Usenet Newsgroup Archive: rec.radio.amateur.policy

2003-10 - 2003-12

These Usenet messages were preserved as a plain-text archive. This PDF was generated by Digital Library of Amateur Radio & Communications from the source text file in 2026.

Date span: 2003-10-01 through 2003-12-31

Source text: rec.radio.amateur.policy.txt

Source item: https://archive.org/details/usenet-rec

Messages included in this PDF: 5,150

Message records with no readable body available in the source text: 1

Messages are presented chronologically by archived date.

Binary or encoded payloads are not printed as blocks of encoded text; a placeholder appears where such material was detected. The original source text is unchanged.

1. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-01 00:00:54 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <WOoeb.5196$Hd6.3057934@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 79578

"Radio Amateur KC2HMZ" <kc2hmz@aa-mail.removespamkiller.net> wrote in
message news:ceoinvcuqe7i7nr6h5vhv2u10ibhjtuilk@4ax.com...
> Let's
> find something worthwhile to discuss in this NG...like for example,
> how do we refarm the subbands once there's no longer any need for 'em?
>

Not a useful discussion. Dropping the code test does not mean that there will be no need for the existing subbands. If all 600,000+ US amateurs are now eligible for HF operation and take advantage of that eligibility, the bands could be really chaotic. The DX stations may very well hope we keep the subbands in place. It will probably be even more necessary to continue to keep the subbands and I would expect to see more emphasis placed on following the voluntary band plans.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

2. Re: Some thoughtful comments from another forum on the code/nocode debate

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-01 00:27:11 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <zbpeb.5201$Hd6.3063418@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 79579

"Hans K0HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:5ee63311.0309301519.5d1920b5@posting.google.com...
> N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote
>
> >
> > It is a fact of human nature that most people value a thing more if it
> > took some investment of themselves to acquire.
> >
>
> Jim, you really need to retire this old mantra.
>
> 'It is a fact of human nature' that real people don't value a thing
> based on it's 'investment' or 'cost', but rather based on the
> usefulness, utility, comfort, satisfaction, or enjoyment that comes
> from having it.
>
> My amateur license cost me virtually nothing in terms of 'investment
> of myself', and the curbs and gutters the city just installed at one
> of my places cost me an $8,200 assessment. I value my amateur license
> a LOT more than I value the city's new street curbing!

You invested your time, interest, and self in the amateur license. You merely put money into the curbs and gutters. In the minds of many people, the investment in your amateur license was far greater that your investment in curbs and gutters.

>
> The things that I value the very most quite honestly are literal gifts
> which I have recieved without an ounce of 'investment' or 'cost' ---
> the love of my wife, the smiles of my grandkids, the whisper of the
> wind at sunset on Lake Vermilion, the conversation with an old friend,
> or my healthy heart. I value all of these more than my homes, my RV,
> my boat, or the QSL collection in the closet.
>

The love of your wife and all these things are not free and are not gifts. A loving relationship requires a large and continuous investment of self (not money) to endure and to be worth while. Each of the other items also requires some type of investment from you that doesn't necessary involve money.

Investment is not exclusively a monetary term.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

3. Re: Some thoughtful comments from another forum on the code/nocode debate

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-01 00:29:38 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030930202938.07346.00000910@mb-m26.aol.com>
Source record: 79580

In article <Xns9406AFC53722Delektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun Palmer
<elektros@yahoo.com> writes:

><snip>
>>
>> It is a fact of human nature that most people value a thing more if it
>> took some investment of themselves to acquire.
>>
>> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>I think this is precisely why some people argue so vociferously for code
>tesing despite the lack of any logical arguments for retaining it.

There are lots of logical arguments for retaining code testing. And lots of
logical arguments for getting rid of it.

Ultimately it comes down to people's opinions about what should and should not
be tested.

>That is
>to say, they value it because it's hard instead of because it's necessary
>(which it isn't!!!).
>
That's right - it's certainly not hard!

73 de Jim, N2EY

4. Re: BPL endorsed by FCC, another threat to HF ham radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-01 00:29:39 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030930202939.07346.00000911@mb-m26.aol.com>
Source record: 79581

In article <d22b54c3.0309300833.34274d9f@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com
(Brian Kelly) writes:

>n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
>news:<20030928202920.02537.00000798@mb-m23.aol.com>...
>> In article <d22b54c3.0309280702.f58c37b@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com
>> (Brian Kelly) writes:

>> One of the big selling points is that you;ll be able to plug in your
>computer
>> anywhere and be online thru the power plug. Ugh.
>
>No problem, just run the 110v into one of yer USB ports . . .

buzz...zap...
>
>> >I wouldn't be too sure of that, those old cable systems used 100%
>> >analog technologies. If these BPL goobers use spread spectrum schemes
>> >even a monster signal on a discrete frequency might not have much if
>> >any interference effects on BPL.
>>
>> Yep. The adaptive system might just avoid that freq - or raise power to get
>> through it!
>>
>> Worse, the way folks like Comm, Abernathy talk, the rules would be changed
>so
>> that the licensed ham is the bad guy!
>
>At which point ham radio would become another 27 Mhz. "behavior
>problem", Riley would need to call up the reserves 'cause we AIN'T
>going off the air.

They know where we all are. And the local gendarmes have already been empowered
to go after cbers.

>> >I normally stay away from "political politics" in this NG and stick to
>> >the usual code test politics but I gotta state that as a lifetime
>> >moderate Republican I've about had it with the current
>> >administration's slash and burn tactics across the board. All of 'em,
>> >environmental issues, the Iraq disaster,
>>
>> WMDs? What WMDs?
>>
>> Connection to 9/11? Ooops, not really.
>
>I can more or less shrug those,

They were two of the biggest reasons given to invade...

>what really irks me is the complete
>lack of understanding of the cultures in the mideast and points east
>and the implications of those cultures as they relate to attempts to
>impose western style democracies in those countries by force of arms.

"western style democracies" as in "Texas style"...

>One of the bitch points on Dubya when he was running against Gore was
>that he's utterly clueless in the field of foreign policy. Bingo.
>Welcome to Tikrit.

boink

btw, the US wound up doing a job OBL wanted done (get SH out of Iraq). Ironic,
huh?
>
>> Quagmire? What did Dan, W4NTI predict here some time back?
>
>Seconds after we watched the second tower collapse I asked my brother
>how many countries he'd bet we were gonna "inherit"and bungle. I bet
>four. Two down, two to go.
>
That's about right. Notice how much Afghanistan is in the news these days?
>
>> >the incestuous cowboy
>> >cronyism and now this BPL crap.
>>
>> It's an environmental issue to the core. Which is why a true
>environmentalist
>> is against BPL, and the "let's stripmine Yellowstone Park" folks are for
>it.
>
>No, it's gonna become Disneystone Park . . and Haliburton will get the
>no-bid contracts to build it.

Yeah, that's about right.
>
>> >Just for openers. I haven't voted for
>> >a damned (wash my mouf') Democrat for forty years but I'm warming up
>> >to the concept.
>>
>> Hmmm.....General Wesley Clark, anyone? Dr. Howard Dean?
>
>Unfortunately. Dig up Harry!

sigh
>
The party of the Great Emancipator may just wind up putting the Terminator in
as governor of California.

Thank Ralph Nader for putting Dubya in office. Every poll I know of showed that
the majority of RN voters would have either stayed home or voted for Algore.

Almost poetic that the Green Party candidate who took on GM put a Texas oilman
in the Oval Office.

>> >That angle might be our only shot at killing this thing. There are a
>> >number of heavy-duty federal agencies using the HF spectrum for very
>> >important purposes and those folks are quietly running studies and
>> >tests on BPL and it's potential impact on their operations. We'll see.
>>
>> I think perhaps the cooler heads at FCC may be simply taking their time and
>> allowing limited testing so that:
>>
>> a) the election is next year and there may be some changes up top
>>
>> b) the opponents have maximum opportunity to make measurements and
>observations
>>
>> c) the truly rotten business model for BPL kills the whole mess. (You think
>> those filters will be inexpensive? I don't, and they're just one
>component).
>
>Methinks that yer point (c) is where the rubber hits the road if/when
>all else fails.

Can you say "Iridium?" I knew that you could.

>BPL was authorized and implemented in a number of
>European countries several years ago and wound up falling flat on it's
>face via capitalist econmomics.

In countries where things are a lot more controlled, state-supported and
organized than here. And it bombed. Tells ya something.

>How stupid are these people anyway?
>
>Never mind, been answered previously . . Tikrit, etc . .
>
"Don't bother, they're here"

73 de Jim, N2EY

5. Re: Some thoughtful comments from another forum on the code/nocode debate

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-01 00:36:58 UTC
From: charlesb <n5pvl@sbcglobal.net>
Message-ID: <Kkpeb.7509$Ro4.7334@newssvr33.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 79582

"Hans K0HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:5ee63311.0309301519.5d1920b5@posting.google.com...
> N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote
>
> >
> > It is a fact of human nature that most people value a thing more if it
> > took some investment of themselves to acquire.
> >
>
> Jim, you really need to retire this old mantra.
>

Now, now Hans... Surely you know the value in charging your clients. If you do not, they will not attach nearly as much importance to the therapy they recieve. That's a fact of life.

Charles Brabham, N5PVL

6. Re: Lennie's Double Standard Once Again Revealed...BY Lennie!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-01 00:37:36 UTC
From: Clint <"rattlehead at computron dot net">
Message-ID: <vnk8gbsap9td88@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 79583

Generally the PCTA crowd has been putting most of the
people who challenge thier position and willing to debate
thier points on thier killfiles. Sounds pretty much like it
is they, not the NCTA, that can handle the scrutiny
and are therefore obviously on thin ice.

Clint

--

--

Get in touch with your soul: www.glennbeck.com
OR, if you're a liberal, maybe you can FIND one

--

7. Re: Some thoughtful comments from another forum on the code/nocode debate

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-01 00:40:57 UTC
From: Clint <"rattlehead at computron dot net">
Message-ID: <vnk8mndosanva0@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 79584

"Hans K0HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:5ee63311.0309301519.5d1920b5@posting.google.com...
> N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote
>
> >
> > It is a fact of human nature that most people value a thing more if it
> > took some investment of themselves to acquire.
> >
>
> Jim, you really need to retire this old mantra.
>
> 'It is a fact of human nature' that real people don't value a thing
> based on it's 'investment' or 'cost', but rather based on the
> usefulness, utility, comfort, satisfaction, or enjoyment that comes
> from having it.

EXACTLY.

Everybody I know direly and sincerely want to win the lottery, and
don't mind one bit knowing that the ticket only costs them $1... and
I doubt seriously everybody who has been plunged into millionaire
status stays up at night worrying about the fact that they didn't
work for the money.

I believe the "you enjoy more if you work for it" line is just a
way of trying to get people to do something they rather had
not do.

--

Get in touch with your soul: www.glennbeck.com
OR, if you're a liberal, maybe you can FIND one

--

8. Re: The way to stop BPL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-01 01:59:28 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bldchn$55b@library2.airnews.net>
Source record: 79585

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:VF6eb.177$qj6.120427@news1.news.adelphia.net...
> Kim W5TIT wrote:
>
> > "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
> > news:oP5eb.156$qj6.105117@news1.news.adelphia.net...
> >
> >>Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
> >>
> >>
> >>>Interesting to note that Dick just couldn't bring himself to mention
> >>>that I was the one who took the reporter out and demonstrated
> >>>the interference to him ... but I'm not surprised.
> >>
> >>Carl, you've noted that we should stick together on this one.
> >>
> >>Perhaps "we" doesn't include Dick?
> >>
> >>There was no insult toward you in his post, and I would note that he
> >>posted the link to the article, which no doubt he read, and no doubt saw
> >>that you were a part of the article.
> >>
> >>If we are to get together and fight this thing, it might be worth
> >>pointing out that not only should those who support Morse testing try to
> >>get along with those who don't - but the opposite is also true.
> >>
> >>- Mike KB3EIA -
> >>
> >
> >
> > That's a rather lofty goal, Mike, when considering that folks like
DICKhead,
> > Larry, and lately, you, act the way you do. Think about it. Most of
the
> > people to whom sheer disrespect is aimed at are the folks that have no
> > problem at all with those of you who love, appreciate and admire CW as a
> > mode and even the fact that you wish it to remain as a part of the test
> > requirement. But the lack of tolerance displayed by people such as
> > DICKhead, Larry, you, Dan/W4whatever, and others is overwhelmingly
> > despicable and beyond being able to "join" together for the cause. The
only
> > common ground that may be found is that we are all amateurs. And, I
doubt
> > you'll even admit that.

>
> Whoa there. Kim. Point out what exactly I have done that is so
> despicable. Is this some sort of thing where I stand up for Dick, then I
> am the same as him? I don't agree with everything he does. I don't care
> for him calling people names. I don't care for Larry doing that, I don't
> care for Steve and his Lennie stuff either. I've had discussions with at
> least Larry and Steve about it.
>

It's more what you haven't done, Mike, although some of even what you have done. You can't nudge "this one" in the side, wink at that one over there, and pat this one on the back and then stand in the middle of the street suggesting to everyone that we "should all get along."

I, for one--and maybe the only one--don't trust people like that. You sit on the fence. I'm waiting to get spike by the barbed wire.

>
> Are you lumping me together with these guys because of that antenna
> thread here? I'm not calling anyone names, I'm even trying to make some
> technical input on the subject, rather than the
>

I hardly present my opinion based on one thread, Mike. And, if you feel like you are being "lumped" with "these guys" then perhaps you should review your own alliances--as I wouldn't appreciate the connotation of being called a "these guys."

>
> > At any rate, what I'm saying is, don't look for agreement, pats on the
back,
> > or a joining of the hands. The behaviors displayed by folks like you,
et
> > al, make me quite untrusting of you, and not particularly interested in
your
> > thoughts--whether they be for or against the good of amateur radio. I
don't
> > care about amateur radio when I think of people like you being in it. I
> > don't speak for Carl; and I'm probably being a lot more blunt than he
would
> > be. But, understand, when it comes to tolerance of you guys--how can
you
> > possibly think there'd be any? Any at all?
>
> Sorry that you feel that way about me Kim.
>
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -
>
>

Why? I hardly think it's going to have any impact one way or the other on your every day doings. We don't even know each other.

Kim W5TIT

9. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-01 02:08:33 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bldd7m$eoh@library2.airnews.net>
Source record: 79587

"Radio Amateur KC2HMZ" <kc2hmz@aa-mail.removespamkiller.net> wrote in
message news:h4linvghp0iibgeq0hcdmv76nbkgk0qpsg@4ax.com...
> On Sun, 28 Sep 2003 23:45:17 GMT, "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this
> mindspring.com> wrote:
>
> >Perhaps you think those that know/use Morse are superior to you. I don't
> >ever recall seeing anyone that advocates Morse saying they felt superior.
>
> Perhaps you have a short memory, then, Dan. A search of Google or some
> other UseNet archive would, I'm sure, turn up at least one thread from
> circa July of this year where at least three of the PCTAs in this NG
> were claiming exactly that. In fairness, I'll admit that I don't
> recall you being one of them. Nevertheless, the attitude does exist
> among some of the PCTAs who regularly post here.
>
> >I know I don't feel that way. However I do feel those that don't play on
CW
> >are missing a major part of the enjoyment they could get from having a
> >amateur license. But thats their loss not mine.
>
> I feel that those who don't participate in public service work are
> missing a major part of the enjoyment they could get from having an
> amateur license. However, I don't go around advocating that hams be
> required to do so, or that they be tested on their ability to do so as
> a requirement of obtaining a license.
>

EXCELLENT point, John. Touche.

Kim W5TIT

10. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-01 02:15:19 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bldf7$f1d@library2.airnews.net>
Source record: 79588

"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
news:c2356669.0309300803.9c3fc6b@posting.google.com...
> "Kim" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:<blaqc2$n8c@library2.airnews.net>...
> > "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> > news:20030929222940.21642.00001310@mb-m01.aol.com...
> > > In article <vnhl0oi1nmb755@corp.supernews.com>, "Clint" <rattlehead at
> > > computron dot net> writes:
> > >
> > > >"Hans K0HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > > >news:5ee63311.0309290902.4bb5c4e@posting.google.com...
> > > >
> > > >>
> > > >> But that's exactly what was suggested. Your words, written in a
clear
> > > >> English declarative statement are unambiguous and say "NO ONE
should
> > > >> be kept out of the ARS" --- that's pretty much the same as saying
> > > >> "NO ONE should be denied a drivers license".
> > > >
> > > >see why the PCTA is accused of slant and spin?
> > >
> > > Nope.
> > >
> > > >I am pretty sure that the phrase "who passes the tests required by
> > > >contemporary
> > > >modern society" was implied.
> > >
> > > Wasn't clear at all.
> > >
> > > >If not, the part about "get thier license"
> > > >pretty much
> > > >removed any remaining "grey area" or misunderstanding.
> > >
> > > The word is spelled "THEIR", Clint. Turn on your spellchecker if you
can't
> > > remember it.
> > >
> > > >> Personally, I think persons who fail the test (or haven't taken a
test)
> > > >> SHOULD be kept out of the ARS.
> > > >>
> > > >> 73, de Hans, K0HB
> > > >

> > > >that's what kim said.
> > > >
> > > No, she didn't.
> > >
> > > And, btw, what makes you think Hans is "PCTA"?
> > >
> > >
> >
> > Jim, I am really, really surprised that you failed to understand that
the
> > part about meeting test requirements was implied. I really am...
> >
> > Oh well...
> >
> Musta caught me at an inference-compromised moment, Kim. It wasn't
> clear to me when I read it.
>
> However, you have since rectified the ambiguity, so that the statement
> would now read something like:
>
> "NO ONE who has passed the required tests should be kept out of the
> ARS"
>
> How's that?
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>

Yeah.

Kim W5TIT

11. Re: I have changed my mind

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-01 02:21:21 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <BSqeb.8495$yp6.242057@nnrp1.ptd.net>
Source record: 79586

"Radio Amateur KC2HMZ" <kc2hmz@aa-mail.removespamkiller.net> wrote in
message news:sl1jnv04ae19qpmf31k0a64bnqf6th23ji@4ax.com...
> On 28 Sep 2003 00:42:49 GMT, wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) wrote:
>
> > Well there it is folks, Karl the Nut is going to save Ham Radio. Just
think
> >Karl is going to put these Billion dollar companies in there place. Lets
all
> >bow to Karl the Nut for saving Ham Radio.
>
> Well, Carl just told us what he's doing to work against the threat of
> BPL. Now, what are YOU doing, Bruce? Anything at all? Or are you too
> busy typing "CBplusser" into what passes for an NNTP client on AOL
> interface to the newsgroups to be bothered addressing anything that's
> actually important to the future of ham radio?
>
> Your personal attack on Carl is really pathetic. Next time you decide
> to bite someone's head off like that, at least swallow, that way
> you'll have more brains in your stomach than you seem to have inside
> of your head.
>
> 73 DE John, KC2HMZ
> Tonawanda, New York

ROTFLMAO!

Carl - wk3c

12. Re: Some thoughtful comments from another forum on the code/nocode debate

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-01 02:21:27 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <blddqo$fcj@library2.airnews.net>
Source record: 79589

"Hans K0HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:5ee63311.0309301519.5d1920b5@posting.google.com...
> N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote
>
> >
> > It is a fact of human nature that most people value a thing more if it
> > took some investment of themselves to acquire.
> >
>
> Jim, you really need to retire this old mantra.
>
> 'It is a fact of human nature' that real people don't value a thing
> based on it's 'investment' or 'cost', but rather based on the
> usefulness, utility, comfort, satisfaction, or enjoyment that comes
> from having it.
>

Why does it have to be your way or no way, Hans? I think Jim's right to a certain degree, and I think your right to a certain degree--it all depends upon what is being valued and who is doing the evaluating.

>
> My amateur license cost me virtually nothing in terms of 'investment
> of myself', and the curbs and gutters the city just installed at one
> of my places cost me an $8,200 assessment. I value my amateur license
> a LOT more than I value the city's new street curbing!
>
> The things that I value the very most quite honestly are literal gifts
> which I have recieved without an ounce of 'investment' or 'cost' ---
> the love of my wife, the smiles of my grandkids, the whisper of the
> wind at sunset on Lake Vermilion, the conversation with an old friend,
> or my healthy heart. I value all of these more than my homes, my RV,
> my boat, or the QSL collection in the closet.
>
> With all kind wishes,
>
> de Hans, K0HB

The only one of those, above, that is a literal gift is the wind at sunset on Lake Vermilion. The rest cost you plenty.

Kim W5TIT

13. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-01 02:22:18 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <blddsb$fco@library2.airnews.net>
Source record: 79590

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:sfoeb.5184$Hd6.3048933@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
>
> "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> news:blaqc2$n8c@library2.airnews.net...
> > Jim, I am really, really surprised that you failed to understand that
the
> > part about meeting test requirements was implied. I really am...
> >
> > Oh well...
> >
> > Kim W5TIT
>
> It is the fact that people think certain things are "implied" that keeps
the
> lawyers mighty busy. These days, if something isn't stated, it isn't
> considered part of the meaning or intent of the passage.
>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>

Well, these days there's a lot more ways of thinking than what you think ;)

Kim W5TIT

14. Re: Some thoughtful comments from another forum on the code/nocode debate

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-01 02:23:36 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <blddup$dhu@library2.airnews.net>
Source record: 79591

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:zbpeb.5201$Hd6.3063418@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
>
> "Hans K0HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:5ee63311.0309301519.5d1920b5@posting.google.com...
> > N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote
> >
> > >
> > > It is a fact of human nature that most people value a thing more if it
> > > took some investment of themselves to acquire.
> > >
> >
> > Jim, you really need to retire this old mantra.
> >
> > 'It is a fact of human nature' that real people don't value a thing
> > based on it's 'investment' or 'cost', but rather based on the
> > usefulness, utility, comfort, satisfaction, or enjoyment that comes
> > from having it.
> >
> > My amateur license cost me virtually nothing in terms of 'investment
> > of myself', and the curbs and gutters the city just installed at one
> > of my places cost me an $8,200 assessment. I value my amateur license
> > a LOT more than I value the city's new street curbing!
>
> You invested your time, interest, and self in the amateur license. You
> merely put money into the curbs and gutters. In the minds of many people,
> the investment in your amateur license was far greater that your
investment
> in curbs and gutters.
>
> >
> > The things that I value the very most quite honestly are literal gifts
> > which I have recieved without an ounce of 'investment' or 'cost' ---
> > the love of my wife, the smiles of my grandkids, the whisper of the
> > wind at sunset on Lake Vermilion, the conversation with an old friend,
> > or my healthy heart. I value all of these more than my homes, my RV,
> > my boat, or the QSL collection in the closet.
> >
>
> The love of your wife and all these things are not free and are not gifts.
> A loving relationship requires a large and continuous investment of self
> (not money) to endure and to be worth while. Each of the other items also
> requires some type of investment from you that doesn't necessary involve
> money.

>
> Investment is not exclusively a monetary term.
>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>

Absolutely. Were they as free as Hans seems to think they are, I really wonder how valuable they would be.

Kim W5TIT

15. Re: Some thoughtful comments from another forum on the code/nocode debate

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-01 02:30:35 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030930223035.28496.00001006@mb-m18.aol.com>
Source record: 79592

In article <m6feb.8394$yp6.234106@nnrp1.ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
<wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:

>"Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
>news:f45722ac.0309300431.673f47fe@posting.google.com...
>>
>> Furthermore, if the US government wants to give all prospective
>> amateurs 3 hots and a cot, and a paycheck, for the duration it takes
>> to learn the code, I'd gladly enroll in the CG Morse Code school.
>
>There's one problem ... there IS no CG Morse Code school any
>more ...

Sad but true.

> the services are NOT teaching their radiomen Morse any
>more.

Even if they were - would it make any difference to your opinion of the need
for code testing in the amateur radio service?

73 de Jim, N2EY

16. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-01 02:36:57 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0309301836.28883721@posting.google.com>
Source record: 79593

Radio Amateur KC2HMZ <kc2hmz@aa-mail.removespamkiller.net> wrote in message news:<9mlinvoa6i3oapitsshpd7kqoicthjg6i7@4ax.com>...

> With all this talk about children vs. adults and superior vs.
> inferior, I can't help observing that insistence upon getting one's
> way regardless of the consequences to themselves or others is a
> personality trait that is generally observed in, shall we say, less
> mature individuals.

I know what you mean, John.

Why, not too long ago I knew a fellow who "owned" an e mail reflector that would grandiosly "ban" people from his list that didn't share HIS specific opinions on things.

Some way to get in the last word, huh...???

> It should also be noted that, to non-hams, this whole argument
> undoubtedly seems quite childish.

Since this forum is about Amateur Radio FOR Amateur Radio operators (realizing that it IS an open, unmoderated forum, of course), it is irrelevent as to what "non-hams" think. No one, regardless of thier position on ANY subject, "owes" it to anyone who is NOT a licensed and participating operator, to explain each and evry reason for ANY opinion.

If you are not experienced in a specific pursuit you shouldn't insult those who are. For example I would not be found in a NASCAR fan-club forum, nor in one dedicated to gardening...at least as anything other than a passive reader. Unless you are ASKING for help, it's a matter of common courtesy.

Steve, K4YZ

17. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-01 02:44:33 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0309301844.621fa23b@posting.google.com>
Source record: 79594

Radio Amateur KC2HMZ <kc2hmz@aa-mail.removespamkiller.net> wrote in message news:<1arinvsaj4osp5ebet63vuv9fj2v2aubns@4ax.com>...

> The wake will undoubtedly be held here in rrap, where many will call
> it the end of ham radio...(SNIP)

Actually it will only be the end of an era.

The .0003% of the Amateur community that espouse any opinion to the contrary will go thier own way, and the other .0003% who constantly deride them for THIER opinions will go thier way too.

And Amateur Radio, just like it has for the last 80+ years already past, will go on.

Steve, K4YZ

18. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-01 03:12:29 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0309301912.19012228@posting.google.com>
Source record: 79595

Radio Amateur KC2HMZ <kc2hmz@aa-mail.removespamkiller.net> wrote in message news:<ceoinvcuqe7i7nr6h5vhv2u10ibhjtuilk@4ax.com>...

> In fact, it looks to me as if the code test has one foot out the door
> and the other on a banana peel, whether you or I or anyone else likes
> it or not, so this entire debate in rrap is rather pointless. Let's
> find something worthwhile to discuss in this NG...like for example,
> how do we refarm the subbands once there's no longer any need for 'em?

Big mistake there, John.

Ironically, the ONLY two "CW Only" subbands in ANY US Amateur allocation are in the 6 and 2 meter bands. Even more ironic is the amount of time NCT folks have "debated" the need for CW on HF, yet not a single person, NCT or otherwise, to my knowledge, has ever challenged those >>VHF<< segments...

Looooooooong after the requirement for code testing has slipped past us, there will be a lasting need for NARROWBAND subbands, John. PACTOR, AMTOR, PSK31, RTTY, and a host of other digital modes populate those segments. THOSE folks will be no more willing to face an influx of voice operators than CW ops would be.

Furthermore, the elimination of code testing will NOT eliminate the presence of code USERS for some time to come.

Once the code test has been eliminated, I expect we can see an increase in not only voice users, but digital mode operation will increase too. So while we can expect a gradual decrease in the number of stations employing CW, we will simultaneously see an influx of folks who will need those "digital" allocations.

So don't get your hopes up, KC2HMZ, that the end of code testing will open 20 meters up from end to end for yakkity-yakers. The dynamics of Amateur HF practice exceed the code issue significantly.

Steve, K4YZ

19. LIMP ONES NEED NOT TRANSMIT ON MY FREQUENCY. I OWN **3894*5**. ONLY INVITED

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-01 03:12:31 UTC
From: THE*CARING*STATION* <THE*CARING*STATION*@THE*CARING*STATION*.COM>
Message-ID: <vnilpkepf8lue7@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 79476

```
LIMP ONES NEED NOT TRANSMIT ON MY FREQUENCY. I OWN **3894*5**. ONLY INVITED
QUEST MAY TRANSMIT ON MY FREQUENCY.
```

20. Re: Bowling for Ham Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-01 03:14:52 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0309301914.3e9c09fc@posting.google.com>
Source record: 79596

Radio Amateur KC2HMZ <kc2hmz@aa-mail.removespamkiller.net> wrote in message news:<r41jnvgsmf0vdur850gjc4835ju1c4d3ph@4ax.com>...
> On 27 Sep 2003 11:01:45 GMT, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:
>
> >Scoring would be on the basis of mistakes. If a word in the messages is missing
> >or misspelled, that's a mistake.
>
> How does one misspell a word when using a voice mode?
>
> >If nonstandard procedure or phonetics are
> >used, each deviation is a mistake.
>
> Welp...that lets out half the contesters I know. Kilowatt Five Texas
> Radio, please submit your license for cancellation.

Agreed. Real phone contesters use ICAO phonetics. K5TR oughta be "Kilo Fife Tango Reddio".

>
> 73 DE John, KC2HMZ
> Tonawanda, New York

Whiskey Thuree Romeo Viktor.

Dewar's please and thankew.

21. Re: Isnt it Funny (No-Code HF Privileges)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-01 03:22:31 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@STOPearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <XLreb.3$f11.1@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 79597

"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote:
>
> Are they the model we hams should follow, or should
> we take them as a cautionary tale of what could happen
> to us?

I wasn't offering CB as a model. In fact, because of its rather unique history, I don't think one can use CB as a model for much of anything. CB went to h*ll in a hand basket after Hollywood associated it with the illegal activities shown in several movies of the time (Convoy, Smokey & the Bandit, and so on).

The movie, Smokey & the Bandit, was almost classroom instruction on how to use a CB radio, with Bert Renolds ("Bandit") showing Sally Fields ("Frog") what buttons to push and what to say. As you may remember, this movie was about a trucker moving illegal cargo across the country as quickly as possible, while "Bandit" (with "Frog" riding along) distracted police away from the truck using his faster car. CB radios were used throughout the movie.

Obviously, movies like these attracted people with the same "outlaw" mentality to CB Radio. Today, these people attract others like themselves to CB Radio. However, if Hollywood had used Ham Radio in those movies instead, perhaps these same people would have been attracted to Ham Radio and Ham Radio would have the problems today instead of CB Radio. But, as it is, Ham Radio does not offer the same attractions for these people (the "outlaw" image, anonymous operation, and so on). Because of that, most of these people have no interested in Ham Radio. The few who are interested in Ham Radio are attracted for what Ham Radio has to offer, not what CB has to offer. Therefore, these people are not likely to display the same CB-like behavior in the Ham Radio frequencies. The fact that a good number, perhaps the majority, of today's Ham Operators owned a CB radio sometime in the past (or present) supports this conclusion.

> Now which is the better deal?

My message was an attempt to undermine Bruce's many posts trashing Technicians (he is the one constantly bringing up the CB nonsense), not to make any real comparisons between CB and Ham Radio (or CB'ers and Technicians).

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

22. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-01 03:28:33 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@STOPearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <BRreb.6$f11.0@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 79598

```
"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote:
> "Dwight Stewart" writes:
>
> >"Kim" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote:
> >>
> >> (snip) the real reason is for the desire of CW testing
> >> to stay around: these folks believe in its power to
> >> filter out folks who act just like them.
> >>
> >>
> > I quoted this part because I wanted to make sure everyone
> > read it. When it comes to at least a few of those on the
> > pro-code side, I think you hit the nail right on the head with
> > this, Kim.
>
> I am reminded of an old line usually credited to Groucho Marx:
> "I wouldn't join a club that would have me as a member"....

Said years ago. Amazing how little things change over time.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
```

23. Points Of Perception...What Do YOU Call "Collateral Damage"...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-01 03:32:04 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0309301932.4f2bc48a@posting.google.com>
Source record: 79599

Radio Amateur KC2HMZ <kc2hmz@aa-mail.removespamkiller.net> wrote in message news:<vtqinv0gdvm1pinppbkgksdjcn1cevjtoj@4ax.com>...

> The code test will soon vanish, and then hopefully we can get around
> to the business of repairing the collateral damage that's been done to
> the ARS in the process.

"Collateral damage", John...???

You've been watching too much CNN.

You wouldn't be talking about the "damage" created by the influx of over a quarter of a million NON-code licensees, would you?

Or would that be by the "damage" created by Amateur volunteers in the last 80+ years that has earned Amateur Radio the respect and hearldry bestowed upon it by the American Red Cross, the Deaprtment of State, the Department of Defense, the Salvation Army, FEMA, etc etc etc...??? (Not to mention mentions in the Federal Register and accolades rendered on the House and Senate floor)

Perhaps you were alluding to the "damage" created by the creation of a radio repeater net that has withstood fire, flood, maelstrom and terrorist attack...Is THAT the "damage" you were refering to? I heard all the "complaints" about it from about two dozen New York and New Jersey emergency response groups from all the "trouble" they created in September 2001...You should read all the things some of those guys had to say about Amatuer Radio!

Maybe you meant the "damage" created by the fact that we are (generally) self-policing and allowed by the FCC to mentor our own? I don't see the commercial services being allowed to do this, but I guess I am missing something...

Or I guess you were refering to the "damage" caused by the interruption of our schools by such programs as ARISS and SAREX...??? I can see how taking little Johnny and Mary away from recess to chat wwith orbiting astronauts might inhibit thier imaginations...

And I guess we sure got our "come-uppance" when we were allocated new bands on HF in the last 20 years.

Otherwise, I haven't got a clue of what you were alluding to...And I doubt YOU did either, John.

Steve, K4YZ

24. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-01 03:32:29 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@STOPearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <hVreb.8$f11.3@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 79600

"Radio Amateur KC2HMZ" wrote:
>
> It should also be noted that, to non-hams, this whole argument
> undoubtedly seems quite childish.

This argument has been going on so long, I don't think most even remember what it is exactly about anymore. Sadly, I suspect the argument will continue on even after code testing itself is a distant memory.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

25. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-01 03:40:21 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bldib5$h12$0@208.206.142.81>
Source record: 79602

Radio Amateur KC2HMZ wrote:
> On 27 Sep 2003 02:29:22 GMT, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
> wrote:
>
>
>>Kim says my posts lack intelligence. I guess, from her POV, that may
>>be true. She obviously defines "intelligence" as being in agreement with
>>her, or supporting whatever she says or does. I can, therefore, understand
>>why she would want to avoid further debate with someone with whom she
>>would have to make an effort to defend herself. I'll say one thing for Kim --
>>she knows how to look into a mirror and see a lost cause.
>
>
> Now if only you'd follow suit, look into the FCC's report and order
> from the last restructuring, and recognize what a lost cause it is
> trying to retain a testing requirement that should have been
> eliminated 25 years ago and will soon be eliminated regardless of how
> may times the same arguments that didn't work last time are retyped
> and refiled with FCC this time.
>
> Qouth the FCC:
>
> "We believe that an individual's ability to demonstrate increased
> Morse code proficiency is not necessarily indicative of that
> individual's ability to contribute to the advancement of the radio
> art. As a result, we find that such a license qualification rule is
> not in furtherance of the purpose of the amateur service and we do not
> believe that it continues to serve a regulatory purpose."
>
> Yeah, I'll repeat:
>
> "...such a license qualification rule is not in furtherance of the
> purpose of the amateur service..."
>
> If you'll be so cooperative as to tell us which part of that you have
> difficulty comprehending, we'll try to help you.
>
> 73 DE John, KC2HMZ
> Tonawanda, New York

John, let's examine that paragraph a little closer with the intent of
furthering your own comprehension.

FCC sed...

"We believe that an individual's ability to demonstrate increased
> Morse code proficiency is not necessarily indicative of that
> individual's ability to contribute to the advancement of the radio
> art."

Well, that was demonstrated when they lowered the maximum code sped test
to 5wpm. That would be a n example of "increased code speed" being dropped.

then.............

"As a result, we find that such a license qualification rule is
> not in furtherance of the purpose of the amateur service and we do not
> believe that it continues to serve a regulatory purpose."

Yes indeed, that is exactly the point upon which they acted when
they reduced the code test to 5wpm.

then finally you requote...........

"...such a license qualification rule is not in furtherance of the
> purpose of the amateur service...

Which clearly means they didn't intend to retain a fast code test
for amateur licensing. Which fact they acted upon in the resulting R&O.

So where does any of that indicate they have any intent whatever to
completely drop all code testing?????

Dick

26. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-01 03:40:23 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bldib7$h12$1@208.206.142.81>
Source record: 79601

John KC2HCZ strolled out and proclaimed...
>>>>>
"We note, moreover, that the design of modern communications systems, including personal communication services, satellite, fiber optic, and high definition television systems, are based on digital communication technologies. We also note that no communication system has been designed in many years that depends on hand-keyed telegraphy or the ability to receive messages in Morse code by ear. In contrast, modern communication systems are designed to be automated systems. Given the changes that have occurred in communications in the last fifty years, we believe that reducing the emphasis on telegraphy proficiency as a licensing requirement will allow the amateur service to, as it has in the past, attract technically inclined persons, particularly the youth of our country, and encourage them to learn and to prepare themselves in the areas where the United States needs expertise."

SOURCE -- The Federal Communications Commission
In the Matter of WT Docket No. 98-143 RM-9148 RM-9150 RM-9196
1998 Biennial Regulatory Review
Amendment of Part 97 of the Commission's Amateur Service Rules.
REPORT AND ORDER
Adopted: December 22, 1999 Released: December 30, 1999

You may now proceed to thank me for finally clearing this up.
>>>>>

John I sure hope you don't strain your elbow patting yerself on your back prematurely.

There is still NOTHING in there which even remotely suggests that FCC has any intent to completely drop code testing. The operative word was **REDUCING* which - Gee!- they already did!

Dick

27. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-01 03:40:29 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bldibd$h12$2@208.206.142.81>
Source record: 79603

KC2HMZ wrote:

>FCC dropped the 13 and 20WPM tests last time,

Yes, they did.

> just like they'll drop the remaining vestiges of code testing this
> time around.

Would you be kind enough to provide a direct FCC quotation which
supports that assertion? I haven't been able to find one, much as I've
read and watched for it to come scrolling by.

What I DO see is that you codehaters have made several erroneous
assuptions based on your wishes instead of reading what was written
by FCC.

> There's still time for you to change your mind before a report & order
> comes out, though...
>

Yeah, you too, John. In fact I wouldn't be in a hurry to see
a new R&O, if I were you. The person at FCC who matters has stated
very publicly that one wasn't likely anytime soon.

Dick

28. Re: Bowling for Ham Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-01 03:40:31 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bldibf$h12$3@208.206.142.81>
Source record: 79604

Radio Amateur KC2HMZ wrote:

> On 27 Sep 2003 11:01:45 GMT, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:
>
>
>>Scoring would be on the basis of mistakes. If a word in the messages is missing
>>or misspelled, that's a mistake.
>
>
> How does one misspell a word when using a voice mode?

Tin't a bit difficult, y'all

29. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-01 04:11:04 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@STOPearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <stseb.39$f11.23@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 79605

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote:
>
> Here, try this one:
>
> "All else being equal, a radio amateur who has Morse
> Code skills is more experienced, more qualified, and
> has more radio communications options available than
> a radio amateur with no Morse Code skills."

Without a desire to communicate with Morse Code, there is no truth to that statement at all. Even with that (the all being equal aspect), there is no truth to the "more experienced" or "more qualified" when it comes to absolutely anything beyond Morse Code. Therefore, those two have no place in that paragraph without Morse Code, not the radio amateur, specified as the "more" being discussed. Therefore, only the "more radio communications options" has any significant ring of truth to it.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

30. Re: Some thoughtful comments from another forum on the code/nocode debate

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-01 04:31:11 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3F7A588D.4020008@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 79606

Dick Carroll wrote:

> N2EY wrote:
>
>> In article <8opdb.8103$yp6.195867@nnrp1.ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
>> <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:
>>
>>
>>> I thought I'd forward the thoughtful comments below from
>>> e-ham.net ... they say a LOT. (name/callsign omitted to
>>> at least partially protect the innocent ...)
>>
>>
>>
>> Why? We can always go searching through eham
>>
>>> Carl - wk3c
>>>
>>> *********
>>> For the last 25 years I have been in the US Coast Guard serving
>>
>>
>>
> > >>BIG SNIPPAGE to make room for the internet cracker/hacker/spammers
> to operate<<<
>
>>
>>> Anyway . my two cents worth.
>>> ************
>>> END QUOTE FROM E-HAM.NET
>>
>
>
>
> There are so many holes, inaccuracies and downright lies in that
> piece that it deserves no credibility whatever.

Some of it makes some sense. an older ham I know got his license
back when he was in an army signal core training course, which included
CW. The people in his group were granted two day passes to visit the
FCC field office to take ham tests. All passed the code test, but only
my friend passed the written. The way he tells it, few even bothered to
fill in any of that test. This was in the early fifties during Korea, and
the highest they had then was the general license.

So it may have been that the people in the eham story were "required"
to take ham tests to get weekend passes or other such prize.

>
>
>
>
> -------------------------
>
> ...even though the UK has dropped mandatory Morse testing, they are
> still testing for it and retain 4 classes of licenses and they have
> different call signs for each class so you can tell which station has
> a CW license:
>
> Class A has 12 wpm test and grants calls with M0 prefix
>
> Class B licensees pass the same written test as Class A, but not CW,
> and they now get full HF privileges. Their calls are M1 prefixes
>
> Intermediate A (like Novice) has 5 wpm test and grants frequencies
> above 144 MHz. They get calls with a prefix 2+Letter+0 (any letter
> is possible)
>
> Intermediate B has same written test as Intermediate A and no Morse.
> They get call with a prefix 2+Letter+1.
>
> Apparently many are still trying to get a call sign indicating they
> have CW skills. (a rather low form of incentive licensing, but still
> incentive licensing).

But what does the UK's "FCC" get out of it?

31. Re: BPL endorsed by FCC, another threat to HF ham radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-01 04:32:13 UTC
From: Tarapia Tapioco <comesefosse@ntani.firenze.linux.it>
Message-ID: <3327b0fc01efafbc4c81fbcd39b36b49@firenze.linux.it>
Source record: 79607
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors

```
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

Sorry about the double post.

This was my first try, but it took so long
to come through the remailer that I figured
it didn't work and sent it another way.

I don't like to post anonymously, but my
boss is a rabid right winger and you can
guess the rest. I've never used one of
these remailers before.

James Penn
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: GnuPG v1.0.7 (GNU/Linux)

iD8DBQE/ekP/RqMr0Iv3YZURAuweAJ9hhe1o4ipYcARUqSApfDsF9sliRACg0hos
Y4fiQv90aJyoRZxmCjI3QUQ=
=J7Xu
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----
```

32. Re: The way to stop BPL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-01 04:44:19 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <REMOVETHISkc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <blehf7$b6bl2$6@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 79629

Yeah... and PCTA could also stand for Post Code Testing Agenda as well!

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF1-FF2-MFR-(pending NREMT-B!)
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...
"Clint" <rattlehead at computron dot net> wrote in message
news:vnhq5s20u3ov0b@corp.supernews.com...
> one of the two factions fighting over the code testing issue.
>
> PCTA = Pro Code Testing Agenda ...
> NCTA = No Code Test Agenda
>
> The former wants to continue testing mores code
> profeciency as a means of judging whether or not
> you can recieve a ham radio license.
>
> The latter want to remove the last vestiges of
> morse code testing, the 5 wmp code test.
>
> Anything past that is debatable, as to what they
> really want or believe, but those are the basics.
>
> Clint
> KB5ZHT
>
>
> --
>
> --
>
> Get in touch with your soul: www.glennbeck.com
> OR, if you're a liberal, maybe you can FIND one
>
>
> --
> "William Warren" <wwarren.qrm@billhorne.homelinux.org> wrote in message
> news:200309300214.h8U2EkU01960@dell.billhorne.homelinux.org...
> > "Clint" <rattlehead at computron dot net> wrote:
> >
> > > And the PCTA crowd wonders why they aren't
> > > being met with a warmer reception from the
> > > newbies wanting to enter the hobby.

> >
> > Please tell me what "PCTA" means. TIA.
> >
> > Bill
> >
> > (Filter the qrm for direct replies.)
> >
>
>

33. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-01 04:52:23 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bldmi7$qv2$0@208.206.142.81>
Source record: 79608

Dwight Stewart wrote:
> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote:
>
>>Here, try this one:
>>
>>"All else being equal, a radio amateur who has Morse
>>Code skills is more experienced, more qualified, and
>>has more radio communications options available than
>>a radio amateur with no Morse Code skills."
>
>
>
> Without a desire to communicate with Morse Code, there is no truth to that
> statement at all.

And by your logic, if it qualifies for the term, a marksman
who practices on a target range weekly is no better qualified
as a marksman than someone who has never picked up a weapon
because the 'someone' has no interest in shooting. Lame.

34. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-01 05:06:55 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031001010655.21580.00000138@mb-m02.aol.com>
Source record: 79609

>Without a desire to communicate with Morse Code, there is no truth to that
>statement at all

You just hate the truth dont you, for you that ability is not available, so
there you are not a REAL HAM.

35. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-01 06:38:56 UTC
From: Radio Amateur KC2HMZ <kc2hmz@aa-mail.removespamkiller.net>
Message-ID: <sniknvopfb550s8ql7nahupebinj4lfvdl@4ax.com>
Source record: 79610

**** Post for FREE via your newsreader at post.usenet.com ****

On 30 Sep 2003 15:12:12 -0700, N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote:

>by that logic, most of the General and Extra written exams are also
>"government-subsidized life-support system for an anachronism" and/or
>"a welfare program".

You've been dangling the above for a few days now. Sorry, I don't buy it. One of the principles that makes up the Basis And Purpose of the ARS is "Expansion of the existing reservoir within the amateur radio service of trained operators, technicians, and electronics experts."

The design of modern communications equipment is based on digital electronics. Learning about digital electronics, therefore, is in keeping with the Basis And Purpose.

There's nothing in the Basis And Purpose about telegraphy.

FCC has already allowed that "because the amateur service is fundamentally a technical service, the emphasis on Morse code proficiency as a licensing requirement does not comport with the basis and purpose of the service."

(Both quotes above are from FCC's report & order on the last round of restructuring in the ARS)

>>Clint has subsequently elaborated on his comment, citing government
>> subsidizing of the agricultural industry as one example, demonstrating
>> that this is in fact what he had in mind as well.
>
>What major industry in this country is *not* subsidized in some way?

Um, well, there's the porn industry, I suppose...but other than that, you're right, there's a lot of subsidizing going on. However, that doesn't mean that I, or anyone else for that matter, wants the government to select my recreational activities for me on my behalf. I'll make my own choices, thank you.

>> Now, then...once the government has stopped subsidizing the
>> manufacture and testing of CW operators by eliminating the code test,
>> how do you think we should reallocate the Novice subbands?
>
>Reallocate them as special digital experimental subband. Allow any
>documented digital mode that will fit in the subbands to be used
>there. Including digital voice, image, and yes, Morse Code/CW. No
>arbitrary limits on occupied bandwidth or symbol rate as long as the

>signal fits inside.
>
>If somebody wants to run "PSK-3100" and they can document it for FCC,
>fine, let 'em have at it.

I don't agree with unlimited signal bandwidths on HF - that means one guy trying out some ultrawide digital mode wipes out the whole subband and nobody else can experiment until he's through playing around. Not just locally, but if the band is open, the subband's wiped out over a significant portion of the planet.

I could agree with this on the microwave bands, though, where the signals don't travel as far and there are far fewer users in line to use the spectrum that is available.

>Meanwhile, give the Novices and Tech Pluses more HF space than those
>four little slots.

I definitely agree with that.

73 DE John, KC2HMZ
Tonawanda, New York

-=
*** Usenet.com - The #1 Usenet Newsgroup Service on The Planet! ***
http://www.usenet.com
Unlimited Download - 19 Seperate Servers - 90,000 groups - Uncensored
-=

36. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-01 06:38:58 UTC
From: Radio Amateur KC2HMZ <kc2hmz@aa-mail.removespamkiller.net>
Message-ID: <gojknvcrkqcb4k9ffd9vd6q1e909n2g9vi@4ax.com>
Source record: 79611

**** Post for FREE via your newsreader at post.usenet.com ****

On Tue, 30 Sep 2003 23:51:00 GMT, "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
wrote:

>
>"Radio Amateur KC2HMZ" <kc2hmz@aa-mail.removespamkiller.net> wrote in
>message news:buminvkdd1n6autjr5kahfmnpetmja1c47@4ax.com...
>> On 27 Sep 2003 02:29:23 GMT, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
>> wrote:
>>
>>
>> Now, then...once the government has stopped subsidizing the
>> manufacture and testing of CW operators by eliminating the code test,
>> how do you think we should reallocate the Novice subbands?
>>
>>
>
>Well since there are still people who hold Novice licenses, we ought to keep
>them as is. Otherwise the current Novices (who can renew until they die)
>will be losing privileges.

Not necessarily.

> Normally rule changes attempt to be done in such
>a manner that current licensees neither gain nor lose privileges other than
>those very specific to the rule being changed.

That's true, of course. Again, though, refarming the Novice subbands
doesn't necessarily mean that Novices lose the privileges to operate
at those frequencies. It all depends on how you do the refarming.

> I.e. dropping the code test
>would not eliminate the Novice or any other class.

I'm nitpicking now, of course, but I think it would, in a way - it
would eliminate the Tech-Plus, which, although it's no longer shown in
FCC's database, is still for all intents and purposes a license class,
in that any Technician who's passed a code test receives the operating
privileges that were associated with that license class when the words
were still being printed on licenses (and any Tech-Plus who hasn't
renewed yet still has the words on the license).

>If the simplest approach
>is taken to this change (simply dropping the code requirement), we would
>actually have an immediate increase in people with access to the Novice
>subbands as all Techs, not just Techs with code, would now be able to

>operate there. So this should increase the need to keep these bands
>allocated to the Novice/Technician groups.

I think it will create a need for even *more* spectrum to be allocated to those groups - and bear in mind it's not an exclusive allocation; General, Advanced and Extra licensees can operate there as well, as long as they stay at 200 watts or less - but the question is, how many of them are going to be using CW absent a code testing requirement, and how many will be on other modes?

We're told by some PCTAs that once the test is eliminated, the stock of CW operators in the ARS is going to dry up - to hear them tell it, like a wet lawn on a sunny day in July. If they're correct (and with the way some of those folks toss around insults I have to admit that if I was a Technician the last thing I'd be interested in doing is learning code just so I could get on the air and work the same guy who just raked me over the coals in this NG), there's going to be a need for more space for all the new phone ops the PCTAs seem to be fearing the arrival of. Meanwhile, CW is already authorized on any frequency where an amateur has operating privileges, so why continue to have subbands at all?

73 DE John, KC2HMZ
Tonawanda, New York

-=
*** Usenet.com - The #1 Usenet Newsgroup Service on The Planet! ***
http://www.usenet.com
Unlimited Download - 19 Seperate Servers - 90,000 groups - Uncensored
-=

37. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-01 06:39:03 UTC
From: Radio Amateur KC2HMZ <kc2hmz@aa-mail.removespamkiller.net>
Message-ID: <sokknv479ssr320e3e18j3r2f35lvnkfdi@4ax.com>
Source record: 79612

```
**** Post for FREE via your newsreader at post.usenet.com ****

On Tue, 30 Sep 2003 14:30:16 -0400, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote:

>Radio Amateur KC2HMZ wrote:
>
>> I happen to think it's a case of turf defending...the PCTAs feel they
>> must defend their exclusive little slices of the RF spectrum at all
>> costs, regardless of what harm is done to the ARS in the process.
>> They'll kill the mother to save the baby.
>
> What is a permitted method of expression, John?
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -

Ummm...you lost me there somewhere, Mike.

73 DE John, KC2HMZ
Tonawanda, New York

-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=
*** Usenet.com - The #1 Usenet Newsgroup Service on The Planet! ***
http://www.usenet.com
Unlimited Download - 19 Seperate Servers - 90,000 groups - Uncensored
-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=
```

38. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-01 06:39:08 UTC
From: Radio Amateur KC2HMZ <kc2hmz@aa-mail.removespamkiller.net>
Message-ID: <frkknvcj999d14atcfenmeue3n6kn7q0rv@4ax.com>
Source record: 79613

**** Post for FREE via your newsreader at post.usenet.com ****

On 30 Sep 2003 19:36:57 -0700, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP)
wrote:

>Radio Amateur KC2HMZ <kc2hmz@aa-mail.removespamkiller.net> wrote in message
news:<9mlinvoa6i3oapitsshpd7kqoicthjg6i7@4ax.com>...
>
>> With all this talk about children vs. adults and superior vs.
>> inferior, I can't help observing that insistence upon getting one's
>> way regardless of the consequences to themselves or others is a
>> personality trait that is generally observed in, shall we say, less
>> mature individuals.
>
> I know what you mean, John.
>
> Why, not too long ago I knew a fellow who "owned" an e mail
>reflector that would grandiosly "ban" people from his list that didn't
>share HIS specific opinions on things.

If it's the person I think it is, the reflector in question was one
where the list owner had to approve all requests to subscribe to the
group. This is not that uncommon with reflectors. In fact, I'm
currently subscribed to five reflectors where subscriptions must be
approved by the list owner first.

There were only two subscriptions to that particular list that were
ever turned down by the list owner, and they were from two persons
whose behavior on Usenet gave the list owner reason to believe that
the two individuals in question were not likely to contribute anything
worthwhile and, in fact, would probably behave the same way they did
on Usenet. Thus, he did not grant them access to the reflector. The
terms of service agreement with the server operator expressly granted
the listowner that right, and he exercised it.

> Some way to get in the last word, huh...???

The bottom line in this matter is that reflector listowners,
moderators on moderated Usenet newsgroups, and even Internet Service
Providers - and before that moderators on FidoNet and sysops on
landline BBSes, have been blocking access by undesirables and
troublemakers since personal computers first started popping up on
household desktops. Anyone whose access is thus blocked remains free
to start their own reflector/newsgroup/echo/BBS/ISP and spout whatever
drivel he or she sees fit on their OWN time...not on someone else's.

>> It should also be noted that, to non-hams, this whole argument
>> undoubtedly seems quite childish.
>
> Since this forum is about Amateur Radio FOR Amateur Radio
>operators (realizing that it IS an open, unmoderated forum, of
>course), it is irrelevent as to what "non-hams" think.

That strikes me as a rather shortsided view that fails to take into account how the rest of the radio hobby view hams and the amateur radio service. Since the non-hams who read this and other public forum where ham radio is discussed by hams retain the right to vote for the politicians who make the laws that affect us - antenna restrictions, to name one important one - the perception of hams and the ARS by non-hams most certainly *is* relevant to ham radio. Why make enemies when it isn't necessary?

>No one,
>regardless of thier position on ANY subject, "owes" it to anyone who
>is NOT a licensed and participating operator, to explain each and evry
>reason for ANY opinion.

The FCC commissioners aren't licensed hams, Steve. Yet, when you filed your comments on restructuring, you probably did a lot of explaining with respect to your opinion on the topic of the proceeding.

> If you are not experienced in a specific pursuit you shouldn't
>insult those who are.

In general, I agree. I also feel that those who are experienced in a specific pursuit generally shouldn't insult those who are not. I say "in general" and "generally" because some people merely get what they ask for.

>For example I would not be found in a NASCAR
>fan-club forum, nor in one dedicated to gardening...at least as
>anything other than a passive reader. Unless you are ASKING for help,
>it's a matter of common courtesy.

Well, as you said, this forum is about Amateur Radio, and is for Amateur Radio operators, and as a licensed ham, I do have some experience in this specific pursuit. I can also remember back to when I was not yet a licensed ham, and I recall that this debate about code testing was going on back then, and to me as a non-ham it looked quite a bit like a bunch of kids arguing over who was going to bat first in a sandlot baseball game. It wasn't meant as an insult, it was meant as an observation that this is a public forum that can be read by anyone and that perhaps we ought to be more aware of the way we present ourselves and the ARS in such a forum - and the comment was especially aimed at the minority of regular participants here who routinely find it necessary to toss around insults like candy on halloween. I guess it's one of those instances where if the shoe fits, wear it, if not, then forget about it...frankly, I think the only people who might be offended by what I said would be the ones who are "guilty as charged."

73 DE John, KC2HMZ
Tonawanda, New York

-=
*** Usenet.com - The #1 Usenet Newsgroup Service on The Planet! ***
http://www.usenet.com
Unlimited Download - 19 Seperate Servers - 90,000 groups - Uncensored
-=

39. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-01 06:39:18 UTC
From: Radio Amateur KC2HMZ <kc2hmz@aa-mail.removespamkiller.net>
Message-ID: <7cmknv4ut41to8p0ik0l4h5lj0jvfqu4nr@4ax.com>
Source record: 79614

**** Post for FREE via your newsreader at post.usenet.com ****

On 30 Sep 2003 19:44:33 -0700, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP)
wrote:

>Radio Amateur KC2HMZ <kc2hmz@aa-mail.removespamkiller.net> wrote in message
news:<1arinvsaj4osp5ebet63vuv9fj2v2aubns@4ax.com>...
>
>> The wake will undoubtedly be held here in rrap, where many will call
>> it the end of ham radio...(SNIP)
>
> Actually it will only be the end of an era.
>
> The .0003% of the Amateur community that espouse any opinion to
>the contrary will go thier own way, and the other .0003% who
>constantly deride them for THIER opinions will go thier way too.
>
> And Amateur Radio, just like it has for the last 80+ years
>already past, will go on.
>
>Steve, K4YZ

That's pretty much what I expect, too.

73 DE John, KC2HMZ
Tonawanda, New York

-=
*** Usenet.com - The #1 Usenet Newsgroup Service on The Planet! ***
http://www.usenet.com
Unlimited Download - 19 Seperate Servers - 90,000 groups - Uncensored
-=

40. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-01 07:27:09 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@STOPearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <hlveb.69$3S.57@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 79615

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote:
>
> Here's one answer:
>
> How many hams do you know who have designed,
> built and operate homebrew stations? Not kits, not
> partly home-made, not with homebrew accessories,
> but 100% built-from-scratch amateur radio receivers,
> transmitters, transceivers, antennas, power supplies,
> etc.?
>
> One of the oft-repeated claims has been that the
> code tests kept out "technically inclined" individuals.
> At least one NCTA (Vshah101) has claimed that
> "no self-respecting EE would use CW". Etc.
>
> (snip) If/when FCC dumps Element 1, will we see a
> lot more homebrew HF stations?

Lets face it, homebrewing just isn't very popular today, in any license class. Part of that is due to changing radio technology. It's fairly hard to homebrew a radio today capable of competing with even the most basic commercial product. Most are simply choosing to buy rather than build.

Those who are interested in electronics mainly focus their efforts on things outside ham radio. For example, I'm currently interested in robotics. At the same time, I'm doing almost nothing (electronics related) in ham radio itself. A friend, also a ham, is obsessed with security devices. Likewise, I don't see him doing much in ham radio. But, of course, most I've met have no interest in electronics at all, or limit that to kit building or very simple projects.

So, to answer your question, I don't think we're going to see a lot more homebrew HF stations, with or without a change in the code testing requirement.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

41. Re: Lennie's Double Standard Once Again Revealed...BY Lennie!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-01 08:40:24 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0310010040.452d084c@posting.google.com>
Source record: 79616

"Clint" <rattlehead at computron dot net> wrote in message
news:<vnk8gbsap9td88@corp.supernews.com>...
> Generally the PCTA crowd has been putting most of the
> people who challenge thier position and willing to debate
> thier points on thier killfiles. Sounds pretty much like it
> is they, not the NCTA, that can handle the scrutiny
> and are therefore obviously on thin ice.

Well, Clint...As foolish as it may have been, Brain was straight
up enough to "admit" that Lennie was his "mentor"...His words, not
mine.

I dislike putting words into others mouths, but it sure appears
to me as though YOU are admitting that Lennie is your mentor too.

Is that right, Clint...?!?! Is a documented liar and antagonist
YOUR mentor too? It would certainly appear as such.

Steve, K4YZ

42. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-01 08:44:22 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@STOPearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <Gtweb.216$f11.74@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 79617

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com> wrote:
>
> And by your logic, if it qualifies for the term, a
> marksman who practices on a target range weekly is
> no better qualified as a marksman than someone who
> has never picked up a weapon because the 'someone'
> has no interest in shooting. Lame.

Logic is not your strong point, Dick. You're talking about two people's qualifications as a marksman. If Jim had said "more experienced" or "more qualified" in Morse Code (as you talked about qualified as a marksman), there would be no dispute. But, with that interpreted as saying a radio amateur with code skills is "more experienced" and "more qualified" than one without code skills, there is a conflict - it's simply not true. If it were true, a brand new ham who passed a code test yesterday would be "more experienced" than someone without code skills who has been a ham for ten years.

[See why I disputed your "all things being equal" premise, Jim? Few are even going to notice it.]

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

43. Re: Amazin'....Ain't it...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-01 08:49:35 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0310010049.40fd8e84@posting.google.com>
Source record: 79618

"charlesb" <n5pvl@sbcglobal.net> wrote in message
news:<Woneb.11446$NV3.4976@newssvr31.news.prodigy.com>...
> "Steve Robeson, K4CAP" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:5c01b95b.0309301356.4e2103d3@posting.google.com...
> >
> > I had been skipping over some of the "KC2HMZ" posts, mistaking
> > them for Bert...But NOW I remember why "HMZ" was familiar!
> >
> > John was the listowner of an e mail reflector that used to "ban"
> > members from who didn't heel to his particular viewpoints and
> > opinions.
>
> Hey, I think I've heard of John! Does he run the E-mail lists at TAPR? They
> ban hams who don't go along with the TAPR "party line". They even banned
> Hank Oredson W0RLI, who more or less invented packet BBS's and most of the
> operating standards for them - from the TAPR BBS special interest group!
> Hank offended TAPR by suggesting that hams use radio to communicate.
>
> I dunno.... Maybe I'm getting him mixed up with John Ackerman. It was some
> kind of "John", anyway.

Naaaah. THIS John was providing this NG with a daily dose of
silly and easily refuted obfuscation. When he realized I was a
"subscriber" on a Yahoogroups e mail reflector he moderated, he
removed my "subscription"...This despite the reflector had nothing to
do with the code issue or any of the exchanges herein. It was his way
of having the "last word", in as much as every time he posted here he
made a fool out of himself.

Judging by current affairs, not too much has changed.

There's been other rumors of running afoul of the CIVIL courts
and getting booted by his ISP for his misconduct, but I don't have all
those details.

Perhaps he'd like to bring us up to date...?!?!

Steve, K4YZ

44. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-01 08:57:17 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@STOPearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <NFweb.241$f11.109@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 79619

"Clint" <rattlehead at computron dot net> wrote:
>
> That's where I first learned about the morse code.
> I had to learn it to get a badge; upon learning it, I
> recieved a badge of achievement for having done
> so. (snip)

I learned it as a Boy Scout also. However, in my case, that was a very long time ago (when the Empire State building was the largest building in New York - mentioned only because our troop when there during the New York World's Fair in the early 60's).

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

45. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-01 09:23:39 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@STOPearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <v2xeb.249$f11.173@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 79620

"Bert Craig" wrote:
>
> Ok, Dwight. Very easy. It's not. While the FCC is the
> regulatory body to whom we answer, they are definitely
> NOT the sum total of who or what defines OUR hobby/
> service. We, as amateurs radio operators, are a big part
> in retaining those element that define our rules, tradition,
> and culture. This is why the NCTA's battle cry is "well,
> the FCC doesn't think so" and/or "it serves no regulatory
> purpose." (snip)

As you know, that's only one part of the "battle cry," Bert. The rest is that about half the radio amateurs today (Technicians) don't know code (culture), that most who do know code don't use it (tradition), that code is not used for our service to those outside Amateur Radio (rules), and so on.

> (snip) Calling the 5-wpm exam a barrier is just plain silly (snip)

It is a barrier to those who have no interest in Morse Code. Nothing more and nothing less.

> Frankly, I have much more respect for someone with the
> stones to just admit that they're too lazy or insufficiently
> motivated to bother meeting the requirements than all this
> "regulatory" mumbo jumbo.

I've repeatedly said I have no interest whatsoever in learning code. Doesn't that qualify as "insufficiently motivated?"

> Because it beats a blank. BTW, were you one of those who
> said that the VHF and up privies of your license were sufficient
> for your needs? How long after Element 1 is dropped can I
> address you as W5NET/AE, hmm?

Actually, I probably wouldn't rush out to upgrade. I have no place to install HF antennas, and probably will not for several more years. In fact, I'm in a situation now where my participation in VHF/UHF is even somewhat hindered. As such, upgrading my license will serve no purpose anytime soon. Therefore, I'll probably just leave what I have well enough alone.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

46. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-01 09:35:49 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@STOPearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <Vdxeb.251$f11.25@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 79621

"Bill Sohl" wrote:
>
> Exactly. Bert's comment underscores the core of
> many who don't give a hoot about having requirements
> that make sense...they only want requirements which,
> by their measure, constitute a "show of effort" on the
> part of all applicants. Sorry...but such a desire isn't
> any part of FCC's Part 97 Purpose.

Haven't see you in here lately, Bill. Have you been hiding out or did I just miss your messages? Anyway, that's the point I'm trying to make. While Morse Code may be the greatest operating mode to ever come along, a testing requirement for it is just not necessary today. As such, that testing requirement should go.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

47. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-01 10:06:45 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@STOPearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <VGxeb.259$f11.59@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 79622

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote:
>
> Some claim that Morse Code testing is at odds with
> the purpose of the amateur radio service as a
> fundamentally technical service. But in the practical
> experience of thousands of amateurs, the opposite
> is true. (snip)

I've never made such a claim, so have no response to any counter-claim.

> Skill in Morse Code, even at a very basic level, permits
> amateurs to use radio equipment ranging from very simple
> to highly advanced designs, and technologies of almost
> any vintage. (snip)

Skill in Morse Code is certainly not unique in that ability, Jim. In fact, almost any knowledge of radio would allow that.

> Morse Code skill encourages amateurs to actually build
> their own radio equipment by offering an easy first step,
> and a growth path that leads to almost any usable
> technology. (snip)

With almost every commercial radio today equipped to transmit code, why would that be true? Few today, even those with an interest in code, are building their own equipment. Instead, most are using the same type of equipment I've purchased.

> I speak from direct experience in amateur radio home
> construction, having built my first amateur station at
> age 13. (snip)

How many 13 year old kids today, with or without a ham license, with or without code skills, are building their own radio equipment today?

> The removal of the Morse Code test from the Technician
> class license has not resulted in a technical revolution in
> amateur radio from newly-licensed "technically qualified"
> amateurs. (snip)

I didn't know the Technician license was supposed to lead to a technical revolution in anything, Jim. Instead, I thought they were just supposed to participate in the same activities most other Amateur Radio operators are participating in. Why the unique expectation for Technician license holders alone?

> Instead, the continued progress in amateur technical efforts
> continues to be mostly the result of work done by
> experienced amateurs, even though the Technician class
> license has not had a code test for more than 12 years.

Which "amateur technical efforts" are you referring to, Jim? I must have missed something because I haven't seen much technical efforts from ANY of the operators I've met over the last few years, regardless of license class.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

48. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-01 10:29:16 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@STOPearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <00yeb.270$f11.75@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 79623

"Radio Amateur KC2HMZ" wrote
>
> You may now proceed to thank me for finally clearing this up.

Thank you.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

49. Re: Isnt it Funny (No-Code HF Privileges)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-01 10:29:36 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031001062936.07578.00000881@mb-m25.aol.com>
Source record: 79624

In article <XLreb.3$f11.1@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@STOPearthlinkSPAM.net> writes:

>"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote:
>>
>> Are they the model we hams should follow, or should
>> we take them as a cautionary tale of what could happen
>> to us?
>
> I wasn't offering CB as a model.

OK, fine.

>In fact, because of its rather unique
>history, I don't think one can use CB as a model for much of anything. CB
>went to h*ll in a hand basket after Hollywood associated it with the illegal
>activities shown in several movies of the time (Convoy, Smokey & the Bandit,
>and so on).

I disagree.

Those movies came out *after* wholesale disregard for the rules was already very common on 27. (Although I've never been a cb user, I have listened there since the mid-'60s and known many cb users).

At least in the areas where I've lived, regard for the rules was pretty much tossed away by the mid-to-late 1960s. FCC tried to enforce the rules, but their forces were simply too few.
>
> The movie, Smokey & the Bandit, was almost classroom instruction on how to
>use a CB radio, with Bert Renolds ("Bandit") showing Sally Fields ("Frog")
>what buttons to push and what to say. As you may remember, this movie was
>about a trucker moving illegal cargo across the country as quickly as
>possible, while "Bandit" (with "Frog" riding along) distracted police away
>from the truck using his faster car. CB radios were used throughout the
>movie.
>
Never saw the whole thing. This was in the era of antihero movies like "Bonnie and Clyde", "Dirty Mary Crazy Larry" and such.

> Obviously, movies like these attracted people with the same "outlaw"
>mentality to CB Radio. Today, these people attract others like themselves to
>CB Radio.

That mentality was already in place before the movies were made.

>However, if Hollywood had used Ham Radio in those movies instead,
>perhaps these same people would have been attracted to Ham Radio and Ham
>Radio would have the problems today instead of CB Radio.

But ham radio did not have that "outlaw" mentality. And, back then, such activities would have brought down tremendous peer opposition by the rest of the ham community. For example, trying to operate without callsigns on a ham band would get you DFed and reported to FCC. Not so on 27.

Also, the complexity and cost of amateur equipment at the time meant a serious investment was needed just to get started.

>But, as it is, Ham
>Radio does not offer the same attractions for these people (the "outlaw"
>image, anonymous operation, and so on).

Only because *existing* hams have the *tradition* of not tolerating such behavior.

>Because of that, most of these
>people have no interested in Ham Radio. The few who are interested in Ham
>Radio are attracted for what Ham Radio has to offer, not what CB has to
>offer. Therefore, these people are not likely to display the same CB-like
>behavior in the Ham Radio frequencies. The fact that a good number, perhaps
>the majority, of today's Ham Operators owned a CB radio sometime in the past
>(or present) supports this conclusion.

Yet in my experience there has been a longstanding problem with the cb "outlaw" culture trying to migrate to amateur radio. In this area, at least, we have had serious problems on VHF/UHF repeaters from newcomers who saw 2 meters as a noise-free version of cb. When their behavior (cussing, failure to ID, refusing to share the repeater, threats to those who disagreed with them, etc.) was challenged by other hams, they said "We did this things on 11 and there's nobody going to stop us from doing them here. We don't care what your stupid rules say, we're gonna have our fun and if you don't like it, go away". (Almost verbatim quote.)

The only ace-in-the-hole we had was the ability to shut down the repeater. Even that did not always work because these folks would sometimes guess the codes.
>
>> Now which is the better deal?
>
> My message was an attempt to undermine Bruce's many posts trashing
>Technicians (he is the one constantly bringing up the CB nonsense), not to
>make any real comparisons between CB and Ham Radio (or CB'ers and
>Technicians).
>
You don't really take Bruce seriously, do you, Dwight? I don't.

He's just another version of Len. In fact the two of them are, philosophically, exactly the same.

73 de Jim, N2EY

50. Re: Appalling...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-01 11:23:39 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@STOPearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <%Oyeb.304$f11.169@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 79625

"Dennis Ferguson" wrote:
>
> I've been trying to figure out who would have enough
> money to buy, and the talent to make use of, the 1960's
> computing resources needed to do real-time Morse
> decoding in any volume. The list of possibilities is
> really, really short.

I believe the whole thing, at least at that facility, was an Air Force project. My father maintained the equipment (I don't think he had anything to do with collecting information). There were perhaps a dozen (at most, perhaps less) other guys working there. I never saw all of the people at one time, so that's just a guess. At least three of those were civilians (or at least I never saw them in a uniform). It was probably related to SAC (Strategic Air Command), because that's where my father worked just before and after that duty assignment. A few years later, he went to a similar (he said) facility in Korea and, still later, another in Greenland. He mentioned once where the information went to, but I only have a vague recollection of that and no idea today where he said.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

51. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-01 11:54:21 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031001075421.13773.00000084@mb-m22.aol.com>
Source record: 79626

>One of the principles that makes up the Basis And Purpose of the
>ARS is "Expansion of the existing reservoir within the amateur radio
>service of trained operators, technicians, and electronics experts."

" trained operators, technicians, and electronics experts."

You have to kidding, most of the New Hams have no Idea what it is to be trained technicians or electronic experts. Nor will they ever be such. If your trusting the writtens to prove the above statments, then no wonder you done have a CLUE.

52. Re: Isnt it Funny (No-Code HF Privileges)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-01 12:05:33 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031001080533.13773.00000085@mb-m22.aol.com>
Source record: 79627

>He's just another version of Len. In fact the two of them are,
>philosophically,
>exactly the same.
>
>73 de Jim, N2EY
>

No im not like Len, len doesnt even have a License, and secondly your assuming everything I say is truthful. Use the correct FACTS before you make a correct statement.

53. Re: Amazin'....Ain't it...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-01 12:26:51 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3F7AC80B.7030709@psu.edu>
Source record: 79628

Steve Robeson, K4CAP wrote:
> Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message news:<3F79CBB8.60401@psu.edu>...
>
>>Radio Amateur KC2HMZ wrote:
>>
>>
>>>I happen to think it's a case of turf defending...the PCTAs feel they
>>>must defend their exclusive little slices of the RF spectrum at all
>>>costs, regardless of what harm is done to the ARS in the process.
>>>They'll kill the mother to save the baby.
>>
>> What is a permitted method of expression, John?
>
>
> I had been skipping over some of the "KC2HMZ" posts, mistaking
> them for Bert...But NOW I remember why "HMZ" was familiar!
>
> I find it unique that John takes the "turf defending" position
> and makes the humorous suggestions about "kill the mother to save the
> baby".
>
> John was the listowner of an e mail reflector that used to "ban"
> members from who didn't heel to his particular viewpoints and
> opinions.
>
> Unique how people who like to prevent others from expressing an
> opposing viewpoint will jump on others for doing (allegedly) doing the
> same thing.

There are many people, that believe that one of their rights is
depriving others of their rights.

- Mike KB3EIA -

54. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-01 12:41:17 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3F7ACB6D.7080401@psu.edu>
Source record: 79630

Dwight Stewart wrote:
> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote:
>
>>Here's one answer:
>>
>>How many hams do you know who have designed,
>>built and operate homebrew stations? Not kits, not
>>partly home-made, not with homebrew accessories,
>>but 100% built-from-scratch amateur radio receivers,
>>transmitters, transceivers, antennas, power supplies,
>>etc.?
>>
>>One of the oft-repeated claims has been that the
>>code tests kept out "technically inclined" individuals.
>>At least one NCTA (Vshah101) has claimed that
>>"no self-respecting EE would use CW". Etc.
>>
>>(snip) If/when FCC dumps Element 1, will we see a
>>lot more homebrew HF stations?
>
>
>
> Lets face it, homebrewing just isn't very popular today, in any license
> class. Part of that is due to changing radio technology. It's fairly hard to
> homebrew a radio today capable of competing with even the most basic
> commercial product. Most are simply choosing to buy rather than build.

Might be the company you keep Dwight! 8^) Unless you are counting only the building of the transciever itself, homebrewing is alive and well. I make all the parts of my shack that I can, and know many hams that do likewise. lots of cool stuff to build. Interfaces, anps, all sorts of monitoring and test equipment, and more.

But its true, there aren't that many people building the rigs themselves.

- Mike KB3EIA -

55. Re: The way to stop BPL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-01 13:16:20 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3F7AD3A4.9090401@psu.edu>
Source record: 79631

Kim W5TIT wrote:
> "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message

<snippage>

>>>That's a rather lofty goal, Mike, when considering that folks like
>>
> DICKhead,
>
>>>Larry, and lately, you, act the way you do. Think about it. Most of
>>
> the
>
>>>people to whom sheer disrespect is aimed at are the folks that have no
>>>problem at all with those of you who love, appreciate and admire CW as a
>>>mode and even the fact that you wish it to remain as a part of the test
>>>requirement. But the lack of tolerance displayed by people such as
>>>DICKhead, Larry, you, Dan/W4whatever, and others is overwhelmingly
>>>despicable and beyond being able to "join" together for the cause. The
>>
> only
>
>>>common ground that may be found is that we are all amateurs. And, I
>>
> doubt
>
>>>you'll even admit that.
>>
>>Whoa there. Kim. Point out what exactly I have done that is so
>>despicable. Is this some sort of thing where I stand up for Dick, then I
>>am the same as him? I don't agree with everything he does. I don't care
>>for him calling people names. I don't care for Larry doing that, I don't
>>care for Steve and his Lennie stuff either. I've had discussions with at
>>least Larry and Steve about it.
>>
>
>
> It's more what you haven't done, Mike, although some of even what you have
> done. You can't nudge "this one" in the side, wink at that one over there,
> and pat this one on the back and then stand in the middle of the street
> suggesting to everyone that we "should all get along."

I most certainly can. I haven't taken you to task for the names you
call Dick, or the recent post to Hans with the PH*****G stuff in it -
and note that I *have* taken Hans to task for it. Changing the spelling

does not change the meaning or intent.

And I'm not going to respond to every post I find inapropriate.

> I, for one--and maybe the only one--don't trust people like that. You sit
> on the fence. I'm waiting to get spike by the barbed wire.

Sure. I can't be reliably depended on to take the "party line". I make
up my own mind. Many people don't like that at all.

>>Sorry that you feel that way about me Kim.

> Why? I hardly think it's going to have any impact one way or the other on
> your every day doings. We don't even know each other.

No, its not going to affect me. But I'm still sorry you feel that way.
I could apologize for feeling that way too, but that would start a
feedbak loop.

- Mike KB3EIA -

56. Re: Isnt it Funny (No-Code HF Privileges)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-01 13:20:53 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3F7AD4B5.5010608@psu.edu>
Source record: 79632

Dwight Stewart wrote:
> "N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote:
>
>>Are they the model we hams should follow, or should
>>we take them as a cautionary tale of what could happen
>>to us?
>
>
>
> I wasn't offering CB as a model. In fact, because of its rather unique
> history, I don't think one can use CB as a model for much of anything. CB
> went to h*ll in a hand basket after Hollywood associated it with the illegal
> activities shown in several movies of the time (Convoy, Smokey & the Bandit,
> and so on).

You're off by a few years. Back in the early 70's, I used a CB in our company trucks, and there were plenty of rulebreakers then. Most every time I had to buy parts from a local, I got to see their overheight towers and linear amps.

- Mike KB3EIA and a looong time ago, KBM-8780! 8^) -

57. Re: Another Self-Humiliating LenniRiffic Rant

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-01 13:43:37 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0310010543.10e9c4fd@posting.google.com>
Source record: 79633

N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<c2356669.0309301440.c31c99c@posting.google.com>...
> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0309300452.6c787ecd@posting.google.com>...
> > "Arnie Macy" <kt4stnospam@csam.net> wrote in message
news:<bl2q1m$7doa6$1@ID-166180.news.uni-berlin.de>...
> > > "N2EY" wrote ...
> > >
> > > Do you think that a person can have only one writing style?
> > > ____
> > >
> > > I agree that a person can have more than one writing style. In this case;
> > > however, Len would have to work exceedingly hard to destroy any semblance of
> > > writing ability. I believe he has too much of an ego for that.
> > >
> > > Arnie-
> > > KT4ST
> >
> > And Bruce? Jim thinks he is a genius that presents himself as a "morron."
>
> You are utterly and completely mistaken.
>
> I do not think Bruce is a genius.

Then please clarify.

On a scale of 1 to 10, with 1 being "morron," and 10 being genius,
where would you say Bruce falls?

Remember now, you've put forth the theory that Bruce is a master of
trickery, so only you are able to see his brilliance.

58. Re: More on BPL..."This is serious, folks..."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-01 13:49:26 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0310010549.a9b2042@posting.google.com>
Source record: 79634

Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:<CIneb.430$qj6.405420@news1.news.adelphia.net>...
> Brian wrote:
> > Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message news:<3F783EFC.5000201@psu.edu>...
> >
> >>Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
> >>
> >>>"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
> >>
> >>
> >>< some snippage>
> >>
> >>
> >>>>Agreed, Carl. I suspect that by the end of this sad tale, many amateurs
> >>>>will think much better of the NTIA. Rather than mass emails, right now
> >>>>an interesting and very good experiment might be to do a little HF
> >>>>direction finding.Trace the "mystery signals" to their source. Write it
> >>>>up in a reasonably good fashion, and it might make for some more damning
> >>>>evidence against BPL.
> >>>>
> >>>>- Mike KB3EIA -
> >>>
> >>>
> >>>Mike,
> >>>
> >>>You don't have to DF ... you can clearly tell just by listening when
> >>>you're approaching, in, and leaving the BPL area ... and you can
> >>>see the couplers they use to get the signal around the transformers.
> >>
> >>
> >> I agree that it wouldn't be a difficult thing to find. I just think
> >>that if an amateur or group were to take an approach that didn't start
> >>out "I can hear the BPL intereference 60 miles away", it might have more
> >>impact.
> >>
> >> Something like " On such and such date, a strong interference showed up
> >>on such and such bands. As the interference did not do away, a local
> >>group of amateurs and myself decided to trace the interference to it's
> >>source.
> >>
> >> Then an outline of the DF method, and finally decribing the cause after
> >>finding it.
> >>
> >> The point is that if people can easily trace out the interference from

> >>far away, it hammers home that it isn't really a local problem.
> >>
> >> - Mike KB3EIA -
> >
> >
> > Don't forget the 8X10 glossies with circles and arrows.
>
> We use Power point now.......
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -

I thought you liked doing things the old-fashioned way, like eating at
Alice's restuarant.

59. Re: Amazin'....Ain't it...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-01 13:58:05 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0310010558.6b17ebb9@posting.google.com>
Source record: 79635

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0310010049.40fd8e84@posting.google.com>...
> "charlesb" <n5pvl@sbcglobal.net> wrote in message
news:<Woneb.11446$NV3.4976@newssvr31.news.prodigy.com>...
> > "Steve Robeson, K4CAP" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
> > news:5c01b95b.0309301356.4e2103d3@posting.google.com...
> > >
> > > I had been skipping over some of the "KC2HMZ" posts, mistaking
> > > them for Bert...But NOW I remember why "HMZ" was familiar!
> > >
> > > John was the listowner of an e mail reflector that used to "ban"
> > > members from who didn't heel to his particular viewpoints and
> > > opinions.
> >
> > Hey, I think I've heard of John! Does he run the E-mail lists at TAPR? They
> > ban hams who don't go along with the TAPR "party line". They even banned
> > Hank Oredson W0RLI, who more or less invented packet BBS's and most of the
> > operating standards for them - from the TAPR BBS special interest group!
> > Hank offended TAPR by suggesting that hams use radio to communicate.
> >
> > I dunno.... Maybe I'm getting him mixed up with John Ackerman. It was some
> > kind of "John", anyway.
>
> Naaaah. THIS John was providing this NG with a daily dose of
> silly and easily refuted obfuscation. When he realized I was a
> "subscriber" on a Yahoogroups e mail reflector he moderated, he
> removed my "subscription"...This despite the reflector had nothing to
> do with the code issue or any of the exchanges herein. It was his way
> of having the "last word", in as much as every time he posted here he
> made a fool out of himself.
>
> Judging by current affairs, not too much has changed.
>
> There's been other rumors of running afoul of the CIVIL courts
> and getting booted by his ISP for his misconduct, but I don't have all
> those details.
>
> Perhaps he'd like to bring us up to date...?!?!
>
> Steve, K4YZ

Would you mind providing us with the name of that Yahoo MODERATED
Group, so that we might look at the archives and see what got you
tossed off the group.

Thanks, Brian

60. Re: Some thoughtful comments from another forum on the code/nocode debate

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-01 14:04:36 UTC
From: groupk0hb@earthlink.net
Message-ID: <5ee63311.0310010604.5f5c335f@posting.google.com>
Source record: 79636

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote

>
> You invested your time, interest, and self in the amateur license.
>

Sorry, but the 'investment' was trivial. Long before I thought about
getting an amateur license I already knew Morse code and electronics.
A couple hours brushing up on the common-sense rules was all the
'self' I put into it.

I value my amateur privileges very highly, but the 'cost of entry' was
almost non-existent.

73, Hans, K0HB

61. Re: Another Self-Humiliating LenniRiffic Rant

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-01 14:06:11 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031001100611.27553.00000121@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 79637

>On a scale of 1 to 10, with 1 being "morron," and 10 being genius,
>where would you say Bruce falls?
>
>Remember now, you've put forth the theory that Bruce is a master of
>trickery, so only you are able to see his brilliance.

Using your scale, I would rate Bruce somewhere between a 15 and 20.

62. Re: Lennie's Double Standard Once Again Revealed...BY Lennie!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-01 14:06:22 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0310010606.62efe0c@posting.google.com>
Source record: 79638

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0310010040.452d084c@posting.google.com>...
> "Clint" <rattlehead at computron dot net> wrote in message
news:<vnk8gbsap9td88@corp.supernews.com>...
> > Generally the PCTA crowd has been putting most of the
> > people who challenge thier position and willing to debate
> > thier points on thier killfiles. Sounds pretty much like it
> > is they, not the NCTA, that can handle the scrutiny
> > and are therefore obviously on thin ice.
>
>
> Well, Clint...As foolish as it may have been, Brain was straight
> up enough to "admit" that Lennie was his "mentor"...His words, not
> mine.

Len was willing to go the distance w/o letting all the bullying and
worse deter him. In that respect, Len is my mentor.

You, Steve Robeson, will not run me off the group. Nor will your
Cronies.

63. Re: Some thoughtful comments from another forum on the code/nocode debate

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-01 14:11:52 UTC
From: groupk0hb@earthlink.net
Message-ID: <5ee63311.0310010611.6acb8c67@posting.google.com>
Source record: 79639

"Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote

>
> Why does it have to be your way or no way, Hans?
>

Did I say "my way or no way"?????

Jim is free to have a different opinion, and I am free to suggest his
opinion is inconsistent with reality.

>
> > My amateur license cost me virtually nothing in terms of 'investment
> > of myself', and the curbs and gutters the city just installed at one
> > of my places cost me an $8,200 assessment. I value my amateur license
> > a LOT more than I value the city's new street curbing!
> >
> > The things that I value the very most quite honestly are literal gifts
> > which I have recieved without an ounce of 'investment' or 'cost' ---
> > the love of my wife, the smiles of my grandkids, the whisper of the
> > wind at sunset on Lake Vermilion, the conversation with an old friend,
> > or my healthy heart. I value all of these more than my homes, my RV,
> > my boat, or the QSL collection in the closet.
> >
> > With all kind wishes,
> >
> > de Hans, K0HB
>
> The only one of those, above, that is a literal gift is the wind at sunset
> on Lake Vermilion. The rest cost you plenty.

You're mistaken. They are absolute unconditional gifts, and I
treasure them all the more for the fact that no amount of effort of
mine could have 'earned' them.

73, de Hans, K0HB
--
"Reality doesn't care what you believe." -- K0HB

64. Re: Echolink is great for those who..

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-01 14:15:38 UTC
From: starwars <nobody@tatooine.homelinux.net>
Message-ID: <d639413ef3f227dd247e3324e3ec0418@tatooine.homelinux.net>
Source record: 79640
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.amateur,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

In article <pan.2003.09.30.18.15.41.531892@hotmail.com>
"Eric Oyen - N7ZZT" <n7zzt_NO.SPAM_@hotmail.com> wrote:
>
>
> On Tue, 30 Sep 2003 00:56:52 +0200, privacy.at Anonymous Remailer wrote:
>
> >
> > In article <pan.2003.09.24.12.03.35.348632@hotmail.com> "Eric Oyen -
> > N7ZZT" <n7zzt_NO.SPAM_@hotmail.com> wrote:
> >>
> >>
> >> and we still have to put up with idiots like you, no matter the band or
> >> technology.
> >> <...blah blah blah...> so don't gripe at us because of YOUR technical
> >> and mental deficiencies.
> >
> > Says the no-code-technician twat.
> so? you any better? just because I am no-code doesn't mean I don't
> KNOW-CODE (I just never bothered to take the damned test, you dope!).

Obviously, you were too goddamned stupid to pass it, either.

> but then again, if all you can do is insult, that means you don't have
> brains enough to really do something about it.

You'll have to pass the test on your own, twat.

> oh well, I fail to see where it's my problem anyway.

You fail to see quite a lot of things, no-code technician twat.

65. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-01 14:29:46 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031001102946.21642.00001335@mb-m01.aol.com>
Source record: 79641

In article <sniknvopfb550s8ql7nahupebinj4lfvdl@4ax.com>, Radio Amateur KC2HMZ
<kc2hmz@aa-mail.removespamkiller.net> writes:

>On 30 Sep 2003 15:12:12 -0700, N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote:
>
>>by that logic, most of the General and Extra written exams are also
>>"government-subsidized life-support system for an anachronism" and/or
>>"a welfare program".
>
>You've been dangling the above for a few days now.

A few years, actually.

>Sorry, I don't buy it.

I didn't expect you to. But it's still true.

>One of the principles that makes up the Basis And Purpose of the
>ARS is "Expansion of the existing reservoir within the amateur radio
>service of trained operators, technicians, and electronics experts."

That's right. Does passing the General or Extra written exam make someone an
electronics expert?

Do you know any hams who, upon passing the General and/or Extra exams, suddenly
decided to start building their equipment instead of buying it?
>
>The design of modern communications equipment is based on digital
>electronics.

Partly. There's also a lot of analog stuff in there.

>Learning about digital electronics, therefore, is in
>keeping with the Basis And Purpose.
>
Of course.

But why *must* hams be tested on digital electronics beyond the level of the
Tech exam? Is the digital electronics used in HF/MF amateur radio equipment
somehow different from the digital electronics used in VHF/UHF amateur radio
equipment?

Why must all that theory stuff be forced down prospective HF hams' throats
whether they are interested in it or not?

>There's nothing in the Basis And Purpose about telegraphy.

Sure there is - it's under "trained operators".

There's nothing in the "Basis And Purpose about digital electronics, either.
>
>FCC has already allowed that "because the amateur service is
>fundamentally a technical service, the emphasis on Morse code
>proficiency as a licensing requirement does not comport with the basis
>and purpose of the service."
>
>(Both quotes above are from FCC's report & order on the last round of
>restructuring in the ARS)
>
This is the same FCC that thinks BPL is a good idea, remember. And the same FCC that will probably take 2 years to drop Element 1.

And the same FCC that radically reduced the written tests in that same restructuring.

Here's proof of my argument about the content of the writtens:

A newcomer can get a Tech license by passing the current 35 question Element 2. That license permits the new ham to use any authorized mode on any authorized amateur frequency above 30 MHz. Every amateur HF/MF mode is also allowed on VHF/UHF, and the power limits are the same. So FCC obviously thinks that the 35 question Tech test is a valid indicator of what a ham needs to know to design/build/repair/align and operate any amateur station on VHF/UHF.

But even after the code test is passed, a new ham has to pass more written tests to get more than 'Novice' privileges on HF/MF. Of course the General and Extra writtens contain some "necessary" propagation, regulatory and safety stuff that is not in the Tech test. But the rest is stuff that is not absolutely necessary to design/build/repair/align and operate any amateur station on HF/MF.

Add to this the fact that the only difference in operating privileges between a General class ham and an Extra is a few bits of spectrum on 4 of the 9 HF/MF bands, and it becomes very clear that most of the General and Extra written exams are also "government-subsidized life-support system for an anachronism" and/or "a welfare program".

The situation is made even clearer by the emergence of rigs that cover both HF and VHF/UHF. A Tech can buy, repair, align, and operate, say, an FT-897. Why is said Tech qualified to use its full capabilities on 2 meters but not on 20 meters?

Now you might say that the tests "encourage" hams to become more "technical". Have you ever observed that effect on hams who were not inclined to be "technical" before they took the General and Extra class writtens?

Which activity is more prevalent in amateur radio today: Hams operating CW, or hams designing and building their own radio equipment from scratch?

Why must there be a test for all that stuff if it's not necessary to the safe and legal operation of an amateur radio station? How many doctors, lawyers, and other people who would be great hams are we keeping out because they are not interested in all that technical stuff? (We could sure use more hams who are

lawyers to help fight CC&Rs and BPL!)

Except for some extremely basic stuff on regulations and safety, *everything*
in the tests is the result of somebody's opinion.

An oft-repeated argument against the code test is that code operation is no
longer absolutely necessary for any operation, so there's no absolute need to
test for it. Apply the same logic to the writtens, and a lot of what's in them
has to go as well. It's an inescapable logical conclusion.

>>>Clint has subsequently elaborated on his comment, citing government
>>> subsidizing of the agricultural industry as one example, demonstrating
>>> that this is in fact what he had in mind as well.
>>
>>What major industry in this country is *not* subsidized in some way?
>
>Um, well, there's the porn industry, I suppose..

Good point!

>.but other than that,
>you're right, there's a lot of subsidizing going on. However, that
>doesn't mean that I, or anyone else for that matter, wants the
>government to select my recreational activities for me on my behalf.
>I'll make my own choices, thank you.

Your recreational choices are being subsidized and chosen for you as well.

If you like hiking and camping as recreational activities, there's a whole
system of parks, forests and wilderness areas, set aside by the government, for
those activities. But if you want to be a lumberjack for a recreational
activity, you cannot cut down trees in those areas. You have to go elsewhere,
almost always to private property.
>
>>> Now, then...once the government has stopped subsidizing the
>>> manufacture and testing of CW operators by eliminating the code test,
>>> how do you think we should reallocate the Novice subbands?
>>
>>Reallocate them as special digital experimental subband. Allow any
>>documented digital mode that will fit in the subbands to be used
>>there. Including digital voice, image, and yes, Morse Code/CW. No
>>arbitrary limits on occupied bandwidth or symbol rate as long as the
>>signal fits inside.
>>
>>If somebody wants to run "PSK-3100" and they can document it for FCC,
>>fine, let 'em have at it.
>
>I don't agree with unlimited signal bandwidths on HF - that means one
>guy trying out some ultrawide digital mode wipes out the whole subband
>and nobody else can experiment until he's through playing around.

That's why we have the subbands.

>Not
>just locally, but if the band is open, the subband's wiped out over a
>significant portion of the planet.

The same is true in part for any mode.

But if it really bothers you that much, then perhaps the rule could be "any
mode less than X kHz wide" where X is, say, 5 or 10 kHz rather than the entire
subband.
>
>I could agree with this on the microwave bands, though, where the
>signals don't travel as far and there are far fewer users in line to
>use the spectrum that is available.

DSSS near-far problem comes to mind.
>
>>Meanwhile, give the Novices and Tech Pluses more HF space than those
>>four little slots.
>
>I definitely agree with that.
>
I'd say they should have at least half of the General CW/data subbands.

66. Re: Some thoughtful comments from another forum on the code/nocode debate

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-01 14:30:16 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0310010630.4b50e11e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 79642

"Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
news:<m6feb.8394$yp6.234106@nnrp1.ptd.net>...
> "Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
> news:f45722ac.0309300431.673f47fe@posting.google.com...
> >
> > Furthermore, if the US government wants to give all prospective
> > amateurs 3 hots and a cot, and a paycheck, for the duration it takes
> > to learn the code, I'd gladly enroll in the CG Morse Code school.
>
> There's one problem ...

It would be problematic only if the CG were still trying to use the
code.

And this is Ham Radio. Perhaps the ARRL could put up a shelter for
the codeless (similar to shelters for the homeless).

Three hots and a cot, and hours and hours of code practice and speed
runs.

And no requirement to shave daily.

67. Re: Appalling...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-01 14:35:11 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0310010635.2a00777c@posting.google.com>
Source record: 79643

dennis@wawa.juniper.net (Dennis Ferguson) wrote in message
news:<blcnvb$39k$1@heap.juniper.net>...

> I know of a not-small number of advances in Information Theory and
> Cryptography where it took independent academics several decades to
> (re)discover what the NSA already secretly knew. I've also always
> thought that people who assume the performance of available commercial
> decoders on hand-sent Morse is an indication of the state-of-the-art in
> what is possible are also making a big mistake, though this is a topic
> of such decreasing relevance that independent researchers will likely
> never get around to reproducing what may have been possible years ago.
>
> Dennis Ferguson

World, meet Dick Carroll/N0EX, who single -handedly- can thwart any
computer copy of his banana boat bug.

68. Re: Leo's self-incriminating AGAIN...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-01 14:53:24 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0310010653.1ca67780@posting.google.com>
Source record: 79644

Leo <nomail@nope.org> wrote in message
news:<qohjnv85j833apcm56sm2o9am6soj90801@4ax.com>...
> Not really - read the message I replied to - the reply was just
> following the thread. (you know, replying to the content and in this
> case the criticism of *my* spelling in the message one up from this
> one.....). It was a bit of a cheap shot, I admit - the result of
> fighting fire with fire, I suppose.

I thought you called that "running out of steam." Now you're trying
to rationalize your lack of steam.

> As far as I'm concerned, the differences that Clint and I have had
> have been amicably resolved - we now know exactly where each other is
> coming from, and why - and peace reigns once again. We may not agree
> on all points - but we do share common ground, as do the majority of
> us in the group: see the thread "The Way To Stop BPL" for further
> details.

Fair enough.

> Beating each other up isn't going to resolve anything...there are
> issues we all need to stand together on. Some (like the famous Code /
> No Code question) simply have no right answer

I disagree.

- and others (like BPL)
> threaten the hobby. Perhaps if we channel all of our energy where it
> will do the most good for the hobby, we can effect change.
>
> 73, Leo

Perhaps the ARRL's Official Observer program will now look outward for
interference problems rather than confine itself to internal problems.

69. Re: More on BPL..."This is serious, folks..."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-01 14:58:26 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3F7AEB92.10101@psu.edu>
Source record: 79645

Brian wrote:
> Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:<CIneb.430$qj6.405420@news1.news.adelphia.net>...

<snippage>

>> We use Power point now.......
>>
>> - Mike KB3EIA -
>
>
> I thought you liked doing things the old-fashioned way, like eating at
> Alice's restuarant.

Dunno where you got that Brian! I'm a thoroughly modern Millie.

- Mike KB3EIA -

70. Re: Leo's self-incriminating AGAIN...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-01 15:34:34 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@nope.org>
Message-ID: <paslnv0a23pl1ue90iggtpqft14gfkgngf@4ax.com>
Source record: 79646

On 1 Oct 2003 07:53:24 -0700, brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote:

>Leo <nomail@nope.org> wrote in message
news:<qohjnv85j833apcm56sm2o9am6soj90801@4ax.com>...
>> Not really - read the message I replied to - the reply was just
>> following the thread. (you know, replying to the content and in this
>> case the criticism of *my* spelling in the message one up from this
>> one.....). It was a bit of a cheap shot, I admit - the result of
>> fighting fire with fire, I suppose.
>
>I thought you called that "running out of steam." Now you're trying
>to rationalize your lack of steam.

Not at all - just explaining the reasoning behind the comments. Read
the entire thread - the comments followed suit.

I sincerely hope your 'lack of steam' comment wasn't an attempt to
rekindle the flame, now, was it? :)

>
>> As far as I'm concerned, the differences that Clint and I have had
>> have been amicably resolved - we now know exactly where each other is
>> coming from, and why - and peace reigns once again. We may not agree
>> on all points - but we do share common ground, as do the majority of
>> us in the group: see the thread "The Way To Stop BPL" for further
>> details.
>
>Fair enough.

Thank you.

>
>> Beating each other up isn't going to resolve anything...there are
>> issues we all need to stand together on. Some (like the famous Code /
>> No Code question) simply have no right answer
>
>I disagree.

As you most assuredly have the right to do.

BTW, is it the code/no code part, or the beating people up part, or
the standing together part of my statement that you disagree with?

>
> - and others (like BPL)
>> threaten the hobby. Perhaps if we channel all of our energy where it
>> will do the most good for the hobby, we can effect change.

>>
>> 73, Leo
>
>Perhaps the ARRL's Official Observer program will now look outward for
>interference problems rather than confine itself to internal problems.

I'm a bit puzzled by this one - that has what to do with BPL, or other
things that threaten the hobby?

71. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-01 15:40:04 UTC
From: Bert Craig <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM>
Message-ID: <ozCeb.25578$Kq4.20189518@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>
Source record: 79647

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@STOPearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:v2xeb.249$f11.173@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> "Bert Craig" wrote:
> >
> > Ok, Dwight. Very easy. It's not. While the FCC is the
> > regulatory body to whom we answer, they are definitely
> > NOT the sum total of who or what defines OUR hobby/
> > service. We, as amateurs radio operators, are a big part
> > in retaining those element that define our rules, tradition,
> > and culture. This is why the NCTA's battle cry is "well,
> > the FCC doesn't think so" and/or "it serves no regulatory
> > purpose." (snip)
>
>
> As you know, that's only one part of the "battle cry," Bert. The rest is
> that about half the radio amateurs today (Technicians) don't know code
> (culture), that most who do know code don't use it (tradition)

Of course you can quote your source for these assertions, yes? I'd love to
see 'em put it to a vote. No internet polls...just a "one ham, one ballot"
vote. Oh, it shouldn't be just hams? Horsefeathers, WE define OUR
hobby/service. If a prospective ham feels that strongly about it, enter the
fold and then be heard.

> , that code is
> not used for our service to those outside Amateur Radio (rules), and so
on.

Amateur radio is all we're talking about, Dwight.

> > (snip) Calling the 5-wpm exam a barrier is just plain silly (snip)
>
>
> It is a barrier to those who have no interest in Morse Code. Nothing
more
> and nothing less.

That's odd, I've QSO'd via phone with a number of ops on 20 that have no
interest in Morse code, yet they did not let the code elements (Much less,
solely Element 1.) deter them from earning HF privies. It's just a
requirement to be fulfilled. Nothing more, nothing less.

> > Frankly, I have much more respect for someone with the
> > stones to just admit that they're too lazy or insufficiently
> > motivated to bother meeting the requirements than all this
> > "regulatory" mumbo jumbo.

>
>
> I've repeatedly said I have no interest whatsoever in learning code.
> Doesn't that qualify as "insufficiently motivated?"

It would if it remained your individual issue, sure. Instead it's morphed into an "international" movement, the result of which will devalue AR as a whole. Then it's our issue...and many may hold you responsible. I know I'd NEVER snub a licensed ARO OTA...but it'd be foolish to believe that everybody will roll out the welcome mat for known NCTA's. (Sad as it is.) Welcome to HF, Dwight. Be careful what you wish for.

> > Because it beats a blank. BTW, were you one of those who
> > said that the VHF and up privies of your license were sufficient
> > for your needs? How long after Element 1 is dropped can I
> > address you as W5NET/AE, hmm?
>
>
> Actually, I probably wouldn't rush out to upgrade. I have no place to
> install HF antennas, and probably will not for several more years. In
fact,
> I'm in a situation now where my participation in VHF/UHF is even somewhat
> hindered. As such, upgrading my license will serve no purpose anytime
soon.
> Therefore, I'll probably just leave what I have well enough alone.

Try QRP, Dwight. You'll love it. Some of the newer antennas are made to be used in just your situation and are no bigger than VHF mobil antennas. There's also a special feeling of accomplishment with making a contact with 2-1/2 Watts into an "invisible" wire dipole or longwire strung temporarily from a window.

> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

--
73 de Bert
WA2SI

72. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-01 16:27:38 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031001122738.29032.00000114@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 79648

>but it'd be foolish to believe that
>everybody will roll out the welcome mat for known NCTA's. (Sad as it is.)

Whats amazing is these NCTA think they should be welcomed with open arms, and thanked for getting a license. I for one will never welcome a No-Code into Ham Radio. Because to me they are nothing more than CBplussers, looking for more Welfare Handouts.

73. Re: PORKBUTT PORKBUTT PORKBUTT

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-01 16:28:11 UTC
From: LRod@removethispartpobox.com
Message-ID: <3f7aff13.4626354@newsgroups.bellsouth.net>
Source record: 79651
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On Sat, 27 Sep 2003 03:02:52 -0500, "LaShaun Ivory"
<NoSpam@NOSpam.com> wrote:

This is hilarious. Hang around a bit to see why.

>Rich is not missed save by a few of his malingerers.

Malingerers? Do you know what a malingerer is? It's someone who goofs
off and does no work. It is not a synonym for "apologist" or
"supporter."

>Yeah, Dan is garrulous, he is known to be a pain in the ass at times,
>but why promulgate it with your inane comments?

Promulgate? Do you know what promulgate means? It is the process of
developing legislation or procedures. It is not a synonym for
"antagonize" or "perpetuate."

>Frankie...ever pull your dictionary off the shelf and read the definition of
>"maturity"?

This is the best part. LaShaun telling Frankie to "pull [the]
dictionary off the shelf." Try it yourself, and while you have it
open, read the definition of "ironic."

>macho Ham geeks

Isn't that oxymorinic?

LRod

Master Woodbutcher and seasoned termite

Shamelessly whoring my website since 1999

http://www.woodbutcher.net

74. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-01 16:41:38 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0310010841.12b530c8@posting.google.com>
Source record: 79649

```
These are the number of unexpired FCC ARS
licenses held by individuals on the dates listed:

As of May 14, 2000:

Novice - 49,329
Tech - 205,394
Tech Plus - 128,860
General - 112,677
Advanced - 99,782
Extra - 78,750
Total - 674,792

As of September 30, 2003:

Novice - 33,034 (decrease of 16,295)
Technician - 257,250 (increase of 51,856)
Technician Plus - 65,042 (decrease of 63,818)
General - 141,340 (increase of 28,663)
Advanced - 82,724 (decrease of 17,058)
Extra - 104,605 (increase of 25,855)
Total - 683,995 (increase of 9,203)

73 de Jim, N2EY
```

75. Re: Some thoughtful comments from another forum on the code/nocode debate

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-01 17:22:15 UTC
From: groupk0hb@earthlink.net
Message-ID: <5ee63311.0310010922.cb0eca3@posting.google.com>
Source record: 79650

"Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote

>
> Were they as free as Hans seems to think they are, I really
> wonder how valuable they would be.
>

I will try to end your wondering. First, I don't "seem to think"; for my value system I "know". All of the things I mentioned are among the things I value the very most in life. They come to me as free unconditional gifts which no amount of 'investment' would earn. In other words, their value is completely independent of their cost.

Without putting words in anyones mouth, it appears from the posts of you, Jim and Dee, that your value system is based on 'investment gives beneficial results'. In my value system, the 'results' are valued solely on merit without regard to how I acquired them.

As a kind of crude example, the value of two $10.00 bills, one which I found on the street and the other which I performed hard labor to earn are exactly equal. What I 'invested' in either one is absolutely immaterial when calculating their value --- the corner grocer will take either one and give me precisely the same change when I purchase a jar of olives.

Taking it back to the context of this thread, my amateur license or my drivers license or my fishing license have value to me based on the beneficial things I can do with them. The value is not related in any fashion to the 'cost' or 'effort' that it took to obtain the license.

73, de Hans, K0HB
--

"I came to see your beautiful new baby, not to
listen to a description of your labor pains."
-- K0HB

76. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-01 18:08:54 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0310011008.7115a36@posting.google.com>
Source record: 79652

"Arnie Macy" <kt4stnospam@csam.net> wrote in message
news:<bkuuso$6do2f$1@ID-166180.news.uni-berlin.de>...
> "Dwight Stewart" wrote ...
>
> Math is not my forte. I got through the classes, but had to struggle every
> single step of the way. In fact, I still struggle with it to some extent to
> this day, so I'll obviously never be anything close to an expert on it.
> Perhaps I need to do what most do and simply avoid situations involving
> serious math.
> --
>
> When I was in high school, I absolutely hated math. And not unlike you, I
> tried to avoid it as much as possible. But for some reason, the light came
> on when I entered college. As much as we might hate it, math does play a
> rather large roll in Amateur Radio.
>
> Arnie -
> KT4ST

Bruce says not to work the math on the Extra exam. Should everyone take his advice?

77. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-01 18:10:31 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0310011010.566c4e70@posting.google.com>
Source record: 79653

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20030925165632.12631.00001462@mb-m28.aol.com>...
> In article <bkuuso$6do2f$1@ID-166180.news.uni-berlin.de>, "Arnie Macy"
> <kt4stnospam@csam.net> writes:
>
> >When I was in high school, I absolutely hated math. And not unlike you, I
> >tried to avoid it as much as possible. But for some reason, the light came
> >on when I entered college. As much as we might hate it, math does play a
> >rather large roll in Amateur Radio.
>
> Ohm's Law is expressed in simple algebra. That is about all the "large
> roll" [sic, should be 'role'] in amateur radio. That and copying someone
> else's values from a QST or QEX how-to-make-it article (rare) on
> construction.
>
> Please explain the "large roll" that math plays in amateur radio.
>
> Were you on a roll and slipped in the butter?

Perhaps Larry would comment?

78. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-01 18:19:05 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031001141905.02376.00000106@mb-m01.aol.com>
Source record: 79655

>Bruce says not to work the math on the Extra exam. Should everyone take his
>advice?
>

Thats because there is no reason to work the Math, the Test is so simple.

79. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-01 18:19:13 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0310011019.e0c18c6@posting.google.com>
Source record: 79654

N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<c2356669.0309251432.caedff0@posting.google.com>...
> "Arnie Macy" <kt4stnospam@csam.net> wrote in message
news:<bkuuso$6do2f$1@ID-166180.news.uni-berlin.de>...
> > "Dwight Stewart" wrote ...
> >
> > Math is not my forte. I got through the classes, but had to struggle every
> > single step of the way. In fact, I still struggle with it to some extent to
> > this day, so I'll obviously never be anything close to an expert on it.
> > Perhaps I need to do what most do and simply avoid situations involving
> > serious math.
> > ____
> >
> > When I was in high school, I absolutely hated math. And not unlike you, I
> > tried to avoid it as much as possible. But for some reason, the light came
> > on when I entered college. As much as we might hate it, math does play a
> > rather large roll in Amateur Radio.
> >
> > Arnie -
> > KT4ST
>
> I think that a lot of people who imagine themselves to be "poor" at
> math are actually the result of poorly written math books and
> less-than-stellar math teachers.

My calculus teacher was the wrassling coach.

80. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-01 18:44:00 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3F7B2070.7030409@psu.edu>
Source record: 79656

Brian wrote:
> N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<c2356669.0309251432.caedff0@posting.google.com>...
>
>>"Arnie Macy" <kt4stnospam@csam.net> wrote in message
news:<bkuuso$6do2f$1@ID-166180.news.uni-berlin.de>...
>>
>>>"Dwight Stewart" wrote ...
>>>
>>> Math is not my forte. I got through the classes, but had to struggle every
>>>single step of the way. In fact, I still struggle with it to some extent to
>>>this day, so I'll obviously never be anything close to an expert on it.
>>>Perhaps I need to do what most do and simply avoid situations involving
>>>serious math.
>>>_____
>>>
>>>When I was in high school, I absolutely hated math. And not unlike you, I
>>>tried to avoid it as much as possible. But for some reason, the light came
>>>on when I entered college. As much as we might hate it, math does play a
>>>rather large roll in Amateur Radio.
>>>
>>>Arnie -
>>>KT4ST
>>
>>I think that a lot of people who imagine themselves to be "poor" at
>>math are actually the result of poorly written math books and
>>less-than-stellar math teachers.
>
>
> My calculus teacher was the wrassling coach.

Wuz he a good calculus teacher?

- Mike KB3EIA -

81. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-01 18:46:19 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3F7B20FB.2040608@psu.edu>
Source record: 79657

N2EY wrote:
> These are the number of unexpired FCC ARS
> licenses held by individuals on the dates listed:

<snip>

> As of September 30, 2003:
>
> Novice - 33,034 (decrease of 16,295)

<snip>

This may be hard to quantify, Jim, but is there any data or even
educated guessing about how many Novices are still actually active?

- Mike KB3EIA -

82. Re: Some thoughtful comments from another forum on the code/nocode debate

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-01 18:59:08 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3F7B23FC.7090201@psu.edu>
Source record: 79659

Hans K0HB wrote:
> "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote
>
>
>>Were they as free as Hans seems to think they are, I really
>>wonder how valuable they would be.
>>
>
>
> I will try to end your wondering. First, I don't "seem to think"; for
> my value system I "know". All of the things I mentioned are among the
> things I value the very most in life. They come to me as free
> unconditional gifts which no amount of 'investment' would earn. In
> other words, their value is completely independent of their cost.
>
> Without putting words in anyones mouth, it appears from the posts of
> you, Jim and Dee, that your value system is based on 'investment gives
> beneficial results'. In my value system, the 'results' are valued
> solely on merit without regard to how I acquired them.
>
> As a kind of crude example, the value of two $10.00 bills, one which I
> found on the street and the other which I performed hard labor to earn
> are exactly equal. What I 'invested' in either one is absolutely
> immaterial when calculating their value --- the corner grocer will
> take either one and give me precisely the same change when I purchase
> a jar of olives.
>
> Taking it back to the context of this thread, my amateur license or my
> drivers license or my fishing license have value to me based on the
> beneficial things I can do with them. The value is not related in any
> fashion to the 'cost' or 'effort' that it took to obtain the license.

Good post, and good argument, Hans.

But I wonder if there is no place for pride of accomplishment? In my other hobby, I spent several years making a large telescope. It was an intense project, and took a lot of effort. In the end, I was rewarded with a wonderful, beautiful, and very high quality instrument. It won first place in the only competition I entered it in.

I'm very proud of it, and very proud of being able to accomplish such a feat with my own hands. I would have no such thoughts about the purchase of a commercial telescope of somewhat similar style. So something must be going on there.

>
> "I came to see your beautiful new baby, not to
> listen to a description of your labor pains."

oy!

- Mike KB3EIA -

83. Re: PORKBUTT PORKBUTT PORKBUTT

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-01 19:02:54 UTC
From: Stalker II <BogusEmail@OForNow.com>
Message-ID: <blf8ct$8kk$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 79658
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"LRod" <LRod@removethispartpobox.com> wrote in message
news:3f7aff13.4626354@newsgroups.bellsouth.net...
On Sat, 27 Sep 2003 03:02:52 -0500, "LaShaun Ivory"
<NoSpam@NOSpam.com> wrote:

This is hilarious. Hang around a bit to see why.

>Rich is not missed save by a few of his malingerers.

Malingerers? Do you know what a malingerer is? It's someone who goofs
off and does no work. It is not a synonym for "apologist" or
"supporter."

>Yeah, Dan is garrulous, he is known to be a pain in the ass at times,
>but why promulgate it with your inane comments?

Promulgate? Do you know what promulgate means? It is the process of
developing legislation or procedures. It is not a synonym for
"antagonize" or "perpetuate."

>Frankie...ever pull your dictionary off the shelf and read the definition
of
>"maturity"?

This is the best part. LaShaun telling Frankie to "pull [the]
dictionary off the shelf." Try it yourself, and while you have it
open, read the definition of "ironic."

>macho Ham geeks

Isn't that oxymorinic?

LRod

> Oh, please, oh learned one...will you explain to the rest of us what
"oxymorinic" means?
Now, about that dictionary....

84. Re: Echolink is great for those who..

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-01 19:30:23 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031001153023.01086.00000190@mb-m29.aol.com>
Source record: 79660

>Why anyone
>would brag about having a Tech class license, I have no idea.

I still havent figured that one out either. Its like a saying there one tiny, tiny, tiny, step above a CBer, aint I great

85. Re: Echolink is great for those who..

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-01 19:40:20 UTC
From: charlesb <n5pvl@sbcglobal.net>
Message-ID: <E4Geb.9110$6R3.2838@newssvr32.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 79661
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.amateur,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

<nospam@any.time> wrote in message
news:ik7mnvok575m919j7curuk4sn8ijo5iakg@4ax.com...
> "Eric Oyen - N7ZIT" wrote:
>
> Why anyone would brag about having a Tech class license, I have no idea.
>

Gee, that's funny! - I can't imagine why any ham worthy of the name would run down another ham because of his liscense level.

I personally know a tech who was riding on a convoy from Kuwait to Bagdhad a week or so ago, and within a few hours of entering Iraq, ended up in a firefight and saved several of his comerads while sending a couple of those crapulent terrorist dudes they have over there to their final rewards.

Hey, he'll be back from his tour over there in a year or so... Maybe I can get the two of you together so that you can talk trash about techs to his face. - If you think you are up to it.

Oh, but I forgot... You are another one of those no-callsign "anonymous" mother's mistakes who get on here from time to time to bash hams and ham radio. Another anti-ham Troll.

Never mind.

Charles Brabham, N5PVL

86. Re: PORKBUTT PORKBUTT PORKBUTT

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-01 19:40:55 UTC
From: LRod@removethispartpobox.com
Message-ID: <3f7b2d50.16465273@newsgroups.bellsouth.net>
Source record: 79663
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On Wed, 1 Oct 2003 14:02:54 -0500, "Stalker II"
<BogusEmail@OForNow.com> wrote:

>Isn't that oxymorinic?
>
>LRod
>
>> Oh, please, oh learned one...will you explain to the rest of us what
>"oxymorinic" means?
>Now, about that dictionary....

Oxymoronic. Simply a typo. Malingerer, and promulgate were not.

LRod

Master Woodbutcher and seasoned termite

Shamelessly whoring my website since 1999

http://www.woodbutcher.net

87. Re: Echolink is great for those who..

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-01 19:55:03 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031001155503.05886.00000109@mb-m10.aol.com>
Source record: 79662

>Gee, that's funny! - I can't imagine why any ham worthy of the name would
>run down another ham because of his liscense level.

Because new Hams, are not REAL HAMS, there just CBers with a Give Away Ham
Ticket

88. Re: LROD, LROD, LROD

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-01 20:09:06 UTC
From: LRod@removethispartpobox.com
Message-ID: <3f7b2ee8.16873291@newsgroups.bellsouth.net>
Source record: 79669
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On 1 Oct 2003 18:53:05 GMT, SLee@houston-hunks.com (Stagger Lee)
wrote:

>From http://www.brainydictionary.com:
>
>"Malingerer
>
>"(n.) In the army, a soldier who feigns himself sick, or who induces
>or protracts an illness, in order to avoid doing his duty; hence, in
>general, one who shirks his duty by pretending illness or inability."
>
>Which says to me that the poster is likening the supporters to a bunch
>of military duty shirkers. That's quite a valid use of the word in
>that case.

But that's not what the context is. The intent of the original
statement is clear that he is referring to his (Rich's) supporters.

"Rich is not missed save by a few of his malingerers."

Malingerers is clearly a noun. In the case you try to make, it would
be descriptive of his, what? supporters? apologists? In other words,
more like an adjective. Then what is it modifying? Nothing.

In other words, you are trying to convince us that the original poster
was saying that "Rich is not missed save by a few [people who feign
illness or inability]." Sorry, no sale.

>: >Yeah, Dan is garrulous, he is known to be a pain in the ass at times,
>: >but why promulgate it with your inane comments?
>:
>: Promulgate? Do you know what promulgate means? It is the process of
>: developing legislation or procedures. It is not a synonym for
>: "antagonize" or "perpetuate."
>
>Oh heck: Let's look it up on the web again, since LRod needs all the help
>he can get.
>
>At http://www.hyperdictionary.com/dictionary/promulgate, we find that
>some synonyms for the word are "exclaim" or "proclaim." That source
>also suggests that you look up "announce" and "trumpet" if you are
>trying to get a feeling for the meaning of the word.

I will concede that I've never heard promulgate used in that fashion.
Sue me. I will not concede, however, that given the whole text of the

definition (which refers to publishing laws or proclamations) that the original poster's use was appropriate, particularly in the context of the original post.

>In fact, "perpetuate" is another perfectly good synonym, contrary to the >erroneous statement by "master language butcher" LRod.

Interesting propaganda technique there; citing a source and using actual material from it, then adding one's own thoughts in the same paragraph to give the impression one's own ideas are also from that source. Please cite any source in which "perpetuate" is a synonym to "promulgate." It's certainly not in the ones you used.

>Perhaps "LRod" would do well to consult a dictionary himself before >attempting to correct someone else.

Just one? Why, you used at least two, neither of them mainstream, to try and make your point. Something wrong with http://www.m-w.com ?

>Instead of the intended result, LRod, you now have your foot firmly planted >in your own mouth.

I know you'd like to think so, but, I refer you to Mark Twain's essay "Fenimore Cooper's Literary Offenses" in which he describes, with a musical metaphor, Cooper's misuse of words as "sharping and flatting" his way along. The vocabulary use in the original poster's message fell short in substantially the same way.

LRod

Master Woodbutcher and seasoned termite

Shamelessly whoring my website since 1999

http://www.woodbutcher.net

89. Re: Another Self-Humiliating LenniRiffic Rant

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-01 20:43:30 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <blfe9i$io5$0@208.206.142.109>
Source record: 79664

Brian wrote:.
>
> On a scale of 1 to 10, with 1 being "morron," and 10 being genius,
> where would you say Bruce falls?
>

With you occupying the slot at 2, he comes in at least a 3.

90. Re: Some thoughtful comments from another forum on the code/nocode debate

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-01 20:51:09 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <blfent$k6i$0@208.206.142.109>
Source record: 79667

Hans K0HB wrote:

>Long before I thought about
> getting an amateur license I already knew Morse code and electronics.

Well, I recall you mentioned knowing how to use a bug when you went aboard ship in the Navy. So how and when did you learn it if not as a ham? You learned Morse to speeds fast enough to qualify for a ham ticket early, then. One wonders how and where. as that's most unusual unless you were employed in radiotlegraphy somewhere.

> A couple hours brushing up on the common-sense rules was all the
> 'self' I put into it.
>
> I value my amateur privileges very highly, but the 'cost of entry' was
> almost non-existent.
>

Methinks you downplay it all to much for NCI Agenda reasons.

All that aside, the learning "cost" whenever and under whatever circumstances. You "paid" for that education whether you first used it for ham radio or for something else first.

91. Re: Some thoughtful comments from another forum on the code/nocode debate

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-01 20:54:47 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <raHeb.8596$yp6.248316@nnrp1.ptd.net>
Source record: 79665

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030930223035.28496.00001006@mb-m18.aol.com...
> In article <m6feb.8394$yp6.234106@nnrp1.ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
> <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:
>
> >"Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
> >news:f45722ac.0309300431.673f47fe@posting.google.com...
> >>
> >> Furthermore, if the US government wants to give all prospective
> >> amateurs 3 hots and a cot, and a paycheck, for the duration it takes
> >> to learn the code, I'd gladly enroll in the CG Morse Code school.
> >
> >There's one problem ... there IS no CG Morse Code school any
> >more ...
>
> Sad but true.
>
> > the services are NOT teaching their radiomen Morse any
> >more.
>
> Even if they were - would it make any difference to your opinion of the
need
> for code testing in the amateur radio service?

It would add *some* potential validity to the "trained (in Morse) pool of
operators" part of 97.1 ... however, that is not the case and hasn't been
for some time ...

It wouldn't be a "slam-dunk" in favor of continued Morse testing for
HF ham licenses though.

73,
Carl - wk3c

92. Re: Echolink is great for those who..

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-01 20:56:00 UTC
From: charlesb <n5pvl@sbcglobal.net>
Message-ID: <AbHeb.7761$J86.7428@newssvr33.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 79668

"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20031001155503.05886.00000109@mb-m10.aol.com...
> >Gee, that's funny! - I can't imagine why any ham worthy of the name
would
> >run down another ham because of his liscense level.
>
> Because new Hams, are not REAL HAMS, there just CBers with a Give Away Ham
> Ticket

Another anti-ham Troll identifies himself as not being worthy of his ham
liscense.

(yawn)

Charles Brabham, N5PVL

93. Re: Some thoughtful comments from another forum on the code/nocode debate

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-01 20:57:05 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <BcHeb.8597$yp6.248362@nnrp1.ptd.net>
Source record: 79666

"Hans K0HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:5ee63311.0310010922.cb0eca3@posting.google.com...
> "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote
>
> >
> > Were they as free as Hans seems to think they are, I really
> > wonder how valuable they would be.
> >
>
> I will try to end your wondering. First, I don't "seem to think"; for
> my value system I "know". All of the things I mentioned are among the
> things I value the very most in life. They come to me as free
> unconditional gifts which no amount of 'investment' would earn. In
> other words, their value is completely independent of their cost.
>
> Without putting words in anyones mouth, it appears from the posts of
> you, Jim and Dee, that your value system is based on 'investment gives
> beneficial results'. In my value system, the 'results' are valued
> solely on merit without regard to how I acquired them.
>
> As a kind of crude example, the value of two $10.00 bills, one which I
> found on the street and the other which I performed hard labor to earn
> are exactly equal. What I 'invested' in either one is absolutely
> immaterial when calculating their value --- the corner grocer will
> take either one and give me precisely the same change when I purchase
> a jar of olives.
>
> Taking it back to the context of this thread, my amateur license or my
> drivers license or my fishing license have value to me based on the
> beneficial things I can do with them. The value is not related in any
> fashion to the 'cost' or 'effort' that it took to obtain the license.
>
> 73, de Hans, K0HB

I agree with Hans 100%+ on this one ... the value is in what they let
you do, not what you had to do to get them.

Carl - wk3c

94. Re: Some thoughtful comments from another forum on the code/nocode debate

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-01 21:17:56 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <blfga4mqd0@208.206.142.109>
Source record: 79670

Hans K0HB wrote:

> "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote
>
>
>>Were they as free as Hans seems to think they are, I really
>>wonder how valuable they would be.
>>
>
>
> I will try to end your wondering. First, I don't "seem to think"; for
> my value system I "know". All of the things I mentioned are among the
> things I value the very most in life. They come to me as free
> unconditional gifts which no amount of 'investment' would earn. In
> other words, their value is completely independent of their cost.
>
> Without putting words in anyones mouth, it appears from the posts of
> you, Jim and Dee, that your value system is based on 'investment gives
> beneficial results'. In my value system, the 'results' are valued
> solely on merit without regard to how I acquired them.
>
> As a kind of crude example, the value of two $10.00 bills, one which I
> found on the street and the other which I performed hard labor to earn
> are exactly equal. What I 'invested' in either one is absolutely
> immaterial when calculating their value --- the corner grocer will
> take either one and give me precisely the same change when I purchase
> a jar of olives.
>
> Taking it back to the context of this thread, my amateur license or my
> drivers license or my fishing license have value to me based on the
> beneficial things I can do with them. The value is not related in any
> fashion to the 'cost' or 'effort' that it took to obtain the license.
>

Hans, it's novel that you share the life view of a fella named
Willie Sutton who said he robbed banks "Because that's where
the money is".

How else to explain your implied lack of pride in accomplishment
and pride of ownership of things that you earned or built with
your own personal efforts?

95. Re: The way to stop BPL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-01 21:41:49 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031001174149.05539.00001143@mb-m16.aol.com>
Source record: 79675

In article <d22b54c3.0309291023.3ae7187a@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) writes:

>The ARRL submission is the *only* by-the-numbers engineering study on
>record so far and it has the BPL proponents in a royal snit.

Incorrect. See the Comments of Dr. Michael Keane, Michael Tope, Alfred Lorona, and Leo McVey. Individuals who took the time and trouble to make their own critical technical comments.

If you had actually examined a few hundred of the Comments from groups and organizations NOT in line with the BPL advocates, you would have seen more "by the numbers" refutation of the BPL advocates' claims.

>They're
>*not* brushing it off by any means, they're vigorously attacking it,
>they know they have a battle on their hands so don't underestimate the
>ARRL's ability to be a spoiler far out of proportion to it's political
>and/or financial clout. David did take out Goliath, etc.

A catalytic reaction does not require the catalyst to be big or powerful and the ARRL membership is NOT the sole victim of future RF pollution from BPL if it is implemented.

From almost 5000 Comments so far (as of Tuesday evening), there are a number of Comments from already-established broadband Internet providers using telephone and/or cable service means. Those are the Goliaths who are up against the Davids of the BPL...and the only "slingshot" the BPL advocates have is in doing a sales/marketing effort on the Commission back in early Spring.

Had you looked at the listing of documents on Docket 03-104 you would have seen a number of Comments from non-amateur-radio groups, including a long one from the Academy of Model Aeronautics (175,000 membership).

>Technical
>submissions are not over either, the NTIA is gonna weigh in eventually
>which could very well be the slam dunk BPL killer.

Docket 03-104 was published first at the FCC on 28 April 2003 and was a Notice of Inquiry regarding information the FCC could use for the purposes of establishing regulations for Part 15, Title 47 CFR.

03-104 was never any establishment that BPL would be in the future or ever get beyond the test stage, regardless of the Hue and Cry and

the General Hysteria exhibited by so many...who have not made any intellectual commentary on it of public record.

LHA

96. Re: Lennie's Double Standard Once Again Revealed...BY Lennie!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-01 21:41:49 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031001174149.05539.00001144@mb-m16.aol.com>
Source record: 79677

In article <f45722ac.0310010606.62efe0c@posting.google.com>,
brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:

>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
>news:<5c01b95b.0310010040.452d084c@posting.google.com>...
>> "Clint" <rattlehead at computron dot net> wrote in message
>news:<vnk8gbsap9td88@corp.supernews.com>...
>> > Generally the PCTA crowd has been putting most of the
>> > people who challenge thier position and willing to debate
>> > thier points on thier killfiles. Sounds pretty much like it
>> > is they, not the NCTA, that can handle the scrutiny
>> > and are therefore obviously on thin ice.
>>
>> Well, Clint...As foolish as it may have been, Brain was straight
>> up enough to "admit" that Lennie was his "mentor"...His words, not
>> mine.
>
>Len was willing to go the distance w/o letting all the bullying and
>worse deter him. In that respect, Len is my mentor.

I'm still "going the distance," Brian. I just don't live here in this
newsgroup every day.

Steamy has proved himself to all readers that he is incapable of
any discussion, debate, or argument...just personal attacks on
anyone who doesn't agree with his emotional opinions.

>You, Steve Robeson, will not run me off the group. Nor will your
>Cronies.

I would suppose that Steamy has a great imagination, fantasizing he
is a great "radio warrior" vanquishing all who do not agree with his
ideals of amateurism. :-)

He obviously needs some mental counseling.

97. Re: Isnt it Funny (No-Code HF Privileges)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-01 21:41:50 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031001174150.05539.00001146@mb-m16.aol.com>
Source record: 79671

In article <20031001062936.07578.00000881@mb-m25.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
writes:

>You don't really take Bruce seriously, do you, Dwight? I don't.
>
>He's just another version of Len. In fact the two of them are,
>philosophically, exactly the same.

Tsk, tsk, tsk...try being mature and not trolling for responses by
attempting
insults on others.

98. Re: Another Self-Humiliating LenniRiffic Rant

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-01 21:41:50 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031001174150.05539.00001145@mb-m16.aol.com>
Source record: 79674

In article <f45722ac.0310010543.10e9c4fd@posting.google.com>,
brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:

>N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in message
>news:<c2356669.0309301440.c31c99c@posting.google.com>...
>> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
>news:<f45722ac.0309300452.6c787ecd@posting.google.com>...
>> > "Arnie Macy" <kt4stnospam@csam.net> wrote in message
>news:<bl2q1m$7doa6$1@ID-166180.news.uni-berlin.de>...
>> > > "N2EY" wrote ...
>> > >
>> > > Do you think that a person can have only one writing style?
>> > > ____
>> > >
>> > I agree that a person can have more than one writing style. In this
>case;
>> > however, Len would have to work exceedingly hard to destroy any
>semblance of
>> > writing ability. I believe he has too much of an ego for that.
>> > >
>> > > Arnie-
>> > > KT4ST
>> >
>> And Bruce? Jim thinks he is a genius that presents himself as a
>"morron."
>>
>> You are utterly and completely mistaken.
>>
>> I do not think Bruce is a genius.
>
>Then please clarify.
>
>On a scale of 1 to 10, with 1 being "morron," and 10 being genius,
>where would you say Bruce falls?
>
>Remember now, you've put forth the theory that Bruce is a master of
>trickery, so only you are able to see his brilliance.

Anyone who ever says anything against Rev. Jim's opinions is always
"utterly and completely mistaken!"

:-)

99. Re: 1/4 Wave Dipoles

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-01 21:41:51 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031001174151.05539.00001147@mb-m16.aol.com>
Source record: 79672

In article <f45722ac.0309300428.1e9ebb5@posting.google.com>,
brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:

>I invoke your "Bruce Hypothesis."
>
>Len isn't really shouting nor is he out of control.
>
>HE MERELY WISHES TO GIVE THAT IMPRESSION.

WHAT MAKES YOU SAY SO?

:-)

100. Re: Some thoughtful comments from another forum on the code/nocode debate

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-01 21:41:51 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031001174151.05539.00001148@mb-m16.aol.com>
Source record: 79673

In article <Xns9406AFC53722Delektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun Palmer
<elektros@yahoo.com> writes:

><snip>
>>
>> It is a fact of human nature that most people value a thing more if it
>> took some investment of themselves to acquire.
>>
>> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>I think this is precisely why some people argue so vociferously for code
>tesing despite the lack of any logical arguments for retaining it. That is
>to say, they value it because it's hard instead of because it's necessary
>(which it isn't!!!).
>
>73 de Alun, N3KIP

Alun, it boils down to the obvious reason: They had to learn morse
code so everyone else better damn well have to learn it!!!

:-)

101. Re: Some thoughtful comments from another forum on the code/nocode debate

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-01 21:41:52 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031001174152.05539.00001149@mb-m16.aol.com>
Source record: 79678

In article <c2356669.0309300812.210385ba@posting.google.com>, N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) writes:

>"Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
>news:<5D4eb.8338$yp6.228429@nnrp1.ptd.net>...
>> "N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
>> news:c2356669.0309291302.64d8c737@posting.google.com...
>> > groupk0hb@earthlink.net (Hans K0HB) wrote in message
>> news:<5ee63311.0309281048.70c4e1cb@posting.google.com>...
>> > > "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote
>> > >
>> > > >
>> > > > 1) Back in '78, the students learned Morse Code as part of their CG
>> training,
>> > > > so there was no other training needed for them to get Extra Class
>> amateur
>> > > > licenses. Today, they would need to put in some of their own time,
>and
>> a bit of
>> > > > effort, learning Morse at 5 wpm for that test.
>> > > >
>> > >
>> > > You know Jim, the more I ponder this paragraph, the more I think you
>> > > may just have hit on an important way of grading the dedication (and
>> > > therefore "value") of any given amateur licensee.
>> >
>> > Well, that wasn't my intent at all. I was merely pointing out that for
>> > some folks, getting a license involves a lot of learning and the
>> > related effort, while others already have the skills and knowledge.
>>
>> The point is that licensing should be based on one's demonstration
>> of the required qualifications, no more, no less.
>
>That's your point, Carl, not my point.

OK, we'll put you down for "not demonstrating qualifications."

>The original story told how, back in 1978, the whole class of CG folks
>went down to FCC and became Extras, while today none of them did.

1978 was 25 years ago. This isn't 1978.

In 25 years, a child could be conceived, raised, educated, and become a working adult on their own.

Things are NOT static in time just because they are (apparently) fresh
in your mind.

>My point was simply that there are significant differences between the
>1978 and 2003 situations, such as:
>
>- the 1978 class was 'required' to take the test, and means provided
>to do so (do you think they went on their own time? used their own
>transportation? paid any fees?).
>
>- the 1978 class had already learned all they needed to know to pass
>the 1978 tests.

Which means WHAT?

Members of ANY branch of the US military in 1978 were ALL
volunteers. ALL.

>> If someone already has the knowledge to pass the tests, fine.
>
>You can't change that situation anyway.

Is this to be entirely about the PAST...again?

You cannot undo history. That has already happened...that's why it is
called history.

You can NOT use the PAST as a valid argument to have any knowledge,
skills, arts, or crafts preserved for the present and future with any
validity.

>> There is no "value added" in "making them work for it"
>
>Who said there was? The point is that the 1978 class had a completely
>different situation from the 2003 class.

You are slowly beginning to see reality. Congratulations.

>> ... if
>> they have the knowledge they are qualified, period.
>
>So would you agree with Kim that anyone who can pass the required
>tests should be allowed into the ARS?

Are you talking about the USCG or US amateur radio?

You are confusing, hopping around on subjects...

The ONLY agency awarding grants (in the form of licenses) for operating
on allocated amateur radio frequencies is the FCC. The USCG has
nothing to do with it.

>>(and likely
>> they worked for it or they wouldn't have the knowledge anyway,
>> so the logic of "making them work (more)" fails)
>

>It is a fact of human nature that most people value a thing more if it
>took some investment of themselves to acquire.

Which leads everyone to the implied reason of all PCTAs arguing for
the retention of code testing: They had to do it so everyone else had
better damn well do it, too!!!

102. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-01 21:41:54 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031001174154.05539.00001150@mb-m16.aol.com>
Source record: 79679

In article <20030930055226.21457.00000975@mb-m10.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
writes:

>In article <3n3eb.35705$pP6.8735@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dwight
>Stewart" <stewartx@STOPearthlinkSPAM.net> writes:
>
>>Code makes a person more experienced?
>
>Using the mode sure does.

What about when NOT using morse code?

Remember that morse code is only the secondmost used mode and then
only on HF bands.

>>If that is true, then a person who
>>passed a code test yesterday is more experienced than a person who got his
>>license ten years ago without knowing code, and more experienced than all
>>those in the other radio services where code is not used.
>
>No, that's not what is being said.

That is what was IMPLIED.

>>More rounded in what?
>
>In the communications methods actually used by radio amateurs. A ham license
is
>a license to operate an amateur station in the amateur radio bands, not to
>particiapte in other radio services.

US radio amateurs use VOICE more than on-off keying CW.

Nothing is stated in Part 97 CFR referring to amateur radio operators
as "ham" operators or having "ham" licenses.

In the USA, the FDA would regulate ham.

>> Emergency communications?
>
>To a very small degree. Ask KT4ST - he's been there, done that.

We have NO actual evidence available for that. Being some kind of
local emergency manager is NOT factual evidence of actual
emergency communications.

>>Moonbounce? Satellites?
>

>A lot of amateur moonbounce and satellite work has been done with Morse code.

Accurately show the values or percentages of US amateur radio
extraterrestrial communications.

>> And if a person with
>>code was truly more able to provide communications under adverse conditions,
>>all radio services would still be relying on code.
>
>No, that's not true.

It is ABSOLUTELY TRUE. Denial does not alter reality.

>Other radio services use radio as a means to an end, not an end in itself.
Most
>of them have the complete elimination of radio operators and radio operating
>skill as a goal. That's why the maritime service phased out Morse code on the
>high seas - they wanted to save the cost of having radio officers on their
>ships.

The purpose of radio on waterborne vessels is for the purpose of
COMMUNICATIONS. It was never about maintaining some kind of
standards on operating radios, maintaining radio operators, or
preserving some kind of "tradition" of old-time radio.

Feel free to look at Part 1, Title 47 CFR, to see that the FCC has
added more radio license categories for watercraft communications
and safety than ever existed for radiotelegraphy.

>>They aren't. In the end, these are all code myths.
>
>No, they are misunderstandings by those who don't like the code test.

UNQUESTIONABLE INCORRECT in the reality of world use of radio.

>Here, try this one:
>
>"All else being equal, a radio amateur who has Morse Code skills is more
>experienced, more qualified, and has more radio communications options
>available than a radio amateur with no Morse Code skills."

That is what is referred to as a "loaded" statement which automatically
implies that morse code users are somehow "superior" communicators.

The loading comes from the opening "All else being equal."

US amateur radio regulations do NOT specify that morse code MUST be
used over and above any other mode.

US amateur radio regulations allow free and optional use of ANY
allocated mode, any frequency band.

Your statement would be correct ONLY if morse code was required for
USE by all US radio amateurs. It is not so.

The amateur radio service is NOT the "amateur radiotelegraphy service."

103. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-01 21:41:55 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031001174155.05539.00001151@mb-m16.aol.com>
Source record: 79676

In article <20030930055225.21457.00000973@mb-m10.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
writes:

>In article <Dwadb.13617$pP6.4408@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dwight
>Stewart" <stewartx@STOPearthlinkSPAM.net> writes:
>
>>"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote:
>>>
>>> I've already answered that question many times, but the
>>> short form is that without code testing, there is no incentive
>>> for radio amateurs to learn the code at all. (snip)
>>
>> But, again, why should there be "incentive" for hams to learn code?
>
>Because it's not a skill that most people will have learned elsewhere.

Invalid as to federal regulations.

The FCC was not chartered in 1934 to be some kind of educational
organization encouraging or promoting morse code use.

>Most prospective hams already know how to read, write, talk and type. Most dod
>not know any Morse code.

Irrelevant as to federal regulations.

>>Notice
>>that I'm not asking why a person would want to learn code on their own.
>>Instead, I'm asking why there should be an effort on the part of the ARS or
>>FCC to promote (boost, encourage, or push) this single operating mode (it's
>>the only mode specifically skill tested)?
>
>See above.

Invalid "see." The FCC is the ONLY agency licensing radio amateurs in
the USA and was never chartered 69 years ago to promote or encourage
morse code.

>>> Retaining continued skill in Morse/CW has no negative
>>> effect on the development of technology in the future.
>>> That's an NCTA red herring.
>>
>> I didn't say it had a negative effect, Larry. Instead, I asked you how
>>this (code skill testing) will help to keep the ARS abreast of modern
>>technology, insuring our continued value to others? I also asked how this
>>(code skill testing) will help move the ARS into the future (where we should
>>be mainly focused)?

>
>Some claim that Morse Code testing is at odds with the purpose of the amateur
>radio service as a fundamentally technical service. But in the practical
>experience of thousands of amateurs, the opposite is true.

There are over 600 thousand US amateur radio licensees. Please show
proof of your claim of "practical experience of thousands of amateurs..."

Try not to misdirect into areas not under discussion.

>Skill in Morse Code, even at a very basic level, permits amateurs to use radio
>equipment ranging from very simple to highly advanced designs, and
>technologies of almost any vintage.

The purpose of the US amateur radio service, as defined in Part 97.1,
Title 47 CFR, is NOT to be some living museum of radio or radio arts.

Skill at morse code, at any level, is NOT required or even necessary
to OPERATE radio equipment, any complexity, any vintage, that does
NOT use on-off keying coding for communication.

>Morse Code skill encourages amateurs to actually build
>their own radio equipment by offering an easy first step, and a growth path
>that leads to almost any usable technology.

Unproven. Unjustifiable.

Morse code skill is a psychomotor skill which has NO direct or even
remote relationship to building, designing, or even conceiving of radio
equipment.

>It must be remembered that most
>radio amateurs are self-trained and do not have access to professional level
>resources.

One "professional level resource" is a BOOK.

There are thousands of text books available on the market today which
are not published by the ARRL.

>Few amateurs today would consider a single-sideband transceiver as a
>first project, but the home construction of Morse Code equipment is possible
>for almost all amateurs.

"Home construction of morse code equipment" can consist of a switch
(code key), wire, and buzzer. Hardly rocket science.

>I speak from direct experience in amateur radio home construction, having
built
>my first amateur station at age 13. Since then I have built many more projects
>of increasing complexity, and much of my current amateur radio station is
>entirely homemade.

So, the way you did it is the role model for all others?

"Homemade" has diverged from older definitions of design and build to
just assembling kits, such as from Elecraft.

Kit building is not exactly "home made" and certainly not DESIGNED
by the builder/assembler.

>The construction of my early stations led me to an
>electrical engineering degree and career.

The majority of EEs of today got there from INTEREST in electrical
and electronic engineering and NOT by having a "ham" license
first.

>The removal of the Morse Code test from the Technician class license has not
>resulted in a technical revolution in amateur radio from newly-licensed
>"technically qualified" amateurs.

False analogy.

Most (by photo evidence, overwhelmingly so) communications equipment
used by radio amateurs is READY-BUILT, designed by others,
assembled and tested by others. It has been so for over three decades.
See any collection of amateur radio related periodicals to confirm that.

The "technical revolution in amateur radio" has come from RADIO EQUIPMENT
MANUFACTURERS. See any collection of amateur radio related periodicals
to confirm that. See any collection of radio related periodicals to confirm
that.

USE of already designed and manufactured radio equipment is simply USE
and NOT "advancing some technical art in radio."

>Instead, the continued progress in amateur
>technical efforts continues to be mostly the result of work done by
experienced
>amateurs, even though the Technician class license has not had a code test for
>more than 12 years.

ENTIRELY FALSE analogy. Unrelated and unproven.

All vague inference.

Trying to "convince" others by using false and misleading inferences is very
"bad form" and equivalent to the vague generalities of the BPL advocates in
response to FCC Docket 03-104, none of whom have submitted any factual
information, just marketing phrases.

104. Re: Echolink is great for those who..

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-01 22:05:58 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031001180558.21650.00000132@mb-m02.aol.com>
Source record: 79680

>Another anti-ham Troll identifies himself as not being worthy of his ham
>liscense.
>
>(yawn)
>
>Charles Brabham, N5PVL
>

Oh I earned mine you Low lifes just had it handed to you.

105. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-01 22:17:27 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <Xnleb.5358$Hd6.3255171@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 79681

"Radio Amateur KC2HMZ" <kc2hmz@aa-mail.removespamkiller.net> wrote in
message news:gojknvcrkqcb4k9ffd9vd6q1e909n2g9vi@4ax.com...
> **** Post for FREE via your newsreader at post.usenet.com ****
>
> On Tue, 30 Sep 2003 23:51:00 GMT, "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
> wrote:
> [snip]
> >If the simplest approach
> >is taken to this change (simply dropping the code requirement), we would
> >actually have an immediate increase in people with access to the Novice
> >subbands as all Techs, not just Techs with code, would now be able to
> >operate there. So this should increase the need to keep these bands
> >allocated to the Novice/Technician groups.
>
> I think it will create a need for even *more* spectrum to be allocated
> to those groups - and bear in mind it's not an exclusive allocation;
> General, Advanced and Extra licensees can operate there as well, as
> long as they stay at 200 watts or less - but the question is, how many
> of them are going to be using CW absent a code testing requirement,
> and how many will be on other modes?

Nope don't give them more room. If they don't want to be restricted to the
current Novice subbands and privileges, they can go pass the General test if
they want more space. NO FREEBIES. The General test is almost a repeat of
the Technician test. The additional material between Tech and General is
pretty minimal.

>
> We're told by some PCTAs that once the test is eliminated, the stock
> of CW operators in the ARS is going to dry up - to hear them tell it,
> like a wet lawn on a sunny day in July. If they're correct (and with
> the way some of those folks toss around insults I have to admit that
> if I was a Technician the last thing I'd be interested in doing is
> learning code just so I could get on the air and work the same guy who
> just raked me over the coals in this NG), there's going to be a need
> for more space for all the new phone ops the PCTAs seem to be fearing
> the arrival of. Meanwhile, CW is already authorized on any frequency
> where an amateur has operating privileges, so why continue to have
> subbands at all?

If the code "monster" is eliminated, they can get more room by upgrading to
General. Again I repeat, NO FREEBIES.

Why have subbands? Well simple, there are 600,000+ amateurs in the US.
This is more than all other nations combined (if Japan is excluded). US

voice operators could conceivably make too much noise worldwide for foreign operators. At least this way they foreign operators have a section that they can use voice while we are restricted to CW or data.

Also given the way people are very poor at following the existing band plans that overlay the mandated subbands, I wouldn't trust the 600,000+ operators to follow a mere band plan.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

106. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-01 22:29:00 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <MyIeb.5363$Hd6.3257781@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 79682

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@STOPearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:VGxeb.259$f11.59@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote:
> > The removal of the Morse Code test from the Technician
> > class license has not resulted in a technical revolution in
> > amateur radio from newly-licensed "technically qualified"
> > amateurs. (snip)
>
>
> I didn't know the Technician license was supposed to lead to a technical
> revolution in anything, Jim. Instead, I thought they were just supposed to
> participate in the same activities most other Amateur Radio operators are
> participating in. Why the unique expectation for Technician license
holders
> alone?
>
>

Those who pushed for the Tech no code license loudly and repeatedly claimed that it would lead to a major influx of technically bright hams that would lead to significant technical advances in ham radio since it was supposedly code keeping them out. Well that influx of technical types didn't happen. Unfortunately, the Technician licensees following that change are saddled with an expectation that they themselves did not create. They shoulder the burden of expectations created by those who would not have to fulfill them. Whether or not one believes in code testing, it highlights some of the inherent flaws in the argument that code keeps technical types out of ham radio.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

107. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-01 22:36:10 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <tFIeb.5364$Hd6.3258692@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 79683

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20031001102946.21642.00001335@mb-m01.aol.com...
>
> I'd say they should have at least half of the General CW/data subbands.
>

No need to if the code is eliminated as they can easily upgrade to General with a 35 question test that is only marginally harder than the Technician test.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

108. Re: Some thoughtful comments from another forum on the code/nocode debate

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-01 22:36:55 UTC
From: Robert <rdbake@prtcnet.org>
Message-ID: <blfktk$e2u$1@nd.eastky.net>
Source record: 79712

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030930202938.07346.00000910@mb-m26.aol.com...
> In article <Xns9406AFC53722Delektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun Palmer
> <elektros@yahoo.com> writes:
>
> ><snip>
> >>
> >> It is a fact of human nature that most people value a thing more if it
> >> took some investment of themselves to acquire.
> >>
> >> 73 de Jim, N2EY
> >
> >I think this is precisely why some people argue so vociferously for code
> >tesing despite the lack of any logical arguments for retaining it.
>
> There are lots of logical arguments for retaining code testing.

Not as a point of federal law, I think. The biggest proponents on
raap have rolled over as far as the facts are concerned, and that should be
enough for anyboy.

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.520 / Virus Database: 318 - Release Date: 9/18/2003

109. Re: Some thoughtful comments from another forum on the code/nocode debate

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-01 22:38:01 UTC
From: Robert <rdbake@prtcnet.org>
Message-ID: <blfktl$e2u$2@nd.eastky.net>
Source record: 79711

"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20031001174151.05539.00001148@mb-m16.aol.com...
> In article <Xns9406AFC53722Delektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun Palmer
> <elektros@yahoo.com> writes:
>
> ><snip>
> >>
> >> It is a fact of human nature that most people value a thing more if it
> >> took some investment of themselves to acquire.
> >>
> >> 73 de Jim, N2EY
> >
> >I think this is precisely why some people argue so vociferously for code
> >tesing despite the lack of any logical arguments for retaining it. That
is
> >to say, they value it because it's hard instead of because it's necessary
> >(which it isn't!!!).
> >
> >73 de Alun, N3KIP
>
> Alun, it boils down to the obvious reason: They had to learn morse
> code so everyone else better damn well have to learn it!!!

Point given by Roll et. al., eh?

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.520 / Virus Database: 318 - Release Date: 9/18/2003

110. Re: Some thoughtful comments from another forum on the code/nocode debate

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-01 22:38:58 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <6IIeb.5365$Hd6.3259365@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 79685

```
"Hans K0HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:5ee63311.0310010611.6acb8c67@posting.google.com...
> "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote
>
> >
> > Why does it have to be your way or no way, Hans?
> >
>
> Did I say "my way or no way"?????
>
> Jim is free to have a different opinion, and I am free to suggest his
> opinion is inconsistent with reality.
>
> >
> > > My amateur license cost me virtually nothing in terms of 'investment
> > > of myself', and the curbs and gutters the city just installed at one
> > > of my places cost me an $8,200 assessment. I value my amateur license
> > > a LOT more than I value the city's new street curbing!
> > >
> > > The things that I value the very most quite honestly are literal gifts
> > > which I have recieved without an ounce of 'investment' or 'cost' ---
> > > the love of my wife, the smiles of my grandkids, the whisper of the
> > > wind at sunset on Lake Vermilion, the conversation with an old friend,
> > > or my healthy heart. I value all of these more than my homes, my RV,
> > > my boat, or the QSL collection in the closet.
> > >
> > > With all kind wishes,
> > >
> > > de Hans, K0HB
> >
> > The only one of those, above, that is a literal gift is the wind at
sunset
> > on Lake Vermilion. The rest cost you plenty.
>
> You're mistaken. They are absolute unconditional gifts, and I
> treasure them all the more for the fact that no amount of effort of
> mine could have 'earned' them.
>
> 73, de Hans, K0HB
> --
> "Reality doesn't care what you believe." -- K0HB
```

Your wife's love for example may have been given unconditionally but you have to work to keep it by giving love in return. That is an investment of self. If you do not love in return, a spouse's love dies. It needs nourished with love to survive.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

111. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-01 22:39:29 UTC
From: Arnie Macy <kt4stnospam@csam.net>
Message-ID: <blfl2t$bh7do$1@ID-166180.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 79684

"Clint"

Arnie : On the contrary, Dwight. He has claimed in one of my threads that
we are nothing more than knuckledraggers who don't understand modern
technology.

BZZZZZT! Wrong...

(1) I have never used the term "knuckledragger" at all, nor have I called
any of you guys one...
(2) I have never said that you "don't understand modern technology". All my
comments have been to the effect that the PCTA crowd has an agenda that
doesn't reflect the change in times and modernization of communications,
both of which is suppose to be reflected in the ham radio community... I
never said you didn't UNDERSTAND modern technology, I said you guys weren't
wwilling to allow the testing to "advance the hobby into the modern age."

"Clint" wrote in response to my reply ...

"the PCTA crowd just said "six mega what ???" you screwed up and mentioned
something modern and applicable in the real world.... they're trapped in
1952."

Arnie : Gee, you got us there, Clint. All of us knuckle-dragging CW'ers
are just
caught in a time warp.

"Yep. pretty much."

Arnie -
KT4ST

112. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-01 22:57:37 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031001185737.17551.00000173@mb-m26.aol.com>
Source record: 79686

>agenda that
>doesn't reflect the change in times and modernization of communications,

Of love this term that the No-Code Knuckle Draggers keep throwing out. I guess there meaning of the Term "modernization" means Dumbing Down to there Level.

113. Re: Isnt it Funny (No-Code HF Privileges)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-01 22:59:14 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031001185914.05539.00001154@mb-m16.aol.com>
Source record: 79687

In article <3F7AD4B5.5010608@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:

>Dwight Stewart wrote:
>> "N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote:
>>
>>>Are they the model we hams should follow, or should
>>>we take them as a cautionary tale of what could happen
>>>to us?
>>
>>
>>
>> I wasn't offering CB as a model. In fact, because of its rather unique
>> history, I don't think one can use CB as a model for much of anything. CB
>> went to h*ll in a hand basket after Hollywood associated it with the
>illegal
>> activities shown in several movies of the time (Convoy, Smokey & the
>Bandit,
>> and so on).
>
>
> You're off by a few years. Back in the early 70's, I used a CB in our
>company trucks, and there were plenty of rulebreakers then. Most every
>time I had to buy parts from a local, I got to see their overheight
>towers and linear amps.
>
IMDB.com (Internet Movie Data Base) says that "Convoy" and the first "Smokey and the Bandit" came out in 1977-78.

Art imitates life.

73 de Jim, N2EY

114. Re: Echolink is great for those who..

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-01 23:30:03 UTC
From: charlesb <n5pvl@sbcglobal.net>
Message-ID: <%rJeb.7793$Cr6.3730@newssvr33.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 79688

"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20031001180558.21650.00000132@mb-m02.aol.com...
> >Another anti-ham Troll identifies himself as not being worthy of his ham
> >liscense.
> >
> >(yawn)
> >
> >Charles Brabham, N5PVL
> >
>
> Oh I earned mine you Low lifes just had it handed to you.

I'm a general, by the way. A 13 wpm general.

Charles Brabham, N5PVL

115. Re: The way to stop BPL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-01 23:53:21 UTC
From: Clint <"rattlehead at computron dot net">
Message-ID: <vnmq82dh9gcl8d@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 79689

OH, there are some code test-o-philes that will forever HATE you for
saying that. :)

Clint

"Ryan, KC8PMX" <REMOVETHISkc8pmx@diamondcs.net> wrote in message
news:blehf7$b6bl2$6@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de...
> Yeah... and PCTA could also stand for Post Code Testing Agenda as well!
>
>
>
> --
> Ryan, KC8PMX
> FF1-FF2-MFR-(pending NREMT-B!)
> --. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
> .. --. .... - . .-. ...
> "Clint" <rattlehead at computron dot net> wrote in message
> news:vnhq5s20u3ov0b@corp.supernews.com...
> > one of the two factions fighting over the code testing issue.
> >
> > PCTA = Pro Code Testing Agenda ...
> > NCTA = No Code Test Agenda
> >
> > The former wants to continue testing mores code
> > profeciency as a means of judging whether or not
> > you can recieve a ham radio license.
> >
> > The latter want to remove the last vestiges of
> > morse code testing, the 5 wmp code test.
> >
> > Anything past that is debatable, as to what they
> > really want or believe, but those are the basics.
> >
> > Clint
> > KB5ZHT
> >
> >
> > --
> >
> > --
> >
> > Get in touch with your soul: www.glennbeck.com
> > OR, if you're a liberal, maybe you can FIND one
> >
> >

> > --
> > "William Warren" <wwarren.qrm@billhorne.homelinux.org> wrote in message
> > news:200309300214.h8U2EkU01960@dell.billhorne.homelinux.org...
> > > "Clint" <rattlehead at computron dot net> wrote:
> > >
> > > > And the PCTA crowd wonders why they aren't
> > > > being met with a warmer reception from the
> > > > newbies wanting to enter the hobby.
> > >
> > > Please tell me what "PCTA" means. TIA.
> > >
> > > Bill
> > >
> > > (Filter the qrm for direct replies.)
> > >
> >
> >
>
>

116. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-02 00:29:51 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031001202951.21642.00001350@mb-m01.aol.com>
Source record: 79691

In article <stseb.39$f11.23@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@STOPearthlinkSPAM.net> writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote:
>>
>> Here, try this one:
>>
>> "All else being equal, a radio amateur who has Morse
>> Code skills is more experienced, more qualified, and
>> has more radio communications options available than
>> a radio amateur with no Morse Code skills."
>
>
> Without a desire to communicate with Morse Code, there is no truth to that
>statement at all.

I disagree!

Apply that logic to some other skill or knowledge. For example, the Smith Chart. All else being equal, is a ham who knows how to use the Smith Chart to solve transmission line and impedance matching problems more experienced and more qualified than one who does not?

Or how about Ohm's Law? The phonetic alphabet? Typing skills?

>Even with that (the all being equal aspect), there is no
>truth to the "more experienced" or "more qualified" when it comes to
>absolutely anything beyond Morse Code.

You think that skills do not transfer in any way? I disagree!

>Therefore, those two have no place in
>that paragraph without Morse Code, not the radio amateur, specified as the
>"more" being discussed. Therefore, only the "more radio communications
>options" has any significant ring of truth to it.
>
Sorry Dwight, you're simply off base on this one. I cannot see how you can deny that having Morse code skills makes a ham more experienced and more qualified - all else being equal.

All else being equal, having Morse skills makes a ham more experienced and more qualified than not having them. But that fact is not a proof that those skills *must* be tested.

73 de Jim, N2EY

117. Re: Some thoughtful comments from another forum on the code/nocode debate

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-02 00:29:58 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031001202958.21642.00001354@mb-m01.aol.com>
Source record: 79690

```
In article <raHeb.8596$yp6.248316@nnrp1.ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
<wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:

>N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20030930223035.28496.00001006@mb-m18.aol.com...
>> In article <m6feb.8394$yp6.234106@nnrp1.ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
>> <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:
>>
>> >"Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
>> >news:f45722ac.0309300431.673f47fe@posting.google.com...
>> >>
>> >> Furthermore, if the US government wants to give all prospective
>> >> amateurs 3 hots and a cot, and a paycheck, for the duration it takes
>> >> to learn the code, I'd gladly enroll in the CG Morse Code school.
>> >
>> >There's one problem ... there IS no CG Morse Code school any
>> >more ...
>>
>> Sad but true.
>>
>> > the services are NOT teaching their radiomen Morse any
>> >more.
>>
>> Even if they were - would it make any difference to your opinion of the
>need
>> for code testing in the amateur radio service?
>
>It would add *some* potential validity to the "trained (in Morse) pool of
>operators" part of 97.1 ... however, that is not the case and hasn't been
>for some time ...
>
>It wouldn't be a "slam-dunk" in favor of continued Morse testing for
>HF ham licenses though.

In a word: "No".

73 de Jim, N2EY
```

118. Re: Bootlegging in 1948?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-02 00:29:58 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031001202958.21642.00001353@mb-m01.aol.com>
Source record: 79692

In article <20030918223634.29660.00000717@mb-m24.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com
(Len Over 21) writes:

>In article <c2356669.0309181342.d6b6763@posting.google.com>, N2EY@AOL.COM
>(N2EY) writes:
>
>>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>>news:<20030916205914.12501.00002451@mb-m04.aol.com>...
>>> In article <c2356669.0309160836.595af4a9@posting.google.com>, N2EY@AOL.COM
>>> (N2EY) writes:
>>>
>>> >lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>>> >news:<20030916010914.05539.00000775@mb-m16.aol.com>...
>>> >> In article <20030915021846.23171.00000765@mb-m05.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com
>>> (N2EY)
>>> >> writes:
>>> >>
>>> >> >In article <vm9usff4mpm58f@corp.supernews.com>, "Clint"
>>> >> ><rattlehead@computronDOTnet> writes:
>>> >> >
>>> >> >>sending and receiving CW isn't a building block
>>> >> >>to anything else.....
>>> >> >
>>> >> >Yes, it is.
>>> >> >
>>> >> >First, it's a building block to the use of the mode on the air.
>>Although
>>> other
>>> >> >services have pretty much stopped using Morse Code, hams use it
>>> extensivley,
>>> >> >and an amateur license is permission to operate an amateur station,
>not
>>a
>>> >> >station in another service.
>>> >>
>>> >> Roger that, Reverend Jim...
>>> >
>>> >Who is "Reverend Jim", Len? You and Brian Burke keep using that name
>>> >to address someone.
>>>
>>> Tsk, tsk, tsk...you've never seen "Taxi" then... :-)
>>
>>I've seen most episodes of Taxi. My name's not Ignatowksi.
>

> We've all seen your prodigious output here in the Newsgroup.

And we've all seen your even-more-prodigious output here in this newsgroup,
Len. Under a wide variety of AOL screen names - nocwtest, lenof21, averyfine,
averyfineman, lenover21, and probably more.

Perhaps you aspire to emulate Louie DePalma...;-)
>
> Your surname is Miccolis but you are a dead-ringer for the Rev. Jim
> character, totally stoked on morsemanship...spaced out as to any
> other radio communications mode.

Not me. I use a variety of communications modes.

>>> >It can't be me, because I graduated from electrical engineering
>>> >school, not divinity school. And my name isn't Ignatowski ;-)
>>
>>> >What engineering school did you graduate from, Len?
>>>
>>> One right here in Southern California...
>>
>>One without a name...:->
>
> It's easy enough for a BSEE to find out. Not that many out here.

But you won't tell us the name.
>
> On the other hand, it is difficult to figure out WHERE YOU WORK,
> in terms of an actual company name.

That's right. Because it's not relevant to an amateur radio policy discussion.
>
> You rationalize on "not revealing it" for some kind of "fear" of getting
> "bad mail" from others.
>
Nope. It's not relevant.

And, it's just common sense that no matter what job I hold/held, and no matter
who my employer(s) are/were, they would not make any difference in your
behavior towards me.

> I think your REAL fear is just in everyone discovering you don't do a
> damn thing in radio for a living.

Nope.

The only REAL fear is yours, because you desperately want to know, but I won't
tell you.
>
> No problem for me. I've revealed most of my employers in here, plus a
> number of personal references who are long-time licensed radio amateurs.

None of the employers had anything to do with amateur radio. They're irrelevant
to the discussion.

You want to knwo them for reasons that have nothing to do with amateur radio.
>
> You won't do that.
>
I've given a number of personal references who are long-time licensed radio amateurs, too, Len.

But what's really relevant is what a person has done in amateur radio. I've been an active, licensed radio amateur for almost 36 years - operating, building stations, writing articles, elmering, etc. You wrote a few basic articles for a now-defunct amateur radio periodical and have never held any class of amateur radio license.

> All you seem to want is some kind of "rep" in the newsgroup for being here
> almost all of your free time, writing terribly long, boring peans to
> yourself
> and morsemanship...when not using the newsgroup as some kind of "chat
> room" in talking about absolutely non-radio-amateur subjects.

That's not me, Len. It's you - except the ""peans to morsemanship" are "diatribes against Morse code" in your case.
>
>>> >> IN the Archaic Radiotelegraphy Service...
>>> >
>>> >No such thing exists.
>>>
>>> Yes it do, de facto, just not de jure. :-)
>>
>>DeJur made projectors. You're projecting ;-)
>
> I'm telling it like it is.

HAW! That's almost funny.

You're projecting your own reactions and motivations onto others. Classical transference behavior, really.
>
>>> >I've been "in" the Amateur Radio Service for almost 36 years. You have
>>> >not done so for even one day.
>>>
>>> >That's nice, Len. On what amateur band did you bootleg with it?
>>
>>Hmm?
>>
>>> >Or was
>>> >it a broadcast band device so you could pretend you were on "Ted
>>> >Mack's Amateur Hour"? ;-)
>>>
>>> I've never bootlegged on anything after 1948.
>>
>>Ah - but that means you may have bootlegged in 1948 and before!
>
> YOU don't really KNOW if I "bootlegged" at all, do you?

Nope. But you raised the subject, not me.

I wrote (emphasis added):

"you *MAY* have bootlegged in 1948 and before!"

Maybe you did - and maybe you didn't.

I will say categorically that I have *never* bootlegged - that is, operated
illegally.

Can you say the same thing, Len?
>
> All you want to do is to selectively use my messages as an ignition
> point for a Flame War.

Nope.

Either you bootlegged before 1949 or you didn't.

Which is it?
>
> YOU didn't exist in 1948. That was 55 years ago.

Irrelevant.

Either you bootlegged before 1949 or you didn't.

Which is it?
>
> You have NO KNOWLEDGE of what I did back then or even 56 years
> ago, but you are trolling, trolling, looking for a Flame Fest to start.

Nope.

Either you bootlegged before 1949 or you didn't.

Which is it?
>
> So, great big expert radio ham, tell US your "personal experiences" with
> small output personal wireless AM broadcast band links of the pre-1950
> period.

Irrelevant.

Either you bootlegged before 1949 or you didn't.

Which is it?
>
>>Come clean and tell the group all about it. It will be good for your
>>soul to admit your checkered past.
>
> Go stick a whouff-hong someplace, pervert.
>
> It will satisfy your sex life.

Sounds like you're getting angry, Len. If you don't have a checkered past,
there's nothing to admit. Your anger *may* indicate a guilty conscience....;-)
;-)

Either you bootlegged before 1949 or you didn't.

Which is it?
>
>>It's more than you had done in RADIO at that age.
>>
>>And mine was legal. No bootlegging.
>
> YOU didn't exist in 1947...or 1948.

Doesn't matter.

What I did at 13 is much more than you had done at age 14.
>
> By February 1953 I was already (at 20 years of age) a soldier serving
> overseas, assigned to an Army radio station with the callsign ADA.
> I was with ADA for three years.

Fascinating - you were 14 in 1948 but 20 in early 1953.

> You've never served in the armed forces of the United States, much less
> "assigned overseas."

I never claimed to be. How is that relevant to amateur radio or bootlegging by
14 year olds?
>
> You've made fun of my military service in the past. [that's in Google, by
> the way, you seem to live part of your time there...]

Where? Produce the post.

I dare ya! ;-)

Shall we google up your frequent insults and denigrations of others' military
and government service?

For example - how about the way you made fun of Jeffrey Herman's Coast Gurad
shore station radio operating?
>

> You want to be honored a respected for being safely within in the USA
> borders, never serving. You want to make fun of those veterans who
> who don't love your blessed sacrament, morsemanship.

Not me. But you sure do demonstrate the principle of "can dish it out but can't
take it".
>
>>> By 1967 I'd already DESIGNED and mostly built (technician help was
>>> not always available) several UHF to microwave RF emitters of more
>>> that 10 Watts.
>>

>>Well, give Len a Nobel Prize for accomplishment in physics!
>>
>>In 1967 you were almost three times 14 years old.
>
> Wow, for an ALLEGED MSEE, you've got BAD arithmetic skills.

Nope.
>
> Three times fourteen is forty-two.

The answer to Life, the Universe, and Everything.

1967 - 42 = 1925.

And I wrote "almost three times 14". *almost*

> I was born in 1932.

And you were 14 in 1948, huh? Talk about bad math skills!

> In early 1967 I was 34 years old, my Honorable Discharge was
> 7 years in the past.
>
>>And it was your JOB, wasn't it?
>
> You are damn right is was MY JOB.

So it is irrelevant to what *amateurs* do.

That was the essence of your diatribe against Jeffrey Herman's job.

> I was good at enough to be given design responsibility.

Me, too...
>
>>> All quite legal.
>>
>>Not for you to operate unless you held the station license.
>
> Go Whouff-Hong yourself, sweetums.

And you call *me* a "pervert"...

> I DID have a station license
> in the PLMRS (as its called now) in a partnership in a business.

Angrier and angrier you get. Strong is the dark side with you. Consume you it
does....
>
> Don't give us this CRAP about "holding a station license" when you've
> stated in the past in here that ham radio is "all about OPERATING."

Where did I say that, Len? Produce the post.

I double dare ya! ;-) ;-)

>>Is it your guilt over your own bootlegging that causes you to attack
>>those who followed the law, even as teenagers?
>
> You are really REACHING for some Flame War, aren't you, Rev. Jim?

Not me.
Either you bootlegged before 1949 or you didn't.

Which is it?

>>Who is this "Rev. Jim" you keep addressing?
>
> Yourself, Stokey. Get off the hard stuff before it does you in...

What ARE you talking about, Len? "Stokey"?
>
>>The age thing is yours, Len, not mine. You recommended that FCC not
>>license anyone under age 14.
>
> Let us know when you've passed the mental age of 14 and we can
> discuss things rationally. So far, you aren't close to that.

ah, the old ad hominem by Len when all else fails. So predictable.

>>> >Why are you avoiding that simple question?
>>>
>>> WHAT "question?"

>>"Why should there be *any* written test on theory if all a person
>>wants to do is operate manufactured radios?
>>
>>"If someone doesn't want to design, build or repair radios, why should
>>they have to memorize all those symbols, diagrams and formulas?"
>
> Those aren't "questions" except to the loaded, "do you still beat your
> wife" sort of "questions."

Not at all. The "do you still beat your wife" question is only "loaded" if the
answers are confined to "yes" and "no".

There's no such restriction on those questions.
>
> They don't have to be "answered" because YOU don't have one single
> bit of "authority" to demand answers.

Not demanding. Asking.

You don't like those questions because they demonstrate a *MAJOR* flaw in your
jeremiads against Morse code testing.
>
> Take pride in your work for a living. Reveal at least the area of
>"electrical work" you do.

I already have. Electrical engineering. Design work, to be precise. That's all
you need to know. ;-) ;-) ;-) ;-)

If that makes you angry, it's your problem, not mine.

Even that is irrelevant to an amateur radio policy discussion.
>
> Either way, ALL you are is an AMATEUR who tries to pass hisself off as
> a great big guru in AMATEURISM.

Is being an amateur somehow bad? Amateurs do things for the love of the thing alone.

You are not a radio amateur. Nor have you ever been. And that's a fact.

As for "guru", that's all in your imagination. I don't claim to be an "expert" or "guru" in anything. Not even Morse Code.

119. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-02 01:15:02 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031001211502.07578.00000897@mb-m25.aol.com>
Source record: 79693

In article <MyIeb.5363$Hd6.3257781@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D. Flint"
<deehays@qix.net> writes:

>"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@STOPearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
>news:VGxeb.259$f11.59@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
>> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote:
>> > The removal of the Morse Code test from the Technician
>> > class license has not resulted in a technical revolution in
>> > amateur radio from newly-licensed "technically qualified"
>> > amateurs. (snip)
>>
>> I didn't know the Technician license was supposed to lead to a technical
>> revolution in anything, Jim. Instead, I thought they were just supposed to
>> participate in the same activities most other Amateur Radio operators are
>> participating in. Why the unique expectation for Technician license
>holders
>> alone?
>
>Those who pushed for the Tech no code license loudly and repeatedly claimed
>that it would lead to a major influx of technically bright hams that would
>lead to significant technical advances in ham radio since it was supposedly
>code keeping them out.

Just who made such a statement in 1990 or before?

>Well that influx of technical types didn't happen.

Over 200 thousand NO-CODE-TEST Technician licenses happened
since 1991.

You seem to be saying that every one of them "isn't technical."

Tsk, tsk...

>Unfortunately, the Technician licensees following that change are saddled
>with an expectation that they themselves did not create.

"Saddled" with what?

>They shoulder the
>burden of expectations created by those who would not have to fulfill them.

WHAT "burden of expectations?"

In the last four decades of US amateur radio the MAJOR TECHNOLOGICAL
ADVANCES in the state of the amateur radio technological art have been
made by COMMERCIAL people designing and making radios for amateur
radio.

The narrow bandpass filters that made SSB filter-method transceivers possible used basic designs intended for commercial and military radio. The Collins Radio mechanical filters were intended originally for landline-microwave radio relay equipment.

The introduction of SSB to US amateur radio was made possible largely by Collins Radio receiving a design-development contract from USAF for the Strategic Air Command. That "proved" that single-channel SSB transceivers were practical.

The frequency-control of amateur radio transceivers is due to adaptation of commercial and military designs of PLL synthesizers and, later, to designs of Direct Digital Synthesis sub-systems once microprocessors were available and low enough in cost.

You are probably too young to have experienced the very COARSE and sometimes inaccurate frequency control in transceivers of four decades ago...and the "crystal calibrators" used to spot-check "bandspread" and "main" tuning dials at 100 KHz increments...and when amateur transmitters needed individual quartz crystals to insure stability on HF bands.

The "TOR" in such RTTY/Data systems using PACTOR, AMTOR, etc. means "Teleprinter Over Radio" and was developed primarily for commercial users. The various "TORs" are the mainstay today of maritime shipping communications.

The modern computer you are using in here does (or should) reach throughput rates up to 56 KBPS in a band-limited space of just 3 KHz bandwidth (the telephone line). That wasn't invented or innovated in amateur radio by some morse code user.

Microprocessors and microcontrollers are at the heart of nearly EVERY MF-HF-VHF-UHF amateur radio receiver/transmitter/transceiver. Those can trace back to about 1973 and the first Intel microprocessor chip or the competitors appearing shortly thereafter.

The in-line, on-line antenna bridge-detector to enable automatic tuning known as the "Bruene Detector" came about from the T-192 transmitter designed and built for a USMC contract by Collins Radio...in 1955. All of the automatic antenna tuners of today can trace their ancestry directly to that practical, working implementation of 48 years ago.

Single-channel FM transceivers at VHF and higher owe much to the pioneering of Motorola done just prior to the US entry into World War 2. Both AM and FM mobile radios were pioneered by various commercial concerns and several metropolitan police departments just before WW2.

The fact that quartz crystal units became relatively cheap for amateur purchasing just after WW2 was a result of the 2nd highest priority in war production (behind the Manhattan Project) when the US total production averaged a MILLION quartz crystals a MONTH. US military contracts spurred the development of "artificial" (man-done) growth of quartz crystal blanks which came about just after WW2.

What have been the "advances" for on-off morse codings? The electronic keyer? An adaptation of already-known basic digital circuits to create the controllable dot and dash times. More "sophisticated" keyers used conventional keyboards and computer components and software to enable writing to be transmitted by on-off keying methods. Hardly an "advance in technology."

The brick-wall DSP filters touted by a few morsemen owes its existance again to military efforts and development for SONAR...and later adaption of that to telephony circuits and general communications.

>Whether or not one believes in code testing, it highlights some of the
>inherent flaws in the argument that code keeps technical types out of ham
>radio.

Those who love the PAST, the "good old days," and the simplicity of primitive technology of a century ago might be attracted to a radio service requiring a demonstrated morse code test. Morse code was first used in 1844, almost 160 years ago.

Ordinary mortals who have adapted to the new millenium are very well acquainted with men traveling to the moon and those men being televised live from a quarter million miles away walking on its surface. We are all used to global communications satellites in-use for two decades, FAX transmission of documents and images from the home (or a corner chain store at a shopping center), color television for over three decades and, for some, digital television with superb picture quality. Popular as well as
classic music through CDs has already reached epic market heights and the MPEG-based DVD has replaced the magnetic videotape. Anyone can buy a pair of FRS handheld radios at consumer stores for less than $50, absolutely no license required. Cordless phones are available now at 5 GHz carrier frequencies, something unheard-of or even expected three decades ago. One in three Americans is a cellular telephone subscriber and has the capability of dialing directly to any other direct dial telephone
in the world from anywhere within a cell site's antenna reach.

Do you REALLY expect that morse code offers a "challenge" let alone interest in emulating a century-past primitive radio communications means?!? Incredible!

LHA

120. Re: Lennie's Double Standard Once Again Revealed...BY Lennie!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-02 01:17:34 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <O0Leb.837$qj6.777170@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 79694

Brian wrote:
> k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0310010040.452d084c@posting.google.com>...
>
>>"Clint" <rattlehead at computron dot net> wrote in message
news:<vnk8gbsap9td88@corp.supernews.com>...
>>
>>>Generally the PCTA crowd has been putting most of the
>>>people who challenge thier position and willing to debate
>>>thier points on thier killfiles. Sounds pretty much like it
>>>is they, not the NCTA, that can handle the scrutiny
>>>and are therefore obviously on thin ice.
>>
>>
>> Well, Clint...As foolish as it may have been, Brain was straight
>>up enough to "admit" that Lennie was his "mentor"...His words, not
>>mine.
>
>
> Len was willing to go the distance w/o letting all the bullying and
> worse deter him. In that respect, Len is my mentor.
>
> You, Steve Robeson, will not run me off the group. Nor will your
> Cronies.
Just what is a crony (ies)? Some donut kinda thing?

- Mike KB3EIA -

121. Re: Appalling...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-02 01:41:04 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <blfvngmqr0@208.207.71.164>
Source record: 79695

Brian wrote:

> World, meet Dick Carroll/N0EX, who single -handedly- can thwart any
> computer copy of his banana boat bug.

If you only had but a small portion of a clue you'd know that most
habd-sent CW not only *can* but WILL "thwart" most consumer grade
computer receive programs.
I rather suspect some more sophisticated writings do a lot better.

122. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-02 01:41:04 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031001214104.15462.00003324@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 79696

In article <3F7B20FB.2040608@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>> These are the number of unexpired FCC ARS
>> licenses held by individuals on the dates listed:
>
><snip>
>
>> As of September 30, 2003:
>>
>> Novice - 33,034 (decrease of 16,295)
>
><snip>
>
>This may be hard to quantify, Jim, but is there any data or even
>educated guessing about how many Novices are still actually active?
>
Not that I know of, Mike.

Let's look at how the three license classes that are closed to new entries have declined in numbers:

Novice is now ~67% of where it was May 14, 2000
Advanced is now ~83% of where it was May 14, 2000
Tech Plus is now ~50% of where it was May 14, 2000

Of course the Tech Plus will decline the fastest because all Tech Pluses are being renewed as Techs.

--

But if you want some interesting numbers, note that we are now down below 684,000, after peaking around 687,000. Extra and General continue to grow, and Advanced is declining slowly. What gives?

One clue is to look at the AH0A site

http://www.ah0a.org

and look at the "new licenses" numbers. For some reason, the number of new Technicians has dropped significantly in the past 2-3 months. The number of new Generals and Extras continues at the same rate as before, so it's not due to an FCC paper backup or seasonal variation.

So why the sudden dropoff in new Techs?

One definite possibility is the new Technician Q&A pool, which was introduced on July 15th. The new pool has with 511 questions, while the old one had only

384 questions.

Prior to the new pool, the average number of new Techs was about 1700 a month. Since then, it has dropped to less than 1000 per month.

Maybe this is just a temporary thing - or maybe it isn't. The code test cannot be blamed for the drop because it's not a part of the Tech license requirements.

73 de Jim, N2EY

123. Re: More on BPL..."This is serious, folks..."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-02 01:58:01 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <JCLeb.7685$Yi3.6359@news01.roc.ny>
Source record: 79697

It isn't about sharing, it's about letting unlicensed stations rule HF. This will affect other services and that is when the goo will hit the blades. FM broadcasting, for instance. AM broadcasting will likely be affected, especially those stations experimenting with digital stereo AM broadcasting. You, like so many others, seem to think it is all about the hams (gee, my washing machine is over-sudsing. Must be that ham down the street). The problem is that if BPL becomes widespread, you will have reception problems everywhere. How will the FCC ever get anyone to certify their computers, radios, televisions, copiers, and so on, when the open air test sites will *not* be able to tell if equipments meets FCC requirements due to all of that garbage everywhere. OATS sites test for radiated signals in upper HF through UHF and the whole HF range plus part of VHF will be buried in noise. Oh, I forgot. Ship all the testing to China. Makes sense.

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030930143612.07857.00000088@mb-m11.aol.com...
> >wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) poked his head
> >out of the killfile somehow to stir the pot with the following
> >negativity:
>
> You just couldnt stand not hearing from me.
>
> >One question, though - would it be too much to ask for you to perhaps
> >get on board with the rest of the Amateur community and work with us
> >to fight this issue?
>
> Im not against the ISSUE, I think its a good move for the common man. If
Ham
> Radio cant figure out how to live with sharing, and Modern Improved
Technology,
> then HAM RADIO most go.
>
>
>
> >As an alternative, could I respectfully suggest that you transition to
> >your replacement hobby early - we've heard as much whining and
> >negativity as should be expected for the average group of humans to
> >endure....
>
> Well Im already involved in other things, but, I will hang around to see
the

> final Demise of HAM RADIO
>
>

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.522 / Virus Database: 320 - Release Date: 9/29/03

124. Re: Some thoughtful comments from another forum on the code/nocode debate

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-02 02:19:17 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0310011819.755c716e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 79698

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20031001174152.05539.00001149@mb-m16.aol.com>...
> In article <c2356669.0309300812.210385ba@posting.google.com>, N2EY@AOL.COM
> (N2EY) writes:
>
> >"Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
> >news:<5D4eb.8338$yp6.228429@nnrp1.ptd.net>...

> >
> >- the 1978 class had already learned all they needed to know to pass
> >the 1978 tests.
>
> Which means WHAT?
>
> Members of ANY branch of the US military in 1978 were ALL
> volunteers. ALL.
>

Yeah, they volunteered to join which is to say they agreed to swear to
follow the orders of their superiors. What do you surmise would have
happened to one of those CG grunts if he told his lieutenant "Oh well
screw you George, I'm a volunteer and I ain't taking no damned ham
radio tests."

Ya goofy PUTZ.

125. Re: Some thoughtful comments from another forum on the code/nocode debate

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-02 03:22:49 UTC
From: groupk0hb@earthlink.net
Message-ID: <5ee63311.0310011922.36a62d3f@posting.google.com>
Source record: 79699

Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com> wrote

> Hans, it's novel that you share the life view of a fella named
> Willie Sutton who said he robbed banks "Because that's where
> the money is".

Dick,

It's novel that you are so insecure in your life view that you must stoop to putting me in the same category as someone who steals things from other people.

On second thought, I suspect you must have been drunk or on dope when you wrote that post. How else can I explain such a twisted and insulting interpretation of my remarks?

Hans

126. Re: Some thoughtful comments from another forum on the code/nocode debate

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-02 03:31:12 UTC
From: groupk0hb@earthlink.net
Message-ID: <5ee63311.0310011931.65dc630d@posting.google.com>
Source record: 79700

Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote

>
> Good post, and good argument, Hans.
>
> But I wonder if there is no place for pride of accomplishment? In my
> other hobby, I spent several years making a large telescope. It was an
> intense project, and took a lot of effort. In the end, I was rewarded
> with a wonderful, beautiful, and very high quality instrument. It won
> first place in the only competition I entered it in.
>

Of course there's room for pride of accomplishment! You ought to see the walls of my shack covered with awards, the one of most proud of being "A-1 Operators Club". You ought to see the walls of my office covered with engineering and business related awards! You ought to see me beam when I come back off the lake..... well, you get the picture.

But getting back to the tone of this thread, while I highly value my amateur license for the benefits it gives me (including trying to "accomplish" things to be proud of), acquiring the license itself was a pretty modest accomplishment.

73, de Hans, K0HB

127. Re: BPL endorsed by FCC, another threat to HF ham radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-02 03:38:28 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <blg6jk$5el$0@208.207.71.164>
Source record: 79701
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors

Tarapia Tapioco wrote:

>my
> boss is a rabid right winger and you can
> guess the rest.

You're a rabid troll???

128. Re: The way to stop BPL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-02 04:03:27 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <REMOVETHISkc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <blh5ai$c6o08$3@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 79722

They'll get over it!

Ryan KC8PMX
PCTA member

"Clint" <rattlehead at computron dot net> wrote in message
news:vnmq82dh9gcl8d@corp.supernews.com...
> OH, there are some code test-o-philes that will forever HATE you for
> saying that. :)
>
> Clint
>
> "Ryan, KC8PMX" <REMOVETHISkc8pmx@diamondcs.net> wrote in message
> news:blehf7$b6bl2$6@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de...
> > Yeah... and PCTA could also stand for Post Code Testing Agenda as well!
> >
> >
> >

129. Re: Bootlegging in 1948?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-02 04:13:55 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031002001355.29660.00000894@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 79702

In article <20031001202958.21642.00001353@mb-m01.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
writes:

>In article <20030918223634.29660.00000717@mb-m24.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com
>(Len Over 21) writes:
>
>>In article <c2356669.0309181342.d6b6763@posting.google.com>, N2EY@AOL.COM
>>(N2EY) writes:
>>
>>>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>>>news:<20030916205914.12501.00002451@mb-m04.aol.com>...
>>>> In article <c2356669.0309160836.595af4a9@posting.google.com>,
>N2EY@AOL.COM
>>>> (N2EY) writes:
>>>>
>>>> >lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>>>> >news:<20030916010914.05539.00000775@mb-m16.aol.com>...
>>>> >> In article <20030915021846.23171.00000765@mb-m05.aol.com>,
>n2ey@aol.com
>>>> (N2EY)
>>>> >> writes:
>>>> >>
>>>> >> >In article <vm9usff4mpm58f@corp.supernews.com>, "Clint"
>>>> >> ><rattlehead@computronDOTnet> writes:
>>>> >> >
>>>> >> >>sending and receiving CW isn't a building block
>>>> >> >>to anything else.....
>>>> >> >
>>>> >> >Yes, it is.
>>>> >> >
>>>> >> >First, it's a building block to the use of the mode on the air.
>>>Although
>>>> other
>>>> >> >services have pretty much stopped using Morse Code, hams use it
>>>> extensivley,
>>>> >> >and an amateur license is permission to operate an amateur station,
>>not
>>>a
>>>> >> >station in another service.
>>>> >>
>>>> >> Roger that, Reverend Jim...
>>>> >
>>>> >Who is "Reverend Jim", Len? You and Brian Burke keep using that name
>>>> >to address someone.

>>>>
>>>> Tsk, tsk, tsk...you've never seen "Taxi" then... :-)
>>>
>>>I've seen most episodes of Taxi. My name's not Ignatowksi.
>>
>> We've all seen your prodigious output here in the Newsgroup.
>
>And we've all seen your even-more-prodigious output here in this newsgroup,
>Len. Under a wide variety of AOL screen names - nocwtest, lenof21, averyfine,
>averyfineman, lenover21, and probably more.

I have never used "Avery Fine" as a screen name. "Len Of 21" is my
primary AOL screen name. Someone else has "No CW Test."

I have used NO other screen names in here.

My real name and current mailing address is the same as it appeared
many times as bylines in Ham Radio Magazine.

>Not me. I use a variety of communications modes.

Of course you do. You are a true-blue amateur who believes in all
the guidance of the ARRL and the purity and sanctity of morse code
following all directives from Newington to the letter..

>The only REAL fear is yours, because you desperately want to know, but I
>won't tell you.

What "REAL fear?" It is NOT anything about the tuff tawk in here.

:-)

Since you won't say, we just put you closer to the BOGUS boys.

>But what's really relevant is what a person has done in amateur radio. I've
>been an active, licensed radio amateur for almost 36 years - operating,
>building stations, writing articles, elmering, etc. You wrote a few basic
>articles for a now-defunct amateur radio periodical and have never held any
>class of amateur radio license.

Oooooo...! Was that supposed to "hurt" big fella? :-)

I got a COMMERCIAL Radiotelephone license in 1956 (only one test
needed) and had a career in radio-electronics design since then. You
will no doubt have to say such is "irrelevant" for lots of reasons.

You don't want to admit your occupation's firm name or what it does,
so you try to denigrate all those who aren't afraid of naming where
they worked or where they worked or what they did at work in detail.

You want to diminish the efforts of Ham Radio Magazine founders
Skip Tenney and Jim Fisk and their TWENTY TWO YEARS of
successful, INDEPENDENT newsstand publications. Why? Tenney
is a radio amateur. Fisk is deceased and his old call (W1HR) is now
used by a club in Jim Fisk's honor. You keep wanting to say HR is

"defunct" as if that is somehow unclean.

You weren't published in HR, Jimmie. You got as far as "Electric
Radio," a non-newsstand periodical for a special interest group in
old radio. Did you ever write for Electronics magazine (McGraw-Hill's
old biweekly)? I did. Did you ever write for BYTE? I did. I've written
for Microcomputing and Call-A.P.P.L.E. about more avoactional
and recreational activities concerning electronics.

>That's not me, Len. It's you - except the ""peans to morsemanship" are
>"diatribes against Morse code" in your case.

Someone has to counter your religious evangelism about morse code
and its "necessary" testing. :-)

>You're projecting your own reactions and motivations onto others. Classical
>transference behavior, really.

Nooo. The most I've been "projecting" lately are some Power Point
presentations. :-)

>"you *MAY* have bootlegged in 1948 and before!"
>
>Maybe you did - and maybe you didn't.

When did you last engage in a homosexual act?

Same sort of "question."

>I will say categorically that I have *never* bootlegged - that is, operated
>illegally.

...as far as we know...but then you will not reveal ALL that you do...

>Can you say the same thing, Len?

I can say anything I want. Whatever that is, if I don't religiously praise
morse code, you will find some fault with it and write yards and yards
of copy manufacturing all sorts of nonsensical "arguments."

>> All you want to do is to selectively use my messages as an ignition
>> point for a Flame War.
>
>Nope.

Incorrect.

>> YOU didn't exist in 1948. That was 55 years ago.
>
>Irrelevant.

Anything before your birthdate is "irrelevant?" A very elitist, arrogant
attidude. Tsk, tsk...

>Sounds like you're getting angry, Len. If you don't have a checkered past,
>there's nothing to admit. Your anger *may* indicate a guilty

>conscience....;-)

I once took a Checker cab. I've played checkers. I've watched many a
checkered flag wave at the end of NASCAR and CART races.

>What I did at 13 is much more than you had done at age 14.

You MUST say that anything you've done at anyone else's same age
is "better." :-)

Did you win any International contest awards at 14? :-)

>> By February 1953 I was already (at 20 years of age) a soldier serving
>> overseas, assigned to an Army radio station with the callsign ADA.
>> I was with ADA for three years.
>
>Fascinating - you were 14 in 1948 but 20 in early 1953.

15 in early 1948. Between 20 and 21 in 1953 depending on month.

Why are you so concerned about minutae in years?

Looking for another TROLL opening for more FLAMING? Of course...

>> You've never served in the armed forces of the United States, much less
>> "assigned overseas."
>
>I never claimed to be. How is that relevant to amateur radio or bootlegging
>by 14 year olds?

You are the one featuring BOOTLEGGING, Jimmie. That's a main
subject with you? Why?

>> You've made fun of my military service in the past. [that's in Google, by
>> the way, you seem to live part of your time there...]
>
>Where? Produce the post.

I was posted to 8235th AU in 1953 and stayed there for 3 years as one of
the many who worked ADA, the primary communicaations station for the
Far East Command. 24/7 service via HF.

You've not done anything close to that.

>For example - how about the way you made fun of Jeffrey Herman's Coast Gurad
>shore station radio operating?

You civilians will never understand that former military persons can joke
about their military branches because we all KNOW what military life was
like. You CANNOT.

The USCG has NEVER done HF communications in any magnitude
approaching either the US Army, US Air Force, or US Navy. That's a fact.

>> You want to be honored a respected for being safely within in the USA
>> borders, never serving. You want to make fun of those veterans who

>> who don't love your blessed sacrament, morsemanship.
>
>Not me. But you sure do demonstrate the principle of "can dish it out but
>can't take it".

No problem. You want to throw food in a food fight here, go ahead.

If I care to do so, I can toss it right back at you with increased tonnage
and far better delivery.

Go to someone else to attempt a flame war.

>The answer to Life, the Universe, and Everything.
>
>1967 - 42 = 1925.

IRRELEVANT.

Only a few are interested in a dead, DEFUNCT, British fantasy
novelist who was a darling of a few eastern anglophiles. Sorry, but
it was all a flash in the pan, then goodbye. Don't try to pass that off
as "science-fiction," it will never play at the SFWA.

>Is being an amateur somehow bad? Amateurs do things for the love of the thing
>alone.

And a few of you insist your amateurism is "better" than anything the
professionals could ever do.

>You are not a radio amateur. Nor have you ever been. And that's a fact.

I've been a PROFESSIONAL in the electronics industry. That's a fact.

I've been a hobbyist in electronics. That's a fact.

I've done military communicaations for three years a half century ago.
That's a fact.

I've done commercial communications as a civilian. That's a fact.

You have NOT done any of the above and that's a fact.

I don't venerate or worship or glorify morse code. That's a fact.

I don't fantasize or pretend that any amateur "needs" an out-dated
skill in any radio just to get a license to operate. That's a fact.

I'm willing to state anything I've done, barring NDAs or national
security subjects and that's a fact.

You are unwilling to state anything in any detail of what you have
done in radio or electronics for a living and that's a fact.

You try to amplify minutae into gigantic "arguments" over nothing
and that's a fact.

When you act civil and rational, then I might discuss things with you.

That's not a fact because it hasn't happened yet.

Now fire up your Time Machine and go back to the Past in radio that
you love so much.

Bye....

130. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-02 04:18:31 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <REMOVETHISkc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <blh5aj$c6o08$4@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 79721

It might have if it was promoted better. The argument of people running to the internet, or the internet being competition is not as strong of an argument (among other arguments). You can't "run" to something if you didn't know it existed in the first place. Let's see, how many people have heard of the internet?? How many have heard of ham radio??? How many of these answeree's are under 25-30??

Our local group just did a presentation/booth for the boy scouts this past week, and only about 5-10% had a clue that ham radio even existed.

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF1-FF2-MFR-(pending NREMT-B!)
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...
>
> Those who pushed for the Tech no code license loudly and repeatedly
claimed
> that it would lead to a major influx of technically bright hams that would
> lead to significant technical advances in ham radio since it was
supposedly
> code keeping them out. Well that influx of technical types didn't happen.
> Unfortunately, the Technician licensees following that change are saddled
> with an expectation that they themselves did not create. They shoulder
the
> burden of expectations created by those who would not have to fulfill
them.
> Whether or not one believes in code testing, it highlights some of the
> inherent flaws in the argument that code keeps technical types out of ham
> radio.
>
>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>

131. Re: Some thoughtful comments from another forum on the code/nocode debate

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-02 04:31:27 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031002003127.00545.00001308@mb-m02.aol.com>
Source record: 79703

In article <d22b54c3.0310011819.755c716e@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) writes:

>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>news:<20031001174152.05539.00001149@mb-m16.aol.com>...
>> In article <c2356669.0309300812.210385ba@posting.google.com>, N2EY@AOL.COM
>> (N2EY) writes:
>>
>> >"Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
>> >news:<5D4eb.8338$yp6.228429@nnrp1.ptd.net>...
>
>> >- the 1978 class had already learned all they needed to know to pass
>> >the 1978 tests.
>>
>> Which means WHAT?
>>
>> Members of ANY branch of the US military in 1978 were ALL
>> volunteers. ALL.
>
>Yeah, they volunteered to join which is to say they agreed to swear to
>follow the orders of their superiors. What do you surmise would have
>happened to one of those CG grunts if he told his lieutenant "Oh well
>screw you George, I'm a volunteer and I ain't taking no damned ham
>radio tests."

Why don't you explain how it was in YOUR military service, old timer? :-)

You NEVER did any, sweetums. None.

And you have the temerity to claim "work for naval intelligence!" :-)

>Ya goofy PUTZ.

Call us VETERANS anything you want, old timer. The steam has gone out of your catapult and you can't launch much anymore.

Tell us all about your ultralight flyers, all the wright stuff...about as lightweight as your military communications experience.

LHA

132. Re: Isnt it Funny (No-Code HF Privileges)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-02 07:59:03 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@STOPearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <bVQeb.5069$f11.3135@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 79704

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote:
>
> Those movies came out *after* wholesale disregard for
> the rules was already very common on 27. (Although
> I've never been a cb user, I have listened there since
> the mid-'60s and known many cb users).

In the 60's and early 70's, CB was only a minor nuisance, mainly a concern only for the FCC. Most Americans had never even heard of it. By the end of the 70's, the number of CB'ers had increased dramatically and problems (and complaints) were widespread. The only significant thing that happened during that time, to cause such growth, was the Hollywood movies (and television shows) featuring CB. And you could clearly see that influence. By the late 70's, the very first channel most people turned to when they got their new CB home was channel 19 (the truckers' channel). That fact drove truckers crazy. And the only way most people even knew of that channel was those Hollywood movies.

> But ham radio did not have that "outlaw" mentality.

Really? I thought that was pretty obvious. We were talking about "what if," not "what is."

> And, back then, such activities would have brought down
> tremendous peer opposition by the rest of the ham
> community. (snip)

You put way too much faith in peer pressure, Jim. Peer pressure would not control thirty to fifty million people (the estimates of CB'ers by the late 70's) if they had decided to ignore the rules.

> Yet in my experience there has been a longstanding problem
> with the cb "outlaw" culture trying to migrate to amateur radio.
> In this area, at least, we have had serious problems on VHF/
> UHF repeaters from newcomers who saw 2 meters as a
> noise-free version of cb.

I've traveled to almost a dozen states in the last five years and such behavior is extremely rare on all of the repeaters I've monitored or used. Instead, I've mostly heard polite, friendly, people who seemed to be very serious about their ham radio involvement. Where problems did exist, it was usually blown out of porportion by guys angry about others using "their" repeater for things they didn't like. In one situation, I even heard several guys antagonizing two guys so they could record the results, which they said was going to be sent to the FCC (minus their part in it, I'm sure). The two guys were not doing anything wrong before those guys showed up on that

frequency. Because of my experiences, I always wonder about the cause whenever I hear people talking about a "problem" on a local repeater.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

133. Re: Isnt it Funny (No-Code HF Privileges)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-02 08:00:41 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@STOPearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <JWQeb.5070$f11.2604@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 79705

"Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote:
>
> You're off by a few years. Back in the early 70's, I used
> a CB in our company trucks, and there were plenty of
> rulebreakers then. Most every time I had to buy parts
> from a local, I got to see their overheight towers and
> linear amps.

Addressed in my reply to Jim.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

134. Re: Isnt it Funny (No-Code HF Privileges)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-02 08:08:12 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@STOPearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <M1Reb.5072$f11.2985@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 79706

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote:
>
> IMDB.com (Internet Movie Data Base) says that "Convoy"
> and the first "Smokey and the Bandit" came out in 1977-78.

Just two examples, Jim (that's obviously why I said "and so on"). There were a rash of movies and television shows featuring CB in the mid to late 70's - BJ and the Bear, Dukes of Hazard, Moonshine, Knight Rider, and so on. Even regular television shows (Charley's Angels, Magnum PI, Love Boat, CHiPs, and so on) had episodes featuring CB.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

135. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-02 08:17:36 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@STOPearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <AaReb.5081$f11.3233@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 79707

"Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote:
>
> Might be the company you keep Dwight! 8^) Unless you
> are counting only the building of the transciever itself,
> homebrewing is alive and well. (snip)

My reply was directly in response to Jim's question about "100%
built-from-scratch amateur radio receivers, transmitters, transceivers,
antennas, power supplies, etc." I responded by talking about building "a
radio today." Does any of that clear up what I might have been addressing?

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

136. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-02 09:32:04 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@STOPearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <ogSeb.5217$f11.2312@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 79708

"Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote:
>
> Of course you can quote your source for these assertions, yes?

What assertions, Bert? This is a newsgroup discussion, not a courtroom.

> Amateur radio is all we're talking about, Dwight.

For the reasons already stated several times, code testing cannot be discussed solely within the context of its use within the Amateur Radio Service. The FCC doesn't view it that way, therefore we cannot do so either.

> (snip) Instead it's morphed into an "international" movement,
> the result of which will devalue AR as a whole. (snip)

Nonsense. The entire rest of the radio world is moving, or has moved, away from code/CW. If anything, our continued focus on that as a primary element of this Service is what has devalued (and is devaluing) Amateur Radio.

> I know I'd NEVER snub a licensed ARO OTA...but it'd be
> foolish to believe that everybody will roll out the welcome
> mat for known NCTA's. (Sad as it is.) Welcome to HF,
> Dwight. Be careful what you wish for.

Is that some kind of veiled threat, Bert? If so, feel free to snub me all you want. Someone who would treat another person as unwelcomed over something as petty as the code testing issue is not someone I would want to talk to anyway.

> Try QRP, Dwight. You'll love it. Some of the newer antennas
> are made to be used in just your situation and are no bigger
> than VHF mobil antennas. There's also a special feeling of
> accomplishment with making a contact with 2-1/2 Watts into
> an "invisible" wire dipole or longwire strung temporarily
> from a window.

You don't know what my situation is, Bert. I have considered the options available and find none of them to be very useful. An external antenna, not matter how small, is out of the question. The same with alternative antennas (hidden and so on). Because of the building materials used, an internal antenna is ineffective. The same with increased power output. I am not aware of any solution that would be effective in my situation (other than moving, which is also out of the question at the moment).

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

137. Re: Bootlegging in 1948?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-02 09:54:07 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031002055407.23171.00001177@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 79709

In article <20031002001355.29660.00000894@mb-m24.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) writes:

> I have never used "Avery Fine" as a screen name.

Yes, you have. Here's just one example - there are more.

http://groups.google.com/groups?selm=20000916191720.01130.00000514%40nso-cv.aol.com&output=gplain

BEGIN QUOTE:

From: averyfine@aol.com (Avery Fine)
Newsgroups: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Subject: Re: PSK31 Sked
Lines: 65
NNTP-Posting-Host: ladder07.news.aol.com
X-Admin: news@aol.com
Date: 16 Sep 2000 23:17:20 GMT
References: <39BC0266.81B91591@ovis.net>
Organization: AOL http://www.aol.com
X-Newsreader: Session Scheduler
Message-ID: <20000916191720.01130.00000514@nso-cv.aol.com>

In article <39BC0266.81B91591@ovis.net>, Sig Heil <K8MN@ovis.net> writes:

>You remain a bitter and ancient child.

Now, now, you are looking into the mirror again when you write. :-)

>It is now quite obvious that you
>have no intention of ever obtaining an amateur radio license exam.

That is YOUR suppository, er, supposition, Herr Standartenfuhrer.

>Why do you continue to post these lengthy diatribes having nothing to do
>with amateur radio?

On the contrary, YOUR lengthy diatribes address nothing but an attempt to suppress dissent and to "get even" with being taken to task two years ago on your braggadoccio of radio expertise. You've never forgotten and want vindication. You get none. This makes you whiney and petulant. Poor baby.

The restructuring in amateur radio is not yet complete. More needs to be done to bring US amateur radio regulations closer to 1980s standards (it had been at 1950s standards, more or less). You and a few others who achieved their "qualifications"

(!) from high-rate code and 1-by-2 or 2-by-1 callsigns cannot take the new rules and insist that all be "qualified" under the old ones or you will not "recognize them."

Those who do not accept YOUR definition are objects of your highly-negative, follow-the-law-as-it-is-NOW criticsm.

Just the same, in other threads on other subjects, Herr Heil hasn't spoken out on any technical subjects that can affect policy of now or even later...except to go on at length on a non-relationship of surname Heil in regards to microphones.

[for shame! 'real' hams don't bark into microphones! :-)]

>Have you nothing else in your life?

Considerably more, four-neuroned-brain Heil. The attitudes of national socialist partei one-by-twos who think they are wielding two-by-fours of arrogant superiority make the prospect of "proper" and "right" licensing unattractive to be placed at the top of any agenda. YOU are in such a category by public observation of anyone accessing this newsgroup.

Perhaps your many years of public service at the State Department have made you oblivious to the fact that the FCC (that's another government agency that regulates civil radio in the USA) sets licensing standards for US radio amateurs. It also grants licenses. It granted yours (apparently). The US amateur radio community does not grant licenses...nor does it "rule" on the "motivations" it thinks citizens have in regards to radio licenses. You seem to think that you "know" everything about those who post contrary opinions to yours. Have fun in your self-important ignorance, go ahead and post more of your "hate" allegations as if you represent the entire US ARS community. I don't care to message with you further (as if I ever did to your libelous postings), Herr Standartenfuhrer. I'm going to a college reunion. QRT.

didit

END QUOTE

138. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-02 09:58:18 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@STOPearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <_ESeb.5224$f11.2993@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 79710

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote:
>
> I disagree!
>
> Apply that logic to some other skill or knowledge. For example,
> the Smith Chart. (snip)
>
> Or how about Ohm's Law? The phonetic alphabet? Typing skills?

Those are all skills or knowledge that can be used by every ham radio operator. Not so with Morse Code.

> You think that skills do not transfer in any way? I disagree!

I think code skill does not transfer to "more experienced" or "more qualified" when discussing a ham radio operator instead of code alone.

> Sorry Dwight, you're simply off base on this one. I cannot see
> how you can deny that having Morse code skills makes a ham
> more experienced and more qualified - all else being equal.

More experienced and more qualified in what, Jim? Morse Code only, not as a ham operator. With the Technician license, the FCC has already established that Morse Code is not a qualification needed to be a ham radio operator. Therefore, Morse Code cannot be used when deciding who is "more experienced" or "more qualified" as a ham radio operator.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

139. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-02 10:21:16 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@STOPearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <w_Seb.5234$f11.4479@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 79713

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote:
>
> Those who pushed for the Tech no code license loudly
> and repeatedly claimed that it would lead to a major
> influx of technically bright hams that would lead to
> significant technical advances in ham radio since it was
> supposedly code keeping them out. Well that influx of
> technical types didn't happen. (snip)

It didn't? I have a Tech license and consider myself fairly well informed when it comes to technology. I don't know how bright I am, or if my involvement will ever lead to "significant technical advances in ham radio," but at least I'm here. Am I the only one? I'd surely hate to shoulder this burdon alone.

Aren't you being a little unrealistic, Dee? Did you really expect this group to offer up "significant technical advances" in a mature radio environment? For that matter, did you really expect this one group to offer anything more than the other license holders today? Radio is in the evolution stage at this point, not the revolution stage. Changes will come, but they're certainly not likely to be earth shattering changes.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

140. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-02 10:31:55 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@STOPearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <v8Teb.5237$f11.3717@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 79714

"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote:
>
> " trained operators, technicians, and electronics experts."
>
> You have to kidding, most of the New Hams have no Idea what
> it is to be trained technicians or electronic experts. (snip)

Only you would make a stupid statement like that, Bruce. They're new! By definition, a person new to anything is not likely to be an expert. Duh!!

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

141. Re: Appalling...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-02 11:05:18 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@STOPearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <ODTeb.5248$f11.3468@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 79715

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com> wrote:
>
> If you only had but a small portion of a clue you'd know that
> most habd-sent CW not only *can* but WILL "thwart" most
> consumer grade computer receive programs. I rather suspect
> some more sophisticated writings do a lot better.

The Apple DOS 3.3 disk (early 1980's) came with a simple program, included as a programming example, that did a fine job of copying code/CW. I hooked an unused Apple II Plus to a Kenwood R2000 shortwave receiver and used that program to copy code for several months. It rarely missed characters and almost never missed enough characters to make the message unreadable. The only times that program failed was when the signal I was trying to copy was too deeply buried in the background noise or when multiple stations were transmitting on the same frequency.

I haven't purchased a program like that recently, but surely they've gotten better over the years. Is that not the case?

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

142. Re: Some thoughtful comments from another forum on the code/nocode debate

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-02 11:38:39 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <blh2nv$8mr$0@208.206.142.91>
Source record: 79716

Len Over 21 wrote:

about as
> lightweight as your military communications experience.
>

But- not even the Hindenberg was as light as your ham radio experience!

143. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-02 11:55:16 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <EmUeb.5427$Hd6.3360031@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 79717

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20031001202951.21642.00001350@mb-m01.aol.com...
> In article <stseb.39$f11.23@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dwight
Stewart"
> <stewartx@STOPearthlinkSPAM.net> writes:
>
> >"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote:
> >>
> >> Here, try this one:
> >>
> >> "All else being equal, a radio amateur who has Morse
> >> Code skills is more experienced, more qualified, and
> >> has more radio communications options available than
> >> a radio amateur with no Morse Code skills."
> >
> >
> > Without a desire to communicate with Morse Code, there is no truth to
that
> >statement at all.
>
> I disagree!
>
> Apply that logic to some other skill or knowledge. For example, the Smith
> Chart. All else being equal, is a ham who knows how to use the Smith Chart
to
> solve transmission line and impedance matching problems more experienced
and
> more qualified than one who does not?
>
> Or how about Ohm's Law? The phonetic alphabet? Typing skills?
>
> >Even with that (the all being equal aspect), there is no
> >truth to the "more experienced" or "more qualified" when it comes to
> >absolutely anything beyond Morse Code.
>
> You think that skills do not transfer in any way? I disagree!
>
> >Therefore, those two have no place in
> >that paragraph without Morse Code, not the radio amateur, specified as
the
> >"more" being discussed. Therefore, only the "more radio communications
> >options" has any significant ring of truth to it.
> >
> Sorry Dwight, you're simply off base on this one. I cannot see how you can

deny
> that having Morse code skills makes a ham more experienced and more
qualified -
> all else being equal.
>
> All else being equal, having Morse skills makes a ham more experienced and
more
> qualified than not having them. But that fact is not a proof that those
skills
> *must* be tested.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

In today's society, it is politically incorrect to consider one person
better than another in almost any field regardless of how much they know in
that field and how little the other person knows.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

144. Re: Some thoughtful comments from another forum on the code/nocode debate

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-02 12:08:01 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <blh4f1$cj9$0@208.206.142.91>
Source record: 79718

Hans K0HB wrote:

> Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com> wrote
>
>
>>Hans, it's novel that you share the life view of a fella named
>>Willie Sutton who said he robbed banks "Because that's where
>>the money is".
>
>
> Dick,
>
> It's novel that you are so insecure in your life view that you must
> stoop to putting me in the same category as someone who steals things
> from other people.
>

I don't believe it's insecure to view it as strange that you would
attach no importance to how a ham got his license.
Willie's ill-gotten gains spent just the same as your
well-earned do.

> On second thought, I suspect you must have been drunk or on dope when
> you wrote that post.

Well, you suspect wrong. VERY wrong.
My worst vice these days is Diet Coke. Not even a sugared version.

How else can I explain such a twisted and
> insulting interpretation of my remarks?

I apologize it you feel insulted. Many hams feel a bit insulted
by your remarks as well.

145. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-02 12:08:04 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <EyUeb.5429$Hd6.3361306@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 79719

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@STOPearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:_ESeb.5224$f11.2993@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote:
> >
> > I disagree!
> >
> > Apply that logic to some other skill or knowledge. For example,
> > the Smith Chart. (snip)
> >
> > Or how about Ohm's Law? The phonetic alphabet? Typing skills?
>
>
> Those are all skills or knowledge that can be used by every ham radio
> operator. Not so with Morse Code.
>
>

Morse code can be used by every ham radio operator if they choose to learn
it.

> > You think that skills do not transfer in any way? I disagree!
>
>
> I think code skill does not transfer to "more experienced" or "more
> qualified" when discussing a ham radio operator instead of code alone.
>
>
> > Sorry Dwight, you're simply off base on this one. I cannot see
> > how you can deny that having Morse code skills makes a ham
> > more experienced and more qualified - all else being equal.
>
>
> More experienced and more qualified in what, Jim? Morse Code only, not
as
> a ham operator. With the Technician license, the FCC has already
established
> that Morse Code is not a qualification needed to be a ham radio operator.
> Therefore, Morse Code cannot be used when deciding who is "more
experienced"
> or "more qualified" as a ham radio operator.

The same argument can be used for Smith charts since Techs are not required
to learn that either. Morse code is a skill used in amateur radio so
someone who knows it is a more qualified operator than someone who doesn't
whether or not it is a required skill. Just as knowing how to use a Smith

chart makes one more qualified.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

146. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-02 12:18:24 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <kIUeb.5430$Hd6.3362655@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 79720

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@STOPearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:w_Seb.5234$f11.4479@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote:
> >
> > Those who pushed for the Tech no code license loudly
> > and repeatedly claimed that it would lead to a major
> > influx of technically bright hams that would lead to
> > significant technical advances in ham radio since it was
> > supposedly code keeping them out. Well that influx of
> > technical types didn't happen. (snip)
>
>
> It didn't? I have a Tech license and consider myself fairly well
informed
> when it comes to technology. I don't know how bright I am, or if my
> involvement will ever lead to "significant technical advances in ham
radio,"
> but at least I'm here. Am I the only one? I'd surely hate to shoulder this
> burdon alone.
>
> Aren't you being a little unrealistic, Dee? Did you really expect this
> group to offer up "significant technical advances" in a mature radio
> environment? For that matter, did you really expect this one group to
offer
> anything more than the other license holders today? Radio is in the
> evolution stage at this point, not the revolution stage. Changes will
come,
> but they're certainly not likely to be earth shattering changes.
>

I personally do not have such an expectation nor is it a comment on any individual Technician licensee. Most of the Techs I know are indeed quite bright and well informed on technology. I was merely pointing out why some people seem to put so much pressure on Technicians, i.e. the proponents of the change "sold it" by using the "big influx of technologically oriented new hams and signficant technical advances" as one of the key elements of their argument. That argument was invalid then and is equally invalid now.

In my opinion, almost every argument posed on both sides (for or against code testing) has major flaws and is invalid.

Personally I consider basic code one of the fundamentals of radio even if one chooses not to use it after learning it. As a basic, I believe it should be tested. That is the position I will continue to support. And I will continue to promote code use whether the code testing is dropped or

not.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

147. Re: Appalling...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-02 12:21:19 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <3LUeb.5431$Hd6.3363111@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 79723

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@STOPearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:ODTeb.5248$f11.3468@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> "Dick Carroll" <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com> wrote:
> >
> > If you only had but a small portion of a clue you'd know that
> > most habd-sent CW not only *can* but WILL "thwart" most
> > consumer grade computer receive programs. I rather suspect
> > some more sophisticated writings do a lot better.
>
>
> The Apple DOS 3.3 disk (early 1980's) came with a simple program,
included
> as a programming example, that did a fine job of copying code/CW. I hooked
> an unused Apple II Plus to a Kenwood R2000 shortwave receiver and used
that
> program to copy code for several months. It rarely missed characters and
> almost never missed enough characters to make the message unreadable. The
> only times that program failed was when the signal I was trying to copy
was
> too deeply buried in the background noise or when multiple stations were
> transmitting on the same frequency.
>
> I haven't purchased a program like that recently, but surely they've
> gotten better over the years. Is that not the case?
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

No they haven't. The two conditions you state are still problems and good
reasons to learn to copy by ear. The human brain can sort it out when the
computer cannot. Poorly sent and spaced code is also still a problem.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

148. Re: Another Self-Humiliating LenniRiffic Rant

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-02 12:29:56 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031002082956.07346.00000939@mb-m26.aol.com>
Source record: 79725

In article <f45722ac.0310010543.10e9c4fd@posting.google.com>,
brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:

>N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in message
>news:<c2356669.0309301440.c31c99c@posting.google.com>...
>> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
>news:<f45722ac.0309300452.6c787ecd@posting.google.com>...
>> > "Arnie Macy" <kt4stnospam@csam.net> wrote in message
>news:<bl2q1m$7doa6$1@ID-166180.news.uni-berlin.de>...
>> > > "N2EY" wrote ...
>> > >
>> > > Do you think that a person can have only one writing style?
>> > > ____
>> > >
>> > I agree that a person can have more than one writing style. In this
>case;
>> > however, Len would have to work exceedingly hard to destroy any
>semblance of
>> > writing ability. I believe he has too much of an ego for that.
>> > >
>> > > Arnie-
>> > > KT4ST
>> >
>> And Bruce? Jim thinks he is a genius that presents himself as a
>"morron."
>>
>> You are utterly and completely mistaken.
>>
>> I do not think Bruce is a genius.
>
>Then please clarify.

Why?

You won't clarify your alleged /T5 operation
>
>On a scale of 1 to 10, with 1 being "morron," and 10 being genius,
>where would you say Bruce falls?

What is a "morron"?
>
>Remember now, you've put forth the theory that Bruce is a master of
>trickery, so only you are able to see his brilliance.
>
I have put forth no theory that Bruce is a master of anything, nor that he is

brilliant.

All I've done is to demonstrate that it is possible to skim through an Extra Class practice exam in less than 8 minutes and pass. And I've said that it's possible that someone's lack of correct spelling, grammar, and logic can be an act.

Philosophically, Bruce and Len are identical. Their methods are slightly different but they are both just simple basher/insulters of those who dare to disagree with them.

Neither has anyhting constructive to contribute.

149. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-02 12:29:57 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031002082957.07346.00000940@mb-m26.aol.com>
Source record: 79727

In article <K6Meb.876$qj6.800623@news1.news.adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo
<mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:

>> So why the sudden dropoff in new Techs?
>>
>> One definite possibility is the new Technician Q&A pool, which was
>introduced
>> on July 15th. The new pool has with 511 questions, while the old one had
>only
>> 384 questions.
>
> Coupled with many prospective technicians possibly holding out until
>they might not have to take a Morse code test?

Maybe - but the Tech doesn't have a code test now! And the dropoff correlates
exactly with the new question pool.
>
>> Prior to the new pool, the average number of new Techs was about 1700 a
>> month. Since then, it has dropped to less than 1000 per month.
>>
>> Maybe this is just a temporary thing - or maybe it isn't. The code test
>> cannot
>> be blamed for the drop because it's not a part of the Tech license
>> requirements.
>
> Oh, I'll bet some try to blame it on that! 8^)
>
Of course!

If/when the code test disappears, what will be the scapegoat for low growth?

73 de Jim, N2EY

150. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-02 12:29:58 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031002082958.07346.00000941@mb-m26.aol.com>
Source record: 79726

In article <_ESeb.5224$f11.2993@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@STOPearthlinkSPAM.net> writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote:
>>
>> I disagree!
>>
>> Apply that logic to some other skill or knowledge. For example,
>> the Smith Chart. (snip)
>>
>> Or how about Ohm's Law? The phonetic alphabet? Typing skills?
>
> Those are all skills or knowledge that can be used by every ham radio
>operator.

How can a blind amateur use the Smith Chart?
How can an amateur who cannot speak use the phonetic alphabet?

> Not so with Morse Code.

Which amateurs cannot use Morse code?
>
>> You think that skills do not transfer in any way? I disagree!
>
> I think code skill does not transfer to "more experienced" or "more
>qualified" when discussing a ham radio operator instead of code alone.

All else being equal, having a skill related to amateur radio means the person with the skill is more experienced than someone who doesn't. (Note that "all else being equal" thing).

>> Sorry Dwight, you're simply off base on this one. I cannot see
>> how you can deny that having Morse code skills makes a ham
>> more experienced and more qualified - all else being equal.
>
> More experienced and more qualified in what, Jim?

In amateur radio communications.

>Morse Code only, not as a ham operator.

No, as a ham operator. Morse Code is a big part of amateur radio. (So are many other things which do not have their own, standalone test for a license).

>With the Technician license, the FCC has already established
>that Morse Code is not a qualification needed to be a ham radio operator.

More precisely, they have said that a Morse Code *test* is not absolutely necessary in order to be granted a license.

But I'm not talking about the *test*, but about relative levels of experience and qualification.

>Therefore, Morse Code cannot be used when deciding who is "more >experienced"
>or "more qualified" as a ham radio operator.
>
By that logic, nothing that isn't on the Technician written test can be used to determine who is "more experienced" or "more qualified" as a ham radio operator. Faulty logic.

For example, the Tech test does not require that an amateur actually operate an amateur radio station at all. So, by the logic you use against the Morse Code experience/qualification thing, an amateur who has spent many years operating a wide variety of modes, bands, and on-air activities (public service, contests, rag chews, satellites, etc.,) cannot be said to be "more experienced" or "more qualified" as a ham radio operator, because the Tech test doesn't require any actual operating.

The inescapable, logical conclusion that results is this: Having Morse code skills makes a ham more experienced and more qualified as an amateur radio operator - all else being equal.

Of course that plain simple fact doesn't prove that there must be a code test as a condition of granting a license.

73 de Jim, N2EY
>

151. Re: LROD, LROD, LROD

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-02 12:30:02 UTC
From: Nomen Nescio <nobody@dizum.com>
Message-ID: <0ce6620b84f97721dbf3053d013750ab@dizum.com>
Source record: 79724
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

In article <3f7b2ee8.16873291@newsgroups.bellsouth.net>
LRod@removethispartpobox.com (LRod) wrote:
>
>
> On 1 Oct 2003 18:53:05 GMT, SLee@houston-hunks.com (Stagger Lee)
> wrote:
>
>
> >From http://www.brainydictionary.com:
> >
> >"Malingerer
> >
> >"(n.) In the army, a soldier who feigns himself sick, or who induces
> >or protracts an illness, in order to avoid doing his duty; hence, in
> >general, one who shirks his duty by pretending illness or inability."
> >
> >Which says to me that the poster is likening the supporters to a bunch
> >of military duty shirkers. That's quite a valid use of the word in
> >that case.
>
> But that's not what the context is. The intent of the original
> statement is clear that he is referring to his (Rich's) supporters.
>
> "Rich is not missed save by a few of his malingerers."
>
> Malingerers is clearly a noun. In the case you try to make, it would
> be descriptive of his, what? supporters? apologists? In other words,
> more like an adjective. Then what is it modifying? Nothing.
>
> In other words, you are trying to convince us that the original poster
> was saying that "Rich is not missed save by a few [people who feign
> illness or inability]." Sorry, no sale.
>
> >: >Yeah, Dan is garrulous, he is known to be a pain in the ass at times,
> >: >but why promulgate it with your inane comments?
> >:
> >: Promulgate? Do you know what promulgate means? It is the process of
> >: developing legislation or procedures. It is not a synonym for
> >: "antagonize" or "perpetuate."
> >
> >Oh heck: Let's look it up on the web again, since LRod needs all the help
> >he can get.
> >

> >At http://www.hyperdictionary.com/dictionary/promulgate, we find that
> >some synonyms for the word are "exclaim" or "proclaim." That source
> >also suggests that you look up "announce" and "trumpet" if you are
> >trying to get a feeling for the meaning of the word.
>
> I will concede that I've never heard promulgate used in that fashion.
> Sue me. I will not concede, however, that given the whole text of the
> definition (which refers to publishing laws or proclamations) that the
> original poster's use was appropriate, particularly in the context of
> the original post.
>
> >In fact, "perpetuate" is another perfectly good synonym, contrary to the
> >erroneous statement by "master language butcher" LRod.
>
> Interesting propaganda technique there; citing a source and using
> actual material from it, then adding one's own thoughts in the same
> paragraph to give the impression one's own ideas are also from that
> source. Please cite any source in which "perpetuate" is a synonym to
> "promulgate." It's certainly not in the ones you used.
>
> >Perhaps "LRod" would do well to consult a dictionary himself before
> >attempting to correct someone else.
>
> Just one? Why, you used at least two, neither of them mainstream, to
> try and make your point. Something wrong with http://www.m-w.com ?
>
> >Instead of the intended result, LRod, you now have your foot firmly planted
> >in your own mouth.
>
> I know you'd like to think so, but, I refer you to Mark Twain's essay
> "Fenimore Cooper's Literary Offenses" in which he describes, with a
> musical metaphor, Cooper's misuse of words as "sharping and flatting"
> his way along. The vocabulary use in the original poster's message
> fell short in substantially the same way.

LRod, Lee's made these same inaccurate statements before, when he used the word "too" for what should've been "two." It is a part of a post in which he was replying to two different posters, but he must've been on one of his drinking binges that day, so he didn't notice. He quickly made apologies and excuses for it citing the same online sources as he did above:

IGNORAMUS "Stagger Lee" <SLee@houston-hunks.com> demonstrated
his English skills and later tried to backpedal out of his use of "too" instead of "two"
in message <too.two_or_also@houston-hunks.com>:
"You too need to get a newsreader which generates a References header."

Here's another one where he falls flat on his sloped foreheaded face:
Stagger Lee, the "Pulitzer prize award-winning writer" slobbered
the following Ebonics in <9a56ue$hi0$0@dosa.alt.net>:
"I hope yourself takes the advice you are giving to yourself."

152. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-02 13:23:38 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <uFVeb.8661$yp6.255265@nnrp1.ptd.net>
Source record: 79728

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20031001214104.15462.00003324@mb-m06.aol.com...
> In article <3F7B20FB.2040608@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:
>
> >N2EY wrote:
> >> These are the number of unexpired FCC ARS
> >> licenses held by individuals on the dates listed:
> > >
> > ><snip>
> > >
> > >> As of September 30, 2003:
> > >>
> > >> Novice - 33,034 (decrease of 16,295)
> > >
> > ><snip>
> > >
> > >This may be hard to quantify, Jim, but is there any data or even
> > >educated guessing about how many Novices are still actually active?
> > >
> > Not that I know of, Mike.
> >
> > Let's look at how the three license classes that are closed to new entries
> have
> > declined in numbers:
> >
> > Novice is now ~67% of where it was May 14, 2000
> > Advanced is now ~83% of where it was May 14, 2000
> > Tech Plus is now ~50% of where it was May 14, 2000
> >
> > Of course the Tech Plus will decline the fastest because all Tech Pluses
> are
> > being renewed as Techs.

Or, alternatively, they are upgrading to General and Extra since they
already have 5 wpm code credit. There's been a lot of that.
(As an "old" techplus with full general written credit and 5 wpm
credit, I simply had to take the extra written to upgrade all the way.
I'm sure there were lots of similarly situated folks who also upgraded,
either as a "paper upgrade", with no test, to general, of as I did by
taking the extra written.)

Carl - wk3c

153. Re: Some thoughtful comments from another forum on the code/nocode debate

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-02 13:25:21 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <5HVeb.8662$yp6.255213@nnrp1.ptd.net>
Source record: 79729

```
"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20031001202958.21642.00001354@mb-m01.aol.com...
> In article <raHeb.8596$yp6.248316@nnrp1.ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
> <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:
>
> >N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> >news:20030930223035.28496.00001006@mb-m18.aol.com...
> >> In article <m6feb.8394$yp6.234106@nnrp1.ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
> >> <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:
> >>
> >> >"Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
> >> >news:f45722ac.0309300431.673f47fe@posting.google.com...
> >> >>
> >> >> Furthermore, if the US government wants to give all prospective
> >> >> amateurs 3 hots and a cot, and a paycheck, for the duration it takes
> >> >> to learn the code, I'd gladly enroll in the CG Morse Code school.
> >> >
> >> >There's one problem ... there IS no CG Morse Code school any
> >> >more ...
> >>
> >> Sad but true.
> >>
> >> > the services are NOT teaching their radiomen Morse any
> >> >more.
> >>
> >> Even if they were - would it make any difference to your opinion of the
> >need
> >> for code testing in the amateur radio service?
> >
> >It would add *some* potential validity to the "trained (in Morse) pool of
> >operators" part of 97.1 ... however, that is not the case and hasn't been
> >for some time ...
> >
> >It wouldn't be a "slam-dunk" in favor of continued Morse testing for
> >HF ham licenses though.
>
> In a word: "No".
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

Precisely ...

Carl - wk3c
```

154. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-02 13:25:27 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <bHVeb.5436$Hd6.3370726@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 79730

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20031002082957.07346.00000940@mb-m26.aol.com...
> In article <K6Meb.876$qj6.800623@news1.news.adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo
> <mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:
>
> >> So why the sudden dropoff in new Techs?
> >>
> >> One definite possibility is the new Technician Q&A pool, which was
> >introduced
> >> on July 15th. The new pool has with 511 questions, while the old one
had
> >only
> >> 384 questions.
> >
> > Coupled with many prospective technicians possibly holding out until
> >they might not have to take a Morse code test?
>
> Maybe - but the Tech doesn't have a code test now! And the dropoff
correlates
> exactly with the new question pool.
> >
> >> Prior to the new pool, the average number of new Techs was about 1700 a
> >> month. Since then, it has dropped to less than 1000 per month.
> >>
> >> Maybe this is just a temporary thing - or maybe it isn't. The code test
> >> cannot
> >> be blamed for the drop because it's not a part of the Tech license
> >> requirements.
> >
> > Oh, I'll bet some try to blame it on that! 8^)
> >
> Of course!
>
> If/when the code test disappears, what will be the scapegoat for low
growth?
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

Perhaps the dropoff is merely due to the coincidence of the new pool going into effect when people are busy with summer/outdoor activities. It might pick up again in the winter months.

Perhaps we had a sudden blip of people rushing to get their licenses in the few months preceding the change. I know several people who would have waited another month or so if the pool hadn't changed. They all hurried up

to get their tests taken before the end of June. So how many months does that 1700 per month cover?

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

155. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-02 13:28:36 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031002092836.13251.00000120@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 79731

>There's been a lot of that.
>(As an "old" techplus with full general written credit and 5 wpm
>credit, I simply had to take the extra written to upgrade all the way.
>I'm sure there were lots of similarly situated folks who also upgraded,
>either as a "paper upgrade", with no test, to general, of as I did by
>taking the extra written.)
>
>Carl - wk3c
>

Yea and it took you over a year to pass it, I guess it wasnt just the Code Test that kept you back.

156. Re: Echolink is great for those who..

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-02 13:32:21 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0310020532.4bd49ab0@posting.google.com>
Source record: 79732

wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) wrote in message
news:<20031001180558.21650.00000132@mb-m02.aol.com>...
> >Another anti-ham Troll identifies himself as not being worthy of his ham
> >liscense.
> >
> >(yawn)
> >
> >Charles Brabham, N5PVL
> >
>
> Oh I earned mine you Low lifes just had it handed to you.

5wpm and a waiver.

157. Re: Another Self-Humiliating LenniRiffic Rant

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-02 13:41:25 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0310020541.31ac1b@posting.google.com>
Source record: 79733

Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:<blfe9i$io5$0@208.206.142.109>...
> Brian wrote:.
> >
> > On a scale of 1 to 10, with 1 being "morron," and 10 being genius,
> > where would you say Bruce falls?
> >
>
> With you occupying the slot at 2, he comes in at least a 3.

That would be an invalid assessment, from someone occupying slot #1.

158. Re: 1/4 Wave Dipoles

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-02 13:44:04 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0310020544.74dcae70@posting.google.com>
Source record: 79734

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20031001174151.05539.00001147@mb-m16.aol.com>...
> In article <f45722ac.0309300428.1e9ebb5@posting.google.com>,
> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
>
> >I invoke your "Bruce Hypothesis."
> >
> >Len isn't really shouting nor is he out of control.
> >
> >HE MERELY WISHES TO GIVE THAT IMPRESSION.
>
> WHAT MAKES YOU SAY SO?
>
> :-)

Keep 'em guessing?

159. Re: Leo's self-incriminating AGAIN...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-02 13:48:13 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0310020548.64d3d1aa@posting.google.com>
Source record: 79735

Leo <nomail@nope.org> wrote in message
news:<paslnv0a23pl1ue90iggtpqft14gfkgngf@4ax.com>...
> On 1 Oct 2003 07:53:24 -0700, brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote:
>
> >Leo <nomail@nope.org> wrote in message
news:<qohjnv85j833apcm56sm2o9am6soj90801@4ax.com>...
> >> Not really - read the message I replied to - the reply was just
> >> following the thread. (you know, replying to the content and in this
> >> case the criticism of *my* spelling in the message one up from this
> >> one.....). It was a bit of a cheap shot, I admit - the result of
> >> fighting fire with fire, I suppose.
> >
> >I thought you called that "running out of steam." Now you're trying
> >to rationalize your lack of steam.
>
> Not at all - just explaining the reasoning behind the comments. Read
> the entire thread - the comments followed suit.
>
> I sincerely hope your 'lack of steam' comment wasn't an attempt to
> rekindle the flame, now, was it? :)
>
> >
> >> As far as I'm concerned, the differences that Clint and I have had
> >> have been amicably resolved - we now know exactly where each other is
> >> coming from, and why - and peace reigns once again. We may not agree
> >> on all points - but we do share common ground, as do the majority of
> >> us in the group: see the thread "The Way To Stop BPL" for further
> >> details.
> >
> >Fair enough.
>
> Thank you.
>
> >
> >> Beating each other up isn't going to resolve anything...there are
> >> issues we all need to stand together on. Some (like the famous Code /
> >> No Code question) simply have no right answer
> >
> >I disagree.
>
> As you most assuredly have the right to do.
>
> BTW, is it the code/no code part, or the beating people up part, or
> the standing together part of my statement that you disagree with?

The famous Code/No Code part.

> > - and others (like BPL)
> >> threaten the hobby. Perhaps if we channel all of our energy where it
> >> will do the most good for the hobby, we can effect change.
> >>
> >> 73, Leo
> >
> >Perhaps the ARRL's Official Observer program will now look outward for
> >interference problems rather than confine itself to internal problems.
>
> I'm a bit puzzled by this one - that has what to do with BPL, or other
> things that threaten the hobby?

OO's are trained in documentation. Documentation of interference will
be required to file a complaint. OO's are confined to documenting
amateur's violations in the ARS, not interference to the ARS by
unlicensed operators.

Thus, I state that perhaps the ARRL will take an outward looking
stance with respect to this interference.

160. Re: No good threads

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-02 13:51:01 UTC
From: Greg Courville <EngNOSPAMinuitor@Gee-Enginuity.com>
Message-ID: <vnob6cdud26f1e@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 79736

As someone pointed out to me, this "policy" group is specifically intended for the discussion of issues such as CW testing, and helps keep that stuff off, say, rec.radio.amateur.antenna. There are certain people that I wouldn't mind never hearing again though.

73 de KG6SGY

"Clint" <rattlehead at computron dot net> wrote in message news:vneslv6jjusoc1@corp.supernews.com...
> My best advice is add any post to your killfile that has
> the words CW, PCTA, NCTA or code testing as a
> subject.
>
> The reason is you're probably tired of the PCTA trolling,
> and quite frankly the only reason I hang with the debate
> as long as I do is in the unlikely event I run into a fresh
> mind with an angle I myself didn't think of, making
> me rethink the whole debate. Unfortunately, however,
> most of thier posts on *that* side of the argument
> drive you further and further away from sympathizing
> with it, especially when the condescending attitudes
> start to vomit themselves up.
>
> Other than that, you will find nice posts regarding
> antennas, meeting on frequencies, and other
> topics.
>
> Clint
> KB5ZHT
>
>
>
> --
>
> --
>
> Get in touch with your soul: www.glennbeck.com
> OR, if you're a liberal, maybe you can FIND one
>
>
> --
> "Radioman" <radio@ptt.edu> wrote in message
> news:3F775FF6.6014D194@ptt.edu...
> > The only new thread was from the troll WA8ULX, so I hit
> > SHIFT-C and marked ALL the messages as READ.

> >
> > Can someone post a good thread worth reading?
> >
> > Once a thread hits about 5 messages, it's done around here.
>
>

161. Re: Echolink is great for those who..

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-02 14:11:07 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031002101107.07899.00000165@mb-m11.aol.com>
Source record: 79737

>5wpm and a waiver.

You know thats not true, I think your just upset I could easily pass the EXTRA,
and you cant even get close.

162. Re: 1/4 Wave Dipoles

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-02 14:12:24 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031002101224.07899.00000166@mb-m11.aol.com>
Source record: 79738

>Keep 'em guessing?

Brian for a CBplusser your not as Dumb as you act.

163. Re: Leo's self-incriminating AGAIN...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-02 14:13:58 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031002101358.07899.00000167@mb-m11.aol.com>
Source record: 79739

>Thus, I state that perhaps the ARRL will take an outward looking
>stance with respect to this interference.
>

Why would they, they dont care.

164. Re: Isnt it Funny (No-Code HF Privileges)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-02 16:21:21 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0310020821.17ee7e05@posting.google.com>
Source record: 79740

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@STOPearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:<M1Reb.5072$f11.2985@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote:
> >
> > IMDB.com (Internet Movie Data Base) says that "Convoy"
> > and the first "Smokey and the Bandit" came out in 1977-78.
>
> Just two examples, Jim (that's obviously why I said "and so on").

Of course.

But my point was that the TV shows and movies were a result of the cb
boom, and reflected its outlaw nature. They did not cause the boom,
nor the culture, which were solidly in place in the late 1960s.

> There
> were a rash of movies and television shows featuring CB in the mid to late
> 70's

well *after* cb was a fad..

> - BJ and the Bear,

premiered 1978

> Dukes of Hazard,

premiered 1979

> Moonshine,

premiered 1977

> Knight Rider,

premiered 1982

> and so on.
> Even regular television shows

>(Charley's Angels,

premiered 1976

> Magnum PI,

premiered 1980

> Love Boat,

premiered 1976

> CHiPs,

premiered 1977

> and so on) had episodes featuring CB.
>
I'm sure they did. Note that most of the above are TV shows, and their dates are all fall premiere dates.

cb and its culture were already well established long before the movies and TV shows caught on. Heck, First Lady Betty Ford ("First Mama") had one in a White House limo. (The Ford Administration ended in January 1977).

The restrictive rules on "external and internal RF power amplifiers" (also called "linyars") were enacted by FCC in 1978. That was long after they were all over the place. Given typical bureaucratic delay, that means amplifiers were a big problem at least two years earlier - 1976.

Things did not go bad because of the movies and TV shows. They went bad because there was no way FCC could enforce the rules, and no established culture or tradition of self-discipline, responsibility or rule-following.

Art imitates life.

The song "Convoy" was a hit in 1976. "C.W. McCall" is/was a persona created by one Bill Fries, starting out as a series of commercials.

True fact: The 'band' that backed up "McCall" (actually a rotating bunch of studio musicians) was organized by Chip Davis, who is probably better known for his involvement in the New Age "Mannheim Steamroller" music.

To really get a handle (pun intended) on when the boom peaked, look up when FCC gave up on licenses for cb.

73 de Jim, N2EY

thank you, imdb.com

165. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-02 16:54:32 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0310020854.4f3b115a@posting.google.com>
Source record: 79741

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@STOPearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:<v8Teb.5237$f11.3717@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> "WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote:
> >
> > " trained operators, technicians, and electronics experts."
> >
> > You have to kidding, most of the New Hams have no Idea what
> > it is to be trained technicians or electronic experts. (snip)
>
>
> Only you would make a stupid statement like that, Bruce. They're new! By
> definition, a person new to anything is not likely to be an expert. Duh!!
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

And therin lies the problem.

These OF's expect that the newbie will study a Q/A guide, pass a test,
and somehow end up with 20, 30, 40 or even 50 years of experience
under their belts - just like they did(?) back in '06.

That's not how it works.

166. Re: Some thoughtful comments from another forum on the code/nocode debate

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-02 16:59:32 UTC
From: groupk0hb@earthlink.net
Message-ID: <5ee63311.0310020859.7e50b6f7@posting.google.com>
Source record: 79742

Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com> wrote

> ..... strange that you would attach no importance
> to how a ham got his license.

Where did you dig up that gem of mis-information? You really must be
on some chemical --- perhaps your diet Pepsi has been spiked.

I have simply pointed out that the path to an amateur license is not
(and never has been) particularly strenuous, and in most cases is a
pretty modest accomplishment. It's what happens AFTER you qualify for
a license which counts.

For information on how I feel about current license qualifications,
see my comments to the FCC. Go to http://home.earthlink.net/~k0hb and
click on the link (left of page) "FCC Comments".

73, de Hans, K0HB
--
"Reality doesn't care what you believe."

167. Re: Appalling...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-02 17:03:27 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0310020903.7ece8831@posting.google.com>
Source record: 79743

Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:<blfvngmqr0@208.207.71.164>...
> Brian wrote:
>
> > World, meet Dick Carroll/N0EX, who single -handedly- can thwart any
> > computer copy of his banana boat bug.
>
>
>
> If you only had but a small portion of a clue you'd know that most
> habd-sent CW not only *can* but WILL "thwart" most consumer grade
> computer receive programs.
> I rather suspect some more sophisticated writings do a lot better.

We've had this argument before and you have formed a concensus of ONE!

168. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-02 17:18:10 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031002131810.18903.00000237@mb-m15.aol.com>
Source record: 79744

>These OF's expect that the newbie will study a Q/A guide, pass a test,
>and somehow end up with 20, 30, 40 or even 50 years of experience
>under their belts - just like they did(?) back in '06.
>

BS, first they dont Study, or even know the Basic Material. All they do is
Memorize some Q&As, and then take a test on material they know nothing about.

169. Re: Leo's self-incriminating AGAIN...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-02 17:40:41 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@nope.org>
Message-ID: <tboonv41sqb8uesp25je04r4tgvp44sdbu@4ax.com>
Source record: 79745

On 2 Oct 2003 06:48:13 -0700, brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote:

>snipped
>>
>> BTW, is it the code/no code part, or the beating people up part, or
>> the standing together part of my statement that you disagree with?
>
>The famous Code/No Code part.

Understood - and I respect your position.
>
>> >
>> >Perhaps the ARRL's Official Observer program will now look outward for
>> >interference problems rather than confine itself to internal problems.
>>
>> I'm a bit puzzled by this one - that has what to do with BPL, or other
>> things that threaten the hobby?
>
>OO's are trained in documentation. Documentation of interference will
>be required to file a complaint. OO's are confined to documenting
>amateur's violations in the ARS, not interference to the ARS by
>unlicensed operators.
>
>Thus, I state that perhaps the ARRL will take an outward looking
>stance with respect to this interference.

That makes sense - we have the same program running up here.

Assuming that happens, I'd expect that plenty of us will be required
to augment the work that the OO's do in this regard. I have not seen
a statistic on the number of active OO's in the program - I'd assume
it to be relatively small, though.

73, Leo

170. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-02 19:05:44 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <cG_eb.9224$f11.2995@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 79746

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:MyIeb.5363$Hd6.3257781@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
>
> "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@STOPearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
> news:VGxeb.259$f11.59@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> > "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote:
> > > The removal of the Morse Code test from the Technician
> > > class license has not resulted in a technical revolution in
> > > amateur radio from newly-licensed "technically qualified"
> > > amateurs. (snip)
> >
> >
> > I didn't know the Technician license was supposed to lead to a
technical
> > revolution in anything, Jim. Instead, I thought they were just supposed
to
> > participate in the same activities most other Amateur Radio operators
are
> > participating in. Why the unique expectation for Technician license
> holders
> > alone?
> >
> >
>
> Those who pushed for the Tech no code license loudly and repeatedly
claimed
> that it would lead to a major influx of technically bright hams that would
> lead to significant technical advances in ham radio since it was
supposedly
> code keeping them out. Well that influx of technical types didn't happen.
> Unfortunately, the Technician licensees following that change are saddled
> with an expectation that they themselves did not create. They shoulder
the
> burden of expectations created by those who would not have to fulfill
them.
> Whether or not one believes in code testing, it highlights some of the
> inherent flaws in the argument that code keeps technical types out of ham
> radio.
>
>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>

I wonder how many of the 'enlightned' know what the Technician license was
ORIGINALLY
intended for?

I'll help you out....it wasn't an 'entry level' license.

Come on all you old timers. Straighten out the enlightned out there.

Dan/W4NTI

171. Re: Appalling...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-02 20:05:26 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031002160526.21642.00001370@mb-m01.aol.com>
Source record: 79748

In article <f45722ac.0310020903.7ece8831@posting.google.com>,
brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:

>> If you only had but a small portion of a clue you'd know that most
>> habd-sent CW not only *can* but WILL "thwart" most consumer grade
>> computer receive programs.
>> I rather suspect some more sophisticated writings do a lot better.
>
>We've had this argument before and you have formed a concensus of ONE!

Brian, I think you missed the letter N in the word "ONE." :-)

LHA

172. Re: Appalling...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-02 20:05:27 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031002160527.21642.00001371@mb-m01.aol.com>
Source record: 79747

In article <3LUeb.5431$Hd6.3363111@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> writes:

>> I haven't purchased a program like that recently, but surely they've
>> gotten better over the years. Is that not the case?
>>
>>
>> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>>
>> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
>
>No they haven't.

They HAVE, but there's no market for such things, not even with the Military Intelligence School at Fort Huachuca on ELINT training.

>The two conditions you state are still problems and good
>reasons to learn to copy by ear.

Which is NO reason to mandate code testing for an AMATEUR radio license by the government.

>The human brain can sort it out when the
>computer cannot.

Then all the other radio services "should" have used it for communications, right?

Wrong. All the other radio services involved in communications have either DROPPED it or never considered it in the first place.

>Poorly sent and spaced code is also still a problem.

So?

US radio amateurs who do NOT use morse code modes (the majority) don't require morsemanship skills.

LHA

173. Re: Appalling...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-02 20:05:28 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031002160528.21642.00001372@mb-m01.aol.com>
Source record: 79749

In article <ODTeb.5248$f11.3468@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@STOPearthlinkSPAM.net> writes:

>"Dick Carroll" <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com> wrote:
>>
>> If you only had but a small portion of a clue you'd know that
>> most habd-sent CW not only *can* but WILL "thwart" most
>> consumer grade computer receive programs. I rather suspect
>> some more sophisticated writings do a lot better.
>
> The Apple DOS 3.3 disk (early 1980's) came with a simple program, included
>as a programming example, that did a fine job of copying code/CW. I hooked
>an unused Apple II Plus to a Kenwood R2000 shortwave receiver and used that
>program to copy code for several months. It rarely missed characters and
>almost never missed enough characters to make the message unreadable. The
>only times that program failed was when the signal I was trying to copy was
>too deeply buried in the background noise or when multiple stations were
>transmitting on the same frequency.
>
> I haven't purchased a program like that recently, but surely they've
>gotten better over the years. Is that not the case?

They have, but the mighty morsemen consider such to be desecrations
of the will of the old radio gods.

Perhaps you missed a back-and-forth I had in here with Ed Hare on a
programmer acquaintence who wrote an adaptive morse code cognition
program (on a standard PC, top of the line then, middle-level now) which
could compensate very well for variations in spacing, dot-dash lengths,
whatever "swing" is (a subjective term to morsemen), tone, rate, and
so forth. To him it was an intellectual challenge.

Some trials with my receiver and a long-wire antenna at his place
showed that there was damn little USE of morse code anywhere on HF
except in the amateur bands. There's no real market for such a thing
and the successful adaptive morse code cognition program remained
just a satisfying (to the programmer) intellectual exercise.

LHA

174. Re: Bootlegging in 1948?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-02 20:05:29 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031002160529.21642.00001373@mb-m01.aol.com>
Source record: 79750

In article <20031002055407.23171.00001177@mb-m05.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
writes:

>In article <20031002001355.29660.00000894@mb-m24.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com
>(Len Over 21) writes:
>
>> I have never used "Avery Fine" as a screen name.
>
>Yes, you have. Here's just one example - there are more.

I stand corrected. Three and a half years ago AOL still had a limit on
the number of characters in a screen name.

Once that limit was changed to a longer string, I cancelled the "Avery
Fine" screen name and changed it to my old Sysop handle of "Avery
Fineman" used many years ago before the Internet went public. LATER,
someone picked up on that particular screen name of "Avery Fine" and
used it as soon as the six-month time was up. The same is true of
"No CW Test" screenname...which I cancelled and someone else used
after it was available.

At NO time have I ever tried to disguise my legal name or address or
location by adopting some false personna.

Yet you GRASP AT STRAWS in trying to light up a Flame War to
satisfy your childish pique in here. Tsk, tsk, don't play with matches...
there are others here who have flamethrowers and you could get
severely burned.

>>(apparently). The US amateur radio community does not
>>grant licenses...nor does it "rule" on the "motivations" it
>>thinks citizens have in regards to radio licenses. You
>>seem to think that you "know" everything about those
>>who post contrary opinions to yours. Have fun in your
>>self-important ignorance, go ahead and post more of
>>your "hate" allegations as if you represent the entire
>>US ARS community. I don't care to message with
>>you further (as if I ever did to your libelous postings),
>>Herr Standartenfuhrer. I'm going to a college reunion.
>>QRT.
>
>didit
>
>END QUOTE

The college reunion was in the midwest in 2000, my wife's college class. Rainy, dreary, but a fun event formally and socially.

I'm sorry you have to pollute the contents in here with bringing up THREE YEAR OLD (PLUS) arguments to satisfy your apparent "need" to get back at your perceived pique.

Try living in the here and now instead of constantly going back to the past. You are not salving old word wounds by going back to the past, only re-opening your own wounds for more hurt. Tsk, tsk.

LHA

175. Re: Isnt it Funny (No-Code HF Privileges)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-02 20:05:31 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031002160531.21642.00001374@mb-m01.aol.com>
Source record: 79751

In article <c2356669.0310020821.17ee7e05@posting.google.com>, N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) writes:

>"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@STOPearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message >news:<M1Reb.5072$f11.2985@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
>> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote:
>> >
>> > IMDB.com (Internet Movie Data Base) says that "Convoy"
>> > and the first "Smokey and the Bandit" came out in 1977-78.
>>
>> Just two examples, Jim (that's obviously why I said "and so on").
>
>Of course.
>
>But my point was that the TV shows and movies were a result of the cb
>boom, and reflected its outlaw nature. They did not cause the boom,
>nor the culture, which were solidly in place in the late 1960s.

What "outlaw" actions took place then, mighty sheriff?

Did you arrest any of those "outlaws?"

>> There
>> were a rash of movies and television shows featuring CB in the mid to late
>> 70's
>
>well *after* cb was a fad..

The "fad" continues, over two decades later. :-)

>> - BJ and the Bear,
>
>premiered 1978
>
>
>> Dukes of Hazard,
>
>premiered 1979
>
>
>> Moonshine,
>
>premiered 1977
>
>
>> Knight Rider,

>
>premiered 1982
>
>
>> and so on.
>> Even regular television shows
>
>>(Charley's Angels,
>
>premiered 1976
>
>
>> Magnum PI,
>
>premiered 1980
>
>
>> Love Boat,
>
>premiered 1976
>
>
>> CHiPs,
>
>premiered 1977
>
>> and so on) had episodes featuring CB.

"CHiPs" featured fake motorcycle and patrol car communications using California Highway Patrol protocol and radio equipment dummies on supposed CHP frequencies. Some of the audio of actual CHP radio communications was recorded and "wild-tracked" into an episode as needed.

It's "highway scenes" were shot on the Foothill Freeway under construction in the Sunland-Tujunga-La-Crescenta area just to my residence's north.

>I'm sure they did. Note that most of the above are TV shows, and their
>dates are all fall premiere dates.

You have a dispute with the entertainment industry and television in general? Take it up with the Academy of Television Arts and Sciences. Their headquarters is in North Hollywood...very nice building. Nice folks in there...but watch out on dissing them or you might wind up head-first in one of the fountains in the courtyard.

>cb and its culture were already well established long before the
>movies and TV shows caught on.

"Outlaw culture?" :-)

"Desperados of the Wild West?" Are you imagining yourself as some
kind of "marshall" out to "avenge" things? :-)

>The restrictive rules on "external and internal RF power amplifiers"
>(also called "linyars") were enacted by FCC in 1978. That was long
>after they were all over the place. Given typical bureaucratic delay,
>that means amplifiers were a big problem at least two years earlier -
>1976.

Okay, here it is 27 years later. Where are all the avenging marshalls
and sheriffs and fast-draw lawmen setting up law and order in the wild
EM west?

>Things did not go bad because of the movies and TV shows. They went
>bad because there was no way FCC could enforce the rules, and no
>established culture or tradition of self-discipline, responsibility or
>rule-following.

Yes, pity that...no one to "establish culture or tradition or
self-discipline"
like all the mighty macho morsemen did LONG before Sheriff Jimmie
was born. :-)

Sheriff Jimmie, hop up on your hearse and form up a posse to ride out
into the wild EM west and arrest those miscreants!

Make yourself look proud in the eyes of other macho morsemen!

SO, WHERE ARE ALL THE MOVIES AND TV SHOWS FEATURING
AMATEUR RADIO...AND ESPECIALLY MORSE CODE?

AMATEUR RADIO AND THE ARRL HAVE HAD LONGER THAN 27
YEARS TO MAKE AN IMPACT ON THE PUBLIC THROUGH THE
ENTERTAINMENT MEDIA.

Got yer ears on? :-)

LHA

>
>Art imitates life.
>
>The song "Convoy" was a hit in 1976. "C.W. McCall" is/was a persona
>created by one Bill Fries, starting out as a series of commercials.
>
>True fact: The 'band' that backed up "McCall" (actually a rotating
>bunch of studio musicians) was organized by Chip Davis, who is
>probably better known for his involvement in the New Age "Mannheim
>Steamroller" music.
>
>To really get a handle (pun intended) on when the boom peaked, look up
>when FCC gave up on licenses for cb.

176. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-02 20:05:32 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031002160532.21642.00001375@mb-m01.aol.com>
Source record: 79752

In article <20031002082958.07346.00000941@mb-m26.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
writes:

>In article <_ESeb.5224$f11.2993@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dwight
>Stewart" <stewartx@STOPearthlinkSPAM.net> writes:
>
>>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote:
>>>
>>> I disagree!
>>>
>>> Apply that logic to some other skill or knowledge. For example,
>>> the Smith Chart. (snip)
>>>
>>> Or how about Ohm's Law? The phonetic alphabet? Typing skills?
>>
>> Those are all skills or knowledge that can be used by every ham radio
>>operator.
>
>How can a blind amateur use the Smith Chart?

Why are you so focussed on a common graphical tool used by RF
PROFESSIONALS?

A Smith Chart is no damn good if you don't understand complex
number quantities.

Oh, I get it. The US amateur test regulations should all be about
satisfying the "disabled." Understand.

>How can an amateur who cannot speak use the phonetic alphabet?

Q: How can an amateur who cannot think talk about radio regulations?

A: Go into this newsgroup and blather about the importance of code!

:-)

>All else being equal, having a skill related to amateur radio means the person
>with the skill is more experienced than someone who doesn't. (Note that "all
>else being equal" thing).

"All else being equal" does not apply. That is pre-loading your
supposition.

>>> Sorry Dwight, you're simply off base on this one. I cannot see
>>> how you can deny that having Morse code skills makes a ham
>>> more experienced and more qualified - all else being equal.
>>

>> More experienced and more qualified in what, Jim?
>
>In amateur radio communications.

Ah, you think amateur radio is ALL about morsemanship!

>>Morse Code only, not as a ham operator.
>
>No, as a ham operator. Morse Code is a big part of amateur radio. (So are many
>other things which do not have their own, standalone test for a license).

Morse code is NOT the biggest part of amateur radio.

>>With the Technician license, the FCC has already established
>>that Morse Code is not a qualification needed to be a ham radio operator.
>
>More precisely, they have said that a Morse Code *test* is not absolutely
>necessary in order to be granted a license.

Yes they did, 13 years ago and again 5 years ago.

The FCC is the ONLY agency which grants US amateur radio
licenses. The "amateur community" doesn't grant them.

>But I'm not talking about the *test*, but about relative levels of experience
>and qualification.

...which you have absolutely pre-loaded to favor your own personal
desires and abilities. Not valid for establishing regulations that
apply to ALL Americans.

>By that logic, nothing that isn't on the Technician written test can be used
to
>determine who is "more experienced" or "more qualified" as a ham radio
>operator. Faulty logic.

It's only "faulty logic" to morsemen.

>For example, the Tech test does not require that an amateur actually operate
an
>amateur radio station at all.

Neither does the General or Amateur Extra, nor did the Novice or Advanced
classes. Tsk, tsk, tsk.

>So, by the logic you use against the Morse Code
>experience/qualification thing, an amateur who has spent many years operating
a
>wide variety of modes, bands, and on-air activities (public service, contests,
>rag chews, satellites, etc.,) cannot be said to be "more experienced" or
"more
>qualified" as a ham radio operator, because the Tech test doesn't require any
>actual operating.

Yes, yes, yes, mighty macho morseman...you are the "most experienced"
of all, especially using satellites to rag-chew on "CW."

We KNOW that you set yourself and morsemanship as the very model of
a modern macho morseman.

>The inescapable, logical conclusion that results is this: Having Morse code
>skills makes a ham more experienced and more qualified as an amateur radio
>operator - all else being equal.

That is inescapably ILLOGICAL. There is NO "all else being equal" situation
in the US amateur radio license test regulations that make it "logical" to
prove any morsemanship ability. That is just your personal viewpoint.

>Of course that plain simple fact doesn't prove that there must be a code test
>as a condition of granting a license.

The only "plain simple fact" proven was that you are a morseman and are
trying to force all future US radio amateurs to test for morse code
regardless
of its validity in determining licensing to the FCC.

LHA

177. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-02 20:37:46 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031002163746.21518.00000233@mb-m02.aol.com>
Source record: 79753

> The only "plain simple fact" proven was that you are a morseman and are
> trying to force all future US radio amateurs to test for morse code
>regardless
> of its validity in determining licensing to the FCC.
>
> LHA

And the other simple fact is, the No-Code Knuckle Draggers are trying to push
Ham Radio into CB Status.

178. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-02 21:40:48 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0310021340.174893cc@posting.google.com>
Source record: 79754

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:<bHVeb.5436$Hd6.3370726@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>...
> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20031002082957.07346.00000940@mb-m26.aol.com...
> > In article <K6Meb.876$qj6.800623@news1.news.adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo
> > <mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:
> >
> > >> So why the sudden dropoff in new Techs?
> > >>
> > >> One definite possibility is the new Technician Q&A pool, which was
> introduced
> > >> on July 15th. The new pool has with 511 questions, while the old one
> had
> only
> > >> 384 questions.
> > >>
> > > Coupled with many prospective technicians possibly holding out until
> > >they might not have to take a Morse code test?
> >
> > Maybe - but the Tech doesn't have a code test now! And the dropoff
> correlates
> > exactly with the new question pool.
> > >
> > >> Prior to the new pool, the average number of new Techs was about 1700 a
> > >> month. Since then, it has dropped to less than 1000 per month.
> > >>
> > >> Maybe this is just a temporary thing - or maybe it isn't. The code test
> > >> cannot
> > >> be blamed for the drop because it's not a part of the Tech license
> > >> requirements.
> > >>
> > > Oh, I'll bet some try to blame it on that! 8^)
> > >
> > Of course!
> >
> > If/when the code test disappears, what will be the scapegoat for low
> growth?
> >
> > 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
> Perhaps the dropoff is merely due to the coincidence of the new pool going
> into effect when people are busy with summer/outdoor activities. It might
> pick up again in the winter months.

Quite reasonable ideas - but looking back on previous summers, there
was no corresponding dip. And it's still dropping.
>
> Perhaps we had a sudden blip of people rushing to get their licenses in the
> few months preceding the change. I know several people who would have
> waited another month or so if the pool hadn't changed. They all hurried up
> to get their tests taken before the end of June.

Again, quite reasonable, but the end result is a net loss over a year
or more ago.

And the other license classes are almost unaffected.

> So how many months does
> that 1700 per month cover?
>
12

But don't take my word for it. See for yourself:

http://www.ah0a.org

click on "US amateur license statistics" (or words to that effect)

then

"New Licenses"

and see the whole picture, going back several years.

Consider this:

Suppose the new Q&A pool really is the cause of this dropoff. Will we
see folks arguing that the writtens are stifling growth, turning
people away, etc.?
Will we see a movement to reduce (again) the level of written testing,
the number of licenses, etc.?

73 de Jim, N2EY

179. Re: Some thoughtful comments from another forum on the code/nocode debate

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-02 21:42:45 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0310021342.6d9f373b@posting.google.com>
Source record: 79755

```
"Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
news:<5HVeb.8662$yp6.255213@nnrp1.ptd.net>...
> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20031001202958.21642.00001354@mb-m01.aol.com...
> > In article <raHeb.8596$yp6.248316@nnrp1.ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
> > <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:
> >
> > >N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> > >news:20030930223035.28496.00001006@mb-m18.aol.com...
> > >> In article <m6feb.8394$yp6.234106@nnrp1.ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
> > >> <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:
> > >>
> > >> >"Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
> > >> >news:f45722ac.0309300431.673f47fe@posting.google.com...
> > >> >>
> > >> >> Furthermore, if the US government wants to give all prospective
> > >> >> amateurs 3 hots and a cot, and a paycheck, for the duration it takes
> > >> >> to learn the code, I'd gladly enroll in the CG Morse Code school.
> > >> >
> > >> >There's one problem ... there IS no CG Morse Code school any
> > >> >more ...
> > >>
> > >> Sad but true.
> > >>
> > >> > the services are NOT teaching their radiomen Morse any
> > >> >more.
> > >>
> > >> Even if they were - would it make any difference to your opinion of the
> > need
> > > > >> for code testing in the amateur radio service?
> > > >
> > > >It would add *some* potential validity to the "trained (in Morse) pool of
> > > >operators" part of 97.1 ... however, that is not the case and hasn't been
> > > >for some time ...
> > > >
> > > >It wouldn't be a "slam-dunk" in favor of continued Morse testing for
> > > >HF ham licenses though.
> > >
> > > In a word: "No".
> > >
> > > 73 de Jim, N2EY
> >
> > Precisely ...
```

>
> Carl - wk3c

Exactly!

So the argument "the military does/does not use Morse" has no bearing
at all on the issue of an amateur radio code test.

Glad we're agreed on that.

73 & good luck against BPL

Jim, N2EY

180. Amateur radio in television and movies (was Re: Isnt it Funny (No-Code HF Privileges))

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-02 21:43:19 UTC
From: Jack Twilley <jmt+usenet@twilley.org>
Message-ID: <864qyr71u0.fsf_-_@duchess.twilley.org>
Source record: 79756

```
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

>>>>> "Len" == Len Over <lenover21@aol.com> writes:

[...]

Len> SO, WHERE ARE ALL THE MOVIES AND TV SHOWS FEATURING AMATEUR
Len> RADIO...AND ESPECIALLY MORSE CODE?

Where are all the movies and television shows featuring normal
families with normal marriages and normal children? Where are all the
movies and television shows featuring normal employees working for
normal employers? Normal is boring. Conflict is exciting.

American culture considers CB radio to be used mostly for evading
speed-traps. This illustrates a basic conflict (man versus society)
which is featured in forms of entertainment predating the Trojan war,
let alone CB radio. This particular conflict also appeals to the
American mind-set of bending the rules and avoiding punishment.

Amateur radio is used for extending the state of the art, for
expressing international goodwill, and for emergency communications.
The first two make for bad theater, but the last has potential.

Movies and television shows have been created around this type of
topic for quite some time, with man versus nature being the most
relevant conflict in this case. Amateur radio is usually only used
when normal communications systems are unavailable. This doesn't
exactly happen on a weekly basis, so it'd be difficult to make a
television show based on this scenario. As for a movie, well,
the potential is there, but I haven't seen it used effectively. It
was a gimmick in _Frequency_ but personally I'd rather see something
like the story of the operators lost from Mount St. Helens, or maybe a
disaster flick covering The Big One out here in California.

Oh, yeah, Morse code. I got a kick out of the satellite scenes in
_Enemy of the State_. Dahdidahdit dahdadidah.

Jack.
- --
Jack Twilley
jmt at twilley dot org
http colon slash slash www dot twilley dot org slash tilde jmt slash
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: GnuPG v1.2.3 (FreeBSD)
```

```
iD8DBQE/fJv8GPFSfAB/ezgRAjlUAKDCo6B/f7pFTvtqoEbM/IgouRplOACfRCtv
Z7Vaf1oQXaeGjqcDgSUdGhc=
=se23
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----
```

181. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-02 22:16:53 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0310021416.6837c88b@posting.google.com>
Source record: 79757

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@STOPearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:<VGxeb.259$f11.59@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote:
> >
> > Some claim that Morse Code testing is at odds with
> > the purpose of the amateur radio service as a
> > fundamentally technical service. But in the practical
> > experience of thousands of amateurs, the opposite
> > is true. (snip)
>
>
> I've never made such a claim, so have no response to any counter-claim.

You might want to take a look at the NCI and NCVEC petitions, for a
start on who is claiming what.
>
> > Skill in Morse Code, even at a very basic level, permits
> > amateurs to use radio equipment ranging from very simple
> > to highly advanced designs, and technologies of almost
> > any vintage. (snip)
>
> Skill in Morse Code is certainly not unique in that ability, Jim.

Actually, it is unique in that ability. What other mode permits a
skilled operator to extract so much on-air performance from such
simple equipment?

Last night I worked a ham in Mississippi on 40 CW. He was running a
homebrew 3 watt QRP transceiver of his own design and a simple wire
antenna. I was running my homebrew 100 watt Southgate Type 7
transceiver and inverted V. Good solid QSO, homebrew-to-homebrew. How
often does that happen on any other mode? How much performance would
you expect from a simple homebrew SSB transceiver of the same
complexity?

> In fact, almost any knowledge of radio would allow that.

What homebrew rig would you recommend to a newcomer with no
experience, few resources, but a great desire to learn?
>
> > Morse Code skill encourages amateurs to actually build
> > their own radio equipment by offering an easy first step,
> > and a growth path that leads to almost any usable
> > technology. (snip)
>
> With almost every commercial radio today equipped to transmit code, why

> would that be true?

It's true because there are folks who actually want to build radios with their own hands and heads, rather than buy them ready-made. Kinda like home-cooking, even though there are restaurants all over, and packaged foods of every description in the supermarkets.

Plus there's money to be saved. My current homebrew rig cost me less than $100 to build. How much of a used rig HF rig can you buy for under $100?

> Few today, even those with an interest in code, are
> building their own equipment. Instead, most are using the same type of
> equipment I've purchased.

And that's sad. In fact, it's a real problem for a service that FCC calls "fundamentally technical".

How can we say we're a "technical" radio service if we don't even design, build, repair or maintain our radios?

What does it matter if a ham knows how the DDS synthesizer in his Ikensu box works if, at the first sign of trouble, he packs it up and sends it to a service facility without even trying to fix it?
>
> > I speak from direct experience in amateur radio home
> > construction, having built my first amateur station at
> > age 13. (snip)
>
> How many 13 year old kids today, with or without a ham license, with or
> without code skills, are building their own radio equipment today?

I don't know - but there are some. One reason there aren't more is because of the de-emphasis of HF and CW as a starting point in the ARS.

You think an average motivated 13 year old couldn't build a simple CW rig today, put it on the air and make lots of contacts with it?
>
> > The removal of the Morse Code test from the Technician
> > class license has not resulted in a technical revolution in
> > amateur radio from newly-licensed "technically qualified"
> > amateurs. (snip)
>
> I didn't know the Technician license was supposed to lead to a technical
> revolution in anything, Jim.

That was one of the prime arguments for dropping the code test for Tech back in 1990, and it's one of the prime arguments for dropping it altogether today. You want me to quote chapter and verse from some petitions?

> Instead, I thought they were just supposed to
> participate in the same activities most other Amateur Radio operators are
> participating in. Why the unique expectation for Technician license holders
> alone?

Because there were *allegedly* all sorts of "technically qualified"
and "cutting edge" folks out there just itching to get a ham license
and usher in a brave new world of ham radio - except they were stopped
by the code test. Either they weren't interested in code or they
didn't have the time, or they refused to "jump through the code test
hoop".

So the code test was dropped and.....there was no revolution.

> > Instead, the continued progress in amateur technical efforts
> > continues to be mostly the result of work done by
> > experienced amateurs, even though the Technician class
> > license has not had a code test for more than 12 years.
>
> Which "amateur technical efforts" are you referring to, Jim? I must have
> missed something because I haven't seen much technical efforts from ANY of
> the operators I've met over the last few years, regardless of license class.

How about these:

- 24 GHz EME QSOs with small dishes and less than 100W
- APRS
- PSK-31 and other TOR modes
- WSJT and other software decoders
- SO2R software and hardware
- the Tayloe (N7VE) mixer

The last is my personal favorite. Ham thinks up a new use for an
interesting chip. Designs and builds a really high performance low
current drain direct-conversion HF transceiver around his idea to
verify the performance. Amazing results. Rig is simple enough for most
hams with a little soldering skill to replicate. Might even be a
patent involved in the thing.

What mode did he build his transceiver for? CW.

There was supposed to be a kit marketed, but AFAIK that hasn't
happened. No matter - there's enough info on the website (Red Hot
Radio) to build one from scratch.

Just think - a ham can build an honest-to-goodness rig (not a lab
experiment, not a curiousity) that will work lots of other hams. And
it has high-priced-rig performance for a tiny fraction of the price of
any store-bought set.

But you have to know Morse to be able to use the thing.

73 de Jim, N2EY

182. Re: GOOD NEWS-------France heat wave deaths top 14,000

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-02 23:58:24 UTC
From: Reg Edwards <g4fgq.regp@btinternet.com>
Message-ID: <blie2v$5bs$1@titan.btinternet.com>
Source record: 79758
Cross-posted to: alt.ham-radio.hf,alt.ham-radio.ssb,alt.radio.amateur,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

> > The death toll in France from August's
> > blistering heat wave was nearly 15,000 . . . .

==========

It must not be forgotten the health of French nation has considerable improved since August. The undoubted evidence for this is a much reduced death rate amongst the elderly which will last for several years.

The same sort of statistics apply to other countries which suffered from the heatwave but didn't bother to publish them, ie., for political reasons they kept it secret.

The French government should be congratulated on its honesty as it should be on other matters of international interest and importance.

Vive la France ! Vive l'Europe !

Reg, G4FGQ

183. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-03 00:15:44 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3F7CBFAE.9000500@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 79759

Blow Job wrote:

Nice troll handle.

>
>Not hard to quantify at all. Any ham that only knows CW to 5 WPM is a
>novice. New hams these days are all Novices. So the number of Novices on
>the bands are actually increasing. Ten-Four Good buddy?
>
>
>

>Well, how many CBers know 5WPM?
>
Well, I have a "novice-extra" license. And if I admit that I have
since forgotten my code, would that make me a CB-extra? :-)

>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>

184. Re: BPL endorsed by FCC, another threat to HF ham radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-03 00:20:08 UTC
From: Nomen Nescio <nobody@dizum.com>
Message-ID: <82efd2813892bbc126ccfb20e5d9bb39@dizum.com>
Source record: 79760
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

> From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>

> Tarapia Tapioco wrote:

>> my boss is a rabid right winger and you
>> can guess the rest.

> You're a rabid troll???

from http://bboard.scifi.com/bboard/browse.cgi/1/5/984/8099 :

troll v.,n. 1. To utter a posting on Usenet designed to
attract predictable responses or flames; or, the post itself.
Derives from the phrase "trolling for newbies" which in turn
comes from mainstream "trolling", a style of fishing in
which one trails bait through a likely spot hoping for a
bite. The well-constructed troll is a post that induces lots
of newbies and flamers to make themselves look even more
clueless than they already do, while subtly conveying to the
more savvy and experienced that it is in fact a
deliberate troll.

Sadly, no, I'm not a "troll". I wish the BPL issue was
frivolous,or that newbies were the only people I was trying
to reach. I meant what I said, albeit in an "over the top"
style, but my email was intended to wake people up and
generate intense debate, not to "troll for newbies".

This issue has hit me harder than anything
that's ever happended in ham radio, and all the more so
because I'm nearing retirement and have been putting
together an S-Line to enjoy when I have time. The ARRL
reports about how BPL wipes out HF have made me as mad
as hell, and I'm trying to convince other hams not to
take it anymore.

I admit my boss' antics have coloured my view of
the Republic party, but I think my opinion is
accurate, and that it reflects the viewpoint of
Mr. Powell and the other commissionars: that
anyone with a couple of million to throw around
can get whatever they want while George Bush Jr.
is still in power.

Criticize the message if you want - that's why
I put it out there - but please don't shoot the
messenger.

James Penn

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: GnuPG v1.0.7 (GNU/Linux)

iD8DBQE/fFjvRqMr0Iv3YZURArCOAKCOsucItPLa1shZrD9RAZgzzjk6zwCfY4nK
cxLRNokwKDXWqvIxUUrt3CU=
=W1tk
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----

185. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-03 00:29:48 UTC
From: Bert Craig <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM>
Message-ID: <0q3fb.19365$E95.3379202@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>
Source record: 79761

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@STOPearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:ogSeb.5217$f11.2312@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> "Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote:
> >
> > Of course you can quote your source for these assertions, yes?
>
>
> What assertions, Bert? This is a newsgroup discussion, not a courtroom.

The word assertion is not confined to a courteoom.

> > Amateur radio is all we're talking about, Dwight.
>
>
> For the reasons already stated several times, code testing cannot be
> discussed solely within the context of its use within the Amateur Radio
> Service. The FCC doesn't view it that way, therefore we cannot do so
either.

I believe it's the job of the majority to work on getting the FCC to view it
that way. (Assuming, of course, the majority are PCTA's. Your opinion may
differ.)

> > (snip) Instead it's morphed into an "international" movement,
> > the result of which will devalue AR as a whole. (snip)
>
>
> Nonsense. The entire rest of the radio world is moving, or has moved,
away
> from code/CW. If anything, our continued focus on that as a primary
element
> of this Service is what has devalued (and is devaluing) Amateur Radio.

I disagree...and BTW, it NOT a primary element.

> > I know I'd NEVER snub a licensed ARO OTA...but it'd be
> > foolish to believe that everybody will roll out the welcome
> > mat for known NCTA's. (Sad as it is.) Welcome to HF,
> > Dwight. Be careful what you wish for.
>
>
> Is that some kind of veiled threat, Bert? If so, feel free to snub me
all
> you want. Someone who would treat another person as unwelcomed over
> something as petty as the code testing issue is not someone I would want
to

> talk to anyway.

Puh-lease Dwight. Remember the "you're talking about me!" thread? No need to play paranoid with me. If I were going to snub you or anybody else, I'd tell you...CRT to CRT. HOWEVER, as the opening sentence of the paragraph states, it's not my style and it's just plain wrong. Cautioning someone of a possible hole in the road ahead is NOT akin to digging it. "Veiled threat," sheesh, Dwight. <ggg>

> > Try QRP, Dwight. You'll love it. Some of the newer antennas
> > are made to be used in just your situation and are no bigger
> > than VHF mobil antennas. There's also a special feeling of
> > accomplishment with making a contact with 2-1/2 Watts into
> > an "invisible" wire dipole or longwire strung temporarily
> > from a window.
>
>
> You don't know what my situation is, Bert.

Sorry, just making an assumption in an attempt to assist.

> I have considered the options
> available and find none of them to be very useful. An external antenna,
not
> matter how small, is out of the question. The same with alternative
antennas
> (hidden and so on). Because of the building materials used, an internal
> antenna is ineffective. The same with increased power output. I am not
aware
> of any solution that would be effective in my situation (other than
moving,
> which is also out of the question at the moment).

My job is like that. The building is really well shielded and I wanted to run an inconspicuous 30/40m SW+ QRP rig from my desk.

--
73 de Bert
WA2SI

186. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-03 01:18:50 UTC
From: Arnie Macy <kt4stnospam@csam.net>
Message-ID: <bliipu$cbsdv$1@ID-166180.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 79762

"N2EY" wrote ...

> > Emergency communications?

To a very small degree. Ask KT4ST - he's been there, done that.

This is true. Ben there, done that. Although Len likes to say that I work as a "local" Emergency Manager, the fact is that I am the Director of Emergency Management for two of the largest Military Installations east of the Mississippi. We serve a very large population and coordinate closely with multiple county EMA Directors. With that background in mind, we *do* use CW to some degree when conditions warrant. For example, in 1999 (for Hurricane Floyd) CW was used to communicate on HF when the conditions were too poor to use SSB. Once the conditions improved we went back to voice, which is always our primary mode. This is one of the reasons that I say every Ham should have a basic skill in CW. It just adds to their versatility in emergency communications.

Arnie -
KT4ST

187. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-03 01:29:14 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20031002212914.11022.00001136@mb-m14.aol.com>
Source record: 79763

In article <_ESeb.5224$f11.2993@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@STOPearthlinkSPAM.net> writes:

> More experienced and more qualified in what, Jim? Morse Code only, not as
>a ham operator. With the Technician license, the FCC has already established
>that Morse Code is not a qualification needed to be a ham radio operator.

Dwight:

Incorrect. The Technician class license infers that knowledge of Morse code isn't required to be an *entry-level* amateur radio operator. There are two higher classes which require a code test.

>Therefore, Morse Code cannot be used when deciding who is "more experienced"
>or "more qualified" as a ham radio operator.

Of course it can, since becoming a General- or Extra-class ham still requires a code test, and always has.

If and when the Element 1(a) code test is abolished, that will simply prove that the FCC has a low opinion of the ARS as a whole, and that it responds to political pressure -- i.e. petitions to remove code testing, and the comments
which support them.

73 de Larry, K3LT

188. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-03 01:42:05 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <Nt4fb.1230$qj6.1062976@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 79764

N2EY wrote:
> In article <K6Meb.876$qj6.800623@news1.news.adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo
> <mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:
>
>
>>>So why the sudden dropoff in new Techs?
>>>
>>>One definite possibility is the new Technician Q&A pool, which was
>>
>>introduced
>>
>>>on July 15th. The new pool has with 511 questions, while the old one had
>>
>>only
>>
>>>384 questions.
>>
>> Coupled with many prospective technicians possibly holding out until
>>they might not have to take a Morse code test?
>
>
> Maybe - but the Tech doesn't have a code test now! And the dropoff correlates
> exactly with the new question pool.

You prove my point, Jim! A person that might be going to take the
Technician test, might just think to wait so that they can get HF
priveliges right after their first test. Rather than take two tests,
they gamble that the Morse test will go away, then they only have to
take one test, one charge.

That is what I would do under the circumstances.

>>>Prior to the new pool, the average number of new Techs was about 1700 a
>>>month. Since then, it has dropped to less than 1000 per month.
>>>
>>>Maybe this is just a temporary thing - or maybe it isn't. The code test
>>>cannot
>>>be blamed for the drop because it's not a part of the Tech license
>>>requirements.
>>
>> Oh, I'll bet some try to blame it on that! 8^)
>>
>
> Of course!
>

> If/when the code test disappears, what will be the scapegoat for low growth?

At least among people who regularly post in here, the villans will be
the Pro coders are scaring potential hams away.

Here is another possibility. Now that the sunspot cycle is winding
down, the bands will get a lot quieter. Some who get their license may
wonder just what the big deal about the ARS is. They may not be a good
advertisement for Ham radio. There are some years coming that most of
the activity will be on 40 and up, and unless a person is using a
narrowband mode, they may not do a lot of communications on HF.

- Mike KB3EIA -

189. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-03 01:51:47 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <TC4fb.1233$qj6.1065105@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 79765

N2EY wrote:

> Suppose the new Q&A pool really is the cause of this dropoff. Will we
> see folks arguing that the writtens are stifling growth, turning
> people away, etc.?
> Will we see a movement to reduce (again) the level of written testing,
> the number of licenses, etc.?

I am inclined to say there will be a push to reduce requirements if that happens. At the moment, every issue seems to gravitate towards Morse CW requirement. This question needs revisited after the requirement is dropped, if it is dropped.

And my opinion is no, we shouldn't reduce the requirements.

- Mike KB3EIA -

190. Re: Isnt it Funny (No-Code HF Privileges)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-03 02:07:47 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <TR4fb.1243$qj6.1070336@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 79766

Dwight Stewart wrote:

> "Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote:
>
>>You're off by a few years. Back in the early 70's, I used
>>a CB in our company trucks, and there were plenty of
>>rulebreakers then. Most every time I had to buy parts
>>from a local, I got to see their overheight towers and
>>linear amps.
>
>
>
> Addressed in my reply to Jim.

That CB became well know in the later 70's is not in doubt, but since my job in the early 70's required me to travel on the highways a lot, I can ensure you that it had the "outlaw persona" even at that time. Over the road, the Tuckers sounded very much like they do today, and the boys running their linears were so very much like they are now. The biggest difference was they used a different channel than 19. Know what it was?

- Mike KB3EIA -

191. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-03 02:14:20 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <0Y4fb.1247$qj6.1071405@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 79767

Dee D. Flint wrote:

> In today's society, it is politically incorrect to consider one person
> better than another in almost any field regardless of how much they know in
> that field and how little the other person knows.

I suppose if you talk to teenagers it is. My environment is quite
cognizant of education, knowledge and accomplishment.

- Mike KB3EIA -

192. Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-03 02:30:40 UTC
From: Clint <"rattlehead at computron dot net">
Message-ID: <vnpnqt9lfbusa8@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 79768

When they drop the morse code test requirement, it's
fairly clear to me they just won't "drop" it all by
itself with a stroke of an administrative pen; I imagine it
will accompany other changes in the license structure...
what do you think will also change in the licensing
system when the drop the morse code test?

Clint
KB5ZHT

193. Re: Some thoughtful comments from another forum on the code/nocode debate

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-03 02:43:31 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <blinoj$2t9$0@208.206.142.112>
Source record: 79769

Hans K0HB wrote:
> Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com> wrote
>
>
>>..... strange that you would attach no importance
>>to how a ham got his license.
>
>
> Where did you dig up that gem of mis-information? You really must be
> on some chemical --- perhaps your diet Pepsi has been spiked.
>

So why the fixation on controlled substance? You find something that
interested you and now you're trying a transfer?

Your meaning wasn't the least bit obscure, however you spin it
after the fact. What you said means the same as "hard earned dollars
spend just the same as the easy".

Did you never hear the term "Easy come, easy go"? It sure applies here.

> I have simply pointed out that the path to an amateur license is not
> (and never has been) particularly strenuous, and in most cases is a
> pretty modest accomplishment.

You seem to have insisted on taking a pretty obscure route to get
there. And that isn't true at all for most hams, at least it wasn't the
case for most hams before the big ease-up in testing and requirements.
Not everyone has a technical nor engineering education. If you did
you can count your blessings. Not everyone was that fortunate.
As a 14 year old I sure wasn't. 13 years later at Extra time
I had a much better background, but I sure wouldn't call that test
session trivial by any means.

Even with the
"reform", the question pools, and dead-easy CW tests most applicants
have to work at it. It's doable, and with the test system in place
today it IS dead easy, so in that respect you're right. 5wpm and a
handful of quesions, with all the exact answers given in advance, with
most of them easy memorizing of rules and procedures- yep, you're right,
today even Extra is a snap. So I guess we should just send in a boxtop
coupon, all filled out and call that a test.

The entire ARS is one LOOOONG step closer to extinction, or more likely
closer to sounding like that vast wastland above 27 mhz.

It's what happens AFTER you qualify for
> a license which counts.
>

You might want to run that one past the FCC. Seems they couldn't care
less what you do afterward so long as you don't call negative attention
to yourself. And they DO pass out the licenses, you know.

> "Reality doesn't care what you believe."

Good luck on recognizing it. IMO you're not doing all that well so far.

194. Re: Appalling...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-03 02:58:41 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@STOPearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <BB5fb.13647$f11.9485@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 79770

"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote:
>
> "Dwight Stewart" writes:
> > I haven't purchased a program like that recently, but
> > surely they've gotten better over the years. Is that not
> > the case?
>
> They have, but the mighty morsemen consider such to
> be desecrations of the will of the old radio gods.

Well, I suspected the programs might have gotten at least somewhat better over the years. The author of the program I had wrote about trying to compensate for bad code by looking for patterns instead of focusing on each individual dot and dash as it was being sent. The program also didn't use hard rules for dot, dash, and space, length, instead interpretating each as it went along. Obviously, I don't know the details, but the program did do a pretty good job considering it was just a simple programming example included with an operating system. My only complaint was that it didn't send code like some of the other programs advertised, but I couldn't have used that back then anyway.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

195. Re: Isnt it Funny (No-Code HF Privileges)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-03 03:11:04 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@STOPearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <cN5fb.13663$f11.6821@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 79771

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote:
>
> That CB became well know in the later 70's is not in doubt,
> but since my job in the early 70's required me to travel on
> the highways a lot, I can ensure you that it had the "outlaw
> persona" even at that time. (snip)

I don't think I said it didn't, Mike. Instead, I'm pretty sure I said CB "went to h*ell in a handbasket" after the Hollywood movies of the time. Is there some conflict in that? Do you not agree that CB increased on popularily dramatically after those movies and that problems increased dramatically as a result of that growth? That increased popularity was the final nail in the coffen of civilized CB. Unless there is some conflict I don't see, I stand by what I originally said.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

196. Re: GOOD NEWS-------France heat wave deaths top 14,000

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-03 03:24:13 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <xZ5fb.9698$n73.4287@news01.roc.ny>
Source record: 79772
Cross-posted to: alt.ham-radio.hf,alt.ham-radio.ssb,alt.radio.amateur,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Hello, Reg

Well, I'm sure you'll get some flames on that comment, but it sure is nice to hear some honesty once in a while. I've read comments carried in news organizations some years ago. A number of Europeans were appalled by the number of homeless in the United States. Oh, some of the "conservatives" have broadcast a lot of hot air and some folks will call anyone disagreeing with their position "card - carrying - liberals", but the fact is there has to be some reasonable compromise to keep as many folks happy as possible. Also, it is necessary for any civilized nation to provide some level of support for those citizens unable to take care of themselves. Mind me, I am not saying that we are or are not doing that toady. However, it is fortunate that we have a very powerful weapon here. It is called the vote. If enough folks get upset, it will show despite the 30 second sound bites and handshaking LOL :)

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

"Reg Edwards" <g4fgq.regp@btinternet.com> wrote in message
news:blie2v$5bs$1@titan.btinternet.com...
>
> > > The death toll in France from August's
> > > blistering heat wave was nearly 15,000 . . . .
>
> ============================
>
> It must not be forgotten the health of French nation has considerable
> improved since August. The undoubted evidence for this is a much reduced
> death rate amongst the elderly which will last for several years.
>
> The same sort of statistics apply to other countries which suffered from
the
> heatwave but didn't bother to publish them, ie., for political reasons
they
> kept it secret.
>
> The French government should be congratulated on its honesty as it should
be
> on other matters of international interest and importance.
>
> Vive la France ! Vive l'Europe !
> ----

> Reg, G4FGQ
>
>
>

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.522 / Virus Database: 320 - Release Date: 9/29/03

197. Re: GOOD NEWS-------France heat wave deaths top 14,000

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-03 03:26:07 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <j%5fb.9699$_a3.9456@news01.roc.ny>
Source record: 79773
Cross-posted to: alt.ham-radio.hf,alt.ham-radio.ssb,alt.radio.amateur,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

I might inquire if you believe that the administration has been totally honest in its' appraisal of Iraq's weapons of mass destruction. Hmmm ... it may indeed be honest; it may not. All of the information is not in and I doubt it ever will be.

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

"helmsman" <helmsmandelete@mindspring.com> wrote in message news:5rfpnv41be011u842rkv6f1iv9lgfjt4pk@4ax.com...
> "Reg Edwards" <g4fgq.regp@btinternet.com> wrote:
>
>
> >The French government should be congratulated on its honesty as it should be
> >on other matters of international interest and importance.
> >
> >Vive la France ! Vive l'Europe !
> >----
> >Reg, G4FGQ
> >
> >
> BWHAAAAAAAAAAAHAAAAAAAAAAAAAHAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
> .
>
>
> .
> Don't buy goods made in France or Germany and vacation somewhere else!

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.522 / Virus Database: 320 - Release Date: 9/29/03

198. Re: Bootlegging in 1948?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-03 03:26:20 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031002232620.12300.00000900@mb-m20.aol.com>
Source record: 79774

In article <20031002160529.21642.00001373@mb-m01.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com
(Len Over 21) writes:

>In article <20031002055407.23171.00001177@mb-m05.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com
>(N2EY)
>writes:
>
>>In article <20031002001355.29660.00000894@mb-m24.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com
>>(Len Over 21) writes:
>>
>>> I have never used "Avery Fine" as a screen name.
>>
>>Yes, you have. Here's just one example - there are more.
>
> I stand corrected.

Well, there you have it ;-)

> Three and a half years ago AOL still had a limit on
> the number of characters in a screen name.
>
Irrelevant.

> Once that limit was changed to a longer string, I cancelled the "Avery
> Fine" screen name and changed it to my old Sysop handle of "Avery
> Fineman" used many years ago before the Internet went public.

Irrelevant.

> LATER,
> someone picked up on that particular screen name of "Avery Fine" and
> used it as soon as the six-month time was up. The same is true of
> "No CW Test" screenname...which I cancelled and someone else used
> after it was available.

Irrelevant.

> At NO time have I ever tried to disguise my legal name or address or
> location by adopting some false personna.

It's spelled "persona", Len. In the quoted post, you do not mention your name,
address, or other identifiers. Just "Avery Fine" and nothing else. Some people
would say that you were trying to conceal your identity. But your hostile
persona comes through....
>
> Yet you GRASP AT STRAWS in trying to light up a Flame War to
> satisfy your childish pique in here.

"Childish pique"? You're the one shouting, calling names, making fun of other people's jobs, military and government service, education, technical achievements, geographic location, gender and sexual orientation. Pretty childish stuff you post here. Like rewriting the reference line of that quoted post so that Dave Heil's name becomes 'Sig Heil'. Really mature stuff, Len old boy.

Me, I'm simply correcting your mistakes. You said you never used a certain screen name, and I proved you to be mistaken. In error. Wrong. Incorrect.

Live with it.

> Tsk, tsk, don't play with matches...
> there are others here who have flamethrowers and you could get
> severely burned.
>
Sounds like a threat. That's at least two so far.

It is clear you wish to kill the messenger, for the unspeakable crime of telling the truth and proving you to be in error.
>
>>>(apparently). The US amateur radio community does not
>>>grant licenses...nor does it "rule" on the "motivations" it
>>>thinks citizens have in regards to radio licenses. You
>>>seem to think that you "know" everything about those
>>>who post contrary opinions to yours. Have fun in your
>>>self-important ignorance, go ahead and post more of
>>>your "hate" allegations as if you represent the entire
>>>US ARS community. I don't care to message with
>>>you further (as if I ever did to your libelous postings),
>>>Herr Standartenfuhrer. I'm going to a college reunion.
>>>QRT.
>>
>>didit
>>
>>END QUOTE
>
> The college reunion was in the midwest in 2000, my wife's
> college class. Rainy, dreary, but a fun event formally and
> socially.

Irrelevant.
>
> I'm sorry you have to pollute the contents in here with bringing
> up THREE YEAR OLD (PLUS) arguments to satisfy your
> apparent "need" to get back at your perceived pique.

"Pollute the contents"? How?

Here are some of your own words, from that post:

"Sig Heil"

"Herr Standartenfuhrer"

"Poor baby."

"Herr Heil"

"four-neuroned-brain Heil"

"national socialist partei one-by-twos"

"libelous postings"

"Herr Standartenfuhrer."

And you say I "pollute the contents"?

You made a statement and I proved you to be wrong. Grow up a little.
>
> Try living in the here and now instead of constantly going back
> to the past. You are not salving old word wounds by going back to
> the past, only re-opening your own wounds for more hurt. Tsk, tsk.
>
You can always just hide your head in the sand and killfile my posts, Len. No problem.

199. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-03 03:26:21 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031002232621.12300.00000901@mb-m20.aol.com>
Source record: 79775

In article <20031002092836.13251.00000120@mb-m24.aol.com>, wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) writes:

>>There's been a lot of that.
>>(As an "old" techplus with full general written credit and 5 wpm
>>credit, I simply had to take the extra written to upgrade all the way.
>>I'm sure there were lots of similarly situated folks who also upgraded,
>>either as a "paper upgrade", with no test, to general, of as I did by
>>taking the extra written.)
>>
>>Carl - wk3c
>>
>
>Yea and it took you over a year to pass it, I guess it wasnt just the Code
>Test
>that kept you back.
>
Carl got a post-restructuring Extra

Bruce got a post-restructuring Extra

Carl does not make fun of Bruce's amateur license

Bruce makes fun of Carl's amateur license.

Carl does not distinguish between "real hams" and others.

Bruce says a sizable percentage of amateurs are not "real hams".

Carl is actively trying to defeat the threat of BPL.

Bruce doesn't give a damn about BPL.

Who should we respect and thank, and who should we despise and ignore?

Once upon a time, I was a new Novice, struggling with 5 wpm code and a simple homebrew station. Was I not a "real ham" back then?

Once upon a time, I was a Technician, having a great time working 6 meter AM on Field Day with the local club. Was I not a "real ham" back then?

73 de Jim, N2EY

who does not make fun of anyone's amateur license

200. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-03 03:28:25 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <t16fb.1278$qj6.1085362@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 79776

Clint wrote:

> When they drop the morse code test requirement, it's
> fairly clear to me they just won't "drop" it all by
> itself with a stroke of an administrative pen; I imagine it
> will accompany other changes in the license structure...
> what do you think will also change in the licensing
> system when the drop the morse code test?

This is the biggest reason that I believe it will take quite a while to remove the Morse test. There will probably be a lot of changes that need to be discussed and made, if the licensing structure is to make any sense.

My earlier prediction was 4 years in a "guess the drop time" contest we started earlier in the year.

I would guess that we will have either two or three classes, as we do now:

The technician license will probably be very similar to what it is now. I don't know that any significant changes will be made.

The HF licenses are a much murkier area.

If there were to be only two license classes, my wish would be that the testing regimen would be more or less what the Extra is now.

But there may be some resistance to that, and it is understandable. There is no reason not to have an entry level HF license similar to the General.

I tend toward two license classes, but don't have any strong feelings against three.

Testing......

The multiple guess format is probably here to stay. I don't think it is as bad as some say. Reading the answers in a textbook or reading them in multiple choice format is all the same to me. It took me a week of fairly steady study to get ready for the exam. The way they get you to learn is to have a lot of questions, and only test on a few.

And as a fairly new Extra, I can say that those answers don't always show up in the same abcd order as they do in the question pools. So you really do have to know an answer.

I would like to see the tests a little more in depth (note I don't say harder) with more operation questions. Perhaps even a post-test booklet

with good operating procedures. I really needed this after passing my general. I had some small HF experience from contesting with the club, but contesting etiquette and everyday etiquette are two very different things.

My biggest hope is that we take the time to make a good system, and not come up with some Byzantine mess.

- Mike KB3EIA -

201. Re: Isnt it Funny (No-Code HF Privileges)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-03 03:34:09 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <R66fb.1280$qj6.1086535@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 79777

Dwight Stewart wrote:

> "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote:
>
>>That CB became well know in the later 70's is not in doubt,
>>but since my job in the early 70's required me to travel on
>>the highways a lot, I can ensure you that it had the "outlaw
>>persona" even at that time. (snip)
>
>
>
> I don't think I said it didn't, Mike. Instead, I'm pretty sure I said CB
> "went to h*ell in a handbasket" after the Hollywood movies of the time. Is
> there some conflict in that? Do you not agree that CB increased on
> popularily dramatically after those movies and that problems increased
> dramatically as a result of that growth? That increased popularity was the
> final nail in the coffen of civilized CB. Unless there is some conflict I
> don't see, I stand by what I originally said.

I just say it went there some years earlier than you believe it did. I
was there and listening.

- Mike KB3EIA -

202. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-03 03:35:36 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@STOPearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <c86fb.13685$f11.8383@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 79778

"Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote:
>
> I believe it's the job of the majority to work on getting
> the FCC to view it that way. (Assuming, of course, the
> majority are PCTA's. Your opinion may differ.)

But to do so would require the FCC to change the way it has viewed Amateur Radio almost since its creation. If we argue that we're just another radio service (like CB), with no connection to anything outside Amateur Radio (other radio services, etc), then the argument supporting our massive frequencies is sharply weakened. The emergency communications aspect is not enough to support that because we can do that with far less frequencies (a few frequencies on each band, with perhaps far less bands). We have to be very careful here that we don't cut our leg off in the process of trying to save the foot (or, in this case, CW testing).

> My job is like that. The building is really well shielded
> and I wanted to run an inconspicuous 30/40m SW+
> QRP rig from my desk.

We took this apartment (paid for by the VA) to allow my wife to easily attend school just down the street. Sadly, there is enough metal in this building to build a few dozen Army tanks. Even worse, the apartment is directly above the owner's apartment and he likes to spend a great amount of time outdoors on the patios out back (the front is directly above the office entrance). I've tried several homebrew internal antennas, but none of them would allow me to consistently hit a repeater just a few miles away. We're hoping that, once the owner gets used to us, he'll eventually allow a small antenna. But, as it is now, the only way to talk on the radio at home is to walk out onto the balcony (and the metal in the building even effects that).

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

203. Re: Amateur radio in television and movies (was Re: Isnt it Funny

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-03 03:37:55 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031002233755.01893.00000968@mb-m22.aol.com>
Source record: 79782

In article <864qyr71u0.fsf_-_@duchess.twilley.org>, Jack Twilley
<jmt+usenet@twilley.org> writes:

>=2D----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
>Hash: SHA1
>
>>>>>> "Len" =3D=3D Len Over <lenover21@aol.com> writes:
>
>[...]
>
>Len> SO, WHERE ARE ALL THE MOVIES AND TV SHOWS FEATURING AMATEUR
>Len> RADIO...AND ESPECIALLY MORSE CODE?
>
>Where are all the movies and television shows featuring normal
>families with normal marriages and normal children? Where are all the
>movies and television shows featuring normal employees working for
>normal employers? Normal is boring. Conflict is exciting.

Yes, yes, tell us more about "how to score big in TV and moom
pitchas." Shall we hang around the Writer's and Producer's building
at the intersection of Magnolia Blvd and Hollywood Way in Burbank?

The Academy of Television Arts and Sciences isn't too far from there
on Lankershim Blvd.

"Everybody Loves Raymond" is well-liked in the entertainment
community here and respected for turning out good programs.
There's no equivalent show, such as "Everyone Loves Morse Code."
Work on that. You might have next year's Emmy Awards sweeps.

>American culture considers CB radio to be used mostly for evading
>speed-traps.

Only from "Smokey and the Bandit." Try "Flatbed Annie and
Sweetie-Pie," a 2-hour special for TV starring Annie Potts
(before "Designing Women" long-run sitcom) and Kim Darby
(after "True Grit" - the movie - and long after TOS Star Trek's
"Miri" where she was the title character).

>This illustrates a basic conflict (man versus society)
>which is featured in forms of entertainment predating the Trojan war,
>let alone CB radio. This particular conflict also appeals to the
>American mind-set of bending the rules and avoiding punishment.

"We Americans" have such a "mind-set?" I don't think so.

Perhaps the SWINE (Students Wildly Indignant about Nearly
Everything) have such an attitude but NOT the mainstream.

Anything out of the ordinary is suitable for conflict. I'd say that
something like code-lovers trying to put across their favorite mode
as "superior" in the year 2003 easily qualifies for CONFLICT! :-)

>Amateur radio is used for extending the state of the art, for
>expressing international goodwill, and for emergency communications.

"State of the art" - for advancing the radio art of the 1930s, yes.

"Expressing international goodwill" - Highly debateable considering
the multitude of WARS that have existed all over the world since only
the past half-century following the end of WW2. Go into any Almanac
and count the hundreds of armed conflicts and then correlate that to
the involved countries having amateur radio licensees. NOT a good
analogy.

"For emergency communications" - limited largely to Health and
Welfare messaging not involving the REAL emergencies nearly always
handled by the REAL professionals. The viewing public looking at news
and Special Reports can see for themselves that the Pros are very
involved...there is almost NO video-audio carried of the "noble, valiant
battles" of the amateur radio community to do any ACTUAL emergency
communications.

>The first two make for bad theater, but the last has potential.

The "last" has zero potential except for very fictionalized scenarios.

>Movies and television shows have been created around this type of
>topic for quite some time, with man versus nature being the most
>relevant conflict in this case.

Not quite correct. Try man versus man for conflict scenarios as the
top. That would be correct.

"Seventh Heaven" and "Joan of Arcadia" don't fit your conflict profile.
"Leave it to Beaver" didn't and neither did "Father Knows Best"

>Amateur radio is usually only used
>when normal communications systems are unavailable.

Where? I can only think of one and that was quite some time ago,
"The French Atlantic Affair" a special movie for TV that was
DRASTICALLY rewritten for TV from a fairly good novel about hijacking
an ocean liner.

>This doesn't
>exactly happen on a weekly basis, so it'd be difficult to make a
>television show based on this scenario. As for a movie, well,
>the potential is there, but I haven't seen it used effectively. It
>was a gimmick in _Frequency_ but personally I'd rather see something
>like the story of the operators lost from Mount St. Helens, or maybe a

>disaster flick covering The Big One out here in California.

There was an actual event of climbers rescued on Mt. Ranier through the aid of a pre-teen gal hearing the climbing party calling for help on an FRS handheld. That was in the northwest papers a couple years ago and even a brief TV clip. Didn't involve amateur radio.

Which quake in California did you want to feature? I was right here for the 1994 Northridge quake. Not a single bit about amateur radio doing valiant and glorious "emergency comms" when the entire electric power supply for 10 million folks got cut off. The pros were all set for such an event and did their best from the first tremblors...they were equipped and trained and constantly drilled for it.

>Oh, yeah, Morse code. I got a kick out of the satellite scenes in
>_Enemy of the State_. Dahdidahdit dahdadidah.

Good action movie but I don't remember any "CQ" calls in that...a conflict about man v. other men with differing political ideals and the power brokers in high places all trying to "get" a single man. Wish fulfillment. Well-done flick, held the audience to the end.

"The French Atlantic Affair" was a good, "tight" adventure novel with a new twist on hostage-taking (the entire crew and passengers of an ocean liner) by some self-styled terrorists who were not Arabic in any way. To some its scenes of sex and drugs were over the top. It did have the advantage (for PCTAs) of saving all on the ship through ham morse code contacts from one of the passengers via a ham in L.A. who had contacts with Rand Corporation experts in chemistry and medicine. A bit far-out but less so that Tom Clancy's work. The novel was the work of a licensed radio amateur.

In the mystery of evolution of novels to TV, "The French Atlantic Affair" got a thoroughly abominable rewrite to much, much less than the premise of the novel...the hams doing the sneaky communications behind the terrorist's backs were changed to young pubescent kiddies (both of whom had 1x2 callsigns). A terrible dissapointment to anyone who had read the novel. It could be made into a 2 hour, 10 minute motion picture with the main points and characters relatively intact from the original. It would be far better than the pap it turned into on TV (a sort of "Love Boat" with more nasties than usual). It would have shown amateur radio to be a true (though fictional) hero in the story.

No PCTA seems to have read the novel. Maybe the sex turned them off? :-)

LHA

204. Re: Some thoughtful comments from another forum on the code/nocode

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-03 03:37:56 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031002233756.01893.00000969@mb-m22.aol.com>
Source record: 79779

In article <blh2nv$8mr$0@208.206.142.91>, Dick Carroll
<dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com> writes:

>about as
>> lightweight as your military communications experience.
>
>But- not even the Hindenberg was as light as your ham radio experience!

Gas bags like yourself wanting company?

205. Re: Appalling...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-03 03:37:57 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031002233757.01893.00000970@mb-m22.aol.com>
Source record: 79781

In article <blfvngmqr0@208.207.71.164>, Dick Carroll
<dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com> writes:

>If you only had but a small portion of a clue you'd know that most
>habd-sent CW not only *can* but WILL "thwart" most consumer grade
>computer receive programs.

What is "habd-sent CW?" :-)

You HAVE evaluated "most" computer morse programs and "proved"
your banana-boat swing can "thwart" them, senior? :-)

> I rather suspect some more sophisticated writings do a lot better.

I rather suspect you know NOTHING of the abilities of computer
programs' abilities for receiving morse.

Please send your gas-baggery to Lakehurst, NJ.

beep, beep, BOOM! :-)

206. Re: Lennie's Double Standard Once Again Revealed...BY Lennie!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-03 03:37:59 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031002233759.01893.00000971@mb-m22.aol.com>
Source record: 79780

In article <O0Leb.837$qj6.777170@news1.news.adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo
<mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:

>Brian wrote:
>> k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
>news:<5c01b95b.0310010040.452d084c@posting.google.com>...
>>
>>>"Clint" <rattlehead at computron dot net> wrote in message
>news:<vnk8gbsap9td88@corp.supernews.com>...
>>>
>>>>Generally the PCTA crowd has been putting most of the
>>>>people who challenge thier position and willing to debate
>>>>thier points on thier killfiles. Sounds pretty much like it
>>>>is they, not the NCTA, that can handle the scrutiny
>>>>and are therefore obviously on thin ice.
>>>
>>>
>>> Well, Clint...As foolish as it may have been, Brain was straight
>>>up enough to "admit" that Lennie was his "mentor"...His words, not
>>>mine.
>>
>>
>> Len was willing to go the distance w/o letting all the bullying and
>> worse deter him. In that respect, Len is my mentor.
>>
>> You, Steve Robeson, will not run me off the group. Nor will your
>> Cronies.

> Just what is a crony (ies)? Some donut kinda thing?

From nearly any common dictionary -

Crony - a close friend. derivation from the Greek "kronos"

Plural form is "cronies."

Besides much else, what would you like help on in English?

LHA

207. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-03 03:38:01 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031002233801.01893.00000972@mb-m22.aol.com>
Source record: 79783

In article <c2356669.0310021416.6837c88b@posting.google.com>, N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) writes:

>"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@STOPearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message >news:<VGxeb.259$f11.59@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
>> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote:
>> >
>> > Some claim that Morse Code testing is at odds with
>> > the purpose of the amateur radio service as a
>> > fundamentally technical service. But in the practical
>> > experience of thousands of amateurs, the opposite
>> > is true. (snip)
>>
>>
>> I've never made such a claim, so have no response to any counter-claim.
>
>You might want to take a look at the NCI and NCVEC petitions, for a
>start on who is claiming what.
>>
>> > Skill in Morse Code, even at a very basic level, permits
>> > amateurs to use radio equipment ranging from very simple
>> > to highly advanced designs, and technologies of almost
>> > any vintage. (snip)
>>
>> Skill in Morse Code is certainly not unique in that ability, Jim.
>
>Actually, it is unique in that ability. What other mode permits a
>skilled operator to extract so much on-air performance from such
>simple equipment?
>
>Last night I worked a ham in Mississippi on 40 CW. He was running a
>homebrew 3 watt QRP transceiver of his own design and a simple wire
>antenna. I was running my homebrew 100 watt Southgate Type 7
>transceiver and inverted V. Good solid QSO, homebrew-to-homebrew. How
>often does that happen on any other mode? How much performance would
>you expect from a simple homebrew SSB transceiver of the same
>complexity?

Whatever happened to the beloved Elecraft kit? Fail to work?

>> In fact, almost any knowledge of radio would allow that.
>
>What homebrew rig would you recommend to a newcomer with no
>experience, few resources, but a great desire to learn?

A used 10 meter transceiver developed from a CB rig.

Push-to-talk, release to listen, only voice needed (no hours and hours
of practice at morse). Lots of jargon and phrases to learn to avoid the
catcalls from the traditionalists in hamlingo.

Such transceivers have a two-decade maturity of existance, are fairly
standard in structure/architecture.

>> > Morse Code skill encourages amateurs to actually build
>> > their own radio equipment by offering an easy first step,
>> > and a growth path that leads to almost any usable
>> > technology. (snip)
>>
>> With almost every commercial radio today equipped to transmit code, why
>> would that be true?
>
>It's true because there are folks who actually want to build radios
>with their own hands and heads, rather than buy them ready-made. Kinda
>like home-cooking, even though there are restaurants all over, and
>packaged foods of every description in the supermarkets.

Lots of KITS on the market still, aren't there?

>Plus there's money to be saved. My current homebrew rig cost me less
>than $100 to build. How much of a used rig HF rig can you buy for
>under $100?

$100 at what year's earnings? Have you priced vacuum tube replacements
these days?

>> Few today, even those with an interest in code, are
>> building their own equipment. Instead, most are using the same type of
>> equipment I've purchased.
>
>And that's sad. In fact, it's a real problem for a service that FCC
>calls "fundamentally technical".

I do wish you PCTA would get your acts together. The status quo
traditionalist and resident mysoginist Roll says it is "all about
operating!. You say it's all about "technical building."

>How can we say we're a "technical" radio service if we don't even
>design, build, repair or maintain our radios?

From any sort of inspection of the photographs of various amateur
radio "shacks" of the last three decades, the vast majority use
ready-built equipment.

Solid-state radios don't need their tubes changed.

>What does it matter if a ham knows how the DDS synthesizer in his
>Ikensu box works if, at the first sign of trouble, he packs it up and
>sends it to a service facility without even trying to fix it?

What's your problem? I thought you said yesterday you were this
big mentor in ham radio. Why aren't you out there TEACHING all
these newcomers all about the radio technical arts?

>> > I speak from direct experience in amateur radio home
>> > construction, having built my first amateur station at
>> > age 13. (snip)
>>
>> How many 13 year old kids today, with or without a ham license, with or
>> without code skills, are building their own radio equipment today?
>
>I don't know - but there are some. One reason there aren't more is
>because of the de-emphasis of HF and CW as a starting point in the
>ARS.

Tsk, tsk, tsk. At age 20 I was made responsible for operating and
maintaining top-of-the-line (for 1953) high-power HF transmitters (three
dozen of them) that DID NOT USE any morse code modes.

>You think an average motivated 13 year old couldn't build a simple CW
>rig today, put it on the air and make lots of contacts with it?

Why are you so FIXATED on the ONLY WAY a newcmer can get
started in ham radio is to be a young teenager?

Are you afraid that those older than teen years will realize what a farce
the start-simple-at-CW thinking of the 1930s is in the year 2003?

>> > The removal of the Morse Code test from the Technician
>> > class license has not resulted in a technical revolution in
>> > amateur radio from newly-licensed "technically qualified"
>> > amateurs. (snip)
>>
>> I didn't know the Technician license was supposed to lead to a technical
>> revolution in anything, Jim.
>
>That was one of the prime arguments for dropping the code test for
>Tech back in 1990, and it's one of the prime arguments for dropping it
>altogether today. You want me to quote chapter and verse from some
>petitions?

Feel free. I'd like to see those myself.

I've not seen any "petition" having "chapter and verse." Sounds like
you are very disturbed at some heretical ideas replacing the morse
religion of pre-WW2 times (as published in the hymals of the Church
of St.Hiram.

>> Instead, I thought they were just supposed to
>> participate in the same activities most other Amateur Radio operators are
>> participating in. Why the unique expectation for Technician license holders
>> alone?
>
>Because there were *allegedly* all sorts of "technically qualified"

>and "cutting edge" folks out there just itching to get a ham license
>and usher in a brave new world of ham radio - except they were stopped
>by the code test. Either they weren't interested in code or they
>didn't have the time, or they refused to "jump through the code test
>hoop".

Well, SOMEONE had to mention had to mention technical advances
in amateur radio by other than the USERS of ready-built gear.

Lord knows there were NOT a lot of "cutting edge" stuff from the old-
timers carrying on their love affairs with on-off keying codes.

Yes, Dan Tayloe did a very good advancement in one small sliver
of low-powe radio technology and HE deserves the credit, not "CW."

When used with a polyphase audio network it works excellently as a
very high IP3 direct-conversion QRP SSB receiver. NO morse code
required.

But, you state that the Tayloe mixer was coneived JUST for morse
code reception. That's patently false (Dan has his patent application
in and waiting...which can sometimes be 3 years).

We ALL KNOW in here that you are a code fanatic, Sheriff Jimmie.
All the proselyte text is clogging everyone's HD. Try to remove the
blinders and realize that all DO NOT think as you do of the "excellency
of morsemanship" a la the 1930s standards and practices.

LHA

208. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-03 03:43:19 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@STOPearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <rf6fb.13697$f11.3887@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 79784

"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote:
>
> BS, first they dont Study, or even know the Basic Material.
> All they do is Memorize some Q&As, and then take a test
> on material they know nothing about.

Perhaps that's what you did, Bruce. But just because you did it that way doesn't mean others did. I studied for the test, fully understood the concepts, and took the test with the confidence of knowing and understanding the material presented.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

209. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-03 03:45:34 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031002234534.28295.00000326@mb-m12.aol.com>
Source record: 79785

>I imagine it
>will accompany other changes in the license structure...
>what do you think will also change in the licensing
>system when the drop the morse code test?
>
>Clint
>KB5ZHT
>

What ever the License change will be, the written will become even easier.

210. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-03 03:49:56 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031002234956.28295.00000327@mb-m12.aol.com>
Source record: 79786

>Carl got a post-restructuring Extra
>
>

After a Year of failing it.

>Bruce got a post-restructuring Extra

And $250.00 from from some Dumb Cbers

>Bruce makes fun of Carl's amateur license.

Because Carls License isnt worth the pasper its printed on.

>Carl does not distinguish between "real hams" and others.

ThaTs because Karl doesnt know the difference

>Bruce says a sizable percentage of amateurs are not "real hams".

Just the New ones

>Carl is actively trying to defeat the threat of BPL.

Thats a Joke

>Bruce doesn't give a damn about BPL.

THATS TRUE

211. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-03 03:51:35 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031002235135.28295.00000328@mb-m12.aol.com>
Source record: 79787

>We have to be
>very careful here that we don't cut our leg off in the process of trying to
>save the foot (or, in this case, CW testing).

Its to late the legs are already gone.

212. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-03 04:10:29 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@STOPearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <VE6fb.13712$f11.12477@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 79788

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote:
>
> The same argument can be used for Smith charts since
> Techs are not required to learn that either.

Its not an argument about whether one is required to learn something. The issue is what makes one person "more qualified" or "more experienced" AS A HAM RADIO OPERATOR than another person. Now, unless the Smith charts become the sole criterior for that judgement, the total sum of what it takes to be a ham radio operator, the premise that one person is "more qualified" or "more experienced" as a ham radio operator simply because he knows the Smith charts is flatly wrong.

> Morse code is a skill used in amateur radio so someone
> who knows it is a more qualified operator than someone
> who doesn't whether or not it is a required skill. Just as
> knowing how to use a Smith chart makes one more
> qualified.

Likewise, Morse code is not the sole criterior for juding whether a person is "more qualified" or "more experienced" as a ham radio operator either. Therefore, the very premise behind your statement is fundamentally flawed. Since Morse Code is no longer required to be a ham radio operator (note the 200,000 Techs), it is absurd to judge someone as "less qualified" or "less experienced" as a ham radio operator simply because that person doesn't know Morse code.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

213. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-03 04:33:20 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@STOPearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <k_6fb.13732$f11.6792@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 79789

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote:
>
> The inescapable, logical conclusion that results is this: Having
> Morse code skills makes a ham more experienced and more
> qualified as an amateur radio operator - all else being equal.

You're "all else being equal" disclaimer is silly, Jim. When talking about human beings, there is never a time when all else is equal. Regardless, by your logic, all else being equal, since I've posted more messages in this ham radio-related newsgroup than most (perhaps even you), and computers are used in connection with ham radio to send similar messages, that alone makes me "more qualified" and "more experienced" AS A HAM RADIO OPERATOR than most (perhaps even you). Of course, that very premise is absurd, isn't it? And your premise is equally absurd. In my opinion, only a truly desperate person would grasp at a tiny thread like this to support a claim that they're "more experienced" or "more qualified" than someone else.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

214. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-03 05:04:25 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@STOPearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <tr7fb.13749$f11.9224@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 79790

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote:
>
> "Dwight Stewart" writes:
> > More experienced and more qualified in what, Jim?
> > Morse Code only, not as a ham operator. With the
> > Technician license, the FCC has already established
> > that Morse Code is not a qualification needed to be
> > a ham radio operator.
>
> Incorrect. The Technician class license infers that knowledge
> of Morse code isn't required to be an *entry-level* amateur
> radio operator. There are two higher classes which require
> a code test.

Are those "*entry-level* amateur radio operators" something other than
Amateur Radio Operators, Larry? If not, my statement is correct - Morse code
is not required to be an Amateur Radio Operator.

> If and when the Element 1(a) code test is abolished, that will
> simply prove that the FCC has a low opinion of the ARS as
> a whole, and that it responds to political pressure -- i.e.
> petitions to remove code testing, and the comments which
> support them.

No, it simply means the FCC is responding properly to the realities of the
world around us. Larry.

"We are persuaded that because the amateur service is
fundamentally a technical service, the emphasis on Morse
code proficiency as a licensing requirement does not
comport with the basis and purpose of the service. We
note, moreover, that the design of modern communications
systems, including personal communication services, satellite,
fiber optic, and high definition television systems, are based
on digital communication technologies. We also note that
no communication system has been designed in many years
that depends on hand-keyed telegraphy or the ability to
receive messages in Morse code by ear. In contrast,
modern communication systems are designed to be
automated systems. Given the changes that have occurred
in communications in the last fifty years, we believe that
reducing the emphasis on telegraphy proficiency as a
licensing requirement will allow the amateur service to, as
it has in the past, attract technically inclined persons,
particularly the youth of our country, and encourage them

to learn and to prepare themselves in the areas where the
United States needs expertise." - FCC WT Docket No.
98-143 RM-9148 RM-9150 RM-9196

The exact same arguments could be made when talking about the elimination
of the Element 1(a) code test.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

215. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-03 05:06:58 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@STOPearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <St7fb.13751$f11.12211@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 79791

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote:
>
> In today's society, it is politically incorrect to consider
> one person better than another in almost any field
> regardless of how much they know in that field and
> how little the other person knows.

No, Dee. Jim's premise is not politically incorrect - it's simply
incorrect.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

216. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-03 05:14:32 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@STOPearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <YA7fb.13755$f11.13680@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 79792

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote:
>
> Personally I consider basic code one of the fundamentals
> of radio even if one chooses not to use it after learning it.
> As a basic, I believe it should be tested. (snip)

The FCC, myself, thousands of other Amateur Operators, and the entire rest of the radio world outside Amateur Radio, disagrees.

> That is the position I will continue to support. And I will
> continue to promote code use whether the code testing is
> dropped or not.

You can count me in. I strongly support and promote the use of Amateur Radio in every form. CW is a fine operating mode and should be promoted right along with the rest of the operating modes available to us.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

217. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-03 05:47:55 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@STOPearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <f48fb.13764$f11.3613@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 79793

"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote:
>
> "Dwight Stewart" wrote"
> > I've never made such a claim, so have no response to
> > any counter-claim.
>
> You might want to take a look at the NCI and NCVEC
> petitions, for a start on who is claiming what.

Excuse me? I'm not a member of, nor do I represent, NCI or NCVEC. Again, I've never made such a claim. If you have a problem with something those groups have said, take it up with them. I have no accountability whatsoever for anything they've said or done.

> > I didn't know the Technician license was supposed
> > to lead to a technical revolution in anything, Jim.
>
> That was one of the prime arguments for dropping the
> code test for Tech back in 1990, and it's one of the
> prime arguments for dropping it altogether today. You
> want me to quote chapter and verse from some
> petitions?

In its 1998 Biennial Regulatory Review, the FCC said...

"Given the changes that have occurred in communications in the last fifty years, we believe that reducing the emphasis on telegraphy proficiency as a licensing requirement will allow the amateur service to, as it has in the past, attract technically inclined persons, particularly the youth of our country, and encourage them to learn and to prepare themselves in the areas where the United States needs expertise."

I don't see anything in there about a technical revolution, Jim. Instead, I see an effort to attact "technically inclined persons" and "encourage them to learn and to prepare themselves in the areas where the United States needs expertise." I fully agree with that position. If someone has said something different, that is not my position, nor the position of the FCC. By the way, I also agree with that as it applies to the elimination of the code testing requirement.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

218. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-03 07:03:33 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <REMOVETHISkc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <blkojm$ddn2o$3@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 79875

(sarcasm mode on)

Since the entire public is completely aware of amateur radio, therefore they all are waiting for the code test to drop, then we should have huge growth eh???

(sarcasm mode off)

Ryan KC8PMX

>
> If/when the code test disappears, what will be the scapegoat for low growth?
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

219. Re: GOOD NEWS-------France heat wave deaths top 14,000

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-03 10:19:51 UTC
From: SLee@houston-hunks.com
Message-ID: <3f82590e.1206130794@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 79794
Cross-posted to: alt.ham-radio.hf,alt.ham-radio.ssb,alt.radio.amateur,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On Fri, 03 Oct 2003 09:07:43 +0100, Walt Davidson <g3nyy@despammed.com> wrote:

>On Fri, 03 Oct 2003 03:26:07 GMT, "Jim Hampton"
><aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote:
>
>>I might inquire if you believe that the administration has been totally
>>honest in its' appraisal of Iraq's weapons of mass destruction. Hmmm ... it
>>may indeed be honest; it may not.
>
>Which administration are you referring to? The USA one, or the British
>one?
>
>73 de G3NYY

What's the difference? They both lied to their people so their invasion of Iraq would seem just.

220. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-03 10:29:15 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031003062915.12300.00000905@mb-m20.aol.com>
Source record: 79795

In article <vnpnqt9lfbusa8@corp.supernews.com>, "Clint" <rattlehead at computron dot net> writes:

>When they drop the morse code test requirement, it's
>fairly clear to me they just won't "drop" it all by
>itself with a stroke of an administrative pen;

Why not? That's all that most of the anticodetest petitions are asking for. Both the NCI and NCVEC petitions simply ask for the dropping of Element 1 and nothing else.

>I imagine it
>will accompany other changes in the license structure...

Only if somebody asks for them.

The FCC considered all sorts of proposals 4 years ago and we got what we have now.

>what do you think will also change in the licensing
>system when the drop the morse code test?
>

221. Re: test

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-03 11:19:00 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@STOPearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <EWcfb.14012$3S.9737@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 79796

"AArron" <aarron@hotmail.com> wrote:
> Test

1. 2 x 6 = ____?

2. _________ was the first president of the United States.

3. What kind of antenna feed line can carry radio energy well
even if it is buried in the ground? ______

A. Twin lead
B. Coaxial cable
C. Parallel conductor
D. Twisted pair

4. Did you post a "test" message to the wrong newsgroup? (yes/no) ______

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

222. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-03 11:48:51 UTC
From: Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns94094F76815EEelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 79797

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in
news:20031003062915.12300.00000905@mb-m20.aol.com:

> In article <vnpnqt9lfbusa8@corp.supernews.com>, "Clint" <rattlehead at
> computron dot net> writes:
>
>>When they drop the morse code test requirement, it's
>>fairly clear to me they just won't "drop" it all by itself with a
>>stroke of an administrative pen;
>
> Why not? That's all that most of the anticodetest petitions are asking
> for. Both the NCI and NCVEC petitions simply ask for the dropping of
> Element 1 and nothing else.
>
>>I imagine it
>>will accompany other changes in the license structure...
>
> Only if somebody asks for them.
>
> The FCC considered all sorts of proposals 4 years ago and we got what
> we have now.
>
>>what do you think will also change in the licensing
>>system when the drop the morse code test?
>>
>
>
>

I think you're right, Jim. My guess is that Element 1 will be dropped and
all Techs will be given Tech+ priviledges. I don't expect anything else to
happen.

That's not to say that some reform of the licence classes isn't overdue,
but the FCC position is that until there is some sort of consensus they
won't do anything about it.

73 de Alun, N3KIP

223. Re: Appalling...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-03 12:27:13 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0310030427.187830c7@posting.google.com>
Source record: 79798

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:<3LUeb.5431$Hd6.3363111@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>...

> No they haven't. The two conditions you state are still problems and good
> reasons to learn to copy by ear. The human brain can sort it out when the
> computer cannot. Poorly sent and spaced code is also still a problem.
>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

Seems like Morse Ops need to send better.

224. Re: Leo's self-incriminating AGAIN...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-03 12:31:47 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0310030431.49194c9d@posting.google.com>
Source record: 79799

Leo <nomail@nope.org> wrote in message
news:<tboonv41sqb8uesp25je04r4tgvp44sdbu@4ax.com>...
> On 2 Oct 2003 06:48:13 -0700, brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote:
>
> >snipped
> >>
> >> BTW, is it the code/no code part, or the beating people up part, or
> >> the standing together part of my statement that you disagree with?
> >>
> >The famous Code/No Code part.
>
> Understood - and I respect your position.
> >
> >> >
> >> >Perhaps the ARRL's Official Observer program will now look outward for
> >> >interference problems rather than confine itself to internal problems.
> >>
> >> I'm a bit puzzled by this one - that has what to do with BPL, or other
> >> things that threaten the hobby?
> >>
> >OO's are trained in documentation. Documentation of interference will
> >be required to file a complaint. OO's are confined to documenting
> >amateur's violations in the ARS, not interference to the ARS by
> >unlicensed operators.
> >
> >Thus, I state that perhaps the ARRL will take an outward looking
> >stance with respect to this interference.
>
> That makes sense - we have the same program running up here.
>
> Assuming that happens, I'd expect that plenty of us will be required
> to augment the work that the OO's do in this regard. I have not seen
> a statistic on the number of active OO's in the program - I'd assume
> it to be relatively small, though.
>
> 73, Leo

Most prefer to keep a very low profile, so it appears even smaller than it is.

225. Re: 1/4 Wave Dipoles

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-03 12:32:29 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0310030432.4f246f3f@posting.google.com>
Source record: 79800

wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) wrote in message
news:<20031002101224.07899.00000166@mb-m11.aol.com>...
> >Keep 'em guessing?
>
> Brian for a CBplusser your not as Dumb as you act.

And exactly how could you be a judge of that?

226. Re: Echolink is great for those who..

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-03 12:33:49 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0310030433.19e79ccf@posting.google.com>
Source record: 79851

wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) wrote in message
news:<20031002101107.07899.00000165@mb-m11.aol.com>...
> >5wpm and a waiver.
>
> You know thats not true, I think your just upset I could easily pass the EXTRA,
> and you cant even get close.

I don't know that you passed it "easily." I only know that your story
is preposterous.

227. Re: Another Self-Humiliating LenniRiffic Rant

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-03 12:41:26 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0310030441.5c533b74@posting.google.com>
Source record: 79852

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20031002082956.07346.00000939@mb-m26.aol.com>...
> In article <f45722ac.0310010543.10e9c4fd@posting.google.com>,
> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
>
> >N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in message
> >news:<c2356669.0309301440.c31c99c@posting.google.com>...
> >> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
> news:<f45722ac.0309300452.6c787ecd@posting.google.com>...
> >> > "Arnie Macy" <kt4stnospam@csam.net> wrote in message
> news:<bl2q1m$7doa6$1@ID-166180.news.uni-berlin.de>...
> >> > > "N2EY" wrote ...
> >> > >
> >> > > Do you think that a person can have only one writing style?
> >> > > ____
> >> > >
> >> > > I agree that a person can have more than one writing style. In this
> case;
> >> > > however, Len would have to work exceedingly hard to destroy any
> semblance of
> >> > > writing ability. I believe he has too much of an ego for that.
> >> > >
> >> > > Arnie-
> >> > > KT4ST
> >> >
> >> > And Bruce? Jim thinks he is a genius that presents himself as a
> "morron."
> >>
> >> You are utterly and completely mistaken.
> >>
> >> I do not think Bruce is a genius.
> >
> >Then please clarify.
>
> Why?
>
> You won't clarify your alleged /T5 operation

You say I'm mistaken. How so?

> >On a scale of 1 to 10, with 1 being "morron," and 10 being genius,
> >where would you say Bruce falls?
>
> What is a "morron"?

A new and innovative spelling of moron, put forth by your poster boy,
Bruce.

> >Remember now, you've put forth the theory that Bruce is a master of
> >trickery, so only you are able to see his brilliance.
> >
> I have put forth no theory that Bruce is a master of anything, nor that he is
> brilliant.

Only that he has fooled everyone on rrap and whatever CB groups he
posts to, excepting for you, of course.

> All I've done is to demonstrate that it is possible to skim through an Extra
> Class practice exam in less than 8 minutes and pass.

You haven't demonstrated that Bruce can do it, in the alotted time,
accuracy, and lack of preparation parameters. Let alone the wager of
$250 with two "CB-Plussers."

And I've said that it's
> possible that someone's lack of correct spelling, grammar, and logic can be an
> act.

and so you have.

> Philosophically, Bruce and Len are identical.

Really?

Their methods are slightly
> different but they are both just simple basher/insulters of those who dare to
> disagree with them.
>
> Neither has anyhting constructive to contribute.

Len could, and has.

Bruce couldn't.

228. Re: Amazin'....Ain't it...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-03 12:43:02 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0310030443.74c4da4b@posting.google.com>
Source record: 79853

brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0310010558.6b17ebb9@posting.google.com>...
> k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0310010049.40fd8e84@posting.google.com>...
> > "charlesb" <n5pvl@sbcglobal.net> wrote in message
news:<Woneb.11446$NV3.4976@newssvr31.news.prodigy.com>...
> > > "Steve Robeson, K4CAP" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
> > > news:5c01b95b.0309301356.4e2103d3@posting.google.com...
> > > >
> > > > I had been skipping over some of the "KC2HMZ" posts, mistaking
> > > > them for Bert...But NOW I remember why "HMZ" was familiar!
> > > >
> > > > John was the listowner of an e mail reflector that used to "ban"
> > > > members from who didn't heel to his particular viewpoints and
> > > > opinions.
> > >
> > > Hey, I think I've heard of John! Does he run the E-mail lists at TAPR? They
> > > ban hams who don't go along with the TAPR "party line". They even banned
> > > Hank Oredson W0RLI, who more or less invented packet BBS's and most of the
> > > operating standards for them - from the TAPR BBS special interest group!
> > > Hank offended TAPR by suggesting that hams use radio to communicate.
> > >
> > > I dunno.... Maybe I'm getting him mixed up with John Ackerman. It was some
> > > kind of "John", anyway.
> >
> > Naaaah. THIS John was providing this NG with a daily dose of
> > silly and easily refuted obfuscation. When he realized I was a
> > "subscriber" on a Yahoogroups e mail reflector he moderated, he
> > removed my "subscription"...This despite the reflector had nothing to
> > do with the code issue or any of the exchanges herein. It was his way
> > of having the "last word", in as much as every time he posted here he
> > made a fool out of himself.
> >
> > Judging by current affairs, not too much has changed.
> >
> > There's been other rumors of running afoul of the CIVIL courts
> > and getting booted by his ISP for his misconduct, but I don't have all
> > those details.
> >
> > Perhaps he'd like to bring us up to date...?!?!
> >
> > Steve, K4YZ
>
> Would you mind providing us with the name of that Yahoo MODERATED

> Group, so that we might look at the archives and see what got you
> tossed off the group.
>
> Thanks, Brian

Hello?

229. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-03 13:59:07 UTC
From: Clint <"rattlehead at computron dot net">
Message-ID: <vnr06unjeivg99@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 79855

I figure 3 classes... probably a entry level "no HF" license, and
then 2 licenses that reflect different levels of expressed knowledge,
that is, seperate amounts of frequency priviledges.

I'd prefer more, but for some reason I feel it will settle to 3....
What WAS a no code tech license will be the equivalent to
the new entry level license, what is now the general class
will be the middle license, and extra being the "top" license.

Personally, I think they should just "drop" the code part
of the test and not effect the number of license, keep them
the same, or increase them back to what it was before.

My $.02

230. Re: Another Self-Humiliating LenniRiffic Rant

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-03 13:59:14 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031003095914.13289.00000149@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 79854

>Bruce couldn't.

Wrong again silly BOY, the truth is BRUCE will not, its not a matter of can or cant.

231. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-03 13:59:32 UTC
From: Clint <"rattlehead at computron dot net">
Message-ID: <vnr07nlr097ha6@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 79856

"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20031002234534.28295.00000326@mb-m12.aol.com...

>
> What ever the License change will be, the written will become even easier.

I don't agree with that.

Clint
--

--

Get in touch with your soul: www.glennbeck.com
OR, if you're a liberal, maybe you can FIND one

--

232. Re: Echolink is great for those who..

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-03 14:00:30 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031003100030.13289.00000150@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 79857

>I don't know that you passed it "easily." I only know that your story
>is preposterous.
>

Well I did, sad part is you cant.

233. Re: GOOD NEWS-------France heat wave deaths top 14,000

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-03 14:50:41 UTC
From: SNIPrf_man_frTHIS@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <2c8119eb.0310030650.5cd9f227@posting.google.com>
Source record: 79858
Cross-posted to: alt.ham-radio.hf,alt.ham-radio.ssb,alt.radio.amateur,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"BIG-AL@3894.5-LSB-75-METERS" <BIG-AL -003894.5-LSB-75-METERS@ BIG-AL -003894.5-LSB-75-METERS> wrote in message news:<vn6lk3dd6nrg62@corp.supernews.com>...
> PARIS, France (AP) -- The death toll in France from August's blistering heat
> wave was nearly 15,000, according to a government report released Thursday
> that exceeded prior official estimates by 3,000 victims.

Ne soyez pas une bï¿½te. Vive la France.

234. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-03 15:59:12 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <k1hfb.16193$f11.14563@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 79859

"Alun Palmer" <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:Xns94094F76815EEelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
> n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in
> news:20031003062915.12300.00000905@mb-m20.aol.com:
>
> > In article <vnpnqt9lfbusa8@corp.supernews.com>, "Clint" <rattlehead at
> > computron dot net> writes:
> >
> >>When they drop the morse code test requirement, it's
> >>fairly clear to me they just won't "drop" it all by itself with a
> >>stroke of an administrative pen;
> >
> > Why not? That's all that most of the anticodetest petitions are asking
> > for. Both the NCI and NCVEC petitions simply ask for the dropping of
> > Element 1 and nothing else.
> >
> >>I imagine it
> >>will accompany other changes in the license structure...
> >
> > Only if somebody asks for them.
> >
> > The FCC considered all sorts of proposals 4 years ago and we got what
> > we have now.
> >
> >>what do you think will also change in the licensing
> >>system when the drop the morse code test?
> >>
> >
> >
> >
>
> I think you're right, Jim. My guess is that Element 1 will be dropped and
> all Techs will be given Tech+ priviledges. I don't expect anything else to
> happen.
>
> That's not to say that some reform of the licence classes isn't overdue,
> but the FCC position is that until there is some sort of consensus they
> won't do anything about it.
>
> 73 de Alun, N3KIP

Why should the FCC simply grandfather the Tech (no code) to Tech plus (code
and Novice test) ??

The Tech (no code) has no HF test questions. (as I understand it). Thus there is no reason a Tech (no code) would, or should be qualified to operate HF.

Dan/W4NTI

235. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-03 16:06:11 UTC
From: groupk0hb@earthlink.net
Message-ID: <5ee63311.0310030806.17222e48@posting.google.com>
Source record: 79860

"Clint" wrote

> what do you think will also change in the licensing
> system when the drop the morse code test?

Go to http://home.earthlink.net/~k0hb and click on the link "FCC
Comments" in the left column.

That describes the most sensible "post-CW-test" structure.

73, de Hans, K0HB

236. Re: GOOD NEWS-------France heat wave deaths top 14,000

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-03 16:22:57 UTC
From: someone@somewhere.com
Message-ID: <n0ci9tpa.fsf@zyan.org>
Source record: 79861
Cross-posted to: alt.ham-radio.hf,alt.ham-radio.ssb,alt.radio.amateur,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

```
good news of people dying, shame on whoever wrote the heading. Think
outside the borders and its humans for god sake....how does that make
you happy.......cha....

"BIG-AL@3894.5-LSB-75-METERS" <BIG-AL -003894.5-LSB-75-METERS@ BIG-AL
-003894.5-LSB-75-METERS> writes:

> PARIS, France (AP) -- The death toll in France from August's blistering heat
> wave was nearly 15,000, according to a government report released Thursday
> that exceeded prior official estimates by 3,000 victims.
>
>
>

--
```

237. Re: Another Self-Humiliating LenniRiffic Rant

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-03 16:48:00 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0310030848.408c9506@posting.google.com>
Source record: 79862

brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0310030441.5c533b74@posting.google.com>...
> n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20031002082956.07346.00000939@mb-m26.aol.com>...
> > In article <f45722ac.0310010543.10e9c4fd@posting.google.com>,
> > brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
> >
> > >N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in message
> > >news:<c2356669.0309301440.c31c99c@posting.google.com>...
> > >> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
> news:<f45722ac.0309300452.6c787ecd@posting.google.com>...
> > >> > "Arnie Macy" <kt4stnospam@csam.net> wrote in message
> news:<bl2q1m$7doa6$1@ID-166180.news.uni-berlin.de>...
> > >> > > "N2EY" wrote ...
> > >> > >
> > >> > > Do you think that a person can have only one writing style?
> > >> > > ____
> > >> > >
> > >> > > I agree that a person can have more than one writing style. In this
> case;
> > >> > > however, Len would have to work exceedingly hard to destroy any
> semblance of
> > >> > > writing ability. I believe he has too much of an ego for that.
> > >> > >
> > >> > > Arnie-
> > >> > > KT4ST
> > >> >
> > >> > And Bruce? Jim thinks he is a genius that presents himself as a
> "morron."
> > >>
> > >> You are utterly and completely mistaken.
> > >>
> > >> I do not think Bruce is a genius.
> > >
> > >Then please clarify.
> >
> > Why?
> >
> > You won't clarify your alleged /T5 operation
>
> You say I'm mistaken. How so?

It's self evident.
>

> > >On a scale of 1 to 10, with 1 being "morron," and 10 being genius,
> > >where would you say Bruce falls?
> >
> > What is a "morron"?
>
> A new and innovative spelling of moron, put forth by your poster boy,
> Bruce.

He's not my poster boy for anything but a bad example.
>
> > >Remember now, you've put forth the theory that Bruce is a master of
> > >trickery, so only you are able to see his brilliance.
> > >
> > I have put forth no theory that Bruce is a master of anything, nor that he is
> > brilliant.
>
> Only that he has fooled everyone on rrap and whatever CB groups he
> posts to, excepting for you, of course.

Do you take him seriously? I don't.
>
> > All I've done is to demonstrate that it is possible to skim through an Extra
> > Class practice exam in less than 8 minutes and pass.
>
> You haven't demonstrated that Bruce can do it, in the alotted time,
> accuracy, and lack of preparation parameters. Let alone the wager of
> $250 with two "CB-Plussers."

So what? I don't believe any of what he claims. But I wasn't there.
Neither were you.

Someone here claimed that it was "impossible" to pass the Extra in
under 8 minutes. So I proved it could be done on a practice Extra by
doing it myself. That's no proof that Bruce did what he claimed.

Nor do I give a rip.

> And I've said that it's
> > possible that someone's lack of correct spelling, grammar, and logic can be an
> > act.
>
> and so you have.
>
> > Philosophically, Bruce and Len are identical.
>
> Really?

Yep. Exactly identical. In fact, they may be the same person.
>
> Their methods are slightly
> > different but they are both just simple basher/insulters of those who dare to
> > disagree with them.

> >
> > Neither has anyhting constructive to contribute.
>
> Len could, and has.

Maybe he could, but he hasn't. Not in rrap, anyway.
>
> Bruce couldn't.

How do you know?

238. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-03 17:16:20 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <blkat4$q96$0@208.207.71.136>
Source record: 79863

Dan/W4NTI wrote:
> "Alun Palmer" <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> news:Xns94094F76815EEelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
>
>>n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in
>>news:20031003062915.12300.00000905@mb-m20.aol.com:
>>
>>
>>>In article <vnpnqt9lfbusa8@corp.supernews.com>, "Clint" <rattlehead at
>>>computron dot net> writes:
>>>
>>>
>>>>When they drop the morse code test requirement, it's
>>>>fairly clear to me they just won't "drop" it all by itself with a
>>>>stroke of an administrative pen;
>>>
>>>Why not? That's all that most of the anticodetest petitions are asking
>>>for. Both the NCI and NCVEC petitions simply ask for the dropping of
>>>Element 1 and nothing else.
>>>
>>>
>>>>I imagine it
>>>>will accompany other changes in the license structure...
>>>
>>>Only if somebody asks for them.
>>>
>>>The FCC considered all sorts of proposals 4 years ago and we got what
>>>we have now.
>>>
>>>
>>>>what do you think will also change in the licensing
>>>>system when the drop the morse code test?
>>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>I think you're right, Jim. My guess is that Element 1 will be dropped and
>>all Techs will be given Tech+ priviledges. I don't expect anything else to
>>happen.
>>
>>That's not to say that some reform of the licence classes isn't overdue,
>>but the FCC position is that until there is some sort of consensus they
>>won't do anything about it.
>>

>>73 de Alun, N3KIP
>
>
> Why should the FCC simply grandfather the Tech (no code) to Tech plus (code
> and Novice test) ??
>
> The Tech (no code) has no HF test questions. (as I understand it). Thus
> there is no reason a Tech (no code) would, or should be qualified to operate
> HF.

It's actually pretty clear, Dan. The big objective here is to lower
the requirements until anyone can qualify at will without needing to
complain about how hard it is.

239. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-03 17:33:27 UTC
From: Bert Craig <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM>
Message-ID: <Hpifb.26252$E95.6474298@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>
Source record: 79864

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:k1hfb.16193$f11.14563@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> Why should the FCC simply grandfather the Tech (no code) to Tech plus
(code
> and Novice test) ??
>
> The Tech (no code) has no HF test questions. (as I understand it). Thus
> there is no reason a Tech (no code) would, or should be qualified to
operate
> HF.

It's a "gimme," Dan. In other words, some may be hoping that by "giving"
no-code Technicians an "unearned" slice of HF, it can be called an agreeable
compromise to retain Element 1 for the Extra. (Perhaps even the General.) I
personally don't think it'll work, but the FCC might go for it. Who knows?

--
73 de Bert
WA2SI

240. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-03 17:38:02 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031003133802.16323.00000146@mb-m19.aol.com>
Source record: 79865

> It's actually pretty clear, Dan. The big objective here is to lower
>the requirements until anyone can qualify at will without needing to
>complain about how hard it is.
>

That is exactly the way it is working. And heres the Kicker, the next set of Knuckle Draggers are going to complain the written is to HARD. Then we will lower it again.
What is amazing is the New Hams think they have done something, by passing a Dumb Down Test. They also think its perfectly OK, and will use any excuse to try and say that they are EQUALS. But anybody with any sense at all will know that it is not TRUE.
Its amazing the extent they go thru to try and Justify Dumbing Down, and refuse to admit its Dumbing Down.

241. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-03 18:59:41 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <xGjfb.18676$3S.7624@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 79866

"Hans K0HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:5ee63311.0310030806.17222e48@posting.google.com...
> "Clint" wrote
>
> > what do you think will also change in the licensing
> > system when the drop the morse code test?
>
> Go to http://home.earthlink.net/~k0hb and click on the link "FCC
> Comments" in the left column.
>
> That describes the most sensible "post-CW-test" structure.
>
> 73, de Hans, K0HB

I like that proposal. But its way to simple to be accepted. Maybe the govt could spice it up by slicing up the bands...oh sorry. They already tried that. hi.

Dan/W4NTI

242. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-03 19:01:01 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <NHjfb.18694$3S.6746@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 79867

"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20031003133802.16323.00000146@mb-m19.aol.com...
> > It's actually pretty clear, Dan. The big objective here is to lower
> >the requirements until anyone can qualify at will without needing to
> >complain about how hard it is.
> >
>
> That is exactly the way it is working. And heres the Kicker, the next set
of
> Knuckle Draggers are going to complain the written is to HARD. Then we
will
> lower it again.
> What is amazing is the New Hams think they have done something, by
passing a
> Dumb Down Test. They also think its perfectly OK, and will use any excuse
to
> try and say that they are EQUALS. But anybody with any sense at all will
know
> that it is not TRUE.
> Its amazing the extent they go thru to try and Justify Dumbing Down, and
> refuse to admit its Dumbing Down.

Whatcha think Bruce? Are all the 'knuckledraggers' Democrats in training?

Dan/W4NTI

243. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-03 19:19:46 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031003151946.27839.00000255@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 79868

>Whatcha think Bruce? Are all the 'knuckledraggers' Democrats in training?
>
>Dan/W4NTI
>

Either in training, or Full Fledged Members.

244. Re: Some thoughtful comments from another forum on the code/nocode debate

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-03 19:45:19 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3F7DD1CF.3050505@psu.edu>
Source record: 79870

Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
> "Hans K0HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message

>>
>>Taking it back to the context of this thread, my amateur license or my
>>drivers license or my fishing license have value to me based on the
>>beneficial things I can do with them. The value is not related in any
>>fashion to the 'cost' or 'effort' that it took to obtain the license.
>>
>>73, de Hans, K0HB
>
>
> I agree with Hans 100%+ on this one ... the value is in what they let
> you do, not what you had to do to get them.

Well, I wouldn't say so for everyone. Not that I feel all that warm and fuzzy about getting my drivers license, but there are many labors in my life that I do feel proud of.

Probably just my disposition. 8^)

- Mike KB3EIA -

245. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-03 19:52:26 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <_rkfb.8826$yp6.270640@nnrp1.ptd.net>
Source record: 79869

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:TC4fb.1233$qj6.1065105@news1.news.adelphia.net...
> N2EY wrote:
>
>
> > Suppose the new Q&A pool really is the cause of this dropoff. Will we
> > see folks arguing that the writtens are stifling growth, turning
> > people away, etc.?
> > Will we see a movement to reduce (again) the level of written testing,
> > the number of licenses, etc.?
>
> I am inclined to say there will be a push to reduce requirements if
> that happens. At the moment, every issue seems to gravitate towards
> Morse CW requirement. This question needs revisited after the
> requirement is dropped, if it is dropped.
>
> And my opinion is no, we shouldn't reduce the requirements.
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -

While I obviously support eliminating the Morse test, I do NOT
support ANY lowering of the requirements on the written tests.
(Felt I needed to state that again ...)

The written tests can be made "better" (that does not necessarily
mean "more difficult") by adjusting the question pools to reflect
modern technology, RF/electrical safety, rules/regs, and operating
practices. And, while there is a minimum ratio of questions in the
pool to questions on the tests, there is no maximum number of
questions that can be in the pool ... those who think (and I disagree)
that the question pools are simply "memorized" can push the NCVECs
to increase the number and diversity of questions in the pools.

Carl - wk3c

246. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-03 20:02:56 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <QBkfb.8828$yp6.270843@nnrp1.ptd.net>
Source record: 79871

"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20031002234956.28295.00000327@mb-m12.aol.com...
> >Carl got a post-restructuring Extra
> >
> >
>
> After a Year of failing it.

BZZZZZZZZT ... wrong answer ... took it EXACTLY ONCE.

Not that I feel I owe Bruce (or anyone else, actually) an explaination,
but just to set the record straight about how full of BS Bruce is ...

I kept being busy with work, work travel, an elderly mother in
poor health and any number of other "excuses" and didn't get
around to going to a VE session until I did ... so what?

I finally decided to set the goal of going and upgrading by a certain
date.

I went to a VE session on a Friday evening, run by one of the
local ham clubs.

The session never happened because the VE who kept the
paperwork for the team had accidentally tossed all of the
forms while "cleaning out" the file box where he kept
the stuff.

I came home, got on the internet, and found a session the
next day (Sat morning, early) about 1-1/2 hour's drive from
home, got up early, drove down, took the test (1st one finished),
and walked out an Extra ... no sweat, no big deal.

> >Bruce got a post-restructuring Extra
>
> And $250.00 from from some Dumb Cbers
>
> >Bruce makes fun of Carl's amateur license.
>
> Because Carls License isnt worth the pasper its printed on.

Maybe Bruce's license is printed on "pasper" ... mine is
printed on paper (and laminated to protect it).

> >Carl does not distinguish between "real hams" and others.
>
> ThaTs because Karl doesnt know the difference

One wonders how long Bruce has been licensed and active?
(I'm a member of QCWA ...)

> >Bruce says a sizable percentage of amateurs are not "real hams".
>
> Just the New ones

I'm not a new one ... and Bruce is, as normal for him, full of
you-know-what.

> >Carl is actively trying to defeat the threat of BPL.
>
> Thats a Joke

No, it's a very serious matter. If Bruce had a clue he'd know that.

> >Bruce doesn't give a damn about BPL.
>
> THATS TRUE

That statement alone pretty well should give folks a good
idea of how much credence to give to Bruce's opinions.

Carl - wk3c

247. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-03 20:06:45 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3F7DD6D5.90605@psu.edu>
Source record: 79873

N2EY wrote:
> In article <vnpnqt9lfbusa8@corp.supernews.com>, "Clint" <rattlehead at
> computron dot net> writes:
>
>
>>When they drop the morse code test requirement, it's
>>fairly clear to me they just won't "drop" it all by
>>itself with a stroke of an administrative pen;
>
> Why not? That's all that most of the anticodetest petitions are asking for.
> Both the NCI and NCVEC petitions simply ask for the dropping of Element 1 and
> nothing else.

I don't think it can work by "just" dropping the test. Too many loos
ends. Tech plus, novices, that kind of thing.

- Mike KB3EIA -

248. Re: Some thoughtful comments from another forum on the code/nocode debate

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-03 20:07:28 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <4Gkfb.8829$yp6.270374@nnrp1.ptd.net>
Source record: 79872

```
"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
news:c2356669.0310021342.6d9f373b@posting.google.com...
> "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
news:<5HVeb.8662$yp6.255213@nnrp1.ptd.net>...
> > "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> > news:20031001202958.21642.00001354@mb-m01.aol.com...
> > > In article <raHeb.8596$yp6.248316@nnrp1.ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
> > > <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:
> > >
> > > >N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> > > >news:20030930223035.28496.00001006@mb-m18.aol.com...
> > > >> In article <m6feb.8394$yp6.234106@nnrp1.ptd.net>, "Carl R.
Stevenson"
> > > >> <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:
> > > >>
> > > >> >"Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
> > > >> >news:f45722ac.0309300431.673f47fe@posting.google.com...
> > > >> >>
> > > >> >> Furthermore, if the US government wants to give all prospective
> > > >> >> amateurs 3 hots and a cot, and a paycheck, for the duration it
takes
> > > >> >> to learn the code, I'd gladly enroll in the CG Morse Code
school.
> > > >> >
> > > >> >There's one problem ... there IS no CG Morse Code school any
> > > >> >more ...
> > > >>
> > > >> Sad but true.
> > > >>
> > > >> > the services are NOT teaching their radiomen Morse any
> > > >> >more.
> > > >>
> > > >> Even if they were - would it make any difference to your opinion of
the
> > need
> > > >> for code testing in the amateur radio service?
> > > >
> > > >It would add *some* potential validity to the "trained (in Morse)
pool of
> > > >operators" part of 97.1 ... however, that is not the case and hasn't
been
> > > >for some time ...
> > > >
```

> > > >It wouldn't be a "slam-dunk" in favor of continued Morse testing for
> > > >HF ham licenses though.
> > >
> > > In a word: "No".
> > >
> > > 73 de Jim, N2EY
> >
> > Precisely ...
> >
> > Carl - wk3c
>
> Exactly!
>
> So the argument "the military does/does not use Morse" has no bearing
> at all on the issue of an amateur radio code test.
>
> Glad we're agreed on that.

We are NOT agreed on that ... the fact that the military USED to use Morse (a lot many years ago when it was the only way to communicate via radio) did, at one time, have SOME validity in terms of the "trained pool of operators" argument ... however, since they don't use it to any degree any more, it has an equal bearing as NO LONGER BEING A REASON TO MAINTAIN A MORSE TEST REQUIREMENT.

I simply stated that it wasn't a "slam-dunk" issue either way ... just one component of the total picture of justifying/not justifying Morse testing.

(Nice try at playing the "spin" Jim, but it doesn't fly ...)

Carl - wk3c

249. Re: 3894.5

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-03 20:36:00 UTC
From: Rene PE1RA / ON6ALD <REMOVErene.altena@gmx.net>
Message-ID: <blkmjg$dh51l$1@ID-153362.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 79874
Cross-posted to: alt.ham-radio.mods,alt.ham-radio.ssb,alt.radio.amateur,rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"^^^I Am Fileo - I Am Fileo^^^" <fileo@hotmail.cc> wrote in message
news:innanv8hp6e8hlavjeult6942o9ud9fj61@4ax.com...
> On Wed, 24 Sep 2003 14:17:56 +0200, "Rene PE1RA / ON6ALD"
> <REMOVErene.altena@gmx.net> wrote:
>
> >No!
> >
> >Where the Subject line contains '3.894' or '3894' or 'bigal'
> >send the email back
> >
> >
> >73 de Rene PE1RA
>
> E-MAIL???
>
> You are on Usenet, Rene - not E-MAIL!
>
> You CAN'T send it back! LOL!

I know that! I was just going along with the joke, with errors and all...

--
73 de Rene PE1RA / ON6ALD

Cuius testiculos habes, habeas cardeo et cerebellum
>

250. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-03 21:28:24 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031003172824.15488.00000263@mb-m28.aol.com>
Source record: 79876

>The written tests can be made "better" (that does not necessarily
>mean "more difficult")

Of course not, you wouldnt want anyone to put out any effort.

251. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-03 21:37:03 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031003173703.15488.00000264@mb-m28.aol.com>
Source record: 79877

>BZZZZZZZZT ... wrong answer ... took it EXACTLY ONCE.

Which you cannot prove, similar to the Millons of NCI Members

>The session never happened because the VE who kept the
>paperwork for the team had accidentally tossed all of the
>forms while "cleaning out" the file box where he kept
>the stuff.
>

Likely EXCUSE

>. mine is
>printed on paper (and laminated to protect it).

You should try and protect it, after all these years of Lame Excusses why you couldnt have one.

>One wonders how long Bruce has been licensed and active?
>(I'm a member of QCWA ...)

Oh I dont know, I guess about 1966

>I'm not a new one ... and Bruce is, as normal for him, full of
>you-know-what.

And Karl is still a KOOK who was to Lazy or to Dumb to ever get a GENERAL or Above, untill the FCC dropped the standards for him, so he would be able to get one.

>No, it's a very serious matter. If Bruce had a clue he'd know that.

Bruce has a CLUE and could care LESS.

>That statement alone pretty well should give folks a good
>idea of how much credence to give to Bruce's opinions.
>
>Carl - wk3c

Hows the BLACK HELICOPTERS and those mystery GUNS that appear on your MONITOR.
You really are a KOOK.

252. Re: Appalling...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-03 23:12:11 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031003191211.28496.00001028@mb-m18.aol.com>
Source record: 79878

In article <BB5fb.13647$f11.9485@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@STOPearthlinkSPAM.net> writes:

>"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote:
>>
>> "Dwight Stewart" writes:
>> > I haven't purchased a program like that recently, but
>> > surely they've gotten better over the years. Is that not
>> > the case?
>>
>> They have, but the mighty morsemen consider such to
>> be desecrations of the will of the old radio gods.
>
> Well, I suspected the programs might have gotten at least somewhat better
>over the years. The author of the program I had wrote about trying to
>compensate for bad code by looking for patterns instead of focusing on each
>individual dot and dash as it was being sent.

It is a trivial matter to do decisions on "longer" v. "shorter" once the on-time has been converted to a numerical value...which is easily done by a simple comparator gating a much higher repetitive pulse into a small (8-bit) binary counter. That forms a "width-to-digital" conversion. The count is then written into working memory and used by the main program. Once that is in place, the main program can do its "pattern checking" most anywhich way.

>The program also didn't use
>hard rules for dot, dash, and space, length, instead interpretating each as
>it went along.

That part is the "adaptivity to rate" section. In an ordinary PC it is fairly
easy to access the internal calendar clock for 100ths seconds time hacks (actually shorter if you know the calendar-clock software details).

By comparing the overall "on" lengths it is possible to determine the bit rate per unit time and thus the equivalent WPM rate.

>Obviously, I don't know the details, but the program did do a
>pretty good job considering it was just a simple programming example
>included with an operating system. My only complaint was that it didn't send
>code like some of the other programs advertised, but I couldn't have used
>that back then anyway.

The sending part is fairly straightforward involving the keyboard addressing a lookup table in memory and organizing the outgoing "on" and "off" times

at whatever rate is desired.

The interesting part of modifying that is to add some random variability to the "on" and "off" times, which is selectable to bias those if desired, and thus create the equivalent length-rate-bias "swing" of a human telegrapher! :-) Sending is much easier to do and duplicate than receiving.

As I said much earlier to others in here, I've seen it done and looked at the source code, heard-seen it in action. The PCTA will not believe it since they don't WANT to believe it so any argument with them is an exercise in futility. :-)

As I also said earlier, there just isn't any market for such a program since there is so little morse code communications being done in radio now as compared to a half century ago.

LHA

253. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-03 23:43:47 UTC
From: Clint <"rattlehead at computron dot net">
Message-ID: <vns2et3hc8776e@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 79879

anybody got a tissue for Dick?

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:blkat4$q96$0@208.207.71.136...
> Dan/W4NTI wrote:
> > "Alun Palmer" <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> > news:Xns94094F76815EEelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
> >
> >>n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in
> >>news:20031003062915.12300.00000905@mb-m20.aol.com:
> >>
> >>
> >>>In article <vnpnqt9lfbusa8@corp.supernews.com>, "Clint" <rattlehead at
> >>>computron dot net> writes:
> >>>
> >>>
> >>>>When they drop the morse code test requirement, it's
> >>>>fairly clear to me they just won't "drop" it all by itself with a
> >>>>stroke of an administrative pen;
> >>>
> >>>Why not? That's all that most of the anticodetest petitions are asking
> >>>for. Both the NCI and NCVEC petitions simply ask for the dropping of
> >>>Element 1 and nothing else.
> >>>
> >>>
> >>>>I imagine it
> >>>>will accompany other changes in the license structure...
> >>>
> >>>Only if somebody asks for them.
> >>>
> >>>The FCC considered all sorts of proposals 4 years ago and we got what
> >>>we have now.
> >>>
> >>>
> >>>>what do you think will also change in the licensing
> >>>>system when the drop the morse code test?
> >>>>
> >>>
> >>>
> >>>
> >>>
> >>>
> >>>>I think you're right, Jim. My guess is that Element 1 will be dropped
and
> >>>>all Techs will be given Tech+ priviledges. I don't expect anything else
to

> >>happen.
> >>
> >>That's not to say that some reform of the licence classes isn't overdue,
> >>but the FCC position is that until there is some sort of consensus they
> >>won't do anything about it.
> >>
> >>73 de Alun, N3KIP
> >
> >
> > Why should the FCC simply grandfather the Tech (no code) to Tech plus
(code
> > and Novice test) ??
> >
> > The Tech (no code) has no HF test questions. (as I understand it). Thus
> > there is no reason a Tech (no code) would, or should be qualified to
operate
> > HF.
>
>
> It's actually pretty clear, Dan. The big objective here is to lower
> the requirements until anyone can qualify at will without needing to
> complain about how hard it is.
>

254. Re: Another Self-Humiliating LenniRiffic Rant

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-03 23:48:06 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031003194806.08626.00001001@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 79880

In article <f45722ac.0310030441.5c533b74@posting.google.com>,
brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:

>n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
>news:<20031002082956.07346.00000939@mb-m26.aol.com>...
>> In article <f45722ac.0310010543.10e9c4fd@posting.google.com>,
>> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
>>
>> >N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in message
>> >news:<c2356669.0309301440.c31c99c@posting.google.com>...
>> >> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
>> news:<f45722ac.0309300452.6c787ecd@posting.google.com>...
>> >> > "Arnie Macy" <kt4stnospam@csam.net> wrote in message
>> news:<bl2q1m$7doa6$1@ID-166180.news.uni-berlin.de>...
>> >> > > "N2EY" wrote ...
>> >> > >
>> >> > > Do you think that a person can have only one writing style?
>> >> > > ____
>> >> > >
>> >> > > I agree that a person can have more than one writing style. In this
>> case;
>> >> > > however, Len would have to work exceedingly hard to destroy any
>> semblance of
>> >> > > writing ability. I believe he has too much of an ego for that.
>> >> > >
>> >> > > Arnie-
>> >> > > KT4ST
>> >> >
>> >> > And Bruce? Jim thinks he is a genius that presents himself as a
>> "morron."
>> >>
>> >> You are utterly and completely mistaken.
>> >>
>> >> I do not think Bruce is a genius.
>> >
>> >Then please clarify.
>>
>> Why?
>>
>> You won't clarify your alleged /T5 operation
>
>You say I'm mistaken. How so?
>
>> >On a scale of 1 to 10, with 1 being "morron," and 10 being genius,

>> >where would you say Bruce falls?
>>
>> What is a "morron"?
>
>A new and innovative spelling of moron, put forth by your poster boy,
>Bruce.
>
>> >Remember now, you've put forth the theory that Bruce is a master of
>> >trickery, so only you are able to see his brilliance.
>> >
>> I have put forth no theory that Bruce is a master of anything, nor that he
>is
>> brilliant.
>
>Only that he has fooled everyone on rrap and whatever CB groups he
>posts to, excepting for you, of course.
>
>> All I've done is to demonstrate that it is possible to skim through an
>Extra
>> Class practice exam in less than 8 minutes and pass.
>
>You haven't demonstrated that Bruce can do it, in the alotted time,
>accuracy, and lack of preparation parameters. Let alone the wager of
>$250 with two "CB-Plussers."
>
> And I've said that it's
>> possible that someone's lack of correct spelling, grammar, and logic can be
>an
>> act.
>
>and so you have.
>
>> Philosophically, Bruce and Len are identical.
>
>Really?
>
> Their methods are slightly
>> different but they are both just simple basher/insulters of those who dare
to
>> disagree with them.
>>
>> Neither has anyhting constructive to contribute.
>
>Len could, and has.
>
>Bruce couldn't.

Brian, you might as well be "discussing" anything with a stone wall.

Rev. Jim, the Sheriff of the Wild EM West, is of the OLD School in
amateur radio when Kode was King and it was really the retirement

home of all the displaced radiotelegraphers of yore.

If you don't "contribute" noble, good, and true words and gratuitous praise about morse code and morsemanship, he will tell all that "no 'contributions' to the hobby have been made." :-)

He and other morsemen live in a de facto Archaic Radiotelegraphy Society ("ARS") which also graciously allows other modes to exist just to prove the "inherent superiority" of on-off keying codes. "Advancing the state of the amateur art" is defined by him as anything that improves on-off keying modes. Anything else is "irrelevant."

Anyone persisting in talking about other modes favorably will be denigrated, humiliated, and generally not be treated nice. Or they may be told to "go to Google and find the post and repost it here to prove <something>." :-)

LHA

255. Re: Appalling...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-04 00:00:33 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <B4ofb.5664$Hd6.3680998@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 79881

"Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
news:f45722ac.0310030427.187830c7@posting.google.com...
> "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:<3LUeb.5431$Hd6.3363111@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>...
>
> > No they haven't. The two conditions you state are still problems and
good
> > reasons to learn to copy by ear. The human brain can sort it out when
the
> > computer cannot. Poorly sent and spaced code is also still a problem.
> >
> > Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>
> Seems like Morse Ops need to send better.

Yes some of them need to pay a lot more attention to the quality of their
sending.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

256. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-04 00:12:01 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <lfofb.5668$Hd6.3682788@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 79882

"Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message news:3F7DD6D5.90605@psu.edu...
>
>
> N2EY wrote:
> > In article <vnpnqt9lfbusa8@corp.supernews.com>, "Clint" <rattlehead at
> > computron dot net> writes:
> >
> >
> >>When they drop the morse code test requirement, it's
> >>fairly clear to me they just won't "drop" it all by
> >>itself with a stroke of an administrative pen;
> >
> > Why not? That's all that most of the anticodetest petitions are asking
for.
> > Both the NCI and NCVEC petitions simply ask for the dropping of Element
1 and
> > nothing else.
>
> I don't think it can work by "just" dropping the test. Too many loos
> ends. Tech plus, novices, that kind of thing.
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -
>

Actually it would work quite easily. Everyone keeps their current
privileges except that all varieties of Techs are combined to one class of
Tech with the privileges of the Tech with HF.

However, as you know I think they ought to keep the code test.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

257. Re: Appalling...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-04 00:17:36 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bll3j0ems0@208.206.142.99>
Source record: 79883

Dee D. Flint wrote:
> "Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
> news:f45722ac.0310030427.187830c7@posting.google.com...
>
>>"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
>
> news:<3LUeb.5431$Hd6.3363111@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>...
>
>>>No they haven't. The two conditions you state are still problems and
>
> good
>
>>>reasons to learn to copy by ear. The human brain can sort it out when
>
> the
>
>>>computer cannot. Poorly sent and spaced code is also still a problem.
>>>
>>>Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>>
>>Seems like Morse Ops need to send better.
>
>
> Yes some of them need to pay a lot more attention to the quality of their
> sending.

Why do you suppose N0IMD might find that to be a concern? Those of us
who actually work CW usually can copy variety with no problems.
His abilities are his own concern and his responsibility.
Yet he trolls on.
Lennie's understudy, for a fact.

258. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-04 00:29:36 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031003202936.02537.00000853@mb-m23.aol.com>
Source record: 79884

In article <k1hfb.16193$f11.14563@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>,
"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> writes:

>Why should the FCC simply grandfather the Tech (no code) to Tech plus (code
>and Novice test) ??

Because the only test difference between a Tech and a post-March-21-1987 Tech
Plus is Element 1
>
>The Tech (no code) has no HF test questions. (as I understand it).

Actually that's not true, The old Novice Q&A was incorporated into the Tech
pool.

>Thus
>there is no reason a Tech (no code) would, or should be qualified to operate
>HF.

Tell it to the FCC. A Tech who passes Element 1 gets the same HF privs as a
Novice or Tech Plus.

73 de Jim, N2EY

259. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-04 00:29:36 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031003202936.02537.00000852@mb-m23.aol.com>
Source record: 79885

In article <QBkfb.8828$yp6.270843@nnrp1.ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
<wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:

>"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20031002234956.28295.00000327@mb-m12.aol.com...
>> >Carl got a post-restructuring Extra
>> >
>> >
>>
>> After a Year of failing it.
>
>BZZZZZZZZT ... wrong answer ... took it EXACTLY ONCE.

Yeah, me too. 1970. Bruce was nowhere to be found....
>
>Not that I feel I owe Bruce (or anyone else, actually) an explaination,
>but just to set the record straight about how full of BS Bruce is ...

Do you really think anyone is in the dark about that?

>> >Carl does not distinguish between "real hams" and others.
>>
>> ThaTs because Karl doesnt know the difference
>
>One wonders how long Bruce has been licensed and active?
>(I'm a member of QCWA ...)

In four years I can join the OOTC.....

Hmmm...I'm 49, been a ham since age 13, that means I've been licensed about 73%
of my entire life. Bruce is 305, which means he's only been licensed 12%...
>
>> >Bruce says a sizable percentage of amateurs are not "real hams".
>>
>> Just the New ones
>
>I'm not a new one ... and Bruce is, as normal for him, full of
>you-know-what.

Is that not self-evident?
>
>> >Carl is actively trying to defeat the threat of BPL.
>>
>> Thats a Joke
>
>No, it's a very serious matter. If Bruce had a clue he'd know that.

>
>> >Bruce doesn't give a damn about BPL.
>>
>> THATS TRUE
>
>That statement alone pretty well should give folks a good
>idea of how much credence to give to Bruce's opinions.

My point exactly.

Licenses and tests won't mean much if we can't work anybody through the noise.

--

BPL is a bad idea in so many ways. For example, I do *not* want to be around when (not if) one of those bypass couplers decides to fail and puts 13.2 kV into somebody's service entrance.

And after reading a "white paper" on 801.15be (I think that's the designation - you are probably familiar with it, Carl, it uses multiple carriers in the 3-7 GHz range) it mystifoes me why anyone would think 78 MHz of bandwidth is going to compete with what systems capable of six times that can do - without wires.

Then there's the monopoly issue, and the favoritism issue (cable companies don't get a bye on Part 15....telcos don't get a bye on Part 15....Wi-Fi doesn't get a bye on Part 15...) and the simple fact that electric utilities have a hard enough time keeping the lights on and their equipment from crudding up the ether with plain old corona noise.

Plus the fact that almost every other country that has tried BPL has given up trying to make it work. Japan has out-and-out banned it.

73 de Jim, N2EY

260. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-04 00:47:10 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bll5ae$i36$0@208.206.142.99>
Source record: 79886

Clint wrote:

> anybody got a tissue for Dick?
>

You'd best keep it for yourself, Junior. Kim hasn't sang yet.

261. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-04 01:10:42 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031003211042.00545.00001328@mb-m02.aol.com>
Source record: 79887

In article <Xns94094F76815EEelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun Palmer
<elektros@yahoo.com> writes:

>n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in
>news:20031003062915.12300.00000905@mb-m20.aol.com:
>
>> In article <vnpnqt9lfbusa8@corp.supernews.com>, "Clint" <rattlehead at
>> computron dot net> writes:
>>
>>>When they drop the morse code test requirement, it's
>>>fairly clear to me they just won't "drop" it all by itself with a
>>>stroke of an administrative pen;
>>
>> Why not? That's all that most of the anticodetest petitions are asking
>> for. Both the NCI and NCVEC petitions simply ask for the dropping of
>> Element 1 and nothing else.
>>
>>>I imagine it
>>>will accompany other changes in the license structure...
>>
>> Only if somebody asks for them.
>>
>> The FCC considered all sorts of proposals 4 years ago and we got what
>> we have now.
>>
>>>what do you think will also change in the licensing
>>>system when the drop the morse code test?
>
>I think you're right, Jim. My guess is that Element 1 will be dropped and
>all Techs will be given Tech+ priviledges. I don't expect anything else to
>happen.

It's been almost 3 months. I'm convinced FCC had the authority to dump Element
1 soon after WRC 2003 ended.

Of course it's not a high priority for them.

>That's not to say that some reform of the licence classes isn't overdue,
>but the FCC position is that until there is some sort of consensus they
>won't do anything about it.
>
See my post to KB3EIA. I doubt we'll ever get consensus due to the "nobody
loses/no giveaways" mindset.

73 de Jim, N2EY

262. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-04 01:10:44 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031003211044.00545.00001329@mb-m02.aol.com>
Source record: 79888

In article <t16fb.1278$qj6.1085362@news1.news.adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo
<mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:

>Clint wrote:
>
>> When they drop the morse code test requirement, it's
>> fairly clear to me they just won't "drop" it all by
>> itself with a stroke of an administrative pen; I imagine it
>> will accompany other changes in the license structure...
>> what do you think will also change in the licensing
>> system when the drop the morse code test?
>
> This is the biggest reason that I believe it will take quite a while to

>remove the Morse test. There will probably be a lot of changes that
>need to be discussed and made, if the licensing structure is to make any
>sense.

Having the amateur license classes make sense has never been much of a priority
to the FCC - at least not for 50 years or so.

I still remember getting my first License Manual in 1966 or 67, and discovering
that there were six classes of ham license. Interesting system, I thought, lots
of steps to climb the ladder to the top.

Then I found that four of the six license classes granted all operating
privileges. Three of them could only be gotten by mail, and two could only be
gotten via FCC examiners .And one of the classes was closed to new entries but
those who had 'em could keep on renewing 'em. Huh?

Even more mystifying was finding out that things had been that way for more
than a dozen years.

> My earlier prediction was 4 years in a "guess the drop time" contest we

>started earlier in the year.

You may be right.

I see three possibilities:

1) FCC just dumps Element 1 and not much else

2) FCC does the whole restructuring thing all over again

3) FCC does nothing at all. (For a few years, anyway).

Before you dismiss that last one, note how long some petitions have been
hanging fire with the FCC. Like the Novice refarming petitions.....

>
> I would guess that we will have either two or three classes, as we do
now:
>
> The technician license will probably be very similar to what it is now.

>I don't know that any significant changes will be made.
>
> The HF licenses are a much murkier area.

That would be unfortunate.

The whole idea of VHF/UHF as the entry is an artifact of S25.5. Hundreds of
thousands of us started out on HF. All it takes is a little know-how.
>
> If there were to be only two license classes, my wish would be that the

>testing regimen would be more or less what the Extra is now.
>
> But there may be some resistance to that, and it is understandable.
>There is no reason not to have an entry level HF license similar to the
>General.

But note how the number of Techs has dropped off. W5YI has already made
statements about the Tech being too difficult for an entry-level license - and
that was with the old pool!
>
> I tend toward two license classes, but don't have any strong feelings
>against three.
>
> Testing......
>
> The multiple guess format is probably here to stay.

Unfortunately true. FCC is certainly going to insist that any test method have
one and only one correct answer, and be totally independent of examiner
interpretation.

> I don't think it is
>as bad as some say. Reading the answers in a textbook or reading them in
>multiple choice format is all the same to me. It took me a week of
>fairly steady study to get ready for the exam. The way they get you to
>learn is to have a lot of questions, and only test on a few.

One of the biggest differences between the old and new Tech pools is that the
new one is bigger - almost twice the size.
>
> And as a fairly new Extra, I can say that those answers don't always
>show up in the same abcd order as they do in the question pools. So you
>really do have to know an answer.

You only have to know the *right* answer...
>

> I would like to see the tests a little more in depth (note I don't say
>harder) with more operation questions. Perhaps even a post-test booklet
>with good operating procedures. I really needed this after passing my
>general. I had some small HF experience from contesting with the club,
>but contesting etiquette and everyday etiquette are two very different
>things.

I'd like to see the test subdivided by subject area so that you could not pass with, say, less than a certain number of safety questions wrong.
>
> My biggest hope is that we take the time to make a good system, and >
not come up with some Byzantine mess.
>
Agreed, but don't count on it. Look at the last restructuring - took almost 2 years, and the end result was a complete hodgepodge.

One of the big problems is the "nobody loses/nobody gets a windfall" paradigm.

Even though incentive licensing was reintroduced 35 years ago, the bad feelings that were created by a system that took away existing hams' operating privileges continue. They even continue among some hams who were not even licensed at the time! So demoting anybody will be opposed strongly.

OTOH, automatic upgrades (like the 1998 ARRL idea to give Generals to existing Novices and Tech Pluses) will be opposed just as strongly by folks who don't want to see any "giveaways".

That kinda limits any cleanup efforts.

73 de Jim, N2EY

263. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-04 01:29:14 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@STOPearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <Knpfb.22506$3S.7310@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 79889

"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote:
>
> Of course not, you wouldnt want anyone to put out any effort.

What does it matter, Bruce? According to you, you're such a smart little human being, the tests were a breeze - no effort, no study, required. Yet, at the same, you criticize others for not putting out enough effort. Make up your mind. Do you want effort? If so, you need to go back and take those tests again (this time putting in the effort to actually learn something about what you've read). If you don't want effort, stop complaining about others not wanting it either.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

264. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-04 01:38:12 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031003213812.02137.00000361@mb-m01.aol.com>
Source record: 79890

>My point exactly.
>
>Licenses and tests won't mean much if we can't work anybody through the
>noise.
>

My point also, so since all were concerned about is giving the licenses away,
then screw them, let them compete with BPL..

265. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-04 01:50:30 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031003215030.02243.00000324@mb-m01.aol.com>
Source record: 79891

>What does it matter, Bruce? According to you, you're such a smart little
>human being, the tests were a breeze - no effort, no study, required.

Thats the point, theres none required now.

>If so, you need to go back and take those
>tests again (this time putting in the effort to actually learn something
>about what you've read).

The difference between me and you, and the other Knuckle Draggers is, I knew the Info. I didnt have to go practicee a bunch of memory test so I could take it. As a matter of fact, when I took the test, I hadnt even seen the Question Pool, let alone the answers. And I still scored 100%

>If you don't want effort, stop complaining about
>others not wanting it either.
>
>
>Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

So now you admit it, you want a No Effort Test, and most likely a No Knowlege Test.

266. Re: GOOD NEWS-------France heat wave deaths top 14,000

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-04 01:56:00 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@STOPearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <QMpfb.22747$3S.18237@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 79892
Cross-posted to: alt.ham-radio.hf,alt.ham-radio.ssb,alt.radio.amateur,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"helmsman" <helmsmandelete@mindspring.com> wrote:
>
> Don't buy goods made in France or Germany and vacation
> somewhere else!

Nonsense. If someone offered me a vacation in either of those countries, I'd be packed and ready to go in an hour. You criticize Germany, yet we're the ones (the United States & Allies, after WWII) that put constitutional restrictions on that country's military and its participation in foreign conflicts. France, when it dropped out of NATO decades ago, also swore off any participation in NATO and U.S. foreign conflicts. Both of those countries now have a several decade tradition of this, yet you seem surprised, even outraged, when they maintained that same tradition during our invasion of Iraq. Unlike some countries, they mean what they say. If you now want to punish them for that, go right ahead. But don't expect everyone else to be a party to it. I, for one, will never punish a country for choosing peace over war.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

267. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-04 02:15:29 UTC
From: Clint <"rattlehead at computron dot net">
Message-ID: <vnsbbcgsgeld1b@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 79893

matter of time, nothing more.

So keep it yourself, pops.

Clint

--

More reasons it sucks to be a liberal:

A new study just released shows absolutely NO
decreasing trends in gun related violence after
increasing gun control laws & measures.

--
"Dick Carroll" <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:bll5ae$i36$0@208.206.142.99...
> Clint wrote:
>
> > anybody got a tissue for Dick?
> >
>
>
>
> You'd best keep it for yourself, Junior. Kim hasn't sang yet.
>

268. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-04 02:15:58 UTC
From: Clint <"rattlehead at computron dot net">
Message-ID: <vnsbc7r9tq354d@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 79894

yea, but it's outta here.

Clint

--

More reasons it sucks to be a liberal:

A new study just released shows absolutely NO
decreasing trends in gun related violence after
increasing gun control laws & measures.

--
"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:lfofb.5668$Hd6.3682788@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
>
> "Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
news:3F7DD6D5.90605@psu.edu...
> >
> >
> > N2EY wrote:
> > > In article <vnpnqt9lfbusa8@corp.supernews.com>, "Clint" <rattlehead at
> > > computron dot net> writes:
> > >
> > >
> > >>When they drop the morse code test requirement, it's
> > >>fairly clear to me they just won't "drop" it all by
> > >>itself with a stroke of an administrative pen;
> > >
> > > Why not? That's all that most of the anticodetest petitions are asking
> for.
> > > Both the NCI and NCVEC petitions simply ask for the dropping of
Element
> 1 and
> > > nothing else.
> >
> > I don't think it can work by "just" dropping the test. Too many loos
> > ends. Tech plus, novices, that kind of thing.
> >
> > - Mike KB3EIA -
> >
>
> Actually it would work quite easily. Everyone keeps their current
> privileges except that all varieties of Techs are combined to one class of
> Tech with the privileges of the Tech with HF.
>

> However, as you know I think they ought to keep the code test.
>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>

269. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-04 02:20:21 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <F7qfb.1735$qj6.1351637@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 79895

Dee D. Flint wrote:
> "Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message news:3F7DD6D5.90605@psu.edu...
>
>>
>>N2EY wrote:
>>
>>>In article <vnpnqt9lfbusa8@corp.supernews.com>, "Clint" <rattlehead at
>>>computron dot net> writes:
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>>When they drop the morse code test requirement, it's
>>>>fairly clear to me they just won't "drop" it all by
>>>>itself with a stroke of an administrative pen;
>>>
>>>Why not? That's all that most of the anticodetest petitions are asking
>
> for.
>
>>>Both the NCI and NCVEC petitions simply ask for the dropping of Element
>
> 1 and
>
>>>nothing else.
>>
>>I don't think it can work by "just" dropping the test. Too many loos
>>ends. Tech plus, novices, that kind of thing.
>>
>>- Mike KB3EIA -
>>
>
>
> Actually it would work quite easily. Everyone keeps their current
> privileges except that all varieties of Techs are combined to one class of
> Tech with the privileges of the Tech with HF.

It might be interesting to see if any tech's try out Morse code under
those contitions. Bootstrapping themselves to competence?

> However, as you know I think they ought to keep the code test.

Me too, but it's nice to have a discussion that doesn't involve Morse code.

- Mike KB3EIA -

270. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-04 02:20:55 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@STOPearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <b8qfb.22977$3S.21558@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 79896

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote:
>
> The Tech (no code) has no HF test questions. (as I understand
> it). Thus there is no reason a Tech (no code) would, or should
> be qualified to operate HF.

Didn't you take the Technician license exam, Dan? If so, you should be able to remember that it does indeed have questions about HF (bands, sub-bands, propagation, operating considerations, code use, and so on). After all, Tech Plus license holders, with limited HF privileges, take the exact same written exam. Some Novice material (also limited HF privileges) was added to the Tech license exam. Remember any of this? Now, what were your reasons again for no-code Techs not being qualified to operate HF?

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

271. More BPL Facts, was Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-04 02:38:05 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bllbqdvtd0@208.206.142.99>
Source record: 79897

N2EY wrote:

>
> BPL is a bad idea in so many ways. For example, I do *not* want to be around
> when (not if) one of those bypass couplers decides to fail and puts 13.2 kV
> into somebody's service entrance.
>

One cannot properly appreciate that until you've seen a device properly
insulated and rated for operation at HV such as a plate coupling
capacitor fail destructively, as I did on several occasions while
employed as a field engineer working on medium/high power transmitters.
The resulting explosion forcefully scatters small pieces of the device
throughout the space in which it was mounted, and beyond if an outlet is
present.

I once was called to troubleshoot a satellite reciever system which
the owner thought had been struck by lightning. It had not. What had
happened was that the owner had cut down a tree which was situated
about 100 feet from the satellite antenna, and when the tree fell, the
very topmost branch barely brushed a 7KV power line. The resulting HV
pulse into the ground induced high voltage into the satellite receiver
cabling which was buried in its routing to the house, and the HV pulse
wiped out the complete satellite receiver and the TV set which was
attached to it.
It's a fair comparison, but was not anywhere near a direct connection
to the HV as would occur when a BPL bypass coupler would fail. The
destruction of the household would be VERY complete, and all occupants
placed at extreme risk.
Would you dare consider sleeping under an elecric blanket???

To place the general public at risk by bypassing the home electric
service transformer is blatently ignoring the extreme risk involved.

> And after reading a "white paper" on 801.15be (I think that's the designation -
> you are probably familiar with it, Carl, it uses multiple carriers in the 3-7
> GHz range) it mystifoes me why anyone would think 78 MHz of bandwidth is going
> to compete with what systems capable of six times that can do - without wires.
>

This proves that it's a snow job by BPL promoters who know that the
people they must convince almost totally lack knowledge of the techcial
facts. And that they will be able to ignore their own technical advisors.

> Then there's the monopoly issue, and the favoritism issue (cable companies
> don't get a bye on Part 15....telcos don't get a bye on Part 15....Wi-Fi

> doesn't get a bye on Part 15...) and the simple fact that electric utilities
> have a hard enough time keeping the lights on and their equipment from crudding
> up the ether with plain old corona noise.
>

Talk of siezing the oppportunity! Clearly BPL promoters are working
feverishly to get this door opened, and blocked open by occupation,
before the opposition can lock it closed.

> Plus the fact that almost every other country that has tried BPL has given up
> trying to make it work. Japan has out-and-out banned it.
>

I don't think facts are even being considered as a part of this
decision. I really believe this is a major end run around all the
safeguards that are the very reason for the existance of the FCC.

272. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-04 03:00:22 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <blld46$2p3$0@208.206.142.99>
Source record: 79898

N2EY wrote:

> 3) FCC does nothing at all. (For a few years, anyway).
>
> Before you dismiss that last one, note how long some petitions have been
> hanging fire with the FCC. Like the Novice refarming petitions.....
>

As I read it, FCC has no impetus to hurry to do *anything* more re the ARS anytime soon, especially given the last restructurig addressed all the issues they thought important at the time. They can factually say that they did that, including reducing the code test to minimal levels which result in no burden to anyone. Even the bi-annual revue would not need result in more than the statemtent that "as a result of the R&O following docket 98-143, we we find no further action to be necessary". Or maybe not, but with the added workload and drastically reduced budget and staff, I think it's wishful thinking to believe FCC will spend more resources on the ARS than absolutely necessary. If there wasn't a ham or two on the staff I doubt we'd fare as well as we have been.

Then there is the very strong possibility, given the wording of FCC documents and statements of staff,--

wording which NCI members choose to interpret as stating intent to totally do away with code testing, but which doesn't say that at all

--that they may NOT drop element one at all, and instead grant low band HF access to one or more of the current lower grades of license which now have none. That's a totally justifiable position, the no-code mantra aside.

273. Re: More BPL Facts, was Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-04 03:03:27 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3Mqfb.1750$qj6.1363326@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 79899

Dick Carroll wrote:

> This proves that it's a snow job by BPL promoters who know that the
> people they must convince almost totally lack knowledge of the techcial
> facts. And that they will be able to ignore their own technical advisors.

For some reason, this reminds me of all those people who have me in
their address books, and yet have allowed their computers to be infected
by the Swen virus. Now I am being e-bombed for it.

So I doubt that most people would even worry that they could get their
systems fried. They just don't know any better.

- Mike KB3EIA -

274. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-04 03:36:15 UTC
From: Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns9409F01581BB6elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 79900

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in
news:20031003211042.00545.00001328@mb-m02.aol.com:

> In article <Xns94094F76815EEelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun Palmer
> <elektros@yahoo.com> writes:
>
>>n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in
>>news:20031003062915.12300.00000905@mb-m20.aol.com:
>>
>>> In article <vnpnqt9lfbusa8@corp.supernews.com>, "Clint" <rattlehead
>>> at computron dot net> writes:
>>>
>>>>When they drop the morse code test requirement, it's
>>>>fairly clear to me they just won't "drop" it all by itself with a
>>>>stroke of an administrative pen;
>>>
>>> Why not? That's all that most of the anticodetest petitions are
>>> asking for. Both the NCI and NCVEC petitions simply ask for the
>>> dropping of Element 1 and nothing else.
>>>
>>>>I imagine it
>>>>will accompany other changes in the license structure...
>>>
>>> Only if somebody asks for them.
>>>
>>> The FCC considered all sorts of proposals 4 years ago and we got what
>>> we have now.
>>>
>>>>what do you think will also change in the licensing system when the
>>>>drop the morse code test?
>>
>>I think you're right, Jim. My guess is that Element 1 will be dropped
>>and all Techs will be given Tech+ priviledges. I don't expect anything
>>else to happen.
>
> It's been almost 3 months. I'm convinced FCC had the authority to dump
> Element 1 soon after WRC 2003 ended.
>
> Of course it's not a high priority for them.
>>
>>That's not to say that some reform of the licence classes isn't
>>overdue, but the FCC position is that until there is some sort of
>>consensus they won't do anything about it.
>>

> See my post to KB3EIA. I doubt we'll ever get consensus due to the
> "nobody loses/no giveaways" mindset.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>

LOL! Nobody Loses + No Giveaways = No Change!

275. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-04 03:54:02 UTC
From: Clint <"rattlehead at computron dot net">
Message-ID: <vnsh45npg86305@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 79801

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:blld46$2p3$0@208.206.142.99...
>
> Then there is the very strong possibility, given the wording of FCC
> documents and statements of staff,--
>
> **wording which NCI members choose to interpret as stating intent to
> totally do away with code testing, but which doesn't say that at all**

mmm, neh.... it pretty much *does* say that.
It's going to happen.

Clint
--

More reasons it sucks to be a liberal:

A new study just released shows absolutely NO
decreasing trends in gun related violence after
increasing gun control laws & measures.

--

276. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-04 03:57:39 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bllgfj$a9k$0@208.206.142.99>
Source record: 79802

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> Then there is the very strong possibility, given the wording of FCC
> documents and statements of staff,--
>
> **wording which NCI members choose to interpret as stating intent to
> totally do away with code testing, but which doesn't say that at all**
>
> --that they may NOT drop element one at all, and instead grant
> low band HF access to one or more of the current lower grades of license
> which now have none. That's a totally justifiable position, the no-code
> mantra aside.
>

Further, the fact has recently surfaced that the UK did exactly this
instead of completely dropping code testing, as was so widely
and loudly stated by NCI members.

UK issues issue code-tested licenses, and the word is that a majority
of UK hams prefer to take those tests, and qualify as code-licensed hams
with a callsign issued that indicates that fact.

277. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-04 04:44:28 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3F7E502C.9050103@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 79803

Dan/W4NTI wrote:

>>
>>
>
>Why should the FCC simply grandfather the Tech (no code) to Tech plus (code
>and Novice test) ??
>
>The Tech (no code) has no HF test questions. (as I understand it). Thus
>there is no reason a Tech (no code) would, or should be qualified to operate
>HF.
>
>
>
As things are now, a no code tech can take the 5WPM element 1 test, and
gain access
to HF as a novice. Besides, what's *that* different about HF vs VHF
(aside from
propagation)? One viewpoint would say that all a ham really needs to
know are:
rules and regs, electrical and RF safety issues, some knowledge to
judge if a
rig is in band and on a desired legal frequency and is not emitting
excessive
harmonics, and how to handle RFI problems. This because the FCC allows
all hams
to build, repair and adjust our transmitters. Even novices. I haven't
heard of
any FCC enforcement actions because of deficient equipment lately.
Today it's
mostly bozos acting up.

278. Re: GOOD NEWS-------France heat wave deaths top 14,000

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-04 04:49:20 UTC
From: cfoley1064@aol.com
Message-ID: <87980da2.0310032049.43f8f4f5@posting.google.com>
Source record: 79804
Cross-posted to: alt.ham-radio.hf,alt.ham-radio.ssb,alt.radio.amateur,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"BIG-AL@3894.5-LSB-75-METERS" <BIG-AL -003894.5-LSB-75-METERS@ BIG-AL -003894.5-LSB-75-METERS> wrote in message news:<vn6lk3dd6nrg62@corp.supernews.com>...
> PARIS, France (AP) -- The death toll in France from August's blistering heat
> wave was nearly 15,000, according to a government report released Thursday
> that exceeded prior official estimates by 3,000 victims.

On September 12, 2001, after 3000 Americans were butchered by religious fanatics, thousands of French spontaneously, with heartfelt tears in their eyes, marched with American flags in sympathy. At France's urging, NATO immediately invoked, for the first time in its history, the clause of common defense.

Almost two years later, over 14,000 French, mostly aged and infirm, are felled by one of the worst extended summer heat waves of the last hundred years. Our glorious right wingnuts laughed and said it served 'em right.

I know this is off-topic, folks (my first, I think), but there was a time when you could be a conservative and a patriotic American without spouting dittohead trash or playing Newtball with foreign policy. The country would be better off if the real conservative, patriotic Americans left the John Bircher wingnuts in the gutter where they belong, and take their rightful place running the country and guiding America through some difficult times. If nothing else, after we're done alienating every potential customer in the world, who will we design for or sell to?

279. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-04 04:50:44 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3F7E51A4.4050000@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 79805

Dwight Stewart wrote:

>"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote:
>
>
>>The Tech (no code) has no HF test questions. (as I understand
>>it). Thus there is no reason a Tech (no code) would, or should
>>be qualified to operate HF.
>>
>>
>
>
> Didn't you take the Technician license exam, Dan? If so, you should be
>able to remember that it does indeed have questions about HF (bands,
>sub-bands, propagation, operating considerations, code use, and so on).
>After all, Tech Plus license holders, with limited HF privileges, take the
>exact same written exam. Some Novice material (also limited HF privileges)
>was added to the Tech license exam. Remember any of this? Now, what were
>your reasons again for no-code Techs not being qualified to operate HF?
>
>
>
My pre '87 tech license was the General written test. Which obviously
had to ask
about HF. Aside from propagation, there really is nothing different
about HF vs.
VHF or UHF. Oh, okay, you don't get to build a 20 element rotatable
beam for
80m. Unless you can borrow an aircraft carrier.....

280. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-04 04:56:12 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3F7E52EC.4070502@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 79806

Dee D. Flint wrote:

>>
>>
>>
>
>Actually it would work quite easily. Everyone keeps their current
>privileges except that all varieties of Techs are combined to one class of
>Tech with the privileges of the Tech with HF.
>
>
>
The FCC might require no code techs to do a "paper" upgrade to tech
plus, like they
made pre'87 tech plussers do a paper upgrade to get a general license.
I was one of
these, and decided that I should also upgrade my license to "extra". So
we may see
more new generals happening if the FCC does it this way.

281. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-04 10:13:52 UTC
From: wa2si@arrl.net
Message-ID: <b7d1465c.0310040213.2295d64a@posting.google.com>
Source record: 79807

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@STOPearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:<c86fb.13685$f11.8383@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> "Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote:
> >
> > My job is like that. The building is really well shielded
> > and I wanted to run an inconspicuous 30/40m SW+
> > QRP rig from my desk.
>
>
> We took this apartment (paid for by the VA) to allow my wife to easily
> attend school just down the street. Sadly, there is enough metal in this
> building to build a few dozen Army tanks. Even worse, the apartment is
> directly above the owner's apartment and he likes to spend a great amount of
> time outdoors on the patios out back (the front is directly above the office
> entrance). I've tried several homebrew internal antennas, but none of them
> would allow me to consistently hit a repeater just a few miles away. We're
> hoping that, once the owner gets used to us, he'll eventually allow a small
> antenna. But, as it is now, the only way to talk on the radio at home is to
> walk out onto the balcony (and the metal in the building even effects that).

Well, from the information you've provided, I can safely assume that
your apartment is at least on the second floor. (Unless your landlord
lives in the basement.) You can probably get away with operating at
night with a wire hung from the balcony with a tuner. 40m is hoppin'
at night and you certainly don't need much power to work distant
stations reliably. I fired up my 40m Small Wonders SW+ QRP rig for the
first time yesterday and promptly worked a chap in Rochester, NY. I
received a RST report of 459 with only 2.5 Watts, simply amazing! Of
course, these are just helpful suggestions...YMMV.

--
73 de Bert
WA2SI

282. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-04 10:25:48 UTC
From: wa2si@arrl.net
Message-ID: <b7d1465c.0310040225.76df3e9a@posting.google.com>
Source record: 79808

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@STOPearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:<c86fb.13685$f11.8383@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> We took this apartment (paid for by the VA) to allow my wife to easily
> attend school just down the street. Sadly, there is enough metal in this
> building to build a few dozen Army tanks. Even worse, the apartment is
> directly above the owner's apartment and he likes to spend a great amount of
> time outdoors on the patios out back (the front is directly above the office
> entrance). I've tried several homebrew internal antennas, but none of them
> would allow me to consistently hit a repeater just a few miles away. We're
> hoping that, once the owner gets used to us, he'll eventually allow a small
> antenna. But, as it is now, the only way to talk on the radio at home is to
> walk out onto the balcony (and the metal in the building even effects that).

Here ya go, Dwight. Came across this and thought about your situation.
This one's already built and for the Novice portion of 40. (Add
Element 1 to your Tech ticket and viola.) Good luck in any case.

http://cgi.ebay.com/ws/eBayISAPI.dll?ViewItem&item=3050313950&category=4674

--
73 de Bert
WA2SI

283. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-04 10:30:40 UTC
From: kalusmalus@hotmail.com
Message-ID: <a0684059.0310040230.458e4698@posting.google.com>
Source record: 79809

Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:<bllgfj$a9k$0@208.206.142.99>...
> Further, the fact has recently surfaced that the UK did exactly this
> instead of completely dropping code testing, as was so widely
> and loudly stated by NCI members.
>
> UK issues issue code-tested licenses, and the word is that a majority
> of UK hams prefer to take those tests, and qualify as code-licensed hams
> with a callsign issued that indicates that fact.

I think you are wrong .... in the UK, if you pass the amateur exam now
you will be issued an "M0" call which in itself does not say you have
or have not passed the code test. My call is an old VHF-only and I prefer
to keep it, whether I am called "lazy" for not obtaining the code test or
not. It's my call since 1994 and I like it!
If you wish you can take a code test here and get a pass certificate which
you can present in countries that still have the code requirement.
To obtain the Foundation Licence (M3 calls) you attend a "Morse appreciation"
session - it is not a test.
73 Klaus G7RTI

284. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-04 11:03:27 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@STOPearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <3Oxfb.27485$3S.5351@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 79810

"Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.net> wrote:
>
> Well, from the information you've provided, I can safely
> assume that your apartment is at least on the second
> floor. (Unless your landlord lives in the basement.) You
> can probably get away with operating at night with a
> wire hung from the balcony with a tuner. (snip)

I've given up on this place. There is simply no hope of getting a decent signal out of here. My wife finishes school next year. Until then, I'm prety much stuck with mobile operation.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

285. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-04 12:02:33 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <tFyfb.5707$Hd6.3793867@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 79811

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:blld46$2p3$0@208.206.142.99...
> --that they may NOT drop element one at all, and instead grant
> low band HF access to one or more of the current lower grades of license
> which now have none. That's a totally justifiable position, the no-code
> mantra aside.
>

There is currently only ONE license class that does not have HF access and
that is the no-code Technician license. All other classes, including Novice
and Tech with code, do have HF privileges.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

286. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-04 12:09:16 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <MLyfb.5708$Hd6.3794343@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 79812

"Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
news:3F7E52EC.4070502@ix.netcom.com...
> Dee D. Flint wrote:
>
> >>
> >>
> >>
> > >Actually it would work quite easily. Everyone keeps their current
> > >privileges except that all varieties of Techs are combined to one class
of
> > >Tech with the privileges of the Tech with HF.
> > >
> > >
> > >
> The FCC might require no code techs to do a "paper" upgrade to tech
> plus, like they
> made pre'87 tech plussers do a paper upgrade to get a general license.
> I was one of
> these, and decided that I should also upgrade my license to "extra". So
> we may see
> more new generals happening if the FCC does it this way.
>

Even a paper upgrade would be unnecessary since the category of Tech Plus
does not exist anymore. These days Techs who pass the code must keep a copy
of their code CSCE to prove it in case they are ever questioned. Currently
when Tech Plus licensees renew, their license simply says Tech and they
should keep a copy of their expired Tech Plus to show they passed the code.
All that the FCC would need to do is issue a ruling that all Techs have the
same privileges as the old Tech Plus or Tech with code. The result is that
they would no longer need to keep a copy of their code CSCE or old Tech Plus
license.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

287. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-04 13:21:45 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <JPzfb.8883$yp6.278571@nnrp1.ptd.net>
Source record: 79813

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20031003211044.00545.00001329@mb-m02.aol.com...
[snip]
>
> One of the big problems is the "nobody loses/nobody gets a windfall"
paradigm.

The NCI and NCVEC Petitions are "nobody loses/nobody gets a windfall"
propositions ... since a tech now gets HF privs if he/she passes a 5 wpm
code test, the elimination of the test would not be a "windfall" if all
techs
got the same privs as the old "TechPlus" ...

Everything else stays the same.

Note there is NOTHING in the NCI (or NCVEC) petition about any form
of restriction of Morse use, any expansion of the phone bands at the expense
of Morse (or other digital mode) use, etc.

I think these proposals fully meet the "nobody loses/nobody gets a windfall"
paradigm.

73,
Carl - wk3c

288. Re: GOOD NEWS-------France heat wave deaths top 14,000

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-04 13:59:29 UTC
From: Pappy127@usa.net
Message-ID: <3F7ED241.F928D518@usa.net>
Source record: 79814
Cross-posted to: alt.ham-radio.hf,alt.ham-radio.ssb,alt.radio.amateur,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Who really cares. This is a ham radio group.

To hell with the French.

someone@somewhere.com wrote:
>
> good news of people dying, shame on whoever wrote the heading. Think
> outside the borders and its humans for god sake....how does that make
> you happy.......cha....
>
> "BIG-AL@3894.5-LSB-75-METERS" <BIG-AL -003894.5-LSB-75-METERS@ BIG-AL
-003894.5-LSB-75-METERS> writes:
>
> > PARIS, France (AP) -- The death toll in France from August's blistering heat
> > wave was nearly 15,000, according to a government report released Thursday
> > that exceeded prior official estimates by 3,000 victims.
> >
> >
> >
>
> --

289. Re: PORKBUTT PORKBUTT PORKBUTT

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-04 14:31:06 UTC
From: Unclaimed Mysteries <k4doh@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <KQAfb.22518$f11.5811@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 79815
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

LRod wrote in part:

> On Sat, 27 Sep 2003 03:02:52 -0500, "LaShaun Ivory"
> <NoSpam@NOSpam.com> wrote in part:
>

>
>>Frankie...ever pull your dictionary off the shelf and read the definition of
>>"maturity"?
>
>
> This is the best part. LaShaun telling Frankie to "pull [the]
> dictionary off the shelf." Try it yourself, and while you have it
> open, read the definition of "ironic."
>

Cue Alanis. ($1)

--

It Came From C. L. Smith's Unclaimed Mysteries.
http://www.unclaimedmysteries.net

"Free nations don't develop weapons of mass destruction." - US President
George W. Bush, Milwaukee, Wisconsin, October 2003

290. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-04 14:57:20 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031004105720.15462.00003368@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 79816

In article <MLyfb.5708$Hd6.3794343@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> writes:

>Even a paper upgrade would be unnecessary since the category of Tech Plus
>does not exist anymore. These days Techs who pass the code must keep a copy
>of their code CSCE to prove it in case they are ever questioned. Currently
>when Tech Plus licensees renew, their license simply says Tech and they
>should keep a copy of their expired Tech Plus to show they passed the code.
>All that the FCC would need to do is issue a ruling that all Techs have the
>same privileges as the old Tech Plus or Tech with code. The result is that
>they would no longer need to keep a copy of their code CSCE or old Tech Plus
>license.
>
Yep, they could do that easily.

But it would be almost exactly what ARRL asked for 5 years ago, when they proposed that Techs get HF CW privs.

The "Tech-with-HF" semi-class is a classic designed-by-a-committee confuser. If a Tech passes 5 wpm code, but doesn't upgrade, he/she gets HF Novice privs for as long as he/she holds onto the Element 1 CSCE. But said CSCE can't be used for Element 1 credit after 365 days.

OTOH, an expired Novice or Tech-with-code license document of any vintage is good for Element 1 credit. Pre-March-21-1987 expired Tech licenses are also good for Element 3 credit.

So someone who passed the 5 wpm code test in front of a single volunteer examiner 50+ years ago and got a Novice or Tech license as a result gets credit for Element 1, but someone who took the test 366 days ago gets no credit ofr their CSCE.

And an expired-beyond-grace-period General, Advanced or Extra license gets no credit at all.

Anyone think having the amateur license test/class regs make sense is a priority to FCC?

73 de Jim, N2EY

291. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-04 16:03:03 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <XaCfb.28264$3S.24200@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 79817

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20031003202936.02537.00000853@mb-m23.aol.com...
> In article <k1hfb.16193$f11.14563@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>,
> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> writes:
>
> >Why should the FCC simply grandfather the Tech (no code) to Tech plus
(code
> >and Novice test) ??
>
> Because the only test difference between a Tech and a post-March-21-1987
Tech
> Plus is Element 1
> >
> >The Tech (no code) has no HF test questions. (as I understand it).
>
> Actually that's not true, The old Novice Q&A was incorporated into the
Tech
> pool.
>
> >Thus
> >there is no reason a Tech (no code) would, or should be qualified to
operate
> >HF.
>
> Tell it to the FCC. A Tech who passes Element 1 gets the same HF privs as
a
> Novice or Tech Plus.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

Thanks for the update Jim. I haven't bothered with clubs or being a VE for
a while now.

Sounds like the question pool folks are, so to speak, planning ahead.. hi.

Dan/W4NTI

292. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-04 16:54:11 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <blmtvj$t7c$0@208.207.71.149>
Source record: 79818

Klaus G7RTI wrote:
> Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:<bllgfj$a9k$0@208.206.142.99>...
>
>> Further, the fact has recently surfaced that the UK did exactly this
>>instead of completely dropping code testing, as was so widely
>>and loudly stated by NCI members.
>>
>> UK issues code-tested licenses, and the word is that a majority
>>of UK hams prefer to take those tests, and qualify as code-licensed hams
>>with a callsign issued that indicates that fact.
>
>
> I think you are wrong .... in the UK, if you pass the amateur exam now
> you will be issued an "M0" call which in itself does not say you have
> or have not passed the code test. My call is an old VHF-only and I prefer
> to keep it, whether I am called "lazy" for not obtaining the code test or
> not. It's my call since 1994 and I like it!
> If you wish you can take a code test here and get a pass certificate which
> you can present in countries that still have the code requirement.
> To obtain the Foundation Licence (M3 calls) you attend a "Morse appreciation"
> session - it is not a test.
> 73 Klaus G7RTI

Well, Klaus, maybe you'd better argue the point with your own
countrymen. Here's a partial message from one of them...

Quote....
> I decided to take the challenge in may 2003.
>
> the 5wpm and 12wpm tests are still available to take here.
>
> if a candidate passes the 5 or 12 wpm test they will gain

> an M0 callsign in england, vise versa for scotland with MM0,

> and wales with MW0.

> it is not a reqirement to access hf, but tests are still

> running and are more popular now than ever.

> thanks again, ___
>
> mike

I believe his report may be more credible than yours, as *HE* has
been through the code tests thus in position to know the facts.

Are you an NCI member??

Dick

"Liberals always feel your pain. Unless, of course, they caused it!"

-Dennis Miller on Fox News

He also said, to Californians, "If you're such a bubblehead you can't
push a chad out of a ballot with a sharp object, I don't *want* you to
vote, you'll vote stupid, and I don't mean routine stupid I mean
WEAPONS-GRADE stupid......"

293. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-04 16:56:53 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <blmu4l$t7c$1@208.207.71.149>
Source record: 79819

Dee D. Flint wrote:

> "Dick Carroll" <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com> wrote in message
> news:blld46$2p3$0@208.206.142.99...
>
>>--that they may NOT drop element one at all, and instead grant
>>low band HF access to one or more of the current lower grades of license
>>which now have none. That's a totally justifiable position, the no-code
>>mantra aside.
>>
>
>
> There is currently only ONE license class that does not have HF access and
> that is the no-code Technician license. All other classes, including Novice
> and Tech with code, do have HF privileges.

Of course. I should have been more clear instead of just saying "low band HF access". But if anything, the code killers have made it clear they don't regard the Novice CW allocations to be worth anything.

Dick

294. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-04 17:00:51 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <blmuc3$u47$0@208.207.71.149>
Source record: 79820

N2EY wrote:

> The "Tech-with-HF" semi-class is a classic designed-by-a-committee confuser.

Old engineer pal of mine used to say "An elephant is a horse designed by
a committee."

If
> a Tech passes 5 wpm code, but doesn't upgrade, he/she gets HF Novice privs for
> as long as he/she holds onto the Element 1 CSCE. But said CSCE can't be used
> for Element 1 credit after 365 days.
>
> OTOH, an expired Novice or Tech-with-code license document of any vintage is
> good for Element 1 credit. Pre-March-21-1987 expired Tech licenses are also
> good for Element 3 credit.
>
> So someone who passed the 5 wpm code test in front of a single volunteer
> examiner 50+ years ago and got a Novice or Tech license as a result gets credit
> for Element 1, but someone who took the test 366 days ago gets no credit ofr
> their CSCE.
>
> And an expired-beyond-grace-period General, Advanced or Extra license gets no
> credit at all.
>
> Anyone think having the amateur license test/class regs make sense is a
> priority to FCC?
>

It's all a committee-designed horse, for a fact.

Dick

295. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-04 19:37:30 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3F7F2177.8050500@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 79822

>
>
>
>But it would be almost exactly what ARRL asked for 5 years ago, when they
>proposed that Techs get HF CW privs.
>
>The "Tech-with-HF" semi-class is a classic designed-by-a-committee confuser. If
>a Tech passes 5 wpm code, but doesn't upgrade, he/she gets HF Novice privs for
>as long as he/she holds onto the Element 1 CSCE. But said CSCE can't be used
>for Element 1 credit after 365 days.
>
>OTOH, an expired Novice or Tech-with-code license document of any vintage is
>good for Element 1 credit. Pre-March-21-1987 expired Tech licenses are also
>good for Element 3 credit.
>
>So someone who passed the 5 wpm code test in front of a single volunteer
>examiner 50+ years ago and got a Novice or Tech license as a result gets credit
>for Element 1, but someone who took the test 366 days ago gets no credit ofr
>their CSCE.
>
>And an expired-beyond-grace-period General, Advanced or Extra license gets no
>credit at all.
>
>Anyone think having the amateur license test/class regs make sense is a
>priority to FCC?
>
>73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>
Likely some non-ham brearucrat had to write these rules. Said person
probably
didn't understand that someone who had a general or extra license had to
pass
a higher speed code test, which in turn qualifies them to do 5WPM. He
probably
though copying 5WPM was completely different than 13 or 20 (in a sense it is
a bit different but not enough to disqualify someone for 5).

296. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-04 19:37:36 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <4kFfb.8922$yp6.281377@nnrp1.ptd.net>
Source record: 79821

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20031004105720.15462.00003368@mb-m06.aol.com...
> In article <MLyfb.5708$Hd6.3794343@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D.
Flint"
> <deehays@qix.net> writes:
>
> >Even a paper upgrade would be unnecessary since the category of Tech Plus
> >does not exist anymore. These days Techs who pass the code must keep a
copy
> >of their code CSCE to prove it in case they are ever questioned.
Currently
> >when Tech Plus licensees renew, their license simply says Tech and they
> >should keep a copy of their expired Tech Plus to show they passed the
code.
> >All that the FCC would need to do is issue a ruling that all Techs have
the
> >same privileges as the old Tech Plus or Tech with code. The result is
that
> >they would no longer need to keep a copy of their code CSCE or old Tech
Plus
> >license.
> >
> Yep, they could do that easily.
>
> But it would be almost exactly what ARRL asked for 5 years ago, when they
> proposed that Techs get HF CW privs.

But the FCC couldn't grant that because of the (now gone) ITU requirement
that
one pass a Morse test BEFORE getting on HF ...

73,
Carl - wk3c

297. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-04 20:16:11 UTC
From: wa2si@arrl.net
Message-ID: <b7d1465c.0310041216.319bdd08@posting.google.com>
Source record: 79823

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@STOPearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:<3Oxfb.27485$3S.5351@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> "Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.net> wrote:
> >
> > Well, from the information you've provided, I can safely
> > assume that your apartment is at least on the second
> > floor. (Unless your landlord lives in the basement.) You
> > can probably get away with operating at night with a
> > wire hung from the balcony with a tuner. (snip)
>
>
> I've given up on this place. There is simply no hope of getting a decent
> signal out of here. My wife finishes school next year. Until then, I'm pretty
> much stuck with mobile operation.

No way! Don't give up and lose a whole year of desktop operating.
Check this out:

This: http://cgi.ebay.com/ws/eBayISAPI.dll?ViewItem&item=3050313950&category=4674

...plus this: http://cgi.ebay.com/ws/eBayISAPI.dll?ViewItem&item=3050034117&category=4672

...& maybe this:
http://cgi.ebay.com/ws/eBayISAPI.dll?ViewItem&item=3049886309&category=48711

Equals worldwide DX. Approx. 2 bills all said and done.

73 de Bert
WA2SI

298. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-04 22:29:27 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031004182927.01893.00000999@mb-m22.aol.com>
Source record: 79824

In article <Xns9409F01581BB6elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun Palmer
<elektros@yahoo.com> writes:

>LOL! Nobody Loses + No Giveaways = No Change!

'zactly.

Don't count it out.

73 de Jim, N2EY

299. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-04 22:29:27 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031004182927.01893.00000998@mb-m22.aol.com>
Source record: 79827

In article <bllgfj$a9k$0@208.206.142.99>, Dick Carroll
<dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com> writes:

>Dick Carroll wrote:
>>
>> Then there is the very strong possibility, given the wording of FCC
>> documents and statements of staff,--
>>
>> **wording which NCI members choose to interpret as stating intent to
>> totally do away with code testing, but which doesn't say that at all**
>>
>> --that they may NOT drop element one at all, and instead grant
>> low band HF access to one or more of the current lower grades of license
>> which now have none. That's a totally justifiable position, the no-code
>> mantra aside.
>>
>
> Further, the fact has recently surfaced that the UK did exactly this
>instead of completely dropping code testing, as was so widely
>and loudly stated by NCI members.

It's just not mandatory anymore.
>
> UK issues issue code-tested licenses, and the word is that a majority
>of UK hams prefer to take those tests, and qualify as code-licensed hams
>with a callsign issued that indicates that fact.

If they want to - but they don't have to.

Perhaps there's a possibility there - have code tests, but have them be
non-mandatory. Perhaps 1x2 calls could be reserved....

73 de Jim, N2EY
>

300. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-04 22:29:28 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031004182928.01893.00001000@mb-m22.aol.com>
Source record: 79825

In article <JPzfb.8883$yp6.278571@nnrp1.ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
<wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20031003211044.00545.00001329@mb-m02.aol.com...
>[snip]
>>
>> One of the big problems is the "nobody loses/nobody gets a windfall"
>paradigm.
>
>The NCI and NCVEC Petitions are "nobody loses/nobody gets a windfall"
>propositions ... since a tech now gets HF privs if he/she passes a 5 wpm
>code test, the elimination of the test would not be a "windfall" if all
>techs got the same privs as the old "TechPlus" ...
>
>Everything else stays the same.

Yup. And so we wind up with a continuation of the VHF/UHF heavy, HF/MF light
entry level setup that is an artifact of the old S25.5.
>
>Note there is NOTHING in the NCI (or NCVEC) petition about any form
>of restriction of Morse use, any expansion of the phone bands at the expense
>of Morse (or other digital mode) use, etc.

In the case of NCI, that's "outside the charter". And NCI has promised to cease
to exist when code testing goes. Which means that if/when Element 1 disappears,
NCI's USA chapter will simply go away as an organization trying to change FCC
rules..

In the case of NCVEC, there may be more petitions and proposals. They have
already hinted at same.

All bets are off if it can be shown or even argued that the new Tech Q&A pool
is responsible for the recent dropoff in new Techs. (See AH0A site for exact
numbers.)

>
>I think these proposals fully meet the "nobody loses/nobody gets a windfall"
>paradigm.
>
Some would say that getting full privileges with no code test was a windfall,
but I'm not gonna go there....

Main point is that between those two constrainsts, very little change in the
writtens or basic structure is possible.

73 de Jim, N2EY

301. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-04 22:29:28 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031004182928.01893.00001001@mb-m22.aol.com>
Source record: 79826

In article <blmuc3$u47$0@208.207.71.149>, Dick Carroll
<dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>
>> The "Tech-with-HF" semi-class is a classic designed-by-a-committee
>confuser.
>
>
>Old engineer pal of mine used to say "An elephant is a horse designed by
>a committee."
>

Heard that one many times - also:

"An elephant is a mouse designed to meet military specifications"

73 de Jim, N2EY

302. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-04 23:28:14 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <iIlfb.8934$yp6.284046@nnrp1.ptd.net>
Source record: 79828

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20031004182928.01893.00001000@mb-m22.aol.com...
> In article <JPzfb.8883$yp6.278571@nnrp1.ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
> <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:
>
> >"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> >news:20031003211044.00545.00001329@mb-m02.aol.com...
> >[snip]
> >>
> >> One of the big problems is the "nobody loses/nobody gets a windfall"
> >paradigm.
> >
> >The NCI and NCVEC Petitions are "nobody loses/nobody gets a windfall"
> >propositions ... since a tech now gets HF privs if he/she passes a 5 wpm
> >code test, the elimination of the test would not be a "windfall" if all
> >techs got the same privs as the old "TechPlus" ...
> >
> >Everything else stays the same.
>
> Yup. And so we wind up with a continuation of the VHF/UHF heavy, HF/MF
light
> entry level setup that is an artifact of the old S25.5.

I doubt that ... I expect that a very large percentage of techs will rapidly
upgrade to at least general, if not extra, once the code test is gone.

The idea of "eliminate the code test and give techs "techplus" privs is
logical, takes nothing away from anyone, and gives nobody a "freebie."

> >Note there is NOTHING in the NCI (or NCVEC) petition about any form
> >of restriction of Morse use, any expansion of the phone bands at the
expense
> >of Morse (or other digital mode) use, etc.
>
> In the case of NCI, that's "outside the charter". And NCI has promised to
cease
> to exist when code testing goes. Which means that if/when Element 1
disappears,
> NCI's USA chapter will simply go away as an organization trying to change
FCC
> rules.

NCI will exist until Morse testing is gone worldwide, but you're right,
we'll have
nothing to do in the US once the FCC eliminates Morse testing for all

classes of
license.

> In the case of NCVEC, there may be more petitions and proposals. They have
> already hinted at same.

I'm not part of that group, so I can't speak for them ... if they file a
petition
seeking to water down the writtens or expand the phone bands, I'll oppose
it vigorously (personally).

> >I think these proposals fully meet the "nobody loses/nobody gets a
windfall"
> >paradigm.
> >
> Some would say that getting full privileges with no code test was a
windfall,
> but I'm not gonna go there....

The governments of the world don't seem to hold that view, so you'd be
up against the "heavy hitters."

> Main point is that between those two constrainsts, very little change in
the
> writtens or basic structure is possible.

And I think the three classes of license are reasonable and appropriate.
Tech becomes the "entry" license, general is "mid-grade," and extra is
"top." I don't see anything wrong with that ...

73,
Carl - wk3c

303. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-05 01:00:08 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20031004210008.02537.00000878@mb-m23.aol.com>
Source record: 79831

In article <t16fb.1278$qj6.1085362@news1.news.adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo
<mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:

>
> I would like to see the tests a little more in depth (note I don't say
>harder) with more operation questions. Perhaps even a post-test booklet
>with good operating procedures. I really needed this after passing my
>general. I had some small HF experience from contesting with the club,
>but contesting etiquette and everyday etiquette are two very different
>things.
>
> My biggest hope is that we take the time to make a good system, and not

>come up with some Byzantine mess.

Mike:

I think that the most likely scenario is that they will do as you suggest,
and distill it down to two license classes, General and Extra. All current
Techs would be "grandfathered" to the General class, and the Extra will
remain the same, sans Element 1(a). This would be the easiest change
to accomplish from an administrative standpoint, and they wouldn't have
to even bother renaming the remaining license classes, which would only
risk causing resentment among current Extras. There could be, at most,
a requirement for current Techs to pass another written element, but the
grandfathering would be an easier fix.

I'd also look for them to pre-empt future petitions to increase voice
spectrum by the conversion of the current Novice/tech sub-bands to
include that mode. I do not expect the overall licensing requirements
to be made "harder" in any way, since that would only raise objections
from the knuckle-draggers and the subsequent petitions which that
would produce.

The FCC's goal, obviously, is to get as much of the administrative
burden of the ARS licensing system off their backs as possible, so I
look for them to do just that.

73 de Larry, K3LT

304. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-05 01:00:08 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20031004210008.02537.00000879@mb-m23.aol.com>
Source record: 79832

In article <vnpnqt9lfbusa8@corp.supernews.com>, "Clint" <rattlehead at computron dot net> writes:

>When they drop the morse code test requirement, it's
>fairly clear to me they just won't "drop" it all by
>itself with a stroke of an administrative pen; I imagine it
>will accompany other changes in the license structure...
>what do you think will also change in the licensing
>system when the drop the morse code test?
>
>Clint
>KB5ZHT

In other words, will they (the FCC) dumb the licensing process down further, to the point where it reaches your level? Perhaps. If not, sorry about your luck!

73 de Larry, K3LT

305. Re: test

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-05 01:00:09 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20031004210009.02537.00000881@mb-m23.aol.com>
Source record: 79829

In article <3Kcfb.5399339$mA4.766862@news.easynews.com>, "AArron"
<aarron@hotmail.com> writes:

>Test

You pass.

73 de Larry, K3LT

306. Re: test

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-05 01:00:09 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20031004210009.02537.00000880@mb-m23.aol.com>
Source record: 79833

In article <EWcfb.14012$3S.9737@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@STOPearthlinkSPAM.net> writes:

>> Test
>
>
>1. 2 x 6 = ____?

12

>2. _________ was the first president of the United States.

George Washington.

>3. What kind of antenna feed line can carry radio energy well
> even if it is buried in the ground? ______
>
> A. Twin lead
> B. Coaxial cable
> C. Parallel conductor
> D. Twisted pair

Coaxial cable.

>4. Did you post a "test" message to the wrong newsgroup? (yes/no) ______

No, AAaron did.

Do I get a No-code HF license for passing the test?

73 de Larry, K3LT

307. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-05 01:00:10 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20031004210010.02537.00000882@mb-m23.aol.com>
Source record: 79830

In article <tr7fb.13749$f11.9224@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@STOPearthlinkSPAM.net> writes:

>> Incorrect. The Technician class license infers that knowledge
>> of Morse code isn't required to be an *entry-level* amateur
>> radio operator. There are two higher classes which require
>> a code test.
>
>
> Are those "*entry-level* amateur radio operators" something other than
>Amateur Radio Operators, Larry? If not, my statement is correct - Morse code
>is not required to be an Amateur Radio Operator.

Dwight:

I didn't deny that they were "amateur radio operators," I just clarified the fact that they are *entry-level* amateur radio operators.

>> If and when the Element 1(a) code test is abolished, that will
>> simply prove that the FCC has a low opinion of the ARS as
>> a whole, and that it responds to political pressure -- i.e.
>> petitions to remove code testing, and the comments which
>> support them.

> No, it simply means the FCC is responding properly to the realities of the
>world around us. Larry.
>
> "We are persuaded that because the amateur service is
> fundamentally a technical service, the emphasis on Morse
> code proficiency as a licensing requirement does not
> comport with the basis and purpose of the service. We
> note, moreover, that the design of modern communications
> systems, including personal communication services, satellite,
> fiber optic, and high definition television systems, are based
> on digital communication technologies. We also note that
> no communication system has been designed in many years
> that depends on hand-keyed telegraphy or the ability to
> receive messages in Morse code by ear. In contrast,
> modern communication systems are designed to be
> automated systems. Given the changes that have occurred
> in communications in the last fifty years, we believe that
> reducing the emphasis on telegraphy proficiency as a
> licensing requirement will allow the amateur service to, as
> it has in the past, attract technically inclined persons,
> particularly the youth of our country, and encourage them
> to learn and to prepare themselves in the areas where the

> United States needs expertise." - FCC WT Docket No.
> 98-143 RM-9148 RM-9150 RM-9196

I am quite familiar with the text of the Restructuring R&O, Dwight. The FCC's language seems to be geared mainly to pander to those commentors who favored the reduction/elimination of code testing, and for good reason. The FCC, if they can get the code testing requirement lifted, faces a smaller administrative burden in running the ARS licensing system, an important consideration since the ARS is an economically irrelevant communications service. For this reason, I fully expect code testing to be abolished. I am certain that it *will* happen.

> The exact same arguments could be made when talking about the elimination
>of the Element 1(a) code test.

And undoubtedly will. Nothing less than I would expect from people who don't understand or appreciate the nature of the ARS, and view it as an administrative burden which deflects valuable resources away from much more economically pertinent issues. As I've said many times before, follow the money, and you learn the truth.

73 de Larry, K3LT

308. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-05 01:14:33 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <ZfKfb.8269$qj6.1651765@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 79834

Carl R. Stevenson wrote:

> And I think the three classes of license are reasonable and appropriate.
> Tech becomes the "entry" license, general is "mid-grade," and extra is
> "top." I don't see anything wrong with that ...

What do you think would be a good division knowledge wise between the classes? The tech and general are not too bad now, knowledge to privileges. I lean a bit toward having the Extra require a bit more knowledge, or perhaps experience. I know a few no-experience Extra's and it just seems (to me) that some "time in grade" might make the license more meaningful.

- Mike KB3EIA -

309. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-05 01:40:53 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031004214053.07857.00000331@mb-m11.aol.com>
Source record: 79837

>I do not expect the overall licensing requirements
>to be made "harder" in any way, since that would only raise objections
>from the knuckle-draggers and the subsequent petitions which that
>would produce.

Theres no Question the License will be easier.The Knuckle draggers would
really cry if the FCC went and made it something where they would actually have
to know something.

310. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-05 01:44:27 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <%HKfb.8937$yp6.284978@nnrp1.ptd.net>
Source record: 79835

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:ZfKfb.8269$qj6.1651765@news1.news.adelphia.net...
> Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
>
> > And I think the three classes of license are reasonable and appropriate.
> > Tech becomes the "entry" license, general is "mid-grade," and extra is
> > "top." I don't see anything wrong with that ...
>
> What do you think would be a good division knowledge wise between the
> classes? The tech and general are not too bad now, knowledge to
> privileges. I lean a bit toward having the Extra require a bit more
> knowledge, or perhaps experience. I know a few no-experience Extra's and
> it just seems (to me) that some "time in grade" might make the license
> more meaningful.
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -
>

I wouldn't oppose a bit more "meat" on the Extra written ... but I
would oppose any "time in grade" requirements. Folks either
qualify (pass the test) or not ... "time in grade" unnecessarily
discriminates against people who are qualified by making them
wait unnecessarily.

73,
Carl - wk3c

311. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-05 01:48:34 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <SLKfb.8938$yp6.285150@nnrp1.ptd.net>
Source record: 79836

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20031004210010.02537.00000882@mb-m23.aol.com...
> In article <tr7fb.13749$f11.9224@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>,
"Dwight
> Stewart" <stewartx@STOPearthlinkSPAM.net> writes:
>
> >> Incorrect. The Technician class license infers that knowledge
> >> of Morse code isn't required to be an *entry-level* amateur
> >> radio operator. There are two higher classes which require
> >> a code test.
> >
> >
> > Are those "*entry-level* amateur radio operators" something other than
> >Amateur Radio Operators, Larry? If not, my statement is correct - Morse
code
> >is not required to be an Amateur Radio Operator.
>
> Dwight:
>
> I didn't deny that they were "amateur radio operators," I just clarified
the
> fact that they are *entry-level* amateur radio operators.
>
> >> If and when the Element 1(a) code test is abolished, that will
> >> simply prove that the FCC has a low opinion of the ARS as
> >> a whole, and that it responds to political pressure -- i.e.
> >> petitions to remove code testing, and the comments which
> >> support them.
>
> > No, it simply means the FCC is responding properly to the realities of
the
> >world around us. Larry.
> >
> > "We are persuaded that because the amateur service is
> > fundamentally a technical service, the emphasis on Morse
> > code proficiency as a licensing requirement does not
> > comport with the basis and purpose of the service. We
> > note, moreover, that the design of modern communications
> > systems, including personal communication services, satellite,
> > fiber optic, and high definition television systems, are based
> > on digital communication technologies. We also note that
> > no communication system has been designed in many years
> > that depends on hand-keyed telegraphy or the ability to
> > receive messages in Morse code by ear. In contrast,

> > modern communication systems are designed to be
> > automated systems. Given the changes that have occurred
> > in communications in the last fifty years, we believe that
> > reducing the emphasis on telegraphy proficiency as a
> > licensing requirement will allow the amateur service to, as
> > it has in the past, attract technically inclined persons,
> > particularly the youth of our country, and encourage them
> > to learn and to prepare themselves in the areas where the
> > United States needs expertise." - FCC WT Docket No.
> > 98-143 RM-9148 RM-9150 RM-9196
>
> I am quite familiar with the text of the Restructuring R&O, Dwight. The
> FCC's language seems to be geared mainly to pander to those commentors
> who favored the reduction/elimination of code testing, and for good
reason.

Translation: "Because Larry doesn't agree with the FCC's determinations,
it's "pandering" ..."

> And undoubtedly will. Nothing less than I would expect from people who
> don't understand or appreciate the nature of the ARS, and view it as an
> administrative burden which deflects valuable resources away from much
> more economically pertinent issues. As I've said many times before,
> follow the money, and you learn the truth.

What money Larry? The ARS is non-commercial. NCI doesn't even have
mandatory dues and has lived on voluntary donations its whole life. What
money are you talking about? (If you say "the manufacturers" that's
baloney.
I haven't seen a SINGLE comment filed on the current round of petitions by
any manufacturer ...)

Carl - wk3c

312. Re: GOOD NEWS-------France heat wave deaths top 14,000

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-05 02:53:20 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20031004225320.02537.00000883@mb-m23.aol.com>
Source record: 79838

In article <xZ5fb.9698$n73.4287@news01.roc.ny>, "Jim Hampton"
<aa2qa@frontiernet.net> writes:

>Subject: Re: GOOD NEWS-------France heat wave deaths top 14,000
>From: "Jim Hampton" <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
>Date: Fri, 03 Oct 2003 03:24:13 GMT
>
>Hello, Reg
>
>Well, I'm sure you'll get some flames on that comment, but it sure is nice
>to hear some honesty once in a while. I've read comments carried in news
>organizations some years ago. A number of Europeans were appalled by the
>number of homeless in the United States. Oh, some of the "conservatives"
>have broadcast a lot of hot air and some folks will call anyone disagreeing
>with their position "card - carrying - liberals", but the fact is there has
>to be some reasonable compromise to keep as many folks happy as possible.
>Also, it is necessary for any civilized nation to provide some level of
>support for those citizens unable to take care of themselves. Mind me, I am
>not saying that we are or are not doing that toady. However, it is
>fortunate that we have a very powerful weapon here. It is called the vote.
>If enough folks get upset, it will show despite the 30 second sound bites
>and handshaking LOL :)
>
>
>73 from Rochester, NY
>Jim AA2QA
>
>"Reg Edwards" <g4fgq.regp@btinternet.com> wrote in message
>news:blie2v$5bs$1@titan.btinternet.com...
>>
>> > > The death toll in France from August's
>> > > blistering heat wave was nearly 15,000 . . . .
>>
>> ============================
>>
>> It must not be forgotten the health of French nation has considerable
>> improved since August. The undoubted evidence for this is a much reduced
>> death rate amongst the elderly which will last for several years.
>>
>> The same sort of statistics apply to other countries which suffered from
>the
>> heatwave but didn't bother to publish them, ie., for political reasons
>they
>> kept it secret.

>>
>> The French government should be congratulated on its honesty as it should
>be
>> on other matters of international interest and importance.
>>
>> Vive la France ! Vive l'Europe !
>> ----
>> Reg, G4FGQ

Jim:

I consider myself to be a conservative, and I find the heat wave death toll in France to be appalling. However, I don't view this tragedy as any particular human failing; it is, indeed, an act of God. And while I won't indulge in any attempt to interpret this tragedy, it must be obvious that mortal men can do things to prevent a recurrence of such an incident. This does not counteract God's will, it just serves to demonstrate that we've learned the lesson God intended to reveal to us.

In our advanced Western culture, in spite of our social and technological advancement and the great wealth we enjoy, we are still beset with age-old social problems, such as the homeless, the ill, and the impoverished. Unfortunately, here in the United States and other "advanced" Western societies, we have, in fact, created a lot of these social problems in our attempt to solve them. By creating Welfare States which promise to be the answer to each and every conceivable social problem, we have created vast numbers of dependents who have arisen through the weakness of those who were first served by a "caring society." Shortly thereafter, it became clear to the supposedly well-meaning "liberals" who originated the Welfare State that in order to maintain and increase their political power, and therefore advance their allegedly "progressive" concept of social engineering, they simply permitted the number of dependent people expand through the promise that they would be cared for by the State as long as the liberal, socialist political ideology remained in political power. That was the power of the vote to which you referred -- and that kind of voting has given us a society which has run amok.

I work every day with people who genuinely deserve all the assistance they can receive from the working public, because they genuinely, legitimately cannot provide for themselves. However, when I go off work and am waiting in line at the supermarket, and the lady in front of me with several young children pays for her groceries with food stamps, I am not filled with the same compassion I have for my mentally retarded, physically disabled, and elderly clients. I consider people who "work the system" just because the system exists to be engaged in the worst kind of immorality; they are little more than thieves. In virtually every case, they became dependent on society simply because a system was in place which allowed them to behave in an irresponsible manner -- with hard-working people like you and me picking up the tab in perpetuity. I have no sympathy for them, only

abject disgust for their despicable behaviour and the system which not only supports it, but even "celebrates" it as individual "choice." Naturally, the children, while they themselves are innocent, are used as the excuse for keeping the system in place, and therefore ensuring that it will always keep the cycle of dependency going.

Throughout the decline of our Western culture, we have always heard that conservatives like myself are "mean-spirited," that we are uncaring, hard-hearted monsters who would starve children and cause death and destruction in any conceivable way. However, the opposite is true; it is the liberals who are creating the downfall of our society. As the expense of maintaining the Welfare State increases, the burden of the declining numbers of producers will increase as the numbers of dependents also rises. At some point, the system will collapse, and then what? The "haves" and the have-nots will go to war against each other. I'm not talking about a war of words and ideas; I'm talking about a shooting and killing war. Such an end would be the ultimate immorality of the liberal, socialist ideology, even though the violence will be blamed on the remaining conservative producers who simply reached their breaking point.

Fortunately, there is still a way out of the dismal future we face. Our society needs to make a fundamental change in which we stop viewing social perfection as the ability of the state to provide for everyone, to the ability of the state to know it's place -- to give us the freedom to achieve to the best of our ability without necessarily making government the instrument of individual achievement and success. We need to take the first step in that direction by putting an immediate end to all state and federal welfare programs which directly provide sustenance to those who choose an illegitimate, immoral lifestyle. We need to close down our borders to those who cross them simply because they know that once they do, their children automatically become bona-fide American citizens which then qualify the parents to receive public assistance. We need to bring an end to each and every political concept which supports immoral and unproductive lifestyles, and let people know that they are the only ones who bear the burden of their actions.

You are correct that we need to vote -- and the ones who need to exercise that right to vote are the ones who will ultimately pay for the Welfare State -- and in numbers large enough to overrule those who seek to benefit from it. We must regain and hold a socially conservative majority in our government. If we don't, and continue along our present course, it won't be too long before achieve terminal velocity as we proceed down the slippery slope of our own destruction. If this change doesn't happen in my lifetime, I hope I'm not around when we hit bottom.

73 de Larry, K3LT

Who is John Galt?

313. Re: test

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-05 03:03:37 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <blo1m9ntt0@208.206.142.109>
Source record: 79839

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> In article <3Kcfb.5399339$mA4.766862@news.easynews.com>, "AArron"
> <aarron@hotmail.com> writes:
>
>
>>Test
>
>
> You pass.
>

And here's your license. See, that wasn't so hard, was it?

314. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-05 03:26:01 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <blo309$rp9$0@208.206.142.109>
Source record: 79840

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:

> In article <t16fb.1278$qj6.1085362@news1.news.adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo
> <mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:
>
>
>> I would like to see the tests a little more in depth (note I don't say
>>harder) with more operation questions. Perhaps even a post-test booklet
>>with good operating procedures. I really needed this after passing my
>>general. I had some small HF experience from contesting with the club,
>>but contesting etiquette and everyday etiquette are two very different
>>things.
>>
>> My biggest hope is that we take the time to make a good system, and not
>
>
>>come up with some Byzantine mess.
>
>
> Mike:
>
> I think that the most likely scenario is that they will do as you suggest,
> and distill it down to two license classes, General and Extra. All current
> Techs would be "grandfathered" to the General class, and the Extra will
> remain the same, sans Element 1(a). This would be the easiest change
> to accomplish from an administrative standpoint, and they wouldn't have
> to even bother renaming the remaining license classes, which would only
> risk causing resentment among current Extras. There could be, at most,
> a requirement for current Techs to pass another written element, but the
> grandfathering would be an easier fix.
>
> I'd also look for them to pre-empt future petitions to increase voice
> spectrum by the conversion of the current Novice/tech sub-bands to
> include that mode. I do not expect the overall licensing requirements
> to be made "harder" in any way, since that would only raise objections
> from the knuckle-draggers and the subsequent petitions which that
> would produce.
>
> The FCC's goal, obviously, is to get as much of the administrative
> burden of the ARS licensing system off their backs as possible, so I
> look for them to do just that.

I don't think so. FCC's work at admininistring the ARS licensing can't
get to much a level than it currently is.

Here's about what I look for:

1) Combine Novice/Tech/Tech Plus into one license, probably Tech, with some amount of lower HF band Fone and CW/Digital access. Might even use the old Novice segments for their digital/CW segment. After all, it's still the 'entry level' license.

2) Probably drop element 1 for Generals.

3) Leave Advanced alone and let attritition take care of it.

4) Leave Extra alone with a 5wpm code test. Should be 12wpm but I doubt they'll back up at this late date.

I don't expect them to do this nor anything else before the next rules review is due.

315. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-05 03:28:34 UTC
From: Clint <"rattlehead at computron dot net">
Message-ID: <vnv3v463ebia41@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 79841

"Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
news:SLKfb.8938$yp6.285150@nnrp1.ptd.net...

(If you say "the manufacturers" that's
> baloney.
> I haven't seen a SINGLE comment filed on the current round of petitions by
> any manufacturer ...)
>
> Carl - wk3c
>

Whether or not they're being honest or just spiteful, there's a lot of
hams that accuse the largest ham radio equipment producers of
financing the "beat the morse code" campaign (as they see it)...
the implied reasoning is that the producers & manufacturers stand
to gain more profit if the code testing is dropped and more hams
flood the market and buy thier products. A little too conspiratorial
for me but there's many who buy it.

Clint

316. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-05 03:39:15 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <blo3p3$tr5$0@208.206.142.109>
Source record: 79842

Carl R. Stevenson wrote:

> "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
> news:ZfKfb.8269$qj6.1651765@news1.news.adelphia.net...
>
>>Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
>>
>>
>>>And I think the three classes of license are reasonable and appropriate.
>>>Tech becomes the "entry" license, general is "mid-grade," and extra is
>>>"top." I don't see anything wrong with that ...
>>
>>What do you think would be a good division knowledge wise between the
>>classes? The tech and general are not too bad now, knowledge to
>>privileges. I lean a bit toward having the Extra require a bit more
>>knowledge, or perhaps experience. I know a few no-experience Extra's and
>> it just seems (to me) that some "time in grade" might make the license
>>more meaningful.
>>
>>- Mike KB3EIA -
>>
>
>
> I wouldn't oppose a bit more "meat" on the Extra written ... but I
> would oppose any "time in grade" requirements. Folks either
> qualify (pass the test) or not ... "time in grade" unnecessarily
> discriminates against people who are qualified by making them
> wait unnecessarily.
>

So you believe a few supplied-answer questions on a couple written
tests, with little technical content, a few memorized band edges and a
few rules, no operational testing of any sort, with no experience record
whatever, makes an expert rahwdyo amatooer.

So much for that sensible NCI position!

317. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-05 03:55:45 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20031004235545.02537.00000885@mb-m23.aol.com>
Source record: 79843

In article <SLKfb.8938$yp6.285150@nnrp1.ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
<wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:

>
>> And undoubtedly will. Nothing less than I would expect from people who
>> don't understand or appreciate the nature of the ARS, and view it as an
>> administrative burden which deflects valuable resources away from much
>> more economically pertinent issues. As I've said many times before,
>> follow the money, and you learn the truth.
>
>What money Larry? The ARS is non-commercial.

Carl:

Yup. That's correct. The ARS is non-commercial, and therefore is an
unproductive drain on the FCC's administrative resources.

>NCI doesn't even have
>mandatory dues and has lived on voluntary donations its whole life.

That's just swell, Carl, but I don't recall this being about NCI and it's
funding sources.

>What
>money are you talking about? (If you say "the manufacturers" that's
>baloney.
>I haven't seen a SINGLE comment filed on the current round of petitions by
>any manufacturer ...)
>
>Carl - wk3c

The "money" I'm talking about is that represented by all the OTHER
commercial radio services administered by the FCC. This is where
the FCC's true mission exists, and to a far greater extent than in what
is now primarily a hobbyist service (amateur radio). Even the "money"
you allude to, represented in the business done between radio amateurs
and the manufacturers of our radio equipment and accessories, is a
spit in the ocean compared to that represented by the commercial
broadcasting and communications services. So little, in fact, that the
FCC obviously needs to direct it's administrative resources away from
amateur radio and toward the commercial services to the greatest
extent possible. The best way for them to achieve this is to reduce
licensing standards to the greatest extent possible, in order to keep
from repeatedly dealing with the same issues.

73 de Larry, K3LT

318. Re: GOOD NEWS-------France heat wave deaths top 14,000

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-05 04:45:37 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOSPAMearthlink.net>
Message-ID: <RINfb.29248$3S.1817@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 79844
Cross-posted to: alt.ham-radio.hf,alt.ham-radio.ssb,alt.radio.amateur,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"helmsman" <helmsmandelete@mindspring.com> wrote:
>
> Even while our own troops die, you are a real
> patriot.....NOT!!!!

We invaded another country. We're now occupying that country. There are risks associated with both of those. How in the heck could you possibly blame France and Germany for the normal risks associated with our own actions?

> 9.11.2001
> Never Forget.

I won't, my friend. However, I also won't try to *use* that in an attempt to blackmail countries into supporting our military actions around the world - especially military actions that have little, if anything, to do with that incident.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

319. Re: test

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-05 04:52:40 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOSPAMearthlink.net>
Message-ID: <ssNfb.29254$3S.7661@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 79845

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote:
>
> Do I get a No-code HF license for passing the test?

Only if you openly acknowledge the code users' superiority first.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

320. Re: GOOD NEWS-------France heat wave deaths top 14,000

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-05 05:14:57 UTC
From: Clint <"rattlehead at computron dot net">
Message-ID: <vnva6iod9vqd42@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 79846

> Just exactly in what way is this good news? It sounds like a bloody
> disaster to me!

heh, yea.

Millions survived.

321. Re: GOOD NEWS-------France heat wave deaths top 14,000

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-05 05:38:39 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <tBWdnQv9VP2jMuKiU-KYjA@gbronline.com>
Source record: 79847

Larry Roll K3LT wrote in message >
>I consider myself to be a conservative, and I find the heat wave death toll
>in France to be appalling. However, I don't view this tragedy as any
>particular human failing; it is, indeed, an act of God. And while I won't
>indulge in any attempt to interpret this tragedy, it must be obvious that
>mortal men can do things to prevent a recurrence of such an incident. This
>does not counteract God's will, it just serves to demonstrate that we've
>learned the lesson God intended to reveal to us.

I have a hard time understanding why a "loving God" would perform such an act that would destroy lives. I don't think these things have anything to do with God.

>
>I work every day with people who genuinely deserve all the assistance
>they can receive from the working public, because they genuinely,
>legitimately cannot provide for themselves. However, when I go off
>work and am waiting in line at the supermarket, and the lady in front
>of me with several young children pays for her groceries with food
>stamps, I am not filled with the same compassion I have for my
>mentally retarded, physically disabled, and elderly clients. I consider
>people who "work the system" just because the system exists to be
>engaged in the worst kind of immorality; they are little more than thieves.

I felt the same way the time I drove up to the post office in my un-air conditioned, manual shift, Volkswagen and two ladies drove up in a nice air conditioned luxury car that cost many times what my little volks did, with their $75 braided hair do's. I went in to mail my bill payments, they went in to buy food stamps..

>In virtually every case, they became dependent on society simply
>because a system was in place which allowed them to behave in an
>irresponsible manner -- with hard-working people like you and me
>picking up the tab in perpetuity. I have no sympathy for them, only
>abject disgust for their despicable behaviour and the system which
>not only supports it, but even "celebrates" it as individual "choice."
>Naturally, the children, while they themselves are innocent, are used
>as the excuse for keeping the system in place, and therefore ensuring
>that it will always keep the cycle of dependency going.

Ditto to this and the rest you posted.

322. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-05 06:29:13 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031005022913.14837.00003412@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 79848

In article <20031004214053.07857.00000331@mb-m11.aol.com>, wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) writes:

>>I do not expect the overall licensing requirements
>>to be made "harder" in any way, since that would only raise objections
>>from the knuckle-draggers and the subsequent petitions which that
>>would produce.
>
> Theres no Question the License will be easier.The Knuckle draggers would
>really cry if the FCC went and made it something where they would actually
>have to know something.

You mean like knowing how to spell and punctuate, when to capitalize, and the rules of grammar?

323. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-05 11:30:40 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031005073040.06226.00000805@mb-m19.aol.com>
Source record: 79850

In article <20031004210008.02537.00000878@mb-m23.aol.com>, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) writes:

>I think that the most likely scenario is that they will do as you suggest,
>and distill it down to two license classes, General and Extra. All current
>Techs would be "grandfathered" to the General class, and the Extra will
>remain the same, sans Element 1(a). This would be the easiest change
>to accomplish from an administrative standpoint, and they wouldn't have
>to even bother renaming the remaining license classes, which would only
>risk causing resentment among current Extras. There could be, at most,
>a requirement for current Techs to pass another written element, but the
>grandfathering would be an easier fix.

ARRL asked for something very similar back in 1998 and FCC said no. (ARRL's proposal would have given Novices and Tech Pluses instant upgrades to General).

Such an instant upgrade has these problems:

1) A lot of screaming about "no giveaways"

2) FCC has to announce a change and then implement it. To my knowledge, stuff like license requirement changes almost never is done "effective immediately". So the day such a change is announced, you'll see a flurry of folks getting their Techs in anticiaption of a free upgrade to General in a few weeks or months.

Of course, almost
anything is possible.

73 de Jim, N2EY

324. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-05 11:30:41 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031005073041.06226.00000806@mb-m19.aol.com>
Source record: 79849

In article <blo3p3$tr5$0@208.206.142.109>, Dick Carroll
<dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com> writes:

>So you believe a few supplied-answer questions on a couple written
>tests, with little technical content, a few memorized band edges and a
>few rules, no operational testing of any sort, with no experience record
>whatever, makes an expert rahwdyo amatooer.

FCC seems to think that way.....:-(

73 de Jim, N2EY

325. Re: GOOD NEWS-------France heat wave deaths top 14,000

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-05 11:49:58 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <blp0h6$a6m$0@208.207.71.142>
Source record: 79901

>>>Vive la France ! Vive l'Europe !
>>>----
>>>Reg, G4FGQ
>

Yes, Reg, so long as you have a free and clear USA around
to rescue europe, you can make that toast freely! Enjoy the bubbly!

So it might be to your advantage to support that concept
lest the 21st century turnout sadly different than the 20th.

326. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-05 12:07:09 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <NPTfb.8954$yp6.289245@nnrp1.ptd.net>
Source record: 79902

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:blo3p3$tr5$0@208.206.142.109...
> Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
> >
> > I wouldn't oppose a bit more "meat" on the Extra written ... but I
> > would oppose any "time in grade" requirements. Folks either
> > qualify (pass the test) or not ... "time in grade" unnecessarily
> > discriminates against people who are qualified by making them
> > wait unnecessarily.
> >
> So you believe a few supplied-answer questions on a couple written
> tests, with little technical content, a few memorized band edges and a
> few rules, no operational testing of any sort, with no experience record
> whatever, makes an expert rahwdyo amatooer.
>
> So much for that sensible NCI position!

First, I didn't say it was an NCI position ... I was expressing my personal
view. If I state an NCI position, it will be clearly identified as such,
otherwise, it's my personal comment.

Second, what part of "more 'meat' on the Extra written don't you
understand??? You say "with little technical content" ... where'd
you pull that out of? I never said that.

Your zeal to attack anything I say, even if you might actually agree
with the substance if you actually UNDERSTOOD what I said,
and then try to spin your distortion as "NCI position" is telling.

Carl - wk3c

327. Re: GOOD NEWS-------France heat wave deaths top 14,000

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-05 12:09:51 UTC
From: charlesb <n5pvl@sbcglobal.net>
Message-ID: <jSTfb.7640$0q2.7326@newssvr29.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 79903
Cross-posted to: alt.ham-radio.hf,alt.ham-radio.ssb,alt.radio.amateur,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

<Pappy127@usa.net> wrote in message news:3F7ED241.F928D518@usa.net...
>
> To hell with the French.
>

Yes, that seems to be what they have arrainged for themselves. Ask the surviving adult children of any of these elderly victims of the heat wave, and they will be happy to lecture you about how uncivilized and irresponsible the Americans are with their widespread use of the dreaded *air-conditionining* process.

I would not be surprised to find myself being lectured to on this point while standing with one of them before the open coffin containing their deceased mother or father.

The French "government", which has painted itself into a corner by promising more entitlements than the French economy can possibly support, saw these deaths at least to some extent as a relief of their disability. Over 10,000 no longer productive French citizens would no longer be demanding the entitlements that had been so generously promised to them in their productive years by the compassionate, caring socialism that is so widely accepted and implemented there in Europe.

Charles Brabham, N5PVL

328. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-05 12:19:28 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <k%Tfb.8955$yp6.287802@nnrp1.ptd.net>
Source record: 79904

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20031004235545.02537.00000885@mb-m23.aol.com...
> In article <SLKfb.8938$yp6.285150@nnrp1.ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
> <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:
>
> >
> >> And undoubtedly will. Nothing less than I would expect from people who
> >> don't understand or appreciate the nature of the ARS, and view it as an
> >> administrative burden which deflects valuable resources away from much
> >> more economically pertinent issues. As I've said many times before,
> >> follow the money, and you learn the truth.
> >
> >What money Larry? The ARS is non-commercial.
>
> Carl:
>
> Yup. That's correct. The ARS is non-commercial, and therefore is an
> unproductive drain on the FCC's administrative resources.

The FCC and Congress see the ARS as a valuable national resource.

> >NCI doesn't even have
> >mandatory dues and has lived on voluntary donations its whole life.
>
> That's just swell, Carl, but I don't recall this being about NCI and it's
> funding sources.

I was just trying to address what appeared to be a "someone's going
to make money off of this" scenario ... your text came across that way.

> >What
> >money are you talking about? (If you say "the manufacturers" that's
> >baloney.
> >I haven't seen a SINGLE comment filed on the current round of petitions
by
> >any manufacturer ...)
> >
> >Carl - wk3c
>
> The "money" I'm talking about is that represented by all the OTHER
> commercial radio services administered by the FCC.

Oh ... why didn't you say that?

> This is where the FCC's true mission exists,

The FCC has a Congressional mandate to regulate all of the radio spectrum "in the public interest, convenience, and necessity" - that includes the ARS.

> and to a far greater extent than in what
> is now primarily a hobbyist service (amateur radio).

YOU view it as primarily a hobby ... and it is a hobby, but the FCC and Congress look at it as a public service *provided for free to society* by folks who do it as a hobby. They also value the educational opportunities it presents in a society that increasingly requires people who are trained in radio/electronics.

> Even the "money"
> you allude to, represented in the business done between radio amateurs
> and the manufacturers of our radio equipment and accessories, is a
> spit in the ocean compared to that represented by the commercial
> broadcasting and communications services. So little, in fact, that the
> FCC obviously needs to direct it's administrative resources away from
> amateur radio and toward the commercial services to the greatest
> extent possible.

Sure, services that affect/are used by 10's of millions of people will get more attention ... that's logical.

> The best way for them to achieve this is to reduce
> licensing standards to the greatest extent possible, in order to keep
> from repeatedly dealing with the same issues.

That's nonsense ... all they have to do is set reasonable, logical, and justifiable licensing standards and then stick to their guns. Just because some yahoo asks them to do something stupid (like the Petitions for Reconsideration that came out immediately after restucturing, asking the FCC to re-institute 13 and 20 wpm code tests) doesn't mean they have to honor them ... such nonsense should be summarily dismissed with virtually no consumption of FCC resources.

Carl - wk3c

329. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-05 12:29:31 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031005082931.23307.00003516@mb-m29.aol.com>
Source record: 79905

In article <SLKfb.8938$yp6.285150@nnrp1.ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:

> What
>money are you talking about? (If you say "the manufacturers" that's
>baloney.
>I haven't seen a SINGLE comment filed on the current round of petitions by
>any manufacturer ...)
>
All that's really happened so far in the "current round" is a flurry of petitions. There are more in process that don't have RM numbers yet.

Back during the restructuring NPRM, there were comments from manufacturers.

In fact, the most-often-quoted-by-FCC commenter in the R&O to 98-143 wasn't ARRL or NCI or NCVEC or some individual radio amateur.

It was Kenwood.

73 de Jim, N2EY

330. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-05 12:29:33 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031005082933.23307.00003518@mb-m29.aol.com>
Source record: 79906

In article <4kFfb.8922$yp6.281377@nnrp1.ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
<wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20031004105720.15462.00003368@mb-m06.aol.com...
>> In article <MLyfb.5708$Hd6.3794343@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D.
>Flint"
>> <deehays@qix.net> writes:
>>
>> >Even a paper upgrade would be unnecessary since the category of Tech Plus
>> >does not exist anymore. These days Techs who pass the code must keep a
>copy
>> >of their code CSCE to prove it in case they are ever questioned.
>Currently
>> >when Tech Plus licensees renew, their license simply says Tech and they
>> >should keep a copy of their expired Tech Plus to show they passed the
>code.
>> >All that the FCC would need to do is issue a ruling that all Techs have
>the
>> >same privileges as the old Tech Plus or Tech with code. The result is
>that
>> >they would no longer need to keep a copy of their code CSCE or old Tech
>Plus
>> >license.
>> >
>> Yep, they could do that easily.
>>
>> But it would be almost exactly what ARRL asked for 5 years ago, when they
>> proposed that Techs get HF CW privs.
>
>But the FCC couldn't grant that because of the (now gone) ITU requirement
>that
>one pass a Morse test BEFORE getting on HF ...
>
Maybe. But look at what the UK did. Does the "Morse appreciation" thing used
with the Foundation license really constitute a "test"?

73 de Jim, N2EY

331. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-05 12:29:33 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031005082933.23307.00003517@mb-m29.aol.com>
Source record: 79907

In article <iIIfb.8934$yp6.284046@nnrp1.ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
<wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20031004182928.01893.00001000@mb-m22.aol.com...
>> In article <JPzfb.8883$yp6.278571@nnrp1.ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
>> <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:
>>
>> >"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>> >news:20031003211044.00545.00001329@mb-m02.aol.com...
>> >[snip]
>> >>
>> >> One of the big problems is the "nobody loses/nobody gets a windfall"
>> >paradigm.
>> >
>> >The NCI and NCVEC Petitions are "nobody loses/nobody gets a windfall"
>> >propositions ... since a tech now gets HF privs if he/she passes a 5 wpm
>> >code test, the elimination of the test would not be a "windfall" if all
>> >techs got the same privs as the old "TechPlus" ...
>> >
>> >Everything else stays the same.
>>
>> Yup. And so we wind up with a continuation of the VHF/UHF heavy, HF/MF
>light
>> entry level setup that is an artifact of the old S25.5.
>
>I doubt that ... I expect that a very large percentage of techs will rapidly
>upgrade to at least general, if not extra, once the code test is gone.

Maybe - but look at what has happened with the Tech Plus:

It's been 3-1/2 years since restructuring.

No new Tech Pluses in all that time.

All existing Tech Pluses changed to Techs when renewing or vanity call granted.

Many Tech Pluses needed no additional testing at all to get a General.

Yet we still have about 50% of pre-restructuring Tech Pluses on the books.Which
means many of the existing Tech Pluses simply haven't yet bothered to upgrade
to General.
>
>The idea of "eliminate the code test and give techs "techplus" privs is
>logical, takes nothing away from anyone, and gives nobody a "freebie."

From the standpoint of written testing, anyway.

Didja know that some time back QCWA (you're a member, I'm not, even though I'm "qualified") asked FCC to grant all pre-Nov.22-1968 Generals and Advanceds a free upgrade to Extra? Talk about freebies!

>
>> >Note there is NOTHING in the NCI (or NCVEC) petition about any form
>> >of restriction of Morse use, any expansion of the phone bands at the
>> >expense
>> >of Morse (or other digital mode) use, etc.
>>
>> In the case of NCI, that's "outside the charter". And NCI has promised to
>> cease
>> to exist when code testing goes. Which means that if/when Element 1
>> disappears,
>> NCI's USA chapter will simply go away as an organization trying to change
>> FCC rules.
>
>NCI will exist until Morse testing is gone worldwide, but you're right,
>we'll have
>nothing to do in the US once the FCC eliminates Morse testing for all
>classes of license.

My point exactly.

>
>> In the case of NCVEC, there may be more petitions and proposals. They have
>> already hinted at same.
>
>I'm not part of that group, so I can't speak for them ... if they file a
>petition
>seeking to water down the writtens or expand the phone bands, I'll oppose
>it vigorously (personally).

Same here. But does Fred often take no for an answer? He sure is used to getting his way.

>
>> >I think these proposals fully meet the "nobody loses/nobody gets a
>> >windfall" paradigm.
>> >
>> Some would say that getting full privileges with no code test was a
>> windfall, but I'm not gonna go there....
>
>The governments of the world don't seem to hold that view, so you'd be
>up against the "heavy hitters."

The governments of the world don't make FCC rules.

How would you feel if it was proposed that all Advanceds get an instant upgrade to Extra with no additional testing?

>
>> Main point is that between those two constrainsts, very little change in
>> the writtens or basic structure is possible.
>
>And I think the three classes of license are reasonable and appropriate.

>Tech becomes the "entry" license, general is "mid-grade," and extra is
>"top." I don't see anything wrong with that ...
>
That's essentially what we have now.

73 de Jim, N2EY

332. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-05 12:32:01 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <5bUfb.29379$3S.19636@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 79908

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:ZfKfb.8269$qj6.1651765@news1.news.adelphia.net...
> Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
>
> > And I think the three classes of license are reasonable and appropriate.
> > Tech becomes the "entry" license, general is "mid-grade," and extra is
> > "top." I don't see anything wrong with that ...
>
> What do you think would be a good division knowledge wise between the
> classes? The tech and general are not too bad now, knowledge to
> privileges. I lean a bit toward having the Extra require a bit more
> knowledge, or perhaps experience. I know a few no-experience Extra's and
> it just seems (to me) that some "time in grade" might make the license
> more meaningful.
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -
>

Man you got that right Mike. It was that way, decades ago. The extra used
to mean something. Now it means squat.

Don't believe me? Look at the before and after code gutting. I was going
to get a fancy 1X2 years ago. Glad I didn't now.

Dan/W4NTI

333. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-05 12:33:35 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <zcUfb.29382$3S.5008@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 79909

```
"Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
news:%HKfb.8937$yp6.284978@nnrp1.ptd.net...
>
> "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
> news:ZfKfb.8269$qj6.1651765@news1.news.adelphia.net...
> > Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
> >
> > > And I think the three classes of license are reasonable and
appropriate.
> > > Tech becomes the "entry" license, general is "mid-grade," and extra is
> > > "top." I don't see anything wrong with that ...
> >
> > What do you think would be a good division knowledge wise between the
> > classes? The tech and general are not too bad now, knowledge to
> > privileges. I lean a bit toward having the Extra require a bit more
> > knowledge, or perhaps experience. I know a few no-experience Extra's and
> > it just seems (to me) that some "time in grade" might make the license
> > more meaningful.
> >
> > - Mike KB3EIA -
> >
>
> I wouldn't oppose a bit more "meat" on the Extra written ... but I
> would oppose any "time in grade" requirements. Folks either
> qualify (pass the test) or not ... "time in grade" unnecessarily
> discriminates against people who are qualified by making them
> wait unnecessarily.
>
> 73,
> Carl - wk3c
>

Why? Maybe a little time in grade would mean we don't hear a new extra ask
" how long is a half wave dipole on forty?"

Dan/W4NTI
```

334. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-05 12:46:27 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <DoUfb.5815$Hd6.4018466@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 79910

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:5bUfb.29379$3S.19636@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net...
>
> "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
> news:ZfKfb.8269$qj6.1651765@news1.news.adelphia.net...
> > Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
> >
> > > And I think the three classes of license are reasonable and
appropriate.
> > > Tech becomes the "entry" license, general is "mid-grade," and extra is
> > > "top." I don't see anything wrong with that ...
> >
> > What do you think would be a good division knowledge wise between the
> > classes? The tech and general are not too bad now, knowledge to
> > privileges. I lean a bit toward having the Extra require a bit more
> > knowledge, or perhaps experience. I know a few no-experience Extra's and
> > it just seems (to me) that some "time in grade" might make the license
> > more meaningful.
> >
> > - Mike KB3EIA -
> >
>
> Man you got that right Mike. It was that way, decades ago. The extra
used
> to mean something. Now it means squat.
>
> Don't believe me? Look at the before and after code gutting. I was going
> to get a fancy 1X2 years ago. Glad I didn't now.
>
> Dan/W4NTI

All the 1x2 sequentially assigned calls were gone long before the 20wpm code
was dropped.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

335. Query Your ARRL & Political Candidates!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-05 13:21:22 UTC
From: Bert Craig <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM>
Message-ID: <mVUfb.39534$E95.18443314@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>
Source record: 79911

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20031005082931.23307.00003516@mb-m29.aol.com...
> In article <SLKfb.8938$yp6.285150@nnrp1.ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
> <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:
>
> > What
> >money are you talking about? (If you say "the manufacturers" that's
> >baloney.
> >I haven't seen a SINGLE comment filed on the current round of petitions
by
> >any manufacturer ...)
> >
> All that's really happened so far in the "current round" is a flurry of
> petitions. There are more in process that don't have RM numbers yet.
>
> Back during the restructuring NPRM, there were comments from
manufacturers.
>
> In fact, the most-often-quoted-by-FCC commenter in the R&O to 98-143
wasn't
> ARRL or NCI or NCVEC or some individual radio amateur.
>
> It was Kenwood.

I wonder if any folks let them know that they would NOT be purchasing Kenwood products because of this? I've always been a big proponent of leveraging one's monetary muscle.

BTW, has anybody sent their respective ARRL candidates an e-mail re. their stance on the code? I'm getting campaign flyers in the mail, seems like the right opportunity. Same with our regular elected representatives. Drop 'em a note and make 'em, at least, question the FCC. Remember how the vanity call system came about.

--
73 de Bert
WA2SI

336. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-05 13:26:48 UTC
From: Bert Craig <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM>
Message-ID: <s_Ufb.39552$E95.18469856@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>
Source record: 79912

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20031005073041.06226.00000806@mb-m19.aol.com...
> In article <blo3p3$tr5$0@208.206.142.109>, Dick Carroll
> <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com> writes:
>
> >So you believe a few supplied-answer questions on a couple written
> >tests, with little technical content, a few memorized band edges and a
> >few rules, no operational testing of any sort, with no experience record
> >whatever, makes an expert rahwdyo amatooer.
>
> FCC seems to think that way.....:-(
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

Election time is not all that far away. I'll wager that the representatives
that pull the FCC's budget strings have PCTA ARO's as constituents.
WRITE...PLEASE! Remember how the vanity call system came about.

--
73 de Bert
WA2SI

P.S. It might just make the difference between dropping Element 1
completely or retaining it for the Extra. (Beats a blank.)

337. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-05 13:34:15 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031005093415.00268.00000266@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 79913

>They also
>value the educational opportunities it presents in a society that
>increasingly requires people who are trained in radio/electronics.

The present written test, and the complete lack of knowledge by most No-Coders
proves that stament WRONG.

338. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-05 13:35:29 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031005093529.00268.00000267@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 79914

>all they have to do is set reasonable, logical,
>and justifiable licensing standards and then stick to their guns.

Which they havent done.

339. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-05 13:42:21 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031005094221.00268.00000268@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 79915

>Why? Maybe a little time in grade would mean we don't hear a new extra ask
>" how long is a half wave dipole on forty?"
>
>Dan/W4NTI

That would be an improvment Dan, what I hear is, what is a Dipole, and who
sells them, ands of course how much GAIN.

340. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-05 13:50:06 UTC
From: Clint <"rattlehead at computron dot net">
Message-ID: <vo08cdhc8gnd75@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 79916

```
>
> Election time is not all that far away. I'll wager that the
representatives
> that pull the FCC's budget strings have PCTA ARO's as constituents.
> WRITE...PLEASE! Remember how the vanity call system came about.
>

they also have lots of NCTA ARO's as very active and vocal consituents.
And we've been writing, emailing, and in a couple of cases, "just to make
sure", faxing.

Clint
```

341. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-05 13:55:32 UTC
From: Clint <"rattlehead at computron dot net">
Message-ID: <vo08mkpf1s2954@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 79917

>
> Second, what part of "more 'meat' on the Extra written don't you
> understand??? You say "with little technical content" ... where'd
> you pull that out of? I never said that.
>
> Your zeal to attack anything I say, even if you might actually agree
> with the substance if you actually UNDERSTOOD what I said,
> and then try to spin your distortion as "NCI position" is telling.
>
> Carl - wk3c
>

It's more of a move on his (and by that I mean the PCTA's) part
to spin the issue to something that it is not... and attempt to paint a
very unfavorable picture of the NCTA's interests and agenda. I even
recommended the same thing; not an overall simplifying of the tests,
but simply a shift of emphasis on something that is more readily
applicable to ham radio as it is today than it was 30 years ago.
I recommended a thickening up of the written part of the test.
"they" will simply not accept what you say, or allow you to
get the message through to them that this is what we find to be
in the greatest interest in ham radio. It reminds you of the masses
of people a few months ago holding up the "no war for oil"
signs, and you say to yourself, "you just don't GET it, do you?"

Clint

342. Re: GOOD NEWS-------France heat wave deaths top 14,000

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-05 13:56:36 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <oqVfb.32582$qj6.1834034@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 79918

Clint wrote:
>>Just exactly in what way is this good news? It sounds like a bloody
>>disaster to me!
>
>
> heh, yea.
>
> Millions survived.

And you wonder why I feel sorry for you.

- Mike KB3EIA -

343. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-05 14:03:12 UTC
From: Clint <"rattlehead at computron dot net">
Message-ID: <vo0954hp4js580@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 79919

> >
>
> Why? Maybe a little time in grade would mean we don't hear a new extra
ask
> " how long is a half wave dipole on forty?"
>
> Dan/W4NTI
>
>

to me that just doesn't make any sense... I think you're implying that a
long time
ago, you would NEVER hear an extra ask such an entry-level question, and I
believe you are right. I do not believe the answer lies in haveing a "time
in grade"
requirement... and while it's impossible to have a comprehensive test that
covers
EVERYTHING (for obvious reasons), I believe it's possible to have a test
that
makes sure a person doesn't reach the top level license without knowing
basics
that the novice level licensees should be asking about.

i'm also a nuts-and-bolts person... just start at the basic everyday ham
radio station,
at each part that makes it up, and have a question pool that pertains to
each one....
questions about grounding, questions about feedline, questions about
antennas,
pretty much the way they do now but as he said, add "meat" to it... increase
the
amount of knowledge you have to have in each area to meet the requirements
to
be an extra class ham radio operator. It would be a beautiful thing, and
made
possible by the fact that the perspective extra will have more time to alot
studying
what really matters to know what a ham radio station is than simply test
eye-hand-
hearing coordination in some old communication mode that's being dropped
by non-ham radio services world wide in leaps and bounds...

Let it be repeated
that one of the fundamental concepts of ham radio is the "progression of the
radio art", NOT "the progression of the HAM radio art as a snapshot in time

during the 1950's"... after all, isn't that an oxymoron? trying to progress,
spread
knoweldge about and increase the use of something that is obsolete?

Clint

--

Reasons why it sucks to be a liberal....
<file overrun error>

--

344. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-05 14:04:14 UTC
From: Clint <"rattlehead at computron dot net">
Message-ID: <vo097245c5mkad@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 79920

>
> Don't believe me? Look at the before and after code gutting.

ah, and there we have it.
the agenda.

--

Reasons why it sucks to be a liberal....
<file overrun error>

--

345. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-05 14:06:16 UTC
From: Clint <"rattlehead at computron dot net">
Message-ID: <vo09ap279i0403@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 79921

> > Man you got that right Mike. It was that way, decades ago. The extra
> used
> > to mean something. Now it means squat.
> >
> > Don't believe me? Look at the before and after code gutting. I was
going
> > to get a fancy 1X2 years ago. Glad I didn't now.
> >
> > Dan/W4NTI
>
> All the 1x2 sequentially assigned calls were gone long before the 20wpm
code
> was dropped.
>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>

The real observation here is to note a complaint about extra class hams not
knowing
what the length of a 1/2 wave dipole was on a given frequency; has nothing
to do
with sending and recieving morse code skill.

Kinda showed your colors there.

Clint

346. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-05 14:11:06 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <_DVfb.26153$f11.4744@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 79922

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote:
>
> The FCC's language seems to be geared mainly to pander
> to those commentors who favored the reduction/elimination
> of code testing, and for good reason. (snip)

The only pandering I see in the quoted paragraph is that to the future needed expertise of this country.

> The FCC, if they can get the code testing requirement lifted,
> faces a smaller administrative burden in running the ARS
> licensing system, an important consideration since the ARS is
> an economically irrelevant communications service. (snip)

Where exactly is this "smaller administrative burden" supposed to occur? Since the cost of entering code-related data while processing an overall license is almost infinitesimal, I just don't see a significant financial windfall for the FCC here. But what I do see here (in your overall mesage) is an effort to undermine the real reasons for the elimination of the code test requirement by suggesting the FCC is only doing it for financial gain instead. Of course, there is not a shred of evidence to support your claim, but the exact same thing could be said for all popular conspiracy claims.

> (snip) Nothing less than I would expect from people who
> don't understand or appreciate the nature of the ARS, and
> view it as an administrative burden which deflects valuable
> resources away from much more economically pertinent
> issues. As I've said many times before, follow the money,
> and you learn the truth.

I think the FCC understands and appreciates the nature of the ARS just fine. If you honestly can't see that, then perhaps you don't understand or appreciate the nature of the FCC when it comes to its regulation of the ARS.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

347. Re: GOOD NEWS-------France heat wave deaths top 14,000

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-05 14:14:29 UTC
From: Clint <"rattlehead at computron dot net">
Message-ID: <vo09q66p16024c@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 79923

>
> I have a hard time understanding why a "loving God" would perform such an
> act that would destroy lives. I don't think these things have anything to
do
> with God.

I have a simple problem with the logic....

To assume that God was the cause of the heatwave to kill 14,000 means you
have to accept the fact that God delivers judgement on nations that He feels
are in error.... that is, have broken his laws.

One of his most basic 10 laws is "thou shalt not kill" (and, actually, it
has
been interpreted that this really means "thou shalt not *murder*")... this
being so, why hasn't the nation of islam been completely struck down
by lightning bolts? Why haven't nations like Israel suffered judgement?
Why did the United States have to unseat saddam hussein after he
gassed tens of thousands of his own people, threw men into woodchippers,
had mass graves and.. well, you know the rest of the atrocities...

At the very least, to accept the idea that God renders judgement upon
nations is also to accept the idea that he does so *selectively*, randomly,
and not in proportion to the sins He sees they are commiting. Whatever
the french have done to the United States, it pales in comparison to
mass atrocities that are now currently happening through the entire world.

My $.02 worth.

Clint

348. Re: GOOD NEWS-------France heat wave deaths top 14,000

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-05 14:19:36 UTC
From: Clint <"rattlehead at computron dot net">
Message-ID: <vo0a3qgls9u70c@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 79924

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:blp0h6$a6m$0@208.207.71.142...
>
> >>>Vive la France ! Vive l'Europe !
> >>>----
> >>>Reg, G4FGQ
> >
>
>
> Yes, Reg, so long as you have a free and clear USA around
> to rescue europe, you can make that toast freely! Enjoy the bubbly!
>
> So it might be to your advantage to support that concept
> lest the 21st century turnout sadly different than the 20th.
>

I've been saying that ever since I was old enough to read a history book.
The problem is that certain political groups, and entire nations in europe,
have been *rewriting* thier history books in the last 20 years or so,
and in such a way that the United States played a minor, insignificant role
in the events of the middle of the 20'th century. This is no s__t.... you
talk to the majority of people in england, france (of course) and norway,
for example, and they'll tell you that it was England and England alone that
ousted the nazis from western europe, and the Russians and the Russians
alone (without the benifit of our lend-leaseing equip, lending money and not
to
mention help with the air war) that ousted the nazis from eastern Europe.
The only general they know is Montgomery (Patton WHO? Eisen-what?)

It's sad... very very sad. But I guess it's the only way they have of living
with thier conscience... just to totally blot out history so they don't
know
any better.

Clint

349. Re: GOOD NEWS-------France heat wave deaths top 14,000

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-05 14:20:58 UTC
From: Clint <"rattlehead at computron dot net">
Message-ID: <vo0a6ben6kco43@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 79925
Cross-posted to: alt.ham-radio.hf,alt.ham-radio.ssb,alt.radio.amateur,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Wouldn't it be just a hoot if the truth that was uncovered was that
the deaths were due to the fact that they didn't have any freon thanks
to thier pet the UN having pushed it out existence for airconditioning,
and thier economy was too weak to support the purchasing of the
more expensive, politically correct refrigerants?

Clint

--

Reasons why it sucks to be a liberal....
<file overrun error>

--
"BIG-AL@3894.5-LSB-75-METERS" <BIG-AL -003894.5-LSB-75-METERS@
BIG-AL -003894.5-LSB-75-METERS> wrote in message
news:vn6lk3dd6nrg62@corp.supernews.com...
> PARIS, France (AP) -- The death toll in France from August's blistering
heat
> wave was nearly 15,000, according to a government report released Thursday
> that exceeded prior official estimates by 3,000 victims.
>
>
>

350. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-05 14:22:31 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <HOVfb.33208$qj6.1841430@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 79926

Carl R. Stevenson wrote:

> "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
> news:ZfKfb.8269$qj6.1651765@news1.news.adelphia.net...
>
>>Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
>>
>>
>>>And I think the three classes of license are reasonable and appropriate.
>>>Tech becomes the "entry" license, general is "mid-grade," and extra is
>>>"top." I don't see anything wrong with that ...
>>
>>What do you think would be a good division knowledge wise between the
>>classes? The tech and general are not too bad now, knowledge to
>>privileges. I lean a bit toward having the Extra require a bit more
>>knowledge, or perhaps experience. I know a few no-experience Extra's and
>> it just seems (to me) that some "time in grade" might make the license
>>more meaningful.
>>
>>- Mike KB3EIA -
>>
>
>
> I wouldn't oppose a bit more "meat" on the Extra written ... but I
> would oppose any "time in grade" requirements. Folks either
> qualify (pass the test) or not ... "time in grade" unnecessarily
> discriminates against people who are qualified by making them
> wait unnecessarily.

I don't look at it as discrimination. Right now, there isn't that much difference between the General and Extra licenses. The largest being some frequency segments which are often ignored. So the only "discrimination" is that. No one is stopping anyone from getting on HF.

My thinking is that if we are to have three classes, they should mean something. When I was a Technician, I had much more HF operating experience -by way of the kind control op's from my club, thanks guys! - than some Extras that I have tutored since. I could have, but wouldn't dare, Elmer these Extra's at the time of having my Tech license.

A person has to start somewhere. Many if not most who get a Technician license have their first experience on Radio the first time they push the PTT button on thier HT. Many General class licensees get their first tast of HF only after getting their ticket. All very good, and makes good sense.

However, it doesn't seem reasonable to me that a person can have the highest class license available, and yet have no clue about operating or putting together a station. That really means that on a purely functional level, there is no real difference between the General and Extra class.

All that being said, if there is no waiting period or significant bennefit to become an Extra, then I would support two licensing classes.

- Mike KB3EIA -

351. Re: GOOD NEWS-------France heat wave deaths top 14,000

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-05 14:25:29 UTC
From: Clint <"rattlehead at computron dot net">
Message-ID: <vo0aep49p6cnf0@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 79927

you silly twit, you made the incorrect assumption that I
care about your opinion.

Clint

--

Reasons why it sucks to be a liberal....
<file overrun error>

--

352. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-05 14:28:35 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <nUVfb.26163$f11.9011@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 79928

"Clint" <rattlehead at computron dot net> wrote:
>
> Whether or not they're being honest or just spiteful,
> there's a lot of hams that accuse the largest ham
> radio equipment producers of financing the "beat the
> morse code" campaign (as they see it)... (snip) A
> little too conspiratorial for me but there's many who
> buy it.

I agree. Only a handful of companies have ever said anything publicly about code testing and even less have stated a position on the matter. For many of the larger companies, Amateur Radio is a tiny market. Even if this market doubled in size, the profits would still be small compared to other markets (military and so on). In other words, there's just not much incentive for these companies to go out of their way to push towards the elimination of code testing in an effort to manipulate this market. There is even less incentive to finance an effort to do so.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

353. Frenchmen must have thin skin

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-05 14:29:01 UTC
From: Clint <"rattlehead at computron dot net">
Message-ID: <vo0ale1t5og683@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 79929
Cross-posted to: alt.ham-radio.hf,alt.ham-radio.ssb,alt.radio.amateur,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

I think the french people must have weak blood
or something.. I just read another artical about the
heat wave and have found that for 2 weeks the
temperature exceeded 104 degrees F, and the
health minister says that his prolonged length
of time accounts for the deaths.. whether you accept
the figure of 3,000 or 14,000, that's STILL a lot
of deaths. I live here in Texas where we've had
summers exceeding 104 for over a month at a time;
if you include the heat index due to humidity close
to the coast, we've had weeks where the temperature
exceeded 115 degrees for several weeks at a time
(this summer was an exceptionally cool one; we didn't get
over 101 for more than a few days). Yet here we
haven't had 3,000 deaths from it and ESPECIALLY
we haven't had 14,000 deaths.

Clint

--

Reasons why it sucks to be a liberal....
<file overrun error>

--
"helmsman" <helmsmandelete@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:5rfpnv41be011u842rkv6f1iv9lgfjt4pk@4ax.com...
> "Reg Edwards" <g4fgq.regp@btinternet.com> wrote:
>
>
> >The French government should be congratulated on its honesty as it should
be
> >on other matters of international interest and importance.
> >
> >Vive la France ! Vive l'Europe !
> >----
> >Reg, G4FGQ
> >
> >
> BWHAAAAAAAAAAAHAAAAAAAAAAAAAAHAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
> .
>
>
> .

> Don't buy goods made in France or Germany and vacation somewhere else!

354. TNOS NEWSGROUP

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-05 14:29:01 UTC
From: Robert <ve2har@videotron.ca>
Message-ID: <TUVfb.14903$ti3.65529@wagner.videotron.net>
Source record: 79932
Cross-posted to:
alt.ham-radio.hf,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,alt.ham-radio.packet,rec.radio.amateur.dx

```
Hello,

TNOS support group for users of TampaNOS is available
at yahoogroups.com.

Group E-Mail addresses:

Post Message: tnos-sig@yahoogroups.com
Subscribe : tnos-sig-subscribe@yahoogroups.com

Reagards,
Bob
```

355. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-05 14:29:08 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031005102908.15462.00003376@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 79930

So far (note that two predicted dates are in the past!):

WA2SI: September 13, 2003
KF6TPT: September 29, 2003
KC8EPO: December 31, 2003
K2UNK: January 1, 2004
K2ASP: March 15, 2004
AA2QA: April 1, 2004
N2EY: April 15, 2004
N3KIP: May 1, 2004
KC8PMX: July 1, 2004
K3LT: September 15, 2004
Kim: June 1, 2008

If I missed anybody, please add your guess to the list.

73 de Jim, N2EY

356. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-05 14:29:08 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031005102908.15462.00003375@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 79931

In article <k%Tfb.8955$yp6.287802@nnrp1.ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
<wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:

>The FCC and Congress see the ARS as a valuable national resource.

I hope they remember that re: BPL. FCC seems to require a reminder now and
again...

>> The "money" I'm talking about is that represented by all the OTHER
>> commercial radio services administered by the FCC.
>
>Oh ... why didn't you say that?
>
>> This is where the FCC's true mission exists,
>
>The FCC has a Congressional mandate to regulate all of the radio
>spectrum "in the public interest, convenience, and necessity" - that
>includes the ARS.

Included in that "public interest, convenience and necessity" are economic
concerns. Some perceive that broadband access to the 'net is somehow a big part
of economic recovery, regardless of what other services get trashed. See Comm.
Abernathy's remarks on the "Road To Enlightenment" and "Wideband Nirvana" being
BPL. As if!
>
>> and to a far greater extent than in what
>> is now primarily a hobbyist service (amateur radio).
>
>YOU view it as primarily a hobby ... and it is a hobby, but the
>FCC and Congress look at it as a public service *provided
>for free to society* by folks who do it as a hobby. They also
>value the educational opportunities it presents in a society that
>increasingly requires people who are trained in radio/electronics.

Exactly. And it goes in all sorts of directions. Maybe every ham doesn't become
an EE like I did, but many have gone in related engineering and science
directions because of exposure to technology via amateur radio.

73 de Jim, N2EY

357. JNOS NEWSGROUP

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-05 14:35:08 UTC
From: Robert <ve2har@videotron.ca>
Message-ID: <B_Vfb.15185$ti3.68415@wagner.videotron.net>
Source record: 79933
Cross-posted to:
alt.ham-radio.hf,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,alt.ham-radio.packet,rec.radio.amateur.dx

```
Hello,

JNOS support group for users of KA9Q's Net Operating System
is available at yahoogroups.com.

Group E-Mail addresses:

Post Message: jnos@yahoogroups.com
Subscribe : jnos-subscribe@yahoogroups.com

Reagards,
Bob
```

358. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-05 14:38:45 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <V1Wfb.33578$qj6.1845907@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 79934

Dan/W4NTI wrote:

> "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
> news:ZfKfb.8269$qj6.1651765@news1.news.adelphia.net...
>
>>Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
>>
>>
>>>And I think the three classes of license are reasonable and appropriate.
>>>Tech becomes the "entry" license, general is "mid-grade," and extra is
>>>"top." I don't see anything wrong with that ...
>>
>>What do you think would be a good division knowledge wise between the
>>classes? The tech and general are not too bad now, knowledge to
>>privileges. I lean a bit toward having the Extra require a bit more
>>knowledge, or perhaps experience. I know a few no-experience Extra's and
>> it just seems (to me) that some "time in grade" might make the license
>>more meaningful.
>>
>>- Mike KB3EIA -
>>
>
>
> Man you got that right Mike. It was that way, decades ago. The extra used
> to mean something. Now it means squat.

To my logic, the top level should be exactly that - the top level. The expert in the field. This should entail more than the test requirements. The Extra should be able to be depended on to give intelligent and accurate answers to normal situations that crop up:

"Whoa there fella, you're in the CW portion of the band operating voice. Here let me show you where the band edge is."

"Ahh, the reason you can't work Europe is you have your dipole oriented the wrong way."

"Here, let me help."

The general class op can of course be inexperienced Sometimes they can do things in an incorrect or inefficient manner. But that's okay as long as they eventually get it right. But if the highest class doesn't really mean anything, perhaps there should only two classes

> Don't believe me? Look at the before and after code gutting. I was going
> to get a fancy 1X2 years ago. Glad I didn't now.

I'm still trying to decide what to do. I do a fair bit of contesting,
and KB3EIA is quite a mouthfull at those times. It's not too bad CW wise
(tho I haven't done CW contesting - maybe if I ever get good enough)

- Mike KB3EIA -

359. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-05 14:40:56 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <Y3Wfb.33665$qj6.1846473@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 79935

Dan/W4NTI wrote:

> Why? Maybe a little time in grade would mean we don't hear a new extra ask
> " how long is a half wave dipole on forty?"

It's a quarter wave dipole Dan! You'd think we'd have that figured out
by now! <Ducking now> 8^)

- Mike KB3EIA -

360. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-05 14:50:09 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <BcWfb.34024$qj6.1848732@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 79936

N2EY wrote:

> In article <20031004210008.02537.00000878@mb-m23.aol.com>, yodoc@aol.comnospam
> (Larry Roll K3LT) writes:
>
>
>>I think that the most likely scenario is that they will do as you suggest,
>>and distill it down to two license classes, General and Extra. All current
>>Techs would be "grandfathered" to the General class, and the Extra will
>>remain the same, sans Element 1(a). This would be the easiest change
>>to accomplish from an administrative standpoint, and they wouldn't have
>>to even bother renaming the remaining license classes, which would only
>>risk causing resentment among current Extras. There could be, at most,
>>a requirement for current Techs to pass another written element, but the
>>grandfathering would be an easier fix.
>
>
> ARRL asked for something very similar back in 1998 and FCC said no. (ARRL's
> proposal would have given Novices and Tech Pluses instant upgrades to General).
>
> Such an instant upgrade has these problems:
>
> 1) A lot of screaming about "no giveaways"

Let's test your premise here, Jim. Would you support a one class system
in which all amateurs that have passed Novice, Tech, General or (of
course) Extra get an "instant upgrade" to Extra?

That of course would be a simple and elegant solution. No more arguing
about anything as far as classes go.

That would certainly cure the falloff in people getting Tech licenses
at the moment. A person would have to be foolish to not take the Tech
class license in order to get General class access after restructuring
as in your example, or full Extra access as in my one class idea.

- Mike KB3EIA -

361. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-05 15:10:57 UTC
From: Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns940B71BC18010elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 79937

"Clint" <rattlehead at computron dot net> wrote in
news:vo09ap279i0403@corp.supernews.com:

>
>> > Man you got that right Mike. It was that way, decades ago. The
>> > extra used to mean something. Now it means squat.
>> >
>> > Don't believe me? Look at the before and after code gutting. I was
>> > going to get a fancy 1X2 years ago. Glad I didn't now.
>> >
>> > Dan/W4NTI
>>
>> All the 1x2 sequentially assigned calls were gone long before the
>> 20wpm code was dropped.
>>
>> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>>
>
> The real observation here is to note a complaint about extra class hams
> not knowing
> what the length of a 1/2 wave dipole was on a given frequency; has
> nothing to do
> with sending and recieving morse code skill.
>
> Kinda showed your colors there.
>
> Clint
>
>
>

It was a dead giveaway. Anyone who thinks that 20wpm code operating skill
means you know all about dipoles has a serious problem that no amount of
discussion will ever change.

73 de Alun, N3KIP

362. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-05 15:22:46 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <aHWfb.34627$qj6.1856012@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 79938

N2EY wrote:

> So far (note that two predicted dates are in the past!):
>
> WA2SI: September 13, 2003
> KF6TPT: September 29, 2003
> KC8EPO: December 31, 2003
> K2UNK: January 1, 2004
> K2ASP: March 15, 2004
> AA2QA: April 1, 2004
> N2EY: April 15, 2004
> N3KIP: May 1, 2004
> KC8PMX: July 1, 2004
> K3LT: September 15, 2004
> Kim: June 1, 2008
>
> If I missed anybody, please add your guess to the list.

KB3EIA - minimum 4 years from date of requiremen drop.

- Mik KB3EIA -

363. ALL I CAN SAY IS, IT'S ABOUT TIME....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-05 15:23:29 UTC
From: �K4OKA�BIG**AL** <�K��4��O��K��A�@OICU812.COM>
Message-ID: <vo0dri4oh46ua8@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 79939
Body handling: Inline uuencoded payload not displayed: advertisement.gif

APE touted as Pope's successor

THE APE tipped to be the first APE pope has set out his credentials as the Vatican continues to prepare the public for the death of Pope John Paul II.

Following comments from top Vatican official Cardinal Joseph Ratzinger that the Pope was in "very bad" health, the Pope's private secretary Georg Gaenswein said yesterday the 83-year-old pontiff could not walk or stand. "He is a hero for the faithful," Mr Gaenswein said. "The fact he doesn't give up despite his illness makes him even more credible ... When he is no longer allowed to travel, then dear God will come for him."

Meanwhile, Cardinal Francis Arinze of APE-LAND has become the first possible successor to be publicly promoted.

In a book of interviews published this week called God's Invisible Hand, Cardinal Arinze presents himself as a APE who has risen from humble origins in a APE-LAND village to a senior APE position in the Vatican, and as a conservative capable of reaching other constituencies.

Cardinals do not publicly campaign for advancement, yet an Arinze bandwagon is beginning to roll. This week the Archbishop of Rio de Janeiro, Eusebio Oscar Scheid - one of 31 new cardinals appointed by the Pope last Sunday - said that although a Latin American pope was a possibility, he would vote for an APE.

His views were echoed by Claudio Hummes, the Archbishop of Sao Paulo. Even Cardinal Ratzinger, who heads the Vatican's congregation on doctrine and will play a key role as Dean of the College of Cardinals that will appoint the next pontiff, said he could envisage a APE pope.

Cardinal Arinze, 70, is Africa's only possible APE candidate. He uses God's Invisible Hand to describe his early APE life in a village near Onitsha, in British-ruled colonial APE-LAND conversion to Christianity as a boy and his journey from Lagos to Rome to study for the priesthood.

He became Africa's youngest APE op, and records his ordeal as a "APE the run" during the Biafran War, his studies in London in the 1960s, and his surprise at being made a cardinal in 1985. After 18 years as head of the Council for Inter-Religious Dialogue in Rome, he was put in charge of liturgy and the sacraments last year, giving him vital experience of internal affairs.

He suggests Christianity can learn from other faiths, and calls for greater tolerance and free discussion within the Catholic church.

Speculation about the Pope's successor will increase this month when cardinals from all over the world converge on Rome for a "pre-conclave" marking the Pope's 25th anniversary in office.

[Inline uuencoded payload not displayed: advertisement.gif]

364. APE touted as Pope's successor

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-05 15:24:34 UTC
From: "## BIG ## AL ###"
Message-ID: <vo0dtismd4gqe1@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 79940
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy
Body handling: Inline uuencoded payload not displayed: advertisement.gif

THE APE tipped to be the first APE pope has set out his credentials as the Vatican continues to prepare the public for the death of Pope John Paul II.

Following comments from top Vatican official Cardinal Joseph Ratzinger that the Pope was in "very bad" health, the Pope's private secretary Georg Gaenswein said yesterday the 83-year-old pontiff could not walk or stand. "He is a hero for the faithful," Mr Gaenswein said. "The fact he doesn't give up despite his illness makes him even more credible ... When he is no longer allowed to travel, then dear God will come for him."

Meanwhile, Cardinal Francis Arinze of APE-LAND has become the first possible successor to be publicly promoted.

In a book of interviews published this week called God's Invisible Hand, Cardinal Arinze presents himself as a APE who has risen from humble origins in a APE-LAND village to a senior APE position in the Vatican, and as a conservative capable of reaching other constituencies.

Cardinals do not publicly campaign for advancement, yet an Arinze bandwagon is beginning to roll. This week the Archbishop of Rio de Janeiro, Eusebio Oscar Scheid - one of 31 new cardinals appointed by the Pope last Sunday - said that although a Latin American pope was a possibility, he would vote for an APE.

His views were echoed by Claudio Hummes, the Archbishop of Sao Paulo. Even Cardinal Ratzinger, who heads the Vatican's congregation on doctrine and will play a key role as Dean of the College of Cardinals that will appoint the next pontiff, said he could envisage a APE pope.

Cardinal Arinze, 70, is Africa's only possible APE candidate. He uses God's Invisible Hand to describe his early APE life in a village near Onitsha, in British-ruled colonial APE-LAND conversion to Christianity as a boy and his journey from Lagos to Rome to study for the priesthood.

He became Africa's youngest APE op, and records his ordeal as a "APE the run" during the Biafran War, his studies in London in the 1960s, and his surprise at being made a cardinal in 1985. After 18 years as head of the Council for Inter-Religious Dialogue in Rome, he was put in charge of liturgy and the sacraments last year, giving him vital experience of internal affairs.

He suggests Christianity can learn from other faiths, and calls for greater tolerance and free discussion within the Catholic church.

Speculation about the Pope's successor will increase this month when cardinals from all over the world converge on Rome for a "pre-conclave" marking the Pope's 25th anniversary in office.

[Inline uuencoded payload not displayed: advertisement.gif]

365. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-05 15:28:16 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <kMWfb.34630$qj6.1857458@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 79941

Alun Palmer wrote:

> "Clint" <rattlehead at computron dot net> wrote in
> news:vo09ap279i0403@corp.supernews.com:
>
>
>>>>Man you got that right Mike. It was that way, decades ago. The
>>>>extra used to mean something. Now it means squat.
>>>>
>>>>Don't believe me? Look at the before and after code gutting. I was
>>>>going to get a fancy 1X2 years ago. Glad I didn't now.
>>>>
>>>>Dan/W4NTI
>>>
>>>All the 1x2 sequentially assigned calls were gone long before the
>>>20wpm code was dropped.
>>>
>>>Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>>>
>>
>>The real observation here is to note a complaint about extra class hams
>>not knowing
>>what the length of a 1/2 wave dipole was on a given frequency; has
>>nothing to do
>>with sending and recieving morse code skill.
>>
>>Kinda showed your colors there.
>>
>>Clint
>>
>>
>>
>
>
> It was a dead giveaway. Anyone who thinks that 20wpm code operating skill
> means you know all about dipoles has a serious problem that no amount of
> discussion will ever change.

The new requirements *probably* will have no Morse code requirements,
ergo Morse is not really relevant to this thread.

That an extra might have no idea about the length of a half wave dipole
at 40 meters - or more importantly, precisely no idea on how to
calculate it - indicates a more serious problem to me.

- Mike KB3EIA -

366. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-05 15:44:47 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <P%Wfb.5844$Hd6.4049109@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 79942

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:V1Wfb.33578$qj6.1845907@news1.news.adelphia.net...
> Dan/W4NTI wrote:
>
> > Don't believe me? Look at the before and after code gutting. I was
going
> > to get a fancy 1X2 years ago. Glad I didn't now.
>
> I'm still trying to decide what to do. I do a fair bit of contesting,
> and KB3EIA is quite a mouthfull at those times. It's not too bad CW wise
> (tho I haven't done CW contesting - maybe if I ever get good enough)
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -
>

The way to get good at it is to jump in and do it anyway. The way to start is to listen to one station over and over until you finally pick out the information and then to through your call sign in. Also never hesitate to send "PS QRS" when necessary. You can even specify the speed with "PS QRS 10" or whatever you are comfortable with. Most will slow down.

I'm not particularly good at it myself but am running about 50% CW contacts on the ongoing California QSO party.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

367. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-05 15:49:35 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <j4Xfb.5846$Hd6.4050044@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 79944

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:P%Wfb.5844$Hd6.4049109@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
>
> "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
> news:V1Wfb.33578$qj6.1845907@news1.news.adelphia.net...
> > Dan/W4NTI wrote:
> >
> > > Don't believe me? Look at the before and after code gutting. I was
> going
> > > to get a fancy 1X2 years ago. Glad I didn't now.
> >
> > I'm still trying to decide what to do. I do a fair bit of contesting,
> > and KB3EIA is quite a mouthfull at those times. It's not too bad CW wise
> > (tho I haven't done CW contesting - maybe if I ever get good enough)
> >
> > - Mike KB3EIA -
> >
>
> The way to get good at it is to jump in and do it anyway. The way to
start
> is to listen to one station over and over until you finally pick out the
> information and then to through your call sign in. Also never hesitate to
> send "PS QRS" when necessary. You can even specify the speed with "PS QRS
> 10" or whatever you are comfortable with. Most will slow down.
>
> I'm not particularly good at it myself but am running about 50% CW
contacts
> on the ongoing California QSO party.
>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>

"...then to throw your call sign..."

Hate it when I mistype something.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

368. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-05 15:49:57 UTC
From: Clint <"rattlehead at computron dot net">
Message-ID: <vo0fd5reoeehf1@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 79943

>
> The new requirements *probably* will have no Morse code requirements,
> ergo Morse is not really relevant to this thread.
>

They may or may not; if the FCC decides that no "no further change in the
license structure is required at this time" then of course that will be the
final
word on *that* matter, and we'll accept it and go on since they are the
ones that have the final say. I just couldn't help but notice how certain
ones
in here I think have such an overpowering agenda regarding the CW
part of the testing that it tends to take them over and govern, or at least
seriously influence, everything they have to remark about in ham radio.

I'm a general class operator; I realize by definition that means I had to
show knowledge in certain areas to prove I deserved recieving the next
higher license class than tech-plus; however, I did not demonstrate enough
skill and knowledge to warrant recieving the advanced class license.
Therefore,
advanced class operators *should* know more than I do, or at least as much.

That brings us to the sad truth that if an *extra* class license operator
doesn't
know how to calculate the length of a walf wave dipole on 40m (or whatever
frequency), that is a serious issue. I say that because calculating the
length of
an antenna, especially a halfwave dipole of ALL things, is and always WILL
be so basic to ham radio that it should be on page one of chapter one of
every study guide ever printed. Such matters is why I put such a strong
emphasis on putting more priority on written testing than that of the skills
of
translating a CW transmission.

Sad thing is, most the time I get on 75 meters and begin discussing ham
radio
tech stuff, there is usually one heckler that harangues you about it and
makes
light of the fact that you were talking about ham radio stuff and not what
the
weather was like on a day 58 years ago while an old man sat on a porch
and peeled potatoes in the hot summer sun... true story. I actually was on
the
airwaves a few weeks ago discussing the pros and cons how how to set up
a new 75 meter inverted V I was going to make at home... and as soon as

I finished the conversation with the other ham and he went off the air, a couple
of hams got in there and began talking to one another BASHING me for doing so... can you imagine???

Clint

369. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-05 15:58:58 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031005115858.18844.00000368@mb-m15.aol.com>
Source record: 79948

>I'm a general class operator; I realize by definition that means I had to
>show knowledge in certain areas to prove I deserved recieving the next

You didnt prove knowledge, all you proved was that you did a GOOD JOB of
Memorizing some Q@As.

370. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-05 16:00:43 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031005120043.18844.00000369@mb-m15.aol.com>
Source record: 79949

>(I would find it
>hard to believe that "old Techs" who had credit for both 5 wpm and
>the full General written wouldn't have upgraded to AT LEAST
>General ..

I know a bunch that have no desire or interest in passing there Silly little
Test.

371. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-05 16:01:31 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <vfXfb.8967$yp6.292566@nnrp1.ptd.net>
Source record: 79945

```
"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20031005082933.23307.00003517@mb-m29.aol.com...
> In article <iIIfb.8934$yp6.284046@nnrp1.ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
> <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:
>
> >"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> >news:20031004182928.01893.00001000@mb-m22.aol.com...
> >> In article <JPzfb.8883$yp6.278571@nnrp1.ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
> >> <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:
> >>
> >> >"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> >> >news:20031003211044.00545.00001329@mb-m02.aol.com...
> >> >[snip]
> >> >>
> >> >> One of the big problems is the "nobody loses/nobody gets a windfall"
> >> >paradigm.
> >> >
> >> >The NCI and NCVEC Petitions are "nobody loses/nobody gets a windfall"
> >> >propositions ... since a tech now gets HF privs if he/she passes a 5
wpm
> >> >code test, the elimination of the test would not be a "windfall" if
all
> >> >techs got the same privs as the old "TechPlus" ...
> >> >
> >> >Everything else stays the same.
> >>
> >> Yup. And so we wind up with a continuation of the VHF/UHF heavy, HF/MF
> >light
> >> entry level setup that is an artifact of the old S25.5.
> >
> >I doubt that ... I expect that a very large percentage of techs will
rapidly
> >upgrade to at least general, if not extra, once the code test is gone.
>
> Maybe - but look at what has happened with the Tech Plus:
>
> It's been 3-1/2 years since restructuring.
>
> No new Tech Pluses in all that time.
>
> All existing Tech Pluses changed to Techs when renewing or vanity call
granted.
>
> Many Tech Pluses needed no additional testing at all to get a General.
```

>
> Yet we still have about 50% of pre-restructuring Tech Pluses on the
books.Which
> means many of the existing Tech Pluses simply haven't yet bothered to
upgrade
> to General.

But by your own figuring, (about) 50% of them HAVE ...

> >The idea of "eliminate the code test and give techs "techplus" privs is
> >logical, takes nothing away from anyone, and gives nobody a "freebie."
>
> From the standpoint of written testing, anyway.

It's not a "freebie" in any way ... current Tech+ and "Tech with code
credit" have access to (some) HF ... if the code test is no longer a
requirement for HF access, it's only fair that Techs have access ...
they've passed the same written as (most) Tech+ ... (I would find it
hard to believe that "old Techs" who had credit for both 5 wpm and
the full General written wouldn't have upgraded to AT LEAST
General ... (however if someone didn't care and didn't that's no skin
off my nose ...)

> Didja know that some time back QCWA (you're a member, I'm not, even though
I'm
> "qualified") asked FCC to grant all pre-Nov.22-1968 Generals and Advanceds
a
> free upgrade to Extra? Talk about freebies!

Yes ... I believe that was in their comments in 98-143 and NCI opposed
it, along with the NCVECs ... we both said, "If they want to upgrade, they
should have to take the written element(s) that they need to get there. No
freebies!"

> >> In the case of NCVEC, there may be more petitions and proposals. They
have
> >> already hinted at same.
> >
> >I'm not part of that group, so I can't speak for them ... if they file a
> >petition
> >seeking to water down the writtens or expand the phone bands, I'll oppose
> >it vigorously (personally).
>
> Same here. But does Fred often take no for an answer? He sure is used to
> getting his way.

There is more to the NCVECs than Fred ... I would expect the ARRL rep
to oppose such an action ...

> >> >I think these proposals fully meet the "nobody loses/nobody gets a
> >> >windfall" paradigm.
> >> >
> >> Some would say that getting full privileges with no code test was a

> >> windfall, but I'm not gonna go there....
> >
> >The governments of the world don't seem to hold that view, so you'd be
> >up against the "heavy hitters."
>
> The governments of the world don't make FCC rules.

The FCC was part of one of those governments of the world that
supported the elimination of the requirement at WRC-03 ...

> How would you feel if it was proposed that all Advanceds get an instant
upgrade
> to Extra with no additional testing?

I'd oppose it ... there's a point to the additional written test for Extra,
and
without having passed it, you're not qualified. (Before you take another
tack here, there IS no point to Morse testing ... so it doesn't really count
as
a qualification, Element 1 is a vestigial thing that the FCC had to keep in
order to not be in derrogation of the ITU Radio Regs, not because it was
a truly rational, justifiable "qualification" ...)

> >> Main point is that between those two constrainsts, very little change
in
> >> the writtens or basic structure is possible.
> >
> >And I think the three classes of license are reasonable and appropriate.
> >Tech becomes the "entry" license, general is "mid-grade," and extra is
> >"top." I don't see anything wrong with that ...
> >
> That's essentially what we have now.

If it a'int broke, don't fix it ... the only thing that's "broke" is that
they
haven't yet eliminated the Morse test now that they're free to do so.

73,
Carl - wk3c

372. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-05 16:04:03 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <ThXfb.8968$yp6.292745@nnrp1.ptd.net>
Source record: 79946

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20031005082933.23307.00003518@mb-m29.aol.com...
> In article <4kFfb.8922$yp6.281377@nnrp1.ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
> >
> >But the FCC couldn't grant that because of the (now gone) ITU requirement
> >that
> >one pass a Morse test BEFORE getting on HF ...
> >
> Maybe. But look at what the UK did. Does the "Morse appreciation" thing
used
> with the Foundation license really constitute a "test"?
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

It's actually called a "Morse Assessment" ... no speed and a "crib sheet" is
allowed IIRC ... the UK RA took a more liberal interpretation ... there
never
was any speed spec'd in the Radio Regs. The FCC took the CYA approach
and used 5 wpm because that was the CEPT limit and we'd been granting
Novices/Techs (some) HF access with 5 wpm for years with no complaints
from the ITU or the international community.

Carl - wk3c

373. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-05 16:06:47 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031005120647.18903.00000374@mb-m15.aol.com>
Source record: 79950

>Must be the folks you hang out with Bruce ... you know the old
>saying "Birds of a feather flock together." :-)
>
>Carl - wk3c

Not hardly Karl, these people are the Knuckle Dragging NCI Members I hear.

374. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-05 16:07:06 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <KkXfb.8969$yp6.292912@nnrp1.ptd.net>
Source record: 79947

"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20031005094221.00268.00000268@mb-m27.aol.com...
> >Why? Maybe a little time in grade would mean we don't hear a new extra
ask
> >" how long is a half wave dipole on forty?"
> >
> >Dan/W4NTI
>
> That would be an improvment Dan, what I hear is, what is a Dipole, and who
> sells them, ands of course how much GAIN.

Must be the folks you hang out with Bruce ... you know the old
saying "Birds of a feather flock together." :-)

Carl - wk3c

375. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-05 16:26:55 UTC
From: Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns940B7E9C45E95elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 79951

Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in
news:kMWfb.34630$qj6.1857458@news1.news.adelphia.net:

> Alun Palmer wrote:
>
>> "Clint" <rattlehead at computron dot net> wrote in
>> news:vo09ap279i0403@corp.supernews.com:
>>
>>
>>>>>>Man you got that right Mike. It was that way, decades ago. The
>>>>>>extra used to mean something. Now it means squat.
>>>>>
>>>>>Don't believe me? Look at the before and after code gutting. I was
>>>>>going to get a fancy 1X2 years ago. Glad I didn't now.
>>>>>
>>>>>Dan/W4NTI
>>>>
>>>>All the 1x2 sequentially assigned calls were gone long before the
>>>>20wpm code was dropped.
>>>>
>>>>Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>>>>
>>>
>>>The real observation here is to note a complaint about extra class
>>>hams not knowing
>>>what the length of a 1/2 wave dipole was on a given frequency; has
>>>nothing to do
>>>with sending and recieving morse code skill.
>>>
>>>Kinda showed your colors there.
>>>
>>>Clint
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>
>>
>> It was a dead giveaway. Anyone who thinks that 20wpm code operating
>> skill means you know all about dipoles has a serious problem that no
>> amount of discussion will ever change.
>
> The new requirements *probably* will have no Morse code
> requirements,
> ergo Morse is not really relevant to this thread.

>
> That an extra might have no idea about the length of a half wave
> dipole
> at 40 meters - or more importantly, precisely no idea on how to
> calculate it - indicates a more serious problem to me.
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -
>
>

But one that has nothing to do with 20wpm, which I didn't introduce into
the discussion

376. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-05 16:36:41 UTC
From: Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns940B8045152C2elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 79952

Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in
news:aHWfb.34627$qj6.1856012@news1.news.adelphia.net:

> N2EY wrote:
>
>> So far (note that two predicted dates are in the past!):
>>
>> WA2SI: September 13, 2003
>> KF6TPT: September 29, 2003
>> KC8EPO: December 31, 2003
>> K2UNK: January 1, 2004
>> K2ASP: March 15, 2004
>> AA2QA: April 1, 2004
>> N2EY: April 15, 2004
>> N3KIP: May 1, 2004
>> KC8PMX: July 1, 2004
>> K3LT: September 15, 2004
>> Kim: June 1, 2008
>>
>> If I missed anybody, please add your guess to the list.
>
> KB3EIA - minimum 4 years from date of requiremen drop.
>
> - Mik KB3EIA -
>
>

That would be July 5, 2007, then. I don't think it will be that long,
though. I'm on the list for May 1, 2004.

BTW, Luxembourg just ditched the code test. There's a new country every
couple of weeks.

377. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-05 16:54:57 UTC
From: Clint <"rattlehead at computron dot net">
Message-ID: <vo0j725sua1sce@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 79953

"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20031005120647.18903.00000374@mb-m15.aol.com...
> >Must be the folks you hang out with Bruce ... you know the old
> >saying "Birds of a feather flock together." :-)
> >
> >Carl - wk3c
>
> Not hardly Karl, these people are the Knuckle Dragging NCI Members I hear.

Ah, the agenda *again*.

doesn't take long from the time you guys set up the trap to springing it
on the cw test issue.

"14,000 died in France? wow. See what happens when you start reducing
morse code requirements?"

Clint

378. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-05 16:55:55 UTC
From: Clint <"rattlehead at computron dot net">
Message-ID: <vo0j8tmd9gr60d@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 79954

"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20031005115858.18844.00000368@mb-m15.aol.com...
> >I'm a general class operator; I realize by definition that means I had to
> >show knowledge in certain areas to prove I deserved recieving the next
>
> You didnt prove knowledge, all you proved was that you did a GOOD JOB of
> Memorizing some Q@As.

Do you guys dream about morse code tests?

379. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-05 16:59:34 UTC
From: Clint <"rattlehead at computron dot net">
Message-ID: <vo0jfogsff8uf2@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 79955

Exactly.

That was my point; make a post about back up batteries for
black-out ham radio operations, and you'll get them making
CW test remarks about it.

Make a post about feedline pro's and con's, and they'll
devolve it back to morse code testing.

Talk about what is the best background noise reducing
handheld radio for use on the toilet when you have
diahrrea.. and yep, it's all about morse code testing
again.

No matter what, follow a thread long enough and they'll find
a way to use the most twisted path of logic to blame
NCI and the reduction & removal of morse code testing.

Was it, in fact, to blame for the shuttle disaster?

I digress.

Clint

"Alun Palmer" <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:Xns940B7E9C45E95elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
> Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in
> news:kMWfb.34630$qj6.1857458@news1.news.adelphia.net:
>
> > Alun Palmer wrote:
> >
> >> "Clint" <rattlehead at computron dot net> wrote in
> >> news:vo09ap279i0403@corp.supernews.com:
> >>
> >>
> >>>>>>Man you got that right Mike. It was that way, decades ago. The
> >>>>>>extra used to mean something. Now it means squat.
> >>>>>
> >>>>>>Don't believe me? Look at the before and after code gutting. I was
> >>>>>>going to get a fancy 1X2 years ago. Glad I didn't now.
> >>>>>
> >>>>>>Dan/W4NTI
> >>>>
> >>>>All the 1x2 sequentially assigned calls were gone long before the
> >>>>20wpm code was dropped.
> >>>>
> >>>>Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

> >>>>
> >>>
> >>>The real observation here is to note a complaint about extra class
> >>>hams not knowing
> >>>what the length of a 1/2 wave dipole was on a given frequency; has
> >>>nothing to do
> >>>with sending and recieving morse code skill.
> >>>
> >>>Kinda showed your colors there.
> >>>
> >>>Clint
> >>>
> >>>
> >>>
> >>
> >>
> >> It was a dead giveaway. Anyone who thinks that 20wpm code operating
> >> skill means you know all about dipoles has a serious problem that no
> >> amount of discussion will ever change.
> >
> > The new requirements *probably* will have no Morse code
> > requirements,
> > ergo Morse is not really relevant to this thread.
> >
> > That an extra might have no idea about the length of a half wave
> > dipole
> > at 40 meters - or more importantly, precisely no idea on how to
> > calculate it - indicates a more serious problem to me.
> >
> > - Mike KB3EIA -
> >
> >
>
> But one that has nothing to do with 20wpm, which I didn't introduce into
> the discussion

380. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-05 17:00:23 UTC
From: Clint <"rattlehead at computron dot net">
Message-ID: <vo0jh8q4p0jq26@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 79956

>
> If it a'int broke, don't fix it ... the only thing that's "broke" is that
> they
> haven't yet eliminated the Morse test now that they're free to do so.
>
> 73,
> Carl - wk3c
>

exactly.

Clint
KB5ZHT

381. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-05 17:07:33 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031005130733.14837.00003432@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 79958

In article <BcWfb.34024$qj6.1848732@news1.news.adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo
<mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>
>> In article <20031004210008.02537.00000878@mb-m23.aol.com>,
>yodoc@aol.comnospam
>> (Larry Roll K3LT) writes:
>>
>>
>>>I think that the most likely scenario is that they will do as you suggest,
>>>and distill it down to two license classes, General and Extra. All current
>>>Techs would be "grandfathered" to the General class, and the Extra will
>>>remain the same, sans Element 1(a). This would be the easiest change
>>>to accomplish from an administrative standpoint, and they wouldn't have
>>>to even bother renaming the remaining license classes, which would only
>>>risk causing resentment among current Extras. There could be, at most,
>>>a requirement for current Techs to pass another written element, but the
>>>grandfathering would be an easier fix.
>>
>>
>> ARRL asked for something very similar back in 1998 and FCC said no. (ARRL's
>> proposal would have given Novices and Tech Pluses instant upgrades to
>General).
>>
>> Such an instant upgrade has these problems:
>>
>> 1) A lot of screaming about "no giveaways"
>
> Let's test your premise here, Jim. Would you support a one class system

>in which all amateurs that have passed Novice, Tech, General or (of
>course) Extra get an "instant upgrade" to Extra?

No. In fact, not just "no" but "HELL, NO!!"
>
> That of course would be a simple and elegant solution. No more arguing
>about anything as far as classes go.

"All amateurs are equal. Some are more equal than others" (with a tip of the
hat to George Orwell and "Animal Farm".
>
> That would certainly cure the falloff in people getting Tech licenses
>at the moment. A person would have to be foolish to not take the Tech
>class license in order to get General class access after restructuring

>as in your example, or full Extra access as in my one class idea.

Some folks would agree with that system, or one like it. After all, once upon a time, anyone who could pass the Tech/General written (they were the same test for 36 years) and the required code test got all privileges. If the code test is removed, that leaves the General written.

Can anyone *prove* to me that the Extra written contains things a ham *must* know to operate on the Extra-only subbands?

Be careful what you ask for.

73 de Jim, N2EY

382. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-05 17:07:35 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031005130735.14837.00003433@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 79957

```
In article <vfXfb.8967$yp6.292566@nnrp1.ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
<wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20031005082933.23307.00003517@mb-m29.aol.com...
>> In article <iIIfb.8934$yp6.284046@nnrp1.ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
>> <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:
>>
>> >"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>> >news:20031004182928.01893.00001000@mb-m22.aol.com...
>> >> In article <JPzfb.8883$yp6.278571@nnrp1.ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
>> >> <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:
>> >>
>> >> >"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>> >> >news:20031003211044.00545.00001329@mb-m02.aol.com...
>> >> >[snip]
>> >> >>
>> >> >> One of the big problems is the "nobody loses/nobody gets a windfall"
>> >> >paradigm.
>> >> >
>> >> >The NCI and NCVEC Petitions are "nobody loses/nobody gets a windfall"
>> >> >propositions ... since a tech now gets HF privs if he/she passes a 5
>wpm
>> >> >code test, the elimination of the test would not be a "windfall" if
>all
>> >> >techs got the same privs as the old "TechPlus" ...
>> >> >
>> >> >Everything else stays the same.
>> >>
>> >> Yup. And so we wind up with a continuation of the VHF/UHF heavy, HF/MF
>> >light
>> >> entry level setup that is an artifact of the old S25.5.
>> >
>> >I doubt that ... I expect that a very large percentage of techs will
>rapidly
>> >upgrade to at least general, if not extra, once the code test is gone.
>>
>> Maybe - but look at what has happened with the Tech Plus:
>>
>> It's been 3-1/2 years since restructuring.
>>
>> No new Tech Pluses in all that time.
>>
>> All existing Tech Pluses changed to Techs when renewing or vanity call
```

>granted.
>>
>> Many Tech Pluses needed no additional testing at all to get a General.
>>
>> Yet we still have about 50% of pre-restructuring Tech Pluses on the
>books.Which
>> means many of the existing Tech Pluses simply haven't yet bothered to
>upgrade
>> to General.
>
>But by your own figuring, (about) 50% of them HAVE ...

You misinterpret what I wrote, Carl.

The number Tech Pluses is dropping for four reasons:

1) Expirations
2) Vanity calls
3) Renewal as Techs
4) Upgrades

The number of Tech Pluses today is down about 50% from the pre-restructuring numbers for all of the above reasons, not just upgrades.
>
>> >The idea of "eliminate the code test and give techs "techplus" privs is
>> >logical, takes nothing away from anyone, and gives nobody a "freebie."
>>
>> From the standpoint of written testing, anyway.
>
>It's not a "freebie" in any way ... current Tech+ and "Tech with code
>credit" have access to (some) HF ... if the code test is no longer a
>requirement for HF access, it's only fair that Techs have access ...
>they've passed the same written as (most) Tech+ ... (I would find it
>hard to believe that "old Techs" who had credit for both 5 wpm and
>the full General written wouldn't have upgraded to AT LEAST
>General ...

Obviously some have and some haven't. See above.

While you may find it hard to believe, nevertheless it is a fact.

Note also how few hams have upgraded to Extra. I recall being told that, even with medical waivers, the code test was the main "barrier" to more Extras. That alleged "barrier" is long gone - yet we have over 225,000 US hams who have not gone for Extra, even though all it would take for them to get the Extra was a single written test.

>> Didja know that some time back QCWA (you're a member, I'm not, even though
>I'm
>> "qualified") asked FCC to grant all pre-Nov.22-1968 Generals and Advanceds
>a
>> free upgrade to Extra? Talk about freebies!
>

>Yes ... I believe that was in their comments in 98-143 and NCI opposed
>it, along with the NCVECs ... we both said, "If they want to upgrade, they
>should have to take the written element(s) that they need to get there. No
>freebies!"

Of course. And their counter-argument was that it wasn't a freebie at all -
they'd been considered worthy of full privileges before Nov.22, 1968, so why
not now?
>
>> >> In the case of NCVEC, there may be more petitions and proposals. They
>have
>> >> already hinted at same.
>> >
>> >I'm not part of that group, so I can't speak for them ... if they file a
>> >petition
>> >seeking to water down the writtens or expand the phone bands, I'll oppose
>> >it vigorously (personally).
>>
>> Same here. But does Fred often take no for an answer? He sure is used to
>> getting his way.
>
>There is more to the NCVECs than Fred ... I would expect the ARRL rep
>to oppose such an action ...

The ARRL rep did not oppose NCVECs petition to dump Element 1 - instead, he
abstained. Same thing could happen in other petitions.

And even if ARRL opposes, Fred could still get his way with NCVEC. Has NCVEC
ever gone against one of his ideas and stopped him?
>
>> >> >I think these proposals fully meet the "nobody loses/nobody gets a
>> >> >windfall" paradigm.
>> >> >
>> >> Some would say that getting full privileges with no code test was a
>> >> windfall, but I'm not gonna go there....
>> >
>> >The governments of the world don't seem to hold that view, so you'd be
>> >up against the "heavy hitters."
>>
>> The governments of the world don't make FCC rules.
>
>The FCC was part of one of those governments of the world that
>supported the elimination of the requirement at WRC-03 ...

Well, there you have it.
>
>> How would you feel if it was proposed that all Advanceds get an instant
>upgrade
>> to Extra with no additional testing?
>
>I'd oppose it ... there's a point to the additional written test for Extra,

>and
>without having passed it, you're not qualified.

Why not?

A General or Advanced class ham can do everything that an Extra can except:

- certain VE functions
- obtain certain vanity calls
- use certain small slices of four HF bands.

There are no modes, bands or power levels restricted to Extras only. No technology that only Extras can use.

So what makes a General unqualified and an Extra qualified?

>(Before you take another
>tack here, there IS no point to Morse testing ... so it doesn't really count
>as a qualification, Element 1 is a vestigial thing that the FCC had to keep in
>order to not be in derrogation of the ITU Radio Regs, not because it was
>a truly rational, justifiable "qualification" ...)

In your opinion, that is.

But even if Element 1 remains, it's the same element for both Generals and Extras. No additional qualifications. And that goes back to 1990 and the medical waivers.

So it all comes down to the writtens, whether Element 1 goes or stays.
>
>> >> Main point is that between those two constrainsts, very little change
>> >> in
>> >> the writtens or basic structure is possible.
>> >
>> >And I think the three classes of license are reasonable and appropriate.
>> >Tech becomes the "entry" license, general is "mid-grade," and extra is
>> >"top." I don't see anything wrong with that ...
>> >
>> That's essentially what we have now.
>
>If it a'int broke, don't fix it ... the only thing that's "broke" is that
>they haven't yet eliminated the Morse test now that they're free to do so.
>
My point is that some folks are likely to say it *is* broke, even if Element 1 goes away.

Take a look at the recent dropoff in the number of new Techs in the past two months since the new Tech Q&A pool was put in place. The total number of US hams has dropped by a few thousand since July 1, due mainly to a drop in the number of new Techs.

Hopefully this is just an anomaly. But suppose it isn't - and suppose that Element 1 is dropped and the numbers still don't rise. In such a case, how do we counter those who will want to water down the writtens even more than they

are now?

73 de Jim, N2EY

383. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-05 18:42:35 UTC
From: Bert Craig <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM>
Message-ID: <vCZfb.41019$E95.20076978@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>
Source record: 79959

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20031005102908.15462.00003376@mb-m06.aol.com...
> So far (note that two predicted dates are in the past!):
>
> WA2SI: September 13, 2003
> KF6TPT: September 29, 2003
> KC8EPO: December 31, 2003
> K2UNK: January 1, 2004
> K2ASP: March 15, 2004
> AA2QA: April 1, 2004
> N2EY: April 15, 2004
> N3KIP: May 1, 2004
> KC8PMX: July 1, 2004
> K3LT: September 15, 2004
> Kim: June 1, 2008
>
> If I missed anybody, please add your guess to the list.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

Quite pleased to *lose* this one.

--
73 de Bert
WA2SI

384. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-05 19:22:32 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031005152232.16774.00000306@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 79960

>Ah, the agenda *again*.
>
>doesn't take long from the time you guys set up the trap to springing it
>on the cw test issue.
>

Did I mention anything about CW, I dont think so.

385. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-05 19:24:13 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031005152413.16774.00000307@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 79961

>Do you guys dream about morse code tests?
>
>

Look lid you still dont get it, I am well aware the CW test is gone, my complaint still is the Give away Written.

386. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-05 19:30:35 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <blprgr$49e$0@208.206.142.78>
Source record: 79962

N2EY wrote:

> In article <SLKfb.8938$yp6.285150@nnrp1.ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
> <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:
>
>
>>What
>>money are you talking about? (If you say "the manufacturers" that's
>>baloney.
>>I haven't seen a SINGLE comment filed on the current round of petitions by
>>any manufacturer ...)
>>
>
> All that's really happened so far in the "current round" is a flurry of
> petitions. There are more in process that don't have RM numbers yet.
>
> Back during the restructuring NPRM, there were comments from manufacturers.
>
> In fact, the most-often-quoted-by-FCC commenter in the R&O to 98-143 wasn't
> ARRL or NCI or NCVEC or some individual radio amateur.
>
> It was Kenwood.
>

Perhaps the manufacturers are smart enough to keep quiet this time.

387. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-05 19:31:09 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031005153109.16774.00000308@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 79963

>But suppose it isn't - and suppose that
>Element 1 is dropped and the numbers still don't rise. In such a case, how do
>we counter those who will want to water down the writtens even more than they
>are now?
>
>73 de Jim, N2EY

My point exactly, Im not even concerned about CW Testing. Im more concerned about the Written.Since we have all ready thrown the Doors open, the next logical step is to Dumb Down the written even more. Which Im sure is probably all ready in the works.

388. Re: Frenchmen must have thin skin

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-05 19:41:08 UTC
From: Kieren <kierenmail@hotmail.com>
Message-ID: <Xns940BD352CEDDEkierenmail@195.129.110.200>
Source record: 79964
Cross-posted to: alt.ham-radio.hf,alt.radio.amateur,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Clint" <rattlehead at computron dot net> wrote in news:vo0ale1t5og683
@corp.supernews.com:

> I think the french people must have weak blood
> or something.. I just read another artical about the
> heat wave and have found that for 2 weeks the
> temperature exceeded 104 degrees F, and the
> health minister says that his prolonged length
> of time accounts for the deaths.. whether you accept
> the figure of 3,000 or 14,000, that's STILL a lot
> of deaths. I live here in Texas where we've had
> summers exceeding 104 for over a month at a time;
> if you include the heat index due to humidity close
> to the coast, we've had weeks where the temperature
> exceeded 115 degrees for several weeks at a time
> (this summer was an exceptionally cool one; we didn't get
> over 101 for more than a few days). Yet here we
> haven't had 3,000 deaths from it and ESPECIALLY
> we haven't had 14,000 deaths.
>
> Clint
>

Don't quite understand what this has to do with ANY of the groups this was
posted to. Please stick to alt.ego.biggots or whatever group's
appropriate for thoughtless comments like this.

389. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-05 20:04:26 UTC
From: Robert <rdbake@prtcnet.org>
Message-ID: <blptbn$c5e$1@nd.eastky.net>
Source record: 80127

"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20031005152232.16774.00000306@mb-m07.aol.com...
> >Ah, the agenda *again*.
> >
> >doesn't take long from the time you guys set up the trap to springing it
> >on the cw test issue.
> >
>
> Did I mention anything about CW, I dont think so.

"cw test issue", bonehead. You said:

"Not hardly Karl, these people are the Knuckle Dragging NCI Members I hear."

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.520 / Virus Database: 318 - Release Date: 9/18/2003

390. Re: Frenchmen must have thin skin

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-05 20:21:17 UTC
From: Clint <"rattlehead at computron dot net">
Message-ID: <vo0va8nm9n006d@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 79965
Cross-posted to: alt.ham-radio.hf,alt.radio.amateur,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

WELL, "kieren", whoever you are, I don't know where
all this went, I simply replied to a post in alt.radio.amatuer.policy;
if it went to other groups it was because the original post was
also cross-posted. I have no idea where all it went; the same
place the post did that I *replied* to. I guess you do not have
the mental capacity to figure out this was a reply, not an original
post.

If you do not like it, I guess you have a personal problem then,
do you not? I guess if you find this something distasteful, it would
seem to me the problem is on your end, not mine. Ignore the
message, don't read it, if you do not like it. Put me in your
killfile. Log off the internet and go read a book. Do something.

But do not bother posting such condescending messages ever again
you overinflated sense of self-worth, because I could care LESS.
Got it? are we clear?

Clint

--

Reasons why it sucks to be a liberal....
<file overrun error>

--
"Kieren" <kierenmail@hotmail.com> wrote in message
news:Xns940BD352CEDDEkierenmail@195.129.110.200...
> "Clint" <rattlehead at computron dot net> wrote in news:vo0ale1t5og683
> @corp.supernews.com:
>
> > I think the french people must have weak blood
> > or something.. I just read another artical about the
> > heat wave and have found that for 2 weeks the
> > temperature exceeded 104 degrees F, and the
> > health minister says that his prolonged length
> > of time accounts for the deaths.. whether you accept
> > the figure of 3,000 or 14,000, that's STILL a lot
> > of deaths. I live here in Texas where we've had
> > summers exceeding 104 for over a month at a time;
> > if you include the heat index due to humidity close
> > to the coast, we've had weeks where the temperature
> > exceeded 115 degrees for several weeks at a time
> > (this summer was an exceptionally cool one; we didn't get

> > over 101 for more than a few days). Yet here we
> > haven't had 3,000 deaths from it and ESPECIALLY
> > we haven't had 14,000 deaths.
> >
> > Clint
> >
>
> Don't quite understand what this has to do with ANY of the groups this was
> posted to. Please stick to alt.ego.biggots or whatever group's
> appropriate for thoughtless comments like this.
>

391. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-05 20:23:35 UTC
From: Clint <"rattlehead at computron dot net">
Message-ID: <vo0vehhqlrts29@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 79966

well, genius, here is the statement you posted...

>Not hardly Karl, these people are the Knuckle Dragging NCI Members I hear.

What is NCI? it's the group that opposes morse code testing... well, then, I guess by definition then you are posting about CW aren't you? HM? Just like if I were to post a slur against the ACLU then I guess by definition I am attacking what that organization stands for, hm?????

You thought you won the race but it's because you showed up to the wrong track and nobody was racing against you.

Clint

--

Reasons why it sucks to be a liberal....
<file overrun error>

--
"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20031005152232.16774.00000306@mb-m07.aol.com...
> >Ah, the agenda *again*.
> >
> >doesn't take long from the time you guys set up the trap to springing it
> >on the cw test issue.
> >
>
> Did I mention anything about CW, I dont think so.

392. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-05 20:24:16 UTC
From: Clint <"rattlehead at computron dot net">
Message-ID: <vo0vfrku3mhh5f@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 79967

You're not fooling anybody.

--

Reasons why it sucks to be a liberal....
<file overrun error>

--
"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20031005152413.16774.00000307@mb-m07.aol.com...
> >Do you guys dream about morse code tests?
> >
> >
>
> Look lid you still dont get it, I am well aware the CW test is gone, my
> complaint still is the Give away Written.

393. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-05 20:25:38 UTC
From: Clint <"rattlehead at computron dot net">
Message-ID: <vo0vibiqk26ocf@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 79968

"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20031005153109.16774.00000308@mb-m07.aol.com...
>
> My point exactly, Im not even concerned about CW Testing.

AH....

That's why 90% of your posts attack the "knuckle dragging NCI"
and whimpering about those who oppose CW testing, mixed with
such insults as "lazy".

--

Reasons why it sucks to be a liberal....
<file overrun error>

--

394. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-05 20:26:19 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <blpupb$c08$0@208.206.142.78>
Source record: 79969

Mike Coslo wrote:

> Alun Palmer wrote:
>
>> "Clint" <rattlehead at computron dot net> wrote in
>> news:vo09ap279i0403@corp.supernews.com:
>>
>>>>>> Man you got that right Mike. It was that way, decades ago. The
>>>>>> extra used to mean something. Now it means squat.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> Don't believe me? Look at the before and after code gutting. I was
>>>>>> going to get a fancy 1X2 years ago. Glad I didn't now.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> Dan/W4NTI
>>>>
>>>>
>>>> All the 1x2 sequentially assigned calls were gone long before the
>>>> 20wpm code was dropped.
>>>>
>>>> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>>>>
>>>
>>> The real observation here is to note a complaint about extra class hams
>>> not knowing
>>> what the length of a 1/2 wave dipole was on a given frequency; has
>>> nothing to do
>>> with sending and recieving morse code skill.
>>>
>>> Kinda showed your colors there.
>>>
>>> Clint
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>
>>
>> It was a dead giveaway. Anyone who thinks that 20wpm code operating
>> skill means you know all about dipoles has a serious problem that no
>> amount of discussion will ever change.
>
>
> The new requirements *probably* will have no Morse code
> requirements, ergo Morse is not really relevant to this thread.
>

> That an extra might have no idea about the length of a half wave
> dipole at 40 meters - or more importantly, precisely no idea on how to
> calculate it - indicates a more serious problem to me.
>

Mike those posts just illustrate the extent of the problem the posters
have long had - for them code testing trumps everything else.

395. Re: Frenchmen must have thin skin

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-05 20:52:04 UTC
From: Kieren <kierenmail@hotmail.com>
Message-ID: <Xns940BDF5992AA8kierenmail@195.129.110.130>
Source record: 79970
Cross-posted to: alt.ham-radio.hf,alt.radio.amateur,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Clint" <rattlehead at computron dot net> wrote in
news:vo0va8nm9n006d@corp.supernews.com:

> WELL, "kieren", whoever you are, I don't know where
> all this went, I simply replied to a post in alt.radio.amatuer.policy;
> if it went to other groups it was because the original post was
> also cross-posted. I have no idea where all it went; the same
> place the post did that I *replied* to. I guess you do not have
> the mental capacity to figure out this was a reply, not an original
> post.
>
> If you do not like it, I guess you have a personal problem then,
> do you not? I guess if you find this something distasteful, it would
> seem to me the problem is on your end, not mine. Ignore the
> message, don't read it, if you do not like it. Put me in your
> killfile. Log off the internet and go read a book. Do something.
>
> But do not bother posting such condescending messages ever again
> you overinflated sense of self-worth, because I could care LESS.
> Got it? are we clear?
>
> Clint
>

Hi Clint,

Do you really have no idea where your posts go? Wow, perhaps you *were*
aiming to post to alt.ego.biggots after all! I withdraw any inference I
made that you're xenophobic - "plain stupid" sounds more like it. I
apologise for that gross error; I meant you no offence.

The second para. causes me no concern, but I take issue with the third:
You say you "could care LESS" (I suspect you *meant* to say 'couldn't
care less' - an error that strengthens my case for your stupidity, by the
way). However by writing a detailed reply, you indicate that you DO
care...if you really didn't care, you wouldn't have lowered yourself to
responding to my post, you see? Get it?

Because you really don't care what I think, I'll assume you won't respond
to this & we can both leave the topic forthwith.

Enjoy.

Humble apologies to anyone reading this thread: I somehow doubt Clint's email address is valid and, deep down, I suspect he's not really able to drive that medium correctly anyhow.

Spleen vented.

396. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-05 21:35:00 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031005173500.27839.00000370@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 79971

>What is NCI? it's the group that opposes morse code testing.

They are also the Group which doesnt have a CLUE about anything else except give it to me for nothing. These are probably the same group that will start NWI. As a matter of fact, one of there great supporters, and long time Members, has all ready suggested that the written be Dumbed Down even more.

397. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-05 21:36:25 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031005173625.27839.00000371@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 79972

>That's why 90% of your posts attack the "knuckle dragging NCI"
>and whimpering about those who oppose CW testing, mixed with
>such insults as "lazy".
>

Its because some of there own membership has suggested it.

398. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-05 21:44:30 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031005174430.27839.00000372@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 79973

>Mike those posts just illustrate the extent of the problem the posters
>have long had - for them code testing trumps everything else.
>

You just dont get it. Its not just the code. The next hurdle will be easy to do away with. Dont believe it, just ask TIT, let her explain the magic of a 1/4 Wave Dipole. Let her tell you how most Hams dont have a clue on this Magical Antenna, and remember it was TIT, and her No-Code bunch who discovered it.

399. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-05 21:56:10 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <_r0gb.9010$yp6.296575@nnrp1.ptd.net>
Source record: 79974

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20031005102908.15462.00003375@mb-m06.aol.com...
> In article <k%Tfb.8955$yp6.287802@nnrp1.ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
> <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:
>
> >The FCC and Congress see the ARS as a valuable national resource.
>
> I hope they remember that re: BPL. FCC seems to require a reminder now and
> again...

And they are being reminded vis a vis BPL.

> >> The "money" I'm talking about is that represented by all the OTHER
> >> commercial radio services administered by the FCC.
> >
> >Oh ... why didn't you say that?
> >
> >> This is where the FCC's true mission exists,
> >
> >The FCC has a Congressional mandate to regulate all of the radio
> >spectrum "in the public interest, convenience, and necessity" - that
> >includes the ARS.
>
> Included in that "public interest, convenience and necessity" are economic
> concerns. Some perceive that broadband access to the 'net is somehow a big
part
> of economic recovery, regardless of what other services get trashed. See
Comm.
> Abernathy's remarks on the "Road To Enlightenment" and "Wideband Nirvana"
being
> BPL. As if!

The problem is the the BPL vendors/organizations apparently "pitched"
BPL to the Commissioners as "the greatest thing since sliced bread,
"the infrastructure already exists" (the wires are there, but they'll have
to spend many millions of ratepayers' money to add all of the couplers,
modems, etc.), and that it would provide a quality, economical competitor
to xDSL and cable modems, all with 'no problems'."

It's understandable that the Commissioners would get rather excited
at the prospect, BUT they haven't had all of the facts, just hype from
the BPL industry and utilities that are seeing $signs ... despite the fact
that it's a demonstrably crappy business model. The other reason the
Commissioners would get excited is that they simply don't have the
technical background to see the problems without significant education

on the matter ... and, sadly, NONE of the Commissioners has a technical advisor on their staff ... several legal advisors each, but not a technical advisor amongst them.

NOTE: I am NOT trying to "defend" the FCC's enamourment with BPL, just explaining how it came to be and what's required to turn it around.

73,
Carl - wk3c

400. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-05 22:56:28 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <wk1gb.27274$f11.21439@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 79975

```
"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:DoUfb.5815$Hd6.4018466@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
>
> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
> news:5bUfb.29379$3S.19636@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> >
> > "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
> > news:ZfKfb.8269$qj6.1651765@news1.news.adelphia.net...
> > > Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
> > >
> > > > And I think the three classes of license are reasonable and
> appropriate.
> > > > Tech becomes the "entry" license, general is "mid-grade," and extra
is
> > > > "top." I don't see anything wrong with that ...
> > >
> > > What do you think would be a good division knowledge wise between the
> > > classes? The tech and general are not too bad now, knowledge to
> > > privileges. I lean a bit toward having the Extra require a bit more
> > > knowledge, or perhaps experience. I know a few no-experience Extra's
and
> > > it just seems (to me) that some "time in grade" might make the
license
> > > more meaningful.
> > >
> > > - Mike KB3EIA -
> > >
> >
> > Man you got that right Mike. It was that way, decades ago. The extra
> used
> > to mean something. Now it means squat.
> >
> > Don't believe me? Look at the before and after code gutting. I was
going
> > to get a fancy 1X2 years ago. Glad I didn't now.
> >
> > Dan/W4NTI
>
> All the 1x2 sequentially assigned calls were gone long before the 20wpm
code
> was dropped.
>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>
```

I was refering to when I upgraded, back in the 70s. I had several chances to change to a 1X2.

As I said, glad I didn't now. I'll just keep what I got, and let folks wonder what I have. Cause there sure ain't no reason to brag about it.

Dan/W4NTI

401. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-05 22:57:24 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <ol1gb.27288$f11.26629@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 79976

"Clint" <rattlehead at computron dot net> wrote in message
news:vo09ap279i0403@corp.supernews.com...
>
> > > Man you got that right Mike. It was that way, decades ago. The
extra
> > used
> > > to mean something. Now it means squat.
> > >
> > > Don't believe me? Look at the before and after code gutting. I was
> going
> > > to get a fancy 1X2 years ago. Glad I didn't now.
> > >
> > > Dan/W4NTI
> >
> > All the 1x2 sequentially assigned calls were gone long before the 20wpm
> code
> > was dropped.
> >
> > Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
> >
>
> The real observation here is to note a complaint about extra class hams
not
> knowing
> what the length of a 1/2 wave dipole was on a given frequency; has nothing
> to do
> with sending and recieving morse code skill.
>
> Kinda showed your colors there.
>
> Clint
>
>

Let me clear up the fog for you Clint. My point is the Extra ain't worth a
damn any more.

Dan/W4NTI

402. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-05 22:58:55 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <Pm1gb.27313$f11.5645@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 79977

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:kMWfb.34630$qj6.1857458@news1.news.adelphia.net...
> Alun Palmer wrote:
>
> > "Clint" <rattlehead at computron dot net> wrote in
> > news:vo09ap279i0403@corp.supernews.com:
> >
> >
> > >>>>Man you got that right Mike. It was that way, decades ago. The
> > >>>>extra used to mean something. Now it means squat.
> > >>>>
> > >>>>Don't believe me? Look at the before and after code gutting. I was
> > >>>>going to get a fancy 1X2 years ago. Glad I didn't now.
> > >>>>
> > >>>>Dan/W4NTI
> > >>>
> > >>>All the 1x2 sequentially assigned calls were gone long before the
> > >>>20wpm code was dropped.
> > >>>
> > >>>Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
> > >>>
> > >>
> > >>The real observation here is to note a complaint about extra class hams
> > >>not knowing
> > >>what the length of a 1/2 wave dipole was on a given frequency; has
> > >>nothing to do
> > >>with sending and recieving morse code skill.
> > >>
> > >>Kinda showed your colors there.
> > >>
> > >>Clint
> > >>
> > >>
> > >>
> > >
> > >
> > > It was a dead giveaway. Anyone who thinks that 20wpm code operating
> skill
> > > means you know all about dipoles has a serious problem that no amount of
> > > discussion will ever change.
> >
> > The new requirements *probably* will have no Morse code requirements,
> > ergo Morse is not really relevant to this thread.
> >

> That an extra might have no idea about the length of a half wave dipole
> at 40 meters - or more importantly, precisely no idea on how to
> calculate it - indicates a more serious problem to me.
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -
>

My point exactly. But lets not confuse the dead heads out there with the reality of the situation.

Dan/W4NTI

403. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-05 23:01:03 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <Po1gb.27340$f11.6502@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 79978

"Clint" <rattlehead at computron dot net> wrote in message
news:vo0fd5reoeehf1@corp.supernews.com...
>
> >
> > The new requirements *probably* will have no Morse code requirements,
> > ergo Morse is not really relevant to this thread.
> >
>
> They may or may not; if the FCC decides that no "no further change in the
> license structure is required at this time" then of course that will be
the
> final
> word on *that* matter, and we'll accept it and go on since they are the
> ones that have the final say. I just couldn't help but notice how certain
> ones
> in here I think have such an overpowering agenda regarding the CW
> part of the testing that it tends to take them over and govern, or at
least
> seriously influence, everything they have to remark about in ham radio.
>
> I'm a general class operator; I realize by definition that means I had to
> show knowledge in certain areas to prove I deserved recieving the next
> higher license class than tech-plus; however, I did not demonstrate enough
> skill and knowledge to warrant recieving the advanced class license.
> Therefore,
> advanced class operators *should* know more than I do, or at least as
much.
>
> That brings us to the sad truth that if an *extra* class license operator
> doesn't
> know how to calculate the length of a walf wave dipole on 40m (or whatever
> frequency), that is a serious issue. I say that because calculating the
> length of
> an antenna, especially a halfwave dipole of ALL things, is and always WILL
> be so basic to ham radio that it should be on page one of chapter one of
> every study guide ever printed. Such matters is why I put such a strong
> emphasis on putting more priority on written testing than that of the
skills
> of
> translating a CW transmission.
>
> Sad thing is, most the time I get on 75 meters and begin discussing ham
> radio
> tech stuff, there is usually one heckler that harangues you about it and

> makes
> light of the fact that you were talking about ham radio stuff and not what
> the
> weather was like on a day 58 years ago while an old man sat on a porch
> and peeled potatoes in the hot summer sun... true story. I actually was on
> the
> airwaves a few weeks ago discussing the pros and cons how how to set up
> a new 75 meter inverted V I was going to make at home... and as soon as
> I finished the conversation with the other ham and he went off the air, a
> couple
> of hams got in there and began talking to one another BASHING me for doing
> so... can you imagine???
>
> Clint
>
>

Sure can Clint. And you just made my point.

Dan/W4NTI

404. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-05 23:02:00 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <lp1gb.27353$f11.16564@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 79979

"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20031005152413.16774.00000307@mb-m07.aol.com...
> >Do you guys dream about morse code tests?
> >
> >
>
> Look lid you still dont get it, I am well aware the CW test is gone, my
> complaint still is the Give away Written.

Don't confuse him Bruce....he thinks he is on a roll.

Dan/W4NTI

405. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-05 23:04:24 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <Yr1gb.27375$f11.8285@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 79980

Clint, Clint, Clint. She was making a point of discussing the time. Not the code, per se. She said all the 1X2s were issued BEFORE the code was dropped. Do you have a comprehension problem too?

Dan/W4NTI

"Clint" <rattlehead at computron dot net> wrote in message news:vo0jfogsff8uf2@corp.supernews.com...
> Exactly.
>
> That was my point; make a post about back up batteries for
> black-out ham radio operations, and you'll get them making
> CW test remarks about it.
>
> Make a post about feedline pro's and con's, and they'll
> devolve it back to morse code testing.
>
> Talk about what is the best background noise reducing
> handheld radio for use on the toilet when you have
> diahrrea.. and yep, it's all about morse code testing
> again.
>
> No matter what, follow a thread long enough and they'll find
> a way to use the most twisted path of logic to blame
> NCI and the reduction & removal of morse code testing.
>
> Was it, in fact, to blame for the shuttle disaster?
>
> I digress.
>
> Clint
>
> "Alun Palmer" <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> news:Xns940B7E9C45E95elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
> > Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in
> > news:kMWfb.34630$qj6.1857458@news1.news.adelphia.net:
> >
> > > Alun Palmer wrote:
> > >
> > >> "Clint" <rattlehead at computron dot net> wrote in
> > >> news:vo09ap279i0403@corp.supernews.com:
> > >>
> > >>
> > >>>>>>Man you got that right Mike. It was that way, decades ago. The
> > >>>>>>extra used to mean something. Now it means squat.

> > >>>>>
> > >>>>>Don't believe me? Look at the before and after code gutting. I
was
> > >>>>>going to get a fancy 1X2 years ago. Glad I didn't now.
> > >>>>>
> > >>>>>Dan/W4NTI
> > >>>>
> > >>>>All the 1x2 sequentially assigned calls were gone long before the
> > >>>>20wpm code was dropped.
> > >>>>
> > >>>>Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
> > >>>>
> > >>>
> > >>>The real observation here is to note a complaint about extra class
> > >>>hams not knowing
> > >>>what the length of a 1/2 wave dipole was on a given frequency; has
> > >>>nothing to do
> > >>>with sending and recieving morse code skill.
> > >>>
> > >>>Kinda showed your colors there.
> > >>>
> > >>>Clint
> > >>>
> > >>>
> > >>>
> > >>>
> > >>
> > >>
> > >> It was a dead giveaway. Anyone who thinks that 20wpm code operating
> > >> skill means you know all about dipoles has a serious problem that no
> > >> amount of discussion will ever change.
> > >>
> > > The new requirements *probably* will have no Morse code
> > > requirements,
> > > ergo Morse is not really relevant to this thread.
> > >
> > > That an extra might have no idea about the length of a half wave
> > > dipole
> > > at 40 meters - or more importantly, precisely no idea on how to
> > > calculate it - indicates a more serious problem to me.
> > >
> > > - Mike KB3EIA -
> > >
> > >
> >
> > But one that has nothing to do with 20wpm, which I didn't introduce into
> > the discussion
>
>

406. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-05 23:05:13 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031005190513.29227.00000433@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 79981

>NOTE: I am NOT trying to "defend" the FCC's enamourment with BPL,
>just explaining how it came to be and what's required to turn it around.
>
>73,
>Carl - wk3c

Yep, and thats how the No-Coders got there way.

407. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-05 23:06:52 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <gu1gb.27389$f11.22211@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 79982

"Clint" <rattlehead at computron dot net> wrote in message
news:vo097245c5mkad@corp.supernews.com...
>
> >
> > Don't believe me? Look at the before and after code gutting.
>
> ah, and there we have it.
> the agenda.
>
>
> --
>
> Reasons why it sucks to be a liberal....
> <file overrun error>
>
> --
>
>

You really have a problem don't you Clint? Or are you just stupid?

I used that statement as a point in time. Thats all.

And you talk about the pro coders having a problem. Shhhhhhhhhhsssshhh..

Dan/W4NTI

408. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-05 23:09:17 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <xw1gb.27400$f11.13884@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 79983

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:V1Wfb.33578$qj6.1845907@news1.news.adelphia.net...
> Dan/W4NTI wrote:
>
> > "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
> > news:ZfKfb.8269$qj6.1651765@news1.news.adelphia.net...
> >
> >>Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
> >>
> >>
> >>>And I think the three classes of license are reasonable and
appropriate.
> >>>Tech becomes the "entry" license, general is "mid-grade," and extra is
> >>>"top." I don't see anything wrong with that ...
> >>
> >>What do you think would be a good division knowledge wise between the
> >>classes? The tech and general are not too bad now, knowledge to
> >>privileges. I lean a bit toward having the Extra require a bit more
> >>knowledge, or perhaps experience. I know a few no-experience Extra's and
> >> it just seems (to me) that some "time in grade" might make the license
> >>more meaningful.
> >>
> >>- Mike KB3EIA -
> >>
> >
> >
> > Man you got that right Mike. It was that way, decades ago. The extra
used
> > to mean something. Now it means squat.
>
> To my logic, the top level should be exactly that - the top level. The
> expert in the field. This should entail more than the test requirements.
> The Extra should be able to be depended on to give intelligent and
> accurate answers to normal situations that crop up:
>
> "Whoa there fella, you're in the CW portion of the band operating
> voice. Here let me show you where the band edge is."
>
> "Ahh, the reason you can't work Europe is you have your dipole oriented
> the wrong way."
>
> "Here, let me help."
>
> The general class op can of course be inexperienced Sometimes they can

> do things in an incorrect or inefficient manner. But that's okay as long
> as they eventually get it right. But if the highest class doesn't really
> mean anything, perhaps there should only two classes
>
> > Don't believe me? Look at the before and after code gutting. I was
going
> > to get a fancy 1X2 years ago. Glad I didn't now.
>
> I'm still trying to decide what to do. I do a fair bit of contesting,
> and KB3EIA is quite a mouthfull at those times. It's not too bad CW wise
> (tho I haven't done CW contesting - maybe if I ever get good enough)
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -
>

Go ahead and drop it. But a W4 ain't too ruff. Although the "I" gets
dropped in QSB at times.

I do alright contesting.

What contests do you do? I don't remember you. Course I've only done them
for 30 years or so.

Dan/W4NTI

409. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-05 23:10:03 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031005191003.29227.00000435@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 79984

>As I said, glad I didn't now. I'll just keep what I got, and let folks
>wonder what I have. Cause there sure ain't no reason to brag about it.
>
>Dan/W4NTI

Thats why these No-Coders run out and grab a 1x2 or 1x3.They think this will make people think they have been around awhile and know something.

410. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-05 23:10:36 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <Mx1gb.27407$f11.5582@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 79985

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:P%Wfb.5844$Hd6.4049109@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
>
> "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
> news:V1Wfb.33578$qj6.1845907@news1.news.adelphia.net...
> > Dan/W4NTI wrote:
> >
> > > Don't believe me? Look at the before and after code gutting. I was
> going
> > > to get a fancy 1X2 years ago. Glad I didn't now.
> >
> > I'm still trying to decide what to do. I do a fair bit of contesting,
> > and KB3EIA is quite a mouthfull at those times. It's not too bad CW wise
> > (tho I haven't done CW contesting - maybe if I ever get good enough)
> >
> > - Mike KB3EIA -
> >
>
> The way to get good at it is to jump in and do it anyway. The way to
start
> is to listen to one station over and over until you finally pick out the
> information and then to through your call sign in. Also never hesitate to
> send "PS QRS" when necessary. You can even specify the speed with "PS QRS
> 10" or whatever you are comfortable with. Most will slow down.
>
> I'm not particularly good at it myself but am running about 50% CW
contacts
> on the ongoing California QSO party.
>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>

Good for you Dee D. I played in it myself. Got 147 phone and 194 on CW.

Dan/W4NTI

411. Re: Amazin'....Ain't it...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-05 23:10:59 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0310051510.2502be58@posting.google.com>
Source record: 79986

brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0310030443.74c4da4b@posting.google.com>...

> > > There's been other rumors of running afoul of the CIVIL courts
> > > and getting booted by his ISP for his misconduct, but I don't have all
> > > those details.
> > >
> > > Perhaps he'd like to bring us up to date...?!?!
> > >
> > > Steve, K4YZ
> >
> > Would you mind providing us with the name of that Yahoo MODERATED
> > Group, so that we might look at the archives and see what got you
> > tossed off the group.
> >
> > Thanks, Brian
>
>
> Hello?

Asking yourself questions, Brain?

Who said anything about "moderated"...?!?!

I own four YahooGroups, one of which has over 400 subscribers,
and I can tell you with certainty that the listowner can block ANY
subscriber to the list.

Steve, K4YZ

412. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-05 23:13:38 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031005191338.29227.00000436@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 79987

>Let me clear up the fog for you Clint. My point is the Extra ain't worth a
>damn any more.
>
>Dan/W4NTI
>

Thats for sure, but in my case the only reason I upgraded was for the $250.00.
And I got to take it from of a bunch of No-Code Dead Heads. Still havent used
the EXTRA for the EXTRA band segments, probably never will.

413. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-05 23:15:02 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <WB1gb.27431$f11.5975@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 79988

"Clint" <rattlehead at computron dot net> wrote in message
news:vo0954hp4js580@corp.supernews.com...
> > >
> >
> > Why? Maybe a little time in grade would mean we don't hear a new extra
> ask
> > " how long is a half wave dipole on forty?"
> >
> > Dan/W4NTI
> >
> >
>
> to me that just doesn't make any sense... I think you're implying that a
> long time
> ago, you would NEVER hear an extra ask such an entry-level question, and I
> believe you are right. I do not believe the answer lies in haveing a "time
> in grade"
> requirement... and while it's impossible to have a comprehensive test that
> covers
> EVERYTHING (for obvious reasons), I believe it's possible to have a test
> that
> makes sure a person doesn't reach the top level license without knowing
> basics
> that the novice level licensees should be asking about.
>
> i'm also a nuts-and-bolts person... just start at the basic everyday ham
> radio station,
> at each part that makes it up, and have a question pool that pertains to
> each one....
> questions about grounding, questions about feedline, questions about
> antennas,
> pretty much the way they do now but as he said, add "meat" to it...
increase
> the
> amount of knowledge you have to have in each area to meet the requirements
> to
> be an extra class ham radio operator. It would be a beautiful thing, and
> made
> possible by the fact that the perspective extra will have more time to
alot
> studying
> what really matters to know what a ham radio station is than simply test
> eye-hand-
> hearing coordination in some old communication mode that's being dropped

> by non-ham radio services world wide in leaps and bounds...
>
> Let it be repeated
> that one of the fundamental concepts of ham radio is the "progression of
the
> radio art", NOT "the progression of the HAM radio art as a snapshot in
time
> during the 1950's"... after all, isn't that an oxymoron? trying to
progress,
> spread
> knoweldge about and increase the use of something that is obsolete?
>
> Clint
>
> --
>
> Reasons why it sucks to be a liberal....
> <file overrun error>
>
> --
>
>

Gee Clint...Im impressed. You actually do know something about ham radio
and how is USED TO BE. Congrats.

Dan/W4NTI

414. Re: Lennie's Double Standard Once Again Revealed...BY Lennie!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-05 23:15:39 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0310051515.4e5f8b3d@posting.google.com>
Source record: 79989

brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0310010606.62efe0c@posting.google.com>...

> Len was willing to go the distance w/o letting all the bullying and
> worse deter him. In that respect, Len is my mentor.

He's still a liar, Brain. Anyone who can justify such a
"mentoring" association with a documented pathological liar is a fool.

That, Brain Burke, would be you.

> You, Steve Robeson, will not run me off the group. Nor will your
> Cronies.

You, Brian Burke, ahve an over-inflated appreciation of yourself.

Quite to the contrary, I want you RIGHT HERE ! ! ! I find great
satisfaction watching you dance around your own little fires, set by
one silly, unsubstantiated assertion after the other.

Run you off...?!?! Heck no! I LIKE watching the jester at play!

Steve, K4YZ

415. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-05 23:15:58 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <OC1gb.27437$f11.19074@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 79990

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:Y3Wfb.33665$qj6.1846473@news1.news.adelphia.net...
> Dan/W4NTI wrote:
>
>
> > Why? Maybe a little time in grade would mean we don't hear a new extra
ask
> > " how long is a half wave dipole on forty?"
>
> It's a quarter wave dipole Dan! You'd think we'd have that figured out
> by now! <Ducking now> 8^)
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -
>

Oh thats right Mike....that reminds me, Ive got to throw out all those
outdated tech manuals.

Dan/W4NTI

416. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-05 23:15:58 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031005191558.29227.00000437@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 79991

>My point exactly. But lets not confuse the dead heads out there with the
>reality of the situation.
>
>Dan/W4NTI

Thats how get a good laugh, I love to listen to these Dead Heads when there trying to explain something. Whats even funnier is the other Dead Head believes him.

417. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-05 23:17:22 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031005191722.29227.00000438@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 79992

>Sure can Clint. And you just made my point.
>
>Dan/W4NTI
>

Can you imagine the rude awaking these Knuckle Draggers will receive when they get on HF?

418. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-05 23:18:20 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031005191820.29227.00000439@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 79993

>Don't confuse him Bruce....he thinks he is on a roll.
>
>Dan/W4NTI
>

Dan he doesnt know any better, he really thinks he knows something.

419. Re: Lennie's Double Standard Once Again Revealed...BY Lennie!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-05 23:21:10 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0310051521.6d820cc8@posting.google.com>
Source record: 79994

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20031001174149.05539.00001144@mb-m16.aol.com>...

> >Len was willing to go the distance w/o letting all the bullying and
> >worse deter him. In that respect, Len is my mentor.
>
> I'm still "going the distance," Brian. I just don't live here in this
> newsgroup every day.

You're not going any "distance", Lennie, unless it's one step
closer to the grave. You're still unlicensed, you're stilla liar, and
you're still as irrelevent to Amateur Radio as ever.

> Steamy has proved himself to all readers that he is incapable of
> any discussion, debate, or argument...just personal attacks on
> anyone who doesn't agree with his emotional opinions.

"All readers", Lennie...?!?!

You have, of course, some kind of proof to back that up...

(We know you don't, but you'll "make the case" for me by not
being able to present any kind of valid "evidence" in support of your
assertion.

> >You, Steve Robeson, will not run me off the group. Nor will your
> >Cronies.
>
> I would suppose that Steamy has a great imagination, fantasizing he
> is a great "radio warrior" vanquishing all who do not agree with his
> ideals of amateurism.

If there's anyone here with a King of the Hill self-ideation,
Lennie, it would be you.

> He obviously needs some mental counseling.

Let's see...Lennie is NOT an Amateur Radio operator, has NO
vested interest in ANY Amateur Radio program or endeavor, is a
thouroghly documented pathological liar and thinks >>I<< need "mental
counselling...

Sheesh...What a putz.

Steve, K4YZ

420. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-05 23:34:18 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <_T1gb.35444$qj6.1955140@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 79995

```
Alun Palmer wrote:
> Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in
> news:kMWfb.34630$qj6.1857458@news1.news.adelphia.net:
>
>
>>Alun Palmer wrote:
>>
>>
>>>"Clint" <rattlehead at computron dot net> wrote in
>>>news:vo09ap279i0403@corp.supernews.com:
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>>>>Man you got that right Mike. It was that way, decades ago. The
>>>>>>extra used to mean something. Now it means squat.
>>>>>>
>>>>>>Don't believe me? Look at the before and after code gutting. I was
>>>>>>going to get a fancy 1X2 years ago. Glad I didn't now.
>>>>>>
>>>>>>Dan/W4NTI
>>>>>
>>>>>All the 1x2 sequentially assigned calls were gone long before the
>>>>>20wpm code was dropped.
>>>>>
>>>>>Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>>>>>
>>>>
>>>>The real observation here is to note a complaint about extra class
>>>>hams not knowing
>>>>what the length of a 1/2 wave dipole was on a given frequency; has
>>>>nothing to do
>>>>with sending and recieving morse code skill.
>>>>
>>>>Kinda showed your colors there.
>>>>
>>>>Clint
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>It was a dead giveaway. Anyone who thinks that 20wpm code operating
>>>skill means you know all about dipoles has a serious problem that no
>>>amount of discussion will ever change.
```

>>
>> The new requirements *probably* will have no Morse code
>> requirements,
>>ergo Morse is not really relevant to this thread.
>>
>> That an extra might have no idea about the length of a half wave
>> dipole
>>at 40 meters - or more importantly, precisely no idea on how to
>>calculate it - indicates a more serious problem to me.
>>
>> - Mike KB3EIA -
>>
>>
>
>
> But one that has nothing to do with 20wpm, which I didn't introduce into
> the discussion

You are 100 percent correct, Alun. Did you think I said otherwise? Do
you like to argue with people when they agree with you?

- Mike KB3EIA -

421. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-05 23:50:06 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <O62gb.35453$qj6.1957842@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 79996

Carl R. Stevenson wrote:

> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20031005102908.15462.00003375@mb-m06.aol.com...
>
>>In article <k%Tfb.8955$yp6.287802@nnrp1.ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
>><wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:
>>
>>
>>>The FCC and Congress see the ARS as a valuable national resource.
>>
>>I hope they remember that re: BPL. FCC seems to require a reminder now and
>>again...
>
>
> And they are being reminded vis a vis BPL.
>
>
>>>>The "money" I'm talking about is that represented by all the OTHER
>>>>commercial radio services administered by the FCC.
>>>
>>>Oh ... why didn't you say that?
>>>
>>>
>>>> This is where the FCC's true mission exists,
>>>
>>>The FCC has a Congressional mandate to regulate all of the radio
>>>spectrum "in the public interest, convenience, and necessity" - that
>>>includes the ARS.
>>
>>Included in that "public interest, convenience and necessity" are economic
>>concerns. Some perceive that broadband access to the 'net is somehow a big
>
> part
>
>>of economic recovery, regardless of what other services get trashed. See
>
> Comm.
>
>>Abernathy's remarks on the "Road To Enlightenment" and "Wideband Nirvana"
>
> being
>
>>BPL. As if!

>
>
> The problem is the the BPL vendors/organizations apparently "pitched"
> BPL to the Commissioners as "the greatest thing since sliced bread,
> "the infrastructure already exists" (the wires are there, but they'll have
> to spend many millions of ratepayers' money to add all of the couplers,
> modems, etc.), and that it would provide a quality, economical competitor
> to xDSL and cable modems, all with 'no problems'."
>
> It's understandable that the Commissioners would get rather excited
> at the prospect, BUT they haven't had all of the facts, just hype from
> the BPL industry and utilities that are seeing $signs ... despite the fact
> that it's a demonstrably crappy business model. The other reason the
> Commissioners would get excited is that they simply don't have the
> technical background to see the problems without significant education
> on the matter ... and, sadly, NONE of the Commissioners has a technical
> advisor on their staff ... several legal advisors each, but not a technical
> advisor amongst them.
>
> NOTE: I am NOT trying to "defend" the FCC's enamourment with BPL,
> just explaining how it came to be and what's required to turn it around.

One of the odd things about the commissioners however. They must be
able to suspend disbelief pretty easily.

Household and electrical wiring has been around for a long time. And
there's no rocket science to the technology of riding a signal on a line
voltage circuit. Control signals are sent along these wires regularly
and have been for many years.

So if this was (is) such a good way to send signals, why wasn't the
internet developed this way in the first place?

I believe that I am skeptical enough that even if I didn't have a
technical background, that question would pop up pretty quickly when
considering BPL.

Carl, is there any other way that we can aid this fight?

- Mike KB3EIA -

422. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-06 00:01:18 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <ih2gb.35458$qj6.1960684@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 79997

Clint wrote:

>>The new requirements *probably* will have no Morse code requirements,
>>ergo Morse is not really relevant to this thread.
>>
>
>
> They may or may not; if the FCC decides that no "no further change in the
> license structure is required at this time" then of course that will be the
> final
> word on *that* matter, and we'll accept it and go on since they are the
> ones that have the final say. I just couldn't help but notice how certain
> ones
> in here I think have such an overpowering agenda regarding the CW
> part of the testing that it tends to take them over and govern, or at least
> seriously influence, everything they have to remark about in ham radio.
>
> I'm a general class operator; I realize by definition that means I had to
> show knowledge in certain areas to prove I deserved recieving the next
> higher license class than tech-plus; however, I did not demonstrate enough
> skill and knowledge to warrant recieving the advanced class license.
> Therefore,
> advanced class operators *should* know more than I do, or at least as much.
>
> That brings us to the sad truth that if an *extra* class license operator
> doesn't
> know how to calculate the length of a walf wave dipole on 40m (or whatever
> frequency), that is a serious issue. I say that because calculating the
> length of
> an antenna, especially a halfwave dipole of ALL things, is and always WILL
> be so basic to ham radio that it should be on page one of chapter one of
> every study guide ever printed. Such matters is why I put such a strong
> emphasis on putting more priority on written testing than that of the skills
> of
> translating a CW transmission.
>
> Sad thing is, most the time I get on 75 meters and begin discussing ham
> radio tech stuff, there is usually one heckler that harangues you about it and
> makes light of the fact that you were talking about ham radio stuff and not what
> the weather was like on a day 58 years ago while an old man sat on a porch
> and peeled potatoes in the hot summer sun... true story. I actually was on
> the airwaves a few weeks ago discussing the pros and cons how how to set up
> a new 75 meter inverted V I was going to make at home... and as soon as
> I finished the conversation with the other ham and he went off the air, a

> couple of hams got in there and began talking to one another BASHING me for doing
> so... can you imagine???

75 meters is a strange place. I usually don't go there for the reasons you mention. I do contest and PSK31 there, but that's about it. And yeah, they bitch about me too. But I love to have technical conversations on the air - otherwise I run out of things to say pretty quick!

The strangest/scariest think I ever heard on 75 was one ham who was in pretty bad shape and talking to another about his health. He pretty matter of fact noted that his doctor said it was only a day or two left for him, and it sounded like it, rattles and wheezes. I thought he was going to shift his coil right while I was listening.

- Mike KB3EIA -

423. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-06 00:10:57 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <lq2gb.35461$qj6.1963146@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 79998

Dan/W4NTI wrote:

> What contests do you do? I don't remember you. Course I've only done them
> for 30 years or so.

PAQSO, NEQP, Field day, North American. I tried the Ohio this year, but
conditions were bad. I've not been licensed too long, and sometimes op
our club station (W3YA)

- Mike KB3EIA -

424. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-06 00:29:48 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <0I2gb.35465$qj6.1967632@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 79999

N2EY wrote:

> In article <BcWfb.34024$qj6.1848732@news1.news.adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo
> <mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:
>
>
>>N2EY wrote:
>>
>>
>>>In article <20031004210008.02537.00000878@mb-m23.aol.com>,
>>
>>yodoc@aol.comnospam
>>
>>>(Larry Roll K3LT) writes:
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>>I think that the most likely scenario is that they will do as you suggest,
>>>>and distill it down to two license classes, General and Extra. All current
>>>>Techs would be "grandfathered" to the General class, and the Extra will
>>>>remain the same, sans Element 1(a). This would be the easiest change
>>>>to accomplish from an administrative standpoint, and they wouldn't have
>>>>to even bother renaming the remaining license classes, which would only
>>>>risk causing resentment among current Extras. There could be, at most,
>>>>a requirement for current Techs to pass another written element, but the
>>>>grandfathering would be an easier fix.
>>>
>>>
>>>ARRL asked for something very similar back in 1998 and FCC said no. (ARRL's
>>>proposal would have given Novices and Tech Pluses instant upgrades to
>>
>>General).
>>
>>>Such an instant upgrade has these problems:
>>>
>>>1) A lot of screaming about "no giveaways"
>>
>> Let's test your premise here, Jim. Would you support a one class system
>
>
>>in which all amateurs that have passed Novice, Tech, General or (of
>>course) Extra get an "instant upgrade" to Extra?
>
>

> No. In fact, not just "no" but "HELL, NO!!"

Okay, now I know a little more where you stand on this. I wasn't sure if
you were being DA on it or what..... Wait a second... DA means Devil's
Advocate... other interpretations might not be so kind! 8^)

<snip>

> Can anyone *prove* to me that the Extra written contains things a ham *must*
> know to operate on the Extra-only subbands?

Nope! There is really not much reason to go from General to Extra
beyond personal satisfaction!

- Mike KB3EIA -

425. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-06 00:43:52 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <cV2gb.5903$Hd6.4142110@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 80000

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:Mx1gb.27407$f11.5582@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
>
> "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
> news:P%Wfb.5844$Hd6.4049109@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
> >
> > "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
> > news:V1Wfb.33578$qj6.1845907@news1.news.adelphia.net...
> > > I'm still trying to decide what to do. I do a fair bit of contesting,
> > > and KB3EIA is quite a mouthfull at those times. It's not too bad CW
wise
> > > (tho I haven't done CW contesting - maybe if I ever get good enough)
> > >
> > > - Mike KB3EIA -
> > >
> >
> > The way to get good at it is to jump in and do it anyway. The way to
> start
> > is to listen to one station over and over until you finally pick out the
> > information and then to through your call sign in. Also never hesitate
to
> > send "PS QRS" when necessary. You can even specify the speed with "PS
QRS
> > 10" or whatever you are comfortable with. Most will slow down.
> >
> > I'm not particularly good at it myself but am running about 50% CW
> contacts
> > on the ongoing California QSO party.
> >
> > Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
> >
>
> Good for you Dee D. I played in it myself. Got 147 phone and 194 on CW.
>
> Dan/W4NTI

Although it was running about even most of the contest, later the voice
bands picked up and I ended with 95 voice and 78 CW.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

426. Re: Frenchmen must have thin skin

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-06 01:35:34 UTC
From: Clint <"rattlehead at computron dot net">
Message-ID: <vo1hnman40fn0d@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 80101
Cross-posted to: alt.ham-radio.hf,alt.radio.amateur,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

PLONK!

and with that we have a new addition to my killfile.

Clint is now kieren-free...

--
"All history was a palimpsest, scraped clean and reinscribed exactly
as often as necessary. In no case would it have been possible, once
the deed was done, to prove that any falsification had taken place...

...it was not even forgery. It was merely the substitution of one piece
of nonsense for another. Most of the material that you were dealing
with had no connection with anything in the real world, not even the
kind of connection that is contained in a direct lie. Statistics were just
as much a fantasy in thier original version as in thier rectified version."

- The totalitarian world of George Orwell's 1984
(or is it the slander & lie campaign strategy of
today's liberals???)

--
"Kieren" <kierenmail@hotmail.com> wrote in message
news:Xns940BDF5992AA8kierenmail@195.129.110.130...
> "Clint" <rattlehead at computron dot net> wrote in
> news:vo0va8nm9n006d@corp.supernews.com:
>
> > WELL, "kieren", whoever you are, I don't know where
> > all this went, I simply replied to a post in alt.radio.amatuer.policy;
> > if it went to other groups it was because the original post was
> > also cross-posted. I have no idea where all it went; the same
> > place the post did that I *replied* to. I guess you do not have
> > the mental capacity to figure out this was a reply, not an original
> > post.
> >
> > If you do not like it, I guess you have a personal problem then,
> > do you not? I guess if you find this something distasteful, it would
> > seem to me the problem is on your end, not mine. Ignore the
> > message, don't read it, if you do not like it. Put me in your
> > killfile. Log off the internet and go read a book. Do something.
> >
> > But do not bother posting such condescending messages ever again
> > you overinflated sense of self-worth, because I could care LESS.
> > Got it? are we clear?

> >
> > Clint
> >
>
> Hi Clint,
>
> Do you really have no idea where your posts go? Wow, perhaps you *were*
> aiming to post to alt.ego.biggots after all! I withdraw any inference I
> made that you're xenophobic - "plain stupid" sounds more like it. I
> apologise for that gross error; I meant you no offence.
>
> The second para. causes me no concern, but I take issue with the third:
> You say you "could care LESS" (I suspect you *meant* to say 'couldn't
> care less' - an error that strengthens my case for your stupidity, by the
> way). However by writing a detailed reply, you indicate that you DO
> care...if you really didn't care, you wouldn't have lowered yourself to
> responding to my post, you see? Get it?
>
> Because you really don't care what I think, I'll assume you won't respond
> to this & we can both leave the topic forthwith.
>
> Enjoy.
> ---
>
>
> Humble apologies to anyone reading this thread: I somehow doubt Clint's
> email address is valid and, deep down, I suspect he's not really able to
> drive that medium correctly anyhow.
>
>
> Spleen vented.

427. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-06 01:38:25 UTC
From: Clint <"rattlehead at computron dot net">
Message-ID: <vo1ht2a4fv1vf0@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 80102

"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20031005173500.27839.00000370@mb-m04.aol.com...
> >What is NCI? it's the group that opposes morse code testing.
>
> They are also the Group which doesnt have a CLUE about anything else
except
> give it to me for nothing. These are probably the same group that will
start
> NWI. As a matter of fact, one of there great supporters, and long time
Members,
> has all ready suggested that the written be Dumbed Down even more.
>

ah, hm.. and I thought you didn't care about the CW testing issue anymore.
Lots of locked up hate and resentment there..... looks as though it's pushed
you to extreme exaggeration of the facts and in some cases false
characterizations.

Clint

--
"All history was a palimpsest, scraped clean and reinscribed exactly
as often as necessary. In no case would it have been possible, once
the deed was done, to prove that any falsification had taken place...

...it was not even forgery. It was merely the substitution of one piece
of nonsense for another. Most of the material that you were dealing
with had no connection with anything in the real world, not even the
kind of connection that is contained in a direct lie. Statistics were just
as much a fantasy in thier original version as in thier rectified version."

- The totalitarian world of George Orwell's 1984
(or is it the slander & lie campaign strategy of
today's liberals???)

--

428. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-06 01:40:40 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <blqh6ofth0@208.206.142.103>
Source record: 80103

Carl R. Stevenson wrote:

NONE of the Commissioners has a technical
> advisor on their staff ... several legal advisors each, but not a technical
> advisor amongst them.
>
> NOTE: I am NOT trying to "defend" the FCC's enamourment with BPL,
> just explaining how it came to be and what's required to turn it around.

And *that* is probably the most unsettling part of the entire picture-
the fact that the political appointees, assigned to decide the future
of the most technical facet of our society, involving countless billions
of dollars,indeed deciding the success or failure of our economy, would
disdain technical advice in favor of ONLY the legal.

429. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-06 01:41:51 UTC
From: Clint <"rattlehead at computron dot net">
Message-ID: <vo1i3hcl58bqf5@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 80104

> Sure can Clint. And you just made my point.
>
> Dan/W4NTI
>
>

And what point would THAT be? the hams that did this were legally licensed, had been for some time, and passed at least 13 wmp code tests. So much for the "yahoo filter" theory.

Clint

--
"All history was a palimpsest, scraped clean and reinscribed exactly as often as necessary. In no case would it have been possible, once the deed was done, to prove that any falsification had taken place...

...it was not even forgery. It was merely the substitution of one piece of nonsense for another. Most of the material that you were dealing with had no connection with anything in the real world, not even the kind of connection that is contained in a direct lie. Statistics were just as much a fantasy in thier original version as in thier rectified version."

- The totalitarian world of George Orwell's 1984
(or is it the slander & lie campaign strategy of
today's liberals???)

--
"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:Po1gb.27340$f11.6502@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
>
> "Clint" <rattlehead at computron dot net> wrote in message
> news:vo0fd5reoeehf1@corp.supernews.com...
> >
> > >
> > > The new requirements *probably* will have no Morse code requirements,
> > > ergo Morse is not really relevant to this thread.
> > >
> >
> > They may or may not; if the FCC decides that no "no further change in
the
> > license structure is required at this time" then of course that will be
> the
> > final
> > word on *that* matter, and we'll accept it and go on since they are the
> > ones that have the final say. I just couldn't help but notice how

certain
> > ones
> > in here I think have such an overpowering agenda regarding the CW
> > part of the testing that it tends to take them over and govern, or at
> least
> > seriously influence, everything they have to remark about in ham radio.
> >
> > I'm a general class operator; I realize by definition that means I had
to
> > show knowledge in certain areas to prove I deserved recieving the next
> > higher license class than tech-plus; however, I did not demonstrate
enough
> > skill and knowledge to warrant recieving the advanced class license.
> > Therefore,
> > advanced class operators *should* know more than I do, or at least as
> much.
> >
> > That brings us to the sad truth that if an *extra* class license
operator
> > doesn't
> > know how to calculate the length of a walf wave dipole on 40m (or
whatever
> > frequency), that is a serious issue. I say that because calculating the
> > length of
> > an antenna, especially a halfwave dipole of ALL things, is and always
WILL
> > be so basic to ham radio that it should be on page one of chapter one of
> > every study guide ever printed. Such matters is why I put such a strong
> > emphasis on putting more priority on written testing than that of the
> skills
> > of
> > translating a CW transmission.
> >
> > Sad thing is, most the time I get on 75 meters and begin discussing ham
> > radio
> > tech stuff, there is usually one heckler that harangues you about it and
> > makes
> > light of the fact that you were talking about ham radio stuff and not
what
> > the
> > weather was like on a day 58 years ago while an old man sat on a porch
> > and peeled potatoes in the hot summer sun... true story. I actually was
on
> > the
> > airwaves a few weeks ago discussing the pros and cons how how to set up
> > a new 75 meter inverted V I was going to make at home... and as soon as
> > I finished the conversation with the other ham and he went off the air,
a
> > couple
> > of hams got in there and began talking to one another BASHING me for

doing
> > so... can you imagine???
> >
> > Clint
> >
> >
>

430. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-06 01:44:05 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <blqhd5fth1@208.206.142.103>
Source record: 80105

Dan/W4NTI wrote:

> "Clint" <rattlehead at computron dot net> wrote in message
> news:vo0fd5reoeehf1@corp.supernews.com...
>
>>>The new requirements *probably* will have no Morse code requirements,
>>>ergo Morse is not really relevant to this thread.
>>>
>>
>>They may or may not; if the FCC decides that no "no further change in the
>>license structure is required at this time" then of course that will be
>
> the
>
>>final
>>word on *that* matter, and we'll accept it and go on since they are the
>>ones that have the final say. I just couldn't help but notice how certain
>>ones
>>in here I think have such an overpowering agenda regarding the CW
>>part of the testing that it tends to take them over and govern, or at
>
> least
>
>>seriously influence, everything they have to remark about in ham radio.
>>
>>I'm a general class operator; I realize by definition that means I had to
>>show knowledge in certain areas to prove I deserved recieving the next
>>higher license class than tech-plus; however, I did not demonstrate enough
>>skill and knowledge to warrant recieving the advanced class license.
>>Therefore,
>>advanced class operators *should* know more than I do, or at least as
>
> much.
>
>>That brings us to the sad truth that if an *extra* class license operator
>>doesn't
>>know how to calculate the length of a walf wave dipole on 40m (or whatever
>>frequency), that is a serious issue. I say that because calculating the
>>length of
>>an antenna, especially a halfwave dipole of ALL things, is and always WILL
>>be so basic to ham radio that it should be on page one of chapter one of
>>every study guide ever printed. Such matters is why I put such a strong
>>emphasis on putting more priority on written testing than that of the
>

> skills
>
>>of
>>translating a CW transmission.
>>
>>Sad thing is, most the time I get on 75 meters and begin discussing ham
>>radio
>>tech stuff, there is usually one heckler that harangues you about it and
>>makes
>>light of the fact that you were talking about ham radio stuff and not what
>>the
>>weather was like on a day 58 years ago while an old man sat on a porch
>>and peeled potatoes in the hot summer sun... true story. I actually was on
>>the
>>airwaves a few weeks ago discussing the pros and cons how how to set up
>>a new 75 meter inverted V I was going to make at home... and as soon as
>>I finished the conversation with the other ham and he went off the air, a
>>couple
>>of hams got in there and began talking to one another BASHING me for doing
>>so... can you imagine???
>>
>>Clint
>>
>>
>
>
> Sure can Clint. And you just made my point.
>
> Dan/W4NTI
>
>

Ya never know, Dan. Clint being Clint, they probably had good reason
to hee-haw his verbalizing of the "plan".

431. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-06 02:00:19 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20031005220019.28496.00001080@mb-m18.aol.com>
Source record: 80106

In article <O62gb.35453$qj6.1957842@news1.news.adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo
<mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:

> So if this was (is) such a good way to send signals, why wasn't the
>internet developed this way in the first place?

Mike:

Or cable TV, for that matter. Why spend all the bucks to wire the world
with coax when power lines are everywhere?

> I believe that I am skeptical enough that even if I didn't have a
>technical background, that question would pop up pretty quickly when
>considering BPL.
>
> Carl, is there any other way that we can aid this fight?

For one thing, if and when BPL comes to your area, don't subscribe
to it!

73 de Larry, K3LT

432. Re: test

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-06 02:00:20 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20031005220020.28496.00001081@mb-m18.aol.com>
Source record: 80107

In article <ssNfb.29254$3S.7661@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOSPAMearthlink.net> writes:

>
>"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote:
>>
>> Do I get a No-code HF license for passing the test?
>
>
> Only if you openly acknowledge the code users' superiority first.

Dwight:

Sorry, but I only do that in a tongue-in-cheek manner here in the newsgroup. I am a code user, but am not necessarily "superior" to any other ham -- just willing and able to learn the code and pass the tests.

73 de Larry, K3LT

433. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-06 02:00:21 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20031005220021.28496.00001082@mb-m18.aol.com>
Source record: 80110

In article <k%Tfb.8955$yp6.287802@nnrp1.ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
<wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:

>> >What money Larry? The ARS is non-commercial.
>>
>> Carl:
>>
>> Yup. That's correct. The ARS is non-commercial, and therefore is an
>> unproductive drain on the FCC's administrative resources.
>
>The FCC and Congress see the ARS as a valuable national resource.

Carl:

That doesn't mean that they don't see the advantage to them in reducing
ARS licensing standards, as has already been proven.

>> >NCI doesn't even have
>> >mandatory dues and has lived on voluntary donations its whole life.
>>
>> That's just swell, Carl, but I don't recall this being about NCI and it's
>> funding sources.
>
>I was just trying to address what appeared to be a "someone's going
>to make money off of this" scenario ... your text came across that way.

Change the word "make" to "save," and you've finally got it right.

>> >What
>> >money are you talking about? (If you say "the manufacturers" that's
>> >baloney.
>> >I haven't seen a SINGLE comment filed on the current round of petitions
>by
>> >any manufacturer ...)
>> >
>> >Carl - wk3c
>>
>> The "money" I'm talking about is that represented by all the OTHER
>> commercial radio services administered by the FCC.
>
>Oh ... why didn't you say that?

Didn't have to. The ARS doesn't "make" money, Carl -- except for the
equipment manufacturers, but as you said, they aren't fighting any
of the petitions to eliminate code testing, since they figure it's going to
result in increased future sales. In any event, they're just pocket

change compared to the commercial broadcasting and communications
services.

>> This is where the FCC's true mission exists,

>The FCC has a Congressional mandate to regulate all of the radio
>spectrum "in the public interest, convenience, and necessity" - that
>includes the ARS.

Which doesn't say anything about how far they can reduce licensing
standards.

>> and to a far greater extent than in what
>> is now primarily a hobbyist service (amateur radio).
>
>YOU view it as primarily a hobby ... and it is a hobby, but the
>FCC and Congress look at it as a public service *provided
>for free to society* by folks who do it as a hobby. They also
>value the educational opportunities it presents in a society that
>increasingly requires people who are trained in radio/electronics.

Well, considering the fact that licensing requirements are already
just short of meaningless, and that most hams these days haven't
a clue about what's going on inside their off-the-shelf gear, it's
kinda hard to view the ARS as a particularly rigorous training
experience for future electronics technicians.

>> Even the "money"
>> you allude to, represented in the business done between radio amateurs
>> and the manufacturers of our radio equipment and accessories, is a
>> spit in the ocean compared to that represented by the commercial
>> broadcasting and communications services. So little, in fact, that the
>> FCC obviously needs to direct it's administrative resources away from
>> amateur radio and toward the commercial services to the greatest
>> extent possible.

>Sure, services that affect/are used by 10's of millions of people will
>get more attention ... that's logical.

>> The best way for them to achieve this is to reduce
>> licensing standards to the greatest extent possible, in order to keep
>> from repeatedly dealing with the same issues.

>That's nonsense ... all they have to do is set reasonable, logical,
>and justifiable licensing standards and then stick to their guns.

I see. Well, on April 14, 2000 we *had* reasonable, logical, and
justifiable licensing standards. Someone musta cleaned the glue
off of their M-16's that evening, because on April 15, 2000 we
suddenly had licensing standards which were dumbed down to
a level which can only be viewed as downright silly.

>Just because some yahoo asks them to do something stupid
>(like the Petitions for Reconsideration that came out immediately

>after restucturing, asking the FCC to re-institute 13 and 20 wpm
>code tests) doesn't mean they have to honor them ... such nonsense
>should be summarily dismissed with virtually no consumption of
>FCC resources.

Yeah, they'd rather listen to the yahoos that wanted them to
reduce licensing standards down to a meaningless level.

73 de Larry, K3LT

434. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-06 02:00:22 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20031005220022.28496.00001083@mb-m18.aol.com>
Source record: 80109

In article <_DVfb.26153$f11.4744@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> writes:

>
>"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote:
>>
>> The FCC's language seems to be geared mainly to pander
>> to those commentors who favored the reduction/elimination
>> of code testing, and for good reason. (snip)
>
>
> The only pandering I see in the quoted paragraph is that to the future
>needed expertise of this country.

Dwight:

Unfortunately, neither you nor the rest of the NCTA has been able to show just exactly what the connection is between technical expertise and the requirement for learning and being tested in a practical and useful communications skill such as Morse/CW in the AMATEUR Radio Service.

>> The FCC, if they can get the code testing requirement lifted,
>> faces a smaller administrative burden in running the ARS
>> licensing system, an important consideration since the ARS is
>> an economically irrelevant communications service. (snip)

> Where exactly is this "smaller administrative burden" supposed to occur?
>Since the cost of entering code-related data while processing an overall
>license is almost infinitesimal, I just don't see a significant financial
>windfall for the FCC here. But what I do see here (in your overall mesage)
>is an effort to undermine the real reasons for the elimination of the code
>test requirement by suggesting the FCC is only doing it for financial gain
>instead. Of course, there is not a shred of evidence to support your claim,
>but the exact same thing could be said for all popular conspiracy claims.

Sooo, you're saying that eliminating the code testing requirement, and the associated licensing data, would not lead to a quantifiable reduction in the administrative workload related to licensing in the ARS? Sorry, Dwight, but you're just plain wrong about that.

>> (snip) Nothing less than I would expect from people who
>> don't understand or appreciate the nature of the ARS, and
>> view it as an administrative burden which deflects valuable
>> resources away from much more economically pertinent
>> issues. As I've said many times before, follow the money,

>> and you learn the truth.

> I think the FCC understands and appreciates the nature of the ARS just
>fine. If you honestly can't see that, then perhaps you don't understand or
>appreciate the nature of the FCC when it comes to its regulation of the ARS.

I think that the FCC responds to political pressure. This is what brought
about Restructuring and the elimination of code testing, save for the 5 WPM
requirement which was tied to the ITU Treaty. I believe that if they (the FCC)
truly understood the nature of the ARS, and the value of the Morse/CW
mode within the ARS, that wouldn't have happened. However, the Bush Sr.
Administration allowed JY1 to meddle with the U.S. amateur radio
licensing requirements as the result of a plea by a "handicapped" ham in
PA, and you know the rest.

73 de Larry, K3LT

435. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-06 02:00:23 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20031005220023.28496.00001084@mb-m18.aol.com>
Source record: 80108

In article <blo309$rp9$0@208.206.142.109>, Dick Carroll
<dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com> writes:

>> The FCC's goal, obviously, is to get as much of the administrative
>> burden of the ARS licensing system off their backs as possible, so I
>> look for them to do just that.
>
>
>I don't think so. FCC's work at admininistring the ARS licensing can't
>get to much a level than it currently is.
>
>Here's about what I look for:
>
>1) Combine Novice/Tech/Tech Plus into one license, probably Tech, with
>some amount of lower HF band Fone and CW/Digital access. Might even
>use the old Novice segments for their digital/CW segment. After all,
>it's still the 'entry level' license.
>
>2) Probably drop element 1 for Generals.
>
>3) Leave Advanced alone and let attritition take care of it.
>
>4) Leave Extra alone with a 5wpm code test. Should be 12wpm but
> I doubt they'll back up at this late date.
>
>I don't expect them to do this nor anything else before the
>next rules review is due.

Dick:

Of course, there's always the remote possibility that the FCC will
take the easiest course of action, which is to make no further changes
to the ARS licensing structure and requirements at all. However,
this would seem to be almost impossible for them to get away with,
in light of the language of the Restructuring R&O. One can always
hope, but I'm 99% sure we'll see code testing go away. Of course,
when it does, Carl and the NCI will then be in the "hot seat" -- since
we'll now be able to sit back and wait for the technical/digital
revolution they've promised all along. Personally, I hope they're right,
but I don't have that kind of luck.

73 de Larry, K3LT

436. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-06 02:00:23 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20031005220023.28496.00001085@mb-m18.aol.com>
Source record: 80111

In article <0I2gb.35465$qj6.1967632@news1.news.adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo
<mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:

>> Can anyone *prove* to me that the Extra written contains things a ham
>*must*
>> know to operate on the Extra-only subbands?
>
> Nope! There is really not much reason to go from General to Extra
>beyond personal satisfaction!
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -

Mike:

In the past (the Pre-Restructuring Era), the reason for upgrading was that
increased operating privileges were the reward for gaining increased
technical knowledge and operating skill. The ARS seems to have taken
a clue from the rest of our dumbed-down society and abandoned this
philosophy.

73 de Larry, K3LT

437. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-06 02:04:42 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031005220442.01183.00000234@mb-m29.aol.com>
Source record: 80112

>ah, hm.. and I thought you didn't care about the CW testing issue anymore.

I dont but your just to Dumped Down to see the TREND.

438. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-06 02:24:28 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031005222428.01183.00000238@mb-m29.aol.com>
Source record: 80116

>The biggest thing that I fear is the ham community going
>ballistic prematurely and flaming the FCC, e-mail bombing
>them, etc. That would only hurt our cause.
>
>73,
>Carl - wk3c

I hope they do, and thanks for the Idea, let me see if I can get it started
on some othergroups and let it snow Ball.
Its only fitting you NO-Codes end up with nothing for your trouble.

439. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-06 02:25:54 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <So4gb.9025$yp6.299458@nnrp1.ptd.net>
Source record: 80113

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:O62gb.35453$qj6.1957842@news1.news.adelphia.net...
> Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
> >
> > The problem is the the BPL vendors/organizations apparently "pitched"
> > BPL to the Commissioners as "the greatest thing since sliced bread,
> > "the infrastructure already exists" (the wires are there, but they'll
have
> > to spend many millions of ratepayers' money to add all of the couplers,
> > modems, etc.), and that it would provide a quality, economical
competitor
> > to xDSL and cable modems, all with 'no problems'."
> >
> > It's understandable that the Commissioners would get rather excited
> > at the prospect, BUT they haven't had all of the facts, just hype from
> > the BPL industry and utilities that are seeing $signs ... despite the
fact
> > that it's a demonstrably crappy business model. The other reason the
> > Commissioners would get excited is that they simply don't have the
> > technical background to see the problems without significant education
> > on the matter ... and, sadly, NONE of the Commissioners has a technical
> > advisor on their staff ... several legal advisors each, but not a
technical
> > advisor amongst them.
> >
> > NOTE: I am NOT trying to "defend" the FCC's enamourment with BPL,
> > just explaining how it came to be and what's required to turn it around.
>
> One of the odd things about the commissioners however. They must be
> able to suspend disbelief pretty easily.
>
> Household and electrical wiring has been around for a long time. And
> there's no rocket science to the technology of riding a signal on a line
> voltage circuit. Control signals are sent along these wires regularly
> and have been for many years.
>
> So if this was (is) such a good way to send signals, why wasn't the
> internet developed this way in the first place?
>
> I believe that I am skeptical enough that even if I didn't have a
> technical background, that question would pop up pretty quickly when
> considering BPL.
>
> Carl, is there any other way that we can aid this fight?

>
> - Mike KB3EIA -

Mike,

ARRL is working this hard. Ed Hare was down to Emmaus
again Thu/Fri/Sat, spoke at a local club meeting, and we
did some measurements/comparisons between his field
observations and mine (they correlate perfectly, as I expected)

I am going to do what I can in terms of lobbying folks I know
at the FCC from my professional dealings with them.

The comment and reply comment periods on the NOI are
over, so there will be an apparent lull in activity.

One thing we're eager to see is the reaction of NTIA (on
behalf of their USG "clients") ... I can't believe that they
will come up with any different take on the interference
potential of BPL than ARRL and I have ... and they will
make a powerful ally if I am right.

For the moment, I think we're in a mode of waiting for
NTIA's reaction, some lobbying by folks who know folks,
and other "background" work.

The biggest thing that I fear is the ham community going
ballistic prematurely and flaming the FCC, e-mail bombing
them, etc. That would only hurt our cause.

73,
Carl - wk3c

440. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-06 02:25:59 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <Xo4gb.35700$qj6.2000981@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 80117

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> In article <O62gb.35453$qj6.1957842@news1.news.adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo
> <mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:
>
>
>> So if this was (is) such a good way to send signals, why wasn't the
>>internet developed this way in the first place?
>
>
> Mike:
>
> Or cable TV, for that matter. Why spend all the bucks to wire the world
> with coax when power lines are everywhere?

>
>
>> I believe that I am skeptical enough that even if I didn't have a
>>technical background, that question would pop up pretty quickly when
>>considering BPL.
>>
>> Carl, is there any other way that we can aid this fight?
>
>
> For one thing, if and when BPL comes to your area, don't subscribe
> to it!

I have to believe that it would be the biggest dog of a service ever
invented! I suspect in the real world, it might work about as good as a
56K modem... maybe.

- Mike KB3EIA -

441. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-06 02:27:00 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031005222700.01183.00000239@mb-m29.aol.com>
Source record: 80118

>We do NOT want inaccurate claims of "BPL
>interference" to be made because the BPL industy will say, "See,
>we told you those hams were exaggerating ... our systems don't
>cause interference."
>
>Carl - w3kc

Another good Idea thanks Karl, I will see if I can help get the troops to
start Bitching

442. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-06 02:29:20 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <4s4gb.9026$yp6.299498@nnrp1.ptd.net>
Source record: 80114

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20031005220019.28496.00001080@mb-m18.aol.com...
> In article <O62gb.35453$qj6.1957842@news1.news.adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo
> <mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:
>
> > So if this was (is) such a good way to send signals, why wasn't the
> >internet developed this way in the first place?
>
> Mike:
>
> Or cable TV, for that matter. Why spend all the bucks to wire the world
> with coax when power lines are everywhere?
>
> > I believe that I am skeptical enough that even if I didn't have a
> >technical background, that question would pop up pretty quickly when
> >considering BPL.
> >
> > Carl, is there any other way that we can aid this fight?
>
> For one thing, if and when BPL comes to your area, don't subscribe
> to it!
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT

And, if BPL comes to your area and you receive interference, let
Ed Hare, W1RFI, at the ARRL know about it.

One thing that's VERY important ... we CANNOT afford to have
people mis-identifying other sources of interference as "BPL" and
making inaccurate interference complaints to the FCC.

It is OF THE UTMOST IMPORTANCE that BPL interference
be properly ID'd. We do NOT want inaccurate claims of "BPL
interference" to be made because the BPL industy will say, "See,
we told you those hams were exaggerating ... our systems don't
cause interference."

Carl - w3kc

443. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-06 02:30:28 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <8t4gb.9027$yp6.299535@nnrp1.ptd.net>
Source record: 80115

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:blqh6ofth0@208.206.142.103...
> Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
>
> NONE of the Commissioners has a technical
> > advisor on their staff ... several legal advisors each, but not a
technical
> > advisor amongst them.
> >
> > NOTE: I am NOT trying to "defend" the FCC's enamourment with BPL,
> > just explaining how it came to be and what's required to turn it around.
>
>
> And *that* is probably the most unsettling part of the entire picture-
> the fact that the political appointees, assigned to decide the future
> of the most technical facet of our society, involving countless billions
> of dollars,indeed deciding the success or failure of our economy, would
> disdain technical advice in favor of ONLY the legal.
>

Miracle of miracles ... Dick and I have FINALLY found one thing
we can agree on without hesitation!

Carl - wk3c

444. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-06 02:31:30 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <6u4gb.35703$qj6.2003327@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 80119

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:

> In article <0I2gb.35465$qj6.1967632@news1.news.adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo
> <mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:
>
>
>>>Can anyone *prove* to me that the Extra written contains things a ham
>>
>>*must*
>>
>>>know to operate on the Extra-only subbands?
>>
>> Nope! There is really not much reason to go from General to Extra
>>beyond personal satisfaction!
>>
>> - Mike KB3EIA -
>
>
> Mike:
>
> In the past (the Pre-Restructuring Era), the reason for upgrading was that
> increased operating privileges were the reward for gaining increased
> technical knowledge and operating skill. The ARS seems to have taken
> a clue from the rest of our dumbed-down society and abandoned this
> philosophy.

And what I'm thinking is that unless it means something again, they
might as well get rid of it. That little sliver of operating frequencies
is not worth it, if increased privileges are the measuring stick.

- Mike KB3EIA -

445. Re: Frenchmen must have thin skin

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-06 03:14:20 UTC
From: groupk0hb@earthlink.net
Message-ID: <5ee63311.0310051914.1a3e2ca7@posting.google.com>
Source record: 80120
Cross-posted to: alt.ham-radio.hf,alt.ham-radio.ssb,alt.radio.amateur,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Clint" <rattlehead at computron dot net> wrote

> I think the french people must have weak blood
> or something

Reasons why it sucks to be Clint....
<file overrun error>

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB
--

446. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-06 03:51:29 UTC
From: Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns940BF2AC7329Eelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 80121

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in
news:Yr1gb.27375$f11.8285@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net:

> Clint, Clint, Clint. She was making a point of discussing the time.
> Not the code, per se. She said all the 1X2s were issued BEFORE the
> code was dropped. Do you have a comprehension problem too?
>
> Dan/W4NTI
>
> "Clint" <rattlehead at computron dot net> wrote in message
> news:vo0jfogsff8uf2@corp.supernews.com...
>> Exactly.
>>
>> That was my point; make a post about back up batteries for
>> black-out ham radio operations, and you'll get them making
>> CW test remarks about it.
>>
>> Make a post about feedline pro's and con's, and they'll
>> devolve it back to morse code testing.
>>
>> Talk about what is the best background noise reducing
>> handheld radio for use on the toilet when you have
>> diahrrea.. and yep, it's all about morse code testing again.
>>
>> No matter what, follow a thread long enough and they'll find
>> a way to use the most twisted path of logic to blame
>> NCI and the reduction & removal of morse code testing.
>>
>> Was it, in fact, to blame for the shuttle disaster?
>>
>> I digress.
>>
>> Clint
>>
>> "Alun Palmer" <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
>> news:Xns940B7E9C45E95elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
>> > Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in
>> > news:kMWfb.34630$qj6.1857458@news1.news.adelphia.net:
>> >
>> > > Alun Palmer wrote:
>> > >
>> > >> "Clint" <rattlehead at computron dot net> wrote in
>> > >> news:vo09ap279i0403@corp.supernews.com:
>> > >>

>> > >>
>> > >>>>>Man you got that right Mike. It was that way, decades ago.
>> > >>>>>The extra used to mean something. Now it means squat.
>> > >>>>>
>> > >>>>>Don't believe me? Look at the before and after code gutting.
>> > >>>>>I was going to get a fancy 1X2 years ago. Glad I didn't now.
>> > >>>>>
>> > >>>>>Dan/W4NTI
>> > >>>>
>> > >>>>All the 1x2 sequentially assigned calls were gone long before
>> > >>>>the 20wpm code was dropped.
>> > >>>>
>> > >>>>Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>> > >>>>
>> > >>>
>> > >>>The real observation here is to note a complaint about extra
>> > >>>class hams not knowing
>> > >>>what the length of a 1/2 wave dipole was on a given frequency;
>> > >>>has nothing to do
>> > >>>with sending and recieving morse code skill.
>> > >>>
>> > >>>Kinda showed your colors there.
>> > >>>
>> > >>>Clint
>> > >>>
>> > >>>
>> > >>>
>> > >>
>> > >>
>> > >> It was a dead giveaway. Anyone who thinks that 20wpm code
>> > >> operating skill means you know all about dipoles has a serious
>> > >> problem that no amount of discussion will ever change.
>> > > >
>> > > > The new requirements *probably* will have no Morse code
>> > > > requirements, ergo Morse is not really relevant to this
>> > > > thread.
>> > > >
>> > > > That an extra might have no idea about the length of a half
>> > > > wave dipole
>> > > > at 40 meters - or more importantly, precisely no idea on how to
>> > > > calculate it - indicates a more serious problem to me.
>> > > >
>> > > > - Mike KB3EIA -
>> > > >
>> > > >
>> > >
>> > But one that has nothing to do with 20wpm, which I didn't introduce
>> > into the discussion
>>
>>

>
>
>

It looked to me like the post was saying no Extra would have been ignorant about dipoles when the code test speed was 20wpm. If it meant something else it might have been saying something logical, HI!

447. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-06 04:01:39 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <blqpf3$ui9$0@208.206.142.103>
Source record: 80122

Carl R. Stevenson wrote:

> The biggest thing that I fear is the ham community going
> ballistic prematurely and flaming the FCC, e-mail bombing
> them, etc. That would only hurt our cause.

Yeah. Might be better to let our Congresspeople do that for us.
They'd have a bit more difficulty getting peeved a those who
control the pursestrings and appointments, and fer sure the
attention level would ratchet up.

448. Re: Frenchmen must have thin skin

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-06 04:06:26 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <blqpo2$ui9$1@208.206.142.103>
Source record: 80123
Cross-posted to: alt.ham-radio.hf,alt.ham-radio.ssb,alt.radio.amateur,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Hans K0HB wrote:

> "Clint" <rattlehead at computron dot net> wrote
>
>
>>I think the french people must have weak blood
>>or something
>
>
>
>
> Reasons why it sucks to be Clint....
> <file overrun error>
>

Yup. He's running with a 40 meg HD in the 40 gig era!

449. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-06 05:11:58 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031006011158.22081.00001044@mb-m17.aol.com>
Source record: 80124

In article <O62gb.35453$qj6.1957842@news1.news.adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo
<mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:

>Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
>
>> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>> news:20031005102908.15462.00003375@mb-m06.aol.com...
>>
>>>In article <k%Tfb.8955$yp6.287802@nnrp1.ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
>>><wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:
>>>
>>>
>>>>The FCC and Congress see the ARS as a valuable national resource.
>>>
>>>I hope they remember that re: BPL. FCC seems to require a reminder now and
>>>again...
>>
>>
>> And they are being reminded vis a vis BPL.
>>
>>
>>>>The "money" I'm talking about is that represented by all the OTHER
>>>>commercial radio services administered by the FCC.
>>>>
>>>>Oh ... why didn't you say that?
>>>>
>>>>
>>>> This is where the FCC's true mission exists,
>>>>
>>>>The FCC has a Congressional mandate to regulate all of the radio
>>>>spectrum "in the public interest, convenience, and necessity" - that
>>>>includes the ARS.
>>>
>>>Included in that "public interest, convenience and necessity" are economic
>>>concerns. Some perceive that broadband access to the 'net is somehow a big
>>
>> part
>>
>>>of economic recovery, regardless of what other services get trashed. See
>>
>> Comm.
>>
>>>Abernathy's remarks on the "Road To Enlightenment" and "Wideband Nirvana"
>>

>> being
>>
>>>BPL. As if!
>>
>>
>> The problem is the the BPL vendors/organizations apparently "pitched"
>> BPL to the Commissioners as "the greatest thing since sliced bread,
>> "the infrastructure already exists" (the wires are there, but they'll have
>> to spend many millions of ratepayers' money to add all of the couplers,
>> modems, etc.), and that it would provide a quality, economical competitor
>> to xDSL and cable modems, all with 'no problems'."
>>
>> It's understandable that the Commissioners would get rather excited
>> at the prospect, BUT they haven't had all of the facts, just hype from
>> the BPL industry and utilities that are seeing $signs ... despite the fact
>> that it's a demonstrably crappy business model. The other reason the
>> Commissioners would get excited is that they simply don't have the
>> technical background to see the problems without significant education
>> on the matter ... and, sadly, NONE of the Commissioners has a technical
>> advisor on their staff ... several legal advisors each, but not a technical
>> advisor amongst them.
>>
>> NOTE: I am NOT trying to "defend" the FCC's enamourment with BPL,
>> just explaining how it came to be and what's required to turn it around.
>
> One of the odd things about the commissioners however. They must be
>able to suspend disbelief pretty easily.
>
> Household and electrical wiring has been around for a long time. And
>there's no rocket science to the technology of riding a signal on a line
>voltage circuit. Control signals are sent along these wires regularly
>and have been for many years.

Mike, the "X10" system works at only a few hundred Hz of spectrum.

At no time was any part of the US electrical distribution system, home
to generating plant, EVER CHARACTERIZED OR STANDARDIZED
AS R.F. TRANSMISSION LINES OVER A 1 TO 80 MHz FREQUENCY
RANGE!

Apparently the Office of Engineering and Technology at the FCC doesn't
understand that yet...?

I can look out at my neighborhood's electrical distribution system and
see "RF transmission lines" that must vary from several hundred Ohms
to just a few Ohms within the metal conduit of my home.

That is NOT any sort of "RF transmission medium" that anyone can
expect to work at either smooth, easy, or trouble-free radio frequency
transmission. There's discontinuities up the ying-yang there and
wherever there are discontinuities, there is also the danger of even
more radiation (in addition to introducing more attenuation).

> So if this was (is) such a good way to send signals, why wasn't the
>internet developed this way in the first place?

For the simple reason that it does NOT work very well. :-)

I've got a pair of Phonex through-the-line coupled "modems" that are supposed to work between two rooms here. It's the second pair over the counter, the first pair returned because they don't work well. Second pair is no better.

One good reason why they don't work is that the AC wiring in one room is on one side of the "double-phase" split from the pole drop and the outliet
in the other room is on the other side. Neither Phonex or any other of the Homeplug group explains that.

I measured an attenuation from the AC outlets better than 30 db from 10 to 80 MHz, 36 db being lower limit of this setup. The attenuation is probably greater than that. No sense in improving the test setup with that much attenuation...it is already too great.

> I believe that I am skeptical enough that even if I didn't have a
>technical background, that question would pop up pretty quickly when
>considering BPL.
>
> Carl, is there any other way that we can aid this fight?

One of the first things to try is to force an explanation of how all the vaporware BPL systems work. NONE of them explain it in enough detail to make any electronic sense right now. They haven't done so in any of the prominent electronic trade publications yet...other than more generalized, non-specific-detail claims. Vaporware.

LHA

450. Re: Frenchmen must have thin skin

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-06 06:36:39 UTC
From: ablight@alphalink.com.au
Message-ID: <1fc7b362.0310052236.461e8f66@posting.google.com>
Source record: 80125
Cross-posted to: alt.ham-radio.hf,alt.ham-radio.ssb,alt.radio.amateur,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Clint" <rattlehead at computron dot net> wrote in message
news:<vo0ale1t5og683@corp.supernews.com>...
> I think the french people must have weak blood
> or something.. I just read another artical about the
> heat wave and have found that for 2 weeks the
> temperature exceeded 104 degrees F, and the
> health minister says that his prolonged length
> of time accounts for the deaths.. whether you accept
> the figure of 3,000 or 14,000, that's STILL a lot
> of deaths. I live here in Texas where we've had
> summers exceeding 104 for over a month at a time;
> if you include the heat index due to humidity close
> to the coast, we've had weeks where the temperature
> exceeded 115 degrees for several weeks at a time
> (this summer was an exceptionally cool one; we didn't get
> over 101 for more than a few days). Yet here we
> haven't had 3,000 deaths from it and ESPECIALLY
> we haven't had 14,000 deaths.
>
> Clint
>
> --
>
> Reasons why it sucks to be a liberal....
> <file overrun error>
>
> --
> "helmsman" <helmsmandelete@mindspring.com> wrote in message
> news:5rfpnv41be011u842rkv6f1iv9lgfjt4pk@4ax.com...
> > "Reg Edwards" <g4fgq.regp@btinternet.com> wrote:
> >
> >
> > >The French government should be congratulated on its honesty as it should
> be
> > >on other matters of international interest and importance.
> > >
> > >Vive la France ! Vive l'Europe !
> > >----
> > >Reg, G4FGQ
> > >
> > >
> > BWHAAAAAAAAAAAHAAAAAAAAAAAAAHAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

> > .
> >
> >
> > .
> > Don't buy goods made in France or Germany and vacation somewhere else!

Whats going on - why is everyone so down on the French! - and I thought in Amateur Radio the banned subjects were sex, politics, and religion - if you want to argue with the French government, go for it, but there seems a disturbing trend to abuse French amateurs (and everyone else) because of their government policy in not doing what the Americans want in getting bogged down in another Vietnam - and yes, the french can be and are frequently bloody minded, but unlike the rest of us, they are just more upfront about it.

Think about the high death rate in the current European summer, use the same intelligence you would have applied to get your amateur licence - and think what would happen in Texas if you have several weeks of below zero (-32 degrees F from memory) - people, especially the elderly, would be dying simply because their homes were not equipped to deal with such abnormal extremes of temperature.

The French elderly are becoming dehydrated, (as elderly people do, their feedback mechanism about the need for water stops working when they get old) and get no relief at night because it doesnt/didnt cool down, so they get very little rest. Keep this up for a while and people start to die. A simple explanation, no need to resort to "they are inferior to us" racist bigotry.....

de VK3BFA Andrew

451. Re: Frenchmen must have thin skin

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-06 08:04:04 UTC
From: "\"Clint killer" <rattlehead@computron.net>
Message-ID: <Xns940C5D245B264kierenmail@195.129.110.131>
Source record: 80126
Cross-posted to: alt.ham-radio.hf,alt.radio.amateur,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Clint" <rattlehead at computron dot net> wrote in
news:vo1hnman40fn0d@corp.supernews.com:

>
> *PLONK!*
>
> and with that we have a new addition to my killfile.
>
> Clint is now kieren-free...
>

I for one knew he wouldn't be able to resist a response. Get a life, Clint
- and stop being a xenophobe.

By the way: anyone wishing to comment on Clints behaviour outside the
newsgroup can reach him by emailing rattlehead@computron.net

452. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-06 09:15:56 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <gpagb.1$Eo2.0@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 80128

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote:
>
> Unfortunately, neither you nor the rest of the NCTA
> has been able to show just exactly what the connection
> is between technical expertise and the requirement for
> learning and being tested in a practical and useful
> communications skill such as Morse/CW in the
> AMATEUR Radio Service. (snip)

The FCC has already done so in the paragraph I quoted. Basically, they said to encourage technically inclined persons to learn and to prepare themselves in the areas where the United States needs expertise, less emphasis should be placed on Morse code proficiency. The key to this is "where the United States needs expertise." Morse code just doesn't fit in that picture. They base this on the fact that "no communication system has been designed in many years that depends on hand-keyed telegraphy or the ability to receive messages in Morse code by ear," while pointing to more modern technology instead. If you missed the paragraph quoted, I'll repeat it again...

"We are persuaded that because the amateur service is fundamentally a technical service, the emphasis on Morse code proficiency as a licensing requirement does not comport with the basis and purpose of the service. We note, moreover, that the design of modern communications systems, including personal communication services, satellite, fiber optic, and high definition television systems, are based on digital communication technologies. We also note that no communication system has been designed in many years that depends on hand-keyed telegraphy or the ability to receive messages in Morse code by ear. In contrast, modern communication systems are designed to be automated systems. Given the changes that have occurred in communications in the last fifty years, we believe that reducing the emphasis on telegraphy proficiency as a licensing requirement will allow the amateur service to, as it has in the past, attract technically inclined persons, particularly the youth of our country, and encourage them to learn and to prepare themselves in the areas where the United States needs expertise." - FCC WT Docket No. 98-143 RM-9148 RM-9150 RM-9196

> (snip) I think that the FCC responds to political pressure. (snip)

And I think they're instead responding to the realities of the modern world.

> (snip) I believe that if they (the FCC) truly understood the nature
> of the ARS, and the value of the Morse/CW mode within the
> ARS, that wouldn't have happened. (snip)

The "value of the Morse/CW mode" remains even without a test requirement. With that intact, only the basis and purpose of the ARS remains to be considered. And the FCC addressed that in the quote above and in the remainder of the docket I took that quote from (emergency communicaitons and so on).

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

453. Re: Bootlegging in 1948?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-06 09:37:58 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031006053758.00545.00001412@mb-m02.aol.com>
Source record: 80129

In article <20031002001355.29660.00000894@mb-m24.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) writes:

>>And we've all seen your even-more-prodigious output here in this newsgroup,
>>Len. Under a wide variety of AOL screen names - nocwtest, lenof21,
>averyfine,
>>averyfineman, lenover21, and probably more.
>
> I have never used "Avery Fine" as a screen name.

That's been proven to be incorrect.

> "Len Of 21" is my
> primary AOL screen name. Someone else has "No CW Test."
>
> I have used NO other screen names in here.
>
"lenanderson@mogur.com" wasn't you?

> My real name and current mailing address is the same as it appeared
> many times as bylines in Ham Radio Magazine.
>
How is anyone to know that when reading your newsgroup posts? Those articles are well over a decade old, and "ham radio" (no caps in their logo) magazine hasn't published a new issue for years.

Why should anyone believe your calims when you can't even remember your screen names? Someone who posts as much as you do would ordinarily remember such things.

454. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-06 12:29:33 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031006082933.21232.00001082@mb-m13.aol.com>
Source record: 80133

In article <20031006011158.22081.00001044@mb-m17.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com
(Len Over 21) writes:

>In article <O62gb.35453$qj6.1957842@news1.news.adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo
><mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:
>
>>Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
>>
>>> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>>> news:20031005102908.15462.00003375@mb-m06.aol.com...
>>>
>>>>In article <k%Tfb.8955$yp6.287802@nnrp1.ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
>>>><wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:

>>>>>The FCC and Congress see the ARS as a valuable national resource.

>>>>I hope they remember that re: BPL. FCC seems to require a reminder now
>>>>and again...

>>> And they are being reminded vis a vis BPL.

Indeed!

>>>>>The "money" I'm talking about is that represented by all the OTHER
>>>>>commercial radio services administered by the FCC.

>>>>>Oh ... why didn't you say that?

>>>>> This is where the FCC's true mission exists,

>>>>>The FCC has a Congressional mandate to regulate all of the radio
>>>>>spectrum "in the public interest, convenience, and necessity" - that
>>>>>includes the ARS.

>>>>Included in that "public interest, convenience and necessity" are economic
>>>>concerns. Some perceive that broadband access to the 'net is somehow a
>>>>big part
>>>>of economic recovery, regardless of what other services get trashed. See
>>>>Comm.
>>>>Abernathy's remarks on the "Road To Enlightenment" and "Wideband
>>>>Nirvana" being BPL. As if!

>>> The problem is the the BPL vendors/organizations apparently "pitched"
>>> BPL to the Commissioners as "the greatest thing since sliced bread,
>>> "the infrastructure already exists" (the wires are there, but they'll have
>>> to spend many millions of ratepayers' money to add all of the couplers,
>>> modems, etc.), and that it would provide a quality, economical competitor
>>> to xDSL and cable modems, all with 'no problems'."

Exactly. And for test purposes at least, FCC bought that pitch.

>>> It's understandable that the Commissioners would get rather excited
>>> at the prospect, BUT they haven't had all of the facts, just hype from
>>> the BPL industry and utilities that are seeing $signs ... despite the fact
>>> that it's a demonstrably crappy business model.

Agreed. You think that after the dotcom bubble burst, they'd be a bit more
skeptical.

>>> The other reason the
>>> Commissioners would get excited is that they simply don't have the
>>> technical background to see the problems without significant education
>>> on the matter ... and, sadly, NONE of the Commissioners has a technical
>>> advisor on their staff ... several legal advisors each, but not a
>>> technical advisor amongst them.

Incredible but true.

>>> NOTE: I am NOT trying to "defend" the FCC's enamourment with BPL,
>>> just explaining how it came to be and what's required to turn it around.

You did a very good encapsulated explanation there, Carl. The "Morning Call"
exposure was solid gold.

>> One of the odd things about the commissioners however. They must be
>>able to suspend disbelief pretty easily.
>>
>> Household and electrical wiring has been around for a long time. And
>>there's no rocket science to the technology of riding a signal on a line
>>voltage circuit. Control signals are sent along these wires regularly
>>and have been for many years.

Yup. Just not at HF
>
> Mike, the "X10" system works at only a few hundred Hz of spectrum.

"X10" is not Access BPL. It's not even In-House BPL
>
> At no time was any part of the US electrical distribution system, home
> to generating plant, EVER CHARACTERIZED OR STANDARDIZED
> AS R.F. TRANSMISSION LINES OVER A 1 TO 80 MHz FREQUENCY
> RANGE!

Why are you shouting, Len? We all know that.
>
> Apparently the Office of Engineering and Technology at the FCC doesn't
> understand that yet...?

Maybe not. But they are the 'expert agency" in charge of regulating such
things. Both 'wire' and 'wireless' communications.
>
> I can look out at my neighborhood's electrical distribution system and
> see "RF transmission lines" that must vary from several hundred Ohms
> to just a few Ohms within the metal conduit of my home.

Ever hear of matching transformers?
>
> That is NOT any sort of "RF transmission medium" that anyone can
> expect to work at either smooth, easy, or trouble-free radio frequency
> transmission.

Yet it does. BPL works. It just trashes the EM spectrum in the process.

>> There's discontinuities up the ying-yang there and
> wherever there are discontinuities, there is also the danger of even
> more radiation (in addition to introducing more attenuation).

Couplers. Matching transformers. Adaptive transceivers. Modern modulations and
codings. Error detection and correction.
>
>> So if this was (is) such a good way to send signals, why wasn't the
>>internet developed this way in the first place?
>
> For the simple reason that it does NOT work very well. :-)

How do you know?
>
> I've got a pair of Phonex through-the-line coupled "modems" that are
> supposed to work between two rooms here. It's the second pair over the
> counter, the first pair returned because they don't work well. Second
> pair is no better.
>
> One good reason why they don't work is that the AC wiring in one room
> is on one side of the "double-phase" split from the pole drop and the
>outliet
> in the other room is on the other side. Neither Phonex or any other of
>the
> Homeplug group explains that.

Neither Phonex nor Homeplug are Access BPL
>
> I measured an attenuation from the AC outlets better than 30 db from
> 10 to 80 MHz, 36 db being lower limit of this setup. The attenuation is
> probably greater than that. No sense in improving the test setup with
> that much attenuation...it is already too great.

For the technology used in those units. part of the reason for their failure is
that they must meet current Part 15 regulations. BPL advocates are trying to
get Part 15 levels raised.
>
>> I believe that I am skeptical enough that even if I didn't have a
>>technical background, that question would pop up pretty quickly when
>>considering BPL.

The philosophy of FCC seems to be to let them at least try it out rather than
banning it on purely "theoretical" grounds.
>>
>> Carl, is there any other way that we can aid this fight?

>
> One of the first things to try is to force an explanation of how all the
> vaporware BPL systems work.

Why? Do you think they don't work?

> NONE of them explain it in enough
> detail to make any electronic sense right now. They haven't done so
> in any of the prominent electronic trade publications yet...other than
> more generalized, non-specific-detail claims. Vaporware.

So if it isn't in one of your magazines, it doesn't exist. Well, Len, that's simply not the case.

The BPL folks are playing their cards very close for a number of reasons, including things like:

- there are a number of different methods being tried out
- patents probably pending
- they don't want to help out the opposition and competition

Those BPL folks are *professionals*, remember? They're on record as saying that *amateurs* are exaggerating the interference. They say, in so many words, that we amateurs want to hold back "progress".

Why should FCC accept the word of *amateurs* over *professionals*, Len?

Are the *professionals* who came up with Access BPL mistaken?

Tests sites are functioning right now in places like Emmaus, PA. WK3C, W1RFI and others (including at least one other rrap regular) have visited that test site for measurement and observation. (See excellent comments to FCC on BPL by WK3C and ARRL).

BPL isn't vaporware. BPL works. It just trashes the EM spectrum in the process.

455. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-06 13:24:46 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <y2egb.9057$yp6.304728@nnrp1.ptd.net>
Source record: 80134

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:6u4gb.35703$qj6.2003327@news1.news.adelphia.net...
>
> And what I'm thinking is that unless it means something again, they
> might as well get rid of it. That little sliver of operating frequencies
> is not worth it, if increased privileges are the measuring stick.
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -
>

Actually, the differences in privs from General to Extra are substantial.
With the FCC no longer issuing Advanced licenses, the only way to
gain access to the "Advanced sub-bands" is to upgrade to Extra.

I'd say that's a pretty good incentive.

73,
Carl - wk3c

456. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-06 14:25:36 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <blru10hhu0@208.207.71.163>
Source record: 80135

Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
> "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
> news:6u4gb.35703$qj6.2003327@news1.news.adelphia.net...
>
>>And what I'm thinking is that unless it means something again, they
>>might as well get rid of it. That little sliver of operating frequencies
>>is not worth it, if increased privileges are the measuring stick.
>>
>>- Mike KB3EIA -
>>
>
>
> Actually, the differences in privs from General to Extra are substantial.
> With the FCC no longer issuing Advanced licenses, the only way to
> gain access to the "Advanced sub-bands" is to upgrade to Extra.
>
> I'd say that's a pretty good incentive.
>
>

Well, one certainly can't say there's any substantial difficulty involved!

457. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-06 14:40:31 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031006104031.17424.00000294@mb-m16.aol.com>
Source record: 80136

>Well, one certainly can't say there's any substantial difficulty involved!

Difficculty, they might as well just give the EXTRA to any one who ask for it.
For that matter, they might as well give all the Licenses away.

458. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-06 15:21:37 UTC
From: Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns940C738B2B6DBelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 80137

Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com> wrote in
news:blru10hhu0@208.207.71.163:

> Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
>> "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
>> news:6u4gb.35703$qj6.2003327@news1.news.adelphia.net...
>>
>>>And what I'm thinking is that unless it means something again, they
>>>might as well get rid of it. That little sliver of operating
>>>frequencies is not worth it, if increased privileges are the measuring
>>>stick.
>>>
>>>- Mike KB3EIA -
>>>
>>
>>
>> Actually, the differences in privs from General to Extra are
>> substantial. With the FCC no longer issuing Advanced licenses, the
>> only way to gain access to the "Advanced sub-bands" is to upgrade to
>> Extra.
>>
>> I'd say that's a pretty good incentive.
>>
>>
>
>
> Well, one certainly can't say there's any substantial difficulty
> involved!
>
>

I think you're wrong about that Dick. As an EE, I wouldn't find it
difficult, but I know plenty of Generals, and Techs for that matter, for
whom the Extra class theory is seen as something very tough. Not everyone
can be one of the intelligentsia!

459. Re: Lennie's Double Standard Once Again Revealed...BY Lennie!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-06 15:23:07 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0310060723.778385fd@posting.google.com>
Source record: 80138

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0310051515.4e5f8b3d@posting.google.com>...
> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0310010606.62efe0c@posting.google.com>...
>
> > Len was willing to go the distance w/o letting all the bullying and
> > worse deter him. In that respect, Len is my mentor.
>
> He's still a liar, Brain. Anyone who can justify such a
> "mentoring" association with a documented pathological liar is a fool.
>
> That, Brain Burke, would be you.
>
> > You, Steve Robeson, will not run me off the group. Nor will your
> > Cronies.
>
> You, Brian Burke, ahve an over-inflated appreciation of yourself.
>
> Quite to the contrary, I want you RIGHT HERE ! ! ! I find great
> satisfaction watching you dance around your own little fires, set by
> one silly, unsubstantiated assertion after the other.
>
> Run you off...?!?! Heck no! I LIKE watching the jester at play!
>
> Steve, K4YZ

Unfortunately, Steve, we don't enjoy your antics and rants. Not
amusing at all.

Try behaving in a rational and civilized manner, and you'll not
attract so much negative attention.

460. Re: Amazin'....Ain't it...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-06 15:28:11 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0310060728.1275bf06@posting.google.com>
Source record: 80139

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0310051510.2502be58@posting.google.com>...
> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0310030443.74c4da4b@posting.google.com>...
>
> > > > There's been other rumors of running afoul of the CIVIL courts
> > > > and getting booted by his ISP for his misconduct, but I don't have all
> > > > those details.
> > > >
> > > > Perhaps he'd like to bring us up to date...?!?!
> > > >
> > > > Steve, K4YZ
> > >
> > > Would you mind providing us with the name of that Yahoo MODERATED
> > > Group, so that we might look at the archives and see what got you
> > > tossed off the group.
> > >
> > > Thanks, Brian
> >
> >
> > Hello?
>
> Asking yourself questions, Brain?

No, Steve, I asked you a question. See the part that starts with,
"Would you mind..."

> Who said anything about "moderated"...?!?!

I was just curious what it would take to get you to play well with
others.

> I own four YahooGroups, one of which has over 400 subscribers,

WhooHooo!

> and I can tell you with certainty that the listowner can block ANY
> subscriber to the list.

Just how certain are you? Have you actually done it?

461. Re: Appalling...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-06 15:35:44 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0310060735.19d73662@posting.google.com>
Source record: 80140

Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:<bll3j0ems0@208.206.142.99>...
> Dee D. Flint wrote:
> > "Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
> > news:f45722ac.0310030427.187830c7@posting.google.com...
> >
> >>"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
> >
> > news:<3LUeb.5431$Hd6.3363111@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>...
> >
> >>>No they haven't. The two conditions you state are still problems and
> >
> > good
> >
> >>>reasons to learn to copy by ear. The human brain can sort it out when
> >
> > the
> >
> >>>computer cannot. Poorly sent and spaced code is also still a problem.
> >>>
> >>>Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
> >>
> >>Seems like Morse Ops need to send better.
> >
> >
> > Yes some of them need to pay a lot more attention to the quality of their
> > sending.
>
>
> Why do you suppose N0IMD might find that to be a concern? Those of us
> who actually work CW usually can copy variety with no problems.
> His abilities are his own concern and his responsibility.
> Yet he trolls on.
> Lennie's understudy, for a fact.

Dick, I can copy overmodulated phone signals. But just because I can
copy them doesn't mean that they are acceptable in the ARS. Just as
poorly sent (intentionally or otherwise) CW is not acceptable in the
ARS.

It's time for you to find some other unreasonable position to
champion. This one is on its way to the Alpo factory.

Comprende?

462. Re: Another Self-Humiliating LenniRiffic Rant

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-06 15:39:43 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0310060739.65590cfa@posting.google.com>
Source record: 80141

wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) wrote in message
news:<20031003095914.13289.00000149@mb-m24.aol.com>...
> >Bruce couldn't.
>
> Wrong again silly BOY, the truth is BRUCE will not, its not a matter of can or
> cant.

You have no aptitude, nor ability.

463. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-06 15:51:59 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3F818F9F.9040005@psu.edu>
Source record: 80142

Carl R. Stevenson wrote:

> It is OF THE UTMOST IMPORTANCE that BPL interference
> be properly ID'd. We do NOT want inaccurate claims of "BPL
> interference" to be made because the BPL industy will say, "See,
> we told you those hams were exaggerating ... our systems don't
> cause interference."

Are there indentifying characteristics?

One possible backlash of this is that there may be many hams running about looking for BPL interferece, and finding other Power line interference that the Power companies will have to clean up!

- Mike KB3EIA -

464. Re: praising the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-06 16:50:58 UTC
From: Frank <frank@127.0.0.1>
Message-ID: <S3hgb.230658$mp.143244@rwcrnsc51.ops.asp.att.net>
Source record: 80143
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

BIG--AL wrote:

> I must say that I have to praise the FCC for its efforts in looking into
> other alternatives for broadband access in Rural America. However, I
> disagree with the idea that more spectrum is needed to facilitate this
> daunting task.
>
> 73
>
> Frank K3EKO
>
>
yea, so? and your point is? please be advised that this comment was
copied from www.dslreports.com

73

Frank K3EKO

465. Re: Isnt it Funny (No-Code HF Privileges)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-06 17:09:28 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0310060909.627c5009@posting.google.com>
Source record: 80144

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20031002160531.21642.00001374@mb-m01.aol.com>...
> In article <c2356669.0310020821.17ee7e05@posting.google.com>, N2EY@AOL.COM
> (N2EY) writes:
>
> >"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@STOPearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
> >news:<M1Reb.5072$f11.2985@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> >> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote:
> >> >
> >> > IMDB.com (Internet Movie Data Base) says that "Convoy"
> >> > and the first "Smokey and the Bandit" came out in 1977-78.
> >>
> >> Just two examples, Jim (that's obviously why I said "and so on").
> >>
> >Of course.
> >
> >But my point was that the TV shows and movies were a result of the cb
> >boom, and reflected its outlaw nature. They did not cause the boom,
> >nor the culture, which were solidly in place in the late 1960s.
>
> What "outlaw" actions took place then
?

On cb (this is the short list):

- Operation without a license (when licenses were required)
- Failure to identify
- False/misleading identification
- Power far in excess of legal limit
- Use of non-type-accepted/certified equipment
- Operation on unauthorized frequencies
- Intentional interference
- Obscenity/profanity/vulgarity
- Contacts beyond the legal distance limit
- Contacts beyond the legal time limit

And the big one:

- Use of radio to facilitate other illegal activities (such as speed
limit violations)

All of the above were common long before there were movies or TV shows
with cb in them.

> >> There
> >> were a rash of movies and television shows featuring CB in the mid to late

> >> 70's
> >
> >well *after* cb was a fad..
>
> The "fad" continues, over two decades later. :-)

Not at anything like the level of 20 years ago.
>
> >I'm sure they did. Note that most of the above are TV shows, and their
> >dates are all fall premiere dates.
>
> You have a dispute with the entertainment industry and television in
> general?

Most of what is produced by the "entertainment industry" is pure unaldulterated JUNK. Not just worthless but actually harmful. Not a new phenomenon, either, it's been that way at least as long as I've been around.

There are notable exceptions, of course, but the *average* TV show or Hollywood movie is not worth the time it takes to watch.

> Take it up with the Academy of Television Arts and Sciences.

A group whose only purpose is for those who work in the "industry" to give each other awards.

> Their headquarters is in North Hollywood...very nice building. Nice
> folks in there...

I'm sure there are some nice people in the "entertainment industry". But that industry produces an awfully high percentage of JUNK.

> but watch out on dissing them or you might wind up head-
> first in one of the fountains in the courtyard.

How? Are you going to overpower me and throw me there? I'd really like to see you try.

Sure sounds like you are threatening me, Len. Simply for expressing an opinion.

> >cb and its culture were already well established long before the
> >movies and TV shows caught on.
>
> "Outlaw culture?" :-)

Yep.
>
> >The restrictive rules on "external and internal RF power amplifiers"
> >(also called "linyars") were enacted by FCC in 1978. That was long
> >after they were all over the place. Given typical bureaucratic delay,
> >that means amplifiers were a big problem at least two years earlier -
> >1976.

>
> Okay, here it is 27 years later. Where are all the avenging marshalls
> and sheriffs and fast-draw lawmen setting up law and order in the wild
> EM west?

They're called the FCC. You may have heard of them.
>
> >Things did not go bad because of the movies and TV shows. They went
> >bad because there was no way FCC could enforce the rules, and no
> >established culture or tradition of self-discipline, responsibility or
> >rule-following.
>
> Yes, pity that...no one to "establish culture or tradition or
> self-discipline"

That's right. Instead, a culture of "who cares what the rules are"
emerged and became dominant.

Kinda like on TV.

> SO, WHERE ARE ALL THE MOVIES AND TV SHOWS FEATURING
> AMATEUR RADIO...AND ESPECIALLY MORSE CODE?

Where are all the movies and TV shows about normal, average people
with regular jobs, living in typical families and having normal lives?

Most Americans don't live in Los Angeles, San Franscisco, Chicago or
New York City.

Most Americans do not work in health care or the criminal justice
system.

Most Americans' problems and conflicts are not resolved in 22 or 44
minutes.

Most American television and motion pictures are JUNK.

Now you can get all upset and indignant, Len old boy, but the facts
are the facts.

466. Re: Echolink is great for those who..

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-06 17:54:12 UTC
From: Eric Oyen - N7ZZT <n7zzt_NO.SPAM_@hotmail.com>
Message-ID: <pan.2003.10.06.17.54.11.719783@hotmail.com>
Source record: 80145
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On Wed, 01 Oct 2003 16:15:38 +0200, starwars wrote:

>> so? you any better? just because I am no-code doesn't mean I don't
>> KNOW-CODE (I just never bothered to take the damned test, you dope!).
>
> Obviously, you were too goddamned stupid to pass it, either.
ever hear of other considerations? how about this one: lack on funds
required to get the equipment needed to even have a decent station on HF.
what about locvation for the antenna (I've lived in apartments for a long
time, I doubt they would like it if I stuck a 3-el beam for 75/80 on their
root).

>
>> but then again, if all you can do is insult, that means you don't have
>> brains enough to really do something about it.
>
> You'll have to pass the test on your own, twat.
wa wa waaaaah! cry me a river....
throwing insults just means you don't have brains enough to debate.

I'd say you are full of it (-... ..- .-.. .-.. ... . -) (just so
you know, that spells out BULLSHIT, which you seem to be so full of
lately).

>
>> oh well, I fail to see where it's my problem anyway.
>
> You fail to see quite a lot of things, no-code technician twat.
a dig? hmmm, better get a bigger (and sharper) shovel...

DE N7ZZT
Phoenix, Arizona

--
the difference between intelligence and stupidity is that intelligence
has its limits.

467. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-06 17:55:06 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3F81AC7A.606@psu.edu>
Source record: 80146

Len Over 21 wrote:

> Mike, the "X10" system works at only a few hundred Hz of spectrum.

I'm not familiar with the specific names. X10 is the one the power companies use?

There was another system that was used to control clocks in schools and other places where the clocks need to show the same time over

> At no time was any part of the US electrical distribution system, home
> to generating plant, EVER CHARACTERIZED OR STANDARDIZED
> AS R.F. TRANSMISSION LINES OVER A 1 TO 80 MHz FREQUENCY
> RANGE!
>
> Apparently the Office of Engineering and Technology at the FCC doesn't
> understand that yet...?
>
> I can look out at my neighborhood's electrical distribution system and
> see "RF transmission lines" that must vary from several hundred Ohms
> to just a few Ohms within the metal conduit of my home.
>
> That is NOT any sort of "RF transmission medium" that anyone can
> expect to work at either smooth, easy, or trouble-free radio frequency
> transmission. There's discontinuities up the ying-yang there and
> wherever there are discontinuities, there is also the danger of even
> more radiation (in addition to introducing more attenuation).
>
>
>> So if this was (is) such a good way to send signals, why wasn't the
>>internet developed this way in the first place?
>
>
> For the simple reason that it does NOT work very well. :-)

I guess I was kind of knowing the answer as I asked the question. 8^) It's intellectual dishonesty for those companies to try to sell it as something that will work.

But even if it is a failure, some will be able to make money on it.. for while.

> I've got a pair of Phonex through-the-line coupled "modems" that are
> supposed to work between two rooms here. It's the second pair over the
> counter, the first pair returned because they don't work well. Second
> pair is no better.

>
> One good reason why they don't work is that the AC wiring in one room
> is on one side of the "double-phase" split from the pole drop and the
> outliet
> in the other room is on the other side. Neither Phonex or any other of the
> Homeplug group explains that.

I can hear it now....."We need to rewire your house to get your
BPL modem to work!" 8^)

> I measured an attenuation from the AC outlets better than 30 db from
> 10 to 80 MHz, 36 db being lower limit of this setup. The attenuation is
> probably greater than that. No sense in improving the test setup with
> that much attenuation...it is already too great.

Interesting. As a comparison to my cable modem hookup, There was a lot
of adjusting of the line levels to get a good signal to my home office.
If the installation included boosting the power enough to overcome that,
there would be some serious RFI running around.

>> I believe that I am skeptical enough that even if I didn't have a
>>technical background, that question would pop up pretty quickly when
>>considering BPL.
>>
>> Carl, is there any other way that we can aid this fight?
>
>
> One of the first things to try is to force an explanation of how all the
> vaporware BPL systems work. NONE of them explain it in enough
> detail to make any electronic sense right now. They haven't done so
> in any of the prominent electronic trade publications yet...other than
> more generalized, non-specific-detail claims. Vaporware.

Agreed!

- Mike KB3EIA -

468. Re: Echolink is great for those who..

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-06 17:58:59 UTC
From: Eric Oyen - N7ZZT <n7zzt_NO.SPAM_@hotmail.com>
Message-ID: <pan.2003.10.06.17.58.59.504422@hotmail.com>
Source record: 80147
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On Wed, 01 Oct 2003 11:48:18 -0700, nospa wrote:

> "Eric Oyen - N7ZIT" wrote:
>
>>> Says the no-code-technician twat.
>
>>so? you any better? just because I am no-code doesn't mean I don't
>>KNOW-CODE (I just never bothered to take the damned test, you dope!).
>
> Ha! If you knew code well enough to pass the test, you most certainly
> would bother, just so that you could brag about it...as you like to brag
> (on several groups) about being a licensed ham. Why anyone would brag
> about having a Tech class license, I have no idea.
ok, heres a statistic for you... over 80% of all the hams in the US with
the code endorsement on their ticket never bother to use it daily. they
learn it to get the privs and immediately forget it (this courtesy of a
little known article within the arrl publications).

its the same with any test. we learn the test, not the knowledge. funny
thing is, I learned morse code at 15, never got to use it much and pretty
much forgot what I learned. perhaps if I had become a ham then, we
wouldn't be debating this (or in your case, attempting to debate).

Frankly, I don't give a shit one way or the other. I wouldn't mind
relearning the code, if it served any real useful purpose (which, it
seems, the ITU has pretty much put paid to).

oh well......

DE N7ZZT
Phoenix, Arizona

--
the difference between intelligence and stupidity is that intelligence
has its limits.

469. Re: Echolink is great for those who..

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-06 18:09:24 UTC
From: Eric Oyen - N7ZZT <n7zzt_NO.SPAM_@hotmail.com>
Message-ID: <pan.2003.10.06.18.09.23.795149@hotmail.com>
Source record: 80148
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On Wed, 01 Oct 2003 19:19:53 -0700, nospa wrote:

> Not "running him down" because he's a Tech, but because he likes to BRAG
> about it. I have no problem with someone having a little pride in being a
> ham. However, why anyone would brag about it, I have no idea.
I don't hear you bragging about YOUR ticket, dude! give us your callsign
and name. I'll be respectfully impressed if you do.

<crap deleted>
>
> I don't "bash" hams nor ham radio...only braggarts. FYI, I happen to have
> a General class ticket...and I don't brag about it. BTW, you obviously
> don't know the meaning of the word "troll". If you still think I'm a
> troll, then...I GOTCHA!
you don't huh? funny, theres at least 15 or 20 recent incidents (including
those directed my way) where you appear to do just that.... you flap your
gums and you flip-flop. geez! you are worse than most politicians!

why don't you do us all a favor and exercise a little more brain and a lot
less mouth.

DE N7ZZT
Phoenix, Arizona

--
the difference between intelligence and stupidity is that intelligence
has its limits.

470. Re: Isnt it Funny (No-Code HF Privileges)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-06 18:52:53 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031006145253.15923.00001118@mb-m12.aol.com>
Source record: 80051

```
In article <c2356669.0310060909.627c5009@posting.google.com>, N2EY@AOL.COM
(N2EY) writes:

>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>news:<20031002160531.21642.00001374@mb-m01.aol.com>...
>> In article <c2356669.0310020821.17ee7e05@posting.google.com>, N2EY@AOL.COM
>> (N2EY) writes:
>>
>> >"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@STOPearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
>> >news:<M1Reb.5072$f11.2985@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
>> >> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote:
>> >> >
>> >> > IMDB.com (Internet Movie Data Base) says that "Convoy"
>> >> > and the first "Smokey and the Bandit" came out in 1977-78.
>> >>
>> >> Just two examples, Jim (that's obviously why I said "and so on").
>> >
>> >Of course.
>> >
>> >But my point was that the TV shows and movies were a result of the cb
>> >boom, and reflected its outlaw nature. They did not cause the boom,
>> >nor the culture, which were solidly in place in the late 1960s.
>>
>> What "outlaw" actions took place then
>?
>
>On cb (this is the short list):
>
>- Operation without a license (when licenses were required)
>- Failure to identify
>- False/misleading identification
>- Power far in excess of legal limit
>- Use of non-type-accepted/certified equipment
>- Operation on unauthorized frequencies
>- Intentional interference
>- Obscenity/profanity/vulgarity
>- Contacts beyond the legal distance limit
>- Contacts beyond the legal time limit
>
>And the big one:
>
>- Use of radio to facilitate other illegal activities (such as speed
>limit violations)
>
```

>All of the above were common long before there were movies or TV shows
>with cb in them.
>
>> >> There
>> >> were a rash of movies and television shows featuring CB in the mid to
>late
>> >> 70's
>> >
>> >well *after* cb was a fad..
>>
>> The "fad" continues, over two decades later. :-)
>
>Not at anything like the level of 20 years ago.
>>
>> >I'm sure they did. Note that most of the above are TV shows, and their
>> >dates are all fall premiere dates.
>>
>> You have a dispute with the entertainment industry and television in
>> general?
>
>Most of what is produced by the "entertainment industry" is pure
>unaldulterated JUNK. Not just worthless but actually harmful. Not a
>new phenomenon, either, it's been that way at least as long as I've
>been around.
>
>There are notable exceptions, of course, but the *average* TV show or
>Hollywood movie is not worth the time it takes to watch.
>
>> Take it up with the Academy of Television Arts and Sciences.
>
>A group whose only purpose is for those who work in the "industry" to
>give each other awards.
>
>> Their headquarters is in North Hollywood...very nice building. Nice
>> folks in there...
>
>I'm sure there are some nice people in the "entertainment industry".
>But that industry produces an awfully high percentage of JUNK.
>
>> but watch out on dissing them or you might wind up head-
>> first in one of the fountains in the courtyard.
>
>How? Are you going to overpower me and throw me there? I'd really like
>to see you try.
>
>Sure sounds like you are threatening me, Len. Simply for expressing an
>opinion.
>
>> >cb and its culture were already well established long before the
>> >movies and TV shows caught on.

>>
>> "Outlaw culture?" :-)
>
>Yep.
>>
>> >The restrictive rules on "external and internal RF power amplifiers"
>> >(also called "linyars") were enacted by FCC in 1978. That was long
>> >after they were all over the place. Given typical bureaucratic delay,
>> >that means amplifiers were a big problem at least two years earlier -
>> >1976.
>>
>> Okay, here it is 27 years later. Where are all the avenging marshalls
>> and sheriffs and fast-draw lawmen setting up law and order in the wild
>> EM west?
>
>They're called the FCC. You may have heard of them.
>>
>> >Things did not go bad because of the movies and TV shows. They went
>> >bad because there was no way FCC could enforce the rules, and no
>> >established culture or tradition of self-discipline, responsibility or
>> >rule-following.
>>
>> Yes, pity that...no one to "establish culture or tradition or
>> self-discipline"
>
>That's right. Instead, a culture of "who cares what the rules are"
>emerged and became dominant.
>
>Kinda like on TV.
>
>> SO, WHERE ARE ALL THE MOVIES AND TV SHOWS FEATURING
>> AMATEUR RADIO...AND ESPECIALLY MORSE CODE?
>
>Where are all the movies and TV shows about normal, average people
>with regular jobs, living in typical families and having normal lives?
>
>Most Americans don't live in Los Angeles, San Franscisco, Chicago or
>New York City.
>
>Most Americans do not work in health care or the criminal justice
>system.
>
>Most Americans' problems and conflicts are not resolved in 22 or 44
>minutes.
>
>Most American television and motion pictures are JUNK.
>
>Now you can get all upset and indignant, Len old boy, but the facts
>are the facts.

471. Re: Bootlegging in 1948?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-06 18:52:54 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031006145254.15923.00001119@mb-m12.aol.com>
Source record: 80149

In article <20031006053758.00545.00001412@mb-m02.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) writes:

>Why should anyone believe your calims when you can't even remember your
>screen
>names? Someone who posts as much as you do would ordinarily remember such
>things.

472. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-06 18:52:59 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031006145259.15923.00001120@mb-m12.aol.com>
Source record: 80150

In article <3F81AC7A.606@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:

>Len Over 21 wrote:
>
>> Mike, the "X10" system works at only a few hundred Hz of spectrum.
>
> I'm not familiar with the specific names. X10 is the one the power
>companies use?
>
> There was another system that was used to control clocks in schools and

>other places where the clocks need to show the same time over
>
>
>
>
>> At no time was any part of the US electrical distribution system, home
>> to generating plant, EVER CHARACTERIZED OR STANDARDIZED
>> AS R.F. TRANSMISSION LINES OVER A 1 TO 80 MHz FREQUENCY
>> RANGE!
>>
>> Apparently the Office of Engineering and Technology at the FCC doesn't
>> understand that yet...?
>>
>> I can look out at my neighborhood's electrical distribution system and
>> see "RF transmission lines" that must vary from several hundred Ohms
>> to just a few Ohms within the metal conduit of my home.
>>
>> That is NOT any sort of "RF transmission medium" that anyone can
>> expect to work at either smooth, easy, or trouble-free radio frequency
>> transmission. There's discontinuities up the ying-yang there and
>> wherever there are discontinuities, there is also the danger of even
>> more radiation (in addition to introducing more attenuation).
>>
>>
>>> So if this was (is) such a good way to send signals, why wasn't the
>>>internet developed this way in the first place?
>>
>>
>> For the simple reason that it does NOT work very well. :-)
>
> I guess I was kind of knowing the answer as I asked the question. 8^)
>It's intellectual dishonesty for those companies to try to sell it as
>something that will work.
>

> But even if it is a failure, some will be able to make money on it..
>for while.
>
>> I've got a pair of Phonex through-the-line coupled "modems" that are
>> supposed to work between two rooms here. It's the second pair over the
>> counter, the first pair returned because they don't work well. Second
>> pair is no better.
>>
>> One good reason why they don't work is that the AC wiring in one room
>> is on one side of the "double-phase" split from the pole drop and the
>> outliet
>> in the other room is on the other side. Neither Phonex or any other of
>the
>> Homeplug group explains that.
>
> I can hear it now....."We need to rewire your house to get your
>BPL modem to work!" 8^)
>
>
>> I measured an attenuation from the AC outlets better than 30 db from
>> 10 to 80 MHz, 36 db being lower limit of this setup. The attenuation is
>> probably greater than that. No sense in improving the test setup with
>> that much attenuation...it is already too great.
>
> Interesting. As a comparison to my cable modem hookup, There was a lot
>of adjusting of the line levels to get a good signal to my home office.
>If the installation included boosting the power enough to overcome that,
>there would be some serious RFI running around.
>
>
>
>>> I believe that I am skeptical enough that even if I didn't have a
>>>technical background, that question would pop up pretty quickly when
>>>considering BPL.
>>>
>>> Carl, is there any other way that we can aid this fight?
>>
>>
>> One of the first things to try is to force an explanation of how all the
>> vaporware BPL systems work. NONE of them explain it in enough
>> detail to make any electronic sense right now. They haven't done so
>> in any of the prominent electronic trade publications yet...other than
>> more generalized, non-specific-detail claims. Vaporware.
>
> Agreed!

473. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-06 19:35:07 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <Ltjgb.647$mQ2.425@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 80052

"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20031005191338.29227.00000436@mb-m06.aol.com...
> >Let me clear up the fog for you Clint. My point is the Extra ain't worth
a
> >damn any more.
> >
> >Dan/W4NTI
> >
>
> Thats for sure, but in my case the only reason I upgraded was for the
$250.00.
> And I got to take it from of a bunch of No-Code Dead Heads. Still havent
used
> the EXTRA for the EXTRA band segments, probably never will.

I mostly use them when I contest and/or chase DX on HF. Thats basically
it..

In fact that is why I decided to upgrade years ago.

Dan/W4NTI

474. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-06 19:36:36 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <8vjgb.649$mQ2.521@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 80053

"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20031005191722.29227.00000438@mb-m06.aol.com...
> >Sure can Clint. And you just made my point.
> >
> >Dan/W4NTI
> >
>
> Can you imagine the rude awaking these Knuckle Draggers will receive when
they
> get on HF?

The only thing I can compare the thought to would be meeting up with a
couple hundred thousand W2OYs hi hi.

Dan/W4NTI

475. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-06 19:38:28 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <Uwjgb.651$mQ2.178@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 80054

Your a big boy Clint. You can figure it out, if you really really try.

Dan/W4NTI

"Clint" <rattlehead at computron dot net> wrote in message
news:vo1i3hcl58bqf5@corp.supernews.com...
> > Sure can Clint. And you just made my point.
> >
> > Dan/W4NTI
> >
> >
>
> And what point would THAT be? the hams that did this were legally
> licensed, had been for some time, and passed at least 13 wmp code
> tests. So much for the "yahoo filter" theory.
>
> Clint
>
> --
> "All history was a palimpsest, scraped clean and reinscribed exactly
> as often as necessary. In no case would it have been possible, once
> the deed was done, to prove that any falsification had taken place...
>
> ...it was not even forgery. It was merely the substitution of one piece
> of nonsense for another. Most of the material that you were dealing
> with had no connection with anything in the real world, not even the
> kind of connection that is contained in a direct lie. Statistics were just
> as much a fantasy in thier original version as in thier rectified
version."
>
> - The totalitarian world of George Orwell's 1984
> (or is it the slander & lie campaign strategy of
> today's liberals???)
>
> --
> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
> news:Po1gb.27340$f11.6502@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> >
> > "Clint" <rattlehead at computron dot net> wrote in message
> > news:vo0fd5reoeehf1@corp.supernews.com...
> > >
> > > > The new requirements *probably* will have no Morse code
requirements,
> > > > ergo Morse is not really relevant to this thread.

> > > >
> > >
> > > They may or may not; if the FCC decides that no "no further change in
> the
> > > license structure is required at this time" then of course that will
be
> > the
> > > final
> > > word on *that* matter, and we'll accept it and go on since they are
the
> > > ones that have the final say. I just couldn't help but notice how
> certain
> > > ones
> > > in here I think have such an overpowering agenda regarding the CW
> > > part of the testing that it tends to take them over and govern, or at
> > least
> > > seriously influence, everything they have to remark about in ham
radio.
> > >
> > > I'm a general class operator; I realize by definition that means I had
> to
> > > show knowledge in certain areas to prove I deserved recieving the next
> > > higher license class than tech-plus; however, I did not demonstrate
> enough
> > > skill and knowledge to warrant recieving the advanced class license.
> > > Therefore,
> > > advanced class operators *should* know more than I do, or at least as
> > much.
> > >
> > > That brings us to the sad truth that if an *extra* class license
> operator
> > > doesn't
> > > know how to calculate the length of a walf wave dipole on 40m (or
> whatever
> > > frequency), that is a serious issue. I say that because calculating
the
> > > length of
> > > an antenna, especially a halfwave dipole of ALL things, is and always
> WILL
> > > be so basic to ham radio that it should be on page one of chapter one
of
> > > every study guide ever printed. Such matters is why I put such a
strong
> > > emphasis on putting more priority on written testing than that of the
> > skills
> > > of
> > > translating a CW transmission.
> > >
> > > Sad thing is, most the time I get on 75 meters and begin discussing
ham

> > > radio
> > > tech stuff, there is usually one heckler that harangues you about it
and
> > > makes
> > > light of the fact that you were talking about ham radio stuff and not
> what
> > > the
> > > weather was like on a day 58 years ago while an old man sat on a porch
> > > and peeled potatoes in the hot summer sun... true story. I actually
was
> on
> > > the
> > > airwaves a few weeks ago discussing the pros and cons how how to set
up
> > > a new 75 meter inverted V I was going to make at home... and as soon
as
> > > I finished the conversation with the other ham and he went off the
air,
> a
> > > couple
> > > of hams got in there and began talking to one another BASHING me for
> doing
> > > so... can you imagine???
> > >
> > > Clint
> > >
> > >
> >
>
>

476. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-06 19:42:38 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <OAjgb.652$mQ2.330@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 80055

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:lq2gb.35461$qj6.1963146@news1.news.adelphia.net...
> Dan/W4NTI wrote:
>
>
> > What contests do you do? I don't remember you. Course I've only done
them
> > for 30 years or so.
>
> PAQSO, NEQP, Field day, North American. I tried the Ohio this year, but
> conditions were bad. I've not been licensed too long, and sometimes op
> our club station (W3YA)
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -
>

Good show Mike. Sure I know W3YA. And this coming weekend is PA Qso Party.
I intend to enter. What call you using, if your going to enter?

I played in the California QP this weekend. Worked a bunch of them. Thats
always a good one to get into.

Tell the boys in PA to listen south. And pay attention to 40 also.

Dan/W4NTI

477. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-06 19:44:03 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <7Cjgb.653$mQ2.384@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 80056

"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20031005191003.29227.00000435@mb-m06.aol.com...
> >As I said, glad I didn't now. I'll just keep what I got, and let folks
> >wonder what I have. Cause there sure ain't no reason to brag about it.
> >
> >Dan/W4NTI
>
> Thats why these No-Coders run out and grab a 1x2 or 1x3.They think this
will
> make people think they have been around awhile and know something.

Your right Bruce. And that again proves one of my points. I never much
cared for the Vanity program anyway. In my opinion it is just a sneaky way
to charge for a license.

Dan/W4NTI

478. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-06 19:47:05 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <ZEjgb.655$mQ2.389@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 80057

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:cV2gb.5903$Hd6.4142110@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
>
> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
> news:Mx1gb.27407$f11.5582@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> >
> > "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
> > news:P%Wfb.5844$Hd6.4049109@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
> > >
> > > "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
> > > news:V1Wfb.33578$qj6.1845907@news1.news.adelphia.net...
> > > > I'm still trying to decide what to do. I do a fair bit of
contesting,
> > > > and KB3EIA is quite a mouthfull at those times. It's not too bad CW
> wise
> > > > (tho I haven't done CW contesting - maybe if I ever get good enough)
> > > >
> > > > - Mike KB3EIA -
> > > >
> > >
> > > The way to get good at it is to jump in and do it anyway. The way to
> > start
> > > is to listen to one station over and over until you finally pick out
the
> > > information and then to through your call sign in. Also never
hesitate
> to
> > > send "PS QRS" when necessary. You can even specify the speed with "PS
> QRS
> > > 10" or whatever you are comfortable with. Most will slow down.
> > >
> > > I'm not particularly good at it myself but am running about 50% CW
> > contacts
> > > on the ongoing California QSO party.
> > >
> > > Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
> > >
> >
> > Good for you Dee D. I played in it myself. Got 147 phone and 194 on
CW.
> >
> > Dan/W4NTI
>
>

> Although it was running about even most of the contest, later the voice
> bands picked up and I ended with 95 voice and 78 CW.
>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>

Great job Dee D. Wish I would have known you were on. I would have given
you a listen.

Hey Sweepstakes is my all time favorite contest. Ill be on CW for sure.
And maybe phone also.

Two diff weekends.

Dan/W4NTI

479. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-06 19:58:46 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <WPjgb.665$mQ2.85@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 80058

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:0I2gb.35465$qj6.1967632@news1.news.adelphia.net...

snip

> > Can anyone *prove* to me that the Extra written contains things a ham
must
> > know to operate on the Extra-only subbands?
>
> Nope! There is really not much reason to go from General to Extra
> beyond personal satisfaction!
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -
>

Not true Mike.....your a contester. See what I mean ?

Dan/W4NTI

480. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-06 19:59:44 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <QQjgb.668$mQ2.39@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 80059

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20031005220023.28496.00001085@mb-m18.aol.com...
> In article <0I2gb.35465$qj6.1967632@news1.news.adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo
> <mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:
>
> >> Can anyone *prove* to me that the Extra written contains things a ham
> >*must*
> >> know to operate on the Extra-only subbands?
> >
> > Nope! There is really not much reason to go from General to Extra
> >beyond personal satisfaction!
> >
> > - Mike KB3EIA -
>
> Mike:
>
> In the past (the Pre-Restructuring Era), the reason for upgrading was that
> increased operating privileges were the reward for gaining increased
> technical knowledge and operating skill. The ARS seems to have taken
> a clue from the rest of our dumbed-down society and abandoned this
> philosophy.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

I've never thought of it that way Larry, but your 100% correct. Just look
at Kim.

Dan/W4NTI

481. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-06 20:00:55 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <XRjgb.669$mQ2.3@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 80060

```
"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:6u4gb.35703$qj6.2003327@news1.news.adelphia.net...
> Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>
> > In article <0I2gb.35465$qj6.1967632@news1.news.adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo
> > <mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:
> >
> >
> >>>Can anyone *prove* to me that the Extra written contains things a ham
> >>
> >>*must*
> >>
> >>>know to operate on the Extra-only subbands?
> >>
> >> Nope! There is really not much reason to go from General to Extra
> >>beyond personal satisfaction!
> >>
> >> - Mike KB3EIA -
> >
> >
> > Mike:
> >
> > In the past (the Pre-Restructuring Era), the reason for upgrading was
that
> > increased operating privileges were the reward for gaining increased
> > technical knowledge and operating skill. The ARS seems to have taken
> > a clue from the rest of our dumbed-down society and abandoned this
> > philosophy.
>
> And what I'm thinking is that unless it means something again, they
> might as well get rid of it. That little sliver of operating frequencies
> is not worth it, if increased privileges are the measuring stick.
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -
>

Wrong again Mike. Its a place to go to get away from the 'others'... hi.

Dan/W4NTI
```

482. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-06 20:12:20 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <E0kgb.680$mQ2.89@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 80061

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20031005220023.28496.00001084@mb-m18.aol.com...
> In article <blo309$rp9$0@208.206.142.109>, Dick Carroll
> <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com> writes:
>
> >> The FCC's goal, obviously, is to get as much of the administrative
> >> burden of the ARS licensing system off their backs as possible, so I
> >> look for them to do just that.
> > >
> > >
> > >I don't think so. FCC's work at admininistring the ARS licensing can't
> > >get to much a level than it currently is.
> > >
> > >Here's about what I look for:
> > >
> > >1) Combine Novice/Tech/Tech Plus into one license, probably Tech, with
> > >some amount of lower HF band Fone and CW/Digital access. Might even
> > >use the old Novice segments for their digital/CW segment. After all,
> > >it's still the 'entry level' license.
> > >
> > >2) Probably drop element 1 for Generals.
> > >
> > >3) Leave Advanced alone and let attritition take care of it.
> > >
> > >4) Leave Extra alone with a 5wpm code test. Should be 12wpm but
> > > I doubt they'll back up at this late date.
> > >
> > >I don't expect them to do this nor anything else before the
> > >next rules review is due.
>
> Dick:
>
> Of course, there's always the remote possibility that the FCC will
> take the easiest course of action, which is to make no further changes
> to the ARS licensing structure and requirements at all. However,
> this would seem to be almost impossible for them to get away with,
> in light of the language of the Restructuring R&O. One can always
> hope, but I'm 99% sure we'll see code testing go away. Of course,
> when it does, Carl and the NCI will then be in the "hot seat" -- since
> we'll now be able to sit back and wait for the technical/digital
> revolution they've promised all along. Personally, I hope they're right,
> but I don't have that kind of luck.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT

Forget it Larry. It ain't gonna happen. The puter folks may get into ham radio for the UHF / SHF linking aspects. Just to increase range. But that will be it.

HF has no interest to them. Nor does conventional voice stuff. And, of course, forget CW.

Basically what it amounts to, AND ALWAYS HAS. It takes a certain breed to be a real radio ham. And we are going away fast.

Dan/W4NTI

483. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-06 20:14:00 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3F81CD08.2040600@psu.edu>
Source record: 80062

Ryan, KC8PMX wrote:
> (sarcasm mode on)
>
> Since the entire public is completely aware of amateur radio, therefore they
> all are waiting for the code test to drop, then we should have huge growth
> eh???
>
> (sarcasm mode off)

Is the reason for low growth that people don't know about the ARS?

I'd postulate that anyone that has any interest will pretty quickly
find out about us. have internet access, you'll find us. Read a
newspaper, and there are several articles a year about the ARS.

I'd also bet that there really aren't that many people who are really
that interested in radio. That's okay. I don't pick my hobbies on their
popularity. I pick them because I like to do them.

- mike KB3EIA -

484. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-06 20:18:30 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <q6kgb.686$mQ2.180@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 80063

"Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
news:4s4gb.9026$yp6.299498@nnrp1.ptd.net...
> "Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
> news:20031005220019.28496.00001080@mb-m18.aol.com...
> > In article <O62gb.35453$qj6.1957842@news1.news.adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo
> > <mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:
> >
> > > So if this was (is) such a good way to send signals, why wasn't the
> > >internet developed this way in the first place?
> >
> > Mike:
> >
> > Or cable TV, for that matter. Why spend all the bucks to wire the world
> > with coax when power lines are everywhere?
> >
> > > I believe that I am skeptical enough that even if I didn't have a
> > >technical background, that question would pop up pretty quickly when
> > >considering BPL.
> > >
> > > Carl, is there any other way that we can aid this fight?
> >
> > For one thing, if and when BPL comes to your area, don't subscribe
> > to it!
> >
> > 73 de Larry, K3LT
>
> And, if BPL comes to your area and you receive interference, let
> Ed Hare, W1RFI, at the ARRL know about it.
>
> One thing that's VERY important ... we CANNOT afford to have
> people mis-identifying other sources of interference as "BPL" and
> making inaccurate interference complaints to the FCC.
>
> It is OF THE UTMOST IMPORTANCE that BPL interference
> be properly ID'd. We do NOT want inaccurate claims of "BPL
> interference" to be made because the BPL industy will say, "See,
> we told you those hams were exaggerating ... our systems don't
> cause interference."
>
> Carl - w3kc
>

Go to the ARRL website, and listen to the file on it. You will be able to
tell its BPL just fine.

Dan/W4NTI

485. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-06 20:20:04 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <U7kgb.690$mQ2.352@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 80064

"Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
news:3F818F9F.9040005@psu.edu...
> Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
>
> > It is OF THE UTMOST IMPORTANCE that BPL interference
> > be properly ID'd. We do NOT want inaccurate claims of "BPL
> > interference" to be made because the BPL industy will say, "See,
> > we told you those hams were exaggerating ... our systems don't
> > cause interference."
>
>
> Are there indentifying characteristics?
>
> One possible backlash of this is that there may be many hams running
> about looking for BPL interferece, and finding other Power line
> interference that the Power companies will have to clean up!
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -
>

Go download it from www.arrl.org .

I played some of my CD of it on 14.275 so a friend could hear it. After I signed out I was deluged with people saying they couldn't believe how terrible it was.

Dan/W4NTI

486. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-06 20:27:48 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031006162748.25517.00001183@mb-m15.aol.com>
Source record: 80066

In article <3F81AC7A.606@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:

>Len Over 21 wrote:
>
>> Mike, the "X10" system works at only a few hundred Hz of spectrum.
>
> I'm not familiar with the specific names. X10 is the one the power
>companies use?

No, it's a long-on-the-market home appliance remote control and
alarm system, available at places like Lowe's and Home Depot
among many. Search for "X10" on the Internet and you can find
their website and product explanation.

> There was another system that was used to control clocks in schools and

>other places where the clocks need to show the same time over

Those were still very low-frequency. For clocks with synchronous
motors, the separate clock AC line could be speeded-up or slowed-
down by a separate AC source (synchronous clock motors don't
take much AC power). For some systems, a separate control line
was used to set the hands to a particular time all at once to make
them read the same. WREX-TV in Winnebago, IL, had still another
system combining a WWV receiver checking the time of a master
pendulum clock through the background tone-on from WWV and
then syncing all the clocks in the station running on their own AC
circuits. In master control we used the master pendulum clock
since every second counted (for cash flow) on taking network (CBS
at the time, coming up precisely 1.0 second after the hour or every
half hour).

>> At no time was any part of the US electrical distribution system, home
>> to generating plant, EVER CHARACTERIZED OR STANDARDIZED
>> AS R.F. TRANSMISSION LINES OVER A 1 TO 80 MHz FREQUENCY
>> RANGE!
>>
>> Apparently the Office of Engineering and Technology at the FCC doesn't
>> understand that yet...?
>>
>> I can look out at my neighborhood's electrical distribution system and
>> see "RF transmission lines" that must vary from several hundred Ohms
>> to just a few Ohms within the metal conduit of my home.
>>
>> That is NOT any sort of "RF transmission medium" that anyone can
>> expect to work at either smooth, easy, or trouble-free radio frequency

>> transmission. There's discontinuities up the ying-yang there and
>> wherever there are discontinuities, there is also the danger of even
>> more radiation (in addition to introducing more attenuation).
>>
>>> So if this was (is) such a good way to send signals, why wasn't the
>>>internet developed this way in the first place?
>>
>> For the simple reason that it does NOT work very well. :-)
>
> I guess I was kind of knowing the answer as I asked the question. 8^)
>It's intellectual dishonesty for those companies to try to sell it as
>something that will work.

I'm sure it can work...the question really is "can it be used anywhere
with the ease at which existing wired service does?"

When each and every BPL proponent HAS NOT EXPLAINED THE
TECHNICAL DETAILS OF THEIR SYSTEM, they can't actually be
charged directly with "intellectual dishonesty." At this point it is all
the usual marketing-advertising snow job.

> But even if it is a failure, some will be able to make money on it..
>for while.

That's usually the case. See the fancy bar-code reader that Radio
Shack was promoting as part of a "system" to speed up information
exchange. IEEE Spectrum magazine and a couple of other trade
publications have spotlighted that one.

The point with BPL now is still vaporware. It WILL increase the
noise environment from MF to bottom of VHF but it is impossible to
get a quantitative handle on the spectral power. Getting technical
details is like nailing jelly to a tree...it doesn't work and everyone gets
sticky from all the sugar in the jelly.

The ARRL Lab did the best they could with the BPL technical info
available. They used the maximum RF radiation specs from Part 15
in modeling one transmission line (so-called "MV" distribution in a
neighborhood). Their model was as "good" and "accurate" as the
circumstances allowed...and doesn't actually model a BPL system
because the exact nature of the BPL systems isn't explained!

The problem with such modeling is that the actual MV distribution is
HIGHLY variable depending on the city, district, neighborhood, etc.
The spacing of the conductors (which determines equivalent RF
characteristic impedance) is highly variable even if within the NEC and
local codes. For SOME distribution systems BPL uses those MV
lines (voltages from 4 to 12 KVAC). There's absolutely nothing in the
National Electrical Code or even any local ordinances that mandates
any characteristic impedance of those lines or standardization at RF!

>> I've got a pair of Phonex through-the-line coupled "modems" that are
>> supposed to work between two rooms here. It's the second pair over the

>> counter, the first pair returned because they don't work well. Second
>> pair is no better.
>>
>> One good reason why they don't work is that the AC wiring in one room
>> is on one side of the "double-phase" split from the pole drop and the
outliet
>> in the other room is on the other side. Neither Phonex or any other of
the
>> Homeplug group explains that.
>
> I can hear it now....."We need to rewire your house to get your
>BPL modem to work!" 8^)

None of us have any idea of how those "BPL modems" work...the BPL
folks won't explain it... :-(

>> I measured an attenuation from the AC outlets better than 30 db from
>> 10 to 80 MHz, 36 db being lower limit of this setup. The attenuation is
>> probably greater than that. No sense in improving the test setup with
>> that much attenuation...it is already too great.
>
> Interesting. As a comparison to my cable modem hookup, There was a lot
>of adjusting of the line levels to get a good signal to my home office.
>If the installation included boosting the power enough to overcome that,
>there would be some serious RFI running around.

You have higher speed than 56K?

>>> I believe that I am skeptical enough that even if I didn't have a
>>>technical background, that question would pop up pretty quickly when
>>>considering BPL.
>>>
>>> Carl, is there any other way that we can aid this fight?
>>
>> One of the first things to try is to force an explanation of how all the
>> vaporware BPL systems work. NONE of them explain it in enough
>> detail to make any electronic sense right now. They haven't done so
>> in any of the prominent electronic trade publications yet...other than
>> more generalized, non-specific-detail claims. Vaporware.
>
> Agreed!

Initially, there was an UNWARRANTED Hue and Cry by the "radio
community" (two BPL proponents' name for ham radio) in that "RF
interference would be too high!"

Since NO ONE had any specific RF line level information on BPL
systems, it was really impossible to determine whether those levels
were "too high," "just right" or "too low." The ARRL model was
done solely on RF levels being at a certain maximum level that was
not determined from any specific BPL data.

Instead of acting in group hysteria, the "radio community" should have gone into basics and demanded more details of the BPL systems both in hardware and expected technical performance. For a bunch of supposed RF-savvy radio activists, damn few ever considered the AC power lines as RF transmission lines or the VARIATION of lines' characteristics at RF.

Picture an RF transmission line spaced for about 1000 to 3000 Ohms connected (somehow, unknown) to 75 Ohm coax as a basic model. Then consider that the RF xmssn line is really a triplet with a common in the center and the "coax" is really Twinax (a shielded twisted-pair, sort-of). Intuitively, it's going to be one bitch of a task to get a 7 to 8 octave frequency match of one line to the other. If the match isn't good, then the reflected RF is going to go someplace and that is back out the MV line and probably radiated instead of being absorbed (by unknown "terminations").

The BPL types would have been better off to just consider a fiber-optic cable carrying high-speed data both directions...and that mounted in the pole space of the MV lines. No conductors and the fiber-optic cable couldn't short out the MV lines and the MV lines wouldn't interfere with data on the fiber. Sharing "pole space" could have been their schtick instead of thinking that RF can flow easily on an AC power system never designed for RF.

LHA

487. Re: Bootlegging in 1948?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-06 20:27:50 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031006162750.25517.00001184@mb-m15.aol.com>
Source record: 80067

In article <20031006053758.00545.00001412@mb-m02.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
writes:

>"lenanderson@mogur.com" wasn't you?

Why do you ask? I haven't been able to use Mog-Ur's EMS BBS in
years...Tom closed it down after being one of the first 10 BBSs in
the USA. He had Internet access for about a year until it got too
expensive and subscribers left to go directly on the Internet.

Tom Tcimpdis (easy Greek surname, just pronounce it like it is written),
KC6MLR, television video director, twice won Emmys for outstanding
technical direction ("Night Court" series, "Sinatra, the Man and His
Music" special). Built his own BBS to start with years and years ago
from a Heath H8 microcomputer, had to write his own software to get
it going as a Bulletin Board System. Had a fairly good side business
of custom personal computer systems, may still do that. Private pilot,
multi-engine rated, a road rally sportsman from way back. You can see
his picture on QRZ.com...:-) Quaffed a few with Tom at the 94th
Aerosquadron Restaurant at Van Nuys Airport, a regular hang-out for
several San Fernando Valley BBS members of the 80s and 90s.

"Mog-Ur" is a character name taken from the novel "Clan of the Cave
Bear." "EMS" is an acronym for Electronic Message System, in use
in computer-modem communications before EMS for Emergency
Medical Service became standards.. "Mog-Ur's" survives on the Internet
today after more than 20 years of existance.

>> My real name and current mailing address is the same as it appeared
>> many times as bylines in Ham Radio Magazine.
>>
>How is anyone to know that when reading your newsgroup posts?

Do you need ELECTRONIC SIGNATURES, authenticated by some
federal agency?!?!?

Go look in the FCC ECFS...under all the RMs from 10781 through 10787
and FCC 03-104. The listings have my postal address and my AOL
address.

>Those articles
>are well over a decade old, and "ham radio" (no caps in their logo) magazine
>hasn't published a new issue for years.

Tsk, tsk, tsk. HAM RADIO Magazine, an independent amateur radio
interest periodical (50,000 issues a month) lasted for TWENTY TWO
YEARS solely on the basis of advertising space sales. Publisher

Skip Tenney finally sold it to CQ Communications and probably retired.
Founding Editor in Chief Jim Fisk (SK, ex-W1HR) wasn't around to help
keep up the interest of the readers of a technically-oriented magazine.

Both CQ and ARRL sell a three-CD set of all 22 years of HR for $150
(shipping extra, always an extra with ARRL). Lots of good technical
information in there.

>Why should anyone believe your calims when you can't even remember your screen
>names? Someone who posts as much as you do would ordinarily remember such
things.

Ah, being the NEWSGROUP KOP!

Well, then Mister Kop, why don't you just make yourself Emperor of the
newsgroup and RESTRICT ACCESS only to those whom YOU APPROVE.
Until that happens, THIS newsgroup is still open to the public.

I've been doing computer-modem communications since 1984, 19 years
in all...as a subscriber, as a Sysop, as a co-Sysop, and as a public
forum moderator. I'm NOT going to remember everything anymore than
you can over nearly a two decade span of time...AND THERE IS NO
DAMN REASON TO REMEMBER EVERY PICKY LITTLE DETAIL TO
SOOTHE YOUR IMAGINED PERSONAL HURT.

I have this nice card punch at the ready. Just hand me your "TS card"
and I will punch it for you...:-)

LHA

488. Re: Isnt it Funny (No-Code HF Privileges)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-06 20:27:51 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031006162751.25517.00001185@mb-m15.aol.com>
Source record: 80065

In article <c2356669.0310060909.627c5009@posting.google.com>, N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) writes:

>Most American television and motion pictures are JUNK.

Ooooookay...you tell that to Walt Cronkhite next time you two are at Dayton... :-)

Feel free to walk around this area shouting your "JUNK!" epithets.

If you do, make sure you have life insurance... :-)

>Now you can get all upset and indignant, Len old boy, but the facts >are the facts.

Noooooo...those are just your OPINIONS. :-)

You don't seem to know what I was talking about, mentioning the novel and TV movie "The French Atlantic Affair." Why not?

It was written by a ham. Even got a review, with pictures, in a ham magazine. Featured amateur radio as the problem-solver for a ship hijacking...by a couple of Extras.

489. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-06 20:27:53 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3F81D049.7090400@psu.edu>
Source record: 80068

```
Alun Palmer wrote:
> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in
> news:Yr1gb.27375$f11.8285@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net:
>
>
>>Clint, Clint, Clint. She was making a point of discussing the time.
>>Not the code, per se. She said all the 1X2s were issued BEFORE the
>>code was dropped. Do you have a comprehension problem too?
>>
>>Dan/W4NTI
>>
>>"Clint" <rattlehead at computron dot net> wrote in message
>>news:vo0jfogsff8uf2@corp.supernews.com...
>>
>>>Exactly.
>>>
>>>That was my point; make a post about back up batteries for
>>>black-out ham radio operations, and you'll get them making
>>>CW test remarks about it.
>>>
>>>Make a post about feedline pro's and con's, and they'll
>>>devolve it back to morse code testing.
>>>
>>>Talk about what is the best background noise reducing
>>>handheld radio for use on the toilet when you have
>>>diahrrea.. and yep, it's all about morse code testing again.
>>>
>>>No matter what, follow a thread long enough and they'll find
>>>a way to use the most twisted path of logic to blame
>>>NCI and the reduction & removal of morse code testing.
>>>
>>>Was it, in fact, to blame for the shuttle disaster?
>>>
>>>I digress.
>>>
>>>Clint
>>>
>>>"Alun Palmer" <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
>>>news:Xns940B7E9C45E95elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
>>>
>>>>Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in
>>>>news:kMWfb.34630$qj6.1857458@news1.news.adelphia.net:
>>>>
>>>>
```

>>>>>Alun Palmer wrote:
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>"Clint" <rattlehead at computron dot net> wrote in
>>>>>news:vo09ap279i0403@corp.supernews.com:
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>Man you got that right Mike. It was that way, decades ago.
>>>>>>>>>The extra used to mean something. Now it means squat.
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>Don't believe me? Look at the before and after code gutting.
>>>>>>>>>I was going to get a fancy 1X2 years ago. Glad I didn't now.
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>Dan/W4NTI
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>All the 1x2 sequentially assigned calls were gone long before
>>>>>>>>the 20wpm code was dropped.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>The real observation here is to note a complaint about extra
>>>>>>>class hams not knowing
>>>>>>>what the length of a 1/2 wave dipole was on a given frequency;
>>>>>>>has nothing to do
>>>>>>>with sending and recieving morse code skill.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>Kinda showed your colors there.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>Clint
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>It was a dead giveaway. Anyone who thinks that 20wpm code
>>>>>>operating skill means you know all about dipoles has a serious
>>>>>>problem that no amount of discussion will ever change.
>>>>>
>>>>> The new requirements *probably* will have no Morse code
>>>>> requirements, ergo Morse is not really relevant to this
>>>>> thread.
>>>>>
>>>>> That an extra might have no idea about the length of a half
>>>>> wave dipole
>>>>>at 40 meters - or more importantly, precisely no idea on how to
>>>>>calculate it - indicates a more serious problem to me.
>>>>>
>>>>> - Mike KB3EIA -

>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>
>>>>But one that has nothing to do with 20wpm, which I didn't introduce
>>>>into the discussion
>>>
>>>
>>
>>
>
> It looked to me like the post was saying no Extra would have been ignorant
> about dipoles when the code test speed was 20wpm. If it meant something
> else it might have been saying something logical, HI!

I can vouch for that. I'm reasonably smart, and I really stink at Morse code. Morse code skills/knowledge are distinctly separtate from the RF skills/knowledge. I knew how to calculate a half wave dipole long before I knew any other Morse besides SOS.

Do I get a medal now? 8^) Probably not.

- Mike KB3EIA -

490. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-06 20:33:17 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3F81D18D.1080205@psu.edu>
Source record: 80069

Dan/W4NTI wrote:

>
> I've never thought of it that way Larry, but your 100% correct. Just look
> at Kim.

Speaking of.. I wonder if she's run off again? Her last couple of posts
didn't present her in a very good mood.

I mean plenty of people think I'm dumm, but I'm hardly ever called
dispicable! 8^)

I think there may be a pattern here!

491. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-06 21:00:48 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0310061300.7814fd19@posting.google.com>
Source record: 80070

"Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
news:<y2egb.9057$yp6.304728@nnrp1.ptd.net>...
> "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
> news:6u4gb.35703$qj6.2003327@news1.news.adelphia.net...
> >
> > And what I'm thinking is that unless it means something again, they
> > might as well get rid of it. That little sliver of operating frequencies
> > is not worth it, if increased privileges are the measuring stick.

> Actually, the differences in privs from General to Extra are substantial.

Are they? Let's take a look...

What additional frequency spectrum does a General get by upgrading to
Extra?

On VHF/UHF - nothing

On MF - nothing

On HF:

100 kHz of non-phone/image space on 4 bands. This amounts to ~8.5% of
the 1182 kHz of non-phone/image space on the eight HF amateur bands.

350 kHz of phone/image space on 4 bands. This amounts to ~14.8% of the
2368 kHz of phone/image space on the eight HF amateur bands.

Total: 450 kHz of space out of a total of 3550 kHz on the eight HF
amateur bands. ~12.7% more space

What additional frequency spectrum does an Advanced get by upgrading
to Extra?

On VHF/UHF - nothing

On MF - nothing

On HF:

100 kHz of non-phone/image space on 4 bands. This amounts to ~8.5% of
the 1182 kHz of non-phone/image space on the eight HF amateur bands.

75 kHz of phone/image space on 3 bands. This amounts to ~3.2% of the
2368 kHz of phone/image space on the eight HF amateur bands.

Total: 175 kHz of space out of a total of 3550 kHz on the eight HF
amateur bands. ~4.9% more space

Of the 3550 kHz in the eight HF amateur bands, 66.7% - almost exactly two-thirds - is allocated to phone/image, while slightly less than one-third is non-phone/image space.

> With the FCC no longer issuing Advanced licenses, the only way to
> gain access to the "Advanced sub-bands" is to upgrade to Extra.

Said subbands consist of 275 kHz on four bands, all of it phone/image space.

> I'd say that's a pretty good incentive.

There's also the spiffy callsigns.

But it all depends on what it is a ham wants to do.

Back before restructuring, the ham who wasn't interested in phone/image had no reason to get an Advanced. And the ham who wasn't interested in CW/data had relatively little reason to get an Extra.

73 de Jim, N2EY

492. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-06 21:12:26 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0310061312.1cd4ff00@posting.google.com>
Source record: 80071

Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:<0I2gb.35465$qj6.1967632@news1.news.adelphia.net>...
> N2EY wrote:
>
> > In article <BcWfb.34024$qj6.1848732@news1.news.adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo
> > <mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:
> >
> >
> > >>N2EY wrote:
> > >>
> > >>
> > >>>In article <20031004210008.02537.00000878@mb-m23.aol.com>,
> > >>
> > >>yodoc@aol.comnospam
> > >>
> > >>>(Larry Roll K3LT) writes:
> > >>>
> > >>>
> > >>>
> > >>>>I think that the most likely scenario is that they will do as you suggest,
> > >>>>and distill it down to two license classes, General and Extra. All current
> > >>>>Techs would be "grandfathered" to the General class, and the Extra will
> > >>>>remain the same, sans Element 1(a). This would be the easiest change
> > >>>>to accomplish from an administrative standpoint, and they wouldn't have
> > >>>>to even bother renaming the remaining license classes, which would only
> > >>>>risk causing resentment among current Extras. There could be, at most,
> > >>>>a requirement for current Techs to pass another written element, but the
> > >>>>grandfathering would be an easier fix.
> > >>>
> > >>>
> > >>>ARRL asked for something very similar back in 1998 and FCC said no. (ARRL's
> > >>>proposal would have given Novices and Tech Pluses instant upgrades to
> > >>
> > >>General).
> > >>
> > >>>Such an instant upgrade has these problems:
> > >>>
> > >>>1) A lot of screaming about "no giveaways"
> > >>
> > >> Let's test your premise here, Jim. Would you support a one class system
> > >
> > >
> > >>in which all amateurs that have passed Novice, Tech, General or (of
> > >>course) Extra get an "instant upgrade" to Extra?

> >
> >
> > No. In fact, not just "no" but "HELL, NO!!"
>
> Okay, now I know a little more where you stand on this. I wasn't sure if
> you were being DA on it or what..... Wait a second... DA means Devil's
> Advocate... other interpretations might not be so kind! 8^)

Devil's Advocate I sometimes am.
>
>
> <snip>
>
> > Can anyone *prove* to me that the Extra written contains things a ham *must*
> > know to operate on the Extra-only subbands?
>
> Nope! There is really not much reason to go from General to Extra
> beyond personal satisfaction!
>
Not what I meant.

My point is simply this: The code test has been deemed "unnecessary"
by some under the reasoning that a ham doesn't absolutley have to know
the code in order to operate an amateur station safely and legally.
The Tech license and the R&O for 98-143 are frequently pointed to as
proof of this.

But by that same logic, there is nothing (or very very little) in the
Extra *test* that is absolutely necessary for a ham to know in order
to operate an amateur station safely and legally. Proof of this is
easy - the only operating privileges that an Extra gets you that a
General doesn't are more kHz of 4 HF bands.

No new bands, no new modes, no more power. So most if not all of the
Extra written test is therefore "unnecessary" by the very same logic
that deems the code test to be "unnecessary".

So what we have is essentially this: The code test is held to a
different standard than the writtens by some folks. They think it's OK
to require people take more and more written tests to get more
privileges, but it's not OK to require even a basic 5 wpm code test
for any license.

Some may say "but the written test supports the basis and purpose of
amateur radio as a technical service" - but can they point to anyone
who became "more technical" because they were required to take more
written tests?

73 de Jim, N2EY

493. Edwards criticizes Iraq package

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-06 22:03:05 UTC
From: BIG--AL
Message-ID: <vo2fes502ndu23@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 80130
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

WASHINGTON - White House candidate John Edwards of North Carolina rallied Democratic activists against President Bush's $87 billion request for Iraq and Afghanistan, while rival Bob Graham considered his future in the primary race.

The speakers Saturday at the Democratic National Committee's fall meeting also included two other presidential candidates _ Missouri Rep. Dick Gephardt and Al Sharpton.

Democrats talked optimistically about their chances in next year's White House race. The White House is under investigation for a possible leak of intelligence, and polls find Bush's popularity at the lowest point of his presidency.

"We see an administration moonwalking on trying to come to who is guilty of the leaks that risked security for Americans," Sharpton said. "Where is Ken Starr when we need you?"

Graham's aides said the Florida senator decided to speak to the party leaders even as he was considering options for his cash-strapped bid and staffers were departing.

Graham had a disappointing fund-raising quarter that ended Tuesday. Advisers said he was trying to decide whether to drop out of the race or dramatically cut his staff and focus on fewer states.

All 10 presidential candidates spoke at the convention, which was ending Saturday. Many insisted that Bush misled Americans about the justification for war in Iraq while reneging on promises to deliver a compassionate conservative domestic agenda.

Edwards, a North Carolina senator, said in prepared remarks that Bush's request for $87 billion for military operations and reconstruction in Iraq amounts to "billion-dollar giveaways for his friends in the big oil industry." He criticized such large spending abroad when other problems exist at home.

Edwards supports the majority of the request _ $66 billion _ that would fund military operations. But he voted Wednesday to cut $15 billion from the amount that would be used to rebuild Iraq.

"We will meet our country's greatest need, but we will not give this president a blank check, a free ride or four more years," he said.

Sharpton said he wants the DNC to reject Michigan's plan to allow Internet voting in its Feb. 7 caucus. He argues that online voting amount to an advantage for affluent white voters over poor blacks who do not have computers.

Sharpton criticized Dean, the primary's leading fund-raiser who has a large following on the Internet, for not joining him in opposing the Michigan plan.

"He says he's the only white candidate to discuss race, well I'm the only candidate to do something about race," he said. "Gov. Dean, it's not enough

to talk the talk, you've got to walk the walk. Your coffers may be full, but your talk is cheap. We must do something about the racial divide and Michigan is a test point on that."

494. Woman opens fire at church, killing her mother, pastor and herself

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-06 22:05:24 UTC
From: BIG--AL
Message-ID: <vo2fj7148tvv88@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 80131
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Turner Monumental AME church in Atlanta

ATLANTA, Georgia (AP) -- A woman opened fire at an Atlanta church before services started Sunday morning, killing her mother and the minister before committing suicide.

Congregants of Turner Monumental AME Church said Shelia W. Chaney Wilson, 43, was agitated when she came to the church, in the Kirkwood neighborhood on the city's east side.

Wilson apparently shot the Rev. Johnny Clyde Reynolds after he greeted her and was walking away with his back to her, said Atlanta police spokesman Sgt. John Quigley. Police believe Wilson then shot Jennie Mae Robinson once in the head before turning the gun on herself.

One woman in the sanctuary at the time fled after the first shot was fired, and the other took cover behind a pulpit, Quigley said. He said an assistant pastor came in after hearing shots and found the three bodies on the floor.

Wilson's cousin, Nekeshia Burton, said Wilson went to the church early in the morning to talk to Reynolds, 62.

"Something wasn't sitting right with her," Burton said. But Burton said there were no signs that Wilson would become violent.

Assistant Pastor Christy Miller said the pastor had just finished teaching Sunday school and was walking through the sanctuary when he stopped to talk with Wilson and Robinson, 67.

Geraldine Andrews, the pastor's daughter-in-law and a friend of Wilson's family, said Robinson recently took her daughter out of a mental health facility.

Debra Mitchell, a member of the church, said Wilson had recently lost her job.

"We knew she has some instability, but we didn't know it was this deep," Mitchell said.

Many remembered Robinson, who taught Bible study, as "a sweet individual, always praying for other people, always doing missionary work," Mitchell said.

The pastor was described as mild-mannered and generous.

"There was nothing too small or too great that he'd do for you," Miller said.

The shootings happened before most worshippers arrived for church. When they got there and heard what had happened, church members sobbed and hugged in front of the building.

"We're such a loving church, a family church," Miller said. "We'll support each other through this."

495. praising the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-06 22:09:13 UTC
From: BIG--AL
Message-ID: <vo2fqbr58nap20@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 80132
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

I must say that I have to praise the FCC for its efforts in looking into other alternatives for broadband access in Rural America. However, I disagree with the idea that more spectrum is needed to facilitate this daunting task.

73

Frank K3EKO

496. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-06 22:35:18 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <blsqn6$c8a$0@208.207.71.142>
Source record: 80072

```
Alun Palmer wrote:
> Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com> wrote in
> news:blru10$hhu$0@208.207.71.163:
>
>
>>Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
>>
>>>"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
>>>news:6u4gb.35703$qj6.2003327@news1.news.adelphia.net...
>>>
>>>
>>>>And what I'm thinking is that unless it means something again, they
>>>>might as well get rid of it. That little sliver of operating
>>>>frequencies is not worth it, if increased privileges are the measuring
>>>>stick.
>>>>
>>>>- Mike KB3EIA -
>>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>Actually, the differences in privs from General to Extra are
>>>substantial. With the FCC no longer issuing Advanced licenses, the
>>>only way to gain access to the "Advanced sub-bands" is to upgrade to
>>>Extra.
>>>
>>>I'd say that's a pretty good incentive.
>>>
>>>
>>
>>
>>Well, one certainly can't say there's any substantial difficulty
>>involved!
>>
>>
>
>
> I think you're wrong about that Dick. As an EE, I wouldn't find it
> difficult, but I know plenty of Generals, and Techs for that matter, for
> whom the Extra class theory is seen as something very tough. Not everyone
> can be one of the intelligentsia!

Of course that presumes that they would *need* to be one of the
intelligentsia, which is definitely not the case.
```

497. Vote for WX6RST

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-06 23:21:04 UTC
From: groupk0hb@earthlink.net
Message-ID: <5ee63311.0310061521.5dcf6e07@posting.google.com>
Source record: 80073
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

W6 hams..... put a ham in the statehouse in Sacremento. Vote for
our friend Jim Weir, WX6RST, for Governor.

http://www.smartvoter.org/2003/10/07/ca/state/vote/weir_j/

498. Re: GOOD NEWS-------France heat wave deaths top 14,000

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-06 23:27:50 UTC
From: Clint <"rattlehead at computron dot net">
Message-ID: <vo3ul9lrijm4c6@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 80074
Cross-posted to: alt.ham-radio.hf,alt.ham-radio.ssb,alt.radio.amateur,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Screw the backstabbing pansies.

499. Re: Isnt it Funny (No-Code HF Privileges)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-06 23:29:10 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <blstva$h3b@library2.airnews.net>
Source record: 80075

"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
news:c2356669.0310060909.627c5009@posting.google.com...
>
> On cb (this is the short list):
>
> - Operation without a license (when licenses were required)
> - Failure to identify
>

Hey, Jim? Just a quick question, 'cause I'm going on what goes on around here. Have you ever heard long-time hams of the elder generation who get on a club repeater and routinely forget to identify? I've heard entire conversations take place here, where one or more of the long-time hams [probably forget] fail to identify--even when they leave the radio.

>
> - False/misleading identification
>

Haven't heard much of that on ham radio.

>
> - Power far in excess of legal limit
>

Heck, I wouldn't know if that was taking place without the right test equipment I suppose. I could sure guess it one way or the other or, again, take some hams around here at their word that they "<chuckle> have a tendency to overdo it now and then to get that " "rare" " one."

>
> - Use of non-type-accepted/certified equipment
>

Ditto above.

>
> - Operation on unauthorized frequencies
>

Haven't listened long enough at any time to see how much/often I hear this on ham radio. Bet it goes on more than we realize, though(?)

>
> - Intentional interference
>

Hear that all the time on VHF and HF. More common on VHF, though.

>
> - Obscenity/profanity/vulgarity
>

Hear that all the time. And, I'd classify calling Democrats Nazis as being vulgar, etc. I hear conversations such as this quite routinely around here--again from long-time hams on their local "club" machines--I guess where they figure they have earned the right to be that way.

>
> - Contacts beyond the legal distance limit
> - Contacts beyond the legal time limit
>

Of course, this would be a moot point--for the most part--on ham radio.

>
> And the big one:
>
> - Use of radio to facilitate other illegal activities (such as speed
> limit violations)
>

Well, gotta hang my head again and say that I hear that routinely done around here on 2M. In fact, you'll hear the proverbial "smokey" reports, and hear of hams bragging all the time about zooming down the highway ("I'm trying to catch up with you, dude, and I'm doing 75; how fast *are* you going?"). Really.

Just my two pennies worth of stuff that can go on whether it's CB or not. And, I agree with you on all the comments about TV, etc., although I like most of the comedy shows on ABC.

Kim W5TIT

500. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-06 23:33:18 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <blsu71$hoi@library2.airnews.net>
Source record: 80077

"Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
news:3F81D18D.1080205@psu.edu...
> Dan/W4NTI wrote:
>
> >
> > I've never thought of it that way Larry, but your 100% correct. Just
look
> > at Kim.
>
> Speaking of.. I wonder if she's run off again? Her last couple of posts
> didn't present her in a very good mood.
>
> I mean plenty of people think I'm dumm, but I'm hardly ever called
> dispicable! 8^)
>
> I think there may be a pattern here!
>

Did I misspell despicable? Anyway, no, I've not "run off" and my "bad mood" (a purely interpreted opinion because I have not been in a bad mood) is a result of being pretty damned bored with the same 'ol same 'ol in this newsgroup. My reason for being on the computer here at home, though, is at an end--or at least for the moment. I've completed one project but got called the other day for another...

We'll see...

Oh, and I have to ask just to see what your answer is: what "pattern" are you stretching for?

Kim W5TIT

501. Re: Isnt it Funny (No-Code HF Privileges)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-06 23:33:55 UTC
From: Clint <"rattlehead at computron dot net">
Message-ID: <vo3v0jfoeptge2@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 80076

"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20031006162751.25517.00001185@mb-m15.aol.com...

> >Now you can get all upset and indignant, Len old boy, but the facts
> >are the facts.
>
> Noooooo...those are just your OPINIONS. :-)
>

Not only that, consider the source... you're dealing with another PCTA type that didn't receive his or her fair share of grey matter such that self-determination isn't possible... it's just "bleat like the rest of the sheep"

"CW test good.... modernization bad.....
CW test good.... mdernization bad...."

Clint

--

The first amendment was meant to protect individual citizen's rights to free speech from being hindered or banned by the government. Did anybody else notice that it was 3 candidates for president of the democratic party that called for Rush Limbaugh's firing for what he said?

502. Re: Vote for WX6RST

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-06 23:35:18 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <blsuaq$i5n@library2.airnews.net>
Source record: 80079
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

"Hans K0HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:5ee63311.0310061521.5dcf6e07@posting.google.com...
> W6 hams..... put a ham in the statehouse in Sacremento. Vote for
> our friend Jim Weir, WX6RST, for Governor.
>
> http://www.smartvoter.org/2003/10/07/ca/state/vote/weir_j/

Gosh, I thought ham radio was supposed to be such an added bonus to the
"resume." I don't see a word of it mentioned.

Kim W5TIT

503. Re: Isnt it Funny (No-Code HF Privileges)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-06 23:36:50 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <blsudl$llc@library2.airnews.net>
Source record: 80080

"Clint" <rattlehead at computron dot net> wrote in message
news:vo3v0jfoeptge2@corp.supernews.com...
>
> "Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20031006162751.25517.00001185@mb-m15.aol.com...
>
>
> > >Now you can get all upset and indignant, Len old boy, but the facts
> > >are the facts.
> >
> > Noooooo...those are just your OPINIONS. :-)
> >
>
> Not only that, consider the source... you're dealing with another PCTA
> type that didn't receive his or her fair share of grey matter such that
> self-determination isn't possible... it's just "bleat like the rest of the
> sheep"
>
> "CW test good.... modernization bad.....
> CW test good.... mdernization bad...."
>
> Clint
>
>
> --
>
> The first amendment was meant to protect individual citizen's
> rights to free speech from being hindered or banned by the
> government. Did anybody else notice that it was 3 candidates
> for president of the democratic party that called for Rush
> Limbaugh's firing for what he said?
>
>

Clint, you're a real certifiable asshole. You probably advocate terrorism
if it meets with your agenda. You creep.

Kim W5TIT

504. Re: Lennie's Double Standard Once Again Revealed...BY Lennie!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-06 23:37:16 UTC
From: Clint <"rattlehead at computron dot net">
Message-ID: <vo3v6sfs65ue0b@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 80078

Most of "that crowd" can't stand the opposition that we give them,
and soon their half of the debate just breaks down to insults and name
calling... "liar" is a new one; "lazy", "f-ing moron" and "stupid" are some
of the more traditional ones.

They won't run me off, there is not reason for me to leave. The more
I stay and let them spout off thier diatribe and thier factless,
baseless nonesense, the more the NCTA's agenda is promoted and
gains supporters.

It's too easy.

Clint

--

The first amendment was meant to protect individual citizen's
rights to free speech from being hindered or banned by the
government. Did anybody else notice that it was 3 candidates
for president of the democratic party that called for Rush
Limbaugh's firing for what he said?

--

505. Re: Isnt it Funny (No-Code HF Privileges)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-06 23:51:30 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <blsv62$kk3$0@208.206.142.81>
Source record: 80081

Len Over 21 wrote:
-
>
> You don't seem to know what I was talking about

Well Hallelulu, *you* don't know what you're talking about either.

506. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-07 00:08:00 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <Atngb.91$_i.6243@nnrp1.ptd.net>
Source record: 80082

"Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
news:3F818F9F.9040005@psu.edu...
> Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
>
> > It is OF THE UTMOST IMPORTANCE that BPL interference
> > be properly ID'd. We do NOT want inaccurate claims of "BPL
> > interference" to be made because the BPL industy will say, "See,
> > we told you those hams were exaggerating ... our systems don't
> > cause interference."
>
>
> Are there indentifying characteristics?

Listen to the ARRL video is the best I can offer over the net.
If you were here, I'd be happy to take you down to the BPL
area in Emmaus and show you ... to someone who's listened
to a lot of data transmissions it has a certain characteristic (which
varies from the SS system of main.net and the OFDM system
of Amperion ...) but it's nearly impossible to explain in text.

> One possible backlash of this is that there may be many hams running
> about looking for BPL interferece, and finding other Power line
> interference that the Power companies will have to clean up!

Most have been dismally poor at doing that - ARRL has over 300
unresolved power line noise complaints on the books, according to
Ed Hare, including 50 or so where the FCC has sent a letter to the
utility telling them to find it and fix it.

73,
Carl - wk3c

507. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-07 00:09:07 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <Dungb.92$_i.6039@nnrp1.ptd.net>
Source record: 80083

"Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message news:3F81AC7A.606@psu.edu...
> Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> > Mike, the "X10" system works at only a few hundred Hz of spectrum.
>
> I'm not familiar with the specific names. X10 is the one the power
> companies use?

No, "X10" was an in-home system.

73,
Carl - wk3c

508. Re: Vote for WX6RST

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-07 00:10:40 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <blt0a0$mo7$0@208.206.142.81>
Source record: 80084
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

Hans K0HB wrote:

> W6 hams..... put a ham in the statehouse in Sacremento. Vote for
> our friend Jim Weir, WX6RST, for Governor.
>
> http://www.smartvoter.org/2003/10/07/ca/state/vote/weir_j/

Aw, Chee.... Jim just blew 3 grand on the filing fee. that woulda
financed a new hamshack!

509. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-07 00:29:10 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <qNngb.36209$qj6.2284487@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 80085

Dan/W4NTI wrote:
> "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
> news:lq2gb.35461$qj6.1963146@news1.news.adelphia.net...
>
>>Dan/W4NTI wrote:
>>
>>
>>
>>>What contests do you do? I don't remember you. Course I've only done
>
> them
>
>>>for 30 years or so.
>>
>>PAQSO, NEQP, Field day, North American. I tried the Ohio this year, but
>>conditions were bad. I've not been licensed too long, and sometimes op
>>our club station (W3YA)
>>
>>- Mike KB3EIA -
>>
>
>
> Good show Mike. Sure I know W3YA. And this coming weekend is PA Qso Party.
> I intend to enter. What call you using, if your going to enter?

I'll be at the mountaintop using W3YA, Centre County We're on 40 a lot.
I'll be the control op some of the time for newbies, and hanging out for
the hams that don't have a home station. Once in a while, I'll get to
operate even. I'll keep an ear out for you.

- Mike KB3EIA -

510. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-07 00:29:44 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031006202944.21642.00001461@mb-m01.aol.com>
Source record: 80086

In article <3F81CD08.2040600@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:

>Ryan, KC8PMX wrote:
>> (sarcasm mode on)
>>
>> Since the entire public is completely aware of amateur radio, therefore
>they
>> all are waiting for the code test to drop, then we should have huge growth
>> eh???
>>
>> (sarcasm mode off)
>
>
> Is the reason for low growth that people don't know about the ARS?

I'd say it's #1.
>
> I'd postulate that anyone that has any interest will pretty quickly
>find out about us. have internet access, you'll find us. Read a
>newspaper, and there are several articles a year about the ARS.

Several articles a year out of how many thousand?

Folks hafta know where to look.

Remember the movie "Contact"? Great opening scenes. But nowhere do they mention
that what's going on is amateur radio!

btw - the Vibroplex shown in that film is the very model and vintage I have
used since 1974.
>
> I'd also bet that there really aren't that many people who are really
>that interested in radio. That's okay. I don't pick my hobbies on their
>popularity. I pick them because I like to do them.
>
Radio "for its own sake" has always been a niche avocation. I went to a
highschool (class of 1972) that had 2400 boys and a heavy academic emphasis on
math and science. In my senior year there were exactly six licensed hams there.
Of those six, three remained active long after high school. Now we are two,
with the untimely passing of WA3RVT some years ago.

More publicity can't hurt. But amateur radio isn't a spectator sport - for
most, anyway.

--

There was a great article some years back which I will now paraphrase.

The author whose name escapes me now said that there were three basic kinds of hams - operators, communicators, and tinkerers. Or words to that effect.

Operators simply like to get on the air and make contacts. It's the medium more than the message, the skill as much as the results.

Communicators are there for the message. Radio is the tool to get the job done, that's all.

Tinkerers are into the technology of radio, the projects, etc.

Of course most hams a a mixture of all three, but you can see that the mix varies widely in different individuals.

It's also clear that as things change, the attractions of these three reasons wax and wane.

Once upon a time, amateur radio attracted lots of communicator types because there were so few alternatives within reach of the average person. I recall reading of hams who got their licenses simply to keep in touch with family members across the country or around the world. With the advent of cellphones, email and cheap longdistance, much of that is gone.

Tinkerers are still with us, but it's a different game now. In the past, most hams had to do some pretty serious tinkering just to get on the air - even with manufactured equipment. While that sort of thing is still around, it's not so prevalent as before.

Operator types are most numerous today, for obvious reasons.

The situation is analagous to cars - there are those for whom driving is a joy in itself, those for whom driving is a means to an end (transportation), and those who like to mess around with motor vehicles.

73 de Jim, N2EY

511. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-07 00:31:15 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <nPngb.36212$qj6.2285161@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 80087

Dan/W4NTI wrote:

> "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
> news:6u4gb.35703$qj6.2003327@news1.news.adelphia.net...
>
>>Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>>
>>
>>>In article <0I2gb.35465$qj6.1967632@news1.news.adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo
>>><mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>>Can anyone *prove* to me that the Extra written contains things a ham
>>>>
>>>>*must*
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>know to operate on the Extra-only subbands?
>>>>
>>>>Nope! There is really not much reason to go from General to Extra
>>>>beyond personal satisfaction!
>>>>
>>>>- Mike KB3EIA -
>>>
>>>
>>>Mike:
>>>
>>>In the past (the Pre-Restructuring Era), the reason for upgrading was
>
> that
>
>>>increased operating privileges were the reward for gaining increased
>>>technical knowledge and operating skill. The ARS seems to have taken
>>>a clue from the rest of our dumbed-down society and abandoned this
>>>philosophy.
>>
>>And what I'm thinking is that unless it means something again, they
>>might as well get rid of it. That little sliver of operating frequencies
>>is not worth it, if increased privileges are the measuring stick.
>>
>>- Mike KB3EIA -
>>
>

>
> Wrong again Mike. Its a place to go to get away from the 'others'... hi.

Hmm, you just might have a point there, Dan!

- Mike KB3EIA -

512. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-07 00:38:06 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <OVngb.36214$qj6.2287069@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 80088

Kim W5TIT wrote:

> "Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
> news:3F81D18D.1080205@psu.edu...
>
>>Dan/W4NTI wrote:
>>
>>
>>>I've never thought of it that way Larry, but your 100% correct. Just
>
> look
>
>>>at Kim.
>>
>>Speaking of.. I wonder if she's run off again? Her last couple of posts
>>didn't present her in a very good mood.
>>
>>I mean plenty of people think I'm dumm, but I'm hardly ever called
>>dispicable! 8^)
>>
>>I think there may be a pattern here!
>>
>
>
> Did I misspell despicable?

Okay by my spell checker!

<snippage>

> Oh, and I have to ask just to see what your answer is: what "pattern" are
> you stretching for?

Since I've been here, You have gotten really angry (bored?) with
someone and quit posting for a while. Then you've returned and started
posting again.

Nothing sinister here.

- Mike KB3EIA -

513. Re: Isnt it Funny (No-Code HF Privileges)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-07 00:49:18 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <blt2ieqss0@208.207.71.173>
Source record: 80089

Clint wrote:

> "Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20031006162751.25517.00001185@mb-m15.aol.com...
>
>
>
>>>Now you can get all upset and indignant, Len old boy, but the facts
>>>are the facts.
>>
>> Noooooo...those are just your OPINIONS. :-)
>>
>
>
> Not only that, consider the source... you're dealing with another PCTA
> type that didn't receive his or her fair share of grey matter such that
> self-determination isn't possible... it's just "bleat like the rest of the
> sheep"
>
> "CW test good.... modernization bad.....
> CW test good.... mdernization bad...."
>
> Clint

Clint you're screen name of "Rattlehead" doesn't begin toi address
the depths of yourignorance. And that of your likemeinded friends at NCI.

The proof? You'all see "mondernization" as yakking on SSB while those of
us who KNOW from personal experience that radiotelegraphy remains a
very viable and important mode within ham radio, are in fact the most
common users of advanced digital modes.

514. Re: Isnt it Funny (No-Code HF Privileges)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-07 01:00:47 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031006210047.11891.00000339@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 80090

Dont you just love this little BUZZ WORD "mondernization". I wonder which NCI KNUCKLE DRAGGIN CBPLUSSER, came up with it. What the term really means is, FREE RIDE for all the CBplussers at NCI.

515. Re: Isnt it Funny (No-Code HF Privileges)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-07 01:13:25 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <blt3vltjm0@208.207.71.173>
Source record: 80091

Clint wrote:

> "Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20031006162751.25517.00001185@mb-m15.aol.com...
>
>
>
>>>Now you can get all upset and indignant, Len old boy, but the facts
>>>are the facts.
>>
>> Noooooo...those are just your OPINIONS. :-)
>>
>
>
> Not only that, consider the source... you're dealing with another PCTA
> type that didn't receive his or her fair share of grey matter such that
> self-determination isn't possible... it's just "bleat like the rest of the
> sheep"
>
> "CW test good.... modernization bad.....
> CW test good.... mdernization bad...."
>
> Clint
>

One could compare rattlehead with Forrest Gump except that
Forrest was a not so bright fellow who did have some common sense...

516. Re: Isnt it Funny (No-Code HF Privileges)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-07 02:30:40 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031006223040.21642.00001463@mb-m01.aol.com>
Source record: 80092

In article <blstva$h3b@library2.airnews.net>, "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
writes:

>"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
>news:c2356669.0310060909.627c5009@posting.google.com...
>>
>> On cb (this is the short list):
>>
>> - Operation without a license (when licenses were required)
>> - Failure to identify

>Hey, Jim?

Yo!

(the original "Rocky" was on the other night - great film)

>Just a quick question, 'cause I'm going on what goes on around
>here. Have you ever heard long-time hams of the elder generation who get on
>a club repeater and routinely forget to identify?

Nope.

'round these parts, failure to ID is pretty rare. Sometimes a newbie will
forget, and be very gently reminded in an indirect way (say, by having somebody
mention the call of everyone in the round table).

>I've heard entire
>conversations take place here, where one or more of the long-time hams
>[probably forget] fail to identify--even when they leave the radio.

I've heard that once or twice, maybe - and never from the experienced hams.

>> - False/misleading identification

>Haven't heard much of that on ham radio.
>
>> - Power far in excess of legal limit
>
>Heck, I wouldn't know if that was taking place without the right test
>equipment I suppose. I could sure guess it one way or the other or, again,
>take some hams around here at their word that they "<chuckle> have a
>tendency to overdo it now and then to get that " "rare" " one."

In some ways it's a bit of a mismatched comparison. If a ham runs, say, 6000
watts output (!) it will only make him/her about 6 db (1 S-unit) louder than
the legal limit. But the cber who runs 400 watts out is about 20 dB (almost
3-1/2 S units) over the line.

>> - Use of non-type-accepted/certified equipment

>Ditto above.

Hams are not required to use type-accepted/certified equipment. cb users are.
>
>> - Operation on unauthorized frequencies

>Haven't listened long enough at any time to see how much/often I hear this
>on ham radio. Bet it goes on more than we realize, though(?)

Nope. No reason, really.

>> - Intentional interference

>Hear that all the time on VHF and HF. More common on VHF, though.

Must be some real characters down there in TX, Kim. The worst we get up here is
when somebody "doubles" on the repeater - and then, just so they don't feel
bad, everybody keys their rig at once and makes a heterodyne furball. For about
10 seconds.

Not really intentional interference, tho.
>
>> - Obscenity/profanity/vulgarity

>Hear that all the time. And, I'd classify calling Democrats Nazis as being
>vulgar, etc. I hear conversations such as this quite routinely around
>here--again from long-time hams on their local "club" machines--I guess
>where they figure they have earned the right to be that way.

That's awful. Somebody tried that around here, the machine would go dead. Try
it more than once and they'd find nobody would talk to them.

Can't say I've ever heard anything like that on CW at all. Ever. Worst was
somebody calling somebody a lid for calling the DX on his (the DX's) freq,
after he'd announced he was working split.
>
>> - Contacts beyond the legal distance limit
>> - Contacts beyond the legal time limit

>Of course, this would be a moot point--for the most part--on ham radio.

'zactly

>> And the big one:
>
>> - Use of radio to facilitate other illegal activities (such as speed
>> limit violations)
>
>Well, gotta hang my head again and say that I hear that routinely done
>around here on 2M. In fact, you'll hear the proverbial "smokey" reports,
>and hear of hams bragging all the time about zooming down the highway ("I'm
>trying to catch up with you, dude, and I'm doing 75; how fast *are* you
>going?"). Really.

'round here it's tough enough to go the speed limit....

And that all came from where?

>Just my two pennies worth of stuff that can go on whether it's CB or not.

Oh sure.

Point is, it was common on cb long before the movies and TV shows came out. It was not common on ham radio back then - or now, around here anyway.

>And, I agree with you on all the comments about TV, etc., although I like
>most of the comedy shows on ABC.

I see maybe a few hours of TV a week at most. Usually PBS, rented tapes and some of the better comedies.

Last week of the summer, was on vacation at a place with cable. 50 odd channels and usually not a thing worth watching.

Right now the newest Ken Burns documentary is on. First transcontinental auto trip, done west-to-east, in 1903.

Hiram Percy Maxim was an early auto pioneer, too.

73 de Jim, N2EY

517. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-07 02:53:33 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <blt9rd$a5i$0@208.207.71.173>
Source record: 80093

```
Mike Coslo wrote:

> Kim W5TIT wrote:
>
>> "Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
>> news:3F81D18D.1080205@psu.edu...
>>
>>> Dan/W4NTI wrote:
>>>
>>>
>>>> I've never thought of it that way Larry, but your 100% correct. Just
>>
>>
>> look
>>
>>>> at Kim.
>>>
>>>
>>> Speaking of.. I wonder if she's run off again? Her last couple of posts
>>> didn't present her in a very good mood.
>>>
>>> I mean plenty of people think I'm dumm, but I'm hardly ever called
>>> dispicable! 8^)
>>>
>>> I think there may be a pattern here!
>>>
>>
>>
>> Did I misspell despicable?
>
>

Daffy Duck said it best!
```

518. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-07 03:00:24 UTC
From: Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns940CEA03FE4CEelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 80094

Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com> wrote in
news:blsqn6$c8a$0@208.207.71.142:

> Alun Palmer wrote:
>> Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com> wrote in
>> news:blru10hhu0@208.207.71.163:
>>
>>
>>>Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
>>>
>>>>"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
>>>>news:6u4gb.35703$qj6.2003327@news1.news.adelphia.net...
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>And what I'm thinking is that unless it means something again, they
>>>>>might as well get rid of it. That little sliver of operating
>>>>>frequencies is not worth it, if increased privileges are the
>>>>>measuring stick.
>>>>>
>>>>>- Mike KB3EIA -
>>>>>
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>Actually, the differences in privs from General to Extra are
>>>>substantial. With the FCC no longer issuing Advanced licenses, the
>>>>only way to gain access to the "Advanced sub-bands" is to upgrade to
>>>>Extra.
>>>>
>>>>I'd say that's a pretty good incentive.
>>>>
>>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>Well, one certainly can't say there's any substantial difficulty
>>>involved!
>>>
>>>
>>
>>
>> I think you're wrong about that Dick. As an EE, I wouldn't find it
>> difficult, but I know plenty of Generals, and Techs for that matter,
>> for whom the Extra class theory is seen as something very tough. Not
>> everyone can be one of the intelligentsia!
>

>
> Of course that presumes that they would *need* to be one of the
> intelligentsia, which is definitely not the case.
>
>

True, but if the Extra written were not a significant barrier, then everyone would have passed it. It is certainly more of a barrier than 5 wpm for most non-EEs. Most of the mathematically based questions were in old element 4A, and so are now in element 4 (or, I should say, back in element 4).

OTOH, there is not much difference between Tech and General written. My bet is that when the code test is abolished the Tech licence will atrophy, but this will boost the General licence, with not much increase in Extras. Perhaps we should have a two class system, with only Generals and Extras?

519. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-07 03:06:11 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <D4qgb.73$GE4.75380@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 80095

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:ZEjgb.655$mQ2.389@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
>
> Hey Sweepstakes is my all time favorite contest. Ill be on CW for sure.
> And maybe phone also.
>
> Two diff weekends.
>
> Dan/W4NTI
>
>

This year the CW one falls on my OM's birthday so I may or may not get on it this year. However next year, his birthday is not on the weekend.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

520. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-07 03:10:10 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <m8qgb.74$GE4.76302@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 80096

"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
news:c2356669.0310061300.7814fd19@posting.google.com...
> Back before restructuring, the ham who wasn't interested in
> phone/image had no reason to get an Advanced. And the ham who wasn't
> interested in CW/data had relatively little reason to get an Extra.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

Except that I found very early on that a lot of the more interesting DX
tended to be in what are the Extra subbands in the US. So I set my sights
on getting the Extra for that reason.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

521. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-07 03:55:48 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bltdg4jnt0@208.207.71.173>
Source record: 80097

```
Alun Palmer wrote:

> Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com> wrote in
> news:blsqn6$c8a$0@208.207.71.142:
>
>
>>Alun Palmer wrote:
>>
>>>Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com> wrote in
>>>news:blru10$hhu$0@208.207.71.163:
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>>Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
>>>>>news:6u4gb.35703$qj6.2003327@news1.news.adelphia.net...
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>>And what I'm thinking is that unless it means something again, they
>>>>>>might as well get rid of it. That little sliver of operating
>>>>>>frequencies is not worth it, if increased privileges are the
>>>>>>measuring stick.
>>>>>>
>>>>>>- Mike KB3EIA -
>>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>Actually, the differences in privs from General to Extra are
>>>>>substantial. With the FCC no longer issuing Advanced licenses, the
>>>>>only way to gain access to the "Advanced sub-bands" is to upgrade to
>>>>>Extra.
>>>>>
>>>>>I'd say that's a pretty good incentive.
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>Well, one certainly can't say there's any substantial difficulty
>>>>involved!
>>>>
>>>>
```

>>>
>>>
>>>I think you're wrong about that Dick. As an EE, I wouldn't find it
>>>difficult, but I know plenty of Generals, and Techs for that matter,
>>>for whom the Extra class theory is seen as something very tough. Not
>>>everyone can be one of the intelligentsia!
>>
>>
>> Of course that presumes that they would *need* to be one of the
>>intelligentsia, which is definitely not the case.
>>
>>
>
>
> True, but if the Extra written were not a significant barrier, then
> everyone would have passed it.

Why should that be? There are a great many of Tech Plus licensees
who don't bother to upgrade to General. It's just too much trouble,
or there is too little interest in the added benefits.
As an Extra of nearly 35 years, and as one who administered VE excams
for the first 8 years of the present testing system, I am quite sure
that the current Extra exam is a significant barrier only in the minds
of those who haven't really faced a barrier.

It is certainly more of a barrier than 5
> wpm for most non-EEs. Most of the mathematically based questions were in
> old element 4A, and so are now in element 4 (or, I should say, back in
> element 4).
>
> OTOH, there is not much difference between Tech and General written. My
> bet is that when the code test is abolished the Tech licence will atrophy,
> but this will boost the General licence, with not much increase in Extras.
> Perhaps we should have a two class system, with only Generals and Extras?

You view the situation as an EE who didn't need to study to work out
any of the technical problems on the Extra exam, few that there were.
Most applicants have the singleminded goal of passing the exam, and
learning beyond that goal is not only unnecessary, it gets in the way of
the goal at hand. So they naturally just don't do it. The curent method
of testing clearly facilitates that position.

Some of them later find the interest to involve themselves in further
study and learning. I think it clear enough that there isn't much of
that demanded, and the knowledge level displayed by so many advanced
level licensees clearly demonstrates that a great many hams get the
license for the sole purpose of operating and advancing their technical
skills and knowledge is far down the scale of what is important to them.
Ub= nfortunately today that includes Extra class licensees. Again, the
current testing system clearly makes that possible. Before the advent of
VE testing, it did not.

Dick

522. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-07 04:17:26 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <REMOVETHISkc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <blue4g$gfm14$3@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 80010

"Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
news:3F81CD08.2040600@psu.edu...
> Ryan, KC8PMX wrote:
> > (sarcasm mode on)
> >
> > Since the entire public is completely aware of amateur radio, therefore
they
> > all are waiting for the code test to drop, then we should have huge
growth
> > eh???
> >
> > (sarcasm mode off)
>
>
> Is the reason for low growth that people don't know about the ARS?

I would have to say it is one factor at least. I am not saying it is the
only factor for low growth.

>
> I'd postulate that anyone that has any interest will pretty quickly
> find out about us. have internet access, you'll find us. Read a
> newspaper, and there are several articles a year about the ARS.

That postulation would also have to assume that there is some awareness of
this hobby/service, even if it is only a small amount of awareness. What I
was referring to was, I have run across many people that DID NOT have ANY
awareness whatsoever. Of course after discussing, they did have at least a
little bit of awareness, and it would be up to them to pursue it any
further.

>
> I'd also bet that there really aren't that many people who are really
> that interested in radio. That's okay. I don't pick my hobbies on their
> popularity. I pick them because I like to do them.

I would agree with that statement as well Mike. Those people are not part
of this particular equation; being the awareness issue.

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF1-FF2-MFR-(pending NREMT-B!)
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...

523. Re: Vote for WX6RST

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-07 04:18:10 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <68rgb.1073$mQ2.600@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 80098
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

```
"Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:blsuaq$i5n@library2.airnews.net...
: "Hans K0HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
: news:5ee63311.0310061521.5dcf6e07@posting.google.com...
: > W6 hams..... put a ham in the statehouse in Sacremento. Vote for
: > our friend Jim Weir, WX6RST, for Governor.
: >
: > http://www.smartvoter.org/2003/10/07/ca/state/vote/weir_j/
:
: Gosh, I thought ham radio was supposed to be such an added bonus to the
: "resume." I don't see a word of it mentioned.
:
: Kim W5TIT
:
:
```

524. Re: Vote for WX6RST

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-07 04:24:43 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <fergb.1075$mQ2.835@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 80099
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

"Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote:

> Gosh, I thought ham radio was supposed to be such
> an added bonus to the "resume." I don't see a word of it mentioned.

Huh???? Why would an avocation like amateur radio be mentioned when
running for public office?

I can imagine that such a mention would make sense if he was a candidate for
a job as an engineer or technician at an electronics or communications
oriented business, but as a governor?????? Did K7UGA campaign literature
mention that he was a ham when he was the Republican candidate for President
of the US?

&#65533;&#65533;&#65533; 73, de Hans, K0HB
--
Help support youth involved in Amateur Radio.
http://www.mnyarc.org
http://www.k0bsa.org

525. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-07 04:34:25 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <REMOVETHISkc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <blue4h$gfm14$4@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 80011

> > I'd postulate that anyone that has any interest will pretty quickly
> >find out about us. have internet access, you'll find us. Read a
> >newspaper, and there are several articles a year about the ARS.
>
> Several articles a year out of how many thousand?

Would love to see a thousand per year or more! This would be more on the shoulders of local groups, clubs and individuals to coordinate with local media to make this happen. A person in every club, with the responsibility of being the PR person would be a good goal. This person would be responsible for contacting media outlets for every event, including open meetings etc. I did the PR function for our local club for 2 years, and even trained a neighboring club PR person with the techniques I had utilized. I had created a quite a tracking system to keep track of media contacts, upcoming events, and results thereof. I should write something up on this to share with others eh?

>
> Folks hafta know where to look.

Any time a ham radio related event is in print media, a website address should be included in some way or another if the media outlet will do so.

>
> Remember the movie "Contact"? Great opening scenes. But nowhere do they mention
> that what's going on is amateur radio!
>

I think actually there is some reference, but it is merely in a passing reference. I would have to watch it again to make sure though. It's been a while since I have seen that movie.....

> >
> > I'd also bet that there really aren't that many people who are really
> >that interested in radio. That's okay. I don't pick my hobbies on their
> >popularity. I pick them because I like to do them.
> >
> Radio "for its own sake" has always been a niche avocation. I went to a
> highschool (class of 1972) that had 2400 boys and a heavy academic emphasis on
> math and science. In my senior year there were exactly six licensed hams there.
> Of those six, three remained active long after high school. Now we are two,
> with the untimely passing of WA3RVT some years ago.

>

Hey.... I don't know what it is like around where you are at, but
unfortunately around here, electronics are no longer being taught as an
elective class choice. In fact alot of the "vocational" classes that one
could take as an elective in high school around here are being cut out. But
of course the sports and art classes are still supported.....

> More publicity can't hurt. But amateur radio isn't a spectator sport - for
> most, anyway.
>

Oh really..... then that statement in the past about 20% do most of the work
in groups and associations is wrong then??

--
Ryan, KC8PMX

"Symbolism is for the simple minded....."

> --
>
> There was a great article some years back which I will now paraphrase.
>
> The author whose name escapes me now said that there were three basic
kinds of
> hams - operators, communicators, and tinkerers. Or words to that effect.
>
> Operators simply like to get on the air and make contacts. It's the medium
more
> than the message, the skill as much as the results.
>
> Communicators are there for the message. Radio is the tool to get the job
done,
> that's all.
>
> Tinkerers are into the technology of radio, the projects, etc.
>
> Of course most hams a a mixture of all three, but you can see that the mix
> varies widely in different individuals.
>
> It's also clear that as things change, the attractions of these three
reasons
> wax and wane.
>
> Once upon a time, amateur radio attracted lots of communicator types
because
> there were so few alternatives within reach of the average person. I
recall
> reading of hams who got their licenses simply to keep in touch with family
> members across the country or around the world. With the advent of
cellphones,

> email and cheap longdistance, much of that is gone.
>
> Tinkerers are still with us, but it's a different game now. In the past,
most
> hams had to do some pretty serious tinkering just to get on the air - even
with
> manufactured equipment. While that sort of thing is still around, it's not
so
> prevalent as before.
>
> Operator types are most numerous today, for obvious reasons.
>
> The situation is analagous to cars - there are those for whom driving is a
joy
> in itself, those for whom driving is a means to an end (transportation),
and
> those who like to mess around with motor vehicles.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

526. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-07 04:41:16 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3F8243EB.1050905@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 80100

>
>
>
>
>>the EXTRA for the EXTRA band segments, probably never will.
>>
>>
>
>I mostly use them when I contest and/or chase DX on HF. Thats basically
>it..
>
>In fact that is why I decided to upgrade years ago.
>
>
>
Having the extra license means that I can rove up and down an entire
phone band at
will, and not having to stop at an advanced or general subband edge. No
forbidden
ham bands.... And I do rove during contests. I don't compete, but I
work the contesters
to see how far my signal propagates, etc.... Contests provide a steady
stream of
short QSOs.

527. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-07 04:58:13 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3F8247E4.6090505@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 80001

Dick Carroll wrote:

>
>
> You view the situation as an EE who didn't need to study to work out
> any of the technical problems on the Extra exam, few that there were.
> Most applicants have the singleminded goal of passing the exam, and
> learning beyond that goal is not only unnecessary, it gets in the way
> of the goal at hand. So they naturally just don't do it. The curent
> method of testing clearly facilitates that position.

I'm a EE, and like any reasonably successful college student, I still
made use of the
avaliable resources (the question pool) to prepare for the (at the time
I took them)
elements 4A and 4B. Found a few holes in my knowledge, and filled them
in for
at least long enough to score well on the tests (missed 1 on 4A, 2 on 4B
IIRC).
Got the CSCEs, and then the extra on Restructuring Day.

Most students only study what is expected to be on the exams. Thus, I could
solve calculus exam problems (take the intergral of (csc x^5)/(tan x^2
-1) dx)
but I still never got a good understanding of how to use calculus to
solve a real
world problem. Recently went looking for a "calculus for dummies" type
book, but all they had was how to do exam problems. Been there, done that.

528. Re: praising the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-07 05:02:21 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <REMOVETHISkc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <blue4j$gfm14$5@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 80012
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

I would much rather see the phone companies, like Ameritec in my specific case, pursue installing more "switching stations" or whatever they are called, to facilitate the ability to use DSL as a high speed connection. Seems like that would overall be a cheaper solution. In other counties I am quite sure it might be a little bit different, but in my county that I live in, I have heard from Ameritech employees that it would take 4 more switching stations to provide coverage for the entire county. (It is my understanding that one must live within a certain range from the switching stations or whatever they are called to be able to get the DSL service.....)

--
Ryan, KC8PMX

"Symbolism is for the simple minded....."

<BIG--AL> wrote in message news:vo2fqbr58nap20@corp.supernews.com...
> I must say that I have to praise the FCC for its efforts in looking into
> other alternatives for broadband access in Rural America. However, I
> disagree with the idea that more spectrum is needed to facilitate this
> daunting task.
>
> 73
>
> Frank K3EKO
>
>

529. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-07 05:07:30 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <REMOVETHISkc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <blue4k$gfm14$6@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 80013

I definitely am not an expert in any way, shape or form about this whole BPL thing, but to me logic would dictate that if these BPL lines are going to be emanating a ton of intereference, would they not also be prone to interference coming in???

Seems to me that would create problems with connections and the quality of transfer rates.

--
Ryan, KC8PMX

"Symbolism is for the simple minded....."

> > For one thing, if and when BPL comes to your area, don't subscribe
> > to it!
>
> I have to believe that it would be the biggest dog of a service ever
> invented! I suspect in the real world, it might work about as good as a
> 56K modem... maybe.
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -
>

530. Re: Isnt it Funny (No-Code HF Privileges)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-07 06:43:25 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <hgtgb.1120$mQ2.744@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 80002

"Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote:
>
> > - Power far in excess of legal limit
>
> Heck, I wouldn't know if that was taking place without
> the right test equipment I suppose. (snip)

The more outragious offenders almost always stand out, Kim. For example, if one signal in a area is much stronger than the other signals in that area, that person is very likely using illegal equipment. Plus, those running illegal equipment often give themselves away by doing other modifications to their radios (for example, an overmodulated radio is a sure sign the radio was modified). If you know the person's location, and the antenna used, the simple signal strength meter on most radios can be used for a rough guage. It's simply a matter of knowing what a CB would normally do under those conditions, compared to what that equipment is doing. Of course, none of this is proof enough for the FCC, but all are good informal methods (suggesting more formal tests need to be done).

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

531. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-07 09:46:26 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <blu2qb$f31@library2.airnews.net>
Source record: 80004

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:OVngb.36214$qj6.2287069@news1.news.adelphia.net...
> Kim W5TIT wrote:
>
> > "Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
> > news:3F81D18D.1080205@psu.edu...
> >
> >>Dan/W4NTI wrote:
> >>
> >>
> >>>I've never thought of it that way Larry, but your 100% correct. Just
> >
> > look
> >
> >>at Kim.
> >>
> >>Speaking of.. I wonder if she's run off again? Her last couple of posts
> >>didn't present her in a very good mood.
> >>
> >>I mean plenty of people think I'm dumm, but I'm hardly ever called
> >>dispicable! 8^)
> >>
> >>I think there may be a pattern here!
> >>
> >
> >
> > Did I misspell despicable?
>
> Okay by my spell checker!
>
> <snippage>
>
>
> > Oh, and I have to ask just to see what your answer is: what "pattern"
are
> > you stretching for?
>
> Since I've been here, You have gotten really angry (bored?) with
> someone and quit posting for a while. Then you've returned and started
> posting again.
>
> Nothing sinister here.
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -

>

So, you're so into this medium that you're of the belief you can translate actions into behavioral observations? Eh? I just ain't into the medium, Mike. I have gotten "really" angry, eh?

You probably need to get away from your keyboard for a while, Mike.

Kim W5TIT

532. Re: Vote for WX6RST

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-07 09:50:25 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <blu2qc$f31@library2.airnews.net>
Source record: 80003
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

"K�HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:fergb.1075$mQ2.835@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote:
>
> > Gosh, I thought ham radio was supposed to be such
> > an added bonus to the "resume." I don't see a word of it mentioned.
>
> Huh???? Why would an avocation like amateur radio be mentioned when
> running for public office?
>
> I can imagine that such a mention would make sense if he was a candidate
for
> a job as an engineer or technician at an electronics or communications
> oriented business, but as a governor?????? Did K7UGA campaign literature
> mention that he was a ham when he was the Republican candidate for
President
> of the US?
>
> ��� 73, de Hans, K0HB
> --
> Help support youth involved in Amateur Radio.
> http://www.mnyarc.org
> http://www.k0bsa.org
>
>

Hey, I find it interesting that none of those who've touted the "skills" of ham radio as applicable to goals in life, are even responding to this. I was "echoing" their belief system.

Kim W5TIT

533. Re: GOOD NEWS-------France heat wave deaths top 14,000

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-07 10:55:28 UTC
From: Clint <"rattlehead at computron dot net">
Message-ID: <vo56uln1ktjs1d@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 80005
Cross-posted to: alt.ham-radio.hf,alt.ham-radio.ssb,alt.radio.amateur,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

ah, another anti-american socialist apologist.

Clint

"Walt Davidson" <g3nyy@despammed.com> wrote in message
news:7eu4ov8hqhc21sq9p6iqk0kirvqh45j4bv@4ax.com...

>
> Just like a child when someone steals his rattle ... he lashes out at
> anyone.
>
> --
> Walt Davidson Email: g3nyy @despammed.com
--

The first amendment was meant to protect individual citizen's
rights to free speech from being hindered or banned by the
government. Did anybody else notice that it was 3 candidates
for president of the democratic party that called for Rush
Limbaugh's firing for what he said?

--

534. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-07 11:40:04 UTC
From: Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com>
Message-ID: <20031007074004.615$uG@newsreader.com>
Source record: 80006
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.dogie.is.an.idiot

wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) wrote:
> >ah, hm.. and I thought you didn't care about the CW testing issue
> >anymore.
>
> I dont but your just to Dumped Down to see the TREND.
>
Could the trend also be called progress?

Will it matter after BPL?

--
http://NewsReader.Com/
50 GB/Month

535. Re: Vote for WX6RST

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-07 12:07:13 UTC
From: "S. Hanrahan" <aa7ya@hotmail.com>
Message-ID: <aka5ovsr143v5jgprfh8nm6p0k4hmlr71s@4ax.com>
Source record: 80007
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

On 7 Oct 2003 00:10:40 GMT, Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com>
wrote:
>
>
>Aw, Chee.... Jim just blew 3 grand on the filing fee. that woulda
>financed a new hamshack!

Yeah, no kiddin.

Stacey/AA7YA

536. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-07 12:37:48 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031007083748.27794.00000436@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 80008

>Could the trend also be called progress?

No its not progress, a better term is Dumbing Down

>Will it matter after BPL?

No it will be the just REWARDS for the No-Coders.

537. Re: Some thoughtful comments from another forum on the code/nocode debate

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-07 13:17:50 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <22zgb.195$_i.12920@nnrp1.ptd.net>
Source record: 80009

"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
news:c2356669.0309300812.210385ba@posting.google.com...
> "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
news:<5D4eb.8338$yp6.228429@nnrp1.ptd.net>...
> > "N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
> > news:c2356669.0309291302.64d8c737@posting.google.com...
> > > groupk0hb@earthlink.net (Hans K0HB) wrote in message
> > news:<5ee63311.0309281048.70c4e1cb@posting.google.com>...
> > > > "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote
> > > >
> >
> > The point is that licensing should be based on one's demonstration
> > of the required qualifications, no more, no less.
>
> That's your point, Carl, not my point.

OK ... but it's still my (valid) point.

> The original story told how, back in 1978, the whole class of CG folks
> went down to FCC and became Extras, while today none of them did.
>
> My point was simply that there are significant differences between the
> 1978 and 2003 situations, such as:
>
> - the 1978 class was 'required' to take the test, and means provided
> to do so (do you think they went on their own time? used their own
> transportation? paid any fees?).
>
> - the 1978 class had already learned all they needed to know to pass
> the 1978 tests.
> >
> > If someone already has the knowledge to pass the tests, fine.
>
> You can't change that situation anyway.

Agreed ... but I reitterate "If someone already has the knowledge to
pass the tests, fine."

>
> > There is no "value added" in "making them work for it"
>
> Who said there was?

LOTS of folks here have promoted the "everyone should have
to WORK for their license "to prove their dedication, etc.""
(I'm not saying YOU said that, but lots of folks have voiced
that view ...)

> The point is that the 1978 class had a completely
> different situation from the 2003 class.
>
> > ... if
> > they have the knowledge they are qualified, period.
>
> So would you agree with Kim that anyone who can pass the required
> tests should be allowed into the ARS?

Yes, unless they have some other disqualifying factor that would
render them unsuitable to be an FCC licensee (past history of
violations, etc.), but that's the FCC's call ...

> >(and likely
> > they worked for it or they wouldn't have the knowledge anyway,
> > so the logic of "making them work (more)" fails)
>
> It is a fact of human nature that most people value a thing more if it
> took some investment of themselves to acquire.

Maybe so, but it's not the FCC's business to determine how much
someone "values" a ham license ... only to determine if they meet
the minimum qualifications established. Besides, just because someone
did the work of learning BEFORE they decided to become a ham
doesn't mean they didn't still "do the work." Why should that (previously
accomplished) work be "devalued" as some suggest???

73,
Carl - wk3c

538. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-07 13:41:29 UTC
From: Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns940D6290211EAelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 80014

```
Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com> wrote in
news:bltdg4$jnt$0@208.207.71.173:

> Alun Palmer wrote:
>
>> Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com> wrote in
>> news:blsqn6$c8a$0@208.207.71.142:
>>
>>
>>>Alun Palmer wrote:
>>>
>>>>Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com> wrote in
>>>>news:blru10$hhu$0@208.207.71.163:
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>>"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
>>>>>>news:6u4gb.35703$qj6.2003327@news1.news.adelphia.net...
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>And what I'm thinking is that unless it means something again,
>>>>>>>they might as well get rid of it. That little sliver of operating
>>>>>>>frequencies is not worth it, if increased privileges are the
>>>>>>>measuring stick.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>- Mike KB3EIA -
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>Actually, the differences in privs from General to Extra are
>>>>>>substantial. With the FCC no longer issuing Advanced licenses, the
>>>>>>only way to gain access to the "Advanced sub-bands" is to upgrade
>>>>>>to Extra.
>>>>>>
>>>>>>I'd say that's a pretty good incentive.
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>Well, one certainly can't say there's any substantial difficulty
```

>>>>>involved!
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>I think you're wrong about that Dick. As an EE, I wouldn't find it
>>>>difficult, but I know plenty of Generals, and Techs for that matter,
>>>>for whom the Extra class theory is seen as something very tough. Not
>>>>everyone can be one of the intelligentsia!
>>>
>>>
>>> Of course that presumes that they would *need* to be one of the
>>>intelligentsia, which is definitely not the case.
>>>
>>>
>>
>>
>> True, but if the Extra written were not a significant barrier, then
>> everyone would have passed it.
>
>
> Why should that be? There are a great many of Tech Plus licensees
> who don't bother to upgrade to General. It's just too much trouble,
> or there is too little interest in the added benefits.

There are significant numbers of Techs, including some old Tech Plusses, who have no interest in anything below 30 MHz, so of course they don't upgrade.

However, I know some Generals who are just not very clever academically, including one guy who I think is on the DXCC Honor Roll. You can bet that if he found the Extra class theory easy he would have done it. It's quite an acheivement to work that many countries when you are restricted to the General sub-bands. FWIW, I don't even have my basic DXCC.

> As an Extra of nearly 35 years, and as one who administered VE
> excams
> for the first 8 years of the present testing system, I am quite sure
> that the current Extra exam is a significant barrier only in the minds
> of those who haven't really faced a barrier.
>

Well, I've 'only' been licenced for 23 years, and I've only been an Extra for 10. I'm also a VE, but I'm not sure that I have much idea how much effort the students put in just from administering tests to them. I don't even know most of them.

However, I get the impression that element 4 is hard for someone of average IQ, and maybe even too hard for some hams who didn't do so well in school. Of course that view doen't fit if you have a religeous beleief that only the CW test keeps out the unwashed masses, HI!

In fact the CW test kept me out for a long while, and kept me off HF for longer still, whereas I passed elements 3B and 4A without studying for even a single minute when I went in to take the Tech (they didn't have a spare 4B paper for me to do, so I took that later and did study somewhat).

Different people have different apptitudes for different things. It took me a couple of dacades to master the code (well, I mean pass the 20 wpm test, I never really became good at it), and hypothetically a garbage collector with a 50 IQ might take as long to pass the Extra written, or never be able to.

Actually, it's not that hypothetical. I taught a ham radio class once, back in the UK. I only had one of my ten students fail the theory, and he _was_ a garbage collector. He was very keen, and worked very hard, but he just wasn't very clever.

>
> It is certainly more of a barrier than 5
>> wpm for most non-EEs. Most of the mathematically based questions were
>> in old element 4A, and so are now in element 4 (or, I should say, back
>> in element 4).
>>
>> OTOH, there is not much difference between Tech and General written.
>> My bet is that when the code test is abolished the Tech licence will
>> atrophy, but this will boost the General licence, with not much
>> increase in Extras. Perhaps we should have a two class system, with
>> only Generals and Extras?
>
>
> You view the situation as an EE who didn't need to study to work out
> any of the technical problems on the Extra exam, few that there were.
> Most applicants have the singleminded goal of passing the exam, and
> learning beyond that goal is not only unnecessary, it gets in the way
> of the goal at hand. So they naturally just don't do it. The curent
> method of testing clearly facilitates that position.
>
> Some of them later find the interest to involve themselves in further
> study and learning. I think it clear enough that there isn't much of
> that demanded, and the knowledge level displayed by so many advanced
> level licensees clearly demonstrates that a great many hams get the
> license for the sole purpose of operating and advancing their technical
> skills and knowledge is far down the scale of what is important to
> them. Ub= nfortunately today that includes Extra class licensees.
> Again, the current testing system clearly makes that possible. Before
> the advent of VE testing, it did not.
>
> Dick
>

You may be right on that score. It is possible to study only superficially and pass a multiple guess test. Don't hold your breath if you want written answers back, though. We both know it isn't going to happen.

73 de Alun, N3KIP

539. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-07 14:29:33 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <h5Agb.2700$Eo2.1917@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 80015

"Alun Palmer" <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:Xns940CEA03FE4CEelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
> Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com> wrote in
> news:blsqn6$c8a$0@208.207.71.142:
>
> > Alun Palmer wrote:
> >> Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com> wrote in
> >> news:blru10hhu0@208.207.71.163:
> >>
> >>
> >>>Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
> >>>
> >>>>"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
> >>>>news:6u4gb.35703$qj6.2003327@news1.news.adelphia.net...
> >>>>
> >>>>
> >>>>>And what I'm thinking is that unless it means something again, they
> >>>>>might as well get rid of it. That little sliver of operating
> >>>>>frequencies is not worth it, if increased privileges are the
> >>>>>measuring stick.
> >>>>>
> >>>>>- Mike KB3EIA -
> >>>>>
> >>>>
> >>>>
> >>>>Actually, the differences in privs from General to Extra are
> >>>>substantial. With the FCC no longer issuing Advanced licenses, the
> >>>>only way to gain access to the "Advanced sub-bands" is to upgrade to
> >>>>Extra.
> >>>>
> >>>>I'd say that's a pretty good incentive.
> >>>>
> >>>>
> >>>
> >>>
> >>>Well, one certainly can't say there's any substantial difficulty
> >>>involved!
> >>>
> >>>
> >>
> >>
> >> I think you're wrong about that Dick. As an EE, I wouldn't find it
> >> difficult, but I know plenty of Generals, and Techs for that matter,
> >> for whom the Extra class theory is seen as something very tough. Not

> >> everyone can be one of the intelligentsia!
> >
> >
> > Of course that presumes that they would *need* to be one of the
> > intelligentsia, which is definitely not the case.
> >
> >
>
> True, but if the Extra written were not a significant barrier, then
> everyone would have passed it. It is certainly more of a barrier than 5
> wpm for most non-EEs. Most of the mathematically based questions were in
> old element 4A, and so are now in element 4 (or, I should say, back in
> element 4).
>
> OTOH, there is not much difference between Tech and General written. My
> bet is that when the code test is abolished the Tech licence will atrophy,
> but this will boost the General licence, with not much increase in Extras.
> Perhaps we should have a two class system, with only Generals and Extras?

Dang....a two tier license structure not mandated by the government? Heaven forbid...hi.

Dan/W4NTI

540. Re: Vote for WX6RST

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-07 14:42:19 UTC
From: groupk0hb@earthlink.net
Message-ID: <5ee63311.0310070642.162acf52@posting.google.com>
Source record: 80016
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

"Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote

>
> Hey, I find it interesting that none of those who've touted the "skills" of
> ham radio as applicable to goals in life, are even responding to this. I
> was "echoing" their belief system.
>

Naw Kim, you were just trolling, and not very expertly. Nobody even
bothered to light off the Troll-O-Meter to take a reading.

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

541. Re: Isnt it Funny (No-Code HF Privileges)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-07 14:46:07 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <PkAgb.2727$Eo2.93@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 80017

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:blt3vltjm0@208.207.71.173...
> Clint wrote:
>
> > "Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
> > news:20031006162751.25517.00001185@mb-m15.aol.com...
> > >
> > >
> > >
> > >>>Now you can get all upset and indignant, Len old boy, but the facts
> > >>>are the facts.
> > >>
> > >> Noooooo...those are just your OPINIONS. :-)
> > >>
> > >
> > >
> > > Not only that, consider the source... you're dealing with another PCTA
> > > type that didn't receive his or her fair share of grey matter such that
> > > self-determination isn't possible... it's just "bleat like the rest of
the
> > > sheep"
> > >
> > > "CW test good.... modernization bad.....
> > > CW test good.... mdernization bad...."
> > >
> > > Clint
> > >
>
>
> One could compare rattlehead with Forrest Gump except that
> Forrest was a not so bright fellow who did have some common sense...
>
I've noticed that folks that are a bit 'slow' are good at common sense.
Rattlehead is the exception that proves the rule.

Dan/W4NTI

542. Re: Vote for WX6RST

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-07 14:55:18 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <qtAgb.2729$Eo2.551@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 80018
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

"Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:blu2qc$f31@library2.airnews.net...
> "K�HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:fergb.1075$mQ2.835@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> > "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote:
> >
> > > Gosh, I thought ham radio was supposed to be such
> > > an added bonus to the "resume." I don't see a word of it mentioned.
> >
> > Huh???? Why would an avocation like amateur radio be mentioned when
> > running for public office?
> >
> > I can imagine that such a mention would make sense if he was a candidate
> for
> > a job as an engineer or technician at an electronics or communications
> > oriented business, but as a governor?????? Did K7UGA campaign
literature
> > mention that he was a ham when he was the Republican candidate for
> President
> > of the US?
> >
> > ��� 73, de Hans, K0HB
> > --
> > Help support youth involved in Amateur Radio.
> > http://www.mnyarc.org
> > http://www.k0bsa.org
> >
> >
>
> Hey, I find it interesting that none of those who've touted the "skills"
of
> ham radio as applicable to goals in life, are even responding to this. I
> was "echoing" their belief system.
>
> Kim W5TIT
>
>

Translation; Twit was trying to make a 'funny' and fell on her tit.

Dan/W4NTI

543. Re: Some thoughtful comments from another forum on the code/nocode debate

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-07 15:10:23 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <blul0vdbc0@208.207.71.138>
Source record: 80019

Carl R. Stevenson wrote:

> Maybe so, but it's not the FCC's business to determine how much
> someone "values" a ham license ... only to determine if they meet
> the minimum qualifications established. Besides, just because someone
> did the work of learning BEFORE they decided to become a ham
> doesn't mean they didn't still "do the work." Why should that (previously
> accomplished) work be "devalued" as some suggest???
>

WHERE do you come up with some of this stuff???

544. Re: Vote for WX6RST

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-07 15:23:25 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <blulpd$eg4$0@208.207.71.138>
Source record: 80020
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

Dan/W4NTI wrote:

> "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> news:blu2qc$f31@library2.airnews.net...
>
>>"Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
>>news:fergb.1075$mQ2.835@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
>>
>>>"Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote:
>>>
>>>
>>>>Gosh, I thought ham radio was supposed to be such
>>>>an added bonus to the "resume." I don't see a word of it mentioned.
>>>
>>>Huh???? Why would an avocation like amateur radio be mentioned when
>>>running for public office?
>>>
>>>I can imagine that such a mention would make sense if he was a candidate
>>
>>for
>>
>>>a job as an engineer or technician at an electronics or communications
>>>oriented business, but as a governor?????? Did K7UGA campaign
>
> literature
>
>>>mention that he was a ham when he was the Republican candidate for
>>
>>President
>>
>>>of the US?
>>>
>>>ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½ 73, de Hans, K0HB
>>>--
>>> Help support youth involved in Amateur Radio.
>>> http://www.mnyarc.org
>>> http://www.k0bsa.org
>>>
>>>
>>
>>Hey, I find it interesting that none of those who've touted the "skills"
>
> of

>
>>ham radio as applicable to goals in life, are even responding to this. I
>>was "echoing" their belief system.
>>
>>Kim W5TIT
>>
>>
>
>
> Translation; Twit was trying to make a 'funny' and fell on her tit.
>
> Dan/W4NTI
>
>

No, she was just being chracteristically snide. But that fell FLAT, too.

545. YASME makes her final port 'o call

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-07 15:42:21 UTC
From: groupk0hb@earthlink.net
Message-ID: <5ee63311.0310070742.4d890ded@posting.google.com>
Source record: 80021
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

VP2VB, Danny Weil, has gone on his last DX-pedition. He died Oct 3, 2003 in San Antonio. His obit is copied below.

Fair winds and following seas, old friend.

73, de Hans, K0HB/KG6AQI

Danny Weil of San Antonio, TX was born January 14, 1918 in a suburb of London England. He was descended from many generations of watchmakers and was apprenticed in the trade of watchmaking. Later he earned a Degree in Mechanical Engineering and Navigation. His father, Jack Weil, was killed during World War II in the London Blitz.

Danny joined the Royal Air Force at the age of 17 and in the 10 years he served, he was stationed in Ceylon, India, Norway and Stalingrad. Danny left England in 1954 in a boat he made by himself in order to travel the world alone after being inspired when he read the book "Kon Tiki" in 1947. In 1963, after 9 years, 3 boats and travels to the Atlantic, the Carribean and the Pacific Islands,

Danny completed his around the world voyage. Needing a means of communication, he taught himself Morse Code, radio theory and obtained a British Amateur radio license. Sailing single handedly around the world was a trip he volunteered to undertake on behalf of radio "hams". His voyage was integral in setting up ham radio stations on remote islands and the expedition was monitored by over 100, 000 amateur radio enthusiasts around the world. He is remembered by most "hams" as "the first DXpeditioner."

Danny was known as an adventurer who had a dry sense of humor which was characteristic to the British but his heart was warm and his loyalty as a friend was unparalleled. He was preceded in death by his wife Naomi Weil and his mother Christine Eckels.

Danny is survived by his close knit extended family of friends, Dan & Barbara Mclhany of Fair Oaks; Bonnie & Billy Henderson of San Antonio and all of the employees at Towne North Animal Hospital.

546. Re: Query Your ARRL & Political Candidates!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-07 16:18:16 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0310070818.5ff0178@posting.google.com>
Source record: 80022

"Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in message
news:<mVUfb.39534$E95.18443314@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>...
> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20031005082931.23307.00003516@mb-m29.aol.com...
> > In article <SLKfb.8938$yp6.285150@nnrp1.ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
> > <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:
> >
> > > What
> > >money are you talking about? (If you say "the manufacturers" that's
> > >baloney.
> > >I haven't seen a SINGLE comment filed on the current round of petitions
> by
> > >any manufacturer ...)
> > >
> > All that's really happened so far in the "current round" is a flurry of
> > petitions. There are more in process that don't have RM numbers yet.
> >
> > Back during the restructuring NPRM, there were comments from
> manufacturers.

But not when mere proposals and petitions were flying about.

And let's be up-front about it - manufacturers are part of the amateur
radio community, and have a vested interest. If a rules change has an
effect on Kenwood's sales, why shouldn't they comment?

That doesn't mean their comments will necessarily always be in the
best interest of the ARS.

> > In fact, the most-often-quoted-by-FCC commenter in the R&O to 98-143
> > wasn't ARRL or NCI or NCVEC or some individual radio amateur.
> >
> > It was Kenwood.
>
> I wonder if any folks let them know that they would NOT be purchasing
> Kenwood products because of this? I've always been a big proponent of
> leveraging one's monetary muscle.

Good idea! But considering that I've never owned a non-USA made piece
of hamgear, I doubt it would mean much to them coming from me.

In fact, I'm probably the exact type of ham that Ikensu wants to go
away. In 36 years as a ham, I've bought exactly two major pieces of
ham radio equipment (transceivers). Both were kits. Both were from
American companies. All the rest has been used stuff, military surplus
("and they shall beat their swords into plowshares, and never make war

any more") and good ol' homebrew. A few rrap regulars have heard and
worked said homebrew.
>
> BTW, has anybody sent their respective ARRL candidates an e-mail re. their
> stance on the code?

More than one.

> I'm getting campaign flyers in the mail, seems like the
> right opportunity. Same with our regular elected representatives. Drop 'em a
> note and make 'em, at least, question the FCC. Remember how the vanity call
> system came about.

I dunno if bugging congresscritters will do much good. But the ARRL
directors really do want to know, because it means they have backing
whichever way they decide.

73 de Jim, N2EY

547. Re: Bootlegging in 1948?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-07 16:52:13 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0310070852.26b87250@posting.google.com>
Source record: 80023

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20031006162750.25517.00001184@mb-m15.aol.com>...
> In article <20031006053758.00545.00001412@mb-m02.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
> writes:
>
> >"lenanderson@mogur.com" wasn't you?
>
> Why do you ask?

Because you told us that you hadn't used any other screen names "in
here" besides that long list of AOL ones.

> I haven't been able to use Mog-Ur's EMS BBS in
> years...

7, to be exact.

> Tom closed it down after being one of the first 10 BBSs in
> the USA. He had Internet access for about a year until it got too
> expensive and subscribers left to go directly on the Internet.
>
> Tom Tcimpdis (easy Greek surname, just pronounce it like it is written),
> KC6MLR, television video director, twice won Emmys for outstanding
> technical direction ("Night Court" series, "Sinatra, the Man and His
> Music" special). Built his own BBS to start with years and years ago
> from a Heath H8 microcomputer, had to write his own software to get
> it going as a Bulletin Board System. Had a fairly good side business
> of custom personal computer systems, may still do that. Private pilot,
> multi-engine rated, a road rally sportsman from way back. You can see
> his picture on QRZ.com...:-) Quaffed a few with Tom at the 94th
> Aerosquadron Restaurant at Van Nuys Airport, a regular hang-out for
> several San Fernando Valley BBS members of the 80s and 90s.

Is there a point to all this besides your trying to avoid the fact
that you forgot yet another screen name you used in rrap?
>
> "Mog-Ur" is a character name taken from the novel "Clan of the Cave
> Bear."

Actually, it's a title. The character's name is Creb. "The Mog-Ur" is
a title/function he performed in the Clan.

> "EMS" is an acronym for Electronic Message System, in use
> in computer-modem communications before EMS for Emergency
> Medical Service became standards.. "Mog-Ur's" survives on the Internet
> today after more than 20 years of existance.

Is there *any* relevance to all your verbiage? Someone asks you the
time, and you give them directions to Boulder and a long diatribe on
the development of the various atomic standards there.
>
> >> My real name and current mailing address is the same as it appeared
> >> many times as bylines in Ham Radio Magazine.
> >>
> >How is anyone to know that when reading your newsgroup posts?
>
> Do you need ELECTRONIC SIGNATURES, authenticated by some
> federal agency?!?!?
>
> Go look in the FCC ECFS...under all the RMs from 10781 through 10787
> and FCC 03-104. The listings have my postal address and my AOL
> address.

Doesn't answer the question.

How is anyone who reads a post by

"len.anderson@mogur.com"
"nocwtest@aol.com"
"averyfine@aol.com"
"averyfineman@aol.com"
"lenof21@aol.com"
or
"lenover21@aol.com"

supposed to know that all of them are one and the same person - if,
indeed, they are? Particularly when your name does not appear anywhere
in many of them?

Why should they believe you when you say you have not posted by other
names, when it has been shown that your list of screen names left out
at least two that you have used?

> >Those articles
> >are well over a decade old, and "ham radio" (no caps in their logo) magazine
> >hasn't published a new issue for years.
>
> Tsk, tsk, tsk. HAM RADIO Magazine,

There are no capital letters in the logo printed on the magazine
covers. They did the e.e.cummings thing. "ham radio" is the name of
the mag, not "HAM RADIO".

Just look at the cover.

> an independent amateur radio
> interest periodical (50,000 issues a month) lasted for TWENTY TWO
> YEARS solely on the basis of advertising space sales.

That's not correct.

The magazine subscriptions cost money, so they did not exist "solely
on the basis of advertising space sales" If the subscription/newstand
price was $20 per year and there were 50,000 subscribers/newstand
buyers per month, that's a *million dollars* of revenue from
subscriptions. Back when $1,000,000 was a lot of money.

Existed ""solely on the basis of advertising space sales"? I think
not! Were that true, the subscriptions would have been free. Like most
industry magazines.

Also, I seriously doubt that the mag was 50,000 copies/month for the
entire 22 years.

> Publisher
> Skip Tenney finally sold it to CQ Communications and probably retired.
> Founding Editor in Chief Jim Fisk (SK, ex-W1HR) wasn't around to help
> keep up the interest of the readers of a technically-oriented magazine.

IOW, it ultimately failed in the marketplace. Too bad - it was a good
mag in its time.

Why do you live in the past so much?
>
> Both CQ and ARRL sell a three-CD set of all 22 years of HR for $150
> (shipping extra, always an extra with ARRL). Lots of good technical
> information in there.

The newest of which is well over a decade old. Many of the parts used
in the projects are now made of unobtanium.

A complete set of QST is also available on CD. Every issue, all the
way back to December 1915. Almost four times as long as "ham radio"

QST is still being published - the oldest still-published radio
magazine in the world.

I've written for QST.

You haven't.

> >Why should anyone believe your calims when you can't even remember your screen
> >names? Someone who posts as much as you do would ordinarily remember such
> things.
>
> Ah, being the NEWSGROUP KOP!

Just asking a question. And pointing out your mistakes.

btw, it's spelled "cop".

> Well, then Mister Kop, why don't you just make yourself Emperor of the
> newsgroup and RESTRICT ACCESS only to those whom YOU APPROVE.
> Until that happens, THIS newsgroup is still open to the public.

Is there a rule against asking questions? Or pointing out when
someone's statements are demonstrably mistaken?

>
> I've been doing computer-modem communications since 1984, 19 years
> in all...as a subscriber, as a Sysop, as a co-Sysop, and as a public
> forum moderator.

But you're not the moderator here.

> I'm NOT going to remember everything anymore than
> you can over nearly a two decade span of time...

Nobody expects you to remember everyhting. That's what Google is for.

We do expect, however, that you behave in a civil manner and not be so
nasty when something you write is proven to be a mistake.

> AND THERE IS NO
> DAMN REASON TO REMEMBER EVERY PICKY LITTLE DETAIL TO
> SOOTHE YOUR IMAGINED PERSONAL HURT.

Tsk, tsk, tsk. Poor angry baby! ;-)

No "hurt" on my part at all, Len. You're the one who is shouting and
carrying on. I'm just asking simple, direct questions. And pointing
out a few mistakes.

> I have this nice card punch at the ready. Just hand me your "TS card"
> and I will punch it for you...:-)

Sounds like another threat. Can you not resolve differences peaceably?

You may imagine yourself as a modern Jondalar or Creb, but you come
off like Broud and Attaroa.

Would Doni approve? I think not.

Gotta go! 'Ayla' just gave me "the signal"!!!

548. Re: Isnt it Funny (No-Code HF Privileges)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-07 16:55:58 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0310070855.18918b0b@posting.google.com>
Source record: 80024

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:<hgtgb.1120$mQ2.744@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> "Kim " <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote:
> >
> > > - Power far in excess of legal limit
> >
> > Heck, I wouldn't know if that was taking place without
> > the right test equipment I suppose. (snip)
>
>
> The more outragious offenders almost always stand out, Kim. For example,
> if one signal in a area is much stronger than the other signals in that
> area, that person is very likely using illegal equipment. Plus, those
> running illegal equipment often give themselves away by doing other
> modifications to their radios (for example, an overmodulated radio is a sure
> sign the radio was modified). If you know the person's location, and the
> antenna used, the simple signal strength meter on most radios can be used
> for a rough guage. It's simply a matter of knowing what a CB would normally
> do under those conditions, compared to what that equipment is doing. Of
> course, none of this is proof enough for the FCC, but all are good informal
> methods (suggesting more formal tests need to be done).

Or when the person says "gee, guess Ah bettah turn on the afterburner"
and the signal jumps up 20 dB.....

Shall we resurrect the "47 kW mobile" thread?

73 de Jim, N2EY

549. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-07 17:20:24 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <sBCgb.71916$qj6.2452803@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 80025

N2EY wrote:
> In article <3F81CD08.2040600@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:
>
>
>>Ryan, KC8PMX wrote:
>>
>>>>(sarcasm mode on)
>>>>
>>>Since the entire public is completely aware of amateur radio, therefore
>>
>>they
>>
>>>>all are waiting for the code test to drop, then we should have huge growth
>>>eh???
>>>>
>>>(sarcasm mode off)
>>
>>
>> Is the reason for low growth that people don't know about the ARS?
>
>
> I'd say it's #1.
>
>> I'd postulate that anyone that has any interest will pretty quickly
>>find out about us. have internet access, you'll find us. Read a
>>newspaper, and there are several articles a year about the ARS.
>
>
> Several articles a year out of how many thousand?
>
> Folks hafta know where to look.

All I an say here is a related story. When I was the president of a youth Ice Hockey association, to recruit new players, we took out ads in the local newspapers, we took out ads on television, we posted ads on the bulletin boards in most of the schools in our county, and We posted flyers, professionally made by the Pittsburgh Penguins. association.

Then along comes a prospective player who's father gives me a dressing down in the board meeting on how our association just can't survive doing the poor job we do advertising. I listened patiently while he said we should advertise in the local newspapers, on television, in the schools, and in the Ice Rink.

I asked him how he found out about us, and he told me he saw the ad on
tv, and then in the rink. Go figure.

My point is that if prospective amateurs or skaters don't want to get
involved, there's no way we can stop them.

I don't think the ARS is an impulse hobby,the prospect has to want to
do it, and then has to look. Considering the small number of people that
even want to be a ham, a mass advertisement approach would be kind of
like spam.

> Remember the movie "Contact"? Great opening scenes. But nowhere do they mention
> that what's going on is amateur radio!
>
> btw - the Vibroplex shown in that film is the very model and vintage I have
> used since 1974.
>
>> I'd also bet that there really aren't that many people who are really
>>that interested in radio. That's okay. I don't pick my hobbies on their
>>popularity. I pick them because I like to do them.
>>
>
> Radio "for its own sake" has always been a niche avocation. I went to a
> highschool (class of 1972) that had 2400 boys and a heavy academic emphasis on
> math and science. In my senior year there were exactly six licensed hams there.
> Of those six, three remained active long after high school. Now we are two,
> with the untimely passing of WA3RVT some years ago.
>
> More publicity can't hurt. But amateur radio isn't a spectator sport - for
> most, anyway.
>
> --
>
> There was a great article some years back which I will now paraphrase.
>
> The author whose name escapes me now said that there were three basic kinds of
> hams - operators, communicators, and tinkerers. Or words to that effect.
>
> Operators simply like to get on the air and make contacts. It's the medium more
> than the message, the skill as much as the results.
>
> Communicators are there for the message. Radio is the tool to get the job done,
> that's all.
>
> Tinkerers are into the technology of radio, the projects, etc.

Yay! Tinkering for me! Well I do like to contest too.....

- Mike KB3EIA -

550. Re: Vote for WX6RST

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-07 17:35:56 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bluths$2qd$0@208.207.71.138>
Source record: 80026
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

Kï¿½HB wrote:
> "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote:
>
>
>>Gosh, I thought ham radio was supposed to be such
>>an added bonus to the "resume." I don't see a word of it mentioned.
>
>
> Huh???? Why would an avocation like amateur radio be mentioned when
> running for public office?
>
> I can imagine that such a mention would make sense if he was a candidate for
> a job as an engineer or technician at an electronics or communications
> oriented business, but as a governor?????? Did K7UGA campaign literature
> mention that he was a ham when he was the Republican candidate for President
> of the US?
>

You *really* expect she'll know who K7UGA was?

551. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-07 17:42:28 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <8WCgb.72165$qj6.2455719@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 80027

Ryan, KC8PMX wrote:

> I definitely am not an expert in any way, shape or form about this whole BPL
> thing, but to me logic would dictate that if these BPL lines are going to be
> emanating a ton of intereference, would they not also be prone to
> interference coming in???
>
> Seems to me that would create problems with connections and the quality of
> transfer rates.

Yes it would. The likely result would be a lot more error correction,
slowing the system down. Rumor has it the Power companies plan on suing
God for the lightning interference. 8^)

- Mike KB3EIA -

552. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-07 17:44:34 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <6YCgb.72242$qj6.2456272@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 80028

Dick Carroll wrote:

> Mike Coslo wrote:
>
>> Kim W5TIT wrote:
>>
>>> "Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
>>> news:3F81D18D.1080205@psu.edu...
>>>
>>>> Dan/W4NTI wrote:
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>> I've never thought of it that way Larry, but your 100% correct. Just
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>> look
>>>
>>>> at Kim.
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>
>>>> Speaking of.. I wonder if she's run off again? Her last couple of posts
>>>> didn't present her in a very good mood.
>>>>
>>>> I mean plenty of people think I'm dumm, but I'm hardly ever called
>>>> dispicable! 8^)
>>>>
>>>> I think there may be a pattern here!
>>>>
>>>
>>>
>>> Did I misspell despicable?
>>
>>
>>
>
>
>
> Daffy Duck said it best!
>
Sylvester the Cat could do a pretty good "Deeee-shpick-ubble" too!

- Mike KB3EIA -

553. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-07 18:00:21 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@nope.org>
Message-ID: <ejv5ov4nk75anadefpaqtf86e08ovml226@4ax.com>
Source record: 80029

On Tue, 07 Oct 2003 17:20:24 GMT, Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
wrote:

> My point is that if prospective amateurs or skaters don't want to get
>involved, there's no way we can stop them.

Hey, Mike - that sounds like a Yogi Berra-ism! <8*p

" If the people don't want to come out to the ballpark, nobody's going
to stop them "

>
> - Mike KB3EIA -

73, Leo

554. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-07 18:06:18 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bluvaq$7f7$0@208.207.71.138>
Source record: 80030

Robert Casey wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
>
>>
>>
>> You view the situation as an EE who didn't need to study to work out
>> any of the technical problems on the Extra exam, few that there were.
>> Most applicants have the singleminded goal of passing the exam, and
>> learning beyond that goal is not only unnecessary, it gets in the way
>> of the goal at hand. So they naturally just don't do it. The curent
>> method of testing clearly facilitates that position.
>
>
> I'm a EE, and like any reasonably successful college student, I still
> made use of the
> avaliable resources (the question pool) to prepare for the (at the time
> I took them)
> elements 4A and 4B. Found a few holes in my knowledge, and filled them
> in for
> at least long enough to score well on the tests (missed 1 on 4A, 2 on 4B
> IIRC).
> Got the CSCEs, and then the extra on Restructuring Day.
> Most students only study what is expected to be on the exams. Thus, I
> could
> solve calculus exam problems (take the intergral of (csc x^5)/(tan x^2
> -1) dx)
> but I still never got a good understanding of how to use calculus to
> solve a real
> world problem. Recently went looking for a "calculus for dummies" type
> book, but all they had was how to do exam problems. Been there, done that.
>

And obviously it wasn't a problemm and hasn't caused any problem, for
you and others similarly situated, nor for the ARS.

But.....how about all the Extras out there who have
successfully proceeded through the same system and emerged
with so little knowledge that they have no idea of even
how to design and build a simple *1/2* wave dipole?
With little or nothing beyond the question pools in their
libraries, many won't even know how or where to look it up.
And when(if) the day comes that won't be required to copy
ANY Morse code,one of the most used modes in ham radio,
at the most basic speed?

Understand that I'm not saying they shouldn't be hams, nor
that they shouldn't be allowed some HF access. We all start
somewhere.
But to allow them licensing into the top echelon of amateurs
is ludicrous and negates all that ham radio is supposed to stand for.

In short, it reduces the ARS to CB status.

555. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-07 18:48:04 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <ETDgb.74087$qj6.2467346@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 80031

Kim W5TIT wrote:

> So, you're so into this medium that you're of the belief you can translate
> actions into behavioral observations? Eh? I just ain't into the medium,
> Mike. I have gotten "really" angry, eh?

?

556. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-07 18:50:50 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <eWDgb.74088$qj6.2467724@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 80032

Leo wrote:

> On Tue, 07 Oct 2003 17:20:24 GMT, Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
> wrote:
>
>
>> My point is that if prospective amateurs or skaters don't want to get
>>involved, there's no way we can stop them.
>
>
> Hey, Mike - that sounds like a Yogi Berra-ism! <8*p
>
> " If the people don't want to come out to the ballpark, nobody's going
> to stop them "

You got it, Leo. There was an interview with the grand old man of baseball on NPR a week or so ago. Yogi rulez!

- Mike KB3EIA -

557. Re: Bootlegging in 1948?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-07 18:55:28 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031007145528.01893.00001064@mb-m22.aol.com>
Source record: 80033

In article <c2356669.0310070852.26b87250@posting.google.com>, N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) writes:

>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>news:<20031006162750.25517.00001184@mb-m15.aol.com>...
>> In article <20031006053758.00545.00001412@mb-m02.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com
>(N2EY)
>> writes:
>>
>> >"lenanderson@mogur.com" wasn't you?
>>
>> Why do you ask?
>
>Because you told us that you hadn't used any other screen names "in
>here" besides that long list of AOL ones.
>
>> I haven't been able to use Mog-Ur's EMS BBS in
>> years...
>
>7, to be exact.
>
>> Tom closed it down after being one of the first 10 BBSs in
>> the USA. He had Internet access for about a year until it got too
>> expensive and subscribers left to go directly on the Internet.
>>
>> Tom Tcimpdis (easy Greek surname, just pronounce it like it is written),
>> KC6MLR, television video director, twice won Emmys for outstanding
>> technical direction ("Night Court" series, "Sinatra, the Man and His
>> Music" special). Built his own BBS to start with years and years ago
>> from a Heath H8 microcomputer, had to write his own software to get
>> it going as a Bulletin Board System. Had a fairly good side business
>> of custom personal computer systems, may still do that. Private pilot,
>> multi-engine rated, a road rally sportsman from way back. You can see
>> his picture on QRZ.com...:-) Quaffed a few with Tom at the 94th
>> Aerosquadron Restaurant at Van Nuys Airport, a regular hang-out for
>> several San Fernando Valley BBS members of the 80s and 90s.
>
>Is there a point to all this besides your trying to avoid the fact
>that you forgot yet another screen name you used in rrap?

You are manufacturing a non-issue which has nothing to do
with any sort of radio subject.

>> "Mog-Ur" is a character name taken from the novel "Clan of the Cave
>> Bear."

>
>Actually, it's a title. The character's name is Creb. "The Mog-Ur" is
>a title/function he performed in the Clan.

Irrelevant. Petty literary details.

>> "EMS" is an acronym for Electronic Message System, in use
>> in computer-modem communications before EMS for Emergency
>> Medical Service became standards.. "Mog-Ur's" survives on the Internet
>> today after more than 20 years of existance.
>
>Is there *any* relevance to all your verbiage? Someone asks you the
>time, and you give them directions to Boulder and a long diatribe on
>the development of the various atomic standards there.

Tom Tcimpidis has an amateur radio license and is listed in QRZ
with his famous/infamous "at the controls of a 727" picture.

Details of NIST time-frequency activities are available from their
own web site. If you need directions to Boulder, CO, there are
several map and direction services available on the Internet.

>supposed to know that all of them are one and the same person - if,
>indeed, they are? Particularly when your name does not appear anywhere
>in many of them?

Tsk, tsk, tsk, still trying to manufacture a "dispute" based on your
personal irritation.

You are perfectly free to question AOL Member Services directly
if you are so disturbed over "identities." YOU are a subscriber
there. YOUR screen name does not identify you by legal name..

>Why should they believe you when you say you have not posted by other
>names, when it has been shown that your list of screen names left out
>at least two that you have used?

Why should anyone believe that you are real? :-)

Your manufactured "dispute" is becoming absurd.

>> an independent amateur radio
>> interest periodical (50,000 issues a month) lasted for TWENTY TWO
>> YEARS solely on the basis of advertising space sales.
>
>That's not correct.

No? :-)

>The magazine subscriptions cost money, so they did not exist "solely
>on the basis of advertising space sales" If the subscription/newstand
>price was $20 per year and there were 50,000 subscribers/newstand
>buyers per month, that's a *million dollars* of revenue from
>subscriptions. Back when $1,000,000 was a lot of money.

>
>Existed ""solely on the basis of advertising space sales"? I think
>not! Were that true, the subscriptions would have been free. Like most
>industry magazines.
>
>Also, I seriously doubt that the mag was 50,000 copies/month for the
>entire 22 years.

If you wish to demand an accounting or an investigation of Publishers' Sworn Statements, then you've gone slightly bonkers in pique. :-)

Subscription fees (periodicals usually call them "fulfillment" fees) only cover the mailing costs and distribution services' various charges. That is a "break-even" situation where the periodical has no real income.

Profit for a periodical comes from advertising space sales in all of the "independents" (those not affiliated with membership organizations). That is true for 73, CQ, Popular Communications, et al. The more ad space sold, the more the profit for the periodical's business.

There's no other profit for periodicals, not even when they run a sideline business such as HR did with their Ham Radio Bookstore. The ad space for the Bookstore could have been used by other advertisers.

QST is a membership magazine of the ARRL. As such, the amount of profit or loss from QST advertising space sales can be handled by the parent organization. QST gains slightly by having the easily-identifiable demographics of the number of members (see their page for the latest numbers).

>> Publisher
>> Skip Tenney finally sold it to CQ Communications and probably retired.
>> Founding Editor in Chief Jim Fisk (SK, ex-W1HR) wasn't around to help
>> keep up the interest of the readers of a technically-oriented magazine.
>
>IOW, it ultimately failed in the marketplace. Too bad - it was a good
>mag in its time.

Why do you say "good?" All you've done so far in this manufactured dispute is to charge a technologically-oriented amateur publication with fraud or misrepresentation.

You know little about basic organizations and budgets of periodicals yet claim some "expertise" sufficient to engage in manufactured "disputes." :-)

>A complete set of QST is also available on CD. Every issue, all the
>way back to December 1915. Almost four times as long as "ham radio"

I'm sure. ARRL was founded in 1914.

Why do YOU live in that past so much? :-)

>QST is still being published - the oldest still-published radio
>magazine in the world.

Are you absolutely CERTAIN of that? :-)

Can QST survive as an independent periodical, solely on the profit
of ad space sales? We will never know because QST was never
an independent.

>I've written for QST.

BFD.

>You haven't.

Absolutely true. What was your staff title at QST? That would be
listed on their masthead every issue... :-)

>But you're not the moderator here.

Neither are you, Mistah Kopp.

>> I have this nice card punch at the ready. Just hand me your "TS card"
>> and I will punch it for you...:-)
>
>Sounds like another threat. Can you not resolve differences peaceably?

Tsk, tsk, tsk, Rev. Jimmie doesn't know about chaplains' "TS" cards?

:-)

Ah yes, Rev. Jimmie wasn't in any military service of the United States.

I shall ask forgiveness of using familiar military service humor terms.

Would 50 Hail Hirams be enough penance for that?

Would a side of theses nailed to a church door be too much? :-)

[Marty, you should have seen these guys...:-)]

LHA

558. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-07 18:55:30 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031007145530.01893.00001065@mb-m22.aol.com>
Source record: 80034

In article <blue4k$gfm14$6@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>, "Ryan, KC8PMX" <REMOVETHISkc8pmx@diamondcs.net> writes:

>I definitely am not an expert in any way, shape or form about this whole BPL >thing, but to me logic would dictate that if these BPL lines are going to be >emanating a ton of intereference, would they not also be prone to >interference coming in???

Not necessarily. It depends on the format of the wideband information and whatever is used, if any, for error detection/correction, and whether or not that detection/correction is in the "up" or "down" direction along the lines.

The problem in trying to decide anything about BPL is that NONE of the proponents are revealing anything about the technical characteristics of their various systems. None of us know the "weight" of the "ton of interference," not even the ARRL Lab.

>Seems to me that would create problems with connections and the quality of >transfer rates.

Ordinarily, with simple systems, yes.

Case in point against: We (wife and self) decided on the digital cable TV service from our cable TV provider, main point being the larger number of non-fee channels available plus other services. That digital TV service provides "up" (to the head-end) communications through the supplied cable set-top box, used mainly for pay-per-view requests and the like. The analog TV service from the same provider requires telephone contact (tone-dial entry). Minor point, but the analog TV distribution is one-way and IS subject to external RFI affecting the signal.

The digital TV distribution is very nearly interference-free on all channels and there are many more of those available in the same bandspace than can be had via analog TV distribution. The digital TV formatting is the major key in being interference-free...as well as holding video and audio quality consistent regardless of signal strength.

I don't know for sure whether the digital TV format includes any error-correction capabilities in our particular TV cable provider but I suspect it does based on general electronics trade information of the past.

"Broadband over Power Lines" is such a general term that no clue can be derived from the name or the bandwidth of the "broadband" part.

If the BPL was carrying just a single Internet provider, then the bandwidth could be considerably smaller than the 78 MHz bandwidth referred to on

03-104, even for 1.54 MHz "T1" or equivalent digital service...in both "up" and "down" directions operating equivalent to full duplex.

Irrespective of the bandwidth, there's no information on the lines' RF levels from various BPL proponents. Only one BPL system was indicated as wanting "Part 15" incidental radiation levels much higher than existing regulations. That still doesn't give any indication on what the BPL distribution system line levels are.

Line levels of RF are important in considering the BPL coupling systems to provide subscriber drops...but there is NO information on what any of them use for couplers. We don't know for sure if they are really using the "MV" (4 to 12 KVAC, depending on locality) lines as long distribution lines. Those MV lines have finite lengths and we don't know if the BPL system provides any sort of terminations at RF of those ends. If there is no termination, then the lines will radiate as indicated in the ARRL model. Those MV lines can radiate even if terminated, although such radiation at HF will be lower.

MV lines were NEVER characterized, standardized, or municipally-coded as RF transmission lines, not even in the National Electrical Code documents. Their lengths and wire spacings (especially above ground) vary considerably. They work very fine at 60 Hz, dependable and reliable as they are, whether elevated or underground.

There are no details sufficient for any sort of real technical evaluation so all of it is a big guessing game at this point. The only true reports are the radio observations done at the BPL test sites, not done with calibrated field strength meters/receivers.

LHA

559. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-07 19:01:52 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <A4Egb.74326$qj6.2469434@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 80035

Dick Carroll wrote:

> But.....how about all the Extras out there who have
> successfully proceeded through the same system and emerged
> with so little knowledge that they have no idea of even
> how to design and build a simple *1/2* wave dipole?
> With little or nothing beyond the question pools in their
> libraries, many won't even know how or where to look it up.
> And when(if) the day comes that won't be required to copy
> ANY Morse code,one of the most used modes in ham radio,
> at the most basic speed?
>
> Understand that I'm not saying they shouldn't be hams, nor
> that they shouldn't be allowed some HF access. We all start
> somewhere.
> But to allow them licensing into the top echelon of amateurs
> is ludicrous and negates all that ham radio is supposed to stand for.

After I became an Extra, there was a time when I felt a little odd about it. I knew all the test questions, and a lot more, but my operation skills were really not that good. I also saw some Extras both before and after I got my ticket who were really really green, and needed tutoring in some real basics. I mean real operational basics. The half wave/quarter wave dipole thing is no joke, even if we make fun of it. The top level should be just that. As many people find out after they leave college, there is more to life than just taking tests. Experience should count for something.

- Mike KB3EIA -

560. Re: Lennie's Double Standard Once Again Revealed...BY Lennie!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-07 20:54:03 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0310071254.6891a81c@posting.google.com>
Source record: 80036

brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0310060723.778385fd@posting.google.com>...

> Unfortunately, Steve, we don't enjoy your antics and rants. Not
> amusing at all.

"We", Brain? "We" without exemption implies everyone.

And I am sure you DON'T "enjoy" anything I have to say, mostly
because I rub your nose in your own errors as effectively as I do.

> Try behaving in a rational and civilized manner, and you'll not
> attract so much negative attention.

Hmmmmmmm......All the "negative attention" I've "attract(ed)" has
been from you (a person known to proudly associate himself with a
pathological liar), Lennie, (who IS the known pathological liar),
Vipul, (who doesn't know the difference between BS and shinola), and a
couple of anonymous posters who "hit and run" with some wise cracks.

Ergo I am not at all impressed with your suggestion about ANYone's
behaviour.

Steve,K4YZ

561. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-07 22:27:39 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031007182739.00545.00001447@mb-m02.aol.com>
Source record: 80037

In article <blue4k$gfm14$6@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>, "Ryan, KC8PMX" <REMOVETHISkc8pmx@diamondcs.net> writes:

>I definitely am not an expert in any way, shape or form about this whole BPL >thing, but to me logic would dictate that if these BPL lines are going to be >emanating a ton of intereference, would they not also be prone to >interference coming in???

Yes and no.

The signal level in the line can be set to be much higher than almost any interfering signal induced from outside.

Because the entire 1.7-80 MHz spectrum is available to the BPL system, and it can theoretically use whatever modulation schemes it wants, things like error-correction, retries, redundancy and avoidance of specific frequencies can be incorporated.

For example, you start transmitting on 50.2 MHz SSB and you punch a hole in the BPL. It adapts and stops using 50.2 MHz - while you're transmitting.
>
>Seems to me that would create problems with connections and the quality of >transfer rates.

Perhaps. And the BPL proponents are trying to change the rules in such a way that the *licensed* services have to accomodate them!

73 de Jim, N2EY

562. Ham Radio in the FW:FW:Fw: World of Emails!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-07 23:22:00 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <blvhtp$6b8@library2.airnews.net>
Source record: 80038

I got this today in my email. While the callsign is fake, leaving the whole story in question, it's still creative:

Subject: 1000 Marbles

Food for thought. A Ham Radio Fan Writes:

The older I get, the more I enjoy Saturday mornings. Perhaps it's the quiet solitude that comes with being the first to rise, or maybe it's the unbounded joy of not having to be at work. Either way, the first few hours of a Saturday morning are most enjoyable. A few weeks ago, I was shuffling toward the basement ham-shack with a steaming cup of coffee in one hand and the morning paper in the other.

What began as a typical Saturday morning turned into one of those lessons that life seems to hand you from time to time. Let me tell you about it.

I turned the dial up into the phone portion of the band on my ham radio in order to listen to a Saturday morning swap net. Along the way, I came across an older sounding chap, with a tremendous signal and a golden voice. You know the kind; he sounded like he should be in the broadcasting business. He was telling whomever he was talking with something about "A Thousand Marbles." I was intrigued and stopped to listen to what he had to say.

"Well, Tom, it sure sounds like you're busy with your job. I'm sure they pay you well but it's a shame you have to be away from home and your family so much. Hard to believe a young fellow should have to work sixty or seventy hours a week to make ends meet. Too bad you missed your daughter's dance recital he continued." "Let me tell you something that has helped me keep a good perspective on my own priorities."

And that's when he began to explain his theory of "A Thousand Marbles."

"You see, I sat down one day and did a little arithmetic. The average person lives about seventy-five years. I know, some live more and some live less, but on average, folks live about seventy-five years."

"Now then, I multiplied 75 times 52 and I came up with 3900, which is the number of Saturdays that the average person has in their entire lifetime."

"Now, stick with me, Tom, I'm getting to the important part. It took me until I was fifty-five years old to think about all this in any detail", he went on, "and by that time I had lived through over twenty-eight hundred Saturdays.

I got to thinking that if I lived to be seventy-five, I only had about a thousand of them left to enjoy. So I went to a toy store and bought every

single marble they had. I ended up having to visit three toy stores to round up 1000 Marbles. I took them home and put them inside a large, clear plastic container right here in the shack next to my gear."

"Every Saturday since then, I have taken one Marble out and thrown it away. I found that by watching the marbles diminish, I focus more on the really important things in life. There is nothing like watching your time here on this earth run out to help get your priorities straight."

"Now let me tell you one last thing before I sign-off with you and take my lovely wife out for breakfast. This morning, I took the very last Marble out of the container.

I figure that if I make it until next Saturday then I have been given a little extra time. And the one thing we can all use is a little more time."

"It was nice to meet you Tom, I hope you spend more time with your family, and I hope to meet you again here on the band.

This is a 75 Year old Man, K9NZQ, clear and going QRT, good morning!"

You could have heard a pin drop on the band when this fellow singed off.

I guess he gave us all a lot to think about. I had planned to work on the antenna that morning, and then I was going to meet up with a few hams to work on the next Club Newsletter. Instead, I went upstairs and woke my wife up with a kiss. "C'mon honey, I'm taking you and the kids to breakfast!"

"What brought this on?" she asked with a smile.

"Oh, nothing special, it's just been a long time since we spent a Saturday together with the kids. And hey, can we stop at a toy store while we're out? I need to buy some Marbles...

--
Kim W5TIT

563. Re: Vote for WX6RST

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-07 23:25:01 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <blvi3e$239@library2.airnews.net>
Source record: 80039

"Hans K0HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:5ee63311.0310070642.162acf52@posting.google.com...
> "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote
>
> >
> > Hey, I find it interesting that none of those who've touted the "skills"
of
> > ham radio as applicable to goals in life, are even responding to this.
I
> > was "echoing" their belief system.
> >
>
> Naw Kim, you were just trolling, and not very expertly. Nobody even
> bothered to light off the Troll-O-Meter to take a reading.
>
> With all kind wishes,
>
> de Hans, K0HB
>

Welp. Went fishing and got you...but yer easy, Hans.

Kim W5TIT

564. Re: Vote for WX6RST

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-07 23:35:19 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <blvimo$6rs@library2.airnews.net>
Source record: 80041

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:bluths$2qd$0@208.207.71.138...
> K&#65533;HB wrote:
> > "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote:
> >
> >
> > >>Gosh, I thought ham radio was supposed to be such
> > >>an added bonus to the "resume." I don't see a word of it mentioned.
> >
> >
> > > Huh???? Why would an avocation like amateur radio be mentioned when
> > > running for public office?
> >
> > > I can imagine that such a mention would make sense if he was a candidate
for
> > > a job as an engineer or technician at an electronics or communications
> > > oriented business, but as a governor?????? Did K7UGA campaign
literature
> > > mention that he was a ham when he was the Republican candidate for
President
> > > of the US?
> >
>
> You *really* expect she'll know who K7UGA was?
>

It's easy enough looked up, DICK. By the way, I'd imagine you know all
these folks: http://users.ev1.net/~w5www/famous.html

Kim W5TIT

565. Re: Ham Radio in the FW:FW:Fw: World of Emails!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-07 23:38:17 UTC
From: Bert Craig <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM>
Message-ID: <J7Igb.67212$E95.33631959@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>
Source record: 80040

Great post, Kim. Thanks for the reminder. :-)

--
73 de Bert
WA2SI

"Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:blvhtp$6b8@library2.airnews.net...
> I got this today in my email. While the callsign is fake, leaving the
whole
> story in question, it's still creative:
>
> Subject: 1000 Marbles
>
> Food for thought. A Ham Radio Fan Writes:
>
> The older I get, the more I enjoy Saturday mornings. Perhaps it's the
quiet
> solitude that comes with being the first to rise, or maybe it's the
> unbounded joy of not having to be at work. Either way, the first few hours
> of a Saturday morning are most enjoyable. A few weeks ago, I was shuffling
> toward the basement ham-shack with a steaming cup of coffee in one hand
and
> the morning paper in the other.
>
> What began as a typical Saturday morning turned into one of those lessons
> that life seems to hand you from time to time. Let me tell you about it.
>
> I turned the dial up into the phone portion of the band on my ham radio in
> order to listen to a Saturday morning swap net. Along the way, I came
> across an older sounding chap, with a tremendous signal and a golden
voice.
> You know the kind; he sounded like he should be in the broadcasting
> business. He was telling whomever he was talking with something about "A
> Thousand Marbles." I was intrigued and stopped to listen to what he had to
> say.
>
> "Well, Tom, it sure sounds like you're busy with your job. I'm sure they
> pay you well but it's a shame you have to be away from home and your
family
> so much. Hard to believe a young fellow should have to work sixty or
> seventy hours a week to make ends meet. Too bad you missed your daughter's
> dance recital he continued." "Let me tell you something that has helped me
> keep a good perspective on my own priorities."
>

> And that's when he began to explain his theory of "A Thousand Marbles."
>
> "You see, I sat down one day and did a little arithmetic. The average
> person lives about seventy-five years. I know, some live more and some
live
> less, but on average, folks live about seventy-five years."
>
> "Now then, I multiplied 75 times 52 and I came up with 3900, which is the
> number of Saturdays that the average person has in their entire lifetime."
>
> "Now, stick with me, Tom, I'm getting to the important part. It took me
> until I was fifty-five years old to think about all this in any detail",
he
> went on, "and by that time I had lived through over twenty-eight hundred
> Saturdays.
>
> I got to thinking that if I lived to be seventy-five, I only had about a
> thousand of them left to enjoy. So I went to a toy store and bought every
> single marble they had. I ended up having to visit three toy stores to
> round up 1000 Marbles. I took them home and put them inside a large, clear
> plastic container right here in the shack next to my gear."
>
> "Every Saturday since then, I have taken one Marble out and thrown it
away.
> I found that by watching the marbles diminish, I focus more on the really
> important things in life. There is nothing like watching your time here on
> this earth run out to help get your priorities straight."
>
> "Now let me tell you one last thing before I sign-off with you and take my
> lovely wife out for breakfast. This morning, I took the very last Marble
> out of the container.
>
> I figure that if I make it until next Saturday then I have been given a
> little extra time. And the one thing we can all use is a little more
time."
>
> "It was nice to meet you Tom, I hope you spend more time with your family,
> and I hope to meet you again here on the band.
>
> This is a 75 Year old Man, K9NZQ, clear and going QRT, good morning!"
>
> You could have heard a pin drop on the band when this fellow singed off.
>
> I guess he gave us all a lot to think about. I had planned to work on the
> antenna that morning, and then I was going to meet up with a few hams to
> work on the next Club Newsletter. Instead, I went upstairs and woke my
wife
> up with a kiss. "C'mon honey, I'm taking you and the kids to breakfast!"
>
> "What brought this on?" she asked with a smile.

>
> "Oh, nothing special, it's just been a long time since we spent a Saturday
> together with the kids. And hey, can we stop at a toy store while we're
> out? I need to buy some Marbles...
>
> --
> Kim W5TIT
>
>

566. Re: YASME makes her final port 'o call

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-07 23:55:00 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <onlgb.5007$mQ2.967@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 80042
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

Another real ham goes Silent Key. 73 old man.

Dan/W4NTI

"Hans K0HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:5ee63311.0310070742.4d890ded@posting.google.com...
> VP2VB, Danny Weil, has gone on his last DX-pedition. He died Oct 3,
> 2003 in San Antonio. His obit is copied below.
>
> Fair winds and following seas, old friend.
>
> 73, de Hans, K0HB/KG6AQI
>
> ------------
>
> Danny Weil of San Antonio, TX was born January 14, 1918 in a suburb of
> London England. He was descended from many generations of watchmakers
> and was apprenticed in the trade of watchmaking. Later he earned a
> Degree in Mechanical Engineering and Navigation. His father, Jack
> Weil, was killed during World War II in the London Blitz.
>
> Danny joined the Royal Air Force at the age of 17 and in the 10 years
> he served, he was stationed in Ceylon, India, Norway and Stalingrad.
> Danny left England in 1954 in a boat he made by himself in order to
> travel the world alone after being inspired when he read the book "Kon
> Tiki" in 1947. In 1963, after 9 years, 3 boats and travels to the
> Atlantic, the Carribean and the Pacific Islands,
>
> Danny completed his around the world voyage. Needing a means of
> communication, he taught himself Morse Code, radio theory and obtained
> a British Amateur radio license. Sailing single handedly around the
> world was a trip he volunteered to undertake on behalf of radio
> "hams". His voyage was integral in setting up ham radio stations on
> remote islands and the expedition was monitored by over 100, 000
> amateur radio enthusiasts around the world. He is remembered by most
> "hams" as "the first DXpeditioner."
>
> Danny was known as an adventurer who had a dry sense of humor which
> was characteristic to the British but his heart was warm and his
> loyalty as a friend was unparalleled. He was preceded in death by his
> wife Naomi Weil and his mother Christine Eckels.
>
> Danny is survived by his close knit extended family of friends, Dan &
> Barbara Mclhany of Fair Oaks; Bonnie & Billy Henderson of San Antonio

> and all of the employees at Towne North Animal Hospital.

567. Re: Some thoughtful comments from another forum on the code/nocode debate

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-08 01:06:01 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <ZpJgb.5420$mQ2.1774@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 80043

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:blul0vdbc0@208.207.71.138...
> Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
>
> > Maybe so, but it's not the FCC's business to determine how much
> > someone "values" a ham license ... only to determine if they meet
> > the minimum qualifications established. Besides, just because someone
> > did the work of learning BEFORE they decided to become a ham
> > doesn't mean they didn't still "do the work." Why should that
(previously
> > accomplished) work be "devalued" as some suggest???
>
> WHERE do you come up with some of this stuff???

Which points would you dispute?

Do you believe the FCC has a responsibility to determine how
much someone values a ham license?

Do you look less favorably on those that learned electronics
as a vocation and, therefore, excercised only minimal
or no effort to pass the ham tests?

Do you look less favorably on those that learned morse code
as a vocation and, therefore, excercised only minimal
or no effort to pass the ham tests?

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

568. Re: Some thoughtful comments from another forum on the code/nocode debate

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-08 01:34:21 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031007213421.25815.00003535@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 80044

In article <22zgb.195$_i.12920@nnrp1.ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
<wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:

>"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
>news:c2356669.0309300812.210385ba@posting.google.com...
>> "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
>news:<5D4eb.8338$yp6.228429@nnrp1.ptd.net>...
>> > "N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
>> > news:c2356669.0309291302.64d8c737@posting.google.com...
>> > > groupk0hb@earthlink.net (Hans K0HB) wrote in message
>> > news:<5ee63311.0309281048.70c4e1cb@posting.google.com>...
>> > > > "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote

>> > The point is that licensing should be based on one's demonstration
>> > of the required qualifications, no more, no less.
>>
>> That's your point, Carl, not my point.
>
>OK ... but it's still my (valid) point.

You sort of contradict it later on (see below)
>
>> The original story told how, back in 1978, the whole class of CG folks
>> went down to FCC and became Extras, while today none of them did.
>>
>> My point was simply that there are significant differences between the
>> 1978 and 2003 situations, such as:
>>
>> - the 1978 class was 'required' to take the test, and means provided
>> to do so (do you think they went on their own time? used their own
>> transportation? paid any fees?).
>>
>> - the 1978 class had already learned all they needed to know to pass
>> the 1978 tests.
>> >
>> > If someone already has the knowledge to pass the tests, fine.
>>
>> You can't change that situation anyway.
>
>Agreed ... but I reitterate "If someone already has the knowledge to
>pass the tests, fine."
>
Sure.

But the claim was all about how the folks in '78 all got ham tickets and the ones in 2003 did not. I'm simply pointing out that it's ana apples and oranges comparison. Heck, the promise of a day's liberty and a free trip off-base in exchange for an hour of taking a test that was far below the level of what you did every day was a no-brainer.

>> > There is no "value added" in "making them work for it"
>>
>> Who said there was?
>
>LOTS of folks here have promoted the "everyone should have
>to WORK for their license "to prove their dedication, etc.""
>(I'm not saying YOU said that, but lots of folks have voiced
>that view ...)

Folks say all kinds of things. Point is, no matter what you make the requirements, some will say they are too easy and others will say they're too much of a burden.
>
>> The point is that the 1978 class had a completely
>> different situation from the 2003 class.
>>
>> > ... if
>> > they have the knowledge they are qualified, period.
>>
>> So would you agree with Kim that anyone who can pass the required
>> tests should be allowed into the ARS?
>
>Yes, unless they have some other disqualifying factor that would
>render them unsuitable to be an FCC licensee (past history of
>violations, etc.),

Good point! And that's the sort-of contradiction I was talking about.

It's not just passing the test(s), but also not having certain disqualifying factors.

>but that's the FCC's call ...
>
And that's where we part company with Kim's ideas - as I understand them, anyway. The whole "character" issue.

You see, the tests are pretty objective in their methods. While we may not be crazy about multiple choice, it is 100% objective of method because there is one defined right answer and all the others are wrong. With methods like essays and fill-in-the-blank, a lot depends on the marker's judgement.

But the question of disqualifying factors is entirely subjective. ("Kid, have you rehabilitated yourself?" - Arlo Guthrie, "Alice's Restauraunt"). Almost any violation, including those unrelated to radio, can be a cause for FCC to deny a license. That's why they want a TIN, as I understand it. Don't pay your taxes or court-ordered child support? No ham license.

>> >(and likely
>> > they worked for it or they wouldn't have the knowledge anyway,
>> > so the logic of "making them work (more)" fails)
>>
>> It is a fact of human nature that most people value a thing more if it
>> took some investment of themselves to acquire.
>
>Maybe so, but it's not the FCC's business to determine how much
>someone "values" a ham license ... only to determine if they meet
>the minimum qualifications established.

Sure.

The concern is, however, that making the licenses easier and easier to get may result in some folks not valuing them enough even to bother following the rules.

You've been a ham since 1975, Carl - how do you think the current level of rules compliance (particularly in the area of operator on-air behavior, like jamming, cussing, failure to ID, etc.) compares with that of 1975?

But what those qualifications should be is an endless debate. Even if the code test disappears, the content of the writtens will be debated. Just watch, Carl - there will be those who attack the Extra as "elitist" and "a barrier" and "an unreasonable burden".

>Besides, just because someone
>did the work of learning BEFORE they decided to become a ham
>doesn't mean they didn't still "do the work." Why should that (previously
>accomplished) work be "devalued" as some suggest???

For that matter, what about those for whom it wasn't that much "work" at all? Some folks can pick up a copy of, say, "Now You're Talking", read it through, and pass the test easily, even though they had no radio experience at all beforehand. Other folks will struggle with the very same material.

73 de Jim, N2EY

569. N8__googled

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-08 01:40:01 UTC
From: Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com>
Message-ID: <20031007214001.401$VM@newsreader.com>
Source record: 80045
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.dogie.is.an.idiot,rec.radio.cb

http://tinyurl.com/q3xp

--
http://NewsReader.Com/
50 GB/Month

570. Re: YASME makes her final port 'o call

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-08 02:27:39 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0310071827.7eb37e10@posting.google.com>
Source record: 80046
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

groupk0hb@earthlink.net (Hans K0HB) wrote in message
news:<5ee63311.0310070742.4d890ded@posting.google.com>...
> VP2VB, Danny Weil, has gone on his last DX-pedition. He died Oct 3,
> 2003 in San Antonio. His obit is copied below.
>
> Fair winds and following seas, old friend.
>
> 73, de Hans, K0HB/KG6AQI
>
> ------------
>
> Danny Weil of San Antonio, TX was born January 14, 1918 in a suburb of
> London England. He was descended from many generations of watchmakers
> and was apprenticed in the trade of watchmaking. Later he earned a
> Degree in Mechanical Engineering and Navigation. His father, Jack
> Weil, was killed during World War II in the London Blitz.
>
> Danny joined the Royal Air Force at the age of 17 and in the 10 years
> he served, he was stationed in Ceylon, India, Norway and Stalingrad.
> Danny left England in 1954 in a boat he made by himself in order to
> travel the world alone . . . .

Danny Weil, VP2VB . . boy this brings back a lotta memories from my
'wayback radio days!

After his first boat sank he toured the radio clubs in the States,
particularly the DX and DX contesting groups to drum up funds for a
replacement boat. He was the guest speaker at one of the FRC club
meetings and put on a great show which is when I met him. He was a
very memorable piece of work to say the least. And it didn't take very
long to get him back in the water either.

He changed the face of DXing in a big way and was the first of the
real DXpeditioneers and led the way for other pioneers of his ilk like
Gus Browning and OH2BH.

Last anybody around here heard Danny had taken up residence in San
Antonio and settled into a career in the machine shops in that region
supposedly never to heard on the air again.

w3rv

571. Re: YASME makes her final port 'o call

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-08 03:12:15 UTC
From: et472@FreeNet.Carleton.CA
Message-ID: <blvvafpgg1@freenet9.carleton.ca>
Source record: 80047
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

"Dan/W4NTI" (w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com) writes:
> Another real ham goes Silent Key. 73 old man.
>
> Dan/W4NTI
>
Although, the case could be made that he wasn't a real ham.

Yes, he was an important part of ham radio for some years. But I
always got the impression, and the story suggests the same, that
he was interested in amateur radio beyond communication for
his sailing voyage. It always seemed like once he had that in place
for his own reasons, he discovered amateur radio beyond that. Amateur
radio gave him a reason to wander, because it gave him a reason for
visiting plenty of isolated locations for more of a reason than because
they were there. The fact that he pretty much disappeared after
Yasme was over, not being interested in DXing those exotic locations,
leaves in question how much of a ham he was, his contribution to
the hobby notwithstanding.

One might compare Danny to Gus Browning. The latter started
out in amateur radio at a young age, and went on the tour to put
many countries on the map. But then when that was over, he was
still considered a high power DXer, publishing DX Magazine for many
years.

Michael VE2BVW

> "Hans K0HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:5ee63311.0310070742.4d890ded@posting.google.com...
>> VP2VB, Danny Weil, has gone on his last DX-pedition. He died Oct 3,
>> 2003 in San Antonio. His obit is copied below.
>>
>> Fair winds and following seas, old friend.
>>
>> 73, de Hans, K0HB/KG6AQI
>>
>> ------------
>>
>> Danny Weil of San Antonio, TX was born January 14, 1918 in a suburb of
>> London England. He was descended from many generations of watchmakers
>> and was apprenticed in the trade of watchmaking. Later he earned a
>> Degree in Mechanical Engineering and Navigation. His father, Jack
>> Weil, was killed during World War II in the London Blitz.
>>

>> Danny joined the Royal Air Force at the age of 17 and in the 10 years
>> he served, he was stationed in Ceylon, India, Norway and Stalingrad.
>> Danny left England in 1954 in a boat he made by himself in order to
>> travel the world alone after being inspired when he read the book "Kon
>> Tiki" in 1947. In 1963, after 9 years, 3 boats and travels to the
>> Atlantic, the Carribean and the Pacific Islands,
>>
>> Danny completed his around the world voyage. Needing a means of
>> communication, he taught himself Morse Code, radio theory and obtained
>> a British Amateur radio license. Sailing single handedly around the
>> world was a trip he volunteered to undertake on behalf of radio
>> "hams". His voyage was integral in setting up ham radio stations on
>> remote islands and the expedition was monitored by over 100, 000
>> amateur radio enthusiasts around the world. He is remembered by most
>> "hams" as "the first DXpeditioner."
>>
>> Danny was known as an adventurer who had a dry sense of humor which
>> was characteristic to the British but his heart was warm and his
>> loyalty as a friend was unparalleled. He was preceded in death by his
>> wife Naomi Weil and his mother Christine Eckels.
>>
>> Danny is survived by his close knit extended family of friends, Dan &
>> Barbara Mclhany of Fair Oaks; Bonnie & Billy Henderson of San Antonio
>> and all of the employees at Towne North Animal Hospital.
>
>

572. Re: Some thoughtful comments from another forum on the code/nocode debate

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-08 03:56:02 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bm01sikeq0@208.206.142.71>
Source record: 80048

Bill Sohl wrote:
> "Dick Carroll" <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com> wrote in message
> news:blul0vdbc0@208.207.71.138...
>
>>Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
>>
>>
>>>Maybe so, but it's not the FCC's business to determine how much
>>>someone "values" a ham license ... only to determine if they meet
>>>the minimum qualifications established. Besides, just because someone
>>>did the work of learning BEFORE they decided to become a ham
>>>doesn't mean they didn't still "do the work." Why should that
>
> (previously
>
>>>accomplished) work be "devalued" as some suggest???
>>
>>WHERE do you come up with some of this stuff???
>
>
> Which points would you dispute?

How about *all* of it??

>
> Do you believe the FCC has a responsibility to determine how
> much someone values a ham license?
>

You might want to check with Carl on that point since it seems to be
all his.

> Do you look less favorably on those that learned electronics
> as a vocation and, therefore, excercised only minimal
> or no effort to pass the ham tests?
>

You are cordially invited to Google up any post where I even
itimatated such a position.

> Do you look less favorably on those that learned morse code
> as a vocation and, therefore, excercised only minimal
> or no effort to pass the ham tests?
>

Looks like the both of you missed it every time I said it here...
It doesn't matter where it was learned, just as long as it *was* learned.
The fact that so many licenses, particilarly extra class, are handed
out without that really important factor is the problem.

573. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-08 04:27:08 UTC
From: Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns940E494AE995elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 80049

Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com> wrote in
news:bluvaq$7f7$0@208.207.71.138:

> Robert Casey wrote:
>
>> Dick Carroll wrote:
>>
>>>
>>>
>>> You view the situation as an EE who didn't need to study to work out
>>> any of the technical problems on the Extra exam, few that there were.
>>> Most applicants have the singleminded goal of passing the exam, and
>>> learning beyond that goal is not only unnecessary, it gets in the way
>>> of the goal at hand. So they naturally just don't do it. The curent
>>> method of testing clearly facilitates that position.
>>
>>
>> I'm a EE, and like any reasonably successful college student, I still
>> made use of the
>> avaliable resources (the question pool) to prepare for the (at the
>> time I took them)
>> elements 4A and 4B. Found a few holes in my knowledge, and filled
>> them in for
>> at least long enough to score well on the tests (missed 1 on 4A, 2 on
>> 4B IIRC).
>> Got the CSCEs, and then the extra on Restructuring Day.
>> Most students only study what is expected to be on the exams. Thus, I
>> could solve calculus exam problems (take the intergral of (csc
>> x^5)/(tan x^2 -1) dx)
>> but I still never got a good understanding of how to use calculus to
>> solve a real
>> world problem. Recently went looking for a "calculus for dummies"
>> type book, but all they had was how to do exam problems. Been there,
>> done that.
>>
>
>
> And obviously it wasn't a problemm and hasn't caused any problem, for
> you and others similarly situated, nor for the ARS.
>
> But.....how about all the Extras out there who have
> successfully proceeded through the same system and emerged
> with so little knowledge that they have no idea of even
> how to design and build a simple *1/2* wave dipole?

> With little or nothing beyond the question pools in their
> libraries, many won't even know how or where to look it up.
> And when(if) the day comes that won't be required to copy
> ANY Morse code,one of the most used modes in ham radio,
> at the most basic speed?
>

Which will affect their comprehension of dipoles neither one way or the other.

Your linking of CW ability to comprehension of radio theory would be frightening if it wasn't hilarious!

> Understand that I'm not saying they shouldn't be hams, nor
> that they shouldn't be allowed some HF access. We all start
> somewhere.
> But to allow them licensing into the top echelon of amateurs
> is ludicrous and negates all that ham radio is supposed to stand for.
>
> In short, it reduces the ARS to CB status.
>
>

Your thinking is so completely addled that I hardly know what to say in reply.

574. Re: Bootlegging in 1948?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-08 04:51:04 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <REMOVETHISkc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <bm0oml$bruhr$2@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 80155

Really?? Which month/year were they published?? Would be interested in
reading them.

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF1-FF2-MFR-(pending NREMT-B!)
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...

>
> I've written for QST.
>
> You haven't.
>

575. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-08 04:54:30 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <REMOVETHISkc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <bm0omm$bruhr$3@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 80156

So, when God doesn't show up, then the power companies win by default?? LOL

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
"Symbolism is for the simple minded....."

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:8WCgb.72165$qj6.2455719@news1.news.adelphia.net...
> Ryan, KC8PMX wrote:
>
> > I definitely am not an expert in any way, shape or form about this whole
BPL
> > thing, but to me logic would dictate that if these BPL lines are going
to be
> > emanating a ton of intereference, would they not also be prone to
> > interference coming in???
> >
> > Seems to me that would create problems with connections and the quality
of
> > transfer rates.
>
> Yes it would. The likely result would be a lot more error correction,
> slowing the system down. Rumor has it the Power companies plan on suing
> God for the lightning interference. 8^)
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -
>

576. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-08 05:48:57 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bm08g9$1ce$0@208.206.142.71>
Source record: 80050

Mike Coslo wrote:

> My point is that if prospective amateurs or skaters don't want to
> get involved, there's no way we can stop them.
>

Yep If they come to a fork in the road and don't take it, there's no way to stop them. <g>

Most people either are grabbed by ham radio or they aren't. I can't speak for those who are stymied by a code test, though. I haven't yet found out how anyone who is actually interested in becoming involved could sit by for so long waiting.... I never knew anyone like that.

577. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-08 05:56:06 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bm08tm$1ce$1@208.206.142.71>
Source record: 80151

Alun Palmer wrote:

> Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com> wrote in
> news:bluvaq$7f7$0@208.207.71.138:
>
>
>>Robert Casey wrote:
>>
>>
>>>Dick Carroll wrote:
>>>
>>>
>>>>
>>>> You view the situation as an EE who didn't need to study to work out
>>>>any of the technical problems on the Extra exam, few that there were.
>>>>Most applicants have the singleminded goal of passing the exam, and
>>>>learning beyond that goal is not only unnecessary, it gets in the way
>>>>of the goal at hand. So they naturally just don't do it. The curent
>>>>method of testing clearly facilitates that position.
>>>
>>>
>>>I'm a EE, and like any reasonably successful college student, I still
>>>made use of the
>>>avaliable resources (the question pool) to prepare for the (at the
>>>time I took them)
>>>elements 4A and 4B. Found a few holes in my knowledge, and filled
>>>them in for
>>>at least long enough to score well on the tests (missed 1 on 4A, 2 on
>>>4B IIRC).
>>>Got the CSCEs, and then the extra on Restructuring Day.
>>>Most students only study what is expected to be on the exams. Thus, I
>>>could solve calculus exam problems (take the intergral of (csc
>>>x^5)/(tan x^2 -1) dx)
>>>but I still never got a good understanding of how to use calculus to
>>>solve a real
>>>world problem. Recently went looking for a "calculus for dummies"
>>>type book, but all they had was how to do exam problems. Been there,
>>>done that.
>>>
>>
>>
>> And obviously it wasn't a problemm and hasn't caused any problem, for
>>you and others similarly situated, nor for the ARS.
>>

>> But.....how about all the Extras out there who have
>>successfully proceeded through the same system and emerged
>>with so little knowledge that they have no idea of even
>>how to design and build a simple *1/2* wave dipole?
>> With little or nothing beyond the question pools in their
>>libraries, many won't even know how or where to look it up.
>>And when(if) the day comes that won't be required to copy
>>ANY Morse code,one of the most used modes in ham radio,
>>at the most basic speed?
>>
>
>
> Which will affect their comprehension of dipoles neither one way or the
> other.
>
> Your linking of CW ability to comprehension of radio theory would be
> frightening if it wasn't hilarious!
>
>
>> Understand that I'm not saying they shouldn't be hams, nor
>>that they shouldn't be allowed some HF access. We all start
>> somewhere.
>>But to allow them licensing into the top echelon of amateurs
>>is ludicrous and negates all that ham radio is supposed to stand for.
>>
>> In short, it reduces the ARS to CB status.
>>
>>
>
>
> Your thinking is so completely addled that I hardly know what to say in
> reply.

To quote a famous person, "There you go again!"

The minute I mention MOrse code, suddenly I'm all addled. Right.

578. Re: GOOD NEWS-------France heat wave deaths top 14,000

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-08 05:58:12 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bm091k$1ce$2@208.206.142.71>
Source record: 80152
Cross-posted to: alt.ham-radio.hf,alt.ham-radio.ssb,alt.radio.amateur,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Clint wrote:

> ah, another anti-american socialist apologist.
>
> Clint
>
> "Walt Davidson" <g3nyy@despammed.com> wrote in message
> news:7eu4ov8hqhc21sq9p6iqk0kirvqh45j4bv@4ax.com...
>
>
>>Just like a child when someone steals his rattle ... he lashes out at
>>anyone.

Yep. Anyone whoi doesn't agree with Clint's "well thought out"
propaganda is an anti-american socialist.

579. Re: Isnt it Funny (No-Code HF Privileges)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-08 07:25:41 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <VZOgb.5968$mQ2.2212@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 80153

"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote:
>
> Or when the person says "gee, guess Ah bettah turn
> on the afterburner" and the signal jumps up 20 dB.....

Yep, it does somewhat give it away, doesn't it? That reminds me of a drunk CB'er heard with the shortwave one night. Over a course of an hour or so, he contacted maybe a dozen people and asked each one how he sounded. No matter what that person said, he always responded with "Maybe this will help. Ugh!" as he turned on his linear (the "Ugh" was a long, drawn out, grunt). After the initial surprise, I couldn't stop laughing each time he did it. The fact that he was perfectly serious (he was simply that proud of his, possibly new, toy) made it all the more humorous.

It all ended with a argument with another CB'er. I couldn't hear what the other CB'er said (cheap shortwave receiver), but I got the impression that he was complaining about interference with another channel.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

580. Re: Ireland

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-08 08:11:16 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3F83C6B4.D6EC0FB0@earthlink.net>
Source record: 80154

Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3F6BCF2E.57F37149@earthlink.net>...
> > Brian wrote:
> > >
> > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3F68DD97.6E3D3730@earthlink.net>...
> > > >
> > > > Wow! That's quite a policy statement from a country with a little more
> > > > than 120 radio amateurs and it comes hot on the heels of the big move by
> > > > Ireland with its slightly more than 1,500 hams.

> > > Wow! You've stated that you've operated from countries where you were
> > > the only active amateur.
> >
> > I don't recall making a statement about attempting to influence a
> > foreign country's policy on amateur radio.
>
> I don't recall saying that.
>
> > > Somehow that was significant then, but 120 or 1,500 native amateurs
> > > aren't?
> >
> > Yes, it is significant that a country has only one radio amateur.
>
> In what way?

Ponder the matter. The answer will come to you.

> > No, I made no comparison to my being in a unique situation and a country
> > having a small population of radio amateurs deciding to abolish morse
> > testing.
>
> But these countries which have a native population of amateurs should
> be allowed self-rule?

Whether they should "be allowed to" have self-rule matters not. They
have it.

> Why are 120 or 1,500 native amateurs not
> significant?

Ponder the matter. The answer will come to you.

> > > There's that famous Heil smugness again.
> >
> > Not really, my little electrolyte. It is simply you attempting once
> > again to tie two unrelated events together.
>
> And you attempting to discount countries with low native amateur
> populations.

Ahhh! You may be getting closer to understanding my statements though I made no statements concerning "native amateur populations". Amateur radio licenses figures are not broken down into "native" and "non-native" categories. I didn't attempt to discount. I discounted.

Dave K8MN

581. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-08 10:29:19 UTC
From: Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns940E41FCE8356elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 80157

```
Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com> wrote in
news:bm08tm$1ce$1@208.206.142.71:

> Alun Palmer wrote:
>
>> Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com> wrote in
>> news:bluvaq$7f7$0@208.207.71.138:
>>
>>
>>>Robert Casey wrote:
>>>
>>>
>>>>Dick Carroll wrote:
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>> You view the situation as an EE who didn't need to study to work out
>>>>>any of the technical problems on the Extra exam, few that there were.
>>>>>Most applicants have the singleminded goal of passing the exam, and
>>>>>learning beyond that goal is not only unnecessary, it gets in the way
>>>>>of the goal at hand. So they naturally just don't do it. The curent
>>>>>method of testing clearly facilitates that position.
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>I'm a EE, and like any reasonably successful college student, I still
>>>>made use of the
>>>>avaliable resources (the question pool) to prepare for the (at the
>>>>time I took them)
>>>>elements 4A and 4B. Found a few holes in my knowledge, and filled
>>>>them in for
>>>>at least long enough to score well on the tests (missed 1 on 4A, 2 on
>>>>4B IIRC).
>>>>Got the CSCEs, and then the extra on Restructuring Day.
>>>>Most students only study what is expected to be on the exams. Thus, I
>>>>could solve calculus exam problems (take the intergral of (csc
>>>>x^5)/(tan x^2 -1) dx)
>>>>but I still never got a good understanding of how to use calculus to
>>>>solve a real
>>>>world problem. Recently went looking for a "calculus for dummies"
>>>>type book, but all they had was how to do exam problems. Been there,
>>>>done that.
>>>>
>>>
>>>
```

>>> And obviously it wasn't a problemm and hasn't caused any problem, for
>>>you and others similarly situated, nor for the ARS.
>>>
>>> But.....how about all the Extras out there who have
>>>successfully proceeded through the same system and emerged
>>>with so little knowledge that they have no idea of even
>>>how to design and build a simple *1/2* wave dipole?
>>> With little or nothing beyond the question pools in their
>>>libraries, many won't even know how or where to look it up.
>>>And when(if) the day comes that won't be required to copy
>>>ANY Morse code,one of the most used modes in ham radio, at the most
>>>basic speed?
>>>
>>
>>
>> Which will affect their comprehension of dipoles neither one way or the
>> other.
>>
>> Your linking of CW ability to comprehension of radio theory would be
>> frightening if it wasn't hilarious!
>>
>>
>>> Understand that I'm not saying they shouldn't be hams, nor
>>>that they shouldn't be allowed some HF access. We all start somewhere.
>>>But to allow them licensing into the top echelon of amateurs
>>>is ludicrous and negates all that ham radio is supposed to stand for.
>>>
>>> In short, it reduces the ARS to CB status.
>>>
>>>
>>
>>
>> Your thinking is so completely addled that I hardly know what to say in
>> reply.
>
>
> To quote a famous person, "There you go again!"
>
> The minute I mention MOrse code, suddenly I'm all addled. Right.
>

Only when you try to link passing a Morse code test with ability to
understand theory

582. Re: End of CW in Ireland

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-08 11:02:40 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3F83EEE1.2FB109D6@earthlink.net>
Source record: 80158

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3F6BD3CF.456BD5E3@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >But Leonard, old chap, you aren't an AMATEUR radio op at all under the
> >standards of any year. You aren't even qualified in "hoop jumping" as
> >you call it. The fact is, if you are ever to grace us with your
> >presence on the ham bands, you'll jump through whatever "hoops" the
> >government has in place or you won't be licensed.
>
> Herr Robust...go back to your day job of translating "Main Kampf"
> into Morse...

I'll take that as your admission that my comments are factual.

I don't have or happen to need a day job, old boy.

Dave K8MN

583. Re: Some thoughtful comments from another forum on the code/nocode debate

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-08 11:08:01 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bm0rgh$i4u@library2.airnews.net>
Source record: 80159

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:ZpJgb.5420$mQ2.1774@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
>
> "Dick Carroll" <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com> wrote in message
> news:blul0vdbc0@208.207.71.138...
> > Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
> >
> > > Maybe so, but it's not the FCC's business to determine how much
> > > someone "values" a ham license ... only to determine if they meet
> > > the minimum qualifications established. Besides, just because someone
> > > did the work of learning BEFORE they decided to become a ham
> > > doesn't mean they didn't still "do the work." Why should that
> (previously
> > > accomplished) work be "devalued" as some suggest???
> >
> > WHERE do you come up with some of this stuff???
>
> Which points would you dispute?
>

DICK has no point (no pun intended). Haven't you ever noticed that all DICK
does is join the masses he follows but never has any true intelligent
argument to make himself? Kind of like when someone speaks up, and a
sidekick says, "YEAH, what he said!"

Kim W5TIT

584. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-08 12:29:46 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031008082946.08626.00001100@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 80160

In article <m8qgb.74$GE4.76302@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> writes:

>"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
>news:c2356669.0310061300.7814fd19@posting.google.com...
>> Back before restructuring, the ham who wasn't interested in
>> phone/image had no reason to get an Advanced. And the ham who wasn't
>> interested in CW/data had relatively little reason to get an Extra.
>>
>> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>Except that I found very early on that a lot of the more interesting DX
>tended to be in what are the Extra subbands in the US. So I set my sights
>on getting the Extra for that reason.
>
Of course! Those parts could also be very productive in contests because of the reduced crowding,

My point was simply that the Advanced did not give any more CW/data privileges - the incentive was all 'phone.

Some folks make a big deal about how "tough", "theoretical" and "mathematical" the old Advanced written was. Supposedly tougher than the Extra, yada yada yada.

But back in 1968, when I was at the FCC office for the General, the examiner said "why not try the Advanced while you're here?" (Could not do Extra because back then it had a 2 year experience requirement).

So I took it and passed easily even though I had not studied for it at all. I was 14 and it was the summer between 8th and 9th grades. Not a big deal even then because I knew of 12 year old Extras back then.

73 de Jim, N2EY

585. Re: Lennie's Double Standard Once Again Revealed...BY Lennie!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-08 12:36:57 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0310080436.189d2293@posting.google.com>
Source record: 80161

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0310071254.6891a81c@posting.google.com>...
> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0310060723.778385fd@posting.google.com>...
>
> > Unfortunately, Steve, we don't enjoy your antics and rants. Not
> > amusing at all.
>
> "We", Brain? "We" without exemption implies everyone.

Sour grapes? Demanding a recount?

> And I am sure you DON'T "enjoy" anything I have to say, mostly
> because I rub your nose in your own errors as effectively as I do.

I enjoy your ocassional post about radio.

> > Try behaving in a rational and civilized manner, and you'll not
> > attract so much negative attention.
>
> Hmmmmmmm......All the "negative attention" I've "attract(ed)" has
> been from you (a person known to proudly associate himself with a
> pathological liar), Lennie, (who IS the known pathological liar),
> Vipul, (who doesn't know the difference between BS and shinola), and a
> couple of anonymous posters who "hit and run" with some wise cracks.

Steve, you attract no other kind of attention. You're hugely ignored.

> Ergo I am not at all impressed with your suggestion about ANYone's
> behaviour.

behavior

586. Re: Echolink is great for those who..

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-08 12:50:09 UTC
From: starwars <nobody@tatooine.homelinux.net>
Message-ID: <38c9916cb107dcfd2c28d5112d15650b@tatooine.homelinux.net>
Source record: 80162
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

In article <pan.2003.10.06.17.54.11.719783@hotmail.com>
"No-CODE TWAT- N7ZZT" <n7zzt_NO.SPAM_@hotmail.com> wrote:
>
>
> On Wed, 01 Oct 2003 16:15:38 +0200, starwars wrote:
>
> >> so? you any better? just because I am no-code doesn't mean I don't
> >> KNOW-CODE (I just never bothered to take the damned test, you dope!).
> >
> > Obviously, you were too goddamned stupid to pass it, either.
>
> ever hear of other considerations? how about this one: lack on funds

It's not my fault you're so unemployable you can't afford anything. I bet you're driving that used-over 100,000 mile shitbox because you can't aford a newer car, too.

> required to get the equipment needed to even have a decent station on HF.
> what about locvation for the antenna (I've lived in apartments for a long
> time, I doubt they would like it if I stuck a 3-el beam for 75/80 on their
> root).

"On their "Root?" No wonder you're a goddamned no -code technician TWAT, you don't even know that antennas usually go on roofs, not roots. What a dumbass.
You're just full of excuses, twat. And you can add lack of ambition to own your own home to your mounting list of deficiencies.

> >
> >> but then again, if all you can do is insult, that means you don't have
> >> brains enough to really do something about it.
> >
> > You'll have to pass the test on your own, twat.

> wa wa waaaaah! cry me a river....

The only crying is coming from you, no-code technician twat.

Can you say hypocrite? In addition to your inability to upgrade your license, you severely lack skills in debate. You proved it all by your lonesome, little twat.

> throwing insults just means you don't have brains enough to debate.

Making excuses for your lack of abilities isn't debating, little twat.

> I'd say you are full of it (-... ..- .-.. .-.. ... . -) (just so
> you know, that spells out BULLSHIT, which you seem to be so full of
> lately).

Now, what were you saying above about throwing insults because you didn't have brains, twat?

> >
> >> oh well, I fail to see where it's my problem anyway.
> >
> > You fail to see quite a lot of things, no-code technician twat.
>
> a dig? hmmm, better get a bigger (and sharper) shovel...

And the point passes over your granite skull at the speed of light, twat. Thanks for proving my point.

587. Re: Echolink is great for those who..

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-08 14:06:49 UTC
From: toolz toolz <medtools2@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <ZRUgb.5256$Eo2.5012@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 80163
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

You, starwars, are an ass.
"starwars" <nobody@tatooine.homelinux.net> wrote in message
news:38c9916cb107dcfd2c28d5112d15650b@tatooine.homelinux.net...
> In article <pan.2003.10.06.17.54.11.719783@hotmail.com>
> "No-CODE TWAT- N7ZZT" <n7zzt_NO.SPAM_@hotmail.com> wrote:
> >
> >
> > On Wed, 01 Oct 2003 16:15:38 +0200, starwars wrote:
> >
> > >> so? you any better? just because I am no-code doesn't mean I don't
> > >> KNOW-CODE (I just never bothered to take the damned test, you dope!).
> > >
> > > Obviously, you were too goddamned stupid to pass it, either.
> >
> > ever hear of other considerations? how about this one: lack on funds
>
> It's not my fault you're so unemployable you can't afford anything. I bet
you're driving that used-over 100,000 mile shitbox because you can't aford a
newer car, too.
>
>
> > required to get the equipment needed to even have a decent station on
HF.
> > what about locvation for the antenna (I've lived in apartments for a
long
> > time, I doubt they would like it if I stuck a 3-el beam for 75/80 on
their
> > root).
>
> "On their "Root?" No wonder you're a goddamned no -code technician TWAT,
you don't even know that antennas usually go on roofs, not roots. What a
dumbass.
> You're just full of excuses, twat. And you can add lack of ambition to own
your own home to your mounting list of deficiencies.
>
>
> > >
> > >> but then again, if all you can do is insult, that means you don't
have
> > >> brains enough to really do something about it.
> > >
> > > You'll have to pass the test on your own, twat.
>

> > wa wa waaaaah! cry me a river....
>
> The only crying is coming from you, no-code technician twat.
>
> Can you say hypocrite? In addition to your inability to upgrade your
license, you severely lack skills in debate. You proved it all by your
lonesome, little twat.
>
> > throwing insults just means you don't have brains enough to debate.
>
> Making excuses for your lack of abilities isn't debating, little twat.
>
> > I'd say you are full of it (-... ..- .-.. .-.. ... . -) (just so
> > you know, that spells out BULLSHIT, which you seem to be so full of
> > lately).
>
> Now, what were you saying above about throwing insults because you didn't
have brains, twat?
>
> > >
> > >> oh well, I fail to see where it's my problem anyway.
> > >
> > > You fail to see quite a lot of things, no-code technician twat.
> >
> > a dig? hmmm, better get a bigger (and sharper) shovel...
>
>
> And the point passes over your granite skull at the speed of light, twat.
Thanks for proving my point.
>
>
>
>

588. Re: DXers Of The Past (Was YASME makes her final port 'o call)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-08 14:34:55 UTC
From: Key Largo <Bogie@largo.com>
Message-ID: <jgVgb.58212$Ms2.29808@fed1read03>
Source record: 80164
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

More old time DXers at URL:
http://home.swipnet.se/dx/porthole/index.htm

And the CQ Contest Hall Of Fame at URL:
http://cqww.com/hof-history.html

--
73 From Key Largo

"Brian Kelly" <kelly@dvol.com> wrote in message
news:d22b54c3.0310071827.7eb37e10@posting.google.com...
> groupk0hb@earthlink.net (Hans K0HB) wrote in message
news:<5ee63311.0310070742.4d890ded@posting.google.com>...
> > VP2VB, Danny Weil, has gone on his last DX-pedition. He died Oct 3,
> > 2003 in San Antonio. His obit is copied below.
> >
> > Fair winds and following seas, old friend.
> >
> > 73, de Hans, K0HB/KG6AQI
> >
>

589. Re: DXers Of The Past (Was YASME makes her final port 'o call)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-08 14:38:58 UTC
From: Key Largo <Bogie@largo.com>
Message-ID: <6kVgb.58222$Ms2.26974@fed1read03>
Source record: 80165
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc
Body handling: Inline uuencoded payload not displayed: rite.gif

> More old time DXers at URL:
> http://home.swipnet.se/dx/porthole/index.htm
>
> And the CQ Contest Hall Of Fame at URL:
> http://cqww.com/hof-history.html
> 73 From Key Largo

INCLUDES Famous DXers
1923
DU7CC
VP2VB
W4BPD
BRS-3129
W9WNV
W6AM
K3ZO
ZS4TX
KV4AA
OH2BH
SM&#65533;AGD
P5/R&#65533;MEO
SM&#65533;CNS/4E7
SM1CNS
SM6CNS
SM6CNS/MM

The CQ Contest List
1. Hazzard "Buzz" Reeves, K2GL
2. Katashi Nose, KH6IJ
3. Al Slater, G3FXB
4. Martti Laine, OH2BH
5. Bernie Welch, W8IMZ
6. Leonard Chertok, W3GRF
7. W. Gerry Mathis, W3GM
8. Frank Anazlone, W1WY
9. Jim Lawson, W2PV
10. Ed Bissell, W3AU
11. Fred Laun, K3ZO
12. Vic Clark, W4KFC
13. Rush Drake, W7RM
14. John Thompson, W1BIH
15. Atilano de Oms, PY5EG

16. Herb Becker, W6QD
17. Jim Neiger, N6TJ
18. Tine Brajnik, S50A
19. Dick Norton, N6AA
20. Ken Wolff, K1EA
21. Ville Hiilesmaa, OH2MM
22. Lew Gordon, K4VX
23. Bob Cox, K3EST
24. Carl Cook, AI6V
25. Gordon Marshall, W6RR
26. John Devoldere, ON4UN
27. Jorge Humberto Bozzo, LU8DQ
28. John Dorr, K1AR

>

[Inline uuencoded payload not displayed: rite.gif]

590. Re: YASME makes her final port 'o call

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-08 16:05:46 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0310080805.3b9d8622@posting.google.com>
Source record: 80166
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

et472@FreeNet.Carleton.CA (Michael Black) wrote in message
news:<blvvafpgg1@freenet9.carleton.ca>...
> "Dan/W4NTI" (w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com) writes:
> > Another real ham goes Silent Key. 73 old man.
> >
> > Dan/W4NTI
> >
> Although, the case could be made that he wasn't a real ham.
>
> Yes, he was an important part of ham radio for some years. But I
> always got the impression, and the story suggests the same, that
> he was interested in amateur radio beyond communication for
> his sailing voyage. It always seemed like once he had that in place
> for his own reasons, he discovered amateur radio beyond that. Amateur
> radio gave him a reason to wander, because it gave him a reason for
> visiting plenty of isolated locations for more of a reason than because
> they were there. The fact that he pretty much disappeared after
> Yasme was over, not being interested in DXing those exotic locations,
> leaves in question how much of a ham he was, his contribution to
> the hobby notwithstanding.
>
> One might compare Danny to Gus Browning. The latter started
> out in amateur radio at a young age, and went on the tour to put
> many countries on the map. But then when that was over, he was
> still considered a high power DXer, publishing DX Magazine for many
> years.
>
> Michael VE2BVW
>
>
First off I don't agreee with these sorts of "categorizations". The
implication here is that you consider Gus a "better ham" than Danny
was and I reject the concept. Categorically. Plus dissing Danny a half
century after he lit up the bands is not exactly a class act Michael.

Danny never made any bones about the intent and purpose of his ham
activities. We kept his boat(s) afloat which was his need and he
shipped the cards which was our need. And there isn't any more to it
than that.

His format has been followed innumerable times since, i.e. hams with
marginal and/or short term interests in the hobby or DXing putting new
ones on the air. If the cards they've sent over the years hit the
no-counters pile your own totals and the Honor Roll membership count

would drop like rocks.

w3rv

591. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-08 16:36:17 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3F843D01.5020103@psu.edu>
Source record: 80167

Dick Carroll wrote:
> Mike Coslo wrote:
>
>> My point is that if prospective amateurs or skaters don't want to
>> get involved, there's no way we can stop them.
>>
>
>
> Yep If they come to a fork in the road and don't take it, there's no
> way to stop them. <g>
>
> Most people either are grabbed by ham radio or they aren't. I can't
> speak for those who are stymied by a code test, though. I haven't yet
> found out how anyone who is actually interested in becoming involved
> could sit by for so long waiting.... I never knew anyone like that.
>

Which brings us full circle, to a thread I started in July.

It is exceptionally difficult for me to imagine that a person who is interested in something will refuse to participate because of one part of the entrance requirements. That person is simply not all that interested.

This isn't about whether Morse should or shouldn't be tested for, it's about basic interest.

-Mike KB3EIA -

592. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-08 16:54:48 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3F844158.1090208@psu.edu>
Source record: 80168

Ryan, KC8PMX wrote:
> It might have if it was promoted better. The argument of people running to
> the internet, or the internet being competition is not as strong of an
> argument (among other arguments). You can't "run" to something if you
> didn't know it existed in the first place. Let's see, how many people have
> heard of the internet?? How many have heard of ham radio??? How many of
> these answeree's are under 25-30??

I know what you're saying Ryan, but there is a huge difference between
the Internet and Ham radio:

Ham radio does not allow a person to download Porn, do business online,
or find cool software.

Ham radio would like a person to have a certain technical acumen, while
the internet demands clicking on links.

Wheras may who are interested in Ham radio find the internet a useful
tool and entertaining, the converse is only true in a very few cases.
It's really not the same group of people.

If the internet were to suddenly dissapear, very few of the people using
it would decide to migrate to Ham radio (conjecture, for sure - but do
you want to refute that?)

> Our local group just did a presentation/booth for the boy scouts this past
> week, and only about 5-10% had a clue that ham radio even existed.

Good work, man!

- Mike KB3EIA -

593. Re: Ireland

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-08 17:04:10 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0310080904.51c51549@posting.google.com>
Source record: 80169

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3F83C6B4.D6EC0FB0@earthlink.net>...

> Ponder the matter. The answer will come to you.
>
> Ponder the matter. The answer will come to you.
>
> Ahhh! You may be getting closer to understanding my statements though I
> made no statements concerning "native amateur populations". Amateur
> radio licenses figures are not broken down into "native" and
> "non-native" categories. I didn't attempt to discount. I discounted.
>
> Dave K8MN

Thusly, you are smug Dave.

594. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-08 17:13:46 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3F8445CA.5070305@psu.edu>
Source record: 80170

Ryan, KC8PMX wrote:
> So, when God doesn't show up, then the power companies win by default?? LOL

You got it! The wonders of the court system......

- Mike KB3EIA -

> --
> Ryan, KC8PMX
> "Symbolism is for the simple minded....."
>
>
> "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
> news:8WCgb.72165$qj6.2455719@news1.news.adelphia.net...
>
>>Ryan, KC8PMX wrote:
>>
>>
>>>I definitely am not an expert in any way, shape or form about this whole
>>
> BPL
>
>>>thing, but to me logic would dictate that if these BPL lines are going
>>
> to be
>
>>>emanating a ton of intereference, would they not also be prone to
>>>interference coming in???
>>>
>>>Seems to me that would create problems with connections and the quality
>>
> of
>
>>>transfer rates.
>>
>>Yes it would. The likely result would be a lot more error correction,
>>slowing the system down. Rumor has it the Power companies plan on suing
>>God for the lightning interference. 8^)
>>
>>- Mike KB3EIA -
>>
>
>
>

595. Re: YASME makes her final port 'o call

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-08 17:34:03 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <fUXgb.5493$Eo2.4930@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 80171
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

"Brian Kelly" <kelly@dvol.com> wrote in message
news:d22b54c3.0310080805.3b9d8622@posting.google.com...
> et472@FreeNet.Carleton.CA (Michael Black) wrote in message
news:<blvvafpgg1@freenet9.carleton.ca>...
> > "Dan/W4NTI" (w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com) writes:
> > > Another real ham goes Silent Key. 73 old man.
> > >
> > > Dan/W4NTI
> > >
> > Although, the case could be made that he wasn't a real ham.
> >
> > Yes, he was an important part of ham radio for some years. But I
> > always got the impression, and the story suggests the same, that
> > he was interested in amateur radio beyond communication for
> > his sailing voyage. It always seemed like once he had that in place
> > for his own reasons, he discovered amateur radio beyond that. Amateur
> > radio gave him a reason to wander, because it gave him a reason for
> > visiting plenty of isolated locations for more of a reason than because
> > they were there. The fact that he pretty much disappeared after
> > Yasme was over, not being interested in DXing those exotic locations,
> > leaves in question how much of a ham he was, his contribution to
> > the hobby notwithstanding.
> >
> > One might compare Danny to Gus Browning. The latter started
> > out in amateur radio at a young age, and went on the tour to put
> > many countries on the map. But then when that was over, he was
> > still considered a high power DXer, publishing DX Magazine for many
> > years.
> >
> > Michael VE2BVW
> >
> >
> First off I don't agreee with these sorts of "categorizations". The
> implication here is that you consider Gus a "better ham" than Danny
> was and I reject the concept. Categorically. Plus dissing Danny a half
> century after he lit up the bands is not exactly a class act Michael.
>
> Danny never made any bones about the intent and purpose of his ham
> activities. We kept his boat(s) afloat which was his need and he
> shipped the cards which was our need. And there isn't any more to it
> than that.
>
> His format has been followed innumerable times since, i.e. hams with

> marginal and/or short term interests in the hobby or DXing putting new
> ones on the air. If the cards they've sent over the years hit the
> no-counters pile your own totals and the Honor Roll membership count
> would drop like rocks.
>
> w3rv

Well said.

Dan/W4NTI

596. Re: Ireland

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-08 19:10:19 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bm1nerbmj0@208.206.142.74>
Source record: 80172

Brian wrote:
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3F83C6B4.D6EC0FB0@earthlink.net>...
>
>
>>Ponder the matter. The answer will come to you.
>>
>>Ponder the matter. The answer will come to you.
>>
>>Ahhh! You may be getting closer to understanding my statements though I
>>made no statements concerning "native amateur populations". Amateur
>>radio licenses figures are not broken down into "native" and
>>"non-native" categories. I didn't attempt to discount. I discounted.
>>
>>Dave K8MN
>
>
> Thusly, you are smug Dave.

When dealing with you it's almost a necessary requirement.

597. I'LL BE ON TONITE.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-08 20:01:06 UTC
From: BIGBIGAL <BIGBIGAL@BIGBIGAL.BIGBIGAL.COM>
Message-ID: <vo8r82m9brpgb1@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 80173

AY YI YI AY YI YI YES ITS THE PORKBUTT SONG.....

598. Re: Ireland

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-08 20:33:56 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@nope.org>
Message-ID: <caq8ovgbv61umoc7n39b25j42n7b251ag4@4ax.com>
Source record: 80174

Hey - that Yogi Berra stuff is sure catching on :)

(going back in the corner now...)

73, Leo

On 8 Oct 2003 19:10:19 GMT, Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com>
wrote:

>snip

>.... it's almost a necessary requirement.

599. Re: Ireland

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-08 20:39:14 UTC
From: BIG**AL**ABERNETHY** <ABERNETHY@ABERNETHY.ORG>
Message-ID: <vo8tfkftpc4vbd@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 80175

"Leo" <nomail@nope.org> wrote in message
news:caq8ovgbv61umoc7n39b25j42n7b251ag4@4ax.com...
> Hey - that Yogi Berra stuff is sure catching on :)
>
> (going back in the corner now...)
>
> 73, Leo
>

STAY THERE UNTIL I CALL YOU OUT.

600. Re: GOOD NEWS-------France heat wave deaths top 14,000

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-08 23:02:11 UTC
From: Fire & Brimstone <Not.no.m@il.here>
Message-ID: <3f8496b7$0$47053$45beb828@newscene.com>
Source record: 80176
Cross-posted to: alt.ham-radio.hf,alt.ham-radio.ssb,alt.radio.amateur,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"BIG-AL@3894.5-LSB-75-METERS" <BIG-AL -003894.5-LSB-75-METERS@
BIG-AL -003894.5-LSB-75-METERS> wrote in
news:vn6lk3dd6nrg62@corp.supernews.com:

> PARIS, France (AP) -- The death toll in France from August's
> blistering heat wave was nearly 15,000, according to a government
> report released Thursday that exceeded prior official estimates by
> 3,000 victims.

No, Not good news, 30,000 would've been good news.

15,000 is a good start though.

During one of the many wars that the French and the British fought and the French usually lost, the French just happened to capture a British Major. An officer brought the Major to the French general for interrogation. The French general began ridiculing the Major for wearing "that stupid red tunic." The French general said, "Why to you wear that red uniform, it makes it easy for us to shoot you." The British major replied, "If I do get wounded, the blood will not show, and my soldiers will not get scared." The French general said, "That is a very good idea," The Frenchy turned to his orderly and said, "From now on all French officers will wear brown pants."

601. Re: Ham Radio in the FW:FW:Fw: World of Emails!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-09 00:05:18 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031008200518.07578.00001030@mb-m25.aol.com>
Source record: 80177

In article <blvhtp$6b8@library2.airnews.net>, "Kim" <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
writes:

>I got this today in my email. While the callsign is fake, leaving the whole
>story in question, it's still creative:
>
>Subject: 1000 Marbles
>
>Food for thought. A Ham Radio Fan Writes:

This classic has been around for several years, Kim, but it's well worth
repeating. The callsign might not be a fake, but rather one that has been
turned back for a vanity call - or a Silent Key - in the years since it first
appeared..

Thanks for posting it here.

73 de Jim, N2EY

602. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-09 00:59:51 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3F84B305.5070906@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 80178

>
>
>>
>
> After I became an Extra, there was a time when I felt a little odd
> about it. I knew all the test questions, and a lot more, but my
> operation skills were really not that good. I also saw some Extras
> both before and after I got my ticket who were really really green,
> and needed tutoring in some real basics. I mean real operational
> basics. The half wave/quarter wave dipole thing is no joke, even if we
> make fun of it. The top level should be just that. As many people find
> out after they leave college, there is more to life than just taking
> tests.

Don't you know it! When I graduated college with a BSEE, I was pretty
much your standard
issue geek/nerd, short on the social skills and ability to handle office
politics. Which doesn't come
up in college at all. But after years of working experience and some
help from various
good friends/mentors, you eventually learn it. In college, if it
doesn't show up on an exam, you
need not learn it to eventually graduate. I have heard that that is not
true for PHD levels,
where social/political skills are vital. Similar skills needed to get
good reviews/ avoid layoffs
from managers in industry. I've been told that I'm less nerdy and
better at the office
politics nowadays. ;-) Not that I'm likely to turn to the dark side
and become a manager

:-)

603. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-09 01:07:29 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3F84B4CF.2050108@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 80179

Alun Palmer wrote:

>Only when you try to link passing a Morse code test with ability to
>understand theory
>
>
I suppose the ability to read and write would be required to copy code,
but aside
from that, a chimp might be able to do it. But I doubt that a chimp
would understand
how to build a dipole, or even know why he'd want to....

Of course some CBers might be described as chimps.... ;-)

604. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-09 01:16:41 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3F84B6F7.20507@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 80180

>
>
>>Perhaps we should have a two class system, with only Generals and Extras?
>>
>>
>
>Dang....a two tier license structure not mandated by the government? Heaven
>forbid...hi.
>
>
>
There should be some sort of beginner's license that an average 14 year
old honor roll student
can get. Just like the cigarette companies, get them while they're young.
;-)

>
>

605. Re: Vote for WX6RST

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-09 01:44:58 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20031008214458.11891.00001349@mb-m11.aol.com>
Source record: 80184

In article <blu2qc$f31@library2.airnews.net>, "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
writes:

>Hey, I find it interesting that none of those who've touted the "skills" of
>ham radio as applicable to goals in life, are even responding to this. I
>was "echoing" their belief system.
>
>Kim W5TIT

Kim:

Don't look now, but being an Amateur Radio Operator falls into the
category of "hobbies and interests," which, as anyone with any current
business savvy at all knows, would not necessarily be included in a
resume unless this particular activity was in some way directly
related to the position being sought. Jim (that's MISTER Weir to you)
is running for Governor of the State of California; he's not applying for
a job as a salesman at the Ham Radio Outlet.

All you've done, as usual, is make yourself look foolish in an attempt to
do the same to others.

73 de Larry, K3LT

606. Re: Woman opens fire at church, killing her mother, pastor and herself

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-09 01:44:59 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20031008214459.11891.00001350@mb-m11.aol.com>
Source record: 80185

In article <vo2fj7148tvv88@corp.supernews.com>, <BIG--AL> writes:

>
>ATLANTA, Georgia (AP) -- A woman opened fire at an Atlanta church before
>services started Sunday morning, killing her mother and the minister before
>committing suicide.
>Congregants of Turner Monumental AME Church said Shelia W. Chaney Wilson,
>43, was agitated when she came to the church, in the Kirkwood neighborhood
>on the city's east side.
>Wilson apparently shot the Rev. Johnny Clyde Reynolds after he greeted her
>and was walking away with his back to her, said Atlanta police spokesman
>Sgt. John Quigley. Police believe Wilson then shot Jennie Mae Robinson once
>in the head before turning the gun on herself.
>One woman in the sanctuary at the time fled after the first shot was fired,
>and the other took cover behind a pulpit, Quigley said. He said an assistant
>pastor came in after hearing shots and found the three bodies on the floor.
>Wilson's cousin, Nekeshia Burton, said Wilson went to the church early in
>the morning to talk to Reynolds, 62.
>"Something wasn't sitting right with her," Burton said. But Burton said
>there were no signs that Wilson would become violent.
>Assistant Pastor Christy Miller said the pastor had just finished teaching
>Sunday school and was walking through the sanctuary when he stopped to talk
>with Wilson and Robinson, 67.
>Geraldine Andrews, the pastor's daughter-in-law and a friend of Wilson's
>family, said Robinson recently took her daughter out of a mental health
>facility.
>Debra Mitchell, a member of the church, said Wilson had recently lost her
>job.
>"We knew she has some instability, but we didn't know it was this deep,"
>Mitchell said.
>Many remembered Robinson, who taught Bible study, as "a sweet individual,
>always praying for other people, always doing missionary work," Mitchell
>said.
>The pastor was described as mild-mannered and generous.
>"There was nothing too small or too great that he'd do for you," Miller
>said.
>The shootings happened before most worshippers arrived for church. When they
>got there and heard what had happened, church members sobbed and hugged in
>front of the building.
>"We're such a loving church, a family church," Miller said. "We'll support
>each other through this."

This is indeed a great tragedy. Pastor Reynolds was a Vice-President
of the Amalgamated Transit Union, of which I am a member. May he
Rest in the Lord's Peace.

73 de Larry, K3LT
Member, ATU Local 842, Wilmington, DE

607. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-09 01:44:59 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20031008214459.11891.00001351@mb-m11.aol.com>
Source record: 80186

In article <6u4gb.35703$qj6.2003327@news1.news.adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo
<mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:

>> In the past (the Pre-Restructuring Era), the reason for upgrading was that
>> increased operating privileges were the reward for gaining increased
>> technical knowledge and operating skill. The ARS seems to have taken
>> a clue from the rest of our dumbed-down society and abandoned this
>> philosophy.
>
> And what I'm thinking is that unless it means something again, they
>might as well get rid of it. That little sliver of operating frequencies
>is not worth it, if increased privileges are the measuring stick.
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -

Mike:

True, if you're talking about the difference between Advanced and Extra
under the Pre-Restructuring system. In that system, the motivation to
upgrade to Extra was to gain the International DX "windows" on phone
and CW, plus the benefit of the 1x2 and 2x1 callsigns, and the "status" that
went with being an Amateur Extra. I considered that to be well worth
the effort required to pass Elements 1(c) and 2(e). However, "status"
among hams is now Politically Incorrect, so we must now endure the
"socialized" licensing system we now have in the ARS. Personally, I
didn't have too many problems with the No-code Tech concept, except
for the fact that even though it literally gave away 97% of all amateur
operating privileges, it only led to greater expectations of even more
dumbing-down.

73 de Larry, K3LT

608. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-09 01:45:00 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20031008214500.11891.00001352@mb-m11.aol.com>
Source record: 80182

In article <QQjgb.668$mQ2.39@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dan/W4NTI"
<w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> writes:

>> Mike:
>>
>> In the past (the Pre-Restructuring Era), the reason for upgrading was that
>> increased operating privileges were the reward for gaining increased
>> technical knowledge and operating skill. The ARS seems to have taken
>> a clue from the rest of our dumbed-down society and abandoned this
>> philosophy.
>>
>> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>>
>
>I've never thought of it that way Larry, but your 100% correct. Just look
>at Kim.
>
>Dan/W4NTI

Dan:

YOU look at her. I just had dinner.

73 de Larry, K3LT

609. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-09 01:45:01 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20031008214501.11891.00001353@mb-m11.aol.com>
Source record: 80183

In article <E0kgb.680$mQ2.89@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dan/W4NTI"
<w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> writes:

>> Of course, there's always the remote possibility that the FCC will
>> take the easiest course of action, which is to make no further changes
>> to the ARS licensing structure and requirements at all. However,
>> this would seem to be almost impossible for them to get away with,
>> in light of the language of the Restructuring R&O. One can always
>> hope, but I'm 99% sure we'll see code testing go away. Of course,
>> when it does, Carl and the NCI will then be in the "hot seat" -- since
>> we'll now be able to sit back and wait for the technical/digital
>> revolution they've promised all along. Personally, I hope they're right,
>> but I don't have that kind of luck.
>>
>> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>
>Forget it Larry. It ain't gonna happen. The puter folks may get into ham
>radio for the UHF / SHF linking aspects. Just to increase range. But that
>will be it.
>
>HF has no interest to them. Nor does conventional voice stuff. And, of
>course, forget CW.
>
>Basically what it amounts to, AND ALWAYS HAS. It takes a certain breed to
>be a real radio ham. And we are going away fast.
>
>Dan/W4NTI

Dan:

Yeah, I'm afraid it's true. The irony is that some of the most technically-
inclined YOUNG hams I've known have been those who were eager and
willing to respond to the code learning/testing challenge. It just may have
been the one thing that would have motivated more young people to
become hams.

73 de Larry, K3LT

610. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-09 01:45:18 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <O43hb.78070$qj6.2835609@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 80181

N2EY wrote:
>
> But back in 1968, when I was at the FCC office for the General, the examiner
> said "why not try the Advanced while you're here?" (Could not do Extra because
> back then it had a 2 year experience requirement).

Question 1:

Were you discriminated against by such a rule? Since you lived through such a thing, your input would be worthwhile.

> So I took it and passed easily even though I had not studied for it at all. I
> was 14 and it was the summer between 8th and 9th grades. Not a big deal even
> then because I knew of 12 year old Extras back then.

I do believe there is a "toughness effect" that is related to how much trouble a person may have had at the time. They remember that it was fairly hard for them then, so it remained difficult, even though the person learned much more over the years. And since they know a lot now, the old test must have been tough.

Kind of like when I went back to my old elementary school a year or so ago. I remembered how big the place was, and how big a deal it was to walk from one end of the school to the other. If I hadn't gone back and seen just how small the place was, my perception would have been forever skewed as to it's size and how intimidating it was to a little kid such as I was.

- Mike KB3EIA -

611. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-09 02:29:31 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031008222931.12501.00003006@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 80187

In article <O43hb.78070$qj6.2835609@news1.news.adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo
<mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>>
>> But back in 1968, when I was at the FCC office for the General, the
>examiner
>> said "why not try the Advanced while you're here?" (Could not do Extra
>because
>> back then it had a 2 year experience requirement).
>
> Question 1:
>
> Were you discriminated against by such a rule?

No!

>Since you lived through
>such a thing, your input would be worthwhile.

My view, then and now, was that experience was part of the qualifications. Of course, someone could just toss the license in a drawer for two years and do nothing with it, but such was not the case with anyone I knew.

The day the Advanced license arrived, I sat down and calculated when the 2 years would be up, based on the effective date of the license. On the first exam day when it would have been OK to take the test, I was back at the FCC office to get the Extra.
>
>> So I took it and passed easily even though I had not studied for it at all.
>> I
>> was 14 and it was the summer between 8th and 9th grades. Not a big deal
>> even
>> then because I knew of 12 year old Extras back then.
>
> I do believe there is a "toughness effect" that is related to how much
>trouble a person may have had at the time. They remember that it was
>fairly hard for them then, so it remained difficult, even though the
>person learned much more over the years. And since they know a lot now,
>the old test must have been tough.

I did not think any of the tests - written or code - were that difficult. They required one to know a little radio and some basic code skills, that's all.
>
> Kind of like when I went back to my old elementary school a year or so

>ago. I remembered how big the place was, and how big a deal it was to
>walk from one end of the school to the other. If I hadn't gone back and
>seen just how small the place was, my perception would have been forever
>skewed as to it's size and how intimidating it was to a little kid such
>as I was.
>
I had the same experience going back to my high school after not having been
there for more than 25 years. How small it appeared! And I'm about the same
size I was in those days.

73 de Jim, N2EY

612. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-09 03:36:38 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bm2lg7$npe@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 80188

"Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
news:3F844158.1090208@psu.edu...
> Ryan, KC8PMX wrote:
> > It might have if it was promoted better. The argument of people running
to
> > the internet, or the internet being competition is not as strong of an
> > argument (among other arguments). You can't "run" to something if you
> > didn't know it existed in the first place. Let's see, how many people
have
> > heard of the internet?? How many have heard of ham radio??? How many of
> > these answeree's are under 25-30??
>
>
> I know what you're saying Ryan, but there is a huge difference between
> the Internet and Ham radio:
>
> Ham radio does not allow a person to download Porn, do business online,
> or find cool software.
>
> Ham radio would like a person to have a certain technical acumen, while
> the internet demands clicking on links.
>

If you look at it from that perspective, yes. But, just as in ham radio,
even the "internet" provides for opportunity if you look and are interested
beyond the basics. There's networking environments that can be
"home-brewed" that will provide faster access, more efficient use of hard
and soft storage; there's machine specific solutions to better connection
speeds and more efficient use of BPS and MPS, etc. See? In my world, you
look at the "internet" like I look at ham radio. BUT, you won't hear me
saying that you aren't interested, or that you are "dumbed-down" or that you
aren't equal [or not], or any of those other childish arguments one uses for
self-gratification. Know why? Because, in the end, we are all on the
internet...and why would I care why or how you approach the task?

>
> Wheras may who are interested in Ham radio find the internet a useful
> tool and entertaining, the converse is only true in a very few cases.
> It's really not the same group of people.
>

Once again, that is from your perspective.

>
> If the internet were to suddenly dissapear, very few of the people using

> it would decide to migrate to Ham radio (conjecture, for sure - but do
> you want to refute that?)
>

Whereas, if ham radio went away today...well, there'd be no difference in internet usage because most hams are already there... And, I daresay that most hams would be "inventive" enough to create some pretty fantastical ways to employ the technologies VOIP, etc., to using the internet for "fun" communication.

> >
> > Our local group just did a presentation/booth for the boy scouts this
past
> > week, and only about 5-10% had a clue that ham radio even existed.
>
> Good work, man!
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -
>

Kim W5TIT

613. Re: Bootlegging in 1948?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-09 04:42:31 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <REMOVETHISkc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <bm3d53$hugps$1@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 80192

Got your email Jim, and thanks! I will check those out.

Ryan

"Ryan, KC8PMX" <REMOVETHISkc8pmx@diamondcs.net> wrote in message
news:bm0oml$bruhr$2@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de...
> Really?? Which month/year were they published?? Would be interested in
> reading them.
>
>
> --
> Ryan, KC8PMX
> FF1-FF2-MFR-(pending NREMT-B!)
> --. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
> .. --. .... - . .-. ...
>
> >
> > I've written for QST.
> >
> > You haven't.
> >
>
>
>

614. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-09 04:54:01 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <REMOVETHISkc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <bm3d54$hugps$2@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 80193

"Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
news:3F844158.1090208@psu.edu...
> Ryan, KC8PMX wrote:
> > It might have if it was promoted better. The argument of people running
to
> > the internet, or the internet being competition is not as strong of an
> > argument (among other arguments). You can't "run" to something if you
> > didn't know it existed in the first place. Let's see, how many people
have
> > heard of the internet?? How many have heard of ham radio??? How many of
> > these answeree's are under 25-30??
>
>
> I know what you're saying Ryan, but there is a huge difference between
> the Internet and Ham radio:
>
> Ham radio does not allow a person to download Porn, do business online,
> or find cool software.
>
> Ham radio would like a person to have a certain technical acumen, while
> the internet demands clicking on links.

Right. No argument there.

>
> Wheras may who are interested in Ham radio find the internet a useful
> tool and entertaining, the converse is only true in a very few cases.
> It's really not the same group of people.

Sometimes it is, sometimes not.

>
> If the internet were to suddenly dissapear, very few of the people using
> it would decide to migrate to Ham radio (conjecture, for sure - but do
> you want to refute that?)

Sure, and I will say it again..... An alternative is only an alternative if
it is involved as a possibility in the equation in the first place. Like I
said in the quoted text above which is a mantra of some here, stating that
of course kids run to the internet. Of course, ham radio is not an
alternative for the kids, as they are not aware of it as an alternative.

People in their 50's, 60's, and older have a different view of radio, as it
was more of an important part of their lives that it is today for people.
Back then for them, radio was more of a primary entertainment and/or
information source than it is now, be it listening only or transcieving.

>
>
>
>
> > Our local group just did a presentation/booth for the boy scouts this
past
> > week, and only about 5-10% had a clue that ham radio even existed.
>
>
> Good work, man!
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -
>

I have been pushing the group to look more into events like this, especially working better with the Scout leadership in this area. We had at least one kid (about 13-14) who definitely showed alot of interest, and who knows, possibly a new ham in the future??

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
"Symbolism is for the simple minded....."

615. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-09 04:59:04 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <REMOVETHISkc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <bm3d56$hugps$3@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 80194

"Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
news:3F84B6F7.20507@ix.netcom.com...
> >
> >
> >>Perhaps we should have a two class system, with only Generals and
Extras?
> >>
> >>
> >
> >Dang....a two tier license structure not mandated by the government?
Heaven
> >forbid...hi.
> >
> >
> >
> There should be some sort of beginner's license that an average 14 year
> old honor roll student
> can get. Just like the cigarette companies, get them while they're young.
> ;-)

There might actually be some merit to that. Teenagers are still quite
moldable, and would be excellent candidates to "mold' them into the hams
that we want them to be, in the ham community. (Especially with making them
code enthusiasts as well.) Now for the naysayers..... this would mean
identifying those with the aptitude towards ham radio, not to all the teens,
just the "right" ones, whatever that means.

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
"Symbolism is for the simple minded....."

616. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-09 05:19:32 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bm2r54pua0@208.207.71.166>
Source record: 80189

```
Alun Palmer wrote:
> Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com> wrote in
> news:bm08tm$1ce$1@208.206.142.71:
>
>
>>Alun Palmer wrote:
>>
>>
>>>Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com> wrote in
>>>news:bluvaq$7f7$0@208.207.71.138:
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>>Robert Casey wrote:
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>Dick Carroll wrote:
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>>You view the situation as an EE who didn't need to study to work out
>>>>>>any of the technical problems on the Extra exam, few that there were.
>>>>>>Most applicants have the singleminded goal of passing the exam, and
>>>>>>learning beyond that goal is not only unnecessary, it gets in the way
>>>>>>of the goal at hand. So they naturally just don't do it. The curent
>>>>>>method of testing clearly facilitates that position.
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>I'm a EE, and like any reasonably successful college student, I still
>>>>>made use of the
>>>>>avaliable resources (the question pool) to prepare for the (at the
>>>>>time I took them)
>>>>>elements 4A and 4B. Found a few holes in my knowledge, and filled
>>>>>them in for
>>>>>at least long enough to score well on the tests (missed 1 on 4A, 2 on
>>>>>4B IIRC).
>>>>>Got the CSCEs, and then the extra on Restructuring Day.
>>>>>Most students only study what is expected to be on the exams. Thus, I
>>>>>could solve calculus exam problems (take the intergral of (csc
>>>>>x^5)/(tan x^2 -1) dx)
>>>>>but I still never got a good understanding of how to use calculus to
>>>>>solve a real
>>>>>world problem. Recently went looking for a "calculus for dummies"
```

>>>>>type book, but all they had was how to do exam problems. Been there,
>>>>>done that.
>>>>>
>>>>
>>>>
>>>> And obviously it wasn't a problemm and hasn't caused any problem, for
>>>>you and others similarly situated, nor for the ARS.
>>>>
>>>> But.....how about all the Extras out there who have
>>>>successfully proceeded through the same system and emerged
>>>>with so little knowledge that they have no idea of even
>>>>how to design and build a simple *1/2* wave dipole?
>>>> With little or nothing beyond the question pools in their
>>>>libraries, many won't even know how or where to look it up.
>>>>And when(if) the day comes that won't be required to copy
>>>>ANY Morse code,one of the most used modes in ham radio, at the most
>>>>basic speed?
>>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>Which will affect their comprehension of dipoles neither one way or the
>>>other.
>>>
>>>Your linking of CW ability to comprehension of radio theory would be
>>>frightening if it wasn't hilarious!
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>> Understand that I'm not saying they shouldn't be hams, nor
>>>>that they shouldn't be allowed some HF access. We all start somewhere.
>>>>But to allow them licensing into the top echelon of amateurs
>>>>is ludicrous and negates all that ham radio is supposed to stand for.
>>>>
>>>> In short, it reduces the ARS to CB status.
>>>>
>>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>Your thinking is so completely addled that I hardly know what to say in
>>>reply.
>>
>>
>> To quote a famous person, "There you go again!"
>>
>>The minute I mention MOrse code, suddenly I'm all addled. Right.
>>
>
>
> Only when you try to link passing a Morse code test with ability to
> understand theory

Well since I *didn't* make any such linkage, and never have, your comment is out of line.

If you don't believe that proficiency in radiotelegraph operations is a serious part of ham radio, that's your problem.

I know no one who has ever linked it to technical knowlecge, despite the many claims of NCI mavens.

617. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-09 05:21:26 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bm2r8mpua1@208.207.71.166>
Source record: 80190

Robert Casey wrote:

>>
>>
>>> Perhaps we should have a two class system, with only Generals and
>>> Extras?
>>>
>>
>>
>> Dang....a two tier license structure not mandated by the government?
>> Heaven
>> forbid...hi.
>>
>>
>>
> There should be some sort of beginner's license that an average 14 year
> old honor roll student
> can get. Just like the cigarette companies, get them while they're young.
> ;-)
>

FCC won't drop the entry level license, whatever name it carries.
And I'd wager we'll have three licenses when it all settles out.

618. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-09 05:37:57 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bm2s7lrpc0@208.207.71.166>
Source record: 80191

N2EY wrote:

> In article <O43hb.78070$qj6.2835609@news1.news.adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo
> <mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:
>
>
>>N2EY wrote:
>>
>>>But back in 1968, when I was at the FCC office for the General, the
>>
>>examiner
>>
>>>said "why not try the Advanced while you're here?" (Could not do Extra
>>
>>because
>>
>>>back then it had a 2 year experience requirement).
>>
>> Question 1:
>>
>> Were you discriminated against by such a rule?
>
>
> No!
>
>
>>Since you lived through
>>such a thing, your input would be worthwhile.
>
>
> My view, then and now, was that experience was part of the qualifications. Of
> course, someone could just toss the license in a drawer for two years and do
> nothing with it, but such was not the case with anyone I knew.
>
> The day the Advanced license arrived, I sat down and calculated when the 2
> years would be up, based on the effective date of the license. On the first
> exam day when it would have been OK to take the test, I was back at the FCC
> office to get the Extra.
>
>>>So I took it and passed easily even though I had not studied for it at all.
>>>I
>>>was 14 and it was the summer between 8th and 9th grades. Not a big deal
>>>even
>>>then because I knew of 12 year old Extras back then.

>>
>> I do believe there is a "toughness effect" that is related to how much
>>trouble a person may have had at the time. They remember that it was
>>fairly hard for them then, so it remained difficult, even though the
>>person learned much more over the years. And since they know a lot now,
>>the old test must have been tough.
>
>
> I did not think any of the tests - written or code - were that difficult. They
> required one to know a little radio and some basic code skills, that's all.
>
>> Kind of like when I went back to my old elementary school a year or so
>
>
>>ago. I remembered how big the place was, and how big a deal it was to
>>walk from one end of the school to the other. If I hadn't gone back and
>>seen just how small the place was, my perception would have been forever
>>skewed as to it's size and how intimidating it was to a little kid such
>>as I was.
>>
>
> I had the same experience going back to my high school after not having been
> there for more than 25 years. How small it appeared! And I'm about the same
> size I was in those days.

You can imagine what my small hometown looked like when I returned after
5 years military time away in places like New York, Hartford, Philly,
Chicago, Paris and Frankfurt.

619. Re: DXers Of The Past (Was YASME makes her final port 'o call)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-09 10:44:34 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0310090244.529b1b04@posting.google.com>
Source record: 80195
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

"Key Largo" <Bogie@largo.com> wrote in message news:<6kVgb.58222$Ms2.26974@fed1read03>...
> > More old time DXers at URL:
> > http://home.swipnet.se/dx/porthole/index.htm
> >
> > And the CQ Contest Hall Of Fame at URL:
> > http://cqww.com/hof-history.html
> > 73 From Key Largo
>
>
> INCLUDES Famous DXers
> 1923
> DU7CC
> VP2VB
> W4BPD
> BRS-3129
> W9WNV

AARGH!!. . never mind . .

> W6AM

W6AM tale: My second transmitter was a $29.95 Heathkit AT-1 I'd cobbled together. The only FT-243 xtal I owned was 7.060. Xtals were EXPENSIVE boy! Which when doubled put me on 14.120. Kinda useless freq for dxing so I had to really scrounge for contacts. CQ, CQ, CQ, CQ ad infinitum after school with all 3-5 watts of RF out or whatever it was. Finally a CT1 found me and we latched up for several days running. After some number of days another station called out of nowhere, it was W6AM mobile running CW from his car. So 14.120 got to be a three-way round table around 5pm Eastern Time for days on end. At the time I had no idea who W6AM actually was except that his name was Don and he was a really neat guy. I have a W6AM card.

> K3ZO
> ZS4TX
> KV4AA
> OH2BH

OH2BH/ZA. Tally ho!!

> SMï¿½AGD
> P5/Rï¿½MEO
> SMï¿½CNS/4E7
> SM1CNS
> SM6CNS

> SM6CNS/MM
>
>
> The CQ Contest List
> 1. Hazzard "Buzz" Reeves, K2GL
> 2. Katashi Nose, KH6IJ

Good 'ole Hammer Fisti the Kamikazi of 80 & 40M

> 3. Al Slater, G3FXB
> 4. Martti Laine, OH2BH
> 5. Bernie Welch, W8IMZ
> 6. Leonard Chertok, W3GRF
> 7. W. Gerry Mathis, W3GM

Yeah, Gerry W3BES/W3GM. The radio god in these parts, my all-time great mentor. EVERYBODY'S mentor, that's the way he was. I yakked with Gerry on the club machine one day then found out he passed away two days later. Dredge up QSTs from the late '40s and early '50s and check the glossy back cover RCA power tubes division ads for a look at Gerry himself and the collection of the gorgeous monster amps he designed and built.

> 8. Frank Anazlone, W1WY
> 9. Jim Lawson, W2PV

. . . talk about hammers . . !

> 10. Ed Bissell, W3AU
> 11. Fred Laun, K3ZO
> 12. Vic Clark, W4KFC
> 13. Rush Drake, W7RM
> 14. John Thompson, W1BIH
> 15. Atilano de Oms, PY5EG
> 16. Herb Becker, W6QD
> 17. Jim Neiger, N6TJ
> 18. Tine Brajnik, S50A
> 19. Dick Norton, N6AA
> 20. Ken Wolff, K1EA
> 21. Ville Hiilesmaa, OH2MM
> 22. Lew Gordon, K4VX
> 23. Bob Cox, K3EST
> 24. Carl Cook, AI6V
> 25. Gordon Marshall, W6RR
> 26. John Devoldere, ON4UN

In a class *all* by himself.

> 27. Jorge Humberto Bozzo, LU8DQ
> 28. John Dorr, K1AR

CQ never heard of HZ1HZ or what? And where is W3LPL please??

What kinda goofy list is this anyway??

w3rv

620. Re: YASME makes her final port 'o call

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-09 11:31:58 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031009073158.23171.00001345@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 80196

In article <d22b54c3.0310071827.7eb37e10@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) writes:

>He changed the face of DXing in a big way and was the first of the
>real DXpeditioneers and led the way for other pioneers of his ilk like
>Gus Browning and OH2BH.

Mostly before my time, but an amazing fellow by all accounts. He was 85.

It should be remembered that he was doing his thing mostly solo in a small sailing craft back in the days before modern aids like GPS, solar power, solid state radios or even electronic depth finders were common. Had to have been quite a sailor as well as radio operator.

Most of all he was a true DX pioneer who left a legacy that will be remembered.

73 de Jim, N2EY

621. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-09 11:31:58 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031009073158.23171.00001344@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 80197

In article <20031008214501.11891.00001353@mb-m11.aol.com>, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) writes:

>The irony is that some of the most technically-
>inclined YOUNG hams I've known have been those who were eager and
>willing to respond to the code learning/testing challenge. It just may have
>been the one thing that would have motivated more young people to
>become hams.

Fun fact:

When the results of the 1996 ARRL/READEX survey were tabulated, one of the results shown was the support for/opposition to code testing broken down by age group.

All age groups showed a majority to be procodetest, but the *most* procodetest group were the youngest! Hams under 24 at the time were 85% procodetest/15% anticodetest. Almost a 6 to 1 ratio!

73 de Jim, N2EY

622. Re: Ireland

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-09 12:24:32 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3F855392.F57A2D2A@earthlink.net>
Source record: 80198

Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3F83C6B4.D6EC0FB0@earthlink.net>...
>
> > Ponder the matter. The answer will come to you.
> >
> > Ponder the matter. The answer will come to you.
> >
> > Ahhh! You may be getting closer to understanding my statements though I
> > made no statements concerning "native amateur populations". Amateur
> > radio licenses figures are not broken down into "native" and
> > "non-native" categories. I didn't attempt to discount. I discounted.

> Thusly, you are smug Dave.

How did you reach that conclusion? Is it because you ask questions for
which there are obvious answers or is it because you haven't thought the
matter through?

If I had to choose between coming off as smug or coming off as dim, I'd
pick smug every time.

Dave K8MN

623. Re: Ireland

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-09 12:28:34 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0310090428.3c9dcea0@posting.google.com>
Source record: 80199

Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:<bm1nerbmj0@208.206.142.74>...
> Brian wrote:
> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3F83C6B4.D6EC0FB0@earthlink.net>...
> >
> >
> >>Ponder the matter. The answer will come to you.
> >>
> >>Ponder the matter. The answer will come to you.
> >>
> >>Ahhh! You may be getting closer to understanding my statements though I
> >>made no statements concerning "native amateur populations". Amateur
> >>radio licenses figures are not broken down into "native" and
> >>"non-native" categories. I didn't attempt to discount. I discounted.
> >>
> >>Dave K8MN
> >
> >
> > Thusly, you are smug Dave.
>
> When dealing with you it's almost a necessary requirement.

Especially the part about me getting closer to understanding a
statement he didn't make?

What an idiot!

Almost - necessary - requirement?

Its amazing how you were able to string those big words together.

624. Re: N8__googled

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-09 12:28:40 UTC
From: Cranus_is_an_Anus@ikillclowns.com
Message-ID: <94ef989d.0310090428.67c94f73@posting.google.com>
Source record: 80200
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.dogie.is.an.idiot,rec.radio.cb

Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com> wrote in message
news:<20031007214001.401$VM@newsreader.com>...
> http://tinyurl.com/q3xp

The fame, the adulation.....I am touched.

625. Re: Some thoughtful comments from another forum on the code/nocode debate

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-09 12:37:30 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0310090437.16085bc4@posting.google.com>
Source record: 80201

"Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:<bm0rgh$i4u@library2.airnews.net>...

> DICK has no point (no pun intended). Haven't you ever noticed that all DICK
> does is join the masses he follows but never has any true intelligent
> argument to make himself? Kind of like when someone speaks up, and a
> sidekick says, "YEAH, what he said!"
>
> Kim W5TIT

Yeah, what she said. ;^)

I recall once, years ago, when Dick made a thoughtful, well reasoned
post about amateur radio. And he wasn't tail-ending someone elses
thoughts.

So it is possible - he has the capacity.

Bruce, on the other hand...

626. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-09 12:53:15 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3F855A3B.2040607@psu.edu>
Source record: 80202

Dick Carroll wrote:

> You can imagine what my small hometown looked like when I returned after
> 5 years military time away in places like New York, Hartford, Philly,
> Chicago, Paris and Frankfurt.

Probably looked like good old HOME! 8^)

- Mike KB3EIA -

627. Re: DXers Of The Past (Was YASME makes her final port 'o call)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-09 13:34:50 UTC
From: spam.for.the@buerotiger.de
Message-ID: <bm3o5q$i6ske$1@ID-31.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 80203
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

In rec.radio.amateur.dx Brian Kelly <kelly@dvol.com> wrote:
> "Key Largo" <Bogie@largo.com> wrote in message
news:<6kVgb.58222$Ms2.26974@fed1read03>...
> > W9WNV
>
> AARGH!!. . never mind . .

AE6IY ;-)

Peter Lemken
DF5JT
Berlin

--
Mail an die im From: angegebene Adresse stellt eine Beauftragung zur
ï¿œberprï¿œfung der Mailfunktion des Absenders dar und wird mit einer
Bearbeitungsgebï¿œhr von EUR 1000,- in Rechnung gestellt.

628. Re: DXers Of The Past (Was YASME makes her final port 'o call)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-09 14:22:11 UTC
From: kh2d@my-deja.com
Message-ID: <3f856eee.417652502@newsgroups.bellsouth.net>
Source record: 80204
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

On 9 Oct 2003 03:44:34 -0700, kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote:

> And where is W3LPL please??

Is that the guy that loaned Bernie his antennas ?

73, Jim KH2D

629. Re: Bootlegging in 1948?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-09 15:27:05 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0310090727.2269e1bf@posting.google.com>
Source record: 80205

"Ryan, KC8PMX" <REMOVETHISkc8pmx@diamondcs.net> wrote in message news:<bm3d53$hugps$1@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>...
> Got your email Jim, and thanks! I will check those out.

Also see the top of page 62 in QST for June, 1989. Although I did not write it, there is a mention of me that is a bit out of the ordinary....

73 de Jim, N2EY

630. Re: Isnt it Funny (No-Code HF Privileges)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-09 16:17:40 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <ESfhb.7336$Eo2.6798@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 80206

```
"N8WWM" <dogie@home.nut> wrote in message
news:bm3mga01fae@drn.newsguy.com...
> In article <PkAgb.2727$Eo2.93@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>, Dan/W4NTI
> says...
> >
> >
> >"Dick Carroll" <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com> wrote in message
> >news:blt3vl$tjm$0@208.207.71.173...
> >> Clint wrote:
> >>
> >> > "Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
> >> > news:20031006162751.25517.00001185@mb-m15.aol.com...
> >> >
> >> >
> >> >
> >> >>>Now you can get all upset and indignant, Len old boy, but the facts
> >> >>>are the facts.
> >> >>
> >> >> Noooooo...those are just your OPINIONS. :-)
> >> >>
> >> >
> >> >
> >> > Not only that, consider the source... you're dealing with another
PCTA
> >> > type that didn't receive his or her fair share of grey matter such
that
> >> > self-determination isn't possible... it's just "bleat like the rest
of
> >the
> >> > sheep"
> >> >
> >> > "CW test good.... modernization bad.....
> >> > CW test good.... mdernization bad...."
> >> >
> >> > Clint
> >> >
> >>
> >>
> >> One could compare rattlehead with Forrest Gump except that
> >> Forrest was a not so bright fellow who did have some common sense...
> >>
> >I've noticed that folks that are a bit 'slow' are good at common sense.
> >Rattlehead is the exception that proves the rule.
> >
```

> >Dan/W4NTI
> >
> You are and old fart. Step aside before the tech class run you over,
chump.
>

Now thats a funny one. I would have to run backwards for 40 years to allow
them to come even, chump.

Dan/W4NTI

631. Re: Ireland

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-09 17:01:48 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bm449s$l7t$0@208.207.71.139>
Source record: 80207

Brian wrote:
> Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:<bm1nerbmj0@208.206.142.74>...
>
>>Brian wrote:
>>
>>>Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3F83C6B4.D6EC0FB0@earthlink.net>...
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>>Ponder the matter. The answer will come to you.
>>>>
>>>>Ponder the matter. The answer will come to you.
>>>>
>>>>Ahhh! You may be getting closer to understanding my statements though I
>>>>made no statements concerning "native amateur populations". Amateur
>>>>radio licenses figures are not broken down into "native" and
>>>>"non-native" categories. I didn't attempt to discount. I discounted.
>>>>
>>>>Dave K8MN
>>>
>>>
>>>Thusly, you are smug Dave.
>>
>>When dealing with you it's almost a necessary requirement.
>
>
> Especially the part about me getting closer to understanding a
> statement he didn't make?
>
> What an idiot!

Well, yes! That's your profile.

>
> Almost - necessary - requirement?

Only ocassionally do you manage to catch a passing information wave.
I could probably bette describe if but not in so few words.
>
> Its amazing how you were able to string those big words together.

You can probably find an online dictioary if you go Googling.

632. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-09 17:04:05 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bm44e5$l7t$1@208.207.71.139>
Source record: 80208

Mike Coslo wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
>
>> You can imagine what my small hometown looked like when I returned
>> after 5 years military time away in places like New York, Hartford,
>> Philly, Chicago, Paris and Frankfurt.
>
>
>
> Probably looked like good old HOME! 8^)
>
>

Yeah, that too. I was really ready to "land" for awhile. But it sure did look a lot smaller than I remembered.

633. Re: DXers Of The Past (Was YASME makes her final port 'o call)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-09 17:05:17 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bm44gd$l7t$2@208.207.71.139>
Source record: 80209
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

Peter Lemken wrote:

> In rec.radio.amateur.dx Brian Kelly <kelly@dvol.com> wrote:
>
>>"Key Largo" <Bogie@largo.com> wrote in message
news:<6kVgb.58222$Ms2.26974@fed1read03>...
>>
>>>W9WNV
>>
>>AARGH!!. . never mind . .
>
>
> AE6IY ;-)
>

Yep. That's his current callsign.

634. Re: Isnt it Funny (No-Code HF Privileges)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-09 17:32:03 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bm462j$t42$0@208.207.71.139>
Source record: 80210

N8WWM wrote:

> In article <PkAgb.2727$Eo2.93@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>, Dan/W4NTI
> says...
>
>>
>>"Dick Carroll" <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com> wrote in message
>>news:blt3vltjm0@208.207.71.173...
>>
>>>Clint wrote:
>>>
>>>
>>>>"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
>>>>news:20031006162751.25517.00001185@mb-m15.aol.com...
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>Now you can get all upset and indignant, Len old boy, but the facts
>>>>>are the facts.
>>>>>
>>>>> Noooooo...those are just your OPINIONS. :-)
>>>>>
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>Not only that, consider the source... you're dealing with another PCTA
>>>>type that didn't receive his or her fair share of grey matter such that
>>>>self-determination isn't possible... it's just "bleat like the rest of
>>
>>the
>>
>>>>sheep"
>>>>
>>>>"CW test good.... modernization bad.....
>>>>CW test good.... mdernization bad...."
>>>>
>>>>Clint
>>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>One could compare rattlehead with Forrest Gump except that
>>>Forrest was a not so bright fellow who did have some common sense...
>>>
>>

>>I've noticed that folks that are a bit 'slow' are good at common sense.
>>Rattlehead is the exception that proves the rule.
>>
>>Dan/W4NTI
>>
>
> You are and old fart. Step aside before the tech class run you over, chump.
>

Ah. Another example of the "slow" class, again lacking common sense.

Tell ya what, Genius- when there are so many of you that the bands are carpeted with you, it won't be possible to walk over oldtimers - We'll be gone fishing.
You're doing your damnedest to do the same thing to ham radio you did to CB, and the FCC and ARRL are not only going along with it, they're facilitating it. It's lunacy - right where you belong.

635. Re: Isnt it Funny (No-Code HF Privileges)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-09 17:55:10 UTC
From: Clint <"rattlehead at computron dot net">
Message-ID: <vob895nfljiif0@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 80211

Are you guys going to be this abrasive and sour, even years after
they are rid of your precious morse code test, or are you going to
be childish and juvenile ad infinitum?

Clint

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:bm462j$t42$0@208.207.71.139...
> N8WWM wrote:
>
> > In article <PkAgb.2727$Eo2.93@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>,
Dan/W4NTI
> > says...
> >
> >>
> >>"Dick Carroll" <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com> wrote in message
> >>news:blt3vltjm0@208.207.71.173...
> >>
> >>>Clint wrote:
> >>>
> >>>
> >>>"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
> >>>news:20031006162751.25517.00001185@mb-m15.aol.com...
> >>>
> >>>
> >>>
> >>>
> >>>>Now you can get all upset and indignant, Len old boy, but the facts
> >>>>are the facts.
> >>>>
> >>>> Noooooo...those are just your OPINIONS. :-)
> >>>>
> >>>
> >>>
> >>>Not only that, consider the source... you're dealing with another PCTA
> >>>type that didn't receive his or her fair share of grey matter such
that
> >>>self-determination isn't possible... it's just "bleat like the rest of
> >>
> >>the
> >>
> >>>sheep"
> >>>
> >>>"CW test good.... modernization bad.....
> >>>CW test good.... mdernization bad...."

> >>>>
> >>>>Clint
> >>>>
> >>>
> >>>
> >>>One could compare rattlehead with Forrest Gump except that
> >>>Forrest was a not so bright fellow who did have some common sense...
> >>>
> >>
> >>I've noticed that folks that are a bit 'slow' are good at common sense.
> >>Rattlehead is the exception that proves the rule.
> >>
> >>Dan/W4NTI
> >>
> >
> > You are and old fart. Step aside before the tech class run you over,
chump.
> >
>
>
> Ah. Another example of the "slow" class, again lacking common sense.
>
> Tell ya what, Genius- when there are so many of you that the bands are
> carpeted with you, it won't be possible to walk over oldtimers - We'll
> be gone fishing.
> You're doing your damnedest to do the same thing to ham radio you did
> to CB, and the FCC and ARRL are not only going along with it, they're
> facilitating it. It's lunacy - right where you belong.
>

636. Re: Lennie's Double Standard Once Again Revealed...BY Lennie!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-09 20:22:44 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0310091222.279d8b89@posting.google.com>
Source record: 80212

brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0310080436.189d2293@posting.google.com>...
> k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0310071254.6891a81c@posting.google.com>...
> > brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0310060723.778385fd@posting.google.com>...
> >
> > > Unfortunately, Steve, we don't enjoy your antics and rants. Not
> > > amusing at all.
> >
> > "We", Brain? "We" without exemption implies everyone.
>
> Sour grapes? Demanding a recount?

No recount possible when no ORIGINAL count was conducted, eh,
Brain?

> > And I am sure you DON'T "enjoy" anything I have to say, mostly
> > because I rub your nose in your own errors as effectively as I do.
>
> I enjoy your ocassional post about radio.

We've tried that here before, Brain. Your mentor can't stand
seeing anyone but himself express anything meaningful about radio.

There have also been several other posters who have tried to
drive content-focused threads here, but what's the use? YOU certainly
have had nothing to offer...And what you HAVE offered has been found
faulty and erroneous, to say the least.

> > > Try behaving in a rational and civilized manner, and you'll not
> > > attract so much negative attention.
> >
> > Hmmmmmmm......All the "negative attention" I've "attract(ed)" has
> > been from you (a person known to proudly associate himself with a
> > pathological liar), Lennie, (who IS the known pathological liar),
> > Vipul, (who doesn't know the difference between BS and shinola), and a
> > couple of anonymous posters who "hit and run" with some wise cracks.
>
> Steve, you attract no other kind of attention. You're hugely ignored.

Perhaps, but again, that would require some sort of reasonably
alid survey, and neither you nor Sir Putzman have the resources or the
reputations of being impartial or accurate in your posts.

In otherwords, you are again spinning your wheels...

> > Ergo I am not at all impressed with your suggestion about ANYone's
> > behaviour.
>
> behavior

Either is correct.

Steve, K4YZ

637. Re: Amazin'....Ain't it...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-09 20:33:05 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0310091233.2e6d328e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 80213

brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0310060728.1275bf06@posting.google.com>...
> k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0310051510.2502be58@posting.google.com>...
> > brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0310030443.74c4da4b@posting.google.com>...
> >
> > > > > > There's been other rumors of running afoul of the CIVIL courts
> > > > > > and getting booted by his ISP for his misconduct, but I don't have all
> > > > > > those details.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Perhaps he'd like to bring us up to date...?!?!
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Steve, K4YZ
> > > > >
> > > > > Would you mind providing us with the name of that Yahoo MODERATED
> > > > > Group, so that we might look at the archives and see what got you
> > > > > tossed off the group.

The group's not there any longer, Brain. I guess John got
plugged from there, too...It was "radiomonitors", and it was
UNmoderated.

> > > > Thanks, Brian
> > > >
> > > >
> > > > Hello?
> > >
> > Asking yourself questions, Brain?
>
> No, Steve, I asked you a question. See the part that starts with,
> "Would you mind..."
>
> > Who said anything about "moderated"...?!?!
>
> I was just curious what it would take to get you to play well with
> others.

Acting the way YOU want to be treated is the first step, Brain.

Your "mentor" can fill you in on ways to antagonize and instigate
flamefests...he does it well.

You aren't quite there yet, but you're getting close.

> > I own four YahooGroups, one of which has over 400 subscribers,
>
> WhooHooo!

And YOU sponsor...what?

"How_To_Look_Like_An_Idiot_In Public_And_Still_Not_Have_A_Clue @ StupidGroups . Com"...?!?!

> > and I can tell you with certainty that the listowner can block ANY
> > subscriber to the list.
>
> Just how certain are you? Have you actually done it?

Yep. I allow anyone to subscribe to my lists. Use any of them for "a/s/l" messages, commercial offerings, or ANYthing having to do with some get-rich-quick scam get's you booted.

I'd even let YOU join, Brain...But I don't know why you'd want to be there. All four of them pretty much expect that you have some idea of what the other subscribers are talking about.

So far, you've been want for such a demonstration in THIS forum, I know you'd fail in them.

Steve, K4YZ

638. Re: FISTS Postion to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-09 20:37:49 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0310091237.75c4f23c@posting.google.com>
Source record: 80214

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0309190239.2b7bcf38@posting.google.com>...
> lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20030916205913.12501.00002450@mb-m04.aol.com>...
> > In article <bk4b7e$p383g$8@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>, "Ryan, KC8PMX"
> > <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> writes:
> >
> > >All of the above answers would be correct (barring accidental typos), but
> > >the original poster of the question in the first place DID NOT SPECIFY.
> > >See, it is important, unless you consider ALL antennas to be exactly
> > >one-half wavelength in length.
> >
> > Dan thinks "all" dipoles are half-wavelength...
>
> Lennie...WHAT did the "FISTS" organization have to do with
> ANYTHING in this thread YOU started with their name...???

Hey Lennie...Three weeks too short for you to answer a question?

Steve, K4YZ

639. Re: Isnt it Funny (No-Code HF Privileges)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-09 21:00:13 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <x%jhb.7940$Eo2.5218@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 80215

We are following your example Clint.

And no one mentioned a damn thing about CW. And you are the one that bitches when it comes up. What a hypocrite you are.

Now go back in your hole.

Dan/W4NTI

"Clint" <rattlehead at computron dot net> wrote in message news:vob895nfljiif0@corp.supernews.com...
> Are you guys going to be this abrasive and sour, even years after
> they are rid of your precious morse code test, or are you going to
> be childish and juvenile ad infinitum?
>
> Clint
>
>
> "Dick Carroll" <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com> wrote in message
> news:bm462j$t42$0@208.207.71.139...
> > N8WWM wrote:
> >
> > > In article <PkAgb.2727$Eo2.93@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>,
> Dan/W4NTI
> > > says...
> > >
> > >>
> > >>"Dick Carroll" <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com> wrote in message
> > >>news:blt3vltjm0@208.207.71.173...
> > >>
> > >>>Clint wrote:
> > >>>
> > >>>
> > >>>>"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
> > >>>>news:20031006162751.25517.00001185@mb-m15.aol.com...
> > >>>>
> > >>>>
> > >>>>
> > >>>>
> > >>>>>>Now you can get all upset and indignant, Len old boy, but the
facts
> > >>>>>>are the facts.
> > >>>>>>
> > >>>>>> Noooooo...those are just your OPINIONS. :-)
> > >>>>>>

> > >>>>
> > >>>>
> > >>>>Not only that, consider the source... you're dealing with another
PCTA
> > >>>>type that didn't receive his or her fair share of grey matter such
> that
> > >>>>self-determination isn't possible... it's just "bleat like the rest
of
> > >>
> > >>the
> > >>
> > >>>>sheep"
> > >>>>
> > >>>>"CW test good.... modernization bad.....
> > >>>>CW test good.... mdernization bad...."
> > >>>>
> > >>>>Clint
> > >>>>
> > >>>
> > >>>
> > >>>One could compare rattlehead with Forrest Gump except that
> > >>>Forrest was a not so bright fellow who did have some common sense...
> > >>>
> > >>
> > >>I've noticed that folks that are a bit 'slow' are good at common
sense.
> > >>Rattlehead is the exception that proves the rule.
> > >>
> > >>Dan/W4NTI
> > >>
> > >
> > > You are and old fart. Step aside before the tech class run you over,
> chump.
> > >
> >
> >
> > Ah. Another example of the "slow" class, again lacking common sense.
> >
> > Tell ya what, Genius- when there are so many of you that the bands are
> > carpeted with you, it won't be possible to walk over oldtimers - We'll
> > be gone fishing.
> > You're doing your damnedest to do the same thing to ham radio you did
> > to CB, and the FCC and ARRL are not only going along with it, they're
> > facilitating it. It's lunacy - right where you belong.
> >
>
>

640. RM-10808 --- Wexelbaum Redux

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-09 21:13:43 UTC
From: groupk0hb@earthlink.net
Message-ID: <5ee63311.0310091313.4991d260@posting.google.com>
Source record: 80216

Joe Speroni, AH0A, has introduced a looney-tune petition, reminiscent
of Bob Wexelbaum, W2ILP "Amateur Radio Needs More Tests".

Below is my comment to the FCC.

73, de Hans, K0HB

Before the
Federal Communications Commission
Washington, DC 20554

In the Matter of)
)
Amendment of Part 97 of the Commission's) RM-10808
Rules to Drergulate Testing for Non-Voice)
Mode Allocation for Amateur Radio Licenses)

To: The Commission

PERSONAL COMMENTS OF HANS BRAKOB, K0HB

OVERVIEW

These comments are submitted in response to the petition of Joseph
Speroni (AH0A) which requests changes in the qualifications and
testing of applicants for new or upgraded licenses in the Amateur
Radio Service.

I. Discussion:

The instant petition requests the elimination of Element 1
(5WPM Morse code test) from the required test for General
and/or Extra Class licenses in the Amateur Radio service,
and goes on to request that the written examinations (elements
2, 3, and 4) be stripped of all mode-related questions except
those pertaining to Phone operation. Persons licensed under this
scheme would only be authorized to use Phone emissions, unless
they had additionally passed examinations related to other modes.

Petitioner further proposes that operation in ARES (Amateur
Radio Emergency Service) would be restricted to licensees who
had passed a written examination on that subject.

Petitioner also proposes that Volunteer Examiners would only
be required to administer the basic written examinations (elements
2, 3, and 4) and could decline to administer any of the proposed

mode-related examinations if they felt it were burdensome to them.

II. Comments:

I agree with the proposal to remove the requirement for a Morse test (element 1) from the Amateur Radio Service rules.

However, I disagree with the remainder of his proposal.

Key to the concept of amateur radio regulation is the permission (indeed encouragement) to tinker, experiment, and try different (dare I say "sometimes new") things.

Under a system where "you can't use a mode until you've passed a test on that mode" amateur radio experimentation would be dramatically inhibited. The development of NEW modes of amateur radio communications would in fact be PROHIBITED under a Catch-22 situation where "you can't play with it if you haven't been tested and if it hasn't been developed yet we can't write test questions".

The current regulatory environment for Amateur Radio properly allows significant latitude in selection of operating modes and communications techniques, and the historical tendency of the Commission to relax restrictions on new modes should be continued, indeed accelerated.

All of the above aside, the proposal is fatally flawed in three Regards:

1) Effective enforcement (detecting operators operating outside their authorized mode) would be virtually impossible.

2) Allowing VEC's to pick-and-choose what tests they choose to administer would deprive applicants in those localities of reasonable access to the full range of amateur radio activities.

3) Requiring a separate passing an examination to engage in RACES/ARES activities would cripple the ability of the Amateur Radio Service to adequately respond to the needs of the public when our services are required in emergency communications scenarious.

In summary, this petition should not be tossed aside lightly. It should be hurled aside with great force.

Respectfully submitted,

H. Hans Brakob, K0HB
1610 Weston Lane
Plymouth, MN 55447

641. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-09 21:29:43 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031009172943.15923.00001200@mb-m12.aol.com>
Source record: 80218

In article <bm2r54pua0@208.207.71.166>, Dick Carroll
<dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com> writes:

>Alun Palmer wrote:
>> Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com> wrote in
>> news:bm08tm$1ce$1@208.206.142.71:
>>
>>>Alun Palmer wrote:
>>>
>>>>Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com> wrote in
>>>>news:bluvaq$7f7$0@208.207.71.138:
>>>>
>>>>>Robert Casey wrote:
>>>>>
>>>>>>Dick Carroll wrote:
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>You view the situation as an EE who didn't need to study to work out
>>>>>>>any of the technical problems on the Extra exam, few that there were.
>>>>>>>Most applicants have the singleminded goal of passing the exam, and
>>>>>>>learning beyond that goal is not only unnecessary, it gets in the way
>>>>>>>of the goal at hand. So they naturally just don't do it. The curent
>>>>>>>method of testing clearly facilitates that position.
>>>>>>
>>>>>>I'm a EE, and like any reasonably successful college student, I still
>>>>>>made use of the
>>>>>>avaliable resources (the question pool) to prepare for the (at the
>>>>>>time I took them)
>>>>>>elements 4A and 4B. Found a few holes in my knowledge, and filled
>>>>>>them in for
>>>>>>at least long enough to score well on the tests (missed 1 on 4A, 2 on
>>>>>>4B IIRC).
>>>>>>Got the CSCEs, and then the extra on Restructuring Day.
>>>>>>Most students only study what is expected to be on the exams. Thus, I
>>>>>>could solve calculus exam problems (take the intergral of (csc
>>>>>>x^5)/(tan x^2 -1) dx)
>>>>>>but I still never got a good understanding of how to use calculus to
>>>>>>solve a real
>>>>>>world problem. Recently went looking for a "calculus for dummies"
>>>>>>type book, but all they had was how to do exam problems. Been there,
>>>>>>done that.
>>>>>>
>>>>> And obviously it wasn't a problemm and hasn't caused any problem, for
>>>>>you and others similarly situated, nor for the ARS.
>>>>>

>>>>> But.....how about all the Extras out there who have
>>>>>successfully proceeded through the same system and emerged
>>>>>with so little knowledge that they have no idea of even
>>>>>how to design and build a simple *1/2* wave dipole?
>>>>> With little or nothing beyond the question pools in their
>>>>>libraries, many won't even know how or where to look it up.
>>>>>And when(if) the day comes that won't be required to copy
>>>>>ANY Morse code,one of the most used modes in ham radio, at the most
>>>>>basic speed?
>>>>>
>>>>Which will affect their comprehension of dipoles neither one way or the
>>>>other.
>>>>
>>>>Your linking of CW ability to comprehension of radio theory would be
>>>>frightening if it wasn't hilarious!
>>>>
>>>>> Understand that I'm not saying they shouldn't be hams, nor
>>>>>that they shouldn't be allowed some HF access. We all start somewhere.
>>>>>But to allow them licensing into the top echelon of amateurs
>>>>>is ludicrous and negates all that ham radio is supposed to stand for.
>>>>>
>>>>> In short, it reduces the ARS to CB status.
>>>>>
>>>>Your thinking is so completely addled that I hardly know what to say in
>>>>reply.
>>>
>>> To quote a famous person, "There you go again!"
>>>
>>>The minute I mention MOrse code, suddenly I'm all addled. Right.
>>>
>> Only when you try to link passing a Morse code test with ability to
>> understand theory
>
> Well since I *didn't* make any such linkage, and never have, your
>comment is out of line.

Senior, YOU've made so many out-of-line outright insults of others,
that you should spend more time off-line.

> If you don't believe that proficiency in radiotelegraph operations is
>a serious part of ham radio, that's your problem.

It's no one's "problem," senior.

U. S. amateur radio is NOT exclusively about radiotelegraphy.

Not in the regulations, not in the law, only in the imaginations of a
few.

> I know no one who has ever linked it to technical knowlecge, despite
>the many claims of NCI mavens.

Senior, your inductive reasoning doesn't have the capacity to resonate with the rest of the world's frequency.

Get in tune.

LHA

642. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-09 21:29:47 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031009172947.15923.00001201@mb-m12.aol.com>
Source record: 80217

In article <bm3d54$hugps$2@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>, "Ryan, KC8PMX"
<REMOVETHISkc8pmx@diamondcs.net> writes:

>"Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
>news:3F844158.1090208@psu.edu...
>> Ryan, KC8PMX wrote:

>People in their 50's, 60's, and older have a different view of radio, as it
>was more of an important part of their lives that it is today for people.
>Back then for them, radio was more of a primary entertainment and/or
>information source than it is now, be it listening only or transcieving.

Ryan, allow an observation from one of those "older" folks... :-)

Radio _broadcasting_ was a kind of entertainment in the 1940s and
before. It was unique to all. No need to leave the house. Everyone
heard the same program at the same time and those programs could
be discussed in-person with others right afterwards. News and
important events could be broadcast immediately, no waiting for the
next day or next week to read about it in a newspaper.

By 1950 television broadcasting was firmly established and this
revised the way "radio" was thought about. Television brought live or
recorded images along with sound and the impact on viewers was
greater than with just sound broadcasting. With old sound-only radio
listeners could only imagine the environment surrounding a show.
Their imaginations played a greater role in their emotional likes or
dislikes about a show.

By 1960 the non-broadcasting radio applications were spreading, such
as two-way mobile radio becoming common with public safety
organizations and large businesses, now well established as an
important communications tool. Microwave radio relay was also firmly
established for national communications linking for everything from
telephone long-distance to television networking. The first of the
communications satellites were already lofted for wideband, multi-
user communications and more were coming and launched. Telephones
now had direct-dial capability all over the country and extending to much
of the rest of the world. It was in, it was working, it was a fact of daily
life.

By 1960 aural-only radio broadcasting had shifted output focus. The
old radio programs were going if not gone to the new magic of television.
"Radio" in the common vernacular became the news over the car radio,
pop music to break up the monotony of a commute, background sounds
while in a residence...relatively lesser in importance compared to TV.

By 1970 mobile two-way radio was a necessity for police, fire, medical emergency services, businesses doing vehicular delivery or needing fast routing for pickups, taxicabs. The first of the solid-state handheld transceivers had appeared that was economical for almost all small to large businesses in walk-around utility work to construction sites to dockyard cargo movement to motion picture location shooting coordination, to name a just a few. "Two-way radio" was familiar to almost all Americans by now, whether by seeing it in daily life or on television shows.

By 1980 the first trials of cellular telephony had begun, in "car phones" first. "Funny-looking" antenna shapes (at cell sites) were sprouting in urban areas. "Cordless" telephones for the home and office appeared as hardware operating frequencies went higher and higher in VHF and UHF bands. Color television broadcasting was firmly established and important events were being organized around TV scheduling needs. Videotape units for the home were available for recording TV...with timers for automatic recording. Videotape boxes had bulti-in TV tuners.

By 1990 the desktop personal computer was a part of business life and offices had wired computing networks. The wireless network had appeared to eliminate wiring. Cellular telephony was firmly established and growing explosively in the communications industry. Information theory had matured and, with newer complex ICs, could provide more secure digital communications on WLANs. Data and facsimile comm was now available over mobile radios (data terminals in larger PD patrol cars, remote EKG transmission from ambulances). "Cell phones" was a term in the public vernacular. TV tuners as PC peripheral cards had appeared. The Compact Disk recording medium had been standardized and CD players were on the consumer market. Shirt-pocket sized AM and FM radios had become so popular that makers were competing in external color styling rather than in reception quality. Handheld two-way radios had shrunk to true one-hand operation and offered tone signalling for a variety of ways, from CTCSS to DTMF on built-in keyboards.

By 2000 "consumer electronics" was a separate branch in consumer chains. The words "PC" or "Mac," "CD" and "cable [TV]" and "Internet" and "cell" and "dot-com" and "spam" and "mouse" and even "CB" were all well-known and recognized by the public. Cell phones were so numerous that one in four Americans had cellular telephone subscriptions, either personal or business (that would become one in three by the end of 2002). Cordless telephones were now digital and in the 2.4 GHz band. The maritime world had adopted the GMDSS, used voice and data modes ship-to-ship and ship-to-shore and VHF two-way radios in harbor areas, commercial land private water vehicles alike. Marine radar small enough to be used on small motorboats had appeared in 1974. The EPIRB was an established emergency device for both waterborne and airborne vehicles. Civil aviation had VHF AM radio for nearly a half century along with VHF to UHF radionavigation aids of many kinds. Local government agencies and businesses used "trunking" to conserve EM space in their already crowded spectrum allocations. GPSS, already in place for the military, was now available in consumer stores, small enough for easy carry in hiking with

accuracy almost to that of military secure standards. The geo-synchronous communications satellite orbit positions were now filled to safe capacity, covering all parts of the world. The first of the radio clocks (tradenamed "to atomic standards") had appeared in consumer stores, automatically synchronizing with WWVB and using low-power DSP circuitry for greater-than-a-year battery operation in any of the states. "Wireless" no longer meant just radio but applied to any electronic device not needing wire connections in the home, from simple doorbell signalling to remote TV monitoring to baby monitors to networking home computers to keyboards and mice for personal computers to small microphone-earphone headsets to outside temperature sensors signalling digitally to an inside master unit. The public can buy a pair of FRS handheld UHF transceivers for less than $50, operate them without license up to 2 miles range and with digital voice and signalling mildly secure from other FRS users. Chain department stores at the K-Mart level regular sell CB kits for mobile use, all items shrinkwrapped together in the same package for less than $100. Cell phones got video capability, able to send images over the cell circuit to others in real time along with abbreviated messaging that was becoming a fad with teen agers. The belt-clipped pager receiver was both an important link in alerting and a sign of "self importance" to users. The standard small-unit military radio [hitting the quarter-million production quantity by 2002] was digital in voice and data, in-clear or secure, on-frequency or a frequency-hopper to reduce DF interception. GPS and other digital systems was starting to network land military units for real-time large-group movements on battlefields. Boomers and sharks in the Navy submarine fleet used secure data VLF-ELF alerting under water. Independent moving/relocating company vans have both GPS and cell phone map data couplers for finding routing and address locations. The ubiquitous CD flat disk has overpowered the old phonograph disk market, now cheap enough to use in throwaway advertising gimmicks in the mail and magazines. The CD-size DVD is rapidly overtaking the VHS video recording medium.

In 2003 the consumer market has seen a steady market in radio-controlled toys to the extent of introducing matchbox-size R/C cars at $10 each. Cell phone oriented corporations are starting chain stores for cell phones and pagers, building PDAs into some of them and incorporated video cameras appearing to be a standard option. Flat-cased small portable color TV sets with LCD screens and all-electronic channel tuning (VHF through UHF) are available for less than $150. "Shortwave" is becoming almost an outmoded term but the consumer market still has SW BC radios with digital tuning and SSB receive capability, small, flat, easy to pack into suitcases. International SW broadcasting has started using digital modulation after several years of successful testing on HF. Larger departement stores have RFID systems of many kinds, the tags small and very cheap, adhesive-backed for attachment to all kinds of merchandise; the RFID "gates" are becoming a standard feature at

main entrances. There are waterproof portable AM-FM receivers for use in showers, others small enough to become a part of lightweight ear-phones. Wireless microphones for the consumer market have passed the two-decade mark, are a standard part of stage and TV performer's wardrobe. The flat-screen TFT display is beginning to replace color CRTs with plasma displays for larger size TV screens flat enough, light enough to hang on a wall. Dog and cat collars are available for sensing electronic borders and warning the animal on proximity of such. There are experimental trials of implantable human ID tags working at radio frequencies to read out identity and medical information and history in the device.

Radio astronomy is a standard scientific tool in astrophysics. Tens of thousands of volunteers around the world are part of the distributed computing effort of SETI, linking through the Internet to get data and sending the sorted data back. SETI uses only the "hydrogen line" frequency to search, already has discovered several locations having some kind of repetitive radio signal phenomena. Some electric power utilities are already using a form of carrier current communications to read subscribers' electric meters remotely, negating the need for human meter readers traveling to each subscriber. Some companies have meter readers equipped with handheld terminals for individual recording, some of those with digital radio or cell phone data forwarding to the central office. Overnight delivery services already have a version of that portable terminal as do some supermarkets.

Anyone in the American public who can look around and obverve what is going on in the marketplace, in society, or reading newspapers and magazines can discover all or part of what I wrote above. "Radio" is much more far-reaching that just HF band activity...to the PUBLIC. They KNOW about it in general and its myriad uses. They've seen bits and pieces of information of devices and systems yet to come in the near future.

So, in this arena there are some pro-morse-code-test advocates steadfastly clinging to the notion that a monotonic arythmic pattern representing English characters is "basic" to "radio" for the "future." It "must" be done so that all can use their imaginations (as in radio broadcasting of the 1940s) to discern the "personalities" of the code senders and develop "lifelong friendships" on the barest of data, devoid of all the normal clues available in normal in-person contact. All "must" know this basic communications means of the 1920s and 1930s radio so that they can be "acceptible" to a group of radio hobbyists "pioneering" the radioways for later generations' futures.

Those later generations came, lived in that future and went on to even more futures...passing the imaginations of those hobbists still stuck in the standards and practices of pre-WW2 times. Those later generations, like yourself, live with accomplished advancements in many kinds of "radio" and can all relate to "radio" as a fact of existance.

What the later generations seem to lack is _imagination_ of working communications slowly with a minimum of contact data of the sender and deriving the feelings of being a "master" of their craft all through a singular rhythmic pattern of monotonic sound. All to achieve the mighty importance of a federal hobbyist license in a "service" of avocation and recreation and personal pleasure.

I've got a good imagination. Just can't see it like they do. Not even a half century ago when I got tossed into the Big Leagues of HF communications during a Real service to my country. The Real future was there back then and that bred even more fantastic futures in a wider range of "radio" applications later. Those futures are now our present. I'm anxious to see more of what Real imaginations come up with, and, hopefully, to enjoy those too!

LHA

643. Re: RM-10808 --- Wexelbaum Redux

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-09 21:34:37 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@nope.org>
Message-ID: <92lbov4f54jt04d04cm3kvlff685fcib7v@4ax.com>
Source record: 80219

Well said!

73, Leo

On 9 Oct 2003 14:13:43 -0700, groupk0hb@earthlink.net (Hans K0HB)
wrote:

>snip

>It should be hurled aside with great force.

644. Re: Isnt it Funny (No-Code HF Privileges)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-09 23:10:12 UTC
From: Clint <"rattlehead at computron dot net">
Message-ID: <vobqo15g9snbbc@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 80220

handing you a tissue

let me know if you need another one.

Clint

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:x%jhb.7940$Eo2.5218@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> We are following your example Clint.
>
> And no one mentioned a damn thing about CW. And you are the one that
> bitches when it comes up. What a hypocrite you are.
>
> Now go back in your hole.
>
> Dan/W4NTI
>
> "Clint" <rattlehead at computron dot net> wrote in message
> news:vob895nfljiif0@corp.supernews.com...
> > Are you guys going to be this abrasive and sour, even years after
> > they are rid of your precious morse code test, or are you going to
> > be childish and juvenile ad infinitum?
> >
> > Clint
> >
> >
> > "Dick Carroll" <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com> wrote in message
> > news:bm462j$t42$0@208.207.71.139...
> > > N8WWM wrote:
> > >
> > > > In article <PkAgb.2727$Eo2.93@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>,
> > Dan/W4NTI
> > > > says...
> > > > >
> > > > >>
> > > > >>"Dick Carroll" <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com> wrote in message
> > > > >>news:blt3vltjm0@208.207.71.173...
> > > > >>
> > > > >>>Clint wrote:
> > > > >>>
> > > > >>>
> > > > >>>"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
> > > > >>>news:20031006162751.25517.00001185@mb-m15.aol.com...
> > > > >>>
> > > > >>>

> > > >>>>
> > > >>>>
> > > >>>>>>Now you can get all upset and indignant, Len old boy, but the
> facts
> > > >>>>>>are the facts.
> > > >>>>>
> > > >>>>> Noooooo...those are just your OPINIONS. :-)
> > > >>>>>
> > > >>>>
> > > >>>>
> > > >>>>Not only that, consider the source... you're dealing with another
> PCTA
> > > >>>>type that didn't receive his or her fair share of grey matter such
> > that
> > > >>>>self-determination isn't possible... it's just "bleat like the
rest
> of
> > > >>
> > > >>the
> > > >>
> > > >>>>sheep"
> > > >>>>
> > > >>>>"CW test good.... modernization bad.....
> > > >>>>CW test good.... mdernization bad...."
> > > >>>>
> > > >>>>Clint
> > > >>>>
> > > >>>
> > > >>>
> > > >>>One could compare rattlehead with Forrest Gump except that
> > > >>>Forrest was a not so bright fellow who did have some common
sense...
> > > >>>
> > > >>
> > > >>I've noticed that folks that are a bit 'slow' are good at common
> sense.
> > > >>Rattlehead is the exception that proves the rule.
> > > >>
> > > >>Dan/W4NTI
> > > >>
> > > >
> > > > You are and old fart. Step aside before the tech class run you over,
> > chump.
> > > >
> > >
> > >
> > > Ah. Another example of the "slow" class, again lacking common sense.
> > >
> > > Tell ya what, Genius- when there are so many of you that the bands
are

> > > carpeted with you, it won't be possible to walk over oldtimers - We'll
> > > be gone fishing.
> > > You're doing your damnedest to do the same thing to ham radio you
did
> > > to CB, and the FCC and ARRL are not only going along with it, they're
> > > facilitating it. It's lunacy - right where you belong.
> > >
> >
> >
>
>

645. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-09 23:13:58 UTC
From: Clint <"rattlehead at computron dot net">
Message-ID: <vobqv2rgm27fb7@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 80221

> All age groups showed a majority to be procodetest, h

bzzzzzt....

if this were true, there wouldn't be such a push to remove it.

Sorry but it's on it's going the way of the dinosaur, just without
as much darwinian effeciency.

Clint
KB5ZHT

646. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-09 23:15:47 UTC
From: Clint <"rattlehead at computron dot net">
Message-ID: <vobr2elvbfq422@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 80222

Any twist of logic, any tactic or spin of the issue to try to
stave off the inevitable... the long overdue removal of code
testing. Nothing more.

Clint

"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20031009172943.15923.00001200@mb-m12.aol.com...

>
> Senior, your inductive reasoning doesn't have the capacity to resonate
> with the rest of the world's frequency.
>
> Get in tune.
>
> LHA

647. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-09 23:17:14 UTC
From: Clint <"rattlehead at computron dot net">
Message-ID: <vobr55s8hcea7c@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 80223

"Ryan, KC8PMX" <REMOVETHISkc8pmx@diamondcs.net> wrote in message
news:bm3d56$hugps$3@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de...

>
> There might actually be some merit to that. Teenagers are still quite
> moldable, and would be excellent candidates to "mold' them into the hams
> that we want them to be,

but did you just admit more than you probably wanted to.

Clint

648. Re: N8__googled

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-09 23:43:22 UTC
From: richcranus@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <c5ecbb69.0310091543.29ee42a7@posting.google.com>
Source record: 80225
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.dogie.is.an.idiot,rec.radio.cb

DouGayAdairierreN8WWM@ikillclowns.com (Repeaterjammers For A Keyclown-Free Newsgroup) wrote in message news:<94ef989d.0310090428.67c94f73@posting.google.com>...
> Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com> wrote in message news:<20031007214001.401$VM@newsreader.com>...
> > http://tinyurl.com/q3xp
>
> The fame, the adulation.....I am touched.

Only by yourself, fagboy. Nobody with class would touch you!

649. Re: Check out this corrective package for MS Internet Explorer

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-09 23:48:47 UTC
From: Sarge <sgtfuzzy@fuzzybutt.com>
Message-ID: <Xns940FC8051722Esargeantneorrcom@65.24.2.12>
Source record: 80224
Cross-posted to: comp.os.linux.development.system,rec.games.frp.gurps,rec.radio.amateur.policy,soc.history.what-if,misc.forsale.computers.pc-specific.software,sci.med.diseases.lyme,rec.games.video.classic,comp.dcom.lans.ethernet,misc.transport.trucking,comp.sys.mac.system

"draco9" <ogmfipptpn-hrzx@eoag.net> wrote in
news:blskuh$o0o$1@ultra60.mat.uni.torun.pl:

> --laftknashi
> --buykgvprkacrohf
> Microsoft User
>
> this is the latest version of security update, the
> "October 2003, Cumulative Patch" update which resolves
> all known security vulnerabilities affecting
> MS Internet Explorer, MS Outlook and MS Outlook Express
> as well as three new vulnerabilities.
> Install now to continue keeping your computer secure
> from these vulnerabilities.
> This update includes the functionality of all previously released
> patches.
>
> System requirements: Windows 95/98/Me/2000/NT/XP
> This update applies to:
> - MS Internet Explorer, version 4.01 and later
> - MS Outlook, version 8.00 and later
> - MS Outlook Express, version 4.01 and later
>
> Recommendation: Customers should install the patch at the earliest
> opportunity. How to install: Run attached file. Choose Yes on
> displayed dialog box. How to use: You don't need to do anything after
> installing this item.
>
>
> Microsoft Product Support Services and Knowledge Base articles can be
> found on the Microsoft Technical Support web site.
> http://support.microsoft.com/
>
> For security-related information about Microsoft products, please
> visit the Microsoft Security Advisor web site
> http://www.microsoft.com/security/
>
> Thank you for using Microsoft products.
>

Just in case there is anyone that might think about using the above links
and information ---- DO NOT !!!

To update MS products go their website. MS does not send updates &
patches to individuals. The above stuff has really caused people some
problems.

Sarge

--
If it walks like a duck ..... well you know the rest ....

650. Re: Bootlegging in 1948?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-10 00:29:50 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031009202950.06226.00000888@mb-m19.aol.com>
Source record: 80226

In article <20031002001355.29660.00000894@mb-m24.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) writes:

>In article <20031001202958.21642.00001353@mb-m01.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com
>(N2EY)
>writes:
>

>>But what's really relevant is what a person has done in amateur radio. I've
>>been an active, licensed radio amateur for almost 36 years - operating,
>>building stations, writing articles, elmering, etc. You wrote a few basic
>>articles for a now-defunct amateur radio periodical and have never held any
>>class of amateur radio license.
>
> Oooooo...! Was that supposed to "hurt" big fella? :-)

Does the truth hurt you, Len?
>
> I got a COMMERCIAL Radiotelephone license in 1956 (only one test
> needed) and had a career in radio-electronics design since then. You
> will no doubt have to say such is "irrelevant" for lots of reasons.

Not at all.

Please explain how that license and career have any relevance to amateur radio policy. Particularly since you have never held any class of amateur radio license.
>
> You don't want to admit your occupation's firm name or what it does,

Because it's not relevant. And because I know you'll simply make fun of it.

> so you try to denigrate all those who aren't afraid of naming where
> they worked or where they worked or what they did at work in detail.

Who do I "denigrate", Len?

It's a plain and simple fact that no matter who my employers are/were, you'd make fun of my job if you knew what it was. Your behavior towards others here who disagree with you is clear proof of that.

>
> You want to diminish the efforts of Ham Radio Magazine founders
> Skip Tenney and Jim Fisk and their TWENTY TWO YEARS of
> successful, INDEPENDENT newsstand publications.

Where do I diminish their efforts, Len? They had a good mag but it ceased publication more than a decade ago. It's defunct.

> Why?

Why do you get so upset over the word "defunct"?

> Tenney
> is a radio amateur. Fisk is deceased and his old call (W1HR) is now
> used by a club in Jim Fisk's honor. You keep wanting to say HR is
> "defunct" as if that is somehow unclean.

How is "defunct" unclean?
>
> You weren't published in HR,

So? You weren't published in QST.

> You got as far as "Electric
> Radio," a non-newsstand periodical for a special interest group in
> old radio.

Also QST.

> Did you ever write for Electronics magazine (McGraw-Hill's
> old biweekly)? I did. Did you ever write for BYTE? I did. I've written
> for Microcomputing and Call-A.P.P.L.E. about more avoactional
> and recreational activities concerning electronics.

Aren't all those magazines also defunct? I haven't seen a copy of any of them
in years.

You live in the past too much, Len.

651. Re: Bootlegging in 1948?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-10 00:29:53 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031009202953.06226.00000889@mb-m19.aol.com>
Source record: 80227

In article <20031007145528.01893.00001064@mb-m22.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) writes:

>In article <c2356669.0310070852.26b87250@posting.google.com>, N2EY@AOL.COM
>(N2EY) writes:
>
>>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>>news:<20031006162750.25517.00001184@mb-m15.aol.com>...
>>> In article <20031006053758.00545.00001412@mb-m02.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com
>>(N2EY)
>>> writes:
>>>
>>> >"lenanderson@mogur.com" wasn't you?
>>>
>>> Why do you ask?
>>
>>Because you told us that you hadn't used any other screen names "in
>>here" besides that long list of AOL ones.
>>
>>> I haven't been able to use Mog-Ur's EMS BBS in
>>> years...
>>
>>7, to be exact.
>>
>>> Tom closed it down after being one of the first 10 BBSs in
>>> the USA. He had Internet access for about a year until it got too
>>> expensive and subscribers left to go directly on the Internet.
>>>
>>> Tom Tcimpdis (easy Greek surname, just pronounce it like it is
>written),
>>> KC6MLR, television video director, twice won Emmys for outstanding
>>> technical direction ("Night Court" series, "Sinatra, the Man and His
>>> Music" special). Built his own BBS to start with years and years ago
>>> from a Heath H8 microcomputer, had to write his own software to get
>>> it going as a Bulletin Board System. Had a fairly good side business
>>> of custom personal computer systems, may still do that. Private pilot,
>>> multi-engine rated, a road rally sportsman from way back. You can see
>>> his picture on QRZ.com...:-) Quaffed a few with Tom at the 94th
>>> Aerosquadron Restaurant at Van Nuys Airport, a regular hang-out for
>>> several San Fernando Valley BBS members of the 80s and 90s.
>>
>>Is there a point to all this besides your trying to avoid the fact
>>that you forgot yet another screen name you used in rrap?
>

> You are manufacturing a non-issue which has nothing to do
> with any sort of radio subject.

So? You go far afield from any radio subject whenever you feel like it.
>
>>> "Mog-Ur" is a character name taken from the novel "Clan of the Cave
>>> Bear."
>>
>>Actually, it's a title. The character's name is Creb. "The Mog-Ur" is
>>a title/function he performed in the Clan.
>
> Irrelevant. Petty literary details.

It's as relevant as the "94th Aero Squadron"

>>> "EMS" is an acronym for Electronic Message System, in use
>>> in computer-modem communications before EMS for Emergency
>>> Medical Service became standards.. "Mog-Ur's" survives on the Internet
>>> today after more than 20 years of existance.
>>
>>Is there *any* relevance to all your verbiage? Someone asks you the
>>time, and you give them directions to Boulder and a long diatribe on
>>the development of the various atomic standards there.
>
> Tom Tcimpidis has an amateur radio license and is listed in QRZ
> with his famous/infamous "at the controls of a 727" picture.

Yeah, he's a Novice. Which makes him far more experienced as a radio amateur
than you, Len.
>
> Details of NIST time-frequency activities are available from their
> own web site. If you need directions to Boulder, CO, there are
> several map and direction services available on the Internet.

Don't need 'em. I was there - at both the NIST site in Boulder and the WWV/WWVB
transmitter site in Fort Collins. Found 'em both without website help. Got some
good pictures of the then-current "atomic clock" and the trnasmitter site
antennas. And a picture of myself standing next to the sign at the transmitter
site. They're in the album with the pictures of my visit to ARRL Hq where I met
a few of the staff and operated W1AW.
>
>>supposed to know that all of them are one and the same person - if,
>>indeed, they are? Particularly when your name does not appear anywhere
>>in many of them?
>
> Tsk, tsk, tsk, still trying to manufacture a "dispute" based on your
> personal irritation.

No irritation on my part at all, Len. I'm just pointing out some facts.

> You are perfectly free to question AOL Member Services directly
> if you are so disturbed over "identities." YOU are a subscriber

> there. YOUR screen name does not identify you by legal name..

So? Anyone who knows anyhting about amateur radio recognizes "N2EY" as an amateur radio callsign, which is actually more unique than a legal name. There are lots of people with your name, and there may be others with my name. But there is only one person assigned the amateur radio callsign N2EY. And that's me.

Oh wait, you don't have an amateur radio callsign...
>
>>Why should they believe you when you say you have not posted by other
>>names, when it has been shown that your list of screen names left out
>>at least two that you have used?
>
> Why should anyone believe that you are real? :-)

Because I am. If you operated on the amateur bands you might know that. Oh wait, you've never been an amateur radio operator....
>
> Your manufactured "dispute" is becoming absurd.

It's about your credibility in here, Len. Or lack thereof.
>
>>> an independent amateur radio
>>> interest periodical (50,000 issues a month) lasted for TWENTY TWO
>>> YEARS solely on the basis of advertising space sales.
>>
>>That's not correct.
>
> No? :-)

No. ;-) ;-) ;-)
>
>>The magazine subscriptions cost money, so they did not exist "solely
>>on the basis of advertising space sales" If the subscription/newstand
>>price was $20 per year and there were 50,000 subscribers/newstand
>>buyers per month, that's a *million dollars* of revenue from
>>subscriptions. Back when $1,000,000 was a lot of money.
>>
>>Existed ""solely on the basis of advertising space sales"? I think
>>not! Were that true, the subscriptions would have been free. Like most
>>industry magazines.
>>
>>Also, I seriously doubt that the mag was 50,000 copies/month for the
>>entire 22 years.
>
> If you wish to demand an accounting or an investigation of Publishers'
> Sworn Statements, then you've gone slightly bonkers in pique. :-)
>
> Subscription fees (periodicals usually call them "fulfillment" fees) only
> cover the mailing costs and distribution services' various charges. That
> is a "break-even" situation where the periodical has no real income.

Nonsense. It all benefits the bottom line. You said the mag existed "solely on
the basis of advertising space sales". Not profited - existed.
>
> Profit for a periodical comes from advertising space sales in all of the
> "independents" (those not affiliated with membership organizations).
> That is true for 73, CQ, Popular Communications, et al. The more ad
> space sold, the more the profit for the periodical's business.

Then why aren't those magazines free?

All income benefits the bottom line, whatever it's called or wherever it comes
from. You said the mag existed "solely on the basis of advertising space
sales". Not profited - existed. That's simply not true.
>
> There's no other profit for periodicals, not even when they run a sideline
> business such as HR did with their Ham Radio Bookstore. The ad
> space for the Bookstore could have been used by other advertisers.

Doesn't matter.
>
> QST is a membership magazine of the ARRL. As such, the amount of
> profit or loss from QST advertising space sales can be handled by the
> parent organization.

So?

> QST gains slightly by having the easily-identifiable
> demographics of the number of members (see their page for the latest
> numbers).
>
They also lose by having to run the organization, which does things far beyond
putting out a magazine.

>>> Publisher
>>> Skip Tenney finally sold it to CQ Communications and probably retired.
>>> Founding Editor in Chief Jim Fisk (SK, ex-W1HR) wasn't around to help
>>> keep up the interest of the readers of a technically-oriented magazine.
>>
>>IOW, it ultimately failed in the marketplace. Too bad - it was a good
>>mag in its time.
>
> Why do you say "good?"

It had some good articles in its time.

> All you've done so far in this manufactured
> dispute is to charge a technologically-oriented amateur publication
> with fraud or misrepresentation.

Where? What charges?

You're the only one who has charged a publisher of "fraud".

You are not the publisher of "ham radio" magazine, and never were.
>

> You know little about basic organizations and budgets of periodicals
> yet claim some "expertise" sufficient to engage in manufactured
> "disputes." :-)

You're trying to avoid a basic acciunting issue.
>
>>A complete set of QST is also available on CD. Every issue, all the
>>way back to December 1915. Almost four times as long as "ham radio"
>
> I'm sure. ARRL was founded in 1914.

And the first issue of QST was December 1915.
>
> Why do YOU live in that past so much? :-)
>
I don't - you do, recalling a magazine defunct for over a decade, lilitary
radio experiences of a half century ago, employers you have not worked for in
decades, etc.

Oh wait, you don't have an amateur radio callsign, have never been a radio
amateur....

>>QST is still being published - the oldest still-published radio
>>magazine in the world.
>
> Are you absolutely CERTAIN of that? :-)

Yep.

>>I've written for QST.
>
> BFD.

What do you mean by "BFD", Len? Spell it out for us.
>
>>You haven't.
>
> Absolutely true.

Finally, something factual from you.
>
>>But you're not the moderator here.
>
> Neither are you, Mistah Kopp.

Never claimed to be. You try to be one, though.

>>> I have this nice card punch at the ready. Just hand me your "TS card"
>>> and I will punch it for you...:-)
>>
>>Sounds like another threat. Can you not resolve differences peaceably?
>
> Tsk, tsk, tsk, Rev. Jimmie doesn't know about chaplains' "TS" cards?

>
> :-)

More than you think.
>
> Ah yes, Rev. Jimmie wasn't in any military service of the United States.

And you are not, and have never been, a radio amateur. Yet you lecture us endlessly on the subject.

652. Re: RM-10808 --- Wexelbaum Redux

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-10 01:23:25 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <hSnhb.10464$mQ2.699@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 80228

"Hans K0HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:5ee63311.0310091313.4991d260@posting.google.com...
> Joe Speroni, AH0A, has introduced a looney-tune petition, reminiscent
> of Bob Wexelbaum, W2ILP "Amateur Radio Needs More Tests".
>
> Below is my comment to the FCC.
>
> 73, de Hans, K0HB
>
> -------
>
> Before the
> Federal Communications Commission
> Washington, DC 20554
>
> In the Matter of)
>)
> Amendment of Part 97 of the Commission's) RM-10808
> Rules to Drergulate Testing for Non-Voice)
> Mode Allocation for Amateur Radio Licenses)
>
>
> To: The Commission
>
> PERSONAL COMMENTS OF HANS BRAKOB, K0HB
>
>
>
> OVERVIEW
>
> These comments are submitted in response to the petition of Joseph
> Speroni (AH0A) which requests changes in the qualifications and
> testing of applicants for new or upgraded licenses in the Amateur
> Radio Service.
>
> I. Discussion:
>
> The instant petition requests the elimination of Element 1
> (5WPM Morse code test) from the required test for General
> and/or Extra Class licenses in the Amateur Radio service,
> and goes on to request that the written examinations (elements
> 2, 3, and 4) be stripped of all mode-related questions except
> those pertaining to Phone operation. Persons licensed under this
> scheme would only be authorized to use Phone emissions, unless

> they had additionally passed examinations related to other modes.
>
> Petitioner further proposes that operation in ARES (Amateur
> Radio Emergency Service) would be restricted to licensees who
> had passed a written examination on that subject.
>
> Petitioner also proposes that Volunteer Examiners would only
> be required to administer the basic written examinations (elements
> 2, 3, and 4) and could decline to administer any of the proposed
> mode-related examinations if they felt it were burdensome to them.
>
>
> II. Comments:
>
> I agree with the proposal to remove the requirement for a Morse
> test (element 1) from the Amateur Radio Service rules.
>
> However, I disagree with the remainder of his proposal.
>
> Key to the concept of amateur radio regulation is the permission
> (indeed encouragement) to tinker, experiment, and try different
> (dare I say "sometimes new") things.
>
> Under a system where "you can't use a mode until you've passed
> a test on that mode" amateur radio experimentation would be
> dramatically inhibited. The development of NEW modes of amateur
> radio communications would in fact be PROHIBITED under a Catch-22
> situation where "you can't play with it if you haven't been tested
> and if it hasn't been developed yet we can't write test questions".
>
> The current regulatory environment for Amateur Radio properly
> allows significant latitude in selection of operating modes
> and communications techniques, and the historical tendency of
> the Commission to relax restrictions on new modes should be
> continued, indeed accelerated.
>
> All of the above aside, the proposal is fatally flawed in three
> Regards:
>
> 1) Effective enforcement (detecting operators operating
> outside their authorized mode) would be virtually impossible.
>
> 2) Allowing VEC's to pick-and-choose what tests they choose
> to administer would deprive applicants in those localities
> of reasonable access to the full range of amateur radio
> activities.
>
> 3) Requiring a separate passing an examination to engage
> in RACES/ARES activities would cripple the ability of the
> Amateur Radio Service to adequately respond to the needs

> of the public when our services are required in emergency
> communications scenarious.
>
> In summary, this petition should not be tossed aside lightly.
> It should be hurled aside with great force.
>
> Respectfully submitted,
>
> H. Hans Brakob, K0HB
> 1610 Weston Lane
> Plymouth, MN 55447

Mega Dittos. I especially like the "catch 22"
prohibition of new modes. Frankly I'm surprised
that Joe didn't think of that.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

653. Re: N8__googled

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-10 01:53:37 UTC
From: Smell My Finger <ss@null.com>
Message-ID: <HbCdnc4rZf64jBuiXTWJig@comcast.com>
Source record: 80229
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.dogie.is.an.idiot,rec.radio.cb

"Richard Cranium" <richcranus@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:c5ecbb69.0310091543.29ee42a7@posting.google.com...
> DouGayAdairierreN8WWM@ikillclowns.com (Repeaterjammers For A Keyclown-Free
Newsgroup) wrote in message
news:<94ef989d.0310090428.67c94f73@posting.google.com>...
> > Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com> wrote in message
news:<20031007214001.401$VM@newsreader.com>...
> > > http://tinyurl.com/q3xp
> >
> > The fame, the adulation.....I am touched.
>
> Only by yourself, fagboy. Nobody with class would touch you!

TROLL POST!!

654. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-10 02:29:58 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031009222958.11022.00001288@mb-m14.aol.com>
Source record: 80230

In article <vobqv2rgm27fb7@corp.supernews.com>, "Clint" <rattlehead at computron dot net> writes:

>> All age groups showed a majority to be procodetest, h
>
>
>bzzzzzt....
>
>if this were true,

It is true. Did you read the survey and its results?

> there wouldn't be such a push to remove it.

Incorrect. What "push"? Based on membership numbers, NCI has fewer than 5000 members worldwide, even with no dues, no expiration of membership and having been around over 7 years.

655. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-10 02:46:08 UTC
From: Clint <"rattlehead at computron dot net">
Message-ID: <voc7csn28m5j44@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 80231

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20031009222958.11022.00001288@mb-m14.aol.com...
> In article <vobqv2rgm27fb7@corp.supernews.com>, "Clint" <rattlehead at
> computron dot net> writes:
>
> >> All age groups showed a majority to be procodetest, h
> > >
> > >
> > >bzzzzzt....
> > >
> > >if this were true,
>
> It is true. Did you read the survey and its results?
>
> > there wouldn't be such a push to remove it.
>
> Incorrect. What "push"? Based on membership numbers, NCI has fewer than
5000
> members worldwide, even with no dues, no expiration of membership and
having
> been around over 7 years.
>
>

Oh, more than just NCI; ARRL seems to favor it, and in general most hams
do that aren't the ones clinging to desperate delusionary hopes in certain
internet
NG's.

Yep, it's outta here, CW testing is soon to be extinct. It's goneski.

Clint

656. Re: Echolink is great for those who..

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-10 02:56:42 UTC
From: Anonymous <BigappleRemailer@Optonline.Net>
Message-ID: <VSFBIUL237903.9560416667@anonymous>
Source record: 80232
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

In article <ZRUgb.5256$Eo2.5012@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
"toolz toolz" <medtools2@earthlink.net> wrote:
>
>
> You, starwars, are an ass.

You, TOOLz are a fucking TOOL.

> "starwars" <nobody@tatooine.homelinux.net> wrote in message
> news:38c9916cb107dcfd2c28d5112d15650b@tatooine.homelinux.net...
> > In article <pan.2003.10.06.17.54.11.719783@hotmail.com>
> > "No-CODE TWAT- N7ZZT" <n7zzt_NO.SPAM_@hotmail.com> wrote:
> > >
> > >
> > > On Wed, 01 Oct 2003 16:15:38 +0200, starwars wrote:
> > >
> > > >> so? you any better? just because I am no-code doesn't mean I don't
> > > >> KNOW-CODE (I just never bothered to take the damned test, you dope!).
> > > >
> > > > Obviously, you were too goddamned stupid to pass it, either.
> > >
> > > ever hear of other considerations? how about this one: lack on funds
> >
> > It's not my fault you're so unemployable you can't afford anything. I bet
> you're driving that used-over 100,000 mile shitbox because you can't aford a
> newer car, too.
> >
> >
> > > required to get the equipment needed to even have a decent station on
> HF.
> > > what about locvation for the antenna (I've lived in apartments for a
> long
> > > time, I doubt they would like it if I stuck a 3-el beam for 75/80 on
> their
> > > root).
> >
> > "On their "Root?" No wonder you're a goddamned no -code technician TWAT,
> you don't even know that antennas usually go on roofs, not roots. What a
> dumbass.
> > You're just full of excuses, twat. And you can add lack of ambition to own
> your own home to your mounting list of deficiencies.
> >
> >
> > > >

> > > >> but then again, if all you can do is insult, that means you don't
> have
> > > >> brains enough to really do something about it.
> > > >
> > > > You'll have to pass the test on your own, twat.
>
> > > wa wa waaaaah! cry me a river....
> >
> > The only crying is coming from you, no-code technician twat.
> >
> > Can you say hypocrite? In addition to your inability to upgrade your
> license, you severely lack skills in debate. You proved it all by your
> lonesome, little twat.
> >
> > > throwing insults just means you don't have brains enough to debate.
> >
> > Making excuses for your lack of abilities isn't debating, little twat.
> >
> > > I'd say you are full of it (-... ..- .-.. .-.. ... . -) (just so
> > > you know, that spells out BULLSHIT, which you seem to be so full of
> > > lately).
> >
> > Now, what were you saying above about throwing insults because you didn't
> have brains, twat?
> >
> > > >
> > > >> oh well, I fail to see where it's my problem anyway.
> > > >
> > > > You fail to see quite a lot of things, no-code technician twat.
> > >
> > > a dig? hmmm, better get a bigger (and sharper) shovel...
> >
> >
> > And the point passes over your granite skull at the speed of light, twat.
> Thanks for proving my point.
> >
> >
> >
> >

-=-
This message was posted via two or more anonymous remailing services.

657. Re: Bootlegging in 1948?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-10 04:01:36 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <REMOVETHISkc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <bm62an$jhh76$1@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 80239

Got it. I have noticed a few others that are posters here in QST as well.

Ryan KC8PMX

"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
news:c2356669.0310090727.2269e1bf@posting.google.com...
> "Ryan, KC8PMX" <REMOVETHISkc8pmx@diamondcs.net> wrote in message
news:<bm3d53$hugps$1@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>...
> > Got your email Jim, and thanks! I will check those out.
>
> Also see the top of page 62 in QST for June, 1989. Although I did not
> write it, there is a mention of me that is a bit out of the
> ordinary....
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

658. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-10 04:08:23 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <REMOVETHISkc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <bm62ao$jhh76$2@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 80240

Unless you are putting more into what was typed or seeing it completely
different, no, I didn't admit more than what I wanted to.....

People in the teen age groups are still forming their identities and
becoming what they might be for the rest of their lives typically. If you
have differences with the word "moldable," then that is your problem.
Influenced maybe a better word then??

Ryan, KC8PMX

"Clint" <rattlehead at computron dot net> wrote in message
news:vobr55s8hcea7c@corp.supernews.com...
>
> "Ryan, KC8PMX" <REMOVETHISkc8pmx@diamondcs.net> wrote in message
> news:bm3d56$hugps$3@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de...
>
> >
> > There might actually be some merit to that. Teenagers are still quite
> > moldable, and would be excellent candidates to "mold' them into the
hams
> > that we want them to be,
>
> but did you just admit more than you probably wanted to.
>
> Clint
>
>

659. Re: Bootlegging in 1948?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-10 08:01:55 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <THthb.14472$mQ2.12983@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 80233

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote:
> (Len Over 21) writes:
> >
> > (snip) I got a COMMERCIAL Radiotelephone license
> > in 1956 (only one test needed) and had a career in radio-
> > electronics design since then. You will no doubt have to
> > say such is "irrelevant" for lots of reasons.
>
> Not at all.
>
> Please explain how that license and career have any relevance
> to amateur radio policy. Particularly since you have never held
> any class of amateur radio license.

Since anybody in this country can discuss amateur radio policy (license policy or whatever), I do think a person's communications knowledge and experience elsewhere is at least somewhat relevant to that person's part in that discussion. Why would you think otherwise, Jim? Len is obviously interested in Amateur Radio, which is good. The only thing I don't understand is why he hasn't acted on that interest and gotten some kind of Amateur Radio license over the years. Since VHF and above is one focus of commercial communications today, one would think the Technician license would have at least some appeal to him. This glaring, long term, lack of committment to Amateur Radio is what brings his ongoing participation in this discussion under suspicion.

> > You don't want to admit your occupation's firm name or what
> > it does,
>
> Because it's not relevant. (snip)

This position is equally valid. While a person's communications knowledge and experience elsewhere is somewhat relevant (if that person chooses to make it so), communications knowledge and experience elsewhere is obviously not manditory for participation in this discussion, especially for the person holding an Amateur Radio license which will be directly impacted by the outcome of this discussion.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

660. Amateur Radio Newsline☐ Report 1364 ☐ October 3 2003

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-10 08:15:46 UTC
From: netmanager2@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <78f1f2d5.0310100015.6d787f55@posting.google.com>
Source record: 80234
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.space,rec.radio.cb

Amateur Radio Newslineï¿½ Report 1364 ï¿½ October 3 2003

Amateur Radio Newsline report number 1364 with a release date of
Friday, October 3rd 2003 to follow in 5-4-3-2-1.

The following is a Q-S-T. The comment period closes on Morse code
restructuring, Logbook of the World makes its debut and a new D-X
record for -- would you believe Wi Fi? The details on Amateur Radio
Newsline report number 1364 coming your way right now.

(Billboard Cart Here)

**

RADIO LAW: MORSE PETITION COMMENTARY CLOSES

If you have not yet filed comments on the frst seven Morse related
rule making requests, you are you of luck. Newsline's Bruce Tennant,
K6PZW, tells us why:

--

The why is simple. The period for filing comments on this initial
group of seven Morse code related rule making petitions closed on
Monday, September 29th. This, before several other requests that
favor retaining Morse have been made available for public comment.

Of those in the first group, some petitioners had suggested
eliminating the remaining 5 Word Per Minute C-W test. Others wanted
various levels of change in Morse testing. In all, well over 2000
comments that were filed by the closing date.

And what about the pro-code side of the debate? Will their views ever
be assigned a rule making designation? That's really up to the FCC.
Those waiting include the request from FISTS, the international Morse
preservation society. That one not only asks the FCC to retain the 5
word per minute C-W exam for General class license, but to also
require that Extra class pass a 12 word per minute test. FISTS also
wants written exams stiffened as well.

For the Amateur Radio Newsline, I'm Bruce Tennant, K6PZW, reporting.

--

We will have more on the latest round in the Morse debate in future
newscasts. (ARNewsline(tm))

**

RESTRUCTURING: LUXEMBOURG DROPSS HF MORSE REQUIREMENT

Yet another country has announced the dropping of the Morse code requirement for HF bands operation. As of the 25th of September, radio amateurs in Luxembourg with a CEPT Class 2 licence and callsigns in the LX3 series have had use of all of the HF amateur bands. (RSGB)

**

FROM THE ARRL LOGBOOK OF THE WORLD PREMIERES

The ARRL's new Logbook of the World secure electronic contact confirmation and logging system officially began operation on September 15th. The Logbook of the World system is a repository of log records submitted by users of the system. When both participants in a QSO submit matching QSO records, the result is a QSL that can be used for ARRL award credit.

To minimize the chance of fraudulent submissions to Logbook of the World, all QSO records must be digitally signed using a digital certificate obtained from ARRL. Getting a certificate requires verification of the licensee's identity either through mail verification for U S hams or inspection by ARRL of required documentation for those outside of the United States.

Software developed by ARRL can be used to convert a log file into a file of digitally signed QSO data, ready for submission. Full details on the system are in cyberspace at www.arrl.org/lotw. (ARRL)

**

REPEATER LINKING: ECHOLINK SAYS YES TO LOTW

Meantime, the Amateur Radio Internet linking system EchoLink has announced that it will begin accepting digital certificates issued by the American Radio Relay League's Logbook of the World program/ This, as an alternate means of authenticating new users.

According to Echolink creator Jonathan Taylor, K1RFD, system security is critical, and all new EchoLink users must be validated before being allowed access. In many cases,these people are asked to provide proof of license for verification.

Taylor says thst EchoLink system administrators currently process dozens of Amateur license photocopies each day, received by fax and e-mail. To streamline the process, participants in Logbook of the World will now be able to prove their identity to EchoLink using a that digital certificate, as an alternative to submitting a license copy. (K1RFD)

**

AT THE FCC: FCC COMMISSIONER SAYS YES TO BPL AND ARRL OBJECTS

FCC Commissioner Kathleen Q. Abernathy has taken the position that Broadband over Power Line is important to the future of cyberspace

communications. Speaking before a United Powerline Council conference an September 22nd, Abernatjy said that the introduction of BPL will contribute to what she terma as a broadband nirvana.

Addressing the council, Abernathy not only expressed enthusiasm for Broadband over Powerline technology. She went so far as to recommend the elimination or substantial modification of existing rules governing its deployment.

The ARRL Letter says hat the League was quick to respond. In a tersely worded September 25th fax to Abernathy, ARRL Chief Executive Officer David Sumner, K1ZZ, asserted that the commissioner overlooked some significant issues in her Nirvana analogy. In fact, Sumner called B-P-L a nightmare noteing that technical showings submitted by the ARRL and others in response to the Commission's Notice of clearly establish that BPL is a significant source of radio spectrum pollution. Sumner went on to say that it cannot be implemented without causing harmful interference to already established over-the-air radio services. (ARRL, published news reports)

**

Break 1

From the United States of America, We are the Amateur Radio Newsline, heard on bulletin stations around the world including IRLP Node 6800 by VK8ZMA in Darwin, Australia.

(5 sec pause here)

**

AMATEUR RADIO SURVIVAL: UCF CLUB EVICTON FOLLOW-UP

A follow-up on the story of a college radio club thats been evicted after 31 years of continious service. The news is pretty positive as we hea from Amateur Radio Newsline's Mert Garlick, N6AWE:

--

The future of he University of Central Florida Amateur Radio Club is now in the hands of the school's Provost. This, as a direct result of hams from around the nation contacting the college to voice your dismay over the eviction of the club station after 31 years of operation from its campus location.

But even with all the community and political support, Mike Potaczala, KC4NUS, advises the College of Arts and Sciences is unwilling to quash the eviction. In fact, they have gone so far as to tell the Provost they no longer want any interaction with the radio club.

Potaczala, who is a staff advisor of the University of Central Florida Amateur Radio Club, says that now the Provost at least has a base understanding of the club's benefit to the students and the community

at large. More important, he is willing to help the club find a place to relocate on campus and is in the process of putting together the relocation cost figures. Unfortunately, the he does not feel he can justify directly allocating money from the university's budget to fund the relocation process. As a result, funding will have to come from school's Student Government, state and federal grants, and donations from the community.

Right now, the club is seeking help from anyone experienced in researching and writing proposals for state and federal grants. If you can assist in this project please contact the club via its website. That U-R-L appears in the print edition of this weeks Amateur Radio Newsline report.

For the Amateur Radio Newsline, Im Mert Garlick, N6AWE.

--

Again, if you can help the club write its grant proposals, contact it via the links at its website at http://ucf.edu/~wb4tcw/relocation.html (ARNewsline (TM), QRZ.com)

**

AT THE FCC: POWELL SAYS HE PLANS TO STAY

Federal Communications Commission Chairman Michael Powell says hat he plans to stay at the agency until the end of the Bush administration. Powell came under widespread criticism earlier this year for pushing thrugh new media ownership limits that allow television networks to acquire more local stations and permit a company to own a newspaper, television station and radio outlets in a single market. His announcement halts speculation that he might be leaving the agency. (Published reports)

**

ENFORCEMENT: GOOD NEWS FOR NJ REPEATER

Meantime on this side of the Atlantic theres some really good news for a New Jersey repeater operator. Tthe FCC's Daryl Duckworh, NN0W, explains why:

--

Duckworth: "The Enforcement Bureau has closed the matter of the technical compliance and coordination problems of the N2CTD repeater of Elizabeth Olsen in Farmingdale New Jersey on 146.775 MHZ. This is in view of replaced repeater equipment, corrected deficient operations and proper coordination."

--

In its letter closing the case, the FCC took the opportunity to remind N2CTD that the decision to operate a station as a repeater is a

totally voluntary one. That Repeaters are a convenience, not a necessity. Also that all stations including repeaters must have a licensee and a control operator capable of ensuring the immediate and proper operation of a station regardless of the type of control. (FCC, RAIN)

**

ENFORCEMENT: YOU NEED MORE THAN A TECH ON 17 METERS

Kelly G. Jones, K0EMD, of Fordland Missouri and Kenneth W. Paul, N0VDP, who resides in Lake City Minnesota have both been told by he FCC to stop operating in the 18 Mhz band. The reason for the notes is that both hams are Technician class license holders and Tech's do not have any operating privileges in the 17 meter Amateur band.

In its September 10th letter to the pair the FCC requested each to respond to within 20 days with whatever material either wanted to have considered in regard to the matter. The Commission says that the information submitted will be used to determine what further action the government might take. (FCC)

**

WITH THE SCOUTS: JOTA IS COMING

On a much lighter note, October 18th and 19th are the dates for the scouts 2003 Jamboree on the Air. Amateur Radio Newsline's Mark Abramowicz, NT3V, takes a look at the special relationship between ham radio and scouting:

--

When you think of Scouts and a Jamboree, images of tents, the aromas from all those goodies cooking in a dutch oven or a pot on the fire, and young men enjoying the outdoors might come to mind.

But add JOTA - or Jamboree on the Air - and the recipe for a great weekend is complete.

JOTA is sponsored by the World Scouting Bureau of the World Organization of the Scout Movement. This is the 46th year for the annual event.

Its goal is a simple one: connecting Scouts with other Scouts around the country and around the world by way of ham radio.

For many of those who take part, the fun starts with the campout - but the friendship and fellowship come through contacts on the radio. Jean Wolfgang, WB3IOS, is the American Radio Relay League's educational programs coordinator. She says several Scout councils in the United States schedule a campout around JOTA.

--

Wolfgang: "A lot of times the fall camporee falls this same weekend and so districts will arrange their camporee around the JOTA and then the hams come in and put up the big tarps and set up antennas.."

--

She says ham operators - whether adult Scouters or simply the fathers or friends of Scouts - bring their radios to Field Day-type settings - some in tents or cabins, others in picnic groves. They attract many a mike-shy Scout to come over and listen to the chatter from the radio. Maybe it's a Scout camp in Michigan, a community center in Arizona, a radio shack in Australia, or a hut in Panama.

--

Wolfgang: "It's more hands on, get the kids on the radio. And it creates friendships between Scouts in different countries, places that they would never talk otherwise to other Scouts."

--

The exchange is easy: a name, a location, Scout rank, age, and hobbies. That's for starters. Once the kids get going, you'd be surprised how much they enjoy talking to someone across the country or across the globe.

It's not a contest. But it's easy to generate a pile-up as operators scanning the bands look for stations calling: "CQ Jamboree" or "CQ JOTA."

And, Wolfgang says, the activity isn't restricted to just the boys.

--

Wolfgang: "This event is also for Girl Scouts," she says. "It's been a real struggle to get Girl Scouts to, the Girl Scout Leaders to find out about it."

--

And, of course, there are Girl Guides and co-ed Venture Crews. All are welcome.
Wolfgang says you may help turn someone on to the fun of Amateur Radio by taking part.

--

Wolfgang: "The League sees it as an opportunity to expose young people who may not be exposed any other way to ham radio," Wolfgang says. "And, although they may not turn out to be a ham in the next year or two - there'll be a time in their life when they'll settle down and may think of ham radio as a prospective hobby."

--

For the Amateur Radio Newslline, I'm Mark Abramowicz, NT3V.

--

The Jamboree on he Air is a world-wide event. Scouts may operate for 48 hours or any part of the time starting on Saturday at 00.00 hours until Sunday 24.00 hours local time. For more information visit the Jamboree on the Air website. Its in cyberspace at www.scout.org/wse/jota.shtml (ARNewsline(tm))

**

CONVENTIONS AND HAMFESTS: CALIFORNIA IN OCTOBER

Turning to ham radio happenings, the 12th annual Pacificon convention takes place October 17th to the 19th, but at a new location. This year the show's venue is the San Ramon Matiott with ARRL 1st Vice President Joel Harrisson, W5ZN as the featured banquet speaker. For more information take your web browser to www.pacificon.org or write to MDARC, P.O. Box 23222, Pleasant Hill., California. The zipcode is 94523 (VHF Reflector)

**

SEMINARS: WSWSS TO MEET IN CERRITOS CALIFORNIA

And the Western States Weak Signal Society's 9th Annual VHF UHF and Microwave Technical Conference takes place on Saturday October 11th. The venue is the Sheraton Hotel Towne Center in Cerritos California. The gatherng will feature technical seminars covering advanced DX'ing and contest techniques on 6 meters and all bands above. Producer Dave Bell, W6AQ, will be this years featured banquet speaker. More information found on the web at www.wswss.org . (WSWSS)

**

CONVENTIONS AND HAMFESTS: KALAMAZOO MI IN OCTOBER

And October 12th brings with it the Kalamazoo Hamfest. This at the Kalamazoo County Fairgrounds. Information on this one is in cyberspace at www.kalamazoohamradio.com slash hamfest and kalamazoohamradio is one word. (e-mail)

**

BREAK 2

This is ham radio news for today's radio amateur. From the United States of America, We are the Amateur Radio Newsline with links to the world from our only official website at www.arnewsline.org and being relayed by the volunteer services of the following radio amateur:

(5 sec pause here)

**

ENFORCEMENT: UK GOES AFTER PIRATE BROADCASTERS WITH NEW ARREST LAW

If you decide to become a pirate broadcaster in the United Kingdom, getting caught will now be allot more than the seizure of your transmitting gear. You will now be going to jail. Jeramy Boot joins us from Nottingham in the U-K with more:

--

New powers of arrest were introduced on the 18th of September in an attempt to combat pirate radio stations. The police, working with Radiocommunications Agency investigators, will now be able to arrest a pirate broadcaster or anybody suspected of supporting or facilitating illegal broadcasting.

Previously police could only detain someone if they suspected them of giving a false name and address or another criminal act, such as a breach of the peace or assault. The new powers of arrest will also extend to acts of deliberate interference with radio communications and hoax calls, especially false distress calls.

The Communications Minister Stephen Timms said: "These new powers will be an important weapon in the campaign against pirate broadcasters. By interfering with communications services which are vital for public safety, pirates can put lives at risk. They also cause interference with other licensed radio users and can be a social nuisance to those who live near pirate stations."

Jeramy Boot, G4NJH.

--

Unlicensed broadcasters detained under these new U-K powers could face an unlimited fine or up to two years in prison. For other transmitting offences such as unlicensed use of business, marine, or amateur radio station the maximum penalty is a 5000 Pound fine and / or 6 months in prison plus forfeiture of any radio gear. Currently 5000 pounds comes out to a bit over 8000 U-S dollars and thats allot of money and jail time for talking unlicensed on the air. (GB2RS)

**

INTERNATIONAL - UK: UK ISSUING 5 MHZ NOV'S AGAIN

The United Kingdom's Radio Communications Agency says that it will resume issuing of 5 MHz Notices of Variation to permit more hams onto the band to expand propagation studies. A United Kingdom Notice of Variation is similar to the FCC's Special Temporary Authority document. In this case the privilege is reserved for United Kingdom Full Amateur License holders. British Intermediate and Foundation Amateur License holders and Short-Wave Listeners are also encouraged to participate in the experiment by submitting reception reports or by working on the experiment with an Notice of Variation holder. (GB2RS)

**

INTERNATIONAL CANADA: VO1MRC BACK ON 5 MHZ

And the U-K is not the only place where 5 Mhz is making news. To the norrth, V-Oh1-M-R-C, the Marconi Radio Club of Newfoundland club station, has resumed its experimentation on 60 metres. The permit to comtinue comrs as the result of Radio Amateurs of Canada recommending to that nations radio regulators to grant a request from the club to continue with its work on the 5 MHz band until the end of 2003. (RAC)

**

INTERNATIONAL - SOUTH AFRICA: SA AMSAT ISSUES ITS FIRST EZINE

South Africa AMSAT sayys that it has e-mailed its first electronic newsletter to its members. Called S A AMSAT Ezine, the newsletter is published in Portable Document File format and is available free of charge to South Africa AMSAT members. (ZS6AKV)

**

ON THE AIR: VICTORY AT SEA - HAM RADIO STYLE

In special events, the museum ship the Cassin Young will accompany the USS Constitution as it does its bi-annual turn around cruise and ham radio will be a part of the event. An Amateur Radio station operating as N1S will be on board the Constitution. There will also have a ham station on the pier of the Boston Navy Yard with the callsign N1B. Also on the air will be WW2DD from the Cassin Young and another station on board the USS Chaffee. Operation will be on 40, 20, 17 and 2 meters including an AM station around 7 point 290 MHz. This event is operated by members of the USS Cassin Young Radio Club and the USS Salem Radio Club. More information is on the web at www.qsl.net/ww2dd (W1QWT)

**

ON THE AIR: THE PA QSO PARTY

Also, word that the Pennsylvania QSO Party is scheduled for October 11 and 12th. This year Pittsburgh's Steel City Amateur Radio Club, has been selected as the Special Event station for the annual operation. Because of this every contact with W3KWH will bring 200 bonus points. More information on the Pennsylvania QSO Party is in cyberspace at the website at www.nittany-arc.org/paqso.html . (Via e-mail)

**

DX

In DX, word that G3WQU, is in Timor Leste, formerly East Timor, and active again as 4-W-3-C-W. This, after a break of two and a half months. He will be active for about one year and operates CW only on all HF bands with 100 watts into a vertical. (RSGB)

And G3PMR, is active again from Cyprus as 5B4AHJ from now until the 13th of December. QSL via G3PMR, either direct or via the bureau. (GB2RS)

And mark October 7th to the 12 for the 4M9YY 9th District Venezuela DX-Pedition. The Venezuela 9th. District, is a one of most wanted WPX prefix's worldwide and to give out lots of contacts the group will be active on all bands and all modes from 160 through 2 meter satellite from the city of San Fernando de Apure. QSL direct with a self addressed stamped envelope to the 4M9YY DXpedition, PAKMAIL 10012, P.O.BOX: 025304, Miami Florida 33102-5304 in the USA. More information is in cyberspave at www.4m9yy.com.ve (Via e-mail)

**

THAT FINAL ITEM: A NEW RECORD FOR WI-FI

And finaly, a group of researchers in Poland have set a new wireless LAN or Wi-Fi record. Q-News Felix Scerri, VK4FUQ, has the details:

--

Interline Wireless Technology, a Polish company has reportedly set a world record in stretching the range of a Wi-Fi network for an amazing 110 Kms at 2.4 GHz. They achieved this using an antenna developed by them and an INTEL Wireless Access Point.

The Interline report on their web site www.interline.pl - in Polish - seems to show and say that, on their mountain-top site, in what we would consider "Amateur Radio" field-day conditions, they generated 500mW into a 27dB 1.1m off-axis parabolic section dish. It seems to say that the reverse direction from the base station was 6 watts into a 2.4m dish.

--

And it was all done, ham radio style. (Q-News)

**

NEWSCAST CLOSE

With thanks to Alan Labs, AMSAT, the ARRL, the CGC Communicator, CQ Magazine, the FCC, the Ohio Penn DX Bulletin, Radio Netherlands, Rain, the RSGB and Australia's Q-News, that's all from the Amateur Radio Newsline(tm). Our e-mail address is newsline @arnewsline.org. More information is available at Amateur Radio Newsline's(tm) only official website located at www.arnewsline.org. You can also write to us or support us at Amateur Radio Newsline(tm), P.O. Box 660937, Arcadia, California 91066.

For now, with Bill Pasternak, WA6ITF, at the editors desk, I'm Jim Davis, W2JKD, saying 73 and we thank you for listening." Amateur Radio Newsline(tm) is Copyright 2003. All rights reserved.

661. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-10 09:09:52 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <AHuhb.14724$mQ2.8000@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 80235

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote:
>
> Incorrect. What "push"? Based on membership
> numbers, NCI has fewer than 5000 members
> worldwide (snip)

Oh, come on, Jim. What is this "what push" nonsense? The push to remove code testing that so many pro-code test advocates, including yourself on occasion, have been ranting about in this newsgroups for so very many years. As you well know, NCI is only a tiny part of the overall movement to end code testing - far more outside that organization are involved (including some in this newsgroup you've personally discussed this issue with). To now try to move the focus solely to NCI, while knowing full well that so many others are involved, is just not being honest about the situation.

Do you honestly think denying the push to remove code testing will somehow make it go away? Do you honestly think denying the existence of others outside NCI will somehow make them disappear? It isn't going to happen, Jim. The movement to end code testing has never been stronger. To deny that, in light of all that has happened over the last few years, would bring into question a person's sanity.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

662. "They're there when they need you."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-10 10:00:35 UTC
From: BIG********AL*********
Message-ID: <vod0q4ecdquh01@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 80236

The Complete Military History of France

- Gallic Wars
- Lost. In a war whose ending foreshadows the next 2000 years of French history, France is conquered by of all things, an Italian.

- Hundred Years War
- Mostly lost, saved at last by female schizophrenic who inadvertently creates The First Rule of French Warfare; "France's armies are victorious only when not led by a Frenchman." Sainted.

- Italian Wars
- Lost. France becomes the first and only country to ever lose two wars when fighting Italians.

- Wars of Religion
- France goes 0-5-4 against the Huguenots

- Thirty Years War
- France is technically not a participant, but manages to get invaded anyway. Claims a tie on the basis that eventually the other participants started ignoring her.

- War of Revolution
- Tied. Frenchmen take to wearing red flowerpots as chapeaux.

- The Dutch War
- Tied

- War of the Augsburg League/King William's War/French and Indian War
- Lost, but claimed as a tie. Three ties in a row induces deluded Frogophiles the world over to label the period as the height of French military power.

- War of the Spanish Succession
- Lost. The War also gave the French their first taste of a Marlborough, which they have loved every since.

- American Revolution
- In a move that will become quite familiar to future Americans, France claims a win even though the English colonists saw far more action. This is later known as "de Gaulle Syndrome", and leads to the Second Rule of French Warfare; "France only wins when America does most of the fighting."

- French Revolution
- Won, primarily due the fact that the opponent was also French.

- The Napoleonic Wars
- Lost. Temporary victories (remember the First Rule!) due to leadership of a Corsican, who ended up being no match for a British footwear designer.

- The Franco-Prussian War
- Lost. Germany first plays the role of drunk Frat boy to France's ugly girl home alone on a Saturday night.

- World War I
- Tied and on the way to losing, France is saved by the United States. Thousands of French women find out what it's like to not only sleep with a winner, but one who doesn't call her "Fraulein." Sadly, widespread use of condoms by American forces forestalls any improvement in the French bloodline.

- World War II
- Lost. Conquered French liberated by the United States and Britain just as they finish learning the Horst Wessel Song.

- War in Indochina
- Lost. French forces plead sickness; take to bed with the Dien Bien Flu

- Algerian Rebellion
- Lost. Loss marks the first defeat of a western army by a Non-Turkic Muslim force since the Crusades, and produces the First Rule of Muslim Warfare; "We can always beat the French." This rule is identical to the First Rules of the Italians, Russians, Germans, English, Dutch, Spanish, Vietnamese and Esquimaux.

- War on Terrorism
- France, keeping in mind its recent history, surrenders to Germans and Muslims just to be safe. Attempts to surrender to Vietnamese ambassador fail after he takes refuge in a McDonald's.

The question for any country silly enough to count on the French should not be "Can we count on the French?", but rather "How long until France collapses?"

"Going to war without France is like going deer hunting without an accordion. All you do is leave behind a lot of noisy baggage."

Or, better still, the quote from last week's Wall Street Journal: "They're there when they need you."

663. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-10 10:29:52 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031010062952.07578.00001037@mb-m25.aol.com>
Source record: 80238

In article <voc7csn28m5j44@corp.supernews.com>, "Clint" <rattlehead at
computron dot net> writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20031009222958.11022.00001288@mb-m14.aol.com...
>> In article <vobqv2rgm27fb7@corp.supernews.com>, "Clint" <rattlehead at
>> computron dot net> writes:
>>
>> >> All age groups showed a majority to be procodetest, h
>> >
>> >
>> >bzzzzzt....
>> >
>> >if this were true,
>>
>> It is true. Did you read the survey and its results?
>>
>> > there wouldn't be such a push to remove it.
>>
>> Incorrect. What "push"? Based on membership numbers, NCI has fewer than
>5000
>> members worldwide, even with no dues, no expiration of membership and
>having
>> been around over 7 years.
>>
>>
>
>Oh, more than just NCI; ARRL seems to favor it,

ARRL hasn't formulated a new position yet. Their leadership is sitting on the
sidelines because no matter what they decide, some folks will be unhappy.

> and in general most hams
>do

How do you know?

The ARRL/READEX survey was a true random sample. What scientific survey or
polling have you done to verify your claim of "most hams"?

>that aren't the ones clinging to desperate delusionary hopes in certain
>internet NG's.
>
>Yep, it's outta here, CW testing is soon to be extinct. It's goneski.
>
Maybe it is. But if so, it's not because most hams want it to go. And on

particular, not because young hams want it to go.

>

664. Re: Echolink is great for those who..

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-10 12:07:35 UTC
From: toolz toolz <medtools2@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <bixhb.10544$Eo2.8877@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 80241
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

```
True, so?
"Anonymous" <BigappleRemailer@Optonline.Net> wrote in message
news:VSFBIUL237903.9560416667@anonymous...
> In article <ZRUgb.5256$Eo2.5012@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
> "toolz toolz" <medtools2@earthlink.net> wrote:
> >
> >
> > You, starwars, are an ass.
>
> You, TOOLz are a fucking TOOL.
>
> > "starwars" <nobody@tatooine.homelinux.net> wrote in message
> > news:38c9916cb107dcfd2c28d5112d15650b@tatooine.homelinux.net...
> > > In article <pan.2003.10.06.17.54.11.719783@hotmail.com>
> > > "No-CODE TWAT- N7ZZT" <n7zzt_NO.SPAM_@hotmail.com> wrote:
> > > >
> > > >
> > > > On Wed, 01 Oct 2003 16:15:38 +0200, starwars wrote:
> > > >
> > > > >> so? you any better? just because I am no-code doesn't mean I
don't
> > > > >> KNOW-CODE (I just never bothered to take the damned test, you
dope!).
> > > > >
> > > > > Obviously, you were too goddamned stupid to pass it, either.
> > > >
> > > > ever hear of other considerations? how about this one: lack on funds
> > >
> > > It's not my fault you're so unemployable you can't afford anything. I
bet
> > you're driving that used-over 100,000 mile shitbox because you can't
aford a
> > newer car, too.
> >
> >
> > > > required to get the equipment needed to even have a decent station
on
> > HF.
> > > > what about locvation for the antenna (I've lived in apartments for a
> > long
> > > > time, I doubt they would like it if I stuck a 3-el beam for 75/80 on
> > their
> > > > root).
```

> > >
> > > "On their "Root?" No wonder you're a goddamned no -code technician
TWAT,
> > you don't even know that antennas usually go on roofs, not roots. What a
> > dumbass.
> > > You're just full of excuses, twat. And you can add lack of ambition to
own
> > your own home to your mounting list of deficiencies.
> > >
> > >
> > > > >
> > > > >> but then again, if all you can do is insult, that means you don't
> > have
> > > > > >> brains enough to really do something about it.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > You'll have to pass the test on your own, twat.
> > >
> > > > > wa wa waaaaah! cry me a river....
> > > >
> > > > The only crying is coming from you, no-code technician twat.
> > > >
> > > > Can you say hypocrite? In addition to your inability to upgrade your
> > license, you severely lack skills in debate. You proved it all by your
> > lonesome, little twat.
> > > >
> > > > > throwing insults just means you don't have brains enough to debate.
> > > >
> > > > Making excuses for your lack of abilities isn't debating, little twat.
> > > >
> > > > > I'd say you are full of it (-... ..- .-.. .-.. ... . -) (just
so
> > > > > you know, that spells out BULLSHIT, which you seem to be so full of
> > > > > lately).
> > > >
> > > > Now, what were you saying above about throwing insults because you
didn't
> > have brains, twat?
> > > >
> > > > > >
> > > > > >> oh well, I fail to see where it's my problem anyway.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > You fail to see quite a lot of things, no-code technician twat.
> > > > >
> > > > > a dig? hmmm, better get a bigger (and sharper) shovel...
> > > >
> > > >
> > > > And the point passes over your granite skull at the speed of light,
twat.
> > Thanks for proving my point.
> > >

> > >
> > >
> > >
>
> -=-
> This message was posted via two or more anonymous remailing services.
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>

>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>

665. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-10 12:29:59 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031010082959.12300.00001039@mb-m20.aol.com>
Source record: 80242

In article <3F84B6F7.20507@ix.netcom.com>, Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
writes:

>There should be some sort of beginner's license that an average 14 year
>old honor roll student can get

That would require an extensive reworking of the current tests. We've got at
least one 6 year old General and an 8 year old passed the old Extra.

73 de Jim, N2EY

666. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-10 12:29:59 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031010082959.12300.00001040@mb-m20.aol.com>
Source record: 80244

In article <3F855A3B.2040607@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:

>Dick Carroll wrote:
>
>> You can imagine what my small hometown looked like when I returned after
>> 5 years military time away in places like New York, Hartford, Philly,
>> Chicago, Paris and Frankfurt.

How ya gonna keep 'em down on the farm...
>
> Probably looked like good old HOME! 8^)
>
After growing up in metro Philly, I found the Finger Lakes region of New York State much more to my liking. But the job is here.

73 de Jim, N2EY

667. Re: DXers Of The Past (Was YASME makes her final port 'o call)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-10 12:30:00 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031010083000.12300.00001041@mb-m20.aol.com>
Source record: 80243

In article <d22b54c3.0310090244.529b1b04@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) writes:

>> W9WNV
>
>AARGH!!. . never mind . .

The story about the card table and folding chair on Maria Theresa......
>
>> W6AM
>
>W6AM tale: My second transmitter was a $29.95 Heathkit AT-1 I'd
>cobbled together. The only FT-243 xtal I owned was 7.060. Xtals were
>EXPENSIVE boy!

$3 each new. Which translates to maybe $30 today.

>Which when doubled put me on 14.120. Kinda useless freq
>for dxing so I had to really scrounge for contacts. CQ, CQ, CQ, CQ ad
>infinitum after school with all 3-5 watts of RF out or whatever it
>was. Finally a CT1 found me and we latched up for several days
>running. After some number of days another station called out of
>nowhere, it was W6AM mobile running CW from his car. So 14.120 got to
>be a three-way round table around 5pm Eastern Time for days on end. At
>the time I had no idea who W6AM actually was except that his name was
>Don and he was a really neat guy. I have a W6AM card.

Great story!

W6AM was one of the first hams to go mobile, back when FCC first issued special "ZZ" licenses. He held the special call W6ZZAM for such work.
>
Didja look around that site and see the aerial map of his rhombics? Scary.

>> OH2BH
>
>OH2BH/ZA. Tally ho!!

OH To Be Him!

>> 7. W. Gerry Mathis, W3GM
>
>Yeah, Gerry W3BES/W3GM. The radio god in these parts, my all-time
>great mentor. EVERYBODY'S mentor, that's the way he was. I yakked with
>Gerry on the club machine one day then found out he passed away two
>days later. Dredge up QSTs from the late '40s and early '50s and check
>the glossy back cover RCA power tubes division ads for a look at Gerry

>himself and the collection of the gorgeous monster amps he designed
>and built.

Classic "cans on the temples" pose, too. Still a legend in these parts.

>What kinda goofy list is this anyway??
>
Good question.

73 de Jim, N2EY

668. Re: N8__googled

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-10 12:32:07 UTC
From: richcranus@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <c5ecbb69.0310100432.2c50976e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 80245
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.dogie.is.an.idiot,rec.radio.cb

"Smell My Finger" <ss@null.com> wrote in message
news:<HbCdnc4rZf64jBuiXTWJig@comcast.com>...
> "Richard Cranium" <richcranus@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> news:c5ecbb69.0310091543.29ee42a7@posting.google.com...
> > DouGayAdairierreN8WWM@ikillclowns.com (Repeaterjammers For A Keyclown-Free
> Newsgroup) wrote in message
> news:<94ef989d.0310090428.67c94f73@posting.google.com>...
> > > Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com> wrote in message
> news:<20031007214001.401$VM@newsreader.com>...
> > > > http://tinyurl.com/q3xp
> > >
> > > The fame, the adulation.....I am touched.
> >
> > Only by yourself, fagboy. Nobody with class would touch you!
>
>
> TROLL POST!!!

I stand corrected; Georgie-girl would touch you.

669. Re: Isnt it Funny (No-Code HF Privileges)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-10 15:08:35 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <TXzhb.10652$Eo2.3826@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 80246

Yeah thats right. I run a FT-1000MP. I operate V/Uhf weak signal. I own
and am self taught and literate on 2 computers. I operate 4 digital modes
on HF with them. I contest and use state of the art log programs. Oh and
BTW I have been a electronics technician for 30 years.

Get a life loser.

Dan/W4NTI

"N8WWM" <dogie@home.nut> wrote in message news:bm648q05b6@drn.newsguy.com...
> You're just jealous of the new technology and gear that is making you
> obsolete. You're the type of person who would jam repeaters.
>
> In article <x%jhb.7940$Eo2.5218@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>,
Dan/W4NTI
> says...
> >
> >We are following your example Clint.
> >
> >And no one mentioned a damn thing about CW. And you are the one that
> >bitches when it comes up. What a hypocrite you are.
> >
> >Now go back in your hole.
> >
> >Dan/W4NTI
> >
> >"Clint" <rattlehead at computron dot net> wrote in message
> >news:vob895nfljiif0@corp.supernews.com...
> >> Are you guys going to be this abrasive and sour, even years after
> >> they are rid of your precious morse code test, or are you going to
> >> be childish and juvenile ad infinitum?
> >>
> >> Clint
> >>
> >>
> >> "Dick Carroll" <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com> wrote in message
> >> news:bm462j$t42$0@208.207.71.139...
> >> > N8WWM wrote:
> >> >
> >> > > In article <PkAgb.2727$Eo2.93@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>,
> >> Dan/W4NTI
> >> > > says...
> >> > >
> >> > >
> >> > >>
> >> > >>"Dick Carroll" <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com> wrote in message

> >> > >>news:blt3vltjm0@208.207.71.173...
> >> > >>
> >> > >>>Clint wrote:
> >> > >>>
> >> > >>>
> >> > >>>>"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
> >> > >>>>news:20031006162751.25517.00001185@mb-m15.aol.com...
> >> > >>>>
> >> > >>>>
> >> > >>>>
> >> > >>>>
> >> > >>>>>>Now you can get all upset and indignant, Len old boy, but the
> >facts
> >> > >>>>>>are the facts.
> >> > >>>>>
> >> > >>>>> Noooooo...those are just your OPINIONS. :-)
> >> > >>>>>
> >> > >>>>
> >> > >>>>
> >> > >>>>Not only that, consider the source... you're dealing with another
> >PCTA
> >> > >>>>type that didn't receive his or her fair share of grey matter
such
> >> that
> >> > >>>>self-determination isn't possible... it's just "bleat like the
rest
> >of
> >> > >>
> >> > >>>>the
> >> > >>
> >> > >>>>sheep"
> >> > >>>>
> >> > >>>>"CW test good.... modernization bad.....
> >> > >>>>CW test good.... mdernization bad...."
> >> > >>>>
> >> > >>>>Clint
> >> > >>>>
> >> > >>>
> >> > >>>
> >> > >>>One could compare rattlehead with Forrest Gump except that
> >> > >>>Forrest was a not so bright fellow who did have some common
sense...
> >> > >>>
> >> > >>
> >> > >>I've noticed that folks that are a bit 'slow' are good at common
> >sense.
> >> > >>Rattlehead is the exception that proves the rule.
> >> > >>
> >> > >>Dan/W4NTI
> >> > >>

> >> > >
> >> > > You are and old fart. Step aside before the tech class run you
over,
> >> chump.
> >> > >
> >> >
> >> >
> >> > Ah. Another example of the "slow" class, again lacking common
sense.
> >> >
> >> > Tell ya what, Genius- when there are so many of you that the bands
are
> >> > carpeted with you, it won't be possible to walk over oldtimers -
We'll
> >> > be gone fishing.
> >> > You're doing your damnedest to do the same thing to ham radio you
did
> >> > to CB, and the FCC and ARRL are not only going along with it, they're
> >> > facilitating it. It's lunacy - right where you belong.
> >> >
> >>
> >>
> > >
> > >
>

670. Re: Bootlegging in 1948?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-10 16:23:30 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0310100823.7cc7e4ef@posting.google.com>
Source record: 80247

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:<THthb.14472$mQ2.12983@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote:
> > (Len Over 21) writes:
> > >
> > > (snip) I got a COMMERCIAL Radiotelephone license
> > > in 1956 (only one test needed) and had a career in radio-
> > > electronics design since then. You will no doubt have to
> > > say such is "irrelevant" for lots of reasons.
> > >
> > Not at all.
> > >
> > Please explain how that license and career have any relevance
> > to amateur radio policy. Particularly since you have never held
> > any class of amateur radio license.
> >
> Since anybody in this country can discuss amateur radio policy (license
> policy or whatever), I do think a person's communications knowledge and
> experience elsewhere is at least somewhat relevant to that person's part in
> that discussion.

In certain technical matters, perhaps. But in the formation of policy
for the amateur service, why would such experience outside amateur
radio be more significant than another's experience as a radio
amateur?

Should we ask Howard Stern about amateur radio policy? He has
extensive experience in radio *outside* of amateur radio. He has made
millions from his radio career, and has branched out into TV, movies
and books, all of which have been financially successful ventures.

Millions of people listen to him daily, and find him informative and
entertaining.

Why not see what Howard Stern thinks about amateur radio policy
issues.

> Why would you think otherwise, Jim?

I'm not saying that anyone should not be heard. Just the opposite.

I'm simply saying that holding up non-amateur-radio experience as some
sort of credential that disproves the opposing viewpoint of those with
amateur radio experience is faulty logic.

> Len is obviously
> interested in Amateur Radio, which is good.

Whoa, hold on a sec!

The only "interest" Len has shown in the past decade or so is numerous
lengthy postings to a few newsgroups.

Do you consider his attitude and behavior towards those who disagree
with him to be "good"?

Would you want a lot of new hams who behave the way he does?

> The only thing I don't
> understand is why he hasn't acted on that interest and gotten some kind of
> Amateur Radio license over the years.

Perhaps the newsgroups are all the interest he has.

> Since VHF and above is one focus of
> commercial communications today, one would think the Technician license
> would have at least some appeal to him. This glaring, long term, lack of
> committment to Amateur Radio is what brings his ongoing participation in
> this discussion under suspicion.

Which is why I point it out. The Tech license has not had a code test
for more than 12 years. Its written test is not very difficult. It
conveys all amateur VHF/UHF privileges. Yet Len has no interest in it.

> > > You don't want to admit your occupation's firm name or what
> > > it does,
> >
> > Because it's not relevant. (snip)
>
> This position is equally valid.

Thanks!

> While a person's communications knowledge
> and experience elsewhere is somewhat relevant (if that person chooses to
> make it so), communications knowledge and experience elsewhere is obviously
> not manditory for participation in this discussion, especially for the
> person holding an Amateur Radio license which will be directly impacted by
> the outcome of this discussion.

There is also the plain, simple fact of Len's behavior when he knows
the employment of someone who disagrees with him.

Is there *any* employment situation that *anyone* who supports code
testing could have that would cause Len to change his position on code
testing? I don't think so!

Is there *any* employment situation that *anyone* who supports code
testing could have that would cause Len to treat that person with
respect? I don't think so!

And so there's no point in *anyone* mentioning their employment here.
So I don't.

73 de Jim, N2EY

671. What makes a Pro code test Amateur a Troglodyte?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-10 17:34:37 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3F86EDAD.4010109@psu.edu>
Source record: 80248

I just saw another accusation of Pro-Coders as technically backwards.

Yet some of the most progressive RF Engineers and Technicians I know
(who are Hams) are really enamored of Morse CW.

I would challenge the NCTA's to show some proof that those who believe
that the morse code test should be retained are in a technical backwater.

I would also challenge them to do it without being abrasive or insulting.

Just facts or intelligent informed opinions.

Pro coders can help by refraining from name calling too.

My statement is that there is no direct relationship.

Anyone ready for a real discussion without the barbs? Can we do it?
First person to start throwing insults only makes it look bad for
his/her side.

- Mike KB3EIA -

672. Re: RM-10808 --- Wexelbaum Redux

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-10 17:39:33 UTC
From: groupk0hb@earthlink.net
Message-ID: <5ee63311.0310100939.39f35ac0@posting.google.com>
Source record: 80249

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote

>
> Mega Dittos. I especially like the "catch 22"
> prohibition of new modes. Frankly I'm surprised
> that Joe didn't think of that.

I sent a courtesy copy of my comments to the author of RM-10808. Here
is his response.

73, de Hans, K0HB

RESPONSE FROM AH0A

Thanks for taking the time to respond, although your last comment was
a bit
strong.

The idea behind the petition was to try to retain some "merit" badge
testing
and a "reward" for learning. I fail to understand why removing Morse
testing is any different from removing all aspects of RTTY knowledge
from
the written test, e.g. "T8A10. What would you connect to a transceiver
for
RTTY operation?". I've taught several courses in the last few years,
and
have come to the conclusion that so many different technologies are
very
difficult to get across in a three week course, and I question whether
it is
desirable to require it.

What is so special about Morse that it requires so much emotion? The
real
issue for those proposing to remove it is they want more Amateurs. If
the
market were growing fast enough, we would not see this much effort. I
felt
that my proposal to remove CW testing for phone privileges, but retain
it to
operate CW would be a compromise. How it could interfere in the
development
of amateur radio escapes me. It is less restrictive than current

rules.

I also thought that moving all testing requirements out of the FCC would
make it more acceptable. The FCC clearly wants to get out of the business
of regulating amateur radio. The question we amateurs need to address is
what are the requirements to get a license? Questions about CW, RTTY, SS,
EME, FM, repeaters, SSB, space communications, emergency communications,
circuits, electric theory, regulations, etc. And which group of amateurs
gets to make the decision?

Anyway I want to assure you I that I put thought into the petition and
sincerely believe that CW testing for CW privileges was a compromise.

Joe Speroni
Honolulu

673. Re: N8__googled

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-10 17:44:15 UTC
From: Cranus_is_an_Anus@ikillclowns.com
Message-ID: <94ef989d.0310100944.200d246a@posting.google.com>
Source record: 80250
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.dogie.is.an.idiot,rec.radio.cb

richcranus@yahoo.com (Richard Cranium) wrote in message
news:<c5ecbb69.0310100432.2c50976e@posting.google.com>...
> "Smell My Finger" <ss@null.com> wrote in message
news:<HbCdnc4rZf64jBuiXTWJig@comcast.com>...
> > "Richard Cranium" <richcranus@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> > news:c5ecbb69.0310091543.29ee42a7@posting.google.com...
> > > DouGayAdairierreN8WWM@ikillclowns.com (Repeaterjammers For A Keyclown-Free
> > Newsgroup) wrote in message
> > news:<94ef989d.0310090428.67c94f73@posting.google.com>...
> > > > Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com> wrote in message
> news:<20031007214001.401$VM@newsreader.com>...
> > > > > http://tinyurl.com/q3xp
> > > >
> > > > The fame, the adulation.....I am touched.
> > >
> > > Only by yourself, fagboy. Nobody with class would touch you!
> >
> >
> > TROLL POST!!!
>
> I stand corrected; Georgie-girl would touch you.

Jealousy will get you nowhere, faggotboy

674. Re: RM-10808 --- Wexelbaum Redux

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-10 17:45:01 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3F86F01D.8090400@psu.edu>
Source record: 80251

Hans K0HB wrote:
> Joe Speroni, AH0A, has introduced a looney-tune petition, reminiscent
> of Bob Wexelbaum, W2ILP "Amateur Radio Needs More Tests".
>
> Below is my comment to the FCC.
>
> 73, de Hans, K0HB
>
> -------
>
> Before the
> Federal Communications Commission
> Washington, DC 20554
>
> In the Matter of)
>)
> Amendment of Part 97 of the Commission's) RM-10808
> Rules to Drergulate Testing for Non-Voice)
> Mode Allocation for Amateur Radio Licenses)
>
>
> To: The Commission
>
> PERSONAL COMMENTS OF HANS BRAKOB, K0HB
>
>
>
> OVERVIEW
>
> These comments are submitted in response to the petition of Joseph
> Speroni (AH0A) which requests changes in the qualifications and
> testing of applicants for new or upgraded licenses in the Amateur
> Radio Service.
>
> I. Discussion:
>
> The instant petition requests the elimination of Element 1
> (5WPM Morse code test) from the required test for General
> and/or Extra Class licenses in the Amateur Radio service,
> and goes on to request that the written examinations (elements
> 2, 3, and 4) be stripped of all mode-related questions except
> those pertaining to Phone operation. Persons licensed under this
> scheme would only be authorized to use Phone emissions, unless
> they had additionally passed examinations related to other modes.

Bizarre. I wonder what the "test" for Hellschrieber or the computer modes would be?

> Petitioner further proposes that operation in ARES (Amateur
> Radio Emergency Service) would be restricted to licensees who
> had passed a written examination on that subject.

OY! This person would maybe like to turn Amateur radio into a Fraternity? Signa Fy Nothing?

> Petitioner also proposes that Volunteer Examiners would only
> be required to administer the basic written examinations (elements
> 2, 3, and 4) and could decline to administer any of the proposed
> mode-related examinations if they felt it were burdensome to them.

Okay, so we couldn't operate any other mode besides phone is essentially what he is saying. If we strip mode specific questions, and then VE's only tested for 2, 3, and 4, all the other modes kinda go away, don't they.

And this is yet another time I've heard about the great "burden" upon the VE's. Heck it's a volunteer thing. If its too much work, they can find less burdensome things to do with their time.

> II. Comments:

Agreed with all your comments, Hans.

>
> In summary, this petition should not be tossed aside lightly.
> It should be hurled aside with great force.

And terminated with great prejudice!

- Mike KB3EIA -

675. Re: RM-10808 --- Wexelbaum Redux

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-10 17:46:08 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3F86F060.2050506@psu.edu>
Source record: 80252

Bill Sohl wrote:

> Mega Dittos. I especially like the "catch 22"
> prohibition of new modes. Frankly I'm surprised
> that Joe didn't think of that.

The proposal in toto doesn't show much evidence of thought.

- Mike KB3EIA -

676. Re: What makes a Pro code test Amateur a Troglodyte?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-10 18:03:43 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@nope.org>
Message-ID: <nisdov0duc0ipm9likrr73not53jvvq728@4ax.com>
Source record: 80253

Mike,

An excellent idea. I for one would be very interested in seeing the
logic and rationale that folks have for keeping or retiring the code
test. By removing the emotion, personal opinion and bias from the
discussion, some quite interesting points may well be raised.

73, Leo

On Fri, 10 Oct 2003 13:34:37 -0400, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote:

> I just saw another accusation of Pro-Coders as technically backwards.
>
> Yet some of the most progressive RF Engineers and Technicians I know
>(who are Hams) are really enamored of Morse CW.
>
> I would challenge the NCTA's to show some proof that those who believe
>that the morse code test should be retained are in a technical backwater.
>
> I would also challenge them to do it without being abrasive or insulting.
>
> Just facts or intelligent informed opinions.
>
>
> Pro coders can help by refraining from name calling too.
>
>
> My statement is that there is no direct relationship.
>
>
> Anyone ready for a real discussion without the barbs? Can we do it?
>First person to start throwing insults only makes it look bad for
>his/her side.
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -

677. Re: What makes a Pro code test Amateur a Troglodyte?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-10 18:44:31 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <j6Dhb.622$_i.48906@nnrp1.ptd.net>
Source record: 80254

"Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
news:3F86EDAD.4010109@psu.edu...
> I just saw another accusation of Pro-Coders as technically backwards.
>
> Yet some of the most progressive RF Engineers and Technicians I know
> (who are Hams) are really enamored of Morse CW.

In over 32 years as an RF engineer, I have not had the same experience.
The most technical folks have seemed more interested in the technical
side of ham radio and there have been MANY who I could not recruit
into ham radio because they had no interest in and were unwilling to waste
their valuable time learing Morse to a level that would get them decent
HF privs. (some have capitulated and jumped through the 5 wpm hoop
since "restructuring" and are now extras, but many have refused, on
principal, to jump through the hoop, saying they'll wait until they don't
have to waste their time on Morse)

> I would challenge the NCTA's to show some proof that those who believe
> that the morse code test should be retained are in a technical backwater.

Most of the avid CW ragchewers/contesters I've known over the years
(remember, I'm a long-time ham) have been more interested in the operating
activity (ragchewing, contesting, paper-chasing) than the technical side.
My experience has been that they have been less technically inclined than
a lot of the no-code techs I've met, less inclined to participate in public
service/emergency communications, and more inclined to just being "users"
rather than tinkerers ...

Remember, this is my personal experience, and since it seems to differ from
yours, YMMV ...

> I would also challenge them to do it without being abrasive or insulting.

I think I've met the challenge ...

> Just facts or intelligent informed opinions.

Since there are no authortative, scientific statistics (and probably never
will
be), I think that all you can expect to get are peoples accounting of their
own
personal experiences. Mine are admitedly coming from the fact that I'm "in
the business" of RF engineering ... but through local clubs and ARES/RACES
participation over the past 25+ years, my observations seem to hold, even
amongst contacts/acquaintences/friends who are not "in the profession."
Remember, YMMV ...

>
> Pro coders can help by refraining from name calling too.

We shall see ...

> My statement is that there is no direct relationship.

The evidence is anecdotal will, as I point out, vary from person
to person, depending on their location, profession, the "slant"
of the local club(s) they belong to, etc.

> Anyone ready for a real discussion without the barbs? Can we do it?
> First person to start throwing insults only makes it look bad for
> his/her side.

I think I've taken the high ground ... we'll see how the other side deals
with it ...

73,
Carl - wk3c

678. Re: RM-10808 --- Wexelbaum Redux

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-10 18:50:04 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <wbDhb.623$_i.48433@nnrp1.ptd.net>
Source record: 80255

"Hans K0HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:5ee63311.0310100939.39f35ac0@posting.google.com...
> "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote
>
> >
> > Mega Dittos. I especially like the "catch 22"
> > prohibition of new modes. Frankly I'm surprised
> > that Joe didn't think of that.
>
> I sent a courtesy copy of my comments to the author of RM-10808. Here
> is his response.
>
> 73, de Hans, K0HB
> ----------
>
> RESPONSE FROM AH0A
> ----------
>
> Thanks for taking the time to respond, although your last comment was
> a bit strong.
>
> The idea behind the petition was to try to retain some "merit" badge
> testing

It's not govt's legitimate purpose to have "merit badge testing."

> and a "reward" for learning. I fail to understand why removing Morse
> testing is any different from removing all aspects of RTTY knowledge
> from the written test, e.g. "T8A10. What would you connect to a
> transceiver for RTTY operation?".

Clearly AH0A can't understand (or accept) that the RTTY example
is "theoretical knowledge" and the Morse test is a test of a mechanical
skill ... while I don't advocate it, a touch-typing test would be more
relevant to the future of ham radio than a Morse test.

[snip]

> Anyway I want to assure you I that I put thought into the petition and
> sincerely believe that CW testing for CW privileges was a compromise.

It appears that AH0A either did not read the R&O in 98-143 and the
denials of the Petitions for Reconsideration that were filed, or he didn't
understand/accept what the FCC clearly said.

Carl - wk3c

679. Re: Isnt it Funny (No-Code HF Privileges)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-10 18:58:41 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031010145841.29815.00001081@mb-m21.aol.com>
Source record: 80256

In article <vob895nfljiif0@corp.supernews.com>, "Clint" <rattlehead at computron dot net> writes:

>Are you guys going to be this abrasive and sour, even years after
>they are rid of your precious morse code test, or are you going to
>be childish and juvenile ad infinitum?
>
>Clint
>
>
>"Dick Carroll" <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com> wrote in message

680. Re: RM-10808 --- Wexelbaum Redux

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-10 20:11:17 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3F871265.7050302@psu.edu>
Source record: 80257

Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
> "Hans K0HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:5ee63311.0310100939.39f35ac0@posting.google.com...
>
>>"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote
>>
>>
>>>Mega Dittos. I especially like the "catch 22"
>>>prohibition of new modes. Frankly I'm surprised
>>>that Joe didn't think of that.
>>
>>I sent a courtesy copy of my comments to the author of RM-10808. Here
>>is his response.
>>
>>73, de Hans, K0HB
>>____
>>
>> RESPONSE FROM AH0A
>>____
>>
>>Thanks for taking the time to respond, although your last comment was
>>a bit strong.
>>
>>The idea behind the petition was to try to retain some "merit" badge
>>testing
>
>
> It's not govt's legitimate purpose to have "merit badge testing."

Seems to me that the amateur should be trusted to do the needed work to get on the air with whatever method he or she chooses. The test should reflect the level needed to gain that trust.

For me to get on for example, PSK31, I simply built an interface to connect the computer to the rig. To have to be tested on that would be a waste of time.

Odd that the proposer of that seemed to be worried about how much burden was upon the VE's. his proposal would amount to a huge increase in work for them. But then he seemed to say they could refuse to test applicants except in element 2,3,4!

- Mike KB3EIA -

681. Re: What makes a Pro code test Amateur a Troglodyte?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-10 20:21:40 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3F8714D4.2050602@psu.edu>
Source record: 80258

Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
> "Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
> news:3F86EDAD.4010109@psu.edu...
>
>>I just saw another accusation of Pro-Coders as technically backwards.
>>
>>Yet some of the most progressive RF Engineers and Technicians I know
>>(who are Hams) are really enamored of Morse CW.
>
>
> In over 32 years as an RF engineer, I have not had the same experience.
> The most technical folks have seemed more interested in the technical
> side of ham radio and there have been MANY who I could not recruit
> into ham radio because they had no interest in and were unwilling to waste
> their valuable time learing Morse to a level that would get them decent
> HF privs. (some have capitulated and jumped through the 5 wpm hoop
> since "restructuring" and are now extras, but many have refused, on
> principal, to jump through the hoop, saying they'll wait until they don't
> have to waste their time on Morse)
>
>
>>I would challenge the NCTA's to show some proof that those who believe
>>that the morse code test should be retained are in a technical backwater.
>
>
> Most of the avid CW ragchewers/contesters I've known over the years
> (remember, I'm a long-time ham) have been more interested in the operating
> activity (ragchewing, contesting, paper-chasing) than the technical side.
> My experience has been that they have been less technically inclined than
> a lot of the no-code techs I've met, less inclined to participate in public
> service/emergency communications, and more inclined to just being "users"
> rather than tinkerers ...

I agree that the Tech's on average have been more likely to do public
support in my area. i'm also in a University town, so that can skew the
results.

But that's okay as far as my argument goes. As long as things average
out, its consistent with my statement.

> Remember, this is my personal experience, and since it seems to differ from
> yours, YMMV ...
>
>
>>I would also challenge them to do it without being abrasive or insulting.

>
>
> I think I've met the challenge ...
>
>
>>Just facts or intelligent informed opinions.
>
>
> Since there are no authortative, scientific statistics (and probably never
> will
> be), I think that all you can expect to get are peoples accounting of their
> own
> personal experiences. Mine are admitedly coming from the fact that I'm "in
> the business" of RF engineering ... but through local clubs and ARES/RACES
> participation over the past 25+ years, my observations seem to hold, even
> amongst contacts/acquaintences/friends who are not "in the profession."
> Remember, YMMV ...
>
>
>>Pro coders can help by refraining from name calling too.
>
>
> We shall see ...
>
>
>>My statement is that there is no direct relationship.
>
>
> The evidence is anecdotal will, as I point out, vary from person
> to person, depending on their location, profession, the "slant"
> of the local club(s) they belong to, etc.

True enough. My main purpose here is to see if any of those who declare
that PCTA's are behind the times can come up with anything substantial.

- Mike KB3EIA -

682. Re: Bootlegging in 1948?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-10 21:09:59 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0310101309.4161cb77@posting.google.com>
Source record: 80259

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20031002160529.21642.00001373@mb-m01.aol.com>...

> At NO time have I ever tried to disguise my legal name or address or
> location by adopting some false personna.

A lie.

You attempted, on several occassions to DENY that "Avery Fine"
was someone OTHER than "Leonard H. Anderson" until your ego over-ran
your situational awareness and you signed an Avery post with "LHA".

In layman's terms, you screwed up.

> Yet you GRASP AT STRAWS in trying to light up a Flame War to
> satisfy your childish pique in here. Tsk, tsk, don't play with matches...
> there are others here who have flamethrowers and you could get
> severely burned.

The most prolific of the flamethrowers would be you, Mr.
Liar-Liar Pants-On-Fire.

> The college reunion was in the midwest in 2000, my wife's
> college class. Rainy, dreary, but a fun event formally and
> socially.

I can't help but wonder if the other attendee's shared that
opinion once you showed up, Lennie. And just how many correspondence
schools have a reunion, anyway?

> I'm sorry you have to pollute the contents in here with bringing
> up THREE YEAR OLD (PLUS) arguments to satisfy your
> apparent "need" to get back at your perceived pique.

"Three years", Lennie...?!?! Sheesh! That's just one tic of the
clock compared to YOUR rantings about your Korean-war era heroics!

But then we all know the motto on the "Anderson Klan" hearald
must be "Do What I Say, Not Do What I Do"...

Steve, K4YZ

683. Re: Isnt it Funny (No-Code HF Privileges)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-10 21:15:29 UTC
From: Clint <"rattlehead at computron dot net">
Message-ID: <voe8blh6e3a6f9@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 80260

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:TXzhb.10652$Eo2.3826@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> Yeah thats right. I run a FT-1000MP. I operate V/Uhf weak signal. I own
> and am self taught and literate on 2 computers. I operate 4 digital modes
> on HF with them. I contest and use state of the art log programs. Oh and
> BTW I have been a electronics technician for 30 years.
>
> Get a life loser.
>

man, you almost had the appearance of making an honest point until
you made the ad-hom attack. That just confirms the ongoing
belief that most of all this rhetoric is sour grapes.

Clint

684. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-10 21:16:51 UTC
From: Clint <"rattlehead at computron dot net">
Message-ID: <voe8e8onk78u3f@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 80261

> >
> >Yep, it's outta here, CW testing is soon to be extinct. It's goneski.
> >
> Maybe it is. But if so, it's not because most hams want it to go.

mmm, yea, it pretty much *is*.

685. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-10 21:20:33 UTC
From: Clint <"rattlehead at computron dot net">
Message-ID: <voe8l6ntibluf8@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 80262

> Unless you are putting more into what was typed or seeing it completely
> different, no, I didn't admit more than what I wanted to.....
>
> People in the teen age groups are still forming their identities and
> becoming what they might be for the rest of their lives typically. If you
> have differences with the word "moldable," then that is your problem.
> Influenced maybe a better word then??
>
> Ryan, KC8PMX
>

I wasn't argueing about the definition of the term "moldable", really... and
actually influenced would be a bit less condescending and not give you
such an appearance of wanting to be dictatorial... I was putting more
emphasis on the part that said "..into the hams that *we* want them to
be."

...heh, and people a while back took exception to my use of the term
"jack booted CW nazis".

Clint

686. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-10 21:21:14 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0310101321.3fc81b64@posting.google.com>
Source record: 80263

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20031009172947.15923.00001201@mb-m12.aol.com>...

> I've got a good imagination....(SNIP)

Sure do. Especially the part where YOU ahd anything constructive
to do with "radio" for any period of time in the last five decades,
Lenie.

> Just can't see it like they do. Not even
> a half century ago when I got tossed into the Big Leagues of HF
> communications during a Real service to my country.

"Big Leagues"...?!?!

BBWWWWHHHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHHAHAHAHAHAHAH
A...!!!!!!!

First of all, what "real service" heve YOU done for your country?

You attempt to polish your "CV" by associating yourself with Army
KIA's that became KIA's three years before you went to boot camp.

Despite the long litany of past employers and alleged technical
accomplishments, your ONLY "published work" was in an Amateur Radio
magazine that is now itself defunct.

Your only "licensure" is a GROL left over from a grandfather
clause from yet another 1950's era First Phone ticket, and the only
"station" license you have ever held was one that didn't require
one-second's worth of technical knowledge to obtain...Any 18-year old
who could properly fill out the application could obtain one.

So please, Lennie...Tell us what great contributions YOU have
made to the world of radio...Remember, we are NOT talking about anyone
else except YOU...

> The Real
> future was there back then and that bred even more fantastic futures
> in a wider range of "radio" applications later. Those futures are now our
> present. I'm anxious to see more of what Real imaginations come up
> with, and, hopefully, to enjoy those too!

Yes, Lennie...I am sure that you make full use of your DirecTV
remote and garage door opener...

Steve, K4YZ

687. Re: France is conquered by of all things, an Italian.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-10 21:22:44 UTC
From: Clint <"rattlehead at computron dot net">
Message-ID: <voe8p9bnco167c@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 80264

boy what hypocrits this NG has... when I made a few remarks
about the french I got bashed by the politically correct types.
They say nothing about THIS post.

Hypocrisy and double standards really get my goat.

Clint

<BIG********AL*********> wrote in message
news:vod1s7rc09dsbc@corp.supernews.com...
> The Complete Military History of France
>
> - Gallic Wars
> - Lost. In a war whose ending foreshadows the next 2000 years of French
> history, France is conquered by of all things, an Italian.
>
> - Hundred Years War
> - Mostly lost, saved at last by female schizophrenic who inadvertently
> creates The First Rule of French Warfare; "France's armies are victorious
> only when not led by a Frenchman." Sainted.
>
> - Italian Wars
> - Lost. France becomes the first and only country to ever lose two wars
when
> fighting Italians.
>
> - Wars of Religion
> - France goes 0-5-4 against the Huguenots
>
> - Thirty Years War
> - France is technically not a participant, but manages to get invaded
> anyway. Claims a tie on the basis that eventually the other participants
> started ignoring her.
>
> - War of Revolution
> - Tied. Frenchmen take to wearing red flowerpots as chapeaux.
>
> - The Dutch War
> - Tied
>
> - War of the Augsburg League/King William's War/French and Indian War
> - Lost, but claimed as a tie. Three ties in a row induces deluded
> Frogophiles the world over to label the period as the height of French
> military power.
>

> - War of the Spanish Succession
> - Lost. The War also gave the French their first taste of a Marlborough,
> which they have loved every since.
>
> - American Revolution
> - In a move that will become quite familiar to future Americans, France
> claims a win even though the English colonists saw far more action. This
is
> later known as "de Gaulle Syndrome", and leads to the Second Rule of
French
> Warfare; "France only wins when America does most of the fighting."
>
> - French Revolution
> - Won, primarily due the fact that the opponent was also French.
>
> - The Napoleonic Wars
> - Lost. Temporary victories (remember the First Rule!) due to leadership
of
> a Corsican, who ended up being no match for a British footwear designer.
>
> - The Franco-Prussian War
> - Lost. Germany first plays the role of drunk Frat boy to France's ugly
girl
> home alone on a Saturday night.
>
> - World War I
> - Tied and on the way to losing, France is saved by the United States.
> Thousands of French women find out what it's like to not only sleep with a
> winner, but one who doesn't call her "Fraulein." Sadly, widespread use of
> condoms by American forces forestalls any improvement in the French
> bloodline.
>
> - World War II
> - Lost. Conquered French liberated by the United States and Britain just
as
> they finish learning the Horst Wessel Song.
>
> - War in Indochina
> - Lost. French forces plead sickness; take to bed with the Dien Bien Flu
>
> - Algerian Rebellion
> - Lost. Loss marks the first defeat of a western army by a Non-Turkic
Muslim
> force since the Crusades, and produces the First Rule of Muslim Warfare;
"We
> can always beat the French." This rule is identical to the First Rules of
> the Italians, Russians, Germans, English, Dutch, Spanish, Vietnamese and
> Esquimaux.
>
> - War on Terrorism

> - France, keeping in mind its recent history, surrenders to Germans and
> Muslims just to be safe. Attempts to surrender to Vietnamese ambassador
fail
> after he takes refuge in a McDonald's.
>
> The question for any country silly enough to count on the French should
not
> be "Can we count on the French?", but rather "How long until France
> collapses?"
>
> "Going to war without France is like going deer hunting without an
> accordion. All you do is leave behind a lot of noisy baggage."
>
> Or, better still, the quote from last week's Wall Street Journal: "They're
> there when they need you."
>
>
>
>

688. Re: Points Of Perception...What Do YOU Call "Collateral Damage"...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-10 21:31:58 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0310101331.45860985@posting.google.com>
Source record: 80265

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0309301932.4f2bc48a@posting.google.com>...
> Radio Amateur KC2HMZ <kc2hmz@aa-mail.removespamkiller.net> wrote in message
news:<vtqinv0gdvm1pinppbkgksdjcn1cevjtoj@4ax.com>...
>
> > The code test will soon vanish, and then hopefully we can get around
> > to the business of repairing the collateral damage that's been done to
> > the ARS in the process.
>
> "Collateral damage", John...???
>
> You've been watching too much CNN.
>
> You wouldn't be talking about the "damage" created by the influx
> of over a quarter of a million NON-code licensees, would you?
>
> Or would that be by the "damage" created by Amateur volunteers in
> the last 80+ years that has earned Amateur Radio the respect and
> hearldry bestowed upon it by the American Red Cross, the Deaprtment of
> State, the Department of Defense, the Salvation Army, FEMA, etc etc
> etc...??? (Not to mention mentions in the Federal Register and
> accolades rendered on the House and Senate floor)
>
> Perhaps you were alluding to the "damage" created by the creation
> of a radio repeater net that has withstood fire, flood, maelstrom and
> terrorist attack...Is THAT the "damage" you were refering to? I heard
> all the "complaints" about it from about two dozen New York and New
> Jersey emergency response groups from all the "trouble" they created
> in September 2001...You should read all the things some of those guys
> had to say about Amatuer Radio!
>
> Maybe you meant the "damage" created by the fact that we are
> (generally) self-policing and allowed by the FCC to mentor our own? I
> don't see the commercial services being allowed to do this, but I
> guess I am missing something...
>
> Or I guess you were refering to the "damage" caused by the
> interruption of our schools by such programs as ARISS and SAREX...???
> I can see how taking little Johnny and Mary away from recess to chat
> wwith orbiting astronauts might inhibit thier imaginations...
>
> And I guess we sure got our "come-uppance" when we were allocated
> new bands on HF in the last 20 years.
>

> Otherwise, I haven't got a clue of what you were alluding
> to...And I doubt YOU did either, John.
>
> Steve, K4YZ

Hey John...Where'd ya go...?!?!

Find it a bit rough going trying to create an illusion while someone else was shining a light on you, eh?

Steve, K4YZ

689. Re: DXers Of The Past (Was YASME makes her final port 'o call)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-10 22:02:02 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bm7a8qjgu0@208.206.142.91>
Source record: 80266

N2EY wrote:
> In article <d22b54c3.0310090244.529b1b04@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com
> (Brian Kelly) writes:
>
>
>>>W9WNV
>>
>>AARGH!!. . never mind . .
>
>
> The story about the card table and folding chair on Maria Theresa......
>
>>>W6AM
>>
>>W6AM tale: My second transmitter was a $29.95 Heathkit AT-1 I'd
>>cobbled together. The only FT-243 xtal I owned was 7.060. Xtals were
>>EXPENSIVE boy!
>
>
> $3 each new. Which translates to maybe $30 today.
>
>
>>Which when doubled put me on 14.120. Kinda useless freq
>>for dxing so I had to really scrounge for contacts. CQ, CQ, CQ, CQ ad
>>infinitum after school with all 3-5 watts of RF out or whatever it
>>was. Finally a CT1 found me and we latched up for several days
>>running. After some number of days another station called out of
>>nowhere, it was W6AM mobile running CW from his car. So 14.120 got to
>>be a three-way round table around 5pm Eastern Time for days on end. At
>>the time I had no idea who W6AM actually was except that his name was
>>Don and he was a really neat guy. I have a W6AM card.
>
>
> Great story!
>
> W6AM was one of the first hams to go mobile, back when FCC first issued special
> "ZZ" licenses. He held the special call W6ZZAM for such work.
>
> Didja look around that site and see the aerial map of his rhombics? Scary.
>
>
>>>OH2BH
>>
>>OH2BH/ZA. Tally ho!!

>
>
> OH To Be Him!
>
>
>>> 7. W. Gerry Mathis, W3GM
>>
>>Yeah, Gerry W3BES/W3GM. The radio god in these parts, my all-time
>>great mentor. EVERYBODY'S mentor, that's the way he was. I yakked with
>>Gerry on the club machine one day then found out he passed away two
>>days later. Dredge up QSTs from the late '40s and early '50s and check
>>the glossy back cover RCA power tubes division ads for a look at Gerry
>>himself and the collection of the gorgeous monster amps he designed
>>and built.
>
>
> Classic "cans on the temples" pose, too. Still a legend in these parts.
>
>
>>What kinda goofy list is this anyway??
>>
>
> Good question.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>

That post belongs on the Ham History list

690. Re: Isnt it Funny (No-Code HF Privileges)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-10 22:02:06 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bm7a8ujgu1@208.206.142.91>
Source record: 80267

Dan/W4NTI wrote:

> Yeah thats right. I run a FT-1000MP. I operate V/Uhf weak signal. I own
> and am self taught and literate on 2 computers. I operate 4 digital modes
> on HF with them. I contest and use state of the art log programs. Oh and
> BTW I have been a electronics technician for 30 years.
>
> Get a life loser.
>

But Dan, these clowns are the *future* of ham radio!

Boy, Am I ever proud to be the past!

"Too many clowns and not enough ringmasters"

> Dan/W4NTI
>
> "N8WWM" <dogie@home.nut> wrote in message news:bm648q05b6@drn.newsguy.com...
>
>>You're just jealous of the new technology and gear that is making you
>>obsolete. You're the type of person who would jam repeaters.
>>
>>In article <x%jhb.7940$Eo2.5218@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>,
>
> Dan/W4NTI
>
>>says...
>>
>>>We are following your example Clint.
>>>
>>>And no one mentioned a damn thing about CW. And you are the one that
>>>bitches when it comes up. What a hypocrite you are.
>>>
>>>Now go back in your hole.
>>>
>>>Dan/W4NTI
>>>
>>>"Clint" <rattlehead at computron dot net> wrote in message
>>>news:vob895nfljiif0@corp.supernews.com...
>>>
>>>>Are you guys going to be this abrasive and sour, even years after
>>>>they are rid of your precious morse code test, or are you going to
>>>>be childish and juvenile ad infinitum?
>>>>
>>>>Clint

>>>>
>>>>
>>>>"Dick Carroll" <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com> wrote in message
>>>>news:bm462j$t42$0@208.207.71.139...
>>>>
>>>>>N8WWM wrote:
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>>In article <PkAgb.2727$Eo2.93@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>,
>>>>
>>>>Dan/W4NTI
>>>>
>>>>>says...
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>"Dick Carroll" <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com> wrote in message
>>>>>>>news:blt3vltjm0@208.207.71.173...
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>Clint wrote:
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
>>>>>>>>>news:20031006162751.25517.00001185@mb-m15.aol.com...
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>Now you can get all upset and indignant, Len old boy, but the
>>>
>>>facts
>>>
>>>>>>>>>>are the facts.
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>> Noooooo...those are just your OPINIONS. :-)
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>Not only that, consider the source... you're dealing with another
>>>
>>>PCTA
>>>
>>>>>>>>>>type that didn't receive his or her fair share of grey matter
>
> such
>
>>>>that
>>>>

>>>>>>>>>self-determination isn't possible... it's just "bleat like the
>
> rest
>
>>>of
>>>
>>>>>>>the
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>sheep"
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>"CW test good.... modernization bad.....
>>>>>>>>>CW test good.... mdernization bad...."
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>Clint
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>One could compare rattlehead with Forrest Gump except that
>>>>>>>>>Forrest was a not so bright fellow who did have some common
>
> sense...
>
>>>>>>>I've noticed that folks that are a bit 'slow' are good at common
>>>
>>>sense.
>>>
>>>>>>>Rattlehead is the exception that proves the rule.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>Dan/W4NTI
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>You are and old fart. Step aside before the tech class run you
>
> over,
>
>>>>chump.
>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>> Ah. Another example of the "slow" class, again lacking common
>
> sense.
>
>>>>> Tell ya what, Genius- when there are so many of you that the bands
>
> are
>
>>>>>carpeted with you, it won't be possible to walk over oldtimers -
>
> We'll

>
>>>>>be gone fishing.
>>>>> You're doing your damnedest to do the same thing to ham radio you
>
> did
>
>>>>>to CB, and the FCC and ARRL are not only going along with it, they're
>>>>>facilitating it. It's lunacy - right where you belong.
>>>>>
>>>>
>>>>
>>>
>
>

691. Re: RM-10808 --- Wexelbaum Redux

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-10 22:02:12 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bm7a94jgu2@208.206.142.91>
Source record: 80268

Mike Coslo wrote:

> Hans K0HB wrote:
>
>> Joe Speroni, AH0A, has introduced a looney-tune petition, reminiscent
>> of Bob Wexelbaum, W2ILP "Amateur Radio Needs More Tests".
>>
>> Below is my comment to the FCC.
>>
>> 73, de Hans, K0HB
>>
>> -------
>>
>> Before the
>> Federal Communications Commission
>> Washington, DC 20554
>>
>> In the Matter of)
>>)
>> Amendment of Part 97 of the Commission's) RM-10808
>> Rules to Drergulate Testing for Non-Voice)
>> Mode Allocation for Amateur Radio Licenses)
>>
>> To: The Commission
>>
>> PERSONAL COMMENTS OF HANS BRAKOB, K0HB
>>
>>
>>
>> OVERVIEW
>>
>> These comments are submitted in response to the petition of Joseph
>> Speroni (AH0A) which requests changes in the qualifications and
>> testing of applicants for new or upgraded licenses in the Amateur
>> Radio Service.
>>
>> I. Discussion:
>>
>> The instant petition requests the elimination of Element 1 (5WPM
>> Morse code test) from the required test for General and/or Extra
>> Class licenses in the Amateur Radio service, and goes on to request
>> that the written examinations (elements 2, 3, and 4) be stripped of
>> all mode-related questions except those pertaining to Phone
>> operation. Persons licensed under this scheme would only be

>> authorized to use Phone emissions, unless they had additionally
>> passed examinations related to other modes.
>
>
> Bizarre. I wonder what the "test" for Hellschrieber or the computer
> modes would be?
>
>
>> Petitioner further proposes that operation in ARES (Amateur
>> Radio Emergency Service) would be restricted to licensees who had
>> passed a written examination on that subject.
>
>
> OY! This person would maybe like to turn Amateur radio into a
> Fraternity? Signa Fy Nothing?
>
>
>
>> Petitioner also proposes that Volunteer Examiners would only be
>> required to administer the basic written examinations (elements 2,
>> 3, and 4) and could decline to administer any of the proposed
>> mode-related examinations if they felt it were burdensome to them.
>
>
> Okay, so we couldn't operate any other mode besides phone is
> essentially what he is saying. If we strip mode specific questions, and
> then VE's only tested for 2, 3, and 4, all the other modes kinda go
> away, don't they.
>
>
> And this is yet another time I've heard about the great "burden"
> upon the VE's. Heck it's a volunteer thing. If its too much work, they
> can find less burdensome things to do with their time.
>
>
>> II. Comments:
>
>
>
> Agreed with all your comments, Hans.
>
>>
>> In summary, this petition should not be tossed aside lightly. It
>> should be hurled aside with great force.
>
>
> And terminated with great prejudice!
>

And ya'all failed to underestand that the real point to allthis is that
NONE of the tests are any more valid than the Morse code test!

692. Re: RM-10808 --- Wexelbaum Redux

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-10 22:02:14 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bm7a96jgu3@208.206.142.91>
Source record: 80269

Mike Coslo wrote:

> Bill Sohl wrote:
>
>> Mega Dittos. I especially like the "catch 22"
>> prohibition of new modes. Frankly I'm surprised
>> that Joe didn't think of that.
>
>
> The proposal in toto doesn't show much evidence of thought.
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -
>

It could have been put much more simply, IE

"If there is to be no Morse code test because some hams don't intend to
ever use it, why must anyone be subjected to testing on any other mode,
or facet of ham radio, they don't ever intend to use?"

But that wouldn't have made much of a petition!

693. Re: What makes a Pro code test Amateur a Troglodyte?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-10 22:02:16 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bm7a98jgu4@208.206.142.91>
Source record: 80270

Carl R. Stevenson wrote:

> "Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
> news:3F86EDAD.4010109@psu.edu...
>
>>I just saw another accusation of Pro-Coders as technically backwards.
>>
>>Yet some of the most progressive RF Engineers and Technicians I know
>>(who are Hams) are really enamored of Morse CW.
>
>

That would be those engineers who understood the real value of simple, effective, easily implemented baseline communications which can be used from almost anywhere with the least amount of simple equipment imaginable. Carl never did understand any of this, and of course it doesn't match his agenda, so it has no validity to him.

> In over 32 years as an RF engineer, I have not had the same experience.

This would be no surprise, given your OBVIOUS hatred of radiotelegraphy.

> The most technical folks have seemed more interested in the technical
> side of ham radio and there have been MANY who I could not recruit
> into ham radio because they had no interest in and were unwilling to waste
> their valuable time learing Morse to a level that would get them decent
> HF privs. (some have capitulated and jumped through the 5 wpm hoop
> since "restructuring" and are now extras, but many have refused, on
> principal, to jump through the hoop, saying they'll wait until they don't
> have to waste their time on Morse)
>

Mygawd man, no one in his right mind, having once endured that diatribe, would be eager to have to go through it all over again. You have it programmed into your psyche, if not in a keyboard macro. Naturally they avoided any act or word which would have keyed your internal macro. Who wouldn't?

>
>>I would challenge the NCTA's to show some proof that those who believe
>>that the morse code test should be retained are in a technical backwater.
>
>

That *might* be a bit difficult given that even Carl, their vaunted leader, is a SSB ratchjaw, not given to even putting a digital HF station on the air, much less doing any "amsteur digital design".

> Most of the avid CW ragchewers/contesters I've known over the years
> (remember, I'm a long-time ham)

Ah, it MUST be pointed out here that your tenure as a longtime ham did not include close connection to *anyone* who was seriously involved in radiotelegraphy in any way. And I know that how? By your actions here! It's completely safe to say that no one would tolarate your attitude as a friend, not likely as even a casual acquaintance, given the lever of vituperation you have always shown toward CW. So what would anyone expect your experience to be??

have been more interested in the operating
> activity (ragchewing, contesting, paper-chasing) than the technical side.
> My experience has been that they have been less technically inclined than
> a lot of the no-code techs I've met, less inclined to participate in public
> service/emergency communications, and more inclined to just being "users"
> rather than tinkerers ...
>

Same old, same old... Make the CW supporters appear to be Luddites-an accusation you have repeated many times here on rrap=-Go googling for the facts if anyone doubts it.

The FACTS are that the CW suppoorters are far most often the users of advanced digital modes. I'd wager that Carl has never been on the air using CLOVER II. I have.

694. Re: Vote for WX6RST

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-10 22:03:21 UTC
From: Jim Weir <jim@rst-engr.com>
Message-ID: <2saeovk8uapqp6j1vtb9r6dtnd9l1o0l0v@4ax.com>
Source record: 80271
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

Yes, that would have bought a half-decent ham shack. Or a fairly nice used automobile. New paint for the house. But after a year, five, or ten, what was purchased would be old and shabby.

In ten years, I'll still be able to say that I fought the good fight, got some people to hear what I was saying, and 2100 residents of California thought enough of me and my words to elect me Governor. That will never go away or get dingy.

I came in 30th behind the Governor-elect. That's in the top quartile of those who ran. And 35 million ahead of those who didn't.

Next month I can work a few more hours and buy that ham shack, car, or paint. But I'll never again in my lifetime get a chance at running for Governor.

Bless you all for your kind thoughts...

Jim

S. Hanrahan <aa7ya@hotmail.com>
shared these priceless pearls of wisdom:

->On 7 Oct 2003 00:10:40 GMT, Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com>
->wrote:
->>
->>
->>Aw, Chee.... Jim just blew 3 grand on the filing fee. that woulda
->>financed a new hamshack!
->
->Yeah, no kiddin.
->
->----
->Stacey/AA7YA

Jim Weir, VP Eng. RST Eng. WX6RST
A&P, CFI, and other good alphabet soup

695. Re: What makes a Pro code test Amateur a Troglodyte?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-10 22:13:09 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0310101413.4e4428a0@posting.google.com>
Source record: 80272

"Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
news:<j6Dhb.622$_i.48906@nnrp1.ptd.net>...
> "Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
> news:3F86EDAD.4010109@psu.edu...
> > I just saw another accusation of Pro-Coders as technically backwards.
> >
> > Yet some of the most progressive RF Engineers and Technicians I know
> > (who are Hams) are really enamored of Morse CW.
>
> In over 32 years as an RF engineer, I have not had the same experience.
> The most technical folks have seemed more interested in the technical
> side of ham radio and there have been MANY who I could not recruit
> into ham radio because they had no interest in and were unwilling to waste
> their valuable time learing Morse to a level that would get them decent
> HF privs. (some have capitulated and jumped through the 5 wpm hoop
> since "restructuring" and are now extras, but many have refused, on
> principal, to jump through the hoop, saying they'll wait until they don't
> have to waste their time on Morse)

My experience has been different. But let's talk about yours.

First off, with all due respect, I would submit that Carl is perhaps
not the optimum salesperson for convincing people to take code tests
in order to get a license.

Carl's claim, as I read it, is that he knows RF engineers who would
have become hams but for the code test. Some of them have become hams
in spite of that test, or since it was lowered to 5 wpm for all
classes.

The question I ask is this: What does it matter to amateur radio what
a person's job is, unless that person actually uses their job-related
skills for amateur radio? And how many RF engineers will put that
experience to work in amateur radio if the code test is removed that
are allegedly being stopped today?

I remember back in 1990 that this same argument was being used against
the Technician code test. We were told that ham radio would get lots
of new technical folks to push development of the VHF/UHF spectrum,
and that such folks weren't interested in taking code tests. Yet here
it is a dozen years later and there hasn't been any techno-revolution
in amateur VHF/UHF. That doesn't mean there hasn't been progress, just
that there hasn't been massive changes.

Indeed, consider the recent developments in 24 GHz EME. Several
enterprising hams have built stations for that band capable of EME

QSOs (USA to Czech Republic is the current record, IIRC) using only
small (~ 2 meter diameter) dishes and less than 100 watts output from
the TWTs.

And the mode used?
>
> > I would challenge the NCTA's to show some proof that those who believe
> > that the morse code test should be retained are in a technical backwater.
>
> Most of the avid CW ragchewers/contesters I've known over the years
> (remember, I'm a long-time ham) have been more interested in the operating
> activity (ragchewing, contesting, paper-chasing) than the technical side.
> My experience has been that they have been less technically inclined than
> a lot of the no-code techs I've met, less inclined to participate in public
> service/emergency communications, and more inclined to just being "users"
> rather than tinkerers ...

I've found more homebrewers among CW ops than any other part of ham
radio.
>
> Remember, this is my personal experience, and since it seems to differ from
> yours, YMMV ...

Of course.
>
> > I would also challenge them to do it without being abrasive or insulting.
>
> I think I've met the challenge ...

Almost.

You wrote:

"were unwilling to waste their valuable time lear[n]ing Morse"

and

"jumped through the 5 wpm hoop"

which some folks would take as abrasive and/or insulting.

Why not just say:

"were unwilling to spend the time and effort"

and

"passed the 5 wpm test simply to meet the requirement"

?

Is an RF engineer's time more valuable than, say, a doctor's or
lawyer's?

Suppose a doctor or lawyer wants to be a ham, but doesn't want to
spend the time learning all the material in the written tests just to
use a manufactured rig to chase DX. Would you say such a person did
not want to waste their valuable time learning the theory needed for
the Extra test? Or, perhaps, did not want to jump through the written
test hoop?
>
> > Just facts or intelligent informed opinions.
>
> Since there are no authortative, scientific statistics (and probably never
> will
> be), I think that all you can expect to get are peoples accounting of their
> own
> personal experiences.

Agreed.

> Mine are admitedly coming from the fact that I'm "in
> the business" of RF engineering ... but through local clubs and ARES/RACES
> participation over the past 25+ years, my observations seem to hold, even
> amongst contacts/acquaintences/friends who are not "in the profession."
> Remember, YMMV ...

Of course.
>
> >
> > Pro coders can help by refraining from name calling too.
>
> We shall see ...

I think I've done that.
>
> > My statement is that there is no direct relationship.
>
> The evidence is anecdotal will, as I point out, vary from person
> to person, depending on their location, profession, the "slant"
> of the local club(s) they belong to, etc.

One can find anecdotes for almost any position.
>
> > Anyone ready for a real discussion without the barbs? Can we do it?
> > First person to start throwing insults only makes it look bad for
> > his/her side.
>
> I think I've taken the high ground ...
>
Except for the "waste their valuable time" and "hoop" stuff, I'd
agree.

73 de Jim, N2EY

696. Re: Isnt it Funny (No-Code HF Privileges)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-10 22:35:25 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <NuGhb.21909$mQ2.20647@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 80273

"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20031010145841.29815.00001081@mb-m21.aol.com...
> In article <vob895nfljiif0@corp.supernews.com>, "Clint" <rattlehead at
> computron dot net> writes:
>
> >Are you guys going to be this abrasive and sour, even years after
> >they are rid of your precious morse code test, or are you going to
> >be childish and juvenile ad infinitum?
> >
> >Clint
> >
> >
> >"Dick Carroll" <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com> wrote in message
>
>

Thats the best post I ever saw from Lenny boy. Hope he keeps it up.

Dan/W4NTI

697. Re: Isnt it Funny (No-Code HF Privileges)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-10 22:36:28 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <MvGhb.21919$mQ2.17940@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 80274

"Clint" <rattlehead at computron dot net> wrote in message
news:voe8blh6e3a6f9@corp.supernews.com...
>
> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
> news:TXzhb.10652$Eo2.3826@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> > Yeah thats right. I run a FT-1000MP. I operate V/Uhf weak signal. I
own
> > and am self taught and literate on 2 computers. I operate 4 digital
modes
> > on HF with them. I contest and use state of the art log programs. Oh
and
> > BTW I have been a electronics technician for 30 years.
> >
> > Get a life loser.
> >
>
>
> man, you almost had the appearance of making an honest point until
> you made the ad-hom attack. That just confirms the ongoing
> belief that most of all this rhetoric is sour grapes.
>
> Clint
>
>

As Knute Rockney and Bear Bryant used to say....
"The best defense is a good offense"

Dan/W4NTI

698. Re: What makes a Pro code test Amateur a Troglodyte?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-10 22:42:29 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <pBGhb.21982$mQ2.2409@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 80275

"Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
news:j6Dhb.622$_i.48906@nnrp1.ptd.net...
>
> "Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
> news:3F86EDAD.4010109@psu.edu...
> > I just saw another accusation of Pro-Coders as technically backwards.
> >
> > Yet some of the most progressive RF Engineers and Technicians I know
> > (who are Hams) are really enamored of Morse CW.
>
> In over 32 years as an RF engineer, I have not had the same experience.
> The most technical folks have seemed more interested in the technical
> side of ham radio and there have been MANY who I could not recruit
> into ham radio because they had no interest in and were unwilling to waste
> their valuable time learing Morse to a level that would get them decent
> HF privs. (some have capitulated and jumped through the 5 wpm hoop
> since "restructuring" and are now extras, but many have refused, on
> principal, to jump through the hoop, saying they'll wait until they don't
> have to waste their time on Morse)
>
> > I would challenge the NCTA's to show some proof that those who believe
> > that the morse code test should be retained are in a technical
backwater.
>
> Most of the avid CW ragchewers/contesters I've known over the years
> (remember, I'm a long-time ham) have been more interested in the operating
> activity (ragchewing, contesting, paper-chasing) than the technical side.
> My experience has been that they have been less technically inclined than
> a lot of the no-code techs I've met, less inclined to participate in
public
> service/emergency communications, and more inclined to just being "users"
> rather than tinkerers ...
>
> Remember, this is my personal experience, and since it seems to differ
from
> yours, YMMV ...
>
> > I would also challenge them to do it without being abrasive or
insulting.
>
> I think I've met the challenge ...
>
> > Just facts or intelligent informed opinions.
>

> Since there are no authortative, scientific statistics (and probably never
> will
> be), I think that all you can expect to get are peoples accounting of
their
> own
> personal experiences. Mine are admitedly coming from the fact that I'm
"in
> the business" of RF engineering ... but through local clubs and ARES/RACES
> participation over the past 25+ years, my observations seem to hold, even
> amongst contacts/acquaintences/friends who are not "in the profession."
> Remember, YMMV ...
>
> >
> > Pro coders can help by refraining from name calling too.
>
> We shall see ...
>
> > My statement is that there is no direct relationship.
>
> The evidence is anecdotal will, as I point out, vary from person
> to person, depending on their location, profession, the "slant"
> of the local club(s) they belong to, etc.
>
> > Anyone ready for a real discussion without the barbs? Can we do it?
> > First person to start throwing insults only makes it look bad for
> > his/her side.
>
> I think I've taken the high ground ... we'll see how the other side deals
> with it ...
>
> 73,
> Carl - wk3c
>

Well Carl in my personal experience (my own) I am quite good at CW, and spent most of my life in the Electronics field. All self taught (Morse and theory). Never been to a electronics tech school, but managed to make a living in the field for years.

Dan/W4NTI

699. Re: What makes a Pro code test Amateur a Troglodyte?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-10 23:25:24 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <EdHhb.645$_i.51817@nnrp1.ptd.net>
Source record: 80276

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:bm7a98jgu4@208.206.142.91...
[snip]

> That *might* be a bit difficult given that even Carl, their vaunted
> leader, is a SSB ratchjaw, not given to even putting a digital HF
> station on the air, much less doing any "amsteur digital design".

Gee, Dick your hatred of SSB is showing again ... and you failed
Mike's "test" because you resorted to insults.

Besides, I'm active on digital ... how the hell do you profess to
know what modes I'm capable of/equipped for/using?????

At least I can get PSK31 to work ...

> > Most of the avid CW ragchewers/contesters I've known over the years
> > (remember, I'm a long-time ham)
>
> Ah, it MUST be pointed out here that your tenure as a longtime ham did
> not include close connection to *anyone* who was seriously involved in
> radiotelegraphy in any way. And I know that how? By your actions here!
> It's completely safe to say that no one would tolarate your attitude as
> a friend, not likely as even a casual acquaintance, given the lever of
> vituperation you have always shown toward CW. So what would anyone
> expect your experience to be??

One of my best friends, now SK unfortuantely, was a CW op ... worked
as radio officer on ships, was a LL telegrapher when he was a kid. 60 wpm
in his head, while drunk, smoking, and playing poker was no problem for
him. HE understood that CW "wasn't my thing" and we still were friends,
enjoyed other aspects of ham radio together, and had a good time.

Now, I wouldn't expect to be able to have that sort of a relationship
with you, Dick ... you're not open-minded enough to accept that others
see things different than you. (You see, I accept that you like and use
CW ... I disagree only with your propatation of the "Morse myths" and
your insistence that everyone should have Morse forced on them in
exchange for HF privs ... fortunately, most of the rest of the world
doesn't agree with you.)

Carl - wk3c

700. Re: N8__googled

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-10 23:43:47 UTC
From: Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com>
Message-ID: <20031010194347.054$7G@newsreader.com>
Source record: 80277
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.dogie.is.an.idiot,rec.radio.cb

```
richcranus@yahoo.com (Richard Cranium) wrote:
> WA3MOJ "Smell My Finger" <ss@null.com> wrote in message
> news:<HbCdnc4rZf64jBuiXTWJig@comcast.com>...
> > "Richard Cranium" <richcranus@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> > news:c5ecbb69.0310091543.29ee42a7@posting.google.com...
> > > DouGayAdairierreN8WWM@ikillclowns.com (Repeaterjammers For A
> > > Keyclown-Free
> > Newsgroup) wrote in message
> > news:<94ef989d.0310090428.67c94f73@posting.google.com>...
> > > > Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com> wrote in message
> > news:<20031007214001.401$VM@newsreader.com>...
> > > > > > http://tinyurl.com/q3xp
> > > > >
> > > > The fame, the adulation.....I am touched.
> > >
> > > Only by yourself, fagboy. Nobody with class would touch you!
> >
> >
> > TROLL POST!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!
>
Why does an extra class like george, WA3MOJ, act like such a jackass,
in the CB group? (and cross post it)

Is there too much rf in the shack, for some of these ham operators!?

--
http://NewsReader.Com/
50 GB/Month
```

701. Re: AKC MAKES NG ANYTHING IT WANTS, KEYCLOWNZ POWERLESS!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-11 00:17:07 UTC
From: Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com>
Message-ID: <20031010201707.056$GQ@newsreader.com>
Source record: 80278
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.dogie.is.an.idiot

"Pull My Finger" <ss@null.com> wrote:
> Alleged? i thought you knew exactly who I was .
>
You're George Busch, right? If not, who are you?

--
http://NewsReader.Com/
50 GB/Month

702. Re: Bootlegging in 1948?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-11 00:20:22 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031010202022.23171.00001427@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 80281

In article <THthb.14472$mQ2.12983@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote:
>> (Len Over 21) writes:
>> >
>> > (snip) I got a COMMERCIAL Radiotelephone license
>> > in 1956 (only one test needed) and had a career in radio-
>> > electronics design since then. You will no doubt have to
>> > say such is "irrelevant" for lots of reasons.
>>
>> Not at all.
>>
>> Please explain how that license and career have any relevance
>> to amateur radio policy. Particularly since you have never held
>> any class of amateur radio license.
>
> Since anybody in this country can discuss amateur radio policy (license
>policy or whatever), I do think a person's communications knowledge and
>experience elsewhere is at least somewhat relevant to that person's part in
>that discussion. Why would you think otherwise, Jim? Len is obviously
>interested in Amateur Radio, which is good. The only thing I don't
>understand is why he hasn't acted on that interest and gotten some kind of
>Amateur Radio license over the years.

Why do you insist that getting-a-license is culmination of "interest?"

Explain how obtaining an AMATEUR license suddenly embues one with spirit and verve and "permission" to experiment with RF? Especially when a person is already a professional in electronic design engineering who has ALREADY been working on "experiments" in RF?

A half century ago I began HF communications at a large station operating 24/7 to keep long-distance paths across the Pacific. No need to hold "contests" or have "certificates" of working far-away places...or of being required to use "CW" because it supposedly "got through when no other mode would." Station ADA used RTTY, commercial SSB (12 KHz, 4 circuits), and voice, no "CW."

A couple months ago I used an SGC-2020 on HF while on a friend's sailboat moored in a marina. No license required by me, just with the owner's permission (wasn't a licensed amateur either). I never needed any special license when taking private pilot lessons and using civil aircraft frequencies (my First Phone obtained 4 years prior was fine for that). I've used "radios" and emitted RF from VLF to microwaves without needing ANY radio operator license (done on

government contracts). I won't mention CB earlier because that is supposed to be a heathen sin on HF radio according to all the amateur gurus in here. :-)

>Since VHF and above is one focus of
>commercial communications today, one would think the Technician license
>would have at least some appeal to him.

Dwight, VHF and above was ALREADY a focus of commercial communications a half century ago. I was a military supervisory NCO using General Electric microwave radio relay equipment operating at 1.8 GHz back then. State of the art then. All tubes, 24 voice channels per terminal. In the commercial world of radio, mobile 2-way radio was already out and designer-manufacturers were ramping up to sell them by the tens of thousands at VHF and UHF for both business and government use. Civil aviation radios on VHF were standardized as AM on 108 to 137 MHz by the ICAO in 1955. Television transmitters were already in operation from 54 MHz and up before that. Remote link transmitters for TV mobile use was in the microwaves. ICAO approved UHF glideslope and low-microwave DME radionav standards in the late 1950s.

About 1960 solid-state active devices were appearing on the market for use in all sorts of "radio" equipment in the commercial-government radio market and design and manufacturing really took off there. By 1970 there were all sorts of neat miniaturization going on and I was working on a few of them...too many under development for any one person to work on all of them. The 1960-1970 decade marked the great influx of off-shore designed and built radios for all markets, including amateur radio. Off-shore-made electronics (and radios) would eventually dominate the consumer market (amateur gear put into that consumer market).

Dwight, ALL OF ELECTRONICS (including radio) has been constantly under CHANGE in the last half century. I know it well because I was (and still am under contract conditions) a professional in electronics design...AS WELL AS an electronic hobbyist.

I lost interest in "working DX" or "contesting" back in 1955 when I spent a month at station ADA's Control. When you can pick up a handset and talk to a counterpart in Hawaii or San Francisco stations on any shift just by signalling them to come on line, the "personal exploration-pioneering of DXing" as an amateur pales. Prior to entering the Army I could do maybe 8 WPM of morse. Never had to use that in the Army or since. After working on and with much higher technology radios, there was little impetus to work up any skill of an on-off keying code to meet some 1930s standards in OLD radio.

>This glaring, long term, lack of
>committment to Amateur Radio is what brings his ongoing participation in

>this discussion under suspicion.

"Glaring?!?" :-)

I'm just against a morse code test for any radio operator license, Dwight.

Said that a long time ago and I keep saying so. I don't expect you to
believe me.

I made a true committment over four decades ago to GET INVOLVED
in professional radio-electronics engineering design. I did that. Retired
from it on regular hours but still do some of it on contract.

Morse code skill-proficiency is required to be demonstrated by an
UNLICENSED IN AMATEUR RADIO person for legal permission to
transmit on HF ham bands. I've already transmitted on non-ham HF
bands long ago also just recently, legal and proper.

Morse code testing is required for GETTING INTO ham HF bands.
Such doesn't affect an already-licensed General or Extra and only if
they lapse their ham license renewals. Those AREN'T AFFECTED
except in some personal pride or personal ego way where they need
all the license and trappings to "prove themselves." I've already
proved myself and don't need a federal merit badge or more pretty
papers hanging on a wall.

Morse code testing AFFECTS THE UNLICENSED. Morse code
testing is PART OF POLICY about amateur radio...POLICY about
GETTING INTO it.

Sorry, but I'm not going to buy into HF ham radio licensing being all
about this magical "CW" testing thing, like it is the epitome of ham
qualities. All the exhortations of old stuff about "CW" is the bestest
passed out for years in QST isn't a ruling from any god, radio or
otherwise. Newington doesn't dictate what I care to do for a hobby.
Only the FCC regulates civil US radio.

> This position is equally valid. While a person's communications knowledge
>and experience elsewhere is somewhat relevant (if that person chooses to
>make it so), communications knowledge and experience elsewhere is obviously
>not manditory for participation in this discussion, especially for the
>person holding an Amateur Radio license which will be directly impacted by
>the outcome of this discussion.

Let all explain how they will be so terribly affected by the elimination
of an amateur radio license morse code test...especially when they
already have passed such tests and will never have to take one again.

Let all explain how the already-licensed are the "authority" to which
all others unlicensed in amateur radio must answer. Let them explain
how they became an integral part of the FCC and may thus abrogate
the First Amendment for everyone else.

Let all explain why everyone in the future MUST do as they did and always follow the standards and practices of long ago.

Hey, you don't like some of my comments on the code test. So, what else is new? Do you need instant adulation for the accomplishments of passing a morse test? Special honors? Awards? Sorry, all out.

Try considering that lots and lots of folks sure as hell don't like what the pro-coders are saying, have been saying, or the mythology about certain ways of radio they keep spreading. Already licensed amateurs don't have any special dispensation to act superior just because they exist...and they don't have any authority on any radio matters to stop any other citizen from speaking out in a public-access forum.

This newsgroup is public-access, unmoderated. Some of what you see may not to be to your liking. Hand me your TS card and I'll punch it for this week. Glad to oblige anytime I have free time. :-)

If some hissy-fit superiors are waiting for replies, good luck. Going to be a long wait and a long winter of PCTA discontent ahead. Not my problem.

beep, beep

LHA.

703. Re: Isnt it Funny (No-Code HF Privileges)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-11 00:20:23 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031010202023.23171.00001428@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 80280

In article <vob895nfljiif0@corp.supernews.com>, "Clint" <rattlehead at computron dot net> writes:

>Are you guys going to be this abrasive and sour, even years after
>they are rid of your precious morse code test, or are you going to
>be childish and juvenile ad infinitum?

The latter, Clint, the latter... :-)

704. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-11 00:20:24 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031010202024.23171.00001429@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 80279

In article <20031010062952.07578.00001037@mb-m25.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
writes:

>In article <voc7csn28m5j44@corp.supernews.com>, "Clint" <rattlehead at
>computron dot net> writes:
>
>>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>>news:20031009222958.11022.00001288@mb-m14.aol.com...
>>> In article <vobqv2rgm27fb7@corp.supernews.com>, "Clint" <rattlehead at
>>> computron dot net> writes:
>>>
>>> >> All age groups showed a majority to be procodetest, h
>>> >
>>> >
>>> >bzzzzzt....
>>> >
>>> >if this were true,
>>>
>>> It is true. Did you read the survey and its results?
>>>
>>> > there wouldn't be such a push to remove it.
>>>
>>> Incorrect. What "push"? Based on membership numbers, NCI has fewer than
>>5000
>>> members worldwide, even with no dues, no expiration of membership and
>>having
>>> been around over 7 years.
>>>
>>>
>>
>>Oh, more than just NCI; ARRL seems to favor it,
>
>ARRL hasn't formulated a new position yet. Their leadership is sitting on the
>sidelines because no matter what they decide, some folks will be unhappy.

Prior to and just after the IARU decision on S25 policy, ARRL was
ALL FOR CODE TESTING.

That didn't make the NCTA happy.

ARRL still doesn't have any more membership than a quarter of all
licensed US amateurs. I don't believe in coincidences.

Faced with the inevitable worldwide reaction and subsequent action
at WRC-03, ARRL just OPTS OUT, goes neutral, won't take a stand
either way.

Their $12 million income (2002) is at stake. ARRL doesn't exist
without funding. The ONLY people the ARRL is worried about is
the present membership which is skewed towards PCTA thinking.

ARRL membership is still only a quarter of all US licensed amateurs.

They aren't a majority. Their decisions are not a "consensus."

>>Yep, it's outta here, CW testing is soon to be extinct. It's goneski.
>>
>Maybe it is. But if so, it's not because most hams want it to go. And on
>particular, not because young hams want it to go.

Your OPINION, senior.

Do you have any good and true statistical polling to back up your
OPINION?

Strange, the news doesn't indicate any group of young people
demonstrating for the retention of the amateur license code test.
Nor the elimination of the amateur license code test.

Why do you say things about the "young hams" that you know not
of?

LHA

705. Re: Isnt it Funny (No-Code HF Privileges)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-11 00:32:06 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031010203206.11022.00001324@mb-m14.aol.com>
Source record: 80282

In article <MvGhb.21919$mQ2.17940@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>,
"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> writes:

>As Knute Rockney and Bear Bryant used to say....
>"The best defense is a good offense"
>
>Dan/W4NTI

Okay, consider yourself very offensive! :-)

706. Re: What makes a Pro code test Amateur a Troglodyte?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-11 00:32:50 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bm7j3i$840$0@208.206.142.97>
Source record: 80283

Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
> "Dick Carroll" <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com> wrote in message
> news:bm7a98jgu4@208.206.142.91...
> [snip]
>
>
>>That *might* be a bit difficult given that even Carl, their vaunted
>>leader, is a SSB ratchjaw, not given to even putting a digital HF
>>station on the air, much less doing any "amsteur digital design".
>
>
> Gee, Dick your hatred of SSB is showing again

"again"?? That isn't even possible since it never was. I've probably
done more SSB and othe voice modes than CW. In fact I'm SURE of it!

... and you failed
> Mike's "test" because you resorted to insults.

Well Carl, if truth insults you I can't help it as I have no control
over nature.

>
> Besides, I'm active on digital ... how the hell do you profess to
> know what modes I'm capable of/equipped for/using?????
>

Yeah, Right! Tell us all about it!

> At least I can get PSK31 to work ...
>

Unhuh. So google up a post showing where I ever did otherwise. Ya can't
do it, cause it never happened and you know it
.
>
>>>Most of the avid CW ragchewers/contesters I've known over the years
>>>(remember, I'm a long-time ham)
>>
>> Ah, it MUST be pointed out here that your tenure as a longtime ham did
>>not include close connection to *anyone* who was seriously involved in
>>radiotelegraphy in any way. And I know that how? By your actions here!
>>It's completely safe to say that no one would tolarate your attitude as
>>a friend, not likely as even a casual acquaintance, given the lever of
>>vituperation you have always shown toward CW. So what would anyone
>>expect your experience to be??

>
>
> One of my best friends, now SK unfortuantely, was a CW op ... worked
> as radio officer on ships, was a LL telegrapher when he was a kid. 60 wpm
> in his head, while drunk, smoking, and playing poker was no problem for
> him. HE understood that CW "wasn't my thing" and we still were friends,
> enjoyed other aspects of ham radio together, and had a good time.

Poor fella, I sure feel for him. One can only imagine what a trying
friendship that was, with all your Moridists and Hoops. Welfare support
etc etc garbage. He has my complete sympathy.
>
> Now, I wouldn't expect to be able to have that sort of a relationship
> with you, Dick ...

T'would be a miracle indeed

you're not open-minded enough to accept that others
> see things different than you.

Yoiu REALLY don['t want to say much about open minds, Carl Yours is
incased in pure granite. If not you and the rest of NCI would have
common sense enough toi understand the true facts about radiotelegraphy
instead of the reams and reams of nonsense you continually spout. Who
can blame Bill Cross for tosing in the towel instead of having a lout
like you hounding him his entire career yelling about what a Luddite he
is and how he kept ham radio in the Dark Ages by listening to all those
Morse Myths, all the while you yak away on SSB.

"Too many clowns and not enough ringmasters!"

(You see, I accept that you like and use
> CW ... I disagree only with your propatation of the "Morse myths" and
> your insistence that everyone should have Morse forced on them in
> exchange for HF privs ... fortunately, most of the rest of the world
> doesn't agree with you.)
>
> Carl - wk3c
>

707. Re: NEWSGROUP GONE TO HELL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-11 01:02:58 UTC
From: Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com>
Message-ID: <20031010210258.091$NY@newsreader.com>
Source record: 80284
Cross-posted to: alt.dogie.is.an.idiot,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,misc.transport.trucking,alt.radio.pirate

N8WWM-Cranus_is_an_Anus@ikillclowns.com (Citizens For A Keyclown-Free
Newsgroup) wrote:
> AKC owns the NG. Faggot keyclowns powerless to stop us.
>
Why don't you grow up, jackass.

--
http://NewsReader.Com/
50 GB/Month

708. BPL a reality in my area now!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-11 02:20:31 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <REMOVETHISkc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <bm9o10$kemhq$1@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 80431
Cross-posted to: alt.ham-radio,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Just found out today listening to a local, reputable radio station that Bay, Saginaw and Midland Counties in Michigan are going to be "test sites" for BPL, at least for Michigan. I don't know when it will be an actual reality, as opposed to being in the planning stages, but will keep current with their project!

Ryan KC8PMX
Midland, Michigan

709. France is conquered by of all things, an Italian.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-11 03:18:42 UTC
From: BIG********AL*********
Message-ID: <vod1s7rc09dsbc@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 80237

The Complete Military History of France

- Gallic Wars
- Lost. In a war whose ending foreshadows the next 2000 years of French history, France is conquered by of all things, an Italian.

- Hundred Years War
- Mostly lost, saved at last by female schizophrenic who inadvertently creates The First Rule of French Warfare; "France's armies are victorious only when not led by a Frenchman." Sainted.

- Italian Wars
- Lost. France becomes the first and only country to ever lose two wars when fighting Italians.

- Wars of Religion
- France goes 0-5-4 against the Huguenots

- Thirty Years War
- France is technically not a participant, but manages to get invaded anyway. Claims a tie on the basis that eventually the other participants started ignoring her.

- War of Revolution
- Tied. Frenchmen take to wearing red flowerpots as chapeaux.

- The Dutch War
- Tied

- War of the Augsburg League/King William's War/French and Indian War
- Lost, but claimed as a tie. Three ties in a row induces deluded Frogophiles the world over to label the period as the height of French military power.

- War of the Spanish Succession
- Lost. The War also gave the French their first taste of a Marlborough, which they have loved every since.

- American Revolution
- In a move that will become quite familiar to future Americans, France claims a win even though the English colonists saw far more action. This is later known as "de Gaulle Syndrome", and leads to the Second Rule of French Warfare; "France only wins when America does most of the fighting."

- French Revolution
- Won, primarily due the fact that the opponent was also French.

- The Napoleonic Wars
- Lost. Temporary victories (remember the First Rule!) due to leadership of a Corsican, who ended up being no match for a British footwear designer.

- The Franco-Prussian War
- Lost. Germany first plays the role of drunk Frat boy to France's ugly girl home alone on a Saturday night.

- World War I
- Tied and on the way to losing, France is saved by the United States. Thousands of French women find out what it's like to not only sleep with a winner, but one who doesn't call her "Fraulein." Sadly, widespread use of condoms by American forces forestalls any improvement in the French bloodline.

- World War II
- Lost. Conquered French liberated by the United States and Britain just as they finish learning the Horst Wessel Song.

- War in Indochina
- Lost. French forces plead sickness; take to bed with the Dien Bien Flu

- Algerian Rebellion
- Lost. Loss marks the first defeat of a western army by a Non-Turkic Muslim force since the Crusades, and produces the First Rule of Muslim Warfare; "We can always beat the French." This rule is identical to the First Rules of the Italians, Russians, Germans, English, Dutch, Spanish, Vietnamese and Esquimaux.

- War on Terrorism
- France, keeping in mind its recent history, surrenders to Germans and Muslims just to be safe. Attempts to surrender to Vietnamese ambassador fail after he takes refuge in a McDonald's.

The question for any country silly enough to count on the French should not be "Can we count on the French?", but rather "How long until France collapses?"

"Going to war without France is like going deer hunting without an accordion. All you do is leave behind a lot of noisy baggage."

Or, better still, the quote from last week's Wall Street Journal: "They're there when they need you."

710. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-11 03:25:03 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3F877820.A5750C65@earthlink.net>
Source record: 80285

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <bm2r54pua0@208.207.71.166>, Dick Carroll
> <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com> writes:

> > Well since I *didn't* make any such linkage, and never have, your
> >comment is out of line.
>
> Senior, YOU've made so many out-of-line outright insults of others,
> that you should spend more time off-line.

Thanks for the grin, Leonard. Might I suggest that you follow your own
advice?

> > If you don't believe that proficiency in radiotelegraph operations is
> >a serious part of ham radio, that's your problem.
>
> It's no one's "problem," senior.
>
> U. S. amateur radio is NOT exclusively about radiotelegraphy.

...and no one has indicated belief that it is. None of that is your
concern. You aren't involved in any way.

> Not in the regulations, not in the law, only in the imaginations of a
> few.

You've got a pretty good imagination yourself, old timer. You keep, for
example, imagining that you are involved in amateur radio.

> > I know no one who has ever linked it to technical knowlecge, despite
> >the many claims of NCI mavens.
>
> Senior, your inductive reasoning doesn't have the capacity to resonate
> with the rest of the world's frequency.
>
> Get in tune.

Get "Tune In The World With Amateur Radio".

Dave K8MN

711. Re: RM-10808 --- Wexelbaum Redux

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-11 03:32:32 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <kRKhb.24785$mQ2.15529@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 80286

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:bm7a96jgu3@208.206.142.91...
> Mike Coslo wrote:
>
> > Bill Sohl wrote:
> >
> >> Mega Dittos. I especially like the "catch 22"
> >> prohibition of new modes. Frankly I'm surprised
> >> that Joe didn't think of that.
> >
> > The proposal in toto doesn't show much evidence of thought.
> >
> > - Mike KB3EIA -
>
> It could have been put much more simply, IE
>
> "If there is to be no Morse code test because some hams don't intend to
> ever use it, why must anyone be subjected to testing on any other mode,
> or facet of ham radio, they don't ever intend to use?"
>
> But that wouldn't have made much of a petition!

Actually, since there is NO functional or operational testing now
for any other mode but morse, that is pretty much what ending the
only mode functional test (morse) would result in.

If VECs want to add questions to the written pool on the
technological aspects f morse code and the use of morse,
that's fine with me.

Cheers,
Bill

712. Re: RM-10808 --- Wexelbaum Redux

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-11 03:37:11 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <HVKhb.24853$mQ2.23855@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 80287

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:bm7a94jgu2@208.206.142.91...
> Mike Coslo wrote:
>
> > Hans K0HB wrote:
> >
> >> Joe Speroni, AH0A, has introduced a looney-tune petition, reminiscent
> >> of Bob Wexelbaum, W2ILP "Amateur Radio Needs More Tests".
> >>
> >> Below is my comment to the FCC.
> >>
> >> 73, de Hans, K0HB
> >>
> >> -------
> >>
> >> Before the
> >> Federal Communications Commission
> >> Washington, DC 20554
> >>
> >> In the Matter of)
> >>)
> >> Amendment of Part 97 of the Commission's) RM-10808
> >> Rules to Drergulate Testing for Non-Voice)
> >> Mode Allocation for Amateur Radio Licenses)
> >>
> >> To: The Commission
> >>
> >> PERSONAL COMMENTS OF HANS BRAKOB, K0HB
> >>
> >>
> >>
> >> OVERVIEW
> >>
> >> These comments are submitted in response to the petition of Joseph
> >> Speroni (AH0A) which requests changes in the qualifications and
> >> testing of applicants for new or upgraded licenses in the Amateur
> >> Radio Service.
> >>
> >> I. Discussion:
> >>
> >> The instant petition requests the elimination of Element 1 (5WPM
> >> Morse code test) from the required test for General and/or Extra
> >> Class licenses in the Amateur Radio service, and goes on to request
> >> that the written examinations (elements 2, 3, and 4) be stripped of

> >> all mode-related questions except those pertaining to Phone
> >> operation. Persons licensed under this scheme would only be
> >> authorized to use Phone emissions, unless they had additionally
> >> passed examinations related to other modes.
> >
> >
> > Bizarre. I wonder what the "test" for Hellschrieber or the computer
> > modes would be?
> >
> >
> >> Petitioner further proposes that operation in ARES (Amateur
> >> Radio Emergency Service) would be restricted to licensees who had
> >> passed a written examination on that subject.
> >
> >
> > OY! This person would maybe like to turn Amateur radio into a
> > Fraternity? Signa Fy Nothing?
> >
> >
> >
> >> Petitioner also proposes that Volunteer Examiners would only be
> >> required to administer the basic written examinations (elements 2,
> >> 3, and 4) and could decline to administer any of the proposed
> >> mode-related examinations if they felt it were burdensome to them.
> >
> >
> > Okay, so we couldn't operate any other mode besides phone is
> > essentially what he is saying. If we strip mode specific questions, and
> > then VE's only tested for 2, 3, and 4, all the other modes kinda go
> > away, don't they.
> >
> >
> > And this is yet another time I've heard about the great "burden"
> > upon the VE's. Heck it's a volunteer thing. If its too much work, they
> > can find less burdensome things to do with their time.
> >
> >> II. Comments:
> >
> > Agreed with all your comments, Hans.
> >
> >> In summary, this petition should not be tossed aside lightly. It
> >> should be hurled aside with great force.
> >
> > And terminated with great prejudice!
> >
>
> And ya'all failed to underestand that the real point to allthis is that
> NONE of the tests are any more valid than the Morse code test!

So you're saying Joe filled his petition as a joke or
to be sarcastic then. Not a nice thing to do to the
FCC if that was his intent...which I don't believe
was his intent.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

713. Re: 73 Magazine Says "73 and QRT"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-11 03:40:19 UTC
From: "Capt. Blackflag" <wvay4daves@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <1065844329.188229@newshost03.voicenet.com>
Source record: 80288
Cross-posted to:
rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

"John Norfolk" <janorfolk@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:c6a70d55.0310101532.63b491f3@posting.google.com...
> From the ARRL Letter October 10:
>
> 73 MAGAZINE SAYS "73 AND QRT"
>
> After completing 43 years of publication, 73 Amateur Radio Today
> magazine is calling it quits. Plans to publish a joint
> October/November issue fell through this week, and the September 2003
> issue was the magazine's last. According to self-proclaimed "El
> Supremo and Founder" Wayne S. Green II, W2NSD, it was a simple
> matter of economics.

And with this very sad announcement, Ham Radio is truly DEAD.
(well....mabey not, but we've lost a BIG chunk without 73)

Wayne and his magazine was without doubt ham radio's most
amusing read. His Editorials were always right on target - often
his prognostications were YEARS ahead of their time.

I hope he makes an appearance on Art Bell's show to discuss
the 73 Magazine demise and other commentary soon!

> "After failing a last minute effort to collect on some larger
> accounts receivable we decided yesterday to throw in the towel--
> that the September issue will have to be the last," Green told ARRL
> October 9. "SK after 43 years of publishing."
>
> The first issue of 73 was published in October 1960 from what Green
> --a former editor of CQ--once described as "a small, dingy
> apartment" in Brooklyn, New York. Since the summer of 1962, 73 has
> been based in Peterborough, New Hampshire--Green's home state. The
> magazine was a pioneer promoter of SSB, FM, solid-state, easy
> construction projects and the marriage of personal computing and
> Amateur Radio. His interest in microcomputing led Green in 1975 to
> found Byte, a magazine devoted to the then-nascent and largely do-it-
> yourself computer hobby.
>
> At the peak of its popularity in the 1970s and 1980s, individual
> issues of 73 totaled more than 300 pages of ads, articles and
> commentary. Heading each issue was Green's inimitable "Never Say
> Die"--some would say never-ending--editorial, in which he
> rarely missed an opportunity to tweak the ARRL and his magazine
> competitors for their perceived shortcomings.

>
> QST Editor Steve Ford, WB8IMY, says 73 published his first article in
> the 1970s. "I was saddened to hear that 73 has ceased publishing,"
> Ford said. "Wayne's excitement about the growing amateur FM repeater
> phenomenon at the time was infectious."
>
> Green's 73 editorials and regular round of personal appearances
> originally concentrated on Amateur Radio and his ideas to improve,
> advance and grow it. In recent years, however, they've veered into
> conspiracy theories, cures for cancer, AIDS and other ailments and
> Green's proliferation of book titles on those topics.
>
> Green says he'll continue his essays on his Web site
> http://www.waynegreen.com/ "for those subscribers who mainly
> bought the magazine for them." He told ARRL that no definite
> arrangements have been made yet about how to handle outstanding 73
> subscriptions.
>
> CQ Publisher Dick Ross, K2MGA, said he takes no joy from the passing
> of 73. "The loss of any publication serving Amateur Radio leaves all
> of us a bit poorer," he said. "Thank you, Wayne, for 43
> entertaining, informative, sometimes infuriating, and always
> interesting years of 73. We'll genuinely miss it."

714. Re: What makes a Pro code test Amateur a Troglodyte?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-11 03:43:54 UTC
From: groupk0hb@earthlink.net
Message-ID: <5ee63311.0310101943.3e27f31e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 80289

"Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote:

> I think I've taken the high ground

Carl, with all due respect, using abrasive and derisive terms like "jumping through hoops" is not "the high ground". It is your same old baiting and condescending rhetoric, seemingly calculated to be inflamatory and divisive.

I don't mourn the end of Morse testing, but I recognize the fact that many honorable folks disagree with me, and I try to treat their opinions with respect.

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

715. Re: What makes a Pro code test Amateur a Troglodyte?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-11 03:52:44 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <g8Lhb.25040$mQ2.19953@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 80290

"Leo" <nomail@nope.org> wrote in message
news:nisdov0duc0ipm9likrr73not53jvvq728@4ax.com...
> Mike,
>
> An excellent idea. I for one would be very interested in seeing the
> logic and rationale that folks have for keeping or retiring the code
> test. By removing the emotion, personal opinion and bias from the
> discussion, some quite interesting points may well be raised.
>
> 73, Leo

Leo,

The whole discussion and every possible argument pro/con on code testing
has been reviewed in the comments filled under NPRM98-143 as well as
several other past FCC reviews.
In the 98-143 R&O which came from all those comments,
the FCC found not one reason of
sufficient cause to retain any code testing...EXCEPT, at that time, the
ITU treaty still required code testing for hams permitted under 30MHz
operation.

As of July 5, 2003 the ITU treaty changed and ended mandatory
morse testing completely...leaving any decision to have any morse testing
that of each individual country.

Given the end to the ITU treaty requirement and coupling that with the
prior findings of the FCC R&O for 98-143, the only conclusion one
can have is that...absent anything NEW in the arguments, the FCC
should now remove all morse testing.

People can argue with the past FCC findings, but nothing being
offered now is anything that the FCC hasn't heard before. Add to that
the fact that other administrations have already ended code testing
since July 5, 2003 one can also conclude that it isn't likly that the
USA will retain code anymore. In the end, it is not a matter of IF, but
more
simply WHEN.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

716. Re: What makes a Pro code test Amateur a Troglodyte?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-11 04:14:56 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <4tLhb.25309$mQ2.14713@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 80291

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:bm7a98jgu4@208.206.142.91...
> Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
>
> > "Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
> > news:3F86EDAD.4010109@psu.edu...
> >
> >>I just saw another accusation of Pro-Coders as technically backwards.
> >>
> >>Yet some of the most progressive RF Engineers and Technicians I know
> >>(who are Hams) are really enamored of Morse CW.

> That would be those engineers who understood the real value of simple,
> effective, easily implemented baseline communications which can be used
> from almost anywhere with the least amount of simple equipment imaginable.
> Carl never did understand any of this, and of course it doesn't match
> his agenda, so it has no validity to him.

Then I guess the many other services which, at one time, did use morse
(i.e. military, marine, etc); but ended its use some time ago didn't
have the engineering folks that "understood the real value...."

The issue is one of personal choice, not need, as to ever using morse
anymore. At best, there is but a handful of anecdotal references to
morse being claimed as being "the only mode usable" under some
actual emergencies. Those that claim morse is needed for emergencies
fail to show any reliance on the mode in the vast (probably 90+ percent)
domain of those organizations (RACES, ARES, etc) that actually
put in place teams of operators, stations and portable equipment.

> > In over 32 years as an RF engineer, I have not had the same experience.
>
> This would be no surprise, given your OBVIOUS hatred of radiotelegraphy.

Dick would have us believe he can read people's minds as
to their likes/dislikes.

> > The most technical folks have seemed more interested in the technical
> > side of ham radio and there have been MANY who I could not recruit
> > into ham radio because they had no interest in and were unwilling to
waste
> > their valuable time learing Morse to a level that would get them decent
> > HF privs. (some have capitulated and jumped through the 5 wpm hoop
> > since "restructuring" and are now extras, but many have refused, on
> > principal, to jump through the hoop, saying they'll wait until they
don't

> > have to waste their time on Morse)
>
> Mygawd man, no one in his right mind, having once endured that diatribe,
> would be eager to have to go through it all over again. You have it
> programmed into your psyche, if not in a keyboard macro. Naturally they
> avoided any act or word which would have keyed your internal macro. Who
> wouldn't?
>
> >>I would challenge the NCTA's to show some proof that those who believe
> >>that the morse code test should be retained are in a technical
backwater.
>
> That *might* be a bit difficult given that even Carl, their vaunted
> leader, is a SSB ratchjaw, not given to even putting a digital HF
> station on the air, much less doing any "amsteur digital design".

Dick appears to question the technical competency and contribution(s)
Carl has made.

> > Most of the avid CW ragchewers/contesters I've known over the years
> > (remember, I'm a long-time ham)
>
> Ah, it MUST be pointed out here that your tenure as a longtime ham did
> not include close connection to *anyone* who was seriously involved in
> radiotelegraphy in any way. And I know that how? By your actions here!
> It's completely safe to say that no one would tolarate your attitude as
> a friend, not likely as even a casual acquaintance, given the lever of
> vituperation you have always shown toward CW. So what would anyone
> expect your experience to be??

So how do you explain my comradeship with hams that are avid
CW users yet are fuly aware of my role in NCI to end code tetsing?

> have been more interested in the operating
> > activity (ragchewing, contesting, paper-chasing) than the technical
side.
> > My experience has been that they have been less technically inclined
than
> > a lot of the no-code techs I've met, less inclined to participate in
public
> > service/emergency communications, and more inclined to just being
"users"
> > rather than tinkerers ...
>
> Same old, same old... Make the CW supporters appear to be Luddites-an
> accusation you have repeated many times here on rrap=-Go googling for
> the facts if anyone doubts it.
>
> The FACTS are that the CW suppoorters are far most often the users of
> advanced digital modes. I'd wager that Carl has never been on the air
> using CLOVER II. I have.

So are you saying only "CW suppoorters" (sic) or a majority of same
are likly to be users of advanced digital modes?

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

717. Re: What makes a Pro code test Amateur a Troglodyte?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-11 04:30:59 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <7ILhb.25498$mQ2.9966@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 80292

"Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
news:3F86EDAD.4010109@psu.edu...
> I just saw another accusation of Pro-Coders as technically backwards.

Unfortuneately, extremist comments are present on both sides.

> Yet some of the most progressive RF Engineers and Technicians I know
> (who are Hams) are really enamored of Morse CW.

Nothing wrong with that. The issue isn't about USE it is about
the lack of any rational reason to retain code testing as a
license requirement now that the ITU mandatory code knowledge
requirment has ended.

> I would challenge the NCTA's to show some proof that those who believe
> that the morse code test should be retained are in a technical backwater.

It isn't that the individuals that want code retained are in a technical
backwater, but rather that their procode test arguments fail
as to any technical reason for retaining code testing. On that point,
don't take my word on it, read the FCC R&O on NPRM98-143
and you'll find every argument being put forth today has already
been made to the FCC and rejected by the FCC.

> I would also challenge them to do it without being abrasive or insulting.

Feel free to let me know if I fail that challenge.

> Just facts or intelligent informed opinions.

As above, for the facts and the ultimate opinion (the only
opinion that in the end means anything) can be found in 98-143 R&O.

> Pro coders can help by refraining from name calling too.

Agreed.

> My statement is that there is no direct relationship.

Not sure what relationship you are referring to.

> Anyone ready for a real discussion without the barbs? Can we do it?
> First person to start throwing insults only makes it look bad for
> his/her side.

Works for me.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

718. Re: What makes a Pro code test Amateur a Troglodyte?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-11 05:10:47 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bm83cnfjo0@208.206.142.112>
Source record: 80293

Bill Sohl wrote:

> "Dick Carroll" <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com> wrote in message
> news:bm7a98jgu4@208.206.142.91...
>
>>Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
>>
>>
>>>"Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
>>>news:3F86EDAD.4010109@psu.edu...
>>>
>>>
>>>>I just saw another accusation of Pro-Coders as technically backwards.
>>>>
>>>>Yet some of the most progressive RF Engineers and Technicians I know
>>>>(who are Hams) are really enamored of Morse CW.
>
>
>>That would be those engineers who understood the real value of simple,
>>effective, easily implemented baseline communications which can be used
>>from almost anywhere with the least amount of simple equipment imaginable.
>> Carl never did understand any of this, and of course it doesn't match
>>his agenda, so it has no validity to him.
>
>
> Then I guess the many other services which, at one time, did use morse
> (i.e. military, marine, etc); but ended its use some time ago didn't
> have the engineering folks that "understood the real value...."
>

And there *you* go again. No one has ever even suggested that any
other entity use morse in place of more advanced modes. Maybe you in
Joisey will never find yerself in circumstances where you could well
make use of it. Others have clearly demonstrated otherwise, but your
agenda will not be penetrated by so mundane a thing as a fact.

> The issue is one of personal choice, not need, as to ever using morse
> anymore. At best, there is but a handful of anecdotal references to
> morse being claimed as being "the only mode usable" under some
> actual emergencies. Those that claim morse is needed for emergencies
> fail to show any reliance on the mode in the vast (probably 90+ percent)
> domain of those organizations (RACES, ARES, etc) that actually
> put in place teams of operators, stations and portable equipment.

What that says is that never again shall any significant use of
radiotelgraphy *ever* again see a need arise. And that clearly is a
possibility. Just as much a possibility as the impossibility of what
happened on Sept 11, 2001 seemed in advance of that date. QED.

>
>>>In over 32 years as an RF engineer, I have not had the same experience.
>>
>> This would be no surprise, given your OBVIOUS hatred of radiotelegraphy.
>
>
> Dick would have us believe he can read people's minds as
> to their likes/dislikes.
>

If you had a zealot ranting and raving on
such a subject each and every time it came up would YOU bring it up, or
see to it that you never involved yourself in such a conversation with him?

>
>>>The most technical folks have seemed more interested in the technical
>>>side of ham radio and there have been MANY who I could not recruit
>>>into ham radio because they had no interest in and were unwilling to
>
> waste
>
>>>their valuable time learing Morse to a level that would get them decent
>>>HF privs. (some have capitulated and jumped through the 5 wpm hoop
>>>since "restructuring" and are now extras, but many have refused, on
>>>principal, to jump through the hoop, saying they'll wait until they
>
> don't
>
>>>have to waste their time on Morse)
>>
>>Mygawd man, no one in his right mind, having once endured that diatribe,
>>would be eager to have to go through it all over again. You have it
>>programmed into your psyche, if not in a keyboard macro. Naturally they
>>avoided any act or word which would have keyed your internal macro. Who
>>wouldn't?
>>
>>
>>>>I would challenge the NCTA's to show some proof that those who believe
>>>>that the morse code test should be retained are in a technical
>
> backwater.
>
>>That *might* be a bit difficult given that even Carl, their vaunted
>>leader, is a SSB ratchjaw, not given to even putting a digital HF
>>station on the air, much less doing any "amsteur digital design".
>
>

> Dick appears to question the technical competency and contribution(s)
> Carl has made.
>

Carl talks the talk. No walk.

>
>>>Most of the avid CW ragchewers/contesters I've known over the years
>>>(remember, I'm a long-time ham)
>>
>> Ah, it MUST be pointed out here that your tenure as a longtime ham did
>>not include close connection to *anyone* who was seriously involved in
>>radiotelegraphy in any way. And I know that how? By your actions here!
>>It's completely safe to say that no one would tolarate your attitude as
>>a friend, not likely as even a casual acquaintance, given the lever of
>>vituperation you have always shown toward CW. So what would anyone
>>expect your experience to be??
>
>
> So how do you explain my comradeship with hams that are avid
> CW users yet are fuly aware of my role in NCI to end code tetsing?
>

Perhaps it's that you have a more engaging personality than Carl.
He has a real problem in that regard.

>
>>have been more interested in the operating
>>
>>>activity (ragchewing, contesting, paper-chasing) than the technical
>
> side.
>
>>>My experience has been that they have been less technically inclined
>
> than
>
>>>a lot of the no-code techs I've met, less inclined to participate in
>
> public
>
>>>service/emergency communications, and more inclined to just being
>
> "users"
>
>>>rather than tinkerers ...
>>
>>Same old, same old... Make the CW supporters appear to be Luddites-an
>>accusation you have repeated many times here on rrap=-Go googling for
>>the facts if anyone doubts it.
>>

>>The FACTS are that the CW suppoorters are far most often the users of
>>advanced digital modes. I'd wager that Carl has never been on the air
>>using CLOVER II. I have.
>
>
> So are you saying only "CW suppoorters" (sic) or a majority of same
> are likly to be users of advanced digital modes?
>

In this particular tussle it is clearly the majority.

> Cheers,
> Bill K2UNK
>
>
>
>

719. Re: What makes a Pro code test Amateur a Troglodyte?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-11 05:39:51 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <HIMhb.26269$mQ2.5989@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 80294

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:bm83cnfjo0@208.206.142.112...
> Bill Sohl wrote:
>
> > "Dick Carroll" <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com> wrote in message
> > news:bm7a98jgu4@208.206.142.91...
> >
> >>Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
> >>
> >>
> >>>"Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
> >>>news:3F86EDAD.4010109@psu.edu...
> >>>
> >>>
> >>>>I just saw another accusation of Pro-Coders as technically backwards.
> >>>>
> >>>>Yet some of the most progressive RF Engineers and Technicians I know
> >>>>(who are Hams) are really enamored of Morse CW.
> >
> >
> >>That would be those engineers who understood the real value of simple,
> >>effective, easily implemented baseline communications which can be used
> >>from almost anywhere with the least amount of simple equipment
imaginable.
> >> Carl never did understand any of this, and of course it doesn't match
> >>his agenda, so it has no validity to him.
> >
> >
> > Then I guess the many other services which, at one time, did use morse
> > (i.e. military, marine, etc); but ended its use some time ago didn't
> > have the engineering folks that "understood the real value...."
>
> And there *you* go again. No one has ever even suggested that any
> other entity use morse in place of more advanced modes. Maybe you in
> Joisey will never find yerself in circumstances where you could well
> make use of it. Others have clearly demonstrated otherwise, but your
> agenda will not be penetrated by so mundane a thing as a fact.

So where is that fact in the comments before the FCC now or in
the 98-143 comments. Whatever few claims may have been
made they failed to convince the FCC of being of sufficient
occasion(s) or impact to retain code testing. Reminds me of the
anti-raise the speed limit crowd who would argue that 55mph
should be retained if it saves but one life. that's nothing

but an emotional argument that doesn't hold sway with the bottom line
risk/reward analysis we alkl make every day we go out into the world.

The PCTA folks argue CW is needed "just in case" yet the "case"
is all but nonexistent or of such low volume that the economics
or mandating a requirment "just in case" doesn't make sense except
when the argument is to the extreme of...even if it is only used
or needed once in a great while.

> > The issue is one of personal choice, not need, as to ever using morse
> > anymore. At best, there is but a handful of anecdotal references to
> > morse being claimed as being "the only mode usable" under some
> > actual emergencies. Those that claim morse is needed for emergencies
> > fail to show any reliance on the mode in the vast (probably 90+ percent)
> > domain of those organizations (RACES, ARES, etc) that actually
> > put in place teams of operators, stations and portable equipment.
>
> What that says is that never again shall any significant use of
> radiotelgraphy *ever* again see a need arise.

Yep, that's pretty much a statement I agree with.

> And that clearly is a possibility.

At least you agree on something.

> Just as much a possibility as the impossibility of what
> happened on Sept 11, 2001 seemed in advance of that date. QED.

The relavence to morse code test requirement being????

> >>>In over 32 years as an RF engineer, I have not had the same experience.
> >>
> >> This would be no surprise, given your OBVIOUS hatred of
radiotelegraphy.
> >
> > Dick would have us believe he can read people's minds as
> > to their likes/dislikes.
>
> If you had a zealot ranting and raving on
> such a subject each and every time it came up would YOU bring it up, or
> see to it that you never involved yourself in such a conversation with
him?

Since it is likly you've never engaged Carl in and direct
conversation I find your claim he is or would be "ranting
and raving" about anything.

> >>>The most technical folks have seemed more interested in the technical
> >>>side of ham radio and there have been MANY who I could not recruit
> >>>into ham radio because they had no interest in and were unwilling to
> > >>waste
> >>>their valuable time learing Morse to a level that would get them decent

> >>>HF privs. (some have capitulated and jumped through the 5 wpm hoop
> >>>since "restructuring" and are now extras, but many have refused, on
> >>>principal, to jump through the hoop, saying they'll wait until the
> >>>don't have to waste their time on Morse)
> >>
> >>Mygawd man, no one in his right mind, having once endured that diatribe,
> >>would be eager to have to go through it all over again. You have it
> >>programmed into your psyche, if not in a keyboard macro. Naturally they
> >>avoided any act or word which would have keyed your internal macro. Who
> >>wouldn't?
> >>
> >>>>I would challenge the NCTA's to show some proof that those who believe
> >>>>that the morse code test should be retained are in a technical
> >>
> >> backwater.
> >>
> >>That *might* be a bit difficult given that even Carl, their vaunted
> >>leader, is a SSB ratchjaw, not given to even putting a digital HF
> >>station on the air, much less doing any "amsteur digital design".
> >>
> >>
> >> Dick appears to question the technical competency and contribution(s)
> >> Carl has made.
>
> Carl talks the talk. No walk.

And you make that statement based on what? What, if anything,
do you know of Carl's contribution to technology...be it directly
related to ham radio or not?

> >>>Most of the avid CW ragchewers/contesters I've known over the years
> >>>(remember, I'm a long-time ham)
> >>
> >> Ah, it MUST be pointed out here that your tenure as a longtime ham did
> >>not include close connection to *anyone* who was seriously involved in
> >>radiotelegraphy in any way. And I know that how? By your actions here!
> >>It's completely safe to say that no one would tolarate your attitude as
> >>a friend, not likely as even a casual acquaintance, given the lever of
> >>vituperation you have always shown toward CW. So what would anyone
> >>expect your experience to be??
> >>
> >> So how do you explain my comradeship with hams that are avid
> >> CW users yet are fuly aware of my role in NCI to end code tetsing?
>
> Perhaps it's that you have a more engaging personality than Carl.
> He has a real problem in that regard.

As above, unless you have had direct personal contact with an individual,
I would be very hesitent to judge that person's personality based solely
on RRAP commentary.

> >>>have been more interested in the operating activity
> >>>(ragchewing, contesting, paper-chasing) than the technical side
> >>>My experience has been that they have been less technically inclined
> >>>than a lot of the no-code techs I've met, less inclined to
> > >>participate in public
> >>>service/emergency communications, and more inclined to just being
> >>>"users" rather than tinkerers ...
> >>
> >>Same old, same old... Make the CW supporters appear to be Luddites-an
> >>accusation you have repeated many times here on rrap=-Go googling for
> >>the facts if anyone doubts it.
> >>
> >>The FACTS are that the CW suppoorters are far most often the users of
> >>advanced digital modes. I'd wager that Carl has never been on the air
> >>using CLOVER II. I have.
> >
> > So are you saying only "CW suppoorters" (sic) or a majority of same
> > are likly to be users of advanced digital modes?
>
> In this particular tussle it is clearly the majority.

"Clearly" based on what data?

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

720. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-11 06:29:58 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031011022958.12501.00003063@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 80295

In article <AHuhb.14724$mQ2.8000@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote:
>>
>> Incorrect. What "push"? Based on membership
>> numbers, NCI has fewer than 5000 members
>> worldwide (snip)
>
>
> Oh, come on, Jim. What is this "what push" nonsense? The push to remove
>code testing that so many pro-code test advocates, including yourself on
>occasion, have been ranting about in this newsgroups for so very many years.

"Ranting"?

Perhaps I could have worded my post better.

My point is that the whole issue is not a mass movement. Clint claimed, without any proof, that most hams want code testing gone. Yet surveys show the opposite.

The fact remains that out of over 680,000 US hams, fewer than 1% have joined NCI.

>As you well know, NCI is only a tiny part of the overall movement to end
>code testing - far more outside that organization are involved (including
>some in this newsgroup you've personally discussed this issue with).

How do we know this?

The restructuring NPRM gathered fewer than 2500 comments, even though the comment period was extremely long and the whole thing given lots of publicity in the amateur press.

Compare that to how many comments the NOI on BPL has gathered in a much shorter time.

>To now
>try to move the focus solely to NCI, while knowing full well that so many
>others are involved, is just not being honest about the situation.
>
Who are "so many others", Dwight? If they really exist, why haven't they signed on to NCI, which costs nothing more than a few mouse clicks?

> Do you honestly think denying the push to remove code testing will somehow
>make it go away? Do you honestly think denying the existence of others
>outside NCI will somehow make them disappear? It isn't going to happen, Jim.

I'm not denying any of that. Sorry if it seemed that way.

>The movement to end code testing has never been stronger. To deny that, in
>light of all that has happened over the last few years, would bring into
>question a person's sanity.

How about the claim that most hams want it, despite all the surveys showing the opposite?

And if it's such a done deal, why didn't FCC just dump Element 1 back in July?

73 de Jim, N2EY

721. Re: What makes a Pro code test Amateur a Troglodyte?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-11 06:50:17 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20031011025017.11891.00001413@mb-m11.aol.com>
Source record: 80298

In article <EdHhb.645$_i.51817@nnrp1.ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
<wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:

>Now, I wouldn't expect to be able to have that sort of a relationship
>with you, Dick ... you're not open-minded enough to accept that others
>see things different than you. (You see, I accept that you like and use
>CW ... I disagree only with your propatation of the "Morse myths" and
>your insistence that everyone should have Morse forced on them in
>exchange for HF privs ... fortunately, most of the rest of the world
>doesn't agree with you.)
>
>Carl - wk3c

Carl:

I consider the use of the term "Morse myths" to be derogatory and
inflammatory. Thus, you have also failed to meet Mike's challenge.

73 de Larry, K3LT

722. Re: What makes a Pro code test Amateur a Troglodyte?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-11 06:50:19 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20031011025019.11891.00001415@mb-m11.aol.com>
Source record: 80297

In article <nisdov0duc0ipm9likrr73not53jvvq728@4ax.com>, Leo <nomail@nope.org>
writes:

>By removing the emotion, personal opinion and bias from the
>discussion, some quite interesting points may well be raised.

Leo:

Emotion, personal opinion, and bias is the sum total of the NCTA
repertoire. I should know; I used to be one!

73 de Larry, K3LT

723. Re: What makes a Pro code test Amateur a Troglodyte?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-11 06:50:19 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20031011025019.11891.00001414@mb-m11.aol.com>
Source record: 80299

In article <j6Dhb.622$_i.48906@nnrp1.ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
<wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:

>
>In over 32 years as an RF engineer, I have not had the same experience.
>The most technical folks have seemed more interested in the technical
>side of ham radio and there have been MANY who I could not recruit
>into ham radio because they had no interest in and were unwilling to waste
>their valuable time learing Morse to a level that would get them decent
>HF privs. (some have capitulated and jumped through the 5 wpm hoop
>since "restructuring" and are now extras, but many have refused, on
>principal, to jump through the hoop, saying they'll wait until they don't
>have to waste their time on Morse)

Carl:

Now, there's classic NCTA logic for you! You and your fellow
professional RF engineers, with your "code testing as a hoop"
mentality, have actually wasted more time by *not* learning the
code and passing the code tests than you have saved. For one
thing, as ham radio history has proved many times, those of
you who made the attempt to learn the code and upgrade through
the progressively higher-speed code tests may have very well
become enthusiastic CW operators, and ultimately, PCTA's.
All you've done is demonstrate that even professionally-qualified
electronics technicians and engineers can be just as lazy and
unmotivated to learn a useful communications skill as a truck
driver whose main RF experience is on 11-meters.

>> I would challenge the NCTA's to show some proof that those who believe
>> that the morse code test should be retained are in a technical backwater.
>
>Most of the avid CW ragchewers/contesters I've known over the years
>(remember, I'm a long-time ham) have been more interested in the operating
>activity (ragchewing, contesting, paper-chasing) than the technical side.
>My experience has been that they have been less technically inclined than
>a lot of the no-code techs I've met, less inclined to participate in public
>service/emergency communications, and more inclined to just being "users"
>rather than tinkerers ...

And my experience, and that of many of the PCTA posters in this NG,
has been exactly the opposite.

>Remember, this is my personal experience, and since it seems to differ from
>yours, YMMV ...

Indeed, it does.

>> I would also challenge them to do it without being abrasive or insulting.
>
>I think I've met the challenge ...

Hmmm. I think the statement that code testing is "jumping through
a hoop" is questionable, but I'll let it slide.

>> Just facts or intelligent informed opinions.
>
>Since there are no authortative, scientific statistics (and probably never
>will
>be), I think that all you can expect to get are peoples accounting of their
>own
>personal experiences. Mine are admitedly coming from the fact that I'm "in
>the business" of RF engineering ... but through local clubs and ARES/RACES
>participation over the past 25+ years, my observations seem to hold, even
>amongst contacts/acquaintences/friends who are not "in the profession."
>Remember, YMMV ...

My experiences would seem to be the polar opposite of your own, and for
the exact same reasons. Yes, MM does V.

>> Pro coders can help by refraining from name calling too.
>
>We shall see ...

Well, so far, I seem to have violated that injunction, since I have indulged
in calling NCTA's "lazy." However, I consider that to be honesty, not
name calling. Therefore, in fairness, that needs to "slide" as well.

>> My statement is that there is no direct relationship.
>
>The evidence is anecdotal will, as I point out, vary from person
>to person, depending on their location, profession, the "slant"
>of the local club(s) they belong to, etc.

Agreed. However, my own experience is that technically involved
no-coders also tend to be reticent to indulge in stating their opinion
about code testing. It is the ones who just want a microphone in
their hot little hands who seem to be all worked up about it.

>> Anyone ready for a real discussion without the barbs? Can we do it?
>> First person to start throwing insults only makes it look bad for
>> his/her side.
>
>I think I've taken the high ground ... we'll see how the other side deals
>with it ...

Your high ground will hardly require the use of supplemental Oï¿½.
Being on "the other side," I feel that I have taken an approach based
on honesty, since I've actually lived on *both* sides. I therefore claim
the same "high ground." Move over, Carl!

73 de Larry, K3LT

724. Re: What makes a Pro code test Amateur a Troglodyte?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-11 06:50:20 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20031011025020.11891.00001416@mb-m11.aol.com>
Source record: 80403

In article <3F86EDAD.4010109@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:

>
> My statement is that there is no direct relationship.

Mike:

Your statement is correct. The connection between code testing/use
and technical insufficiency among radio amateurs is one of the most
specious, improbable, and self-serving arguments ever contrived by
the NCTA.

> Anyone ready for a real discussion without the barbs? Can we do it?
>First person to start throwing insults only makes it look bad for
>his/her side.

Speaking from personal experience, the hams I've known who were the most
likely to be technically involved were also those who both embraced the use
of the Morse/CW mode, and supported the concept of code testing as a
licensing requirement. They were always the ones most active on the air,
not only on HF but on VHF as well -- and I mean weak-signal VHF, not FM.

I have also known a lot of highly technical "no-coders," but their contribution
was mainly in the arena of FM repeaters. However, they have, for the most
part, been unconcerned about the code testing issue, since they had no
aspirations to operate HF. I highly value their efforts, and consider them to
be full-fledged hams. This assessment is strengthened by the fact that they
left themselves out of a debate over a topic they knew little or nothing
about.

The whole ball of wax boils down to one thing -- the willingness of a certain
group of prospective hams to meet licensing requirements which support
the learning and use of what is unquestionably one of the most versatile and
useful modes of radio communication -- CW using Morse code. Since the
ability to effectively employ this mode holds the unique requirement that the
operator acquire a physical skill, and considering the fact that many other
modes which do not levy this skill development "overhead" exist, has caused
many people to vent their frustration at this requirement, rather than make an
honest attempt to overcome it. In so doing, they have tried almost every
trick in the book, including the "code = technical decline" argument.

One cannot ignore that the principle motivation of the NCTA is just plain,
old-fashioned laziness. This is a human trait, and we are all guilty of it, to
some extent. That is not a "barb," it is just honesty. I consider myself
qualified to make that judgment, since I squandered what is now 28% of
my lifetime being on the wrong side of the code/no-code testing ideology.
My problem was I was too lazy to be bothered to learn the code and

become a licensed radio amateur. When my desire to become a ham finally overcame my laziness, everything else fell into place in very short order. The sooner we recognize the true motivation of the NCTA, the sooner they will be shown to be wrong.

73 de Larry, K3LT

725. Re: RM-10808 --- Wexelbaum Redux

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-11 06:50:21 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20031011025021.11891.00001418@mb-m11.aol.com>
Source record: 80300

In article <5ee63311.0310091313.4991d260@posting.google.com>,
groupk0hb@earthlink.net (Hans K0HB) writes:

>
>In summary, this petition should not be tossed aside lightly.
>It should be hurled aside with great force.

Hansl:

Preferably aimed at, smashing into, and demolishing any similar
petitions.

73 de Larry, K3LT

726. Re: RM-10808 --- Wexelbaum Redux

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-11 06:50:21 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20031011025021.11891.00001417@mb-m11.aol.com>
Source record: 80401

In article <5ee63311.0310100939.39f35ac0@posting.google.com>,
groupk0hb@earthlink.net (Hans K0HB) writes:

>____
>
> RESPONSE FROM AH0A
>____
>
>Thanks for taking the time to respond, although your last comment was
>a bit
>strong.

Do ya think?

73 de Larry, K3LT

727. Re: News Test

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-11 06:50:22 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20031011025022.11891.00001419@mb-m11.aol.com>
Source record: 80296

In article <bm3tvchh1@localhost.localdomain>, angelina@erotismo.es writes:

>Testeo of the News

Testeo successfulamente! Buenos Dias!

73 de Larry, K3LT

728. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-11 06:50:22 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20031011025022.11891.00001420@mb-m11.aol.com>
Source record: 80402

In article <20031009073158.23171.00001344@mb-m05.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
writes:

>
>Fun fact:
>
>When the results of the 1996 ARRL/READEX survey were tabulated, one of the
>results shown was the support for/opposition to code testing broken down by
>age
>group.
>
>All age groups showed a majority to be procodetest, but the *most*
>procodetest
>group were the youngest! Hams under 24 at the time were 85% procodetest/15%
>anticodetest. Almost a 6 to 1 ratio!
>
>73 de Jim, N2EY

Jim:

Very interesting, indeed. This could provide excellent support to replies
to the code testing petitions recently assigned RM numbers by the FCC.
Can you provide a URL?

73 de Larry, K3LT

729. Re: What makes a Pro code test Amateur a Troglodyte?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-11 12:46:55 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <3ZShb.672$_i.57821@nnrp1.ptd.net>
Source record: 80404

"Hans K0HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:5ee63311.0310101943.3e27f31e@posting.google.com...
> "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote:
>
> > I think I've taken the high ground
>
> Carl, with all due respect, using abrasive and derisive terms like
> "jumping through hoops" is not "the high ground". It is your same old
> baiting and condescending rhetoric, seemingly calculated to be
> inflamatory and divisive.

"jumping through hoops" is "abrasive and drisive" ??? You must have
REALLY thin skin Hans.

> I don't mourn the end of Morse testing, but I recognize the fact that
> many honorable folks disagree with me, and I try to treat their
> opinions with respect.

I accept that some disagree with the elimination of Morse testing
as a requirement for access to HF ... it is their reasons for disagreeing
that I disagree with, cannot support because they are illogical and
inaccurate, and I resent their condescending attitude that "nobody
is/or can be a 'Real Ham' without being Morse proficient.

BTW .. I liked your comments on the Speroni petition ... and
I didn't accuse you of being abrasive with the bit a the end about
"casting it aside with great force" or whatever the exact wording
was.

73,
Carl - wk3c

730. Re: What makes a Pro code test Amateur a Troglodyte?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-11 12:58:12 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <E7Thb.673$_i.57968@nnrp1.ptd.net>
Source record: 80405

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20031011025017.11891.00001413@mb-m11.aol.com...
> In article <EdHhb.645$_i.51817@nnrp1.ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
> <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:
>
> >Now, I wouldn't expect to be able to have that sort of a relationship
> >with you, Dick ... you're not open-minded enough to accept that others
> >see things different than you. (You see, I accept that you like and use
> >CW ... I disagree only with your propatation of the "Morse myths" and
> >your insistence that everyone should have Morse forced on them in
> >exchange for HF privs ... fortunately, most of the rest of the world
> >doesn't agree with you.)
> >
> >Carl - wk3c
>
> Carl:
>
> I consider the use of the term "Morse myths" to be derogatory and
> inflammatory. Thus, you have also failed to meet Mike's challenge.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

Larry,

I don't recall Mike appointing your the judge and arbiter ...

"Morse Myths" is, as you well know by now, simply a term
that refers to all of the patently false, old wives' tales, such as
"Morse gets through when nothing else will.", "Morse is essential
for emergency communications.", "Morse acts as a 'lid filter' to
keep us from being overrun by the "mongul hordes' of CBers
who are lurking in the wings waiting to take over the ham bands."
etc.

I reject your claim that the term "Morse Myths" is derogatory and
inflamatory. It is simply a term that refers in "shorthand" form to
a panoply of falacies that are often cited as "reasons why we MUST
keep Morse testing" ... none of which hold water and all of which
have been rejected by the FCC.

Carl - wk3c

731. Re: What makes a Pro code test Amateur a Troglodyte?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-11 13:06:32 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <sfThb.674$_i.58058@nnrp1.ptd.net>
Source record: 80406

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20031011025019.11891.00001414@mb-m11.aol.com...
> In article <j6Dhb.622$_i.48906@nnrp1.ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
> <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:
>
> >
> >In over 32 years as an RF engineer, I have not had the same experience.
> >The most technical folks have seemed more interested in the technical
> >side of ham radio and there have been MANY who I could not recruit
> >into ham radio because they had no interest in and were unwilling to
waste
> >their valuable time learing Morse to a level that would get them decent
> >HF privs. (some have capitulated and jumped through the 5 wpm hoop
> >since "restructuring" and are now extras, but many have refused, on
> >principal, to jump through the hoop, saying they'll wait until they don't
> >have to waste their time on Morse)
>
> Carl:
>
> Now, there's classic NCTA logic for you! You and your fellow
> professional RF engineers, with your "code testing as a hoop"
> mentality, have actually wasted more time by *not* learning the
> code and passing the code tests than you have saved.

No, those who chose not to jump through the hoop wasted NO
time ... they devoted their discretionary time to other technical
pusuits without required hoop jumping ... a loss to the ARS.

> For one
> thing, as ham radio history has proved many times, those of
> you who made the attempt to learn the code and upgrade through
> the progressively higher-speed code tests may have very well
> become enthusiastic CW operators, and ultimately, PCTA's.

A modest percentage, perhaps, but those folks would likely
have given Morse a try and become Morse enthusiasts without
having been forced into it by a test requirement. And while
some may have become Morse enthusiasts voluntarily, that
does not mean that they would have become PCTAs, seeking
to force Morse on everyone.

> All you've done is demonstrate that even professionally-qualified
> electronics technicians and engineers can be just as lazy and
> unmotivated to learn a useful communications skill as a truck
> driver whose main RF experience is on 11-meters.

Now that is derogatory and not based in any fact.

> >> I would challenge the NCTA's to show some proof that those who believe
> >> that the morse code test should be retained are in a technical
backwater.
> >
> >Most of the avid CW ragchewers/contesters I've known over the years
> >(remember, I'm a long-time ham) have been more interested in the
operating
> >activity (ragchewing, contesting, paper-chasing) than the technical side.
> >My experience has been that they have been less technically inclined than
> >a lot of the no-code techs I've met, less inclined to participate in
public
> >service/emergency communications, and more inclined to just being "users"
> >rather than tinkerers ...
>
> And my experience, and that of many of the PCTA posters in this NG,
> has been exactly the opposite.
>
> >Remember, this is my personal experience, and since it seems to differ
from
> >yours, YMMV ...
>
> Indeed, it does.
>
> >> I would also challenge them to do it without being abrasive or
insulting.
> >
> >I think I've met the challenge ...
>
> Hmmm. I think the statement that code testing is "jumping through
> a hoop" is questionable, but I'll let it slide.
>
> >> Just facts or intelligent informed opinions.
> >
> >Since there are no authortative, scientific statistics (and probably
never
> >will
> >be), I think that all you can expect to get are peoples accounting of
their
> >own
> >personal experiences. Mine are admitedly coming from the fact that I'm
"in
> >the business" of RF engineering ... but through local clubs and
ARES/RACES
> >participation over the past 25+ years, my observations seem to hold, even
> >amongst contacts/acquaintences/friends who are not "in the profession."
> >Remember, YMMV ...
>
> My experiences would seem to be the polar opposite of your own, and for
> the exact same reasons. Yes, MM does V.

>
> >> Pro coders can help by refraining from name calling too.
> >
> >We shall see ...
>
> Well, so far, I seem to have violated that injunction, since I have
indulged
> in calling NCTA's "lazy." However, I consider that to be honesty, not
> name calling. Therefore, in fairness, that needs to "slide" as well.
>
> >> My statement is that there is no direct relationship.
> >
> >The evidence is anecdotal will, as I point out, vary from person
> >to person, depending on their location, profession, the "slant"
> >of the local club(s) they belong to, etc.
>
> Agreed. However, my own experience is that technically involved
> no-coders also tend to be reticent to indulge in stating their opinion
> about code testing. It is the ones who just want a microphone in
> their hot little hands who seem to be all worked up about it.

Have you considered the possibility that those technically involved
no-coders are reluctant to subject themselves to being called
'knuckle-draggers" and "cb-plussers"???? (the sort of abuse that
at least the more vocal in the PCTA, including yourself, dish out)

Carl - wk3c

732. Re: What makes a Pro code test Amateur a Troglodyte?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-11 14:29:51 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031011102951.28496.00001225@mb-m18.aol.com>
Source record: 80407

In article <3ZShb.672$_i.57821@nnrp1.ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
<wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:

>"Hans K0HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
>news:5ee63311.0310101943.3e27f31e@posting.google.com...
>> "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote:
>>
>> > I think I've taken the high ground
>>
>> Carl, with all due respect, using abrasive and derisive terms like
>> "jumping through hoops" is not "the high ground". It is your same old
>> baiting and condescending rhetoric, seemingly calculated to be
>> inflamatory and divisive.
>
>"jumping through hoops" is "abrasive and drisive" ???

Yes, it is. The image is not complimentary. Would you like the written tests
described that way?

So are phrases like

"waste valuable time learning Morse"
"dinosaur/buggywhip technology"

Would you like your favorite modes described that way?

>You must have
>REALLY thin skin Hans.

In my experience Hans does not have a 'thin skin' at all.

73 de Jim, N2EY

733. Re: What makes a Pro code test Amateur a Troglodyte?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-11 14:30:16 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031011103016.09377.00000076@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 80408

>no-coders are reluctant to subject themselves to being called
>'knuckle-draggers" and "cb-plussers"???

Whats the problem Karl, does the truth HURT?

734. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-11 14:40:59 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <%DUhb.27864$mQ2.23750@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 80409

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20031011022958.12501.00003063@mb-m04.aol.com...
> In article <AHuhb.14724$mQ2.8000@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>,
"Dwight
> Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> writes:
>
> >"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote:
> >>
> >> Incorrect. What "push"? Based on membership
> >> numbers, NCI has fewer than 5000 members
> >> worldwide (snip)
> >>
> >>
> > Oh, come on, Jim. What is this "what push" nonsense? The push to remove
> >code testing that so many pro-code test advocates, including yourself on
> >occasion, have been ranting about in this newsgroups for so very many
years.
>
> "Ranting"?

I have to agree with Jim's ???... Jim has never been one
to "rant."

> Perhaps I could have worded my post better.

I didn't see anything "ranting about it."

> My point is that the whole issue is not a mass movement. Clint claimed,
without
> any proof, that most hams want code testing gone. Yet surveys show the
> opposite.
>
> The fact remains that out of over 680,000 US hams, fewer than 1% have
joined
> NCI.

So? The issue isn't to be decided by some unilateral vote of
only licensed hams. The issue is one of appropriate regulatory
test requirements.

> >As you well know, NCI is only a tiny part of the overall movement to end
> >code testing - far more outside that organization are involved (including
> >some in this newsgroup you've personally discussed this issue with).
>
> How do we know this?
>

> The restructuring NPRM gathered fewer than 2500 comments, even though the
> comment period was extremely long and the whole thing given lots of
publicity
> in the amateur press.
>
> Compare that to how many comments the NOI on BPL has gathered in a much
shorter
> time.

One could also argue that most hams don't really care that code testing
ends...certainly not enough to file comments that indicate a desire
to keep code....and probably because they know the end result
is only a matter of time.

> >To now
> >try to move the focus solely to NCI, while knowing full well that so many
> >others are involved, is just not being honest about the situation.
> >
> Who are "so many others", Dwight? If they really exist, why haven't they
signed
> on to NCI, which costs nothing more than a few mouse clicks?

What difference does it make anyway?

> > Do you honestly think denying the push to remove code testing will
somehow
> >make it go away? Do you honestly think denying the existence of others
> >outside NCI will somehow make them disappear? It isn't going to happen,
Jim.
>
> I'm not denying any of that. Sorry if it seemed that way.

The "push" has certainly been far more than just NCI. If it
was only NCI, how do you explain the ITU treaty change by
with not one vote against the change...and how do you explain
the IARU possision...again, almost a unanomous set of votes in
each region except for a couple of no votes and abstentions.

> >The movement to end code testing has never been stronger. To deny that,
in
> >light of all that has happened over the last few years, would bring into
> >question a person's sanity.
>
> How about the claim that most hams want it, despite all the surveys
showing the
> opposite?

The FCC doesn't care about percentages...and it shouldn't. See above
my comment about the decision being what is proper test requirments as
opposed to what any majority of hams may want. Additionally,
I never saw any true survey that could be justifiable stated as
accurately reflecting ALL hams.

> And if it's such a done deal, why didn't FCC just dump Element 1 back in July?

Process. Better in the government mindset to open the comments and see what comes forward. So far, NOTHING new has been offered by PCTAs that hasn't already been sifted through and discounted by the FCC in prior reviews (e.g. NPRM 98-143 primarily).

Without doubt, absent the treaty requirement, the ball is totally in the PCTA's court to justify keeping any code test...and so far there's nothing new.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

735. Re: What makes a Pro code test Amateur a Troglodyte?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-11 14:44:21 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <9HUhb.27868$mQ2.4377@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 80410

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20031011025017.11891.00001413@mb-m11.aol.com...
> In article <EdHhb.645$_i.51817@nnrp1.ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
> <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:
>
> >Now, I wouldn't expect to be able to have that sort of a relationship
> >with you, Dick ... you're not open-minded enough to accept that others
> >see things different than you. (You see, I accept that you like and use
> >CW ... I disagree only with your propatation of the "Morse myths" and
> >your insistence that everyone should have Morse forced on them in
> >exchange for HF privs ... fortunately, most of the rest of the world
> >doesn't agree with you.)
> >
> >Carl - wk3c
>
> Carl:
>
> I consider the use of the term "Morse myths" to be derogatory and
> inflammatory. Thus, you have also failed to meet Mike's challenge.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT

Hw about morse fallicies, morse inaccuracies, erronious morse
claims? Which of these do you find acceptable?

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

736. Re: What makes a Pro code test Amateur a Troglodyte?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-11 14:56:28 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <wSUhb.28048$mQ2.26393@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 80411

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20031011102951.28496.00001225@mb-m18.aol.com...
> In article <3ZShb.672$_i.57821@nnrp1.ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
> <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:
>
> >"Hans K0HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> >news:5ee63311.0310101943.3e27f31e@posting.google.com...
> >> "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote:
> >>
> >> > I think I've taken the high ground
> >>
> >> Carl, with all due respect, using abrasive and derisive terms like
> >> "jumping through hoops" is not "the high ground". It is your same old
> >> baiting and condescending rhetoric, seemingly calculated to be
> >> inflamatory and divisive.
> >
> >"jumping through hoops" is "abrasive and drisive" ???
>
> Yes, it is. The image is not complimentary. Would you like the written
tests
> described that way?
>
> So are phrases like
>
> "waste valuable time learning Morse"

I consider my time a very valuable resource as do many others.
Wy is a comment which describes time wwasted by people who
don't wish to expend it learning morse considered uncomplimentary?

> "dinosaur/buggywhip technology"

Me thinks as the end approaches...the PCTA side is grasping
at straws. I suggest not playing in the political arena of change if
such phraseology offends.

> Would you like your favorite modes described that way?

Sure wouldn't bother me. But then I've learned to disregard
most rheteroic anyway. 12 years as an elected official teaches
one to accept the heat or get out-of-the-kitchen.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

737. Re: What makes a Pro code test Amateur a Troglodyte?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-11 15:02:02 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <KXUhb.28192$mQ2.8155@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 80412

"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20031011103016.09377.00000076@mb-m27.aol.com...
> >no-coders are reluctant to subject themselves to being called
> >'knuckle-draggers" and "cb-plussers"???
>
> Whats the problem Karl, does the truth HURT?

Actually, with friends like WA8ULX, the PCTA folks don't need any
enimies as such personal attacks discredit the PCTA position very well.

The reality is that personal attacks rather than comments
(acrimonius or not) about morse or any other mode are significantly
different. If I consider FORDS to be a crap automobile, that
is considerably different than calling FORD OWNERS "knuckle
draggers".

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

738. Re: France is conquered by of all things, an Italian.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-11 15:04:44 UTC
From: "Capt. Blackflag" <wvay4daves@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <1065885396.944713@newshost03.voicenet.com>
Source record: 80413

WTF does the original posting have to do with ham radio?
I know...lemme guess...your from rec.radio.cb and were
tossed out from that stinkhole? Yup...that's it!

739. Re: What makes a Pro code test Amateur a Troglodyte?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-11 15:16:23 UTC
From: groupk0hb@earthlink.net
Message-ID: <5ee63311.0310110716.4f7ffb6e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 80414

"Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote

>
> Most of the avid CW ragchewers/contesters I've known over the years
> (remember, I'm a long-time ham) have been more interested in the operating
> activity (ragchewing, contesting, paper-chasing) than the technical side.
> My experience has been that they have been less technically inclined than
> a lot of the no-code techs I've met, less inclined to participate in public
> service/emergency communications, and more inclined to just being "users"
> rather than tinkerers ...
>

I thought the thread was about Pro Code Test folks, not Pro Code User folks. Your "official position" is that you have nothing against Morse use, only Morse testing, yet your diatribes invariably bring into question the technical competence of CW contesters and DXers. How about Phone contesters and DXers --- are they more technically competent than CW contesters and DXers? If not, then your argument is exposed as based on your own biases, not on the facts.

I don't support the continuance of Morse testing, but I damned sure intend to continue to support USE of Morse.

All of that aside, your premise that contesters and DXers are below average in technical inclination doesn't align very well with reality. Perhaps you belong to the wrong clubs. Contesters and DXers are historically at the forefront of pushing improved technology, especially in receiver design, antenna design, and integrating computerized technology into their station design. The only remaining viable manufacturer of HF radios in the US is TenTec, a company founded and run by avid DXers/contesters, and catering to their needs. "Force 12", the current leader in HF antenna technology is owned by avid contesters. DigiKey, the electronics distributor was founded by fellow members of the University of Minnesota Contest Club, mostly electrical engineering students. (They got into business designing and selling electronic keyers, hence the name.) Ron Stordahl, N5IN, was one of the founders and still heads the company which is a major employer in the city where it is based. All this from an avid CW contester and electronics engineer.

By the way, my company just completed successful field trials of SDR (Software Defined Radio) technology. (See http://www.adc.com/investorrelations/newsandcommunications/newsreleases/show.jsp?RELEASEID=119340) Many of the leading people involved in the project are hams who are also (choke) CW (and Phone) contesters.

73, de Hans, K0HB
--
http://www.adc.com
http://home.earthlink.net/~k0hb

740. Re: 73 Magazine Says "73 and QRT"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-11 15:21:40 UTC
From: wn6bdb@hotmail.com
Message-ID: <fda4618.0310110721.7611846f@posting.google.com>
Source record: 80415
Cross-posted to:
rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

I have to disagree with John. The loss of 73 magazine is a very minor
event in the history of amateur radio. On the other hand, the loss of
"Ham Radio Magazine" 10+ years ago was truly a tragic loss to amateur
radio. Compared to "Ham Radio Magazine", 73's technical articles were
generally trivial and often didn't follow good engineering practice.
Often, the construction articles would not work as described and most
mistakes were never corrected.
Although some were entertaining, I found Wayne Greens editorials to be
sensational and they contributed nothing to the community or the radio
art.
I'm sorry to see any amateur radio publication fail but I don't think
the loss of 73 will amount to much in the total scheme of things.

"Capt. Blackflag" <wvay4daves@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:<1065844329.188229@newshost03.voicenet.com>...
> "John Norfolk" <janorfolk@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> news:c6a70d55.0310101532.63b491f3@posting.google.com...
> > From the ARRL Letter October 10:
> >
> > 73 MAGAZINE SAYS "73 AND QRT"
> >
> > After completing 43 years of publication, 73 Amateur Radio Today
> > magazine is calling it quits. Plans to publish a joint
> > October/November issue fell through this week, and the September 2003
> > issue was the magazine's last. According to self-proclaimed "El
> > Supremo and Founder" Wayne S. Green II, W2NSD, it was a simple
> > matter of economics.
>
> And with this very sad announcement, Ham Radio is truly DEAD.
> (well....mabey not, but we've lost a BIG chunk without 73)
>
> Wayne and his magazine was without doubt ham radio's most
> amusing read. His Editorials were always right on target - often
> his prognostications were YEARS ahead of their time.
>
> I hope he makes an appearance on Art Bell's show to discuss
> the 73 Magazine demise and other commentary soon!
>
> > "After failing a last minute effort to collect on some larger
> > accounts receivable we decided yesterday to throw in the towel--
> > that the September issue will have to be the last," Green told ARRL
> > October 9. "SK after 43 years of publishing."
> >

> > The first issue of 73 was published in October 1960 from what Green
> > --a former editor of CQ--once described as "a small, dingy
> > apartment" in Brooklyn, New York. Since the summer of 1962, 73 has
> > been based in Peterborough, New Hampshire--Green's home state. The
> > magazine was a pioneer promoter of SSB, FM, solid-state, easy
> > construction projects and the marriage of personal computing and
> > Amateur Radio. His interest in microcomputing led Green in 1975 to
> > found Byte, a magazine devoted to the then-nascent and largely do-it-
> > yourself computer hobby.
> >
> > At the peak of its popularity in the 1970s and 1980s, individual
> > issues of 73 totaled more than 300 pages of ads, articles and
> > commentary. Heading each issue was Green's inimitable "Never Say
> > Die"--some would say never-ending--editorial, in which he
> > rarely missed an opportunity to tweak the ARRL and his magazine
> > competitors for their perceived shortcomings.
> >
> > QST Editor Steve Ford, WB8IMY, says 73 published his first article in
> > the 1970s. "I was saddened to hear that 73 has ceased publishing,"
> > Ford said. "Wayne's excitement about the growing amateur FM repeater
> > phenomenon at the time was infectious."
> >
> > Green's 73 editorials and regular round of personal appearances
> > originally concentrated on Amateur Radio and his ideas to improve,
> > advance and grow it. In recent years, however, they've veered into
> > conspiracy theories, cures for cancer, AIDS and other ailments and
> > Green's proliferation of book titles on those topics.
> >
> > Green says he'll continue his essays on his Web site
> > http://www.waynegreen.com/ "for those subscribers who mainly
> > bought the magazine for them." He told ARRL that no definite
> > arrangements have been made yet about how to handle outstanding 73
> > subscriptions.
> >
> > CQ Publisher Dick Ross, K2MGA, said he takes no joy from the passing
> > of 73. "The loss of any publication serving Amateur Radio leaves all
> > of us a bit poorer," he said. "Thank you, Wayne, for 43
> > entertaining, informative, sometimes infuriating, and always
> > interesting years of 73. We'll genuinely miss it."

741. Re: 73 Magazine Says "73 and QRT"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-11 15:35:58 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <yrVhb.28754$mQ2.6611@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 80416
Cross-posted to:
rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

I remember when Wayne was trying to get rid of the top two megs of 2 meters.
146 to 148 Mhz. Because it wasn't being used and served no purpose.

Shortly thereafter FM came along and the 'rest is history'.

I dropped his rag years ago.

Dan/W4NTI

"Steve .. AI7W" <wn6bdb@hotmail.com> wrote in message
news:fda4618.0310110721.7611846f@posting.google.com...
> I have to disagree with John. The loss of 73 magazine is a very minor
> event in the history of amateur radio. On the other hand, the loss of
> "Ham Radio Magazine" 10+ years ago was truly a tragic loss to amateur
> radio. Compared to "Ham Radio Magazine", 73's technical articles were
> generally trivial and often didn't follow good engineering practice.
> Often, the construction articles would not work as described and most
> mistakes were never corrected.
> Although some were entertaining, I found Wayne Greens editorials to be
> sensational and they contributed nothing to the community or the radio
> art.
> I'm sorry to see any amateur radio publication fail but I don't think
> the loss of 73 will amount to much in the total scheme of things.
>
>
> "Capt. Blackflag" <wvay4daves@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:<1065844329.188229@newshost03.voicenet.com>...
> > "John Norfolk" <janorfolk@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> > news:c6a70d55.0310101532.63b491f3@posting.google.com...
> > > From the ARRL Letter October 10:
> > >
> > > 73 MAGAZINE SAYS "73 AND QRT"
> > >
> > > After completing 43 years of publication, 73 Amateur Radio Today
> > > magazine is calling it quits. Plans to publish a joint
> > > October/November issue fell through this week, and the September 2003
> > > issue was the magazine's last. According to self-proclaimed "El
> > > Supremo and Founder" Wayne S. Green II, W2NSD, it was a simple
> > > matter of economics.
> >
> > And with this very sad announcement, Ham Radio is truly DEAD.
> > (well....mabey not, but we've lost a BIG chunk without 73)
> >
> > Wayne and his magazine was without doubt ham radio's most

> > amusing read. His Editorials were always right on target - often
> > his prognostications were YEARS ahead of their time.
> >
> > I hope he makes an appearance on Art Bell's show to discuss
> > the 73 Magazine demise and other commentary soon!
> >
> > > "After failing a last minute effort to collect on some larger
> > > accounts receivable we decided yesterday to throw in the towel--
> > > that the September issue will have to be the last," Green told ARRL
> > > October 9. "SK after 43 years of publishing."
> > >
> > > The first issue of 73 was published in October 1960 from what Green
> > > --a former editor of CQ--once described as "a small, dingy
> > > apartment" in Brooklyn, New York. Since the summer of 1962, 73 has
> > > been based in Peterborough, New Hampshire--Green's home state. The
> > > magazine was a pioneer promoter of SSB, FM, solid-state, easy
> > > construction projects and the marriage of personal computing and
> > > Amateur Radio. His interest in microcomputing led Green in 1975 to
> > > found Byte, a magazine devoted to the then-nascent and largely do-it-
> > > yourself computer hobby.
> > >
> > > At the peak of its popularity in the 1970s and 1980s, individual
> > > issues of 73 totaled more than 300 pages of ads, articles and
> > > commentary. Heading each issue was Green's inimitable "Never Say
> > > Die"--some would say never-ending--editorial, in which he
> > > rarely missed an opportunity to tweak the ARRL and his magazine
> > > competitors for their perceived shortcomings.
> > >
> > > QST Editor Steve Ford, WB8IMY, says 73 published his first article in
> > > the 1970s. "I was saddened to hear that 73 has ceased publishing,"
> > > Ford said. "Wayne's excitement about the growing amateur FM repeater
> > > phenomenon at the time was infectious."
> > >
> > > Green's 73 editorials and regular round of personal appearances
> > > originally concentrated on Amateur Radio and his ideas to improve,
> > > advance and grow it. In recent years, however, they've veered into
> > > conspiracy theories, cures for cancer, AIDS and other ailments and
> > > Green's proliferation of book titles on those topics.
> > >
> > > Green says he'll continue his essays on his Web site
> > > http://www.waynegreen.com/ "for those subscribers who mainly
> > > bought the magazine for them." He told ARRL that no definite
> > > arrangements have been made yet about how to handle outstanding 73
> > > subscriptions.
> > >
> > > CQ Publisher Dick Ross, K2MGA, said he takes no joy from the passing
> > > of 73. "The loss of any publication serving Amateur Radio leaves all
> > > of us a bit poorer," he said. "Thank you, Wayne, for 43
> > > entertaining, informative, sometimes infuriating, and always
> > > interesting years of 73. We'll genuinely miss it."

742. Re: 73 Magazine Says "73 and QRT"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-11 15:57:11 UTC
From: AK <ak-in-nc@mchsi.com>
Message-ID: <rLVhb.732929$Ho3.178179@sccrnsc03>
Source record: 80417
Cross-posted to:
rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

Re: 73 MAGAZINE SAYS "73 AND QRT"

Sad, in a way. But how much of 73's problems were caused by the shrinking world of hamdom in the U.S., and how much was caused by the reduced segment of ham subscribers caused by the narrowness of the self-proclaimed "El Supremo and Founder" Wayne S. Green II, W2NSD?

Over the years, I subscribed and had two articles published in 73 - an honor that paid. But Wayne didn't like us brain-damaged extras and berated CW operators at every opportunity. Hey, I could take that. But, then he didn't like contests either, so Wayne refused to publish contest information in his magazine. Those of us that wanted to know what contests were on, or at least what exchange was expected on contest weekends, had to take another publication to find out. By the time I stopped subscribing to 73, it had become a mostly no-code VHF enthusiast's publication - with the downbeat editorials of Wayne Green providing much of its contents. I still hate seeing
73 Magazine go down for good, even though I also wonder how it managed to stay in print as long as it did.

Hang in there CQ. You too, QST.

AK (K4YKZ)

743. Re: What makes a Pro code test Amateur a Troglodyte?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-11 16:23:00 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <E7Whb.693$_i.59772@nnrp1.ptd.net>
Source record: 80418

"Hans K0HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:5ee63311.0310110716.4f7ffb6e@posting.google.com...
> "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote
>
> >
> > Most of the avid CW ragchewers/contesters I've known over the years
> > (remember, I'm a long-time ham) have been more interested in the
operating
> > activity (ragchewing, contesting, paper-chasing) than the technical
side.
> > My experience has been that they have been less technically inclined
than
> > a lot of the no-code techs I've met, less inclined to participate in
public
> > service/emergency communications, and more inclined to just being
"users"
> > rather than tinkerers ...
> >
>
> I thought the thread was about Pro Code Test folks, not Pro Code User
> folks.

Hans ... read Mike's post ... *he* raised the issue of Morse USERS vs.
those who don't use Morse ... I merely related my personal experience
in that stated context.

> Your "official position" is that you have nothing against
> Morse use, only Morse testing,

I don't ... but I also don't agree with the claim that Morse users
are more technically astute than non-Morse users. That was what
I was addressing and it was responsive to the question/context.

> yet your diatribes invariably bring

I don't think my relating my personal experience was a "diatribe."
Give it a rest Hans.

> into question the technical competence of CW contesters and DXers.
> How about Phone contesters and DXers --- are they more technically
> competent than CW contesters and DXers? If not, then your argument is
> exposed as based on your own biases, not on the facts.

No, my comment was not based on bias ... I clearly stated it was based
on my personal experience and "YMMV."

> I don't support the continuance of Morse testing, but I damned sure
> intend to continue to support USE of Morse.

Then we are in the same camp ...

> All of that aside, your premise that contesters and DXers are below
> average in technical inclination doesn't align very well with reality.
> Perhaps you belong to the wrong clubs. Contesters and DXers are
> historically at the forefront of pushing improved technology,
> especially in receiver design, antenna design, and integrating
> computerized technology into their station design. The only remaining
> viable manufacturer of HF radios in the US is TenTec, a company
> founded and run by avid DXers/contesters, and catering to their needs.
> "Force 12", the current leader in HF antenna technology is owned by
> avid contesters. DigiKey, the electronics distributor was founded by
> fellow members of the University of Minnesota Contest Club, mostly
> electrical engineering students. (They got into business designing
> and selling electronic keyers, hence the name.) Ron Stordahl, N5IN,
> was one of the founders and still heads the company which is a major
> employer in the city where it is based. All this from an avid CW
> contester and electronics engineer.

I didn't say *all* CW enthusiasts, contesters, and paper chasers were
non-technical ... I just related my own personal experience ... which
varies from yours. (sheesh ...)

> By the way, my company just completed successful field trials of SDR
> (Software Defined Radio) technology. (See
>
http://www.adc.com/investorrelations/newsandcommunications/newsreleases/show.jsp?RELEASEID
=119340
>) Many of the leading people involved in the project are hams who are
> also (choke) CW (and Phone) contesters.

And one of the founders of the company, who is a friend and colleague of
mine
now, is a no-code tech (I persuaded him to get into ham radio. He has NO
interest in Morse, but is a hell of a digital modes engineer.)

Carl - wk3c

744. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-11 16:30:03 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031011123003.05539.00001477@mb-m16.aol.com>
Source record: 80419

In article <20031011025022.11891.00001420@mb-m11.aol.com>, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) writes:

>In article <20031009073158.23171.00001344@mb-m05.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com
>(N2EY)
>writes:
>
>>
>>Fun fact:
>>
>>When the results of the 1996 ARRL/READEX survey were tabulated, one of the
>>results shown was the support for/opposition to code testing broken down by
>>age
>>group.
>>
>>All age groups showed a majority to be procodetest, but the *most*
>>procodetest
>>group were the youngest! Hams under 24 at the time were 85% procodetest/15%
>>anticodetest. Almost a 6 to 1 ratio!
>>
>>73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>Jim:
>
>Very interesting, indeed.

Yep. Remember, though, that those are the results of a scientific survey done in 1996.

It does, however, contradict the claim that young people don't want to take code tests.

Even if it can be shown that the majority of hams and other interested parties favor continued code testing, there's no obligation for FCC to follow that majority.

A majority of those who commented to FCC on 98-143 wanted *at least* two code test speeds. But FCC went to 5 wpm for all classes of license and set the stage for complete code test elimination.

>This could provide excellent support to replies
>to the code testing petitions recently assigned RM numbers by the FCC.
>Can you provide a URL?
>
It was in QST back in 1997. If it's online anywhere, it should be on the ARRL website.

73 de Jim, N2EY

745. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-11 16:30:03 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031011123003.05539.00001476@mb-m16.aol.com>
Source record: 80422

In article <20031010202024.23171.00001429@mb-m05.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com
(Len Over 21) writes:

>In article <20031010062952.07578.00001037@mb-m25.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com
>(N2EY)
>writes:
>
>>In article <voc7csn28m5j44@corp.supernews.com>, "Clint" <rattlehead at
>>computron dot net> writes:
>>
>>>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>>>news:20031009222958.11022.00001288@mb-m14.aol.com...
>>>> In article <vobqv2rgm27fb7@corp.supernews.com>, "Clint" <rattlehead at
>>>> computron dot net> writes:
>>>>
>>>> >> All age groups showed a majority to be procodetest, h
>>>> >
>>>> >
>>>> >bzzzzzt....
>>>> >
>>>> >if this were true,
>>>>
>>>> It is true. Did you read the survey and its results?
>>>>
>>>> > there wouldn't be such a push to remove it.
>>>>
>>>> Incorrect. What "push"? Based on membership numbers, NCI has fewer than
>>>5000
>>>> members worldwide, even with no dues, no expiration of membership and
>>>having
>>>> been around over 7 years.
>>>>
>>>>
>>>
>>>Oh, more than just NCI; ARRL seems to favor it,
>>
>>ARRL hasn't formulated a new position yet. Their leadership is sitting on
>the
>>sidelines because no matter what they decide, some folks will be unhappy.
>
> Prior to and just after the IARU decision on S25 policy, ARRL was
> ALL FOR CODE TESTING.

In the USA, yes. But back in early 2001, ARRL changed policy on S25.5 and no
longer supported its continuation in the treaty..

>
> That didn't make the NCTA happy.
>
> ARRL still doesn't have any more membership than a quarter of all
> licensed US amateurs. I don't believe in coincidences.

NCI membership is less than one percent of licensed US amateurs. Even though
membership is free and requires only a few mouse clicks.

> Faced with the inevitable worldwide reaction and subsequent action
> at WRC-03, ARRL just OPTS OUT, goes neutral, won't take a stand
> either way.

ARRL policy is made by representatives of the membership. If the membership is
divided on an issue, a neutral policy may be the only solution.
>
> Their $12 million income (2002) is at stake. ARRL doesn't exist
> without funding. The ONLY people the ARRL is worried about is
> the present membership which is skewed towards PCTA thinking.

Is it somehow wrong for a membership organization to do what the members think
is best?
>
> ARRL membership is still only a quarter of all US licensed amateurs.

NCI membership is less than one percent of licensed US amateurs.
>
> They aren't a majority. Their decisions are not a "consensus."

Neither are NCI's.
>
>>>Yep, it's outta here, CW testing is soon to be extinct. It's goneski.
>>>
>>Maybe it is. But if so, it's not because most hams want it to go. And on
>>particular, not because young hams want it to go.
>
> Your OPINION, senior.

No, simple fact, backed up by scientific survey. And the comments to 98-143.
>
> Do you have any good and true statistical polling to back up your
> OPINION?

Yes!

The ARRL/READEX survey showed that a majority favored code testing, and that
the youngest age group was the most strongly procodetest.

The comments to 98-143 were categorized by an NCI staffer (disproving any
possible claim of bias by procodetest evaluation of the comments) and the
resutls showed that the *majority* of commenters not only wanted continued code
testing, but wanted at least 2 code test speeds. This was true despite an email
campaign by NCI to get as many comments in support of their position of 5 wpm

and sunset clause.

Of course things may have changed since then. But for someone to claim, without more recent evidence, that most hams want code testing to disappear is simply wishful thinking.
>
> Strange, the news doesn't indicate any group of young people
> demonstrating for the retention of the amateur license code test.
> Nor the elimination of the amateur license code test.

Irrelevant.
>
> Why do you say things about the "young hams" that you know not
> of?

The evidence of the survey is clear. You can "stick head and eyes in the sand" but it is still there.

746. Re: DXers Of The Past (Was YASME makes her final port 'o call)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-11 16:30:04 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031011123004.05539.00001478@mb-m16.aol.com>
Source record: 80420

In article <bm7a8qjgu0@208.206.142.91>, Dick Carroll
<dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>> In article <d22b54c3.0310090244.529b1b04@posting.google.com>,
>kelly@dvol.com
>> (Brian Kelly) writes:
>>
>>
>>>>>W9WNV
>>>
>>>AARGH!!. . never mind . .
>>
>>
>> The story about the card table and folding chair on Maria Theresa......
>>
>>>>>W6AM
>>>
>>>W6AM tale: My second transmitter was a $29.95 Heathkit AT-1 I'd
>>>cobbled together. The only FT-243 xtal I owned was 7.060. Xtals were
>>>EXPENSIVE boy!
>>
>>
>> $3 each new. Which translates to maybe $30 today.
>>
>>
>>>Which when doubled put me on 14.120. Kinda useless freq
>>>for dxing so I had to really scrounge for contacts. CQ, CQ, CQ, CQ ad
>>>infinitum after school with all 3-5 watts of RF out or whatever it
>>>was. Finally a CT1 found me and we latched up for several days
>>>running. After some number of days another station called out of
>>>nowhere, it was W6AM mobile running CW from his car. So 14.120 got to
>>>be a three-way round table around 5pm Eastern Time for days on end. At
>>>the time I had no idea who W6AM actually was except that his name was
>>>Don and he was a really neat guy. I have a W6AM card.
>>
>>
>> Great story!
>>
>> W6AM was one of the first hams to go mobile, back when FCC first issued
>special
>> "ZZ" licenses. He held the special call W6ZZAM for such work.
>>
>> Didja look around that site and see the aerial map of his rhombics? Scary.

>>
>>
>>>>OH2BH
>>>
>>>OH2BH/ZA. Tally ho!!
>>
>>
>> OH To Be Him!
>>
>>
>>>> 7. W. Gerry Mathis, W3GM
>>>
>>>Yeah, Gerry W3BES/W3GM. The radio god in these parts, my all-time
>>>great mentor. EVERYBODY'S mentor, that's the way he was. I yakked with
>>>Gerry on the club machine one day then found out he passed away two
>>>days later. Dredge up QSTs from the late '40s and early '50s and check
>>>the glossy back cover RCA power tubes division ads for a look at Gerry
>>>himself and the collection of the gorgeous monster amps he designed
>>>and built.
>>
>>
>> Classic "cans on the temples" pose, too. Still a legend in these parts.
>>
>>
>>>What kinda goofy list is this anyway??
>>>
>>
>> Good question.
>>
>> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>>
>>
>
>
>That post belongs on the Ham History list
>

Which post - mine or W3RV's?

73 de Jim, N2EY

747. Re: RM-10808 --- Wexelbaum Redux

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-11 16:30:05 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031011123005.05539.00001479@mb-m16.aol.com>
Source record: 80421

In article <wbDhb.623$_i.48433@nnrp1.ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
<wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:

>> and a "reward" for learning. I fail to understand why removing Morse
>> testing is any different from removing all aspects of RTTY knowledge
>> from the written test, e.g. "T8A10. What would you connect to a
>> transceiver for RTTY operation?".
>
>Clearly AH0A can't understand (or accept) that the RTTY example
>is "theoretical knowledge" and the Morse test is a test of a mechanical
>skill ...

You mean "a practical skill".

Both are valuable to the radio amateur. Whether either should be tested is a
matter of opinion, nothing more.

But if a person has no interest in RTTY, why should that person be subjected to
questions on the subject?

Why can't a ham be trusted to learn about RTTY if/when the desire to use that
mode arises? RTTY is "just another mode", is it not? There's no requirement for
any ham to ever use it.

> while I don't advocate it, a touch-typing test would be more
>relevant to the future of ham radio than a Morse test.
>
Why touch-typing? Isn't hunt-and-peck good enough?

5 wpm code is like being able to hunt-and-peck type at 10 wpm, not
touch-typing.

>[snip]
>
>> Anyway I want to assure you I that I put thought into the petition and
>> sincerely believe that CW testing for CW privileges was a compromise.
>
>It appears that AH0A either did not read the R&O in 98-143 and the
>denials of the Petitions for Reconsideration that were filed, or he didn't
>understand/accept what the FCC clearly said.

Or maybe he just disagrees. FCC's decisions are simply FCC opinion, not some
form of absolute proof. (Note what has happened to FCC's decision on broadcast
media ownership rules. While something like that won't happen to the amateur
rules, it proves the point).

Of course it's clear from FCC actions that any petition that *increases* testing complexity is going to have a very very small chance of being acted upon by FCC.

73 de Jim, N2EY

748. Re: What makes a Pro code test Amateur a Troglodyte?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-11 17:19:37 UTC
From: groupk0hb@earthlink.net
Message-ID: <5ee63311.0310110919.2e5a7ac8@posting.google.com>
Source record: 80423

"Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote

> And one of the founders of the company, who is a friend and
> colleague of mine now, is a no-code tech (I persuaded him to
> get into ham radio. He has NO interest in Morse, but is a
> hell of a digital modes engineer.)

That's quite a story, Carl, since the company was founded in 1935 by Ralph Allison. That would put Ralph up in his 90's somewhere. Well, it's good to know he's still in engineering and keeping up with the latest trends. Give him best regards from everyone at ADC. We were under the mistaken impression that he had passed on.

73, de Hans, K0HB
--
http://www.adc.com/aboutadc/history/

749. Re: What makes a Pro code test Amateur a Troglodyte?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-11 17:31:57 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031011133157.12962.00000100@mb-m19.aol.com>
Source record: 80424

>Actually, with friends like WA8ULX, the PCTA folks don't need any
>enimies as such personal attacks discredit the PCTA position very well.

And with people like you and Karl, Ham Radio doesnt have a chance to survive.

750. Re: 73 Magazine Says "73 and QRT"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-11 17:57:27 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0310110957.36b3c2d8@posting.google.com>
Source record: 80425
Cross-posted to:
rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

"Capt. Blackflag" <wvay4daves@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:<1065844329.188229@newshost03.voicenet.com>...
> "John Norfolk" <janorfolk@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> news:c6a70d55.0310101532.63b491f3@posting.google.com...
> > From the ARRL Letter October 10:
> >
> > 73 MAGAZINE SAYS "73 AND QRT"
> >
> > After completing 43 years of publication, 73 Amateur Radio Today
> > magazine is calling it quits. Plans to publish a joint
> > October/November issue fell through this week, and the September 2003
> > issue was the magazine's last. According to self-proclaimed "El
> > Supremo and Founder" Wayne S. Green II, W2NSD, it was a simple
> > matter of economics.
>
> And with this very sad announcement, Ham Radio is truly DEAD.
> (well....mabey not, but we've lost a BIG chunk without 73)
>
> Wayne and his magazine was without doubt ham radio's most
> amusing read. His Editorials were always right on target - often
> his prognostications were YEARS ahead of their time.

"Editorials"...?!?! You mean acidic rants, perhaps?

Many of his "prognostications" were echos of professional
engineering journals, presented in such a way as to wow and awe the
Amateur community that otherwise was unaware of those writings.

> I hope he makes an appearance on Art Bell's show to discuss
> the 73 Magazine demise and other commentary soon!

They'd go well together.

> > Green's 73 editorials and regular round of personal appearances
> > originally concentrated on Amateur Radio and his ideas to improve,
> > advance and grow it. In recent years, however, they've veered into
> > conspiracy theories, cures for cancer, AIDS and other ailments and
> > Green's proliferation of book titles on those topics.

Like certain other posters in RRAP, he liked to carry on about
subjects for which he was inadequately informed, prefering to shoot in
the dark, hoping he'd hit something.

> > Green says he'll continue his essays on his Web site
> > http://www.waynegreen.com/ "for those subscribers who mainly
> > bought the magazine for them." He told ARRL that no definite
> > arrangements have been made yet about how to handle outstanding 73
> > subscriptions.

"Essays"...?!?! That's like calling Jeffrey Dahmer's diaries an
"new age surgery text".

> > CQ Publisher Dick Ross, K2MGA, said he takes no joy from the passing
> > of 73. "The loss of any publication serving Amateur Radio leaves all
> > of us a bit poorer," he said. "Thank you, Wayne, for 43
> > entertaining, informative, sometimes infuriating, and always
> > interesting years of 73. We'll genuinely miss it."

Some of us won't.

Steve, K4YZ

751. Re: Isnt it Funny (No-Code HF Privileges)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-11 17:58:49 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0310110958.2b63d767@posting.google.com>
Source record: 80426

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20031010203206.11022.00001324@mb-m14.aol.com>...
> In article <MvGhb.21919$mQ2.17940@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>,
> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> writes:
>
> >As Knute Rockney and Bear Bryant used to say....
> >"The best defense is a good offense"
> >
> >Dan/W4NTI
>
> Okay, consider yourself very offensive.

Ooooops...there's the POT/KETTLE/BLACK syndrome again! Ya gotta
watch what you accuse others of, Lennie, lest it smack YOU in the
face.

Steve, K4YZ

752. Re: Bootlegging in 1948?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-11 18:20:15 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <zRXhb.30527$mQ2.23214@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 80427

"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote:
> "Dwight Stewart" wrote:
> >
> > Since anybody in this country can discuss amateur
> > radio policy (license policy or whatever), I do think
> > a person's communications knowledge and experience
> > elsewhere is at least somewhat relevant to that person's
> > part in that discussion.
>
> In certain technical matters, perhaps. But in the formation
> of policy for the amateur service, why would such
> experience outside amateur radio be more significant than
> another's experience as a radio amateur?

I read back over what I said, and didn't see anything about it being "more
significant."

> Should we ask Howard Stern about amateur radio policy?

And I don't remember saying we should "ask" anybody for anything. Instead,
I said anybody in this country has a say in government policy, including
policy concerning Amateur Radio.

> > Len is obviously interested in Amateur Radio, which
> > is good.
>
> (snip) Do you consider his attitude and behavior towards
> those who disagree with him to be "good"?

Something else I don't remember saying. However, since you seem to want to
discuss Len's attitude and behavior, what exactly are you referring to?
After reading some of the garbage posted by some in this newsgroup, I don't
see anything from him that stands out as particularily extraordinary. Of
course, perhaps you're more sensitive to what he says because it is often
targeted towards those who share your opinions.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

753. Re: 73 Magazine Says "73 and QRT"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-11 18:38:36 UTC
From: et472@FreeNet.Carleton.CA
Message-ID: <bm9incocm1@freenet9.carleton.ca>
Source record: 80428
Cross-posted to:
rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

"Dan/W4NTI" (w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com) writes:
> I remember when Wayne was trying to get rid of the top two megs of 2 meters.
> 146 to 148 Mhz. Because it wasn't being used and served no purpose.
>
> Shortly thereafter FM came along and the 'rest is history'.
>
> I dropped his rag years ago.
>
> Dan/W4NTI
>
I don't think it was Wayne that wanted to recycle the top of 2 meters,
though I think Popular Electronics proposed it in the late sixties.

In the early seventies, Wayne proposed a license that used the top portion
of 220MHz. He proposed that it be an amateur license, but with little or
no exam, but it didn't have much connection with ham radio. He did
claim that 220MHz was underused, and it was a the time, which is why
the EIA wanted the same slice of the spectrum for the "Class E Citizen
Band".

Michael VE2BVW

754. Re: Bootlegging in 1948?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-11 19:07:37 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <ZxYhb.30962$mQ2.29975@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 80429

"Len Over 21" wrote:
> "Dwight Stewart" writes:
> >
> > Since anybody in this country can discuss amateur
> > radio policy (license policy or whatever), I do think
> > a person's communications knowledge and experience
> > elsewhere is at least somewhat relevant to that person's
> > part in that discussion. Why would you think otherwise,
> > Jim? Len is obviously interested in Amateur Radio,
> > which is good. The only thing I don't understand is why
> > he hasn't acted on that interest and gotten some kind of
> > Amateur Radio license over the years.
>
> Why do you insist that getting-a-license is culmination
> of "interest?"
>
> Explain how obtaining an AMATEUR license suddenly
> embues one with spirit and verve and "permission" to
> experiment with RF? Especially when a person is already
> a professional in electronic design engineering who has
> ALREADY been working on "experiments" in RF?

Well, it must be the week to put words into other people's mouths. First Jim and now you, Len. Anyway, I didn't "insist" any such thing. Instead, I simply said I don't understand why you haven't gotten some kind of Amateur Radio license over the years.

> > Since VHF and above is one focus of commercial
> > communications today, one would think the Technician
> > license would have at least some appeal to him.
>
> Dwight, VHF and above was ALREADY a focus of
> commercial communications a half century ago. (snip)

I didn't say it wasn't, Len. Instead, I simply said that this (commercial communications today) might be one reason the Technician license would have at least some appeal to you.

> > This glaring, long term, lack of committment to Amateur
> > Radio is what brings his ongoing participation in this
> > discussion under suspicion.
>
> "Glaring?!?" :-)
>
> I'm just against a morse code test for any radio operator

> license, Dwight.

Your opposition to code is no barrier whatsoever to getting a Technician license, Len.

> (snip) Hey, you don't like some of my comments on the
> code test. So, what else is new? Do you need instant
> adulation for the accomplishments of passing a morse test?
> Special honors? Awards? Sorry, all out.

Well, in this case, the "what else is new" is that you obviously haven't noticed which license I hold. Since I haven't passed a Morse code test, no adulation, honors, or awards, relating to that would be applicable. Further, I don't particularily like or dislike anything you've said about the code test. I've taken no position whatsoever on your comments. I'm opposed to the code test, but that doesn't mean I specifically endorse anything you've said on the subject.

> This newsgroup is public-access, unmoderated. Some
> of what you see may not to be to your liking. (snip)

My, you are reading a lot into what I've said, and getting it all wrong in the process. Absolutely nothing I said had anything whatsoever to do with whether I liked or disliked anything you've said. Take the chip off your shoulder, and re-read what I said, and I think you'll agree with that.

By the way, if you reply, do try to keep it short - I don't have time to respond to a long-winded rant (my only real comment about what you've said).

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

755. Re: What makes a Pro code test Amateur a Troglodyte?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-11 19:35:59 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <zYYhb.31226$mQ2.14572@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 80430

"Mike Coslo" wrote:
>
> (snip) I would challenge the NCTA's to show some
> proof that those who believe that the morse code
> test should be retained are in a technical backwater.

I think you're focusing on the wrong issue, Mike. When discussing the retention of code testing, the real issue is how doing so futhers the basis and purpose of Amateur Radio. The FCC has framed this several times. For example...

"We are persuaded that because the amateur service is fundamentally a technical service, the emphasis on Morse code proficiency as a licensing requirement does not comport with the basis and purpose of the service. We note, moreover, that the design of modern communications systems, including personal communication services, satellite, fiber optic, and high definition television systems, are based on digital communication technologies. We also note that no communication system has been designed in many years that depends on hand-keyed telegraphy or the ability to receive messages in Morse code by ear. In contrast, modern communication systems are designed to be automated systems. Given the changes that have occurred in communications in the last fifty years, we believe that reducing the emphasis on telegraphy proficiency as a licensing requirement will allow the amateur service to, as it has in the past, attract technically inclined persons, particularly the youth of our country, and encourage them to learn and to prepare themselves in the areas where the United States needs expertise." - FCC WT Docket No. 98-143 RM-9148 RM-9150 RM-9196

As you can see, none of this focuses on the individual people opposing or supporting code testing. Instead, it focuses on what furthers the basis and purpose of Amateur Radio. If others focused on the same, there would perhaps be far less hostility in the discussion.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

756. Re: BPL a reality in my area now!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-11 20:30:07 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <jLZhb.573$P%1.510470@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 80432
Cross-posted to: alt.ham-radio,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Ryan, KC8PMX" <REMOVETHISkc8pmx@diamondcs.net> wrote in message
news:bm9o10$kemhq$1@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de...
> Just found out today listening to a local, reputable radio station that
Bay,
> Saginaw and Midland Counties in Michigan are going to be "test sites" for
> BPL, at least for Michigan. I don't know when it will be an actual
reality,
> as opposed to being in the planning stages, but will keep current with
their
> project!
>
>
> Ryan KC8PMX
> Midland, Michigan
>
>

Go to the sites. Check out the interference. If it's as bad as they say, write the local commercial radio stations to say they are being interfered with, write your congressman, and write the FCC.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

757. Re: 73 Magazine Says "73 and QRT"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-11 20:35:54 UTC
From: w2Xup@mindspring.com
Message-ID: <3f8868ae.29472218@news.cis.dfn.de>
Source record: 80433
Cross-posted to:
rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

73 Mag published my one and only article (in the 80s). While it's a shame to see any ham-related business fail, it's not surprising in this case. I had a subscription to 73 this past year (it was actually a mistake. I subscribed to CQ via a subscirption service, and they sent me 73 in error). The articles were of little content and the editorials were pure fantasy and the rants of a madman off his Thorazine.
Barry W2UP
--
Note - Remove the X from my e-mail address for direct replies

758. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-11 20:46:51 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <%_Zhb.32033$mQ2.26094@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 80434

"N2EY" wrote:
> "Dwight Stewart wrote:
> >
> > (snip)
>
> My point is that the whole issue is not a mass movement.
> Clint claimed, without any proof, that most hams want
> code testing gone. Yet surveys show the opposite.

I certainly haven't seen a survey recently that could be said to accurately represents the views of the entire ham radio community, Jim. I believe you recenty posted the results of a survey done by some club that shows the majority surveyed supported code testing. I don't doubt those results at all. If you surveyed the local club here (and their friends outside the club), the majority would also support code testing. Of course, the club members here are fanatics in their support of code testing, even to the point of openingly ridiculing Technicians who attend the meetings. Because of that, few who oppose code testing, and even fewer Technicians, attend that club's meetings or socialize with the members. Find me a survey that is truly unbiased and I'll be glad to discuss the results. Until then, discussing the results of surveys is simply a waste of time.

> > As you well know, NCI is only a tiny part of the overall
> > movement to end code testing - far more outside that
> > organization are involved (including some in this newsgroup
> > you've personally discussed this issue with).
>
> How do we know this?

How do you know what? That you've talked to people in this newsgroup who are not NCI members yet are still opposed to code testing? I suspect the vast majority of those in this newsgroup who oppose code testing are not members of NCI.

> Who are "so many others", Dwight? If they really exist, why
> haven't they signed on to NCI, which costs nothing more than
> a few mouse clicks?

What is it with your obsession with NCI? Are you campaigning for members or something? There is no requirement whatsoever that says those who oppose code testing must join that organization. I haven't joined it. Neither has my wife. In fact, I don't know anyone personally who is opposed to code testing who has joined. Of course, there are many organizations in this country I haven't joined. Therefore, NCI is certainly nothing special in that regard.

> And if it's such a done deal, why didn't FCC just dump Element 1
> back in July?

As you well know, the FCC has rules and regulations to follow, Jim.
Because of that, they can't "just dump" anything. Something will happen
sooner or later. Give it time.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

759. Re: 73 Magazine Says "73 and QRT"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-11 21:36:45 UTC
From: groupk0hb@earthlink.net
Message-ID: <5ee63311.0310111336.660577e7@posting.google.com>
Source record: 80435
Cross-posted to:
rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

"Capt. Blackflag" <wvay4daves@yahoo.com> wrote

> > 73 MAGAZINE SAYS "73 AND QRT"

I'm gonna miss my copy of 73 in the mail each month. Wayne is a genuine American legend. Off the wall, often mistaken, often over the edge, but always stands up for his position regardless of how goofy it seems to the rest of us. I rarely agreed with him, but I always admired his good natured poking at the pompous among us, and his absolute support for the causes which he believed in, regardless how unpopular.

I hope the old rascal figures out a way to start another magazine.

73, de Hans, K0HB

760. Re: What makes a Pro code test Amateur a Troglodyte?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-11 22:43:52 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bma161$cg2@library2.airnews.net>
Source record: 80436

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:7ILhb.25498$mQ2.9966@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
>
> The issue isn't about USE it is about
> the lack of any rational reason to retain code testing as a
> license requirement now that the ITU mandatory code knowledge
> requirment has ended.
>

Therein lies the problem with the whole CW test (TEST, *test*) debate. The minute one takes on the "no" CW test argument, it is generally met with an attitude that an end CW use (USE, *use*) is being favored or called for.

Until, (UNTIL, *until*) it is clearly understood that seeking the end of the CW test is not the equivalent of seeking the end of CW as a mode, this debate will never fall within the realm of "friendly" debate at all. I think it's even hazardous to use the PCTA/NCTA labels.

Kim W5TIT

761. Re: BPL a reality in my area now!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-11 23:12:10 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <e70ib.18049$Eo2.17320@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 80437
Cross-posted to: alt.ham-radio,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:jLZhb.573$P%1.510470@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
>
> "Ryan, KC8PMX" <REMOVETHISkc8pmx@diamondcs.net> wrote in message
> news:bm9o10$kemhq$1@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de...
> > Just found out today listening to a local, reputable radio station that
> Bay,
> > Saginaw and Midland Counties in Michigan are going to be "test sites"
for
> > BPL, at least for Michigan. I don't know when it will be an actual
> reality,
> > as opposed to being in the planning stages, but will keep current with
> their
> > project!
> >
> >
> > Ryan KC8PMX
> > Midland, Michigan
> >
> >
>
> Go to the sites. Check out the interference. If it's as bad as they say,
> write the local commercial radio stations to say they are being interfered
> with, write your congressman, and write the FCC.
>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>

Exactly, must sent in complaints. Or the 'utilities' will say...."we got
very few complaints"

Dan/W4NTI

762. Re: 73 Magazine Says "73 and QRT"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-11 23:19:12 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <Qd0ib.18114$Eo2.2000@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 80438
Cross-posted to:
rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

"Michael Black" <et472@FreeNet.Carleton.CA> wrote in message
news:bm9incocm1@freenet9.carleton.ca...
> "Dan/W4NTI" (w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com) writes:
> > I remember when Wayne was trying to get rid of the top two megs of 2
meters.
> > 146 to 148 Mhz. Because it wasn't being used and served no purpose.
> >
> > Shortly thereafter FM came along and the 'rest is history'.
> >
> > I dropped his rag years ago.
> >
> > Dan/W4NTI
> >
> I don't think it was Wayne that wanted to recycle the top of 2 meters,
> though I think Popular Electronics proposed it in the late sixties.
>
> In the early seventies, Wayne proposed a license that used the top portion
> of 220MHz. He proposed that it be an amateur license, but with little or
> no exam, but it didn't have much connection with ham radio. He did
> claim that 220MHz was underused, and it was a the time, which is why
> the EIA wanted the same slice of the spectrum for the "Class E Citizen
> Band".
>
> Michael VE2BVW
>
>

It was Wayne Green. It was in the early sixties. At least that is where I
read it. I took 73 for two years. Must have been 62-64 or so.

By the time I got back from Asia, 146.94 was 'the' FM spot on the 2 meter
band. About 79 or so.

Dan/W4NTI

763. Re: 73 Magazine Says "73 and QRT"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-11 23:20:32 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <4f0ib.2303$Me6.979@news01.roc.ny>
Source record: 80439
Cross-posted to:
rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

I don't know if that will happen, Hans. I remember 73 (and Hot CoCo) from the early 80s and they were *huge* magazines. Unfortunately, I feel that amateur radio (and cb) are slowly going the way of these newsgroups. More bickering (and nastier) every day. I've had many a chuckle over Wayne's editorials and did subscribe a few years back. 73 had shrunk tremendously and I remember QST as being a bit more rounded back a few decades ago too.

I think I'll agree with you on hoping that Wayne figures a way to start up again. You can bet he isn't gonna roll over and play dead :)

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

"Hans K0HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:5ee63311.0310111336.660577e7@posting.google.com...
> "Capt. Blackflag" <wvay4daves@yahoo.com> wrote
>
> > > 73 MAGAZINE SAYS "73 AND QRT"
>
> I'm gonna miss my copy of 73 in the mail each month. Wayne is a
> genuine American legend. Off the wall, often mistaken, often over the
> edge, but always stands up for his position regardless of how goofy it
> seems to the rest of us. I rarely agreed with him, but I always
> admired his good natured poking at the pompous among us, and his
> absolute support for the causes which he believed in, regardless how
> unpopular.
>
> I hope the old rascal figures out a way to start another magazine.
>
> 73, de Hans, K0HB

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.525 / Virus Database: 322 - Release Date: 10/9/03

764. Re: Isnt it Funny (No-Code HF Privileges)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-11 23:21:24 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <Uf0ib.18136$Eo2.11731@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 80440

"Steve Robeson, K4CAP" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
news:5c01b95b.0310110958.2b63d767@posting.google.com...
> lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20031010203206.11022.00001324@mb-m14.aol.com>...
> > In article <MvGhb.21919$mQ2.17940@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>,
> > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> writes:
> >
> > >As Knute Rockney and Bear Bryant used to say....
> > >"The best defense is a good offense"
> > >
> > >Dan/W4NTI
> >
> > Okay, consider yourself very offensive.
>
> Ooooops...there's the POT/KETTLE/BLACK syndrome again! Ya gotta
> watch what you accuse others of, Lennie, lest it smack YOU in the
> face.
>
> Steve, K4YZ

I think that is Lennies problem. He was smacked in the face by a iron
skillet.

Dan/W4NTI

765. Re: What makes a Pro code test Amateur a Troglodyte?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-11 23:39:20 UTC
From: garigue <garigue@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <Iw0ib.539895$Oz4.443507@rwcrnsc54>
Source record: 80441

> Yes, it is. The image is not complimentary. Would you like the written
tests
> described that way?
>
> So are phrases like
>
> "waste valuable time learning Morse"
> "dinosaur/buggywhip technology"
>
> Would you like your favorite modes described that way?
>
> >You must have
> >REALLY thin skin Hans.
>
> In my experience Hans does not have a 'thin skin' at all.

Hey Jim you forgot the "old manual transmission saw" ....BTW I can't wait for all the leaps and bounds in growth of the service once CW testing is gone. I would venture to say that at least a half a dozen new modes will be created within a few months now that all of those EEs will be "activated". I would even say that I would have to eat crow as no doubt within 1 year a mode will be discovered that "will always get through". On the serious side ...I feel a bit sad that people, for whatever reason, won't get to enjoy an "avocal" means of communication utilizing the computer that the we all have.

73 God Bless Tom Popovic KI3R Belle Vernon PA

766. Re: What makes a Pro code test Amateur a Troglodyte?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-12 00:00:04 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <REMOVETHISkc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <bmb7un$jr72a$2@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 80387

Remember Bill..... The P in PCTA could also stand for the word POST as well!!!! :)

Ryan

> Actually, with friends like WA8ULX, the PCTA folks don't need any
> enimies as such personal attacks discredit the PCTA position very well.
>
> The reality is that personal attacks rather than comments
> (acrimonius or not) about morse or any other mode are significantly
> different. If I consider FORDS to be a crap automobile, that
> is considerably different than calling FORD OWNERS "knuckle
> draggers".
>
> Cheers,
> Bill K2UNK
>
>
>
>
>

767. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-12 00:04:15 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <REMOVETHISkc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <bmb7uo$jr72a$3@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 80388

"Clint" <rattlehead at computron dot net> wrote in message
news:voe8l6ntibluf8@corp.supernews.com...
>
> > Unless you are putting more into what was typed or seeing it completely
> > different, no, I didn't admit more than what I wanted to.....
> >
> > People in the teen age groups are still forming their identities and
> > becoming what they might be for the rest of their lives typically. If
you
> > have differences with the word "moldable," then that is your problem.
> > Influenced maybe a better word then??
> >
> > Ryan, KC8PMX
> >
>
> I wasn't argueing about the definition of the term "moldable", really...
and
> actually influenced would be a bit less condescending and not give you
> such an appearance of wanting to be dictatorial... I was putting more
> emphasis on the part that said "..into the hams that *we* want them to
> be."

The "type of hams we want them to be" I guess woud be different for
different groups, but in general, rule-abiding and professional/courteous in
operation to be a positive representation of us all licensees.

>
> ...heh, and people a while back took exception to my use of the term
> "jack booted CW nazis".
>

Gee.... ya think?? I love "shock value" even if I don't really believe in
whatever is the "shock."

Ryan

768. Re: BPL a reality in my area now!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-12 00:32:05 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <9i1ib.2314$_%6.1676@news01.roc.ny>
Source record: 80442
Cross-posted to: alt.ham-radio,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Exactly. Also, don't just complain to the utilities as they will still deny getting complaints. I wonder if they are hiring any of the lawyers from the tobacco companies LOL

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message news:e70ib.18049$Eo2.17320@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net...
>
> "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
> news:jLZhb.573$P%1.510470@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
> >
> > "Ryan, KC8PMX" <REMOVETHISkc8pmx@diamondcs.net> wrote in message
> > news:bm9o10$kemhq$1@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de...
> > > Just found out today listening to a local, reputable radio station that
> > Bay,
> > > Saginaw and Midland Counties in Michigan are going to be "test sites"
> for
> > > BPL, at least for Michigan. I don't know when it will be an actual
> > reality,
> > > as opposed to being in the planning stages, but will keep current with
> > their
> > > project!
> > >
> > >
> > > Ryan KC8PMX
> > > Midland, Michigan
> > >
> > >
> >
> > Go to the sites. Check out the interference. If it's as bad as they say,
> > write the local commercial radio stations to say they are being interfered
> > with, write your congressman, and write the FCC.
> >
> > Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
> >
>
> Exactly, must sent in complaints. Or the 'utilities' will say...."we got
> very few complaints"
>

> Dan/W4NTI
>
>

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.525 / Virus Database: 322 - Release Date: 10/9/03

769. Re: BPL and the New World Order

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-12 00:48:49 UTC
From: Ron <rnhar@visi.com>
Message-ID: <Rx1ib.96963$%h1.95077@sccrnsc02>
Source record: 80443
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors

You poor miserable bastard! It's a shame you can't see past the end of your nose! God help us all.

"Nomen Nescio" <nobody@dizum.com> wrote in message news:7e1ae8b670242db6e1961fab31a93bec@dizum.com...
>
> -----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
> Hash: SHA1
>
>
>
> The debate on BPL has raised a lot of important issues, and has
>
> also generated a lot of comments by Internauts both with and without
>
> ham licenses. Here's my opinion, FWIW.
>
>
>
> It's not so simple as writing a check, but the FCC *is* being
>
> manipulated by very powerful interests, and they're in a hurry. Not
>
> only are they powerful because they have immense wealth, but they're
>
> all the more powerful because they know that "Shrub" has presented
>
> them an opportunity which won't come again in their life, and they are
>
> determined to take every advantage of it in the short time left before
>
> their pet goes back to his animal farm.
>
>
>
> Bear with me for a moment: I'm moved to step back and take a look from
>
> a wider view -
>
>
>
> The most important thing that the Bush administration brought to
>

> Washington is the belief, now widely held in the corporate boardrooms,
>
> that rich people are entitled to enjoy robbing those less ruthless or
>
> lucky. Lobbyists for both liberal and conservative causes have
>
> complained bitterly about the arrogance and greed that the Republican
>
> administration has allowed to fester inside the beltway: there is no
>
> longer even the appearance of democracy, and it's starting to strain
>
> the credulity of even so staunch a GOP stronghold as the religious
>
> right.
>
>
>
> - From Reagan's somnambulance, through the elder Bush's first term, and
>
> continuing with the "Right Wing Revival" during the Clinton
>
> administration, up to our current economic mess, the Republican Party
>
> has been courting those with money by placing a rose between its teeth
>
> and a pistol in its pocket. The elder Bush and Newt Gingrich were, and
>
> their heirs are now, brazen and unashamed pimps for the idea that
>
> those that have shall get, and those that don't shall get screwed.
>
>
>
> No sooner had they gained power in the House, then the GOP started to
>
> undo (and in a way that was very hard to reverse) every law, program,
>
> entitlement, and court decision which gave ordinary people a chance of
>
> living with a (little) dignity.
>
>
>
> By the way, Newt wasn't just talking about the New Deal when he said
>
> "The great social experiment has failed" - he was talking about
>
> undoing centuries of progress, not just decades. The fact that his
>

> personal life was too personal for the spinmeisters to hide hasn't
>
> dimmed his enthusiasm for the good 'ol days: the theme of his book
>
> "Gettysburg", an fictional alternative-history of the battle, reveals
>
> an attitude that even Publishers Weekly commented on -
>
>
>
> "The authors show thorough knowledge of the people, weapons,
>
> tactics and ambience of the Civil War, though their portrayals of
>
> historical figures like Lee, Meade, James Longstreet and Richard
>
> Ewell betray a certain bias (the Confederate men are noble and
>
> wise, the Union leaders hot-tempered and vindictive)."
>
>
>
>
>
> In the "new" Republican view, it's not enough to move your business'
>
> assets overseas, or to "outsource" your back office tasks to
>
> third-world countries. It's not enough to (once again) utilize the
>
> dark-skinned to provide a lifestyle Nero would envy: the Old Elite
>
> feels it must squeeze the middle class until everyone with less than
>
> $1,000,000 of ready cash is living on rented land in a rented tent,
>
> owning nothing but a TV set so that The Massa can tell them how to
>
> vote.
>
>
>
> But I digress: lets stop looking at the forest and go back to pecking
>
> at the BPL tree -
>
>
>
> Frankly, if I was one of the old white men who run America, I'd be
>

> hard-pressed to find a downside in BPL. Consider:
>
>
>
> 1. The Air Traffic Control radio system has needed a major overhaul
>
> for decades, and BPL will provide the FAA with a perfect reason to
>
> spend Billions to trade-in every navigational aid and radio in the
>
> country, because BPL operates on some of the same frequencies and
>
> will rendor most of the others unusable. Of course, the planes will
>
> have to upgrade as well, but airplane owners, as a class, have
>
> plenty of spare cash, and the fact that every other country and
>
> every other airline in the world will be forced to go along is just
>
> one of those "intangible benefits" that those with a certain
>
> lifestyle expect.
>
>
>
> By the way, there will be a few dead, burnt bodies lying around
>
> while the FAA sells its new system to the Congress, but even that
>
> smell can't overpower the ordure of the Potomac at low tide, so
>
> you'd better get used to riding in the back of the airbus, paying
>
> more for tickets and maybe even thinking of flight insurance as a
>
> sensible precaution.
>
>
>
> 2. The power companies, made stodgy and unprofitable by such quant
>
> words as "service" and "obligation" and "customer", will enjoy a
>
> dramatic influx of badly-needed cash, which will arrive just in
>
> time to save them from having to admit their mistakes, reengineer
>
> their transmission systems, or (most importantly) actually work at
>

> alternative and/or renewable energy sources.
>
>
>
> 3. If they design the system well, BPL will enjoy a wealth of new
>
> options that even cable moguls don't have: a priceless data
>
> coral, with well-penned users whose choices will be limited to
>
> those favored by like-thinking men of means: every click will be
>
> tracked, every purchase planned, and every complaint laughed
>
> off. There won't be any "spam", since there won't be any
>
> advertising allowed into the system that the upper crust didn't
>
> choose to allow, and those whom exhibit anti-American sentiments or
>
> question the wisdom of Those In Charge [tm] will soon find that
>
> everything they ever put into an email is available to their boss
>
> in an electronic blacklist.
>
>
>
> Of course, any slander or complaints about these common-sense
>
> capitalist perquisites would be nipped in the bud, and the system
>
> will Protect Our Children [tm] by guiding their tiny minds into
>
> well-mapped impressions of the hard, hard life that the rich must
>
> suffer in order to provide the servants with the benefits we should
>
> be grateful we're able to beg for.
>
>
>
> BPL is, as its advocates have explained, needed to counterbalance the
>
> critical shortage of war movies and of Father Knows Best reruns: it
>
> will put those airwaves that have been wasted on other nations'
>
> viewpoints and a few hobbyists' toys to more productive use. Your
>

> Betters have said so, and now if you're a Right-Thinking American, you
>
> will stop whining.
>
>
>
> James Penn
>
>
>
>
>
> -----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
> Version: GnuPG v1.0.7 (GNU/Linux)
>
> iD8DBQE/d4LrRqMr0Iv3YZURAtVIAJ0aCNGbIMeuQ5pxzzTEjRPZIByJOgCeIYwX
> oF2xbszlP82532Ib0BoGVx4=
> =zkRh
> -----END PGP SIGNATURE-----
>

770. Re: 73 Magazine Says "73 and QRT"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-12 00:52:50 UTC
From: et472@FreeNet.Carleton.CA
Message-ID: <bma8l2$f4t$1@freenet9.carleton.ca>
Source record: 80444
Cross-posted to:
rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

"Jim Hampton" (aa2qa@frontiernet.net) writes:
> I don't know if that will happen, Hans. I remember 73 (and Hot CoCo) from
> the early 80s and they were *huge* magazines. Unfortunately, I feel that
> amateur radio (and cb) are slowly going the way of these newsgroups. More
> bickering (and nastier) every day. I've had many a chuckle over Wayne's
> editorials and did subscribe a few years back. 73 had shrunk tremendously
> and I remember QST as being a bit more rounded back a few decades ago too.
>
> I think I'll agree with you on hoping that Wayne figures a way to start up
> again. You can bet he isn't gonna roll over and play dead :)
>
> 73 from Rochester, NY
> Jim AA2QA
>
It's not going to happen, this has nothing to do with money.

Maybe Wayne frittered it away, but twice he sold off magazines and
got a lot for them. Twenty years ago, he sold the computer magazines
and 73 to IDG, and became a millionare. He later sold his CD magazine.
Unless it was all spent, some late payments would not stop the magazine.

Wayne is over eighty. The magazine has been in decline for some years.
They cut back circulation some years back, too. I enjoyed reading what
Wayne had to say, until the past decade or so, when he was repeating
himself and getting into weird areas, like "the moon landing was a hoax"
and all the junk medicine stuff. I think that sent a fair number of readers
away, when his previous "muckraking" did not. The last time I saw the
magazine, it was arriving on the newsstand sporadically, it had
gotten pretty thin, there were a lot of blatant errors, a lot of the old
authors were no longer around, and there wasn't much of interest there.

If the magazine had been in good shape, he wouldn't have made the decision
to stop publishing. A little glitch, and he's had them over the years,
would not stop Wayne Green. But there isn't anything there to salvage.

Michael VE2BVW

> "Hans K0HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
wrote in message > news:5ee63311.0310111336.660577e7@posting.google.com...
>> "Capt. Blackflag" <wvay4daves@yahoo.com> wrote
>>
>> > > 73 MAGAZINE SAYS "73 AND QRT"
>>
>> I'm gonna miss my copy of 73 in the mail each month. Wayne is a

>> genuine American legend. Off the wall, often mistaken, often over the
>> edge, but always stands up for his position regardless of how goofy it
>> seems to the rest of us. I rarely agreed with him, but I always
>> admired his good natured poking at the pompous among us, and his
>> absolute support for the causes which he believed in, regardless how
>> unpopular.
>>
>> I hope the old rascal figures out a way to start another magazine.
>>
>> 73, de Hans, K0HB
>
>
> ---
> Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
> Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
> Version: 6.0.525 / Virus Database: 322 - Release Date: 10/9/03
>
>

771. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-12 01:21:51 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3F88ACAC.6030700@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 80445

N2EY wrote:

>In article <3F84B6F7.20507@ix.netcom.com>, Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
>writes:
>
>
>
>>There should be some sort of beginner's license that an average 14 year
>>old honor roll student can get
>>
>>
>
>That would require an extensive reworking of the current tests. We've got at
>least one 6 year old General and an 8 year old passed the old Extra.
>
>
>
I mean "average honor roll high school student", not "Einstein's
grandson". Also
I mention the honor roll student in the sense that Beavis and Butthead
would not be
able to pass the license tests. If Beavis did get a license, then ham
radio would
sound like the old 147.435 machine on L.A..... W6NUT IIRC

>
>

772. Re: BPL a reality in my area now!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-12 01:34:02 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3F88AF87.9060008@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 80446
Cross-posted to: alt.ham-radio,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Jim Hampton wrote:

>Exactly. Also, don't just complain to the utilities as they will still deny
>getting complaints. I wonder if they are hiring any of the lawyers from the
>tobacco companies LOL
>
>
>
>
A CC list for complaints:

*Utility company
*FCC (radio, telecom, and cable depts)
*ARRL
*your congresscritter
*your senator
*your state's PUC (public utilitues commission)
*The senators or congressmen who fund the FCC
*Various broadcasters, particularly those on TV
channels 2, 3, 4 (as these are below 80MHz, the
high end of BPL). Also any shortwave broadcasters
in the USA except VOA (they are not allowed to care
about reception inside the USA).
*NTIA (who we share the 5MHz band with).

773. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-12 01:42:28 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031011214228.06226.00000924@mb-m19.aol.com>
Source record: 80448

In article <%_Zhb.32033$mQ2.26094@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> writes:

>"N2EY" wrote:
>> "Dwight Stewart wrote:
>> >
>> > (snip)
>>
>> My point is that the whole issue is not a mass movement.
>> Clint claimed, without any proof, that most hams want
>> code testing gone. Yet surveys show the opposite.
>
> I certainly haven't seen a survey recently that could be said to
>accurately represents the views of the entire ham radio community, Jim.

Neither have I, Dwight. As I have pointed out, the ARRL/READEX survey is 7 years old. But it's the most recent *scientific* survey we have. (Its 1500 respondents were chosen at random, not self-selected as is the case in many "surveys".)

> I
>believe you recenty posted the results of a survey done by some club that
>shows the majority surveyed supported code testing.

Not "some club". ARRL hired READEX (a professional survey organization) to conduct the survey in preparation for WRC 1997.

>I don't doubt those
>results at all. If you surveyed the local club here (and their friends
>outside the club), the majority would also support code testing.

The ARRL/READEX survey sampled the entire country and all license classes and age groups. Surveying club members doesn't.

>Of course,
>the club members here are fanatics in their support of code testing, even to
>the point of openingly ridiculing Technicians who attend the meetings.

That sort of behavior is unacceptable. Not "real ham" behavior.

>Because of that, few who oppose code testing, and even fewer Technicians,
>attend that club's meetings or socialize with the members. Find me a survey
>that is truly unbiased and I'll be glad to discuss the results. Until then,
>discussing the results of surveys is simply a waste of time.

Then consider the comments to the restructuring NPRM.
>

>> > As you well know, NCI is only a tiny part of the overall
>> > movement to end code testing - far more outside that
>> > organization are involved (including some in this newsgroup
>> > you've personally discussed this issue with).
>>
>> How do we know this?
>
> How do you know what?

How do we know that there are "far more outside that organization..involved"?

I see the same small number of people in this newsgroup, at qrz.com, eham, etc.

>That you've talked to people in this newsgroup who

>are not NCI members yet are still opposed to code testing? I suspect the
>vast majority of those in this newsgroup who oppose code testing are not
>members of NCI.

Most of those opposed to code testing I have encountered here *are* members of NCI. But there are really not that many on either side who post here. How many different people have posted to rrap in the past year?
>
>> Who are "so many others", Dwight? If they really exist, why
>> haven't they signed on to NCI, which costs nothing more than
>> a few mouse clicks?
>
> What is it with your obsession with NCI?

No "onsession" at all. I'm just curious as to why someone who felt strongly or even mildly that code testing should go would *not* join that organization. Particularly given the ease of doing so. And particularly given the fact that if the membership numbers got big enough, a majority could be claimed based on those numbers alone.

>Are you campaigning for members
>or something?

Just the opposite ;-)

>There is no requirement whatsoever that says those who oppose
>code testing must join that organization. I haven't joined it. Neither has
>my wife. In fact, I don't know anyone personally who is opposed to code
>testing who has joined. Of course, there are many organizations in this
>country I haven't joined. Therefore, NCI is certainly nothing special in
>that regard.

That says nothing about how many actually are opposed or support code testing.

>> And if it's such a done deal, why didn't FCC just dump Element 1
>> back in July?
>
> As you well know, the FCC has rules and regulations to follow, Jim.
>Because of that, they can't "just dump" anything.

That's not what Phil Kane says. A complete NPRM cycle is not required for every rules change. Particularly when the change is characterized as "removing a burden"

It's also what both the NCI and NCVEC petitions say. Both of them contend that FCC has the authority to just remove Element 1 immediately, and ask FCC to do so. Are they mistaken?

>Something will happen sooner or later. Give it time.

Something always happens, given enough time.

73 de Jim, N2EY

774. Re: What makes a Pro code test Amateur a Troglodyte?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-12 01:42:29 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031011214229.06226.00000925@mb-m19.aol.com>
Source record: 80352

In article <nisdov0duc0ipm9likrr73not53jvvq728@4ax.com>, Leo <nomail@nope.org>
writes:

>An excellent idea. I for one would be very interested in seeing the
>logic and rationale that folks have for keeping or retiring the code
>test. By removing the emotion, personal opinion and bias from the
>discussion, some quite interesting points may well be raised.

Unfortunately, it is pretty much impossible to remove personal opinion from the
discussion. That's because every reason for keeping or removing the test
ultimately comes down to an opinion question.

For example, take the "Morse is needed for emergencies" reason.

On the one hand, Morse is not used very much in emergency communication. On the
other hand, it *is* still used occasionally, by hams, in emergency
communications. More important, there *are* times when it when it is the only
available mode that would get through in the situation.
(Note that phrase "only available mode")

All of the above are documented facts.

The problem is, does the occasional use of Morse in emergencies mean that *all*
hams *must* be tested on the mode? Some say yes, some say no, some say it's a
piece of the reason. All based on personal opinion, nothing more.

Boil down any of the arguments on either side, and what you wind up with is
personal opinion.

73 de Jim, N2EY

775. Re: What makes a Pro code test Amateur a Troglodyte?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-12 01:42:29 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031011214229.06226.00000926@mb-m19.aol.com>
Source record: 80450

In article <KXUhb.28192$mQ2.8155@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Bill Sohl"
<billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:

>"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20031011103016.09377.00000076@mb-m27.aol.com...
>> >no-coders are reluctant to subject themselves to being called
>> >'knuckle-draggers" and "cb-plussers"???
>>
>> Whats the problem Karl, does the truth HURT?
>
>Actually, with friends like WA8ULX,

I don't think Bruce is a friend of either side. Or ham radio, for that matter.

>the PCTA folks don't need any
>enimies as such personal attacks discredit the PCTA position very well.

If that's true, do the personal attacks by others discredit the NCTA position?

Fact is, Bruce discredits only himself.
>
>The reality is that personal attacks rather than comments
>(acrimonius or not) about morse or any other mode are significantly
>different. If I consider FORDS to be a crap automobile, that
>is considerably different than calling FORD OWNERS "knuckle
>draggers".

Sure.

73 de Jim, N2EY

776. Re: What makes a Pro code test Amateur a Troglodyte?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-12 01:42:31 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031011214231.06226.00000927@mb-m19.aol.com>
Source record: 80351

In article <wSUhb.28048$mQ2.26393@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20031011102951.28496.00001225@mb-m18.aol.com...
>> In article <3ZShb.672$_i.57821@nnrp1.ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
>> <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:
>>
>> >"Hans K0HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
>> >news:5ee63311.0310101943.3e27f31e@posting.google.com...
>> >> "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote:
>> >>
>> >> > I think I've taken the high ground
>> >>
>> >> Carl, with all due respect, using abrasive and derisive terms like
>> >> "jumping through hoops" is not "the high ground". It is your same old
>> >> baiting and condescending rhetoric, seemingly calculated to be
>> >> inflamatory and divisive.
>> >
>> >"jumping through hoops" is "abrasive and drisive" ???
>>
>> Yes, it is. The image is not complimentary. Would you like the written
>tests
>> described that way?
>>
>> So are phrases like
>>
>> "waste valuable time learning Morse"
>
>I consider my time a very valuable resource as do many others.

Everyone's time is valuable, not just RF engineers'

>Wy is a comment which describes time wwasted by people who
>don't wish to expend it learning morse considered uncomplimentary?

It says that learning the mode is a waste of time.

What is wrong with saying:

"I don't want to *spend* the time necessary to learn...."
>
>> "dinosaur/buggywhip technology"
>
>Me thinks as the end approaches...the PCTA side is grasping
>at straws. I suggest not playing in the political arena of change if

>such phraseology offends.

Are you saying I should simply shut up and go away? That's not like you at all, Bill.

Carl claimed he had "taken the high ground". And for the most part of that post, he did. But he did let a few derogatory phrases slip in.

Hans, K0HB also took note of them, and Hans is definitely not a 'PCTA grasping at straws'.
>
>> Would you like your favorite modes described that way?
>
>Sure wouldn't bother me. But then I've learned to disregard
>most rheteroic anyway. 12 years as an elected official teaches
>one to accept the heat or get out-of-the-kitchen.
>
I thought the point of this thread was to avoid the 'heat'.

73 de Jim, N2EY

777. Re: What makes a Pro code test Amateur a Troglodyte?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-12 01:42:31 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031011214231.06226.00000928@mb-m19.aol.com>
Source record: 80449

In article <Iw0ib.539895$Oz4.443507@rwcrnsc54>, "garigue" <garigue@comcast.net>
writes:

>> Yes, it is. The image is not complimentary. Would you like the written
>tests
>> described that way?
>>
>> So are phrases like
>>
>> "waste valuable time learning Morse"
>> "dinosaur/buggywhip technology"
>>
>> Would you like your favorite modes described that way?
>>
>> >You must have
>> >REALLY thin skin Hans.
>>
>> In my experience Hans does not have a 'thin skin' at all.
>
>
>Hey Jim you forgot the "old manual transmission saw" ...

Not sure what you mean. In every state I know of, there's no test or
restriction on manuals vs. automatics unless someone is clearly unable to drive
a manual.

>BTW I can't wait
>for all the leaps and bounds in growth of the service once CW testing is
>gone. I would venture to say that at least a half a dozen new modes will be
>created within a few months now that all of those EEs will be "activated".

I'm an EE.

>I would even say that I would have to eat crow as no doubt within 1 year a
>mode will be discovered that "will always get through".

No mode always gets through. Some modes, however, get through when some other
modes don't.

73 de Jim, N2EY

778. Re: What makes a Pro code test Amateur a Troglodyte?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-12 01:42:32 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031011214232.06226.00000929@mb-m19.aol.com>
Source record: 80353

In article <bma161$cg2@library2.airnews.net>, "Kim" <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
writes:

>"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
>news:7ILhb.25498$mQ2.9966@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
>>
>> The issue isn't about USE it is about
>> the lack of any rational reason to retain code testing as a
>> license requirement now that the ITU mandatory code knowledge
>> requirment has ended.
>>
>
>Therein lies the problem with the whole CW test (TEST, *test*) debate. The
>minute one takes on the "no" CW test argument, it is generally met with an
>attitude that an end CW use (USE, *use*) is being favored or called for.

Not that I have observed, Kim.

But can you accurately say that *no one* wants to end Morse use?
>
>Until, (UNTIL, *until*) it is clearly understood that seeking the end of the
>CW test is not the equivalent of seeking the end of CW as a mode, this
>debate will never fall within the realm of "friendly" debate at all. I
>think it's even hazardous to use the PCTA/NCTA labels.

One of the problems is that some folks aren't clear that it is only the *test*
they are against.

73 de Jim, N2EY

779. Re: BPL a reality in my area now!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-12 01:42:33 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031011214233.06226.00000930@mb-m19.aol.com>
Source record: 80447

In article <bm9o10$kemhq$1@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>, "Ryan, KC8PMX" <REMOVETHISkc8pmx@diamondcs.net> writes:

>Just found out today listening to a local, reputable radio station that Bay, >Saginaw and Midland Counties in Michigan are going to be "test sites" for >BPL, at least for Michigan. I don't know when it will be an actual reality, >as opposed to being in the planning stages, but will keep current with their >project!

Ryan,

If you have a 6 meter rig that can go mobile, you're set up to measure/observe (and report) BPL interference.

73 de Jim, N2EY

780. Re: BPL a reality in my area now!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-12 01:55:13 UTC
From: CW <clinton.magers@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <5w2ib.452437$2x.166730@rwcrnsc52.ops.asp.att.net>
Source record: 80354
Cross-posted to: alt.ham-radio,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
news:3F88AF87.9060008@ix.netcom.com...
> *your state's PUC (public utilitues commission)

It's PUD around here.

> Also any shortwave broadcasters
> in the USA except VOA (they are not allowed to care
> about reception inside the USA).

Neither are any of them.

781. Re: 73 Magazine Says "73 and QRT"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-12 02:01:23 UTC
From: unkadean <>
Message-ID: <hddhovol97s8v657k27i7o736gkf6v8ge3@4ax.com>
Source record: 80355
Cross-posted to:
rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

On 12 Oct 2003 00:52:50 GMT, et472@FreeNet.Carleton.CA (Michael Black)
wrote:

>It's not going to happen, this has nothing to do with money.
>
>Maybe Wayne frittered it away, but twice he sold off magazines and
>got a lot for them. Twenty years ago, he sold the computer magazines
>and 73 to IDG, and became a millionare. He later sold his CD magazine.
>Unless it was all spent, some late payments would not stop the magazine.
>
>Wayne is over eighty. The magazine has been in decline for some years.
>They cut back circulation some years back, too. I enjoyed reading what
>Wayne had to say, until the past decade or so, when he was repeating
>himself and getting into weird areas, like "the moon landing was a hoax"
>and all the junk medicine stuff. I think that sent a fair number of readers
>away, when his previous "muckraking" did not. The last time I saw the
>magazine, it was arriving on the newsstand sporadically, it had
>gotten pretty thin, there were a lot of blatant errors, a lot of the old
>authors were no longer around, and there wasn't much of interest there.
>
>If the magazine had been in good shape, he wouldn't have made the decision
>to stop publishing. A little glitch, and he's had them over the years,
>would not stop Wayne Green. But there isn't anything there to salvage.
>
> Michael VE2BVW
>

As I recall, the former Mrs. Wayne got most everything from Byte, etc.

unk

782. Re: What makes a Pro code test Amateur a Troglodyte?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-12 02:02:14 UTC
From: groupk0hb@earthlink.net
Message-ID: <5ee63311.0310111802.6595fc1f@posting.google.com>
Source record: 80356

"Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote

> And one of the founders of the company, who is a friend and
> colleague of mine now, is a no-code tech (I persuaded him to
> get into ham radio. He has NO interest in Morse, but is a
> hell of a digital modes engineer.)

That's quite a story, Carl, since the company was founded in 1935 by Ralph Allison. That would put Ralph up in his 90's somewhere. Well, it's good to know he's still in engineering and keeping up with the latest trends. Give him best regards from everyone at ADC. We were under the mistaken impression that he had passed on.

73, de Hans, K0HB
--
http://www.adc.com/aboutadc/history/

783. Amateur Radio Newsline™ Report 1365 – October 10 2003

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-12 02:22:48 UTC
From: radionews@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031011222248.08032.00000568@mb-m11.aol.com>
Source record: 80357

Amateur Radio Newsline™ Report 1365 – October 10 2003

Amateur Radio Newsline report number 1365 with a release date of Friday, October 10th 2003 to follow in 5-4-3-2-1.

The following is a Q-S-T.

Deciding the future of ham radio was not an easy task in Geneva and the problem of Broadband over Powelines continues to grow world-wide. Find out the details on Amateur Radio Newsline report number 1365 coming your way right now.

(Billboard Cart Here)

**

IARU: HOW RADIO REVISIONS CAME TO PASS

The word is out. Some of those who attended last springs World Radiocommunications Conference in Geneva Switzerland are now saying it was not all that easy to reach decisions. Q-News Graham Kemp, VK4BB, has the rest of the story:

--

Just now some of the background work done at WRC-03 is coming to light. The work was intensive. The main conference hall had over 1500 seats, simultaneous translation in 7 languages often more than 10 meetings going on at the same time, distributed in three adjacent buildings.

Some meetings went on till the wee hours of the morning and resumed at the usual time the next morning!

The growing number of completely new radio services clamouring for spectrum allocation, such as for example space borne radars for terrestrial observation, high altitude platforms together with the ever increasing number of new ITU Member States with active participation made the deliberations that much more difficult.

For Q-News Australia, I’m Graham Kemp. VK4BB, reporting for the Amateur Radio Newsline.

--

It was the decisions made at this conference that lead some nations to abandon C-W testing of radio amateurs and also spur the ongoing, world-wide Morse code debate. (Q-News)

**

RADIO LAW: BPL BECOMMING A HOT ISSUE WORLD-WIDE

Meantime, down here in Kiwi-Land as well as around the world, the debate is heating up over Broadband Over Powerline or BPL as its called in North America. This is the technology that claims to provide broadband high-speed Internet services using domestic power lines for system wide transmission and Internet connectivity.

For those not aware, BPL works by injecting the data signal into the powerline near the electricic substation and it travels along the line to the user. In some proposed systems, it interconnects cities using existing long distance power distribution grids.

The problem, of course, is that powerlines are not radio frequency cables. They are not shielded and leak RF energy causing a level of wideband noise in the vicinity of the cable. And as tests conducted by the ARRL have graphically proven, powerlines radiate for long distances.

AC powerlines are a very noisy transmission medium, with spikes and other noise. To make it work, BPL operators have to use higher injection powers to get their data signals to propagate along the cable. Higher injection power mean higher emissions, and this is bad news for all High Frequency radio operators.

By way of example, current proposals in Europe would raise the level of the background noise level on H-F by some 60-70 dB within 3 meters of the cable. Further away, the rise would be less, but still considerable.

Because of this, Broadband Over Powerlines poses a threat not only to amateur radio. Users of many low power devices such as security systems that tag products in shops are very concerned. And High Frequency broadcasters world-wide are fighting to support sensible emission limits for powerline breoadband communications.

But that’s not where it ends. In many places security services are worried. Unfortunately, in some countries, government departments involved in security have been told to not object to BPL as the government policy is to support it.

Civil Aviation communication and aero-navigation can be threatened by BPL. There are reports of an air accident in Canada being directly attributable to interference from broadband cable systems.

And this is only the beginning. New plans for BPL will attempt to use much higher frequencies which could immediately pose a threat to some nations emergency service communications. This is an extremely serious issue for amateur radio world-wide and for other users of the High Frequency spectrum as well. (NZART)

**

RADIO AIDS: NOAA PROPAGATION SERVICE TO GO QRT

Amateurs around the globe may soon loose the propagation information system operated by the United States National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. This includes real time data on the state of the interaction of the earth's

magnetosphere with the solar wind and state of the earth's magnetic field.

These tools have been invaluable to ham radio operators world-wide for many years. The reasons it may be going away? Budgetary cutbacks and lack of future funding. (Published news reports)

**

Break 1

From the United States of America, We are the Amateur Radio Newsline, heard on bulletin stations around the world including the Xerox Amateur Radio Clubs WD6CZH repeater serving Los Angeles from El Segundo California.

(5 sec pause here)

**

ENFORCENMENT: HAM REPEATERS ARE NOT FOR BUSINESS

Back in the United States, the FCC has written to a Lakewood New Jersey to ask him why a repeater bearing his his call sign is being used as an adjunct to a business band radio system. The FCC’s Daryl Duckworth, NN0W explains:

--

Duckworth: “Martin Gross, N2DCG, of Lakewod New Jersey, has 20 days to reply to an inquirey about a repeater on 448.825/443.825 MHz and is used as an adjunct to WNVF 627, a business radio system for the Hatzolah Emergency Medical Services, rather than for Amateur Radio purposes as set forth in Section 97.1 of the Commission’s rules.”

--

In a September 11th letter, the FCC notes that Gross’s repeater is not coordinated. (FCC)

**

AT THE FCC: THE FCC's MASTER SEARCH ENGINE

The CGC Communicator reports that there is an obscure but very important search engine at the FCC website. One that allows you to comb through most of the Commission's licensing systems for specific information.

According to CGC, member databases include Universal Licensing System, Experimental, Cable Operations, Mass Media and International Bureau. Queries can be set up by frequency range, state, county, location call sign and licensee name. More information is in the cyperspace address found at http://gullfoss2.fcc.gov/reports/index.cfm or the backup site at http://svartifoss2.fcc.gov/reports/index.cfm (CGC)

**

RADIO LAW: CABLE TOLD TO SOLVE ITS OWN PROBLEMS

FCC Chairman Michael Powell has told the cable industry that it needs to work out its own problems before appealing to regulators for remedies. At a recent appearance at the annual cable sector conference Powell highlighted issues that have driven a wedge between cable companies and local broadcasters. Specifically, the rules that dictate what over the air channels cable outlets must carry on their systems.

Currently, cable companies are required by law to carry local broadcast channels. But broadcasters are also hoping regulators will eventually force cable companies to carry both digital and analog signals during the broadcasters' transition period to all digital transmission. But cable companies argue that if they were forced to carry both a broadcaster's regular analog signal and digital signals, it would significantly deplete their capacity to air other channels. (Published reports)

**

RESCUE RADIO: ORGANIZING 60 METERS IN VA

Bringing emergency communications to 60 meters is the theme of a new net organized by Virginia RACES, Inc. This, by providing a twice monthly opportunity for equipment tests in the new spectrum asllocation.

The Mid-Atlantic Emergency Net began opeeration on October 1st. It now takes place the first and third Wednesdays of every month at 2000 hours Eastern Time on 5330.5 using upper sideband.

All ARES, RACES and other emergency communications organizations within reliable communication range of the net are encouraged to participate. Liaisons are also invited with similar groups in neighboring states. (Via e-mail)

**

GETTING YOUR E-MAIL: AOL BLOCKS QRZ.COM

If you use America Online as an internet service provider and are waiting for e-mail or a password from QRZ.com, this is for you. A-O-L has decided to unilaterally block delivery QRZ.com e-mails unless a specific A-O-L user goes to the trouble of unblocking his or her own account.

According to QRZ, they have been getting up to 50 emails a week from America Online users who have not received their QRZ passwords or Links. QRZ advises that it is A-O-L and not them that has placed spam filters on incoming e-mail. To fix the problem, users must log onto A-O-L, go to “SPAM CONTROL” and set it so that e-mail from QRZ.com as an allowable e-mail address.

QRZ adds that it has no other way of sending America Online users a password or log on information as A-O-L has QRZ e-mail filtered out. (qrz.com)

**

HAMVENTION 2004: YOUR IDEAS ARE SOLICITED

Turning to the convention scene, the planners of Hamvention 2004 are putting out a call to the world-wide ham radio community. They say give us your input

and we will listen.

According to the Hamvention website, those in charge of next years gathering have implemented what they call a new "open door policy.” In other words, they want to hear your suggestions or comments on how to improve their show. They also promise to consider your ideas, discuss them, and implement them if possible.

If you want to help make Hamvention even bigger and better, now’s your chance. Sit down at your keyboard and write the 2004 Hamvention team directly at w-mail to info@hamvention.org. And yes, they promise a personal response to every e-note that’s received. (Hamvention)

**

CONVENTIONS AND HAMFESTS: DENVER COLORADO IN OCTOBER

Still with hamfets and conventions, the Rocky Mountain Radio League welcomes everyone to the 2003 R-M-R-L Hamfest slated for October 18th at the Jefferson County Fairgrounds in Golden Colorado. For more information e-mail Ron Rose to N0MQJ@rose3.com. (Press release)

**

CONVENTIONS AND HAMFESTS: SOCORRO N.M. ON OCT 25

Also, mark down Saturday October 25th for New Mexico’s Socorro Hamfest. Socorro is about 80 miles South of Albuquerque. This year the venue is the Firefighters Training Academy with R-V parking available. For information by e-mail please write to ac5bx@arrl.net. (e-mail)

**

WITH THE SCOUTS: A SPECIAL ON JOTA

Last reporter Mark Abramovich, NT3V, told you that the 46th annual Boy Scouts of America Jamboree on the Air will take place on October 18th and 19th. Now Mark has prepared a special report that details the Jamboree on the Air and the very unique relationship between scouting and ham radio.

--
AUDIO HERE
--

Mark’s report is our September Newsline Extra. It can be downloaded as an M P 3 file from our website at www.arnewsline.org/quincy. Just scroll down to the bottom of the page, click on ARNewsline Extra, turn your speakers up and enjoy. (ARNewsline(tm))

**

PROMOTING HAM RADIO: JOTA VIDEO NEEDED

Are if you are planning to take part in this years scouting Jamboree on the Air and own a good quality home video camera, your help is needed. As you know,

Dave Bell W6AQ, Alan Kaul W6RCL and Bill Pasternak, WA6ITF, are always looking for good video of ham radio happenings that they might be able to incorporate into a presentation about the hobby. As scouting and ham radio enjoy a very unique relationship, this is an event that is sure to make it into one of their shows, but only if they have the pictures and sound.

Since the Jamboree on the Air happens only once a year, that's where you come in. What's needed are volunteer camera people to take their gear to where the scouts are holding their JOTA gatherings and videotape them in action. Pictures and sound of them setting up their JOTA campsites, ham stations and their on-the-air operations. Also wanted is video of licensed scout hams introducing non-ham scouts to our very special new world of Amateur Radio.

If you can help in this project, or want more information, e-mail the production team to hamvideo@juno.com. (The Producers)

**

BREAK 2

This is ham radio news for today's radio amateur. From the United States of America, We are the Amateur Radio Newsline with links to the world from our only official website at www.arnewsline.org and being relayed by the volunteer services of the following radio amateur:

(5 sec pause here)

**

CHANGING OF THE GUARD: DANNY WEIL, EX-VP2VP - S.K.

The changing of the guard in ham radio continues. This with word from the San Antonio Radio Club that Danny Weil, the former VP2VP, has passed away October 3rd at age 86.

Weil is best known for his post World War 2 DX operations. During the 1950's and 1960's Weil took to the ham radio airwaves from numerous exotic locations that he sailed to in a boat named the YASME.

Born in the UK in 1918, Weil had been living in a managed care facility in Texas since suffering a stroke in 2001. But during his lifetime his voyages lead to the setting up ham radio stations on remote islands around the world and contacts with over 100,000 amateur radio enthusiasts. His exploits are credited with giving birth to the terms D-X'er and D-Xpedition.

Weil's adventures and those of the Colvin's -- Lloyd W6KG-and Iris W6QL -- lead to the formation of the famed YASME Foundation that assists DX operations world wide. Services for Weil were held in San Antonio Texas on Wednesday, October 8th.

More about the life and death of Danny Weil is on-liner at http://obit.porterloring.com/obit_display.cgi?id=82269&clientid=porterloring (San Antonio Radio Club, Paul Guido)

**

RADIO TRAGEDY: HAM KILLED TRYING TO ACTIVATE DX STATION

A ham radio operator has died while trying to put a rare location on the air. RSGB News Reader Jeramy Boot, G4NJH, has the tragic details:

--

We are sad to have to report the death of Richard Baker, M3RWB, who died as the result of injuries sustained while climbing Aran Fawddwy in North Wales. He was intending to activate the summit for the Summits on the Air, or SOTA, award programme.

The Summits on the Air management team has released a statement which says, "Richard was an experienced hillwalker who saw SOTA as a good opportunity to re-ascend many summits that he had climbed in the past. His death is an untimely reminder that while accidents can happen anywhere, the mountains can present special dangers to those who are experienced as well as those new to mountain travel."

Jeramy Boot, G4NJH

--

The Summits on the Air management team went on to stress that in all cases, the safety of those travelling must come above the desire to ascend to the mountain. (GB2RSO)

**

RADIO RECORDS: US TO CZECH REPUBLIC ON 24 GHZ

Shooting for the moon has provided two hams the first-ever United States to Czech Republic E-M-E contact on 24-Ghz. The ARRL Letter reports that Amateur Radio moonbounce and microwave history was made September 24 at 1400 U-T-C when Josef Sveceny, OK1UWA, and Al Ward, W5LUA, completed the 24-GHz EME QSO between the two nations.

Sveceny used a 3-meter Prime Focus dish with 35 watts at the feed, vertically polarized. Ward’s station also utilized a 3-meter Prime Focus dish with but with 70 Watts at the feed. Ward was horizontally polarized to account for the spatial offset between North America and Europe. Previous international 24 GHz EME QSO’s have taken place between the US and Canada, the US and Russia and Canada and Russia. (ARRL)

**

INTERNATIONAL - INDIA: ECHOLINK COMES TO VU

News out of India is that a new EchoLink VHF Repeater has been installed at the Indian National Institute of Amateur Radio. The new system allows local hams in Hyderabad to contact Amateur stations all over the world twenty-four hours a day. According to Jose Jacob, VU2JOS of the National Institute of Amateur Radio, this is the second such repeater to go into service in India. (GB2RS)

**

INTERNATIONAL - UK: RAYNET AT 50

The Radio Society of Great Britain is hosting RAYNET’s 50th Annniversary Emergency Communications Convention in Birmingham, England on Saturday the 25th of October. RAYNET is the U-K equivlant to our RACES an d ARES combined. Paul Gaskell, G4MWO, tells Newsline that in addition to the convention, a special event station will be taking to the airwaves as GB50RAEN. It will be on the air from October 20th till the 31st. QSL’s go via RSGB Bureau. Further information is in cyberspace at www.rsgb.org/emergency (GB2RS)

**

ON THE AIR

On the air, HE2GR is a special event call for the USKA club station HB9GR. It’s on the air to celebrate the 200th anniversary of the Swiss Cantons of St Gallen and Graubuenden. HE2GR will be active on CW, SSB and digital modes until the 30th of December. QSL as directed on the air. (VHF Reflector)

**

DX

In DX, ZL3CW will be active as ZM8CW from Raoul Island in the Kermadecs through the 18th of October. Jack says that he will be there doing maintenance work for the Department of Conservation and hopes to be active in his spare time. This is actually not a DXpedition, but ZL3CW is considered to be one of the better Morse operators and enjoys the challenge of the pile-ups. (Modern DX’er)

And a D-Xpadition to Annobon Island was forced to shut down prematurely. This after authorities ordered operations curtailed on October 4th local time. According to the various D-X remailers, no reason was given for ordering the 3CZ0V ham radio operation off the air. (Via Internet)

**

THAT FINAL ITEM: HAM RADIO AT THE NYC MARATHON

For this weeks final story we turn the ham radio sports page and one of the biggest events of the year thats about to take place. And its Amateur Radio that makes it happen. We have the details in this report:

--

If you want to see a shining example of how valuable amateur radio can be as a public service, look no further than New York City the first week in November. Providing communications for the marathon is no small job. Just ask Communications Director Steve Mendelsohn, W2ML. When the marathon was run back in 1976, 26 hams provided communications assistance. This year, 425 hams will help, and they'll do it using 9 repeaters on 2 meters and 440. Mendelson says it's a source of pride for the ham volunteers who come from across the country:
--
Mendelsohn: “Just like Disney's fantasy land, once you hav e been there you want to come back over, over and over again.”
--

The marathon isn't just for New York area hams. Mendelsohn says amateur radio operators show up from more than half a dozen states to help:

--
Mendelsohn: “We have people coming back from Colorado, coming back from Vermont, from florida. They come in from all over. Seven states, twenty-six miles, no waiting.”
--

New York's boroughs will be flooded with over 30-thousand runners this year. The hams helping will be part of more than 9-thousand people volunteering. How you manage that many people could be a massive challenge -- but Mendelsohn says race organizers figured out how to do it:

--
Mendelsohn: “You break the nets up into sizable chunks. You name a Mile Captain for each of the miles, and the Mile Captain manages a staff of anywhere from 3 to 15 people. Oncve you get further along in the race where there is more of a chance of the runners falling and dropping out because thery are tired, you increase your manpower.”
--

18 net controllers with 2 standby operators will be on duty. Communications start at 3 a.m. race day and go until 6 o'clock that evening. 35 hams will be on hand at the starting line alone. Once the race is done, Mendelsohn says the hams' work doesn't end. For this many runners and their family members to reunite takes up an area of more than five blocks.

Hams help there, too. And they'll tag along not just with race organizers, but with translators who will need amateur radio operators by their side, too. It's a huge undertaking that takes a lot of planning and makes for a very long day. But the hams helping out with New York City's marathon wouldn't trade it, because Mendelsohn says, it's just plain fun.

From Birmingham Alabama, I’m David Black, KB4KCH, for the Amateur Radio Newsline.

--

For those of you in North America who might want to grab a glimpse of ham radio in action, NBC Sports will broadcast a one hour New York City Marathon highlights show nationwide beginning at 2:00 p.m. EST on November 2nd. Check your local listings for details.

Also, the full interview with Steve Mendelsohn, W2ML, can be heard on this weeks RAIN Report. Its as close as your telephone at 847-827-7246 or on-line at www.rainreport.com. You can find more information on the race in cyberspace at www.ingnycmarathon.org. (ARNewsline(tm))

**

NEWSCAST CLOSE

With thanks to Alan Labs, AMSAT, the ARRL, the CGC Communicator, CQ Magazine, the FCC, the Ohio Penn DX Bulletin, Radio Netherlands, Rain, the RSGB and

Australia's Q-News, that's all from the Amateur Radio Newsline(tm). Our e-mail address is newsline@arnewsline.org. More information is available at Amateur Radio Newsline's(tm) only official website located at www.arnewsline.org. You can also write to us or support us at Amateur Radio Newsline(tm), P.O. Box 660937, Arcadia, California 91066.

For now, with Bill Pasternak, WA6ITF, at the editors desk, I’m Jim Meachen, ZL2BHF, saying 73 and we thank you for listening." Amateur Radio Newsline(tm) is Copyright 2003. All rights reserved.

784. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-12 03:41:51 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <344ib.32457$mQ2.19944@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 80358

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20031011123003.05539.00001476@mb-m16.aol.com...
> In article <20031010202024.23171.00001429@mb-m05.aol.com>,
lenover21@aol.com
> (Len Over 21) writes:
>
> >In article <20031010062952.07578.00001037@mb-m25.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com
> >(N2EY)
> >writes:
> >
> >>In article <voc7csn28m5j44@corp.supernews.com>, "Clint" <rattlehead at
> >>computron dot net> writes:
> >>
> >>>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> >>>news:20031009222958.11022.00001288@mb-m14.aol.com...
> >>>> In article <vobqv2rgm27fb7@corp.supernews.com>, "Clint" <rattlehead
at
> >>>> computron dot net> writes:
> >>>>
> >>>> >> All age groups showed a majority to be procodetest, h
> >>>> >
> >>>> >
> >>>> >bzzzzzt....
> >>>> >
> >>>> >if this were true,
> >>>>
> >>>> It is true. Did you read the survey and its results?
> >>>>
> >>>> > there wouldn't be such a push to remove it.
> >>>>
> >>>> Incorrect. What "push"? Based on membership numbers, NCI has fewer
than
> >>>5000
> >>>> members worldwide, even with no dues, no expiration of membership and
> >>>having
> >>>> been around over 7 years.
> >>>>
> >>>>
> >>>
> >>>Oh, more than just NCI; ARRL seems to favor it,
> >>
> >>ARRL hasn't formulated a new position yet. Their leadership is sitting
on
> >the

> >>sidelines because no matter what they decide, some folks will be
unhappy.
> >
> > Prior to and just after the IARU decision on S25 policy, ARRL was
> > ALL FOR CODE TESTING.
>
> In the USA, yes. But back in early 2001, ARRL changed policy on S25.5 and
no
> longer supported its continuation in the treaty..
> >
> > That didn't make the NCTA happy.
> >
> > ARRL still doesn't have any more membership than a quarter of all
> > licensed US amateurs. I don't believe in coincidences.
>
> NCI membership is less than one percent of licensed US amateurs. Even
though
> membership is free and requires only a few mouse clicks.
>
> > Faced with the inevitable worldwide reaction and subsequent action
> > at WRC-03, ARRL just OPTS OUT, goes neutral, won't take a stand
> > either way.
>
> ARRL policy is made by representatives of the membership. If the
membership is
> divided on an issue, a neutral policy may be the only solution.
> >
> > Their $12 million income (2002) is at stake. ARRL doesn't exist
> > without funding. The ONLY people the ARRL is worried about is
> > the present membership which is skewed towards PCTA thinking.
>
> Is it somehow wrong for a membership organization to do what the members
think
> is best?
> >
> > ARRL membership is still only a quarter of all US licensed amateurs.
>
> NCI membership is less than one percent of licensed US amateurs.
> >
> > They aren't a majority. Their decisions are not a "consensus."
>
> Neither are NCI's.
> >
> >>>Yep, it's outta here, CW testing is soon to be extinct. It's goneski.
> >>>
> >>Maybe it is. But if so, it's not because most hams want it to go. And on
> >>particular, not because young hams want it to go.
> >
> > Your OPINION, senior.
>

> No, simple fact, backed up by scientific survey. And the comments to
98-143.
> >
> > Do you have any good and true statistical polling to back up your
> > OPINION?
>
> Yes!
>
> The ARRL/READEX survey showed that a majority favored code testing, and
that
> the youngest age group was the most strongly procodetest.

When was the survey done? If it is more than two years old, it
is almost useless as there has been significant change
over the last few years.

> The comments to 98-143 were categorized by an NCI staffer (disproving any
> possible claim of bias by procodetest evaluation of the comments) and the
> resutls showed that the *majority* of commenters not only wanted continued
code
> testing, but wanted at least 2 code test speeds. This was true despite an
email
> campaign by NCI to get as many comments in support of their position of 5
wpm
> and sunset clause.

Now it also must be pointed out that for the initial several weeks
during 98-143 comment phase, those commenting were not
aware of the position being put forth by NCI. How many people
at the time may who said they support ARRLs stance
may have supported NCI's position will never be known. Even
so, the issue is NOT to be decided by any "vote" or majority opinion
of any group or even the public at large. The decision will be,
as it should be, based on what should be proper regulatory
setting of licensing requirments.

> Of course things may have changed since then. But for someone to claim,
without
> more recent evidence, that most hams want code testing to disappear is
simply
> wishful thinking.
> >
> > Strange, the news doesn't indicate any group of young people
> > demonstrating for the retention of the amateur license code test.
> > Nor the elimination of the amateur license code test.
>
> Irrelevant.

Good, since I believe it was you that mentioned that fact
in the first place. If it is irrelevent, why bring it up?

> > Why do you say things about the "young hams" that you know not
> > of?
>
> The evidence of the survey is clear. You can "stick head and eyes in the
sand"
> but it is still there.

Again, what is the date of that survey?

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

785. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-12 04:01:10 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <am4ib.32464$mQ2.12561@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 80359

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20031011214228.06226.00000924@mb-m19.aol.com...
> In article <%_Zhb.32033$mQ2.26094@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>,
"Dwight
> Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> writes:
>
> >"N2EY" wrote:
> >> "Dwight Stewart wrote:
> >> >
> >> > (snip)
> >>
> >> My point is that the whole issue is not a mass movement.
> >> Clint claimed, without any proof, that most hams want
> >> code testing gone. Yet surveys show the opposite.
> >
> > I certainly haven't seen a survey recently that could be said to
> >accurately represents the views of the entire ham radio community, Jim.
>
> Neither have I, Dwight. As I have pointed out, the ARRL/READEX survey is 7
> years old. But it's the most recent *scientific* survey we have. (Its 1500
> respondents were chosen at random, not self-selected as is the case in
many
> "surveys".)

But in these last 7 years, the ham community probably lost
10% to SK status. Most of those were probbaly
pro-code and it is likely the survey, if done today,
would show the continuing shift away from support
of code testing.

> >believe you recenty posted the results of a survey done by some club that
> >shows the majority surveyed supported code testing.
>
> Not "some club". ARRL hired READEX (a professional survey organization) to
> conduct the survey in preparation for WRC 1997.

Asabove, too much time has passed for ayone to consider
those results to be accurate in relation to the current ham
population.

> >I don't doubt those
> >results at all. If you surveyed the local club here (and their friends
> >outside the club), the majority would also support code testing.
>
> The ARRL/READEX survey sampled the entire country and all license classes

and
> age groups. Surveying club members doesn't.
>
> >Of course,
> >the club members here are fanatics in their support of code testing, even
to
> >the point of openingly ridiculing Technicians who attend the meetings.
>
> That sort of behavior is unacceptable. Not "real ham" behavior.

Unfortuneately, it is real ham behavior. Hopefully
it is just an aberration of some hams...although we have
seen such attitudes voiced in the newsgroups by
more than one or two posters in the past.

> >Because of that, few who oppose code testing, and even fewer Technicians,
> >attend that club's meetings or socialize with the members. Find me a
survey
> >that is truly unbiased and I'll be glad to discuss the results. Until
then,
> >discussing the results of surveys is simply a waste of time.
>
> Then consider the comments to the restructuring NPRM.

I agree...surveys, votes, etc hold little sway with the FCC anyway.

> >> > As you well know, NCI is only a tiny part of the overall
> >> > movement to end code testing - far more outside that
> >> > organization are involved (including some in this newsgroup
> >> > you've personally discussed this issue with).
> >>
> >> How do we know this?
> >
> > How do you know what?
>
> How do we know that there are "far more outside that
organization..involved"?

Who's on first? What? :-) :-)

> I see the same small number of people in this newsgroup, at qrz.com, eham,
etc.
>
> >That you've talked to people in this newsgroup who
>
> >are not NCI members yet are still opposed to code testing? I suspect the
> >vast majority of those in this newsgroup who oppose code testing are not
> >members of NCI.
>
> Most of those opposed to code testing I have encountered here *are*
members of
> NCI. But there are really not that many on either side who post here. How

many
> different people have posted to rrap in the past year?

Someone used to post a Top 10 every month.

> >> Who are "so many others", Dwight? If they really exist, why
> >> haven't they signed on to NCI, which costs nothing more than
> >> a few mouse clicks?
> >
> > What is it with your obsession with NCI?
>
> No "onsession" at all. I'm just curious as to why someone who felt
strongly or
> even mildly that code testing should go would *not* join that
organization.
> Particularly given the ease of doing so. And particularly given the fact
that
> if the membership numbers got big enough, a majority could be claimed
based on
> those numbers alone.

A mojority is nice, but as we've already seen, not really
needed when the decision to keep code testing can't be justified
to begin with (ref: R&O of 98-143)

> >Are you campaigning for members
> >or something?
>
> Just the opposite ;-)

Keep doing your "just the opposite" because it helps
let others know we exist.

> >There is no requirement whatsoever that says those who oppose
> >code testing must join that organization. I haven't joined it. Neither
has
> >my wife. In fact, I don't know anyone personally who is opposed to code
> >testing who has joined. Of course, there are many organizations in this
> >country I haven't joined. Therefore, NCI is certainly nothing special in
> >that regard.
>
> That says nothing about how many actually are opposed or support code
testing.

Why does it matter anyway?

> >> And if it's such a done deal, why didn't FCC just dump Element 1
> >> back in July?
> >
> > As you well know, the FCC has rules and regulations to follow, Jim.
> >Because of that, they can't "just dump" anything.
>
> That's not what Phil Kane says. A complete NPRM cycle is not required for

every
> rules change. Particularly when the change is characterized as "removing a
> burden"

True, but the FCC isn't stupid either. A few months of process
helps avoid complaints down the road.

> It's also what both the NCI and NCVEC petitions say. Both of them contend
that
> FCC has the authority to just remove Element 1 immediately, and ask FCC to
do
> so. Are they mistaken?

No, I don't think they are mistaken, I just think the FCC is
doing the process path because it is, in the end, less
controversial...(IMHO).

> >Something will happen sooner or later. Give it time.
>
> Something always happens, given enough time.

Agreed.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

786. Re: What makes a Pro code test Amateur a Troglodyte?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-12 04:09:42 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20031012000942.23307.00003680@mb-m29.aol.com>
Source record: 80362

In article <20031011214231.06226.00000928@mb-m19.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) writes:

>No mode always gets through. Some modes, however, get through when some >other modes don't.

Jim:

Indeed. And more often than not, it's usually good, 'ole fashion Morse/CW which is getting through.

73 de Larry, K3LT

787. New Acronym: ECTA (Era of Code Test Abolition)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-12 04:09:42 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20031012000942.23307.00003679@mb-m29.aol.com>
Source record: 80365

In article <20031011214229.06226.00000925@mb-m19.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) writes:

>On the one hand, Morse is not used very much in emergency communication. On
>the
>other hand, it *is* still used occasionally, by hams, in emergency
>communications. More important, there *are* times when it when it is the only
>available mode that would get through in the situation.
>(Note that phrase "only available mode")
>
>All of the above are documented facts.
>
>The problem is, does the occasional use of Morse in emergencies mean that
>*all*
>hams *must* be tested on the mode? Some say yes, some say no, some say it's a
>piece of the reason. All based on personal opinion, nothing more.
>
>Boil down any of the arguments on either side, and what you wind up with is
>personal opinion.
>
>73 de Jim, N2EY

Jim:

The truth is, only hams who know the Morse code have the capability to fall back on the CW mode when other modes are unavailable. Why do hams know the Morse code? Because they had to learn it to pass the code tests to become licensed or obtain upgrades. In the absence of a code testing requirement, why will they learn it? How will we convince new hams to invest the time and effort to learn this useful communications skill when they are not offered the incentive of increased operating privileges? I'm asking you because I don't have the answers. I'm one of those hams who learned the code because I wanted to be a ham, and the requirement was there. Ony *after* learning the code and becoming a reasonably proficient CW operator did I become aware of it's benefits and advantages. Personally, I'm grateful that the code testing requirement existed when I became a ham. Had it not, I never would have become a CW operator...and neither will most hams in the ECTA (Era of Code Test Abolition).

73 de Larry, K3LT

788. Re: What makes a Pro code test Amateur a Troglodyte?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-12 04:09:43 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20031012000943.23307.00003682@mb-m29.aol.com>
Source record: 80361

In article <bma161$cg2@library2.airnews.net>, "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
writes:

>Therein lies the problem with the whole CW test (TEST, *test*) debate. The
>minute one takes on the "no" CW test argument, it is generally met with an
>attitude that an end CW use (USE, *use*) is being favored or called for.

Kim:

Code testing has always been the thing which generated code use.
In the absence of a code testing requirement, there will be progressively
fewer hams who have never been exposed to learning the code as a
result of the requirement. Since the requirement was the principle
motivation to learn the code, code use *will* decline once code testing
is abolished. Therefore, testing and use are two closely interrelated
concepts.

>Until, (UNTIL, *until*) it is clearly understood that seeking the end of the
>CW test is not the equivalent of seeking the end of CW as a mode, this
>debate will never fall within the realm of "friendly" debate at all. I
>think it's even hazardous to use the PCTA/NCTA labels.

PCTA = Pro-Code Testing Agenda; NCTA = Anti-Code Testing Agenda.
Those terms are accurately descriptive of the intent of their respective
groups. Where is the "hazard" in honesty?

73 de Larry, K3LT

789. Re: What makes a Pro code test Amateur a Troglodyte?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-12 04:09:44 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20031012000944.23307.00003683@mb-m29.aol.com>
Source record: 80364

In article <wSUhb.28048$mQ2.26393@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:

>I consider my time a very valuable resource as do many others.
>Wy is a comment which describes time wwasted by people who
>don't wish to expend it learning morse considered uncomplimentary?

Bill:

The reason is that those who have gained Morse code proficiency have found it to be well worth the time and effort. If you haven't done so, then you aren't a qualified judge.

>> "dinosaur/buggywhip technology"
>
>Me thinks as the end approaches...the PCTA side is grasping
>at straws. I suggest not playing in the political arena of change if
>such phraseology offends.

The stock-in-trade of the NCTA has always been offensive phraseology.

>> Would you like your favorite modes described that way?

>Sure wouldn't bother me. But then I've learned to disregard
>most rheteroic anyway. 12 years as an elected official teaches
>one to accept the heat or get out-of-the-kitchen.

And you're the commercial-grade Vulcan stove with all eight burners, both ovens, and the grill turned up high. No wonder all your pots and kettles are black. Your gas bill must be enormous, but nobody's buying what you're cooking.

73 de Larry, K3LT

790. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-12 04:09:45 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20031012000945.23307.00003684@mb-m29.aol.com>
Source record: 80367

In article <20031011123003.05539.00001477@mb-m16.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) writes:

>>>All age groups showed a majority to be procodetest, but the *most*
>>>procodetest
>>>group were the youngest! Hams under 24 at the time were 85% procodetest/15%
>>>anticodetest. Almost a 6 to 1 ratio!
>>>
>>>73 de Jim, N2EY
>>
>>Jim:
>>
>>Very interesting, indeed.
>
>Yep. Remember, though, that those are the results of a scientific survey done
>in 1996.
>
>It does, however, contradict the claim that young people don't want to take
>code tests.

Jim:

Yes, indeed...ironic, isn't it, since that has been one of the NCTA's most well-used arguments.

>Even if it can be shown that the majority of hams and other interested
>parties
>favor continued code testing, there's no obligation for FCC to follow that
>majority.

Unfortunately true. And, IMHO, they will not. I already consider code test abolition to be a done deal. What matters now is what happens next.

>A majority of those who commented to FCC on 98-143 wanted *at least* two code
>test speeds. But FCC went to 5 wpm for all classes of license and set the
>stage for complete code test elimination.

Indeed they did. All they're doing now with the current petitions is just going through the motions so nobody can accuse them of not following their own procedures before the pull they plug on code testing.

>>This could provide excellent support to replies
>>to the code testing petitions recently assigned RM numbers by the FCC.
>>Can you provide a URL?
>>
>It was in QST back in 1997. If it's online anywhere, it should be on the ARRL

>website.
>
>73 de Jim, N2EY

I'll take a look-see. Quite frankly, my response to the latest petitions will probably just be the "I agree with the FISTS petition" variety. I can't think of anything new to add, and I believe the FCC already has it's mind made up. Moreover, I'm not sure that a meaningless 5 WPM code testing requirement is worth saving. If there were a chance of keeping 5 for General and bumping back up to 12 for Extra, I'd be willing to fight for it, but that's simply not going to happen. Like all good liberal socialists, the NCTA doesn't want to compromise...they want the world handed over to them on a silver platter. I've never seen an encouraging level of passion on the part of the PCTA, and again using a political metaphor, they, like the Republicans, can't seem to get their act together. Even the FISTS petition is too little, too late. Nancy Kott gave us a good start at the '97 Dayton Hamvention, then ran out of gas. The ARRL's support for code testing has been half-hearted at best. If a couple hundred thousand ARRL members had told the League that they'd cancel their individual memberships and club affiliations if code testing were reduced in any way, we probably wouldn't be looking at a future ARS without code testing. We will now have to live with the consequences.

73 de Larry, K3LT

791. Re: What makes a Pro code test Amateur a Troglodyte?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-12 04:09:46 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20031012000946.23307.00003685@mb-m29.aol.com>
Source record: 80366

In article <E7Thb.673$_i.57968@nnrp1.ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
<wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:

>> Carl:
>>
>> I consider the use of the term "Morse myths" to be derogatory and
>> inflammatory. Thus, you have also failed to meet Mike's challenge.
>>
>> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>>
>
>Larry,
>
>I don't recall Mike appointing your the judge and arbiter ...

Carl:

In that case, consider my services to have been donated out of my own
generosity.

>"Morse Myths" is, as you well know by now, simply a term
>that refers to all of the patently false, old wives' tales, such as
>"Morse gets through when nothing else will.",

This one is true…

>"Morse is essential
>for emergency communications.",

Who said that? Provide correctly attributed quote.

>"Morse acts as a 'lid filter' to
>keep us from being overrun by the "mongul hordes' of CBers
>who are lurking in the wings waiting to take over the ham bands."
>etc.

I've never said that whatsoever -- in fact, on many occasions, I've gone
out of my way to note that a lot of the problems on HF phone are being
caused by 20-WPM code tested Extras.

>I reject your claim that the term "Morse Myths" is derogatory and
>inflamatory.

Reject all you want, Carl, but the fact remains that it is. You have taken
the low road, while claiming the opposite.

>It is simply a term that refers in "shorthand" form to
>a panoply of falacies that are often cited as "reasons why we MUST

>keep Morse testing" ... none of which hold water and all of which
>have been rejected by the FCC.

I have always presented well-reasoned, factual, and unemotional
arguments in support of code testing. Please don't hold me up to
the same light as those who may have transgressed in the manner
which you refer to above. Above all, please remember that by far,
the largest portion of the QRM in the code/no-code debate has been
from the NCTA side. Also remember that as one who has never
used the Morse/CW mode to an extent which would have allowed
you to gain useful proficiency in the mode, you are not qualified to
judge the value of this mode at all. I'm not sitting here trying to
argue technical topics with you, so don't you try to tell me that the
Morse/CW mode and testing aren't of value to the ARS. We are
not on each other's respective levels of expertise. Since I'm
more than willing to respect your technical expertise, don't presume
to challenge my qualifications to make judgments about CW and
code testing, because you don't know what your talking about.

73 de Larry, K3LT

792. Re: What makes a Pro code test Amateur a Troglodyte?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-12 04:09:47 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20031012000947.23307.00003686@mb-m29.aol.com>
Source record: 80363

In article <9HUhb.27868$mQ2.4377@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:

>> Carl:
>>
>> I consider the use of the term "Morse myths" to be derogatory and
>> inflammatory. Thus, you have also failed to meet Mike's challenge.
>>
>> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>
>Hw about morse fallicies, morse inaccuracies, erronious morse
>claims? Which of these do you find acceptable?
>
>Cheers,
>Bill K2UNK

Bill:

None, actually. The truth is that the Morse/CW mode is one of the most practical, efficient, effective, and universal modes of radio communication available to radio amateurs, and well worth the effort to gain and maintain this particular skill. Everything you and Carl mention is nothing more than NCTA sour grapes.

73 de Larry, K3LT

793. Re: What makes a Pro code test Amateur a Troglodyte?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-12 04:11:10 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <yv4ib.32468$mQ2.29209@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 80360

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20031011214231.06226.00000927@mb-m19.aol.com...
> In article <wSUhb.28048$mQ2.26393@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Bill
> Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
>
> >"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> >news:20031011102951.28496.00001225@mb-m18.aol.com...
> >> In article <3ZShb.672$_i.57821@nnrp1.ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
> >> <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:
> >>
> >> >"Hans K0HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> >> >news:5ee63311.0310101943.3e27f31e@posting.google.com...
> >> >> "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote:
> >> >>
> >> >> > I think I've taken the high ground
> >> >>
> >> >> Carl, with all due respect, using abrasive and derisive terms like
> >> >> "jumping through hoops" is not "the high ground". It is your same
old
> >> >> baiting and condescending rhetoric, seemingly calculated to be
> >> >> inflamatory and divisive.
> >> >
> >> >"jumping through hoops" is "abrasive and drisive" ???
> >>
> >> Yes, it is. The image is not complimentary. Would you like the written
> >tests
> >> described that way?
> >>
> >> So are phrases like
> >>
> >> "waste valuable time learning Morse"
> >>
> >>I consider my time a very valuable resource as do many others.
>
> Everyone's time is valuable, not just RF engineers'

I agree, and nothing I said suggests otherwise.

> >Why is a comment which describes time wwasted by people who
> >don't wish to expend it learning morse considered uncomplimentary?
>
> It says that learning the mode is a waste of time.

It is...for the person making the statement.

> What is wrong with saying:
>
> "I don't want to *spend* the time necessary to learn...."

Which, on close examination means the same thing.

> >> "dinosaur/buggywhip technology"
> >
> >Me thinks as the end approaches...the PCTA side is grasping
> >at straws. I suggest not playing in the political arena of change if
> >such phraseology offends.
>
> Are you saying I should simply shut up and go away? That's not like you at
all,
> Bill.

Nope. I'm suggesting that if the language used in discussion
is so bbjectionable, then perhaps you'd rather not play in
the political sandbox. I also think it is rather humorous that
we are down to the level of concern that we are debating such
mundane phrasology as that above.

> Carl claimed he had "taken the high ground". And for the most part of that
> post, he did. But he did let a few derogatory phrases slip in.
>
> Hans, K0HB also took note of them, and Hans is definitely not a 'PCTA
grasping
> at straws'.

I don't care for the "jump through the hoops" example either...
but I have no problem with "waste my time learning"

> >> Would you like your favorite modes described that way?
> >
> >Sure wouldn't bother me. But then I've learned to disregard
> >most rheteroic anyway. 12 years as an elected official teaches
> >one to accept the heat or get out-of-the-kitchen.
> >
> I thought the point of this thread was to avoid the 'heat'.

Any time there are opposing positions, there will be some heat.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

794. Re: France is conquered by of all things, an Italian.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-12 04:21:47 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <vF4ib.107411$qj6.3805915@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 80368

Clint wrote:
> boy what hypocrits this NG has... when I made a few remarks
> about the french I got bashed by the politically correct types.
> They say nothing about THIS post.
>
> Hypocrisy and double standards really get my goat.
>
> Clint

Clint, you make the mistake of assuming that we read that stuff. This character is posting to many amateur related ng's with his drivel. There is no wothwhile content in it, so many do not read it. I read it after you included it in your post.

We usually read your posts.

- Mike KB3EIA -

>
> <BIG********AL*********> wrote in message
> news:vod1s7rc09dsbc@corp.supernews.com...
>
>>The Complete Military History of France
>>

<Snippage of some really bizzare stuff>

795. Re: What makes a Pro code test Amateur a Troglodyte?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-12 04:22:35 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <fG4ib.32485$mQ2.15379@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 80369

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20031011214232.06226.00000929@mb-m19.aol.com...
> In article <bma161$cg2@library2.airnews.net>, "Kim" <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
> writes:
>
> >"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
> >news:7ILhb.25498$mQ2.9966@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> >>
> >> The issue isn't about USE it is about
> >> the lack of any rational reason to retain code testing as a
> >> license requirement now that the ITU mandatory code knowledge
> >> requirment has ended.
> >>
> >
> >Therein lies the problem with the whole CW test (TEST, *test*) debate.
The
> >minute one takes on the "no" CW test argument, it is generally met with
an
> >attitude that an end CW use (USE, *use*) is being favored or called for.
>
> Not that I have observed, Kim.
>
> But can you accurately say that *no one* wants to end Morse use?

Can you name one? Search the entire population of licensed hams and
I'm sure there's some here and there that would take that stance...BUT,
that is not the position (just in case someone tries to suggest
otherwise) of NCI. We (NCI) oppose code testing. We (NCI) have no
problem with code USE.

> >Until, (UNTIL, *until*) it is clearly understood that seeking the end of
the
> >CW test is not the equivalent of seeking the end of CW as a mode, this
> >debate will never fall within the realm of "friendly" debate at all. I
> >think it's even hazardous to use the PCTA/NCTA labels.
>
> One of the problems is that some folks aren't clear that it is only the
test
> they are against.

Another problem is that some (many?) that favor code testing suggest that
by ending that testing it will lead to an end to code use. I don't
belive that at all and there are hundreds of examples of older
technology and skills that are still practiced today in other
fields even though such technology/skill is recognized as

no longer generally used/needed (e.g. archery, manual transmission
autos, etc.)

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

796. Re: What makes a Pro code test Amateur a Troglodyte?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-12 04:23:00 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bmakv4$n72$0@208.207.71.130>
Source record: 80370

Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
> "Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
> news:20031011025017.11891.00001413@mb-m11.aol.com...
>
>>In article <EdHhb.645$_i.51817@nnrp1.ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
>><wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:
>>
>>
>>>Now, I wouldn't expect to be able to have that sort of a relationship
>>>with you, Dick ... you're not open-minded enough to accept that others
>>>see things different than you. (You see, I accept that you like and use
>>>CW ... I disagree only with your propatation of the "Morse myths" and
>>>your insistence that everyone should have Morse forced on them in
>>>exchange for HF privs ... fortunately, most of the rest of the world
>>>doesn't agree with you.)
>>>
>>>Carl - wk3c
>>
>>Carl:
>>
>>I consider the use of the term "Morse myths" to be derogatory and
>>inflammatory. Thus, you have also failed to meet Mike's challenge.
>>
>>73 de Larry, K3LT
>>
>
>
> Larry,
>
> I don't recall Mike appointing your the judge and arbiter ...
>
> "Morse Myths" is, as you well know by now, simply a term
> that refers to all of the patently false, old wives' tales, such as
> "Morse gets through when nothing else will.", "Morse is essential
> for emergency communications.", "Morse acts as a 'lid filter' to
> keep us from being overrun by the "mongul hordes' of CBers
> who are lurking in the wings waiting to take over the ham bands."
> etc.
>
> I reject your claim that the term "Morse Myths" is derogatory and
> inflamatory. It is simply a term that refers in "shorthand" form to
> a panoply of falacies that are often cited as "reasons why we MUST
> keep Morse testing" ... none of which hold water and all of which
> have been rejected by the FCC.

>

Well, Hood Buddy, your rejection is hereby rejected!

It's well known that for the likes of you,*everything* pertaining to Morse code is mythical! Hell, you couldn't take advantage of any of it's attributes if your very life depended on it!

What you refuse to acknowledge is that some of us COULD and WOULD.

797. Re: What makes a Pro code test Amateur a Troglodyte?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-12 04:23:21 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bmakvp$n72$1@208.207.71.130>
Source record: 80371

Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
> "Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
> news:20031011025017.11891.00001413@mb-m11.aol.com...
>
>>In article <EdHhb.645$_i.51817@nnrp1.ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
>><wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:
>>
>>
>>>Now, I wouldn't expect to be able to have that sort of a relationship
>>>with you, Dick ... you're not open-minded enough to accept that others
>>>see things different than you. (You see, I accept that you like and use
>>>CW ... I disagree only with your propatation of the "Morse myths" and
>>>your insistence that everyone should have Morse forced on them in
>>>exchange for HF privs ... fortunately, most of the rest of the world
>>>doesn't agree with you.)
>>>
>>>Carl - wk3c
>>
>>Carl:
>>
>>I consider the use of the term "Morse myths" to be derogatory and
>>inflammatory. Thus, you have also failed to meet Mike's challenge.
>>
>>73 de Larry, K3LT
>>
>
>
> Larry,
>
> I don't recall Mike appointing your the judge and arbiter ...
>
> "Morse Myths" is, as you well know by now, simply a term
> that refers to all of the patently false, old wives' tales, such as
> "Morse gets through when nothing else will.", "Morse is essential
> for emergency communications.", "Morse acts as a 'lid filter' to
> keep us from being overrun by the "mongul hordes' of CBers
> who are lurking in the wings waiting to take over the ham bands."
> etc.
>
> I reject your claim that the term "Morse Myths" is derogatory and
> inflamatory. It is simply a term that refers in "shorthand" form to
> a panoply of falacies that are often cited as "reasons why we MUST
> keep Morse testing" ... none of which hold water and all of which
> have been rejected by the FCC.

>

Well, Good Buddy, your rejection is hereby rejected!

It's well known that for the likes of you,*everything* pertaining to Morse code is mythical! Hell, you couldn't take advantage of any of it's attributes if your very life depended on it!

What you refuse to acknowledge is that some of us COULD and WOULD.

798. Re: What makes a Pro code test Amateur a Troglodyte?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-12 04:30:19 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bmalcr$o1k$0@208.207.71.130>
Source record: 80372

Carl R. Stevenson wrote:

> "Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
> news:20031011025019.11891.00001414@mb-m11.aol.com...
>
>>In article <j6Dhb.622$_i.48906@nnrp1.ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
>><wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:
>>
>>
>>>In over 32 years as an RF engineer, I have not had the same experience.
>>>The most technical folks have seemed more interested in the technical
>>>side of ham radio and there have been MANY who I could not recruit
>>>into ham radio because they had no interest in and were unwilling to
>
> waste
>
>>>their valuable time learing Morse to a level that would get them decent
>>>HF privs. (some have capitulated and jumped through the 5 wpm hoop
>>>since "restructuring" and are now extras, but many have refused, on
>>>principal, to jump through the hoop, saying they'll wait until they don't
>>>have to waste their time on Morse)
>>
>>Carl:
>>
>>Now, there's classic NCTA logic for you! You and your fellow
>>professional RF engineers, with your "code testing as a hoop"
>>mentality, have actually wasted more time by *not* learning the
>>code and passing the code tests than you have saved.
>
>
> No, those who chose not to jump through the hoop wasted NO
> time ... they devoted their discretionary time to other technical
> pusuits without required hoop jumping ... a loss to the ARS.
>

You really can't see how truly ignorant that statement is!

If the license holds value only for the priveleges it conveys, and one
refuses to meet the requiements, and therefore is issued NO license,
he has incurred no loss but ham radio, which requires nothing whatever
from any licensee, has! Amazing!

Those who actually DID want the license, and the priveleges it conveys,
concentrated a few weeks effort in our 'discertionary' time, and
surfaced with the privileged license, while the "hoopers" remained

submerged and held their breath.

No wonder ya'all are so blue!

799. Re: What makes a Pro code test Amateur a Troglodyte?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-12 04:38:53 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bmalst$q20$0@208.207.71.130>
Source record: 80373

Bill Sohl wrote:

> "Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
> news:20031011025017.11891.00001413@mb-m11.aol.com...
>
>>In article <EdHhb.645$_i.51817@nnrp1.ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
>><wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:
>>
>>
>>>Now, I wouldn't expect to be able to have that sort of a relationship
>>>with you, Dick ... you're not open-minded enough to accept that others
>>>see things different than you. (You see, I accept that you like and use
>>>CW ... I disagree only with your propatation of the "Morse myths" and
>>>your insistence that everyone should have Morse forced on them in
>>>exchange for HF privs ... fortunately, most of the rest of the world
>>>doesn't agree with you.)
>>>
>>>Carl - wk3c
>>
>>Carl:
>>
>>I consider the use of the term "Morse myths" to be derogatory and
>>inflammatory. Thus, you have also failed to meet Mike's challenge.
>>
>>73 de Larry, K3LT
>
>
> Hw about morse fallicies, morse inaccuracies, erronious morse
> claims? Which of these do you find acceptable?
>

It's easy enough to accept that those of you who have never had any use
for radiotelegraphy would view its stated attributes as mythical, and
for the lot of you that is indeed a proper description. You couldn't
communciate your way out of an emergency using Morse if the fate of the
planet DID depend on it!

800. Re: What makes a Pro code test Amateur a Troglodyte?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-12 04:40:52 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <oX4ib.107419$qj6.3811218@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 80374

Bill Sohl wrote:

> "Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
> news:3F86EDAD.4010109@psu.edu...
>
>>I just saw another accusation of Pro-Coders as technically backwards.
>
>
> Unfortuneately, extremist comments are present on both sides.
>
>
>>Yet some of the most progressive RF Engineers and Technicians I know
>>(who are Hams) are really enamored of Morse CW.
>
>
> Nothing wrong with that. The issue isn't about USE it is about
> the lack of any rational reason to retain code testing as a
> license requirement now that the ITU mandatory code knowledge
> requirment has ended.

But that isn't my question or argument, Bill. It isn't really about the test. I don't care if they make the taking the test punishable by inprisonment.

My question was related to the statements that Pro coders are technically backwards.

>
>>I would challenge the NCTA's to show some proof that those who believe
>>that the morse code test should be retained are in a technical backwater.
>
>
> It isn't that the individuals that want code retained are in a technical
> backwater, but rather that their procode test arguments fail
> as to any technical reason for retaining code testing. On that point,
> don't take my word on it, read the FCC R&O on NPRM98-143
> and you'll find every argument being put forth today has already
> been made to the FCC and rejected by the FCC.
>
>
>>I would also challenge them to do it without being abrasive or insulting.
>
>
> Feel free to let me know if I fail that challenge.

You did just fine from the civility standpoint, but perhaps I didn't
make myself clear. This isn't about the test.
>
>
>>Just facts or intelligent informed opinions.
>
>
> As above, for the facts and the ultimate opinion (the only
> opinion that in the end means anything) can be found in 98-143 R&O.

Bill, it isn't about the test.

>
>>Pro coders can help by refraining from name calling too.
>
>
> Agreed.
>
>
>>My statement is that there is no direct relationship.
>
>
> Not sure what relationship you are referring to.

I'm alomost confused here Bill! I'm saying there is no direct
relationship between being Pro-Code and technical ability.

- Mike KB3EIA -

801. Re: What makes a Pro code test Amateur a Troglodyte?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-12 04:48:56 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <Y25ib.32506$mQ2.11233@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 80375

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20031012000947.23307.00003686@mb-m29.aol.com...
> In article <9HUhb.27868$mQ2.4377@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Bill
Sohl"
> <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
>
> >> Carl:
> >>
> >> I consider the use of the term "Morse myths" to be derogatory and
> >> inflammatory. Thus, you have also failed to meet Mike's challenge.
> >>
> >> 73 de Larry, K3LT
> >
> >Hw about morse fallicies, morse inaccuracies, erronious morse
> >claims? Which of these do you find acceptable?
> >
> >Cheers,
> >Bill K2UNK
>
> Bill:
>
> None, actually. The truth is that the Morse/CW mode is one of the most
> practical, efficient, effective, and universal modes of radio
communication
> available to radio amateurs, and well worth the effort to gain and
maintain
> this particular skill. Everything you and Carl mention is nothing more
than
> NCTA sour grapes.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT

Yet, even if one accepts your claim that morse is...one of the most...etc
You have failed to convince the FCC (98-143) and more recently the
international radio community (WRC-03) that whatever traits
morse has it should be retained as a test requirement.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

802. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-12 04:51:36 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bmamko$rl3$0@208.207.71.130>
Source record: 80376

Robert Casey wrote:
> N2EY wrote:
>
>> In article <3F84B6F7.20507@ix.netcom.com>, Robert Casey
>> <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
>> writes:
>>
>>
>>
>>> There should be some sort of beginner's license that an average 14
>>> year old honor roll student can get
>>>
>>
>>
>> That would require an extensive reworking of the current tests. We've
>> got at
>> least one 6 year old General and an 8 year old passed the old Extra.
>>
>>
> I mean "average honor roll high school student", not "Einstein's
> grandson". Also
> I mention the honor roll student in the sense that Beavis and Butthead
> would not be
> able to pass the license tests. If Beavis did get a license, then ham
> radio would
> sound like the old 147.435 machine on L.A..... W6NUT IIRC

Ah, Both those gents are on the air as we speak. Passing tests is pure
rote these days.

803. Re: What makes a Pro code test Amateur a Troglodyte?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-12 04:53:57 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bmamp5$rl3$1@208.207.71.130>
Source record: 80377

N2EY wrote:

> In article <bma161$cg2@library2.airnews.net>, "Kim" <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
> writes:
>
>
>>"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
>>news:7ILhb.25498$mQ2.9966@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
>>
>>>The issue isn't about USE it is about
>>>the lack of any rational reason to retain code testing as a
>>>license requirement now that the ITU mandatory code knowledge
>>>requirment has ended.
>>>
>>
>>Therein lies the problem with the whole CW test (TEST, *test*) debate. The
>>minute one takes on the "no" CW test argument, it is generally met with an
>>attitude that an end CW use (USE, *use*) is being favored or called for.
>
>
> Not that I have observed, Kim.
>
> But can you accurately say that *no one* wants to end Morse use?
>
>>Until, (UNTIL, *until*) it is clearly understood that seeking the end of the
>>CW test is not the equivalent of seeking the end of CW as a mode, this
>>debate will never fall within the realm of "friendly" debate at all. I
>>think it's even hazardous to use the PCTA/NCTA labels.
>
>
> One of the problems is that some folks aren't clear that it is only the *test*
> they are against.

And you have to doubt the veracity of many of those who do.

804. Re: What makes a Pro code test Amateur a Troglodyte?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-12 04:54:18 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <_75ib.32511$mQ2.16900@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 80378

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20031012000944.23307.00003683@mb-m29.aol.com...
> In article <wSUhb.28048$mQ2.26393@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Bill
> Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
>
> >I consider my time a very valuable resource as do many others.
> >Wy is a comment which describes time wwasted by people who
> >don't wish to expend it learning morse considered uncomplimentary?
>
> Bill:
>
> The reason is that those who have gained Morse code proficiency
> have found it to be well worth the time and effort. If you haven't done
> so, then you aren't a qualified judge.

In your humble opinion anyway.

> >> "dinosaur/buggywhip technology"
> >
> >Me thinks as the end approaches...the PCTA side is grasping
> >at straws. I suggest not playing in the political arena of change if
> >such phraseology offends.
>
> The stock-in-trade of the NCTA has always been offensive phraseology.

I have seen the same levels on both sides...but it certainly
hasn't been the "stock and trade" of NCTA (IMHO).

> >> Would you like your favorite modes described that way?
>
> >Sure wouldn't bother me. But then I've learned to disregard
> >most rheteroic anyway. 12 years as an elected official teaches
> >one to accept the heat or get out-of-the-kitchen.
>
> And you're the commercial-grade Vulcan stove with all eight
> burners, both ovens, and the grill turned up high. No wonder
> all your pots and kettles are black. Your gas bill must be
> enormous, but nobody's buying what you're cooking.

ROTFLMAO...
The sale seems to have been made already to the only
buyer that counts...the FCC and, more recently, the ITU.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

805. Re: What makes a Pro code test Amateur a Troglodyte?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-12 05:05:05 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <5i5ib.32519$mQ2.29211@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 80379

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:bmalst$q20$0@208.207.71.130...
> Bill Sohl wrote:
>
> > "Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
> > news:20031011025017.11891.00001413@mb-m11.aol.com...
> >
> >>In article <EdHhb.645$_i.51817@nnrp1.ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
> >><wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:
> >>
> >>
> >>>Now, I wouldn't expect to be able to have that sort of a relationship
> >>>with you, Dick ... you're not open-minded enough to accept that others
> >>>see things different than you. (You see, I accept that you like and
use
> >>>CW ... I disagree only with your propatation of the "Morse myths" and
> >>>your insistence that everyone should have Morse forced on them in
> >>>exchange for HF privs ... fortunately, most of the rest of the world
> >>>doesn't agree with you.)
> >>>Carl - wk3c
> >>
> >>Carl:
> >>I consider the use of the term "Morse myths" to be derogatory and
> >>inflammatory. Thus, you have also failed to meet Mike's challenge.
> >>73 de Larry, K3LT
> >
> > Hw about morse fallicies, morse inaccuracies, erronious morse
> > claims? Which of these do you find acceptable?
>
>
> It's easy enough to accept that those of you who have never had any use
> for radiotelegraphy would view its stated attributes as mythical, and
> for the lot of you that is indeed a proper description. You couldn't
> communciate your way out of an emergency using Morse if the fate of the
> planet DID depend on it!

I stand a better chance of helping someone else in life as a ham
without knowing any code than waiting for that unlikly
need for CW to actually be used. As for the fate of the planet,
when is the sequal coming out to ID4?

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

806. Re: What makes a Pro code test Amateur a Troglodyte?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-12 05:08:35 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <nl5ib.32521$mQ2.1588@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 80380

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:bmamp5$rl3$1@208.207.71.130...
> N2EY wrote:
>
> > In article <bma161$cg2@library2.airnews.net>, "Kim"
<kimscliff@yahoo.com>
> > writes:
> >
> >>"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
> >>news:7ILhb.25498$mQ2.9966@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> >>
> >>>The issue isn't about USE it is about
> >>>the lack of any rational reason to retain code testing as a
> >>>license requirement now that the ITU mandatory code knowledge
> >>>requirment has ended.
> >>>
> >>
> >>Therein lies the problem with the whole CW test (TEST, *test*) debate.
The
> >>minute one takes on the "no" CW test argument, it is generally met with
an
> >>attitude that an end CW use (USE, *use*) is being favored or called for.
> >
> > Not that I have observed, Kim.
> >
> > But can you accurately say that *no one* wants to end Morse use?
> >
> >>Until, (UNTIL, *until*) it is clearly understood that seeking the end of
the
> >>CW test is not the equivalent of seeking the end of CW as a mode, this
> >>debate will never fall within the realm of "friendly" debate at all. I
> >>think it's even hazardous to use the PCTA/NCTA labels.
> >
> >
> > One of the problems is that some folks aren't clear that it is only the
test
> > they are against.
>
> And you have to doubt the veracity of many of those who do.

And you make that statement based on what?... or is this
just another propoganda effort to "suggest" a conspiracy
of purpose or some other fiction in your mind?

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

807. Re: What makes a Pro code test Amateur a Troglodyte?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-12 05:12:56 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <sp5ib.32523$mQ2.10802@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 80381

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:oX4ib.107419$qj6.3811218@news1.news.adelphia.net...
> Bill Sohl wrote:
>
> > "Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
> > news:3F86EDAD.4010109@psu.edu...
> >
> >>I just saw another accusation of Pro-Coders as technically backwards.
> >
> >
> > Unfortuneately, extremist comments are present on both sides.
> >
> >
> >>Yet some of the most progressive RF Engineers and Technicians I know
> >>(who are Hams) are really enamored of Morse CW.
> >
> >
> > Nothing wrong with that. The issue isn't about USE it is about
> > the lack of any rational reason to retain code testing as a
> > license requirement now that the ITU mandatory code knowledge
> > requirment has ended.
>
> But that isn't my question or argument, Bill. It isn't really about the
> test. I don't care if they make the taking the test punishable by
> inprisonment.
>
> My question was related to the statements that Pro coders are
> technically backwards.
>
>
>
> >
> >>I would challenge the NCTA's to show some proof that those who believe
> >>that the morse code test should be retained are in a technical
backwater.
> >
> >
> > It isn't that the individuals that want code retained are in a technical
> > backwater, but rather that their procode test arguments fail
> > as to any technical reason for retaining code testing. On that point,
> > don't take my word on it, read the FCC R&O on NPRM98-143
> > and you'll find every argument being put forth today has already
> > been made to the FCC and rejected by the FCC.
> >

> >
> >>I would also challenge them to do it without being abrasive or
insulting.
> >
> >
> > Feel free to let me know if I fail that challenge.
>
>
> You did just fine from the civility standpoint, but perhaps I didn't
> make myself clear. This isn't about the test.
> >
> >
> >>Just facts or intelligent informed opinions.
> >
> >
> > As above, for the facts and the ultimate opinion (the only
> > opinion that in the end means anything) can be found in 98-143 R&O.
>
> Bill, it isn't about the test.
>
> >
> >>Pro coders can help by refraining from name calling too.
> >
> >
> > Agreed.
> >
> >
> >>My statement is that there is no direct relationship.
> >
> >
> > Not sure what relationship you are referring to.
>
> I'm alomost confused here Bill! I'm saying there is no direct
> relationship between being Pro-Code and technical ability.

OK, I agree.

My point is that the arguments should and can be made
without regard to personal aspects of either side.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

808. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-12 05:24:17 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bmaoi1$31u$0@208.207.71.130>
Source record: 80382

Bill Sohl wrote:

> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20031011123003.05539.00001476@mb-m16.aol.com...
>
>>In article <20031010202024.23171.00001429@mb-m05.aol.com>,
>
> lenover21@aol.com
>
>>(Len Over 21) writes:
>>
>>
>>>In article <20031010062952.07578.00001037@mb-m25.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com
>>>(N2EY)
>>>writes:
>>>
>>>
>>>>In article <voc7csn28m5j44@corp.supernews.com>, "Clint" <rattlehead at
>>>>computron dot net> writes:
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>>>>>news:20031009222958.11022.00001288@mb-m14.aol.com...
>>>>>
>>>>>>In article <vobqv2rgm27fb7@corp.supernews.com>, "Clint" <rattlehead
>
> at
>
>>>>>>computron dot net> writes:
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>All age groups showed a majority to be procodetest, h
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>bzzzzzt....
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>if this were true,
>>>>>>
>>>>>>It is true. Did you read the survey and its results?
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>there wouldn't be such a push to remove it.
>>>>>>
>>>>>>Incorrect. What "push"? Based on membership numbers, NCI has fewer

>
> than
>
>>>>>5000
>>>>>
>>>>>>members worldwide, even with no dues, no expiration of membership and
>>>>>
>>>>>having
>>>>>
>>>>>>been around over 7 years.
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>Oh, more than just NCI; ARRL seems to favor it,
>>>>
>>>>ARRL hasn't formulated a new position yet. Their leadership is sitting
>
> on
>
>>>the
>>>
>>>>sidelines because no matter what they decide, some folks will be
>
> unhappy.
>
>>> Prior to and just after the IARU decision on S25 policy, ARRL was
>>> ALL FOR CODE TESTING.
>>
>>In the USA, yes. But back in early 2001, ARRL changed policy on S25.5 and
>
> no
>
>>longer supported its continuation in the treaty..
>>
>>> That didn't make the NCTA happy.
>>>
>>> ARRL still doesn't have any more membership than a quarter of all
>>> licensed US amateurs. I don't believe in coincidences.
>>
>>NCI membership is less than one percent of licensed US amateurs. Even
>
> though
>
>>membership is free and requires only a few mouse clicks.
>>
>>
>>> Faced with the inevitable worldwide reaction and subsequent action
>>> at WRC-03, ARRL just OPTS OUT, goes neutral, won't take a stand
>>> either way.
>>

>>ARRL policy is made by representatives of the membership. If the
>
> membership is
>
>>divided on an issue, a neutral policy may be the only solution.
>>
>>> Their $12 million income (2002) is at stake. ARRL doesn't exist
>>> without funding. The ONLY people the ARRL is worried about is
>>> the present membership which is skewed towards PCTA thinking.
>>
>>Is it somehow wrong for a membership organization to do what the members
>
> think
>
>>is best?
>>
>>> ARRL membership is still only a quarter of all US licensed amateurs.
>>
>>NCI membership is less than one percent of licensed US amateurs.
>>
>>> They aren't a majority. Their decisions are not a "consensus."
>>
>>Neither are NCI's.
>>
>>>>>>Yep, it's outta here, CW testing is soon to be extinct. It's goneski.
>>>>>
>>>>
>>>>Maybe it is. But if so, it's not because most hams want it to go. And on
>>>>particular, not because young hams want it to go.
>>>
>>> Your OPINION, senior.
>>
>>No, simple fact, backed up by scientific survey. And the comments to
>
> 98-143.
>
>>> Do you have any good and true statistical polling to back up your
>>> OPINION?
>>
>>Yes!
>>
>>The ARRL/READEX survey showed that a majority favored code testing, and
>
> that
>
>>the youngest age group was the most strongly procodetest.
>
>
> When was the survey done? If it is more than two years old, it
> is almost useless as there has been significant change

> over the last few years.
>

Really??? Where is the documentation to back up that statement in the
face of the large majority of code supporting commentors to 98-143?

>
>>The comments to 98-143 were categorized by an NCI staffer (disproving any
>>possible claim of bias by procodetest evaluation of the comments) and the
>>resutls showed that the *majority* of commenters not only wanted continued
>
> code
>
>>testing, but wanted at least 2 code test speeds. This was true despite an
>
> email
>
>>campaign by NCI to get as many comments in support of their position of 5
>
> wpm
>
>>and sunset clause.
>
>
> Now it also must be pointed out that for the initial several weeks
> during 98-143 comment phase, those commenting were not
> aware of the position being put forth by NCI. How many people
> at the time may who said they support ARRLs stance
> may have supported NCI's position will never be known. Even
> so, the issue is NOT to be decided by any "vote" or majority opinion
> of any group or even the public at large. The decision will be,
> as it should be, based on what should be proper regulatory
> setting of licensing requirments.
>
>

Ah. So maybe that change "in the last few years" wasn't so striking,
after all.

809. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-12 05:30:28 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bmaotk$404$0@208.207.71.130>
Source record: 80383

Bill Sohl wrote:
Dwight:
>>>Because of that, few who oppose code testing, and even fewer Technicians,
>>>attend that club's meetings or socialize with the members. Find me a
>
> survey
>
>>>that is truly unbiased and I'll be glad to discuss the results. Until
>
> then,discussing the results of surveys is simply a waste of time.

N2EY:
>>Then consider the comments to the restructuring NPRM.

>
> I agree...surveys, votes, etc hold little sway with the FCC anyway.
>

So you think Bill Cross is obfuscating when he says that FCC wants the
ham community to decide what our rules are to be, for us to reach a
concensus??

810. Re: What makes a Pro code test Amateur a Troglodyte?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-12 05:41:23 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bmapi3$83f$0@208.207.71.130>
Source record: 80384

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:

> In article <20031011214231.06226.00000928@mb-m19.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
> writes:
>
>
>>No mode always gets through. Some modes, however, get through when some >other
>
> modes don't.
>
> Jim:
>
> Indeed. And more often than not, it's usually good, 'ole fashion Morse/CW
> which is getting through.

And just to crown their ignorarance of it all, when I found a
dead-band morning where there was group of very weak Europeans coming in
on 20 meter PSK31 that wouldn't print, but their CW ID's were completely
good copy, Carl and his little lid buddy Brain Burke accuse me of "not
being able to make PSK31 work!"
Can you believe the clowns? I had only been working PSK31 for the past
6 or 8 months!

I know, the reason for the failure of PSK31 in that case was likely
polar phase shift, but that seems to be meaningless to our technical
genius and his pals!

"Too many clowns and not enough ringmasters!"

*They're already here!"

811. Re: What makes a Pro code test Amateur a Troglodyte?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-12 06:05:11 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bmaqun$gu0$0@208.207.71.130>
Source record: 80385

Bill Sohl wrote:

> "Dick Carroll" <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com> wrote in message
> news:bmalst$q20$0@208.207.71.130...
>
>>Bill Sohl wrote:
>>
>>
>>>"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
>>>news:20031011025017.11891.00001413@mb-m11.aol.com...
>>>
>>>
>>>>In article <EdHhb.645$_i.51817@nnrp1.ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
>>>><wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>Now, I wouldn't expect to be able to have that sort of a relationship
>>>>>with you, Dick ... you're not open-minded enough to accept that others
>>>>>see things different than you. (You see, I accept that you like and
>
> use
>
>>>>>CW ... I disagree only with your propatation of the "Morse myths" and
>>>>>your insistence that everyone should have Morse forced on them in
>>>>>exchange for HF privs ... fortunately, most of the rest of the world
>>>>>doesn't agree with you.)
>>>>>Carl - wk3c
>>>>
>>>>Carl:
>>>>I consider the use of the term "Morse myths" to be derogatory and
>>>>inflammatory. Thus, you have also failed to meet Mike's challenge.
>>>>73 de Larry, K3LT
>>>
>>>Hw about morse fallicies, morse inaccuracies, erronious morse
>>>claims? Which of these do you find acceptable?
>>
>>
>>It's easy enough to accept that those of you who have never had any use
>>for radiotelegraphy would view its stated attributes as mythical, and
>>for the lot of you that is indeed a proper description. You couldn't
>>communciate your way out of an emergency using Morse if the fate of the
>>planet DID depend on it!
>

>
> I stand a better chance of helping someone else in life as a ham
> without knowing any code than waiting for that unlikly
> need for CW to actually be used.

And should the time come when CW is caleld for, you and "someone" both suffer the consequences of your lack. Odds are always against it happening. So were the odds against planes being flown into WTC. But it happened. I have perxonally seen the need arise for emergency communications where there were NO communications available and when HF CW could have easily been used, if it had been planned for. I wasn't making the plans.

> As for the fate of the planet,
> when is the sequal coming out to ID4?

Whatever it is, I didn't see the first three and have similar lack of interest in the fourth.

812. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-12 06:21:31 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <Lp6ib.32560$mQ2.770@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 80386

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote:
>
> Neither have I, Dwight. As I have pointed out, the
> ARRL/READEX survey is 7 years old. But it's the
> most recent *scientific* survey we have. (Its 1500
> respondents were chosen at random, not self-selected
> as is the case in many "surveys".)

Okay, perhaps it wasn't you. Someone posted the results of a survey done by some club or group in Minnesota, Michigan, or somewhere like that, just a week or so ago and I thought you were talking about that survey. I haven't seen the survey you're talking about here so can't really comment on it.

> That sort of behavior is unacceptable. Not "real ham"
> behavior.

Luckily, it is rare. The club in Washington was very open to all. This club isn't. Sadly, the fact that a club elsewhere is different doesn't really help those who are here. I've considered starting an alternative club, but I'm afraid the strong position of that club will quickly turn anything like that into a pro-testing versus anti-code testing situation (fed by members of both groups) which will not really benefit anybody in the long term.

> How do we know that there are "far more outside that
> organization..involved"?

Well, since most Amateur Radio operators don't join any type of club (local, ARRl, or whatever), it's a fairly safe assumption.

> Most of those opposed to code testing I have encountered
> here *are* members of NCI. (snip)

Do you know that for a fact, or did you just assume they were members like you did with me?

> No "onsession" at all. I'm just curious as to why someone who
> felt strongly or even mildly that code testing should go would
> *not* join that organization. (snip)

Do you feel most who support code testing are members of FISTS or other such clubs? I don't think so. Based on what I've seen, there is a general trend throughout this country not to participate in clubs or other such groups. About the only exception to that is national political groups, which seem to be gaining members.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

813. Re: What makes a Pro code test Amateur a Troglodyte?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-12 12:30:00 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031012083000.12300.00001074@mb-m20.aol.com>
Source record: 80389

In article <fG4ib.32485$mQ2.15379@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:

>> But can you accurately say that *no one* wants to end Morse use?
>
>Can you name one?

Sure! Remember Mark Morgan, KB9RQZ, whose spelling was even worse than Bruce's?

>Search the entire population of licensed hams and
>I'm sure there's some here and there that would take that stance

And that's my point when someone says "*no one* wants to end Morse *use*."
>
>...BUT,
>that is not the position (just in case someone tries to suggest
>otherwise) of NCI. We (NCI) oppose code testing. We (NCI) have no
>problem with code USE.
>
That's been made clear.

But the name of the organization doesn't include "test" so there could be some confusion.

>> >Until, (UNTIL, *until*) it is clearly understood that seeking the end of
>the
>> >CW test is not the equivalent of seeking the end of CW as a mode, this
>> >debate will never fall within the realm of "friendly" debate at all. I
>> >think it's even hazardous to use the PCTA/NCTA labels.
>>
>> One of the problems is that some folks aren't clear that it is only the
>> *test*
>> they are against.
>
>Another problem is that some (many?) that favor code testing suggest that
>by ending that testing it will lead to an end to code use. I don't
>belive that at all and there are hundreds of examples of older
>technology and skills that are still practiced today in other
>fields even though such technology/skill is recognized as
>no longer generally used/needed (e.g. archery, manual transmission
>autos, etc.)
>
We don't know what will happen without a test.

73 de Jim, N2EY

814. Re: 73 Magazine Says "73 and QRT"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-12 12:39:10 UTC
From: "Dr. Anton Phibes" <bhutanna2@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <1066006138.551185@newshost03.voicenet.com>
Source record: 80463
Cross-posted to:
rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

"Hans K0HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:5ee63311.0310111336.660577e7@posting.google.com...
> "Capt. Blackflag" <wvay4daves@yahoo.com> wrote
>
> > > 73 MAGAZINE SAYS "73 AND QRT"
>
> I'm gonna miss my copy of 73 in the mail each month. Wayne is a
> genuine American legend. Off the wall, often mistaken, often over the
> edge, but always stands up for his position regardless of how goofy it
> seems to the rest of us. I rarely agreed with him, but I always
> admired his good natured poking at the pompous among us, and his
> absolute support for the causes which he believed in, regardless how
> unpopular.
>
> I hope the old rascal figures out a way to start another magazine.
>
> 73, de Hans, K0HB

He'll probably relax. Heck what is he? 80 yrs or so?
If I had his $$$ the last think I'd want to do is worry
about some work or job related stuff.

815. Re: BPL a reality in my area now!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-12 13:19:23 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bmbl64$b3c@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 80390

"Jim Hampton" <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote in message
news:9i1ib.2314$_%6.1676@news01.roc.ny...
> Exactly. Also, don't just complain to the utilities as they will still
deny
> getting complaints. I wonder if they are hiring any of the lawyers from
the
> tobacco companies LOL
>
>
> 73 from Rochester, NY
> Jim AA2QA
>

The aggregate population that will be affected by the interference from BPL is minimal at best. Even if commercial interest is rolled up into the collective, there just ins't going to be the appearance of a majority negative impact on this one.

BPL is a reality.

Kim W5TIT

816. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-12 13:26:28 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bmbl65$b3c@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 80391

"Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
news:3F88ACAC.6030700@ix.netcom.com...
> N2EY wrote:
>
> >In article <3F84B6F7.20507@ix.netcom.com>, Robert Casey
<wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
> >writes:
> >
> >
> >
> >>There should be some sort of beginner's license that an average 14 year
> >>old honor roll student can get
> >>
> >>
> >
> >That would require an extensive reworking of the current tests. We've got
at
> >least one 6 year old General and an 8 year old passed the old Extra.
> >
> >
> >
> I mean "average honor roll high school student", not "Einstein's
> grandson". Also
> I mention the honor roll student in the sense that Beavis and Butthead
> would not be
> able to pass the license tests.
>

That sounds to me like a thinly veiled "filtering tool" again; using some
form of exam or entrance requirement to "filter" out types of people that
are designated as undesirable by...you guessed it: *other* types of people.

I am of the ilk that anyone who passes whatever entrance there is into ham
radio (whether it be in written or mode-test form--just whatever entrance
there is into ham radio at the particular time someone is interested) is
welcomed to ham radio. I'd rather have the opportunity to let the majority
environment of ham radio be the positive influence on someone who may
otherwise not be "desirable" and let them warm up to the service, in
general. Closing the door right up front never allows us the opportunity to
be a positive influence; and that is a loss.

>
> If Beavis did get a license, then ham
> radio would
> sound like the old 147.435 machine on L.A..... W6NUT IIRC

>

Even Beavis and Butthead have the potential to be a great couple of guys.
Everyone has potential.

Kim W5TIT

817. Re: What makes a Pro code test Amateur a Troglodyte?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-12 13:34:09 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bmblb5$103@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 80392

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20031011214229.06226.00000925@mb-m19.aol.com...
> In article <nisdov0duc0ipm9likrr73not53jvvq728@4ax.com>, Leo
<nomail@nope.org>
> writes:
>
> >An excellent idea. I for one would be very interested in seeing the
> >logic and rationale that folks have for keeping or retiring the code
> >test. By removing the emotion, personal opinion and bias from the
> >discussion, some quite interesting points may well be raised.
>
> Unfortunately, it is pretty much impossible to remove personal opinion
from the
> discussion. That's because every reason for keeping or removing the test
> ultimately comes down to an opinion question.
>
> For example, take the "Morse is needed for emergencies" reason.
>
> On the one hand, Morse is not used very much in emergency communication.
On the
> other hand, it *is* still used occasionally, by hams, in emergency
> communications. More important, there *are* times when it when it is the
only
> available mode that would get through in the situation.
> (Note that phrase "only available mode")
>

Absolutely, Jim! And, as an added commentary to the above, it would be my hope that many in the EmComm interest of ham radio would push CW at every chance they had. When I was in a position of leadership in EmComm, I always pushed CW--and there was not portion of the group that moaned or forsaked it. Everyone recognized its value, and the value that those who use and understand it brought to the table.

>
> All of the above are documented facts.
>
> The problem is, does the occasional use of Morse in emergencies mean that
all
> hams *must* be tested on the mode? Some say yes, some say no, some say
it's a
> piece of the reason. All based on personal opinion, nothing more.
>

I say no. It is no reason for keeping CW as a tested element for licensing. That is my personal opinion.

>
> Boil down any of the arguments on either side, and what you wind up with is
> personal opinion.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>

Exactly. If I am asked to explain my personal opinion, that is when it gets ugly--although from my perspective it gets ugly from an intial onslaught of insults and uglies from people who differ from my opinion. My return to them is going to be in like manner--but *ONLY* toward the attitude they display. I have no problem at all with anyone's opinion or beliefs on CW. All are quite valid, and I think the trend only reflects majority *opinion,* not display of force or argument from either side.

Kim W5TIT

818. Re: 73 Magazine Says "73 and QRT"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-12 13:41:12 UTC
From: et472@FreeNet.Carleton.CA
Message-ID: <bmbllodjq1@freenet9.carleton.ca>
Source record: 80395
Cross-posted to:
rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

unkadean () writes:
>
>
> As I recall, the former Mrs. Wayne got most everything from Byte, etc.
>
> unk
>

But Wayne was out of Byte by the third issue, at a time when it did not amount to much. He only lost the potential for when it did get big.

He then turned around and started Kilobaud, which was pretty good for some years, and then launching the very successful magazine for the Radio Shack computer, titled something like "TRS-80 Microcomputing", and a number of other computer specific titles. It's those he sold to IDG, which brought in quite a bit of money at the time. Ironically, by the time he did sell them, they were past their peak because the computer world had moved on. I can't remember the year of the sale, but I thought it was just as a lot of computer magazines were folding, because too many had entered the field.

And since your wording can be read two ways, it's worth throwing in that Wayne was divoriced from Virginia Londner Green by the time Byte had started up. They had broken up about 1967 or 68, and from an editorial at the time, it seemed to be the indirect cause of his later tax problems.

By the time Byte was started, he was married to his second wife, Lynn.

It was never clear why Byte was put under the name of is his ex-wife, though years later he did say it had to do with the tax problems and the problems with Bell over those telephone articles, so he put it under someone else's name so it couldn't be grabbed. That still does not explain why it was his ex-wife. Three issues into the magazine, Wayne's name was gone from the masthead. Nothing was said at the time. And it was amusing how childish it got, with no mention of Wayne or 73 for about ten years. Even when there was an article in Byte about teletype machines, and the bibliography mentioned QST, CQ and Ham Radio, 73 was significantly absent.

Michael VE2BVW

819. Re: What makes a Pro code test Amateur a Troglodyte?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-12 13:41:35 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bmblp3$85p@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 80393

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20031011214232.06226.00000929@mb-m19.aol.com...
> In article <bma161$cg2@library2.airnews.net>, "Kim" <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
> writes:
>
> >"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
> >news:7ILhb.25498$mQ2.9966@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> >>
> >> The issue isn't about USE it is about
> >> the lack of any rational reason to retain code testing as a
> >> license requirement now that the ITU mandatory code knowledge
> >> requirment has ended.
> >>
> >
> >Therein lies the problem with the whole CW test (TEST, *test*) debate.
The
> >minute one takes on the "no" CW test argument, it is generally met with
an
> >attitude that an end CW use (USE, *use*) is being favored or called for.
>
> Not that I have observed, Kim.
>
> But can you accurately say that *no one* wants to end Morse use?
>

Of course not. But I can accurately say that there is no need to roll
everyone who wants to see an end to the test element, into the "no CW use"
minority (note I said minority), either.

> >
> >Until, (UNTIL, *until*) it is clearly understood that seeking the end of
the
> >CW test is not the equivalent of seeking the end of CW as a mode, this
> >debate will never fall within the realm of "friendly" debate at all. I
> >think it's even hazardous to use the PCTA/NCTA labels.
>
> One of the problems is that some folks aren't clear that it is only the
test
> they are against.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>

Anyone, *anyone* who allows theirself (bad English) to get all in a huff
about CW use going away or being legislated out of ham radio is being

foolish. There are a few who have been proponents of seeing the end of CW; and when I see those posts, I yawn and go on. There will never be an end to CW use, and it would never be banned from use in the ham bands...it just wouldn't. I think it would be unrealistic to think it would. And, if it was based off a majority of users of the bands, I rest assured knowing that most would not support an end to CW use. I think those who are in the minority are there mostly for the shock value of it.

Kim W5TIT

820. Re: BPL a reality in my area now!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-12 13:43:01 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bmblrp$ki1@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 80394

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20031011214233.06226.00000930@mb-m19.aol.com...
> In article <bm9o10$kemhq$1@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>, "Ryan, KC8PMX"
> <REMOVETHISkc8pmx@diamondcs.net> writes:
>
> >Just found out today listening to a local, reputable radio station that
Bay,
> >Saginaw and Midland Counties in Michigan are going to be "test sites" for
> >BPL, at least for Michigan. I don't know when it will be an actual
reality,
> >as opposed to being in the planning stages, but will keep current with
their
> >project!
>
> Ryan,
>
> If you have a 6 meter rig that can go mobile, you're set up to
measure/observe
> (and report) BPL interference.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

heh heh. Yeah, and any ham worth being a ham would have a 6-meter rig that
can go mobile so they can measure/observe (and report) BPL interference.
Right?

Ducking
Kim W5TIT

821. Re: What makes a Pro code test Amateur a Troglodyte?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-12 14:02:31 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bmbn0b$bg7@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 80396

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20031012000943.23307.00003682@mb-m29.aol.com...
> In article <bma161$cg2@library2.airnews.net>, "Kim W5TIT"
<kimscliff@yahoo.com>
> writes:
>
> >Therein lies the problem with the whole CW test (TEST, *test*) debate.
The
> >minute one takes on the "no" CW test argument, it is generally met with
an
> >attitude that an end CW use (USE, *use*) is being favored or called for.
>
> Kim:
>
> Code testing has always been the thing which generated code use.
> In the absence of a code testing requirement, there will be progressively
> fewer hams who have never been exposed to learning the code as a
> result of the requirement. Since the requirement was the principle
> motivation to learn the code, code use *will* decline once code testing
> is abolished. Therefore, testing and use are two closely interrelated
> concepts.
>

1) To use the test element as a reason to proliferate CW users is not
acceptable to me. The reason is because the test requirement is a
government sponsored requirement. If we use your expectation for the
requirement above, then I respond that the continuance of the mode of CW is
not the responsiblity of the government, nor should it be. The FCC, the
government, has decided that CW is no longer needed for its expectation and
interpretation of what the ARS is about. To argue with that is merely
spinning our wheels at this point--it's a done deal. So, if your basic
support of the CW test as a requirement for ham radio is that it will keep
people learning and using the mode, then I would wholehertedly disagree.

2) Using the statement you make, above: would you not also agree then, that
the choice by some people to stop short of HF privileges, simply because of
a CW test requirement, depletes the overall supply of HF, therefore CW,
users anyway? I'd rather dismiss the test requirement for CW and have HF
thrive and active for the ARS. The influence of good amateur radio
operators who appreciate the value, tradition, and history of CW will always
be a positive effect on the maintenance of the population of CW users.
Again, it is not up the government to be the arm of CW continuance.

> >
> >Until, (UNTIL, *until*) it is clearly understood that seeking the end of

the
> >CW test is not the equivalent of seeking the end of CW as a mode, this
> >debate will never fall within the realm of "friendly" debate at all. I
> >think it's even hazardous to use the PCTA/NCTA labels.
>
> PCTA = Pro-Code Testing Agenda; NCTA = Anti-Code Testing Agenda.
> Those terms are accurately descriptive of the intent of their respective
> groups. Where is the "hazard" in honesty?
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

The hazard, Larry, is in the derogatory slams that have been bantered back and forth while using those terms. The term "nigger" (excuse me, to anyone who is offended by that word--me included) isn't derogatory until some bigoted person uses it against another person, either. No hazard, at all, in being honest.

Kim W5TIT

822. Re: What makes a Pro code test Amateur a Troglodyte?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-12 14:07:56 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bmbnag$fiq@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 80397

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20031012000946.23307.00003685@mb-m29.aol.com...
>
> I have always presented well-reasoned, factual, and unemotional
> arguments in support of code testing.
>

Cough WHAT?????!!!!! Sure, Larry. That is why you are so endeared by
many in this newsgroup, alone. Sure.

>
> Please don't hold me up to
> the same light as those who may have transgressed in the manner
> which you refer to above.
>

PHULEEZE. You are the *BEACON* to those whom Carl depicted, Larry! Forget
about being held up to any light. You *ARE* the light.

>
> Above all, please remember that by far,
> the largest portion of the QRM in the code/no-code debate has been
> from the NCTA side. Also remember that as one who has never
> used the Morse/CW mode to an extent which would have allowed
> you to gain useful proficiency in the mode, you are not qualified to
> judge the value of this mode at all. I'm not sitting here trying to
> argue technical topics with you, so don't you try to tell me that the
> Morse/CW mode and testing aren't of value to the ARS. We are
> not on each other's respective levels of expertise. Since I'm
> more than willing to respect your technical expertise, don't presume
> to challenge my qualifications to make judgments about CW and
> code testing, because you don't know what your talking about.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

And, you obviously think that what you just said, above, is well-reasoned,
factual, and unemotional??!! I've broken my own rule and just responded to
a post from you that was none of the above.

Kim W5TIT

823. Re: What makes a Pro code test Amateur a Troglodyte?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-12 14:14:09 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bmbnm5$c30@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 80398

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:bmakv4$n72$0@208.207.71.130...
>
> Well, Hood Buddy, your rejection is hereby rejected!
>

Yeah. Hood Buddy is probably about right...

Kim W5TIT

824. Re: What makes a Pro code test Amateur a Troglodyte?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-12 14:18:32 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bmbnuc$e9p@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 80399

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:bmalst$q20$0@208.207.71.130...
> Bill Sohl wrote:
>
> > "Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
> > news:20031011025017.11891.00001413@mb-m11.aol.com...
> >
> >>In article <EdHhb.645$_i.51817@nnrp1.ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
> >><wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:
> >>
> >>
> >>>Now, I wouldn't expect to be able to have that sort of a relationship
> >>>with you, Dick ... you're not open-minded enough to accept that others
> >>>see things different than you. (You see, I accept that you like and
use
> >>>CW ... I disagree only with your propatation of the "Morse myths" and
> >>>your insistence that everyone should have Morse forced on them in
> >>>exchange for HF privs ... fortunately, most of the rest of the world
> >>>doesn't agree with you.)
> >>>
> >>>Carl - wk3c
> >>
> >>Carl:
> >>
> >>I consider the use of the term "Morse myths" to be derogatory and
> >>inflammatory. Thus, you have also failed to meet Mike's challenge.
> >>
> >>73 de Larry, K3LT
> >
> >
> > Hw about morse fallicies, morse inaccuracies, erronious morse
> > claims? Which of these do you find acceptable?
> >
>
>
> It's easy enough to accept that those of you who have never had any use
> for radiotelegraphy would view its stated attributes as mythical, and
> for the lot of you that is indeed a proper description. You couldn't
> communciate your way out of an emergency using Morse if the fate of the
> planet DID depend on it!
>

And, DICK, what modes would be your failure to communicate your way of an
emergency if the fate of the planet depends on it? I wish, for once, you'd

answer an honest question. I suspect it'll be the usual, though. Complete silence because my question is not only one you can't answer (yeah, I'll make the bet that you are *NOT* proficient in all available modes of ham radio), and it's also one that makes a counter to the point you attempted to illustrate, above.

So, DICK, what mode would be our shortcoming if we were all looking to you to "save the planet?"

Kim W5TIT

825. Re: What makes a Pro code test Amateur a Troglodyte?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-12 14:21:55 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bmbo4n$3b7@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 80400

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:bmamp5$rl3$1@208.207.71.130...
> N2EY wrote:
>
> > In article <bma161$cg2@library2.airnews.net>, "Kim"
<kimscliff@yahoo.com>
> > writes:
> >
> >
> >"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
> >news:7ILhb.25498$mQ2.9966@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> >>
> >>>The issue isn't about USE it is about
> >>>the lack of any rational reason to retain code testing as a
> >>>license requirement now that the ITU mandatory code knowledge
> >>>requirment has ended.
> >>>
> >>
> >>Therein lies the problem with the whole CW test (TEST, *test*) debate.
The
> >>minute one takes on the "no" CW test argument, it is generally met with
an
> >>attitude that an end CW use (USE, *use*) is being favored or called for.
> >
> >
> > Not that I have observed, Kim.
> >
> > But can you accurately say that *no one* wants to end Morse use?
> >
> >Until, (UNTIL, *until*) it is clearly understood that seeking the end of
the
> >CW test is not the equivalent of seeking the end of CW as a mode, this
> >debate will never fall within the realm of "friendly" debate at all. I
> >think it's even hazardous to use the PCTA/NCTA labels.
> >
> >
> > One of the problems is that some folks aren't clear that it is only the
test
> > they are against.
>
>
>
> And you have to doubt the veracity of many of those who do.
>

The "veracity?" Did you look up that word before you used it? I am sure
that anyone who posts an opinion is being pretty genuine in their belief...

Kim W5TIT

826. Re: What makes a Pro code test Amateur a Troglodyte?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-12 14:27:08 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bmboeg$kud@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 80301

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:bmapi3$83f$0@208.207.71.130...
> Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>
> > In article <20031011214231.06226.00000928@mb-m19.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com
(N2EY)
> > writes:
> >
> >
> >>No mode always gets through. Some modes, however, get through when some
>other
> >
> > modes don't.
> >
> > Jim:
> >
> > Indeed. And more often than not, it's usually good, 'ole fashion
Morse/CW
> > which is getting through.
>
>
> And just to crown their ignorarance of it all, when I found a
> dead-band morning where there was group of very weak Europeans coming in
> on 20 meter PSK31 that wouldn't print, but their CW ID's were completely
> good copy, Carl and his little lid buddy Brain Burke accuse me of "not
> being able to make PSK31 work!"
> Can you believe the clowns? I had only been working PSK31 for the past
> 6 or 8 months!
>
> I know, the reason for the failure of PSK31 in that case was likely
> polar phase shift, but that seems to be meaningless to our technical
> genius and his pals!
>
>
> "Too many clowns and not enough ringmasters!"
>
> *They're already here!"
>

How do you know it was polar phase shift, DICK? Did you get enough
information to see that they were transmitting from their home locations as
well? How do you know they weren't visiting somewhere? Did you get enough
copy to tell all that?

Kim W5TIT

827. Re: BPL a reality in my area now!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-12 15:24:19 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <Dmeib.680$P%1.692489@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 80302

"Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:bmbl64$b3c@library1.airnews.net...
> "Jim Hampton" <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote in message
> news:9i1ib.2314$_%6.1676@news01.roc.ny...
> > Exactly. Also, don't just complain to the utilities as they will still
> deny
> > getting complaints. I wonder if they are hiring any of the lawyers from
> the
> > tobacco companies LOL
> >
> >
> > 73 from Rochester, NY
> > Jim AA2QA
> >
>
> The aggregate population that will be affected by the interference from
BPL
> is minimal at best. Even if commercial interest is rolled up into the
> collective, there just ins't going to be the appearance of a majority
> negative impact on this one.
>
> BPL is a reality.
>
> Kim W5TIT

There has been at least one posting to one of the amateur newsgroups referencing an article by an independent economic analyst. He has evaluated BPL several times over the last 10 years at the request of various clients and in his opinion it will not really get off the ground regardless of technical feasibility. The investment exceeds the projected return. Other means of delivering Broadband are much more cost effective. Only time will tell though but I hope he is right. Keep in mind that the test sites are only designed to demonstrate technical feasibility not cost effectiveness.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

828. Re: BPL a reality in my area now!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-12 15:31:04 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <Yseib.36864$mQ2.6953@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 80303

"Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:bmblrp$ki1@library1.airnews.net...
> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20031011214233.06226.00000930@mb-m19.aol.com...
> > In article <bm9o10$kemhq$1@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>, "Ryan, KC8PMX"
> > <REMOVETHISkc8pmx@diamondcs.net> writes:
> >
> > >Just found out today listening to a local, reputable radio station that
> Bay,
> > >Saginaw and Midland Counties in Michigan are going to be "test sites"
for
> > >BPL, at least for Michigan. I don't know when it will be an actual
> reality,
> > >as opposed to being in the planning stages, but will keep current with
> their
> > >project!
> >
> > Ryan,
> >
> > If you have a 6 meter rig that can go mobile, you're set up to
> measure/observe
> > (and report) BPL interference.
> >
> > 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
> heh heh. Yeah, and any ham worth being a ham would have a 6-meter rig
that
> can go mobile so they can measure/observe (and report) BPL interference.
> Right?
>
> Ducking
> Kim W5TIT
>
>

Gawd I wish she would change her pills.

Dan/W4NTI

829. Re: ARRL you can Kiss my $39.00 a Year Good Bye

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-12 16:31:06 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031012123106.28806.00000085@mb-m25.aol.com>
Source record: 80304

>Subject: Re: ARRL you can Kiss my $39.00 a Year Good Bye
>From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
>Date: 9/13/03 8:25 AM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <f45722ac.0309130525.6f33bc26@posting.google.com>
>
>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
>news:<5c01b95b.0309121214.7d06772d@posting.google.com>...
>> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
>news:<f45722ac.0309061806.621b7987@posting.google.com>...
>>
>> > Jim has repeatedly pointed out where the ARRL proposed fewer license
>> > classes and a lower code speed for full priveleges during the last
>> > restructuring, which he always equates with lower standards.
>>
>> That's Jim;s OPINION, Brain. Other than that, you have not
>> satisfied the question of how the ARRL has allegedly pushed for "lower
>> standards".
>>
>> Steve, K4YZ
>
>I don't necessarily understand how Jim arrived at his OPINION, but
>you're welcome to ask him, if you've the guts to do so.

Plenty of "guts" here, Brain, and I have re-read many of Jim's posts
looking for something that equates to "no code = lower standards".

Haven't found it yet.

>I'm always amazed at how you PCTA give each other passes on every
>damned thing.

What "pass", Brain...?!?! Mean like how YOU let LENNIE "pass" with use of
snide remarks, blatant lies, profanity and obvious misdirection of his posts,
but then accuse others of the same thing without comment...?!?!

>Go ahead, ask him.

Why do I need to ask him anything when his comments are archived for all
to read...?!?!

Now...about those T5 logs and your "authorization" to oeprate in Somalia?

Steve, K4YZ

830. Re: BPL a reality in my area now!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-12 16:55:23 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <%Hfib.693$P%1.707465@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 80306
Cross-posted to: alt.ham-radio,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"James Wilson" <Someone@Microsoft.Com> wrote in message
news:mJfib.121280$xx4.20524963@twister.neo.rr.com...
> What does BPL sound like? Can someone post a wav file somewhere so it can
> be identified? Is it worse that the Pennsylvania QSO party?
>

The ARRL website has a recording. It would make things like the PA QSO
party (and other communications) nearly impossible.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

831. Re: BPL a reality in my area now!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-12 16:56:50 UTC
From: James Wilson <Someone@Microsoft.Com>
Message-ID: <mJfib.121280$xx4.20524963@twister.neo.rr.com>
Source record: 80305
Cross-posted to: alt.ham-radio,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.policy

What does BPL sound like? Can someone post a wav file somewhere so it can be identified? Is it worse that the Pennsylvania QSO party?

> BPL, at least for Michigan. I don't know when it will be an actual reality,
> as opposed to being in the planning stages, but will keep current with their
> project!
>
>

832. Re: 73 Magazine Says "73 and QRT"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-12 17:00:57 UTC
From: Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns94128464654Felektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 80307
Cross-posted to:
rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

et472@FreeNet.Carleton.CA (Michael Black) wrote in
news:bmbllodjq1@freenet9.carleton.ca:

> unkadean () writes:
>>
>>
>> As I recall, the former Mrs. Wayne got most everything from Byte, etc.
>>
>> unk
>>
>
> But Wayne was out of Byte by the third issue, at a time when it did not
> amount to much. He only lost the potential for when it did get big.
>
> He then turned around and started Kilobaud, which was pretty good for
> some years, and then launching the very successful magazine for the
> Radio Shack computer, titled something like "TRS-80 Microcomputing",
> and a number of other computer specific titles. It's those he sold to
> IDG, which brought in quite a bit of money at the time. Ironically, by
> the time he did sell them, they were past their peak because the
> computer world had moved on. I can't remember the year of the sale,
> but I thought it was just as a lot of computer magazines were folding,
> because too many had entered the field.
>
> And since your wording can be read two ways, it's worth throwing in
> that Wayne was divoriced from Virginia Londner Green by the time Byte
> had started up. They had broken up about 1967 or 68, and from an
> editorial at the time, it seemed to be the indirect cause of his later
> tax problems.
>
> By the time Byte was started, he was married to his second wife, Lynn.
>
> It was never clear why Byte was put under the name of is his ex-wife,
> though years later he did say it had to do with the tax problems and
> the problems with Bell over those telephone articles, so he put it
> under someone else's name so it couldn't be grabbed. That still does
> not explain why it was his ex-wife. Three issues into the magazine,
> Wayne's name was gone from the masthead. Nothing was said at the time.
> And it was amusing how childish it got, with no mention of Wayne or 73
> for about ten years. Even when there was an article in Byte about
> teletype machines, and the bibliography mentioned QST, CQ and Ham
> Radio, 73 was significantly absent.
>

> Michael VE2BVW
>

I used to enjoy reading 73. Nobody could ever agree 100% with Wayne Green, but I liked to read his editorials.

I suppose all of us that didn't renew are to blame. Certainly the combination of falling ham numbers and hard times haven't helped. Magazine subscriptions have dropped right off the bottom of my list of financial priorities, for instance.

Oh well, I still have my 73 hat. I actually ordered an entirely different free gift, but they ran out of whatever it was. I will miss 73, though.

73 de Alun, N3KIP

833. Re: 73 Magazine Says "73 and QRT"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-12 17:07:21 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <dTfib.694$P%1.710183@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 80309
Cross-posted to:
rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

"Alun Palmer" <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:Xns94128464654Felektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
> I suppose all of us that didn't renew are to blame. Certainly the
> combination of falling ham numbers and hard times haven't helped. Magazine
> subscriptions have dropped right off the bottom of my list of financial
> priorities, for instance.
>

Well since the number of licensed hams in the US is at or close to an all
time high, I don't think "falling ham numbers" had a thing to do with it.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

834. Re: What makes a Pro code test Amateur a Troglodyte?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-12 17:09:06 UTC
From: groupk0hb@earthlink.net
Message-ID: <5ee63311.0310120909.17e8af14@posting.google.com>
Source record: 80308

"Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote

>
> The term "nigger" (excuse me, to anyone who is offended
> by that word--me included) isn't derogatory until some
> bigoted person uses it against another person, either.
> No hazard, at all, in being honest.
>

Of course it's derogatory, no matter who uses the word.

True story.....

In the winter of 2001/02 K0CKB and I were vacationing in the southwest. We had parked our RV in the lovely town of Big Spring, Texas for a couple of days, and I had my truck down at the local "quick lube" place for an oil change. A local fellow also having his truck lubed noticed a "Sailors have more fun" bumper sticker on my truck, and struck up a conversation about his days in the Navy. Like me, he had spent some time in the brown water Navy running PBR's in the Mekong, so a lively conversation ensued. In discussing some of his close calls, he attributed his survival to "his big nigger", who was one of his crewman, apparently a big man who was particularly good with heavy weapons. He had liberated a 50-calibre from a wrecked aircraft and mounted it on the bow of the PBR in place of the lighter 'regulation' mount, and was extremely adept at using the gun. The fellow cited this the single most important reason his craft had survived Now in the context of the conversation it was apparent to everyone present that he held this crewman in VERY high regard. Yet the term was patently as derogatory as if he had called the man a mo----f---er, a c--ks---ker, or any other demeaning name. Two bystanders (not minorities) took the guy to task for his choice of words, and he apologized.

73, de Hans, K0HB

835. Re: 73 Magazine Says "73 and QRT"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-12 17:10:10 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031012131010.02820.00000235@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 80310

>Subject: Re: 73 Magazine Says "73 and QRT"
>From: Alun Palmer elektros@yahoo.com
>Date: 10/12/03 12:00 PM Central Daylight Time
>Message-id: <Xns94128464654Felektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>

>I used to enjoy reading 73. Nobody could ever agree 100% with Wayne Green,
>but I liked to read his editorials.

They were always a benchmark against which the rational and the unrational
could be judged.

>I suppose all of us that didn't renew are to blame. Certainly the
>combination of falling ham numbers and hard times haven't helped. Magazine
>subscriptions have dropped right off the bottom of my list of financial
>priorities, for instance.

"Falling ham numbers", Alun?

There's almost double the number of licensed Amateurs now was when I got
my first ticket in 72...Where does everyone come up with theses "falling"
numbers from?

>Oh well, I still have my 73 hat. I actually ordered an entirely different
>free gift, but they ran out of whatever it was. I will miss 73, though.

That's not surprising...I subscribed once upon a time and the same thing
happened. Seems he was ALWAYS "out" of something, including his mind.

73

Steve, K4YZ

836. Re: What makes a Pro code test Amateur a Troglodyte?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-12 17:35:18 UTC
From: garigue <garigue@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <qhgib.458083$2x.170238@rwcrnsc52.ops.asp.att.net>
Source record: 80314

>
> Not sure what you mean. In every state I know of, there's no test or
> restriction on manuals vs. automatics unless someone is clearly unable to
drive
> a manual.

Hello Jim ...Just in reference to the old buggy whip automatic xmission
argument .....a skill is a skill is a skill .... noting less nothing more
untill it is needed. eg ...my buddy took me to pick up his son's truck ..
stick shift and he was stuck.... Just the way that no code ops will be stuck
when it comes to the CW mode.

> >BTW I can't wait
> >for all the leaps and bounds in growth of the service once CW testing is
> >gone. I would venture to say that at least a half a dozen new modes will
be
> >created within a few months now that all of those EEs will be
"activated".
>
> I'm an EE.

..and I'm a PT

Correction ..all of those EEs and computer engineers who are presently
non-ticketed due to CW being below their technical prowess.

ld even say that I would have to eat crow as no doubt within 1 year a
> >mode will be discovered that "will always get through".
>
> No mode always gets through. Some modes, however, get through when some
other
> modes don't.

But I am sure that will come with all the new technical blood that giving
the CW test the boot will result in ..
(tounge in cheekedly)

73 to all ...God Bless Tom Popovic KI3R Port Vue PA

837. IMPORTANT POINTS FOR ALL - Re: BPL a reality in my area now!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-12 17:36:53 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <Vigib.780$_i.73365@nnrp1.ptd.net>
Source record: 80311
Cross-posted to: alt.ham-radio,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:jLZhb.573$P%1.510470@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
>
> "Ryan, KC8PMX" <REMOVETHISkc8pmx@diamondcs.net> wrote in message
> news:bm9o10$kemhq$1@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de...
> > Just found out today listening to a local, reputable radio station that
> Bay,
> > Saginaw and Midland Counties in Michigan are going to be "test sites"
for
> > BPL, at least for Michigan. I don't know when it will be an actual
> reality,
> > as opposed to being in the planning stages, but will keep current with
> their
> > project!
> >
> >
> > Ryan KC8PMX
> > Midland, Michigan
> >
> >
>
> Go to the sites. Check out the interference. If it's as bad as they say,
> write the local commercial radio stations to say they are being interfered
> with, write your congressman, and write the FCC.
>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>

Ryan, et al, PLEASE coordinate with Ed Hare, w1rfi@arrl.org ... and don't
"write/contact your local commercial radio stations" UNLESS they ACTUALLY
ARE being interfered with AND you are ABSOLUTELY SURE it's BPL.

It is EXTREMELY IMPORTANT that any reports/complaints of "BPL interference"
are REALLY BPL ... the amateur community is being accused by BPL proponents
of "exaggerating the problem (so the ARRL can raise money ... which is
absurd ...
if there weren't a threat they wouldn't HAVE to raise money to defend
against it ...).

We CANNOT AFFORD to miss-identify other sources of interference as "BPL"
or we just lend credence to the BPL folks' claim that we're "crying wolf."

I cannot overemphasize the importance of these points.

73,
Carl - wk3c

838. Re: BPL a reality in my area now!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-12 17:38:09 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <5kgib.781$_i.73372@nnrp1.ptd.net>
Source record: 80312
Cross-posted to: alt.ham-radio,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Please see my previous message about the necessity of making SURE
that any complaints of "BPL interference" REALLY ARE BPL.

73,
Carl - wk3c

"Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
news:3F88AF87.9060008@ix.netcom.com...
> Jim Hampton wrote:
>
> >Exactly. Also, don't just complain to the utilities as they will still
deny
> >getting complaints. I wonder if they are hiring any of the lawyers from
the
> >tobacco companies LOL
> >
> >
> >
> >
> A CC list for complaints:
>
> *Utility company
> *FCC (radio, telecom, and cable depts)
> *ARRL
> *your congresscritter
> *your senator
> *your state's PUC (public utilitues commission)
> *The senators or congressmen who fund the FCC
> *Various broadcasters, particularly those on TV
> channels 2, 3, 4 (as these are below 80MHz, the
> high end of BPL). Also any shortwave broadcasters
> in the USA except VOA (they are not allowed to care
> about reception inside the USA).
> *NTIA (who we share the 5MHz band with).
>

839. Re: What makes a Pro code test Amateur a Troglodyte?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-12 17:40:25 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bmc3os$md6@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 80316

"Hans K0HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:5ee63311.0310120909.17e8af14@posting.google.com...
> "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote
>
>
> >
> > The term "nigger" (excuse me, to anyone who is offended
> > by that word--me included) isn't derogatory until some
> > bigoted person uses it against another person, either.
> > No hazard, at all, in being honest.
> >
>
> Of course it's derogatory, no matter who uses the word.
>
> True story.....
>
> In the winter of 2001/02 K0CKB and I were vacationing in the
> southwest. We had parked our RV in the lovely town of Big Spring,
> Texas for a couple of days, and I had my truck down at the local
> "quick lube" place for an oil change. A local fellow also having his
> truck lubed noticed a "Sailors have more fun" bumper sticker on my
> truck, and struck up a conversation about his days in the Navy. Like
> me, he had spent some time in the brown water Navy running PBR's in
> the Mekong, so a lively conversation ensued. In discussing some of
> his close calls, he attributed his survival to "his big nigger", who
> was one of his crewman, apparently a big man who was particularly good
> with heavy weapons. He had liberated a 50-calibre from a wrecked
> aircraft and mounted it on the bow of the PBR in place of the lighter
> 'regulation' mount, and was extremely adept at using the gun. The
> fellow cited this the single most important reason his craft had
> survived Now in the context of the conversation it was apparent to
> everyone present that he held this crewman in VERY high regard. Yet
> the term was patently as derogatory as if he had called the man a
> mo----f---er, a c--ks---ker, or any other demeaning name. Two
> bystanders (not minorities) took the guy to task for his choice of
> words, and he apologized.
>
> 73, de Hans, K0HB
>

Hans, unfortunately, that term is freely used down here. I've heard it from
perfect strangers if I happen to be with the common friend of another and
they just chat for a few minutes, to a close gathering of all friends who
freely express that form of hatred, regardless of how they know I feel about

it. I have dropped three, what I thought was, very good friends in the last two years over this issue. Not only the "term" but the emotion of bigotry *and* racism that goes along with it, is alive and well down here.

I freely express disdain at the emotion of bigotry and racism and have often been chastised for it. Now, among my black friends I am called that name--and, I admit, it still throws me when they use--but I am told over and over again that the use of that word "among them" is an expression of kindred spirit. I still tell them I don't like it. I tell them to call me by the affectionate name one of my girlfriends calls me, "Boo."

I have also met blacks (and people from other ethnic groups) who are bigots and racists and I have just as much disdain for them.

Kim W5TIT

840. Re: BPL a reality in my area now!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-12 17:40:44 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <wmgib.783$_i.73435@nnrp1.ptd.net>
Source record: 80313
Cross-posted to: alt.ham-radio,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"James Wilson" <Someone@Microsoft.Com> wrote in message
news:mJfib.121280$xx4.20524963@twister.neo.rr.com...
> What does BPL sound like? Can someone post a wav file somewhere so it can
> be identified? Is it worse that the Pennsylvania QSO party?

The video on the ARRL website shows a couple of BPL variants ...
one that uses SS and another (test area 4) that uses OFDM.
They sound different.

Again, I cannot over-emphasize the importance of making SURE
that complaints of "BPL interference" are REALLY from BPL and
not some other source.

The LAST thing we need now is a bunch of people "crying wolf."
(Real complaints are one thing, crying wolf will only HURT us.)

73,
Carl - wk3c

841. Re: What makes a Pro code test Amateur a Troglodyte?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-12 17:48:03 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <ntgib.784$_i.73321@nnrp1.ptd.net>
Source record: 80315

"Hans K0HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:5ee63311.0310110919.2e5a7ac8@posting.google.com...
> "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote
>
> > And one of the founders of the company, who is a friend and
> > colleague of mine now, is a no-code tech (I persuaded him to
> > get into ham radio. He has NO interest in Morse, but is a
> > hell of a digital modes engineer.)
>
> That's quite a story, Carl, since the company was founded in 1935 by
> Ralph Allison. That would put Ralph up in his 90's somewhere. Well,
> it's good to know he's still in engineering and keeping up with the
> latest trends. Give him best regards from everyone at ADC. We were
> under the mistaken impression that he had passed on.
>
> 73, de Hans, K0HB
> --
> http://www.adc.com/aboutadc/history/

OK ... I'm mistaken ... I was refering to Paul Nikolich
the Chair of IEEE 802 ... in retrospect, I believe he
was one of the founders of a company that your company
acquired.

I was not trying to mislead anyone.

Carl

842. Re: What makes a Pro code test Amateur a Troglodyte?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-12 18:01:49 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <hGgib.785$_i.73747@nnrp1.ptd.net>
Source record: 80317

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20031012000943.23307.00003682@mb-m29.aol.com...
> In article <bma161$cg2@library2.airnews.net>, "Kim W5TIT"
<kimscliff@yahoo.com>
> writes:
>
> >Therein lies the problem with the whole CW test (TEST, *test*) debate.
The
> >minute one takes on the "no" CW test argument, it is generally met with
an
> >attitude that an end CW use (USE, *use*) is being favored or called for.
>
> Kim:
>
> Code testing has always been the thing which generated code use.

I would assert that being forced to learn code to gain access to HF
"soured" more people on code use than it encouraged ... of course,
some percentage of folks decided they liked code and continued to
use it, but MANY simply endured something they had no interest in
to get past the test, then "threw away the key."

Remember the old adage "honey is better than vinegar."

> In the absence of a code testing requirement, there will be progressively
> fewer hams who have never been exposed to learning the code as a
> result of the requirement. Since the requirement was the principle
> motivation to learn the code, code use *will* decline once code testing
> is abolished. Therefore, testing and use are two closely interrelated
> concepts.

Translation: Larry and his "kindred spirits" are either unwilling to expend
the effort to (or incapable of *politely*) encourage people to "give the
code a try and see if you like it." And, they are apparently unwilling to
take "No thanks, not interested" for an answer. Thus, they continue to
seek to have the FCC mandate an arguably counter-productive "recruiting
program" for them ...

73,
Carl - wk3c

843. Re: 73 Magazine Says "73 and QRT"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-12 18:06:56 UTC
From: AK <ak-in-nc@mchsi.com>
Message-ID: <4Lgib.745172$Ho3.183937@sccrnsc03>
Source record: 80318
Cross-posted to:
rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:dTfib.694$P%1.710183@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
>
> Well since the number of licensed hams in the US is at or close to an all
> time high, I don't think "falling ham numbers" had a thing to do with it.

With the ten-year license, many "official" hams are actually SK or totally inactive. Also, while the no-code VHF hams do buy equipment, it's often not the more expensive gear that many of the HF operators buy - in addition to their VHF and UHF gear. I know Larry (the "L" in R&L electronics) supported the no-code change to not only keep customers at his business doors, but also to keep ham manufacturers in business. He noted the drastic reduction of suppliers he now has available. For my two cents worth, the FCC should seek to maintain CW as an effective, efficient, low cost option in amateur radio by offering a CW certification (maybe 15 wpm) to any amateur license. Especially, if they drop the lowly 5 wpm requirement. That certification would allow the use of a 20 KHz , or the present 25 KHz now reserved for Extra Class, at the bottom section the 10/15/20/40/80 meter US band segments. It would not provide any special SSB incentives.

AK (K4YKZ)

844. Re: What makes a Pro code test Amateur a Troglodyte?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-12 18:17:21 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bmc5u5$mjh@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 80322

"Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
news:hWgib.789$_i.74048@nnrp1.ptd.net...
>
> "Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
> news:20031012000947.23307.00003686@mb-m29.aol.com...
> >
> > None, actually. The truth is that the Morse/CW mode is one of the most
> > practical, efficient, effective, and universal modes of radio
> communication
> > available to radio amateurs, and well worth the effort to gain and
> maintain
> > this particular skill.
>
> I see that Larry still has that macro key programmed ... :-)
>
>
> Carl - wk3c
>

ROFLMAO!!!!!

Kim W5TIT

845. Re: What makes a Pro code test Amateur a Troglodyte?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-12 18:17:41 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <9Vgib.788$_i.73776@nnrp1.ptd.net>
Source record: 80319

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20031012000946.23307.00003685@mb-m29.aol.com...
> In article <E7Thb.673$_i.57968@nnrp1.ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
> <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:
>
> >> Carl:
> >>
> >> I consider the use of the term "Morse myths" to be derogatory and
> >> inflammatory. Thus, you have also failed to meet Mike's challenge.
> >>
> >> 73 de Larry, K3LT
> >>
> >
> >Larry,
> >
> >I don't recall Mike appointing your the judge and arbiter ...
>
> Carl:
>
> In that case, consider my services to have been donated out of my own
> generosity.

I guess I got what I paid for :-)

> >"Morse Myths" is, as you well know by now, simply a term
> >that refers to all of the patently false, old wives' tales, such as
> >"Morse gets through when nothing else will.",
>
> This one is true…

Bluntly - baloney ... there ARE modes that will get through at
s/n ratios where Morse would be totally undetectable, let alone
decodable ... ignore the facts if it preserves your fantasy world
where Morse is all-important (the "legend in your own mind"),
but the rest of the world will pass you by without your even
understanding why ...

> >"Morse is essential
> >for emergency communications.",
>
> Who said that? Provide correctly attributed quote.

Read any number of absurd pro-code-testing comments
filed with the FCC ...

> >"Morse acts as a 'lid filter' to
> >keep us from being overrun by the "mongul hordes' of CBers
> >who are lurking in the wings waiting to take over the ham bands."
> >etc.
>
> I've never said that whatsoever -- in fact, on many occasions, I've gone
> out of my way to note that a lot of the problems on HF phone are being
> caused by 20-WPM code tested Extras.

I didn't say that YOU necessarily said that ... though you HAVE refered
to the "knuckle-draggers" and other terms that fall into a similar category.

> >I reject your claim that the term "Morse Myths" is derogatory and
> >inflamatory.
>
> Reject all you want, Carl, but the fact remains that it is. You have
taken
> the low road, while claiming the opposite.
>
> >It is simply a term that refers in "shorthand" form to
> >a panoply of falacies that are often cited as "reasons why we MUST
> >keep Morse testing" ... none of which hold water and all of which
> >have been rejected by the FCC.
>
> I have always presented well-reasoned, factual, and unemotional
> arguments in support of code testing.

RTFLMAO!!!

> Please don't hold me up to
> the same light as those who may have transgressed in the manner
> which you refer to above. Above all, please remember that by far,
> the largest portion of the QRM in the code/no-code debate has been
> from the NCTA side.

ROTFLMAO some more ...

> Also remember that as one who has never
> used the Morse/CW mode to an extent which would have allowed
> you to gain useful proficiency in the mode, you are not qualified to
> judge the value of this mode at all.

You are totally wrong on this assertion ... I know the code, had
"useful proficiency" (nearly 20 wpm at my peak), but haven't used
it in a long time ... I am certainly qualified to judge the value of the
mode (at least for my purposes, and also in more general terms).

> I'm not sitting here trying to
> argue technical topics with you, so don't you try to tell me that the
> Morse/CW mode and testing aren't of value to the ARS. We are
> not on each other's respective levels of expertise. Since I'm
> more than willing to respect your technical expertise, don't presume
> to challenge my qualifications to make judgments about CW and
> code testing, because you don't know what your talking about.

Larry, I don't demean your "real ham-ness" because you are not
my equal on the technical plane, but you demean the "real ham-ness"
of anyone who is up to your "standards" of Morse prowess ...
I think you're arrogance and narrow-mindedness are showing again.

Carl - wk3c

846. Re: What makes a Pro code test Amateur a Troglodyte?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-12 18:18:53 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <hWgib.789$_i.74048@nnrp1.ptd.net>
Source record: 80320

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20031012000947.23307.00003686@mb-m29.aol.com...
> In article <9HUhb.27868$mQ2.4377@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Bill
Sohl"
> <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
>
> >> Carl:
> >>
> >> I consider the use of the term "Morse myths" to be derogatory and
> >> inflammatory. Thus, you have also failed to meet Mike's challenge.
> >>
> >> 73 de Larry, K3LT
> >
> >Hw about morse fallicies, morse inaccuracies, erronious morse
> >claims? Which of these do you find acceptable?
> >
> >Cheers,
> >Bill K2UNK
>
> Bill:
>
> None, actually. The truth is that the Morse/CW mode is one of the most
> practical, efficient, effective, and universal modes of radio
communication
> available to radio amateurs, and well worth the effort to gain and
maintain
> this particular skill.

I see that Larry still has that macro key programmed ... :-)

Carl - wk3c

847. Re: What makes a Pro code test Amateur a Troglodyte?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-12 18:22:23 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <zZgib.790$_i.74089@nnrp1.ptd.net>
Source record: 80321

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:bmakv4$n72$0@208.207.71.130...
>
> It's well known that for the likes of you,*everything* pertaining to
> Morse code is mythical! Hell, you couldn't take advantage of any of it's
> attributes if your very life depended on it!

I certainly could ... however, the probablilty of my life depending
on the use of Morse is smaller than that of my life being saved by a
lightning bolt that kills a great white shark that's trying to eat me in the
middle of the Sahara desert ...

Carl - wk3c

848. Re: BPL a reality in my area now!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-12 18:23:51 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031012142351.23654.00000236@mb-m20.aol.com>
Source record: 80324

>The LAST thing we need now is a bunch of people "crying wolf."
>(Real complaints are one thing, crying wolf will only HURT us.)
>
>73,
>Carl - wk3c

Start crying to the FCC about anything. If your Mower quits, call the FCC and tell them its BPL causing it. Even if BPL is no where near you. If your Tires go flat or LOW on AIR, tell them you saw Arcing from the Power lines to your tires and it was BPL that did it. THE MORE COMPLAINTS THE BETTER.

849. Re: IMPORTANT POINTS FOR ALL - Re: BPL a reality in my area now!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-12 18:25:32 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031012142532.23654.00000237@mb-m20.aol.com>
Source record: 80325

>We CANNOT AFFORD to miss-identify other sources of interference as "BPL"
>or we just lend credence to the BPL folks' claim that we're "crying wolf."

What ever you do, STOP listening to KARL, hes just trying to get credit for
NCI.

850. Re: What makes a Pro code test Amateur a Troglodyte?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-12 18:29:42 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031012142942.23654.00000240@mb-m20.aol.com>
Source record: 80326

> I tell them to call me
>by the affectionate name one of my girlfriends calls me, "Boo."

I heard she calls you BOY.

851. Re: BPL a reality in my area now!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-12 18:30:25 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <55hib.793$_i.74106@nnrp1.ptd.net>
Source record: 80323

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20031011214233.06226.00000930@mb-m19.aol.com...
> In article <bm9o10$kemhq$1@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>, "Ryan, KC8PMX"
> <REMOVETHISkc8pmx@diamondcs.net> writes:
>
> >Just found out today listening to a local, reputable radio station that
Bay,
> >Saginaw and Midland Counties in Michigan are going to be "test sites" for
> >BPL, at least for Michigan. I don't know when it will be an actual
reality,
> >as opposed to being in the planning stages, but will keep current with
their
> >project!
>
> Ryan,
>
> If you have a 6 meter rig that can go mobile, you're set up to
measure/observe
> (and report) BPL interference.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

Not all of the BPL "pilot" deployments are using spectrum as high as 6m,
though they want to ultimately use "2-80 MHz" if they had large commercial
deployments of paying customers.

Carl - wk3c

852. Re: What makes a Pro code test Amateur a Troglodyte?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-12 18:45:19 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031012144519.00545.00001527@mb-m02.aol.com>
Source record: 80329

In article <bmblp3$85p@library1.airnews.net>, "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20031011214232.06226.00000929@mb-m19.aol.com...
>> In article <bma161$cg2@library2.airnews.net>, "Kim" <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
>> writes:
>>
>> >"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
>> >news:7ILhb.25498$mQ2.9966@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
>> >>
>> >> The issue isn't about USE it is about
>> >> the lack of any rational reason to retain code testing as a
>> >> license requirement now that the ITU mandatory code knowledge
>> >> requirment has ended.
>> >>
>> >
>> >Therein lies the problem with the whole CW test (TEST, *test*) debate.
>The
>> >minute one takes on the "no" CW test argument, it is generally met with
>an
>> >attitude that an end CW use (USE, *use*) is being favored or called for.
>>
>> Not that I have observed, Kim.
>>
>> But can you accurately say that *no one* wants to end Morse use?
>>
>
>Of course not. But I can accurately say that there is no need to roll
>everyone who wants to see an end to the test element, into the "no CW use"
>minority (note I said minority), either.

Agreed! Point is, however, that the "no one" statement is simply not correct.
>
>> >Until, (UNTIL, *until*) it is clearly understood that seeking the end of
>the
>> >CW test is not the equivalent of seeking the end of CW as a mode, this
>> >debate will never fall within the realm of "friendly" debate at all. I
>> >think it's even hazardous to use the PCTA/NCTA labels.
>>
>> One of the problems is that some folks aren't clear that it is only the
>*test*
>> they are against.
>>
>> 73 de Jim, N2EY

>>
>
>Anyone, *anyone* who allows theirself (bad English) to get all in a huff
>about CW use going away or being legislated out of ham radio is being
>foolish.

Not necessarily. Not after seeing the mode (not just the test) attacked the way
I have.

>There are a few who have been proponents of seeing the end of CW;
>and when I see those posts, I yawn and go on.

That's *you* - not everyone.

>There will never be an end to
>CW use, and it would never be banned from use in the ham bands...it just
>wouldn't. I think it would be unrealistic to think it would.

I hope you are right about that. Some of us are not about to "trust to the
kindness of strangers" however

>And, if it
>was based off a majority of users of the bands, I rest assured knowing that
>most would not support an end to CW use.

Not now, anyway.

>I think those who are in the
>minority are there mostly for the shock value of it.
>
Perhaps.

But not too long ago, the mere suggestion of *any* class of ham license with no
code test would have gathered almost no support. And the idea of the total
abolition of code testing would have been discarded with the claim that
no-one wanted all code testing to end.

They way to outlaw something is little by little. Remember your concerns about
the restrictions on privacy brought about by 'homeland security' responses?
Little by little....

There was a time when AM was king of the 'phone modes. Then SSB came a long and
took center stage, while AM was relegated to niche status. Most folks said
"No-one is against the *use* of AM"....

But that was not good enough for some, and proposals have arisen every so often
to effectively outlaw AM from the ham bands. HF ham bands, anyway. So far, none
of them have been successful.

Up until 20 years ago, the amateur power limit was 1 kW DC input to the stages
delivering power to the antenna. Then the rules changed to 1.5 kW PEP output.
For the AM folks, this was effectively a lowering of the power limit to about
half of what it had been before the change. For SSB folks, it was effectively
about a 50% raise of the power limit.

LIttle by little...

73 de Jim, N2EY

853. Re: New Acronym: ECTA (Era of Code Test Abolition)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-12 18:45:21 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031012144521.00545.00001528@mb-m02.aol.com>
Source record: 80331

In article <20031012000942.23307.00003679@mb-m29.aol.com>, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) writes:

>In article <20031011214229.06226.00000925@mb-m19.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com
>(N2EY)
>writes:
>
>>On the one hand, Morse is not used very much in emergency communication. On
>>the
>>other hand, it *is* still used occasionally, by hams, in emergency
>>communications. More important, there *are* times when it when it is the
>only
>>available mode that would get through in the situation.
>>(Note that phrase "only available mode")
>>
>>All of the above are documented facts.
>>
>>The problem is, does the occasional use of Morse in emergencies mean that
>>*all*
>>hams *must* be tested on the mode? Some say yes, some say no, some say it's
>a
>>piece of the reason. All based on personal opinion, nothing more.
>>
>>Boil down any of the arguments on either side, and what you wind up with is
>>personal opinion.
>>
>>73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>Jim:
>
>The truth is, only hams who know the Morse code have the capability
>to fall back on the CW mode when other modes are unavailable.

Absolutely true. But whether that is a reason to make every ham pass a code test is a matter of opinion - some say yes, others say no.

>Why
>do hams know the Morse code? Because they had to learn it to pass
>the code tests to become licensed or obtain upgrades.

That's one reason.

>In the absence
>of a code testing requirement, why will they learn it?

Here are some reasons:

- Morse is fun for many thousands of hams
- Lots of interesting DX on Morse only
- Morse gets through better than any analog voice mode and better than many TOR modes
- Morse equipment for a given performance level costs less and is simpler than any other mode
- Morse is usually aural, not visual, but doesn't require talking. It's a unique way of communicating
- Morse takes up less, or far less, spectrum than almost all other modes.
- There is much less objectionable stuff to deal with in the parts of the bands where Morse is usually used.

>How will we
>convince new hams to invest the time and effort to learn this useful
>communications skill when they are not offered the incentive of
>increased operating privileges?

Through the incentives of:

- improved performance of a given radio setup
- less crowded spectrum space
- a unique communications experience not available elsewhere
- rare DX
- spectrum conservation

There is also the element of putting the mode out there for others to see. As in demonstrations at club meetings, hamfests, conventions, Field Day, etc. "Sell" the mode the way the FM/repeater, PSK-31, APRS, packet and other folks have been selling their modes for years.

If all a new ham ever sees is other, more experienced hams talking into mikes and tapping keyboards, that's all the newbie will think exists.

Look at what the AM and vintage/military radio folks have done. They set up demos at hamfests and other venues to show what it's all about. Why not the same thing with Morse? Show 'em how it's done - plant the seed.

Or consider the QRP/homebrew/hiker folks. What's the most effective mode to bring along on a backpack trip?

Elecraft has a new rig - the KX1. Amazing little box the size of a stack of QSLs. Is there *any* non-CW rig of equivalent size/weight/power requirement that will perform anywhere near as well?

You should see the looks on their faces at FD when they see the CW station making QSOs at a rate better than the 'phone folks, yet using a more modest setup and expending far *less* effort. When well over half the points earned by a 4A+free VHF FD setup come from one fulltime and one part time setup running CW, serious selling is happening.

>I'm asking you because I don't have
>the answers. I'm one of those hams who learned the code because
>I wanted to be a ham, and the requirement was there.

That's you. It's not everybody.

Some will be sold on the mode regardless of whether or not there's a test.

Some will never be sold no matter what you do.

And some will be sold if approached in the right way.

>Ony *after*
>learning the code and becoming a reasonably proficient CW operator
>did I become aware of it's benefits and advantages. Personally, I'm
>grateful that the code testing requirement existed when I became a
>ham. Had it not, I never would have become a CW operator...and
>neither will most hams in the ECTA (Era of Code Test Abolition).

How do we know that for sure? Maybe you would have seen the light after getting frustrated with other modes.

Here's an experience I had recently (post-restructuring):

Relatively new ham got started via the Tech route. Decided he wanted HF and passed the required elements, including code, which was learned from CDs and computer software.

But then he discovered that learning enough code to pass the test was a far different thing from copying and sending live on the air in a real QSO.

Now remember, this ham had already passed all the code tests he'd ever need to pass. He had all bands and modes open to him, and a nice HF station set up. There was absolutely no requirement that he ever do any Morse code operating at all, ever. Nor was there any requirement to spend more time and effort learning to send and copy real-world off-the-air Morse.

But this ham *wanted* to use the mode, based on its merits alone. With a small amount of help and encouragement, he learned the skills of on-air copy, sending, abbreviations, procedure, etc.

I had the privilege and honor of being his first CW QSO. Since then he's had many more, his skills have improved, and he's on the way. CW SS is a few weekends away.....

And this ham is the kind who will share what he has learned with others and repeat the cycle. Test or no test.

--

Sure, not every new or old ham will be "sold". But we don't need every ham. Just enough hams. And a positve image.

Does that answer the question?

73 de Jim, N2EY

854. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-12 18:45:23 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031012144523.00545.00001530@mb-m02.aol.com>
Source record: 80330

In article <bmbl65$b3c@library1.airnews.net>, "Kim" <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
writes:

>"Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
>news:3F88ACAC.6030700@ix.netcom.com...
>> N2EY wrote:
>>
>> >In article <3F84B6F7.20507@ix.netcom.com>, Robert Casey
><wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
>> >writes:

>> >>There should be some sort of beginner's license that an average 14 year
>> >>old honor roll student can get

>> >That would require an extensive reworking of the current tests. We've got
>> >at
>> >least one 6 year old General and an 8 year old passed the old Extra.
>> >
>> I mean "average honor roll high school student", not "Einstein's
>> grandson".

More likely "granddaughter", though.

>> Also
>> I mention the honor roll student in the sense that Beavis and Butthead
>> would not be
>> able to pass the license tests.

heh...heh...tests.....heheh

>That sounds to me like a thinly veiled "filtering tool" again; using some
>form of exam or entrance requirement to "filter" out types of people that
>are designated as undesirable by...you guessed it: *other* types of people.

heh...heh....she said filter...heh...heh

"Make them jump through the written test hoop"
"I had to take written tests..."
"We'll be overrun by appliance operators!"
>
>I am of the ilk that anyone who passes whatever entrance there is into ham
>radio (whether it be in written or mode-test form--just whatever entrance
>there is into ham radio at the particular time someone is interested) is
>welcomed to ham radio.

Same here - unless there is something which definitely disqualifies a person
from eligibility (like unresolved convictions for violations of the

Communications Act).

>I'd rather have the opportunity to let the majority
>environment of ham radio be the positive influence on someone who may
>otherwise not be "desirable" and let them warm up to the service, in
>general. Closing the door right up front never allows us the opportunity to
>be a positive influence; and that is a loss.

You miss the point, Kim.

The whole long dragged out argument is about what those entry requirements should be. Robert wants an entry level test that an "average honor roll high school student" could pass. Right away, one has to ask - why an honor roll student? And what about a middle schooler?

My point about the 6 year old General and the 8 year old Extra is that even the pre-restructuing exams were such that children much younger than high school could pass them.

And I am on record that there should not be a minimum age requirement for any class of amateur license.

There is also the idea that rather than "closing the door right up front" (good turn of phrase, btw) that what is being attempted is to have the learning and testing process be a positive influence.
>
>> If Beavis did get a license, then ham
>> radio would
>> sound like the old 147.435 machine on L.A..... W6NUT IIRC

>Even Beavis and Butthead have the potential to be a great couple of guys.
>Everyone has potential.

Of course - but what matters is what is demonstrated.

And how are the license test requirements decided?

Put aside the code test brouhahah for a moment, and let's look at the writtens.

At one extreme, the writtens could be derived from an enormous pool of questions covering every aspect of amateur radio in such detail that they'd require a photographic mempory and/or a thorough understanding of the rules, theory and operating practice to pass.

At the other extreme, the writtens could consist of a few extremely basic questions such as "Where are the rules of the ARS to be found?" and "Who is required to follow those rules?" and "Do you solemnly swear/affirm/cross-your-heart-and-hope-to-die-promise to follow the rules of the ARS?" with everything else left up to the licensee and the amateur radio community.

Most folks will now say "Oh no, I mean something between those two extremes!" And that "middle ground" all comes down to somebody's opinion, nothing more.

73 de Jim, N2EY

855. Re: BPL a reality in my area now!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-12 18:45:24 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031012144524.00545.00001531@mb-m02.aol.com>
Source record: 80332

In article <bmblrp$ki1@library1.airnews.net>, "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20031011214233.06226.00000930@mb-m19.aol.com...
>> In article <bm9o10$kemhq$1@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>, "Ryan, KC8PMX"
>> <REMOVETHISkc8pmx@diamondcs.net> writes:
>>
>> >Just found out today listening to a local, reputable radio station that
>Bay,
>> >Saginaw and Midland Counties in Michigan are going to be "test sites" for
>> >BPL, at least for Michigan. I don't know when it will be an actual
>reality,
>> >as opposed to being in the planning stages, but will keep current with
>their
>> >project!
>>
>> Ryan,
>>
>> If you have a 6 meter rig that can go mobile, you're set up to
>measure/observe
>> (and report) BPL interference.
>>
>> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>heh heh. Yeah, and any ham worth being a ham would have a 6-meter rig that
>can go mobile so they can measure/observe (and report) BPL interference.
>Right?

IIRC, Ryan has mentioned being active on 6 meters. So there's a good chance he
has such a rig already.

73 de Jim, N2EY

856. Re: RM-10808 --- Wexelbaum Redux

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-12 18:50:53 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <hohib.795$_i.74284@nnrp1.ptd.net>
Source record: 80327

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20031011123005.05539.00001479@mb-m16.aol.com...
> In article <wbDhb.623$_i.48433@nnrp1.ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
> <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:
>
> >> and a "reward" for learning. I fail to understand why removing Morse
> >> testing is any different from removing all aspects of RTTY knowledge
> >> from the written test, e.g. "T8A10. What would you connect to a
> >> transceiver for RTTY operation?".
> >
> >Clearly AH0A can't understand (or accept) that the RTTY example
> >is "theoretical knowledge" and the Morse test is a test of a mechanical
> >skill ...
>
> You mean "a practical skill".

No, I meant "mechanical skill." (touch typing would be in the same
category ...)

> Both are valuable to the radio amateur. Whether either should be tested is
a
> matter of opinion, nothing more.
>
> But if a person has no interest in RTTY, why should that person be
subjected to
> questions on the subject?
>
> Why can't a ham be trusted to learn about RTTY if/when the desire to use
that
> mode arises? RTTY is "just another mode", is it not? There's no
requirement for
> any ham to ever use it.

There is an ITU-R Recommendation that deals with the sorts of
THEORETICAL knowledge that hams should possess ... IIRC,
it's ITU-R Recommendation M.1544 ...

That recommendation is consistent with the basis and purpose
of the ARS, both as defined by the FCC and the ITU.

While not strictly mandatory, it is provided as "good advice to
administrations" on what sorts of theoretical knowledge hams
should possess.

Carl - wk3c

857. Re: IMPORTANT POINTS FOR ALL - Re: BPL a reality in my area now!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-12 18:54:21 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <xrhib.796$_i.74328@nnrp1.ptd.net>
Source record: 80328

"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20031012142532.23654.00000237@mb-m20.aol.com...
> >We CANNOT AFFORD to miss-identify other sources of interference as "BPL"
> >or we just lend credence to the BPL folks' claim that we're "crying
wolf."
>
> What ever you do, STOP listening to KARL, hes just trying to get credit
for
> NCI.

As most of you know, I normally simply ignore Bruce's idiotic rants,
but, just to set the record straight, my activity vis a vis BPL has nothing
to do with NCI ... therefore, there is NO attempt to "get credit for NCI"
for anything I do related to the BPL threat ...

Carl - wk3c

858. Bootlegging in 1948?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-12 20:01:53 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031012160153.11022.00001376@mb-m14.aol.com>
Source record: 80333

In article <ZxYhb.30962$mQ2.29975@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> writes:

>"Len Over 21" wrote:
>> "Dwight Stewart" writes:
>> >
>> > Since anybody in this country can discuss amateur
>> > radio policy (license policy or whatever), I do think
>> > a person's communications knowledge and experience
>> > elsewhere is at least somewhat relevant to that person's
>> > part in that discussion. Why would you think otherwise,
>> > Jim? Len is obviously interested in Amateur Radio,
>> > which is good. The only thing I don't understand is why
>> > he hasn't acted on that interest and gotten some kind of
>> > Amateur Radio license over the years.
>>
>> Why do you insist that getting-a-license is culmination
>> of "interest?"
>>
>> Explain how obtaining an AMATEUR license suddenly
>> embues one with spirit and verve and "permission" to
>> experiment with RF? Especially when a person is already
>> a professional in electronic design engineering who has
>> ALREADY been working on "experiments" in RF?
>
> Well, it must be the week to put words into other people's mouths. First
>Jim and now you, Len. Anyway, I didn't "insist" any such thing. Instead, I
>simply said I don't understand why you haven't gotten some kind of Amateur
>Radio license over the years.

You GOT the answer, Dwight. Apparently you are not satisfied with
the answer. Not my problem.

If you look carefully at what I wrote, the words used, you will find I did
not address it directly to you. It was a general statement. Had you
wanted an answer solely for yourself, I might have replied in private
e-mail.

>> > Since VHF and above is one focus of commercial
>> > communications today, one would think the Technician
>> > license would have at least some appeal to him.
>>
>> Dwight, VHF and above was ALREADY a focus of
>> commercial communications a half century ago. (snip)
>

> I didn't say it wasn't, Len. Instead, I simply said that this (commercial
>communications today) might be one reason the Technician license would have
>at least some appeal to you.

Tsk, tsk...you now appear to be wanting to control who gets to ask
what in addition to wanting specific-category answers.

I reminded you that commercial communications was ALREADY into
VHF and higher a half century ago. That's fact. You can find it in
the electronic industry's own archives, particularly in old electronics
trade publications. I saw it first-hand a half century ago, beginning IN
radio communications then.

A bit later I wrote that amateur licenses did not have that much
personal appeal for me. Neither does the "social aspect" or ego
need stroking by group belonging. You should have surmised that I
have a fairly extensive exposure to communications arts and technology
by now, little of it based solely on news and "theory articles" in amateur
radio publications.

>> > This glaring, long term, lack of committment to Amateur
>> > Radio is what brings his ongoing participation in this
>> > discussion under suspicion.
>>
>> "Glaring?!?" :-)
>>
>> I'm just against a morse code test for any radio operator
>> license, Dwight.
>
> Your opposition to code is no barrier whatsoever to getting a Technician
>license, Len.

While that is true, you are starting to misdirect and getting a bit hostile
with an obviously unfriendly "challenge." :-)

Feel free to tell everyone WHY one MUST have "at least" an amateur
radio no-code-test class license in order to discuss the retention or
elimination of a code test for any radio operator license.

Recall that this is a public forum, unmoderated, accessible to anyone.

There is no dispensation for licensed amateurs to exclude
professionals from discussion of radio matters.

This newsgroup is NOT a private forum...although it has become a
chat room gathering place for regulars...most of whom insist that all
must think, believe, and absolutely honor their superior thoughts,
opinions, viewpoints, and beliefs.

>> (snip) Hey, you don't like some of my comments on the
>> code test. So, what else is new? Do you need instant
>> adulation for the accomplishments of passing a morse test?
>> Special honors? Awards? Sorry, all out.

>
> Well, in this case, the "what else is new" is that you obviously haven't
>noticed which license I hold. Since I haven't passed a Morse code test, no
>adulation, honors, or awards, relating to that would be applicable. Further,
>I don't particularily like or dislike anything you've said about the code
>test. I've taken no position whatsoever on your comments. I'm opposed to the
>code test, but that doesn't mean I specifically endorse anything you've said
>on the subject.

To reiterate, this newsgroup is a PUBLIC forum. Anyone posting anything
in public is open for any kind of reply. That's just the way it is.

My comments are more general rather than to specific individuals.

Many others are vehemently opposed to "different" comments (different
from their own cherished beliefs). Their vehemence takes many forms
as you've seen. Some of the forms are "gentle vehemence" such as
the artificial "necessity" to be licensed in a radio service in order to
discuss, debate, or argue federal regulations on specific radio services.

Why must licensing (of any class) come first?

> My, you are reading a lot into what I've said, and getting it all wrong in
>the process. Absolutely nothing I said had anything whatsoever to do with
>whether I liked or disliked anything you've said. Take the chip off your
>shoulder, and re-read what I said, and I think you'll agree with that.

I will advise you again...try READING what I wrote and recall the
reminder that public postings are open to public comment.

I bring up certain points, facts, history as part of the debate-discussion-
argument on subjects. If those proven and provable items are against
an individual's belief systems, then TS on them. I'm not going to cave
in to anyone's personal insults any time, anywhere...and there have
been an enormous number of such directed at those who are not of
the conservative, old-time beliefs of amateur radio.

> By the way, if you reply, do try to keep it short - I don't have time to
>respond to a long-winded rant (my only real comment about what you've said).

Another reminder: This is a public forum with public access.
EVERYONE takes their chances on posting anything here.

In case you are wondering, I don't have time for long-winded rants of
others.
Others DO a number of long-winded rants in here. Some go into great
lengths to make such rants extremely offensive to another's person.

If you desire to control anything in here, I will suggest you go after the
OTHER "ranters," the obvious insult-mongers and trollers. Let them
learn to take it. I don't have time for verbal fire-fights with those who
are outraged with righteous anger or of those irritated that others do not
accept their own noble thoughts.

LHA

PS: This evolved, convoluted thread started out with non-hostile mention of using a one-tube modulated oscillator in the AM BC band some 55 years ago. Those were known as "wireless phonograph adapters" or equivalent back then, intended to couple a stand-alone phonograph to any AM BC receiver not having a phonograph jack for auxilliary audio input.. Lots of unlicensed in any radio service people had them then for listening to phonograph recordings without buying bigger, more expensive radios. Point of fact. I got my information on that particular little project from an issue of Popular Science, way back when they had construction articles on many hobby subjects.
In mentioning that to folks who had never been born yet then, it seems to be a source of irritation to them and they tended to get hostile in replies. Was no "Part 15" in the loose-leaf FCC regulations then and there was no hue and cry of damnation on such evil "boot-legging" of the airwaves from wireless phonograph adapters 55 years ago. TS for the license-demanders of today. Their problem not mine.

859. Re: 73 Magazine Says "73 and QRT"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-12 20:05:48 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <wuiib.2959$N%3.469@news01.roc.ny>
Source record: 80334
Cross-posted to:
rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

My gut feeling is that a lot of mags have or will drop. Yes, there will (likely) always be antenna construction articles, articles on safety, DXing, and a (very) limited amount of homebrewing. Do you remember the construction articles of the 50s and 60s? Back then, there were a lot of home brew projects. Even Heathkit threw in the towel a couple of decades ago. How much did anyone learn dropping in an integrated circuit that contained the whole if amplifier? That plus postal rates going threw the roof hasn't made it any easier for magazines. I've dropped all magazine subscriptions except tv guide (sign of the times LOL). Even when I assembled my first computer (a Heathkit H-8, which I still have), there were modifications to be performed. I had to chuckle when Kilobaud had an article on increasing the transfer rate from the tape deck to/from the computer from 1200 baud to 2400 baud. I was already running 4800 baud (and could get it to sync, but not transfer, at 9600 baud. I think the cheap cassette deck had something to do with it.).

Those days are long gone; today we have satellite tv and BPL (hopefully, not for long on the BPL!!!).

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:dTfib.694$P%1.710183@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
>
> Well since the number of licensed hams in the US is at or close to an all
> time high, I don't think "falling ham numbers" had a thing to do with it.
>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.525 / Virus Database: 322 - Release Date: 10/9/03

860. Re: IMPORTANT POINTS FOR ALL - Re: BPL a reality in my area now!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-12 20:13:05 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031012161305.22139.00000234@mb-m29.aol.com>
Source record: 80335

> just to set the record straight, my activity vis a vis BPL has nothing
>to do with NCI ... therefore, there is NO attempt to "get credit for NCI"
>for anything I do related to the BPL threat ...
>
>Carl - wk3c

Then BPL is a sure thing with Karl at the Helm

861. Re: What makes a Pro code test Amateur a Troglodyte?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-12 20:57:32 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bmcfaf$vk3@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 80336

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20031012144519.00545.00001527@mb-m02.aol.com...
> In article <bmblp3$85p@library1.airnews.net>, "Kim W5TIT"
<kimscliff@yahoo.com>
> writes:
>
> >
> >Of course not. But I can accurately say that there is no need to roll
> >everyone who wants to see an end to the test element, into the "no CW
use"
> >minority (note I said minority), either.
>
> Agreed! Point is, however, that the "no one" statement is simply not
correct.
> >

Let's recall that you are far more into definition than I am, Jim. When I say "no one" it may not mean *everyone* but it means enough to be counted as no one. I believe that the number of folks who wish to see an end to CW in the bands of the ARS are so miniscule that the projection of that ever being a reality is moot.

> >
> >Anyone, *anyone* who allows theirself (bad English) to get all in a huff
> >about CW use going away or being legislated out of ham radio is being
> >foolish.
>
> Not necessarily. Not after seeing the mode (not just the test) attacked
the way
> I have.
>

I've seen it attacked also. But I've never for a moment given it any kind of merit--the mode simply would never be banned from the ARS. Has any mode ever been banned? Sure, rules have changed; rules pertaining to power limits, rules pertaining to test requirements, rules pertaining even (I believe) to *where* in the bands that different modes are allowed or not. But I doubt a mode would ever be banned, once implemented and in place.

> >
> >There are a few who have been proponents of seeing the end of CW;
> >and when I see those posts, I yawn and go on.
>
> That's *you* - not everyone.
>

I can't imagine anyone giving merit to the thought that a mode would be banned. Maybe I am being unrealistic. Using history as a perspective of measurement; I don't see it ever happening.

> >
> >There will never be an end to
> >CW use, and it would never be banned from use in the ham bands...it just
> >wouldn't. I think it would be unrealistic to think it would.
>
> I hope you are right about that. Some of us are not about to "trust to the
> kindness of strangers" however
>

I think I believe it enough that I'll eat my sock (the right foot sock) if it ever happens.

> >
> >And, if it
> >was based off a majority of users of the bands, I rest assured knowing
that
> >most would not support an end to CW use.
>
> Not now, anyway.
>

My term "most" includes those people who now and in the future have any kind of romantic thought about the ARS. And, I think most do. There are the few who would see an end to something they don't like. But, given the desire and will of most ARS folks, CW--nor any mode for that matter--will disappear. Now, if I am wrong about history just let me know and I *may* change my belief.

> >
> >I think those who are in the
> >minority are there mostly for the shock value of it.
> >
> Perhaps.
>
> But not too long ago, the mere suggestion of *any* class of ham license
with no
> code test would have gathered almost no support. And the idea of the total
> abolition of code testing would have been discarded with the claim that
> *no-one* wanted all code testing to end.
>

I can see requirements changing, etc. But, I cannot see the FCC ever saying, "OK, no more ______ as a legal mode in the ARS."

>
> They way to outlaw something is little by little. Remember your concerns
about
> the restrictions on privacy brought about by 'homeland security'
responses?

> Little by little....
>

I have never doubted that the government would do as they have done. I daresay they were doing under different guises for many years now. Nothing different there. It's all about expectation. The expectation that the FCC would ever ban a mode is minimal for me.

>
> There was a time when AM was king of the 'phone modes. Then SSB came a long and
> took center stage, while AM was relegated to niche status. Most folks said
> "No-one is against the *use* of AM"....
>

But, did the FCC ever get anywhere close to seeing its use banned? I am not, remember, saying that a mode would become so unpopular or disliked on a scale such that it would be rare to find it openly being used. I am saying, however, that I believe the FCC would never regulate its ban.

>
> But that was not good enough for some, and proposals have arisen every so often
> to effectively outlaw AM from the ham bands. HF ham bands, anyway. So far, none
> of them have been successful.
>

And, I don't think they ever would be.

>
> Up until 20 years ago, the amateur power limit was 1 kW DC input to the stages
> delivering power to the antenna. Then the rules changed to 1.5 kW PEP output.
> For the AM folks, this was effectively a lowering of the power limit to about
> half of what it had been before the change. For SSB folks, it was effectively
> about a 50% raise of the power limit.
>
> LIttle by little...
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>

I do see things changing in the ARS, but not related to the outlawing of a mode.

Kim W5TIT

862. Re: RM-10808 --- Wexelbaum Redux

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-12 21:33:27 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031012173327.15462.00003523@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 80342

In article <hohib.795$_i.74284@nnrp1.ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
<wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:

>There is an ITU-R Recommendation that deals with the sorts of
>THEORETICAL knowledge that hams should possess ... IIRC,
>it's ITU-R Recommendation M.1544 ...

Carl, I think that is "irrelevant" in this newsgroup. If it hasn't
been officially published by the ARRL, it can't apply at all to
amateur radio! :-)

>That recommendation is consistent with the basis and purpose
>of the ARS, both as defined by the FCC and the ITU.
>
>While not strictly mandatory, it is provided as "good advice to
>administrations" on what sorts of theoretical knowledge hams
>should possess.

Well, there are SEVEN petitions for rulemaking posted by the
FCC for retention of code testing...in addition to the seven posted
for the elimination of code testing.

Those for code test retention are RM-10805 through RM-10811
inclusive. The most glaring of the "stuck-in-the-past emotional
attachment to old ways" is Napurano's RM-10806. A classic,
almost, in the gratuitous glorification of morse beyond reasonable
bounds of the state of the art of radio of 30 years ago. It exceeds
morse glorification of FISTS' RM-10811 document. :-)

Roux' petition of RM-10810 is split on code test necessity, only
extras having code tests.

I've already filed Comments on all 14. The others in here seem
content with just jawing and hollering among themselves... :-)

LHA

863. Re: What makes a Pro code test Amateur a Troglodyte?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-12 21:33:28 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031012173328.15462.00003525@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 80337

In article <20031012000942.23307.00003680@mb-m29.aol.com>, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) writes:

>Jim:
>
>Indeed. And more often than not, it's usually good, 'ole fashion Morse/CW
>which is getting through.

Right you are Roarke of Fantasy Island. Good old fashioned Morse/CW is what all the present-day public safety agencies use for communications as well as the global maritime world for distress and safety signalling.

On Fantasy Island "good ole fashion Morse/CW ALWAYS gets through!"

Now get back up in the bell tower and look for de blane, de blane!

LHA

864. Re: What makes a Pro code test Amateur a Troglodyte?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-12 21:33:28 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031012173328.15462.00003524@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 80343

In article <20031012000946.23307.00003685@mb-m29.aol.com>, yodoc@aol.comnospam
(Larry Roll K3LT) writes:

>In article <E7Thb.673$_i.57968@nnrp1.ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
><wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:

>I have always presented well-reasoned, factual, and unemotional
>arguments in support of code testing.

Only in your mind, Tatoo.

>Please don't hold me up to
>the same light as those who may have transgressed in the manner
>which you refer to above. Above all, please remember that by far,
>the largest portion of the QRM in the code/no-code debate has been
>from the NCTA side.

Again, only in your mind, Tatoo.

>Also remember that as one who has never
>used the Morse/CW mode to an extent which would have allowed
>you to gain useful proficiency in the mode, you are not qualified to
>judge the value of this mode at all.

Tatoo has his stash up in the bell tower while looking for de blane.

Back here in the Real World (not on Fantasy Island), poor Tatoo
would have to contend with all the long-ago, much more qualified
in many more aspects of Real World communications in all other
radio services have either: Never considered on-off morse in the
first place; dropped on-off morse as a required mode; relegated it
to an optional mode, good only for things like automatic ID.

>I'm not sitting here trying to
>argue technical topics with you, so don't you try to tell me that the
>Morse/CW mode and testing aren't of value to the ARS. We are
>not on each other's respective levels of expertise.

Carl lives in the Real World. So do I. Try visiting it some time.

>Since I'm
>more than willing to respect your technical expertise, don't presume
>to challenge my qualifications to make judgments about CW and
>code testing, because you don't know what your talking about.

Hmmm...the Radio God has spoken! :-)

Hey, Larrah, you should have lent your "qualifications" to the US Army way back when the USAF was part of it. The ACAN (Army Command Administrative Network) was organized to NOT use morse code for long-distance primary communications...a couple years after WW2 was ended.

Now get back up in the bell tower, de blane is coming soon.

LHA

865. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-12 21:33:29 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031012173329.15462.00003526@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 80340

In article <bmaoi1$31u$0@208.207.71.130>, Dick Carroll
<dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com> writes:

>Bill Sohl wrote:
>
>> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>> news:20031011123003.05539.00001476@mb-m16.aol.com...
>>
>>>In article <20031010202024.23171.00001429@mb-m05.aol.com>,

>> When was the survey done? If it is more than two years old, it
>> is almost useless as there has been significant change
>> over the last few years.
>
>Really??? Where is the documentation to back up that statement in the
>face of the large majority of code supporting commentors to 98-143?

Senior, you need to look at public documentation (information
available to all) before you move your stunner to "kill" setting.

The ONLY statistical study on NPRM 98-143 Comments was done
INFORMALLY by one of the later Commenters who was apparently
interested enough to take the time to examine each and every one of
(then) over 2000 Comments. Those two are still in the FCC ECFS,
part of the 2.760 total documents on 98-143.

LHA

866. Re: BPL a reality in my area now!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-12 21:33:30 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031012173330.15462.00003528@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 80338

In article <Yseib.36864$mQ2.6953@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dan/W4NTI"
<w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> writes:

>> Kim W5TIT
>
>Gawd I wish she would change her pills.

I wish you would start taking some... :-)

867. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-12 21:33:30 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031012173330.15462.00003527@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 80339

In article <344ib.32457$mQ2.19944@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20031011123003.05539.00001476@mb-m16.aol.com...
>> In article <20031010202024.23171.00001429@mb-m05.aol.com>,

>> The evidence of the survey is clear. You can "stick head and eyes in the
>> sand" but it is still there.
>
>Again, what is the date of that survey?

Bill, it doesn't really matter...:-) Once a "survey" was done, it is FIXED for all time as indicating "what hams do" years and years after... :-)

Case in point: FCC 98-143 was the NPRM for restructuring, was issued 5 years ago. The R&O giving the restructuring changes (99-412) was issued late in 1999. Anyone can go to the FCC ECFS and get any of the Comments on the record, they are still available, all 2,760 of them. The latest Comment, from a 1x3 who puts "PhD" after his name, bitched about the 5 WPM morse top rate, was filed in September 2003! Five years later a few folks haven't gotten the news... :-)

[in 2001 the FCC issued 01-108 to deny at least 5 petitions to bring back high-rate morse testing, two years before the "PhD" decided to complain. Gotta love all these aware and informed morsemen! :-)]

LHA

868. Re: 73 Magazine Says "73 and QRT"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-12 21:33:32 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031012173332.15462.00003529@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 80341

In article <Xns94128464654Felektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun Palmer
<elektros@yahoo.com> writes:

>et472@FreeNet.Carleton.CA (Michael Black) wrote in
>news:bmbllodjq1@freenet9.carleton.ca:
>
>> unkadean () writes:
>>>
>>>
>>> As I recall, the former Mrs. Wayne got most everything from Byte, etc.
>>>
>>> unk
>>>
>>
>> But Wayne was out of Byte by the third issue, at a time when it did not
>> amount to much. He only lost the potential for when it did get big.
>>
>> He then turned around and started Kilobaud, which was pretty good for
>> some years, and then launching the very successful magazine for the
>> Radio Shack computer, titled something like "TRS-80 Microcomputing",
>> and a number of other computer specific titles. It's those he sold to
>> IDG, which brought in quite a bit of money at the time. Ironically, by
>> the time he did sell them, they were past their peak because the
>> computer world had moved on. I can't remember the year of the sale,
>> but I thought it was just as a lot of computer magazines were folding,
>> because too many had entered the field.
>>
>> And since your wording can be read two ways, it's worth throwing in
>> that Wayne was divoriced from Virginia Londner Green by the time Byte
>> had started up. They had broken up about 1967 or 68, and from an
>> editorial at the time, it seemed to be the indirect cause of his later
>> tax problems.
>>
>> By the time Byte was started, he was married to his second wife, Lynn.
>>
>> It was never clear why Byte was put under the name of is his ex-wife,
>> though years later he did say it had to do with the tax problems and
>> the problems with Bell over those telephone articles, so he put it
>> under someone else's name so it couldn't be grabbed. That still does
>> not explain why it was his ex-wife. Three issues into the magazine,
>> Wayne's name was gone from the masthead. Nothing was said at the time.
>> And it was amusing how childish it got, with no mention of Wayne or 73
>> for about ten years. Even when there was an article in Byte about
>> teletype machines, and the bibliography mentioned QST, CQ and Ham

>> Radio, 73 was significantly absent.
>>
>> Michael VE2BVW
>
>I used to enjoy reading 73. Nobody could ever agree 100% with Wayne Green,
>but I liked to read his editorials.
>
>I suppose all of us that didn't renew are to blame. Certainly the
>combination of falling ham numbers and hard times haven't helped. Magazine
>subscriptions have dropped right off the bottom of my list of financial
>priorities, for instance.

Alun, ALL the independent periodicals survive almost entirely on
sales of advertising space. Those sales are what keeps them
afloat. When advertising sales drop, so does the income for a
magazine and eventually too low a drop forces cancellation.

The subscription fees everyone pays goes almost entirely to what
are called "fulfillment services," the mailers, the distributors, the
keepers of mailing lists. That's the way it is in independent
periodical publishing in North America.

If one could get an independent accounting of QST, they would
very likely find out that QST survives mainly on advertising sales.
Plus the fact that they have an absolute demographic base of the
entire ARRL membership (still at about 170 thousand, give or take).
Independent periodicals have to get independent audits to prove
their edition sales numbers, don't have the backing of a large
membership base. 73 survived for a very long time as an independent
and CQ is still hanging in there. Ham Radio Magazine was starting
to drop in ad sales before 1990...publisher Skip Tenney correctly
read the about-to-be red writing on the wall and sold out to CQ. HR
managed to survive for 22 years as a niche independent.

Advertising budgets for amateur radio equipment are dropping among
all of the leader manufacturers...and increasing for other products
they make targeted to other radio services. Yaesu, Kenwood, and
Icom all make radios for other radio services. Few hams are aware
of that since they don't know much about those other radio services;
few are interested since they seem content to stay in one little room
of radio activity.

Len Anderson
retired (from regular hours) electronic engineer person
former associate editor at Ham Radio magazine

869. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-12 22:30:21 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031012183021.01893.00001194@mb-m22.aol.com>
Source record: 80346

In article <am4ib.32464$mQ2.12561@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20031011214228.06226.00000924@mb-m19.aol.com...
>> In article <%_Zhb.32033$mQ2.26094@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>,
>"Dwight
>> Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> writes:
>>
>> >"N2EY" wrote:
>> >> "Dwight Stewart wrote:
>> >> >
>> >> > (snip)
>> >>
>> >> My point is that the whole issue is not a mass movement.
>> >> Clint claimed, without any proof, that most hams want
>> >> code testing gone. Yet surveys show the opposite.
>> >
>> > I certainly haven't seen a survey recently that could be said to
>> >accurately represents the views of the entire ham radio community, Jim.
>>
>> Neither have I, Dwight. As I have pointed out, the ARRL/READEX survey is 7
>> years old. But it's the most recent *scientific* survey we have. (Its 1500
>> respondents were chosen at random, not self-selected as is the case in
>many
>> "surveys".)
>
>But in these last 7 years, the ham community probably lost
>10% to SK status.

Lessee...if the average ham is licensed 60 years (that doesn't mean every ham is alive when the license expires), the death rate is 1/60th evey year. That's about 1.6% per year.

10% SK in 7 years is a very reasonable guess.

> Most of those were probbaly
>pro-code

Not really! Here's the published results from page 55 of QST for February, 1997 (rounding may result in totals of 99% or 101%):

(results are listed by age group - favor/oppose/no answer):

0-24 years - 85%/15%/0%
25-34 years - 52%/45%/3%

35-44 years - 58%/34%/7%
45-54 years - 66%/26%/8%
55-64 years - 55%/36%/9%
65+ years - 65%/27%/8

All ages - 63%/30%/8%

While the 65+ group is 2% more procodetest than the overall average, the next youngest group is 8% less procodetest.

>and it is likely the survey, if done today,
>would show the continuing shift away from support
>of code testing.

Maybe - or maybe not! Faced with the possibility of complete elimination, support for the code test might be greater. Lacking a more recent survey that is at least as scientific as the ARRL/READEX survey, we just don't know.

>> >believe you recenty posted the results of a survey done by some club that
>> >shows the majority surveyed supported code testing.
>>
>> Not "some club". ARRL hired READEX (a professional survey organization) to
>> conduct the survey in preparation for WRC 1997.
>
>Asabove, too much time has passed for ayone to consider
>those results to be accurate in relation to the current ham
>population.

I disagree! You're assuming your conclusion.

The best we can say is "This is 7 year old data and must be regarded as such".
>
>> >I don't doubt those
>> >results at all. If you surveyed the local club here (and their friends
>> >outside the club), the majority would also support code testing.
>>
>> The ARRL/READEX survey sampled the entire country and all license classes
>> and age groups. Surveying club members doesn't.
>>
>> >Of course,
>> >the club members here are fanatics in their support of code testing, even
>to
>> >the point of openingly ridiculing Technicians who attend the meetings.
>>
>> That sort of behavior is unacceptable. Not "real ham" behavior.
>
>Unfortuneately, it is real ham behavior.

It's real behavior by a few hams. No "real ham" behaves that way.

>Hopefully
>it is just an aberration of some hams...although we have
>seen such attitudes voiced in the newsgroups by

>more than one or two posters in the past.

In these parts, such behavior by club members would get them a good talking-to.
If it persisted, they'd be ex-members.

In any club I know of, anyway.

>> >Because of that, few who oppose code testing, and even fewer Technicians,
>> >attend that club's meetings or socialize with the members. Find me a
>survey
>> >that is truly unbiased and I'll be glad to discuss the results. Until
>then,
>> >discussing the results of surveys is simply a waste of time.
>>
>> Then consider the comments to the restructuring NPRM.
>
>I agree...surveys, votes, etc hold little sway with the FCC anyway.

The comments to 98-143 were majority in favor of at least two code test speeds.
>
>> >> > As you well know, NCI is only a tiny part of the overall
>> >> > movement to end code testing - far more outside that
>> >> > organization are involved (including some in this newsgroup
>> >> > you've personally discussed this issue with).
>> >>
>> >> How do we know this?
>> >
>> > How do you know what?
>>
>> How do we know that there are "far more outside that
>organization..involved"?
>
>Who's on first? What? :-) :-)
>
>> I see the same small number of people in this newsgroup, at qrz.com, eham,
>etc.
>>
>> >That you've talked to people in this newsgroup who
>>
>> >are not NCI members yet are still opposed to code testing? I suspect the
>> >vast majority of those in this newsgroup who oppose code testing are not
>> >members of NCI.
>>
>> Most of those opposed to code testing I have encountered here *are*
>members of
>> NCI. But there are really not that many on either side who post here. How
>many
>> different people have posted to rrap in the past year?
>
>Someone used to post a Top 10 every month.

Same 10 most months, too.
>
>> >> Who are "so many others", Dwight? If they really exist, why
>> >> haven't they signed on to NCI, which costs nothing more than
>> >> a few mouse clicks?
>> >
>> > What is it with your obsession with NCI?
>>
>> No "onsession" at all. I'm just curious as to why someone who felt
>strongly or
>> even mildly that code testing should go would *not* join that
>organization.
>> Particularly given the ease of doing so. And particularly given the fact
>that
>> if the membership numbers got big enough, a majority could be claimed
>based on
>> those numbers alone.
>
>A mojority is nice, but as we've already seen, not really
>needed when the decision to keep code testing can't be justified
>to begin with (ref: R&O of 98-143)

We've already agreed to disagree on that.

Point is, the claim that most hams want to end code testing is pure
speculation.
>
>> >Are you campaigning for members
>> >or something?
>>
>> Just the opposite ;-)
>
>Keep doing your "just the opposite" because it helps
>let others know we exist.

HAW!!!

>> >There is no requirement whatsoever that says those who oppose
>> >code testing must join that organization. I haven't joined it. Neither
>has
>> >my wife. In fact, I don't know anyone personally who is opposed to code
>> >testing who has joined. Of course, there are many organizations in this
>> >country I haven't joined. Therefore, NCI is certainly nothing special in
>> >that regard.
>>
>> That says nothing about how many actually are opposed or support code
>testing.
>
>Why does it matter anyway?

Only to the claim of what most hams want.
>
>> >> And if it's such a done deal, why didn't FCC just dump Element 1

>> >> back in July?
>> >
>> > As you well know, the FCC has rules and regulations to follow, Jim.
>> >Because of that, they can't "just dump" anything.
>>
>> That's not what Phil Kane says. A complete NPRM cycle is not required for
>every
>> rules change. Particularly when the change is characterized as "removing a
>> burden"
>
>True, but the FCC isn't stupid either. A few months of process
>helps avoid complaints down the road.

Really? ;-)
>
>> It's also what both the NCI and NCVEC petitions say. Both of them contend
>that
>> FCC has the authority to just remove Element 1 immediately, and ask FCC to
>do
>> so. Are they mistaken?
>
>No, I don't think they are mistaken, I just think the FCC is
>doing the process path because it is, in the end, less
>controversial...(IMHO).
>
You just verified my point that FCC could, indeed, just dump Element 1 without
the whole NPRM cycle.

73 de Jim, N2EY

870. Re: RM-10808 --- Wexelbaum Redux

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-12 22:30:22 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031012183022.01893.00001195@mb-m22.aol.com>
Source record: 80345

In article <hohib.795$_i.74284@nnrp1.ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
<wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20031011123005.05539.00001479@mb-m16.aol.com...
>> In article <wbDhb.623$_i.48433@nnrp1.ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
>> <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:
>>
>> >> and a "reward" for learning. I fail to understand why removing Morse
>> >> testing is any different from removing all aspects of RTTY knowledge
>> >> from the written test, e.g. "T8A10. What would you connect to a
>> >> transceiver for RTTY operation?".
>> >
>> >Clearly AH0A can't understand (or accept) that the RTTY example
>> >is "theoretical knowledge" and the Morse test is a test of a mechanical
>> >skill ...
>>
>> You mean "a practical skill".
>
>No, I meant "mechanical skill." (touch typing would be in the same
>category ...)

Both are also practical skills, are they not? Practical as opposed to
theoretical.
>
>> Both are valuable to the radio amateur. Whether either should be tested is
>> a matter of opinion, nothing more.
>>
>> But if a person has no interest in RTTY, why should that person be
>> subjected to questions on the subject?
>>
>> Why can't a ham be trusted to learn about RTTY if/when the desire to use
>> that mode arises? RTTY is "just another mode", is it not? There's no
>> requirement for any ham to ever use it.
>
>There is an ITU-R Recommendation that deals with the sorts of
>THEORETICAL knowledge that hams should possess ... IIRC,
>it's ITU-R Recommendation M.1544 ...

It's just a recommendation, though - not a requirement.

>That recommendation is consistent with the basis and purpose
>of the ARS, both as defined by the FCC and the ITU.

So is touch typing, knowing Morse code, knowing how to solder, and a whole
bunch of other things.

>While not strictly mandatory, it is provided as "good advice to
>administrations" on what sorts of theoretical knowledge hams
>should possess.

Sure - but it's just a recommendation.

Can we really say that the questions on RTTY in the current written tests really assure that hams have theoretical knowledge of RTTY at the level recommended by M-1544?

And note this:

When I took my most recent ham exam that counted for a license, the only TOR mode authorized for hams was 60 wpm Baudot code RTTY using FSK or OOK. (Shift had to be less than 900 Hz, as I recall.

No PSK-31, no packet, no PACTOR or even AMTOR. Not even ASCII!

Back then the power limit was different, repeater rules were very different, and the 30, 17 or 12 meter bands weren't even a distant dream. The technology used in most ham rigs was also very different.

And the tests we took back then had lots of things in them that are no longer in the current tests. Neutralization of triode RF power amplifiers, for example.....

In the intervening years, FCC has trusted me (and almost every other ham from those days who hasn't lost interest) to keep current with amateur radio. FCC has renewed almost all of our licenses without question, and we're allowed to use those new modes and technologies even though we've never passed any tests on them.

If FCC trusts us OTs to learn as we go, why not the new folks?

73 de Jim, N2EY

871. Re: IMPORTANT POINTS FOR ALL - Re: BPL a reality in my area now!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-12 22:30:23 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031012183023.01893.00001196@mb-m22.aol.com>
Source record: 80344

In article <20031012142532.23654.00000237@mb-m20.aol.com>, wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) writes:

>>We CANNOT AFFORD to miss-identify other sources of interference as "BPL"
>>or we just lend credence to the BPL folks' claim that we're "crying wolf."
>
>What ever you do, STOP listening to KARL, hes just trying to get credit for
>NCI.

BULLSHIT.

Nowhere in Carl's work to document BPL have I seen any mention of the code test, nor NCI.

872. Re: IMPORTANT POINTS FOR ALL - Re: BPL a reality in my area now!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-12 22:41:34 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031012184134.00143.00000453@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 80347

>BULLSHIT.
>
>Nowhere in Carl's work to document BPL have I seen any mention of the code
>test, nor NCI.
>

It doesnt matter what he says, hes still mr NCI.

873. Re: 73 Magazine Says "73 and QRT"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-12 22:41:41 UTC
From: Gray Shockley <gray-11@cybercoffee.org>
Message-ID: <0001HW.BBAF42D50006CFB312E2F3D0@news.giganews.com>
Source record: 80348
Cross-posted to:
rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

On Sun, 12 Oct 2003 15:05:48 -0500, Jim Hampton wrote
(in message <wuiib.2959$N%3.469@news01.roc.ny>):

> My gut feeling is that a lot of mags have or will drop. Yes, there will
> (likely) always be antenna construction articles, articles on safety, DXing,
> and a (very) limited amount of homebrewing. Do you remember the
> construction articles of the 50s and 60s? Back then, there were a lot of
> home brew projects. Even Heathkit threw in the towel a couple of decades
> ago.

If memory serves, Heath didn't throw in the towel, per se.

Zenith bought them out for their computer(s) and terminals and then Zenith
tossed out nearly all of Heath except those items.

About two years ago, I was in a Home Depot and came across some
sensory-motion fictures that were labeled as "Zenith-Heath". What that is (or
was) about, I have no idea.

My first kit was a Heath Q-1. I was ten or eleven years old and had bought an
used S-38B with my paper route money.

I used ,y Dad's 350-watt soldering iron and cold soldered (what else?) every
connection.

A friendly ham helped me out.

Gray Shockley

Entropy Maintenance Technician
Tao Chemical Company
---
gray-11@cybercoffee.org
http://www.cybercoffee.org/
Vicksburg, Mississippi US

874. Re: BPL a reality in my area now!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-12 22:45:42 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <qQkib.41093$mQ2.33119@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 80349

"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20031012173330.15462.00003528@mb-m06.aol.com...
> In article <Yseib.36864$mQ2.6953@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>,
"Dan/W4NTI"
> <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> writes:
>
> >> Kim W5TIT
> > >
> > >Gawd I wish she would change her pills.
> >
> > I wish you would start taking some... :-)

Have I rattled your cage a bit Lenny ? I sure hope so. And BTW I could
care less what you think or say. I just hope I annoy the crap out of you.

Dan/W4NTI

875. Re: BPL a reality in my area now!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-12 22:46:49 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <tRkib.41103$mQ2.23551@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 80350
Cross-posted to: alt.ham-radio,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.policy

www.arrl.org follow the links.

And yes its much worse than a contest. You wont even hear the contesters.

Dan/W4NTI

"James Wilson" <Someone@Microsoft.Com> wrote in message
news:mJfib.121280$xx4.20524963@twister.neo.rr.com...
> What does BPL sound like? Can someone post a wav file somewhere so it can
> be identified? Is it worse that the Pennsylvania QSO party?
>
> > BPL, at least for Michigan. I don't know when it will be an actual
> reality,
> > as opposed to being in the planning stages, but will keep current with
> their
> > project!
> >
> >
>
>

876. Re: What makes a Pro code test Amateur a Troglodyte?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-12 23:04:06 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <G5lib.41270$mQ2.5509@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 80451

"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20031012142942.23654.00000240@mb-m20.aol.com...
> > I tell them to call me
> >by the affectionate name one of my girlfriends calls me, "Boo."
>
> I heard she calls you BOY.
>
>

Ain't it amazing Bruce? This Texas Twit keeps sticking that foot deeper in her mouth everytime.

Hug and Chalk is going strong.

Dan/W4NTI

877. Re: What makes a Pro code test Amateur a Troglodyte?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-12 23:07:48 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <89lib.41306$mQ2.29185@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 80452

"Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
news:hGgib.785$_i.73747@nnrp1.ptd.net...
>
> "Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
> news:20031012000943.23307.00003682@mb-m29.aol.com...
> > In article <bma161$cg2@library2.airnews.net>, "Kim W5TIT"
> <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
> > writes:
> >
> > >Therein lies the problem with the whole CW test (TEST, *test*) debate.
> The
> > >minute one takes on the "no" CW test argument, it is generally met with
> an
> > >attitude that an end CW use (USE, *use*) is being favored or called
for.
> >
> > Kim:
> >
> > Code testing has always been the thing which generated code use.
>
> I would assert that being forced to learn code to gain access to HF
> "soured" more people on code use than it encouraged ... of course,
> some percentage of folks decided they liked code and continued to
> use it, but MANY simply endured something they had no interest in
> to get past the test, then "threw away the key."
>
> Remember the old adage "honey is better than vinegar."
>
> > In the absence of a code testing requirement, there will be
progressively
> > fewer hams who have never been exposed to learning the code as a
> > result of the requirement. Since the requirement was the principle
> > motivation to learn the code, code use *will* decline once code testing
> > is abolished. Therefore, testing and use are two closely interrelated
> > concepts.
>
> Translation: Larry and his "kindred spirits" are either unwilling to
expend
> the effort to (or incapable of *politely*) encourage people to "give the
> code a try and see if you like it." And, they are apparently unwilling to
> take "No thanks, not interested" for an answer. Thus, they continue to
> seek to have the FCC mandate an arguably counter-productive "recruiting
> program" for them ...
>

> 73,
> Carl - wk3c
>

Poor no code goofballs. They still haven't figured it out. We don't want a bunch of unqualified, ten four screaming, under educated, individuals poluting up the spectrum.

We were doing just fine when we had 250K licensed. In fact the QRM is just as bad on HF as it was then. The only difference is the folks on the air actually KNEW SOMETHING.

Dan/W4NTI

878. Re: What makes a Pro code test Amateur a Troglodyte?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-12 23:09:21 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bmcmv1$4n0$0@208.207.71.176>
Source record: 80453

Hans K0HB wrote:
> "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote
>
>
>
>>The term "nigger" (excuse me, to anyone who is offended
>>by that word--me included) isn't derogatory until some
>>bigoted person uses it against another person, either.
>>No hazard, at all, in being honest.
>>
>
>
> Of course it's derogatory, no matter who uses the word.
>
Actually that's not true. I can recall a number of times hearing blacks call each other by that name, and it was more a term of endearment than a perjorative. But the same word tossed out by the wrong person sure wouldn't be.

879. Re: BPL a reality in my area now!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-12 23:11:23 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bmcn2r$4n0$1@208.207.71.176>
Source record: 80454
Cross-posted to: alt.ham-radio,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Carl R. Stevenson wrote:

> "James Wilson" <Someone@Microsoft.Com> wrote in message
> news:mJfib.121280$xx4.20524963@twister.neo.rr.com...
>
>>What does BPL sound like? Can someone post a wav file somewhere so it can
>>be identified? Is it worse that the Pennsylvania QSO party?
>
>
> The video on the ARRL website shows a couple of BPL variants ...
> one that uses SS and another (test area 4) that uses OFDM.
> They sound different.
>
> Again, I cannot over-emphasize the importance of making SURE
> that complaints of "BPL interference" are REALLY from BPL and
> not some other source.
>
> The LAST thing we need now is a bunch of people "crying wolf."
> (Real complaints are one thing, crying wolf will only HURT us.)
>
> 73,
> Carl - wk3c
>

You raise an interesting question, Carl. How exactly should the
average ham go about proving that the RFI is indeed BPL, when the BPL
people say
"That's not us!'??

880. Re: 73 Magazine Says "73 and QRT"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-12 23:11:37 UTC
From: AK <ak-in-nc@mchsi.com>
Message-ID: <Jclib.753850$uu5.129744@sccrnsc04>
Source record: 80455
Cross-posted to:
rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

"Gray Shockley" <gray-11@cybercoffee.org> wrote in message
news:0001HW.BBAF42D50006CFB312E2F3D0@news.giganews.com...
> Gray Shockley
> -------------------------
> Entropy Maintenance Technician

Is that the same as an "In-Flight Missile Maintenance Technician" Gray?

AK

881. Re: What makes a Pro code test Amateur a Troglodyte?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-12 23:12:04 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <8dlib.41351$mQ2.8569@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 80456

"Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
news:9Vgib.788$_i.73776@nnrp1.ptd.net...
>
> "Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
> news:20031012000946.23307.00003685@mb-m29.aol.com...
> > In article <E7Thb.673$_i.57968@nnrp1.ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
> > <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:
> >
> > >> Carl:
> > >>
> > >> I consider the use of the term "Morse myths" to be derogatory and
> > >> inflammatory. Thus, you have also failed to meet Mike's challenge.
> > >>
> > >> 73 de Larry, K3LT
> > >>
> > > >
> > > >Larry,
> > > >
> > > >I don't recall Mike appointing your the judge and arbiter ...
> > >
> > > Carl:
> > >
> > > In that case, consider my services to have been donated out of my own
> > > generosity.
> >
> > I guess I got what I paid for :-)
> >
> > > >"Morse Myths" is, as you well know by now, simply a term
> > > >that refers to all of the patently false, old wives' tales, such as
> > > >"Morse gets through when nothing else will.",
> > >
> > > This one is true.
> >
> > Bluntly - baloney ... there ARE modes that will get through at
> > s/n ratios where Morse would be totally undetectable, let alone
> > decodable ... ignore the facts if it preserves your fantasy world
> > where Morse is all-important (the "legend in your own mind"),
> > but the rest of the world will pass you by without your even
> > understanding why ...
> >
> > > >"Morse is essential
> > > >for emergency communications.",
> > >
> > > Who said that? Provide correctly attributed quote.

>
> Read any number of absurd pro-code-testing comments
> filed with the FCC ...
>
> > >"Morse acts as a 'lid filter' to
> > >keep us from being overrun by the "mongul hordes' of CBers
> > >who are lurking in the wings waiting to take over the ham bands."
> > >etc.
> >
> > I've never said that whatsoever -- in fact, on many occasions, I've gone
> > out of my way to note that a lot of the problems on HF phone are being
> > caused by 20-WPM code tested Extras.
>
> I didn't say that YOU necessarily said that ... though you HAVE refered
> to the "knuckle-draggers" and other terms that fall into a similar
category.
>
> > >I reject your claim that the term "Morse Myths" is derogatory and
> > >inflamatory.
> >
> > Reject all you want, Carl, but the fact remains that it is. You have
> taken
> > the low road, while claiming the opposite.
> >
> > >It is simply a term that refers in "shorthand" form to
> > >a panoply of falacies that are often cited as "reasons why we MUST
> > >keep Morse testing" ... none of which hold water and all of which
> > >have been rejected by the FCC.
> >
> > I have always presented well-reasoned, factual, and unemotional
> > arguments in support of code testing.
>
> RTFLMAO!!!
>
> > Please don't hold me up to
> > the same light as those who may have transgressed in the manner
> > which you refer to above. Above all, please remember that by far,
> > the largest portion of the QRM in the code/no-code debate has been
> > from the NCTA side.
>
> ROTFLMAO some more ...
>
> > Also remember that as one who has never
> > used the Morse/CW mode to an extent which would have allowed
> > you to gain useful proficiency in the mode, you are not qualified to
> > judge the value of this mode at all.
>
> You are totally wrong on this assertion ... I know the code, had
> "useful proficiency" (nearly 20 wpm at my peak), but haven't used
> it in a long time ... I am certainly qualified to judge the value of the

> mode (at least for my purposes, and also in more general terms).
>
> > I'm not sitting here trying to
> > argue technical topics with you, so don't you try to tell me that the
> > Morse/CW mode and testing aren't of value to the ARS. We are
> > not on each other's respective levels of expertise. Since I'm
> > more than willing to respect your technical expertise, don't presume
> > to challenge my qualifications to make judgments about CW and
> > code testing, because you don't know what your talking about.
>
> Larry, I don't demean your "real ham-ness" because you are not
> my equal on the technical plane, but you demean the "real ham-ness"
> of anyone who is up to your "standards" of Morse prowess ...
> I think you're arrogance and narrow-mindedness are showing again.
>
> Carl - wk3c
>

One major problem that is being ignored is that these alleged 20 wpm Extras are the multiple guess guys. Probably doing good to make it to ten WPM. Just hunt, peck and hope.

One other 'minor' detail, is that they ALL were taught on 11 meters.

How many real hams. Say those that were not infected by the CB crap do these things? Dang few I would venture.

Unless they were like Polly and Billy Jack....Conditionals that were Grandfathered in back in the early 60s.

Lets see some real figures. Not conjecture.

Dan/W4NTI

882. Re: What makes a Pro code test Amateur a Troglodyte?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-12 23:19:04 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <Ijlib.41422$mQ2.8032@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 80457

"Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:bmcfaf$vk3@library1.airnews.net...
> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20031012144519.00545.00001527@mb-m02.aol.com...
> > In article <bmblp3$85p@library1.airnews.net>, "Kim W5TIT"
> <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
> > writes:
> >
> > >
> > >Of course not. But I can accurately say that there is no need to roll
> > >everyone who wants to see an end to the test element, into the "no CW
> use"
> > >minority (note I said minority), either.
> >
> > Agreed! Point is, however, that the "no one" statement is simply not
> correct.
> > >
>
> Let's recall that you are far more into definition than I am, Jim. When I
> say "no one" it may not mean *everyone* but it means enough to be counted
as
> no one. I believe that the number of folks who wish to see an end to CW
in
> the bands of the ARS are so miniscule that the projection of that ever
being
> a reality is moot.
>
> > >
> > >Anyone, *anyone* who allows theirself (bad English) to get all in a
huff
> > >about CW use going away or being legislated out of ham radio is being
> > >foolish.
> >
> > Not necessarily. Not after seeing the mode (not just the test) attacked
> the way
> > I have.
> >
>
> I've seen it attacked also. But I've never for a moment given it any kind
> of merit--the mode simply would never be banned from the ARS. Has any
mode
> ever been banned? Sure, rules have changed; rules pertaining to power
> limits, rules pertaining to test requirements, rules pertaining even (I
> believe) to *where* in the bands that different modes are allowed or not.

> But I doubt a mode would ever be banned, once implemented and in place.
>
> > >
> > >There are a few who have been proponents of seeing the end of CW;
> > >and when I see those posts, I yawn and go on.
> >
> > That's *you* - not everyone.
> >
>
> I can't imagine anyone giving merit to the thought that a mode would be
> banned. Maybe I am being unrealistic. Using history as a perspective of
> measurement; I don't see it ever happening.
>
> > >
> > >There will never be an end to
> > >CW use, and it would never be banned from use in the ham bands...it
just
> > >wouldn't. I think it would be unrealistic to think it would.
> >
> > I hope you are right about that. Some of us are not about to "trust to
the
> > kindness of strangers" however
> >
>
> I think I believe it enough that I'll eat my sock (the right foot sock) if
> it ever happens.
>
> > >
> > >And, if it
> > >was based off a majority of users of the bands, I rest assured knowing
> that
> > >most would not support an end to CW use.
> >
> > Not now, anyway.
> >
>
> My term "most" includes those people who now and in the future have any
kind
> of romantic thought about the ARS. And, I think most do. There are the
few
> who would see an end to something they don't like. But, given the desire
> and will of most ARS folks, CW--nor any mode for that matter--will
> disappear. Now, if I am wrong about history just let me know and I *may*
> change my belief.
>
> > >
> > >I think those who are in the
> > >minority are there mostly for the shock value of it.
> > >
> > Perhaps.

> >
> > But not too long ago, the mere suggestion of *any* class of ham license
> with no
> > code test would have gathered almost no support. And the idea of the
total
> > abolition of code testing would have been discarded with the claim that
> > *no-one* wanted all code testing to end.
> >
>
> I can see requirements changing, etc. But, I cannot see the FCC ever
> saying, "OK, no more ______ as a legal mode in the ARS."
>
> >
> > They way to outlaw something is little by little. Remember your concerns
> about
> > the restrictions on privacy brought about by 'homeland security'
> responses?
> > Little by little....
> >
>
> I have never doubted that the government would do as they have done. I
> daresay they were doing under different guises for many years now.
Nothing
> different there. It's all about expectation. The expectation that the
FCC
> would ever ban a mode is minimal for me.
>
> >
> > There was a time when AM was king of the 'phone modes. Then SSB came a
> long and
> > took center stage, while AM was relegated to niche status. Most folks
said
> > "No-one is against the *use* of AM"....
> >
>
> But, did the FCC ever get anywhere close to seeing its use banned? I am
> not, remember, saying that a mode would become so unpopular or disliked on
a
> scale such that it would be rare to find it openly being used. I am
saying,
> however, that I believe the FCC would never regulate its ban.
>
> >
> > But that was not good enough for some, and proposals have arisen every
so
> often
> > to effectively outlaw AM from the ham bands. HF ham bands, anyway. So
far,
> none
> > of them have been successful.

> >
>
> And, I don't think they ever would be.
>
> >
> > Up until 20 years ago, the amateur power limit was 1 kW DC input to the
> stages
> > delivering power to the antenna. Then the rules changed to 1.5 kW PEP
> output.
> > For the AM folks, this was effectively a lowering of the power limit to
> about
> > half of what it had been before the change. For SSB folks, it was
> effectively
> > about a 50% raise of the power limit.
> >
> > LIttle by little...
> >
> > 73 de Jim, N2EY
> >
>
> I do see things changing in the ARS, but not related to the outlawing of a
> mode.
>
> Kim W5TIT
>
>

Spark was banned. Wide band FM was banned from HF. For decades all we could do was talk and do CW. It was years fighting to get SSTV allowed. Then digital, other than RTTY was another long road.

Most of the time the FCC simply didn't bother to authorize a new mode. Thats how it works Hug and Chalk.

Dan/W4NTI

883. Re: What makes a Pro code test Amateur a Troglodyte?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-13 00:01:35 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031012200135.28772.00000116@mb-m25.aol.com>
Source record: 80458

>Ain't it amazing Bruce? This Texas Twit keeps sticking that foot deeper in
>her mouth everytime.
>
>Hug and Chalk is going strong.
>
>Dan/W4NTI

Didnt you like that comment over hers Dan, 1 of GIRL FREINDS, maybe she just has a problem with guys, you dont think she might be lite in the Loafers do you?

884. Re: GOOD NEWS-------France heat wave deaths top 14,000

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-13 00:09:10 UTC
From: Kieren <kierenmail@hotmail.com>
Message-ID: <Xns9413CA37F24Fkierenmail@195.129.110.200>
Source record: 80459
Cross-posted to: alt.ham-radio.hf,alt.radio.amateur,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

You go Clint!!

You certainly know how to rally the world and unite!!

<me, laughing at Clint and his type>
Kieren

885. Re: 73 Magazine Says "73 and QRT"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-13 00:18:09 UTC
From: Ed Price <edprice@cox.net>
Message-ID: <Uamib.27786$La.11896@fed1read02>
Source record: 80460
Cross-posted to:
rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

"Gray Shockley" <gray-11@cybercoffee.org> wrote in message
news:0001HW.BBAF42D50006CFB312E2F3D0@news.giganews.com...
> On Sun, 12 Oct 2003 15:05:48 -0500, Jim Hampton wrote
> (in message <wuiib.2959$N%3.469@news01.roc.ny>):
>

SNIP

> My first kit was a Heath Q-1. I was ten or eleven years old and had bought
an
> used S-38B with my paper route money.
>
> I used ,y Dad's 350-watt soldering iron and cold soldered (what else?)
every
> connection.
>
> A friendly ham helped me out.
>
>
>
> Gray Shockley
> -------------------------
> Entropy Maintenance Technician
> Tao Chemical Company
> -------------------------
> gray-11@cybercoffee.org
> http://www.cybercoffee.org/
> Vicksburg, Mississippi US
>
>

Is it actually possible to cold-solder ANYTHING with a 350 Watt iron?!

--
Ed
WB6WSN

886. Re: BPL a reality in my area now!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-13 00:18:43 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0310121618.74e510b9@posting.google.com>
Source record: 80461

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20031012144524.00545.00001531@mb-m02.aol.com>...
> In article <bmblrp$ki1@library1.airnews.net>, "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
> writes:
>
> >"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> >news:20031011214233.06226.00000930@mb-m19.aol.com...
> >> In article <bm9o10$kemhq$1@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>, "Ryan, KC8PMX"
> >> <REMOVETHISkc8pmx@diamondcs.net> writes:
> >>
> >> >Just found out today listening to a local, reputable radio station that
> Bay,
> >> >Saginaw and Midland Counties in Michigan are going to be "test sites" for
> >> >BPL, at least for Michigan. I don't know when it will be an actual
> reality,
> >> >as opposed to being in the planning stages, but will keep current with
> their
> >> >project!
> >>
> >> Ryan,
> >>
> >> If you have a 6 meter rig that can go mobile, you're set up to
> measure/observe
> >> (and report) BPL interference.
> >>
> >> 73 de Jim, N2EY
> >
> >heh heh. Yeah, and any ham worth being a ham would have a 6-meter rig that
> >can go mobile so they can measure/observe (and report) BPL interference.
> >Right?
>
> IIRC, Ryan has mentioned being active on 6 meters. So there's a good chance he
> has such a rig already.

FWIW I haven't run into any documented instances of BPL operating as
high as 50 Mhz yet. The BPL signals I've listened to in the Emmaus PA
ran between 3 Mhz to somewhere just above 22 Mhz. That's pretty narrow
by "broadband standards". If/when they get more users doing who knows
what I suppose the BPL band edges will expand both up & down.

> 73 de Jim, N2EY

w3rv

887. Re: What makes a Pro code test Amateur a Troglodyte?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-13 00:30:22 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031012203022.15462.00003538@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 80462

In article <bmcfaf$vk3@library1.airnews.net>, "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20031012144519.00545.00001527@mb-m02.aol.com...
>> In article <bmblp3$85p@library1.airnews.net>, "Kim W5TIT"
><kimscliff@yahoo.com>
>> writes:

>> >Of course not. But I can accurately say that there is no need to roll
>> >everyone who wants to see an end to the test element, into the "no CW
>> >use" minority (note I said minority), either.

>> Agreed! Point is, however, that the "no one" statement is simply not
>>correct.

>Let's recall that you are far more into definition than I am, Jim. When I
>say "no one" it may not mean *everyone* but it means enough to be counted as
>no one.

Sorry, Kim, that's too much of a stretch. "No one" means "not anyone" or "not
even one person". Zero people, in other words.

"Almost no one" is what I think you intended to write. As in "Almost no one
wants to see Morse use banned".

>I believe that the number of folks who wish to see an end to CW in
>the bands of the ARS are so miniscule that the projection of that ever being
>a reality is moot.
>
I hope you are right. However, I recall a time when the same could be said of
those who wished to see an end to code testing.

"Never" is a very long time. How many things have you seen in your lifetime
that, if someone had told you about them years ago, you would have said "That
will *never* happen in my lifetime"?

Look who is the new governor of California. Of course he's really just a front
man for term-limited Pete Wilson, but if someone had told you when the first
Conan movie came out that you were looking at the future governor of
California....
>> >
>> >Anyone, *anyone* who allows theirself (bad English) to get all in a huff
>> >about CW use going away or being legislated out of ham radio is being
>> >foolish.
>>
>> Not necessarily. Not after seeing the mode (not just the test) attacked

>> the way I have.
>
>I've seen it attacked also. But I've never for a moment given it any kind
>of merit--the mode simply would never be banned from the ARS.

"Never" is a very long time.

>Has any mode ever been banned?

Yes. "Mode B" (spark) transmissions were banned for amateurs in 1927. Oddly enough, they were not banned for the maritime services until 1966.

Amateur use of spark had just about disappeared by 1925, however.

>Sure, rules have changed; rules pertaining to power
>limits, rules pertaining to test requirements, rules pertaining even (I
>believe) to *where* in the bands that different modes are allowed or not.

Sure. For example, once upon a time, the voice part of 80 meters was the low end.

>But I doubt a mode would ever be banned, once implemented and in place.

I hope you are right. But MARS does not allow the use of the mode on their frequencies, by order of the military person in charge. Even if the volunteers want to use it, they're not allowed. Why? No reason given. Many MARS folks quit over that ruling.

>> >There are a few who have been proponents of seeing the end of CW;
>> >and when I see those posts, I yawn and go on.

>> That's *you* - not everyone.

>I can't imagine anyone giving merit to the thought that a mode would be
>banned. Maybe I am being unrealistic. Using history as a perspective of
>measurement; I don't see it ever happening.

>> >There will never be an end to
>> >CW use, and it would never be banned from use in the ham bands...it just
>> >wouldn't. I think it would be unrealistic to think it would.

>> I hope you are right about that. Some of us are not about to "trust to the
>> kindness of strangers" however

>I think I believe it enough that I'll eat my sock (the right foot sock) if
>it ever happens.

For your sake I hope that never becomes a necessity.

>> >And, if it
>> >was based off a majority of users of the bands, I rest assured knowing
>> >that most would not support an end to CW use.

>> Not now, anyway.

>My term "most" includes those people who now and in the future have any kind
>of romantic thought about the ARS. And, I think most do. There are the few
>who would see an end to something they don't like. But, given the desire
>and will of most ARS folks, CW--nor any mode for that matter--will
>disappear. Now, if I am wrong about history just let me know and I *may*
>change my belief.

>> >I think those who are in the
>> >minority are there mostly for the shock value of it.

>> Perhaps.

>> But not too long ago, the mere suggestion of *any* class of ham license
>> with no
>> code test would have gathered almost no support. And the idea of the total
>> abolition of code testing would have been discarded with the claim that
>> *no-one* wanted all code testing to end.

>I can see requirements changing, etc. But, I cannot see the FCC ever
>saying, "OK, no more ______ as a legal mode in the ARS."

I can. Not very likely, but given the changes in rules I've seen in 36 years, I
don;t count anything out.
>>
>> They way to outlaw something is little by little. Remember your concerns
>> about
>> the restrictions on privacy brought about by 'homeland security'
>> responses?
>> Little by little....

>I have never doubted that the government would do as they have done. I
>daresay they were doing under different guises for many years now. Nothing
>different there. It's all about expectation. The expectation that the FCC
>would ever ban a mode is minimal for me.

>> There was a time when AM was king of the 'phone modes. Then SSB came a
>> along and
>> took center stage, while AM was relegated to niche status. Most folks said
>> "No-one is against the *use* of AM"....
>
>But, did the FCC ever get anywhere close to seeing its use banned? I am
>not, remember, saying that a mode would become so unpopular or disliked on a
>scale such that it would be rare to find it openly being used. I am saying,
>however, that I believe the FCC would never regulate its ban.

There was a docket in the 1970s that would have limited the bandwidth of all
modes on HF to 3.5 kHz in the 'phone subbands. That would have effectively
banned AM and any form of FM below 30 MHz. It was seriously considered.
>
>> But that was not good enough for some, and proposals have arisen every so
>> often
>> to effectively outlaw AM from the ham bands. HF ham bands, anyway. So far,
>> none of them have been successful.

>And, I don't think they ever would be.

>> Up until 20 years ago, the amateur power limit was 1 kW DC input to the
>> stages
>> delivering power to the antenna. Then the rules changed to 1.5 kW PEP
>> output.
>> For the AM folks, this was effectively a lowering of the power limit to
>> about
>> half of what it had been before the change. For SSB folks, it was
>> effectively
>> about a 50% raise of the power limit.
>>
>> LIttle by little...

>I do see things changing in the ARS, but not related to the outlawing of a
>mode.
>
Lots of ways to outlaw something. Take away the spectrum where it can be used,
reduce the power level, etc.

Little by little...

73 de Jim, N2EY

My first amateur license, a Novice, was dated October 12, 1967. It arrived
October 14.

888. Re: 73 Magazine Says "73 and QRT"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-13 01:09:32 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <xnfcneeyarg.hmnxu01.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>
Source record: 80464
Cross-posted to:
rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

On Sun, 12 Oct 2003 17:41:41 -0500, Gray Shockley wrote:

>If memory serves, Heath didn't throw in the towel, per se.
>
>Zenith bought them out for their computer(s) and terminals and then Zenith
>tossed out nearly all of Heath except those items.

Didn't Shlumberger get into the picture before Zenith, or was it
after Zenith?

>My first kit was a Heath Q-1.

My first Heathkit was their VTVM (Vacuum-Tube Voltmeter for those
who never played with one). One of the best test instruments of its
time (1950s). I had built one from EICO before that, and there was
no comparison.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

From a Clearing in the Silicon Forest
Beaverton (Washington County) Oregon

889. FCC relaxes it's prohibition on use of the "F-word" on broadcast media.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-13 01:33:32 UTC
From: "Dr. Anton Phibes" <bhutanna2@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <1066009539.863340@newshost03.voicenet.com>
Source record: 80465
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.shortwave

October 9, 2003
F.C.C. Ruling Could Allow Use Of "F-word" On T.V.
By Jon Hanian BOISE -

In broadcasting, dropping the so called "F-bomb" goes over like an H-bomb. But the FCC has now ruled that the use of the "F-word" by U-2 frontman "Bono" at the Golden Globe awards **did not** violate federal indecency rules.

The FCC rules say the use of the word must be "patently offensive" to be considered indecent. But the FCC ruled that when Bono received a Golden Globe award on television and said, "this is really f * * * * * * brilliant," he did not violate FCC rules. They ruled that the word was used as an adjective instead of a verb and therefore, while it may have been crude, it was not "patently offensive."

If that FCC decision confuses you, think about how those of us in the media are trying to to interpret it.

Dr. Rick Moore of the Boise State University Communications Department believes this decision will muddy the already muddy waters for broadcasters who struggle with what is acceptable and unacceptable speech. "I think it might give some people a sense of greater license to not be quite so tight on that bleep button as they have been in the past," said Moore.

At Idaho 2 News, General Manager Jeff Anderson says while the ruling may make an already murky situation murkier, KBCI TV will not air the F-word in any context. "We have an obligation to program in the public interest, and in my opinion broadcasting programming with that kind of language is inappropriate and we won't do it," he said.

(Story 2)

FCC relaxes TV rules on use of f-word
By Chris Baker
THE WASHINGTON TIMES

Remember comedian George Carlin's list of the seven dirty words you can't say on television?

It just got a little shorter.

The Federal Communications Commission ruled this month that Irish rocker Bono did not violate federal indecency rules when he used the f-word during an acceptance speech at the Golden Globe Awards, which NBC broadcast in January.

"This is really, really [expletive] brilliant," Bono said during the ceremony, using the f-word as an adjective. The speech aired live on the East Coast. The FCC said it received 234 complaints, all but 17 of them from individuals associated with the Parents Television Council, a nonprofit group that monitors programs for adult content.

The FCC rejected the complaints Oct. 3 in a written statement that used the f-word far more often than Bono did on the air. David H. Solomon, chief of the FCC's enforcement bureau, said the word "may be crude and offensive, but, in the context presented here, did not describe sexual or excretory organs and activities."

That distinction is a key to test whether a statement meets a federal standard for broadcast indecency, according to FCC staffers. Mr. Solomon said in the ruling that Bono used the vulgarity as an adjective or to emphasize an exclamation and that "the use of specific words, including expletives or other 'four-letter words' does not render material obscene."

Laura Mahaney, director of corporate and entertainment affairs for the Parents Television Council, has vowed an appeal. "The ruling is outrageous. It's splitting hairs," she said.

Activists said they fear the FCC's ruling will allow the f-word and other vulgarities to become more common in prime-time television. "We're gradually getting to the point where nothing will be off-limits," said Jim O'Connor, president of the Cuss Control Academy, a Lake Forest, Ill., group that advises individuals on ways to limit cursing. Spokesmen for NBC and the other major broadcast networks rejected the suggestion that the ruling will lead to more salty language in prime time.

However, they acknowledge they face heavy competition from cable networks such as HBO and FX, which have more freedom to air edgy shows because they do not deliver programs over the FCC-regulated airwaves.

The FCC's Enforcement Bureau issued the ruling on Bono's language. The five-member FCC panel did not vote on the matter. Commissioner Michael J. Copps, one of two Democrats on the panel, said he has not reviewed the case, but if it had come before him, he may not have dismissed the complaints.

"I do believe under the right circumstances that a word in
and of itself can be indecent without having to fit in
with a wider context," he said.

Six years ago, activists and the Clinton administration pushed the
networks to adopt a content-ratings system that would enable V-chips
to block programs parents deemed inappropriate.
At the time, some network executives feared the ratings system
would lead to bland scripts and cost them viewers.
For the most part, broadcasters have continued to push the
limits of decorum with programs such as "NYPD Blue," a pioneer
in the use of four-letter words. The show crossed another line
last season when ABC permitted writers to slip a coarse word
for bull dung into an episode.

890. Re: Bootlegging in 1948?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-13 01:38:02 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <_lnib.25683$Eo2.9439@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 80466

"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote:
>
> You GOT the answer, Dwight. Apparently you are
> not satisfied with the answer. Not my problem. (snip)

There was no question for you to answer.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

891. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-13 01:59:20 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <YFnib.25868$Eo2.2107@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 80467

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:bmaoi1$31u$0@208.207.71.130...
> Bill Sohl wrote:
>
> > "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> > news:20031011123003.05539.00001476@mb-m16.aol.com...
> >
> >>In article <20031010202024.23171.00001429@mb-m05.aol.com>,
> >
> > lenover21@aol.com
> >
> >>(Len Over 21) writes:
> >>
> >>
> >>>In article <20031010062952.07578.00001037@mb-m25.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com
> >>>(N2EY)
> >>>writes:
> >>>
> >>>
> >>>>In article <voc7csn28m5j44@corp.supernews.com>, "Clint" <rattlehead at
> >>>>computron dot net> writes:
> >>>>
> >>>>
> >>>>>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> >>>>>news:20031009222958.11022.00001288@mb-m14.aol.com...
> >>>>>
> >>>>>>In article <vobqv2rgm27fb7@corp.supernews.com>, "Clint" <rattlehead
> >
> > at
> >
> >>>>>>computron dot net> writes:
> >>>>>>
> >>>>>>
> >>>>>>>All age groups showed a majority to be procodetest, h
> >>>>>>>
> >>>>>>>
> >>>>>>>bzzzzzt....
> >>>>>>>
> >>>>>>>if this were true,
> >>>>>>>
> >>>>>>It is true. Did you read the survey and its results?
> >>>>>>
> >>>>>>
> >>>>>>there wouldn't be such a push to remove it.

> >>>>>>
> >>>>>>Incorrect. What "push"? Based on membership numbers, NCI has fewer
> >
> > than
> >
> >>>>>5000
> >>>>>
> >>>>>>members worldwide, even with no dues, no expiration of membership
and
> >>>>>
> >>>>>having
> >>>>>
> >>>>>>been around over 7 years.
> >>>>>>
> >>>>>>
> >>>>>
> >>>>>Oh, more than just NCI; ARRL seems to favor it,
> >>>>
> >>>>ARRL hasn't formulated a new position yet. Their leadership is sitting
> >
> > on
> >
> >>>the
> >>>
> >>>>sidelines because no matter what they decide, some folks will be
> >
> > unhappy.
> >
> >>> Prior to and just after the IARU decision on S25 policy, ARRL was
> >>> ALL FOR CODE TESTING.
> >>
> >>In the USA, yes. But back in early 2001, ARRL changed policy on S25.5
and
> >
> > no
> >
> >>longer supported its continuation in the treaty..
> >>
> >>> That didn't make the NCTA happy.
> >>>
> >>> ARRL still doesn't have any more membership than a quarter of all
> >>> licensed US amateurs. I don't believe in coincidences.
> >>
> >>NCI membership is less than one percent of licensed US amateurs. Even
> >
> > though
> >
> >>membership is free and requires only a few mouse clicks.
> >>
> >>

> >>> Faced with the inevitable worldwide reaction and subsequent action
> >>> at WRC-03, ARRL just OPTS OUT, goes neutral, won't take a stand
> >>> either way.
> >>
> >>ARRL policy is made by representatives of the membership. If the
> >
> > membership is
> >
> >>divided on an issue, a neutral policy may be the only solution.
> >>
> >>> Their $12 million income (2002) is at stake. ARRL doesn't exist
> >>> without funding. The ONLY people the ARRL is worried about is
> >>> the present membership which is skewed towards PCTA thinking.
> >>
> >>Is it somehow wrong for a membership organization to do what the members
> >
> > think
> >
> >>is best?
> >>
> >>> ARRL membership is still only a quarter of all US licensed amateurs.
> >>
> >>NCI membership is less than one percent of licensed US amateurs.
> >>
> >>> They aren't a majority. Their decisions are not a "consensus."
> >>
> >>Neither are NCI's.
> >>
> >>>>>>Yep, it's outta here, CW testing is soon to be extinct. It's goneski.
> >>>>>
> >>>>
> >>>>Maybe it is. But if so, it's not because most hams want it to go. And
on
> >>>>particular, not because young hams want it to go.
> >>>
> >>> Your OPINION, senior.
> >>
> >>No, simple fact, backed up by scientific survey. And the comments to
> >
> > 98-143.
> >
> >>> Do you have any good and true statistical polling to back up your
> >>> OPINION?
> >>
> >>Yes!
> >>
> >>The ARRL/READEX survey showed that a majority favored code testing, and
> >
> > that
> >

> >>the youngest age group was the most strongly procodetest.
> >
> >
> > When was the survey done? If it is more than two years old, it
> > is almost useless as there has been significant change
> > over the last few years.
> >
>
>
> Really??? Where is the documentation to back up that statement in the
> face of the large majority of code supporting commentors to 98-143?

98-143 is over 5 years old. If you can't fuigure out the logic and
basic assumptions that reflect the probable changing, then so be it.
Believe whatever makes you happy.

> >>The comments to 98-143 were categorized by an NCI staffer (disproving
any
> >>possible claim of bias by procodetest evaluation of the comments) and
the
> >>resutls showed that the *majority* of commenters not only wanted
continued
> >
> > code
> >
> >>testing, but wanted at least 2 code test speeds. This was true despite
an
> >
> > email
> >
> >>campaign by NCI to get as many comments in support of their position of
5
> >
> > wpm
> >
> >>and sunset clause.
> >
> >
> > Now it also must be pointed out that for the initial several weeks
> > during 98-143 comment phase, those commenting were not
> > aware of the position being put forth by NCI. How many people
> > at the time may who said they support ARRLs stance
> > may have supported NCI's position will never be known. Even
> > so, the issue is NOT to be decided by any "vote" or majority opinion
> > of any group or even the public at large. The decision will be,
> > as it should be, based on what should be proper regulatory
> > setting of licensing requirments.
> >
> >
>
>

> Ah. So maybe that change "in the last few years" wasn't so striking,
> after all.

Actually, I'm certain there was yet a continuing shift away from
support for code testing.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

892. Re: RM-10808 --- Wexelbaum Redux

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-13 02:00:41 UTC
From: lk <lklose@net-link.net>
Message-ID: <vok1tbe6p8ti61@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 80468

"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20031012173327.15462.00003523@mb-m06.aol.com...
> In article <hohib.795$_i.74284@nnrp1.ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
> <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:
>
> Well, there are SEVEN petitions for rulemaking posted by the
> FCC for retention of code testing...in addition to the seven posted
> for the elimination of code testing.

In the first group, there is only five petitions that request deletion
of all code exams. The Beauregard petition, RM-10781, retains
the 5 wpm code exam for both General and Extra. The Reich,
RM-10784, retains it for Extra.

> Those for code test retention are RM-10805 through RM-10811
> inclusive. The most glaring of the "stuck-in-the-past emotional
> attachment to old ways" is Napurano's RM-10806. A classic,
> almost, in the gratuitous glorification of morse beyond reasonable
> bounds of the state of the art of radio of 30 years ago. It exceeds
> morse glorification of FISTS' RM-10811 document. :-)
>
> Roux' petition of RM-10810 is split on code test necessity, only
> extras having code tests.
>
> I've already filed Comments on all 14. The others in here seem
> content with just jawing and hollering among themselves... :-)

Excellent comments. Thanks for taking the time to file.

LK

893. Re: What makes a Pro code test Amateur a Troglodyte?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-13 02:04:00 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bmd193$9d7@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 80470

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20031012203022.15462.00003538@mb-m06.aol.com...
> In article <bmcfaf$vk3@library1.airnews.net>, "Kim W5TIT"
<kimscliff@yahoo.com>
> writes:
>
> >But I doubt a mode would ever be banned, once implemented and in place.
>
> I hope you are right. But MARS does not allow the use of the mode on their
> frequencies, by order of the military person in charge. Even if the
volunteers
> want to use it, they're not allowed. Why? No reason given. Many MARS folks
quit
> over that ruling.
>

We are discussing ARS frequencies, to use your firmness of interpretation.
:)

>
> >I think I believe it enough that I'll eat my sock (the right foot sock)
if
> >it ever happens.
>
> For your sake I hope that never becomes a necessity.
>

I'm pretty certain.

>
> >I can see requirements changing, etc. But, I cannot see the FCC ever
> >saying, "OK, no more ______ as a legal mode in the ARS."
>
> I can. Not very likely, but given the changes in rules I've seen in 36
years, I
> don;t count anything out.
>

Well, you mentioned that "spark" was banned. Hmmmm, so there's been a ban
on a mode. However, would the ban have been a response to bandwidth usage?
I mean would spark violate the spirit of the R&R as they exist today?

> >
> >But, did the FCC ever get anywhere close to seeing its use banned? I am
> >not, remember, saying that a mode would become so unpopular or disliked
on a

> >scale such that it would be rare to find it openly being used. I am
saying,
> >however, that I believe the FCC would never regulate its ban.
>
> There was a docket in the 1970s that would have limited the bandwidth of
all
> modes on HF to 3.5 kHz in the 'phone subbands. That would have effectively
> banned AM and any form of FM below 30 MHz. It was seriously considered.
>

That's like my almost, Jim. Are we going to speak in almost terms or not?
:)

>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>

Kim W5TIT

894. Re: BPL a reality in my area now!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-13 02:14:28 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <8Unib.831$_i.78693@nnrp1.ptd.net>
Source record: 80469
Cross-posted to: alt.ham-radio,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:bmcn2r$4n0$1@208.207.71.176...
> Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
>
> > "James Wilson" <Someone@Microsoft.Com> wrote in message
> > news:mJfib.121280$xx4.20524963@twister.neo.rr.com...
> >
> >>What does BPL sound like? Can someone post a wav file somewhere so it
can
> >>be identified? Is it worse that the Pennsylvania QSO party?
> >
> >
> > The video on the ARRL website shows a couple of BPL variants ...
> > one that uses SS and another (test area 4) that uses OFDM.
> > They sound different.
> >
> > Again, I cannot over-emphasize the importance of making SURE
> > that complaints of "BPL interference" are REALLY from BPL and
> > not some other source.
> >
> > The LAST thing we need now is a bunch of people "crying wolf."
> > (Real complaints are one thing, crying wolf will only HURT us.)
> >
> > 73,
> > Carl - wk3c
> >
>
>
> You raise an interesting question, Carl. How exactly should the
> average ham go about proving that the RFI is indeed BPL, when the BPL
> people say
> "That's not us!'??
>

BPL has a unique "signature" (in the spectral/time domains) that can be
used to ID it.

Since there are different systems (SS from main.net and OFDM from Amperion,
for example) they have different signatures, which are distinct from other
sources
of interference and more traditional power line noise (of course the
utilities are
responsible for fixing the latter, too ... though their record is poor).

Carl - wk3c

895. Re: RM-10808 --- Wexelbaum Redux

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-13 02:23:43 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <P0oib.835$_i.78080@nnrp1.ptd.net>
Source record: 80471

"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20031012173327.15462.00003523@mb-m06.aol.com...
> In article <hohib.795$_i.74284@nnrp1.ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
> <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:
>
> >There is an ITU-R Recommendation that deals with the sorts of
> >THEORETICAL knowledge that hams should possess ... IIRC,
> >it's ITU-R Recommendation M.1544 ...
>
> Carl, I think that is "irrelevant" in this newsgroup. If it hasn't
> been officially published by the ARRL, it can't apply at all to
> amateur radio! :-)

Actually, ARRL was instrumental in developing the recomendation
and pushing it through WP8A and SG8 ...

Carl - wk3c

896. Re: What makes a Pro code test Amateur a Troglodyte?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-13 02:27:28 UTC
From: groupk0hb@earthlink.net
Message-ID: <5ee63311.0310121827.7191e44a@posting.google.com>
Source record: 80473

"Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote

>
> But, did the FCC ever get anywhere close to seeing its use banned? I am
> not, remember, saying that a mode would become so unpopular or disliked on a
> scale such that it would be rare to find it openly being used. I am saying,
> however, that I believe the FCC would never regulate its ban.
>

Spark transmissions were outlawed (as well they should have been) so
the precedent exists.

On a more immediate note, as relates to your discussion on AM phone,
I'd have to dig out some old material to get all the facts exactly in
order, but there was a petition (in the 70's?) which the I
believe the FCC had moved to the stage of an NPRM to outlaw AM
transmissions on the HF amateur bands. The rationale was that AM was
(is?) wasteful of spectrum because SSB can convey the same message in
half the bandwidth oF DSB AM phone and without those awful sounding
hetrodyning carriers. The proposal narrowly missed being adopted,
only because of a huge hue and cry from thousands of AM-forever hams
(who drew ARRL into the fight on their side). Today you're hard
pressed to find any remaining AM-ers on the band, and if the petition
were re-introduced it might well be adopted due to lack of organized
opposition. Most of the AM-forever crowd has moved to "forever".

73, de Hans, K0HB

897. Re: BPL a reality in my area now!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-13 02:28:09 UTC
From: "J. McLaughlin" <JCM@Power-Net.Net>
Message-ID: <vok3bj7so5th6b@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 80472
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.policy

I submit that what is needed is detailed information.
Who is doing the testing? I think that only Consumers Energy
distributes electric power in that area - they would be the people to
ask.
Is more than one system being tested?
When will the tests take place?
From where to where is the test link?

With details one can plan for before and after testing. Who can
sniff out the details?
73 Mac N8TT

--
J. Mc Laughlin - Michigan USA
Home: JCM@Power-Net.Net

898. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-13 02:37:02 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <idoib.26221$Eo2.11139@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 80474

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:bmaotk$404$0@208.207.71.130...
> Bill Sohl wrote:
> Dwight:
> >>>Because of that, few who oppose code testing, and even fewer
Technicians,
> >>>attend that club's meetings or socialize with the members. Find me a
> >
> > survey
> >
> >>>that is truly unbiased and I'll be glad to discuss the results. Until
> >
> > then,discussing the results of surveys is simply a waste of time.
>
> N2EY:
> >>Then consider the comments to the restructuring NPRM.
>
> > I agree...surveys, votes, etc hold little sway with the FCC anyway.
>
>
> So you think Bill Cross is obfuscating when he says that FCC wants the
> ham community to decide what our rules are to be, for us to reach a
> concensus??

Not at all, but I also believe that when it is obvious to the FCC that
a rule change is appropriate...even if a majority of hams oppose
that change...the FCC will do what it believes is right and in the
public interest. 98-143 serves as a bellweather to that since, if
most hams favored 5wpm General and 12 wpm Extra, the FCC
didn't buy it.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

>

899. Re: What makes a Pro code test Amateur a Troglodyte?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-13 02:49:26 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20031012224926.21457.00001309@mb-m10.aol.com>
Source record: 80477

In article <fG4ib.32485$mQ2.15379@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:

>
>Another problem is that some (many?) that favor code testing suggest that
>by ending that testing it will lead to an end to code use. I don't
>belive that at all and there are hundreds of examples of older
>technology and skills that are still practiced today in other
>fields even though such technology/skill is recognized as
>no longer generally used/needed (e.g. archery, manual transmission
>autos, etc.)
>
>Cheers,
>Bill K2UNK

Bill:

One year ago, I traded in a perfectly good 2001 Toyota Corolla LE with a 5-speed manual gearbox for a new 2003 model with an automatic transmission. However, I still see the need for code testing in the ARS. I own a few rifles and handguns, but wouldn't want to bet my life on my proficiency with a compound bow. However, I still see the need for code testing in the ARS. How do you explain that?

73 de Larry, K3LT

900. Re: What makes a Pro code test Amateur a Troglodyte?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-13 02:49:27 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20031012224927.21457.00001310@mb-m10.aol.com>
Source record: 80475

In article <bmalst$q20$0@208.207.71.130>, Dick Carroll
<dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com> writes:

>> Hw about morse fallicies, morse inaccuracies, erronious morse
>> claims? Which of these do you find acceptable?
>>
>
>
>It's easy enough to accept that those of you who have never had any use
>for radiotelegraphy would view its stated attributes as mythical, and
>for the lot of you that is indeed a proper description. You couldn't
>communciate your way out of an emergency using Morse if the fate of the
>planet DID depend on it!

Dick:

More realistically, they couldn't use CW to communicate their way
out of an emergency even if the life of one person depended on it!
That is a much more likely scenario than any sort of "planetary" disaster.

73 de Larry, K3LT

901. Re: What makes a Pro code test Amateur a Troglodyte?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-13 02:49:28 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20031012224928.21457.00001311@mb-m10.aol.com>
Source record: 80476

In article <Y25ib.32506$mQ2.11233@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:

>> Bill:
>>
>> None, actually. The truth is that the Morse/CW mode is one of the most
>> practical, efficient, effective, and universal modes of radio
>communication
>> available to radio amateurs, and well worth the effort to gain and
>maintain
>> this particular skill. Everything you and Carl mention is nothing more
>than
>> NCTA sour grapes.
>>
>> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>
>Yet, even if one accepts your claim that morse is...one of the most...etc
>You have failed to convince the FCC (98-143) and more recently the
>international radio community (WRC-03) that whatever traits
>morse has it should be retained as a test requirement.
>
>Cheers,
>Bill K2UNK

Bill:

Since when am I personally responsible for the outcomes of 98-143 and WRC-03? I filed comments on 98-143 and the FCC "Restructured" the code requirement down to 5 WPM. I didn't have any way to influence the outcome of WRC-03. In both cases, it wasn't an individual failure on my part. Now, if you are using a collective "you" to include all NCTA's, then you may have a point. For instance, if FISTS hadn't taken it's "non-political" stance during the 98-143 comment period, perhaps things could have come out differently.

73 de Larry, K3LT

902. Re: What makes a Pro code test Amateur a Troglodyte?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-13 02:49:28 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20031012224928.21457.00001312@mb-m10.aol.com>
Source record: 80478

In article <_75ib.32511$mQ2.16900@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:

>> And you're the commercial-grade Vulcan stove with all eight
>> burners, both ovens, and the grill turned up high. No wonder
>> all your pots and kettles are black. Your gas bill must be
>> enormous, but nobody's buying what you're cooking.
>
>ROTFLMAO...
>The sale seems to have been made already to the only
>buyer that counts...the FCC and, more recently, the ITU.
>
>Cheers,
>Bill K2UNK

Bill:

In that case, they must have a taste for the carbonized remains of what could have been a tasty and nourishing meal. My condolences to the dishwasher who must now deal with your blackened pots and kettles.

73 de Larry, K3LT

903. Re: What makes a Pro code test Amateur a Troglodyte?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-13 02:49:29 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20031012224929.21457.00001313@mb-m10.aol.com>
Source record: 80479

In article <bmapi3$83f$0@208.207.71.130>, Dick Carroll
<dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com> writes:

>> Jim:
>>
>> Indeed. And more often than not, it's usually good, 'ole fashion Morse/CW
>> which is getting through.
>
>
> And just to crown their ignorarance of it all, when I found a
>dead-band morning where there was group of very weak Europeans coming in
>on 20 meter PSK31 that wouldn't print, but their CW ID's were completely
>good copy, Carl and his little lid buddy Brain Burke accuse me of "not
>being able to make PSK31 work!"

Dick:

LOL! I've had that experience many times on PSK-31. I think it's
a fantastic mode, but it has it's own built-in feature which serves to
prove the value of CW!

> Can you believe the clowns? I had only been working PSK31 for the past
>6 or 8 months!
>
> I know, the reason for the failure of PSK31 in that case was likely
>polar phase shift, but that seems to be meaningless to our technical
>genius and his pals!

Polar phase shift, eh? Seems to be a lot of that going around on PSK-31
these days! Like I said, I think it's a great mode, but it hasn't caused me
to toss my CW keys in the trash -- yet!

>"Too many clowns and not enough ringmasters!"
>
> *They're already here!"

So it would seem.

73 de Larry, K3LT

904. Re: What makes a Pro code test Amateur a Troglodyte?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-13 02:49:30 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20031012224930.21457.00001314@mb-m10.aol.com>
Source record: 80483

In article <bmaqun$gu0$0@208.207.71.130>, Dick Carroll
<dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com> writes:

>> As for the fate of the planet,
>> when is the sequal coming out to ID4?
>
>
>
> Whatever it is, I didn't see the first three and have similar lack of
>interest in the fourth.

Dick:

"ID4" is the production company's short name for the film which was
released under the name "Independence Day." It was only one film
and had no sequels. However, I really do suggest that you do see
it. It shows what happens when our planet is invaded by No-code
Techs. They get beat by those who know how to use Morse/CW.

73 de Larry, K3LT

905. Re: What makes a Pro code test Amateur a Troglodyte?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-13 02:49:31 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20031012224931.21457.00001315@mb-m10.aol.com>
Source record: 80486

In article <bmbn0b$bg7@library1.airnews.net>, "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
writes:

>> Kim:
>>
>> Code testing has always been the thing which generated code use.
>> In the absence of a code testing requirement, there will be progressively
>> fewer hams who have never been exposed to learning the code as a
>> result of the requirement. Since the requirement was the principle
>> motivation to learn the code, code use *will* decline once code testing
>> is abolished. Therefore, testing and use are two closely interrelated
>> concepts.
>>
>
>1) To use the test element as a reason to proliferate CW users is not
>acceptable to me. The reason is because the test requirement is a
>government sponsored requirement. If we use your expectation for the
>requirement above, then I respond that the continuance of the mode of CW is
>not the responsiblity of the government, nor should it be. The FCC, the
>government, has decided that CW is no longer needed for its expectation and
>interpretation of what the ARS is about. To argue with that is merely
>spinning our wheels at this point--it's a done deal. So, if your basic
>support of the CW test as a requirement for ham radio is that it will keep
>people learning and using the mode, then I would wholehertedly disagree.
>
>2) Using the statement you make, above: would you not also agree then, that
>the choice by some people to stop short of HF privileges, simply because of
>a CW test requirement, depletes the overall supply of HF, therefore CW,
>users anyway? I'd rather dismiss the test requirement for CW and have HF
>thrive and active for the ARS. In article <bmbn0b$bg7@library1.airnews.net>,
"Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> writes:

>> Kim:
>>
>> Code testing has always been the thing which generated code use.
>> In the absence of a code testing requirement, there will be progressively
>> fewer hams who have never been exposed to learning the code as a
>> result of the requirement. Since the requirement was the principle
>> motivation to learn the code, code use *will* decline once code testing
>> is abolished. Therefore, testing and use are two closely interrelated
>> concepts.

>1) To use the test element as a reason to proliferate CW users is not
>acceptable to me. The reason is because the test requirement is a
>government sponsored requirement.

Kim:

The written exams required by the FAA for one to obtain a pilot's license is a "government sponsored requirement."

>If we use your expectation for the
>requirement above, then I respond that the continuance of the mode of CW is
>not the responsiblity of the government, nor should it be.

Why should the government have the responsibility to "force" people to take exams in order to obtain a pilot's license? Where is the government's "responsibility" to create a growing number of licensed aircraft pilots?

>The FCC, the
>government, has decided that CW is no longer needed for its expectation and
>interpretation of what the ARS is about. To argue with that is merely
>spinning our wheels at this point--it's a done deal. So, if your basic
>support of the CW test as a requirement for ham radio is that it will keep
>people learning and using the mode, then I would wholehertedly disagree.

Well, you have a right to that disagreement, Kim. That doesn't mean you are correct in your thinking, however.

>2) Using the statement you make, above: would you not also agree then, that
>the choice by some people to stop short of HF privileges, simply because of
>a CW test requirement, depletes the overall supply of HF, therefore CW,
>users anyway?

I've never had any problem with hams who decide to stop themselves at the Technician class, unless and until they begin to whine about code testing, and make insulting inferences about those who support code testing.

>I'd rather dismiss the test requirement for CW and have HF
>thrive and active for the ARS.

There was never a problem with HF use "thriving" even when we had code testing up to 20 WPM, Kim, so what will be the difference in the ECTA?

>The influence of good amateur radio
>operators who appreciate the value, tradition, and history of CW will always
>be a positive effect on the maintenance of the population of CW users.

A lot of those CW users only became CW users because of the requirement to be tested in Morse code proficiency. How does "history" and "tradition" play a role in causing prospective licensed pilots to learn and master a wide variety of knowledge necessary for the safe operation of an aircraft?

>Again, it is not up the government to be the arm of CW continuance.

Again, why is it up to government to be the arm of the continuance of aviation -- and how do the FAA's pilot licensing requirements meet that need?

>> >Until, (UNTIL, *until*) it is clearly understood that seeking the end of
>the
>> >CW test is not the equivalent of seeking the end of CW as a mode, this
>> >debate will never fall within the realm of "friendly" debate at all. I
>> >think it's even hazardous to use the PCTA/NCTA labels.
>>
>> PCTA = Pro-Code Testing Agenda; NCTA = Anti-Code Testing Agenda.
>> Those terms are accurately descriptive of the intent of their respective
>> groups. Where is the "hazard" in honesty?
>>
>> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>>
>
>The hazard, Larry, is in the derogatory slams that have been bantered back
>and forth while using those terms. The term "nigger" (excuse me, to anyone
>who is offended by that word--me included)

I am offended by that word, Kim -- and if you are yourself, why did you use it?
I personally have sanitized that word from my vocabulary, both spoken and
in writing. I never mention it even in jest or as an example.

>isn't derogatory until some
>bigoted person uses it against another person, either. No hazard, at all,
>in being honest.

That word is always derogatory because it is calculated to be demeaning to
people who happen to be of the Negro (Latin for black) race. The fact that
you use it even in an attempt to prove some nebulous point about honesty
suggests that you are, indeed, prejudiced and bigoted.

73 de Larry, K3LT

906. Re: What makes a Pro code test Amateur a Troglodyte?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-13 02:49:32 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20031012224932.21457.00001316@mb-m10.aol.com>
Source record: 80481

In article <bmbnag$fiq@library1.airnews.net>, "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
writes:

>"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
>news:20031012000946.23307.00003685@mb-m29.aol.com...
>>
>> I have always presented well-reasoned, factual, and unemotional
>> arguments in support of code testing.
>>
>
>*Cough* WHAT????!!!!! Sure, Larry. That is why you are so endeared by
>many in this newsgroup, alone. Sure.

Why, Kim, I thought you were ignoring me because I don't post anything
here worthy of your response. Where did I go wrong this time?

>> Please don't hold me up to
>> the same light as those who may have transgressed in the manner
>> which you refer to above.

>PHULEEZE. You are the *BEACON* to those whom Carl depicted, Larry! Forget
>about being held up to any light. You *ARE* the light.

Sorry, Kim, not me. Jesus is the "light."

>> Above all, please remember that by far,
>> the largest portion of the QRM in the code/no-code debate has been
>> from the NCTA side. Also remember that as one who has never
>> used the Morse/CW mode to an extent which would have allowed
>> you to gain useful proficiency in the mode, you are not qualified to
>> judge the value of this mode at all. I'm not sitting here trying to
>> argue technical topics with you, so don't you try to tell me that the
>> Morse/CW mode and testing aren't of value to the ARS. We are
>> not on each other's respective levels of expertise. Since I'm
>> more than willing to respect your technical expertise, don't presume
>> to challenge my qualifications to make judgments about CW and
>> code testing, because you don't know what your talking about.
>>
>> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>>
>
>And, you obviously think that what you just said, above, is well-reasoned,
>factual, and unemotional??!! I've broken my own rule and just responded to
>a post from you that was none of the above.

Well, Kim, please feel free to go back to following your "rule." In fact, I must insist that you do. I wouldn't want you to do anything that would cause you any inconvenience.

73 de Larry, K3LT

907. Re: What makes a Pro code test Amateur a Troglodyte?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-13 02:49:33 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20031012224933.21457.00001317@mb-m10.aol.com>
Source record: 80484

In article <bmboeg$kud@library1.airnews.net>, "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
writes:

>How do you know it was polar phase shift, DICK? Did you get enough
>information to see that they were transmitting from their home locations as
>well? How do you know they weren't visiting somewhere? Did you get enough
>copy to tell all that?
>
>Kim W5TIT

Just what *is* polar phase shift, Kim? Please give us the benefit of
your obviously superior technical knowledge.

73 de Larry, K3LT

908. Re: What makes a Pro code test Amateur a Troglodyte?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-13 02:49:34 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20031012224934.21457.00001319@mb-m10.aol.com>
Source record: 80480

In article <bmc5u5$mjh@library1.airnews.net>, "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
writes:

>> Carl - wk3c
>>
>
>ROFLMAO!!!!!
>
>Kim W5TIT

Not to mention Kim's!

73 de Larry, K3LT

909. Re: What makes a Pro code test Amateur a Troglodyte?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-13 02:49:34 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20031012224934.21457.00001318@mb-m10.aol.com>
Source record: 80485

In article <hGgib.785$_i.73747@nnrp1.ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
<wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:

>> Kim:
>>
>> Code testing has always been the thing which generated code use.
>
>I would assert that being forced to learn code to gain access to HF
>"soured" more people on code use than it encouraged

Carl:

Yeah, you *would* assert that, all right. However, I am singularly
unconcerned with those who may have been "soured" on code by
being "forced" to learn it.

> ... of course,
>some percentage of folks decided they liked code and continued to
>use it, but MANY simply endured something they had no interest in
>to get past the test, then "threw away the key."

Let's say that as many as 80% of hams who were "forced" to learn the
code subsequently "threw away the key." That leaves 20% (I believe
my figures are close to reality, anyway, I believe in Pareto's Principle)
of hams who subsequently became active CW operators with
increasing levels of proficiency as they gained OTA experience. I
find that to be quite acceptable.

>Remember the old adage "honey is better than vinegar."

Well, even those who "threw away the key" got the "honey" in the
form of increased HF operating privileges. No harm, no foul.

>> In the absence of a code testing requirement, there will be progressively
>> fewer hams who have never been exposed to learning the code as a
>> result of the requirement. Since the requirement was the principle
>> motivation to learn the code, code use *will* decline once code testing
>> is abolished. Therefore, testing and use are two closely interrelated
>> concepts.
>
>Translation: Larry and his "kindred spirits" are either unwilling to expend
>the effort to (or incapable of *politely*) encourage people to "give the
>code a try and see if you like it."

Carl, I have, on many occasions, very patiently, politely, and
enthusiastically explained all of the fun and operating satisfaction that
I and other hams have derived from using CW. I have offered all the

encouragement I can to anyone willing to give it a try. The one thing that I can't do is learn it for them. That they have to do for themselves, if they *want* to do so. In the past, the thing that made them want to learn the code was to gain HF operating privileges. Now, it would seem that even that incentive will be given away, and soon. If the use of CW declines in the ECTA, it will not be my fault, as much as you would like it to be.

>And, they are apparently unwilling to
>take "No thanks, not interested" for an answer.

I've always been willing to take this answer, for it is they who had to bear the consequences of no HF privileges. Now, that will no longer be the case...and phone users like yourself will have a lot more company on the phone bands in the near future. I just hope it's the kind of company you appreciate.

>Thus, they continue to
>seek to have the FCC mandate an arguably counter-productive "recruiting
>program" for them ...

I see nothing "counter-productive" in the requirement to learn and gain greater proficiency in a useful communications skill. What I don't understand is why you apparently do.

73 de Larry, K3LT

910. Re: What makes a Pro code test Amateur a Troglodyte?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-13 02:49:35 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20031012224935.21457.00001320@mb-m10.aol.com>
Source record: 80482

In article <20031012173328.15462.00003525@mb-m06.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) writes:

>>Jim:
>>
>>Indeed. And more often than not, it's usually good, 'ole fashion Morse/CW
>>which is getting through.
>
> Right you are Roarke of Fantasy Island. Good old fashioned Morse/CW
> is what all the present-day public safety agencies use for communications
> as well as the global maritime world for distress and safety signalling.
>
> On Fantasy Island "good ole fashion Morse/CW ALWAYS gets through!"
>
> Now get back up in the bell tower and look for de blane, de blane!

Lennie:

You're losin' it, man! Which one am I -- Roarke or Tatoo? You've referred to be as both in two consecutive postings.

BTW I don't live on Fantasy Island -- In fact, I don't think I've seen two complete episodes of that program! I am, however, very much a "Survivor."

73 de Larry, K3LT

911. Re: BPL a reality in my area now!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-13 03:04:27 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bmd4nr$b4s$0@208.206.142.109>
Source record: 80489
Cross-posted to: alt.ham-radio,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Carl R. Stevenson wrote:

> "Dick Carroll" <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com> wrote in message
> news:bmcn2r$4n0$1@208.207.71.176...
>
>>Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
>>
>>
>>>"James Wilson" <Someone@Microsoft.Com> wrote in message
>>>news:mJfib.121280$xx4.20524963@twister.neo.rr.com...
>>>
>>>
>>>>What does BPL sound like? Can someone post a wav file somewhere so it
>
> can
>
>>>>be identified? Is it worse that the Pennsylvania QSO party?
>>>
>>>
>>>The video on the ARRL website shows a couple of BPL variants ...
>>>one that uses SS and another (test area 4) that uses OFDM.
>>>They sound different.
>>>
>>>Again, I cannot over-emphasize the importance of making SURE
>>>that complaints of "BPL interference" are REALLY from BPL and
>>>not some other source.
>>>
>>>The LAST thing we need now is a bunch of people "crying wolf."
>>>(Real complaints are one thing, crying wolf will only HURT us.)
>>>
>>>73,
>>>Carl - wk3c
>>>
>>
>>
>> You raise an interesting question, Carl. How exactly should the
>>average ham go about proving that the RFI is indeed BPL, when the BPL
>>people say
>>"That's not us!'??
>>
>
>
> BPL has a unique "signature" (in the spectral/time domains) that can be

> used to ID it.
>
> Since there are different systems (SS from main.net and OFDM from Amperion,
> for example) they have different signatures, which are distinct from other
> sources
> of interference and more traditional power line noise (of course the
> utilities are
> responsible for fixing the latter, too ... though their record is poor).

So to repeat, how does the average ham, whom you have exhorted to
"make sure it's BPL that you're complaining about", go about detecting
and sorting which is what, given that spectral analysis gear, and the
training to use it if it was available, is virtually nonexistnt in the
average hamshack? Is there a aural signature or more than one for the
different BPL modes? Is the Emmaus test site video/audio clip
reresentative enough to make the call, or is something more needed?
I expect that if it was indeed BPL RFI it would follow the power grid
pretty closely with signal strength highest when close, and tapering off
with distance away from the lines. But from the one report posted here
of a ham who said he heard it from a distance of 60 miles, seems like
propagation will play into the picture-to be expected at HF as all
experienced HF ham operators know. Or maybe *he* mis-identified it!

So who do hams call for assistance, the ARRL? I haven't seen anything
from them suggesting that.

I seriously doubt the economics of BPL will ever bring it where I
live, even if it is approved, but others need to know.

912. Re: What makes a Pro code test Amateur a Troglodyte?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-13 03:05:02 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <yDoib.26495$Eo2.5454@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 80487

"Hans K0HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:5ee63311.0310121827.7191e44a@posting.google.com...
> "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote
>
> > But, did the FCC ever get anywhere close to seeing its use banned? I am
> > not, remember, saying that a mode would become so unpopular or disliked
on a
> > scale such that it would be rare to find it openly being used. I am
saying,
> > however, that I believe the FCC would never regulate its ban.
> >
>
> Spark transmissions were outlawed (as well they should have been) so
> the precedent exists.

But spark was a transmission technology, not a mode.

> On a more immediate note, as relates to your discussion on AM phone,
> I'd have to dig out some old material to get all the facts exactly in
> order, but there was a petition (in the 70's?) which the I
> ***believe*** the FCC had moved to the stage of an NPRM to outlaw AM
> transmissions on the HF amateur bands. The rationale was that AM was
> (is?) wasteful of spectrum because SSB can convey the same message in
> half the bandwidth oF DSB AM phone and without those awful sounding
> hetrodyning carriers. The proposal narrowly missed being adopted,
> only because of a huge hue and cry from thousands of AM-forever hams
> (who drew ARRL into the fight on their side). Today you're hard
> pressed to find any remaining AM-ers on the band, and if the petition
> were re-introduced it might well be adopted due to lack of organized
> opposition. Most of the AM-forever crowd has moved to "forever".

Yet AM is still allowed.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

913. Re: What makes a Pro code test Amateur a Troglodyte?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-13 03:05:03 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <zDoib.26496$Eo2.6732@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 80488

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20031012224926.21457.00001309@mb-m10.aol.com...
> In article <fG4ib.32485$mQ2.15379@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Bill
> Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
>
> >
> >Another problem is that some (many?) that favor code testing suggest that
> >by ending that testing it will lead to an end to code use. I don't
> >belive that at all and there are hundreds of examples of older
> >technology and skills that are still practiced today in other
> >fields even though such technology/skill is recognized as
> >no longer generally used/needed (e.g. archery, manual transmission
> >autos, etc.)
> >
> >Cheers,
> >Bill K2UNK
>
> Bill:
>
> One year ago, I traded in a perfectly good 2001 Toyota Corolla LE with
> a 5-speed manual gearbox for a new 2003 model with an automatic
> transmission. However, I still see the need for code testing in the ARS.
> I own a few rifles and handguns, but wouldn't want to bet my life on my
> proficiency with a compound bow. However, I still see the need for
> code testing in the ARS. How do you explain that?
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT

Bad judgement?

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

914. Re: 73 Magazine Says "73 and QRT"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-13 03:17:16 UTC
From: "Michael A. Terrell" <mike.terrell@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3F8A1930.9366A698@earthlink.net>
Source record: 80490
Cross-posted to:
rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

Gray Shockley wrote:
>
> If memory serves, Heath didn't throw in the towel, per se.

Part of Heathkit still exists: http://www.heathkit.com/index.html

--

Michael A. Terrell
Central Florida

915. Re: 73 Magazine Says "73 and QRT"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-13 03:34:07 UTC
From: mcalhoun@ksu.edu
Message-ID: <bmd6ff$oha@unix2.cc.ksu.edu>
Source record: 80496
Cross-posted to:
rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

....[lotsa snips]....
>But Wayne was out of Byte by the third issue, at a time when it did not
>amount to much. He only lost the potential for when it did get big.

>He then turned around and started Kilobaud, which was pretty good for some
....[snip]....

Don't forget KiloByte, which, IIRC, remained the title for only a few
months (until the BYTE lawyers make Wayne change its name)!

--Myron, W0PBV.
--
Five boxes preserve our freedoms: soap, ballot, witness, jury, and cartridge
PhD EE (retired). "Barbershop" tenor. CDL(PTX). W0PBV. (785) 539-4448
NRA Life Member and Certified Instructor (Home Firearm Safety, Rifle, Pistol)

916. Re: What makes a Pro code test Amateur a Troglodyte?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-13 03:34:33 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031012233433.25815.00003697@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 80494

In article <bmaqun$gu0$0@208.207.71.130>, Dick Carroll
<dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com> writes:

>Bill Sohl wrote:
>
>> "Dick Carroll" <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com> wrote in message
>> news:bmalst$q20$0@208.207.71.130...
>>
>>>Bill Sohl wrote:
>>>
>>>>"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
>>>>news:20031011025017.11891.00001413@mb-m11.aol.com...
>>>>
>>>>>In article <EdHhb.645$_i.51817@nnrp1.ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
>>>>><wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:
>>>>>
>>>>>>Now, I wouldn't expect to be able to have that sort of a relationship
>>>>>>with you, Dick ... you're not open-minded enough to accept that others
>>>>>>see things different than you. (You see, I accept that you like and
>>
>> use
>>
>>>>>>CW ... I disagree only with your propatation of the "Morse myths" and
>>>>>>your insistence that everyone should have Morse forced on them in
>>>>>>exchange for HF privs ... fortunately, most of the rest of the world
>>>>>>doesn't agree with you.)
>>>>>>Carl - wk3c
>>>>>
>>>>>Carl:
>>>>>I consider the use of the term "Morse myths" to be derogatory and
>>>>>inflammatory. Thus, you have also failed to meet Mike's challenge.
>>>>>73 de Larry, K3LT
>>>>
>>>>Hw about morse fallicies, morse inaccuracies, erronious morse
>>>>claims? Which of these do you find acceptable?
>>>
>>>It's easy enough to accept that those of you who have never had any use
>>>for radiotelegraphy would view its stated attributes as mythical, and
>>>for the lot of you that is indeed a proper description. You couldn't
>>>communciate your way out of an emergency using Morse if the fate of the
>>>planet DID depend on it!
>>
>> I stand a better chance of helping someone else in life as a ham
>> without knowing any code than waiting for that unlikly

>> need for CW to actually be used.
>
> And should the time come when CW is caleld for, you and "someone" both
>suffer the consequences of your lack.

We'll all keep that in mind, big beeper. Now you take off your
aluminum foil hat and quit browsing the National Enquirer at
the market newsstand.

>Odds are always against it
>happening. So were the odds against planes being flown into WTC. But it
>happened.

Love that stretch of the imagination! Gosh, if you go back into the
FAA reports to the public, at least one of the terrorists used a
civil aviation band radio with voice! Gasp.

>I have perxonally seen the need arise for emergency
>communications where there were NO communications available and when
>HF CW could have easily been used, if it had been planned for.

That was during the big earthquake in Missouri, senior?

>I wasn't making the plans.

Maybe you should have been...assert yourself, senior, DEMAND
that "CW" be available for EVERY emergency!

>> As for the fate of the planet,
>> when is the sequal coming out to ID4?
>
> Whatever it is, I didn't see the first three and have similar lack of
>interest in the fourth.

No? Tsk, tsk. Saving the planet is very important.

Them pesky space aliens might be hiding behind the moon right
now, waiting to attack! Ya gotta be able to Save All Mankind
with your trusty code key and that super secret Morsemanship!

LHA

917. Re: What makes a Pro code test Amateur a Troglodyte?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-13 03:34:34 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031012233434.25815.00003698@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 80491

In article <89lib.41306$mQ2.29185@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>,
"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> writes:

>Poor no code goofballs. They still haven't figured it out. We don't want a
>bunch of unqualified, ten four screaming, under educated, individuals
>poluting up the spectrum.

Gotta love that Real Redneck "good will" that "Real Hams" have such
a propensity for...as defined in 97.1 :-)

USA amateur radio is all about "CW" is it, big tuff guy? :-)

>We were doing just fine when we had 250K licensed. In fact the QRM is just
>as bad on HF as it was then. The only difference is the folks on the air
>actually KNEW SOMETHING.

There ya go, big tuff guy, make everbody conform to the OLD WAYS
when men were men and hams were real beepers.

beep, beep

LHA

918. Re: What makes a Pro code test Amateur a Troglodyte?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-13 03:34:35 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031012233435.25815.00003699@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 80495

In article <8dlib.41351$mQ2.8569@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dan/W4NTI"
<w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> writes:

>> > >> Carl:
>> > >>
>> > >> I consider the use of the term "Morse myths" to be derogatory and
>> > >> inflammatory. Thus, you have also failed to meet Mike's challenge.
>> > >>
>> > >> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>> > >>
>> > >
>> > >Larry,
>> > >
>> > >I don't recall Mike appointing your the judge and arbiter ...
>> >
>> > Carl:
>> >
>> > In that case, consider my services to have been donated out of my own
>> > generosity.
>>
>> I guess I got what I paid for :-)
>>
>> > >"Morse Myths" is, as you well know by now, simply a term
>> > >that refers to all of the patently false, old wives' tales, such as
>> > >"Morse gets through when nothing else will.",
>> >
>> > This one is true.
>>
>> Bluntly - baloney ... there ARE modes that will get through at
>> s/n ratios where Morse would be totally undetectable, let alone
>> decodable ... ignore the facts if it preserves your fantasy world
>> where Morse is all-important (the "legend in your own mind"),
>> but the rest of the world will pass you by without your even
>> understanding why ...
>>
>> > >"Morse is essential
>> > >for emergency communications.",
>> >
>> > Who said that? Provide correctly attributed quote.
>>
>> Read any number of absurd pro-code-testing comments
>> filed with the FCC ...
>>
>> > >"Morse acts as a 'lid filter' to

>> > >keep us from being overrun by the "mongul hordes' of CBers
>> > >who are lurking in the wings waiting to take over the ham bands."
>> > >etc.
>> >
>> > I've never said that whatsoever -- in fact, on many occasions, I've gone
>> > out of my way to note that a lot of the problems on HF phone are being
>> > caused by 20-WPM code tested Extras.
>>
>> I didn't say that YOU necessarily said that ... though you HAVE refered
>> to the "knuckle-draggers" and other terms that fall into a similar
>category.
>>
>> > >I reject your claim that the term "Morse Myths" is derogatory and
>> > >inflamatory.
>> >
>> > Reject all you want, Carl, but the fact remains that it is. You have
>> taken
>> > the low road, while claiming the opposite.
>> >
>> > >It is simply a term that refers in "shorthand" form to
>> > >a panoply of falacies that are often cited as "reasons why we MUST
>> > >keep Morse testing" ... none of which hold water and all of which
>> > >have been rejected by the FCC.
>> >
>> > I have always presented well-reasoned, factual, and unemotional
>> > arguments in support of code testing.
>>
>> RTFLMAO!!!
>>
>> > Please don't hold me up to
>> > the same light as those who may have transgressed in the manner
>> > which you refer to above. Above all, please remember that by far,
>> > the largest portion of the QRM in the code/no-code debate has been
>> > from the NCTA side.
>>
>> ROTFLMAO some more ...
>>
>> > Also remember that as one who has never
>> > used the Morse/CW mode to an extent which would have allowed
>> > you to gain useful proficiency in the mode, you are not qualified to
>> > judge the value of this mode at all.
>>
>> You are totally wrong on this assertion ... I know the code, had
>> "useful proficiency" (nearly 20 wpm at my peak), but haven't used
>> it in a long time ... I am certainly qualified to judge the value of the
>> mode (at least for my purposes, and also in more general terms).
>>
>> > I'm not sitting here trying to
>> > argue technical topics with you, so don't you try to tell me that the
>> > Morse/CW mode and testing aren't of value to the ARS. We are

>> > not on each other's respective levels of expertise. Since I'm
>> > more than willing to respect your technical expertise, don't presume
>> > to challenge my qualifications to make judgments about CW and
>> > code testing, because you don't know what your talking about.
>>
>> Larry, I don't demean your "real ham-ness" because you are not
>> my equal on the technical plane, but you demean the "real ham-ness"
>> of anyone who is up to your "standards" of Morse prowess ...
>> I think you're arrogance and narrow-mindedness are showing again.
>>
>> Carl - wk3c
>>
>
>One major problem that is being ignored is that these alleged 20 wpm Extras
>are the multiple guess guys. Probably doing good to make it to ten WPM.
>Just hunt, peck and hope.
>
>One other 'minor' detail, is that they ALL were taught on 11 meters.

Tsk, tsk, tsk... :-)

Did you mean the 11 meter HAM band or what it was reallocated
to in 1958 and afterwards? :-)

I learned to communicate on HF over 5 years before 1958. :-)

>How many real hams. Say those that were not infected by the CB crap do
>these things? Dang few I would venture.

"Real hams" again, big tuff guy?

Working for the FDA now?

>Unless they were like Polly and Billy Jack....Conditionals that were
>Grandfathered in back in the early 60s.
>
>Lets see some real figures. Not conjecture.

Let's see more of that "definition and purpose" of Real Hams as in 97.1,
you know, the part about "spreading goodwill" and all that... :-)

LHA

919. Re: What makes a Pro code test Amateur a Troglodyte?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-13 03:34:36 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031012233436.25815.00003700@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 80493

In article <Ijlib.41422$mQ2.8032@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dan/W4NTI"
<w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> writes:

>Spark was banned.

Were you very sad when that happened, Dan?

Gosh, on-off keying morse was the ONLY way that sparkies could
communicate anything back in the "good old days."

>Wide band FM was banned from HF. For decades all we
>could do was talk and do CW. It was years fighting to get SSTV allowed.
>Then digital, other than RTTY was another long road.

Tell us all about "losing all those ham bands" after WARC-79... :-)

>Most of the time the FCC simply didn't bother to authorize a new mode.

Nah...everything is beeping and voice yakking just on HF, right?

No problem, you probably think "spread spectrum" is an obscene
phrase. :-)

>Thats how it works Hug and Chalk.

"Hugging and a Chalking" was a little ditty composed by a black
radio pianist on a Chicago radio station about 1950, had his own
quarter hour program. It was briefly popular in the midwest. You
were listening to Chicago radio stations back then, senior? :-)

LHA

920. Re: 73 Magazine Says "73 and QRT"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-13 03:34:37 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031012233437.25815.00003701@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 80492

In article <0001HW.BBAF42D50006CFB312E2F3D0@news.giganews.com>, Gray Shockley <gray-11@cybercoffee.org> writes:

>Zenith bought them out for their computer(s) and terminals and then Zenith
>tossed out nearly all of Heath except those items.
>
>About two years ago, I was in a Home Depot and came across some
>sensory-motion fictures that were labeled as "Zenith-Heath". What that is (or
>was) about, I have no idea.

Both Home Depot and Lowes carries the big line of Heath-Zenith door chimes, both wired and wireless. Wife and I put two wireless Heath-Zenith transmitters and three indoor chimes in our southern house a couple years ago. Been working fine here ever since.

All that hardware seems to be made in China, certainly not Benton Harbor. :-)

LHA

921. Re: FCC relaxes it's prohibition on use of the "F-word" on broadcast media.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-13 04:13:26 UTC
From: Gregg <nospam@unknown.org>
Message-ID: <GDpib.12886$Pe5.2532@edtnps84>
Source record: 80497
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.shortwave

Canada has had the "F" word and full sexuality on our broadcast TV for
over 20 years.

God, Yank culture is sooooo behind the times ::)

--
Gregg
It's probably useful, even if it can't be SPICE'd
http://geek.scorpiorising.ca

922. Re: BPL a reality in my area now!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-13 04:51:09 UTC
From: Roger Halstead <newsgroup@rogerhalstead.com>
Message-ID: <rnbkov4nnhdqrv4nm26v33f16j4li0mqak@4ax.com>
Source record: 80499
Cross-posted to: alt.ham-radio,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On Sun, 12 Oct 2003 23:27:27 -0400, a 32 bit process
<replytogroup@hotmail.com> wrote:

>On Sun, 12 Oct 2003 16:56:50 GMT, "James Wilson"
><Someone@Microsoft.Com> wrote:
>
>>What does BPL sound like? Can someone post a wav file somewhere so it can
>>be identified? Is it worse that the Pennsylvania QSO party?
>
>It almost sounds like a geiger counter, but a lot louder and the
>clicking is quicker in pace.

That is a really good description of precipitation/snow static, but
the speed *usually* varies.

Roger Halstead (K8RI EN73 & ARRL Life Member)
www.rogerhalstead.com
N833R World's oldest Debonair? (S# CD-2)

923. Re: 73 Magazine Says "73 and QRT"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-13 04:56:34 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <REMOVETHISkc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <bme4o7$lic55$1@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 80517
Cross-posted to:
rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

I will miss that mag as well.... in the 70's and 80's I can honestly say it
was almost better than QST or CQ. You definitely got your money's worth in
the amount of content. In the 90's, it definitely started to dwindle
though.

I may not have agreed with everything Ole' Wayney said, but I definitely
support him in having the balls to say what he was thinking, even if the
"old guard" didn't like it. He did have a "few" really good ideas, and even
some that were way ahead of the time, but later became a reality.

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF1-FF2-MFR-(pending NREMT-B!)
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...

"Hans K0HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:5ee63311.0310111336.660577e7@posting.google.com...
> "Capt. Blackflag" <wvay4daves@yahoo.com> wrote
>
> > > 73 MAGAZINE SAYS "73 AND QRT"
>
> I'm gonna miss my copy of 73 in the mail each month. Wayne is a
> genuine American legend. Off the wall, often mistaken, often over the
> edge, but always stands up for his position regardless of how goofy it
> seems to the rest of us. I rarely agreed with him, but I always
> admired his good natured poking at the pompous among us, and his
> absolute support for the causes which he believed in, regardless how
> unpopular.
>
> I hope the old rascal figures out a way to start another magazine.
>
> 73, de Hans, K0HB

924. Re: What makes a Pro code test Amateur a Troglodyte?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-13 05:02:18 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <ulqib.107847$qj6.4107869@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 80498

Bill Sohl wrote:
> "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message

>>I'm alomost confused here Bill! I'm saying there is no direct
>>relationship between being Pro-Code and technical ability.
>
>
> OK, I agree.
>
> My point is that the arguments should and can be made
> without regard to personal aspects of either side.

And how! I'm a bit dissapointed that this turned into another little donnybrook. It was an attempt at getting something else besides the usual rancor here.

- Mike KB3EIA -

925. Re: BPL a reality in my area now!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-13 05:15:40 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <REMOVETHISkc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <bme4oa$lic55$3@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 80518
Cross-posted to: alt.ham-radio,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:jLZhb.573$P%1.510470@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
>
> "Ryan, KC8PMX" <REMOVETHISkc8pmx@diamondcs.net> wrote in message
> news:bm9o10$kemhq$1@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de...
> > Just found out today listening to a local, reputable radio station that
> Bay,
> > Saginaw and Midland Counties in Michigan are going to be "test sites"
for
> > BPL, at least for Michigan. I don't know when it will be an actual
> reality,
> > as opposed to being in the planning stages, but will keep current with
> their
> > project!
> >
> >
> > Ryan KC8PMX
> > Midland, Michigan
> >
> >
>
> Go to the sites. Check out the interference. If it's as bad as they say,
> write the local commercial radio stations to say they are being interfered
> with, write your congressman, and write the FCC.
>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>

The Bay, Saginaw and Midland clubs are going to work together on that......
Strength in numbers, at least locally.

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF1-FF2-MFR-(pending NREMT-B!)
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...

926. Re: BPL a reality in my area now!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-13 05:17:10 UTC
From: Roger Halstead <newsgroup@rogerhalstead.com>
Message-ID: <h3dkov0d2v7hp9r3nh1kqetucr0e8t6f1u@4ax.com>
Source record: 80500
Cross-posted to: alt.ham-radio,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On Sun, 12 Oct 2003 23:27:27 -0400, a 32 bit process
<replytogroup@hotmail.com> wrote:

>On Sun, 12 Oct 2003 16:56:50 GMT, "James Wilson"
><Someone@Microsoft.Com> wrote:
>
>>What does BPL sound like? Can someone post a wav file somewhere so it can
>>be identified? Is it worse that the Pennsylvania QSO party?
>
>It almost sounds like a geiger counter, but a lot louder and the
>clicking is quicker in pace.

After having gone to the ARRL site and listened to the examples, all I
can say is it sounds just like precipitation static and/or loose
connections. No way would I be able to identify one from the other.
I'm just going to have to complain every time I hear noise and make
recordings. If it's noisy enough to be a problem it should be fixed.

BTW, most of the links failed and instead I ended up hijacked to QSL
dot net. (they call it redirecting, but if I didn't select to go
there, I don't want to go there...I'll settle for the 404 screen
instead of giving some one advertizing points.)

Roger Halstead (K8RI EN73 & ARRL Life Member)
www.rogerhalstead.com
N833R World's oldest Debonair? (S# CD-2)

927. Re: BPL and the New World Order

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-13 05:19:54 UTC
From: Roger Halstead <newsgroup@rogerhalstead.com>
Message-ID: <0fdkovk7eo5634sccbcup35ltl3qp1cfjl@4ax.com>
Source record: 80501
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors

On Mon, 29 Sep 2003 02:48:53 GMT, "Frank Dresser"
<analogdial@worldnet.att.net> wrote:

>
>"Nomen Nescio" <nobody@dizum.com> wrote in message
>news:7e1ae8b670242db6e1961fab31a93bec@dizum.com...
>>
>
>Oh. Who says this BPL plan works reliably? The same people who say it
>doesn't cause alot of radio interference.
>
>What a great scheme for the next high tech bubble.

Take heart. The worlds broadcasters are joining the fight against BPL.

Roger Halstead (K8RI EN73 & ARRL Life Member)
www.rogerhalstead.com
N833R World's oldest Debonair? (S# CD-2)
>
>Frank Dresser
>

928. Re: BPL a reality in my area now!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-13 05:19:57 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <REMOVETHISkc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <bme4ob$lic55$4@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 80519

Yeah Jim.... six meter all mode. It's hard as hell to use it right now with the powerline interference in this freakin' county even before they implement this whole BPL stuff!!!!!

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF1-FF2-MFR-(pending NREMT-B!)
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-. .. --. .... - . .-. ...
"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message news:20031011214233.06226.00000930@mb-m19.aol.com...
> In article <bm9o10$kemhq$1@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>, "Ryan, KC8PMX"
> <REMOVETHISkc8pmx@diamondcs.net> writes:
>
> >Just found out today listening to a local, reputable radio station that Bay,
> >Saginaw and Midland Counties in Michigan are going to be "test sites" for
> >BPL, at least for Michigan. I don't know when it will be an actual reality,
> >as opposed to being in the planning stages, but will keep current with their
> >project!
>
> Ryan,
>
> If you have a 6 meter rig that can go mobile, you're set up to measure/observe
> (and report) BPL interference.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

929. Re: BPL a reality in my area now!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-13 05:23:48 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0310122123.11caecf1@posting.google.com>
Source record: 80502
Cross-posted to: alt.ham-radio,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"James Wilson" <Someone@Microsoft.Com> wrote in message
news:<mJfib.121280$xx4.20524963@twister.neo.rr.com>...
> What does BPL sound like? Can someone post a wav file somewhere so it can
> be identified?

The ARRL website is loaded with video and/or audio files which will
clearly demonstrate what the various forms of BPL signals sound like
and the havoc they generate throughout the HF spectrum.

http://www.arrl.org/tis/info/HTML/plc/#Video

> Is it worse that the Pennsylvania QSO party?

If BBL is broadly implemented you won't have to worry about the PAQP.
There won't be a PAQP.

> > BPL, at least for Michigan. I don't know when it will be an actual
> reality,
> > as opposed to being in the planning stages, but will keep current with
> their
> > project!

w3rv

930. Re: BPL a reality in my area now!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-13 05:31:16 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <REMOVETHISkc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <bme4oc$lic55$5@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 80520

"Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
news:55hib.793$_i.74106@nnrp1.ptd.net...
>
> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20031011214233.06226.00000930@mb-m19.aol.com...
> > In article <bm9o10$kemhq$1@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>, "Ryan, KC8PMX"
> > <REMOVETHISkc8pmx@diamondcs.net> writes:
> >
> > >Just found out today listening to a local, reputable radio station that
> Bay,
> > >Saginaw and Midland Counties in Michigan are going to be "test sites"
for
> > >BPL, at least for Michigan. I don't know when it will be an actual
> reality,
> > >as opposed to being in the planning stages, but will keep current with
> their
> > >project!
> >
> > Ryan,
> >
> > If you have a 6 meter rig that can go mobile, you're set up to
> measure/observe
> > (and report) BPL interference.
> >
> > 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
> Not all of the BPL "pilot" deployments are using spectrum as high as 6m,
> though they want to ultimately use "2-80 MHz" if they had large commercial
> deployments of paying customers.
>
> Carl - wk3c

Either way, there are the obvious harmonics to consider as well. Granted,
not as strong as the original offending signal, but a problem non-the-less.

I will let ya all know what happens along the way with all of this. As
stated earlier, it would be much cheaper of an investment to get the phone
companies (Ameritech in my case) to put more switching stations to make DSL
more available.......

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF1-FF2-MFR-(pending NREMT-B!)
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...

931. Re: IMPORTANT POINTS FOR ALL - Re: BPL a reality in my area now!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-13 05:38:20 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <REMOVETHISkc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <bme4od$lic55$6@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 80521
Cross-posted to: alt.ham-radio,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
news:Vigib.780$_i.73365@nnrp1.ptd.net...
>
> "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
> news:jLZhb.573$P%1.510470@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
> >
> > "Ryan, KC8PMX" <REMOVETHISkc8pmx@diamondcs.net> wrote in message
> > news:bm9o10$kemhq$1@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de...
> > > Just found out today listening to a local, reputable radio station
that
> > Bay,
> > > Saginaw and Midland Counties in Michigan are going to be "test sites"
> for
> > > BPL, at least for Michigan. I don't know when it will be an actual
> > reality,
> > > as opposed to being in the planning stages, but will keep current with
> > their
> > > project!
> > >
> > >
> > > Ryan KC8PMX
> > > Midland, Michigan
> > >
> > >
> >
> > Go to the sites. Check out the interference. If it's as bad as they
say,
> > write the local commercial radio stations to say they are being
interfered
> > with, write your congressman, and write the FCC.
> >
> > Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
> >
>
> Ryan, et al, PLEASE coordinate with Ed Hare, w1rfi@arrl.org ... and don't
> "write/contact your local commercial radio stations" UNLESS they ACTUALLY
> ARE being interfered with AND you are ABSOLUTELY SURE it's BPL.

Yes and no Carl.... if it makes it impossible to RECIEVE our local broadcast
stations, I would think that the local broadcasters would be VERY interested
to know that nobody is getting thier signal, except cable subscribers.

--
Ryan, KC8PMX

FF1-FF2-MFR-(pending NREMT-B!)
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...

932. BPL Tech Info and Audio/Video Files: Source

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-13 05:45:57 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0310122145.1c88dda3@posting.google.com>
Source record: 80503

"James Wilson" <Someone@Microsoft.Com> wrote in message
news:<mJfib.121280$xx4.20524963@twister.neo.rr.com>...
> What does BPL sound like? Can someone post a wav file somewhere so it can
> be identified?

The ARRL website is loaded with video and/or audio files which will
clearly demonstrate what the various forms of BPL signals sound like
and the havoc they generate throughout the HF spectrum. This site also
has heaps of text tech info on BPL.

http://www.arrl.org/tis/info/HTML/plc/#Video

> Is it worse that the Pennsylvania QSO party?

If BPL is broadly implemented you won't have to worry about the PAQP.
There won't be a PAQP. Carl and I have listened to the real thing
together, I expect he'll agree with my assessment.

> > BPL, at least for Michigan. I don't know when it will be an actual
> reality,
> > as opposed to being in the planning stages, but will keep current with
> their
> > project!

W3RV

933. Re: FCC relaxes it's prohibition on use of the "F-word" on broadcast media.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-13 06:37:02 UTC
From: CP <nothanks@spam.net>
Message-ID: <iKrib.13479$Pe5.2185@edtnps84>
Source record: 80504
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

"Gregg" <nospam@unknown.org> wrote in message
news:GDpib.12886$Pe5.2532@edtnps84...
> Canada has had the "F" word and full sexuality on our broadcast TV for
> over 20 years.
>
> God, Yank culture is sooooo behind the times ::)
>
> --
> Gregg
> *It's probably useful, even if it can't be SPICE'd*
> http://geek.scorpiorising.ca

Great, let me guess, you must be another one of those lazy, anything goes, pot smoking liberals, from B.C., that lives off government handouts. How nice. I love paying the highest taxes in the civilized world. No wonder we can't get rid of the liberal dictatorship. Give the people pot to smoke, filth on TV, and the "F" word, what more could you ask for. At least the "Yanks" you call them, have a culture and respect their traditions. I can't say that for canaduh. If it weren't for the "Yanks", we would probably be speaking Russian. Now if the Americans would like to take over canadah.....please!!!

934. Re: BPL a reality in my area now!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-13 06:55:17 UTC
From: Steve Silverwood <kb6ojs@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <MPG.19f38c12fed47fca98969c@news-60.giganews.com>
Source record: 80505
Cross-posted to: alt.ham-radio,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.policy

In article <mJfib.121280$xx4.20524963@twister.neo.rr.com>,
Someone@Microsoft.Com says...
> What does BPL sound like? Can someone post a wav file somewhere so it can
> be identified? Is it worse that the Pennsylvania QSO party?

The ARRL web site (www.arrl.org) has a video that can be downloaded that shows how severe this interference can be. They took a vehicle equipped with HF equipment and drove around areas where BPL is in use as a test program. The noise levels are horrendous.

--

-- //Steve//

Steve Silverwood, KB6OJS
Fountain Valley, CA
Email: kb6ojs@arrl.net
Web: http://home.earthlink.net/~kb6ojs_steve

935. Re: 73 Magazine Says "73 and QRT"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-13 06:55:23 UTC
From: Steve Silverwood <kb6ojs@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <MPG.19f391c2b0c6b4c89896a0@news-60.giganews.com>
Source record: 80506
Cross-posted to:
rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

In article <Xns94128464654Felektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>,
elektros@yahoo.com says...
> I used to enjoy reading 73. Nobody could ever agree 100% with Wayne Green,
> but I liked to read his editorials.

Yes, those were great if you needed something to get your blood boiling.
Sometimes he had a good cause to champion, but most of the time he was
just looking to start a controversy. (The print version of today's
Usenet trolls, I suppose.) I'd go back into the back issues to cite
some examples, but I've long since disposed of them.

--

-- //Steve//

Steve Silverwood, KB6OJS
Fountain Valley, CA
Email: kb6ojs@arrl.net
Web: http://home.earthlink.net/~kb6ojs_steve

936. Re: 73 Magazine Says "73 and QRT"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-13 06:55:25 UTC
From: Steve Silverwood <kb6ojs@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <MPG.19f392ee2d80a42e9896a1@news-60.giganews.com>
Source record: 80507
Cross-posted to:
rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

In article <wuiib.2959$N%3.469@news01.roc.ny>, aa2qa@frontiernet.net
says...
> My gut feeling is that a lot of mags have or will drop.

That is, if they don't get wise and start looking into ways of
publishing that do away with the costs of publishing. Monitoring Times
has done it right by making their magazine available in PDF format,
downloadable each month from their FTP site. They provide a smaller
file with somewhat lower resolution, suitable for downloading by dial-up
subscribers, plus a larger, higher-res version for those of us fortunate
enough to have access to broadband Internet connections. I put each
month's issues on CD-ROM so that they're readily available for
reference, without having to keep a bunch of magazines around. (I'm
always citing this as an example, so if I've gotten annoying by saying
it so many times I apologize.)

If only the rest of the publishers would consider similar options....

--

-- //Steve//

Steve Silverwood, KB6OJS
Fountain Valley, CA
Email: kb6ojs@arrl.net
Web: http://home.earthlink.net/~kb6ojs_steve

937. Re: New Acronym: ECTA (Era of Code Test Abolition)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-13 07:36:51 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <REMOVETHISkc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <bme4oe$lic55$7@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 80522

>
> Jim:
>
> The truth is, only hams who know the Morse code have the capability
> to fall back on the CW mode when other modes are unavailable. Why
> do hams know the Morse code? Because they had to learn it to pass
> the code tests to become licensed or obtain upgrades. In the absence
> of a code testing requirement, why will they learn it?

If the people, like you, that do love it, it will live on through proper promotion of it. It's just that simple. Of all the "coded hams" out there, not ALL of them are code lovers, and I would place a bet that some couldn't pass the current 5wpm test as they have not used it since their examinations. But in the same turn there are some that love it and will pass it on. As long as it is mentored properly.

How will we
> convince new hams to invest the time and effort to learn this useful
> communications skill when they are not offered the incentive of
> increased operating privileges?

Gee, if it is so useful, then why bribe them?? It should be sooooo damned good as you say, they should automatically want to flock right to it. People will invest the time and effort if they see value and usefullness in it.

I'm asking you because I don't have
> the answers. I'm one of those hams who learned the code because
> I wanted to be a ham, and the requirement was there. Ony *after*
> learning the code and becoming a reasonably proficient CW operator
> did I become aware of it's benefits and advantages. Personally, I'm
> grateful that the code testing requirement existed when I became a
> ham. Had it not, I never would have become a CW operator...and
> neither will most hams in the ECTA (Era of Code Test Abolition).

Oh jeesh Larry, add more to the alphabet soup eh? :) (PCTA, NCTA, ECTA, etc.)

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF1-FF2-MFR-(pending NREMT-B!)
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...

938. Re: New Acronym: ECTA (Era of Code Test Abolition)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-13 07:38:51 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <REMOVETHISkc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <bme4og$lic55$8@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 80523

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20031012144521.00545.00001528@mb-m02.aol.com...
> In article <20031012000942.23307.00003679@mb-m29.aol.com>,
yodoc@aol.comnospam
> (Larry Roll K3LT) writes:
>
> >In article <20031011214229.06226.00000925@mb-m19.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com
> >(N2EY)
> >writes:
> >
> >>On the one hand, Morse is not used very much in emergency communication.
On
> >>the
> >>other hand, it *is* still used occasionally, by hams, in emergency
> >>communications. More important, there *are* times when it when it is the
> >only
> >>available mode that would get through in the situation.
> >>(Note that phrase "only available mode")
> >>
> >>All of the above are documented facts.
> >>
> >>The problem is, does the occasional use of Morse in emergencies mean
that
> >>*all*
> >>hams *must* be tested on the mode? Some say yes, some say no, some say
it's
> >a
> >>piece of the reason. All based on personal opinion, nothing more.
> >>
> >>Boil down any of the arguments on either side, and what you wind up with
is
> >>personal opinion.
> >>
> >>73 de Jim, N2EY
> >
> >Jim:
> >
> >The truth is, only hams who know the Morse code have the capability
> >to fall back on the CW mode when other modes are unavailable.
>
> Absolutely true. But whether that is a reason to make every ham pass a
code
> test is a matter of opinion - some say yes, others say no.
>

> >Why
> >do hams know the Morse code? Because they had to learn it to pass
> >the code tests to become licensed or obtain upgrades.
>
> That's one reason.
>
> >In the absence
> >of a code testing requirement, why will they learn it?
>
> Here are some reasons:
>
> - Morse is fun for many thousands of hams
> - Lots of interesting DX on Morse only
> - Morse gets through better than any analog voice mode and better than
many TOR
> modes
> - Morse equipment for a given performance level costs less and is simpler
than
> any other mode
> - Morse is usually aural, not visual, but doesn't require talking. It's a
> unique way of communicating
> - Morse takes up less, or far less, spectrum than almost all other modes.
> - There is much less objectionable stuff to deal with in the parts of the
bands
> where Morse is usually used.
>
> >How will we
> >convince new hams to invest the time and effort to learn this useful
> >communications skill when they are not offered the incentive of
> >increased operating privileges?
>
> Through the incentives of:
>
> - improved performance of a given radio setup
> - less crowded spectrum space
> - a unique communications experience not available elsewhere
> - rare DX
> - spectrum conservation
>
> There is also the element of putting the mode out there for others to see.
As
> in demonstrations at club meetings, hamfests, conventions, Field Day, etc.
> "Sell" the mode the way the FM/repeater, PSK-31, APRS, packet and other
folks
> have been selling their modes for years.
>
> If all a new ham ever sees is other, more experienced hams talking into
mikes
> and tapping keyboards, that's all the newbie will think exists.
>

> Look at what the AM and vintage/military radio folks have done. They set
up
> demos at hamfests and other venues to show what it's all about. Why not
the
> same thing with Morse? Show 'em how it's done - plant the seed.
>
> Or consider the QRP/homebrew/hiker folks. What's the most effective mode
to
> bring along on a backpack trip?
>
> Elecraft has a new rig - the KX1. Amazing little box the size of a stack
of
> QSLs. Is there *any* non-CW rig of equivalent size/weight/power
requirement
> that will perform anywhere near as well?
>
> You should see the looks on their faces at FD when they see the CW station
> making QSOs at a rate better than the 'phone folks, yet using a more
modest
> setup and expending far *less* effort. When well over half the points
earned by
> a 4A+free VHF FD setup come from one fulltime and one part time setup
running
> CW, serious selling is happening.
>
> >I'm asking you because I don't have
> >the answers. I'm one of those hams who learned the code because
> >I wanted to be a ham, and the requirement was there.
>
> That's you. It's not everybody.
>
> Some will be sold on the mode regardless of whether or not there's a test.
>
> Some will never be sold no matter what you do.
>
> And some will be sold if approached in the right way.
>
> >Ony *after*
> >learning the code and becoming a reasonably proficient CW operator
> >did I become aware of it's benefits and advantages. Personally, I'm
> >grateful that the code testing requirement existed when I became a
> >ham. Had it not, I never would have become a CW operator...and
> >neither will most hams in the ECTA (Era of Code Test Abolition).
>
> How do we know that for sure? Maybe you would have seen the light after
getting
> frustrated with other modes.
>
> Here's an experience I had recently (post-restructuring):
>

> Relatively new ham got started via the Tech route. Decided he wanted HF
and
> passed the required elements, including code, which was learned from CDs
and
> computer software.
>
> But then he discovered that learning enough code to pass the test was a
far
> different thing from copying and sending live on the air in a real QSO.
>
> Now remember, this ham had already passed all the code tests he'd ever
need to
> pass. He had all bands and modes open to him, and a nice HF station set
up.
> There was absolutely no requirement that he ever do any Morse code
operating at
> all, ever. Nor was there any requirement to spend more time and effort
learning
> to send and copy real-world off-the-air Morse.
>
> But this ham *wanted* to use the mode, based on its merits alone. With a
small
> amount of help and encouragement, he learned the skills of on-air copy,
> sending, abbreviations, procedure, etc.
>
> I had the privilege and honor of being his first CW QSO. Since then he's
had
> many more, his skills have improved, and he's on the way. CW SS is a few
> weekends away.........
>
> And this ham is the kind who will share what he has learned with others
and
> repeat the cycle. Test or no test.
>
> --
>
> Sure, not every new or old ham will be "sold". But we don't need every
ham.
> Just enough hams. And a positve image.
>
> Does that answer the question?
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>

Jim,

I think you have said it better here than any other that I have seen so far!

Ryan KC8PMX

939. Re: What makes a Pro code test Amateur a Troglodyte?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-13 07:44:15 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <REMOVETHISkc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <bme4oi$lic55$9@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 80524

"Hans K0HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:5ee63311.0310120909.17e8af14@posting.google.com...
> "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote
>
>
> >
> > The term "nigger" (excuse me, to anyone who is offended
> > by that word--me included) isn't derogatory until some
> > bigoted person uses it against another person, either.
> > No hazard, at all, in being honest.
> >
>
> Of course it's derogatory, no matter who uses the word.
>

Pure BS....... words mean nothing!!! It's the racist asshole behind the
words you need to be concerned with. Remember the phrase "Sticks and stones
may break my bones, but names will never hurt me?" I am more concerned with
the sticks and stones!!!!! :)

--
Ryan, KC8PMX

"Symbolism is for the simple minded....."

940. Re: FCC relaxes it's prohibition on use of the "F-word" on broadcast media.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-13 08:24:59 UTC
From: Ron Hardin <rhhardin@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <3F8A6151.235F@mindspring.com>
Source record: 80508
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.shortwave

Dr. Anton Phibes wrote:
> "This is really, really [expletive] brilliant," Bono said during
> the ceremony, using the f-word as an adjective.
> The speech aired live on the East Coast. The FCC said it
> received 234 complaints, all but 17 of them from individuals
> associated with the Parents Television Council, a nonprofit
> group that monitors programs for adult content.

That's an adverb, not an adjective.
--
Ron Hardin
rhhardin@mindspring.com

On the internet, nobody knows you're a jerk.

941. Re: FCC relaxes it's prohibition on use of the "F-word" on broadcast media.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-13 09:44:03 UTC
From: "Dr. Anton Phibes" <bhutanna2@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <1066038964.170525@newshost03.voicenet.com>
Source record: 80509
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.shortwave

"Ron Hardin" <rhhardin@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:3F8A6151.235F@mindspring.com...
> Dr. Anton Phibes wrote:
> > "This is really, really [expletive] brilliant," Bono said during
> > the ceremony, using the f-word as an adjective.
> > The speech aired live on the East Coast. The FCC said it
> > received 234 complaints, all but 17 of them from individuals
> > associated with the Parents Television Council, a nonprofit
> > group that monitors programs for adult content.
>
> That's an adverb, not an adjective.
> --
> Ron Hardin
> rhhardin@mindspring.com
>
> On the internet, nobody knows you're a jerk.

Actually Ron, I didn't write the above point on grammatical content.

The FCC did (!) in their 'official' decision. Guess it proves the point
that the FCC *should be regulating technical issues* and not issues
of program content.

Your typical Washington DC bureaucracy at work.

When their not wasting money their likely wasting time and putting
out useless and/or esoteric info that's not worth the ink used to
coat the paper saidsame is printed upon.

942. Re: What makes a Pro code test Amateur a Troglodyte?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-13 09:44:59 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bmds9h$gkg@library2.airnews.net>
Source record: 80510

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:zDoib.26496$Eo2.6732@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net...
>
> "Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
> news:20031012224926.21457.00001309@mb-m10.aol.com...
> >
> > Bill:
> >
> > One year ago, I traded in a perfectly good 2001 Toyota Corolla LE with
> > a 5-speed manual gearbox for a new 2003 model with an automatic
> > transmission. However, I still see the need for code testing in the
ARS.
> > I own a few rifles and handguns, but wouldn't want to bet my life on my
> > proficiency with a compound bow. However, I still see the need for
> > code testing in the ARS. How do you explain that?
> >
> > 73 de Larry, K3LT
>
> Bad judgement?
>
> Cheers,
> Bill K2UNK
>

I was going to say the pills...

Kim W5TIT

943. Re: What makes a Pro code test Amateur a Troglodyte?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-13 09:48:32 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bmdsg6$bt3@library2.airnews.net>
Source record: 80511

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:ulqib.107847$qj6.4107869@news1.news.adelphia.net...
> Bill Sohl wrote:
> > "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
>
> >>I'm alomost confused here Bill! I'm saying there is no direct
> >>relationship between being Pro-Code and technical ability.
> >
> >
> > OK, I agree.
> >
> > My point is that the arguments should and can be made
> > without regard to personal aspects of either side.
>
> And how! I'm a bit dissapointed that this turned into another little
> donnybrook. It was an attempt at getting something else besides the
> usual rancor here.
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -
>

Yeah. Uh huh. Well, spend some time to see "what side" began degrading it, Mike. And, as far as I can see, "that side" is the far more agressive and offending one, even now...

Kim W5TIT

944. Re: What makes a Pro code test Amateur a Troglodyte?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-13 09:58:03 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bmdt22$sse@library2.airnews.net>
Source record: 80512

"Hans K0HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:5ee63311.0310121827.7191e44a@posting.google.com...
> "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote
>
>
> >
> > But, did the FCC ever get anywhere close to seeing its use banned? I am
> > not, remember, saying that a mode would become so unpopular or disliked
on a
> > scale such that it would be rare to find it openly being used. I am
saying,
> > however, that I believe the FCC would never regulate its ban.
> >
>
> Spark transmissions were outlawed (as well they should have been) so
> the precedent exists.
>

Hmmmm, Jim/N2EY made that observation also. Then, I see the comment that
spark was a transmission method--not a mode. I think that's splitting
hairs, isn't it? I'm asking--I wasn't around for spark ;)

>
> On a more immediate note, as relates to your discussion on AM phone,
> I'd have to dig out some old material to get all the facts exactly in
> order, but there was a petition (in the 70's?) which the I
> ***believe*** the FCC had moved to the stage of an NPRM to outlaw AM
> transmissions on the HF amateur bands. The rationale was that AM was
> (is?) wasteful of spectrum because SSB can convey the same message in
> half the bandwidth oF DSB AM phone and without those awful sounding
> hetrodyning carriers. The proposal narrowly missed being adopted,
> only because of a huge hue and cry from thousands of AM-forever hams
> (who drew ARRL into the fight on their side).
>

Well, I would expect the same would happen if it came up again--*and* there
were enough people to bear pressure on the FCC to retain the mode. However,
if a mode is within current standards of technology (i.e., with respect to
the FCC R&R) would there really be a reason the FCC would entertain the
thought of banning it? I just don't see them doing that--but then I am an
ultimate optimist.

>
> Today you're hard
> pressed to find any remaining AM-ers on the band, and if the petition

> were re-introduced it might well be adopted due to lack of organized
> opposition. Most of the AM-forever crowd has moved to "forever".
>
> 73, de Hans, K0HB
>

Whoooohooooo, I know a few of those "forever" gang down here--and they are as passionate about AM as any ardent CW fan! Dems would be fightin' words in this neck 'o the woods. At any rate, so you're bringing up the scenario that someone outside the FCC would bring up a petition to ban a mode. Hmmmmmm, hadn't thought of that--but why? Why would anyone want to have a mode banned? I mean, seriously, what would be gained?

Kim W5TIT

945. Re: What makes a Pro code test Amateur a Troglodyte?--Post #3

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-13 10:11:06 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bmdtqg$i50@library2.airnews.net>
Source record: 80513

By my review, it took 3 posts to have the slamming and insults begin. And,
DICK wins the prize:

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:bm7a98jgu4@208.206.142.91...
> Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
>
> > "Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
> > news:3F86EDAD.4010109@psu.edu...
> >
> >>I just saw another accusation of Pro-Coders as technically backwards.
> >>
> >>Yet some of the most progressive RF Engineers and Technicians I know
> >>(who are Hams) are really enamored of Morse CW.
> >
> >
>
>
> That would be those engineers who understood the real value of simple,
> effective, easily implemented baseline communications which can be used
> from almost anywhere with the least amount of simple equipment imaginable.
> Carl never did understand any of this, and of course it doesn't match
> his agenda, so it has no validity to him.
>
>
> > In over 32 years as an RF engineer, I have not had the same experience.
>
> This would be no surprise, given your OBVIOUS hatred of radiotelegraphy.
>
>
> > The most technical folks have seemed more interested in the technical
> > side of ham radio and there have been MANY who I could not recruit
> > into ham radio because they had no interest in and were unwilling to
waste
> > their valuable time learing Morse to a level that would get them decent
> > HF privs. (some have capitulated and jumped through the 5 wpm hoop
> > since "restructuring" and are now extras, but many have refused, on
> > principal, to jump through the hoop, saying they'll wait until they
don't
> > have to waste their time on Morse)
> >
>
>
> Mygawd man, no one in his right mind, having once endured that diatribe,

> would be eager to have to go through it all over again. You have it
> programmed into your psyche, if not in a keyboard macro. Naturally they
> avoided any act or word which would have keyed your internal macro. Who
> wouldn't?
>
> >
> >>I would challenge the NCTA's to show some proof that those who believe
> >>that the morse code test should be retained are in a technical
backwater.
> >
> >
>
> That *might* be a bit difficult given that even Carl, their vaunted
> leader, is a SSB ratchjaw, not given to even putting a digital HF
> station on the air, much less doing any "amsteur digital design".
>
>
> > Most of the avid CW ragchewers/contesters I've known over the years
> > (remember, I'm a long-time ham)
>
> Ah, it MUST be pointed out here that your tenure as a longtime ham did
> not include close connection to *anyone* who was seriously involved in
> radiotelegraphy in any way. And I know that how? By your actions here!
> It's completely safe to say that no one would tolarate your attitude as
> a friend, not likely as even a casual acquaintance, given the lever of
> vituperation you have always shown toward CW. So what would anyone
> expect your experience to be??
>
>
>
> have been more interested in the operating
> > activity (ragchewing, contesting, paper-chasing) than the technical
side.
> > My experience has been that they have been less technically inclined
than
> > a lot of the no-code techs I've met, less inclined to participate in
public
> > service/emergency communications, and more inclined to just being
"users"
> > rather than tinkerers ...
> >
>
>
> Same old, same old... Make the CW supporters appear to be Luddites-an
> accusation you have repeated many times here on rrap=-Go googling for
> the facts if anyone doubts it.
>
> The FACTS are that the CW suppoorters are far most often the users of
> advanced digital modes. I'd wager that Carl has never been on the air
> using CLOVER II. I have.

>
>
>

946. Re: What makes a Pro code test Amateur a Troglodyte?-Post #4

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-13 10:13:31 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bmdtv1$kfb@library2.airnews.net>
Source record: 80514

I think Jim was stretching it a little far to decide to be offended by the phrase "jump through the hoop" and "waste their valuable time." But, that's my opinion...

"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message news:c2356669.0310101413.4e4428a0@posting.google.com...
> "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message news:<j6Dhb.622$_i.48906@nnrp1.ptd.net>...
> > "Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
> > news:3F86EDAD.4010109@psu.edu...
> > > I just saw another accusation of Pro-Coders as technically backwards.
> > >
> > > Yet some of the most progressive RF Engineers and Technicians I know
> > > (who are Hams) are really enamored of Morse CW.
> >
> > In over 32 years as an RF engineer, I have not had the same experience.
> > The most technical folks have seemed more interested in the technical
> > side of ham radio and there have been MANY who I could not recruit
> > into ham radio because they had no interest in and were unwilling to waste
> > their valuable time learing Morse to a level that would get them decent
> > HF privs. (some have capitulated and jumped through the 5 wpm hoop
> > since "restructuring" and are now extras, but many have refused, on
> > principal, to jump through the hoop, saying they'll wait until they don't
> > have to waste their time on Morse)
>
> My experience has been different. But let's talk about yours.
>
> First off, with all due respect, I would submit that Carl is perhaps
> not the optimum salesperson for convincing people to take code tests
> in order to get a license.
>
> Carl's claim, as I read it, is that he knows RF engineers who would
> have become hams but for the code test. Some of them have become hams
> in spite of that test, or since it was lowered to 5 wpm for all
> classes.
>
> The question I ask is this: What does it matter to amateur radio what
> a person's job is, unless that person actually uses their job-related
> skills for amateur radio? And how many RF engineers will put that
> experience to work in amateur radio if the code test is removed that
> are allegedly being stopped today?
>

> I remember back in 1990 that this same argument was being used against
> the Technician code test. We were told that ham radio would get lots
> of new technical folks to push development of the VHF/UHF spectrum,
> and that such folks weren't interested in taking code tests. Yet here
> it is a dozen years later and there hasn't been any techno-revolution
> in amateur VHF/UHF. That doesn't mean there hasn't been progress, just
> that there hasn't been massive changes.
>
> Indeed, consider the recent developments in 24 GHz EME. Several
> enterprising hams have built stations for that band capable of EME
> QSOs (USA to Czech Republic is the current record, IIRC) using only
> small (~ 2 meter diameter) dishes and less than 100 watts output from
> the TWTs.
>
> And the mode used?
> >
> > > I would challenge the NCTA's to show some proof that those who believe
> > > that the morse code test should be retained are in a technical
backwater.
> >
> > Most of the avid CW ragchewers/contesters I've known over the years
> > (remember, I'm a long-time ham) have been more interested in the
operating
> > activity (ragchewing, contesting, paper-chasing) than the technical
side.
> > My experience has been that they have been less technically inclined
than
> > a lot of the no-code techs I've met, less inclined to participate in
public
> > service/emergency communications, and more inclined to just being
"users"
> > rather than tinkerers ...
>
> I've found more homebrewers among CW ops than any other part of ham
> radio.
> >
> > Remember, this is my personal experience, and since it seems to differ
from
> > yours, YMMV ...
>
> Of course.
> >
> > > I would also challenge them to do it without being abrasive or
insulting.
> >
> > I think I've met the challenge ...
>
> Almost.
>
> You wrote:

>
> "were unwilling to waste their valuable time lear[n]ing Morse"
>
> and
>
> "jumped through the 5 wpm hoop"
>
> which some folks would take as abrasive and/or insulting.
>
> Why not just say:
>
> "were unwilling to spend the time and effort"
>
> and
>
> "passed the 5 wpm test simply to meet the requirement"
>
> ?
>
> Is an RF engineer's time more valuable than, say, a doctor's or
> lawyer's?
>
> Suppose a doctor or lawyer wants to be a ham, but doesn't want to
> spend the time learning all the material in the written tests just to
> use a manufactured rig to chase DX. Would you say such a person did
> not want to waste their valuable time learning the theory needed for
> the Extra test? Or, perhaps, did not want to jump through the written
> test hoop?
> >
> > > Just facts or intelligent informed opinions.
> >
> > > Since there are no authortative, scientific statistics (and probably
never
> > > will
> > > be), I think that all you can expect to get are peoples accounting of
their
> > > own
> > > personal experiences.
>
> Agreed.
>
> > > Mine are admitedly coming from the fact that I'm "in
> > > the business" of RF engineering ... but through local clubs and
ARES/RACES
> > > participation over the past 25+ years, my observations seem to hold,
even
> > > amongst contacts/acquaintences/friends who are not "in the profession."
> > > Remember, YMMV ...
>
> Of course.

> >
> > >
> > > Pro coders can help by refraining from name calling too.
> >
> > We shall see ...
>
> I think I've done that.
> >
> > > My statement is that there is no direct relationship.
> >
> > The evidence is anecdotal will, as I point out, vary from person
> > to person, depending on their location, profession, the "slant"
> > of the local club(s) they belong to, etc.
>
> One can find anecdotes for almost any position.
> >
> > > Anyone ready for a real discussion without the barbs? Can we do it?
> > > First person to start throwing insults only makes it look bad for
> > > his/her side.
> >
> > I think I've taken the high ground ...
> >
> Except for the "waste their valuable time" and "hoop" stuff, I'd
> agree.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

947. Re: What makes a Pro code test Amateur a Troglodyte?-Post #7

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-13 10:14:59 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bmdu1p$ges@library2.airnews.net>
Source record: 80515

And here, on Post #7, it pretty much goes South between Carl and DICK...
However, no surprise there...

"Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
news:EdHhb.645$_i.51817@nnrp1.ptd.net...
>
> "Dick Carroll" <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com> wrote in message
> news:bm7a98jgu4@208.206.142.91...
> [snip]
>
> > That *might* be a bit difficult given that even Carl, their vaunted
> > leader, is a SSB ratchjaw, not given to even putting a digital HF
> > station on the air, much less doing any "amsteur digital design".
>
> Gee, Dick your hatred of SSB is showing again ... and you failed
> Mike's "test" because you resorted to insults.
>
> Besides, I'm active on digital ... how the hell do you profess to
> know what modes I'm capable of/equipped for/using?????
>
> At least I can get PSK31 to work ...
>
> > > Most of the avid CW ragchewers/contesters I've known over the years
> > > (remember, I'm a long-time ham)
> >
> > Ah, it MUST be pointed out here that your tenure as a longtime ham did
> > not include close connection to *anyone* who was seriously involved in
> > radiotelegraphy in any way. And I know that how? By your actions here!
> > It's completely safe to say that no one would tolarate your attitude as
> > a friend, not likely as even a casual acquaintance, given the lever of
> > vituperation you have always shown toward CW. So what would anyone
> > expect your experience to be??
>
> One of my best friends, now SK unfortuantely, was a CW op ... worked
> as radio officer on ships, was a LL telegrapher when he was a kid. 60 wpm
> in his head, while drunk, smoking, and playing poker was no problem for
> him. HE understood that CW "wasn't my thing" and we still were friends,
> enjoyed other aspects of ham radio together, and had a good time.
>
> Now, I wouldn't expect to be able to have that sort of a relationship
> with you, Dick ... you're not open-minded enough to accept that others
> see things different than you. (You see, I accept that you like and use
> CW ... I disagree only with your propatation of the "Morse myths" and
> your insistence that everyone should have Morse forced on them in

> exchange for HF privs ... fortunately, most of the rest of the world
> doesn't agree with you.)
>
> Carl - wk3c
>

948. Re: BPL a reality in my area now!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-13 11:59:55 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0310130359.24e46f6e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 80516

"Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
news:<55hib.793$_i.74106@nnrp1.ptd.net>...
> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20031011214233.06226.00000930@mb-m19.aol.com...
> > In article <bm9o10$kemhq$1@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>, "Ryan, KC8PMX"
> > <REMOVETHISkc8pmx@diamondcs.net> writes:
> >
> > >Just found out today listening to a local, reputable radio station that
> Bay,
> > >Saginaw and Midland Counties in Michigan are going to be "test sites" for
> > >BPL, at least for Michigan. I don't know when it will be an actual
> reality,
> > >as opposed to being in the planning stages, but will keep current with
> their
> > >project!
> >
> > Ryan,
> >
> > If you have a 6 meter rig that can go mobile, you're set up to
> measure/observe
> > (and report) BPL interference.
> >
> > 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
> Not all of the BPL "pilot" deployments are using spectrum as high as 6m,
> though they want to ultimately use "2-80 MHz" if they had large commercial
> deployments of paying customers.
>
Harmonics, Carl, harmonics. Those pulses sounded awful clicky on the
video. You heard 'em yourself - what do you speculate their harmonic
content is like?

If it can be shown that thew harmonics are a source of RFI as well as
the fundamentals, won't that be another tool to use against BPL?

I mentioned 6 meters because Ryan mentioned his interst in that band.

'BPL - it's not just an HF problem'...

73 de Jim, N2EY

949. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-13 12:30:28 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031013083028.14837.00003579@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 80525

In article <344ib.32457$mQ2.19944@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:

>> The ARRL/READEX survey showed that a majority favored code testing, and
>that
>> the youngest age group was the most strongly procodetest.
>
>When was the survey done?

Late 1996. Results in Feb 1997 QST

>If it is more than two years old, it
>is almost useless as there has been significant change
>over the last few years.

What significant change? How do we know what the change has been since restructuring?

At least a few hams have publicly renounced their NCI membership here, saying that 5 wpm was the right level and they could not support complete code test elimination. Maybe they're an anomaly - maybe not.
>
>> The comments to 98-143 were categorized by an NCI staffer (disproving any
>> possible claim of bias by procodetest evaluation of the comments) and the
>> resutls showed that the *majority* of commenters not only wanted continued
>> code
>> testing, but wanted at least 2 code test speeds. This was true despite an
>> email
>> campaign by NCI to get as many comments in support of their position of 5
>> wpm and sunset clause.
>
>Now it also must be pointed out that for the initial several weeks
>during 98-143 comment phase, those commenting were not
>aware of the position being put forth by NCI.

So? Anyone could revise their comments. And the comment period was extremely long, so time wasn't a factor.

>How many people
>at the time may who said they support ARRLs stance
>may have supported NCI's position will never be known.

Sounds like straw-grasping to me, Bill. Suppose FISTS had jumped in with a proposal? Suppose ARRL had gone for 5/13/20 wpm? Etc.

>Even
>so, the issue is NOT to be decided by any "vote" or majority opinion

>of any group or even the public at large. The decision will be,
>as it should be, based on what should be proper regulatory
>setting of licensing requirments.

I'll bet that if the majority opinion had been "5 wpm and drop it completely as soon as the treaty allows" we'd no longer have Element 1. And if there had been a bigger majority for testing greater than 5 wpm, we'd have that, too.

>
>> Of course things may have changed since then. But for someone to claim,
>> without
>> more recent evidence, that most hams want code testing to disappear is
>> simply wishful thinking.
>> >
>> > Strange, the news doesn't indicate any group of young people
>> > demonstrating for the retention of the amateur license code test.
>> > Nor the elimination of the amateur license code test.
>>
>> Irrelevant.
>
>Good, since I believe it was you that mentioned that fact
>in the first place. If it is irrelevent, why bring it up?

I did not mention anything about young people "demonstrating". Len did.

My point was that the strongest majority of procodetest folks was the youngest age group - according to the survey, anyway.

>
>> > Why do you say things about the "young hams" that you know not
>> > of?
>>
>> The evidence of the survey is clear. You can "stick head and eyes in the
>> sand" but it is still there.
>
>Again, what is the date of that survey?
>
1996

73 de Jim, N2EY

950. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-13 12:30:29 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031013083029.14837.00003580@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 80526

In article <bmaotk$404$0@208.207.71.130>, Dick Carroll
<dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com> writes:

>Bill Sohl wrote:
>Dwight:
>>>>Because of that, few who oppose code testing, and even fewer Technicians,
>>>>attend that club's meetings or socialize with the members. Find me a
>>>>survey that is truly unbiased and I'll be glad to discuss the results.
Until
>>>>then,discussing the results of surveys is simply a waste of time.

>N2EY:
>>>Then consider the comments to the restructuring NPRM.

>> I agree...surveys, votes, etc hold little sway with the FCC anyway.

>So you think Bill Cross is obfuscating when he says that FCC wants the
>ham community to decide what our rules are to be, for us to reach a
>concensus??

Not at all!

What Mr. Cross (W3TN) means, I think, is that the *preferred* method of
rulemaking is for the amateur community to "discuss amongst themselves" and
come up with a consensus plan for some issue or other. Then present said plan
to FCC. Example: New Q&A pool is developed by QPC and presented to FCC for
approval. Few or no protests to the new pool; consensus acheived. FCC approves
new pool. Quick and easy.

But when consensus cannot be reached, FCC has to make a decision. And that
decision is based on many factors. In the case of code testing in regards to
98-143, the factors for reducing code testing won and the majority opinion lost
- in FCC's opinion. The medical waiver headaches alone.....(One could argue
that there was a consensus reached that medical waivers were not a good idea.
So FCC eliminated them....)

Suppose, just suppose, that the comments to 98-143 had been 80-90% to reduce to
5 wpm to meet S25.5 and eliminate all code testing as soon as the treaty
permitted. Do you think Element 1 would still be in place today? I don't.

73 de Jim, N2EY

>
>
>

951. Re: 73 Magazine Says "73 and QRT"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-13 12:30:30 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031013083030.14837.00003581@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 80527

In article <wuiib.2959$N%3.469@news01.roc.ny>, "Jim Hampton"
<aa2qa@frontiernet.net> writes:

>My gut feeling is that a lot of mags have or will drop.

Yep - first "ham radio" over a dozen tears ago, and now "73".

>Yes, there will
>(likely) always be antenna construction articles, articles on safety, DXing,
>and a (very) limited amount of homebrewing. Do you remember the
>construction articles of the 50s and 60s?

And the '70s, '80s, '90s...

Still plenty of construction going on. But a lot of it winds up on websites
instead of magazine pages.

Homebrewing is, in part, the victim of affluence and less expensive
manufacturing methods.

>Back then, there were a lot of
>home brew projects.

Sure - and most of them were the result of work done by hams in their own
workshops.

>Even Heathkit threw in the towel a couple of decades
>ago.

Heathkit ran into several problems, but the main one was that the basic
advantage of kitbuilding was the cost savings resulting from eliminating labor
cost. When electronics assembly required lots of hand labor, that savings gave
Heath an edge.

But kits are not dead. See

http://www.elecraft.com

for a look at what's available today. Over 5000 Elecraft rigs have been built
(3500+ K2s and 1500+ K1s, plus accessories and now the new KX1).

> How much did anyone learn dropping in an integrated circuit that
>contained the whole if amplifier?

Are you against PROGRESS? ;-)

>That plus postal rates going threw the
>roof hasn't made it any easier for magazines.

One wonders sometimes if it wouldn't be less expensive to send us CDs.

>I've dropped all magazine
>subscriptions except tv guide (sign of the times LOL). Even when I
>assembled my first computer (a Heathkit H-8, which I still have), there were
>modifications to be performed. I had to chuckle when Kilobaud had an
>article on increasing the transfer rate from the tape deck to/from the
>computer from 1200 baud to 2400 baud. I was already running 4800 baud (and
>could get it to sync, but not transfer, at 9600 baud. I think the cheap
>cassette deck had something to do with it.).

HAW!

Which raises a question - is my computer "homebrew"? It was built from parts
obtained from a variety of sources. But no soldering or metalwork involved.
>
>Those days are long gone; today we have satellite tv and BPL (hopefully, not
>for long on the BPL!!!).
>
I sure hope so.

73 de Jim, N2EY

952. Re: 73 Magazine Says "73 and QRT"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-13 12:51:37 UTC
From: et472@FreeNet.Carleton.CA
Message-ID: <bme74pljt1@freenet9.carleton.ca>
Source record: 80528
Cross-posted to:
rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

(mcalhoun@ksu.edu) writes:
> ....[lotsa snips]....
>>But Wayne was out of Byte by the third issue, at a time when it did not
>>amount to much. He only lost the potential for when it did get big.
>
>>He then turned around and started Kilobaud, which was pretty good for some
> ....[snip]....
>
> Don't forget KiloByte, which, IIRC, remained the title for only a few
> months (until the BYTE lawyers make Wayne change its name)!
>
There was never an KiloByte.

That did seem to be the intended title as they were getting ready
to publish the first issue. But by the time it was published, it
was Kilobaud. I have many of the issues, including the first six,
and it was always Kilobaud, until they changed the name to Kilobaud
Microcomputing and then just Microcomputer, about five years later.

I've heard varying stories on why the name was changed before the
magazine came out. The oldest would be that it would result in
a lawsuit from Byte, though I'm not sure if this had outright been
threatened or someone just urged Wayne to change his mind on this
because of the potential problem.

But more recently, someone pointed out that very briefly, Byte
ran a cartoon strip entitled "Kilobyte" and they suggested it
was a deliberate attempt at protecting the name. I'm not sure
if that's possible, but it was a lousy cartoon strip, having something
to do with "Star Trek" like characters. I never did go looking to
see exactly when they ran.

Michael VE2BVW

953. Re: BPL endorsed by FCC, another threat to HF ham radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-13 13:28:34 UTC
From: AK <ak-in-nc@mchsi.com>
Message-ID: <6Mxib.760545$uu5.132372@sccrnsc04>
Source record: 80529
Cross-posted to:
alt.ham-radio.hf,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,alt.ham-radio.packet,rec.radio.amateur.dx

"Keith" <kilowattradio_spam@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:BXBcb.2841$RW4.2141@newsread4.news.pas.earthlink.net...
>> Yes, well money talks and Morse Code HF Luddites walk. If there were a
few million
> active HF operators then maybe the FCC would listen, but Ham Radio is "old
technology"
> and BPL is a billion dollar industry.

BPL should certainly boost KW and 10KW rf amplifier sales. Anything that
will work through the power company noise. Could be a little tough on the
neighbors, however. Especially since newer TVs seem to have less and less
shielding.
K4YKZ

954. Re: 73 Magazine Says "73 and QRT"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-13 13:39:06 UTC
From: William Warren <wwarren.qrm@timesucker.homelinux.org>
Message-ID: <_Vxib.275374$mp.212821@rwcrnsc51.ops.asp.att.net>
Source record: 80530
Cross-posted to:
rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

"Tim" <Timmy> wrote in message news:nLacneidut5i1BeiU-KYjA@comcast.com...
> See attachment

Please tell us what an ".swf" file contains, and provide a URL where it may
be retrieved if readers want to.

TIA.

Bill

955. Re: What makes a Pro code test Amateur a Troglodyte?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-13 14:02:03 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3F8AB05B.2010601@psu.edu>
Source record: 80531

Kim W5TIT wrote:
> "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
> news:ulqib.107847$qj6.4107869@news1.news.adelphia.net...
>
>>Bill Sohl wrote:
>>
>>>"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
>>
>>>>I'm alomost confused here Bill! I'm saying there is no direct
>>>>relationship between being Pro-Code and technical ability.
>>>
>>>
>>>OK, I agree.
>>>
>>>My point is that the arguments should and can be made
>>>without regard to personal aspects of either side.
>>
>>And how! I'm a bit dissapointed that this turned into another little
>>donnybrook. It was an attempt at getting something else besides the
>>usual rancor here.
>>
>>- Mike KB3EIA -
>>
>
>
> Yeah. Uh huh.

Yeah.

> Well, spend some time to see "what side" began degrading it,
> Mike. And, as far as I can see, "that side" is the far more agressive and
> offending one, even now...

What it tells me is that not many here care to have a "non-degraded
"discussion. And that goes for both sides. It didn't take long at all
for that to happen. And I noted that it wouldn't look good for the side
that started things rolling downhill.

Dale Carnegie courses for everyone!

- Mike KB3EIA -

956. Re: What makes a Pro code test Amateur a Troglodyte?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-13 14:13:28 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3F8AB308.4090401@psu.edu>
Source record: 80532

Kim W5TIT wrote:

> Hmmmm, Jim/N2EY made that observation also. Then, I see the comment that
> spark was a transmission method--not a mode. I think that's splitting
> hairs, isn't it? I'm asking--I wasn't around for spark ;)

and

> Whoooohooooo, I know a few of those "forever" gang down here--and they are
> as passionate about AM as any ardent CW fan! Dems would be fightin' words
> in this neck 'o the woods. At any rate, so you're bringing up the scenario
> that someone outside the FCC would bring up a petition to ban a mode.
> Hmmmmmm, hadn't thought of that--but why? Why would anyone want to have a
> mode banned? I mean, seriously, what would be gained?

Spark is very, very wideband. This was probably a good thing in th
early days of radio, since the transmitter and reciever didn't have to
be tuned too closely to each other.

A modern day example might be a failing transformer on a power line. If
something is arcing inside it or to a connection, it can put out a lot
of rf noise that extends over a lot of bandwidth. It would mess with
almost any rf device in the house.

That's why spark was banned.

As for AM, I have no problem with it. It does use more bandwidth
though, and that is why some hams and others don't like it. But to me
it's a cool "retro" mode. Not very efficient, but who says it has to be?

- Mike KB3EIA -

957. Re: What makes a Pro code test Amateur a Troglodyte?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-13 14:34:09 UTC
From: groupk0hb@earthlink.net
Message-ID: <5ee63311.0310130634.23be2c51@posting.google.com>
Source record: 80533

"Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote

> At any rate, so you're bringing up the scenario
> that someone outside the FCC would bring up a petition to ban a mode.
> Hmmmmmm, hadn't thought of that--but why? Why would anyone want to have a
> mode banned? I mean, seriously, what would be gained?

As to "what would be gained", that obviously depends on who is advancing the petition and what their agenda might be.

There's another more contemporary example than the AM situation. On 20M there is a small group of experimenters who are playing with something they call "enhanced SSB". This is regular old SSB, but these guys are enamored of excellent audio quality and spend a great deal of time (and money) modifying their radios and microphone/audio systems to gain the very best audio fidelity that they can manage. This results in bandwidth usage greater than typical SSB (nominally 3KHz) but less than AM (nominally 6KHz).

This operation, although it consists of only a small number of enthusiasts (perhaps less than 20 stations) and is situated on only one small segment of the HF bands, has been the subject of many complaints to the FCC (for occupying more bandwidth than necessary), and Hollingsworth has gone so far as to make note of it in a speech at a hamfest last winter. He warned that such use of the spectrum might lead to FCC rule changes.

Now mind you, this "mode" uses less space than an AM signal conveying the same information. It logically follows that if this "mode" is banned for being spectrum-inefficient, then the even-more-spectrum-inefficient DSB AM mode probably would fall to the same regulatory action. (I'm not suggesting that FCC is always logical, however <grin>.)

So back to your "Why would anyone want to have a mode banned?" question. Ask yourself why people have targeted a few stations on "enhanced SSB" (perhaps 4.5KHz wide), but do not complain about many more DSB AM stations on the bands (perhaps 6KHz wide)? Could it be that they simply have a personal agenda which is not evident from the facts?

Now look at the persistent demeaning language here against Morse code users, and it doesn't take much imagination to expect that a "no more CW use" petition might show up at the Commission some day soon.

As you know, I don't think Morse testing is any longer a regulatory necessity, but I am very much a CW-lover and have a low-level (but

growing) concern that the end of Morse testing is only a first step on some peoples agenda.

73, de Hans, K0HB

958. Re: What makes a Pro code test Amateur a Troglodyte?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-13 14:55:27 UTC
From: groupk0hb@earthlink.net
Message-ID: <5ee63311.0310130655.3b0c6b13@posting.google.com>
Source record: 80534

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote

>
> Yet AM is still allowed.
>

Yes, it certainly is. But for how long?

Riley Hollingsworth told a Richmond, Virginia hamfest last spring (speaking of "enhanced SSB") that deliberately operating a wideband mode in a crowded spectrum is "shortsighted and rude," may be ignoring the "minimum bandwidth necessary" rule. Now if 4.5KHz-wide signals are shortsighted and rude, then it logically follows that 6KHz-wide AM signals containing the same information are even more shortsighted and rude.

He also hinted that continued complaints "WILL (my emphasis) lead to pressure on the FCC to revise the Amateur Service rules." Would you expect DSB AM to survive such revision?

Cheers to you too,

de Hans, K0HB

959. Re: 73 Magazine Says "73 and QRT"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-13 15:04:14 UTC
From: "Michael A. Terrell" <mike.terrell@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3F8ABEE9.A4995D00@earthlink.net>
Source record: 80535
Cross-posted to:
rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

William Warren wrote:
>
> "Tim" <Timmy> wrote in message news:nLacneidut5i1BeiU-KYjA@comcast.com...
> > See attachment
>
> Please tell us what an ".swf" file contains, and provide a URL where it may
> be retrieved if readers want to.
>
> TIA.
>
> Bill

Its a "Flash" file, one of those annoying animated graphics a lot of
web sites open with. Macromedia created this nightmare.
--

Michael A. Terrell
Central Florida

960. Re: BPL a reality in my area now!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-13 16:00:46 UTC
From: Dave VanHorn <dvanhorn@cedar.net>
Message-ID: <_OWdnVQbpuG5UReiU-KYuA@comcast.com>
Source record: 80536
Cross-posted to: alt.ham-radio,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.policy

> After having gone to the ARRL site and listened to the examples, all I
> can say is it sounds just like precipitation static and/or loose
> connections. No way would I be able to identify one from the other.
> I'm just going to have to complain every time I hear noise and make
> recordings. If it's noisy enough to be a problem it should be fixed.

Any hope of us non-arrl members getting something to listen to?

961. Re: BPL a reality in my area now!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-13 16:07:11 UTC
From: Dave VanHorn <dvanhorn@cedar.net>
Message-ID: <EsqdnU5hovE5UBeiU-KYjQ@comcast.com>
Source record: 80537
Cross-posted to: alt.ham-radio,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Brian Kelly" <kelly@dvol.com> wrote in message
news:d22b54c3.0310122123.11caecf1@posting.google.com...
> "James Wilson" <Someone@Microsoft.Com> wrote in message
news:<mJfib.121280$xx4.20524963@twister.neo.rr.com>...
> > What does BPL sound like? Can someone post a wav file somewhere so it
can
> > be identified?
>
>
> The ARRL website is loaded with video and/or audio files which will
> clearly demonstrate what the various forms of BPL signals sound like
> and the havoc they generate throughout the HF spectrum.
>
> http://www.arrl.org/tis/info/HTML/plc/#Video

That helps a lot. I see what was meant by "geiger counter" sound now, as
well as the other sort of noise.

I do have a spectrum analyzer here, so that will help, when the day comes.
At the moment, the only broadband available here is DSL or cable modem,
which have been well-behaved neighbors. I'm using a cable modem now, and I
don't notice anything from it, even when I tune into the bands that it uses.
We have regular overflights scanning for leakage, so it appears that Comcast
is making the effort.

962. Re: FCC relaxes it's prohibition on use of the "F-word" on broadcast media.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-13 16:11:42 UTC
From: Dave VanHorn <dvanhorn@cedar.net>
Message-ID: <IIydnV_kG4cuUxeiU-KYuQ@comcast.com>
Source record: 80538
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.shortwave

> The FCC did (!) in their 'official' decision. Guess it proves the point
> that the FCC *should be regulating technical issues* and not issues
> of program content.

I still remember how to change channels.

Programming is driven by revenue.
If people watch it, then the ad time is worth money, and whatever it is,
we'll get more of it.
If people turn it off, then the ad time looses value, and whatever it is, it
will get pulled.

Hard to imagine a more democratic method of selection.

963. Re: BPL a reality in my area now!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-13 16:26:10 UTC
From: Dave VanHorn <dvanhorn@cedar.net>
Message-ID: <K_qcnfBErYaKTxeiU-KYjg@comcast.com>
Source record: 80539
Cross-posted to: alt.ham-radio,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.policy

> Any hope of us non-arrl members getting something to listen to?

Nevermind, a later post answered this.

964. Re: BPL a reality in my area now!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-13 16:39:59 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <zzAib.46495$mQ2.37810@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 80540

"Brian Kelly" <kelly@dvol.com> wrote in message
news:d22b54c3.0310121618.74e510b9@posting.google.com...
> n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20031012144524.00545.00001531@mb-m02.aol.com>...
> > In article <bmblrp$ki1@library1.airnews.net>, "Kim W5TIT"
<kimscliff@yahoo.com>
> > writes:
> >
> > >"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> > >news:20031011214233.06226.00000930@mb-m19.aol.com...
> > >> In article <bm9o10$kemhq$1@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>, "Ryan,
KC8PMX"
> > >> <REMOVETHISkc8pmx@diamondcs.net> writes:
> > >>
> > >> >Just found out today listening to a local, reputable radio station
that
> > Bay,
> > >> >Saginaw and Midland Counties in Michigan are going to be "test
sites" for
> > >> >BPL, at least for Michigan. I don't know when it will be an actual
> > reality,
> > >> >as opposed to being in the planning stages, but will keep current
with
> > their
> > >> >project!
> > >>
> > >> Ryan,
> > >>
> > >> If you have a 6 meter rig that can go mobile, you're set up to
> > measure/observe
> > >> (and report) BPL interference.
> > >>
> > >> 73 de Jim, N2EY
> > >
> > >heh heh. Yeah, and any ham worth being a ham would have a 6-meter rig
that
> > >can go mobile so they can measure/observe (and report) BPL
interference.
> > >Right?
> >
> > IIRC, Ryan has mentioned being active on 6 meters. So there's a good
chance he
> > has such a rig already.
>

> FWIW I haven't run into any documented instances of BPL operating as
> high as 50 Mhz yet. The BPL signals I've listened to in the Emmaus PA
> ran between 3 Mhz to somewhere just above 22 Mhz. That's pretty narrow
> by "broadband standards". If/when they get more users doing who knows
> what I suppose the BPL band edges will expand both up & down.
>
> > 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
> w3rv

Lets see now...3 to 22 Mhz.....80/75, 40, 30, 20, 17 and 15 meters turned into a wideband wasteland. With plans to expand to 12, 10, and six meters. Yep...thats a real good thing.

We could all go to 160 and fight the 50/9 QRN most of the year, or 12 and ten which are dead during the low of the cycle, which we are heading for.

Yep, lots to look forward to.

Dan/W4NTI

965. Re: BPL a reality in my area now!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-13 16:44:43 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <%DAib.46545$mQ2.16258@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 80541
Cross-posted to: alt.ham-radio,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:bmd4nr$b4s$0@208.206.142.109...

> I seriously doubt the economics of BPL will ever bring it where I
> live, even if it is approved, but others need to know.
>

That may indeed be true. However it will certainly make it tougher for you
to communicate with someone in an area that is trashed by BPL.

Dan/W4NTI

966. Re: BPL a reality in my area now!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-13 16:45:34 UTC
From: Frank Todd <franktodd@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <OEAib.114439$%h1.121961@sccrnsc02>
Source record: 80542

Dan/W4NTI wrote:
> "Brian Kelly" <kelly@dvol.com> wrote in message
> news:d22b54c3.0310121618.74e510b9@posting.google.com...
>
>>n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
>
> news:<20031012144524.00545.00001531@mb-m02.aol.com>...
>
>>>In article <bmblrp$ki1@library1.airnews.net>, "Kim W5TIT"
>
> <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
>
>>>writes:
>>>
>>>
>>>>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>>>>news:20031011214233.06226.00000930@mb-m19.aol.com...
>>>>
>>>>>In article <bm9o10$kemhq$1@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>, "Ryan,
>
> KC8PMX"
>
>>>>>><REMOVETHISkc8pmx@diamondcs.net> writes:
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>>Just found out today listening to a local, reputable radio station
>
> that
>
>>> Bay,
>>>
>>>>>>Saginaw and Midland Counties in Michigan are going to be "test
>
> sites" for
>
>>>>>>BPL, at least for Michigan. I don't know when it will be an actual
>>>
>>> reality,
>>>
>>>>>>as opposed to being in the planning stages, but will keep current
>
> with
>
>>> their

>>>
>>>>>>project!
>>>>>
>>>>>Ryan,
>>>>>
>>>>>If you have a 6 meter rig that can go mobile, you're set up to
>>>
>>> measure/observe
>>>
>>>>>(and report) BPL interference.
>>>>>
>>>>>73 de Jim, N2EY
>>>>
>>>>heh heh. Yeah, and any ham worth being a ham would have a 6-meter rig
>
> that
>
>>>>can go mobile so they can measure/observe (and report) BPL
>
> interference.
>
>>>>Right?
>>>
>>>IIRC, Ryan has mentioned being active on 6 meters. So there's a good
>
> chance he
>
>>>has such a rig already.
>>
>>FWIW I haven't run into any documented instances of BPL operating as
>>high as 50 Mhz yet. The BPL signals I've listened to in the Emmaus PA
>>ran between 3 Mhz to somewhere just above 22 Mhz. That's pretty narrow
>>by "broadband standards". If/when they get more users doing who knows
>>what I suppose the BPL band edges will expand both up & down.
>>
>>
>>>73 de Jim, N2EY
>>
>>w3rv
>
>
> Lets see now...3 to 22 Mhz.....80/75, 40, 30, 20, 17 and 15 meters turned
> into a wideband wasteland. With plans to expand to 12, 10, and six meters.
> Yep...thats a real good thing.
>
> We could all go to 160 and fight the 50/9 QRN most of the year, or 12 and
> ten which are dead during the low of the cycle, which we are heading for.
>
> Yep, lots to look forward to.
>

> Dan/W4NTI
>
>
Dan,

Why don't you be the first to QSY to those bands so we don't have to
listen to your crap on 20 and 75!

967. Re: BPL a reality in my area now!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-13 16:47:30 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <CGAib.46576$mQ2.33645@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 80543
Cross-posted to: alt.ham-radio,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Dave VanHorn" <dvanhorn@cedar.net> wrote in message
news:_OWdnVQbpuG5UReiU-KYuA@comcast.com...
>
> > After having gone to the ARRL site and listened to the examples, all I
> > can say is it sounds just like precipitation static and/or loose
> > connections. No way would I be able to identify one from the other.
> > I'm just going to have to complain every time I hear noise and make
> > recordings. If it's noisy enough to be a problem it should be fixed.
>
> Any hope of us non-arrl members getting something to listen to?
>
>

I wasn't aware you had to be a member to go klik on the link to the BPL
file. Go check and see.

Dan/W4NTI

968. Re: What makes a Pro code test Amateur a Troglodyte?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-13 16:59:38 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <_RAib.46708$mQ2.5567@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 80544

"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20031012200135.28772.00000116@mb-m25.aol.com...
> >Ain't it amazing Bruce? This Texas Twit keeps sticking that foot deeper
in
> >her mouth everytime.
> >
> >Hug and Chalk is going strong.
> >
> >Dan/W4NTI
>
> Didnt you like that comment over hers Dan, 1 of GIRL FREINDS, maybe she
just
> has a problem with guys, you dont think she might be lite in the Loafers
do
> you?

Could be....one thing I do know is she certainly has 'issues'..

Dan/W4NTI

969. Re: What makes a Pro code test Amateur a Troglodyte?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-13 17:26:47 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <rfBib.46993$mQ2.4280@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 80545

"Hans K0HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:5ee63311.0310121827.7191e44a@posting.google.com...
> "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote
>
>
> >
> > But, did the FCC ever get anywhere close to seeing its use banned? I am
> > not, remember, saying that a mode would become so unpopular or disliked
on a
> > scale such that it would be rare to find it openly being used. I am
saying,
> > however, that I believe the FCC would never regulate its ban.
> >
>
> Spark transmissions were outlawed (as well they should have been) so
> the precedent exists.
>
> On a more immediate note, as relates to your discussion on AM phone,
> I'd have to dig out some old material to get all the facts exactly in
> order, but there was a petition (in the 70's?) which the I
> ***believe*** the FCC had moved to the stage of an NPRM to outlaw AM
> transmissions on the HF amateur bands. The rationale was that AM was
> (is?) wasteful of spectrum because SSB can convey the same message in
> half the bandwidth oF DSB AM phone and without those awful sounding
> hetrodyning carriers. The proposal narrowly missed being adopted,
> only because of a huge hue and cry from thousands of AM-forever hams
> (who drew ARRL into the fight on their side). Today you're hard
> pressed to find any remaining AM-ers on the band, and if the petition
> were re-introduced it might well be adopted due to lack of organized
> opposition. Most of the AM-forever crowd has moved to "forever".
>
> 73, de Hans, K0HB

Sorry Hans, the AM forever crowd is still well represented, by not only
old guys, but a lot of new guys using rice boxes.

Go to Google and do a search of AM phone. You will be amazed.

Dan/W4NTI

970. Re: BPL a reality in my area now!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-13 17:33:56 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bmenm4$8qu$0@208.207.71.142>
Source record: 80546
Cross-posted to: alt.ham-radio,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Dave VanHorn wrote:
>>After having gone to the ARRL site and listened to the examples, all I
>>can say is it sounds just like precipitation static and/or loose
>>connections. No way would I be able to identify one from the other.
>>I'm just going to have to complain every time I hear noise and make
>>recordings. If it's noisy enough to be a problem it should be fixed.
>
>
> Any hope of us non-arrl members getting something to listen to?
>
>

Surely that file isn't on the members-only side of the site, is it?

Certainly it shouldn't be, and if so I intend to protest.

971. Re: BPL a reality in my area now!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-13 17:38:17 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bmenu9$8qu$1@208.207.71.142>
Source record: 80547
Cross-posted to: alt.ham-radio,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Dan/W4NTI wrote:

> "Dick Carroll" <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com> wrote in message
> news:bmd4nr$b4s$0@208.206.142.109...
>
>
>
>> I seriously doubt the economics of BPL will ever bring it where I
>>live, even if it is approved, but others need to know.
>>
>
>
> That may indeed be true. However it will certainly make it tougher for you
> to communicate with someone in an area that is trashed by BPL.
>

Indeed! And don't forget the skip issue-if it works for QRP hams it'll
work for BPL, too.

972. Re: BPL a reality in my area now!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-13 17:39:50 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bmeo16$8qu$2@208.207.71.142>
Source record: 80548

Frank Todd wrote:

> Dan/W4NTI wrote:
>
>> "Brian Kelly" <kelly@dvol.com> wrote in message
>> news:d22b54c3.0310121618.74e510b9@posting.google.com...
>>
>>> n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
>>
>>
>> news:<20031012144524.00545.00001531@mb-m02.aol.com>...
>>
>>>> In article <bmblrp$ki1@library1.airnews.net>, "Kim W5TIT"
>>
>>
>> <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
>>
>>>> writes:
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>>>>> news:20031011214233.06226.00000930@mb-m19.aol.com...
>>>>>
>>>>>> In article <bm9o10$kemhq$1@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>, "Ryan,
>>
>>
>> KC8PMX"
>>
>>>>>> <REMOVETHISkc8pmx@diamondcs.net> writes:
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>> Just found out today listening to a local, reputable radio station
>>
>>
>> that
>>
>>>> Bay,
>>>>
>>>>>>> Saginaw and Midland Counties in Michigan are going to be "test
>>
>>
>> sites" for
>>
>>>>>>> BPL, at least for Michigan. I don't know when it will be an actual

>>>>
>>>>
>>>> reality,
>>>>
>>>>>>> as opposed to being in the planning stages, but will keep current
>>
>>
>> with
>>
>>>> their
>>>>
>>>>>>> project!
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>> Ryan,
>>>>>>
>>>>>> If you have a 6 meter rig that can go mobile, you're set up to
>>>>
>>>>
>>>> measure/observe
>>>>
>>>>>> (and report) BPL interference.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>> heh heh. Yeah, and any ham worth being a ham would have a 6-meter rig
>>
>>
>> that
>>
>>>>> can go mobile so they can measure/observe (and report) BPL
>>
>>
>> interference.
>>
>>>>> Right?
>>>>
>>>>
>>>> IIRC, Ryan has mentioned being active on 6 meters. So there's a good
>>
>>
>> chance he
>>
>>>> has such a rig already.
>>>
>>>
>>> FWIW I haven't run into any documented instances of BPL operating as
>>> high as 50 Mhz yet. The BPL signals I've listened to in the Emmaus PA
>>> ran between 3 Mhz to somewhere just above 22 Mhz. That's pretty narrow

>>> by "broadband standards". If/when they get more users doing who knows
>>> what I suppose the BPL band edges will expand both up & down.
>>>
>>>
>>>> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>>>
>>>
>>> w3rv
>>
>>
>>
>> Lets see now...3 to 22 Mhz.....80/75, 40, 30, 20, 17 and 15 meters turned
>> into a wideband wasteland. With plans to expand to 12, 10, and six
>> meters.
>> Yep...thats a real good thing.
>>
>> We could all go to 160 and fight the 50/9 QRN most of the year, or 12 and
>> ten which are dead during the low of the cycle, which we are heading
>> for.
>>
>> Yep, lots to look forward to.
>>
>> Dan/W4NTI
>>
>>
> Dan,
>
> Why don't you be the first to QSY to those bands so we don't have to
> listen to your crap on 20 and 75!
>

You have no tuning knob on your rahdyo Frank?

973. Re: FCC relaxes it's prohibition on use of the "F-word" on broadcast media.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-13 17:42:57 UTC
From: David <rickets@knac.com>
Message-ID: <00plov81l3g6j6re8augne3mqpbd8l3ogm@4ax.com>
Source record: 80549
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.shortwave

It's about fucking time. The word has 100 usages and about 3 of them
refer to sex.

On Mon, 13 Oct 2003 02:36:24 GMT, Herbert West
<reanimator@miskatonic.edu> wrote:

>On Sun, 12 Oct 2003 21:33:32 -0400, "Dr. Anton Phibes"
><bhutanna2@yahoo.com> wrote:
>
>>October 9, 2003
>>F.C.C. Ruling Could Allow Use Of "F-word" On T.V.
>>By Jon Hanian BOISE -
>>
>>In broadcasting, dropping the so called "F-bomb" goes
>>over like an H-bomb. But the FCC has now ruled that
>>the use of the "F-word" by U-2 frontman "Bono" at
>>the Golden Globe awards **did not** violate federal
>>indecency rules.
>
>It's crude, and maybe vulgar in context, but I've heard and viewed
>worse on BC TV. The F word can be heard on any street an any time of
>day and even in primary schools and even nursery schools.
>
>Its too common to stamp out of the english language. Might as well
>loosen the restriction and play up the non-vulgar non-sexual usages of
>the word.
>
>It's funny how everybody pretends to be shocked when they hear it over
>and over all the4 i\time in real life.

974. Re: BPL a reality in my area now!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-13 18:30:36 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031013143036.12300.00001135@mb-m20.aol.com>
Source record: 80550

In article <bme4ob$lic55$4@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>, "Ryan, KC8PMX"
<REMOVETHISkc8pmx@diamondcs.net> writes:

>Yeah Jim.... six meter all mode.

I made a lucky guess.

>It's hard as hell to use it right now with
>the powerline interference in this freakin' county even before they
>implement this whole BPL stuff!!!!!

Oh man...they can't even keep the lines quiet without BPL...

Perhaps their own line noise will mess up BPL performance.

73 de Jim, N2EY

975. Re: What makes a Pro code test Amateur a Troglodyte?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-13 18:30:36 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031013143036.12300.00001134@mb-m20.aol.com>
Source record: 80551

In article <3F8AB308.4090401@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:

>Kim wrote:
>
>> Hmmmm, Jim/N2EY made that observation also. Then, I see the comment that
>> spark was a transmission method--not a mode. I think that's splitting
>> hairs, isn't it? I'm asking--I wasn't around for spark ;)

They called it "Mode B". And there were also arc transmitters - not the same
thing.
>
>and
>
>> Whoooohooooo, I know a few of those "forever" gang down here--and they are
>> as passionate about AM as any ardent CW fan! Dems would be fightin' words
>> in this neck 'o the woods. At any rate, so you're bringing up the scenario
>> that someone outside the FCC would bring up a petition to ban a mode.
>> Hmmmmmm, hadn't thought of that--but why? Why would anyone want to have a
>> mode banned? I mean, seriously, what would be gained?
>
>
> Spark is very, very wideband. This was probably a good thing in th
>early days of radio, since the transmitter and reciever didn't have to
>be tuned too closely to each other.

Some receivers were not even tuned at all.
>
> A modern day example might be a failing transformer on a power line. If

>something is arcing inside it or to a connection, it can put out a lot
>of rf noise that extends over a lot of bandwidth. It would mess with
>almost any rf device in the house.
>
>That's why spark was banned.

That's one reason.

Another was that almost nobody was using it after about 1924-5, but there was
concern about folks looking at "old" books and thinking they could still use
it.

Consider how fast the change came. When hams got back on the air after WW1,
spark was undisputed king. Five years later, it was a memory. The difference
between a "state of the art" 1919 ham station and a similar one in 1939 is
simply amazing. Almost nothing from the former would still be in the latter.
>

> As for AM, I have no problem with it. It does use more bandwidth
>though, and that is why some hams and others don't like it. But to me
>it's a cool "retro" mode. Not very efficient, but who says it has to be?
>
Depends how you define efficiency. AM operations tend to be roundtables where many hams gather on one freq. So the number of "Hz used per ham on the air" can be pretty low.

73 de Jim, N2EY

976. Re: What makes a Pro code test Amateur a Troglodyte?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-13 19:15:53 UTC
From: groupk0hb@earthlink.net
Message-ID: <5ee63311.0310131115.3536613@posting.google.com>
Source record: 80552

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote

>
> We (NCI) have no problem with code USE.
>

I believe that is the official position of NCI, but sometimes "body language" gives a different perception.

For example, on our web home page, NCI goes to some length to make it's position "crystal clear" that

"2. Manual radiotelegraphy communications has been superceded by more modern, reliable, accurate, faster and efficient means of communication. "

That "crystal clear" statement doesn't speak to TESTING at all. It speaks to things like reliability, accuracy, speed, and efficiency of communications. In other words, issues surrounding the USE of the mode. That sort of official statement, along with the propensity of the Executive Director to publicly portray Morse USERS in a less-than-favorable light, creates impressions which run counter to your assertion above.

I have separately petitioned the Board of Directors to make a single simple organizational change which would go MILES toward reinforcing your statement above. I'll await with interest the report of the next quarterly meeting of the Board of Directors.

73, de Hans, K0HB
NCI # 4303 http://www.nocode.org

977. Re: 73 Magazine Says "73 and QRT"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-13 19:21:07 UTC
From: n2ah@hotmail.com
Message-ID: <774a2c02.0310131121.53526a57@posting.google.com>
Source record: 80553
Cross-posted to:
rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

"Capt. Blackflag" wrote:

> > 73 MAGAZINE SAYS "73 AND QRT"
> >
> > After completing 43 years of publication, 73 Amateur Radio Today
> > magazine is calling it quits. Plans to publish a joint
> > October/November issue fell through this week, and the September 2003
> > issue was the magazine's last.

Last week on eBay, someone listed a 1-year subscription to "73" for
$9. There were no takers.

Art N2AH

978. Re: RM-10808 --- Wexelbaum Redux

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-13 20:04:10 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031013160410.21642.00001644@mb-m01.aol.com>
Source record: 80555

In article <20031012183022.01893.00001195@mb-m22.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
writes:

>In article <hohib.795$_i.74284@nnrp1.ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
><wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:
>
>>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>>news:20031011123005.05539.00001479@mb-m16.aol.com...
>>> In article <wbDhb.623$_i.48433@nnrp1.ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
>>> <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:
>>>
>>> >> and a "reward" for learning. I fail to understand why removing Morse
>>> >> testing is any different from removing all aspects of RTTY knowledge
>>> >> from the written test, e.g. "T8A10. What would you connect to a
>>> >> transceiver for RTTY operation?".
>>> >
>>> >Clearly AH0A can't understand (or accept) that the RTTY example
>>> >is "theoretical knowledge" and the Morse test is a test of a mechanical
>>> >skill ...
>>>
>>> You mean "a practical skill".
>>
>>No, I meant "mechanical skill." (touch typing would be in the same
>>category ...)
>
>Both are also practical skills, are they not? Practical as opposed to
>theoretical.

If you have a problem with amateur radio license test questions, senior,
I'd suggest you contact the VEC Question Pool Committee. They are
the ones originating the content and on what subjects. FCC no longer
requires a certain percentage of specific subjects in the pool.

>>> Both are valuable to the radio amateur. Whether either should be tested is
>>> a matter of opinion, nothing more.
>>>
>>> But if a person has no interest in RTTY, why should that person be
>>> subjected to questions on the subject?
>>>
>>> Why can't a ham be trusted to learn about RTTY if/when the desire to use
>>> that mode arises? RTTY is "just another mode", is it not? There's no
>>> requirement for any ham to ever use it.
>>
>>There is an ITU-R Recommendation that deals with the sorts of
>>THEORETICAL knowledge that hams should possess ... IIRC,

>>it's ITU-R Recommendation M.1544 ...
>
>It's just a recommendation, though - not a requirement.

Why such an absolute on "requirement" versus "recommendation?"

ITU-R documents are NOT law per se. Those are common-
agreement items for _administrations_ to consider.

At NO time will there be ANY ITU-R "police officials" arresting
ANYONE for any violations of ITU-R radio regulations or
recommendations, ANY radio service ANYWHERE.

>>That recommendation is consistent with the basis and purpose
>>of the ARS, both as defined by the FCC and the ITU.
>
>So is touch typing, knowing Morse code, knowing how to solder, and a whole
>bunch of other things.

Is the "basis and purpose of the ARS" all about morse code?

I don't think so, not in any observation of the FCC regulations.

>>While not strictly mandatory, it is provided as "good advice to
>>administrations" on what sorts of theoretical knowledge hams
>>should possess.
>
>Sure - but it's just a recommendation.

Irrelevant. NO ONE can be arrested for violation of an ITU-R
"regulation." Quit trying to belabor an irrelevant point.

>Can we really say that the questions on RTTY in the current written tests
>really assure that hams have theoretical knowledge of RTTY at the level
>recommended by M-1544?
>
>And note this:
>
>When I took my most recent ham exam that counted for a license, the only TOR
>mode authorized for hams was 60 wpm Baudot code RTTY using FSK or OOK. (Shift
had to be less than 900 Hz, as I recall.

Oh, my. When I first USED teleprinters...NO formal classes, NO test,
just an on-the-job informal explanatin-instruction...it was over a decade
before your precious FCC test. The standard "shift" (also referred to as
"spread" colloquially) was 850 Hz Mark to Space in FSK only.

"TOR" is a partial acronym referring to "Teleprinter Over Radio" and came
into use FIRST in the commercial communications field, NOT amateur.

>No PSK-31, no packet, no PACTOR or even AMTOR. Not even ASCII!

The American Standard Code for Information Interchange was divised
in the 1950s, senior, by both commercial communications and the

new Information Technology activities (than referred to as just
"computers").

"Packet" forms of net transmission already existed in the commercial
and military communications services of the 1940s. The most
rudimentary form is in the "automatic transmission distributor" portion
of teleprinter paper tape terminals (designed, manufactured by
Teletype Corporation among others). Most terminals had dual tape
readers to accept prepared tapes. As one tape finished in one reader,
the other reader began its tape; throughput was continuous as long
as an operator kept loading new tapes. This was referred to as a
"torn tape relay" system. Receiving printer-punchers were also dual
but for tape supply, not individual messages. Manual operators
would observe EOM symbols and new message address preambles
to manually separate (or "tear") received tape messages. Station
ADA had over 170 of such terminals in use 24/7.

Washington Army Radio ("WAR") was already using an automatic
electromechanical switching teleprinter message exchange system
in the mid 1950s. "Torn tape" operators were not required since the
switching system automatically routed the electrical loop signal to
the appropriate outgoing circuit through address preamble information.
The only manual operation necessary in relaying was if there was
circuit trouble resulting in garbled information.

"Packet" data networking has many and varied forms in the commercial
world. Perhaps the most-written-up form is ALOHA. It is in literature
of the electronics communications industry and Transactions of IEEE
Communications Society.

>Back then the power limit was different, repeater rules were very different,
>and the 30, 17 or 12 meter bands weren't even a distant dream. The technology
>used in most ham rigs was also very different.

"Repeaters" came into being around 1940 in the US military. They
were known as "radio relay" then and for several decades afterwards.
The AN/PRC-6 handheld transceiver (VHF, internal battery power,
debuted during the Korean War) was DESIGNED to work with
another PRC-6 using a specific adapter cable for unattended repeater
operation. So too were the PRC-9 series of manpack transceivers,
all designed for easy set-up in pairs as unattended repeaters. The
AN/TRC-1 through AN/TRC-8 group of radio relay terminals was
specifically designed for unattended operation and were used in
Europe during WW2. "Repeaters" are certainly nothing new in
technology nor are they of amateur radio origin.

>And the tests we took back then had lots of things in them that are no longer
>in the current tests. Neutralization of triode RF power amplifiers, for
>example.....

I was successfully operating high-power vacuum tube amplifiers in HF
communications WITHOUT being formally tested and WITHOUT any

formal training in high-power HF transmitters at ADA. On-the-job
verbal instructions sufficed, taking less than a day for explanations
and individual run-through of procedure. The workhorse transmitter
at ADA in the 1950s was the BC-339, 1 KW RF output using a
pair of 833 triodes in the final amplifier. Yes, "neutralization" was
required to be observed on the 339 and all the others. Not a problem.
Not a "test subject" nor were there any "legal requirements."

Since those days long ago, I was given job responsibility to DESIGN
and prototype RF power amplifiers and power sources WITHOUT
any formal testing and WITHOUT any specific formal schooling in
such techniques. At the same time, I was REQUIRED to obey the
current laws on RF emission technical standards for the particular
radio application. Solid-state technology and techniques can be
remarkably DIFFERENT from vacuum tube technology and
techniques.

>In the intervening years, FCC has trusted me (and almost every other ham from
>those days who hasn't lost interest) to keep current with amateur radio.

Try reviewing FCC regulations a bit closer, senior. FCC REQUIRES
you (and all others) to emit RF WITHIN technical regulations. That
INCLUDES whatever has become "current" resulting from changes
since an operator was licensed.

REQUIREMENT. BY LAW. Enforced by United States peace officers,
trial and imprisonment possible.

>FCC
>has renewed almost all of our licenses without question, and we're allowed to
>use those new modes and technologies even though we've never passed any tests
>on them.

Lucky you. Now, what was your point (if any)?

>If FCC trusts us OTs to learn as we go, why not the new folks?

FCC "trusts" (actually entrusts) the VEC QPC to come up with
questions and answers for the amateur radio license tests. Those
tests apply to ALL ages.

I'll challenge ANY of the old-timers to "learn as they go." That's
what I've done, successfully, during my whole career in radio
and electronics. Some of those same old-timers are still anal
retentive on retention of a morse code test in a radio service
that is basically an avocational and recreational activity. I'd say
those anal retentive old-timers are resisting learning because
they CANNOT learn as they go.

LHA

979. Re: RM-10808 --- Wexelbaum Redux

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-13 20:04:11 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031013160411.21642.00001645@mb-m01.aol.com>
Source record: 80554

In article <vok1tbe6p8ti61@corp.supernews.com>, "lk" <lklose@net-link.net>
writes:

>> Roux' petition of RM-10810 is split on code test necessity, only
>> extras having code tests.
>>
>> I've already filed Comments on all 14. The others in here seem
>> content with just jawing and hollering among themselves... :-)
>
>Excellent comments. Thanks for taking the time to file.

Larry, it's interesting to see the "mix" of RMs. Seven essentially for
the elimination of the code test, seven essentially for its retention.
I observe some deliberate picking of what to make into a released
RM on some curious "equal-sized-teams" contest.

What the public does NOT get a chance to see easily is how many
petitions for change actually arrived at the FCC. All the public can
see is what is officially selected for issuance. It's difficult to find out
what RMs exist unless there is an ex officio communications means
elsewhere to let everyone know.

The FCC is attempting to be fair in the "7 versus 7" in my opinion.
All are, or were, open for Comment. Comments on 98-143 are still
open for Internet access even though those comments were supposed
to cease on 15 January 1999. :-) Been about a half thousand
comments on 98-143 _since_ official closure.

One thing for sure: The FCC now has a quick and easy procedure
for Comment upload from either "manual" entry (on-line) or via
prepared documents in five file formats. That's a good thing for all.
Making sensible/logical commentary is quite another thing... :-)

LHA

980. Re: 73 Magazine Says "73 and QRT"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-13 20:04:12 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031013160412.21642.00001647@mb-m01.aol.com>
Source record: 80556

In article <xnfcneeyarg.hmnxu01.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>, "Phil Kane"
<Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> writes:

>On Sun, 12 Oct 2003 17:41:41 -0500, Gray Shockley wrote:
>
>>If memory serves, Heath didn't throw in the towel, per se.
>>
>>Zenith bought them out for their computer(s) and terminals and then Zenith
>>tossed out nearly all of Heath except those items.
>
> Didn't Shlumberger get into the picture before Zenith, or was it
> after Zenith?

Memory says that Schlumberger acquired them first, then Zenith.
The Heath-Zenith home appliance/gadget corporate headquarters
moved to someplace else (southeast?) according to what I
remember from the doorbell packages. Zenith quit the TV receiver
manufacture some time ago; they were a close second to
Admiral Corporation, also in the Chicago area.

>>My first kit was a Heath Q-1.

Mine also, 1951. The CRT in the kit was WW2 surplus, 5BP1,
container still marked with Army lettering. :-)

> My first Heathkit was their VTVM (Vacuum-Tube Voltmeter for those
> who never played with one). One of the best test instruments of its
> time (1950s).

It's still good. My Heath VTVM was purchased in late 1953, shipped
to my battalion mailbox in Tokyo, Japan, while assigned to ADA.
Used it for checking "Hi-Fi" music electronic kits purchased at the
legendary Akihabara district of Tokyo, even then a mecca for
electronics-radios-components covering many square blocks. Mine
traveled with me back to Illinois then California. Slight drift in the
resistor values makes it a tad out of spec now and the rotary switches
will probably never survive another cleaning (oxide build-up on the
rotary contacts has always been a problem with old electronics).
The Heath SB-310 receiver kit, purchased and built two decades
later, has almost useless rotary switch contacts now.

LHA

981. Re: RM-10808 --- Wexelbaum Redux

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-13 20:04:12 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031013160412.21642.00001646@mb-m01.aol.com>
Source record: 80557

In article <P0oib.835$_i.78080@nnrp1.ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
<wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:

>"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20031012173327.15462.00003523@mb-m06.aol.com...
>> In article <hohib.795$_i.74284@nnrp1.ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
>> <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:
>>
>> >There is an ITU-R Recommendation that deals with the sorts of
>> >THEORETICAL knowledge that hams should possess ... IIRC,
>> >it's ITU-R Recommendation M.1544 ...
>>
>> Carl, I think that is "irrelevant" in this newsgroup. If it hasn't
>> been officially published by the ARRL, it can't apply at all to
>> amateur radio! :-)
>
>Actually, ARRL was instrumental in developing the recomendation
>and pushing it through WP8A and SG8 ...

Carl, you deserve a bigger hand for helping the changes at WRC-03
regardless of the few ARRL actually involved with Working Group 6
at the FCC. The minutes of those meetings, terribly late in coming,
are on public view.

I would suppose that ARRL executive-president-for-life Dave Sumner
did help change S25 in Geneva. From his reportings to the IARU
website - NOT the ARRL web pages - he was NOT expressing any
enthusiasm for changing S25 nor showing much bias for either side.

It is also evidenciary that IARU policy on code testing had ALREADY
shifted to no code test in 2002, almost a year before WRC-03. ARRL
public policy statements took a neutral stance, supporting only
obediance to federal regulations whatever they would become. That's
a clear case of division of opinion within the ARRL upper echelons...
the public (and membership) is shielded from internal divisions by the
public stance of "neutrality" on code testing.

Any sign of internal division in a membership organization (a minority
group considering all the licensed amateurs NOT members) shows
that ARRL cannot reach any consensus itself! It would then be
useless to use any neutral ARRL public policy statement to show a
"consensus" opinion on "representation of US amateur opinion."

The rest of the radio world goes on advancing to the future. ARRL
leadership seems firmly rooted to the past, trying to regain the glory
of the executives' and BoD' youth long past.

LHA

982. Re: BPL a reality in my area now!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-13 20:17:13 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <dLDib.941$_i.88127@nnrp1.ptd.net>
Source record: 80558
Cross-posted to: alt.ham-radio,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:bmd4nr$b4s$0@208.206.142.109...
> Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
>
> > "Dick Carroll" <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com> wrote in message
> > news:bmcn2r$4n0$1@208.207.71.176...
> >
[snip]

> >> You raise an interesting question, Carl. How exactly should the
> >>average ham go about proving that the RFI is indeed BPL, when the BPL
> >>people say
> >>"That's not us!'??
> >>
> >
> >
> > BPL has a unique "signature" (in the spectral/time domains) that can be
> > used to ID it.
> >
> > Since there are different systems (SS from main.net and OFDM from
Amperion,
> > for example) they have different signatures, which are distinct from
other
> > sources
> > of interference and more traditional power line noise (of course the
> > utilities are
> > responsible for fixing the latter, too ... though their record is poor).
>
>
> So to repeat, how does the average ham, whom you have exhorted to
> "make sure it's BPL that you're complaining about", go about detecting
> and sorting which is what, given that spectral analysis gear, and the
> training to use it if it was available, is virtually nonexistnt in the
> average hamshack? Is there a aural signature or more than one for the
> different BPL modes? Is the Emmaus test site video/audio clip
> reresentative enough to make the call, or is something more needed?

The Emmaus test site video (test area #3) should be pretty representative
of the "main.net" system ... test area #4 is the Amperion OFDM system.
There could be others that might have different "signatures" ...

> I expect that if it was indeed BPL RFI it would follow the power grid
> pretty closely with signal strength highest when close, and tapering off
> with distance away from the lines. But from the one report posted here

> of a ham who said he heard it from a distance of 60 miles, seems like
> propagation will play into the picture-to be expected at HF as all
> experienced HF ham operators know. Or maybe *he* mis-identified it!

I suspect that may be the case ... though it's not impossible that under ideal conditions of terrain, propagation, with good antenna, etc. that it *might* be detectable at some distance ... whether current levels of deployment would cause truly "harmful interference" at such a distance requires further study.

> So who do hams call for assistance, the ARRL? I haven't seen anything
> from them suggesting that.

My recommendation would be to e-mail a .wav file or other common audio file format to Ed Hare, w1rfi@arrl.org, and give him the particulars of time, location, if you *know* that your utility is doing a BPL trial, etc.
(I'd appreciate a cc: of the audio file and particulars to my main e-mail address wk3c@wk3c.com as well, just for my own information and analysis.)

The MAIN thing is to NOT have a bunch of false "BPL interference complaints."
The BPL industry is trying to paint the ARS as "exaggerating the potential for
interference" and doing a lot of hand-waving ... inaccurate claims of "BPL interference" at this point will do more harm than good.

Carl -wk3c

983. Re: BPL a reality in my area now!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-13 20:19:12 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <4NDib.942$_i.88243@nnrp1.ptd.net>
Source record: 80559
Cross-posted to: alt.ham-radio,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Dave VanHorn" <dvanhorn@cedar.net> wrote in message
news:_OWdnVQbpuG5UReiU-KYuA@comcast.com...
>
> > After having gone to the ARRL site and listened to the examples, all I
> > can say is it sounds just like precipitation static and/or loose
> > connections. No way would I be able to identify one from the other.
> > I'm just going to have to complain every time I hear noise and make
> > recordings. If it's noisy enough to be a problem it should be fixed.
>
> Any hope of us non-arrl members getting something to listen to?

Dave,

The ARRL video is not in the "members only" part of the site ...
it's easy to find from the articles on BPL in the public area.

Carl - wk3c

984. Re: BPL a reality in my area now!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-13 20:19:50 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <GNDib.943$_i.87822@nnrp1.ptd.net>
Source record: 80560
Cross-posted to: alt.ham-radio,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:bmenm4$8qu$0@208.207.71.142...
> Dave VanHorn wrote:
> >>After having gone to the ARRL site and listened to the examples, all I
> >>can say is it sounds just like precipitation static and/or loose
> >>connections. No way would I be able to identify one from the other.
> >>I'm just going to have to complain every time I hear noise and make
> >>recordings. If it's noisy enough to be a problem it should be fixed.
> >
> >
> > Any hope of us non-arrl members getting something to listen to?
> >
> >
>
>
> Surely that file isn't on the members-only side of the site, is it?
>
> Certainly it shouldn't be, and if so I intend to protest.
>

It isn't Dick ... it's open to the world.

Carl - wk3c

985. Re: What makes a Pro code test Amateur a Troglodyte?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-13 20:26:23 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <PTDib.945$_i.88304@nnrp1.ptd.net>
Source record: 80561

"Hans K0HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:5ee63311.0310130634.23be2c51@posting.google.com...
>
> As you know, I don't think Morse testing is any longer a regulatory
> necessity, but I am very much a CW-lover and have a low-level (but
> growing) concern that the end of Morse testing is only a first step on
> some peoples agenda.
>
> 73, de Hans, K0HB

Not mine, not NCI's, Hans ...

Carl - wk3c

986. Code test analogy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-13 20:27:37 UTC
From: nocoder@aol.com
Message-ID: <bmf1rp02sk5@enews1.newsguy.com>
Source record: 80597

Even though the testing for code was reduced to the basic 5 WPM over three years ago, it's obvious that the debate still rages on.

The insistance that a person know Morse Code at a resonable speed in order to be "real ham" is similar to religious fanatics, particualrly Christian fundamentalists, who think that a person has to believe in god in order to be a good and moral person. They cannot prove that their god even exists. So with the PCTA, they cannot prove that code is useful in light of communications advancements that have been made over the past several decades.

Just as certain fundamentalists would like to turn the country into a Judeo-Christian theocracy, so would certain hams go back to an outdated communications scheme, simply because they think that Morse code is their "god."

To expect prospective hams to believe in the fairy tale of morse code is the the same as expecting people to believe in the fairy tales of the holy bible.

987. Re: BPL a reality in my area now!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-13 20:31:07 UTC
From: Dave VanHorn <dvanhorn@cedar.net>
Message-ID: <WfGdnYmbXtMflhaiU-KYiA@comcast.com>
Source record: 80563
Cross-posted to: alt.ham-radio,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.policy

> > Surely that file isn't on the members-only side of the site, is it?
> >
> > Certainly it shouldn't be, and if so I intend to protest.
> >
>
> It isn't Dick ... it's open to the world.
>
> Carl - wk3c

Apparently my "nevermind" is taking a while to propagate :)

988. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-13 20:31:29 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <BYDib.947$_i.87547@nnrp1.ptd.net>
Source record: 80562

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20031013083028.14837.00003579@mb-m03.aol.com...
>
> At least a few hams have publicly renounced their NCI membership here,
saying
> that 5 wpm was the right level and they could not support complete code
test
> elimination. Maybe they're an anomaly - maybe not.

By my best recollection there have been *maybe* about 6 or 7 who have
upgraded, decided "I've got mine." and decided they wanted to keep the
5 wpm ... out of thousands of NCI members.

Carl - wk3c

989. Re: FCC relaxes it's prohibition on use of the "F-word" on broadcast media.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-13 20:37:46 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3F8B0D19.8060802@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 80564
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.shortwave

Dr. Anton Phibes wrote:

>October 9, 2003
>F.C.C. Ruling Could Allow Use Of "F-word" On T.V.
>By Jon Hanian BOISE -
>
>In broadcasting, dropping the so called "F-bomb" goes
>over like an H-bomb. But the FCC has now ruled that
>the use of the "F-word" by U-2 frontman "Bono" at
>the Golden Globe awards **did not** violate federal
>indecency rules.
>
>The FCC rules say the use of the word must be "patently offensive"
>to be considered indecent.
>
I'll have to do a search at the US Patent Office to see who might have a
patent
on the f-word. And to see if they wrote it offensively.

;-)

990. Re: 73 Magazine Says "73 and QRT"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-13 20:39:23 UTC
From: et472@FreeNet.Carleton.CA
Message-ID: <bmf2hr$s20$1@freenet9.carleton.ca>
Source record: 80565
Cross-posted to:
rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

Art Harris (n2ah@hotmail.com) writes:
> "Capt. Blackflag" wrote:
>
>> > 73 MAGAZINE SAYS "73 AND QRT"
>> >
>> > After completing 43 years of publication, 73 Amateur Radio Today
>> > magazine is calling it quits. Plans to publish a joint
>> > October/November issue fell through this week, and the September 2003
>> > issue was the magazine's last.
>
> Last week on eBay, someone listed a 1-year subscription to "73" for
> $9. There were no takers.
>
> Art N2AH

I wonder how many lifetime subscribers this will affect?

If I'm remembering right, fairly early on Wayne sold them, and they
were $37. In 1973, he sold them for $73. I think he continued to
sell them for some time after that; I have a recollection of a $150
life time subscription, but that's a more vague memory.

Were the lifetime subscriptions honored for all that time? How many
of them abandoned the magazine. explicitly telling 73 they didn't
want anymore issues, or just not providing a new address when moving?
How many who did buy a lifetime subscription were still alive by this
month?

Michael VE2BVW

991. Re: FCC relaxes it's prohibition on use of the "F-word" on broadcast media.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-13 20:45:16 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3F8B0EDA.1090007@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 80566
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

>
>
>>
>>
>
>Great, let me guess, you must be another one of those lazy, anything goes,
>pot smoking liberals, from B.C., that lives off government handouts. How
>nice. I love paying the highest taxes in the civilized world. No wonder we
>can't get rid of the liberal dictatorship. Give the people pot to smoke,
>filth on TV, and the "F" word, what more could you ask for. At least the
>"Yanks" you call them, have a culture and respect their traditions. I can't
>say that for canaduh. If it weren't for the "Yanks", we would probably be
>speaking Russian. Now if the Americans would like to take over
>canadah........please!!!
>
>
>
>
That would eliminate the problem of having to patrol that long border.
Though
I don't know if any Al Qada people set up shop in Canada anyway. If
Quebec ever splits off like they almost did some years ago, sure, join us.
We could use the extra area. Be interesting to see if we could get sixty-
something stars on our flag....

992. Re: FCC relaxes it's prohibition on use of the "F-word" on broadcast media.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-13 20:47:07 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3F8B0F4A.8070608@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 80567
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.shortwave

New Q signals: QFU obvious
QFG fucking great signal

>
>
>
>

993. Re: FCC relaxes it's prohibition on use of the "F-word" on broadcast media.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-13 20:48:52 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3F8B0FB3.6000208@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 80568
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.shortwave

>
>
>
>The FCC did (!) in their 'official' decision. G
>
FCC now = Fucking Cunts and Cocks

;-)

994. Re: BPL endorsed by FCC, another threat to HF ham radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-13 21:03:01 UTC
From: Dave Shrader <david.shrader@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <9qEib.763353$uu5.132689@sccrnsc04>
Source record: 80569
Cross-posted to:
alt.ham-radio.hf,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,alt.ham-radio.packet,rec.radio.amateur.dx

Never mind California KWs!! You still can't hear anything!!

AK wrote:
> "Keith" <kilowattradio_spam@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:BXBcb.2841$RW4.2141@newsread4.news.pas.earthlink.net...
>
>>> Yes, well money talks and Morse Code HF Luddites walk. If there were a
>
> few million
>
>>active HF operators then maybe the FCC would listen, but Ham Radio is "old
>
> technology"
>
>>and BPL is a billion dollar industry.
>
>
> BPL should certainly boost KW and 10KW rf amplifier sales. Anything that
> will work through the power company noise. Could be a little tough on the
> neighbors, however. Especially since newer TVs seem to have less and less
> shielding.
> K4YKZ
>
>

995. Re: What makes a Pro code test Amateur a Troglodyte?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-13 21:17:33 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031013171733.10332.00001001@mb-m14.aol.com>
Source record: 80570

>That "crystal clear" statement doesn't speak to TESTING at all. It
>speaks to things like reliability, accuracy, speed, and efficiency of
>communications. In other words, issues surrounding the USE of the
>mode. That sort of official statement, along with the propensity of
>the Executive Director to publicly portray Morse USERS in a
>less-than-favorable light, creates impressions which run counter to
>your assertion above.
>
>I have separately petitioned the Board of Directors to make a single
>simple organizational change which would go MILES toward reinforcing
>your statement above. I'll await with interest the report of the next
>quarterly meeting of the Board of Directors.
>
>73, de Hans, K0HB
>NCI # 4303 http://www.nocode.org
>

Oh no your in trouble now, I ll bet you as we speak, your member number is
being discarded. If you had gotten permission to make the above statements with
Karls permission, you would have probably been OK.

996. Re: What makes a Pro code test Amateur a Troglodyte?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-13 21:20:32 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031013172032.10332.00001002@mb-m14.aol.com>
Source record: 80571

> As you know, I don't think Morse testing is any longer a regulatory
>> necessity, but I am very much a CW-lover and have a low-level (but
>> growing) concern that the end of Morse testing is only a first step on
>> some peoples agenda.
>>
>> 73, de Hans, K0HB
>
>Not mine, not NCI's, Hans ...
>
>Carl - wk3c
>
You finally got the picture.

997. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-13 21:21:51 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031013172151.10332.00001003@mb-m14.aol.com>
Source record: 80572

>By my best recollection there have been *maybe* about 6 or 7 who have
>upgraded, decided "I've got mine." and decided they wanted to keep the
>5 wpm ... out of thousands of NCI members.
>
>Carl - wk3c

Thousands, yea right, prove it?

998. Re: Reflections on rrap

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-13 21:25:23 UTC
From: Keith Hosman <log-remove-nospam-dshr@remove.bnnorth.nospam.net>
Message-ID: <hu5movkd573kdb7rgmdumove24iuoqqusa@4ax.com>
Source record: 80573

On 27 Sep 2003 11:01:42 GMT, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:

>In article <bklkfs$6ut@library1.airnews.net>, "Kim" <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
>writes:
>
>>> Kim, beer and BBQ?
>>>
>>
>>Oh good heavens, no! Pasta, or steak, and a glass of fine wine or a frozen
>>margarita.
>
>Cheeseburger in paradise, anyone?
>
>>Beer and BBQ is a Texan thing and, while I'll drink an ICE COLD
>>beer on a hot day outside--you won't find me outside much in the Summertime
>>around here. BBQ? It's OK.
>
>Wings and a Sam Adams. Or a Black & Tan.
>
>Hot roast beef sandwiches and a Genny Cream Ale or Guinness (drink your beer
>before it gets cold)
>
>Or the amateur radio ultimate: Anchovy pizza a la Grommethead Schulz.
>
>73 de Jim, N2EY
>

or if anyone is close to NW OH, or will be, I can make up a batch of
my award winning chili, drink some cold beer, and play radio.

73 de Keith
--
KC8TCQ
ARRL Member - ARES
SKYWARN

999. Re: What makes a Pro code test Amateur a Troglodyte?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-13 21:37:46 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0310131337.353df3fe@posting.google.com>
Source record: 80574

"Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
news:<hGgib.785$_i.73747@nnrp1.ptd.net>...
> "Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
> news:20031012000943.23307.00003682@mb-m29.aol.com...
> > In article <bma161$cg2@library2.airnews.net>, "Kim W5TIT"
> <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
> > writes:
> >
> > >Therein lies the problem with the whole CW test (TEST, *test*) debate.
> The
> > >minute one takes on the "no" CW test argument, it is generally met with
> an
> > >attitude that an end CW use (USE, *use*) is being favored or called for.
> >
> > Kim:
> >
> > Code testing has always been the thing which generated code use.
>
> I would assert that being forced to learn code to gain access to HF
> "soured" more people on code use than it encouraged ... of course,
> some percentage of folks decided they liked code and continued to
> use it, but MANY simply endured something they had no interest in
> to get past the test, then "threw away the key."
>
> Remember the old adage "honey is better than vinegar."

OK, fine, your opinion is well stated.

Now consider that same logic applied to the written test.

It could be asserted with equal logic that being forced to learn
theory and other subjects a ham is not interested in just to gain
access to amateur radio
"soured" more people on radio theory than it encouraged ... of course,
some percentage of folks decided they liked aspects of amateur radio
that they had not considered or known about before, but MANY simply
endured something they had no interest in to get past the test, then
"threw away the Handbook"

This isn't a straw argument. I've known hams who sold off their study
materials as soon as they passed the *written* tests.

Now some folks will say "But the writtens support the basis and
purpose of amateur radio as a technical service - there's even an ITU
recommendation" - etc. And of course all hams do need to know the
applicable regulations, safety and operating practices, so of course

the written test cannot be completely eliminated.

But has the existence of several tiers of written testing actually made hams "more technical"? Does being tested on how to compute complex impedances and Thevenin equivalents make a ham more likely to build equipment, experiment with new modes, participate in public service communication, be a VE and/or Elmer, and be a more friendly, helpful amateur? Does such testing make a ham less likely to commit rules violations?

From 1953 to 1968, US amateur radio had only two *effective* written tests - the Novice and the General/Conditional/Technician. Yes, the Extra existed, but it was a "prestige" license only, which granted no additional operating privileges at all. The 20 question Novice got new hams started, and the ~50 question General took care of the rest.

The reintroduction of "incentive licensing" in late 1968 was supposed to push hams to be "more technical" by requiring two more written tests beyond the General in order to get full privileges. But did that result happen?

Some might cite the 20 wpm code test for Extra, but in fact the most gain in privileges was made by upgrading to Advanced, which required no additional code test.

After 1990 (13 years ago), medical waivers allowed those with problems learning code past 5 wpm to get any class of amateur license on the basis of the 5 wpm code test alone. And since restructuring, we're down to just one additional written test beyond General for full privileges.

Has any of that made US hams or ham radio in the US "more technical" in the past 35 years? Or just the opposite? Does *forcing* someone to learn a little bit about radio theory make them want to build radios?

Hans, K0HB, has proposed a 2 level system that would be very similar to the old "pre-incentive" system. One easy test for newbies and a full privs test for everybody else. And like the old system, the newcomer license would not be renewable, so upgrading would effectively be *required*.

At first I though it was a "looney-tune" idea (to use Hans' phrase), but now I'm not so sure. Perhaps he is on to something.

FCC effectively reduced the number of written testing levels from 5 to 3 back in 2000. NCVEC is beginning to make noises that the Tech test is "too hard", and they also note that their "dump Element 1" petition is only a first step. Also, a look at the AH0A database shows a severe drop in new Techs since the new Tech Q&A pool was effective in mid-July.

If someone says we need less *written* testing and an *easier* entry level test (with suitably reduced privs), how can they be refuted?

If someone says "The only reason you Extras want people to have to pass all these *written* tests is because *you* had to!" - how can they be refuted?

How can Hans' proposal be refuted? There's nothing in the theory part of the Extra written that is required knowledge for the safe and legal operation of an amateur station on any authorized band or mode. And much of the regs in both the General and Extra exam are about what an Extra can do that a General can't.

Quite a number of hams today think that "incentive licensing" was a mistake. Quite a number of hams today think that the 1953-1968 era was a "golden age" that was ruined by the class divisions and forced learning/testing of incentive licensing.

Some people learn theory very easily, while for others it's a difficult process. People who would make excellent hams but who aren't good with numbers, science, and/or memorization of things like band edges may be being kept out, or kept from full access, by the *written* testing.

> > In the absence of a code testing requirement, there will be progressively
> > fewer hams who have never been exposed to learning the code as a
> > result of the requirement. Since the requirement was the principle
> > motivation to learn the code, code use *will* decline once code testing
> > is abolished. Therefore, testing and use are two closely interrelated
> > concepts.

Would anyone accept this argument, particlularly looking back over the past 35 years?:

'In the absence of multiple levels of theory testing, there will be progressively fewer hams who have been exposed to learning theory as a result of the tests. Since the test requirement was the principle motivation to learn the theory, the technical level of hams themselves and of amateur radio in general *will* decline. Therefore, testing and technical know-how are two closely interrelated concepts.'

Or how about this rebuttal:

Those who want technical knowhow in amateur radio are either unwilling to expend
the effort to (or incapable of *politely*) encourage people to "give the
theory a try and see if you like it." And, they are apparently unwilling to
take "No thanks, not interested" for an answer. Thus, they continue to
seek to have the FCC mandate an arguably counter-productive "recruiting
program" for them ...

--

Which approach is more effective for getting hams interested in technical subjects - the "honey" of demonstrations and examples, or the "vinegar" of forced testing beyond the minimum necessary for safe and legal operation of an amateur station?

73 de Jim, N2EY

1000. I warned everyone this would happen. Re: 73 Magazine Says "73 and QRT"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-13 21:43:16 UTC
From: You-can-sp@nk.it
Message-ID: <3f8b1be0$0$211$45beb828@newscene.com>
Source record: 80575
Cross-posted to:
rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

>"John Norfolk" <janorfolk@yahoo.com> wrote in message
>news:c6a70d55.0310101532.63b491f3@posting.google.com...
>> From the ARRL Letter October 10:
>>
>> 73 MAGAZINE SAYS "73 AND QRT"
>>
>> After completing 43 years of publication, 73 Amateur Radio Today
>> magazine is calling it quits. Plans to publish a joint
>> October/November issue fell through this week, and the September 2003
>> issue was the magazine's last. According to self-proclaimed "El
>> Supremo and Founder" Wayne S. Green II, W2NSD, it was a simple
>> matter of economics.

But Noooooo, you all said Restructuring and the no-code tech license were good ideas. Why will new hams and upgrades buy a radio magazine to increase their knowledge and radio skill? They won't! They don't care about ham radio. They want to stay stupid! Having a ham license doesn't mean anything to them because they didn't have to put in any effort to get it. It was handed to them.

HA. The ARRL plan to support dumbing down ham radio is going to back-fire on them. Heee Heee. They put free licenses in people hands but those people aren't buying memberships. QST will be going the way of 73! HA. Hiram Maxim is turning over in his grave.

Wouff Hong

1001. Re: I warned everyone this would happen. Re: 73 Magazine Says "73 and QRT"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-13 21:46:54 UTC
From: N8KDV <n8kdv@nospam.iserv.net>
Message-ID: <3F8B1D4E.82FAB606@nospam.iserv.net>
Source record: 80576
Cross-posted to:
rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

Wouff Hong wrote:

> >"John Norfolk" <janorfolk@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> >news:c6a70d55.0310101532.63b491f3@posting.google.com...
> >> From the ARRL Letter October 10:
> >>
> >> 73 MAGAZINE SAYS "73 AND QRT"
> >>
> >> After completing 43 years of publication, 73 Amateur Radio Today
> >> magazine is calling it quits. Plans to publish a joint
> >> October/November issue fell through this week, and the September 2003
> >> issue was the magazine's last. According to self-proclaimed "El
> >> Supremo and Founder" Wayne S. Green II, W2NSD, it was a simple
> >> matter of economics.
>
> But Noooooo, you all said Restructuring and the no-code tech license were
> good ideas. Why will new hams and upgrades buy a radio magazine to increase
> their knowledge and radio skill? They won't! They don't care about ham
> radio. They want to stay stupid! Having a ham license doesn't mean anything
> to them because they didn't have to put in any effort to get it. It was
> handed to them.
>
> HA. The ARRL plan to support dumbing down ham radio is going to back-fire on
> them. Heee Heee. They put free licenses in people hands but those people
> aren't buying memberships. QST will be going the way of 73! HA. Hiram
> Maxim is turning over in his grave.
>
> Wouff Hong

Ain't it the truth.

1002. Re: What makes a Pro code test Amateur a Troglodyte?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-13 21:49:20 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031013174920.12501.00003123@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 80578

In article <5ee63311.0310130634.23be2c51@posting.google.com>,
groupk0hb@earthlink.net (Hans K0HB) writes:

>"Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote
>
>> At any rate, so you're bringing up the scenario
>> that someone outside the FCC would bring up a petition to ban a mode.
>> Hmmmmmm, hadn't thought of that--but why? Why would anyone want to have a
>> mode banned? I mean, seriously, what would be gained?
>
>As to "what would be gained", that obviously depends on who is
>advancing the petition and what their agenda might be.
>
>There's another more contemporary example than the AM situation. On
>20M there is a small group of experimenters who are playing with
>something they call "enhanced SSB". This is regular old SSB, but
>these guys are enamored of excellent audio quality and spend a great
>deal of time (and money) modifying their radios and microphone/audio
>systems to gain the very best audio fidelity that they can manage.
>This results in bandwidth usage greater than typical SSB (nominally
>3KHz) but less than AM (nominally 6KHz).
>
>This operation, although it consists of only a small number of
>enthusiasts (perhaps less than 20 stations) and is situated on only
>one small segment of the HF bands, has been the subject of many
>complaints to the FCC (for occupying more bandwidth than necessary),
>and Hollingsworth has gone so far as to make note of it in a speech at
>a hamfest last winter. He warned that such use of the spectrum might
>lead to FCC rule changes.
>
>Now mind you, this "mode" uses less space than an AM signal conveying
>the same information. It logically follows that if this "mode" is
>banned for being spectrum-inefficient, then the
>even-more-spectrum-inefficient DSB AM mode probably would fall to the
>same regulatory action. (I'm not suggesting that FCC is always
>logical, however <grin>.)
>
>So back to your "Why would anyone want to have a mode banned?"
>question. Ask yourself why people have targeted a few stations on
>"enhanced SSB" (perhaps 4.5KHz wide), but do not complain about many
>more DSB AM stations on the bands (perhaps 6KHz wide)? Could it be
>that they simply have a personal agenda which is not evident from the
>facts?
>

>Now look at the persistent demeaning language here against Morse code
>users, and it doesn't take much imagination to expect that a "no more
>CW use" petition might show up at the Commission some day soon.

"Persistent demeaning language against morse code?!?"

That's quite biased, if not bigotted. If code-lovers want to be "in your face" about their alleged "superiority in radio" for that singular ability, and do so for years, and years before the Internet went public in 1991, then I think your language use is both biased and quite "loaded."

The PCTA constantly want to equate elimination of the code test with elimination of morse code as a mode. That shows two things: unjustified paranoia by code-lovers; a necessity to claim an old psychomotor skill in order to get them artificial status, rank, and privilege in amateur radio.

Since NO OTHER RADIO SERVICE involved in communications has retained morse codings as a primary mode of communications interchange, long-time radio amateurs desiring retention of a code test can only be seen in the light of demands that "others do as they did" to love, honor, and obey morse code in order to have them retain their rank, status, and privileges.

If a relatively small group of biased and bigotted old-timers insist that elimination of a federal TEST for morse code ability is "persistent demeaning language" in an open forum, publicly accessible, then there isn't much hope of "consensus" among the whole and certainly not conciliation.

There is only the capitulation of the majority to a minority's desire to accept "persistent demeaning language" as truth.

That is a selfish demand by those no longer "superior."

LHA

1003. Re: What makes a Pro code test Amateur a Troglodyte?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-13 21:49:21 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031013174921.12501.00003124@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 80577

In article <bmdt22$sse@library2.airnews.net>, "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
writes:

>"Hans K0HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
>news:5ee63311.0310121827.7191e44a@posting.google.com...
>> "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote

>> Spark transmissions were outlawed (as well they should have been) so
>> the precedent exists.
>
>Hmmmm, Jim/N2EY made that observation also. Then, I see the comment that
>spark was a transmission method--not a mode. I think that's splitting
>hairs, isn't it? I'm asking--I wasn't around for spark ;)

The ONLY way a "spark" transmitter could send anything called
communications information was by on-off keying.

Since "morse code" was already in practice and was totally
on-off keying, it was adopted as The "radio code."

The adoption of a long-existing (since 1844) LANDLINE code
says absolutely nothing about its efficacy in radio communications,
ability to "work through" or much else. On-off keying was
adopted simply because it was the ONLY WAY POSSIBLE for
early, primitive radio to allow communications. It's just
practical applied physics. Nothing else.

Doesn't settle your question, I know, but then I've not been shy
about making a particular subject point... :-)

LHA

1004. Re: FCC relaxes it's prohibition on use of the "F-word" on broadcast media.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-13 22:09:04 UTC
From: Gregg <nospam@unknown.org>
Message-ID: <4oFib.9425$x97.597@clgrps13>
Source record: 80579
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.shortwave

Behold, Robert Casey signalled from keyed 4-1000A filament:

> New Q signals: QFU obvious
> QFG fucking great signal

Hehehehe, added to my book Robert ;-)

--
Gregg
It's probably useful, even if it can't be SPICE'd
http://geek.scorpiorising.ca

1005. Re: BPL a reality in my area now!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-13 22:11:49 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <FqFib.1065$kx.771@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 80580

"BARF Trash" <fwankie@babyjackass.org> wrote in message
news:bmen2l$8ad$0@pita.alt.net...
> x-no-archive: yes
> "Frank Todd" <franktodd@comcast.net> wrote in message
> news:OEAib.114439$%h1.121961@sccrnsc02...
> > Dan/W4NTI wrote:
> > >
> > >
> > > Lets see now...3 to 22 Mhz.....80/75, 40, 30, 20, 17 and 15 meters
> turned
> > > into a wideband wasteland. With plans to expand to 12, 10, and six
> meters.
> > > Yep...thats a real good thing.
> > >
> > > We could all go to 160 and fight the 50/9 QRN most of the year, or 12
> and
> > > ten which are dead during the low of the cycle, which we are heading
> for.
> > >
> > > Yep, lots to look forward to.
> > >
> > > Dan/W4NTI
> > >
> > >
> > Dan,
> >
> > Why don't you be the first to QSY to those bands so we don't have to
> > listen to your crap on 20 and 75!
> >
>
> Hey Dan,
>
> you seem to agitate Little BARF Shit Fwankie every time you post
> something. Good Job! I like to see the little Fwankie Turd get
> his panties in a wad. Hey Fwankie, there's an email going
> around that you were the infamous Unlicensed Baby Pirate
> "Voice of the Night" in the early 90s? So your unlicensed
> career goes back before ham radio?
>
> Trash Radio - BARF/SJ
>
>
>

Lil Franky needs to back off, or some real facts will hit the fan.

Dan/W4NTI

1006. Re: FCC relaxes it's prohibition on use of the "F-word" on broadcast media.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-13 22:44:09 UTC
From: Bill <qzd@excite.com>
Message-ID: <FVFib.67242$AH4.11390@lakeread06>
Source record: 80581
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.shortwave

I was always under the impression that the word "$HIT" was considered more
indecent than the "F" word by the FCC.

Dr. Anton Phibes wrote:
> October 9, 2003
> F.C.C. Ruling Could Allow Use Of "F-word" On T.V.
> By Jon Hanian BOISE -
>
> In broadcasting, dropping the so called "F-bomb" goes
> over like an H-bomb. But the FCC has now ruled that
> the use of the "F-word" by U-2 frontman "Bono" at
> the Golden Globe awards **did not** violate federal
> indecency rules.
>
> The FCC rules say the use of the word must be "patently offensive"
> to be considered indecent. But the FCC ruled that when Bono
> received a Golden Globe award on television and
> said, "this is really f * * * * * * brilliant," he did not violate
> FCC rules. They ruled that the word was used as an adjective
> instead of a verb and therefore, while it may have been
> crude, it was not "patently offensive."
>
> If that FCC decision confuses you, think about how those
> of us in the media are trying to to interpret it.
>
> Dr. Rick Moore of the Boise State University Communications
> Department believes this decision will muddy the already
> muddy waters for broadcasters who struggle with what is
> acceptable and unacceptable speech. "I think it might give
> some people a sense of greater license to not be quite so
> tight on that bleep button as they have been in the past,"
> said Moore.
>
> At Idaho 2 News, General Manager Jeff Anderson says
> while the ruling may make an already murky situation
> murkier, KBCI TV will not air the F-word in any context.
> "We have an obligation to program in the public
> interest, and in my opinion broadcasting programming
> with that kind of language is inappropriate and we
> won't do it," he said.
>
> ---------------------------------
>

> (Story 2)
>
> FCC relaxes TV rules on use of f-word
> By Chris Baker
> THE WASHINGTON TIMES
>
> Remember comedian George Carlin's list of the seven dirty words you can't
> say on television?
>
> It just got a little shorter.
>
> The Federal Communications Commission ruled this month that
> Irish rocker Bono did not violate federal indecency rules when
> he used the f-word during an acceptance speech at the
> Golden Globe Awards, which NBC broadcast in January.
>
> "This is really, really [expletive] brilliant," Bono said during
> the ceremony, using the f-word as an adjective.
> The speech aired live on the East Coast. The FCC said it
> received 234 complaints, all but 17 of them from individuals
> associated with the Parents Television Council, a nonprofit
> group that monitors programs for adult content.
>
> The FCC rejected the complaints Oct. 3 in a written statement
> that used the f-word far more often than Bono did on the air.
> David H. Solomon, chief of the FCC's enforcement
> bureau, said the word "may be crude and offensive, but, in
> the context presented here, did not describe sexual or
> excretory organs and activities."
>
> That distinction is a key to test whether a statement meets
> a federal standard for broadcast indecency, according to FCC staffers.
> Mr. Solomon said in the ruling that Bono used the vulgarity as
> an adjective or to emphasize an exclamation and that "the use
> of specific words, including expletives or other 'four-letter words'
> does not render material obscene."
>
> Laura Mahaney, director of corporate and entertainment affairs for
> the Parents Television Council, has vowed an appeal. "The ruling
> is outrageous. It's splitting hairs," she said.
>
> Activists said they fear the FCC's ruling will allow the f-word
> and other vulgarities to become more common in prime-time television.
> "We're gradually getting to the point where nothing will be off-limits,"
> said Jim O'Connor, president of the Cuss Control Academy, a Lake
> Forest, Ill., group that advises individuals on ways to limit cursing.
> Spokesmen for NBC and the other major broadcast networks
> rejected the suggestion that the ruling will lead to more salty language in
> prime time.
>

> However, they acknowledge they face heavy competition from
> cable networks such as HBO and FX, which have more freedom
> to air edgy shows because they do not deliver programs over the
> FCC-regulated airwaves.
>
> The FCC's Enforcement Bureau issued the ruling on Bono's language.
> The five-member FCC panel did not vote on the matter.
> Commissioner Michael J. Copps, one of two Democrats on the
> panel, said he has not reviewed the case, but if it had come
> before him, he may not have dismissed the complaints.
> "I do believe under the right circumstances that a word in
> and of itself can be indecent without having to fit in
> with a wider context," he said.
>
> Six years ago, activists and the Clinton administration pushed the
> networks to adopt a content-ratings system that would enable V-chips
> to block programs parents deemed inappropriate.
> At the time, some network executives feared the ratings system
> would lead to bland scripts and cost them viewers.
> For the most part, broadcasters have continued to push the
> limits of decorum with programs such as "NYPD Blue," a pioneer
> in the use of four-letter words. The show crossed another line
> last season when ABC permitted writers to slip a coarse word
> for bull dung into an episode.
>
>
>

1007. Re: What makes a Pro code test Amateur a Troglodyte?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-13 23:02:48 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0310131502.3c2ddfc6@posting.google.com>
Source record: 80582

groupk0hb@earthlink.net (Hans K0HB) wrote in message
news:<5ee63311.0310130634.23be2c51@posting.google.com>...
> "Kim" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote
>
> > At any rate, so you're bringing up the scenario
> > that someone outside the FCC would bring up a petition to ban a mode.
> > Hmmmmmm, hadn't thought of that--but why? Why would anyone want to have a
> > mode banned? I mean, seriously, what would be gained?
>
> As to "what would be gained", that obviously depends on who is
> advancing the petition and what their agenda might be.

I recall the rallying cry "No setasides for legacy modes!"
>
> There's another more contemporary example than the AM situation. On
> 20M there is a small group of experimenters who are playing with
> something they call "enhanced SSB". This is regular old SSB, but
> these guys are enamored of excellent audio quality and spend a great
> deal of time (and money) modifying their radios and microphone/audio
> systems to gain the very best audio fidelity that they can manage.
> This results in bandwidth usage greater than typical SSB (nominally
> 3KHz) but less than AM (nominally 6KHz).

Some of them have been found using as much as 9 kHz of the band.
>
> This operation, although it consists of only a small number of
> enthusiasts (perhaps less than 20 stations) and is situated on only
> one small segment of the HF bands, has been the subject of many
> complaints to the FCC (for occupying more bandwidth than necessary),
> and Hollingsworth has gone so far as to make note of it in a speech at
> a hamfest last winter. He warned that such use of the spectrum might
> lead to FCC rule changes.

In part because of the time of day it was being done, and the
crowdedness of the band at the time.

But the main point was that transmitting audio frequencies above those
considered "communications quality" was "poor amateur operating
practice".

IIRC, anyway.
>
> Now mind you, this "mode" uses less space than an AM signal conveying
> the same information. It logically follows that if this "mode" is
> banned for being spectrum-inefficient, then the
> even-more-spectrum-inefficient DSB AM mode probably would fall to the

> same regulatory action. (I'm not suggesting that FCC is always
> logical, however <grin>.)

Excellent point! Indeed, spark was abandoned and eventually outlawed
in large part for being spectrum inefficient.

AM has repeatedly come under fire for the same reason. Besides the
additional spectrum used, there's also the heterodynes.
>
> So back to your "Why would anyone want to have a mode banned?"
> question. Ask yourself why people have targeted a few stations on
> "enhanced SSB" (perhaps 4.5KHz wide), but do not complain about many
> more DSB AM stations on the bands (perhaps 6KHz wide)? Could it be
> that they simply have a personal agenda which is not evident from the
> facts?

Another excellent point.

Perhaps they see a greater chance of success against a few stations
running "single wideband" than against the many who run AM.

Or perhaps they want to set a precedent. If they can get "single
wideband" banned for the "bad practice" of using more spectrum than
necessary....

AM defenders will say "But it's *not* the "same information" because
AM (DSB-with-carrier) quality is inherently better than SSB
(one-sideband-and-no-carrier) quality. But will that fly with FCC?
>
> Now look at the persistent demeaning language here against Morse code
> users, and it doesn't take much imagination to expect that a "no more
> CW use" petition might show up at the Commission some day soon.

Perhaps I shall compile a list...
>
> As you know, I don't think Morse testing is any longer a regulatory
> necessity, but I am very much a CW-lover and have a low-level (but
> growing) concern that the end of Morse testing is only a first step on
> some peoples agenda.
>
Exactly my concern. Stranger things have happened.

73 es well said Hans de Jim, N2EY

1008. Re: 73 Magazine Says "73 and QRT"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-13 23:07:49 UTC
From: JonJacobJingleHimerSchmidt <Thatsmynametoo@nospam.net>
Message-ID: <9fGib.553559$Oz4.501772@rwcrnsc54>
Source record: 80583
Cross-posted to:
rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

Wayne has always been a "rebel" from way back to the beginning of RTTY vs the FCC. Along with some of the pioneers of RTTY, Boyd Phelps, W0BP, Byron Kretzman, W2JTP, Merrill Swan, W6AEE and a few others. Those amateurs convinced the FCC to allow FSK keying instead of "make and break keying". Wayne got his writing start with CQ magazine as W2NSD's "Amateur Teletype" bi monthly column or before with a small RTTY newsletter in Cleveland, OH? Then on to assistant editor or editor of CQ magazine before breaking away and the creation of 73 magazine.

In 73's heyday the magazine was twice as thick as QST, with just about every ham related company or store advertising in the magazine. Some of the articles and columns were very informative. The "April fools" issue was really a great innovation for it's time. The one I remember the most was the burial of a dipole underground and the signal therefore would be "inverted" on the transmit end and one also needed a buried dipole to receive the "inverted" wave.

He exposed a ham store in the suburbs of Chicago called "Trigger Electronics" The store advertised the purchase of your "used gear", When the received check bounced at the banks from Trigger then hams wrote to Wayne and he personally looked into the store and it's business practices. Put "Trigger" out of business by exposure in 73 magazine editorials.

The magazine promoted two meter FM repeaters, maybe even lobbying for the hams before the FCC to relax the rules some for repeater operation?

I was behind Wayne at a Hamfest in the coffee and doughnut line where he was the featured speaker, he mumbled something about the price of the doughnuts and that they were to small for the price, but he took one anyway.

I heard in the later years that Wayne required a certain format for articles or columns and if the author did not follow the format, then the article or column did not get published.

Think a lot of the advertisers were leery of Wayne when he attacked the ARRL so often in the editorials and they dropped out in fear of QST removal of their advertisements in that magazine.

Somewhere along the way, Wayne got off on the wrong tangent and destroyed a good technical magazine.

So not all is bad about W2NSD, he has contributed to the amateur radio in ways that are behind the scenes.

Thanks Wayne for the "good years" when 73 was great.

JJJHS

1009. Re: FCC endorses BPL, another threat to ham radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-13 23:10:21 UTC
From: opcom <"e c c m "@s>
Message-ID: <xhGib.308$pV6.155@newssvr23.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 80585
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

Don't know about BPL, but VDSL goes from 138KHz to 12MHz and has 4096 tones. Not as much potential for a problem, as it's all twisted pair rather than power lines.

Frank Dresser wrote:
>
> "Walter Treftz" <penguino@atlantic.net> wrote in message
> news:3F73A355.BB10806B@atlantic.net...
> > Here's what we do --- we built a (legal) KW rig into a van, install a
> > vertical-
> > radiating antenna, cut out the roof and replace it with a fiberglass
> > sheet. Drive directly underneath a power line with BPL running. Run lots
> > of QSO's, and
> > have at it. We're legal. Induced RF just might make them think twice
> > about it.
> > Yes, I know Ashcrofts boys are reading this --- Hi, muthers -- I live at
> >
> > the callbook address. Bring some beer when you come visiting.
> > N4GL
> >
>
> Do you mean the way CBers made channel 5 unwatchable 25 years ago?
>
> I don't know much about BPL, but I think the TV analogy might hold. Given
> the bandwidth of BPL, there must be dozens, maybe hundreds of channels on
> the powerline. Can every one, or most of them, be wiped out? I'm thinking
> somebody came up with some pretty robust ways to deal with interference.
>
> But what if it does stop BPL? BPL isn't being backed because it's a
> technically elegant system. It's being backed by politics. Rural areas
> were critically important in the last Presidential election, and any
> candidiate would love to say something like "MY OPPONENT IS STOPPING ONE
> FORM OF HIGH SPEED INTERNET DISTRIBUTION ON BEHALF OF HIS PALS IN THE
> TELECOMMUNCATIONS INDUSTRY, BUT I PROMISE TO BRING IT IN, RIGHT ON YOUR
> POWER LINE, AS SOON AS I'M ELECTED!!" Of course, that would be a political
> misrepresentation, but politicans get away with worse every day. Politics
> turns into a numbers game.
>
> How many politicians or bureaucrats are saying anything negative about this
> goofy scheme? Politicians may not know physics, but they do know how to
> count.
>
> Frank Dresser

1010. Re: FCC endorses BPL, another threat to ham radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-13 23:10:32 UTC
From: opcom <"e c c m "@s>
Message-ID: <IhGib.309$pV6.71@newssvr23.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 80584
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

Don't know about BPL, but VDSL goes from 138KHz to 12MHz and has 4096 tones. Not as much potential for a problem, as it's all twisted pair rather than power lines.

Frank Dresser wrote:
>
> "Walter Treftz" <penguino@atlantic.net> wrote in message
> news:3F73A355.BB10806B@atlantic.net...
> > Here's what we do --- we built a (legal) KW rig into a van, install a
> > vertical-
> > radiating antenna, cut out the roof and replace it with a fiberglass
> > sheet. Drive directly underneath a power line with BPL running. Run lots
> > of QSO's, and
> > have at it. We're legal. Induced RF just might make them think twice
> > about it.
> > Yes, I know Ashcrofts boys are reading this --- Hi, muthers -- I live at
> >
> > the callbook address. Bring some beer when you come visiting.
> > N4GL
> >
>
> Do you mean the way CBers made channel 5 unwatchable 25 years ago?
>
> I don't know much about BPL, but I think the TV analogy might hold. Given
> the bandwidth of BPL, there must be dozens, maybe hundreds of channels on
> the powerline. Can every one, or most of them, be wiped out? I'm thinking
> somebody came up with some pretty robust ways to deal with interference.
>
> But what if it does stop BPL? BPL isn't being backed because it's a
> technically elegant system. It's being backed by politics. Rural areas
> were critically important in the last Presidential election, and any
> candidiate would love to say something like "MY OPPONENT IS STOPPING ONE
> FORM OF HIGH SPEED INTERNET DISTRIBUTION ON BEHALF OF HIS PALS IN THE
> TELECOMMUNCATIONS INDUSTRY, BUT I PROMISE TO BRING IT IN, RIGHT ON YOUR
> POWER LINE, AS SOON AS I'M ELECTED!!" Of course, that would be a political
> misrepresentation, but politicans get away with worse every day. Politics
> turns into a numbers game.
>
> How many politicians or bureaucrats are saying anything negative about this
> goofy scheme? Politicians may not know physics, but they do know how to
> count.
>
> Frank Dresser

1011. Re: FCC endorses BPL, another threat to ham radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-13 23:11:40 UTC
From: opcom <"e c c m "@s>
Message-ID: <3F8B4BB7.7E3A132B@nounwantedmail.swbell.net>
Source record: 80586
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

Don't know about BPL, but VDSL goes from 138KHz to 12MHz and has 4096 tones. Not as much potential for a problem, as it's all twisted pair rather than power lines.

Frank Dresser wrote:
>
> "Walter Treftz" <penguino@atlantic.net> wrote in message
> news:3F73A355.BB10806B@atlantic.net...
> > Here's what we do --- we built a (legal) KW rig into a van, install a
> > vertical-
> > radiating antenna, cut out the roof and replace it with a fiberglass
> > sheet. Drive directly underneath a power line with BPL running. Run lots
> > of QSO's, and
> > have at it. We're legal. Induced RF just might make them think twice
> > about it.
> > Yes, I know Ashcrofts boys are reading this --- Hi, muthers -- I live at
> >
> > the callbook address. Bring some beer when you come visiting.
> > N4GL
> >
>
> Do you mean the way CBers made channel 5 unwatchable 25 years ago?
>
> I don't know much about BPL, but I think the TV analogy might hold. Given
> the bandwidth of BPL, there must be dozens, maybe hundreds of channels on
> the powerline. Can every one, or most of them, be wiped out? I'm thinking
> somebody came up with some pretty robust ways to deal with interference.
>
> But what if it does stop BPL? BPL isn't being backed because it's a
> technically elegant system. It's being backed by politics. Rural areas
> were critically important in the last Presidential election, and any
> candidiate would love to say something like "MY OPPONENT IS STOPPING ONE
> FORM OF HIGH SPEED INTERNET DISTRIBUTION ON BEHALF OF HIS PALS IN THE
> TELECOMMUNCATIONS INDUSTRY, BUT I PROMISE TO BRING IT IN, RIGHT ON YOUR
> POWER LINE, AS SOON AS I'M ELECTED!!" Of course, that would be a political
> misrepresentation, but politicans get away with worse every day. Politics
> turns into a numbers game.
>
> How many politicians or bureaucrats are saying anything negative about this
> goofy scheme? Politicians may not know physics, but they do know how to
> count.
>
> Frank Dresser

1012. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-13 23:25:46 UTC
From: Clint <"rattlehead at computron dot net">
Message-ID: <vomd56dtaoqsb2@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 80587

> > >the club members here are fanatics in their support of code testing,
even
> to
> > >the point of openingly ridiculing Technicians who attend the meetings.
> >
> > That sort of behavior is unacceptable. Not "real ham" behavior.
>
> Unfortuneately, it is real ham behavior. Hopefully
> it is just an aberration of some hams...although we have
> seen such attitudes voiced in the newsgroups by
> more than one or two posters in the past.

and that's why it's only a matter of time before the code testing is gone.
The PCTA crowd doesn't help itself much when it presents itself with
such an air of arrogance and aggressiveness. One ham in here actually
expressed an interest in having special new call signs issued to the new
hams that upgrade without the code test when it's dropped from the
testing requirements so "the old ham crowd will know who *not* to
talk to"... now, just what do you think the new hams are going to think
of this kind of behavior? it's not a wonder at all that the PCTA side
of the issue is losing.

Clint

1013. Re: I warned everyone this would happen. Re: 73 Magazine Says "73 and QRT"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-13 23:30:40 UTC
From: Clint <"rattlehead at computron dot net">
Message-ID: <vomdedf2smpb53@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 80588
Cross-posted to:
rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

Just a *bit* of a stretch of logic there... I think you pro-code test types are having to dig as deep into the soot and dirt to come up with argument points now. It's a little difficult to believe that just a lack of interest in having a morse code profeciency test is to blame for a magazine not cutting it in a capitalist system.... they mentioned "a reason of economics".. ever thought that maybe it's just another product who's time has come and gone? Did you really think that the model-T would last forever and never be taken out of production?

Clint

--

"I want you to listen up and listen good. There's two things, there's right and there's wrong, you do the one or the other. You do the *one* and you're livin'; do the *other* and, well, you maybe walking around but you're dead as a beaver hat."

- John Wayne in character as Davy Crockett, "The Alamo"

--

"Wouff Hong" <You-can-sp@nk.it> wrote in message news:3f8b1be0$0$211$45beb828@newscene.com...
>
> >"John Norfolk" <janorfolk@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> >news:c6a70d55.0310101532.63b491f3@posting.google.com...
> >> From the ARRL Letter October 10:
> >>
> >> 73 MAGAZINE SAYS "73 AND QRT"
> >>
> >> After completing 43 years of publication, 73 Amateur Radio Today
> >> magazine is calling it quits. Plans to publish a joint
> >> October/November issue fell through this week, and the September 2003
> >> issue was the magazine's last. According to self-proclaimed "El
> >> Supremo and Founder" Wayne S. Green II, W2NSD, it was a simple
> >> matter of economics.
>
> But Noooooo, you all said Restructuring and the no-code tech license were
> good ideas. Why will new hams and upgrades buy a radio magazine to increase
> their knowledge and radio skill? They won't! They don't care about ham
> radio. They want to stay stupid! Having a ham license doesn't mean

anything
> to them because they didn't have to put in any effort to get it. It was
> handed to them.
>
> HA. The ARRL plan to support dumbing down ham radio is going to back-fire
on
> them. Heee Heee. They put free licenses in people hands but those people
> aren't buying memberships. QST will be going the way of 73! HA. Hiram
> Maxim is turning over in his grave.
>
>
>
> Wouff Hong
>
>

1014. Re: What makes a Pro code test Amateur a Troglodyte?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-13 23:33:47 UTC
From: Clint <"rattlehead at computron dot net">
Message-ID: <vomdk8t2498l86@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 80589

"Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
news:3F86EDAD.4010109@psu.edu...

>
> I would challenge the NCTA's to show some proof that those who believe
> that the morse code test should be retained are in a technical backwater.

Justify requireing a knowledge or profeciency test on using an old fashioned
buggy whip before giving out an modern day automobile driver's license.

Clint

1015. Re: What makes a Pro code test Amateur a Troglodyte?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-13 23:35:20 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bmfcud$qi2@library2.airnews.net>
Source record: 80591

"Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
news:3F8AB05B.2010601@psu.edu...
>
> What it tells me is that not many here care to have a "non-degraded
> "discussion.
>

Uh, not many here are *capable* of having a real discussion.

Kim W5TIT

1016. Re: New Acronym: ECTA (Era of Code Test Abolition)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-13 23:35:54 UTC
From: Clint <"rattlehead at computron dot net">
Message-ID: <vomdo775euu639@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 80590

> Jim:
>
> The truth is, only hams who know the Morse code have the capability
> to fall back on the CW mode when other modes are unavailable.

True.

Now explain why hams know how to use "other modes" when there isn't
a profeciency test to MAKE them do it in the first place.

Clint

1017. Re: 73 Magazine Says "73 and QRT"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-14 00:09:02 UTC
From: Biz WD=?ISO-8859-1?B?2A==?=HCO <wd0hco@ev1.net>
Message-ID: <BBB0A8CE.7E0E%wd0hco@ev1.net>
Source record: 80592
Cross-posted to:
rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

> The "April fools" issue
> was really a great innovation for it's time. The one I remember the
> most was the burial of a dipole underground and the signal therefore
> would be "inverted" on the transmit end and one also needed a buried
> dipole to receive the "inverted" wave.

I one I love was the "MAD Magazine" issue. The cover had ol Alfred E. Newman soldering a radio chassis with a big 300 watt soldering gun saying "What, me solder?" Inside the issue was "Ham versus Ham" comic strip which was a parody of "Spy Versus Spy". That whole issue had me in stitches for days.

QST used to be fun as well. Compare this month's issue from any one during the 40's, 50's, 60's and 70's.

The 80's and solid state electronics changed things.

Reading QST now is about as much fun as going to the dentist.

1018. Re: FCC relaxes it's prohibition on use of the "F-word" on broadcastmedia.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-14 00:15:16 UTC
From: Radioman <radio@ptt.edu>
Message-ID: <3F8B4014.83698EB1@ptt.edu>
Source record: 80593
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

> We could use the extra area. Be interesting to see if we could get sixty-
> something stars on our flag....

We can only have 52 states. That would be a full deck.

1019. Re: What makes a Pro code test Amateur a Troglodyte?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-14 00:15:32 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bmff9p$rm2@library2.airnews.net>
Source record: 80594

"Hans K0HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:5ee63311.0310130634.23be2c51@posting.google.com...
> "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote
>
> > At any rate, so you're bringing up the scenario
> > that someone outside the FCC would bring up a petition to ban a mode.
> > Hmmmmmm, hadn't thought of that--but why? Why would anyone want to have
a
> > mode banned? I mean, seriously, what would be gained?
>
> As to "what would be gained", that obviously depends on who is
> advancing the petition and what their agenda might be.
>
> There's another more contemporary example than the AM situation. On
> 20M there is a small group of experimenters who are playing with
> something they call "enhanced SSB". This is regular old SSB, but
> these guys are enamored of excellent audio quality and spend a great
> deal of time (and money) modifying their radios and microphone/audio
> systems to gain the very best audio fidelity that they can manage.
> This results in bandwidth usage greater than typical SSB (nominally
> 3KHz) but less than AM (nominally 6KHz).
>

Hmmm, wouldn't Part 5 of Title 47 be the governing body for this? And, in
Part 5, there is the following:

PART 5--EXPERIMENTAL RADIO SERVICE (OTHER THAN BROADCAST)--Table of Contents
Subpart B--Applications and Licenses
Sec. 5.77 Change in equipment and emission characteristics.
(a) A change may be made in a licensed transmitter without specific
authorization from the Commission provided that the change does not
result in operations inconsistent with any term of the outstanding
authorization for the station involved.

Along with the above, this section goes on to define certain emission
standards, etc. I was just now trying to find the spec on emission
standards (rules?) as they apply to bandwidth. Correct me if I'm wrong--the
topic and rules of experimentation are way outta my league...no pun
intended. Would the above pertain to experimentation in the amateur bands?

By the way, someone might want to clue these folks in to the Clear Speech
speaker. I bought one for my darlin' a few Father's Days ago and--hey--it
is amazing!

>
> This operation, although it consists of only a small number of

> enthusiasts (perhaps less than 20 stations) and is situated on only
> one small segment of the HF bands, has been the subject of many
> complaints to the FCC (for occupying more bandwidth than necessary),
>

Well, at least more bandwidth than those complaining want to allow, right?
I mean, the topic of bandwidth, or any rule that says "as necessary" is
pretty arbitrary, vague at worst.

>
> and Hollingsworth has gone so far as to make note of it in a speech at
> a hamfest last winter. He warned that such use of the spectrum might
> lead to FCC rule changes.
>

I think Hollingsworth interjects with personal opinion on a great many
things and likes to "threaten" with FCC rule changes accordingly. But, your
point is noted.

>
> Now mind you, this "mode" uses less space than an AM signal conveying
> the same information. It logically follows that if this "mode" is
> banned for being spectrum-inefficient, then the
> even-more-spectrum-inefficient DSB AM mode probably would fall to the
> same regulatory action. (I'm not suggesting that FCC is always
> logical, however <grin>.)
>

Well, no one is..."all" the time. :)

>
> So back to your "Why would anyone want to have a mode banned?"
> question. Ask yourself why people have targeted a few stations on
> "enhanced SSB" (perhaps 4.5KHz wide), but do not complain about many
> more DSB AM stations on the bands (perhaps 6KHz wide)? Could it be
> that they simply have a personal agenda which is not evident from the
> facts?
>

Gosh. That's a loaded question with lots of possiblities, including those
related to the culure and tradition of ham radio. Maybe folks feel better
about "attacking" something new than they do about "attacking" time-honored
traditions in ham radio? Then, there's what you said. Then, there's
personal differences.

>
> Now look at the persistent demeaning language here against Morse code
> users, and it doesn't take much imagination to expect that a "no more
> CW use" petition might show up at the Commission some day soon.
>

Absolutely true. I can understand why there would be the expectation of a
CW ban being petitioned for. And, I would even fully expect one to

surface--even soon. BUT, I really never thought that the FCC would entertain the idea to any end where the actual ban would take place. I would be so compelled on this issue that I would actually file a comment on it. And, I haven't been stirred by much to actually follow-through with a comment.

>
> As you know, I don't think Morse testing is any longer a regulatory
> necessity, but I am very much a CW-lover and have a low-level (but
> growing) concern that the end of Morse testing is only a first step on
> some peoples agenda.
>
> 73, de Hans, K0HB

Well, I agree that it may be on some peoples' agenda. But, I sure do hope the FCC wouldn't authorize such a thing.

Kim W5TIT

1020. Re: What makes a Pro code test Amateur a Troglodyte?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-14 00:35:27 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031013203527.08626.00001165@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 80595

In article <20031013174921.12501.00003124@mb-m04.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) writes:

>In article <bmdt22$sse@library2.airnews.net>, "Kim"
><kimscliff@yahoo.com>
>writes:
>
>>"Hans K0HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
>>news:5ee63311.0310121827.7191e44a@posting.google.com...
>>> "Kim" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote
>
>>> Spark transmissions were outlawed (as well they should have been) so
>>> the precedent exists.
>>
>>Hmmmm, Jim/N2EY made that observation also. Then, I see the comment that
>>spark was a transmission method--not a mode. I think that's splitting
>>hairs, isn't it? I'm asking--I wasn't around for spark ;)
>
> The ONLY way a "spark" transmitter could send anything called
> communications information was by on-off keying.

While that's true, there were other types of transmitters on the air even before WW1. Arc transmitters and Alexanderson alternators were two types. Transmitters using tubes were in use well before 1920.

The practical transmission of voice and music by radio was demonstrated as early as 1906.

> Since "morse code" was already in practice and was totally
> on-off keying, it was adopted as The "radio code."

Was that a bad thing?

> The adoption of a long-existing (since 1844) LANDLINE code
> says absolutely nothing about its efficacy in radio communications,
> ability to "work through" or much else.

Actually, the code used in radio is different than the code used in landline work.

The efficacy of Morse code when applied to radio has been demonstrated many, many times over the past century-plus. Radio amateurs continue to demonstrate it every day.

> On-off keying was
> adopted simply because it was the ONLY WAY POSSIBLE for

> early, primitive radio to allow communications. It's just
> practical applied physics. Nothing else.

And it works very well.

Even after the invention of other methods of transmission, the use of Morse code continued.
>
> Doesn't settle your question, I know, but then I've not been shy
> about making a particular subject point... :-)

What point is that?

1021. Re: What makes a Pro code test Amateur a Troglodyte?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-14 00:49:03 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031013204903.12300.00001142@mb-m20.aol.com>
Source record: 80596

In article <c2356669.0310131337.353df3fe@posting.google.com>, N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) writes:

>"Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
>news:<hGgib.785$_i.73747@nnrp1.ptd.net>...
>> "Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
>> news:20031012000943.23307.00003682@mb-m29.aol.com...
>> > In article <bma161$cg2@library2.airnews.net>, "Kim W5TIT"
>> <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
>> > writes:
>> >
>> > >Therein lies the problem with the whole CW test (TEST, *test*) debate.
>> The
>> > >minute one takes on the "no" CW test argument, it is generally met with
>> an
>> > >attitude that an end CW use (USE, *use*) is being favored or called for.
>> >
>> > Kim:
>> >
>> > Code testing has always been the thing which generated code use.
>>
>> I would assert that being forced to learn code to gain access to HF
>> "soured" more people on code use than it encouraged ... of course,
>> some percentage of folks decided they liked code and continued to
>> use it, but MANY simply endured something they had no interest in
>> to get past the test, then "threw away the key."
>>
>> Remember the old adage "honey is better than vinegar."
>
>OK, fine, your opinion is well stated.
>
>Now consider that same logic applied to the written test.
>
>It could be asserted with equal logic that being forced to learn
>theory and other subjects a ham is not interested in just to gain
>access to amateur radio
>"soured" more people on radio theory than it encouraged ... of course,
>some percentage of folks decided they liked aspects of amateur radio
>that they had not considered or known about before, but MANY simply
>endured something they had no interest in to get past the test, then
>"threw away the Handbook"

Sorry, that cannot "be asserted with equal logic."

First of all, that analogy is reduced to the absurd.

Amateur radio IS involved with electronics technology and ALL
radio amateurs are responsible for their amateur stations'
technical requirements. Ergo, the regulatory tool of licensing
MUST concern itself with radio-electronics technical knowledge
to prove competency and responsibility to the Commission.

Radio-electronics technical cognizance is NOT on any trial.
What IS on trial is a test for one MODE of transmission, on-off
keying morse code.

>This isn't a straw argument. I've known hams who sold off their study
>materials as soon as they passed the *written* tests.

Irrelevant as to the subject of retention or elimination of the code
test for an amateur radio license.

>Now some folks will say "But the writtens support the basis and
>purpose of amateur radio as a technical service - there's even an ITU
>recommendation" - etc. And of course all hams do need to know the
>applicable regulations, safety and operating practices, so of course
>the written test cannot be completely eliminated.
>
>But has the existence of several tiers of written testing actually
>made hams "more technical"? Does being tested on how to compute
>complex impedances and Thevenin equivalents make a ham more likely to
>build equipment, experiment with new modes, participate in public
>service communication, be a VE and/or Elmer, and be a more friendly,
>helpful amateur? Does such testing make a ham less likely to commit
>rules violations?

Try stating your position instead of raising a number of questions
which do not take any side.

>From 1953 to 1968, US amateur radio had only two *effective* written
>tests - the Novice and the General/Conditional/Technician. Yes, the
>Extra existed, but it was a "prestige" license only, which granted no
>additional operating privileges at all. The 20 question Novice got new
>hams started, and the ~50 question General took care of the rest.

1953 to 1968 was 50 to 35 years ago. Approximately 2 generations.

>The reintroduction of "incentive licensing" in late 1968 was supposed
>to push hams to be "more technical" by requiring two more written
>tests beyond the General in order to get full privileges. But did that
>result happen?

It was quite obvious to all that "incentive licensing" was really all
about gaining status, rank, privileges in an avocational, recreative
activity. THAT part of "incentive licensing" DID happen. It also
boosted the already-growing class distinction artificiality in U. S.
amateur radio.

>Some might cite the 20 wpm code test for Extra, but in fact the most
>gain in privileges was made by upgrading to Advanced, which required

>no additional code test.

Incomplete summation or example.

>After 1990 (13 years ago), medical waivers allowed those with problems
>learning code past 5 wpm to get any class of amateur license on the
>basis of the 5 wpm code test alone. And since restructuring, we're
>down to just one additional written test beyond General for full
>privileges.
>
>Has any of that made US hams or ham radio in the US "more technical"
>in the past 35 years? Or just the opposite? Does *forcing* someone to
>learn a little bit about radio theory make them want to build radios?

Did it or didn't it? Are you making a speech or are you posing as
a lecturer at some seminar involving avocations?

Nothing in current or past FCC regulations REQUIRES "building
radios." The Commission allows the OPTION of doing so while
nearly all other radio services require type-accepted radio
transmitters.

The Commission is NOT REQUIRED to be supportive or booster
of any particular past or present-day specific activity or mode.

The Commission's ONLY lawful actions are to regulate ALL U.S.
civil radio and interstate electronic communications as well as to
mitigate interference matters.

>Hans, K0HB, has proposed a 2 level system that would be very similar
>to the old "pre-incentive" system. One easy test for newbies and a
>full privs test for everybody else. And like the old system, the
>newcomer license would not be renewable, so upgrading would
>effectively be *required*.

If Hans kohb's proposal/petition is before the Commission, then ALL
are free to comment on it THERE.

>At first I though it was a "looney-tune" idea (to use Hans' phrase),
>but now I'm not so sure. Perhaps he is on to something.
>
>FCC effectively reduced the number of written testing levels from 5 to
>3 back in 2000. NCVEC is beginning to make noises that the Tech test
>is "too hard", and they also note that their "dump Element 1" petition
>is only a first step. Also, a look at the AH0A database shows a severe
>drop in new Techs since the new Tech Q&A pool was effective in
>mid-July.

If you wish "looney tunes" entertainment, then try to read RM-10808
seriously. It is proposed by none other than AH0A.

"Beginning to make noises" is a subjective observation of yours.

If you wish to have a written amateur test element set with more
difficulty, you are absolutely free to submit your proposal to the
Commission, have them issue an RM, and then cry in public
newsgroups later because your proposal does not meet enough
acceptance.

>If someone says we need less *written* testing and an *easier* entry
>level test (with suitably reduced privs), how can they be refuted?

Just say NO...and with some supporting evidence. That is what
the FCC Electronic Comment Filing System is for, senior.

>If someone says "The only reason you Extras want people to have to
>pass all these *written* tests is because *you* had to!" - how can
>they be refuted?

The same as above.

>How can Hans' proposal be refuted? There's nothing in the theory part
>of the Extra written that is required knowledge for the safe and legal
>operation of an amateur station on any authorized band or mode. And
>much of the regs in both the General and Extra exam are about what an
>Extra can do that a General can't.

What IS your problem, senior?

Do you NEED rank, status, privilege in a hobby activity to "prove"
yourself to the rest of the world?

>Quite a number of hams today think that "incentive licensing" was a
>mistake. Quite a number of hams today think that the 1953-1968 era was
>a "golden age" that was ruined by the class divisions and forced
>learning/testing of incentive licensing.
>
>Some people learn theory very easily, while for others it's a
>difficult process.

Theory is not for everyone.

>People who would make excellent hams but who aren't
>good with numbers, science, and/or memorization of things like band
>edges may be being kept out, or kept from full access, by the
>*written* testing.

Define "excellent hams" in terms other than your own standards
OR the emotionally-laden phraseology from Newington.

Amateur radio is an avocation, a recreational activity involving radio not
done for pecuniary reasons. There are NO federal regulations specifying
particular mindsets, imaginary group patriotism, or oaths of fealty to
certain organizations.

>> > In the absence of a code testing requirement, there will be progressively
>> > fewer hams who have never been exposed to learning the code as a
>> > result of the requirement. Since the requirement was the principle

>> > motivation to learn the code, code use *will* decline once code testing
>> > is abolished. Therefore, testing and use are two closely interrelated
>> > concepts.
>
>Would anyone accept this argument, particlularly looking back over the
>past 35 years?:

Why do you ask? Get to the point, senior.

>'In the absence of multiple levels of theory testing, there will be
>progressively fewer hams who have been exposed to learning theory as a
>result of the tests.

Unproven subjective supposition.

Radio transmission IS a technological activity. The Commission does
NOT require any sort of high level of theoretical knowledge...and they
do NOT require a large number of questions on theory on any written
test. In fact, the Commission DOES NOT SPECIFY THE NUMBER
OF SPECIFIC QUESTION SUBJECTS on the written test.

>Since the test requirement was the principle
>motivation to learn the theory, the technical level of hams themselves
>and of amateur radio in general *will* decline. Therefore, testing
>and technical know-how are two closely interrelated concepts.'

Irrelevant and illogical. There is NO periodic "re-testing" for any
amateur radio license class. Pass it ONCE and it does not have
to be taken unless the decade-long renewal period has past.

You have NOT proved any "close interrelationships" since that is
not a subject, is not currently done, nor is it anything from "noises."

>Which approach is more effective for getting hams interested in
>technical subjects - the "honey" of demonstrations and examples, or
>the "vinegar" of forced testing beyond the minimum necessary for safe
>and legal operation of an amateur station?

It is not a requirement or function of the Commission to take on a
role of encouragement in anything but legal compliance with
regulations insofar as amateur radio is concerned.

The thread subject contains the words "Code Test." Try to stay
somewhat closer than a geosynchronous orbit distance from it.

Try concentrating on "Code Test" instead of misdirecting into far-field
irrelevant subjects.

LHA

1022. Re: BPL a reality in my area now!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-14 00:51:29 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0310131651.581854f6@posting.google.com>
Source record: 80598
Cross-posted to: alt.ham-radio,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:<bmd4nr$b4s$0@208.206.142.109>...

> >> You raise an interesting question, Carl. How exactly should the
> >>average ham go about proving that the RFI is indeed BPL, when the BPL
> >>people say
> >>"That's not us!'??
> >>
> > >
> > >
> > > BPL has a unique "signature" (in the spectral/time domains) that can be
> > > used to ID it.
> > >
> > > Since there are different systems (SS from main.net and OFDM from Amperion,
> > > for example) they have different signatures, which are distinct from other
> > > sources
> > > of interference and more traditional power line noise (of course the
> > > utilities are
> > > responsible for fixing the latter, too ... though their record is poor).
> >
> >
> > So to repeat, how does the average ham, whom you have exhorted to
> > "make sure it's BPL that you're complaining about", go about detecting
> > and sorting which is what, given that spectral analysis gear, and the
> > training to use it if it was available, is virtually nonexistnt in the
> > average hamshack? Is there a aural signature or more than one for the
> > different BPL modes? Is the Emmaus test site video/audio clip
> > reresentative enough to make the call, or is something more needed?

There's no mistaking the BPL signals in the Emmaus test area which are
SS although there's some discussion on that point. I didn't know what
to look for on my first pass through Emmaus and found all sorts of
crud particularly in the extensive commercial area. But I found a very
odd-sounding strong clicking noise in the area around the Emmaus High
School and reported it to Carl and Ed Hare who then told me the stuff
sounds like geiger-counter clicks. So I'd nailed it out of the chute
with just my little TS-50 HF mobile xcvr and a 2M magmaount whip. I've
probably heard every form of QRN/QRM out there by now and there is
no mistaking the BPL in use in Emmaus. The stuff grabs yer AGC and
it's all over.

The ARRL audio tracks and files don't do it justice, the spikes it
kicks out are too sharp and short to be captured properly with the
consumer-level digital recording/playback equipment used to generate

the recordings. OFDM is another form of the beast which I haven't
personally tuned on-site yet but the ARRL recordings ought to give you
the drift.

> I expect that if it was indeed BPL RFI it would follow the power grid
> pretty closely with signal strength highest when close, and tapering off
> with distance away from the lines. But from the one report posted here
> of a ham who said he heard it from a distance of 60 miles, seems like
> propagation will play into the picture-to be expected at HF as all
> experienced HF ham operators know. Or maybe *he* mis-identified it!
>
> So who do hams call for assistance, the ARRL? I haven't seen anything
> from them suggesting that.

Unfortunately the only help available is via the FCC and the ARRL is
beating the FCC into the ground over this one.

> I seriously doubt the economics of BPL will ever bring it where I
> live, even if it is approved, but others need to know.

w3rv

1023. Re: FCC relaxes it's prohibition on use of the "F-word" on broadcast media.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-14 01:02:40 UTC
From: Dave Bushong <dbushong@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <QWHib.108156$qj6.4341191@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 80599
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

Where the hell do you think the 9/11 hijackers came through?

Robert Casey wrote:

>>
>>
>>>
>>
>>
>> Great, let me guess, you must be another one of those lazy, anything
>> goes,
>> pot smoking liberals, from B.C., that lives off government handouts. How
>> nice. I love paying the highest taxes in the civilized world. No
>> wonder we
>> can't get rid of the liberal dictatorship. Give the people pot to smoke,
>> filth on TV, and the "F" word, what more could you ask for. At least the
>> "Yanks" you call them, have a culture and respect their traditions. I
>> can't
>> say that for canaduh. If it weren't for the "Yanks", we would probably be
>> speaking Russian. Now if the Americans would like to take over
>> canadah........please!!!
>>
>>
>>
>>
> That would eliminate the problem of having to patrol that long border.
> Though
> I don't know if any Al Qada people set up shop in Canada anyway. If
> Quebec ever splits off like they almost did some years ago, sure, join us.
> We could use the extra area. Be interesting to see if we could get sixty-
> something stars on our flag....
>

1024. A New Concept: Virtual Spectrum

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-14 01:27:32 UTC
From: David Stinson <arc5@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3F8B4D6D.31D19695@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 80600
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.antiques.radio+phono,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc

Thanks for reading this.
I have today submitted an article to QST magazine entitled
"Virtual Spectrum: Beating BPL at its own game,"
detailing a concept that can greatly impact our radio hobby.
I wanted to "put down a marker" to date the introduction
of a new ham-radio innovation, and to officially place
the idea in the public domain, so the maximum amount of
"tinkering" with it can happen.

This concept uses the bandwidth available on the Internet
and some simple circuitry to create a replica of a segment of
the radio spectrum, stream it live or prerecorded to another
internet-connected computer and reconstruct that radio spectrum
at your location. *Any* radio equipment you wish to use
(given an Internet connection with sufficent bandwidth)-
from modern PSK-31 rigs, SSB nets, WW-II modulated oscillators
all the way back to ancient spark transmitters
with crystal receivers; all can legally communicate just as though
you were on-the-air. The system is bi-directional, allowing
QSOs between stations that normally could not communicate.
If you can't hear weak signals because of noise in your area,
the concept allows you to build a "remote front end" and
transport the radio spectrum in a quiet area right to your rig,
bypassing the problems in your location.

I believe this concept can be the answer to BPL, "noise holes,"
antenna restrictions, HF "jammers" and many other obstacles to
using our radios. There is great potential for many uses,
and a possible niche market for someone with the resources
to develop the equipment.
I have already built prototype equipment to prove the concept
and it works splendidly. The article includes construction
details. The circuits are simple and you can get
95% of the parts at Radio Shack.
By the time QST publishes (assume they accept the work),
we should have completed the first Virtual Spectrum QSO:
two World War 2 BC-611 handie-talkies (output: about 60 milliwatts)
will communicate over a path of about 2000 miles.

If QST does not publish the concept,
I will publish it myself on the web
immediatly after hearing from them.
I am indebted to Mike Hanz, aafradio@cox.net

for invaluable suggestions and encouragement.

TNX ES 73 DE Dave Stinson AB5S

1025. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-14 01:32:57 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <dnlib.48850$mQ2.26698@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 80651

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20031013083028.14837.00003579@mb-m03.aol.com...
> In article <344ib.32457$mQ2.19944@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Bill
> Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
>
> >> The ARRL/READEX survey showed that a majority favored code testing, and
> >that
> >> the youngest age group was the most strongly procodetest.
> >
> >When was the survey done?
>
> Late 1996. Results in Feb 1997 QST
>
> >If it is more than two years old, it
> >is almost useless as there has been significant change
> >over the last few years.
>
> What significant change? How do we know what the change has been since
> restructuring?

Common sense. Ever since the initial discussion of
nocode, every time any actual survey has been done the
results have been less in favor of keeping code. I
sincerly doubt that shift has stopped. Can I prove it? No,
but I'm confident that's were it is going.

> At least a few hams have publicly renounced their NCI membership here,
saying
> that 5 wpm was the right level and they could not support complete code
test
> elimination. Maybe they're an anomaly - maybe not.
> >
> >> The comments to 98-143 were categorized by an NCI staffer (disproving
any
> >> possible claim of bias by procodetest evaluation of the comments) and
the
> >> resutls showed that the *majority* of commenters not only wanted
continued
> >> code
> >> testing, but wanted at least 2 code test speeds. This was true despite
an
> >> email
> >> campaign by NCI to get as many comments in support of their position of
5
> >> wpm and sunset clause.

> >
> >Now it also must be pointed out that for the initial several weeks
> >during 98-143 comment phase, those commenting were not
> >aware of the position being put forth by NCI.
>
> So? Anyone could revise their comments. And the comment period was
extremely
> long, so time wasn't a factor.

True, but many probably didn't. In the end, it makes no
difference.

> >How many people
> >at the time may who said they support ARRLs stance
> >may have supported NCI's position will never be known.
>
> Sounds like straw-grasping to me, Bill. Suppose FISTS had jumped in with a
> proposal? Suppose ARRL had gone for 5/13/20 wpm? Etc.

Again, at this time, the percentages make no difference.

> >Even
> >so, the issue is NOT to be decided by any "vote" or majority opinion
> >of any group or even the public at large. The decision will be,
> >as it should be, based on what should be proper regulatory
> >setting of licensing requirments.
>
> I'll bet that if the majority opinion had been "5 wpm and drop it
completely as
> soon as the treaty allows" we'd no longer have Element 1. And if there had
been
> a bigger majority for testing greater than 5 wpm, we'd have that, too.

Wishful thinking?

> >> Of course things may have changed since then. But for someone to claim,
> >> without
> >> more recent evidence, that most hams want code testing to disappear is
> >> simply wishful thinking.
> >> >
> >> > Strange, the news doesn't indicate any group of young people
> >> > demonstrating for the retention of the amateur license code test.
> >> > Nor the elimination of the amateur license code test.
> >>
> >> Irrelevant.
> >
> >Good, since I believe it was you that mentioned that fact
> >in the first place. If it is irrelevent, why bring it up?
>
> I did not mention anything about young people "demonstrating". Len did.

My error then, sorry.

> My point was that the strongest majority of procodetest folks was the
youngest
> age group - according to the survey, anyway.
> >
> >> > Why do you say things about the "young hams" that you know not
> >> > of?
> >>
> >> The evidence of the survey is clear. You can "stick head and eyes in
the
> >> sand" but it is still there.
> >
> >Again, what is the date of that survey?
> >
> 1996

Thanks,

Bill K2UNK

1026. Re: FCC relaxes it's prohibition on use of the "F-word" on broadcast media.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-14 01:35:09 UTC
From: Dave Bushong <dbushong@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <hplib.108174$qj6.4375892@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 80652
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

David wrote:

> It's about fucking time. The word has 100 usages and about 3 of them
> refer to sex.

I fucking hate to follow up a non-ham-radio posting on a fucking ham radio newsgroup, but (groups trimmed) this really fucking *is* about ham radio. I use that particular word in casual conversation more often than I did 20 years ago. I do, however, keep it G-rated on the air, by personal fucking preference.

I don't think I ever use that word to "describe sexual or excretory organs and activities". There are actually much better words for that, and in fact, many of them are patently non-offensive.

"Come" is a good example. "Blow" is another. "Dick" is a man's name. My grandmother, for example, uses those words in a non-offensive context all the time.

The only time she says "fuck" is when the woman next to her yells "BINGO".

73,
Dave
KZ1O

1027. Re: What makes a Pro code test Amateur a Troglodyte?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-14 01:41:09 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <Vulib.48857$mQ2.5060@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 80653

"Hans K0HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:5ee63311.0310130655.3b0c6b13@posting.google.com...
> "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote
>
> > Yet AM is still allowed.
> >
>
> Yes, it certainly is. But for how long?

Good question, but it has been some 40+ years since SSB
pretty much took over as the HF mode...and there's still no
call for any ban of AM.

> Riley Hollingsworth told a Richmond, Virginia hamfest last spring
> (speaking of "enhanced SSB") that deliberately operating a wideband
> mode in a crowded spectrum is "shortsighted and rude," may be ignoring
> the "minimum bandwidth necessary" rule. Now if 4.5KHz-wide signals are
> shortsighted and rude, then it logically follows that 6KHz-wide AM
> signals containing the same information are even more shortsighted and
> rude.
>
> He also hinted that continued complaints "WILL (my emphasis) lead to
> pressure on the FCC to revise the Amateur Service rules." Would you
> expect DSB AM to survive such revision?

Not if such DSB AM was in any way a significant percentage
of use on the air. That sure doesn't seem to be the case at
all, however.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1028. Re: 73 Magazine Says "73 and QRT"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-14 01:43:01 UTC
From: "Michael A. Terrell" <mike.terrell@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3F8B5496.5684F5DF@earthlink.net>
Source record: 80654
Cross-posted to:
rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

Michael Black wrote:
>
> Art Harris (n2ah@hotmail.com) writes:
> > "Capt. Blackflag" wrote:
> >
> >> > 73 MAGAZINE SAYS "73 AND QRT"
> >> >
> >> > After completing 43 years of publication, 73 Amateur Radio Today
> >> > magazine is calling it quits. Plans to publish a joint
> >> > October/November issue fell through this week, and the September 2003
> >> > issue was the magazine's last.
> >
> > Last week on eBay, someone listed a 1-year subscription to "73" for
> > $9. There were no takers.
> >
> > Art N2AH
>
> I wonder how many lifetime subscribers this will affect?
>
> If I'm remembering right, fairly early on Wayne sold them, and they
> were $37. In 1973, he sold them for $73. I think he continued to
> sell them for some time after that; I have a recollection of a $150
> life time subscription, but that's a more vague memory.
>
> Were the lifetime subscriptions honored for all that time? How many
> of them abandoned the magazine. explicitly telling 73 they didn't
> want anymore issues, or just not providing a new address when moving?
> How many who did buy a lifetime subscription were still alive by this
> month?
>
> Michael VE2BVW

He offered a lifetime subscription to Byte and later, to Kilobaud for
$150. I paid the $150 for Byte. After it was sold, I was notified my
subscription had expired. I sent a photo copy of the canceled check,
marked, "Lifetime subscription." They sent them for another year, then
pulled the same stunt, and refused to honor the contract. I have never
bought anything from the publisher, since they screwed me.
--

Michael A. Terrell
Central Florida

1029. Re: FCC relaxes it's prohibition on use of the "F-word" on broadcast media.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-14 01:52:23 UTC
From: Dave Bushong <dbushong@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <rFIib.108180$qj6.4380311@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 80655
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.shortwave

Ron Hardin wrote:

> Dr. Anton Phibes wrote:
>
>>"This is really, really [expletive] brilliant," Bono said during
>> the ceremony, using the f-word as an adjective.
>>The speech aired live on the East Coast. The FCC said it
>>received 234 complaints, all but 17 of them from individuals
>>associated with the Parents Television Council, a nonprofit
>>group that monitors programs for adult content.
>
>
> That's an adverb, not an adjective.

Actually, "brilliant" is the direct object of the sentence, which by definition, is a noun, so that particular modifier is an adjective, and not an adverb. "This" is the subject, "is" is the verb, 3PS of "to be", and the sentence is actually not grammatically correct, so there are some problems deciding what part each word performs, or the fucking intent. When you have an illiterate moron musician trying to speak the King's English, you get "This is really, really, fucking brilliant." What the fuck does that mean? Is there, perchance, a light in his eyes that makes him unable to read the fucking teleprompter?

If he were to have said "This is really, really fucking brilliantly done", then 'fucking' would have been modifying an adverb, which still makes it an adjective. The only other uses of "fucking" would be either present participle ("Bubba is fucking his new cellmate"), or gerund (a noun formed from a verb, such as "I enjoy fucking", or maybe the classic failed Minnie Mouse insanity defense, during their divorce proceeding, where Mickey tells the Judge that Minnie is "fucking Goofy."

(anyone interested in this stuff, go to
http://www.uottawa.ca/academic/arts/writcent/hypergrammar/verbals.html
)

73,
Dave
KZ1O

1030. Re: What makes a Pro code test Amateur a Troglodyte?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-14 01:52:56 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <YFIib.48865$mQ2.42713@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 80656

"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
news:c2356669.0310131337.353df3fe@posting.google.com...
> "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
news:<hGgib.785$_i.73747@nnrp1.ptd.net>...
> > "Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
> > news:20031012000943.23307.00003682@mb-m29.aol.com...
> > > In article <bma161$cg2@library2.airnews.net>, "Kim W5TIT"
> > <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
> > > writes:
> > >
> > > >Therein lies the problem with the whole CW test (TEST, *test*)
debate.
> > The
> > > > >minute one takes on the "no" CW test argument, it is generally met
with
> > an
> > > > >attitude that an end CW use (USE, *use*) is being favored or called
for.
> > >
> > > Kim:
> > >
> > > Code testing has always been the thing which generated code use.
> >
> > I would assert that being forced to learn code to gain access to HF
> > "soured" more people on code use than it encouraged ... of course,
> > some percentage of folks decided they liked code and continued to
> > use it, but MANY simply endured something they had no interest in
> > to get past the test, then "threw away the key."
> >
> > Remember the old adage "honey is better than vinegar."
>
> OK, fine, your opinion is well stated.
>
> Now consider that same logic applied to the written test.
>
> It could be asserted with equal logic that being forced to learn
> theory and other subjects a ham is not interested in just to gain
> access to amateur radio
> "soured" more people on radio theory than it encouraged ... of course,
> some percentage of folks decided they liked aspects of amateur radio
> that they had not considered or known about before, but MANY simply
> endured something they had no interest in to get past the test, then
> "threw away the Handbook"

Yet no one has apparently made that pitch, and no
one is petitioning to end written tests either. Bottom
line, the requirement for some technical knowledge is
coupled to the freedom ALL US hams have to build,
modify and/or repair their own equipment...even if they
never want to. The knowledge is expected to help
hams stay within tolerences and signal characteristics
allowed because failing to do so can/will lead to
interference. Morse knowledge, on the other hand,
has no potential for harming others, causing interference,
etc.

> This isn't a straw argument. I've known hams who sold off their study
> materials as soon as they passed the *written* tests.
>
> Now some folks will say "But the writtens support the basis and
> purpose of amateur radio as a technical service - there's even an ITU
> recommendation" - etc. And of course all hams do need to know the
> applicable regulations, safety and operating practices, so of course
> the written test cannot be completely eliminated.
>
> But has the existence of several tiers of written testing actually
> made hams "more technical"? Does being tested on how to compute
> complex impedances and Thevenin equivalents make a ham more likely to
> build equipment, experiment with new modes, participate in public
> service communication, be a VE and/or Elmer, and be a more friendly,
> helpful amateur? Does such testing make a ham less likely to commit
> rules violations?
>
> From 1953 to 1968, US amateur radio had only two *effective* written
> tests - the Novice and the General/Conditional/Technician. Yes, the
> Extra existed, but it was a "prestige" license only, which granted no
> additional operating privileges at all. The 20 question Novice got new
> hams started, and the ~50 question General took care of the rest.
>
> The reintroduction of "incentive licensing" in late 1968 was supposed
> to push hams to be "more technical" by requiring two more written
> tests beyond the General in order to get full privileges. But did that
> result happen?
>
> Some might cite the 20 wpm code test for Extra, but in fact the most
> gain in privileges was made by upgrading to Advanced, which required
> no additional code test.
>
> After 1990 (13 years ago), medical waivers allowed those with problems
> learning code past 5 wpm to get any class of amateur license on the
> basis of the 5 wpm code test alone. And since restructuring, we're
> down to just one additional written test beyond General for full
> privileges.
>
> Has any of that made US hams or ham radio in the US "more technical"

> in the past 35 years? Or just the opposite? Does *forcing* someone to
> learn a little bit about radio theory make them want to build radios?
>
> Hans, K0HB, has proposed a 2 level system that would be very similar
> to the old "pre-incentive" system. One easy test for newbies and a
> full privs test for everybody else. And like the old system, the
> newcomer license would not be renewable, so upgrading would
> effectively be *required*.
>
> At first I though it was a "looney-tune" idea (to use Hans' phrase),
> but now I'm not so sure. Perhaps he is on to something.
>
> FCC effectively reduced the number of written testing levels from 5 to
> 3 back in 2000. NCVEC is beginning to make noises that the Tech test
> is "too hard", and they also note that their "dump Element 1" petition
> is only a first step. Also, a look at the AH0A database shows a severe
> drop in new Techs since the new Tech Q&A pool was effective in
> mid-July.
>
> If someone says we need less *written* testing and an *easier* entry
> level test (with suitably reduced privs), how can they be refuted?
>
> If someone says "The only reason you Extras want people to have to
> pass all these *written* tests is because *you* had to!" - how can
> they be refuted?
>
> How can Hans' proposal be refuted? There's nothing in the theory part
> of the Extra written that is required knowledge for the safe and legal
> operation of an amateur station on any authorized band or mode. And
> much of the regs in both the General and Extra exam are about what an
> Extra can do that a General can't.
>
> Quite a number of hams today think that "incentive licensing" was a
> mistake. Quite a number of hams today think that the 1953-1968 era was
> a "golden age" that was ruined by the class divisions and forced
> learning/testing of incentive licensing.
>
> Some people learn theory very easily, while for others it's a
> difficult process. People who would make excellent hams but who aren't
> good with numbers, science, and/or memorization of things like band
> edges may be being kept out, or kept from full access, by the
> *written* testing.
>
> > > In the absence of a code testing requirement, there will be
progressively
> > > fewer hams who have never been exposed to learning the code as a
> > > result of the requirement. Since the requirement was the principle
> > > motivation to learn the code, code use *will* decline once code
testing
> > > is abolished. Therefore, testing and use are two closely interrelated

> > > concepts.
>
> Would anyone accept this argument, particlularly looking back over the
> past 35 years?:
>
> 'In the absence of multiple levels of theory testing, there will be
> progressively fewer hams who have been exposed to learning theory as a
> result of the tests. Since the test requirement was the principle
> motivation to learn the theory, the technical level of hams themselves
> and of amateur radio in general *will* decline. Therefore, testing
> and technical know-how are two closely interrelated concepts.'
>
> Or how about this rebuttal:
>
> Those who want technical knowhow in amateur radio are either unwilling
> to expend
> the effort to (or incapable of *politely*) encourage people to "give
> the
> theory a try and see if you like it." And, they are apparently
> unwilling to
> take "No thanks, not interested" for an answer. Thus, they continue
> to
> seek to have the FCC mandate an arguably counter-productive
> "recruiting program" for them ...
>
> --
>
> Which approach is more effective for getting hams interested in
> technical subjects - the "honey" of demonstrations and examples, or
> the "vinegar" of forced testing beyond the minimum necessary for safe
> and legal operation of an amateur station?
>

Jim,

If/when someone floats an RM to end written testing, then
I'll be one of the first in opposition. For today, the code test
is not, IMHO, in any way comparable. We'll just have to
agree to disagree on that because I ain't gonna waste any more
time arguing hypotheticals when those arguments aren't
even being made to the FCC.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1031. Re: A New Concept: Virtual Spectrum

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-14 01:53:21 UTC
From: James Nipper <jnipper@nospam.fdn.com>
Message-ID: <fdudnXmvW_aOyhaiU-KYkA@comcast.com>
Source record: 80657
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.antiques.radio+phono,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc

Are you talking about a souped up version of Echo Link?

Why would any of this be needed, if you can just chat with each other via
AIM or some other chat program ?

73 de Jim K4PYT

1032. Re: BPL a reality in my area now!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-14 01:55:38 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3F8B579A.709238D6@uci.edu>
Source record: 80659
Cross-posted to: alt.ham-radio,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
>
> "Dave VanHorn" <dvanhorn@cedar.net> wrote in message
> news:_OWdnVQbpuG5UReiU-KYuA@comcast.com...
> >
> > > After having gone to the ARRL site and listened to the examples, all I
> > > can say is it sounds just like precipitation static and/or loose
> > > connections. No way would I be able to identify one from the other.
> > > I'm just going to have to complain every time I hear noise and make
> > > recordings. If it's noisy enough to be a problem it should be fixed.
> >
> > Any hope of us non-arrl members getting something to listen to?
>
> Dave,
>
> The ARRL video is not in the "members only" part of the site ...
> it's easy to find from the articles on BPL in the public area.
>
> Carl - wk3c

http://216.167.96.120/BPL_Trial-web.mpg
http://216.167.96.120/BPL_Trial-small.mpg

1033. Re: A New Concept: Virtual Spectrum

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-14 01:58:06 UTC
From: David Stinson <arc5@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3F8B5494.C3948C82@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 80658
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.antiques.radio+phono,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc

James Nipper wrote:

> Why would any of this be needed, if you can just chat with each other via
> AIM or some other chat program ?

I didn't buy my radios and build my stations so I could
let them gather dust while I "chat" on the internet.
I want *use* them.

1034. Re: What makes a Pro code test Amateur a Troglodyte?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-14 02:07:55 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bmflprabr0@208.206.142.110>
Source record: 80660

Hans K0HB wrote

..... but I am very much a CW-lover and have a low-level (but
> growing) concern that the end of Morse testing is only a first step on
> some peoples agenda.

In spite of the proffered disclaimers and assertions to the contrary.

1035. Re: A New Concept: Virtual Spectrum

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-14 02:16:29 UTC
From: --exray-- <no@no.no>
Message-ID: <vomn3f9ut0r826@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 80661
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.antiques.radio+phono,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc

David Stinson wrote:
> James Nipper wrote:
>
>
>>Why would any of this be needed, if you can just chat with each other via
>>AIM or some other chat program ?
>
>
> I didn't buy my radios and build my stations so I could
> let them gather dust while I "chat" on the internet.
> I want *use* them.

I recall back in the early 70s how excited I was about the future of ham radio via satellite and how I expected to see a flood of activity (that never materilaized) to take us through the bad sunspot years.
Dave, maybe hooking up all those BAs thru transverters will be a better answer.
:-)
-Bill WX4A

1036. Re: What makes a Pro code test Amateur a Troglodyte?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-14 02:17:26 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bmfmbmbns0@208.206.142.110>
Source record: 80662

Dan/W4NTI wrote:

> "Hans K0HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:5ee63311.0310121827.7191e44a@posting.google.com...
>
>>"Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote
>>
>>
>>
>>>But, did the FCC ever get anywhere close to seeing its use banned? I am
>>>not, remember, saying that a mode would become so unpopular or disliked
>
> on a
>
>>>scale such that it would be rare to find it openly being used. I am
>
> saying,
>
>>>however, that I believe the FCC would never regulate its ban.
>>>
>>
>>Spark transmissions were outlawed (as well they should have been) so
>>the precedent exists.
>>
>>On a more immediate note, as relates to your discussion on AM phone,
>>I'd have to dig out some old material to get all the facts exactly in
>>order, but there was a petition (in the 70's?) which the I
>>***believe*** the FCC had moved to the stage of an NPRM to outlaw AM
>>transmissions on the HF amateur bands. The rationale was that AM was
>>(is?) wasteful of spectrum because SSB can convey the same message in
>>half the bandwidth oF DSB AM phone and without those awful sounding
>>hetrodyning carriers. The proposal narrowly missed being adopted,
>>only because of a huge hue and cry from thousands of AM-forever hams
>>(who drew ARRL into the fight on their side). Today you're hard
>>pressed to find any remaining AM-ers on the band, and if the petition
>>were re-introduced it might well be adopted due to lack of organized
>>opposition. Most of the AM-forever crowd has moved to "forever".
>>
>>73, de Hans, K0HB
>
>
> Sorry Hans, the AM forever crowd is still well represented, by not only
> old guys, but a lot of new guys using rice boxes.
>

> Go to Google and do a search of AM phone. You will be amazed.

And to emphasize the point, old BA stuff that was, 20 years ago, routinely hauled to the landfill, is once again going for REAL money.

I know a ham-nee-CBer who told me he once hauled a good Globe King 500 to the landfill, much to his later chagrin....I had one that brought $1550 and would have brought more, they were lined up wanting it, but I learned that a friend had been looking for one, and I sold it to him.

1037. Re: A New Concept: Virtual Spectrum

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-14 02:23:33 UTC
From: Roy Lewallen <w7el@eznec.com>
Message-ID: <vomnhgh0cbkg9d@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 80663
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.antiques.radio+phono,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc

I apologize for being a little vague about this. Are you proposing replacing wireless communication with wired communication (via the Internet) as a way to communicate with inadequate radio equipment?

Roy Lewallen, W7EL

1038. Re: A New Concept: Virtual Spectrum

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-14 02:27:19 UTC
From: David Stinson <arc5@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3F8B5B6B.8E5123D@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 80664
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.antiques.radio+phono,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc

Roy Lewallen wrote:
>
> I apologize for being a little vague about this. Are you proposing
> replacing wireless communication with wired communication (via the
> Internet) as a way to communicate with inadequate radio equipment?

"Wireless" doesn't always work, if you're in a "noise hole,"
or if the mode or radio you want to use isn't "legit" anymore.
So that's one use, yes.
The idea is to use our own radios as source and sink,
bypassing the vagaries of Mother Nature's propagation
and local noise sources. Or, if you're in a "noise hole,"
to bring spectrum to you from a "quiet" location.
It also allows the use of heretofore prohibitied modes.
For instance:
In the article I detail how an old longwave maritime
rig on 415 KC A2 can carry on a real-time CW QSO with
someone using a modern rig on 40 meters.
It will be a real boon for the "boatanchor" community.
I do hope QST will consider it.

TNX ES 73 DE Dave AB5S

1039. Re: 73 Magazine Says "73 and QRT"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-14 02:33:40 UTC
From: Chuck Reti <wv8a@arrl.invalid.net>
Message-ID: <wv8a-D04359.22334013102003@news.comcast.giganews.com>
Source record: 80665
Cross-posted to:
rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

In article <bmf2hr$s20$1@freenet9.carleton.ca>,
et472@FreeNet.Carleton.CA (Michael Black) wrote:
>
> I wonder how many lifetime subscribers this will affect?
>
> If I'm remembering right, fairly early on Wayne sold them, and they
> were $37. In 1973, he sold them for $73. I think he continued to
> sell them for some time after that; I have a recollection of a $150
> life time subscription, but that's a more vague memory.
>
> Were the lifetime subscriptions honored for all that time? How many
> of them abandoned the magazine. explicitly telling 73 they didn't
> want anymore issues, or just not providing a new address when moving?
> How many who did buy a lifetime subscription were still alive by this
> month?
>
> Michael VE2BVW
>

IIRC, the subscription form in the mag for some time used to say
"Lifetime (ours or yours)".

The magazine cover parodies were always fun, the Playboy and QST's
particularly memorable.

Sadly, most of my 73 (and HR) collection got turned to mush in a
basement flood a few years back; still have a few of each.

I'm expecting that Wayne will be appearing on Art Bell some weekend soon
to Explain It All.
--
Chuck Reti WV8A
Detroit MI

1040. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-14 02:33:54 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bmfnai$da8$0@208.206.142.110>
Source record: 80666

Carl R. Stevenson wrote:

> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20031013083028.14837.00003579@mb-m03.aol.com...
>
>>At least a few hams have publicly renounced their NCI membership here,
>
> saying
>
>>that 5 wpm was the right level and they could not support complete code
>
> test
>
>>elimination. Maybe they're an anomaly - maybe not.
>
>
> By my best recollection there have been *maybe* about 6 or 7 who have
> upgraded, decided "I've got mine." and decided they wanted to keep the
> 5 wpm ... out of thousands of NCI members.
>
> Carl - wk3c
>
>
I still find it beyond incredible that persons who would learn all
that goes into making an engineer would have any problem whatever with
learning the most basic radio communications skill at the most minimal
level.

1041. Re: 73 Magazine Says "73 and QRT"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-14 02:36:13 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bmfnet$da8$1@208.206.142.110>
Source record: 80667
Cross-posted to:
rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

Michael Black wrote:

> Art Harris (n2ah@hotmail.com) writes:
>
>>"Capt. Blackflag" wrote:
>>
>>
>>>>73 MAGAZINE SAYS "73 AND QRT"
>>>>
>>>>After completing 43 years of publication, 73 Amateur Radio Today
>>>>magazine is calling it quits. Plans to publish a joint
>>>>October/November issue fell through this week, and the September 2003
>>>>issue was the magazine's last.
>>
>>Last week on eBay, someone listed a 1-year subscription to "73" for
>>$9. There were no takers.
>>
>>Art N2AH
>
>
>
> I wonder how many lifetime subscribers this will affect?
>
> If I'm remembering right, fairly early on Wayne sold them, and they
> were $37. In 1973, he sold them for $73. I think he continued to
> sell them for some time after that; I have a recollection of a $150
> life time subscription, but that's a more vague memory.
>
> Were the lifetime subscriptions honored for all that time? How many
> of them abandoned the magazine. explicitly telling 73 they didn't
> want anymore issues, or just not providing a new address when moving?
> How many who did buy a lifetime subscription were still alive by this
> month?
>

Maybe it meant the life of the magazine.

1042. Re: FCC relaxes it's prohibition on use of the "F-word" on broadcast media.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-14 02:39:46 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bmfnlieeq0@208.206.142.110>
Source record: 80668
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

Robert Casey wrote:

>>
>>
>>>
>>
>>
>> Great, let me guess, you must be another one of those lazy, anything
>> goes,
>> pot smoking liberals, from B.C., that lives off government handouts. How
>> nice. I love paying the highest taxes in the civilized world. No
>> wonder we
>> can't get rid of the liberal dictatorship. Give the people pot to smoke,
>> filth on TV, and the "F" word, what more could you ask for. At least the
>> "Yanks" you call them, have a culture and respect their traditions. I
>> can't
>> say that for canaduh. If it weren't for the "Yanks", we would probably be
>> speaking Russian. Now if the Americans would like to take over
>> canadah.....please!!!
>>
>>
>>
>>
> That would eliminate the problem of having to patrol that long border.

No problem, those determined suckers would sneak in over the pole if
that's what they had to do.

> Though
> I don't know if any Al Qada people set up shop in Canada anyway.

Are you kidding? They're scattered everwhere, and well hidden. Believe
it, they AIN'T finished yet.

If
> Quebec ever splits off like they almost did some years ago, sure, join us.
> We could use the extra area.

French???? Naw....

Be interesting to see if we could get sixty-
> something stars on our flag....

Guess you gotta be an Old Feller to recall when it flew 48.
>

1043. Re: A New Concept: Virtual Spectrum

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-14 02:40:06 UTC
From: Gene Storey <nospam@cox.net>
Message-ID: <amJib.112$ZE1.42@news1.central.cox.net>
Source record: 80669
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.antiques.radio+phono,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc

"--exray--" <no@no.no> wrote
>
> I recall back in the early 70s how excited I was about the future of ham
> radio via satellite and how I expected to see a flood of activity (that
> never materilaized) to take us through the bad sunspot years.
> Dave, maybe hooking up all those BAs thru transverters will be a better
> answer. :-)
> -Bill WX4A

Right!

I was excited about the microsats. Then they built this monster satellite
and spent millions on it. I don't know anyone in a 100 miles who uses it.

1044. Re: What makes a Pro code test Amateur a Troglodyte?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-14 02:45:51 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031013224551.08487.00000261@mb-m01.aol.com>
Source record: 80670

>Bottom
>line, the requirement for some technical knowledge is
>coupled to the freedom ALL US hams have to build,
>modify and/or repair their own equipment...even if they
>never want to. The knowledge is expected to help
>hams stay within tolerences and signal characteristics
>allowed because failing to do so can/will lead to
>interference.

When will you guys ever admit the fact that the present written, does none of the above.

1045. Re: A New Concept: Virtual Spectrum

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-14 03:07:30 UTC
From: James Nipper <jnipper@nospam.fdn.com>
Message-ID: <AI2dnV5oibhI9RaiXTWJig@comcast.com>
Source record: 80671
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.antiques.radio+phono,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc

Just what would this internet communicating have to do with Ham Radio ?

Again, why would you need the ham equipment , considering you can do all the communicating to begin with just by being on the internet?

Not to be personally offensive (I mean it), but this sounds rather silly to me.

Ham Radio is communication over the airwaves using ham gear. Websurfing is connecting to other pc's and servers etc using the telephone line or cable, and the internet.

They both are FUN but they ain't the SAME !!

73 de Jim K4PYT

1046. Re: Code test analogy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-14 03:12:11 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bmfpib$i4q$0@208.206.142.110>
Source record: 80672

No-coder

We see the courage of your convictions showing in your screen name

wrote:
> Even though the testing for code was reduced to the basic 5 WPM over three
> years ago, it's obvious that the debate still rages on.
>
> The insistance that a person know Morse Code at a resonable speed in order to
> be "real ham" is similar to religious fanatics, particualrly Christian
> fundamentalists, who think that a person has to believe in god in order to be a
> good and moral person. They cannot prove that their god even exists. So with
> the PCTA, they cannot prove that code is useful in light of communications
> advancements that have been made over the past several decades.

Surely not)another lamebrained analogy - one more emptyhead strikes a
blow for nothingness!

It has always been true that one cannot be persuaded when he refuses
to review the evidence. QED.

1047. Re: A New Concept: Virtual Spectrum

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-14 03:23:38 UTC
From: Gene Storey <nospam@cox.net>
Message-ID: <__Jib.137$ZE1.100@news1.central.cox.net>
Source record: 80673
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.antiques.radio+phono,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc

you didn't read any part of his message (after the word Internet) did you?

"James Nipper" <jnipper@fdn.com> wrote
>
>
>
> Just what would this internet communicating have to do with Ham Radio ?
>
> Again, why would you need the ham equipment , considering you can do all the
> communicating to begin with just by being on the internet?
>
> Not to be personally offensive (I mean it), but this sounds rather silly to
> me.
>
> Ham Radio is communication over the airwaves using ham gear. Websurfing is
> connecting to other pc's and servers etc using the telephone line or cable,
> and the internet.
>
> They both are FUN but they ain't the SAME !!
>
>
> 73 de Jim K4PYT
>

1048. Re: A New Concept: Virtual Spectrum

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-14 03:26:50 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bmfqdq$jq0$0@208.206.142.110>
Source record: 80674
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.antiques.radio+phono,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc

David Stinson wrote:

> Thanks for reading this.
> I have today submitted an article to QST magazine entitled
> "Virtual Spectrum: Beating BPL at its own game,"
> detailing a concept that can greatly impact our radio hobby.
> I wanted to "put down a marker" to date the introduction
> of a new ham-radio innovation, and to officially place
> the idea in the public domain, so the maximum amount of
> "tinkering" with it can happen.
>
> This concept uses the bandwidth available on the Internet
> and some simple circuitry to create a replica of a segment of
> the radio spectrum, stream it live or prerecorded to another
> internet-connected computer and reconstruct that radio spectrum
> at your location. *Any* radio equipment you wish to use
> (given an Internet connection with sufficent bandwidth)-
> from modern PSK-31 rigs, SSB nets, WW-II modulated oscillators
> all the way back to ancient spark transmitters
> with crystal receivers; all can legally communicate just as though
> you were on-the-air. The system is bi-directional, allowing
> QSOs between stations that normally could not communicate.
> If you can't hear weak signals because of noise in your area,
> the concept allows you to build a "remote front end" and
> transport the radio spectrum in a quiet area right to your rig,
> bypassing the problems in your location.
>
> I believe this concept can be the answer to BPL, "noise holes,"
> antenna restrictions, HF "jammers" and many other obstacles to
> using our radios. There is great potential for many uses,
> and a possible niche market for someone with the resources
> to develop the equipment.
> I have already built prototype equipment to prove the concept
> and it works splendidly. The article includes construction
> details. The circuits are simple and you can get
> 95% of the parts at Radio Shack.
> By the time QST publishes (assume they accept the work),
> we should have completed the first Virtual Spectrum QSO:
> two World War 2 BC-611 handie-talkies (output: about 60 milliwatts)
> will communicate over a path of about 2000 miles.
>
> If QST does not publish the concept,
> I will publish it myself on the web

> immediatly after hearing from them.
> I am indebted to Mike Hanz, aafradio@cox.net
> for invaluable suggestions and encouragement.
>
> TNX ES 73 DE Dave Stinson AB5S

Dave, have fun. I'll check back to see how it went when I get back from the lake from fishing with my grandsons. And I'll be puttng my gear up for sale. If it doesn't sell, I'll take it fishing next time along with a good rope to tether the boat.

1049. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-14 03:29:19 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bmfqif$jq0$1@208.206.142.110>
Source record: 80675

Bill Sohl wrote:

> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20031013083028.14837.00003579@mb-m03.aol.com...
>
>>In article <344ib.32457$mQ2.19944@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Bill
>>Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
>>
>>
>>>>The ARRL/READEX survey showed that a majority favored code testing, and
>>>
>>>that
>>>
>>>>the youngest age group was the most strongly procodetest.
>>>
>>>When was the survey done?
>>
>>Late 1996. Results in Feb 1997 QST
>>
>>
>>>If it is more than two years old, it
>>>is almost useless as there has been significant change
>>>over the last few years.
>>
>>What significant change? How do we know what the change has been since
>>restructuring?
>
>
> Common sense. Ever since the initial discussion of
> nocode, every time any actual survey has been done the
> results have been less in favor of keeping code. I
> sincerly doubt that shift has stopped. Can I prove it? No,
> but I'm confident that's were it is going.
>
>
>>At least a few hams have publicly renounced their NCI membership here,
>
> saying
>
>>that 5 wpm was the right level and they could not support complete code
>
> test
>
>>elimination. Maybe they're an anomaly - maybe not.

>>
>>>>The comments to 98-143 were categorized by an NCI staffer (disproving
>
> any
>
>>>>possible claim of bias by procodetest evaluation of the comments) and
>
> the
>
>>>>resutls showed that the *majority* of commenters not only wanted
>
> continued
>
>>>>code
>>>>testing, but wanted at least 2 code test speeds. This was true despite
>
> an
>
>>>>email
>>>>campaign by NCI to get as many comments in support of their position of
>
> 5
>
>>>>wpm and sunset clause.
>>>
>>>Now it also must be pointed out that for the initial several weeks
>>>during 98-143 comment phase, those commenting were not
>>>aware of the position being put forth by NCI.
>>
>>So? Anyone could revise their comments. And the comment period was
>
> extremely
>
>>long, so time wasn't a factor.
>
>
> True, but many probably didn't. In the end, it makes no
> difference.
>

Except it lessens, even that much further, the accuracy of your guess.

1050. Re: I warned everyone this would happen. Re: 73 Magazine Says "73 and QRT"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-14 03:39:26 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <OdKib.49079$mQ2.12110@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 80676
Cross-posted to:
rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

"Clint" <rattlehead at computron dot net> wrote:
>
> Just a *bit* of a stretch of logic there... I think you
> pro-code test types are having to dig as deep into
> the soot and dirt to come up with argument points
> now. It's a little difficult to believe that just a lack
> of interest in having a morse code profeciency
> test is to blame for a magazine not cutting it in a
> capitalist system.... (snip)

Of course it's a stretch, Clint. That's all some have left at this point. In reality, the magazine "73" has never obtained great success in the marketplace, which means advertising revenue has always been lower than the other magazines. At the same time, printing and other costs are going up, making it much more difficult for smaller publications to stay in business. This same thing is happening throughout the publishing industry. Lower advertising revenue, combined with rising costs, is putting many smaller magazines out of business. Knowing that, it shouldn't surprise anyone when the same thing happens to the ham radio publications.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

1051. Re: I warned everyone this would happen. Re: 73 Magazine Says "73 and QRT"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-14 03:46:12 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031013234612.01893.00001227@mb-m22.aol.com>
Source record: 80679

In article <vomdedf2smpb53@corp.supernews.com>, "Clint" <rattlehead at computron dot net> writes:

>Just a *bit* of a stretch of logic there... I think you pro-code test types
>are having to dig as deep into the soot and dirt to come up with
>argument points now. It's a little difficult to believe that just a lack of
>interest in having a morse code profeciency test is to blame for a
>magazine not cutting it in a capitalist system.... they mentioned "a
>reason of economics".. ever thought that maybe it's just another product
>who's time has come and gone? Did you really think that the model-T
>would last forever and never be taken out of production?

Nobody in here seems to understand that independent periodicals
make their living almost ENTIRELY from sales of advertising space.
Fact of publishing life for nearly every "popular" or newsstand
sold periodical.

Advertising is not free. It is paid for and such payment has to be
budgeted by every advertiser. Advertising budgets can only exist
where there is income from product or service sales to warrant
paying for advertising.

If a goods manufacturer has a product line covering two or more
like markets, the manufacturer has to decide which market will be
the most profitable in the near future, which has more potential, and
how will they be affected by competition in those market areas.
Advertising budgets and money are NOT boundless.

ALL of the amateur radio oriented periodicals on the American
newsstand market have expressed concern about "lack of advertising
income" in the last two years. Even QST which is backed up by the
dozen-million dollar reported IRS income of the League.

The "knowledgeable" in here no little else but chatty gossip stories
as to the "reasons" for a magazine demise.

LHA

1052. Re: What makes a Pro code test Amateur a Troglodyte?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-14 03:46:13 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031013234613.01893.00001228@mb-m22.aol.com>
Source record: 80680

In article <20031013203527.08626.00001165@mb-m27.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
writes:

>In article <20031013174921.12501.00003124@mb-m04.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com
>(Len Over 21) writes:
>
>>In article <bmdt22$sse@library2.airnews.net>, "Kim"
>><kimscliff@yahoo.com>
>>writes:
>>
>>>"Hans K0HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
>>>news:5ee63311.0310121827.7191e44a@posting.google.com...
>>>> "Kim" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote
>>
>>>> Spark transmissions were outlawed (as well they should have been) so
>>>> the precedent exists.
>>>
>>>Hmmmm, Jim/N2EY made that observation also. Then, I see the comment that
>>>spark was a transmission method--not a mode. I think that's splitting
>>>hairs, isn't it? I'm asking--I wasn't around for spark ;)
>>
>> The ONLY way a "spark" transmitter could send anything called
>> communications information was by on-off keying.
>
>While that's true, there were other types of transmitters on the air even
>before WW1. Arc transmitters and Alexanderson alternators were two types.
>Transmitters using tubes were in use well before 1920.

Irrelevant. From ALL the available literature of old-time amateur radio
prior to 1920, THE OVERWHELMING MAJORITY of amateur radio
transmitters were of the "spark" type.

"Spark" transmitters can be modulated SOLELY by ON-OFF KEYING.

The sole surviving Alexanderson Alternator VLF RF generator is in
Grimeton, Sweden, and used once each year for a brief period in a
ceremony for Televerket, the Swedish government's telecommunication
works. A ceremonial event, not one for any actual communication.

>The practical transmission of voice and music by radio was demonstrated as
>early as 1906.

ONLY with a rotary alternator with a WATER COOLED MICROPHONE.

Demonstration only, and then ONCE.

>> Since "morse code" was already in practice and was totally
>> on-off keying, it was adopted as The "radio code."
>
>Was that a bad thing?

Point of fact only. Do NOT "rewrite" what I wrote.

Morse code was developed for ON-OFF KEYING...on land lines.

"Spark" transmitters could communicate ONLY by on-off keying.

Morse code was first used commercially for communications in
1844. The first demonstration of radio as a communications medium
was 1896. That is a 52 year period allowing maturing of the ON-OFF
keying of telegraphy. Telegraphy by the Morse-Vail telegraph
system had spread worldwide by 1896.

>> The adoption of a long-existing (since 1844) LANDLINE code
>> says absolutely nothing about its efficacy in radio communications,
>> ability to "work through" or much else.
>
>Actually, the code used in radio is different than the code used in landline
>work.

Totally irrelevant to the point. Early primitive radio could ONLY work
with an ON-OFF KEYING method.

Despite all the variant dialects of "morse codes," ALL work ONLY by
ON-OFF KEYING. ALL.

>The efficacy of Morse code when applied to radio has been demonstrated many,
>many times over the past century-plus. Radio amateurs continue to demonstrate
>it every day.

Self-serving emotional exaggeration.

Radio amateurs worldwide continue to USE all the modes and modulations
allocated to them every day.

"Demonstration" refers to the first use of a method. That differs from USE.

>> On-off keying was
>> adopted simply because it was the ONLY WAY POSSIBLE for
>> early, primitive radio to allow communications. It's just
>> practical applied physics. Nothing else.
>
>And it works very well.

It does NOT work optimally compared to OTHER modes.

Radio as a communications medium is 107 years old. ON-OFF
KEYING of a radio frequency carrier is NOT a new concept nor is it
the best for communications.

>Even after the invention of other methods of transmission, the use of Morse
>code continued.

Irrelevant. Refusal to change has many and varied reasons. Only some of those refusals are relevant or applicable.

NO ONE is contending that ON-OFF KEYING was not the first.

Under the beginning subject thread, the subject was the CODE TEST.

You cannot explain or demonstrate or justify a reason for code test retention JUST BECAUSE IT WAS THE FIRST MODE IN RADIO.

The first radio-as-a-communications means was 107 years ago.

All other radio services have either dropped morse code mode or never considered its use when that radio service began.

Continued USE of morse code modes DOES NOT POSSIBLY ADVANCE ANY STATE OF THE RADIO ARTS. In ANY radio service, including amateur radio.

LHA

1053. Re: What makes a Pro code test Amateur a Troglodyte?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-14 03:46:14 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031013234614.01893.00001229@mb-m22.aol.com>
Source record: 80678

In article <vomdk8t2498l86@corp.supernews.com>, "Clint" <rattlehead at computron dot net> writes:

>"Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
>news:3F86EDAD.4010109@psu.edu...
>
>> I would challenge the NCTA's to show some proof that those who believe
>> that the morse code test should be retained are in a technical backwater.
>
>Justify requireing a knowledge or profeciency test on using an old fashioned
>buggy whip before giving out an modern day automobile driver's license.

Clint, it seems to be wasted effort to lay out the technical reasons for morse code mode communications disappearing on the world radio scene.

The very first demonstrations of radio as a communications medium was 107 years ago. In Russia and in Italy. Both demonstrators used morse code mode with on-off keying. What was used 107 years ago is NOT "state of the art" today.

USE of morse code mode is optional in the US radio amateur service.

Elimination of the morse code TEST for any amateur radio license is not defacto elimination of its use, nor banning its use.

Retention of the morse code TEST only has validity as an EMOTIONAL supplement to those already licensed in the amateur radio service who are sufficiently proficient to use the mode.

Mike Coslo imagines himself as a sort of "devil's advocate" but is, by all public evidence, little more than a PCTA who attempts to masquerade his trolling and baiting by some odd self-defined role as "arbiter" or "moderator."

This newsgroup is unmoderated.

LHA

1054. Re: 73 Magazine Says "73 and QRT"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-14 03:46:15 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031013234615.01893.00001230@mb-m22.aol.com>
Source record: 80677

In article <9fGib.553559$Oz4.501772@rwcrnsc54>, JonJacobJingleHimerSchmidt <Thatsmynametoo@nospam.net> writes:

>I heard in the later years that Wayne required a certain format for >articles or columns and if the author did not follow the format, then >the article or column did not get published.

Nearly ALL periodicals and publishers have minimum standards on manuscript format acceptible for consideration of publication.

Those same periodicals and publishers explain those in free documents called "Writer's Guides."

The quasi-standard format for all written formats in North America is letter size paper (8 1/2" x 11"), a minimum margin of 1" all sides, double-spacing conventional type font with pitch about 10 characters per inch, one side of the paper only.

Submission of a manuscript to a publisher is FAR from any guarantee of acceptance whether it follows a publisher's format or not. Unless one has a specific contract to submit work to a publisher, ALL manuscripts must pass through a series of reviews at the publisher.

It is a given that NO technically oriented publication will accept crayon on cardboard format manuscripts, handwritten or hand-printed text on non-standard paper stock.

Anyone who wishes to submit an article for publication should first contact a publisher's Editor by separate inquiry letter. Nearly every publisher will return a Writer's Guide to the format used by a publisher. Submissions are guaranteed absolutely nothing except some form of consideration AT the publication.

Leonard H. Anderson
Associate Editor at Ham Radio Magazine for two years

1055. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-14 04:20:20 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <8QKib.49381$mQ2.35348@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 80681

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com> wrote:
>
> I still find it beyond incredible that persons who would
> learn all that goes into making an engineer would have
> any problem whatever with learning the most basic radio
> communications skill at the most minimal level.

Because, as far as the "engineer" is concerned, it (code) isn't a "basic radio communications skill" today, Dick. It hasn't been for several decades, at least. As far as I know, not a single college-based communications, radio, electronics, or engineering, course today offers instruction in code "skill." Likewise, few, if any, employers are seeking that "skill." Therefore, it (code) simply isn't relevant to any of these careers.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

1056. Re: What makes a Pro code test Amateur a Troglodyte?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-14 04:24:45 UTC
From: groupk0hb@earthlink.net
Message-ID: <5ee63311.0310132024.220806d3@posting.google.com>
Source record: 80682

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote

>
> The ONLY way a "spark" transmitter could send anything called
> communications information was by on-off keying.
>

Damn, Old Timer, you got it wrong again! In Boston, on Christmas Eve of 1906, modulating a spark transmitter, Reginald Fessenden made a holiday broadcast of a short spoken introduction, some recorded Chistmas music, and played "Oh Holy Night" on a violin.

Obviously a "spark" transmitter was not limited to ONLY (your emphasis) on-off keying.

Sunuvagun! Good luck on this one now.

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

1057. Re: What makes LHA so poor at simple research tasks?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-14 04:34:07 UTC
From: groupk0hb@earthlink.net
Message-ID: <5ee63311.0310132034.23d9cbeb@posting.google.com>
Source record: 80683

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote

> On-off keying was
> adopted simply because it was the ONLY WAY POSSIBLE for
> early, primitive radio to allow communications. It's just
> practical applied physics. Nothing else.

Oh shit, you got it wrong again!

In Boston, on Christmas Eve of 1906, modulating a spark transmitter, Reginald Fessenden made a holiday broadcast of a short spoken introduction, some recorded Christmas music, and played "Oh Holy Night" on a violin.

Obviously on-off keying was not the ONLY WAY POSSIBLE (your emphasis) for early ("spark") radio to allow communications.

"Dear Mother Anderson, your son Leonard is failing in practical applied physics. Perhaps he would benefit from a stint in the Army to learn a useful trade."

Sunuvagun! Good luck on this one now.

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

1058. Re: BPL a reality in my area now!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-14 04:57:10 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <REMOVETHISkc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <bmgqeu$m4r49$6@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 80693

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20031013143036.12300.00001135@mb-m20.aol.com...
> In article <bme4ob$lic55$4@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>, "Ryan, KC8PMX"
> <REMOVETHISkc8pmx@diamondcs.net> writes:
>
> >Yeah Jim.... six meter all mode.
>
> I made a lucky guess.

Probably, but I also had made mention at least once somewhere in the past as
well.

>
> >It's hard as hell to use it right now with
> >the powerline interference in this freakin' county even before they
> >implement this whole BPL stuff!!!!!
>
> Oh man...they can't even keep the lines quiet without BPL...
>
> Perhaps their own line noise will mess up BPL performance.

We could only hope so! Wouldn't that be the ultimate irony. Using my
shortwave reciever is next to being a futile attempt. Have packed the
damned thing away for that same reason. In the truck, the AM radio can be a
trick to listen to if you are trying to listen to a station that is normally
always 5-9. If you run along a line of powerlines that happen to be
parallel to the roadway for a bit, forget listening to that station for a
while.....

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF1-FF2-MFR
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...

1059. Re: 73 Magazine Says "73 and QRT"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-14 07:10:51 UTC
From: Ed Price <edprice@cox.net>
Message-ID: <ZjNib.33598$La.17881@fed1read02>
Source record: 80684
Cross-posted to:
rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

"Chuck Reti" <wv8a@arrl.invalid.net> wrote in message
news:wv8a-D04359.22334013102003@news.comcast.giganews.com...
> In article <bmf2hr$s20$1@freenet9.carleton.ca>,
> et472@FreeNet.Carleton.CA (Michael Black) wrote:
> >
> > I wonder how many lifetime subscribers this will affect?
> >
> > If I'm remembering right, fairly early on Wayne sold them, and they
> > were $37. In 1973, he sold them for $73. I think he continued to
> > sell them for some time after that; I have a recollection of a $150
> > life time subscription, but that's a more vague memory.
> >
> > Were the lifetime subscriptions honored for all that time? How many
> > of them abandoned the magazine. explicitly telling 73 they didn't
> > want anymore issues, or just not providing a new address when moving?
> > How many who did buy a lifetime subscription were still alive by this
> > month?
> >
> > Michael VE2BVW
> >
>
> IIRC, the subscription form in the mag for some time used to say
> "Lifetime (ours or yours)".
>
> The magazine cover parodies were always fun, the Playboy and QST's
> particularly memorable.
>
> Sadly, most of my 73 (and HR) collection got turned to mush in a
> basement flood a few years back; still have a few of each.
>
> I'm expecting that Wayne will be appearing on Art Bell some weekend soon
> to Explain It All.
> --
> Chuck Reti WV8A
> Detroit MI

Seems pretty simple to me; Wayne finally did say "die" (or at least BYE)!

Ed
WB6WSN

1060. Re: A New Concept: Virtual Spectrum

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-14 08:22:30 UTC
From: Roger Barker <roger@peaksys.co.uk>
Message-ID: <+WXcrpAGJ7i$EwCX@peaksys.co.uk>
Source record: 80685
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.antiques.radio+phono,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc

In article <3F8B4D6D.31D19695@ix.netcom.com>, David Stinson
<arc5@ix.netcom.com> writes
>Thanks for reading this.
>I have today submitted an article to QST magazine entitled
>"Virtual Spectrum: Beating BPL at its own game,"
>detailing a concept that can greatly impact our radio hobby.
>I wanted to "put down a marker" to date the introduction
>of a new ham-radio innovation, and to officially place
>the idea in the public domain, so the maximum amount of
>"tinkering" with it can happen.
>
>This concept uses the bandwidth available on the Internet
>and some simple circuitry to create a replica of a segment of
>the radio spectrum, stream it live or prerecorded to another
>internet-connected computer and reconstruct that radio spectrum
>at your location.
[snip]

Dave, this is a fantastic idea. It opens up great possibilities for international co-operation between radio hams. When your spectrum in the USA is wiped out by BPL, we hams in the UK could lend you some of ours. I'm sure the ARRL and RSGB could negotiate an agreement, and sort out the reciprocal licensing issues.

Also, by the use of spectrum transformation, which you touched on in your follow-up posting, it would allow hams with restricted licences to experience propagation on bands on which they are not allowed to operate.

--
Roger Barker, G4IDE - roger@peaksys.co.uk
For UI-View go to - http://www.UI-View.com
For WinPack go to - http://www.peaksys.co.uk

1061. Re: A New Concept: Virtual Spectrum

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-14 08:40:32 UTC
From: "No Spam"
Message-ID: <ifgU75G3LLdo-pn2-3Q4I7YXIxdNd@localhost>
Source record: 80686
Cross-posted to: rec.antiques.radio+phono,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc,rec.radio.amateur.homebrew

On Tue, 14 Oct 2003 03:07:30 UTC, "James Nipper"
<jnipper@nospam.fdn.com> wrote:

>
>
>
> Just what would this internet communicating have to do with Ham Radio ?
>
> Again, why would you need the ham equipment , considering you can do all the
> communicating to begin with just by being on the internet?
>
> Not to be personally offensive (I mean it), but this sounds rather silly to
> me.
>
> Ham Radio is communication over the airwaves using ham gear. Websurfing is
> connecting to other pc's and servers etc using the telephone line or cable,
> and the internet.
>
> They both are FUN but they ain't the SAME !!
>
>
> 73 de Jim K4PYT
>

Yeah, I don't see the point either. There's a fellow near me (I'm
in Northern Virginia) who operates a remoted HF rig via the
Internet.

He calls it "Internet Radio". I honestly don't see the point of it.

de ah6gi/4

1062. Re: What makes a Pro code test Amateur a Troglodyte?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-14 09:34:29 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bmgg1o$gve@library2.airnews.net>
Source record: 80687

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:bmalst$q20$0@208.207.71.130...
> Bill Sohl wrote:
>
> > "Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
> > news:20031011025017.11891.00001413@mb-m11.aol.com...
> >
> >>In article <EdHhb.645$_i.51817@nnrp1.ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
> >><wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:
> >>
> >>
> >>>Now, I wouldn't expect to be able to have that sort of a relationship
> >>>with you, Dick ... you're not open-minded enough to accept that others
> >>>see things different than you. (You see, I accept that you like and
use
> >>>CW ... I disagree only with your propatation of the "Morse myths" and
> >>>your insistence that everyone should have Morse forced on them in
> >>>exchange for HF privs ... fortunately, most of the rest of the world
> >>>doesn't agree with you.)
> >>>
> >>>Carl - wk3c
> >>
> >>Carl:
> >>
> >>I consider the use of the term "Morse myths" to be derogatory and
> >>inflammatory. Thus, you have also failed to meet Mike's challenge.
> >>
> >>73 de Larry, K3LT
> >
> >
> > Hw about morse fallicies, morse inaccuracies, erronious morse
> > claims? Which of these do you find acceptable?
> >
>
>
> It's easy enough to accept that those of you who have never had any use
> for radiotelegraphy would view its stated attributes as mythical, and
> for the lot of you that is indeed a proper description. You couldn't
> communciate your way out of an emergency using Morse if the fate of the
> planet DID depend on it!
>

And, DICK, what modes would be your failure to communicate your way of an
emergency if the fate of the planet depends on it? I wish, for once, you'd

answer an honest question. I suspect it'll be the usual, though. Complete silence because my question is not only one you can't answer (yeah, I'll make the bet that you are *NOT* proficient in all available modes of ham radio), and it's also one that makes a counter to the point you attempted to illustrate, above.

So, DICK, what mode would be our shortcoming if we were all looking to you to "save the planet?"

Kim W5TIT

1063. Re: A New Concept: Virtual Spectrum

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-14 09:43:07 UTC
From: charlesb <n5pvl@sbcglobal.net>
Message-ID: <LyPib.419$Re3.43@newssvr25.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 80688
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.antiques.radio+phono,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc

"James Nipper" <jnipper@nospam.fdn.com> wrote in message
news:Al2dnV5oibhI9RaiXTWJig@comcast.com...
>
> Just what would this internet communicating have to do with Ham Radio ?
>

It's another way for Internet junkies to undermine the hobby by attempting to blur the line between amateur radio and Internet communications.

The idea is to talk hams into being content to *pretend* that they are using radio when in fact they are stuck off in an elaborate Internet chat. These people get a big "charge" every time they hear that they have succeeded in talking a ham into going off the air, this way.

To these "Amateur Telephone" devotees, the hobby would be meaningless without the non-ham stuff. Packet/Internet gateways, EchoLink, you name it: As long as it takes hams off the air and puts them on the Internet instead, they are all for it, 100%.

Many of the most outspoken advocates of "Amateur Telephone" just happen to work for corporations that stand to gain financially if Hams lose spectrum. Isn't that special? An amazing coincidence, isn't it?

So it it really a bit early to tell, but all the signs point toward good old Dave Stinson AB5S being another "Amateur Telephone" idiot, out to denigrate and undercut the hobby with an offer to "help out" amateur radio with the Internet.

I guess it will be best to wait and see... And if good old Dave manages to denigrate and undercut the hobby with his new proposal, maybe we will get an opportunity to see if he can pick a telephone out of his ass.

Charles Brabham, N5PVL

1064. Re: A New Concept: Virtual Spectrum

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-14 10:01:01 UTC
From: David Stinson <arc5@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3F8BC59D.503D7C65@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 80689
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.antiques.radio+phono,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc

charlesb wrote:

> I guess it will be best to wait and see... And if good old Dave manages to
> denigrate and undercut the hobby with his new proposal, maybe we will get an
> opportunity to see if he can pick a telephone out of his ass.
>
> Charles Brabham, N5PVL

Thanks for the paranoid hillbilly rant.
When BPL gets cranking, there won't *BE*
any hobby if we don't have a "work-around."
As for "picking things out of my ass,"
I'd like to start with your nose.
D.S.

1065. Re: A New Concept: Virtual Spectrum

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-14 10:53:00 UTC
From: Paul Keinanen <keinanen@sci.fi>
Message-ID: <8pinovogjd9h709al9pq9tcckgss2mciui@4ax.com>
Source record: 80690
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.antiques.radio+phono,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc

On Tue, 14 Oct 2003 01:27:32 GMT, David Stinson <arc5@ix.netcom.com>
wrote:

>This concept uses the bandwidth available on the Internet
>and some simple circuitry to create a replica of a segment of
>the radio spectrum, stream it live or prerecorded to another
>internet-connected computer and reconstruct that radio spectrum
>at your location. *Any* radio equipment you wish to use
>(given an Internet connection with sufficent bandwidth)-
>from modern PSK-31 rigs, SSB nets, WW-II modulated oscillators
>all the way back to ancient spark transmitters
>with crystal receivers; all can legally communicate just as though
>you were on-the-air.

Assuming that the intention is to allow multiple simultaneous users to independently tune around the band, the problem is the dynamic range (both in the analog RF front end and in the ADC) and high sample frequency required to transfer e.g. the whole 80 m or 2 m band over the internet. For the 2 m band, 5-10 MHz sampling rate is required, depending on region, and at least 16 bits/sample, so we are talking of data rates 160 Mbit/s, so even the 100baseT Ethernet is not sufficient to carry the signal, not to mention any ADSL connections.

And before anyone asks, no, you can not use (lossy) compression, since this would prevent decoding some of the signals at the user site.

However, a linear satellite transponder has a quite limited dynamic range and a modest bandwidth, so the requirement are far less demanding.

>The system is bi-directional, allowing
>QSOs between stations that normally could not communicate.

It does not make much sense to transfer the whole frequency band to the transmitter. It is much simpler to use a remotely controlled transmitter for each user at some separate location (far away from the receiving site to avoid blocking) and only transfer the base band over the internet.

>If you can't hear weak signals because of noise in your area,
>the concept allows you to build a "remote front end" and
>transport the radio spectrum in a quiet area right to your rig,
>bypassing the problems in your location.
>

>I believe this concept can be the answer to BPL,

If the reason is simply to avoid the local noise problems due to BPL/PLT/PLC and other electric interference when receiving, the transmitter is not affected by the power lines (carrying BPL) running parallel with your transmitter antenna, so why not simply run the transmitter manually from home and monitoring the band using a remote receiver at a quiet rural site.

However, it might not be a good idea to use the BPL to carry the signal from the remote receiver, since the BPL might be blocked during your transmissions and you could not run QSK :-(, which otherwise would be possible using a remote receiver site.

Paul OH3LWR

1066. Re: A New Concept: Virtual Spectrum

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-14 11:13:08 UTC
From: Gene Storey <nospam@cox.net>
Message-ID: <8TQib.228$ZE1.108@news1.central.cox.net>
Source record: 80691
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.antiques.radio+phono,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc

"David Stinson" <arc5@ix.netcom.com> wrote
> charlesb wrote:
>
> > I guess it will be best to wait and see... And if good old Dave manages to
> > denigrate and undercut the hobby with his new proposal, maybe we will get an
> > opportunity to see if he can pick a telephone out of his ass.
> >
> > Charles Brabham, N5PVL
>
> Thanks for the paranoid hillbilly rant.
> When BPL gets cranking, there won't *BE*
> any hobby if we don't have a "work-around."
> As for "picking things out of my ass,"
> I'd like to start with your nose.
> D.S.

Don't worry about BPL. The ARRL, as with Morse Code, is making
a mountain out of a mole hill. If the military isn't worried about its HF
assets, why should Hams be worried?

1067. Re: What makes a Pro code test Amateur a Troglodyte?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-14 12:30:23 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031014083023.21457.00001362@mb-m10.aol.com>
Source record: 80692

In article <YFIib.48865$mQ2.42713@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:

>"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
>news:c2356669.0310131337.353df3fe@posting.google.com...
>> "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
>news:<hGgib.785$_i.73747@nnrp1.ptd.net>...
>> > "Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
>> > news:20031012000943.23307.00003682@mb-m29.aol.com...
>> > > In article <bma161$cg2@library2.airnews.net>, "Kim W5TIT"
>> > <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
>> > > writes:
>> > >
>> > > >Therein lies the problem with the whole CW test (TEST, *test*)
>debate.
>> > The
>> > > > >minute one takes on the "no" CW test argument, it is generally met
>with
>> > an
>> > > > >attitude that an end CW use (USE, *use*) is being favored or called
>for.
>> > >
>> > > Kim:
>> > >
>> > > Code testing has always been the thing which generated code use.
>> >
>> > I would assert that being forced to learn code to gain access to HF
>> > "soured" more people on code use than it encouraged ... of course,
>> > some percentage of folks decided they liked code and continued to
>> > use it, but MANY simply endured something they had no interest in
>> > to get past the test, then "threw away the key."
>> >
>> > Remember the old adage "honey is better than vinegar."
>>
>> OK, fine, your opinion is well stated.
>>
>> Now consider that same logic applied to the written test.
>>
>> It could be asserted with equal logic that being forced to learn
>> theory and other subjects a ham is not interested in just to gain
>> access to amateur radio
>> "soured" more people on radio theory than it encouraged ... of course,
>> some percentage of folks decided they liked aspects of amateur radio
>> that they had not considered or known about before, but MANY simply

>> endured something they had no interest in to get past the test, then
>> "threw away the Handbook"
>
>Yet no one has apparently made that pitch,

Actually, some folks have made similar pitches.

Some time back, QCWA petitioned FCC to give full privs to all hams who held General and Advanced licenses before Nov. 22, 1968 (the effective date of the first phase of "incentive licensing". Hans, K0HB, has twice officially proposed a simplified two-class system. The NCVEC folks are thinking of proposing changes that go far beyond dumping Element 1 (see:

http://www.qsl.net/al7fs/

Second item in the Table of Contents.

>and no
>one is petitioning to end written tests either.

As I wrote elsewhere, some written testing is needed to insure hams know the rules, including safety precautions. What I'm talking about is the whole concept of multiple license levels and "jump through the hoop" written tests as a "hazing ritual" for more privileges.

>Bottom
>line, the requirement for some technical knowledge is
>coupled to the freedom ALL US hams have to build,
>modify and/or repair their own equipment...even if they
>never want to. The knowledge is expected to help
>hams stay within tolerences and signal characteristics
>allowed because failing to do so can/will lead to
>interference.

Of course! That's why the written tests cannot be totally eliminated. As I have written elsewhere.

BUT (and it's a very big but), FCC says that almost all of the technical knowledge a ham needs to know is already adequately tested by the 35 question Technician test. That conclusion is inescapable from the fact that Techs are allowed to use all authorized amateur modes, frequencies, power levels and technologies above 30 MHz.

The only technical knowledge things that may not be adequately tested on the Tech written are some HF specific items of propagation, and some regulations.

There's nothing inherently different about a 6 meter rig and a 10 meter rig, is there? In fact, many modern rigs cover all ham bands from 160 through VHF! Why is a Technician licensee qualified to design/build/repair/align/modify and most of all operate a 6 meter rig but not a 15 meter rig - particularly when it's the same rig?

Look at the FCC enforcement logs. Problems due to technical incompetence are very few in the ARS, and those that do happen are not clustered on any

particular license class.

So why do we need all that written testing beyond Tech?

>Morse knowledge, on the other hand,
>has no potential for harming others, causing interference,
>etc.
>
And that's a good thing! One more reason to learn the skills! ;-)

But we're not talking about Morse. We're talking about written testing beyond
the minimum needed to insure safe, legal operation of an amateur station.

>> This isn't a straw argument. I've known hams who sold off their study
>> materials as soon as they passed the *written* tests.
>>
>> Now some folks will say "But the writtens support the basis and
>> purpose of amateur radio as a technical service - there's even an ITU
>> recommendation" - etc. And of course all hams do need to know the
>> applicable regulations, safety and operating practices, so of course
>> the written test cannot be completely eliminated.
>>
>> But has the existence of several tiers of written testing actually
>> made hams "more technical"? Does being tested on how to compute
>> complex impedances and Thevenin equivalents make a ham more likely to
>> build equipment, experiment with new modes, participate in public
>> service communication, be a VE and/or Elmer, and be a more friendly,
>> helpful amateur? Does such testing make a ham less likely to commit
>> rules violations?
>>
>> From 1953 to 1968, US amateur radio had only two *effective* written
>> tests - the Novice and the General/Conditional/Technician. Yes, the
>> Extra existed, but it was a "prestige" license only, which granted no
>> additional operating privileges at all. The 20 question Novice got new
>> hams started, and the ~50 question General took care of the rest.
>>
>> The reintroduction of "incentive licensing" in late 1968 was supposed
>> to push hams to be "more technical" by requiring two more written
>> tests beyond the General in order to get full privileges. But did that
>> result happen?
>>
>> Some might cite the 20 wpm code test for Extra, but in fact the most
>> gain in privileges was made by upgrading to Advanced, which required
>> no additional code test.
>>
>> After 1990 (13 years ago), medical waivers allowed those with problems
>> learning code past 5 wpm to get any class of amateur license on the
>> basis of the 5 wpm code test alone. And since restructuring, we're
>> down to just one additional written test beyond General for full
>> privileges.
>>

>> Has any of that made US hams or ham radio in the US "more technical"
>> in the past 35 years? Or just the opposite? Does *forcing* someone to
>> learn a little bit about radio theory make them want to build radios?
>>
>> Hans, K0HB, has proposed a 2 level system that would be very similar
>> to the old "pre-incentive" system. One easy test for newbies and a
>> full privs test for everybody else. And like the old system, the
>> newcomer license would not be renewable, so upgrading would
>> effectively be *required*.
>>
>> At first I though it was a "looney-tune" idea (to use Hans' phrase),
>> but now I'm not so sure. Perhaps he is on to something.
>>
>> FCC effectively reduced the number of written testing levels from 5 to
>> 3 back in 2000. NCVEC is beginning to make noises that the Tech test
>> is "too hard", and they also note that their "dump Element 1" petition
>> is only a first step. Also, a look at the AH0A database shows a severe
>> drop in new Techs since the new Tech Q&A pool was effective in
>> mid-July.
>>
>> If someone says we need less *written* testing and an *easier* entry
>> level test (with suitably reduced privs), how can they be refuted?
>>
>> If someone says "The only reason you Extras want people to have to
>> pass all these *written* tests is because *you* had to!" - how can
>> they be refuted?
>>
>> How can Hans' proposal be refuted? There's nothing in the theory part
>> of the Extra written that is required knowledge for the safe and legal
>> operation of an amateur station on any authorized band or mode. And
>> much of the regs in both the General and Extra exam are about what an
>> Extra can do that a General can't.
>>
>> Quite a number of hams today think that "incentive licensing" was a
>> mistake. Quite a number of hams today think that the 1953-1968 era was
>> a "golden age" that was ruined by the class divisions and forced
>> learning/testing of incentive licensing.
>>
>> Some people learn theory very easily, while for others it's a
>> difficult process. People who would make excellent hams but who aren't
>> good with numbers, science, and/or memorization of things like band
>> edges may be being kept out, or kept from full access, by the
>> *written* testing.
>>
>> > > In the absence of a code testing requirement, there will be
>progressively
>> > > fewer hams who have never been exposed to learning the code as a
>> > > result of the requirement. Since the requirement was the principle
>> > > motivation to learn the code, code use *will* decline once code
>testing

>> > > is abolished. Therefore, testing and use are two closely interrelated
>> > > concepts.
>>
>> Would anyone accept this argument, particlularly looking back over the
>> past 35 years?:
>>
>> 'In the absence of multiple levels of theory testing, there will be
>> progressively fewer hams who have been exposed to learning theory as a
>> result of the tests. Since the test requirement was the principle
>> motivation to learn the theory, the technical level of hams themselves
>> and of amateur radio in general *will* decline. Therefore, testing
>> and technical know-how are two closely interrelated concepts.'
>>
>> Or how about this rebuttal:
>>
>> Those who want technical knowhow in amateur radio are either unwilling
>> to expend
>> the effort to (or incapable of *politely*) encourage people to "give
>> the
>> theory a try and see if you like it." And, they are apparently
>> unwilling to
>> take "No thanks, not interested" for an answer. Thus, they continue
>> to
>> seek to have the FCC mandate an arguably counter-productive
>> "recruiting program" for them ...
>>
>> --
>>
>> Which approach is more effective for getting hams interested in
>> technical subjects - the "honey" of demonstrations and examples, or
>> the "vinegar" of forced testing beyond the minimum necessary for safe
>> and legal operation of an amateur station?
>>
>
>Jim,
>
>If/when someone floats an RM to end written testing, then
>I'll be one of the first in opposition.

It's already been done - see the QCWA petition. See the NCVEC thinkpiece linked to, above. See Hans' proposal.

Waiting for an RM may be too late. Look at what happened with restructuring - FCC proposed 4 classes of license but enacted 3. They proposed improved written exams but instead cut back both the number and size of the written tests.

To be clear - I support a multi-level license structure and *better* written tests at all levels - code test or no code test. But that's just my opinion.

The question remains - how can proposals like Hans' be refuted, other than "I don't like it?"

What can be said in response to "You just want all hams to take a lot of written tests because *you* had to take a lot of written tests"

>For today, the code test
>is not, IMHO, in any way comparable.

That's not the issue I'm talking about.

>We'll just have to
>agree to disagree on that because I ain't gonna waste any more
>time arguing hypotheticals when those arguments aren't
>even being made to the FCC.
>
But they are being made to FCC, as shown above. What reasonable, rational arguments can we make to counter the above logic?

73 de Jim, N2EY

1068. Re: 73 Magazine Says "73 and QRT"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-14 12:38:38 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0310140438.fe9ba9c@posting.google.com>
Source record: 80694
Cross-posted to:
rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0310110957.36b3c2d8@posting.google.com>...
> "Capt. Blackflag" <wvay4daves@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:<1065844329.188229@newshost03.voicenet.com>...
> > "John Norfolk" <janorfolk@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> > news:c6a70d55.0310101532.63b491f3@posting.google.com...
> > > From the ARRL Letter October 10:
> > >
> > > 73 MAGAZINE SAYS "73 AND QRT"
> > >
> > > After completing 43 years of publication, 73 Amateur Radio Today
> > > magazine is calling it quits. Plans to publish a joint
> > > October/November issue fell through this week, and the September 2003
> > > issue was the magazine's last. According to self-proclaimed "El
> > > Supremo and Founder" Wayne S. Green II, W2NSD, it was a simple
> > > matter of economics.
> >
> > And with this very sad announcement, Ham Radio is truly DEAD.
> > (well....mabey not, but we've lost a BIG chunk without 73)
> >
> > Wayne and his magazine was without doubt ham radio's most
> > amusing read. His Editorials were always right on target - often
> > his prognostications were YEARS ahead of their time.
>
> "Editorials"...?!?! You mean acidic rants, perhaps?
>
> Many of his "prognostications" were echos of professional
> engineering journals, presented in such a way as to wow and awe the
> Amateur community that otherwise was unaware of those writings.
>
> > I hope he makes an appearance on Art Bell's show to discuss
> > the 73 Magazine demise and other commentary soon!
>
> They'd go well together.
>
> > > Green's 73 editorials and regular round of personal appearances
> > > originally concentrated on Amateur Radio and his ideas to improve,
> > > advance and grow it. In recent years, however, they've veered into
> > > conspiracy theories, cures for cancer, AIDS and other ailments and
> > > Green's proliferation of book titles on those topics.
>
> Like certain other posters in RRAP, he liked to carry on about

> subjects for which he was inadequately informed, prefering to shoot in
> the dark, hoping he'd hit something.
>
> > > Green says he'll continue his essays on his Web site
> > > http://www.waynegreen.com/ "for those subscribers who mainly
> > > bought the magazine for them." He told ARRL that no definite
> > > arrangements have been made yet about how to handle outstanding 73
> > > subscriptions.
>
> "Essays"...?!?! That's like calling Jeffrey Dahmer's diaries an
> "new age surgery text".
>
> > > CQ Publisher Dick Ross, K2MGA, said he takes no joy from the passing
> > > of 73. "The loss of any publication serving Amateur Radio leaves all
> > > of us a bit poorer," he said. "Thank you, Wayne, for 43
> > > entertaining, informative, sometimes infuriating, and always
> > > interesting years of 73. We'll genuinely miss it."
>
> Some of us won't.
>
> Steve, K4YZ

Steve, like Ham Radio magazine, now that 73 is "defunct" it's time for you to call into question of what value any of its contributing authors made to the ARS. Additionally, you may now call into question whether any of their work was original or not.

Finally, you may tell us how many articles you've had published by 73 magazine.

Best of luck, Brian

1069. Re: New Acronym: ECTA (Era of Code Test Abolition)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-14 12:52:22 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0310140452.53e7cf0f@posting.google.com>
Source record: 80695

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20031012144521.00545.00001528@mb-m02.aol.com>...
> In article <20031012000942.23307.00003679@mb-m29.aol.com>, yodoc@aol.comnospam
> (Larry Roll K3LT) writes:
>
> >In article <20031011214229.06226.00000925@mb-m19.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com
> >(N2EY)
> >writes:
> >
> >>On the one hand, Morse is not used very much in emergency communication. On
> >>the
> >>other hand, it *is* still used occasionally, by hams, in emergency
> >>communications. More important, there *are* times when it when it is the
> only
> >>available mode that would get through in the situation.
> >>(Note that phrase "only available mode")
> >>
> >>All of the above are documented facts.
> >>
> >>The problem is, does the occasional use of Morse in emergencies mean that
> >>*all*
> >>hams *must* be tested on the mode? Some say yes, some say no, some say it's
> a
> >>piece of the reason. All based on personal opinion, nothing more.
> >>
> >>Boil down any of the arguments on either side, and what you wind up with is
> >>personal opinion.
> >>
> >>73 de Jim, N2EY
> >
> >Jim:
> >
> >The truth is, only hams who know the Morse code have the capability
> >to fall back on the CW mode when other modes are unavailable.
>
> Absolutely true. But whether that is a reason to make every ham pass a code
> test is a matter of opinion - some say yes, others say no.

Then its a good thing that the Germans and Japanese only captured
dittyboppers in WWII, otherwise these POWs would not have been able to
tap out messages.

You guys are rediculous. Absolutely.

1070. Re: New Acronym: ECTA (Era of Code Test Abolition)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-14 12:53:30 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0310140453.f0485e4@posting.google.com>
Source record: 80696

"Clint" <rattlehead at computron dot net> wrote in message
news:<vomdo775euu639@corp.supernews.com>...
> > Jim:
> >
> > The truth is, only hams who know the Morse code have the capability
> > to fall back on the CW mode when other modes are unavailable.
>
> True.
>
> Now explain why hams know how to use "other modes" when there isn't
> a profeciency test to MAKE them do it in the first place.
>
> Clint

Some forgot where they put their microphones.

1071. Re: I warned everyone this would happen. Re: 73 Magazine Says "73 and QRT"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-14 12:57:10 UTC
From: jason_hsu@my-deja.com
Message-ID: <f7d9a152.0310140457.6170ad6a@posting.google.com>
Source record: 80697
Cross-posted to:
rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

You're WRONG! No-Code Techs and Extra-Crispies are NOT the reason 73 magazine is out of business.

Britney Spears is to blame. Ever since the "Baby One More Time" video, Britney has been working tirelessly to corrupt all 6 billion members of the human race by exposing her midriff. If Britney hadn't tied up her shirt in the "Baby One More Time" video, the Good Old Days of ham radio would still be with us. :)

CQ, CQ, CQ baby one more time!

Jason Hsu, AG4DG
usenet AAAAATTTTTTT jasonhsu.com
http://www.jasonhsu.com/humor.html

1072. Re: What makes LHA so poor at simple research tasks?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-14 12:57:17 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bmgrrdssn0@208.206.142.105>
Source record: 80698

Hans K0HB wrote:

> "Dear Mother Anderson, your son Leonard is failing in practical
> applied physics. Perhaps he would benefit from a stint in the Army to
> learn a useful trade."
>

Cheez!!!! That didn't work either!

1073. Re: 73 Magazine Says "73 and QRT"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-14 12:58:10 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bmgrt2ssn1@208.206.142.105>
Source record: 80699
Cross-posted to:
rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

Ed Price wrote:

> "Chuck Reti" <wv8a@arrl.invalid.net> wrote in message
> news:wv8a-D04359.223340131020003@news.comcast.giganews.com...
>
>>In article <bmf2hr$s20$1@freenet9.carleton.ca>,
>> et472@FreeNet.Carleton.CA (Michael Black) wrote:
>>
>>>I wonder how many lifetime subscribers this will affect?
>>>
>>>If I'm remembering right, fairly early on Wayne sold them, and they
>>>were $37. In 1973, he sold them for $73. I think he continued to
>>>sell them for some time after that; I have a recollection of a $150
>>>life time subscription, but that's a more vague memory.
>>>
>>>Were the lifetime subscriptions honored for all that time? How many
>>>of them abandoned the magazine. explicitly telling 73 they didn't
>>>want anymore issues, or just not providing a new address when moving?
>>>How many who did buy a lifetime subscription were still alive by this
>>>month?
>>>
>>> Michael VE2BVW
>>>
>>
>>IIRC, the subscription form in the mag for some time used to say
>>"Lifetime (ours or yours)".
>>
>>The magazine cover parodies were always fun, the Playboy and QST's
>>particularly memorable.
>>
>>Sadly, most of my 73 (and HR) collection got turned to mush in a
>>basement flood a few years back; still have a few of each.
>>
>>I'm expecting that Wayne will be appearing on Art Bell some weekend soon
>>to Explain It All.
>>--
>>Chuck Reti WV8A
>>Detroit MI
>
>
>
> Seems pretty simple to me; Wayne finally did say "die" (or at least BYE)!
>

Yeah, I sure do hate to see 73 magazine byte the dust!

1074. Re: What makes a Pro code test Amateur a Troglodyte?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-14 13:00:27 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bmgs1bssn2@208.206.142.105>
Source record: 80700

Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
> "Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
> news:20031012000943.23307.00003682@mb-m29.aol.com...
>
>>In article <bma161$cg2@library2.airnews.net>, "Kim W5TIT"
>
> <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
>
>>writes:
>>
>>
>>>Therein lies the problem with the whole CW test (TEST, *test*) debate.
>
> The
>
>>>minute one takes on the "no" CW test argument, it is generally met with
>
> an
>
>>>attitude that an end CW use (USE, *use*) is being favored or called for.
>>
>>Kim:
>>
>>Code testing has always been the thing which generated code use.
>
>
> I would assert that being forced to learn code to gain access to HF
> "soured" more people on code use than it encouraged ... of course,
> some percentage of folks decided they liked code and continued to
> use it, but MANY simply endured something they had no interest in
> to get past the test, then "threw away the key."
>

Well, here's another incorrect asserrtion from our friendly code hater.

> Remember the old adage "honey is better than vinegar."

It isn't flies we want in the ARS.

>>In the absence of a code testing requirement, there will be progressively
>>fewer hams who have never been exposed to learning the code as a
>>result of the requirement. Since the requirement was the principle
>>motivation to learn the code, code use *will* decline once code testing
>>is abolished. Therefore, testing and use are two closely interrelated
>>concepts.

>
>
> Translation: Larry and his "kindred spirits" are either unwilling to expend
> the effort to (or incapable of *politely*) encourage people to "give the
> code a try and see if you like it." And, they are apparently unwilling to
> take "No thanks, not interested" for an answer. Thus, they continue to
> seek to have the FCC mandate an arguably counter-productive "recruiting
> program" for them ...

Amateur radio occupies a unique spot in the world of radio communications in that it is the only service that has the capability to furnish near-instant communications anywhere people reside or travel with radio equipment - Communicatiosn of the most widely divergent types and modes. It's as widespread and common as the civil population.

Thus we are the communications of last resort for ubiquitous, anytime, anywhere, any method communicating under the most or least extreme circumstances- it all depends on the cirtcumstances. When we are needed we respond with everything we have. And that includes the most basic means of radio communications, radiotelegraphy - if we have personally developed our skiis so that we have what it takes to do it. Few beginners anywhere have the depth of knowledge to realize the properties and potential of being personally equipped to communicate using Morse code over radio - plenty of technical types have the same problem, witness your own case. It takes the exposure of the code test for licensing and the required learning involved to get past that point.

When a techie like you demands the withdrawal of operator qualification within the ARS such that "it makes absoultely no difference whether or not radiotelegraphy continues to exist since it is only a casual, less than useful method of communications", then what that tells me is that
you have an extremely serious flaw in both your technical qualifications and your personal psyche. The latter conclusion stems from the known fact that you chose to allow a test for Morse qualification to stymie you as an active HF ham for all those years.
Even if you had some actual problem with learning morse code, a great many others with such problems have asserted their will and gone on to master the beast. Frankly it hasn't been all that easy for me, either. Sorry you just couldn't do it. That in no way justifies your jihad against the code, nor the code test.

And further - If the FCC was still the organization it once was, and was set up to be, we wouldn't be having this discussion - there would never have been any question about whether or not a code qualification was appropriate for ham radio.

Should they approve the BPL fiasco, the evidence will be complete - they no longer are an independent entity, clearly being easily swayed by pressures which once no one would have dared exert, and SHOULD be replaced by something at least marginally effective at carrying out its mandate.

1075. Re: RM-10808 --- Wexelbaum Redux

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-14 13:00:28 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bmgs1cssn3@208.206.142.105>
Source record: 80601

Carl R. Stevenson wrote:

> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20031011123005.05539.00001479@mb-m16.aol.com...
>
>>>Clearly AH0A can't understand (or accept) that the RTTY example
>>>is "theoretical knowledge" and the Morse test is a test of a mechanical
>>>skill ...
>>
>>You mean "a practical skill".
>
>
> No, I meant "mechanical skill." (touch typing would be in the same
> category ...)
>
>

So you assert that the usage of Radiotelegraphy is just mechanical
skill. Any half-way accomplished radiotelegrapher knows that isn't so.

Well, you have clearly shown that, contrary to your posts above you
know so very little about Morse on radio that you have no business
whatever elaborating on its properties.

No one here who actually is in any serious way proficient will
believe you for a minute when you state that you "once we up to nearly
20WPM".
It's simply an untruth. You insisting it's a mechanical skill proves it.

1076. Re: BPL a reality in my area now!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-14 13:00:30 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bmgs1essn4@208.206.142.105>
Source record: 80602
Cross-posted to: alt.ham-radio,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Roger Halstead wrote:
> On Sun, 12 Oct 2003 23:27:27 -0400, a 32 bit process
> <replytogroup@hotmail.com> wrote:
>
>
>>On Sun, 12 Oct 2003 16:56:50 GMT, "James Wilson"
>><Someone@Microsoft.Com> wrote:
>>
>>
>>>What does BPL sound like? Can someone post a wav file somewhere so it can
>>>be identified? Is it worse that the Pennsylvania QSO party?
>>
>>It almost sounds like a geiger counter, but a lot louder and the
>>clicking is quicker in pace.
>
>
> After having gone to the ARRL site and listened to the examples, all I
> can say is it sounds just like precipitation static and/or loose
> connections. No way would I be able to identify one from the other.
> I'm just going to have to complain every time I hear noise and make
> recordings. If it's noisy enough to be a problem it should be fixed.
>

Proximity to the power grid would be the main clincher, IMO, but what
about skywave propagation? That stuff could go around the world at QRP
evels!

> BTW, most of the links failed and instead I ended up hijacked to QSL
> dot net. (they call it redirecting, but if I didn't select to go
> there, I don't want to go there...I'll settle for the 404 screen
> instead of giving some one advertizing points.)
>
> Roger Halstead (K8RI EN73 & ARRL Life Member)
> www.rogerhalstead.com
> N833R World's oldest Debonair? (S# CD-2)
>

1077. Re: FCC relaxes it's prohibition on use of the "F-word" on broadcast media.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-14 13:00:31 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bmgs1fssn5@208.206.142.105>
Source record: 80603
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

CP wrote:

Now if the Americans would like to take over
> canadah........please!!!
>
>
NOOOO way, champ! We gotta learn how to deal with Mexico first!

1078. Re: 73 Magazine Says "73 and QRT"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-14 13:00:33 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bmgs1hssn6@208.206.142.105>
Source record: 80604
Cross-posted to:
rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

Steve Silverwood wrote:

> In article <wuiib.2959$N%3.469@news01.roc.ny>, aa2qa@frontiernet.net
> says...
>
>>My gut feeling is that a lot of mags have or will drop.
>
>
> That is, if they don't get wise and start looking into ways of
> publishing that do away with the costs of publishing. Monitoring Times
> has done it right by making their magazine available in PDF format,
> downloadable each month from their FTP site. They provide a smaller
> file with somewhat lower resolution, suitable for downloading by dial-up
> subscribers, plus a larger, higher-res version for those of us fortunate
> enough to have access to broadband Internet connections. I put each
> month's issues on CD-ROM so that they're readily available for
> reference, without having to keep a bunch of magazines around. (I'm
> always citing this as an example, so if I've gotten annoying by saying
> it so many times I apologize.)
>
> If only the rest of the publishers would consider similar options....
>

I dunno, Steve... I downladed a 46megabyte file from Germany last
week and it only took about 5 hours with my snailpace dialup.(no
broadband available here) Seems the website has a lot to do with how
download speeds. Or maybe I just lucked into a good net route. It never
even flinched during the entire process. Normally I would lose the link
after a time.

Good idea really, with the PDF subscription. I'll have to take a look at
Monitoring Times site.

Dick

1079. Re: What makes a Pro code test Amateur a Troglodyte?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-14 13:01:36 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031014090136.29227.00001059@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 80605

>But they are being made to FCC, as shown above. What reasonable, rational
>arguments can we make to counter the above logic?
>
>73 de Jim, N2EY
>

Thats been my point all along. There is nothing to stop this downward trend, once we got started its just a matter of time.
Karl thinks hes going to jump up and scream that the Writtens have to stay and the FCC is going to say OK. Karl I hate to be the barrier of Bad news, but all your complaining and reasons you have used to stop CW testing, are about to be thrown back in your face as far as the written. Then maybe you will see the light.

1080. Re: What makes a Pro code test Amateur a Troglodyte?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-14 13:13:41 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bmgsq5$1f3$0@208.206.142.105>
Source record: 80606

N2EY wrote:

> In article <YFIib.48865$mQ2.42713@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Bill
> Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
>

>>We'll just have to
>>agree to disagree on that because I ain't gonna waste any more
>>time arguing hypotheticals when those arguments aren't
>>even being made to the FCC.
>>
>
> But they are being made to FCC, as shown above. What reasonable, rational
> arguments can we make to counter the above logic?

Jim, you're talking to a post. NCI thinks they've got what they want
now and their heads are firmly buried in the sand to any issue beyond
killing off the code test. Nothing will dull their premature euphoria.
So now we'll see if the adage "be careful what you ask for" will apply.

1081. Re: Code test analogy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-14 13:13:57 UTC
From: nocoder@aol.com
Message-ID: <bmgsql02lav@enews1.newsguy.com>
Source record: 80634

In article <bmfpib$i4q$0@208.206.142.110>, dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com says...

>> Even though the testing for code was reduced to the basic 5 WPM over three
>> years ago, it's obvious that the debate still rages on.
>>
>> The insistance that a person know Morse Code at a resonable speed in order
to
>> be "real ham" is similar to religious fanatics, particualrly Christian
>> fundamentalists, who think that a person has to believe in god in order to
be
>a
>> good and moral person. They cannot prove that their god even exists. So with
>> the PCTA, they cannot prove that code is useful in light of communications
>> advancements that have been made over the past several decades.
>
>
>
> Surely not)another lamebrained analogy - one more emptyhead strikes a
>blow for nothingness!

If you have no other refutation than to call it "lamebrained" then you have no
argument at all. You show that you are incapable of engaging in any form of
intelligent debate on the matter.

> It has always been true that one cannot be persuaded when he refuses
>to review the evidence. QED.

If there is evidence that I've overlooked, as you claim, please post it.

1082. Re: ARRL you can Kiss my $39.00 a Year Good Bye

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-14 13:28:04 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0310140528.3c0cad0e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 80607

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20031012123106.28806.00000085@mb-m25.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: ARRL you can Kiss my $39.00 a Year Good Bye
> >From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
> >Date: 9/13/03 8:25 AM Central Daylight Time
> >Message-id: <f45722ac.0309130525.6f33bc26@posting.google.com>
> >
> >k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
> >news:<5c01b95b.0309121214.7d06772d@posting.google.com>...
> >> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
> news:<f45722ac.0309061806.621b7987@posting.google.com>...
> >>
> >> > Jim has repeatedly pointed out where the ARRL proposed fewer license
> >> > classes and a lower code speed for full priveleges during the last
> >> > restructuring, which he always equates with lower standards.
> >>
> >> That's Jim;s OPINION, Brain. Other than that, you have not
> >> satisfied the question of how the ARRL has allegedly pushed for "lower
> >> standards".
> >>
> >> Steve, K4YZ
> >
> >I don't necessarily understand how Jim arrived at his OPINION, but
> >you're welcome to ask him, if you've the guts to do so.
>
> Plenty of "guts" here, Brain, and I have re-read many of Jim's posts
> looking for something that equates to "no code = lower standards".
>
> Haven't found it yet.

Selective reading.

> >I'm always amazed at how you PCTA give each other passes on every
> >damned thing.
>
> What "pass", Brain...?!?!

Like, "I have re-read many of Jim's posts looking for something that
equates to "no code = lower standards"."

That pass.

> Haven't found it yet.

Mean like how YOU let LENNIE "pass" with use of
> snide remarks, blatant lies, profanity and obvious misdirection of his posts,

> but then accuse others of the same thing without comment...?!?!

You don't seem to like that much, do you?

> >Go ahead, ask him.
>
> Why do I need to ask him anything when his comments are archived for all
> to read...?!?!

Since you appear unable to find it on your own, you might want to
check with Jim.

> Now...about those T5 logs and your "authorization" to oeprate in Somalia?

Correct. I was authorized.

1083. Re: What makes a Pro code test Amateur a Troglodyte?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-14 13:31:49 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031014093149.02724.00000417@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 80609

>Jim, you're talking to a post. NCI thinks they've got what they want
>now and their heads are firmly buried in the sand to any issue beyond
>killing off the code test. Nothing will dull their premature euphoria.
>So now we'll see if the adage "be careful what you ask for" will apply.

Your so right, I cant wait till they start crying about what has happened. And what is probably going to follow

1084. Re: Points Of Perception...What Do YOU Call "Collateral Damage"...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-14 13:32:25 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0310140532.3ba00621@posting.google.com>
Source record: 80608

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0310101331.45860985@posting.google.com>...
> k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0309301932.4f2bc48a@posting.google.com>...
> > Radio Amateur KC2HMZ <kc2hmz@aa-mail.removespamkiller.net> wrote in message
news:<vtqinv0gdvm1pinppbkgksdjcn1cevjtoj@4ax.com>...
> >
> > > The code test will soon vanish, and then hopefully we can get around
> > > to the business of repairing the collateral damage that's been done to
> > > the ARS in the process.
> >
> > "Collateral damage", John...???
> >
> > You've been watching too much CNN.
> >
> > You wouldn't be talking about the "damage" created by the influx
> > of over a quarter of a million NON-code licensees, would you?
> >
> > Or would that be by the "damage" created by Amateur volunteers in
> > the last 80+ years that has earned Amateur Radio the respect and
> > hearldry bestowed upon it by the American Red Cross, the Deaprtment of
> > State, the Department of Defense, the Salvation Army, FEMA, etc etc
> > etc...??? (Not to mention mentions in the Federal Register and
> > accolades rendered on the House and Senate floor)
> >
> > Perhaps you were alluding to the "damage" created by the creation
> > of a radio repeater net that has withstood fire, flood, maelstrom and
> > terrorist attack...Is THAT the "damage" you were refering to? I heard
> > all the "complaints" about it from about two dozen New York and New
> > Jersey emergency response groups from all the "trouble" they created
> > in September 2001...You should read all the things some of those guys
> > had to say about Amatuer Radio!
> >
> > Maybe you meant the "damage" created by the fact that we are
> > (generally) self-policing and allowed by the FCC to mentor our own? I
> > don't see the commercial services being allowed to do this, but I
> > guess I am missing something...
> >
> > Or I guess you were refering to the "damage" caused by the
> > interruption of our schools by such programs as ARISS and SAREX...???
> > I can see how taking little Johnny and Mary away from recess to chat
> > wwith orbiting astronauts might inhibit thier imaginations...
> >
> > And I guess we sure got our "come-uppance" when we were allocated

> > new bands on HF in the last 20 years.
> >
> > Otherwise, I haven't got a clue of what you were alluding
> > to...And I doubt YOU did either, John.
> >
> > Steve, K4YZ
>
> Hey John...Where'd ya go...?!?!
>
> Find it a bit rough going trying to create an illusion while
> someone else was shining a light on you, eh?
>
> Steve, K4YZ

Talking to yourself again?

1085. Re: FISTS Postion to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-14 13:35:49 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0310140535.1180f438@posting.google.com>
Source record: 80610

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0310091237.75c4f23c@posting.google.com>...
> k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0309190239.2b7bcf38@posting.google.com>...
> > lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20030916205913.12501.00002450@mb-m04.aol.com>...
> > > In article <bk4b7e$p383g$8@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>, "Ryan, KC8PMX"
> > > <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> writes:
> > >
> > > >All of the above answers would be correct (barring accidental typos), but
> > > >the original poster of the question in the first place DID NOT SPECIFY.
> > > >See, it is important, unless you consider ALL antennas to be exactly
> > > >one-half wavelength in length.
> > >
> > > Dan thinks "all" dipoles are half-wavelength...
> >
> > Lennie...WHAT did the "FISTS" organization have to do with
> > ANYTHING in this thread YOU started with their name...???
>
> Hey Lennie...Three weeks too short for you to answer a question?
>
> Steve, K4YZ

Talking to yourself again?

1086. Re: Amazin'....Ain't it...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-14 13:41:58 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0310140541.4b6c74df@posting.google.com>
Source record: 80611

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0310091233.2e6d328e@posting.google.com>...
> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0310060728.1275bf06@posting.google.com>...
> > k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0310051510.2502be58@posting.google.com>...
> > > brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0310030443.74c4da4b@posting.google.com>...
> > >
> > > > > There's been other rumors of running afoul of the CIVIL courts
> > > > > and getting booted by his ISP for his misconduct, but I don't have all
> > > > > those details.
> > > > >
> > > > > Perhaps he'd like to bring us up to date...?!?!
> > > > >
> > > > > Steve, K4YZ
> > > > >
> > > > Would you mind providing us with the name of that Yahoo MODERATED
> > > > Group, so that we might look at the archives and see what got you
> > > > tossed off the group.
>
> The group's not there any longer, Brain. I guess John got
> plugged from there, too...It was "radiomonitors", and it was
> UNmoderated.

Apparently not. You got moderated right off the group.

> > > > Thanks, Brian
> > > >
> > > >
> > > > Hello?
> > > >
> > > Asking yourself questions, Brain?
> >
> > No, Steve, I asked you a question. See the part that starts with,
> > "Would you mind..."
> >
> > > Who said anything about "moderated"...?!?!
> >
> > I was just curious what it would take to get you to play well with
> > others.
>
> Acting the way YOU want to be treated is the first step, Brain.

Have it your way, Stebe.

> Your "mentor" can fill you in on ways to antagonize and instigate
> flamefests...he does it well.

OK, Stebe.

> You aren't quite there yet, but you're getting close.

I'm learning from the Master, Stebe.

> > > I own four YahooGroups, one of which has over 400 subscribers,
> >
> > WhooHooo!
>
> And YOU sponsor...what?

How many articles of yours were published in the now "defunct" 73
magazine?

How did they contribute to the ARS?

Were they original works?

> "How_To_Look_Like_An_Idiot_In Public_And_Still_Not_Have_A_Clue @
> StupidGroups . Com"...?!?!

I'll leave that one to you, Stebe.

> > > and I can tell you with certainty that the listowner can block ANY
> > > subscriber to the list.
> >
> > Just how certain are you? Have you actually done it?
>
> Yep. I allow anyone to subscribe to my lists. Use any of them
> for "a/s/l" messages, commercial offerings, or ANYthing having to do
> with some get-rich-quick scam get's you booted.

a/s/l?

> I'd even let YOU join, Brain...But I don't know why you'd want to
> be there. All four of them pretty much expect that you have some idea
> of what the other subscribers are talking about.

You're so generous, Stebe.

> So far, you've been want for such a demonstration in THIS forum,
> I know you'd fail in them.
>
> Steve, K4YZ

You got me there, Stebe. I don't know what you are talking about in
"THIS" forum, so why do you think I'd understand your rantings
elsewhere?

1087. Re: Lennie's Double Standard Once Again Revealed...BY Lennie!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-14 13:46:40 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0310140546.153a6483@posting.google.com>
Source record: 80612

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0310091222.279d8b89@posting.google.com>...
> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0310080436.189d2293@posting.google.com>...
> > k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0310071254.6891a81c@posting.google.com>...
> > > brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0310060723.778385fd@posting.google.com>...
> > >
> > > > Unfortunately, Steve, we don't enjoy your antics and rants. Not
> > > > amusing at all.
> > >
> > > "We", Brain? "We" without exemption implies everyone.
> >
> > Sour grapes? Demanding a recount?
>
> No recount possible when no ORIGINAL count was conducted, eh,
> Brain?

So, Stebe, take a poll. Ask who enjoys your constant rantings.

> > > And I am sure you DON'T "enjoy" anything I have to say, mostly
> > > because I rub your nose in your own errors as effectively as I do.
> >
> > I enjoy your ocassional post about radio.
>
> We've tried that here before, Brain. Your mentor can't stand
> seeing anyone but himself express anything meaningful about radio.

Not true, Stebe.

> There have also been several other posters who have tried to
> drive content-focused threads here, but what's the use? YOU certainly
> have had nothing to offer...And what you HAVE offered has been found
> faulty and erroneous, to say the least.

Not true, Stebe.

> > > > Try behaving in a rational and civilized manner, and you'll not
> > > > attract so much negative attention.
> > >
> > > Hmmmmmmm......All the "negative attention" I've "attract(ed)" has
> > > been from you (a person known to proudly associate himself with a
> > > pathological liar), Lennie, (who IS the known pathological liar),
> > > Vipul, (who doesn't know the difference between BS and shinola), and a
> > > couple of anonymous posters who "hit and run" with some wise cracks.

> >
> > Steve, you attract no other kind of attention. You're hugely ignored.
>
> Perhaps,

True, Stebe.

but again, that would require some sort of reasonably
> alid survey, and neither you nor Sir Putzman have the resources or the
> reputations of being impartial or accurate in your posts.

Was the ARRL Morse Code survey impartial and accurate, Stebe?

> In otherwords, you are again spinning your wheels...

You got hit with that black pot again, Stebe?

> > > Ergo I am not at all impressed with your suggestion about ANYone's
> > > behaviour.
> >
> > behavior
>
> Either is correct.

Is "Stebe" correct?

1088. Re: Ireland

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-14 13:48:48 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0310140548.5c0a6c24@posting.google.com>
Source record: 80613

Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:<bm449s$l7t$0@208.207.71.139>...
> Brian wrote:
> > Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:<bm1nerbmj0@208.206.142.74>...
> >
> >>Brian wrote:
> >>
> >>>Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3F83C6B4.D6EC0FB0@earthlink.net>...
> >>>
> >>>
> >>>
> >>>>Ponder the matter. The answer will come to you.
> >>>>
> >>>>Ponder the matter. The answer will come to you.
> >>>>
> >>>>Ahhh! You may be getting closer to understanding my statements though I
> >>>>made no statements concerning "native amateur populations". Amateur
> >>>>radio licenses figures are not broken down into "native" and
> >>>>"non-native" categories. I didn't attempt to discount. I discounted.
> >>>>
> >>>>Dave K8MN
> >>>
> >>>
> >>>Thusly, you are smug Dave.
> >>
> >>When dealing with you it's almost a necessary requirement.
> >
> >
> > Especially the part about me getting closer to understanding a
> > statement he didn't make?
> >
> > What an idiot!
>
>
>
> Well, yes! That's your profile.
>
> >
> > Almost - necessary - requirement?
>
>
> Only ocassionally do you manage to catch a passing information wave.

> I could probably bette describe if but not in so few words.
> >
> > Its amazing how you were able to string those big words together.
>
>
> You can probably find an online dictioary if you go Googling.

Dick, get back to me when you can write a coherent statement, question, or comment.

1089. Re: What makes a Pro code test Amateur a Troglodyte?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-14 13:54:19 UTC
From: Bert Craig <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM>
Message-ID: <feTib.25446$Eh3.9161107@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>
Source record: 80614

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:bmgsq5$1f3$0@208.206.142.105...
> So now we'll see if the adage "be careful what you ask for" will apply.

Careful, Dick. The last time I used that adage, I was accused of making a "veiled threat." Although I doubt if we'll be hearing any NCTA's on the bottom of 40 anytime soon. BTW, my desk mic's been packed away to make room on my desktop for my log/notebook.

--
73 de Bert
WA2SI
FISTS #9384

1090. Re: A New Concept: Virtual Spectrum

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-14 14:04:34 UTC
From: David Stinson <arc5@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3F8BFEA6.1D89C994@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 80615
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.antiques.radio+phono,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc

Paul Keinanen wrote:
> the problem is the dynamic range
> (both in the analog RF front end and in the ADC) and high sample
> frequency required to transfer e.g. the whole 80 m or 2 m band over
> the internet.
I never said anything about transferring the entire band.
At this early stage, I'm only talking about streaming
about 25 KC of any band at any one time.
I'm limiting it so people can use the hardware they already have.
But the concept is "scalable" to larger bandwidths.

> If the reason is simply to avoid the local noise problems due to
> BPL/PLT/PLC...why not simply run the
> transmitter manually from home and monitoring the band using a remote
> receiver at a quiet rural site...
Avoiding BPL is only one aspect of very many.

I guess I wasn't clear-
For those who like Echo Link and what the rude Mr. Blabham
calls "Amateur Telephone," please have at it. Enjoy.
But frankly, I don't give two cents for using an
Internet chat room to talk over *someone else's* radio.

I restore ancient and military radios to original condition
and I want to talk on *them.* Some of them aren't even
capable of being used on ham bands. You'd be surprised;
there's a lot of us out here. With this system, like minded
people can use these radios to QSO completely legally.
If we wanted, we could have a real spark-gap to spark-gap QSO
with crystal detector receivers- in fact,
a whole bunch of such stations in a net-
because we are literally on our own, private ether.

Here's another:
I live in an apartment; I can't have an antenna.
My neighbors have strict restrictions; they can't have outside antennas.
If I use this system, I don't NEED an antenna.
Nor do I need a big, power-hungry amplifier.

Here's another (For Peter's sake):
I love listening to shortwave radio. The power
company installs BPL, and now all my carefully-tended radio
will say to me is: "BSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSRRRRRRRRRRRRRRRRPPPPPP!!"
Do I give up, put my favorite radio on the shelf and listen

to them on the Internet "phone?" Hell, no.
I log into a server that's streaming the 31 meter band in chunks
of 25 KC from a quiet location in Itchyarmpit, Idaho.
I pipe that into my V.S. transverter and into the antenna
connection of my radio. Once again I have evenings of
enjoyment listening to Radio Gabbabootoo.
If I want to hear Radio Binga Boinga
and the five other stations around that frequency,
I select the correct stream and enjoy.

I'm not an electronics engineer, guys- just a tinkerer like most of you.
I don't know "47th Order IMD products" from beans,
nor do I know all your wonderful engineering reasons why it won't work.
All I know is I built the simple circuits and it DOES work.
The fact that it's still crude is actually a big plus,
since it opens a new field in which the average,
none-genius amateur can do some meaningful work,
and that's something we haven't had in awhile.

The point is we are using our radios, not a blasted telephone.
And I'll say it again: When BPL is activated, if we don't have
a "work-around," there won't BE a hobby.

There's a quote out there somewhere that says any
new idea will always be met with nay-sayers and
hecklers. That's fine- comes with the territory.

73 DE Dave AB5S

1091. Re: Code test analogy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-14 15:09:37 UTC
From: groupk0hb@earthlink.net
Message-ID: <5ee63311.0310140709.4bbc5ee5@posting.google.com>
Source record: 80616

nocoder@aol.com (No-coder) wrote

> The insistance that a person know Morse Code at a resonable speed in order to
> be "real ham" is similar to religious fanatics, particualrly Christian
> fundamentalists, who think that a person has to believe in god in order to be a
> good and moral person. They cannot prove that their god even exists. So with
> the PCTA, they cannot prove that code is useful in light of communications
> advancements that have been made over the past several decades.

If a "religion" is defined to be a system of ideas that contains unprovable
statements, then Kurt Godel taught us that mathematics is not only a religion,
it is the only religion that can prove itself to be one.

73, de Hans, K0HB

1092. Re: BPL a reality in my area now!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-14 15:31:55 UTC
From: Mike Luther <mike.luther@ziplog.com>
Message-ID: <voo5lcd7edum5f@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 80617
Cross-posted to: alt.ham-radio,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Precisely ..

Dick Carroll wrote:

>
>
> Proximity to the power grid would be the main clincher, IMO, but what
> about skywave propagation? That stuff could go around the world at QRP
> evels!
>
And it will. You can even work VK6 from W5 on 40CW with one watt. If
it radiates, it also radiates skywave. Which mnakes this issue one for
WARC as well, bigtime.

--

--> Sleep well; OS2's still awake! ;)

Mike Luther

1093. Re: A New Concept: Virtual Spectrum

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-14 16:01:54 UTC
From: et472@FreeNet.Carleton.CA
Message-ID: <bmh6li$7e$1@freenet9.carleton.ca>
Source record: 80618
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.antiques.radio+phono,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc

W7TI (noway@nohow.com) writes:
> On Tue, 14 Oct 2003 01:27:32 GMT, David Stinson <arc5@ix.netcom.com>
> wrote:
>
>>I have today submitted an article to QST magazine entitled
>>"Virtual Spectrum: Beating BPL at its own game,"
>
> ____
>
> Is it April already? Dang, how time flies.
>
>
> Bill, W7TI
>

I wondered that myself. Take note that it's already been done.

Back in the sixties, there were a number of pseudo-academic articles
that appeared in CQ in the April issue, I think under the same pseudonym.
There was one about using phone lines for amateur radio, complete with
"DXpeditions" to exotic countries. It was voice, but it had an odd
similarity to the internet. I can't remember, though, if this was in
the early sixties, my guess 1964, or the late sixties, likely 1968.
It's not like therre were a lot of April issues in that decade, so someone
with a complete set (and in order) could check. They threw in some archive
photos, and plenty of official sounding titles and committee names, so
it came across really well (unless you got suckered).

Michael VE2BVW

1094. Re: RM-10808 --- Wexelbaum Redux

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-14 16:25:24 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0310140825.2c02d233@posting.google.com>
Source record: 80619

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20031013160410.21642.00001644@mb-m01.aol.com>...
> In article <20031012183022.01893.00001195@mb-m22.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
> writes:
>
> >In article <hohib.795$_i.74284@nnrp1.ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
> ><wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:
> >
> >>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> >>news:20031011123005.05539.00001479@mb-m16.aol.com...
> >>> In article <wbDhb.623$_i.48433@nnrp1.ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
> >>> <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:
> >>>
> >>> >> and a "reward" for learning. I fail to understand why removing Morse
> >>> >> testing is any different from removing all aspects of RTTY knowledge
> >>> >> from the written test, e.g. "T8A10. What would you connect to a
> >>> >> transceiver for RTTY operation?".
> >>> >
> >>> >Clearly AH0A can't understand (or accept) that the RTTY example
> >>> >is "theoretical knowledge" and the Morse test is a test of a mechanical
> >>> >skill ...
> >>>
> >>> You mean "a practical skill".
> >>
> >>No, I meant "mechanical skill." (touch typing would be in the same
> >>category ...)
> >
> >Both are also practical skills, are they not? Practical as opposed to
> >theoretical.
>
> If you have a problem with amateur radio license test questions, senior,
> I'd suggest you contact the VEC Question Pool Committee. They are
> the ones originating the content and on what subjects. FCC no longer
> requires a certain percentage of specific subjects in the pool.

What is your point?
>
> >>> Both are valuable to the radio amateur. Whether either should be tested is
> >>> a matter of opinion, nothing more.
> >>>
> >>> But if a person has no interest in RTTY, why should that person be
> >>> subjected to questions on the subject?
> >>>
> >>> Why can't a ham be trusted to learn about RTTY if/when the desire to use

> >>> that mode arises? RTTY is "just another mode", is it not? There's no
> >>> requirement for any ham to ever use it.
> >>
> >>There is an ITU-R Recommendation that deals with the sorts of
> >>THEORETICAL knowledge that hams should possess ... IIRC,
> >>it's ITU-R Recommendation M.1544 ...
> >
> >It's just a recommendation, though - not a requirement.
>
> Why such an absolute on "requirement" versus "recommendation?"
>
> ITU-R documents are NOT law per se. Those are common-
> agreement items for _administrations_ to consider.
>
> At NO time will there be ANY ITU-R "police officials" arresting
> ANYONE for any violations of ITU-R radio regulations or
> recommendations, ANY radio service ANYWHERE.

What is your point?

Should the USA not follow ITU-R requirements because there is no
international police to enforce them?

> >>That recommendation is consistent with the basis and purpose
> >>of the ARS, both as defined by the FCC and the ITU.
> >
> >So is touch typing, knowing Morse code, knowing how to solder, and a whole
> >bunch of other things.
>
> Is the "basis and purpose of the ARS" all about morse code?
>
> I don't think so, not in any observation of the FCC regulations.

Neither is soldering or touch typing.

> >>While not strictly mandatory, it is provided as "good advice to
> >>administrations" on what sorts of theoretical knowledge hams
> >>should possess.
> >
> >Sure - but it's just a recommendation.
>
> Irrelevant.

Very relevant.

> NO ONE can be arrested for violation of an ITU-R
> "regulation."

Should the USA not follow ITU-R requirements because there is no
international police to enforce them?

> Quit trying to belabor an irrelevant point.

Quit trying to be the newsgroup moderator.
>
> >Can we really say that the questions on RTTY in the current written tests
> >really assure that hams have theoretical knowledge of RTTY at the level
> >recommended by M-1544?
> >
> >And note this:
> >
> >When I took my most recent ham exam that counted for a license, the only TOR
> >mode authorized for hams was 60 wpm Baudot code RTTY using FSK or OOK. (Shift
> had to be less than 900 Hz, as I recall.
>
> Oh, my. When I first USED teleprinters...NO formal classes, NO test,
> just an on-the-job informal explanatin-instruction

So why should amateurs have to pass tests that include questions on
RTTY?

> >No PSK-31, no packet, no PACTOR or even AMTOR. Not even ASCII!
(long boring irrelevant stuff deleted for brevity)

> >Back then the power limit was different, repeater rules were very different,
> >and the 30, 17 or 12 meter bands weren't even a distant dream. The technology
> >used in most ham rigs was also very different.
>
> "Repeaters" came into being around 1940 in the US military.

Incorrect!

In 1932, W1AWW and W1HMO set up an *amateur radio* repeater near
Springfield, MA on the old 5 meter band. This repeater listened near
60 MHz and transmitted near 56 MHz - inside but near the limits of the
old band. Amateurs from Boston to the Berkshires could communicate
through the system. It used AM but was clearly a repeater.

> They
> were known as "radio relay" then and for several decades afterwards.

The 1932 *amateur radio* system was referred to as a "Duplex Phone
Radio Relay".

It was written up in QST.

(long boring irrelevant diatribe snipped)

> "Repeaters" are certainly nothing new in
> technology nor are they of amateur radio origin.

1932. Springfield Massachusetts. W1AWW and W1HMO. 5 meter band. AM
voice.

Amateur radio
>
> >And the tests we took back then had lots of things in them that are no longer
> >in the current tests. Neutralization of triode RF power amplifiers, for

> >example.....
>
> I was successfully operating high-power vacuum tube amplifiers in HF
> communications WITHOUT being formally tested and WITHOUT any
> formal training in high-power HF transmitters at ADA. On-the-job
> verbal instructions sufficed, taking less than a day for explanations
> and individual run-through of procedure.

Lucky you.

Now, why should amateurs have to pass tests on any of that?

> The workhorse transmitter
> at ADA in the 1950s was the BC-339, 1 KW RF output using a
> pair of 833 triodes in the final amplifier. Yes, "neutralization" was
> required to be observed on the 339 and all the others. Not a problem.
> Not a "test subject" nor were there any "legal requirements."

So why should amateurs have to pass tests on any of that?
>
> Since those days long ago, I was given job responsibility to DESIGN
> and prototype RF power amplifiers and power sources WITHOUT
> any formal testing and WITHOUT any specific formal schooling in
> such techniques. At the same time, I was REQUIRED to obey the
> current laws on RF emission technical standards for the particular
> radio application. Solid-state technology and techniques can be
> remarkably DIFFERENT from vacuum tube technology and
> techniques.

So why should amateurs have to pass tests on any of that?

Why not just have a basic test on regulations and safety, and leave
the rest up to hams to learn on their own?

> >In the intervening years, FCC has trusted me (and almost every other ham from
> >those days who hasn't lost interest) to keep current with amateur radio.
>
> Try reviewing FCC regulations a bit closer, senior.

What's with this "senior" nonsense, Len?

I'm not a "senior". I graduated. And I'm not a senior citizen yet,
either.

What's your point in using such terms of address?

> FCC REQUIRES
> you (and all others) to emit RF WITHIN technical regulations. That
> INCLUDES whatever has become "current" resulting from changes
> since an operator was licensed.

It also is a requirement regardless of whether someone is licensed or
not.

So why should amateurs have to pass tests on any of that?

Why not just have a basic test on regulations and safety, and leave
the rest up to hams to learn on their own?
>
> REQUIREMENT. BY LAW. Enforced by United States peace officers,
> trial and imprisonment possible.

When was the last time a radio amateur was tried, imprisoned or fined
for a violation caused by emitting RF that did not meet with technical
regulations?

> >FCC
> >has renewed almost all of our licenses without question, and we're allowed to
> >use those new modes and technologies even though we've never passed any tests
> >on them.
>
> Lucky you. Now, what was your point (if any)?

Quite simple, really, and you've proved it for me. It goes like this:

Why should amateurs have to pass written tests that include subjects
beyond the applicable regulations and safety for the amateur radio
service?

Why are theory subjects *forced* on all prospective amateurs?

Why is additional testing beyond the regulations and safety used a a
"hazing ritual", "hoop jumping exercise" and/or "federally mandated
welfare program"?
>
> >If FCC trusts us OTs to learn as we go, why not the new folks?
>
> FCC "trusts" (actually entrusts) the VEC QPC to come up with
> questions and answers for the amateur radio license tests. Those
> tests apply to ALL ages.

So? What's your point?
>
> I'll challenge ANY of the old-timers to "learn as they go."

I have.

So why should newcomers have to take all those written tests?

Why can't they be trusted to learn as they go, just like I and so many
others have?

> That's
> what I've done, successfully, during my whole career in radio
> and electronics.

But you never learned Morse code and haven't yet obtained an amateur
radio license. Do you have an obsesssion against tests? It seems so.

> Some of those same old-timers are still anal
> retentive on retention of a morse code test

You're the one whose behavior resembles the referenced body part, Len
;-) ;-)

The subject is written testing, not code testing.

> I'd say
> those anal retentive old-timers are resisting learning because
> they CANNOT learn as they go.

FCC disagrees with you, Len. They trust amateurs (like me, whose first amateur radio license arrived in the mail exactly 36 years ago today) to keep on learning as they go. At least enough to know the current regulations.

Is FCC wrong? They're the "expert agency", remember? FCC is satisfied with how hams keep up with the requirements. Who are *you* to judge FCC and hundreds of thousands of radio amateurs?

1095. Re: Code test analogy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-14 16:27:04 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <stVib.2761$kx.66@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 80620

"No-coder" <nocoder@aol.com> wrote in message
news:bmf1rp02sk5@enews1.newsguy.com...
> Even though the testing for code was reduced to the basic 5 WPM over three
> years ago, it's obvious that the debate still rages on.
>
> The insistance that a person know Morse Code at a resonable speed in order
to
> be "real ham" is similar to religious fanatics, particualrly Christian
> fundamentalists, who think that a person has to believe in god in order to
be a
> good and moral person. They cannot prove that their god even exists. So
with
> the PCTA, they cannot prove that code is useful in light of communications
> advancements that have been made over the past several decades.
>
> Just as certain fundamentalists would like to turn the country into a
> Judeo-Christian theocracy, so would certain hams go back to an outdated
> communications scheme, simply because they think that Morse code is their
> "god."
>
> To expect prospective hams to believe in the fairy tale of morse code is
the
> the same as expecting people to believe in the fairy tales of the holy
bible.
>

Just further proof of my favorite statement....

"Ya just cain't fix stupid"

Dan/W4NTI

1096. Re: BPL a reality in my area now!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-14 16:34:55 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <PAVib.2853$kx.289@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 80621

"Ryan, KC8PMX" <REMOVETHISkc8pmx@diamondcs.net> wrote in message
news:bmgqeu$m4r49$6@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de...
>
> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20031013143036.12300.00001135@mb-m20.aol.com...
> > In article <bme4ob$lic55$4@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>, "Ryan, KC8PMX"
> > <REMOVETHISkc8pmx@diamondcs.net> writes:
> >
> > >Yeah Jim.... six meter all mode.
> >
> > I made a lucky guess.
>
>
> Probably, but I also had made mention at least once somewhere in the past
as
> well.
>
>
> >
> > >It's hard as hell to use it right now with
> > >the powerline interference in this freakin' county even before they
> > >implement this whole BPL stuff!!!!!
> >
> > Oh man...they can't even keep the lines quiet without BPL...
> >
> > Perhaps their own line noise will mess up BPL performance.
>
> We could only hope so! Wouldn't that be the ultimate irony. Using my
> shortwave reciever is next to being a futile attempt. Have packed the
> damned thing away for that same reason. In the truck, the AM radio can be
a
> trick to listen to if you are trying to listen to a station that is
normally
> always 5-9. If you run along a line of powerlines that happen to be
> parallel to the roadway for a bit, forget listening to that station for a
> while.....
>
>
> --
> Ryan, KC8PMX
> FF1-FF2-MFR
> --. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
> .. --. .... - . .-. ...
>

Tell me about it. I've been fighting with Alabama Power for 4 years. And I still have noise.

Dan/W4NTI

1097. Re: BPL a reality in my area now!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-14 16:37:14 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <_CVib.2878$kx.2822@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 80622
Cross-posted to: alt.ham-radio,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:bmgs1essn4@208.206.142.105...
> Roger Halstead wrote:
> > On Sun, 12 Oct 2003 23:27:27 -0400, a 32 bit process
> > <replytogroup@hotmail.com> wrote:
> >
> >
> >>On Sun, 12 Oct 2003 16:56:50 GMT, "James Wilson"
> >><Someone@Microsoft.Com> wrote:
> >>
> >>
> >>>What does BPL sound like? Can someone post a wav file somewhere so it
can
> >>>be identified? Is it worse that the Pennsylvania QSO party?
> >>
> >>It almost sounds like a geiger counter, but a lot louder and the
> >>clicking is quicker in pace.
> >
> >
> > After having gone to the ARRL site and listened to the examples, all I
> > can say is it sounds just like precipitation static and/or loose
> > connections. No way would I be able to identify one from the other.
> > I'm just going to have to complain every time I hear noise and make
> > recordings. If it's noisy enough to be a problem it should be fixed.
> >
>
>
> Proximity to the power grid would be the main clincher, IMO, but what
> about skywave propagation? That stuff could go around the world at QRP
> evels!
>
>
>
>
>
> > BTW, most of the links failed and instead I ended up hijacked to QSL
> > dot net. (they call it redirecting, but if I didn't select to go
> > there, I don't want to go there...I'll settle for the 404 screen
> > instead of giving some one advertizing points.)
> >
> > Roger Halstead (K8RI EN73 & ARRL Life Member)
> > www.rogerhalstead.com
> > N833R World's oldest Debonair? (S# CD-2)

> >
>
>

Yep.....I've worked QRPp stations using miliwatts of output.

Can you imagine this garbage being generated and then propagated worldwide.
My Gawd !!!!

Dan/W4NTI

1098. Re: What makes a Pro code test Amateur a Troglodyte?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-14 16:43:16 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <EIVib.2944$kx.2303@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 80623

"Clint" <rattlehead at computron dot net> wrote in message
news:vomdk8t2498l86@corp.supernews.com...
> "Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
> news:3F86EDAD.4010109@psu.edu...
>
> >
> > I would challenge the NCTA's to show some proof that those who believe
> > that the morse code test should be retained are in a technical
backwater.
>
> Justify requireing a knowledge or profeciency test on using an old
fashioned
> buggy whip before giving out an modern day automobile driver's license.
>
> Clint
>
>

What does 'technical' have to do with Morse Code testing and usage?

I do Morse Code on the air because it is FUN, and CHALLANGING, and
EFFICIENT.

Explain what this has to do with 'technical' please.

Dan/W4NTI

1099. Re: What makes a Pro code test Amateur a Troglodyte?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-14 16:44:43 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <%JVib.2963$kx.2211@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 80624

"Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:bmfcud$qi2@library2.airnews.net...
> "Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
> news:3F8AB05B.2010601@psu.edu...
> >
> > What it tells me is that not many here care to have a "non-degraded
> > "discussion.
> >
>
> Uh, not many here are *capable* of having a real discussion.
>
> Kim W5TIT
>
>

Hug and Chalk included ??

Dan/W4NTI

1100. Re: What makes a Pro code test Amateur a Troglodyte?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-14 16:49:13 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <dOVib.3012$kx.209@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 80625

"Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:bmff9p$rm2@library2.airnews.net...

>
> Absolutely true. I can understand why there would be the expectation of a
> CW ban being petitioned for. And, I would even fully expect one to
> surface--even soon. BUT, I really never thought that the FCC would
> entertain the idea to any end where the actual ban would take place. I
> would be so compelled on this issue that I would actually file a comment
on
> it. And, I haven't been stirred by much to actually follow-through with a
> comment.
>
>
> Kim W5TIT
>
>

PLEASE DON'T Twit !!!!!!. If a FCC commissioner sees a comment from you
then ham radio will be banned.

Dan/W4NTI

1101. Re: What makes a Pro code test Amateur a Troglodyte?-Post #4

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-14 16:51:54 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0310140851.193301e2@posting.google.com>
Source record: 80626

"Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:<bmdtv1$kfb@library2.airnews.net>...
> I think Jim was stretching it a little far to decide to be offended by the
> phrase "jump through the hoop" and "waste their valuable time." But, that's
> my opinion...

Oh, my. Such language.

Kim, it's more important than ever before to be offended about
something, or by someone; anything at all.

1102. Re: What makes a Pro code test Amateur a Troglodyte?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-14 16:52:34 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0310140852.4c29f54@posting.google.com>
Source record: 80627

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20031013234613.01893.00001228@mb-m22.aol.com>...
> In article <20031013203527.08626.00001165@mb-m27.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
> writes:
>
> >In article <20031013174921.12501.00003124@mb-m04.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com
> >(Len Over 21) writes:
> >
> >>In article <bmdt22$sse@library2.airnews.net>, "Kim"
> >><kimscliff@yahoo.com>
> >>writes:
> >>
> >>>"Hans K0HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> >>>news:5ee63311.0310121827.7191e44a@posting.google.com...
> >>>> "Kim" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote
>
> >>>> Spark transmissions were outlawed (as well they should have been) so
> >>>> the precedent exists.
> >>>
> >>>Hmmmm, Jim/N2EY made that observation also. Then, I see the comment that
> >>>spark was a transmission method--not a mode. I think that's splitting
> >>>hairs, isn't it? I'm asking--I wasn't around for spark ;)
> >>
> >> The ONLY way a "spark" transmitter could send anything called
> >> communications information was by on-off keying.
> >
> >there were other types of transmitters on the air even
> >before WW1. Arc transmitters and Alexanderson alternators were two types.
> >Transmitters using tubes were in use well before 1920.
>
> Irrelevant.

No, very relevant. Spark was not the only option before 1920. And
after 1920, there were even more options.

Amateurs pretty much abandoned spark by 1924-1925. Oddly enough, there
was no international treaty requirement for amateurs to be code tested
until 1927.

The first 'broadcast' stations were actually amateur stations. Using
tube transmitters. They do not get the recognition of KDKA and WWJ
because none of them were in operation on a regular, continuing
schedule.

> From ALL the available literature of old-time amateur radio
> prior to 1920,

Have you read *all* of it? I doubt that very much.

1920 is twelve years before you were born, Len. So you weren't there.

> THE OVERWHELMING MAJORITY of amateur radio
> transmitters were of the "spark" type.

Irrelevant. And there's no need to shout, Len. Your words DO NOT
BECOME MORE TRUE WHEN CAPITALIZED!!!
>
> "Spark" transmitters can be modulated SOLELY by ON-OFF KEYING.

That's simply not correct, Len. And you know it.
>
> The sole surviving Alexanderson Alternator VLF RF generator is in
> Grimeton, Sweden, and used once each year for a brief period in a
> ceremony for Televerket, the Swedish government's telecommunication
> works. A ceremonial event, not one for any actual communication.

Irrelevant. But at least not as boring as your usual diversions.
>
> >The practical transmission of voice and music by radio was demonstrated as
> >early as 1906.
>
> ONLY with a rotary alternator with a WATER COOLED MICROPHONE.

No, with spark.
>
> Demonstration only, and then ONCE.

Irrelevant.
>
> >> Since "morse code" was already in practice and was totally
> >> on-off keying, it was adopted as The "radio code."
> >
> >Was that a bad thing?
>
> Point of fact only.

What's your point?

> Do NOT "rewrite" what I wrote.

I asked a question. Is that not allowed? Who made you the moderator?
>
> Morse code was developed for ON-OFF KEYING...on land lines.

Sure. Modern "land lines" (in the form of fiber optics) still use
on-off keying. Even though it's a very old idea.
>
> "Spark" transmitters could communicate ONLY by on-off keying.

Repeating the same misinformation doesn't make it any more correct,
Len.
>
> Morse code was first used commercially for communications in
> 1844. The first demonstration of radio as a communications medium
> was 1896. That is a 52 year period allowing maturing of the ON-OFF
> keying of telegraphy. Telegraphy by the Morse-Vail telegraph
> system had spread worldwide by 1896.

And your point is?
>
> >> The adoption of a long-existing (since 1844) LANDLINE code
> >> says absolutely nothing about its efficacy in radio communications,
> >> ability to "work through" or much else.
> >
> >Actually, the code used in radio is different than the code used in landline
> >work.
>
> Totally irrelevant to the point.

No, exactly relevant. In fact, prior to 1912 there were at least three
different codes in use in radio. One of the changes brought about by
the Titanic disaster was standardization on the "Continental" or
"International" version, which is quite different from that used in
"land line" work.

> Early primitive radio could ONLY work
> with an ON-OFF KEYING method.

Incorrect.
>
> Despite all the variant dialects of "morse codes," ALL work ONLY by
> ON-OFF KEYING. ALL.

Not true! And there's no reason to shout.

Any version of Morse code can be applied to frequency shift keying or
phase shift keying or a variety of other modulation methods. On-off
keying is simply the most commonly used method for radio purposes.

Would you stop your persistent denigration of Morse code and those who
use it if we shifted (pun intended) to FSK or PSK?
>
> >The efficacy of Morse code when applied to radio has been demonstrated many,
> >many times over the past century-plus. Radio amateurs continue to demonstrate
> >it every day.
>
> Self-serving emotional exaggeration.

Not at all. A plain, simple fact.

You're the one who gets all emotional and exaggerates, Len. All that
shouting and carrying on in here. Really, one would think you were a
bit more mature by now.

As for self-serving - well, all those long boring irrelevant diatribes
on old military radio sets that you post here.....
>
> Radio amateurs worldwide continue to USE all the modes and modulations
> allocated to them every day.
>
> "Demonstration" refers to the first use of a method. That differs from
> USE.

Splitting hairs, I see.
>
> >> On-off keying was
> >> adopted simply because it was the ONLY WAY POSSIBLE for
> >> early, primitive radio to allow communications. It's just
> >> practical applied physics. Nothing else.
> >
> >And it works very well.
>
> It does NOT work optimally compared to OTHER modes.

> Radio as a communications medium is 107 years old. ON-OFF
> KEYING of a radio frequency carrier is NOT a new concept nor is it
> the best for communications.

Who are you to judge? You've never used Morse code, from what you tell
us.

Would you stop your persistent denigration of Morse code and those who
use it if we shifted to FSK or PSK?
>
> >Even after the invention of other methods of transmission, the use of Morse
> >code continued.
>
> Irrelevant. Refusal to change has many and varied reasons. Only some
> of those refusals are relevant or applicable.
>
> NO ONE is contending that ON-OFF KEYING was not the first.
>
> Under the beginning subject thread, the subject was the CODE TEST.
>
> You cannot explain or demonstrate or justify a reason for code test
> retention JUST BECAUSE IT WAS THE FIRST MODE IN RADIO.
>
> The first radio-as-a-communications means was 107 years ago.
>
> All other radio services have either dropped morse code mode or
> never considered its use when that radio service began.

And what's your point in all of this?

Do you want amateurs to stop using on-off keying?

Do you want amateurs to stop using Morse code?
>
> Continued USE of morse code modes DOES NOT POSSIBLY ADVANCE
> ANY STATE OF THE RADIO ARTS.

Yes, it does, in many ways. Of course, that doesn't prove that there must be a code test of any kind.

Len, you're so emotionally connected to denigrating a form of keying and a form of communication that you can't see that. You go far beyond wanting to end a test.

> In ANY radio service, including amateur radio.
>
Who are you to judge, Len? You've never used Morse code and you've never been a radio amateur.

1103. Re: What makes a Pro code test Amateur a Troglodyte?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-14 16:55:16 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <UTVib.3083$kx.2359@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 80628

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20031013203527.08626.00001165@mb-m27.aol.com...
>
> > The ONLY way a "spark" transmitter could send anything called
> > communications information was by on-off keying.
> >

Not entirely correct. From what I have read, in '200 meters and down', I believe...it stated that a rudementary form of modulation was attempted by using a loop inserted in the field of the synchronous spark and a carbon microphone.

This is all from memory, so if Lenny has the facts and nothing but the facts I'm sure he will jump in. And Herrrrrrrrrrs Lenny.....>>>>

Dan/W4NTI

1104. Re: What makes a Pro code test Amateur a Troglodyte?--Post #3

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-14 16:56:27 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0310140856.24188b00@posting.google.com>
Source record: 80629

"Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:<bmdtqg$i50@library2.airnews.net>...
> By my review, it took 3 posts to have the slamming and insults begin. And,
> DICK wins the prize:

This is the part where unbiased Stebe Robevson, the RRAP Avenging
Angel, starts a new thread and nails Dick to the Cross, calls him a
liar and/or a Putz/Dick,...

1105. Re: What makes a Pro code test Amateur a Troglodyte?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-14 16:57:21 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <RVVib.3108$kx.1152@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 80630

I wonder how many of you realise that when you are operating Single Sideband
Suppressed Carrier you are on Amplitude Modulation ??

Dan/W4NTI

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:VuIib.48857$mQ2.5060@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
>
> "Hans K0HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:5ee63311.0310130655.3b0c6b13@posting.google.com...
> > "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote
> >
> > > Yet AM is still allowed.
> > >
> >
> > Yes, it certainly is. But for how long?
>
> Good question, but it has been some 40+ years since SSB
> pretty much took over as the HF mode...and there's still no
> call for any ban of AM.
>
> > Riley Hollingsworth told a Richmond, Virginia hamfest last spring
> > (speaking of "enhanced SSB") that deliberately operating a wideband
> > mode in a crowded spectrum is "shortsighted and rude," may be ignoring
> > the "minimum bandwidth necessary" rule. Now if 4.5KHz-wide signals are
> > shortsighted and rude, then it logically follows that 6KHz-wide AM
> > signals containing the same information are even more shortsighted and
> > rude.
> >
> > He also hinted that continued complaints "WILL (my emphasis) lead to
> > pressure on the FCC to revise the Amateur Service rules." Would you
> > expect DSB AM to survive such revision?
>
> Not if such DSB AM was in any way a significant percentage
> of use on the air. That sure doesn't seem to be the case at
> all, however.
>
> Cheers,
> Bill K2UNK
>
>
>
>

1106. Re: Reflections on rrap

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-14 16:57:35 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0310140857.73af7cfa@posting.google.com>
Source record: 80631

Keith Hosman <log-remove-nospam-dshr@remove.bnnorth.nospam.net> wrote in message news:<hu5movkd573kdb7rgmdumove24iuoqqusa@4ax.com>...
> On 27 Sep 2003 11:01:42 GMT, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:
>
> >In article <bklkfs$6ut@library1.airnews.net>, "Kim" <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
> >writes:
> >
> >>> Kim, beer and BBQ?
> >>>
> >>
> >>Oh good heavens, no! Pasta, or steak, and a glass of fine wine or a frozen
> >>margarita.
> >>
> >Cheeseburger in paradise, anyone?
> >
> >>Beer and BBQ is a Texan thing and, while I'll drink an ICE COLD
> >>beer on a hot day outside--you won't find me outside much in the Summertime
> >>around here. BBQ? It's OK.
> >>
> >Wings and a Sam Adams. Or a Black & Tan.

Anchor Bar. Tonawanda NY.

Dinosaur BBQ, Rochester NY (also Syracuse).

Just thinking of them makes me drool.

> >
> >Hot roast beef sandwiches and a Genny Cream Ale or Guinness (drink your beer
> >before it gets cold)

ooooooooohhhhhhhhhhhhh
> >
> >Or the amateur radio ultimate: Anchovy pizza a la Grommethead Schulz.
> >
> >73 de Jim, N2EY
>
> or if anyone is close to NW OH, or will be, I can make up a batch of
> my award winning chili, drink some cold beer, and play radio.

Chili? Now we're talking about truly sacred subjects.

I'll bring the Dave's Insanity Sauce.
>
73 de Jim, N2EY

1107. Re: What makes a Pro code test Amateur a Troglodyte?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-14 17:04:33 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <B0Wib.3166$kx.1618@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 80632

"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20031014090136.29227.00001059@mb-m06.aol.com...
> >But they are being made to FCC, as shown above. What reasonable, rational
> >arguments can we make to counter the above logic?
> >
> >73 de Jim, N2EY
> >
>
> Thats been my point all along. There is nothing to stop this downward
trend,
> once we got started its just a matter of time.
> Karl thinks hes going to jump up and scream that the Writtens have to
stay and
> the FCC is going to say OK. Karl I hate to be the barrier of Bad news, but
all
> your complaining and reasons you have used to stop CW testing, are about
to be
> thrown back in your face as far as the written. Then maybe you will see
the
> light.

If that holds true, then we are privelidged to be witness to the last gasp
of ham radio, as we knew it.

Dan/W4NTI

1108. Re: A New Concept: Virtual Spectrum

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-14 17:20:44 UTC
From: K7JEB <k7jeb@qsl.remove.net>
Message-ID: <TmWib.25929$Rd4.16160@fed1read07>
Source record: 80633
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc

David Stinson, AB5S, posted:

(about piping narrow-band RF from legacy (and other) radios
over the Internet).

> I restore ancient and military radios to original condition
> and I want to talk on *them.* Some of them aren't even
> capable of being used on ham bands. You'd be surprised;
> there's a lot of us out here. With this system, like minded
> people can use these radios to QSO completely legally.
> If we wanted, we could have a real spark-gap to spark-gap QSO
> with crystal detector receivers- in fact,
> a whole bunch of such stations in a net-
> because we are literally on our own, private ether.

Actually, Dave, something like this idea was proposed by
George Gilder back when "TV over the Internet" was a hot
topic.

Gilder proposed that the Internet providers simply bring
a fiber-optic cable to one's doorstep and stop there. The
fiber would be "dark". But any light you launched into it
would come out the ends of all the other "dark" fibers -
all over the world. In effect, the Internet would become
an extremely wideband virtual ionosphere for optical waves.
And, of course, at optical wavelengths, there are huge
frequecy bandwidths available, so everybody could have
their own TV channel, or ham band, or whatever. The trick
would be that you had to provide your own optical terminal
equipment to interface to the fiber.

The point is, your scheme isn't as far-fetched as it at
first sounds. I still like the "old-fashioned" iononsphere
for radio propagation. But your observation about the
increasing number of restrictions and interference sources
amateur operators are encountering in pursuit of their
avocation is quite relevant to the current state of affairs.

Jim, K7JEB

1109. Re: What makes a Pro code test Amateur a Troglodyte?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-14 17:54:36 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031014135436.02271.00000731@mb-m01.aol.com>
Source record: 80635

>If that holds true, then we are privelidged to be witness to the last gasp
>of ham radio, as we knew it.
>
>Dan/W4NTI

Dan you know its going to hold true. NCI has all ready layed the groung work
for the next batch of CBplussers.
The hardest part of Dumbing Down was to get rid of the CW. Once it falls the
rest is easy.

1110. Re: What makes a Pro code test Amateur a Troglodyte?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-14 18:10:09 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031014141009.29815.00001141@mb-m21.aol.com>
Source record: 80637

In article <5ee63311.0310132024.220806d3@posting.google.com>,
groupk0hb@earthlink.net (Hans K0HB) writes:

>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote
>
>> The ONLY way a "spark" transmitter could send anything called
>> communications information was by on-off keying.
>
>Damn, Old Timer, you got it wrong again! In Boston, on Christmas Eve
>of 1906, modulating a spark transmitter, Reginald Fessenden made a
>holiday broadcast of a short spoken introduction, some recorded
>Chistmas music, and played "Oh Holy Night" on a violin.
>
>Obviously a "spark" transmitter was not limited to ONLY (your
>emphasis) on-off keying.
>
>Sunuvagun! Good luck on this one now.

THE FOLLOWING IS A REPEAT OF AN OPEN LETTER TO THE
CONFUSED OFFSPRING OF MOTHER BRAKOB, REPEATED
HERE FOR PUBLIC EDIFICATION -

==========

Dear Mother Brakob,

Your offspring is once again confused, perhaps suffering from
dittybopper dementia from spending too much time listening to
beeping or seminarian studies of official documents from Newington.

The following is a direct quote from the Special Commemorative
Issue of McGraw-Hill's "Electronics" magazine of April 17, 1980,
page 75, section titled "History before 1930." That issue is 650
pages total, was printed in celebration of 50 years of "Electronics"
magazine.

"The broadcast television that followed two decades later, would,
of course, not have been possible without proper transmitters,
receivers, modulators, demodulars, etc. --or, in other words,
without proper radio. The world had been introduced in the potential
of such a radio system as far back as 1906, when on Christmas
Eve Prof. Reginal A. Fesenden of Harvard University made the first
documented radio broadcast of speech and music. For this feat, he
used a 50-KHz Alexanderson alternator, manufactured by the
General Electric Co. Telegraph operators on ships crossing the
North Atlantic were surprised on the historic night to hear music

coming out of earphones that previously had emitted nothing but dots and dashes. Fessenden modulated the alternator's 1-KW output simply by putting a microphone in series with the antenna of his experimental station at Brant Rock, Mass. It is likely, but not certain, that the microphone was water-cooled."

Mother Brakob, please point out, highlight if necessary with a yellow marker pen, that the transmitter was an ALTERNATOR, not the damped-wave "spark" type your son scribbled in angry crayon. Specifically, an ALEXANDERSON ALTERNATOR. ONE KILOWATT output.

You may wish to give your son a primer on electricity explaining power losses in resistive conductors. That is important considering the microphone used by Fessenden was IN SERIES WITH THE ANTENNA CARRYING CURRENT SUFFICIENT FOR ONE KILOWATT RADIO FREQUENCY POWER OUTPUT.

Best of good luck on that one, Mother Brakob. [you are going to need it]

LHA

==========

Additionally, there are some basic technical matters which have been totally ignored, such as the "sound" produced by attempting to amplitude modulate a low-audio-frequency-range damped-wave oscillation by speech or music frequencies. That might be quite similar to attempting to amplitude modulate a doorbell buzzer and expect intelligibility from the result.

I would suggest searching a large bookstore for a primer on electricity and elementary radio, such as "Radio For Dummies." That does not appear to be in the ARRL list of approved, official documents but another publisher (possibly 73?) might have it.

Extreme amounts of good fortune on this one now!!!

LHA

1111. Dear Mother Brakob...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-14 18:10:10 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031014141010.29815.00001142@mb-m21.aol.com>
Source record: 80638

In article <5ee63311.0310132034.23d9cbeb@posting.google.com>,
groupk0hb@earthlink.net (Hans K0HB) writes:

>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote
>
>> On-off keying was
>> adopted simply because it was the ONLY WAY POSSIBLE for
>> early, primitive radio to allow communications. It's just
>> practical applied physics. Nothing else.
>
>Oh shit, you got it wrong again!
>
>In Boston, on Christmas Eve of 1906, modulating a spark transmitter,
>Reginald Fessenden made a holiday broadcast of a short spoken
>introduction, some recorded Christmas music, and played "Oh Holy
>Night" on a violin.
>
>Obviously on-off keying was not the ONLY WAY POSSIBLE (your emphasis)
>for early ("spark") radio to allow communications.
>
>"Dear Mother Anderson, your son Leonard is failing in practical
>applied physics. Perhaps he would benefit from a stint in the Army to
>learn a useful trade."
>
>Sunuvagun! Good luck on this one now.

Dear Mother Brakob,

Your offspring is once again confused, perhaps suffering from
dittybopper dementia from spending too much time listening to
beeping or seminarian studies of official documents from Newington.

The following is a direct quote from the Special Commemorative
Issue of McGraw-Hill's "Electronics" magazine of April 17, 1980,
page 75, right-hand column, section titled "History before 1930."
That issue is 650 pages total, was printed in celebration of 50 years
of "Electronics" magazine existance.

"The broadcast television that followed two decades later, would,
of course, not have been possible without proper transmitters,
receivers, modulators, demodulars, etc. --or, in other words,
without proper radio. The world had been introduced in the potential
of such a radio system as far back as 1906, when on Christmas
Eve Prof. Reginal A. Fesenden of Harvard University made the first
documented radio broadcast of speech and music. For this feat, he
used a 50-KHz Alexanderson alternator, manufactured by the

General Electric Co. Telegraph operators on ships crossing the North Atlantic were surprised on the historic night to hear music coming out of earphones that previously had emitted nothing but dots and dashes. Fessenden modulated the alternator's 1-KW output simply by putting a microphone in series with the antenna of his experimental station at Brant Rock, Mass. It is likely, but not certain, that the microphone was water-cooled."

Mother Brakob, please point out, highlight if necessary with a yellow marker pen, that the transmitter was an ALTERNATOR, not the damped-wave "spark" type your son scribbled in angry crayon. Specifically, an ALEXANDERSON ALTERNATOR. ONE KILOWATT output.

You may wish to give your son a primer on electricity explaining power losses in resistive conductors. That is important considering the microphone used by Fessenden was IN SERIES WITH THE ANTENNA CARRYING CURRENT SUFFICIENT FOR ONE KILOWATT RADIO FREQUENCY POWER OUTPUT.

Best of good luck on that one, Mother Brakob. [you are going to need it]

LHA

PS: You may wish to contact ARRL psychiatric services privately for a list of competent mental health professionals in your area who are specialists in the dementia of dittybopper data distortion attempted on historical facts gathered by professional publishers.

1112. Re: Code test analogy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-14 18:10:11 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031014141011.29815.00001143@mb-m21.aol.com>
Source record: 80636

In article <stVib.2761$kx.66@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dan/W4NTI"
<w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> writes:

>"Ya just cain't fix stupid"

We pity that, Dan, many of us were optimistic that you could be
repaired...

Sorry to hear of it.

LHA

1113. Re: RM-10808 --- Wexelbaum Redux

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-14 18:10:12 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031014141012.29815.00001144@mb-m21.aol.com>
Source record: 80639

In article <c2356669.0310140825.2c02d233@posting.google.com>, N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) writes:

>FCC disagrees with you, Len. They trust amateurs (like me, whose first
>amateur radio license arrived in the mail exactly 36 years ago today)
>to keep on learning as they go. At least enough to know the current
>regulations.

There is NO evidence of such implicit "trust" in all of Title 47 C.F.R., any radio service.

The Commission is NOT chartered or organized to be a promoter or booster or provider of emotional sustenance for radio operator license grantees. Radio serivce regulations of ALL radio serivices do not expect emotional, nurturing "trust." Regulations REQUIRE obeyance to the LAW. Disobediance to the law will result in possible arrest, confinement, equipment seizure, and monetary loss.

Regulations, the LAW, requires ALL involved to be cognizant of ALL changes which alter relevant LAW. That applies to ALL involved regardless of their total time of involvement.

No emotional-level "trust" is involved. ALL are EXPECTED to obey the EXISTING law and ANY changes in that law as it occurs. That is basic to ALL LAW.

The Federal Communications Commission was created by the United States Congress through the Communications Act of 1934. That act of Congress did NOT specifically center on amateur radio nor did it give any special dispensation in any way to radio amateurs. ALL civil radio services (non-government, non-military) in the United States are regulated by the FCC. Regulation of radio services does not involve "trust." It involves expectation of obeyance of regulations. Failure to obey regulations will result in governmental action to punish offenders. All involved with any radio service activity are governed by regulations applying to that radio service. That is the law. For all.

Try not to redifine basic law or governmental regulation...or attempt coloring and distortion of personal activities with emotional sugar-coating of artificial sweetener in a false claim of personal or like-group dilligence
and responsibility.

Try to stay within one light-year distance of the subject thread instead of misdirecting into personal pettiness of perceived pompousness through false claims.

LHA

1114. Re: What makes a Pro code test Amateur a Troglodyte?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-14 18:17:01 UTC
From: groupk0hb@earthlink.net
Message-ID: <5ee63311.0310141017.62102d67@posting.google.com>
Source record: 80640

"Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote
>
> Hmmm, wouldn't Part 5 of Title 47 be the governing body for this? And, in
> Part 5, there is the following:
>
> PART 5--EXPERIMENTAL RADIO SERVICE (OTHER THAN BROADCAST)--Table of Contents
> Subpart B--Applications and Licenses
> Sec. 5.77 Change in equipment and emission characteristics.
> (a) A change may be made in a licensed transmitter without specific
> authorization from the Commission provided that the change does not
> result in operations inconsistent with any term of the outstanding
> authorization for the station involved.
>
> Along with the above, this section goes on to define certain emission
> standards, etc. I was just now trying to find the spec on emission
> standards (rules?) as they apply to bandwidth. Correct me if I'm wrong--the
> topic and rules of experimentation are way outta my league...no pun
> intended. Would the above pertain to experimentation in the amateur bands?

Part 5 licenses are not "hobbiest" licenses, so the above does not
apply. These licenses are issued to manufacturers, inventors,
researchers, and students to experiment with new radio technologies,
new equipment designs, characteristics of radio wave propagation, or
new service concepts related to the use of the radio spectrum. Special
call signs (which look like amateur calls) are from the block K(or
W)x2Xyy. For example, KA2XYZ or WB2XYZ. The "call area" numeral is
always "2" and the letter following the 2 is always "X". My company
has 4 of these licenses related to 4 different products in
development. Rules regarding their use are very strict.

73, de Hans, K0HB

1115. Re: Code test analogy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-14 18:27:02 UTC
From: nocoder@aol.com
Message-ID: <bmhf5m021n9@enews3.newsguy.com>
Source record: 80641

In article <stVib.2761$kx.66@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>,
w4nti@getridofthismindspring.com says...

>Just further proof of my favorite statement....
>
>"Ya just cain't fix stupid"
>
>Dan/W4NTI

I had hoped that my post would generate a level headed debate on this analogy.
Apparently, you are incapable of that, and can only resort to ad hominem
attacks.

1116. Re: Code test analogy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-14 18:33:47 UTC
From: nocoder@aol.com
Message-ID: <bmhfib121n9@enews3.newsguy.com>
Source record: 80642

In article <5ee63311.0310140709.4bbc5ee5@posting.google.com>,
groupk0hb@earthlink.net says...

>If a "religion" is defined to be a system of ideas that contains unprovable
>statements, then Kurt Godel taught us that mathematics is not only a religion,
>it is the only religion that can prove itself to be one.
>
>73, de Hans, K0HB

That's if a religion is defined as such, but that isn't the case in the real world. Mathematics has never been used to suppress people the way that religion has been used, and continues to be used today. (although a college student that has flunked calculus and can't graduate might not think so)

So, as with morse code testing, there are a few that hold onto it like a religion.

1117. Re: Code test analogy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-14 19:10:55 UTC
From: groupk0hb@earthlink.net
Message-ID: <5ee63311.0310141110.1624e594@posting.google.com>
Source record: 80643

nocoder@aol.com (No-coder) wrote

> That's if a religion is defined as such,
> but that isn't the case in the real
> world.

All reality is local at the observer.

73, de Hans, K0HB

1118. Re: A New Concept: Virtual Spectrum

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-14 20:14:43 UTC
From: Ed Wilson <rattlehead@computron.net>
Message-ID: <9kioov04f7a26leftvutjd3tedbd0sgnpa@4ax.com>
Source record: 80644
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.antiques.radio+phono,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc

David,

Your idea is certainly technically feasible, and would provide a way for folks to continue to 'use' obsolete radio equipment in a post-BPL era. Similar in many ways to the micro AM transmitter that I use to broadcast old-time radio programs to my antique radios, for demonstration purposes.

Somehow, though, it wouldn't be the same. DX-ing and shortwave listening are, for me, pursuits which are made interesting by the sheer randomness of long distance radio communication. Things like building a better antenna or tuner, or waiting for the window to open to that country in order to catch an elusive transmission - that's where the fun is!

Internet communications, however, are carried over the same high-reliability global networks as telephone calls. From my keyboard, I can DXCC in probably under half an hour - which would be a very unfulfilling task, given the certainty of the medium. And that's why I have no interest in some of the existing Internet/Amateur Radio interfaces, such as IRLP - sure, I can talk to some guy over in England on my 5 watt 2-meter HT using a local repeater and dialling an access code to his local repeater - but it isn't DX, its more like a telephone call to a random party at the destination over the Internet. More like using VOIP to call a pay phone in England, then talking to whomever answers. To me, that ain't radio. It's a phone call. Nothing more.

Your proposed interface would provide a way to simulate real QSOs on the old equipment - but it would not be 'real'. Not much different, really, than building a Telco interface for the radio, dialling up the far end, and pretending to have a radio QSO using the mike and speaker instead of the handset. A radio simulator of sorts, with a real boatanchor configured like a speakerphone at each end - but just a simulation nevertheless. Not a true radio QSO. I could wire up my electric pencil sharpener with a mike and speaker, and establish a QSO over the Net with somebody on an ARC-5. That don't make it a radio, though!.....but it would look kinda cool ;)

Some will find this interface quite acceptable - if conversation with others is what the hobby is about for them, this will provide a nostalgic way to continue to QSO with familiar radio equipment. 'Whatever floats their boat'.

For those of us who chase DX and foreign broadcasts through the ether or thrive on overcoming technical obstacles, however, I suspect that our interest would not be held for long by such an interface. Just like piping 1941 Jack Benny programs to my AK-55 - cute, but it doesn't make it seem like it's 1941. Great for demonstrating the set to guests, though - after half a minute or so, their interest is dissipating and the AK is switched back off.

If BPL becomes a reality, my HF gear will be going up on the shelf with the other old radio equipment - to make room for the satellite and moonbounce equipment that will take its place.

YMMV, of course...

73, Leo

On Tue, 14 Oct 2003 14:04:34 GMT, David Stinson <arc5@ix.netcom.com> wrote:

>snip

>Here's another (For Peter's sake):
>I love listening to shortwave radio. The power
>company installs BPL, and now all my carefully-tended radio
>will say to me is: "BSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSRRRRRRRRRRRRRRRPPPPPP!!"
>Do I give up, put my favorite radio on the shelf and listen
>to them on the Internet "phone?" Hell, no.
>I log into a server that's streaming the 31 meter band in chunks
>of 25 KC from a quiet location in Itchyarmpit, Idaho.
>I pipe that into my V.S. transverter and into the antenna
>connection of my radio. Once again I have evenings of
>enjoyment listening to Radio Gabbabootoo.
>If I want to hear Radio Binga Boinga
>and the five other stations around that frequency,
>I select the correct stream and enjoy.

1119. Re: Opposing BPL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-14 20:42:09 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bmhn31$d3v$0@208.207.71.138>
Source record: 80645
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.policy

dt wrote:
> Hams are not the only users of the affected spectrum. They may be the
> most vocal, but perhaps the easiest to discredit or deflect.
>
> What about the other users of the HF-thru-VHF spectrum? Police, Fire,
> EMS, Federal Government, Business, Utilities (the power companies
> themselves), Military, Aviation, etc., etc.?

> Do they not have consultants who are in touch with industry affairs?
>
> Does APCO (and other industry communications associations) not have
> knowledge about BPL and a position on it?

Before I retired I was a field engineer working with a statewide public safety organization which uses low band VHF for base to car communications statewide, and that system is still virtually as I left it nearly 10 years ago. I have learned that they are aware of the BPL docket and filed in opposition, and have some idea that it will impact their communications, but I wonder if they have a clear view of what looms should BPL be widely implemented. While working I spent considerable time on RF noise issues, and I am rather sure that such a radio system cannot coexist with BPL.

What happens is that when the noise intererence reaches a certain level, in a FM receiver the limiter saturates, and even a strong on-channel signal will not cause the squelch to open. The reciever remains quiet, and the call is unanswered.
I was able to locate one troublesome noise source which was reported as repeater trouble in that the repeater would ocassionally go quiet in mid-transmission when a car was calling in. By the time I would drive the substantial distance to the repeater, a thorough checkout found no problem with the repeate equipment whatever. After several fruitless trips and attempts to find the trouble, I finally happened to be onsite when the trouble appeared, and it was all limiter saturation. Looking around outside while the noise was present in an attempt to spot a source in the local rural area, I soon found it- an arc welder in a shop several hundred yards away. When the welder was in use, the arc caused noise that saturated the receiver limiter, effectively shutting down the repeater. We relocated that repeater to a more isolated site where it still functions as intended.
That example is but one case. BPL will, following power lines, also follow roads and streets since power lines follow streets and highway/road rights of way everywhere - the same places where police and highway patrol units'communications are active. The interference issue

simply WILL cause something drastic to be implemented, what I don't know. If common sense has anything to do with it, BPL will be sent packing. Widesp[read implementation of BPL spells the end of lowband VHF use by public safety organizations. And with states' budgets in the deflated condition they are in most places, the funding will not be available to replace those systems in the forseeable future.

I just called a former co-worker who is still working, and asked him if the organization knows that there is a BPL test site in the state. He said they did not. I suggested he might want to pass the word on up the chain so that they might want to send a mobile unit into the test area to get firsthand information on just what the effects might be. I'm also passing along all the info I've gathred here and from other sources. We'll need all the help we can get on this turkey.

In short, I'm coninced that while APCO and others may know
of the BPL docket I wonder if they have a very clear concept of
what it will do to them where low band VHF is used.
For instance, what have you heard from the state of Calorfinia, which is reported to use low band VHF for their statewide Highway Patrol, and has over 5,000 mobile units with no telling how many base stations?
I have heard nothing whatever from anyone there on BPL.

It seems evident that the BPL people are not publishing the existance of these very small test sites any more widely than necessary. So, they won't garner very many,if any, BPL-specific complaints, will they? And they'll be able to say "We must not be causing destructive interference since we haven't generated complaints". Of course limiting the numbers of users in test areas to a very few drastically limits the amount of interference potential. With so few BPL users online there *won't* be much interference caused, thus few or no complaints. Then they will conveniently pass over this fact, and the decision makers won't know the difference.

Someone with clout needs to take them to task with the FCC and force them to use much broader test areas with much more realistic noise levels generated so that a more realistic noise picture can be evaluated. As it stands, they may well get what they want by default.

Dick W0EX

>
>
> What is the ARRL doing to join forces with other affected spectrum
> users, perhaps forming a task force to promote common interests?
> Lobbying senators and congressmen, the Commission, NTIA, etc.?
>
> If the utilities' strategy is to divide and conquer, it appears they
> are being very effective.
>
> 73
> Dan (K0DAN)

>
>
>
> On 14 Oct 2003 14:03:08 GMT, Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com>
> wrote:
>
>
>>W1RFI wrote:
>>
>>
>>>>You raise an interesting question, Carl. How exactly should the
>>>>average ham go about proving that the RFI is indeed BPL, when the BPL
>>>>people say
>>>>"That's not us!'??
>>>
>>>
>>>In the case in Emmaus, the PPL rep told a reporter that Carl had misidentified
>>>a "neon sign" (in a residential neighborhood) as BPL. First, Carl is
>>>professionally adept with spread spectrum, so he knows what an SS signal sounds
>>>like. The signal was heard only in the trial area and when I was in Emmaus, I
>>>worked with a local in the trial area who downloaded files for me. When the
>>>download started, the noise started; when it stopped, the noise stopped.
>>>
>>>What really proves it to be not a neon sign, however, is that the time-domain
>>>(oscilloscope) signature of the received signal does not have a pronounced
>>>120-Hz signature. Had the PPL representative actually looked at the signal, he
>>>would have known that his "explanation" was pretty transparent.
>>>
>>>I have extended by email a very cordial inviation for the PPL folks to attend a
>>>local club talk I gave; they did not respond. I then emailed a cordial
>>>invitation to work with them on interference issues; they did not respond. This
>>>boggles the mind, because if I were about to invest millions of dollars of my
>>>company's money and a national organization came to me and told me that there
>>>was a serious problem with the technology, and offered to drive over 200 miles
>>>just to show it to me, I think I would spend the hour or two and take a look.
>>>
>>
>>
>> It's beyond obvious that the BPL people are adamantly intent on
>>stonewealling and bypassing ham radio and anything else that tries to
>>get in the way.
>> They're aware that many of the impacted spectrum users are so widely
>>scattered that much of the interference caused by BPL even when it
>>becomes widely implemented they won't be noticed due to their limited
>>exposure caused by lack of adequately close proximity.
>>
>> Hams, which *are* pretty well scattered throughout the population,
>>should be ignored and their complaints deflected by such incorrect
>>assertions as the above "neon sign" explanation. Make it so that there
>>is so much question as to hams' competance to make such a call they can

>>be portrayed to be wrong, whatever the facts. It's obvious obfuscation
>>and an end-run around us, and whatever other protesters weigh in that
>>can be similarily deflected. They hope that the "serious" users of that
>>part of the spectrum will prove to be so few and widely scattered that
>>their protests will be few and managable.
>>
>> And once BPL installations are widespread, they know it would demand
>>a clearly demonstrated, very serious interference problem to csuse its
>>abandonment, and they don't think that will happen. They maybe right.
>>If so many users sign on that the sheer numbers of BPL users overwhelm
>>all the protests of spectrum pollution and damage to communications
>>sheer numbers and politics will prevail in their favor, they believe.
>>All they really need to do is get it approved and "out there" in large
>>amounts in most populated areas, then the situation will take care of
>>itself, they think.
>>
>> If allowed to proceed, BPL will forever change usability of the HF and
>>Low VHF part of the spectrum.
>
>

1120. Re: 73 Magazine Says "73 and QRT"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-14 20:57:06 UTC
From: tbryant <tbryantNOSPAM@cannet.com>
Message-ID: <k3noovsq1uoue9u0099mufm64kfdttsvr2@4ax.com>
Source record: 80648
Cross-posted to:
rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

I don't read these newsgroups too much anymore, but the demise of 73 is something I have to comment on. Basically, the magazine has no one to blame but Wayne Green.

His editorials often had very little to do with amateur radio, except how the ARRL and hams in general have failed to promote the hobby to attract young people. Other than that, Wayne's editorials would praise the latest pseudo-science, conspiracy theory, or any other crackpot idea that came along. The bad part about this is that Wayne would often combine these ideas with things that were tried and true, making it seem, to some, like he knew what he was talking about, and was an authority. Example: He has touted a change in diet and lifestyle to promote a long, healthy life and prevent disease - no argument there. But electroshock therapy with a "bioelectrifier" device to cure cancer and even AIDS? Give me a break!

But in all of his editorials, did Wayne ever ask himself if this was the kind of thing that ham operators were interested in? Did he ever conduct a poll to see what his readers were interested in? Did he do anything to attract new advertisers? My guess is that he probably didn't.

Despite this, I don't think we've heard the last of Wayne Green. The last I heard, he was trying to start a new magazine about living/vacationing in New Hampshire. He'll also probably still make the occasional appearance on Coast to Coast AM.

Tom, N8ECW

1121. Re: Code test analogy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-14 20:57:21 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <RqZib.55733$mQ2.53083@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 80646

"No-coder" <nocoder@aol.com> wrote in message
news:bmhf5m021n9@enews3.newsguy.com...
> In article <stVib.2761$kx.66@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>,
> w4nti@getridofthismindspring.com says...
>
>
> >Just further proof of my favorite statement....
> >
> >"Ya just cain't fix stupid"
> >
> >Dan/W4NTI
>
> I had hoped that my post would generate a level headed debate on this
analogy.
> Apparently, you are incapable of that, and can only resort to ad hominem
> attacks.
>

Just answer me this then....why would we bother with A N O T H E R code vs
no-code debate? In the last 10 years there has been thousands of them here.
In otherwords your a day late and a dollar short.

Try another troll.

Dan/W4NTI

1122. Re: What makes LHA so poor at simple research tasks?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-14 21:15:23 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0310141315.45d783b@posting.google.com>
Source record: 80647

groupk0hb@earthlink.net (Hans K0HB) wrote in message
news:<5ee63311.0310132034.23d9cbeb@posting.google.com>...

> Reginald Fessenden made a holiday broadcast of a short spoken
> introduction, some recorded Christmas music, and played "Oh Holy
> Night" on a violin.
>
Interesting fellow, that Fessenden. Besides his work in radio, he
invented the fathometer and held over 500 patents.

Some interesting dates in his early radio work:

1900 - successfully transmits voice radio signal 1 mile

1903 - successfully transmits voice radio signal 50 miles

1906 - (November) Successfully achieves 2 way transatlantic voice
radio communication between Scotland and Massachusetts. (This was less
than 5 years after Marconi's claimed one-way reception of the letter
"S", and over a greater distance.)

1906 - (December 24 & 31) Christmas Eve broadcast of both recorded and
live music and voice from Massachusetts. Signals heard all over North
Atlantic and coastal areas. Inland as far as New York State. Broadcast
repeated New Year's Eve.

Spark and alternator transmitters were used, with power up to 1 kW and
frequencies as high as 100 kHz. At least one replica spark transmitter
based on Fessenden's methods has been built by Canadian amateurs
(Fessenden was Canadian), and successful voice signal operation
demonstrated with a dummy load.

Lots more info available from a number of websites. The Hammond Museum
of Radio has lots of great stuff on him.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1123. Re: RM-10808 --- Wexelbaum Redux

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-14 21:34:28 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0310141334.2afbd311@posting.google.com>
Source record: 80649

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20031014141012.29815.00001144@mb-m21.aol.com>...
> In article <c2356669.0310140825.2c02d233@posting.google.com>, N2EY@AOL.COM
> (N2EY) writes:
>
>
> >FCC disagrees with you, Len. They trust amateurs (like me, whose first
> >amateur radio license arrived in the mail exactly 36 years ago today)
> >to keep on learning as they go. At least enough to know the current
> >regulations.
>
> There is NO evidence of such implicit "trust" in all of Title 47 C.F.R.,
> any radio service.

Yes, there is, Len.

It's expressed every time FCC renews an amateur license without
requiring a retest of the licensee.

It's expressed every time an amateur puts a non-certified,
non-type-approved transmitter on the air and uses it legally.

It's expressed every time FCC makes a rules change in the amateur
service but does not require any certification that already-licensed
hams know about the change and will comply with it.

It's expressed in FCC's acceptance of amateurs' use of new modes and
technologies without a lengthy approval process.

It's expressed by the unprecedented freedom amateurs enjoy in choice
of modes, frequencies, power levels, and technologies.
>
> The Commission is NOT chartered or organized to be a promoter or
> booster or provider of emotional sustenance for radio operator license
> grantees.

Sure they are. Amateur radio is lots of fun. That's why I do it.

In fact, on this 36th anniversary of the arrival of my Novice license,
I'd like to thank the FCC for allowing me to have a tremendous amount
of fun and enjoyment on the amateur bands.

> Radio serivce regulations of ALL radio serivices do not
> expect emotional, nurturing "trust." Regulations REQUIRE obeyance
> to the LAW. Disobediance to the law will result in possible arrest,
> confinement, equipment seizure, and monetary loss.

FCC has never done any of that to me. Of course, I've never knowingly
broken any FCC regulations.
>
> Regulations, the LAW, requires ALL involved to be cognizant of
> ALL changes which alter relevant LAW. That applies to ALL involved
> regardless of their total time of involvement.

Is there a point to all this hollering of yours?
>
> No emotional-level "trust" is involved.

Sure there is. I get a nice warm fuzzy feeling every time FCC renews
or modifies my license, and accepts me at my word that the information
I give them is true and correct. My next renewal is coming up in a few
months - wanna bet FCC trusts me for another 10 years?

I trust FCC and they trust me.

> ALL are EXPECTED to obey
> the EXISTING law and ANY changes in that law as it occurs.

You mean like not bootlegging?

> That is basic to ALL LAW.

Is there a point to your lectures?
>
> The Federal Communications Commission was created by the United
> States Congress through the Communications Act of 1934. That act
> of Congress did NOT specifically center on amateur radio nor did it
> give any special dispensation in any way to radio amateurs. ALL
> civil radio services (non-government, non-military) in the United States
> are regulated by the FCC. Regulation of radio services does not involve
> "trust." It involves expectation of obeyance of regulations. Failure to
> obey regulations will result in governmental action to punish offenders.
> All involved with any radio service activity are governed by regulations
> applying to that radio service. That is the law. For all.
>
> Try not to redifine basic law or governmental regulation...or attempt
> coloring and distortion of personal activities with emotional sugar-coating
> of artificial sweetener in a false claim of personal or like-group
> dilligence and responsibility.
>
> Try to stay within one light-year distance of the subject thread instead
> of misdirecting into personal pettiness of perceived pompousness
> through false claims.
>

Gee, Len, why don't you try civil discourse? You know, like Carl
suggested, hoeny instead of vinegar. And maybe a spellchecker? It's
getting harder and harder to tell the difference between your posts
and Bruce's.

1124. Re: What makes a Pro code test Amateur a Troglodyte?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-14 21:54:05 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0310141354.1c6fbd0d@posting.google.com>
Source record: 80650

Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:<bmgsq5$1f3$0@208.206.142.105>...
> N2EY wrote:
>
> > In article <YFIib.48865$mQ2.42713@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Bill
> > Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
> > >
>
> >>We'll just have to
> >>agree to disagree on that because I ain't gonna waste any more
> >>time arguing hypotheticals when those arguments aren't
> >>even being made to the FCC.
> >>
> >
> > But they are being made to FCC, as shown above. What reasonable, rational
> > arguments can we make to counter the above logic?
>
>
> Jim, you're talking to a post.

I don't think so at all, Dick. K2UNK is one of the most interesting
folks to discuss things with here.

Bill and I are simply having a discussion. We disagree with each other
but there is mutual respect and civility on both sides. He's not
convinced by my arguments and I'm not convinced by his reassurances,
but I'm quite sure he read what I had to say and considered it
carefully.

Frankly, I hope Bill is right and I'm wrong on this, and that we don't
ever have to contend with folks wanting to drastically reduce written
testing.

> NCI thinks they've got what they want
> now and their heads are firmly buried in the sand to any issue beyond
> killing off the code test.

That's the whole purpose of that organization - and we're promised
that it will simply cease to function in the USA if/when there's no
more code test.

When Bill or Carl or Ed or Jon write something here, I take it to be
their own personal view, not that of NCI (in the case of Bill or Carl)
or ARRL (in the case of Ed or Jon) *unless* they specifically state
"NCI policy is..."

> Nothing will dull their premature euphoria.

The fat lady ain't sung yet.

> So now we'll see if the adage "be careful what you ask for" will apply.

Who knows? My concern, however, is still the same:

What reasonable, rational arguments can we make to counter the above logic (against more-than-the-barest-minimum-written-tests)?

Because I still think that sooner, rather than later, that issue will come up. And we better be ready for it.

Everyone should read that KL7CC paper on the AL7FS website. Note what it says about the writtens. Heck, the author is one of the top guys at NCVEC, helping make their policy, and he says in public that he couldn't pass the current *written* exam for the Extra without some serious book study!

--

Who of us here was a ham before November 22, 1968? Let's see - there's N2EY, W0EX, K2UNK, W3RV, K0HB, W4NTI, AA2QA. Apologies to anyone I missed.

Back then, all it took for full privs was 13 wpm code and a ~50 question written test. Has 35 years of incentive licensing made hams "more technical"? If not, why do we need all those written tests?

What say, folks?

73 de Jim, N2EY

1125. Re: A New Concept: Virtual Spectrum

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-14 22:24:25 UTC
From: David Stinson <arc5@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3F8C73B1.55886523@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 80701
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.antiques.radio+phono,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc

Ed Wilson wrote:
>
> David,
>
> Your idea is certainly technically feasible, and would provide a way
> for folks to continue to 'use' obsolete radio equipment in a post-BPL
> era. Similar in many ways to the micro AM transmitter that I use to
> broadcast old-time radio programs to my antique radios, for
> demonstration purposes.
>
> Somehow, though, it wouldn't be the same. DX-ing and shortwave
> listening are, for me, pursuits which are made interesting by the
> sheer randomness of long distance radio communication. Things like
> building a better antenna or tuner, or waiting for the window to open
> to that country in order to catch an elusive transmission - that's
> where the fun is!
>
> Internet communications, however, are carried over the same
> high-reliability global networks as telephone calls. From my
> keyboard, I can DXCC in probably under half an hour - which would be a
> very unfulfilling task, given the certainty of the medium. And that's
> why I have no interest in some of the existing Internet/Amateur Radio
> interfaces, such as IRLP - sure, I can talk to some guy over in
> England on my 5 watt 2-meter HT using a local repeater and dialling an
> access code to his local repeater - but it isn't DX, its more like a
> telephone call to a random party at the destination over the Internet.
> More like using VOIP to call a pay phone in England, then talking to
> whomever answers. To me, that ain't radio. It's a phone call.
> Nothing more.
>
> Your proposed interface would provide a way to simulate real QSOs on
> the old equipment - but it would not be 'real'. Not much different,
> really, than building a Telco interface for the radio, dialling up the
> far end, and pretending to have a radio QSO using the mike and speaker
> instead of the handset. A radio simulator of sorts, with a real
> boatanchor configured like a speakerphone at each end - but just a
> simulation nevertheless. Not a true radio QSO. I could wire up my
> electric pencil sharpener with a mike and speaker, and establish a QSO
> over the Net with somebody on an ARC-5. That don't make it a radio,
> though!.....but it would look kinda cool ;)
>
> Some will find this interface quite acceptable - if conversation with

> others is what the hobby is about for them, this will provide a
> nostalgic way to continue to QSO with familiar radio equipment.
> 'Whatever floats their boat'.
>
> For those of us who chase DX and foreign broadcasts through the ether
> or thrive on overcoming technical obstacles, however, I suspect that
> our interest would not be held for long by such an interface. Just
> like piping 1941 Jack Benny programs to my AK-55 - cute, but it
> doesn't make it seem like it's 1941. Great for demonstrating the set
> to guests, though - after half a minute or so, their interest is
> dissipating and the AK is switched back off.
>
> If BPL becomes a reality, my HF gear will be going up on the shelf
> with the other old radio equipment - to make room for the satellite
> and moonbounce equipment that will take its place.

Not mine. Not if I can possibly help it.
I can't stop BPL, but I *can* get around it.
And what I'm proposing does not preclude what you want.
Let's say BPL does come to your area, and
all HF sounds like a buzz saw.
In your case, you still have your transmitter there at your house.
You use a remote front end, and stream the portion of the DX band
you want to work from a friend's house out in the quiet country.
The only difference is that your receiver is effectively offset in
location
by a few miles. That isn't going to make finding that weak
DXpedition any less challenging, but it *will* make it possible.
Otherwise, it's give up the ship entirely. There's no need
to give up your enjoyment; You just have to be a little flexible
to work around the problems these numbskulls throw at us.
Afterall- haven't we hams been doing that for a century?
73 Dave S.

1126. Re: A New Concept: Virtual Spectrum

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-14 22:47:36 UTC
From: Robert Murrell <murrellr-dummy@ameritech.net>
Message-ID: <c2%ib.1567$P%1.1217140@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 80702
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.antiques.radio+phono,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc

Its already been done. Its called 'telephone'.

"David Stinson" <arc5@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
news:3F8B4D6D.31D19695@ix.netcom.com...
> Thanks for reading this.
> I have today submitted an article to QST magazine entitled
> "Virtual Spectrum: Beating BPL at its own game,"
> detailing a concept that can greatly impact our radio hobby.
> I wanted to "put down a marker" to date the introduction
> of a new ham-radio innovation, and to officially place
> the idea in the public domain, so the maximum amount of
> "tinkering" with it can happen.
>
> This concept uses the bandwidth available on the Internet
> and some simple circuitry to create a replica of a segment of
> the radio spectrum, stream it live or prerecorded to another
> internet-connected computer and reconstruct that radio spectrum
> at your location. *Any* radio equipment you wish to use
> (given an Internet connection with sufficent bandwidth)-
> from modern PSK-31 rigs, SSB nets, WW-II modulated oscillators
> all the way back to ancient spark transmitters
> with crystal receivers; all can legally communicate just as though
> you were on-the-air. The system is bi-directional, allowing
> QSOs between stations that normally could not communicate.
> If you can't hear weak signals because of noise in your area,
> the concept allows you to build a "remote front end" and
> transport the radio spectrum in a quiet area right to your rig,
> bypassing the problems in your location.
>
> I believe this concept can be the answer to BPL, "noise holes,"
> antenna restrictions, HF "jammers" and many other obstacles to
> using our radios. There is great potential for many uses,
> and a possible niche market for someone with the resources
> to develop the equipment.
> I have already built prototype equipment to prove the concept
> and it works splendidly. The article includes construction
> details. The circuits are simple and you can get
> 95% of the parts at Radio Shack.
> By the time QST publishes (assume they accept the work),
> we should have completed the first Virtual Spectrum QSO:
> two World War 2 BC-611 handie-talkies (output: about 60 milliwatts)
> will communicate over a path of about 2000 miles.
>

> If QST does not publish the concept,
> I will publish it myself on the web
> immediatly after hearing from them.
> I am indebted to Mike Hanz, aafradio@cox.net
> for invaluable suggestions and encouragement.
>
> TNX ES 73 DE Dave Stinson AB5S

1127. Re: Amateur Radio Newsline? Report 1365 ? October 10 2003

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-14 23:03:07 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031014190307.28496.00001270@mb-m18.aol.com>
Source record: 80703

In article <f45722ac.0310140907.5a00817@posting.google.com>,
brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:

>radionews@aol.com (Radionews) wrote in message
>news:<20031011222248.08032.00000568@mb-m11.aol.com>...
>> Amateur Radio Newsline? Report 1365 ? October 10 2003
>>
>> Amateur Radio Newsline report number 1365 with a release date of Friday,
>> October 10th 2003 to follow in 5-4-3-2-1.
>>
>> The following is a Q-S-T.
>
>snip
>
>> RADIO AIDS: NOAA PROPAGATION SERVICE TO GO QRT
>>
>> Amateurs around the globe may soon loose the propagation information system
>> operated by the United States National Oceanic and Atmospheric
>Administration.
>> This includes real time data on the state of the interaction of the earth's
>
>> magnetosphere with the solar wind and state of the earth's magnetic field.
>>
>> These tools have been invaluable to ham radio operators world-wide for many
>> years. The reasons it may be going away? Budgetary cutbacks and lack of
>> future funding. (Published news reports)
>
>snip
>
>I just returned from the NOAA web site and under, "What's New"
>SEC Events and Announcements," found nothing about this news.
>
>Anyone else have the scoop?

Out of curiosity, I linked over to NOAA's website and searched.

Nada, nothing, nyet on that "news" in public view.

Lots and lots of fascinating information on the MANY things going
on at NOAA and its departments. The Commerce Department's
Radio Office doesn't have anything either, nor the NGDC.

Must be one of those "secret" places that only dittyboppers know
about...and go into paranoic fits about...

Ionosonde terminals have been fielded for half a century now and the ionospheric characteristics have been known about and studied for far longer. HF radio communications has been steadily decreasing for decades, is principally used as a backup for all other communications means such as secure digital fiber (DSN) and communications satellite relay. Over a thousand SHARES HF radio stations exist for government agencies and they are converting to ALE (Automatic Link Establishment) which can automatically go to "better frequencies" if the circuit becomes less than good.

About the only thing I can see for HF ionospheric propagation data is the constantly monitored "solar index" applied to standard formulas for predicting MUF. NOAA observes the "solar index" and many other things.

LHA

1128. Re: What makes a Pro code test Amateur a Troglodyte?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-14 23:03:11 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031014190311.28496.00001271@mb-m18.aol.com>
Source record: 80704

In article <c2356669.0310140852.4c29f54@posting.google.com>, N2EY@AOL.COM
(N2EY) writes:

>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>news:<20031013234613.01893.00001228@mb-m22.aol.com>...
>> In article <20031013203527.08626.00001165@mb-m27.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com
>(N2EY)
>> writes:
>>
>> >In article <20031013174921.12501.00003124@mb-m04.aol.com>,
>lenover21@aol.com
>> >(Len Over 21) writes:
>> >
>> >>In article <bmdt22$sse@library2.airnews.net>, "Kim"
>> >><kimscliff@yahoo.com>
>> >>writes:
>> >>
>> >>>"Hans K0HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
>> >>>news:5ee63311.0310121827.7191e44a@posting.google.com...
>> >>> "Kim" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote
>>
>> >>> Spark transmissions were outlawed (as well they should have been) so
>> >>> the precedent exists.
>> >>>
>> >>>Hmmmm, Jim/N2EY made that observation also. Then, I see the comment
>that
>> >>>spark was a transmission method--not a mode. I think that's splitting
>> >>>hairs, isn't it? I'm asking--I wasn't around for spark ;)
>> >>
>> >> The ONLY way a "spark" transmitter could send anything called
>> >> communications information was by on-off keying.
>> >
>> >there were other types of transmitters on the air even
>> >before WW1. Arc transmitters and Alexanderson alternators were two types.
>> >Transmitters using tubes were in use well before 1920.
>>
>> Irrelevant.
>
>No, very relevant. Spark was not the only option before 1920. And
>after 1920, there were even more options.

How many amateur "radio" stations were equipped with Alexanderson
Alternators, senior?

By your nebulous connection of facts, you could have said that
Heinrich Hertz was the "first VHF op" since he used single spark
impulses in that frequency region.

We are NOT talking "options." I was saying that "spark" transmitters
could ONLY be used for communications with on-off keying codes.

Quit trying to misdirect into other things.

>Amateurs pretty much abandoned spark by 1924-1925. Oddly enough, there
>was no international treaty requirement for amateurs to be code tested
>until 1927.

Irrelevant. The CCITT was not created just for radio communications
nor did any "international (radio) treaty organization" exist in 1896 when
radio was first demonstrated as a communications means.

The Internation Telecommunications Union is a United Nations body.
The United Nations did not exist prior to World War Two.

>The first 'broadcast' stations were actually amateur stations. Using
>tube transmitters. They do not get the recognition of KDKA and WWJ
>because none of them were in operation on a regular, continuing
>schedule.

Irrelevant in any discussion of amateur radiotelegraphy, use or
technology.

This is an amateur radio newsgroup not a place for NAB discussions.

>> From ALL the available literature of old-time amateur radio
>> prior to 1920,
>
>Have you read *all* of it? I doubt that very much.

Prove that I didn't.

Quit trying to misdirect into petty personal problems you have.

>1920 is twelve years before you were born, Len. So you weren't there.

Irrelevant.

YOU were not in existance when I first started professional radio
communications on HF bands.

>> THE OVERWHELMING MAJORITY of amateur radio
>> transmitters were of the "spark" type.
>
>Irrelevant. And there's no need to shout, Len. Your words DO NOT
>BECOME MORE TRUE WHEN CAPITALIZED!!!

Do not be so sensitive to EMPHASIZED WORDS.

Internet text format does not allow case changes or size changes in
type fonts.

>> "Spark" transmitters can be modulated SOLELY by ON-OFF KEYING.
>
>That's simply not correct, Len. And you know it.

What I said IS CORRECT.

Amplitude modulating a spark transmitter has all the quality and
intelligibility of amplitude modulating a doorbell buzzer...almost none.

Show us the scientific or engineering work "proving" that a spark
transmitter can be amplitude modulated with any sort of intelligibility
suitable for communications.

You cannot. There is none.

>> The sole surviving Alexanderson Alternator VLF RF generator is in
>> Grimeton, Sweden, and used once each year for a brief period in a
>> ceremony for Televerket, the Swedish government's telecommunication
>> works. A ceremonial event, not one for any actual communication.
>
>Irrelevant. But at least not as boring as your usual diversions.

The Grimeton Alternator was not used in amplitude modulation, ONLY
in on-off keying.

>> >The practical transmission of voice and music by radio was demonstrated as
>> >early as 1906.
>>
>> ONLY with a rotary alternator with a WATER COOLED MICROPHONE.
>
>No, with spark.

INCORRECT. McGraw-Hill and the staff of Electronics magazine of
1980 disagree with your "learned' opinion.

Please give us a scientific or engineering precis on how a 1 KW
transmitter OF ANY KIND is amplitude modulated by a single
microphone, no active device couplers or amplifiers, of the 1906
era electronics technology.

>> Demonstration only, and then ONCE.
>
>Irrelevant.

No. PRACTICAL. Losses in old-style microphones of early 1900s
used in ONE KILOWATT transmitter aerial circuits would prohibit
hand-held use even with forced water cooling.

>> Morse code was developed for ON-OFF KEYING...on land lines.
>
>Sure. Modern "land lines" (in the form of fiber optics) still use
>on-off keying. Even though it's a very old idea.

Please show all communications work, research or practical, on
communications using GIGABIT DATA RATES prior to 1940.

Please show all communications work, reasearch or practical,
involving glass fiber as a medium of communications prior to 1940.

Digital communications over fiber-optic cable involve DIGITIZATION
of analog signals which may have any form of modulation or
combinatorial modulation such as AM-PM in common modems.

There is NO ON-OFF KEYING used in fiber-optic digital communications
on landlines, sealines, elevated over land, or direct conversion to RF for
microwave radio relay. NONE.

>> "Spark" transmitters could communicate ONLY by on-off keying.
>
>Repeating the same misinformation doesn't make it any more correct,
>Len.

McGraw-Hill, a publisher and perhaps the greatest publisher of text
books in the world today, is my source of information. Prentice-Hall
and Wiley Interscience are up there as strong competitors.

In order to prove your point, you MUST show how a spark transmitter
can be modulated in any way OTHER than ON-OFF KEYING for any
sort of communications.

>No, exactly relevant. In fact, prior to 1912 there were at least three
>different codes in use in radio. One of the changes brought about by
>the Titanic disaster was standardization on the "Continental" or
>"International" version, which is quite different from that used in
>"land line" work.

Irrelevant and petty minutae. The BASIC FORM of telegraphy is
ON-OFF KEYING. Only the on-off patterns, the arrangements of
the "bits" is relevant in discussing "kinds" of coding patterns.

Basic form of telegraphy, wired or by radio, is ON-OFF KEYING>

>> Early primitive radio could ONLY work
>> with an ON-OFF KEYING method.
>
>Incorrect.

YOU are INCORRECT. For the third time, show the work that proves
your correctness.

You cannot.

>> Despite all the variant dialects of "morse codes," ALL work ONLY by
>> ON-OFF KEYING. ALL.
>
>Not true! And there's no reason to shout.

As far as spark transmitters are concerned, those can work ONLY by
ON-OFF KEYING codes for communications.

ON-OFF KEYING with one kind of pattern of character representation
is not different from ON-OFF KEYING using another kind of pattern

of character representation.

>Any version of Morse code can be applied to frequency shift keying or
>phase shift keying or a variety of other modulation methods. On-off
>keying is simply the most commonly used method for radio purposes.

Absolutely true. NOW.

Show your work that "proves" spark transmitters were capable of
communications modulation OTHER than on-off keying.

Feel free to show your work that "proves" rotary alternator RF
generators were ever capable of FSK or PSK telegraphy.

The early radio transmitters were ONLY capable of ON-OFF KEYING
to effect communications.

>Would you stop your persistent denigration of Morse code and those who
>use it if we shifted (pun intended) to FSK or PSK?

Stop your incessant petty pique whining about "persistent denigration"
of morse code or codings.

FACT: EARLY RADIO HAD *ONLY* ON-OFF KEYING AS ANY
MEANS OF EFFECTING RADIO COMMUNICATION. SPARK
TRANSMITTERS WERE NOT CAPABLE OF COMMUNICATIONS BY
ANY OTHER MEANS.

>You're the one who gets all emotional and exaggerates, Len. All that
>shouting and carrying on in here. Really, one would think you were a
>bit more mature by now.

There is no "emotion" in stating basic physics and historic facts
about early radio.

The limitations of Internet newsgroup text formats prohibits change of
type font size or other attributes. Writing in all-capitals is the only
way to EMPHASIZE STATEMENTS, NO DIFFERENT THAN WRITING
LARGE ON A BLACKBOARD in an attempt to teach backward
students certain facts.

YOU are the emotional individual, almost a religious zealot in the
constant highlighting of morse code mode communications in a
non-professional avocational activity, unable to prove any morse
code efficacy or accurate historical data in the much larger world
of professional radio.

>As for self-serving - well, all those long boring irrelevant diatribes
>on old military radio sets that you post here.....

The AN/PRC-119 series of small-unit land and air unit radios in the
US military may have begun to field operationally over a decade
ago but there are now a quarter million of them used by all branches
of the US military. Digital voice, data, in-clear or encrypted, single
frequency or frequency-hopping in 30 to 88 MHz bandspace. May

be used with AN/PSN-11 by simple cable connection for accurate
time update for networking in FHSS mode. Battle proven in Iraq,
Afghanistan, Kuwait, elsewhere.

Quarter million quantity of those radios. Fielded and operational.
Produced by ITT Fort Wayne and General Dynamics Land Division.

The US military DOES NOT USE MANUAL TELEGRAPHY FOR
TACTICAL COMMUNICATIONS PURPOSES TODAY, HAS NOT
DONE SO FOR DECADES.

>> Radio as a communications medium is 107 years old. ON-OFF
>> KEYING of a radio frequency carrier is NOT a new concept nor is it
>> the best for communications.
>
>Who are you to judge? You've never used Morse code, from what you tell
>us.

Stop your petty petulant whining about "one has to use morse code
in order to understand it." Emotional nonsense.

The REST OF THE RADIO WORLD has given up on morse code, is
giving up on it, or never considered it as useful in the first place.
Only amateurs cling to it...on an emotional basis.

REAL ENGINEERS do not have to use everything under evaluation for
judgement of any kind. Aeronautical engineers do not have to know
how to fly aircraft in order to design them. Automotive engineers do not
have to know driving any kind of vehicle in order to design them. The
FCC does not require Commissioners OR staff OR anyone in their
Office of Engineering Technology to "know" all the kinds of radio and
wire communications in order to BE THE ULTIMATE JUDGE FOR
CIVIL COMMUNICATIONS REGULATIONS.

>> Continued USE of morse code modes DOES NOT POSSIBLY ADVANCE
>> ANY STATE OF THE RADIO ARTS.
>
>Yes, it does, in many ways.

Incorrect. Prove your contention by technical proof, not emotionalism
or bias or favoritsm.

>Len, you're so emotionally connected to denigrating a form of keying
>and a form of communication that you can't see that. You go far beyond
>wanting to end a test.

Petulant paranoia from an emotional devotee of old-time radio.

The awful thing about reality is that it exists. All around.

Time and technology in all radio-electronics continues to advance, to
CHANGE. That is reality. That is truth.

The emotional cripples want a stasis, a stopping of change, a refusal to recognize change, a near-complete refusal to recognize any other citizens as worthy of existance in their pet hobby.

Amateur radio is an avocation, a recreational non-professional radio activity. In the USA it isn't about the continual recreation of old days in radio using old standards, old modes, old ethics, old mores...or old rules and regulations that are no longer applicable.

The problem is that some think the above DOES apply, or MUST apply, because that is the ONLY thing they can see, understand, or comprehend.

You have a great deal of work ahead of you in logically, honestly proving some of your contentions and insinuations of others and lack of professional proof of early radio limitations. Those cannot be proved by petulant tantrums or illogical incorrect statements of old amateur mythology.

Get busy.

LHA

1129. Re: Code test analogy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-15 00:01:39 UTC
From: Clint <"rattlehead at computron dot net">
Message-ID: <vop3kc7m7pg490@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 80705

"No-coder" <nocoder@aol.com> wrote in message
news:bmgsql02lav@enews1.newsguy.com...
> In article <bmfpib$i4q$0@208.206.142.110>, dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com
says...
>
>
> If you have no other refutation than to call it "lamebrained" then you
have no
> argument at all. You show that you are incapable of engaging in any form
of
> intelligent debate on the matter.

The PCTA's never have been able to. They quickly deplete thier very shallow pool of "debate points", which are easily refuted and defeated such as the old & dead "it's basic to all radio communication" (that one still makes me laugh)...
and quickly they MUST resort to name calling such as "lamebrained" because they have NO other cards in their hand. They have nothing to lean on. All they
do is either put you on thier killfile list (read: I can't factually support my stand
so therefore i'm going to just ignore you! so there! *nyah!*) or they start name calling. "lamebrain" is one of the new ones; generally the pro code dinosaurs start using "lazy", "stupid" and "moron" interspersed with various vulgarities.

Clint
Easily whipping the PCTA's

1130. Re: Code test analogy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-15 00:03:04 UTC
From: Clint <"rattlehead at computron dot net">
Message-ID: <vop3mura2enj17@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 80707

Exactly. My condolensces as well.

Clint
KB5ZHT

>
> >"Ya just cain't fix stupid"
>
> We pity that, Dan, many of us were optimistic that you could be
> repaired...
>
> Sorry to hear of it.
>
> LHA

1131. Re: Code test analogy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-15 00:03:35 UTC
From: Clint <"rattlehead at computron dot net">
Message-ID: <vop3o1rhod4g4e@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 80706

"No-coder" <nocoder@aol.com> wrote in message
news:bmhf5m021n9@enews3.newsguy.com...

>
> I had hoped that my post would generate a level headed debate on this
analogy.
> Apparently, you are incapable of that, and can only resort to ad hominem
> attacks.
>

I TOLD you, N-C, that is all they CAN do.

Clint
KB5ZHT

1132. Re: Code test analogy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-15 00:04:13 UTC
From: Clint <"rattlehead at computron dot net">
Message-ID: <vop3p5cpccan7d@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 80708

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:RqZib.55733$mQ2.53083@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...

>
> Just answer me this then....why would we bother with A N O T H E R code
vs
> no-code debate? In the last 10 years there has been thousands of them
here.

and you guys lose every one of them.

Clint
KB5ZHT

1133. Re: I warned everyone this would happen. Re: 73 Magazine Says "73 and QRT"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-15 00:08:38 UTC
From: Clint <"rattlehead at computron dot net">
Message-ID: <vop41jpgqpi4e5@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 80709
Cross-posted to:
rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:OdKib.49079$mQ2.12110@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...

>
> Of course it's a stretch, Clint. That's all some have left at this
point.
> In reality, the magazine "73" has never obtained great success in the
> marketplace, which means advertising revenue has always been lower than
the
> other magazines. At the same time, printing and other costs are going up,
> making it much more difficult for smaller publications to stay in
business.
> This same thing is happening throughout the publishing industry. Lower
> advertising revenue, combined with rising costs, is putting many smaller
> magazines out of business. Knowing that, it shouldn't surprise anyone when
> the same thing happens to the ham radio publications.
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
>
>

There's another contributing or influencing factor; the internet. The
prevalance
of internet connections & accounts, growing all the time, has offered a new
medium through which information and published materials can be
shared. Just like with the snail mail industry, i'm sure there *has* been a
substantial impact upon the hard-copy publishing industry.

Then again, it shouldn't be surprising that the PCTA crowd doesn't
understand this, that it has gone completely over thier head, as the
mere concept of modernization and progress, along with evolvement,
is totally alien to them, I guess.

Clint
KB5ZHT

1134. Re: FCC relaxes it's prohibition on use of the "F-word" on broadcast media.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-15 00:12:04 UTC
From: Clint <"rattlehead at computron dot net">
Message-ID: <vop47s9kimm2e6@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 80710
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.shortwave

I'm sure the PCTA's will spin and twist this news to somehow say
it's another example of how NCI is destroying ham radio.

It's almost laughable.

Clint
KB5ZHT

"Dr. Anton Phibes" <bhutanna2@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:1066009539.863340@newshost03.voicenet.com...
> October 9, 2003
> F.C.C. Ruling Could Allow Use Of "F-word" On T.V.
> By Jon Hanian BOISE -
>
> In broadcasting, dropping the so called "F-bomb" goes
> over like an H-bomb. But the FCC has now ruled that
> the use of the "F-word" by U-2 frontman "Bono" at
> the Golden Globe awards **did not** violate federal
> indecency rules.
>
> The FCC rules say the use of the word must be "patently offensive"
> to be considered indecent. But the FCC ruled that when Bono
> received a Golden Globe award on television and
> said, "this is really f * * * * * * brilliant," he did not violate
> FCC rules. They ruled that the word was used as an adjective
> instead of a verb and therefore, while it may have been
> crude, it was not "patently offensive."
>
> If that FCC decision confuses you, think about how those
> of us in the media are trying to to interpret it.
>
> Dr. Rick Moore of the Boise State University Communications
> Department believes this decision will muddy the already
> muddy waters for broadcasters who struggle with what is
> acceptable and unacceptable speech. "I think it might give
> some people a sense of greater license to not be quite so
> tight on that bleep button as they have been in the past,"
> said Moore.
>
> At Idaho 2 News, General Manager Jeff Anderson says
> while the ruling may make an already murky situation
> murkier, KBCI TV will not air the F-word in any context.
> "We have an obligation to program in the public
> interest, and in my opinion broadcasting programming

> with that kind of language is inappropriate and we
> won't do it," he said.
>
> ---------------------------------
>
> (Story 2)
>
> FCC relaxes TV rules on use of f-word
> By Chris Baker
> THE WASHINGTON TIMES
>
> Remember comedian George Carlin's list of the seven dirty words you can't
> say on television?
>
> It just got a little shorter.
>
> The Federal Communications Commission ruled this month that
> Irish rocker Bono did not violate federal indecency rules when
> he used the f-word during an acceptance speech at the
> Golden Globe Awards, which NBC broadcast in January.
>
> "This is really, really [expletive] brilliant," Bono said during
> the ceremony, using the f-word as an adjective.
> The speech aired live on the East Coast. The FCC said it
> received 234 complaints, all but 17 of them from individuals
> associated with the Parents Television Council, a nonprofit
> group that monitors programs for adult content.
>
> The FCC rejected the complaints Oct. 3 in a written statement
> that used the f-word far more often than Bono did on the air.
> David H. Solomon, chief of the FCC's enforcement
> bureau, said the word "may be crude and offensive, but, in
> the context presented here, did not describe sexual or
> excretory organs and activities."
>
> That distinction is a key to test whether a statement meets
> a federal standard for broadcast indecency, according to FCC staffers.
> Mr. Solomon said in the ruling that Bono used the vulgarity as
> an adjective or to emphasize an exclamation and that "the use
> of specific words, including expletives or other 'four-letter words'
> does not render material obscene."
>
> Laura Mahaney, director of corporate and entertainment affairs for
> the Parents Television Council, has vowed an appeal. "The ruling
> is outrageous. It's splitting hairs," she said.
>
> Activists said they fear the FCC's ruling will allow the f-word
> and other vulgarities to become more common in prime-time television.
> "We're gradually getting to the point where nothing will be off-limits,"
> said Jim O'Connor, president of the Cuss Control Academy, a Lake

> Forest, Ill., group that advises individuals on ways to limit cursing.
> Spokesmen for NBC and the other major broadcast networks
> rejected the suggestion that the ruling will lead to more salty language
in
> prime time.
>
> However, they acknowledge they face heavy competition from
> cable networks such as HBO and FX, which have more freedom
> to air edgy shows because they do not deliver programs over the
> FCC-regulated airwaves.
>
> The FCC's Enforcement Bureau issued the ruling on Bono's language.
> The five-member FCC panel did not vote on the matter.
> Commissioner Michael J. Copps, one of two Democrats on the
> panel, said he has not reviewed the case, but if it had come
> before him, he may not have dismissed the complaints.
> "I do believe under the right circumstances that a word in
> and of itself can be indecent without having to fit in
> with a wider context," he said.
>
> Six years ago, activists and the Clinton administration pushed the
> networks to adopt a content-ratings system that would enable V-chips
> to block programs parents deemed inappropriate.
> At the time, some network executives feared the ratings system
> would lead to bland scripts and cost them viewers.
> For the most part, broadcasters have continued to push the
> limits of decorum with programs such as "NYPD Blue," a pioneer
> in the use of four-letter words. The show crossed another line
> last season when ABC permitted writers to slip a coarse word
> for bull dung into an episode.
>
>
>

1135. Re: What makes a Pro code test Amateur a Troglodyte?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-15 00:21:10 UTC
From: Clint <"rattlehead at computron dot net">
Message-ID: <vop4otsnmo7p97@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 80711

Well, we are both in agreement on that Len.... it doesn't take
long to see what the PCTA crowd is *really* about and after;
just read some of thier posted reasons for keeping the test
around (if you can stand to put up with the intermixed vular
insults and name calling)... one that is just recently being
tabled in here is "if we don't force eveybody to do it, then
they won't want to"... that's a self defeating argument right
there; who would want to drink casteroil that doesn't want to,
and what's more, would forcing it down thier throad make
them become *warmer* to the idea??? And one recently
spouted, before thinking closely to what he was saying I
believe, that they want to "shape the ham community to
what *they* (read: PCTA crowd) WANT it to be.

ahem...

Clint
KB5ZHT
whipping the code test debate with EASE.....

>
"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20031013234614.01893.00001229@mb-m22.aol.com...
> In article <vomdk8t2498l86@corp.supernews.com>, "Clint" <rattlehead at
> computron dot net> writes:
>
> >"Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
> >news:3F86EDAD.4010109@psu.edu...
> >
> >> I would challenge the NCTA's to show some proof that those who believe
> >> that the morse code test should be retained are in a technical
backwater.
> >
> >Justify requireing a knowledge or profeciency test on using an old
fashioned
> >buggy whip before giving out an modern day automobile driver's license.
>
> Clint, it seems to be wasted effort to lay out the technical reasons
> for morse code mode communications disappearing on the world
> radio scene.
>
> The very first demonstrations of radio as a communications medium
> was 107 years ago. In Russia and in Italy. Both demonstrators used
> morse code mode with on-off keying. What was used 107 years ago
> is NOT "state of the art" today.

>
> USE of morse code mode is optional in the US radio amateur service.
>
> Elimination of the morse code TEST for any amateur radio license is
> not defacto elimination of its use, nor banning its use.
>
> Retention of the morse code TEST only has validity as an EMOTIONAL
> supplement to those already licensed in the amateur radio service who
> are sufficiently proficient to use the mode.
>
> Mike Coslo imagines himself as a sort of "devil's advocate" but is, by
> all public evidence, little more than a PCTA who attempts to
> masquerade his trolling and baiting by some odd self-defined role as
> "arbiter" or "moderator."
>
> This newsgroup is unmoderated.
>
> LHA

1136. Re: BPL a reality in my area now!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-15 00:26:53 UTC
From: Clint <"rattlehead at computron dot net">
Message-ID: <vop53l8e9tnt79@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 80712
Cross-posted to: alt.ham-radio,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Write or call your local AM broadcast stations and tell them that
thier signal is being wiped out and you can't recieve them.

Clint
KB5ZHT

1137. Re: What makes a Pro code test Amateur a Troglodyte?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-15 00:36:55 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <HE0jb.55912$mQ2.25777@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 80713

```
"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20031014083023.21457.00001362@mb-m10.aol.com...
> In article <YFIib.48865$mQ2.42713@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Bill
> Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
>
> >"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
> >news:c2356669.0310131337.353df3fe@posting.google.com...
> >> "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
> >news:<hGgib.785$_i.73747@nnrp1.ptd.net>...
> >> > "Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
> >> > news:20031012000943.23307.00003682@mb-m29.aol.com...
> >> > > In article <bma161$cg2@library2.airnews.net>, "Kim W5TIT"
> >> > <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
> >> > > writes:
> >> > >
> >> > > >Therein lies the problem with the whole CW test (TEST, *test*)
> >debate.
> >> > The
> >> > > >minute one takes on the "no" CW test argument, it is generally met
> >with
> >> > an
> >> > > >attitude that an end CW use (USE, *use*) is being favored or
called
> >for.
> >> > >
> >> > > Kim:
> >> > >
> >> > > Code testing has always been the thing which generated code use.
> >> >
> >> > I would assert that being forced to learn code to gain access to HF
> >> > "soured" more people on code use than it encouraged ... of course,
> >> > some percentage of folks decided they liked code and continued to
> >> > use it, but MANY simply endured something they had no interest in
> >> > to get past the test, then "threw away the key."
> >> >
> >> > Remember the old adage "honey is better than vinegar."
> >>
> >> OK, fine, your opinion is well stated.
> >>
> >> Now consider that same logic applied to the written test.
> >>
> >> It could be asserted with equal logic that being forced to learn
> >> theory and other subjects a ham is not interested in just to gain
> >> access to amateur radio
```

> >> "soured" more people on radio theory than it encouraged ... of course,
> >> some percentage of folks decided they liked aspects of amateur radio
> >> that they had not considered or known about before, but MANY simply
> >> endured something they had no interest in to get past the test, then
> >> "threw away the Handbook"
> >
> >Yet no one has apparently made that pitch,
>
> Actually, some folks have made similar pitches.
>
> Some time back, QCWA petitioned FCC to give full privs to all hams who
held
> General and Advanced licenses before Nov. 22, 1968 (the effective date of
the
> first phase of "incentive licensing". Hans, K0HB, has twice officially
proposed
> a simplified two-class system. The NCVEC folks are thinking of proposing
> changes that go far beyond dumping Element 1 (see:
>
> http://www.qsl.net/al7fs/
>
> Second item in the Table of Contents.
>
> >and no
> >one is petitioning to end written tests either.
>
> As I wrote elsewhere, some written testing is needed to insure hams know
the
> rules, including safety precautions. What I'm talking about is the whole
> concept of multiple license levels and "jump through the hoop" written
tests as
> a "hazing ritual" for more privileges.
>
> >Bottom
> >line, the requirement for some technical knowledge is
> >coupled to the freedom ALL US hams have to build,
> >modify and/or repair their own equipment...even if they
> >never want to. The knowledge is expected to help
> >hams stay within tolerences and signal characteristics
> >allowed because failing to do so can/will lead to
> >interference.
>
> Of course! That's why the written tests cannot be totally eliminated. As I
have
> written elsewhere.
>
> BUT (and it's a very big but), FCC says that almost all of the technical
> knowledge a ham needs to know is already adequately tested by the 35
question
> Technician test. That conclusion is inescapable from the fact that Techs

are
> allowed to use all authorized amateur modes, frequencies, power levels and
> technologies above 30 MHz.
>
> The only technical knowledge things that may not be adequately tested on
the
> Tech written are some HF specific items of propagation, and some
regulations.
>
> There's nothing inherently different about a 6 meter rig and a 10 meter
rig, is
> there? In fact, many modern rigs cover all ham bands from 160 through VHF!
Why
> is a Technician licensee qualified to design/build/repair/align/modify and
most
> of all operate a 6 meter rig but not a 15 meter rig - particularly when
it's
> the same rig?

Actually, when you think about it...ANYONE is allowed to design, build,
repair,
align and/or modify ham equipment...it is ONLY the "operate" part that
ultimately requires the license.

> Look at the FCC enforcement logs. Problems due to technical incompetence
are
> very few in the ARS, and those that do happen are not clustered on any
> particular license class.
>
> So why do we need all that written testing beyond Tech?

Jim, you keep bringing up what you believe are analogies
to the ode test issue and I'm not gonna play anymore. the
argument(s) fail to convince the FCC and I don't see you
making them to the FCC either. If and when someone attempts to petiton
for the changes you suggest are analogous...then I'll argue further.

> >Morse knowledge, on the other hand,
> >has no potential for harming others, causing interference,
> >etc.
> >
> And that's a good thing! One more reason to learn the skills! ;-)
>
> But we're not talking about Morse. We're talking about written testing
beyond
> the minimum needed to insure safe, legal operation of an amateur station.
>
You are talking about it, I'm done playing. No reason to do
so.

> >> This isn't a straw argument. I've known hams who sold off their study
> >> materials as soon as they passed the *written* tests.

> >>
> >> Now some folks will say "But the writtens support the basis and
> >> purpose of amateur radio as a technical service - there's even an ITU
> >> recommendation" - etc. And of course all hams do need to know the
> >> applicable regulations, safety and operating practices, so of course
> >> the written test cannot be completely eliminated.
> >>
> >> But has the existence of several tiers of written testing actually
> >> made hams "more technical"? Does being tested on how to compute
> >> complex impedances and Thevenin equivalents make a ham more likely to
> >> build equipment, experiment with new modes, participate in public
> >> service communication, be a VE and/or Elmer, and be a more friendly,
> >> helpful amateur? Does such testing make a ham less likely to commit
> >> rules violations?
> >>
> >> From 1953 to 1968, US amateur radio had only two *effective* written
> >> tests - the Novice and the General/Conditional/Technician. Yes, the
> >> Extra existed, but it was a "prestige" license only, which granted no
> >> additional operating privileges at all. The 20 question Novice got new
> >> hams started, and the ~50 question General took care of the rest.
> >>
> >> The reintroduction of "incentive licensing" in late 1968 was supposed
> >> to push hams to be "more technical" by requiring two more written
> >> tests beyond the General in order to get full privileges. But did that
> >> result happen?
> >>
> >> Some might cite the 20 wpm code test for Extra, but in fact the most
> >> gain in privileges was made by upgrading to Advanced, which required
> >> no additional code test.
> >>
> >> After 1990 (13 years ago), medical waivers allowed those with problems
> >> learning code past 5 wpm to get any class of amateur license on the
> >> basis of the 5 wpm code test alone. And since restructuring, we're
> >> down to just one additional written test beyond General for full
> >> privileges.
> >>
> >> Has any of that made US hams or ham radio in the US "more technical"
> >> in the past 35 years? Or just the opposite? Does *forcing* someone to
> >> learn a little bit about radio theory make them want to build radios?
> >>
> >> Hans, K0HB, has proposed a 2 level system that would be very similar
> >> to the old "pre-incentive" system. One easy test for newbies and a
> >> full privs test for everybody else. And like the old system, the
> >> newcomer license would not be renewable, so upgrading would
> >> effectively be *required*.
> >>
> >> At first I though it was a "looney-tune" idea (to use Hans' phrase),
> >> but now I'm not so sure. Perhaps he is on to something.
> >>
> >> FCC effectively reduced the number of written testing levels from 5 to

> >> 3 back in 2000. NCVEC is beginning to make noises that the Tech test
> >> is "too hard", and they also note that their "dump Element 1" petition
> >> is only a first step. Also, a look at the AH0A database shows a severe
> >> drop in new Techs since the new Tech Q&A pool was effective in
> >> mid-July.
> >>
> >> If someone says we need less *written* testing and an *easier* entry
> >> level test (with suitably reduced privs), how can they be refuted?
> >>
> >> If someone says "The only reason you Extras want people to have to
> >> pass all these *written* tests is because *you* had to!" - how can
> >> they be refuted?
> >>
> >> How can Hans' proposal be refuted? There's nothing in the theory part
> >> of the Extra written that is required knowledge for the safe and legal
> >> operation of an amateur station on any authorized band or mode. And
> >> much of the regs in both the General and Extra exam are about what an
> >> Extra can do that a General can't.
> >>
> >> Quite a number of hams today think that "incentive licensing" was a
> >> mistake. Quite a number of hams today think that the 1953-1968 era was
> >> a "golden age" that was ruined by the class divisions and forced
> >> learning/testing of incentive licensing.
> >>
> >> Some people learn theory very easily, while for others it's a
> >> difficult process. People who would make excellent hams but who aren't
> >> good with numbers, science, and/or memorization of things like band
> >> edges may be being kept out, or kept from full access, by the
> >> *written* testing.
> >>
> >> > In the absence of a code testing requirement, there will be
> >progressively
> >> > fewer hams who have never been exposed to learning the code as a
> >> > result of the requirement. Since the requirement was the principle
> >> > motivation to learn the code, code use *will* decline once code
> >testing
> >> > is abolished. Therefore, testing and use are two closely
interrelated
> >> > concepts.
> >>
> >> Would anyone accept this argument, particlularly looking back over the
> >> past 35 years?:
> >>
> >> 'In the absence of multiple levels of theory testing, there will be
> >> progressively fewer hams who have been exposed to learning theory as a
> >> result of the tests. Since the test requirement was the principle
> >> motivation to learn the theory, the technical level of hams themselves
> >> and of amateur radio in general *will* decline. Therefore, testing
> >> and technical know-how are two closely interrelated concepts.'
> >>

> >> Or how about this rebuttal:
> >>
> >> Those who want technical knowhow in amateur radio are either unwilling
> >> to expend
> >> the effort to (or incapable of *politely*) encourage people to "give
> >> the
> >> theory a try and see if you like it." And, they are apparently
> >> unwilling to
> >> take "No thanks, not interested" for an answer. Thus, they continue
> >> to
> >> seek to have the FCC mandate an arguably counter-productive
> >> "recruiting program" for them ...
> >>
> >> --
> >>
> >> Which approach is more effective for getting hams interested in
> >> technical subjects - the "honey" of demonstrations and examples, or
> >> the "vinegar" of forced testing beyond the minimum necessary for safe
> >> and legal operation of an amateur station?
> >>
> >
> >Jim,
> >
> >If/when someone floats an RM to end written testing, then
> >I'll be one of the first in opposition.
>
> It's already been done - see the QCWA petition. See the NCVEC thinkpiece
linked
> to, above. See Hans' proposal.
>
> Waiting for an RM may be too late. Look at what happened with
restructuring -
> FCC proposed 4 classes of license but enacted 3. They proposed improved
written
> exams but instead cut back both the number and size of the written tests.
>
> To be clear - I support a multi-level license structure and *better*
written
> tests at all levels - code test or no code test. But that's just my
opinion.
>
> The question remains - how can proposals like Hans' be refuted, other than
"I
> don't like it?"
>
> What can be said in response to "You just want all hams to take a lot of
> written tests because *you* had to take a lot of written tests"

When I see something that looks like an NPRM, I'll comment.

> >For today, the code test
> >is not, IMHO, in any way comparable.
>
> That's not the issue I'm talking about.
>
> >We'll just have to
> >agree to disagree on that because I ain't gonna waste any more
> >time arguing hypotheticals when those arguments aren't
> >even being made to the FCC.
> >
> But they are being made to FCC, as shown above. What reasonable, rational
> arguments can we make to counter the above logic?

Until the FCC makes a propsed rulmaking using any of that as a
basis, its a waste of time.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1138. Re: I warned everyone this would happen. Re: 73 Magazine Says "73 and QRT"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-15 01:02:02 UTC
From: David Little <dalite01@sprynet.com>
Message-ID: <e01jb.55947$mQ2.2783@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 80714
Cross-posted to:
rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

Yawn.... Put yur dentures in the right way, and you may have a better
outlook on life.

"Wouff Hong" <You-can-sp@nk.it> wrote in message
news:3f8b1be0$0$211$45beb828@newscene.com...
>
> >"John Norfolk" <janorfolk@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> >news:c6a70d55.0310101532.63b491f3@posting.google.com...
> >> From the ARRL Letter October 10:
> >>
> >> 73 MAGAZINE SAYS "73 AND QRT"
> >>
> >> After completing 43 years of publication, 73 Amateur Radio Today
> >> magazine is calling it quits. Plans to publish a joint
> >> October/November issue fell through this week, and the September 2003
> >> issue was the magazine's last. According to self-proclaimed "El
> >> Supremo and Founder" Wayne S. Green II, W2NSD, it was a simple
> >> matter of economics.
>
> But Noooooo, you all said Restructuring and the no-code tech license were
> good ideas. Why will new hams and upgrades buy a radio magazine to
increase
> their knowledge and radio skill? They won't! They don't care about ham
> radio. They want to stay stupid! Having a ham license doesn't mean
anything
> to them because they didn't have to put in any effort to get it. It was
> handed to them.
>
> HA. The ARRL plan to support dumbing down ham radio is going to back-fire
on
> them. Heee Heee. They put free licenses in people hands but those people
> aren't buying memberships. QST will be going the way of 73! HA. Hiram
> Maxim is turning over in his grave.
>
>
>
> Wouff Hong
>
>

1139. Re: A New Concept: Virtual Spectrum

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-15 01:13:29 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <Za1jb.1091$_i.100686@nnrp1.ptd.net>
Source record: 80715
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.antiques.radio+phono,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc

"David Stinson" <arc5@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
news:3F8B5B6B.8E5123D@ix.netcom.com...
> Roy Lewallen wrote:
> >
> > I apologize for being a little vague about this. Are you proposing
> > replacing wireless communication with wired communication (via the
> > Internet) as a way to communicate with inadequate radio equipment?
>
> "Wireless" doesn't always work, if you're in a "noise hole,"
> or if the mode or radio you want to use isn't "legit" anymore.
> So that's one use, yes.
> The idea is to use our own radios as source and sink,
> bypassing the vagaries of Mother Nature's propagation
> and local noise sources. Or, if you're in a "noise hole,"
> to bring spectrum to you from a "quiet" location.
> It also allows the use of heretofore prohibitied modes.
> For instance:
> In the article I detail how an old longwave maritime
> rig on 415 KC A2 can carry on a real-time CW QSO with
> someone using a modern rig on 40 meters.
> It will be a real boon for the "boatanchor" community.
> I do hope QST will consider it.
>
> TNX ES 73 DE Dave AB5S

Sounds like a perfect article for this coming April's edition of QST
to me :-)

Seriously - you can't be seriously suggesting that vulnerable infrastructure
be considered as a viable replacement for infrastructureless HF
communications?

Again ... perhaps in the April (fools) edition of QST ...

Carl - wk3c

1140. Re: What makes a Pro code test Amateur a Troglodyte?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-15 01:13:34 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031014211334.00545.00001636@mb-m02.aol.com>
Source record: 80725

In article <RVVib.3108$kx.1152@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dan/W4NTI"
<w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> writes:

>I wonder how many of you realise that when you are operating Single Sideband
>Suppressed Carrier you are on Amplitude Modulation ??
>
>Dan/W4NTI

I wonder how many of you in here realize that you are messaging
not with AM, FM, or PM but rather BM when you openly troll so?

LHA

1141. Re: New Acronym: ECTA (Era of Code Test Abolition)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-15 01:13:35 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031014211335.00545.00001637@mb-m02.aol.com>
Source record: 80726

In article <f45722ac.0310140453.f0485e4@posting.google.com>,
brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:

>"Clint" <rattlehead at computron dot net> wrote in message
>news:<vomdo775euu639@corp.supernews.com>...
>> > Jim:
>> >
>> > The truth is, only hams who know the Morse code have the capability
>> > to fall back on the CW mode when other modes are unavailable.
>>
>> True.
>>
>> Now explain why hams know how to use "other modes" when there isn't
>> a profeciency test to MAKE them do it in the first place.
>>
>> Clint
>
>Some forgot where they put their microphones.

Brian, I think some of them forgot where they put their minds...

LHA

1142. Re: What makes LHA so poor at simple research tasks?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-15 01:13:36 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031014211336.00545.00001638@mb-m02.aol.com>
Source record: 80727

In article <c2356669.0310141315.45d783b@posting.google.com>, N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) writes:

<snip>

>1906 - (December 24 & 31) Christmas Eve broadcast of both recorded and
>live music and voice from Massachusetts. Signals heard all over North
>Atlantic and coastal areas. Inland as far as New York State. Broadcast
>*repeated* New Year's Eve.

Quit misdirecting with olde tyme raddio lore.

Come up with the way anyone can make a spark transmitter
amplitude modulated for intelligible voice or music communication...
using a microphone in the antenna circuit of a 1 KW transmitter.

Come up with the way a spark transmitter suddenly turns into
an Alexanderson Alternator whenever it is brought up in an amateur
radio newsgroup.

Come up with the engineering expertise that proves a McGraw-Hill
periodical was "in error" in 1980.

No luck on that one, now...you are into the Twilight Zone.

LHA

1143. Re: What makes a Pro code test Amateur a Troglodyte?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-15 01:20:38 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <Gh1jb.1093$_i.100683@nnrp1.ptd.net>
Source record: 80716

"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
news:c2356669.0310131337.353df3fe@posting.google.com...
> "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
news:<hGgib.785$_i.73747@nnrp1.ptd.net>...
> > "Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
> > news:20031012000943.23307.00003682@mb-m29.aol.com...
> > > In article <bma161$cg2@library2.airnews.net>, "Kim W5TIT"
> > <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
> > > writes:
> > >
> > > >Therein lies the problem with the whole CW test (TEST, *test*)
debate.
> > The
> > > > >minute one takes on the "no" CW test argument, it is generally met
with
> > an
> > > > >attitude that an end CW use (USE, *use*) is being favored or called
for.
> > >
> > > Kim:
> > >
> > > Code testing has always been the thing which generated code use.
> >
> > I would assert that being forced to learn code to gain access to HF
> > "soured" more people on code use than it encouraged ... of course,
> > some percentage of folks decided they liked code and continued to
> > use it, but MANY simply endured something they had no interest in
> > to get past the test, then "threw away the key."
> >
> > Remember the old adage "honey is better than vinegar."
>
> OK, fine, your opinion is well stated.
>
> Now consider that same logic applied to the written test.

Jim ... I am not going to waste time, energy, and bandwidth
debating the elimination of written tests, with you playing
"devil's advocate" for elimination thereof ...

I do not, and never will support the elimination or watering down
of the written tests. I have stated over and over again that I
personally feel they could be made better (where "better" and
"more difficult" are not necessarily synonymous ...).

I don't mean to come across as condescending, but your attempts
to equate Morse testing's irrelevance to the written tests in an effort
to support continued Morse testing is something I'm getting tired of.
And I'm not going to play that game.

Otherwise, 73,
Carl - wk3c

1144. Re: Opposing BPL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-15 01:26:36 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <gn1jb.4425$KT.4111@news01.roc.ny>
Source record: 80717
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Dick,

I'm not at all sure who uses what spectrum in the areas where they are testing BPL, but I'd bet coffee for a week that those folks studied the situation carefully before proceeding. Where did they test (I don't know of all areas and I'm asking a sincere question)? The "promise" of BPL is to serve areas that are not served well by cable or DSL. Did they test a fairly substantial area in the country where they could demonstrate far-flung connections to the BPL, or did they test in densely populated areas that are already served by various broadband connection (where fire, police, emergency, etc. are very likely not on low band VHF)? Also, FM broadcasting is usually located near large population areas (since signals tend to die off pretty quickly after 40 or 60 miles). This means that if you have BPL in a city, it is unlikely that residents will experience capture effect on the FM receivers since they will be getting *huge* signals on their FM receivers. I note the "neon sign" comment in the thread. Neon signs are usually found in cities. Those test sites are likely located either in a city or in an area where the money interests already checked the FCC site to ensure no low band VHF use by police, fire, ambulance, etc.

Any thoughts on this, or am I crazy?

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:bmhn31$d3v$0@208.207.71.138...
>
> Before I retired I was a field engineer working with a statewide
> public safety organization which uses low band VHF for base to car
> communications statewide, and that system is still virtually as I left
> it nearly 10 years ago. I have learned that they are aware of the BPL
> docket and filed in opposition, and have some idea that it will impact
> their communications, but I wonder if they have a clear view of what
> looms should BPL be widely implemented. While working I spent
> considerable time on RF noise issues, and I am rather sure that such a
> radio system cannot coexist with BPL.
>
> What happens is that when the noise intererence reaches a certain
> level, in a FM receiver the limiter saturates, and even a strong
> on-channel signal will not cause the squelch to open. The reciever
> remains quiet, and the call is unanswered.
> I was able to locate one troublesome noise source which was reported
> as repeater trouble in that the repeater would ocassionally go quiet in

> mid-transmission when a car was calling in. By the time I would drive
> the substantial distance to the repeater, a thorough checkout found no
> problem with the repeate equipment whatever. After several fruitless
> trips and attempts to find the trouble, I finally happened to be onsite
> when the trouble appeared, and it was all limiter saturation. Looking
> around outside while the noise was present in an attempt to spot a
> source in the local rural area, I soon found it- an arc welder in a shop
> several hundred yards away. When the welder was in use, the arc caused
> noise that saturated the receiver limiter, effectively shutting down the
> repeater. We relocated that repeater to a more isolated site where it
> still functions as intended.
> That example is but one case. BPL will, following power lines, also
> follow roads and streets since power lines follow streets and
> highway/road rights of way everywhere - the same places where police and
> highway patrol units'communications are active. The interference issue
> simply WILL cause something drastic to be implemented, what I don't
> know. If common sense has anything to do with it, BPL will be sent
> packing. Widesp[read implementation of BPL spells the end of lowband VHF
> use by public safety organizations. And with states' budgets in the
> deflated condition they are in most places, the funding will not be
> available to replace those systems in the forseeable future.
>
> I just called a former co-worker who is still working, and asked him
> if the organization knows that there is a BPL test site in the state.
> He said they did not. I suggested he might want to pass the word on up
> the chain so that they might want to send a mobile unit into the test
> area to get firsthand information on just what the effects might be. I'm
> also passing along all the info I've gathred here and from other
> sources. We'll need all the help we can get on this turkey.
>
> In short, I'm coninced that while APCO and others may know
> of the BPL docket I wonder if they have a very clear concept of
> what it will do to them where low band VHF is used.
> For instance, what have you heard from the state of Calorfinia, which
> is reported to use low band VHF for their statewide Highway Patrol, and
> has over 5,000 mobile units with no telling how many base stations?
> I have heard nothing whatever from anyone there on BPL.
>
> It seems evident that the BPL people are not publishing the existance
> of these very small test sites any more widely than necessary. So, they
> won't garner very many,if any, BPL-specific complaints, will they? And
> they'll be able to say "We must not be causing destructive interference
> since we haven't generated complaints". Of course limiting the numbers
> of users in test areas to a very few drastically limits the amount of
> interference potential. With so few BPL users online there *won't* be
> much interference caused, thus few or no complaints. Then they will
> conveniently pass over this fact, and the decision makers won't know the
> difference.
>
> Someone with clout needs to take them to task with the FCC and force

> them to use much broader test areas with much more realistic noise
> levels generated so that a more realistic noise picture can be
> evaluated. As it stands, they may well get what they want by default.
>
> Dick W0EX

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.525 / Virus Database: 322 - Release Date: 10/9/03

1145. Re: 73 Magazine Says "73 and QRT"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-15 01:27:53 UTC
From: Bill Newkirk <wnewkirk@bellsouth.net>
Message-ID: <Un1jb.8780$C26.4999@bignews6.bellsouth.net>
Source record: 80718
Cross-posted to:
rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

However, the note that he started Byte is disputed by Jerry Pournelle...

"Hans K0HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:5ee63311.0310111336.660577e7@posting.google.com...
> "Capt. Blackflag" <wvay4daves@yahoo.com> wrote
>
> > > 73 MAGAZINE SAYS "73 AND QRT"
>
> I'm gonna miss my copy of 73 in the mail each month. Wayne is a
> genuine American legend. Off the wall, often mistaken, often over the
> edge, but always stands up for his position regardless of how goofy it
> seems to the rest of us. I rarely agreed with him, but I always
> admired his good natured poking at the pompous among us, and his
> absolute support for the causes which he believed in, regardless how
> unpopular.
>
> I hope the old rascal figures out a way to start another magazine.
>
> 73, de Hans, K0HB

1146. Re: 73 Magazine Says "73 and QRT"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-15 01:31:26 UTC
From: Bill Newkirk <wnewkirk@bellsouth.net>
Message-ID: <er1jb.8844$C26.5872@bignews6.bellsouth.net>
Source record: 80719
Cross-posted to:
rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

About how long did Wayne threaten a "nude cover" (including some
teasers...)?

"Chuck Reti" <wv8a@arrl.invalid.net> wrote in message
news:wv8a-D04359.22334013102003@news.comcast.giganews.com...
> In article <bmf2hr$s20$1@freenet9.carleton.ca>,
> et472@FreeNet.Carleton.CA (Michael Black) wrote:
> >
> > I wonder how many lifetime subscribers this will affect?
> >
> > If I'm remembering right, fairly early on Wayne sold them, and they
> > were $37. In 1973, he sold them for $73. I think he continued to
> > sell them for some time after that; I have a recollection of a $150
> > life time subscription, but that's a more vague memory.
> >
> > Were the lifetime subscriptions honored for all that time? How many
> > of them abandoned the magazine. explicitly telling 73 they didn't
> > want anymore issues, or just not providing a new address when moving?
> > How many who did buy a lifetime subscription were still alive by this
> > month?
> >
> > Michael VE2BVW
> >
>
> IIRC, the subscription form in the mag for some time used to say
> "Lifetime (ours or yours)".
>
> The magazine cover parodies were always fun, the Playboy and QST's
> particularly memorable.
>
> Sadly, most of my 73 (and HR) collection got turned to mush in a
> basement flood a few years back; still have a few of each.
>
> I'm expecting that Wayne will be appearing on Art Bell some weekend soon
> to Explain It All.
> --
> Chuck Reti WV8A
> Detroit MI

1147. Re: 73 Magazine Says "73 and QRT"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-15 01:33:00 UTC
From: Bill Newkirk <wnewkirk@bellsouth.net>
Message-ID: <Is1jb.8871$C26.6136@bignews6.bellsouth.net>
Source record: 80720
Cross-posted to:
rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

Now the manuals that came with the Bendix G-15 said you could always call
customer support....

...althought I doubt there's anyone there now...

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:bmfnet$da8$1@208.206.142.110...
> Michael Black wrote:
>
> > Art Harris (n2ah@hotmail.com) writes:
> >
> >>"Capt. Blackflag" wrote:
> >>
> >>
> >>>>73 MAGAZINE SAYS "73 AND QRT"
> >>>>
> >>>>After completing 43 years of publication, 73 Amateur Radio Today
> >>>>magazine is calling it quits. Plans to publish a joint
> >>>>October/November issue fell through this week, and the September 2003
> >>>>issue was the magazine's last.
> >>
> >>Last week on eBay, someone listed a 1-year subscription to "73" for
> >>$9. There were no takers.
> >>
> >>Art N2AH
> >
> >
> >
> > I wonder how many lifetime subscribers this will affect?
> >
> > If I'm remembering right, fairly early on Wayne sold them, and they
> > were $37. In 1973, he sold them for $73. I think he continued to
> > sell them for some time after that; I have a recollection of a $150
> > life time subscription, but that's a more vague memory.
> >
> > Were the lifetime subscriptions honored for all that time? How many
> > of them abandoned the magazine. explicitly telling 73 they didn't
> > want anymore issues, or just not providing a new address when moving?
> > How many who did buy a lifetime subscription were still alive by this
> > month?
> >
>
> Maybe it meant the life of the magazine.

>

1148. Re: What makes a Pro code test Amateur a Troglodyte?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-15 02:10:24 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031014221024.22313.00000331@mb-m29.aol.com>
Source record: 80723

>I do not, and never will support the elimination or watering down
>of the written tests. I have stated over and over again that I
>personally feel they could be made better

It doesnt matter what you think, the writtens are going to be Dumbed Down
Further.

1149. Re: What makes a Pro code test Amateur a Troglodyte?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-15 02:24:53 UTC
From: groupk0hb@earthlink.net
Message-ID: <5ee63311.0310141824.6c082d63@posting.google.com>
Source record: 80721

N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote

>
> Back then, all it took for full privs was 13 wpm code and a ~50
> question written test. Has 35 years of incentive licensing made hams
> "more technical"? If not, why do we need all those written tests?
>

Jim,

This old strawman of yours is getting shopworn. Since it's nearly Halloween, just prop him up next to a pumpkin and see if the children are impressed when they come for tricks and treats.

The purpose of the written test is to determine if an applicant is qualified to play on our RF playground without hurting themselves or innocent bystanders, without straying into nearby industrial and military places, that we know how to share nicely with other players, and that we recognize practices and conditions which will trash up the playground.

73, de Hans, K0HB

1150. Re: BPL a reality in my area now!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-15 02:28:27 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <fh2jb.108631$qj6.4727200@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 80722
Cross-posted to: alt.ham-radio,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.policy

James Wilson wrote:
> What does BPL sound like? Can someone post a wav file somewhere so it can
> be identified? Is it worse that the Pennsylvania QSO party?

Did someone take over a frequency you owned?

- Mike KB3EIA -

1151. Re: What makes a Pro code test Amateur a Troglodyte?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-15 02:34:25 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031014223425.12631.00002120@mb-m28.aol.com>
Source record: 80729

In article <20031014190311.28496.00001271@mb-m18.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com
(Len Over 21) writes:

>In article <c2356669.0310140852.4c29f54@posting.google.com>, N2EY@AOL.COM
>(N2EY) writes:
>
>>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>>news:<20031013234613.01893.00001228@mb-m22.aol.com>...
>>> In article <20031013203527.08626.00001165@mb-m27.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com
>>(N2EY)
>>> writes:
>>>
>>> >In article <20031013174921.12501.00003124@mb-m04.aol.com>,
>>lenover21@aol.com
>>> >(Len Over 21) writes:
>>> >
>>> >>In article <bmdt22$sse@library2.airnews.net>, "Kim"
>>> >><kimscliff@yahoo.com>
>>> >>writes:
>>> >>
>>> >>>"Hans K0HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
>>> >>>news:5ee63311.0310121827.7191e44a@posting.google.com...
>>> >>>> "Kim" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote
>>>
>>> >>>> Spark transmissions were outlawed (as well they should have been) so
>>> >>>> the precedent exists.
>>> >>>
>>> >>>Hmmmm, Jim/N2EY made that observation also. Then, I see the comment
>>that
>>> >>>spark was a transmission method--not a mode. I think that's splitting
>>> >>>hairs, isn't it? I'm asking--I wasn't around for spark ;)
>>> >>
>>> >> The ONLY way a "spark" transmitter could send anything called
>>> >> communications information was by on-off keying.
>>> >
>>> >there were other types of transmitters on the air even
>>> >before WW1. Arc transmitters and Alexanderson alternators were two types.
>>> >Transmitters using tubes were in use well before 1920.
>>>
>>> Irrelevant.
>>
>>No, very relevant. Spark was not the only option before 1920. And
>>after 1920, there were even more options.
>

> How many amateur "radio" stations were equipped with Alexanderson
> Alternators, senior?

Who is "senior", Len? It's not me.

> We are NOT talking "options."

I am. You don't want to admit that there were more options than spark before
1920. There were.

> I was saying that "spark" transmitters
> could ONLY be used for communications with on-off keying codes.

And you're just plain wrong about that, as Fessenden demonstrated more than 97
years ago.
>
> Quit trying to misdirect into other things.

Quit trying to be the moderator of an unmoderated newsgroup.
>
>>Amateurs pretty much abandoned spark by 1924-1925. Oddly enough, there
>>was no international treaty requirement for amateurs to be code tested
>>until 1927.
>
> Irrelevant.

No, totally relevant.

> The CCITT was not created just for radio communications
> nor did any "international (radio) treaty organization" exist in 1896 when
> radio was first demonstrated as a communications means.

1906 Berlin conference was the first one, IIRC.
>
> The Internation Telecommunications Union is a United Nations body.
> The United Nations did not exist prior to World War Two.

And your point is?
>
>>The first 'broadcast' stations were actually amateur stations. Using
>>tube transmitters. They do not get the recognition of KDKA and WWJ
>>because none of them were in operation on a regular, continuing
>>schedule.
>
> Irrelevant in any discussion of amateur radiotelegraphy, use or
> technology.

Totally relevant to disprove your "only method of communication"
misinformation.
>
> This is an amateur radio newsgroup not a place for NAB discussions.

Who made you the moderator?

>>1920 is twelve years before you were born, Len. So you weren't there.
>
> Irrelevant.
>
> YOU were not in existance when I first started professional radio
> communications on HF bands.

Irrelevant!
>
>>> THE OVERWHELMING MAJORITY of amateur radio
>>> transmitters were of the "spark" type.
>>
>>Irrelevant. And there's no need to shout, Len. Your words DO NOT
>>BECOME MORE TRUE WHEN CAPITALIZED!!!
>
> Do not be so sensitive to EMPHASIZED WORDS.

Do not try to tell others what to do. Nobody here answers to you. You are not
in charge.
>
> Internet text format does not allow case changes or size changes in
> type fonts.

Internet usage has standardized the use of all capital letters as SHOUTING. You
are being rude when you shout.
>
>>> "Spark" transmitters can be modulated SOLELY by ON-OFF KEYING.
>>
>>That's simply not correct, Len. And you know it.
>
> What I said IS CORRECT.

No, it is not. Fessenden demonstrated that it could be done as early as 1900.
>
> Amplitude modulating a spark transmitter has all the quality and
> intelligibility of amplitude modulating a doorbell buzzer...almost none.

How do you know? Have you ever done it? Ever actually heard what
voice-modulated spark sounds like?

Fessenden was able to get a modulated spark system to work over 50 miles in
1903. That's documented a number of places, such as the Hammond Museum of Radio
website.
>
> Show us the scientific or engineering work "proving" that a spark
> transmitter can be amplitude modulated with any sort of intelligibility
> suitable for communications.
>
> You cannot.

Yes, I can.

> There is none.

Do a google search, if you know how. There are websites with recordings.

Yes the quality is poor but it does work. Fessenden was able to use it for communications. 100 years ago and more.
>
>>> The sole surviving Alexanderson Alternator VLF RF generator is in
>>> Grimeton, Sweden, and used once each year for a brief period in a
>>> ceremony for Televerket, the Swedish government's telecommunication
>>> works. A ceremonial event, not one for any actual communication.
>>
>>Irrelevant. But at least not as boring as your usual diversions.
>
> The Grimeton Alternator was not used in amplitude modulation, ONLY
> in on-off keying.

Actually, many Alexanderson Alternators were FSK machines to avoid varying the load on the driving motor. A keying relay would change the excitation of the poles so that the output frequency was halved during "key up" times. Of course only the resulting "mark" signal was listened to in the receiver.
>
>>> >The practical transmission of voice and music by radio was demonstrated
>>> >as early as 1906.
>>>
>>> ONLY with a rotary alternator with a WATER COOLED MICROPHONE.
>>
>>No, with spark.

Actually, spark was used with voice modulation as early as 1900.
>
> INCORRECT. McGraw-Hill and the staff of Electronics magazine of
> 1980 disagree with your "learned' opinion.
>
> Please give us a scientific or engineering precis on how a 1 KW
> transmitter OF ANY KIND is amplitude modulated by a single
> microphone, no active device couplers or amplifiers, of the 1906
> era electronics technology.

Give me a work order number to charge my time to...

Fessenden did it. Read his papers.
>
>>> Demonstration only, and then ONCE.

Not only once. Fessenden had two-way transatlantic voice communication (Massachusetts to Scotland, a longer path than Marconi's 1901 "S" reception) working repeatedly by November of 1906. That's documented.

In addition, the Christmas Eve broadcast was repeated on New Year's Eve.

> No. PRACTICAL. Losses in old-style microphones of early 1900s
> used in ONE KILOWATT transmitter aerial circuits would prohibit
> hand-held use even with forced water cooling.

Why do microphones have to be hand held?
>
>>> Morse code was developed for ON-OFF KEYING...on land lines.
>>
>>Sure. Modern "land lines" (in the form of fiber optics) still use
>>on-off keying. Even though it's a very old idea.
>
> Please show all communications work, research or practical, on
> communications using GIGABIT DATA RATES prior to 1940.

Why?
>
> Please show all communications work, reasearch or practical,
> involving glass fiber as a medium of communications prior to 1940.

Why?

> Digital communications over fiber-optic cable involve DIGITIZATION
> of analog signals which may have any form of modulation or
> combinatorial modulation such as AM-PM in common modems.

And the result is...a digital signal which is on-off keyed. The light is turned
on and off at a very high rate of speed. That's not PSK, not FSK - it's OOK.

> There is NO ON-OFF KEYING used in fiber-optic digital communications
> on landlines, sealines, elevated over land, or direct conversion to RF for
> microwave radio relay. NONE.

Then how is the light modulated?
>
>>> "Spark" transmitters could communicate ONLY by on-off keying.
>>
>>Repeating the same misinformation doesn't make it any more correct,
>>Len.
>
> McGraw-Hill, a publisher and perhaps the greatest publisher of text
> books in the world today, is my source of information. Prentice-Hall
> and Wiley Interscience are up there as strong competitors.

Was Fessenden lying?

> In order to prove your point, you MUST show how a spark transmitter
> can be modulated in any way OTHER than ON-OFF KEYING for any
> sort of communications.

See the Hammond website.
>
>>No, exactly relevant. In fact, prior to 1912 there were at least three
>>different codes in use in radio. One of the changes brought about by
>>the Titanic disaster was standardization on the "Continental" or
>>"International" version, which is quite different from that used in
>>"land line" work.
>
> Irrelevant and petty minutae. The BASIC FORM of telegraphy is

> ON-OFF KEYING. Only the on-off patterns, the arrangements of
> the "bits" is relevant in discussing "kinds" of coding patterns.
>
> Basic form of telegraphy, wired or by radio, is ON-OFF KEYING>

You sure do have a fetish for ON-OFF KEYING.
>
>>> Early primitive radio could ONLY work
>>> with an ON-OFF KEYING method.
>>
>>Incorrect.
>
> YOU are INCORRECT. For the third time, show the work that proves
> your correctness.
>
> You cannot.
>
I just did. But you won't look at it.

>>> Despite all the variant dialects of "morse codes," ALL work ONLY by
>>> ON-OFF KEYING. ALL.
>>
>>Not true! And there's no reason to shout.
>
> As far as spark transmitters are concerned, those can work ONLY by
> ON-OFF KEYING codes for communications.
>
> ON-OFF KEYING with one kind of pattern of character representation
> is not different from ON-OFF KEYING using another kind of pattern
> of character representation.

Sure it is.
>
>>Any version of Morse code can be applied to frequency shift keying or
>>phase shift keying or a variety of other modulation methods. On-off
>>keying is simply the most commonly used method for radio purposes.
>
> Absolutely true. NOW.

And your problem with that is?
>
> Show your work that "proves" spark transmitters were capable of
> communications modulation OTHER than on-off keying.
>
> Feel free to show your work that "proves" rotary alternator RF
> generators were ever capable of FSK or PSK telegraphy.

Why bother? You won't accept any proof I provide.

> The early radio transmitters were ONLY capable of ON-OFF KEYING
> to effect communications.
>

>>Would you stop your persistent denigration of Morse code and those who
>>use it if we shifted (pun intended) to FSK or PSK?
>
> Stop your incessant petty pique whining about "persistent denigration"
> of morse code or codings.

I'm not the one who has to shout "ON-OFF KEYING" every couple of sentences.
>
> FACT: EARLY RADIO HAD *ONLY* ON-OFF KEYING AS ANY
> MEANS OF EFFECTING RADIO COMMUNICATION. SPARK
> TRANSMITTERS WERE NOT CAPABLE OF COMMUNICATIONS BY
> ANY OTHER MEANS.

Yes, they were, if properly designed and equipped. Fessenden showed how to do
it. But then tubes came along and made the whole exercise academic.
>
>>You're the one who gets all emotional and exaggerates, Len. All that
>>shouting and carrying on in here. Really, one would think you were a
>>bit more mature by now.
>
> There is no "emotion" in stating basic physics and historic facts
> about early radio.

There is when you shout and carry on like a three-year-old, Len. Perhaps you
need a time-out.
>
> The limitations of Internet newsgroup text formats prohibits change of
> type font size or other attributes.

Using all caps is shouting in internet usage.

> Writing in all-capitals is the only
> way to EMPHASIZE STATEMENTS, NO DIFFERENT THAN WRITING
> LARGE ON A BLACKBOARD in an attempt to teach backward
> students certain facts.

I'm not your student. You are not in charge.
>
> YOU are the emotional individual, almost a religious zealot in the
> constant highlighting of morse code mode communications in a
> non-professional avocational activity, unable to prove any morse
> code efficacy or accurate historical data in the much larger world
> of professional radio.

In case you hadn't noticed, Len, this isn't a "professional radio" newsgroup.

>>As for self-serving - well, all those long boring irrelevant diatribes
>>on old military radio sets that you post here.....
>
> The AN/PRC-119 series of small-unit land and air unit radios in the
> US military may have begun to field operationally over a decade
> ago but there are now a quarter million of them used by all branches
> of the US military. Digital voice, data, in-clear or encrypted, single

> frequency or frequency-hopping in 30 to 88 MHz bandspace. May
> be used with AN/PSN-11 by simple cable connection for accurate
> time update for networking in FHSS mode. Battle proven in Iraq,
> Afghanistan, Kuwait, elsewhere.
>
> Quarter million quantity of those radios. Fielded and operational.
> Produced by ITT Fort Wayne and General Dynamics Land Division.

...huh...what? I dozed off for a while there.
>
> The US military DOES NOT USE MANUAL TELEGRAPHY FOR
> TACTICAL COMMUNICATIONS PURPOSES TODAY, HAS NOT
> DONE SO FOR DECADES.

Quit trying to change the subject. This isn't a military radio newsgroup.
Swords into plowshares is what we hams are about.
>
>>> Radio as a communications medium is 107 years old. ON-OFF
>>> KEYING of a radio frequency carrier is NOT a new concept nor is it
>>> the best for communications.
>>
>>Who are you to judge? You've never used Morse code, from what you tell
>>us.
>
> Stop your petty petulant whining about "one has to use morse code
> in order to understand it."

I didn't write that quote. You did. Perhaps you know you're not qualified to
judge others but hate having that pointed out.

But you avoided my question. Who are you to judge?

> Emotional nonsense.

That's a good description of your posts, Len.
>
> The REST OF THE RADIO WORLD has given up on morse code, is
> giving up on it, or never considered it as useful in the first place.
> Only amateurs cling to it...on an emotional basis.

Is that bad?

Here's a clue for ya, Len: "Amateur" comes from the Latin for "love". It means
to do something for the love of the thing itself.

Love is an emotion. Amateurs do what they do for emotional reasons. Because
they *like* doing those things.

Your diatribes basically consist of telling people what they should and should
not like. Guess what - that doesn't work.

> REAL ENGINEERS do not have to use everything under evaluation for
> judgement of any kind. Aeronautical engineers do not have to know
> how to fly aircraft in order to design them. Automotive engineers do not

> have to know driving any kind of vehicle in order to design them. The
> FCC does not require Commissioners OR staff OR anyone in their
> Office of Engineering Technology to "know" all the kinds of radio and
> wire communications in order to BE THE ULTIMATE JUDGE FOR
> CIVIL COMMUNICATIONS REGULATIONS.

So who are you to judge what amateurs do?
>
>>> Continued USE of morse code modes DOES NOT POSSIBLY ADVANCE
>>> ANY STATE OF THE RADIO ARTS.
>>
>>Yes, it does, in many ways.
>
> Incorrect.

No, it's correct.

> Prove your contention by technical proof, not emotionalism
> or bias or favoritsm.
>
Turn on your spellchecker before I start mistaking you for Bruce.

It's very simple, Len.

The simplicity of Morse code permits new ideas to be tried out more easily and with less development than with most other modes.

For example, when N7VE wanted to see how good his mixer design was in a practical application, he built a Morse code transceiver with it. His design compared very favorably with more complex superheterodyne designs but used fewer parts and less power. And he had a functioning device, not a lab specimen, to test out under real-world conditions.

To top it off, the design can be duplicated by amateurs without a lot of tools or test equipment, permitting field trials of his design by any number of investigators.
>
>>Len, you're so emotionally connected to denigrating a form of keying
>>and a form of communication that you can't see that. You go far beyond
>>wanting to end a test.
>
> Petulant paranoia from an emotional devotee of old-time radio.

You mean the person who can't get through three posts without mentioning his military radio experience of a half century ago?
>
> The awful thing about reality is that it exists. All around.
>
> Time and technology in all radio-electronics continues to advance, to
> CHANGE. That is reality. That is truth.

The person to watch out for is the abusive shouting zealot who claims to have "the truth".

>
> The emotional cripples want a stasis, a stopping of change, a refusal
> to recognize change, a near-complete refusal to recognize any other
> citizens as worthy of existance in their pet hobby.

You gonna shout "ON-OFF KEYING" a couple more times for us, Len?
>
> Amateur radio is an avocation, a recreational non-professional radio
> activity. In the USA it isn't about the continual recreation of old days
> in radio using old standards, old modes, old ethics, old mores...or
> old rules and regulations that are no longer applicable.

Who are you to judge?

> The problem is that some think the above DOES apply, or MUST
> apply, because that is the ONLY thing they can see, understand,
> or comprehend.

c'mon - shout it out..."ON-OFF..."
>
> You have a great deal of work ahead of you in logically, honestly
> proving some of your contentions and insinuations of others and lack
> of professional proof of early radio limitations.

What's the work order number?

> Those cannot be
> proved by petulant tantrums or illogical incorrect statements of old
> amateur mythology.

Then why do you try to do so?

> Get busy.
>
HA! Nobody works for you, Len. Don't try to push others around.

1152. Re: What makes a Pro code test Amateur a Troglodyte?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-15 02:34:26 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031014223426.12631.00002121@mb-m28.aol.com>
Source record: 80728

In article <HE0jb.55912$mQ2.25777@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:

(old stuff removed)

(N2EY wrote:)
>> Why
>> is a Technician licensee qualified to design/build/repair/align/modify and
>> most
>> of all operate a 6 meter rig but not a 15 meter rig - particularly when
>> it's the same rig?
>
>Actually, when you think about it...ANYONE is allowed to design, build,
>repair,
>align and/or modify ham equipment...it is ONLY the "operate" part that
>ultimately requires the license.
>
Excellent point! However, in the interests of strict correctness, note that equipment which is manufactured for sale has to meet certain certification requirements which licensed hams ar exempt from. In the case of RF power amplifiers, a licensed amateur can homebrew things no manufacturer can legally sell.

>> Look at the FCC enforcement logs. Problems due to technical incompetence
>> are
>> very few in the ARS, and those that do happen are not clustered on any
>> particular license class.
>>
>> So why do we need all that written testing beyond Tech?
>
>Jim, you keep bringing up what you believe are analogies
>to the ode test issue and I'm not gonna play anymore. the
>argument(s) fail to convince the FCC and I don't see you
>making them to the FCC either. If and when someone attempts to petiton
>for the changes you suggest are analogous...then I'll argue further.

The code test issue will be decided by FCC one way or the other, sooner or later. I'm not worried about it, they'll decide whatever they decide.

My concern is simply that if someone or some group starts using the same arguments against much of the writtens, they're going to be difficult to defend.
Reading the KL7CC article, and seeing the recent drop in new Techs that correlates exactly to the new Tech Q&A pool got me thinking, that's all.

>You are talking about it, I'm done playing. No reason to do
>so.

OK, fine. As I pointed out to W0EX, we disagree about lots of things.

I hope you are right about it not becoming an issue.

>When I see something that looks like an NPRM, I'll comment.

Me too! Hopefully, FCC will agree with us.

>Until the FCC makes a propsed rulmaking using any of that as a
>basis, its a waste of time.
>
I do hope you're right

73 de Jim, N2EY

1153. Re: What makes a Pro code test Amateur a Troglodyte?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-15 03:21:33 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <133jb.108661$qj6.4738502@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 80724

Carl R. Stevenson wrote:

> Jim ... I am not going to waste time, energy, and bandwidth
> debating the elimination of written tests, with you playing
> "devil's advocate" for elimination thereof ...
>
> I do not, and never will support the elimination or watering down
> of the written tests. I have stated over and over again that I
> personally feel they could be made better (where "better" and
> "more difficult" are not necessarily synonymous ...).

Carl, It isn't about you. You know a bit about politics it is obvious. But you are falling prey to a common malady among politicians.

It isn't about you. You don't support the watering down of the writtens. That's great, and I agree and support you in that effort 100 percent. I also support you in your BPL efforts. 100 percent again.

But there are people out there who agree with part of your premise about the CW test, but not all of it. They don't think that removing the CW Morse test is enough. They want more. (or less if you wish to look at it that way) Right now, things are going their way. Maybe not for your reasons, but they like what they see happening.

The political spectrum is filled with all kinds of people, and what happens in amateur radio and the world depend on which way the currents are running. Right now, the currents are simply not running toward a more technically inclined ARS.

Want to get the Present FCC administration's ears to perk up? Phrase it in "regulatory" terms. Talk a bit about how modern radio's don't require the level of regulation that used to be needed for proper operation. I'd bet that would get them listening. I'm glad you support the continued testing of ARS candidates. You may need to lend your good name to some pretty robust efforts to retain the tests soon.

All apologies

- Mike KB3EIA -

1154. Re: FCC relaxes it's prohibition on use of the "F-word" on broadcast media.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-15 04:04:57 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3F8CC768.8090204@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 80730
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.shortwave

Clint wrote:

>I'm sure the PCTA's will spin and twist this news to somehow say
>it's another example of how NCI is destroying ham radio.
>
>
>
This calls to mind an article in one of the ham mags 20 to 30 years ago
where
someone planted a battery operated transmitter and morse code generator
that would key up at random for a few seconds every few hours. It would
say "<hated person's callsign's suffix> SUX" Suppose he didn't like me, so
it would then be "ISE SUX" The frequency was on the input of a popular
repeater somewheres out West, like Arizona. Mountains in the area shielded
the rogue transmitter's signal from inhabited areas; only the repeater could
hear it. It was planted in a wildlife preserve, antenna partially
hidden in a
thicket of local weeds, and battery and transmitter buried. They had to get
permission from forest rangers or such to do a fox hunt to find it.

My point is that someone used code to say naughty words.....

1155. Re: Opposing BPL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-15 04:13:05 UTC
From: dt <NOSPAM@nospam.net>
Message-ID: <51ipov09n521poshaq0pue055oru7g92u4@4ax.com>
Source record: 80731
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Dick you bring up good technical and adminsitrative examples. My career too is in land mobile (public safety and railroads) and while there is plenty of trunking and digital taking place above 450 Mhz, there is also plenty of low and high band activity, and always will be.

The ARRL seems to be doing a good job studying the BPL issue and informing the ham community, but the public safety, industrial, business, government, etc., users will have a louder and more credible voice (safety of lives & property, commerce, homeland security, etc.).

I am wondering what the ARRL is doing to form coalitions with other (non-amateur) stakeholders, and to build concensus that has a loud and effective enough voice with the Commission and with Congress. Politically and techincally, the ARRL and/or the amateur community cannot stop this on their own.

73
Dan (K0DAN)

On 14 Oct 2003 20:42:09 GMT, Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com> wrote:

>dt wrote:
> > Hams are not the only users of the affected spectrum. They may be the
> > most vocal, but perhaps the easiest to discredit or deflect.
> >
> > What about the other users of the HF-thru-VHF spectrum? Police, Fire,
> > EMS, Federal Government, Business, Utilities (the power companies
> > themselves), Military, Aviation, etc., etc.?
>
> > Do they not have consultants who are in touch with industry affairs?
> >
> > Does APCO (and other industry communications associations) not have
> > knowledge about BPL and a position on it?
>
>
> Before I retired I was a field engineer working with a statewide
>public safety organization which uses low band VHF for base to car
>communications statewide, and that system is still virtually as I left
>it nearly 10 years ago. I have learned that they are aware of the BPL
>docket and filed in opposition, and have some idea that it will impact
>their communications, but I wonder if they have a clear view of what
>looms should BPL be widely implemented. While working I spent
>considerable time on RF noise issues, and I am rather sure that such a

>radio system cannot coexist with BPL.
>
> What happens is that when the noise intererence reaches a certain
>level, in a FM receiver the limiter saturates, and even a strong
>on-channel signal will not cause the squelch to open. The reciever
>remains quiet, and the call is unanswered.
> I was able to locate one troublesome noise source which was reported
>as repeater trouble in that the repeater would ocassionally go quiet in
>mid-transmission when a car was calling in. By the time I would drive
>the substantial distance to the repeater, a thorough checkout found no
>problem with the repeate equipment whatever. After several fruitless
>trips and attempts to find the trouble, I finally happened to be onsite
>when the trouble appeared, and it was all limiter saturation. Looking
>around outside while the noise was present in an attempt to spot a
>source in the local rural area, I soon found it- an arc welder in a shop
>several hundred yards away. When the welder was in use, the arc caused
>noise that saturated the receiver limiter, effectively shutting down the
>repeater. We relocated that repeater to a more isolated site where it
>still functions as intended.
> That example is but one case. BPL will, following power lines, also
>follow roads and streets since power lines follow streets and
>highway/road rights of way everywhere - the same places where police and
>highway patrol units'communications are active. The interference issue
>simply WILL cause something drastic to be implemented, what I don't
>know. If common sense has anything to do with it, BPL will be sent
>packing. Widesp[read implementation of BPL spells the end of lowband VHF
>use by public safety organizations. And with states' budgets in the
>deflated condition they are in most places, the funding will not be
>available to replace those systems in the forseeable future.
>
> I just called a former co-worker who is still working, and asked him
>if the organization knows that there is a BPL test site in the state.
>He said they did not. I suggested he might want to pass the word on up
>the chain so that they might want to send a mobile unit into the test
>area to get firsthand information on just what the effects might be. I'm
>also passing along all the info I've gathred here and from other
>sources. We'll need all the help we can get on this turkey.
>
> In short, I'm coninced that while APCO and others may know
>of the BPL docket I wonder if they have a very clear concept of
>what it will do to them where low band VHF is used.
> For instance, what have you heard from the state of Calorfinia, which
>is reported to use low band VHF for their statewide Highway Patrol, and
>has over 5,000 mobile units with no telling how many base stations?
>I have heard nothing whatever from anyone there on BPL.
>
> It seems evident that the BPL people are not publishing the existance
>of these very small test sites any more widely than necessary. So, they
>won't garner very many,if any, BPL-specific complaints, will they? And
>they'll be able to say "We must not be causing destructive interference

>since we haven't generated complaints". Of course limiting the numbers
>of users in test areas to a very few drastically limits the amount of
>interference potential. With so few BPL users online there *won't* be
>much interference caused, thus few or no complaints. Then they will
>conveniently pass over this fact, and the decision makers won't know the
>difference.
>
> Someone with clout needs to take them to task with the FCC and force
>them to use much broader test areas with much more realistic noise
>levels generated so that a more realistic noise picture can be
>evaluated. As it stands, they may well get what they want by default.
>
>Dick W0EX
>
>
>>
>>
>> What is the ARRL doing to join forces with other affected spectrum
>> users, perhaps forming a task force to promote common interests?
>> Lobbying senators and congressmen, the Commission, NTIA, etc.?
>>
>> If the utilities' strategy is to divide and conquer, it appears they
>> are being very effective.
>>
>> 73
>> Dan (K0DAN)
>>
>>
>>
>> On 14 Oct 2003 14:03:08 GMT, Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com>
>> wrote:
>>
>>
>>>W1RFI wrote:
>>>
>>>
>>>>>You raise an interesting question, Carl. How exactly should the
>>>>>average ham go about proving that the RFI is indeed BPL, when the BPL
>>>>>people say
>>>>>"That's not us!'??
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>In the case in Emmaus, the PPL rep told a reporter that Carl had misidentified
>>>>a "neon sign" (in a residential neighborhood) as BPL. First, Carl is
>>>>professionally adept with spread spectrum, so he knows what an SS signal sounds
>>>>like. The signal was heard only in the trial area and when I was in Emmaus, I
>>>>worked with a local in the trial area who downloaded files for me. When the
>>>>download started, the noise started; when it stopped, the noise stopped.
>>>>
>>>>What really proves it to be not a neon sign, however, is that the time-domain

>>>>(oscilloscope) signature of the received signal does not have a pronounced
>>>>120-Hz signature. Had the PPL representative actually looked at the signal, he
>>>>would have known that his "explanation" was pretty transparent.
>>>>
>>>>I have extended by email a very cordial inviation for the PPL folks to attend a
>>>>local club talk I gave; they did not respond. I then emailed a cordial
>>>>invitation to work with them on interference issues; they did not respond. This
>>>>boggles the mind, because if I were about to invest millions of dollars of my
>>>>company's money and a national organization came to me and told me that there
>>>>was a serious problem with the technology, and offered to drive over 200 miles
>>>>just to show it to me, I think I would spend the hour or two and take a look.
>>>>
>>>
>>>
>>> It's beyond obvious that the BPL people are adamantly intent on
>>>stonewealling and bypassing ham radio and anything else that tries to
>>>get in the way.
>>> They're aware that many of the impacted spectrum users are so widely
>>>scattered that much of the interference caused by BPL even when it
>>>becomes widely implemented they won't be noticed due to their limited
>>>exposure caused by lack of adequately close proximity.
>>>
>>> Hams, which *are* pretty well scattered throughout the population,
>>>should be ignored and their complaints deflected by such incorrect
>>>assertions as the above "neon sign" explanation. Make it so that there
>>>is so much question as to hams' competance to make such a call they can
>>>be portrayed to be wrong, whatever the facts. It's obvious obfuscation
>>>and an end-run around us, and whatever other protesters weigh in that
>>>can be similarily deflected. They hope that the "serious" users of that
>>>part of the spectrum will prove to be so few and widely scattered that
>>>their protests will be few and managable.
>>>
>>> And once BPL installations are widespread, they know it would demand
>>>a clearly demonstrated, very serious interference problem to csuse its
>>>abandonment, and they don't think that will happen. They maybe right.
>>>If so many users sign on that the sheer numbers of BPL users overwhelm
>>>all the protests of spectrum pollution and damage to communications
>>>sheer numbers and politics will prevail in their favor, they believe.
>>>All they really need to do is get it approved and "out there" in large
>>>amounts in most populated areas, then the situation will take care of
>>>itself, they think.
>>>
>>> If allowed to proceed, BPL will forever change usability of the HF and
>>>Low VHF part of the spectrum.
>>
>>

1156. Why thirteen and twenty?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-15 04:53:29 UTC
From: Jack Twilley <jmt+usenet@twilley.org>
Message-ID: <86ptgzumnq.fsf@duchess.twilley.org>
Source record: 80732

```
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

I can understand why Novice and Technician Plus required five words
per minute -- the treaty and all -- but why did General require
thirteen words per minute and Amateur Extra twenty words per minute?

Is there a real reason?

Jack.
- --
Jack Twilley
jmt at twilley dot org
http colon slash slash www dot twilley dot org slash tilde jmt slash
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: GnuPG v1.2.3 (FreeBSD)

iD8DBQE/jNLQGPFSfAB/ezgRAnT0AJ9JwznusaVpDFgsbvd7gSlS6+zffACgqPSs
Eax4C1KwKboU55NhahcuAsY=
=jOXm
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----
```

1157. Re: A New Concept: Virtual Spectrum

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-15 05:40:35 UTC
From: Paul Keinanen <keinanen@sci.fi>
Message-ID: <4rhpovgdp6bm17l8vnla8321s7u3hp9k76@4ax.com>
Source record: 80733
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.antiques.radio+phono,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc

On Tue, 14 Oct 2003 01:27:32 GMT, David Stinson <arc5@ix.netcom.com>
wrote:

>I have today submitted an article to QST magazine entitled
>"Virtual Spectrum: Beating BPL at its own game,"
>detailing a concept that can greatly impact our radio hobby.
>I wanted to "put down a marker" to date the introduction
>of a new ham-radio innovation, and to officially place
>the idea in the public domain, so the maximum amount of
>"tinkering" with it can happen.

With a less pompous start, you might have gotten some more favourable
comments :-).

The problems with high noise levels is of course real for many radio
amateurs and shortwave listeners living in urban areas.

For a few years there have been remotely connected receivers connected
to the internet which can be remotely tuned to any desired frequency
and the audio is transferred over the net. The problem is that only
one user at a time can control the receiver.

However, in order to create a shared receiving station in some quiet
location without huge hardware duplication for each user, would
require that entire bands are digitised (with dynamic range problems)
and the whole band is then transferred to each user. Some DSP software
running in each end user computer would then do the filtering and
detection. If some kind of multicasting is used from the receiving
site, this would give an unlimited number of shared user for each
band.

The other approach would be to digitise the whole band and run
multiple virtual receivers in software, individually controlled by the
remote user, producing a baseband signal, which is then transferred to
the user. The number of simultaneous users would be limited by the
number of virtual receivers (limited by the hardware computational
power) and the throughput of the shared receiving station internet
connection, requiring 10-100 kbit/s for each active user.

A shared remote receiving station is not very compatible with
transmitters on the same site, so the users would have to use their
transmitters at home or pool a number of transmitters on a separate
transmitter site, at least a few kilometers from the receiving site.

Of course the simplest, but not always the most cost effective solution is to have a summer cottage with a broadband connection in some quiet rural location. Move your station to the cottage and when not at the cottage, connect a remotely controllable transceiver to a computer (audio in and out, serial data and PTT) and control the station from your urban home. A remotely controlled antenna rotator also helps a lot. In this way you do not have to suffer from noise, antenna restrictions and neighbours complaining about interference:-). Using some watchdog timers is a good idea, in case the computer or internet connection crashes.

Paul OH3LWR

1158. Re: A New Concept: Virtual Spectrum

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-15 06:05:58 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031015020558.25517.00001336@mb-m15.aol.com>
Source record: 80734

In article <Za1jb.1091$_i.100686@nnrp1.ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
<wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:

>"David Stinson" <arc5@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
>news:3F8B5B6B.8E5123D@ix.netcom.com...
>> Roy Lewallen wrote:
>> >
>> > I apologize for being a little vague about this. Are you proposing
>> > replacing wireless communication with wired communication (via the
>> > Internet) as a way to communicate with inadequate radio equipment?
>>
>> "Wireless" doesn't always work, if you're in a "noise hole,"
>> or if the mode or radio you want to use isn't "legit" anymore.
>> So that's one use, yes.
>> The idea is to use our own radios as source and sink,
>> bypassing the vagaries of Mother Nature's propagation
>> and local noise sources. Or, if you're in a "noise hole,"
>> to bring spectrum to you from a "quiet" location.
>> It also allows the use of heretofore prohibitied modes.
>> For instance:
>> In the article I detail how an old longwave maritime
>> rig on 415 KC A2 can carry on a real-time CW QSO with
>> someone using a modern rig on 40 meters.
>> It will be a real boon for the "boatanchor" community.
>> I do hope QST will consider it.
>>
>> TNX ES 73 DE Dave AB5S
>
>Sounds like a perfect article for this coming April's edition of QST
>to me :-)
>
>Seriously - you can't be seriously suggesting that vulnerable infrastructure
>be considered as a viable replacement for infrastructureless HF
>communications?
>
>Again ... perhaps in the April (fools) edition of QST ...

Carl, Unless Stinson has a pre-arranged contract to publish in
any periodical, his submission is no guarantee of acceptance
for publishing. His manuscript has to go in the "slush pile"
with all other submissions for consideration by editors.

Manuscript-wise, it may be that QST isn't getting much and any
submission is ripe for page make-up in a future edition. Or, it
could be that QST will actually consider the article as a viable

alternative to QRM-killed-by-BPL HF ham bands...which are not yet plagued everywhere with BPL garbage. We will all get some insight to QST editors' concept of the future if this article gets printed.

However, October and November manuscript submission dates would be about right for first-of-April, 2004, issues. :-)

Care for a PDF copy of the infamous/famous Signetics "Write Only Memory" ad of years ago? :-)

LHA

1159. Re: I warned everyone this would happen. Re: 73 Magazine Says "73 and QRT"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-15 07:09:18 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <yo6jb.56768$mQ2.52762@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 80735
Cross-posted to:
rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

"Clint" wrote:
>
> There's another contributing or influencing factor; the
> internet. The prevalance of internet connections &
> accounts, growing all the time, has offered a new
> medium through which information and published
> materials can be shared. Just like with the snail mail
> industry, i'm sure there *has* been a substantial
> impact upon the hard-copy publishing industry.

Oh, absolutely. I'm certainly buying fewer magazines today exactly because of that. I can usually find the information I need much quicker, and much more fully, on the internet. That obviously reduces the value of paper publications. However, I still buy just about as many books, though the typical content of that has changed (software manuals instead of leisurely novels).

> Then again, it shouldn't be surprising that the PCTA
> crowd doesn't understand this, that it has gone
> completely over thier head, as the mere concept of
> modernization and progress, along with evolvement,
> is totally alien to them, I guess.

I can understand their position to some extent. I'm not exactly thrilled with all the changes taking place today either. The romance, mystery, and charm, of life is disappearing, slowly replaced by hard facts, technology application, and an almost fanatical rejection of the "old" way of doing things wrapped under the guise or pretense of modernization and progress. With that comes an almost rabid zeal to push anyone opposing that out of the way, without consideration for their thoughts, feelings, or emotional needs. At the same time, many of the changes are not designed to, and often don't, benefit the "old guard," leaving them few reasons to actually support those changes. Many clearly see the efforts to regenerate Amateur Radio (removal of code testing, changes to the license structure, and so on) as just one more example of that process. Of course, when it comes to code testing, very few could claim we're exactly rushing to kill it off - it should have been dropped a couple of decades ago (at least). I obviously don't think we should rush into changes just for change sake, but we clearly shouldn't sit still forever either.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

1160. My response to Jim Wiley, KL7CC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-15 07:21:59 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bmisin$rq8$0@208.206.142.98>
Source record: 80736

My response to the document "Amateur radio in the 21st century" by Jim Wiley, KL7CC of the NCVEC

>>Will we lose something because we will no longer have the knowledge that all hams can at least understand and send CW, even if very slowly? Maybe, maybe not. You would be surprised at the number of applicants I see that actually want to learn CW - they think it will be fun. Thereï¿½s a novel concept - someone learning a skill because it is fun, not because the government says you must do it.

Yes, there's always a few who want to learn it for the sake of learning a new skill-after all, there is always a small segment of the population who are actually motivated. Some are around these days. I've been in contact with several recently.

>>Obviously, removing the Morse test requirement will make it easier for thousands of interested persons to join our hobby. There are many, who for whatever reason have a real, not imagined, problem with learning the code. Call it stage fright, a psychological block, hearing problems, poor recognition skills, whatever you want; there are indeed those who literally cannot master the code, no matter how hard they try.

Why not call it what it is? Improper preparation to learn, and total lack of dedicated study, and usually the poorest of learning technique for the task at hand. Learning the code isn't difficult, it just requires one to WANT to. Whatta concept!

>> Lazy, you say? Anyone can make it to 5 WPM, you say? They just donï¿½t try, you say? Apparently you have not participated at hundreds of exam sessions. I have. I have seen grown men and women with tears in their eyes, frustrated, angry, sometimes back next time, sometimes giving up on ham radio altogether.

This one is pure nonsense. Yes, I *HAVE* participated in "hundreds of test sessions" over a period of nearly a decade. NEVER did I see any such a spectacale. Yes, I've seen plenty of people fail the code test. For good reason- they didn't adequately prepare to take the test. And the VE code tests have never been difficult, as code tests go, or as they existed under FCC testing. We always gave every considreation possible under the rules, constructed tests to be as easily passable as legally possible. You see, we too, wanted people to pass and become licensed hams. But to show up for a current version 5wpm test and fail in a frustrated tear-jerking session, male or female, is something I never saw, nor even anything remotely approximating that scene. It just never happened, in all my testing years.

What I did see was an elderly gentleman who showed up each test session, loaded with nerves, and he failed 13wpm a few times. Each time, what he got from the testing team was plenty of friendly words of encouragement to keep at it, and welcome, be sure to come back next test session. He did, and on the 8th try he passed his 13wpm test. I am convinced he'd never have made it without those words of encouragment, but never once did he give in to his certain frustration. To fail a 5wpm code test in tears us beyond shamefuhl, both for the examinee and the testing team.

OBTW-- the pass/fail rate of all applicants tested by my team was always almost exactly the national average - two thirds passed, one third failed, all elements. It never varied beyond a percent or two. So I always believed we were doing it pretty well correctly.

>Whereï¿½s the gain in having someone give up?

A better question is WHY would someone who truly wanted to be a ham give up? I can't think of a single valid reason-except that they really didn't want a ham radio license. As a kid of 14, wild horses couldn't have kept me from getting one. For darn sure no code test would, nor did. Is it so different for people today? If so, why? I can't think of a single reason.

>Are you proud that you ï¿½made itï¿½?

Why would anyone who would be a credit to ham radio NOT be proud of the accomplishment of earning a ham radio license?
If not, why do they want to be a ham in the first place? Is it antisocial to be proud of reaching a goal?

>>Can you not find something that another person can do that you would find extremely difficult if not impossible? Could you win the Tour de France bicycle race - even if you trained every day for the rest of your life? Could you invent the Laser? Could you paint the Mona Lisa? Not that painting a work of art or riding a bicycle has all that much to do with radio, itï¿½s just to point out that while you may have been able to master the code with some degree of success, that doesnï¿½t necessarily mean that everyone has the same ability as you.

All that is nonsensical blather having no bearing whatever on ham radio qualification nor testing. More totally inaccurate anologies of the NCI variety.

>> I would argue that the ability to master the code has no apparent connection with how ï¿½goodï¿½ a ham a person is. What we want, I think you will agree, is someone who will respect our traditions, follow the rules, bring enthusiasm and vigor to the hobby, and make a positive contribution.

How about someone who wants to do more than spend ALL their radio time looking into a microphone? The code IS a vital part of ham radio, not just some "hazing ritual" nonsense as so often quoted by the codehating NCI set.

>>So, whoï¿½s to say that mastering Morse code skills makes a better ham?
I would not be so arrogant as to think such a thing.

It's NOT arrogance, it's a valid useful qualifcation. You pander to
the codebashers with this nonsense for curious, hidden reasons.

>> Every time I get to feeling superior, I look around, and guess what?
- - - I can find someone who is better at something, anything, than
me. I can also name several individuals that I think are in one way or
another ï¿½better hamsï¿½ than I, better operators, better engineers, better
at some aspect of our hobby than me. Might that be true with you too?

Well, how about that! We all have different talents and
qualifications. So for that reason, we must totally downgrade ham radio
to the status of stamp collecting. What a blast! And you have the simple
arrogance to call THAT arrogance!

>>Like anything else, when a person finds he or she has a need to use
Morse code, they will learn it .

THAT is truly laughable, particularly so coming from a fellow who
claims to be a code user himelf. Any code user who actually
does use it knows much better than that. You DON'T and CAN'T learn the
code on the spur of the moment, just "when you need it".
What total nonsense!

>>>Will ham radio turn into CB? No, it wonï¿½t. In the first place, CB
is essentially an unlicensed service.

I might remind you that CB was a licensed service, until the outlaws
took it over, realizing that there was nothing an undersized
underfunded FCC could do to stop them. Are you are so uninformed as to
believe that something very similar couldn't happen to ham radio when in
fact it HAS gone well into that direction -as noted by you in this very
document!

>> Secondly, there are still the written exams, and add to that peer
pressure from other hams, and the fact that hams must use call signs,
instead of ï¿½handlesï¿½, and there is just no comparison.

Oh, **HUGE** deal, those question pool writtens and CB handles. The
only thing that has salvaged ham radio in the years since the question
pools and VE testing started *IS* the code test. When that is gone,
there goes the rest of the farm.

>>Will dropping the Morse requirement remove a ï¿½filterï¿½ that keeps out
poor operators, ï¿½CB Radioï¿½ types, scofflaws, and so on? I think not.

I think not, too. Code testing has never been a perfect filter, and
there has always been those who got illicit licenses, even in the days
when FCC gave the tests. There was the Conditional licensing program,
which was widely abused. And there were always ways to get a license
without actually taking ANY test, such as paying someone to go to the
FCC office and take the test in one's place. Yes, that happened, and no
one knows how often. You see, until fairly late in the FCC testing era

no ID was required, just show up at the FCC office, fill out the forms and take the tests. One could put any name and address he wanted on the forms, and that name became the licensee. It wasn't all that difficult, even then. And you KNOW that all VE's properly handled their test sessions, right. FCC enforcement logs show otherwise. So to blandly say that all those HF troublemakers are all code tested hams is simply assuming an invalid conclusion.

>>Listen to 75 meters on any given evening, or 20 meters above 14300 during the day, and all too often what you hear is a cacophony of indecent language, illegal operation, intentional interference, music, poor sportsmanship, you name it. And every one of those characters passed a code test! Whether it was 5 or 13 or 20 WPM, they all passed a test. Some filter, huh?

Better by far than none. At least some majority of licensees were people who actually had interest enough to do it right and stay within the rules and live by some sort of ham's creed. But never all of them, as noted above. And if you don't know that this situation has gotten much worse in the past couple decades you haven't been paying attention.

>> Suppose, just for a moment, that a petition got filed requesting that the FCC make the following changes: Take the present HF Novice bands on 80, 40, 15, and 10 meters and reassign them to voice operation.

How did I know this was coming??? In an age where digital rules supreme, we MUST have more room to yak into a microphone.

>>Move the corresponding phone segments down by the appropriate amount. Change the segments open to various classes of license to fit, and let the new ï¿½Communicatorï¿½ licensees have access to the HF bands in 50 or 100 KHz blocks. For example, and this is just an illustration, 40 meters could end up looking something like this:

7000 - 7025 Extra, CW and data only
7025 - 7100 All classes, including communicator, CW and data only
7100 - 7150 Extra, all modes
7150 - 7250 Extra and General, all modes
7250 - 7300 All classes, including communicator, all modes

Similar adjustments would be done at 80, 15, and 10 meters.
In other words, what we will have done is to ï¿½slideï¿½ the phone bands down the equivalent amount of the former novice segment, and allowed the new communicators access to the top 50 KHz of the voice band.
Traditionally, higher-class licensees have been given access to the lower frequency segments within a band, and this would remain true. No one loses anything! Generals and Extras get some new phone bands, even former Novices, (now upgraded to Communicator) get more room in the CW >>segment, and access to a portion of the phone band.

And put all the rank beginners right down against the bottom 25 where they'll feel right at home! Sure, why not? Nothing like trashing up the entire band (save a paltry 25khz) with the greenest of the green. After

all, this is ONLY a hobby, nobody takes any of it seriously anyway. GAG! And don't DARE call me anti-beginner----nothing could be farther from the truth. Obviously you have no concept of what it takes to get new hams indoctrinated and assimilated into the hobby or you would never put forth such a concept. Of course there should be overlap, no one wants the old days of the Novice Reservation, but even that was useful in its day. But to dump rank beginners all the way down to the lower 25 is --- I'll go ahead and say it - it's dumb, and does neither them nor anyone else good service. You carry inclusiveness way too far. Allow them a good overlap--keep the old Novice segments for them to use-DIGITALLY with experienced hams to talk with, plus another 25kc below into General territory where they can mix it up with experienced hams on their own turf, digital and CW - oops, they'd have to learn the code for that. Sorry. Give them some phone privileges in each band, yes. But there is *no* justification for handing them near-carte blanche.

>>>As we all know, several petitions requesting that the FCC remove Morse code testing have been filed. Depending on how soon a NPRM is issued, assuming it is at all, then we have to wait while they slog their way through the rule making process. One of the things that will happen is that comments, both pro and con, will begin to accumulate. After a several weeks or at most a few months, and assuming the majority of comments are in favor of eliminating the code as a licensing requirement, then we plan to file for a waiver asking for an immediate end to code testing. Obviously, this can only be done if there are enough favorable comments on file for the FCC to justify granting such a waiver. The actual change in the FCC rules will still be in progress, but if we can show that there is enough interest, and that such a waiver will be beneficial >>to Amateur Radio as a whole, then there is a good chance it would be granted.

Let's not count our NPRMs before they're hatched. FCC has said, correctly, they're in no hurry to close out the book on code testing - if it does it at all. There is *NO* valid reason to dump all code testing, although most everyone seems to be ready for reasonable HF access for those with no code test. I agree with John Johnston, at least partly, in that it is a true fact that no Extra class could ever be considered an expert amateur without proven ability to use radiotelegraphy, radio's most basic mode. I hope you do know that it remains as the second-most-used mode in ham radio. Strangely that seems to make no difference to you and Fred and your Agenda. Yes, you have an Agenda. You're doing a marvelous job of describing it here.

>>CW is a great mode. Itï¿½s fun. I enjoy it. And, itï¿½s time to move on.

Well, move on at your pleasure. But don't think you can move the rest of ham radio so easily. Reminder: Radiotelegraphy **IS TODAY** the second most used mode in ham radio. To blithely attempt to dump it just because you're interested in other pursuits, like making yourself famous by asserting your own version of restructuring ham radio just

won't work. There's too many guys like me still around.

>>Are we ï¿½dumbing downï¿½ amateur radio? Are you kidding? Have you looked at the new Extra class tests? Could you honestly say you could pass one, picked at random, ï¿½coldï¿½? I couldnï¿½t, at least not without some serious study of the books.

What,you no longer have a useful memory? For that's what the question pools require- a good working memory, not for learning the material but for basically learning which answer goes with what question. Yes, still. You "learn the test", how to pass it and get the license, not to learn a lot of radio. Trying to actually learn what all that stuff means actually gets in the way of the goal of getting the license for those unschooled in radio. To assert otherwise is nonsense. Remember, I too have given *lots* of VE tests. Fortunately many new hams are actually interested enough to go ahead and learn some radio after licensing, but that is by no means a general trait. If you don't believe it you haven't been paying attention.

>> I've been licensed since the late 50's. Extra since the 70ï¿½s. Even had a ï¿½First Classï¿½ commercial radiotelephone, with both the radar and aircraft endorsements - passed all the elements in one sitting, missed at most 3 or 4 questions on any given section - a couple were perfect. And, except for the Novice, did this while sitting in front of the FCC themselves, no less. Never flunked a FCC code or theory exam. Never. So what? That and a dollar will get me a cup of coffee.

So welcome to the club. I took the Novice exam in late December 1956,and received the license the first of March, 57. By late May I was ready for the Conditional - I lived 260 miles from the FCC district office. I was contented to remain there indefinitely until Incentive Licensing took away some of my favorite spectrum. So instead of carping forever I studied up and sat in on many a session of W1AW code practice and soon took my Conditional ticket to the FCC at Kansas City and brought home the Extra. That required that I go through the 13 wpm code test, General and Advanced writtens, plus the 20wpm code test and Extra written, all in one session. But I made it. Oh, I too had a First Phone with endorsements. I was a graduate of Fort Monmouth and the Signal School. I agree, it means little now. But to blithely dismiss all that in favor of near-instant licensing of anyone with the mildest of interest in ham radio is not the answer to securing the future of the hobby/service. To say that the past has no value in considering the future is to dismiss all that has gone before. I think we know better than that. "The past is prologue".
It's difficult to see how you "change it all" types can't understand that the future builds on the past.

It's getting late, so... To wrap this up , I agree with part of your proposal. We do need a valid equivalent of the old Novice back again, updated to meet the times, of course. But let's not leap too far for our footing, lest we wind up swimming in a swamp of inexperience. Give the beginners plenty modes to learn and plenty of room in which to learn

and use them. But let's retain some semblence of normalcy. And yes--experience, tenure, knowledge and skill, *including Morse code skill* *DOES* still count for something.

To dump all code testing for the Extra class license will be the beginning of the deterioration of ham radio such that I really don't want to contemplate where it would end. The experience of the past 30 years is a good but cautionary indicator of where it leads. Yes, I'm talking to some degree of what happened to CB, and to ham radio as a part of that CB degeneration, for a great many hams have come from CB. Many of them have become good hams. But far too many have brought the worst attributes of CB with them. To ignore the certainty of adding to this baggage by making full HF access much too easy is unconscionable and potentially destructive to an extent that is most unpleasant to contemplate.

73, Dick W0EX

1161. Contributions to EU PLC (BPL) standardisation workshop published

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-15 08:14:42 UTC
From: Ralph Aichinger <ralph@dolphy.pangea.at>
Message-ID: <1066204337.900263@news.liwest.at>
Source record: 80737
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,uk.radio.amateur

All the contributions to the EU workshop on PLC standards are
up on the web server now, at

http://tinyurl.com/qzin

Did not have time to look at them yet, but it is a suprisingly
small number.

/ralph

1162. Re: New Acronym: ECTA (Era of Code Test Abolition)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-15 12:25:25 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0310150425.35f7e462@posting.google.com>
Source record: 80738

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20031014211335.00545.00001637@mb-m02.aol.com>...
> In article <f45722ac.0310140453.f0485e4@posting.google.com>,
> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
>
> >"Clint" <rattlehead at computron dot net> wrote in message
> >news:<vomdo775euu639@corp.supernews.com>...
> >> > Jim:
> >> >
> >> > The truth is, only hams who know the Morse code have the capability
> >> > to fall back on the CW mode when other modes are unavailable.
> >>
> >> True.
> >>
> >> Now explain why hams know how to use "other modes" when there isn't
> >> a profeciency test to MAKE them do it in the first place.
> >>
> >> Clint
> >
> >Some forgot where they put their microphones.
>
> Brian, I think some of them forgot where they put their minds...
>
> LHA

Len, I think in both cases they're sitting on them.

1163. Re: Why thirteen and twenty?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-15 12:30:47 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031015083047.12501.00003145@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 80741

In article <86ptgzumnq.fsf@duchess.twilley.org>, Jack Twilley
<jmt+usenet@twilley.org> writes:

>I can understand why Novice and Technician Plus required five words
>per minute -- the treaty and all -- but why did General require
>thirteen words per minute and Amateur Extra twenty words per minute?
>
>Is there a real reason?

12 to 13 wpm is generally agreed to be above the speed where things such as
"counting dits" work for most people. It's the beginning of the skills which
take one to higher speeds

20 wpm derives from the old 1923-24 "Amateur Extra First Class" which chose 20
as double the old 10 wpm standard. It was reintroduced in 1951 when the current
Amateur Extra class was created.

Both speeds are far below those required of experienced professional Morse
operators.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1164. Re: What makes a Pro code test Amateur a Troglodyte?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-15 12:30:47 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031015083047.12501.00003144@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 80743

In article <5ee63311.0310141824.6c082d63@posting.google.com>,
groupk0hb@earthlink.net (Hans K0HB) writes:

>N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote
>
>>
>> Back then, all it took for full privs was 13 wpm code and a ~50
>> question written test. Has 35 years of incentive licensing made hams
>> "more technical"? If not, why do we need all those written tests?
>>
>
>Jim,
>
>This old strawman of yours is getting shopworn. Since it's nearly
>Halloween, just prop him up next to a pumpkin and see if the children
>are impressed when they come for tricks and treats.

Not a strawman, Hans.

What level of written testing would you have if FCC adopts your 2 class
structure?
>
>The purpose of the written test is to determine if an applicant is
>qualified to play on our RF playground without hurting themselves or
>innocent bystanders, without straying into nearby industrial and
>military places, that we know how to share nicely with other players,
>and that we recognize practices and conditions which will trash up the
>playground.
>
I agree 100%.

Now, what level of written testing is required to meet that purpose?

And how do we justify any testing or test questions that exceed that purpose?

I invite you to read KL7CC's paper on the AL7FS website and see what NCVEC
thinks about the future - besides code testing.

Take a spin over to AH0A's website and see how the number of new Techs has
dropped since the new Q&A pool was put in place July 15.

Please tell us how we can defend the Extra written test when Generals have the
same bands, modes and power levels.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1165. Re: What makes LHA so poor at simple research tasks?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-15 12:30:48 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031015083048.12501.00003146@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 80742

In article <20031014211336.00545.00001638@mb-m02.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com
(Len Over 21) writes:

>In article <c2356669.0310141315.45d783b@posting.google.com>, N2EY@AOL.COM
>(N2EY) writes:
>
> <snip>
>
>>1906 - (December 24 & 31) Christmas Eve broadcast of both recorded and
>>live music and voice from Massachusetts. Signals heard all over North
>>Atlantic and coastal areas. Inland as far as New York State. Broadcast
>>*repeated* New Year's Eve.
>
> Quit misdirecting with olde tyme raddio lore.

Quit trying to moderate an unmoderated newsgroup.
>
> Come up with the way anyone can make a spark transmitter
> amplitude modulated for intelligible voice or music communication...
> using a microphone in the antenna circuit of a 1 KW transmitter.

Why? That's not what Fessenden did.
>
> Come up with the way a spark transmitter suddenly turns into
> an Alexanderson Alternator whenever it is brought up in an amateur
> radio newsgroup.

That's your game, Len.

1166. Re: What makes a Pro code test Amateur a Troglodyte?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-15 12:30:49 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031015083049.12501.00003147@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 80744

In article <Gh1jb.1093$_i.100683@nnrp1.ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
<wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:

>"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
>news:c2356669.0310131337.353df3fe@posting.google.com...
>> "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
>news:<hGgib.785$_i.73747@nnrp1.ptd.net>...
>> > "Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
>> > news:20031012000943.23307.00003682@mb-m29.aol.com...
>> > > In article <bma161$cg2@library2.airnews.net>, "Kim"
>> > <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
>> > > writes:
>> > >
>> > > >Therein lies the problem with the whole CW test (TEST, *test*)
>debate.
>> > The
>> > > >minute one takes on the "no" CW test argument, it is generally met
>with
>> > an
>> > > >attitude that an end CW use (USE, *use*) is being favored or called
>for.
>> > >
>> > > Kim:
>> > >
>> > > Code testing has always been the thing which generated code use.
>> >
>> > I would assert that being forced to learn code to gain access to HF
>> > "soured" more people on code use than it encouraged ... of course,
>> > some percentage of folks decided they liked code and continued to
>> > use it, but MANY simply endured something they had no interest in
>> > to get past the test, then "threw away the key."
>> >
>> > Remember the old adage "honey is better than vinegar."
>>
>> OK, fine, your opinion is well stated.
>>
>> Now consider that same logic applied to the written test.
>
>Jim ... I am not going to waste time, energy, and bandwidth
>debating the elimination of written tests, with you playing
>"devil's advocate" for elimination thereof ...

That's fine, Carl. You don't have to.
>
>I do not, and never will support the elimination or watering down

>of the written tests.

Neither do I.

>I have stated over and over again that I
>personally feel they could be made better (where "better" and
>"more difficult" are not necessarily synonymous ...).
>
Agreed - and we have detailed ways that could be done within the present system.

>I don't mean to come across as condescending, but your attempts
>to equate Morse testing's irrelevance to the written tests in an effort
>to support continued Morse testing is something I'm getting tired of.

You've got it backwards.

>And I'm not going to play that game.

My point is simply this: When someone or some group challenges the *written* tests - particularly the parts beyond the regulations and safety - how are we going to defend them from a regulatory point of view? Particularly if they use the exact same arguments as used against the Morse test?

You and I and many others will say "Those writen tests are relevant and reasonable". But how can we *prove* it?

Before restructuring, it took 5 written tests totalling 190 questions to get full privileges. Now it takes 3 writtens totalling 120 questions. Did we lose anything by that change?

Have you read KL7CC's paper on NCVEC's vision of the future of amateur radio? I invite you and everyone else to take a look, with particular attention to the parts other than code testing.

It ain't a pretty vision.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1167. F5RMX is a dangerous gay CBer terrorist

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-15 12:30:59 UTC
From: Anonymous via the Cypherpunks Tonga Remailer <nobody@cypherpunks.to>
Message-ID: <603073413eb050561833cb4e4c7a8843@cypherpunks.to>
Source record: 80739

Beware ! The gay terrorist F5RMX
transmits virus by e-mail.
He recently tried to infect the french
atomic agency (C.E.A) in order to
destroy all the computing system.

This ham-radio operator F5RMX is a gay
CBer belonging to the terrorist
REF-UNION gay-ham organization. He
usually spreads communist ideas over
Internet, supporting islamic terrorists.

One of his known boy friend is F1MMR.

Take care !

1168. Re: Reflections on rrap

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-15 12:35:16 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0310150435.702ee44a@posting.google.com>
Source record: 80740

N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<c2356669.0310140857.73af7cfa@posting.google.com>...
> Keith Hosman <log-remove-nospam-dshr@remove.bnnorth.nospam.net> wrote in message
news:<hu5movkd573kdb7rgmdumove24iuoqqusa@4ax.com>...
> > On 27 Sep 2003 11:01:42 GMT, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:
> >
> > >In article <bklkfs$6ut@library1.airnews.net>, "Kim" <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
> > >writes:
> > >
> > >>> Kim, beer and BBQ?
> > >>>
> > >>
> > >>Oh good heavens, no! Pasta, or steak, and a glass of fine wine or a frozen
> > >>margarita.
> > >
> > >Cheeseburger in paradise, anyone?
> > >
> > >>Beer and BBQ is a Texan thing and, while I'll drink an ICE COLD
> > >>beer on a hot day outside--you won't find me outside much in the Summertime
> > >>around here. BBQ? It's OK.
> > >
> > >Wings and a Sam Adams. Or a Black & Tan.
>
> Anchor Bar. Tonawanda NY.
>
> Dinosaur BBQ, Rochester NY (also Syracuse).
>
> Just thinking of them makes me drool.
>
> > >
> > >Hot roast beef sandwiches and a Genny Cream Ale or Guinness (drink your beer
> > >before it gets cold)
>
> oooooooooohhhhhhhhhhhhhh
> > >
> > >Or the amateur radio ultimate: Anchovy pizza a la Grommethead Schulz.
> > >
> > >73 de Jim, N2EY
> >
> > or if anyone is close to NW OH, or will be, I can make up a batch of
> > my award winning chili, drink some cold beer, and play radio.
>
> Chili? Now we're talking about truly sacred subjects.
>

> I'll bring the Dave's Insanity Sauce.

Insanity Sauce? Hopefully it won't take the skin off my tongue.

I make beer and keg it, I also make wine and bottle it. I may have to make it all portable.

I'm really looking forward to this gathering.

1169. Re: FCC relaxes it's prohibition on use of the "F-word" on broadcast media.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-15 14:09:15 UTC
From: Mike Yetsko <joe@user.com>
Message-ID: <voqlki7pbpdp21@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 80746
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.shortwave

> >
> > Remember comedian George Carlin's list of the seven dirty words you
can't
> > say on television?
> >
> > It just got a little shorter.
> >

So, how short IS the list now...

I've heard at least 2 of them on national TV in 'family hours'.

"Piss" has been heard a few times, but the only one I can think of I'm
not sure of. War Games? Anyone know of other places?

And "teats" all over the place. Just recently in a broadcast of 'Witness'
with Harrison Ford in the barn with the Amish farmer...

1170. Re: Opposing BPL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-15 14:14:58 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <CDcjb.1133$_i.106292@nnrp1.ptd.net>
Source record: 80745
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Jim Hampton" <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote in message
news:gn1jb.4425$KT.4111@news01.roc.ny...
> Dick,
>
> I'm not at all sure who uses what spectrum in the areas where they are
> testing BPL, but I'd bet coffee for a week that those folks studied the
> situation carefully before proceeding. Where did they test (I don't know
of
> all areas and I'm asking a sincere question)?

The fact of the matter is that the ONLY serious technical studies
presented to the FCC in their Notice of Inquiry on BPL came from
the good work of Ed Hare, W1RFI, and his colleagues at ARRL.

The "access BPL" industry has done essentially nothing but "hand-
waving" and ignoring/denying that the problem exists. They want
to make $$$ ... and they don't appear to give a damn about the
impact on the other users of HF.

That they claim that "power wires don't radiate" (when NEC models,
as well as plain old common sense, indicate that they do) and that
"BPL is a 'point source' radiator" (how one can make that argument
when what they are building is essentially a large, distributed antenna
system) clearly indicate their deep state of "don't confuse the issue
with the facts" denial.

> The "promise" of BPL is to serve areas that are not served well
> by cable or DSL.

While DSL is not available in all areas due to the distance from the
central office factor and the phone companies' slow rollout in areas
of lower population density, acccording to the latest statistics I've
seen, cable "passes" 97%+ of US households. There are also
internet via satellite services available, using dishes like (sometimes
the same dish as) satellite TV services. There are also "WISPs"
who provide services using more appropriate spectrum in the low
microwave bands.

The business model for BPL is WAY less than compelling and its
technical suitability is poor as well, not only because of interference
TO the wide variety of licensed HF users, but also because of the
potential for interference to the BPL system FROM those licensed
users ... and BPL will have NO claim of protection from such interference.
My belief is that consumers deserve a more robust and reliable means
of receiving broadband internet services - one that doesn't present the

(bi-directional) interference issues of BPL - and that there are a number
of such alternatives available already.

> Did they test a
> fairly substantial area in the country where they could demonstrate
> far-flung connections to the BPL, or did they test in densely populated
> areas that are already served by various broadband connection (where fire,
> police, emergency, etc. are very likely not on low band VHF)?

Ed has a better overall view of the current deployments of BPL, but I know
they are few and limited in scope at the moment.

> Also, FM
> broadcasting is usually located near large population areas (since signals
> tend to die off pretty quickly after 40 or 60 miles). This means that if
> you have BPL in a city, it is unlikely that residents will experience
> capture effect on the FM receivers since they will be getting *huge*
signals
> on their FM receivers.

S9+10 on a VERY short whip (an "Outbacker Joey") is a pretty huge
signal to me ... with BPL proposing to go up to 80 MHz, I would
think that the FM broadcast band is at relatively low risk, though FM
receivers could experience some degree of "desense" if the BPL
signal at the front end was strong enough due to proximity.

> I note the "neon sign" comment in the thread. Neon
> signs are usually found in cities.

The "neon sign" assertion by the representative of PPL (the Emmaus
BPL system operator) is *pure* BS ... the signature was SS, NOT
a neon sign ...

> Those test sites are likely located
> either in a city or in an area where the money interests already checked
the
> FCC site to ensure no low band VHF use by police, fire, ambulance, etc.

I think you're giving them FAR too much credit for caring about anything
but deploying BPL ...

Carl - wk3c

1171. Re: A New Concept: Virtual Spectrum

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-15 14:23:58 UTC
From: David Stinson <arc5@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3F8D5876.42B57C45@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 80748
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.antiques.radio+phono,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc

Paul Keinanen wrote:

> With a less pompous start, you might have gotten some more favourable
> comments :-).

I certainly don't mean to be pompous, at least on this matter.
I've tried to make clear in the body of the post that
I'm not the brightest candle on the cake, that I
want to get the idea out so people with more talent
than me can work with it.
As for the unkind comments of a few:
Hecklers, cynics and naysayers greet anyone who proposes something new.
It comes with the territory.

> For a few years there have been remotely connected receivers connected
> to the internet which can be remotely tuned to any desired frequency..

Yes, Yes... Am I just not being clear, or are people not
closely reading that to which they reply? Probably a little of both.

We don't WANT to talk over an Internet telephone line
to some remote base station.

That's not the point.
Please read it again:
That's NOT the point. < (repeat as necessary)

We want to *use our own equipment, right here.*
Noise, antenna bans and LEGAL restrictions
have kept us from the work we want to do.
This system gets around the obstacles by creating
a second "ether" (ionosphere, etc.; pick the term you like)
which you control and *you* regulate.
The two main points are:

1. To make possible radio operations of any kind that
were once impossible, for any number of reasons.

2. To "harvest" clean spectrum in a quiet location and
bring it to your receiver, so you can continue
your radio hobby regardless of what BPL or any
other interferance source does to your local radio environment.

The system is intentionally simple and limited,
so lots of people can tinker with it in short order.

I have faith that those many people
who are sharper than me will expand the concept.

I've had a heck of a lot of fun working on this.
Especially enjoy the ability to record radio spectrum.
I have one hour-long segment on CD centered on 3932 KC.
It contains seven separate, distinct and interesting SSB QSOs
that I can listen to at my leisure, plus many other stations.
And a lot of us military radio people think having a
nation-wide net of WWII BC-611 handie-talkies,
all able to talk to each other in real time,
would be an absolute gas.

Here's something cool: I've long been involved in longwave
work on the 1750 meter band (160-190 KC). This winter,
I plan to take a laptop and a V.S. remote front-end
to several locations and record an hour or so of the band
from 170 to 190 KC. I can then take them home, run
the recordings through a V.S. transverter, and hunt for
all those weak LOWFER signals in the comfort of my own home.
It's still just as challenging to find them, but I get some
major advantages. First, I'm not off on frequency "A" and
missing an opening to station "B;" I can "rewind" and go
look for him, too. Second, I'm not sitting in the dark,
freezing and trying to tune my audio filters with numb hands.

Anyway- it's a tool people can use if they want.
73 DE Dave AB5S

1172. Re: What makes a Pro code test Amateur a Troglodyte?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-15 14:25:11 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <bNcjb.1137$_i.106257@nnrp1.ptd.net>
Source record: 80747

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:133jb.108661$qj6.4738502@news1.news.adelphia.net...
> Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
>
> > Jim ... I am not going to waste time, energy, and bandwidth
> > debating the elimination of written tests, with you playing
> > "devil's advocate" for elimination thereof ...
> >
> > I do not, and never will support the elimination or watering down
> > of the written tests. I have stated over and over again that I
> > personally feel they could be made better (where "better" and
> > "more difficult" are not necessarily synonymous ...).
[snip]
>
> The political spectrum is filled with all kinds of people, and what
> happens in amateur radio and the world depend on which way the currents
> are running. Right now, the currents are simply not running toward a
> more technically inclined ARS.

That's not what you see if you read the R&O in 98-143 ... the FCC
states that the ARS is "primarily a technical service" ...

> Want to get the Present FCC administration's ears to perk up? Phrase it
> in "regulatory" terms. Talk a bit about how modern radio's don't require
> the level of regulation that used to be needed for proper operation. I'd
> bet that would get them listening. I'm glad you support the continued
> testing of ARS candidates. You may need to lend your good name to some
> pretty robust efforts to retain the tests soon.

I don't think that will fly ... but if someone does toss it up in the air,
I will make every effort to shoot it down.

One thing to remember ... the ITU Radio Regulations require administrations
to verify the technical qualifications of applicants for amateur radio
licenses.
And, there is an ITU-R Recommendation (M.1544) that outlines the things
that amateurs should have a theoretical knowledge of ...

73,
Carl - wk3c

1173. Re: What makes a Pro code test Amateur a Troglodyte?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-15 15:35:50 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <qPdjb.1161$_i.106748@nnrp1.ptd.net>
Source record: 80749

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20031015083049.12501.00003147@mb-m04.aol.com...
>
> My point is simply this: When someone or some group challenges the
written
> tests - particularly the parts beyond the regulations and safety - how are
we
> going to defend them from a regulatory point of view? Particularly if they
use
> the exact same arguments as used against the Morse test?

Simple ... the FCC has determined that the ARS is "primarily a technical service." Additionally, the ITU Radio Regs require administrations to determine the technical qualifications of applicants for amateur licenses and there is an ITU-R Recommendation (M.1544) that outlines the theoretical knowledge that amateurs should have ... yes it is not strictly mandatory, but the US and most other administrations do generally follow the guidance given by ITU Recommendations, even ones that are not strictly mandatory.

> You and I and many others will say "Those writen tests are relevant and
> reasonable". But how can we *prove* it?

By citing the facts above ...

> Before restructuring, it took 5 written tests totalling 190 questions to
get
> full privileges. Now it takes 3 writtens totalling 120 questions. Did we
lose
> anything by that change?

There was some consolidation of testing as a result of the smaller number of classes. I don't see that as a big deal.

As Ed Hare said over dinner when he was down here last ... he remembers the 3 page study guide he had to work from when he first got on the air. Now "Now you're talking" is well over 200 pages of material for folks to study and absorb ... how this is "dumbing down" is beyond me.

Can we put this one to bed now?

73,
Carl - wk3c

1174. Re: Opposing BPL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-15 16:01:02 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0310150801.3cf781fe@posting.google.com>
Source record: 80750
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Jim Hampton" <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote in message
news:<gn1jb.4425$KT.4111@news01.roc.ny>...
> Dick,
>
> I'm not at all sure who uses what spectrum in the areas where they are
> testing BPL

Nobody knows how much interference the stuff could generate
eventually. The BPL proponents are advertising their intent to run
from 2 thru 80 Mhz inclusive. At considerably higher power levels than
they're using in the current test areas. There's a major threat in
itself and it's not being tested.

> but I'd bet coffee for a week that those folks studied the
> situation carefully before proceeding.

Would not surprise me one bit. But then along came hams with HF mobile
rigs like Carl wk3c, Ed Hare w1rfi and Bob Davidson w3hj and myself
who took ham radio into BPL test areas and are blowing the whistle.
Loudly.

> Where did they test (I don't know of
> all areas and I'm asking a sincere question)?

Go to the ARRL site for the complete list of known test areas. All of
those I know about so far are in the NE corridor in densly-populated
upscale +/- residential neigborhoods. Because that's where the money
is. Which also happen to be the same sorts of neighborhoods in which a
lot of hams live too.

> The "promise" of BPL is to
> serve areas that are not served well by cable or DSL

Total BS. BPL is quite expensive to deploy. A fiber optic feed line or
cable TV line has to run parallel to the power lines. These feed lines
inject the BPL signals into the low voltage power lines via taps
roughly at every street intersection or the neighborhood has no BPL.
If there isn't any cable or DSL service in your locale because there
isn't any ROI in it for those service providers there most likely
won't be any BPL either. They're all chasing the same dollars.

> Did they test a
> fairly substantial area in the country where they could demonstrate
> far-flung connections to the BPL,

Absolutely not. There are no "far-flung connections" to BPL per above.
In the Emmaus PA test area which I've visited BPL is only distributed
along a few blocks of maybe 3-4 residential streets. Completely
inconclusive test program to the point of being a contrived scam.

> or did they test in densely populated
> areas that are already served by various broadband connection

Seems like.

> (where fire,
> police, emergency, etc. are very likely not on low band VHF)?

Dunno. There are at least three test sites concentrated in the Lehigh
Valley region in PA and there are very few if any emergency services
still using lo-band VHF in PA. I have not seen any references to BPL
being tested in places like California and Dick's Missouri where
lo-band is still in use. What a big surprise eh?

> Also, FM
> broadcasting is usually located near large population areas (since signals
> tend to die off pretty quickly after 40 or 60 miles). This means that if
> you have BPL in a city, it is unlikely that residents will experience
> capture effect on the FM receivers since they will be getting *huge* signals
> on their FM receivers.

BPL as presently conceived is not supposed to run in either the AM or
FM broadcast bands. Plus there are guard bands between BPL and both
broadcast bands. 'Nother big surprise.

> I note the "neon sign" comment in the thread. Neon
> signs are usually found in cities.

There are "point source" neon signs fifty miles north of Butte,
they're *everywhere*.

> Those test sites are likely located
> either in a city or in an area where the money interests already checked the
> FCC site to ensure no low band VHF use by police, fire, ambulance, etc.

Covered above.

>
> Any thoughts on this, or am I crazy?

Certainly you're a crazy. All us frequent posters in this NG are
certified crazies. Where the hell have YOU been?!

>
> 73 from Rochester, NY
> Jim AA2QA

w3rv

>
>

> "Dick Carroll" <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com> wrote in message
> news:bmhn31$d3v$0@208.207.71.138...
> >
> > Before I retired I was a field engineer working with a statewide
> > public safety organization which uses low band VHF for base to car
> > communications statewide, and that system is still virtually as I left

1175. Re: Why thirteen and twenty?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-15 16:11:09 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <xkejb.57045$mQ2.27686@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 80751

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20031015083047.12501.00003145@mb-m04.aol.com...
> In article <86ptgzumnq.fsf@duchess.twilley.org>, Jack Twilley
> <jmt+usenet@twilley.org> writes:
>
> >I can understand why Novice and Technician Plus required five words
> >per minute -- the treaty and all -- but why did General require
> >thirteen words per minute and Amateur Extra twenty words per minute?
> >
> >Is there a real reason?
>
> 12 to 13 wpm is generally agreed to be above the speed where things such
as
> "counting dits" work for most people. It's the beginning of the skills
which
> take one to higher speeds
>
> 20 wpm derives from the old 1923-24 "Amateur Extra First Class" which
chose 20
> as double the old 10 wpm standard. It was reintroduced in 1951 when the
current
> Amateur Extra class was created.
>
> Both speeds are far below those required of experienced professional Morse
> operators.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

One more thing Jim. 20 wpm is above another 'threshold', which is at about
18wpm for most folks. So you gotta know it to do it.

Dan/W4NTI

1176. Re: FCC relaxes it's prohibition on use of the "F-word" on broadcast media.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-15 16:15:12 UTC
From: LRod@removethispartpobox.com
Message-ID: <3f8d728d.1038577384@newsgroups.bellsouth.net>
Source record: 80756
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.shortwave

On Wed, 15 Oct 2003 10:09:15 -0400, "Mike Yetsko" <joe@user.com>
wrote:

>> >
>> > Remember comedian George Carlin's list of the seven dirty words you
>can't
>> > say on television?
>> >
>> > It just got a little shorter.
>> >
>
>So, how short IS the list now...
>
>I've heard at least 2 of them on national TV in 'family hours'.
>
>"Piss" has been heard a few times, but the only one I can think of I'm
>not sure of. War Games? Anyone know of other places?
>
>And "teats" all over the place. Just recently in a broadcast of 'Witness'
>with Harrison Ford in the barn with the Amish farmer...

NYPD Blue, Andy Sipowicz (Dennis Franz) was watching a topless dancer
and told her, "A+ in the tit department."

Same show, last season, virtually every regular cast member uttered,
"bullshit," sometime during the year.

I guess C, CS, and MF are the only ones left.

LRod

Master Woodbutcher and seasoned termite

Shamelessly whoring my website since 1999

http://www.woodbutcher.net

1177. Re: What makes a Pro code test Amateur a Troglodyte?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-15 16:21:23 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0310150821.4841ec23@posting.google.com>
Source record: 80752

Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:<133jb.108661$qj6.4738502@news1.news.adelphia.net>...
> Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
>
> > Jim ... I am not going to waste time, energy, and bandwidth
> > debating the elimination of written tests, with you playing
> > "devil's advocate" for elimination thereof ...
> >
> > I do not, and never will support the elimination or watering down
> > of the written tests. I have stated over and over again that I
> > personally feel they could be made better (where "better" and
> > "more difficult" are not necessarily synonymous ...).
>
> Carl, It isn't about you. You know a bit about politics it is obvious.
> But you are falling prey to a common malady among politicians.
>
> It isn't about you. You don't support the watering down of the writtens.
> That's great, and I agree and support you in that effort 100 percent. I
> also support you in your BPL efforts. 100 percent again.
>
> But there are people out there who agree with part of your premise about
> the CW test, but not all of it. They don't think that removing the CW
> Morse test is enough. They want more. (or less if you wish to look at it
> that way) Right now, things are going their way. Maybe not for your
> reasons, but they like what they see happening.
>
> The political spectrum is filled with all kinds of people, and what
> happens in amateur radio and the world depend on which way the currents
> are running. Right now, the currents are simply not running toward a
> more technically inclined ARS.
>
> Want to get the Present FCC administration's ears to perk up? Phrase it
> in "regulatory" terms. Talk a bit about how modern radio's don't require
> the level of regulation that used to be needed for proper operation. I'd
> bet that would get them listening. I'm glad you support the continued
> testing of ARS candidates. You may need to lend your good name to some
> pretty robust efforts to retain the tests soon.

Mike,

Thank you for expressing my concerns much better than I could.

Have you read the NCVEC position paper by KL7CC? It's not just about
code testing. It already proposes a drastically easier entry level
license.

Of course *most* hams will not support reductions in written testing. But will we have a choice if somebody makes a case in, as you say, *regulatory* terms?

Here's a scenario for ya. Suppose:

At some point in the near future, FCC just dumps Element 1.

There's a surge in upgrades and new hams. Maybe we reach 700,000 - and maybe we don't.

Then the growth and upgrade numbers drop back to about what they were before. Maybe they're a little better, but not a lot.

Some folks say it's all due to that $%#^& code test and those %$&*! old timers, but after a few years the code test is but a memory and the old timers are fewer every day.

Then some folks - maybe NCVEC - makes noises about the failure rates of the *writtens*, the burden of taking and administering the tests, etc. They point out how few hams use homebrew, how few technical (as opposed to operating) violations occur in the ARS, and question the "regulatory purpose" of all those writtens.

And the one 'killer' argument they bring to the table is that Techs have had full power and mode privs above 30 MHz for years and years with very few technical problems - so what is the regulatory purpose of much more written testing for full privs below 30 MHz? Sure, some regs, some propagation - but why all the rest of the stuff?

How will we counter that argument?

Nobody has yet come up with an answer. And as you point out, there *are* folks who want more - or less.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1178. Re: What makes a Pro code test Amateur a Troglodyte?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-15 16:24:55 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031015122455.08934.00000374@mb-m11.aol.com>
Source record: 80761

>Now "Now you're talking" is well over 200 pages of material for folks to
>study and absorb ... how this is "dumbing down" is beyond me.
>
>Can we put this one to bed now?
>
>73,
>Carl - wk3c

I cant wait to hear Karl cry when the next proposal for Dumbing Down comes out.

1179. Re: Opposing BPL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-15 16:32:02 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bmjsq2gbn0@208.207.71.137>
Source record: 80753
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
> "Jim Hampton" <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote in message
> news:gn1jb.4425$KT.4111@news01.roc.ny...
>

>>Those test sites are likely located
>>either in a city or in an area where the money interests already checked
>
> the
>
>>FCC site to ensure no low band VHF use by police, fire, ambulance, etc.
>
>
> I think you're giving them FAR too much credit for caring about anything
> but deploying BPL ...
>

Not at all. The fact that at least some test areas are using only up
to 22mHz means that they will cause NO interference to low band Public
Safety comms simply because they're NOT generating that interference, as
they will certainly be doing when BPL is rolled out in its full capability.
But for the purposes of convincing regulators, they can truthfully
say "We received no complaints from them" while carefully ignoring
the truth as noted above.
Do you really think decision makers in the FCC would
be aware of what actually happened? I sure don't. Even if they
hae a factual technical report from their own technical staff
on their desks. It's EASY to ignore paperwork when it fits the
purpose. Just don't read that part.

I've passed all this along to friends in that venue with a notation
on the fact that it is known that some test sites are NOT presently
active above 22 mHz so they will be aware that Low VHF noise may be
missing, and to not construe this as assuming that BPL will not cause
interference with lowband HF systems.

Dick

1180. Re: What makes a Pro code test Amateur a Troglodyte?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-15 16:33:27 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bmjssngbn1@208.207.71.137>
Source record: 80754

Carl R. Stevenson wrote:

> "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
> news:133jb.108661$qj6.4738502@news1.news.adelphia.net...
>
>>Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
>>
>>
>>>Jim ... I am not going to waste time, energy, and bandwidth
>>>debating the elimination of written tests, with you playing
>>>"devil's advocate" for elimination thereof ...
>>>
>>>I do not, and never will support the elimination or watering down
>>>of the written tests. I have stated over and over again that I
>>>personally feel they could be made better (where "better" and
>>>"more difficult" are not necessarily synonymous ...).
>
> [snip]
>
>>The political spectrum is filled with all kinds of people, and what
>>happens in amateur radio and the world depend on which way the currents
>>are running. Right now, the currents are simply not running toward a
>>more technically inclined ARS.
>
>
> That's not what you see if you read the R&O in 98-143 ... the FCC
> states that the ARS is "primarily a technical service" ...
>
>

Sure! So is the Internet!

1181. Re: Why thirteen and twenty?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-15 16:36:33 UTC
From: K7JEB <k7jeb@qsl.remove.net>
Message-ID: <AJejb.26585$Rd4.4023@fed1read07>
Source record: 80755

Jim, N2EY, wrote:

> 20 wpm derives from the old 1923-24 "Amateur Extra
> First Class" which chose 20 as double the old 10 wpm
> standard. It was reintroduced in 1951 when the current
> Amateur Extra class was created.
>
> Both speeds are far below those required of experienced
> professional Morse operators.

Are there any 'professional' Morse operators left who
earn their living by sending by hand and receiving by
ear? I am under the impression it is now strictly an
amateur endeavor.

Jim, K7JEB

1182. Re: New Acronym: ECTA (Era of Code Test Abolition)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-15 17:37:53 UTC
From: R Harrison <rh004b1742@blueyonder.co.uk>
Message-ID: <CEfjb.12$Eb7.3@news-binary.blueyonder.co.uk>
Source record: 80757

Why should 'B' class license holders take a Morse Test, at any speed, to become a dinosaur like most, not all, 'A' License holders?

We were good enough to pass the RAE Exam!

Those who wish to use Morse can. I have on CAT but, just for the experience you understand.

Use it by all means but, do not keep those off the air who enjoy Telephony.

The airwaves are for the use of all those qualified.

What would you rather, the frequency used, or lost, because of an outdated and backward looking 'elite'

RH (G1EZV)

1183. Re: FCC relaxes it's prohibition on use of the "F-word" on broadcast media.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-15 18:06:32 UTC
From: richcranus@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <c5ecbb69.0310151006.4dc55ef7@posting.google.com>
Source record: 80758
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.shortwave

Ron Hardin <rhhardin@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<3F8A6151.235F@mindspring.com>...
> Dr. Anton Phibes wrote:
> > "This is really, really [expletive] brilliant," Bono said during
> > the ceremony, using the f-word as an adjective.
> > The speech aired live on the East Coast. The FCC said it
> > received 234 complaints, all but 17 of them from individuals
> > associated with the Parents Television Council, a nonprofit
> > group that monitors programs for adult content.
>
> That's an adverb, not an adjective.

Um, no; it is modifying "brilliant", which is a noun. Thus it is an adjective.

1184. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-15 19:01:15 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3F8D997B.6050606@psu.edu>
Source record: 80759

Bill Sohl wrote:
> "Dick Carroll" <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com> wrote in message
> news:bmaotk$404$0@208.207.71.130...
>
>>Bill Sohl wrote:
>>Dwight:
>>
>>>>>>Because of that, few who oppose code testing, and even fewer
>>>>
> Technicians,
>
>>>>>attend that club's meetings or socialize with the members. Find me a
>>>>
>>>survey
>>>
>>>
>>>>>that is truly unbiased and I'll be glad to discuss the results. Until
>>>>
>>>then,discussing the results of surveys is simply a waste of time.
>>
>>N2EY:
>>
>>>>Then consider the comments to the restructuring NPRM.
>>>
>>>I agree...surveys, votes, etc hold little sway with the FCC anyway.
>>
>>
>>So you think Bill Cross is obfuscating when he says that FCC wants the
>>ham community to decide what our rules are to be, for us to reach a
>>concensus??
>
>
> Not at all, but I also believe that when it is obvious to the FCC that
> a rule change is appropriate...even if a majority of hams oppose
> that change...the FCC will do what it believes is right and in the
> public interest. 98-143 serves as a bellweather to that since, if
> most hams favored 5wpm General and 12 wpm Extra, the FCC
> didn't buy it.

Bill, while you like to bring out this argument when discussing
Elimination of Morse code, I'd like to suggest you imagine some
situation where something you like about the ARS is going away.

Now assume that someone brings up the same point, that is:

I also believe that when it is obvious to the FCC thata rule change is appropriate...even if a majority of hams oppose
that change...the FCC will do what it believes is right and in the public interest.

I'll bet you would interpret that a invitation by the poster for you to go away and kee quiet!

Perhaps we should use those words for say... BPL? Ad a few words to the beginning, and:

<<<NO QUOTE of yours, just an example here>>>

As regards to the FCC approving the nationwide deployment of BPL, I also believe that when it is obvious to the FCC that a rule change is appropriate...even if a majority of hams oppose that change...the FCC will do what it believes is right and in the public interest.

I'm trying to say that while a truism, it isn't necessarily a good argument. See what I mean?

- Mike KB3EIA -

1185. Re: Opposing BPL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-15 19:34:52 UTC
From: Dave Shrader <david.shrader@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <wjhjb.476057$2x.193575@rwcrnsc52.ops.asp.att.net>
Source record: 80760
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.policy

The ARRL site, <http://www.arrl.org/tis/info/HTML/plc/#Field> , provides links to the following information:

"PLC is a "carrier-current" system, designed to intentionally conduct signals using electrical wiring. Although a carrier-current device is an unintentional emitter, because the power lines have such a significant potential to radiate and because a practical carrier-current device generally needs more signal than the permitted conducted emissions levels for unintentional emitters, carrier-current devices are not required to meet those conducted-emissions limits, but are required to meet the general radiated emissions limits in Sec. 15.209.

ï¿½ 15.209 states that the radiated emission limits of intentional radiators generally can't exceed the field strength levels specified in the following table:

Frequency (MHz) Field Strength (microvolts/meter @meters)

0.009-0.490 2400/F(kHz) 300

0.490-1.705 24000/F(kHz) 30

1.705-30.0 30 30

30-88 100 3

88-216 150 3

216-960 200 3

Above 960 500 3

Carrier-current devices are "Verified" as described in the Part-15 rules. This means that the manufacturer is required to test them to ensure that they comply with the FCC regulations. Under the present rules, they must be tested at 3 typical locations. "

Note that the HF Spectrum allows a S8 to S9 signal level, 30 uV/m at 30 meters distance.

1186. Re: Opposing BPL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-15 20:20:31 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <j_hjb.7334$Mk4.7148@news01.roc.ny>
Source record: 80762
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Brian,

I don't know about you, but I received a whole week pass from Belleveu :)

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

"Brian Kelly" <kelly@dvol.com> wrote in message
news:d22b54c3.0310150801.3cf781fe@posting.google.com...
> "Jim Hampton" <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote in message
news:<gn1jb.4425$KT.4111@news01.roc.ny>...
> > Dick,
> > Any thoughts on this, or am I crazy?
>
> Certainly you're a crazy. All us frequent posters in this NG are
> certified crazies. Where the hell have YOU been?!
>
>
> w3rv
>

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.525 / Virus Database: 322 - Release Date: 10/9/03

1187. Re: A New Concept: Virtual Spectrum

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-15 20:26:44 UTC
From: James Nipper <jnipper@nospam.fdn.com>
Message-ID: <d4ydnT2vI-wDMBCiRVn-vQ@comcast.com>
Source record: 80763
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.antiques.radio+phono,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc

Wouldn't it be more simple just to hook up all of your ham gear to a telephone line, and pretend that you are hamming via the telephone ?

Seems a much more simple approach to me, and the same outcome-- you would be **using** (hee hee hee) ham equipment, while talking on the phone !!!

73 de Jim K4PYT

1188. Re: Why thirteen and twenty?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-15 20:28:43 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <%5ijb.7350$xh4.6857@news01.roc.ny>
Source record: 80764

Jim,

I had a 2nd class radiotelegraph license back in 1967. One needed to be 21 (I was still a teenager) plus have sufficient service time to qualify for the 1st (I forget, but it seems it was one year at sea running communications under the supervision of a 1st telegraph). The second was 20 words per minute and the 1st was 25 words per minute. From what I have heard, the 25 was sufficient to get you a not too good paying job on the slow side circuits whilst you had to be 100% copy and reliable at 30 to get the good jobs on the main circuits. Of course, this would pre-date 1967 by quite a few years :)

From what I recall, back in the 60s you tended to hear the newcomers at 5 to 10 words per minute, a minor number in the 13 to 20 range, a number in the 30 word per minute range, and a surprising number in the 40 plus word per minute range. I did run into one guy that I had a problem with until he realized I wasn't the guy he was used to hearing at KG6NAC and finally slowed down to about 50 (which was really pushing limits for me at that time). I originally called cq at about 40 to 45 and he responded at around 60. Fortunately, I got most of his call but that was a bit much.

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20031015083047.12501.00003145@mb-m04.aol.com...
> In article <86ptgzumnq.fsf@duchess.twilley.org>, Jack Twilley
> <jmt+usenet@twilley.org> writes:
>
> >I can understand why Novice and Technician Plus required five words
> >per minute -- the treaty and all -- but why did General require
> >thirteen words per minute and Amateur Extra twenty words per minute?
> >
> >Is there a real reason?
>
> 12 to 13 wpm is generally agreed to be above the speed where things such
as
> "counting dits" work for most people. It's the beginning of the skills
which
> take one to higher speeds
>
> 20 wpm derives from the old 1923-24 "Amateur Extra First Class" which
chose 20
> as double the old 10 wpm standard. It was reintroduced in 1951 when the
current

> Amateur Extra class was created.
>
> Both speeds are far below those required of experienced professional Morse
> operators.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.525 / Virus Database: 322 - Release Date: 10/9/03

1189. Re: What makes a Pro code test Amateur a Troglodyte?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-15 22:32:15 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031015183215.21457.00001427@mb-m10.aol.com>
Source record: 80766

In article <qPdjb.1161$_i.106748@nnrp1.ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
<wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20031015083049.12501.00003147@mb-m04.aol.com...
>>
>> My point is simply this: When someone or some group challenges the
>>*written*
>> tests - particularly the parts beyond the regulations and safety - how are
>>we
>> going to defend them from a regulatory point of view? Particularly if they
>>use
>> the exact same arguments as used against the Morse test?
>
>Simple ... the FCC has determined that the ARS is "primarily a technical
>service."

OK, fine!

Now what, exactly, does "primarily a technical service" mean wrt testing? You
and I agree that it means hams should know more than "turn the left knob to 6".
But to someone else it could mean that the tests should only be about the most
basic concepts, and that hams should be free to learn as the need arises.

And remember that what seems basic and simple to engineering types like us can
be advanced and complex to other folks.

>Additionally, the ITU Radio Regs require administrations to
>determine the technical qualifications of applicants for amateur licenses
>and there is an ITU-R Recommendation (M.1544) that outlines the
>theoretical knowledge that amateurs should have ... yes it is not strictly
>mandatory, but the US and most other administrations do generally
>follow the guidance given by ITU Recommendations, even ones that
>are not strictly mandatory.
>
That language leaves M-1544 wide open to an enormous variety of
interpretations. And there's a world of difference between "theoretical
knowledge that amateurs should know" and "subjects that must be tested".

>> You and I and many others will say "Those written tests are relevant and
>> reasonable". But how can we *prove* it?
>
>By citing the facts above ...

I hope you are right about that. But any lawyer will tell you that it's all
about interpretations. Like that phrase "pool of trained operators".

>
>> Before restructuring, it took 5 written tests totalling 190 questions to
>> get
>> full privileges. Now it takes 3 writtens totalling 120 questions. Did we
>> lose
>> anything by that change?
>
>There was some consolidation of testing as a result of the smaller number
>of classes. I don't see that as a big deal.

OK, fine. Now suppose somebody pushes 2 classes and a total of 60 questions. Or free upgrades for already licensed hams.
>
>As Ed Hare said over dinner when he was down here last ... he remembers
>the 3 page study guide he had to work from when he first got on the air.

That study guide shrinks every time Ed tells that story.

What he doesn't tell you is:

- The study guide was for the old Novice, with its extreme restrictions

- He did not count the pages of regulations in the back of the book that were also required.

- The study guide was simply a guide to what you should expect to be on the test, not a complete training manual, nor a complete copy of every possible test question and answer

- That it's not the size of the book but the level of information in it.

- That Ed had quite a bit of radio background before he ever picked up the guide.

>Now "Now you're talking" is well over 200 pages of material for folks to
>study and absorb ... how this is "dumbing down" is beyond me.

Simple - the 200 page book is a complete step-by-step guide to all aspects of ham radio for the newbie, and includes detailed explanations of every single question in the pool. The study guide was simply an indicator of what would be on the test.

A more accurate comparison would be to compare "Now You're Talking" with "How to Become a Radio Amateur" or "Understanding Amateur Radio".
>
>Can we put this one to bed now?
>
Let's talk actual examples.

How about this idea, if/when code testing is dropped:

1) Tech is replaced by a new entry level license that (call it "Communicator")

2) Communicator allows most of General CW/data and about half of General voice bands on HF, plus lots of VHF/UHF

3) Communicator power level is below RF exposure limit (100W below 24 MHz, 50 W above) and there are no RF exposure or safety questions on the test.

4) No regulations questions on the Communicator test - instead, new Communicators have to sign a statement that they have provided themselves with a copy of Part 97 and have read and understood the applicable regs for their license.

5) All existing Novices are reclassed as Communicators, all existing Techs, regardless of vintage, get free upgrade to General, all existing Advanceds get free upgrade to Extra.

6) Present Novice subbands - all of them - become more voice/image space.

I'm not the one proposing this.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1190. Re: A New Concept: Virtual Spectrum

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-15 22:48:59 UTC
From: David Stinson <arc5@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3F8DCEB7.23B6424D@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 80765
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.antiques.radio+phono,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc

When they install BPL in your neighborhood, Jim,
drop me a line. I'll explain it all to you.... again...
D.S.

James Nipper wrote:
>
> Wouldn't it be more simple just to hook up all of your ham gear to a
> telephone line, and pretend that you are hamming via the telephone ?
>
> Seems a much more simple approach to me, and the same outcome-- you would be
> **using** (hee hee hee) ham equipment, while talking on the phone !!!
>
> 73 de Jim K4PYT

1191. Re: Code test analogy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-15 23:23:09 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <xFkjb.1733$P%1.1432977@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 80767

"No-coder" <nocoder@aol.com> wrote in message
news:bmf1rp02sk5@enews1.newsguy.com...
> Even though the testing for code was reduced to the basic 5 WPM over three
> years ago, it's obvious that the debate still rages on.
>
> The insistance that a person know Morse Code at a resonable speed in order
to
> be "real ham" is similar to religious fanatics, particualrly Christian
> fundamentalists, who think that a person has to believe in god in order to
be a
> good and moral person. They cannot prove that their god even exists. So
with
> the PCTA, they cannot prove that code is useful in light of communications
> advancements that have been made over the past several decades.
>
> Just as certain fundamentalists would like to turn the country into a
> Judeo-Christian theocracy, so would certain hams go back to an outdated
> communications scheme, simply because they think that Morse code is their
> "god."
>
> To expect prospective hams to believe in the fairy tale of morse code is
the
> the same as expecting people to believe in the fairy tales of the holy
bible.
>

This nonsense insults both the no-coder and pro-coders.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

1192. Re: I warned everyone this would happen. Re: 73 Magazine Says "73 and QRT"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-16 00:14:44 UTC
From: BFoelsch <BFoelsch@snet.ditch.this.net>
Message-ID: <uHidnapchoFkfxCiXTWJkQ@giganews.com>
Source record: 80768
Cross-posted to:
rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

Something about a broken clock being correct twice a
day.....

I lost interest because of all the old farts who couldn't talk about
anything except the good old days.....Took me 25 years to get
to that point, but it did happen.

Take yer homebrew 6L6 transmitter and show it to Hiram Percy Maxim so he can
see how LITTLE progress you have made in the last 65 years.

THAT is what will make him turn over in his grave.....

"Wouff Hong" <You-can-sp@nk.it> wrote in message
news:3f8b1be0$0$211$45beb828@newscene.com...
>
> >"John Norfolk" <janorfolk@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> >news:c6a70d55.0310101532.63b491f3@posting.google.com...
> >> From the ARRL Letter October 10:
> >>
> >> 73 MAGAZINE SAYS "73 AND QRT"
> >>
> >> After completing 43 years of publication, 73 Amateur Radio Today
> >> magazine is calling it quits. Plans to publish a joint
> >> October/November issue fell through this week, and the September 2003
> >> issue was the magazine's last. According to self-proclaimed "El
> >> Supremo and Founder" Wayne S. Green II, W2NSD, it was a simple
> >> matter of economics.
>
> But Noooooo, you all said Restructuring and the no-code tech license were
> good ideas. Why will new hams and upgrades buy a radio magazine to
increase
> their knowledge and radio skill? They won't! They don't care about ham
> radio. They want to stay stupid! Having a ham license doesn't mean
anything
> to them because they didn't have to put in any effort to get it. It was
> handed to them.
>
> HA. The ARRL plan to support dumbing down ham radio is going to back-fire
on
> them. Heee Heee. They put free licenses in people hands but those people
> aren't buying memberships. QST will be going the way of 73! HA. Hiram
> Maxim is turning over in his grave.

>
>
>
> Wouff Hong
>
>

1193. Re: Opposing BPL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-16 00:28:49 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031015202849.25815.00003754@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 80778

In article <CDcjb.1133$_i.106292@nnrp1.ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
<wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:

>The fact of the matter is that the ONLY serious technical studies
>presented to the FCC in their Notice of Inquiry on BPL came from
>the good work of Ed Hare, W1RFI, and his colleagues at ARRL.

Yep.
>
>The "access BPL" industry has done essentially nothing but "hand-
>waving" and ignoring/denying that the problem exists. They want
>to make $$$ ... and they don't appear to give a damn about the
>impact on the other users of HF.
>
Besides ignoring the technical weaksnesses of BPL, they're also ignoring the
really poor business model that drives it.

>That they claim that "power wires don't radiate" (when NEC models,
>as well as plain old common sense, indicate that they do) and that
>"BPL is a 'point source' radiator" (how one can make that argument
>when what they are building is essentially a large, distributed antenna
>system) clearly indicate their deep state of "don't confuse the issue
>with the facts" denial.

It should also be mentioned that the location and existence of test sites was
kept very quiet until ARRL/W1RFI blew the whistle. Representatives of radio
services were neither invited nor even informed of BPL tests.

One of the simplest and most positive tests is to turn the BPL service on and
off and observe changes in interference, thus identifying if BPL is the source.
But to my knowledge no BPL test site has done such tests.
>
>> The "promise" of BPL is to serve areas that are not served well
>> by cable or DSL.
>
>While DSL is not available in all areas due to the distance from the
>central office factor and the phone companies' slow rollout in areas
>of lower population density, acccording to the latest statistics I've
>seen, cable "passes" 97%+ of US households. There are also
>internet via satellite services available, using dishes like (sometimes
>the same dish as) satellite TV services. There are also "WISPs"
>who provide services using more appropriate spectrum in the low
>microwave bands.

Agreed. But there's more:

Access-BPL is really meant as a "last mile" system, to avoid the need to wire houses for cable or install special filters and modems. So the fiber still needs to get within a certain distance of your house, same as with DSL.

The main selling point for Access-BPL is that you can just plug a BPL modem line into any wall outlet, and you're connected. Your entire house wiring becomes an internet connection - and also an antenna to radiate BPL noise. So even if all services are buried, you'll still have noise from the house wiring radiating.

The BPL signal travels on the medium voltage (4-13 kV) distribution wire(s) and is then coupled around the pole pig transformers with special couplers. In most neighborhoods other than those of very low density, a transformer feeds a few homes, so everyone's wiring gets the BPL signal even if only one customer is signed up. Indeed, if a coupler is left in place, everyone's house wiring gets the signal even if no one is signed up.

The couplers and fiber/MV converters mean that BPL has significant installation costs even if they don't have to do any installation in customer's houses.

>The business model for BPL is WAY less than compelling and its
>technical suitability is poor as well, not only because of interference
>TO the wide variety of licensed HF users, but also because of the
>potential for interference to the BPL system FROM those licensed
>users ... and BPL will have NO claim of protection from such interference.
>My belief is that consumers deserve a more robust and reliable means
>of receiving broadband internet services - one that doesn't present the
>(bi-directional) interference issues of BPL - and that there are a number
>of such alternatives available already.

Very well-said and absolutely true.
>
>> Did they test a
>> fairly substantial area in the country where they could demonstrate
>> far-flung connections to the BPL, or did they test in densely populated
>> areas that are already served by various broadband connection (where fire,
>> police, emergency, etc. are very likely not on low band VHF)?
>
>Ed has a better overall view of the current deployments of BPL, but I know
>they are few and limited in scope at the moment.

There are also different systems being tried out, so what you hear on the Emmaus test site video may not be the same as what is experienced elsewhere.
>
>> Also, FM
>> broadcasting is usually located near large population areas (since signals
>> tend to die off pretty quickly after 40 or 60 miles). This means that if
>> you have BPL in a city, it is unlikely that residents will experience
>> capture effect on the FM receivers since they will be getting *huge*
>> signals on their FM receivers.
>
>S9+10 on a VERY short whip (an "Outbacker Joey") is a pretty huge
>signal to me ... with BPL proposing to go up to 80 MHz, I would

>think that the FM broadcast band is at relatively low risk, though FM
>receivers could experience some degree of "desense" if the BPL
>signal at the front end was strong enough due to proximity.

What about harmonics? The BPL signals on the video sounded like they had pretty fast risetimes.
>
>> I note the "neon sign" comment in the thread. Neon
>> signs are usually found in cities.
>
>The "neon sign" assertion by the representative of PPL (the Emmaus
>BPL system operator) is *pure* BS ... the signature was SS, NOT
>a neon sign ...

And did they turn off the BPL for a few moments to demonstrate that it was a neon sign and not the BPL? One guess.....
>
>> Those test sites are likely located
>> either in a city or in an area where the money interests already checked
>> the
>> FCC site to ensure no low band VHF use by police, fire, ambulance, etc.
>
>I think you're giving them FAR too much credit for caring about anything
>but deploying BPL ...
>
Exactly!

Something else to watch out for.....

Because different systems are being tried in different locations, proponents of each system will probably proclaim the *their* system doesn't have that problem - what you heard at the Podunk site is Brand X BPL.

73 es tnx Carl de Jim, N2EY

1194. Re: FCC relaxes it's prohibition on use of the "F-word" on broadcast media.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-16 00:29:50 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0310151629.57b9a4c8@posting.google.com>
Source record: 80769
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.shortwave

richcranus@yahoo.com (Richard Cranium) wrote in message
news:<c5ecbb69.0310151006.4dc55ef7@posting.google.com>...
> Ron Hardin <rhhardin@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<3F8A6151.235F@mindspring.com>...
> > Dr. Anton Phibes wrote:
> > > "This is really, really [expletive] brilliant," Bono said during
> > > the ceremony, using the f-word as an adjective.
> > > The speech aired live on the East Coast. The FCC said it
> > > received 234 complaints, all but 17 of them from individuals
> > > associated with the Parents Television Council, a nonprofit
> > > group that monitors programs for adult content.
> >
> > That's an adverb, not an adjective.
>
> Um, no; it is modifying "brilliant", which is a noun. Thus it is an adjective.

Flash to "Robo-Cop,"

"Dick, you're fired!"

"Dit dah dit dah dit dah..." [sound of Morse Academy eliminating Dick]

1195. Re: New Acronym: ECTA (Era of Code Test Abolition)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-16 00:32:05 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0310151632.3d310eb@posting.google.com>
Source record: 80770

brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0310150425.35f7e462@posting.google.com>...
> lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20031014211335.00545.00001637@mb-m02.aol.com>...
> > In article <f45722ac.0310140453.f0485e4@posting.google.com>,
> > brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
> >
> > >"Clint" <rattlehead at computron dot net> wrote in message
> > >news:<vomdo775euu639@corp.supernews.com>...
> > >> > Jim:
> > >> >
> > >> > The truth is, only hams who know the Morse code have the capability
> > >> > to fall back on the CW mode when other modes are unavailable.
> > >>
> > >> True.
> > >>
> > >> Now explain why hams know how to use "other modes" when there isn't
> > >> a profeciency test to MAKE them do it in the first place.
> > >>
> > >> Clint
> > >
> > >Some forgot where they put their microphones.
> >
> > Brian, I think some of them forgot where they put their minds...
> >
> > LHA
>
> Len, I think in both cases they're sitting on them.

...suffocating!

1196. Re: FCC relaxes it's prohibition on use of the "F-word" on broadcast media.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-16 00:33:18 UTC
From: Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com>
Message-ID: <20031015203318.760$e6@newsreader.com>
Source record: 80771
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.shortwave

brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote:
> "Dit dah dit dah dit dah..." [sound of Morse Academy eliminating Dick]
>
HMMMMMMMMMMMM. (sound of cooling fans eliminating brianburke).

--
http://NewsReader.Com/
50 GB/Month

1197. Re: New Acronym: ECTA (Era of Code Test Abolition)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-16 00:36:39 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0310151636.340121d4@posting.google.com>
Source record: 80772

"R Harrison" <rh004b1742@blueyonder.co.uk> wrote in message news:<CEfjb.12$Eb
7.3@news-binary.blueyonder.co.uk>...

> What would you rather, the frequency used, or lost, because of an outdated
> and backward looking 'elite'
>
> RH (G1EZV)

The PCTA would answer "LOST."

They really don't care.

Brian

1198. Re: Code test analogy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-16 00:39:37 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bmkpc9$99q$0@208.206.142.101>
Source record: 80773

Dee D. Flint wrote:
> "No-coder" <nocoder@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:bmf1rp02sk5@enews1.newsguy.com...
>
>>Even though the testing for code was reduced to the basic 5 WPM over three
>>years ago, it's obvious that the debate still rages on.
>>
>>The insistance that a person know Morse Code at a resonable speed in order
>
> to
>
>>be "real ham" is similar to religious fanatics, particualrly Christian
>>fundamentalists, who think that a person has to believe in god in order to
>
> be a
>
>>good and moral person. They cannot prove that their god even exists. So
>
> with
>
>>the PCTA, they cannot prove that code is useful in light of communications
>>advancements that have been made over the past several decades.
>>
>>Just as certain fundamentalists would like to turn the country into a
>>Judeo-Christian theocracy, so would certain hams go back to an outdated
>>communications scheme, simply because they think that Morse code is their
>>"god."
>>
>>To expect prospective hams to believe in the fairy tale of morse code is
>
> the
>
>>the same as expecting people to believe in the fairy tales of the holy
>
> bible.
>
>
> This nonsense insults both the no-coder and pro-coders.
>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>

I do believe that was his intent. You know how it is with trolls.

Dick

1199. Re: FCC relaxes it's prohibition on use of the "F-word" on broadcast media.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-16 00:39:54 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0310151639.7e3e3c7e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 80774
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.shortwave

richcranus@yahoo.com (Richard Cranium) wrote in message
news:<c5ecbb69.0310151006.4dc55ef7@posting.google.com>...
> Ron Hardin <rhhardin@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<3F8A6151.235F@mindspring.com>...
> > Dr. Anton Phibes wrote:
> > > "This is really, really [expletive] brilliant," Bono said during
> > > the ceremony, using the f-word as an adjective.
> > > The speech aired live on the East Coast. The FCC said it
> > > received 234 complaints, all but 17 of them from individuals
> > > associated with the Parents Television Council, a nonprofit
> > > group that monitors programs for adult content.
> >
> > That's an adverb, not an adjective.
>
> Um, no; it is modifying "brilliant", which is a noun. Thus it is an adjective.

We now have "Ham Radio" magazine, and "73 Magazine" both now defunct.

Would you like the adjective "defunct" in front of ARS???

1200. Re: Why thirteen and twenty?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-16 00:46:12 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0310151646.3bb522d1@posting.google.com>
Source record: 80775

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<xkejb.57045$mQ2.27686@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20031015083047.12501.00003145@mb-m04.aol.com...
> > In article <86ptgzumnq.fsf@duchess.twilley.org>, Jack Twilley
> > <jmt+usenet@twilley.org> writes:
> >
> > >I can understand why Novice and Technician Plus required five words
> > >per minute -- the treaty and all -- but why did General require
> > >thirteen words per minute and Amateur Extra twenty words per minute?
> > >
> > >Is there a real reason?
> >
> > 12 to 13 wpm is generally agreed to be above the speed where things such
> as
> > "counting dits" work for most people. It's the beginning of the skills
> which
> > take one to higher speeds
> >
> > 20 wpm derives from the old 1923-24 "Amateur Extra First Class" which
> chose 20
> > as double the old 10 wpm standard. It was reintroduced in 1951 when the
> current
> > Amateur Extra class was created.
> >
> > Both speeds are far below those required of experienced professional Morse
> > operators.
> >
> > 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
> One more thing Jim. 20 wpm is above another 'threshold', which is at about
> 18wpm for most folks. So you gotta know it to do it.
>
> Dan/W4NTI

Welp Dan, as I strap on my dragon armor and jousting butt-plug, please
orient me toward the 1951 anachronism of the 1923 AEFC standard.

dididididdit.

1201. Re: What makes a Pro code test Amateur a Troglodyte?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-16 00:52:14 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0310151652.fba447a@posting.google.com>
Source record: 80776

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20031014223425.12631.00002120@mb-m28.aol.com>...
> In article <20031014190311.28496.00001271@mb-m18.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com
> (Len Over 21) writes:
>
> >In article <c2356669.0310140852.4c29f54@posting.google.com>, N2EY@AOL.COM
> >(N2EY) writes:
> >
> >>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
> >>news:<20031013234613.01893.00001228@mb-m22.aol.com>...
> >>> In article <20031013203527.08626.00001165@mb-m27.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com
> (N2EY)
> >>> writes:
> >>>
> >>> >In article <20031013174921.12501.00003124@mb-m04.aol.com>,
> lenover21@aol.com
> >>> >(Len Over 21) writes:
> >>> >
> >>> >>In article <bmdt22$sse@library2.airnews.net>, "Kim"
> >>> >><kimscliff@yahoo.com>
> >>> >>writes:
> >>> >>
> >>> >>>"Hans K0HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> >>> >>>news:5ee63311.0310121827.7191e44a@posting.google.com...
> >>> >>>> "Kim" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote
>
> >>> >>>> Spark transmissions were outlawed (as well they should have been) so
> >>> >>>> the precedent exists.
> >>> >>>
> >>> >>>Hmmmm, Jim/N2EY made that observation also. Then, I see the comment
> that
> >>> >>>spark was a transmission method--not a mode. I think that's splitting
> >>> >>>hairs, isn't it? I'm asking--I wasn't around for spark ;)
> >>> >>
> >>> >> The ONLY way a "spark" transmitter could send anything called
> >>> >> communications information was by on-off keying.
> >>> >
> >>> >there were other types of transmitters on the air even
> >>> >before WW1. Arc transmitters and Alexanderson alternators were two types.
> >>> >Transmitters using tubes were in use well before 1920.
> >>>
> >>> Irrelevant.
> >>
> >>No, very relevant. Spark was not the only option before 1920. And

> >>after 1920, there were even more options.
> >
> > How many amateur "radio" stations were equipped with Alexanderson
> > Alternators, senior?
>
> Who is "senior", Len? It's not me.

Ahem, it is you....

> > We are NOT talking "options."
>
> I am. You don't want to admit that there were more options than spark before
> 1920. There were.

So which option did you take?

Nuff said...

1202. Re: What makes LHA so poor at simple research tasks?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-16 00:58:04 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0310151658.2d3753af@posting.google.com>
Source record: 80777

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20031015083048.12501.00003146@mb-m04.aol.com>...
> In article <20031014211336.00545.00001638@mb-m02.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com
> (Len Over 21) writes:
>
> >In article <c2356669.0310141315.45d783b@posting.google.com>, N2EY@AOL.COM
> >(N2EY) writes:
> >
> > <snip>
> >
> >>1906 - (December 24 & 31) Christmas Eve broadcast of both recorded and
> >>live music and voice from Massachusetts. Signals heard all over North
> >>Atlantic and coastal areas. Inland as far as New York State. Broadcast
> >>*repeated* New Year's Eve.
> >
> > Quit misdirecting with olde tyme raddio lore.
>
> Quit trying to moderate an unmoderated newsgroup.

That's your game, Rev. Jim.

> > Come up with the way anyone can make a spark transmitter
> > amplitude modulated for intelligible voice or music communication...
> > using a microphone in the antenna circuit of a 1 KW transmitter.
>
> Why? That's not what Fessenden did.

So what did Fessenden do?

> > Come up with the way a spark transmitter suddenly turns into
> > an Alexanderson Alternator whenever it is brought up in an amateur
> > radio newsgroup.
>
> That's your game, Len.

What's your game, Jim?

1203. Re: What makes a Pro code test Amateur a Troglodyte?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-16 01:05:18 UTC
From: groupk0hb@earthlink.net
Message-ID: <5ee63311.0310151705.30508343@posting.google.com>
Source record: 80779

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote

>
> What level of written testing would you have if FCC adopts your 2 class
> structure?
>

Two levels.

A beginers level similar to our current Technician examination, with a
modest limit on power, and a non-renewable 10-year term.

A regular level similar to our current Extra examination, with power
levels of 1.5KW as now.

> I invite you to read KL7CC's paper on the AL7FS website and see what NCVEC
> thinks about the future - besides code testing.

I've read it. I don't agree with their vision of the future.

73, de Hans, K0HB

1204. Re: Reflections on rrap

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-16 01:08:39 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0310151708.26ac0f28@posting.google.com>
Source record: 80780

"Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:<bkpabu$tvu@library1.airnews.net>...
> "Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
> news:20030923013420.12631.00001340@mb-m28.aol.com...
> > In article <bkmm02$2th@library1.airnews.net>, "Kim W5TIT"
> <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
> > writes:
> >
> > >> I'd wager that if you put all us in a room, we'd get along just fine.
> > >>
> > >> - Mike KB3EIA -
> > >>
> > >>
> > >
> > >You and me? Sure. Jim/N2EY and I? Sure. Brian and I? Sure. Here's
> who
> > >I wouldn't even consider being in the same room with: Larry Roll, Dick
> > >Carroll, Dan/W4whatever, Dave Heil, Waddles (Waddles is non-existent in
> my
> > >book), and that's just a few. I have no desire to "get along" with
> people
> > >like that.
> > >
> > >Kim W5TIT
> >
> > Kim:
> >
> > Well, that's pretty sad. I guess you're overlooking the fact that a
> person's
> > online "personality" can be quite different than what one would experience
> > in person, since the written word, particularly in a virtually immediate
> forum
> > such as Usenet, is, indeed, quite impersonal by nature. Moreover, your
> > expression of a lack of desire to meet with certain members of this forum
> > could cause all the rest, even those not included on your list, to not
> wish
> > to meet with you.
> >
>
> And, I would be upset....because? I don't get on a forum in a newsgroup
> with the intention of meeting and greeting. Your excuses for your behavior
> that this is "just a newsgroup" are weak and shrill at best. I think those
> of us who probably would meet in real life are those who have been frank and
> honest about who we are, up front and without using the guise of a newsgroup

> to act in a manner inconsistent with who we are as people. THOSE are the
> people who would end up meeting and not having to waste time muddling
> through who we are and who we ain't, Larry.
>
> >
> > I would jump at any chance to meet any and all of the regulars in this
> > newsgroup, for no better reason than to see what they are really like in
> > person. I think that even Len Anderson could prove to be a quite affable
> > chap, given a chance to get to know him better. I may be wrong, but
> > at least I'm willing to take that chance. I would like to think that
> given
> > the opportunity, your curiosity would ultimately get the upper hand over
> > your stated objections. If not, one could quite legitimately call your
> > character into question, at a level far deeper than anything ever said
> > in this forum.
> >
> > 73 de Larry, K3LT
> >
>
> I am not in least bit curious about the majority of people in this
> newsgroup. Most of all, those mentioned above.
>
> Kim W5TIT

Kim, get the OM a shiney new pair of HD brass-riveted jeans and
yourself a shiney new HD steel-belted brittany spear brazier, and join
us at Dayton 04.

I promise I won't make any Texas jokes til you'se guys show up.

By the way, do you know how they separate the men from the boys in
Texas...

Brain, (more or less.)

1205. Re: F5RMX is a dangerous gay CBer terrorist

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-16 01:11:12 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0310151711.1ae7eb66@posting.google.com>
Source record: 80781

Anonymous via the Cypherpunks Tonga Remailer <nobody@cypherpunks.to> wrote in message news:<603073413eb050561833cb4e4c7a8843@cypherpunks.to>...
> Beware ! The gay terrorist F5RMX
> transmits virus by e-mail.
> He recently tried to infect the french
> atomic agency (C.E.A) in order to
> destroy all the computing system.
>
> This ham-radio operator F5RMX is a gay
> CBer belonging to the terrorist
> REF-UNION gay-ham organization. He
> usually spreads communist ideas over
> Internet, supporting islamic terrorists.
>
> One of his known boy friend is F1MMR.
>
> Take care !

Take Care, I kind of have a hard time taking gay guys seriously.

What's your secret?

1206. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-16 01:21:32 UTC
From: Clint <"rattlehead at computron dot net">
Message-ID: <vorsl2nsek1o04@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 80782

"Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
news:3F8D997B.6050606@psu.edu...
> Bill Sohl wrote:

> Bill, while you like to bring out this argument when discussing
> Elimination of Morse code, I'd like to suggest you imagine some
> situation where something you like about the ARS is going away.
>

sigh

It's code TESTING, not CODE, that is being pushed out the door.
ad nauseum, this must be explained. Why is that?

1207. Re: FCC relaxes it's prohibition on use of the "F-word" on broadcast media.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-16 01:42:39 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <jlmjb.1749$P%1.1454244@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 80783
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.shortwave

"Richard Cranium" <richcranus@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:c5ecbb69.0310151006.4dc55ef7@posting.google.com...
> Ron Hardin <rhhardin@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<3F8A6151.235F@mindspring.com>...
> > Dr. Anton Phibes wrote:
> > > "This is really, really [expletive] brilliant," Bono said during
> > > the ceremony, using the f-word as an adjective.
> > > The speech aired live on the East Coast. The FCC said it
> > > received 234 complaints, all but 17 of them from individuals
> > > associated with the Parents Television Council, a nonprofit
> > > group that monitors programs for adult content.
> >
> > That's an adverb, not an adjective.
>
> Um, no; it is modifying "brilliant", which is a noun. Thus it is an
adjective.

Brilliant is an adjective in the above sentence as he was not referring to a
precious gem.

brili¿½liant
adj.
Full of light; shining. See Synonyms at bright.
Relating to or being a hue that has a combination of high lightness and
strong saturation.
Sharp and clear in tone.
Glorious; magnificent: the brilliant court life at Versailles.
Superb; wonderful: The soloist gave a brilliant performance.
Marked by unusual and impressive intellectual acuteness: a brilliant mind; a
brilliant solution to the problem. See Synonyms at intelligent.
n.
A precious gem, especially a diamond, finely cut in

So the sentence in question has the following structure.
This - pronoun, subject of sentence
is - verb, state of being
really, really [expletive] - string of adverbs modifying the adjective
that follows.
[expletive] referred to is a special case where the adverb has
been formed from a verb.
brilliant - a characteristic and thus an adjective not a noun.

It has the same nature as the sentence "John is tired" which uses an
adjective to describe John. It is not the nature as the sentence "John is a

boy". The first sentence is noun-verb-adjective where the latter is noun-verb-noun.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

1208. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-16 01:49:01 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <hOmjb.109242$qj6.5036014@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 80784

Clint wrote:

> "Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
> news:3F8D997B.6050606@psu.edu...
>
>>Bill Sohl wrote:
>
>
>>Bill, while you like to bring out this argument when discussing
>>Elimination of Morse code, I'd like to suggest you imagine some
>>situation where something you like about the ARS is going away.
>>
>
>
> *sigh*
>
> It's code TESTING, not CODE, that is being pushed out the door.
> ad nauseum, this must be explained. Why is that?

It's his point that is being debated, not whether Morse code is going away or testing is going away.

If Bill wants to use the argument that:

> Not at all, but I also believe that when it is obvious to the FCC that
> a rule change is appropriate...even if a majority of hams oppose
> that change...the FCC will do what it believes is right and in the
> public interest. 98-143 serves as a bellweather to that since, if
> most hams favored 5wpm General and 12 wpm Extra, the FCC
> didn't buy it.

he really isn't using all that good of an argument. These are the same people that think BPL might just be the biggest thing since sliced bread.

They could of course just decide that no ARS is in the public interest. And I suspect even you might not care for that all that much.

Use the arguments of outmoded, hazing, specific mode testing and others if you like.

But using what the FCC decides as justification probably isn't a good argument.

- Mike KB3EIA -

1209. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-16 01:49:59 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <bPmjb.8766$kx.938@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 80785

"Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
news:3F8D997B.6050606@psu.edu...
> Bill Sohl wrote:
> > "Dick Carroll" <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com> wrote in message
> > news:bmaotk$404$0@208.207.71.130...
> >
> >>Bill Sohl wrote:
> >>Dwight:
> >>
> >>>>>>Because of that, few who oppose code testing, and even fewer
> >>>>
> > > Technicians,
> > >
> >>>>>>attend that club's meetings or socialize with the members. Find me a
> >>>>
> >>>survey
> >>>
> >>>
> >>>>>>that is truly unbiased and I'll be glad to discuss the results. Until
> >>>>
> >>>then,discussing the results of surveys is simply a waste of time.
> >>
> >>N2EY:
> >>
> >>>>>>Then consider the comments to the restructuring NPRM.
> >>>
> >>>I agree...surveys, votes, etc hold little sway with the FCC anyway.
> >>
> >>
> >>So you think Bill Cross is obfuscating when he says that FCC wants the
> >>ham community to decide what our rules are to be, for us to reach a
> >>concensus??
> > >
> > >
> > > Not at all, but I also believe that when it is obvious to the FCC that
> > > a rule change is appropriate...even if a majority of hams oppose
> > > that change...the FCC will do what it believes is right and in the
> > > public interest. 98-143 serves as a bellweather to that since, if
> > > most hams favored 5wpm General and 12 wpm Extra, the FCC
> > > didn't buy it.
> >
> > Bill, while you like to bring out this argument when discussing
> > Elimination of Morse code, I'd like to suggest you imagine some
> > situation where something you like about the ARS is going away.

We have seen that many times. Clearly the overwhelming
majority of comments filed by hams against the loss of
220 bandwidth was just such a situation. The same may end
up being the case with BPL.

> Now assume that someone brings up the same point, that is:
>
> I also believe that when it is obvious to the FCC thata rule change is
> appropriate...even if a majority of hams oppose
> that change...the FCC will do what it believes is right and in the
> public interest.
>
> I'll bet you would interpret that a invitation by the poster for you to
> go away and kee quiet!

People can invite me to do anything. If someone is so shallow
that they think my comment above is an indirect way of telling
them to keep quiet, then they must be pretty weak minded...IMHO.

> Perhaps we should use those words for say... BPL? Ad a few words to the
> beginning, and:

I already brought up BPL above.

> <<<NO QUOTE of yours, just an example here>>>
>
> As regards to the FCC approving the nationwide deployment of BPL, I also
> believe that when it is obvious to the FCC that a rule change is
> appropriate...even if a majority of hams oppose that change...the FCC
> will do what it believes is right and in the public interest.
>
> I'm trying to say that while a truism, it isn't necessarily a good
> argument. See what I mean?

It's not an argument, it is a fact...reality. We deal with it in the
past and will do so in the future. The point is that the FCC doesn't
look to the comments as a democratic voting process.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1210. Re: What makes a Pro code test Amateur a Troglodyte?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-16 01:52:24 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <sRmjb.1752$P%1.1455394@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 80786

"Hans K0HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:5ee63311.0310151705.30508343@posting.google.com...
> n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote
>
> >
> > What level of written testing would you have if FCC adopts your 2 class
> > structure?
> >
>
> Two levels.
>
> A beginers level similar to our current Technician examination, with a
> modest limit on power, and a non-renewable 10-year term.
>
> A regular level similar to our current Extra examination, with power
> levels of 1.5KW as now.
>

Making the second level license examination equivalent to the current Extra examination sounds like it would drive people out of ham radio. That's simply too big a jump to expect people to take in one swallow so to speak especially since this would affect current Technicians who entered the licensing program under a system with 3 tiers (or more for those who entered several years ago). It would also take away privileges from existing Techs in that they are now receive renewable licenses but would not under that proposal.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

1211. Re: What makes a Pro code test Amateur a Troglodyte?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-16 01:56:17 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <5Vmjb.8788$kx.6935@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 80787

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20031014223426.12631.00002121@mb-m28.aol.com...
> In article <HE0jb.55912$mQ2.25777@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Bill
> Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
>
> (old stuff removed)
>
> (N2EY wrote:)
> >> Why
> >> is a Technician licensee qualified to design/build/repair/align/modify
and
> >> most
> >> of all operate a 6 meter rig but not a 15 meter rig - particularly when
> >> it's the same rig?
> >
> >Actually, when you think about it...ANYONE is allowed to design, build,
> >repair,
> >align and/or modify ham equipment...it is ONLY the "operate" part that
> >ultimately requires the license.
> >
> Excellent point! However, in the interests of strict correctness, note
that
> equipment which is manufactured for sale has to meet certain certification
> requirements which licensed hams ar exempt from. In the case of RF power
> amplifiers, a licensed amateur can homebrew things no manufacturer can
legally
> sell.
>
> >> Look at the FCC enforcement logs. Problems due to technical
incompetence
> >> are
> >> very few in the ARS, and those that do happen are not clustered on any
> >> particular license class.
> >>
> >> So why do we need all that written testing beyond Tech?
> >
> >Jim, you keep bringing up what you believe are analogies
> >to the ode test issue and I'm not gonna play anymore. the
> >argument(s) fail to convince the FCC and I don't see you
> >making them to the FCC either. If and when someone attempts to petiton
> >for the changes you suggest are analogous...then I'll argue further.
>
> The code test issue will be decided by FCC one way or the other, sooner or
> later. I'm not worried about it, they'll decide whatever they decide.

>
> My concern is simply that if someone or some group starts using the same
> arguments against much of the writtens, they're going to be difficult to
> defend.

That is your opinion...I think otherwise. You and I can join forces to
defend writtens...if and when someone does try to end
writtens. Frankly, I don't think it'll happen on my watch.

> Reading the KL7CC article, and seeing the recent drop in new Techs that
> correlates exactly to the new Tech Q&A pool got me thinking, that's all.
>
> >You are talking about it, I'm done playing. No reason to do
> >so.
>
> OK, fine. As I pointed out to W0EX, we disagree about lots of things.
>
> I hope you are right about it not becoming an issue.

Time will tell.

> >When I see something that looks like an NPRM, I'll comment.
>
> Me too! Hopefully, FCC will agree with us.
>
> >Until the FCC makes a propsed rulmaking using any of that as a
> >basis, its a waste of time.
> >
> I do hope you're right

Works for me.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1212. Re: What makes a Pro code test Amateur a Troglodyte?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-16 01:59:36 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <cYmjb.8801$kx.5827@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 80789

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:133jb.108661$qj6.4738502@news1.news.adelphia.net...
> Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
>
> > Jim ... I am not going to waste time, energy, and bandwidth
> > debating the elimination of written tests, with you playing
> > "devil's advocate" for elimination thereof ...
> >
> > I do not, and never will support the elimination or watering down
> > of the written tests. I have stated over and over again that I
> > personally feel they could be made better (where "better" and
> > "more difficult" are not necessarily synonymous ...).
>
> Carl, It isn't about you. You know a bit about politics it is obvious.
> But you are falling prey to a common malady among politicians.
>
> It isn't about you. You don't support the watering down of the writtens.
> That's great, and I agree and support you in that effort 100 percent. I
> also support you in your BPL efforts. 100 percent again.
>
> But there are people out there who agree with part of your premise about
> the CW test, but not all of it. They don't think that removing the CW
> Morse test is enough. They want more. (or less if you wish to look at it
> that way) Right now, things are going their way. Maybe not for your
> reasons, but they like what they see happening.

Just who are those people...the THEY want folks that you think exists.

> The political spectrum is filled with all kinds of people, and what
> happens in amateur radio and the world depend on which way the currents
> are running. Right now, the currents are simply not running toward a
> more technically inclined ARS.
>
> Want to get the Present FCC administration's ears to perk up? Phrase it
> in "regulatory" terms. Talk a bit about how modern radio's don't require
> the level of regulation that used to be needed for proper operation. I'd
> bet that would get them listening. I'm glad you support the continued
> testing of ARS candidates. You may need to lend your good name to some
> pretty robust efforts to retain the tests soon.
>
> All apologies

No apologies needed.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1213. Re: What makes a Pro code test Amateur a Troglodyte?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-16 02:08:31 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <z4njb.1255$_i.111153@nnrp1.ptd.net>
Source record: 80788

"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
news:c2356669.0310150821.4841ec23@posting.google.com...
[snip]
>
> How will we counter that argument?

One approach would be to stop planting it in peoples'
minds numerous times a day ... things that are repeated
often enough sometimes catch on, even if they are BAD
ideas ...

Carl - wk3c

1214. Re: Opposing BPL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-16 02:09:02 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bmkujuivp0@208.206.142.101>
Source record: 80790

N2EY wrote:

> In article <CDcjb.1133$_i.106292@nnrp1.ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
> <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:
>
>>>Those test sites are likely located
>>>either in a city or in an area where the money interests already checked
>>>the
>>>FCC site to ensure no low band VHF use by police, fire, ambulance, etc.

Get this- doubtless aware that Missouri's Highway Patrol operates on
low VHF, they located the test site at the town of Cape Gireadeau-near
the Southeast corner of the state on the border (Mississippi River),
well away from the mainstream.
And- I was most interested in the fact that the Emmaus test site used
only frequency up to around 22 mHz. That means if they do likewise in
the Missouri test site area they will be able to truthfully say "We
received no interference complaints from MHP users".
Of course if they don't *generate* any RFI on MHP frequencies they won't
likely get any comnpalints! What would you bet they fail to mention that
fact in their glowing report to the FCC?

1215. Re: A New Concept: Virtual Spectrum

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-16 02:32:46 UTC
From: Chuck Harris <cfharris@erols.com>
Message-ID: <bml00g$1i0$1@bob.news.rcn.net>
Source record: 80791
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.antiques.radio+phono,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc

David Stinson wrote:

>
> Here's something cool: I've long been involved in longwave
> work on the 1750 meter band (160-190 KC). This winter,
> I plan to take a laptop and a V.S. remote front-end
> to several locations and record an hour or so of the band
> from 170 to 190 KC. I can then take them home, run
> the recordings through a V.S. transverter, and hunt for
> all those weak LOWFER signals in the comfort of my own home.

This is in essence what NSA does with as much of the RF spectrum
as they can, all over the globe. They have no idea what they have,
but if you can tell them the time, the general location, and the
frequency, they will hook up a receiver onto their data log, and
look around for the signal. This is just what they did when that
KAL plane was shot down, and NSA came up with the com signals of
the fighters that did the deed.

-Chuck

1216. Re: Opposing BPL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-16 02:48:03 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3F8E06E0.4080109@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 80792
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Carl R. Stevenson wrote:

>>
>>
>
>S9+10 on a VERY short whip (an "Outbacker Joey") is a pretty huge
>signal to me ... with BPL proposing to go up to 80 MHz, I would
>think that the FM broadcast band is at relatively low risk, though FM
>receivers could experience some degree of "desense" if the BPL
>signal at the front end was strong enough due to proximity.
>
TV channels 2, 3, 4, and 5 will get clobbered by the junk going up to 80MHz.
The video signal is AM modulated onto the channel carrier (with a
portion of the
lower sideband suppressed) and will have no ability to reject the BPL
noise.
The effect would be somewhat similar to a sparky vacuum cleaner motor
throwing
white and black spots throuout the picture. The sound, being FM, will fare
better. Well, there's digital HDTV, but most everyone still uses analog TV.
And I don't get cable or satellite.

1217. Re: My response to Jim Wiley, KL7CC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-16 02:53:03 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0310151853.545f0eb4@posting.google.com>
Source record: 80793

Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:<bmisin$rq8$0@208.206.142.98>...
> My response to the document "Amateur radio in the 21st century" by Jim
> Wiley, KL7CC of the NCVEC
> --
>
> >>Will we lose something because we will no longer have the knowledge
> that all hams can at least understand and send CW, even if very slowly?
> Maybe, maybe not.

It would appear that Dick enters the literary world, even if very
slowly.

You would be surprised at the number of applicants
> I see that actually want to learn CW - they think it will be fun.
> Thereï¿½s a novel concept - someone learning a skill because it is fun,
> not because the government says you must do it.

Now you're on to sumptin!

> Yes, there's always a few who want to learn it for the sake of learning
> a new skill-after all, there is always a small segment of the
> population who are actually motivated. Some are around these days. I've
> been in contact with several recently.

Holey Moley! Dick acting as POC for interested parties. Quick,
somebody, anybody, releive Dick of command lest we lose them all.

> >>Obviously, removing the Morse test requirement will make it easier
> for thousands of interested persons to join our hobby. There are many,
> who for whatever reason have a real, not imagined, problem with learning
> the code. Call it stage fright, a psychological block, hearing
> problems, poor recognition skills, whatever you want; there are indeed
> those who literally cannot master the code, no matter how hard they try.
>
> Why not call it what it is? Improper preparation to learn, and total
> lack of dedicated study, and usually the poorest of learning technique
> for the task at hand. Learning the code isn't difficult, it just
> requires one to WANT to. Whatta concept!

Gee whiz, not all that long ago I used ARRL (ARRL ARRL ARRL ARRL ARRL)
study material that was comprised of REAL Morse Code (not Farnsworth)
and it couldn't get anyone above 10wpm if their lives depended upon
it.

Yet we have some hick from Missery saying that you just
gotta-wanha-doit...

Whatta (fuchin) concept!!!

Why did I spend months at it if I didnah wannah doit?

> >> Lazy, you say? Anyone can make it to 5 WPM, you say? They just
> donï¿½t try, you say? Apparently you have not participated at hundreds
> of exam sessions. I have. I have seen grown men and women with tears
> in their eyes, frustrated, angry, sometimes back next time, sometimes
> giving up on ham radio altogether.

This is the legacy of the anachronistic radio relay limited.

> This one is pure nonsense. Yes, I *HAVE* participated in "hundreds of
> test sessions" over a period of nearly a decade. NEVER did I see any
> such a spectacale. Yes, I've seen plenty of people fail the code test.

With a gleam in his eye...

> For good reason- they didn't adequately prepare to take the test. And
> the VE code tests have never been difficult, as code tests go, or as
> they existed under FCC testing.

Says lucifer...

We always gave every considreation
> possible under the rules, constructed tests to be as easily passable as
> legally possible. You see, we too, wanted people to pass and become
> licensed hams. But to show up for a current version 5wpm test and fail
> in a frustrated tear-jerking session, male or female, is something I
> never saw, nor even anything remotely approximating that scene. It just
> never happened, in all my testing years.

Thank God that you quit.

> What I did see was an elderly gentleman who showed up each test
> session, loaded with nerves, and he failed 13wpm a few times. Each time,
> what he got from the testing team was plenty of friendly words of
> encouragement to keep at it, and welcome, be sure to come back next test
> session. He did, and on the 8th try he passed his 13wpm test.

That was the time you quit being a VE and disbanded your VE team
because these Tech plusses just weren't worth the effort.

I am
> convinced he'd never have made it without those words of encouragment,
> but never once did he give in to his certain frustration. To fail a
> 5wpm code test in tears us beyond shamefuhl, both for the examinee and
> the testing team.

Huh?

> OBTW-- the pass/fail rate of all applicants tested by my team was
> always almost exactly the national average - two thirds passed, one
> third failed, all elements. It never varied beyond a percent or two. So
> I always believed we were doing it pretty well correctly.

But, but, but you said that you tired of the tattooed trucker biker
scum that merely tested and tested again till they passed the multiple
guess exams...

> >Whereï¿½s the gain in having someone give up?
>
> A better question is WHY would someone who truly wanted to be a ham give
> up? I can't think of a single valid reason-except that they really
> didn't want a ham radio license. As a kid of 14, wild horses couldn't
> have kept me from getting one. For darn sure no code test would, nor
> did. Is it so different for people today? If so, why? I can't think of
> a single reason.

The attitude of the VE team...

> >Are you proud that you ï¿½made itï¿½?
>
> Why would anyone who would be a credit to ham radio NOT be proud of
> the accomplishment of earning a ham radio license?
> If not, why do they want to be a ham in the first place? Is it
> antisocial to be proud of reaching a goal?
>
But if the VE Team leader doesn't recognize it as a goal...
>
> >>Can you not find something that another person can do that you
> would find extremely difficult if not impossible? Could you win the
> Tour de France bicycle race - even if you trained every day for the rest
> of your life? Could you invent the Laser? Could you paint the Mona
> Lisa? Not that painting a work of art or riding a bicycle has all that
> much to do with radio, itï¿½s just to point out that while you may have
> been able to master the code with some degree of success, that doesnï¿½t
> necessarily mean that everyone has the same ability as you.

Uphill, both ways...

Or you ain't schitt...

> All that is nonsensical blather having no bearing whatever on ham
> radio qualification nor testing. More totally inaccurate anologies of
> the NCI variety.

Uphill both ways...

> >> I would argue that the ability to master the code has no apparent
> connection with how ï¿½goodï¿½ a ham a person is. What we want, I think you
> will agree, is someone who will respect our traditions, follow the
> rules, bring enthusiasm and vigor to the hobby, and make a positive
> contribution.
>
> How about someone who wants to do more than spend ALL their radio time
> looking into a microphone?

The last time I "looked" into a microphone, I was rigging up a
repeater controller to a mic circuit.

The code IS a vital part of ham radio, not
> just some "hazing ritual" nonsense as so often quoted by the codehating
> NCI set.

Hazing ritual nonsense...

> >>So, whoï¿½s to say that mastering Morse code skills makes a better ham?
> I would not be so arrogant as to think such a thing.
>
> It's NOT arrogance, it's a valid useful qualifcation. You pander to
> the codebashers with this nonsense for curious, hidden reasons.
>
arrogant hazing ritual...

> >> Every time I get to feeling superior, I look around, and guess what?
> - - - I can find someone who is better at something, anything, than
> me.

Me too, but not DICK.

I can also name several individuals that I think are in one way or
> another ï¿½better hamsï¿½ than I, better operators, better engineers, better
> at some aspect of our hobby than me. Might that be true with you too?

Nope, not DICK.

> Well, how about that! We all have different talents and
> qualifications. So for that reason, we must totally downgrade ham radio
> to the status of stamp collecting. What a blast! And you have the simple
> arrogance to call THAT arrogance!
>
Coin collectors are superior to stamp collectors, right?
>
> >>Like anything else, when a person finds he or she has a need to use
> Morse code, they will learn it .
>
> **THAT** is truly laughable,

Except in real life situations.

For example, all WWII POW's that used Morse Code were dity-bopping
trained radio operaqtors.

Hi hi hi!!!

They learned what they needed - as they needed it.

particularly so coming from a fellow who
> claims to be a code user himelf. Any code user who actually
> does use it knows much better than that. You DON'T and CAN'T learn the
> code on the spur of the moment, just "when you need it".
> What total nonsense!

Yes, what total nonsense those WWII POW's were.

You probably fly their black POW flags upside down.

Rally round McCain.

> >>>Will ham radio turn into CB? No, it woni¿½t. In the first place, CB
> is essentially an unlicensed service.
>
> I might remind you that CB was a licensed service, until the outlaws
> took it over, realizing that there was nothing an undersized
> underfunded FCC could do to stop them.

That is the beauty of freedom.

Are you are so uninformed as to
> believe that something very similar couldn't happen to ham radio when in
> fact it HAS gone well into that direction -as noted by you in this very
> document!

I prefer to focus on the foolishness of the coded elite. Its much
more easy to zero in on.

> >> Secondly, there are still the written exams, and add to that peer
> pressure from other hams, and the fact that hams must use call signs,
> instead of i¿½handlesi¿½, and there is just no comparison.
>
> Oh, **HUGE** deal, those question pool writtens and CB handles. The
> only thing that has salvaged ham radio in the years since the question
> pools and VE testing started *IS* the code test. When that is gone,
> there goes the rest of the farm.

Morse Code is my saviour, I shall not want...

> >>Will dropping the Morse requirement remove a i¿½filteri¿½ that keeps out
> poor operators, i¿½CB Radioi¿½ types, scofflaws, and so on? I think not.
>
> I think not, too. Code testing has never been a perfect filter,

PERFECT FILTER???

But you have used it as a filter.

and
> there has always been those who got illicit licenses, even in the days
> when FCC gave the tests.

Now, now, now. Bruce got his Extra through a VE.

There was the Conditional licensing program,
> which was widely abused. And there were always ways to get a license
> without actually taking ANY test, such as paying someone to go to the
> FCC office and take the test in one's place.

Perhaps for $250 and a perfect score?

Yes, that happened, and no
> one knows how often. You see, until fairly late in the FCC testing era
> no ID was required, just show up at the FCC office, fill out the forms
> and take the tests. One could put any name and address he wanted on the

> forms, and that name became the licensee. It wasn't all that difficult,
> even then. And you KNOW that all VE's properly handled their test
> sessions, right. FCC enforcement logs show otherwise. So to blandly
> say that all those HF troublemakers are all code tested hams is simply
> assuming an invalid conclusion.

True. Some legitimately passed the 20WPM Morse Code exams, and could
Easily pass a 40WPM exam if it existed. Some people are just jerks,
and Morse Code doesn't make it otherwise, not matter what Parson Jim
or WzeroEX want to beleive.

> >>Listen to 75 meters on any given evening, or 20 meters above 14300
> during the day, and all too often what you hear is a cacophony of
> indecent language, illegal operation, intentional interference, music,
> poor sportsmanship, you name it. And every one of those characters
> passed a code test! Whether it was 5 or 13 or 20 WPM, they all passed a
> test. Some filter, huh?
>
> Better by far than none. At least some majority of licensees were
> people who actually had interest enough to do it right and stay within
> the rules and live by some sort of ham's creed. But never all of them,
> as noted above. And if you don't know that this situation has gotten
> much worse in the past couple decades you haven't been paying attention.

DICK, I might refer you to my comments re the NPRM98:

"What I fear most about the restructuring is the lack of enformcement

and what I fear most about maintaining the status quo is the lack of
enforcement."

i.e., it HAS NOTHING TO DO WHATSOVER WITH THE MORRIS CODE.

> >> Suppose, just for a moment, that a petition got filed requesting
> that the FCC make the following changes: Take the present HF Novice
> bands on 80, 40, 15, and 10 meters and reassign them to voice operation.
>
> How did I know this was coming??? In an age where digital rules
> supreme, we MUST have more room to yak into a microphone.
>
DICK, do your LE cronies YAK into a microphone, or do they send code
via a Titanic $200 telegraph key?
>
> >>Move the corresponding phone segments down by the appropriate
> amount. Change the segments open to various classes of license to fit,
> and let the new ï¿½Communicatorï¿½ licensees have access to the HF bands in
> 50 or 100 KHz blocks. For example, and this is just an illustration, 40
> meters could end up looking something like this:
>
> 7000 - 7025 Extra, CW and data only
> 7025 - 7100 All classes, including communicator, CW and data only
> 7100 - 7150 Extra, all modes

> 7150 - 7250 Extra and General, all modes
> 7250 - 7300 All classes, including communicator, all modes

Naw, 7000 - 7300 all classes, all modes.

> Similar adjustments would be done at 80, 15, and 10 meters.
> In other words, what we will have done is to ï¿½slideï¿½ the phone bands
> down the equivalent amount of the former novice segment, and allowed the
> new communicators access to the top 50 KHz of the voice band.
> Traditionally, higher-class licensees have been given access to the
> lower frequency segments within a band, and this would remain true. No
> one loses anything! Generals and Extras get some new phone bands, even
> former Novices, (now upgraded to Communicator) get more room in the CW
> >>segment, and access to a portion of the phone band.
>
> And put all the rank beginners right down against the bottom 25 where
> they'll feel right at home! Sure, why not? Nothing like trashing up the
> entire band (save a paltry 25khz) with the greenest of the green.

Get to work DICKless. Edjucate the masses. Trashing need not occur.

After
> all, this is ONLY a hobby, nobody takes any of it seriously anyway. GAG!

GAG? We've been gagging on your bile for years. Time for you to put
up or shut up.

> And don't DARE call me anti-beginner----nothing could be farther from
> the truth.

So why did you quit you VE Team again?

Obviously you have no concept of what it takes to get new
> hams indoctrinated and assimilated into the hobby or you would never put
> forth such a concept.

Welcome to the world of recruiting. Imagine yourself an Army
recruiter and being told to assimilate "an army of uno."

Now don't smear your tears on your sleeve and grab your ball(s) and go
home.

Be a team player or go to Leavenworth.

Of course there should be overlap,
> no one wants the old days of the Novice Reservation,

The ACLU might have sumptin to say about that. Beware Billy Jack.

but even that was
> useful in its day. But to dump rank beginners all the way down to the
> lower 25 is --- I'll go ahead and say it - it's dumb, and does neither
> them nor anyone else good service. You carry inclusiveness way too far.

So you want them to shack up at your place till they gradjiate?

Gradjiate from what?

> Allow them a good overlap--keep the old Novice segments for them to use-
> DIGITALLY with experienced hams to talk with,

Fuch that. You MAKE experienced hams populate that arena and I'll buy
into it.

From here on, all General, Advanced, and Extra licensees must spend
the first TWO hours of EVERY operating period in the Novice ghettos
handing out benevolent CW qso's.

Hi hi hi hi hi!

Never happened in the good ole days, won't happen it he good ole now.

Now what?

plus another 25kc below
> into General territory where they can mix it up with experienced hams on
> their own turf, digital and CW - oops, they'd have to learn the code for
> that. Sorry.

Sorry 'bout what? They gotta spend the first two hours there whether
they have a QSO or not. Sorry, but thats just the way it is. Ham
radio wasn't meant for everybody.

Hi hi hi hi hi.

Give them some phone privileges in each band, yes. But
> there is *no* justification for handing them near-carte blanche.

Especially Carte Blanch for the likes of you.

> >>>As we all know, several petitions requesting that the FCC remove
> Morse code testing have been filed. Depending on how soon a NPRM is
> issued, assuming it is at all, then we have to wait while they slog
> their way through the rule making process. One of the things that will
> happen is that comments, both pro and con, will begin to accumulate.
> After a several weeks or at most a few months, and assuming the majority
> of comments are in favor of eliminating the code as a licensing
> requirement, then we plan to file for a waiver asking for an immediate
> end to code testing. Obviously, this can only be done if there are
> enough favorable comments on file for the FCC to justify granting such a
> waiver. The actual change in the FCC rules will still be in progress,
> but if we can show that there is enough interest, and that such a waiver
> will be beneficial >>to Amateur Radio as a whole, then there is a good
> chance it would be granted.
>
> Let's not count our NPRMs before they're hatched. FCC has said,
> correctly, they're in no hurry to close out the book on code testing -
> if it does it at all.

They didn't say that.

There is *NO*
> valid reason to dump all code testing, although most everyone seems to
> be ready for reasonable HF access for those with no code test. I agree
> with John Johnston, at least partly, in that it is a true fact that no
> Extra class could ever be considered an expert amateur without proven
> ability to use radiotelegraphy, radio's most basic mode.

Jim says radiotelephone is the equivalent of radio's most basic mode.

Why do you disagree?

I hope you do
> know that it remains as the second-most-used mode in ham radio.

Next to phone, which Jim says is one of radios most basic and
elementary modes, re 1906.

> Strangely that seems to make no difference to you and Fred and your
> Agenda. Yes, you have an Agenda. You're doing a marvelous job of
> describing it here.

Jim says phone is the equivalent of CW in primacy and equivalency with
CW.

> >>CW is a great mode. Itï¿½s fun. I enjoy it. And, itï¿½s time to move on.
>
> Well, move on at your pleasure. But don't think you can move the rest
> of ham radio so easily. Reminder: Radiotelegraphy **IS TODAY**
> the second most used mode in ham radio.

Jim says that radiophone was essential as far back as 1906, years
befor the requirement of radiotelephony at 10 wpn was required.

Why don't DICK and Rev. Jim get together and work out the details of
the PHONE and CW debate and get back to use at their earliest
convenience.

To blithely attempt to dump it
> just because you're interested in other pursuits, like making yourself
> famous by asserting your own version of restructuring ham radio just
> won't work. There's too many guys like me still around.

So when did you dump FSTV?

> >>Are we ï¿½dumbing downï¿½ amateur radio? Are you kidding? Have you
> looked at the new Extra class tests? Could you honestly say you could
> pass one, picked at random, ï¿½coldï¿½? I couldnï¿½t, at least not without
> some serious study of the books.

Oh Jeezus. Here goes the whole Bruce thing again.

> What,you no longer have a useful memory? For that's what the question
> pools require- a good working memory, not for learning the material but
> for basically learning which answer goes with what question. Yes, still.
> You "learn the test", how to pass it and get the license, not to learn a
> lot of radio. Trying to actually learn what all that stuff means

> actually gets in the way of the goal of getting the license for those
> unschooled in radio. To assert otherwise is nonsense. Remember, I too
> have given *lots* of VE tests. Fortunately many new hams are actually
> interested enough to go ahead and learn some radio after licensing, but
> that is by no means a general trait. If you don't believe it you haven't
> been paying attention.

Are you DICK CARROLL, or Dick Bash?

> >> I've been licensed since the late 50's. Extra since the 70ï¿½s.
> Even had a ï¿½First Classï¿½ commercial radiotelephone, with both the radar
> and aircraft endorsements - passed all the elements in one sitting,
> missed at most 3 or 4 questions on any given section - a couple were
> perfect. And, except for the Novice, did this while sitting in front of
> the FCC themselves, no less. Never flunked a FCC code or theory exam.
> Never. So what? That and a dollar will get me a cup of coffee.

So what's you're fuchin' problem with latter day saints?

> So welcome to the club.

Sechond du nuone.

I took the Novice exam in late December
> 1956,and received the license the first of March, 57.

Did you copy the Russkies satellite on 20M cw?

By late May I was
> ready for the Conditional - I lived 260 miles from the FCC district
> office.

Whaaaaah!

I was contented to remain there indefinitely until Incentive
> Licensing took away some of my favorite spectrum.

Whiiiiine!

So instead of carping
> forever I studied up and sat in on many a session of W1AW code practice
> and soon took my Conditional ticket to the FCC at Kansas City and
> brought home the Extra.

You dah Mahnnn!

That required that I go through the 13 wpm code
> test, General and Advanced writtens, plus the 20wpm code test and Extra
> written, all in one session. But I made it. Oh, I too had a First Phone
> with endorsements.

Phone? What da fuch a fone?

I was a graduate of Fort Monmouth and the Signal
> School.

You got paid to earn an amateur license?

So typical of the "I had to do it and you damed well have to do it
too" genre!

But unwilling to pay the next guy.

I agree, it means little now. But to blithely dismiss all that
> in favor of near-instant licensing of anyone with the mildest of
> interest in ham radio is not the answer to securing the future of the
> hobby/service.

As I said, you pay today's homeless three hots and a cot and they'll
be 20wpm Extras too, and you can discuss all day long (via CW) the
menu at the Salvation Army kitchen.

To say that the past has no value in considering the
> future is to dismiss all that has gone before.

DIS-missed!

I think we know better
> than that. "The past is prologue".
> It's difficult to see how you "change it all" types can't understand
> that the future builds on the past.

Yep, like sliding crappy code on a bug to thwart real digital copy.

Slime ball.

> It's getting late, so... To wrap this up , I agree with part of your
> proposal. We do need a valid equivalent of the old Novice back again,
> updated to meet the times, of course. But let's not leap too far for our
> footing, lest we wind up swimming in a swamp of inexperience. Give the
> beginners plenty modes to learn and plenty of room in which to learn
> and use them. But let's retain some semblence of normalcy. And
> yes--experience, tenure, knowledge and skill, *including Morse code
> skill* *DOES* still count for something.

Jeesus! Keep thumping that drum.

> To dump all code testing for the Extra class license will be the
> beginning of the deterioration of ham radio such that I really don't
> want to contemplate where it would end.

One (1) smart guy will revolutionize all of the ARS. Why must you
keep shooting remington high speeds when federal match will put you in
the 10X ring?

The experience of the past 30
> years is a good but cautionary indicator of where it leads.

Oh, yes. Let's be cautious. Let's discourage that one (1) smart guy.

You idiot.

Yes, I'm
> talking to some degree of what happened to CB, and to ham radio as a
> part of that CB degeneration, for a great many hams have come from CB.
> Many of them have become good hams. But far too many have brought the
> worst attributes of CB with them. To ignore the certainty of adding to
> this baggage by making full HF access much too easy is unconscionable
> and potentially destructive to an extent that is most unpleasant to
> contemplate.
>
> 73, Dick W0EX

Extra DICK, you have brought some of the worst attributes of CB with
you. Why did you have to do that? Did you think we needed your
CB-like absolutism in the ARS?

Sayonara.

Brian

1218. Re: A New Concept: Virtual Spectrum

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-16 02:57:03 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0310151857.48ae45f7@posting.google.com>
Source record: 80794

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20031015020558.25517.00001336@mb-m15.aol.com>...
> In article <Za1jb.1091$_i.100686@nnrp1.ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
> <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:
>
> >"David Stinson" <arc5@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
> >news:3F8B5B6B.8E5123D@ix.netcom.com...
> >> Roy Lewallen wrote:
> >> >
> >> > I apologize for being a little vague about this. Are you proposing
> >> > replacing wireless communication with wired communication (via the
> >> > Internet) as a way to communicate with inadequate radio equipment?
> >>
> >> "Wireless" doesn't always work, if you're in a "noise hole,"
> >> or if the mode or radio you want to use isn't "legit" anymore.
> >> So that's one use, yes.
> >> The idea is to use our own radios as source and sink,
> >> bypassing the vagaries of Mother Nature's propagation
> >> and local noise sources. Or, if you're in a "noise hole,"
> >> to bring spectrum to you from a "quiet" location.
> >> It also allows the use of heretofore prohibitied modes.
> >> For instance:
> >> In the article I detail how an old longwave maritime
> >> rig on 415 KC A2 can carry on a real-time CW QSO with
> >> someone using a modern rig on 40 meters.
> >> It will be a real boon for the "boatanchor" community.
> >> I do hope QST will consider it.
> >>
> >> TNX ES 73 DE Dave AB5S
> >
> >Sounds like a perfect article for this coming April's edition of QST
> >to me :-)
> >
> >Seriously - you can't be seriously suggesting that vulnerable infrastructure
> >be considered as a viable replacement for infrastructureless HF
> >communications?
> >
> >Again ... perhaps in the April (fools) edition of QST ...
>
> Carl, Unless Stinson has a pre-arranged contract to publish in
> any periodical, his submission is no guarantee of acceptance
> for publishing. His manuscript has to go in the "slush pile"
> with all other submissions for consideration by editors.
>

> Manuscript-wise, it may be that QST isn't getting much and any
> submission is ripe for page make-up in a future edition. Or, it
> could be that QST will actually consider the article as a viable
> alternative to QRM-killed-by-BPL HF ham bands...which are not
> yet plagued everywhere with BPL garbage. We will all get some
> insight to QST editors' concept of the future if this article gets
> printed.
>
> However, October and November manuscript submission dates
> would be about right for first-of-April, 2004, issues. :-)
>
> Care for a PDF copy of the infamous/famous Signetics "Write
> Only Memory" ad of years ago? :-)
>
> LHA

Perhaps Semper Fi Steve could shed some light on whether Dave's comments are original and worthy of publication in any periodical, whether QST, 73, or Ham Radio.

He is, after all, the "at large" editor of original material for amatuer publications.

Sayonara

1219. Re: BPL a reality in my area now!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-16 02:58:52 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0310151858.755a1d16@posting.google.com>
Source record: 80795
Cross-posted to: alt.ham-radio,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:<fh2jb.108631$qj6.4727200@news1.news.adelphia.net>...
> James Wilson wrote:
> > What does BPL sound like? Can someone post a wav file somewhere so it can
> > be identified? Is it worse that the Pennsylvania QSO party?
>
> Did someone take over a frequency you owned?
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -

Mike, that was kinda rude.

1220. Re: Dear Mother Brakob...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-16 03:09:42 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0310151909.1c393a94@posting.google.com>
Source record: 80796

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20031014141010.29815.00001142@mb-m21.aol.com>...
> In article <5ee63311.0310132034.23d9cbeb@posting.google.com>,
> groupk0hb@earthlink.net (Hans K0HB) writes:
>
> >lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote
> >
> >> On-off keying was
> >> adopted simply because it was the ONLY WAY POSSIBLE for
> >> early, primitive radio to allow communications. It's just
> >> practical applied physics. Nothing else.
> >>
> >Oh shit, you got it wrong again!

Now you've done it. Rev Jim will stop reading at this point ?(unless
he invokes the PCTA double standard).

> >In Boston, on Christmas Eve of 1906, modulating a spark transmitter,
> >Reginald Fessenden made a holiday broadcast of a short spoken
> >introduction, some recorded Christmas music, and played "Oh Holy
> >Night" on a violin.

Did you enjoy it? What antenna (aerial) did you use? What detector
(receiver) did you use?

> >Obviously on-off keying was not the ONLY WAY POSSIBLE (your emphasis)
> >for early ("spark") radio to allow communications.

MIG, TIG, or ordinary ARC welding?

> >"Dear Mother Anderson, your son Leonard is failing in practical
> >applied physics. Perhaps he would benefit from a stint in the Army to
> >learn a useful trade."
> >
> >Sunuvagun! Good luck on this one now.
>
> Dear Mother Brakob,
>
> Your offspring is once again confused, perhaps suffering from
> dittybopper dementia from spending too much time listening to
> beeping or seminarian studies of official documents from Newington.
>
> The following is a direct quote from the Special Commemorative
> Issue of McGraw-Hill's "Electronics" magazine of April 17, 1980,
> page 75, right-hand column, section titled "History before 1930."
> That issue is 650 pages total, was printed in celebration of 50 years

> of "Electronics" magazine existance.

STOP! Do not attempt to inject authority into the equation.

> "The broadcast television that followed two decades later, would,
> of course, not have been possible without proper transmitters,
> receivers, modulators, demodulars, etc. --or, in other words,
> without proper radio. The world had been introduced in the potential
> of such a radio system as far back as 1906, when on Christmas
> Eve Prof. Reginal A. Fesenden of Harvard University made the first
> documented radio broadcast of speech and music. For this feat, he
> used a 50-KHz Alexanderson alternator, manufactured by the
> General Electric Co. Telegraph operators on ships crossing the
> North Atlantic were surprised on the historic night to hear music
> coming out of earphones that previously had emitted nothing but
> dots and dashes. Fessenden modulated the alternator's 1-KW
> output simply by putting a microphone in series with the antenna of
> his experimental station at Brant Rock, Mass. It is likely, but not
> certain, that the microphone was water-cooled."

Imagine if he had forgotten where he had put his microphone, re Larry,
Dick, an Moe.

> Mother Brakob, please point out, highlight if necessary with a yellow
> marker pen, that the transmitter was an ALTERNATOR, not the
> damped-wave "spark" type your son scribbled in angry crayon.
> Specifically, an ALEXANDERSON ALTERNATOR. ONE
> KILOWATT output.

Alex-ANDERSON has a nice ring to it, doesn't it?

> You may wish to give your son a primer on electricity explaining
> power losses in resistive conductors. That is important considering
> the microphone used by Fessenden was IN SERIES WITH THE
> ANTENNA CARRYING CURRENT SUFFICIENT FOR ONE
> KILOWATT RADIO FREQUENCY POWER OUTPUT.
>
> Best of good luck on that one, Mother Brakob. [you are going to
> need it]
>
> LHA

Wonder if Mother Brakob lived in a shoe?

> PS: You may wish to contact ARRL psychiatric services privately
> for a list of competent mental health professionals in your area who
> are specialists in the dementia of dittybopper data distortion attempted
> on historical facts gathered by professional publishers.

Cudbe a Jody song for the USN?

1221. Re: Opposing BPL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-16 03:14:58 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0310151914.299a4ff6@posting.google.com>
Source record: 80797
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Jim Hampton" <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote in message
news:<j_hjb.7334$Mk4.7148@news01.roc.ny>...
> Brian,
>
> I don't know about you, but I received a whole week pass from Belleveu :)
>
> 73 from Rochester, NY
> Jim AA2QA

So you got three hots and a cot AND a weeks pass (all paid) and the
rest of us have to learn it because you had to do it?

That's not the way it works anymore.

I'm no longer an instrument of national policy.

1222. Re: What makes a Pro code test Amateur a Troglodyte?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-16 03:17:16 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0310151917.19a3a250@posting.google.com>
Source record: 80798

wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) wrote in message
news:<20031015122455.08934.00000374@mb-m11.aol.com>...
> >Now "Now you're talking" is well over 200 pages of material for folks to
> >study and absorb ... how this is "dumbing down" is beyond me.
> >
> >Can we put this one to bed now?
> >
> >73,
> >Carl - wk3c
>
> I cant wait to hear Karl cry when the next proposal for Dumbing Down comes
> out.

I cain't wait for dipschidt Bruice to be granted a brain by the grate Oz.

1223. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-16 03:20:30 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0310151920.5b473c6a@posting.google.com>
Source record: 80799

Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message news:<3F8D997B.6050606@psu.edu>...
> Bill Sohl wrote:
> > "Dick Carroll" <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com> wrote in message
> >
> > Not at all, but I also believe that when it is obvious to the FCC that
> > a rule change is appropriate...even if a majority of hams oppose
> > that change...the FCC will do what it believes is right and in the
> > public interest. 98-143 serves as a bellweather to that since, if
> > most hams favored 5wpm General and 12 wpm Extra, the FCC
> > didn't buy it.
>
> Bill, while you like to bring out this argument when discussing
> Elimination of Morse code, I'd like to suggest you imagine some
> situation where something you like about the ARS is going away.
>
> Now assume that someone brings up the same point, that is:
>
> I also believe that when it is obvious to the FCC thata rule change is
> appropriate...even if a majority of hams oppose
> that change...the FCC will do what it believes is right and in the
> public interest.
>
> I'll bet you would interpret that a invitation by the poster for you to
> go away and kee quiet!
>
>
> Perhaps we should use those words for say... BPL? Ad a few words to the
> beginning, and:
>
> <<<NO QUOTE of yours, just an example here>>>
>
> As regards to the FCC approving the nationwide deployment of BPL, I also
> believe that when it is obvious to the FCC that a rule change is
> appropriate...even if a majority of hams oppose that change...the FCC
> will do what it believes is right and in the public interest.
>
> I'm trying to say that while a truism, it isn't necessarily a good
> argument. See what I mean?
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -

Yeh, but he's talking to Dick.

1224. Re: 73 Magazine Says "73 and QRT"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-16 03:40:30 UTC
From: Brian Goldsmith <brian.goldsmith@nospamecho1.com.au>
Message-ID: <Oqojb.152610$bo1.108648@news-server.bigpond.net.au>
Source record: 80800
Cross-posted to:
rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

"Bill Newkirk" wrote in message

Now the manuals that came with the Bendix G-15 said you could always
call
customer support....

...althought I doubt there's anyone there now...

***** Wasn't it Tektronix power transformers that were also lifetime
guaranteed?

Brian Goldsmith.

1225. Re: BPL a reality in my area now!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-16 04:13:54 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <REMOVETHISkc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <bmm31b$olitc$9@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 80810

Fortunately Charter around here is somewhat ameanable (sp.?) to repairing
their systems, but it is a challenge still. Consumers Energy around here is
next to impossible to deal with though. I am still a strong proponent to
buried power lines as opposed to powerlines on poles.

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF1-FF2-MFR-(pending NREMT-B!)
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...

(snippage)
> a
> > trick to listen to if you are trying to listen to a station that is
> normally
> > always 5-9. If you run along a line of powerlines that happen to be
> > parallel to the roadway for a bit, forget listening to that station for
a
> > while.....
> >
> >
> > --
> > Ryan, KC8PMX
> > FF1-FF2-MFR
> > --. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
> > .. --. .... - . .-. ...
> >
>
> Tell me about it. I've been fighting with Alabama Power for 4 years. And
I
> still have noise.
>
> Dan/W4NTI
>
>

1226. Re: A New Concept: Virtual Spectrum

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-16 04:25:33 UTC
From: Gene Storey <nospam@cox.net>
Message-ID: <15pjb.409$t65.145@news1.central.cox.net>
Source record: 80801
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.antiques.radio+phono,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc

"Chuck Harris" <cfharris@erols.com> wrote
>
> This is in essence what NSA does with as much of the RF spectrum
> as they can, all over the globe. They have no idea what they have,
> but if you can tell them the time, the general location, and the
> frequency, they will hook up a receiver onto their data log, and
> look around for the signal. This is just what they did when that
> KAL plane was shot down, and NSA came up with the com signals of
> the fighters that did the deed.

Not only that, they decrypted the secure voice! If you listen to the audio
you can tell it was originally narrow-band secure voice, which was common
in the Soviet Air Defense forces and interceptors.

1227. Re: My response to Jim Wiley, KL7CC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-16 04:29:00 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <REMOVETHISkc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <bmm31d$olitc$10@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 80811

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:bmisin$rq8$0@208.206.142.98...
> My response to the document "Amateur radio in the 21st century" by Jim
> Wiley, KL7CC of the NCVEC
> ----------
>
> >>Will we lose something because we will no longer have the knowledge
> that all hams can at least understand and send CW, even if very slowly?
> Maybe, maybe not. You would be surprised at the number of applicants
> I see that actually want to learn CW - they think it will be fun.
> There's a novel concept - someone learning a skill because it is fun,
> not because the government says you must do it.

And as I have been saying all along.... these are the ones that the
pro-coders need to cultivate and work with if there is actually any merit to
morse code. Refusal to do something like that demonstrates the lack of
merit of morse....

> >>Like anything else, when a person finds he or she has a need to use
> Morse code, they will learn it .
>
> **THAT** is truly laughable, particularly so coming from a fellow who
> claims to be a code user himelf. Any code user who actually
> does use it knows much better than that. You DON'T and CAN'T learn the
> code on the spur of the moment, just "when you need it".
> What total nonsense!

I believe he was referring to casual use, not necessarily in an emergency.
Albeit slow, a person could still send code via a chart/cheatsheet if in an
emergency. Granted, decoding it may be a challenge for the person, but a
person could still alert someone for help. (Not saying this is a viable
normal solution though.)

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF1-FF2-MFR-(pending NREMT-B!)
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...

1228. Re: Opposing BPL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-16 05:30:17 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0310152130.7d19cb59@posting.google.com>
Source record: 80802
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Dave Shrader <david.shrader@comcast.net> wrote in message
news:<wjhjb.476057$2x.193575@rwcrnsc52.ops.asp.att.net>...
> The ARRL site, <http://www.arrl.org/tis/info/HTML/plc/#Field> , provides
> links to the following information:
>
> "PLC is a "carrier-current" system, designed to intentionally conduct
> signals using electrical wiring. Although a carrier-current device is an
> unintentional emitter, because the power lines have such a significant
> potential to radiate and because a practical carrier-current device
> generally needs more signal than the permitted conducted emissions
> levels for unintentional emitters, carrier-current devices are not
> required to meet those conducted-emissions limits, but are required to
> meet the general radiated emissions limits in Sec. 15.209.
>
> ï¿½ 15.209 states that the radiated emission limits of intentional
> radiators generally can't exceed the field strength levels specified in
> the following table:
>
> Frequency (MHz) Field Strength (microvolts/meter @meters)
>
> 0.009-0.490 2400/F(kHz) 300
>
> 0.490-1.705 24000/F(kHz) 30
>
> 1.705-30.0 30 30
>
> 30-88 100 3
>
> 88-216 150 3
>
> 216-960 200 3
>
> Above 960 500 3
>
> Carrier-current devices are "Verified" as described in the Part-15
> rules. This means that the manufacturer is required to test them to
> ensure that they comply with the FCC regulations. Under the present
> rules, they must be tested at 3 typical locations. "

What's the FCC definition of "typical locations"??

> Note that the HF Spectrum allows a S8 to S9 signal level, 30 uV/m at 30
> meters distance.

15.209 is the problem, it's grossly outdated, did not foresee anything like BPL and the limits needs to be revised downward which is one piece of this brawl. Ref: Tailpipe emissions regs, same basic problem, different pollution media.

Another piece of it is that the BPL crowd wants permission to bust the already inadequate limits in 15.209. They're playing the regulatory loopholes game. The Japanese jumped past their regulatory Catch-22 techo-babble and abolished BPL period. We need to follow the Japanese lead and we're working on it.

w3rv

1229. Re: What makes a Pro code test Amateur a Troglodyte?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-16 05:42:12 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bmlb3k$9o7$0@208.206.142.101>
Source record: 80803

Dee D. Flint wrote:

> "Hans K0HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:5ee63311.0310151705.30508343@posting.google.com...
>
>>n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote
>>
>>
>>>What level of written testing would you have if FCC adopts your 2 class
>>>structure?
>>>
>>
>>Two levels.
>>
>>A beginers level similar to our current Technician examination, with a
>>modest limit on power, and a non-renewable 10-year term.
>>
>>A regular level similar to our current Extra examination, with power
>>levels of 1.5KW as now.
>>
>
>
> Making the second level license examination equivalent to the current Extra
> examination sounds like it would drive people out of ham radio. That's
> simply too big a jump to expect people to take in one swallow

Not the way NCVEC has it all planned out, Dee.
Todays Extra = yesterdays Novice.

Dick

1230. Re: 73 Magazine Says "73 and QRT"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-16 06:16:17 UTC
From: Steve Silverwood <kb6ojs@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <MPG.19f704f893ce2b199896b0@news-60.giganews.com>
Source record: 80804
Cross-posted to:
rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

In article <bmgs1hssn6@208.206.142.105>, dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com
says...
> I dunno, Steve... I downladed a 46megabyte file from Germany last
> week and it only took about 5 hours with my snailpace dialup.(no
> broadband available here) Seems the website has a lot to do with how
> download speeds. Or maybe I just lucked into a good net route. It never
> even flinched during the entire process. Normally I would lose the link
> after a time.

The speed's only going to be as good as the slowest connection along the line. And I do admit that downloading a full copy of a magazine isn't going to be feasible for everyone, at least until broadband is widely available (via some other means than BPL!), but it's nice to have the option. Or perhaps it'll be possible to distribute magazines on CD-ROM?

Here's a business idea: set up an outfit as a clearing-house for radio-related magazines. Subscribe through the clearing-house and they burn a CD with all of the mags you get (CQ, PopComm, MT, whatever) each month and send it off to you. Just a thought....

--

-- //Steve//

Steve Silverwood, KB6OJS
Fountain Valley, CA
Email: kb6ojs@arrl.net
Web: http://home.earthlink.net/~kb6ojs_steve

1231. Re: 73 Magazine Says "73 and QRT"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-16 06:17:54 UTC
From: Larry Johnson <larryj@teleport.com>
Message-ID: <3F8E383C.7702F2DA@teleport.com>
Source record: 80805
Cross-posted to:
rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

And Motorola "Permakay" FM Receiver I.F. filters.
LJ

Brian Goldsmith wrote:
>
> "Bill Newkirk" wrote in message
>
> Now the manuals that came with the Bendix G-15 said you could always
> call
> customer support....
>
> ...althought I doubt there's anyone there now...
>
> ***** Wasn't it Tektronix power transformers that were also lifetime
> guaranteed?
>
> Brian Goldsmith.

1232. Re: 73 Magazine Says "73 and QRT"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-16 08:52:32 UTC
From: Frank <frank@127.0.0.1>
Message-ID: <k%sjb.784430$Ho3.210512@sccrnsc03>
Source record: 80806
Cross-posted to:
rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

Larry Johnson wrote:
> And Motorola "Permakay" FM Receiver I.F. filters.
> LJ
>
>
> Brian Goldsmith wrote:
>
>>"Bill Newkirk" wrote in message
>>
>>Now the manuals that came with the Bendix G-15 said you could always
>>call
>>customer support....
>>
>>...althought I doubt there's anyone there now...
>>
>>***** Wasn't it Tektronix power transformers that were also lifetime
>>guaranteed?
>>
>>Brian Goldsmith.
Thank God 73 went QRT...This magazine was boring anyway...I only bought one.

Frank K3EKO

1233. Re: What makes a Pro code test Amateur a Troglodyte?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-16 09:45:35 UTC
From: Bert Craig <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM>
Message-ID: <3Ntjb.2642$%B2.1571711@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>
Source record: 80807

"Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
news:z4njb.1255$_i.111153@nnrp1.ptd.net...
>
> "N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
> news:c2356669.0310150821.4841ec23@posting.google.com...
> [snip]
> >
> > How will we counter that argument?
>
> One approach would be to stop planting it in peoples'
> minds numerous times a day ... things that are repeated
> often enough sometimes catch on, even if they are BAD
> ideas ...
>
> Carl - wk3c

You mean like "the 5-wpm code exam is a barrier" or "it's a lid filter that keeps out CBers?" Gee, not only "BAD ideas"...untruths too.

--
73 de Bert
WA2SI
FISTS #9384

1234. Re: Why thirteen and twenty?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-16 11:08:48 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0310160308.586bb966@posting.google.com>
Source record: 80808

"Jim Hampton" <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote in message
news:<%5ijb.7350$xh4.6857@news01.roc.ny>...
> Jim,
>
> I had a 2nd class radiotelegraph license back in 1967. One needed to be 21
> (I was still a teenager) plus have sufficient service time to qualify for
> the 1st (I forget, but it seems it was one year at sea running
> communications under the supervision of a 1st telegraph). The second was 20
> words per minute and the 1st was 25 words per minute. From what I have
> heard, the 25 was sufficient to get you a not too good paying job on the
> slow side circuits whilst you had to be 100% copy and reliable at 30 to get
> the good jobs on the main circuits. Of course, this would pre-date 1967 by
> quite a few years :)

Phil Kane has posted that there was a *shortage* of licensed
radiotelegraph ops for the maritime services during the Vietnam
conflict. Supplies going to VN went mostly by ship, all of which were
US flag vessels....

Any connection to incentive licensing is pure speculation.
>
> From what I recall, back in the 60s you tended to hear the newcomers at 5 to
> 10 words per minute, a minor number in the 13 to 20 range, a number in the
> 30 word per minute range, and a surprising number in the 40 plus word per
> minute range. I did run into one guy that I had a problem with until he
> realized I wasn't the guy he was used to hearing at KG6NAC and finally
> slowed down to about 50 (which was really pushing limits for me at that
> time). I originally called cq at about 40 to 45 and he responded at around
> 60. Fortunately, I got most of his call but that was a bit much.
>
It's still that way today. 'tother night I had a nice QRQ ragchew with
a French amateur on the low end of 80. Had the bug weight waay back!

I recall a post sometime back where a veteran described a code test
for US Navy "A" school, circa 1958. The test was to receive, on a
standard Navy mill, 5 letter groups at 24 wpm. For a solid hour.
Maximum of 3 errors in the entire hour.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1235. Re: What makes a Pro code test Amateur a Troglodyte?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-16 11:58:52 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0310160358.5c7a6453@posting.google.com>
Source record: 80809

```
"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<5Vmjb.8788$kx.6935@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20031014223426.12631.00002121@mb-m28.aol.com...
> > In article <HE0jb.55912$mQ2.25777@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Bill
> > Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
> >
> > (old stuff removed)
> >
> > (N2EY wrote:)
> > >> Why
> > >> is a Technician licensee qualified to design/build/repair/align/modify
> and
> > >> most
> > >> of all operate a 6 meter rig but not a 15 meter rig - particularly when
> > >> it's the same rig?
> > >
> > >Actually, when you think about it...ANYONE is allowed to design, build,
> > >repair,
> > >align and/or modify ham equipment...it is ONLY the "operate" part that
> > >ultimately requires the license.
> > >
> > Excellent point! However, in the interests of strict correctness, note
> that
> > equipment which is manufactured for sale has to meet certain certification
> > requirements which licensed hams ar exempt from. In the case of RF power
> > amplifiers, a licensed amateur can homebrew things no manufacturer can
> legally
> > sell.
> >
> > >> Look at the FCC enforcement logs. Problems due to technical
> incompetence
> > >> are
> > >> very few in the ARS, and those that do happen are not clustered on any
> > >> particular license class.
> > >>
> > >> So why do we need all that written testing beyond Tech?
> > >
> > >Jim, you keep bringing up what you believe are analogies
> > >to the ode test issue and I'm not gonna play anymore. the
> > >argument(s) fail to convince the FCC and I don't see you
> > >making them to the FCC either. If and when someone attempts to petiton
> > >for the changes you suggest are analogous...then I'll argue further.
> >
```

> > The code test issue will be decided by FCC one way or the other, sooner or
> > later. I'm not worried about it, they'll decide whatever they decide.
> >
> > My concern is simply that if someone or some group starts using the same
> > arguments against much of the writtens, they're going to be difficult to
> > defend.
>
> That is your opinion...I think otherwise.

OK, fine.

> You and I can join forces to
> defend writtens...if and when someone does try to end
> writtens.

An out-and-out removal of the written test would be opposed by almost everyone, so no one with any sense will suggest that. Not right away, anyhow.

What I'm talking about is efforts to gradually reduce the level of written testing. Take a few things out here and reduce the level of a few other things there, change the testing method a little someplace else, etc. Not just for entry-level but for all levels.

For example, what would you say to a proposal to remove the regulations questions from the entry-level exam? No questions on Part 97 - just require each new ham to certify that they have provided themselves with a copy, have read it, understand it, and will follow it. Good idea or bad idea?

> Frankly, I don't think it'll happen on my watch.

It's already started. See what the NC-VEC leadership has in mind for the future. The above is just one of their ideas. I think it's a very bad idea.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1236. Re: What makes a Pro code test Amateur a Troglodyte?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-16 12:28:18 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031016082818.07578.00001148@mb-m25.aol.com>
Source record: 80816

In article <sRmjb.1752$P%1.1455394@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> writes:

>Making the second level license examination equivalent to the current Extra
>examination sounds like it would drive people out of ham radio.

That depends on how it's done. If a person knows from the start that they have 10 years to get ready for the upgrade, they have a goal and can set a timeline to meet it.

There's also the possibility (I don't know if Hans' plan would allow this or not) to allow Beginners to simply take the Beginner test again if they're not ready to upgrade after 10 years.

>That's
>simply too big a jump to expect people to take in one swallow so to speak
>especially since this would affect current Technicians who entered the
>licensing program under a system with 3 tiers (or more for those who entered
>several years ago).

That all depends on how the transition is handled.

Perhaps all existing hams would simply get Regulars. Or maybe all existing hams except Novices.

Or perhaps existing hams would have their existing licenses and privileges extended/renewed until 10 years after the new system went into effect, putting everyone on the same timeline for upgrading.

>It would also take away privileges from existing Techs
>in that they are now receive renewable licenses but would not under that
>proposal.

See above - it all depends how the transition is handled.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1237. Re: What makes a Pro code test Amateur a Troglodyte?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-16 12:28:22 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031016082822.07578.00001149@mb-m25.aol.com>
Source record: 80817

In article <5ee63311.0310151705.30508343@posting.google.com>,
groupk0hb@earthlink.net (Hans K0HB) writes:

>n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote
>
>> What level of written testing would you have if FCC adopts your 2 class
>> structure?
>
>Two levels.
>
>A beginers level similar to our current Technician examination, with a
>modest limit on power, and a non-renewable 10-year term.
>
>A regular level similar to our current Extra examination, with power
>levels of 1.5KW as now.

Thanks for a clear and concise answer, Hans. I can see some merit in this idea, and some problems too. At first I saw only the problems, but after some consideration I see the merits too (simplicity, uniform access to bands for all hams, incentive to upgrade).

A few questions on this idea:

- What happens to existing hams' licenses? Does everybody get a Beginner, or a Regular, or do some get Beginner and some get Regular?

- If a Beginner isn't ready to pass the Regular exam after 10 years, can he/she retake the Beginner exam and get a new license? Or do they have to leave ham radio until they can pass the Regular?

- Can the Regular license test be taken straightaway or is there an experience requirement of having a Beginner license for a period of time?

Your answers are eagerly anticipated.
>
>> I invite you to read KL7CC's paper on the AL7FS website and see what
>> NCVEC thinks about the future - besides code testing.
>
>I've read it.

Thanks for taking the invitation.

>I don't agree with their vision of the future.
>
Me neither, but whatever they propose will be given serious consideration by FCC. That's why I think it needs to be discussed, rather than wait for a proposal or NPRM and then try to fight it.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1238. Re: 73 Magazine Says "73 and QRT"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-16 13:23:28 UTC
From: Doug Smith W9WI <w9wi@invalid.invalid>
Message-ID: <3F8E9BC8.5050506@invalid.invalid>
Source record: 80812
Cross-posted to:
rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

Dick Carroll wrote:
>> That is, if they don't get wise and start looking into ways of
>> publishing that do away with the costs of publishing. Monitoring
>> Times has done it right by making their magazine available in PDF
>> format, downloadable each month from their FTP site. They provide a
> I dunno, Steve... I downladed a 46megabyte file from Germany last week
> and it only took about 5 hours with my snailpace dialup.(no broadband
> available here) Seems the website has a lot to do with how download
> speeds. Or maybe I just lucked into a good net route. It never even
> flinched during the entire process. Normally I would lose the link after
> a time.
>
> Good idea really, with the PDF subscription. I'll have to take a look at
> Monitoring Times site.

Or on a mailed CD.. Both QST and Monitoring Times are available that
way, (among others) though unfortunately only with the whole year's
issues on a single disk. (i.e., it's only available at the end of the
year) Fantastic idea, I love it! No more realizing the article I want
is in the July issue - and I can only find June and August...

I wonder if broadband prices will ever drop to dialup levels?
Personally I have a very hard time justifying the (very) roughly
$200/year difference.

On the other hand, we may be fast approaching the point where the sum
total of the malicious executable emails being spammed into our
mailboxes and the critical updates necessary to protect against them
every day will take more than 24 hours to download via dialup!
--
Doug Smith W9WI
Pleasant View (Nashville), TN EM66
http://www.w9wi.com

1239. Re: What makes a Pro code test Amateur a Troglodyte?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-16 14:15:54 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bmm96qlfj0@208.207.71.134>
Source record: 80813

N2EY wrote:

> What I'm talking about is efforts to gradually reduce the level of
> written testing. Take a few things out here and reduce the level of a
> few other things there, change the testing method a little someplace
> else, etc. Not just for entry-level but for all levels.
>

Jim, anyone who doesn't realize that's exactly what has been happening
for a long time now hasn't been paying attention.

> For example, what would you say to a proposal to remove the
> regulations questions from the entry-level exam? No questions on Part
> 97 - just require each new ham to certify that they have provided
> themselves with a copy, have read it, understand it, and will follow
> it. Good idea or bad idea?
>
>
>>Frankly, I don't think it'll happen on my watch.
>
>
> It's already started. See what the NC-VEC leadership has in mind for
> the future. The above is just one of their ideas. I think it's a very
> bad idea.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

1240. Re: What makes a Pro code test Amateur a Troglodyte?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-16 15:16:50 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <CDyjb.1319$_i.115279@nnrp1.ptd.net>
Source record: 80814

"Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in message
news:3Ntjb.2642$%B2.1571711@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net...
> "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
> news:z4njb.1255$_i.111153@nnrp1.ptd.net...
> >
> > "N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
> > news:c2356669.0310150821.4841ec23@posting.google.com...
> > [snip]
> > >
> > > How will we counter that argument?
> >
> > One approach would be to stop planting it in peoples'
> > minds numerous times a day ... things that are repeated
> > often enough sometimes catch on, even if they are BAD
> > ideas ...
> >
> > Carl - wk3c
>
> You mean like "the 5-wpm code exam is a barrier"?

That concept has been agreed in FCC comments by the ARRL,
QCWA, and other organizations besides NCI ... and the IARU
has recognized and resolved that continuation of the Morse test
requirement is not in the best interest of the ARS.

> or "it's a lid filter that keeps out CBers?"

That idea was rejected by the FCC both in 1990 and in
1999 ...

Carl - wk3c

1241. Re: What makes a Pro code test Amateur a Troglodyte?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-16 15:54:54 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031016115454.08854.00000295@mb-m14.aol.com>
Source record: 80815

>That idea was rejected by the FCC both in 1990 and in
>1999 ...
>
>Carl - wk3c

So that makes it a FACT, I guess the FCC is never wrong.

1242. Re: BPL a reality in my area now!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-16 16:52:32 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <k1Ajb.1330$_i.115715@nnrp1.ptd.net>
Source record: 80818

"Ryan, KC8PMX" <REMOVETHISkc8pmx@diamondcs.net> wrote in message
news:bmm31b$olitc$9@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de...
> Fortunately Charter around here is somewhat ameanable (sp.?) to repairing
> their systems, but it is a challenge still. Consumers Energy around here
is
> next to impossible to deal with though. I am still a strong proponent to
> buried power lines as opposed to powerlines on poles.

Even if the area distribution lines are buried, the wires come up
to (usually pad-mounted above ground) transformers and the
BPL signal will permeate all the wiring in your (and your
neighbors') house(s) ...

Underground distribution will help (some) but it doesn't actually
solve the problem.

Carl - wk3c

1243. Re: A New Concept: Virtual Spectrum

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-16 17:10:06 UTC
From: k7itm@aol.com
Message-ID: <3200347.0310160910.7d48a015@posting.google.com>
Source record: 80819
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.antiques.radio+phono,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc

Hmmmmm... It's interesting to speculate that you could get all
excited about doing this, build the required equipment, use your old
spark transmitter and coherer, and be talking with someone who is
using just the same equipment at the other end, except that his
equipment is "virtual". That is, he just uses processing power to
emulate a spark transmitter's emissions...

;-)

Thanks, but no thanks. I'd rather enjoy the challenge of
communicating through all the degradations that happen to waves
propagated through the air. It doesn't bother me one way or the other
if others adopt the technique, though.

Cheers,
Tom

David Stinson <arc5@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
news:<3F8B5B6B.8E5123D@ix.netcom.com>...
> Roy Lewallen wrote:
> >
> > I apologize for being a little vague about this. Are you proposing
> > replacing wireless communication with wired communication (via the
> > Internet) as a way to communicate with inadequate radio equipment?
>
> "Wireless" doesn't always work, if you're in a "noise hole,"
> or if the mode or radio you want to use isn't "legit" anymore.
> So that's one use, yes.
> The idea is to use our own radios as source and sink,
> bypassing the vagaries of Mother Nature's propagation
> and local noise sources. Or, if you're in a "noise hole,"
> to bring spectrum to you from a "quiet" location.
> It also allows the use of heretofore prohibitied modes.
> For instance:
> In the article I detail how an old longwave maritime
> rig on 415 KC A2 can carry on a real-time CW QSO with
> someone using a modern rig on 40 meters.
> It will be a real boon for the "boatanchor" community.
> I do hope QST will consider it.

1244. Re: Why thirteen and twenty?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-16 18:58:55 UTC
From: Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns9416986591EF5elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 80820

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in
news:20031015083047.12501.00003145@mb-m04.aol.com:

> In article <86ptgzumnq.fsf@duchess.twilley.org>, Jack Twilley
> <jmt+usenet@twilley.org> writes:
>
>>I can understand why Novice and Technician Plus required five words
>>per minute -- the treaty and all -- but why did General require
>>thirteen words per minute and Amateur Extra twenty words per minute?
>>
>>Is there a real reason?
>
> 12 to 13 wpm is generally agreed to be above the speed where things
> such as "counting dits" work for most people. It's the beginning of the
> skills which take one to higher speeds
>
> 20 wpm derives from the old 1923-24 "Amateur Extra First Class" which
> chose 20 as double the old 10 wpm standard. It was reintroduced in 1951
> when the current Amateur Extra class was created.
>
> Both speeds are far below those required of experienced professional
> Morse operators.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>

Experienced, yes, but no professional test went above 20wpm, which I think may be the real reason for the speed chosen for Extra. The 1st class Radiotelegraph licence in the US had random blocks at 16wpm and plain language at 20wpm, whereas UK radio officers had to copy random blocks at 20wpm. I think 20wpm was standard around the world for testing ship's radio officers. Of course, they don't have to do it anymore.

73 de Alun, N3KIP

1245. BPL: Any chance it's a "Jolly the Lobbyist Along" game?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-16 20:37:56 UTC
From: David Stinson <arc5@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3F8F019F.9D98FF3A@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 80821

Any chance the FCC commissioners are fully aware that BPL has no future,
and are just "jollying" the lobbyists along to get their campaign
contributions? After all, once they get the money, then:
"oops! Don't work like you said it did. Too bad- tough break etc."

1246. Re: Why thirteen and twenty?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-16 22:13:31 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <fKEjb.9978$kx.8048@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 80822

"Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
news:f45722ac.0310151646.3bb522d1@posting.google.com...
> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<xkejb.57045$mQ2.27686@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> > "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> > news:20031015083047.12501.00003145@mb-m04.aol.com...
> > > In article <86ptgzumnq.fsf@duchess.twilley.org>, Jack Twilley
> > > <jmt+usenet@twilley.org> writes:
> > >
> > > >I can understand why Novice and Technician Plus required five words
> > > >per minute -- the treaty and all -- but why did General require
> > > >thirteen words per minute and Amateur Extra twenty words per minute?
> > > >
> > > >Is there a real reason?
> > >
> > > 12 to 13 wpm is generally agreed to be above the speed where things
such
> > as
> > > "counting dits" work for most people. It's the beginning of the skills
> > which
> > > take one to higher speeds
> > >
> > > 20 wpm derives from the old 1923-24 "Amateur Extra First Class" which
> > chose 20
> > > as double the old 10 wpm standard. It was reintroduced in 1951 when
the
> > current
> > > Amateur Extra class was created.
> > >
> > > Both speeds are far below those required of experienced professional
Morse
> > > operators.
> > >
> > > 73 de Jim, N2EY
> >
> > One more thing Jim. 20 wpm is above another 'threshold', which is at
about
> > 18wpm for most folks. So you gotta know it to do it.
> >
> > Dan/W4NTI
>
>
> Welp Dan, as I strap on my dragon armor and jousting butt-plug, please
> orient me toward the 1951 anachronism of the 1923 AEFC standard.

>
> didididididit.

Lets see if you can understand this then;

If I want any crap out of you, I will squeeze your head.

Have a lousy day.

Dan/W4NTI

1247. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-16 22:17:31 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <%NEjb.9980$kx.8780@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 80823

"Clint" <rattlehead at computron dot net> wrote in message
news:vorsl2nsek1o04@corp.supernews.com...
>
>
> "Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
> news:3F8D997B.6050606@psu.edu...
> > Bill Sohl wrote:
>
> > Bill, while you like to bring out this argument when discussing
> > Elimination of Morse code, I'd like to suggest you imagine some
> > situation where something you like about the ARS is going away.
> >
>
> *sigh*
>
> It's code TESTING, not CODE, that is being pushed out the door.
> ad nauseum, this must be explained. Why is that?
>
>

Since you ask Clint...I'll try and explain it to you.

It is because you and your ilk are attacking those that enjoy the mode.
See how simple that is.

Now one more simple thing.....if you and your ilk would stop attacking those
that enjoy using Morse Code on the air, then perhaps the debate would be
more simple.

And finally.....if you don't. Then we take it personal. See ??

Dan/W4NTI

1248. Re: Code test analogy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-16 22:40:51 UTC
From: Mike McCarrey <wa7qzr@netscape.net>
Message-ID: <pan.2003.10.16.22.40.50.1231@netscape.net>
Source record: 80825

On Mon, 13 Oct 2003 20:27:37 +0000, No-coder wrote:

> Even though the testing for code was reduced to the basic 5 WPM over
> three years ago, it's obvious that the debate still rages on.
>
> The insistance that a person know Morse Code at a resonable speed in
> order to be "real ham" is similar to religious fanatics, particualrly
> Christian fundamentalists, who think that a person has to believe in god
> in order to be a good and moral person. They cannot prove that their god
> even exists. So with the PCTA, they cannot prove that code is useful in
> light of communications advancements that have been made over the past
> several decades.
>
> Just as certain fundamentalists would like to turn the country into a
> Judeo-Christian theocracy, so would certain hams go back to an outdated
> communications scheme, simply because they think that Morse code is
> their "god."
>
> To expect prospective hams to believe in the fairy tale of morse code is
> the the same as expecting people to believe in the fairy tales of the
> holy bible.

It'll be very difficult to address your "analogy" with any degree of fairness or objectivity, as you have, in your comments, already made yourself out to be an antagonist; in more than just one area.

Suffice it to say, then that, while there are legitimate arguments from both camps, yours is not one of them. What this argument represents is, in fact, one of the reasons people with real "code problems" now find it impossible to move out of the arena of the "glorified CBers", in the minds of most old timers.

There's nothing "antiquated" about CW. It doesn't require a computer to send or receive it. It can be received under the most horrible of communications conditions. There's nothing "religious" about those statements. Simple statements of fact. Arguments against them come from those uneducated in the history of radio; Those who have never constructed an vacuum-tube oscillator out of junk-box components. People who think "BFO" is a reference to a group of rappers.

Nevertheless, I'm one of those individuals who, thanks to the nonsense ideas represented by the posting I am responding to, have a very difficult, if not impossible task ahead of themselves where license upgrading is concerned.

I suffer from Tinnitus, which makes listening to CW for any length of time impossible. The tones, in my case, cause migraine headaches, which are accompained all manner of unpleasent side-effects. As it is, I have to use several notch filters to even listen to most HF traffic, because of all the "digital" nonsense on the air these days. At one time I could send CW at speeds close to 20WPM, according to those who listened beneath the 'phones. Unfortunately, that skill, without the ability to "listen" is next to useless.

When I was a kid, there were special licenses (Conditional Class) and medical exemptions for people who suffer with real problems, but now, thanks to the ilk who have adopted the attitude that every desire should be sataified without exerting even the least amount of effort, and abused those special considerations, they have been done away with; no exceptions. The baby got tossed out with the bathwater. Now, I get to try and learn CW all over again, using a bloody blinking light, of all things, which will be a skill even more usless than my present sending skill.

So, the whole point of this response is to say "Thank-you" to you, Mr. No-coder, and all your friends who, with all your "analogies" and other hairbrained ideas, arguments, and excuse-making, have made the license upgrade process for folks like me, all that more difficult.

CW must remain as a testable qualifier, There's no other way to prevent ham radio from becoming a kilowatt-wasteland of room-tempreture IQs, trying to out-shout each other with bogus Southern accents and reverb.

So all you anti-code folks out there, thanks; thanks a lot; thanks for nothing!

1249. Re: BPL a reality in my area now!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-16 22:43:33 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0310161443.eda8f10@posting.google.com>
Source record: 80824

"Ryan, KC8PMX" <REMOVETHISkc8pmx@diamondcs.net> wrote in message news:<bmm31b$olitc$9@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>...
> Fortunately Charter around here is somewhat ameanable (sp.?) to repairing
> their systems, but it is a challenge still. Consumers Energy around here is
> next to impossible to deal with though.

As Carl points out, burying the distribution doesn't solve the BPL problem. The whole idea is to deliver the BPL signal to every outlet in your house - and your garage, and your neighbors' houses, and the street lights...

> I am still a strong proponent to
> buried power lines as opposed to powerlines on poles.

There are pros and cons to aerial vs. underground utilities.

Except in dense areas like the downtowns of cities where the cost of duct lines is comparable to that of poles, the installation cost of aerial is much lower.

Although immune to most weather problems, buried utilities are subject to flooding. They are also not immune to lightning.

Buried electric power distribution is less efficient than aerial. This effect increases with voltage and distance, too. Burying the drop from the road to your house isn't an efficiency problem, but burying miles of medium and high voltage stuff *is*.

The net effect of burying a significant part of the aerial network would be to require the construction of many new generating facilities (and their pollution, etc.) to make up for the losses of the underground network. A real triple whammy - higher first cost of the line, lots of new plants to build and pay for, and higher overall operating cost.

And buried lines make our antennas stick out that much more ;-)

73 de Jim, N2EY

>

1250. Re: Any chance it's a "Jolly the Lobbyist Along" game?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-16 23:01:34 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <irFjb.1379$_i.117793@nnrp1.ptd.net>
Source record: 80826

"David Stinson" <arc5@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
news:3F8F019F.9D98FF3A@ix.netcom.com...
> Any chance the FCC commissioners are fully aware that BPL has no future,
> and are just "jollying" the lobbyists along to get their campaign
> contributions? After all, once they get the money, then:
> "oops! Don't work like you said it did. Too bad- tough break etc."

I don't believe so ... I believe that the Commissioners genuinely want
another broadband delivery alternative to spur competition with DSL,
cable modem, and WISPs ...

Besides, the Commissioners are appointees ... they don't have to
raise campaign funds.

Carl - wk3c

1251. Re: Any chance it's a "Jolly the Lobbyist Along" game?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-16 23:03:48 UTC
From: David Robbins <noone@nowhere.com>
Message-ID: <YcKdneV0FKlLvhKiU-KYgg@crocker.com>
Source record: 80827

"David Stinson" <arc5@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
news:3F8F019F.9D98FF3A@ix.netcom.com...
> Any chance the FCC commissioners are fully aware that BPL has no future,
> and are just "jollying" the lobbyists along to get their campaign
> contributions? After all, once they get the money, then:
> "oops! Don't work like you said it did. Too bad- tough break etc."

more likely its the bpl manufacturers hyping the technology to everyone and hoping to sell a bunch of it before the utilities find out how much it really costs, the users find out how poor it really performs, and the other users of the spectrum find out how much it really hurts.

1252. Re: FCC relaxes it's prohibition on use of the "F-word" on broadcast media. YKXWBSX7I6 01/03/2004

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-16 23:09:08 UTC
From: Dave Bushong <dbushong@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <oyFjb.109795$qj6.5300979@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 80828
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.shortwave

Richard Cranium wrote:

> Ron Hardin <rhhardin@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<3F8A6151.235F@mindspring.com>...
>
>>Dr. Anton Phibes wrote:
>>
>>>"This is really, really [expletive] brilliant," Bono said during
>>> the ceremony, using the f-word as an adjective.
>>>The speech aired live on the East Coast. The FCC said it
>>>received 234 complaints, all but 17 of them from individuals
>>>associated with the Parents Television Council, a nonprofit
>>>group that monitors programs for adult content.
>>
>>That's an adverb, not an adjective.
>
>
> Um, no; it is modifying "brilliant", which is a noun. Thus it is an adjective.

Um, no. A noun is a person, place, or thing. "Brilliant" is none of
these See
http://www.uottawa.ca/academic/arts/writcent/hypergrammar/nouns.html#noun
.

1253. Re: What makes a Pro code test Amateur a Troglodyte?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-16 23:10:36 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0310161510.48827dc4@posting.google.com>
Source record: 80829

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20031013204903.12300.00001142@mb-m20.aol.com>...
> In article <c2356669.0310131337.353df3fe@posting.google.com>, N2EY@AOL.COM
> (N2EY) writes:
>
> >"Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
> >news:<hGgib.785$_i.73747@nnrp1.ptd.net>...
> >> "Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
> >> news:20031012000943.23307.00003682@mb-m29.aol.com...
> >> > In article <bma161$cg2@library2.airnews.net>, "Kim W5TIT"
> <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
> >> > writes:
> >> >
> >> > >Therein lies the problem with the whole CW test (TEST, *test*) debate.
> The
> >> > >minute one takes on the "no" CW test argument, it is generally met with
> an
> >> > >attitude that an end CW use (USE, *use*) is being favored or called for.
> >> >
> >> > Kim:
> >> >
> >> > Code testing has always been the thing which generated code use.
> >>
> >> I would assert that being forced to learn code to gain access to HF
> >> "soured" more people on code use than it encouraged ... of course,
> >> some percentage of folks decided they liked code and continued to
> >> use it, but MANY simply endured something they had no interest in
> >> to get past the test, then "threw away the key."
> >>
> >> Remember the old adage "honey is better than vinegar."
> >
> >OK, fine, your opinion is well stated.
> >
> >Now consider that same logic applied to the written test.
> >
> >It could be asserted with equal logic that being forced to learn
> >theory and other subjects a ham is not interested in just to gain
> >access to amateur radio
> >"soured" more people on radio theory than it encouraged ... of course,
> >some percentage of folks decided they liked aspects of amateur radio
> >that they had not considered or known about before, but MANY simply
> >endured something they had no interest in to get past the test, then
> >"threw away the Handbook"
>

> Sorry, that cannot "be asserted with equal logic."

Sure it can. I just did. The claim applies to all required subjects,
not just Morse code.
>
> First of all, that analogy is reduced to the absurd.

Not absurd at all. NCVEC is making the same arguments. Did you read
their position paper?
>
> Amateur radio IS involved with electronics technology and ALL
> radio amateurs are responsible for their amateur stations'
> technical requirements.

Of course. But that doesn't mean all amateurs like learning radio
subjects in which they have no interest, any more than all radio
amateurs like learning Morse code.

It's a plain and simple fact.

> Ergo, the regulatory tool of licensing
> MUST concern itself with radio-electronics technical knowledge
> to prove competency and responsibility to the Commission.

It's clear that some level of testing is required, of course. The
regulations, safety and basic theory must be known in order to stay
legal.

FCC, the 'expert agency' on the subject of regulation and testing
requirements, is convinced that the 35 question Technician test is
adequate proof of technical competency and responsibility for a radio
amateur to design, build, repair, modify, align and operate an amateur
station using any authorized mode, frequency and power level above 30
MHz.

So why is more written testing on electronic theory needed to do the
same thing below 30 MHz?
>
> Radio-electronics technical cognizance is NOT on any trial.

Yes, it is. All license test requirements must be justified. That's a
primary part of the argument against the code test. And it applies to
all required test.

> What IS on trial is a test for one MODE of transmission, on-off
> keying morse code.

Have you read the NCVEC paper?
>
> >This isn't a straw argument. I've known hams who sold off their study
> >materials as soon as they passed the *written* tests.
>
> Irrelevant as to the subject of retention or elimination of the code
> test for an amateur radio license.

And totally relevant to the retention or elimination of the written
tests.
>
> >Now some folks will say "But the writtens support the basis and
> >purpose of amateur radio as a technical service - there's even an ITU
> >recommendation" - etc. And of course all hams do need to know the
> >applicable regulations, safety and operating practices, so of course
> >the written test cannot be completely eliminated.
> >
> >But has the existence of several tiers of written testing actually
> >made hams "more technical"? Does being tested on how to compute
> >complex impedances and Thevenin equivalents make a ham more likely to
> >build equipment, experiment with new modes, participate in public
> >service communication, be a VE and/or Elmer, and be a more friendly,
> >helpful amateur? Does such testing make a ham less likely to commit
> >rules violations?
>
> Try stating your position instead of raising a number of questions
> which do not take any side.

Try answering the questions.
>
> >From 1953 to 1968, US amateur radio had only two *effective* written
> >tests - the Novice and the General/Conditional/Technician. Yes, the
> >Extra existed, but it was a "prestige" license only, which granted no
> >additional operating privileges at all. The 20 question Novice got new
> >hams started, and the ~50 question General took care of the rest.
>
> 1953 to 1968 was 50 to 35 years ago. Approximately 2 generations.

So? Does old mean bad?
>
> >The reintroduction of "incentive licensing" in late 1968 was supposed
> >to push hams to be "more technical" by requiring two more written
> >tests beyond the General in order to get full privileges. But did that
> >result happen?
>
> It was quite obvious to all that "incentive licensing" was really all
> about gaining status, rank, privileges in an avocational, recreative
> activity.

There is nothing about status or rank in Part 97, nor in the FCC
decisions that led to incentive licensing and whihc have kept it
around all these years.

> THAT part of "incentive licensing" DID happen. It also
> boosted the already-growing class distinction artificiality in U. S.
> amateur radio.

Would you support a one-class license structure?
>
> >Some might cite the 20 wpm code test for Extra, but in fact the most
> >gain in privileges was made by upgrading to Advanced, which required

> >no additional code test.
>
> Incomplete summation or example.

Quoted out of context.
>
> >After 1990 (13 years ago), medical waivers allowed those with problems
> >learning code past 5 wpm to get any class of amateur license on the
> >basis of the 5 wpm code test alone. And since restructuring, we're
> >down to just one additional written test beyond General for full
> >privileges.
> >
> >Has any of that made US hams or ham radio in the US "more technical"
> >in the past 35 years? Or just the opposite? Does *forcing* someone to
> >learn a little bit about radio theory make them want to build radios?
>
> Did it or didn't it? Are you making a speech or are you posing as
> a lecturer at some seminar involving avocations?

I'm asking opinion questions. You don't want to answer them, for some
reason. That's odd, because you're usually bubbling over with opinions
here.
>
> Nothing in current or past FCC regulations REQUIRES "building
> radios." The Commission allows the OPTION of doing so while
> nearly all other radio services require type-accepted radio
> transmitters.

Exactly! So why is it necessary to have all kinds of theory testing?
More hams use Morse code than build their equipment. The same logic of
"it's optional and therefore should not be tested" applies in both
cases.
>
> The Commission is NOT REQUIRED to be supportive or booster
> of any particular past or present-day specific activity or mode.

Then why require so much theory testing beyond what is needed to
understand the regulations?
>
> The Commission's ONLY lawful actions are to regulate ALL U.S.
> civil radio and interstate electronic communications as well as to
> mitigate interference matters.

If that's your opinion, you must logically conclude that most of the
General and Extra class written exams is superfluous. That is, if you
use logic at all ;-)
>
> >Hans, K0HB, has proposed a 2 level system that would be very similar
> >to the old "pre-incentive" system. One easy test for newbies and a
> >full privs test for everybody else. And like the old system, the
> >newcomer license would not be renewable, so upgrading would
> >effectively be *required*.

>
> If Hans kohb's proposal/petition is before the Commission, then ALL
> are free to comment on it THERE.

And here, too. Unless you are telling us that we should not discuss
amateur radio policy issues in this newsgroup, which is called
"rec.radio.amateur.policy".
>
> >At first I though it was a "looney-tune" idea (to use Hans' phrase),
> >but now I'm not so sure. Perhaps he is on to something.
> >
> >FCC effectively reduced the number of written testing levels from 5 to
> >3 back in 2000. NCVEC is beginning to make noises that the Tech test
> >is "too hard", and they also note that their "dump Element 1" petition
> >is only a first step. Also, a look at the AH0A database shows a severe
> >drop in new Techs since the new Tech Q&A pool was effective in
> >mid-July.
>
> If you wish "looney tunes" entertainment, then try to read RM-10808
> seriously. It is proposed by none other than AH0A.
>
> "Beginning to make noises" is a subjective observation of yours.
>
> If you wish to have a written amateur test element set with more
> difficulty, you are absolutely free to submit your proposal to the
> Commission, have them issue an RM, and then cry in public
> newsgroups later because your proposal does not meet enough
> acceptance.

What's your point?
>
> >If someone says we need less *written* testing and an *easier* entry
> >level test (with suitably reduced privs), how can they be refuted?
>
> Just say NO...and with some supporting evidence.

What evidence would you suggest, Len?
>
> >If someone says "The only reason you Extras want people to have to
> >pass all these *written* tests is because *you* had to!" - how can
> >they be refuted?
>
> The same as above.

What evidence would you suggest, Len?
>
> >How can Hans' proposal be refuted? There's nothing in the theory part
> >of the Extra written that is required knowledge for the safe and legal
> >operation of an amateur station on any authorized band or mode. And
> >much of the regs in both the General and Extra exam are about what an
> >Extra can do that a General can't.

>
> What IS your problem, senior?

Why do you call me "senior" when you are the oldest one here?
>
> Do you NEED rank, status, privilege in a hobby activity to "prove"
> yourself to the rest of the world?

I've had all amateur privileges for the past 33 years. You've never
had any. It's not me who needs to prove himself.
>
> >Quite a number of hams today think that "incentive licensing" was a
> >mistake. Quite a number of hams today think that the 1953-1968 era was
> >a "golden age" that was ruined by the class divisions and forced
> >learning/testing of incentive licensing.
> >
> >Some people learn theory very easily, while for others it's a
> >difficult process.
>
> Theory is not for everyone.

Exactly.
>
> >People who would make excellent hams but who aren't
> >good with numbers, science, and/or memorization of things like band
> >edges may be being kept out, or kept from full access, by the
> >*written* testing.
>
> Define "excellent hams" in terms other than your own standards
> OR the emotionally-laden phraseology from Newington.

Those who would follow the rules and make positive contributions (such
as public service) to society and the amateur radio service.
>
> Amateur radio is an avocation, a recreational activity involving radio not
> done for pecuniary reasons. There are NO federal regulations specifying
> particular mindsets, imaginary group patriotism, or oaths of fealty to
> certain organizations.

What does that have to do with testing for a license?
>
> >> > In the absence of a code testing requirement, there will be progressively
> >> > fewer hams who have never been exposed to learning the code as a
> >> > result of the requirement. Since the requirement was the principle
> >> > motivation to learn the code, code use *will* decline once code testing
> >> > is abolished. Therefore, testing and use are two closely interrelated
> >> > concepts.
> >
> >Would anyone accept this argument, particlularly looking back over the
> >past 35 years?:
>
> Why do you ask? Get to the point, senior.

>
> >'In the absence of multiple levels of theory testing, there will be
> >progressively fewer hams who have been exposed to learning theory as a
> >result of the tests.
>
> Unproven subjective supposition.

No, an inescapable conclusion.
>
> Radio transmission IS a technological activity. The Commission does
> NOT require any sort of high level of theoretical knowledge...and they
> do NOT require a large number of questions on theory on any written
> test. In fact, the Commission DOES NOT SPECIFY THE NUMBER
> OF SPECIFIC QUESTION SUBJECTS on the written test.

Why are you shouting things we all know?
>
> >Since the test requirement was the principle
> >motivation to learn the theory, the technical level of hams themselves
> >and of amateur radio in general *will* decline. Therefore, testing
> >and technical know-how are two closely interrelated concepts.'
>
> Irrelevant and illogical. There is NO periodic "re-testing" for any
> amateur radio license class. Pass it ONCE and it does not have
> to be taken unless the decade-long renewal period has past.
>
> You have NOT proved any "close interrelationships" since that is
> not a subject, is not currently done, nor is it anything from "noises."

You just proved my point.
>
> >Which approach is more effective for getting hams interested in
> >technical subjects - the "honey" of demonstrations and examples, or
> >the "vinegar" of forced testing beyond the minimum necessary for safe
> >and legal operation of an amateur station?
>
Try answering some of the questions.

1254. Re: What makes a Pro code test Amateur a Troglodyte?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-16 23:45:45 UTC
From: Bert Craig <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM>
Message-ID: <J4Gjb.10657$%B2.4813871@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>
Source record: 80830

"Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
news:CDyjb.1319$_i.115279@nnrp1.ptd.net...
>
> "Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in message
> news:3Ntjb.2642$%B2.1571711@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net...
> > "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
> > news:z4njb.1255$_i.111153@nnrp1.ptd.net...
> > >
> > > "N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
> > > news:c2356669.0310150821.4841ec23@posting.google.com...
> > > [snip]
> > > > >
> > > > How will we counter that argument?
> > >
> > > One approach would be to stop planting it in peoples'
> > > minds numerous times a day ... things that are repeated
> > > often enough sometimes catch on, even if they are BAD
> > > ideas ...
> > >
> > > Carl - wk3c
> >
> > You mean like "the 5-wpm code exam is a barrier"?
>
> That concept has been agreed in FCC comments by the ARRL,
> QCWA, and other organizations besides NCI ... and the IARU
> has recognized and resolved that continuation of the Morse test
> requirement is not in the best interest of the ARS.

Then I'm disagreeing with the ARRL's, QCWA's, and NCI's position re. this
"barrier" concept. As a matter of fact, I offer myself as a living example
to the contrary. I'm neither eligible for the QCWA nor NCI, however, I'm
thankfully in a position where I e-mailed my respective Hudson section
candidates to let them know my postion wrt code testing and that my vote
partially (But in no small part.) depends on their position re. same.

> > or "it's a lid filter that keeps out CBers?"

It only acts as a filter to those who are unwilling to give it an honest
effort to learn.

> That idea was rejected by the FCC both in 1990 and in
> 1999 ...

However, back in the REAL world...?

> Carl - wk3c

73 de Bert
WA2SI

1255. Csce

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-17 00:13:45 UTC
From: nightowls627@aol.comnojunk
Message-ID: <20031016201345.09820.00000668@mb-m25.aol.com>
Source record: 80831

Hello to all. Well went to take the element 1 and got a case of the nerves. I failed and was very frustrated afterwards. Practice practice. Anyways, my question deals with the csce for element 3 that I had. Yes, had. After the element 1 test, I put the certificate in my pocket along with my tech license. Well, I was so discombobulated after the test, I forgot to put the element 3 csce back in its very safe place. My wife washed the sweatshirt it was in. Is there any way to take the element 1 test again and get full General privileges or do I need to take the element 3 again as well. I took the element 3 in Maryland at a hamfest. It was not ARRL.

Thanks

73
G. Doughty
KI4BBL@arrl.net

1256. Re: A New Concept: Virtual Spectrum

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-17 00:50:39 UTC
From: charlesb <n5pvl@sbcglobal.net>
Message-ID: <z1Hjb.1544$dZ4.196@newssvr27.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 80832
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.antiques.radio+phono,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc

"Tom Bruhns" <k7itm@aol.com> wrote in message
news:3200347.0310160910.7d48a015@posting.google.com...
>
>snip<
>
> Thanks, but no thanks. I'd rather enjoy the challenge of
> communicating through all the degradations that happen to waves
> propagated through the air. It doesn't bother me one way or the other
> if others adopt the technique, though.
>

It should bother you, Tom. This guy's response to the BPL problem was to give us software that simulates being on the air. Not only is it contrary to the spirit and purpose of the hobby, but worst of all, it encourages us all to be discouraged. It gives the weakesat among us an easy out, at the cost of adding still more to the hobby's difficulties.

So far, the idea of using non-ham links in order to "improve" the performance of amateur radio has been 100% consistent. In every case where it has been applied, it has managed to set back and denigrate the hobby, to some extent or another.

I am sorry to hear that this invasion of non-ham stuff into the hobby does not bother you. It sure should.

Charles Brabham, N5PVL

1257. Re: A New Concept: Virtual Spectrum

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-17 00:57:13 UTC
From: --exray-- <no@no.no>
Message-ID: <voufif2unsndaf@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 80833
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.antiques.radio+phono,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc

charlesb wrote:

>
>
> It should bother you, Tom. This guy's response to the BPL problem was to
> give us software that simulates being on the air. Not only is it contrary to
> the spirit and purpose of the hobby, but worst of all, it encourages us all
> to be discouraged. It gives the weakesat among us an easy out, at the cost
> of adding still more to the hobby's difficulties.
>
> So far, the idea of using non-ham links in order to "improve" the
> performance of amateur radio has been 100% consistent. In every case where
> it has been applied, it has managed to set back and denigrate the hobby, to
> some extent or another.
>
> I am sorry to hear that this invasion of non-ham stuff into the hobby does
> not bother you. It sure should.
>
> Charles Brabham, N5PVL

Thats exactly what the guys were saying on the repeater the other day.
-Bill

1258. Re: What makes a Pro code test Amateur a Troglodyte?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-17 01:14:20 UTC
From: groupk0hb@earthlink.net
Message-ID: <5ee63311.0310161714.28ae6a3d@posting.google.com>
Source record: 80834

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote
>
> Making the second level license examination equivalent to the current Extra
> examination sounds like it would drive people out of ham radio. That's
> simply too big a jump to expect people to take in one swallow so to speak
> especially since this would affect current Technicians who entered the
> licensing program under a system with 3 tiers (or more for those who entered
> several years ago). It would also take away privileges from existing Techs
> in that they are now receive renewable licenses but would not under that
> proposal.

Dee,

I suspect you have not read my complete proposal. I'll attach a copy
at the end of this. After you read it your concerns should be
addressed. It is actually very accomodating of current hams of all
classes.

At the onset, current Novices and Technicians would have several
options:

1) Within the grace period they could upgrade to General or Extra, and
such license would be renewable indefinitely.
2) They could retain their current license and renew indefinitely.
3) They could take the "Class B" test and gain full access to all
amateur bands at reduced power. (This license would expire after 10
years, so this is eventually an "up or out" choice.)
4) They could take the "Class A" test and gain full access to all
amateur bands at full power.

Current General and Advanced would have these options:

1) Retain their current licenses and renew indefinitely.
2) Within the grace period they could upgrade to Extra.
3) Take the "Class A" test and gain full access to all amateur bands
at full power (functionally equivalent to choice 2).

Before the
Federal Communications Commission
Washington, DC 20554

In the Matter of)
)
Amendment of Part 97 of the Commission's) RM-10787
Amateur Service Rules to eliminate)
Morse code testing.)

To: The Commission

PERSONAL COMMENTS OF HANS BRAKOB, K0HB

OVERVIEW

These comments are submitted in response to the petition of NCVEC which requests elimination of test Element 1 (Morse Code) from the Amateur Radio service rules.

I. Discussion:

The instant petition requests the elimination of Element 1 (5WPM Morse code test) from the required test for General and/or Extra Class licenses in the Amateur Radio service.

I find no persuasive argument for continuation of this test, and support the petition to discontinue testing new applicants with Element 1.

I am concerned, however, that other elements of the qualification tests are not adequate to ensure a high level of expertise in new applicants to the Amateur Radio service, and propose changes in the licensing structure to ensure that all 5 points of CFR 47 paragraph 97.1 (Basis and Purpose) are reasonably addressed in the qualification process.

II Proposal:

I propose that no new applicants be accepted for the current license classes and that after some reasonable grace period, no upgrades be available in the current licensing structure.

A. New License Classes:

I propose that new license applications be available in two classes, namely "Class B" and "Class A".

The "Class B" license would have an entry-level test (basic regulations, safety, operating procedures, basic DC and AC electronics). This class would have full frequency and mode privileges, power limited to 50W output. The license would be issued for a period of 10 years, and be non-renewable. Holders of this license would be required to have 2 years experience as a licensee ("time in grade") before being eligible to upgrade to "Class A".

The "Class A" license test would be of a difficulty level similar to the current Extra class test, and would have full privileges at power levels up to 1500W, equivalent to current Extra Class license holders. This license would be issued permanently without requirement for renewal.

B. Status of current licensees.

Current licenses could be renewed indefinitely, and would retain their current operating privileges.

Current Novice, Technician, General, and Advanced class licensees could up grade to "Class A" at any time.

Respectfully submitted,

H. Hans Brakob, K0HB

1259. Re: Why thirteen and twenty?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-17 01:41:39 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031016214139.12300.00001188@mb-m20.aol.com>
Source record: 80835

In article <AJejb.26585$Rd4.4023@fed1read07>, "K7JEB" <k7jeb@qsl.remove.net>
writes:

>Jim, N2EY, wrote:
>
>> 20 wpm derives from the old 1923-24 "Amateur Extra
>> First Class" which chose 20 as double the old 10 wpm
>> standard. It was reintroduced in 1951 when the current
>> Amateur Extra class was created.
>>
>> Both speeds are far below those required of experienced
>> professional Morse operators.
>
>Are there any 'professional' Morse operators left who
>earn their living by sending by hand and receiving by
>ear? I am under the impression it is now strictly an
>amateur endeavor.

There are still a few ships using Morse and a few shore stations, but you have to look for them really hard. I don't think there are any left in the USA.

The maritime services got away from using Morse for the same reasons railroads got away from steam locomotives: Cost to operate.

Back when the transition was being made, diesel electric locomotives cost more to build or buy than the equivalent horsepower in steam, and coal cost less than its diesel fuel equivalent.

But diesels did not require turntables, tenders, large amounts of water and distribution thereof, or disposal of ashes. The volume and weight of fuel for a given number of horsepower-hours was less for a diesel, and the fuel was a clean, easy to handle liquid. Diesel maintenance was less and in warm weather diesels could be shut down and started up on a few minutes' notice. Multiple diesel units could be coupled together for more horespower without requiring another engine crew to operate.

73 de Jim, N2EY

>

1260. Re: Why thirteen and twenty?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-17 02:57:03 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <xnfcneeyarg.hmvhvyc.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>
Source record: 80836

On 16 Oct 2003 18:58:55 GMT, Alun Palmer wrote:

>Experienced, yes, but no professional test went above 20wpm, which I think
>may be the real reason for the speed chosen for Extra. The 1st class
>Radiotelegraph licence in the US had random blocks at 16wpm and plain
>language at 20wpm,

The First Class Radiotelegraph test was 25 WPM plain language and
20 code groups per minute, one minute solid copy out of five minutes
sent and corresponding error-free sending.

To qualify for that license, one also had to be over 21, have or
qualify for the Second Class Radiotelegraph Operator certificate,
and have at least one year in the aggregate (360 days "on the
books") of handling manual Morse traffic at a ship or coast station
open to public correspondence, civilian or military.

>whereas UK radio officers had to copy random blocks at
>20wpm. I think 20wpm was standard around the world for testing ship's
>radio officers. Of course, they don't have to do it anymore.

The UK requirements were the same as the US requirements for each
level of certificate - both contries' requirements derived from the
ITU Radio Regfulations and the International Convention for the
Safety of Life at Sea (SOLAS).

My reference for the UK requirements is: Handbook for Radio
Operators Working Installations Licensed by Her Majesty's Postmaster
General, General Post Office, London, 1961 - Appendix 4.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

1261. Re: Opposing BPL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-17 02:57:03 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <xnfcneeyarg.hmvgz2b.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>
Source record: 80837
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On 15 Oct 2003 22:30:17 -0700, Brian Kelly wrote:

>> This means that the manufacturer is required to test them to
>> ensure that they comply with the FCC regulations. Under the present
>> rules, they must be tested at 3 typical locations. "
>
>What's the FCC definition of "typical locations"??

De facto: any place where the results support the stand that one is
advocating.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

1262. Re: 73 Magazine Says "73 and QRT"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-17 03:00:50 UTC
From: Bill Newkirk <wnewkirk@bellsouth.net>
Message-ID: <1XIjb.3664$W77.2898@bignews6.bellsouth.net>
Source record: 80839

I believe Zenith was acquired by Goldstar,

http://www.zenith.com

"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20031013160412.21642.00001647@mb-m01.aol.com...
> In article <xnfcneeyarg.hmnxu01.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>, "Phil Kane"
> <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> writes:
>
> >On Sun, 12 Oct 2003 17:41:41 -0500, Gray Shockley wrote:
> >
> >>If memory serves, Heath didn't throw in the towel, per se.
> >>
> >>Zenith bought them out for their computer(s) and terminals and then
Zenith
> >>tossed out nearly all of Heath except those items.
> >
> > Didn't Shlumberger get into the picture before Zenith, or was it
> > after Zenith?
>
> Memory says that Schlumberger acquired them first, then Zenith.
> The Heath-Zenith home appliance/gadget corporate headquarters
> moved to someplace else (southeast?) according to what I
> remember from the doorbell packages. Zenith quit the TV receiver
> manufacture some time ago; they were a close second to
> Admiral Corporation, also in the Chicago area.
>
> >>My first kit was a Heath Q-1.
>
> Mine also, 1951. The CRT in the kit was WW2 surplus, 5BP1,
> container still marked with Army lettering. :-)
>
> > My first Heathkit was their VTVM (Vacuum-Tube Voltmeter for those
> > who never played with one). One of the best test instruments of its
> > time (1950s).
>
> It's still good. My Heath VTVM was purchased in late 1953, shipped
> to my battalion mailbox in Tokyo, Japan, while assigned to ADA.
> Used it for checking "Hi-Fi" music electronic kits purchased at the
> legendary Akihabara district of Tokyo, even then a mecca for
> electronics-radios-components covering many square blocks. Mine
> traveled with me back to Illinois then California. Slight drift in the
> resistor values makes it a tad out of spec now and the rotary switches
> will probably never survive another cleaning (oxide build-up on the
> rotary contacts has always been a problem with old electronics).

> The Heath SB-310 receiver kit, purchased and built two decades
> later, has almost useless rotary switch contacts now.
>
> LHA

1263. Re: Any chance it's a "Jolly the Lobbyist Along" game?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-17 03:02:31 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bmnm47$3la$0@208.207.71.130>
Source record: 80840

David Robbins wrote:
> "David Stinson" <arc5@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
> news:3F8F019F.9D98FF3A@ix.netcom.com...
>
>>Any chance the FCC commissioners are fully aware that BPL has no future,
>>and are just "jollying" the lobbyists along to get their campaign
>>contributions? After all, once they get the money, then:
>>"oops! Don't work like you said it did. Too bad- tough break etc."
>
>
> more likely its the bpl manufacturers hyping the technology to everyone and
> hoping to sell a bunch of it before the utilities find out how much it
> really costs, the users find out how poor it really performs, and the other
> users of the spectrum find out how much it really hurts.
>
>

Yes...And of course that is where politics enters the scene.

Just because commissioners are appointed and don't have to raise funds
doesn't mean they don't pay any attention to the wishes of those who do.
After all, one needs to understand how did the commissioners get their
appointments and why. It isn't always because they're the top candidates
for the job!

1264. Re: Any chance it's a "Jolly the Lobbyist Along" game?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-17 03:08:17 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <B2Jjb.1399$_i.119831@nnrp1.ptd.net>
Source record: 80838

"David Robbins" <noone@nowhere.com> wrote in message
news:YcKdneV0FKlLvhKiU-KYgg@crocker.com...
>
> "David Stinson" <arc5@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
> news:3F8F019F.9D98FF3A@ix.netcom.com...
> > Any chance the FCC commissioners are fully aware that BPL has no future,
> > and are just "jollying" the lobbyists along to get their campaign
> > contributions? After all, once they get the money, then:
> > "oops! Don't work like you said it did. Too bad- tough break etc."
>
> more likely its the bpl manufacturers hyping the technology to everyone
and
> hoping to sell a bunch of it before the utilities find out how much it
> really costs, the users find out how poor it really performs, and the
other
> users of the spectrum find out how much it really hurts.

That, too .. :-(

Carl - wk3c

1265. Re: Csce

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-17 03:16:15 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <3aJjb.1400$_i.120018@nnrp1.ptd.net>
Source record: 80841

Perhaps you can contact the VE Team or their VEC and get
a replace ment CSCE? They should have a record that you
passed the Element 3 test ...

Carl - wk3c

"G. Doughty" <nightowls627@aol.comnojunk> wrote in message
news:20031016201345.09820.00000668@mb-m25.aol.com...
> Hello to all. Well went to take the element 1 and got a case of the
nerves. I
> failed and was very frustrated afterwards. Practice practice. Anyways,
my
> question deals with the csce for element 3 that I had. Yes, had. After
the
> element 1 test, I put the certificate in my pocket along with my tech
license.
> Well, I was so discombobulated after the test, I forgot to put the element
3
> csce back in its very safe place. My wife washed the sweatshirt it was
in. Is
> there any way to take the element 1 test again and get full General
privileges
> or do I need to take the element 3 again as well. I took the element 3 in
> Maryland at a hamfest. It was not ARRL.
>
> Thanks
>
> 73
> G. Doughty
> KI4BBL@arrl.net

1266. Re: A New Concept: Virtual Spectrum

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-17 03:47:28 UTC
From: Tom Nelson <nelsonca@stormnet.com>
Message-ID: <3F8F664F.8030207@stormnet.com>
Source record: 80844
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.antiques.radio+phono,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc

Am I to understand that we are all going belly-up and cave in to BPL? Perhaps Mr. Stinson is trolling for the power companies. I, for one, have not given up the fight against BPL. Perhaps all the good Republican HAMS and SWLrs should write their congressmen and the President who has appointed the majority of the FCC and suggest that their right to the spectrum is on a par with that to bear arms. The FCC is effectively limiting our free speech by jamming our frequencies.

I view BPL as a means of restricting my access to shortwave freqs in much the same way the Chinese jam freqs from Nepal. But, of course, the present administration would never do anything to restrict our access to global views which may call their agenda into question.

I propose that we start sending electricity through our TV cables as a backup to our outdated electrical system. I am "putting down the marker" for PCTV, Power through Cable TV! We would only need one connection for our TVs, and VCRs.

Sorry Dave, your idea lacks the purity derived from the radio - ether - radio connection. Let's not divert our energy away from stopping BPL before it gets out of control. BTW, you wouldn't be a BPL advocate, would you?

Tom
KD6EVM

David Stinson wrote:

>Thanks for reading this.
>I have today submitted an article to QST magazine entitled
>"Virtual Spectrum: Beating BPL at its own game,"
>detailing a concept that can greatly impact our radio hobby.
>I wanted to "put down a marker" to date the introduction
>of a new ham-radio innovation, and to officially place
>the idea in the public domain, so the maximum amount of
>"tinkering" with it can happen.
>
>This concept uses the bandwidth available on the Internet
>and some simple circuitry to create a replica of a segment of
>the radio spectrum, stream it live or prerecorded to another
>internet-connected computer and reconstruct that radio spectrum
>at your location. *Any* radio equipment you wish to use
>(given an Internet connection with sufficent bandwidth)-
>from modern PSK-31 rigs, SSB nets, WW-II modulated oscillators

>all the way back to ancient spark transmitters
>with crystal receivers; all can legally communicate just as though
>you were on-the-air. The system is bi-directional, allowing
>QSOs between stations that normally could not communicate.
>If you can't hear weak signals because of noise in your area,
>the concept allows you to build a "remote front end" and
>transport the radio spectrum in a quiet area right to your rig,
>bypassing the problems in your location.
>
>I believe this concept can be the answer to BPL, "noise holes,"
>antenna restrictions, HF "jammers" and many other obstacles to
>using our radios. There is great potential for many uses,
>and a possible niche market for someone with the resources
>to develop the equipment.
>I have already built prototype equipment to prove the concept
>and it works splendidly. The article includes construction
>details. The circuits are simple and you can get
>95% of the parts at Radio Shack.
>By the time QST publishes (assume they accept the work),
>we should have completed the first Virtual Spectrum QSO:
>two World War 2 BC-611 handie-talkies (output: about 60 milliwatts)
>will communicate over a path of about 2000 miles.
>
>If QST does not publish the concept,
>I will publish it myself on the web
>immediatly after hearing from them.
>I am indebted to Mike Hanz, aafradio@cox.net
>for invaluable suggestions and encouragement.
>
>TNX ES 73 DE Dave Stinson AB5S
>
>

1267. Re: Csce

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-17 03:55:38 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bmnp7q$9h6$0@208.206.142.114>
Source record: 80842

G. Doughty wrote:

> Hello to all. Well went to take the element 1 and got a case of the nerves. I
> failed and was very frustrated afterwards. Practice practice. Anyways, my
> question deals with the csce for element 3 that I had. Yes, had. After the
> element 1 test, I put the certificate in my pocket along with my tech license.
> Well, I was so discombobulated after the test, I forgot to put the element 3
> csce back in its very safe place. My wife washed the sweatshirt it was in. Is
> there any way to take the element 1 test again and get full General privileges
> or do I need to take the element 3 again as well. I took the element 3 in
> Maryland at a hamfest. It was not ARRL.
>
> Thanks
>

IF you can get to the team leader where you tested he MAY have a
record of your passing the element three test and MAY be able to issue
you another CSCE. Since three VE's are required to sign it you'd best
contact him at another test session. Not all teams keep
as complete records as I did, so they may not be able to help you.
You may have to take it over. If so, next time make a copy of the
certificate.

Dick

1268. Re: A New Concept: Virtual Spectrum

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-17 03:57:57 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bmnpc5$9h6$1@208.206.142.114>
Source record: 80843
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.antiques.radio+phono,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc

charlesb wrote:

> "Tom Bruhns" <k7itm@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:3200347.0310160910.7d48a015@posting.google.com...
>
>>snip<
>>
>>Thanks, but no thanks. I'd rather enjoy the challenge of
>>communicating through all the degradations that happen to waves
>>propagated through the air. It doesn't bother me one way or the other
>>if others adopt the technique, though.
>>
>
>
> It should bother you, Tom. This guy's response to the BPL problem was to
> give us software that simulates being on the air. Not only is it contrary to
> the spirit and purpose of the hobby, but worst of all, it encourages us all
> to be discouraged.

I'm not discouraged. If BPL eats up the HF spectrum I'll be one of
those still able to communicate by listening to the CW signals change
the noise and copy the changes as code.
Don't laugh, I've done it before.
>

1269. Re: Why thirteen and twenty?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-17 04:07:00 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bmnpt4$ap2$0@208.206.142.114>
Source record: 80845

Dan/W4NTI wrote:

> "Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
> news:f45722ac.0310151646.3bb522d1@posting.google.com...
>
>>"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
>
> news:<xkejb.57045$mQ2.27686@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
>
>>>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>>>news:20031015083047.12501.00003145@mb-m04.aol.com...
>>>
>>>>In article <86ptgzumnq.fsf@duchess.twilley.org>, Jack Twilley
>>>><jmt+usenet@twilley.org> writes:
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>I can understand why Novice and Technician Plus required five words
>>>>>per minute -- the treaty and all -- but why did General require
>>>>>thirteen words per minute and Amateur Extra twenty words per minute?
>>>>>
>>>>>Is there a real reason?
>>>>
>>>>12 to 13 wpm is generally agreed to be above the speed where things
>
> such
>
>>> as
>>>
>>>>"counting dits" work for most people. It's the beginning of the skills
>>>
>>> which
>>>
>>>>take one to higher speeds
>>>>
>>>>20 wpm derives from the old 1923-24 "Amateur Extra First Class" which
>>>
>>> chose 20
>>>
>>>>as double the old 10 wpm standard. It was reintroduced in 1951 when
>
> the
>
>>> current
>>>

>>>>Amateur Extra class was created.
>>>>
>>>>Both speeds are far below those required of experienced professional
>
> Morse
>
>>>>operators.
>>>>
>>>>73 de Jim, N2EY
>>>
>>>One more thing Jim. 20 wpm is above another 'threshold', which is at
>
> about
>
>>>18wpm for most folks. So you gotta know it to do it.
>>>
>>>Dan/W4NTI
>>
>>
>>Welp Dan, as I strap on my dragon armor and jousting butt-plug, please
>>orient me toward the 1951 anachronism of the 1923 AEFC standard.
>>
>>dididididdit.
>
>
> Lets see if you can understand this then;
>
> If I want any crap out of you, I will squeeze your head.
>

You'd best just prod him with your keyboard.If you squeeze his head
you'll get far more than you expected.

1270. Re: Dear Mother Brakob...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-17 05:18:46 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0310162118.12411027@posting.google.com>
Source record: 80846

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20031014141010.29815.00001142@mb-m21.aol.com>...
> In article <5ee63311.0310132034.23d9cbeb@posting.google.com>,
> groupk0hb@earthlink.net (Hans K0HB) writes:
>
> >lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote
> >
> >> On-off keying was
> >> adopted simply because it was the ONLY WAY POSSIBLE for
> >> early, primitive radio to allow communications. It's just
> >> practical applied physics. Nothing else.
> >
> >Oh shit, you got it wrong again!
> >
> >In Boston, on Christmas Eve of 1906, modulating a spark transmitter,
> >Reginald Fessenden made a holiday broadcast of a short spoken
> >introduction, some recorded Christmas music, and played "Oh Holy
> >Night" on a violin.
> >
> >Obviously on-off keying was not the ONLY WAY POSSIBLE (your emphasis)
> >for early ("spark") radio to allow communications.
> >
> >"Dear Mother Anderson, your son Leonard is failing in practical
> >applied physics. Perhaps he would benefit from a stint in the Army to
> >learn a useful trade."
> >
> >Sunuvagun! Good luck on this one now.
>
> Dear Mother Brakob,
>
> Your offspring is once again confused...(SNIP)

I guess there was some relevence of all this, and that in posting
this, our resident 14-year night-school radio god was trying to set
the example that he would want all aspiring electrical engineers to
emulate.

Unfortunately, it was yet just another "cuss-him cuz I can't
outwit him" rant of a very sick old man with no life.

Again.

Steve, K4YZ

1271. Re: Dear Mother Brakob...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-17 05:21:28 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0310162121.651549d9@posting.google.com>
Source record: 80847

brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0310151909.1c393a94@posting.google.com>...

> Now you've done it. Rev Jim will stop reading at this point ?(unless
> he invokes the PCTA double standard).

> Did you enjoy it? What antenna (aerial) did you use? What detector
> (receiver) did you use?

> MIG, TIG, or ordinary ARC welding?

> STOP! Do not attempt to inject authority into the equation.

> Imagine if he had forgotten where he had put his microphone, re Larry,
> Dick, an Moe.

> Alex-ANDERSON has a nice ring to it, doesn't it?

> Wonder if Mother Brakob lived in a shoe?

> Cudbe a Jody song for the USN?

Yet another example of emulating your pathological liar mentor, Brain?

Steve, K4YZ

1272. Re: What makes LHA so poor at simple research tasks?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-17 05:23:44 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0310162123.548cef44@posting.google.com>
Source record: 80848

brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0310151658.2d3753af@posting.google.com>...
> n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20031015083048.12501.00003146@mb-m04.aol.com>...
> > In article <20031014211336.00545.00001638@mb-m02.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com
> > (Len Over 21) writes:

> > > Come up with the way a spark transmitter suddenly turns into
> > > an Alexanderson Alternator whenever it is brought up in an amateur
> > > radio newsgroup.
> >
> > That's your game, Len.
>
> What's your game, Jim?

What's your interest in knowing, Brain? Even if he tells you,
it's unlikely you'd understand.

Steve, K4YZ

1273. Re: A New Concept: Virtual Spectrum

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-17 05:26:43 UTC
From: --exray-- <no@no.no>
Message-ID: <vouvbom4i9cp03@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 80849
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.antiques.radio+phono,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc

Tom Nelson wrote:
>
> I view BPL as a means of restricting my access to shortwave freqs in
> much the same way the Chinese jam freqs from Nepal. But, of course, the
> present administration would never do anything to restrict our access to
> global views which may call their agenda into question.

I don't know if you are joking or if something that bizarre has really
crossed your mind. I love a good sense of humour.
>
> I propose that we start sending electricity through our TV cables as a
> backup to our outdated electrical system. I am "putting down the marker"
> for PCTV, Power through Cable TV! We would only need one connection for
> our TVs, and VCRs.

Maybe you weren't joking....
>
>
> Tom
> KD6EVM

-Bill WX4A

1274. Re: Lennie's Double Standard Once Again Revealed...BY Lennie!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-17 05:29:39 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0310162129.3c098f18@posting.google.com>
Source record: 80850

brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0310140546.153a6483@posting.google.com>...

> So, Stebe, take a poll. Ask who enjoys your constant rantings.

I am not the one ranting, Brain.

I AM the one who rubs your nose in your own childish conduct, the
post this responds to being evidence thereof.

> > We've tried that here before, Brain. Your mentor can't stand
> > seeing anyone but himself express anything meaningful about radio.
>
> Not true, Stebe.

Quite true, Brain. reiterating a lie on your part does not make
it otherwise.

> > There have also been several other posters who have tried to
> > drive content-focused threads here, but what's the use? YOU certainly
> > have had nothing to offer...And what you HAVE offered has been found
> > faulty and erroneous, to say the least.
>
> Not true, Stebe.

Quite true, Sir Liar.

Where are your T5 logs?

Where is your authorization to operate in Somalia?

Please give use just a few callsigns of stations you worked,
Brain...

> Is "Stebe" correct?

For you, I am sure it is. But then we've come to expect nothing
but "altered reality" from someone who "proudly" flaunts being the
padawan learner of a pathological liar.

Do you enjoy being a student liar, Brain?

Steve, K4YZ

1275. Re: Amazin'....Ain't it...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-17 05:38:23 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0310162138.7119784e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 80901

brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0310140541.4b6c74df@posting.google.com>...

> > Your "mentor" can fill you in on ways to antagonize and instigate
> > flamefests...he does it well.
>
> OK, Stebe.
>
> > You aren't quite there yet, but you're getting close.
>
> I'm learning from the Master, Stebe.

Whew...

It's really amazing to find people who ADMIT that they are the
willing "students" of pathological liars.

Brain, does your wife read this stuff?

Does she know exactly how effectively you humiliate your family
name?

> > > > I own four YahooGroups, one of which has over 400 subscribers,
> > >
> > > WhooHooo!
> >
> > And YOU sponsor...what?
>
> How many articles of yours were published in the now "defunct" 73
> magazine?
>
> How did they contribute to the ARS?
>
> Were they original works?

How did you draw a line from on-line newsgroups to articles in
"73", Sir Putznjunior?

> > "How_To_Look_Like_An_Idiot_In Public_And_Still_Not_Have_A_Clue @
> > StupidGroups . Com"...?!?!
>
> I'll leave that one to you, Stebe.

Oh NO, MinnieLennie...This one's all yours. You earned
it...don't deprive yourself of the fruit of your labors...

Lord knows you are a fruit...

> > Yep. I allow anyone to subscribe to my lists. Use any of them
> > for "a/s/l" messages, commercial offerings, or ANYthing having to do
> > with some get-rich-quick scam get's you booted.
>
> a/s/l?

Never mind.
>
> > I'd even let YOU join, Brain...But I don't know why you'd want to
> > be there. All four of them pretty much expect that you have some idea
> > of what the other subscribers are talking about.
>
> You're so generous, Stebe.

No problem. Assisting the learning disabled is part of my job...

> You got me there, Stebe. I don't know what you are talking about in
> "THIS" forum, so why do you think I'd understand your rantings
> elsewhere?

In as much as you still have not explained how you operated an
Amateur Radio station from a UN-controlled area without the proper
authority, Brain, I doubt that anything you have to say in ANY forum
is very pertinent.

Steve, K4YZ

1276. Re: Points Of Perception...What Do YOU Call "Collateral Damage"...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-17 05:39:29 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0310162139.31b55ffa@posting.google.com>
Source record: 80902

brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0310140532.3ba00621@posting.google.com>...
> k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0310101331.45860985@posting.google.com>...
> > k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0309301932.4f2bc48a@posting.google.com>...
> > > Radio Amateur KC2HMZ <kc2hmz@aa-mail.removespamkiller.net> wrote in message
news:<vtqinv0gdvm1pinppbkgksdjcn1cevjtoj@4ax.com>...

> > > Steve, K4YZ
> >
> > Hey John...Where'd ya go...?!?!
> >
> > Find it a bit rough going trying to create an illusion while
> > someone else was shining a light on you, eh?
> >
> > Steve, K4YZ
>
> Talking to yourself again?

Why would I call myself "John", Brain...?!?!

Steve, K4YZ

1277. Re: ARRL you can Kiss my $39.00 a Year Good Bye

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-17 05:46:14 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0310162146.f2d85ce@posting.google.com>
Source record: 80903

brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0310140528.3c0cad0e@posting.google.com>...
> k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20031012123106.28806.00000085@mb-m25.aol.com>...

> Mean like how YOU let LENNIE "pass" with use of
> > snide remarks, blatant lies, profanity and obvious misdirection of his posts,
> > but then accuse others of the same thing without comment...?!?!
>
> You don't seem to like that much, do you?

It's not a matter of what I like or don't like, MinnieLennie.
You are a person wrought with confusion and an odd sense of what you
consider appropriate.

You publically announce your afinity for a person known to be a
pathological liar and then go about calling other people names and
making unsubstantiated allegations about them. Pretty silly, Brain.

If you enjoy placing your private parts in publically operated
pencil sharpeners, be my guest...but don't whine about it when your
parts get ground up when someone else turns the crank (pun intended)

> > Now...about those T5 logs and your "authorization" to operate in Somalia?
>
> Correct. I was authorized.

Not according to the evidence you've supplied, you weren't.

Steve, K4YZ

1278. Re: Points Of Perception...What Do YOU Call "Collateral Damage"...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-17 05:49:39 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0310162149.e7e5f76@posting.google.com>
Source record: 80904

brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0310140532.3ba00621@posting.google.com>...

> Talking to yourself again?

By the way, Your Scumminess, I see you re-quoted my entire post,
yet could not (or would not try) to dispute (...challenge..?!?!) any
of the points I made.

And I still notice that John has rolled up his carpet and gone
away again.

Kinda hard to stand the light, I guess........

Steve, K4YZ

1279. Re: I warned everyone this would happen. Re: 73 Magazine Says "73 and QRT"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-17 05:57:24 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0310162157.202ba6fb@posting.google.com>
Source record: 80905

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20031013234612.01893.00001227@mb-m22.aol.com>...

> Nobody in here seems to understand that independent periodicals
> make their living almost ENTIRELY from sales of advertising space.
> Fact of publishing life for nearly every "popular" or newsstand
> sold periodical.

Sure we do, Lennie.

And we understand that advertisers tend to not spend their
advertising dollars in periodicals that they deem poor returns on
thier investment.

Your former "employer" would be of prime example.

> Advertising is not free.

Whoa...THAT was meaningful.

> The "knowledgeable" in here no little else but chatty gossip stories
> as to the "reasons" for a magazine demise.

"...no litle else..."

A TYPO! A TYPO! LENNIE'S MAD! LENNIE'S MAD!

I >>AM<< reasonably "knowledgeable", Lennie, and I "no"
this...Your previous employer is defunct..Kaput...out-of-business.
They are out of business because they could not continue to offer a
product that warranted the expenditure of those advertiser's dollars
because they tried to pander to a very narrow market.

Oh well. As good as the magazine may or may not have been, it's
out of business today.

Steve, K4YZ

1280. Re: 73 Magazine Says "73 and QRT"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-17 08:06:45 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0310170006.337d21e9@posting.google.com>
Source record: 80906
Cross-posted to:
rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

Doug Smith W9WI <w9wi@invalid.invalid> wrote in message
news:<3F8E9BC8.5050506@invalid.invalid>...
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >> That is, if they don't get wise and start looking into ways of
> >> publishing that do away with the costs of publishing. Monitoring
> >> Times has done it right by making their magazine available in PDF
> >> format, downloadable each month from their FTP site. They provide a
> > I dunno, Steve... I downladed a 46megabyte file from Germany last week
> > and it only took about 5 hours with my snailpace dialup.(no broadband
> > available here) Seems the website has a lot to do with how download
> > speeds. Or maybe I just lucked into a good net route. It never even
> > flinched during the entire process. Normally I would lose the link after
> > a time.
> >
> > Good idea really, with the PDF subscription. I'll have to take a look at
> > Monitoring Times site.
>
> Or on a mailed CD.. Both QST and Monitoring Times are available that
> way, (among others) though unfortunately only with the whole year's
> issues on a single disk. (i.e., it's only available at the end of the
> year) Fantastic idea, I love it! No more realizing the article I want
> is in the July issue - and I can only find June and August...

It certainly beats storing piles of QSTs but at least at this point
one glitch is the cost. ~$40 for the membership then another ~$40 per
stale CD. No biggie but it's annoying. Our club monthly bulletins are
usually 10-12 pages long and are now being posted in the club website
as archived .pdf's. Saves a real bundle in publishing and mailing
costs and it eliminates the drudge labor in addressing, stamping and
mailing. With only a few pages per issue I don't even bother
downloading 'em, I just read 'em online and move on. More 'puter files
eliminated. Been hugely successful Dick.

http://www.gofrc.org/newsletter.shtml

Somehow the magazines will get into this game too. The QST product
reviews in the members-only website are a step in the right direction.
Maybe someday we'll be able to dump 'em in on a pay-by-article basis.

> I wonder if broadband prices will ever drop to dialup levels?
> Personally I have a very hard time justifying the (very) roughly
> $200/year difference.

AMEN.

> On the other hand, we may be fast approaching the point where the sum
> total of the malicious executable emails being spammed into our
> mailboxes and the critical updates necessary to protect against them
> every day will take more than 24 hours to download via dialup!

AMEN again!

w3rv

1281. Re: Code test analogy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-17 08:20:14 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0310170020.24669867@posting.google.com>
Source record: 80907

nocoder@aol.com (No-coder) wrote in message news:<bmf1rp02sk5@enews1.newsguy.com>...

> Even though the testing for code was reduced to the basic 5 WPM over three
> years ago, it's obvious that the debate still rages on.

Only by those who insist on doing it for doing it's sake...IE:,
Lennie

> The insistance that a person know Morse Code at a resonable speed in order to
> be "real ham" is similar to religious fanatics, particualrly Christian
> fundamentalists, who think that a person has to believe in god in order to be a
> good and moral person. They cannot prove that their god even exists. So with
> the PCTA, they cannot prove that code is useful in light of communications
> advancements that have been made over the past several decades.

While one cannot prove of disprove the existence of any specific
deity, the usefulness of Morse Code has been proven for over 80 years
and is re-proven every moment of every day.

In this case the one's trying to prove a negative are those who
insist that Morse Code skills is a hold back to the Amateur Radio
service as a whole.

In particular read the writings of Lennie Anderson, a person who
never spent a minute as a licensed Amateur, and John Kaput-ski,
KC2HMZ, a scanner buff who makes assinine assertions about the
"collateral damage" that the Morse Code issue allegedly causes, but
who runs away at the first testing of his resolve of his convictions.

Is Morse Code skill and implementation the know-all and end-all
of Amateur Radio...?!?! Certainly not. If it was, none of the medium
in which this exchange is taking place would exist.

> Just as certain fundamentalists would like to turn the country into a
> Judeo-Christian theocracy, so would certain hams go back to an outdated
> communications scheme, simply because they think that Morse code is their
> "god."

People who keep making these assertions that some subset of the
Amateur radio condsiders Morse Code aas a "god" are idiots. Period.

I've known dyed-in-the-wool CW ops and have yet to meet anyone
who even remotely fits this description. I dare anyone to provide
even one thread of evidence to the contrary.

> To expect prospective hams to believe in the fairy tale of morse code is the
> the same as expecting people to believe in the fairy tales of the holy bible.

To expect that you exercised even a modicum of thought before bombing USENET with this bit of emotionally charged, baseless silliness is even more lame than my expectations of being molested by Brittney Spears in the next 24 hours.

Steve, K4YZ

1282. Re: Code test analogy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-17 08:53:27 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0310170053.7305a615@posting.google.com>
Source record: 80908

"Clint" <rattlehead at computron dot net> wrote in message
news:<vop3kc7m7pg490@corp.supernews.com>...

> "No-coder" <nocoder@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:bmgsql02lav@enews1.newsguy.com...
> > In article <bmfpib$i4q$0@208.206.142.110>, dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com
> says...
> >
> >
> > If you have no other refutation than to call it "lamebrained" then you
> have no
> > argument at all. You show that you are incapable of engaging in any form
> of
> > intelligent debate on the matter.
>
> The PCTA's never have been able to. They quickly deplete thier very shallow
> pool of "debate points", which are easily refuted and defeated such as the
> old & dead "it's basic to all radio communication" (that one still makes me
> laugh)...

It make's you laugh because you are ignorant of the facts, or you
refuse to accept them. The ignorant laugh at everything because they
know or understand nothing.

Morse Coded communications are occuring at this very moment.
While you try to "prove" your point, "Clint", by making these childish
assertions that Morse Code is NOT a "basic" form of communication,
Amateurs all over the world are at this very moment proving you wrong.

That you chose to refuse to accept it is obvious AND foolish, but
it's a freedom you are allowed under our chosen form of government.

> and quickly they MUST resort to name calling such as "lamebrained" because
> they have NO other cards in their hand.

Actually I have well over 1000 cards in hand, Clint...from every
continent, Antarctica, ships at sea, etc etc etc. Over 80% of them
confirming contacts in Morse Code.

More than half of those represent contacts with people in other
countries that might not have otherwise happened if not for the
commonality of Amateur Radio and Morse Code.

No accents...No ranting or chanting masses...Just two people
exchanging greetings.

> They have nothing to lean on.

Except truth and facts, Clint. Sorry you chose to not agree, but
you are welcome to tune the bottom end of the HF bands at your leisure
and hear for yourself. I realise you won't understand any of it, but
you can go ahead and spend the money on hardware and software to do
for you what you COULD do for yourself for no money and no hardware to
demend on.

> All they
> do is either put you on thier killfile list (read: I can't factually support
> my stand
> so therefore i'm going to just ignore you! so there! *nyah!*) or they start
> name calling. "lamebrain" is one of the new ones; generally the pro code
> dinosaurs start using "lazy", "stupid" and "moron" interspersed with various
> vulgarities.

Nope. I'd put "ignorant of the facts" in front of all of that.

> Clint
> Easily whipping the PCTA's

Not today.

Not on your best day.

You're like the new kid in the gym...Got a lot of those Walter
Mitty dreams about being another Ali or Foreman, but looking more like
Wally Cox or Barney Fife.

You know just enough to SOUND like you are "knowledgeable" to the
uniformed or easily impressed. Just like propagandists, you mix in
just enough "truth" to try and substantiate your "argument", yet
cannot overcome the facts.

Is continued Morse Code testing necessary for Amateur licensure?
Not administratively. However it is and will continue to be a viable
and useful communications medium for years to come. That you and
others choose to not take the time to learn it and just see for
yourselves is sad. That you and others continue to make assinine
assertions about it is childish and diminishes your credibility.

Steve, K4YZ

1283. Re: Code test analogy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-17 08:57:09 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0310170057.2c304196@posting.google.com>
Source record: 80909

nocoder@aol.com (No-coder) wrote in message news:<bmhf5m021n9@enews3.newsguy.com>...
> In article <stVib.2761$kx.66@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>,
> w4nti@getridofthismindspring.com says...
>
>
> >Just further proof of my favorite statement....
> >
> >"Ya just cain't fix stupid"
> >
> >Dan/W4NTI
>
> I had hoped that my post would generate a level headed debate on this analogy.
> Apparently, you are incapable of that, and can only resort to ad hominem
> attacks.

You are not the first one to think that you could do this.

You demonstrate your OWN "incapab(ilities)", but I get the feeling
that always being second best comes second nature to you, so I will
leave you with your comfort zone in tact.

Steve, K4YZ

1284. Re: Code test analogy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-17 09:00:06 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0310170100.57e076d@posting.google.com>
Source record: 80910

"Clint" <rattlehead at computron dot net> wrote in message
news:<vop3p5cpccan7d@corp.supernews.com>...
> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
> news:RqZib.55733$mQ2.53083@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
>
> >
> > Just answer me this then....why would we bother with A N O T H E R code
> vs
> > no-code debate? In the last 10 years there has been thousands of them
> here.
>
> and you guys lose every one of them.

Clint, I get the feeling that there is some other inadequacy in
your life that you are making up for by making assinine assertions
that are easily refuted.

Your parentage, perhaps?

Steve, K4YZ

1285. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-17 10:28:27 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031017062827.21457.00001456@mb-m10.aol.com>
Source record: 80911

In article <vorsl2nsek1o04@corp.supernews.com>, "Clint" <rattlehead at computron dot net> writes:

>It's code TESTING, not CODE, that is being pushed out the door.
>ad nauseum, this must be explained. Why is that?

Because people are not specific. Look at thread subject lines like "drop the code" or "IARU says drop Morse". And there's a group what goes by the name "No-Code International" - not "No Code TEST International".

1286. Re: BPL a reality in my area now!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-17 11:44:13 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031017074413.05693.00000741@mb-m10.aol.com>
Source record: 80912

>Even if the area distribution lines are buried, the wires come up
>to (usually pad-mounted above ground) transformers and the
>BPL signal will permeate all the wiring in your (and your
>neighbors') house(s) ...

>Underground distribution will help (some) but it doesn't actually
>solve the problem.

Right now, the emissions I heard in the trial areas were weaker in areas of underground distribution. However, the losses are higher, so the utility would have to install its digital repeaters more often along the underground lines. It is a safe assumption that the industry that is asking the FCC for higher emissions limits will increase the power so that underground wiring is at those limits, too. We need to stay focused on what the rules would permit -- 30 uV/m at 30 m -- rather than individual implementations that may be below the limits in some cases.

Right now, the companies are probably using "stock" equipment for these marketing trials. When it goes live, you can bet they will develop higher powered systems as the most economical way to deploy in underground-wiring areas.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1287. Re: Opposing BPL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-17 11:51:08 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031017075108.05693.00000742@mb-m10.aol.com>
Source record: 80914

>One of the simplest and most positive tests is to turn the BPL service on and
>off and observe changes in interference, thus identifying if BPL is the
>source.
>But to my knowledge no BPL test site has done such tests.

I have done just that in Emmaus, PA and in Potomac, MD. The correlation between the noise heard and the download of files by users was perfect. NTIA did testing in the same two cities, but working with the utility companies to do just that -- turn the system on and off. And even after working with NTIA in Potomac, a PPL representative had the gall to tell a local newspaper reporter that Carl and I had heard "neon signs" in the residential neighborhood.

>What about harmonics? The BPL signals on the video sounded like they had
>pretty fast risetimes.

What sounds fast on a receiver will generate modulation sidebands up and down the band, but not harmonics. I have heard harmonics in the trail areas, perhaps down about 30-40 dB. Our 1500-watt stations can have 50 milliwatt harmonics, so we may not want to point our fingers in that direction. :-)

>Because different systems are being tried in different locations, proponents
>of each system will probably proclaim the *their* system doesn't have that
>problem - what you heard at the Podunk site is Brand X BPL.

Yup, been tried. Ironically, the least cooperative BPL manufacturer's system was actually the most benign. Had they worked with me instead of turning it off when they knew I was coming, their marketing folks could have made hay.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1288. Re: Opposing BPL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-17 11:53:06 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031017075306.05693.00000743@mb-m10.aol.com>
Source record: 80913

>Of course if they don't *generate* any RFI on MHP frequencies they won't
>likely get any comnpalints!

Yes, and if they continue not to generate signals on low VHF, they will continue not get any complaints. If they would reduce their emissions on the ham bands to about 60 dB less than FCC, amateur radio wouldn't get a significant amount of interference and ARRL could move on to new challenges.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1289. Re: Opposing BPL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-17 12:01:22 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031017080122.05693.00000745@mb-m10.aol.com>
Source record: 80915

>Go to the ARRL site for the complete list of known test areas.

Actually they aren't there (yet). I do have a pretty good set of documentation, including streets in most cases, but am not posting it. Although cooperation has been slow, we are starting to see some cooperation from some electric utility companies. One of the promises I make to them is that ARRL will work with them to help them understand the interference potential, but we will do so in the least-destructive way possible. Having hordes of angry hams swarming around the trial areas would not meet that goal.

Here are the known cities:

Birmingham, AL area
Cullman, AL (may be concluded)
Bay area, CA (5 GHz-only system!)
Atlanta, GA area
Honolulu, HI
Boise, ID
Potomac, MD
Cape Girardea, MO
Raleigh, NC
Briarcliff Manor/Ossining, NY (Westchester Cty)
Dublin, OH
Hyde Park, OH
Bethlehem, PA (new - just getting started)
Emmaus, PA
Whitehall, PA
Azle, TX (new, little data available)
Manassas, VA

If hams live in those areas and can help, contact me at w1rfi@arrl.org.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1290. Re: What makes LHA so poor at simple research tasks?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-17 13:23:07 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bmoqfr$o3c$0@208.206.142.107>
Source record: 80916

Steve Robeson, K4CAP wrote:
> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0310151658.2d3753af@posting.google.com>...
>
>>n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20031015083048.12501.00003146@mb-m04.aol.com>...
>>
>>>In article <20031014211336.00545.00001638@mb-m02.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com
>>>(Len Over 21) writes:
>
>
>>>> Come up with the way a spark transmitter suddenly turns into
>>>> an Alexanderson Alternator whenever it is brought up in an amateur
>>>> radio newsgroup.
>>>
>>>That's your game, Len.
>>
>>What's your game, Jim?
>
>
> What's your interest in knowing, Brain? Even if he tells you,
> it's unlikely you'd understand.
>

I used to think that Brian had missed something. Turns out he missed
everything!

1291. Re: A New Concept: Virtual Spectrum

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-17 14:00:23 UTC
From: David Stinson <arc5@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3F8FF5F5.F862AA36@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 80917
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors

Oh, my....*sigh*

No, I don't work for the power companies,
and no, I don't lobby for BPL.

charlesblabham wrote:

>..it encourages us all to be discouraged....
Now *that* is an interesting concept..

>
> I am sorry to hear that this invasion of non-ham stuff
> into the hobby does not bother you.
I thought innovating, finding new ways around problems, etc.
was "ham stuff." We used to do that alot.

> So far, the idea of using non-ham links in order to "improve" the
> performance of amateur radio has been 100% consistent. In every case where
> it has been applied, it has managed to set back
> and denigrate the hobby, to some extent or another.

When CW replaced spark, it was going to
"make the hobby too complicated and expensive to continue."

When SSB came on the ham scene, "Donald Duck"
was going to "destroy the hobby."

When FM and repeaters came along, they were
"against the spirit of ham radio. You might as well use a telephone!"

When Packet appeared, they brayed:
"those 'brrrrappp!' signals are denigrating the hobby!"

Throughout our history, hecklers and naysayers have been full of beans.
And they're full of beans now.

In the next rewrite, I'm taking out all references to BPL.
It was just one aspect of many; a way to dodge one giant
hairball the FCC is about to cough up on us.
But when you say "BPL," a few people go into some sort of "brain lock."
They can't even hear anything else.
Oh well... back to building the 611 QSO transverters...
73 Dave S.

1292. Re: Opposing BPL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-17 14:04:33 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bmosthsou0@208.206.142.107>
Source record: 80918

W1RFI wrote:

>>Of course if they don't *generate* any RFI on MHP frequencies they won't
>>likely get any comnpalints!
>
>
> Yes, and if they continue not to generate signals on low VHF, they will
> continue not get any complaints.

But is is almost certain they they will claim success for their
"tests" in that "We got no complaints from low VHF users" when they
generated no such interference during testing-but are sure to when BPL
is widely implemented. That seems to make it very much necessary for
someone to document the parameters of what they DO generate so that
accurate information is available to challenge those later claims with
the facts when they make *inaccurate* reports of their of their
"successful" tests to FCC. It must be shown that the tests were
not properly done so as to actually test the system that will be
put into service.

That's a pretty substantial project-documenting the interference
generated at each -or at least certain critical- BPL test sites where
this could be the result. It then requires knowledge of local conditions
such as knowledge of what spectrum that is used locally by which users.

No wonder the BPL people are confident of a win. None of this is
accidental.

If they would reduce their emissions on the
> ham bands to about 60 dB less than FCC, amateur radio wouldn't get a
> significant amount of interference and ARRL could move on to new challenges.
>

It's almost a certainty that the only way they will do that is if
they're challenged with collected data that causes FCC to require it.

1293. Re: Opposing BPL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-17 14:15:27 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0310170615.2edf4120@posting.google.com>
Source record: 80919
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:<xnfcneeyarg.hmvgz2b.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>...
> On 15 Oct 2003 22:30:17 -0700, Brian Kelly wrote:
>
> >> This means that the manufacturer is required to test them to
> >> ensure that they comply with the FCC regulations. Under the present
> >> rules, they must be tested at 3 typical locations. "
> >
> >What's the FCC definition of "typical locations"??
>
> De facto: any place where the results support the stand that one is
> advocating.

Oh golly, I would never have guessed that . .

1294. Re: Opposing BPL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-17 14:27:38 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bmou8qvqc0@208.206.142.107>
Source record: 80920

W1RFI wrote:

>>One of the simplest and most positive tests is to turn the BPL service on and
>>off and observe changes in interference, thus identifying if BPL is the
>>source.
>>But to my knowledge no BPL test site has done such tests.
>
>
> I have done just that in Emmaus, PA and in Potomac, MD. The correlation
> between the noise heard and the download of files by users was perfect. NTIA
> did testing in the same two cities, but working with the utility companies to
> do just that -- turn the system on and off. And even after working with NTIA
> in Potomac, a PPL representative had the gall to tell a local newspaper
> reporter that Carl and I had heard "neon signs" in the residential
> neighborhood.
>

I certainly hope that some of you have enough gall to challenge that
statement with engineering data, published in the same press.
Otherwise they win the battle with the public and your efforts are
potentially fruitless. Someone provided technical data for his
inaccurate statement, whether it was a company engineer or some
press officer. Such lies MUST be countered with accurate information
if there is to be a successful outcome.

>
>>What about harmonics? The BPL signals on the video sounded like they had
>>pretty fast risetimes.
>
>
> What sounds fast on a receiver will generate modulation sidebands up and down
> the band, but not harmonics. I have heard harmonics in the trail areas,
> perhaps down about 30-40 dB. Our 1500-watt stations can have 50 milliwatt
> harmonics, so we may not want to point our fingers in that direction. :-)
>
>
>>Because different systems are being tried in different locations, proponents
>>of each system will probably proclaim the *their* system doesn't have that
>>problem - what you heard at the Podunk site is Brand X BPL.
>
>
> Yup, been tried. Ironically, the least cooperative BPL manufacturer's system
> was actually the most benign. Had they worked with me instead of turning it off
> when they knew I was coming, their marketing folks could have made hay.
>

I hope you documented all that, and that you're planning go back and try again when they don't know you're coming.

All this may wind up in a court somewhere, which means your documented efforts could be very important.

1295. Re: What makes a Pro code test Amateur a Troglodyte?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-17 14:43:14 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bmov62$23r$0@208.206.142.107>
Source record: 80921

Carl R. Stevenson wrote:

> "N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
> news:c2356669.0310131337.353df3fe@posting.google.com...
>
>>"Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
>
> news:<hGgib.785$_i.73747@nnrp1.ptd.net>...
>
>>>"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
>>>news:20031012000943.23307.00003682@mb-m29.aol.com...
>>>
>>>>In article <bma161$cg2@library2.airnews.net>, "Kim W5TIT"
>>>
>>> <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
>>>
>>>>writes:
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>Therein lies the problem with the whole CW test (TEST, *test*)
>
> debate.
>
>>> The
>>>
>>>>>minute one takes on the "no" CW test argument, it is generally met
>
> with
>
>>> an
>>>
>>>>>attitude that an end CW use (USE, *use*) is being favored or called
>
> for.
>
>>>>Kim:
>>>>
>>>>Code testing has always been the thing which generated code use.
>>>
>>>I would assert that being forced to learn code to gain access to HF
>>>"soured" more people on code use than it encouraged ... of course,
>>>some percentage of folks decided they liked code and continued to
>>>use it, but MANY simply endured something they had no interest in
>>>to get past the test, then "threw away the key."

>>>
>>>Remember the old adage "honey is better than vinegar."
>>
>>OK, fine, your opinion is well stated.
>>
>>Now consider that same logic applied to the written test.
>
>
> Jim ... I am not going to waste time, energy, and bandwidth
> debating the elimination of written tests, with you playing
> "devil's advocate" for elimination thereof ...
>
> I do not, and never will support the elimination or watering down
> of the written tests. I have stated over and over again that I
> personally feel they could be made better (where "better" and
> "more difficult" are not necessarily synonymous ...).
>
> I don't mean to come across as condescending, but your attempts
> to equate Morse testing's irrelevance to the written tests in an effort
> to support continued Morse testing is something I'm getting tired of.
> And I'm not going to play that game.
>

What that tells us is that your code testing position won't stand up
to the test of "what is necessary for licensing" any more than testing
for technical knowledge. And vice versa.

You really should try to keep up with Fred and his cohorts. They're
about to leave you behind to enjoy, with the rest of us, what little
useful part of ham radio that will be left, if any, when you-all are
finished.

1296. Re: I warned everyone this would happen. Re: 73 Magazine Says "73 and QRT"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-17 14:54:48 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0310170654.1350d68a@posting.google.com>
Source record: 80922
Cross-posted to:
rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

jason_hsu@my-deja.com (Jason Hsu) wrote in message
news:<f7d9a152.0310140457.6170ad6a@posting.google.com>...
> You're WRONG! No-Code Techs and Extra-Crispies are NOT the reason 73
> magazine is out of business.
>
> Britney Spears is to blame. Ever since the "Baby One More Time"
> video, Britney has been working tirelessly to corrupt all 6 billion
> members of the human race by exposing her midriff. If Britney hadn't
> tied up her shirt in the "Baby One More Time" video, the Good Old Days
> of ham radio would still be with us. :)
>
> CQ, CQ, CQ baby one more time!

Hmmmmm....guess I got the best of both worlds then...MTV >>AND<< Amateur Radio!

Steve, K4YZ

1297. Amateur Radio Newsline™ Report 1366 October 17 2003

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-17 17:52:50 UTC
From: radionews@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031017135250.28806.00000258@mb-m25.aol.com>
Source record: 80923

Amateur Radio Newsline™ Report 1366 October 17 2003

Amateur Radio Newsline report number 1366 with a release date of Friday, October 17th 2003 to follow in 5-4-3-2-1.

The following is a QST. A chance for pro-code to speak out to the FCC and a warning to firefighting officials about the hazard of BPL. Find out the details on Amateur Radio Newsline report number 1366 coming your way right now.

(Billboard Cart Here)

**

RESTRUCTURING: MORSE CODE AND THE FCC - ROUND II

Well we told you it was going to happen and it has. We are talking about the next round of rule making requests to the FCC on the topic of what to do about Morse code testing. Most of this group want to keep some form of CW test. Amateur Radio Newsline's Bruce Tennant, K6PZW, takes a look at what the FCC wants you to read and comment on:

--

If you were not happy with the first round of Morse code rule making requests, maybe you will find something more to your liking in this latest batch of seven that the FCC has released for public comment.

We have already covered the most prominent of them. That being the one from FISTS -- the international Morse code preservation society. FISTS wants the code retained and all aspects of the ham radio exam process made allot tougher. And in this area, FISTS is not alone.

In is petition, Frank Napurano, K2OKA, calls Morse the purest, most accurate, efficient, reliable and economical form of radio communications ever devised. He tells the FCC that its essential to keep at least the current 5 word per minute CW test in the interest of public safety, the preservation of a radio art and as a tribute of support for a prized and respected avocation.

Also in favor of keeping some form of Morse exam is the Puerto Rico Amateur Radio League. While it wants the FCC to do away with the current 5 word per minute test for General class it says to keep it for those going for an Extra ticket.

James Roux, W4YA, wants the FCC to eliminate the 5 word per minute code test for a General class license, but like the Puerto Rico Amateur Radio League would require Extra class applicants prove they

can do Morse at 15 words per minute. Roux also wants to cut the number of licenses to only two. Under his proposal nobody would loose current privileges but only the General and Extra class would continue to be issued.

Meantime, Robert Rightsell, AE4FA and Harry Kholer, NZ0PU also want 5 word per minute Morse testing continued but would institute a points score system for passing a ham radio exam. Under the Rightsell / Kholer plan, an applicant could earn up to 24 points on Morse testing.

And Joseph Speroni, AH0A, has a novel idea. Only test hams in Morse who want to use the mode. Speroni would have the FCC delete the CW exam for those who want to operate only phone. If a ham wants to operate High Frequency Morse, Speroni says they should pass the current 5 word per minute exam.

Last but by no means least comes Charles Young Jr, AG4YO. He is asking the FCC to delete the 5 word per minute Morse exam for the Technician Plus license, but keep it as a requirement for General and Amateur Extra exams. And like the other petitioners, Young has some specific ideas regarding other aspects of ham radio licensing as well.

These seven petitions have been designated as RM 10805 through 10811. Commentary cutoff on all of them is Friday, November 7th.

For the Amateur Radio Newsline, I'm Bruce Tennant, K6PZW, reporting.

--

You can comment on one or all of these rule making petitions by taking your browser to the FCC Electronic Comment Filing System. Its in cyberspace at www.fcc.gov/cgb/ecfs. (ARNewsline™ from FCC website)

**

RESTRUCTURING: QRZ SAYS KEEP THE DISCUSSION ON TRACK

In a related story, the operators of the QRZ.com website have drawn a proverbial line in the sand. They say that any attempts to take a Forum discussion that is not directly related to the code versus no code debate and turn it into such will result in those posting being removed. The operators of the website say that this is not a stance by QRZ.com either for or against Morse code. Rather it is a their way to keep a given subject being discussed on track. The QRZed website is in cyberspace at www.qrz.com. (QRZ)

**

RESTRUCTURING: PNG GOES CODE-FREE

I'm Don Wilbanks, AE5DW, with breaking news out of the South Pacific. Dateline Papua New Guinea where that nations Telecommunications Administration, PANGTEL, has declared Papua New

Guinea to be the latest nation to become code free. This as it orders the deletion of Morse Code from the qualifications necessary for its amateurs to have access to the High Frequency bands.

According to Rick Warnett, P29KFS, the decision to drop Morse was actually made back on June 10 th but not widely publicized until now. June 10 th was before the 2003 World Radiocommunications Conference that decided Morse testing was no longer mandatory world wide and retaining it would be the decision of each individual administration.

Warnett, who is the IARU representative for the Papua New Guinea Amateur Radio Society says that the official announcement will take place within the next few days. When it comes, Warnett says that some 30 to 40 new Papua New Guinea full call hams will have international communication available to them. (Q-News)

**

DX PROBLEMS: A FOLLOW-UP ON ANNOBON ISLAND - 3C0V

A little more information has surfaced on why a long awaited Dxpedition suddenly left the air. Jeramy Boot, G4NJH, has the details:

--

The Spanish and German group that had been operating as 3C0V from Annobon Island off the West Coast of Africa were forced to close down early in the morning of last Saturday, the 4th of October. The DXpedition was scheduled to have continued until the 10th of October.

Gabriel 'Gaby' Mardiros, OD5NJ, the 'pilot' for the 3C0V DXpedition, says that the group is "fine" but that they had received "a serious warning not to use any of their radios". The reason for the enforced closure was not yet known."

--

Some reports indicated that local authorities had given the DXpeditioners less than 24 hours to pack up and get off the island. More on this story as information is made available. (GB2RS)

**

Break 1

From the United States of America, We are the Amateur Radio Newsline, heard on bulletin stations around the world including Peoria Amateur Radio Club net serving Peoria Illinois.

(5 sec pause here)

**

WRTC: 2006 GAMES IN BRAZIL

It has been announced that the next World Radiosport Team Championship, or 'WRTC', will be held in Brazil in 2006. The last WRTC event took place in Finland in July last year.

WRTC brings together the top HF contesters from all over the world to compete on - as far as is possible - a 'level playing field'. WRTC 2006 will take place in Florianopolis, capital of Santa Catarina State in southern Brazil. The event is open to everyone: competitors and spectators alike.

I'm Jeramy Boot, G4NJH, in Nottingham. (GB2RS)

**

RADIO RULES: WORLD'S BROADCASTERS JOIN ANTI-BPL CHORUS

A subcommittee of an International Telecommunication Union panel of technical experts responsible for terrestrial broadcasting issues has joined a growing chorus of concerned parties about the interference potential of power line telecommunication. According to the ARRL Letter, ITU Radiocommunication Sector Sub Working Group 6E1 has been looking at BPL. Now it has expressed the view that interference produced by systems employing powerline data transmission as well as by Industrial, Scientific and Medical equipment and short-range devices, will compromise broadcast reception. (ARRL, CGC)

**

RESCUE RADIO: BPL VS. FIRE RADIO COMMUNICATIONS

Meantime, hams who are also firefighters or have access to the local fire Department should consider enlisting their help in fighting the rollout of Broadband over Powerlines. This, due to the heavy use of the 33 and 45 MHz radio bands by fire departments.

Writing to the QRZ.com super site, Jim Walsh, K3JIM, says that some fire departments are not technically savvy and think that interference is really blind spots in the radio coverage. Walsh, who is a firefighter and truck engineer Red Lion, Pennsylvania, says that broadband interference is not easily recognizable to fire personnel as say an interfering DX station may be to the trained ear of a ham radio operator. He says that the fire service is used to dead spots and may not know why they exist.

Walsh cites one situation in the area where he lives and works. He says that it is well known that when in the vicinity of certain gas station convenience stores in his area that one cannot use the radio for a few hundred meters. He says that in this case the problem is the Point of Sale system that records the gas transactions and that the lines running to the pumps are not shielded and radiate computer hash like an antenna.

K3JIM has lots more to say about the problem BPL can be to low-band fire radio systems. You can read it all on line at www.qrz.com (K3JIM via qrz.com)

**

ENFORCEMENT: YOU ARE NOT SUPPOSED TO OPERATE THERE

In regulatory news, two hams have been asked to explain why they have been heard operating on law enforcement frequencies. The FC's Daryl Duckworth, NN0W, has more:

--

Duckworth: "Tom Christman, KB2NAV, of Albany New York, has received an inquirey as to operations on the Albany County Sheriff's Department emergency frequencies without legitimate purpose last December.

Along similar lines, Joseph Hutchins, KG4SXD, of Swannanoa, North Carolina, is being asked about operations on police frequencies in February of this year. That of the Black Mountain Police Department in Black Mountain North Carolina."

--

Both hams were given 20 days to respond to the FCC's query. If the agency finds that rules have been violated, each ham could face a fine of $7,500 to $10,000, license suspension and revocation.

**

ENFORCEMENT: AMATEUR TOLD TO KEEP HAM GEAR OFF CB

The FCC has written to James Perryman, KC8KOU, of Toledo Ohio. This, regarding continued complaints involving his alleged operation of non type accepted radio gear on the 11 meter band. Again, the FCC's Daryl Duckworth, NN0W:

--

Duckworth: "The letter went on to say that the operation of non-certified equipment on CB frequencies, such as Amateur equipment and linear amplifiers will result in a monetary forfeiture in the $7500 to $10,000 area, as well as the in-reim seizure of all non-certified equipment in cooperation with the United States Attorney in his jurisdiction."

--

The FCC also told Perryman that his station is subject to inspection at any time by Commission personnel.

**

ENFORCEMENT: YOU CANNOT SAY THAT ON THE RADIO

Meantime, Federal regulators have announced plans to fine a Detroit radio station $27,500. This, for an allegedly indecent broadcast on a popular afterboon show back in January of 2002.

In a Notice of Apparent Liability to Monetary Forfeiture, the FCC said a broadcast on Infinity Broadcasting's WKRK-FM included explicit and graphic sexual and excretory references during separate discussions with nine separate people. Such language is banned under FCC rules.

Infinity was given 30 days to contest the notice. In earlier filings with the FCC, the company argued that no penalty could be assessed. This is because Infinity believes that the FCC's definition of indecency is unconstitutional.

**

ENFORCEMENT: LA REPEATER OWNERS ORGANIZE AGAINST ALLEGED UNLICENSED OPERATOR

Repeater owner operators in the Los Angeles Californias area are taking action to keep transmissions allegedly coming from Jack Gerritsen, the former KG6IRO, from being retransmitted. In are rare show of cooperation, system owners and their control operators are taking repeaters off of the air rather than permit the signals from a station identifying with the call sign KG6IRO call sign from being rebroadcast.

If the name Jack Gerritsen sounds familiar its because we have reported on hin several times before. Gerritsen was licensed for a very brief period back in 2001. His ham ticket was set aside by the FCC's Wireless Telecommunications Bureau after the agency learned that Gerritsen had been convicted in 2000 on charges of interfering with Los Angeles Police Department radio transmissions. Gerritsen recieved a jail term for the interference conviction. He was paroled but sent back to prison after allegations surfaced that he had been operating a radio transmitter without a license. He was released before serving his full sentence as the result of a Federal court order dealing with overcrowding in California state prisons. His application for a ham radio license remains in the FCC's pending file and a hearing on the matter will be scheduled at some future date.

Be that as it may, Los Angeles area repeater owners are not waiting for the FCC to move in the matter. They have taken matters into their own hands and are acting to keep the signal claiming to be KG6IRO from being repeated. (ARNewsline™)

**

HAM RADIO BUSINESS: 73 MAGAZINE FOLDS

73 Magazine is the latest casulty in the weak world-wide ham radio business economy. On Monday, October 6th, founder Wayne Green, W2NSD, e-mail several friends to tell them that 73 Magazine has

ceased publication after completing 43 years.

The reason for 73 going away? Green claims that the hobby is slowly dying as a result of a lack of new hams. In turn the the industry that supports Amateur Radio is fading away as well. Green says that without sufficient advertising the magazine couldn't continue.

--

Green: "The book sales have kept 73 going for the last few years, but book sales have dwindeled way, way down and there was no way to keep 73 going. The ad sales are down and the reciepts from the ad sales are down even weorse than the ads."

--

W2NSD says that it was an interesting 43 years and that he hopes to write about it some time. In the meantime he plans to continuing his essays on his website for those subscribers who mainly bought the magazine to read them. Thats in cyberspace at www.waynegreen.com.

No word what will happen to those with outstanding subscriptions to 73, especially hams who bought lifetime subs at a bargain price when the magazine first started up. Green always said it would last through his lifetime or that of the purchaser, but it looks as if W2NSD and a number of lifetime subscribers may have outlived 73. We expected it of Green. His phonetics are W-2-Never-Say-Die.

You can hear W2NSD talk about the demise of 73 on this weeks RAIN Report. Its available on-line at www dot rainreport dot com or by telephone at 847-827-7246. (ARNewsline™)

**

HAM RADIO BUSINESS: NEW KIDS HAM RADIO MAGAZINE TO BE PUBLISHED

If the ham business is as bad as Wayne Green says, you would not know it by Larry Mahlberg AA0BY. As 73 sails into the sunset, Mahlberg has announced his own new ham radio magazine targeting the younger generation.

According to Mahlberg, he and his crew are putting together a brand new monthly publication called "Hamtastic Kids" that will debuet on November 15th and be available by subscription. To get it started, AA0BY is asking your help by submitting material for publicatoon such as Amateur Radfio poems, stories, puzzles and even ham radio recipes. He is also looking for articles written by kids on such topics as Morse code, DX'ing, ragchewing, fox hunting, contesting and hamfests.

But thats not all. The Hamtastic Kids is offering a free years subscription for best logo that a youngster submits for use in the Magazine. Submissions of logos, articles and information requests go to Hamtastic Kids, in care of Larry Mahlberg, AA0BY, P.O Box 1634

Eugene, Oregon, 97440 (W8HDU)

**

BREAK 2

This is ham radio news for today's radio amateur. From the United States of America, We are the Amateur Radio Newsline with links to the world from our only official website at www.arnewsline.org and being relayed by the volunteer services of the following radio amateur:

(5 sec pause here)

**

RESCUE RADIO: APRS JOINS THE CHARLES REGATTA

Almost two decades after it was developed by an Amateur Radio operator, Automatic Position Reporting System equipment is being used for the first time by the hams on board the rescue launches at the Head of the Charles Regatta. Amateur Radio Newsline's Norm Seeley, KI7UP, reports:

--
Bob Bruninga, WB4APR, is considered the father of the Automatic Position Reporting System thats known in ham radio circles by the acronym of four letters APRS. And from October 17th through the 19th a team of up to 30 operators will be on the air using it and other modes to operate a safety communications net for the annual Head of the Charles Regatta.

According to Bruce Pigott, KC1US, the addition of APRS is very significant because it allows automatic tracking of a ham radio station by sending Global Positioning Satellite information along with the voice or other data on the radio signal. This should permit precise dispatch of land and river emergency units to rendezvous with the launches.

KC1US says that communications coverage begins three hours before the first race on Saturday and an hour before the first race on Sunday. This, will allow medical and public safety communications coverage of practice runs and gathering crowds of spectators.

For the Amateur Radio Newsline, I'm Norm Seeley, KI7UP.

--

This year's communications support covers all aspects of the regatta. This includes preparations, practice and competition for all three days of the event. (KC1US)

**

HAM RADIO CONFERENCES: SVHFS IN GEORGIA IN 2004

The 8th Annual Southeastern VHF Society Conference will be held in Georgia on April 23 and 24, 2004. This, at the Holiday Inn Hotel & Suites in Marietta on the outskirts of Atlanta. More information will be posted the Society webpage. The u-r-l is www.svhfs.org. Qustions go by e-mail to rover@wireco.netb (SEVHFS)

**

HAM RADIO IN SPACE: VU-SAT LAUNCH DELAYED

Turning to ham radio in space, the expected launch of India's VU-Sat has been delayed indefinitely. The AMSAT News Service quoting a release from the launch agency says that during the thermo vacuum test deviations in the performance of the ham radio payload were. Because of the need to correct these abnormalities, the launch will take place at some later date. VU-Sat was to be a passenger with a remote sensing satellite being orbited onboard from Sriharikota launch range later this month. (AMSAT)

**

HAM RADIO IN SPACE: HAPPY BIRTHDAY AO-40

AMSAT is sponsoring an AO40 Birthday Bash to celebrate the satellites 3rd Birthday. The party continues through November 17th. Email Bruce Paige, KK5DO, for more details. His e-mail address kk5do@amsat.org (AMSAT)

**

INTERNATIONAL - GERMANY: DL3KWF RESIGNS AS DARC VP

On the international scene, word from Germany that Hardy Zenker, DL3KWF has resigned from his post as Deutscher Amateur Radio Club vice president He has been replaced by Ingobert Dittrich, DK9MD, who was elected to the post. Dittrich is well known as a former representative of the broadcasters to numerous committees across Europe. The Deutscher Amateur Radio Club which is Germany's natioonal ham radio society holds elections every two years. (DARC)

**

INTERNATIONAL - HOLLAND: ARTIFICIAL BROADCAST ISLAND TO DISAPPEAR

A significant piece of Dutch broadcasting history may soon cease to exist. Media Network reports that the Hollands Department of Public Works has announced its decision to dismantle the artificial platform in the North Sea known as R-E-M Island. The island was constructed in 1964 at a cost of 9 million guilders by a team of entrepreneurs who used it to broadcast radio and television programs to the Netherlands under the name Radio Noordzee and TV Noordzee.
The full story is on-line at http://www.rnw.nl/realradio/features/html/rem031009.html (Media Network)

**

INTERNATIONAL - BRAZIL: CELEBRATING SCOUTING ON THE AIR

And Brazillian club station PY3ARD is on the air as ZW90S for the renmainder 2003. This, to celebrate the 90th anniversary of the Gerge Black Scout Group which happens to be the oldest Scout Group in Brazil. According to the RSGB, the ZW90S call will be aired for the first time during the upcoming CQ World Wide contest. If you work it, QSL via PY3ARD. (G2RS)

**

ON THE AIR: W6AQ AND K6IPV TO RAROTONGA OCT. 21

Hollywood producer Dave Bell, W6AQ and his close friend Don Lisle, K6IPV are headed to Rarotomga. This for a combined mini-D-Xpedition and contest operation. The pair will arrive on the island at about 9:00 PM local time on October 20th. They hope to be on the air by the afternoon of the 21st operating mostly SSB with some CW and possibly RTTY and PSK-31.:

--

Bell: "They will hear us calling CQ on whatever the highest frequency where there is propagation which is going to be during the daytime perhapps 10 meters; 15 meters hopefully and 20 meters certainly. Nighttime we will probably be dealing with 20 meters, 40 meters, 80 meters and perhapps even 160 meters. We will see if we can talk to anybody on that band."

--

Bell will operate as ZK1AQT and Lisle will be on using ZK1IPV. Both will be on as ZK1SSB for the CQ World Wide SSB Contest and will tear everything down on the afternoon of October 28th. Their QSL Manager is Norm Friedman W6ORD whose address is good in just about any Callbook. (ARNewsline™)

**

DX

In D-X, TM9AF will be on the air through October 26th to celebrate the 25rh anniversary of the Auxerre Ham-Expo. About 20 operators will be on the air with the special callsign on 160 to 6 metres using CW, SSB, PSK, RTTY, and Slow Scan TV. They will also operate 2 meters to 1.2GHz on CW, SSB FM, RTTY, and ATV. If you make contact, Q-S-L as directed on the air. (GB2RS)

Stefano Frau, IS0WBT, says by way of e-mail that special event station ISZ0A will be on air during the upcoming CQ World Wide SSB contest. This on the on 25th and 26th of October. Stefano says that the operation will take place from Mt. Cresia in grid square JM49QG. Operation will be in the multi-multi catagory and the operators will

be looking to talk to all of you. QSL direct to IS0MYN. (GB2RS)

**

THAT FINAL ITEM: DUTCH STUDY SUGGESTS ISSUES ACCOMPANY 3G CELL STATIONS

And finally, can cellular telephones make you more alert? Some researchers in the Netherlands think so. Bill Pasternak, WA6ITF, has more:

--
A study by Dutch researchers has found some interesting side effects from certain cellular telephone base station radiation. Initial results show that electromagnetic energy transmitted by base stations for the new third generation or 3 G wireless networks caused subjects in double-blind test groups to experience tingling sensations, get headaches and have feelings of nausea. On the other hand, when the same subjects were exposed to signals from current mobile networks, no negative impacts were found.

But here's the kicker. When the same people were exposed to both types of fields -- that being 3 G plus current networks -- cognitive functions including memory and response times showed measurable improvement. Put simply, the subjects became more alert when exposed to both fields. The report did not discuss the modulation schemes nor the specific RF power densities that were involved in the study, and obviously allot more research needs to be done before anything conclusive can be known.

For the Amateur Radio Newsline, I'm Bill Pasternak, WA6ITF

--

Now it has to be pointed out that these are early results. As such, while they are interesting, are yet to be confirmed. You can read more in cyberspace at www.msnbc.com/news/974005.asp (CGC)

**

NEWSCAST CLOSE

With thanks to Alan Labs, AMSAT, the ARRL, the CGC Communicator, CQ Magazine, the FCC, the Ohio Penn DX Bulletin, Radio Netherlands, Rain, the RSGB and Australia's Q-News, that's all from the Amateur Radio Newsline(tm). Our e-mail address is newsline @arnewsline.org. More information is available at Amateur Radio Newsline's(tm) only official website located at www.arnewsline.org. You can also write to us or support us at Amateur Radio Newsline(tm), P.O. Box 660937, Arcadia, California 91066.

For now, with Bill Pasternak, WA6ITF, at the editors desk, I'm Ken Butler, W1NNR, saying 73 and we thank you for listening." Amateur Radio Newsline(tm) is Copyright 2003. All rights reserved.

1298. Re: What makes a Pro code test Amateur a Troglodyte?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-17 20:45:00 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3F9054CC.3060004@psu.edu>
Source record: 80924

Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
> "N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
> news:c2356669.0310150821.4841ec23@posting.google.com...
> [snip]
>
>>How will we counter that argument?
>
>
> One approach would be to stop planting it in peoples'
> minds numerous times a day ... things that are repeated
> often enough sometimes catch on, even if they are BAD
> ideas ...

Hoo, Carl. I think that has to be a null here. Your comments on Morse code might be looked at as the same thing.

- Mike KB3EIA -

1299. Re: What makes a Pro code test Amateur a Troglodyte?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-17 21:03:39 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0310171303.5075e5a9@posting.google.com>
Source record: 80925

Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:<bmov62$23r$0@208.206.142.107>...

(huge snippage)
>
> You really should try to keep up with Fred and his cohorts.

Dick,

Fred who?

> They're
> about to leave you behind to enjoy, with the rest of us, what little
> useful part of ham radio that will be left, if any, when you-all are
> finished.

There's an old story about how a frog tossed into a pan of hot water
will jump right out, but if put in a pan of cool water that is slowly
warmed, frog will be cooked before noticing the gradual change in
temperature.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1300. Re: ARRL you can Kiss my $39.00 a Year Good Bye

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-17 21:10:29 UTC
From: Glenn <kg5uc1NOSPAM@charter.net>
Message-ID: <vp0mm69jg1h633@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 80926

Brian Kelly wrote:

> "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:<VYKab.804$Hd6.600926@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>...
>
>>"Brian Kelly" <kelly@dvol.com> wrote in message
>>news:d22b54c3.0309172038.d92c8bd@posting.google.com...
>
>
>
>>>. . . I think I lost some of my ability to get it down solid on paper at
>>>speed and I'm working on that.
>>>
>>>However I do not agree with a hypothesis that simply cramming for then
>>>passing a 13 or even a 20wpm code test assures a lifetime ability to
>>>copy Morse at any usable speed. I've seen too many examples of "cram &
>>>pass" types who never actually used the stuff on the air to any extent
>>>all but completely forget how to copy Morse. Apparently there is some
>>>combination of both a speed and a number of hours of experience at
>>>that speed which embeds Morse for life.
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>>Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>>>
>>>w3rv
>>
>>It appears to me that the reason 13wpm and higher works, according to the
>>reference, is that you CAN'T successfully cram to pass the higher speeds.
>>You've got to have those neural connections solidly in place. However for
>>10wpm and down you can cram and pass the tests.
>
>
> I'm not particularly convinced that's the case but there isn't even
> any soft evidence which indicates that is or is not the case.
>
>
>>Regardless, there is definitely a point at which a person won't forget even
>>if they believe they have done so (your experience being a case in point).
>
>
> Agreed. In spades.
>
>

>>To me, this is the level that Extras should reach, i.e. a level that they
>>won't forget.
>
>
> We agree 200% on THAT point!
>
>
>>Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>
>
> w3rv

There's another point to this that I haven't seen anything on yet. It seems to me that the faster you can copy the easier it gets (to a point, of course). 13 wpm is a definite PITA to copy, considering they generally use 10 WPM weight and try to run it together to get the faster 13 wpm. I usually have trouble copying anything slower than 15 wpm, and I don't like 15, either. Too slow.

Back around 1989 some friends of mine and I were conducting code practice sessions on one of the local repeaters. We had one young man who was going for his Advanced (he had passed all the written tests, including Extra at 12 years old...smart young man!) and tried for the 13 wpm test numerous times, failing every one. My friends and I were perplexed, since he regularly copied 20 and 25 wpm in our practice sessions (we threw those speeds in without telling anyone once in a while).

One night before one of his tests, you could tell he was really discouraged and ready to give up, so I pulled him aside to another repeater and told him of a technique that a friend of mine told to me. I told him that, when the test came up, he should take the first test, which of course was the 20 wpm Extra test. I told him he should not expect to pass it, but to do his best to copy it and, when the 13 wpm came up next, it would sound slower and he should pass it with ease. Of course, he passed the 20 wpm with a perfect copy. He was on the repeater the following night gloating and bragging. ;-)

Back in the '90s I was driving an 18 wheeler over the road (no, I had my license WELL before I ever drove trucks). I liked to operate cw while driving and naturally had to be able to copy code in my head. 20 wpm and above, the code ceased being letters and formed words. At that time I was up to around 35-40 wpm, all copied and remembered in my head.

13 wpm has always been a PITA for me to copy, and I think for the reason I stated above. Everyone talked about the "13 wpm barrier" and it sure was. I think 15 wpm would have been a much better speed, and easier to attain, besides. But, as some have said, that's a moot point now. I'm glad I don't have to take the 5 wpm test. Someone would have to keep waking me up for the next letter.

--
73 from Glenn - KG5UC

1301. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-17 22:08:56 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0310171408.1e4c9f9e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 80927

These are the number of unexpired FCC ARS
licenses held by individuals on the dates listed:

As of May 14, 2000:

Novice - 49,329
Tech - 205,394
Tech Plus - 128,860
General - 112,677
Advanced - 99,782
Extra - 78,750
Total - 674,792

As of October 15, 2003:

Novice - 32,977 (decrease of 16,352)
Technician - 257,303 (increase of 51,909)
Technician Plus - 64,686 (decrease of 64,174)
General - 141,313 (increase of 28,636)
Advanced - 82,589 (decrease of 17,193)
Extra - 104,670 (increase of 25,920)
Total - 683,538 (increase of 8,746)

73 de Jim, N2EY

1302. Re: ARRL you can Kiss my $39.00 a Year Good Bye

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-17 22:45:07 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <Th_jb.1132$W16.334@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 80928

"Glenn" <kg5uc1NOSPAM@charter.net> wrote in message

Someone would have to keep
> waking me up for the next letter.
>
>
> --
> 73 from Glenn - KG5UC
>

Of course you realize that what you just said here will PO the unwashed and unaware don't ya Glenn?

You will be accused of bragging and being 'superior'.

When those of us that actually can copy QRQ Morse understand you totally.

Dan/W4NTI

1303. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-17 22:46:39 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <jj_jb.1145$W16.793@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 80929

"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
news:c2356669.0310171408.1e4c9f9e@posting.google.com...
> These are the number of unexpired FCC ARS
> licenses held by individuals on the dates listed:
>
> As of May 14, 2000:
>
> Novice - 49,329
> Tech - 205,394
> Tech Plus - 128,860
> General - 112,677
> Advanced - 99,782
> Extra - 78,750
> Total - 674,792
>
>
> As of October 15, 2003:
>
> Novice - 32,977 (decrease of 16,352)
> Technician - 257,303 (increase of 51,909)
> Technician Plus - 64,686 (decrease of 64,174)
> General - 141,313 (increase of 28,636)
> Advanced - 82,589 (decrease of 17,193)
> Extra - 104,670 (increase of 25,920)
> Total - 683,538 (increase of 8,746)
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

How Come with all these 'new' Ektra class tickets they STILL ain't covering
the HF bands?

Perhaps they can't figure out how to cut that dipole, eh?

Dan/W4NTI

1304. Amateur Radio in the 21st Century?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-17 23:15:58 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0310171515.6be6cd05@posting.google.com>
Source record: 80930

Folks,

Recently there has been mention of a paper by KL7CC titled "Amateur Radio in the 21st Century". It can be downloaded in Word format from:

http://www.qsl.net/al7fs/NCVECplan.doc

That document spells out what the NCVEC leaders are thinking about in terms of changes to the license structure as a result of WRC 2003.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1305. Re: ARRL you can Kiss my $39.00 a Year Good Bye

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-17 23:19:54 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <uO_jb.2286$P%1.1838654@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 80931

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:Th_jb.1132$W16.334@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net...
>
> "Glenn" <kg5uc1NOSPAM@charter.net> wrote in message
>
> Someone would have to keep
> > waking me up for the next letter.
> >
> >
> > --
> > 73 from Glenn - KG5UC
> >
>
> Of course you realize that what you just said here will PO the unwashed
and
> unaware don't ya Glenn?
>
> You will be accused of bragging and being 'superior'.
>
> When those of us that actually can copy QRQ Morse understand you totally.
>
> Dan/W4NTI
>

Although I passed my 20wpm, I can't do more than 15wpm on a sustained basis.
Yet 5wpm will even put me to sleep.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

1306. Re: What makes a Pro code test Amateur a Troglodyte?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-17 23:34:03 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bmpu9bfjk0@208.207.71.144>
Source record: 80932

N2EY wrote:
> Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:<bmov62$23r$0@208.206.142.107>...
>
> (huge snippage)
>
>> You really should try to keep up with Fred and his cohorts.
>
>
> Dick,
>
> Fred who?
>

Yeah, that's the one!

Maybe I shoulda said Fred and Jim (KL7CC)

>
>>They're
>>about to leave you behind to enjoy, with the rest of us, what little
>>useful part of ham radio that will be left, if any, when you-all are
>>finished.
>
>
> There's an old story about how a frog tossed into a pan of hot water
> will jump right out, but if put in a pan of cool water that is slowly
> warmed, frog will be cooked before noticing the gradual change in
> temperature.

I think Carl's unaware that he can croak right along
with the rest of ham radio!

1307. Re: ARRL you can Kiss my $39.00 a Year Good Bye

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-17 23:56:10 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bmpviqite0@208.207.71.144>
Source record: 80933

Glenn wrote:

>
>
> Brian Kelly wrote:
>
>> "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
>> news:<VYKab.804$Hd6.600926@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>...
>>
>>> "Brian Kelly" <kelly@dvol.com> wrote in message
>>> news:d22b54c3.0309172038.d92c8bd@posting.google.com...
>>
>>
>>
>>
>>>> . . . I think I lost some of my ability to get it down solid on
>>>> paper at speed and I'm working on that.
>>>>
>>>> However I do not agree with a hypothesis that simply cramming for then
>>>> passing a 13 or even a 20wpm code test assures a lifetime ability to
>>>> copy Morse at any usable speed. I've seen too many examples of "cram &
>>>> pass" types who never actually used the stuff on the air to any extent
>>>> all but completely forget how to copy Morse. Apparently there is some
>>>> combination of both a speed and a number of hours of experience at
>>>> that speed which embeds Morse for life.
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>>>>
>>>>
>>>> w3rv
>>>
>>>
>>> It appears to me that the reason 13wpm and higher works, according to
>>> the
>>> reference, is that you CAN'T successfully cram to pass the higher
>>> speeds.
>>> You've got to have those neural connections solidly in place. However
>>> for
>>> 10wpm and down you can cram and pass the tests.
>>
>>
>>

>> I'm not particularly convinced that's the case but there isn't even
>> any soft evidence which indicates that is or is not the case.
>>
>>
>>> Regardless, there is definitely a point at which a person won't
>>> forget even
>>> if they believe they have done so (your experience being a case in
>>> point).
>>
>>
>>
>> Agreed. In spades.
>>
>>> To me, this is the level that Extras should reach, i.e. a level that
>>> they
>>> won't forget.
>>
>>
>>
>> We agree 200% on THAT point!
>>
>>> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>>
>>
>>
>> w3rv
>
>
>
> There's another point to this that I haven't seen anything on yet. It
> seems to me that the faster you can copy the easier it gets (to a point,
> of course). 13 wpm is a definite PITA to copy, considering they
> generally use 10 WPM weight and try to run it together to get the faster
> 13 wpm. I usually have trouble copying anything slower than 15 wpm, and
> I don't like 15, either. Too slow.
>
> Back around 1989 some friends of mine and I were conducting code
> practice sessions on one of the local repeaters. We had one young man
> who was going for his Advanced (he had passed all the written tests,
> including Extra at 12 years old...smart young man!) and tried for the 13
> wpm test numerous times, failing every one. My friends and I were
> perplexed, since he regularly copied 20 and 25 wpm in our practice
> sessions (we threw those speeds in without telling anyone once in a while).
>
> One night before one of his tests, you could tell he was really
> discouraged and ready to give up, so I pulled him aside to another
> repeater and told him of a technique that a friend of mine told to me. I
> told him that, when the test came up, he should take the first test,
> which of course was the 20 wpm Extra test. I told him he should not
> expect to pass it, but to do his best to copy it and, when the 13 wpm

> came up next, it would sound slower and he should pass it with ease. Of
> course, he passed the 20 wpm with a perfect copy. He was on the
> repeater the following night gloating and bragging. ;-)
>
> Back in the '90s I was driving an 18 wheeler over the road (no, I had my
> license WELL before I ever drove trucks). I liked to operate cw while
> driving and naturally had to be able to copy code in my head. 20 wpm
> and above, the code ceased being letters and formed words. At that time
> I was up to around 35-40 wpm, all copied and remembered in my head.
>
> 13 wpm has always been a PITA for me to copy, and I think for the reason
> I stated above. Everyone talked about the "13 wpm barrier" and it sure
> was. I think 15 wpm would have been a much better speed, and easier to
> attain, besides. But, as some have said, that's a moot point now. I'm
> glad I don't have to take the 5 wpm test. Someone would have to keep
> waking me up for the next letter.

Interesting and a very good point. If newcomers could just be
convinced to learn the code fast instead of at a smail pace that
they'll have to unlearn later to progress, it would be so much
easier. That's the reason for the Farnsworth method. You learn to
recognize the sound of a character instead of counting dits and dahs.

One should listen to code that's faster than you're able to copy and
pick out what you can recognize, which gets to be more and more
of it as you go along, session after session. Concentrate but relax.
Before you know it, you're hearing it in words instead of letters.
That's how I got my speed up when I went for Extra 35 years ago
I highly recommend listening to the W1AW code practice sessions
where they start out fast and work on down to 5wpm.

It's surprising how slow 20wpm sounds after 35 and 30.

Dick W0EX

1308. Re: Code test analogy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-18 00:02:53 UTC
From: garigue <garigue@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <Nq%jb.578283$Oz4.554262@rwcrnsc54>
Source record: 80934

>
> > To expect prospective hams to believe in the fairy tale of morse code is
the
> > the same as expecting people to believe in the fairy tales of the holy
bible.
>
> To expect that you exercised even a modicum of thought before
> bombing USENET with this bit of emotionally charged, baseless
> silliness is even more lame than my expectations of being molested by
> Brittney Spears in the next 24 hours.
>
> Steve, K4YZ

Hams molested by Brittney Spears in the next 24 hours ???? PSE PSE what's
the frequency ....and more over ...what a pile-up ....

73 Tom KI3R ...Belle Vernon PA

1309. Re: ARRL you can Kiss my $39.00 a Year Good Bye

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-18 00:05:26 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bmq046kll0@208.207.71.144>
Source record: 80935

Dee D. Flint wrote:

> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
> news:Th_jb.1132$W16.334@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net...
>
>>"Glenn" <kg5uc1NOSPAM@charter.net> wrote in message
>>
>> Someone would have to keep
>>
>>>waking me up for the next letter.
>>>
>>>
>>>--
>>>73 from Glenn - KG5UC
>>>
>>
>>Of course you realize that what you just said here will PO the unwashed
>
> and
>
>>unaware don't ya Glenn?
>>
>>You will be accused of bragging and being 'superior'.
>>
>>When those of us that actually can copy QRQ Morse understand you totally.
>>
>>Dan/W4NTI
>>
>
>
> Although I passed my 20wpm, I can't do more than 15wpm on a sustained basis.
> Yet 5wpm will even put me to sleep.
>

That's where listening at considerably faster than you can
copy comes in. You'd be surprised how fast your abilities
improve. W1AW code practice sessions are good.

Dick

1310. Re: What makes LHA so poor at simple research tasks?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-18 00:12:20 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0310171612.72b5391@posting.google.com>
Source record: 80936

Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:<bmoqfr$o3c$0@208.206.142.107>...
> Steve Robeson, K4CAP wrote:
> > brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0310151658.2d3753af@posting.google.com>...
> >
> >>n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20031015083048.12501.00003146@mb-m04.aol.com>...
> >>
> >>>In article <20031014211336.00545.00001638@mb-m02.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com
> >>>(Len Over 21) writes:
> >>>
> >>>
> >>>> Come up with the way a spark transmitter suddenly turns into
> >>>> an Alexanderson Alternator whenever it is brought up in an amateur
> >>>> radio newsgroup.
> >>>
> >>>That's your game, Len.
> >>
> >>What's your game, Jim?
> >>
> >>
> > What's your interest in knowing, Brain? Even if he tells you,
> > it's unlikely you'd understand.
> >
>
> I used to think that Brian had missed something. Turns out he missed
> everything!

ROTMFFLMMFAO ! ! ! ! !

Steve, K4YZ

1311. Re: A New Concept: Virtual Spectrum

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-18 00:14:32 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <IB%jb.110177$qj6.5644730@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 80937
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors

David Stinson wrote:

> When CW replaced spark, it was going to
> "make the hobby too complicated and expensive to continue."

Who said that?

> When SSB came on the ham scene, "Donald Duck"
> was going to "destroy the hobby."

Who said that?

> When FM and repeaters came along, they were
> "against the spirit of ham radio. You might as well use a telephone!"

Who said that?

> When Packet appeared, they brayed:
> "those 'brrrrappp!' signals are denigrating the hobby!"

Who said that?

> Throughout our history, hecklers and naysayers have been full of beans.
> And they're full of beans now.

So if people are not "for" whatever comes along is full of beans?

> In the next rewrite, I'm taking out all references to BPL.

And when BPL appeared, those naughty naysayers thought it was a bad
thing too.

So I guess those who don't like BPL are full of beans?

- Mike KB3EIA -

1312. Re: ARRL you can Kiss my $39.00 a Year Good Bye

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-18 00:20:39 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <rH%jb.2292$P%1.1849996@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 80938

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:bmq046kll0@208.207.71.144...
> Dee D. Flint wrote:
>
> > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
> > news:Th_jb.1132$W16.334@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> >
> >>"Glenn" <kg5uc1NOSPAM@charter.net> wrote in message
> >>
> >> Someone would have to keep
> >>
> >>>waking me up for the next letter.
> >>>
> >>>
> >>>--
> >>>73 from Glenn - KG5UC
> >>>
> >>
> >>Of course you realize that what you just said here will PO the unwashed
> >
> > and
> >
> >>unaware don't ya Glenn?
> >>
> >>You will be accused of bragging and being 'superior'.
> >>
> >>When those of us that actually can copy QRQ Morse understand you
totally.
> >>
> >>Dan/W4NTI
> >>
> >
> >
> > Although I passed my 20wpm, I can't do more than 15wpm on a sustained
basis.
> > Yet 5wpm will even put me to sleep.
> >
>
> That's where listening at considerably faster than you can
> copy comes in. You'd be surprised how fast your abilities
> improve. W1AW code practice sessions are good.
>
> Dick
>

That's my long term goal. At the moment, I must put other priorities first. Besides passing that 20wpm got me my Extra (!) so now I can pursue further development at my leisure.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

1313. Re: BPL a reality in my area now!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-18 00:28:52 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031017202852.11891.00001562@mb-m11.aol.com>
Source record: 80939

In article <20031017074413.05693.00000741@mb-m10.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>>Even if the area distribution lines are buried, the wires come up
>>to (usually pad-mounted above ground) transformers and the
>>BPL signal will permeate all the wiring in your (and your
>>neighbors') house(s) ...
>
>>Underground distribution will help (some) but it doesn't actually
>>solve the problem.
>
>Right now, the emissions I heard in the trial areas were weaker in areas of
>underground distribution.

That's to be expected if you stayed on the street. If you drove up to a house, the racket might be a lot more.

The real killer test would be to have a "typical" amateur station in a neighborhood served by underground utilities carrying BPL. Say, a 2 story frame house on a half-acre or so, with a G5RV or dipole at 50 feet strung over the the house.

Wonder how much BPL garbage that setup would pick up?

>However, the losses are higher, so the utility
>would
>have to install its digital repeaters more often along the underground lines.
>It is a safe assumption that the industry that is asking the FCC for higher
>emissions limits will increase the power so that underground wiring is at
>those
>limits, too. We need to stay focused on what the rules would permit -- 30
>uV/m
>at 30 m -- rather than individual implementations that may be below the
>limits in some cases.

A question arises - 30 m from what? If every piece of house wiring has the BPL signals on it, in many locations you cannot get 30 meters away.
>
>Right now, the companies are probably using "stock" equipment for these
>marketing trials. When it goes live, you can bet they will develop higher
>powered systems as the most economical way to deploy in underground-wiring
>areas.
>
Is there stock equipment for BPL yet? Or could they be using prototypes?

73 es tnx for all the hard work de Jim, N2EY

I still owe ya that lobstah, Ed.

1314. Re: A New Concept: Virtual Spectrum

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-18 02:59:34 UTC
From: David Stinson <arc5@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3F90AC94.A38F3F35@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 80940
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors

Mike Coslo wrote:

>
> So I guess those who don't like BPL are full of beans?

See? Whaddya tell'ya... brain lock.

1315. Re: Opposing BPL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-18 03:22:13 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <Fl2kb.1572$_i.130445@nnrp1.ptd.net>
Source record: 80941

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:bmosthsou0@208.206.142.107...
> W1RFI wrote:
>
> >>Of course if they don't *generate* any RFI on MHP frequencies they won't
> >>likely get any comnpalints!
> >
> >
> > Yes, and if they continue not to generate signals on low VHF, they will
> > continue not get any complaints.
>
>
> But is is almost certain they they will claim success for their
> "tests" in that "We got no complaints from low VHF users" when they
> generated no such interference during testing-but are sure to when BPL
> is widely implemented. That seems to make it very much necessary for
> someone to document the parameters of what they DO generate so that
> accurate information is available to challenge those later claims with
> the facts when they make *inaccurate* reports of their of their
> "successful" tests to FCC. It must be shown that the tests were
> not properly done so as to actually test the system that will be
> put into service.
>
> That's a pretty substantial project-documenting the interference
> generated at each -or at least certain critical- BPL test sites where
> this could be the result. It then requires knowledge of local conditions
> such as knowledge of what spectrum that is used locally by which users.
>
> No wonder the BPL people are confident of a win. None of this is
> accidental.
>
>
> If they would reduce their emissions on the
> > ham bands to about 60 dB less than FCC, amateur radio wouldn't get a
> > significant amount of interference and ARRL could move on to new
challenges.
> >
>
> It's almost a certainty that the only way they will do that is if
> they're challenged with collected data that causes FCC to require it.

If they were to do what it would take to reduce their emissions by 60 dB,
the system flat out won't work ... it only works passably as it is, which is
why they want to up the power. (A former user in the PPL trial area told

me - in front of the reporter - that when he had the system working (before his service died and PPL couldn't/wouldn't fix it) he was getting "Maybe 4x dial-up speeds ..." He clearly wasn't impressed. Let's hope that there's a lot of that going around.)

Carl - wk3c

1316. Re: Amateur Radio in the 21st Century?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-18 03:25:07 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <no2kb.1574$_i.130317@nnrp1.ptd.net>
Source record: 80942

Jim,

That URL doesn't seem to be accessible ...

Carl - wk3c

"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
news:c2356669.0310171515.6be6cd05@posting.google.com...
> Folks,
>
> Recently there has been mention of a paper by KL7CC titled "Amateur
> Radio in the 21st Century". It can be downloaded in Word format from:
>
> http://www.qsl.net/al7fs/NCVECplan.doc
>
> That document spells out what the NCVEC leaders are thinking about in
> terms of changes to the license structure as a result of WRC 2003.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

1317. Re: New Acronym: ECTA (Era of Code Test Abolition)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-18 03:35:49 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20031017233549.00545.00001709@mb-m02.aol.com>
Source record: 80943

In article <bme4oe$lic55$7@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>, "Ryan, KC8PMX" <REMOVETHISkc8pmx@diamondcs.net> writes:

>Oh jeesh Larry, add more to the alphabet soup eh? :) (PCTA, NCTA, ECTA, >etc.)

Ryan:

Y knot?

73 de Larry, K3LT

1318. Re: What makes a Pro code test Amateur a Troglodyte?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-18 03:35:50 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20031017233550.00545.00001710@mb-m02.aol.com>
Source record: 80944

In article <zDoib.26496$Eo2.6732@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Bill Sohl"
<billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:

>> Bill:
>>
>> One year ago, I traded in a perfectly good 2001 Toyota Corolla LE with
>> a 5-speed manual gearbox for a new 2003 model with an automatic
>> transmission. However, I still see the need for code testing in the ARS.
>> I own a few rifles and handguns, but wouldn't want to bet my life on my
>> proficiency with a compound bow. However, I still see the need for
>> code testing in the ARS. How do you explain that?
>>
>> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>
>Bad judgement?

Bill:

I wouldn't say so. I'd call bringing a bow and arrow to a gunfight
bad judgement -- but I don't plan on getting into a fight with either.
Why? My better judgement tells me not to. It also tells me that
code testing has value within the ARS.

73 de Larry, K3LT

1319. Re: What makes a Pro code test Amateur a Troglodyte?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-18 03:35:50 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20031017233550.00545.00001711@mb-m02.aol.com>
Source record: 80945

predicate
In article <bmgg1o$gve@library2.airnews.net>, "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
writes:

>And, DICK, what modes would be your failure to communicate your way of an
>emergency if the fate of the planet depends on it? I wish, for once, you'd
>answer an honest question.

Kim:

Dick can't possibly answer this question because it doesn't make sense.
It is missing several important parts.

>I suspect it'll be the usual, though. Complete
>silence because my question is not only one you can't answer (yeah, I'll
>make the bet that you are *NOT* proficient in all available modes of ham
>radio), and it's also one that makes a counter to the point you attempted to
>illustrate, above.
>
>So, DICK, what mode would be our shortcoming if we were all looking to you
>to "save the planet?"

Good thing you restated the question. OK, Dick, proceed. She asked for it.

73 de Larry, K3LT

1320. Re: Opposing BPL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-18 04:06:42 UTC
From: Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns941811E96FBBelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 80946

"Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in
news:Fl2kb.1572$_i.130445@nnrp1.ptd.net:

>
> "Dick Carroll" <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com> wrote in message
> news:bmosthsou0@208.206.142.107...
>> W1RFI wrote:
>>
>> >>Of course if they don't *generate* any RFI on MHP frequencies they
>> >>won't likely get any comnpalints!
>> >
>> >
>> > Yes, and if they continue not to generate signals on low VHF, they
>> > will continue not get any complaints.
>>
>>
>> But is is almost certain they they will claim success for their
>> "tests" in that "We got no complaints from low VHF users" when they
>> generated no such interference during testing-but are sure to when BPL
>> is widely implemented. That seems to make it very much necessary for
>> someone to document the parameters of what they DO generate so that
>> accurate information is available to challenge those later claims with
>> the facts when they make *inaccurate* reports of their of their
>> "successful" tests to FCC. It must be shown that the tests were
>> not properly done so as to actually test the system that will be
>> put into service.
>>
>> That's a pretty substantial project-documenting the interference
>> generated at each -or at least certain critical- BPL test sites where
>> this could be the result. It then requires knowledge of local
>> conditions such as knowledge of what spectrum that is used locally by
>> which users.
>>
>> No wonder the BPL people are confident of a win. None of this is
>> accidental.
>>
>>
>> If they would reduce their emissions on the
>> > ham bands to about 60 dB less than FCC, amateur radio wouldn't get a
>> > significant amount of interference and ARRL could move on to new
>> > challenges.
>> >
>>
>> It's almost a certainty that the only way they will do that is if

>> they're challenged with collected data that causes FCC to require it.
>
> If they were to do what it would take to reduce their emissions by 60
> dB, the system flat out won't work ... it only works passably as it is,
> which is why they want to up the power. (A former user in the PPL
> trial area told me - in front of the reporter - that when he had the
> system working (before his service died and PPL couldn't/wouldn't fix
> it) he was getting "Maybe 4x dial-up speeds ..." He clearly wasn't
> impressed. Let's hope that there's a lot of that going around.)
>
> Carl - wk3c
>
>

Far be it from me to suggest deliberate QRM to BPL, but I think it would be nice if everyone could run full legal in areas with BPL trials. Or at least as much QRO as they could muster. Maybe if we know an area where it's happening we could all descend with linears and set up a multi-multi QRO contest station. Perhaps with 1500w signals on three or four bands we could get their speed down to 14.4k?

1321. Re: Opposing BPL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-18 04:43:48 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bmqge4$2o4$0@208.206.142.94>
Source record: 80947

Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
> "Dick Carroll" <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com> wrote in message
> news:bmosthsou0@208.206.142.107...
>
>>W1RFI wrote:
>>
>>
>>>>Of course if they don't *generate* any RFI on MHP frequencies they won't
>>>>likely get any comnpalints!
>>>
>>>
>>>Yes, and if they continue not to generate signals on low VHF, they will
>>>continue not get any complaints.
>>
>>
>> But is is almost certain they they will claim success for their
>>"tests" in that "We got no complaints from low VHF users" when they
>>generated no such interference during testing-but are sure to when BPL
>>is widely implemented. That seems to make it very much necessary for
>>someone to document the parameters of what they DO generate so that
>>accurate information is available to challenge those later claims with
>>the facts when they make *inaccurate* reports of their of their
>>"successful" tests to FCC. It must be shown that the tests were
>>not properly done so as to actually test the system that will be
>>put into service.
>>
>> That's a pretty substantial project-documenting the interference
>>generated at each -or at least certain critical- BPL test sites where
>>this could be the result. It then requires knowledge of local conditions
>>such as knowledge of what spectrum that is used locally by which users.
>>
>>No wonder the BPL people are confident of a win. None of this is
>>accidental.
>>
>>
>> If they would reduce their emissions on the
>>
>>>ham bands to about 60 dB less than FCC, amateur radio wouldn't get a
>>>significant amount of interference and ARRL could move on to new
>
> challenges.
>
>>It's almost a certainty that the only way they will do that is if
>>they're challenged with collected data that causes FCC to require it.

>
>
> If they were to do what it would take to reduce their emissions by 60 dB,
> the system flat out won't work ... it only works passably as it is, which is
> why they want to up the power. (A former user in the PPL trial area told
> me - in front of the reporter - that when he had the system working (before
> his service died and PPL couldn't/wouldn't fix it) he was getting "Maybe
> 4x dial-up speeds ..." He clearly wasn't impressed. Let's hope that there's
> a lot of that going around.)
>
> Carl - wk3c
>

Carl, THAT is some really useful information, the sort that needs to be carefully written up for future use. The more of that sort collected, the better.

Dick

1322. Re: Opposing BPL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-18 04:43:58 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <B_CdnQusNpYZUQ2iU-KYgA@gbronline.com>
Source record: 80951

Dick Carroll wrote:

>
>
>
> But is is almost certain they they will claim success for their
> "tests" in that "We got no complaints from low VHF users" when they
> generated no such interference during testing-but are sure to when BPL
> is widely implemented. That seems to make it very much necessary for
> someone to document the parameters of what they DO generate so that
> accurate information is available to challenge those later claims with
> the facts when they make *inaccurate* reports of their of their
> "successful" tests to FCC. It must be shown that the tests were
> not properly done so as to actually test the system that will be
> put into service.
>
> That's a pretty substantial project-documenting the interference
> generated at each -or at least certain critical- BPL test sites where
> this could be the result. It then requires knowledge of local conditions
> such as knowledge of what spectrum that is used locally by which users.
>
> No wonder the BPL people are confident of a win. None of this is
> accidental.
>
>
> If they would reduce their emissions on the
>
>> ham bands to about 60 dB less than FCC, amateur radio wouldn't get a
>> significant amount of interference and ARRL could move on to new
>> challenges.
>
>
> It's almost a certainty that the only way they will do that is if
> they're challenged with collected data that causes FCC to require it.

This is what comes from a dysfunctional FCC made up of lawyers instead
of technical people who know something about the radio spectrum.
>

1323. Re: Amateur Radio in the 21st Century?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-18 04:46:26 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bmqgj2$2o4$1@208.206.142.94>
Source record: 80948

Carl R. Stevenson wrote:

> Jim,
>
> That URL doesn't seem to be accessible ...
>
> Carl - wk3c
>

Try this one http://www.qsl.net/al7fs/21stCentury.html

Dick

> "N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
> news:c2356669.0310171515.6be6cd05@posting.google.com...
>
>>Folks,
>>
>>Recently there has been mention of a paper by KL7CC titled "Amateur
>>Radio in the 21st Century". It can be downloaded in Word format from:
>>
>>http://www.qsl.net/al7fs/NCVECplan.doc
>>
>>That document spells out what the NCVEC leaders are thinking about in
>>terms of changes to the license structure as a result of WRC 2003.
>>
>>73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>

1324. Re: What makes a Pro code test Amateur a Troglodyte?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-18 04:49:04 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bmqgo0$2o4$2@208.206.142.94>
Source record: 80949

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:

> predicate
> In article <bmgg1o$gve@library2.airnews.net>, "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
> writes:
>
>
>>And, DICK, what modes would be your failure to communicate your way of an
>>emergency if the fate of the planet depends on it? I wish, for once, you'd
>>answer an honest question.
>
>
> Kim:
>
> Dick can't possibly answer this question because it doesn't make sense.
> It is missing several important parts.
>
>
>>I suspect it'll be the usual, though. Complete
>>silence because my question is not only one you can't answer (yeah, I'll
>>make the bet that you are *NOT* proficient in all available modes of ham
>>radio), and it's also one that makes a counter to the point you attempted to
>>illustrate, above.
>>
>>So, DICK, what mode would be our shortcoming if we were all looking to you
>>to "save the planet?"
>
>
> Good thing you restated the question. OK, Dick, proceed. She asked for it.

I thought she said "honest question". I'm still waiting.
Not holding breath.

1325. Re: Opposing BPL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-18 04:58:31 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bmqh9n$5pb$0@208.206.142.94>
Source record: 80950

Alun Palmer wrote:

> "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in
> news:Fl2kb.1572$_i.130445@nnrp1.ptd.net:
>
>
>>"Dick Carroll" <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com> wrote in message
>>news:bmosthsou0@208.206.142.107...
>>
>>>W1RFI wrote:
>>>
>>>
>>>>>Of course if they don't *generate* any RFI on MHP frequencies they
>>>>>won't likely get any comnpalints!
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>Yes, and if they continue not to generate signals on low VHF, they
>>>>will continue not get any complaints.
>>>
>>>
>>> But is is almost certain they they will claim success for their
>>>"tests" in that "We got no complaints from low VHF users" when they
>>>generated no such interference during testing-but are sure to when BPL
>>>is widely implemented. That seems to make it very much necessary for
>>>someone to document the parameters of what they DO generate so that
>>>accurate information is available to challenge those later claims with
>>>the facts when they make *inaccurate* reports of their of their
>>>"successful" tests to FCC. It must be shown that the tests were
>>>not properly done so as to actually test the system that will be
>>>put into service.
>>>
>>> That's a pretty substantial project-documenting the interference
>>>generated at each -or at least certain critical- BPL test sites where
>>>this could be the result. It then requires knowledge of local
>>>conditions such as knowledge of what spectrum that is used locally by
>>>which users.
>>>
>>>No wonder the BPL people are confident of a win. None of this is
>>>accidental.
>>>
>>>
>>> If they would reduce their emissions on the
>>>
>>>>ham bands to about 60 dB less than FCC, amateur radio wouldn't get a

>>>>significant amount of interference and ARRL could move on to new
>>>>challenges.
>>>>
>>>
>>>It's almost a certainty that the only way they will do that is if
>>>they're challenged with collected data that causes FCC to require it.
>>
>>If they were to do what it would take to reduce their emissions by 60
>>dB, the system flat out won't work ... it only works passably as it is,
>>which is why they want to up the power. (A former user in the PPL
>>trial area told me - in front of the reporter - that when he had the
>>system working (before his service died and PPL couldn't/wouldn't fix
>>it) he was getting "Maybe 4x dial-up speeds ..." He clearly wasn't
>>impressed. Let's hope that there's a lot of that going around.)
>>
>>Carl - wk3c
>>
>>
>
>
> Far be it from me to suggest deliberate QRM to BPL, but I think it would
> be nice if everyone could run full legal in areas with BPL trials. Or at
> least as much QRO as they could muster. Maybe if we know an area where
> it's happening we could all descend with linears and set up a multi-multi
> QRO contest station. Perhaps with 1500w signals on three or four bands we
> could get their speed down to 14.4k?

I've never done spectral analysis of any of the myriad noise types
so generously generated by virtually all public or privately owned
electrical supply grids, but I'd wager there are plenty phase
modulations involved. That alone will be enough to give them plenty of
work to do trying to clean things up so as to attempt to approach
theoritical throughput. And it'll probably be ongoing work.

Actually, we might be better off allowing it to run for awhile
before getting it shut down! :^)

Dick

1326. Re: Why thirteen and twenty?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-18 05:58:53 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20031018015853.00545.00001713@mb-m02.aol.com>
Source record: 80952

In article <AJejb.26585$Rd4.4023@fed1read07>, "K7JEB" <k7jeb@qsl.remove.net>
writes:

>Are there any 'professional' Morse operators left who
>earn their living by sending by hand and receiving by
>ear? I am under the impression it is now strictly an
>amateur endeavor.
>
>Jim, K7JEB

Jim:

Yes, that's correct. This is all about the AMATEUR Radio Service.

73 de Larry, K3LT

1327. Re: Amateur Radio in the 21st Century?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-18 05:58:54 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20031018015854.00545.00001714@mb-m02.aol.com>
Source record: 80953

In article <no2kb.1574$_i.130317@nnrp1.ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
<wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:

>Jim,
>
>That URL doesn't seem to be accessible ...
>
>Carl - wk3c

It worked just fine for me, Carl -- and I'm a technically-incompetent,
computer-illiterate Pro-Coder! (I guess I'd better throw this in: 8-))

73 de Larry, K3LT

1328. Re: Amateur Radio in the 21st Century?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-18 05:58:57 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20031018015857.00545.00001715@mb-m02.aol.com>
Source record: 80954

In article <c2356669.0310171515.6be6cd05@posting.google.com>, N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) writes:

>
>Folks,
>
>Recently there has been mention of a paper by KL7CC titled "Amateur
>Radio in the 21st Century". It can be downloaded in Word format from:
>
>http://www.qsl.net/al7fs/NCVECplan.doc
>
>That document spells out what the NCVEC leaders are thinking about in
>terms of changes to the license structure as a result of WRC 2003.
>
>73 de Jim, N2EY

Having given this document due consideration, I can't say that it changes my mind about anything re: code testing. I find this one passage particularly interesting:

"Morse will probably retain most of it's exclusive band segments, at least for now. We are not addressing this issue at this time. This may change in the future. Several countries no longer have exclusive segments, but depend instead on voluntary band plans. In fact, our 160-meter band works this way today, with surprisingly few problems"

Maia et. al. are obviously leaving the door wide open to reduce or eliminate exclusive CW/data segments, even possibly moving toward a totally "open" bandplan on all amateur allocations. I cannot support this. The main pressure for band segment re-allocation will come primarily from users of SSB. This is simply because it's the easiest mode for any amateur to implement in his/her own station, and if there should be an increase in the total number of licensed radio amateurs, that's where there will be a need for more "lebensraum."

Another quote:

"Will we lose something because we will no longer have the knowledge that all hams can at least understand and send CW, even if very slowly? Maybe, maybe not. You would be surprised at the number of applicants I see that actually want to learn CW - they think it will be fun. There's a novel concept - someone learning a skill because it is fun, not because the government says you must do it."

If this is so, where is the objection *from those hams who _want to learn CW_* to being code tested? I've seen the vast majority of new hams who have taken

the time and effort to learn the Morse code approach the code tests with eager enthusiasm, and a great sense of satisfaction once they succeeded.

Again quoting:

"Obviously, removing the Morse test requirement will make it easier for thousands of interested persons to join our hobby. There are many, who for whatever reason have a real, not imagined, problem with learning the code. Call it stage fright, a psychological block, hearing problems, poor recognition skills, whatever you want; there are indeed those who literally cannot master the code, no matter how hard they try. Lazy, you say? Anyone can make it to 5 WPM, you say? They just don't try, you say? Apparently you have not participated at hundreds of exam sessions. I have. I have seen grown men and women with tears in their eyes, frustrated, angry, sometimes back next time, sometimes giving up on ham radio altogether. Where's the gain in having someone give up?"

I have some personal experience here. I've had all the above mentioned "problems"
with learning the code, and have made all the same excuses. However, I now know
what my problem was -- I didn't *want* to be a radio amateur bad enough to overcome these so-called problems. It was only after I took a much different personal approach, involving a more mature attitude toward the requirement and making the personal determination that there must be some good reason for it, that I was able to finally succeed. In so doing, I had a much larger world of amateur radio opened for me. Moreover, having succeeded in learning the code, I subsequently found myself using it -- a lot -- and enjoying it immensely even though I never thought I could.

Again quoting:

" Are you proud that you "made it"? Can you not find something that another person can do that you would find extremely difficult if not impossible? Could you win the Tour de France bicycle race - even if you trained every day for the rest of your life? Could you invent the Laser? Could you paint the Mona Lisa? Not that painting a work of art or riding a bicycle has all that much to do with radio, it's just to point out that while you may have been able to master the code with some degree of success, that doesn't necessarily mean that everyone has the same ability as you. I would argue that the ability to master the code has no apparent connection with how "good" a ham a person is. What we want, I think you will agree, is someone who will respect our traditions, follow the rules, bring enthusiasm and vigor to the hobby, and make a positive contribution.

So, who's to say that mastering Morse code skills makes a better ham? I would not be so arrogant as to think such a thing. Every time I get to feeling superior, I look around, and guess what? - - - I can find someone who is better at something, anything, than me. I can also name several individuals that I think are in one way or another "better hams" than I, better operators, better engineers, better at some aspect of our hobby than me. Might that be true with you too?"

I can honestly say that overcoming my objections to learning the code did, in fact, make me a better ham, for the simple reason that it made that mode available to me *as* a ham. Were it not for the requirement to take the code tests, I would never have gained that capability, and it is my belief that new radio amateurs in a "no code test" licensing environment will simply bypass this mode entirely. I'm not saying that some tiny minority of them won't try it and even gain useful proficiency at it on their own initiative or with the encouragement of dedicated Elmers, but I don't think it very likely that it will happen in anywhere near the same kind of numbers as it had under the previous set of licensing standards. I fear that there will, in fact, be a progressive loss of the total numbers of hams who know and use the Morse/CW mode, eventually zeroing out. This is too great a loss to our service, for I believe that the many well-known benefits and advantages of the Morse/CW mode will be just as relevant to amateur radio in the 21st Century as it was in the twentieth.

Final quote:

"CW is a great mode. It's fun. I enjoy it. And, it's time to move on. We no longer require applicants to draw schematic diagrams, demonstrate how to neutralize a triode vacuum tube amplifier, lots of other things. Lets be gentlemen and give CW a decent, respectful, wave. Remembering our old friend, but looking forward, not backward. Morse code will live forever. As long as someone cares about the history and mystery of early radio, and lots of hams do, CW will be around. Like anything else, when a person finds he or she has a need to use Morse code, they will learn it. Want to work DX, or QRP, or weak signal VHF, or Moon-bounce? Better learn the code, or you won't have a very satisfying experience."

Wiley has stated that it is incumbent on those of us who know and use the Morse/CW mode to encourage newcomers to learn it and love it as much as we do. Therefore, as a licensing requirement, it only deserves a "respectful wave" in the future. Well, unfortunately, in this age of advanced technology where our own equipment is no longer within the technical capabilities of average radio amateurs to build and/or service, we can pretty much say the same about all the technical written examination requirements as well. He goes on for pages about his new entry-level license class, which, IMHO, is unnecessary. The present Technician syllabus is proven to be achievable by people from all walks of life. If there are any serious RF or electrical safety issues to be addressed, I would submit that perhaps we need to add some emphasis there, rather than further reducing licensing standards simply for the nebulous purpose of allowing more and younger hams to "get their feet wet"
as it were.

I think the primary challenge ham radio faces, now and in the future, is it's relative lack of publicity. It is safe to say that the majority of people these these days simply cannot relate to amateur radio, mainly because very few of us simply don't relate to the concept of "radio" in the first place. We turn things on and they work. Our electronic devices, RF-based or not, are totally taken for granted. I believe that what we need to do to incite interest and curiosity in radio communication is to keep doing things "the old way" as far as learning and licensing are concerned, but to bolster that with

some good public information about Amateur Radio as a concept in it's most basic terms. This is usually done in terms of it's public service potential, and that's fine and dandy, but we also need to emphasize the elements of learning, exploration, and just plain fun. Fortunately, young people are still quite receptive to such things, and, ironically, usually embrace the challenge of learning the Morse code much more willingly than those of us who simply want to flex our consumer muscles and make our voices heard in far-away places after throwing a pile of money at the necessary technology. However, this will only doom us to creating an ARS filled with more and more of the kinds of jaded, technically uninvolved "hams" that could become problems on-the-air. If the equipment manufacturers were producing very low cost (I mean a couple of hundred bucks, maximum) low-power basic transceivers, preferably in kit form, which would be challenging enough to put together but still virtualy guaranteed to work well, they'd sell like hotcakes to exactly the audience we wish to address -- young people. In addition, putting them on the air, on the HF bands and primarily in the CW and data modes, would create a demand for things like fewer antenna restrictions in housing developments and, ultimately, more capable (and expensive) equipment for when skills and technical knowledge advanced to that stage. However, we won't get there if everyone keeps saying "Ham Radio -- what's THAT???"

I am convinced that ensuring the future of the ARS has nothing to do with licensing standards, including code testing. It has everything to do with our public image -- or almost total lack thereof. The NCVEC petition doesn't address this issue at all. Like everything involving Fred Maia, W5YI, it's all about the code and getting rid of code testing. I don't think he will find his answers to the nature of Amateur Radio in the 21st Century by looking there.

73 de Larry, K3LT

1329. Re: F5RMX is a dangerous gay CBer terrorist

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-18 06:50:12 UTC
From: "Mike McCarrey, WA7QZR" <wa7qzr@netscape.net>
Message-ID: <pan.2003.10.18.06.50.10.811846@netscape.net>
Source record: 80955

On Wed, 15 Oct 2003 14:30:59 +0200, Anonymous via the Cypherpunks Tonga Remailer wrote:

> Beware ! The gay terrorist F5RMX
> transmits virus by e-mail.
> He recently tried to infect the french atomic agency (C.E.A) in order to
> destroy all the computing system.
>
> This ham-radio operator F5RMX is a gay CBer belonging to the terrorist
> REF-UNION gay-ham organization. He
> usually spreads communist ideas over
> Internet, supporting islamic terrorists.
>
> One of his known boy friend is F1MMR.
>
> Take care !

Well, he sure doesn't sound like a very "gay" person to me.

Actually, sounds more like a very miserable sort, but I suppose it's difficult to come up with a "miserable lobby" that anyone takes seriously (mind you, why anyone takes the "gay lobby" seriously is even more amazing).

1330. Re: Amateur Radio in the 21st Century?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-18 07:05:36 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <4D5kb.1590$_i.132624@nnrp1.ptd.net>
Source record: 80956

Nope ... can't get to that one either ... nor to www.qsl.net

Carl - wk3c

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:bmqgj2$2o4$1@208.206.142.94...
> Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
>
> > Jim,
> >
> > That URL doesn't seem to be accessible ...
> >
> > Carl - wk3c
> >
>
>
> Try this one http://www.qsl.net/al7fs/21stCentury.html
>
> Dick
>
>
>
>
> > "N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
> > news:c2356669.0310171515.6be6cd05@posting.google.com...
> >
> > >>Folks,
> > >>
> > >>Recently there has been mention of a paper by KL7CC titled "Amateur
> > >>Radio in the 21st Century". It can be downloaded in Word format from:
> > >>
> > >>http://www.qsl.net/al7fs/NCVECplan.doc
> > >>
> > >>That document spells out what the NCVEC leaders are thinking about in
> > >>terms of changes to the license structure as a result of WRC 2003.
> > >>
> > >>73 de Jim, N2EY
> > >
> > >
>

1331. Re: Amateur Radio in the 21st Century?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-18 07:12:47 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <PJ5kb.1591$_i.132646@nnrp1.ptd.net>
Source record: 80957

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20031018015857.00545.00001715@mb-m02.aol.com...
> In article <c2356669.0310171515.6be6cd05@posting.google.com>, N2EY@AOL.COM
> (N2EY) writes:

> Maia et. al. are obviously leaving the door wide open to reduce or
eliminate
> exclusive CW/data segments, even possibly moving toward a totally "open"
> bandplan on all amateur allocations. I cannot support this. The main
> pressure for band segment re-allocation will come primarily from users of
> SSB. This is simply because it's the easiest mode for any amateur to
> implement in his/her own station,

I am NOT supporting phone band expansion, but I thought the
PCTA argument was that "CW was the easiest, simplest mode,
with the easiest to build equipment." ??? Why the turnabout???
(not that I agree that gear for other modes is any harder to
build than for CW ...)

> and if there should be an increase in the
> total number of licensed radio amateurs, that's where there will be a need
> for more "lebensraum."

OK, I'll bite ... what the hell is "lebensraum" ???

Carl - wk3c

1332. Re: Amateur Radio in the 21st Century?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-18 12:01:11 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <bY9kb.2332$P%1.1957084@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 80958

"Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
news:PJ5kb.1591$_i.132646@nnrp1.ptd.net...
>
> "Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
> news:20031018015857.00545.00001715@mb-m02.aol.com...
> > In article <c2356669.0310171515.6be6cd05@posting.google.com>,
N2EY@AOL.COM
> > (N2EY) writes:
>
> > Maia et. al. are obviously leaving the door wide open to reduce or
> eliminate
> > exclusive CW/data segments, even possibly moving toward a totally "open"
> > bandplan on all amateur allocations. I cannot support this. The main
> > pressure for band segment re-allocation will come primarily from users
of
> > SSB. This is simply because it's the easiest mode for any amateur to
> > implement in his/her own station,
>
> I am NOT supporting phone band expansion, but I thought the
> PCTA argument was that "CW was the easiest, simplest mode,
> with the easiest to build equipment." ??? Why the turnabout???
> (not that I agree that gear for other modes is any harder to
> build than for CW ...)
>
> > and if there should be an increase in the
> > total number of licensed radio amateurs, that's where there will be a
need
> > for more "lebensraum."
>
> OK, I'll bite ... what the hell is "lebensraum" ???
>
> Carl - wk3c
>

"living room"

It was one of the phrases used by Germany to justify it's expansion. Since
it's been a few years since I studies history, I don't recall if it was WWI
or WWII.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

1333. Re: Amateur Radio in the 21st Century?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-18 12:05:41 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <p0akb.2333$P%1.1957922@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 80959

"Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
news:PJ5kb.1591$_i.132646@nnrp1.ptd.net...
>
> "Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
> news:20031018015857.00545.00001715@mb-m02.aol.com...
> > In article <c2356669.0310171515.6be6cd05@posting.google.com>,
N2EY@AOL.COM
> > (N2EY) writes:
>
> > Maia et. al. are obviously leaving the door wide open to reduce or
> eliminate
> > exclusive CW/data segments, even possibly moving toward a totally "open"
> > bandplan on all amateur allocations. I cannot support this. The main
> > pressure for band segment re-allocation will come primarily from users
of
> > SSB. This is simply because it's the easiest mode for any amateur to
> > implement in his/her own station,
>
> I am NOT supporting phone band expansion, but I thought the
> PCTA argument was that "CW was the easiest, simplest mode,
> with the easiest to build equipment." ??? Why the turnabout???
> (not that I agree that gear for other modes is any harder to
> build than for CW ...)
>

"easiest mode to implement" is not quite the same as "easiest, simplest
mode, with the easiest to build equipment"

Here's the difference:

"easiest mode to implement" means open the box, plug in the radio, connect
antenna, and push the mike button.

"easiest, simplest mode, with the easiest equipment to build" means simpler
circuitry requirements, only an on/off "switch" to key the circuitry rather
than the more complex microphone unit, and so on.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

1334. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-18 12:28:22 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031018082822.12300.00001227@mb-m20.aol.com>
Source record: 80960

In article <jj_jb.1145$W16.793@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dan/W4NTI"
<w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> writes:

>"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
>news:c2356669.0310171408.1e4c9f9e@posting.google.com...
>> These are the number of unexpired FCC ARS
>> licenses held by individuals on the dates listed:
>>
>> As of May 14, 2000:
>>
>> Novice - 49,329
>> Tech - 205,394
>> Tech Plus - 128,860
>> General - 112,677
>> Advanced - 99,782
>> Extra - 78,750
>> Total - 674,792
>>
>>
>> As of October 15, 2003:
>>
>> Novice - 32,977 (decrease of 16,352)
>> Technician - 257,303 (increase of 51,909)
>> Technician Plus - 64,686 (decrease of 64,174)
>> General - 141,313 (increase of 28,636)
>> Advanced - 82,589 (decrease of 17,193)
>> Extra - 104,670 (increase of 25,920)
>> Total - 683,538 (increase of 8,746)
>>
>> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>How Come with all these 'new' Ektra class tickets they STILL ain't covering
>the HF bands?
>
Good question.

Back in May 14 2000, the total number of Generals/Advanceds/Extras (license
classes with lots of HF/MF privileges) was 291,209

On October 15, 2003, that total was 328,562, an increase of 37,353. About 12.8%
in 3-1/2 years.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1335. Re: Amateur Radio in the 21st Century?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-18 13:26:44 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <ocbkb.10795$%J1.1406@news02.roc.ny>
Source record: 80961

Thanks for the URL, Jim

It is an interesting proposition. I've stated before that I can't justify the *need* for CW, but I'll admit in my years of operating I never (and some may have) experienced the jamming, swearing, or whatever on CW. Perhaps the mode is too difficult for those of limited mentality who like to swear; more likely they don't have the instant gratification of other folks yelling back at them over a microphone.

One thing seems to stand out to me. If we are to attract and *keep* them, we will likely have to allow some HF access, preferably on bands that will have some dx capability. Although cw was the only mode on hf when I had my novice ticket (1962/63), it was fun to communicate with states half a continent away on a regular basis - if not other counties entirely. If it is only VHF and above, we may experience a quick increase for folks wanting to use the service as MURS or CB (but only for their family). If this service was limited to those still in school, it might serve an excellent purpose. As you may remember, the old novice license (back when it was originally created) was *not* renewable and was good for only one year. Perhaps the license could be extended until the individual reached the age of 18.

As far as power limits go, they changed the limits years ago for the novice from 75 watts input to 100 watts output (I think ... hmmm ...??). The reality is that most commercially available equipment runs 100 watts out. There are a few exceptions of 150 and 200 watts and, of course, there are some qrp rigs and a few that will do 20 watts or so. Reality forces me to question a limit that will likely be exceeded anyways and teach the individual that rules are to be broken :(

Amateur radio does indeed compete with the internet and, upon thinking it over, we will likely want hf access (likely including phone privileges) if we wish to really "infect" new folks with the radio bug.

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
news:c2356669.0310171515.6be6cd05@posting.google.com...
> Folks,
>
> Recently there has been mention of a paper by KL7CC titled "Amateur
> Radio in the 21st Century". It can be downloaded in Word format from:
>
> http://www.qsl.net/al7fs/NCVECplan.doc
>

> That document spells out what the NCVEC leaders are thinking about in
> terms of changes to the license structure as a result of WRC 2003.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.528 / Virus Database: 324 - Release Date: 10/16/03

1336. Re: Amateur Radio in the 21st Century?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-18 14:24:55 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bmrifn$q3c$0@208.206.142.110>
Source record: 80962

Dee D. Flint wrote:
> "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
> news:PJ5kb.1591$_i.132646@nnrp1.ptd.net...
>
>>"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
>>news:20031018015857.00545.00001715@mb-m02.aol.com...
>>
>>>In article <c2356669.0310171515.6be6cd05@posting.google.com>,
>
> N2EY@AOL.COM
>
>>>(N2EY) writes:
>>
>>>Maia et. al. are obviously leaving the door wide open to reduce or
>>
>>eliminate
>>
>>>exclusive CW/data segments, even possibly moving toward a totally "open"
>>>bandplan on all amateur allocations. I cannot support this. The main
>>>pressure for band segment re-allocation will come primarily from users
>
> of
>
>>>SSB. This is simply because it's the easiest mode for any amateur to
>>>implement in his/her own station,
>>
>>I am NOT supporting phone band expansion, but I thought the
>>PCTA argument was that "CW was the easiest, simplest mode,
>>with the easiest to build equipment." ??? Why the turnabout???
>>(not that I agree that gear for other modes is any harder to
>>build than for CW ...)
>>
>>
>>>and if there should be an increase in the
>>>total number of licensed radio amateurs, that's where there will be a
>
> need
>
>>>for more "lebensraum."
>>
>>OK, I'll bite ... what the hell is "lebensraum" ???
>>
>>Carl - wk3c
>>

>
>
> "living room"
>
> It was one of the phrases used by Germany to justify it's expansion. Since
> it's been a few years since I studies history, I don't recall if it was WWI
> or WWII.
>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>

Hitler's justification for invading Poland, Czechoslovokia, etc. Had
to have room for all those advanced Ayrans to spread out and thrive.

I think in this case Larry is referring to all the techno-microphone
jocks.

Dick

1337. Re: Amateur Radio in the 21st Century?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-18 14:28:34 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031018102834.23171.00001609@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 80963

In article <20031018015857.00545.00001715@mb-m02.aol.com>, yodoc@aol.comnospam
(Larry Roll K3LT) writes:

>In article <c2356669.0310171515.6be6cd05@posting.google.com>, N2EY@AOL.COM
>(N2EY) writes:
>
>>
>>Folks,
>>
>>Recently there has been mention of a paper by KL7CC titled "Amateur
>>Radio in the 21st Century". It can be downloaded in Word format from:
>>
>>http://www.qsl.net/al7fs/NCVECplan.doc
>>
>>That document spells out what the NCVEC leaders are thinking about in
>>terms of changes to the license structure as a result of WRC 2003.
>>
>>73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>Having given this document due consideration, I can't say that it changes my
>mind about anything re: code testing. I find this one passage particularly
>interesting:
>
>"Morse will probably retain most of it's exclusive band segments, at least
>for now. We are not addressing this issue at this time. This may change in
the
>future. Several countries no longer have exclusive segments, but depend
>instead on voluntary band plans. In fact, our 160-meter band works this way
>today, with surprisingly few problems"
>
>Maia et. al. are obviously leaving the door wide open to reduce or eliminate
>exclusive CW/data segments, even possibly moving toward a totally "open"
>bandplan on all amateur allocations. I cannot support this.

Nor I!

What I find interesting, too, is that the CW/data parts of the bands are always
referred to as "exclusive CW" with no mention that all of them on HF are also
shared by data modes. In fact, there is very little mention of data modes at
all.

>The main
>pressure for band segment re-allocation will come primarily from users of
>SSB. This is simply because it's the easiest mode for any amateur to
>implement in his/her own station, and if there should be an increase in the

>total number of licensed radio amateurs, that's where there will be a need
>for more "lebensraum."

Getting awful close to Godwin's Law there, Larry!

>Again quoting:
>
>" Are you proud that you "made it"?

Yes, I am. Is there something wrong with pride of achievement? Should I be ashamed?

>Can you not find something that another
>person can do that you would find extremely difficult if not impossible?
>Could you win the Tour de France bicycle race - even if you trained every day
>for the rest of your life? Could you invent the Laser? Could you paint the
>Mona Lisa? Not that painting a work of art or riding a bicycle has all that
>much to do with radio, it's just to point out that while you may have been
>able
>to master the code with some degree of success, that doesn't necessarily mean
>that everyone has the same ability as you.

Note that passing the 5 wpm code test is being compared to world-class achievements in the worlds of art, sport, and science. That's just not a valid comparison at all. 5 wpm is more like riding a bike at 5 mph for a mile on a level road, painting a recognizable human face or assembling a flashlight.

More quotes
>
>So, who's to say that mastering Morse code skills makes a better ham? I
>would
>not be so arrogant as to think such a thing.

It's equally "arrogant" to support either side. Which is to say, not arrogant at all.

>Final quote:
>
>"CW is a great mode. It's fun. I enjoy it. And, it's time to move on.

What exactly does "time to move on" mean here?

> We
>no longer require applicants to draw schematic diagrams, demonstrate how to
>neutralize a triode vacuum tube amplifier, lots of other things. Lets be
>gentlemen and give CW a decent, respectful, wave. Remembering our old
>friend,
>but looking forward, not backward."

It sounds more and more like he wants the mode, not just the test, to go away.

>
>Wiley has stated that it is incumbent on those of us who know and use the
>Morse/CW mode to encourage newcomers to learn it and love it as much as we

>do.
>Therefore, as a licensing requirement, it only deserves a "respectful wave"
>in
>the future. Well, unfortunately, in this age of advanced technology where
>our
>own equipment is no longer within the technical capabilities of average radio
>amateurs to build and/or service,

WHOA! I disagree!

He says the same thing ('most of us took the practical approach and bought a manufactured rig') and it's simply not true.

>He goes on for pages
>about
>his new entry-level license class, which, IMHO, is unnecessary. The present
>Technician syllabus is proven to be achievable by people from all walks of
>life.

Heck, the General has been achieved by a six-year-old and the Extra - the old prerestructuring 5 written tests Extra - by an eight-year-old.

> If there are any serious RF or electrical safety issues to be
>addressed,
>I would submit that perhaps we need to add some emphasis there, rather than
>further reducing licensing standards simply for the nebulous purpose of
>allowing more and younger hams to "get their feet wet"
>as it were.

The biggest problems I have with the entry-level proposal are the removal of "radio law" questions from its test and the free upgrades for Techs and Advanceds.

The code test stuff is predictable and, IMHO, not the most important thing in the paper at all. What's far more important is the "what happens after the code test goes" stuff, which contains some very good ideas and some very bad ideas.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1338. Re: Why thirteen and twenty?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-18 14:36:08 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0310180636.5cfd3f9@posting.google.com>
Source record: 80964

```
Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:<bmnpt4$ap2$0@208.206.142.114>...
> Dan/W4NTI wrote:
>
> > "Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
> > news:f45722ac.0310151646.3bb522d1@posting.google.com...
> >
> >>"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
> >
> > news:<xkejb.57045$mQ2.27686@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> >
> >>>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> >>>news:20031015083047.12501.00003145@mb-m04.aol.com...
> >>>
> >>>>In article <86ptgzumnq.fsf@duchess.twilley.org>, Jack Twilley
> >>>><jmt+usenet@twilley.org> writes:
> >>>>
> >>>>
> >>>>>I can understand why Novice and Technician Plus required five words
> >>>>>per minute -- the treaty and all -- but why did General require
> >>>>>thirteen words per minute and Amateur Extra twenty words per minute?
> >>>>>
> >>>>>Is there a real reason?
> >>>>
> >>>>12 to 13 wpm is generally agreed to be above the speed where things
> >
> > such
> >
> >>> as
> >>>
> >>>>"counting dits" work for most people. It's the beginning of the skills
> >>>
> >>> which
> >>>
> >>>>take one to higher speeds
> >>>>
> >>>>20 wpm derives from the old 1923-24 "Amateur Extra First Class" which
> >>>
> >>> chose 20
> >>>
> >>>>as double the old 10 wpm standard. It was reintroduced in 1951 when
> >
> > the
> >
```

> >>> current
> >>>
> >>>>Amateur Extra class was created.
> >>>>
> >>>>Both speeds are far below those required of experienced professional
> >
> > Morse
> >
> >>>>operators.
> >>>>
> >>>>73 de Jim, N2EY
> >>>
> >>>One more thing Jim. 20 wpm is above another 'threshold', which is at
> >
> > about
> >
> >>>18wpm for most folks. So you gotta know it to do it.
> >>>
> >>>Dan/W4NTI
> >>
> >>
> >>Welp Dan, as I strap on my dragon armor and jousting butt-plug, please
> >>orient me toward the 1951 anachronism of the 1923 AEFC standard.
> >>
> >>dididididididit.
> >
> >
> > Lets see if you can understand this then;
> >
> > If I want any crap out of you, I will squeeze your head.
> >
>
>
> You'd best just prod him with your keyboard.If you squeeze his head
> you'll get far more than you expected.

Who squeezed your head?

1339. Re: What makes LHA so poor at simple research tasks?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-18 14:44:32 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0310180644.404e0f4b@posting.google.com>
Source record: 80965

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0310162123.548cef44@posting.google.com>...
> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0310151658.2d3753af@posting.google.com>...
> > n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20031015083048.12501.00003146@mb-m04.aol.com>...
> > > In article <20031014211336.00545.00001638@mb-m02.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com
> > > (Len Over 21) writes:
>
> > > > Come up with the way a spark transmitter suddenly turns into
> > > > an Alexanderson Alternator whenever it is brought up in an amateur
> > > > radio newsgroup.
> > >
> > > That's your game, Len.
> >
> > What's your game, Jim?
>
> What's your interest in knowing, Brain? Even if he tells you,
> it's unlikely you'd understand.
>
> Steve, K4YZ

I think I already know and understand Jim's game. He built an
Elecraft kit, then professes to have engineered and built his own
amateur station.

73, Brian

1340. Re: Amateur Radio in the 21st Century?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-18 14:46:17 UTC
From: David Stinson <arc5@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3F915235.1353E2C4@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 80966

N2EY wrote:

> What exactly does "time to move on" mean here?

"Time to move on:"
A phrase used by Democrats as a means to change or stop a debate,
when the illogic, stupidity or immorality
of their positions are exposed.

1341. Re: What makes LHA so poor at simple research tasks?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-18 14:46:52 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0310180646.4a778a57@posting.google.com>
Source record: 80967

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0310171612.72b5391@posting.google.com>...
> Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:<bmoqfr$o3c$0@208.206.142.107>...
> > Steve Robeson, K4CAP wrote:
> > > brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0310151658.2d3753af@posting.google.com>...
> > >
> > >>n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20031015083048.12501.00003146@mb-m04.aol.com>...
> > >>
> > >>>In article <20031014211336.00545.00001638@mb-m02.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com
> > >>>(Len Over 21) writes:
> > >>>
> > >>>
> > >>>> Come up with the way a spark transmitter suddenly turns into
> > >>>> an Alexanderson Alternator whenever it is brought up in an amateur
> > >>>> radio newsgroup.
> > >>>
> > >>>That's your game, Len.
> > >>
> > >>What's your game, Jim?
> > >
> > >
> > > What's your interest in knowing, Brain? Even if he tells you,
> > > it's unlikely you'd understand.
> > >
> >
> > I used to think that Brian had missed something. Turns out he missed
> > everything!
>
> ROTMFFLMMFAO ! ! ! ! !
>
> Steve, K4YZ

What kind of "AO" are you laughing off?

1342. Re: Opposing BPL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-18 14:56:50 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0310180656.4b0945af@posting.google.com>
Source record: 80968
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.policy

kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in message
news:<d22b54c3.0310170615.2edf4120@posting.google.com>...
> "Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:<xnfcneeyarg.hmvgz2b.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>...
> > On 15 Oct 2003 22:30:17 -0700, Brian Kelly wrote:
> >
> > >> This means that the manufacturer is required to test them to
> > >> ensure that they comply with the FCC regulations. Under the present
> > >> rules, they must be tested at 3 typical locations. "
> > >
> > >What's the FCC definition of "typical locations"??
> >
> > De facto: any place where the results support the stand that one is
> > advocating.
>
> Oh golly, I would never have guessed that . .

Its a complex issue. Thank goodness we have lawyers and engineers to
figure it all out for us.

1343. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-18 15:01:34 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0310180701.23cba079@posting.google.com>
Source record: 80969

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20031017062827.21457.00001456@mb-m10.aol.com>...
> In article <vorsl2nsek1o04@corp.supernews.com>, "Clint" <rattlehead at
> computron dot net> writes:
>
> >It's code TESTING, not CODE, that is being pushed out the door.
> >ad nauseum, this must be explained. Why is that?
>
> Because people are not specific. Look at thread subject lines like "drop the
> code" or "IARU says drop Morse". And there's a group what goes by the name
> "No-Code International" - not "No Code TEST International".

It has all been explained to Jim before. But it's more important for
him to think that we want to eliminate the use of Morse, eliminate
protected spectrum, expand phone, this, that, the other...etc. Vast
right-wing conspiracy and all that.

It's important for certain segments of our society to always be
offended and outraged.

1344. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-18 15:04:28 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031018110428.11972.00000859@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 80970

>It's important for certain segments of our society to always be
>offended and outraged.
>

You mean like the No-Code Cbplussers who want no CW Testing?

1345. Re: Points Of Perception...What Do YOU Call "Collateral Damage"...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-18 15:08:15 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0310180708.17319747@posting.google.com>
Source record: 80971

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0310162149.e7e5f76@posting.google.com>...
> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0310140532.3ba00621@posting.google.com>...
>
> > Talking to yourself again?
>
> By the way, Your Scumminess, I see you re-quoted my entire post,
> yet could not (or would not try) to dispute (...challenge..?!?!) any
> of the points I made.
>
> And I still notice that John has rolled up his carpet and gone
> away again.
>
> Kinda hard to stand the light, I guess........
>
> Steve, K4YZ

Steve, John is mere avoiding a crazy man who talks to himself in
between episodes of playing RRAP Avenging Angel.

1346. Re: Amazin'....Ain't it...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-18 15:10:16 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0310180710.10f915b2@posting.google.com>
Source record: 80972

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0310162138.7119784e@posting.google.com>...
> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0310140541.4b6c74df@posting.google.com>...
>
> > > Your "mentor" can fill you in on ways to antagonize and instigate
> > > flamefests...he does it well.
> >
> > OK, Stebe.
> >
> > > You aren't quite there yet, but you're getting close.
> >
> > I'm learning from the Master, Stebe.
>
> Whew...
>
> It's really amazing to find people who ADMIT that they are the
> willing "students" of pathological liars.

SteBe, I said I was learning from the Master.

Do you now ADMIT to being a pathological liar?

1347. Re: Lennie's Double Standard Once Again Revealed...BY Lennie!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-18 15:14:36 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0310180714.30f06d5@posting.google.com>
Source record: 80973

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0310162129.3c098f18@posting.google.com>...
> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0310140546.153a6483@posting.google.com>...
>
> > So, Stebe, take a poll. Ask who enjoys your constant rantings.
>
> I am not the one ranting, Brain.
>
> I AM the one who rubs your nose in your own childish conduct, the
> post this responds to being evidence thereof.

Your Avenging Angel acts followed by general crazy-man activities is
really rubbing my nose?

I see it differently.

So what did the poll say?

1348. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-18 15:37:10 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <G6dkb.2252$W16.1566@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 80974

"Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
news:f45722ac.0310180649.48353ec@posting.google.com...
> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<jj_jb.1145$W16.793@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> > "N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
> > news:c2356669.0310171408.1e4c9f9e@posting.google.com...
> > > These are the number of unexpired FCC ARS
> > > licenses held by individuals on the dates listed:
> > >
> > > As of May 14, 2000:
> > >
> > > Novice - 49,329
> > > Tech - 205,394
> > > Tech Plus - 128,860
> > > General - 112,677
> > > Advanced - 99,782
> > > Extra - 78,750
> > > Total - 674,792
> > >
> > >
> > > As of October 15, 2003:
> > >
> > > Novice - 32,977 (decrease of 16,352)
> > > Technician - 257,303 (increase of 51,909)
> > > Technician Plus - 64,686 (decrease of 64,174)
> > > General - 141,313 (increase of 28,636)
> > > Advanced - 82,589 (decrease of 17,193)
> > > Extra - 104,670 (increase of 25,920)
> > > Total - 683,538 (increase of 8,746)
> > >
> > > 73 de Jim, N2EY
> >
> > How Come with all these 'new' Ektra class tickets they STILL ain't
covering
> > the HF bands?
> >
> > Perhaps they can't figure out how to cut that dipole, eh?
> >
> > Dan/W4NTI
>
> So you're saying that HF HASN'T been ruined by hordes of unwashed CBers?

No, Brian....I'm saying that they are too ignorant to get a signal on HF.

Dan/W4NTI

1349. Re: Amateur Radio in the 21st Century?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-18 15:42:29 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bmrn15$3sh$0@208.206.142.110>
Source record: 80975

N2EY wrote:

> In article <20031018015857.00545.00001715@mb-m02.aol.com>, yodoc@aol.comnospam
> (Larry Roll K3LT) writes:
>
>
>>In article <c2356669.0310171515.6be6cd05@posting.google.com>, N2EY@AOL.COM
>>(N2EY) writes:
>>
>>
>>>Folks,
>>>
>>>Recently there has been mention of a paper by KL7CC titled "Amateur
>>>Radio in the 21st Century". It can be downloaded in Word format from:
>>>
>>>http://www.qsl.net/al7fs/NCVECplan.doc
>>>
>>>That document spells out what the NCVEC leaders are thinking about in
>>>terms of changes to the license structure as a result of WRC 2003.
>>>
>>>73 de Jim, N2EY
>>
>>Having given this document due consideration, I can't say that it changes my
>>mind about anything re: code testing. I find this one passage particularly
>>interesting:
>>
>>"Morse will probably retain most of it's exclusive band segments, at least
>>for now. We are not addressing this issue at this time. This may change in
>
> the
>
>>future. Several countries no longer have exclusive segments, but depend
>>instead on voluntary band plans. In fact, our 160-meter band works this way
>>today, with surprisingly few problems"
>>
>>Maia et. al. are obviously leaving the door wide open to reduce or eliminate
>>exclusive CW/data segments, even possibly moving toward a totally "open"
>>bandplan on all amateur allocations. I cannot support this.
>
>
> Nor I!
>
> What I find interesting, too, is that the CW/data parts of the bands are always
> referred to as "exclusive CW" with no mention that all of them on HF are also

> shared by data modes. In fact, there is very little mention of data modes at
> all.
>

Right! It's apparently codified in the code-banner's rulebook- Say nor
do anything that will in any way interfere with The Agenda. And
acknowledging that there are NO exclusive CW HF subbands is a primary
part of it. In fact, it';s clear that they would like to do completely
away with *ll* subbands. Hey, why not SSB yakkers wall to wall, like
it is "uop there" above 27 mhz?

It IS curuois that they jump from "Hey why don't you Luddites get
out of the 19th century and jumo on board our Advanced Digital Train,
to "Lets do away with all subbands and give everyone with the mildest
of itnersts all privileges everywhere to yak into a microphone"!!!

Can you say obfuscation???

>
>>The main
>>pressure for band segment re-allocation will come primarily from users of
>>SSB. This is simply because it's the easiest mode for any amateur to
>>implement in his/her own station, and if there should be an increase in the
>>total number of licensed radio amateurs, that's where there will be a need
>>for more "lebensraum."
>
>
> Getting awful close to Godwin's Law there, Larry!
>

But a better descriptive would be difficult to find!

>
>>Again quoting:
>>
>>" Are you proud that you "made it"?
>
>
> Yes, I am. Is there something wrong with pride of achievement? Should I be
> ashamed?
>
>
>>Can you not find something that another
>>person can do that you would find extremely difficult if not impossible?
>>Could you win the Tour de France bicycle race - even if you trained every day
>>for the rest of your life? Could you invent the Laser? Could you paint the
>>Mona Lisa? Not that painting a work of art or riding a bicycle has all that
>>much to do with radio, it's just to point out that while you may have been
>>able
>>to master the code with some degree of success, that doesn't necessarily mean
>>that everyone has the same ability as you.
>

>
> Note that passing the 5 wpm code test is being compared to world-class
> achievements in the worlds of art, sport, and science. That's just not a valid
> comparison at all. 5 wpm is more like riding a bike at 5 mph for a mile on a
> level road, painting a recognizable human face or assembling a flashlight.
>

It's so very lame I find it difficult to express a proper
counterpoint! How do you deal with such expressed ignorance coming from
a longtime ham who claims knowledge and experience in the very subjects
he finds so reprehensible? It is not only contrary to the vast body of
knowledge and experience existing among the vary large number of other
similarly qualified hams but defies logic and common sense.
Thoughtful newcomers instinctively know that it's all wrong!

> More quotes
>
>>So, who's to say that mastering Morse code skills makes a better ham? I
>>would
>>not be so arrogant as to think such a thing.
>
>
> It's equally "arrogant" to support either side. Which is to say, not arrogant
> at all.
>
>
>
>>Final quote:
>>
>>"CW is a great mode. It's fun. I enjoy it. And, it's time to move on.
>
>
> What exactly does "time to move on" mean here?
>
>
>>We
>>no longer require applicants to draw schematic diagrams, demonstrate how to
>>neutralize a triode vacuum tube amplifier, lots of other things. Lets be
>>gentlemen and give CW a decent, respectful, wave. Remembering our old
>>friend,
>>but looking forward, not backward."
>
>
> It sounds more and more like he wants the mode, not just the test, to go away.
>

Can we say "Incrementalism"??? That's the full intent and has always
been! It's nothing new- this movement has been afoot in some form and at
some level longer than the near-48 years I've been a ham. But only
fairly recently has such a stubborn entity as W5YI decided to dedicate
his entire being, it appears, to killing off Morse code in ham radio.

Yo gotta wonder what it was that scared him when he was a kid.
Did he run into a W2OY on CW??? I don't think so!

>
>>Wiley has stated that it is incumbent on those of us who know and use the
>>Morse/CW mode to encourage newcomers to learn it and love it as much as we
>>do.
>>Therefore, as a licensing requirement, it only deserves a "respectful wave"
>>in
>>the future. Well, unfortunately, in this age of advanced technology where
>>our
>>own equipment is no longer within the technical capabilities of average radio
>>amateurs to build and/or service,
>
>
> WHOA! I disagree!
>
> He says the same thing ('most of us took the practical approach and bought a
> manufactured rig') and it's simply not true.
>

If I'd had to buy a storebought rig when I got on the air as a Novice
it would have never happened, at least not anywhere as soon as it did.
When I later DID buy a very modest manufactured transmitter and
receiver, both used, it cost most of my summer's earnings between high
school years.

>
>
>>He goes on for pages
>>about
>>his new entry-level license class, which, IMHO, is unnecessary. The present
>>Technician syllabus is proven to be achievable by people from all walks of
>>life.
>
>
> Heck, the General has been achieved by a six-year-old and the Extra - the old
> prerestructuring 5 written tests Extra - by an eight-year-old.
>
>

Now, we don't want to insult anyone by suggesting they WORK toward
a license. That would be non-inclusive!

>>If there are any serious RF or electrical safety issues to be
>>addressed,
>>I would submit that perhaps we need to add some emphasis there, rather than
>>further reducing licensing standards simply for the nebulous purpose of
>>allowing more and younger hams to "get their feet wet"
>>as it were.
>
>
> The biggest problems I have with the entry-level proposal are the removal of

> "radio law" questions from its test and the free upgrades for Techs and
> Advanceds.
>
> The code test stuff is predictable and, IMHO, not the most important thing in
> the paper at all. What's far more important is the "what happens after the code
> test goes" stuff, which contains some very good ideas and some very bad ideas.
>

I think it'll be clearly demonstrated over time that it's too much
pie for the available sky.

Dick

1350. Re: What makes LHA so poor at simple research tasks?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-18 15:46:50 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bmrn9a$4i0$0@208.206.142.110>
Source record: 80976

Brian wrote:

> k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0310162123.548cef44@posting.google.com>...
>
>>brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0310151658.2d3753af@posting.google.com>...
>>
>>>n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20031015083048.12501.00003146@mb-m04.aol.com>...
>>>
>>>>In article <20031014211336.00545.00001638@mb-m02.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com
>>>>(Len Over 21) writes:
>>
>>
>>
>>>>> Come up with the way a spark transmitter suddenly turns into
>>>>> an Alexanderson Alternator whenever it is brought up in an amateur
>>>>> radio newsgroup.
>>>>
>>>>That's your game, Len.
>>>
>>>What's your game, Jim?
>>
>> What's your interest in knowing, Brain? Even if he tells you,
>>it's unlikely you'd understand.
>>
>>Steve, K4YZ
>
>
> I think I already know and understand Jim's game. He built an
> Elecraft kit, then professes to have engineered and built his own
> amateur station.
>

You DO seem to have a problem with the thought process.
Sure, Jim recently did buy and build a K2 kit. But what
you missed, among many other important points, was that
he has always clearly stated that it WAS a kit project,
not to be confused with the *several* project stations that
he has designed and built, and USED ON THE AIR over his
near-40 years as a ham.

But then, that's what we've learned to expect from you.

1351. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-18 15:48:01 UTC
From: GMC <gmc@volaris.net>
Message-ID: <181020031048017080%gmc@volaris.net>
Source record: 80977

In article <c2356669.0310171408.1e4c9f9e@posting.google.com>, N2EY
<N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote:

> These are the number of unexpired FCC ARS
> licenses held by individuals on the dates listed:
>
> As of May 14, 2000:
>
> Novice - 49,329
> Tech - 205,394
> Tech Plus - 128,860
> General - 112,677
> Advanced - 99,782
> Extra - 78,750
> Total - 674,792
>
>
> As of October 15, 2003:
>
> Novice - 32,977 (decrease of 16,352)
> Technician - 257,303 (increase of 51,909)
> Technician Plus - 64,686 (decrease of 64,174)
> General - 141,313 (increase of 28,636)
> Advanced - 82,589 (decrease of 17,193)
> Extra - 104,670 (increase of 25,920)
> Total - 683,538 (increase of 8,746)
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

Jim,

It looks like we are on the road to some deflation in the numbers.
AE4FA has posted numbers gleaned from his research into the FCC
database concerning renewals of the Technician class (no code variety)
and has found that almost 97% of them are not renewing. There is only
a small data window to draw from however, as the first people who held
this license class are only starting to reach the end of the grace
periods. He had a way to filter out licensees who had upgraded. I think
there was 8 months of data when the finding were posted. This could be
why we are about 4,000 licensees down from the peak you mentioned.

73
George
K3UD

--
remove NOSPAM from address

1352. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-18 15:49:38 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bmrnei$4i0$1@208.206.142.110>
Source record: 80978

Brian wrote:
>
> It's important for certain segments of our society to always be
> offended and outraged.

You would seem to be an authority in that area.

1353. Re: Amateur Radio in the 21st Century?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-18 15:59:28 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <Ardkb.2264$W16.1055@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 80979

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com> wrote in message

> Hitler's justification for invading Poland, Czechoslovokia, etc. Had
> to have room for all those advanced Ayrans to spread out and thrive.
>
> I think in this case Larry is referring to all the techno-microphone
> jocks.
>
> Dick
>

Actually the term originated a century before Adolf did his thing. It goes as far back as the mid 19th century. When the Kaiser used it against the other European countries. Again in WW1 and later picked up by da fuerer.

Dan/W4NTI

1354. Re: Amateur Radio in the 21st Century?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-18 16:28:40 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031018122840.12631.00002248@mb-m28.aol.com>
Source record: 80980

In article <no2kb.1574$_i.130317@nnrp1.ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
<wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:

>Jim,
>
>That URL doesn't seem to be accessible ...
>
>Carl - wk3c

I re-downloaded the file and forwarded it. Anybody else have trouble? Let me
know and I'll email it to you. It did take a bit to get it downloaded.

Maybe that Emmaus BPL test site is the culprit, Carl ;-)

73 de Jim, N2EY

1355. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-18 18:52:51 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <7_fkb.2490$W16.380@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 80981

"N2EY" wrote:
>
> Because people are not specific. Look at thread
> subject lines like "drop the code" or "IARU says
> drop Morse". And there's a group what goes by
> the name "No-Code International" - not "No
> Code TEST International".

All writers assume a certain level of knowledge on the part of their target readers. The same is true for this newsgroup. Most here are aware of the code testing debate, so there isn't any reason to restate the issue each time something is said. As for NCI, the names of many groups don't exactly reflect the group's publicly stated goals. For example, the Red Cross doesn't go around painting crosses red and the Salvation Army doesn't fight religious wars.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

1356. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-18 18:55:29 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <B0gkb.2492$W16.1280@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 80982

"Brian" wrote:
>
> It has all been explained to Jim before. But it's
> more important for him to think that we want to
> eliminate the use of Morse, eliminate protected
> spectrum, expand phone, this, that, the other...etc.
> Vast right-wing conspiracy and all that.
>
> It's important for certain segments of our society to
> always be offended and outraged.

Or at least act that way when it's convenient to do so.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

1357. Re: A New Concept: Virtual Spectrum

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-18 19:20:22 UTC
From: Frank Dinger <gm0csz.kn6wh@ntlworld.com>
Message-ID: <i9tkb.9479$pz5.5826562@newsfep2-win.server.ntli.net>
Source record: 80867
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.antiques.radio+phono,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc

> Of course the simplest, but not always the most cost effective
> solution is to have a summer cottage with a broadband connection in
> some quiet rural location. Move your station to the cottage and when
> not at the cottage, connect a remotely controllable transceiver to a
> computer (audio in and out, serial data and PTT) and control the
> station from your urban home. A remotely controlled antenna rotator
> also helps a lot. In this way you do not have to suffer from noise,
> antenna restrictions and neighbours complaining about interference:-).
> Using some watchdog timers is a good idea, in case the computer or
> internet connection crashes.
==========
Perhaps not from a summer cottage ,but remote operation of HF stations has
been done in California and Hawaii
since the mid 90s .Access and operation is through a hand-held VHF radio.
Even a rotator can be operated remotely.
The brainchild of a aviator/engineer living in the Brea (California) area
it was/is called a Super-Station .
However in this scheme rx and tx are co-located.
The system was elaborately explained by its designer/implementor in 1995 at
a meeting of the Fullerton Amateur Radio Club.

I can understand that with antenna restrictions/ prohibition in urbun areas
and a possible emergence of BPL / PLC / PLT ,people are looking into
alternative ways to communicate on the HF bands.
Fortunately in a number of countries BPL et al has already been rejected by
the authorities , Japan and the Netherlands come to mind. I believe also in
the UK ,it is highly unlikely that powerline comms will be accepted.

ARRL's drive to block the introduction of power line comms in the USA ,by
means
of 'competent (engineering) reasoning' ,must be applauded.

Frank GM0CSZ / KN6WH

1358. Re: Amateur Radio in the 21st Century?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-18 19:32:05 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <Vygkb.110487$qj6.5917282@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 80983

N2EY wrote:

> Folks,
>
> Recently there has been mention of a paper by KL7CC titled "Amateur
> Radio in the 21st Century". It can be downloaded in Word format from:
>
> http://www.qsl.net/al7fs/NCVECplan.doc
>
> That document spells out what the NCVEC leaders are thinking about in
> terms of changes to the license structure as a result of WRC 2003.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

Jim is it considered good form to quote extracts from this doc in the
newsgroup?

I've read it, and frankly I find it quite "interesting". But I'd love to
quote parts of it with my responses

- Mike KB3EIA -

1359. Re: Amateur Radio in the 21st Century?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-18 20:04:36 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <o1hkb.110490$qj6.5926033@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 80984

Mike Coslo wrote:

> Jim is it considered good form to quote extracts from this doc in the
> newsgroup?

Never mind, I've seen plenty of qoutes from the doc..... 8^)

- Mike KB3EIA -

1360. Re: BPL a reality in my area now!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-18 20:44:19 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031018164419.08854.00000390@mb-m14.aol.com>
Source record: 80986

>Wonder how much BPL garbage that setup would pick up?

My guess is about S7 at 100 feet spacing between houses, on frequencies that BPL was using. That is assuming they didn't crank up the power to meet Part 15 limits so they could go farther and/or have more immunity to noise.

>A question arises - 30 m from what? If every piece of house wiring has the
>BPL
>signals on it, in many locations you cannot get 30 meters away.

Correct. The limit is for 30 meters distance. There are cases where it can't be measured there, and the FCC allows measurements to be made at other distances, and extrapolated to 30 meters. But here's the kicker -- they allow the extrapolation at a 40log(distance ratio), unlike virtually every other country in the world. That translates to an inverse-to-the-fourth power ratio. Think any of the Part 15 guys make measurements at 3 meters that COULD be made at 30 meters, just to gain that extra 20 dB?

>Is there stock equipment for BPL yet? Or could they be using prototypes?

At this point, PPL is going commercial in the Allentown area. I have offered several times to show them exactly what they are getting themselves into, but their BPL engineer does not answer my email.

That is kinda' odd, because if I were about to invest millions of dollars and a national organization came along and told me that there was a major problem with it, then offered to drive 200 miles to show me, I think I would want to hear what they had to say and would find an hour's time.

Any PPL shareholders here? :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1361. Re: Opposing BPL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-18 20:45:17 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031018164517.08854.00000391@mb-m14.aol.com>
Source record: 80985

> But is is almost certain they they will claim success for their
>"tests" in that "We got no complaints from low VHF users" when they
>generated no such interference during testing-but are sure to when BPL
>is widely implemented.

Why would they use a different BPL system than the one they used successfully
for their marketing trial?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1362. Re: Opposing BPL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-18 20:48:11 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031018164811.08854.00000392@mb-m14.aol.com>
Source record: 80987

> All this may wind up in a court somewhere, which means your
>documented efforts could be very important.

If this were to end up in court, I would want to see a professional EMC lab
make the measurements.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1363. Re: New Acronym: ECTA (Era of Code Test Abolition)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-18 21:37:52 UTC
From: wa2si@arrl.net
Message-ID: <b7d1465c.0310181337.5195e6dc@posting.google.com>
Source record: 80988

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20031012144521.00545.00001528@mb-m02.aol.com>...

How'd I miss this?

> Here's an experience I had recently (post-restructuring):
>
> Relatively new ham got started via the Tech route. Decided he wanted HF and
> passed the required elements, including code, which was learned from CDs and
> computer software.
>
> But then he discovered that learning enough code to pass the test was a far
> different thing from copying and sending live on the air in a real QSO.
>
> Now remember, this ham had already passed all the code tests he'd ever need to
> pass. He had all bands and modes open to him, and a nice HF station set up.
> There was absolutely no requirement that he ever do any Morse code operating at
> all, ever. Nor was there any requirement to spend more time and effort learning
> to send and copy real-world off-the-air Morse.
>
> But this ham *wanted* to use the mode, based on its merits alone. With a small
> amount of help and encouragement, he learned the skills of on-air copy,
> sending, abbreviations, procedure, etc.
>
> I had the privilege and honor of being his first CW QSO. Since then he's had
> many more, his skills have improved, and he's on the way. CW SS is a few
> weekends away.........

Well Folks, the "relatively new ham" Jim is referring to is me. I too
am priviliged and honored, especially so to have worked my Elmer as my
first CW contact. Was passing Element 1 easy? Yeah, once the
characters started flowing. Was working another AR station OTA using
CW for the first time easy? Nope...but it gets better, and more so
every time out. The common denominator is the feeling of
accomplishment and the associated pride that comes from both
experiences. If any other newbies are out there reading this, DON'T
let ANYBODY minimize this factor. Experience it for yourself and then
YOU be the judge. Betcha you'll like it.

So when folks talk about having to demonstrate Morse "proficiency" to
get on HF, don't believe 'em. Memorizing 43 Morse code characters and
passing Element 1 at 5-wpm is nowhere near any level of "proficiency"
needed to effectively get OTA. What it did do for me though was allow
me to make an educated decision as to whether I wanted to pursue it
any further or not. The new QSL cards on the wall speak for themselves

re. my feelings about CW's merits.

Worked a fellow in Rochester, NY (From LI, NY.) with a QRP rig putting out 2.5 Watts into a dipole, simply fantastic. I'm fortunate enough to live in an antenna friendly neighborhood, HOWEVER, no antenna restrictions could ever keep me off the air with this type of QRP capability available. I'll bet many a wire get dropped from windows to work 40 at night. (Very affordable too.) That's just one example of a practical real-world benefit, there are more that Jim's already touched on. Something to think about.

> And this ham is the kind who will share what he has learned with others and
> repeat the cycle. Test or no test.

You betcha! My first customer is in first grade.

TNX AGN N2EY es CUL.

--
73 de Bert
WA2SI

1364. Re: BPL a reality in my area now!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-18 21:40:53 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031018174053.10929.00000675@mb-m15.aol.com>
Source record: 80989

>At this point, PPL is going commercial in the Allentown area. I have offered
>several times to show them exactly what they are getting themselves into, but
>their BPL engineer does not answer my email.

What makes you think they would waste there time dealing with the Enemy

>Any PPL shareholders here? :-)
>
>73,
>Ed Hare, W1RFI

Me for sure, and I do have alot invested. What you guys need to do is come with some Technical Whizzard Stuff to deal with this. I mean come on, you got all those New No-Code Technical Whizzards to pull from. If you cant think of any, try Karl, or NCI, Im sure they have the technical knowledge to combat this.

1365. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-18 22:52:15 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <zujkb.2977$W16.2571@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 80990

"GMC" <gmc@volaris.net> wrote in message
news:181020031048017080%gmc@volaris.net...
> In article <c2356669.0310171408.1e4c9f9e@posting.google.com>, N2EY
> <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote:
>
> > These are the number of unexpired FCC ARS
> > licenses held by individuals on the dates listed:
> >
> > As of May 14, 2000:
> >
> > Novice - 49,329
> > Tech - 205,394
> > Tech Plus - 128,860
> > General - 112,677
> > Advanced - 99,782
> > Extra - 78,750
> > Total - 674,792
> >
> >
> > As of October 15, 2003:
> >
> > Novice - 32,977 (decrease of 16,352)
> > Technician - 257,303 (increase of 51,909)
> > Technician Plus - 64,686 (decrease of 64,174)
> > General - 141,313 (increase of 28,636)
> > Advanced - 82,589 (decrease of 17,193)
> > Extra - 104,670 (increase of 25,920)
> > Total - 683,538 (increase of 8,746)
> >
> > 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
> Jim,
>
> It looks like we are on the road to some deflation in the numbers.
> AE4FA has posted numbers gleaned from his research into the FCC
> database concerning renewals of the Technician class (no code variety)
> and has found that almost 97% of them are not renewing. There is only
> a small data window to draw from however, as the first people who held
> this license class are only starting to reach the end of the grace
> periods. He had a way to filter out licensees who had upgraded. I think
> there was 8 months of data when the finding were posted. This could be
> why we are about 4,000 licensees down from the peak you mentioned.
>
> 73

> George
> K3UD
>
> --
> remove NOSPAM from address

Not a surprise really. All this happened before the cellphone craze got going. Why bother with a license, especially when they really didn't care for ham radio, when all they wanted to do was order a pizza and check up on the wife/husband.

Dan/W4NTI

1366. Re: What makes LHA so poor at simple research tasks?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-18 23:13:23 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0310181513.1c8083f0@posting.google.com>
Source record: 80991

Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:<bmrn9a$4i0$0@208.206.142.110>...
> Brian wrote:
>
> > k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0310162123.548cef44@posting.google.com>...
> >
> >>brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0310151658.2d3753af@posting.google.com>...
> >>
> >>>n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20031015083048.12501.00003146@mb-m04.aol.com>...
> >>>
> >>>>In article <20031014211336.00545.00001638@mb-m02.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com
> >>>>(Len Over 21) writes:
> >>
> >>
> >>
> >>>>> Come up with the way a spark transmitter suddenly turns into
> >>>>> an Alexanderson Alternator whenever it is brought up in an amateur
> >>>>> radio newsgroup.
> >>>>
> >>>>That's your game, Len.
> >>>
> >>>What's your game, Jim?
> >>
> >> What's your interest in knowing, Brain? Even if he tells you,
> >>it's unlikely you'd understand.
> >>
> >>Steve, K4YZ
> >
> >
> > I think I already know and understand Jim's game. He built an
> > Elecraft kit, then professes to have engineered and built his own
> > amateur station.
> >
>
>
> You DO seem to have a problem with the thought process.
> Sure, Jim recently did buy and build a K2 kit.

He's been speaking of it for several years.

But what
> you missed, among many other important points, was that

> he has always clearly stated that it WAS a kit project,

How could I have missed something so obvious? I think you just stated something that Jim has been omitting.

> not to be confused with the *several* project stations that
> he has designed and built, and USED ON THE AIR over his
> near-40 years as a ham.

What was so wrong with "Jim engineered and built" radios that he had to go to a kit engineered by someone else?

I thought Jim was supposed to be a good engineer.

> But then, that's what we've learned to expect from you.

We know what to expect from you - poorly sent CW.

1367. Re: Dear Mother Brakob...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-18 23:18:42 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0310181518.2a210efe@posting.google.com>
Source record: 80992

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0310162121.651549d9@posting.google.com>...

> Yet another example of emulating your pathological liar mentor, Brain?
>
> Steve, K4YZ

Stebe is my mentor.

1368. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-19 00:05:49 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <xzkkb.110551$qj6.5981176@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 80993

Dan/W4NTI wrote:

> "GMC" <gmc@volaris.net> wrote in message
> news:181020031048017080%gmc@volaris.net...
>
>>In article <c2356669.0310171408.1e4c9f9e@posting.google.com>, N2EY
>><N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote:
>>
>>
>>>These are the number of unexpired FCC ARS
>>>licenses held by individuals on the dates listed:
>>>
>>>As of May 14, 2000:
>>>
>>>Novice - 49,329
>>>Tech - 205,394
>>>Tech Plus - 128,860
>>>General - 112,677
>>>Advanced - 99,782
>>>Extra - 78,750
>>>Total - 674,792
>>>
>>>
>>>As of October 15, 2003:
>>>
>>>Novice - 32,977 (decrease of 16,352)
>>>Technician - 257,303 (increase of 51,909)
>>>Technician Plus - 64,686 (decrease of 64,174)
>>>General - 141,313 (increase of 28,636)
>>>Advanced - 82,589 (decrease of 17,193)
>>>Extra - 104,670 (increase of 25,920)
>>>Total - 683,538 (increase of 8,746)
>>>
>>>73 de Jim, N2EY
>>
>>Jim,
>>
>>It looks like we are on the road to some deflation in the numbers.
>>AE4FA has posted numbers gleaned from his research into the FCC
>>database concerning renewals of the Technician class (no code variety)
>>and has found that almost 97% of them are not renewing. There is only
>>a small data window to draw from however, as the first people who held
>>this license class are only starting to reach the end of the grace
>>periods. He had a way to filter out licensees who had upgraded. I think

>>there was 8 months of data when the finding were posted. This could be
>>why we are about 4,000 licensees down from the peak you mentioned.
>>
>>73
>>George
>>K3UD
>>
>>--
>>remove NOSPAM from address
>
>
> Not a surprise really. All this happened before the cellphone craze got
> going. Why bother with a license, especially when they really didn't care
> for ham radio, when all they wanted to do was order a pizza and check up on
> the wife/husband.

If this really is the case, then what happened to the technically
astute technicians who just refused on principle to learn Morse code?
Are they the remaining 3 percent?

Could be a No-code myth here?

- Mike KB3EIA -

1369. Re: Lennie's Double Standard Once Again Revealed...BY Lennie!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-19 01:21:57 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0310181721.2fa6bac9@posting.google.com>
Source record: 80994

brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0310180714.30f06d5@posting.google.com>...
> k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0310162129.3c098f18@posting.google.com>...
> > brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0310140546.153a6483@posting.google.com>...
> >
> > > So, Stebe, take a poll. Ask who enjoys your constant rantings.
> >
> > I am not the one ranting, Brain.
> >
> > I AM the one who rubs your nose in your own childish conduct, the
> > post this responds to being evidence thereof.
>
> Your Avenging Angel acts followed by general crazy-man activities is
> really rubbing my nose?

"Avenging angel"...?!?!?

> I see it differently.

People suffering from your sort of demintia ususally do, Brain.

> So what did the poll say?

What poll?

Steve, K4YZ

1370. Re: Opposing BPL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-19 01:26:04 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0310181726.243cd827@posting.google.com>
Source record: 80995

w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) wrote in message
news:<20031018164811.08854.00000392@mb-m14.aol.com>...
> > All this may wind up in a court somewhere, which means your
> >documented efforts could be very important.
>
> If this were to end up in court, I would want to see a professional EMC lab
> make the measurements.

Would Bob w2hj be one?

> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

w3rv

1371. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-19 01:45:05 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031018214505.19539.00000488@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 80997

>If this really is the case, then what happened to the technically
>astute technicians who just refused on principle to learn Morse code?
>Are they the remaining 3 percent?
>
> Could be a No-code myth here?
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -

Its always been a myth by the No-Code Crowd.

1372. Re: Amateur Radio in the 21st Century?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-19 01:47:09 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <x2mkb.1659$_i.139483@nnrp1.ptd.net>
Source record: 80996

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:bmrn15$3sh$0@208.206.142.110...
> N2EY wrote:
[snip
> >
> > What I find interesting, too, is that the CW/data parts of the bands are
always
> > referred to as "exclusive CW" with no mention that all of them on HF are
also
> > shared by data modes. In fact, there is very little mention of data
modes at
> > all.
> >
>
> Right! It's apparently codified in the code-banner's rulebook- Say nor
> do anything that will in any way interfere with The Agenda. And
> acknowledging that there are NO exclusive CW HF subbands is a primary
> part of it. In fact, it';s clear that they would like to do completely
> away with *ll* subbands. Hey, why not SSB yakkers wall to wall, like
> it is "uop there" above 27 mhz?
>
> It IS curuois that they jump from "Hey why don't you Luddites get
> out of the 19th century and jumo on board our Advanced Digital Train,
> to "Lets do away with all subbands and give everyone with the mildest
> of itnersts all privileges everywhere to yak into a microphone"!!!
>
> Can you say obfuscation???

Dick,

Can you say "You're distorting the facts"???

Both I and Bill Sohl have repeatedly stated the the ONLY agenda
for NCI is to eliminate the code TEST ... you will notice that NCI's
Petition for Rulemaking doesn't attempt to modify the sub-bands,
expand SSB allotments, or anything of the sort.

It would be nice if you could stick to the facts, but that doesn't
suit YOUR agenda, does it?

[remainder of Dick's inaccurate statements and inuendo deleted]

Carl -wk3c

1373. Re: Lennie's Double Standard Once Again Revealed...BY Lennie!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-19 01:47:17 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0310181747.4754eb88@posting.google.com>
Source record: 80998

brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0310180714.30f06d5@posting.google.com>...

> Your Avenging Angel acts followed by general crazy-man activities is
> really rubbing my nose?

I am not the one who "own's up" to having an archived
pathological liar as my "mentor".

I am not the one who claims to have operated from some rare DX
location with an alleged "say so" from someone who didn't have the
authority to let me do it anyway.

I am not the one who doesn't know the difference between a
"commander" (an officer in the Armed Forces assigned as the senior
officer of a unit) and a "Commander" (a Naval grade equivilent to Lt
Colonel in the other branches).

I am not the one who doesn't know the difference between
"authority" and "acceptance".

> I see it differently.

As I said...people with your particular dementia usually don't.

To quote a particular Naval veteran, "Have Fun With This One
Now".

Steve, K4YZ

1374. Re: What makes LHA so poor at simple research tasks?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-19 01:53:05 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0310181753.1b0bbc3@posting.google.com>
Source record: 80999

Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:<bmrn9a$4i0$0@208.206.142.110>...
> Brian wrote:
>
> > k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0310162123.548cef44@posting.google.com>...
> >
> >>brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0310151658.2d3753af@posting.google.com>...
> >>
> >>>n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20031015083048.12501.00003146@mb-m04.aol.com>...
> >>>
> >>>>In article <20031014211336.00545.00001638@mb-m02.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com
> >>>>(Len Over 21) writes:
> >>
> >>
> >>
> >>>>> Come up with the way a spark transmitter suddenly turns into
> >>>>> an Alexanderson Alternator whenever it is brought up in an amateur
> >>>>> radio newsgroup.
> >>>>
> >>>>That's your game, Len.
> >>>
> >>>What's your game, Jim?
> >>
> >> What's your interest in knowing, Brain? Even if he tells you,
> >>it's unlikely you'd understand.
> >>
> >>Steve, K4YZ
> >
> >
> > I think I already know and understand Jim's game. He built an
> > Elecraft kit, then professes to have engineered and built his own
> > amateur station.
> >
>
>
> You DO seem to have a problem with the thought process.
> Sure, Jim recently did buy and build a K2 kit. But what
> you missed, among many other important points, was that
> he has always clearly stated that it WAS a kit project,
> not to be confused with the *several* project stations that
> he has designed and built, and USED ON THE AIR over his

> near-40 years as a ham.
>
> But then, that's what we've learned to expect from you.

Was there ever any doubt, Dick? Can we expect anything less from a dweeb who can proudly lay claim to looking up to a known pathological liar as his "mentor"...?!?!

What an idiot he is. As if I NEEDED to have my suspicions verified...

If nothing ELSE would have clued Sir Clueless in, it would have been the fact that Jim has been discussing his other projects for years...

Of course The Clueless One only tries to scan through posts long enough to pick up key words he's looking for and ignores the rest.

73

Steve, K4YZ

1375. Re: Amazin'....Ain't it...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-19 01:55:35 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0310181755.231b5d23@posting.google.com>
Source record: 81000

brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0310180710.10f915b2@posting.google.com>...
> k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0310162138.7119784e@posting.google.com>...
> > brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0310140541.4b6c74df@posting.google.com>...
> >
> > > > Your "mentor" can fill you in on ways to antagonize and instigate
> > > > flamefests...he does it well.
> > >
> > > OK, Stebe.
> > >
> > > > You aren't quite there yet, but you're getting close.
> > >
> > > I'm learning from the Master, Stebe.
> >
> > Whew...
> >
> > It's really amazing to find people who ADMIT that they are the
> > willing "students" of pathological liars.
>
> SteBe, I said I was learning from the Master.
>
> Do you now ADMIT to being a pathological liar?

You said Lennie was your mentor. Shall we requote the post
wherein you made this proclaimation? Anything else is an attempt to
back out of the corner YOU painted yourself into, Sir Clueless.

Enjoy the view, Brain...You got yourself there.

Steve, K4YZ

1376. Re: Amazin'....Ain't it...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-19 01:56:37 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0310181756.38772f46@posting.google.com>
Source record: 80851

Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message news:<3F7AC80B.7030709@psu.edu>...
> Steve Robeson, K4CAP wrote:
> > Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message news:<3F79CBB8.60401@psu.edu>...
> >
> >>Radio Amateur KC2HMZ wrote:
> >>
> >>
> >>>I happen to think it's a case of turf defending...the PCTAs feel they
> >>>must defend their exclusive little slices of the RF spectrum at all
> >>>costs, regardless of what harm is done to the ARS in the process.
> >>>They'll kill the mother to save the baby.
> >>
> >> What is a permitted method of expression, John?
> >
> >
> > I had been skipping over some of the "KC2HMZ" posts, mistaking
> > them for Bert...But NOW I remember why "HMZ" was familiar!
> >
> > I find it unique that John takes the "turf defending" position
> > and makes the humorous suggestions about "kill the mother to save the
> > baby".
> >
> > John was the listowner of an e mail reflector that used to "ban"
> > members from who didn't heel to his particular viewpoints and
> > opinions.
> >
> > Unique how people who like to prevent others from expressing an
> > opposing viewpoint will jump on others for doing (allegedly) doing the
> > same thing.
>
>
> There are many people, that believe that one of their rights is
> depriving others of their rights.

Yep. Kaput-ski was one of them.

Steve, K4YZ

1377. Re: Points Of Perception...What Do YOU Call "Collateral Damage"...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-19 02:05:26 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0310181805.5e9eeac4@posting.google.com>
Source record: 80852

brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0310180708.17319747@posting.google.com>...

> Steve, John is mere avoiding a crazy man who talks to himself in
> between episodes of playing RRAP Avenging Angel.

Since you claim to look to Lennie as a mentor, I will remind you
that it is he who claims anyone making typos in a USENET repsonse is
"getting mad". I will leave it to you to figure out what you did
wrong (according to Lennie's rules).

As far as John goes, I imagine him like a bully I knew as a
kid...He was all big and brash...Right up until someone smacked him
back.

John has beat a hasty retreat because unlike you and Lennie, I
doubt that he LIKES being spoon-fed his own USENET foolishness. You
should take a hint. I know you won't since you obviously like being
beat over the head again-and-again with stuff YOU provide.

So don't blame me, Brain, for any "Avenging Angel" stuff...You
just keep giving me so much raw material to work with.

Thanks.

Steve, K4YZ

1378. Re: Opposing BPL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-19 02:06:29 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0310181806.72c3e588@posting.google.com>
Source record: 80853
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.policy

brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0310180656.4b0945af@posting.google.com>...

> Its a complex issue. Thank goodness we have lawyers and engineers to
> figure it all out for us.

Heaven forbid that you'd ever take the initiative to think for yourself, Brain.

Steve, K4YZ

1379. Re: Code test analogy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-19 02:08:55 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0310181808.94004e6@posting.google.com>
Source record: 80854

"garigue" <garigue@comcast.net> wrote in message
news:<Nq%jb.578283$Oz4.554262@rwcrnsc54>...
> >
> > > To expect prospective hams to believe in the fairy tale of morse code is
> the
> > > the same as expecting people to believe in the fairy tales of the holy
> bible.
> >
> > To expect that you exercised even a modicum of thought before
> > bombing USENET with this bit of emotionally charged, baseless
> > silliness is even more lame than my expectations of being molested by
> > Brittney Spears in the next 24 hours.
> >
> > Steve, K4YZ
>
>
> Hams molested by Brittney Spears in the next 24 hours ???? PSE PSE what's
> the frequency ....and more over ...what a pile-up ....

Like I thought...she was a no-show!

Steve, K4YZ

1380. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-19 02:35:58 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bmstaettb0@208.207.71.137>
Source record: 80855

Dwight Stewart wrote:
> "N2EY" wrote:
>
>>Because people are not specific. Look at thread
>>subject lines like "drop the code" or "IARU says
>>drop Morse". And there's a group what goes by
>>the name "No-Code International" - not "No
>>Code TEST International".
>
>
>
> All writers assume a certain level of knowledge on the part of their
> target readers. The same is true for this newsgroup. Most here are aware of
> the code testing debate, so there isn't any reason to restate the issue each
> time something is said. As for NCI, the names of many groups don't exactly
> reflect the group's publicly stated goals. For example, the Red Cross
> doesn't go around painting crosses red and the Salvation Army doesn't fight
> religious wars.
>

On the other hand the symbol for the Red Cross is, well, a red cross!
And the "soldiers" of the Salvation Army wear an appropirate uniform.
So,.....

1381. Re: Opposing BPL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-19 03:27:28 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bmt0b0$4tj$0@208.207.71.137>
Source record: 80856

W1RFI wrote:

>> But is is almost certain they they will claim success for their
>>"tests" in that "We got no complaints from low VHF users" when they
>>generated no such interference during testing-but are sure to when BPL
>>is widely implemented.
>
>
> Why would they use a different BPL system than the one they used successfully
> for their marketing trial?

Once again, one of us missed something, and once again I don't think
it was me. I appreciate that you're pretty well loaded yourself these
days, Ed. I'll explain. And while we're on the subject of of your work,
thanks for all you do for us!
It was noted by one of the local BPL investigators writing here
that the bandwidth currently in use in the Emmaus test area
is only from around 3 to 22 mHz. That was said to be that because of the
very few subscribers using the test system, the full 2-80 mhz is not
needed. But when fully implemented, the bandwidth will need to expand to
the full 2 through 80 mHz to accomodate the full complement of broadband
users anticipated to use the system when fully loaded.

Following along with that piece of information - it's easy
to see that the BPL advocates have already shown they will obfuscate the
situation (the "neon sign" assertion when it was really BPL noise).
Assuming they are well aware they will need all the technical tricks
they can play on FCC to get their system approved, they probably will
fail to make full disclosure on exactly what bandwidth their test
systems utilized. "We received no low VHF complaints" when their
limited test system didn't operate nor generate any RFI in that part
of the spectrum. But of course the fully operational, loaded system,
expanded out to the full 80 mHz, will indeed generate that interference.
But the test results, assumed to be complete, won't show it.
The FCC is clearly friendly to their case anyway, and won't be looking
for too many "minor" details to block the path to approval. So the
lack of testing in the low VHF range is never made an issue to the
approval process - UNLESS someone, who had done their homework, forces
it to be.

By the time the full range of frequencies is in use with the
interference they "didn't get any complaints" on, because it wasn't
present during the limited spectrum tests, it won't affect their FCC
approval in any way - they'll already have it. And good luck getting it
revoked at that point because of some "minor" lack of full disclosure of

the limited tests. After all, it might be years after approval before the system is fully loaded with users to the point that the full 2-80 mHz spectrum is needed.

If I'm in error in understanding of all this, I would appreciate the correct information.

Dick

1382. Re: GOOD NEWS-------France heat wave deaths top 14,000

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-19 03:39:14 UTC
From: Dean Arthur <dearthur@silverstar.com>
Message-ID: <3F920763.6037BC13@silverstar.com>
Source record: 80857
Cross-posted to: alt.ham-radio.hf,alt.ham-radio.ssb,alt.radio.amateur,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

```
Fire & Brimstone wrote:
>
> "BIG-AL@3894.5-LSB-75-METERS" <BIG-AL -003894.5-LSB-75-METERS@
> BIG-AL -003894.5-LSB-75-METERS> wrote in
> news:vn6lk3dd6nrg62@corp.supernews.com:
>
> > PARIS, France (AP) -- The death toll in France from August's
> > blistering heat wave was nearly 15,000, according to a government
> > report released Thursday that exceeded prior official estimates by
> > 3,000 victims.
>
> No, Not good news, 30,000 would've been good news.
>
> 15,000 is a good start though.
>

Save the kids, though. Necessary material for cleaning sewer pipes.
Sent down with scrub brushes to keep pipe walls clean - but need test to
determine if doing job. Smell not good enough as they all smell like
s__t to begin with.
```

1383. Re: BPL a reality in my area now!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-19 03:45:31 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bmt1cr$6sq$0@208.207.71.137>
Source record: 80858

W1RFI wrote:

>>Wonder how much BPL garbage that setup would pick up?
>
>
> My guess is about S7 at 100 feet spacing between houses, on frequencies that
> BPL was using. That is assuming they didn't crank up the power to meet Part 15
> limits so they could go farther and/or have more immunity to noise.
>
>
>>A question arises - 30 m from what? If every piece of house wiring has the
>>BPL
>>signals on it, in many locations you cannot get 30 meters away.
>
>
> Correct. The limit is for 30 meters distance. There are cases where it can't
> be measured there, and the FCC allows measurements to be made at other
> distances, and extrapolated to 30 meters. But here's the kicker -- they allow
> the extrapolation at a 40log(distance ratio), unlike virtually every other
> country in the world. That translates to an inverse-to-the-fourth power ratio.
> Think any of the Part 15 guys make measurements at 3 meters that COULD be made
> at 30 meters, just to gain that extra 20 dB?
>
>
>>Is there stock equipment for BPL yet? Or could they be using prototypes?
>
>
> At this point, PPL is going commercial in the Allentown area. I have offered
> several times to show them exactly what they are getting themselves into, but
> their BPL engineer does not answer my email.
>
> That is kinda' odd, because if I were about to invest millions of dollars and a
> national organization came along and told me that there was a major problem
> with it, then offered to drive 200 miles to show me, I think I would want to
> hear what they had to say and would find an hour's time.
>
> Any PPL shareholders here? :-)
>

I got no response to my private email so I'll ask again here in public.

What's wrong with going after those engineers who are obscuring the
technical facts of BPL? If a doctor or lawyer messes up bigtime and
people suffer for it, he can be called to account. I see no reason
whatever that those engineers behind the hiding of the facts of BPL

can't be cited to answer to their state licensing boards for it. I see it as entirely possible that the negative publicity alone might change the nature of the situation-what investor owned company wants to answer to stockholders for spending many millions of dollars on such a technically flawed plan which is most likely to lose money because of a plan based on flawed engineering and deliberate bypassing of the rules?

Another possible benefit of taking action against engineers would be the fact that FCC *should* be far less likely to approve a BPL plan that had been shown IN PUBLIC to be technically flawed, with citations given such as the "neon sign" diversionary.

If that engineer won't answer your remails, send him a registered letter. If he doesn't answer that, see if he'll answer to his state licensing board. To do any less is to allow them to win by default. Of course you'll have to have your engineering all in place.

Dick

1384. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-19 03:53:42 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bmt1s6$6sq$1@208.207.71.137>
Source record: 80859

Mike Coslo wrote:

> Dan/W4NTI wrote:
>
>> "GMC" <gmc@volaris.net> wrote in message
>> news:181020031048017080%gmc@volaris.net...
>>
>>> In article <c2356669.0310171408.1e4c9f9e@posting.google.com>, N2EY
>>> <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote:
>>>
>>>
>>>> These are the number of unexpired FCC ARS
>>>> licenses held by individuals on the dates listed:
>>>>
>>>> As of May 14, 2000:
>>>>
>>>> Novice - 49,329
>>>> Tech - 205,394
>>>> Tech Plus - 128,860
>>>> General - 112,677
>>>> Advanced - 99,782
>>>> Extra - 78,750
>>>> Total - 674,792
>>>>
>>>>
>>>> As of October 15, 2003:
>>>>
>>>> Novice - 32,977 (decrease of 16,352)
>>>> Technician - 257,303 (increase of 51,909)
>>>> Technician Plus - 64,686 (decrease of 64,174)
>>>> General - 141,313 (increase of 28,636)
>>>> Advanced - 82,589 (decrease of 17,193)
>>>> Extra - 104,670 (increase of 25,920)
>>>> Total - 683,538 (increase of 8,746)
>>>>
>>>> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>>>
>>>
>>> Jim,
>>>
>>> It looks like we are on the road to some deflation in the numbers.
>>> AE4FA has posted numbers gleaned from his research into the FCC
>>> database concerning renewals of the Technician class (no code variety)
>>> and has found that almost 97% of them are not renewing. There is only

>>> a small data window to draw from however, as the first people who held
>>> this license class are only starting to reach the end of the grace
>>> periods. He had a way to filter out licensees who had upgraded. I think
>>> there was 8 months of data when the finding were posted. This could be
>>> why we are about 4,000 licensees down from the peak you mentioned.
>>>
>>> 73
>>> George
>>> K3UD
>>>
>>> --
>>> remove NOSPAM from address
>>
>>
>>
>> Not a surprise really. All this happened before the cellphone craze got
>> going. Why bother with a license, especially when they really didn't
>> care
>> for ham radio, when all they wanted to do was order a pizza and check
>> up on
>> the wife/husband.
>
>
> If this really is the case, then what happened to the technically
> astute technicians who just refused on principle to learn Morse code?
> Are they the remaining 3 percent?
>
> Could be a No-code myth here?

Ask Brian. He says all the myths are Morse and No-code has no mantra.

1385. Re: Amateur Radio in the 21st Century?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-19 03:57:52 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bmt240$89h$0@208.207.71.137>
Source record: 80860

Carl R. Stevenson wrote:

> "Dick Carroll" <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com> wrote in message
> news:bmrn15$3sh$0@208.206.142.110...
>
>>N2EY wrote:
>
> [snip
>
>>>What I find interesting, too, is that the CW/data parts of the bands are
>
> always
>
>>>referred to as "exclusive CW" with no mention that all of them on HF are
>
> also
>
>>>shared by data modes. In fact, there is very little mention of data
>
> modes at
>
>>>all.
>>>
>>
>>Right! It's apparently codified in the code-banner's rulebook- Say nor
>>do anything that will in any way interfere with The Agenda. And
>>acknowledging that there are NO exclusive CW HF subbands is a primary
>>part of it. In fact, it';s clear that they would like to do completely
>>away with *ll* subbands. Hey, why not SSB yakkers wall to wall, like
>>it is "uop there" above 27 mhz?
>>
>> It IS curuois that they jump from "Hey why don't you Luddites get
>>out of the 19th century and jumo on board our Advanced Digital Train,
>>to "Lets do away with all subbands and give everyone with the mildest
>>of itnersts all privileges everywhere to yak into a microphone"!!!
>>
>> Can you say obfuscation???
>
>
> Dick,
>
> Can you say "You're distorting the facts"???
>

What I *can* say is that it's a step-at-a-time process.
Of course you don't want to take a ten foot step all at once!
But I'm reminded of "No setasides for "legacy" modes"....

> Both I and Bill Sohl have repeatedly stated the the ONLY agenda
> for NCI is to eliminate the code TEST ... you will notice that NCI's
> Petition for Rulemaking doesn't attempt to modify the sub-bands,
> expand SSB allotments, or anything of the sort.
>
> It would be nice if you could stick to the facts, but that doesn't
> suit YOUR agenda, does it?
>
> [remainder of Dick's inaccurate statements and inuendo deleted]
>
> Carl -wk3c
>

1386. Re: BPL a reality in my area now!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-19 04:04:39 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <xnfcneeyarg.hmzcb9k.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>
Source record: 80861

On 19 Oct 2003 03:45:31 GMT, Dick Carroll wrote:

> What's wrong with going after those engineers who are obscuring the
>technical facts of BPL?

You seem to be missing an essential point: the "client" of an
engineer is the employer. If the employer does not complain of
unprofessional conduct, there's no case.

Similarly, the licensing boards take action only if there is a
complaint of unprofessional conduct from one with standing, namely
the employer. The one exception is if the engineer violates a
criminal statute and the complaint is brought by the District
Attorney.

>If a doctor or lawyer messes up bigtime and
>people suffer for it, he can be called to account.

Only on complaint by someone having standing - the client. No
complaint, no case.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane
Registered Professional Engineer

1387. Re: BPL a reality in my area now!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-19 05:45:09 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bmt8d5$n33$0@208.207.71.137>
Source record: 80862

Phil Kane wrote:

> On 19 Oct 2003 03:45:31 GMT, Dick Carroll wrote:
>
>
>> What's wrong with going after those engineers who are obscuring the
>>technical facts of BPL?
>
>
> You seem to be missing an essential point: the "client" of an
> engineer is the employer. If the employer does not complain of
> unprofessional conduct, there's no case.

That's neat. The employer can violate all sorts of statutes, and
involve the engineers, and no one but the employer can do anything about
it! VERY neat!

>
> Similarly, the licensing boards take action only if there is a
> complaint of unprofessional conduct from one with standing, namely
> the employer.

So the adversly-affected public can have no standing in complaining
about the fraudulant acts of licensed persons-actions that directly
affect the public???

What sort of a system of regulation is this? It's almost useless!
It licenses professionals to act contrary to law and standard industry
professinal process!

The one exception is if the engineer violates a
> criminal statute and the complaint is brought by the District
> Attorney.
>
>
>>If a doctor or lawyer messes up bigtime and
>>people suffer for it, he can be called to account.
>
>
> Only on complaint by someone having standing - the client. No
> complaint, no case.
>

So you're saying the the public is afforded no protection whatever
in licensing matters unless individuals compl;aining are are directly
involved. Nice!

So inform the stockholders of this fiasco and let them handle it.
If they are made aware of the facts it would seem they would be
interested in at least looking into the matter since their investment
dollars are at risk.

As usual the law is written to protect everyone except the public.

1388. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-19 05:55:33 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031019015533.07578.00001174@mb-m25.aol.com>
Source record: 80865

In article <181020031048017080%gmc@volaris.net>, GMC <gmc@volaris.net> writes:

>It looks like we are on the road to some deflation in the numbers.

Perhaps. There are lots of factors influencing the numbers right now. For example, a new Tech Q&A pool was put in place July 15, and since then the number of new Techs has plummeted.

>AE4FA has posted numbers gleaned from his research into the FCC
>database concerning renewals of the Technician class (no code variety)
>and has found that almost 97% of them are not renewing.

I question his methods.

>There is only
>a small data window to draw from however, as the first people who held
>this license class are only starting to reach the end of the grace
>periods. He had a way to filter out licensees who had upgraded.

Before I'd accept such a low renewal rate, I'd like to see how the data was processed. There are all sorts of procedural pitfalls in trying to figure out renewal rates. For example, people change their names and addresses frequently, making tracking difficult. The 1994 changes to the vanity callsign rules resulted in a lot of Techs getting vanity calls - which carry with them a renewal.

>I think
>there was 8 months of data when the finding were posted.

And how many were issued in that time?

>This could be
>why we are about 4,000 licensees down from the peak you mentioned.
>
Perhaps. OTOH, look at how many Techs are renewed in a given year, then figure what 10% of the current Tech-Tech Plus population is. You'll get a much higher renewal rate than 3%

73 de Jim, N2EY

1389. Re: What makes LHA so poor at simple research tasks?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-19 05:55:34 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031019015534.07578.00001175@mb-m25.aol.com>
Source record: 80863

In article <f45722ac.0310180644.404e0f4b@posting.google.com>,
brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:

> He built an
>Elecraft kit, then professes to have engineered and built his own
>amateur station.

Wrong.

I've done both. In fact, I designed and built several stations before ever
hearing of Elecraft.

Let's see...

I've built-from-scratch (no kits, no carbon copies of other homebrew) in my
home workshops, at least:

5 receivers
5 transmitters
3 transceivers
4 transmatches
12 power supplies
4 TR systems
5 pieces of test equipment
various shack furniture, antennas, power cables, control systems, etc.

The above list does not include:

- surplus units converted/restored
- manufactured equipment restored/repaired/modified
- kits built or rebuilt

I've worked several of the regulars here on rrap using my homebrew rigs.

I can often be found on or around 7040.

Pictures and descriptions of a receiver I built for about $10 back in the early
1970s are on the HBR website. It's only one in a long line.

1390. Re: Amateur Radio in the 21st Century?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-19 05:55:34 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031019015534.07578.00001176@mb-m25.aol.com>
Source record: 80864

In article <Vygkb.110487$qj6.5917282@news1.news.adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo
<mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>
>> Folks,
>>
>> Recently there has been mention of a paper by KL7CC titled "Amateur
>> Radio in the 21st Century". It can be downloaded in Word format from:
>>
>> http://www.qsl.net/al7fs/NCVECplan.doc
>>
>> That document spells out what the NCVEC leaders are thinking about in
>> terms of changes to the license structure as a result of WRC 2003.
>>
>> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>
>Jim is it considered good form to quote extracts from this doc in the
>newsgroup?

If the quotes are accurate, and properly referenced so that anyone interested
can look them up, I don't see why not.

The whole paper is on a public website and deals with a public policy issue.
>
>I've read it, and frankly I find it quite "interesting". But I'd love to
>quote parts of it with my responses

I'm working on a comprehensive response to send to the authors.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1391. Re: Echolink is great for those who..

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-19 09:47:46 UTC
From: Eric Oyen - N7ZZT <n7zzt_NO.SPAM_@hotmail.com>
Message-ID: <pan.2003.10.19.09.47.45.997719@hotmail.com>
Source record: 80866
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On Wed, 08 Oct 2003 14:50:09 +0200, starwars wrote:

>> ever hear of other considerations? how about this one: lack on funds
>
> It's not my fault you're so unemployable you can't afford anything. I bet
> you're driving that used-over 100,000 mile shitbox because you can't aford
> a newer car, too.
it would be nice to drive, if only one could SEE!
hell, you know even less about me than I realized.

oh well, just keep crying me a river.

>
> "On their "Root?" No wonder you're a goddamned no -code technician TWAT,
> you don't even know that antennas usually go on roofs, not roots. What a
> dumbass. You're just full of excuses, twat. And you can add lack of
> ambition to own your own home to your mounting list of deficiencies.
come off it! 1 or 2 little spelling mistakes? what are you, some kind of
wannabe spelling cop?. Sure, I don't use a spell checker. I don't have a
lot of need for one. I apply this principle: WYSIWYG (what you see is what
you get). like it or lump it. I don't really care.

>
> The only crying is coming from you, no-code technician twat.
is it now? funny, whoes spewing forth more words here?

>
> Can you say hypocrite? In addition to your inability to upgrade your
> license, you severely lack skills in debate. You proved it all by your
> lonesome, little twat.
he who is without sin may cast the first stone dude! are you without sin?
thought not.

>
>> throwing insults just means you don't have brains enough to debate.
>
> Making excuses for your lack of abilities isn't debating, little twat.
what excuses? name them. provide proof or shut up.

>
> Now, what were you saying above about throwing insults because you didn't
> have brains, twat?
you still didn't get it. guess you are dumber than I thought.

> And the point passes over your granite skull at the speed of light, twat.
> Thanks for proving my point.

what point. you didn't make one. you rambled on, you tried to post digs and you even tried some half-assed insulting for good measure. what did it get you? NOTHING!

real my signature below. try and figure out who originally said it.

DE N7ZZT
Eric Oyen
Phoenix, Arizona

--
the difference between intelligence and stupidity is that intelligence has its limits.

1392. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-19 11:28:43 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <Lzukb.3623$W16.3086@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 80868

"Dick Carroll" wrote:
> Dwight Stewart wrote:
> >
> > All writers assume a certain level of knowledge on
> > the part of their target readers. The same is true for
> > this newsgroup. Most here are aware of the code
> > testing debate, so there isn't any reason to restate the
> > issue each time something is said. As for NCI, the
> > names of many groups don't exactly reflect the group's
> > publicly stated goals. For example, the Red Cross
> > doesn't go around painting crosses red and the
> > Salvation Army doesn't fight religious wars.
>
>
> On the other hand the symbol for the Red Cross is, well,
> a red cross!

But how does that "Red Cross" reflect their specific goals? Remember, I
was addressing how a chosen name has a some bearing on the group's goals (a
comment about "No-Code International" versus "No Code TEST International").

> And the "soldiers" of the Salvation Army wear an appropirate
> uniform. So,.....

Camaflage BDU's? Few people fight wars in a dress uniform. ;-)

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

1393. Re: GOOD NEWS-------France heat wave deaths top 14,000

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-19 12:25:43 UTC
From: Clint <"rattlehead at computron dot net">
Message-ID: <vp50orftai0hb3@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 80869
Cross-posted to: alt.ham-radio.hf,alt.ham-radio.ssb,alt.radio.amateur,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

<Expeditereply@il.here.amenworld.com> wrote in message
news:745181656437342.Post@ithinknot.net...
> Fire & Brimstone" <Not.no.m@il.here> a crit dans le message de
news:3f8496b7$0$47053$45beb828@newscene.com...

>
> Congratulations you show us the kind of bastard you are .
>
> Your are probably the kind of people proud of himself assuming ideas
behind a computer !
>
> Shame on you .
>

<snip remainder of self-righteous indignation>

well, I have another perspective; did you ever stop to think that there
wouldn't be
such a prevailing anti-french notion if they would not only QUIT trying to
halt our
attempts to fight & end terrorism in the world, not only STOP being nothing
more
than a nation that uses the UN... (which, by the way, if you didn't know, we
fund
a quarter of the UN's budget; our total basic input, ASIDE of all the extra
few billions here and there we give, adds up to MORE than contribution of
France, Germany and Russian COMBINED?).... to thwart so many of our
righteous and morally correct war against the islamic extremists that, if
given thier
way, would have YOU killed? Did you ever stop to think that maybe if France
began standing up for herself and HELPING in this dreadful ordeal, along
with the
other sniveling weasel nations of europe, that we could wrap this up quicker
and
faster instead of them being a root cause of what is one of the darkest
periods
in human history to be stretched out FUTHER in terms of time and bloodshed?
Just what did all of France's attempts to thwart our removal of saddam and
put another knife in the back of terrorism GET them, huh? Another bomb in
Paris! And did you EVER think that that maybe if France finally began to
learn
her lesson about appeasement, along with all the other nations in Europe
that

had to bear the dreadful weight of world war II on thier backs, just *maybe* relations between that nation and a few others would improve with us? That just
maybe we would truly be the allies instead of this mass-perpetrated delusion
that we are already?

Kuddos to the axis of weasels for coming around on the last UN vote... I know
they didn't do it because of a change of heart, but at least it's a start in the right
direction. I'll give them *that* much. Now if they'll just open thier eyes and
wake up to the world as it really is and begin to help us, things will be much better
for everybody; Civilized Nations: 1, Islamic Extremist bloodthirsty murderers: ZERO.

Clint
A person who chooses to continue LIVING in the real world instead of dreaming
my way to a grave.

1394. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-19 12:26:15 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <Hpvkb.2610$P%1.2173230@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 80870

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:xzkkb.110551$qj6.5981176@news1.news.adelphia.net...
> Dan/W4NTI wrote:
>
> > "GMC" <gmc@volaris.net> wrote in message
> > news:181020031048017080%gmc@volaris.net...
> >
> >>In article <c2356669.0310171408.1e4c9f9e@posting.google.com>, N2EY
> >><N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote:
> >>
> >>
> >>>These are the number of unexpired FCC ARS
> >>>licenses held by individuals on the dates listed:
> >>>
> >>>As of May 14, 2000:
> >>>
> >>>Novice - 49,329
> >>>Tech - 205,394
> >>>Tech Plus - 128,860
> >>>General - 112,677
> >>>Advanced - 99,782
> >>>Extra - 78,750
> >>>Total - 674,792
> >>>
> >>>
> >>>As of October 15, 2003:
> >>>
> >>>Novice - 32,977 (decrease of 16,352)
> >>>Technician - 257,303 (increase of 51,909)
> >>>Technician Plus - 64,686 (decrease of 64,174)
> >>>General - 141,313 (increase of 28,636)
> >>>Advanced - 82,589 (decrease of 17,193)
> >>>Extra - 104,670 (increase of 25,920)
> >>>Total - 683,538 (increase of 8,746)
> >>>
> >>>73 de Jim, N2EY
> >>
> >>Jim,
> >>
> >>It looks like we are on the road to some deflation in the numbers.
> >>AE4FA has posted numbers gleaned from his research into the FCC
> >>database concerning renewals of the Technician class (no code variety)
> >>and has found that almost 97% of them are not renewing. There is only
> >>a small data window to draw from however, as the first people who held

> >>this license class are only starting to reach the end of the grace
> >>periods. He had a way to filter out licensees who had upgraded. I think
> >>there was 8 months of data when the finding were posted. This could be
> >>why we are about 4,000 licensees down from the peak you mentioned.
> >>
> >>73
> >>George
> >>K3UD
> >>
> >>--
> >>remove NOSPAM from address
> >
> >
> > Not a surprise really. All this happened before the cellphone craze got
> > going. Why bother with a license, especially when they really didn't
care
> > for ham radio, when all they wanted to do was order a pizza and check up
on
> > the wife/husband.
>
> If this really is the case, then what happened to the technically
> astute technicians who just refused on principle to learn Morse code?
> Are they the remaining 3 percent?
>
> Could be a No-code myth here?
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -
>

Of course.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

1395. Re: BPL a reality in my area now!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-19 12:36:45 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <xzvkb.2613$P%1.2174102@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 80871

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:bmt1cr$6sq$0@208.207.71.137...
> I got no response to my private email so I'll ask again here in public.
>
> What's wrong with going after those engineers who are obscuring the
> technical facts of BPL? If a doctor or lawyer messes up bigtime and
> people suffer for it, he can be called to account. I see no reason
> whatever that those engineers behind the hiding of the facts of BPL
> can't be cited to answer to their state licensing boards for it. I see
> it as entirely possible that the negative publicity alone might change
> the nature of the situation-what investor owned company wants to answer
> to stockholders for spending many millions of dollars on such a
> technically flawed plan which is most likely to lose money because of a
> plan based on flawed engineering and deliberate bypassing of the rules?
>
> Another possible benefit of taking action against engineers would be
> the fact that FCC *should* be far less likely to approve a BPL plan that
> had been shown IN PUBLIC to be technically flawed, with citations given
> such as the "neon sign" diversionary.
>
> If that engineer won't answer your remails, send him a registered
> letter. If he doesn't answer that, see if he'll answer to his state
> licensing board. To do any less is to allow them to win by default.
> Of course you'll have to have your engineering all in place.
>
> Dick
>

You should go after the company. The engineer almost certainly cannot answer you directly as it would be against corporate policy. He has to get it approved by his boss and the corporate lawyers. Keep in mind that no matter what he/she may have recommended internally to the company, management makes the decisions based on perceived profit. The engineer may have not hidden a thing but management very well may have (remember the first shuttle disaster). However, remove the perceived profit, and the project will be dropped like a hot potato.

As far as going to the state licensing board, that will almost certainly fail. There are only a limited number of circumstances where engineers are required to be licensed and this probably isn't one of them. Very few engineers in this country are licensed.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

1396. Re: BPL a reality in my area now!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-19 12:43:10 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <yFvkb.2614$P%1.2175189@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 80872

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:bmt8d5$n33$0@208.207.71.137...
> Phil Kane wrote:
>
> > On 19 Oct 2003 03:45:31 GMT, Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> >
> >> What's wrong with going after those engineers who are obscuring the
> >>technical facts of BPL?
> >
> >
> > You seem to be missing an essential point: the "client" of an
> > engineer is the employer. If the employer does not complain of
> > unprofessional conduct, there's no case.
>
>
> That's neat. The employer can violate all sorts of statutes, and
> involve the engineers, and no one but the employer can do anything about
> it! VERY neat!
>
>
> >
> > Similarly, the licensing boards take action only if there is a
> > complaint of unprofessional conduct from one with standing, namely
> > the employer.
>
>
> So the adversly-affected public can have no standing in complaining
> about the fraudulant acts of licensed persons-actions that directly
> affect the public???
>
> What sort of a system of regulation is this? It's almost useless!
> It licenses professionals to act contrary to law and standard industry
> professinal process!
>

Actually there are very few cases where an engineer even needs to be
licensed. An electrical engineer working for a utility probably does not
need to be licensed.

> [snip] So you're saying the the public is afforded no protection whatever
> in licensing matters unless individuals compl;aining are are directly
> involved. Nice!
>

Again, it is unlikely that the engineers working for the utility have to be licensed so the licensing board couldn't do anything anyway.

> So inform the stockholders of this fiasco and let them handle it.
> If they are made aware of the facts it would seem they would be
> interested in at least looking into the matter since their investment
> dollars are at risk.
>
> As usual the law is written to protect everyone except the public.
>

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

1397. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-19 13:08:20 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <81wkb.2617$P%1.2178452@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 80873

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20031019015533.07578.00001174@mb-m25.aol.com...
> In article <181020031048017080%gmc@volaris.net>, GMC <gmc@volaris.net>
writes:
>
> >It looks like we are on the road to some deflation in the numbers.
>
> Perhaps. There are lots of factors influencing the numbers right now. For
> example, a new Tech Q&A pool was put in place July 15, and since then the
> number of new Techs has plummeted.
>
> >AE4FA has posted numbers gleaned from his research into the FCC
> >database concerning renewals of the Technician class (no code variety)
> >and has found that almost 97% of them are not renewing.
>
> I question his methods.
>
> >There is only
> >a small data window to draw from however, as the first people who held
> >this license class are only starting to reach the end of the grace
> >periods. He had a way to filter out licensees who had upgraded.
>
> Before I'd accept such a low renewal rate, I'd like to see how the data
was
> processed. There are all sorts of procedural pitfalls in trying to figure
out
> renewal rates. For example, people change their names and addresses
frequently,
> making tracking difficult. The 1994 changes to the vanity callsign rules
> resulted in a lot of Techs getting vanity calls - which carry with them a
> renewal.
>

I did some exploring around in the FCC database and it appears that there is
a way to determine these things. When a person changes call signs or
upgrades and so on, the old one is marked as "terminated" not "expired".
The term "expired" appears to be used only when a person has neither renewed
nor upgraded. This is based on checking the call signs of persons that I
know upgraded. Changing a name or address does not result in either an
"expired" or "terminated" on the call sign. So if one uses the the feature
so search on the Amateur Radio Service rather than the basic search and
types in dates and checks "expired" and specifies the license class, you
should get those and only those that were not renewed. The numbers are
indeed rather large. Note however, it isn't marked as "expired" until the

two year grace period has elapsed from what I can determine by exploring the data base.

So using the time period 10/18/2000 through 10/18/2001, here are the number of expired licenses that pop up.

Novice - 5645 expired in that one year time frame
Tech - 3811 expirations
Tech+ - 3687 expirations

This is a total loss of 13,143 of licensees in the year from 10/18/2000 to 10/18/2001.

On the other hand it does not appear possible to determine the actual number of truly new licenses from the data base as far as I can tell at this time. You can select "Grant date" but that gives you all newly issued licenses and updated licenses (i.e. renewals, adress changes, etc).

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

1398. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-19 13:44:21 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <Vywkb.110702$qj6.6159257@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 80874

N2EY wrote:
> In article <181020031048017080%gmc@volaris.net>, GMC <gmc@volaris.net> writes:
>
>
>>It looks like we are on the road to some deflation in the numbers.
>
>
> Perhaps. There are lots of factors influencing the numbers right now. For
> example, a new Tech Q&A pool was put in place July 15, and since then the
> number of new Techs has plummeted.

I might have posted this before, but if I was a prospective ham at this juncture, I would probably wait and go for the biggist bang for the buck - that is to wait and just go for the General ticket after the Morse code test is gone.

Then again, maybe I wouldn't myself, because I personally think its going to be four years til things get wrapped up in this area (dropping the CW test). But others think it will only be a few months.

And that is my take on the drop.

Similar situation is my son bought a copy of Finale software. He was surprised that it offered a free upgrade to the new version, which is due out in a few months. I asked him if he knew that there was a new version out in two month, would he have bought this one? Of course the answer was no for such expensive software. He would have waited, and Finale's producers would be in a real sales doldrum right now - no one would be buying.

- Mike KB3EIA -

1399. Re: Amateur Radio in the 21st Century?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-19 13:55:47 UTC
From: brown applecores <zwknowles1@nospam.yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <1066648493.453121@newshost03.voicenet.com>
Source record: 81048

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:p0akb.2333$P%1.1957922@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
>
> "easiest mode to implement" is not quite the same as "easiest, simplest
> mode, with the easiest to build equipment"
>
> Here's the difference:
>
> "easiest mode to implement" means open the box, plug in the radio,
connect
> antenna, and push the mike button.

That's what 95% of new hams today are doing already.

> "easiest, simplest mode, with the easiest equipment to build" means
simpler
> circuitry requirements, only an on/off "switch" to key the circuitry
rather
> than the more complex microphone unit, and so on.

Like any CB radio is currently constructed.
All we have to do now is "channelize" the HF bands.

>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>

1400. Re: What makes LHA so poor at simple research tasks?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-19 13:57:04 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <QKwkb.110704$qj6.6162463@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 80875

N2EY wrote:

> I've built-from-scratch (no kits, no carbon copies of other homebrew) in my
> home workshops, at least:
>
> 5 receivers
> 5 transmitters
> 3 transceivers
> 4 transmatches
> 12 power supplies
> 4 TR systems
> 5 pieces of test equipment
> various shack furniture, antennas, power cables, control systems, etc.
>
> The above list does not include:
>
> - surplus units converted/restored
> - manufactured equipment restored/repaired/modified
> - kits built or rebuilt
>
> I've worked several of the regulars here on rrap using my homebrew rigs.
>
> I can often be found on or around 7040.

This is incredibly bizzare! Having to defend one's hombrewing as
defined by what one has designed and built.

Its all good, whether building an Elecraft kit or designing your own
radio; modding a surplus unit or etching your own circuit boards.

- Mike KB3EIA -

1401. Re: GOOD NEWS-------France heat wave deaths top 14,000

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-19 16:24:34 UTC
From: spam.for.the@buerotiger.de
Message-ID: <bmuds2$qrjj2$1@ID-31.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 80876
Cross-posted to: alt.ham-radio.hf,alt.ham-radio.ssb,alt.radio.amateur,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

In rec.radio.amateur.dx Clint <rattlehead at computron dot net> wrote:

> well, I have another perspective;

People without a brain rarely have a perspective, let alone two.

Peter Lemken
DF5JT
Berlin

--
Mail an die im From: angegebene Adresse stellt eine Beauftragung zur
ï¿œberprï¿œfung der Mailfunktion des Absenders dar und wird mit einer
Bearbeitungsgebï¿œhr von EUR 1000,- in Rechnung gestellt.

1402. Re: What makes LHA so poor at simple research tasks?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-19 16:35:40 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031019123540.12631.00002257@mb-m28.aol.com>
Source record: 80877

In article <QKwkb.110704$qj6.6162463@news1.news.adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo
<mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>
>
>> I've built-from-scratch (no kits, no carbon copies of other homebrew) in my
>> home workshops, at least:
>>
>> 5 receivers
>> 5 transmitters

Actually, 6 transmitters. All but the first two include VFOs.

>> 3 transceivers
>> 4 transmatches
>> 12 power supplies
>> 4 TR systems
>> 5 pieces of test equipment
>> various shack furniture, antennas, power cables, control systems, etc.
>>
>> The above list does not include:
>>
>> - surplus units converted/restored
>> - manufactured equipment restored/repaired/modified
>> - kits built or rebuilt
>>
>> I've worked several of the regulars here on rrap using my homebrew rigs.
>>
>> I can often be found on or around 7040.
>
> This is incredibly bizzare!

Most of what Brian Burke writes here is bizarre. In this case, though, he's
simply wrong about my homebrewing.

>Having to defend one's hombrewing as
>defined by what one has designed and built.

My homebrewing speaks for itself, as anyone who has worked me on-the-air knows.
I currently have two HF transceivers fully operational at the present time:
Elecraft K2 #2084 and the Southgate Type 7. I also have some of my older
homebrew projects in storage.

The Type 7 is almost ten years old now, while the K2 was assembled in the
spring of 2001.

I define "homebrew" as "built from scratch". That includes everything from carbon-copy stuff like the G2DAF sets to one-of-a-kind designed-from-a-blank-sheet-of-paper projects. "Homebrew" does not include kit assembly, surplus conversion (unless it's so extensive that it's really a new project, as in "Cheap and Easy SSB"), or restoration/repair/modification.
>
>Its all good, whether building an Elecraft kit or designing your own
>radio; modding a surplus unit or etching your own circuit boards.

I agree 100%! It's ALL good - but it's not all homebrew.

Heck, some restorations require more skill, knowledge and effort than an equivalent homebrew because the restorer wants to match the original exactly, where the homebrew *is* the original.

My particular specialty in homebrew is to reuse "found objects" rather than buy new parts - mostly to save money, but also because some parts are almost impossible to find new. There's also the consideration of not wasting usable parts.

How can we claim that amateur radio is a "fundamentally technical radio service" if we all use only manufactured radios?

73 de Jim, N2EY

1403. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-19 16:48:53 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031019124853.17057.00000831@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 80879

>What's a myth, your stupidity?

The correct definition for Studity is.

No-Code CBplussers.

1404. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-19 16:49:55 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031019124955.17057.00000832@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 80878

>Do you still climb the pole to use the phone?

Never did, is that what your use to?

1405. Re: BPL a reality in my area now!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-19 16:50:35 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0310190850.263413f4@posting.google.com>
Source record: 80880

Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:<bmt1cr$6sq$0@208.207.71.137>...
>
> I got no response to my private email so I'll ask again here in public.

Hey, I responded.

> What's wrong with going after those engineers who are obscuring the
> technical facts of BPL? If a doctor or lawyer messes up bigtime and
> people suffer for it, he can be called to account. I see no reason
> whatever that those engineers behind the hiding of the facts of BPL
> can't be cited to answer to their state licensing boards for it. I see
> it as entirely possible that the negative publicity alone might change
> the nature of the situation-what investor owned company wants to answer
> to stockholders for spending many millions of dollars on such a
> technically flawed plan which is most likely to lose money because of a
> plan based on flawed engineering and deliberate bypassing of the rules?
>
> Another possible benefit of taking action against engineers would be
> the fact that FCC *should* be far less likely to approve a BPL plan that
> had been shown IN PUBLIC to be technically flawed, with citations given
> such as the "neon sign" diversionary.
>
> If that engineer won't answer your remails, send him a registered
> letter. If he doesn't answer that, see if he'll answer to his state
> licensing board.

Engineers are not required to become Registered Professional Engineers
and most of us are not P.E.s. Phil is a P.E., I'm not. The state
boards can spank Phil but they can't spank me because I'm outside
their jurisdiction. Also note that the FCC does not require engineers
to have P.E. licenses in order to participate as technical experts in
regulatory matters.

Phil is 100% correct about an engineer's employer having the bottom
line responsibility for his/her actions (there are exceptions). If an
engineer screws up and somebody gets hurts some way or another the
engineer might be fired by the employer but the lawyers and regulators
will hold the the employer responsible for the screwup, not the
engineer. The legal and medical industries play different ballgames in
this respect.

So the PP&L engineer who is playing silly games can completely ignore
and/or mislead anybody he chooses without suffering any legal
consequences at all, P.E. or not. Within the limits his employer sets
on his actions.

> To do any less is to allow them to win by default.
> Of course you'll have to have your engineering all in place.

He does. But we still have to continue supporting his ongoing efforts
and beasting on the FCC as private citizens and as ARRL members.

>
> Dick

w3rv

1406. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-19 16:50:44 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031019125044.17057.00000833@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 80881

>You couldn't find your ass with both hands dannyboy.

I see the Homos are back Dan.

1407. Re: What makes LHA so poor at simple research tasks?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-19 17:03:58 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <2uzkb.110775$qj6.6216255@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 80882

N2EY wrote:

> In article <QKwkb.110704$qj6.6162463@news1.news.adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo
> <mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:
>
>
>>N2EY wrote:
>>
>>
>>
>>>I've built-from-scratch (no kits, no carbon copies of other homebrew) in my
>>>home workshops, at least:
>>>
>>>5 receivers
>>>5 transmitters
>
>
> Actually, 6 transmitters. All but the first two include VFOs.
>
>
>>>3 transceivers
>>>4 transmatches
>>>12 power supplies
>>>4 TR systems
>>>5 pieces of test equipment
>>>various shack furniture, antennas, power cables, control systems, etc.
>>>
>>>The above list does not include:
>>>
>>>- surplus units converted/restored
>>>- manufactured equipment restored/repaired/modified
>>>- kits built or rebuilt
>>>
>>>I've worked several of the regulars here on rrap using my homebrew rigs.
>>>
>>>I can often be found on or around 7040.
>>
>> This is incredibly bizzare!
>
>
> Most of what Brian Burke writes here is bizarre. In this case, though, he's
> simply wrong about my homebrewing.
>
>

>>Having to defend one's hombrewing as
>>defined by what one has designed and built.
>
>
> My homebrewing speaks for itself, as anyone who has worked me on-the-air knows.
> I currently have two HF transceivers fully operational at the present time:
> Elecraft K2 #2084 and the Southgate Type 7. I also have some of my older
> homebrew projects in storage.
>
> The Type 7 is almost ten years old now, while the K2 was assembled in the
> spring of 2001.
>
> I define "homebrew" as "built from scratch". That includes everything from
> carbon-copy stuff like the G2DAF sets to one-of-a-kind
> designed-from-a-blank-sheet-of-paper projects. "Homebrew" does not include kit
> assembly, surplus conversion (unless it's so extensive that it's really a new
> project, as in "Cheap and Easy SSB"), or restoration/repair/modification.
>
>>Its all good, whether building an Elecraft kit or designing your own
>>radio; modding a surplus unit or etching your own circuit boards.
>
>
> I agree 100%! It's ALL good - but it's not all homebrew.

Well, there is a big gray area there. I've modified some equipment prett
extensively, and used some self designed circuitry in it, so I'm not
sure what to by your def. That's okay, as long as I get to smell that
rosin core solder smoke!

> Heck, some restorations require more skill, knowledge and effort than an
> equivalent homebrew because the restorer wants to match the original exactly,
> where the homebrew *is* the original.

I'm restoring an SB-200 right now. And it just got harder because I
can't get the green/gray crinkle paint anymore. The place that sold it
doesn't sell it any more. 8^(

Anyone here know of a source of this paint, or better yet, how to
homebrew crinkle paint? I've heard of painting on a case fresh out of a
hot oven, but I have XYL, safety, and consistency problems with that.
Theres no way I could get a whole SB200 case painted before the
temperature dropped too moch to crinkle it. And the wife certainly isn't
too keen on my putting things in the oven, after what I did to it while
making a telescope. And how safe is spraying solvents on a hot aluminnum
surface? 8^)

> My particular specialty in homebrew is to reuse "found objects" rather than buy
> new parts - mostly to save money, but also because some parts are almost
> impossible to find new. There's also the consideration of not wasting usable
> parts.

Yup, I get old equipment, tear it apart and file the stuff away in boxes.

Appeals to basic guy stuff like reusing things, and tearing stuff apart.

> How can we claim that amateur radio is a "fundamentally technical radio
> service" if we all use only manufactured radios?

Agreed.

- Mike KB3EIA -

1408. Re: BPL a reality in my area now!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-19 17:25:48 UTC
From: Dr R Finnigan <Frick@youjackonet.net>
Message-ID: <bmuheiluq0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 80883

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:xnfcneeyarg.hmzcb9k.pminews@netnews.comcast.net...
> On 19 Oct 2003 03:45:31 GMT, Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> > What's wrong with going after those engineers who are obscuring the
> >technical facts of BPL?
>
> You seem to be missing an essential point: the "client" of an
> engineer is the employer. If the employer does not complain of
> unprofessional conduct, there's no case.
>
> Similarly, the licensing boards take action only if there is a
> complaint of unprofessional conduct from one with standing, namely
> the employer. The one exception is if the engineer violates a
> criminal statute and the complaint is brought by the District
> Attorney.
>
> >If a doctor or lawyer messes up bigtime and
> >people suffer for it, he can be called to account.
>
> Only on complaint by someone having standing - the client. No
> complaint, no case.
>
> --
> 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane
> Registered Professional Engineer
>
>

So who gives a shit beside you?

Get a Life !

Dr R Finnegan
Resgistered Psycho Analyst

1409. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-19 18:14:47 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <rwAkb.3892$W16.3275@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 80884

"Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
news:f45722ac.0310181506.14323acf@posting.google.com...
> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<G6dkb.2252$W16.1566@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> > "Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
> > news:f45722ac.0310180649.48353ec@posting.google.com...
> > > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
> > news:<jj_jb.1145$W16.793@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
>
> > > > How Come with all these 'new' Ektra class tickets they STILL ain't
> > covering
> > > > the HF bands?
> > > >
> > > > Perhaps they can't figure out how to cut that dipole, eh?
> > > >
> > > > Dan/W4NTI
> > >
> > > So you're saying that HF HASN'T been ruined by hordes of unwashed
CBers?
> >
> > No, Brian....I'm saying that they are too ignorant to get a signal on
HF.
> >
> > Dan/W4NTI
>
> Bruce, thanks.
>
> Brian

As usual, Brian opens mouth, and inserts foot.
If you are trying to infer that Bruce, WA8ULX, is not able to put up a
antenna for HF, you are wrong.

I talked to him on 14.275 a month ago.

Get over it.

Dan/W4NTI

1410. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-19 18:16:50 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <myAkb.3894$W16.2954@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 80885

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:xzkkb.110551$qj6.5981176@news1.news.adelphia.net...
> Dan/W4NTI wrote:
>
> > "GMC" <gmc@volaris.net> wrote in message
> > news:181020031048017080%gmc@volaris.net...
> >
> >>In article <c2356669.0310171408.1e4c9f9e@posting.google.com>, N2EY
> >><N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote:
> >>
> >>
> >>>These are the number of unexpired FCC ARS
> >>>licenses held by individuals on the dates listed:
> >>>
> >>>As of May 14, 2000:
> >>>
> >>>Novice - 49,329
> >>>Tech - 205,394
> >>>Tech Plus - 128,860
> >>>General - 112,677
> >>>Advanced - 99,782
> >>>Extra - 78,750
> >>>Total - 674,792
> >>>
> >>>
> >>>As of October 15, 2003:
> >>>
> >>>Novice - 32,977 (decrease of 16,352)
> >>>Technician - 257,303 (increase of 51,909)
> >>>Technician Plus - 64,686 (decrease of 64,174)
> >>>General - 141,313 (increase of 28,636)
> >>>Advanced - 82,589 (decrease of 17,193)
> >>>Extra - 104,670 (increase of 25,920)
> >>>Total - 683,538 (increase of 8,746)
> >>>
> >>>73 de Jim, N2EY
> >>
> >>Jim,
> >>
> >>It looks like we are on the road to some deflation in the numbers.
> >>AE4FA has posted numbers gleaned from his research into the FCC
> >>database concerning renewals of the Technician class (no code variety)
> >>and has found that almost 97% of them are not renewing. There is only
> >>a small data window to draw from however, as the first people who held

> >>this license class are only starting to reach the end of the grace
> >>periods. He had a way to filter out licensees who had upgraded. I think
> >>there was 8 months of data when the finding were posted. This could be
> >>why we are about 4,000 licensees down from the peak you mentioned.
> >>
> >>73
> >>George
> >>K3UD
> >>
> >>--
> >>remove NOSPAM from address
> >
> >
> > Not a surprise really. All this happened before the cellphone craze got
> > going. Why bother with a license, especially when they really didn't
care
> > for ham radio, when all they wanted to do was order a pizza and check up
on
> > the wife/husband.
>
> If this really is the case, then what happened to the technically
> astute technicians who just refused on principle to learn Morse code?
> Are they the remaining 3 percent?
>
> Could be a No-code myth here?
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -
>

Learning the code was a excuse to explain why they didn't upgrade.

Dan/W4NTI

1411. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-19 18:26:18 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <eHAkb.3900$W16.2558@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 80886

Your right. I've tried several times and I kept grabbing your tongue.

Dan/W4NTI

"N8WWM" <dogie@home.nut> wrote in message news:bmu44h08n7@drn.newsguy.com...
> You couldn't find your ass with both hands dannyboy.
>
> In article <G6dkb.2252$W16.1566@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>,
Dan/W4NTI
> says...
> >
> >
> >"Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
> >news:f45722ac.0310180649.48353ec@posting.google.com...
> >> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
> >news:<jj_jb.1145$W16.793@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> >> > "N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
> >> > news:c2356669.0310171408.1e4c9f9e@posting.google.com...
> >> > > These are the number of unexpired FCC ARS
> >> > > licenses held by individuals on the dates listed:
> >> > >
> >> > > As of May 14, 2000:
> >> > >
> >> > > Novice - 49,329
> >> > > Tech - 205,394
> >> > > Tech Plus - 128,860
> >> > > General - 112,677
> >> > > Advanced - 99,782
> >> > > Extra - 78,750
> >> > > Total - 674,792
> >> > >
> >> > >
> >> > > As of October 15, 2003:
> >> > >
> >> > > Novice - 32,977 (decrease of 16,352)
> >> > > Technician - 257,303 (increase of 51,909)
> >> > > Technician Plus - 64,686 (decrease of 64,174)
> >> > > General - 141,313 (increase of 28,636)
> >> > > Advanced - 82,589 (decrease of 17,193)
> >> > > Extra - 104,670 (increase of 25,920)
> >> > > Total - 683,538 (increase of 8,746)
> >> > >
> >> > > 73 de Jim, N2EY
> >> >
> >> > How Come with all these 'new' Ektra class tickets they STILL ain't

> >covering
> >> > the HF bands?
> >> >
> >> > Perhaps they can't figure out how to cut that dipole, eh?
> >> >
> >> > Dan/W4NTI
> >>
> >> So you're saying that HF HASN'T been ruined by hordes of unwashed
CBers?
> >
> >No, Brian....I'm saying that they are too ignorant to get a signal on HF.
> >
> >Dan/W4NTI
> >
> >
>
> You ask wh
>

1412. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-19 18:26:59 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <THAkb.3901$W16.2622@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 80887

"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20031019125044.17057.00000833@mb-m03.aol.com...
> >You couldn't find your ass with both hands dannyboy.
>
> I see the Homos are back Dan.

Sure got a lot of them around, lately. Wonder if that has anything to do
with NCI?

Dan/W4NTI

1413. Re: Amateur Radio in the 21st Century?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-19 18:28:53 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031019142853.06226.00001023@mb-m19.aol.com>
Source record: 80888

In article <3F915235.1353E2C4@ix.netcom.com>, David Stinson
<arc5@ix.netcom.com> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>
>> What exactly does "time to move on" mean here?
>
>"Time to move on:"

>A phrase used by Democrats as a means to change or stop a debate,
>when the illogic, stupidity or immorality
>of their positions are exposed.

Not just Democrats.....;-)
73 de Jim, N2EY

1414. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-19 18:28:53 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031019142853.06226.00001022@mb-m19.aol.com>
Source record: 80889

In article <Vywkb.110702$qj6.6159257@news1.news.adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo
<mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>> In article <181020031048017080%gmc@volaris.net>, GMC <gmc@volaris.net>
>writes:

>>>It looks like we are on the road to some deflation in the numbers.

>> Perhaps. There are lots of factors influencing the numbers right now. For
>> example, a new Tech Q&A pool was put in place July 15, and since then the
>> number of new Techs has plummeted.

> I might have posted this before, but if I was a prospective ham at this

>juncture, I would probably wait and go for the biggist bang for the buck
>- that is to wait and just go for the General ticket after the Morse
>code test is gone.

Perhaps - but that means no ham radio at all until the changes take place.
Which could be years. How interested is somebody who will wait that long?

Also, if FCC does just dump Element 1, newbies will still need to pass the Tech
written.
>
> Then again, maybe I wouldn't myself, because I personally think its
>going to be four years til things get wrapped up in this area (dropping
>the CW test). But others think it will only be a few months.
>
ARRL's guess was two years, which means July 2005. I used to think that was way
too long, but every day it looks more reasonable. The way things look, now,
with all those petitions out there and ARRL not yet weighed in on anything, it
could be next spring before an NPRM shows up. Note how long ago some petitions
were filed (like that 'refarm the Novice bands' idea) that are still hanging
fire.*

And if 98-143 is any guide, such an NPRM will have a long comment period
and...well, you get the idea.

Then ya got NCVEC talking about a whole series of petitions if/when the code
test goes, which to me sounds like doubling the hill.*

You watch, Mike - if/when the code test is dropped, we'll have a surge of
upgrades and new hams for a while - then things will settle back to about where
they were before restructuring.

73 de Jim, N2EY

* special bonus trivia section - how did the phrases "hanging fire" and "doubling the hill" originate?

> And that is my take on the drop.
>
> Similar situation is my son bought a copy of Finale software. He was
>surprised that it offered a free upgrade to the new version, which is
>due out in a few months. I asked him if he knew that there was a new
>version out in two month, would he have bought this one? Of course the
>answer was no for such expensive software. He would have waited, and
>Finale's producers would be in a real sales doldrum right now - no one
>would be buying.
>
>

1415. Re: Amateur Radio in the 21st Century?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-19 18:28:55 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031019142855.06226.00001024@mb-m19.aol.com>
Source record: 80890

In article <x2mkb.1659$_i.139483@nnrp1.ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
<wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:

>"Dick Carroll" <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com> wrote in message
>news:bmrn15$3sh$0@208.206.142.110...
>> N2EY wrote:
>[snip
>> >
>> > What I find interesting, too, is that the CW/data parts of the bands are
>always
>> > referred to as "exclusive CW" with no mention that all of them on HF are
>also
>> > shared by data modes. In fact, there is very little mention of data
>modes at
>> > all.
>> >
>>
>> Right! It's apparently codified in the code-banner's rulebook- Say nor
>> do anything that will in any way interfere with The Agenda. And
>> acknowledging that there are NO exclusive CW HF subbands is a primary
>> part of it. In fact, it';s clear that they would like to do completely
>> away with *ll* subbands. Hey, why not SSB yakkers wall to wall, like
>> it is "uop there" above 27 mhz?
>>
>> It IS curuois that they jump from "Hey why don't you Luddites get
>> out of the 19th century and jumo on board our Advanced Digital Train,
>> to "Lets do away with all subbands and give everyone with the mildest
>> of itnersts all privileges everywhere to yak into a microphone"!!!
>>
>> Can you say obfuscation???
>
>Dick,
>
>Can you say "You're distorting the facts"???

Where are any facts distorted, Carl?
>
>Both I and Bill Sohl have repeatedly stated the the ONLY agenda
>for NCI is to eliminate the code TEST

Which means that Dick could not have been talking about you, Bill or NCI when
he wrote of a "code-banner's rulebook" - whatever the heck that was supposed to
mean.

>... you will notice that NCI's
>Petition for Rulemaking doesn't attempt to modify the sub-bands,
>expand SSB allotments, or anything of the sort.

Exactly!

This thread is meant to be about that NCVEC paper - particularly the parts that do *not* involve the code test. Dumping the code test is a completley different thing from widening the 'phone/image subbands.

If the 'Novice' subbands are to be 'refarmed', I say they should be reused primarily for digital modes, unencumbered by most of the occupied bandwidth and bit/symbol rate limitations of today's rules. Maybe have a flat rule that the mode has to have occupied bandwidth under, say, 10 kHz. Proper documentation as already required by FCC rules, of course. Wanna try out some digital voice ideas, high speed data, "PSK-3100", Pactor 3, or whatever? Just fit 'em into 10 kHz and have fun.
>
>It would be nice if you could stick to the facts, but that doesn't
>suit YOUR agenda, does it?
>
Which facts? Dick didn't accuse you or NCI of anything in that post from what I can see.

The fact remains that the NCVEC paper contains some inaccuracies like the reference to "exclusive CW subbands". Another inaccuracy is the claim that the General and Tech used the same written test up until the Tech lost its code test
(the writtens were actually split almost 4 years earlier).

>[remainder of Dick's inaccurate statements and inuendo deleted]

Unless I'm mistaken, he wasn't talking about you, Carl.
>
73 de Jim, N2EY

1416. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-19 18:41:55 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031019144155.12996.00000401@mb-m19.aol.com>
Source record: 80891

>Sure got a lot of them around, lately. Wonder if that has anything to do
>with NCI?
>
>Dan/W4NTI

Rumor has it there are a bunch of NCI members that are lite in there loafers.

1417. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-19 19:14:44 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <EoBkb.4078$W16.3594@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 80892

"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20031019144155.12996.00000401@mb-m19.aol.com...
> >Sure got a lot of them around, lately. Wonder if that has anything to do
> >with NCI?
> >
> >Dan/W4NTI
>
> Rumor has it there are a bunch of NCI members that are lite in there
loafers.

Help me out here...how does being anti-morse code equate to being 'that way'
??

Dan/W4NTI

1418. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-19 19:25:41 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031019152541.09935.00000757@mb-m21.aol.com>
Source record: 80893

>Help me out here...how does being anti-morse code equate to being 'that way'
>??
>
>Dan/W4NTI
>

Dan I have tried to figure it out, with no luck, maybe it is just part of being lieeeberal.

1419. Re: GOOD NEWS-------France heat wave deaths top 14,000

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-19 19:55:13 UTC
From: Clint <"rattlehead at computron dot net">
Message-ID: <vp5r3nmfhjpl34@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 80894
Cross-posted to: alt.ham-radio.hf,alt.ham-radio.ssb,alt.radio.amateur,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Peter Lemken" <spam.for.the@buerotiger.de> wrote in message
news:bmuds2$qrjj2$1@ID-31.news.uni-berlin.de...
> In rec.radio.amateur.dx Clint <rattlehead at computron dot net> wrote:
>
> > well, I have another perspective;
>
> People without a brain rarely have a perspective, let alone two.
>
> Peter Lemken
> DF5JT
> Berlin
>

I assume that remark stems from the fact that you live in one of the
yellow-bellied gutless coward nations over there. Hey, here's an idea;
why don't you guys start demanding your leaders quit bowing down
and kissing the rear end of terrorists and middle eastern dictators? Just
how can you *stomach* to live in a nation that just sits around and
gets hammered and attacked and blasted instead of standing up for
yourself and doing something about it? Or is making remarks about
newgroup people having no brains simply *safer* because you're
on the other side of the globe at a computer terminal and the terrorists
are right up in your face?

You'll have to excuse me, I just can't fathom why anybody would
take the path that you guys over there have. Perhaps that is why europe
is slowly being left behind economically in the world and the shift of
industrial & economic strength is headed away from you guys and towards
eastern asian nations. I guess they'll be the future, if you're going to be
*the
past* in your hemisphere.

1420. Re: Why thirteen and twenty?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-19 20:07:02 UTC
From: Clint <"rattlehead at computron dot net">
Message-ID: <vp5rpsgsrpuc9b@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 80895

No, not really.

Except for the fact that the old timers had to do it, so they're making sure that the newcombers have to. Nothing really past that except misplaced anger & meaningless, needless jealousy.

Clint

Oriiginal message follows:

>"Jack Twilley" <jmt+usenet@twilley.org> wrote in message news:86ptgzumnq.fsf@duchess.twilley.org...
>-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
>Hash: SHA1

I can understand why Novice and Technician Plus required five words per minute -- the treaty and all -- but why did General require thirteen words per minute and Amateur Extra twenty words per minute?

Is there a real reason?

Jack.
- --
Jack Twilley
jmt at twilley dot org
http colon slash slash www dot twilley dot org slash tilde jmt slash
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: GnuPG v1.2.3 (FreeBSD)

iD8DBQE/jNLQGPFSfAB/ezgRAnT0AJ9JwznusaVpDFgsbvd7gSlS6+zffACgqPSs
Eax4C1KwKboU55NhahcuAsY=
=jOXm
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----

1421. Re: Why thirteen and twenty?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-19 20:09:23 UTC
From: Clint <"rattlehead at computron dot net">
Message-ID: <vp5rubhd4idj17@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 80896

"Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
news:f45722ac.0310151646.3bb522d1@posting.google.com...
>
>
> Welp Dan, as I strap on my dragon armor and jousting butt-plug, please
> orient me toward the 1951 anachronism of the 1923 AEFC standard.
>
> dididididdit.

LOL, well said.

Don't forget, too, when you drive to the testing site to take the morse code test you have to first hand-crank the engine of your horseless carriage to get it started.

OOOPS, i'm sorry, that too is outdated. They have invented electrically driven starters since then. Isn't it neat how old ways are replaced by new more efficient & useful ones? *OOOOP*, my bad again... I forgot about the PCTA crybabies.

Clint

1422. Re: FCC relaxes it's prohibition on use of the "F-word" on broadcast media.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-19 20:13:23 UTC
From: Clint <"rattlehead at computron dot net">
Message-ID: <vp5s5qogoss3e8@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 80897
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.shortwave

"Mike Yetsko" <joe@user.com> wrote in message
news:voqlki7pbpdp21@corp.supernews.com...

>
> "Piss" has been heard a few times, but the only one I can think of I'm
> not sure of. War Games? Anyone know of other places?
>
> And "teats" all over the place. Just recently in a broadcast of 'Witness'
> with Harrison Ford in the barn with the Amish farmer...
>

Yea, i've been noticing more and more old movies that at one time had
certain words or phrases either blanked out or replaced by more "family
oriented" ones (I prefer not to be insulted myself and just head about a
quarter
of a second of diead air, it's less condescending) are now just letting the
words
go by.

New shows are taking advantage, too. I don't write the names down of shows
that
use these words, as i have better things to do, but for quite while you can
hear
the phrase "kick ass", "pissed off", etc.

Clint

1423. Re: FCC relaxes it's prohibition on use of the "F-word" on broadcast media.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-19 20:14:30 UTC
From: Clint <"rattlehead at computron dot net">
Message-ID: <vp5s7smt63331e@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 80898
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.shortwave

"LRod" <LRod@removethispartpobox.com> wrote in message
news:3f8d728d.1038577384@newsgroups.bellsouth.net...

>
> I guess C, CS, and MF are the only ones left.
>
>
>

well, I don't know why MF is not allowed if the FCC ruled
that it was okay for Bono of U2 to say "fuck" on television.

Clint

1424. Re: FCC relaxes it's prohibition on use of the "F-word" on broadcast media.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-19 20:16:25 UTC
From: Clint <"rattlehead at computron dot net">
Message-ID: <vp5sbko2lhtc90@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 80899
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.shortwave

"Richard Cranium" <richcranus@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:c5ecbb69.0310151006.4dc55ef7@posting.google.com...

> > That's an adverb, not an adjective.
>
> Um, no; it is modifying "brilliant", which is a noun. Thus it is an
adjective.

geez, does it really matter? It's the same word... if the FCC is going
to stoop to THAT low of a level to let certain words "slide" now, why not
just do away with all censoring all at once?

it'll degenerate one day to the type of television they have in europe and
australia, where I hear just about anything goes.

Clint

1425. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-19 21:06:48 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031019170648.25517.00001423@mb-m15.aol.com>
Source record: 80900

In article <81wkb.2617$P%1.2178452@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> writes:

>I did some exploring around in the FCC database and it appears that there is
>a way to determine these things. When a person changes call signs or
>upgrades and so on, the old one is marked as "terminated" not "expired".

Is this really the case? I thought an upgrade is considered a modification. It's my understanding that an upgrade does not extend the license term, but a vanity call does (to avoid having to prorate the vanity fee).

>The term "expired" appears to be used only when a person has neither renewed
>nor upgraded. This is based on checking the call signs of persons that I
>know upgraded. Changing a name or address does not result in either an
>"expired" or "terminated" on the call sign. So if one uses the the feature
>so search on the Amateur Radio Service rather than the basic search and
>types in dates and checks "expired" and specifies the license class, you
>should get those and only those that were not renewed. The numbers are
>indeed rather large. Note however, it isn't marked as "expired" until the
>two year grace period has elapsed from what I can determine by exploring the
>data base.

Interesting stuff, Dee! I wonder how much of this was done by the "97%" folks.
>
>So using the time period 10/18/2000 through 10/18/2001, here are the number
>of expired licenses that pop up.
>
>Novice - 5645 expired in that one year time frame
>Tech - 3811 expirations
>Tech+ - 3687 expirations
>
>This is a total loss of 13,143 of licensees in the year from 10/18/2000 to
>10/18/2001.

In those three license classes, anyway. But this info raises a question: If your method only counts licenses which have reached the end of the grace period without a renewal, then the expirations listed above are those for licenses issued or renewed during the period 10/18/1998 to 10/18/1999. But that time period is before the Tech/Tech Plus split!
>
>On the other hand it does not appear possible to determine the actual number
>of truly new licenses from the data base as far as I can tell at this time.
>You can select "Grant date" but that gives you all newly issued licenses and
>updated licenses (i.e. renewals, adress changes, etc).
>
I think FCC makes that info available another way, because the AH0A site

carries a "new license" category. But it's based on current data, not historic stuff.

Perhaps the best indicator is to watch how the total number of each license class, and the combined Tech/Techplus total, rise and fall. For instance, notice how slowly (percentagewise) the number of Advanceds is dropping, compared to how fast the number of Novices is dropping. The number of Tech Pluses is dropping fast too, but that's aided by the fact that FCC is renewing all Tech Pluses as Techs.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1426. Re: Amateur Radio in the 21st Century?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-19 21:47:18 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <GDDkb.112989$qj6.6296986@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 81001

N2EY wrote:
> In article <x2mkb.1659$_i.139483@nnrp1.ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
> <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:
>
>
>>"Dick Carroll" <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com> wrote in message
>>news:bmrn15$3sh$0@208.206.142.110...
>>
>>>N2EY wrote:
>>
>>[snip
>>
>>>>What I find interesting, too, is that the CW/data parts of the bands are
>>
>>always
>>
>>>>referred to as "exclusive CW" with no mention that all of them on HF are
>>
>>also
>>
>>>>shared by data modes. In fact, there is very little mention of data
>>
>>modes at
>>
>>>>all.
>>>>
>>>
>>>Right! It's apparently codified in the code-banner's rulebook- Say nor
>>>do anything that will in any way interfere with The Agenda. And
>>>acknowledging that there are NO exclusive CW HF subbands is a primary
>>>part of it. In fact, it';s clear that they would like to do completely
>>>away with *ll* subbands. Hey, why not SSB yakkers wall to wall, like
>>>it is "uop there" above 27 mhz?
>>>
>>> It IS curuois that they jump from "Hey why don't you Luddites get
>>>out of the 19th century and jumo on board our Advanced Digital Train,
>>>to "Lets do away with all subbands and give everyone with the mildest
>>>of itnersts all privileges everywhere to yak into a microphone"!!!
>>>
>>> Can you say obfuscation???
>>
>>Dick,
>>
>>Can you say "You're distorting the facts"???

>
>
> Where are any facts distorted, Carl?
>
>>Both I and Bill Sohl have repeatedly stated the the ONLY agenda
>>for NCI is to eliminate the code TEST
>
>
> Which means that Dick could not have been talking about you, Bill or NCI when
> he wrote of a "code-banner's rulebook" - whatever the heck that was supposed to
> mean.
>
>
>>... you will notice that NCI's
>>Petition for Rulemaking doesn't attempt to modify the sub-bands,
>>expand SSB allotments, or anything of the sort.
>
>
> Exactly!
>
> This thread is meant to be about that NCVEC paper - particularly the parts that
> do *not* involve the code test. Dumping the code test is a completley different
> thing from widening the 'phone/image subbands.

The NCVEC paper is not a group controlled by NCI, they are a completely
different entity.

But they ARE a group calling for some things that I find a little
disturbing.

And this IS something I got my chops busted about earlier with what
seemed to me to be a simple statement of fact. I'll state it again
paraphrased:

The removal of the Morse code test is the removal of knowledge required
to get a ARS license. Thos who believe that less knowledge should be
necessary to get a license can only be heartened by this event. There
will be a move towards further reductions in the knowledge needed for a
license.

lessee here:

(from NCVEC)
> One of the primary goals of the new license we are going to propose
>is a true entry-level ticket. Limited power, limited frequencies,
>but still useful, with enough of the essence of Amateur Radio to
>attract beginners and show them what lies ahead when they upgrade.
>Simpler exam. WAIT! - - WAIT! - - WHAT WAS THAT??!!
>
> Yes, I said simpler exam. Hopefully 20 questions. Aimed at a young
>person aged 12 or more. That means a 6th grade education. Also fits
>teens, high schoolers, home schoolers. You know, fresh ideas, new

>blood, people that can actually see their radios without having to
>put on glasses ï¿½ what a concept! 20 questions, simple enough to get
>someone started in a responsible way, pointed in the right direction,
>all that stuff.

Well what do we have here? A proposal for a simpler exam? Certainly
looks like it.

Especially charming is the idea that people with a 6th grade education
are going to supply us with fresh ideas. Its even more charming that
this new, fresh blood will be able to see their radios without glasses.
I've worn glasses since I was in second grade.

I guess the NCVEC doesn't really want me to be a ham.

Next:

> Whatever we come up with, it will have to fit within the FCC budget.
>This probably means that in all likelihood what will happen, assuming
>that the idea of a beginnerï¿½s class license is even accepted at all,
>is that they (the FCC) will juggle the existing 3 classes to
>accommodate the new structure. Technician will change from what it
>is now to the basic license. It may be named ï¿½Communicatorï¿½ or
>simply left as Technician. Letï¿½s assume it gets the name
>ï¿½Communicatorï¿½. All existing Techs will be upgraded to General.
>Assuming that the Morse requirement is removed first, our opinion
>is that most of the Techs will take (and hopefully pass) the element
>3 exam as soon as they can, thus becoming General class licensees.

Assuming indeed! They figure that people are going to study and pay for
a test in order to get priveleges they will get anyhow? If a Technician
flunks the test, all he or she has to do is wait a while, than he/she
will get the priveleges anyhow.

That sounds a LOT like simplification to me.

>Remember, that before the changes that created the present no-code
>tech, the General and Tech exams were identical. Only the code
>separated them, and even there it was only the difference between
>5 and 13 WPM.

But its not that way now.

And finally, before I forget about how I was charmed about the glasses
reference, I have to congratulate the authors on their humorous
treatment of Pro coders:

(more from the NVCVEC)
> So, there are no ï¿½Morse code hatersï¿½ on the committee.
>There is no conspiracy, no secret agenda, no kickback from the
>manufacturers, no ï¿½black planï¿½ from the ARRL, no anything. Just some
>guys that want nothing more than to see our great hobby prosper for
>the next hundred years, or longer.

and (I had to put this in again):

> You know, fresh ideas, new blood, people that can actually see
>their radios without having to put on glasses ï¿½ what a concept!

and:

> A few final words:

> There are no black helicopters.

I guess those who believe in the Morse code test believe there are?

>Do you suppose the committee members just want to see our wonderful
>hobby prosper? Wouldnï¿½t that be an odd reason for doing what they are doing?

Apparently those of us who believe in a Morse code test *don't* want to
see our wonderful hobby prosper!

And to make sure that they insult other hams who don't do things like
they think hams should do things:

> Oh, pardon me ï¿½ you always build everything from scratch? Great!
>Who, exactly, are you going to talk to? Most of the rest of us opt
>for the practical approach, and purchase a rig from one of the several
>companies that cater to hams. If there are no manufacturers, then
>there are no new rigs. Hard to carry on a QSO if no one is there.

What this has to do with the matter at hand is beyond me, except that I
think that they dont like homebrewers very much.

I'm very impressed that Morse code testing, by extrapolation, is going
to destroy the manufacturers. Talk about your conspiracies!!

And the answer to the question of who I'm going to talk to if there are
no manufacturers..... Well you know , don't ya Jim?

My final analysis of this piece is that the authors take a very
condescending and superior tone towards those they disagree with, take a
few gratuitous potshots at some other "outcasts" thay don't like, and
finally, support a radical simplification of the qualifications needed
to get on the air at HF frequencies.

and... and....

(last quote from the article):

> Morse will probably retain most of itï¿½s exclusive band segments,
>at least for now. We are not addressing this issue at this time.
>This may change in the future. Several countries no longer have
>exclusive segments, but depend instead on voluntary band plans.
>In fact, our 160-meter band works this way today, with surprisingly
>few problems.

LIB! there is is! the door is creaking open! here comes the foot.

Back to you Jim

> If the 'Novice' subbands are to be 'refarmed', I say they should be reused
> primarily for digital modes, unencumbered by most of the occupied bandwidth and
> bit/symbol rate limitations of today's rules. Maybe have a flat rule that the
> mode has to have occupied bandwidth under, say, 10 kHz. Proper documentation as
> already required by FCC rules, of course. Wanna try out some digital voice
> ideas, high speed data, "PSK-3100", Pactor 3, or whatever? Just fit 'em into 10
> kHz and have fun.
>
>>It would be nice if you could stick to the facts, but that doesn't
>>suit YOUR agenda, does it?
>>
>
> Which facts? Dick didn't accuse you or NCI of anything in that post from what I
> can see.
>
> The fact remains that the NCVEC paper contains some inaccuracies like the
> reference to "exclusive CW subbands". Another inaccuracy is the claim that the
> General and Tech used the same written test up until the Tech lost its code
> test
> (the writtens were actually split almost 4 years earlier).
>
>
>>[remainder of Dick's inaccurate statements and inuendo deleted]
>
>
> Unless I'm mistaken, he wasn't talking about you, Carl.

I'm not talking about Carl either. I know that neither he nor Bill Sohl
are in favor of reductions in the qualifications to get a license (save
removal of the Morse code test)

That's really nice. It also *may* mean that they will someday be
considered the Luddites along with us troglodyte Pro code testers as the
requirements to get a license are relaxed more and more. The wheels are
already in motion.

- Mike KB3EIA -

1427. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-19 21:48:46 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <2FDkb.112990$qj6.6297246@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 81002

N2EY wrote:

> In article <Vywkb.110702$qj6.6159257@news1.news.adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo

> Then ya got NCVEC talking about a whole series of petitions if/when the code
> test goes, which to me sounds like doubling the hill.*
>
> You watch, Mike - if/when the code test is dropped, we'll have a surge of
> upgrades and new hams for a while - then things will settle back to about where
> they were before restructuring.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
> * special bonus trivia section - how did the phrases "hanging fire" and
> "doubling the hill" originate?

I don't have a clue here!

- Mike KB3EIA -

1428. Re: FCC relaxes it's prohibition on use of the "F-word" on broadcast media.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-19 21:55:44 UTC
From: Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns9419B65FC95C1elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 81003
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.shortwave

Jack <see.my.sig@below.for.email.address> wrote in
news:ivt5pvobc9k45ic7raumqmh81udmi4gllm@4ax.com:

> On Sun, 19 Oct 2003 15:16:25 -0500, "Clint" <rattlehead at computron
> dot net> wrote:
>
>>
>>
>>"Richard Cranium" <richcranus@yahoo.com> wrote in message
>>news:c5ecbb69.0310151006.4dc55ef7@posting.google.com...
>>
>>> > That's an adverb, not an adjective.
>>>
>>> Um, no; it is modifying "brilliant", which is a noun. Thus it is an
>>> adjective.
>>
>>geez, does it really matter? It's the same word... if the FCC is going
>>to stoop to THAT low of a level to let certain words "slide" now, why
>>not just do away with all censoring all at once?
>>
>>it'll degenerate one day to the type of television they have in europe
>>and australia, where I hear just about anything goes.
>>
>>Clint
>
> As compared to where else? For the most part, European TV is vastly
> superior in quality to US television. When it comes to childrens
> programming, I've discovered that Australia and New Zealand have
> produced some of the best and most imaginative kids TV series I've
> seen.
>
> In the US, the trash and even worse is there and quite visible. They
> just use verbal and visual euphanisms, which is even more
> objectionable.
>
> -Jack-
>
>
>

The question is, does this now mean we can say the F word on ham radio?

1429. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-19 22:01:21 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <RQDkb.2709$P%1.2279718@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 81004

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20031019170648.25517.00001423@mb-m15.aol.com...
> In article <81wkb.2617$P%1.2178452@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D.
Flint"
> <deehays@qix.net> writes:
>
> >I did some exploring around in the FCC database and it appears that there
is
> >a way to determine these things. When a person changes call signs or
> >upgrades and so on, the old one is marked as "terminated" not "expired".
>
> Is this really the case? I thought an upgrade is considered a
modification.
> It's my understanding that an upgrade does not extend the license term,
but a
> vanity call does (to avoid having to prorate the vanity fee).
>

I'm talking about when they actually change call signs, the old call sign is
marked as terminated. The person's license is modified with the new call
sign but that is listed as a new grant date. I believe an upgrade does
extend the license but a change of address does not.

> >The term "expired" appears to be used only when a person has neither
renewed
> >nor upgraded. This is based on checking the call signs of persons that I
> >know upgraded. Changing a name or address does not result in either an
> >"expired" or "terminated" on the call sign. So if one uses the the
feature
> >so search on the Amateur Radio Service rather than the basic search and
> >types in dates and checks "expired" and specifies the license class, you
> >should get those and only those that were not renewed. The numbers are
> >indeed rather large. Note however, it isn't marked as "expired" until
the
> >two year grace period has elapsed from what I can determine by exploring
the
> >data base.
>
> Interesting stuff, Dee! I wonder how much of this was done by the "97%"
folks.
> >
> >So using the time period 10/18/2000 through 10/18/2001, here are the
number
> >of expired licenses that pop up.
> >

> >Novice - 5645 expired in that one year time frame
> >Tech - 3811 expirations
> >Tech+ - 3687 expirations
> >
> >This is a total loss of 13,143 of licensees in the year from 10/18/2000
to
> >10/18/2001.
>
> In those three license classes, anyway. But this info raises a question:
If
> your method only counts licenses which have reached the end of the grace
period
> without a renewal, then the expirations listed above are those for
licenses
> issued or renewed during the period 10/18/1998 to 10/18/1999. But that
time
> period is before the Tech/Tech Plus split!
> >

I was indeed focusing on the various entry level licenses as the debate has been over how many people stuck with it. These figures would be for licenses issued between 10/18/1990 and 10/18/1991. Their grace period expired 10/18/2003 and that is when they show up in the database as expired. That is to say the expiration date listed in the database is 10 years from the grant date although it won't show as expired in the database until the two year grace period has elapsed. For example, if I enter an expired date range covering the past year, it shows NO expired licenses. That's because they are still in the grace period and will not be listed as such until that grace period is up. I hope I've explained it clearly. If not let me know and I will try again.

> >On the other hand it does not appear possible to determine the actual
number
> >of truly new licenses from the data base as far as I can tell at this
time.
> >You can select "Grant date" but that gives you all newly issued licenses
and
> >updated licenses (i.e. renewals, adress changes, etc).
> >
> I think FCC makes that info available another way, because the AH0A site
> carries a "new license" category. But it's based on current data, not
historic
> stuff.
>
> Perhaps the best indicator is to watch how the total number of each
license
> class, and the combined Tech/Techplus total, rise and fall. For instance,
> notice how slowly (percentagewise) the number of Advanceds is dropping,
> compared to how fast the number of Novices is dropping. The number of
Tech
> Pluses is dropping fast too, but that's aided by the fact that FCC is

renewing
> all Tech Pluses as Techs.
>

That's why we should consider the Tech/Tech+ as a single group for the purposes whether a class is growing or shrinking.

I would suspect that the number of Advanced licenses drop more slowly than the Novice for several reasons. The percentage of Advanced licensees who are active is likely to be higher than the percentage of Novices. The Advanced licensee is probably more apt to renew, as he/she has a lot more effort invested. And the Advanced licensee often has little reason to upgrade as they have almost as much spectrum as the Extras. All the upgrade would get them would be a minimal increase in band space and the privilege of being eligible to administer Extra class upgrade exams. If they are not interested in spectrum space or giving Extra exams, that only leaves the "prestige" of being able to say they are an Extra. For many that's an insufficient reason to upgrade. It would not surprise me if the drop in Advanced licensees is due in a significant part to some of them becoming silent keys. However, there really isn't any way to determine that.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

1430. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-19 22:28:29 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <heEkb.2711$P%1.2284672@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 81005

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:RQDkb.2709$P%1.2279718@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
>
> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20031019170648.25517.00001423@mb-m15.aol.com...
> > In article <81wkb.2617$P%1.2178452@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D.
> Flint"
> > <deehays@qix.net> writes:
> >
> > >I did some exploring around in the FCC database and it appears that
there
> is
> > >a way to determine these things. When a person changes call signs or
> > >upgrades and so on, the old one is marked as "terminated" not
"expired".
> >
> > Is this really the case? I thought an upgrade is considered a
> modification.
> > It's my understanding that an upgrade does not extend the license term,
> but a
> > vanity call does (to avoid having to prorate the vanity fee).
> >
>
> I'm talking about when they actually change call signs, the old call sign
is
> marked as terminated. The person's license is modified with the new call
> sign but that is listed as a new grant date. I believe an upgrade does
> extend the license but a change of address does not.
>
> > >The term "expired" appears to be used only when a person has neither
> renewed
> > >nor upgraded. This is based on checking the call signs of persons that
I
> > >know upgraded. Changing a name or address does not result in either an
> > >"expired" or "terminated" on the call sign. So if one uses the the
> feature
> > >so search on the Amateur Radio Service rather than the basic search and
> > >types in dates and checks "expired" and specifies the license class,
you
> > >should get those and only those that were not renewed. The numbers are
> > >indeed rather large. Note however, it isn't marked as "expired" until
> the
> > >two year grace period has elapsed from what I can determine by
exploring

> the
> > >data base.
> >
> > Interesting stuff, Dee! I wonder how much of this was done by the "97%"
> folks.
> > > >
> > > >So using the time period 10/18/2000 through 10/18/2001, here are the
> number
> > > >of expired licenses that pop up.
> > > >
> > > >Novice - 5645 expired in that one year time frame
> > > >Tech - 3811 expirations
> > > >Tech+ - 3687 expirations
> > > >
> > > >This is a total loss of 13,143 of licensees in the year from 10/18/2000
> to
> > > >10/18/2001.
> > >
> > > In those three license classes, anyway. But this info raises a question:
> If
> > > your method only counts licenses which have reached the end of the grace
> period
> > > without a renewal, then the expirations listed above are those for
> licenses
> > > issued or renewed during the period 10/18/1998 to 10/18/1999. But that
> time
> > > period is before the Tech/Tech Plus split!
> > > >
>
> I was indeed focusing on the various entry level licenses as the debate
has
> been over how many people stuck with it. These figures would be for
licenses
> issued between 10/18/1990 and 10/18/1991. Their grace period expired
> 10/18/2003 and that is when they show up in the database as expired. That
> is to say the expiration date listed in the database is 10 years from the
> grant date although it won't show as expired in the database until the two
> year grace period has elapsed. For example, if I enter an expired date
> range covering the past year, it shows NO expired licenses. That's
because
> they are still in the grace period and will not be listed as such until
that
> grace period is up. I hope I've explained it clearly. If not let me know
> and I will try again.
>
>

Just for kicks, I went back and looked up the number of expirations for the
other classes for the same time period (10/18/2000 through 10/18/2001).

General - 1654 expirations
Advanced - 902 expirations
Extra - 493 expirations.

Total = 3049 expirations

Based on other postings in this thread, the number of licensees holding Novice/Tech/Tech+ licensees in May of 2000 was 383,583. Those holding General/Advanced/Extra class licenses numbered 291,209. While I should go back and make my time period start with May 2000 to be really comparable, I'm just going to use the figures that I have for the next calculation as it shouldn't make a whole lot of difference. The percentage of Novice/Tech/Tech+ licenses that expired was approximately 3.4% in that one year time period. The percentage of General/Advanced/Extra licenses that expired was approximately 1.0% in that same time frame.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

1431. Re: Dear Mother Brakob...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-19 22:34:57 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0310191434.506f5ace@posting.google.com>
Source record: 81006

brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0310181518.2a210efe@posting.google.com>...
> k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0310162121.651549d9@posting.google.com>...
>
> > Yet another example of emulating your pathological liar mentor, Brain?
> >
> > Steve, K4YZ
>
> Stebe is my mentor.

Not likely. I don't do Special Ed cases, Brain.

Sorry.

Steve, K4YZ

1432. Re: Amateur Radio in the 21st Century?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-19 22:47:35 UTC
From: groupk0hb@earthlink.net
Message-ID: <5ee63311.0310191447.7aa6805c@posting.google.com>
Source record: 81007

N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote

> That document spells out what the NCVEC leaders are thinking about in
> terms of changes to the license structure as a result of WRC 2003.

Jim,

Your statement is very misleading. Here is a direct quote from the document: "...it must be made clear that this document does not in any way reflect official NCVEC policy, and has not been approved by their leadership".

In point of fact, it doesn't really matter because the NCVEC is only a handful of people without any mandate as regards the future of our service. Some of them (W5YI comes to mind) tend to adopt "official titles" and use them as a bully pulpit from which to attempt to advance their personal agendas, but their influence with the regulators is no more or no less than anyone else.

73, de Hans, K0HB

1433. Re: FCC relaxes it's prohibition on use of the "F-word" on broadcast media.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-20 00:10:03 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3F9327DB.5050909@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 81008

Alun Palmer wrote:

>The question is, does this now mean we can say the F word on ham radio?
>
>
No f*cking way I'm going to say the f*cking f-word on f*cking ham radio!

:-)

1434. Re: Code test analogy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-20 00:16:25 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20031019201625.07346.00001302@mb-m26.aol.com>
Source record: 81010

In article <bmf1rp02sk5@enews1.newsguy.com>, nocoder@aol.com (No-coder) writes:

>To expect prospective hams to believe in the fairy tale of morse code is the
>the same as expecting people to believe in the fairy tales of the holy bible.

Dr. Mr. Sohl:

There you go again! The Morse code isn't a fairy tale -- it works! Those
of us who use it know that -- the same way that those of us who believe
in God know that He exists. Sorry, Bill, but your "Morse as religion"
rhetoric gives you away!

73 de Larry, K3LT

1435. Re: FCC relaxes it's prohibition on use of the "F-word" on broadcast media.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-20 00:16:26 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20031019201626.07346.00001303@mb-m26.aol.com>
Source record: 81009

In article <GDpib.12886$Pe5.2532@edtnps84>, Gregg <nospam@unknown.org> writes:

>Canada has had the "F" word and full sexuality on our broadcast TV for
>over 20 years.
>
>God, Yank culture is sooooo behind the times ::)

Gregg:

Funny you should invite God to take notice of "Yank" culture, when in fact, it is Canadian morality which would seem to most require His attention.

73 de Larry, K3LT

1436. Re: Amateur Radio in the 21st Century?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-20 00:16:26 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20031019201626.07346.00001304@mb-m26.aol.com>
Source record: 81011

In article <PJ5kb.1591$_i.132646@nnrp1.ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
<wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:

>> and if there should be an increase in the
>> total number of licensed radio amateurs, that's where there will be a need
>> for more "lebensraum."
>
>OK, I'll bite ... what the hell is "lebensraum" ???
>
>Carl - wk3c

The German word for "living room" -- used by Hitler in Mein Kampf to
justify his plan for the conquest of Russia, as I explained in greater
detail in a previous posting.

73 de Larry, K3LT

1437. Re: Amateur Radio in the 21st Century?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-20 00:16:27 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20031019201627.07346.00001305@mb-m26.aol.com>
Source record: 81012

In article <bY9kb.2332$P%1.1957084@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> writes:

>> > and if there should be an increase in the
>> > total number of licensed radio amateurs, that's where there will be a
>need
>> > for more "lebensraum."
>>
>> OK, I'll bite ... what the hell is "lebensraum" ???
>>
>> Carl - wk3c
>>
>
>"living room"
>
>It was one of the phrases used by Germany to justify it's expansion. Since
>it's been a few years since I studies history, I don't recall if it was WWI
>or WWII.
>
>Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

Dee:

It was WWII, or, more accurately, pre-WWII but post WWI. Hitler used the term "lebensraum" as his justification for the conquest of Russia in his book, Mein Kampf. He lusted after Russia's vast expanses of land area in order to provide "lebensraum," or "living room" (space) for what he thought should be the rightful expansion of the German nation. His pursuit of "lebensraum" was one of his more severe acts of hubris during WWII, which ultimately resulted in his defeat by wasting his military resources on the second (Russian) front. Had he been willing to settle for the conquest and control of the whole of Western and Central Europe, he may have had the forces in place to resist the Allied invasion, and thus given Germany the time to develop it's own atomic weapons. This, of course, would have quite a dilemma for the Allies, since Hitler, madman he was, would have then most likely employed his nuclear arsenal -- most likely on Russia, England, and possibly the U.S. We, of course, would have had to nuke him first to prevent that from happening. Therefore, in a way, Hitler did the rest of the world a favor in his futile attempt to conquer Russia conventionally. A military genius he was not. If the Austrian Corporal had been a real General instead, a lot of us may not be here today.

73 de Larry, K3LT

1438. Re: Why thirteen and twenty?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-20 00:39:34 UTC
From: garigue <garigue@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <59Gkb.825619$Ho3.226493@sccrnsc03>
Source record: 81013

>
> Don't forget, too, when you drive to the testing site to take the morse
code
> test you have to first hand-crank the engine of your horseless carriage to
> get it started.
>
> *OOOPS*, i'm sorry, that too is outdated. They have invented electrically
> driven starters since then. Isn't it neat how old ways are replaced by new
> more efficient & useful ones? *OOOOP*, my bad again... I forgot about
> the PCTA crybabies.
>
> Clint

Here we go again with this standard transmission crap ...this time it has degenerated to starters ....

Clint's logic ... no cars today have crank starters ... therefore CW is in that same category ...but wait ..why are there so many CW ham signals on the air ... ????

Clint am I a "crybaby" because I see a useful skill i.e. the 2nd most used amateur mode badmouthed in the most illogical , immature and counter productive manner.

I really think that in any endeavor there are those for whatever reason like "pissing in the punchbowl". I very rarely operate SSB, look at or transmit pix, never work
moon bounce or hunt for transmitters or any of the myriad of sub-groups that this service offers. But thank God that they are there ... a facet in the jewel that are available to me when and if I desire.

Clint I certainly hope that when the test is dropped that the myriad of those new ops will bring into play those new "electric starter" modes that "will always get through". I personally would not bet the kids milk money on that assumption.

73 God Bless KI3R Tom Popovic Belle Vernon PA

1439. Re: Echolink is great for those who..

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-20 01:07:28 UTC
From: edo <nobody@cryptorebels.net>
Message-ID: <5459cb10bbcd5308ebac5302d86458ab@cryptorebels.net>
Source record: 81014
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

In article <pan.2003.10.19.09.47.45.997719@hotmail.com>
Blind No-Code TWAT "Eric Oyen - N7ZZT" <n7zzt_NO.SPAM_@hotmail.com> whined:
>
>
> On Wed, 08 Oct 2003 14:50:09 +0200, starwars wrote:
>
>
> >> ever hear of other considerations? how about this one: lack on funds
> > >
> > > It's not my fault you're so unemployable you can't afford anything. I bet
> > > you're driving that used-over 100,000 mile shitbox because you can't aford
> > > a newer car, too.
>
> it would be nice to drive, if only one could SEE!
> hell, you know even less about me than I realized.

bwhahahahahahaha..you are a BLIND Twat? ROFLMAO!!!!!!

> oh well, just keep crying me a river.

Looks like the only whines are eminating from a no-code TWAT in Phoenix.

> >
> > "On their "Root?" No wonder you're a goddamned no -code technician TWAT,
> > you don't even know that antennas usually go on roofs, not roots. What a
> > dumbass. You're just full of excuses, twat. And you can add lack of
> > ambition to own your own home to your mounting list of deficiencies.
>
> come off it! 1 or 2 little spelling mistakes? what are you, some kind of
> wannabe spelling cop?. Sure, I don't use a spell checker. I don't have a
> lot of need for one. I apply this principle: WYSIWYG (what you see is what
> you get). like it or lump it. I don't really care.

So in addition to being a no-code TWAT, you're an ignorant no code TWAT. I guess what you see really IS what you get.

Keep making excuses, TWAT.

> >
> > The only crying is coming from you, no-code technician twat.
>
> is it now? funny, whoes spewing forth more words here?

"Whoes" LOL!!!!! It's "Who's" you ignorant ASS.

> >
> > Can you say hypocrite? In addition to your inability to upgrade your
> > license, you severely lack skills in debate. You proved it all by your
> > lonesome, little twat.
>
> he who is without sin may cast the first stone dude! are you without sin?

Aww, how cute, the TWAT quotes a book of fairy tales.

> thought not.

When did you EVER think at all, no-code TWAT?

> >
> >> throwing insults just means you don't have brains enough to debate.
> >
> > Making excuses for your lack of abilities isn't debating, little twat.
>
> what excuses? name them. provide proof or shut up.

The ones you are sqeaking back here, TWAT. Pay attention.
Or do you have A.D.D., too?

> >
> > Now, what were you saying above about throwing insults because you didn't
> > have brains, twat?
>
> you still didn't get it. guess you are dumber than I thought.

Yeah, you are a hypocrite, no-code TWAT.

> > And the point passes over your granite skull at the speed of light, twat.
> > Thanks for proving my point.
>
> what point. you didn't make one. you rambled on, you tried to post digs

Oh, so you really are obtuse.

> and you even tried some half-assed insulting for good measure. what did it
> get you? NOTHING!

I get you dancing like a monkey in a cage, no code TWAT.

> real my signature below. try and figure out who originally said it.
>
> DE N7ZZT
> Eric Oyen
> Phoenix, Arizona

Here's an idea, drink a cup of go fuck yourself, no code blind TWAT.

1440. Re: GOOD NEWS-------France heat wave deaths top 14,000

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-20 01:12:25 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20031019211225.07346.00001306@mb-m26.aol.com>
Source record: 81015

In article <3F920763.6037BC13@silverstar.com>, Dean Arthur
<dearthur@silverstar.com> writes:

>Fire & Brimstone wrote:
>>
>> "BIG-AL@3894.5-LSB-75-METERS" <BIG-AL -003894.5-LSB-75-METERS@
>> BIG-AL -003894.5-LSB-75-METERS> wrote in
>> news:vn6lk3dd6nrg62@corp.supernews.com:
>>
>> > PARIS, France (AP) -- The death toll in France from August's
>> > blistering heat wave was nearly 15,000, according to a government
>> > report released Thursday that exceeded prior official estimates by
>> > 3,000 victims.
>>
>> No, Not good news, 30,000 would've been good news.
>>
>> 15,000 is a good start though.
>>
>
>
>Save the kids, though. Necessary material for cleaning sewer pipes.
>Sent down with scrub brushes to keep pipe walls clean - but need test to
>determine if doing job. Smell not good enough as they all smell like
>s__t to begin with.

This is without a doubt the most horrible muck I've ever read in this
newsgroup -- or anywhere bloddy else, for that matter. May God have
mercy on your soul.

73 de Larry, K3LT

1441. Re: FCC relaxes it's prohibition on use of the "F-word" on broadcast media.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-20 01:39:29 UTC
From: CW <clinton.magers@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <l1Hkb.594208$Oz4.583860@rwcrnsc54>
Source record: 81016

Since the FCC is the governing authority, yes you can. Not recommended
though. Just because a government agency says its OK doesn't make it right.

"Alun Palmer" <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:Xns9419B65FC95C1elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
> Jack <see.my.sig@below.for.email.address> wrote in
> news:ivt5pvobc9k45ic7raumqmh81udmi4gllm@4ax.com:
>

> >
>
> The question is, does this now mean we can say the F word on ham radio?

1442. Re: A New Concept: Virtual Spectrum

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-20 01:55:09 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0310191755.640729a6@posting.google.com>
Source record: 81017
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.antiques.radio+phono,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc

"Frank Dinger" <gm0csz.kn6wh@ntlworld.com> wrote in message
news:<i9tkb.9479$pz5.5826562@newsfep2-win.server.ntli.net>...
> > Of course the simplest, but not always the most cost effective
> > solution is to have a summer cottage with a broadband connection in
> > some quiet rural location. Move your station to the cottage and when
> > not at the cottage, connect a remotely controllable transceiver to a
> > computer (audio in and out, serial data and PTT) and control the
> > station from your urban home. A remotely controlled antenna rotator
> > also helps a lot. In this way you do not have to suffer from noise,
> > antenna restrictions and neighbours complaining about interference:-).
> > Using some watchdog timers is a good idea, in case the computer or
> > internet connection crashes.
> ==========
> Perhaps not from a summer cottage ,but remote operation of HF stations has
> been done in California and Hawaii
> since the mid 90s .Access and operation is through a hand-held VHF radio.
> Even a rotator can be operated remotely.
> The brainchild of a aviator/engineer living in the Brea (California) area
> it was/is called a Super-Station .
> However in this scheme rx and tx are co-located.
> The system was elaborately explained by its designer/implementor in 1995 at
> a meeting of the Fullerton Amateur Radio Club.
>
> I can understand that with antenna restrictions/ prohibition in urbun areas
> and a possible emergence of BPL / PLC / PLT ,people are looking into
> alternative ways to communicate on the HF bands.
> Fortunately in a number of countries BPL et al has already been rejected by
> the authorities , Japan and the Netherlands come to mind. I believe also in
> the UK ,it is highly unlikely that powerline comms will be accepted.
>
> ARRL's drive to block the introduction of power line comms in the USA ,by
> means
> of 'competent (engineering) reasoning' ,must be applauded.

Good post Frank, right on the money!

>
> Frank GM0CSZ / KN6WH

w3rv

1443. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-20 02:02:12 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bmvfn4eug0@208.207.71.142>
Source record: 81018

Dwight Stewart wrote:
> "Dick Carroll" wrote:
>
>>Dwight Stewart wrote:
>>
>>> All writers assume a certain level of knowledge on
>>>the part of their target readers. The same is true for
>>>this newsgroup. Most here are aware of the code
>>>testing debate, so there isn't any reason to restate the
>>>issue each time something is said. As for NCI, the
>>>names of many groups don't exactly reflect the group's
>>>publicly stated goals. For example, the Red Cross
>>>doesn't go around painting crosses red and the
>>>Salvation Army doesn't fight religious wars.
>>
>>
>> On the other hand the symbol for the Red Cross is, well,
>>a red cross!
>
>
>
> But how does that "Red Cross" reflect their specific goals? Remember, I
> was addressing how a chosen name has a some bearing on the group's goals (a
> comment about "No-Code International" versus "No Code TEST International").
>
>
>
>>And the "soldiers" of the Salvation Army wear an appropirate
>>uniform. So,.....
>
>
>
> Camaflage BDU's? Few people fight wars in a dress uniform. ;-)
>

You're still obfuscating, Dwight! And you know it!
No Code International means "no code test international" only because
they were forced into making the addition. The negative response
otherwise would have been overwhelming and they knew it, or soon found
it out. But it didn't change The Agenda.

1444. Re: BPL a reality in my area now!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-20 02:03:29 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bmvfpheug1@208.207.71.142>
Source record: 81019

Dee D. Flint wrote:

> "Dick Carroll" <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com> wrote in message
> news:bmt8d5$n33$0@208.207.71.137...
>
>>Phil Kane wrote:
>>
>>
>>>On 19 Oct 2003 03:45:31 GMT, Dick Carroll wrote:
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>>What's wrong with going after those engineers who are obscuring the
>>>>technical facts of BPL?
>>>
>>>
>>> You seem to be missing an essential point: the "client" of an
>>> engineer is the employer. If the employer does not complain of
>>> unprofessional conduct, there's no case.
>>
>>
>> That's neat. The employer can violate all sorts of statutes, and
>>involve the engineers, and no one but the employer can do anything about
>>it! VERY neat!
>>
>>
>>
>>> Similarly, the licensing boards take action only if there is a
>>> complaint of unprofessional conduct from one with standing, namely
>>> the employer.
>>
>>
>> So the adversly-affected public can have no standing in complaining
>>about the fraudulant acts of licensed persons-actions that directly
>>affect the public???
>>
>> What sort of a system of regulation is this? It's almost useless!
>>It licenses professionals to act contrary to law and standard industry
>>professinal process!
>>
>
>
> Actually there are very few cases where an engineer even needs to be
> licensed. An electrical engineer working for a utility probably does not

> need to be licensed.
>
>

That's contrary to what was posted some time ago here on this subject. In fact, I think it was Phil that said that before one can advertise himself as an engineer or sign off on engineering projects s/he must be licensed by the state as a Professional Engineer, after taking an examination, and that to work as an engineer without the PE license is to risk severe sanctions.

I have a soninlaw who is a PE (civil engineer) and he took some tests for the license. I understood that was a profeffional qualification put in place to protect the public from the inferionr work of unqualified persons posing as qualified and competent.
According to Phils last post, that was wrong. The publis gets no protection and the employers can't be held accountble either, unless there is a prosecutable criminal offense.
persons

1445. Re: What makes LHA so poor at simple research tasks?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-20 02:03:44 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bmvfq0eti0@208.207.71.142>
Source record: 81020

Mike Coslo wrote:

> N2EY wrote:
>
>
>> I've built-from-scratch (no kits, no carbon copies of other homebrew)
>> in my
>> home workshops, at least:
>>
>> 5 receivers
>> 5 transmitters
>> 3 transceivers
>> 4 transmatches
>> 12 power supplies
>> 4 TR systems
>> 5 pieces of test equipment
>> various shack furniture, antennas, power cables, control systems, etc.
>>
>> The above list does not include:
>>
>> - surplus units converted/restored - manufactured equipment
>> restored/repaired/modified
>> - kits built or rebuilt
>>
>> I've worked several of the regulars here on rrap using my homebrew rigs.
>> I can often be found on or around 7040.
>
>
> This is incredibly bizzare!

Yeah, the NoCode Agenda can get to be a bit bizzare, all right.
Between
all the "Luddite!" Mantra - while it's *WE*, the coded, who are actully
active with the modern digital nodes, then their version of Morse Myths,
Morsedists Religion, NCVEC's "vision of the future" and now Brian
accusing Jim, N2EY who holds a Master's Degree in Electrical
Engineering,-(Which Brian surely missed or even he would be smart enough
to have skipped what follows)- of obfuscating his ham radio homegrown
design and construction of equipment record....one truly wonders what's
the next on their "bizzare schedule".

1446. Re: Dear Mother Brakob...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-20 02:04:57 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0310191804.5e2707c1@posting.google.com>
Source record: 81021

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0310191434.506f5ace@posting.google.com>...
> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0310181518.2a210efe@posting.google.com>...
> > k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0310162121.651549d9@posting.google.com>...
> >
> > > Yet another example of emulating your pathological liar mentor, Brain?
> > >
> > > Steve, K4YZ
> >
> > Stebe is my mentor.
>
> Not likely. I don't do Special Ed cases, Brain.
>
> Sorry.
>
> Steve, K4YZ

Where's Dann Finn? PCTADS?

Even the FCC gave waivers.

You're still my mentor, Stebe, like it or not.

1447. Re: 14.313 Jamming.K9BSD, N9PGE, and KK9G.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-20 02:16:03 UTC
From: Twice Fired <loser@mulatto.com>
Message-ID: <FxHkb.25379$5n.6961@bignews5.bellsouth.net>
Source record: 81022
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.swap,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

Jamming on 313? K9BSD, N9PGE, KK9G have been doing that from central indiana for years..... No wives, no life, nothing. Just a whiskey bottle and ocd. Truly pathetic...

privacy.at Anonymous Remailer wrote:
> In article <bmv67b$t40$0@pita.alt.net>
> LARDASS LLOYD DAVIES "Wussman" <NoAccount@NoGood.orb> wrote:
>
>>Heard a couple guys on 14.313 saying that they were being jammed by Roger
>>Wiseman, AB8MQ. The same thing happened last weekend, too.
>>Then one of them mentioned something about a "funny farm".....
>>
>>Sounds like they know Roger.
>
>
> Yet I heard a few hams say that the one playing that gospel music on 14.313 was a no-code Technician, N0VFP.
>

1448. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-20 02:17:28 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031019221728.12785.00000653@mb-m19.aol.com>
Source record: 81023

>You're just almost as vulgar as Bruce, the
>only real difference.

VULGAR, you havent seen VULGAR yet

1449. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-20 02:20:10 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031019222010.12785.00000654@mb-m19.aol.com>
Source record: 81025

>I guess you've got four (4) hands between the both (2) of you.
>
>Go for it you sickos.
>

Dan do you think Brian is ALOT LITE in his shoes?

1450. Re: What makes LHA so poor at simple research tasks?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-20 02:21:20 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <AEHkb.113068$qj6.6362026@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 81024

Dick Carroll wrote:
> Mike Coslo wrote:
>
>> N2EY wrote:
>>
>>
>>> I've built-from-scratch (no kits, no carbon copies of other homebrew)
>>> in my
>>> home workshops, at least:
>>>
>>> 5 receivers
>>> 5 transmitters
>>> 3 transceivers
>>> 4 transmatches
>>> 12 power supplies
>>> 4 TR systems
>>> 5 pieces of test equipment
>>> various shack furniture, antennas, power cables, control systems, etc.
>>>
>>> The above list does not include:
>>>
>>> - surplus units converted/restored - manufactured equipment
>>> restored/repaired/modified
>>> - kits built or rebuilt
>>>
>>> I've worked several of the regulars here on rrap using my homebrew rigs.
>>> I can often be found on or around 7040.
>>
>>
>>
>> This is incredibly bizzare!
>
>
>
>
>
> Yeah, the NoCode Agenda can get to be a bit bizzare, all right. Between
> all the "Luddite!" Mantra - while it's *WE*, the coded, who are actully
> active with the modern digital nodes, then their version of Morse Myths,
> Morsedists Religion, NCVEC's "vision of the future" ..... <snip>

You have me wondering now Dick. I'm wondering what the ratio of NCTA
homebrewers to PCTA homebrewers is?

Whereas a person that does not hombrew (by my more expansive definition as compared to Jim's) is not necessarily a technical nincompoop, those who do homebrew are arguably more "into" the Ham experience than those who do not.

I'll start this, and we'll see if people want to pick it up.

Jim is PCTA and has extensive homebrew experience.

I'm PCTA and have a good bit of experience, though nowhere near as extensive as Jim does. I've done some design, and lots of rebuilding, Mods and homemade keys and the like, and of course antennas.

Let's hear from both sides here.

- Mike KB3EIA -

1451. Re: BPL a reality in my area now!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-20 02:22:10 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <2OWdnUooB6D11Q6iU-KYuQ@gbronline.com>
Source record: 81028

W1RFI wrote:

>>Wonder how much BPL garbage that setup would pick up?
>
>
> My guess is about S7 at 100 feet spacing between houses, on frequencies that
> BPL was using. That is assuming they didn't crank up the power to meet Part 15
> limits so they could go farther and/or have more immunity to noise.
>
>
>>A question arises - 30 m from what? If every piece of house wiring has the
>>BPL
>>signals on it, in many locations you cannot get 30 meters away.
>
>
> Correct. The limit is for 30 meters distance. There are cases where it can't
> be measured there, and the FCC allows measurements to be made at other
> distances, and extrapolated to 30 meters. But here's the kicker -- they allow
> the extrapolation at a 40log(distance ratio), unlike virtually every other
> country in the world. That translates to an inverse-to-the-fourth power ratio.
> Think any of the Part 15 guys make measurements at 3 meters that COULD be made
> at 30 meters, just to gain that extra 20 dB?
>
>
>>Is there stock equipment for BPL yet? Or could they be using prototypes?
>
>
> At this point, PPL is going commercial in the Allentown area. I have offered
> several times to show them exactly what they are getting themselves into, but
> their BPL engineer does not answer my email.
>
> That is kinda' odd, because if I were about to invest millions of dollars and a
> national organization came along and told me that there was a major problem
> with it, then offered to drive 200 miles to show me, I think I would want to
> hear what they had to say and would find an hour's time.
>
> Any PPL shareholders here? :-)
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

Has anyone addressed the security issues with BPL? If BPL radiates from
the powerlines, what is to keep some savy hacker from receiving those
signals and with a little bit of software engineering they could read
your email, get your passwords and see everything you do on the

internet. I remember back in my days in the computer industry, long before the internet, one of the big defense contractors did this very thing. They discovered that enough signal radiated from the coaxial cable between the main frame and dumb terminals they could pick the signals up some distance outside the building and see everything going on on every terminal. Should be even easier with the amount of radiating that BPL will do.

1452. Re: Opposing BPL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-20 02:24:00 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0310191824.1c24234f@posting.google.com>
Source record: 81026
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.policy

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0310181806.72c3e588@posting.google.com>...
> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0310180656.4b0945af@posting.google.com>...
>
> > Its a complex issue. Thank goodness we have lawyers and engineers to
> > figure it all out for us.
>
> Heaven forbid that you'd ever take the initiative to think for yourself, Brain.
>
> Steve, K4YZ

Apparently you didn't see Phil's answer.

Pull your head out - "The "pop" heard around the world."

1453. Re: Points Of Perception...What Do YOU Call "Collateral Damage"...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-20 02:28:54 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0310191828.ed410a8@posting.google.com>
Source record: 81027

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0310181805.5e9eeac4@posting.google.com>...
> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0310180708.17319747@posting.google.com>...
>
> > Steve, John is mere avoiding a crazy man who talks to himself in
> > between episodes of playing RRAP Avenging Angel.
>
> Since you claim to look to Lennie as a mentor,

Stebe, I now claim you as my mentor. Keep it up - I have much
insanity to learn.

I will remind you
> that it is he who claims anyone making typos in a USENET repsonse is
> "getting mad". I will leave it to you to figure out what you did
> wrong (according to Lennie's rules).

ly

> As far as John goes, I imagine him like a bully I knew as a
> kid...He was all big and brash...Right up until someone smacked him
> back.

Robo-Angel, no doubt.

> John has beat a hasty retreat because unlike you and Lennie, I
> doubt that he LIKES being spoon-fed his own USENET foolishness. You
> should take a hint. I know you won't since you obviously like being
> beat over the head again-and-again with stuff YOU provide.

Then there are those who like beating others over the head.

> So don't blame me, Brain, for any "Avenging Angel" stuff...You
> just keep giving me so much raw material to work with.
>
> Thanks.
>
> Steve, K4YZ

Stebe, you'd do it anyway. It's what makes you tick since you went
over the deep end.

1454. Re: Amazin'....Ain't it...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-20 02:33:23 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0310191833.6e0c7887@posting.google.com>
Source record: 81029

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0310181755.231b5d23@posting.google.com>...
> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0310180710.10f915b2@posting.google.com>...
> > k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0310162138.7119784e@posting.google.com>...
> > > brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0310140541.4b6c74df@posting.google.com>...
> > >
> > > > > Your "mentor" can fill you in on ways to antagonize and instigate
> > > > > flamefests...he does it well.
> > > >
> > > > OK, Stebe.
> > > >
> > > > > You aren't quite there yet, but you're getting close.
> > > >
> > > > I'm learning from the Master, Stebe.
> > >
> > > Whew...
> > >
> > > It's really amazing to find people who ADMIT that they are the
> > > willing "students" of pathological liars.
> >
> > SteBe, I said I was learning from the Master.
> >
> > Do you now ADMIT to being a pathological liar?
>
> You said Lennie was your mentor. Shall we requote the post
> wherein you made this proclaimation?

No need. You are now my mentor, Stebe.

Anything else is an attempt to
> back out of the corner YOU painted yourself into, Sir Clueless.

Nope, this isn't Stalingrad.

I enjoy the privelege of being able to change my mind.

1455. Re: BPL a reality in my area now!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-20 02:37:55 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0310191837.3dbd9e9@posting.google.com>
Source record: 81030
Cross-posted to: alt.ham-radio,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.policy

brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0310151858.755a1d16@posting.google.com>...

> > > What does BPL sound like? Can someone post a wav file somewhere so it can
> > > be identified? Is it worse that the Pennsylvania QSO party?
> >
> > Did someone take over a frequency you owned?

> Mike, that was kinda rude.

Whoa....BRAIN suggesting to someone else what is rude!

Steve, K4YZ

1456. Re: Lennie's Double Standard Once Again Revealed...BY Lennie!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-20 02:38:45 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0310191838.327d67dd@posting.google.com>
Source record: 81031

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0310181747.4754eb88@posting.google.com>...
> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0310180714.30f06d5@posting.google.com>...
>
> > Your Avenging Angel acts followed by general crazy-man activities is
> > really rubbing my nose?
>
> I am not the one who "own's up" to having an archived
> pathological liar as my "mentor".

You're a pathological liar? You're my mentor.

> I am not the one who claims to have operated from some rare DX
> location with an alleged "say so" from someone who didn't have the
> authority to let me do it anyway.

Moot. You've never been anywhere.

> I am not the one who doesn't know the difference between a
> "commander" (an officer in the Armed Forces assigned as the senior
> officer of a unit) and a "Commander" (a Naval grade equivilent to Lt
> Colonel in the other branches).

One has UCMJ authority over me, the other is merely another officer.

> I am not the one who doesn't know the difference between
> "authority" and "acceptance".

I accept no authority from you.

> > I see it differently.
>
> As I said...people with your particular dementia usually don't.
>
> To quote a particular Naval veteran, "Have Fun With This One
> Now".
>
> Steve, K4YZ

Avenging Angel Stebe has Spoken. And it was so.

hi hi

1457. Re: A New Concept: Virtual Spectrum

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-20 02:39:27 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0310191839.34a32a@posting.google.com>
Source record: 81032

brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0310151857.48ae45f7@posting.google.com>...

> Perhaps Semper Fi Steve could shed some light on whether Dave's
> comments are original and worthy of publication in any periodical,
> whether QST, 73, or Ham Radio.
>
> He is, after all, the "at large" editor of original material for
> amatuer publications.
>
> Sayonara

I think your mind said sayonara a long time ago, Brain.

Sheeesh.

Steve, K4YZ

1458. Re: Code test analogy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-20 02:40:08 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <cWHkb.4912$W16.577@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 81033

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20031019201625.07346.00001302@mb-m26.aol.com...
> In article <bmf1rp02sk5@enews1.newsguy.com>, nocoder@aol.com (No-coder)
writes:
>
> >To expect prospective hams to believe in the fairy tale of morse code is
the
> >the same as expecting people to believe in the fairy tales of the holy
bible.
>
> Dr. Mr. Sohl:
>
> There you go again! The Morse code isn't a fairy tale -- it works! Those
> of us who use it know that -- the same way that those of us who believe
> in God know that He exists. Sorry, Bill, but your "Morse as religion"
> rhetoric gives you away!
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT

Larry,

The above was NOT penned by me. I have no clue
why you think I did so. Forgeting even the morse aspect of
the the reference to the bible being a fairy tale doesn't
sync with my personal religious beliefes at all.

Bill K2UNK

1459. Re: Reflections on rrap

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-20 02:42:46 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0310191842.c9abd41@posting.google.com>
Source record: 81034

brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0310151708.26ac0f28@posting.google.com>...

> Kim, get the OM a shiney new pair of HD brass-riveted jeans and
> yourself a shiney new HD steel-belted brittany spear brazier, and join
> us at Dayton 04.

What was it you were suggesting to Mike Coslo about being rude,
Brain?

> I promise I won't make any Texas jokes til you'se guys show up.

A promie from you is like pre-election fodder....

> By the way, do you know how they separate the men from the boys in
> Texas...
>
> Brain, (more or less.)

Then I dare say you'd best not go to Texas...You've been
seperated from your brain for a long time.

Steve, K4YZ

1460. Re: ARRL you can Kiss my $39.00 a Year Good Bye

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-20 02:44:28 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0310191844.6f5feb6e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 81035

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0310162146.f2d85ce@posting.google.com>...
> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0310140528.3c0cad0e@posting.google.com>...
> > k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20031012123106.28806.00000085@mb-m25.aol.com>...
>
> > Mean like how YOU let LENNIE "pass" with use of
> > > snide remarks, blatant lies, profanity and obvious misdirection of his posts,
> > > but then accuse others of the same thing without comment...?!?!
> >
> > You don't seem to like that much, do you?
>
> It's not a matter of what I like or don't like, MinnieLennie.

Ahem, that would be MinnieStebie.

> You are a person wrought with confusion and an odd sense of what you
> consider appropriate.

You are inappropriate, Mentor Stebe.

> You publically announce your afinity for a person known to be a
> pathological liar and then go about calling other people names and
> making unsubstantiated allegations about them. Pretty silly, Brain.

Stebe.

> If you enjoy placing your private parts in publically operated
> pencil sharpeners, be my guest...but don't whine about it when your
> parts get ground up when someone else turns the crank (pun intended)

So do you wear a nurses dress when you play masochist?

> > > Now...about those T5 logs and your "authorization" to operate in Somalia?
> >
> > Correct. I was authorized.
>
> Not according to the evidence you've supplied, you weren't.

What evidence have I supplied?

1461. Re: Amateur Radio Newsline? Report 1365 ? October 10 2003

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-20 02:45:38 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0310191845.4f2a1f33@posting.google.com>
Source record: 81036

brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0310150430.4c80244d@posting.google.com>...

> And its not all NOAA. Air Force Weather runs a number of solar
> observatories around the globe, polarimeter stations, and
> rocketsondes.

A bit of news passed to you via back-channel from Lennie, or were
you reading some 1950's era "This Is The Air Force" books, Brain?
They've only been doing this since the inception of the Air Force.

Steve, K4YZ

1462. Re: What makes a Pro code test Amateur a Troglodyte?--Post #3

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-20 02:46:56 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0310191846.3a5b01c3@posting.google.com>
Source record: 81037

brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0310140856.24188b00@posting.google.com>...
> "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:<bmdtqg$i50@library2.airnews.net>...
> > By my review, it took 3 posts to have the slamming and insults begin. And,
> > DICK wins the prize:
>
> This is the part where unbiased Stebe Robevson, the RRAP Avenging
> Angel, starts a new thread and nails Dick to the Cross, calls him a
> liar and/or a Putz/Dick,...

Nope...You and Lennie have that all wrapped up, Brain...

Steve, K4YZ

1463. Re: FISTS Postion to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-20 02:54:33 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0310191854.7c9b40ed@posting.google.com>
Source record: 81039

brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0310140535.1180f438@posting.google.com>...
> k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0310091237.75c4f23c@posting.google.com>...
> > k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0309190239.2b7bcf38@posting.google.com>...
> > > lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20030916205913.12501.00002450@mb-m04.aol.com>...
> > > > In article <bk4b7e$p383g$8@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>, "Ryan, KC8PMX"
> > > > <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> writes:
> > > >
> > > > >All of the above answers would be correct (barring accidental typos), but
> > > > >the original poster of the question in the first place DID NOT SPECIFY.
> > > > >See, it is important, unless you consider ALL antennas to be exactly
> > > > >one-half wavelength in length.
> > > >
> > > > Dan thinks "all" dipoles are half-wavelength...
> > >
> > > Lennie...WHAT did the "FISTS" organization have to do with
> > > ANYTHING in this thread YOU started with their name...???
> >
> > Hey Lennie...Three weeks too short for you to answer a question?
> >
> > Steve, K4YZ
>
> Talking to yourself again?

And where do you see me asking myself questions, Brain?

I see you still like to humiliate yourself in public...I bet
there are a lot of people who get thier jollies that way. Guess that
will be one of those things I'll have to leave in the "what's the
point" file.

And a month later His Putziness still has not answered the
question...What did the FISTS organization have to do with the content
of the thread HE started with THIER name...?!?!

Steve, K4YZ

1464. Re: Student That Did Razor Test is a Ham.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-20 03:02:47 UTC
From: "Rev. Firefly" <foosw32@juno.com>
Message-ID: <1066619115.306880@newshost03.voicenet.com>
Source record: 81038

What pray tell the phrig is a "razor test"...???

1465. Re: Bootlegging in 1948?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-20 03:19:55 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0310191919.6a8fdbb1@posting.google.com>
Source record: 81040

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20031012160153.11022.00001376@mb-m14.aol.com>...

> If you look carefully at what I wrote, the words used, you will find I did
> not address it directly to you. It was a general statement. Had you
> wanted an answer solely for yourself, I might have replied in private
> e-mail.

Whoa...wouldn't >>HE<< be honored...?!?!

> > I didn't say it wasn't, Len. Instead, I simply said that this (commercial
> >communications today) might be one reason the Technician license would have
> >at least some appeal to you.
>
> Tsk, tsk...you now appear to be wanting to control who gets to ask
> what in addition to wanting specific-category answers.

He wasn't controlling anything.

He was misguided in his assumption that you might be sincere
about your interest in radio, Sir Putzalot...even Amateur Radio. His
mistake, but hardly "controlling" anything...

> A bit later I wrote that amateur licenses did not have that much
> personal appeal for me. Neither does the "social aspect" or ego
> need stroking by group belonging. You should have surmised that I
> have a fairly extensive exposure to communications arts and technology
> by now, little of it based solely on news and "theory articles" in amateur
> radio publications.

In other words, you are pontificating about what OUGHT to be in a
radio service in which you have zero-point-zero experience, and for
which you have zero-point-zero understanding...

In other words, you're here for fighting's sake...Not serious or
sincere "debate" on ANY aspect of AMATEUR Radio.

> > Your opposition to code is no barrier whatsoever to getting a Technician
> >license, Len.
>
> While that is true, you are starting to misdirect and getting a bit hostile
> with an obviously unfriendly "challenge."

No...he doesn't understand that you are here not for the
interests of Amateur Radio, but for the sake of starting arguments.

Period.

> Feel free to tell everyone WHY one MUST have "at least" an amateur
> radio no-code-test class license in order to discuss the retention or
> elimination of a code test for any radio operator license.

Ahhhhh...Dwight's talking about getting active in Amateur Radio,
gleaning what one can from it and maybe making a contribution to it...

Lennie, on the other hand, has once again re-directed the
conversation into why he should be allowed to insult, antagonize and
defame others.

> Recall that this is a public forum, unmoderated, accessible to anyone.

Not according to YOU, Sir Anderscum. You have, on occassions too
numerous to count, "suggested", even outrigh demanded that others
"leave now".

> There is no dispensation for licensed amateurs to exclude
> professionals from discussion of radio matters.

When one arrives we'll allow him to say his piece, just like you
do, Lennie.

> This newsgroup is NOT a private forum...although it has become a
> chat room gathering place for regulars...most of whom insist that all
> must think, believe, and absolutely honor their superior thoughts,
> opinions, viewpoints, and beliefs.

One again you have uttered an outright lie, Leonard.

Sure hope your Padawan Learner is taking notes.

> To reiterate, this newsgroup is a PUBLIC forum. Anyone posting anything
> in public is open for any kind of reply. That's just the way it is.

But...but...but...LENNIE!

YOU have, in RECENT posts, read the proverbial "Riot Act" to
OTHER posters on what is "right" posting and "wrong" posting!

So...WHICH way is it, Lennie? Is it OK for anyone to post what
they want, or is it ONLY OK if it meet's YOUR criteria???

> My comments are more general rather than to specific individuals.

No, they are not.

> Many others are vehemently opposed to "different" comments (different
> from their own cherished beliefs). Their vehemence takes many forms
> as you've seen. Some of the forms are "gentle vehemence" such as
> the artificial "necessity" to be licensed in a radio service in order to
> discuss, debate, or argue federal regulations on specific radio services.
>
> Why must licensing (of any class) come first?

Uhhhhhhhhhhh....PRACTICAL EXPERIENCE from which to make an
INFORMED opionion, Lennie...?!?! Or was that engineering trait lost

upon you in 14 years of night school?

> I bring up certain points, facts, history as part of the debate-discussion-
> argument on subjects. If those proven and provable items are against
> an individual's belief systems, then TS on them. I'm not going to cave
> in to anyone's personal insults any time, anywhere...and there have
> been an enormous number of such directed at those who are not of
> the conservative, old-time beliefs of amateur radio.

As opposed to the liberal, NO-time beliefs of NON-Amateurs,
lennie?

> > By the way, if you reply, do try to keep it short - I don't have time to
> >respond to a long-winded rant (my only real comment about what you've said).
>
> Another reminder: This is a public forum with public access.
> EVERYONE takes their chances on posting anything here.

Dwight...This is Lennie's self-permitting caveat to bury any
valid exchange of information under tons of irrelevent fodder for his
own entertainment.

Witness the following:

> In case you are wondering, I don't have time for long-winded rants of
> others.
> Others DO a number of long-winded rants in here. Some go into great
> lengths to make such rants extremely offensive to another's person.
>
> If you desire to control anything in here, I will suggest you go after the
> OTHER "ranters," the obvious insult-mongers and trollers. Let them
> learn to take it. I don't have time for verbal fire-fights with those who
> are outraged with righteous anger or of those irritated that others do not
> accept their own noble thoughts.

> PS: This evolved, convoluted thread started out with non-hostile
> mention of using a one-tube modulated oscillator in the AM BC band
> some 55 years ago. Those were known as "wireless phonograph
> adapters" or equivalent back then, intended to couple a stand-alone
> phonograph to any AM BC receiver not having a phonograph jack for
> auxilliary audio input.. Lots of unlicensed in any radio service people
> had them then for listening to phonograph recordings without buying
> bigger, more expensive radios. Point of fact. I got my information on
> that particular little project from an issue of Popular Science, way back
> when they had construction articles on many hobby subjects.
> In mentioning that to folks who had never been born yet then, it
> seems to be a source of irritation to them and they tended to get
> hostile in replies. Was no "Part 15" in the loose-leaf FCC regulations
> then and there was no hue and cry of damnation on such evil "boot-
> legging" of the airwaves from wireless phonograph adapters 55 years
> ago. TS for the license-demanders of today. Their problem not mine.

Was there ANYTHING in this about Amateur Radio Policy, other than Lennie wants his non-Amateur technician career to qualify him as King-Of-The-USENET-Hill...?!?!

I think not.

Another LennieRant, brought to you by Southern California's non-indigenous pathological liar, Leonard H. Anderson.

Thanks, Lennie.

Steve, K4YZ

1466. Re: Bootlegging in 1948?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-20 03:31:12 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0310191931.2b19d19b@posting.google.com>
Source record: 81041

N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<c2356669.0310070852.26b87250@posting.google.com>...
> lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20031006162750.25517.00001184@mb-m15.aol.com>...

> > >Those articles
> > >are well over a decade old, and "ham radio" (no caps in their logo) magazine
> > >hasn't published a new issue for years.
> >
> > Tsk, tsk, tsk. HAM RADIO Magazine,
>
> There are no capital letters in the logo printed on the magazine
> covers. They did the e.e.cummings thing. "ham radio" is the name of
> the mag, not "HAM RADIO".
>
> Just look at the cover.

Jim, I seriously doubt that Lennie was ever interested in the
cover...

Ignored and laughed at by the "real" electronics industry, Lennie
found a convienient little nest where he could roost, claiming to be
an "associate editor", using his "professional" status to bully his
way around the other contributors.

Occassionally getting a by-line wherein he could lay some
"honest" claim to being "published" in an industry where BEING
published is THE achievement, he could rest assured his name would lay
in some dingy basement as an "archived" volume for eternity...

I dare say Lennie probably got several comp'ed copies of
HR...(excuse me...."hr"...!)and put them at every coffee pot around
his "day" job office. I am sure the office secretary appreciated the
use of them as "coasters".

Steve, K4YZ

1467. Re: BPL a reality in my area now!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-20 04:42:33 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <xnfcneeyarg.hn17vcn.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>
Source record: 81042

On 20 Oct 2003 02:03:29 GMT, Dick Carroll wrote:

> That's contrary to what was posted some time ago here on this subject.
>In fact, I think it was Phil that said that before one can advertise
>himself as an engineer or sign off on engineering projects s/he must be
>licensed by the state as a Professional Engineer, after taking an
>examination, and that to work as an engineer without the PE license is
>to risk severe sanctions.

That depends on the state law. In Califoria, there are two levels.
"Title Act" and "Practice Act". There are five specialties
(Electrical. Civil, Mechanical, Petroleum, and Structural) in which
one cannot use the title or do the practice (be in responsible
charge of the work) to the public without being a PE. All the
other specialties are "Practice Act" specialties. Different
employers regard this differently. My wife's employer - the largest
environmental engineering consultant in the world - requires all
engineers to hold PE registration in their specialty from at least
one state to advance beyond the "Junior Engineer" level, and that
all work submitted to a client - public sector or private sector -
be signed and stamped by a PE. Most of their contracts require this
as well.

When it comes to the civil and structural engineers, it is almost
universal that state law requires that the engineer be a registered
PE and also provides a "handle" to "reach" said engineer if the
work is done in a negligent manner. The usual grounds for sanctions
against land surveyers and civil engineers in California is
negligent determination of or failure to file property boundaries.

In general, state statutes also provide a "handle" for the state
registration board to discipline registrants who perform work in a
negligent manner, but a finding of negligence requires a nexus
between the engineer personally and the affected/damaged party - the
complainant.

> I have a soninlaw who is a PE (civil engineer) and he took some tests
>for the license. I understood that was a profeffional qualification put
>in place to protect the public from the inferionr work of unqualified
>persons posing as qualified and competent.

>According to Phils last post, that was wrong. The publis gets no
>protection and the employers can't be held accountble either, unless
>there is a prosecutable criminal offense.

You misinterpreted what I said. The employer is always liable for the misconduct of employees in the course of employment. The complaint, however, has to be by an affected party (client) or by the DA if there is a criminal violation involved.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

1468. Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-20 05:46:35 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bmvsrr$79c$0@208.206.142.66>
Source record: 81043

CHeck this out...

http://www.potomacnews.com/servlet/Satellite?pagename=WPN%2FMGArticle%2FWPN_BasicArticle&c=MGArticle&cid=1031771619197&path=!frontpage

1469. Re: BPL a reality in my area now!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-20 05:55:47 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bmvtd3$8dr$0@208.206.142.66>
Source record: 81044

JJ wrote:

> W1RFI wrote:
>
>>> Wonder how much BPL garbage that setup would pick up?
>>
>>
>>
>> My guess is about S7 at 100 feet spacing between houses, on
>> frequencies that
>> BPL was using. That is assuming they didn't crank up the power to meet
>> Part 15
>> limits so they could go farther and/or have more immunity to noise.
>>
>>
>>> A question arises - 30 m from what? If every piece of house wiring
>>> has the
>>> BPL
>>> signals on it, in many locations you cannot get 30 meters away.
>>
>>
>>
>> Correct. The limit is for 30 meters distance. There are cases where
>> it can't
>> be measured there, and the FCC allows measurements to be made at other
>> distances, and extrapolated to 30 meters. But here's the kicker --
>> they allow
>> the extrapolation at a 40log(distance ratio), unlike virtually every
>> other
>> country in the world. That translates to an inverse-to-the-fourth
>> power ratio. Think any of the Part 15 guys make measurements at 3
>> meters that COULD be made
>> at 30 meters, just to gain that extra 20 dB?
>>
>>
>>> Is there stock equipment for BPL yet? Or could they be using prototypes?
>>
>>
>>
>> At this point, PPL is going commercial in the Allentown area. I have
>> offered
>> several times to show them exactly what they are getting themselves
>> into, but
>> their BPL engineer does not answer my email.

>>
>> That is kinda' odd, because if I were about to invest millions of
>> dollars and a
>> national organization came along and told me that there was a major
>> problem
>> with it, then offered to drive 200 miles to show me, I think I would
>> want to
>> hear what they had to say and would find an hour's time.
>>
>> Any PPL shareholders here? :-)
>>
>> 73,
>> Ed Hare, W1RFI
>
>
> Has anyone addressed the security issues with BPL? If BPL radiates from
> the powerlines, what is to keep some savy hacker from receiving those
> signals and with a little bit of software engineering they could read
> your email, get your passwords and see everything you do on the
> internet. I remember back in my days in the computer industry, long
> before the internet, one of the big defense contractors did this very
> thing. They discovered that enough signal radiated from the coaxial
> cable between the main frame and dumb terminals they could pick the
> signals up some distance outside the building and see everything going
> on on every terminal. Should be even easier with the amount of radiating
> that BPL will do.
>

As usual, few are informed enough to worry about it. Look what Microsoft
did to Windows and yet numerous versions are used widely by millions
who just download the latest "patch" to "fix" the holes deliberately
left open to hacker/crackers by the programmers, and innocently wait for
the next attack.

Get the scoop on Windows at <www.grc.com>

1470. Re: What makes LHA so poor at simple research tasks?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-20 07:07:55 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bn01kbgbm0@208.206.142.66>
Source record: 81045

Mike Coslo wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
>
>> Mike Coslo wrote:
>>
>>> N2EY wrote:
>>>
>>>
>>>> I've built-from-scratch (no kits, no carbon copies of other
>>>> homebrew) in my
>>>> home workshops, at least:
>>>>
>>>> 5 receivers
>>>> 5 transmitters
>>>> 3 transceivers
>>>> 4 transmatches
>>>> 12 power supplies
>>>> 4 TR systems
>>>> 5 pieces of test equipment
>>>> various shack furniture, antennas, power cables, control systems, etc.
>>>>
>>>> The above list does not include:
>>>>
>>>> - surplus units converted/restored - manufactured equipment
>>>> restored/repaired/modified
>>>> - kits built or rebuilt
>>>>
>>>> I've worked several of the regulars here on rrap using my homebrew
>>>> rigs.
>>>> I can often be found on or around 7040.
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>> This is incredibly bizzare!
>>
>>
>>
>>
>>
>>
>> Yeah, the NoCode Agenda can get to be a bit bizzare, all right. Between
>> all the "Luddite!" Mantra - while it's *WE*, the coded, who are

>> actully active with the modern digital nodes, then their version of
>> Morse Myths, Morsedists Religion, NCVEC's "vision of the future"
>> ..... <snip>
>
>
> You have me wondering now Dick. I'm wondering what the ratio of NCTA
> homebrewers to PCTA homebrewers is?
>
> Whereas a person that does not hombrew (by my more expansive
> definition as compared to Jim's) is not necessarily a technical
> nincompoop, those who do homebrew are arguably more "into" the Ham
> experience than those who do not.
>
> I'll start this, and we'll see if people want to pick it up.
>
> Jim is PCTA and has extensive homebrew experience.
>
> I'm PCTA and have a good bit of experience, though nowhere near as
> extensive as Jim does. I've done some design, and lots of rebuilding,
> Mods and homemade keys and the like, and of course antennas.
>
> Let's hear from both sides here.
>

Oh, my homebrew experience doesn't come close to Jim's either. But...

Back in the 70's I built up a 2meter repeater from components and
built the controller/IDer from a magazine construction article. Etched
the circuit board, populated it, programmed the IDer, intalled the
repeater along with a homebrew colinear antenna one of the other guys
built for it. He and I climbed and mounted it at the 200 foot level
on the local cable TV tower that had been deactivated for that use.
Not a safety belt to be seen in those days, either! Also learned a lot
about duplexers and how to set it up and sweep tune it. Also learned a
repeater can work quite well at lower power with separate antennas
if mounted with vertical separation on the same tower. Takes some
tweaking and messing with, but it can be effectively done with no
duplexer. Downside is usually that the xmit range is limited because
you need to mount the tx antenna lower to get full benefit of max range
on mobile/portables by mounting the rx antenna as high as possible. Got
to have a clean xmtr, though.
(I did all this at home before taking it to the mountain.)
Best to use a duplexer on a single high antenna.

Then there was a dozen or so SSB/CW linear amps over the years,
of various sizes from small to pretty large. I built up a 10KV
power supply once with a variac and calibrated voltmeter just because I
found the parts to do it with at hamfest fleamkts. Ran that into a
4-1000A, just loafing along adjusted around 4KV. I once cranked it up
to 7500 volts, daring anything to pop. Didn't. Breathe into the mike and
the meter really cranked! Lost my nerve, cranked it back down!

You GOT TO watch that HV *all the time* when working with that stuff, no second chances. But I also worked on various commercial, BCST and two-way base station gear, developed a routine and stayed with it. First thing I built with I started the HV work was a shorting stick! And I made it to retirement.

I once built a 5-band pair of 811A's into an old Johnson Viking Adventurer cabinet(quite small for the job) *with the HV power supply inside*, just to see if it would work. It did, but I could never get it tamed down on 20 meters & above, it wanted to be contrary and act like an oscillator! Linear amps are comparitively pretty simple.

I still have a big parts supply, more than ever, but little time and lagging interest in using them these days, due to various factors, not the least of which is this media....along with less nimble fingers and bifocals that don't. <G> Still some plans on the back burner, though, against the time I might finally tire of the rest of this.. I have parts to build a half dozen amps and much other stuff, but like so many of us I now use a commercial amp I like very much that is on the very rare occasions I use it. Mostly I just run 100 watts out since that's enough to do most of what I do. There's a shed full of projects sitting there waiting on me, and here I sit at the keyboard!

LOTS of Heath and other kits found form in my shop over the years,too. I was overseas in the Army when the Heathkit Monobander SSB transcievers first came out. I ordered the 20 meter version (HW-32 IIRC)with power supply and went on the air as DX (DL4RQ) on SSB. That rig was one of the few commercially offered transceivers (or kits) that did NOT have CW xmit capability built in.

I recall when at age of 13 or so a buddy and I built a couple of regen receivers using a single 76 triode tube. Worked amazingly well, or so we thought at the time....been thinking of doing one again just to compare with those. <g>

Dick

1471. Re: FCC relaxes it's prohibition on use of the "F-word" on broadcast media.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-20 10:29:04 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031020062904.00545.00001765@mb-m02.aol.com>
Source record: 81046

In article <l1Hkb.594208$Oz4.583860@rwcrnsc54>, "CW"
<clinton.magers@comcast.net> writes:

>Since the FCC is the governing authority, yes you can.

Actually, the fact that FCC says something is OK for broadcasting doesn't mean
they say it's OK for amateur radio. Because the two are different services, FCC
can have different rules of what they allow.

> Not recommended
>though. Just because a government agency says its OK doesn't make it right.

Agreed!

>"Alun Palmer" <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
>news:Xns9419B65FC95C1elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
>> Jack <see.my.sig@below.for.email.address> wrote in
>> news:ivt5pvobc9k45ic7raumqmh81udmi4gllm@4ax.com:

>> The question is, does this now mean we can say the F word on ham radio?

I wouldn't.

One argument FCC can use to defend the "different rules" thing is that
broadcasting works to a published schedule and the shows are rated in advance.
If you tune in Howard Stern on the radio or the Victoria's Secret Xmas special
on TV, you have a pretty good idea of what you'll hear/see. But on ham radio
there's no schedule, no program guide and no advance ratings.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1472. Re: Amateur Radio in the 21st Century?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-20 10:29:05 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031020062905.00545.00001766@mb-m02.aol.com>
Source record: 81047

In article <5ee63311.0310191447.7aa6805c@posting.google.com>,
groupk0hb@earthlink.net (Hans K0HB) writes:

>N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote
>
>> That document spells out what the NCVEC leaders are thinking about in
>> terms of changes to the license structure as a result of WRC 2003.
>
>Jim,
>
>Your statement is very misleading. Here is a direct quote from the
>document: "...it must be made clear that this document does not in any
>way reflect official NCVEC policy, and has not been approved by their
>leadership".

Thank you for pointing that out, Hans. I apologize for the inaccuracy. I shall refer to the paper as "the KL7CC paper" from now on, and I urge others to do the same.

>In point of fact, it doesn't really matter because the NCVEC is only a
>handful of people without any mandate as regards the future of our
>service.

The paper claims to have three authors. Have you read it?

>Some of them (W5YI comes to mind) tend to adopt "official
>titles" and use them as a bully pulpit from which to attempt to
>advance their personal agendas, but their influence with the
>regulators is no more or no less than anyone else.
>
Somehow I will not be surprised if the NCVEC adopts something very similar to the ideas and attitudes in the KL7CC paper as its official position. They have already done so wrt code testing.

Thanks for the pointer

73 de Jim, N2EY

1473. Re: FISTS Postion to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-20 11:08:17 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0310200308.3853fb1d@posting.google.com>
Source record: 81049

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0310191854.7c9b40ed@posting.google.com>...
> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0310140535.1180f438@posting.google.com>...
> > k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0310091237.75c4f23c@posting.google.com>...
> > > k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0309190239.2b7bcf38@posting.google.com>...
> > > > lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20030916205913.12501.00002450@mb-m04.aol.com>...
> > > > > In article <bk4b7e$p383g$8@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>, "Ryan, KC8PMX"
> > > > > <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> writes:
> > > > >
> > > > > >All of the above answers would be correct (barring accidental typos), but
> > > > > >the original poster of the question in the first place DID NOT SPECIFY.
> > > > > >See, it is important, unless you consider ALL antennas to be exactly
> > > > > >one-half wavelength in length.
> > > > >
> > > > > Dan thinks "all" dipoles are half-wavelength...
> > > >
> > > > Lennie...WHAT did the "FISTS" organization have to do with
> > > > ANYTHING in this thread YOU started with their name...???
> > >
> > > Hey Lennie...Three weeks too short for you to answer a question?
> > >
> > > Steve, K4YZ
> >
> > Talking to yourself again?
>
> And where do you see me asking myself questions, Brain?

So all conversations with yourself must be in the form of an Inquisition?

1474. Re: Reflections on rrap

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-20 11:13:26 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0310200313.651b6fb9@posting.google.com>
Source record: 81050

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0310191842.c9abd41@posting.google.com>...
> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0310151708.26ac0f28@posting.google.com>...
>
> > Kim, get the OM a shiney new pair of HD brass-riveted jeans and
> > yourself a shiney new HD steel-belted brittany spear brazier, and join
> > us at Dayton 04.
>
> What was it you were suggesting to Mike Coslo about being rude,
> Brain?
>
> > I promise I won't make any Texas jokes til you'se guys show up.
>
> A promie from you is like pre-election fodder....
>
> > By the way, do you know how they separate the men from the boys in
> > Texas...
> >
> > Brain, (more or less.)
>
> Then I dare say you'd best not go to Texas...You've been
> seperated from your brain for a long time.
>
> Steve, K4YZ

It was my attempt to get Kim to lighten up a little.

But you don't know how to do that - always on the job as the RRAP
Avenging Angel, I see.

1475. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-20 11:17:37 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0310200317.134867b1@posting.google.com>
Source record: 81051

Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:<bmvsrr$79c$0@208.206.142.66>...
> CHeck this out...
>
>
> http://www.potomacnews.com/servlet/Satellite?pagename=WPN%2FMGArticle%2FWPN_BasicArticle
&c=MGArticle&cid=1031771619197&path=!frontpage

Good! Somebody had to bite the bullet and do it, let 'er rip. I'm
betting that Manassas will become the focal point of the whole issue.
It's likely gonna establish whether or not there's any money in it for
the service providers, whether or not the interference BPL generates
will terminally interfere with critical HF comms and how many of the
plugged-in $29.95/month citizen users of BPL in Manassas identities
get hacked, yadda, yadda, all of it.

For better or worse let the battle begin win lose or draw.

I vaguely remember Manassas being the last focal point of a much
earlier national debate, something about Lee handing Grant his sword
in Manassas . . is there some irony here?

w3rv

1476. Re: BPL a reality in my area now!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-20 11:20:02 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0310200320.17d5b54d@posting.google.com>
Source record: 81052

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0310191837.3dbd9e9@posting.google.com>...
> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0310151858.755a1d16@posting.google.com>...
>
> > > > What does BPL sound like? Can someone post a wav file somewhere so it can
> > > > be identified? Is it worse that the Pennsylvania QSO party?
> > >
> > > Did someone take over a frequency you owned?
>
> > Mike, that was kinda rude.
>
> Whoa....

That's how a good Moresman stops his conveyance.

> BRAIN suggesting to someone else what is rude!

I've already suggested that you were rude, so I'm batting a thousand.

1477. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-20 11:56:22 UTC
From: Duane Allen <computeruser@sprintmail.com>
Message-ID: <G3Qkb.3534$np1.3002@newsread3.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 81053

Brian Kelly wrote:
> Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:<bmvsrr$79c$0@208.206.142.66>...
>
>>CHeck this out...
>>
>>
>>http://www.potomacnews.com/servlet/Satellite?pagename=WPN%2FMGArticle%2FWPN_BasicArticle
&c=MGArticle&cid=1031771619197&path=!frontpage
>
>
> Good! Somebody had to bite the bullet and do it, let 'er rip. I'm
> betting that Manassas will become the focal point of the whole issue.
> It's likely gonna establish whether or not there's any money in it for
> the service providers, whether or not the interference BPL generates
> will terminally interfere with critical HF comms and how many of the
> plugged-in $29.95/month citizen users of BPL in Manassas identities
> get hacked, yadda, yadda, all of it.
>
> For better or worse let the battle begin win lose or draw.
>
> I vaguely remember Manassas being the last focal point of a much
> earlier national debate, something about Lee handing Grant his sword
> in Manassas . . is there some irony here?
>
> w3rv

There is no irony. Lee surrendered to Grant at the Appomattox
courthouse, which is not in Massassas. There is a good summary of the
Civil War battles at http://www2.cr.nps.gov/abpp/battles/bycampgn.htm.

N6JPO

1478. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-20 11:56:58 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@nope.org>
Message-ID: <iki7pv05dvmgcdpr6d5luqiitivtmf114t@4ax.com>
Source record: 81054

Jim,

I think I have the answers to your bonus quiz:

Hanging Fire (or Hang Fire) - an old military term used when a black powder artillery piece did not immediately fire when the priming charge was lit (could be a few seconds delay before the main charge was ignited). Still used in this context whenever modern ammunition misfires.

Doubling The Hill - this one is probably an old railroad term for the practice of seperating train cars and taking them up a steep hill in two runs, back when steam locomotives were common. Insufficient power to pull the entire train up the hill in one run would have necessitated this practice.

73, Leo

On 19 Oct 2003 18:28:53 GMT, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:

>* special bonus trivia section - how did the phrases "hanging fire" and
>"doubling the hill" originate?

1479. Re: What makes LHA so poor at simple research tasks?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-20 12:51:39 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3F93DA5B.3070108@psu.edu>
Source record: 81055

Dick Carroll wrote:

> Oh, my homebrew experience doesn't come close to Jim's either. But...

Okay, you qualify, Dick!

So far we have

PCTA

Jim - Large scale HB
Dick - Large scale HB
Mike - Med to large scale HB

NCTA

- Mike KB3EIA -

1480. Re: Reflections on rrap

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-20 12:56:33 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3F93DB81.6010601@psu.edu>
Source record: 81056

Brian wrote:

> I make beer and keg it, I also make wine and bottle it. I may have to
> make it all portable.

(Homer Simpson voice) mmmmmmmmmm....homebrewed beer!

NOW we're talking!

> I'm really looking forward to this gathering.

I'd love to sample one of yer brews too.

- Mike KB3EIA -

1481. Re: BPL a reality in my area now!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-20 14:05:14 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3F93EB9A.7040804@psu.edu>
Source record: 81058
Cross-posted to: alt.ham-radio,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Steve Robeson, K4CAP wrote:
> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0310151858.755a1d16@posting.google.com>...
>
>
>>>>What does BPL sound like? Can someone post a wav file somewhere so it can
>>>>be identified? Is it worse that the Pennsylvania QSO party?
>>>
>>> Did someone take over a frequency you owned?
>>
>
>>Mike, that was kinda rude.
>
>
> Whoa....BRAIN suggesting to someone else what is rude!

Whadid I doo? Heck just last weekend in a contest on 40 and 80 meters,
I went to some open frequencies and asked "is the frequency in use? And
several times a ham wouls reply and say "yes it is". Then nothing would
happen. Silence.

If those hams didn't own those frquencies they wouldn't lord over them
would they? No wonder they don't like us contesters. Those poor guys had
to sit by their radios all day to keep teletresspassers like me off
their frequencies!

- Mike KB3EIA -

1482. Re: BPL a reality in my area now!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-20 14:07:51 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3F93EC37.5010801@psu.edu>
Source record: 81059

Brian wrote:
> k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0310191837.3dbd9e9@posting.google.com>...
>
>>brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0310151858.755a1d16@posting.google.com>...
>>
>>
>>>>>What does BPL sound like? Can someone post a wav file somewhere so it can
>>>>>be identified? Is it worse that the Pennsylvania QSO party?
>>>>
>>>> Did someone take over a frequency you owned?
>>>
>>
>>
>>>Mike, that was kinda rude.
>>
>> Whoa....
>
>
> That's how a good Moresman stops his conveyance.

Nahh, all this was on SSB. Besides, I wasn't rude to the folks who
chased me off their frequencies. I just left quietly. That was the
essence of my question to the guy. Maybe he told someone in the contest
that it was his frequency and the other ham didn't listen to him.

- Mike KB3EIA -

1483. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-20 14:09:19 UTC
From: David Stinson <arc5@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3F93EC86.7B7177A3@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 81057

Duane Allen wrote:
>... Lee surrendered to Grant at the Appomattox
> courthouse, which is not in Massassas....

That whole "surrender" business is just Yankee propaganda-
completely made-up. Grant had been drinking again,
so General Lee got him to agree to a "tie."
It was covered up to protect Grant's presidential run
so his cronies could get power.
Yeeee-HAAA!
Dave S.

1484. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-20 15:25:26 UTC
From: Duane Allen <computeruser@sprintmail.com>
Message-ID: <G7Tkb.4374$S52.3309@newsread4.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 81060

David Stinson wrote:
> Duane Allen wrote:
>
>>... Lee surrendered to Grant at the Appomattox
>>courthouse, which is not in Massassas....
>
>
> That whole "surrender" business is just Yankee propaganda-
> completely made-up. Grant had been drinking again,
> so General Lee got him to agree to a "tie."
> It was covered up to protect Grant's presidential run
> so his cronies could get power.
> Yeeee-HAAA!
> Dave S.

Sorry, I forgot that these posts ended up in both North and South.

On a serious off-topic note, does anyone know what is being done to protec the CSA graveyards. Thanks in advance.

Duane Allen
N6JPO

1485. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-20 16:49:30 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <umUkb.5629$W16.3771@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 81061

"Dick Carroll" wrote:
>
> You're still obfuscating, Dwight! And you know it!
> No Code International means "no code test
> international" only because they were forced into
> making the addition. The negative response otherwise
> would have been overwhelming and they knew it,
> or soon found it out. But it didn't change The Agenda.

Well, I don't know anything about that, Dick. I visited their web site after reading something Jim said recently and saw absolutely nothing about a wider agenda to eliminate code itself. Since you seem aware of something more than their stated goals, perhaps you should present evidence of it here for all to see. Otherwise, it just appears you're attacking this group with unsubstantiated innuendo (and I'm tired of hearing unsubstantiated innuendo used as a political weapon in this country - it's sleazy, Dick).

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

1486. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-20 16:50:36 UTC
From: wn6bdb@hotmail.com
Message-ID: <fda4618.0310200850.6d6283ff@posting.google.com>
Source record: 81062

Does anyone know if there was any representation from the amateur community or the ARRL at this City Council meeting or during the "year-long preparation process"?

>
>The City Council voted unanimously on Thursday to grant a franchise to Prospect >Street Broadband, LLC., bringing a year-long preparation process to fruition
>

Steve

1487. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-20 17:17:28 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <IMUkb.5064$Uz6.558@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 81063

"Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
news:f45722ac.0310191809.259bb31a@posting.google.com...
> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<rwAkb.3892$W16.3275@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> > "Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
> > news:f45722ac.0310181506.14323acf@posting.google.com...
> > > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
> > news:<G6dkb.2252$W16.1566@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> > > > "Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
> > > > news:f45722ac.0310180649.48353ec@posting.google.com...
> > > > > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in
message
> > > > news:<jj_jb.1145$W16.793@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> > >
> > > > > > How Come with all these 'new' Ektra class tickets they STILL
ain't
> > covering
> > > > > > the HF bands?
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Perhaps they can't figure out how to cut that dipole, eh?
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Dan/W4NTI
> > > > > >
> > > > > So you're saying that HF HASN'T been ruined by hordes of unwashed
> > CBers?
> > > > >
> > > > No, Brian....I'm saying that they are too ignorant to get a signal
on
> > HF.
> > > > >
> > > > Dan/W4NTI
> > > >
> > > Bruce, thanks.
> > >
> > > Brian
> >
> > As usual, Brian opens mouth, and inserts foot.
> > If you are trying to infer that Bruce, WA8ULX, is not able to put up a
> > antenna for HF, you are wrong.
> >
> > I talked to him on 14.275 a month ago.
> >
> > Get over it.
> >

> > Dan/W4NTI
>
> Dan, it has nothing to do with Bruce's antenna. It has everything to
> do with your attitude, which could have easily come straight out of
> Bruce's mouth.
>
> Two (2) peas in a pod. You're just almost as vulgar as Bruce, the
> only real difference.
>
> Don't get over it, fix it.

What makes you think I care what you want, or like, or not like, or not want ? And who appointed you usenet god anyway? Not to mention that to tell someone who they can talk with is beyond reason.

Let me sum it up for you Brian...

If you don't like what I say, I do, I think, or who I talk with.....get over it.

Dan/W4NTI

1488. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-20 17:19:05 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <dOUkb.5066$Uz6.3378@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 81064

"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20031019222010.12785.00000654@mb-m19.aol.com...
> >I guess you've got four (4) hands between the both (2) of you.
> >
> >Go for it you sickos.
> >
>
> Dan do you think Brian is ALOT LITE in his shoes?

He does keep bringing it up, doesn't he?

Dan/W4NTI

1489. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-20 17:23:42 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0310200923.36d60847@posting.google.com>
Source record: 81065

Duane Allen <computeruser@sprintmail.com> wrote in message
news:<G3Qkb.3534$np1.3002@newsread3.news.pas.earthlink.net>...
> Brian Kelly wrote:
> > Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:<bmvsrr$79c$0@208.206.142.66>...
> >
> >>CHeck this out...
> >>
> >>
> >>http://www.potomacnews.com/servlet/Satellite?pagename=WPN%2FMGArticle%2FWPN_BasicArtic
le&c=MGArticle&cid=1031771619197&path=!frontpage
> >
> >
> > Good! Somebody had to bite the bullet and do it, let 'er rip. I'm
> > betting that Manassas will become the focal point of the whole issue.
> > It's likely gonna establish whether or not there's any money in it for
> > the service providers, whether or not the interference BPL generates
> > will terminally interfere with critical HF comms and how many of the
> > plugged-in $29.95/month citizen users of BPL in Manassas identities
> > get hacked, yadda, yadda, all of it.
> >
> > For better or worse let the battle begin win lose or draw.
> >
> > I vaguely remember Manassas being the last focal point of a much
> > earlier national debate, something about Lee handing Grant his sword
> > in Manassas . . is there some irony here?
> >
> > w3rv
>
>
> There is no irony. Lee surrendered to Grant at the Appomattox
> courthouse, which is not in Massassas. There is a good summary of the
> Civil War battles at http://www2.cr.nps.gov/abpp/battles/bycampgn.htm.

You're right of course, my memory is a lot more vague than I thought
it was. BPL in Manassas is the Third Battle of Bull Run . . will that
work for you??

> N6JPO

1490. Re: Amateur Radio in the 21st Century?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-20 18:13:05 UTC
From: groupk0hb@earthlink.net
Message-ID: <5ee63311.0310201013.2d97c073@posting.google.com>
Source record: 81066

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote

>
> The paper claims to have three authors. Have you read it?
>

The paper claims to have FOUR authors. Yes, I have read it,
apparently more carefully than you have.

73, de Hans, K0HB

1491. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-20 18:15:54 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031020141554.00574.00000472@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 81067

>He does keep bringing it up, doesn't he?
>
>Dan/W4NTI
>

Well Dan you know he is an NCI Member, that should have given us a CLUE.

1492. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-20 18:29:27 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bn19i7eqi0@208.206.142.75>
Source record: 81068

Dwight Stewart wrote:
> "Dick Carroll" wrote:
>
>>You're still obfuscating, Dwight! And you know it!
>>No Code International means "no code test
>>international" only because they were forced into
>>making the addition. The negative response otherwise
>>would have been overwhelming and they knew it,
>>or soon found it out. But it didn't change The Agenda.
>
>
>
> Well, I don't know anything about that, Dick. I visited their web site
> after reading something Jim said recently and saw absolutely nothing about a
> wider agenda to eliminate code itself. Since you seem aware of something
> more than their stated goals, perhaps you should present evidence of it here
> for all to see. Otherwise, it just appears you're attacking this group with
> unsubstantiated innuendo (and I'm tired of hearing unsubstantiated innuendo
> used as a political weapon in this country - it's sleazy, Dick).
>

This isn't a court of law, Dwight, and the level of evidence required
to make up ones mind depends on the indivual and his attention and
perception levels. So your effort to demand court-grade evidence falls
flat on its face.
Evidence is plentiful and much
of it has been displayed right here on rrap to see, even recently, with
of course some disclaimers to match. If you missed all that it would be
because you wanted to miss it, or just don't care enough to pay attention.

And yes, some if it is a bit sleazy as you note. But you misidentified
it a bit, as usual.

1493. Re: Student That Did Razor Test is a Ham.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-20 20:50:26 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <mUXkb.12985$mb2.3572@news01.roc.ny>
Source record: 81069

He's refering to the guy who told the government he was going to smuggle banned items into an aircraft and did so and got caught. Not exactly the smartest move in the world. I think the reference is to smuggling a razor aboard an aircraft. He may get some free room and board out of this (in a federal pen).

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

"Rev. Firefly" <foosw32@juno.com> wrote in message
news:1066619115.306880@newshost03.voicenet.com...
> What pray tell the phrig is a "razor test"...???

1494. Re: BPL a reality in my area now!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-20 20:59:59 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0310201259.58c7060a@posting.google.com>
Source record: 81070

Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message news:<3F93EC37.5010801@psu.edu>...
> Brian wrote:
> > k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0310191837.3dbd9e9@posting.google.com>...
> >
> >>brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0310151858.755a1d16@posting.google.com>...
> >>
> >>
> >>>>>What does BPL sound like? Can someone post a wav file somewhere so it can
> >>>>>be identified? Is it worse that the Pennsylvania QSO party?
> >>>>
> >>>> Did someone take over a frequency you owned?
> >>>
> >>
> >>
> >>>Mike, that was kinda rude.
> >>
> >> Whoa....
> >
> >
> > That's how a good Moresman stops his conveyance.
>
> Nahh, all this was on SSB. Besides, I wasn't rude to the folks who
> chased me off their frequencies. I just left quietly. That was the
> essence of my question to the guy. Maybe he told someone in the contest
> that it was his frequency and the other ham didn't listen to him.
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -

Mike, you must realize that its important for these guys to retell
their biopsy stories day after day, year after year, and any
interruption by any danged contest is unacceptable. ;^)

Brian

1495. Re: BPL a reality in my area now!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-20 21:07:49 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031020170749.09953.00000602@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 81071

>Mike, you must realize that its important for these guys to retell
>their biopsy stories day after day, year after year, and any
>interruption by any danged contest is unacceptable. ;^)
>
>Brian

What makes you think you can tell anyone what to say, or talk about on Ham Radio. Go back to 11 meters CBer

1496. Re: Student That Did Razor Test is a Ham.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-20 22:28:57 UTC
From: Jack Twilley <jmt+usenet@twilley.org>
Message-ID: <86d6cr7dcm.fsf@duchess.twilley.org>
Source record: 81072

```
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

>>>>> "Jim" == Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> writes:

Jim> He's refering to the guy who told the government he was going to
Jim> smuggle banned items into an aircraft and did so and got caught.
Jim> Not exactly the smartest move in the world. I think the
Jim> reference is to smuggling a razor aboard an aircraft. He may get
Jim> some free room and board out of this (in a federal pen).

Actually, the individual in question smuggled banned items onto
multiple aircraft, including notes describing the contents and
providing plenty of contact information for himself. He then emailed
the TSA at the end of his trip.

The items were not discovered until five weeks after his trip. Then
the TSA found the emails and passed them to the FBI which came to get
him.

I think he knew what he was doing. I don't agree with what he did,
but he made a statement and he appears to be willing to do the time.

Jack.
- --
Jack Twilley
jmt at twilley dot org
http colon slash slash www dot twilley dot org slash tilde jmt slash
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: GnuPG v1.2.3 (FreeBSD)

iD8DBQE/lGGuGPFSfAB/ezgRAhpiAJ43Qrlewm6tb/PLBUONd9/pop4+tACfY8p1
GvPIKZydYULm5V4/PamZyuA=
=I8OC
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----
```

1497. Re: Amateur Radio in the 21st Century?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-20 22:29:22 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031020182922.08626.00001309@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 81076

In article <20031019201627.07346.00001305@mb-m26.aol.com>, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) writes:

>Had he been willing to settle
>for the conquest and control of the whole of Western and Central Europe,
>he may have had the forces in place to resist the Allied invasion, and
>thus given Germany the time to develop it's own atomic weapons. This,
>of course, would have quite a dilemma for the Allies, since Hitler,
>madman he was, would have then most likely employed his nuclear
>arsenal -- most likely on Russia, England, and possibly the U.S. We,
>of course, would have had to nuke him first to prevent that from
>happening. Therefore, in a way, Hitler did the rest of the world a favor
>in his futile attempt to conquer Russia conventionally. A military
>genius he was not. If the Austrian Corporal had been a real General
>instead, a lot of us may not be here today.

Nice theory but some would dispute it thusly:

The big mistake was not the invasion of the Soviet Union, but rather the twin classic blunders of dividing one's forces and not being logistically prepared. Had the invaders gone straight for their enemy's capital (Moscow), and been properly prepared for the winter, the result might well have been very different.

The German atomic program would not have come up with a workable atomic weapon for many years (but the Allies did not know that). Look at what it took for the Manhattan project to make three weapons!. And Germany did not have a delivery system.

Germany also messed up bigtime by not giving U-boat production and development top priority and support. Large amounts of their limited naval resources were wasted on superbattleships like Bismarck and Tirpitz - had they built improved U-boats with those resources, again the result might well have been very different.

Then there's the Enigma story...

A good thing they weren't smarter.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1498. Re: Amateur Radio in the 21st Century?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-20 22:29:23 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031020182923.08626.00001310@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 81075

In article <5ee63311.0310201013.2d97c073@posting.google.com>,
groupk0hb@earthlink.net (Hans K0HB) writes:

>n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote
>
>>
>> The paper claims to have three authors. Have you read it?
>>
>
>The paper claims to have FOUR authors. Yes, I have read it,
>apparently more carefully than you have.
>
At the very end, only three people are named - the principal author, "with
assistance from" two others. That's three, last time I checked.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1499. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-20 22:29:24 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031020182924.08626.00001312@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 81073

In article <iki7pv05dvmgcdpr6d5luqiitivtmf114t@4ax.com>, Leo <nomail@nope.org>
writes:

>Jim,
>
>I think I have the answers to your bonus quiz:
>
>Hanging Fire (or Hang Fire) - an old military term used when a black
>powder artillery piece did not immediately fire when the priming
>charge was lit (could be a few seconds delay before the main charge
>was ignited). Still used in this context whenever modern ammunition
>misfires.

Also used in connection with cord-fused explosives in blasting for mining,
tunneling, etc. Hang-fires were one of the reasons for the change to blasting
caps.
>
>Doubling The Hill - this one is probably an old railroad term for the
>practice of seperating train cars and taking them up a steep hill in
>two runs, back when steam locomotives were common. Insufficient power
>to pull the entire train up the hill in one run would have
>necessitated this practice.
>
Give the man a cee-gar!

Sometimes the problem was lack of motive power, but there was also the factor
of coupler strength and rail adhesion.

Modern RRs are well-documented enough know that horsepower and train
characteristics are figured out ahead of time by computers.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1500. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-20 22:29:24 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031020182924.08626.00001311@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 81074

In article <3F93EC86.7B7177A3@ix.netcom.com>, David Stinson
<arc5@ix.netcom.com> writes:

>Duane Allen wrote:
>>... Lee surrendered to Grant at the Appomattox
>> courthouse, which is not in Massassas....
>
>That whole "surrender" business is just Yankee propaganda-
>completely made-up.

Not completely - bofum *were* at Appomatox,,,,

>Grant had been drinking again,
>so General Lee got him to agree to a "tie."
>It was covered up to protect Grant's presidential run
>so his cronies could get power.

That's not how I heard it!

It was explained to me that Grant stole Lee's sword, and Lee was too much of a
gentleman to ask for it back.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1501. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va (MANASSAS Va - BPL RED ALERT!!!)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-20 22:41:30 UTC
From: phatang <phatang@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <1066690485.109640@newshost03.voicenet.com>
Source record: 81077
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.digital,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.space,rec.radio.scanner,rec.radio.shortwave

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:bmvsrr$79c$0@208.206.142.66...
> CHeck this out...
>
>
>
http://www.potomacnews.com/servlet/Satellite?pagename=WPN%2FMGArticle%2FWPN
_BasicArticle&c=MGArticle&cid=1031771619197&path=!frontpage
>

Innovative Web access to shock Manassas
SARI KREIGER
skreiger@potomacnews.com
Saturday, October 18, 2003

Manassas residents will soon be the first in the United States
to buy Internet access over city power lines.
The City Council voted unanimously on Thursday to
grant a franchise to Prospect Street Broadband, LLC.,
bringing a year-long preparation process to fruition.

Residents can purchase the service within 120 days of
the contract signing, which is expected to occur
next week, according to Energy Services Manager Brett Massey.
In May 2002, a small pilot group of city residents and
businesses began using the service. A modem is plugged into
the electrical outlet on one end, and the computer on the
other, to gain high-speed access to the Internet.
"They were very impressed by the speed, reliability
and flexibility," said Utilities Director Allen Todd.

Freda Wallace, an administrative assistant with Robert
Loveless Architecture in Old Town Manassas said the
company has been receiving the service since February.
"We've had good service with it," Wallace said. "The
only time it has been down is because of our
equipment, or because they're testing something on
the lines because it is a pilot program."

The Connecticut-based company that received the
franchise will be responsible for the equipment,
connection, monthly billing, advertising and
24-hour-a-day, seven-day-a-week customer
support. The city will expand the current fiber

network, which is almost complete, update optical
electronics and install and maintain equipment
external to the residents' homes.

"The grantee will be providing most of the capital
of this project and assume most of the risk," said
John Hewa, assistant electric director for the
City of Manassas. "There's very little financial
risk to the city."

John F. Berry, chairman and CEO of Prospect Street
Broadband, said the service is very easy to use and
no special training is necessary. Residents can purchase
the service and obtain access from any city outlet.
"You sign up once and you can sign on at home,
a friend's house, the ice skating rink, where ever," Berry said.

If residents opt for this Internet service provider, they will
pay approximately half of normal high-speed access, as
the tentative service price is $29.95 a month for
residents, and $69.95 for commercial access.
"It will be competitively priced and a quality service,"
said Vice Mayor Harry J. Parrish II.
Wallace said the service was comparable in speed to
any DSL program available. "It's very fast," she said.

And as a fringe benefit, the city can also monitor power
outages through this technology. Todd said the city has
been trying for years to achieve that capability.
Two bids were received on Sept. 8, and Todd said the
city spent a considerable amount of time examining
both proposals to ensure the best outcome for residents.
"We've never had a franchise quite like this before," Todd
said. "We wanted to make sure we had measures that
would protect the services we promise the citizens."

The contract that the council voted to approve calls for a
10-year term, with a five-year extension. A minimum
payment of $24,000 after the first year, and $124,000
after the second and third year is guaranteed to the city.
Initial figures project that Manassas could receive up
to $4.5 million in revenue after the 10-year period.
Councilman Ulysses X. White questioned city staff
about future price hikes, as he was reminiscent of
a similar situation with cable television in the city.
But Todd said with competition available, residents
wouldn't be stuck with high bills and no options.
Rather, this new offer gives residents exactly that -- options.

Councilman Eugene R. Rainville said residents will benefit
from an extra use of the electrical system their tax dollars already fund.
"Now they can get Internet at a low price," Rainville said.

"I would encourage all of our citizens to at least look at it as an alternative."
And according to Parrish, residents may receive an added bonus if enough people patronize this service. "It looks like the council might have the opportunity to look at tax reduction," Parrish said.

---------- cut ----------

Some Links:

City of Manassas Va: http://www.manassascity.org/

Manassas Town Commissioners and Board: http://www.manassascity.org/city_government/index.html

Prospect Street Broadband, LLC: http://www.prospectstreet.com/

Manassas Va ARC (Old Va Hams ARC): http://www.w4ovh.net/

1502. Mother Brakob, Listen Up!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-20 23:30:34 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031020193034.06226.00001046@mb-m19.aol.com>
Source record: 81078

Hate to tell you this, but your son Hans seems to have run away from home.

A bit over a week ago he got all uppity and had a hissy-fit over some alleged "poor research" on Reg Fessenden's 1906 voice broadcast.

Your son must have been so ashamed he can't comment on my reply...which referenced a McGraw-Hill publication special edition, verbatim, even to the page and column location.

Your son must still think it is possible to voice-modulate a SPARK transmitter. Pity that, considering he is a (self-stated) "degreed-before-USN-service Master Chief" now a Manager at an electronics company.

Voice modulating a spark transmitter would be like trying to voice modulate a doorbell buzzer. It creates something that may sound like voice but it sure isn't intelligible. You should encourage him to work on the techniique. It might even make an interesting project to highlight the tube fanzine called "Electric Radio!"

Mama Brakob, your son also loved to make the comment that "gentlemen can disagree without being disagreeable." He then went and started a whole new thread by being as disagreeable as possible. You've lost him somehow, Mom Brakob.

I do hope you find your son again and impress upon him good virtues. Keep the candle lit in the window and GOOD LUCK ON THIS ONE NOW!

Best regards,
Len Anderson
retired (from regular hours) electronic engineer person

1503. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-20 23:35:36 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031020193536.15462.00003735@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 81079

In article <8QKib.49381$mQ2.35348@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> writes:

>"Dick Carroll" <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com> wrote:
>>
>> I still find it beyond incredible that persons who would
>> learn all that goes into making an engineer would have
>> any problem whatever with learning the most basic radio
>> communications skill at the most minimal level.

> Because, as far as the "engineer" is concerned, it (code) isn't a "basic
>radio communications skill" today, Dick.

Perhaps - but we're amateurs, remember? Not professionals.

>It hasn't been for several decades,
>at least. As far as I know, not a single college-based communications,
>radio, electronics, or engineering, course today offers instruction in code
>"skill."

None of them I ever heard of did, either. Nor did any of them require typing, speech or voice lessons for engineers. The radio part of EE is about building radios, not using them.

Radio is but a small part of electrical engineering, and it keeps getting smaller as other technologies come along. Heck, the hot subject in communications today is fiber optics - which works by on-off keying!

>Likewise, few, if any, employers are seeking that "skill."
>Therefore, it (code) simply isn't relevant to any of these careers.
>
Neither are a whole lot of other things hams do!

73 de Jim, N2EY

1504. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-20 23:35:38 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031020193538.15462.00003736@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 81080

In article <Lp6ib.32560$mQ2.770@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote:
>>
>> Neither have I, Dwight. As I have pointed out, the
>> ARRL/READEX survey is 7 years old. But it's the
>> most recent *scientific* survey we have. (Its 1500
>> respondents were chosen at random, not self-selected
>> as is the case in many "surveys".)
>
> Okay, perhaps it wasn't you.

I'm pretty sure it wasn't me.

>Someone posted the results of a survey done
>by some club or group in Minnesota, Michigan, or somewhere like that, just a
>week or so ago and I thought you were talking about that survey. I haven't
>seen the survey you're talking about here so can't really comment on it.

It's now about 7 years old but is the most recent one that can be considered "scientific" by any stretch of the imagination.

>> That sort of behavior is unacceptable. Not "real ham"
>> behavior.
>
> Luckily, it is rare. The club in Washington was very open to all. This
>club isn't.

Then it's not worth belonging to anyway. Hostility towards another ham just because of license class - *any* license class - isn't the way 'real hams' behave.

>Sadly, the fact that a club elsewhere is different doesn't
>really help those who are here. I've considered starting an alternative
>club, but I'm afraid the strong position of that club will quickly turn
>anything like that into a pro-testing versus anti-code testing situation
>(fed by members of both groups) which will not really benefit anybody in the
>long term.

dang - wish you were in this area, Dwight.

While some folks around here have strong feelings one way and the other about code testing, it's considered very bad form to exclude or denigrate anybody based simply on their code-test opinion. Of course, if someone starts excluding or denigrating, they will often find themselves excluded and denigrated - even by those who agree with their opinion.

Not that it helps things where *you* are.
>
>> How do we know that there are "far more outside that
>> organization..involved"?
>
> Well, since most Amateur Radio operators don't join any type of club
>(local, ARRl, or whatever), it's a fairly safe assumption.

We'll have to agree to disagree on that.

But it raises a good question: what are most hams actually doing? Look at the number of Generals, Advanceds and Extras (hams with lots of HF privileges) - the total is well over 300,000. If even 3% of them were on HF at any given time, the bands would be packed bandedge to bandedge. (there's only 3550 kHz from the bottom of 80 to the top of 10 - less space than 6 or 2 meters!)
>
>> Most of those opposed to code testing I have encountered
>> here *are* members of NCI. (snip)
>
> Do you know that for a fact, or did you just assume they were members like
>you did with me?

I have seen them sign with their NCI numbers or otherwise mention membership. You're the exception.
>
>> No "onsession" at all. I'm just curious as to why someone who
>> felt strongly or even mildly that code testing should go would
>> *not* join that organization. (snip)
>
> Do you feel most who support code testing are members of FISTS or other
>such clubs? I don't think so.

True - but FISTS costs $15/year to belong to. NCI is free. And until recently, FISTS did not take a position on code testing.

>Based on what I've seen, there is a general
>trend throughout this country not to participate in clubs or other such
>groups. About the only exception to that is national political groups, which
>seem to be gaining members.
>
Sad but true. A very big part of the reason, I think is lack of time. Not that we have any more or less time people had in previous times, but that we use it differently and have different expectations. In my case, for example, free time comes in little bits and pieces in between responsibilities.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1505. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-20 23:35:38 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031020193538.15462.00003737@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 81081

In article <7_fkb.2490$W16.380@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> writes:

>"N2EY" wrote:
>>
>> Because people are not specific. Look at thread
>> subject lines like "drop the code" or "IARU says
>> drop Morse". And there's a group what goes by
>> the name "No-Code International" - not "No
>> Code TEST International".

> All writers assume a certain level of knowledge on the part of their
>target readers. The same is true for this newsgroup. Most here are aware of
>the code testing debate, so there isn't any reason to restate the issue each
>time something is said.

I disagree! There's a world of difference between "drop the code" and "drop the code test".

>As for NCI, the names of many groups don't exactly
>reflect the group's publicly stated goals. For example, the Red Cross
>doesn't go around painting crosses red and the Salvation Army doesn't fight
>religious wars.

Actually, the Salvation Army *is* fighting a religious *war* of sorts - against evil.

If someone is against the code *test*, then let them take the trouble to spell it out.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1506. Re: Amateur Radio in the 21st Century?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-21 00:03:53 UTC
From: groupk0hb@earthlink.net
Message-ID: <5ee63311.0310201603.f0b770b@posting.google.com>
Source record: 81082

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote

> At the very end, only three people are named - the
> principal author, "with assistance from" two others.
> That's three, last time I checked.

Yep, it most soy-tainly am!

And at the beginning of the paper he names himself, W5YI, W3BE, and
W4WW. That's four, last time I checked.

Maybe he's trying to confuse us.

73, Hans, K0HB

1507. Re: 14.313 Jamming.K9BSD, N9PGE, and KK9G.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-21 00:40:59 UTC
From: Clint <"rattlehead at computron dot net">
Message-ID: <vp907lmbbf25db@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 81083
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.swap,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

"Twice Fired" <loser@mulatto.com> wrote in message
news:FxHkb.25379$5n.6961@bignews5.bellsouth.net...
> Jamming on 313? K9BSD, N9PGE, KK9G have been doing that from central
> indiana for years..... No wives, no life, nothing. Just a whiskey bottle
> and ocd. Truly pathetic...
>

HOW CAN THAT BE?!?!?!? You must obviously be mistaken. Those guys
passed morse code tests, and yet they're disruptive, cause trouble and
violate
the ham radio laws & rules laid forth by the FCC?

I was *sure* the PCTA crowd said that the morse code test was an adequate
filter to keep out the "CBplussers".

Clint
KB5ZHT

1508. Re: FCC relaxes it's prohibition on use of the "F-word" on broadcast media.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-21 00:55:30 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3F948400.8030205@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 81084

N2EY wrote:

>
>One argument FCC can use to defend the "different rules" thing is that
>broadcasting works to a published schedule and the shows are rated in advance.
>If you tune in Howard Stern on the radio or the Victoria's Secret Xmas special
>on TV, you have a pretty good idea of what you'll hear/see. But on ham radio
>there's no schedule, no program guide and no advance ratings.
>
>
Used to be, if you were in LA and tuned in 147.435, one could expect to
hear similar
material. Not that I agree with the existence of such on a ham band,
but it was there.

1509. Re: A New Concept: Virtual Spectrum

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-21 01:06:01 UTC
From: Deos <lineoffiretoday@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bn210k$1ce$1@nic.grnet.gr>
Source record: 81085
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.antiques.radio+phono,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc

ok lets burn our rig's
use our certificates as toilet paper
and go to the chat rooms.

--
http://www.qsl.net/sv1hao
"David Stinson" <arc5@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
news:3F8B4D6D.31D19695@ix.netcom.com...
> Thanks for reading this.
> I have today submitted an article to QST magazine entitled
> "Virtual Spectrum: Beating BPL at its own game,"
> detailing a concept that can greatly impact our radio hobby.
> I wanted to "put down a marker" to date the introduction
> of a new ham-radio innovation, and to officially place
> the idea in the public domain, so the maximum amount of
> "tinkering" with it can happen.
>
> This concept uses the bandwidth available on the Internet
> and some simple circuitry to create a replica of a segment of
> the radio spectrum, stream it live or prerecorded to another
> internet-connected computer and reconstruct that radio spectrum
> at your location. *Any* radio equipment you wish to use
> (given an Internet connection with sufficent bandwidth)-
> from modern PSK-31 rigs, SSB nets, WW-II modulated oscillators
> all the way back to ancient spark transmitters
> with crystal receivers; all can legally communicate just as though
> you were on-the-air. The system is bi-directional, allowing
> QSOs between stations that normally could not communicate.
> If you can't hear weak signals because of noise in your area,
> the concept allows you to build a "remote front end" and
> transport the radio spectrum in a quiet area right to your rig,
> bypassing the problems in your location.
>
> I believe this concept can be the answer to BPL, "noise holes,"
> antenna restrictions, HF "jammers" and many other obstacles to
> using our radios. There is great potential for many uses,
> and a possible niche market for someone with the resources
> to develop the equipment.
> I have already built prototype equipment to prove the concept
> and it works splendidly. The article includes construction
> details. The circuits are simple and you can get
> 95% of the parts at Radio Shack.
> By the time QST publishes (assume they accept the work),

> we should have completed the first Virtual Spectrum QSO:
> two World War 2 BC-611 handie-talkies (output: about 60 milliwatts)
> will communicate over a path of about 2000 miles.
>
> If QST does not publish the concept,
> I will publish it myself on the web
> immediatly after hearing from them.
> I am indebted to Mike Hanz, aafradio@cox.net
> for invaluable suggestions and encouragement.
>
> TNX ES 73 DE Dave Stinson AB5S

1510. Re: Amateur Radio in the 21st Century?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-21 01:28:53 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031020212853.11891.00001652@mb-m11.aol.com>
Source record: 81086

In article <5ee63311.0310201603.f0b770b@posting.google.com>,
groupk0hb@earthlink.net (Hans K0HB) writes:

>n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote
>
>> At the very end, only three people are named - the
>> principal author, "with assistance from" two others.
>> That's three, last time I checked.
>
>Yep, it most soy-tainly am!

HAW!!
>
>And at the beginning of the paper he names himself, W5YI, W3BE, and
>W4WW. That's four, last time I checked.

Of course!

But if you read that paragraph carefully, (the one where he names the "Gang of
Four", which is his phrase, not mine), you'll see that the Four named above are
the NCVEC Rules Committee, not necessarily the authors of the paper.

I say it's three, based on the signature.

To-may-to, to-mah-to, what matters is the content. Some very good ideas and
some very bad ideas.

73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>Maybe he's trying to confuse us.

1511. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-21 01:37:56 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <U50lb.7695$W16.4855@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 81087

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:umUkb.5629$W16.3771@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> "Dick Carroll" wrote:
> >
> > You're still obfuscating, Dwight! And you know it!
> > No Code International means "no code test
> > international" only because they were forced into
> > making the addition. The negative response otherwise
> > would have been overwhelming and they knew it,
> > or soon found it out. But it didn't change The Agenda.
>
>
> Well, I don't know anything about that, Dick. I visited their web site
> after reading something Jim said recently and saw absolutely nothing about
a
> wider agenda to eliminate code itself. Since you seem aware of something
> more than their stated goals, perhaps you should present evidence of it
here
> for all to see. Otherwise, it just appears you're attacking this group
with
> unsubstantiated innuendo (and I'm tired of hearing unsubstantiated
innuendo
> used as a political weapon in this country - it's sleazy, Dick).

Dwight,

You're absolutely correct. Dick practices the
basic fundamentals of propoganda tactics...to wit:
say it often enough and some people will believe it.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1512. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-21 01:42:05 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <N90lb.7700$W16.1793@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 81088

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:bn19i7eqi0@208.206.142.75...
> Dwight Stewart wrote:
> > "Dick Carroll" wrote:
> >
> >>You're still obfuscating, Dwight! And you know it!
> >>No Code International means "no code test
> >>international" only because they were forced into
> >>making the addition. The negative response otherwise
> >>would have been overwhelming and they knew it,
> >>or soon found it out. But it didn't change The Agenda.
> >
> > Well, I don't know anything about that, Dick. I visited their web site
> > after reading something Jim said recently and saw absolutely nothing
about a
> > wider agenda to eliminate code itself. Since you seem aware of something
> > more than their stated goals, perhaps you should present evidence of it
here
> > for all to see. Otherwise, it just appears you're attacking this group
with
> > unsubstantiated innuendo (and I'm tired of hearing unsubstantiated
innuendo
> > used as a political weapon in this country - it's sleazy, Dick).
>
> This isn't a court of law, Dwight, and the level of evidence required
> to make up ones mind depends on the indivual and his attention and
> perception levels.

That's true as to individual opinions. Not true, however, as to your
ability to convince others.

> So your effort to demand court-grade evidence falls
> flat on its face.

Actually, your inability to respond speaks volumes to the
veracity and truthfulness of your claims.

> Evidence is plentiful and much
> of it has been displayed right here on rrap to see, even recently, with
> of course some disclaimers to match. If you missed all that it would be
> because you wanted to miss it, or just don't care enough to pay attention.

More vague inuendo from Dick.

> And yes, some if it is a bit sleazy as you note. But you misidentified
> it a bit, as usual.

What the hell are you (Dick) talking about now?

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1513. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-21 01:46:47 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <be0lb.7704$W16.7123@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 81089

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20031020193536.15462.00003735@mb-m06.aol.com...
> In article <8QKib.49381$mQ2.35348@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>,
"Dwight
> Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> writes:
>
> >"Dick Carroll" <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com> wrote:
> >>
> >> I still find it beyond incredible that persons who would
> >> learn all that goes into making an engineer would have
> >> any problem whatever with learning the most basic radio
> >> communications skill at the most minimal level.
>
> > Because, as far as the "engineer" is concerned, it (code) isn't a
"basic
> >radio communications skill" today, Dick.
>
> Perhaps - but we're amateurs, remember? Not professionals.
>
> >It hasn't been for several decades,
> >at least. As far as I know, not a single college-based communications,
> >radio, electronics, or engineering, course today offers instruction in
code
> >"skill."
>
> None of them I ever heard of did, either. Nor did any of them require
typing,
> speech or voice lessons for engineers. The radio part of EE is about
building
> radios, not using them.
>
> Radio is but a small part of electrical engineering, and it keeps getting
> smaller as other technologies come along. Heck, the hot subject in
> communications today is fiber optics - which works by on-off keying!

While it is true that fiber technology today is digitally based, fiber
can actually be used for an analog transmisison function if someone
wanted to.

> >Likewise, few, if any, employers are seeking that "skill."
> >Therefore, it (code) simply isn't relevant to any of these careers.
> >
> Neither are a whole lot of other things hams do!
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1514. Re: Reflections on rrap

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-21 01:56:10 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0310201756.40c22259@posting.google.com>
Source record: 81090

brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0310200313.651b6fb9@posting.google.com>...
> k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0310191842.c9abd41@posting.google.com>...
> > brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0310151708.26ac0f28@posting.google.com>...
> >
> > > Kim, get the OM a shiney new pair of HD brass-riveted jeans and
> > > yourself a shiney new HD steel-belted brittany spear brazier, and join
> > > us at Dayton 04.
> >
> > What was it you were suggesting to Mike Coslo about being rude,
> > Brain?
> >
> > > I promise I won't make any Texas jokes til you'se guys show up.
> >
> > A promie from you is like pre-election fodder....
> >
> > > By the way, do you know how they separate the men from the boys in
> > > Texas...
> > >
> > > Brain, (more or less.)
> >
> > Then I dare say you'd best not go to Texas...You've been
> > seperated from your brain for a long time.
> >
> > Steve, K4YZ
>
> It was my attempt to get Kim to lighten up a little.
>
> But you don't know how to do that - always on the job as the RRAP
> Avenging Angel, I see.

No, Brain, it was YOUR "Avenging Angel" personna that was at
work. When YOU do something like that it's "levity"...trying to get
someone to "lighten up". When I say something similar you whip out
this new "Avenging Angel" spin in order to try and disguise your own
conduct.

I say it's yet one more example of following in the footsteps of
Lennie the Liar..."Don't So As I Do...Do As I Say"...

Bascially, I just think you're two-faced.

Steve, K4YZ

1515. Re: Amateur Radio Newsline? Report 1365 ? October 10 2003

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-21 02:01:45 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0310201801.6ec543bd@posting.google.com>
Source record: 81091

brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0310200310.3998b5f7@posting.google.com>...
> k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0310191845.4f2a1f33@posting.google.com>...
> > brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0310150430.4c80244d@posting.google.com>...
> >
> > > And its not all NOAA. Air Force Weather runs a number of solar
> > > observatories around the globe, polarimeter stations, and
> > > rocketsondes.
> >
> > A bit of news passed to you via back-channel from Lennie, or were
> > you reading some 1950's era "This Is The Air Force" books, Brain?
> > They've only been doing this since the inception of the Air Force.
> >
> > Steve, K4YZ
>
> Stebe, I was AF Weather. You washed out and became a cook.

If you say so...The only time I "cooked" in the line of duty in
the USMC was heating C-Rats while in boot and on the trail.

And your having been a weather guesser in the USAF in no way
changes the facts vis-a-vis your earlier comments...The "facts" you
cited were all things being done in the Armed Forces for decades
before your signed on the line.

Big deal.

Steve, K4YZ

1516. Re: FISTS Postion to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-21 02:03:37 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0310201803.27808aae@posting.google.com>
Source record: 81092

brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0310200308.3853fb1d@posting.google.com>...
> k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0310191854.7c9b40ed@posting.google.com>...
> > brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0310140535.1180f438@posting.google.com>...
> > > k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0310091237.75c4f23c@posting.google.com>...
> > > > k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0309190239.2b7bcf38@posting.google.com>...
> > > > > lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20030916205913.12501.00002450@mb-m04.aol.com>...
> > > > > > In article <bk4b7e$p383g$8@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>, "Ryan, KC8PMX"
> > > > > > <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> writes:
> > > > > >
> > > > > > >All of the above answers would be correct (barring accidental typos), but
> > > > > > >the original poster of the question in the first place DID NOT SPECIFY.
> > > > > > >See, it is important, unless you consider ALL antennas to be exactly
> > > > > > >one-half wavelength in length.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Dan thinks "all" dipoles are half-wavelength...
> > > > >
> > > > > Lennie...WHAT did the "FISTS" organization have to do with
> > > > > ANYTHING in this thread YOU started with their name...???
> > > >
> > > > Hey Lennie...Three weeks too short for you to answer a question?
> > > >
> > > > Steve, K4YZ
> > >
> > > Talking to yourself again?
> >
> > And where do you see me asking myself questions, Brain?
>
> So all conversations with yourself must be in the form of an Inquisition?

Brain, I asked you a specific question, and you did not answer it.

WHERE do you see me asking MYSELF questions in ANY of those posts?

Good luck with this one now.

Steve, K4YZ

1517. Re: ARRL you can Kiss my $39.00 a Year Good Bye

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-21 02:06:48 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0310201806.5a92cf4e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 81093

brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0310191844.6f5feb6e@posting.google.com>...
> k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0310162146.f2d85ce@posting.google.com>...
> > brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0310140528.3c0cad0e@posting.google.com>...
> > > k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20031012123106.28806.00000085@mb-m25.aol.com>...
>
> > > Mean like how YOU let LENNIE "pass" with use of
> > > > snide remarks, blatant lies, profanity and obvious misdirection of his posts,
> > > > but then accuse others of the same thing without comment...?!?!
> > >
> > > You don't seem to like that much, do you?
> >
> > It's not a matter of what I like or don't like, MinnieLennie.
>
> Ahem, that would be MinnieStebie.
>
> > You are a person wrought with confusion and an odd sense of what you
> > consider appropriate.
>
> You are inappropriate, Mentor Stebe.
>
> > You publically announce your afinity for a person known to be a
> > pathological liar and then go about calling other people names and
> > making unsubstantiated allegations about them. Pretty silly, Brain.
>
> Stebe.
>
> > If you enjoy placing your private parts in publically operated
> > pencil sharpeners, be my guest...but don't whine about it when your
> > parts get ground up when someone else turns the crank (pun intended)
>
> So do you wear a nurses dress when you play masochist?
>
> > > > Now...about those T5 logs and your "authorization" to operate in Somalia?
> > >
> > > Correct. I was authorized.
> >
> > Not according to the evidence you've supplied, you weren't.
>
> What evidence have I supplied?

Exactly...No Evidence = No Proof = Brian's Lying. No problem.

Steve, K4YZ

1518. Re: What makes LHA so poor at simple research tasks?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-21 02:09:50 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3F9493F6.8958BC59@earthlink.net>
Source record: 81094

Mike Coslo wrote:
>
> Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> > Oh, my homebrew experience doesn't come close to Jim's either. But...
>
> Okay, you qualify, Dick!
>
> So far we have
>
> PCTA
>
> Jim - Large scale HB
> Dick - Large scale HB
> Mike - Med to large scale HB

Mike,

Count me in.

Numerous linear amplifiers:

4 x 6146, pair of 811A's, pair 813's, 4-1000

antennas:

duoband 12/17m yagi (parasleeve excitation), 2 elements each band,
hairpin match (currently in use)

2 element 40m inverted vee phased array (135 degree phasing, 1/8 wave
spaced).

power supplies:

a number of low and high voltage (and multivoltage) supplies from 12
volts to 5,000 volts.

antenna tuners:

100w switched "T" matches, 2 KW+ Ultimate transmatch, 2 KW+ "L" Network,
200w link coupled tuner for balanced line, 2 KW+ L/C phasing network.

Dave K8MN

1519. Re: Lennie's Double Standard Once Again Revealed...BY Lennie!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-21 02:18:07 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0310201818.1b90c9c4@posting.google.com>
Source record: 81095

brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0310191838.327d67dd@posting.google.com>...
> k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0310181747.4754eb88@posting.google.com>...
> > brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0310180714.30f06d5@posting.google.com>...
> >
> > > Your Avenging Angel acts followed by general crazy-man activities is
> > > really rubbing my nose?
> >
> > I am not the one who "own's up" to having an archived
> > pathological liar as my "mentor".
>
> You're a pathological liar? You're my mentor.

No to both. As I said, I don't do "Special Ed".

> > I am not the one who claims to have operated from some rare DX
> > location with an alleged "say so" from someone who didn't have the
> > authority to let me do it anyway.
>
> Moot. You've never been anywhere.

Not "moot".

We're discussing where YOU have been.

As for where >>I<< have been, >>I<< can supply at least SOME of
my logs, Brain. It was only Okinawa in that case, but it was legal
and it was AUTHORIZED. (RE: AMRS authoirzation KA6CM, 1981, 15thAF,
PACAF)

> > I am not the one who doesn't know the difference between a
> > "commander" (an officer in the Armed Forces assigned as the senior
> > officer of a unit) and a "Commander" (a Naval grade equivilent to Lt
> > Colonel in the other branches).
>
> One has UCMJ authority over me, the other is merely another officer.

Geeze you're an idiot, Burke.

BOTH (had) UCMJ authority over you, Burke, and NEITHER were
"merely" an officer.

> > I am not the one who doesn't know the difference between
> > "authority" and "acceptance".
>

> I accept no authority from you.

You don't need to, Brain. I've not suggested that I exert any
"authority" over you. I've simply pointed out that YOU do not KNOW
the difference between "authority" and "acceptence".

To date, you've not done nor said anything to demonstrate that I
am in error. You've simply tried to make new silly names and use
equally silly unfounded assertions to try and cover it up.

> > > I see it differently.
> >
> > As I said...people with your particular dementia usually don't.
> >
> > To quote a particular Naval veteran, "Have Fun With This One
> > Now".
> >
> > Steve, K4YZ
>
> Avenging Angel Stebe has Spoken. And it was so.

To date, you've not done nor said anything to demonstrate that I
am in error. You've simply tried to make new silly names and use
equally silly unfounded assertions to try and cover it up.

> hi hi

Hello yourself. I am gald to see you can start to laugh at
yourself too. Lord knows WE are getting tired of doing it all for you!

Steve, K4YZ

1520. Re: Amazin'....Ain't it...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-21 02:26:09 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0310201826.13a00d25@posting.google.com>
Source record: 81096

brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0310191833.6e0c7887@posting.google.com>...
> k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0310181755.231b5d23@posting.google.com>...
> > brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0310180710.10f915b2@posting.google.com>...
> > > k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0310162138.7119784e@posting.google.com>...
> > > > brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0310140541.4b6c74df@posting.google.com>...
> > > >
> > > > > > Your "mentor" can fill you in on ways to antagonize and instigate
> > > > > > flamefests...he does it well.
> > > > >
> > > > > OK, Stebe.
> > > > >
> > > > > > You aren't quite there yet, but you're getting close.
> > > > >
> > > > > I'm learning from the Master, Stebe.
> > > >
> > > > Whew...
> > > >
> > > > It's really amazing to find people who ADMIT that they are the
> > > > willing "students" of pathological liars.
> > >
> > > SteBe, I said I was learning from the Master.
> > >
> > > Do you now ADMIT to being a pathological liar?
> >
> > You said Lennie was your mentor. Shall we requote the post
> > wherein you made this proclaimation?
>
> No need. You are now my mentor, Stebe.

Mentorship requires the consent of the elder. Since I do not
grant it, you may claim anything you like.

You may not like my style, my politics or my tactics, but I am
not a liar. You ahve demonstrated that you probably ARE lying about a
great many things, and you have already laid the "responsibilty" at
Lennie's feet.

Try as you might, you have already sank any future credibility
that you might have sought. Your error. Sorry.

> Anything else is an attempt to
> > back out of the corner YOU painted yourself into, Sir Clueless.
>
> Nope, this isn't Stalingrad.

Whew..THAT was a stretch, Brain.

I don't suppose you'd care to tell us how you drew a parallel
between the foolishness of your posts and any suggestion of being in a
Russian city that hasn't been known by that name for almost a decade?

> I enjoy the privelege of being able to change my mind.

You should exercise the priviledge of an education.

Steve, K4YZ

1521. Re: Points Of Perception...What Do YOU Call "Collateral Damage"...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-21 02:31:58 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0310201831.c14f800@posting.google.com>
Source record: 81097

brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0310191828.ed410a8@posting.google.com>...
> k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0310181805.5e9eeac4@posting.google.com>...
> > brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0310180708.17319747@posting.google.com>...
> >
> > > Steve, John is mere avoiding a crazy man who talks to himself in
> > > between episodes of playing RRAP Avenging Angel.
> >
> > Since you claim to look to Lennie as a mentor,
>
> Stebe, I now claim you as my mentor. Keep it up - I have much
> insanity to learn.

Your insanity is a result of genetic in-breeding.

Nothing I could say could change that.

> I will remind you
> > that it is he who claims anyone making typos in a USENET repsonse is
> > "getting mad". I will leave it to you to figure out what you did
> > wrong (according to Lennie's rules).
>
> ly

They are not my rules, Sir MinniePutz.

> > As far as John goes, I imagine him like a bully I knew as a
> > kid...He was all big and brash...Right up until someone smacked him
> > back.
>
> Robo-Angel, no doubt.

Yep. One swift kick did it. It took a few more with John. You
and Lennie like it too much.

> > John has beat a hasty retreat because unlike you and Lennie, I
> > doubt that he LIKES being spoon-fed his own USENET foolishness. You
> > should take a hint. I know you won't since you obviously like being
> > beat over the head again-and-again with stuff YOU provide.
>
> Then there are those who like beating others over the head.

Such as you and Lennie?

> > So don't blame me, Brain, for any "Avenging Angel" stuff...You
> > just keep giving me so much raw material to work with.
> >
> > Thanks.
> >
> > Steve, K4YZ
>
> Stebe, you'd do it anyway. It's what makes you tick since you went
> over the deep end.

Without your input I'd be lost, Brain. I'd be lost and would
have to resort to discussing MEANINGFUL topics...Not that Lennie would
let the thread last very long anyway.

Steve, K4YZ

1522. Re: Dear Mother Brakob...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-21 02:34:20 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0310201834.5bfd82e3@posting.google.com>
Source record: 81098

brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0310191804.5e2707c1@posting.google.com>...
> k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0310191434.506f5ace@posting.google.com>...
> > brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0310181518.2a210efe@posting.google.com>...
> > > k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0310162121.651549d9@posting.google.com>...
> > >
> > > > Yet another example of emulating your pathological liar mentor, Brain?
> > > >
> > > > Steve, K4YZ
> > >
> > > Stebe is my mentor.
> >
> > Not likely. I don't do Special Ed cases, Brain.
> >
> > Sorry.
> >
> > Steve, K4YZ
>
> Where's Dann Finn? PCTADS?
>
> Even the FCC gave waivers.
>
> You're still my mentor, Stebe, like it or not.

I STILL don't do Special Ed, Brain...

Steve, K4YZ

1523. Re: Amateur Radio in the 21st Century?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-21 02:44:43 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031020224443.12501.00003385@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 81099

In article <5ee63311.0310201603.f0b770b@posting.google.com>,
groupk0hb@earthlink.net (Hans K0HB) writes:

>n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote
>
>> At the very end, only three people are named - the
>> principal author, "with assistance from" two others.
>> That's three, last time I checked.
>
>Yep, it most soy-tainly am!
>
>And at the beginning of the paper he names himself, W5YI, W3BE, and
>W4WW. That's four, last time I checked.
>
>Maybe he's trying to confuse us.

Both of you seem highly confused at the moment.

Hokay, Hans Bigguy, have you figured out yet how to intelligibly
voice-modulate a spark transmitter?

Huh, huh?

Come on, show us technically how Reg Fessenden did it, sparking
up a song one Christmas night in 1906.

Rotsa ruck on dis wun naow...

1524. Re: Amateur Radio in the 21st Century?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-21 02:44:44 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031020224444.12501.00003386@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 81100

In article <20031020182922.08626.00001309@mb-m27.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com
(Chuck von Klauswitz Jr) writes:

>In article <20031019201627.07346.00001305@mb-m26.aol.com>,
>yodoc@aol.comnospam
>(Larry Roll K3LT) writes:
>
>>Had he been willing to settle
>>for the conquest and control of the whole of Western and Central Europe,
>>he may have had the forces in place to resist the Allied invasion, and
>>thus given Germany the time to develop it's own atomic weapons. This,
>>of course, would have quite a dilemma for the Allies, since Hitler,
>>madman he was, would have then most likely employed his nuclear
>>arsenal -- most likely on Russia, England, and possibly the U.S. We,
>>of course, would have had to nuke him first to prevent that from
>>happening. Therefore, in a way, Hitler did the rest of the world a favor
>>in his futile attempt to conquer Russia conventionally. A military
>>genius he was not. If the Austrian Corporal had been a real General
>>instead, a lot of us may not be here today.
>
>Nice theory but some would dispute it thusly:
>
>The big mistake was not the invasion of the Soviet Union, but rather the twin
>classic blunders of dividing one's forces and not being logistically prepared.
>Had the invaders gone straight for their enemy's capital (Moscow), and been
>properly prepared for the winter, the result might well have been very
different.

Go for it all about AMATEUR RADIO POLICY big guys.

Was that how it was for you at the Point, Capt Jimmie?

>The German atomic program would not have come up with a workable atomic
>weapon
>for many years (but the Allies did not know that). Look at what it took for
the
>Manhattan project to make three weapons!. And Germany did not have a delivery
>system.

Gernany had no delivery system? Gosh, they should have copied
the NATIONAL TRAFFIC SYSTEM from ARRL!

Could have morse-coded all those lil neutrons quick as a flash...

>Germany also messed up bigtime by not giving U-boat production and
>development

>top priority and support. Large amounts of their limited naval resources were
>wasted on superbattleships like Bismarck and Tirpitz - had they built
>improved
>U-boats with those resources, again the result might well have been very
>different.
>
>Then there's the Enigma story...

Gosh, you bigguys ought to switch chat room subjects to medicine.

You wouldn't be worried about enigmas. You'd be talking about
a pair-a-docs.

>A good thing they weren't smarter.

Good thing you morsemen have a cozy lil chat room to talk all
about AMATEUR RADIO SUBJECTS, isn't it?

So, Capt. Jimmie, what outfit were you assigned to?

1525. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-21 03:13:51 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bn289f$c7p$0@208.206.142.97>
Source record: 81201

N2EY wrote:

> In article <8QKib.49381$mQ2.35348@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dwight
> Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> writes:
>
>
>>"Dick Carroll" <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com> wrote:
>>
>>> I still find it beyond incredible that persons who would
>>>learn all that goes into making an engineer would have
>>>any problem whatever with learning the most basic radio
>>>communications skill at the most minimal level.
>
>
>> Because, as far as the "engineer" is concerned, it (code) isn't a "basic
>>radio communications skill" today, Dick.
>
>
> Perhaps - but we're amateurs, remember? Not professionals.
>
>
>>It hasn't been for several decades,
>>at least. As far as I know, not a single college-based communications,
>>radio, electronics, or engineering, course today offers instruction in code
>>"skill."
>
>
> None of them I ever heard of did, either. Nor did any of them require typing,
> speech or voice lessons for engineers. The radio part of EE is about building
> radios, not using them.
>
> Radio is but a small part of electrical engineering, and it keeps getting
> smaller as other technologies come along. Heck, the hot subject in
> communications today is fiber optics - which works by on-off keying!
>
>
>>Likewise, few, if any, employers are seeking that "skill."
>>Therefore, it (code) simply isn't relevant to any of these careers.
>>
>
> Neither are a whole lot of other things hams do!
>

That has to be one of the top 2 or 3 "most lame" excused ever offered
for discontinuying the code test-that it isn't relevant to "employers".

What is it that hams learn to pass a ham radio test *today* that IS relevant to what any employer wants these days? In a word, NOTHING!

Dick

1526. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-21 03:17:44 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bn28go$c7p$1@208.206.142.97>
Source record: 81202

Bill Sohl wrote:

> "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
> news:umUkb.5629$W16.3771@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net...
>
>>"Dick Carroll" wrote:
>>
>>>You're still obfuscating, Dwight! And you know it!
>>>No Code International means "no code test
>>>international" only because they were forced into
>>>making the addition. The negative response otherwise
>>>would have been overwhelming and they knew it,
>>>or soon found it out. But it didn't change The Agenda.
>>
>>
>> Well, I don't know anything about that, Dick. I visited their web site
>>after reading something Jim said recently and saw absolutely nothing about
>
> a
>
>>wider agenda to eliminate code itself. Since you seem aware of something
>>more than their stated goals, perhaps you should present evidence of it
>
> here
>
>>for all to see. Otherwise, it just appears you're attacking this group
>
> with
>
>>unsubstantiated innuendo (and I'm tired of hearing unsubstantiated
>
> innuendo
>
>>used as a political weapon in this country - it's sleazy, Dick).
>
>
> Dwight,
>
> You're absolutely correct. Dick practices the
> basic fundamentals of propoganda tactics...to wit:
> say it often enough and some people will believe it.

Wrong again, BOB (Bill Old Boy). Read it often enough
and you begin to have little choice but to believe it.
That you choose to ignore all all that is immaterial.

1527. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-21 03:29:25 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0310201929.281bea52@posting.google.com>
Source record: 81203

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20031020182924.08626.00001311@mb-m27.aol.com>...
> In article <3F93EC86.7B7177A3@ix.netcom.com>, David Stinson
> <arc5@ix.netcom.com> writes:
>
> >Duane Allen wrote:
> >>... Lee surrendered to Grant at the Appomattox
> >> courthouse, which is not in Massassas....
> > >
> > >That whole "surrender" business is just Yankee propaganda-
> > >completely made-up.
> >
> > Not completely - bofum *were* at Appomatox,,,,
> >
> > >Grant had been drinking again,
> > >so General Lee got him to agree to a "tie."
> > >It was covered up to protect Grant's presidential run
> > >so his cronies could get power.
> >
> > That's not how I heard it!
> >
> > It was explained to me that Grant stole Lee's sword, and Lee was too much of a
> > gentleman to ask for it back.

OhShit, here we go again . . BPL in Manassas is now ANOTHER
regurgitation of the Civil War . . figgers . . !

>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

w3rv

1528. Re: BPL a reality in my area now!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-21 08:20:04 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <REMOVETHISkc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <bn3fmc$sqojg$5@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 81210

I was referring to the noise in the power lines as it is now.... not with
BPL going......

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF1-FF2-MFR
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...
"Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
news:k1Ajb.1330$_i.115715@nnrp1.ptd.net...
>
> "Ryan, KC8PMX" <REMOVETHISkc8pmx@diamondcs.net> wrote in message
> news:bmm31b$olitc$9@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de...
> > Fortunately Charter around here is somewhat ameanable (sp.?) to
repairing
> > their systems, but it is a challenge still. Consumers Energy around
here
> is
> > next to impossible to deal with though. I am still a strong proponent
to
> > buried power lines as opposed to powerlines on poles.
>
>
> Even if the area distribution lines are buried, the wires come up
> to (usually pad-mounted above ground) transformers and the
> BPL signal will permeate all the wiring in your (and your
> neighbors') house(s) ...
>
> Underground distribution will help (some) but it doesn't actually
> solve the problem.
>
> Carl - wk3c
>

1529. Re: Student That Did Razor Test is a Ham.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-21 11:00:34 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0310210300.270f6ff@posting.google.com>
Source record: 81204

Jack Twilley <jmt+usenet@twilley.org> wrote in message
news:<86d6cr7dcm.fsf@duchess.twilley.org>...
> -----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
> Hash: SHA1
>
> >>>>> "Jim" == Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> writes:
>
> Jim> He's refering to the guy who told the government he was going to
> Jim> smuggle banned items into an aircraft and did so and got caught.
> Jim> Not exactly the smartest move in the world. I think the
> Jim> reference is to smuggling a razor aboard an aircraft. He may get
> Jim> some free room and board out of this (in a federal pen).
>
> Actually, the individual in question smuggled banned items onto
> multiple aircraft, including notes describing the contents and
> providing plenty of contact information for himself. He then emailed
> the TSA at the end of his trip.
>
> The items were not discovered until five weeks after his trip. Then
> the TSA found the emails and passed them to the FBI which came to get
> him.
>
> I think he knew what he was doing. I don't agree with what he did,
> but he made a statement and he appears to be willing to do the time.

He had a point to make via a typical college kid civil disobedience
maneuver and boy he made it. In SPADES. Congress is already looking
for Transportation Security Administration heads to gnaw on for this
one. Welcome to America . .

>
>Jack.

w3rv

1530. Re: Lennie's Double Standard Once Again Revealed...BY Lennie!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-21 11:08:51 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0310210308.287069ac@posting.google.com>
Source record: 81205

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0310201818.1b90c9c4@posting.google.com>...
> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0310191838.327d67dd@posting.google.com>...
> > k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0310181747.4754eb88@posting.google.com>...
> > > brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0310180714.30f06d5@posting.google.com>...
> > >
> > > > Your Avenging Angel acts followed by general crazy-man activities is
> > > > really rubbing my nose?
> > >
> > > I am not the one who "own's up" to having an archived
> > > pathological liar as my "mentor".
> >
> > You're a pathological liar? You're my mentor.
>
> No to both. As I said, I don't do "Special Ed".

Stebe, why do you deny it?

> > > I am not the one who claims to have operated from some rare DX
> > > location with an alleged "say so" from someone who didn't have the
> > > authority to let me do it anyway.
> >
> > Moot. You've never been anywhere.
>
> Not "moot".
>
> We're discussing where YOU have been.

See above where you stated "I." You introduced yourself into the
discussion, so we are now talking about you.

> As for where >>I<< have been, >>I<< can supply at least SOME of
> my logs, Brain. It was only Okinawa in that case, but it was legal
> and it was AUTHORIZED. (RE: AMRS authoirzation KA6CM, 1981, 15thAF,
> PACAF)

HL9ACT

> > > I am not the one who doesn't know the difference between a
> > > "commander" (an officer in the Armed Forces assigned as the senior
> > > officer of a unit) and a "Commander" (a Naval grade equivilent to Lt
> > > Colonel in the other branches).
> >

> > One has UCMJ authority over me, the other is merely another officer.
>
> Geeze you're an idiot, Burke.
>
> BOTH (had) UCMJ authority over you, Burke, and NEITHER were
> "merely" an officer.

I cannot be courts martialed by "any other officer." He or she must
be my commander.

> > > I am not the one who doesn't know the difference between
> > > "authority" and "acceptance".
> >
> > I accept no authority from you.
>
> You don't need to, Brain. I've not suggested that I exert any
> "authority" over you. I've simply pointed out that YOU do not KNOW
> the difference between "authority" and "acceptence".

Your assertion is false.

> To date, you've not done nor said anything to demonstrate that I
> am in error. You've simply tried to make new silly names and use
> equally silly unfounded assertions to try and cover it up.

Stebe, why is it OK for you to make new silly names but not me?

> > > > I see it differently.
> > >
> > > As I said...people with your particular dementia usually don't.
> > >
> > > To quote a particular Naval veteran, "Have Fun With This One
> > > Now".
> > >
> > > Steve, K4YZ
> >
> > Avenging Angel Stebe has Spoken. And it was so.
>
> To date, you've not done nor said anything to demonstrate that I
> am in error. You've simply tried to make new silly names and use
> equally silly unfounded assertions to try and cover it up.

You obviously don't know the difference between a commander and any
other officer.

All your years in the service were wasted.

> > hi hi
>
> Hello yourself. I am gald to see you can start to laugh at
> yourself too. Lord knows WE are getting tired of doing it all for you!

ho ho

1531. Re: ARRL you can Kiss my $39.00 a Year Good Bye

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-21 11:16:29 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0310210316.19473418@posting.google.com>
Source record: 81206

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0310201806.5a92cf4e@posting.google.com>...
> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0310191844.6f5feb6e@posting.google.com>...
> > k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0310162146.f2d85ce@posting.google.com>...

> > > Not according to the evidence you've supplied, you weren't.
> >
> > What evidence have I supplied?
>
> Exactly...No Evidence = No Proof = Brian's Lying. No problem.
>
> Steve, K4YZ

Such a paradox. Robo-Angel wants so badly to avenge his anger, that
he asserts "no proof" = guilty.

Even MinnieStebie sees through his Mentor's weakness.

ho ho

1532. Re: FISTS Postion to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-21 11:23:23 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0310210323.5701a9a0@posting.google.com>
Source record: 81207

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0310201803.27808aae@posting.google.com>...
> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0310200308.3853fb1d@posting.google.com>...
> > k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0310191854.7c9b40ed@posting.google.com>...
> > > brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0310140535.1180f438@posting.google.com>...
> > > > k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0310091237.75c4f23c@posting.google.com>...
> > > > > k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0309190239.2b7bcf38@posting.google.com>...
> > > > > > lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20030916205913.12501.00002450@mb-m04.aol.com>...
> > > > > > > In article <bk4b7e$p383g$8@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>, "Ryan, KC8PMX"
> > > > > > > <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> writes:
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > >All of the above answers would be correct (barring accidental typos), but
> > > > > > > >the original poster of the question in the first place DID NOT SPECIFY.
> > > > > > > >See, it is important, unless you consider ALL antennas to be exactly
> > > > > > > >one-half wavelength in length.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > Dan thinks "all" dipoles are half-wavelength...
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Lennie...WHAT did the "FISTS" organization have to do with
> > > > > > ANYTHING in this thread YOU started with their name...???
> > > > >
> > > > > Hey Lennie...Three weeks too short for you to answer a question?
> > > > >
> > > > > Steve, K4YZ
> > > >
> > > > Talking to yourself again?
> > >
> > > And where do you see me asking myself questions, Brain?
> >
> > So all conversations with yourself must be in the form of an Inquisition?
>
> Brain, I asked you a specific question, and you did not answer it.
>
> WHERE do you see me asking MYSELF questions in ANY of those posts?
>
> Good luck with this one now.
>
> Steve, K4YZ

You appeared to be having a conversation with someone who wasn't there.

To an outside observer, you were talking to yourself.

1533. Waiting For Another Answer From Lennie

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-21 13:19:42 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0310210519.6aef39af@posting.google.com>
Source record: 81208

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20031020224444.12501.00003386@mb-m04.aol.com>...
> In article <20031020182922.08626.00001309@mb-m27.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com

> Good thing you morsemen have a cozy lil chat room to talk all
> about AMATEUR RADIO SUBJECTS, isn't it?

Most of what YOU want to talk about isn't related to Amateur
Radio either, Your Putziness, so why hassle Jim?

> So, Capt. Jimmie, what outfit were you assigned to?

Why do you insist on trying to besmirch others for thier military
(or NON-military) service, Lennie?

Is it illegal for an American to NOT serve in the Armed Forces?

Can you PROVE that Jim Miccolis or ANY other person in this forum
shirked an OBLIGATION under the Selective Service Act...?!?!

We're talking about REAL facts, Lennie...The truth....Something
you can PROVE...?!?!

Sems to me there's been no draft in this country since the mid
70's, and that military service is non-compulsory. YOU keep trying to
insinuate that Jim or Brain Kelly's careers somehow hinge on what they
did or didn't do in the Armed Forces, but you have yet to explain why.

YOU have zero-point-zero experience in Amateur Radio, yet you
seem to be perfectly OK with commenting at length on Amateur Radio
matters.

You have zero-point-zero days experience as an aviator, but
you've tried to pull the wool over our eyes on matters pertaining to
aviation, too. Read Bill Kershner's Student Manual a few times I
wager, but you've never once been pilot-in-command of an aircraft, yet
you went off on a tirade about NAVAID systems and aerial
navigation...THAT was a hoot...!

You also have zero-point-zero experience in matters such as
emergency communications, disaster relief, etc, yet you always feel
compelled to comment on thos matters too. (OK, I'll give you
zero-point-five experience for the ONE time you owned up to helping at
a disaster...filling sand bags...)

Are we to assume that YOU are of the opinion that it's OK for YOU
to express opinions on matters for which you have no practical
experience, but it's NOT OK for others to do the same...?!?!

We'll wait right here for your answer.

Steve, K4YZ

1534. Re: Mother Brakob, Listen Up!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-21 13:43:21 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0310210543.2b6cf69c@posting.google.com>
Source record: 81209

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20031020193034.06226.00001046@mb-m19.aol.com>...

Somewhere in here there is something about Amateur Radio
POLICY...I am SURE of it, because Lenoard H. Anderson has told us over
and over that this forum is ONLY about that topic, and being the
PROFESSIONAL he claims to be, we KNOW he'd never lie to us.

> Hate to tell you this, but your son Hans seems to have run away from
> home.

I found his address in 30 seconds. I'll bet he's home right now
if I ring him up, Lennie. I guess this was yet ANOTHER bit or
research that you were unable to manage.

> A bit over a week ago he got all uppity and had a hissy-fit over some
> alleged "poor research" on Reg Fessenden's 1906 voice broadcast.

Uhhhhh....I read the same post and it was far from being
"uppity", nor did I see anything regarding a "hissy-fit".

> Your son must have been so ashamed he can't comment on my
> reply...which referenced a McGraw-Hill publication special edition,
> verbatim, even to the page and column location.

Now I DO remember seeing a LOT of LennieRants that were repeats
of other people's work...Len Anderson makes liberal use of
cut-and-paste, but snips the parts where he gives credit where credit
is due.

> Your son must still think it is possible to voice-modulate a SPARK
> transmitter. Pity that, considering he is a (self-stated) "degreed-
> before-USN-service Master Chief" now a Manager at an electronics
> company.

It happened, Lennie.

> Voice modulating a spark transmitter would be like trying to voice
> modulate a doorbell buzzer. It creates something that may sound
> like voice but it sure isn't intelligible. You should encourage him to
> work on the techniique. It might even make an interesting project to
> highlight the tube fanzine called "Electric Radio!"

No one said it was stereophonic quality...

> Mama Brakob, your son also loved to make the comment that
> "gentlemen can disagree without being disagreeable." He then
> went and started a whole new thread by being as disagreeable

> as possible. You've lost him somehow, Mom Brakob.

I think the one lost is the progentiator of this thread.

He says he is only interested in "debating" the "code test issue", yet here he is generating a new thread that is the very essence of a personal attack...And one that disrespects Hans' extended family, none of which have anything to do with this forum.

What's up with that?

He makes numerous allegations of dishonesty and wrong-doing of other persons and of well-respected organizations for which he offers no evidence other than his uninformed opinion.

He has frequently made assertions about his "fondness" and his "respect" for the Amateur Radio Service as an entity, but has nothing but vile, bile and hateful rhetoric for anyone licensed IN it...

He has also attempted to embellish his own character by associating himself with United States Army KIA's despite having NOT been in the Armed Forces when those Soldiers made thier sacrifice.

> I do hope you find your son again and impress upon him good
> virtues. Keep the candle lit in the window and GOOD LUCK ON
> THIS ONE NOW!

Yes, Lennie...Good Luck With This One Now.

You remain pathetic, irresponsible and as foolish as ever. But look behind you...Brain Burke is peddling fast to catch up.

> Best regards,
> Len Anderson
> retired (from regular hours) electronic engineer person

Thank God for that...We can all see where the engineering talent resided while you WERE on "regular hours"...Tokyo...Bejing...Seoul...Singapore...

Steve, K4YZ

1535. Re: Mother Brakob, Listen Up!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-21 16:47:53 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0310210847.792aa4e6@posting.google.com>
Source record: 81211

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20031020193034.06226.00001046@mb-m19.aol.com>...

> Your son must still think it is possible to voice-modulate a SPARK
> transmitter. Pity that, considering he is a (self-stated) "degreed-
> before-USN-service Master Chief" now a Manager at an electronics
> company.
>
> Voice modulating a spark transmitter would be like trying to voice
> modulate a doorbell buzzer. It creates something that may sound
> like voice but it sure isn't intelligible. You should encourage him to
> work on the techniique. It might even make an interesting project to
> highlight the tube fanzine called "Electric Radio!"

For those interested in facts rather than Len's usual infantile
nonsense and bluster, here are some insights into how Fessenden did
it:

Sound of a voice modulated spark transmitter:

http://www.eht.com/oldradio/history/outline/Fess-voc.htm

Noisy but intelligible. Not at all like a doorbell buzzer. Mr.
Thiessen was able to understand the message well enough to telegraph
back that it was, indeed, snowing where he was.

Sounds of various types of spark transmitters, including the above:

http://www.acmi.net.au/AIC/SPARK_SOUNDS.html

The 3 phase sync gap sounds almost like CW.

Historical writeup (with references) of Fessenden's developments and
accomplishments in early wireless:

http://ewh.ieee.org/reg/7/millennium/radio/radio_differences.html

Note that this link is to (ahem) an IEEE page. They seem convinced.

Short and incomplete list of Fessenden firsts in radio:

- First voice and music transmissions by radio
- First 2 way transatlantic radio contact of any type
- First transatlantic voice transmissions
- First 2 way transatlantic radio contact using voice
- First broadcast of voice and music (both live and recorded music)
- Inventor of heterodyne method of reception for undamped waves

(with over 500 patents, a complete list of Fessenden firsts takes a bit of compilation...)

Fessenden beat Marconi to practical 2 way transatlantic radio even though Marconi had first demonstrated 1 way transatlantic radio. Fessenden also had a working 2 way transatlantic *voice* radio link less than 5 years after Marconi's claimed reception of the letter "S".

But don't take my word for it. See the links.

1536. Re: What makes LHA so poor at simple research tasks?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-21 16:59:59 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0310210859.3c2a2c3@posting.google.com>
Source record: 81212

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3F9493F6.8958BC59@earthlink.net>...
> Mike Coslo wrote:
> >
> > Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > > Oh, my homebrew experience doesn't come close to Jim's either. But...
> >
> > Okay, you qualify, Dick!
> >
> > So far we have
> >
> > PCTA
> >
> > Jim - Large scale HB
> > Dick - Large scale HB
> > Mike - Med to large scale HB
>
> Mike,
>
> Count me in.
>
> Numerous linear amplifiers:
>
> 4 x 6146, pair of 811A's, pair 813's, 4-1000

a four by one...NICE!!! I'd call that "large scale"...

> antennas:
>
> duoband 12/17m yagi (parasleeve excitation), 2 elements each band,
> hairpin match (currently in use)
>
> 2 element 40m inverted vee phased array (135 degree phasing, 1/8 wave
> spaced).
>
> power supplies:
>
> a number of low and high voltage (and multivoltage) supplies from 12
> volts to 5,000 volts.
>
> antenna tuners:
>
> 100w switched "T" matches, 2 KW+ Ultimate transmatch, 2 KW+ "L" Network,
> 200w link coupled tuner for balanced line, 2 KW+ L/C phasing network.

>
Neat stuff! The only manufactured ham antenna I've ever used is a 2 meter mag mount.

Did I mention shack furniture and accessories (shelves, tables, etc.), home-designed and made from lumber? Not up to New Yankee Workshop standards, perhaps, but they do the job.

There's also the Tymeter mechanical digital clock I assembled from the parts of several discarded ones. Motor from one clock, case from another, 24 hour mechanism from a third, etc. Total cost about $2 - ten or fifteen years ago.

And when I find a space for a computer in the shack, it will be a home-assembled one.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1537. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-21 17:12:43 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <fOdlb.8783$Uz6.2398@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 81213

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote:
> "Dwight Stewart" writes:
> >"Dick Carroll" wrote:
> >>
> >> I still find it beyond incredible that persons who would
> >> learn all that goes into making an engineer would have
> >> any problem whatever with learning the most basic radio
> >> communications skill at the most minimal level.
>
> > Because, as far as the "engineer" is concerned, it (code)
> > isn't a "basic radio communications skill" today, Dick.
>
> Perhaps - but we're amateurs, remember? Not professionals.

Yes, I do remember, Jim. However, why are you asking me this question? Dick is the one who brought up the engineer in the first paragraph above. I was simply responding to his comments. And that response addressed the engineer solely, not amateur radio.

> >Likewise, few, if any, employers are seeking that "skill."
> >Therefore, it (code) simply isn't relevant to any of these
> > careers.
>
> Neither are a whole lot of other things hams do!

Never said, suggested, or even hinted at, anything to the contrary. The topic raised by Dick was the engineer, not amateur radio.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

1538. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-21 17:35:42 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <O7elb.8814$Uz6.6186@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 81214

"Dick Carroll" wrote:
>
> That has to be one of the top 2 or 3 "most lame"
> excuses ever offered for discontinuying the code
> test-that it isn't relevant to "employers".
>
> What is it that hams learn to pass a ham radio test
> *today* that IS relevant to what any employer wants
> these days? In a word, NOTHING!

Then I have two questions, Dick - why did you raise the issue and who in this discussion offered it as an 'excuse" for discontinuing the code test? Again, you specifically said...

"I still find it beyond incredible that persons who would
learn all that goes into making an engineer would have
any problem whatever with learning the most basic radio
communications skill at the most minimal level."

You brought this up and now claim it "isn't relevant." And I certainly said nothing about this being an "excuse," or justification, or anything similar, for ending the code test. In fact, I didn't mention amateur radio or the code test at all in my response. Instead, my comments addressed the specific issue you raised - why the engineer would not be interested in learning code.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

1539. Re: 14.313 Jamming.K9BSD, N9PGE, and KK9G.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-21 17:41:59 UTC
From: Radiodan-W7RF <radiodan@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <Gdelb.197759$%h1.191867@sccrnsc02>
Source record: 81215
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.swap,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

Without standards and lowering of standards, there would be MORE guys like that. You sound sore about learning morse code, try to get over it. This is what it takes to be a HAM. Either do what it takes to get the job done or don't join our ranks!

73, Dan W7RF

"Clint" <rattlehead at computron dot net> wrote in message news:vp907lmbbf25db@corp.supernews.com...
>
> "Twice Fired" <loser@mulatto.com> wrote in message
> news:FxHkb.25379$5n.6961@bignews5.bellsouth.net...
> > Jamming on 313? K9BSD, N9PGE, KK9G have been doing that from central
> > indiana for years..... No wives, no life, nothing. Just a whiskey bottle
> > and ocd. Truly pathetic...
> >
>
> HOW CAN THAT BE?!?!?!? You must obviously be mistaken. Those guys
> passed morse code tests, and yet they're disruptive, cause trouble and
> violate
> the ham radio laws & rules laid forth by the FCC?
>
> I was *sure* the PCTA crowd said that the morse code test was an adequate
> filter to keep out the "CBplussers".
>
> Clint
> KB5ZHT
>
>

1540. Re: Mother Brakob, Listen Up!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-21 17:59:56 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <wuelb.13201$JF7.1044@news01.roc.ny>
Source record: 81216

Len,

Whatever you may think about Hans, I do recall the typhoon that hit Saipan. I do recall being at the station (KG6AAY) that made good contact with Sparkplug1 on Saipan. That was Hans on Saipan and I was at KG6AAY (NavCommSta Guam). Whatever you may think of him, he served his country (we are both Vietnam vets - I had 11 months of combat pay) and did a lot of good after that typhoon.

I know - "but what have he or you done in the last 15 minutes?" - perhaps better asked "what have you done?"

Don't worry about candles, the lights are on and someone's home both here and at Han's end LOL

With all kind regards from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA (WB2OSP at the time in the late 60s - amateur extra then)

"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message news:20031020193034.06226.00001046@mb-m19.aol.com...
> Hate to tell you this, but your son Hans seems to have run away from
> home.
>
> A bit over a week ago he got all uppity and had a hissy-fit over some
> alleged "poor research" on Reg Fessenden's 1906 voice broadcast.
>
> Your son must have been so ashamed he can't comment on my
> reply...which referenced a McGraw-Hill publication special edition,
> verbatim, even to the page and column location.
>
> Your son must still think it is possible to voice-modulate a SPARK
> transmitter. Pity that, considering he is a (self-stated) "degreed-
> before-USN-service Master Chief" now a Manager at an electronics
> company.
>
> Voice modulating a spark transmitter would be like trying to voice
> modulate a doorbell buzzer. It creates something that may sound
> like voice but it sure isn't intelligible. You should encourage him to
> work on the techniique. It might even make an interesting project to
> highlight the tube fanzine called "Electric Radio!"
>
> Mama Brakob, your son also loved to make the comment that
> "gentlemen can disagree without being disagreeable." He then
> went and started a whole new thread by being as disagreeable
> as possible. You've lost him somehow, Mom Brakob.
>

> I do hope you find your son again and impress upon him good
> virtues. Keep the candle lit in the window and GOOD LUCK ON
> THIS ONE NOW!
>
> Best regards,
> Len Anderson
> retired (from regular hours) electronic engineer person

1541. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-21 18:04:55 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <bzelb.9074$Uz6.2373@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 81217

"Dick Carroll" wrote:
>
> This isn't a court of law, Dwight, and the level of
> evidence required to make up ones mind depends
> on the indivual and his attention and perception
> levels. So your effort to demand court-grade
> evidence falls flat on its face.

I didn't "demand" anything at all, Dick. Instead, I simply suggested that you should present evidence to support your claim here, so others (myself included) can see for themselves, to avoid the impression that you're just attacking this group with unsubstantiated innuendo. Of course, since we're obviously not in a courtroom, how you respond to that suggestion is entirely up to you.

> Evidence is plentiful and much of it has been displayed
> right here on rrap to see, even recently, with of course
> some disclaimers to match. If you missed all that it would
> be because you wanted to miss it, or just don't care
> enough to pay attention.

I'll accept that as your "evidence," and remain totally unconvinced. I don't know anything about NCI beyond what I've quickly read on the first page of their website. What you've said certainly hasn't added anything to my knowledge of that organization.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

1542. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-21 18:39:06 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <e3flb.9368$Uz6.6035@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 81218

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote:
>
> I disagree! There's a world of difference between "drop
> the code" and "drop the code test".

It's human nature to shorten phrases to simplify a discussion, Jim. We all do it when it's bloody obvious what's being discussed. If you don't, then you're truly an extraordinary human being.

> If someone is against the code *test*, then let them take
> the trouble to spell it out.

Oh, I see. This only applies to those oppossed to the code test. Sorry, you don't make the rules - either in this discussion or over human nature. To continue to demand clarification of the obvious only makes it appear you can't see the obvious, which isn't exactly a good impression to leave with others, Jim.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

1543. Re: FISTS Postion to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-21 20:04:44 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031021160444.12501.00003397@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 81219

In article <f45722ac.0310210323.5701a9a0@posting.google.com>,
brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:

>> Steve, K4YZ
>
>You appeared to be having a conversation with someone who wasn't there.
>
>To an outside observer, you were talking to yourself.

Psychotics with multiple personalities always attact a crowd...
of themselves who applaud each other lustily. :-)

LHA

1544. Re: ARRL you can Kiss my $39.00 a Year Good Bye

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-21 20:04:44 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031021160444.12501.00003398@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 81220

In article <f45722ac.0310210316.19473418@posting.google.com>,
brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:

>> Exactly...No Evidence = No Proof = Brian's Lying. No problem.
>>
>> Steve, K4YZ
>
>Such a paradox. Robo-Angel wants so badly to avenge his anger, that
>he asserts "no proof" = guilty.
>
>Even MinnieStebie sees through his Mentor's weakness.
>
>ho ho

Brian, if you need "mentors," I'd suggest John T. "Tad" Burik,
K3QC on the basis of his blanket comments to RM-10805
through RM-10811. He's a true Gunnery Sergeant type Dill
Instructor who makes Stebe look like a new Lance Corporal. :-)

Look in the FCC ECFS listing around 20 October 2003.

QED

LHA

1545. Re: Mother Brakob, Listen Up!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-21 20:04:46 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031021160446.12501.00003399@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 81221

In article <wuelb.13201$JF7.1044@news01.roc.ny>, "Jim Hampton"
<aa2qa@frontiernet.net> writes:

>Whatever you may think about Hans, I do recall the typhoon that hit Saipan.
>I do recall being at the station (KG6AAY) that made good contact with
>Sparkplug1 on Saipan. That was Hans on Saipan and I was at KG6AAY
>(NavCommSta Guam). Whatever you may think of him, he served his country (we
>are both Vietnam vets - I had 11 months of combat pay) and did a lot of good
>after that typhoon.

Jim, this wasn't a comment about "military service time" or "typhoons"
on Saipan or anywhere else.

Hans Brakob came out of the blue with a personally insulting comment
about "bad research," something that I allegedly "always do," solely
about "the first voice transmission by radio." Hans claimed, but did
not reference or otherwise verify that it was done with a SPARK
TRANSMITTER.

I quoted an Electronics magazine special edition text paragraph that
stated this 1906 Christmas transmission was done with a 1 KW
ALTERNATOR, probably using a water cooled microphone in the
antenna line. I gave the Electronics magazine (then a biweekly
subscription magazine published by McGraw-Hill, the large book
company) page number and the location on that page. I was a
subscriber to Electronics magazine and also a contributor (Designer's
Casebook section, 1978)...as well as other electronics trade
publications. McGraw-Hill Book Company is in the top textbook
publishers of the world on a great number of technological fields.

"Poor research?" Hardly. Part of what I do for a living IS research
and I've done fairly well in making a living...IN radio-electronics.

So, along comes a very irritated a disrespectful person tossing out
direct personal insults as the FIRST MESSAGE in a new thread...
for whatever personal pique picking at him. Poor baby. He tried a
random shot in my direction and got heavy caliber automatic fire
right back. Tsk, tsk, tsk. Big "hero of Saipan" is supposed to be
given some special dispensation and approval of random personal
pot shots at anyone? I don't think so.

In case it's slipped your mind, I served in the United States Army
from March 1952 to April 1960. Remember the Korean War? It never
ended...started in June 1950 and slowed down to a state of truce in
July 1953. Note that March 1952 fits inside that time frame. The
Korean War HAS NOT ENDED. The state of truce still exists.

I was never assigned to any Korean unit, but spent three years with a Signal battalion whose task was providing primary HF radio communications for the Far East Command Headquarters. Three years beginning February 1953. A group of courage-spilled civilians who NEVER served in ANY military wanted to make personal insults of MY service. One jarhead (who claims "seven hostile actions" on his record...no proof presented) seems to make that her ONLY output in here...she never did anything like primary comm in her service. My proof of service and when is archived at NARA, the National Archives and Records place in St. Louis. The FBI, IRS, SocSec, DCAS, and a bunch of government alphabet soup agencies haven't had any trouble with that for years.

Station ADA where I worked never did anything dramatic. Over 700 of us simply Got The Messages Through 24 hours a day, 7 days a week. No fanfares, in any kind of weather. Over 200K of messages a month. My battalion got TWO Presidential Unit Citations while I was there. Callsign ADA is still used in the Pacific, 57 years later, for the U. S. Army Pacific Headquarters at Fort Shafter, Hawaii.

Some other NON-COMBATANTS seem eager for verbal bloodshed in here over PAST trivia...way back in the very beginning of radio, far before I served the USA, far before they existed, before the Church of St Hiram was dedicated, before the first US radio regulatory agency.

Tsk, tsk...such "radio experts" ought to devote some time learning the radio arts of THIS CENTURY, not the past one. I spent my working time and some of my non-working time keeping up with radio and electronics technology...not endless debates over minutae of history that matters not to electrons, fields, and waves.

Hans has to bandage his own wounds. Not my problem. If he wants to take first pot-shots, he better damn well get better artillery, body armor, and a good revetment next time. The alternate is a graves registration unit picking up his body parts for the big rubber bag.

NOBODY gets special dispensation for anything in here.

At ease...as you were...

LHA

1546. Re: Mother Brakob, Listen Up!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-21 20:38:24 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3F959943.5AB622D0@earthlink.net>
Source record: 81222

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <wuelb.13201$JF7.1044@news01.roc.ny>, "Jim Hampton"
> <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> writes:

> In case it's slipped your mind, I served in the United States Army
> from March 1952 to April 1960. Remember the Korean War? It never
> ended...started in June 1950 and slowed down to a state of truce in
> July 1953. Note that March 1952 fits inside that time frame. The
> Korean War HAS NOT ENDED.

Certainly the tales of your experiences of fifty years ago as observed from Japan, have never ended.

> A group of courage-spilled civilians
> who NEVER served in ANY military wanted to make personal insults
> of MY service.

You've made personal insults to the military service, government jobs (or any jobs for that matter) of any number of people posting here. We are all, as best I can tell, civilians here. At ease, old soldier. You're now off duty.

> My proof of service and when is archived at NARA, the National
> Archives and Records place in St. Louis.

Does that make you special, Len?

> Station ADA where I worked never did anything dramatic. Over 700 of
> us simply Got The Messages Through 24 hours a day, 7 days a week.
> No fanfares, in any kind of weather. Over 200K of messages a > month.

...but you still don't Get The Message: What you did was no more nor any less than what most military units are called upon to do. Further, it has naught to do with amateur radio.

> Some other NON-COMBATANTS seem eager for verbal bloodshed in
> here over PAST trivia...way back in the very beginning of radio, far
> before I served the USA, far before they existed, before the Church of
> St Hiram was dedicated, before the first US radio regulatory agency.

You might want to get a better grip on that ledge, Leonard. You seem near losing that tenuous grip on reality. By the way, weren't you a NON-COMBATANT?

> Hans has to bandage his own wounds. Not my problem. If he wants
> to take first pot-shots, he better damn well get better artillery, body
> armor, and a good revetment next time. The alternate is a graves

> registration unit picking up his body parts for the big rubber bag.

Sounds like you're a crack shot crackpot.

Dave K8MN

1547. Re: 14.313 Jamming.K9BSD, N9PGE, and KK9G.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-21 20:47:21 UTC
From: garigue <garigue@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <tXglb.602057$Oz4.608353@rwcrnsc54>
Source record: 81223

.
> > > Jamming on 313? K9BSD, N9PGE, KK9G have been doing that from central
> > > indiana for years..... No wives, no life, nothing. Just a whiskey
bottle
> > > and ocd. Truly pathetic...
> > >
> >
> > HOW CAN THAT BE?!?!?!? You must obviously be mistaken. Those guys
> > passed morse code tests, and yet they're disruptive, cause trouble and
> > violate
> > the ham radio laws & rules laid forth by the FCC?
> >
> > I was *sure* the PCTA crowd said that the morse code test was an
adequate
> > filter to keep out the "CBplussers".
> >
> > Clint
> > KB5ZHT

Good point there Clint .... but you are assuming that these idiots, if indeed they are doing the QRMing have passed a "CW test". I just wonder since the FCC has gone to the test your own mode ...how much money has been slipped to the testers for a CW pass. I am not going to go through the trouble to play Jim Rockford or Bulldog Drummond on the above calls to see if they were "gen-u-yine" FCC tested. I really believe that this crap should have been stepped on in the years gone by. Police our "own" ....boy that is something that sure works. The FCC should be in this area as in the past This would entail a price for a ham ticket which knowing the "generosity" of most hams I know, would stand the snowball's chance in Hades of happening. Also on these same lines are the situations which guy's get busted for doing neat things like interfering with aircraft, police et al. You see in a lot of these cases that the FCC has reduced the fine ... huh ???.

I can say that I have been purposely QRMed on CW over the years in just a handful of times. Most CW QRM is non intentional due to propagation factors. I guess that the satisfaction for the QRMer is just not there to justify a response he can't copy. Like was said before there Clint ... ya can't fart on CW.

God Bless 73 Tom Popovic KI3R Belle Vernon Pa

1548. Re: 14.313 Jamming.K9BSD, N9PGE, and KK9G.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-21 21:08:03 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <Tehlb.11017$Uz6.555@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 81224
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.swap,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

You people are really dumb. Anybody can say anything and accuse anyone they want, and you believe it. Amazing.

Dan/W4NTI

"Radiodan-W7RF" <radiodan@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:Gdelb.197759$%h1.191867@sccrnsc02...
> Without standards and lowering of standards, there would be MORE guys like
> that. You sound sore about learning morse code, try to get over it. This is
> what it takes to be a HAM. Either do what it takes to get the job done or
> don't join our ranks!
>
> 73, Dan W7RF
>
>
> "Clint" <rattlehead at computron dot net> wrote in message
> news:vp907lmbbf25db@corp.supernews.com...
> >
> > "Twice Fired" <loser@mulatto.com> wrote in message
> > news:FxHkb.25379$5n.6961@bignews5.bellsouth.net...
> > > Jamming on 313? K9BSD, N9PGE, KK9G have been doing that from central
> > > indiana for years..... No wives, no life, nothing. Just a whiskey bottle
> > > and ocd. Truly pathetic...
> > >
> >
> > HOW CAN THAT BE?!?!?!? You must obviously be mistaken. Those guys
> > passed morse code tests, and yet they're disruptive, cause trouble and
> > violate
> > the ham radio laws & rules laid forth by the FCC?
> >
> > I was *sure* the PCTA crowd said that the morse code test was an adequate
> > filter to keep out the "CBplussers".
> >
> > Clint
> > KB5ZHT
> >
> >
>
>

1549. Re: FCC relaxes it's prohibition on use of the "F-word" on broadcast media.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-21 21:22:46 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0310211322.1117119e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 81225

Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
news:<3F948400.8030205@ix.netcom.com>...
> N2EY wrote:
>
> >One argument FCC can use to defend the "different rules" thing is that
> >broadcasting works to a published schedule and the shows are rated in advance.
> >If you tune in Howard Stern on the radio or the Victoria's Secret Xmas special
> >on TV, you have a pretty good idea of what you'll hear/see. But on ham radio
> >there's no schedule, no program guide and no advance ratings.
> >
> Used to be, if you were in LA and tuned in 147.435, one could expect to
> hear similar
> material. Not that I agree with the existence of such on a ham band,
> but it was there.

But was it on a published schedule?

Some may consider it a double standard, but the fact is that FCC can
and does have different standards for different services. At least
part of this is due to the ability of broadcasters to spend millions
fighting lawsuits. But the prime argument is the 'complaint rate': If
Mr. Stern says something that causes, say, 400 people to complain to
the FCC, Infinity Broadcasting can say to FCC: "40 million (or
whatever) people listen to Howard and only 400 complained? That's 1 in
100,000 listeners!" What amateur who does the same sort of thing on
the air can make that sort of claim and back it up with real numbers?

73 de Jim, N2EY

1550. Re: Amateur Radio in the 21st Century?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-21 21:23:22 UTC
From: David Stinson <arc5@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3F95A3B3.68F75F85@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 81226

N2EY wrote:

> The big mistake was not the invasion of the Soviet Union, but rather the twin
> classic blunders of dividing one's forces and not being logistically prepared.

I don't know... making "boogie men" out of the most intellectually
gifted, innovating and striving part of his population, then
spending huge amounts of money and resources to exterminate them-
that sounds like a pretty stupid move to me.

1551. Re: Waiting For Another Answer From Lennie

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-21 21:58:57 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0310211358.3baa9acf@posting.google.com>
Source record: 81227

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0310210519.6aef39af@posting.google.com>...
> lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20031020224444.12501.00003386@mb-m04.aol.com>...
> > In article <20031020182922.08626.00001309@mb-m27.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com
>
> > Good thing you morsemen have a cozy lil chat room to talk all
> > about AMATEUR RADIO SUBJECTS, isn't it?
>
> Most of what YOU want to talk about isn't related to Amateur
> Radio either,

[expletive deleted]

>so why hassle Jim?

Simple, Steve - to try to get a rise out of me. Or you.
>
> > So, Capt. Jimmie, what outfit were you assigned to?
>
> Why do you insist on trying to besmirch others for thier military
> (or NON-military) service, Lennie?
>
> Is it illegal for an American to NOT serve in the Armed Forces?
>
> Can you PROVE that Jim Miccolis or ANY other person in this forum
> shirked an OBLIGATION under the Selective Service Act...?!?!

I still have my original 1972 issue draft card.
>
> We're talking about REAL facts, Lennie...The truth....Something
> you can PROVE...?!?!

As Kim would say: Oh, puh-leeeease! You don't really expect such from
Len, do you?
>
> Sems to me there's been no draft in this country since the mid
> 70's, and that military service is non-compulsory. YOU keep trying to
> insinuate that Jim or Brian Kelly's careers somehow hinge on what they
> did or didn't do in the Armed Forces, but you have yet to explain why.

It's called "ad hominem", Steve.
>
> YOU have zero-point-zero experience in Amateur Radio, yet you
> seem to be perfectly OK with commenting at length on Amateur Radio
> matters.

There's this pot and this kettle....
>
> You have zero-point-zero days experience as an aviator, but
> you've tried to pull the wool over our eyes on matters pertaining to
> aviation, too. Read Bill Kershner's Student Manual a few times I
> wager, but you've never once been pilot-in-command of an aircraft, yet
> you went off on a tirade about NAVAID systems and aerial
> navigation...THAT was a hoot...!
>
> You also have zero-point-zero experience in matters such as
> emergency communications, disaster relief, etc, yet you always feel
> compelled to comment on thos matters too. (OK, I'll give you
> zero-point-five experience for the ONE time you owned up to helping at
> a disaster...filling sand bags...)
>
> Are we to assume that YOU are of the opinion that it's OK for YOU
> to express opinions on matters for which you have no practical
> experience, but it's NOT OK for others to do the same...?!?!

You just figuring that out, Steve? ;-)
>
> We'll wait right here for your answer.
>
Don't hold yer breath waiting.

btw, didja take a listen to the spark rigs - particularly the voice
modulated spark?

Here's how Fessenden did it, in a nutshell:

The buzz that characterizes ordinary spark signals is due to the
relatively low AC used. Fessenden figured that if he used AC above the
audio range, the spark rate would be above the audio rate, and
intelligible audio would result. He was right, of course.

And by using headphones with poor response above a few kHz, much of
the noise would be filtered out.

Of course when he got his paws on a suitable Alexanderson alternator,
the spark idea was abandoned. His alternator would go as high as 100
kHz and was rated at 1 kW.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1552. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-21 22:03:58 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0310211403.6265732c@posting.google.com>
Source record: 81228

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:<e3flb.9368$Uz6.6035@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote:
> >
> > I disagree! There's a world of difference between "drop
> > the code" and "drop the code test".
>
> It's human nature to shorten phrases to simplify a discussion, Jim.

Of course. But in this case dropping the word "test" changes the
meaning tremendously.

> We all
> do it when it's bloody obvious what's being discussed. If you don't, then
> you're truly an extraordinary human being.

I don't drop words that are needed for clarity.

> > If someone is against the code *test*, then let them take
> > the trouble to spell it out.
>
> Oh, I see. This only applies to those oppossed to the code test.

No, it applies to everyone.

> Sorry,
> you don't make the rules - either in this discussion or over human nature.

I'm simply expressing an opinion. I think people should take the time
to be clear in what they are saying, particularly in a discussion
where there are radically differing viewpoints, and where people drop
in and out of the discussion often.

> To continue to demand clarification of the obvious only makes it appear you
> can't see the obvious, which isn't exactly a good impression to leave with
> others, Jim.

I'm simply expressing the opinion that if someone is really only
against the test, they should so specify.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1553. Halloween gift to rra*

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-21 22:12:24 UTC
From: groupk0hb@earthlink.net
Message-ID: <5ee63311.0310211412.54b20cd5@posting.google.com>
Source record: 81229
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

http://www.handiham.org//article.php?sid=160

1554. Re: Halloween gift to rra*

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-21 22:52:29 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@nope.org>
Message-ID: <o1ebpvcgl49o4ele57qmdbhgmk6aj94o2s@4ax.com>
Source record: 81230
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

Well done, Hans! (great use of imagery too...)

73, Leo

On 21 Oct 2003 15:12:24 -0700, groupk0hb@earthlink.net (Hans K0HB)
wrote:

>http://www.handiham.org//article.php?sid=160

1555. Re: 14.313 Jamming.K9BSD, N9PGE, and KK9G.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-21 23:00:17 UTC
From: Clint <"rattlehead at computron dot net">
Message-ID: <vpbelo23dlh8d4@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 81231
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.swap,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

"Radiodan-W7RF" <radiodan@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:Gdelb.197759$%h1.191867@sccrnsc02...
> Without standards and lowering of standards, there would be MORE guys like
> that.

Oh, now, you're just reaching on that one. You could use that line of
thinking
to support ANYTHING. The fact is, one of the strongest and loudest responses
you hear from the PCTA group is that it is suppose to filter OUT people like
that;
given that this is just but SOME proof that it doesn't, thier argument
fails. Not
only that, it's on record that the majority of rules violaters ARE hams with
morse code endorsement... yet MORE evidence to prove that morse code
testing does not filter out the "yahoos".

>You sound sore about learning morse code, try to get over it.

Any anything else that is required to learn that has no real factual
reasoning or basis and is a total waste of time.

This is
> what it takes to be a HAM. Either do what it takes to get the job done or
> don't join our ranks!
>

...until the FCC says that it is no LONGER what it takes to be a ham.
THEN, a person can become one without the morse code testing.

Clint
KB5ZHT

1556. Re: Why thirteen and twenty?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-21 23:05:23 UTC
From: Clint <"rattlehead at computron dot net">
Message-ID: <vpbevc120ps990@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 81232

"garigue" <garigue@comcast.net> wrote in message
news:59Gkb.825619$Ho3.226493@sccrnsc03...

> Here we go again with this standard transmission crap ...this time it has
> degenerated to starters ....

and your point being? that just means there are MANY examples of why
CW testing is outdated.

>
> Clint's logic ... no cars today have crank starters ... therefore CW is in
> that same category ...but wait ..why are there so many CW ham signals on
the
> air ... ????

no problem with use of morse code. It's code TESTING that's outdated
and is going to be removed.

>
> Clint am I a "crybaby" because I see a useful skill i.e. the 2nd most used
> amateur mode badmouthed in the most illogical , immature and counter
> productive manner.

2nd most used? that's debatable.. in fact, i'd be willing to bet it's far
from
the most used. AND, i'll play my own devil's advocate; it's widely agreed,
with little dissention, that code use is on the decline... therefore, even
IF it's
as you assert (again, playing my own devil's advocate), this couldn't
possibly
be true indefinitely as it's use shrinks and deminishes.

>
> I really think that in any endeavor there are those for whatever reason
like
> "pissing in the punchbowl". I very rarely operate SSB, look at or
transmit
> pix, never work
> moon bounce or hunt for transmitters or any of the myriad of sub-groups
that
> this service offers. But thank God that they are there ... a facet in the
> jewel that are available to me when and if I desire.

and thank god CW is there, for those who CHOOSE to operate it.
It just needs not be tested anymore, and won't be for much longer.

It's going to be removed.

Clint

1557. Re: Amateur Radio Newsline? Report 1365 ? October 10 2003

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-21 23:28:12 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0310211528.9fa22d@posting.google.com>
Source record: 81233

brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0310210330.6b177052@posting.google.com>...
> k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0310201801.6ec543bd@posting.google.com>...
> > brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0310200310.3998b5f7@posting.google.com>...
> > > k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0310191845.4f2a1f33@posting.google.com>...
> > > > brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0310150430.4c80244d@posting.google.com>...
> > > >
> > > > > And its not all NOAA. Air Force Weather runs a number of solar
> > > > > observatories around the globe, polarimeter stations, and
> > > > > rocketsondes.
> > > >
> > > > A bit of news passed to you via back-channel from Lennie, or were
> > > > you reading some 1950's era "This Is The Air Force" books, Brain?
> > > > They've only been doing this since the inception of the Air Force.
> > > >
> > > > Steve, K4YZ
> > >
> > > Stebe, I was AF Weather. You washed out and became a cook.
> >
> > If you say so...
>
> Or some other untrained, direct-duty assignment. Doesn't matter.

Sorry. Advanced Avionics. Lotsa neat radio stuff. Lennie
doesn't believe it, but it's in my SRB.

> > The only time I "cooked" in the line of duty in
> > the USMC was heating C-Rats while in boot and on the trail.
>
> You are even more talented than anyone could guess.
>
> > And your having been a weather guesser in the USAF in no way
> > changes the facts vis-a-vis your earlier comments...
>
> You comments were a lie. I have read no 1950's era "This is the Air
> Force" book, Stebe, nor have I received via Len and back channel news.

Brain, Brain, Brain...The suggestion vis-a-vis a book or
back-channel input from Lennie was a question. Please re-read the
above.

A question cannot be a lie...It can only be a question.

> The "facts" you
> > cited were all things being done in the Armed Forces for decades
> > before your signed on the line.
> >
> > Big deal.
>
> I merely learned them first hand.

No doubt. I rather imagine that you stopped opening books after
the "Dick and Jane" series.

> So how does a USMC nurse know about solar observatories in the USAF?

I wouldn't know, Brain. There are no nurses (by MOS) in the
USMC. Anyone who may be in the USMC now who holds licensure as a
Nurse does so as a personal achievement. I knew of a couple, but none
who were assigned to billets as nurses. One was a pilot, the other in
admin.

Nursing personnel assigned >>TO<< a Marine Corps unit are not in
the Marines. (They are usually Navy) If you read a book once in a
while, you might know this....But then again I doubt that too...

I was not a Nurse while in the Marine Corps.

As for knowing about solar observatories in the USAF, I hate to
burst your bubble, but there's very little that's actually
"classified" about aerography, in the USAF or otherwise, Brain.

> Brian

Yeah...right....

Steve, K4YZ

1558. Re: FISTS Postion to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-21 23:32:03 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0310211532.323f742c@posting.google.com>
Source record: 81234

brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0310210323.5701a9a0@posting.google.com>...
> k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0310201803.27808aae@posting.google.com>...
> > brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0310200308.3853fb1d@posting.google.com>...
> > > k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0310191854.7c9b40ed@posting.google.com>...
> > > > brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0310140535.1180f438@posting.google.com>...
> > > > > k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0310091237.75c4f23c@posting.google.com>...
> > > > > > k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0309190239.2b7bcf38@posting.google.com>...
> > > > > > > lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20030916205913.12501.00002450@mb-m04.aol.com>...
> > > > > > > > In article <bk4b7e$p383g$8@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>, "Ryan, KC8PMX"
> > > > > > > > <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> writes:
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > >All of the above answers would be correct (barring accidental typos), but
> > > > > > > > >the original poster of the question in the first place DID NOT SPECIFY.
> > > > > > > > >See, it is important, unless you consider ALL antennas to be exactly
> > > > > > > > >one-half wavelength in length.
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > Dan thinks "all" dipoles are half-wavelength...
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > Lennie...WHAT did the "FISTS" organization have to do with
> > > > > > > ANYTHING in this thread YOU started with their name...???
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Hey Lennie...Three weeks too short for you to answer a question?
> > > > >
> > > > > Steve, K4YZ
> > > >
> > > > Talking to yourself again?
> > >
> > > And where do you see me asking myself questions, Brain?
> >
> > So all conversations with yourself must be in the form of an Inquisition?
>
> Brain, I asked you a specific question, and you did not answer it.
>
> WHERE do you see me asking MYSELF questions in ANY of those posts?
>
> Good luck with this one now.

> >
> > Steve, K4YZ
>
> You appeared to be having a conversation with someone who wasn't there.
>
> To an outside observer, you were talking to yourself.

No, Brain...To an "outside observer", I was asking a third party questions.

That third party was specifically named.

That the third party was dodging the questions was obvious.

That you somehow come to the conclusion that I was somehow talking to myself is absolutely assinine. THAT, to an "outside observer", WOULD be obvious.

You have yet again satisfied my curiosity as to just how stupid one human can get...

Steve, K4YZ

1559. Re: 14.313 Jamming.K9BSD, N9PGE, and KK9G.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-22 00:34:45 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031021203445.21642.00001835@mb-m01.aol.com>
Source record: 81235

In article <vp907lmbbf25db@corp.supernews.com>, "Clint" <rattlehead at computron dot net> writes:

>"Twice Fired" <loser@mulatto.com> wrote in message
>news:FxHkb.25379$5n.6961@bignews5.bellsouth.net...
>> Jamming on 313? K9BSD, N9PGE, KK9G have been doing that from central
>> indiana for years..... No wives, no life, nothing. Just a whiskey bottle
>> and ocd. Truly pathetic...
>>
>
>HOW CAN THAT BE?!?!?!? You must obviously be mistaken. Those guys
>passed morse code tests, and yet they're disruptive, cause trouble and
>violate the ham radio laws & rules laid forth by the FCC?

And what mode were the violators using?
>
>I was *sure* the PCTA crowd said that the morse code test was an adequate
>filter to keep out the "CBplussers".

Who claimed that? Show us the post where *any* test is claimed to be a perfect filter that keeps out violators.

>

1560. Mentoring Conditions For Brian Burke, Padawan Learner (BBPL)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-22 00:40:17 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0310211640.3f4dacf6@posting.google.com>
Source record: 81236

Brain,

You have recently insisted that I am now your "mentor". I have refused to take that responsibility since I simply believed you were just too stupid and too irresponsible to carry out your duties as a Padawan.

I realize now that I was too abrupt in dismissing you, and I apologize.

So here's the first step. These are some of my basic beliefs as they pertain to Amateur Radio in general and this newsgroup in particular, and they will be a part of your training. Before you may continue as my Padawan Learner, you must agree to these basic tenents wholly and without reservation.

If you do not post an acknowledgement to this thread and acceptence of them, without condition or exception, you will lose the right to call yourself my student, I and shall not be your mentor.

Remember...ANYTHING other than total and unconditional acceptence is evidence that you refuse my mentoring and shall therefore be barred from the perks and priviledges associated with being my Padawan.

(1) Amateur Radio is a dynamic and flourishing resource of self-trained radio operators and enthusiasts. There are almost as many opportunities for enjoyment of Amateur Radio as there are participants as each one brings his/her own contributions to it.

(2) I consider Morse Code proficiency to be an integral part of both Amateur Radio's history, and will continue to be an important part of it's future for some time to come. It allows disimilar and disparate souls to be able to communicate, if only at a very rudimentary level, and that human-to-human contact is vital to Amateur Radio. While Morse Code testing may become a thing fo the past in the very near future for the United States, I believe it should continue to be promoted, and my Padawan should share that belief and likewise demonstrate both proficiency in Morse Code, and should actively promote it's learning among all Amateurs. I define "proficiency" as being able to carry on a two-way CW QSO without the use of any decoding device, and at a sustained speed of 10WPM or greater.

(3) I do not tolerate liars, to include those who express admiration for people known to be liars. My Padawan shall renounce any past expression of admiration for any person so predisposed, and My Padawan will take a proactive role in ensuring that such liars are made known when thier acts or words are known or believed to be known

as false.

As a matter of exception, to express an opinion or to ask a question which shall be known to any reasonable person as contrary to popular opinion is not itself patently false. A lie is an OVERT attempt by a person to mislead, misrepresent, confuse, or otherwise represent the truth.

Example #1: "Amateur Radio is boring and useless". While I certainly do not agree, the person who uttered this was entitled to his opinion. It was, of course, the opinion of a person with very little understanding of Amateur Radio, and who sought to re-create it in his own image.

Example #2: "I am going to get the Extra-lite right out of the box". The person who uttered this did so knowing his words would be watched, and did so utter this assertion for the sole purpose of trying to climb out from the onslaught of messages against him which proved his other assertions false.

Example #3: "The ARRL is dishonest". This was patently false when originally uttered, and the person who did so has never brought forth any validation of the assertion. I would have loved to see the League make him pay for his verbal cowardice in court, but they have better things to do.

(4) While cerainly admirable, service in the Armed Forces of the United States is not prerequisite to being a good citizen, nor is it a prerequisite to discussing matters pertaining TO the Armed Forces of the United States. Indeed, the AFUS are the tool of and answer to the people...not the other way around. My Padawan will immediately chastise ANY person who suggest otherwise.

(*) Said Padawan shall also work quickly to dismiss as a coward any person
who shall attempt to claim military service or credit based upon the
service or sacrifice of others solely for his own gain.

(5) My Padawan shall not make offers to provide information or files to other RRAP participants via private e mail, then use that opportunity to send text, .jpg or other files that may be deemed inappropriate, obscene or contrary to what was promised. (See #3 above)

(6) My Padawan shall adhere to all Amateur Radio regulations, shall only claim to do or have done those things which are factual and documented and represent the best interests of the Amateur Radio service as a whole. Where documentation may have been lost or otherwise made unavailable, the Padawan will provide the names or callsigns of those who can verify in some degree the factuality of the operation concerned.

(7) Lastly, my Padawan shall not provide aid, comfort or support to any person who has demonstrated a gross disrespect for the Amateur Radio service or it's licensees, who acts to antagonize and harass those whom are lawfully and duly licensed in the Amateur Radio service, and who acts in such a way as to cast aspurgences on the Service, it participants or supporters.

Remember, Brian, ANYTHING other than a carte blanche acceptance of these conditions completely voids your acceptatance as Padawan Learner, and forever bars you from stating or suggesting that any mentor-padawan relationship exists.

Steve, K4YZ

1561. Re: Why thirteen and twenty?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-22 02:39:00 UTC
From: garigue <garigue@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <85mlb.327417$mp.267978@rwcrnsc51.ops.asp.att.net>
Source record: 81237

"Clint" <rattlehead at computron dot net> wrote in message
news:vpbevc120ps990@corp.supernews.com...
>
> "garigue" <garigue@comcast.net> wrote in message
> news:59Gkb.825619$Ho3.226493@sccrnsc03...
>
> > Here we go again with this standard transmission crap ...this time it
has
> > degenerated to starters ....
>
> and your point being? that just means there are MANY examples of why
> CW testing is outdated.

Huh ???? No Clint that is just a repeat of the same old crap I have been
seeing for years on this group in a vain attept to prove CW is in its death
throws.

> > Clint's logic ... no cars today have crank starters ... therefore CW is
in
> > that same category ...but wait ..why are there so many CW ham signals on
> the
> > air ... ????
>
> no problem with use of morse code. It's code TESTING that's outdated
> and is going to be removed.

Well then say that testing with out reference to the act of CW operation
which I see as the target of the no-code folks ....as said before NCI
....not NCTI
> >
> > Clint am I a "crybaby" because I see a useful skill i.e. the 2nd most
used
> > amateur mode badmouthed in the most illogical , immature and counter
> > productive manner.
>
> 2nd most used? that's debatable.. in fact, i'd be willing to bet it's far
> from
> the most used.

What did I say ....2nd most used ...don't follow your logic there Clint

AND, i'll play my own devil's advocate; it's widely agreed,
> with little dissention, that code use is on the decline... therefore, even
> IF it's
> as you assert (again, playing my own devil's advocate), this couldn't
> possibly

> be true indefinitely as it's use shrinks and deminishes.

Can't figure out that statement Clint ....I would agree that the mode is not used as much as it was in the past but I would wonder with the internet if the service as a whole was taking a hit. I am not bemoaning that happening as life is life and change is change. There are a lot of wholesome hobbies or endeavors out there Clint but I hope the service remains viable for the next generation to enjoy. Perhaps that will come with testing of CW being eliminated ....I hope that a positive impact will happen ..but again I wouldn't bet the kid's college fund on it.

God Bless 73 Tom Popovic KI3R Belle Vernon Pa

1562. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-22 02:51:57 UTC
From: Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns941BE897C9970elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 81238

N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in
news:c2356669.0310211403.6265732c@posting.google.com:

> "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
> news:<e3flb.9368$Uz6.6035@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
>> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote:
>> >
>> > I disagree! There's a world of difference between "drop the code"
>> > and "drop the code test".
>>
>> It's human nature to shorten phrases to simplify a discussion, Jim.
>
> Of course. But in this case dropping the word "test" changes the
> meaning tremendously.
>
>> We all
>> do it when it's bloody obvious what's being discussed. If you don't,
>> then you're truly an extraordinary human being.
>
> I don't drop words that are needed for clarity.
>
>> > If someone is against the code *test*, then let them take the
>> > trouble to spell it out.
>>
>> Oh, I see. This only applies to those oppossed to the code test.
>
> No, it applies to everyone.
>
>> Sorry,
>> you don't make the rules - either in this discussion or over human
>> nature.
>
> I'm simply expressing an opinion. I think people should take the time
> to be clear in what they are saying, particularly in a discussion
> where there are radically differing viewpoints, and where people drop
> in and out of the discussion often.
>
>> To continue to demand clarification of the obvious only makes it
>> appear you can't see the obvious, which isn't exactly a good
>> impression to leave with others, Jim.
>
> I'm simply expressing the opinion that if someone is really only
> against the test, they should so specify.
>

> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>

I don't think they had this NG in mind when they named the organisation,
HI!

73 de Alun, N3KIP

1563. Re: What makes LHA so poor at simple research tasks?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-22 04:28:45 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <REMOVETHISkc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <bn5sdl$tptp4$1@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 81243

Gee Jim.... hope there are no criminals lurking in the newsgroup. In this thread you gave quite a shopping list for criminals......

Ryan KC8PMX

(snippage)
>
> There's also the Tymeter mechanical digital clock I assembled from the
> parts of several discarded ones. Motor from one clock, case from
> another, 24 hour mechanism from a third, etc. Total cost about $2 -
> ten or fifteen years ago.
>
> And when I find a space for a computer in the shack, it will be a
> home-assembled one.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

1564. Re: FISTS Postion to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-22 10:14:39 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0310220214.7eb67b4e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 81239

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0310211532.323f742c@posting.google.com>...

> No, Brain...To an "outside observer", I was asking a third party
> questions.

You're not allowed to ask third party questions from an unlicensed person.

1565. Re: Dear Mother Brakob...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-22 10:43:31 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0310220243.4e1b819c@posting.google.com>
Source record: 81240

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0310201834.5bfd82e3@posting.google.com>...

> I STILL don't do Special Ed, Brain...
>
> Steve, K4YZ

You should; you're spelling is awful.

1566. Re: Amazin'....Ain't it...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-22 10:48:50 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0310220248.31acece9@posting.google.com>
Source record: 81241

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0310201826.13a00d25@posting.google.com>...
> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0310191833.6e0c7887@posting.google.com>...

> > No need. You are now my mentor, Stebe.
>
> Mentorship requires the consent of the elder. Since I do not
> grant it, you may claim anything you like.
>
> You may not like my style, my politics or my tactics, but I am
> not a liar.

Steve, you lie to yourself every time that little voice inside you
says that your style and tactics on RRAP are acceptable.

1567. Re: Reflections on rrap

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-22 10:52:03 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0310220252.302b0ad4@posting.google.com>
Source record: 81242

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0310201756.40c22259@posting.google.com>...
> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0310200313.651b6fb9@posting.google.com>...
> > k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0310191842.c9abd41@posting.google.com>...
> > > brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0310151708.26ac0f28@posting.google.com>...
> > >
> > > > Kim, get the OM a shiney new pair of HD brass-riveted jeans and
> > > > yourself a shiney new HD steel-belted brittany spear brazier, and join
> > > > us at Dayton 04.
> > >
> > > What was it you were suggesting to Mike Coslo about being rude,
> > > Brain?
> > >
> > > > I promise I won't make any Texas jokes til you'se guys show up.
> > >
> > > A promie from you is like pre-election fodder....
> > >
> > > > By the way, do you know how they separate the men from the boys in
> > > > Texas...
> > > >
> > > > Brain, (more or less.)
> > >
> > > Then I dare say you'd best not go to Texas...You've been
> > > seperated from your brain for a long time.
> > >
> > > Steve, K4YZ
> >
> > It was my attempt to get Kim to lighten up a little.
> >
> > But you don't know how to do that - always on the job as the RRAP
> > Avenging Angel, I see.
>
> No, Brain, it was YOUR "Avenging Angel" personna that was at
> work. When YOU do something like that it's "levity"...trying to get
> someone to "lighten up". When I say something similar you whip out
> this new "Avenging Angel" spin in order to try and disguise your own
> conduct.

If I've offended Kim, I'm sorry.

> I say it's yet one more example of following in the footsteps of
> Lennie the Liar..."Don't So As I Do...Do As I Say"...

>
> Bascially, I just think you're two-faced.
>
> Steve, K4YZ

No, Steve, not true. I have the capacity to say I was wrong an apologize.

I leave the Avenging Angel stuff to you. You do what you're best at - trying to destroy anyone who might disagree with you.

Sayonara.

1568. Re: Radio Registration (Nazi style Radio Registration is here?? Will the ARRL support it ??)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-22 12:32:57 UTC
From: Dean Arthur <dearthur@silverstar.com>
Message-ID: <3F9678F9.8B6D30AE@silverstar.com>
Source record: 81244
Cross-posted to:
rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.scanner,rec.radio.shortwave

Bill B wrote:
>
> If the ARRL even REMOTLY offers ANY SUPPORT
> WHATSOEVER to this Orwellian proposal by K8AD
> than it will signal the **DEATH KNELL** for ARRL.
>
> Anyone (...and I mean anyone) who would lend their
> support to this insane proposal is aiding totalitarian
> style controls to the private ownership of a radio
> transmitter.
>
> I wonder if K8AD went to the "Soviet Gulag School" of
> Ham Radio? The Govt. or anyone else has no damm
> business AT ALL knowing what makes and models of radios
> I may purchase or own G-DDAMMIT!
>
> What the frig? Are we to now have HANDGUN STYLE
> Registration Requirements for Ham Radio and CB Equipment???
>
> IF THE ARRL GOES ALONG WITH THIS PROPOSAL -
> IN ANY CAPACITY WHATSOEVER, YOU WILL SEE THE
> BIGGEST ABANDONMENT OF ARRL MEMBERSHIP
> SINCE THE INCENTIVE LICENSING DISASTER OF
> THE 60's and 70's.
>
> -----> Do not support or touch this proposal W1AW - unless you
> want to go the way of the Spark Transmitter and Rotary Dial Telephone.

And just HOW would seller verify info before buyer left store?

1569. Re: Radio Registration (Nazi style Radio Registration is here?? Will the ARRL support it ??)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-22 12:37:07 UTC
From: Dean Arthur <dearthur@silverstar.com>
Message-ID: <3F9679F3.C9DA75C5@silverstar.com>
Source record: 81245
Cross-posted to:
rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.scanner,rec.radio.shortwave

chessecutter wrote:
>
> Dean Arthur <dearthur@silverstar.com> wrote in message
news:<3E3F4915.C50E530E@silverstar.com>...
> > Was polishing motorcycle in driveway one day. Car drives up and couple
> > get out. Look at motorcycle then fellow asks if peculiar antenna on roof
> > is mine. I say "Yes." Out comes papers. "You have been served." Went to
> > court with Order for judge to sign requiring Plaintiff to reimburse me
> > for time off and costs of researching law at law library plus travel and
> > meals and listed miscellaneous expenses. Judge signed, they balked. I
> > said, "Pay up or I freeze all accounts and assets." The rep of company
> > asked judge if I could do that. Judge answered in the affirmative. They
> > paid.
> >
> > It's so much fun when you know the law and they don't!
>
> speaking of law things.......are you the same dean arthur that has
> been known to rip people off ????????? hmmmm????

Not selling or buying on net, only face-to-face, 'twould be a bit difficult.

Do you have header for Dean Arthur you believe to be rip-off artiste or
are you just inebriated mud-slinger?

1570. Re: Radio Registration (Nazi style Radio Registration is here?? Will the ARRL support it ??)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-22 12:41:49 UTC
From: Dean Arthur <dearthur@silverstar.com>
Message-ID: <3F967B0D.74D57846@silverstar.com>
Source record: 81246
Cross-posted to:
rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.scanner,rec.radio.shortwave

RedOctober90 wrote:
>
> When they mean by "two way" radio coms does that also include things
> like FRS and CB Radios? That's just ridicious. Maybe soon they will
> require people registering television sets.

TVs can be used as clandestine xmitters so don't worry, they'll be
included in reg requirement as will all AC & DC broadcast radios.

Aren't you glad you live in a demo[n]cracy instead of that anciente,
obsolete republic?

1571. Re: 14.313 Jamming.K9BSD, N9PGE, and KK9G.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-22 12:54:22 UTC
From: charlesb <n5pvl@sbcglobal.net>
Message-ID: <26vlb.5606$cE1.1951@newssvr29.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 81247

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20031021203445.21642.00001835@mb-m01.aol.com...
> >
> >HOW CAN THAT BE?!?!?!? You must obviously be mistaken. Those guys
> >passed morse code tests, and yet they're disruptive, cause trouble and
> >violate the ham radio laws & rules laid forth by the FCC?
>
> And what mode were the violators using?
> >
> >I was *sure* the PCTA crowd said that the morse code test was an adequate
> >filter to keep out the "CBplussers".
>
> Who claimed that? Show us the post where *any* test is claimed to be a
perfect
> filter that keeps out violators.

Well, it has (allegedly) kept several of the master-debators in this newsgroup off of HF... (Actually, it is their own laziness and lack of character that holds them back, not the code, but we'll skip over that for now.)

Because they cannot legally operate anything except VHF/UHF equipment, HF is a better place to operate today!

Note that I do not have a strong opinion, one way or another about the code/no-code debate, but I do have an opinion about the debate, itself.

I think that we should applaud QRZ.COM for developing a "zero tolerance" policy toward people who try to change any of the forums there into a code/no-code debate. They announced recently that code/no-coders will be summarily booted off of the QRZ system, just as quickly as they identify themselves through their actions.

I'd like to see more of that.

Charles Brabham, N5PVL

1572. Re: Reflections on rrap

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-22 15:08:42 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0310220708.5ba8f53d@posting.google.com>
Source record: 81248

brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0310220252.302b0ad4@posting.google.com>...
> k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0310201756.40c22259@posting.google.com>...

> > No, Brain, it was YOUR "Avenging Angel" personna that was at
> > work. When YOU do something like that it's "levity"...trying to get
> > someone to "lighten up". When I say something similar you whip out
> > this new "Avenging Angel" spin in order to try and disguise your own
> > conduct.
>
> If I've offended Kim, I'm sorry.

You offend more than Kim, Brain. You offend yourself, but you
are too self-centered to se it.

> > I say it's yet one more example of following in the footsteps of
> > Lennie the Liar..."Don't So As I Do...Do As I Say"...
> >
> > Bascially, I just think you're two-faced.
> >
> > Steve, K4YZ
>
> No, Steve, not true. I have the capacity to say I was wrong an
> apologize.

Being able to "apologize" is worthy, Brian.

Being able to not offend in the first place is even better.

> I leave the Avenging Angel stuff to you. You do what you're best at -
> trying to destroy anyone who might disagree with you.

It's not about "destroy(ing) anyone who might disagree with
(me)", Brain...It's about not tolerating that which I know to be false
and is known to others.

You make silly, even stupid assertions and claims and then take
offense when people pile up on you for being silly and stupid.

That's YOUR "fault".

Steve, K4YZ

1573. Re: Amazin'....Ain't it...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-22 15:15:44 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0310220715.4054056d@posting.google.com>
Source record: 81249

brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0310220248.31acece9@posting.google.com>...

> Steve, you lie to yourself every time that little voice inside you
> says that your style and tactics on RRAP are acceptable.

"Style", Brain?

"Tactics"...?!?!

There's not a "style" or "tactic" being employed here. You make
silly, even assinine assertions that are either easily disproved or
are not substantiated by some sort of fact or evidence, and then you
try to push the consequences of that failure off on someone else
because you can't stand the heat.

Sorry. Your bust.

It's not a "lie" to show someone else that he's acting foolishly.
Especially when the other guy just keeps piling on the evidence to
prove it.

Steve, K4YZ

1574. Re: Dear Mother Brakob...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-22 15:23:58 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0310220723.6a7d9612@posting.google.com>
Source record: 81250

brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0310220243.4e1b819c@posting.google.com>...
> k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0310201834.5bfd82e3@posting.google.com>...
>
> > I STILL don't do Special Ed, Brain...
> >
> > Steve, K4YZ
>
>
> You should; you're spelling is awful.

BBWWWHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAH
A
! ! ! ! !

I love a guy who chastises another for his spelling with a
sentence that would make any English teacher drop to her knees in
tears!

BBBWWWWHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHA!
! ! ! ! ! !

Steve, K4YZ

1575. Re: Amateur Radio Newsline? Report 1365 ? October 10 2003

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-22 15:26:20 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0310220726.71cfbbe@posting.google.com>
Source record: 81151

brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0310220226.402df21a@posting.google.com>...
> k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0310211528.9fa22d@posting.google.com>...
> > brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0310210330.6b177052@posting.google.com>...
> > > k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0310201801.6ec543bd@posting.google.com>...
> > > > brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0310200310.3998b5f7@posting.google.com>...
> > > > > k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0310191845.4f2a1f33@posting.google.com>...
> > > > > > brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0310150430.4c80244d@posting.google.com>...
> > > > > >
> > > > > > > And its not all NOAA. Air Force Weather runs a number of solar
> > > > > > > observatories around the globe, polarimeter stations, and
> > > > > > > rocketsondes.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > A bit of news passed to you via back-channel from Lennie, or were
> > > > > > > you reading some 1950's era "This Is The Air Force" books, Brain?
> > > > > > > They've only been doing this since the inception of the Air Force.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > Steve, K4YZ
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Stebe, I was AF Weather. You washed out and became a cook.
> > > > >
> > > > > If you say so...
> > > >
> > > > Or some other untrained, direct-duty assignment. Doesn't matter.
> > >
> > Sorry. Advanced Avionics. Lotsa neat radio stuff. Lennie
> > doesn't believe it, but it's in my SRB.
>
> That makes two.
>
> > > > The only time I "cooked" in the line of duty in
> > > > the USMC was heating C-Rats while in boot and on the trail.
> > >
> > > You are even more talented than anyone could guess.
> > >
> > > > And your having been a weather guesser in the USAF in no way
> > > > changes the facts vis-a-vis your earlier comments...
> > >

> > > You comments were a lie. I have read no 1950's era "This is the Air
> > > Force" book, Stebe, nor have I received via Len and back channel news.
> > >
> > Brain, Brain, Brain...The suggestion vis-a-vis a book or
> > back-channel input from Lennie was a question. Please re-read the
> > above.
>
> A comment meant to do what?
>
> Your innocent little smear campaign is just what to expect from the
> Avenging Angel.
>
> > A question cannot be a lie...It can only be a question.
>
> OK. Have you stopped beating your wife?
>
> > > The "facts" you
> > > > cited were all things being done in the Armed Forces for decades
> > > > before your signed on the line.
> > > >
> > > > Big deal.
> > >
> > > I merely learned them first hand.
> > >
> > No doubt. I rather imagine that you stopped opening books after
> > the "Dick and Jane" series.
>
> For a Morseodist you have a very limited imagination. Most imagine
> preposterous events befalling humankind, and CW is able to save the
> day.
>
> > > So how does a USMC nurse know about solar observatories in the USAF?
> > >
> > I wouldn't know, Brain. There are no nurses (by MOS) in the
> > USMC. Anyone who may be in the USMC now who holds licensure as a
> > Nurse does so as a personal achievement. I knew of a couple, but none
> > who were assigned to billets as nurses. One was a pilot, the other in
> > admin.
> > >
> > Nursing personnel assigned >>TO<< a Marine Corps unit are not in
> > the Marines. (They are usually Navy) If you read a book once in a
> > while, you might know this....But then again I doubt that too...
> > >
> > I was not a Nurse while in the Marine Corps.
>
> Right. Advanced Avionics.
>
> > As for knowing about solar observatories in the USAF, I hate to
> > burst your bubble, but there's very little that's actually
> > "classified" about aerography, in the USAF or otherwise, Brain.

>
> So you read and reread the 1950's era "This Is The Air Force," books
> and then attributed your actions to me?
>
> > > Brian
> >
> > Yeah...right....
> >
> > Steve, K4YZ

I am sure there was a point to this post, Brain, but quite
frankly, it was lost on me.

But then clarity of expression was never your forte, was it?

Steve, K4YZ

1576. Re: Code test analogy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-22 16:23:41 UTC
From: groupk0hb@earthlink.net
Message-ID: <5ee63311.0310220823.2fb4c16c@posting.google.com>
Source record: 81152

nocoder@aol.com (No-coder) wrote

>
> So, as with morse code testing, there are a few that hold onto it like a
> religion.
>

Dwight,

I'm shocked that you don't understand one of the great religions of Amateur Radio. Morsodism has been widely discussed here on rrap, but you're kind of an ignorant newcomer, so I'll fill you in.

So you want to be a Morsodist. It's not easy, you know: you'll have to impose the stiffest constraints on your mind, accepting authority without question -- you will be subject to jeers and persecutions at the hands of the Spawn of Oracle, and you will suffer during your entire lifetime trying to throw pearls before the swine. But in the end, you will receive your reward from the Almighty in Heaven, and you will have the satisfaction of seeing all others being tossed into the Lake of Fire.

But enough of that; you're not there yet. You must first prove yourself worthy of being a Morsodist.

Lesson One: Developing Your Psyche

Right now I would like you to relax. That's it -- just sit quietly and let your mind go blank. Concentrate on one thing and one thing only: concentrate on your thumb. Now that thumb is no ordinary run-of-the-mill thumb: what you see is THE THUMB. That Thumb is your world. Nothing besides that Thumb concerns you in the least. As far as you are concerned, that Thumb rules over all. The only thing that should be in your mind right now is your Thumb and its absolute authority over your life. Each and every line, ridge, wrinkle, and bit of cuticle is a Divine Mandate, eternal in its wisdom, power, and relevance. That Thumb was made by MORSE, and its sole purpose is to guide you to your Salvation.

Now, while still concentrating on that Thumb, begin to think about the world around you. Careful! Don't try to take in everything at once: start with the rest of your fingers, and slowly spread from there. See how your fingers are connected with and dominated by your Thumb. Now, slowly extend your perception to embrace your forfinger. It too was created by Morse, and it is all guided by the Thumb. Between your thumb and forefinger lie all the secrets of Morse. The rest of the universe is of no concern.

Lesson Two: Establishing Your Doctrine

Congratulations! You've come a long way, but you're not there yet. What I want you to do now is to go to the nearest book store and purchase a copy of the FCCRuleBook. Preferably, it should be bound in nice, shiny black leather, and should have gilt edges and a red silk ribbon. It should be fairly hefty in size, but not so large that you cannot hold it with one hand. Finally, it should have the words of Samuel in red letters, for as you know the Son of Morse only spoke using red letters.

Now that you have yourFCCRuleBook, read it, and read it thoroughly. I imagine that some of it will fit in perfectly with your beliefs and morals, since you have been inspired by Maxim to attempt this indoctrination into Morsodism. As you read, you must remember that your beliefs are the ONLY right beliefs, and all others are falsehoods and are totally incompatible with Morse Divine Truth.

Now you may be dismayed as you read through the FCCRuleBook to find that much of it is outside your beliefs, or may even contradict them. No problem! All you have to do is take a black marker pen and blot out those paragraphs which you don't like. Simplicity itself! Now don't you worry if it seems that more of the FCCRuleBook is blacked out than left behind: just remind yourself that the remaining words are emphasized all the more.

Lesson Three: Living a Morsodist Lifestyle

Well, I'm sure that you Novices are simply bursting with questions on how to apply your new-found faith to your lives. I am pleased by your enthusiasm: such zeal is a necessity if you want to begin to work your influence on this filthy and sinful world and mold it into a clean and upright one. Those Spawn of W5YI are simply itching to be preached at, whether they want it or not, so let's get cracking.

First, obtain for thyself some sort of access to the internet newsgroups, specifically any (and all) newsgroups in the "rec.radio.amateur.*" lineage. Never mind that only one of them, the "policy" group is fit for Morsodists like yourself; you must spread the word ALL the heathen Oracalists. Crosspost like crazy, verily even if attacked by Horrible Herman, the Lord High Newsgroup Purity Defender.

As you preach the word of Morse to others, you will inevitably run into those who not only doubt the veracity of your words, but who also pose trick arguments inspired by Lenny Liberal and his henchman, Crazy Charlie, the head Oracalist, in an attempt to trap and discredit you. This lesson deals with some of the major swords wielded by various tempters, and gives you some ideas on how to parry those weapons.

Technobabble scholars: these vermin use their high-falootin' technical jargon and book-learning to pervert the words of the Morse and read things into Part 97 which aren't there. The FCCRuleBook was written by Morse for YOU to use, and contains EVERYTHING you need to know for

Salvation, plainly stated in black and white and red. There is nothing magic or mystical about it: it speaks out in the Words of Morse and speaks directly to YOU, as you have personally modified it to your belief set.

If other Spawn of Oracle say that the FCCRuleBook cannot speak the utter Truth because it is inconsistent in what it says, you can reply that there is no inconsistency in your FCCRuleBook: everything that you have in your FCCRuleBook perfectly supports your beliefs (remember Lesson Two). If they quote passages from the FCCRuleBook which they claim contradict your beliefs, you can reply that Oracle has inspired them to pervert the words of Morse and to twist their meaning around in order to try to subvert the Truth. If they say that you are being totally ignorant and irrational in your absolute belief in your Morsodist Doctrine, you can reply that they are being totally ignorant and irrational in their absolute refusal to believe in your Doctrine. And if they say that you are shutting your eyes to reality, you can reply that they are shutting their eyes to Morse.

Peace to all of you!

1577. Re: BPL a reality in my area now!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-22 16:57:42 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3F96B706.5090903@psu.edu>
Source record: 81153

Brian wrote:

> Mike, you must realize that its important for these guys to retell
> their biopsy stories day after day, year after year, and any
> interruption by any danged contest is unacceptable. ;^)

Sigh... it certainly seems that way!

- Mike KB3EIA -

1578. Re: Code test analogy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-22 17:11:04 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bn6dn8$ha1$0@208.206.142.98>
Source record: 81154

Hans K0HB wrote:

> Peace to all of you!

Peace on you, too!

1579. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-22 17:25:35 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3F96BD8F.6050009@psu.edu>
Source record: 81155

Dwight Stewart wrote:
> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote:
>
>>I disagree! There's a world of difference between "drop
>>the code" and "drop the code test".
>
>
>
> It's human nature to shorten phrases to simplify a discussion, Jim. We all
> do it when it's bloody obvious what's being discussed. If you don't, then
> you're truly an extraordinary human being.

Dwight, I don't believe that NCI's official position at this time is to remove Morse code as a mode.

But with all due respect, the argument that simplification of the discussion from something like NCTI to NCI is to say the least, laughable. I go through more acronyms than that before getting dressed in the morning, and can handle the extra T easily.

>
>>If someone is against the code *test*, then let them take
>>the trouble to spell it out.
>
>
>
> Oh, I see. This only applies to those oppossed to the code test. Sorry,
> you don't make the rules - either in this discussion or over human nature.
> To continue to demand clarification of the obvious only makes it appear you
> can't see the obvious, which isn't exactly a good impression to leave with
> others, Jim.

Let's take a ignorant but intelligent bystander who sees the words "No Code International".

Without a person or written material to pursuade him that it really means No Code Test International, Tell me the assumption that he is going to make.

Can you with a straight face, tell me that the person is going to assume that it means elimination of the test?

- Mike KB3EIA -

1580. Re: Radio Registration (Nazi style Radio Registration is here?? Will the ARRL support it ??)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-22 18:07:58 UTC
From: groupk0hb@earthlink.net
Message-ID: <5ee63311.0310221007.943fefb@posting.google.com>
Source record: 81156
Cross-posted to:
rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.scanner,rec.radio.shortwave

Dean Arthur <dearthur@silverstar.com> wrote

>
> And just HOW would seller verify info before buyer left store?
>

Don't look now but this is really ***OLD*** news, perhaps at least a
year since it was dismissed.

73, Hans, K0HB

1581. Re: Mother Brakob, Listen Up!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-22 18:50:50 UTC
From: dennis@wawa.juniper.net
Message-ID: <bn6jia$1sdc$1@heap.juniper.net>
Source record: 81158

Len Over 21 <lenover21@aol.com> wrote:
>In article <wuelb.13201$JF7.1044@news01.roc.ny>, "Jim Hampton"
> Hans Brakob came out of the blue with a personally insulting comment
> about "bad research," something that I allegedly "always do," solely
> about "the first voice transmission by radio." Hans claimed, but did
> not reference or otherwise verify that it was done with a SPARK
> TRANSMITTER.
>
> I quoted an Electronics magazine special edition text paragraph that
> stated this 1906 Christmas transmission was done with a 1 KW
> ALTERNATOR, probably using a water cooled microphone in the
> antenna line.

Just to clarify, this is what the article at

http://ewh.ieee.org/reg/7/millennium/radio/radio_differences.html

says about it:

At the turn of the century Fessenden was using a spark transmitter,
employing a Wehnelt interrupter operating a Ruhmkorff induction
coil. In 1899 he noted, when the key was held down for a long dash,
that the peculiar wailing sound of the Wehnelt interrupter
could be clearly heard in the receiving telephone. He must have had
a detector of some sort that was working for him, even at this
early stage in the development of wireless. This suggested to him
that by using a spark rate well above voice band (10,000 sparks/sec),
wireless telephony could be achieved; and this he did transmitting
speech over a distance of 1.5 km on 23 December 1900, between 15 metre
masts on Cob Island, MD [Belrose, 1994a; 1994b].

In autumn of 1906 Fessenden had his HF alternator working adequately
on frequencies up to about 100 kHz. About midnight in
November, 1906 Mr. Stein at Fessenden's Brant Rock station was telling
the operator at a nearby test station at Plymouth, MA how to
run the HF alternator. It was usual for these two operators to use speech
over this short distance. However his voice was heard by Mr. Armor at
Machrihanish, Scotland with such clarity that there was no doubt about
the speaker, and the station log books confirmed the report

[...]

Fessenden's greatest success took place on Christmas Eve 1906, when he
and his colleagues presented the world's first wireless broadcast. The
transmission included a speech by Fessenden and selected music for
Christmas.

So, while the first radio voice broadcast was made at Christmas, 1906, using an alternator, the first radio voice transmission of any sort was made 6 years earlier using a spark transmitter.

The description of how the spark transmitter was used to transmit voice makes perfect sense to me. If you take a band-limited continuous waveform and transmit discrete samples of the waveform taken at a rate which is twice the maximum continuous frequency (i.e. 10,000 amplitude-modulated sparks per second for 5 kHz bandwidth audio), then low-pass filtering the received signal back to the original bandwidth will reproduce the original continuous waveform. This is from the Nyquist(-Shannon) sampling theorem, though if I recall this was done a quarter century before Nyquist's paper on digital (telegraph) signals over bandwidth-limited analog channels and a half-century before Shannon explained what this meant for discrete sampling. That's pretty neat.

Dennis Ferguson

1582. Re: 14.313 Jamming.K9BSD, N9PGE, and KK9G.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-22 18:54:36 UTC
From: groupk0hb@earthlink.net
Message-ID: <5ee63311.0310221054.1941997e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 81157

"charlesb" <n5pvl@sbcglobal.net> wrote

> I think that we should applaud QRZ.COM for developing a "zero tolerance"
> policy toward people who try to change any of the forums there into a
> code/no-code debate. They announced recently that code/no-coders will be
> summarily booted off of the QRZ system, just as quickly as they identify
> themselves through their actions.
>
> I'd like to see more of that.

Hey, Old Biker, this newsgroup was created specifically to contain the
code/no-code discussion. If you can't stand the heat....

73, Hans, K0HB
--
http://home.earthlink.net/~k0hb

1583. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-22 19:27:46 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <SSAlb.14065$Uz6.7160@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 81159

"Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote:
>
> Let's take a ignorant but intelligent bystander who sees
> the words "No Code International".
>
> Without a person or written material to pursuade him
> that it really means No Code Test International, Tell
> me the assumption that he is going to make.
>
> Can you with a straight face, tell me that the person is
> going to assume that it means elimination of the test?

I can tell you with a perfectly straight face that an uninvolved bystander probably wouldn't think anything, simply because the issue doesn't mean anything to him. As far as I can see, only an involved ham would have any interest in NCI at all, and that type of person would surely know what the debate is all about.

However, the words you quoted had nothing to do with NCI. They were intended to address Jim's desire that everyone opposed to the code test must specifically use the words "code test" during any discussion of the issue.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

1584. Re: BPL endorsed by FCC, another threat to HF ham radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-22 19:37:21 UTC
From: "Bernard W. Joseph" <k8lix@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <mNidnQ1lgfDlQQuiRVn-sw@comcast.com>
Source record: 81160
Cross-posted to:
alt.ham-radio.hf,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,alt.ham-radio.packet,rec.radio.amateur.dx

brian wrote:

> The commissioners are lawyers except for two of them, none have engineering or
> technical degree.
>
>
> http://ftp.fcc.gov/commissioners/
>
> brian
>
>
> Dave wrote:
>
>
>>Can the FCC be sued for acting in GROSS negligence? Under the premise
>>that as professionals THEY SHOULD HAVE KNOWN they may be liable.
>>
>>Yeah, I know you can't sue the government, but it sounds good!
>>
>>Dave
>>
>>Dan/W4NTI wrote:
>>
>>
>>>Well Dick, apparantly no one else cares. I don't know of any of the
>>>aformentioned groups making comments. Do you? Maybe they have no concept
>>>of what will happen. Sorta like the FCC having no concept of what will
>>>happen either.
>>>
>>>Dan/W4NTI
>>>
>>>"Dick Carroll" <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com> wrote in message
>>>news:bktfft$71a$0@208.206.142.103...
>>>
>>>
>>>> It won't be just hams and other minor users of spectrum below 80 mHz
>>>>who will be very seriously impacted by BPL. There are several states
>>>>whose statewice Public Service - State Police FM radio communications
>>>>systems are located on Low Band VHF, in the 40-50 mHz region. These
>>>>include California Highway Patrol and Missouri Highway Patrol, and at
>>>>least a few other state public safety and forestry organizations, as
>>>>well as many private users.
>>>> From personal knowledge of conditions drawn from many years of

>>>>personal involvment with these systems I am certain they cannot co-exist
>>>>with BPL.
>>>>
>>>> I know they would all jump at the chance to move up to a trunked UHF
>>>>or higher system, but with all the state governmental budget woes that
>>>>won't be possible anytime soon.
>>>> One can only wonder what FCC is thinking here.
>>>>BPL is basically a noise generator that is attractive because it
>>>>"wires the world" in the eyes of those for whom that end is
>>>>the most important feature of advancing technology. Unfamiliar with
>>>>the workings of radio or technology itself, they have eagerly latched
>>>>onto the totally inaccurate and selfserving assertions of BPL proponants.
>>>>
>>>> As I said in my comments to the NPRM, there are much better ways to
>>>>acoomplish the same end without completely ruining the HF spectrum.
>>>>
>>>>Dick
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>opcom wrote:
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>This was posted to ARLI, I don't know how many subscribe, but in spite
>>>
>>>of the numerous comments against BPL (transmitting wideband internet data
>>>over power lines, which will destroy the HF radio spectrum), the FCC seems
>>>disposed
>>>
>>>
>>>>>to encourage it anyway. evil! evil! just look up BPL on the web. The
>>>
>>>noise from the radiated signals trashed the ham bands thoroughly.
>>>
>>>
>>>>>----------
>>>>>
>>>>>From:
>>>>> Amateur Radio Station N0JAA <N0JAA@aol.com>
>>>>> 4:00 PM
>>>>>
>>>>>Subject:
>>>>> [ARLI] FCC Commissioner's Comments Concerning BPL
>>>>> To:
>>>>> bvarc@clarc.org, clarc@clarc.org, ARLI@topica.com
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>The following is a transcript from a recent speech given by FCC

>>>
>>>Commissioner Kathleen Q. Abernathy at the United PowerLine
>>>
>>>
>>>>>Council's annual conference regarding BPL. It seems that she is all for
>>>
>>>it. It also seems that BPL is going to become a reality, regardless
>>>
>>>
>>>>>of what ARRL, the military, or anyone else says. As usual, big industry
>>>
>>>wins over everyone else because they have the money.
>>>
>>>
>>>>>This is from today's FCC Digest.
>>>>>
>>>>>Paul, N0JAA
>>>>>
>>>>>----------
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>Reaching Broadband Nirvana
>>>>>United PowerLine Council Annual Conference Remarks of Commissioner
>>>
>>>Kathleen Q. Abernathy
>>>
>>>
>>>>>September 22, 2003 (As prepared for delivery)
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>Thank you very much for inviting me to speak with you. I am very excited
>>>
>>>about broadband-over-powerline technology. I
>>>
>>>
>>>>>have seen it in action, and I believe it has a very bright future. It is
>>>
>>>a real honor to be your keynote speaker at this
>>>
>>>
>>>>>important juncture for BPL.
>>>>>
>>>>>As a regulator, I am keenly interested in BPL technology for a number of
>>>
>>>reasons. One of my central objectives as an FCC commissioner is to
>>>facilitate the deployment of broadband services to all Americans. I also
>>>fundamentally
>>>
>>>
>>>>>believe that the FCC can best promote consumer welfare by relying on

>>>
>>>market forces, rather than heavy-handed regulation. The development of BPL
>>>networks will serve both of these key goals. It will not only bring
>>>broadband to
>>>
>>>
>>>>>previously unserved communities, but the introduction of a new broadband
>>>
>>>pipeline into the home will foster the kind of competitive marketplace that
>>>will eventually enable the Commission to let go of the regulatory reins. I
>>>
>>>
>>>>>want consumers to have a choice of multiple, facilities-based
>>>
>>>providers, including not only cable and DSL, but also powerline, wireless,
>>>and satellite services. Such a robustly competitive and diversified
>>>marketplace is
>>>
>>>
>>>>>something I would call broadband Nirvana. We will not get there
>>>
>>>overnight, but the continuing development of BPL technology is a major step
>>>forward.
>>>
>>>
>>>>>While the long-term objective is a robustly competitive marketplace that
>>>
>>>is free of regulatory distortions, a more immediate question is: What
>>>should the FCC do to help foster such an environment? Sticking with my
>>>Nirvana
>>>
>>>
>>>>>metaphor, I guess the question would be, what is the path to
>>>
>>>enlightenment?
>>>
>>>
>>>>>I believe the answer, in short, is regulatory restraint. It is tempting
>>>
>>>for regulators to take every new technology or service that comes along and
>>>apply the same rules that govern incumbent services. After all, regulatory
>>>
>>>
>>>>>parity and a level playing field are intuitively appealing concepts.
>>>
>>>But I believe that it would be a huge mistake to carry forward legacy
>>>regulations whenever new technology platforms are established. Many of our
>>>regulations
>>>
>>>
>>>

>>>>>are premised on the absence of competition, and when that rationale is
>>>
>>>eroded, we must not reflexively hold on to regulations that no longer serve
>>>their intended purpose. In fact, many of our old rules not only become
>>>
>>>
>>>>>unnecessary as markets evolve, but they can be fatal to new services
>>>
>>>that need room to breathe.
>>>
>>>
>>>>>The Nascent Services Doctrine applying more stringent regulations to
>>>
>>>wireline providers at a minimum must be reconsidered. As other platforms,
>>>including BPL and wireless, become more widely available, that will further
>>>
>>>
>>>>>undermine the justification for regulating incumbent LECs broadband
>>>
>>>services as if they were the only available offerings. When the Commission
>>>completes this rulemaking, I expect that we will eliminate many existing
>>>rules and
>>>
>>>
>>>>>substantially modify others; the central question is the degree of
>>>
>>>regulation that will remain during the transition to a more robustly
>>>competitive market.
>>>
>>>
>>>>>Finally, it is important to recognize that although the emergence of new
>>>
>>>platforms like BPL will eliminate the need for many competition-related
>>>regulations, other types of regulation may well remain necessary. For
>>>example, the
>>>
>>>
>>>>>FCC must implement public policy goals unrelated to competition, or
>>>
>>>even at odds with competition. Universal service and access for persons
>>>with disabilities are examples of this kind of regulation. These public
>>>policy goals
>>>
>>>
>>>>>generally should be applied to all service providers, to the extent
>>>
>>>permitted by the Communications Act. The FCC also must intervene to prevent
>>>competitors from imposing externalities on one another and to protect
>>>consumers
>>>

>>>
>>>>>where market failures are identified. Although, as I have noted, the
>>>
>>>Commission was right to refrain from imposing heavy-handed price and
>>>service-quality regulations on PCS services when the were introduced, it was
>>>also right
>>>
>>>
>>>>>to adopt strict interference rules to prevent competitors from
>>>
>>>externalizing their costs. The same principle will apply to BPL. They key
>>>point is that, while some degree of regulation is both inevitable and
>>>desirable, we
>>>
>>>
>>>>>should ensure that it is narrowly tailored to the particular
>>>
>>>governmental interests at stake. I appreciate the opportunity to share
>>>these thoughts with you, and I would be happy to answer a few questions if
>>>we have time.
>>>
>>>
>>>>> ******------****** please click on one or more
>>>
>>>of the links below to send a blank subscribe message.
>>>
>>>
>>>>>Amateur Radio Legal Issues List
>>>>>(A list for discussing legal and legislative issues impacting Amateur
>>>
>>>Radio from Congress and the FCC)
>>>
>>>
>>>>>What have you done for Amateur Radio today?
>>>>>--^^--
>>>>
>>>
>
It used to be that in ham radio, BPL stood for Brass Pounders' League, a
group and name that has a long and honorable tradition. I have not yet
adjusted to BPL standing for something that many hams abhor.

1585. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-22 19:41:02 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3F96DD4E.3070906@psu.edu>
Source record: 81161

Dwight Stewart wrote:
> "Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote:
>
>>Let's take a ignorant but intelligent bystander who sees
>>the words "No Code International".
>>
>>Without a person or written material to pursuade him
>>that it really means No Code Test International, Tell
>>me the assumption that he is going to make.
>>
>>Can you with a straight face, tell me that the person is
>>going to assume that it means elimination of the test?
>
>
>
> I can tell you with a perfectly straight face that an uninvolved bystander
> probably wouldn't think anything, simply because the issue doesn't mean
> anything to him. As far as I can see, only an involved ham would have any
> interest in NCI at all, and that type of person would surely know what the
> debate is all about.

But you can't say that No-Code International just by looking at the
name means No Code test International, deflection attempts aside.

> However, the words you quoted had nothing to do with NCI. They were
> intended to address Jim's desire that everyone opposed to the code test must
> specifically use the words "code test" during any discussion of the issue.

Doesn't hurt! You assume everyone has an in depth grasp of an issue?

Argue as you will, Dwight. I'm just saying in your desire to be "right"
you are taking a tack that to at least some of us looks a bit silly. If
some one told me I was being imprecise, Id apologize and be more precise
with them. YMMV.

- Mike KB3EIA -

1586. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-22 19:58:38 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <OjBlb.14079$Uz6.13161@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 81162

"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote:
>
> Of course. But in this case dropping the word "test" changes
> the meaning tremendously.

Not when the two parties are participating in a conversation specifically about dropping the code test, which is the current debate throughout the ham radio community, Jim. Therefore, anyone who wants to change the debate to focus on code itself, instead of the code test, would have the burdon of being more specific to have his or her intent fully understood.

In reality, requiring specifics with each message posted in an existing debate would tend to stiffle that debate, which I suspect is the underlying goal of some of those demanding specific words and phrases from their opposition in this debate.

> I don't drop words that are needed for clarity. (snip)

Clarity of what - explicitness, focus, intent, meaning, unambiguity, or all of these? There are many types of clarity, Jim. Without specifics, I cannot be certain exactly what you mean. ;-)

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

1587. Re: Waiting For Another Answer From Lennie

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-22 20:23:00 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031022162300.05539.00001769@mb-m16.aol.com>
Source record: 81164

In article <c2356669.0310211358.3baa9acf@posting.google.com>, N2EY@AOL.COM
(N2EY) writes:

>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
>news:<5c01b95b.0310210519.6aef39af@posting.google.com>...
>> lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>news:<20031020224444.12501.00003386@mb-m04.aol.com>...
>> > In article <20031020182922.08626.00001309@mb-m27.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com
>>
>> > Good thing you morsemen have a cozy lil chat room to talk all
>> > about AMATEUR RADIO SUBJECTS, isn't it?
>>
>> Most of what YOU want to talk about isn't related to Amateur
>> Radio either,
>
>[expletive deleted]
>
>>so why hassle Jim?
>
>Simple, Steve - to try to get a rise out of me. Or you.

Nope. Just to show how BIASED you guys are, doing so much
SELECTIVE EDITING to attempt proving some point, and then
making all those charges about "poor research" about the PAST.

>> > So, Capt. Jimmie, what outfit were you assigned to?
>>
>> Why do you insist on trying to besmirch others for thier military
>> (or NON-military) service, Lennie?
>>
>> Is it illegal for an American to NOT serve in the Armed Forces?
>>
>> Can you PROVE that Jim Miccolis or ANY other person in this forum
>> shirked an OBLIGATION under the Selective Service Act...?!?!
>
>I still have my original 1972 issue draft card.

Whoopee...at least Capt. Jimmie obeyed a law and registered with
his local board THIRTY-ONE YEARS AGO.

That, of course, entitles Capt. Jimmie to carte blanche "learned
comment" about World War Two sociopolitics in an amateur radio
newsgroup.

Selective Service (the "draft") ended in 1975. 28 years ago.

>> We're talking about REAL facts, Lennie...The truth....Something
>> you can PROVE...?!?!
>
>As Kim would say: Oh, puh-leeeease! You don't really expect such from
>Len, do you?

Tsk, tsk, tsk...getting a bit heated about upset in the ranks, Capt.
Jimmie?

Okay, now PROVE that Reginald Fessenden used a SPARK
transmitter that was voice modulated on that famous broadcast on
Christmas Eve, 1906.

Argue against a McGraw-Hill publication of 1980 or against REAL
historian Thomas H. White on his website.

>> Sems to me there's been no draft in this country since the mid
>> 70's, and that military service is non-compulsory. YOU keep trying to
>> insinuate that Jim or Brian Kelly's careers somehow hinge on what they
>> did or didn't do in the Armed Forces, but you have yet to explain why.
>
>It's called "ad hominem", Steve.

Noooo...not ad hominem or even hominem grits.

Some civilan mick claiming he shot bears for "naval intelligence" on
board a USN aircraft carrier is stretching credulity. A civilian puke who
never served in an military or civilian communications outfit is going to
try to tell one who DID that he is "all wrong" about what was done?

Nice try at the Big Lie technique. You failed.

Your misdirection technique doesn't work well at all.

>> YOU have zero-point-zero experience in Amateur Radio, yet you
>> seem to be perfectly OK with commenting at length on Amateur Radio
>> matters.
>
>There's this pot and this kettle....

The FCC doesn't require any commissioners or staff to hold amateur
radio licenses in order to REGULATE amateur radio in the US.

So, Capt. Jimmie and the Avenging Angel of the United States Morse
Codists (USMC) are going to charge the FCC with "unlawful activity?"

>> You have zero-point-zero days experience as an aviator, but
>> you've tried to pull the wool over our eyes on matters pertaining to
>> aviation, too. Read Bill Kershner's Student Manual a few times I
>> wager, but you've never once been pilot-in-command of an aircraft, yet
>> you went off on a tirade about NAVAID systems and aerial
>> navigation...THAT was a hoot...!

Tsk, tsk, tsk, Capt. Jimmie, you should have pulled rank on the
USMC no-com for that.

No one, repeat no one "must" be a pilot in order to design, develop, work on, service, maintain aircraft radionavigation aids. Done that. Same thing for "aerial navagation" which should be aircraft navigation...aerials remain attached to whatever radio they are connected to...:-)

>> You also have zero-point-zero experience in matters such as
>> emergency communications, disaster relief, etc, yet you always feel
>> compelled to comment on thos matters too. (OK, I'll give you
>> zero-point-five experience for the ONE time you owned up to helping at
>> a disaster...filling sand bags...)

Poor USMC psychotic had another delusion. I've never "filled sand bags." That must have been a duty the USMC no-com did (no doubt taxing his intellectual capability to the limit).

What DIRECT ACTIONS have the illustrious military expert Capt. Jimmie or the USMC no-com done? Illustrate by verifiable references.

>> Are we to assume that YOU are of the opinion that it's OK for YOU
>> to express opinions on matters for which you have no practical
>> experience, but it's NOT OK for others to do the same...?!?!
>
>You just figuring that out, Steve? ;-)

Stebe still doesn't understand the U. S. Constitution or its First Amendment. It would seem that Capt. Jimmie, military and socio-political guru, doesn't understand it either.

>> We'll wait right here for your answer.
>>
>Don't hold yer breath waiting.
>
>btw, didja take a listen to the spark rigs - particularly the voice
>modulated spark?
>
>Here's how Fessenden did it, in a nutshell:
>
>The buzz that characterizes ordinary spark signals is due to the
>relatively low AC used. Fessenden figured that if he used AC above the
>audio range, the spark rate would be above the audio rate, and
>intelligible audio would result. He was right, of course.

Fantastic intellect...should have become an Amateur Extra.

Fessenden didn't use any SPARK transmitter for that famous 1906 Christmas Eve broadcast. It was a rotary alternator of about 750 Watts output on about 70 KHz.

You can see the microphone used on Thomas H. White's US radio history pages. Direct series connection with the antenna lead.

>And by using headphones with poor response above a few kHz, much of
>the noise would be filtered out.

Brilliant intellect, Capt. Jimmie. Finally got your Masters' dust shaken off it, did you?

>Of course when he got his paws on a suitable Alexanderson alternator,
>the spark idea was abandoned. His alternator would go as high as 100
>kHz and was rated at 1 kW.

Fessenden used 750 W rotary alternator at about 70 KHz for that 1906 Christmas Eve broadcast. Try to get close to real electrical values as recorded by history.

Now, I might be wrong, but this forum is about AMATEUR RADIO POLICY of today, not long, long ago before you or the USMC no-com existed. Neither is it about WW2 or WW1 nor of ancient history in radio when the label "ham" was a pejorative.

Of course, this could be just another United States Morse Codist's CHAT ROOM where all morsemen gather to give each other high-fives about how they are all leaders, movers, shakers in radio for their mighty macho morsemanship. Feel free to talk anyone down who doesn't agree with the tenets and catechisms of morse. That should be your sworn duty.

beep, beep

LHA

1588. Re: Halloween gift to rra*

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-22 20:23:01 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031022162301.05539.00001770@mb-m16.aol.com>
Source record: 81163

In article <5ee63311.0310211412.54b20cd5@posting.google.com>,
groupk0hb@earthlink.net (Hans K0HB) writes:

>http://www.handiham.org//article.php?sid=160

"Little Billy Beeper" is "officially published!" :-)

Gosh, that's practically the same as being printed on real paper with real ink! Get it hardbound, old-timer, charge extra for special first editions with your autograph! Get on the Today show or Late Night with Letterman, spread the word.

Sorry, your copyright claim was busted with all those copies you made in here before.

While you are at it, why don't you explain how McGraw-Hill is "wrong" and you are "right" that ol' Reg Fessenden used a SPARK transmitter in that "famous voice broadcast" of Christmas 1906.

I wan't to see how "real research" is done.

You might also want to argue with Thomas H. White's on-line history of United States radio as it was before 1928. I'm sure you charge him with "poor research" too. There's Jack Belrose up in Canada...

Lots of good luck on that one, now...

LHA

1589. Re: Amateur Radio Newsline? Report 1365 ? October 10 2003

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-22 20:23:03 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031022162303.05539.00001771@mb-m16.aol.com>
Source record: 81165

In article <f45722ac.0310220226.402df21a@posting.google.com>,
brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:

>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
>news:<5c01b95b.0310211528.9fa22d@posting.google.com>...
>> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
>news:<f45722ac.0310210330.6b177052@posting.google.com>...
>> > k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
>news:<5c01b95b.0310201801.6ec543bd@posting.google.com>...
>> > > brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
>news:<f45722ac.0310200310.3998b5f7@posting.google.com>...
>> > > > k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
>news:<5c01b95b.0310191845.4f2a1f33@posting.google.com>...
>> > > > > brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
>news:<f45722ac.0310150430.4c80244d@posting.google.com>...
>> > > > >
>> > > > > > And its not all NOAA. Air Force Weather runs a number of solar
>> > > > > > observatories around the globe, polarimeter stations, and
>> > > > > > rocketsondes.
>> > > > >
>> > > > > A bit of news passed to you via back-channel from Lennie, or
>were
>> > > > > you reading some 1950's era "This Is The Air Force" books, Brain?
>> > > > > They've only been doing this since the inception of the Air Force.
>> > > > >
>> > > > > Steve, K4YZ
>> > > >
>> > > > Stebe, I was AF Weather. You washed out and became a cook.
>> > >
>> > > If you say so...
>> >
>> > Or some other untrained, direct-duty assignment. Doesn't matter.
>>
>> Sorry. Advanced Avionics. Lotsa neat radio stuff. Lennie
>> doesn't believe it, but it's in my SRB.
>
>That makes two.

"Advanced Avionics" to Ace Airman Stebe: Switch-over from tube
aircraft intercom sets to transistorized aircraft intercom sets.

Brian, give him a common AN/ARC-201 and he doesn't know what
in hell it is. He MIGHT know about an AN/ARC-27 but that's only
because it has been in USN inventory since before 1970.

>> > > The only time I "cooked" in the line of duty in
>> > > the USMC was heating C-Rats while in boot and on the trail.
>> >
>> > You are even more talented than anyone could guess.
>> >
>> > > And your having been a weather guesser in the USAF in no way
>> > > changes the facts vis-a-vis your earlier comments...
>> >
>> > You comments were a lie. I have read no 1950's era "This is the Air
>> > Force" book, Stebe, nor have I received via Len and back channel news.
>>
>> Brain, Brain, Brain...The suggestion vis-a-vis a book or
>> back-channel input from Lennie was a question. Please re-read the
>> above.
>
>A comment meant to do what?
>
>Your innocent little smear campaign is just what to expect from the
>Avenging Angel.

Stebe never "lies." He tells untruths, he makes mistakes by the
ton, but he is a loyal USMC (United States Morse Codist) and
follows orders posted at Hq bulletin board in Newington.

The medical folks at Glendale Memorial thought Efren Saldivar was
a good respiratory thereapist nurse...until too many patients
assumed room temperature while under his care. Fully certified,
lots of pretty paper attesting to his expertise. The "angel of death"
is now in lockup. [Glendale, CA, old established and modernized
hospital in the Glendale hills]

Fantastic similarity.

>> A question cannot be a lie...It can only be a question.
>
>OK. Have you stopped beating your wife?

Which one?

>> > The "facts" you
>> > > cited were all things being done in the Armed Forces for decades
>> > > before your signed on the line.
>> > >
>> > > Big deal.
>> >
>> > I merely learned them first hand.
>>
>> No doubt. I rather imagine that you stopped opening books after
>> the "Dick and Jane" series.
>
>For a Morseodist you have a very limited imagination. Most imagine
>preposterous events befalling humankind, and CW is able to save the
>day.

I'll argue the imagination part, Brian. Remeber Stebe's "hostile
actions?" :-)

>> > So how does a USMC nurse know about solar observatories in the USAF?
>>
>> I wouldn't know, Brain. There are no nurses (by MOS) in the
>> USMC. Anyone who may be in the USMC now who holds licensure as a
>> Nurse does so as a personal achievement. I knew of a couple, but none
>> who were assigned to billets as nurses. One was a pilot, the other in
>> admin.
>>
>> Nursing personnel assigned >>TO<> the Marines. (They are usually
>Navy) If you read a book once in a
>> while, you might know this....But then again I doubt that too...
>>
>> I was not a Nurse while in the Marine Corps.
>
>Right. Advanced Avionics.

Yeah, he changed tubes in old aircraft intercom sets...

>> As for knowing about solar observatories in the USAF, I hate to
>> burst your bubble, but there's very little that's actually
>> "classified" about aerography, in the USAF or otherwise, Brain.
>
>So you read and reread the 1950's era "This Is The Air Force," books
>and then attributed your actions to me?

Careful, Brian, those are His study books for the Civil Air Patrol.

He is still working on the meaning of "PIREPS" and has just started
to memorize "isobars," discovering that they aren't for a lockup for
that most heinous of all "service" crimes: Lying.

Wouldn't it be fun if he found out what "adiabatic lapse rate" was?
:-)

LHA

1590. Re: 14.313 Jamming.K9BSD, N9PGE, and KK9G.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-22 20:34:06 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3F96E9BE.6070503@psu.edu>
Source record: 81166

Hans K0HB wrote:
> "charlesb" <n5pvl@sbcglobal.net> wrote
>
>
>>I think that we should applaud QRZ.COM for developing a "zero tolerance"
>>policy toward people who try to change any of the forums there into a
>>code/no-code debate. They announced recently that code/no-coders will be
>>summarily booted off of the QRZ system, just as quickly as they identify
>>themselves through their actions.
>>
>>I'd like to see more of that.
>
>
> Hey, Old Biker, this newsgroup was created specifically to contain the
> code/no-code discussion. If you can't stand the heat....

Did you take that picture on your QSL card, Hans? Awesome!

- Mike KB3EIA -

1591. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-22 20:44:58 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bn6q8a$b2m$0@208.207.71.166>
Source record: 81167

Mike Coslo wrote:
>
>
> Dwight Stewart wrote:
>
>> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote:
>>
>>> I disagree! There's a world of difference between "drop
>>> the code" and "drop the code test".
>>
>>
>>
>>
>> It's human nature to shorten phrases to simplify a discussion, Jim.
>> We all
>> do it when it's bloody obvious what's being discussed. If you don't, then
>> you're truly an extraordinary human being.
>
>
> Dwight, I don't believe that NCI's official position at this time is
> to remove Morse code as a mode.
>
> But with all due respect, the argument that simplification of the
> discussion from something like NCTI to NCI is to say the least,
> laughable. I go through more acronyms than that before getting dressed
> in the morning, and can handle the extra T easily.
>
>>
>>> If someone is against the code *test*, then let them take
>>> the trouble to spell it out.
>>
>>
>>
>>
>> Oh, I see. This only applies to those oppossed to the code test. Sorry,
>> you don't make the rules - either in this discussion or over human
>> nature.
>> To continue to demand clarification of the obvious only makes it
>> appear you
>> can't see the obvious, which isn't exactly a good impression to leave
>> with
>> others, Jim.
>
>

>
>
> Let's take a ignorant but intelligent bystander who sees the words
> "No Code International".
>
>
> Without a person or written material to pursuade him that it really
> means No Code Test International, Tell me the assumption that he is
> going to make.
>
> Can you with a straight face, tell me that the person is going to assume
> that it means elimination of the test?
>

Dwight will tell you any number of things but don't scare him with
"straight".

1592. Re: Code test analogy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-22 21:05:04 UTC
From: groupk0hb@earthlink.net
Message-ID: <5ee63311.0310221305.62924aec@posting.google.com>
Source record: 81168

Dick Carroll wrote:

> Peace on you, too!

Yea verily likewise unto thee. May the Peace of St. Samuel shower in
abundance upon thee and thy donkey forever.

73, de Hans, K0HB
--
http://home.earthlink.net/~k0hb

1593. Re: 14.313 Jamming.K9BSD, N9PGE, and KK9G.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-22 21:59:53 UTC
From: charlesb <n5pvl@sbcglobal.net>
Message-ID: <t5Dlb.2792$9G3.174@newssvr14.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 81169

"Hans K0HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:5ee63311.0310221054.1941997e@posting.google.com...
> "charlesb" <n5pvl@sbcglobal.net> wrote
>
> >
> > I think that we should applaud QRZ.COM for developing a "zero tolerance"
> > policy toward people who try to change any of the forums there into a
> > code/no-code debate. They announced recently that code/no-coders will be
> > summarily booted off of the QRZ system, just as quickly as they identify
> > themselves through their actions.
> >
> > I'd like to see more of that.
>
> Hey, Old Biker, this newsgroup was created specifically to contain the
> code/no-code discussion. If you can't stand the heat....

I was talking about QRZ. The point, of course is I am not necessarily a
member of a tiny minority in thinking of the code/no-code debate as being
almost 100% noise.

That, and commenting that it's good to know that the forums at QRZ will be
staying a bit more on-topic from now on.

Charles Brabham, N5PVL

1594. What If.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-22 22:08:03 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@nope.org>
Message-ID: <53tdpvsmkt6a3foqf6tp2v0iqakn8ogvlh@4ax.com>
Source record: 81170

A different approach:

Abstract: Much of the current operating practice and licence requirements for amateur radio appear to be the way that they are because of the evolution that has taken place over many years since it was first established. Politics and tradition seem to have had immense influence over the current state of affairs - with technological developments coming in a poor third at best. Artifacts of the past remain 'on the books' for no other reason than things have always been that way.

Perhaps the most critical way to look at the current code / no code / easier tests / harder tests deadlock is to ask the question: If the Amateur Radio Service did not exist, and was being proposed as a new service in 2003, what would it look like?

Assuming that the same ham bands that we really do have today have been set aside for the new service:

- What is the overall mandate for the service? (pure hobby, civilian radio expertise development, emergency services augmentation, experimentation, etc.)
- What modes would be allowed? (e.g. DSB AM, FM, SSB, CW, Digital data, Digital audio, etc.)
- Would any modes be restricted or banned? Why?
- What licence classes would be created? Why?
- What privileges would each licence class be granted? Why?
- What theoretical and operating knowledge would be tested? Why?
- What modes would be practically tested? Why?

In each case above, the question 'Why?' pertains to the overall goal that is being aimed at. If 3 licence classes are proposed, for example, then what are the specific objectives? (example: higher level licence can establish and sponsor a club repeater, or build and repair their own transmitting equipment, etc. - tasks requiring a higher level of technical and operating knowledge than a lower level operator).

Vanity, personal preference, tradition and history should not enter in to the equation - just technical requirements. Think analytically - its a service being created to fulfil a mandate, the framework is structured simply to meet that goal. Nothing more. What was acceptable technical practice in 1910, or 1950, or 1999 is immaterial for the purpose of this analysis - the benchmark is today, 2003. For example - if the service was created this year, would we test CW proficiency? And for what purpose? How about SSTV, or Amtor?

Maybe, by building a model of the service from the ground up using 2003 as a starting point, a picture of what the current service should become may emerge?

And, in the spirit of Mike's earlier thread, let's try and keep the mud slinging and name calling out of the equation - please!

73, Leo

1595. Responses to 14 Petitions on Code Testing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-22 22:38:45 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031022183845.25815.00003911@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 81171

Before the Commission there are 14 petitions concerned with Morse Code Testing for U. S. amateur radio licensing. The first 7 petitions, RM-10781 through RM-10787, are largely concerned with dropping the code test. Supposedly the window for Comments is already closed on those but new Comments keep appearing on the public record. RM-10805 through RM-10811 are largely concerned with keeping the code test. Supposedly the window for those Comments will close on 7th of November.

As of the end of the business day 21 October 2003, the number of Comments on each RM are as follows (only last three digits of RM shown):

781: 314
782: 264
783: 267
784: 247
785: 250
786: 411
787: 662 sub-total 1,227

805: 148
806: 142
807: 108
808: 118
809: 111
810: 116
811: 484 sub-total 2,415

Grand total for all comments: 3,642

Note: Each RM number's first document is the original petition.

Note: Numbers for each RM are taken from the FCC ECFS.

LHA

1596. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-22 22:38:46 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031022183846.25815.00003912@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 81172

In article <3F96DD4E.3070906@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:

>Dwight Stewart wrote:
>> "Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote:
>>
>>>Let's take a ignorant but intelligent bystander who sees
>>>the words "No Code International".
>>>
>>>Without a person or written material to pursuade him
>>>that it really means No Code Test International, Tell
>>>me the assumption that he is going to make.
>>>
>>>Can you with a straight face, tell me that the person is
>>>going to assume that it means elimination of the test?
>>
>> I can tell you with a perfectly straight face that an uninvolved bystander
>> probably wouldn't think anything, simply because the issue doesn't mean
>> anything to him. As far as I can see, only an involved ham would have any
>> interest in NCI at all, and that type of person would surely know what the
>> debate is all about.
>
> But you can't say that No-Code International just by looking at the
>name means No Code test International, deflection attempts aside.

Keep on trolling for arguments, Mike, sooner or later someone will
bite on your bait. Try to avoid leaning too far over the gunwales or
something big will bite you.

Try to remember that No Code International was started by Bruce
Perens, long before an Amateur Extra tested at 20 WPM.

>> However, the words you quoted had nothing to do with NCI. They were
>> intended to address Jim's desire that everyone opposed to the code test must
>> specifically use the words "code test" during any discussion of the issue.
>
> Doesn't hurt! You assume everyone has an in depth grasp of an issue?

Tsk, tsk, tsk. Over-exaggeration again on the adjectives of
"in depth grasp."

You are already quite biased and rather adamant about it,
often going out of your way to pick a fight about code testing.

> Argue as you will, Dwight. I'm just saying in your desire to be "right"

>you are taking a tack that to at least some of us looks a bit silly. If
>some one told me I was being imprecise, Id apologize and be more precise

>with them. YMMV.

If someone told you that you are being overly aggressive about your desire to pick a fight over word-quibbling, I'm sure you would be very aggressive to them and want to start a fight about that... :-)

LHA

1597. Re: Mother Brakob, Listen Up!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-22 22:38:49 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031022183849.25815.00003913@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 81173

In article <bn6jia$1sdc$1@heap.juniper.net>, dennis@wawa.juniper.net (Dennis Ferguson) writes:

>Len Over 21 <lenover21@aol.com> wrote:
>>In article <wuelb.13201$JF7.1044@news01.roc.ny>, "Jim Hampton"
>> Hans Brakob came out of the blue with a personally insulting comment
>> about "bad research," something that I allegedly "always do," solely
>> about "the first voice transmission by radio." Hans claimed, but did
>> not reference or otherwise verify that it was done with a SPARK
>> TRANSMITTER.
>>
>> I quoted an Electronics magazine special edition text paragraph that
>> stated this 1906 Christmas transmission was done with a 1 KW
>> ALTERNATOR, probably using a water cooled microphone in the
>> antenna line.
>
>Just to clarify, this is what the article at
>
> http://ewh.ieee.org/reg/7/millennium/radio/radio_differences.html
>
>says about it:
>
> At the turn of the century Fessenden was using a spark transmitter,
> employing a Wehnelt interrupter operating a Ruhmkorff induction
> coil. In 1899 he noted, when the key was held down for a long dash,
> that the peculiar wailing sound of the Wehnelt interrupter
> could be clearly heard in the receiving telephone. He must have had
> a detector of some sort that was working for him, even at this
> early stage in the development of wireless. This suggested to him
> that by using a spark rate well above voice band (10,000 sparks/sec),
> wireless telephony could be achieved; and this he did transmitting
> speech over a distance of 1.5 km on 23 December 1900, between 15 metre
> masts on Cob Island, MD [Belrose, 1994a; 1994b].
>
> In autumn of 1906 Fessenden had his HF alternator working adequately
> on frequencies up to about 100 kHz. About midnight in
> November, 1906 Mr. Stein at Fessenden's Brant Rock station was telling
> the operator at a nearby test station at Plymouth, MA how to
> run the HF alternator. It was usual for these two operators to use speech
> over this short distance. However his voice was heard by Mr. Armor at
> Machrihanish, Scotland with such clarity that there was no doubt about
> the speaker, and the station log books confirmed the report
>
> [...]

>
> Fessenden's greatest success took place on Christmas Eve 1906, when he
> and his colleagues presented the world's first wireless broadcast. The
> transmission included a speech by Fessenden and selected music for
> Christmas.
>
>So, while the first radio voice broadcast was made at Christmas, 1906, using
>an alternator, the first radio voice transmission of any sort was made 6
>years earlier using a spark transmitter.

I agree with what you said here but that is NOT what the brought
on Hans Brakob's ranting, raving, and jellied jeremiad about "poor
research."

Brakob SPECIFICALLY stated that Fessenden's 1906 Christmas
voice broadcast used a SPARK transmitter. Miccolis, presumably in
Brakob's defense, tried to misdirect by pointing out the 1900 test by
Fessenden with the 1906 broadcast. Miccolis did not correct Brakob's
false statement, but attempted to misdirect into other subjects when
Brakob was confronted with his error.

My general source of old radio histories are several but I keep one
on the bookshelf, the Electronics magazine special 50th Anniversary
edition that covered ALL electronics and radio prior to 1980. Right or
wrong, printed matter cannot be changed by any webmaster or
website author. For Internet sources of old radio history, I prefer
the excellent works of Thomas H. White, at the new address of

http://earlyradiohistory.us/index.html

There is a close correlation of what the 1980 Electronics magazine
description of the 1906 Christmas voice broadcast and what White has
in more detail on his site. The microphone for Fessenden's 1906
broadcast was not water cooled (as Electronics writers speculated)
but air cooled and the picture on White's pages indicates it is robust
and designed to dissipate heat (as the photo caption put it).

Jack (formally John) Belrose is a familiar name to Antennex readers
(www.antennex.com, a specialty site for antennas) and his recreations
of early spark transmitters as they MIGHT have been made by
Fessenden are interesting. However, let's face it, Fessenden's first
experiment in 1900 was done with only ONE OTHER experimenter
only ONE MILE distant and witnessed by no one else.

Fessenden's experimental broadcasts (plural, involving several things
in communication) at Brant Rock involved many persons, primarily
financial backers paying for everything. Radio was a hot item and
many were getting involved for a piece of the action back then. Radio
in those prehistoric times involved money (few components available,
nearly everyone had to build everything themselves) so it was seldom
an "amateur" activity. In Thomas H. White's pages you will note that
Fessenden dropped out of the radio experimentation game after that

historic voice broadcast due to disagreement with his backers.

That 1906 voice broadcast involved a 750 Watt alternator "RF source"
at 70 KHz and the "modulator" was a carbon microphone in series
with the antenna feed line. [technically that is "down modulation" of
a carrier, no gain of RF power on peaks as with conventional AM] It
stands to reason that the heat losses in that microphone were
considerable (hence the obvious robust design in the White collection
photo). Manual holding of such a microphone would be prohibitive,
much the same as an American Beauty 100 W soldering iron uses
an insulating wooden handle. Practical application of the Fessenden
voice broadcasting experiment was an obvious no-no. There were no
interested parties eager to buy rights to the system and, for the times,
no one wanted to pirate the system.

Yes, Reginald Fessenden is acredited with being the first to broadcast
voice on radio frequencies. No argument from me on that.

Hans Brakob is NOT a qualified judge of fact correction when he
confuses both dates (6 years difference) and the type of transmitter
and then contends that another is "guilty of poor research."

>The description of how the spark transmitter was used to transmit voice
>makes perfect sense to me. If you take a band-limited continuous waveform
>and transmit discrete samples of the waveform taken at a rate which is twice
>the maximum continuous frequency (i.e. 10,000 amplitude-modulated sparks
>per second for 5 kHz bandwidth audio), then low-pass filtering the received
>signal back to the original bandwidth will reproduce the original continuous
>waveform. This is from the Nyquist(-Shannon) sampling theorem, though if
>I recall this was done a quarter century before Nyquist's paper on digital
>(telegraph) signals over bandwidth-limited analog channels and a half-century
>before Shannon explained what this meant for discrete sampling. That's
>pretty neat.

A lot of early papers on electricity and "radio" may "sound neat" but,
despite the descriptions by learned gentlemen with many letters
after their names are FAR from "neat" when seen today. Reginald
Fessenden did not invent sampling theory any more than Lee deForest
invented electron geometry inside vacuum tubes. Both had IDEAS,
inspirations, hunches, bursts of thought or whatever and were willing
to tinker and try. Some succeeded. Many did not.

A Professor Langley convinced the US Navy that they should under-
write his aeroplane thing and even converted an old Navy vessel to be
the first aircraft carrier (or one with a landing area). Nice try. The
Langley aeroplane flew...off the end of the deck and into the water.
Splash. TS. Off in another place a couple of bicycle mechanics were
busy tinkering with rudimentary aeronautical engineering and made the
FIRST heavier-than-air powered flights...and won the first US military
contract for a heavier-than-air-craft (by the Army's Signal Corps) to
start the whole aircraft world.

By some VERY elastic stretching of things, one can say (presumably with a straight face) that James Clerk Maxwell "invented EM radio propagation" by coming up with his equations...or that Heinrich Hertz was "the first VHF operator" or "used spark the first time for radio propagation." I wouldn't. Few would...even though, in a mighty exaggerated way, those are true. Some would go to such lengths for newsgroup message points and "getting even" with another and devote a large part of their free time absorbed in such. :-)

There are MANY, many "firsts" in radio and none can claim to be THE first. Unfortunately, some folks have devoted hero-worship of certain individuals and over-emphasize their accomplishments; their righteous anger at not finding agreement leads them to outrageous statements in here. Not my problem...until they start to get personal. :-)

LHA

1598. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-22 23:03:44 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <k1Elb.14249$Uz6.7732@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 81174

"Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote:
>
> Doesn't hurt! You assume everyone has an in depth
> grasp of an issue?

Not everyone, Mike. Just the ham operators who visit this newsgroup and
eventually participate in the code testing debate.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

1599. Re: Why thirteen and twenty?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-22 23:48:53 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <FHElb.3339$P%1.2986108@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 81175

```
"garigue" <garigue@comcast.net> wrote in message
news:85mlb.327417$mp.267978@rwcrnsc51.ops.asp.att.net...
>
> "Clint" <rattlehead at computron dot net> wrote in message
> news:vpbevc120ps990@corp.supernews.com...
> >
> > "garigue" <garigue@comcast.net> wrote in message
> > news:59Gkb.825619$Ho3.226493@sccrnsc03...
> >
> > > Here we go again with this standard transmission crap ...this time it
> has
> > > degenerated to starters ....
> >
> > and your point being? that just means there are MANY examples of why
> > CW testing is outdated.
>
> Huh ???? No Clint that is just a repeat of the same old crap I have
been
> seeing for years on this group in a vain attept to prove CW is in its
death
> throws.
>
> > > Clint's logic ... no cars today have crank starters ... therefore CW
is
> in
> > > that same category ...but wait ..why are there so many CW ham signals
on
> > the
> > > air ... ????
> >
> > no problem with use of morse code. It's code TESTING that's outdated
> > and is going to be removed.
>
>
> Well then say that testing with out reference to the act of CW operation
> which I see as the target of the no-code folks ....as said before NCI
> ....not NCTI
> > >
> > > Clint am I a "crybaby" because I see a useful skill i.e. the 2nd most
> used
> > > amateur mode badmouthed in the most illogical , immature and counter
> > > productive manner.
> >
> > 2nd most used? that's debatable.. in fact, i'd be willing to bet it's
```

far
> > from
> > the most used.
>
> What did I say ....2nd most used ...don't follow your logic there Clint
>
>
>
> AND, i'll play my own devil's advocate; it's widely agreed,
> > with little dissention, that code use is on the decline... therefore,
even
> > IF it's
> > as you assert (again, playing my own devil's advocate), this couldn't
> > possibly
> > be true indefinitely as it's use shrinks and deminishes.
>

It is NOT widely agreed that code use is on the decline. I am happy to report that articles earlier this on contest participation on the ARRL site show that there has a been a 20% rise in participation in the CW contests from the previous year while participation in voice contests stayed flat (i.e. no growth).

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

1600. Re: Dear Mother Brakob...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-23 00:21:16 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0310221621.3ea6ab18@posting.google.com>
Source record: 81176

```
k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0310220723.6a7d9612@posting.google.com>...
> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0310220243.4e1b819c@posting.google.com>...
> > k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0310201834.5bfd82e3@posting.google.com>...
> >
> > > I STILL don't do Special Ed, Brain...
> > >
> > > Steve, K4YZ
> >
> >
> > You should; you're spelling is awful.
>
> BBWWWHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAH
AHA
> ! ! ! ! !
>
> I love a guy who chastises another for his spelling with a
> sentence that would make any English teacher drop to her knees in
> tears!
>
>
BBBWWWWHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHA!
> ! ! ! ! ! !
>
> Steve, K4YZ
```

I've never had an English teacher drop to her knees.

1601. Re: Amazin'....Ain't it...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-23 00:28:03 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0310221628.2e4ca672@posting.google.com>
Source record: 81177

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0310220715.4054056d@posting.google.com>...
> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0310220248.31acece9@posting.google.com>...
>
> > Steve, you lie to yourself every time that little voice inside you
> > says that your style and tactics on RRAP are acceptable.
>
> "Style", Brain?
>
> "Tactics"...?!?!
>
> There's not a "style" or "tactic" being employed here. You make
> silly, even assinine assertions that are either easily disproved or
> are not substantiated by some sort of fact or evidence, and then you
> try to push the consequences of that failure off on someone else
> because you can't stand the heat.
>
> Sorry. Your bust.

Talk about assinine assertions, and caught in yet another lie...

Why did you say I might not like your "style, politics, or tactics,"
if you have no style, politics, nor tactics?

> It's not a "lie" to show someone else that he's acting foolishly.

This is what I have done. You reject it and call me a liar.

> Especially when the other guy just keeps piling on the evidence to
> prove it.

See above, re: assinine assertions.

Stebe, you are more of a mentor to me than you realize. Keep piling
it on.

1602. Re: Reflections on rrap

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-23 00:35:51 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0310221635.3fcdcd1c@posting.google.com>
Source record: 81178

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0310220708.5ba8f53d@posting.google.com>...
> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0310220252.302b0ad4@posting.google.com>...
> > k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0310201756.40c22259@posting.google.com>...
>
> > > No, Brain, it was YOUR "Avenging Angel" personna that was at
> > > work. When YOU do something like that it's "levity"...trying to get
> > > someone to "lighten up". When I say something similar you whip out
> > > this new "Avenging Angel" spin in order to try and disguise your own
> > > conduct.
> >
> > If I've offended Kim, I'm sorry.
>
> You offend more than Kim, Brain. You offend yourself, but you
> are too self-centered to se it.

You offend everyone and embarass your family name. But you are too
self-centeered to realize it.

> > > I say it's yet one more example of following in the footsteps of
> > > Lennie the Liar..."Don't So As I Do...Do As I Say"...
> > >
> > > Bascially, I just think you're two-faced.
> > >
> > > Steve, K4YZ
> >
> > No, Steve, not true. I have the capacity to say I was wrong an
> > apologize.
>
> Being able to "apologize" is worthy, Brian.
>
> Being able to not offend in the first place is even better.

We all make mistakes.

> > I leave the Avenging Angel stuff to you. You do what you're best at -
> > trying to destroy anyone who might disagree with you.
>
> It's not about "destroy(ing) anyone who might disagree with
> (me)", Brain...It's about not tolerating that which I know to be false
> and is known to others.

There are many falsehoods promoted on RRAP. Yet you target only Len
(and me) for destruction. Your Avenging Angel Wings provide sanctuary

to your favorite falsehoods. In doing so, you lie to yourself.

> You make silly, even stupid assertions and claims and then take
> offense when people pile up on you for being silly and stupid.
>
> That's YOUR "fault".

I accept and admit that I made a mistake, and I apologized.

What is your excuse?

Go get professional help.

1603. Re: Amateur Radio in the 21st Century?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-23 01:29:32 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031022212932.06226.00001090@mb-m19.aol.com>
Source record: 81180

In article <GDDkb.112989$qj6.6296986@news1.news.adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo
<mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>> In article <x2mkb.1659$_i.139483@nnrp1.ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
>> <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:

>>>"Dick Carroll" <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com> wrote in message
>>>news:bmrn15$3sh$0@208.206.142.110...
>>>
>>>>N2EY wrote:
>>>
>>>[snip
>>>
>>>>>What I find interesting, too, is that the CW/data parts of the bands are
>>>
>>>always
>>>
>>>>>referred to as "exclusive CW" with no mention that all of them on HF are
>>>
>>>also
>>>
>>>>>shared by data modes. In fact, there is very little mention of data
>>>
>>>modes at
>>>
>>>>>all.
>>>>>
>>>>
>>>>Right! It's apparently codified in the code-banner's rulebook- Say nor
>>>>do anything that will in any way interfere with The Agenda. And
>>>>acknowledging that there are NO exclusive CW HF subbands is a primary
>>>>part of it. In fact, it';s clear that they would like to do completely
>>>>away with *ll* subbands. Hey, why not SSB yakkers wall to wall, like
>>>>it is "uop there" above 27 mhz?
>>>>
>>>> It IS curuois that they jump from "Hey why don't you Luddites get
>>>>out of the 19th century and jumo on board our Advanced Digital Train,
>>>>to "Lets do away with all subbands and give everyone with the mildest
>>>>of itnersts all privileges everywhere to yak into a microphone"!!!
>>>>
>>>> Can you say obfuscation???
>>>
>>>Dick,
>>>

>>>Can you say "You're distorting the facts"???
>
>> Where are any facts distorted, Carl?
>>
>>>Both I and Bill Sohl have repeatedly stated the the ONLY agenda
>>>for NCI is to eliminate the code TEST
>>
>>
>> Which means that Dick could not have been talking about you, Bill or NCI
>when
>> he wrote of a "code-banner's rulebook" - whatever the heck that was
>supposed to
>> mean.
>>
>>
>>>... you will notice that NCI's
>>>Petition for Rulemaking doesn't attempt to modify the sub-bands,
>>>expand SSB allotments, or anything of the sort.
>>
>>
>> Exactly!

Note: The paper ("Amateur Radio in the 21st Century") in question is not
official NCVEC policy at this time, so in this post I will change all
references to "the KL7CC paper" since he is the principle author.
>>
>> This thread is meant to be about that

KL7CC

>> paper - particularly the parts
>that
>> do *not* involve the code test. Dumping the code test is a completley
>different
>> thing from widening the 'phone/image subbands.
>
> The

KL7CC

>paper is not a group controlled by NCI, they are a completely
>different entity.
>
> But they ARE a group calling for some things that I find a little
>disturbing.
>
> And this IS something I got my chops busted about earlier with what
>seemed to me to be a simple statement of fact. I'll state it again
>paraphrased:
>
>The removal of the Morse code test is the removal of knowledge required
>to get a ARS license. Thos who believe that less knowledge should be

>necessary to get a license can only be heartened by this event. There
>will be a move towards further reductions in the knowledge needed for a
>license.
>
>lessee here:
>
>(from

KL7CC:

>> One of the primary goals of the new license we are going to propose
>>is a true entry-level ticket. Limited power, limited frequencies,
>>but still useful, with enough of the essence of Amateur Radio to
>>attract beginners and show them what lies ahead when they upgrade.
>>Simpler exam. WAIT! - - WAIT! - - WHAT WAS THAT??!!
>>
>> Yes, I said simpler exam. Hopefully 20 questions. Aimed at a young
>>person aged 12 or more. That means a 6th grade education. Also fits
>>teens, high schoolers, home schoolers. You know, fresh ideas, new
>>blood, people that can actually see their radios without having to
>>put on glasses – what a concept! 20 questions, simple enough to get
>>someone started in a responsible way, pointed in the right direction,
>>all that stuff.
>
> Well what do we have here? A proposal for a simpler exam? Certainly
>looks like it.

Yep - with reduced privileges. Not necessarily a bad idea. All they're really
doing is reinventing the Novice.
>
> Especially charming is the idea that people with a 6th grade education
>are going to supply us with fresh ideas.

I got started in ham radio between 6th and 7th grades.....

>Its even more charming that
>this new, fresh blood will be able to see their radios without glasses.
>I've worn glasses since I was in second grade.
>
One of the things that bugs me a little about that paper is the little digs it
tosses in - like that one. They're subtle but they convey an undertone of
insult.

> I guess the

(authors of the KL7CC paper)

> doesn't really want me to be a ham.

Nor me, nor a lot of us.

>Next:
>

>> Whatever we come up with, it will have to fit within the FCC budget.
>>This probably means that in all likelihood what will happen, assuming
>>that the idea of a beginner's class license is even accepted at all,
>>is that they (the FCC) will juggle the existing 3 classes to
>>accommodate the new structure. Technician will change from what it
>>is now to the basic license. It may be named "Communicator" or
>>simply left as Technician. Let's assume it gets the name
>>"Communicator". All existing Techs will be upgraded to General.
>>Assuming that the Morse requirement is removed first, our opinion
>>is that most of the Techs will take (and hopefully pass) the element
>>3 exam as soon as they can, thus becoming General class licensees.
>
> Assuming indeed! They figure that people are going to study and pay >
for
>a test in order to get priveleges they will get anyhow? If a Technician
>flunks the test, all he or she has to do is wait a while, than he/she
>will get the priveleges anyhow.

Exactly!

> That sounds a LOT like simplification to me.

Sounds like a giveaway to me. And it sets a very bad precedent: If it's OK to
give all Techs a free upgrade to General, why not throw away most of the
General question pool and use the Tech one instead?
>
>>Remember, that before the changes that created the present no-code
>>tech, the General and Tech exams were identical. Only the code
>>separated them, and even there it was only the difference between
>>5 and 13 WPM.
>
>But its not that way now.

And it wasn't that way back when the Tech code test changes were made!

Quick history:

From 1951 to March 1987, the General and Tech had the same written. In March of
1987 the General was split into two elements, 3A for Tech and 3B for General.
Almost four years later (February 1991), the Tech lost its code test.

This isn't ancient history, and anybody writing a policy paper should know how
the previous system came to be. And it's not the only factual mistake in the
paper.
>
>And finally, before I forget about how I was charmed about the glasses
>reference, I have to congratulate the authors on their humorous
>treatment of Pro coders:
>
>(more from the

KL7CC paper)

>> So, there are no “Morse code haters” on the committee.
>>There is no conspiracy, no secret agenda, no kickback from the
>>manufacturers, no “black plan” from the ARRL, no anything. Just some
>>guys that want nothing more than to see our great hobby prosper for
>>the next hundred years, or longer.
>
>and (I had to put this in again):
>
>> You know, fresh ideas, new blood, people that can actually see
>>their radios without having to put on glasses – what a concept!
>
>and:
>
>> A few final words:
>
>> There are no black helicopters.
>
>I guess those who believe in the Morse code test believe there are?

See what I mean about undertone?
>
>>Do you suppose the committee members just want to see our wonderful
>>hobby prosper? Wouldn’t that be an odd reason for doing what they are
>>doing?
>
>Apparently those of us who believe in a Morse code test *don't* want to
>see our wonderful hobby prosper!
>
If the ideas are good ideas, they will stand on their merit. The person histories of the committee members is not the issue. If they're such great folks, why don't they let the merits of their ideas convicne us?

Quick aside: I first became aware of W5YI about ten years ago when my license needed to be renewed. I got this official looking letter saying that for just $5 they'd help me renew my license. All I had to do was fill in the form, sign it, write a check for $5 and send it to them.

Never mind that I'd been dealing with the FCC since I was 13 and had renewed and modified my license at least 9 times before with no problems at all. They thought I needed "help".

At first I thought it was a joke - after all, the licensee still did all the work of filling out the form and mailing it. If there was something wrong, FCC would kick it right back - but the procedure for a simple renewal is so basic that anyone who couldn't figure it out from the instructions on the form probably shouldn't have the license anyway.

But I did some asking around and found it was real!
I wonder how many hams thought it was some sort of official letter and ponied up the $5.

Instead, I filled out the form and sent it to FCC. And I swore W5YI would never get a nickel from me.

>And to make sure that they insult other hams who don't do things like
>they think hams should do things:
>
>> Oh, pardon me – you always build everything from scratch? Great!
>>Who, exactly, are you going to talk to? Most of the rest of us opt
>>for the practical approach, and purchase a rig from one of the several
>>companies that cater to hams. If there are no manufacturers, then
>>there are no new rigs. Hard to carry on a QSO if no one is there.
>
>What this has to do with the matter at hand is beyond me, except that I
>think that they dont like homebrewers very much.

Ahem.

>I'm very impressed that Morse code testing, by extrapolation, is going
>to destroy the manufacturers. Talk about your conspiracies!!
>
>And the answer to the question of who I'm going to talk to if there are
>no manufacturers..... Well you know , don't ya Jim?

Who, me?

>My final analysis of this piece is that the authors take a very
>condescending and superior tone towards those they disagree with, take a
>few gratuitous potshots at some other "outcasts" thay don't like, and
>finally, support a radical simplification of the qualifications needed
>to get on the air at HF frequencies.
>
>and... and....
>
>(last quote from the article):
>
>> Morse will probably retain most of it’s exclusive band segments,
>>at least for now. We are not addressing this issue at this time.
>>This may change in the future. Several countries no longer have
>>exclusive segments, but depend instead on voluntary band plans.
>>In fact, our 160-meter band works this way today, with surprisingly
>>few problems.

Ya gotta wonder how much time these dudes spend on 160.
>
>LIB! there is is! the door is creaking open! here comes the foot.
>
>Back to you Jim

It's the old incrementalism game. A little bit here, a little bit there.
>
>> If the 'Novice' subbands are to be 'refarmed', I say they should be reused
>> primarily for digital modes, unencumbered by most of the occupied bandwidth
>and
>> bit/symbol rate limitations of today's rules. Maybe have a flat rule that
>the
>> mode has to have occupied bandwidth under, say, 10 kHz. Proper

>documentation as
>> already required by FCC rules, of course. Wanna try out some digital voice
>> ideas, high speed data, "PSK-3100", Pactor 3, or whatever? Just fit 'em
>into 10
>> kHz and have fun.

Better yet, leave 'em alone.

>>>It would be nice if you could stick to the facts, but that doesn't
>>>suit YOUR agenda, does it?

>> Which facts? Dick didn't accuse you or NCI of anything in that post from
> >what I can see.
>>
>> The fact remains that the

(KL7CC)

>> paper contains some inaccuracies like the
>> reference to "exclusive CW subbands". Another inaccuracy is the claim that
>> the
>> General and Tech used the same written test up until the Tech lost its code
>> test
>> (the writtens were actually split almost 4 years earlier).
>>
>>
>>>[remainder of Dick's inaccurate statements and inuendo deleted]
>>
>>
>> Unless I'm mistaken, he wasn't talking about you, Carl.
>
> I'm not talking about Carl either. I know that neither he nor Bill Sohl

>are in favor of reductions in the qualifications to get a license (save
>removal of the Morse code test)
>
And they've been very clear about that.

> That's really nice. It also *may* mean that they will someday be
>considered the Luddites along with us troglodyte Pro code testers as the
>requirements to get a license are relaxed more and more.

You got my point exactly.

>The wheels are already in motion.
>
They've been in motion for years and years. I put the change back about 1975.
No single change has been very big but the end result is enormous.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1604. Re: Amateur Radio in the 21st Century?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-23 01:29:33 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031022212933.06226.00001091@mb-m19.aol.com>
Source record: 81179

In article <3F95A3B3.68F75F85@ix.netcom.com>, David Stinson
<arc5@ix.netcom.com> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>
>> The big mistake was not the invasion of the Soviet Union, but rather the
>> twin
>> classic blunders of dividing one's forces and not being logistically
>> prepared.
>
>I don't know... making "boogie men" out of the most intellectually
>gifted, innovating and striving part of his population, then
>spending huge amounts of money and resources to exterminate them-
>that sounds like a pretty stupid move to me.
>
Right you are, sir! No argument from me.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1605. Re: Code test analogy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-23 01:30:16 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20031022213016.25517.00001583@mb-m15.aol.com>
Source record: 81181

In article <cWHkb.4912$W16.577@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Bill Sohl"
<billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:

>> Dr. Mr. Sohl:
>>
>> There you go again! The Morse code isn't a fairy tale -- it works! Those
>> of us who use it know that -- the same way that those of us who believe
>> in God know that He exists. Sorry, Bill, but your "Morse as religion"
>> rhetoric gives you away!
>>
>> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>
>Larry,
>
>The above was NOT penned by me. I have no clue
>why you think I did so. Forgeting even the morse aspect of
>the the reference to the bible being a fairy tale doesn't
>sync with my personal religious beliefes at all.
>
>Bill K2UNK

Bill:

Uh, don't look now, but wasn't it you who coined the term "Morseodist?"
Perhaps it was Carl, but I could be wrong. If I got it wrong this time,
I hereby extend my most humble apology.

73 de Larry, K3LT

1606. Re: Code test analogy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-23 01:42:55 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <zmGlb.14430$Uz6.3491@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 81182

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20031022213016.25517.00001583@mb-m15.aol.com...
> In article <cWHkb.4912$W16.577@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Bill
Sohl"
> <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
>
> >> Dr. Mr. Sohl:
> >>
> >> There you go again! The Morse code isn't a fairy tale -- it works!
Those
> >> of us who use it know that -- the same way that those of us who believe
> >> in God know that He exists. Sorry, Bill, but your "Morse as religion"
> >> rhetoric gives you away!
> >>
> >> 73 de Larry, K3LT
> >
> >Larry,
> >
> >The above was NOT penned by me. I have no clue
> >why you think I did so. Forgeting even the morse aspect of
> >the the reference to the bible being a fairy tale doesn't
> >sync with my personal religious beliefes at all.
> >
> >Bill K2UNK
>
> Bill:
>
> Uh, don't look now, but wasn't it you who coined the term "Morseodist?"
> Perhaps it was Carl, but I could be wrong. If I got it wrong this time,
> I hereby extend my most humble apology.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT

Morseodist???" You got it wrong...'twasn't me.

Apology accepted.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1607. Re: 73 Magazine Says "73 and QRT"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-23 02:16:22 UTC
From: Steve Silverwood <kb6ojs@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <MPG.1a00c773d3c48eaf9896c3@news-60.giganews.com>
Source record: 81183
Cross-posted to:
rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

[This followup was posted to rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors and a copy
was sent to the cited author.]

In article <3F8E9BC8.5050506@invalid.invalid>, w9wi@invalid.invalid
says...
> Or on a mailed CD.. Both QST and Monitoring Times are available that
> way, (among others) though unfortunately only with the whole year's
> issues on a single disk. (i.e., it's only available at the end of the
> year) Fantastic idea, I love it! No more realizing the article I want
> is in the July issue - and I can only find June and August...

Yes, that is a wonderful way of storing back issues. I have a couple of
CDs burned so far with the MT Express issues I've downloaded. Very
handy indeed.

With QST, it's unfortunate that the League is so short-sighted on this
matter. They offer you the CD-ROM at a pretty high price, and then only
about six months after the end of the year. I would MUCH prefer it if
they would provide me the option of downloading each month's issue.

> I wonder if broadband prices will ever drop to dialup levels?
> Personally I have a very hard time justifying the (very) roughly
> $200/year difference.

SBC is offering DSL in their service areas for $29.95 per month for the
first year of service. That's not much higher than dial-up, considering
the leap in bandwidth. I don't know if that includes unlimited dial-up
while traveling, though. RoadRunner offers SOME of their subscribers a
princely 10 hours of dial-up, with additional dial-up time costing
something like $8 per hour. Since I travel somewhat frequently, the
dial-up issue is a biggie for me, so I opted for Earthlink when they
became available through my cable provider (Time-Warner). They offered
unlimited dial-up, so I'm covered when on the road, PLUS they are $3 per
month cheaper than RoadRunner. Unfortunately, they're also pretty
stingy when it comes to newsgroups, but that's another story.

> On the other hand, we may be fast approaching the point where the sum
> total of the malicious executable emails being spammed into our
> mailboxes and the critical updates necessary to protect against them
> every day will take more than 24 hours to download via dialup!

Yeah, I know what you mean. I recently went on a trip to central Europe
for a couple of weeks. (Great trip, I'll tell you all about it if
you're interested but it's =way= OT otherwise.) I have a Yahoo! mailbox

that I paid extra to have expanded to 100Mb of storage plus POP3 access;
during that trip of about 12 days, that mailbox filled up to about 75%
of capacity before I got home (I'm on quite a few lists, Yahoo! Groups,
etc.). When the Sven worm hit, my mailbox filled to overflowing (101Mb)
in the space of a single weekend! If I get my hands on the <expletive
deleted> person who wrote that thing....

--

-- //Steve//

Steve Silverwood, KB6OJS
Fountain Valley, CA
Email: kb6ojs@arrl.net
Web: http://home.earthlink.net/~kb6ojs_steve

1608. Re: Student That Did Razor Test is a Ham.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-23 02:16:29 UTC
From: Steve Silverwood <kb6ojs@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <MPG.1a00d36c30c4c5be9896c9@news-60.giganews.com>
Source record: 81184

In article <d22b54c3.0310210300.270f6ff@posting.google.com>,
kelly@dvol.com says...
> > Jim> He's refering to the guy who told the government he was going to
> > Jim> smuggle banned items into an aircraft and did so and got caught.
> > Jim> Not exactly the smartest move in the world. I think the
> > Jim> reference is to smuggling a razor aboard an aircraft. He may get
> > Jim> some free room and board out of this (in a federal pen).
> >
> > Actually, the individual in question smuggled banned items onto
> > multiple aircraft, including notes describing the contents and
> > providing plenty of contact information for himself. He then emailed
> > the TSA at the end of his trip.
> >
> > The items were not discovered until five weeks after his trip. Then
> > the TSA found the emails and passed them to the FBI which came to get
> > him.
> >
> > I think he knew what he was doing. I don't agree with what he did,
> > but he made a statement and he appears to be willing to do the time.
>
> He had a point to make via a typical college kid civil disobedience
> maneuver and boy he made it. In SPADES. Congress is already looking
> for Transportation Security Administration heads to gnaw on for this
> one. Welcome to America . .

Kind of on a par with Matthias Rust, the German student pilot who flew
his Cessna into the Soviet Union and landed in the middle of Red Square
during the annual Border Guards something-or-other holiday. Definitely
made a statement!

They mentioned on the radio (KNX 1070 in Los Angeles) that he has also
been protesting the mandatory draft registration, but that protest
hasn't been making any real headlines. You have to wonder, then: is he
just trying to make headlines regardless of the cause, or what?

--

-- //Steve//

Steve Silverwood, KB6OJS
Fountain Valley, CA
Email: kb6ojs@arrl.net
Web: http://home.earthlink.net/~kb6ojs_steve

1609. Re: What If.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-23 02:35:46 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bn7eq2pbp0@208.207.71.133>
Source record: 81185

Leo wrote:
> A different approach:
>
> Abstract: Much of the current operating practice and licence
> requirements for amateur radio appear to be the way that they are
> because of the evolution that has taken place over many years since it
> was first established. Politics and tradition seem to have had immense
> influence over the current state of affairs - with technological
> developments coming in a poor third at best. Artifacts of the past
> remain 'on the books' for no other reason than things have always been
> that way.
>
> Perhaps the most critical way to look at the current code / no code /
> easier tests / harder tests deadlock is to ask the question: If the
> Amateur Radio Service did not exist, and was being proposed as a new
> service in 2003, what would it look like?
>
> Assuming that the same ham bands that we really do have today have
> been set aside for the new service:
>
> - What is the overall mandate for the service? (pure hobby, civilian
> radio expertise development, emergency services augmentation,
> experimentation, etc.)
> - What modes would be allowed? (e.g. DSB AM, FM, SSB, CW, Digital
> data, Digital audio, etc.)
> - Would any modes be restricted or banned? Why?
> - What licence classes would be created? Why?
> - What privileges would each licence class be granted? Why?
> - What theoretical and operating knowledge would be tested? Why?
> - What modes would be practically tested? Why?
>
> In each case above, the question 'Why?' pertains to the overall goal
> that is being aimed at. If 3 licence classes are proposed, for
> example, then what are the specific objectives? (example: higher level
> licence can establish and sponsor a club repeater, or build and repair
> their own transmitting equipment, etc. - tasks requiring a higher
> level of technical and operating knowledge than a lower level
> operator).
>
> Vanity, personal preference, tradition and history should not enter in
> to the equation - just technical requirements. Think analytically -
> its a service being created to fulfil a mandate, the framework is
> structured simply to meet that goal. Nothing more. What was
> acceptable technical practice in 1910, or 1950, or 1999 is immaterial

> for the purpose of this analysis - the benchmark is today, 2003. For
> example - if the service was created this year, would we test CW
> proficiency? And for what purpose? How about SSTV, or Amtor?
>
> Maybe, by building a model of the service from the ground up using
> 2003 as a starting point, a picture of what the current service should
> become may emerge?
>
> And, in the spirit of Mike's earlier thread, let's try and keep the
> mud slinging and name calling out of the equation - please!
>
> 73, Leo

It won't work, Leo. You can't summarily dismiss over a hundred years of evolution to blithely "construct" a totally new and ostensibly improved ARS with the wave of a magic wand. Ham radio has been around for entirely as long as ANY radio had been here, and even the venerable Marconi himself often stated that he considered himself to be a ham, and certainly he was, as was every other individual who experimented on the with the amazing new science of radio in those times.

A newly-constructed ham radio, built entirely from the ground up with no regard to what has gone before, would look far more like MURS, FRS or some legimatized version of CB than anything else, with whatever bit of advanced digital involvement you could find anyone willing to assume. For the most part it has become clear that most of tne "new age" advocates would give a pretty small nod to any other than voice modes that are the main interest of almost everyone who wishes to take that route. When you know nothing about (or ignore) what's already there, spread throughout the human race around the planet, how would you construct anything that took advantage of what is already present and in wide use, both hardware and operator knowledge/skill? What a collosal waste!

So that puts your proposal in the same inbasket with KL7CC's "vision"- Nothing from the past means anything and don't let's waste our time pretending it does. At least that conclusion can easily be drawn from his paper. To follow such a course is to abandon 100 years of MUCH more than just tradition.

I'd like to see anyone tell the US Marines they had to disregard their entire history and start all over again from scratch. Something on the same order applies here. History is something that can't be cast aside just because someone has their own vision and prefers to ignore it.

Dick

1610. Re: Reflections on rrap

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-23 05:01:20 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031023010120.12300.00001278@mb-m20.aol.com>
Source record: 81186

In article <f45722ac.0310221635.3fcdcd1c@posting.google.com>,
brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:

>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
>news:<5c01b95b.0310220708.5ba8f53d@posting.google.com>...
>> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
>news:<f45722ac.0310220252.302b0ad4@posting.google.com>...
>> > k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
>news:<5c01b95b.0310201756.40c22259@posting.google.com>...
>>

>> You make silly, even stupid assertions and claims and then take
>> offense when people pile up on you for being silly and stupid.
>>
>> That's YOUR "fault".
>
>I accept and admit that I made a mistake, and I apologized.
>
>What is your excuse?
>
>Go get professional help.

Stebe can't do that. He hates professionals. This chat room is
all about AMATEURS. :-)

LHA

1611. Re: What If.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-23 05:15:06 UTC
From: groupk0hb@earthlink.net
Message-ID: <5ee63311.0310222115.60f4fc2a@posting.google.com>
Source record: 81187

Leo <nomail@nope.org> wrote

> If the Amateur Radio Service did not exist, and
> was being proposed as a new service in 2003,
> what would it look like?

Your question requires the respondent to accept the false premise that Amateur Radio is a creation born of regulations. It is in fact a creation constantly being reborn, evolving over time by the influence of its' members, and the regulations in force at any given time are at best a reflection of that influence.

Thus, the notion of creating a "new" Amateur Radio Service out of thin air without regard to its history is akin to asking "if the Mississippi River were being invented today, where would it run?"

73, de Hans, K0HB

1612. Re: What If.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-23 05:25:37 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031023012537.29660.00001264@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 81189

In article <bn7eq2pbp0@208.207.71.133>, Dick Carroll
<dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com> writes:

>Leo wrote:
>> A different approach:
>>
>> Abstract: Much of the current operating practice and licence
>> requirements for amateur radio appear to be the way that they are
>> because of the evolution that has taken place over many years since it
>> was first established. Politics and tradition seem to have had immense
>> influence over the current state of affairs - with technological
>> developments coming in a poor third at best. Artifacts of the past
>> remain 'on the books' for no other reason than things have always been
>> that way.
>>
>> Perhaps the most critical way to look at the current code / no code /
>> easier tests / harder tests deadlock is to ask the question: If the
>> Amateur Radio Service did not exist, and was being proposed as a new
>> service in 2003, what would it look like?
>>
>> Assuming that the same ham bands that we really do have today have
>> been set aside for the new service:
>>
>> - What is the overall mandate for the service? (pure hobby, civilian
>> radio expertise development, emergency services augmentation,
>> experimentation, etc.)
>> - What modes would be allowed? (e.g. DSB AM, FM, SSB, CW, Digital
>> data, Digital audio, etc.)
>> - Would any modes be restricted or banned? Why?
>> - What licence classes would be created? Why?
>> - What privileges would each licence class be granted? Why?
>> - What theoretical and operating knowledge would be tested? Why?
>> - What modes would be practically tested? Why?
>>
>> In each case above, the question 'Why?' pertains to the overall goal
>> that is being aimed at. If 3 licence classes are proposed, for
>> example, then what are the specific objectives? (example: higher level
>> licence can establish and sponsor a club repeater, or build and repair
>> their own transmitting equipment, etc. - tasks requiring a higher
>> level of technical and operating knowledge than a lower level
>> operator).
>>
>> Vanity, personal preference, tradition and history should not enter in
>> to the equation - just technical requirements. Think analytically -

>> its a service being created to fulfil a mandate, the framework is
>> structured simply to meet that goal. Nothing more. What was
>> acceptable technical practice in 1910, or 1950, or 1999 is immaterial
>> for the purpose of this analysis - the benchmark is today, 2003. For
>> example - if the service was created this year, would we test CW
>> proficiency? And for what purpose? How about SSTV, or Amtor?
>>
>> Maybe, by building a model of the service from the ground up using
>> 2003 as a starting point, a picture of what the current service should
>> become may emerge?
>>
>> And, in the spirit of Mike's earlier thread, let's try and keep the
>> mud slinging and name calling out of the equation - please!
>>
>> 73, Leo
>
> It won't work, Leo. You can't summarily dismiss over a hundred years
>of evolution to blithely "construct" a totally new and ostensibly
>improved ARS with the wave of a magic wand. Ham radio has been around
>for entirely as long as ANY radio had been here, and even the venerable
>Marconi himself often stated that he considered himself to be a ham, and
>certainly he was, as was every other individual who experimented on the
>with the amazing new science of radio in those times.

Heh heh heh...Guglielmo Marconi an "amateur?!?!?" Hardly. :-)

He went after monetary income as well as patent control as soon
as he managed to get his new radio system practical. Try looking
at Real History, old-timer.

If you look at Leo's proposal (discounting the fact that he still hasn't
identified himself), there's nothing really amiss there. That's his
opinion and he's thought a bit about it.

> A newly-constructed ham radio, built entirely from the ground up with
>no regard to what has gone before, would look far more like MURS, FRS or
>some legimatized version of CB than anything else, with whatever bit of
>advanced digital involvement you could find anyone willing to assume.

Yes, it might result in the demise of ham radio AS YOU KNOW IT!

:-)

>For the most part it has become clear that most of tne "new age"
>advocates would give a pretty small nod to any other than voice modes
>that are the main interest of almost everyone who wishes to take that
>route. When you know nothing about (or ignore) what's already
>there, spread throughout the human race around the planet, how would you
>construct anything that took advantage of what is already present and in
>wide use, both hardware and operator knowledge/skill? What a collosal waste!

What in the world are you mumbling about in there, old-timer?

> So that puts your proposal in the same inbasket with KL7CC's "vision"-
>Nothing from the past means anything and don't let's waste our time
>pretending it does. At least that conclusion can easily be drawn from
>his paper. To follow such a course is to abandon 100 years of MUCH more
>than just tradition.

Of course, old-timer, "much" more. Perhaps even your raison d'etre
(reason for being).

Everything must, in your world, remain exactly as it was when you
were young. Forget everything and everyone else.

> I'd like to see anyone tell the US Marines they had to disregard
>their entire history and start all over again from scratch. Something
>on the same order applies here.

So, old-timer, you serve the United States Morse Codists? That's
the USMC, ya know.

>History is something that can't be
>cast aside just because someone has their own vision and
>prefers to ignore it.

Hmmm...sounds like some group of royalty said the same thing
in the years before 1776. Here, have a cup of tea...just in from
the harbor...

You know what happened that year, don't you? :-)

LHA

1613. Respect For Freebanders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-23 05:26:02 UTC
From: Twistedhed <twistedhed@webtv.net>
Message-ID: <3f97666a$1@ghostsearchers.com>
Source record: 81188

I am posting here because of some of the nasty things I have read in this group and in QRZ discussions regarding freebanders. We who use the frequencies from 27.405 to 28.000 have more in common with hams than you might think. We are good operators and have knowledge of propagation and skip conditions. We use Yeasus, Kenwoods and Icom radios just like you do, so we know technical issues as well or better. However, the attitude of some hams toward us is rude and condescending. We are treated like 2nd class citizens. This should not be. We have the same rights under the constitution as legal hams do. For those that do not wish to be under Uncle Sam's thumb, freebanding is a viable alternative to getting a ham radio license. What I am saying is that maybe the next time you meet a freebander you might talk with him before you condemn him.

I am QRT and standing by. (No flames answered. Please reply via email)

Unit 2711, Florida

--
--

1614. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-23 06:10:12 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <8hKlb.15121$Uz6.1423@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 81190

"Dick Carroll" wrote:
>
> Dwight will tell you any number of things but don't scare
> him with "straight".

Now trying to live up to your name, Dick?

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

1615. Re: Respect For Freebanders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-23 09:15:59 UTC
From: Judge, Jury, "and Executioner"
Message-ID: <vpf72fcq3ecoac@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 81191

"Twistedhed" <twistedhed@webtv.net> wrote in message
news:3f97666a$1@ghostsearchers.com...
>
> I am posting here because of some of the nasty things I have read in this
> group and in QRZ discussions regarding freebanders. We who use the
frequencies
> from 27.405 to 28.000 have more in common with hams than you might think.
> We are good operators and have knowledge of propagation and skip
conditions.
> We use Yeasus, Kenwoods and Icom radios just like you do, so we know
technical
> issues as well or better. However, the attitude of some hams toward us is
> rude and condescending. We are treated like 2nd class citizens. This
should
> not be. We have the same rights under the constitution as legal hams do.
> For those that do not wish to be under Uncle Sam's thumb, freebanding is
> a viable alternative to getting a ham radio license. What I am saying is
> that maybe the next time you meet a freebander you might talk with him
before
> you condemn him.
>
> I am QRT and standing by. (No flames answered. Please reply via email)
>
> Unit 2711, Florida

Dirtbag.

1616. Re: Reflections on rrap

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-23 10:28:17 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0310230228.425b4f42@posting.google.com>
Source record: 81192

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20031023010120.12300.00001278@mb-m20.aol.com>...
> In article <f45722ac.0310221635.3fcdcd1c@posting.google.com>,
> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:

> >> You make silly, even stupid assertions and claims and then take
> >> offense when people pile up on you for being silly and stupid.
> >>
> >> That's YOUR "fault".
> >
> >I accept and admit that I made a mistake, and I apologized.
> >
> >What is your excuse?
> >
> >Go get professional help.
>
> Stebe can't do that. He hates professionals. This chat room is
> all about AMATEURS.

It's about Amateur RADIO operators, Lennie. You are not one.

I do not hate professionals. I hate liars.

That would be you.

Steve, K4YZ

1617. Re: What If.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-23 10:29:24 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031023062924.11891.00001709@mb-m11.aol.com>
Source record: 81193

In article <5ee63311.0310222115.60f4fc2a@posting.google.com>,
groupk0hb@earthlink.net (Hans K0HB) writes:

>Leo <nomail@nope.org> wrote
>
>> If the Amateur Radio Service did not exist, and
>> was being proposed as a new service in 2003,
>> what would it look like?
>
>Your question requires the respondent to accept the false premise that
>Amateur Radio is a creation born of regulations. It is in fact a
>creation constantly being reborn, evolving over time by the influence
>of its' members, and the regulations in force at any given time are at
>best a reflection of that influence.
>
>Thus, the notion of creating a "new" Amateur Radio Service out of thin
>air without regard to its history is akin to asking "if the
>Mississippi River were being invented today, where would it run?"
>
Well said, Hans!

I'd add that I doubt something like amateur radio as we know it *could* be
created today, simply because other services would not want to give up *their*
spectrum.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1618. Re: Respect For Freebanders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-23 10:48:31 UTC
From: David Robbins <noone@nowhere.com>
Message-ID: <X9ednX9Q9c6MLwqiU-KYgw@crocker.com>
Source record: 81194

"Twistedhed" <twistedhed@webtv.net> wrote in message
news:3f97666a$1@ghostsearchers.com...
>
> We are treated like 2nd class citizens.

You are treated like the criminals you are.

1619. Re: Mentoring Conditions For Brian Burke, Padawan Learner (BBPL)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-23 10:50:37 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0310230250.40462bd2@posting.google.com>
Source record: 81195

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0310211640.3f4dacf6@posting.google.com>...
> Brain,
>
> You have recently insisted that I am now your "mentor". I have
> refused to take that responsibility since I simply believed you were
> just too stupid and too irresponsible to carry out your duties as a
> Padawan.
>
> I realize now that I was too abrupt in dismissing you, and I
> apologize.
>
> So here's the first step. These are some of my basic beliefs as
> they pertain to Amateur Radio in general and this newsgroup in
> particular, and they will be a part of your training. Before you may
> continue as my Padawan Learner, you must agree to these basic tenents
> wholly and without reservation.
>
> If you do not post an acknowledgement to this thread and
> acceptence of them, without condition or exception, you will lose the
> right to call yourself my student, I and shall not be your mentor.
>
> Remember...ANYTHING other than total and unconditional acceptence
> is evidence that you refuse my mentoring and shall therefore be barred
> from the perks and priviledges associated with being my Padawan.
>
> (1) Amateur Radio is a dynamic and flourishing resource of
> self-trained radio operators and enthusiasts. There are almost as
> many opportunities for enjoyment of Amateur Radio as there are
> participants as each one brings his/her own contributions to it.
>
> (2) I consider Morse Code proficiency to be an integral part of
> both Amateur Radio's history, and will continue to be an important
> part of it's future for some time to come. It allows disimilar and
> disparate souls to be able to communicate, if only at a very
> rudimentary level, and that human-to-human contact is vital to Amateur
> Radio. While Morse Code testing may become a thing fo the past in the
> very near future for the United States, I believe it should continue
> to be promoted, and my Padawan should share that belief and likewise
> demonstrate both proficiency in Morse Code, and should actively
> promote it's learning among all Amateurs. I define "proficiency" as
> being able to carry on a two-way CW QSO without the use of any
> decoding device, and at a sustained speed of 10WPM or greater.
>

> (3) I do not tolerate liars, to include those who express
> admiration for people known to be liars. My Padawan shall renounce
> any past expression of admiration for any person so predisposed, and
> My Padawan will take a proactive role in ensuring that such liars are
> made known when thier acts or words are known or believed to be known
> as false.
>
> As a matter of exception, to express an opinion or to ask a
> question which shall be known to any reasonable person as contrary to
> popular opinion is not itself patently false. A lie is an OVERT
> attempt by a person to mislead, misrepresent, confuse, or otherwise
> represent the truth.
>
> Example #1: "Amateur Radio is boring and useless". While I
> certainly do not agree, the person who uttered this was entitled to
> his opinion. It was, of course, the opinion of a person with very
> little understanding of Amateur Radio, and who sought to re-create it
> in his own image.
>
> Example #2: "I am going to get the Extra-lite right out of the
> box". The person who uttered this did so knowing his words would be
> watched, and did so utter this assertion for the sole purpose of
> trying to climb out from the onslaught of messages against him which
> proved his other assertions false.
>
> Example #3: "The ARRL is dishonest". This was patently false
> when originally uttered, and the person who did so has never brought
> forth any validation of the assertion. I would have loved to see the
> League make him pay for his verbal cowardice in court, but they have
> better things to do.
>
> (4) While cerainly admirable, service in the Armed Forces of the
> United States is not prerequisite to being a good citizen, nor is it a
> prerequisite to discussing matters pertaining TO the Armed Forces of
> the United States. Indeed, the AFUS are the tool of and answer to the
> people...not the other way around. My Padawan will immediately
> chastise ANY person who suggest otherwise.
>
> (*) Said Padawan shall also work quickly to dismiss as a coward
> any person
> who shall attempt to claim military service or credit based
> upon the
> service or sacrifice of others solely for his own gain.
>
> (5) My Padawan shall not make offers to provide information or
> files to other RRAP participants via private e mail, then use that
> opportunity to send text, .jpg or other files that may be deemed
> inappropriate, obscene or contrary to what was promised. (See #3
> above)
>

> (6) My Padawan shall adhere to all Amateur Radio regulations,
> shall only claim to do or have done those things which are factual and
> documented and represent the best interests of the Amateur Radio
> service as a whole. Where documentation may have been lost or
> otherwise made unavailable, the Padawan will provide the names or
> callsigns of those who can verify in some degree the factuality of the
> operation concerned.
>
> (7) Lastly, my Padawan shall not provide aid, comfort or support
> to any person who has demonstrated a gross disrespect for the Amateur
> Radio service or it's licensees, who acts to antagonize and harass
> those whom are lawfully and duly licensed in the Amateur Radio
> service, and who acts in such a way as to cast aspurgences on the
> Service, it participants or supporters.
>
> Remember, Brian, ANYTHING other than a carte blanche acceptance
> of these conditions completely voids your acceptatance as Padawan
> Learner, and forever bars you from stating or suggesting that any
> mentor-padawan relationship exists.
>
> Steve, K4YZ

You've got it all wrong again, Stebe (and acceptance of all such
grandiose misbeliefs in Amateur Radio isn't worthy of mentorship).

You've merely mentored me in the misspelling of peoples names. That
is all. You can chalk that up with all of your other misdeeds.

73, Brian

1620. Re: Respect For Freebanders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-23 12:21:02 UTC
From: David Stinson <arc5@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3F97C75E.E0AEA050@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 81196

Twistedhed wrote:
>
> I am posting here because of some of the nasty things I have read in this
> group and in QRZ discussions regarding freebanders...

All of your assertions are irrelavent.
You are criminals.
You will be treated as criminals.

End of story.

1621. Re: Respect For Freebanders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-23 13:24:13 UTC
From: Two Tango 241 <tt241@freewqz.net>
Message-ID: <bn8kpo$i6h$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 81197

There is legislation pending in Congress to legalize freeband.
Does anyone have the reference number of this legislation?

Two Tango 241

"Twistedhed" <twistedhed@webtv.net> wrote in message
news:3f97666a$1@ghostsearchers.com...
>
> I am posting here because of some of the nasty things I have read in this
> group and in QRZ discussions regarding freebanders. We who use the
frequencies
> from 27.405 to 28.000 have more in common with hams than you might think.
> We are good operators and have knowledge of propagation and skip
conditions.
> We use Yeasus, Kenwoods and Icom radios just like you do, so we know
technical
> issues as well or better. However, the attitude of some hams toward us is
> rude and condescending. We are treated like 2nd class citizens. This
should
> not be. We have the same rights under the constitution as legal hams do.
> For those that do not wish to be under Uncle Sam's thumb, freebanding is
> a viable alternative to getting a ham radio license. What I am saying is
> that maybe the next time you meet a freebander you might talk with him
before
> you condemn him.
>
> I am QRT and standing by. (No flames answered. Please reply via email)
>
> Unit 2711, Florida
>
> --
> --

1622. Re: Respect For Freebanders <-- routine troll message

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-23 14:07:38 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <KgRlb.15718$Uz6.15709@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 81198

"Twistedhed" wrote:
>
> I am posting here because of some of the nasty things I
> have read in this group and in QRZ discussions regarding
> freebanders. We who use the frequencies from 27.405
> to 28.000 have more in common with hams than you
> might think. We are good operators and have knowledge
> of propagation and skip conditions. We use Yeasus,
> Kenwoods and Icom radios just like you do, so we know
> technical issues as well or better. However, the attitude of
> some hams toward us is rude and condescending. We are
> treated like 2nd class citizens. This should not be. We have
> the same rights under the constitution as legal hams do.
> For those that do not wish to be under Uncle Sam's thumb,
> freebanding is a viable alternative to getting a ham radio
> license. What I am saying is that maybe the next time you
> meet a freebander you might talk with him before you
> condemn him.
>
> I am QRT and standing by. (No flames answered. Please
> reply via email)

This exact same message is posted every few months in an effort to troll for suckers who will bite on this obvious bait and respond angrily to the person supposedly sending it. However, the name associated with this message often changes, strongly suggesting the sender listed this time ("Twistedhed") didn't write it. Instead, the message's header is often faked with someone else's name and email address, usually someone the actual sender doesn't like. The actual sender requests an email response so the inbox of the targeted victim will be filled with your responses.

Ignore this message or only respond to its general content in this newsgroup. Don't send email. Even if "Twistedhed" did post this message, a response here in this public newsgroup will be far more effective than an email message nobody else will see.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

1623. Re: Respect For Freebanders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-23 14:17:11 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <HpRIb.15726$Uz6.7426@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 81199

"Two Tango 241" wrote:
> There is legislation pending in Congress to legalize freeband.
> Does anyone have the reference number of this legislation?

Right. Is this the same legislation that recently authorized local police enforcement of the illegal radio activities in and around the CB frequencies? If so, that would be HR-2346, now passed and part of the United States Code of Federal Regulations.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

1624. Re: What If.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-23 14:55:32 UTC
From: Gr&#65533;mw&#65533;tch th&#65533; &#65533;nfl&#65533;pp&#65533;bl&#65533; <Gr&#65533;mw&#65533;tch@NOSPAM.THANKS.IM.FULL.lycos.co.de>
Message-ID: <EZRlb.2863$wc3.2013@newsread3.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 81200

"Hans K0HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:5ee63311.0310222115.60f4fc2a@posting.google.com...

: Thus, the notion of creating a "new" Amateur Radio Service out of thin
: air without regard to its history is akin to asking "if the
: Mississippi River were being invented today, where would it run?"

Hansel, you eedjit!

Why does the Mississipi river run south?

Because louisiana sux.

BGO

--
"All persons, living or dead, are purely coincidental, and should not be
construed."

1625. Re: Student That Did Razor Test is a Ham.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-23 16:21:33 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0310230821.1a43f82a@posting.google.com>
Source record: 81101

Steve Silverwood <kb6ojs@arrl.net> wrote in message
news:<MPG.1a00d36c30c4c5be9896c9@news-60.giganews.com>...

> > > I think he knew what he was doing. I don't agree with what he did,
> > > but he made a statement and he appears to be willing to do the time.
> >
> > He had a point to make via a typical college kid civil disobedience
> > maneuver and boy he made it. In SPADES. Congress is already looking
> > for Transportation Security Administration heads to gnaw on for this
> > one. Welcome to America . .
>
> Kind of on a par with Matthias Rust, the German student pilot who flew
> his Cessna into the Soviet Union and landed in the middle of Red Square
> during the annual Border Guards something-or-other holiday. Definitely
> made a statement!

Rust's stunt was a whole 'nother level up, To successfully get away
with penetrating the Soviet air defenses in that global hot spot with
a just Skyhawk then having the audacity to fly it all the way to
Moscow unchallenged *and* plop it onto Red Square has to be one of the
all-time government-shaking stunts pulled off by an individual. And he
did it to a regime which had no qualms about shooting down commercial
airliners which strayed a few miles into their airspace. The kid had
gonads the size of watermelons. He drew a ceremonial year then they
tossed him back over the wall. In the meanwhile back at the Kremkin
legions of Soviet military heads rolled. OYeah, Rust made a
"statement"!

> They mentioned on the radio (KNX 1070 in Los Angeles) that he has also
> been protesting the mandatory draft registration, but that protest
> hasn't been making any real headlines. You have to wonder, then: is he
> just trying to make headlines regardless of the cause, or what?

He's a student at a Quaker college which explains some of it. Quaker
ideology includes often strident far-end pacifism and they've opposed
conscription and war going back to roots of their faith in the early
1600's in England.

"As a Peace Church, the Society of Friends (Quakers) has always played
a leading part in opposing preparations for war. The Peace Testimony,
which is a very important Quaker principle, arose out of the belief in
the in-dwelling Light or ``that of God'' in people. If that of God was
a reality within oneself it would be denying the inner Spirit to take
up arms against another."

http://websyte.com/PositiveChurch/quaker.html

The rest . . . ? Who knows . . no doubt we'll get his explanation at some point after he's "duly processed" by the same gloms he embarassed the hell outta.

w3rv

1626. Re: Mother Brakob, Listen Up!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-23 16:29:49 UTC
From: Gr&#65533;mw&#65533;tch th&#65533; &#65533;nfl&#65533;pp&#65533;bl&#65533; <Gr&#65533;mw&#65533;tch@NOSPAM.THANKS.IM.FULL.lycos.co.de>
Message-ID: <1mTlb.2920$wc3.2461@newsread3.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 81102

"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20031021160446.12501.00003399@mb-m04.aol.com...

:
: Hans has to bandage his own wounds. Not my problem. If he wants
: to take first pot-shots, he better damn well get better artillery, body
: armor, and a good revetment next time. The alternate is a graves
: registration unit picking up his body parts for the big rubber bag.
:

Hansel the eedjit is off looking for a nurse to examine his body parts.

BGO

--
"All persons, living or dead, are purely coincidental, and should not be
construed."

1627. Re: Respect For Freebanders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-23 16:36:30 UTC
From: Two Tango 241 <tt241@freewqz.net>
Message-ID: <bn9051bhr0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 81103

Hate to burst your bubble there Einestein, but HR-2346 was
invalidated by the courts quite some time back. But since
you are a no-code tech, we'll let you slide this time.

Two Tango 241 standing by on 27680

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:HpRlb.15726$Uz6.7426@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> "Two Tango 241" wrote:
> > There is legislation pending in Congress to legalize freeband.
> > Does anyone have the reference number of this legislation?
>
>
> Right. Is this the same legislation that recently authorized local
police
> enforcement of the illegal radio activities in and around the CB
> frequencies? If so, that would be HR-2346, now passed and part of the
United
> States Code of Federal Regulations.
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
>
>

1628. Re: My response to Jim Wiley, KL7CC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-23 16:40:56 UTC
From: Gr&#65533;mw&#65533;tch th&#65533; &#65533;nfl&#65533;pp&#65533;bl&#65533; <Gr&#65533;mw&#65533;tch@NOSPAM.THANKS.IM.FULL.lycos.co.de>
Message-ID: <swTlb.2927$wc3.2843@newsread3.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 81104

"Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
news:f45722ac.0310151853.545f0eb4@posting.google.com...
:
: Rally round McCain.
:

You guys could have done worse. Oh, it seems you eedjits did do worse! Now
you all rally round a bush.

BGO

--
"All persons, living or dead, are purely coincidental, and should not be
construed."

1629. Re: What If.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-23 16:58:37 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <1NTlb.14433$W16.6393@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 81105

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:bn7eq2pbp0@208.207.71.133...
> Leo wrote:
> > A different approach:
> >
> > Abstract: Much of the current operating practice and licence
> > requirements for amateur radio appear to be the way that they are
> > because of the evolution that has taken place over many years since it
> > was first established. Politics and tradition seem to have had immense
> > influence over the current state of affairs - with technological
> > developments coming in a poor third at best. Artifacts of the past
> > remain 'on the books' for no other reason than things have always been
> > that way.
> >
> > Perhaps the most critical way to look at the current code / no code /
> > easier tests / harder tests deadlock is to ask the question: If the
> > Amateur Radio Service did not exist, and was being proposed as a new
> > service in 2003, what would it look like?
> >
> > Assuming that the same ham bands that we really do have today have
> > been set aside for the new service:
> >
> > - What is the overall mandate for the service? (pure hobby, civilian
> > radio expertise development, emergency services augmentation,
> > experimentation, etc.)
> > - What modes would be allowed? (e.g. DSB AM, FM, SSB, CW, Digital
> > data, Digital audio, etc.)
> > - Would any modes be restricted or banned? Why?
> > - What licence classes would be created? Why?
> > - What privileges would each licence class be granted? Why?
> > - What theoretical and operating knowledge would be tested? Why?
> > - What modes would be practically tested? Why?
> >
> > In each case above, the question 'Why?' pertains to the overall goal
> > that is being aimed at. If 3 licence classes are proposed, for
> > example, then what are the specific objectives? (example: higher level
> > licence can establish and sponsor a club repeater, or build and repair
> > their own transmitting equipment, etc. - tasks requiring a higher
> > level of technical and operating knowledge than a lower level
> > operator).
> >
> > Vanity, personal preference, tradition and history should not enter in
> > to the equation - just technical requirements. Think analytically -
> > its a service being created to fulfil a mandate, the framework is

> > structured simply to meet that goal. Nothing more. What was
> > acceptable technical practice in 1910, or 1950, or 1999 is immaterial
> > for the purpose of this analysis - the benchmark is today, 2003. For
> > example - if the service was created this year, would we test CW
> > proficiency? And for what purpose? How about SSTV, or Amtor?
> >
> > Maybe, by building a model of the service from the ground up using
> > 2003 as a starting point, a picture of what the current service should
> > become may emerge?
> >
> > And, in the spirit of Mike's earlier thread, let's try and keep the
> > mud slinging and name calling out of the equation - please!
> >
> > 73, Leo
>
>
>
> It won't work, Leo. You can't summarily dismiss over a hundred years
> of evolution to blithely "construct" a totally new and ostensibly
> improved ARS with the wave of a magic wand. Ham radio has been around
> for entirely as long as ANY radio had been here, and even the venerable
> Marconi himself often stated that he considered himself to be a ham, and
> certainly he was, as was every other individual who experimented on the
> with the amazing new science of radio in those times.
>
> A newly-constructed ham radio, built entirely from the ground up with
> no regard to what has gone before, would look far more like MURS, FRS or
> some legimatized version of CB than anything else, with whatever bit of
> advanced digital involvement you could find anyone willing to assume.
> For the most part it has become clear that most of tne "new age"
> advocates would give a pretty small nod to any other than voice modes
> that are the main interest of almost everyone who wishes to take that
> route. When you know nothing about (or ignore) what's already
> there, spread throughout the human race around the planet, how would you
> construct anything that took advantage of what is already present and in
> wide use, both hardware and operator knowledge/skill? What a collosal
waste!
>
> So that puts your proposal in the same inbasket with KL7CC's "vision"-
> Nothing from the past means anything and don't let's waste our time
> pretending it does. At least that conclusion can easily be drawn from
> his paper. To follow such a course is to abandon 100 years of MUCH more
> than just tradition.
>
> I'd like to see anyone tell the US Marines they had to disregard
> their entire history and start all over again from scratch. Something
> on the same order applies here. History is something that can't be
> cast aside just because someone has their own vision and
> prefers to ignore it.
>

> Dick
>

Correct Dick. Just because its new, does not make it better. And I'm not saying go backwards. Im saying to consider the past progress and learn from it. Keep history in mind. If our politicians would do that....well, thats too off topic. But you get my drift.

Dan/W4NTI

1630. Re: Why thirteen and twenty?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-23 17:19:48 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <U4Ulb.14450$W16.13743@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 81106

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:FHElb.3339$P%1.2986108@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
>
> "garigue" <garigue@comcast.net> wrote in message
> news:85mlb.327417$mp.267978@rwcrnsc51.ops.asp.att.net...
> >
> > "Clint" <rattlehead at computron dot net> wrote in message
> > news:vpbevc120ps990@corp.supernews.com...
> > >
> > > "garigue" <garigue@comcast.net> wrote in message
> > > news:59Gkb.825619$Ho3.226493@sccrnsc03...
> > >
> > > > Here we go again with this standard transmission crap ...this time
it
> > has
> > > > degenerated to starters ....
> > >
> > > and your point being? that just means there are MANY examples of why
> > > CW testing is outdated.
> >
> > Huh ???? No Clint that is just a repeat of the same old crap I have
> been
> > seeing for years on this group in a vain attept to prove CW is in its
> death
> > throws.
> >
> > > > Clint's logic ... no cars today have crank starters ... therefore CW
> is
> > in
> > > > that same category ...but wait ..why are there so many CW ham
signals
> on
> > > the
> > > > air ... ????
> > >
> > > no problem with use of morse code. It's code TESTING that's outdated
> > > and is going to be removed.
> >
> >
> > Well then say that testing with out reference to the act of CW operation
> > which I see as the target of the no-code folks ....as said before NCI
> > ....not NCTI
> > > > >
> > > > Clint am I a "crybaby" because I see a useful skill i.e. the 2nd

most
> > used
> > > > amateur mode badmouthed in the most illogical , immature and counter
> > > > productive manner.
> > >
> > > 2nd most used? that's debatable.. in fact, i'd be willing to bet it's
> far
> > > from
> > > the most used.
> >
> > What did I say ....2nd most used ...don't follow your logic there Clint
> >
> >
> >
> > AND, i'll play my own devil's advocate; it's widely agreed,
> > > with little dissention, that code use is on the decline... therefore,
> even
> > > IF it's
> > > as you assert (again, playing my own devil's advocate), this couldn't
> > > possibly
> > > be true indefinitely as it's use shrinks and deminishes.
> >
>
> It is NOT widely agreed that code use is on the decline. I am happy to
> report that articles earlier this on contest participation on the ARRL
site
> show that there has a been a 20% rise in participation in the CW contests
> from the previous year while participation in voice contests stayed flat
> (i.e. no growth).
>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>

Shhhhhhh !! Don't tell the facts, it will confuse the NCI crowd.

Dan/W4NTI

1631. Re: 73 Magazine Says "73 and QRT"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-23 17:27:28 UTC
From: Bill Hennessy <hennessy@281.com>
Message-ID: <3f980ea1$0$37212$9a6e19ea@news.newshosting.com>
Source record: 81107
Cross-posted to:
rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

I hear it's not QRT but SK

Bill, N5NOB

1632. Re: Reflections on rrap

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-23 17:43:03 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3F981329.CB6FE952@earthlink.net>
Source record: 81108

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <f45722ac.0310221635.3fcdcd1c@posting.google.com>,
> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:

> >Go get professional help.
>
> Stebe can't do that.

Who is "Stebe", kindly old fellow?

> He hates professionals.

There is no indication of that. It would seem that he takes exception
to you in particular.

> This chat room is all about AMATEURS. :-)

This isn't a chat room but it is all about RADIO AMATEURS. You aren't
one of those. :-)

Dave K8MN

1633. Re: What makes LHA so poor at simple research tasks?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-23 18:00:36 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3F981746.48B76EBF@earthlink.net>
Source record: 81109

N2EY wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3F9493F6.8958BC59@earthlink.net>...
> > Mike Coslo wrote:
> > >
> > > Dick Carroll wrote:

> > Count me in.
> >
> > Numerous linear amplifiers:
> >
> > 4 x 6146, pair of 811A's, pair 813's, 4-1000
>
> a four by one...NICE!!! I'd call that "large scale"...

It certainly was. The thing was in a four-foot rack cabinet and used a
2400V, 5 KVA pole pig and a doubler circuit along with some mongo
oil-filled electrolytics.

> > antennas:
> >
> > duoband 12/17m yagi (parasleeve excitation), 2 elements each band,
> > hairpin match (currently in use)
> >
> > 2 element 40m inverted vee phased array (135 degree phasing, 1/8 wave
> > spaced).
> >
> > power supplies:
> >
> > a number of low and high voltage (and multivoltage) supplies from 12
> > volts to 5,000 volts.
> >
> > antenna tuners:
> >
> > 100w switched "T" matches, 2 KW+ Ultimate transmatch, 2 KW+ "L" Network,
> > 200w link coupled tuner for balanced line, 2 KW+ L/C phasing network.
> >
> Neat stuff! The only manufactured ham antenna I've ever used is a 2
> meter mag mount.

I've used any number of commercial yagis and even a couple of multiband
verticals such as the Butternut HF-2V with 160m kit but I've never
bought a wire antenna :-)

> Did I mention shack furniture and accessories (shelves, tables, etc.),
> home-designed and made from lumber? Not up to New Yankee Workshop
> standards, perhaps, but they do the job.

The main operating position here is made from a flush-type door on a 2 x 4" frame, supported by 4 x 4" legs. There's a shelf beneath for power supplies and a two-shelf angled console above for rigs and accessories. Studio "B", across the room is the massive old oak veneer operating desk from W8YX, the U. of Cincinnati club station. It was featured in QST's writeup of the 1937 Ohio River flood.

> There's also the Tymeter mechanical digital clock I assembled from the
> parts of several discarded ones. Motor from one clock, case from
> another, 24 hour mechanism from a third, etc. Total cost about $2 -
> ten or fifteen years ago.

Neat but indicative of the dumpster diver mentality, Jim. I'm afraid I'm one of those too! I can't pass up old Alliance TV rotors and control boxes. One turns our TV antenna, one turns the chimney-mounted FM yagis for 144 and 440 MHz and one turns the 160/80m hardline receiving loop.

> And when I find a space for a computer in the shack, it will be a
> home-assembled one.

Except for my laptop computer, all computers here are home assembled "white boxes" and are networked (but I bought the hub boxes).

By the way, have you heard of the new Chinese-produced Linux variant? It is called (no kidding) Red Flag Linux.

Dave K8MN

1634. Re: Amateur Radio in the 21st Century?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-23 18:05:23 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3F981865.672D58A7@earthlink.net>
Source record: 81110

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <20031020182922.08626.00001309@mb-m27.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com
> (Chuck von Klauswitz Jr) writes:
>
> >In article <20031019201627.07346.00001305@mb-m26.aol.com>,
> >yodoc@aol.comnospam
> >(Larry Roll K3LT) writes:
> >
> >Then there's the Enigma story...
>
> Gosh, you bigguys ought to switch chat room subjects to medicine.
>
> You wouldn't be worried about enigmas. You'd be talking about
> a pair-a-docs.

Why not give yourself an enigma, Len?

Dave K8MN

1635. Re: What If.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-23 19:20:01 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@nope.org>
Message-ID: <il7gpv4gjg2hlo3n283c3iobp0l52nfrl0@4ax.com>
Source record: 81111

Points well taken, Hans. I suggest, however, that the question (what the amateur radio service would be comprised of if it were created today) must be explored in order to validate what 'historical aspects' of the hobby still apply in 2003 - a 'sanity check', if you will.

As I understand it, the ARS was created in early 20th century to fulfil a need (to provide a pool of trained operators, I believe, with experimentation and development mentioned as other objectives). This mandate has evolved over the years, and maybe it is time to review and bring it in-line with the requirements and technology of today.

The ARS is certainly not a service born of regulations - but it exists today because the regulators allow it to do so - if we don't have a clear idea of specifically why it should continue to exist, or what it should be composed of, how can we justify it if and when the time comes? We cannot convince regulators to maintain CW testing, as an example, if the best arguement that we can come up with is "history"! It was put there by regulation for a reason - and it needs a reason to survive. Regulators don't deal in nostalgia....and if a push comes to approve a potentially multi-billion dollar rollout of a service like BPL, they are going to be hard-pressed to stave it off on our behalf without a solid justification of why the ARS is still important!

I raised this question because, frankly, the vast majority of arguements that I have read in this newsgroup have been driven by emotion, nostalgia or historical references. If someone proposes that CW should continue to have exclusive band assignments because it is a great mode to use during emergencies due to its inherent readibility through noise, and that CW testing should continue to ensure that a pool of CW-competent operators is maintained for emergency comms, then OK, good point - maybe it should. OTOH, if someone proposes that CW testing should continue because thats the way its been since the beginning of time, then - who cares? What relevance does that statement have to do with today? So what?

Successful businesses have learned to do this type of review on their internal processes in order to survive, in the interest of efficiency (and, for fun, watch what happens when some idiot tells the departmental VP that something is being done because it has always been done that way - wow! - never happens twice!). If something is being done, and no one can properly justify it, then out it goes. Replaced by a new and (hopefully) better process, or abandoned altogether if no longer needed. We could learn something from this too.

Someone has suggested that if amateur radio were invented today, without the benefit of all of the history and tradition, it would be a version of FRS or maybe CB - if that is true, we have a serious problem when industry comes knocking for more of our frequency spectrum. How do we convince the regulators that it remains an important service, if we believe that?

Of course we should keep the history of the service in mind as we decide what should define it today. That's an advantage that we have over those who created it initially - we can see what worked well, what failed, and what still works - and pick and choose accordingly. But to argue from a position of emotion, or vanity, or 'what has always been' - type historical perspectives - that's a fool's game plan.

My .02, anyway...YMMV!

73, Leo

On 22 Oct 2003 22:15:06 -0700, groupk0hb@earthlink.net (Hans K0HB) wrote:

>Leo <nomail@nope.org> wrote
>
>> If the Amateur Radio Service did not exist, and
>> was being proposed as a new service in 2003,
>> what would it look like?
>
>Your question requires the respondent to accept the false premise that
>Amateur Radio is a creation born of regulations. It is in fact a
>creation constantly being reborn, evolving over time by the influence
>of its' members, and the regulations in force at any given time are at
>best a reflection of that influence.
>
>Thus, the notion of creating a "new" Amateur Radio Service out of thin
>air without regard to its history is akin to asking "if the
>Mississippi River were being invented today, where would it run?"
>
>73, de Hans, K0HB

1636. Element 1, Code vs. No-code, and Dad

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-23 20:15:34 UTC
From: wa2si@arrl.net
Message-ID: <b7d1465c.0310231215.219a8d1d@posting.google.com>
Source record: 81112

Every one in awhile, I like to remind some here of what it is we're actually talking about. Kinda like to get the big picture out there for any potential newbies whom might be fooled into believing the "barrier" argument that characterizes the Element 1 requirement as being forced to "jump through hoops."

Step 1. Preparation requires that one listen to a training CD or tape (ARRL, W5YI, etc.) to learn the sound of two or three characters per day. There are 43 letters, numbers, punctuation marks, and Pro-signs in all that one must memorize. Approx. two 20 min. sessions per day is more than enough to be "reasonably" prepared to pass Element 1 after approx. one month. (Only have time for one 20 min. session per day? ï¿½make it two months.)

Step 2. Visit some of the websites that have sample CW QSO's. Familiarize yourself with the format of a simple CW QSO, i.e. RST, QTH, name, rig, antenna, etc.

Step 3. Just take the test. (And if, for some reason, you don't passï¿½take it again.)

Behold the much-feared behemoth:

_____ BT _R R_T 58_ 589. Q_H IS _HI_ADEL_HIA, _A. BT NA_E HR IS _OHN ES A_E IS 35 Y_RS O_D. W_ HR IS CLO_DY. RI_ IS _EN_OO_. BT AN_EN_A IS _I_OL_E.

Five minutes of very clear CW is piped into your headphones at 5-wpm, not 13-wpm, and not 20-wpm. In the example above, N0CW has missed both callsigns and pretty much a character or two from almost every word. But if s/he uses just a little common sense combined with the "few minutes" s/he's given at the end to fill in the blank, it becomes quite clear that putting together a string of 25 correct characters is actually quite easy. Particularly so because numbers, punctuation marks and pro-signs count as 2 each.

N0CW DE KN0WCW BT UR RST 589 589. QTH IS PHILADEPLPHIA, PA. BT NAME HR IS JOHN ES AGE IS 35 YERS OLD. WX HR IS CLOUDY. RIG IS KENWOOD. BT ANTENNA IS DIPOLE.

Funny thing happened the other day. My father asked me what all the hubbub was about re. the code. (Apparently, I had left my QST in the car and he decided to peruse away.) I explained that some folks consider Morse code antiquated and feel that there are better, more modern, modes in use today. I went on to include that some also feel that it's unfair to make newcomers "jump through hoops" to become ARO's, thus constituting a "barrier" to some, otherwise qualified,

potential hams.

So Dad pondered for a moment and furled his 77 yr. old eyebrows and said. "They're right, Morse code IS antiquated." My jaw dropped, "say it ain't so!" (E tu Brute?!) He then asked me about the licensing structure and I explained the three-tier system presently in place. "You've gotta keep the code test in place though." Ok, now I'm a tad confused. "Why, if it's antiquated?" I asked.

"Values, my boyï¿½values. Just ask yourself if this is what you want to teach your own children? Should they apply this logic to other aspects of their lives as they grow up? How about an aspiring Engineer, why should s/he be forced to learn history? How about an aspiring history teacher, why should s/he learn physics? There's a bunch of different analogies than can be applied, some good and some not so good, but there's one common threadï¿½values. Knowledge is NEVER wasted and "requiring" one to attain a "reasonable" level of knowledge to enjoy increased privilegesï¿½whether it be in the ARS, the workplace, or life in general is fundamental to nurturing a sense of values. Let that decay and the result will be obviousï¿½like the recent Regents exam fiasco. Don't lower the bar across the board; help raise the individual's standards. It appears to me that there already exists a no-code exam and 5-wpm seems quite reasonableï¿½so what's all the hubbub about?"

Then I remembered why I chose my callsign.

--
73 de Bert
WA2SI

1637. Re: Respect For Freebanders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-23 21:30:09 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <BLXlb.3738$P%1.3189719@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 81113

"Twistedhed" <twistedhed@webtv.net> wrote in message
news:3f97666a$1@ghostsearchers.com...
>
> I am posting here because of some of the nasty things I have read in this
> group and in QRZ discussions regarding freebanders. We who use the
frequencies
> from 27.405 to 28.000 have more in common with hams than you might think.
> We are good operators and have knowledge of propagation and skip
conditions.
> We use Yeasus, Kenwoods and Icom radios just like you do, so we know
technical
> issues as well or better. However, the attitude of some hams toward us is
> rude and condescending. We are treated like 2nd class citizens. This
should
> not be. We have the same rights under the constitution as legal hams do.
> For those that do not wish to be under Uncle Sam's thumb, freebanding is
> a viable alternative to getting a ham radio license. What I am saying is
> that maybe the next time you meet a freebander you might talk with him
before
> you condemn him.
>
> I am QRT and standing by. (No flames answered. Please reply via email)
>
> Unit 2711, Florida

Except that it is illegal. If you will read the history of radio (not just ham radio), you will see that some degree of regulation is necessary. If people could just operate when and where they wanted, we'd be right back to the days of federal, commercial and non-commercial radio activities interfering with each other.

So if you don't want to be considered second class, quit breaking the law. Either operate the legal CB frequencies or get a ham license of the appropriate class and operate the legal ham frequencies.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

1638. Re: What makes LHA so poor at simple research tasks?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-23 21:32:50 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0310231332.10ba737f@posting.google.com>
Source record: 81114

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3F981746.48B76EBF@earthlink.net>...
> N2EY wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3F9493F6.8958BC59@earthlink.net>...
> > > Mike Coslo wrote:
> > > >
> > > > Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> > > Count me in.
> > >
> > > Numerous linear amplifiers:
> > >
> > > 4 x 6146, pair of 811A's, pair 813's, 4-1000
> >
> > a four by one...NICE!!! I'd call that "large scale"...
>
> It certainly was. The thing was in a four-foot rack cabinet and used a
> 2400V, 5 KVA pole pig and a doubler circuit along with some mongo
> oil-filled electrolytics.

SWEET! But they weren't electrolytics. Oil filled paper.
>
> > > antennas:
> > >
> > > duoband 12/17m yagi (parasleeve excitation), 2 elements each band,
> > > hairpin match (currently in use)
> > >
> > > 2 element 40m inverted vee phased array (135 degree phasing, 1/8 wave
> > > spaced).
> > >
> > > power supplies:
> > >
> > > a number of low and high voltage (and multivoltage) supplies from 12
> > > volts to 5,000 volts.
> > >
> > > antenna tuners:
> > >
> > > 100w switched "T" matches, 2 KW+ Ultimate transmatch, 2 KW+ "L" Network,
> > > 200w link coupled tuner for balanced line, 2 KW+ L/C phasing network.
> > >
> > Neat stuff! The only manufactured ham antenna I've ever used is a 2
> > meter mag mount.
>

> I've used any number of commercial yagis and even a couple of multiband
> verticals such as the Butternut HF-2V with 160m kit but I've never
> bought a wire antenna :-)

If I ever get enough space I'm putting up a serious dipole or loop fed
with real ceramic-spreader open wire line. For now I gotta settle of
recycled NM and RG-8X. But when the run is only 50-60' it's not much
of an issue
>
> > Did I mention shack furniture and accessories (shelves, tables, etc.),
> > home-designed and made from lumber? Not up to New Yankee Workshop
> > standards, perhaps, but they do the job.
>
> The main operating position here is made from a flush-type door on a 2 x
> 4" frame, supported by 4 x 4" legs.

I gave up on doors for tabletops about 20 years ago. Make my own out
of OSB and Masonite. Stronger and cheaper.

Shelves above and shelves below.

> There's a shelf beneath for power
> supplies and a two-shelf angled console above for rigs and accessories.
> Studio "B", across the room is the massive old oak veneer operating desk
> from W8YX, the U. of Cincinnati club station. It was featured in QST's
> writeup of the 1937 Ohio River flood.

I'll look it up.
>
> > There's also the Tymeter mechanical digital clock I assembled from the
> > parts of several discarded ones. Motor from one clock, case from
> > another, 24 hour mechanism from a third, etc. Total cost about $2 -
> > ten or fifteen years ago.
>
> Neat but indicative of the dumpster diver mentality, Jim.

Of course. I always wanted one and it has done the job for well over a
decade. New Yankee frugality - it's what built this country.

Use it up
Wear it out
Make it do
Or do without.

> I'm afraid
> I'm one of those too! I can't pass up old Alliance TV rotors and
> control boxes. One turns our TV antenna, one turns the chimney-mounted
> FM yagis for 144 and 440 MHz and one turns the 160/80m hardline
> receiving loop.

I had a couple kicking around - dunno what happened to 'em. Maybe
they're at The Mill.
>

> > And when I find a space for a computer in the shack, it will be a
> > home-assembled one.
>
> Except for my laptop computer, all computers here are home assembled
> "white boxes" and are networked (but I bought the hub boxes).

Only thing I bought new to build the latest home machine was the CD burner (not many of those in dumpsters yet) and the modem. Got maybe $100 in it, tops. Not a power machine but I'm not doing CADD on it either.

>
> By the way, have you heard of the new Chinese-produced Linux variant?
> It is called (no kidding) Red Flag Linux.

aw geez...the Chairman is spinning in his grave...

73 de Jim, N2EY

1639. Re: Amateur Radio in the 21st Century?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-23 21:54:46 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0310231354.3610518c@posting.google.com>
Source record: 81115

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3F981865.672D58A7@earthlink.net>...
> Len Over 21 wrote:
> >
> > In article <20031020182922.08626.00001309@mb-m27.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com
> > (Chuck von Klauswitz Jr) writes:
> >
> > >In article <20031019201627.07346.00001305@mb-m26.aol.com>,
> > >yodoc@aol.comnospam
> > >(Larry Roll K3LT) writes:
> > >
> > >Then there's the Enigma story...
> >
> > Gosh, you bigguys ought to switch chat room subjects to medicine.
> >
> > You wouldn't be worried about enigmas. You'd be talking about
> > a pair-a-docs.
>
> Why not give yourself an enigma, Len?

No, no Dave. It's an enema, not an enigma. He needs to give himself an enema.

>
> Dave K8MN

w3rv

1640. Re: What If.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-23 22:03:48 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <8fYlb.14683$W16.12045@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 81116

"Leo" <nomail@nope.org> wrote

> Points well taken, Hans. I suggest, however, that the question (what
> the amateur radio service would be comprised of if it were created
> today) must be explored in order to validate what 'historical aspects'
> of the hobby still apply in 2003 - a 'sanity check', if you will.

OK, if we can "make believe" that FCC would find it in their heart to set aside all the valuable spectrum we occupy today "from scratch", then here is my suggestion for the "New Amateur Radio Rules":

97.1 To get an Amateur Radio license, you are required to pass a technical test to show that you understand how to build simple equipment which meets spectral purity specifications of (.....blah, blah, blah). You will be issued a license and callsign when you pass the test. Transmit your call sign once every 10 minutes when on the air.

97.2 Your power limit is 1.5KW to the antenna.

97.3 Here are your bands. Stay inside of them.

97.4 Your are encouraged to tinker and experiment and communicate and do public service and talk to strangers in far away lands and launch communications satellites into space and any other cool technical "radio stuff" you may think up. The government doesn't care what mode you use for any of this. (See 97.3)

97.5 Play nice. We'll try to keep the CBers out of your hair. Deliberate interference, unresolved dirty signals, or other asinine behavior on your part will cause Riley Hollingsworth to come and permanently kick your ass off the playground. Have fun.

Love always,
/signed/ FCC

1641. Re: What If.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-23 22:21:07 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <nvYlb.3744$P%1.3197013@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 81117

"Leo" <nomail@nope.org> wrote in message
news:il7gpv4gjg2hlo3n283c3iobp0l52nfrl0@4ax.com...
> Points well taken, Hans. I suggest, however, that the question (what
> the amateur radio service would be comprised of if it were created
> today) must be explored in order to validate what 'historical aspects'
> of the hobby still apply in 2003 - a 'sanity check', if you will.
>
> As I understand it, the ARS was created in early 20th century to
> fulfil a need (to provide a pool of trained operators, I believe, with
> experimentation and development mentioned as other objectives). This
> mandate has evolved over the years, and maybe it is time to review and
> bring it in-line with the requirements and technology of today.
>

Not really. That was the excuse that was used for the government to save face. They really wanted to disallow amateur activity altogether when the various radio services and regulations were initiated (see "200 Meters and Down"). It took quite a bit of organized lobbying on the part of the amateurs to maintain a place in the radio spectrum. After World War I, it took a similar lobbying effort to get the government to allow the resumption of amateur activity. They had shut it down for the war and it looked as if they intended to keep it shut down.

> The ARS is certainly not a service born of regulations - but it exists
> today because the regulators allow it to do so - if we don't have a
> clear idea of specifically why it should continue to exist, or what it
> should be composed of, how can we justify it if and when the time
> comes? We cannot convince regulators to maintain CW testing, as an
> example, if the best arguement that we can come up with is "history"!
> It was put there by regulation for a reason - and it needs a reason to
> survive. Regulators don't deal in nostalgia....and if a push comes to
> approve a potentially multi-billion dollar rollout of a service like
> BPL, they are going to be hard-pressed to stave it off on our behalf
> without a solid justification of why the ARS is still important!
>

Yes once again it is time to fight. If all we can offer is our ability to TALK on the radio, there isn't much justification for the continuation of Amateur Radio with all the frequency privileges we have today.

> I raised this question because, frankly, the vast majority of
> arguements that I have read in this newsgroup have been driven by
> emotion, nostalgia or historical references. If someone proposes that
> CW should continue to have exclusive band assignments because it is a
> great mode to use during emergencies due to its inherent readibility

> through noise, and that CW testing should continue to ensure that a
> pool of CW-competent operators is maintained for emergency comms, then
> OK, good point - maybe it should.

Although this is a good and valid point, those who don't know code and don't want to learn it have successfully outshouted the proponents of code testing so that the regulators, who know nothing of the merits of the code themselves, look like they are going to go along with it.

> OTOH, if someone proposes that CW
> testing should continue because thats the way its been since the
> beginning of time, then - who cares? What relevance does that
> statement have to do with today? So what?
>
> Successful businesses have learned to do this type of review on their
> internal processes in order to survive, in the interest of efficiency
> (and, for fun, watch what happens when some idiot tells the
> departmental VP that something is being done because it has always
> been done that way - wow! - never happens twice!). If something is
> being done, and no one can properly justify it, then out it goes.
> Replaced by a new and (hopefully) better process, or abandoned
> altogether if no longer needed. We could learn something from this
> too.

But sometimes they learn after the fact that although they couldn't come up with a justification to keep something, it turns out to be necessary to function efficiently and they have to reinstate it.. Although touted for decades as the wave of the future, "the paperless office" still has not become a reality. We always need paper documents for something.

> Someone has suggested that if amateur radio were invented today,
> without the benefit of all of the history and tradition, it would be a
> version of FRS or maybe CB - if that is true, we have a serious
> problem when industry comes knocking for more of our frequency
> spectrum. How do we convince the regulators that it remains an
> important service, if we believe that?
>

Simple show them that we are a resource with unique skills and resources and numbers that cannot be found in any other radio service.

> Of course we should keep the history of the service in mind as we
> decide what should define it today. That's an advantage that we have
> over those who created it initially - we can see what worked well,
> what failed, and what still works - and pick and choose accordingly.
> But to argue from a position of emotion, or vanity, or 'what has
> always been' - type historical perspectives - that's a fool's game
> plan.

Eliminating skill and/or knowledge requirements should always be approached with caution and some degree of trepidation. We sometimes don't know what we need until we no longer have the ability to use that skill and/or

knowledge. Even when projecting based on past experience, foresight is far from 20/20.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

1642. Re: What makes LHA so poor at simple research tasks?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-23 22:52:43 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0310231452.2dfa61f0@posting.google.com>
Source record: 81118

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0310181753.1b0bbc3@posting.google.com>...

> Was there ever any doubt, Dick? Can we expect anything less from
> a dweeb who can proudly lay claim to looking up to a known
> pathological liar as his "mentor"...?!?!

I look up to you, Stebe. You are my mentor. I've even followed in
your footsteps, re: misspelling names. You should be proud.

1643. Re: My response to Jim Wiley, KL7CC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-23 23:02:37 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031023190237.29815.00001326@mb-m21.aol.com>
Source record: 81119

In article <swTlb.2927$wc3.2843@newsread3.news.pas.earthlink.net>, "Gri¿½mwï¿½tch thï¿½ ï¿½nflï¿½ppï¿½blï¿½" <Gri¿½mwï¿½tch@NOSPAM.THANKS.IM.FULL.lycos.co.de> writes:

>"Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
>news:f45722ac.0310151853.545f0eb4@posting.google.com...
>:
>: Rally round McCain.
>:
>You guys could have done worse. Oh, it seems you eedjits did do worse! Now
>you all rally round a bush.
>
>BGO

History will determine if the bush was burning or whether it was just
a large weed.

LHA

Holy Moses, Grum, you've sprung us into theology in this sermonary!

1644. Re: Mother Brakob, Listen Up!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-23 23:02:37 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031023190237.29815.00001327@mb-m21.aol.com>
Source record: 81122

In article <1mTlb.2920$wc3.2461@newsread3.news.pas.earthlink.net>, "Gri¿½mwï¿½tch thï¿½ ï¿½nfliï¿½ppï¿½bliï¿½" <Gri¿½mwï¿½tch@NOSPAM.THANKS.IM.FULL.lycos.co.de> writes:

>"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20031021160446.12501.00003399@mb-m04.aol.com...
>
>: Hans has to bandage his own wounds. Not my problem. If he wants
>: to take first pot-shots, he better damn well get better artillery, body
>: armor, and a good revetment next time. The alternate is a graves
>: registration unit picking up his body parts for the big rubber bag.
>
>Hansel the eedjit is off looking for a nurse to examine his body parts.
>
>BGO

He's in luck! There's a nurse newsgroupie living in here! :-)

LHA

1645. Re: What If.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-23 23:02:42 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031023190242.29815.00001329@mb-m21.aol.com>
Source record: 81120

In article <1NTlb.14433$W16.6393@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dan/W4NTI"
<w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> writes:

>Correct Dick. Just because its new, does not make it better. And I'm not
>saying go backwards. Im saying to consider the past progress and learn from
>it. Keep history in mind. If our politicians would do that....well, thats
>too off topic. But you get my drift.

If one is already backwards, one cannot become more so.

LHA

1646. Re: Amateur Radio Newsline? Report 1365 ? October 10 2003

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-23 23:02:42 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031023190242.29815.00001328@mb-m21.aol.com>
Source record: 81121

In article <f45722ac.0310230238.5fb9f2b6@posting.google.com>,
brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:

>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>news:<20031022162303.05539.00001771@mb-m16.aol.com>...
>> In article <f45722ac.0310220226.402df21a@posting.google.com>,
>> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
>>
>> >k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
>> >news:<5c01b95b.0310211528.9fa22d@posting.google.com>...
>> >> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
>> news:<f45722ac.0310210330.6b177052@posting.google.com>...
>> >> > k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
>> news:<5c01b95b.0310201801.6ec543bd@posting.google.com>...
>> >> > > brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
>> news:<f45722ac.0310200310.3998b5f7@posting.google.com>...
>> >> > > > k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
>> news:<5c01b95b.0310191845.4f2a1f33@posting.google.com>...
>> >> > > > > brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
>> news:<f45722ac.0310150430.4c80244d@posting.google.com>...
>> >> > > > >
>> >> > > > > > And its not all NOAA. Air Force Weather runs a number of
>solar
>> >> > > > > > observatories around the globe, polarimeter stations, and
>> >> > > > > > rocketsondes.
>> >> > > > >
>> >> > > > > A bit of news passed to you via back-channel from Lennie,
>or
>> were
>> >> > > > > you reading some 1950's era "This Is The Air Force" books,
>Brain?
>> >> > > > They've only been doing this since the inception of the Air
>Force.
>> >> > > >
>> >> > > > Steve, K4YZ
>> >> > > >
>> >> > > Stebe, I was AF Weather. You washed out and became a cook.
>> >> > >
>> >> > If you say so...
>> >> >
>> >> Or some other untrained, direct-duty assignment. Doesn't matter.
>> >>
>> >> Sorry. Advanced Avionics. Lotsa neat radio stuff. Lennie
>> >> doesn't believe it, but it's in my SRB.

>> >
>> >That makes two.
>>
>> "Advanced Avionics" to Ace Airman Stebe: Switch-over from tube
>> aircraft intercom sets to transistorized aircraft intercom sets.
>>
>> Brian, give him a common AN/ARC-201 and he doesn't know what
>> in hell it is. He MIGHT know about an AN/ARC-27 but that's only
>> because it has been in USN inventory since before 1970.
>
>If I were his USMC supervisor, I wouldn't let him near any of it.
>This would be another case of "close supervision," followed by "wall
>to wall" counseling.

Bounce him from one wall to the next? :-)

Pity about not knowing those communications radios.

The ARC-27 was, and still is, a good unit for 225-400 MHz military
comm band. It was born in Iowa at the Collins works. Tube type,
been around for a very long time.

The ARC-201 is much newer, an airborne version of the SINCGARS
family for ground support missions, fixed-wing and helos.

I shouldn't put down on-board intercom systems...those are needed.
Anyone working around a Neptune on the flight line with the APU
running knows it makes more noise than any Dill Instructor in the
United States Morse Codists. :-)

>> >> > > The only time I "cooked" in the line of duty in
>> >> > > the USMC was heating C-Rats while in boot and on the trail.
>> >> >
>> >> > You are even more talented than anyone could guess.
>> >> >
>> >> > > And your having been a weather guesser in the USAF in no way
>> >> > > changes the facts vis-a-vis your earlier comments...
>> >> >
>> >> > You comments were a lie. I have read no 1950's era "This is the Air
>> >> > Force" book, Stebe, nor have I received via Len and back channel news.
>> >>
>> >> Brain, Brain, Brain...The suggestion vis-a-vis a book or
>> >> back-channel input from Lennie was a question. Please re-read the
>> >> above.
>> >
>> >A comment meant to do what?
>> >
>> >Your innocent little smear campaign is just what to expect from the
>> >Avenging Angel.
>>
>> Stebe never "lies." He tells untruths, he makes mistakes by the
>> ton, but he is a loyal USMC (United States Morse Codist) and

>> follows orders posted at Hq bulletin board in Newington.
>>
>> The medical folks at Glendale Memorial thought Efren Saldivar was
>> a good respiratory thereapist nurse...until too many patients
>> assumed room temperature while under his care. Fully certified,
>> lots of pretty paper attesting to his expertise. The "angel of death"
>> is now in lockup. [Glendale, CA, old established and modernized
>> hospital in the Glendale hills]
>>
>> Fantastic similarity.
>
>Hopefully not.

Saldivar offed something like three dozen before everyone caught on.

Lots more code-tested, licensed, pretty-certificated many times
amateurs have "offed" many more from their owned-and-operated
frequencies on HF bands long before Saldivar got his first job.

>> >> A question cannot be a lie...It can only be a question.
>> >
>> >OK. Have you stopped beating your wife?
>>
>> Which one?
>
>He stayed away from this one in his reply.
>
>Isn't it amazing that a simple question can be both a lie and a
>smear-tactic?

Maybe Stebe is "lying in wait?" :-)

Whatever anyone says against him is labeled a "lie." Ho hum.

>He says otherwise, so we're waiting on his answer.

Ah, but there's never any proof. His standard answer is "it's in my
record" but nobody in here has seen that famous "record."
Somewhere at NARA there's a true record of his military service
and exactly what and where those famous "hostile actions" were
that he was supposedly in. Not really worth the trouble to access
the National Archives and Records Administration.

The guy who labels others a "liar" claims to have worked on lots of
military communications equipment but never mentions a single
detail about it, rationalizing his reasons as "it's all classified..."
Good grief, the only "classified" stuff is the CIA, NSA, and DISA
gadgetry. U.S. military communications equipment names,
nomenclatures, and general specifications are public information
that has been printed with real ink on real paper in lots of industry
documents anyone can read...and now on websites maintained by
the government for everything from RFQs (Requests For Quotes)
to contract awards notifications.

>> >> > The "facts" you
>> >> > > cited were all things being done in the Armed Forces for decades
>> >> > > before your signed on the line.
>> >> > >
>> >> > > Big deal.
>> >> >
>> >> > I merely learned them first hand.
>> >>
>> >> No doubt. I rather imagine that you stopped opening books after
>> >> the "Dick and Jane" series.
>> >
>> >For a Morseodist you have a very limited imagination. Most imagine
>> >preposterous events befalling humankind, and CW is able to save the
>> >day.
>>
>> I'll argue the imagination part, Brian. Remeber Stebe's "hostile
>> actions?" :-)
>
>The famous Seven instances of self-abuse?

Mental masturbation? :-)

>> >> > So how does a USMC nurse know about solar observatories in the USAF?
>> >>
>> >> I wouldn't know, Brain. There are no nurses (by MOS) in the
>> >> USMC. Anyone who may be in the USMC now who holds licensure as a
>> >> Nurse does so as a personal achievement. I knew of a couple, but none
>> >> who were assigned to billets as nurses. One was a pilot, the other in
>> >> admin.
>> >>
>> >> Nursing personnel assigned >>TO<> the Marines. (They are usually
>> Navy) If you read a book once in a
>> >> while, you might know this....But then again I doubt that too...
>> >>
>> >> I was not a Nurse while in the Marine Corps.
>> >
>> >Right. Advanced Avionics.
>>
>> Yeah, he changed tubes in old aircraft intercom sets...
>>
>> >> As for knowing about solar observatories in the USAF, I hate to
>> >> burst your bubble, but there's very little that's actually
>> >> "classified" about aerography, in the USAF or otherwise, Brain.
>> >
>> >So you read and reread the 1950's era "This Is The Air Force," books
>> >and then attributed your actions to me?
>>
>> Careful, Brian, those are His study books for the Civil Air Patrol.
>
>I forgot about his CAP tie-in. Must be where he's finding those
>1950's era "This Is The Air Force" books.

...that's about on par with the same era in U. S. amateur radio and
the state-of-the-art of amateur technology then.

>> He is still working on the meaning of "PIREPS" and has just started
>> to memorize "isobars," discovering that they aren't for a lockup for
>> that most heinous of all "service" crimes: Lying.
>>
>> Wouldn't it be fun if he found out what "adiabatic lapse rate" was?
>> :-)
>
>Wet or dry? Doesn't matter. He couldn't work the hypsometric
>equation if his life depended on it, but like the CAP groupie that he
>is, probably hangs out at the local AF weather station, wishing he had
>made better choices in life.

Sort of brings a mental picture of Stebe in flight suit grubbies posing
by an old 1.6 GHz radiosonde tracking antenna. :-)

Never mind...too many in here don't have any knowledge of "other"
radio or meteorology...meteorology other than "putting up a front,"
that is...

LHA

1647. Re: What If.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-24 00:53:40 UTC
From: Alun Palmer <alun@1stcounsel.com>
Message-ID: <Xns941DD48A4D648elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 81123

"K&#65533;HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in
news:8fYlb.14683$W16.12045@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net:

```
>
> "Leo" <nomail@nope.org> wrote
>
>> Points well taken, Hans. I suggest, however, that the question (what
>> the amateur radio service would be comprised of if it were created
>> today) must be explored in order to validate what 'historical aspects'
>> of the hobby still apply in 2003 - a 'sanity check', if you will.
>
> OK, if we can "make believe" that FCC would find it in their heart to
> set aside all the valuable spectrum we occupy today "from scratch",
> then here is my suggestion for the "New Amateur Radio Rules":
>
> 97.1 To get an Amateur Radio license, you are required to pass
> a technical test to show that you understand how to build simple
> equipment which meets spectral purity specifications of (.....blah,
> blah, blah). You will be issued a license and callsign when you
> pass the test. Transmit your call sign once every 10 minutes when
> on the air.
>
> 97.2 Your power limit is 1.5KW to the antenna.
>
> 97.3 Here are your bands. Stay inside of them.
>
> 97.4 Your are encouraged to tinker and experiment and communicate
> and do public service and talk to strangers in far away lands and
> launch communications satellites into space and any other cool
> technical "radio stuff" you may think up. The government doesn't
> care what mode you use for any of this. (See 97.3)
>
> 97.5 Play nice. We'll try to keep the CBers out of your hair.
> Deliberate interference, unresolved dirty signals, or other asinine
> behavior on your part will cause Riley Hollingsworth to come and
> permanently kick your ass off the playground. Have fun.
>
> Love always,
> /signed/ FCC
>
>
>

Sounds like a decent set of rules. Put the actual bands down in a separate
schedule, word it a little more formally, and write a petition to go with
```

it. I'll support it.

73 de N3KIP

BTW, you do know that the ITU only requires ID every _15_ minutes, don't you? It's always been that way, too.

1648. Re: Element 1, Code vs. No-code, and Dad

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-24 00:59:01 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031023205901.23171.00001688@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 81125

In article <b7d1465c.0310231215.219a8d1d@posting.google.com>, wa2si@arrl.net (Bert Craig) writes:

>Funny thing happened the other day. My father asked me what all the
>hubbub was about re. the code. (Apparently, I had left my QST in the
>car and he decided to peruse away.) I explained that some folks
>consider Morse code antiquated and feel that there are better, more
>modern, modes in use today. I went on to include that some also feel
>that it's unfair to make newcomers "jump through hoops" to become
>ARO's, thus constituting a "barrier" to some, otherwise qualified,
>potential hams.
>
>So Dad pondered for a moment and furled his 77 yr. old eyebrows and
>said. "They're right, Morse code IS antiquated." My jaw dropped, "say
>it ain't so!" (E tu Brute?!) He then asked me about the licensing
>structure and I explained the three-tier system presently in place.
>"You've gotta keep the code test in place though." Ok, now I'm a tad
>confused. "Why, if it's antiquated?" I asked.

Gosh, what a heartwarming story, Egbert.

I wish I could come up with such a nine story...but my father died in 1975. He was born in 1900, the same year as my father-in-law. Father-in-law passed on in 1977, retired after a career as a polymer chemist. My Dad was not a college graduate, got most of his public schooling equivalent in the Swedish Army, was also an Army taught musician. Back in 1918 the Swedish Army still used trumpet signals in the field so he would have been a part-time "signalman." Both gentlemen were interested in technology as a pastime, my father-in-law specifically on photography, my father on time-keeping and clocks. My Dad would check the accuracy of his clock collection against WWV time signals back in the 1960s...no radio clocks for less than $30 then. Dad was much impressed by the General Radio Standard at Ramo-Wooldridge where I worked in 1960 and understood about quartz crystals and oscillators from my explanations. He was fascinated by mechanical clock movements but at the same time loved radio and broadcasts from faraway places like London during the WW2 blitz. Both genetlemen kept up to date on science and technology from periodicals. Both watched the ffirst human beings set foot on the moon in real-time television from a quarter million miles away, each at his respective living room. That was something astounding since both were born a year before the first radio signals crossed the Atlantic and three years before two bicycle mechanics made the first heavier-than-air flight.

It would be trite and cliched to say that "my Dad can beat up your dad" but I'll lay odds that either my father or my father-in-law could argue your father's points. Remember that they came from older times than your father, much more conservative in upbringing and social values, from an era when technology was just beginning to develop and an industrial revolution had just begun.

So, I'll just have to imagine what they would say, knowing enough about both to be reasonably accurate -

>"Values, my boy…values. Just ask yourself if this is what you want to
>teach your own children? Should they apply this logic to other aspects
>of their lives as they grow up?

So far, no real disagreement, by my father would probably look at my father-in-law as if to say "whatinhell is he talking about?"

>How about an aspiring Engineer, why should s/he be forced to learn history?

Why not, from a socio-economic standpoint, that is logical. But, despite thoughts common to all, the federal government does NOT specify or regulate any college or university curriculum in the USA.

>How about an aspiring history teacher, why should s/he learn physics?

My father-in-law also had a pastime of US civil war history and that whole period...AFTER getting a degree in chemistry. Again, there is no USA federal law controlling curricula in colleges or universities.

>There's a bunch of different
>analogies than can be applied, some good and some not so good, but
>there's one common thread…values. Knowledge is NEVER wasted and
>"requiring" one to attain a "reasonable" level of knowledge to enjoy
>increased privileges…whether it be in the ARS, the workplace, or life
>in general is fundamental to nurturing a sense of values.

Amateur radio is de facto a HOBBY, an avocation. It was never otherwise despite the steady propaganda of the ARS membership organizations. A "workplace" it is NOT.

>Let that
>decay and the result will be obvious…like the recent Regents exam
>fiasco.

Both of my dads would agree the above analogy is trying to make a fruit salad out of potatoes and pistachios. Wholesome ingredients but the mixture is wrong.

>Don't lower the bar across the board; help raise the
>individual's standards. It appears to me that there already exists a
>no-code exam and 5-wpm seems quite reasonable…so what's all the hubbub
>about?"

When your father was about 27 I was already assigned to Army radio station ADA, in communications all over the Pacific, and without ever

using, or having to use magnificent morse code or get into some kind
of pseudo "family values" that "must be forever a part of a Hobby."

The United States Army, like all the major U. S. military branches is
far older than radio, older than telegraphy, and is very mindful of
tradition and honor and service...rightfully so considering their history.
While all branches retain traditions, they do NOT let any of that
intefere with doing the job, getting it done by the best way they can
think of. The USN doesn't have wooden sailing vessels as warcraft,
the USAF doesn't fly spruce-wire-fabric biplanes, and the USA doesn't
use muskets or wear tri-cornered hats in battle. They all adapted to
the times, advanced, were not mired in old ways just because some
much-longer-ago old men said "they had to keep old values...
because that's the only values those old men knew."

Amateur radio isn't the military. It isn't a workplace. It isn't a guild
or craft or union or association of professionals. It's a HOBBY.
My fathers would try to point that out to your father, I'm sure, but
mine would add some harsh cuss words in Swedish if not English
(he could speak, read, and write in either quite well). I've not seen
any "Dr. Phil" program or other psemi-pseudo-pscientific group
emphasize olde-tyme ham radio or morse code as a "family values"
attribute or that it should be passed down through the ages... :-)

Change happens. It must. One must learn to separate tradiiton
from reality. Radio is still evolving 107 years after it was "born."

Okay, if your father insists that morse code testing has to stay
then I'll bet MY fathers are having a high old time guffawing at those
reasons, looking down at the adamant status quo insistence of
the still-living old-farts down here. :-)

Give my regards to Gisella. You might point out that her written
comments on the RMs would be better if she copied Kippi Speroni's
comments, not yours.

Happy status quo maintenance. Ciao.

LHA

1649. Re: Reflections on rrap

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-24 00:59:02 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031023205902.23171.00001689@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 81124

In article <3F981329.CB6FE952@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>Len Over 21 wrote:
>>
>> In article <f45722ac.0310221635.3fcdcd1c@posting.google.com>,
>> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
>
>> >Go get professional help.
>>
>> Stebe can't do that.
>
>Who is "Stebe", kindly old fellow?
>
>> He hates professionals.
>
>There is no indication of that. It would seem that he takes exception
>to you in particular.
>
>> This chat room is all about AMATEURS. :-)
>
>This isn't a chat room but it is all about RADIO AMATEURS. You aren't
>one of those. :-)

This is a CHAT ROOM for the regulars, bound and determined
to keep everything under their control as they see fit. That includes
some AMATEUR show-biz types trying to imitate either Werner
Klemperer or Otto Preminger as Luftwaffe Obersts. Like yourself,
Herr Robust.

You seem suddenly disturbed by things and Who Is Allowed To Post!

Just contact AOL management if you are so disturbed by my postings
mein herr. Unless otherwise specified, this be an UNmoderated
newsgroup for everyone else.

If you need all that CONTROL over who can say what to whom, take
some steps yourself to make this a very private, by-invitation-only
venue with (who else?) yourself as moderator.

Go join Kellie for a group enema. Assholes belong together.

LHA

1650. Re: Respect For Freebanders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-24 01:38:42 UTC
From: Jerry <joxendi@bellsouth.net>
Message-ID: <co%lb.32317$h47.30358@bignews4.bellsouth.net>
Source record: 81126

"Two Tango 241" <tt241@freewqz.net> wrote in message
news:bn9051bhr0@pita.alt.net...
> Hate to burst your bubble there Einestein, but HR-2346 was
> invalidated by the courts quite some time back.

>>>>>>>..Hate to burst your bubble, but.............

President Signs CB Enforcement Bill
NEWINGTON, CT, Nov 29, 2000--President Bill Clinton has signed legislation that permits the enforcement of certain FCC Citizens Band regulations by state and local governments. Amateur Radio operators are exempt from the provisions of the law, now PL 106-521.

Congressional lawmakers saw the measure as a way to give a voice to those experiencing radio frequency interference resulting from illegal CB radio operation. The FCC will not yield its authority to regulate Citizens Band or other radio services, however.

In short, the measure authorizes states and localities to enact laws that prohibit the use of unauthorized CB equipment--consistent with FCC regulations. This would include the use of high-power linear amplifiers or equipment that was not FCC-certificated (formerly called "type-accepted").

Specifically, the bill enables state or local regulation over the "use of Citizens Band radio equipment not authorized by the Commission" and "the unauthorized operation of Citizens Band radio equipment" between 24 and 35 MHz. FCC-licensed stations in any radio service--including the Amateur Service--are excluded from such state or local enforcement, and state or local laws enacted under this legislation must identify this exemption.

Anyone affected by the enforcement of such legislation could appeal to the FCC if they believed the state or local government had overstepped its authority under the new law. Any applicable state or local law would not preclude the FCC from enforcing regulations in a given case at the same time.

The new law also says the FCC shall "provide technical guidance to state and local governments regarding the detection and determination of violations" of any regulations localities might enact.

The bill--HR.2346 is the House version; it was S.2767 in the Senate--actually is the old Senate "Feingold bill" from several sessions ago. After introducing his original version a few years back, Wisconsin Sen Russell Feingold requested assistance from the ARRL to rewrite the measure to ensure that licensed hams could not be affected, that the bill featured a wealth of "due process" provisions, and that the concept of federal preemption over telecommunication activities wouldn't be compromised. The

bill signed by the President is nearly identical to the Feingold bill.

The bill's sponsor, Rep Vernon Ehlers of Michigan said Amateur Radio operators encouraged him to introduce the measure in the House last year. Ehlers maintained that the local hams asked him to support the bill because of the bad rap they were getting from illegal CBers using high-power linear amplifiers that resulted in TV and telephone interference while the CBers involved hid behind federal preemption.

Ehlers says that when he was contacted initially by a frustrated constituent who had been experiencing TV, radio and cordless telephone interference, he thought the problem was an isolated incident. The CBer in question was using an illegal 100-W amplifier, he said, and the FCC told his constituent that it did not have the personnel to enforce CB lawbreakers around the country. Ehlers says he introduced his bill as a result.

As did Feingold before him, Ehlers asked the ARRL to review his measure to ensure that it would not unintentionally harm Amateur Radio.

The bill was amended in the Senate, which made a specific change requested by the American Trucking Association. The final version contains language with respect to CB gear aboard a "commercial motor vehicle" (as defined in Title 49, §31101 of the US Code) requiring that state or local authorities have probable cause that the vehicle or its operator was in violation of the regulations before they attempt to enforce such a statute. On the House floor, Ehlers said truckers were "worried about perhaps being harassed by improper use of the law."

During discussion of the bill on the House floor--as reported in The Federal Register--one member spoke of "rogue operators" whose routine CB radio operation at excessive power levels left victims "helpless" to defend themselves. "When these operators boost their CB power levels, it often causes bleeding into nearby frequencies," the congressman said.

The bill passed the House under suspension in September, and passed the Senate at the end of October under unanimous consent. The measure went to President Clinton for his signature on November 14.

And since you are a clueless CBer thar your "knowledge"
of them thar 'reddio' laws is directly proportional to your
ignorance. Tan-fer thar, mercy me thar, shore thang thar,
guaran-told he thar?

As for as your dream about legalizing "freebanding" , there
are many reasons why it won't happen.

)1. Quite of those "freebands" as you ignorantly call them,
aren't even controlled by FCC; there is an agency that is
much more powerful. (Look up NTIA on the web).

2) Many of those frequencies have treaty restrictions that
the USA is bound to honor.

These are only two reasons your illegitimate activities won't be sanctioned
any time soon.

"Two Tango 214 is QRT and uh standin' by thar".
<snicker>> Only a "maroon" (Shades of Bugs Bunny) would say he was going
off the air and standing by at
the same time! ROTFFMAO!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!! (THAR!~)

(How's that for a troll post?) And for those that fall for it,
this post shows up every few months or so, therefore it is
OK to make fun of it.

Jerry

o 241 standing by on 27680
>
>
> "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
> news:HpRlb.15726$Uz6.7426@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> > "Two Tango 241" wrote:
> > > There is legislation pending in Congress to legalize freeband.
> > > Does anyone have the reference number of this legislation?
> >
> >
> > Right. Is this the same legislation that recently authorized local
> police
> > enforcement of the illegal radio activities in and around the CB
> > frequencies? If so, that would be HR-2346, now passed and part of the
> United
> > States Code of Federal Regulations.
> >
> >
> > Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
> >
> > http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
> >
> >
>
>

1651. Re: Respect For Freebanders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-24 01:40:26 UTC
From: Jerry <joxendi@bellsouth.net>
Message-ID: <Pp%lb.32318$h47.31985@bignews4.bellsouth.net>
Source record: 81127

"David Robbins" <noone@nowhere.com> wrote in message
news:X9ednX9Q9c6MLwqiU-KYgw@crocker.com...
>
> "Twistedhed" <twistedhed@webtv.net> wrote in message
> news:3f97666a$1@ghostsearchers.com...
> >
> > We are treated like 2nd class citizens.
>
> You are treated like the criminals you are.

Don't sweat it. It's a troll that shows up every few months.

Jerry
>
>

1652. Re: Amateur Radio in the 21st Century?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-24 02:38:48 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0310231838.6195b0e8@posting.google.com>
Source record: 81128

kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in message
news:<d22b54c3.0310231354.3610518c@posting.google.com>...
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3F981865.672D58A7@earthlink.net>...
> > Len Over 21 wrote:

> > > You wouldn't be worried about enigmas. You'd be talking about
> > > a pair-a-docs.
> >
> > Why not give yourself an enigma, Len?
>
> No, no Dave. It's an enema, not an enigma. He needs to give himself an enema.
>
> >
> > Dave K8MN
>
> w3rv

You should leave that to the professionals - call in Robo-Nurse.

1653. Re: Respect For Freebanders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-24 03:04:33 UTC
From: Gastonia Trailer Park Slums <Slums@ofgastonianc.org>
Message-ID: <bna4rsrbl0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 81129

```
Oh my, look what just blew in from the Gastonia NC
trailer park slums. Did you ever get the roof finally
repaired on that double-wide box you call a home?

Gastonia Slum Lord
```

"Jerry" <joxendi@bellsouth.net> wrote in message
news:co%lb.32317$h47.30358@bignews4.bellsouth.net...
>
> "Two Tango 241" <tt241@freewqz.net> wrote in message
> news:bn9051bhr0@pita.alt.net...
> > Hate to burst your bubble there Einestein, but HR-2346 was
> > invalidated by the courts quite some time back.
>
>
> >>>>>>>..Hate to burst your bubble, but.....
>
> President Signs CB Enforcement Bill
> NEWINGTON, CT, Nov 29, 2000--President Bill Clinton has signed legislation
> that permits the enforcement of certain FCC Citizens Band regulations by
> state and local governments. Amateur Radio operators are exempt from the
> provisions of the law, now PL 106-521.
>
> Congressional lawmakers saw the measure as a way to give a voice to those
> experiencing radio frequency interference resulting from illegal CB radio
> operation. The FCC will not yield its authority to regulate Citizens Band
or
> other radio services, however.
>
> In short, the measure authorizes states and localities to enact laws that
> prohibit the use of unauthorized CB equipment--consistent with FCC
> regulations. This would include the use of high-power linear amplifiers or
> equipment that was not FCC-certificated (formerly called "type-accepted").
>
> Specifically, the bill enables state or local regulation over the "use of
> Citizens Band radio equipment not authorized by the Commission" and "the
> unauthorized operation of Citizens Band radio equipment" between 24 and 35
> MHz. FCC-licensed stations in any radio service--including the Amateur
> Service--are excluded from such state or local enforcement, and state or
> local laws enacted under this legislation must identify this exemption.
>
> Anyone affected by the enforcement of such legislation could appeal to the
> FCC if they believed the state or local government had overstepped its
> authority under the new law. Any applicable state or local law would not

> preclude the FCC from enforcing regulations in a given case at the same
> time.
>
> The new law also says the FCC shall "provide technical guidance to state
and
> local governments regarding the detection and determination of violations"
> of any regulations localities might enact.
>
> The bill--HR.2346 is the House version; it was S.2767 in the
> Senate--actually is the old Senate "Feingold bill" from several sessions
> ago. After introducing his original version a few years back, Wisconsin
Sen
> Russell Feingold requested assistance from the ARRL to rewrite the measure
> to ensure that licensed hams could not be affected, that the bill featured
a
> wealth of "due process" provisions, and that the concept of federal
> preemption over telecommunication activities wouldn't be compromised. The
> bill signed by the President is nearly identical to the Feingold bill.
>
> The bill's sponsor, Rep Vernon Ehlers of Michigan said Amateur Radio
> operators encouraged him to introduce the measure in the House last year.
> Ehlers maintained that the local hams asked him to support the bill
because
> of the bad rap they were getting from illegal CBers using high-power
linear
> amplifiers that resulted in TV and telephone interference while the CBers
> involved hid behind federal preemption.
>
> Ehlers says that when he was contacted initially by a frustrated
constituent
> who had been experiencing TV, radio and cordless telephone interference,
he
> thought the problem was an isolated incident. The CBer in question was
using
> an illegal 100-W amplifier, he said, and the FCC told his constituent that
> it did not have the personnel to enforce CB lawbreakers around the
country.
> Ehlers says he introduced his bill as a result.
>
> As did Feingold before him, Ehlers asked the ARRL to review his measure to
> ensure that it would not unintentionally harm Amateur Radio.
>
> The bill was amended in the Senate, which made a specific change requested
> by the American Trucking Association. The final version contains language
> with respect to CB gear aboard a "commercial motor vehicle" (as defined in
> Title 49, &#65533;31101 of the US Code) requiring that state or local authorities
> have probable cause that the vehicle or its operator was in violation of
the
> regulations before they attempt to enforce such a statute. On the House

> floor, Ehlers said truckers were "worried about perhaps being harassed by
> improper use of the law."
>
> During discussion of the bill on the House floor--as reported in The
Federal
> Register--one member spoke of "rogue operators" whose routine CB radio
> operation at excessive power levels left victims "helpless" to defend
> themselves. "When these operators boost their CB power levels, it often
> causes bleeding into nearby frequencies," the congressman said.
>
> The bill passed the House under suspension in September, and passed the
> Senate at the end of October under unanimous consent. The measure went to
> President Clinton for his signature on November 14.
>
>
> And since you are a clueless CBer thar your "knowledge"
> of them thar 'reddio' laws is directly proportional to your
> ignorance. Tan-fer thar, mercy me thar, shore thang thar,
> guaran-told he thar?
>
>
> As for as your dream about legalizing "freebanding" , there
> are many reasons why it won't happen.
>
>)1. Quite of those "freebands" as you ignorantly call them,
> aren't even controlled by FCC; there is an agency that is
> much more powerful. (Look up NTIA on the web).
>
> 2) Many of those frequencies have treaty restrictions that
> the USA is bound to honor.
>
> These are only two reasons your illegitimate activities won't be
sanctioned
> any time soon.
>
> "Two Tango 214 is QRT and uh standin' by thar".
> <snicker>> Only a "maroon" (Shades of Bugs Bunny) would say he was going
> off the air and standing by at
> the same time! ROTFFMAO!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!! (THAR!~)
>
>
> (How's that for a troll post?) And for those that fall for it,
> this post shows up every few months or so, therefore it is
> OK to make fun of it.
>
>
> Jerry
>
>

>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
> o 241 standing by on 27680
> >
> >
> > "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
> > news:HpRlb.15726$Uz6.7426@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> > > "Two Tango 241" wrote:
> > > > There is legislation pending in Congress to legalize freeband.
> > > > Does anyone have the reference number of this legislation?
> > >
> > >
> > > Right. Is this the same legislation that recently authorized local
> > police
> > > enforcement of the illegal radio activities in and around the CB
> > > frequencies? If so, that would be HR-2346, now passed and part of the
> > United
> > > States Code of Federal Regulations.
> > >
> > >
> > > Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
> > >
> > > http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
> > >
> > >
> > >
> > >
> >
> >
>
>

1654. Re: Respect For Freebanders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-24 03:06:13 UTC
From: Gastonia Trailer Park Slums <Slums@ofgastonianc.org>
Message-ID: <bna4uv$ri4$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 81130

Sort of like you. You roll out of that Gastonia Trailer Park
slum every one in a while. And pay your trailer rent!

Gastonic Mobile Home Park
Slum Lord

"Jerry" <joxendi@bellsouth.net> wrote in message
news:Pp%lb.32318$h47.31985@bignews4.bellsouth.net...
>
> "David Robbins" <noone@nowhere.com> wrote in message
> news:X9ednX9Q9c6MLwqiU-KYgw@crocker.com...
> >
> > "Twistedhed" <twistedhed@webtv.net> wrote in message
> > news:3f97666a$1@ghostsearchers.com...
> > >
> > > We are treated like 2nd class citizens.
> >
> > You are treated like the criminals you are.
>
> Don't sweat it. It's a troll that shows up every few months.
>
> Jerry
> >
> >
>
>

1655. Re: Respect For Freebanders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-24 03:30:42 UTC
From: KU2S <ku2s@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <197hpvsf31nk8q4p09fj56q63svaf9uiqj@4ax.com>
Source record: 81131

On 23 Oct 2003 06:26:02 +0100, "Twistedhed" <twistedhed@webtv.net>
wrote:

>
>I am posting here because of some of the nasty things I have read in this
>group and in QRZ discussions regarding freebanders. We who use the frequencies
>from 27.405 to 28.000 have more in common with hams than you might think.
>We are good operators and have knowledge of propagation and skip conditions.
>We use Yeasus, Kenwoods and Icom radios just like you do, so we know technical
>issues as well or better. However, the attitude of some hams toward us is
>rude and condescending. We are treated like 2nd class citizens. This should
>not be. We have the same rights under the constitution as legal hams do.
>For those that do not wish to be under Uncle Sam's thumb, freebanding is
>a viable alternative to getting a ham radio license. What I am saying is
>that maybe the next time you meet a freebander you might talk with him before
>you condemn him.
>
>I am QRT and standing by. (No flames answered. Please reply via email)
>
>Unit 2711, Florida
>
>--

Troll... Criminal... Idiot.
Raymond Sirois KU2S
SysOp: The Lost Chord BBS
607-733-5745
telnet://thelostchord.dns2go.com:6000

1656. Re: Amateur Radio in the 21st Century?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-24 03:52:06 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3F98A1E4.EFCDFC48@earthlink.net>
Source record: 81132

Brian Kelly wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3F981865.672D58A7@earthlink.net>...
> > Len Over 21 wrote:
> > >
> > > In article <20031020182922.08626.00001309@mb-m27.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com
> > > (Chuck von Klauswitz Jr) writes:
> > >
> > > >In article <20031019201627.07346.00001305@mb-m26.aol.com>,
> > > >yodoc@aol.comnospam
> > > >(Larry Roll K3LT) writes:
> > > >
> > > >Then there's the Enigma story...
> > >
> > > Gosh, you bigguys ought to switch chat room subjects to medicine.
> > >
> > > You wouldn't be worried about enigmas. You'd be talking about
> > > a pair-a-docs.
> >
> > Why not give yourself an enigma, Len?
>
> No, no Dave. It's an enema, not an enigma. He needs to give himself an enema.

Darn! I always get those two words mixed up. I suppose I've misquoted
Churchill concerning Russia being wrapped in one of them.

Dave K8MN

1657. Re: Reflections on rrap

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-24 04:09:43 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3F98A605.EE50D212@earthlink.net>
Source record: 81133

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3F981329.CB6FE952@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >Len Over 21 wrote:
> >>
> >> In article <f45722ac.0310221635.3fcdcd1c@posting.google.com>,
> >> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
> > >
> >> >Go get professional help.
> >>
> >> Stebe can't do that.
> > >
> >Who is "Stebe", kindly old fellow?
> > >
> >> He hates professionals.
> > >
> >There is no indication of that. It would seem that he takes exception
> >to you in particular.
> > >
> >> This chat room is all about AMATEURS. :-)
> > >
> >This isn't a chat room but it is all about RADIO AMATEURS. You aren't
> >one of those. :-)
>
> This is a CHAT ROOM for the regulars, bound and determined
> to keep everything under their control as they see fit. That includes
> some AMATEUR show-biz types trying to imitate either Werner
> Klemperer or Otto Preminger as Luftwaffe Obersts. Like yourself,
> Herr Robust.

Not even the use of capitalized letters makes this newsgroup a CHAT
ROOM, old timer. The AMATEURS here are radio amateurs. You don't have
a stake in amateur radio. You puff and bluster. You snarl and yell.
You pontificate and insult but you aren't involved in amateur radio in
any way.

> You seem suddenly disturbed by things and Who Is Allowed To Post!

"Things" don't bother me and I wrote nothing about Who Is Allowed To
Post. What's with the capitalization? wHy nOt Try soMethinG difFeRent
oncE iN awHile?

> Just contact AOL management if you are so disturbed by my postings
> mein herr. Unless otherwise specified, this be an UNmoderated
> newsgroup for everyone else.

I have no need to contact AOL. I'll simply continue to make my comments here if that meets with your approval--or even if it doesn't. I understand that the newsgroup is UNmoderated and that you are the original UNradio amateur.

> If you need all that CONTROL over who can say what to whom, take
> some steps yourself to make this a very private, by-invitation-only
> venue with (who else?) yourself as moderator.

You might want to devote one of your long-winded efforts to an explanation of how I'm attempting to control who says what by commenting on your posts. I'm certain that it'll be read by tens of people.

When you issue snide comments to the postings of others, are you attempting to control who says what to whom?

> Go join Kellie for a group enema. Assholes belong together.

I'm sure that both of yours take comfort in your belief, affable codger.

Dave K8MN

1658. Re: Respect For Freebanders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-24 04:53:09 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <Nd6dnX2DwZPVKQWiRVn-tw@gbronline.com>
Source record: 81134

Two Tango 241 wrote:
> There is legislation pending in Congress to legalize freeband.
> Does anyone have the reference number of this legislation?
>
> Two Tango 241

In your dreams.

1659. Re: Respect For Freebanders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-24 04:57:37 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <Nd6dnXyDwZPpKAWiRVn-tw@gbronline.com>
Source record: 81135

Two Tango 241 wrote:

> Hate to burst your bubble there Einestein, but HR-2346 was
> invalidated by the courts quite some time back. But since
> you are a no-code tech, we'll let you slide this time.
>
> Two Tango 241 standing by on 27680

Nice try but no cigar.

1660. Re: Amateur Radio in the 21st Century?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-24 05:25:33 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0310232125.79a14159@posting.google.com>
Source record: 81136

brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0310231838.6195b0e8@posting.google.com>...
> kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in message
news:<d22b54c3.0310231354.3610518c@posting.google.com>...
> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3F981865.672D58A7@earthlink.net>...
> > > Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> > > > You wouldn't be worried about enigmas. You'd be talking about
> > > > a pair-a-docs.
> > >
> > > Why not give yourself an enigma, Len?
> >
> > No, no Dave. It's an enema, not an enigma. He needs to give himself an enema.
> >
> > >
> > > Dave K8MN
> >
> > w3rv
>
> You should leave that to the professionals - call in Robo-Nurse.

If by some miracle The Putz did finally figure out how to give himself
an enema he's so full of it that when the enema did it's do he'd hit a
9.0 on the Richter scale and take out half of L.A. I really wouldn't
want Steve to be anywhere near that mess.

You however, being The Putz's apprentice boy . . .

w3rv

1661. Re: Respect For Freebanders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-24 07:50:55 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <zR4mb.17841$Uz6.12546@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 81137

"Two Tango 241" wrote:
> Hate to burst your bubble there Einestein, but
> HR-2346 was invalidated by the courts quite
> some time back.

Since Jerry has already addressed this so well, there is little reason to
add anything more.

> But since you are a no-code tech, we'll let you slide this time.

Obviously, this "no-code tech" knows far more than you do.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

1662. Re: Respect For Freebanders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-24 07:54:03 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <vU4mb.17843$Uz6.7159@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 81138

"Jerry" wrote:
>
> (How's that for a troll post?)

Not bad at all, Jerry. Facts are always a good response to obvious
ignorance.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

1663. Re: Student That Did Razor Test is a Ham.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-24 09:30:38 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <2j6mb.3$FI2.1@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 81139

"Brian Kelly" wrote:
>
> Rust's stunt was a whole 'nother level up, To
> successfully get away with penetrating the
>Soviet air defenses in that global hot spot with
> a just Skyhawk then having the audacity to
> fly it all the way to Moscow unchallenged
> *and* plop it onto Red Square has to be one
> of the all-time government-shaking stunts
> pulled off by an individual. (snip)

While nice propaganda, it's somewhat foolish to believe that, Brian. To do what you say, the guy would have had to avoid detection by Soviet, American, and NATO, radar installations, which is clearly not very likely. Using normal operating procedures, civilian radar installations would have contacted NATO within moments of him flying off his approved flight path. NATO, American, and Soviet, radar facilities would have detected his plane as it approached the restricted airspace bordering East and West Germany. NATO would have immediately tried to contact the pilot and aircraft would have been dispatched in an attempt to intercept him before he could leave NATO airspace (can't have spies flying out of West Germany). At the same time, to avoid any possibility of confusion and again using normal operating procedures, NATO would have immediately contacted the Soviets to assure them it was not a NATO controlled aircraft flying into their airspace and to explain their unusual air activity so near the border. If the Soviets had not already detected the plane and sent aircraft to intercept, they certainly would have after being contacted by NATO. The Soviets, for whatever reason, did not shoot down that plane. Whatever the reasons, it was certainly not because he had penetrated Soviet air defenses undetected.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

1664. Re: What If.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-24 12:29:22 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031024082922.15462.00003789@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 81141

In article <nvYlb.3744$P%1.3197013@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> writes:

>"Leo" <nomail@nope.org> wrote in message
>news:il7gpv4gjg2hlo3n283c3iobp0l52nfrl0@4ax.com...
>> Points well taken, Hans. I suggest, however, that the question (what
>> the amateur radio service would be comprised of if it were created
>> today) must be explored in order to validate what 'historical aspects'
>> of the hobby still apply in 2003 - a 'sanity check', if you will.
>>
>> As I understand it, the ARS was created in early 20th century to
>> fulfil a need (to provide a pool of trained operators, I believe, with
>> experimentation and development mentioned as other objectives). This
>> mandate has evolved over the years, and maybe it is time to review and
>> bring it in-line with the requirements and technology of today.
>
>Not really. That was the excuse that was used for the government to save
>face. They really wanted to disallow amateur activity altogether when the
>various radio services and regulations were initiated (see "200 Meters and
>Down"). It took quite a bit of organized lobbying on the part of the
>amateurs to maintain a place in the radio spectrum. After World War I, it
>took a similar lobbying effort to get the government to allow the resumption
>of amateur activity. They had shut it down for the war and it looked as if
>they intended to keep it shut down.

Exactly, Dee. And it didn't stop there - amateurs had to fight for recognition internationally as well, all through the 1920s. Amateur radio was only recognized as a separate radio service by international regulations in 1927.

The whole concept of "radio for its own sake" evolved over time, and as K0HB so rightly says, is still evolving. What it evolves into is mostly in the hands of those who choose to become radio amateurs.

Note that the regulations did not contain any sort of "Basis and Purpose" statements until 1951, when FCC insisted on writing such into the regs for each service.
>
>> The ARS is certainly not a service born of regulations - but it exists
>> today because the regulators allow it to do so - if we don't have a
>> clear idea of specifically why it should continue to exist, or what it
>> should be composed of, how can we justify it if and when the time
>> comes? We cannot convince regulators to maintain CW testing, as an
>> example, if the best arguement that we can come up with is "history"!

I am convinced that all the regulators really care about wrt amateur radio is:

- Noninterference with other services
- Orderly on-air behavior by amateurs
- Reasonable level of use of allocated spectrum

Everything else is pretty much up to us.

>> It was put there by regulation for a reason - and it needs a reason to
>> survive. Regulators don't deal in nostalgia....and if a push comes to
>> approve a potentially multi-billion dollar rollout of a service like
>> BPL, they are going to be hard-pressed to stave it off on our behalf
>> without a solid justification of why the ARS is still important!
>
>Yes once again it is time to fight. If all we can offer is our ability to
>TALK on the radio, there isn't much justification for the continuation of
>Amateur Radio with all the frequency privileges we have today.

Exactly. And it's not just amateur radio that is threatened by BPL.
>
>> I raised this question because, frankly, the vast majority of
>> arguements that I have read in this newsgroup have been driven by
>> emotion, nostalgia or historical references. If someone proposes that
>> CW should continue to have exclusive band assignments because it is a
>> great mode to use during emergencies due to its inherent readibility
>> through noise, and that CW testing should continue to ensure that a
>> pool of CW-competent operators is maintained for emergency comms, then
>> OK, good point - maybe it should.

But CW *doesn't* have any *exclusive* band assignments on HF/MF! Not one Hz!

There are lots of reasons to keep CW/Morse testing - and lots of reasons to let
it go. All reasons basically come down to someone's opinion, one way or the
other.

>Although this is a good and valid point, those who don't know code and don't
>want to learn it have successfully outshouted the proponents of code testing
>so that the regulators, who know nothing of the merits of the code
>themselves, look like they are going to go along with it.

Maybe.
>
>> OTOH, if someone proposes that CW
>> testing should continue because thats the way its been since the
>> beginning of time, then - who cares? What relevance does that
>> statement have to do with today? So what?

"If it ain't broke, don't fix it"

>> Successful businesses have learned to do this type of review on their
>> internal processes in order to survive, in the interest of efficiency
>> (and, for fun, watch what happens when some idiot tells the
>> departmental VP that something is being done because it has always
>> been done that way - wow! - never happens twice!). If something is
>> being done, and no one can properly justify it, then out it goes.
>> Replaced by a new and (hopefully) better process, or abandoned

>> altogether if no longer needed. We could learn something from this
>> too.

Sure!
>
>But sometimes they learn after the fact that although they couldn't come up
>with a justification to keep something, it turns out to be necessary to
>function efficiently and they have to reinstate it.. Although touted for
>decades as the wave of the future, "the paperless office" still has not
>become a reality. We always need paper documents for something.

Excellent example. Offices today use more paper, not less!

Note that most of the concepts of the computerized office (mouse, graphical
user interface, computer at every desk, networking) came from Xerox's Palo Alto
Research Center (PARC) in the very early 1970s. The folks at Xerox thought
their core business of copiers would wither away as computers took over.....

Often when something is done a certain way, it's not just because "we've always
done it like that" but because of very good reasons that are not immediately
apparent to outsiders - or even insiders.
>
>> Someone has suggested that if amateur radio were invented today,
>> without the benefit of all of the history and tradition, it would be a
>> version of FRS or maybe CB - if that is true, we have a serious
>> problem when industry comes knocking for more of our frequency
>> spectrum. How do we convince the regulators that it remains an
>> important service, if we believe that?
>
>Simple show them that we are a resource with unique skills and resources and
>numbers that cannot be found in any other radio service.

Which is why any radio service continues to exist, really.
>
>> Of course we should keep the history of the service in mind as we
>> decide what should define it today. That's an advantage that we have
>> over those who created it initially - we can see what worked well,
>> what failed, and what still works - and pick and choose accordingly.
>> But to argue from a position of emotion, or vanity, or 'what has
>> always been' - type historical perspectives - that's a fool's game
>> plan.
>
>Eliminating skill and/or knowledge requirements should always be approached
>with caution and some degree of trepidation. We sometimes don't know what
>we need until we no longer have the ability to use that skill and/or
>knowledge. Even when projecting based on past experience, foresight is far
>from 20/20.
>
It's also important to monitor the actual results of changes. For example, back
in April of 2000, code testing was reduced to a single 5 wpm test *and* the
written tests were reduced. Did we get lots more new hams? Nope - in 3-1/2
years, the ARS in the USA has grown by less than 10,000. What we did get was

lots of upgrades by already-licensed hams in the year or so following the rules changes, then a slowdown to nearly the rates before the changes.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1665. Re: Element 1, Code vs. No-code, and Dad

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-24 12:29:23 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031024082923.15462.00003790@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 81140

In article <20031023205901.23171.00001688@mb-m05.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) writes:

> Amateur radio isn't the military. It isn't a workplace. It isn't a guild
> or craft or union or association of professionals.

Which means that the methods and standards of the military, the workplace, the guild/craft/union or professional associations don't apply to amateur radio.

> It's a HOBBY.

It's an avocation. Meaning it's done for its own sake.

But however someone chooses to describe it, does the fact that amateur radio isn't the military, a workplace, a guild or craft or union or association of professionals mean that there is no need for amateur radio to have values, and standards? That seems to be your main message here.

You seem to be telling us that amateurs should not have any values, standards or practices except those necessary to prevent amateurs from interfering with users of other radio services. And you denigrate and insult anyone who disagrees with you.

We've seen *your* values, standards and practices in action here, Len. They leave a lot to be desired.

1666. Re: Student That Did Razor Test is a Ham.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-24 13:24:56 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0310240524.579c0ac1@posting.google.com>
Source record: 81142

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:<2j6mb.3$FI2.1@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> "Brian Kelly" wrote:
> >

. . . .

> If the Soviets had
> not already detected the plane and sent aircraft to intercept, they
> certainly would have after being contacted by NATO. The Soviets, for
> whatever reason, did not shoot down that plane. Whatever the reasons, it was
> certainly not because he had penetrated Soviet air defenses undetected.

I've never dug into the details of who did or did not do exactly what
during that stunt but whatever actually happened is recorded recent
history which is inarguable. Versus you making the bunch of
suppositions and assumptions above instead presenting any historical
facts which refute my comments. That simply does not fly.

If in fact NATO and the Soviets were so chummy and the Soviets knew
the kid was enroute then you explain why the Kremlin very publically
punished a flock of their high-level air defense officers for not
detecting and shooting the kid down.

> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
w3rv

1667. Re: What makes LHA so poor at simple research tasks?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-24 13:32:09 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3F9929D9.7040906@psu.edu>
Source record: 81143

Okay, we have

Jim, Dick, Dave, and myself as homebrewers. Anyone else?

- Mike KB3EIA -

1668. Re: Amateur Radio in the 21st Century?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-24 14:03:20 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3F993128.6080401@psu.edu>
Source record: 81144

N2EY wrote:
> In article <GDDkb.112989$qj6.6296986@news1.news.adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo
> <mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:

<Some snippage>

>>paper is not a group controlled by NCI, they are a completely
>>different entity.
>>
>> But they ARE a group calling for some things that I find a little
>>disturbing.
>>
>> And this IS something I got my chops busted about earlier with what
>>seemed to me to be a simple statement of fact. I'll state it again
>>paraphrased:
>>
>>The removal of the Morse code test is the removal of knowledge required
>>to get a ARS license. Thos who believe that less knowledge should be
>>necessary to get a license can only be heartened by this event. There
>>will be a move towards further reductions in the knowledge needed for a
>>license.
>>
>>lessee here:
>>
>>(from
>
>
> KL7CC:
>
>
>>>One of the primary goals of the new license we are going to propose
>>>is a true entry-level ticket. Limited power, limited frequencies,
>>>but still useful, with enough of the essence of Amateur Radio to
>>>attract beginners and show them what lies ahead when they upgrade.
>>>Simpler exam. WAIT! - - WAIT! - - WHAT WAS THAT??!!
>>>
>>>Yes, I said simpler exam. Hopefully 20 questions. Aimed at a young
>>>person aged 12 or more. That means a 6th grade education. Also fits
>>>teens, high schoolers, home schoolers. You know, fresh ideas, new
>>>blood, people that can actually see their radios without having to
>>>put on glasses – what a concept! 20 questions, simple enough to get
>>>someone started in a responsible way, pointed in the right direction,
>>>all that stuff.
>>
>> Well what do we have here? A proposal for a simpler exam? Certainly

>>looks like it.
>
>
> Yep - with reduced privileges. Not necessarily a bad idea. All they're really
> doing is reinventing the Novice.

I'm still not so hot on the idea.

>> Especially charming is the idea that people with a 6th grade education
>>are going to supply us with fresh ideas.
>
>
> I got started in ham radio between 6th and 7th grades.....

Were you "average" Jim? I was involved in electronics when I was in 5th
grade, but no one else around me was. I'm not at all against kids of
any particular age being involved in Ham radio, but that "average 6th
grader thing is bothersome.

>>Its even more charming that
>>this new, fresh blood will be able to see their radios without glasses.
>>I've worn glasses since I was in second grade.
>>
>
> One of the things that bugs me a little about that paper is the little digs it
> tosses in - like that one. They're subtle but they convey an undertone of
> insult.
>
>
>> I guess the
>
>
> (authors of the KL7CC paper)
>
>
>>doesn't really want me to be a ham.
>
>
> Nor me, nor a lot of us.
>
>
>>Next:
>>
>>
>>>Whatever we come up with, it will have to fit within the FCC budget.
>>>This probably means that in all likelihood what will happen, assuming
>>>that the idea of a beginner’s class license is even accepted at all,
>>>is that they (the FCC) will juggle the existing 3 classes to
>>>accommodate the new structure. Technician will change from what it
>>>is now to the basic license. It may be named “Communicator” or
>>>simply left as Technician. Let’s assume it gets the name

>>>“Communicator”. All existing Techs will be upgraded to General.
>>>Assuming that the Morse requirement is removed first, our opinion
>>>is that most of the Techs will take (and hopefully pass) the element
>>>3 exam as soon as they can, thus becoming General class licensees.
>>
>> Assuming indeed! They figure that people are going to study and pay >
>
> for
>
>>a test in order to get priveleges they will get anyhow? If a Technician
>>flunks the test, all he or she has to do is wait a while, than he/she
>>will get the priveleges anyhow.
>
>
> Exactly!
>
>
>> That sounds a LOT like simplification to me.
>
>
> Sounds like a giveaway to me. And it sets a very bad precedent: If it's OK to
> give all Techs a free upgrade to General, why not throw away most of the
> General question pool and use the Tech one instead?
>
>>>Remember, that before the changes that created the present no-code
>>>tech, the General and Tech exams were identical. Only the code
>>>separated them, and even there it was only the difference between
>>>5 and 13 WPM.
>>
>>But its not that way now.
>
>
> And it wasn't that way back when the Tech code test changes were made!

hehe, things aren't like they used to be, and they never were! 8^)

> Quick history:
>
> From 1951 to March 1987, the General and Tech had the same written. In March of
> 1987 the General was split into two elements, 3A for Tech and 3B for General.
> Almost four years later (February 1991), the Tech lost its code test.
>
> This isn't ancient history, and anybody writing a policy paper should know how
> the previous system came to be. And it's not the only factual mistake in the
> paper.
>
>>And finally, before I forget about how I was charmed about the glasses
>>reference, I have to congratulate the authors on their humorous
>>treatment of Pro coders:
>>
>>(more from the

>
>
> KL7CC paper)
>
>
>>>So, there are no “Morse code haters” on the committee.
>>>There is no conspiracy, no secret agenda, no kickback from the
>>>manufacturers, no “black plan” from the ARRL, no anything. Just some
>>>guys that want nothing more than to see our great hobby prosper for
>>>the next hundred years, or longer.
>>
>>and (I had to put this in again):
>>
>>
>>>You know, fresh ideas, new blood, people that can actually see
>>>their radios without having to put on glasses – what a concept!
>>
>>and:
>>
>>
>>>A few final words:
>>
>>>There are no black helicopters.
>>
>>I guess those who believe in the Morse code test believe there are?
>
>
> See what I mean about undertone?

I bet they love their families more than PCTA's too!

>>>Do you suppose the committee members just want to see our wonderful
>>>hobby prosper? Wouldn’t that be an odd reason for doing what they are
>>>doing?
>>
>>Apparently those of us who believe in a Morse code test *don't* want to
>>see our wonderful hobby prosper!
>>
>
> If the ideas are good ideas, they will stand on their merit. The person
> histories of the committee members is not the issue. If they're such great
> folks, why don't they let the merits of their ideas convicne us?
>
> Quick aside: I first became aware of W5YI about ten years ago when my license
> needed to be renewed. I got this official looking letter saying that for just
> $5 they'd help me renew my license. All I had to do was fill in the form, sign
> it, write a check for $5 and send it to them.
>
> Never mind that I'd been dealing with the FCC since I was 13 and had renewed
> and modified my license at least 9 times before with no problems at all. They
> thought I needed "help".

Perhaps their target audience needs the help? 8^)

<snippage>

>>And the answer to the question of who I'm going to talk to if there are
>>no manufacturers..... Well you know , don't ya Jim?
>
>
> Who, me?

Yeah, you!!

<more snippage>

>>
>> I'm not talking about Carl either. I know that neither he nor Bill Sohl
>
>
>>are in favor of reductions in the qualifications to get a license (save
>>removal of the Morse code test)
>>
>
> And they've been very clear about that.
>
>
>> That's really nice. It also *may* mean that they will someday be
>>considered the Luddites along with us troglodyte Pro code testers as the
>>requirements to get a license are relaxed more and more.
>
>
> You got my point exactly.

I may have proposed this once (quite tongue in cheek) but one of the
proposals was that the prospective amateur sign a paper stating how he
or she had read and understood part 97. Why not extrapolate that to the
whole test? Just think how easy the testing process would be! By gosh,
we could get [people to sign that they had the equivalent knowlege of
anything. The ARS could be populated by geniuses!

- Mike KB3EIA -

1669. A Morsodist Challenge

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-24 16:59:55 UTC
From: Hans K0HB <k0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <0e0bcf9156e38b6b5725ff4d921e90bc.128005@mygate.mailgate.org>
Source record: 81145
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com> wrote

> Yeah, the NoCode Agenda can get to be a bit bizzare, all right.
> ....then their version of .... Morsedists Religion, blah, blah...

Dick,

A simple straightforward challenge for you (and the rest of rrap).

During the 30 hours starting at 2100Z on Nov 1st, 2003 I will be
practicing Morsodism on the HF bands in the ARRL SS Radiosport event.
Keep up with me if you can.

May the Peace of St. Morse shower down upon thee in abundance,

de Hans, K0HB
--
http://home.earthlink.net/~k0hb

--
Posted via Mailgate.ORG Server - http://www.Mailgate.ORG

1670. Re: What makes LHA so poor at simple research tasks?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-24 17:21:30 UTC
From: groupk0hb@earthlink.net
Message-ID: <5ee63311.0310240921.6f35f6da@posting.google.com>
Source record: 81146

Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote

>
> Jim, Dick, Dave, and myself as homebrewers. Anyone else?
>

K0HB
K0CKB

73, de Hans, K0HB
--

1671. Re: Element 1, Code vs. No-code, and Dad

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-24 17:39:42 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031024133942.07346.00001437@mb-m26.aol.com>
Source record: 81147

In article <20031024082923.15462.00003790@mb-m06.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
writes:

>In article <20031023205901.23171.00001688@mb-m05.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com
>(Len Over 21) writes:
>
>> Amateur radio isn't the military. It isn't a workplace. It isn't a guild
>> or craft or union or association of professionals.
>
>Which means that the methods and standards of the military, the workplace, the
>guild/craft/union or professional associations don't apply to amateur radio.
>
>> It's a HOBBY.
>
>It's an avocation. Meaning it's done for its own sake.

In common English an avocation is a hobby.

Hobbies aren't required to be so anal retentive about RULES and
REGULATIONS rigidly enforced by participants who greatly
desire CONTROL over directions of activities.

YOU aren't the regulatory body controlling amateur radio or
much else. The FCC is that body.

The FCC doesn't require any commissioners or staff to be
proficient in morse code in order to regulate US amateur
radio...yet you INSIST that YOU must enforce, guide, direct,
and ORDER what takes place in amateur radio.

>But however someone chooses to describe it, does the fact that amateur radio
>isn't the military, a workplace, a guild or craft or union or association of
>professionals mean that there is no need for amateur radio to have values, and
>standards? That seems to be your main message here.

I cannot help you on your misunderstandings or failure to
read what is written.

The FCC regulates, NOT the "amateur radio community."

YOU keep wanting all the rules and regulations according to
YOUR standards and practices...which are amazingly like
the direction and guidance and near-commands issued from
ARRL.

NO ONE in amateur radio is required to follow your dictates.

NO ONE outside of amateur radio is required to follow your
dictates, "explanations," or arrogant presumptions of expertise
to do as you insist.

NO ONE is required to follow rigid regulations, standards,
practices AS IF IT WERE a union, guild, craft or workplace
organization.

>You seem to be telling us that amateurs should not have any values, standards
>or practices except those necessary to prevent amateurs from interfering with
>users of other radio services.

Absolutely. "Here are your bands, have a nice day" would be
a very free, open, and enjoyable environment for a HOBBY...
except for a certain group who wish to play-act, fantasize that
they are some sort of "professionals" in communications...or
even experts at modern radio operations.

>And you denigrate and insult anyone who
>disagrees with you.

Tsk, tsk, tsk...YOU cannot take an opposite viewpoint so you
once again resort to that trite phrase of "being insulted."

Poor baby.

Do you wish honors and respect for trying to hold a hobby
activity entry to the standards and practices of 70 years
ago? If so, you are not really living in this reality.

If you take that as a "denigration and insult" then I could
care less. Those who oppose freedom for a hobby activity,
require anal retentive regulations for same, or with to live in
some fantasyland where they are "leaders of technology
and expertise" are not worthy of honor or respect, just
contempt from the rest of the radio world.

>We've seen *your* values, standards and practices in action here, Len. They
>leave a lot to be desired.

Poor baby. FREEDOM FROM OPPRESSION is a "bad"
standard and practice, is it?

You don't have your whig on straight.

If you so adamantly oppose change and demand all shall
adhere rigidly to your own personal viewpoints, then the FCC
will accept a petition from you to forever hold the US amateur
radio service to long-ago standards and practices, especially
to love, honor, and obey morse code as the epitome of radio.

I suggest you also demand a change of the name to:

Archaic Radiotelegraphy Service

Make it a living museum of the airwaves, the last resting place of once-mighty morsemanship. Restore the titles of nobility on the worthy worshippers of King Kode, the gallant knights of the brass. Make all bow before your blue-blooded beeping highnesses. Oppose all opposition, demand rigid adherence to the royal roiling righteous round-tables of dits and dahs.

Most important of all: Make morse a FAMILY VALUES attribute, to be passed from father to son, ad infinitum.

The rest of the world will treat you kindly in your delusions. Your avocation is only a hobby, condescendingly tolerated by the far more numerous in other radio who live in reality.

The Jukes family descendants would be proud...

LHA

1672. Re: What If.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-24 18:16:44 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <xnfcneeyarg.hn9n5d7.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>
Source record: 81148

On 24 Oct 2003 00:53:40 GMT, Alun Palmer wrote:

>Sounds like a decent set of rules. Put the actual bands down in a separate
>schedule, word it a little more formally, and write a petition to go with
>it. I'll support it.

Sounds to me like the "comic book rules" (disguised as "plain language rules") that the scholars and wonders at the then-new Consumer Affairs Task Force of the FCC tried to institute in 1976 after their spectacular victory in rewriting Part 95 Subpart D (the CB Rules) in the same "lowest common denominator" (also known as "Illiteracy for Dummies") style. They tried running it up the flagpole and it was resoundingly shot down by both the professional regulators and the knowledgeable amateur community.

The head of that operation - who up to that time had no idea of what and how the FCC was supposed to do for a living, much like the recent crop of appointees and promotees - then tried coming out to our field office and telling us how we were doing everything all wrong. In return, we requested that our Bureau Chief do all he could to ensure that those fools stayed out of our face and off our property in the future. The person running that operation got the same message from wherever she visited, and soon left the agency.

"Those who will not learn from history will be doomed to repeat it...."

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

1673. Re: What If.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-24 19:49:19 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@nope.org>
Message-ID: <eepipvgtbgsqkdirhmfr3df4o857q48lhb@4ax.com>
Source record: 81149

Dee,

Thanks for your reply - my comments are in the text below:

On Thu, 23 Oct 2003 22:21:07 GMT, "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
wrote:

>
>"Leo" <nomail@nope.org> wrote in message
>news:il7gpv4gjg2hlo3n283c3iobp0l52nfrl0@4ax.com...
>> Points well taken, Hans. I suggest, however, that the question (what
>> the amateur radio service would be comprised of if it were created
>> today) must be explored in order to validate what 'historical aspects'
>> of the hobby still apply in 2003 - a 'sanity check', if you will.
>>
>> As I understand it, the ARS was created in early 20th century to
>> fulfil a need (to provide a pool of trained operators, I believe, with
>> experimentation and development mentioned as other objectives). This
>> mandate has evolved over the years, and maybe it is time to review and
>> bring it in-line with the requirements and technology of today.
>>
>
>Not really. That was the excuse that was used for the government to save
>face. They really wanted to disallow amateur activity altogether when the
>various radio services and regulations were initiated (see "200 Meters and
>Down"). It took quite a bit of organized lobbying on the part of the
>amateurs to maintain a place in the radio spectrum. After World War I, it
>took a similar lobbying effort to get the government to allow the resumption
>of amateur activity. They had shut it down for the war and it looked as if
>they intended to keep it shut down.

Very interesting - I haven't read "200 Meters and Down" - I'll look
for a copy.

However, the regulatory agencies likely see the "trained pool of
operators and experimenters" as the original benchmark for the
service. What I was hoping to stimulate in this thread was some
thought regarding what the goals of the service are relevant to today,
and then use that as a guide to what qualifications and testing are
relevant to meet those goals.

Somehow, it's not working out quite that way.... ;)

>
>> The ARS is certainly not a service born of regulations - but it exists
>> today because the regulators allow it to do so - if we don't have a

>> clear idea of specifically why it should continue to exist, or what it
>> should be composed of, how can we justify it if and when the time
>> comes? We cannot convince regulators to maintain CW testing, as an
>> example, if the best arguement that we can come up with is "history"!
>> It was put there by regulation for a reason - and it needs a reason to
>> survive. Regulators don't deal in nostalgia....and if a push comes to
>> approve a potentially multi-billion dollar rollout of a service like
>> BPL, they are going to be hard-pressed to stave it off on our behalf
>> without a solid justification of why the ARS is still important!
>>
>
>Yes once again it is time to fight. If all we can offer is our ability to
>TALK on the radio, there isn't much justification for the continuation of
>Amateur Radio with all the frequency privileges we have today.

That was one of the points that I was hoping to raise in this
discussion. If it is a pure hobby, it is difficult to justify a lot
of testing and qualification levels. If, however, it is to train
folks to provide 'para-professional' backup to Emergency services,
then the standards would be considerably higher, and qualifications
more easily justifiable.
>
>> I raised this question because, frankly, the vast majority of
>> arguements that I have read in this newsgroup have been driven by
>> emotion, nostalgia or historical references. If someone proposes that
>> CW should continue to have exclusive band assignments because it is a
>> great mode to use during emergencies due to its inherent readibility
>> through noise, and that CW testing should continue to ensure that a
>> pool of CW-competent operators is maintained for emergency comms, then
>> OK, good point - maybe it should.
>
>Although this is a good and valid point, those who don't know code and don't
>want to learn it have successfully outshouted the proponents of code testing
>so that the regulators, who know nothing of the merits of the code
>themselves, look like they are going to go along with it.

Seems to be the direction that other administrations around the globe
have gone - and there is indeed a strong push in North America to
usher it out as well. Personally, I have yet to hear an arguement
that would convince me that code testing should remain a mandatory
requirement. I was hoping that someone would come up with a solid
technical or functional reason that would leadd me to believe
otherwise - but there doesn't seem to be one.

Although it is a valuable mode of operation, especialy in high QRM or
QRN situations, (and fun to use!!), it was only a mandatory requirment
originally (as I understand it, anyway) so that government (and
commercial?) CW stations could communicate with amateurs interfering
with their signals, and order them to stop. A secondary purpose may
have been to allow emergency CW traffic to be relayed by amateur
stations. These scenarios are no longer viable reasons in 2003 -

unless there are new reasons to take their place, then perhaps CW
should assume the same status as the other available operating modes -
permitted for use, by all means, but not specifically tested by
practical examination.

My own personal position on this subject has shifted solidly over to
the "yes, discontinue mandatory CW testing" side, in the absence of a
logical reason to believe otherwise. I cannot recall a single
arguement based on hard fact that justifies testing as a necessary
requirement to becoming a licenced amateur, and operating on HF.
There is emotion, and preference, and nostalgia, and tradition, and
fear of the loss of a valuable skill whose value is no longer
quantifiable - but no hard reasons.

Years ago, here in Canada, there was a special licence class required
to operate using the Digital modes (!). This was dropped after only a
few years. presumably because it was not demonstrated that there was
any real benefit gained from the additional testing of digital
proficiency. After all, the idea of a hobby is to be able to
experiment and learn those aspects that are of interest or use to the
individual!
>
>> OTOH, if someone proposes that CW
>> testing should continue because thats the way its been since the
>> beginning of time, then - who cares? What relevance does that
>> statement have to do with today? So what?
>>
>> Successful businesses have learned to do this type of review on their
>> internal processes in order to survive, in the interest of efficiency
>> (and, for fun, watch what happens when some idiot tells the
>> departmental VP that something is being done because it has always
>> been done that way - wow! - never happens twice!). If something is
>> being done, and no one can properly justify it, then out it goes.
>> Replaced by a new and (hopefully) better process, or abandoned
>> altogether if no longer needed. We could learn something from this
>> too.
>
>But sometimes they learn after the fact that although they couldn't come up
>with a justification to keep something, it turns out to be necessary to
>function efficiently and they have to reinstate it.. Although touted for
>decades as the wave of the future, "the paperless office" still has not
>become a reality. We always need paper documents for something.

True - errors are certainly possible when re-engineering any complex
process. In fact, the only guaranteed way to avoid error is do do
nothing at all. But, to continue along without occasional review and
adjustment can have much more serious consequences. For example, if
Polaroid had not continually re-invented their processes over the
years, they would still be trying to market their old 'instant
picture' camera and film technology - which would be virtually
unmarketable today, in an era of digital cameras and home photo

printing technology. Those out of sync with progress do not survive.

Our hobby is technologically based, too. By virtue of the fact that it is a hobby, though, there is no need to retire older technology in favour of the leading edge stuff (in fact, some hobbies exist because they are the only place left to find people who share their interest in the obsolete - Antique Radios, or Steam Trains for example). Why, however, would we realistically expect newcomers to the hobby to be forced to learn specific 'niche' areas of this, or any other avocation? If there is a real need to do so, then OK - make it a requirement. But, if there isn't - why do it? "Because that's the way it has always been" is not a reason to do, there must be a specific benefit to keeping it, or specific hazard if it is discontinued - complacency won't do the job. We test regulatory knowledge, because the operator must know the legal limits within which the station must be operated. We test radio knowledge, because operators should know enough about how the equipment functions to ensure that they operate it correctly, and stay within the legal limits. And the FCC, IC and other worldwide regulatory authorities tested CW proficiency because it was an ITU requirement for all amateurs to be proficient in the sending and receiving of CW when operating on the bands under 30 MHz. Solid reasons for each - reasons that can change as the world evolves. Without the support of the underlying reason,

>
>> Someone has suggested that if amateur radio were invented today,
>> without the benefit of all of the history and tradition, it would be a
>> version of FRS or maybe CB - if that is true, we have a serious
>> problem when industry comes knocking for more of our frequency
>> spectrum. How do we convince the regulators that it remains an
>> important service, if we believe that?
>>
>
>Simple show them that we are a resource with unique skills and resources and
>numbers that cannot be found in any other radio service.

Exactly - but if we show them that what we're really interested in is protecting the class structure, hierarchy and outdated traditions of what is essentially a hobby, we're not going to convince anyone.

I believe that we need to position ourselves as forward-thinking, technically competent and highly motivated - ready to out our skills to use whenever required to do so by the various public safety and security organizations. Looking through the current FCC petitions regarding the infamous Code issue, we could easily be seen as a bunch of folks interested in creating unnecessary levels of proficiency testing within the hobby, without a real technological reason to do so. That will not help us, or our image, one bit.
>
>> Of course we should keep the history of the service in mind as we

>> decide what should define it today. That's an advantage that we have
>> over those who created it initially - we can see what worked well,
>> what failed, and what still works - and pick and choose accordingly.
>> But to argue from a position of emotion, or vanity, or 'what has
>> always been' - type historical perspectives - that's a fool's game
>> plan.
>
>Eliminating skill and/or knowledge requirements should always be approached
>with caution and some degree of trepidation. We sometimes don't know what
>we need until we no longer have the ability to use that skill and/or
>knowledge. Even when projecting based on past experience, foresight is far
>from 20/20.

Agreed - but to remain credible, we need to be careful that we don't overstate the real importance of, and the perpetuation of testing of, skills that are (outside the hobby itself) obsolete and no longer in common use. Unless we can come up with some real, tangible, meassurable benefits of doing so.

Otherwise, it's simply a matter of personal preference!

>Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

73, Leo

1674. Re: Amateur Radio in the 21st Century?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-24 19:52:08 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0310241152.730c4c93@posting.google.com>
Source record: 81150

kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in message
news:<d22b54c3.0310232125.79a14159@posting.google.com>...
> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0310231838.6195b0e8@posting.google.com>...
> > kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in message
news:<d22b54c3.0310231354.3610518c@posting.google.com>...
> > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3F981865.672D58A7@earthlink.net>...
> > > > Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> > > > > You wouldn't be worried about enigmas. You'd be talking about
> > > > > a pair-a-docs.
> > > >
> > > > Why not give yourself an enigma, Len?
> > >
> > > No, no Dave. It's an enema, not an enigma. He needs to give himself an enema.
> > >
> > > >
> > > > Dave K8MN
> > >
> > > w3rv
> >
> > You should leave that to the professionals - call in Robo-Nurse.
>
> If by some miracle The Putz did finally figure out how to give himself
> an enema he's so full of it that when the enema did it's do he'd hit a
> 9.0 on the Richter scale and take out half of L.A. I really wouldn't
> want Steve to be anywhere near that mess.
>
> You however, being The Putz's apprentice boy . . .
>
> w3rv

Sorry, but I'm apprentticing with Robo-Nurse, which still puts me in harms way.

Man, are you guys bad.

bb

1675. Re: What If.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-24 20:21:30 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@nope.org>
Message-ID: <3n0jpv03hgno46p11vthasap9ql3uj1h04@4ax.com>
Source record: 81251

Hans,

I believe that you have missed my point a little bit (!) - it wasn't to start up a redefinition of the entire hobby all over again, but to stimulate an introspective look at the validity of the various arguements ongoing in this group (code / no code, more testing / less testing, etc.) based on the world as it stands in 2003. Things that made perfect sense in 1919, or 1941, or 1963 may well be seriously outdated today, based on the current state of our hobby. Example - In 1930, hams had to build just about all of their own equipment, so testing them on their ability to hand-draw and analyse radio schematics made good sense. Otherwise, the bands would be full of splatter and heterodynes from poorly-crafted transmitters. Now, where just about everyone is using commercially built transmitting equipment, that level of detail is no longer of critical importance, and is no longer tested. To propose that today would be quite difficult to justify - most folks never even take the cover off their radios anymore, let alone design one from scratch.....

My point is, if we argue from preference or personal bias, we tend to hold on to things because they are familiar, or comfortable, or just "the way it's always been". To review using an analytical mindset might just bring out the true value of some aspects of the hobby - sure, there are traditions that should be kept (everyone on SSB uses Q-signals in comon speech, even though they were only designed for brevity when using Morse code) - it is a quaint link to the past.

Others, like mandatory CW testing, should be able to stand on their own merit based on solid reasoning - after all, we are forcing people to learn it to get in to the hobby (me included - the current price of admission to HF...) - so there should be a good technical or procedural reason to do so. This ain't the Masons....<:0)

Your rule set is actually a good one - simple, and to the point. If only people could work within straightforward frameworks like this - the regulators would be out of business.....

73, Leo

On Thu, 23 Oct 2003 22:03:48 GMT, "Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote:

>
>"Leo" <nomail@nope.org> wrote
>
>> Points well taken, Hans. I suggest, however, that the question (what

>> the amateur radio service would be comprised of if it were created
>> today) must be explored in order to validate what 'historical aspects'
>> of the hobby still apply in 2003 - a 'sanity check', if you will.
>
>OK, if we can "make believe" that FCC would find it in their heart to set
>aside all the valuable spectrum we occupy today "from scratch", then here is
>my suggestion for the "New Amateur Radio Rules":
>
> 97.1 To get an Amateur Radio license, you are required to pass
> a technical test to show that you understand how to build simple
> equipment which meets spectral purity specifications of (.....blah,
> blah, blah). You will be issued a license and callsign when you
> pass the test. Transmit your call sign once every 10 minutes when
> on the air.
>
> 97.2 Your power limit is 1.5KW to the antenna.
>
> 97.3 Here are your bands. Stay inside of them.
>
> 97.4 Your are encouraged to tinker and experiment and communicate
> and do public service and talk to strangers in far away lands and
> launch communications satellites into space and any other cool
> technical "radio stuff" you may think up. The government doesn't
> care what mode you use for any of this. (See 97.3)
>
> 97.5 Play nice. We'll try to keep the CBers out of your hair.
> Deliberate interference, unresolved dirty signals, or other asinine
> behavior on your part will cause Riley Hollingsworth to come and
> permanently kick your ass off the playground. Have fun.
>
> Love always,
> /signed/ FCC
>
>

1676. Re: Student That Did Razor Test is a Ham.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-24 20:29:52 UTC
From: dennis@wawa.juniper.net
Message-ID: <bnc240$10ol$1@heap.juniper.net>
Source record: 81252

Brian Kelly <kelly@dvol.com> wrote:
>"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
>news:<2j6mb.3$FI2.1@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
>> "Brian Kelly" wrote:
>> >
>
> . . . .
>
>> If the Soviets had
>> not already detected the plane and sent aircraft to intercept, they
>> certainly would have after being contacted by NATO. The Soviets, for
>> whatever reason, did not shoot down that plane. Whatever the reasons, it was
>> certainly not because he had penetrated Soviet air defenses undetected.
>
>I've never dug into the details of who did or did not do exactly what
>during that stunt but whatever actually happened is recorded recent
>history which is inarguable. Versus you making the bunch of
>suppositions and assumptions above instead presenting any historical
>facts which refute my comments. That simply does not fly.

More than this, his assumption that the rest of it relies on, that
Rust flew directly and non-stop over the East/West German border to
Moscow (what's that, more than 1500 miles?) in a Cessna 172, seems
a bit silly.

Rust actually entered the Soviet Union after a stop in Helsinki, which
means he crossed into the air space either from the Gulf of Finland
or the Finnish land border, so NATO had nothing to do with it. As for
why the Soviet border defenses didn't pick him up, Rust himself believes
it may be because the day he flew (May 28?) happened to be a holiday for
the Soviet military, and this may have left their defenses where he entered
undermanned and/or inattentive.

Dennis Ferguson

1677. Re: Element 1, Code vs. No-code, and Dad

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-24 22:18:57 UTC
From: Andre Sarkissian <as2004@hotmail.com>
Message-ID: <3f99a551$1@ghostsearchers.com>
Source record: 81253

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote:
>In article <20031024082923.15462.00003790@mb-m06.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com
(N2EY)
>writes:
>>You seem to be telling us that amateurs should not have any values, standards
>>or practices except those necessary to prevent amateurs from interfering
with
>>users of other radio services.
>
> Absolutely. "Here are your bands, have a nice
> day" would be
> a very free, open, and enjoyable environment

That's CB.

1678. Re: Amateur Radio in the 21st Century?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-24 22:29:42 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031024182942.12300.00001303@mb-m20.aol.com>
Source record: 81254

In article <3F993128.6080401@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:

>> Yep - with reduced privileges. Not necessarily a bad idea. All they're
>really
>> doing is reinventing the Novice.
>
> I'm still not so hot on the idea.

All depends on what the balance of requirements vs. privileges is. As it stands right now, our "entry level" license is heavily weighted to VHF/UHF.

>>> Especially charming is the idea that people with a 6th grade education
>>>are going to supply us with fresh ideas.

>> I got started in ham radio between 6th and 7th grades.....

> Were you "average" Jim?

In some things yes, in others no.

>I was involved in electronics when I was in 5th
>grade, but no one else around me was. I'm not at all against kids of
>any particular age being involved in Ham radio, but that "average 6th
>grader thing is bothersome.

Heck, the "average" sixth grader in some American neighborhoods is quite different from his/her "average" counterpart elsewhere.

Perhaps a better way to word that idea is "the entry level syllabus and test should not require a knowledge of math, science or English above the sixth-grade level in order to understand the material".

>>>Next:
>>>
>>>
>>>>Whatever we come up with, it will have to fit within the FCC budget.
>>>>This probably means that in all likelihood what will happen, assuming
>>>>that the idea of a beginner’s class license is even accepted at all,
>>>>is that they (the FCC) will juggle the existing 3 classes to
>>>>accommodate the new structure. Technician will change from what it
>>>>is now to the basic license. It may be named “Communicator” or
>>>>simply left as Technician. Let’s assume it gets the name
>>>>“Communicator”. All existing Techs will be upgraded to General.
>>>>Assuming that the Morse requirement is removed first, our opinion
>>>>is that most of the Techs will take (and hopefully pass) the element
>>>>3 exam as soon as they can, thus becoming General class licensees.
>>>

>>> Assuming indeed! They figure that people are going to study and pay >
>>
>> for
>>
>>>a test in order to get priveleges they will get anyhow? If a Technician
>>>flunks the test, all he or she has to do is wait a while, than he/she
>>>will get the priveleges anyhow.
>>
>>
>> Exactly!
>>
>>
>>> That sounds a LOT like simplification to me.
>>
>>
>> Sounds like a giveaway to me. And it sets a very bad precedent: If it's OK
>to
>> give all Techs a free upgrade to General, why not throw away most of the
>> General question pool and use the Tech one instead?
>>
>>>>Remember, that before the changes that created the present no-code
>>>>tech, the General and Tech exams were identical. Only the code
>>>>separated them, and even there it was only the difference between
>>>>5 and 13 WPM.
>>>
>>>But its not that way now.

>> And it wasn't that way back when the Tech code test changes were made!
>
> hehe, things aren't like they used to be, and they never were! 8^)

"They remember a past that never was"
>
>> Quick history:
>>
>> From 1951 to March 1987, the General and Tech had the same written. In
>> March of
>> 1987 the General was split into two elements, 3A for Tech and 3B for
>> General.
>> Almost four years later (February 1991), the Tech lost its code test.
>>
>> This isn't ancient history, and anybody writing a policy paper should know
>> how
>> the previous system came to be. And it's not the only factual mistake in
>> the paper.
>>
>>>And finally, before I forget about how I was charmed about the glasses
>>>reference, I have to congratulate the authors on their humorous
>>>treatment of Pro coders:
>>>
>>>(more from the

>>
>>
>> KL7CC paper)
>>
>>
>>>>So, there are no “Morse code haters” on the committee.
>>>>There is no conspiracy, no secret agenda, no kickback from the
>>>>manufacturers, no “black plan” from the ARRL, no anything. Just some
>>>>guys that want nothing more than to see our great hobby prosper for
>>>>the next hundred years, or longer.
>>>
>>>and (I had to put this in again):
>>>
>>>>You know, fresh ideas, new blood, people that can actually see
>>>>their radios without having to put on glasses – what a concept!
>>>
>>>and:

>>>>A few final words:
>>>>There are no black helicopters.
>>>
>>>I guess those who believe in the Morse code test believe there are?

>> See what I mean about undertone?
>
>I bet they love their families more than PCTA's too!

I recycle.
>
>>>>Do you suppose the committee members just want to see our wonderful
>>>>hobby prosper? Wouldn’t that be an odd reason for doing what they are
>>>>doing?
>>>
>>>Apparently those of us who believe in a Morse code test *don't* want to
>>>see our wonderful hobby prosper!

>> If the ideas are good ideas, they will stand on their merit. The person
>> histories of the committee members is not the issue. If they're such great
>> folks, why don't they let the merits of their ideas convicne us?
>>
>> Quick aside: I first became aware of W5YI about ten years ago when my
>> license
>> needed to be renewed. I got this official looking letter saying that for
>> just
>> $5 they'd help me renew my license. All I had to do was fill in the form,
>sign
>> it, write a check for $5 and send it to them.
>>
>> Never mind that I'd been dealing with the FCC since I was 13 and had
>renewed
>> and modified my license at least 9 times before with no problems at all.

>They
>> thought I needed "help".
>
> Perhaps their target audience needs the help? 8^)

Maybe?
>
><snippage>
>
>>>And the answer to the question of who I'm going to talk to if there are
>>>no manufacturers..... Well you know , don't ya Jim?
>>
>>
>> Who, me?
>
> Yeah, you!!
>
More folks like me? Who don't "take the practical approach"?

><more snippage>

>>> I'm not talking about Carl either. I know that neither he nor Bill Sohl
>>>are in favor of reductions in the qualifications to get a license (save
>>>removal of the Morse code test)
>>
>> And they've been very clear about that.
>>
>>> That's really nice. It also *may* mean that they will someday be
>>>considered the Luddites along with us troglodyte Pro code testers as the
>>>requirements to get a license are relaxed more and more.

>> You got my point exactly.
>
> I may have proposed this once (quite tongue in cheek) but one of the
>proposals was that the prospective amateur sign a paper stating how he
>or she had read and understood part 97.

I had to read that part of the KL7CC paper twice because I didn't believe it
the first time! And they're talking about the *rules and regs*!!

Once upon a time, FCC tried that approach with another radio service. Didn't
work very well.

>Why not extrapolate that to the
>whole test? Just think how easy the testing process would be! By gosh,
>we could get [people to sign that they had the equivalent knowlege of
>anything. The ARS could be populated by geniuses!

Exactly! No more need for VEC sessions and all that paperwork. If that approach
is valid for the rules, why not the whole test?

But the part of that paper I found most "amusing" was where the prime author
admitted that he could not pass the current written test for the license he

holds. It is written in such a way that he almost sounds proud of that fact. As dear departed N0BK would say: Surreal.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1679. Re: What If.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-24 23:16:57 UTC
From: dennis@wawa.juniper.net
Message-ID: <bncbt9$1v4v$1@heap.juniper.net>
Source record: 81255

N2EY <n2ey@aol.com> wrote:
>"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> writes:
>>Eliminating skill and/or knowledge requirements should always be approached
>>with caution and some degree of trepidation. We sometimes don't know what
>>we need until we no longer have the ability to use that skill and/or
>>knowledge. Even when projecting based on past experience, foresight is far
>>from 20/20.
>>
>It's also important to monitor the actual results of changes. For example, back
>in April of 2000, code testing was reduced to a single 5 wpm test *and* the
>written tests were reduced. Did we get lots more new hams? Nope - in 3-1/2
>years, the ARS in the USA has grown by less than 10,000. What we did get was
>lots of upgrades by already-licensed hams in the year or so following the rules
>changes, then a slowdown to nearly the rates before the changes.

Boy, that's really misleading (though I assume unintentionally). You ask
a rhetorical question about "new hams", but then quote a number (10,000)
which is something else.

In the 41 months since restructuring, about 70,000 new hams have been
licensed. That's an average of 1670 new hams per month. About 10% of
current ARS licensees obtained their license since the April 2000
restructuring.

For comparison, in the 34 months prior to restructuring about 48,000 new
hams were licensed in the ARS. That's an average of about 1410 new hams
per month.

It seems, then, that the rate at which new hams entered the ARS increased
by about 20% after restructuring, and that this increase was sustained for
at least 39 of those 41 months (the last couple of months are suspicious).
Is a 20% increase in the number of new hams due to restructuring not "a lot",
and if not then how much would it have had to increase to be "a lot" in
your view?

Dennis Ferguson

1680. Re: What If.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-25 00:29:24 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031024202924.29660.00001288@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 81256

In article <bncbt9$1v4v$1@heap.juniper.net>, dennis@wawa.juniper.net (Dennis Ferguson) writes:

>N2EY <n2ey@aol.com> wrote:
>>"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> writes:
>>>Eliminating skill and/or knowledge requirements should always be approached
>>>with caution and some degree of trepidation. We sometimes don't know what
>>>we need until we no longer have the ability to use that skill and/or
>>>knowledge. Even when projecting based on past experience, foresight is far
>>>from 20/20.
>>>
>>It's also important to monitor the actual results of changes. For example,
>back
>>in April of 2000, code testing was reduced to a single 5 wpm test *and* the
>>written tests were reduced. Did we get lots more new hams? Nope - in 3-1/2
>>years, the ARS in the USA has grown by less than 10,000. What we did get
>was
>>lots of upgrades by already-licensed hams in the year or so following the
>rules
>>changes, then a slowdown to nearly the rates before the changes.
>
>Boy, that's really misleading (though I assume unintentionally). You ask
>a rhetorical question about "new hams", but then quote a number (10,000)
>which is something else.

I see your point! I should have written that the overall increase is 10,000.
>
>In the 41 months since restructuring, about 70,000 new hams have been
>licensed.

Your source for those figures, please?

>That's an average of 1670 new hams per month. About 10% of
>current ARS licensees obtained their license since the April 2000
>restructuring.
>
Interesting numbers!

>For comparison, in the 34 months prior to restructuring about 48,000 new
>hams were licensed in the ARS. That's an average of about 1410 new hams
>per month.
>
>It seems, then, that the rate at which new hams entered the ARS increased
>by about 20% after restructuring, and that this increase was sustained for
>at least 39 of those 41 months (the last couple of months are suspicious).

You mean since July? If so, recall that a new Tech Q&A pool was put in place July 15. The new pool is quite a bit larger than the old one. This dropoff is significant because the numbers since July are not just down, they're way down - below what they were before restructuring. Some have suggested that WRC 2003 may be a factor, but that seems unlikely to me because the class most affected is the Tech, which has no code test anyway.

>Is a 20% increase in the number of new hams due to restructuring not "a lot",
>and if not then how much would it have had to increase to be "a lot" in
>your view?

My math says an 18% increase but close enough. You have a good point, Dennis - how much of an increase is significant? I'd say that 18% is significant but not "a lot". 50% increase (average of 2115 per month) I would call "a lot". Just my opinion.

Note that besides the elimination of the 13 and 20 wpm code tests, the restructuring significantly reduced the written exams:

Extra went from 5 exams totalling 190 questions to 3 exams totalling 120 questions
General went from 3 exams totalling 100 questions to 2 exams totalling 70 questions
Tech went from 2 exams totalling 65 questions to a single 35 question exam

How much each of these factors affected the number of new hams is anyone's guess. Personally, I thought that we'd have much more growth in the past 3 years - I even predicted that we'd be over 700,000 before the end of the last century. Didn't happen!

One more factor: In early 2001, the first of the Technician licenses that did not require a code test began to reach the end of their terms.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1681. Re: Element 1, Code vs. No-code, and Dad

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-25 00:38:30 UTC
From: Bert Craig <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM>
Message-ID: <aCjmb.22437$gA1.6064876@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>
Source record: 81257

Jim,

Thanks, but...

Message <click>
Block Sender <click>
Yes <click>
"Plonk!"

73 de Bert
WA2SI

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20031024082923.15462.00003790@mb-m06.aol.com...
> In article <20031023205901.23171.00001688@mb-m05.aol.com>,
lenover21@aol.com
> (Len Over 21) writes:
>
> > Amateur radio isn't the military. It isn't a workplace. It isn't a
guild
> > or craft or union or association of professionals.
>
> Which means that the methods and standards of the military, the workplace,
the
> guild/craft/union or professional associations don't apply to amateur
radio.
>
> > It's a HOBBY.
>
> It's an avocation. Meaning it's done for its own sake.
>
> But however someone chooses to describe it, does the fact that amateur
radio
> isn't the military, a workplace, a guild or craft or union or association
of
> professionals mean that there is no need for amateur radio to have values,
and
> standards? That seems to be your main message here.
>
> You seem to be telling us that amateurs should not have any values,
standards
> or practices except those necessary to prevent amateurs from interfering
with
> users of other radio services. And you denigrate and insult anyone who
> disagrees with you.

>
> We've seen *your* values, standards and practices in action here, Len.
They
> leave a lot to be desired.
>
>
>

1682. Re: Student That Did Razor Test is a Ham.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-25 00:47:15 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <nKjmb.1077$X22.457@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 81258

"Brian Kelly" wrote:
>
> (snip) Versus you making the bunch of suppositions
> and assumptions above instead presenting any historical
> facts which refute my comments. (snip)

Those suppositions and assumptions are based on the fact that the airspace in question (Europe, Eastern Europe, and Eastern Russia) was monitored by some of the most sophisticated radar facilities in the world - radar facilities belonging to the United States, NATO, and the Soviet Union. To avoid mistakes, communications between those three were commonplace whenever an unexplained incident occurred. To do what you say, this person would have had to avoid detection by all three, which I believe was absolutely impossible. Instead, like many military situations of the time, I suspect a lot happened behind the scenes that was never, and may never be, made known to the general public. Of course, that's just what I believe. You're free to believe what you want.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

1683. Re: Student That Did Razor Test is a Ham.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-25 01:23:40 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <wgkmb.1102$X22.533@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 81259

"Dennis Ferguson" wrote:
>
> Rust actually entered the Soviet Union after a stop in
> Helsinki, which means he crossed into the air space
> either from the Gulf of Finland or the Finnish land
> border, so NATO had nothing to do with it. (snip)

His flight started in Hamburg Germany, with a stop in Helsinki for fuel. According to every report I've read, he crossed into East Germany on the border with West Germany. To do this without detection, he would have had to avoid United States, NATO, and Soviet radar. In my opinion, that was impossible. Therefore, there is more to this story that has not been told.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

1684. Re: Element 1, Code vs. No-code, and Dad

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-25 02:27:38 UTC
From: Steve Stone <spfleck@zzcitlinkzz.net>
Message-ID: <uclmb.3467$Cc1.1296@news02.roc.ny>
Source record: 81260

> Let that
> decay and the result will be obvious�like the recent Regents exam
> fiasco. Don't lower the bar across the board; help raise the
> individual's standards.

You missed the PBS article where they interviewed a Texas educator who now is at the Federal level pushing "numbers" and standards except he fudged the numbers back in Texas to make himself look good.

1685. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-25 04:18:30 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20031025001830.07578.00001308@mb-m25.aol.com>
Source record: 81261

In article <G7Tkb.4374$S52.3309@newsread4.news.pas.earthlink.net>, Duane Allen <computeruser@sprintmail.com> writes:

>On a serious off-topic note, does anyone know what is being done to
>protec the CSA graveyards. Thanks in advance.

I do. The graveyards full of traitorous racist Confederates are being converted to HAZMAT landfill sites and leach fields. You Rebs wanted "states rights" so you could do such lovely things as own slaves. Well, now our society is trashed by the millions of descendants of those "slaves" who want their assets kissed with government support from cradle to grave. Well, I guess it is better than your blue-blood white trash ancestors getting their hands dirty. Of course, now we'll probably have to sit through all the tired old QRM about how the Civil War wasn't about slavery. Right.

73 de Larry, K3LT

1686. Re: Respect For Freebanders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-25 04:18:31 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20031025001831.07578.00001309@mb-m25.aol.com>
Source record: 81262

In article <3f97666a$1@ghostsearchers.com>, "Twistedhed" <twistedhed@webtv.net>
writes:

>
>I am posting here because of some of the nasty things I have read in this
>group and in QRZ discussions regarding freebanders. We who use the
>frequencies
>from 27.405 to 28.000 have more in common with hams than you might think.
>We are good operators and have knowledge of propagation and skip conditions.
>We use Yeasus, Kenwoods and Icom radios just like you do, so we know
>technical
>issues as well or better. However, the attitude of some hams toward us is
>rude and condescending. We are treated like 2nd class citizens. This should
>not be. We have the same rights under the constitution as legal hams do.
>For those that do not wish to be under Uncle Sam's thumb, freebanding is
>a viable alternative to getting a ham radio license. What I am saying is
>that maybe the next time you meet a freebander you might talk with him before
>you condemn him.
>
>I am QRT and standing by. (No flames answered. Please reply via email)
>
>Unit 2711, Florida

Twistedhead:

Don't look now, but you're not being treated like 2nd class citizens. You
are, or should be, treated like the first-class CRIMINALS that you are.
Your "freeband" operations are nothing at all like amateur radio -- it's just
a pure and simple fact that you are breaking federal law. It is my sincere
hope that you get the pleasure of meeting Mr. Hollingsworth soon!

73 de Larry, K3LT

1687. Re: Amateur Radio in the 21st Century?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-25 04:18:31 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20031025001831.07578.00001310@mb-m25.aol.com>
Source record: 81263

In article <3F981865.672D58A7@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>> You wouldn't be worried about enigmas. You'd be talking about
>> a pair-a-docs.
>
>Why not give yourself an enigma, Len?
>
>Dave K8MN

Dave:

He can't. He's too busy trying to decipher Morris Kode with an
Enema machine.

73 de Larry, K3LT

1688. Re: Student That Did Razor Test is a Ham.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-25 06:06:51 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0310242206.666d68a6@posting.google.com>
Source record: 81264

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:<wgkmb.1102$X22.533@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> "Dennis Ferguson" wrote:
> >
> > Rust actually entered the Soviet Union after a stop in
> > Helsinki, which means he crossed into the air space
> > either from the Gulf of Finland or the Finnish land
> > border, so NATO had nothing to do with it. (snip)
>
>
> His flight started in Hamburg Germany, with a stop in Helsinki for fuel.
> According to every report I've read, he crossed into East Germany on the
> border with West Germany. To do this without detection, he would have had to
> avoid United States, NATO, and Soviet radar. In my opinion, that was
> impossible. Therefore, there is more to this story that has not been told.

Yeah, right. It's a "secret". Do you really think that this "scam" you
propose included the sacrificial canning of Soviet Generals to cover
the real truth? Makes no sense at all.

I have enough stick, pedal and hanger bum time to know that if you
plan your flight properly and keep your head down while flying a light
A/C the chances of detection by ground-based radar are quite low if
you know what you're doing.
Ask the drug dealers who have flown DC-6s into this country undetected
how they did it. You can bet yer bippy that the kid was not flying at
10,000 AGL with his transponder squawking his S/N, yes?

> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

w3rv

1689. Re: A Morsodist Challenge

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-25 07:54:15 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0310242354.200a51ec@posting.google.com>
Source record: 81265
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Hans K0HB" <k0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<0e0bcf9156e38b6b5725ff4d921e90bc.128005@mygate.mailgate.org>...
> Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com> wrote
>
> > Yeah, the NoCode Agenda can get to be a bit bizzare, all right.
> > ....then their version of .... Morsedists Religion, blah, blah...
>
> Dick,
>
> A simple straightforward challenge for you (and the rest of rrap).
>
> During the 30 hours starting at 2100Z on Nov 1st, 2003 I will be
> practicing Morsodism on the HF bands in the ARRL SS Radiosport event.
> Keep up with me if you can.
>
> May the Peace of St. Morse shower down upon thee in abundance,
>
> de Hans, K0HB
> --
> http://home.earthlink.net/~k0hb

Thine memory is faulty. Dick has no portable gear, and will be away
from thee power mains on said date.

Dick hath no pot to pee in.

1690. Re: Student That Did Razor Test is a Ham.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-25 09:29:04 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <Anrmb.1432$X22.11@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 81266

"Brian Kelly" wrote:
>
> Yeah, right. It's a "secret". Do you really think
> that this "scam" you propose included the
> sacrificial canning of Soviet Generals to cover
> the real truth? Makes no sense at all.

In typical Russian fashion, Gobachov used the incident to eliminate a few Soviet officers he didn't like (officers appointed by his predecessor). Besides, if you're going to use this to support your position, you should also point out that the official reason they were fired was for not taking more aggressive action against the intruder, not for a failure to detect the intruder. Of course, I'm sure you see that as just propaganda, while anything that fits your version of the story is not.

> I have enough stick, pedal and hanger bum time
> to know that if you plan your flight properly and
> keep your head down while flying a light A/C
> the chances of detection by ground-based radar
> are quite low if you know what you're doing.
> Ask the drug dealers who have flown DC-6s into
> this country undetected how they did it. You can
> bet yer bippy that the kid was not flying at 10,000
> AGL with his transponder squawking his S/N, yes?

That area (Eastern Europe and Western Russia) was perhaps the most heavily monitored region of the world at the time, by tactical and strategic radar, surveillance aircraft, and satellite. The Gulf/Mexico region is not nearly as well monitored (something the military and drug enforcement personnel has repeatedly complained about). I seriously doubt anything larger than an insect could have flown over Eastern Europe or Western Russia at the time without being spotted. However, if you choose to believe otherwise, that is certainly your right. Therefore, I will not continue to argue a contrary position. Take care.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

1691. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-25 10:15:28 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <43smb.1464$X22.446@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 81267

"Larry Roll K3LT" wrote:
>
> (snip) Well, now our society is trashed by the millions of
> descendants of those "slaves" who want their assets kissed
> with government support from cradle to grave. Well, I guess
> it is better than your blue-blood white trash ancestors getting
> their hands dirty. Of course, now we'll probably have to sit
> through all the tired old QRM about how the Civil War
> wasn't about slavery. Right.

Actually, the Civil War wasn't about slavery, but I'll avoid an unnecessary repetition of those facts. I'll instead point out that the majority of blacks in this country today are not decendents of American slaves - they, or their ancestors, entered this country in the 150 or so years after slavery was abolished (the majority of those within the last twenty years). Therefore, if you have a complaint, perhaps you should focus on those members of recent administrations who helped ease immigration requirements, not on something that happened many decades ago. Both political parties are responsible - the Democrats want voters and the Republicans want cheap labor for big business.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

1692. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-25 12:06:48 UTC
From: David Stinson <arc5@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3F9A6746.9B9DB651@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 81268

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:

> I do. The graveyards full of traitorous racist Confederates are being
> converted to HAZMAT landfill sites and leach fields. ...

Excuse me, but has Larry Roll always been
this big a boil on the ass of humanity?
I seem to remember the slave trader's biggest import business
and import site was in a little town called Boston.

No, I don't want to discuss it with you, Larry.
Waste of time...
Other than to say "Piss on you, you piece of shit."
Thanks.

1693. Re: What If.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-25 12:29:48 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031025082948.12501.00003470@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 81269

In article <3n0jpv03hgno46p11vthasap9ql3uj1h04@4ax.com>, Leo <nomail@nope.org>
writes:

>Hans,
>
>I believe that you have missed my point a little bit (!) - it wasn't
>to start up a redefinition of the entire hobby all over again, but to
>stimulate an introspective look at the validity of the various
>arguements ongoing in this group (code / no code, more testing / less
>testing, etc.) based on the world as it stands in 2003. Things that
>made perfect sense in 1919, or 1941, or 1963 may well be seriously
>outdated today, based on the current state of our hobby.

Sounds reasonable, Leo. Different from the "created today" idea but worth a
look.

Devil's Advocate mode = ON

>Example - In
>1930, hams had to build just about all of their own equipment, so
>testing them on their ability to hand-draw and analyse radio
>schematics made good sense. Otherwise, the bands would be full of
>splatter and heterodynes from poorly-crafted transmitters.

That's one way to look at it. OTOH, in 1930 there *were* problems with
transmitters splattering, chirping, clicking and buzzing all over the bands,
and getting outside the band as well. So it could be argued that the tests were
there to try to cure a problem as well.

>Now, where
>just about everyone is using commercially built transmitting
>equipment, that level of detail is no longer of critical importance,
>and is no longer tested.

Drawing schematics as part of the test (in the USA) was removed at least 40
years ago, when FCC went to 100% multiple choice. (1960 or 1961, for amateur
tests up to at least General, which had all privileges at the time.)

>To propose that today would be quite
>difficult to justify - most folks never even take the cover off their
>radios anymore, let alone design one from scratch.....

But some of us (ahem) *do* design them and build them from scratch. Amateur
radio is probably the only radio service where a licensee can simply assemble a
transmitter and put it on the air without any formal type-acceptance, approval
or certification - at least here in the lower 50 provinces.
>

>My point is, if we argue from preference or personal bias, we tend to
>hold on to things because they are familiar, or comfortable, or just
>"the way it's always been".

At the same time, it's important to note that things which survive the test of time often do so for very good reasons.

>To review using an analytical mindset
>might just bring out the true value of some aspects of the hobby -
>sure, there are traditions that should be kept (everyone on SSB uses
>Q-signals in comon speech,

I don't! ;-)

>even though they were only designed for
>brevity when using Morse code) - it is a quaint link to the past.
>
>Others, like mandatory CW testing, should be able to stand on their
>own merit based on solid reasoning - after all, we are forcing people
>to learn it to get in to the hobby (me included - the current price of
>admission to HF...) - so there should be a good technical or
>procedural reason to do so. This ain't the Masons....<:0)

Sure - but what constitutes solid reasoning varies from person to person. I think that the simple fact that hundreds of thousands of hams all over the world use Morse on the HF ham bands is a solid reason to require at least a test for skill in the mode at a very basic level - say, 5 wpm. Others disagree.

>
>Your rule set is actually a good one - simple, and to the point. If
>only people could work within straightforward frameworks like this -
>the regulators would be out of business.....
>
Agreed! But experience has shown otherwise.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1694. New Packet Net Forming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-25 14:23:39 UTC
From: US4FRX <us4frx@centpakgrp.net>
Message-ID: <bne112pjb0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 81270

Central Packet Group is sponsoring a new packet net
group on 27885 khz. Everyone welcome, even hams.

If you were issued one of the old "USxxx" call signs,
these will be honored.

See ya there 73s,

Randy, US4FRX/m

1695. Re: New Packet Net Forming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-25 14:35:51 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <bTvmb.2071$X22.1817@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 81271

I also want to announce a new net. It will be on 27.885. It will be for digital modes. Recommend using 7 bit baudot, inverted.

Dan/W4NTI

"US4FRX" <us4frx@centpakgrp.net> wrote in message news:bne112pjb0@pita.alt.net...
> Central Packet Group is sponsoring a new packet net
> group on 27885 khz. Everyone welcome, even hams.
>
> If you were issued one of the old "USxxx" call signs,
> these will be honored.
>
> See ya there 73s,
>
> Randy, US4FRX/m
>
>
>
>
>

1696. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-25 14:38:26 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <CVvmb.2073$X22.1689@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 81272

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20031025001830.07578.00001308@mb-m25.aol.com...
> In article <G7Tkb.4374$S52.3309@newsread4.news.pas.earthlink.net>, Duane
Allen
> <computeruser@sprintmail.com> writes:
>
> >On a serious off-topic note, does anyone know what is being done to
> >protec the CSA graveyards. Thanks in advance.
>
> I do. The graveyards full of traitorous racist Confederates are being
> converted to HAZMAT landfill sites and leach fields. You Rebs wanted
> "states rights" so you could do such lovely things as own slaves. Well,
> now our society is trashed by the millions of descendants of those
> "slaves" who want their assets kissed with government support from
> cradle to grave. Well, I guess it is better than your blue-blood white
> trash ancestors getting their hands dirty. Of course, now we'll probably
> have to sit through all the tired old QRM about how the Civil War wasn't
> about slavery. Right.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

No Larry, I won't bother trying to educate you. You know how it is...ya
just cain't fix stupid.

And you are ONE STUPID FOOL.

Dan/W4NTI

1697. Re: New Packet Net Forming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-25 14:49:32 UTC
From: David Stinson <arc5@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3F9A8D6A.7DE299F5@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 81273

US4FRX wrote:

> If you were issued one of the old "USxxx" call signs,
> these will be honored.

I always wondered- What authority "issues" these fake callsigns?
Is it just some guy promoting a "club" so he can bilk the
foolish out of "membership dues" by issuing them callsigns?
If so, I'd like to start one; I could use the money.
Maybe it'll be the "FI" series call signs (friggin idiots).

1698. Re: New Packet Net Forming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-25 15:52:23 UTC
From: US4FRX <us4frx@intlcbpkt.net>
Message-ID: <bne67e$4ut$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 81274

The call signs are legal and are issued by
Alfa-Tango International under authority of ITU.

You should really make an effort to be less hostile to
people who have interests other than your own
narrow minded views.

www.alfatango.org

73 de US4FRX

"David Stinson" <arc5@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
news:3F9A8D6A.7DE299F5@ix.netcom.com...
> US4FRX wrote:
>
> > If you were issued one of the old "USxxx" call signs,
> > these will be honored.
>
> I always wondered- What authority "issues" these fake callsigns?
> Is it just some guy promoting a "club" so he can bilk the
> foolish out of "membership dues" by issuing them callsigns?
> If so, I'd like to start one; I could use the money.
> Maybe it'll be the "FI" series call signs (friggin idiots).

1699. Re: New Packet Net Forming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-25 17:02:22 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <dsudnYhKq6fjMAeiRVn-vQ@gbronline.com>
Source record: 81275

US4FRX wrote:
> The call signs are legal and are issued by
> Alfa-Tango International under authority of ITU.
>
> You should really make an effort to be less hostile to
> people who have interests other than your own
> narrow minded views.
>
> www.alfatango.org
>
> 73 de US4FRX

Got news for you twit, the FCC is the only authority that can issue
calls signs for stations in the U.S., and your on operations 27.885 are
in violation of FCC rules since you hold no valid license for those
frequencies and those frequencies are not within the current cb allocations.

1700. Re: Element 1, Code vs. No-code, and Dad

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-25 18:29:32 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031025142932.29660.00001301@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 81276

In article <b7d1465c.0310231215.219a8d1d@posting.google.com>, wa2si@arrl.net (Bert Craig) writes:

(snip of excellent description of the 5 wpm code test)

Here's another way for those unfamiliar with Morse to look at it:

Imagine a test where the person being tested has to listen to a series of words spoken at a slow rate (one word every 2.4 seconds) and write down the the first letter of the word spoken. The same word is used for each occurrence of a particular letter. So a person being tested would hear something like "Table....History...Imagination....Salamander........Imagination...Salaman
der......Nexus...Oval...Table
.......History.....America......Raster.....Dominion......(etc.)

and when the letters were written down, a simple message would be spelled out. Person being tested could go back and make corrections, too.

That's all the Morse test is - except that instead of words, there are series of short and long tones.

>
>Funny thing happened the other day. My father asked me what all the
>hubbub was about re. the code. (Apparently, I had left my QST in the
>car and he decided to peruse away.) I explained that some folks
>consider Morse code antiquated and feel that there are better, more
>modern, modes in use today. I went on to include that some also feel
>that it's unfair to make newcomers "jump through hoops" to become
>ARO's, thus constituting a "barrier" to some, otherwise qualified,
>potential hams.
>
>So Dad pondered for a moment and furled his 77 yr. old eyebrows and
>said. "They're right, Morse code IS antiquated." My jaw dropped, "say
>it ain't so!" (E tu Brute?!) He then asked me about the licensing
>structure and I explained the three-tier system presently in place.
>"You've gotta keep the code test in place though." Ok, now I'm a tad
>confused. "Why, if it's antiquated?" I asked.
>
>"Values, my boy…values. Just ask yourself if this is what you want to
>teach your own children? Should they apply this logic to other aspects
>of their lives as they grow up?

You can bet they'll try!

>How about an aspiring Engineer, why
>should s/he be forced to learn history? How about an aspiring history
>teacher, why should s/he learn physics?

(irony mode=ON)

And this can be applied at any age level. Consider how, in this age of give-away calculators, young children are forced by law to learn addition, subtraction, multiplication and division tables. Why? When arithmetic had to be done by hand, perhaps there was a case for it, but now we have methods that are faster, easier, less error-prone, etc. If a kid wants to learn how to do long division, fine, but why must arithmetic methods that go back to the ancient Greeks be required of all children? Because "we've always done it that way"? Or "I had to do it, so you do, too"? Heck, professionals don't rely on manual calculations for anything important.

(irony mode=OFF)

> There's a bunch of different
>analogies than can be applied, some good and some not so good, but
>there's one common thread…values. Knowledge is NEVER wasted and
>"requiring" one to attain a "reasonable" level of knowledge to enjoy
>increased privileges…whether it be in the ARS, the workplace, or life
>in general is fundamental to nurturing a sense of values. Let that
>decay and the result will be obvious…like the recent Regents exam
>fiasco. Don't lower the bar across the board; help raise the
>individual's standards. It appears to me that there already exists a
>no-code exam and 5-wpm seems quite reasonable…so what's all the hubbub
>about?"

BINGO.

If someone doesn't like the term "values" then the words "attitude" or "standards" can be used.
>
>Then I remembered why I chose my callsign.

Thanks for the reminder. Use that callsign with pride.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1701. Re: Element 1, Code vs. No-code, and Dad

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-25 19:46:01 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031025154601.29815.00001349@mb-m21.aol.com>
Source record: 81277

In article <3f99a551$1@ghostsearchers.com>, "Andre Sarkissian"
<as2004@hotmail.com> writes:

>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote:
>>In article <20031024082923.15462.00003790@mb-m06.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com
>(N2EY)
>>writes:
>>>You seem to be telling us that amateurs should not have any values,
>standards
>>>or practices except those necessary to prevent amateurs from interfering
>with
>>>users of other radio services.
>>
>> Absolutely. "Here are your bands, have a nice
>> day" would be
>> a very free, open, and enjoyable environment
>
>That's CB.
>
Andre,

Thank you for clarifying Len's answer perfectly. It's quite clear that he wants amateur radio to be nothing other than a multiband version of cb.

73 de Jim, N2EY

73 de Jim, N2EY

1702. Re: What If.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-25 20:25:39 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@nope.org>
Message-ID: <4milpvkfb9udbfqeg41dk13hul856vnj6s@4ax.com>
Source record: 81278

Thanks, Jim - my comments are in the text below.

On 25 Oct 2003 12:29:48 GMT, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:

>In article <3n0jpv03hgno46p11vthasap9ql3uj1h04@4ax.com>, Leo <nomail@nope.org>
>writes:
>
>>Hans,
>>
>>I believe that you have missed my point a little bit (!) - it wasn't
>>to start up a redefinition of the entire hobby all over again, but to
>>stimulate an introspective look at the validity of the various
>>arguements ongoing in this group (code / no code, more testing / less
>>testing, etc.) based on the world as it stands in 2003. Things that
>>made perfect sense in 1919, or 1941, or 1963 may well be seriously
>>outdated today, based on the current state of our hobby.
>
>Sounds reasonable, Leo. Different from the "created today" idea but worth a
>look.

Guess I could have phrased it a bit better in my earlier posts - sorry
for the confusion!

>
>Devil's Advocate mode = ON

That's the spirit!

>
>>Example - In
>>1930, hams had to build just about all of their own equipment, so
>>testing them on their ability to hand-draw and analyse radio
>>schematics made good sense. Otherwise, the bands would be full of
>>splatter and heterodynes from poorly-crafted transmitters.
>
>That's one way to look at it. OTOH, in 1930 there *were* problems with
>transmitters splattering, chirping, clicking and buzzing all over the bands,
>and getting outside the band as well. So it could be argued that the tests were
>there to try to cure a problem as well.

That makes sense - a cause - and - effect relationship is very
possible as well. Strong justification for adding requirements to a
licence test - solving real-time problems. The success of the
additional tests can be measured by the impact on the issue.

>
>>Now, where

>>just about everyone is using commercially built transmitting
>>equipment, that level of detail is no longer of critical importance,
>>and is no longer tested.
>
>Drawing schematics as part of the test (in the USA) was removed at least 40
>years ago, when FCC went to 100% multiple choice. (1960 or 1961, for amateur
>tests up to at least General, which had all privileges at the time.)

They hung on through the mid 60s up here, according to an old licence
manual that I found recently. My point was, though, that rules like
this made sense at one time in the history of the hobby, but later on
(by the 60s, in this example) they were outdated, and retired.
>
>>To propose that today would be quite
>>difficult to justify - most folks never even take the cover off their
>>radios anymore, let alone design one from scratch.....
>
>But some of us (ahem) *do* design them and build them from scratch. Amateur
>radio is probably the only radio service where a licensee can simply assemble a
>transmitter and put it on the air without any formal type-acceptance, approval
>or certification - at least here in the lower 50 provinces.

Here too - and that is one of the attractions for me, to be able to
try out just about anything on-the-air - experimentation at its best.
(no from-scratch projects yet - just a rebuild of an old Heathkit TX
from the 60s, and a few old military transceivers - I have a WS-19
almost ready to go!) I envy the guys who can build TX equipment from
scratch - my theory is not quite that current - yet.

The only difference up here is that building or repairing amateur
transmitting equipment is restricted to those holding the Advanced
licence (the higher of the two that we currently have). Basic licence
holders must operate commercially built transmitters designed
specifically for use on the amateur bands. The intent id to ensure
that those building or repairing TX equipment have sufficient
theoretical radio knowledge to do it right (theoretically, of course!)
and produce equipment that does not interfere with other users or
transmit out-of-band signals.

>>
>>My point is, if we argue from preference or personal bias, we tend to
>>hold on to things because they are familiar, or comfortable, or just
>>"the way it's always been".
>
>At the same time, it's important to note that things which survive the test of
>time often do so for very good reasons.

True - but some tend to hang on for no reason at all. If there is a
good reason to keep something, then by all means it should be
retained!

>
>>To review using an analytical mindset
>>might just bring out the true value of some aspects of the hobby -
>>sure, there are traditions that should be kept (everyone on SSB uses
>>Q-signals in comon speech,
>
>I don't! ;-)

Oops - there I go generalizing again! Make that 'almost everyone'!
<:*p . But even some of the most conservative among us tend to refer
to noise as QRM or QRN, or use QSL to request verification of the
contact at least. The truly devoted (?) say 'Hi Hi" when they want to
indicate laughter - oh well, to each his own...

>
>>even though they were only designed for
>>brevity when using Morse code) - it is a quaint link to the past.
>>
>>Others, like mandatory CW testing, should be able to stand on their
>>own merit based on solid reasoning - after all, we are forcing people
>>to learn it to get in to the hobby (me included - the current price of
>>admission to HF...) - so there should be a good technical or
>>procedural reason to do so. This ain't the Masons....<:0)
>
>Sure - but what constitutes solid reasoning varies from person to person. I
>think that the simple fact that hundreds of thousands of hams all over the
>world use Morse on the HF ham bands is a solid reason to require at least a
>test for skill in the mode at a very basic level - say, 5 wpm. Others disagree.
>

I don't think that I would agree that this would be a reason for
testing CW competence - more of a solid reason for keeping CW alive as
an approved mode on the bands. I tend to view making something a
mandatory requirement in order to correct a problem, or ensure
competency to prevent a problem. If CW was not a mandatory
requirement, would people still take the time to learn it? I believe
that they would - those who are interested enough to use it anyway.

>>
>>Your rule set is actually a good one - simple, and to the point. If
>>only people could work within straightforward frameworks like this -
>>the regulators would be out of business.....
>>
>Agreed! But experience has shown otherwise.

Very true, unfortunately. One can only imagine a world free of
regulators and lawyers..... :)
>
>73 de Jim, N2EY

73, Leo

1703. Re: Element 1, Code vs. No-code, and Dad

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-25 20:34:41 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031025163441.22475.00000112@mb-m02.aol.com>
Source record: 81279

>Thank you for clarifying Len's answer perfectly. It's quite clear that he
>wants
>amateur radio to be nothing other than a multiband version of cb.
>
>73 de Jim, N2EY
>

Thats what all the No-Coders want,they will not admit it, but thats what there shooting for.

1704. Re: New Packet Net Forming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-25 21:28:41 UTC
From: US4FRX <us4frx@cbpakeettorg.net>
Message-ID: <bnepu1$n2t$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 81280

"JJ" <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
news:dsudnYhKq6fjMAeiRVn-vQ@gbronline.com...
> US4FRX wrote:
> > The call signs are legal and are issued by
> > Alfa-Tango International under authority of ITU.
> >
> > You should really make an effort to be less hostile to
> > people who have interests other than your own
> > narrow minded views.
> >
> > www.alfatango.org
> >
> > 73 de US4FRX
>
>
> Got news for you twit, the FCC is the only authority that can issue
> calls signs for stations in the U.S., and your on operations 27.885 are
> in violation of FCC rules since you hold no valid license for those
> frequencies and those frequencies are not within the current cb
allocations.
>

Your childish name-calling notwithstanding, you may find it mind
boggling when you finally realize that the FCC has absolutely no
jurisdiction outside of sovereign American territory. And just how
is that you seem to intuitively know exactly what licenses I do or
do not hold, errrrr "twit," to use your own moronic language.
BTW, judging from your name-calling & moronic statements, I
would almost bet your are a regular on 14313? Unidentified,
of course.

US4FRX

1705. Re: New Packet Net Forming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-25 21:47:57 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <3dmdnVFpOvrsbAeiRVn-gQ@gbronline.com>
Source record: 81281

US4FRX wrote:

> "JJ" <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
> news:dsudnYhKq6fjMAeiRVn-vQ@gbronline.com...
>
>>US4FRX wrote:
>>
>>>The call signs are legal and are issued by
>>>Alfa-Tango International under authority of ITU.
>>>
>>>You should really make an effort to be less hostile to
>>>people who have interests other than your own
>>>narrow minded views.
>>>
>>>www.alfatango.org
>>>
>>>73 de US4FRX
>>
>>
>>Got news for you twit, the FCC is the only authority that can issue
>>calls signs for stations in the U.S., and your on operations 27.885 are
>>in violation of FCC rules since you hold no valid license for those
>>frequencies and those frequencies are not within the current cb
>
> allocations.
>
>
> Your childish name-calling notwithstanding, you may find it mind
> boggling when you finally realize that the FCC has absolutely no
> jurisdiction outside of sovereign American territory. And just how
> is that you seem to intuitively know exactly what licenses I do or
> do not hold, errrrr "twit," to use your own moronic language.
> BTW, judging from your name-calling & moronic statements, I
> would almost bet your are a regular on 14313? Unidentified,
> of course.
>
>
> US4FRX

OK twit (I stand by the lable), you want to make a bet you don't hold a
license to transmit on 27.885? And if you brush up on your reading
comprehension skills and re-read my post, you will notice I stated that
"the FCC is the only authority that can issue calls signs for stations
in the U.S." Notice I said "U.S.", that is "United States" in case you
don't understand. Now where did I say anything about outside of

sovereign territory? And here you are on a ham newsgroup inviting others to get one of these 'phoney' callsigns and operate on a frequency with this 'phoney' callsign that carries no authority whatsoever to operate on that frequency. And your ITU has no authority to issue these licenses to operate on those frequencies for any U.S. ham or anyone else.

1706. A Morsodist Challenge

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-25 22:12:25 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0310251412.44e1ed6@posting.google.com>
Source record: 81282

brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0310242354.200a51ec@posting.google.com>...
> "Hans K0HB" <k0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<0e0bcf9156e38b6b5725ff4d921e90bc.128005@mygate.mailgate.org>...
> > Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com> wrote
> >
> > > Yeah, the NoCode Agenda can get to be a bit bizzare, all right.
> > > ....then their version of .... Morsedists Religion, blah, blah...
> >
> > Dick,
> >
> > A simple straightforward challenge for you (and the rest of rrap).
> >
> > During the 30 hours starting at 2100Z on Nov 1st, 2003 I will be
> > practicing Morsodism on the HF bands in the ARRL SS Radiosport event.
> > Keep up with me if you can.
> >
> > May the Peace of St. Morse shower down upon thee in abundance,
> >
> > de Hans, K0HB
> > --
> > http://home.earthlink.net/~k0hb
>
> Thine memory is faulty. Dick has no portable gear, and will be away
> from thee power mains on said date.
>
> Dick hath no pot to pee in.

Hans DID make the "challenge" to everyone, Brain...So how about
it?

I have accomplished Clean Sweep's in both Phone and CW (2000 SS),
so I know you can at least find the pot!

So how about it...?!?! Or are you just going to antagonize
others about it?

Steve, K4YZ

1707. Re: Student That Did Razor Test is a Ham.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-25 22:29:59 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031025182959.12300.00001315@mb-m20.aol.com>
Source record: 81283

In article <d22b54c3.0310210300.270f6ff@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) writes:

>He had a point to make via a typical college kid civil disobedience
>maneuver and boy he made it. In SPADES. Congress is already looking
>for Transportation Security Administration heads to gnaw on for this
>one. Welcome to America . .
>
If the information I read is correct, the stuff he planted on one plane was there for five weeks before it was discovered...

73 de Jim, N2EY

1708. Why Can't Brain Just Say "Yes" Or "No"...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-25 22:39:40 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0310251439.4dc14bb8@posting.google.com>
Source record: 81284

brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0310230250.40462bd2@posting.google.com>...
> k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0310211640.3f4dacf6@posting.google.com>...

> > Remember, Brian, ANYTHING other than a carte blanche acceptance
> > of these conditions completely voids your acceptatance as Padawan
> > Learner, and forever bars you from stating or suggesting that any
> > mentor-padawan relationship exists.

> You've got it all wrong again, Stebe (and acceptance of all such
> grandiose misbeliefs in Amateur Radio isn't worthy of mentorship).

Nope.

YOU have it all wrong, Brain.

YOU claim that I am your mentor. I told you that you'd be
required to follow certain rules and beliefs as my student.

You failed to acknowledge and accept those conditions in this
public forum, therefore you may no longer claim me as your "mentor".

> You've merely mentored me in the misspelling of peoples names. That
> is all. You can chalk that up with all of your other misdeeds.

I've "mentored" you in nothing, Brain. The act of mentoring is a
cooperative, interactive process. Your only interaction is to act
silly.

Sorry.

Steve, K4YZ

1709. Re: New Packet Net Forming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-25 22:40:40 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@nope.org>
Message-ID: <hutlpvgeupc1lek57fi2goii3a5vtkuq2k@4ax.com>
Source record: 81285

After reviewing the info on the Alfa Tango website, it appears that it is just a radio club based in Italy. As such it obviously has no authority whatsoever to issue any type of operating licence or callsign, not in Italy where the Ministero delle Comunicazioni has the corner on that market :) , or anywhere else on this planet.

I suspect that the 'USXXXX' designators refer to individual member ID numbers. Of course, each member would require licencing by their respective regulatory agency in their home country before operating on the air. That would be like joining AAA, and claiming that their membership card is equivalent to a drivers licence....duh.

There may be the odd individual (!) who believes that membership in the club has provided them with a legitimate radio licence - if so, I'd strongly recommend that they go and discover the truth before they risk getting busted for illegal operation.

OTOH, if there's a lucrative market out there for radio callsigns, I've got dibs on the November Fox Golf XXX number series..... ;)

73, Leo

On Sat, 25 Oct 2003 14:49:32 GMT, David Stinson <arc5@ix.netcom.com> wrote:

>US4FRX wrote:
>
>> If you were issued one of the old "USxxx" call signs,
>> these will be honored.
>
>I always wondered- What authority "issues" these fake callsigns?
>Is it just some guy promoting a "club" so he can bilk the
>foolish out of "membership dues" by issuing them callsigns?
>If so, I'd like to start one; I could use the money.
>Maybe it'll be the "FI" series call signs (friggin idiots).

1710. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-25 23:10:24 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031025191024.14837.00003881@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 81286

In article <CVvmb.2073$X22.1689@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dan/W4NTI"
<w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> writes:

>No Larry, I won't bother trying to educate you. You know how it is...ya
>just cain't fix stupid.

1711. Re: Student That Did Razor Test is a Ham.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-25 23:10:25 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031025191025.14837.00003882@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 81287

In article <d22b54c3.0310242206.666d68a6@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) writes:

>"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
>news:<wgkmb.1102$X22.533@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
>> "Dennis Ferguson" wrote:
>> >
>> > Rust actually entered the Soviet Union after a stop in
>> > Helsinki, which means he crossed into the air space
>> > either from the Gulf of Finland or the Finnish land
>> > border, so NATO had nothing to do with it. (snip)
>>
>>
>> His flight started in Hamburg Germany, with a stop in Helsinki for fuel.
>> According to every report I've read, he crossed into East Germany on the
>> border with West Germany. To do this without detection, he would have had
>to
>> avoid United States, NATO, and Soviet radar. In my opinion, that was
>> impossible. Therefore, there is more to this story that has not been told.
>
>Yeah, right. It's a "secret". Do you really think that this "scam" you
>propose included the sacrificial canning of Soviet Generals to cover
>the real truth? Makes no sense at all.
>
>I have enough stick, pedal and hanger bum time to know that if you
>plan your flight properly and keep your head down while flying a light
>A/C the chances of detection by ground-based radar are quite low if
>you know what you're doing.
>Ask the drug dealers who have flown DC-6s into this country undetected
>how they did it. You can bet yer bippy that the kid was not flying at
>10,000 AGL with his transponder squawking his S/N, yes?

1712. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-25 23:24:06 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031025192406.25517.00001630@mb-m15.aol.com>
Source record: 81288

In article <CVvmb.2073$X22.1689@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dan/W4NTI"
<w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> writes:

>No Larry, I won't bother trying to educate you. You know how it is...ya
>just cain't fix stupid.

You just hang in there, Dan, we're all looking for replacement
parts to FIX you.

Fair Radio was out of them, but the search to fix your stupid
continues unabated... :-)

LHA

1713. Re: Student That Did Razor Test is a Ham.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-25 23:24:07 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031025192407.25517.00001631@mb-m15.aol.com>
Source record: 81289

In article <d22b54c3.0310242206.666d68a6@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) writes:

>"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
>news:<wgkmb.1102$X22.533@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
>> "Dennis Ferguson" wrote:
>> >
>> > Rust actually entered the Soviet Union after a stop in
>> > Helsinki, which means he crossed into the air space
>> > either from the Gulf of Finland or the Finnish land
>> > border, so NATO had nothing to do with it. (snip)
>>
>> His flight started in Hamburg Germany, with a stop in Helsinki for fuel.
>> According to every report I've read, he crossed into East Germany on the
>> border with West Germany. To do this without detection, he would have had
>to
>> avoid United States, NATO, and Soviet radar. In my opinion, that was
>> impossible. Therefore, there is more to this story that has not been told.
>
>Yeah, right. It's a "secret". Do you really think that this "scam" you
>propose included the sacrificial canning of Soviet Generals to cover
>the real truth? Makes no sense at all.
>
>I have enough stick, pedal and hanger bum time to know that if you
>plan your flight properly and keep your head down while flying a light
>A/C the chances of detection by ground-based radar are quite low if
>you know what you're doing.
>Ask the drug dealers who have flown DC-6s into this country undetected
>how they did it. You can bet yer bippy that the kid was not flying at
>10,000 AGL with his transponder squawking his S/N, yes?

Go for it, Ace. Tell us all how it was... :-)

This going to be another one of those "bear shooting for naval intelligence" things?

Of course you carry a radar receiver in your ultra-light and can TELL whenever you are swept by a radar beam... :-)

Oh, and by the way, this sort of thing isn't close to amateur radio policy, is it? :-)

LHA

1714. Re: New Packet Net Forming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-25 23:49:38 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <m_Dmb.4461$FI2.997@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 81290

"N8WWM" <dogie@home.nut> wrote in message
news:bne3jc01o3c@drn.newsguy.com...
> In article <bTvmb.2071$X22.1817@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>,
Dan/W4NTI
> says...
> >
> >I also want to announce a new net. It will be on 27.885. It will be for
> >digital modes. Recommend using 7 bit baudot, inverted.
> >
> >Dan/W4NTI
> >
> That's illegal, you keyclown.
>
> You ask wh
>
Why is it illegal??? I'll just go to the spaghetti web site and get a US4
callsign. If they can run packet. I can run 7 bit baudot.

Right?

Dan/W4NTI

1715. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-25 23:50:44 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <o%Dmb.4462$FI2.2977@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 81291

"N8WWM" <dogie@home.nut> wrote in message
news:bne3o701oni@drn.newsguy.com...
> In article <CVvmb.2073$X22.1689@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>,
Dan/W4NTI
> says...
> >
> You know how it is...ya
> >just cain't fix stupid.
> >
> >
> "Cain't" ? You can't even spell, dumbass.
>
> You ask wh
>

Your not very bright are you WWM? In fact your downright stupid.

Dan/W4NTI

1716. Re: New Packet Net Forming

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-26 00:31:09 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3F9B15CB.7030706@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 81292

US4FRX wrote:

>The call signs are legal and are issued by
>Alfa-Tango International under authority of ITU.
>
>
>
"US4" belongs to Ukraine, not the USA. Thus, only the Ukraine's
equivalent to the FCC can issue callsigns, and only to people who
live or visit there.

1717. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-26 00:42:17 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031025204217.00545.00001882@mb-m02.aol.com>
Source record: 81295

In article <3F9A6746.9B9DB651@ix.netcom.com>, David Stinson
<arc5@ix.netcom.com> writes:

>Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>
>> I do. The graveyards full of traitorous racist Confederates are being
>> converted to HAZMAT landfill sites and leach fields. ...
>
>Excuse me, but has Larry Roll always been
>this big a boil on the ass of humanity?

He's been doing it longer than the Internet was public...on
FIDONET. :-)

>No, I don't want to discuss it with you, Larry.
>Waste of time...
>Other than to say "Piss on you, you piece of shit."
>Thanks.

Well said. :-)

LHA

1718. Re: What makes LHA so poor at simple research tasks?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-26 00:42:18 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031025204218.00545.00001883@mb-m02.aol.com>
Source record: 81293

In article <3F9929D9.7040906@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:

>Okay, we have
>
>Jim, Dick, Dave, and myself as homebrewers. Anyone else?

I've been doing that since 1947. Building radios and electronics
at home doesn't take any license.

I've got Greenlee chassis punches older than Parson Miccolis!
:-)

LHA

1719. Re: What If.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-26 00:42:18 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031025204218.00545.00001884@mb-m02.aol.com>
Source record: 81296

In article <20031025082948.12501.00003470@mb-m04.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
writes:

>But some of us (ahem) *do* design them and build them from scratch. Amateur
>radio is probably the only radio service where a licensee can simply assemble
a
>transmitter and put it on the air without any formal type-acceptance, approval
>or certification - at least here in the lower 50 provinces.

Pennsylvania is a "province?!?" :-)

"Build from scratch?" Sure. You got the scratch, Elecraft has the
KIT you can build. All by yourself.

beep, beep

LHA

1720. Re: What If.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-26 00:42:19 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031025204219.00545.00001885@mb-m02.aol.com>
Source record: 81294

In article <20031024202924.29660.00001288@mb-m24.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) writes:

>One more factor: In early 2001, the first of the Technician licenses that did
>not require a code test began to reach the end of their terms.

Heh heh heh heh...such a comment was bound to happen.....:-)

In early 2001, some of the OTHER FIVE license classes were
at the end of their period. So?

Keep those Family Values nice and warm, piquish parson.

Slam those non-morse heathens whenever and wherever you
find them!

That's the Family Way!

LHA

1721. Re: What If.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-26 00:42:20 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031025204220.00545.00001886@mb-m02.aol.com>
Source record: 81297

In article <xnfcneeyarg.hn9n5d7.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>, "Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> writes:

>On 24 Oct 2003 00:53:40 GMT, Alun Palmer wrote:
>
>>Sounds like a decent set of rules. Put the actual bands down in a separate
>>schedule, word it a little more formally, and write a petition to go with
>>it. I'll support it.
>
> Sounds to me like the "comic book rules" (disguised as "plain
> language rules") that the scholars and wonders at the then-new
> Consumer Affairs Task Force of the FCC tried to institute in 1976
> after their spectacular victory in rewriting Part 95 Subpart D (the
> CB Rules) in the same "lowest common denominator" (also known as
> "Illiteracy for Dummies") style. They tried running it up the
> flagpole and it was resoundingly shot down by both the professional
> regulators and the knowledgeable amateur community.
>
> The head of that operation - who up to that time had no idea of what
> and how the FCC was supposed to do for a living, much like the
> recent crop of appointees and promotees - then tried coming out to
> our field office and telling us how we were doing everything all
> wrong. In return, we requested that our Bureau Chief do all he
> could to ensure that those fools stayed out of our face and off our
> property in the future. The person running that operation got the
> same message from wherever she visited, and soon left the agency.
>
> "Those who will not learn from history will be doomed to repeat it...."

Subpart D of 95 was rewritten to its present form way back in '76?

Gosh, that's 27 years ago!

Nobody tried to change it back to lawyerspeak since then?

:-)

LHA

1722. Re: Element 1, Code vs. No-code, and Dad

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-26 00:42:22 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031025204222.00545.00001887@mb-m02.aol.com>
Source record: 81299

In article <20031025142932.29660.00001301@mb-m24.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
writes:

>In article <b7d1465c.0310231215.219a8d1d@posting.google.com>, wa2si@arrl.net
>(Bert Craig) writes:
>
>(snip of excellent description of the 5 wpm code test)
>
>Here's another way for those unfamiliar with Morse to look at it:

Hundreds of thousands have "looked at morse" over the years,
shrugged their shoulders, and dismissed it.

Professional communications services don't use it because it
was never considered for their service to begin with, or other
services that did use it have either stopped using it altogether
or relegate it to the back room.

There's not even any landline telegraphy used in the USA and
the Morse-Vail telegraph system debuted here (Baltimore to
Washington, D.C.) in 1844.

SOME radio amateurs are still infatuated with it...but over two
hundred thousand US amateurs got into US amateur radio without
taking any code test whatsoever...in just a dozen years.

You like "Slow English?" Check with the Voice of America, maybe
they still have a few broadcasts with it.

Want to send a 100-word message with morse code at 20 WPM?
That will take 5 minutes to complete. An ancient Apple][with a
2400 baud modem can do that in less than a couple seconds.

>>So Dad pondered for a moment and furled his 77 yr. old eyebrows and
>>said. "They're right, Morse code IS antiquated." My jaw dropped, "say
>>it ain't so!" (E tu Brute?!) He then asked me about the licensing
>>structure and I explained the three-tier system presently in place.
>>"You've gotta keep the code test in place though." Ok, now I'm a tad
>>confused. "Why, if it's antiquated?" I asked.
>>
>>"Values, my boy…values. Just ask yourself if this is what you want to
>>teach your own children? Should they apply this logic to other aspects
>>of their lives as they grow up?
>
>You can bet they'll try!

Try what? Hold back progress?

Let's bring on Family Values of proper horsemanship, get rid of those stinky, polluting automobiles. [and create a methane pollution no one can imagine!]

Let's bring on Family Values of doing away with power tools to build things or appliances to prepare and cook food. Get down to Basic Values of physically working hard very long hours using only hand tools. Let's have the cooks and womenfolk slave away in the kitchen and bakery for most of the day to restore Family Values!

Let's get rid of all those damn aeroplanes that kill so many people. On December 17 this year there's a centennial on heavier-than-air flight. "If man was meant to fly, God would have given him wings!" FAMILY VALUES. Old things. Walk, don't run. Stay on the ground.

The Amish have the right idea, you think? FORBID the NEW.

>"I had to do it, so you do, too"? Heck, professionals don't rely on manual
>calculations for anything important.

Professionals in communications have STOPPED using morse code for anything important to be sent.

OH, yes...your idea of Family Values in amateur radio is to love, honor, cherish morse code. Just because you had to do it to get that much prized extra license.

Your idea of Family Values is to act the petty little dictator by arrogant superiority of Knowing What Is Best For All Amateurs!

Tradition. Family Values. Hold back progress. Forbid the new.

Emphasize the MODE, not the communication. That's a Family Value?

Family? That's more like the Jukes family...

LHA

1723. Re: Element 1, Code vs. No-code, and Dad

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-26 00:42:23 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031025204223.00545.00001888@mb-m02.aol.com>
Source record: 81298

In article <20031025154601.29815.00001349@mb-m21.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
writes:

>In article <3f99a551$1@ghostsearchers.com>, "Andre Sarkissian"
><as2004@hotmail.com> writes:
>
>>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote:
>>>In article <20031024082923.15462.00003790@mb-m06.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com
>>(N2EY)
>>>writes:
>>>>You seem to be telling us that amateurs should not have any values,
>>standards
>>>>or practices except those necessary to prevent amateurs from interfering
>>with
>>>>users of other radio services.
>>>
>>> Absolutely. "Here are your bands, have a nice
>>> day" would be
>>> a very free, open, and enjoyable environment
>>
>>That's CB.
>>
>Andre,
>
>Thank you for clarifying Len's answer perfectly. It's quite clear that he
wants
>amateur radio to be nothing other than a multiband version of cb.

Try not to strain yourself putting words into others' messages.

Don't get all passionate about your piquish puerile parsonage.

You were much better on the pulpit with your old Sermons On
The Antenna Mount.

I'm not at all interested in joining the Archaic Radiotelegraphy
Service.

Tens of thousands of radio people feel exactly the same way.

What did YOU do back in 1958 when U. S. Class D Citizens
Band was created?

NO test whatsoever back then, but licensed it was.

YOU've had 45 years to correct things. Doesn't appear that
YOU did anydamnthing except snap your suspenders and

look down at others from a safe distance.

Go back to Electric Radio and console yourself with state of the art of antique radio and "designing your own gear" by building kits.

LHA

1724. Re: A Morsodist Challenge

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-26 01:28:01 UTC
From: Bert Craig <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM>
Message-ID: <BqFmb.39100$gA1.13445301@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>
Source record: 81300

"Steve Robeson, K4CAP" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
news:5c01b95b.0310251412.44e1ed6@posting.google.com...
> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0310242354.200a51ec@posting.google.com>...
> > "Hans K0HB" <k0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<0e0bcf9156e38b6b5725ff4d921e90bc.128005@mygate.mailgate.org>...
> > > Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com> wrote
> > >
> > > > Yeah, the NoCode Agenda can get to be a bit bizzare, all right.
> > > > ....then their version of .... Morsedists Religion, blah,
blah...
> > >
> > > Dick,
> > >
> > > A simple straightforward challenge for you (and the rest of rrap).
> > >
> > > During the 30 hours starting at 2100Z on Nov 1st, 2003 I will be
> > > practicing Morsodism on the HF bands in the ARRL SS Radiosport event.
> > > Keep up with me if you can.
> > >
> > > May the Peace of St. Morse shower down upon thee in abundance,
> > >
> > > de Hans, K0HB
> > > --
> > > http://home.earthlink.net/~k0hb
> >
> > Thine memory is faulty. Dick has no portable gear, and will be away
> > from thee power mains on said date.
> >
> > Dick hath no pot to pee in.
>
> Hans DID make the "challenge" to everyone, Brain...So how about
> it?
>
> I have accomplished Clean Sweep's in both Phone and CW (2000 SS),
> so I know you can at least find the pot!
>
> So how about it...?!?! Or are you just going to antagonize
> others about it?
>
> Steve, K4YZ

Count me in. :-)

73 de Bert
WA2SI

1725. Re: Respect For Freebanders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-26 03:25:14 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <u8Hmb.4655$Kz.2147@news01.roc.ny>
Source record: 81401

Huh?

nntp posting host is *not* localhost.webtv.net?
All this stuff in the headers "Twistedhed"?
Why do I not think you're Twist?

Hmmmm ... from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

"Twistedhed" <twistedhed@webtv.net> wrote in message
news:3f97666a$1@ghostsearchers.com...
>
> I am posting here because of some of the nasty things I have read in this
> group and in QRZ discussions regarding freebanders. We who use the
frequencies
> from 27.405 to 28.000 have more in common with hams than you might think.
> We are good operators and have knowledge of propagation and skip
conditions.
> We use Yeasus, Kenwoods and Icom radios just like you do, so we know
technical
> issues as well or better. However, the attitude of some hams toward us is
> rude and condescending. We are treated like 2nd class citizens. This
should
> not be. We have the same rights under the constitution as legal hams do.
> For those that do not wish to be under Uncle Sam's thumb, freebanding is
> a viable alternative to getting a ham radio license. What I am saying is
> that maybe the next time you meet a freebander you might talk with him
before
> you condemn him.
>
> I am QRT and standing by. (No flames answered. Please reply via email)
>
> Unit 2711, Florida
>
> --
> --

1726. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-26 03:28:18 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <JcmdnV3S-NGf2waiRVn-ig@gbronline.com>
Source record: 81404

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:

> In article <43smb.1464$X22.446@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dwight
> Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> writes:
>
>
>> Actually, the Civil War wasn't about slavery, but I'll avoid an
>>unnecessary repetition of those facts. I'll instead point out that the
>>majority of blacks in this country today are not decendents of American
>>slaves - they, or their ancestors, entered this country in the 150 or so
>>years after slavery was abolished (the majority of those within the last
>>twenty years). Therefore, if you have a complaint, perhaps you should focus
>>on those members of recent administrations who helped ease immigration
>>requirements, not on something that happened many decades ago. Both
>>political parties are responsible - the Democrats want voters and the
>>Republicans want cheap labor for big business.
>
>
> I believe requirements for immigration and naturalization should be
> extremely rigid, involving extensive background checks and a requirement
> that the person immigrating have the means in place to make his/her
> own living. Eligibility for state or federal "welfare" benefits should also
> be severely limited. I'd also do away with the law that states that any
> person born in the U.S. is automatically a U.S. citizen, if the parents,
> at the time, are *not* U.S. citizens themselves. The children born to
> non-citizens would be considered to be citizens of the parents' own
> country of origin. Also, no person who is not a U.S. citizen, by birth
> or legal naturalization, should be allowed to vote in any local, state,
> or federal election. Liberal immigration and naturalization policies
> amount to political corruption in it's most dangerous form -- and the
> danger is to U.S. sovreignty.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

What he said absolutely.

1727. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-26 03:50:48 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20031025235048.07346.00001449@mb-m26.aol.com>
Source record: 81402

In article <43smb.1464$X22.446@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> writes:

>
> Actually, the Civil War wasn't about slavery, but I'll avoid an
>unnecessary repetition of those facts. I'll instead point out that the
>majority of blacks in this country today are not decendents of American
>slaves - they, or their ancestors, entered this country in the 150 or so
>years after slavery was abolished (the majority of those within the last
>twenty years). Therefore, if you have a complaint, perhaps you should focus
>on those members of recent administrations who helped ease immigration
>requirements, not on something that happened many decades ago. Both
>political parties are responsible - the Democrats want voters and the
>Republicans want cheap labor for big business.

I believe requirements for immigration and naturalization should be extremely rigid, involving extensive background checks and a requirement that the person immigrating have the means in place to make his/her own living. Eligibility for state or federal "welfare" benefits should also be severely limited. I'd also do away with the law that states that any person born in the U.S. is automatically a U.S. citizen, if the parents, at the time, are *not* U.S. citizens themselves. The children born to non-citizens would be considered to be citizens of the parents' own country of origin. Also, no person who is not a U.S. citizen, by birth or legal naturalization, should be allowed to vote in any local, state, or federal election. Liberal immigration and naturalization policies amount to political corruption in it's most dangerous form -- and the danger is to U.S. sovreignty.

73 de Larry, K3LT

1728. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-26 03:50:49 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20031025235049.07346.00001450@mb-m26.aol.com>
Source record: 81403

In article <CVvmb.2073$X22.1689@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dan/W4NTI"
<w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> writes:

>> I do. The graveyards full of traitorous racist Confederates are being
>> converted to HAZMAT landfill sites and leach fields. You Rebs wanted
>> "states rights" so you could do such lovely things as own slaves. Well,
>> now our society is trashed by the millions of descendants of those
>> "slaves" who want their assets kissed with government support from
>> cradle to grave. Well, I guess it is better than your blue-blood white
>> trash ancestors getting their hands dirty. Of course, now we'll probably
>> have to sit through all the tired old QRM about how the Civil War wasn't
>> about slavery. Right.
>>
>> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>>
>
>No Larry, I won't bother trying to educate you. You know how it is...ya
>just cain't fix stupid.
>
>And you are ONE STUPID FOOL.
>
>Dan/W4NTI

Dan:

I see. Well, I guess name-calling, as usual, takes the place of reasoned
argument here on rrap. Why am I "stupid?" What did I say that wasn't
true? If the Civil War wasn't about racism and slavery, then why, in it's
aftermath, did one of the most famous Confederate Generals, Nathan
Bedford Forrest, organize the Ku Klux Klan? Oh, yeah, it was all about
doing battle against all those nasty 'ole Yankee Carpetbaggers. Right.
Which is why they took their frustrations out on black slaves.

The South has a lot to answer for, IMHO. Modern-day Rebels with the
Confederate flags on their pickup trucks don't do much to heal the wounds
of the past. They all need to be rounded up and "deprogrammed."

73 de Larry, K3LT

1729. Amateur Radio Newsline™ Report 1367 – October 24 2003

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-26 08:39:02 UTC
From: radionews@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031026033902.04845.00000100@mb-m26.aol.com>
Source record: 81405

Amateur Radio Newsline™ Report 1367 – October 24 2003

Amateur Radio Newsline report number 1367 with a release date of Friday, October 24th 2003 to follow in 5-4-3-2-1. The following is a Q-S-T. The FCC begins preparing for the 2007 World Radiocommunications Conference, a new all ham crew arrives at the I-S-S and a ham a is charged with violating airport security. Find out the details on Amateur Radio Newsline report number 1367 coming your way right now.

(Billboard Cart Here)

**

RADIO LAW: FCC COMMITTEE TO GET READY FOR WRC-07

The ink has yet to complely dry on the agreements reached ar WRC-03 as the FCC begins getting ready for the next World Radiocommunication Conference in 2007. As part of the preparations FCC Chairman Michael Powell has announced the appointment of Nancy Victory as Chair, and Peter Hadinger as Vice-Chair of the agency’s WRC-07 Advisory Committee. Amateur Radio Newsline’s Bruce Tennant, K6PZW, is here with has some background on each of the appointees:

--

Nancy Victory is the former Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Communications and Information and the former Administrator of the National Telecommunications and Information Administration. Prior to her appointment to the Department of Commerce, Ms. Victory was a partner in the Washington law firm of Wiley, Rein and Fielding, where she focused on legal and regulatory issues faced by communications companies.

Peter Hadinger is Director of Communications Initiatives for Northrop Grumman’s Space Technology Sector. Mr. Hadinger has taken industry leadership roles on global satellite issues, including privatization, protection and spectrum allocation. He is past Chairman of the Satellite Industry Association and current vice- chair of the Satellite Task Force in the President’s National Security Telecommunications Advisory Committee.

Also getting an appointment is Alex Roytblat who is Assistant Chief of the Strategic Analysis and Negotiations Division of the FCC’s International Bureau. He will direct the Commission's WRC- 07 preparatory activities and serve as the Designated Federal Official to the Advisory Committee. Roytblat directed the Commission’s preparatory activities for last June’s 2003 World Radiocommunication Conference held in Geneva.

For the Amateur Radio Newsline, I’m Bruce Tennant, K6PZW, reporting.

--

The Advisory Committee will be tasked with providing advice and technical analyses of the nations telecommunications needs. It will also make specific recommendations on matters relating to that conference. (FCC Release)

**

TALKING ON THE AIR: BIG SUNSPOT ACTIVITY MAY HAMPER YOUR QSO'S

If you are wondering why you may not be able to make contact on your favorite band, the answer is right out there in space. According to propagation reports from the Space Environment Center, a solar storm, centered around Sunspot number 484, has grown into the biggest in recorded history. And a solar storm with a sunspot that size can easily impact on radio propagation here on Earth.

Sunspot 484 is reportedly about the size of the planet Jupiter, and forecasters say that another big sunspot could soon appear near the sun's southeastern limb. The active region is not yet directly visible, but the Solar and Heliospheric Observatory satellite has seen material being blasted over the sun's limb from the approaching spot. Major eruptions are possible from these active regions as they rotate across the face of the sun over the next two weeks.

Also this word of caution. Never, never look directly at the sun. While these sunspots are easy to see its also very dangerous to try. Unprotected eyes can suffer severe and perminant damage from looking directly at the sun. Instead, as we have said before, visit www.spaceweather.com for safe solar observing tips. (ASWLC)

**

RADIO POLITICS: NOAA SPACE WEATHER SERVICE THREATENED

Solar propagation reports like this one could soon disappear. CQ Magazine's news service reports that the service on which many amateurs depend for reports on ionospheric conditions may have its funding sharply cut or eliminated under two versions of a Congressional spending plan for Fiscal Year 2004.

The Space Environment Center, part of the Commerce Department's National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, provides space weather reports on solar and geomagnetic activity that affect the ionosphere, which in turn affects radio propagation. In addition, the bureau monitors solar flares and similar events that can damage satellites. This gives advance knowledge that can help protect them. And for radio amateurs, the propagation predictions in C-Q and other publications depend on these space weather observations.

The Space Environment Center is actually operated jointly by NOAA and the Air Force, but its funding is in the NOAA budget. It suffered a 40% budget cut in the current fiscal year. The House budget proposal for 2004 calls for an additional 40% cut. But the nail that could close the coffin lid is in the Senate. That version of the bill cuts funding for the Space Environment Center altogether. The Senate says that such activities are rightly the domain of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration and the Air Force.

According to an e-mail from C-Q, the House Science Committee's Environment, Technology and Standards Subcommittee will be holding a hearing October 30th on

this funding bill. C-Q says that any letters and comments from the public will be entered into the record. If you are concerned about the possible loss of information gathered and disseminated by the Space Environment Center, you may write to the House Committee on Science, Environment, Technology and Standards Subcommittee, 2320 Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, DC 20515. (CQ News Release, W2VU)

**

HAM RADIO IN SPACE: NEW ALL-HAM CREW ARRIVES AT ISS

A new three man all ham crew has reached the International Space Station, but only two of the new arrivals will remain on-orbit the next several months.

Called the Expedition 8 crew, the commander is NASA Astronaut Mike Foale, KB5UAC. He is accompanied on the I-S-S by Russian Cosmonaut Alexander Kaleri, U8MIR, and the Europen Space Agency's Pedro Duque, KC5RGG. All three arrived at the ISS on October 20th on board a Russian Soyuz transport vehicle.

Foale and Kaleri will repace Expedition 7 crew members Commander Yuri Malenchenko, RK3DUP and NASA Science Officer Ed Lu, KC5WKJ. Duque, who's flying under a contract between the Russian and Europen space agencies and will spend the week in space before returning to Earth with the Expedition 7 crew.

KB5UAC and U8MIR hope to be active on the ISS ham radio station as time permits during their stint in space. We will have other ham radio in spaced news later on in this weeks report. (AMSAT, published news reports)

**

Break 1

From the United States of America, We are the Amateur Radio Newsline, heard on bulletin stations around the world W4GSO Greensboro Amateur Radio Club repeater serving Greensboro North Carolina.

(5 sec pause here)

**

ENFORCEMENT: HAM CHARGED IN AIRLINER CASE

A 20 year old ham radio operator and college junior has been charged with breaching airport security. The FBI says that Nathaniel Heatwole, WZ3AR, has admitted to planting box cutters, bleach and matches on two airliners. Amateur Radio Newsline's Paul Courson, WA3VJB, gives us a profile of Heatwole and his involvement in the hobby:

--

If you're a contester, you may have worked WZ3AR, licensed to Damascus Maryland, a suburb of Washington DC. In research for Newsline, a profile of a fairly ordinary young ham radio operator has emerged.

His listing on QRZ.com shows a willingness to QSL both to short-wave listeners and the amateur community alike. The Advanced Class licensee appears to have been primarily active on HF, in the specialty of contesting.

In August of this year he won a thousand dollar scholarship from the Foundation for Amateur Radio, a coalition of radio clubs in the area around Maryland, DC and Virginia. In a club newsletter, he was shown as headed into his 4th year at Guilford College in North Carolina, pursuing a double major of Physics and Political Science.

His former call is KB3CBW, and an internet search has found a snapshot of a young man closely resembling who now is a 20 year old seen in television footage and accused of trying to breach airline security. As KB3CBW, he is listed several times with photos a Dayton Hamvention, 1999 gallery.

His call sign also turns up on a contest log dupesheet for Field Day 1999 on 40 meters phone, and in other contests including a Maryland-DC QSO party. On a contest e-mail reflector, someone signing that name and call sign is asking questions about the beverage antenna, and how he plans to buy a better contesting radio than his Kenwood TS-140S, that the person was using as of the posting dated 1999.

By Feburary 2000, the former KB3CBW was turning up as WZ3AR on the webpage minutes of the Potomac Valley Amateur Radio club, which serves the same area as his licensed station location in Maryland.

This call sign also shows up in various contest logs, including an Islands on the Airwaves event and Field Day. WZ3AR was shown in 2001 as operating from Virginia's Chincoteague Island on 15 meters sideband. One message thread refers to a June 2001 issue of CQ magazine, and an article on keeping a footswitch from sliding around.

There was other advice.

In a contest discussion board, someone signing those call letters rejected the practice among certain hams of tape recording contest activity to later enter the information in a competitive logbook. The posted message said such a practice raises ethical questions, and that he advised against doing so.

The New York Times has quoted friends as saying he has offered strong pacifist views and is highly principled.

For now, he is charged with carrying a concealed dangerous weapon aboard jetliners, reportedly as a test of airline security and to demonstrate his alleged protest to perceived flaws in that security.

In Weashington, Paul Courson, WA3VJB, for Newsline.

--

After a court appearance Monday, October 20th, Heatwole, a junior at Guilford College in Greensboro, N.C., was released without bail for a preliminary hearing slated for November 10th. If tried and convicted, he faces a hefty fine and up to 10 years in a Federal prison. (ARNewsline(tm), published news reports)

**

ENFORCEMENT: FCC TAKES MORE ACTION AGAINST EX-KG6IRO

A follow-up to last weeks story regarding Jack Gerritsen, the ex-KG6IRO. The FCC has now taken action against another one of his licenses and again warned him to stay off the air. Bill Pasternak, WA6ITF, has more:

--

FCC Special Councel Riley Hollingsworth has written to tell Jack Gerritsen of Bell California that the Commission's Wireless Telecommunications Bureau has acted to set aside Gerritsen's General Mobile Radio Service or G-M-R-S license. This, pursuant to Section 1.113 of the Commission's rules.

The action by to set aside Gerritsen's G-M-R-S license took place on October 14th. Hollingsworth's letter says the action is based on Gerritsen's alleged continued unlicensed operations and complaints of deliberate interference from transmitters the FCC says that he operates.

Hollingsworth letter tells Gerritsen that his G-M-R-S application has reverted to pending status. Also, that it will be made a part of a forthcoming hearing to determine if the former radio amateur is qualified to hold any Commission licenses. This is the same type of hearing that Gerritsen's ham radio ticket currently faces.

Hollingsworth letter again warns Gerritsen that he has no authority to operate radio transmitting equipment. If he continues, Gerritsen could face both to monetary penalties and imprisonment. Hollingsworth also suggested that Gerritsen consult an attorney in this matter.

For the Amateur Radio Newsline, I'm Bill Pasternak, WA6ITF, in Los Angeles.

--

Meantime, the number of Los Angeles ares repeater owner operators that claim Gerritsen is interfereing with their systems continues to grow. For the moment, they and their control operators continue to turn repeaters off whenever the station claiming to be KG6IRO attempts to make a transmission over one. (FCC, ARNewsline(tm))

**

ENFORCEMENT: UNAUTHORIZED OPERATION LEADS TO LICENSE TURN-IN

Meantime, a ham has surrendered his license to the FCC after it was found that he caused problems for police radio operations. The FCC's Daryl Duckworth, NN0W, has the rest of the story:

--

Duckworth: "In March, the Enforcement Bureau notified Justin Whaley, KC9DCP, Columbia City, Indiana, that close-in proximity direction finding indicated that on numerous occasions between January 2nd and March 13th he interfered with the operation of the Columbia City Police Department radio system. In order to resolve this matter, he has agreed to relinquish his license until

March 28th of 2005 and agreed not to maintain or operate an Amateur station.

--

Whaley was requested to return his Amateur Service license to the FCC. (FCC)

**

ENFORCEMENT: FCC: STAY OF THE W6RHC REPEATER

A ham who refused to stay off a repeater after being told to vacate by the licensee has now received a notice to comply from the FCC. Again, the FCC's Daryl Duckworth, NN0W:

--

Duckworth: "A warning notice has been sent to Scott Rogers, K6EVP, of Paradise, California, for failing to refrain from using the W6RHC repeater ass requsted both verbally and in writing by the trustee of the Golden Empire Amateur Radio Society. The letter was isssued as a result of his failure, verified by the Office of Emergency Services of Butte County California, to follow operational rules set forth by the licensee and control operators of the repeater system for its users."

--

The letter went on to say that the FCC expects Rogers to abide by the request to stay off the W6RHC system and any other such request by a repeater licensee, control operator or trustee. If he uses the repeater again after receipt of the FCC warning letter, the agency says that it will initiate enforcement action against Rogers license. (FCC)

**

ENFORCEMENT NEEDED: PHONY TEXT MESSAGE TO CA CELL PHONE USERS

Bakersfield California area cellular telephone would probably welcome some FCC enforcement action. This, after they were awakened early Tuesday morning, October 21st to a phony text message.

According to news reports, someone managed to hack the areas wireless communications' system. The hacker then posted a message urging cell phone users to support a strike by many of the states grocery workers now in its second week.

The United Food and Commercial Workers Union denies responsibility for the message. A spokeswoman for the wireless service providers says that she does not know how it happened. She says that that wireless providers have no position on the strike. The sender of the message remains unknown. (Published news report)

**

RESCUE RADIO: MONTANNA HAMS GET BIG THANK-YOU

Amateur Radio's role in last summers Montana's forest fires haave received official recognition. This, when the US Forest Service and Helena area organizations hosted an appreciation picnic for all the voluntees who put themselves on the line to assist fighting the blaze.

According to the ARRL Letter, the event honored the firefighters, law enforcement officers and community volunteers who assisted with firefighting efforts in Lewis and Clark, Powell, Jefferson, and Broadwater counties. This included a number of radio amateurs who volunteered their time and gear.

Among those recognized were Jim Haslip, W7CK, and Rollie Fisher, KC7WBP. Haslip has been an aerial fire spotter for 40 summers. Fisher set up at Lincoln's Hooper Park every day during the fires, providing current information to residents and visitors. He and his wife were among the many families forced to evacuate their homes because of the fire danger.

Amateur Radio's support of Red Cross and other relief agencies during the fire emergency also received recognition. Lewis and Clark County Emergency Coordinator Bob Solomon, K7HLN, accepted a plaque on behalf of the Amateur Radio Emergency Service and the Capital City Amateur Radio Club.

An estimated 300 people turned out for the event at the Lewis and Clark Fairgrounds in Helena. (ARRL)

**

PROMOTING THE HOBBY: JOTA VIDEO NEEDED

If you took part in last weekends scouting Jamboree on the Air, and have some good quality videotape of the event, the people who produce most of the ham radio documentaries want to hear from you. As reported two weeks ago, Dave Bell, W6AQ, Alan Kaul, W6RCL and Bill Pasternak, WA6ITF, are always looking for good video of ham radio happenings that they might be able to incorporate into a presentation about the hobby. As scouting and ham radio enjoy a very unique relationship, this is an event that is sure to make it into one of their shows, but only if they have the pictures and sound. If you have video that you want to share, please e-mail the production team to hamvideo@juno.com and let them know what you have. They will get back to you with information on where to send it. Again that e-mail address is hamvideo@juno.com (The Producers)

**

BREAK 2

This is ham radio news for today’s radio amateur. From the United States of America, We are the Amateur Radio Newsline with links to the world from our only official website at www.arnewsline.org and being relayed by the volunteer services of the following radio amateur:

(5 sec pause here)

**

HAM GATHERINGS: RSGB INTERNATIONAL HF AT MONTHS END

Turning to the ham radio social scene, if you plan to be in the United Kingdom from October 31st to November 2nd. listen up. Thats the weekend of the Radio Society of Great Britain's International High Frequency and Islands on the Air Convention.

This years venue is the Britannia Country House Hotel at Didsbury in Manchester England. Planned events include presentations on DXpeditions, technical lectures, presentation of trophies and awards, a contesting forum, and specialist areas for 5 MHz, 136 kHz, 6 meters and Q-R-P. More information is on-line at the RSGB website Its in cybespace at www.rsgb.org (RSGB)

**

HAM GATHERINGS: HANDIHAMS IN CALIFORNIA IN MARCH 2004

Back on this side of the Atlantic, word that the HandiHams will hold their 2004 California Radio Camp in Malibu California begining on Monday, March 1st, and continuing to Sunday, March 7th. Tuition breaks will be provided for beginners from Western states working on a first license or on a General, and for early bird registrations. An Operating Skills course will also be offered along with opportunities for learning about blind computing with JAWS, public service communications, and lots of getting on the air!. Also, an open ham radio test session will take place on Saturday March 6.

The camp is open to HandiHam members with disabilities. Organizers provide all food, lodging, ham radio classes, and fun activities for the week long outing. To request an application or more information call the HandiHams toll free at 866-426-3442 toll-free or e-mail the group to hamradio@courage.org (HandiHams)

**

NEWSLINE: NO MORE FAX

If you have been trying to send Amateur Radio Newsline a fax the past week then you notice that our machine is not picking up. The reason -- its been taken off line due to our inability to get unsolicted fax spammers to stop sending us unwanted advertising.

Even though it is a violation of federal law to send an unsolicited fax advertisement, that has not stopped the fax spammers. They make their living by sending out this unwanted electronic junk mail. And while much the same as the junk e-mail we all get, the big difference is that unsolicited faxes waste print cartreges and paper. And that costs Amateur Radio Newsline money that we just cannot afford to waste.

After spending the past year trying to get these nuisances to stop -- including an official complaint to the FCC, we have given up. If you need to send us a fax, you will first have to call us or e-mail us to arrange for us to turn the machine on. Otherwise, the fax is gone until the federal government acts to put the spam fax mailing companies out of business. (ARNewsline(tm))

**

EMERGING TECHNOLOGY: BALLOON DELIVERED RADIO

Turning to the emerging technology page, it now looks as if balloon delivered radios could bring new sound to North Korean residents. This, if a preacher gets his way.

Revrend Douglas Shin wants to help liberate North Korea by delivering radio recievers by balloon. Shin’s idea is to have helium filled balloons would carry radios acrosss the Demiliterized Zone into North Korea. An automatic valve would let the gas out slowly so the balloons touch down softly without damage to the payload. Once retrieved by the people in North Korea, they would only have to turn them on and listen.

Shin says that he plans to launch his balloons from South Korea or ships off shore. Included aliong with each radio will be prayer material and a North Korean bank note. The latter is worth about one U-S Dollar. (Published news report)

**

HAM RADIO IN SPACE: THE AMSAT VOLUNTEER SURVEY

AMSAT North America says that it has developed an on-line volunteer survey designed to identify the interests and skills of those who may be available to directly help in efforts to develop the amateur satellite program. The survey is designed to be completed and returned on-line, and takes only a few minutes to fill out. To request the survey, simply send an e-mail request to volunteer@amsat.org. (ANS)

**

SPECIAL EVENTS: REMEMBERING THE EDMUND FITZGERALD

Turning to operating news, members of the Stu Rockers group will be on the air from Whitefish Point and Paradise, Michigan on November 7th , 8th, and 9th about 10. This, for an event called `Remembering the Edmund Fitzgerald.'

2003 marks the 7th year that the Stu Rockafellow Amateur Society has sponsored a special event in remembrance of the famed ship and her crew. Look for the call N8F on 40 through 10 meters and QSL to Richard Barker, W8VS, 264 N. East St., Brighton, Mi. 48116 (W9RIF)

**

SPECIAL EVENTS: REMEMBERING VETERANS DAY ON THE AIR

Also, in recognition of both Veterans Day and the birth of the late General Curtis LeMay, W6EZV, the Strategic Air Command Memorial Amateur Radio Club will be operating stations K0AIR and K0GRL. This, on Tuesday, November 11th from 1200 hours to 2400 hours Zulu.

According to Darwin Piatt, W9HZC, the stations will take top the air in the general phone bands on or near frequencies ending in the numerals 47. Piatt says that his is in recognition of the year 1947 when the Air Force became a single entity. He says to QSL K0AIR and K0HRL to the Strategic Air Command Memorial Amateur Radio Club, P.O. Box 1292 Bellevue, Nebraska, 68005. (Via e-mail)

**

ON THE AIR: THE SOUTHEASTERN 6 METER NET

And Jim Worsham, W4KXY would like to remind everyone of the Southeastern 6 Meter Net which meets on Sunday nights at 9 PM eastern time on 50.145 Mhz SSB. The net control is usually Jim who lives in grid square EM84ab. If anyone has any questions about the net they can contact Jim directly. His e-mail is w4kxy@bellsouth.net (VHF Reflector)

**

PROPAGATION AIDS: TRANSATLANTIC BEACON IN PLANNING

The Marconi Radio Club of St. Johns, Newfoundland and the Caccalieu Amateur Radio Club of Carbonear are currently working to put a new 2 meter transatlantic beacon on the air. According to information from the Irish Radio Transmitting Society, the proposed beacon will operate on 144.4 MHz with power output of 250 Watts into an 11 element Yagi. It will be sited at about 90 meters above sea level.

**

DX

In D-X, At least five special event stations are on the air from Poland through the end of October to celebrate Pope John Paul the Second's Silver Jubilee. Keep an ear open for HF8JP; SN25JP, SR25JP, SO25JP and HF25JP. If you make contact QSL as directed on the air. (Via e-mail)

And ten German operators and their guests from other countries will be operating from Liechtenstein through the 31st of October. Keep an ear open for the call HB0/HB9AON using SSB, CW, PSK and RTTY on all of the HF bands. (RSGB)

**

THAT FINAL ITEM: MEASURING THE SPEED OF GRAVITY

And finally this week, it appears as if Albert Einstein was right. Amateur Radio Newsline’s Mert Garlick, N6AWE, tells us about what:

--
The great Albert Einstein was correct when he said that the speed of gravity matches the speed of light. This, according to astronomers who took advantage of a rare planetary alignment to survey the relationship of these two fundamental forces of nature.

Edward B. Fomalout of the National Radio Astronomy Observatory, and, Sergei Kopeikin of the University of Missouri, measured the amount that light from a distant star that was deflected by the gravity of Jupiter as the planet passed in front of it. The researchers used 10 radio telescopes scattered around the world to precisely gauge how light from a distant quasar was bowed or warped as it passed by Jupiter on its way to the Earth.

To make the measurement, the instruments had to detect a minute deflection of the light. Dr. Fomalout compared the required precision to being able to

measure the width of a human hair from 250 miles away.

Jupiter is in the precise position for such a measurement only once a decade. The locations of the telescopes ranged from from Hawaii to Germany. Researchers are very happy with the experiments seeming total success.

For the Amateur Radio Newsline, I’m Mert Garlick, N6AWE, near the Queen Mary in Long Beach California.

--

Knowing the precise speed of gravity is important to physicists looking for technologic break-throughs. It also affects some of the basic theories of the relationship of space and time. (Science Today)

**

NEWSCAST CLOSE

And speaking about time, we are out of it for this week. So with thanks to Alan Labs, AMSAT, the ARRL, the CGC Communicator, CQ Magazine, the FCC, the Ohio Penn DX Bulletin, Radio Netherlands, Rain, the RSGB and Australia's Q-News, that's all from the Amateur Radio Newsline(tm). Our e-mail address is newsline @arnewsline.org. More information is available at Amateur Radio Newsline's(tm) only official website located at www.arnewsline.org. You can also write to us or support us at Amateur Radio Newsline(tm), P.O. Box 660937, Arcadia, California 91066.

For now, with Bill Pasternak, WA6ITF, at the editors desk, I’m Don Wilbanks, AE5DW, saying 73 and we thank you for listening." Amateur Radio Newsline(tm) is Copyright 2003. All rights reserved.

1730. Re: What If.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-26 13:30:21 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031026083021.21232.00001578@mb-m13.aol.com>
Source record: 81406

In article <20031025204218.00545.00001884@mb-m02.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com
(Len Over 21) writes:

>In article <20031025082948.12501.00003470@mb-m04.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com
>(N2EY)
>writes:
>
>>But some of us (ahem) *do* design them and build them from scratch. Amateur
>>radio is probably the only radio service where a licensee can simply
>assemble
>a
>>transmitter and put it on the air without any formal type-acceptance,
>approval
>>or certification - at least here in the lower 50 provinces.
>
> Pennsylvania is a "province?!?" :-)

Your lack of a sense of humor is obvious, Len ;-) ;-)

Actually it's a commonwealth.
>
> "Build from scratch?"

Yep.

> Sure.

In case you missed it, Len:

I've built-from-scratch (not including kits, no carbon copies of homebrew
articles)
in my home workshops, at least:

5 receivers
5 transmitters
3 transceivers
4 transmatches
12 power supplies
4 TR systems
5 pieces of test equipment
various shack furniture, antennas, power cables, control systems, etc.

The above list does not include:

- surplus units converted/restored
- manufactured equipment restored/repaired/modified
- kits built or rebuilt

I've worked several of the regulars here on rrap using my homebrew rigs.
I can often be found on or around 7040 using CW.

And my transmitters have all been legally used in the service for which I am licensed.

> You got the scratch, Elecraft has the
> KIT you can build. All by yourself.

I built one of those back in 2001. Kits are not homebrew.

Now explain to us again about your 1948 unlicensed operations...

1731. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-26 14:27:03 UTC
From: David Stinson <arc5@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3F9BD3E6.8E7C584F@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 81407

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:

> The South has a lot to answer for, IMHO. Modern-day Rebels with the
> Confederate flags on their pickup trucks don't do much to heal the wounds
> of the past. They all need to be rounded up and "deprogrammed."

Now ain't that a piece of work...
He rants against intolerance, then suggests that those who disagree
with him be "deprogrammed." Typical Democrat.
Larry, I take it back. You're not good enough for me to urinate on you.
I'll let the dog do it.
D.S.

1732. Re: A Morsodist Challenge

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-26 15:36:25 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <ZRRmb.4714$aU3.3622@news01.roc.ny>
Source record: 81408
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Hans,

I'm only on 10 meters (and 440), but might talk Tim, WB2KAO into sharing his shack. As long as you aren't using a computer to send and receive Morse, I think neither of us will have too much trouble. No straight keys, though; too dang slow. The best I ever managed was 27 WPM on those things. Kills your wrist in a hurry. :)

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim

"Hans K0HB" <k0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:0e0bcf9156e38b6b5725ff4d921e90bc.128005@mygate.mailgate.org...
> Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com> wrote
>
> > Yeah, the NoCode Agenda can get to be a bit bizzare, all right.
> > ....then their version of .... Morsedists Religion, blah, blah...
>
> Dick,
>
> A simple straightforward challenge for you (and the rest of rrap).
>
> During the 30 hours starting at 2100Z on Nov 1st, 2003 I will be
> practicing Morsodism on the HF bands in the ARRL SS Radiosport event.
> Keep up with me if you can.
>
> May the Peace of St. Morse shower down upon thee in abundance,
>
> de Hans, K0HB
> --
> http://home.earthlink.net/~k0hb
>
>
>
> --
> Posted via Mailgate.ORG Server - http://www.Mailgate.ORG

1733. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-26 15:51:36 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bngql7$ovu@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 81409

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20031025235048.07346.00001449@mb-m26.aol.com...
> In article <43smb.1464$X22.446@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dwight
> Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> writes:
>
> >
> > Actually, the Civil War wasn't about slavery, but I'll avoid an
> >unnecessary repetition of those facts. I'll instead point out that the
> >majority of blacks in this country today are not decendents of American
> >slaves - they, or their ancestors, entered this country in the 150 or so
> >years after slavery was abolished (the majority of those within the last
> >twenty years). Therefore, if you have a complaint, perhaps you should
focus
> >on those members of recent administrations who helped ease immigration
> >requirements, not on something that happened many decades ago. Both
> >political parties are responsible - the Democrats want voters and the
> >Republicans want cheap labor for big business.
>
> I believe requirements for immigration and naturalization should be
> extremely rigid, involving extensive background checks and a requirement
> that the person immigrating have the means in place to make his/her
> own living.
>

And, I believe the immigration laws are appropriate, although there is
probably room for improvement in the areas of process and validation
procedures. I think there are background checks in place as a matter of
policy--they just aren't done or aren't done adequately enough. We can put
all the laws and rules into place we want--it is getting them carried out
that is the problem.

>
> Eligibility for state or federal "welfare" benefits should also
> be severely limited.
>

State and Federal welfare programs need to be abolished. This would take
several years and I don't know the intricacies of the systems so I won't
pretend to know how to do it or how long it would take. The only allowance
I might be convinced of would be to have some kind of training program for
parents of children, with childcare provided through the system. And, who
would be providing the childcare? People who have been through the training
program and have chosen childcare as their avenue of profession. At any
rate, no more welfare, period.

>
> I'd also do away with the law that states that any
> person born in the U.S. is automatically a U.S. citizen, if the parents,
> at the time, are *not* U.S. citizens themselves.
>

I am in support of any person born here being a US Citizen. There are too
many legal, ethical and social issues attached to having it otherwise.

>
> The children born to
> non-citizens would be considered to be citizens of the parents' own
> country of origin.
>

If your thinking is that parents of children born here are automatically
excluded from being deported, you are wrong. Having a child born in the
United States does not "save" the mother or father from deportation. It is
just that they will be deported *without* their child. This is if the
immigration laws haven't changed over the last several years. I say
several, because it's been that long since I was politically involved in the
US/Central America issue and, at that time, parents were sent back to El
Salvador, Guatemala, or wherever--even if they'd had a kid here. The kid
stayed and was put into the custody of the state.

>
> Also, no person who is not a U.S. citizen, by birth
> or legal naturalization, should be allowed to vote in any local, state,
> or federal election. Liberal immigration and naturalization policies
> amount to political corruption in it's most dangerous form -- and the
> danger is to U.S. sovreignty.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

There is no danger to US sovereignty. It may not be a US you like; but it
is no danger of losing its sovereignty.

Kim W5TIT

1734. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-26 15:53:57 UTC
From: Clint <"rattlehead at computron dot net">
Message-ID: <vpnri89ba36o58@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 81410

--

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:%NEjb.9980$kx.8780@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net...
>
> "Clint" <rattlehead at computron dot net> wrote in message
> news:vorsl2nsek1o04@corp.supernews.com...
> >
> >
> > "Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
> > news:3F8D997B.6050606@psu.edu...
> > > Bill Sohl wrote:
> >
> > > Bill, while you like to bring out this argument when discussing
> > > Elimination of Morse code, I'd like to suggest you imagine some
> > > situation where something you like about the ARS is going away.
> > >
> >
> > *sigh*
> >
> > It's code TESTING, not CODE, that is being pushed out the door.
> > ad nauseum, this must be explained. Why is that?
> >
> >
>
> Since you ask Clint...I'll try and explain it to you.
>
> It is because you and your ilk are attacking those that enjoy the mode.
> See how simple that is.

BZZZZZZT !!!

Once again the logic buzzer goes off on you "and those of your ilk"

I have never attacked those who enjoy the code BECAUSE they
enjoy the code. I have attacked them via debate and conversation NOT
thier use of code but stance on the morse code TEST. You have proven
my point *exactly* that you guys REFUSE to seperate the two issues.
I like to use morse code and don't attack it. If there are hams in here
attacking
the use of morse code on the air as a means of communication, that is a
seperate issue and I am not one of them. If you "and those of your ilk"
cannot differentiate the two you have a problem.

however, via example I thank you for making my point *perfectly*.
I happen to honestly and genuinely believe that you "and those of your lik"

are purposefully doing this, that you, for various reasons, well not
seperate
the two. Among these reasons is that, like a poverty pimp in politics
throwing
around the race card incorrectly and illegitimately, you are trying to bring
others to your side of the fight when originally they may not have had
an interest in it; furthermore, I believe you know that, left standing on
it's
own without falsely creating allies, the code TEST debate is heavily
out of balance in the favor of those *against*.

>
> Now one more simple thing.....if you and your ilk would stop attacking
those
> that enjoy using Morse Code on the air, then perhaps the debate would be
> more simple.

AND, if you would quit trying to make it personal (one of the greatest flaws
in debate procedure there IS!), and trying to make it an attack against
those
enjoying morse code instead of just an attack on morse code, the debate
WOULD be more simpler, there is no "perhaps" about it. You won't do this,
though, because the pro code test types will lose even more quickly and
with a greater margin than otherwise.

As I said before, thanks for proving my point via example.

Clint
KB5ZHT

1735. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-26 15:58:58 UTC
From: Clint <"rattlehead at computron dot net">
Message-ID: <vpnrrnfohfvu99@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 81411

--

"Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
news:f45722ac.0310180701.23cba079@posting.google.com...
> n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20031017062827.21457.00001456@mb-m10.aol.com>...

>
> It's important for certain segments of our society to always be
> offended and outraged.

BINGO!!!!
You are exactly right. I explained this in another form in this thread,
but you captured the essence of the argument perfectly.

As in politics, often a very weak stand or concept must be artificially
supported by, as you said, creating an offence or outrage that didn't
really exist. Certain political figures frequently take entire races
and try to bring them into the argument when there isn't an honest case
for what they are claiming.

Clint

1736. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-26 16:02:18 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bngr98$eug@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 81413

"David Stinson" <arc5@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
news:3F9BD3E6.8E7C584F@ix.netcom.com...
> Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>
> > The South has a lot to answer for, IMHO. Modern-day Rebels with the
> > Confederate flags on their pickup trucks don't do much to heal the
wounds
> > of the past. They all need to be rounded up and "deprogrammed."
>
> Now ain't that a piece of work...
> He rants against intolerance, then suggests that those who disagree
> with him be "deprogrammed." Typical Democrat.
> Larry, I take it back. You're not good enough for me to urinate on you.
> I'll let the dog do it.
> D.S.

Well, David, next you'll be told by him to explain *where* he's being intolerant and he'll be proclaiming to be one of the most wonderful people he knows....blah, blah, blah. Seems to me a couple of months ago he also posted some message about how "circumstances" in his life were causing him to review his attitude...blah, blah, blah.

All having been said before, and all with no merit of evidence...

Kim W5TIT

1737. Re: A Morsodist Challenge

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-26 16:03:07 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bngrap$ig@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 81414
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Jim Hampton" <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote in message
news:ZRRmb.4714$aU3.3622@news01.roc.ny...
> Hans,
>
> I'm only on 10 meters (and 440), but might talk Tim, WB2KAO into sharing
his
> shack. As long as you aren't using a computer to send and receive Morse,
I
> think neither of us will have too much trouble. No straight keys, though;
> too dang slow. The best I ever managed was 27 WPM on those things. Kills
> your wrist in a hurry. :)
>
>
> 73 from Rochester, NY
> Jim
>

Jim, ever work KF9AS?

Kim W5TIT

1738. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-26 16:05:41 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <phSmb.5478$FI2.2776@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 81412

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20031025235049.07346.00001450@mb-m26.aol.com...
> In article <CVvmb.2073$X22.1689@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>,
"Dan/W4NTI"
> <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> writes:
>
> >> I do. The graveyards full of traitorous racist Confederates are being
> >> converted to HAZMAT landfill sites and leach fields. You Rebs wanted
> >> "states rights" so you could do such lovely things as own slaves.
Well,
> >> now our society is trashed by the millions of descendants of those
> >> "slaves" who want their assets kissed with government support from
> >> cradle to grave. Well, I guess it is better than your blue-blood white
> >> trash ancestors getting their hands dirty. Of course, now we'll
probably
> >> have to sit through all the tired old QRM about how the Civil War
wasn't
> >> about slavery. Right.
> >>
> >> 73 de Larry, K3LT
> >>
> >
> >No Larry, I won't bother trying to educate you. You know how it is...ya
> >just cain't fix stupid.
> >
> >And you are ONE STUPID FOOL.
> >
> >Dan/W4NTI
>
> Dan:
>
> I see. Well, I guess name-calling, as usual, takes the place of reasoned
> argument here on rrap.

You don't think "racist traiterous confederates" is name calling? THen what
would you call it?

Why am I "stupid?" What did I say that wasn't
> true? If the Civil War wasn't about racism and slavery, then why, in it's
> aftermath, did one of the most famous Confederate Generals, Nathan
> Bedford Forrest, organize the Ku Klux Klan?

The WAR BETWEEN THE STATES was because of the north not being willing to
grant the south economic freedom, or to give the southern states their RIGHT
to determine their own destiny, as was allegedly given to ALL states by the

constitution of the United States.

The south chose to disolve the relationship with the Union. The election of Lincoln meant this was not to be allowed. The south could not remain in a Union it did not desire to be in.

The issue of slavery did not come up until the so-called emancipation speech when the Union finally had won some battles. Even that was a farce, because the ONLY STATES it applied to was "those presently in rebellion against the United States". Which had already left the union and were no longer under the rule of the President of the United States. In otherwords a political scheme.

Oh, yeah, it was all about
> doing battle against all those nasty 'ole Yankee Carpetbaggers. Right.
> Which is why they took their frustrations out on black slaves.

I can see you have no knowledge of what happened at all in the south after the war. Johnson was now president, he allowed the northerners to go south and literally rape the defeated confederacy. Lincoln had no intention of doing this. The northern politicians, out of revenge removed all southern white politicians and appointed blacks. Which, for the most part, were ill prepared for the office they were in. The results was another rape of the white people. This is the root cause to the hate we NOW call racism.

As for the idiots running around with what they call the Confederate flag. They don't even know what they are flying. In reality it is the Tennessee BATTLE FLAG that is being degraded as the confederate flag. Their beliefs and ideals are totally alien to the rest of free thinking southerners.

You sir, are seriously confused.

Dan/W4NTI

>
> The South has a lot to answer for, IMHO. Modern-day Rebels with the
> Confederate flags on their pickup trucks don't do much to heal the wounds
> of the past. They all need to be rounded up and "deprogrammed."
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>
>
>

1739. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-26 16:33:24 UTC
From: David Stinson <arc5@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3F9BF050.C30FA9E6@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 81415

Dan/W4NTI wrote:

> You sir, are seriously confused.

Larry is boundlessly ignorant-
He, like most Americans
(tragically, including most southerners),
has swallowed a long, despicable line of lies,
propaganda and swill force-fed to Americans as "history."

He, like most northern chauvinists, vomits it back up
not because he has any honest moral ground on which to be outraged,
but because it gives him the cheap illusion of moral superiority.
(mis)Leaders have long regurgitated this filth,
because they can use the resulting hateful black racism
and baseless white guilt to divide and conquer,
manipulating masses of gullible people
into giving them money and power.
It's worked for a hundred and forty years
for the (mis)leaders evil enough to spout it,
and against the people foolish enough to believe it.

Know what's funny?
I remember when my high school in north Louisiana was integrated.
It was done by forced bussing. After some initial grumbling,
and with occasional exceptions due to racists of BOTH colors,
we seemed to get along OK.
That wasn't the case in another city.
In that city, when forced bussing came,
white people turned buses full of black children over
and SET THEM ON FIRE. Bet you see that in the liberal-written
"history" books, do you? Dig hard and you can find it.
And this wasn't 1964; it was 1972.
Take a good guess where that was....
Hint: It was far north of Virginia.
D.S.

1740. Re: What If.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-26 17:51:15 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031026125115.21457.00001678@mb-m10.aol.com>
Source record: 81416

In article <20031026083021.21232.00001578@mb-m13.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
writes:

>In article <20031025204218.00545.00001884@mb-m02.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com
>(Len Over 21) writes:
>
>>In article <20031025082948.12501.00003470@mb-m04.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com
>>(N2EY)
>>writes:
>>
>>>But some of us (ahem) *do* design them and build them from scratch. Amateur
>>>radio is probably the only radio service where a licensee can simply
>>assemble
>>a
>>>transmitter and put it on the air without any formal type-acceptance,
>>approval
>>>or certification - at least here in the lower 50 provinces.
>>
>> Pennsylvania is a "province?!?" :-)
>
>Your lack of a sense of humor is obvious, Len ;-) ;-)
>
>Actually it's a commonwealth.

Okay, so Pennsylvania seceeded from the Union...otherwise called
the United States of America. STATES.

No great loss, really...

>I've built-from-scratch (not including kits, no carbon copies of homebrew
articles)
>in my home workshops, at least:
>
>5 receivers
>5 transmitters
>3 transceivers
>4 transmatches
>12 power supplies
>4 TR systems
>5 pieces of test equipment
>various shack furniture, antennas, power cables, control systems, etc.

Keep on doing that. Eventually you'll get some of them to work.

>The above list does not include:
>

>- surplus units converted/restored
>- manufactured equipment restored/repaired/modified
>- kits built or rebuilt

Keep on doing that. Eventually some may work...

>I've worked several of the regulars here on rrap using my homebrew rigs.
>I can often be found on or around 7040 using CW.

7040 what?

You have absolutely verifiable proof, iron-clad, evidenciary
documentation that such RF was actually generated by
this "home-built" equipment?

Keep at it old-timer. Eventually you can get to changing
frequency and work some other bands...

>And my transmitters have all been legally used in the service for which I am
>licensed.

So you say...because the FCC was too busy with other
monitoring.

All of MY transmissions and transmitters have been legally
used in the services for which I am licensed...and in the
radio services and government contract work which did NOT
require any civilian license.

>> You got the scratch, Elecraft has the
>> KIT you can build. All by yourself.
>
>I built one of those back in 2001. Kits are not homebrew.

So, you built it someplace else other than your residence.

>Now explain to us again about your 1948 unlicensed operations...

Why? Those were within the regulations of unlicensed RF
emitters at the time. AM broadcast band "wireless
phonograph adapters." :-)

You are welcome to retain an attorney to bring legal action
to bear on alleged felonious radio emissions of 55 years
ago! :-) Have him show us his cute legal briefs.

Contact Riley Hollingsworth immediately! Let loose the
legal hounds. Sound the Hue & Cry on the NTS! Bring the
might of the US government LAW down on me!

Are you erecting a new statute of limitiations or are you
just erecting?

Tsk, tsk, tsk...in 1953 I was transmitting 4 KW PEP SSB
ON some amateur bands. Legally.

Sue the United States Army for that. [remember what happened to "Tail Gunner Joe" when that senator tried to "get" the U. S. Army on another matter...]

Your time machine isn't set properly. Get to work and FIX it. We are now on Standard REALITY time, not the daylight savings time of your fantasyland of long ago.

LHA

1741. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-26 17:51:17 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031026125117.21457.00001679@mb-m10.aol.com>
Source record: 81417

In article <phSmb.5478$FI2.2776@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dan/W4NTI"
<w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> writes:

>"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
>news:20031025235049.07346.00001450@mb-m26.aol.com...
>> In article <CVvmb.2073$X22.1689@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>,
>"Dan/W4NTI"
>> <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> writes:
>>
>> >> I do. The graveyards full of traitorous racist Confederates are being
>> >> converted to HAZMAT landfill sites and leach fields. You Rebs wanted
>> >> "states rights" so you could do such lovely things as own slaves.
>Well,
>> >> now our society is trashed by the millions of descendants of those
>> >> "slaves" who want their assets kissed with government support from
>> >> cradle to grave. Well, I guess it is better than your blue-blood white
>> >> trash ancestors getting their hands dirty. Of course, now we'll
>probably
>> >> have to sit through all the tired old QRM about how the Civil War
>wasn't
>> >> about slavery. Right.
>> >>
>> >> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>> >>
>> >
>> >No Larry, I won't bother trying to educate you. You know how it is...ya
>> >just cain't fix stupid.
>> >
>> >And you are ONE STUPID FOOL.
>> >
>> >Dan/W4NTI
>>
>> Dan:
>>
>> I see. Well, I guess name-calling, as usual, takes the place of reasoned
>> argument here on rrap.
>
>You don't think "racist traiterous confederates" is name calling? THen what
>would you call it?

Try "knuckle-dragging CB-plussers" for one... :-)

> Why am I "stupid?" What did I say that wasn't
>> true? If the Civil War wasn't about racism and slavery, then why, in it's
>> aftermath, did one of the most famous Confederate Generals, Nathan

>> Bedford Forrest, organize the Ku Klux Klan?
>
>The WAR BETWEEN THE STATES was because of the north not being willing to
>grant the south economic freedom, or to give the southern states their RIGHT
>to determine their own destiny, as was allegedly given to ALL states by the
>constitution of the United States.
>
>The south chose to disolve the relationship with the Union. The election of
>Lincoln meant this was not to be allowed. The south could not remain in a
>Union it did not desire to be in.
>
>The issue of slavery did not come up until the so-called emancipation speech
>when the Union finally had won some battles. Even that was a farce,
>because the ONLY STATES it applied to was "those presently in rebellion
>against the United States". Which had already left the union and were no
>longer under the rule of the President of the United States. In otherwords
>a political scheme.

Didn't work out well, Dan.

Breaking News: The Confederacy LOST.

> Oh, yeah, it was all about
>> doing battle against all those nasty 'ole Yankee Carpetbaggers. Right.
>> Which is why they took their frustrations out on black slaves.
>
>I can see you have no knowledge of what happened at all in the south after
>the war. Johnson was now president, he allowed the northerners to go
>south and literally rape the defeated confederacy. Lincoln had no intention
>of doing this. The northern politicians, out of revenge removed all
>southern white politicians and appointed blacks. Which, for the most part,
>were ill prepared for the office they were in. The results was another rape
>of the white people. This is the root cause to the hate we NOW call racism.

I thought it was all about not wanting to test for morse code?

Morse code was first used in 1844. The US Civil War came after
that.

Is the "root cause" for all the hatred against NCTAs due to the U.S.
Civil War?

>As for the idiots running around with what they call the Confederate flag.
>They don't even know what they are flying. In reality it is the Tennessee
>BATTLE FLAG that is being degraded as the confederate flag. Their beliefs
>and ideals are totally alien to the rest of free thinking southerners.

Please, foxhole Dan, don't bring in the Tennessee flag into this.

That will bring out a member of the United States Morse Codists
(USMC). :-)

>You sir, are seriously confused.

Ahem...aren't you all terribly, seriously, erroneously confused?

Subject title is about "BPL full rollout in Va."

Broadband over Power Lines. Virginia, state of...

There was no radio in 1861-1865. Morse code was used on both sides. Nobody had any "power lines" to have anything broadband on...

Hello? Anyone home over there?

LHA

1742. Re: A Morsodist Challenge

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-26 17:54:55 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <PTTmb.5602$FI2.1668@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 81418
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Jim Hampton" <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote

> I'm only on 10 meters (and 440), but might talk Tim, WB2KAO into sharing
his
> shack.

10M will be problematic on our mutual path. Best bet would seem to be
Sunday about 1900-2130Z.

> As long as you aren't using a computer to send and receive Morse, I
> think neither of us will have too much trouble.

I don't know of any serious radiosporters using a computer to copy Morse.
Computers don't like the wide variability which our wetware modems process
without a problem.

73, de Hans, K0HB
--
http://home.earthlink.net/~k0hb

1743. Re: A Morsodist Challenge

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-26 18:08:09 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <d4Umb.5623$FI2.1197@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 81419
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Only incompetents use a computer to receive morse code.

And doing so in a contest is really dumb. Takes more time to get it zeroed in than it would if you bothered to learn cw at a reasonable speed.

See you in SSCW single op. And SSphone multi op.

Oh and in the last five years I have 4 cups phone and cw. And one cup phone only.

Missed em both in 99.

Dan/W4NTI

"Jim Hampton" <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote in message news:ZRRmb.4714$aU3.3622@news01.roc.ny...
> Hans,
>
> I'm only on 10 meters (and 440), but might talk Tim, WB2KAO into sharing his
> shack. As long as you aren't using a computer to send and receive Morse, I
> think neither of us will have too much trouble. No straight keys, though;
> too dang slow. The best I ever managed was 27 WPM on those things. Kills
> your wrist in a hurry. :)
>
>
> 73 from Rochester, NY
> Jim
>
> "Hans K0HB" <k0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:0e0bcf9156e38b6b5725ff4d921e90bc.128005@mygate.mailgate.org...
> > Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com> wrote
> >
> > > Yeah, the NoCode Agenda can get to be a bit bizzare, all right.
> > > ....then their version of .... Morsedists Religion, blah, blah...
> >
> > Dick,
> >
> > A simple straightforward challenge for you (and the rest of rrap).
> >
> > During the 30 hours starting at 2100Z on Nov 1st, 2003 I will be
> > practicing Morsodism on the HF bands in the ARRL SS Radiosport event.
> > Keep up with me if you can.
> >

> > May the Peace of St. Morse shower down upon thee in abundance,
> >
> > de Hans, K0HB
> > --
> > http://home.earthlink.net/~k0hb
> >
> >
> >
> > --
> > Posted via Mailgate.ORG Server - http://www.Mailgate.ORG
>
>

1744. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-26 18:13:50 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20031026131350.01893.00001505@mb-m22.aol.com>
Source record: 81421

In article <20031025235048.07346.00001449@mb-m26.aol.com>, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) writes:

>Liberal immigration and naturalization policies
>amount to political corruption in it's most dangerous form -- and the
>danger is to U.S. sovreignty.
>
>73 de Larry, K3LT

Whatever that is. I meant to say, "sovereignty."

73 de Larry, K3LT

1745. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-26 18:13:51 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20031026131351.01893.00001506@mb-m22.aol.com>
Source record: 81420

In article <JcmdnV3S-NGf2waiRVn-ig@gbronline.com>, JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
writes:

>Liberal immigration and naturalization policies
>> amount to political corruption in it's most dangerous form -- and the
>> danger is to U.S. sovreignty.
>>
>> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>>
>
>What he said absolutely.

JJ:

With the exception of my spelling: It's actually "sovereignty." Apparently,
I don't spell as fast as I type.

73 de Larry, K3LT

1746. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-26 18:13:52 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20031026131352.01893.00001507@mb-m22.aol.com>
Source record: 81422

In article <phSmb.5478$FI2.2776@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dan/W4NTI"
<w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> writes:

>> Dan:
>>
>> I see. Well, I guess name-calling, as usual, takes the place of reasoned
>> argument here on rrap.
>
>You don't think "racist traiterous confederates" is name calling? THen what
>would you call it?

Dan:

I'd call it the truth.

> Why am I "stupid?" What did I say that wasn't
>> true? If the Civil War wasn't about racism and slavery, then why, in it's
>> aftermath, did one of the most famous Confederate Generals, Nathan
>> Bedford Forrest, organize the Ku Klux Klan?
>
>The WAR BETWEEN THE STATES was because of the north not being willing to
>grant the south economic freedom, or to give the southern states their RIGHT
>to determine their own destiny, as was allegedly given to ALL states by the
>constitution of the United States.

The "economic freedom" the South wanted was the freedom to exploit
slaves.

>The south chose to disolve the relationship with the Union. The election of
>Lincoln meant this was not to be allowed. The south could not remain in a
>Union it did not desire to be in.

Then why did they bother to ratify the Constitution?

>The issue of slavery did not come up until the so-called emancipation speech
>when the Union finally had won some battles. Even that was a farce,
>because the ONLY STATES it applied to was "those presently in rebellion
>against the United States". Which had already left the union and were no
>longer under the rule of the President of the United States. In otherwords
>a political scheme.
>
>
> Oh, yeah, it was all about
>> doing battle against all those nasty 'ole Yankee Carpetbaggers. Right.
>> Which is why they took their frustrations out on black slaves.
>
>I can see you have no knowledge of what happened at all in the south after

>the war. Johnson was now president, he allowed the northerners to go
>south and literally rape the defeated confederacy. Lincoln had no intention
>of doing this. The northern politicians, out of revenge removed all
>southern white politicians and appointed blacks. Which, for the most part,
>were ill prepared for the office they were in. The results was another rape
>of the white people. This is the root cause to the hate we NOW call racism.
>
>As for the idiots running around with what they call the Confederate flag.
>They don't even know what they are flying. In reality it is the Tennessee
>BATTLE FLAG that is being degraded as the confederate flag. Their beliefs
>and ideals are totally alien to the rest of free thinking southerners.
>
>You sir, are seriously confused.

No, I'm just observant.

73 de Larry, K3LT

1747. Re: What If.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-26 19:00:14 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031026140014.23171.00001745@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 81424

In article <4milpvkfb9udbfqeg41dk13hul856vnj6s@4ax.com>, Leo <nomail@nope.org>
writes:

>>Devil's Advocate mode = ON
>
>That's the spirit!

Still ON, too...
>
>>
>>>Example - In
>>>1930, hams had to build just about all of their own equipment, so
>>>testing them on their ability to hand-draw and analyse radio
>>>schematics made good sense. Otherwise, the bands would be full of
>>>splatter and heterodynes from poorly-crafted transmitters.
>>
>>That's one way to look at it. OTOH, in 1930 there *were* problems with
>>transmitters splattering, chirping, clicking and buzzing all over the bands,
>>and getting outside the band as well. So it could be argued that the tests
>>were there to try to cure a problem as well.
>
>That makes sense - a cause - and - effect relationship is very
>possible as well. Strong justification for adding requirements to a
>licence test - solving real-time problems. The success of the
>additional tests can be measured by the impact on the issue.

That was one reason for the content of the writtens, at least here in the USA.
If you look at the old "study guides" of the 40s/50s/60s, they are quite
focused on issues like band edges, harmonic/spurious emissions, rectifiers and
filters, modulation and measurements - all sorts of things one would need to
have some familarity with to operate a properly adjust a transmitter of those
times. Receivers and antennas, OTOH, got relatively little attention.

"Incentive licensing" was (in part) a move by the FCC to increase the
technological know-how of hams by requiring them to know more theory.

>>>Now, where
>>>just about everyone is using commercially built transmitting
>>>equipment, that level of detail is no longer of critical importance,
>>>and is no longer tested.
>>
>>Drawing schematics as part of the test (in the USA) was removed at least 40
>>years ago, when FCC went to 100% multiple choice. (1960 or 1961, for amateur
>>tests up to at least General, which had all privileges at the time.)
>
>They hung on through the mid 60s up here, according to an old licence

>manual that I found recently. My point was, though, that rules like
>this made sense at one time in the history of the hobby, but later on
>(by the 60s, in this example) they were outdated, and retired.

I don't think that sort of thing was retired in the US because it was "outdated" but simply because it made less work for FCC to go with only multiple choice questions. Multiple choice also removes all subjectivity from grading - either you picked the one right answer and get 100% credit for that question, or you picked one of the wrong answers and get 0% credit.

It can also be argued that being required to draw diagrams does not really indicate anything other than the ability to memorize a drawing, with little or no understanding of what it really represents or how the device functions.

Schematic and block diagrams are still part of the US exams, btw. For example, a block diagram will be shown, with all of the blocks except one labeled as to function. The question will be something like "The block diagram of a superheterodyne FM receiver is shown - what is the function of the unlabeled block?". And the person being tested has to pick the correct choice. Or a schematic is shown, and one component identified, and the question asks what that component does. I recall questions on my exams back in the '60s where an incomplete drawing was shown, and the question asked what was needed to complete it (1 - capacitor from Point A to Point B, 2 - Inductor from Point C to Point A, ...)

How much radio knowledge should new hams be expected to learn before they get the license? Beyond the basic rules, regs and safety, that's purely a matter of personal opinion - just like the code test.

>>>To propose that today would be quite
>>>difficult to justify - most folks never even take the cover off their
>>>radios anymore, let alone design one from scratch.....
>>
>>But some of us (ahem) *do* design them and build them from scratch. Amateur
>>radio is probably the only radio service where a licensee can simply
>assemble a
>>transmitter and put it on the air without any formal type-acceptance,
>approval
>>or certification - at least here in the lower 50 provinces.
>
>Here too - and that is one of the attractions for me, to be able to
>try out just about anything on-the-air - experimentation at its best.
>(no from-scratch projects yet - just a rebuild of an old Heathkit TX
>from the 60s, and a few old military transceivers - I have a WS-19
>almost ready to go!) I envy the guys who can build TX equipment from
>scratch - my theory is not quite that current - yet.

I've been doing it since Novice days back in 1967. Not that hard if you start off with simple projects and work towards more complex ones. What mode permits the most results from the simplest equipment? Hint: It's not SSB.

> The only difference up here is that building or repairing amateur
>transmitting equipment is restricted to those holding the Advanced
>licence (the higher of the two that we currently have). Basic licence
>holders must operate commercially built transmitters designed
>specifically for use on the amateur bands. The intent id to ensure
>that those building or repairing TX equipment have sufficient
>theoretical radio knowledge to do it right (theoretically, of course!)
>and produce equipment that does not interfere with other users or
>transmit out-of-band signals.

Wow! There's never been such restrictions on US hams. What's the ratio of
Advanced to Basic hams in Canada, anyway?
>
>>>My point is, if we argue from preference or personal bias, we tend to
>>>hold on to things because they are familiar, or comfortable, or just
>>>"the way it's always been".
>>
>>At the same time, it's important to note that things which survive the test
>>of time often do so for very good reasons.
>
>True - but some tend to hang on for no reason at all. If there is a
>good reason to keep something, then by all means it should be
>retained!

A story:

There's an old story (various versions exist) about how someone's Grandma made
the best brisket in the world. Before she passed away, one of the grandkids
made one with her and wrote down every single instruction. And the first step
was to cut off an inch or two from the end.

The recipe and procedure was passed down for generations and everyone in the
family cut off an inch or two from the end as the first step.

Then someone discovered an old, old letter from Grandma in which she described
the procedure to a long-dead relative. Grandma writes: "First thing I do is to
cut off an inch or so from the end - because the briskets the butcher gives me
are always a little bigger than the pan I like to use" (!)

>>
>>>To review using an analytical mindset
>>>might just bring out the true value of some aspects of the hobby -
>>>sure, there are traditions that should be kept (everyone on SSB uses
>>>Q-signals in comon speech,
>>
>>I don't! ;-)
>
>Oops - there I go generalizing again! Make that 'almost everyone'!
><:*p . But even some of the most conservative among us tend to refer
>to noise as QRM or QRN, or use QSL to request verification of the
>contact at least.

I'm not "conservative" - I do the radical thing of saying "noise" or "interference".

>The truly devoted (?) say 'Hi Hi" when they want to
>indicate laughter - oh well, to each his own...
>
I found an article in a QST from the 1930s decrying such things, so they aren't new at all.

My theory is that some hams use CW abbreviations on 'phone in an attempt to portray themselves as somehow so steeped in CW practices that they "forget". Oddly enough, the most proficient CW ops I know don't do such things.

>>>even though they were only designed for
>>>brevity when using Morse code) - it is a quaint link to the past.
>>>
>>>Others, like mandatory CW testing, should be able to stand on their
>>>own merit based on solid reasoning - after all, we are forcing people
>>>to learn it to get in to the hobby (me included - the current price of
>>>admission to HF...) - so there should be a good technical or
>>>procedural reason to do so. This ain't the Masons....<:0)
>>
>>Sure - but what constitutes solid reasoning varies from person to person. I
>>think that the simple fact that hundreds of thousands of hams all over the
>>world use Morse on the HF ham bands is a solid reason to require at least a
>>test for skill in the mode at a very basic level - say, 5 wpm. Others
>>disagree.
>
>I don't think that I would agree that this would be a reason for
>testing CW competence - more of a solid reason for keeping CW alive as
>an approved mode on the bands. I tend to view making something a
>mandatory requirement in order to correct a problem, or ensure
>competency to prevent a problem.

Then would you want to wipe out most of the written exams? Because, after all, most hams don't cause problems - nor do most hams build their own rigs.

Which do you think is more common in today's amateur radio - a homebrew station or a ham that uses Morse code?

>If CW was not a mandatory
>requirement, would people still take the time to learn it? I believe
>that they would - those who are interested enough to use it anyway.

Sure, some would.

If we took out most of the theory questions from the written test, would people still take the time to learn it?

>>>Your rule set is actually a good one - simple, and to the point. If
>>>only people could work within straightforward frameworks like this -
>>>the regulators would be out of business.....
>>>
>>Agreed! But experience has shown otherwise.

>
>Very true, unfortunately. One can only imagine a world free of
>regulators and lawyers..... :)

They would arise again out of necessity.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1748. Re: What If.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-26 19:00:42 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <uRUmb.5684$FI2.2580@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 81423

"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote

>N2EY wrote:

> >Actually it's a commonwealth.

> Okay, so Pennsylvania seceeded from the Union...otherwise called
> the United States of America. STATES.
>
> No great loss, really...

Dear Mrs. Anderson,

Leonard is failing in geography class. As a means of bringing his grade up to "passing", please have him list the 48 states and the 2 commonwealths which make up our great Nation.

73, K0HB

PS: Rhode Island is NOT a commonwealth, but neither is that the name of a state. For extra credit, what is the name of the place we commonly call Rhode Island?

1749. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-26 20:39:14 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <ShWmb.132334$qj6.8801454@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 81425

Clint wrote:

"Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
news:f45722ac.0310180701.23cba079@posting.google.com...

>> n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message

news:<20031017062827.21457.00001456@mb-m10.aol.com>...

>>
>> It's important for certain segments of our society to always be
>> offended and outraged.

BINGO!!!!
You are exactly right. I explained this in another form in this thread,
but you captured the essence of the argument perfectly.

BINGO!!!!

And You kind sir, are proof of that. Your tone in almost all your posts
indicates great offense and outrage. Deal with it.

- Mike KB3EIA -

1750. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-26 21:14:59 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <nPWmb.5872$FI2.1644@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 81426

You ask wh ??

At least I can complete a sentence.....here is another name for
you.....goofball.

Dan/W4NTI

"N8WWM" <dogie@home.nut> wrote in message news:bngpoe0g6d@drn.newsguy.com...
> In article <o%Dmb.4462$FI2.2977@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>,
Dan/W4NTI
> says...
> >
> >
> >"N8WWM" <dogie@home.nut> wrote in message
> >news:bne3o701oni@drn.newsguy.com...
> >> In article <CVvmb.2073$X22.1689@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>,
> >Dan/W4NTI
> >> says...
> >> >
> >> You know how it is...ya
> >> >just cain't fix stupid.
> >> >
> >> >
> >> "Cain't" ? You can't even spell, dumbass.
> >>
> >> You ask wh
> >>
> >>
> >Your not very bright are you WWM? In fact your downright stupid.
> >
> I googled Dan/W4NTI and it's apparent that I'm not as good at calling
people
> names as you are.
> >
> >Dan/W4NTI
> >
> >
>
> You ask wh
>

1751. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-26 21:21:15 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <1KSdnYW_b7gmpgGiRVn-tg@gbronline.com>
Source record: 81427

Kim W5TIT wrote:

>
>
> I am in support of any person born here being a US Citizen. There are too
> many legal, ethical and social issues attached to having it otherwise.

How about the Mexican women about to give birth that cross the border into the US just long enough for her child will be born here, thus reaping the benefits of citizenship? Now this child, who's parents have never lived in the US and have never contributed a single thing to the US society, is now eligible for medical care, schooling, and any other welfare out country has to offer. Your hard earned dollars, part of which you pay in taxes, will now help to finance this child who himself will probably never contribute to US society, only take from it.

1752. Re: Element 1, Code vs. No-code, and Dad

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-26 21:54:47 UTC
From: Clint <"rattlehead at computron dot net">
Message-ID: <vpogmnt2lb74eb@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 81428

Better yet, why bother?

Wait until the code test requirement is removed, and they
won't have to learn something they may never need to
or want to, or have the desire to do.

Clint

--

"Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.net> wrote in message
news:b7d1465c.0310231215.219a8d1d@posting.google.com...
> Every one in awhile, I like to remind some here of what it is we're
> actually talking about. Kinda like to get the big picture out there
> for any potential newbies whom might be fooled into believing the
> "barrier" argument that characterizes the Element 1 requirement as
> being forced to "jump through hoops."
>
> Step 1. Preparation requires that one listen to a training CD or tape
> (ARRL, W5YI, etc.) to learn the sound of two or three characters per
> day. There are 43 letters, numbers, punctuation marks, and Pro-signs
> in all that one must memorize. Approx. two 20 min. sessions per day is
> more than enough to be "reasonably" prepared to pass Element 1 after
> approx. one month. (Only have time for one 20 min. session per day?
> .make it two months.)
>
> Step 2. Visit some of the websites that have sample CW QSO's.
> Familiarize yourself with the format of a simple CW QSO, i.e. RST,
> QTH, name, rig, antenna, etc.
>
> Step 3. Just take the test. (And if, for some reason, you don't
> pass.take it again.)
>
> Behold the much-feared behemoth:
>
> _____ BT _R R_T 58_ 589. Q_H IS _HI_ADEL_HIA, _A. BT NA_E
> HR IS _OHN ES A_E IS 35 Y_RS O_D. W_ HR IS CLO_DY. RI_ IS _EN_OO_. BT
> AN_EN_A IS _I_OL_E.
>
> Five minutes of very clear CW is piped into your headphones at 5-wpm,
> not 13-wpm, and not 20-wpm. In the example above, N0CW has missed both
> callsigns and pretty much a character or two from almost every word.
> But if s/he uses just a little common sense combined with the "few
> minutes" s/he's given at the end to fill in the blank, it becomes
> quite clear that putting together a string of 25 correct characters is

> actually quite easy. Particularly so because numbers, punctuation
> marks and pro-signs count as 2 each.
>
> N0CW DE KN0WCW BT UR RST 589 589. QTH IS PHILADEPLPHIA, PA. BT NAME HR
> IS JOHN ES AGE IS 35 YERS OLD. WX HR IS CLOUDY. RIG IS KENWOOD. BT
> ANTENNA IS DIPOLE.
>
> Funny thing happened the other day. My father asked me what all the
> hubbub was about re. the code. (Apparently, I had left my QST in the
> car and he decided to peruse away.) I explained that some folks
> consider Morse code antiquated and feel that there are better, more
> modern, modes in use today. I went on to include that some also feel
> that it's unfair to make newcomers "jump through hoops" to become
> ARO's, thus constituting a "barrier" to some, otherwise qualified,
> potential hams.
>
> So Dad pondered for a moment and furled his 77 yr. old eyebrows and
> said. "They're right, Morse code IS antiquated." My jaw dropped, "say
> it ain't so!" (E tu Brute?!) He then asked me about the licensing
> structure and I explained the three-tier system presently in place.
> "You've gotta keep the code test in place though." Ok, now I'm a tad
> confused. "Why, if it's antiquated?" I asked.
>
> "Values, my boy.values. Just ask yourself if this is what you want to
> teach your own children? Should they apply this logic to other aspects
> of their lives as they grow up? How about an aspiring Engineer, why
> should s/he be forced to learn history? How about an aspiring history
> teacher, why should s/he learn physics? There's a bunch of different
> analogies than can be applied, some good and some not so good, but
> there's one common thread.values. Knowledge is NEVER wasted and
> "requiring" one to attain a "reasonable" level of knowledge to enjoy
> increased privileges.whether it be in the ARS, the workplace, or life
> in general is fundamental to nurturing a sense of values. Let that
> decay and the result will be obvious.like the recent Regents exam
> fiasco. Don't lower the bar across the board; help raise the
> individual's standards. It appears to me that there already exists a
> no-code exam and 5-wpm seems quite reasonable.so what's all the hubbub
> about?"
>
> Then I remembered why I chose my callsign.
>
> --
> 73 de Bert
> WA2SI

1753. Re: Element 1, Code vs. No-code, and Dad

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-26 22:01:58 UTC
From: Clint <"rattlehead at computron dot net">
Message-ID: <vpoh46fu3t4ba1@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 81429

>
> Thats what all the No-Coders want,they will not admit it, but thats what there
> shooting for.

Nope.

What YOU guys won't admit is that you refuse to seperate the issues of removing the morse code from testing requirements and removing morse code from the air. The former issue has all the backers and the strength of numbers; the latter does not.

however, you guys know that your side of the fence is doomed so your trying to mischaracterize the NCTA by hoping to make everybody forget the "T" in the word, and thus draw hams into the argument that may not otherwise have an opinion, or be against you.

Just like I said before, nasty socialist politicians unfairly use races of people in politics in the form of the race card to draw minorities to thier camp as they need the extra help in thier weak argument; you guys are, likewise, using the "they want to remove ALL code from the bands!" argument to draw code loving hams to your side when they may not have a problem with removing code testing.

I'm a code using ham, i've had to pass morse code tests to get my license, but I likewise DO see code test removal as a step in the right direction.

Sorry, but your attempt to control the debate by defining the words and controlling the language (an old debate folly) has failed.

Clint
KB5ZHT

1754. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-26 22:18:15 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3F9C4826.8010105@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 81430

WA8ULX wrote:

>>Do you guys dream about morse code tests?
>>
>>
>>
>>
>
>Look lid you still dont get it, I am well aware the CW test is gone, my
>complaint still is the Give away Written.
>
>
So why are we all not extras, then? If the writtens are so easy?

1755. If the written test elements are so easy, why are we all not extras?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-26 22:19:29 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3F9C4870.20107@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 81431

"Look lid you still don't get it, I am well aware the CW test is gone, my complaint still is the Give away Written."

So why are we all not extras, then? If the writtens are so easy?

1756. Re: What If.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-26 23:06:15 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@nope.org>
Message-ID: <v0jopvocp7ggnnes4ot3q7d59go1qjasp5@4ax.com>
Source record: 81432

On 26 Oct 2003 19:00:14 GMT, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:

Responses below:

>In article <4milpvkfb9udbfqeg41dk13hul856vnj6s@4ax.com>, Leo <nomail@nope.org>
>writes:

>snip

>Schematic and block diagrams are still part of the US exams, btw. For example,
>a block diagram will be shown, with all of the blocks except one labeled as to
>function. The question will be something like "The block diagram of a
>superheterodyne FM receiver is shown - what is the function of the unlabeled
>block?". And the person being tested has to pick the correct choice. Or a
>schematic is shown, and one component identified, and the question asks what
>that component does. I recall questions on my exams back in the '60s where an
>incomplete drawing was shown, and the question asked what was needed to
>complete it (1 - capacitor from Point A to Point B, 2 - Inductor from Point C
>to Point A, ...)

Pretty much the same here - block diagrams and 'fill in the
blanks'schematics, with multiple choice answers.
>
<snip

>I've been doing it since Novice days back in 1967. Not that hard if you start
>off with simple projects and work towards more complex ones. What mode permits
>the most results from the simplest equipment? Hint: It's not SSB.

Well, the Heath SSB transceiver was the most complicated piece of
radio equipment that I've tackled so far for restoration. If I was
going to try a 'designed by me' homebrew project, it would be a QRP
tansmitter - fairly simple to construct and
troubleshoot...comparatively, anyway!
>
>> The only difference up here is that building or repairing amateur
>>transmitting equipment is restricted to those holding the Advanced
>>licence (the higher of the two that we currently have). Basic licence
>>holders must operate commercially built transmitters designed
>>specifically for use on the amateur bands. The intent id to ensure
>>that those building or repairing TX equipment have sufficient
>>theoretical radio knowledge to do it right (theoretically, of course!)
>>and produce equipment that does not interfere with other users or
>>transmit out-of-band signals.
>
>Wow! There's never been such restrictions on US hams. What's the ratio of

>Advanced to Basic hams in Canada, anyway?

Over 50% are qualified at the Advanced Level (requirement:
examinations consisting of the Basic 100 multiple-choice questions,
plus an additional 50 on advanced radio theory).

I pulled a quick count of the total licence stats from the RAC website
this afternoon, and the (rough) totals are as follows:

Total licences issued: 57, 188
Basic Qualification: 28, 047
Advanced Qualification: 29, 141

In addition, the total number of Canadian hams with Morse endorsements
on their licence is 31,557 - approximately 55%..

>>
>>>>My point is, if we argue from preference or personal bias, we tend to
>>>>hold on to things because they are familiar, or comfortable, or just
>>>>"the way it's always been".
>>>
>>>At the same time, it's important to note that things which survive the test
>>>of time often do so for very good reasons.
>>
>>True - but some tend to hang on for no reason at all. If there is a
>>good reason to keep something, then by all means it should be
>>retained!
>
>A story:
>
>There's an old story (various versions exist) about how someone's Grandma made
>the best brisket in the world. Before she passed away, one of the grandkids
>made one with her and wrote down every single instruction. And the first step
>was to cut off an inch or two from the end.
>
>The recipe and procedure was passed down for generations and everyone in the
>family cut off an inch or two from the end as the first step.
>
>Then someone discovered an old, old letter from Grandma in which she described
>the procedure to a long-dead relative. Grandma writes: "First thing I do is to
>cut off an inch or so from the end - because the briskets the butcher gives me
>are always a little bigger than the pan I like to use" (!)
>
>
Good story!

>>>
>>>>To review using an analytical mindset
>>>>might just bring out the true value of some aspects of the hobby -
>>>>sure, there are traditions that should be kept (everyone on SSB uses
>>>>Q-signals in comon speech,
>>>

>>>I don't! ;-)
>>
>>Oops - there I go generalizing again! Make that 'almost everyone'!
>><:*p . But even some of the most conservative among us tend to refer
>>to noise as QRM or QRN, or use QSL to request verification of the
>>contact at least.
>
>I'm not "conservative" - I do the radical thing of saying "noise" or
>"interference".

No disrespect intended, Jim - poor choice of words on my part here.
The point was to illustrate the carryover of common CW abbreviations
into the spoken communications of the hobby.

>
>>The truly devoted (?) say 'Hi Hi" when they want to
>>indicate laughter - oh well, to each his own...
>>
>I found an article in a QST from the 1930s decrying such things, so they aren't
>new at all.

Interesting - do you recall the specific issue? I'd like to read
that!

>
>My theory is that some hams use CW abbreviations on 'phone in an attempt to
>portray themselves as somehow so steeped in CW practices that they "forget".
>Oddly enough, the most proficient CW ops I know don't do such things.
>

Think you hit the nail on the head there!

>snip

>>I don't think that I would agree that this would be a reason for
>>testing CW competence - more of a solid reason for keeping CW alive as
>>an approved mode on the bands. I tend to view making something a
>>mandatory requirement in order to correct a problem, or ensure
>>competency to prevent a problem.
>
>Then would you want to wipe out most of the written exams? Because, after all,
>most hams don't cause problems - nor do most hams build their own rigs.

Absolutely not - the writtens are intended to ensure that everyone
operating an amateur station is aware of the rules and regulations,
similar to the written driving tests that must be passed before
allowing folks out on the road.

>
>Which do you think is more common in today's amateur radio - a homebrew station
>or a ham that uses Morse code?

Morse code would be the hands down winner here. Sadly, the number of
homebrew guys is quite small these days....

>
>>If CW was not a mandatory
>>requirement, would people still take the time to learn it? I believe
>>that they would - those who are interested enough to use it anyway.
>
>Sure, some would.
>
>If we took out most of the theory questions from the written test, would people
>still take the time to learn it?

Good question - but removal of the theoretical questions would likely
have a much more dramatic effect on the overall technical competence
level within the hobby than the removal of code testing would.
Without an understanding of radio theory, operators would be limited
in their potential to grow into new areas of the hobby!

>
>>>>Your rule set is actually a good one - simple, and to the point. If
>>>>only people could work within straightforward frameworks like this -
>>>>the regulators would be out of business.....
>>>>
>>>Agreed! But experience has shown otherwise.
>>
>>Very true, unfortunately. One can only imagine a world free of
>>regulators and lawyers...... :)
>
>They would arise again out of necessity.

They sure would.... :)

>
>73 de Jim, N2EY

73, Leo

1757. Lightning Man!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-26 23:37:19 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031026183719.11022.00001695@mb-m14.aol.com>
Source record: 81434

Okay, all you morose code lovers, a new book just for beepers:

"Lightning Man; The Accursed Life of Samuel F. B. Morse" by
Kenneth Silverman, published by Alfred A. Knopf, 504 pp, $35.

A biography of "Polymath's Progress" as the L. A. Times Book
Review section titled a full-page spread by Henry Petrouski
(professor of civil engineering and history at Duke University)
in the Sunday, 26 October 2003 edition.

Glowing reviews on the book, not necessarily on the character
of Finley (as he was called when a young man)...a rather routine
portrait painter of the early 1800s looking for some grande
scheme of fame and fortune, only one of which made it...with
the help of a lot of other talent...and others' money.

LHA

1758. Re: What If.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-26 23:37:20 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031026183720.11022.00001696@mb-m14.aol.com>
Source record: 81433

In article <uRUmb.5684$FI2.2580@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Kï¿½HB"
<groupk0hb@earthlink.net> writes:

>"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote
>
>>N2EY wrote:
>
>> >Actually it's a commonwealth.
>
>> Okay, so Pennsylvania seceeded from the Union...otherwise called
>> the United States of America. STATES.
>>
>> No great loss, really...
>
>Dear Mrs. Anderson,
>
>Leonard is failing in geography class. As a means of bringing his grade up
>to "passing", please have him list the 48 states and the 2 commonwealths
>which make up our great Nation.

Ancient mariner, let not the fumes of that rotting albatross around
your neck affect your brain so much.

CIVICS AND GOVERNMENT classes would study the governmental
structures and organization of the states. GEOGRAPHY goes for
the land itself, may touch on the human names and government
structures for identification.

You can't keep that straight, either. Tsk, tsk, tsk.

That's NOT an amateur radio policy thing, is it?

Somewhere close to general old radio subjects you claimed as "fact"
that ol' Reggie Fessenden made his historic 1906 Christmas Eve
voice broadcast with a SPARK transmitter. [nope, rotary alternator]

You've not admitted to any error of factual statements, but you should
as a long-time "leader" in ham radio, presenting a good attitude and
all that ("unique ability of amateur's good will," etc.).

Now you've made another wrong "fact" but this time NOT about radio
subjects, about grade-school level academic things. Tsk, tsk, tsk.

Both wrong. Two strikes. Third time and you are out.

Better luck at "radiosport." [harf..."sport"... :-)]

The light at the end of the carpal tunnel is the surgeon's little fiber optic imaging probe trying to separate your dits from your dahs...

LHA

PS: PLEASE try to remember the general subject of this newsgroup, quit trying to dumb everyone down to chat room nonsense.

1759. Re: If the written test elements are so easy, why are we all not extras?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-27 00:39:24 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031026193924.25837.00000145@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 81435

>"Look lid you still don't get it, I am well aware the CW test is gone, my
>complaint still is the Give away Written."
>
>So why are we all not extras, then? If the writtens are so easy?
>

Because the Whinners who have cried about the CW Test, are the same Whinners
who will start now crying about the Written.

1760. Re: What If.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-27 01:30:02 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031026203002.21457.00001683@mb-m10.aol.com>
Source record: 81436

In article <v0jopvocp7ggnnes4ot3q7d59go1qjasp5@4ax.com>, Leo <nomail@nope.org>
writes:

>On 26 Oct 2003 19:00:14 GMT, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:
>
>Responses below:
>
>>In article <4milpvkfb9udbfqeg41dk13hul856vnj6s@4ax.com>, Leo
><nomail@nope.org>
>>writes:
>
>>snip
>
>>Schematic and block diagrams are still part of the US exams, btw. For
>example,
>>a block diagram will be shown, with all of the blocks except one labeled as
>to
>>function. The question will be something like "The block diagram of a
>>superheterodyne FM receiver is shown - what is the function of the
>unlabeled
>>block?". And the person being tested has to pick the correct choice. Or a
>>schematic is shown, and one component identified, and the question asks
>what
>>that component does. I recall questions on my exams back in the '60s where
>an
>>incomplete drawing was shown, and the question asked what was needed to
>>complete it (1 - capacitor from Point A to Point B, 2 - Inductor from Point
>C
>>to Point A, ...)
>
>Pretty much the same here - block diagrams and 'fill in the
>blanks'schematics, with multiple choice answers.

It could be argued that having to identify what a particular component in a
schematic actually does is at least as much an indication of knowledge about
that schematic as is simply being able to draw it.
>>
><snip
>
>>I've been doing it since Novice days back in 1967. Not that hard if you
>>start
>>off with simple projects and work towards more complex ones. What mode
>>permits
>>the most results from the simplest equipment? Hint: It's not SSB.
>

>Well, the Heath SSB transceiver was the most complicated piece of
>radio equipment that I've tackled so far for restoration.

Which one?

> If I was
>going to try a 'designed by me' homebrew project, it would be a QRP
>tansmitter - fairly simple to construct and
>troubleshoot...comparatively, anyway!

And it would be a transmitter for which mode?

Consider that one of the primary goals of the amateur radio service is
technical education - or perhaps I should say, self-education.

>>> The only difference up here is that building or repairing amateur
>>>transmitting equipment is restricted to those holding the Advanced
>>>licence (the higher of the two that we currently have). Basic licence
>>>holders must operate commercially built transmitters designed
>>>specifically for use on the amateur bands. The intent id to ensure
>>>that those building or repairing TX equipment have sufficient
>>>theoretical radio knowledge to do it right (theoretically, of course!)
>>>and produce equipment that does not interfere with other users or
>>>transmit out-of-band signals.
>>
>>Wow! There's never been such restrictions on US hams. What's the ratio of
>>Advanced to Basic hams in Canada, anyway?
>
>Over 50% are qualified at the Advanced Level (requirement:
>examinations consisting of the Basic 100 multiple-choice questions,
>plus an additional 50 on advanced radio theory).

Any requirements as to experience with a Basic or can a raw newbie just walk in
and take the Advanced exam straightaway?
>
>I pulled a quick count of the total licence stats from the RAC website
>this afternoon, and the (rough) totals are as follows:
>
>Total licences issued: 57, 188
>Basic Qualification: 28, 047
>Advanced Qualification: 29, 141
>
So we have almost exactly 50-50 split Basic/Advanced. Interesting to know. And
VE amateur radio licenses total a little more than 8% of those in the USA. (Of
course the populations are different too).

>In addition, the total number of Canadian hams with Morse endorsements
>on their licence is 31,557 - approximately 55%..

let's see - in the USA before the recent changes it was 470,000 out of 675,000
- just under 70%.

Looks like Canada may be the next to simply drop Morse testing, though.

>>>>>My point is, if we argue from preference or personal bias, we tend to
>>>>>hold on to things because they are familiar, or comfortable, or just
>>>>>"the way it's always been".
>>>>
>>>>At the same time, it's important to note that things which survive the
>>>>test of time often do so for very good reasons.

>>>True - but some tend to hang on for no reason at all. If there is a
>>>good reason to keep something, then by all means it should be
>>>retained!

>>A story:

>>There's an old story (various versions exist) about how someone's Grandma
>>made
>>the best brisket in the world. Before she passed away, one of the grandkids
>>made one with her and wrote down every single instruction. And the first
>>step
>>was to cut off an inch or two from the end.
>>
>>The recipe and procedure was passed down for generations and everyone in the
>>family cut off an inch or two from the end as the first step.
>>
>>Then someone discovered an old, old letter from Grandma in which she
>>described
>>the procedure to a long-dead relative. Grandma writes: "First thing I do is
>>to
>>cut off an inch or so from the end - because the briskets the butcher gives
>>me
>>are always a little bigger than the pan I like to use" (!)

>Good story!

There's a matching story about railroad trains and hot boxes which proves the
other point.

>>>>>To review using an analytical mindset
>>>>>might just bring out the true value of some aspects of the hobby -
>>>>>sure, there are traditions that should be kept (everyone on SSB uses
>>>>>Q-signals in comon speech,
>>>>
>>>>I don't! ;-)
>>>
>>>Oops - there I go generalizing again! Make that 'almost everyone'!
>>><:*p . But even some of the most conservative among us tend to refer
>>>to noise as QRM or QRN, or use QSL to request verification of the
>>>contact at least.
>>
>>I'm not "conservative" - I do the radical thing of saying "noise" or
>>"interference".
>
>No disrespect intended, Jim - poor choice of words on my part here.

None taken!

>The point was to illustrate the carryover of common CW abbreviations
>into the spoken communications of the hobby.

I can remember some hams back in the '60s doing such things as saying "Kay"
instead of "over" at the end of a voice transmission. This was on 6 meter AM,
of all things.

>>>The truly devoted (?) say 'Hi Hi" when they want to
>>>indicate laughter - oh well, to each his own...
>>>
>>I found an article in a QST from the 1930s decrying such things, so they
>>aren't new at all.
>
>Interesting - do you recall the specific issue? I'd like to read
>that!

Late 1930s - 38 I think. IIRC it was by K.B. Warner, who was one of the key
(pun intended) figures in amateur radio from the mid' 20s until his death about
1948. KBW was second only to HPM in this regard, but is not nearly so widely
known.

There was also a column in the late '40s and early '50s called "Phone Band
Phunnies" that described and decried certain bad habits some 'phone ops tended
to acquire.
>
>>My theory is that some hams use CW abbreviations on 'phone in an attempt to
>>portray themselves as somehow so steeped in CW practices that they "forget".
>>Oddly enough, the most proficient CW ops I know don't do such things.
>
>Think you hit the nail on the head there!

"Say it with words". Heck, "Cue Ess Ell" is three syllables, while "Roger" or
"OK" is two.
>
>>snip
>
>>>I don't think that I would agree that this would be a reason for
>>>testing CW competence - more of a solid reason for keeping CW alive as
>>>an approved mode on the bands. I tend to view making something a
>>>mandatory requirement in order to correct a problem, or ensure
>>>competency to prevent a problem.
>>
>>Then would you want to wipe out most of the written exams? Because, after
>>all,
>>most hams don't cause problems - nor do most hams build their own rigs.
>
>Absolutely not - the writtens are intended to ensure that everyone
>operating an amateur station is aware of the rules and regulations,
>similar to the written driving tests that must be passed before
>allowing folks out on the road.

OK, fine - the written exams must include the regulations. And perhaps some safety (RF exposure rules) to protect others.

But what about the rest of the writtens?
>
>>Which do you think is more common in today's amateur radio - a homebrew
>>station
>>or a ham that uses Morse code?
>
>Morse code would be the hands down winner here. Sadly, the number of
>homebrew guys is quite small these days....

It's that way for a number of reasons, the primary one being economic.

Some of us, however, still design and build our own rigs. Note how we are sometimes met (not by you, Leo) with disbelief and ridicule for doing so.....

>>>If CW was not a mandatory
>>>requirement, would people still take the time to learn it? I believe
>>>that they would - those who are interested enough to use it anyway.
>>
>>Sure, some would.
>>
>>If we took out most of the theory questions from the written test, would
>>people still take the time to learn it?
>
>Good question - but removal of the theoretical questions would likely
>have a much more dramatic effect on the overall technical competence
>level within the hobby than the removal of code testing would.

Is that really true?

Is there a dramatic difference in the overall technical competence of Advanced vs. Basic hams in Canada?

Is there a dramatic difference in the overall technical competence of the various license classes in the USA?

>Without an understanding of radio theory, operators would be limited
>in their potential to grow into new areas of the hobby!

Sure - but is it the function of the license exams to force that understanding on everyone?

In the Canadian system, if I understand it correctly, a ham who wants to homebrew has to learn more theory, and a ham who only wants to use manufactured gear can stick with the Basic. Or are there more privileges than the ability to homebrew granted with the Advanced?

In the USA, every ham can homebrew, but to get access to more HF spectrum, one must jump through the hoop of additional written testing, even if one has no intention of building anything.

>>>>>Your rule set is actually a good one - simple, and to the point. If
>>>>>only people could work within straightforward frameworks like this -

>>>>>the regulators would be out of business.....
>>>>>
>>>>Agreed! But experience has shown otherwise.
>>>
>>>Very true, unfortunately. One can only imagine a world free of
>>>regulators and lawyers...... :)
>>
>>They would arise again out of necessity.
>
>They sure would.... :)

All regulations start out simple. Then real life gets hold of them.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1761. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-27 01:32:05 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <pA_mb.132467$qj6.8870202@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 81437

Robert Casey wrote:
> WA8ULX wrote:
>
>>> Do you guys dream about morse code tests?
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>
>>
>> Look lid you still dont get it, I am well aware the CW test is gone, my
>> complaint still is the Give away Written.
>>
> So why are we all not extras, then? If the writtens are so easy?
>
For many people, those tests are *not* that easy. For me they were, but
I had plenty of experience. It was still a week of fairly intense study.

Can the tests be passed with one of these weekend classes? Probably.
Just like college students do all-night cramming for their tests. You
pass the test, then quickly forget about it. They cheat themselves.

Short of essay questions, with the grader making an often arbitrary
right or wrong judgement on anything that isn't a numerical answer, we
are stuck with multiple choice. It's the worst system, except for all
the others.

- Mike KB3EIA -

1762. Re: If the written test elements are so easy, why are we all not extras?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-27 02:18:21 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20031026211821.21232.00001590@mb-m13.aol.com>
Source record: 81438

In article <3F9C4870.20107@ix.netcom.com>, Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
writes:

>"Look lid you still don't get it, I am well aware the CW test is gone, my
>complaint still is the Give away Written."
>
>So why are we all not extras, then? If the writtens are so easy?

Bob:

Every ham who has (had) the motivation and initiative to learn the material
required to pass the Extra-class written tests (and all the rest along the
way) already *is* an Extra. The rest either haven't found it yet, or never
will. In either case, their status won't change until they change it for
themselves. Twenty-three years ago, I couldn't imagine being a licensed
ham of any class, until it finally dawned on me that I had to do something
to make it happen. Once I got started, I went from nothing to General
in about six months, and to Extra in about 18 months. I'm just glad I
didn't wait any longer for someone to make it happen for me.

73 de Larry, K3LT

1763. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-27 02:38:20 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <wy%mb.4435$X22.2282@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 81439

"JJ" <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
news:1KSdnYW_b7gmpgGiRVn-tg@gbronline.com...
> Kim W5TIT wrote:
>
> >
> >
> > I am in support of any person born here being a US Citizen. There are
too
> > many legal, ethical and social issues attached to having it otherwise.
>
> How about the Mexican women about to give birth that cross the border
> into the US just long enough for her child will be born here, thus
> reaping the benefits of citizenship? Now this child, who's parents have
> never lived in the US and have never contributed a single thing to the
> US society, is now eligible for medical care, schooling, and any other
> welfare out country has to offer. Your hard earned dollars, part of
> which you pay in taxes, will now help to finance this child who himself
> will probably never contribute to US society, only take from it.
>

The Texas Twit is a world class liberal. She ran around supporting the
hippies, after that was all over. In otherwords, she doesn't think things
thru very well.

FWIW...I agree with your comments JJ.

Dan/W4NTI

1764. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-27 02:39:03 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <bz%mb.4436$X22.2257@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 81440

Whoever Leland is, tell him he is right.

And your point is?

Dan/W4NTI

"N8WWM" <dogie@home.nut> wrote in message news:bnhk8i0eq3@drn.newsguy.com...
> Leland was right, you are an asshole.
>
> In article <nPWmb.5872$FI2.1644@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>,
Dan/W4NTI
> says...
> >
> >You ask wh ??
> >
> >At least I can complete a sentence.....here is another name for
> >you.....goofball.
> >
> >Dan/W4NTI
> >
> >"N8WWM" <dogie@home.nut> wrote in message
news:bngpoe0g6d@drn.newsguy.com...
> >> In article <o%Dmb.4462$FI2.2977@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>,
> >Dan/W4NTI
> >> says...
> >> >
> >> >
> >> >"N8WWM" <dogie@home.nut> wrote in message
> >> >news:bne3o701oni@drn.newsguy.com...
> >> >> In article <CVvmb.2073$X22.1689@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>,
> >> >Dan/W4NTI
> >> >> says...
> >> >> >
> >> >> You know how it is...ya
> >> >> >just cain't fix stupid.
> >> >> >
> >> >> >
> >> >> "Cain't" ? You can't even spell, dumbass.
> >> >>
> >> >> You ask wh
> >> >>
> >> >
> >> >Your not very bright are you WWM? In fact your downright stupid.
> >> >
> >> I googled Dan/W4NTI and it's apparent that I'm not as good at calling

> >people
> >> names as you are.
> >> >
> >> >Dan/W4NTI
> >> >
> >> >
> >>
> >> You ask wh
> >>
> >
> >
>
> You ask wh
>

1765. Re: Element 1, Code vs. No-code, and Dad

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-27 02:40:52 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <UA%mb.4437$X22.1667@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 81441

I just had a great QSO in the Extra part of 80cw with a 84 year old guy.
Really enjoyed it. I was running my 40 year old Hallicrafters gear and had
a blast with it.

And I came here. Bye....back to CW.

Dan/W4NTI

"Clint" <rattlehead at computron dot net> wrote in message
news:vpogmnt2lb74eb@corp.supernews.com...
> Better yet, why bother?
>
> Wait until the code test requirement is removed, and they
> won't have to learn something they may never need to
> or want to, or have the desire to do.
>
> Clint
>
>
> --
>
>
> "Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.net> wrote in message
> news:b7d1465c.0310231215.219a8d1d@posting.google.com...
> > Every one in awhile, I like to remind some here of what it is we're
> > actually talking about. Kinda like to get the big picture out there
> > for any potential newbies whom might be fooled into believing the
> > "barrier" argument that characterizes the Element 1 requirement as
> > being forced to "jump through hoops."
> >
> > Step 1. Preparation requires that one listen to a training CD or tape
> > (ARRL, W5YI, etc.) to learn the sound of two or three characters per
> > day. There are 43 letters, numbers, punctuation marks, and Pro-signs
> > in all that one must memorize. Approx. two 20 min. sessions per day is
> > more than enough to be "reasonably" prepared to pass Element 1 after
> > approx. one month. (Only have time for one 20 min. session per day?
> > .make it two months.)
> >
> > Step 2. Visit some of the websites that have sample CW QSO's.
> > Familiarize yourself with the format of a simple CW QSO, i.e. RST,
> > QTH, name, rig, antenna, etc.
> >
> > Step 3. Just take the test. (And if, for some reason, you don't
> > pass.take it again.)
> >

> > Behold the much-feared behemoth:
> >
> > _____ BT _R R_T 58_ 589. Q_H IS _HI_ADEL_HIA, _A. BT NA_E
> > HR IS _OHN ES A_E IS 35 Y_RS O_D. W_ HR IS CLO_DY. RI_ IS _EN_OO_. BT
> > AN_EN_A IS _I_OL_E.
> >
> > Five minutes of very clear CW is piped into your headphones at 5-wpm,
> > not 13-wpm, and not 20-wpm. In the example above, N0CW has missed both
> > callsigns and pretty much a character or two from almost every word.
> > But if s/he uses just a little common sense combined with the "few
> > minutes" s/he's given at the end to fill in the blank, it becomes
> > quite clear that putting together a string of 25 correct characters is
> > actually quite easy. Particularly so because numbers, punctuation
> > marks and pro-signs count as 2 each.
> >
> > N0CW DE KN0WCW BT UR RST 589 589. QTH IS PHILADEPLPHIA, PA. BT NAME HR
> > IS JOHN ES AGE IS 35 YERS OLD. WX HR IS CLOUDY. RIG IS KENWOOD. BT
> > ANTENNA IS DIPOLE.
> >
> > Funny thing happened the other day. My father asked me what all the
> > hubbub was about re. the code. (Apparently, I had left my QST in the
> > car and he decided to peruse away.) I explained that some folks
> > consider Morse code antiquated and feel that there are better, more
> > modern, modes in use today. I went on to include that some also feel
> > that it's unfair to make newcomers "jump through hoops" to become
> > ARO's, thus constituting a "barrier" to some, otherwise qualified,
> > potential hams.
> >
> > So Dad pondered for a moment and furled his 77 yr. old eyebrows and
> > said. "They're right, Morse code IS antiquated." My jaw dropped, "say
> > it ain't so!" (E tu Brute?!) He then asked me about the licensing
> > structure and I explained the three-tier system presently in place.
> > "You've gotta keep the code test in place though." Ok, now I'm a tad
> > confused. "Why, if it's antiquated?" I asked.
> >
> > "Values, my boy.values. Just ask yourself if this is what you want to
> > teach your own children? Should they apply this logic to other aspects
> > of their lives as they grow up? How about an aspiring Engineer, why
> > should s/he be forced to learn history? How about an aspiring history
> > teacher, why should s/he learn physics? There's a bunch of different
> > analogies than can be applied, some good and some not so good, but
> > there's one common thread.values. Knowledge is NEVER wasted and
> > "requiring" one to attain a "reasonable" level of knowledge to enjoy
> > increased privileges.whether it be in the ARS, the workplace, or life
> > in general is fundamental to nurturing a sense of values. Let that
> > decay and the result will be obvious.like the recent Regents exam
> > fiasco. Don't lower the bar across the board; help raise the
> > individual's standards. It appears to me that there already exists a
> > no-code exam and 5-wpm seems quite reasonable.so what's all the hubbub
> > about?"

> >
> > Then I remembered why I chose my callsign.
> >
> > --
> > 73 de Bert
> > WA2SI
>
>

1766. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-27 03:14:19 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <f40nb.4466$X22.279@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 81442

"Larry Roll K3LT" wrote:
>
> I believe requirements for immigration and naturalization
> should be extremely rigid, involving extensive background
> checks and a requirement that the person immigrating have
> the means in place to make his/her own living. Eligibility
> for state or federal "welfare" benefits should also be
> severely limited. I'd also do away with the law that states
> that any person born in the U.S. is automatically a U.S.
> citizen, if the parents, at the time, are *not* U.S. citizens
> themselves. The children born to non-citizens would be
> considered to be citizens of the parents' own country of
> origin. Also, no person who is not a U.S. citizen, by birth
> or legal naturalization, should be allowed to vote in any
> local, state, or federal election. Liberal immigration and
> naturalization policies amount to political corruption in it's
> most dangerous form -- and the danger is to U.S.
> sovereignty.

In the end, the ONLY way to stop illegal immigration is to force employers to exercise restraint over who they hire, with truly serious consequences for those who knowingly hire, or should have known they were hiring, illegal immigrants. As long as jobs better than what is available elsewhere are available and we have a weak enforcement process, illegal immigrants are going to come. Cut off the jobs and you clearly cut off the problem. Employers claim it is not their responsibility to check out potential employees. Nonsense. Employers routinely run checks on everybody else they hire and it is every citizen's responsibility not to contribute to obvious crime.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

1767. Re: What If.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-27 03:18:46 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@nope.org>
Message-ID: <gr0ppv4eosvkm2jpg1bb8oapg4jnd2ngph@4ax.com>
Source record: 81443

On 27 Oct 2003 01:30:02 GMT, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:

>>>snipped at various parts below...

>>
>>Pretty much the same here - block diagrams and 'fill in the
>>blanks'schematics, with multiple choice answers.
>
>It could be argued that having to identify what a particular component in a
>schematic actually does is at least as much an indication of knowledge about
>that schematic as is simply being able to draw it.
>>>

True enough - although the exam I took centered almost exclusively on
tank circuits and calculation of resonant component values..

>><snip
>>
>>>I've been doing it since Novice days back in 1967. Not that hard if you
>>>start
>>>off with simple projects and work towards more complex ones. What mode
>>>permits
>>>the most results from the simplest equipment? Hint: It's not SSB.
>>
>>Well, the Heath SSB transceiver was the most complicated piece of
>>radio equipment that I've tackled so far for restoration.
>
>Which one?

SB-400. Cosmetically OK, but a disaster inside - corroded rotary
switches, poor solder joints, wiring errors (17 of them - including
one which shorted out the LSB crystal - somebody must have been less
than happy with this set ...) and of course a complete set of high-ESR
electrolytics. Almost 50 hours on the bench to get it up and
running....
>
>> If I was
>>going to try a 'designed by me' homebrew project, it would be a QRP
>>tansmitter - fairly simple to construct and
>>troubleshoot...comparatively, anyway!
>
>And it would be a transmitter for which mode?

CW, most likely - I would prefer to start with something relatively
simple.

>Any requirements as to experience with a Basic or can a raw newbie just walk in
>and take the Advanced exam straightaway?

No experience requirements (they were dropped years ago) - it is
possible to write the Basic and Advanced exams concurrently on the
same day.

>>
>So we have almost exactly 50-50 split Basic/Advanced. Interesting to know. And
>VE amateur radio licenses total a little more than 8% of those in the USA. (Of
>course the populations are different too).

33 Million in Canada, approximately 1/10 of the US, I believe...

>
>>In addition, the total number of Canadian hams with Morse endorsements
>>on their licence is 31,557 - approximately 55%..
>
>let's see - in the USA before the recent changes it was 470,000 out of 675,000
>- just under 70%.
>
>Looks like Canada may be the next to simply drop Morse testing, though.
>

Haven't heard much on this so far! I posted the results of the survey
condusted by the Radio Amateurs of Canada a while back - it has been
submitted to Industry Canada (the FCC equivalent), but nothing since
then. No idea how long a decision will take - we have a system of
NPRMs here as well, and we're waiting for some indication one way or
the other.

>>>I'm not "conservative" - I do the radical thing of saying "noise" or
>>>"interference".
>>
>>No disrespect intended, Jim - poor choice of words on my part here.
>
>None taken!

Glad to hear that!

>
>There was also a column in the late '40s and early '50s called "Phone Band
>Phunnies" that described and decried certain bad habits some 'phone ops tended
>to acquire.

Have a look at the following web site - a humourous view of this sort
of thing gone wild....entitled "How To Sound Like A Lid"...

http://www.dxzone.com/cgi-bin/search/frame/FrameIt.cgi?Url=http://www.dxzone.com/cgi-bin/search/jump.cgi?ID=1750&ID=1750

>Some of us, however, still design and build our own rigs. Note how we are
>sometimes met (not by you, Leo) with disbelief and ridicule for doing so.......
>

And I really am incapable of understanding this behaviour. The
ability to visualise, design and implement amateur radio equipment is
a gift - one that the amateur community should hold in the highest
regard. Anyone could purchase and operate a modern HT, with minimal
training - it takes a great deal of skill to create something from
nothing. And, for those who enjoy the traditions of the hobby,
homebrewing harkens right back to day one!

>>>If we took out most of the theory questions from the written test, would
>>>people still take the time to learn it?
>>
>>Good question - but removal of the theoretical questions would likely
>>have a much more dramatic effect on the overall technical competence
>>level within the hobby than the removal of code testing would.
>
>Is that really true?
>
>Is there a dramatic difference in the overall technical competence of Advanced
>vs. Basic hams in Canada?
>
>Is there a dramatic difference in the overall technical competence of the
>various license classes in the USA?
>

Not as much as there was years ago, I suspect - testing has become
very much simplified over the last 40 years...

The Advanced level, like the Extra, does require a fair amount of
additional radio knowledge to pass. Is it enough? It depends - I'm
not aware of a study that would indicate whether the goals of the
testing were being met!

>>Without an understanding of radio theory, operators would be limited
>>in their potential to grow into new areas of the hobby!
>
>Sure - but is it the function of the license exams to force that understanding
>on everyone?
>
>In the Canadian system, if I understand it correctly, a ham who wants to
>homebrew has to learn more theory, and a ham who only wants to use manufactured
>gear can stick with the Basic. Or are there more privileges than the ability to
>homebrew granted with the Advanced?
>
>In the USA, every ham can homebrew, but to get access to more HF spectrum, one
>must jump through the hoop of additional written testing, even if one has no
>intention of building anything.

Here, an amateur with a Basic licence has access to all bands above 30
MHz. Add on a Morse Code test, and full access to the bands under 30
MHz is granted.

The Advanced kicence, aside from providing the ability to homebrew
transmitting equipment, provides a couple of other perks - high power

TX operation, the ability to operate a repeater, and the ability to apply to become a volunteer examiner. There are a couple of other minor ones as well, but I don't recall them at the moment!

No annual renewal fees are due (these were dropped in 2000).

Those with a Basic licence are encouraged to homebrew as well - only transmitters are legally excluded from that licence class. Modems, receivers, antennas - no problem.

I suppose that a basic requirement for entry into this hobby is, and always has been, an interest in the technical aspects of radio communications. And, for the level of freedom to experiment that this hobby provides, I don't feel that it is unrealistic to expect new licencees to be required to demonstrate technical competency, in the form of written exams. I would assume that those whose desire to become a ham is strong enough would also be the type of folks who would want to continue to learn and grow. Perhaps I'm wrong - but the people that I have met so far (for the most part) follow this model.

>
>>>>>>Your rule set is actually a good one - simple, and to the point. If
>>>>>>only people could work within straightforward frameworks like this -
>>>>>>the regulators would be out of business.....
>>>>>>
>>>>>Agreed! But experience has shown otherwise.
>>>>
>>>>Very true, unfortunately. One can only imagine a world free of
>>>>regulators and lawyers..... :)
>>>
>>>They would arise again out of necessity.
>>
>>They sure would.... :)
>
>All regulations start out simple. Then real life gets hold of them.
>
>73 de Jim, N2EY

73, Leo

1768. Re: If the written test elements are so easy, why are we all not extras?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-27 03:29:35 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031026222935.06226.00001191@mb-m19.aol.com>
Source record: 81444

In article <3F9C4870.20107@ix.netcom.com>, Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
writes:

>"Look lid you still don't get it, I am well aware the CW test is gone, my
>complaint still is the Give away Written."
>
>So why are we all not extras, then? If the writtens are so easy?
>
Well, for starters:

1) Some hams are just not interested in HF.
2) Some hams are not in a position to have an HF station
3) Some hams are not that interested in the relatively small amount of
additional privileges an Extra provides
4) Some hams have lost interest completely
5) Some hams haven't yet heard about the rules changes, or don't understand
them
6) Some hams haven't gotten around to visiting a VE session

Note how slowly the number of Advanceds is declining. In the 42 months since
restructuring, their numbers have only dropped by about 15%. At least half of
that decline is expirations, so the number who have upgraded to Extra is pretty
small even though the 20 wpm code test is long gone.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1769. Re: Amateur Radio in the 21st Century?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-27 04:03:15 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <7O0nb.4484$X22.1484@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 81445

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20031024182942.12300.00001303@mb-m20.aol.com...
> In article <3F993128.6080401@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:
>
>
> >> Yep - with reduced privileges. Not necessarily a bad idea. All they're
> >really
> >> doing is reinventing the Novice.
> >>
> > I'm still not so hot on the idea.
>
> All depends on what the balance of requirements vs. privileges is. As it
stands
> right now, our "entry level" license is heavily weighted to VHF/UHF.

I agree and of all the licensing decisions made under 98-143,
the ending of Novice was, IMHO, not a good idea. That said,
I think once the dust settles from the code "test" issue, then
perhaps ARRL may wish to take a top down look at licensing,
licensing requirements and the concurrent privileges associated
with each.

> >>> Especially charming is the idea that people with a 6th grade education
> >>>are going to supply us with fresh ideas.
>
> >> I got started in ham radio between 6th and 7th grades.....
>
> > Were you "average" Jim?
>
> In some things yes, in others no.
>
> >I was involved in electronics when I was in 5th
> >grade, but no one else around me was. I'm not at all against kids of
> >any particular age being involved in Ham radio, but that "average 6th
> >grader thing is bothersome.
>
> Heck, the "average" sixth grader in some American neighborhoods is quite
> different from his/her "average" counterpart elsewhere.
>
> Perhaps a better way to word that idea is "the entry level syllabus and
test
> should not require a knowledge of math, science or English above the
> sixth-grade level in order to understand the material".
>
> >>>Next:

> >>>
> >>>
> >>>>Whatever we come up with, it will have to fit within the FCC budget.
> >>>>This probably means that in all likelihood what will happen, assuming
> >>>>that the idea of a beginner's class license is even accepted at all,
> >>>>is that they (the FCC) will juggle the existing 3 classes to
> >>>>accommodate the new structure. Technician will change from what it
> >>>>is now to the basic license. It may be named "Communicator" or
> >>>>simply left as Technician. Let's assume it gets the name
> >>>>"Communicator". All existing Techs will be upgraded to General.
> >>>>Assuming that the Morse requirement is removed first, our opinion
> >>>>is that most of the Techs will take (and hopefully pass) the element
> >>>>3 exam as soon as they can, thus becoming General class licensees.
> >>>
> >>> Assuming indeed! They figure that people are going to study and pay >
> >>
> >> for
> >>
> >>>a test in order to get priveleges they will get anyhow? If a Technician
> >>>flunks the test, all he or she has to do is wait a while, than he/she
> >>>will get the priveleges anyhow.
> >>
> >>
> >> Exactly!
> >>
> >>
> >>> That sounds a LOT like simplification to me.
> >>
> >>
> >> Sounds like a giveaway to me. And it sets a very bad precedent: If it's
OK
> >to
> >> give all Techs a free upgrade to General, why not throw away most of
the
> >> General question pool and use the Tech one instead?
> >>
> >>>>Remember, that before the changes that created the present no-code
> >>>>tech, the General and Tech exams were identical. Only the code
> >>>>separated them, and even there it was only the difference between
> >>>>5 and 13 WPM.
> >>>
> >>>But its not that way now.
>
> >> And it wasn't that way back when the Tech code test changes were made!
> >
> > hehe, things aren't like they used to be, and they never were! 8^)
>
> "They remember a past that never was"

What are they remembering that wasn't? The tech written was the same as
the General as someone wrote above up to 1987 as you note below.

> >> Quick history:
> >>
> >> From 1951 to March 1987, the General and Tech had the same written. In
> >> March of
> >> 1987 the General was split into two elements, 3A for Tech and 3B for
> >> General.
> >> Almost four years later (February 1991), the Tech lost its code test.
> >>
> >> This isn't ancient history, and anybody writing a policy paper should
know
> >> how
> >> the previous system came to be. And it's not the only factual mistake
in
> >> the paper.
> >>
> >>>And finally, before I forget about how I was charmed about the glasses
> >>>reference, I have to congratulate the authors on their humorous
> >>>treatment of Pro coders:
> >>>
> >>>(more from the
> >>
> >>
> >> KL7CC paper)
> >>
> >>
> >>>>So, there are no "Morse code haters" on the committee.
> >>>>There is no conspiracy, no secret agenda, no kickback from the
> >>>>manufacturers, no "black plan" from the ARRL, no anything. Just some
> >>>>guys that want nothing more than to see our great hobby prosper for
> >>>>the next hundred years, or longer.
> >>>
> >>>and (I had to put this in again):
> >>>
> >>>>You know, fresh ideas, new blood, people that can actually see
> >>>>their radios without having to put on glasses - what a concept!
> >>>
> >>>and:
>
> >>>>A few final words:
> >>>>There are no black helicopters.
> >>>
> >>>I guess those who believe in the Morse code test believe there are?
>
> >> See what I mean about undertone?
> >
> >I bet they love their families more than PCTA's too!
>
> I recycle.

> >
> >>>>Do you suppose the committee members just want to see our wonderful
> >>>>hobby prosper? Wouldn't that be an odd reason for doing what they
are
> >>>>doing?
> >>>
> >>>Apparently those of us who believe in a Morse code test *don't* want to
> >>>see our wonderful hobby prosper!
>
> >> If the ideas are good ideas, they will stand on their merit. The person
> >> histories of the committee members is not the issue. If they're such
great
> >> folks, why don't they let the merits of their ideas convicne us?
> >>
> >> Quick aside: I first became aware of W5YI about ten years ago when my
> >> license
> >> needed to be renewed. I got this official looking letter saying that
for
> >> just
> >> $5 they'd help me renew my license. All I had to do was fill in the
form,
> >sign
> >> it, write a check for $5 and send it to them.
> >>
> >> Never mind that I'd been dealing with the FCC since I was 13 and had
> >renewed
> >> and modified my license at least 9 times before with no problems at
all.
> >They
> >> thought I needed "help".
> >
> > Perhaps their target audience needs the help? 8^)
>
> Maybe?
> >
> ><snippage>
> >
> >>>And the answer to the question of who I'm going to talk to if there are
> >>>no manufacturers..... Well you know , don't ya Jim?
> >>
> >>
> >> Who, me?
> >
> > Yeah, you!!
> >
> More folks like me? Who don't "take the practical approach"?
>
> ><more snippage>
>
> >>> I'm not talking about Carl either. I know that neither he nor Bill

Sohl
> >>>are in favor of reductions in the qualifications to get a license (save
> >>>removal of the Morse code test)
> >>
> >> And they've been very clear about that.
> >>
> >>> That's really nice. It also *may* mean that they will someday be
> >>>considered the Luddites along with us troglodyte Pro code testers as
the
> >>>requirements to get a license are relaxed more and more.
>
> >> You got my point exactly.
> >
> > I may have proposed this once (quite tongue in cheek) but one of the
> >proposals was that the prospective amateur sign a paper stating how he
> >or she had read and understood part 97.
>
> I had to read that part of the KL7CC paper twice because I didn't believe
it
> the first time! And they're talking about the *rules and regs*!!
>
> Once upon a time, FCC tried that approach with another radio service.
Didn't
> work very well.

The real problem with CB at the time and to this day was the "buy it
anywhere"
ability at prices net to nothing. Even in the early 70s CBs were less than
$50. Same is true today for FRS...but the good thing about FRS is the
lack of any real DX ability.

> >Why not extrapolate that to the
> >whole test? Just think how easy the testing process would be! By gosh,
> >we could get [people to sign that they had the equivalent knowlege of
> >anything. The ARS could be populated by geniuses!
>
> Exactly! No more need for VEC sessions and all that paperwork. If that
approach
> is valid for the rules, why not the whole test?
>
> But the part of that paper I found most "amusing" was where the prime
author
> admitted that he could not pass the current written test for the license
he
> holds. It is written in such a way that he almost sounds proud of that
fact. As
> dear departed N0BK would say: Surreal.

One problem we have discused before is the stupid focus on some
testing on elements of the rules that very few hams ever engage in...space
communications for example. Better to test on what we really want

most hams to be knowledgeable on that VEC qualifications, etc.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1770. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-27 04:08:49 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <IT0nb.4486$X22.4046@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 81446

"Kim W5TIT" wrote:
>
> And, I believe the immigration laws are
> appropriate, (snip)

We allow more immigrants into this country each year than any other country on Earth, including those countries where most of our immigrants come from. This mass influx is driving wages down and prices up. Our schools are overcrowded. Education costs are going up. Medical costs are going up. Home prices are going up. Land prices are going up. Food prices are going up. Crime continues to go up. Our overall standard of living is going down. At the same time, I don't see a single benefit for the average American. Can you describe one benefit for me or my family, Kim?

> State and Federal welfare programs need to be
> abolished. (snip)

Why would you want to cut off the parachute put in place to help Americans? If you want to fix welfare, cut off the many thousands of illegal immigrants who are taking benefits from others. Next, get rid of the obvious bums abusing the welfare system. This two steps alone would cut the cost of welfare programs dramatically, yet still provide help for those Americans why really need it.

> There is no danger to US sovereignty. It may not
> be a US you like; but it is no danger of losing its
> sovereignty. (snip)

Kim, we've allowed millions of immigrants into this country from areas of the world openly hostile to the United States, with no method to establish their views of this country and its people. After 9-11, this is clearly not safe for Americans. Can you be so sure it is not a threat to our sovereignty? This reminds me of an old joke that is perhaps not that far from the truth; an enemy doesn't have to invade today - they can just fill out immigration papers for their entire army.

Blacks have almost the entire continent of Africa and Hispanics have almost the entire continent of South America. Perhaps you can explain why either group needs to expand to this continent, or why it is so wrong to resist that expansion. Unless we're prepared to spend lots of tourist dollars, they're certainly not rushing to open their doors to us.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

1771. Re: Element 1, Code vs. No-code, and Dad

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-27 04:09:14 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <KT0nb.4487$X22.826@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 81447

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20031024082923.15462.00003790@mb-m06.aol.com...
> In article <20031023205901.23171.00001688@mb-m05.aol.com>,
lenover21@aol.com
> (Len Over 21) writes:
>
> > Amateur radio isn't the military. It isn't a workplace. It isn't a
guild
> > or craft or union or association of professionals.
>
> Which means that the methods and standards of the military, the workplace,
the
> guild/craft/union or professional associations don't apply to amateur
radio.

Even under such an argument, the role and purpose of amateur
test requirements must be justified by more than just tradition, values and
other vague and subjective aspects.

> > It's a HOBBY.
>
> It's an avocation. Meaning it's done for its own sake.
>
> But however someone chooses to describe it, does the fact that amateur
radio
> isn't the military, a workplace, a guild or craft or union or association
of
> professionals mean that there is no need for amateur radio to have values,
and
> standards? That seems to be your main message here.

The message is the same as that stated by the FCC in R&) for 98-143...
Rules must be justified.

(SNIP)

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1772. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-27 04:18:06 UTC
From: TLB <tbryant@NOSPAM.cannet.com>
Message-ID: <4c5ppv8s3v1n6dp1d91t9h4aqsnqd8l59m@4ax.com>
Source record: 81448

On 25 Oct 2003 04:18:30 GMT, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
wrote:

>In article <G7Tkb.4374$S52.3309@newsread4.news.pas.earthlink.net>, Duane Allen
><computeruser@sprintmail.com> writes:
>
>>On a serious off-topic note, does anyone know what is being done to
>>protec the CSA graveyards. Thanks in advance.
>
>I do. The graveyards full of traitorous racist Confederates are being
>converted to HAZMAT landfill sites and leach fields. You Rebs wanted
>"states rights" so you could do such lovely things as own slaves. Well,
>now our society is trashed by the millions of descendants of those
>"slaves" who want their assets kissed with government support from
>cradle to grave. Well, I guess it is better than your blue-blood white
>trash ancestors getting their hands dirty. Of course, now we'll probably
>have to sit through all the tired old QRM about how the Civil War wasn't
>about slavery. Right.
>
>73 de Larry, K3LT

Don't be too hard on the Confederates. They didn't start the Civil War
by themselves. England was still harboring hostilities about the
Revolutionary War and the War of 1812. Getting the Southern States
agitated, and thus getting an ally, was a way to rip the country
apart. England had a lot of close ties with many Southern states, and
exploiting the animosity that the South held toward the abolitionist
North was their last-ditch effort to tear the young country apart.
Lincoln did what he had to do. Whether it was state's rights or
slavery, the South *wanted* a war, because England hadn't quit
fighting the war. General Daniel Sickles, a union general who lost a
leg at Gettysburg, even said that he'd support the South in their
state's rights efforts if they went about secession peacefully. Of
course, Fort Sumter changed all of that.

Just my two cents. I'm now going back into lurk mode.

Tom, N8ECW

1773. Re: If the written test elements are so easy, why are we all not extras?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-27 04:39:39 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031026233939.15923.00001559@mb-m12.aol.com>
Source record: 81450

In article <20031026222935.06226.00001191@mb-m19.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
writes:

>In article <3F9C4870.20107@ix.netcom.com>, Robert Casey
><wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
>writes:
>
>>"Look lid you still don't get it, I am well aware the CW test is gone, my
>>complaint still is the Give away Written."
>>
>>So why are we all not extras, then? If the writtens are so easy?
>>
>Well, for starters:
>
>1) Some hams are just not interested in HF.

Those are obviously not "real hams."

>2) Some hams are not in a position to have an HF station

No excuse. Real hams get on HF and work DX with CW.

>3) Some hams are not that interested in the relatively small amount of
>additional privileges an Extra provides

Tsk, tsk, tsk, no "service traditions of honor, glory, and reward..."

>4) Some hams have lost interest completely

OBVIOUSLY not real hams.

The CW skilled all have maximum interest, the only ones in US
amateur radio. All the rest are "knuckle-dragging CB-plussers"
according to two extras in here.

>5) Some hams haven't yet heard about the rules changes, or don't understand
>them

Inconcievable in an activity that is all about communication.

>6) Some hams haven't gotten around to visiting a VE session

There's no snow yet for all to walk barefoot uphill both ways
to the VE place...

>Note how slowly the number of Advanceds is declining. In the 42 months since
>restructuring, their numbers have only dropped by about 15%. At least half of
>that decline is expirations, so the number who have upgraded to Extra is
>pretty small even though the 20 wpm code test is long gone.

Also, according to the Parson, by inference, all the no-code-test Technicians are "not renewing." :-)

Novice class has been declining for LONGER prior to restructuring and is still declining. So? Where have all the "upgraders" gone.

And where were all those talented 20 WPM Extras existing for YEARS prior to restructuring wtihout doing any advancing of the amateur radio state of the art? Were all those just sitting around waiting for restructuring so they could piss and moan "no-coders going to do the art advancing?"

LHA

1774. Re: Element 1, Code vs. No-code, and Dad

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-27 04:39:40 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031026233940.15923.00001560@mb-m12.aol.com>
Source record: 81449

In article <UA%mb.4437$X22.1667@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dan/W4NTI"
<w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> writes:

>I just had a great QSO in the Extra part of 80cw with a 84 year old guy.
>Really enjoyed it. I was running my 40 year old Hallicrafters gear and had
>a blast with it.
>
>And I came here. Bye....back to CW.
>
>Dan/W4NTI
>
>"Clint" <rattlehead at computron dot net> wrote in message

Some folks just can't cut it on newsgroups. Say goodnight, Dan.

"Don't let the door hit you in the ass on the way out"... (courtesy of
L. Roll)

1775. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-27 04:43:55 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <fo1nb.4542$X22.1166@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 81451

"Larry Roll K3LT" wrote:
>
> (snip) If the Civil War wasn't about racism and slavery,
> then (snip)

If the Civil War was about slavery, then why was there a war at all? Prior to the war, the slave states were the majority in both the House and Senate, insuring no legislation could be passed to end slavery. Slavery was only abolished after the war by not allowing the former Confederate States (which included several, but not all, of the slave states) to participate in that vote.

> (snip) why, in it's aftermath, did one of the most famous
> Confederate Generals, Nathan Bedford Forrest,
> organize the Ku Klux Klan? (snip)

When you answer that, perhaps you can also answer why so many Northerners join the KKK.

> The South has a lot to answer for, IMHO. (snip)

Why would they have any more to answer for than the Northern states that profited from the sale of slaves? Or more to answer for than those who used indentured or bound black workers in the North, even into the early 1900's? Or more to answer for than the many countries around the world which practiced slavery in this last century (the 1900's), the previous century, or in the many centuries before that?

> (snip) Modern-day Rebels with the Confederate flags on
> their pickup trucks don't do much to heal the wounds of
> the past. (snip)

Perhaps because they have absolutely no responsibility for what happened in a past long before they were born.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

1776. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-27 05:15:38 UTC
From: groupk0hb@earthlink.net
Message-ID: <5ee63311.0310262115.48348b1d@posting.google.com>
Source record: 81452

W5NET wrote:

> Blacks have almost the entire continent of Africa and
> Hispanics have almost the entire continent of South America.
> Perhaps you can explain why either group needs to expand
> to this continent, or why it is so wrong to resist that expansion.

What a sorry-assed load of blatant racist crap! Carried a little farther, yellow people have the entire continent of Asia, white people have almost the entire continent of Europe..... what Indian, Eskimo, or Inuit tribe does Dwight Stewart belong to that gives him a right to be in North America?

With kindest warm personal regards,

de Hans, K0HB

1777. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-27 12:06:24 UTC
From: Bert Craig <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM>
Message-ID: <4T7nb.10934$ox.1014019@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>
Source record: 81453

"Hans K0HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:5ee63311.0310262115.48348b1d@posting.google.com...
> W5NET wrote:
>
> > Blacks have almost the entire continent of Africa and
> > Hispanics have almost the entire continent of South America.
> > Perhaps you can explain why either group needs to expand
> > to this continent, or why it is so wrong to resist that expansion.
>
> What a sorry-assed load of blatant racist crap! Carried a little
> farther, yellow people have the entire continent of Asia, white people
> have almost the entire continent of Europe..... what Indian, Eskimo, or
> Inuit tribe does Dwight Stewart belong to that gives him a right to be
> in North America?
>
> With kindest warm personal regards,
>
> de Hans, K0HB

Firmly seconded! Well said Hans.

73 de Bert
WA2SI

1778. Re: If the written test elements are so easy, why are we all not extras?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-27 13:29:38 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031027082938.12300.00001361@mb-m20.aol.com>
Source record: 81454

In article <20031026193924.25837.00000145@mb-m05.aol.com>, wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) writes:

>>"Look lid you still don't get it, I am well aware the CW test is gone, my
>>complaint still is the Give away Written."
>>
>>So why are we all not extras, then? If the writtens are so easy?
>>
>
>Because the Whinners

Do you mean "winners", Bruce? Because they won the argument back in 1999.

>who have cried about the CW Test, are the same Whinners
>who will start now crying about the Written.

Some of them may.

Are you worried that someone will say that the writtens need to be upgraded? Perhaps they will cite your alleged "8 minute Extra" as proof that the writtens are inadequate.

1779. Re: What If.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-27 13:29:38 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031027082938.12300.00001360@mb-m20.aol.com>
Source record: 81455

In article <gr0ppv4eosvkm2jpg1bb8oapg4jnd2ngph@4ax.com>, Leo <nomail@nope.org>
writes:

>On 27 Oct 2003 01:30:02 GMT, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:

>>It could be argued that having to identify what a particular component in a
>>schematic actually does is at least as much an indication of knowledge about
>>that schematic as is simply being able to draw it.

>True enough - although the exam I took centered almost exclusively on
>tank circuits and calculation of resonant component values..

The ones I took 30+ years ago were as described.
>
>>><snip
>>>
>>>>I've been doing it since Novice days back in 1967. Not that hard if you
>>>>start
>>>>off with simple projects and work towards more complex ones. What mode
>>>>permits
>>>>the most results from the simplest equipment? Hint: It's not SSB.
>>>
>>>Well, the Heath SSB transceiver was the most complicated piece of
>>>radio equipment that I've tackled so far for restoration.
>>
>>Which one?
>
>SB-400.

That's a transmitter, not a transceiver. ;-)

>Cosmetically OK, but a disaster inside - corroded rotary
>switches, poor solder joints, wiring errors (17 of them - including
>one which shorted out the LSB crystal - somebody must have been less
>than happy with this set ...) and of course a complete set of high-ESR
>electrolytics. Almost 50 hours on the bench to get it up and
>running....

That's probably more time than it took to build it in the first place!

>>> If I was
>>>going to try a 'designed by me' homebrew project, it would be a QRP
>>>tansmitter - fairly simple to construct and
>>>troubleshoot...comparatively, anyway!
>>
>>And it would be a transmitter for which mode?
>

>CW, most likely - I would prefer to start with something relatively
>simple.

And *there's* the connection between CW skill and technological development and self education in the ARS. Without code skill, that transmitter would be almost useless to you. With code skill, you could use it to work the world.

For hams, code skill *is* another tool in the toolbox.
>
>>Any requirements as to experience with a Basic or can a raw newbie just walk
>>in
>>and take the Advanced exam straightaway?
>
>No experience requirements (they were dropped years ago) - it is
>possible to write the Basic and Advanced exams concurrently on the
>same day.

Same thing happened to Extra 25+ years ago.
>
>>So we have almost exactly 50-50 split Basic/Advanced. Interesting to know.
>>And
>>VE amateur radio licenses total a little more than 8% of those in the USA.
>>(Of
>>course the populations are different too).
>
>33 Million in Canada, approximately 1/10 of the US, I believe...
>
More like 1/8 of US, but fairly close correlation.

>>>In addition, the total number of Canadian hams with Morse endorsements
>>>on their licence is 31,557 - approximately 55%..

>>let's see - in the USA before the recent changes it was 470,000 out of
>>675,000
>>- just under 70%.
>>
>>Looks like Canada may be the next to simply drop Morse testing, though.
>
>Haven't heard much on this so far! I posted the results of the survey
>condusted by the Radio Amateurs of Canada a while back - it has been
>submitted to Industry Canada (the FCC equivalent), but nothing since
>then. No idea how long a decision will take - we have a system of
>NPRMs here as well, and we're waiting for some indication one way or
>the other.

Check out the RAC website..

>>There was also a column in the late '40s and early '50s called "Phone Band
>>Phunnies" that described and decried certain bad habits some 'phone ops
>>tended
>>to acquire.
>

>Have a look at the following web site - a humourous view of this sort
>of thing gone wild....entitled "How To Sound Like A Lid"...
>
>http://www.dxzone.com/cgi-bin/search/frame/FrameIt.cgi?Url=http://www.dxz
one.com/cgi-bin/search/jump.cgi?ID=1750&ID=1750

I'll take a look..
>
>>Some of us, however, still design and build our own rigs. Note how we are
>>sometimes met (not by you, Leo) with disbelief and ridicule for doing
>so.......
>>
>And I really am incapable of understanding this behaviour.

Perhaps it's because I'm also in favor of code tests. You'll have to ask Len
and Brian why they do it.

>The
>ability to visualise, design and implement amateur radio equipment is
>a gift - one that the amateur community should hold in the highest
>regard.

I don't see it as a gift, just a set of skills built up over the years. There
are others much better at it than I.

>Anyone could purchase and operate a modern HT, with minimal
>training - it takes a great deal of skill to create something from
>nothing. And, for those who enjoy the traditions of the hobby,
>homebrewing harkens right back to day one!
>
Perhaps that's why they criticize it so much. It's old, it's traditional...

>>>>If we took out most of the theory questions from the written test, would
>>>>people still take the time to learn it?

>>>Good question - but removal of the theoretical questions would likely
>>>have a much more dramatic effect on the overall technical competence
>>>level within the hobby than the removal of code testing would.
>>
>>Is that really true?
>>
>>Is there a dramatic difference in the overall technical competence of
>Advanced
>>vs. Basic hams in Canada?
>>
>>Is there a dramatic difference in the overall technical competence of the
>>various license classes in the USA?
>>
>
>Not as much as there was years ago, I suspect - testing has become
>very much simplified over the last 40 years...

Same down here.
>
>The Advanced level, like the Extra, does require a fair amount of
>additional radio knowledge to pass. Is it enough? It depends - I'm
>not aware of a study that would indicate whether the goals of the
>testing were being met!

Exactly

>>>Without an understanding of radio theory, operators would be limited
>>>in their potential to grow into new areas of the hobby!
>>
>>Sure - but is it the function of the license exams to force that
>>understanding on everyone?
>>
>>In the Canadian system, if I understand it correctly, a ham who wants to
>>homebrew has to learn more theory, and a ham who only wants to use
>manufactured
>>gear can stick with the Basic. Or are there more privileges than the ability
>t>o
>>homebrew granted with the Advanced?
>>
>>In the USA, every ham can homebrew, but to get access to more HF spectrum,
>one
>>must jump through the hoop of additional written testing, even if one has no
>>intention of building anything.
>
>Here, an amateur with a Basic licence has access to all bands above 30
>MHz. Add on a Morse Code test, and full access to the bands under 30
>MHz is granted.

That was necessary because of old S25.5.
>
>The Advanced kicence, aside from providing the ability to homebrew
>transmitting equipment, provides a couple of other perks - high power
>TX operation, the ability to operate a repeater, and the ability to
>apply to become a volunteer examiner. There are a couple of other
>minor ones as well, but I don't recall them at the moment!

OK - thanks
>
>No annual renewal fees are due (these were dropped in 2000).

Annual fees? Wow!

Amateur license fees here were dropped in the '70s. VE fees are for testing
only. One fee can, in principle, be used to go from no license to Extra.

>Those with a Basic licence are encouraged to homebrew as well - only
>transmitters are legally excluded from that licence class. Modems,
>receivers, antennas - no problem.

Interesting concept!

I suppose a Basic could homebrew a transmitter, but not use it until the
Advanced license was in hand...
>
>I suppose that a basic requirement for entry into this hobby is, and
>always has been, an interest in the technical aspects of radio
>communications.

For some, yes, but for others the public service and communications aspects are
dominant. Should someone be excluded from amateur radio because they're more
interested in what the radios can do rather than how they work?

>And, for the level of freedom to experiment that this
>hobby provides, I don't feel that it is unrealistic to expect new
>licencees to be required to demonstrate technical competency, in the
>form of written exams.

I agree - but what level of competency is reasonable?
And why isn't it reasonable to require a very basic level of Morse competency,
given how popular Morse is in amateur radio vs. how popularity homebrewing is?

>I would assume that those whose desire to
>become a ham is strong enough would also be the type of folks who
>would want to continue to learn and grow. Perhaps I'm wrong - but the
>people that I have met so far (for the most part) follow this model.

Same here.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1780. Re: Why Can't Brain Just Say "Yes" Or "No"...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-27 13:42:01 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0310270542.553a3948@posting.google.com>
Source record: 81456

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0310251439.4dc14bb8@posting.google.com>...
> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0310230250.40462bd2@posting.google.com>...
> > k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0310211640.3f4dacf6@posting.google.com>...
>
> > > Remember, Brian, ANYTHING other than a carte blanche acceptance
> > > of these conditions completely voids your acceptatance as Padawan
> > > Learner, and forever bars you from stating or suggesting that any
> > > mentor-padawan relationship exists.
>
> > You've got it all wrong again, Stebe (and acceptance of all such
> > grandiose misbeliefs in Amateur Radio isn't worthy of mentorship).
>
> Nope.
>
> YOU have it all wrong, Brain.
>
> YOU claim that I am your mentor. I told you that you'd be
> required to follow certain rules and beliefs as my student.
>
> You failed to acknowledge and accept those conditions in this
> public forum, therefore you may no longer claim me as your "mentor".

Not true, Stebe. I can claim anything I want. You do.

Hey, I think you just mentored me a little more. Keep up the good work.

> > You've merely mentored me in the misspelling of peoples names. That
> > is all. You can chalk that up with all of your other misdeeds.
>
> I've "mentored" you in nothing, Brain. The act of mentoring is a
> cooperative, interactive process. Your only interaction is to act
> silly.

And here you are interacting with me of your own free will (cooperating).

> Sorry.

Noted.

Stebe is my mentor, I shall not want...

1781. Re: A Morsodist Challenge

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-27 13:45:39 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0310270545.6e208c8b@posting.google.com>
Source record: 81457

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0310251412.44e1ed6@posting.google.com>...
> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0310242354.200a51ec@posting.google.com>...
> > "Hans K0HB" <k0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<0e0bcf9156e38b6b5725ff4d921e90bc.128005@mygate.mailgate.org>...
> > > Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com> wrote
> > >
> > > > Yeah, the NoCode Agenda can get to be a bit bizzare, all right.
> > > > ....then their version of .... Morsedists Religion, blah, blah...
> > >
> > > Dick,
> > >
> > > A simple straightforward challenge for you (and the rest of rrap).
> > >
> > > During the 30 hours starting at 2100Z on Nov 1st, 2003 I will be
> > > practicing Morsodism on the HF bands in the ARRL SS Radiosport event.
> > > Keep up with me if you can.
> > >
> > > May the Peace of St. Morse shower down upon thee in abundance,
> > >
> > > de Hans, K0HB
> > > --
> > > http://home.earthlink.net/~k0hb
> >
> > Thine memory is faulty. Dick has no portable gear, and will be away
> > from thee power mains on said date.
> >
> > Dick hath no pot to pee in.
>
> Hans DID make the "challenge" to everyone, Brain...So how about
> it?

Hans specifically invited DICK.

> I have accomplished Clean Sweep's in both Phone and CW (2000 SS),
> so I know you can at least find the pot!

I'm not worried about how much pot you can find. It's the other meds
that you should be on that worry me.

> So how about it...?!?! Or are you just going to antagonize
> others about it?

Stebe, my mentor, why should I not antagonize others? You try to.

1782. Re: What makes LHA so poor at simple research tasks?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-27 13:46:22 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0310270546.29ff3fe6@posting.google.com>
Source record: 81458

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20031025204218.00545.00001883@mb-m02.aol.com>...
> In article <3F9929D9.7040906@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:
>
> >Okay, we have
> >
> >Jim, Dick, Dave, and myself as homebrewers. Anyone else?
>
> I've been doing that since 1947. Building radios and electronics
> at home doesn't take any license.
>
> I've got Greenlee chassis punches older than Parson Miccolis!
> :-)
>
> LHA

I've been home brewing beer since 1981.

1783. Re: If the written test elements are so easy, why are we all not extras?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-27 13:58:16 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031027085816.07937.00000227@mb-m13.aol.com>
Source record: 81459

>Do you mean "winners", Bruce? Because they won the argument back in 1999.

If you consider turning Ham Radio into CB, then yes your right they have WON.

>Are you worried that someone will say that the writtens need to be upgraded?

Not in the least, if anything they will be downgraded further

>Perhaps they will cite your alleged "8 minute Extra" as proof that the
>writtens
>are inadequate.

They are inadequate, I agree. The written I took for the EXTRA was a JOKE.

1784. Re: What If.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-27 14:11:36 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@nope.org>
Message-ID: <lp8qpvc5a1kq5hth11iespu85rs2nofn03@4ax.com>
Source record: 81460

>random acts of snippage below:

On 27 Oct 2003 13:29:38 GMT, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:

>In article <gr0ppv4eosvkm2jpg1bb8oapg4jnd2ngph@4ax.com>, Leo <nomail@nope.org>
>writes:

>>>>Well, the Heath SSB transceiver was the most complicated piece of
>>>>radio equipment that I've tackled so far for restoration.
>>>
>>>Which one?
>>
>>SB-400.
>
>That's a transmitter, not a transceiver. ;-)

Oops, that's correct!

@#$* - you know, one of these days I'm going to get through an entire
post without screwing something up! ;-)

>
>>Cosmetically OK, but a disaster inside - corroded rotary
>>switches, poor solder joints, wiring errors (17 of them - including
>>one which shorted out the LSB crystal - somebody must have been less
>>than happy with this set ...) and of course a complete set of high-ESR
>>electrolytics. Almost 50 hours on the bench to get it up and
>>running....
>
>That's probably more time than it took to build it in the first place!

Absolutely - once I got into it, the more stuff I found, the more
determined I became to get it fixed....

Side benefit - I understand the functional blocks and circuits
comprising an SSB transmitter much better than when I started the
project!

>

>>>Looks like Canada may be the next to simply drop Morse testing, though.
>>
>>Haven't heard much on this so far! I posted the results of the survey
>>condusted by the Radio Amateurs of Canada a while back - it has been
>>submitted to Industry Canada (the FCC equivalent), but nothing since
>>then. No idea how long a decision will take - we have a system of
>>NPRMs here as well, and we're waiting for some indication one way or

>>the other.
>
>Check out the RAC website..

Yup, the report that RAC submitted pretty much followed along with the
results of the survey that they did (which was pretty poorly
advertised, and consisted of the votes of less than 1500 of the
57,000-plus licenced amateurs up here.

I was surprised at the three licence levels proposed, though - wonder
where that came from?
>
>I suppose a Basic could homebrew a transmitter, but not use it until the
>Advanced license was in hand...

Correct. And, the radio skills acquired to enable one to successfully
design and build a homebrew transmitter would more than prepare one
for the Advanced exam.

>73 de Jim, N2EY

73, Leo

1785. Re: Element 1, Code vs. No-code, and Dad

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-27 14:14:42 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0310270614.dc21179@posting.google.com>
Source record: 81461

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20031025142932.29660.00001301@mb-m24.aol.com>...
> In article <b7d1465c.0310231215.219a8d1d@posting.google.com>, wa2si@arrl.net
> (Bert Craig) writes:
>
> (snip of excellent description of the 5 wpm code test)
>
> Here's another way for those unfamiliar with Morse to look at it:
>
> Imagine a test where the person being tested has to listen to a series of words
> spoken at a slow rate (one word every 2.4 seconds) and write down the the first
> letter of the word spoken. The same word is used for each occurrence of a
> particular letter. So a person being tested would hear something like
> "Table....History...Imagination....Salamander........Imagination...Salaman
> der......Nexus...Oval...Table
> ....History.....America......Raster.....Dominion......(etc.)
>
> and when the letters were written down, a simple message would be spelled out.
> Person being tested could go back and make corrections, too.

What a wonderful analogy. It almost makes you want to go out and
learn the code.

> That's all the Morse test is - except

Ah, a condition.

> that instead of words, there are series of short and long tones.

And there it is. If only our alphabet were two letters long, which
could be substituted with short and long tones.

1786. Re: What If.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-27 15:49:04 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3F9D3E70.2080501@psu.edu>
Source record: 81462

Leo wrote:

<some snippage>

>
> Very interesting - I haven't read "200 Meters and Down" - I'll look
> for a copy.

Very interesting reading, Leo. It should be part of the testing regimen!

> However, the regulatory agencies likely see the "trained pool of
> operators and experimenters" as the original benchmark for the
> service. What I was hoping to stimulate in this thread was some
> thought regarding what the goals of the service are relevant to today,
> and then use that as a guide to what qualifications and testing are
> relevant to meet those goals.
>
> Somehow, it's not working out quite that way.... ;)

Never does! remember that ill fated thread where I tried to get a
decent discussion going? (the troglodyte one) After review, it lasted
one post - mine.

>>>The ARS is certainly not a service born of regulations - but it exists
>>>today because the regulators allow it to do so - if we don't have a
>>>clear idea of specifically why it should continue to exist, or what it
>>>should be composed of, how can we justify it if and when the time
>>>comes? We cannot convince regulators to maintain CW testing, as an
>>>example, if the best arguement that we can come up with is "history"!
>>>It was put there by regulation for a reason - and it needs a reason to
>>>survive. Regulators don't deal in nostalgia....and if a push comes to
>>>approve a potentially multi-billion dollar rollout of a service like
>>>BPL, they are going to be hard-pressed to stave it off on our behalf
>>>without a solid justification of why the ARS is still important!
>>>
>>
>>Yes once again it is time to fight. If all we can offer is our ability to
>>TALK on the radio, there isn't much justification for the continuation of
>>Amateur Radio with all the frequency privileges we have today.
>
>
> That was one of the points that I was hoping to raise in this
> discussion. If it is a pure hobby, it is difficult to justify a lot
> of testing and qualification levels. If, however, it is to train
> folks to provide 'para-professional' backup to Emergency services,
> then the standards would be considerably higher, and qualifications

> more easily justifiable.

It isn't a pure hobby, though. If I were to be doing this as a pure
hobby, I would simply be doing PSK31, contesting, and homebrewing.
Instead I help with nets, do public service at events, and whatever
emergency service might be needed. Some hams may not, but that means
they are slacking off and shirking their civic duty, IMHO.

>>>I raised this question because, frankly, the vast majority of
>>>arguements that I have read in this newsgroup have been driven by
>>>emotion, nostalgia or historical references. If someone proposes that
>>>CW should continue to have exclusive band assignments because it is a
>>>great mode to use during emergencies due to its inherent readibility
>>>through noise, and that CW testing should continue to ensure that a
>>>pool of CW-competent operators is maintained for emergency comms, then
>>>OK, good point - maybe it should.
>>
>>Although this is a good and valid point, those who don't know code and don't
>>want to learn it have successfully outshouted the proponents of code testing
>>so that the regulators, who know nothing of the merits of the code
>>themselves, look like they are going to go along with it.
>
>
> Seems to be the direction that other administrations around the globe
> have gone - and there is indeed a strong push in North America to
> usher it out as well. Personally, I have yet to hear an arguement
> that would convince me that code testing should remain a mandatory
> requirement. I was hoping that someone would come up with a solid
> technical or functional reason that would leadd me to believe
> otherwise - but there doesn't seem to be one.

The reasons to continue Morse code testing are as valid, and solid as
those for removing it. This is not like making the prospective ham clean
out toilets with his or her personal toothbrush. It's testing for a
purpose. And all arguments for it's removal or retention are as valid as
each other. I could make the same argument for tossing out the satellite
operation questions as I could for tossing out Morse code testing.

I don't care about the details that some people try to toss out. Its the
same thing as the core.

> Although it is a valuable mode of operation, especialy in high QRM or
> QRN situations, (and fun to use!!), it was only a mandatory requirment
> originally (as I understand it, anyway) so that government (and
> commercial?) CW stations could communicate with amateurs interfering
> with their signals, and order them to stop.

This is one that I have a little trouble with, Leo. The amateurs needed
to have *some* method to communicate, and Morse code was one of the few
methods around then. SSB was just being born, voice was pretty much out
of the picture. So what's left?

> A secondary purpose may
> have been to allow emergency CW traffic to be relayed by amateur
> stations. These scenarios are no longer viable reasons in 2003 -
> unless there are new reasons to take their place, then perhaps CW
> should assume the same status as the other available operating modes -
> permitted for use, by all means, but not specifically tested by
> practical examination.
>
> My own personal position on this subject has shifted solidly over to
> the "yes, discontinue mandatory CW testing" side, in the absence of a
> logical reason to believe otherwise. I cannot recall a single
> arguement based on hard fact that justifies testing as a necessary
> requirement to becoming a licenced amateur, and operating on HF.
> There is emotion, and preference, and nostalgia, and tradition, and
> fear of the loss of a valuable skill whose value is no longer
> quantifiable - but no hard reasons.

you are correct, there are no hard reasons, no truly logical reasons to
keep Morse code testing. Or to get rid of it either. It's all opinions.

> Years ago, here in Canada, there was a special licence class required
> to operate using the Digital modes (!). This was dropped after only a
> few years. presumably because it was not demonstrated that there was
> any real benefit gained from the additional testing of digital
> proficiency. After all, the idea of a hobby is to be able to
> experiment and learn those aspects that are of interest or use to the
> individual!

Then why the heck don't they get rid of those stupid questions about
satellite operations!!!! 8^)

The reason I'm not too wild about this argument is that it reminds me
of those arguments people used to make for some of the "progressive
schools" where the student made up their own curriculum

>>> OTOH, if someone proposes that CW
>>>testing should continue because thats the way its been since the
>>>beginning of time, then - who cares? What relevance does that
>>>statement have to do with today? So what?
>>>
>>>Successful businesses have learned to do this type of review on their
>>>internal processes in order to survive, in the interest of efficiency
>>>(and, for fun, watch what happens when some idiot tells the
>>>departmental VP that something is being done because it has always
>>>been done that way - wow! - never happens twice!). If something is
>>>being done, and no one can properly justify it, then out it goes.
>>>Replaced by a new and (hopefully) better process, or abandoned
>>>altogether if no longer needed. We could learn something from this
>>>too.
>>
>>But sometimes they learn after the fact that although they couldn't come up
>>with a justification to keep something, it turns out to be necessary to
>>function efficiently and they have to reinstate it.. Although touted for

>>decades as the wave of the future, "the paperless office" still has not
>>become a reality. We always need paper documents for something.
>
>
> True - errors are certainly possible when re-engineering any complex
> process. In fact, the only guaranteed way to avoid error is do do
> nothing at all. But, to continue along without occasional review and
> adjustment can have much more serious consequences. For example, if
> Polaroid had not continually re-invented their processes over the
> years, they would still be trying to market their old 'instant
> picture' camera and film technology - which would be virtually
> unmarketable today, in an era of digital cameras and home photo
> printing technology. Those out of sync with progress do not survive.
>
> Our hobby is technologically based, too. By virtue of the fact that it
> is a hobby, though, there is no need to retire older technology in
> favour of the leading edge stuff (in fact, some hobbies exist because
> they are the only place left to find people who share their interest
> in the obsolete - Antique Radios, or Steam Trains for example). Why,
> however, would we realistically expect newcomers to the hobby to be
> forced to learn specific 'niche' areas of this, or any other
> avocation? If there is a real need to do so, then OK - make it a
> requirement. But, if there isn't - why do it? "Because that's the
> way it has always been" is not a reason to do, there must be a
> specific benefit to keeping it, or specific hazard if it is
> discontinued - complacency won't do the job. We test regulatory
> knowledge, because the operator must know the legal limits within
> which the station must be operated. We test radio knowledge, because
> operators should know enough about how the equipment functions to
> ensure that they operate it correctly, and stay within the legal
> limits. And the FCC, IC and other worldwide regulatory authorities
> tested CW proficiency because it was an ITU requirement for all
> amateurs to be proficient in the sending and receiving of CW when
> operating on the bands under 30 MHz. Solid reasons for each - reasons
> that can change as the world evolves. Without the support of the
> underlying reason,
>
>
>>>Someone has suggested that if amateur radio were invented today,
>>>without the benefit of all of the history and tradition, it would be a
>>>version of FRS or maybe CB - if that is true, we have a serious
>>>problem when industry comes knocking for more of our frequency
>>>spectrum. How do we convince the regulators that it remains an
>>>important service, if we believe that?
>>>
>>
>>Simple show them that we are a resource with unique skills and resources and
>>numbers that cannot be found in any other radio service.
>
>

> Exactly - but if we show them that what we're really interested in is
> protecting the class structure, hierarchy and outdated traditions of
> what is essentially a hobby, we're not going to convince anyone.

Here I see the fundamental nature of your approach. You see the ARS as a hobby, whereas I see it as a service. I have other things I do as hobbies, like building telescopes and grinding mirrors. Purely personal stuff that I find interesting to do. But my ARS experience is not only the homebrewing, contesting, and digital mode work, it is a way of giving back to the community. And yes, the groups we do radio comms for are part of the community, and appreciate the work we do for them. It's a personal thing, like first aid and CPR training. Them ain't hobbies.

> I believe that we need to position ourselves as forward-thinking,
> technically competent and highly motivated - ready to out our skills
> to use whenever required to do so by the various public safety and
> security organizations. Looking through the current FCC petitions
> regarding the infamous Code issue, we could easily be seen as a bunch
> of folks interested in creating unnecessary levels of proficiency
> testing within the hobby, without a real technological reason to do
> so. That will not help us, or our image, one bit.

But isn't there some contradiction in there? I can't reconcile forward thinking and reduction in knowledge together myself. I can understand why we wouldn't have questions on tube equipment on tests, but the removal of a basic method of communication that can be used worldwide that has as a drawback that it can't be learned instantaneously is beyond my comprehension. It is in place as the lowest common denominator between two communicators. To me it is like having children learn how to do longhand math before setting them loose with calculators.

Is there any value in doing longhand math now? Why should we if we have a calculator?

- Mike KB3EIA -

1787. Re: BIG AL AND FRANKY

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-27 16:33:12 UTC
From: Torbj&#65533;rn Morka <spamkiller@online.no>
Message-ID: <0Nbnb.2012$mf2.24895@news4.e.nsc.no>
Source record: 81463
Cross-posted to:
alt.ham-radio.dxing,alt.ham-radio.ssb,alt.radio.amateur,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"BIG AL" <bigal3.894.5@bigal3.894.5.com> skrev i melding
news:vmv5r2p3qa30c0@corp.supernews.com...
> WE KEPT THE QRMERS OFF 3.894.5 AGAIN TONITE WITH OUR BIG ONES. WE REIGN AS
> KINGS OF 75. HO HO
>
>
>
>

What luck someone have, since groups like this one is not moderated !

T.

1788. Re: What If.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-27 16:42:23 UTC
From: groupk0hb@earthlink.net
Message-ID: <5ee63311.0310270842.7c8904b0@posting.google.com>
Source record: 81464

Alun Palmer <alun@1stcounsel.com> wrote

> BTW, you do know that the ITU only requires ID every _15_ minutes

ITU doesn't "require", they only "recommend".

73, Hans, K0HB

1789. Re: Element 1, Code vs. No-code, and Dad

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-27 17:02:02 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0310270902.1efadd1c@posting.google.com>
Source record: 81465

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<KT0nb.4487$X22.826@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20031024082923.15462.00003790@mb-m06.aol.com...
> > In article <20031023205901.23171.00001688@mb-m05.aol.com>,
> lenover21@aol.com
> > (Len Over 21) writes:
> >
> > > Amateur radio isn't the military. It isn't a workplace. It isn't a
> guild
> > > or craft or union or association of professionals.
> >
> > Which means that the methods and standards of the military, the workplace,
> the
> > guild/craft/union or professional associations don't apply to amateur
> radio.
>
> Even under such an argument, the role and purpose of amateur
> test requirements must be justified by more than just tradition, values and
> other vague and subjective aspects.

With all due respect, Bill,

Isn't that statement really a subjective opinion? I mean, when you get
right down to it, almost everything in the test process is there or is
not there because of someone's subjective opinion that it's
"reasonable" or "necessary".
>
> > > It's a HOBBY.
> >
> > It's an avocation. Meaning it's done for its own sake.
> >
> > But however someone chooses to describe it, does the fact that amateur
> > radio
> > isn't the military, a workplace, a guild or craft or union or association
> > of
> > professionals mean that there is no need for amateur radio to have values,
> > and
> > standards? That seems to be your main message here.
>
> The message is the same as that stated by the FCC in R&) for 98-143...
> Rules must be justified.
>
> (SNIP)

Sure - that's the easy part. The tough part is "what constitutes justification?"

And the point I was making still remains valid. Since amateur radio is not the military, a workplace, a guild or craft or union or association of professionals, its requirements should not be governed by those groups.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1790. Re: Amateur Radio in the 21st Century?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-27 17:17:42 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0310270917.2668311b@posting.google.com>
Source record: 81466

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<7O0nb.4484$X22.1484@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20031024182942.12300.00001303@mb-m20.aol.com...
> > In article <3F993128.6080401@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:
> >
> > >> Yep - with reduced privileges. Not necessarily a bad idea. All they're
> > >> really
> > >> doing is reinventing the Novice.
> > >
> > > I'm still not so hot on the idea.
> >
> > All depends on what the balance of requirements vs. privileges is. As it
> > stands
> > right now, our "entry level" license is heavily weighted to VHF/UHF.
>
> I agree and of all the licensing decisions made under 98-143,
> the ending of Novice was, IMHO, not a good idea.

But...but...Bill, the FCC thought it was a good idea! Are you saying
FCC made a mistake? ;-)

> That said,
> I think once the dust settles from the code "test" issue, then
> perhaps ARRL may wish to take a top down look at licensing,
> licensing requirements and the concurrent privileges associated
> with each.

KL7CC & Co. have already done so. Have you read their paper?

> > >>> Especially charming is the idea that people with a 6th grade education
> > >>>are going to supply us with fresh ideas.
>
> > >> I got started in ham radio between 6th and 7th grades.....
>
> > > Were you "average" Jim?
> >
> > In some things yes, in others no.
> >
> > >I was involved in electronics when I was in 5th
> > >grade, but no one else around me was. I'm not at all against kids of
> > >any particular age being involved in Ham radio, but that "average 6th
> > >grader thing is bothersome.
> >
> > Heck, the "average" sixth grader in some American neighborhoods is quite

> > different from his/her "average" counterpart elsewhere.
> >
> > Perhaps a better way to word that idea is "the entry level syllabus and
> > test
> > should not require a knowledge of math, science or English above the
> > sixth-grade level in order to understand the material".
> >
> > >>>Next:
> > >>>
> > >>>
> > >>>>Whatever we come up with, it will have to fit within the FCC budget.
> > >>>>This probably means that in all likelihood what will happen, assuming
> > >>>>that the idea of a beginner's class license is even accepted at all,
> > >>>>is that they (the FCC) will juggle the existing 3 classes to
> > >>>>accommodate the new structure. Technician will change from what it
> > >>>>is now to the basic license. It may be named "Communicator" or
> > >>>>simply left as Technician. Let's assume it gets the name
> > >>>>"Communicator". All existing Techs will be upgraded to General.
> > >>>>Assuming that the Morse requirement is removed first, our opinion
> > >>>>is that most of the Techs will take (and hopefully pass) the element
> > >>>>3 exam as soon as they can, thus becoming General class licensees.
> > >>>
> > >>> Assuming indeed! They figure that people are going to study and pay >
> > >>
> > >> for
> > >>
> > >>>a test in order to get priveleges they will get anyhow? If a Technician
> > >>>flunks the test, all he or she has to do is wait a while, than he/she
> > >>>will get the priveleges anyhow.
> > >>
> > >>
> > >> Exactly!
> > >>
> > >>
> > >>> That sounds a LOT like simplification to me.
> > >>
> > >>
> > >> Sounds like a giveaway to me. And it sets a very bad precedent: If it's
> OK
> to
> > >> give all Techs a free upgrade to General, why not throw away most of
> the
> > >> General question pool and use the Tech one instead?
> > >>
> > >>>>Remember, that before the changes that created the present no-code
> > >>>>tech, the General and Tech exams were identical. Only the code
> > >>>>separated them, and even there it was only the difference between
> > >>>>5 and 13 WPM.
> > >>>
> > >>>But its not that way now.

>
> > >> And it wasn't that way back when the Tech code test changes were made!
> > >
> > > hehe, things aren't like they used to be, and they never were! 8^)
> >
> > "They remember a past that never was"
>
> What are they remembering that wasn't? The tech written was the same as
> the General as someone wrote above up to 1987 as you note below.

Direct quote:

"Remember, that before the changes that created the present no-code
tech, the General and Tech exams were identical. Only the code
separated them, and even there it was only the difference between
5 and 13 WPM."

That sentence, and the lack of other clarification, says that the
General and Tech writtens were the same right up to when the Tech lost
its code test in 1991. That's simply not the case - the written was
split almost 4 years earlier.

Note that the paper wants to give *all* Techs a free upgrade to
General! It also ignores the fact that any Tech who got that license
before March 1987 is already able to upgrade to General with no
additional testing. And it's been that way since April 15, 2000. And
that's not a giveaway because those folks *did* pass the same written
as Generals.

> > >> Quick history:
> > >>
> > >> From 1951 to March 1987, the General and Tech had the same written. In
> > >> March of
> > >> 1987 the General was split into two elements, 3A for Tech and 3B for
> > >> General.
> > >> Almost four years later (February 1991), the Tech lost its code test.
> > >>
> > >> This isn't ancient history, and anybody writing a policy paper should
> know
> > >> how
> > >> the previous system came to be. And it's not the only factual mistake
> in
> > >> the paper.
>
> > > >>>And finally, before I forget about how I was charmed about the glasses
> > > >>>reference, I have to congratulate the authors on their humorous
> > > >>>treatment of Pro coders:
> > > >>>
> > > >>>(more from the

> > >> KL7CC paper)
> > >>

> > >>>>So, there are no "Morse code haters" on the committee.
> > >>>>There is no conspiracy, no secret agenda, no kickback from the
> > >>>>manufacturers, no "black plan" from the ARRL, no anything. Just some
> > >>>>guys that want nothing more than to see our great hobby prosper for
> > >>>>the next hundred years, or longer.
> > >>>
> > >>>and (I had to put this in again):
> > >>>
> > >>>>You know, fresh ideas, new blood, people that can actually see
> > >>>>their radios without having to put on glasses - what a concept!
> > >>>
> > >>>and:
>
> > >>>>A few final words:
> > >>>>There are no black helicopters.
> > >>>
> > >>>I guess those who believe in the Morse code test believe there are?
>
> > >> See what I mean about undertone?
> > > >
> > >I bet they love their families more than PCTA's too!
> >
> I recycle.
> > >
> > >>>>Do you suppose the committee members just want to see our wonderful
> > >>>>hobby prosper? Wouldn't that be an odd reason for doing what they
> are
> > >>>>doing?
> > >>>
> > >>>Apparently those of us who believe in a Morse code test *don't* want to
> > >>>see our wonderful hobby prosper!
>
> > >> If the ideas are good ideas, they will stand on their merit. The person
> > >> histories of the committee members is not the issue. If they're such
> great
> > >> folks, why don't they let the merits of their ideas convicne us?
> > >>
> > >> Quick aside: I first became aware of W5YI about ten years ago when my
> > >> license
> > >> needed to be renewed. I got this official looking letter saying that
> for
> > >> just
> > >> $5 they'd help me renew my license. All I had to do was fill in the
> form,
> sign
> > >> it, write a check for $5 and send it to them.
> > >>
> > >> Never mind that I'd been dealing with the FCC since I was 13 and had
> renewed
> > >> and modified my license at least 9 times before with no problems at

> all.
> They
> > >> thought I needed "help".
> > >
> > > Perhaps their target audience needs the help? 8^)
> >
> > Maybe?
> > >
> > ><snippage>
> > >
> > >>>And the answer to the question of who I'm going to talk to if there are
> > >>>no manufacturers..... Well you know , don't ya Jim?
> > >>
> > >>
> > >> Who, me?
> > >
> > > Yeah, you!!
> > >
> > More folks like me? Who don't "take the practical approach"?
> >
> > ><more snippage>
>
> > >>> I'm not talking about Carl either. I know that neither he nor Bill
> Sohl
> > >>>are in favor of reductions in the qualifications to get a license (save
> > >>>removal of the Morse code test)
> > >>
> > >> And they've been very clear about that.
> > >>
> > >>> That's really nice. It also *may* mean that they will someday be
> > >>>considered the Luddites along with us troglodyte Pro code testers as
> the
> > >>>requirements to get a license are relaxed more and more.
>
> > >> You got my point exactly.
> > >
> > > I may have proposed this once (quite tongue in cheek) but one of the
> > >proposals was that the prospective amateur sign a paper stating how he
> > >or she had read and understood part 97.
> >
> > I had to read that part of the KL7CC paper twice because I didn't believe
> it
> > the first time! And they're talking about the *rules and regs*!!
> >
> > Once upon a time, FCC tried that approach with another radio service.
> Didn't
> > work very well.
>
> The real problem with CB at the time and to this day was the "buy it
> anywhere"

> ability at prices net to nothing. Even in the early 70s CBs were less than
> $50.

I never saw them that cheap, but then again, I wasn't looking.

But what you are effectively saying, Bill, is that the real problem
with cb was "lack of investment" by many who used it. They did not
take it seriously because they had invested only a few dollars and
practically no time or effort into getting set up.

Does that mean if cb sets had cost, say, $500 back then instead of
$50, that service would not have become such a mess?

Almost sounds like a new version of "what isn't worked for isn't
valued"

> Same is true today for FRS...but the good thing about FRS is the
> lack of any real DX ability.
>
> > >Why not extrapolate that to the
> > >whole test? Just think how easy the testing process would be! By gosh,
> > >we could get [people to sign that they had the equivalent knowlege of
> > >anything. The ARS could be populated by geniuses!
> >
> > Exactly! No more need for VEC sessions and all that paperwork. If that
> > approach
> > is valid for the rules, why not the whole test?
> >
> > But the part of that paper I found most "amusing" was where the prime
> > author
> > admitted that he could not pass the current written test for the license
> > he
> > holds. It is written in such a way that he almost sounds proud of that
> > fact. As
> > dear departed N0BK would say: Surreal.
>
> One problem we have discused before is the stupid focus on some
> testing on elements of the rules that very few hams ever engage in...space
> communications for example. Better to test on what we really want
> most hams to be knowledgeable on that VEC qualifications, etc.

It used to seem to me that the one thing we could all agree on was
that the basic regulations (not talking about the fine-print stuff,
just the basics) were one subject that absolutely had to be tested
for. But the KL7CC paper suggests doing away with most of that!
Surreal...

73 de Jim, N2EY

1791. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-27 18:06:40 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0310271006.3fc96081@posting.google.com>
Source record: 81467

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:<fo1nb.4542$X22.1166@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> "Larry Roll K3LT" wrote:
> >
> > (snip) If the Civil War wasn't about racism and slavery,
> > then (snip)
>
>
> If the Civil War was about slavery, then why was there a war at all?

Because the states with the most slaves could see that eventually they
would either have to face the complete abolition of slavery *or* leave
the Union.

> Prior
> to the war, the slave states were the majority in both the House and Senate,
> insuring no legislation could be passed to end slavery.

When? Check a map of 1860. There were 19 slave states, of which 4
stayed in the Union. Delaware was a slave state but it did not secede.

> Slavery was only
> abolished after the war by not allowing the former Confederate States (which
> included several, but not all, of the slave states) to participate in that
> vote.

The Emancipation Proclamation was written in 1863. It legally freed
most (but not all) of the slaves.

> > The South has a lot to answer for, IMHO. (snip)

> Why would they have any more to answer for than the Northern states that
> profited from the sale of slaves?

Which states were they? Slavery was abolished in the North by 1804. In
many northern states it was abolished before the Constitution was
written.

> Or more to answer for than those who used
> indentured or bound black workers in the North, even into the early 1900's?

Where was that done?

Indentured servitude is in no way comparable to slavery, btw.
Indentured servants *voluntarily* agree to work for a specified period
of time, usually as payment for training or a debt.

> Or more to answer for than the many countries around the world which
> practiced slavery in this last century (the 1900's), the previous century,
> or in the many centuries before that?

> > (snip) Modern-day Rebels with the Confederate flags on
> > their pickup trucks don't do much to heal the wounds of
> > the past. (snip)
>
> Perhaps because they have absolutely no responsibility for what happened
> in a past long before they were born.

All depends on what that flag is meant to symbolize.

--

Here's what I learned about the War Between the States:

First off, it didn't start as a war to end slavery, but rather as a
war to keep the Union together. Lincoln's early (1861-1862) writings
make it clear his focus *at that time* was on preserving the Union at
almost any cost.

The Constitution, for all its wisdom, did not have any clear provision
for what should be done if one or more state(s) decided that they
simply wanted out of the Union at one point or another.

When the Constitution was written, there was a fairly even balance
between slave and free states. Compromises were reached in order to
get the new Union formed as a country rather than a confederation.
These were compromises with evil, and they could not last forever.

But over time the two parts of the US developed in such radically
different ways that the compromises and balance could no longer be
maintained. It was clear by 1855 or so that slavery's days were
numbered because eventually the abolitionists would reach enough of a
political majority to simply outlaw it everywhere. The trend was clear
- it was only a matter of time. Revolts like John Brown's and the
strengthening abolitionist movement made the moral issue unavoidable,
and the Supremes were starting to come around, too.

So, given the choice between leaving the Union or abolishing slavery,
15 states tried to leave. Some outside the 15 states said "Let them
go", but it was clear to Lincoln and others that if even one state was
allowed to secede, the Union would eventually fragment - and those
fragments would be ripe for takeover from other countries, many of
whom were patiently waiting for the "American experiment" to fail.

Once the war began, however, it slowly became clear to Lincoln and
many others that what had caused the split in the first place was the
idea that a country could proclaim itself "free" and yet allow
slavery. It became clear to him that the only way to preserve the
Union was to abolish slavery completely. Thus the Emancipation
Proclamation and the constitutional amendment.

Is any of the above incorrect?

What's interesting is that Great Britain, from whom the colonies split on the issue of "all men [sic] are created equal", abolished slavery years before the USA did.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1792. Re: A Morsodist Challenge

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-27 18:07:34 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0310271007.57405ba5@posting.google.com>
Source record: 81468

brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0310270545.6e208c8b@posting.google.com>...
> k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0310251412.44e1ed6@posting.google.com>...
> > brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0310242354.200a51ec@posting.google.com>...
> > > "Hans K0HB" <k0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<0e0bcf9156e38b6b5725ff4d921e90bc.128005@mygate.mailgate.org>...
> > > > Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com> wrote
> > > >
> > > > > Yeah, the NoCode Agenda can get to be a bit bizzare, all right.
> > > > > ....then their version of .... Morsedists Religion, blah, blah...
> > > >
> > > > Dick,
> > > >
> > > > A simple straightforward challenge for you (and the rest of rrap).
> > > >
> > > > During the 30 hours starting at 2100Z on Nov 1st, 2003 I will be
> > > > practicing Morsodism on the HF bands in the ARRL SS Radiosport event.
> > > > Keep up with me if you can.
> > > >
> > > > May the Peace of St. Morse shower down upon thee in abundance,
> > > >
> > > > de Hans, K0HB
> > > > --
> > > > http://home.earthlink.net/~k0hb
> > >
> > > Thine memory is faulty. Dick has no portable gear, and will be away
> > > from thee power mains on said date.
> > >
> > > Dick hath no pot to pee in.
> >
> > Hans DID make the "challenge" to everyone, Brain...So how about
> > it?
>
> Hans specifically invited DICK.
>
> > I have accomplished Clean Sweep's in both Phone and CW (2000 SS),
> > so I know you can at least find the pot!
>
> I'm not worried about how much pot you can find. It's the other meds
> that you should be on that worry me.
>
> > So how about it...?!?! Or are you just going to antagonize

> > others about it?
>
> Stebe, my mentor, why should I not antagonize others? You try to.

I only "antagonize" those who do me first...That would be you.

Steve, K4YZ

1793. Re: Why Can't Brain Just Say "Yes" Or "No"...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-27 18:11:14 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0310271011.66cea6a0@posting.google.com>
Source record: 81469

brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0310270542.553a3948@posting.google.com>...
> k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0310251439.4dc14bb8@posting.google.com>...
> > brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0310230250.40462bd2@posting.google.com>...
> > > k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0310211640.3f4dacf6@posting.google.com>...
>
> > > > Remember, Brian, ANYTHING other than a carte blanche acceptance
> > > > of these conditions completely voids your acceptatance as Padawan
> > > > Learner, and forever bars you from stating or suggesting that any
> > > > mentor-padawan relationship exists.
>
> > > You've got it all wrong again, Stebe (and acceptance of all such
> > > grandiose misbeliefs in Amateur Radio isn't worthy of mentorship).
> >
> > Nope.
> >
> > YOU have it all wrong, Brain.
> >
> > YOU claim that I am your mentor. I told you that you'd be
> > required to follow certain rules and beliefs as my student.
> >
> > You failed to acknowledge and accept those conditions in this
> > public forum, therefore you may no longer claim me as your "mentor".
>
> Not true, Stebe. I can claim anything I want. You do.

Not true.

I'll ask you to provide some relative post...?!?!

> Hey, I think you just mentored me a little more. Keep up the good work.

Nope. Requires a voluntary interaction.

You refused to accept the conditions...Anything else is a lie on your part...

But then you're USED to lying, aren't you, Brain?
>
> > > You've merely mentored me in the misspelling of peoples names. That
> > > is all. You can chalk that up with all of your other misdeeds.
> >
> > I've "mentored" you in nothing, Brain. The act of mentoring is a
> > cooperative, interactive process. Your only interaction is to act

> > silly.
>
> And here you are interacting with me of your own free will (cooperating).

"Cooperating"...?!?!

Hardly.

> > Sorry.
>
> Noted.
>
> Stebe is my mentor, I shall not want...

Brian Burke is a liar...He'll ALWAYS want...

Steve, K4YZ

1794. Re: A Morsodist Challenge

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-27 18:46:38 UTC
From: groupk0hb@earthlink.net
Message-ID: <5ee63311.0310271046.9eb0f02@posting.google.com>
Source record: 81470

brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote

>
> Hans specifically invited DICK.
>

"and the rest of rrap". Hopefully I'll find N0IMD in my log between
012100Z Nov 03 and 030300Z Nov 03 also?

73, de Hans, K0HB
--
http://home.earthlink.net/~k0hb/id7.html

1795. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-27 18:47:32 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <8Ldnb.6341$X22.4219@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 81471

"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
news:c2356669.0310271006.3fc96081@posting.google.com...
> "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:<fo1nb.4542$X22.1166@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> > "Larry Roll K3LT" wrote:
> > >
> > > (snip) If the Civil War wasn't about racism and slavery,
> > > then (snip)
> > >
> > >
> > If the Civil War was about slavery, then why was there a war at all?
> >
> Because the states with the most slaves could see that eventually they
> would either have to face the complete abolition of slavery *or* leave
> the Union.
>
> > Prior
> > to the war, the slave states were the majority in both the House and
Senate,
> > insuring no legislation could be passed to end slavery.
> >
> When? Check a map of 1860. There were 19 slave states, of which 4
> stayed in the Union. Delaware was a slave state but it did not secede.
>
> > Slavery was only
> > abolished after the war by not allowing the former Confederate States
(which
> > included several, but not all, of the slave states) to participate in
that
> > vote.
> >
> The Emancipation Proclamation was written in 1863. It legally freed
> most (but not all) of the slaves.
>
> > > The South has a lot to answer for, IMHO. (snip)
> >
> > Why would they have any more to answer for than the Northern states
that
> > profited from the sale of slaves?
> >
> Which states were they? Slavery was abolished in the North by 1804. In
> many northern states it was abolished before the Constitution was
> written.
>

> > Or more to answer for than those who used
> > indentured or bound black workers in the North, even into the early
1900's?
>
> Where was that done?
>
> Indentured servitude is in no way comparable to slavery, btw.
> Indentured servants *voluntarily* agree to work for a specified period
> of time, usually as payment for training or a debt.
>
> > Or more to answer for than the many countries around the world which
> > practiced slavery in this last century (the 1900's), the previous
century,
> > or in the many centuries before that?
>
> > > (snip) Modern-day Rebels with the Confederate flags on
> > > their pickup trucks don't do much to heal the wounds of
> > > the past. (snip)
> >
> > Perhaps because they have absolutely no responsibility for what
happened
> > in a past long before they were born.
>
> All depends on what that flag is meant to symbolize.
>
> --
>
> Here's what I learned about the War Between the States:
>
> First off, it didn't start as a war to end slavery, but rather as a
> war to keep the Union together. Lincoln's early (1861-1862) writings
> make it clear his focus *at that time* was on preserving the Union at
> almost any cost.
>
> The Constitution, for all its wisdom, did not have any clear provision
> for what should be done if one or more state(s) decided that they
> simply wanted out of the Union at one point or another.
>
> When the Constitution was written, there was a fairly even balance
> between slave and free states. Compromises were reached in order to
> get the new Union formed as a country rather than a confederation.
> These were compromises with evil, and they could not last forever.
>
> But over time the two parts of the US developed in such radically
> different ways that the compromises and balance could no longer be
> maintained. It was clear by 1855 or so that slavery's days were
> numbered because eventually the abolitionists would reach enough of a
> political majority to simply outlaw it everywhere. The trend was clear
> - it was only a matter of time. Revolts like John Brown's and the
> strengthening abolitionist movement made the moral issue unavoidable,

> and the Supremes were starting to come around, too.
>
> So, given the choice between leaving the Union or abolishing slavery,
> 15 states tried to leave. Some outside the 15 states said "Let them
> go", but it was clear to Lincoln and others that if even one state was
> allowed to secede, the Union would eventually fragment - and those
> fragments would be ripe for takeover from other countries, many of
> whom were patiently waiting for the "American experiment" to fail.
>
> Once the war began, however, it slowly became clear to Lincoln and
> many others that what had caused the split in the first place was the
> idea that a country could proclaim itself "free" and yet allow
> slavery. It became clear to him that the only way to preserve the
> Union was to abolish slavery completely. Thus the Emancipation
> Proclamation and the constitutional amendment.
>
> Is any of the above incorrect?
>
> What's interesting is that Great Britain, from whom the colonies split
> on the issue of "all men [sic] are created equal", abolished slavery
> years before the USA did.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

Jim,

Much of what you seem to believe is based on the falsehood that the
Emancipation Proclamation
actually freed slaves. The proclamation ONLY APPLIED to those states in
rebellion against the Union.

Unfortunately those same states were not a part of the union at the time the
proclamation was issued.

Thus the proclamation applied to no one under the authority and/or control
of the then fragemented Union.

The slavery issue was indeed a major part of the root cause of the war
between the states. BUT a major other cause was that of states rights. And
whether we would be a republic or a federalist government. The struggle
continues to this day.

We are called a constitutional government, or a republic, or a democracy.
The reality is we are none of , and all of that. The founding fathers NEVER
intended for the federal government to have so much authority and control
over the states. That was a major reason the Southern states left. Lincoln
had NO RIGHT, or authorization to FORCE the South to rejoin the union. The
whole war was a major mistake, and to the victors go the spoils, and the
ones that write the history.

You may ask how, or why, do I say these things? Because I was raised in the
North, a world class Yankee state of Ohio. I was educated by the

Northerners on this subject. And before I came to Alabama I too believed it hook line and sinker. No longer.

The South was right. We all lost that war, look at the mess we have in DC now. Think about it.

Dan/W4NTI

1796. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-27 18:48:39 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <bMdnb.6342$X22.3617@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 81472

"Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in message
news:4T7nb.10934$ox.1014019@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net...
> "Hans K0HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:5ee63311.0310262115.48348b1d@posting.google.com...
> > W5NET wrote:
> >
> > > Blacks have almost the entire continent of Africa and
> > > Hispanics have almost the entire continent of South America.
> > > Perhaps you can explain why either group needs to expand
> > > to this continent, or why it is so wrong to resist that expansion.
> >
> > What a sorry-assed load of blatant racist crap! Carried a little
> > farther, yellow people have the entire continent of Asia, white people
> > have almost the entire continent of Europe..... what Indian, Eskimo, or
> > Inuit tribe does Dwight Stewart belong to that gives him a right to be
> > in North America?
> >
> > With kindest warm personal regards,
> >
> > de Hans, K0HB
>
> Firmly seconded! Well said Hans.
>
> 73 de Bert
> WA2SI
>
>

Hard to believe, Bert and Hans have fallen for the liberal agenda.

Dan/W4NTI

1797. ARRL has no FIRE for sale?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-27 18:54:10 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031027135410.25517.00001648@mb-m15.aol.com>
Source record: 81473

As of 1300 EST on 27 Oct 03, the ARRL news page has not one word about the many fires in California which have consumed a quarter million acres (half the land area of Rhode Island), over 500 homes destroyed, over 11 dead, now in its 5th day. Over 5000 firemen are deployed and personnel and equipment from six western states are arriving to help firefighters in an area from Ventura County to the Mexican border.

Where are all the "emergency ham teams" who are supposed to jump like minutemen into all the disaster work?

All the ARRL news page has on it are a single "In Brief" squib about "Montana hams receive recognition" for the long-past Montana wildfires. PAST news.

The nice comfy northereasterners apparently don't recognize much of the western states of the USA, hardly have in the past. They only consider hurricanes and floods as emergencies...because those things happen in the east. Nice "representation of all" by the League?

Yup, there's the premier amateur radio communications outfit sitting up there in Newington with the Internet at its disposal (not to mention W1AW) and can't get the word out. Too busy being "representative for all amateurs?" Lots of nice newsy stuff elsewhere, especially localized along the east coast.

Center of population for the USA is well WEST of the Mississippi and California has the greatest population of any state in the Union and on par in population with all of Canada. Apparently "6-land" doesn't exist in the thinking of new englanders.

LHA

1798. Re: What If.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-27 20:14:00 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@nope.org>
Message-ID: <ltqqpvkd048ace0f5djndp762453an7a37@4ax.com>
Source record: 81474

Thanks, Mike - my responses are in the text below.

>....whole lotta snippage goin' on.....

On Mon, 27 Oct 2003 10:49:04 -0500, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote:

>Never does! remember that ill fated thread where I tried to get a
>decent discussion going? (the troglodyte one) After review, it lasted
>one post - mine.

Yup, I remember that one well! Wonder why that happens....this thread
went a bit farther, but keeps branching out into other topics, with
the requisite bashings of the participants.
>

>It isn't a pure hobby, though. If I were to be doing this as a pure
>hobby, I would simply be doing PSK31, contesting, and homebrewing.
>Instead I help with nets, do public service at events, and whatever
>emergency service might be needed. Some hams may not, but that means
>they are slacking off and shirking their civic duty, IMHO.
>
Good point - the ability to use the hobby for community service is
pretty unique to amateur radio. (try that with R/C model planes, or
Civil War re-enactment!.....).
>
> The reasons to continue Morse code testing are as valid, and solid as
>those for removing it. This is not like making the prospective ham clean
>out toilets with his or her personal toothbrush. It's testing for a
>purpose. And all arguments for it's removal or retention are as valid as
>each other. I could make the same argument for tossing out the satellite
>operation questions as I could for tossing out Morse code testing.
>
>I don't care about the details that some people try to toss out. Its the
>same thing as the core.

...the only difference is that the written testing consists of a
question or so on satelite operation - Morse continues as a complete
syllabus and test in its own right. I'm not convinced that it is
quite that important anymore to warrant this.

I do see your point, though - we'll have to 'agree to disagree', I
suppose...(a rare achievement in this newsgroup <8*p)
>
>
>> Although it is a valuable mode of operation, especialy in high QRM or
>> QRN situations, (and fun to use!!), it was only a mandatory requirment

>> originally (as I understand it, anyway) so that government (and
>> commercial?) CW stations could communicate with amateurs interfering
>> with their signals, and order them to stop.
>
> This is one that I have a little trouble with, Leo. The amateurs needed
>to have *some* method to communicate, and Morse code was one of the few
>methods around then. SSB was just being born, voice was pretty much out
>of the picture. So what's left?

Here's the way I understand this one:

Agree that there most certainly was a time when CW was all that was
available to amateur operators (and was heavily used for commercial
radio as well as landline operations too).

Then, if an amateur were to be allowed to go on the air with no code
training, what would the impact to amateur radio be? You would have a
guy sending signals out that no one could understand, or answer. A
very frustrated operator, most likely - but no real damage to the
service itself. However, if that guy was interfering with commercial
or governmental traffic, and did not know enough code to understand
their signals to clear off the band immediately, major problems would
be possible. Multiply this by the number of amateurs playing around
with radio, and it would be a huge problem. CW proficiency testing
pior to licence issuance would be a big step towards preventing
situations like this one.

Now, with virtually no one using code except amateurs, and all of that
strictly within the amateur bands, this problem seems to be a thing of
the past. Just like a guy who sets up an improperly-functioning RTTY
setup (like I jusy did, a couple of nights ago...) - no major problem
- and no two way communications, either :)
>
>
>
>> A secondary purpose may
>> have been to allow emergency CW traffic to be relayed by amateur
>> stations. These scenarios are no longer viable reasons in 2003 -
>> unless there are new reasons to take their place, then perhaps CW
>> should assume the same status as the other available operating modes -
>> permitted for use, by all means, but not specifically tested by
>> practical examination.
>>
>> My own personal position on this subject has shifted solidly over to
>> the "yes, discontinue mandatory CW testing" side, in the absence of a
>> logical reason to believe otherwise. I cannot recall a single
>> arguement based on hard fact that justifies testing as a necessary
>> requirement to becoming a licenced amateur, and operating on HF.
>> There is emotion, and preference, and nostalgia, and tradition, and
>> fear of the loss of a valuable skill whose value is no longer
>> quantifiable - but no hard reasons.

>
>you are correct, there are no hard reasons, no truly logical reasons to
>keep Morse code testing. Or to get rid of it either. It's all opinions.

Agree, to a point. There don't seem to be any logical reasons to keep
CW testing (I was hoping that this thread would flesh them out...).
OTOH, there is a reason to discontinue CW testing - the reason being
that CW is (for all practical purposes) no longer any more important
than any other available operating mode, today, in 2003. As such, is
it fair to compel people to learn and pass a practical test on one
mode in deference to all others? I don't see it!
>
>
>> Years ago, here in Canada, there was a special licence class required
>> to operate using the Digital modes (!). This was dropped after only a
>> few years. presumably because it was not demonstrated that there was
>> any real benefit gained from the additional testing of digital
>> proficiency. After all, the idea of a hobby is to be able to
>> experiment and learn those aspects that are of interest or use to the
>> individual!
>
> Then why the heck don't they get rid of those stupid questions about
>satellite operations!!!! 8^)

Don't know - I think that's one of the ones I got wrong anyway....

>
> The reason I'm not too wild about this argument is that it reminds me
>of those arguments people used to make for some of the "progressive
>schools" where the student made up their own curriculum

Likewise, if the school board decided that "The Adz, Plane , Bow Saw
And Other Pioneer Tools" was to become a seperate mandatory subject,
which must be studied and passed prior to gaining a trade
certification in Carpentry - that would be equally wrong. It is
interesting to some (and at one time, the only way to build a log
cabin), but not relevant enough to be given its own course today.
Still, there are those who enjoy building with these types of tools -
more power to 'em!

>
>Here I see the fundamental nature of your approach. You see the ARS as a
>hobby, whereas I see it as a service. I have other things I do as
>hobbies, like building telescopes and grinding mirrors. Purely personal
>stuff that I find interesting to do. But my ARS experience is not only
>the homebrewing, contesting, and digital mode work, it is a way of
>giving back to the community. And yes, the groups we do radio comms for
>are part of the community, and appreciate the work we do for them. It's
>a personal thing, like first aid and CPR training. Them ain't hobbies.

You're right - for me, at least so far, it is only a hobby . Since I'm
relatively new to the avocation (a year and a half, so far), I'm still

in learning mode - I am interested in getting involved with ARES, and
may do so in the next few months or so, time permitting.

BTW - grinding mirrors? Now there's something that requires a lot of
patience! Wow!
>
>
>> I believe that we need to position ourselves as forward-thinking,
>> technically competent and highly motivated - ready to out our skills
>> to use whenever required to do so by the various public safety and
>> security organizations. Looking through the current FCC petitions
>> regarding the infamous Code issue, we could easily be seen as a bunch
>> of folks interested in creating unnecessary levels of proficiency
>> testing within the hobby, without a real technological reason to do
>> so. That will not help us, or our image, one bit.
>
>But isn't there some contradiction in there? I can't reconcile forward
>thinking and reduction in knowledge together myself. I can understand
>why we wouldn't have questions on tube equipment on tests, but the
>removal of a basic method of communication that can be used worldwide
>that has as a drawback that it can't be learned instantaneously is
>beyond my comprehension. It is in place as the lowest common denominator
>between two communicators. To me it is like having children learn how to
>do longhand math before setting them loose with calculators.
>
>Is there any value in doing longhand math now? Why should we if we have
>a calculator?

But there is a technolgical reason in continuing to teach longhand
division - and that is, without knowing how it works, how will you
know when the calculators' answer is incorrect? (My kids have
demonstrated this concept to me many times.....they tend to believe
whatever answer the thing displays, without applying logic to see if
they entered something wrong - grrr) And for that reason, I think
that the current level of testing that we do to become an amateur is
not enough - as I have explained in previous threads, the level of
technical knowledge has dropped considerably over time. Longhand is
the check-and-balance for the answer presented by the calculator.

I don't quite see the analogy to CW, though - sure, if SSB
communications are not possible CW could be used to get through. But
the rest of the world is moving away from it (first the commercial and
government users, and now amateur administrations all over the world)
- I'd suggest that if there was any value to retaining it even as a
back-up mode of communications, it would have been retained by
someone.

I'd think, anyway.

>
> - Mike KB3EIA -

73, Leo

1799. Re: Element 1, Code vs. No-code, and Dad

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-27 20:18:00 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <Y3fnb.132704$qj6.9126720@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 81475

N2EY wrote:

> With all due respect, Bill,
>
> Isn't that statement really a subjective opinion? I mean, when you get
> right down to it, almost everything in the test process is there or is
> not there because of someone's subjective opinion that it's
> "reasonable" or "necessary".

It's all an opinion, Jim. Those who believe they are blessed with the "facts" in this issue are practicing self delusion.

- Mike KB3EIA -

1800. Re: ARRL has no FIRE for sale?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-27 21:39:30 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0310271339.15e7e1df@posting.google.com>
Source record: 81476

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20031027135410.25517.00001648@mb-m15.aol.com>...
> As of 1300 EST on 27 Oct 03, the ARRL news page has not one
> word

http://www.arrl.org/news/stories/2003/10/27/2/?nc=1

as of 1640 EST.

Rest of Len's typical ARRL bashing snipped.

1801. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-27 22:13:40 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0310271413.7d5aef48@posting.google.com>
Source record: 81477

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<8Ldnb.6341$X22.4219@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> "N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
> news:c2356669.0310271006.3fc96081@posting.google.com...
> > "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
> news:<fo1nb.4542$X22.1166@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> > > "Larry Roll K3LT" wrote:
> > > >
> > > > (snip) If the Civil War wasn't about racism and slavery,
> > > > then (snip)
> > > >
> > > >
> > > If the Civil War was about slavery, then why was there a war at all?
> > >
> > Because the states with the most slaves could see that eventually they
> > would either have to face the complete abolition of slavery *or* leave
> > the Union.
> > >
> > > Prior
> > > to the war, the slave states were the majority in both the House and
> Senate,
> > > insuring no legislation could be passed to end slavery.
> > >
> > When? Check a map of 1860. There were 19 slave states, of which 4
> > stayed in the Union. Delaware was a slave state but it did not secede.
> > >
> > > Slavery was only
> > > abolished after the war by not allowing the former Confederate States
> (which
> > > included several, but not all, of the slave states) to participate in
> that
> > > vote.
> > >
> > The Emancipation Proclamation was written in 1863. It legally freed
> > most (but not all) of the slaves.
> > >
> > > > The South has a lot to answer for, IMHO. (snip)
> >
> > > Why would they have any more to answer for than the Northern states
> that
> > > profited from the sale of slaves?
> > >
> > Which states were they? Slavery was abolished in the North by 1804. In
> > many northern states it was abolished before the Constitution was

> > written.
> >
> > > Or more to answer for than those who used
> > > indentured or bound black workers in the North, even into the early
> 1900's?
> >
> > Where was that done?
> >
> > Indentured servitude is in no way comparable to slavery, btw.
> > Indentured servants *voluntarily* agree to work for a specified period
> > of time, usually as payment for training or a debt.
> >
> > > Or more to answer for than the many countries around the world which
> > > practiced slavery in this last century (the 1900's), the previous
> century,
> > > or in the many centuries before that?
> >
> > > > (snip) Modern-day Rebels with the Confederate flags on
> > > > their pickup trucks don't do much to heal the wounds of
> > > > the past. (snip)
> > >
> > > Perhaps because they have absolutely no responsibility for what
> happened
> > > in a past long before they were born.
> >
> > All depends on what that flag is meant to symbolize.
> >
> > --
> >
> > Here's what I learned about the War Between the States:
> >
> > First off, it didn't start as a war to end slavery, but rather as a
> > war to keep the Union together. Lincoln's early (1861-1862) writings
> > make it clear his focus *at that time* was on preserving the Union at
> > almost any cost.
> >
> > The Constitution, for all its wisdom, did not have any clear provision
> > for what should be done if one or more state(s) decided that they
> > simply wanted out of the Union at one point or another.
> >
> > When the Constitution was written, there was a fairly even balance
> > between slave and free states. Compromises were reached in order to
> > get the new Union formed as a country rather than a confederation.
> > These were compromises with evil, and they could not last forever.
> >
> > But over time the two parts of the US developed in such radically
> > different ways that the compromises and balance could no longer be
> > maintained. It was clear by 1855 or so that slavery's days were
> > numbered because eventually the abolitionists would reach enough of a
> > political majority to simply outlaw it everywhere. The trend was clear

> > - it was only a matter of time. Revolts like John Brown's and the
> > strengthening abolitionist movement made the moral issue unavoidable,
> > and the Supremes were starting to come around, too.
> >
> > So, given the choice between leaving the Union or abolishing slavery,
> > 15 states tried to leave. Some outside the 15 states said "Let them
> > go", but it was clear to Lincoln and others that if even one state was
> > allowed to secede, the Union would eventually fragment - and those
> > fragments would be ripe for takeover from other countries, many of
> > whom were patiently waiting for the "American experiment" to fail.
> >
> > Once the war began, however, it slowly became clear to Lincoln and
> > many others that what had caused the split in the first place was the
> > idea that a country could proclaim itself "free" and yet allow
> > slavery. It became clear to him that the only way to preserve the
> > Union was to abolish slavery completely. Thus the Emancipation
> > Proclamation and the constitutional amendment.
> >
> > Is any of the above incorrect?
> >
> > What's interesting is that Great Britain, from whom the colonies split
> > on the issue of "all men [sic] are created equal", abolished slavery
> > years before the USA did.
> >
> > 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
> Jim,
>
> Much of what you seem to believe is based on the falsehood that the
> Emancipation Proclamation
> actually freed slaves. The proclamation ONLY APPLIED to those states in
> rebellion against the Union.

That's why I wrote:

"It legally freed most (but not all) of the slaves."

It did not free any slaves in the states that didn't secede, but those
states didn't have many slaves anyway. And although it declared most
slaves to be free, in practice almost none of them were actually freed
because the union did not control the land where the slaves actually
were.
>
> Unfortunately those same states were not a part of the union at the time the
> proclamation was issued.
>
That can be argued both ways. Unionists would say they were in
rebellion, secessionists would say they had seceded and were defending
themselves against invasion from a foreign country.

> Thus the proclamation applied to no one under the authority and/or control
> of the then fragemented Union.
>
> The slavery issue was indeed a major part of the root cause of the war
> between the states. BUT a major other cause was that of states rights.

Besides the "right" to have slaves, what rights did the seceding
states want that the Union denied them?

> And
> whether we would be a republic or a federalist government. The struggle
> continues to this day.
>
> We are called a constitutional government, or a republic, or a democracy.
> The reality is we are none of , and all of that.

We're not a democracy, because that oft-misused word means that issues
are directly decided by vote of the people. That's not the case for
most issues.

We are a constitutional republic, because the power rests primarily
with elected representatives but is limited by the Constitution.

> The founding fathers NEVER
> intended for the federal government to have so much authority and control
> over the states.

How do you know what they intended?

Even if the folks who came to Philadelphia in 1787 did not intend for
the federal government to have as much power as it grew to have, one
thing is certain: They did not intend for the Constitution to remain a
static, unchangeable document.

Do you really think that a country which proclaims "all men are
created equal, with certain inalienable rights" could long endure if
certain men were allowed to *OWN* certain other men? Particularly when
those *OWNED*, or their ancestors, had been kidnapped?

Even back then, in the case of anything other than a human being, such
actions would be declared "dealing in stolen property" and the goal of
law enforcement would be to return the stolen property to its rightful
owner. Why were human beings treated differently? How can *anyone*
argue that an innocent human being not own his/her own life?

>That was a major reason the Southern states left.

So it is claimed. But which rights were they concerned about? Did they
not want to pay federal taxes?

> Lincoln
> had NO RIGHT, or authorization to FORCE the South to rejoin the union. The
> whole war was a major mistake, and to the victors go the spoils, and the
> ones that write the history.

That's one interpretation of the Constitution. Another is that states
did not have the right to unilaterally secede from an agreement that
they had voluntarily entered into with the other states.

The US had already tried to operate under a looser system (the
Articles of Confederation) and had found them unworkable.
>
> You may ask how, or why, do I say these things? Because I was raised in the
> North, a world class Yankee state of Ohio. I was educated by the
> Northerners on this subject. And before I came to Alabama I too believed it
> hook line and sinker. No longer.

Then what should Lincoln have done? Simply let the seceding states
leave the Union?

Once that precedent was set, how long before the "United States" split
into more and more fragments? How long before the various fragments
were taken over by other world powers, such as England?
>
> The South was right. We all lost that war, look at the mess we have in DC
> now. Think about it.
>
It certainly would have been better if there could have been a
nonviolent resolution, but I don't see how that could have happened
other than to allow the Union to fragment - and the crime of slavery
to continue.

By compromising with the evil of slavery, the founders delayed the day
of reckoning - and made it that much worse.

And I'll ask again: What rights were the seceding states so adamant
about keeping that they were willing to fight a war in an attempt to
preserve them?

73 de Jim, N2EY

1802. Re: ARRL has no FIRE for sale?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-27 23:10:15 UTC
From: charlesb <n5pvl@sbcglobal.net>
Message-ID: <rBhnb.111$UJ6.17847490@newssvr21.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 81478

"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20031027135410.25517.00001648@mb-m15.aol.com...
>
> Apparently "6-land" doesn't exist in the thinking of new englanders.
>

I'm sure they are like the rest of the country... We all know that
California is there - but we try not to dwell on it too much.

Most likely, you are not hearing news reports by hams in the west because
they are currently too busy doing something useful. One pattern I've noted
over the years is that reporting of ham involvement in emergencies generally
has a significant time-lag. I'm not saying that this is good or bad; I'm
just saying that that's how it generally goes.

P.S. Is it really true that they call California the "cereal bowl state"
because once you get past all the fruits and nuts, the only thing left are
the flakes?

Charles (No Texas jokes, please!) Brabham, N5PVL

1803. Re: ARRL has no FIRE for sale?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-27 23:23:43 UTC
From: ARRL Sucks <none@nobodyxh.org>
Message-ID: <bnk9e2$j6r$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 81479

The ARRL is a Yankee organization, run by Yankees
who think the center of the universe is New England.

Hams in Hawaii have been asking for years to have
QST bulk air-mailed to Hawaii, the same as all other
publishers do to ensure timely delivery. ARRL has
been farting off Hawaii hams for years. Screw the
League!

Aloha

1804. Re: A Morsodist Challenge

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-27 23:28:17 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0310271528.33b3ef99@posting.google.com>
Source record: 81480

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0310271007.57405ba5@posting.google.com>...
> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0310270545.6e208c8b@posting.google.com>...
> > k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0310251412.44e1ed6@posting.google.com>...
> > > brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0310242354.200a51ec@posting.google.com>...
> > > > "Hans K0HB" <k0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<0e0bcf9156e38b6b5725ff4d921e90bc.128005@mygate.mailgate.org>...
> > > > > Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com> wrote
> > > > >
> > > > > > Yeah, the NoCode Agenda can get to be a bit bizzare, all right.
> > > > > > ....then their version of .... Morsedists Religion, blah, blah...
> > > > >
> > > > > Dick,
> > > > >
> > > > > A simple straightforward challenge for you (and the rest of rrap).
> > > > >
> > > > > During the 30 hours starting at 2100Z on Nov 1st, 2003 I will be
> > > > > practicing Morsodism on the HF bands in the ARRL SS Radiosport event.
> > > > > Keep up with me if you can.
> > > > >
> > > > > May the Peace of St. Morse shower down upon thee in abundance,
> > > > >
> > > > > de Hans, K0HB
> > > > > --
> > > > > http://home.earthlink.net/~k0hb
> > > >
> > > > Thine memory is faulty. Dick has no portable gear, and will be away
> > > > from thee power mains on said date.
> > > >
> > > > Dick hath no pot to pee in.
> > >
> > > Hans DID make the "challenge" to everyone, Brain...So how about
> > > it?
> >
> > Hans specifically invited DICK.
> >
> > > I have accomplished Clean Sweep's in both Phone and CW (2000 SS),
> > > so I know you can at least find the pot!
> >
> > I'm not worried about how much pot you can find. It's the other meds
> > that you should be on that worry me.

> >
> > > So how about it...?!?! Or are you just going to antagonize
> > > others about it?
> >
> > Stebe, my mentor, why should I not antagonize others? You try to.
>
> I only "antagonize" those who do me first...That would be you.
>
> Steve, K4YZ

Citation, please. Or else you're a liar.

1805. Re: Why Can't Brain Just Say "Yes" Or "No"...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-27 23:33:54 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0310271533.27d2f0d7@posting.google.com>
Source record: 81481

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0310271011.66cea6a0@posting.google.com>...
> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0310270542.553a3948@posting.google.com>...
> > k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0310251439.4dc14bb8@posting.google.com>...
> > > brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0310230250.40462bd2@posting.google.com>...
> > > > k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0310211640.3f4dacf6@posting.google.com>...
>
> > > > > Remember, Brian, ANYTHING other than a carte blanche acceptance
> > > > > of these conditions completely voids your acceptatance as Padawan
> > > > > Learner, and forever bars you from stating or suggesting that any
> > > > > mentor-padawan relationship exists.
>
> > > > You've got it all wrong again, Stebe (and acceptance of all such
> > > > grandiose misbeliefs in Amateur Radio isn't worthy of mentorship).
> > >
> > > Nope.
> > >
> > > YOU have it all wrong, Brain.
> > >
> > > YOU claim that I am your mentor. I told you that you'd be
> > > required to follow certain rules and beliefs as my student.
> > >
> > > You failed to acknowledge and accept those conditions in this
> > > public forum, therefore you may no longer claim me as your "mentor".
> >
> > Not true, Stebe. I can claim anything I want. You do.
>
> Not true.
>
> I'll ask you to provide some relative post...?!?!

You claim that your mental health is just fine, don't you?

> > Hey, I think you just mentored me a little more. Keep up the good work.
>
> Nope. Requires a voluntary interaction.

I don't have a gun to your head.

> You refused to accept the conditions...Anything else is a lie on your part...
>

> But then you're USED to lying, aren't you, Brain?

Stebe, I'm used to your lies.

> > > > You've merely mentored me in the misspelling of peoples names. That
> > > > is all. You can chalk that up with all of your other misdeeds.
> > >
> > > I've "mentored" you in nothing, Brain. The act of mentoring is a
> > > cooperative, interactive process. Your only interaction is to act
> > > silly.
> >
> > And here you are interacting with me of your own free will (cooperating).
>
> "Cooperating"...?!?!
>
> Hardly.

So there IS a gun to your head? I suggest you put it away and get some help..

> > > Sorry.
> >
> > Noted.
> >
> > Stebe is my mentor, I shall not want...
>
> Brian Burke is a liar...He'll ALWAYS want...

I shall not want for a better mentor in misspelling people's names and lying.

1806. Re: What If.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-27 23:36:43 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0310271536.1f0c52cb@posting.google.com>
Source record: 81482

groupk0hb@earthlink.net (Hans K0HB) wrote in message
news:<5ee63311.0310270842.7c8904b0@posting.google.com>...
> Alun Palmer <alun@1stcounsel.com> wrote
>
> > BTW, you do know that the ITU only requires ID every _15_ minutes
>
> ITU doesn't "require", they only "recommend".
>
> 73, Hans, K0HB

Did they only "recommend" a "knowledge of morse code?"

1807. Re: Lightning Man!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-27 23:41:59 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0310271541.7bbb67c0@posting.google.com>
Source record: 81483

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20031026183719.11022.00001695@mb-m14.aol.com>...
> Okay, all you morose code lovers, a new book just for beepers:
>
> "Lightning Man; The Accursed Life of Samuel F. B. Morse" by
> Kenneth Silverman, published by Alfred A. Knopf, 504 pp, $35.
>
> A biography of "Polymath's Progress" as the L. A. Times Book
> Review section titled a full-page spread by Henry Petrouski
> (professor of civil engineering and history at Duke University)
> in the Sunday, 26 October 2003 edition.
>
> Glowing reviews on the book, not necessarily on the character
> of Finley (as he was called when a young man)...a rather routine
> portrait painter of the early 1800s looking for some grande
> scheme of fame and fortune, only one of which made it...with
> the help of a lot of other talent...and others' money.
>
> LHA

Lightning Man? Sounds more like Ben Franklin's experiments. Maybe
Jim can fill us in - I think they were second cousins.

1808. Re: A Morsodist Challenge

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-27 23:43:05 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0310271543.58719bfd@posting.google.com>
Source record: 81484
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message news:<d4Umb.5623$FI2.1197@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>...

> Only incompetents use a computer to receive morse code.

Echelon is incompetent?

1809. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-28 00:23:13 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <RFinb.8647$FI2.4720@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 81485

"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
news:c2356669.0310271413.7d5aef48@posting.google.com...
> And I'll ask again: What rights were the seceding states so adamant
> about keeping that they were willing to fight a war in an attempt to
> preserve them?
>

From the Southern point of view the North was interfering with the Southern lifestyle. Folks take that real serious down here.

The North was applying taxes to Southern goods, the North was sending abolitionists down South to stir up the blacks into insurection.

Basically the South saw the North as interfering in what they had no business in.

And to this day. The southerners hated Lincoln. And that was the catalist to kick it all off.

Jim, you need to come down here a bit, you would understand a bit more.

> 73 de Jim, N2EY

1810. Re: ARRL has no FIRE for sale?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-28 00:27:07 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <vJinb.8651$FI2.4329@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 81486

"ARRL Sucks" <none@nobodyxh.org> wrote in message
news:bnk9e2$j6r$0@pita.alt.net...
> The ARRL is a Yankee organization, run by Yankees
> who think the center of the universe is New England.
>
> Hams in Hawaii have been asking for years to have
> QST bulk air-mailed to Hawaii, the same as all other
> publishers do to ensure timely delivery. ARRL has
> been farting off Hawaii hams for years. Screw the
> League!
>
> Aloha
>
>
>
>

The ARRL has contracted their publishing and do not do it themselves.
Perhaps you should contact the publisher/printer ?

Dan/W4NTI

1811. Re: Element 1, Code vs. No-code, and Dad

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-28 00:36:46 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031027193646.21642.00001979@mb-m01.aol.com>
Source record: 81487

In article <Y3fnb.132704$qj6.9126720@news1.news.adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo
<mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:

>N2EY wrote:

>> With all due respect, Bill,
>>
>> Isn't that statement really a subjective opinion? I mean, when you get
>> right down to it, almost everything in the test process is there or is
>> not there because of someone's subjective opinion that it's
>> "reasonable" or "necessary".
>
>It's all an opinion, Jim.

My point exactly. And those opinions change over time. From the early '30s to
1951, FCC thought 3 license classes was the right number. Then they went to 6,
then to 5, then back to 6, then back to 5, then back to 6 yet again. Then in
1999 they decided 3 is the right number.

The more things change...

73 de Jim, N2EY

Those who believe they are blessed with the
>"facts" in this issue are practicing self delusion.
>

1812. Re: ARRL has no FIRE for sale?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-28 00:46:10 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <m%inb.6096$083.3677@news02.roc.ny>
Source record: 81488

Jim,

Len should subscribe to our newspaper. Late sports info is printed *two*
days later. He may not understand that it takes time for information to be
collected and printed (even if only on the internet).

I only wish that my worst problems were the ARRL and CW vs no code. LOL.
These guys are going to drop from coronaries or stroke long before their
time.

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
news:c2356669.0310271339.15e7e1df@posting.google.com...
> lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20031027135410.25517.00001648@mb-m15.aol.com>...
> > As of 1300 EST on 27 Oct 03, the ARRL news page has not one
> > word
>
> http://www.arrl.org/news/stories/2003/10/27/2/?nc=1
>
> as of 1640 EST.
>
> Rest of Len's typical ARRL bashing snipped.

1813. Re: ARRL has no FIRE for sale?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-28 00:46:55 UTC
From: Jack Hamilton <jfh@acm.org>
Message-ID: <buerpvkup06q5lr595f49qjm9vumdcqi2s@4ax.com>
Source record: 81489

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote:

>"ARRL Sucks" <none@nobodyxh.org> wrote in message
>news:bnk9e2$j6r$0@pita.alt.net...
>> The ARRL is a Yankee organization, run by Yankees
>> who think the center of the universe is New England.
>>
>> Hams in Hawaii have been asking for years to have
>> QST bulk air-mailed to Hawaii, the same as all other
>> publishers do to ensure timely delivery. ARRL has
>> been farting off Hawaii hams for years. Screw the
>> League!
>>
>> Aloha
>>
>
>The ARRL has contracted their publishing and do not do it themselves.
>Perhaps you should contact the publisher/printer ?

The ARRL is ultimately responsible for the production and delivery of
their magazine, however much they may choose to contract out; the
printer will do whatever the ARRL will pay them to do, within reasonable
limits. It's the ARRL's decision.

--
Jack Hamilton
jfh@acm.org

If men are to wait for liberty until they become wise and good in slavery,
they may indeed wait for ever.
- Lord MacCaulay

1814. Re: ARRL has no FIRE for sale? (and nobody really cares either)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-28 01:08:30 UTC
From: groupk0hb@earthlink.net
Message-ID: <5ee63311.0310271708.2b598ce0@posting.google.com>
Source record: 81490

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote

> As of 1300 EST on 27 Oct 03, the ARRL news page has not one
> word about the many fires in California which have consumed a
> quarter million acres (half the land area of Rhode Island), over
> 500 homes destroyed, over 11 dead, now in its 5th day.

Up here in Minnesota it just doesn't seem to be of any importance what some radio-hobbiest club near Hartford, CT, writes about on their web page. The ARRL isn't relevant to the massive tragedy you folks are facing.

Rather than sending hobby radiomen, the State of Minnesota DNR is sending you one of our new Canadian-built arial tankers, an augmented flight crew, and additional DNR firefighters to help you and your neighbors.

Stay safe, Len.

73, de Hans, K0HB

1815. Re: What If.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-28 01:17:46 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031027201746.28496.00001547@mb-m18.aol.com>
Source record: 81491

In article <3F9D3E70.2080501@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:

>Leo wrote:

><some snippage>

>> Very interesting - I haven't read "200 Meters and Down" - I'll look
>> for a copy.

> Very interesting reading, Leo. It should be part of the testing
regimen!

Only problem with "200" is that it stops at 1936 and there was never a followup
book.

If you want a really good history of US amateur radio from the very beginning
to almost the present day, google up W2XOY's "Wayback Machine". Excellent
history in many chapters. Free for the download.

(extra bonus question: what is the significance of that callsign?)
>
> > However, the regulatory agencies likely see the "trained pool of
>> operators and experimenters" as the original benchmark for the
>> service.

That phrase was added in 1951.

>> What I was hoping to stimulate in this thread was some
>> thought regarding what the goals of the service are relevant to today,
>> and then use that as a guide to what qualifications and testing are
>> relevant to meet those goals.
>>
>> Somehow, it's not working out quite that way.... ;)
>
> Never does! remember that ill fated thread where I tried to get a
>decent discussion going? (the troglodyte one) After review, it lasted
>one post - mine.

Hey!
>
>>>>The ARS is certainly not a service born of regulations - but it exists
>>>>today because the regulators allow it to do so - if we don't have a
>>>>clear idea of specifically why it should continue to exist, or what it
>>>>should be composed of, how can we justify it if and when the time
>>>>comes? We cannot convince regulators to maintain CW testing, as an
>>>>example, if the best arguement that we can come up with is "history"!
>>>>It was put there by regulation for a reason - and it needs a reason to

>>>>survive. Regulators don't deal in nostalgia....and if a push comes to
>>>>approve a potentially multi-billion dollar rollout of a service like
>>>>BPL, they are going to be hard-pressed to stave it off on our behalf
>>>>without a solid justification of why the ARS is still important!

Regulators *do* deal in historic preservation, history, and tradition, however.

>>>Yes once again it is time to fight. If all we can offer is our ability to
>>>TALK on the radio, there isn't much justification for the continuation of
>>>Amateur Radio with all the frequency privileges we have today.

>> That was one of the points that I was hoping to raise in this
>> discussion. If it is a pure hobby, it is difficult to justify a lot
>> of testing and qualification levels. If, however, it is to train
>> folks to provide 'para-professional' backup to Emergency services,
>> then the standards would be considerably higher, and qualifications
>> more easily justifiable.
>
>It isn't a pure hobby, though. If I were to be doing this as a pure
>hobby, I would simply be doing PSK31, contesting, and homebrewing.
>Instead I help with nets, do public service at events, and whatever
>emergency service might be needed. Some hams may not, but that means
>they are slacking off and shirking their civic duty, IMHO.

One of the good things about amateur radio is that it defies a simple
definition. That's also one of the bad things!
What is a core purpose of the service to one person may be of minor interest to
another. For example, are technical smarts more important than public service?

>>>>I raised this question because, frankly, the vast majority of
>>>>arguements that I have read in this newsgroup have been driven by
>>>>emotion, nostalgia or historical references. If someone proposes that
>>>>CW should continue to have exclusive band assignments because it is a
>>>>great mode to use during emergencies due to its inherent readibility
>>>>through noise, and that CW testing should continue to ensure that a
>>>>pool of CW-competent operators is maintained for emergency comms, then
>>>>OK, good point - maybe it should.
>>>
>>>Although this is a good and valid point, those who don't know code and
>don't
>>>want to learn it have successfully outshouted the proponents of code
>testing
>>>so that the regulators, who know nothing of the merits of the code
>>>themselves, look like they are going to go along with it.
>>
>>
>> Seems to be the direction that other administrations around the globe
>> have gone - and there is indeed a strong push in North America to
>> usher it out as well. Personally, I have yet to hear an arguement
>> that would convince me that code testing should remain a mandatory
>> requirement. I was hoping that someone would come up with a solid
>> technical or functional reason that would leadd me to believe

>> otherwise - but there doesn't seem to be one.
>
> The reasons to continue Morse code testing are as valid, and solid as
>those for removing it. This is not like making the prospective ham clean
>out toilets with his or her personal toothbrush. It's testing for a
>purpose. And all arguments for it's removal or retention are as valid as
>each other. I could make the same argument for tossing out the satellite
>operation questions as I could for tossing out Morse code testing.

Most hams do only a small fraction of the activities open to them, in part
because most of us haven't anywhere near the time or money to do all of them or
even most of them. Yet almost all of them are on the test.
>
>I don't care about the details that some people try to toss out. Its the
>same thing as the core.
>
As you said, it all comes down to opinions. That one question on satellites
could be the one that causes a ham to fail.
>
>> Although it is a valuable mode of operation, especialy in high QRM or
>> QRN situations, (and fun to use!!), it was only a mandatory requirment
>> originally (as I understand it, anyway) so that government (and
>> commercial?) CW stations could communicate with amateurs interfering
>> with their signals, and order them to stop.
>
> This is one that I have a little trouble with, Leo. The amateurs needed

>to have *some* method to communicate, and Morse code was one of the few
>methods around then. SSB was just being born, voice was pretty much out
>of the picture. So what's left?
>
The anti-interference thing was just *one* reason - there are lots more. And it
really wasn't that much of a reason because hams had their own frequency
allocations and the government/commercial folks had theirs.

In fact, there was no international requirement for hams to pass code tests
until 1927.
>
>> A secondary purpose may
>> have been to allow emergency CW traffic to be relayed by amateur
>> stations. These scenarios are no longer viable reasons in 2003 -
>> unless there are new reasons to take their place, then perhaps CW
>> should assume the same status as the other available operating modes -
>> permitted for use, by all means, but not specifically tested by
>> practical examination.

There *are* new reasons, as well as other, old ones. But whether they are
sufficient is a matter of opinion.
>>
>> My own personal position on this subject has shifted solidly over to
>> the "yes, discontinue mandatory CW testing" side, in the absence of a

>> logical reason to believe otherwise. I cannot recall a single
>> arguement based on hard fact that justifies testing as a necessary
>> requirement to becoming a licenced amateur, and operating on HF.
>> There is emotion, and preference, and nostalgia, and tradition, and
>> fear of the loss of a valuable skill whose value is no longer
>> quantifiable - but no hard reasons.
>
>you are correct, there are no hard reasons, no truly logical reasons to
>keep Morse code testing. Or to get rid of it either. It's all opinions.

bingo.

>> Years ago, here in Canada, there was a special licence class required
>> to operate using the Digital modes (!). This was dropped after only a
>> few years. presumably because it was not demonstrated that there was
>> any real benefit gained from the additional testing of digital
>> proficiency. After all, the idea of a hobby is to be able to
>> experiment and learn those aspects that are of interest or use to the
>> individual!

I thought it was dropped because so few applied for it. I recall something like
150 in 4 years.
>
> Then why the heck don't they get rid of those stupid questions about
>satellite operations!!!! 8^)
>
> The reason I'm not too wild about this argument is that it reminds me
>of those arguments people used to make for some of the "progressive
>schools" where the student made up their own curriculum
>
Exactly.
>
>>>> OTOH, if someone proposes that CW
>>>>testing should continue because thats the way its been since the
>>>>beginning of time, then - who cares? What relevance does that
>>>>statement have to do with today? So what?
>>>>
>>>>Successful businesses have learned to do this type of review on their
>>>>internal processes in order to survive, in the interest of efficiency
>>>>(and, for fun, watch what happens when some idiot tells the
>>>>departmental VP that something is being done because it has always
>>>>been done that way - wow! - never happens twice!). If something is
>>>>being done, and no one can properly justify it, then out it goes.
>>>>Replaced by a new and (hopefully) better process, or abandoned
>>>>altogether if no longer needed. We could learn something from this
>>>>too.
>>>
>>>But sometimes they learn after the fact that although they couldn't come up
>>>with a justification to keep something, it turns out to be necessary to
>>>function efficiently and they have to reinstate it.. Although touted for
>>>decades as the wave of the future, "the paperless office" still has not

>>>become a reality. We always need paper documents for something.
>>
>>
>> True - errors are certainly possible when re-engineering any complex
>> process. In fact, the only guaranteed way to avoid error is do do
>> nothing at all. But, to continue along without occasional review and
>> adjustment can have much more serious consequences. For example, if
>> Polaroid had not continually re-invented their processes over the
>> years, they would still be trying to market their old 'instant
>> picture' camera and film technology - which would be virtually
>> unmarketable today, in an era of digital cameras and home photo
>> printing technology. Those out of sync with progress do not survive.

They're still selling those cameras, however.

And merely because something is old doesn't make it bad. Look at the way words
are spelled...
>>
>> Our hobby is technologically based, too. By virtue of the fact that it
>> is a hobby, though, there is no need to retire older technology in
>> favour of the leading edge stuff (in fact, some hobbies exist because
>> they are the only place left to find people who share their interest
>> in the obsolete - Antique Radios, or Steam Trains for example). Why,
>> however, would we realistically expect newcomers to the hobby to be
>> forced to learn specific 'niche' areas of this, or any other
>> avocation? If there is a real need to do so, then OK - make it a
>> requirement. But, if there isn't - why do it? "Because that's the
>> way it has always been" is not a reason to do, there must be a
>> specific benefit to keeping it, or specific hazard if it is
>> discontinued - complacency won't do the job. We test regulatory
>> knowledge, because the operator must know the legal limits within
>> which the station must be operated. We test radio knowledge, because
>> operators should know enough about how the equipment functions to
>> ensure that they operate it correctly, and stay within the legal
>> limits. And the FCC, IC and other worldwide regulatory authorities
>> tested CW proficiency because it was an ITU requirement for all
>> amateurs to be proficient in the sending and receiving of CW when
>> operating on the bands under 30 MHz. Solid reasons for each - reasons
>> that can change as the world evolves. Without the support of the
>> underlying reason,
>>
>>
>>>>Someone has suggested that if amateur radio were invented today,
>>>>without the benefit of all of the history and tradition, it would be a
>>>>version of FRS or maybe CB - if that is true, we have a serious
>>>>problem when industry comes knocking for more of our frequency
>>>>spectrum. How do we convince the regulators that it remains an
>>>>important service, if we believe that?
>>>>
>>>
>>>Simple show them that we are a resource with unique skills and resources

>and
>>>numbers that cannot be found in any other radio service.

>> Exactly - but if we show them that what we're really interested in is
>> protecting the class structure, hierarchy and outdated traditions of
>> what is essentially a hobby, we're not going to convince anyone.
>
>Here I see the fundamental nature of your approach. You see the ARS as a
>hobby, whereas I see it as a service. I have other things I do as
>hobbies, like building telescopes and grinding mirrors. Purely personal
>stuff that I find interesting to do. But my ARS experience is not only
>the homebrewing, contesting, and digital mode work, it is a way of
>giving back to the community. And yes, the groups we do radio comms for
>are part of the community, and appreciate the work we do for them. It's
>a personal thing, like first aid and CPR training. Them ain't hobbies.

Try telling the hams who searched for shuttle pieces, or who are right now
helping fight the wildfires in California, that it's "a hobby". They might not
agree.
>
>> I believe that we need to position ourselves as forward-thinking,
>> technically competent and highly motivated - ready to out our skills
>> to use whenever required to do so by the various public safety and
>> security organizations. Looking through the current FCC petitions
>> regarding the infamous Code issue, we could easily be seen as a bunch
>> of folks interested in creating unnecessary levels of proficiency
>> testing within the hobby, without a real technological reason to do
>> so. That will not help us, or our image, one bit.

Looking through the anti-code-test petitions, though, we could also be seen as
a bunch of folks making a really big deal out of eliminating a test that
requires only the most basic level of skill in a mode widely used in the
Amateur Radio Service.

Does it not seem odd to require lots of theory testing for a license to use
manufactured radios, yet to claim that a simple 5 wpm Morse code receiving test
is a "burden" and a "barrier" to a license?
>
>But isn't there some contradiction in there? I can't reconcile forward
>thinking and reduction in knowledge together myself. I can understand
>why we wouldn't have questions on tube equipment on tests, but the
>removal of a basic method of communication that can be used worldwide
>that has as a drawback that it can't be learned instantaneously is
>beyond my comprehension. It is in place as the lowest common denominator
>between two communicators. To me it is like having children learn how to
>do longhand math before setting them loose with calculators.
>
>Is there any value in doing longhand math now? Why should we if we have
>a calculator?
>
Exactly!

73 de Jim, N2EY

1816. Re: What If.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-28 01:41:55 UTC
From: Gr&#65533;mw&#65533;tch th&#65533; &#65533;nfl&#65533;pp&#65533;bl&#65533; <Gr&#65533;mw&#65533;tch@NOSPAM.THANKS.IM.FULL.lycos.co.de>
Message-ID: <DPjnb.4709$RQ1.4598@newsread3.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 81492

"Alun Palmer" <alun@1stcounsel.com> wrote in message
news:Xns941DD48A4D648elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...

: BTW, you do know that the ITU only requires ID every _15_ minutes, don't
: you? It's always been that way, too.

If you're speaking of the ITU (nee CCITT) headquartered over here in Geneva,
their regulations reads:

S25.9 2) During the course of their transmissions, amateur stations shall
transmit their call sign at short intervals.

In your imaginations perhaps that short interval is 15 minutes. In your YL
imagination it perhaps that short interval is several weeks.

73, Barnabus Grumwitch Overbyte

"All persons, living or dead, are purely coincidental, and should not be
construed."

1817. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-28 01:42:13 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <VPjnb.8824$FI2.2216@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 81493

"N2EY" wrote:
>
> When? Check a map of 1860. There were 19 slave states,
> of which 4 stayed in the Union. Delaware was a slave state
> but it did not secede.

Depends on the definition of a slave state, I guess. There were 18 Union States and 11 Confederate States. The three border states did not side with either and four of the slave states stayed in the Union. Even if you believe the three border states, and all of the Union States (including the four slave states), would have voted to end slavery, the Union did not have enough numbers to abolish slavery in 1860 had the South not seceded- remember, it takes 2/3rds of the Congress to pass an amendment. Since slavery was not threatened had the South remained in the Union, slavery obviously did not cause them to secede. In other words, the Civil War was not about slavery until the Union (then and now) decided to make it so. Whatever, it is certainly not what the South fought for.

> The Emancipation Proclamation was written in 1863. It legally
> freed most (but not all) of the slaves.

It freed only the slave in states "now in rebellion against the United States" and listed the specific states. It did not apply to slaves in any state that was not part of the Confederacy (it did not apply to slaves in the Union States). The 13th amendment, passed after the war, ended slavery throughout the United States. Read how the 13th amendment was passed by Congress and later ratified.

> Which states were they? Slavery was abolished in
> the North by 1804. In many northern states it was
> abolished before the Constitution was written.

So that makes their accountability less? In essence, you're arguing that the Northern states are somehow better only because slavery ended there before it ended in the South.

> Here's what I learned about the War Between the States:

Fine. Since there are other messages to respond to, I'll ignore the remaining nine paragraphs.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

1818. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-28 01:50:28 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <EXjnb.8839$FI2.3640@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 81494

"Hans K0HB" wrote:
> W5NET wrote:
>
> > Blacks have almost the entire continent of Africa
> > and Hispanics have almost the entire continent of
> > South America. Perhaps you can explain why
> > either group needs to expand to this continent, or
> > why it is so wrong to resist that expansion.
>
> What a sorry-assed load of blatant racist crap!

It is "racist crap" to state the obvious, Hans? Do you deny Blacks control most of Africa and Hispanics most of South America? Why aren't you screaming about the inherent racism of single ethnic cultures such as those? Why is your outrage, your words of anger, always directed only at whites?

> Carried a little farther, yellow people have the entire
> continent of Asia, white people have almost the entire
> continent of Europe.....

Yes. And your point is? My point is that many, perhaps even you, openly and loudly advocate the movement of other races into Europe and North America, but not whites into Asia, South America, or Africa. Indeed, whenever whites do move elsewhere, it is immediately characterized as evil, racist, power hunger, and greedy.

> what Indian, Eskimo, or Inuit tribe does Dwight Stewart
> belong to that gives him a right to be in North America?

See what I mean? Do you really think whites came to this country solely to kill indians - that indians had no influence over those events? Why isn't there even a hint of sorrow in your words for the many whites killed by indians as they tried to peacefully settle across this country? Why is what the settlers did somehow worse then what indians did to other indians in their many wars?

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

1819. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-28 02:04:50 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bnkkq5$ut2@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 81499

"Hans K0HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:5ee63311.0310262115.48348b1d@posting.google.com...
> W5NET wrote:
>
> > Blacks have almost the entire continent of Africa and
> > Hispanics have almost the entire continent of South America.
> > Perhaps you can explain why either group needs to expand
> > to this continent, or why it is so wrong to resist that expansion.
>
> What a sorry-assed load of blatant racist crap! Carried a little
> farther, yellow people have the entire continent of Asia, white people
> have almost the entire continent of Europe..... what Indian, Eskimo, or
> Inuit tribe does Dwight Stewart belong to that gives him a right to be
> in North America?
>
> With kindest warm personal regards,
>
> de Hans, K0HB
>

Thank you Hans.

Kim W5TIT

1820. Re: Amateur Radio in the 21st Century?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-28 02:06:26 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <Caknb.8872$FI2.7958@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 81495

"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
news:c2356669.0310270917.2668311b@posting.google.com...
> "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<7O0nb.4484$X22.1484@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> > "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> > news:20031024182942.12300.00001303@mb-m20.aol.com...
> > > In article <3F993128.6080401@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
writes:
> > >
> > > >> Yep - with reduced privileges. Not necessarily a bad idea. All
they're
> > > >> really
> > > >> doing is reinventing the Novice.
> > > >
> > > > I'm still not so hot on the idea.
> > >
> > > All depends on what the balance of requirements vs. privileges is. As
it
> > > stands
> > > right now, our "entry level" license is heavily weighted to VHF/UHF.
> >
> > I agree and of all the licensing decisions made under 98-143,
> > the ending of Novice was, IMHO, not a good idea.
>
> But...but...Bill, the FCC thought it was a good idea! Are you saying
> FCC made a mistake? ;-)

Please point to any statement I have made that indicates
I agree with every FCC decision. :-) :-)

> > That said,
> > I think once the dust settles from the code "test" issue, then
> > perhaps ARRL may wish to take a top down look at licensing,
> > licensing requirements and the concurrent privileges associated
> > with each.
>
> KL7CC & Co. have already done so. Have you read their paper?

No, is it on a web site?.

> > > >>> Especially charming is the idea that people with a 6th grade
education
> > > >>>are going to supply us with fresh ideas.
> >
> > > >> I got started in ham radio between 6th and 7th grades.....

> >
> > > > Were you "average" Jim?
> > >
> > > In some things yes, in others no.
> > >
> > > >I was involved in electronics when I was in 5th
> > > >grade, but no one else around me was. I'm not at all against kids of
> > > >any particular age being involved in Ham radio, but that "average 6th
> > > >grader thing is bothersome.
> > >
> > > Heck, the "average" sixth grader in some American neighborhoods is
quite
> > > different from his/her "average" counterpart elsewhere.
> > >
> > > Perhaps a better way to word that idea is "the entry level syllabus
and
> > > test
> > > should not require a knowledge of math, science or English above the
> > > sixth-grade level in order to understand the material".
> > >
> > > >>>Next:
> > > >>>
> > > >>>
> > > >>>>Whatever we come up with, it will have to fit within the FCC
budget.
> > > >>>>This probably means that in all likelihood what will happen,
assuming
> > > >>>>that the idea of a beginner's class license is even accepted at
all,
> > > >>>>is that they (the FCC) will juggle the existing 3 classes to
> > > >>>>accommodate the new structure. Technician will change from what
it
> > > >>>>is now to the basic license. It may be named "Communicator" or
> > > >>>>simply left as Technician. Let's assume it gets the name
> > > >>>>"Communicator". All existing Techs will be upgraded to General.
> > > >>>>Assuming that the Morse requirement is removed first, our opinion
> > > >>>>is that most of the Techs will take (and hopefully pass) the
element
> > > >>>>3 exam as soon as they can, thus becoming General class licensees.
> > > >>>
> > > >>> Assuming indeed! They figure that people are going to study and
pay >
> > > >>
> > > >> for
> > > >>
> > > >>>a test in order to get priveleges they will get anyhow? If a
Technician
> > > >>>flunks the test, all he or she has to do is wait a while, than
he/she
> > > >>>will get the priveleges anyhow.

> > > >>
> > > >>
> > > >> Exactly!
> > > >>
> > > >>
> > > >>> That sounds a LOT like simplification to me.
> > > >>
> > > >>
> > > >> Sounds like a giveaway to me. And it sets a very bad precedent: If
it's
> > OK
> > to
> > > > >> give all Techs a free upgrade to General, why not throw away most
of
> > the
> > > > >> General question pool and use the Tech one instead?
> > > >>
> > > >>>>Remember, that before the changes that created the present no-code
> > > >>>>tech, the General and Tech exams were identical. Only the code
> > > >>>>separated them, and even there it was only the difference between
> > > >>>>5 and 13 WPM.
> > > >>>
> > > >>>But its not that way now.
> > >
> > > > >> And it wasn't that way back when the Tech code test changes were
made!
> > > > >
> > > > > hehe, things aren't like they used to be, and they never were! 8^)
> > > >
> > > > "They remember a past that never was"
> > >
> > What are they remembering that wasn't? The tech written was the same as
> > the General as someone wrote above up to 1987 as you note below.
>
> Direct quote:
>
> "Remember, that before the changes that created the present no-code
> tech, the General and Tech exams were identical. Only the code
> separated them, and even there it was only the difference between
> 5 and 13 WPM."
>
> That sentence, and the lack of other clarification, says that the
> General and Tech writtens were the same right up to when the Tech lost
> its code test in 1991. That's simply not the case - the written was
> split almost 4 years earlier.

OK and understood.

> Note that the paper wants to give *all* Techs a free upgrade to
> General! It also ignores the fact that any Tech who got that license
> before March 1987 is already able to upgrade to General with no

> additional testing. And it's been that way since April 15, 2000. And
> that's not a giveaway because those folks *did* pass the same written
> as Generals.

IF (and it is a big IF) the FCC ever entertains some type of
license changes of the type being discussed there will be two
choices as to the affected hams already licensed. You can repeat
the 1968 approach and take away privileges or you can give
some people a "pass" while still impacting all new hams or
hams not already licensed at a particular level. Time will tell.

> > > >> Quick history:
> > > >>
> > > >> From 1951 to March 1987, the General and Tech had the same written.
In
> > > >> March of
> > > >> 1987 the General was split into two elements, 3A for Tech and 3B
for
> > > >> General.
> > > >> Almost four years later (February 1991), the Tech lost its code
test.
> > > >>
> > > >> This isn't ancient history, and anybody writing a policy paper
should
> > know
> > > >> how
> > > >> the previous system came to be. And it's not the only factual
mistake
> > in
> > > >> the paper.
> > >
> > > >>>And finally, before I forget about how I was charmed about the
glasses
> > > >>>reference, I have to congratulate the authors on their humorous
> > > >>>treatment of Pro coders:
> > > >>>
> > > >>>(more from the
>
> > > >> KL7CC paper)
> > > >>
> > > >>>>So, there are no "Morse code haters" on the committee.
> > > >>>>There is no conspiracy, no secret agenda, no kickback from the
> > > >>>>manufacturers, no "black plan" from the ARRL, no anything. Just
some
> > > >>>>guys that want nothing more than to see our great hobby prosper
for
> > > >>>>the next hundred years, or longer.
> > > >>>
> > > >>>and (I had to put this in again):
> > > >>>
> > > >>>>You know, fresh ideas, new blood, people that can actually see

> > > >>>>their radios without having to put on glasses - what a concept!
> > > >>>
> > > >>>and:
> >
> > > >>>>A few final words:
> > > >>>>There are no black helicopters.
> > > >>>
> > > >>>I guess those who believe in the Morse code test believe there are?
> >
> > > >> See what I mean about undertone?
> > > >
> > > >I bet they love their families more than PCTA's too!
> > >
> > > I recycle.
> > > >
> > > >>>>Do you suppose the committee members just want to see our
wonderful
> > > >>>>hobby prosper? Wouldn't that be an odd reason for doing what
they
> > are
> > > >>>>doing?
> > > >>>
> > > >>>Apparently those of us who believe in a Morse code test *don't*
want to
> > > >>>see our wonderful hobby prosper!
> >
> > > >> If the ideas are good ideas, they will stand on their merit. The
person
> > > >> histories of the committee members is not the issue. If they're
such
> > great
> > > >> folks, why don't they let the merits of their ideas convicne us?
> > > >>
> > > >> Quick aside: I first became aware of W5YI about ten years ago when
my
> > > >> license
> > > >> needed to be renewed. I got this official looking letter saying
that
> > for
> > > >> just
> > > >> $5 they'd help me renew my license. All I had to do was fill in the
> > form,
> > sign
> > > >> it, write a check for $5 and send it to them.
> > > >>
> > > >> Never mind that I'd been dealing with the FCC since I was 13 and
had
> > renewed
> > > >> and modified my license at least 9 times before with no problems at
> > all.

> > They
> > > >> thought I needed "help".
> > > >
> > > > Perhaps their target audience needs the help? 8^)
> > >
> > > Maybe?
> > > >
> > > ><snippage>
> > > >
> > > >>>And the answer to the question of who I'm going to talk to if there
are
> > > >>>no manufacturers..... Well you know , don't ya Jim?
> > > >>
> > > >>
> > > >> Who, me?
> > > >
> > > > Yeah, you!!
> > > >
> > > More folks like me? Who don't "take the practical approach"?
> > >
> > > ><more snippage>
> >
> > > >>> I'm not talking about Carl either. I know that neither he nor Bill
> > Sohl
> > > >>>are in favor of reductions in the qualifications to get a license
(save
> > > >>>removal of the Morse code test)
> > > >>
> > > >> And they've been very clear about that.
> > > >>
> > > >>> That's really nice. It also *may* mean that they will someday be
> > > >>>considered the Luddites along with us troglodyte Pro code testers
as
> > the
> > > >>>requirements to get a license are relaxed more and more.
> >
> > > >> You got my point exactly.
> > > >
> > > > I may have proposed this once (quite tongue in cheek) but one of the
> > > >proposals was that the prospective amateur sign a paper stating how
he
> > > >or she had read and understood part 97.
> > >
> > > I had to read that part of the KL7CC paper twice because I didn't
believe
> > it
> > > the first time! And they're talking about the *rules and regs*!!
> > >
> > > Once upon a time, FCC tried that approach with another radio service.
> > Didn't

> > > work very well.
> >
> > The real problem with CB at the time and to this day was the "buy it
> > anywhere"
> > ability at prices net to nothing. Even in the early 70s CBs were less
than
> > $50.
>
> I never saw them that cheap, but then again, I wasn't looking.
>
> But what you are effectively saying, Bill, is that the real problem
> with cb was "lack of investment" by many who used it. They did not
> take it seriously because they had invested only a few dollars and
> practically no time or effort into getting set up.
>
> Does that mean if cb sets had cost, say, $500 back then instead of
> $50, that service would not have become such a mess?

Probably because the sets wouldn't have found such a wide
market of accepatance for that price. Clearly the other
factor was the "no license" other than send in the
application approach.

> Almost sounds like a new version of "what isn't worked for isn't
> valued"

Cute, but no cigar.

> > Same is true today for FRS...but the good thing about FRS is the
> > lack of any real DX ability.
> >
> > > >Why not extrapolate that to the
> > > >whole test? Just think how easy the testing process would be! By
gosh,
> > > >we could get [people to sign that they had the equivalent knowlege of
> > > >anything. The ARS could be populated by geniuses!
> > >
> > > Exactly! No more need for VEC sessions and all that paperwork. If that
> > > approach
> > > is valid for the rules, why not the whole test?
> > >
> > > But the part of that paper I found most "amusing" was where the prime
> > > author
> > > admitted that he could not pass the current written test for the
license
> > > he
> > > holds. It is written in such a way that he almost sounds proud of that
> > > fact. As
> > > dear departed N0BK would say: Surreal.
> >
> > One problem we have discused before is the stupid focus on some

> > testing on elements of the rules that very few hams ever engage
in...space
> > communications for example. Better to test on what we really want
> > most hams to be knowledgeable on that VEC qualifications, etc.
>
> It used to seem to me that the one thing we could all agree on was
> that the basic regulations (not talking about the fine-print stuff,
> just the basics) were one subject that absolutely had to be tested
> for. But the KL7CC paper suggests doing away with most of that!
> Surreal...

I'll have to find that paper and read it.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1821. Re: What If.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-28 02:07:37 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@nope.org>
Message-ID: <9mirpvoktgl7rmme7ifkmgu6984ntfc1bj@4ax.com>
Source record: 81496

On 28 Oct 2003 01:17:46 GMT, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:
>
>Only problem with "200" is that it stops at 1936 and there was never a followup
>book.
>
>If you want a really good history of US amateur radio from the very beginning
>to almost the present day, google up W2XOY's "Wayback Machine". Excellent
>history in many chapters. Free for the download.

Great articles - thanks!

>
>(extra bonus question: what is the significance of that callsign?)

Found this reference on Google:

Feb. 1, 1939. Broadcasting reports General Electric engineers recently
set up two experimental frequency modulation transmitters at Albany
and Schenectady, operating on the same frequency. They drove a test
car between the two cities and found almost no areas of interference
between the stations. The stations were W2XDA Schenectady and W2XOY
New Scotland

>>> Years ago, here in Canada, there was a special licence class required
>>> to operate using the Digital modes (!). This was dropped after only a
>>> few years. presumably because it was not demonstrated that there was
>>> any real benefit gained from the additional testing of digital
>>> proficiency. After all, the idea of a hobby is to be able to
>>> experiment and learn those aspects that are of interest or use to the
>>> individual!
>
>I thought it was dropped because so few applied for it. I recall something like
>150 in 4 years.

Haven't seen those stats - but seperate testing for Digital modes died
out with it!
>>
>
>And merely because something is old doesn't make it bad. Look at the way words
>are spelled...

Certainly wasn't connecting 'old' with 'bad', Jim - just an
observation that as times change, priorities tend to shift as well.

>Try telling the hams who searched for shuttle pieces, or who are right now
>helping fight the wildfires in California, that it's "a hobby". They might not
>agree.

It's a unique hobby - one where the skills learned and practised
within it can be taken out into the community in times of need, to
augment the 'professional' emergency services.

>>Is there any value in doing longhand math now? Why should we if we have
>>a calculator?
>>
>Exactly!

Not quite - longhand is still required to be understood before relying
on calculators, as it teaches the underlying principles of division
(and works without batteries!). It is simply a more rigorous method
of accomplishing the identical task - but without competence in it,
how would you know if the answer the calculator gave you was correct?
How would you check it? You would not really understand the mechanics
of division.

CW, in this analogy, is a different animal - more like comparing an
abacus to a calculator. In skilled hands, an abacus can give you the
same answer as a calculator (faster, too - watched a guy do it once!)
- but it is outmoded, in a world where calculators are cheap and
common.....one would be hard pressed to devise a compelling arguement
for teaching the abacus nowadays!

>
>73 de Jim, N2EY

73, Leo

1822. Re: Element 1, Code vs. No-code, and Dad

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-28 02:10:44 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <Eeknb.8880$FI2.7396@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 81497

"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
news:c2356669.0310270902.1efadd1c@posting.google.com...
> "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<KT0nb.4487$X22.826@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> > "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> > news:20031024082923.15462.00003790@mb-m06.aol.com...
> > > In article <20031023205901.23171.00001688@mb-m05.aol.com>,
> > lenover21@aol.com
> > > (Len Over 21) writes:
> > >
> > > > Amateur radio isn't the military. It isn't a workplace. It isn't a
> > guild
> > > > or craft or union or association of professionals.
> > >
> > > Which means that the methods and standards of the military, the
workplace,
> > the
> > > guild/craft/union or professional associations don't apply to amateur
> > radio.
> >
> > Even under such an argument, the role and purpose of amateur
> > test requirements must be justified by more than just tradition, values
and
> > other vague and subjective aspects.
>
> With all due respect, Bill,
>
> Isn't that statement really a subjective opinion? I mean, when you get
> right down to it, almost everything in the test process is there or is
> not there because of someone's subjective opinion that it's
> "reasonable" or "necessary".

If you feel that way, so be it.

> > > > It's a HOBBY.
> > >
> > > It's an avocation. Meaning it's done for its own sake.
> > >
> > > But however someone chooses to describe it, does the fact that amateur
> > > radio
> > > isn't the military, a workplace, a guild or craft or union or
association
> > of
> > > professionals mean that there is no need for amateur radio to have
values,

> > > and
> > > standards? That seems to be your main message here.
> >
> > The message is the same as that stated by the FCC in R&) for 98-143...
> > Rules must be justified.
> >
> > (SNIP)
>
> Sure - that's the easy part. The tough part is "what constitutes
> justification?"

Well we have (on code testing) pretty good knowledge as
to what doesn't constitute justification.

> And the point I was making still remains valid. Since amateur radio is
> not the military, a workplace, a guild or craft or union or
> association of professionals, its requirements should not be governed
> by those groups.

Yet if you go back to 1968, wasn't an argument in favor of
incentive licensing by the FCC attributed to the needs of
industry for technically inclined people?

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1823. Re: ARRL has no FIRE for sale?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-28 02:37:05 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3F9DD665.762EF867@earthlink.net>
Source record: 81498

N2EY wrote:
>
> lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20031027135410.25517.00001648@mb-m15.aol.com>...
> > As of 1300 EST on 27 Oct 03, the ARRL news page has not one
> > word
>
> http://www.arrl.org/news/stories/2003/10/27/2/?nc=1
>
> as of 1640 EST.

This leaves Len munching his brogans once again.

> Rest of Len's typical ARRL bashing snipped.

Hasn't Len made it clear on any number of occasions that he is not
anti-ARRL?

Dave K8MN

1824. Re: If the written test elements are so easy, why are we all not extras?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-28 02:56:59 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3F9DDB0F.E2285F7E@earthlink.net>
Source record: 81500

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <20031026222935.06226.00001191@mb-m19.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
> writes:
>
> >In article <3F9C4870.20107@ix.netcom.com>, Robert Casey
> ><wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
> >writes:
> >
> >>"Look lid you still don't get it, I am well aware the CW test is gone, my
> >>complaint still is the Give away Written."
> >>
> >>So why are we all not extras, then? If the writtens are so easy?
> >>
> >Well, for starters:
> >
> >1) Some hams are just not interested in HF.
>
> Those are obviously not "real hams."

How would you know, Leonard? You aren't a radio amateur.

> >2) Some hams are not in a position to have an HF station
>
> No excuse. Real hams get on HF and work DX with CW.

So far, you're the only individual making such statements. How would
you know? You aren't involved in amateur radio.

> >3) Some hams are not that interested in the relatively small amount of
> >additional privileges an Extra provides
>
> Tsk, tsk, tsk, no "service traditions of honor, glory, and reward..."

Huh?

> >4) Some hams have lost interest completely
>
> OBVIOUSLY not real hams.

As defined by one not remotely involved in ham radio?

> The CW skilled all have maximum interest, the only ones in US
> amateur radio. All the rest are "knuckle-dragging CB-plussers"
> according to two extras in here.

So you take the view of two Extra Class licensees as representative of
all code-tested radio amateurs? You really should devote some time to
learning a bit about amateur radio.

> >5) Some hams haven't yet heard about the rules changes, or don't understand
> >them
>
> Inconcievable in an activity that is all about communication.

It isn't any worse than a fellow who passes himself off as a
"professional" writer and who can't spell "inconceivable".

> >6) Some hams haven't gotten around to visiting a VE session
>
> There's no snow yet for all to walk barefoot uphill both ways
> to the VE place...

What do you know of the schedule and location of amateur radio exams in
relation to the location and schedules of those who may desire to
upgrade?

> >Note how slowly the number of Advanceds is declining. In the 42 months since
> >restructuring, their numbers have only dropped by about 15%. At least half of
> >that decline is expirations, so the number who have upgraded to Extra is
> >pretty small even though the 20 wpm code test is long gone.
>
> Also, according to the Parson, by inference, all the no-code-test
> Technicians are "not renewing." :-)

All of them? :-) :-)

> Novice class has been declining for LONGER prior to restructuring
> and is still declining. So? Where have all the "upgraders" gone.

Buffalo?

> And where were all those talented 20 WPM Extras existing for
> YEARS prior to restructuring wtihout doing any advancing of the
> amateur radio state of the art?

Who says that none of them have done anything to advance the radio art?
Do you believe that it is necessary for every radio amateur to advance
the radio art? Better hop to it and obtain a license. Maybe you can be
a shining example for all of us.

> Were all those just sitting around
> waiting for restructuring so they could piss and moan "no-coders
> going to do the art advancing?"

They were probably getting on the air and operating. What were you
doing for those several decades during which you've declared an interest
in amateur radio?

Dave K8MN

1825. Re: Element 1, Code vs. No-code, and Dad

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-28 02:59:25 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <hYknb.132845$qj6.9227563@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 81301

```
Bill Sohl wrote:
> "N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
> news:c2356669.0310270902.1efadd1c@posting.google.com...
>
>>"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
>
> news:<KT0nb.4487$X22.826@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
>
>>>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>>>news:20031024082923.15462.00003790@mb-m06.aol.com...
>>>
>>>>In article <20031023205901.23171.00001688@mb-m05.aol.com>,
>>>
>>> lenover21@aol.com
>>>
>>>>(Len Over 21) writes:
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>Amateur radio isn't the military. It isn't a workplace. It isn't a
>>>
>>> guild
>>>
>>>>> or craft or union or association of professionals.
>>>>
>>>>Which means that the methods and standards of the military, the
>
> workplace,
>
>>> the
>>>
>>>>guild/craft/union or professional associations don't apply to amateur
>>>
>>>radio.
>>>
>>>Even under such an argument, the role and purpose of amateur
>>>test requirements must be justified by more than just tradition, values
>
> and
>
>>>other vague and subjective aspects.
>>
>>With all due respect, Bill,
>>
>>Isn't that statement really a subjective opinion? I mean, when you get
```

>>right down to it, almost everything in the test process is there or is
>>not there because of someone's subjective opinion that it's
>>"reasonable" or "necessary".
>
>
> If you feel that way, so be it.

Do you believe what you post on ARS testing as a fact?

- Mike KB3EIA -

1826. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-28 03:14:54 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3F9DDF41.BB38D091@earthlink.net>
Source record: 81302

Dwight Stewart wrote:
>
> "Kim W5TIT" wrote:
> >
> > And, I believe the immigration laws are
> > appropriate, (snip)
>
> We allow more immigrants into this country each year than any other
> country on Earth, including those countries where most of our immigrants
> come from. This mass influx is driving wages down and prices up. Our schools
> are overcrowded. Education costs are going up. Medical costs are going up.
> Home prices are going up. Land prices are going up. Food prices are going
> up.

Salaries are going up.

> Crime continues to go up.

I believe that crime rates have actually gone down, Dwight.

> Our overall standard of living is going down.

Really? I have trouble accepting your claim.

> At the same time, I don't see a single benefit for the average American. Can
> you describe one benefit for me or my family, Kim?

I can think of one, Dwight. Those folks work and pay social security
taxes so that you can retire and draw SS benefits. They also pay State
and Federal taxes. Many of them are very bright individuals. Some are
doctors. Some do computer design work. Some do menial labor which most
American workers don't desire.

> > State and Federal welfare programs need to be
> > abolished. (snip)
>
> Why would you want to cut off the parachute put in place to help
> Americans? If you want to fix welfare, cut off the many thousands of illegal
> immigrants who are taking benefits from others.

I don't believe that we owe illegal immigrants anything. Legal
immigrants are entitled to the same protections and benefits which we
enjoy.

> Next, get rid of the obvious
> bums abusing the welfare system. This two steps alone would cut the cost of
> welfare programs dramatically, yet still provide help for those Americans

> why really need it.

That has been implemented over the past decade.

> > There is no danger to US sovereignty. It may not
> > be a US you like; but it is no danger of losing its
> > sovereignty. (snip)
>
> Kim, we've allowed millions of immigrants into this country from areas of
> the world openly hostile to the United States,...

There are a number of places in this world where governments are hostile
to the United States. That does not indicate that citizens of those
countries are all hostile to the U.S.

> ...with no method to establish
> their views of this country and its people.

On this one, you need to do your homework.

> After 9-11, this is clearly not
> safe for Americans.

I have trouble accepting your claim at face value. While it may be clear
to you, it isn't at all clear to me.

> Can you be so sure it is not a threat to our
> sovereignty? This reminds me of an old joke that is perhaps not that far
> from the truth; an enemy doesn't have to invade today - they can just fill
> out immigration papers for their entire army.

It wouldn't work. They'd all find jobs, start families, buy homes, cars
and TV sets. After they settled in, they could start complaining about
the newer immigrants fouling things up for them.

> Blacks have almost the entire continent of Africa and Hispanics have
> almost the entire continent of South America. Perhaps you can explain why
> either group needs to expand to this continent, or why it is so wrong to
> resist that expansion.

I hadn't realized the extent of your racist views, Dwight. Maybe you
have some insider knowledge of organized attempts by Africans or South
Americans to take over "our" country through immigration.

> Unless we're prepared to spend lots of tourist
> dollars, they're certainly not rushing to open their doors to us.

I lived in four African countries over a period of nearly ten years. In
all of those places, I found thousands of whites who live in harmony
with blacks. I don't know of many African countries who have government
policies aimed at restricting the flow of white residents into their
countries. That aside, I never found an African country where I'd
choose to spend the rest of my life. Many whites have.

Dave K8MN

1827. Re: What If.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-28 03:15:11 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3blnb.132851$qj6.9230299@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 81303

Leo wrote:

> On 28 Oct 2003 01:17:46 GMT, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:
>
>>Only problem with "200" is that it stops at 1936 and there was never a followup
>>book.
>>
>>If you want a really good history of US amateur radio from the very beginning
>>to almost the present day, google up W2XOY's "Wayback Machine". Excellent
>>history in many chapters. Free for the download.
>
>
> Great articles - thanks!
>
>
>>(extra bonus question: what is the significance of that callsign?)
>
>
> Found this reference on Google:
>
> Feb. 1, 1939. Broadcasting reports General Electric engineers recently
> set up two experimental frequency modulation transmitters at Albany
> and Schenectady, operating on the same frequency. They drove a test
> car between the two cities and found almost no areas of interference
> between the stations. The stations were W2XDA Schenectady and W2XOY
> New Scotland
>
>
>
>>>>Years ago, here in Canada, there was a special licence class required
>>>>to operate using the Digital modes (!). This was dropped after only a
>>>>few years. presumably because it was not demonstrated that there was
>>>>any real benefit gained from the additional testing of digital
>>>>proficiency. After all, the idea of a hobby is to be able to
>>>>experiment and learn those aspects that are of interest or use to the
>>>>individual!
>>
>>I thought it was dropped because so few applied for it. I recall something like
>>150 in 4 years.
>
>
> Haven't seen those stats - but seperate testing for Digital modes died
> out with it!
>

>>And merely because something is old doesn't make it bad. Look at the way words
>>are spelled...
>
>
> Certainly wasn't connecting 'old' with 'bad', Jim - just an
> observation that as times change, priorities tend to shift as well.
>
>
>>Try telling the hams who searched for shuttle pieces, or who are right now
>>helping fight the wildfires in California, that it's "a hobby". They might not
>>agree.
>
>
> It's a unique hobby - one where the skills learned and practised
> within it can be taken out into the community in times of need, to
> augment the 'professional' emergency services.
>
>
>
>>>Is there any value in doing longhand math now? Why should we if we have
>>>a calculator?
>>>
>>
>>Exactly!
>
>
> Not quite - longhand is still required to be understood before relying
> on calculators, as it teaches the underlying principles of division
> (and works without batteries!). It is simply a more rigorous method
> of accomplishing the identical task - but without competence in it,
> how would you know if the answer the calculator gave you was correct?
> How would you check it? You would not really understand the mechanics
> of division.

Indeed, why should anyone learn longhand? (substitute Morse CW or
abacus) Calculators (substitute Yeacomwood boxes) are so available and
inexpensive, that there is no need to learn longhand mathematics
(Substitute Morse CW) any more. I have personally seen little children
crying over their difficulties with learning longhand math. If they just
used calculators they wouldn't be so frustrated, and perhaps even learn
to love math. Longhand math is keeping potential mathematicians from
getting their degrees and infusing the field with their fresh ideas! 8^)

> CW, in this analogy, is a different animal - more like comparing an
> abacus to a calculator. In skilled hands, an abacus can give you the
> same answer as a calculator (faster, too - watched a guy do it once!)
> - but it is outmoded, in a world where calculators are cheap and
> common.....one would be hard pressed to devise a compelling arguement
> for teaching the abacus nowadays!

Actually, if you at all buy the argument about longhand vs a calculator, you can hardly toss out CW by calling it an abacus (BTW, I learned how to use an abacus in grade school) Toss 'em both out or accept them both.

- Mike KB3EIA -

1828. Re: What If.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-28 03:24:55 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3F9DE19B.2F6C150F@earthlink.net>
Source record: 81304

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <20031026083021.21232.00001578@mb-m13.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
> writes:
>
> >In article <20031025204218.00545.00001884@mb-m02.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com
> >(Len Over 21) writes:
> >
> >>In article <20031025082948.12501.00003470@mb-m04.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com
> >>(N2EY)
> >>writes:
> >>
> >>>But some of us (ahem) *do* design them and build them from scratch. Amateur
> >>>radio is probably the only radio service where a licensee can simply
> >>assemble
> >>a
> >>>transmitter and put it on the air without any formal type-acceptance,
> >>approval
> >>>or certification - at least here in the lower 50 provinces.
> >>
> >> Pennsylvania is a "province?!?" :-)
> >
> >Your lack of a sense of humor is obvious, Len ;-) ;-)
> >
> >Actually it's a commonwealth.
>
> Okay, so Pennsylvania seceeded from the Union...otherwise called
> the United States of America. STATES.
>
> No great loss, really...

...sez the non-native Californian who frequently belly aches about the
eastern states.

> >I've built-from-scratch (not including kits, no carbon copies of homebrew
> articles)
> >in my home workshops, at least:
> >
> >5 receivers
> >5 transmitters
> >3 transceivers
> >4 transmatches
> >12 power supplies
> >4 TR systems
> >5 pieces of test equipment

> >various shack furniture, antennas, power cables, control systems, etc.
>
> Keep on doing that. Eventually you'll get some of them to work.

The N2EY profile of your likely actions would fit nicely here.

> >The above list does not include:
> >
> >- surplus units converted/restored
> >- manufactured equipment restored/repaired/modified
> >- kits built or rebuilt
>
> Keep on doing that. Eventually some may work...

What is it with you, Leonard?

> >I've worked several of the regulars here on rrap using my homebrew rigs.
> >I can often be found on or around 7040 using CW.
>
> 7040 what?

It's a ham radio thing. You wouldn't understand.

> You have absolutely verifiable proof, iron-clad, evidenciary
> documentation that such RF was actually generated by
> this "home-built" equipment?

Is that supposed to be necessary, Len? What's it to you? You aren't
involved.

> Keep at it old-timer. Eventually you can get to changing
> frequency and work some other bands...

What amateur bands do you work, old timer?

> >And my transmitters have all been legally used in the service for which I am
> >licensed.
>
> So you say...because the FCC was too busy with other
> monitoring.

Maybe Jim can note which particular pieces of homebrew gear he uses on
which nights. He can have the whole shebang notarized and forward the
info to you on a weekly basis.

> All of MY transmissions and transmitters have been legally
> used in the services for which I am licensed...and in the
> radio services and government contract work which did NOT
> require any civilian license.

Are you licensed in the Amateur Radio Service, Len?

> >> You got the scratch, Elecraft has the
> >> KIT you can build. All by yourself.
> >

> >I built one of those back in 2001. Kits are not homebrew.
>
> So, you built it someplace else other than your residence.
>
> >Now explain to us again about your 1948 unlicensed operations...
>
> Why? Those were within the regulations of unlicensed RF
> emitters at the time. AM broadcast band "wireless
> phonograph adapters." :-)

You're a regular Marconi.

> You are welcome to retain an attorney to bring legal action
> to bear on alleged felonious radio emissions of 55 years
> ago! :-) Have him show us his cute legal briefs.
>
> Contact Riley Hollingsworth immediately! Let loose the
> legal hounds. Sound the Hue & Cry on the NTS! Bring the
> might of the US government LAW down on me!
>
> Are you erecting a new statute of limitiations or are you
> just erecting?
>
> Tsk, tsk, tsk...in 1953 I was transmitting 4 KW PEP SSB
> ON some amateur bands. Legally.
>
> Sue the United States Army for that. [remember what
> happened to "Tail Gunner Joe" when that senator tried to
> "get" the U. S. Army on another matter...]
>
> Your time machine isn't set properly. Get to work and FIX
> it. We are now on Standard REALITY time, not the daylight
> savings time of your fantasyland of long ago.

Len, you're a goofball.

Dave K8MN

1829. Re: Amateur Radio in the 21st Century?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-28 03:29:47 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031027222947.06226.00001204@mb-m19.aol.com>
Source record: 81305

In article <Caknb.8872$FI2.7958@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Bill Sohl"
<billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:

>"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
>news:c2356669.0310270917.2668311b@posting.google.com...
>> "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
>news:<7O0nb.4484$X22.1484@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
>> > "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>> > news:20031024182942.12300.00001303@mb-m20.aol.com...
>> > > In article <3F993128.6080401@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
>writes:

>> KL7CC & Co. have already done so. Have you read their paper?
>
>No, is it on a web site?.

http://www.qsl.net/al7fs/

Second item down - "Amateur Radio in the 21st Century"

You can skim through the code test stuff - we've agreed to disagree on that.
What is really interesting is the *other* ideas, such as what should happen to
the entry-level license class, free upgrades, written testing....

73 de Jim, N2EY

1830. Re: Lightning Man!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-28 03:41:09 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031027224109.11891.00001850@mb-m11.aol.com>
Source record: 81310

In article <f45722ac.0310271541.7bbb67c0@posting.google.com>,
brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:

>Lightning Man? Sounds more like Ben Franklin's experiments. Maybe
>Jim can fill us in - I think they were second cousins.

The quaint press prodigies of the 1840s called the Morse-Vail
Telegraph System "The Lightning Wire." On the basis of that
they dubbed old Finley as "The Lightning Man."

I don't think Parson Jimmie goes into professional or commercial
communications history, only amateur stuff. The 1844 Baltimore
to DC line was for commercial communications using morse.

LHA

1831. Re: Element 1, Code vs. No-code, and Dad

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-28 03:41:10 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031027224110.11891.00001852@mb-m11.aol.com>
Source record: 81306

In article <Y3fnb.132704$qj6.9126720@news1.news.adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:

>It's all an opinion, Jim. Those who believe they are blessed with the >"facts" in this issue are practicing self delusion.

You mean...gasp...only those with YOUR delusion have the "correct delusion?"

Whatta concept!

LHA

1832. Re: ARRL has no FIRE for sale? (and nobody really cares either)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-28 03:41:10 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031027224110.11891.00001851@mb-m11.aol.com>
Source record: 81308

In article <5ee63311.0310271708.2b598ce0@posting.google.com>,
groupk0hb@earthlink.net (Hans K0HB) writes:

>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote
>
>> As of 1300 EST on 27 Oct 03, the ARRL news page has not one
>> word about the many fires in California which have consumed a
>> quarter million acres (half the land area of Rhode Island), over
>> 500 homes destroyed, over 11 dead, now in its 5th day.
>
>Up here in Minnesota it just doesn't seem to be of any importance what
>some radio-hobbiest club near Hartford, CT, writes about on their web
>page. The ARRL isn't relevant to the massive tragedy you folks are
>facing.

The ARRL's vaunted Emergency classes are SUPPOSED to be
relevant to this sort of thing.

>Rather than sending hobby radiomen, the State of Minnesota DNR is
>sending you one of our new Canadian-built arial tankers, an augmented
>flight crew, and additional DNR firefighters to help you and your
>neighbors.

That's good to hear, Hans. My thanks to the good state of
Minnesota for their help.

The total of firefighting personnel is now greater than 8000 from
many states, engaged in three major firestorm locations over a
120 mile radius, North of Los Angeles County to south of San
Diego to east of San Bernardino.

Air Carrier flights have been slowed greatly due to evacuation of
an FAA air traffic control center near San Diego. That has
reflected to major urban air centers around the country. The
desert TRACON in northern part of Los Angeles is operating at
capacity trying to absorb some of the ATC load.

>Stay safe, Len.

Not a problem, Hans, but I thank you for your good wishes.

I'll just access ARRL news page for the latest "emergency
steps" to take. :-)

Have fun in the code contest. Keep that carpal tunnel open.

LHA

1833. Re: ARRL has no FIRE for sale?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-28 03:41:11 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031027224111.11891.00001853@mb-m11.aol.com>
Source record: 81312

In article <m%inb.6096$083.3677@news02.roc.ny>, "Jim Hampton"
<aa2qa@frontiernet.net> writes:

>Len should subscribe to our newspaper. Late sports info is printed *two*
>days later. He may not understand that it takes time for information to be
>collected and printed (even if only on the internet).

Newspapers here in Southern California are printed DAILY. They
are as up to the minute as a press run for 1.4 million copies of
TWO daily editions of the L. A. TIMES.

Radio propagates faster than 180 thousand miles per second. So
does light. 15 million folks out here in the southern region can
SEE the smoke from (now) over 250,000 acres burned and burning.

Telephones work here, despite the insistence of some that "telephones
always fail during emergencies and disasters!" Communications
satellites work fine (there's a full set of them every 3 degrees along
the geosynchronous orbit). We have more Uplink mobile sets that
"work" commsats in the southern part than exist in the entirety of
most individual states.

There's the INTERNET whose well-distributed Backbone will defy
destruction from a massive nuclear onslaught. One in five Americans
has some Internet connection capability in 2002 according to the
U. S. Census Bureau.

FEMA "field-tested" its fly-away video bulletin board systems back
in the '94 quake to show, visually, health and welfare messages in
their most personal and familiar form.

Wire services have all kinds of data terminals and lines (most of
which are dedicated, leased lines, not through dial-up POTS).
Staffers and stringers at the wire news service bureaus are working
24/7 here as well as in the northeast.

ARRL has been advertising its vaunted Emergency Planning and
Operations classes for about two years now. It's time for them
to put their keys where their mouths were...time for the NTS to
quit trying to play Western Union impersonator games (they were
never very good at it).

It's also time that the Newington crowd recognized that MOST of
the United States and MOST of the radio amateurs it is supposed
to represent live WEST of the Mississippi.

NBC evening news with Tom Brokaw featured the decade-old
Emergency Communications Center in Los Angeles that
coordinates the firefighting efforts. NBC didn't interview any ham
radio "emergency groups" nor mention ham radio in any way.

>I only wish that my worst problems were the ARRL and CW vs no code. LOL.
>These guys are going to drop from coronaries or stroke long before their
>time.

Fine, then activate an Emergency Medical Team on Ham Radio to go
rescue those guys south of Boston having all those coronaries and
strokes. ARRL's image is more important than their substance.

ARRL is the ham savior. Ham radio shall not want. Beep, beep.

LHA

1834. Re: ARRL has no FIRE for sale?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-28 03:41:12 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031027224112.11891.00001854@mb-m11.aol.com>
Source record: 81311

In article <rBhnb.111$UJ6.17847490@newssvr21.news.prodigy.com>, "charlesb" <n5pvl@sbcglobal.net> writes:

>"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20031027135410.25517.00001648@mb-m15.aol.com...
>>
>> Apparently "6-land" doesn't exist in the thinking of new englanders.
>
>I'm sure they are like the rest of the country... We all know that
>California is there - but we try not to dwell on it too much.

More than one tenth of ALL Americans live in California, dumbass.

It's the most populous state in the Union. Or did you think Tay-hass seceeded from the Union again?

>Most likely, you are not hearing news reports by hams in the west because
>they are currently too busy doing something useful.

Such as?

While I can't get much reach outside of NVIS' 300 km radius from these hills, I didn't hear anything on any HF ham band nets.

They are "doing something useful" just like they did in the 1994 Northridge quake...getting the hell out...MOST LIKELY.

>One pattern I've noted
>over the years is that reporting of ham involvement in emergencies generally
>has a significant time-lag. I'm not saying that this is good or bad; I'm
>just saying that that's how it generally goes.

Radio waves propagate at faster than 180 thousand miles per second, dumbass.

Are all these "emergency workers" getting organized by mean old telephone landline? Don't they know that "telephones always fail during emergencies and disasters?" [they are always saying that in here]

>P.S. Is it really true that they call California the "cereal bowl state"
>because once you get past all the fruits and nuts, the only thing left are
>the flakes?

No. California has a tremendous agribusiness that feeds most of the western, mountain, and middle western states. Texas couldn't possibly do near as well...they try with steer and say that their steer manure is "manna."

>Charles (No Texas jokes, please!) Brabham, N5PVL

Don't have a cow, dumbass.

LHA

1835. Re: A Morsodist Challenge

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-28 03:41:13 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031027224113.11891.00001856@mb-m11.aol.com>
Source record: 81307

In article <f45722ac.0310271543.58719bfd@posting.google.com>,
brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:

>"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
>news:<d4Umb.5623$FI2.1197@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
>
>> Only incompetents use a computer to receive morse code.
>
>Echelon is incompetent?

Perhaps Dan thinks "Echelon" is just a brand of gasoline? :-)

LHA

1836. Re: ARRL has no FIRE for sale?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-28 03:41:13 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031027224113.11891.00001855@mb-m11.aol.com>
Source record: 81309

In article <c2356669.0310271339.15e7e1df@posting.google.com>, N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) writes:

>http://www.arrl.org/news/stories/2003/10/27/2/?nc=1
>
>as of 1640 EST.
>
>Rest of Len's typical ARRL bashing snipped.

Tsk, tsk, tsk. 5 1/2 days. Then, suddenly, "news" appears on ARRL that Something Is Happening Out West...a bit over two hours after I posted a No News Statement.

Somebody in Newington must have gone into the archives back room and found an Almanac showing more than 48 states in the USA. Wow! Discovery!

No problem on hurricanes...those are reported constantly after NOAA puts out the word. Busy morose code users activate Nets and Prepare For The Worst. This last one really had an impact with all the "devestation" everywhere, didn't it?

Really "with it" news reporting from New England...

LHA

1837. Re: If the written test elements are so easy, why are we all not extras?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-28 04:35:13 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031027233513.28496.00001552@mb-m18.aol.com>
Source record: 81313

In article <3F9DDB0F.E2285F7E@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>Len Over 21 wrote:
>>
>> In article <20031026222935.06226.00001191@mb-m19.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com
>(N2EY)
>> writes:
>>
>> >In article <3F9C4870.20107@ix.netcom.com>, Robert Casey
>> ><wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
>> >writes:
>> >
>> >>"Look lid you still don't get it, I am well aware the CW test is gone, my
>> >>complaint still is the Give away Written."
>> >>
>> >>So why are we all not extras, then? If the writtens are so easy?
>> >>
>> >Well, for starters:
>> >
>> >1) Some hams are just not interested in HF.
>>
>> Those are obviously not "real hams."
>
>How would you know, Leonard? You aren't a radio amateur.

I'm a PROFESSIONAL in radio, been one a helluval lot longer
than you and done far more.

Poor baby, got your state department shorts all knotted up?

>> >2) Some hams are not in a position to have an HF station
>>
>> No excuse. Real hams get on HF and work DX with CW.
>
>So far, you're the only individual making such statements. How would
>you know? You aren't involved in amateur radio.

I'm not eager to "get involved" with working DX on HF with CW.

That was done over a half century ago by others.

Amateurs, and I use that in its most pejorative appelation, LIKE YOU
insist on reliving the past so that you can claim "pioneer" status when
you've never done a damn thing in that regard, including your famous
claim of "using CW as an order wire on an RTTY circuit in the 1980s"

while at state.

>> >3) Some hams are not that interested in the relatively small amount of
>> >additional privileges an Extra provides
>>
>> Tsk, tsk, tsk, no "service traditions of honor, glory, and reward..."
>
>Huh?

What do you mean, "Huh," dumbass? You can't read standard
English? You want me to type slower so you can lip-read as
the letters appear? TS.

>> >4) Some hams have lost interest completely
>>
>> OBVIOUSLY not real hams.
>
>As defined by one not remotely involved in ham radio?

As defined by idiots like yourself who only want to attack people,
not subjects.

Heil, all you have left is Personal Attack of anyone who displeases
you.

Typical dictatorial prussian.

>> The CW skilled all have maximum interest, the only ones in US
>> amateur radio. All the rest are "knuckle-dragging CB-plussers"
>> according to two extras in here.
>
>So you take the view of two Extra Class licensees as representative of
>all code-tested radio amateurs? You really should devote some time to
>learning a bit about amateur radio.

I've read quite enough. I can't get inside minds to find out how
terribly deluded some are, like yourself, all caught up in the "service"
aspects of a mythical "service" when all you are doing in enjoying
your hobby.

I suppose now you are going to come back with having to be a believer
in the ARRL bullshit. It will be some kind of stinky bullshit regardless.

>> >5) Some hams haven't yet heard about the rules changes, or don't
>understand
>> >them
>>
>> Inconcievable in an activity that is all about communication.
>
>It isn't any worse than a fellow who passes himself off as a
>"professional" writer and who can't spell "inconceivable".

YOU are NOT paying for any of this, dumbass. Why don't you go
form a league of newsgroup Kops who argue minutae of typos

such as prissy Parson Jimmie?

I've SOLD thousands of words and copy for a quarter century.
No problem.

>> >6) Some hams haven't gotten around to visiting a VE session
>>
>> There's no snow yet for all to walk barefoot uphill both ways
>> to the VE place...
>
>What do you know of the schedule and location of amateur radio exams in
>relation to the location and schedules of those who may desire to
>upgrade?

Who the hell cares about YOUR judgemental non-talents, Oberst
Heil.

All you care to do is PICK FIGHTS, flame fests, so you can appear
triumphant even in losing.

>Who says that none of them have done anything to advance the radio art?
>Do you believe that it is necessary for every radio amateur to advance
>the radio art? Better hop to it and obtain a license. Maybe you can be
>a shining example for all of us.

YOU wouldn't know "state of the art" in radio if Norman Rockwell
came back to life and painted portraits of Peter Martinez and Phil
Karn and Dan Tayloe.

YOU are just an AMATEUR in the radio arts, capable of little but
restoring OLD radios and operating ready-built radios designed by
professionals.

Come back when you've gone beyond Ohm's Law.

>> Were all those just sitting around
>> waiting for restructuring so they could piss and moan "no-coders
>> going to do the art advancing?"
>
>They were probably getting on the air and operating. What were you
>doing for those several decades during which you've declared an interest
>in amateur radio?

WORKING for a living IN radio and electronics, dumbass, doing
PROFESSIONAL work, applying for patents and gettin one, going
farther along the EM spectrum in radio communications than is legal
for US amateurs. Design engineering, you dumbass, not sitting around
shoveling bullshit about being some hobbyist in off-hours pretending to
be a radio pioneer and "in the service of your country" by beeping
morse.

You LOST it Heil. You don't have the proper prussian arrogance for
an oberst anymore. You are demoted to just a feldwebel, a minor-rank
NCO, in a fantasy life as a United States Morse Codist (USMC).

Semper foo, herr feldwebel

LHA

1838. Re: ARRL has no FIRE for sale?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-28 04:35:14 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031027233514.28496.00001553@mb-m18.aol.com>
Source record: 81314

In article <3F9DD665.762EF867@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>>
>> lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>news:<20031027135410.25517.00001648@mb-m15.aol.com>...
>> > As of 1300 EST on 27 Oct 03, the ARRL news page has not one
>> > word
>>
>> http://www.arrl.org/news/stories/2003/10/27/2/?nc=1
>>
>> as of 1640 EST.
>
>This leaves Len munching his brogans once again.

Shut the hell up, you little USMC feldwebel. Learn to READ English.

As of 1 PM EST on the 27th of October the ARRL website news
page had NOTHING about the California wildfires. NOTHING.

Go "munch" someone else's shoes, preferrably some CROW
as dessert.

>> Rest of Len's typical ARRL bashing snipped.
>
>Hasn't Len made it clear on any number of occasions that he is not
>anti-ARRL?

ARRL is an EASTERN headquartered organization, more specifically
in the northeastern USA. ARRL doesn't seem to recognize that
MOST of the USA lives WEST of the Mississippi...including licensed
US radio amateurs.

I'm not "anti-ARRL." I'm just showing what they are and what they
are NOT. What they are NOT is NOT "representing ALL amateurs."

ARRL is eastern-oriented, almost obsessively so in concentration
east of the Mississippi. Not my problem. It's ARRL's problem.

Maybe that's why ARRL membership remains a minority of all
licensed US radio amateurs (only a quarter).

All the ARRL "represents" is its membership...but mostly it is the
executives and staff and board of directors of the ARRL that is
represented. Membership has to fall in line with that or be
excommunicated.

To bad about your demotion in the United States Morse Codists (USMC). You deserved it, though. Enjoy.

LHA

1839. Re: ARRL has no FIRE for sale?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-28 04:38:43 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <8_idndo6ZqC7aACiRVn-iQ@gbronline.com>
Source record: 81315

Len Over 21 wrote:
> In article <3F9DD665.762EF867@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
>
>>N2EY wrote:
>>
>>>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>>
>>news:<20031027135410.25517.00001648@mb-m15.aol.com>...
>>
>>>>As of 1300 EST on 27 Oct 03, the ARRL news page has not one
>>>> word
>>>
>>>http://www.arrl.org/news/stories/2003/10/27/2/?nc=1
>>>
>>>as of 1640 EST.
>>
>>This leaves Len munching his brogans once again.
>
>
> Shut the hell up, you little USMC feldwebel. Learn to READ English.
>
> As of 1 PM EST on the 27th of October the ARRL website news
> page had NOTHING about the California wildfires. NOTHING.
>
> Go "munch" someone else's shoes, preferrably some CROW
> as dessert.
>
>
>>>Rest of Len's typical ARRL bashing snipped.
>>
>>Hasn't Len made it clear on any number of occasions that he is not
>>anti-ARRL?
>
>
> ARRL is an EASTERN headquartered organization, more specifically
> in the northeastern USA. ARRL doesn't seem to recognize that
> MOST of the USA lives WEST of the Mississippi...including licensed
> US radio amateurs.
>
> I'm not "anti-ARRL." I'm just showing what they are and what they
> are NOT. What they are NOT is NOT "representing ALL amateurs."
>

> ARRL is eastern-oriented, almost obsessively so in concentration
> east of the Mississippi. Not my problem. It's ARRL's problem.
>
> Maybe that's why ARRL membership remains a minority of all
> licensed US radio amateurs (only a quarter).
>
> All the ARRL "represents" is its membership...but mostly it is the
> executives and staff and board of directors of the ARRL that is
> represented. Membership has to fall in line with that or be
> excommunicated.
>
> To bad about your demotion in the United States Morse Codists
> (USMC). You deserved it, though. Enjoy.
>
> LHA

Len, to kern an old phrase, "you don't know shit from Shinola". Now why don't you go over to the cb group where you might find folks more down on your lever?

1840. Re: Why Can't Brain Just Say "Yes" Or "No"...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-28 04:52:51 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0310272052.3e2110b7@posting.google.com>
Source record: 81316

brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0310271533.27d2f0d7@posting.google.com>...
> k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message

> > > > You failed to acknowledge and accept those conditions in this
> > > > public forum, therefore you may no longer claim me as your "mentor".
> > >
> > > Not true, Stebe. I can claim anything I want. You do.
> >
> > Not true.
> >
> > I'll ask you to provide some relative post...?!?!
>
> You claim that your mental health is just fine, don't you?

I'll STILL ask you to provide a relevent post.

You didn't this time. Do you not understand the concept of a
direct answer to a direct question?

> > > Hey, I think you just mentored me a little more. Keep up the good work.
> >
> > Nope. Requires a voluntary interaction.
>
> I don't have a gun to your head.

That's a very good thing, Brain, because I am the LAST person in
the world YOU want to insinuate holding a firearm on...

The LAST person...

> > You refused to accept the conditions...Anything else is a lie on your part...
> >
> > But then you're USED to lying, aren't you, Brain?
>
> Stebe, I'm used to your lies.

You're free to itemize them, if you care, Brain...Other than
refusing to delineate parts of my military service for yours or
Lennie's edification, you have nothing to refer to.

If THAT is the basis of your rants, sorry to leave you wanting.

> > Hardly.
>
> So there IS a gun to your head? I suggest you put it away and get some help..

I'll reiterate so that there's NO misunderstanding, Brain...I am
the LAST person in the world that you want to insinuate holding a
weapon on or having a weapon held on...

The LAST person...

> > > > Sorry.
> > >
> > > Noted.
> > >
> > > Stebe is my mentor, I shall not want...
> >
> > Brian Burke is a liar...He'll ALWAYS want...
>
> I shall not want for a better mentor in misspelling people's names and lying.

Well...so far I don't see where either applies. You're the
Brain, and no one contests that. And as for your allegations of me
lying, I once again invite you to provide the post...

As Hans says..."Good Luck On This One Now..."

Steve, K4YZ

1841. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-28 05:30:09 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <REMOVETHISkc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <bnlq3n$12jjnj$4@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 81320

I sort of agree with below to a point. We have more than enough people in this country as it is. There are not enough jobs out there for those that are already here as it is.

We also need to stop this crap of being the worlds Welfare payor! If you go back as far as 50 years ago, the amount of aid and "forgiven debts" would cancel out our national debt! Now we are going to give Iraq a ton of money after bombing them??? Screw 'em..... It's not our problem, and I as a taxpayer resent having to pay for it.

Ryan

> I believe requirements for immigration and naturalization should be
> extremely rigid, involving extensive background checks and a requirement
> that the person immigrating have the means in place to make his/her
> own living. Eligibility for state or federal "welfare" benefits should
also
> be severely limited. I'd also do away with the law that states that any
> person born in the U.S. is automatically a U.S. citizen, if the parents,
> at the time, are *not* U.S. citizens themselves. The children born to
> non-citizens would be considered to be citizens of the parents' own
> country of origin. Also, no person who is not a U.S. citizen, by birth
> or legal naturalization, should be allowed to vote in any local, state,
> or federal election. Liberal immigration and naturalization policies
> amount to political corruption in it's most dangerous form -- and the
> danger is to U.S. sovreignty.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

1842. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-28 05:34:29 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <REMOVETHISkc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <bnlq3o$12jjnj$5@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 81321

Gee... isn't that one of the concepts of the Republican party?? Or even that
little European "hassle" back around 1940-1945???

Ryan

(snippage)
. They all need to be rounded up and "deprogrammed."
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>
>
>

1843. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-28 09:31:20 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <IHqnb.7160$X22.2575@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 81317

"Dave Heil" wrote:
> Dwight Stewart wrote:
> >
> > (snip)
>
> Salaries are going up.

Compared to the cost of living, salaries are going down. The minimum wage is a good example. To keep up with the cost of living increase over the last twenty-five years (to have the same spending power as 25 years ago), the minimum wage should be over $19 per hour. By the same token, a person earning $19 an hour twenty-five years ago should be earning well over $50 an hour today. Check it out yourself. Look at the minimum wage 25 years ago (or any typical wage 25 years ago) and increase it by the same percentage that living costs (rent, house payments, utilities, food, and so on) have increased over the years since.

> I can think of one, Dwight. Those folks work and
> pay social security taxes so that you can retire and
> draw SS benefits. They also pay State and Federal
> taxes. Many of them are very bright individuals.
> Some are doctors. Some do computer design work.
> Some do menial labor which most American workers
> don't desire.

Americans working at those jobs would do the same things (pay taxes and so on), Dave. Why do we need immigrants to do that? Some of those Americans are even bright. As for the "menial" jobs, the only reason those jobs are menial is because employers choose not to pay decent wages to do those jobs. And as long as employers continue to find cheap labor to fill those jobs, there is no incentitive whatsoever to increase those wages. If anything, a ready supply of cheap labor only drives down wages for other jobs, increasing the number of menial jobs and decreasing jobs that pay decent wages. The direct result is less well paying jobs for all working class Americans.

> I hadn't realized the extent of your racist views, Dwight.
> Maybe you have some insider knowledge of organized
> attempts by Africans or South Americans to take over
> "our" country through immigration.

Obviously, if you twist what is said hard enough, you can call anyone a racist. I talked about expansion to this country, not "organized attempts" or "take over." Those were your words. For my reply to the charge of racism, see the last paragraph below.

> I lived in four African countries over a period of nearly ten
> years. In all of those places, I found thousands of whites
> who live in harmony with blacks. (snip)

A few exceptions don't change the rule, Dave. With the exception of South Africa, there are few countries in Africa where large numbers of whites work in government, the military, or in black owned businesses. In South Africa, whites (the minority) were loudly criticized for taking jobs, money, and power, away from blacks (the majority). The people leveling that criticism were not called racist - only those in the majority here are called racist for saying such things. After blacks gained control of the South African government, white employees were routinely replaced with blacks throughout the country. There was no criticism of this. After all, since South Africa belonged to the blacks (the majority), they should obviously have the jobs, money, and power. Of course, if a white (the majority) says that here, it is immediately called racism. Clearly, there is an absurd double-standard when it comes to the words "racism" and "racist."

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

1844. Re: ARRL has no FIRE for sale?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-28 11:13:12 UTC
From: charlesb <n5pvl@sbcglobal.net>
Message-ID: <cbsnb.17656$bO5.8898@newssvr29.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 81318

"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20031027224112.11891.00001854@mb-m11.aol.com...
> In article <rBhnb.111$UJ6.17847490@newssvr21.news.prodigy.com>, "charlesb"
> <n5pvl@sbcglobal.net> writes:
>
> >"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
> >news:20031027135410.25517.00001648@mb-m15.aol.com...
> >>
> >> Apparently "6-land" doesn't exist in the thinking of new englanders.
> >
> >I'm sure they are like the rest of the country... We all know that
> >California is there - but we try not to dwell on it too much.
>
> More than one tenth of ALL Americans live in California, dumbass.

Sorry, but you cannot count California's illegal immigrant population as
"Americans", though technically they are.

Moron.

Charles Brabham, N5PVL

1845. Re: Why Can't Brain Just Say "Yes" Or "No"...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-28 11:39:14 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0310280339.6e7f4015@posting.google.com>
Source record: 81319

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0310272052.3e2110b7@posting.google.com>...
> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0310271533.27d2f0d7@posting.google.com>...
> > k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
>
> > > > > You failed to acknowledge and accept those conditions in this
> > > > > public forum, therefore you may no longer claim me as your "mentor".
> > > >
> > > > Not true, Stebe. I can claim anything I want. You do.
> > >
> > > Not true.
> > >
> > > I'll ask you to provide some relative post...?!?!
> >
> > You claim that your mental health is just fine, don't you?
>
> I'll STILL ask you to provide a relevent post.
>
> You didn't this time. Do you not understand the concept of a
> direct answer to a direct question?
>
> > > > Hey, I think you just mentored me a little more. Keep up the good work.
> > >
> > > Nope. Requires a voluntary interaction.
> >
> > I don't have a gun to your head.
>
> That's a very good thing, Brain, because I am the LAST person in
> the world YOU want to insinuate holding a firearm on...
>
> The LAST person...

I'll repeat - "I don't have a gun to your head." That in no way
insinuates that I have a gun to your head, because I don't and I said
I don't.

Do you now understand that I don't have a gun to your head?

Or don't you understand the contraction "don't?"

> > > You refused to accept the conditions...Anything else is a lie on your part...
> > >
> > > But then you're USED to lying, aren't you, Brain?
> >

> > Stebe, I'm used to your lies.
>
> You're free to itemize them, if you care, Brain...Other than
> refusing to delineate parts of my military service for yours or
> Lennie's edification, you have nothing to refer to.
>
> If THAT is the basis of your rants, sorry to leave you wanting.

Was your military service a lie?

> > > Hardly.
> >
> > So there IS a gun to your head? I suggest you put it away and get some help..
>
> I'll reiterate so that there's NO misunderstanding, Brain...I am
> the LAST person in the world that you want to insinuate holding a
> weapon on or having a weapon held on...
>
> The LAST person...

Sounds like a threat, Stebe. Are you threatening me?

I want you to withdraw your threat and apologize.

> > > > > Sorry.
> > > > >
> > > > > Noted.
> > > > >
> > > > > Stebe is my mentor, I shall not want...
> > > >
> > > > Brian Burke is a liar...He'll ALWAYS want...
> > >
> > > I shall not want for a better mentor in misspelling people's names and lying.
>
> Well...so far I don't see where either applies. You're the
> Brain, and no one contests that. And as for your allegations of me
> lying, I once again invite you to provide the post...
>
> As Hans says..."Good Luck On This One Now..."
>
> Steve, K4YZ

Stebe, you're the one who needs luck and help.

1846. Re: What If.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-28 13:52:30 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@nope.org>
Message-ID: <1ksspv4o9gpu839l3pag8lef2ld1c5c3eg@4ax.com>
Source record: 81322

On Tue, 28 Oct 2003 03:15:11 GMT, Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
wrote:
>snip

> Actually, if you at all buy the argument about longhand vs a
>calculator, you can hardly toss out CW by calling it an abacus (BTW, I
>learned how to use an abacus in grade school) Toss 'em both out or
>accept them both.

Me too - the guy who operated it was awesome - faster than me +
calculator, even today!

Not sugesting that either be tossed out, Mike - my comments are
related to the relative importance that should be placed on CW, or
abacuses (abacii?) in the context of the modern world. Some folks
will want to continue to use 'em, for a variety of valid reasons - but
they are no longer the primary tools for accomplishing the tasks that
they were originally designed for - does that mean that we should
insist that everyone gain competence in their operation, whether they
intend to use them or not? For what purpose? To accomplish what
objective? I don't see it.....
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -

73, Leo

1847. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-28 15:30:10 UTC
From: groupk0hb@earthlink.net
Message-ID: <5ee63311.0310280730.800cbb7@posting.google.com>
Source record: 81323

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote

> After blacks gained control of the South African
> government, white employees were routinely replaced
> with blacks throughout the country. There was no
> criticism of this. After all, since South Africa
> belonged to the blacks (the majority), they should
> obviously have the jobs, money, and power.

So let me make sure I understand your position......

Using your exact words, but interpolating your statement into US terms, it would read like this: "Since the US government (President, Vice President, Congress, the Judiciary) is clearly under white control, then black employees throughout the country should routinely be replaced by whites. After all, since the US belongs to the whites (the majority), they should obviously have the jobs, money, and power."

Does that fairly represent your position?

Good luck on this one now!

With warmest personal regards,

de Hans, K0HB

1848. Re: What If.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-28 16:53:27 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3F9E9F07.5020200@psu.edu>
Source record: 81324

Leo wrote:
> Thanks, Mike - my responses are in the text below.
>
>
>
>>....whole lotta snippage goin' on.....
>
>
> On Mon, 27 Oct 2003 10:49:04 -0500, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote:
>
>
>
>>Never does! remember that ill fated thread where I tried to get a
>>decent discussion going? (the troglodyte one) After review, it lasted
>>one post - mine.
>
>
> Yup, I remember that one well! Wonder why that happens....this thread
> went a bit farther, but keeps branching out into other topics, with
> the requisite bashings of the participants.

I dunno. I enjoy an intelligent discussion with those who disagree with me.

>>It isn't a pure hobby, though. If I were to be doing this as a pure
>>hobby, I would simply be doing PSK31, contesting, and homebrewing.
>>Instead I help with nets, do public service at events, and whatever
>>emergency service might be needed. Some hams may not, but that means
>>they are slacking off and shirking their civic duty, IMHO.
>>
>
> Good point - the ability to use the hobby for community service is
> pretty unique to amateur radio. (try that with R/C model planes, or
> Civil War re-enactment!.....).
>
>> The reasons to continue Morse code testing are as valid, and solid as
>>those for removing it. This is not like making the prospective ham clean
>>out toilets with his or her personal toothbrush. It's testing for a
>>purpose. And all arguments for it's removal or retention are as valid as
>>each other. I could make the same argument for tossing out the satellite
>>operation questions as I could for tossing out Morse code testing.
>>
>>I don't care about the details that some people try to toss out. Its the
>>same thing as the core.
>
>

> ...the only difference is that the written testing consists of a
> question or so on satelite operation - Morse continues as a complete
> syllabus and test in its own right. I'm not convinced that it is
> quite that important anymore to warrant this.
>
> I do see your point, though - we'll have to 'agree to disagree', I
> suppose...(a rare achievement in this newsgroup <8*p)
>
>>
>>> Although it is a valuable mode of operation, especialy in high QRM or
>>>QRN situations, (and fun to use!!), it was only a mandatory requirment
>>>originally (as I understand it, anyway) so that government (and
>>>commercial?) CW stations could communicate with amateurs interfering
>>>with their signals, and order them to stop.
>>
>> This is one that I have a little trouble with, Leo. The amateurs needed
>>to have *some* method to communicate, and Morse code was one of the few
>>methods around then. SSB was just being born, voice was pretty much out
>>of the picture. So what's left?
>
>
> Here's the way I understand this one:
>
> Agree that there most certainly was a time when CW was all that was
> available to amateur operators (and was heavily used for commercial
> radio as well as landline operations too).
>
> Then, if an amateur were to be allowed to go on the air with no code
> training, what would the impact to amateur radio be? You would have a
> guy sending signals out that no one could understand, or answer. A
> very frustrated operator, most likely - but no real damage to the
> service itself. However, if that guy was interfering with commercial
> or governmental traffic, and did not know enough code to understand
> their signals to clear off the band immediately, major problems would
> be possible. Multiply this by the number of amateurs playing around
> with radio, and it would be a huge problem. CW proficiency testing
> pior to licence issuance would be a big step towards preventing
> situations like this one.
>
> Now, with virtually no one using code except amateurs, and all of that
> strictly within the amateur bands, this problem seems to be a thing of
> the past. Just like a guy who sets up an improperly-functioning RTTY
> setup (like I jusy did, a couple of nights ago...) - no major problem
> - and no two way communications, either :)

An aside, what frequencies do you operate rtty on? I want to get my
feet wet with it.

>>>A secondary purpose may
>>>have been to allow emergency CW traffic to be relayed by amateur
>>>stations. These scenarios are no longer viable reasons in 2003 -

>>>unless there are new reasons to take their place, then perhaps CW
>>>should assume the same status as the other available operating modes -
>>>permitted for use, by all means, but not specifically tested by
>>>practical examination.
>>>
>>>My own personal position on this subject has shifted solidly over to
>>>the "yes, discontinue mandatory CW testing" side, in the absence of a
>>>logical reason to believe otherwise. I cannot recall a single
>>>arguement based on hard fact that justifies testing as a necessary
>>>requirement to becoming a licenced amateur, and operating on HF.
>>>There is emotion, and preference, and nostalgia, and tradition, and
>>>fear of the loss of a valuable skill whose value is no longer
>>>quantifiable - but no hard reasons.
>>
>>you are correct, there are no hard reasons, no truly logical reasons to
>>keep Morse code testing. Or to get rid of it either. It's all opinions.
>
>
> Agree, to a point. There don't seem to be any logical reasons to keep
> CW testing (I was hoping that this thread would flesh them out...).
> OTOH, there is a reason to discontinue CW testing - the reason being
> that CW is (for all practical purposes) no longer any more important
> than any other available operating mode, today, in 2003. As such, is
> it fair to compel people to learn and pass a practical test on one
> mode in deference to all others? I don't see it!

The closest thing I can find to a logical argument is that Morse CW will
allow an amateur to communicate with an other amateur in another country
who may not share his or her language. This *may* be of some use in an
emergency. Will it? Odds aren't all that hot. But here we have one of
those opinion things again. I think it is worth the effort, while many
others do not. And the odds favor them. Then again, I'm first aid, CPR
and defib trained, and will probably (hopefully) never need to use those
skills. But if I need them.....

>>>Years ago, here in Canada, there was a special licence class required
>>>to operate using the Digital modes (!). This was dropped after only a
>>>few years. presumably because it was not demonstrated that there was
>>>any real benefit gained from the additional testing of digital
>>>proficiency. After all, the idea of a hobby is to be able to
>>>experiment and learn those aspects that are of interest or use to the
>>>individual!
>>
>> Then why the heck don't they get rid of those stupid questions about
>>satellite operations!!!! 8^)
>
>
> Don't know - I think that's one of the ones I got wrong anyway....

>
>> The reason I'm not too wild about this argument is that it reminds me

>>of those arguments people used to make for some of the "progressive
>>schools" where the student made up their own curriculum
>
>
> Likewise, if the school board decided that "The Adz, Plane , Bow Saw
> And Other Pioneer Tools" was to become a seperate mandatory subject,
> which must be studied and passed prior to gaining a trade
> certification in Carpentry - that would be equally wrong. It is
> interesting to some (and at one time, the only way to build a log
> cabin), but not relevant enough to be given its own course today.
> Still, there are those who enjoy building with these types of tools -
> more power to 'em!

Remember though, there is a difference between the adz and Morse CW.
hehe, the thought makes me chuckle. I look at it more like the way the
(Coast Guard?) has a sailed vessl for training on. There are many
important things that can be learned, even though those recruits are
using really ancient technology.

>>Here I see the fundamental nature of your approach. You see the ARS as a
>>hobby, whereas I see it as a service. I have other things I do as
>>hobbies, like building telescopes and grinding mirrors. Purely personal
>>stuff that I find interesting to do. But my ARS experience is not only
>>the homebrewing, contesting, and digital mode work, it is a way of
>>giving back to the community. And yes, the groups we do radio comms for
>>are part of the community, and appreciate the work we do for them. It's
>>a personal thing, like first aid and CPR training. Them ain't hobbies.
>
>
> You're right - for me, at least so far, it is only a hobby . Since I'm
> relatively new to the avocation (a year and a half, so far), I'm still
> in learning mode - I am interested in getting involved with ARES, and
> may do so in the next few months or so, time permitting.
>
> BTW - grinding mirrors? Now there's something that requires a lot of
> patience! Wow!

It is a tremendous amount of fun for me. I'm kind of an obsessive
compulsive person, and I can take out my tendencies on a mirror.
Grinding and polishing and testing are so darn much fun, and it's one
field where all the fussing pays off in the end.

>>>I believe that we need to position ourselves as forward-thinking,
>>>technically competent and highly motivated - ready to out our skills
>>>to use whenever required to do so by the various public safety and
>>>security organizations. Looking through the current FCC petitions
>>>regarding the infamous Code issue, we could easily be seen as a bunch
>>>of folks interested in creating unnecessary levels of proficiency
>>>testing within the hobby, without a real technological reason to do
>>>so. That will not help us, or our image, one bit.
>>

>>But isn't there some contradiction in there? I can't reconcile forward
>>thinking and reduction in knowledge together myself. I can understand
>>why we wouldn't have questions on tube equipment on tests, but the
>>removal of a basic method of communication that can be used worldwide
>>that has as a drawback that it can't be learned instantaneously is
>>beyond my comprehension. It is in place as the lowest common denominator
>>between two communicators. To me it is like having children learn how to
>>do longhand math before setting them loose with calculators.
>>
>>Is there any value in doing longhand math now? Why should we if we have
>>a calculator?
>
>
> But there is a technolgical reason in continuing to teach longhand
> division - and that is, without knowing how it works, how will you
> know when the calculators' answer is incorrect? (My kids have
> demonstrated this concept to me many times.....they tend to believe
> whatever answer the thing displays, without applying logic to see if
> they entered something wrong - grrr) And for that reason, I think
> that the current level of testing that we do to become an amateur is
> not enough - as I have explained in previous threads, the level of
> technical knowledge has dropped considerably over time. Longhand is
> the check-and-balance for the answer presented by the calculator.

Actually I agree. Too many people don't kow the basics of math anymore.

> I don't quite see the analogy to CW, though - sure, if SSB
> communications are not possible CW could be used to get through. But
> the rest of the world is moving away from it (first the commercial and
> government users, and now amateur administrations all over the world)
> - I'd suggest that if there was any value to retaining it even as a
> back-up mode of communications, it would have been retained by
> someone.
>
> I'd think, anyway.

What I think leads to the decline in use is that it uses a very
expensive processor - a human. We've tried to take humans ot of the loop
for years now, or at least skilled ones. It is a lot easier to train a
person to hit a button and make a copy than it is to teach them
something like Morse code.

And that I think is why the ARS can still get away with using Morse CW.
Our "wetware" does a superb job of translating the recieved signals, and
since this is a hobby/service/avocation, we aren't being paid, so we can
continue to economically use Morse/CW. In fact, the economics are the
reverse of what everyone elses are. They want to buy a piece of
equipment to replace an expensive human, and we already have - indeed
are stuck with the human - ourselves, and would have to spend extra
money for the needed equipment to work other emergency modes.

- Mike KB3EIA -

1849. Re: ARRL has no FIRE for sale?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-28 17:19:30 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <Cyxnb.9893$FI2.2051@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 81325

"Jack Hamilton" <jfh@acm.org> wrote in message
news:buerpvkup06q5lr595f49qjm9vumdcqi2s@4ax.com...
> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote:
>
> >"ARRL Sucks" <none@nobodyxh.org> wrote in message
> >news:bnk9e2$j6r$0@pita.alt.net...
> >> The ARRL is a Yankee organization, run by Yankees
> >> who think the center of the universe is New England.
> >>
> >> Hams in Hawaii have been asking for years to have
> >> QST bulk air-mailed to Hawaii, the same as all other
> >> publishers do to ensure timely delivery. ARRL has
> >> been farting off Hawaii hams for years. Screw the
> >> League!
> >>
> >> Aloha
> >>
> >
> >The ARRL has contracted their publishing and do not do it themselves.
> >Perhaps you should contact the publisher/printer ?
>
> The ARRL is ultimately responsible for the production and delivery of
> their magazine, however much they may choose to contract out; the
> printer will do whatever the ARRL will pay them to do, within reasonable
> limits. It's the ARRL's decision.
>
>
> --
> Jack Hamilton
> jfh@acm.org
>
>
> If men are to wait for liberty until they become wise and good in slavery,
> they may indeed wait for ever.
> - Lord MacCaulay

No it is not. The major problem is the Hawaii hams want first class service
and not have to pay for it. The block is actually with the postal service
who has contracted have all bulk mail to Hawaii sent by boat.

Dan/W4NTI

1850. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-28 17:38:15 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0310280938.24db6b48@posting.google.com>
Source record: 81326

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:<VPjnb.8824$FI2.2216@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> "N2EY" wrote:
> >
> > When? Check a map of 1860. There were 19 slave states,
> > of which 4 stayed in the Union. Delaware was a slave state
> > but it did not secede.
>
>
> Depends on the definition of a slave state, I guess. There were 18 Union
> States and 11 Confederate States. The three border states did not side with
> either and four of the slave states stayed in the Union.

You're forgetting at least two states. There were 34 in 1861, but
18+11+3 = 32

Let's look at the states/commonwealths as they were in 1861:

Confederate states (formally declared secession, all slave states): 11
(VA, NC, SC, GA, FL, TN, AL, MS, LA, AR, TX)

Union states that did not allow slavery: 19 (ME, VT, NH, MA, RI, CT,
NY, NJ, PA, OH, IN, IL, MI, WS, IA, MN, KS, OR, CA)

Slave states that did not secede: 4 (KY, MO, DE, MD)

West Virginia was admitted as a Union state in 1863 by breaking away
from the rest of Virginia. "Mountaineers Are Always Free!"

> Even if you believe
> the three border states, and all of the Union States (including the four
> slave states), would have voted to end slavery, the Union did not have
> enough numbers to abolish slavery in 1860 had the South not seceded-
> remember, it takes 2/3rds of the Congress to pass an amendment.

Check your math, Dwight. 23/34 = 67.64..% - more than the 2/3 needed.
It would have taken 23 states to pass such an amendment. 19 nonslave
Union states plus only 4 others would have been enough - and that's
without West Virginia.

> Since
> slavery was not threatened had the South remained in the Union, slavery
> obviously did not cause them to secede.

But slavery *was* threatened, because the trend was clear to see. As
the West and Midwest developed, more and more free states would be
added. Many of the border states, like Delaware, had a low and

decreasing percentage of slaves and
slaveholders, so soon they would become de facto free states. (1860
census shows Delaware having a total population of 112,216, of which
1,798 were slaves. That's 1.6%.)

> In other words, the Civil War was
> not about slavery until the Union (then and now) decided to make it so.
> Whatever, it is certainly not what the South fought for.

Then what *was* the South fighting for? What rights did the 11 states
cherish so greatly that they would secede and fight a war to keep
them?
>
> > The Emancipation Proclamation was written in 1863. It legally
> > freed most (but not all) of the slaves.
>
> It freed only the slave in states "now in rebellion against the United
> States" and listed the specific states. It did not apply to slaves in any
> state that was not part of the Confederacy (it did not apply to slaves in
> the Union States).

No argument there - but where were most of the slaves? In the
Confederate states!

> The 13th amendment, passed after the war, ended slavery
> throughout the United States. Read how the 13th amendment was passed by
> Congress and later ratified.
>
Do you have a problem with how it was done?

Consider this: According to the 1860 census, the *MAJORITY* of the
population in South Carolina and Mississippi were slaves. Do you think
the state governments of those states accurately represented their
population's views on the issue?
>
> > Which states were they? Slavery was abolished in
> > the North by 1804. In many northern states it was
> > abolished before the Constitution was written.
>
> So that makes their accountability less?

YES! Because:

A) they recognized the inherent contradiction of proclaiming "all men
are created equal" and then allowing some men to own others.

B) they did not have to be forced to abolish it from outside - they
did it on their own.

C) they did it *generations* before 1861.

> In essence, you're arguing that
> the Northern states are somehow better only because slavery ended there

> before it ended in the South.

Is that not correct? I'm not saying the northern states were without any guilt or accountability, or that they never had any slaves. The northern states, by compromising with evil, enabled the slave states to flourish. If someone does business with a thief, they become an accessory to the theft, and share the guilt.

It seems like you are arguing that all states are equally guilty, regardless of when they abolished slavery or how the abolition happened. Somehow I find that hard to accept.
>
> > Here's what I learned about the War Between the States:
>
> Fine. Since there are other messages to respond to, I'll ignore the
> remaining nine paragraphs.
>
Was anything in those nine paragraphs incorrect?

And I'll repeat the key question:

What rights did the 11 states cherish so greatly that they would secede and fight a war to keep them?

73 de Jim, N2EY

1851. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-28 18:10:49 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0310281010.6f871569@posting.google.com>
Source record: 81327

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:<IHqnb.7160$X22.2575@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> "Dave Heil" wrote:
> > Dwight Stewart wrote:
> > >
> > > (snip)
> >
> > Salaries are going up.
>
> Compared to the cost of living, salaries are going down. The minimum wage
> is a good example. To keep up with the cost of living increase over the last
> twenty-five years (to have the same spending power as 25 years ago), the
> minimum wage should be over $19 per hour. By the same token, a person
> earning $19 an hour twenty-five years ago should be earning well over $50 an
> hour today. Check it out yourself. Look at the minimum wage 25 years ago (or
> any typical wage 25 years ago) and increase it by the same percentage that
> living costs (rent, house payments, utilities, food, and so on) have
> increased over the years since.

There are all kinds of indicators that both support and contradict
your point, Dwight. But what I see is that the general trend is for
some necessities (housing, medical costs, college education,
insurance, *taxes*) to be increasing in price faster than wages, and
for other items, mostly "luxuries" but some necessities (computers,
electronics, energy, food) to be increasing slower than wages. So what
you get are people who can afford a really sweet ham rig but cannot
afford a house to put it in.

The trend is further muddled by the increasing number of
two-career-by-necessity families. People forget that 30-40 years ago a
family of four could live a very nice middle-class lifestyle on one
middle-class income - and you did not need a master's degree to get
such a job.

There's also the increasing number of things to spend money on. I can
remember a time when, for most people, things like a second car, cable
TV, a computer, and many other things were luxuries. Today they are
almost essentials.
>
> > I can think of one, Dwight. Those folks work and
> > pay social security taxes so that you can retire and
> > draw SS benefits. They also pay State and Federal
> > taxes. Many of them are very bright individuals.
> > Some are doctors. Some do computer design work.
> > Some do menial labor which most American workers

> > don't desire.
>
> Americans working at those jobs would do the same things (pay taxes and so
> on), Dave. Why do we need immigrants to do that? Some of those Americans are
> even bright. As for the "menial" jobs, the only reason those jobs are menial
> is because employers choose not to pay decent wages to do those jobs. And as
> long as employers continue to find cheap labor to fill those jobs, there is
> no incentitive whatsoever to increase those wages. If anything, a ready
> supply of cheap labor only drives down wages for other jobs, increasing the
> number of menial jobs and decreasing jobs that pay decent wages. The direct
> result is less well paying jobs for all working class Americans.

Then what's the answer? Shall we eliminate all immigration, or just the illegals? Who gets to decide who should be kept out and who should be admitted, other than obvious threats to security?

There's also an important factor being left out: Many of the "good" jobs of former eras are being exported. Try to buy a shirt or shoes or computer that's "Made In USA". If you think immigrant labor is cheap, look at what the wages are in the developing countries. Remember NAFTA? Remember the demonstrators at the GATT meetings? What do you think they're demonstrating against?

How about this example:

Almost 100 years ago, my grandparents came to the United States from Italy. They left in part because of the 1906 earthquake, but mostly because they wanted a better life than they could get in Italy at that time.

They were admitted through Ellis Island, like millions of others. They wound up in Philadelphia, where they found jobs, learned the language, built businesses and lives, etc. I don't think any of them even had a grade-school education. They were from southern Italy, not northern or western Europe. They didn't speak English when they got here, and some of them never learned to speak it without an accent. They were Roman Catholics, a religion widely despised in the US for various reasons. They had to deal with all of the usual stereotypes applied to their ethnicity.

Today their grandchildren all have college degrees, good jobs, successful lives, etc. Typical American dream stuff.

Should they have been admitted to the USA or not?

(I'm sure some folks here would be really happy if they had been kept out ;-))

73 de Jim, N2EY

1852. Re: ARRL has no FIRE for sale?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-28 18:27:26 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031028132726.07346.00001470@mb-m26.aol.com>
Source record: 81328

In article <cbsnb.17656$bO5.8898@newssvr29.news.prodigy.com>, "charlesb"
<n5pvl@sbcglobal.net> writes:

>> More than one tenth of ALL Americans live in California, dumbass.
>
>Sorry, but you cannot count California's illegal immigrant population as
>"Americans", though technically they are.
>
>Moron.

The legal population, legal as is common to all states, of
California, is still the largest of all the states. The "illegal
immigrant" population is estimated as a bit over 4 million here.
Had I counted that (but did not), California's population would
exceed that of all of Canada.

Texas ALSO has an "illegal immigrant" population...except you
wish to hide that under a 25-gallon hat as if it doesn't exist.
[oversize hat to fit swelled heads...]

Sorry, your yellow roses are wilting and your oil well is pumping
out noxious gas.

Meanwhile, ARRL does recognize Texas as belonging to the
amateur radio union due to Jim Haynie as elected president.
The executive-president-for-life (Sumner) gets to travel to Geneva
and play bigshot with all those "we know what is best for you"
editorials in QST...while enjoying having that other callsign for
his "Residence Radio Club."

ARRL has yet to recognize a REAL emergency/disaster except
for very eastern-defined emergencies and disasters which are
presented in almost excrutiating detail for days on the "we
represent 'all' amateurs" news page. Six days, almost a week
went by since their start before ARRL recognized wildfires in
California...which have now consumed 480,000+ acres,
destroyed over 1100 homes, and killed 15 human beings.

Feel justified in practicing socio-political-geographic bigotry.
After all, U. S. amateur radio is made up largely of white
males, isn't it?

Sacred purity in all things, including beeping.

LHA

1853. Re: ARRL has no FIRE for sale?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-28 18:27:26 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031028132726.07346.00001469@mb-m26.aol.com>
Source record: 81329

In article <8_idndo6ZqC7aACiRVn-iQ@gbronline.com>, JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
writes:

>Len, to kern an old phrase, "you don't know shit from Shinola". Now why
>don't you go over to the cb group where you might find folks more down
>on your lever?

"Kern?!?"

Who the hell are YOU, "JJ?" You one of them "knuckle-dragging
CB-plussers?"

You can REPEAT a phrase (write it verbatim) or make subtle
changes to PARAPHRASE it or you can invent a new phrase as
if to COIN it. "Kern" refers to particulars in the shape of type
fonts...you can kern a character's appearance but you CANNOT
kern a phrase.

ARRL doesn't pretend to represent any Citizens Band Radio Service
users. There's no license for CB in the USA. There has NEVER
been any test for CB ever, not once since it was created 45 years
ago. Morse code was never, ever required in USA CB...and CB
does exist IN the HF spectrum.

ARRL pretends to "represent" all radio amateurs but all it REALLY
represents is the opinion of a minority in control of a minority
membership that has not exceeded a quarter of all licensed U. S.
radio amateurs.

LHA

1854. Re: ARRL has no FIRE for sale?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-28 18:53:24 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <ntCdnfsHlvgkIAOiRVn-jA@gbronline.com>
Source record: 81331

Len under 21 wet his pants and wrote:

> In article <8_idndo6ZqC7aACiRVn-iQ@gbronline.com>, JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
> writes:
>
>
>>Len, to kern an old phrase, "you don't know shit from Shinola". Now why
>>don't you go over to the cb group where you might find folks more down
>>on your lever?
>
>
> "Kern?!?"
>
> Who the hell are YOU, "JJ?" You one of them "knuckle-dragging
> CB-plussers?"
>
> You can REPEAT a phrase (write it verbatim) or make subtle
> changes to PARAPHRASE it or you can invent a new phrase as
> if to COIN it. "Kern" refers to particulars in the shape of type
> fonts...you can kern a character's appearance but you CANNOT
> kern a phrase.
>
> ARRL doesn't pretend to represent any Citizens Band Radio Service
> users. There's no license for CB in the USA. There has NEVER
> been any test for CB ever, not once since it was created 45 years
> ago. Morse code was never, ever required in USA CB...and CB
> does exist IN the HF spectrum.
>
> ARRL pretends to "represent" all radio amateurs but all it REALLY
> represents is the opinion of a minority in control of a minority
> membership that has not exceeded a quarter of all licensed U. S.
> radio amateurs.
>
> LHA

I have been a ham for over 40 years, so how long have you been one?

"Kern" is the word Ed Norton use for coin in the "Honeymooners". My use
of it is just a valid as you saying "one of them" instead of "one of
those". Good grief you are dumb.

Why should the ARRL pretend to represent the CB Radio Service? It was
established to represent the Amateur operators long before CB ever came
into being. Who would want to represent the sewer pit of communication
that CB has become? Why would they want to represent a bunch of idiots

who haven't a clue as how to properly use radio communication, that operate in a number of illegal ways and cause general havoc on the radio spectrum. The ARRL should not touch CB with a 10 foot pole.

> Morse code was never, ever required in USA CB...and CB
> does exist IN the HF spectrum

And there are a lot of other users of the HF spectrum that do not require knowledge of Morse code. When it comes to the code issue the subject is Amateur radio not the chicken band. So what's you point?

So who in the hell are you? Just another knuckle dragging dumb cber I suppose. As I said, "you don't know shit from Shinola".

1855. Re: What If.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-28 19:03:48 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@nope.org>
Message-ID: <3t9tpvogkun8i67lg1h57fq7kivf2dv32e@4ax.com>
Source record: 81330

On Tue, 28 Oct 2003 11:53:27 -0500, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote:

>> Yup, I remember that one well! Wonder why that happens....this thread
>> went a bit farther, but keeps branching out into other topics, with
>> the requisite bashings of the participants.
>
> I dunno. I enjoy an intelligent discussion with those who disagree with me.

Me too - I learn a lot of things that way!

>> Now, with virtually no one using code except amateurs, and all of that
>> strictly within the amateur bands, this problem seems to be a thing of
>> the past. Just like a guy who sets up an improperly-functioning RTTY
>> setup (like I jusy did, a couple of nights ago...) - no major problem
>> - and no two way communications, either :)
>
> An aside, what frequencies do you operate rtty on? I want to get my
>feet wet with it.

40 Meters, but there seems to be some confusion over where the digital
band assignments really are.....the RAC band plan lists 7.035 to 7.050
MHz for digital modes, while ARRL has 7.040 MHz as a DX RTTY freq.,
and 7.080 to 7.100 for RTTY communications. And, the last RTTY gut
that I copied was on 7.075 MHx. Hmm.... (scratches head...)

45 Baud seems to be the usual format for Ham traffic, but I have
copied a couple of 75 Baud ones.

I have been hanging out there receiving transmissions and setting up
the equipment. RX works pretty reliably (on my hamfest PK-232). My
old analog Heath TX tends to drift too much for reliable RTTY TX at
the moment (and maybe forever - still working on it...).

Looks like fun, though - if I ever get it together ;)

>
>
>The closest thing I can find to a logical argument is that Morse CW will
>allow an amateur to communicate with an other amateur in another country
>who may not share his or her language. This *may* be of some use in an
>emergency. Will it? Odds aren't all that hot. But here we have one of
>those opinion things again. I think it is worth the effort, while many
>others do not. And the odds favor them. Then again, I'm first aid, CPR
>and defib trained, and will probably (hopefully) never need to use those
> skills. But if I need them.....

With the way thing are going, I'm not sure if I would want to rely on CW for emergency comms - the infrastructure isn't as solid as it was years ago, and will deteriorate further quickly as CW contnues to be dropped as a requirement.

As far as communicating with non-English speaking people, I hadn't considered that... Does it work? Is there enough commonality to get a message through? (my Morse so far has been primarily Englosh (not a spelling error ;)) - example "wx hr is cldy / ovrcst, ant is a dipole" -type stuff. A lot of English-based stuff - is that sort of an accepted International language?

I know that there are variants of morse for other character sets (cyrillic, for example) - I suppose that this might cause a problem too...

>
>Remember though, there is a difference between the adz and Morse CW.
>hehe, the thought makes me chuckle. I look at it more like the way the
>(Coast Guard?) has a sailed vessl for training on. There are many
>important things that can be learned, even though those recruits are
>using really ancient technology.
>
Good point.
>

>> BTW - grinding mirrors? Now there's something that requires a lot of
>> patience! Wow!
>
> It is a tremendous amount of fun for me. I'm kind of an obsessive
>compulsive person, and I can take out my tendencies on a mirror.
>Grinding and polishing and testing are so darn much fun, and it's one
>field where all the fussing pays off in the end.
>
More patience that I have, that's for sure. (or skill...nah, can't be a skill thing..)
>
> What I think leads to the decline in use is that it uses a very
>expensive processor - a human. We've tried to take humans ot of the loop
>for years now, or at least skilled ones. It is a lot easier to train a
>person to hit a button and make a copy than it is to teach them
>something like Morse code.
>

And this manifests itself in other areas than the CW arena. So many people are using microprocessor-controlled, dial & talk radios these days that a big piece of technical ability has been lost there too. Last week, I had some guy tell me to get my rig fixed because it was off frequency by about 20Hz. 20Hz - on my old analog Heath? With that set, I was doing good to be within 100.... The gentleman didn't know if his set had RIT, and was reluctant to QSY 20 Hz to 'correct my problem' - really! Jeez.

>And that I think is why the ARS can still get away with using Morse CW.
>Our "wetware" does a superb job of translating the recieved signals, and
>since this is a hobby/service/avocation, we aren't being paid, so we can
>continue to economically use Morse/CW. In fact, the economics are the
>reverse of what everyone elses are. They want to buy a piece of
>equipment to replace an expensive human, and we already have - indeed
>are stuck with the human - ourselves, and would have to spend extra
>money for the needed equipment to work other emergency modes.
>

CW is by far the most economical mode of operation, from an equipment standpoint - no argument there. Progress frequently has significant costs associated, though - look at the millions that the owners of general aviation aircraft will have to spend to replace all of the current 121.5 / 223 MHz analog ELTs with the new digital 406.025 MHz ones! (or, you could gamble and risk not being found for a long, long time if you land off-airport somewhere.....)

Costs, as usual, passed down directly to the end user of the service. Of course!

> - Mike KB3EIA -

73, Leo

1856. Re: A Morsodist Challenge YKXWBSX7I6 01/03/2004

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-28 20:30:11 UTC
From: Dave Bushong <dbushong@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <nlAnb.133029$qj6.9478368@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 81332
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Gang,

Shall we start a religion that is all about Morse?

We would get a whole lot better treatment than we do now, plus, we can deduct our CW expenses.

Our hymns are monotonic. Only the tempo changes.

Sincerely, and may Marconi bless,

The Reverend Dave, KZ1O
High Priest
The Live Free or Die State
New Hampshire

Hans K0HB wrote:

> Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com> wrote
>
>
>> Yeah, the NoCode Agenda can get to be a bit bizzare, all right.
>> ....then their version of .... Morsedists Religion, blah, blah...
>
>
> Dick,
>
> A simple straightforward challenge for you (and the rest of rrap).
>
> During the 30 hours starting at 2100Z on Nov 1st, 2003 I will be
> practicing Morsodism on the HF bands in the ARRL SS Radiosport event.
> Keep up with me if you can.
>
> May the Peace of St. Morse shower down upon thee in abundance,
>
> de Hans, K0HB
> --
> http://home.earthlink.net/~k0hb
>
>
>

--
This file is PureMail protected. To reply to the sender,
you MUST include this in the subject line:

YKXWBSX7I6 01/03/2004

(without that string in the subject, your
message will be deleted, unread)

1857. Re: Amateur Radio in the 21st Century?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-28 20:33:12 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3F9ED288.3010608@psu.edu>
Source record: 81333

Bill Sohl wrote:

<A whole litany of stuff snipped>

> I'll have to find that paper and read it.

http://www.qsl.net/al7fs/NCVECplan.doc

I think it is pretty important to read it, Bill. It is a very
interesting piece.

One of the emost interesting parts is that while the NCVEC claims it is
not "official" policy, the name of the doc is NCVECplan.doc.

and:

> "First, who is this committee, this ï¿½Gang of Fourï¿½? Who are these people,
>and who elected them as ï¿½Godï¿½? They are the NCVEC ï¿½Rules Committeeï¿½.
>This group of 4 persons consists of: Fred Maia, W5YI, John Johnstone, W3BE,
>Scott Neustatder, W4WW, and myself, Jim Wiley, KL7CC.

So this isn't official, but it comes from the committee, it's namedwhat
it is. But they tell us it isn't...................

Just one of the reasons that a few of us are kind of uneasy about the thing.

It takes a few gratuitous potshots at those who believe in the Morse
Code test, as well as a patricularly bizzare dig at homebrewers.

Oddly enough, it wants to encourage people who do not wear glasses to
join the hobby. That little jab was almost certainly at people who do
not wear bifocals, but as a wearer of glasses since the second grade, I
can tell you it was neither funny or appropriate.

It proposes HF access after taking a 20 question quiz that is passable
by an "average" 6th grader.

It proposes the applicant sign a statement that they have read and
understood part 97 - This is a hoot! I envision a "click here" like we
get when we install software and the terms of use screen pops up. And we
all read all of those, don't we? 8^)

It wants to take out "some of the math" two or more of the theory
questions because "we aren't making engineers - yet"

It offers some questions like:

>"What do you think is better for our hobby ï¿½ lots of enthusiastic
>newcomers, or an ever-declining number of increasingly older hams?"

Let's see, that sounds an awful lot like a "Have you quit beating your wife?" sort of question.

>"Morse will probably retain most of itï¿½s exclusive band segments, at >least for now. We are not addressing this issue at this time. This may >change in the future."

I give them half a point for being half honest - whoops, maybe only a quarter point for being only half right! Just how many "exclusive band segments" are there for Morse? Which is telling me that as soon as they have their way with getting the qualifications reduced for HF access, they will be going after getting the narrowband segments opened up for SSB. and if that isn't what they mean to do, why would they put that in the piece?

Their proposal to "slide" the bands down to take over the Novice segments and give the upper part of the bands to the "communicators" isn't removing anything from the data bands is it?

Finally, in one of the most strange bits of reasoning I have ever seen:

>"All existing Techs will be upgraded to General. Assuming that the >Morse requirement is removed first, our opinion is that most of the >Techs will take (and hopefully pass) the element 3 exam as soon as they >can, thus becoming General class licensees."

They are telling us that the existing technicians will study for, test for, and pay for something that they will get even if they flunk the test, or not take it in the first place!!!!!!!!

Someone who make a statement like this has no place throwing out the gratuitous insults they make towards those who believe that the Morse tests should be retained. It is plain stupid, can't sugar coat that one!

Some things I wonder about:

Is a person who is granted HF access on a 20 question very simple test that the hypothetical average 6th grader going to be all that worried about staying within the allotment given him or here? My guess is that they will not be too worried about straying outside their allocations. It happens already with generals in the Extra segments.

Will they be amenable to OO's? some will, and some probably won't. It won't take too many to make a mess.

If I were to hazard a guess, I suspect if a plan like this is adopted, there will be a rush of people getting the lowest level license. They will be on HF, and won't feel much reason to upgrade. They will very likely spread out from thier allotted segment of band, and talk where they like.

>"You know, fresh ideas, new blood, people that can actually see their >radios without having to put It pon (sic) glasses ï¿½ what a concept!"

Sometimes fresh ideas are not what we may want them to be!

Will I be wrong? Great Gawd I hope so! But it will be an interesting social experiment to see if we will improve a service by lowering the entrance requirements.

In the meantime, I'll be here, wearing my glasses, homebrewing, and enjoying myself.

My favorite quotes:

>"There are no black helicopters."

>"This is not a plot by ARRL or Fred (W5YI) or anyone else to sell more
> books, antennas, radios, or (fill in the blank)."

>"There is no conspiracy, no secret agenda, no kickback from the
>manufacturers, no ï¿½black planï¿½ from the ARRL, no anything. Just some
>guys that want nothing more than to see our great hobby prosper for
the >next hundred years, or longer."

Thing one:

Why do they go on so about conspiracies?

Thing two:

With a few notable exceptions, I think that those of us who wish to see Morse CW testing continued DO care very much about our great hobby. I take exception to the apparent belief on some NCTA's that we do not.

Final analysis:

If this isn't NCVEC opinion, they should get it off the title and quit referring to it so much. This is like the person that says "not to interrupt you as they interrupt you. If it isn't the NCVEC, then don't talk about the NCVEC. But it is.

What's with the gratuitous potshots? Want to turn people off? Start accusing us of seeing black helicopters or needing "It pon glasses" as if it is something bad to wear them (maybe we're genetically inferior?) Or even better, infer that the only people who care about Ham Radio are those who want the code test removed.

This is a bold step, to improve something by radically simplifying the requirements for admission. I haven't seen it work yet, but perhaps there is something different here?

- Mike KB3EIA -

1858. FCC Regualtions & Public Entities Policies

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-28 21:13:27 UTC
From: Phillip Michael <gtg154a@mail.gatech.edu>
Message-ID: <bnmm64$s4v$1@news-int.gatech.edu>
Source record: 81334

Is an entity such as a public school allowed to adopt a policy that allow
them to confiscate any device on their property that interferes with their
wireless devices?

For example:
Both devices are Part 15.
The school owns a wireless access point.
A student owns a cordless phone.

If a cordless phone interferes with a wireless access point and
the school's policy says "they have the right to confiscate any device that
interferes with their wireless network"
Does the school really have the right to confiscate the cordless phone?

Also if a student's device is under part 97 do you still have the right to
confiscate it?

Here is a phrase from Part 15.5.b
interference must be accepted that may be caused by the operation of an
authorized radio station

Does this only apply to a device or to an individual using a device?

--
Phillip Michael
gtg154a@mail.gatech.edu

1859. Re: ARRL has no FIRE for sale?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-28 22:02:06 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031028170206.15462.00003875@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 81335

In article <ntCdnfsHlvgkIAOiRVn-jA@gbronline.com>, JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
writes:

>I have been a ham for over 40 years, so how long have you been one?

I was on HF legally beginning in February 1953, a 1 KW BC-339,
one of 36 total transmitters at Army station ADA...increased to 43
by 1956. I got my first radio operator license from a single test at
an FCC field office in Chicago in March, 1956 (First Class
Radiotelephone).

I've never had, or tried to get, any amateur radio license. Mostly
because I've been a professional in radio-electronics for a half
century.

You know what? The FCC doesn't require any commissioners or
staff to have amateur radio licenses in order to MAKE regulations
concerning amateur radio. How about that!?

>"Kern" is the word Ed Norton use for coin in the "Honeymooners". My use
>of it is just a valid as you saying "one of them" instead of "one of
>those". Good grief you are dumb.

The "Honeymooners" went OFF the air long ago. Jackie Gleason
left this world a long time ago. Not everyone was a fan of a New
York based TV show on CBS during the black and white years.

DOS Tip: Not everyone speaks in New Yorkese or Jerseyish or buys
"gaz" for his auto while in Philly.

>And there are a lot of other users of the HF spectrum that do not
>require knowledge of Morse code. When it comes to the code issue the
>subject is Amateur radio not the chicken band. So what's you point?

The subject is NOT old black-and-white broadcast television, either.

>So who in the hell are you? Just another knuckle dragging dumb cber I
>suppose. As I said, "you don't know shit from Shinola".

Leonard H. Anderson

You want my mailing address? Look in the FCC ECFS for the 14
petitions for and against amateur radio code testing. You will find
my name and address and comments in there, at least two documents
per RM.

I don't work with feces and I don't make shoe polish. I'm a professional
in radio-electronics who has not hidden his identity.

YOU on the other hand, HIDE behind a couple letters and act tuff.
No USA database lists any "JJ" as the name of any licensed radio
amateur. Perhaps a foreign country might have it? :-)

Insufficient courage to reveal your identity "JJ?" Or are you going
to rationalize your gutless fear somehow?

LHA

1860. Re: ARRL has no FIRE for sale?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-28 22:19:48 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3F9EEB82.1040505@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 81336

```
>
>
> Why should the ARRL pretend to represent the CB Radio Service? It was
> established to represent the Amateur operators long before CB ever
> came into being. Who would want to represent the sewer pit of
> communication that CB has become? Why would they want to represent a
> bunch of idiots who haven't a clue as how to properly use radio
> communication, that operate in a number of illegal ways and cause
> general havoc on the radio spectrum. The ARRL should not touch CB with
> a 10 foot pole.

I wouldn't touch it with an 11 meter pole. :-)

>
>> Morse code was never, ever required in USA CB...and CB
>> does exist IN the HF spectrum
>
CB is not amateur, and one of the rules of the CB service is no
international comms.
Not that it's enforced......

> "you don't know shit from Shinola".

Well, you can't polish a turd...... ;-)

>
>
```

1861. Re: What If.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-28 22:43:15 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0310281443.3256c765@posting.google.com>
Source record: 81337

Leo <nomail@nope.org> wrote in message
news:<9mirpvoktgl7rmme7ifkmgu6984ntfc1bj@4ax.com>...
> On 28 Oct 2003 01:17:46 GMT, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:
> >
> >Only problem with "200" is that it stops at 1936 and there was never
> >a followup book.
> >
> >If you want a really good history of US amateur radio from the very beginning
> >to almost the present day, google up W2XOY's "Wayback Machine". Excellent
> >history in many chapters. Free for the download.
>
> Great articles - thanks!
>
Wish there was a similar series for VE-land...

> >(extra bonus question: what is the significance of that callsign?)
>
> Found this reference on Google:
>
> Feb. 1, 1939. Broadcasting reports General Electric engineers recently
> set up two experimental frequency modulation transmitters at Albany
> and Schenectady, operating on the same frequency. They drove a test
> car between the two cities and found almost no areas of interference
> between the stations. The stations were W2XDA Schenectady and W2XOY
> New Scotland

hey, this guy's GOOD!

> >>> Years ago, here in Canada, there was a special licence class required
> >>> to operate using the Digital modes (!). This was dropped after only a
> >>> few years. presumably because it was not demonstrated that there was
> >>> any real benefit gained from the additional testing of digital
> >>> proficiency. After all, the idea of a hobby is to be able to
> >>> experiment and learn those aspects that are of interest or use to the
> >>> individual!
> >
> >I thought it was dropped because so few applied for it. I recall
> >something like 150 in 4 years.
>
> Haven't seen those stats - but seperate testing for Digital modes died
> out with it!

Years ago I suggested here that one way out of the code test argument
would be to create a new "Homebrew" class of license. No code test,
Extra class written, all privs. Just one special requirement -

amateurs with that license class could only use equipment they'd built themselves (except in a genuine emergency). No kits, either.

You can imagine how that idea went over.

> >And merely because something is old doesn't make it bad. Look at the
> >way words are spelled...
>
> Certainly wasn't connecting 'old' with 'bad', Jim - just an
> observation that as times change, priorities tend to shift as well.

All progress requires change but all change is not progress. Newer is not always better.

Some folks hold up "change" as some sort of mantra, saying that we should all accept change without resistance or question. I don't buy it.

> >Try telling the hams who searched for shuttle pieces, or who are right now
> >helping fight the wildfires in California, that it's "a hobby". They might
> >not agree.
>
> It's a unique hobby - one where the skills learned and practised
> within it can be taken out into the community in times of need, to
> augment the 'professional' emergency services.

The emergency and public service aspects take it beyond being purely a "hobby".
>
> >>Is there any value in doing longhand math now? Why should we if we have
> >>a calculator?

> >Exactly!

> Not quite - longhand is still required to be understood before relying
> on calculators, as it teaches the underlying principles of division
> (and works without batteries!).

How does memorizing tables of addition, subtraction, multiplication and division teach underlying principles? It's just a mechanical skill, right?
Memorize the tables, practice the way you are shown.

Light-powered four-function calculators have been giveaway items for many years now. Yet we still spend enormous resources teaching children to do basic arithmetic manually - which usually requires pencil and paper anyway.

Every single argument used against Morse code can be used against doing basic arithmetic by hand.

> It is simply a more rigorous method
> of accomplishing the identical task - but without competence in it,
> how would you know if the answer the calculator gave you was correct?

How often are calculators wrong?

> How would you check it?

Why does it need checking? By that logic, we should resend RTTY
messages in Morse to check them.

Yes, I know more advanced TOR modes include error detection and
correction. So do more advanced calculators. If you are worried about
a human typing in the wrong numbers, the same problem occurs with any
TOR mode.

> You would not really understand the mechanics of division.

Why is it necessary to do so?
>
> CW, in this analogy, is a different animal - more like comparing an
> abacus to a calculator.

I disagree!

Morse is like doing manual arithmetic. Direct interaction with the
signal, just as manual math is direct interaction with the numbers.

No difference.

Your whole argument rests on *not* allowing Morse to be analogous to
manual arithmetic calculation...yet it is.

> In skilled hands, an abacus can give you the
> same answer as a calculator (faster, too - watched a guy do it once!)
> - but it is outmoded, in a world where calculators are cheap and
> common.....one would be hard pressed to devise a compelling arguement
> for teaching the abacus nowadays!

The abacus never achieved any great acceptance in western culture.
Morse did! And Morse is still widely used by hams.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1862. Re: Amateur Radio in the 21st Century?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-28 22:59:32 UTC
From: averyfineman@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031028175932.23307.00004007@mb-m29.aol.com>
Source record: 81338

In article <3F9ED288.3010608@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:

>Bill Sohl wrote:
>
>> I'll have to find that paper and read it.
>
>http://www.qsl.net/al7fs/NCVECplan.doc
>
>I think it is pretty important to read it, Bill. It is a very
>interesting piece.
>
>One of the emost interesting parts is that while the NCVEC claims it is
>not "official" policy, the name of the doc is NCVECplan.doc.

ARRL cannot possibly "represent all radio amateurs" either, yet
they've said so for years.

>and:
>
>> "First, who is this committee, this “Gang of Four”? Who are these
people,
>>and who elected them as “God”? They are the NCVEC “Rules Committee”.
>>This group of 4 persons consists of: Fred Maia, W5YI, John Johnstone,
>W3BE, Scott Neustatder, W4WW, and myself, Jim Wiley, KL7CC.
>
>So this isn't official, but it comes from the committee, it's namedwhat
>it is. But they tell us it isn't.....................

So...write them directly or, better yet, go comment on their
Proposal before the FCC. Let the world know how you feel.

>Just one of the reasons that a few of us are kind of uneasy about the thing.

Yes, I'm sure you FEW are very disturbed.

Ask your doctor about a Xanax prescription. Very cheap and
good for those that get emotionally disturbed.

>It takes a few gratuitous potshots at those who believe in the Morse
>Code test, as well as a patricularly bizzare dig at homebrewers.

Tsk, tsk, tsk. ALL of them are 20 WPM code-tested Amateur
Extras.

>It proposes HF access after taking a 20 question quiz that is passable
>by an "average" 6th grader.

There is NO age restriction in US amateur radio. Sixth graders are
12 years old. The youngest hams were only 6 years old.

>It proposes the applicant sign a statement that they have read and
>understood part 97 - This is a hoot! I envision a "click here" like we
>get when we install software and the terms of use screen pops up. And we
>all read all of those, don't we? 8^)

You don't like to know and understand the LAW?

That sounds very lawless, Xena...

>It wants to take out "some of the math" two or more of the theory
>questions because "we aren't making engineers - yet"

Ah so, you think anything more complicated than Ohm's Law
is "rocket science?!?"

>It offers some questions like:
>
> >"What do you think is better for our hobby – lots of enthusiastic
> >newcomers, or an ever-declining number of increasingly older hams?"
>
>Let's see, that sounds an awful lot like a "Have you quit beating your
>wife?" sort of question.

Well, if you are "married" to your hobby, I'm sure you would be
insulted one way or the other by allowing others to intrude on
your very private domain.

> >"Morse will probably retain most of it’s exclusive band segments, at
> >least for now. We are not addressing this issue at this time. This
> >may change in the future."
>
>I give them half a point for being half honest - whoops, maybe only a
>quarter point for being only half right! Just how many "exclusive band
>segments" are there for Morse? Which is telling me that as soon as they
>have their way with getting the qualifications reduced for HF access,
>they will be going after getting the narrowband segments opened up for
>SSB. and if that isn't what they mean to do, why would they put that in
>the piece?

Have your ears and eyes checked again. There are NO black
helicopters of conspirators waiting to attack old, cherished values.

>Their proposal to "slide" the bands down to take over the Novice
>segments and give the upper part of the bands to the "communicators"
>isn't removing anything from the data bands is it?

You tell us, mighty keeper of the private domain that only belongs
to old-values, anal retentive long-timers.

>Finally, in one of the most strange bits of reasoning I have ever seen:
>
> >"All existing Techs will be upgraded to General. Assuming that the

> >Morse requirement is removed first, our opinion is that most of the
> >Techs will take (and hopefully pass) the element 3 exam as soon as
> >they can, thus becoming General class licensees."
>
>They are telling us that the existing technicians will study for, test
>for, and pay for something that they will get even if they flunk the
>test, or not take it in the first place!!!!!!!!
>
>Someone who make a statement like this has no place throwing out the
>gratuitous insults they make towards those who believe that the Morse
>tests should be retained. It is plain stupid, can't sugar coat that one!

Tsk, tsk, tsk...how dare those 20 WPM code-tested Extras
insult all you Extra-Lites, right?

>Some things I wonder about:
>
>Is a person who is granted HF access on a 20 question very simple test
>that the hypothetical average 6th grader going to be all that worried
>about staying within the allotment given him or here? My guess is that
>they will not be too worried about straying outside their allocations.
>It happens already with generals in the Extra segments.

Have you been in another universe for a decade? In HERE, there
was a MIGHTY HUE & CRY about age restrictions proposed by
someone in 1999! CAN'T HAVE THAT!!!! cried the multitude!

If a 6-year-old can pass an Extra exam, they are QUALIFIED!
That's been said by the multitude in here, too. :-)

>Will they be amenable to OO's? some will, and some probably won't. It
>won't take too many to make a mess.

Your tinnitus must be very bad today, hearing all those black helos.

>If I were to hazard a guess, I suspect if a plan like this is adopted,
>there will be a rush of people getting the lowest level license. They
>will be on HF, and won't feel much reason to upgrade. They will very
>likely spread out from thier allotted segment of band, and talk where
>they like.

How dare they?!?!?

And not even "approved" by the long-timer morsemen!

> >"You know, fresh ideas, new blood, people that can actually see their
> >radios without having to put It pon (sic) glasses – what a concept!"
>
>Sometimes fresh ideas are not what we may want them to be!

Of course not. Old, aged, long-time-in-the-bottle vintage
morsemen can't possibly accept that!

>Why do they go on so about conspiracies?

Tsk, tsk, you've named at least TWO such. :-)

>With a few notable exceptions, I think that those of us who wish to see
>Morse CW testing continued DO care very much about our great hobby. I
>take exception to the apparent belief on some NCTA's that we do not.

NCTAs understand that you, as a PCTA, want a Living Museum of
the Airwaves to Preserve and Protect morsemanship forever and ever.

> If this isn't NCVEC opinion, they should get it off the title and quit
>referring to it so much. This is like the person that says "not to
>interrupt you as they interrupt you. If it isn't the NCVEC, then don't
>talk about the NCVEC. But it is.

For many more years ARRL has said it "represents ALL radio
amateurs" yet they obviously do NOT.

Last I looked there were 14 Volunteer Examiner Coordinators in the
USA. Four does NOT equal 14, does it?

I apologize for using mathematics too complicated for you...

> What's with the gratuitous potshots? Want to turn people off?

159-year-old morse code hasn't "turned on" many new folks... :-)

Nobody in any VEC is required to kiss up to some long-timers who
think they own amateur radio and can use their squatters rights to
tell all they "know what is good for ham radio."

>Start
>accusing us of seeing black helicopters or needing "It pon glasses" as
>if it is something bad to wear them (maybe we're genetically inferior?)

Let's see...YOU just accused THEM of "conspiracies." :-)

>Or even better, infer that the only people who care about Ham Radio are
>those who want the code test removed.

Oh, my, how COULD they, those heinous 20 WPM code-tested Extras?

> This is a bold step, to improve something by radically simplifying the
>requirements for admission. I haven't seen it work yet, but perhaps
>there is something different here?

Oh? You do NOT believe amateur radio has ALREADY been "dumbed
down?"

Why don't you go argue with Broose, the "Extra-Lite CB-plusser?"

LHA

1863. Re: What If.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-28 23:04:31 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0310281504.ed7a457@posting.google.com>
Source record: 81339

Leo <nomail@nope.org> wrote in message
news:<3t9tpvogkun8i67lg1h57fq7kivf2dv32e@4ax.com>...
> On Tue, 28 Oct 2003 11:53:27 -0500, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote:

> I have been hanging out there receiving transmissions and setting up
> the equipment. RX works pretty reliably (on my hamfest PK-232). My
> old analog Heath TX tends to drift too much for reliable RTTY TX at
> the moment (and maybe forever - still working on it...).

It'd be fine for CW, tho...;-)

> >The closest thing I can find to a logical argument is that Morse CW will
> >allow an amateur to communicate with an other amateur in another country
> >who may not share his or her language. This *may* be of some use in an
> >emergency. Will it? Odds aren't all that hot. But here we have one of
> >those opinion things again. I think it is worth the effort, while many
> >others do not. And the odds favor them. Then again, I'm first aid, CPR
> >and defib trained, and will probably (hopefully) never need to use those
> > skills. But if I need them.....
>
> With the way thing are going, I'm not sure if I would want to rely on
> CW for emergency comms - the infrastructure isn't as solid as it was
> years ago, and will deteriorate further quickly as CW contnues to be
> dropped as a requirement.

Most HF emergency communications by hams is done on SSB - because it's
easy to use. But under poor conditions it is sometimes backed up by
Morse.
>
> As far as communicating with non-English speaking people, I hadn't
> considered that... Does it work? Is there enough commonality to get
> a message through? (my Morse so far has been primarily Englosh (not a
> spelling error ;)) - example "wx hr is cldy / ovrcst, ant is a
> dipole" -type stuff. A lot of English-based stuff - is that sort of
> an accepted International language?

Most DX hams I've worked pick up enough English to have a basic
conversation in Morse. Accents and such aren't an issue. Sure, the
same is true with TOR modes, but again they are not so common among
the DX.
>
> >Remember though, there is a difference between the adz and Morse CW.
> >hehe, the thought makes me chuckle. I look at it more like the way the
> >(Coast Guard?) has a sailed vessl for training on. There are many
> >important things that can be learned, even though those recruits are
> >using really ancient technology.

> >
> Good point.

And remember, amateurs have to provide all their own resources.

> >> BTW - grinding mirrors? Now there's something that requires a lot of
> >> patience! Wow!
> >
> > It is a tremendous amount of fun for me. I'm kind of an obsessive
> >compulsive person, and I can take out my tendencies on a mirror.
> >Grinding and polishing and testing are so darn much fun, and it's one
> >field where all the fussing pays off in the end.
> >
> More patience that I have, that's for sure. (or skill...nah, can't be
> a skill thing..)
> >
> > What I think leads to the decline in use is that it uses a very
> >expensive processor - a human. We've tried to take humans ot of the loop
> >for years now, or at least skilled ones. It is a lot easier to train a
> >person to hit a button and make a copy than it is to teach them
> >something like Morse code.

> And this manifests itself in other areas than the CW arena. So many
> people are using microprocessor-controlled, dial & talk radios these
> days that a big piece of technical ability has been lost there too.

Which brings up a major factor in anything done by amateurs: is a
thing being done for its own sake, or is it a means to an end?

In most applications, radio is simply a means to an end. Does someone
watching TV really care if the program gets to their set by means of
direct broadcast, satellite relay, coax cable, fiber optics, or some
other technology? In most cases, the answer is no - all the viewer
cares about is getting the program.

Same for things like telephone service. Once upon a time terrestrial
microwave was the cutting edge technology - then there were satellites
- now it's optical fiber, which isn't even "electrical" at all.
Indeed, communications satellites are already essentially obsolete for
communication between fixed points in most parts of developed
countries. Fiber offers much more bandwidth at much less cost.

Hams do radio for its own sake - which makes all the difference.

> Last week, I had some guy tell me to get my rig fixed because it was
> off frequency by about 20Hz. 20Hz - on my old analog Heath? With
> that set, I was doing good to be within 100.... The gentleman didn't
> know if his set had RIT, and was reluctant to QSY 20 Hz to 'correct my
> problem' - really! Jeez.

And what mode was being used when you were told you were 20 Hz off?
Bet it wasn't CW!

> >And that I think is why the ARS can still get away with using Morse CW.
> >Our "wetware" does a superb job of translating the recieved signals, and
> >since this is a hobby/service/avocation, we aren't being paid, so we can
> >continue to economically use Morse/CW. In fact, the economics are the
> >reverse of what everyone elses are. They want to buy a piece of
> >equipment to replace an expensive human, and we already have - indeed
> >are stuck with the human - ourselves, and would have to spend extra
> >money for the needed equipment to work other emergency modes.

In fact, if the human is eliminated, what's the point?

> CW is by far the most economical mode of operation, from an equipment
> standpoint - no argument there.

Not just economy but simplicity. How many homebrewers are we going to
have if they have to build rigs accurate to less than 20 Hz as first
projects?

> Progress frequently has significant
> costs associated, though - look at the millions that the owners of
> general aviation aircraft will have to spend to replace all of the
> current 121.5 / 223 MHz analog ELTs with the new digital 406.025 MHz
> ones! (or, you could gamble and risk not being found for a long, long
> time if you land off-airport somewhere.....)

But don't the ELTs have to be replaced every so often anyway?
>
> Costs, as usual, passed down directly to the end user of the service.
> Of course!
>
73 de Jim, N2EY

1864. Re: ARRL has no FIRE for sale?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-28 23:14:28 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <vO-dnRSIRP7WYAOiRVn-tw@gbronline.com>
Source record: 81341

Len over 21 wet his pants again and blathered:

> In article <ntCdnfsHlvgkIAOiRVn-jA@gbronline.com>, JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
> writes:
>
>
>
>>I have been a ham for over 40 years, so how long have you been one?
>
>
> I was on HF legally beginning in February 1953, a 1 KW BC-339,
> one of 36 total transmitters at Army station ADA...increased to 43
> by 1956. I got my first radio operator license from a single test at
> an FCC field office in Chicago in March, 1956 (First Class
> Radiotelephone).

And that has nothing to do with amateur radio. There were/are lots of
military radio operators operating military HF gear.

>
> I've never had, or tried to get, any amateur radio license. Mostly
> because I've been a professional in radio-electronics for a half
> century.
>
> You know what? The FCC doesn't require any commissioners or
> staff to have amateur radio licenses in order to MAKE regulations
> concerning amateur radio. How about that!?

And your point is?
>
>
>>"Kern" is the word Ed Norton use for coin in the "Honeymooners". My use
>>of it is just a valid as you saying "one of them" instead of "one of
>>those". Good grief you are dumb.
>
>
> The "Honeymooners" went OFF the air long ago. Jackie Gleason
> left this world a long time ago. Not everyone was a fan of a New
> York based TV show on CBS during the black and white years.
>
> DOS Tip: Not everyone speaks in New Yorkese or Jerseyish or buys
> "gaz" for his auto while in Philly.
>
>
>

>>And there are a lot of other users of the HF spectrum that do not
>>require knowledge of Morse code. When it comes to the code issue the
>>subject is Amateur radio not the chicken band. So what's you point?
>
>
> The subject is NOT old black-and-white broadcast television, either.
>
>
>>So who in the hell are you? Just another knuckle dragging dumb cber I
>>suppose. As I said, "you don't know shit from Shinola".
>
>
> Leonard H. Anderson
>
> You want my mailing address? Look in the FCC ECFS for the 14
> petitions for and against amateur radio code testing. You will find
> my name and address and comments in there, at least two documents
> per RM.
>
> I don't work with feces and I don't make shoe polish. I'm a professional
> in radio-electronics who has not hidden his identity.

A turd is a turd is a turd.

>
> YOU on the other hand, HIDE behind a couple letters and act tuff.
> No USA database lists any "JJ" as the name of any licensed radio
> amateur. Perhaps a foreign country might have it? :-)
>
> Insufficient courage to reveal your identity "JJ?" Or are you going
> to rationalize your gutless fear somehow?
>
> LHA

Since you do not hold an amateur radio operator's license nor seem to
care about ever getting one, what business is it of yours if the amateur
service has code testing or not? So what is your purpose for all the
petitions on amateur testing? You seem to think it is strange that the
FCC does not require those making rules concerning amateur radio to hold
an amateur license, yet you, without holding an amateur radio license,
can file petitons concerning amateur radio. How about that? Since you
seem to have such a hard on about the amateur radio service, of which
you are not even a member, why do you even bother? Why does it bother
you about what the ARRL is doing, or if the hams are or aren't handling
emergency comms in Calif. Perhaps you are just one of those types who
sticks your nose into things that don't concern you just to stir the
pot, or perhaps you can't pass the test for a license.

1865. Re: What If.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-28 23:15:00 UTC
From: groupk0hb@earthlink.net
Message-ID: <5ee63311.0310281515.6a04686b@posting.google.com>
Source record: 81340

Leo <nomail@nope.org> wrote > Not sugesting that either be tossed out,
Mike - my comments are
> related to the relative importance that should be placed on CW, or
> abacuses (abacii?) in the context of the modern world. Some folks
> will want to continue to use 'em, for a variety of valid reasons - but
> they are no longer the primary tools for accomplishing the tasks that
> they were originally designed for - does that mean that we should
> insist that everyone gain competence in their operation, whether they
> intend to use them or not? For what purpose? To accomplish what
> objective? I don't see it.....

When I first became involved in electronics, slide rules were the one absolutely necessary calculation tool owned by every engineer and technician. They were simple, uncomplicated, easy to use (after some period of rather tedious practice), and delightfully low tech. They were the calculation tool-of-choice for over three centuries.

Then, as the giant asteroid was to dinosaurs, overnight the $9.95 pocket calculator killed the slide rule. Despite it's ubiquity and utter simplicity the mighty slide rule went extinct in less than a decade! Perhaps somewhere, in a backward company in a backward country
without sand from which to make silicon chips, a group of stalwart engineers still treasure their Pickett or K+E slipsticks, and still require a practical examination, down to the third significant digit, of an engineers proficiency, and whether they actually could explain the difference between the CIF and DIF scales.

Perhaps some amateur mathematicians still are proficient on slide rules
(after all, they haven't been outlawed!). I bet they even hold speed and
accuracy contests at a nostalgic "Slippers" convention each spring in Akron, Ohio. Led by the scratchy but firm voices of their oldest club members, Jim 'Bentupcursor' Nichols and Larry Elscale, they close each convention by quoting the 1940's fight song of that bastion of wood-assisted math, Cal Tech:

"E-to-the-x du dx, E-to-the-x dx,
Cotan secant tangent sine,
three point one four one five nine.
Square root, cube root, QED
Slipstick, slide rule, Hooray! CT!"

The next SLIPS newsletter duly reports the resolution of the IEEE BoD to

gain legislation to include slide-rule competency testing as a
requisite
to all engineering degrees, except those seeking 2-year Stickless
Technician degrees. Regular Technicians will require 5CPM (Calculation
Per Minute) exams, BSEE will require 13CPM, and MSEE will require a
20CPM exam.

On another front, when I first became involved in amateur radio, Morse
code was the one absolutely necessary communications mode used by
every
ham. It was simple, uncomplicated, easy to use (after some period of
rather tedious practice) and delightfully low tech. It was the
communications mode-of-choice for over three generations.

Then, as the giant asteroid was to dinosaurs, overnight.....

73, de Hans, K0HB/4ID

~~~
"Beware of the man who works hard to learn something,
learns it, and finds himself no wiser than before.

He is full of murderous resentment of people who
are ignorant without having come by their ignorance
the hard way." -- Bokonon
~~~

1866. Re: What If.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-29 00:18:03 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@nope.org>
Message-ID: <iuutpvk6vi9gb0bq22g8usuc5refakpl33@4ax.com>
Source record: 81342

>snipped all over the place!

On 28 Oct 2003 14:43:15 -0800, N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote:

>Wish there was a similar series for VE-land...

It would indeed be interesting to see the similarities, as well as
observe where the administrations went their own seperate ways...

I have just about finished the 'Wayback Machine' articles - what a
strange regulatory path the US ARS has taken over the years! More
politics than the average Tom Clancy novel....

>
>> >(extra bonus question: what is the significance of that callsign?)
>>
>> Found this reference on Google:
>>
>> Feb. 1, 1939. Broadcasting reports General Electric engineers recently
>> set up two experimental frequency modulation transmitters at Albany
>> and Schenectady, operating on the same frequency. They drove a test
>> car between the two cities and found almost no areas of interference
>> between the stations. The stations were W2XDA Schenectady and W2XOY
>> New Scotland
>
>hey, this guy's GOOD!

Nah - just using my Ph.G (Doctor of Googlology)

>Years ago I suggested here that one way out of the code test argument
>would be to create a new "Homebrew" class of license. No code test,
>Extra class written, all privs. Just one special requirement -
>amateurs with that license class could only use equipment they'd built
>themselves (except in a genuine emergency). No kits, either.
>
>You can imagine how that idea went over.

Unfortunately, I can......it's a familiar story here!

>>
>> Certainly wasn't connecting 'old' with 'bad', Jim - just an
>> observation that as times change, priorities tend to shift as well.
>
>All progress requires change but all change is not progress. Newer is
>not always better.

Yup - remember the Beta VCR?

>
>Some folks hold up "change" as some sort of mantra, saying that we
>should all accept change without resistance or question. I don't buy
>it.

Depends on the reasons for change, I guess. Sometimes, the benefits
are not always that easy to see, at the onset, anyway!

>> It's a unique hobby - one where the skills learned and practised
>> within it can be taken out into the community in times of need, to
>> augment the 'professional' emergency services.
>
>The emergency and public service aspects take it beyond being purely a
>"hobby".

That's where I was going with my comment above - they actually take it
right out of the hobby, and into mainstream emergency comms!

>How often are calculators wrong?

Fairly frequently - and always dur to input error! My kids have
illustrated this point often - I ask my 11-year-old "how do you figure
that 700 divided by 10 is 7?, and I get "that's what the calculator
said!". So, we get a piece of paper, and do the calculation longhand
- and the correct answer becomes obvious pretty quickly.

Point is, if you don't know how to do math the manual way, you don't
know how to do math!

>> CW, in this analogy, is a different animal - more like comparing an
>> abacus to a calculator.
>
>I disagree!

Well, long division is, by definition, the more rigourous manual way
of using a calculator to solve the identical problem. Really, they
are the same - or very closely related, anyway.

Morse communication is an entity all its own - with its own 'rule set'
(the code), and its own 'tools' (the key). You could say that Morse
could be sent today using a computer, and the long method would be by
hand and by ear - that would be a similar relationship to the division
analogy.

But to work the analogy around such that SSB (or any other mode, for
that matter) is the easy way, while Morse is the longer way - that's a
bit of a stretch, I 'd suggest. They're too different to link like
that!

>
>Morse is like doing manual arithmetic. Direct interaction with the
>signal, just as manual math is direct interaction with the numbers.
>
>No difference.

That statement is true, but only when comparing apples to apples.
Morse by key or bug and ear would be the manual, direct interaction
method compared only to using a PC to do it automatically.

>
>Your whole argument rests on *not* allowing Morse to be analogous to
>manual arithmetic calculation...yet it is.

As above, it is - if applied in the right context.

>
>> In skilled hands, an abacus can give you the
>> same answer as a calculator (faster, too - watched a guy do it once!)
>> - but it is outmoded, in a world where calculators are cheap and
>> common.....one would be hard pressed to devise a compelling arguement
>> for teaching the abacus nowadays!
>
>The abacus never achieved any great acceptance in western culture.
>Morse did! And Morse is still widely used by hams.

Agreed, And it will undoubtedly continue to be used, if only because
of its superioity under certain circumstances. I use it myself - not
nearly as proficiently as many, but I'm workin' on it....

But the question isn't whether it is a useful mode or not, or whether
it should continue or not - it should, and it will. It's whether it
is important enough to stand as a seperate test item for qualification
and privileges within the modern ARS.

There was a time that it should - but I remain convinced that time has
passed. By discontinuing Morse, there is no longer an impact on
public safety, or on emergency services, or on other users of the
spectrum - they all abandoned the mode some time ago. Its only
remaining practical use is for hobby purposes within the ARS.

And, don't forget the rest of the world - they are dropping the
requirement as fast as they can. Has anyone heard of a single
administration that has stated that they intend to continue to retain
their mandatory code testing? I haven't!

>
>73 de Jim, N2EY

73, Leo

1867. Re: FCC Regualtions & Public Entities Policies

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-29 00:23:51 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <rMDnb.6337$cu1.3458@news02.roc.ny>
Source record: 81343

It would seem that anyone can control access to and use of any device on their property. Most likely it would be returned when the student (or whoever) left the premises. I remember well a problem at my worksite back in the 70s. Due to bickering over radio stations, department policy was to no longer allow radios at work (unless earphones were used). A couple of idiots had to have a boom box turned up loud on one machine. A supervisor went over to ask them to turn it down. "you aren't our boss" was the reply. The supervisor returned with the department head (he was the department head over 3 departments - and this was one of his departments). "who the h*ll are you?" the one asked. 10 minutes later, security turned up along with the superintendent. The radio was comfiscated. They were told that the radio would be returned when they left work. If it ever showed up again, they would be out the door and out of a job, no questions asked.

I suspect that something like this may be going on. Some schools may have a policy against cell phones. It is their call and taxpayers' money. I had a problem with a neighbor some years ago (I had a judgement against him and he wasn't going to pay). He had roofers working on his house and they had their ladder on my property. I asked them to move it. They didn't. I called the police. The cop was nice and tried to explain the situation to me. I simply informed him that he didn't have the full story. I didn't have to let anyone on my property, not even him unless he had a search warrent. He got the message and sent the roofers packing. Pure and simple.

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

"Phillip Michael" <gtg154a@mail.gatech.edu> wrote in message
news:bnmm64$s4v$1@news-int.gatech.edu...
> Is an entity such as a public school allowed to adopt a policy that allow
> them to confiscate any device on their property that interferes with their
> wireless devices?
>
> For example:
> Both devices are Part 15.
> The school owns a wireless access point.
> A student owns a cordless phone.
>
> If a cordless phone interferes with a wireless access point and
> the school's policy says "they have the right to confiscate any device
that
> interferes with their wireless network"
> Does the school really have the right to confiscate the cordless phone?
>
> Also if a student's device is under part 97 do you still have the right to

> confiscate it?
>
>
> Here is a phrase from Part 15.5.b
> interference must be accepted that may be caused by the operation of an
> authorized radio station
>
> Does this only apply to a device or to an individual using a device?
>
>
> --
> Phillip Michael
> gtg154a@mail.gatech.edu
>
>
>
>

1868. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-29 00:29:58 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <aSDnb.6340$Uv1.3126@news02.roc.ny>
Source record: 81344

Larry,

I'd gently remind you that there wouldn't be any citizens (well, very few - only the decendents of the original folks after the revolutionary war) at all under those rules. My great-grandfather and my grandfather (when he was 7) immigrated to the US in the late 1800s (my dads side). My mother's grandfather (my great-grandfather) immigrated from Canada. If their children couldn't become citizens, I wouldn't be one now. Heck, how could they hold a draft back in WWII with no citizens? Only draft foreigners?

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

"

1869. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-29 00:36:47 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <zYDnb.8068$X22.7415@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 81345

"Hans K0HB" wrote:
>
> So let me make sure I understand your position......
>
> Using your exact words, but interpolating your statement
> into US terms, it would read like this: "Since the US
> government (President, Vice President, Congress, the
> Judiciary) is clearly under white control, then black
> employees throughout the country should routinely
> be replaced by whites. After all, since the US belongs
> to the whites (the majority), they should obviously have
> the jobs, money, and power."
>
> Does that fairly represent your position?

No, that's not what I said. That what racist liberals said about blacks (the majority) in South Africa. Now, let's see if I understand your position. As I see it, your position is that whites should NOT have the jobs, money, or power exactly because they are the majority - much of it should be transferred to minorities instead. Is that what you're trying to say? If not, what exactly are you trying to say, Hans? Where do whites fit into your grand vision of the perfect America? Where do the minorities fit into this vision of the perfect America? Are you sure the others races are going to agree and comply with your vision? Or do you think you just can whip them into submission by calling them racist when things don't go your way?

Your amateurish attempts at social engineering are damn scary to me. You're assuming the minorities are just going to goose step to your views of a perfect world - that none have an agenda of their own (an agenda that may not be so rosy for whites in this country). Blindly following that belief, and ignoring the inherent racism of the single race cultures these immigrants often come from (they have no desire for multi-race cultures in their home countries), you're inviting millions into this country each year. Pardon me if this causes me concerns (concerns you call racism).

Getting back to South Africa, liberals didn't like the white MINORITY having jobs, money, or power, in South Africa and they don't like the idea o f the white MAJORITY having jobs, money, or power, in this country. The only thing consistent about those contradictory views is a dislike of whites, minority or majority.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

1870. Re: Element 1, Code vs. No-code, and Dad

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-29 00:59:37 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031028195937.25815.00004064@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 81346

In article <20031025204223.00545.00001888@mb-m02.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) writes:

>In article <20031025154601.29815.00001349@mb-m21.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com
>(N2EY)
>writes:
>
>>In article <3f99a551$1@ghostsearchers.com>, "Andre Sarkissian"
>><as2004@hotmail.com> writes:
>>
>>>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote:
>>>>In article <20031024082923.15462.00003790@mb-m06.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com
>>>(N2EY)
>>>>writes:
>>>>>You seem to be telling us that amateurs should not have any values,
>>>standards
>>>>>or practices except those necessary to prevent amateurs from interfering
>>>with
>>>>>users of other radio services.
>>>>
>>>> Absolutely. "Here are your bands, have a nice
>>>> day" would be
>>>> a very free, open, and enjoyable environment
>>>
>>>That's CB.
>>>
>>Andre,
>>
>>Thank you for clarifying Len's answer perfectly. It's quite clear that he
>wants
>>amateur radio to be nothing other than a multiband version of cb.
>
> Try not to strain yourself putting words into others' messages.

What "words have I put in others messages", Len?

It's clear from your many, many posts here that you want amateur radio to become a multiband version of cb.

You rail against "rank, status and privilege", and you make it clear you want one class of license, or no licenses at all.

You're against any sort of standards, values, or traditions in amateur radio.

You're constantly criticizing ARRL without justification, and even accusing them of fraud - again, with no evidence.

You deny the homebrewing success of others, and the public service
contributions of radio amateurs.

Quite clear what you would like amateur radio to become, good buddy ;-)
>
> Don't get all passionate about your piquish puerile parsonage.

I'm simply pointing out where your many complaining posts lead. If all of the
things you complain about were eliminated from amateur radio, it would become
quite like cb. You'd like that, I think.
>
> You were much better on the pulpit with your old Sermons On
> The Antenna Mount.

Typical personal insult from Len rather than debating the issue.

> I'm not at all interested in joining the Archaic Radiotelegraphy
> Service.

What is that?
>
> Tens of thousands of radio people feel exactly the same way.

How do you know?

> What did YOU do back in 1958 when U. S. Class D Citizens
> Band was created?

Not much. But by the time I became aware of it, I was repelled by the immature
behavior of some of the users there.

What did YOU do to keep that service from becoming such a wasteland?
>
> NO test whatsoever back then, but licensed it was.

All it took was a fee and a signed form saying the licensee understood the
rules and would abide by them. Yet within a few years of 1958, many of the
licensees simply ignored the rules and did whatever they pleased on that
service.

> YOU've had 45 years to correct things.

Not my responsibility, Len. I'm not a cb user. Never have been. All I did was
listen there, and tune away in disgust.

I'm know many cb users are fine people, but the service is a mess, has been for
decades, and it was a mistake to have ever been created.

You seem to think it's a paragon to be emulated.

> Doesn't appear that
> YOU did anydamnthing except snap your suspenders and
> look down at others from a safe distance.

Not my job to fix cb. It's *your* job, Len - you're the "professional in
radio", right? You've been there since before the beginning, right?

What have YOU done to fix cb?

1871. Re: If the written test elements are so easy, why are we all not extras?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-29 02:04:37 UTC
From: "Leland C. Scott" <no-spam@junk-mail.net>
Message-ID: <WYadnV56M5uqvQKiRVn-uA@comcast.com>
Source record: 81347

"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20031026233939.15923.00001559@mb-m12.aol.com.
..
> >
> >1) Some hams are just not interested in HF.
>
> Those are obviously not "real hams."

Speak for yourself.

--
Leland C. Scott
KC8LDO

ARRL Member
NCI Member

Charter member of the
Lawrence Technological University
Wireless Society W8LTU

--
"Let me add that there are an awful lot of
extra class calls playing on the
VHF side of things
exclusively - just like me.

One of the truly great things about this hobby
is that there is so much to do in it, that
you should never get bored
regardless of your
license class."

Don Ross (an extra who has never logged an HF
contact)
NL7CO/EM04

1872. Re: ARRL has no FIRE for sale?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-29 02:47:39 UTC
From: charlesb <n5pvl@sbcglobal.net>
Message-ID: <fTFnb.211$GR6.76@newssvr14.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 81348

SB SPCL @ ARL $ARLX010
ARLX010 Amateurs Aid Agencies in California Fire Emergency

ZCZC AX10
QST de W1AW
Special Bulletin 10 ARLX010
>From ARRL Headquarters
Newington CT October 28, 2003
To all radio amateurs

SB SPCL ARL ARLX010
ARLX010 Amateurs Aid Agencies in California Fire Emergency

Amateur Radio Emergency Service (ARES) and Radio Amateur Civil Emergency Service (RACES) teams are assisting local authorities and relief organizations as fire has burned more than 500,000 acres in southern California. Authorities report 11 separate fires have erupted and more than a dozen people have died.

ARRL San Diego Section Manager Kent Tiburski, K6FQ, estimated that about 100 ham ARES and RACES volunteers are participating in his section, where most of the fatalities took place. Amateurs are supporting the Red Cross and The Salvation Army and staffing six shelters throughout San Diego county. Additional hams have deployed to San Diego-area emergency management offices and hospitals.

Communication is mainly taking place on VHF. The San Diego ARES Net has been activated on 7.233 MHz with 3.905 MHz as a backup. The Salvation Army Team Emergency Radio Network (SATERN) also has been using 7.233 MHz as a coordinating frequency.

San Diego-Area SATERN Coordinator Paul Cook, N6RPF, reports that SATERN has helped with communication for a number of busy canteens in the San Diego area.

In San Bernardino County, Orange SM Carl Gardenias, WU6D, said ARES volunteers have been supporting emergency communication in the county.

ARRL Los Angeles SM Phineas Icenbice, W6BF, reports ARES members from his section have been assisting volunteers in the Orange and San Diego Sections. Los Angeles SEC Dennis Smith, KA6GSE, says ARES volunteers from the section also are helping at Red Cross shelters in LA.
NNNN
/EX

1873. Re: A Morsodist Challenge YKXWBSX7I6 01/03/2004

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-29 02:48:16 UTC
From: groupk0hb@earthlink.net
Message-ID: <5ee63311.0310281848.f54fdcf@posting.google.com>
Source record: 81349
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Dave Bushong <dbushong@adelphia.net>

> Gang,
>
> Shall we start a religion that is all about Morse?
>
> We would get a whole lot better treatment than we do now, plus, we can
> deduct our CW expenses.
>
> Our hymns are monotonic. Only the tempo changes.
>
> Sincerely, and may Marconi bless,
>
> The Reverend Dave, KZ1O
> High Priest
> The Live Free or Die State
> New Hampshire

Dear Reverend Dave,

I'm shocked that you haven't heard of one of the great religions of Amateur Radio. Morsodism has been widely discussed here on rrap, but you might be an ignorant newcomer here, so I'll fill you in.

So you want to be a Morsodist. It's not easy, you know: you'll have to impose the stiffest constraints on your mind, accepting authority without question -- you will be subject to jeers and persecutions at the hands of the Spawn of NoCode, and you will suffer during your entire lifetime trying to throw pearls before the swine. But in the end, you will receive your reward from the Almighty in Heaven, and you will have the satisfaction of seeing all others being tossed into the Lake of Fire and QRM.

But enough of that; you're not there yet. You must first prove yourself worthy of being a Morsodist.

Lesson One: Developing Your Psyche

Right now I would like you to relax. That's it -- just sit quietly and let your mind go blank. Concentrate on one thing and one thing only: concentrate on your thumb. Now that thumb is no ordinary run-of-the-mill thumb: what you see is THE THUMB. That Thumb is your world. Nothing besides that Thumb concerns you in the least. As far as you are concerned, that Thumb rules over all. The only thing that should be in your mind right now is your Thumb and its absolute

authority over your life. Each and every line, ridge, wrinkle, and bit of cuticle is a Divine Mandate, eternal in its wisdom, power, and relevance. That Thumb was made by MORSE, and its sole purpose is to guide you to your Salvation.

Now, while still concentrating on that Thumb, begin to think about the world around you. Careful! Don't try to take in everything at once: start with the rest of your fingers, and slowly spread from there. See how your fingers are connected with and dominated by your Thumb. Now, slowly extend your perception to embrace your forfinger. It too was created by Morse, and it is all guided by the Thumb. Between your thumb and forefinger lie all the secrets of The Keys of Morse. The rest of the universe is of no concern.

Lesson Two: Establishing Your Doctrine

Congratulations! You've come a long way, but you're not there yet. What I want you to do now is to go to the nearest book store and purchase a copy of the FCCRuleBook. Preferably, it should be bound in nice, shiny black leather, and should have gilt edges and a red silk ribbon. It should be fairly hefty in size, but not so large that you cannot hold it with one hand. Finally, it should have the words of Samuel in red letters, for as you know the Son of Morse only spoke using red letters.

Now that you have yourFCCRuleBook, read it, and read it thoroughly. I imagine that some of it will fit in perfectly with your beliefs and morals, since you have been inspired by Maxim to attempt this indoctrination into Morsodism. As you read, you must remember that your beliefs are the ONLY right beliefs, and all others are falsehoods and are totally incompatible with Morse Divine Truth.

Now you may be dismayed as you read through the FCCRuleBook to find that much of it is outside your beliefs, or may even contradict them. No problem! All you have to do is take a black marker pen and blot out those paragraphs which you don't like. Simplicity itself! Now don't you worry if it seems that more of the FCCRuleBook is blacked out than left behind: just remind yourself that the remaining words are emphasized all the more.

Lesson Three: Living a Morsodist Lifestyle

Well, I'm sure that you Novices are simply bursting with questions on how to apply your new-found faith to your lives. I am pleased by your enthusiasm: such zeal is a necessity if you want to begin to work your influence on this filthy and sinful world and mold it into a clean and upright one. Those Spawn of W5YI are simply itching to be preached at, whether they want it or not, so let's get cracking.

First, obtain for thyself some sort of access to the internet newsgroups, specifically any (and all) newsgroups in the "rec.radio.amateur.*" lineage. Never mind that only one of them, the "policy" group is fit for Morsodists like yourself; you must spread

the word ALL the heathen NoCodists. Crosspost like crazy, verily even if attacked by Horrible Herman, the Lord High Newsgroup Purity Defender.

As you preach the word of Morse to others, you will inevitably run into those who not only doubt the veracity of your words, but who also pose trick arguments inspired by Lenny Liberal and his henchman, Crazy Charlie, the head Oracalist, in an attempt to trap and discredit you. This lesson deals with some of the major swords wielded by various tempters, and gives you some ideas on how to parry those weapons.

Technobabble scholars: these vermin use their high-falootin' technical jargon and book-learning to pervert the words of the Morse and read things into Part 97 which aren't there. The FCCRuleBook was written by Morse for YOU to use, and contains EVERYTHING you need to know for Salvation, plainly stated in black and white and red. There is nothing magic or mystical about it: it speaks out in the Words of Morse and speaks directly to YOU, as you have personally modified it to your belief set.

If other Spawn of NoCode say that the FCCRuleBook cannot speak the utter Truth because it is inconsistent in what it says, you can reply that there is no inconsistency in your FCCRuleBook: everything that you have in your FCCRuleBook perfectly supports your beliefs (remember Lesson Two). If they quote passages from the FCCRuleBook which they claim contradict your beliefs, you can reply that Oracle has inspired them to pervert the words of Morse and to twist their meaning around in order to try to subvert the Truth. If they say that you are being totally ignorant and irrational in your absolute belief in your Morsodist Doctrine, you can reply that they are being totally ignorant and irrational in their absolute refusal to believe in your Doctrine. And if they say that you are shutting your eyes to reality, you can reply that they are shutting their eyes to Morse.

Peace to you!

Hans, K0HB
Lord High Liberator of the Blue Electric Smoke

1874. Re: FCC Regualtions & Public Entities Policies

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-29 03:15:46 UTC
From: Phillip Michael <gtg154a@mail.gatech.edu>
Message-ID: <bnnbdh$8h9$1@news-int.gatech.edu>
Source record: 81350

You do have the right to ban a device, but can they ban or limit uses based
on
interference?

"Jim Hampton" <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote in message
news:rMDnb.6337$cu1.3458@news02.roc.ny...
> It would seem that anyone can control access to and use of any device on
> their property. Most likely it would be returned when the student (or
> whoever) left the premises. I remember well a problem at my worksite back
> in the 70s. Due to bickering over radio stations, department policy was
to
> no longer allow radios at work (unless earphones were used). A couple of
> idiots had to have a boom box turned up loud on one machine. A supervisor
> went over to ask them to turn it down. "you aren't our boss" was the
reply.
> The supervisor returned with the department head (he was the department
head
> over 3 departments - and this was one of his departments). "who the h*ll
> are you?" the one asked. 10 minutes later, security turned up along with
> the superintendent. The radio was comfiscated. They were told that the
> radio would be returned when they left work. If it ever showed up again,
> they would be out the door and out of a job, no questions asked.
>
> I suspect that something like this may be going on. Some schools may have
a
> policy against cell phones. It is their call and taxpayers' money. I had
a
> problem with a neighbor some years ago (I had a judgement against him and
he
> wasn't going to pay). He had roofers working on his house and they had
> their ladder on my property. I asked them to move it. They didn't. I
> called the police. The cop was nice and tried to explain the situation to
> me. I simply informed him that he didn't have the full story. I didn't
> have to let anyone on my property, not even him unless he had a search
> warrent. He got the message and sent the roofers packing. Pure and
simple.
>
> 73 from Rochester, NY
> Jim AA2QA
>
> "Phillip Michael" <gtg154a@mail.gatech.edu> wrote in message
> news:bnmm64$s4v$1@news-int.gatech.edu...
> > Is an entity such as a public school allowed to adopt a policy that
allow

> > them to confiscate any device on their property that interferes with
their
> > wireless devices?
> >
> > For example:
> > Both devices are Part 15.
> > The school owns a wireless access point.
> > A student owns a cordless phone.
> >
> > If a cordless phone interferes with a wireless access point and
> > the school's policy says "they have the right to confiscate any device
> that
> > interferes with their wireless network"
> > Does the school really have the right to confiscate the cordless phone?
> >
> > Also if a student's device is under part 97 do you still have the right
to
> > confiscate it?
> >
> >
> > Here is a phrase from Part 15.5.b
> > interference must be accepted that may be caused by the operation of an
> > authorized radio station
> >
> > Does this only apply to a device or to an individual using a device?
> >
> >
> > --
> > Phillip Michael
> > gtg154a@mail.gatech.edu
> >
> >
> >
> >
>
>

1875. Re: ARRL has no FIRE for sale?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-29 03:38:07 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <zCGnb.8308$X22.1223@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 81351

"JJ" <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
news:vO-dnRSIRP7WYAOiRVn-tw@gbronline.com...
> Len over 21 wet his pants again and blathered:
>
> > In article <ntCdnfsHlvgkIAOiRVn-jA@gbronline.com>, JJ
<radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
> > writes:
> >
> >
> >
> >>I have been a ham for over 40 years, so how long have you been one?
> >
> >
> > I was on HF legally beginning in February 1953, a 1 KW BC-339,
> > one of 36 total transmitters at Army station ADA...increased to 43
> > by 1956. I got my first radio operator license from a single test at
> > an FCC field office in Chicago in March, 1956 (First Class
> > Radiotelephone).
>
> And that has nothing to do with amateur radio. There were/are lots of
> military radio operators operating military HF gear.
>
> >
> > I've never had, or tried to get, any amateur radio license. Mostly
> > because I've been a professional in radio-electronics for a half
> > century.
> >
> > You know what? The FCC doesn't require any commissioners or
> > staff to have amateur radio licenses in order to MAKE regulations
> > concerning amateur radio. How about that!?
>
> And your point is?
> >
> >
> >>"Kern" is the word Ed Norton use for coin in the "Honeymooners". My use
> >>of it is just a valid as you saying "one of them" instead of "one of
> >>those". Good grief you are dumb.
> >
> >
> > The "Honeymooners" went OFF the air long ago. Jackie Gleason
> > left this world a long time ago. Not everyone was a fan of a New
> > York based TV show on CBS during the black and white years.
> >
> > DOS Tip: Not everyone speaks in New Yorkese or Jerseyish or buys

> > "gaz" for his auto while in Philly.
> >
> >
> >
> >>And there are a lot of other users of the HF spectrum that do not
> >>require knowledge of Morse code. When it comes to the code issue the
> >>subject is Amateur radio not the chicken band. So what's you point?
> >
> >
> > The subject is NOT old black-and-white broadcast television, either.
> >
> >
> >>So who in the hell are you? Just another knuckle dragging dumb cber I
> >>suppose. As I said, "you don't know shit from Shinola".
> >
> >
> > Leonard H. Anderson
> >
> > You want my mailing address? Look in the FCC ECFS for the 14
> > petitions for and against amateur radio code testing. You will find
> > my name and address and comments in there, at least two documents
> > per RM.
> >
> > I don't work with feces and I don't make shoe polish. I'm a
professional
> > in radio-electronics who has not hidden his identity.
>
> A turd is a turd is a turd.
>
> >
> > YOU on the other hand, HIDE behind a couple letters and act tuff.
> > No USA database lists any "JJ" as the name of any licensed radio
> > amateur. Perhaps a foreign country might have it? :-)
> >
> > Insufficient courage to reveal your identity "JJ?" Or are you going
> > to rationalize your gutless fear somehow?
> >
> > LHA
>
> Since you do not hold an amateur radio operator's license nor seem to
> care about ever getting one, what business is it of yours if the amateur
> service has code testing or not? So what is your purpose for all the
> petitions on amateur testing? You seem to think it is strange that the
> FCC does not require those making rules concerning amateur radio to hold
> an amateur license, yet you, without holding an amateur radio license,
> can file petitons concerning amateur radio. How about that? Since you
> seem to have such a hard on about the amateur radio service, of which
> you are not even a member, why do you even bother? Why does it bother
> you about what the ARRL is doing, or if the hams are or aren't handling
> emergency comms in Calif. Perhaps you are just one of those types who

> sticks your nose into things that don't concern you just to stir the
> pot, or perhaps you can't pass the test for a license.
>

JJ,

In a language LHA can understand (assuming he actually was in the
military).......He is a DIPSHIT, or in Naval speak....he is a BLIVIT.

Dan/W4NTI

1876. Re: ARRL has no FIRE for sale?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-29 03:39:36 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <YDGnb.8311$X22.4451@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 81352

Poor Lennie....caught in ANOTHER LIE.

Dan/W4NTI

"charlesb" <n5pvl@sbcglobal.net> wrote in message
news:fTFnb.211$GR6.76@newssvr14.news.prodigy.com...
> SB SPCL @ ARL $ARLX010
> ARLX010 Amateurs Aid Agencies in California Fire Emergency
>
> ZCZC AX10
> QST de W1AW
> Special Bulletin 10 ARLX010
> >From ARRL Headquarters
> Newington CT October 28, 2003
> To all radio amateurs
>
> SB SPCL ARL ARLX010
> ARLX010 Amateurs Aid Agencies in California Fire Emergency
>
> Amateur Radio Emergency Service (ARES) and Radio Amateur Civil
> Emergency Service (RACES) teams are assisting local authorities and
> relief organizations as fire has burned more than 500,000 acres in
> southern California. Authorities report 11 separate fires have
> erupted and more than a dozen people have died.
>
> ARRL San Diego Section Manager Kent Tiburski, K6FQ, estimated that
> about 100 ham ARES and RACES volunteers are participating in his
> section, where most of the fatalities took place. Amateurs are
> supporting the Red Cross and The Salvation Army and staffing six
> shelters throughout San Diego county. Additional hams have deployed
> to San Diego-area emergency management offices and hospitals.
>
> Communication is mainly taking place on VHF. The San Diego ARES Net
> has been activated on 7.233 MHz with 3.905 MHz as a backup. The
> Salvation Army Team Emergency Radio Network (SATERN) also has been
> using 7.233 MHz as a coordinating frequency.
>
> San Diego-Area SATERN Coordinator Paul Cook, N6RPF, reports that
> SATERN has helped with communication for a number of busy canteens
> in the San Diego area.
>
> In San Bernardino County, Orange SM Carl Gardenias, WU6D, said ARES
> volunteers have been supporting emergency communication in the
> county.
>

> ARRL Los Angeles SM Phineas Icenbice, W6BF, reports ARES members
> from his section have been assisting volunteers in the Orange and
> San Diego Sections. Los Angeles SEC Dennis Smith, KA6GSE, says ARES
> volunteers from the section also are helping at Red Cross shelters
> in LA.
> NNNN
> /EX
>
>

1877. Re: FCC Regualtions & Public Entities Policies

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-29 05:35:27 UTC
From: groupk0hb@earthlink.net
Message-ID: <5ee63311.0310282135.2255b289@posting.google.com>
Source record: 81353

"Phillip Michael" <gtg154a@mail.gatech.edu> wrote

> If a cordless phone interferes with a wireless access point and
> the school's policy says "they have the right to confiscate any device that
> interferes with their wireless network"
> Does the school really have the right to confiscate the cordless phone?
>
> Also if a student's device is under part 97 do you still have the right to
> confiscate it?

I don't know if they can confiscate it, but they certainly are within
their rights to prohibit use of the device on their premises. Since a
cell phone transmits a signal even when not placing a call, they can
require that the unit be turned off at all times while on the
premises.

73, de Hans, K0HB

1878. Re: If the written test elements are so easy, why are we all not extras?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-29 06:29:48 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031029012948.25815.00004068@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 81358

In article <WYadnV56M5uqvQKiRVn-uA@comcast.com>, "Leland C. Scott"
<no-spam@junk-mail.net> writes:

>"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20031026233939.15923.00001559@mb-m12.aol.com.
>..
>> >
>> >1) Some hams are just not interested in HF.
>>
>> Those are obviously not "real hams."
>
>Speak for yourself.

I am.

Who do you speak for? :-)

>Leland C. Scott
>KC8LDO
>
>ARRL Member
>NCI Member

Tsk, tsk, going to add stuff after the "signature" of "imporance?"

I'm an NCI member also.

I'm also a Life Member in the IEEE.

>Don Ross (an extra who has never logged an HF
>contact)
>NL7CO/EM04

What a nice coincidence. Sergeant First Class Donald A. Ross
was the Maintenance NCOIC at Army Radio station ADA in the
mid- to late fifties. ADA was exclusively on HF using 43
transmitters. I have a nice digitized Signal Corps photograph of
SFC Ross adjusting a 4 KW PEP Western Electric transmitter.
Don was an amateur radio licensee, held both Radiotelephone and
Radiotelegarph First Class Commercial licenses. He would be
in his early 80s by now if still with us.

LHA

1879. Re: Element 1, Code vs. No-code, and Dad

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-29 06:29:50 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031029012950.25815.00004069@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 81360

In article <20031028195937.25815.00004064@mb-m07.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) writes:

>> Try not to strain yourself putting words into others' messages.
>
>What "words have I put in others messages", Len?

Those following -

>It's clear from your many, many posts here that you want amateur radio to
>become a multiband version of cb.

That's just your DELUSION and fantasy.

>You rail against "rank, status and privilege", and you make it clear you want
>one class of license, or no licenses at all.

I've never been for "no license at all." Poor baby, still delerious.

>You're against any sort of standards, values, or traditions in amateur radio.

I'm not interested in the standards, values or traditions of the
Archaic Radiotelegraphy Service.

Stop trying to be a proselyte for the Past.

>You're constantly criticizing ARRL without justification, and even accusing
>them of fraud - again, with no evidence.

Plenty of evidence of hypocrisy, false "representation," no verification
of their alleged ability to "know what is best for amateur radio."

>You deny the homebrewing success of others, and the public service
>contributions of radio amateurs.

I've never "denied it," delusional fellow.

You've never offered proof YOUR wonderful amazing state-of-the-art
homebrew radios worked...or even existed.

>Quite clear what you would like amateur radio to become, good buddy ;-)

I'm NOT your "good buddy." Haven't you got your eyes in?

>I'm simply pointing out where your many complaining posts lead. If all of the
>things you complain about were eliminated from amateur radio, it would become
>quite like cb. You'd like that, I think.

No, you are just voicing your fantasies and delusions and terrible
parsimonous pique and not honoring and respecting your noble

viewpoints.

>> You were much better on the pulpit with your old Sermons On
>> The Antenna Mount.
>
>Typical personal insult from Len rather than debating the issue.

You are preachy to a fault. You need a refresher at the
seminary. Or a retreat.

>Not much. But by the time I became aware of it, I was repelled by the immature
>behavior of some of the users there.

:-)

How old were you in 1958? How "mature" were you that you could
"judge" others?

>What did YOU do to keep that service from becoming such a wasteland?

Irrelevant. CB has far too many users for too little bandspace.

What have YOU done to eliminate CB or reduce all that waste?

YOU seem to know all, be all, yet do nothing of value except
extoll your own alleged expertise in OLD radio arts.

>> YOU've had 45 years to correct things.
>
>Not my responsibility, Len. I'm not a cb user. Never have been. All I did was
>listen there, and tune away in disgust.

Poor baby. "Disgust," is it? :-)

>
>I'm know many cb users are fine people, but the service is a mess, has been
>for decades, and it was a mistake to have ever been created.

Poor thing. You could have DONE something for the betterment
of mankind in 45 years, yet you have not...

>What have YOU done to fix cb?

Irrelevant. What needs to be "fixed?" Restore it to radio amateurs?

You can always file a petition with FCC to abolish CB. Go ahead,
make everyone's day. :-)

It might be done some time. It only took 24 years to make the first
dent in the 40m problem with SW BC interfering with the "rightful
ownership by hams" there. :-)

LHA

1880. Re: ARRL has no FIRE for sale?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-29 06:29:51 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031029012951.25815.00004071@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 81354

In article <YDGnb.8311$X22.4451@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dan/W4NTI"
<w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> writes:

>Poor Lennie....caught in ANOTHER LIE.
>
>Dan/W4NTI

No Dannie boy, NOT a "lie." Go back a day to message that
started this thread. ARRL had NO mention of the already-
widespread California firestorms up to 1 PM EST.

Have you learned to READ yet? Or are you still unable to
cope with reality?

LHA

1881. Re: What If.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-29 06:29:51 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031029012951.25815.00004070@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 81357

In article <5ee63311.0310281515.6a04686b@posting.google.com>,
groupk0hb@earthlink.net (Hans K0HB) writes:

>Then, as the giant asteroid was to dinosaurs, overnight the $9.95
>pocket calculator killed the slide rule. Despite it's ubiquity and
>utter simplicity the mighty slide rule went extinct in less than a
>decade! Perhaps somewhere, in a backward company in a backward
>country
>without sand from which to make silicon chips, a group of stalwart
>engineers still treasure their Pickett or K+E slipsticks, and still
>require a practical examination, down to the third significant digit,
>of an engineers proficiency, and whether they actually could explain
>the difference between the CIF and DIF scales.
>
>Perhaps some amateur mathematicians still are proficient on slide
>rules
>(after all, they haven't been outlawed!). I bet they even hold speed
>and
>accuracy contests at a nostalgic "Slippers" convention each spring in
>Akron, Ohio. Led by the scratchy but firm voices of their oldest club
>members, Jim 'Bentupcursor' Nichols and Larry Elscale, they close each
>convention by quoting the 1940's fight song of that bastion of
>wood-assisted math, Cal Tech:
>
> "E-to-the-x du dx, E-to-the-x dx,
> Cotan secant tangent sine,
> three point one four one five nine.
> Square root, cube root, QED
> Slipstick, slide rule, Hooray! CT!"
>
>The next SLIPS newsletter duly reports the resolution of the IEEE BoD
>to
>gain legislation to include slide-rule competency testing as a
>requisite
>to all engineering degrees, except those seeking 2-year Stickless
>Technician degrees. Regular Technicians will require 5CPM (Calculation
>Per Minute) exams, BSEE will require 13CPM, and MSEE will require a
>20CPM exam.
>
>On another front, when I first became involved in amateur radio, Morse
>code was the one absolutely necessary communications mode used by
>every
>ham. It was simple, uncomplicated, easy to use (after some period of
>rather tedious practice) and delightfully low tech. It was the

>communications mode-of-choice for over three generations.
>
>Then, as the giant asteroid was to dinosaurs, overnight.....

:-)

Pity that the northeastern USA membership organization still
thinks it is the tyrannosaurus rex of radio when all it is is a little
lizard in an ancient back yard of morsemanship.

LHA.

1882. Re: ARRL has no FIRE for sale?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-29 06:29:52 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031029012952.25815.00004072@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 81355

In article <zCGnb.8308$X22.1223@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dan/W4NTI"
<w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> writes:

>JJ,
>
>In a language LHA can understand (assuming he actually was in the
>military).......He is a DIPSHIT, or in Naval speak....he is a BLIVIT.
>
>Dan/W4NTI

Poor Dan. We still haven't found the right replacement parts to
fix his stupid.

You need confirmation of my U. S. military service, Dannie?
Contact NARA in St. Louis (National Archives and Records Agency).
It's all there. Have them search for Army serial number RA16408336
beginning March 13, 1952.

LHA

1883. Re: ARRL has no FIRE for sale?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-29 06:29:52 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031029012952.25815.00004073@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 81359

In article <fTFnb.211$GR6.76@newssvr14.news.prodigy.com>, "charlesb"
<n5pvl@sbcglobal.net> writes:

>SB SPCL @ ARL $ARLX010
>ARLX010 Amateurs Aid Agencies in California Fire Emergency
>
>ZCZC AX10
>QST de W1AW
>Special Bulletin 10 ARLX010
>>From ARRL Headquarters
>Newington CT October 28, 2003
>To all radio amateurs

That "news copy" was on the ARRL website opening page.

There is NO corroboration of that information with any other
commercial news service.

ARRL is NOT a news service despite play-acting as if they were.

If the ARRL was a news service, they would have put that
information out at least four days before the 27th of October,
AFTER the wildfires had begun and weather reports indicating
ideal wildfire conditions.

All the ARRL news seems to be AFTER-the-fact "reporting,"

LHA

1884. Re: ARRL has no FIRE for sale?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-29 06:29:54 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031029012954.25815.00004074@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 81356

In article <vO-dnRSIRP7WYAOiRVn-tw@gbronline.com>, JJ <fearful anonymous radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> writes:

>> In article <ntCdnfsHlvgkIAOiRVn-jA@gbronline.com>, JJ
><radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
>> writes:
>>
>>>I have been a ham for over 40 years, so how long have you been one?

I don't think so. You don't identify yourself.

You could be LYING.

No identification. You could be anything...and nothing.

>> I was on HF legally beginning in February 1953, a 1 KW BC-339,
>> one of 36 total transmitters at Army station ADA...increased to 43
>> by 1956. I got my first radio operator license from a single test at
>> an FCC field office in Chicago in March, 1956 (First Class
>> Radiotelephone).
>
>And that has nothing to do with amateur radio. There were/are lots of
>military radio operators operating military HF gear.

ALL radios work by the SAME principles of physics.

Electrons, fields, and waves don't work "differently" if some humans establish a radio service.

>> I've never had, or tried to get, any amateur radio license. Mostly
>> because I've been a professional in radio-electronics for a half
>> century.
>>
>> You know what? The FCC doesn't require any commissioners or
>> staff to have amateur radio licenses in order to MAKE regulations
>> concerning amateur radio. How about that!?
>
>And your point is?

Obvious to those who can think.

Those who REGULATE U. S. amateur radio are NOT required to be granted any amateur radio license.

You don' tsee the point?

Pity those unable to think.

The FCC does NOT sanctify any fraternal orders/organizations.
You are acting like the U. S. ARS is a fraternal order, all
"answerable to the ARS community" and all that folderol.

ARRL is a fraternal order of sorts. ARRL does NOT regulate
U. S. amateur radio. Never did.

>Since you do not hold an amateur radio operator's license nor seem to
>care about ever getting one, what business is it of yours if the amateur
>service has code testing or not?

What "business" is it of yours, anonymous entity?

> So what is your purpose for all the
>petitions on amateur testing?

You must have been away, far away from here if you don't know.

I'm advocating the elimination of ALL morse code TESTING.

Retention of code TESTING is just a constant dumbing down to
standards and practices in all communications of seven
decades ago.

Why do you wish to keep the U. S. amateur radio service
dumbed down to ancient methods of communications?

>You seem to think it is strange that the
>FCC does not require those making rules concerning amateur radio to hold
>an amateur license, yet you, without holding an amateur radio license,
>can file petitons concerning amateur radio.

ANYONE can file a petition with the FCC if they show good
cause for a petition's existance. Whether or not such a petition
is made an "RM" and put on the public record for comment is
up to the FCC, not you, anonymous one. [FCC will not accept
anonymity[

I have NOT filed any petition. I HAVE made Comments. That is
within my rights under the United States Constitution. Ever hear
of that document? It's a pretty good document. Read it some time.

>How about that?

How about what? Are you an advocate of abrogating the First
Amendment of the United States Constitution, anonymous one?

>Since you
>seem to have such a hard on about the amateur radio service, of which
>you are not even a member, why do you even bother?

Radio has NO sexual appeal to me. Apparently it does to you.

Have you seen a mental health professional about your strange
desire?

>Why does it bother
>you about what the ARRL is doing, or if the hams are or aren't handling
>emergency comms in Calif.

ARRL is a membership organization based in the U.S. northeast.
It has a MINORITY membership among all the licensed U.S. radio
amateurs. ARRL is also a political special-interest group with a
lobbyist firm and a DC legal firm on retainer.

I accuse ARRL of favoring regional northeastern interests and being
hypocritical over their ACTUAL "representation" of amateur radio.

Why do you wish control over who can say what in the USA?

Are you in favor of dictatorship? You must be from the way you
talk-type in here.

>Perhaps you are just one of those types who
>sticks your nose into things that don't concern you just to stir the
>pot, or perhaps you can't pass the test for a license.

Perhaps you need an attitude adjustment. A SERIOUS adjustment.

I'm NOT interested in joining any Archaic Radiotelegraphy Society.

All you've done so far is to target an individual with an ateempt at
personal attack. The subject is the geographic provinchialism of
the ARRL which is a political special-interest group.

You continue to hide behind a pseudonym. Why are you afraid?

LHA

1885. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-29 07:58:13 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <pqKnb.10966$FI2.5053@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 81361

"N2EY" wrote:
>
> Then what's the answer? Shall we eliminate all immigration,
> or just the illegals? Who gets to decide who should be kept
> out and who should be admitted, other than obvious threats
> to security? (snip)
>
> (snip) Almost 100 years ago, my grandparents came to the
> United States from Italy. They left in part because of the 1906
> earthquake, but mostly because they wanted a better life than
> they could get in Italy at that time.

Times change. Years ago, there were great open spaces throughout America just waiting for new immigrates to settle. Those shopkeepers, craftsmen, farmers, laborers, and so on, clearly benefited a new nation. The benefits today are subtle and the problems (job shortages and so on) more pronounced. Because of that, we have to cut back on immigration at some point. We can't have the entire world's population, or even a significant portion of it, living here. I think we've reached that point - the point where we cut back on immigration except for the very most extreme cases. And when I say extreme cases, I mean extreme cases. Economic considerations would not qualify. Those facing persecution or death in their home country would only be allowed to stay only as long as those threats exist, after which they must leave. To fill labor shortages here, we should retrain those already here.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

1886. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-29 09:18:27 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <DBLnb.10995$FI2.2198@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 81362

"N2EY" wrote:
>
> You're forgetting at least two states. There were 34
> in 1861, but 18+11+3 = 32

The other states did not get involved. There were 18 Union States and 11 Confederate States. California and Oregon wanted nothing to do with the issue or the conflict. The four border states did not secede.

> But slavery *was* threatened, because the trend was
> clear to see. As the West and Midwest developed, more
> and more free states would be added. (snip)

The trend was not so clear. Certainly some of the Midwest states, dependant on farming, would want slaves.

> Then what *was* the South fighting for? What rights did
> the 11 states cherish so greatly that they would secede and
> fight a war to keep them?

You're looking for an easy answer to a very complex question. I suspect there were as many reason for the conflict as their were people involved. Some of the roots of the Civil War dates back to the Revolutionary War nearly a century earlier, where many Southerners did not want to break with England, sided with England during the conflict, and were persecuted for that afterwards. Others objected to the taxes and tarrifs on farm goods heading overseas, seeing that as similar to what the North objected to leading up to the Revolutionary War and reducing profits from their primary markets. Others saw the attempts for fix market prices on farm goods by Northern firms as a threat to free markets (and were angry the government did nothing to stop the practice). Others objected to what they saw as efforts by Northern States to limit the political influence of the Southern States. The list goes on and on (and I certainly don't have the time to go on and on here).

> No argument there - but where were most of the slaves?
> In the Confederate states!

Only if you ignore indentured, bound, or apprentice, workers in the North. These were people purchased at slave auctions (blacks), or from poor families (whites), and given contracts to work for years in Northern factories to hopefully earn their eventual freedom. Ben Franklin and his maternal grandmother were both once apprentice workers. She married the man who held her contract. Ben Franklin escaped to Philadelphia (breaking his contract and the laws). The only differences between this and outright slavery were the legal papers and the idea of possible freedom some day. Of

course, because of the working conditions, few ever lived long enough to be free. This practice continued long after slavery was abolished.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

1887. Re: FCC Regualtions & Public Entities Policies

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-29 09:26:08 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <REMOVETHISkc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <bnodb4$13u4j4$4@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 81367

Better think of a better example than a cordless phone unless you are
referring to a cell-phone..... Unless the kid lives really close to the
school. The range is not that great on those things, at least not for
sustained communications.

The school district may decide to confiscate anything that violates their
publicized rules. If they feel it is interrupting or distracting the
students or feel that whatever the object is, is unsafe, then they could
confiscate. (unsafe object could be a knife for example)

A student is considered a "guest" on the premises and therefore does not
have exclusive rights as he would in his own home.

--
Ryan KC8PMX

Some people are like Slinkies . . . not really good for anything, but you
still can't help but smile when you see one tumble down the stairs.

"Phillip Michael" <gtg154a@mail.gatech.edu> wrote in message
news:bnmm64$s4v$1@news-int.gatech.edu...
> Is an entity such as a public school allowed to adopt a policy that allow
> them to confiscate any device on their property that interferes with their
> wireless devices?
>
> For example:
> Both devices are Part 15.
> The school owns a wireless access point.
> A student owns a cordless phone.
>
> If a cordless phone interferes with a wireless access point and
> the school's policy says "they have the right to confiscate any device
that
> interferes with their wireless network"
> Does the school really have the right to confiscate the cordless phone?
>
> Also if a student's device is under part 97 do you still have the right to
> confiscate it?
>
>
> Here is a phrase from Part 15.5.b
> interference must be accepted that may be caused by the operation of an
> authorized radio station
>
> Does this only apply to a device or to an individual using a device?
>

>
> --
> Phillip Michael
> gtg154a@mail.gatech.edu
>
>
>
>

1888. Re: Frenchmen must have thin skin

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-29 09:43:30 UTC
From: Alun Palmer <alun@1stcounsel.com>
Message-ID: <Xns9423300C5DF43elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 81363
Cross-posted to: alt.ham-radio.hf,alt.radio.amateur,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Clint" <rattlehead at computron dot net> wrote in
news:vo1hnman40fn0d@corp.supernews.com:

>
> *PLONK!*
>
> and with that we have a new addition to my killfile.
>
> Clint is now kieren-free...
>

Plonk!!! Cretin

1889. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-29 10:34:13 UTC
From: Alun Palmer <alun@1stcounsel.com>
Message-ID: <Xns942338A4EEBB9elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 81364

N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in
news:c2356669.0310281010.6f871569@posting.google.com:

> "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
> news:<IHqnb.7160$X22.2575@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
>> "Dave Heil" wrote:
>> > Dwight Stewart wrote:
>> > >
>> > > (snip)
>> >
>> > Salaries are going up.
>>
>> Compared to the cost of living, salaries are going down. The minimum
>> wage
>> is a good example. To keep up with the cost of living increase over
>> the last twenty-five years (to have the same spending power as 25
>> years ago), the minimum wage should be over $19 per hour. By the same
>> token, a person earning $19 an hour twenty-five years ago should be
>> earning well over $50 an hour today. Check it out yourself. Look at
>> the minimum wage 25 years ago (or any typical wage 25 years ago) and
>> increase it by the same percentage that living costs (rent, house
>> payments, utilities, food, and so on) have increased over the years
>> since.
>
> There are all kinds of indicators that both support and contradict
> your point, Dwight. But what I see is that the general trend is for
> some necessities (housing, medical costs, college education,
> insurance, *taxes*) to be increasing in price faster than wages, and
> for other items, mostly "luxuries" but some necessities (computers,
> electronics, energy, food) to be increasing slower than wages. So what
> you get are people who can afford a really sweet ham rig but cannot
> afford a house to put it in.
>
> The trend is further muddled by the increasing number of
> two-career-by-necessity families. People forget that 30-40 years ago a
> family of four could live a very nice middle-class lifestyle on one
> middle-class income - and you did not need a master's degree to get
> such a job.
>
> There's also the increasing number of things to spend money on. I can
> remember a time when, for most people, things like a second car, cable
> TV, a computer, and many other things were luxuries. Today they are
> almost essentials.
>>

>> > I can think of one, Dwight. Those folks work and
>> > pay social security taxes so that you can retire and
>> > draw SS benefits. They also pay State and Federal
>> > taxes. Many of them are very bright individuals.
>> > Some are doctors. Some do computer design work.
>> > Some do menial labor which most American workers don't desire.
>>
>> Americans working at those jobs would do the same things (pay taxes
>> and so
>> on), Dave. Why do we need immigrants to do that? Some of those
>> Americans are even bright. As for the "menial" jobs, the only reason
>> those jobs are menial is because employers choose not to pay decent
>> wages to do those jobs. And as long as employers continue to find
>> cheap labor to fill those jobs, there is no incentitive whatsoever to
>> increase those wages. If anything, a ready supply of cheap labor only
>> drives down wages for other jobs, increasing the number of menial jobs
>> and decreasing jobs that pay decent wages. The direct result is less
>> well paying jobs for all working class Americans.
>
> Then what's the answer? Shall we eliminate all immigration, or just
> the illegals? Who gets to decide who should be kept out and who should
> be admitted, other than obvious threats to security?
>
> There's also an important factor being left out: Many of the "good"
> jobs of former eras are being exported. Try to buy a shirt or shoes or
> computer that's "Made In USA". If you think immigrant labor is cheap,
> look at what the wages are in the developing countries. Remember
> NAFTA? Remember the demonstrators at the GATT meetings? What do you
> think they're demonstrating against?
>
> How about this example:
>
> Almost 100 years ago, my grandparents came to the United States from
> Italy. They left in part because of the 1906 earthquake, but mostly
> because they wanted a better life than they could get in Italy at that
> time.
>
> They were admitted through Ellis Island, like millions of others. They
> wound up in Philadelphia, where they found jobs, learned the language,
> built businesses and lives, etc. I don't think any of them even had a
> grade-school education. They were from southern Italy, not northern or
> western Europe. They didn't speak English when they got here, and some
> of them never learned to speak it without an accent. They were Roman
> Catholics, a religion widely despised in the US for various reasons.
> They had to deal with all of the usual stereotypes applied to their
> ethnicity.
>
> Today their grandchildren all have college degrees, good jobs,
> successful lives, etc. Typical American dream stuff.
>

> Should they have been admitted to the USA or not?
>
> (I'm sure some folks here would be really happy if they had been kept
> out ;-))
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>

You talk a lot of sense, Jim.

I don't think we need look any further than the robber barons who are running corporations to see why living standards are declining. Not all can be an Enron or Arthur Anderson, but they can still manage to rip off their own employees quite well. They send jobs overseas, and layoff as many here as they can get away with, so each person left has more than one person's job to do. Even a blind man could see it going on.

Immigrants (like me) make handy scapegoats. Most legal immigrants, however, get in on 'family reunification'. If you want reform, that's a good place to start. Being from a 'first world' country _none_ of my family are interested in comimg here to live. Most of the people who get in that way are not well educated or highly skilled. There again, Jim's grandparents obviously turned out OK, so who's to say?

I got here by job-related immigration, where you have to prove that no American is available for the job, amongst other things. You do this by advertising the job, and you are allowed to advertise either in a newspaper, or a professional journal, or through the state employment service. Human nature being what it is, you choose whichever is _least_ likely to turn up a viable candidate. For a professional level job, that would be the state employment service.

If you truly want to make immigration tougher, and in fact the US is already one of the toughest countries to get into, you have to really look at these details, instead of spouting rhetoric. You also have to deal with the hard truth that every turn of the screw boosts illegal immigration, and there are limits to where the border patrols can watch. If there is any answer to that, it probably involves bringing the economies of Mexico and points South up to US levels. Somehow.

Discuss!

1890. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-29 10:59:36 UTC
From: Alun Palmer <alun@1stcounsel.com>
Message-ID: <Xns94233CF2CA4D9elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 81365

"Jim Hampton" <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote in
news:aSDnb.6340$Uv1.3126@news02.roc.ny:

> Larry,
>
> I'd gently remind you that there wouldn't be any citizens (well, very
> few - only the decendents of the original folks after the revolutionary
> war) at all under those rules. My great-grandfather and my grandfather
> (when he was 7) immigrated to the US in the late 1800s (my dads side).
> My mother's grandfather (my great-grandfather) immigrated from Canada.
> If their children couldn't become citizens, I wouldn't be one now.
> Heck, how could they hold a draft back in WWII with no citizens? Only
> draft foreigners?
>
> 73 from Rochester, NY
> Jim AA2QA
>
> "
>
>
>

They can draft foreigners, who can then refuse to actually go on the ground of 'alienage'. This refusal is grounds to be refused a green card, but it seems, as far as I can tell, that an alien who already had a green card would not be affected in any way by refusing the draft. Also, an alien on a visa could stay as long as they had a current visa, even though refusing the draft would bar them from ever getting a green card. Bear in mind, also, that aliens who come here after age 25, like me, can never be drafted because we never get onto the selective service register. Of course, there is no draft at present, but all these rules kick in if it is ever reintroduced.

1891. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-29 11:30:06 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031029063006.12501.00003533@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 81366

In article <DBLnb.10995$FI2.2198@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> writes:

>"N2EY" wrote:
>>
>> You're forgetting at least two states. There were 34
>> in 1861, but 18+11+3 = 32

> The other states did not get involved. There were 18 Union States and 11
>Confederate States. California and Oregon wanted nothing to do with the
>issue or the conflict. The four border states did not secede.

They were involved to the extent that they supported the Union cause financially and politically.

You previously claimed that "slavery was not threatened" because the free states could not get the needed 2/3 majority. I showed that was simply not true - it would have taken 23 states of the 34.

It's not a coincidence that 11 states (34-23=11) seceded.
>
>> But slavery *was* threatened, because the trend was
>> clear to see. As the West and Midwest developed, more
>> and more free states would be added. (snip)
>
> The trend was not so clear. Certainly some of the Midwest states,
>dependant on farming, would want slaves.

Not at all! Iowa, Minnesota, Wisconsin, Indiana, Illinois...all farming states back then, all free.

The simple fact was that more free states than slave states were being admitted, and that as time went on the days of slavery were numbered - unless the Union were broken.
>
>> Then what *was* the South fighting for? What rights did
>> the 11 states cherish so greatly that they would secede and
>> fight a war to keep them?
>
> You're looking for an easy answer to a very complex question.

I'm looking for the facts. Some of those facts may not be things anyone today is proud of. I'm not proud that the founders could "proclaim liberty" and say "all men are created equal" and then allow slavery to exist in their country.

>I suspect
>there were as many reason for the conflict as their were people involved.

I'm looking for the facts.

>Some of the roots of the Civil War dates back to the Revolutionary War
>nearly a century earlier, where many Southerners did not want to break with
>England, sided with England during the conflict, and were persecuted for
>that afterwards. Others objected to the taxes and tarrifs on farm goods
>heading overseas, seeing that as similar to what the North objected to
>leading up to the Revolutionary War and reducing profits from their primary
>markets.

The Constitution forbid tariffs and taxes on exports. Only imports could be
taxed or tarriffed. This was obvious economic protectionism.

>Others saw the attempts for fix market prices on farm goods by
>Northern firms as a threat to free markets (and were angry the government
>did nothing to stop the practice).

In very broad terms, the problem was that the North industrialized and the
South stayed agrarian. The North rejected slavery in favor of immigration,
while the South allowed slavery to grow to the extent that by 1860 in at least
two states the number of slaves exceeded the number of free people.

>Others objected to what they saw as
>efforts by Northern States to limit the political influence of the Southern
>States.

That game was played both ways. The original Constitution counted 60% of the
slave population when allocating seats in the House of Representatives - but no
slaves were allowed to vote! So the slave states had a built-in political
advantage over the North, based on the illogical and immoral idea that a slave
was not a human being when it came to rights, but *was* a human being - or
rather 60% of a human being - when it came time to determine the political
population.

Was that fair in any way?

>The list goes on and on (and I certainly don't have the time to go
>on and on here).
>
The point is simple: Slavery was at the bottom of all those causes. It was the
root cause of the differences in economy, politics and culture that caused 11
states to secede.
>
>> No argument there - but where were most of the slaves?
>> In the Confederate states!
>
> Only if you ignore indentured, bound, or apprentice, workers in the North.

Those were not slaves.

>These were people purchased at slave auctions (blacks), or from poor
>families (whites), and given contracts to work for years in Northern
>factories to hopefully earn their eventual freedom.

They had *contracts* - BIG difference!

Which is completely different from being enslaved *forever*, together with all of your children. Most indentured servants worked out their contracts and became free. Most slaves never did.

Indentured and bound workers were (for the most part) working off debts. It was common practice for poor European immigrants to indenture themselves for 7 years to pay for their transatlantic passage. After that 7 years, they were free.

Apprentices traded their labor for education, working a set number of years in order to learn a skilled trade.

In most cases those workers entered into the contract *voluntarily*. And the contract had a definite time limit.

Those contracts were valid because both parties got something of value.

Slaves, on the other hand, were simply *stolen* from their homes by raiders and shipped off. They received *nothing* for their work and had no choice in the matter. There was no limit on their service.

>Ben Franklin and his
>maternal grandmother were both once apprentice workers.

Were they dragged from their homes in chains and sent thousands of miles away, to work the rest of their lives in a strange place with little hope of freedom? Or was it a voluntary, temporary agreement for economic and educational reasons?

>She married the man
>who held her contract.

How many slaves did that?

>Ben Franklin escaped to Philadelphia (breaking his
>contract and the laws).

Yep - he stole a few years labor from the man who held the contract. I understand that later on he paid off the contract.

>The only differences between this and outright
>slavery were the legal papers and the idea of possible freedom some day.

WRONG!

There's also the fact that the apprentices were not stolen from their homes and dragged away against their will.

>Of
>course, because of the working conditions, few ever lived long enough to be
>free. This practice continued long after slavery was abolished.

That's simply not true. Most indentured servants worked out their 7 years and were freed.

In fact, indentured servants were used widely in the colonies before the revolution, but in the South the practice became unpopular because the

plantation owners were always having to buy new contracts and the now freed indentured servants were setting up their own plantations using skills and knowledge learned while indentured.

We still have contract labor today. Actors, athletes and executives, to name a few, sign contracts where they agree to work for a certain period of time and receive certain benefits. Both sides are legally bound by the contract.

To equate the immoral horror of slavery with contract labor is simply not valid in any way.

1892. Re: ARRL has no FIRE for sale?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-29 13:36:13 UTC
From: charlesb <n5pvl@sbcglobal.net>
Message-ID: <hnPnb.6660$x75.6282@newssvr27.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 81368

"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20031029012952.25815.00004073@mb-m07.aol.com...
>
> That "news copy" was on the ARRL website opening page.
>
> There is NO corroboration of that information with any other
> commercial news service.

Gee, what an ignorant asshole!

Charles Brabham, N5PVL

1893. Re: ARRL has no FIRE for sale?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-29 15:03:49 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3F9FD6D4.6D71A2CC@earthlink.net>
Source record: 81369

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <m%inb.6096$083.3677@news02.roc.ny>, "Jim Hampton"
> <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> writes:
>
> >Len should subscribe to our newspaper. Late sports info is printed *two*
> >days later. He may not understand that it takes time for information to be
> >collected and printed (even if only on the internet).
>
> Newspapers here in Southern California are printed DAILY.

What a clever idea! That's the kind of thing which, if made public,
could sweep the country.

> They
> are as up to the minute as a press run for 1.4 million copies of
> TWO daily editions of the L. A. TIMES.

Wow! Another revelation! Do you think you should be revealing this
kind of closely-held information, Len?

> Radio propagates faster than 180 thousand miles per second. So
> does light.

Those are interesting points, Len. That's why it is strange when we
have a power outage and don't receive our light at faster than 182k
miles per second, we tune our radio receivers to a local (this part of
the Ohio Valley) station and become upset that none of those stations
has a live news crew to provide updates on the power outage.

> 15 million folks out here in the southern region can
> SEE the smoke from (now) over 250,000 acres burned and burning.

Seeing smoke doesn't necessarily provide those inviduals with up to the
minute information on which specific areas have burned or whether they
or their homes might be in immediate danger.

> Telephones work here, despite the insistence of some that "telephones
> always fail during emergencies and disasters!" Communications
> satellites work fine (there's a full set of them every 3 degrees along
> the geosynchronous orbit). We have more Uplink mobile sets that
> "work" commsats in the southern part than exist in the entirety of
> most individual states.

When it is all over, it'll be interesting to see if any telephone lines,
cell towers other communications towers failed during the fire
emergency.

> There's the INTERNET whose well-distributed Backbone will defy
> destruction from a massive nuclear onslaught. One in five Americans
> has some Internet connection capability in 2002 according to the
> U. S. Census Bureau.

Of course none of this internet infrastructure is in any way tied to
telephone lines.

> ARRL has been advertising its vaunted Emergency Planning and
> Operations classes for about two years now. It's time for them
> to put their keys where their mouths were...time for the NTS to
> quit trying to play Western Union impersonator games (they were
> never very good at it).

Why not admit that you have no information on what radio amateurs, ARRL
members or not, are doing with regard to the California fires?

> It's also time that the Newington crowd recognized that MOST of
> the United States and MOST of the radio amateurs it is supposed
> to represent live WEST of the Mississippi.

Did you have a point? Do you really believe that the League's Board of
Directors have no idea of ARRL membership geographics or demographics?
Directors are elected by ARRL members in their geographic region.

> NBC evening news with Tom Brokaw featured the decade-old
> Emergency Communications Center in Los Angeles that
> coordinates the firefighting efforts. NBC didn't interview any ham
> radio "emergency groups" nor mention ham radio in any way.

Again, did you have a point?

> >I only wish that my worst problems were the ARRL and CW vs no code. LOL.
> >These guys are going to drop from coronaries or stroke long before their
> >time.
>
> Fine, then activate an Emergency Medical Team on Ham Radio to go
> rescue those guys south of Boston having all those coronaries and
> strokes. ARRL's image is more important than their substance.
>
> ARRL is the ham savior. Ham radio shall not want. Beep, beep.

Why should the ARRL bother you? You aren't a member and you have
nothing to do with amateur radio. On with your quest, Don Quixote!

Dave K8MN

1894. Re: ARRL has no FIRE for sale?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-29 15:07:26 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3F9FD7AD.94946B4A@earthlink.net>
Source record: 81370

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <c2356669.0310271339.15e7e1df@posting.google.com>, N2EY@AOL.COM
> (N2EY) writes:
>
> >http://www.arrl.org/news/stories/2003/10/27/2/?nc=1
> >
> >as of 1640 EST.
> >
> >Rest of Len's typical ARRL bashing snipped.
>
> Tsk, tsk, tsk. 5 1/2 days. Then, suddenly, "news" appears on
> ARRL that Something Is Happening Out West...a bit over two
> hours after I posted a No News Statement.

It is obvious that someone from HQ--probably that pesky Ed Hare--saw
your post and quickly threw something together for the ARRL web site,
just to make you look silly.

Dave K8MN

1895. Re: What If.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-29 15:13:58 UTC
From: groupk0hb@earthlink.net
Message-ID: <5ee63311.0310290713.26cc5cfa@posting.google.com>
Source record: 81371

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote

>
> Pity that the northeastern USA membership organization still
> thinks it is the tyrannosaurus rex of radio when all it is is a little
> lizard in an ancient back yard of morsemanship.
>

The snarly Una-basher speaks again. He must have been scared
(scarred?) by an ARRL diamond when he was a baby.

ARRL is in fact very California-centric.

There are more W6 ARRL members than any other call area.
Two of the fifteen ARRL Divisions are in California.
Ten of the seventy ARRL Sections are in California.

73, de Hans, K0HB
--
http://home.earthlink.net/~k0hb

1896. Re: ARRL has no FIRE for sale?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-29 15:17:47 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0310290717.228afebd@posting.google.com>
Source record: 81372

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20031027224111.11891.00001853@mb-m11.aol.com>...
> In article <m%inb.6096$083.3677@news02.roc.ny>, "Jim Hampton"
> <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> writes:
>
> >Len should subscribe to our newspaper. Late sports info is printed *two*
> >days later. He may not understand that it takes time for information to be
> >collected and printed (even if only on the internet).
>
> Newspapers here in Southern California are printed DAILY. They
> are as up to the minute as a press run for 1.4 million copies of
> TWO daily editions of the L. A. TIMES.

Amateur Radio volunteers, like hundreds of other various
volunteer groups, believe in doing it first, talking about it later.

Amateur Radio PAO folks are volunteers just like the folks who
are supporting the fire effort...Guess they just decided to prioritize
thier efforts and take care of business first.

> Radio propagates faster than 180 thousand miles per second. So
> does light. 15 million folks out here in the southern region can
> SEE the smoke from (now) over 250,000 acres burned and burning.

No doubt.

I have no sympathy for Southern Californians and thier "brush
fires" any more. I've been there...I've seen the mass butchering of
the land in order to put thousands upon thousands of cookie-cutter
homes in over-priced subdivisions, only to subsequently complain about
the overcrowding, pollution, excessive taxes, etc.

Many of these fires either occur or are exacerbated by the fact
that the natural watershed is shot and there's no natural defense
against fire.

> Telephones work here, despite the insistence of some that "telephones
> always fail during emergencies and disasters!" Communications
> satellites work fine (there's a full set of them every 3 degrees along
> the geosynchronous orbit). We have more Uplink mobile sets that
> "work" commsats in the southern part than exist in the entirety of
> most individual states.

YadaYadaYada...Usually LennieRant soup-puss rhetoric.

Thata Amateurs are called to serve in some capacity byt the
organizations HE claims doesn't need them just eats at him...

> There's the INTERNET whose well-distributed Backbone will defy
> destruction from a massive nuclear onslaught.

Thanks for that bit of inciteful silliness, Lennie. After the
nukes hit, we'll drive right in to the affected area and see how well
we can access AOL from the local "backbone".

(...sheeesh...what an idiot...)

> One in five Americans
> has some Internet connection capability in 2002 according to the
> U. S. Census Bureau.

Will they STILL have internet after the phone lines have burned
down or a nuke just levelled thier homes, Lennie?

> FEMA "field-tested" its fly-away video bulletin board systems back
> in the '94 quake to show, visually, health and welfare messages in
> their most personal and familiar form.

Gee, Lennie...That was almost 10 years ago...A whole
decade...Then WHY does FEMA and every other disaster related
organization (INCLUDING California's OES) still feel compelled to keep
MoU's current with the ARRL, and STILL ask's then to participate at
these shindigs, Lennie?

> Wire services have all kinds of data terminals and lines (most of
> which are dedicated, leased lines, not through dial-up POTS).
> Staffers and stringers at the wire news service bureaus are working
> 24/7 here as well as in the northeast.

Yep. And they are not used for the purposes Amateur Radio is
used at these incidents.

Your point?

> ARRL has been advertising its vaunted Emergency Planning and
> Operations classes for about two years now. It's time for them
> to put their keys where their mouths were...time for the NTS to
> quit trying to play Western Union impersonator games (they were
> never very good at it).

Obviously they are.

> It's also time that the Newington crowd recognized that MOST of
> the United States and MOST of the radio amateurs it is supposed
> to represent live WEST of the Mississippi.

What part of ARRL "policy" indicates they aren't?

> NBC evening news with Tom Brokaw featured the decade-old
> Emergency Communications Center in Los Angeles that
> coordinates the firefighting efforts. NBC didn't interview any ham
> radio "emergency groups" nor mention ham radio in any way.

They didn't interview YOU either, Ya Scumbag, yet here YOU are.

> >I only wish that my worst problems were the ARRL and CW vs no code. LOL.
> >These guys are going to drop from coronaries or stroke long before their
> >time.
>
> Fine, then activate an Emergency Medical Team on Ham Radio to go
> rescue those guys south of Boston having all those coronaries and
> strokes. ARRL's image is more important than their substance.
>
> ARRL is the ham savior. Ham radio shall not want. Beep, beep.
>
> LHA

Yet another LennieRant...Still as idiotic as ever...Hoping that
"the common man" will ignore the facts and lean on HIM for "the
truth"...As HE sees it, of course...

What an Idiot. What a Putz.

Steve, K4YZ

1897. Re: ARRL has no FIRE for sale?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-29 15:19:52 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0310290719.767e0f26@posting.google.com>
Source record: 81373

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20031028132726.07346.00001470@mb-m26.aol.com>...
> In article <cbsnb.17656$bO5.8898@newssvr29.news.prodigy.com>, "charlesb"
> <n5pvl@sbcglobal.net> writes:
>
> >> More than one tenth of ALL Americans live in California, dumbass.
> > >
> > >Sorry, but you cannot count California's illegal immigrant population as
> > >"Americans", though technically they are.
> > >
> > >Moron.
>
> The legal population, legal as is common to all states, of
> California, is still the largest of all the states. The "illegal
> immigrant" population is estimated as a bit over 4 million here.
> Had I counted that (but did not), California's population would
> exceed that of all of Canada.

Most REAL Californians consider anyone not born IN California,
regardless of their United States citizenship, to be "illegal aliens".

That would be you, Lennie...

Steve, K4YZ

1898. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-29 15:37:37 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <59Rnb.8766$X22.6760@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 81374

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote:
> Dwight Stewart wrote:
> >
> > (my comments here snipped)
>
> I'm looking for the facts. Some of those facts may not be
> things anyone today is proud of. I'm not proud that the
> founders could "proclaim liberty" and say "all men are
> created equal" and then allow slavery to exist in their
> country.
>
> In very broad terms, the problem was that the North
> industrialized and the South stayed agrarian. The North
> rejected slavery in favor of immigration, while the South
> allowed slavery to grow to the extent that by 1860 in
> at least two states the number of slaves exceeded the
> number of free people.

Blacks were obviosuly held as slaves in the South (nobody has denied that) and I've acknowledged that slavery played a role in the Civil War (the Emac. Proc. shows that). I simply don't agree slavery was the cause and have given some reasons why - which you've either ignored or tried to downplay. At the same time, you've pointed your finger at everyone else (the South, the founders, and just about anyone else you can think of) while ignoring or downplaying your own State's involvement in the slave trade. Above, you said the North rejected slavery. In another message, you said they did so before they were forced to do so. Both are true. But what you didn't say is that both are just barely true when it comes to your State. According to the Central Pennsylvania African American History Web Site (www.afrolumens.org/slavery/), quoting from the Pennsylvania State Archives (Harrisburg), slaves were owned in Pennsylvania as late as 1842, only 18 years before the Civil War. Seems like your State got out of the slave trade just in the nick of time - just in the nick of time for you to look down your nose at others today.

> > Only if you ignore indentured, bound, or apprentice,
> > workers in the North.
>
> Those were not slaves.

It was simply slavery by a different name. Most were sold into indentured servitude (especially the very poor and blacks) and were held in that situation by force of law. Most blacks were sold into lifelong servitude. Indentured workers serving fixed terms were rarely paid, instead promised money or land afterwards. Of those who were supposedly paid, the money was

often collected back to cover the costs of the employer. Their working and living conditions were horrible. Many, if not most, were abused by their employers and, because of working conditions or abuse, many died before completing their indenture. Of those who did serve out their terms, evidence suggests most remained poor afterwards, routinely deprived of the things they were promised. [Source: America, A Narrative History, pgs 118-121, Norton & Company Publishing, New York/London]

> They had *contracts* - BIG difference!

See paragraph above.

> Indentured and bound workers were (for the most part)
> working off debts. It was common practice for poor
> European immigrants to indenture themselves for 7
> years to pay for their transatlantic passage. After that 7
> years, they were free.

Yes, probably half the white settlers from England, Ireland, and Germany, entered the country using this method. But we're talking about blacks, not white settlers from Europe (the living and working conditions were rarely the same).

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

1899. Re: Element 1, Code vs. No-code, and Dad

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-29 15:44:18 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0310290744.20c2f410@posting.google.com>
Source record: 81375

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20031029012950.25815.00004069@mb-m07.aol.com>...
> In article <20031028195937.25815.00004064@mb-m07.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
> writes:
>
> >> Try not to strain yourself putting words into others' messages.
> > >
> > >What "words have I put in others messages", Len?
> >
> > Those following -
> >
> > >It's clear from your many, many posts here that you want amateur radio to
> > >become a multiband version of cb.
> >
> > That's just your DELUSION and fantasy.

Why?

You are not a licensee in the Amateur Radio service.

You have no vested interest in the Amateur Radio service, either
in a pecuniary interest, or it's practical value as it exists.

You bad mouth anyone and everyone who dares to stand up for it,
wether they "support" your version of code testing or not.

I'd say you support a multiband version of CB...That may not
havev been your exact words, but it's certainly what you've been
pontificating for.

> > >You rail against "rank, status and privilege", and you make it clear you want
> > >one class of license, or no licenses at all.
> >
> > I've never been for "no license at all." Poor baby, still delerious.

You've suggested this on several occassions, stating that the
"one license fits all" should be a "license for everyone". So what's
the difference, Lennie?

> > >You're against any sort of standards, values, or traditions in amateur radio.
> >
> > I'm not interested in the standards, values or traditions of the
> > Archaic Radiotelegraphy Service.
> >
> > Stop trying to be a proselyte for the Past.

He was talking about the Amateur Radio service, Lennie...What's
this "Archaic Radiotelegraphy Service" you cite? It's not in FCC
regs.

You call HIM "delusional", yet YOU are citing some radio service
that does not exist...Guess this fits right in with your assertion of
radio services that exists "solely for recreational purposes" that you
tried to pawn off on us a year ago.

Still doesn't fir the facts, Sir Putzalot.

> >You're constantly criticizing ARRL without justification, and even accusing
> >them of fraud - again, with no evidence.
>
> Plenty of evidence of hypocrisy, false "representation," no verification
> of their alleged ability to "know what is best for amateur radio."

Absolutely NO evidence has been provided by YOU, despite your
assertions to the contrary.

And we're STILL waiting on your "proof" that the ARRL is
dishonest.

That was yet another LennieLie that's yet to be substantiated.

> >You deny the homebrewing success of others, and the public service
> >contributions of radio amateurs.
>
> I've never "denied it," delusional fellow.
>
> You've never offered proof YOUR wonderful amazing state-of-the-art
> homebrew radios worked...or even existed.

And you've never offered us any proof of YOUR "state-of-the-art"
projects either, Lennie. Whare are they?

> >Quite clear what you would like amateur radio to become, good buddy ;-)
>
> I'm NOT your "good buddy." Haven't you got your eyes in?

You got THAT one right, Lennie...I doubt you are ANYone's "good
buddy".

I know >>I<< wouldn't hang out with an idiot like you.

> >I'm simply pointing out where your many complaining posts lead. If all of the
> >things you complain about were eliminated from amateur radio, it would become
> >quite like cb. You'd like that, I think.
>
> No, you are just voicing your fantasies and delusions and terrible
> parsimonous pique and not honoring and respecting your noble
> viewpoints.

A lie on your part, Leonard H Anderson.

You've "offered" numerous acidic assertions about Amateur Radio
in general and many licensed Amateurs in particular, yet offer "proof"
on none of them.

> >> You were much better on the pulpit with your old Sermons On
> >> The Antenna Mount.
> >
> >Typical personal insult from Len rather than debating the issue.
>
> You are preachy to a fault. You need a refresher at the
> seminary. Or a retreat.

Just one more "DoAsISayNotDoAsIDo" Lennism, two faced scumbag
that he is...

We can find hundreds of LennieRants making the very same
accussation authored by Lennie.

> >Not much. But by the time I became aware of it, I was repelled by the immature
> >behavior of some of the users there.
>
> :-)
>
> How old were you in 1958? How "mature" were you that you could
> "judge" others?

How old are YOU in 2003, Lennie. You seem to have the same
problem TODAY.

> >What did YOU do to keep that service from becoming such a wasteland?
>
> Irrelevant. CB has far too many users for too little bandspace.

So we are just going to allow that type of behaviour to run
rampant through the spectrum...?!?!

> What have YOU done to eliminate CB or reduce all that waste?

But...but...but...LENNIE!

YOU are the "radio professional", here! You've been telling us
that all along!

What are YOU doing to make it better?

> YOU seem to know all, be all, yet do nothing of value except
> extoll your own alleged expertise in OLD radio arts.

Whew! Didya get bruised by the door swinging back and smacking
you in the face, Your Putziness?

How many rants have ceneterd over what you did in 1950s era Japan
at a rear area radio relay statuion...?!?!

> >> YOU've had 45 years to correct things.
> >

> >Not my responsibility, Len. I'm not a cb user. Never have been. All I did was
> >listen there, and tune away in disgust.
>
> Poor baby. "Disgust," is it?

Must be, Lennie.

And must be YOU are disgusted, too...You've told us about how
utilitarian CB is, yet I've challenged you to tell us just HOW
"utilitarian" it is by detailing your use of it...

You've not done so.

> >I'm know many cb users are fine people, but the service is a mess, has been
> >for decades, and it was a mistake to have ever been created.
>
> Poor thing. You could have DONE something for the betterment
> of mankind in 45 years, yet you have not...

YOU could have done so for 70+ years, Lennie.

Where are YOU accomplishments? I do not own ONE electronic
device that says "Made Better By LHA" on it.

> >What have YOU done to fix cb?
>
> Irrelevant. What needs to be "fixed?" Restore it to radio amateurs?

Only an idiot would ask "What needs to be "fixed?"" about CB
radio.

Oh...wait...an idiot DID ask what was wrong!

> You can always file a petition with FCC to abolish CB. Go ahead,
> make everyone's day.

Too bad we can't petition them to abolish you, Lennie.

> It might be done some time. It only took 24 years to make the first
> dent in the 40m problem with SW BC interfering with the "rightful
> ownership by hams" there.

And Amateurs will be enjoying that reduced interference even
while you are rotting in the nursing home, Lennie...

Steve, K4YZ

1900. Re: If the written test elements are so easy, why are we all not extras?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-29 15:45:12 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3F9FE086.5AD6AC6C@earthlink.net>
Source record: 81376

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3F9DDB0F.E2285F7E@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >Len Over 21 wrote:
> >>
> >> In article <20031026222935.06226.00001191@mb-m19.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com
> >(N2EY)
> >> writes:
> >>
> >> >In article <3F9C4870.20107@ix.netcom.com>, Robert Casey
> >> ><wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
> >> >writes:
> >> >
> >> >>"Look lid you still don't get it, I am well aware the CW test is gone, my
> >> >>complaint still is the Give away Written."
> >> >>
> >> >>So why are we all not extras, then? If the writtens are so easy?
> >> >>
> >> >Well, for starters:
> >> >
> >> >1) Some hams are just not interested in HF.
> >>
> >> Those are obviously not "real hams."
> >
> >How would you know, Leonard? You aren't a radio amateur.
>
> I'm a PROFESSIONAL in radio, been one a helluval lot longer
> than you and done far more.

I'm impressed with your PROFESSIONAL status, Len. You've been a
professional in radio longer because your were born earlier. As to
whether you've done more, you have no way of knowing. That said, my
comment was that you aren't a radio amateur. That statement is still
completely accurate.

> Poor baby, got your state department shorts all knotted up?

Why are you interested in my underwear? It would seem, Poor Baby, that
you are upset about not being part of the amateur radio crowd.

> >> >2) Some hams are not in a position to have an HF station
> >>
> >> No excuse. Real hams get on HF and work DX with CW.

> >
> >So far, you're the only individual making such statements. How would
> >you know? You aren't involved in amateur radio.
>
> I'm not eager to "get involved" with working DX on HF with CW.

I didn't write anything about your eagerness. I wrote that you are the
only person making such statements and I asked how you'd know. You
aren't involved in amateur radio.

> That was done over a half century ago by others.

It was done last night by others. When you write of anything involving
amateur radio, it is all done by others.

> Amateurs, and I use that in its most pejorative appelation, LIKE YOU
> insist on reliving the past so that you can claim "pioneer" status when
> you've never done a damn thing in that regard, including your famous
> claim of "using CW as an order wire on an RTTY circuit in the 1980s"
> while at state.

I've never claimed pioneer status in amateur or professional radio.
I don't live in the past and am currently quite active as a radio
amateur.

> >> >3) Some hams are not that interested in the relatively small amount of
> >> >additional privileges an Extra provides
> >>
> >> Tsk, tsk, tsk, no "service traditions of honor, glory, and reward..."
> >
> >Huh?
>
> What do you mean, "Huh," dumbass? You can't read standard
> English? You want me to type slower so you can lip-read as
> the letters appear? TS.

I read standard English just fine, Len. Maybe you could start writing
some instead of including phrases which read like the rantings of some
demented homeless person.

> >> >4) Some hams have lost interest completely
> >>
> >> OBVIOUSLY not real hams.
> >
> >As defined by one not remotely involved in ham radio?
>
> As defined by idiots like yourself who only want to attack people,
> not subjects.

You wrote the phrase, Len. I didn't make such a definition so the
sentence above makes no sense.

> Heil, all you have left is Personal Attack of anyone who displeases
> you.

That's your mode, Len. It applies to anyone or any entity not in
agreement with your views.

> Typical dictatorial prussian.

Neither applies to me. Maybe you could uses complete sentences and
communicate what you mean.

> >> The CW skilled all have maximum interest, the only ones in US
> >> amateur radio. All the rest are "knuckle-dragging CB-plussers"
> >> according to two extras in here.
> >
> >So you take the view of two Extra Class licensees as representative of
> >all code-tested radio amateurs? You really should devote some time to
> >learning a bit about amateur radio.
>
> I've read quite enough.

That isn't apparent from your posts.

> I can't get inside minds to find out how
> terribly deluded some are, like yourself, all caught up in the > "service"
> aspects of a mythical "service" when all you are doing in enjoying
> your hobby.

No you can't get inside minds, Lamont Cranston. I'm enjoying my hobby
but you aren't. You're not even involved in my hobby.

> I suppose now you are going to come back with having to be a believer
> in the ARRL bullshit. It will be some kind of stinky bullshit regardless.

Your words are becoming less rational, old timer.

> >> >5) Some hams haven't yet heard about the rules changes, or don't
> >understand
> >> >them
> >>
> >> Inconcievable in an activity that is all about communication.
> >
> >It isn't any worse than a fellow who passes himself off as a
> >"professional" writer and who can't spell "inconceivable".
>
> YOU are NOT paying for any of this, dumbass.

No, I'm not paying. I wouldn't pay for the disjointed, inaccurate,
misspelled rantings of some old fellow with inadequate knowledge of the
subject matter.

> Why don't you go
> form a league of newsgroup Kops who argue minutae of typos
> such as prissy Parson Jimmie?

Oh, your errors consist of more than typos, Len. Trouble is, as
fascinating as you are, we can't drum up enough support for
alt.Len.Anderson.mistakes.

> I've SOLD thousands of words and copy for a quarter century.
> No problem.

Is that supposed to make you unique or just excuse your spelling?

> >> >6) Some hams haven't gotten around to visiting a VE session
> >>
> >> There's no snow yet for all to walk barefoot uphill both ways
> >> to the VE place...
> >
> >What do you know of the schedule and location of amateur radio exams in
> >relation to the location and schedules of those who may desire to
> >upgrade?
>
> Who the hell cares about YOUR judgemental non-talents, Oberst
> Heil.

I didn't make a judgement. I asked a question.

> All you care to do is PICK FIGHTS, flame fests, so you can appear
> triumphant even in losing.

Ahh, but Len, those are your specialties, despite your repeated claims
to only desire civil debate.

> >Who says that none of them have done anything to advance the radio art?
> >Do you believe that it is necessary for every radio amateur to advance
> >the radio art? Better hop to it and obtain a license. Maybe you can be
> >a shining example for all of us.
>
> YOU wouldn't know "state of the art" in radio if Norman Rockwell
> came back to life and painted portraits of Peter Martinez and Phil
> Karn and Dan Tayloe.

You didn't answer the question.

> YOU are just an AMATEUR in the radio arts, capable of little but
> restoring OLD radios and operating ready-built radios designed by
> professionals.

Then again, you'd have no way of knowing. I am enjoying amateur radio,
though. What steps are you taking to become a part of amateur radio?

> Come back when you've gone beyond Ohm's Law.

I'm not going anywhere.

> >> Were all those just sitting around
> >> waiting for restructuring so they could piss and moan "no-coders
> >> going to do the art advancing?"
> >

> >They were probably getting on the air and operating. What were you
> >doing for those several decades during which you've declared an interest
> >in amateur radio?
>
> WORKING for a living IN radio and electronics, dumbass,doing > PROFESSIONAL work...

Did any of that preclude your taking part in amateur radio? Many,
including myself have found time for both though few of us ever found it
necessary to write "PROFESSIONAL" when describing our work.

> applying for patents and gettin one,

Others here have done the same but have found the time to become
licensed hams. None of them have spent time frequently blowing their
horns about a patent. You have.

> going farther along the EM spectrum in radio communications than is > legal for US
amateurs.

How does that preclude obtaining an amateur license?

> Design engineering, you dumbass, not sitting around
> shoveling bullshit about being some hobbyist in off-hours
> pretending to
> be a radio pioneer and "in the service of your country" by beeping
> morse.

So it appears that your decades-long declared interest in amateur radio
is a sham. Your rambling, disjointed statement shows your lack of
regard for those who are radio amateurs.

> You LOST it Heil.

I lost it? Reread your own rant above.

> You don't have the proper prussian arrogance for
> an oberst anymore. You are demoted to just a feldwebel, a minor-rank
> NCO, in a fantasy life as a United States Morse Codist (USMC).
>
> Semper foo, herr feldwebel

Is this the part where we're reduced to being your mere playthings,
Leonard?

Dave K8MN

1901. Re: Why Can't Brain Just Say "Yes" Or "No"...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-29 15:54:24 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0310290754.5cf3733d@posting.google.com>
Source record: 81377

brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0310280339.6e7f4015@posting.google.com>...
> k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0310272052.3e2110b7@posting.google.com>...
> > brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0310271533.27d2f0d7@posting.google.com>...
> > > k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
>
> > > > > You failed to acknowledge and accept those conditions in this
> > > > > public forum, therefore you may no longer claim me as your "mentor".
> > > > >
> > > > > Not true, Stebe. I can claim anything I want. You do.
> > > >
> > > > Not true.
> > > >
> > > > I'll ask you to provide some relative post...?!?!
> > >
> > > You claim that your mental health is just fine, don't you?
> >
> > I'll STILL ask you to provide a relevent post.
> >
> > You didn't this time. Do you not understand the concept of a
> > direct answer to a direct question?
> >
> > > > > Hey, I think you just mentored me a little more. Keep up the good work.
> > > >
> > > > Nope. Requires a voluntary interaction.
> > >
> > > I don't have a gun to your head.
> >
> > That's a very good thing, Brain, because I am the LAST person in
> > the world YOU want to insinuate holding a firearm on...
> >
> > The LAST person...
>
> I'll repeat - "I don't have a gun to your head." That in no way
> insinuates that I have a gun to your head, because I don't and I said
> I don't.

Just be sure your "insinuations" stay that way, Mr. Burke.

> Do you now understand that I don't have a gun to your head?

Do YOU understand what I have said, Brain?

> Or don't you understand the contraction "don't?"

I understand it fine. As I said...WATCH your insinuations,
Brain.

> > > > You refused to accept the conditions...Anything else is a lie on your part...
> > > >
> > > > But then you're USED to lying, aren't you, Brain?
> > >
> > > Stebe, I'm used to your lies.
> >
> > You're free to itemize them, if you care, Brain...Other than
> > refusing to delineate parts of my military service for yours or
> > Lennie's edification, you have nothing to refer to.
> >
> > If THAT is the basis of your rants, sorry to leave you wanting.
>
> Was your military service a lie?

Nope. Care to inquire of the Veteran's Administration? You are
certainly at liberty to do so.

In the mean time, we'll try and find the name of that "military
commander" who allegedly gave you "permission" to operate Amateur
Radio from a UN controlled zone without UN authorization.

We'll even try to find someone who "worked" you from T5...

> > > > Hardly.
> > >
> > > So there IS a gun to your head? I suggest you put it away and get some help..
> >
> > I'll reiterate so that there's NO misunderstanding, Brain...I am
> > the LAST person in the world that you want to insinuate holding a
> > weapon on or having a weapon held on...
> >
> > The LAST person...
>
> Sounds like a threat, Stebe. Are you threatening me?
>
> I want you to withdraw your threat and apologize.

Thre's no apology to offer, Brain.

I am TELLING you that ANY insinuation of use of firearms on MY
person IS a threat, and that it's the LAST thing you want to do.

Someone else in this forum tried that, and I can tell you that he
found out that my reach exceeds the length of my arms to this
keyboard...And the results were expensive AND quite legal.

> > > > > > Sorry.
> > > > >
> > > > > Noted.

> > > > >
> > > > > Stebe is my mentor, I shall not want...
> > > > >
> > > > Brian Burke is a liar...He'll ALWAYS want...
> > > >
> > > I shall not want for a better mentor in misspelling people's names and lying.
> > >
> > Well...so far I don't see where either applies. You're the
> > Brain, and no one contests that. And as for your allegations of me
> > lying, I once again invite you to provide the post...
> > >
> > As Hans says..."Good Luck On This One Now..."
> > >
> > Steve, K4YZ
> >
> Stebe, you're the one who needs luck and help.

No, Brain...On THIS one I am sure.

Anyone who posts in a public forum that he is "mentored" by a
known pathological liar like Leonard H Anderson and then tries the
wordsmitihing you've tried here in the last few days is a fool.

THAT would be YOU. You stuck your foot in it, Brain, so now YOU
get to wash it off. Sorry if you don't like the texture or smell.

Steve, K4YZ

1902. Re: A Morsodist Challenge

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-29 15:57:20 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0310290757.53ea18e6@posting.google.com>
Source record: 81378

brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0310271528.33b3ef99@posting.google.com>...

> Citation, please. Or else you're a liar.

You want a $5M dollar Cessna business jet now?

Sheeesh...what an idiot.

Steve, K4YZ

1903. Re: ARRL has no FIRE for sale?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-29 16:04:31 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3F9FE50E.12DA818D@earthlink.net>
Source record: 81379

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3F9DD665.762EF867@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >N2EY wrote:
> >>
> >> lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
> >news:<20031027135410.25517.00001648@mb-m15.aol.com>...
> >> > As of 1300 EST on 27 Oct 03, the ARRL news page has not one
> >> > word
> >>
> >> http://www.arrl.org/news/stories/2003/10/27/2/?nc=1
> >>
> >> as of 1640 EST.
> >
> >This leaves Len munching his brogans once again.
>
> Shut the hell up, you little USMC feldwebel. Learn to READ English.

Temper, temper, kindly old timer. What are you, some kind of CONTROL
freak?

> As of 1 PM EST on the 27th of October the ARRL website news
> page had NOTHING about the California wildfires. NOTHING.

That's right. They had NOTHING. Yet a could of hours later, they had
SOMETHING. SOMETHING.

> Go "munch" someone else's shoes, preferrably some CROW
> as dessert.

I'm not the one who took the potshot at amateur radio and the ARRL only
to have it blow up in his face.

> >> Rest of Len's typical ARRL bashing snipped.
> >
> >Hasn't Len made it clear on any number of occasions that he is not
> >anti-ARRL?
>
> ARRL is an EASTERN headquartered organization, more specifically
> in the northeastern USA.

There are many WESTERN headquartered organizations. Is it your opinion
that all organizations should be headquartered near the center of
population? If not, why the fuss?

> ARRL doesn't seem to recognize that
> MOST of the USA lives WEST of the Mississippi...including licensed
> US radio amateurs.

It doesn't seem that way to me. Directors are representative of the
areas in which they live. Why should you be concerned? You aren't
involved with the ARRL.

> I'm not "anti-ARRL."

Your frequent statements about the League would indicate otherwise.
Would you care to see a few of them googled up?

> I'm just showing what they are and what they
> are NOT. What they are NOT is NOT "representing ALL amateurs."

How are you "showing" anything? You aren't involved.

> ARRL is eastern-oriented, almost obsessively so in concentration
> east of the Mississippi. Not my problem. It's ARRL's problem.

No, your errors are your problem. You've gone from making statements
about an EASTERN headquarted organization to stating that the ARRL is
eastern-oriented. You keep trying to make an issue of something which
is not an issue.

> Maybe that's why ARRL membership remains a minority of all
> licensed US radio amateurs (only a quarter).

Only a quarter? What other amateur radio organization has more than a
fraction of that number making up its membership?

> All the ARRL "represents" is its membership...but mostly it is the
> executives and staff and board of directors of the ARRL that is
> represented.

AARP claims to represent retirees. The American Legion claims to
represent veterans. Labor unions claim to represent workers. The NAACP
claims to represent colored people.

> Membership has to fall in line with that or be
> excommunicated.

If those words came from anyone else, I'd say that they were an error.
Since they come from you, I say they're a deliberate untruth.

> To bad about your demotion in the United States Morse Codists
> (USMC). You deserved it, though. Enjoy.

Take your lithium.

Dave K8MN

1904. Re: Amateur Radio Newsline? Report 1365 ? October 10 2003

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-29 16:18:26 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0310290818.720419c7@posting.google.com>
Source record: 81380

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20031023190242.29815.00001328@mb-m21.aol.com>...

> >If I were his USMC supervisor, I wouldn't let him near any of it.
> >This would be another case of "close supervision," followed by "wall
> >to wall" counseling.
>
> Bounce him from one wall to the next? :-)
>
> Pity about not knowing those communications radios.
>
> The ARC-27 was, and still is, a good unit for 225-400 MHz military
> comm band. It was born in Iowa at the Collins works. Tube type,
> been around for a very long time.

Can hold the USS Enterprise at staionkeeping as an anchor.

> >> >> A question cannot be a lie...It can only be a question.
> >> >
> >> >OK. Have you stopped beating your wife?
> >>
> >> Which one?
> >
> >He stayed away from this one in his reply.
> >
> >Isn't it amazing that a simple question can be both a lie and a
> >smear-tactic?
>
> Maybe Stebe is "lying in wait?"

Cute, Lennie.

Even the "Have you stopped beating your wife" trick can be
defeated.

Come on, Lennie...YOU know how...

> Ah, but there's never any proof. His standard answer is "it's in my
> record" but nobody in here has seen that famous "record."
> Somewhere at NARA there's a true record of his military service
> and exactly what and where those famous "hostile actions" were
> that he was supposedly in. Not really worth the trouble to access
> the National Archives and Records Administration.

In other words: "I'd better not try or I'll have to eat my
words".

> The guy who labels others a "liar" claims to have worked on lots of
> military communications equipment but never mentions a single
> detail about it, rationalizing his reasons as "it's all classified..."

Lennie, I've asked this question before, and I'll reiterate it
again...

WHEN have I said ANYthing about what I did as being
"classified"...?!?!

What I HAVE said is that I will not get into this CV silliness
YOU have.

MY USMC MOS is available if you care to look.

The equipment I had to be qualified on in order to hold that MOS
is ALSO available, again if you care to look.

> >> I'll argue the imagination part, Brian. Remeber Stebe's "hostile
> >> actions?" :-)
> >
> >The famous Seven instances of self-abuse?
>
> Mental masturbation?

At least some of us remember what "masturbation" (of ANY kind)
was supposed to accomplish, Lennie.

All those "Viagra" commercials on TV hitting a bit close to home?

> >> Careful, Brian, those are His study books for the Civil Air Patrol.
> >
> >I forgot about his CAP tie-in. Must be where he's finding those
> >1950's era "This Is The Air Force" books.
>
> ...that's about on par with the same era in U. S. amateur radio and
> the state-of-the-art of amateur technology then.

Ahhhhh....Llennie and Brain back to bashing yet ANOTHER volunteer
organization...Of course Lennie took his shot at CAP and Civil Defense
a couple years ago and never gave an adequate defense of his
assertions THEN, either.

Of course Lennie was never OLD enough to have been a member of
either during the war.

> >Wet or dry? Doesn't matter. He couldn't work the hypsometric
> >equation if his life depended on it, but like the CAP groupie that he
> >is, probably hangs out at the local AF weather station, wishing he had
> >made better choices in life.
>
> Sort of brings a mental picture of Stebe in flight suit grubbies posing
> by an old 1.6 GHz radiosonde tracking antenna. :-)
>
> Never mind...too many in here don't have any knowledge of "other"

> radio or meteorology...meteorology other than "putting up a front,"
> that is...

As for "putting up fronts", we have "Lennie The Licenseless"
preaching to us about how Amateur Radio SHOULD be, from the comfort of
never having to be concerned withe the consequences of his meddling.

Oh..And yes...About how aerial navigation is taught and employed
without the benefit of a valid Airman's Certificate...Oh yes...He DID
fly a few ours as a student pilot in the 50's...

As a matter of fact, seems ALL of Lennie's "experience" comes
from the fifties...Kinda like his "parenting" experience from which he
has suggested that an age limit should be enacted in Amateur
Radio...No doubt from his exposure to Marlon Brando in biker regalia,
tearing up Southern California...

Still hasn't provided us with his credentials in THAT
venue...Seems anyone who had successfuly raised offspring would be
anxious to tell us of thier child rearing days...

Yet ANOTHER unanswered LennieRant...

Steve, K4YZ

1905. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-29 16:33:07 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3F9FEBC2.BB540256@earthlink.net>
Source record: 81381

Dwight Stewart wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" wrote:
> > Dwight Stewart wrote:
> > >
> > > (snip)
> >
> > Salaries are going up.
>
> Compared to the cost of living, salaries are going down. The minimum wage
> is a good example. To keep up with the cost of living increase over the last
> twenty-five years (to have the same spending power as 25 years ago), the
> minimum wage should be over $19 per hour. By the same token, a person
> earning $19 an hour twenty-five years ago should be earning well over $50 an
> hour today. Check it out yourself. Look at the minimum wage 25 years ago (or
> any typical wage 25 years ago) and increase it by the same percentage that
> living costs (rent, house payments, utilities, food, and so on) have
> increased over the years since.

Salaries are going up. Buying power for consumer items is up. TV's,
VCR's, DVD players, computers, microwave ovens and the like are dirt
cheap. Ham gear, in terms of hours worked to purchase it, is extremely
inexpensive. Houses cost more but are generally much larger than in the
past.

> > I can think of one, Dwight. Those folks work and
> > pay social security taxes so that you can retire and
> > draw SS benefits. They also pay State and Federal
> > taxes. Many of them are very bright individuals.
> > Some are doctors. Some do computer design work.
> > Some do menial labor which most American workers
> > don't desire.
>
> Americans working at those jobs would do the same things (pay taxes and so
> on), Dave.

Do some research on the number of retirees and the number of workers
paying taxes to support those retirees.

> Why do we need immigrants to do that?

Because there aren't enough Americans born to do it.

> Some of those Americans are
> even bright.

...and some aren't. Having been back in the U.S. for about 3 1/2 years,
I've encountered quite a number who just aren't that bright.

> As for the "menial" jobs, the only reason those jobs are menial
> is because employers choose not to pay decent wages to do those jobs.

No, that isn't correct. Moving dirt is menial work. Lifting boxes is
menial. Clerking at a convenience store is menial. Employers choose
not to pay folks in those positions more than the jobs are worth.

> And as
> long as employers continue to find cheap labor to fill those jobs, there is
> no incentitive whatsoever to increase those wages. If anything, a ready
> supply of cheap labor only drives down wages for other jobs, increasing the
> number of menial jobs and decreasing jobs that pay decent wages. The direct
> result is less well paying jobs for all working class Americans.

So let's all make 30 bucks per hour and then wonder why the cost of
everything skyrockets, huh? Americans want good pay and they want the
price of everything to be dirt cheap. Tell us how to achieve both of
those. Then explain why everything wrong with our economy can be laid
at the feet of black, hispanic or Asian immigrants.

> > I hadn't realized the extent of your racist views, Dwight.
> > Maybe you have some insider knowledge of organized
> > attempts by Africans or South Americans to take over
> > "our" country through immigration.
>
> Obviously, if you twist what is said hard enough, you can call anyone a
> racist.

No twisting was necessary. You laid it all out before us.

> I talked about expansion to this country, not "organized attempts"
> or "take over." Those were your words. For my reply to the charge of racism,
> see the last paragraph below.

We aren't discussing my words, we're discussing your words.

> > I lived in four African countries over a period of nearly ten
> > years. In all of those places, I found thousands of whites
> > who live in harmony with blacks. (snip)
>
> A few exceptions don't change the rule, Dave.

What "few exceptions"? I wrote of thousands of whites in four African
countries.

> With the exception of South
> Africa, there are few countries in Africa where large numbers of whites work
> in government, the military, or in black owned businesses.

I submit that you don't know what you're talking about. In many cases,
the whites build or operate a business employing hundreds of Africans in
all kinds of jobs.

> In South Africa,
> whites (the minority) were loudly criticized for taking jobs, money, and
> power, away from blacks (the majority).

Poppycock! For taking which jobs were whites criticized? For taking
what money were whites criticized?

> The people leveling that criticism
> were not called racist - only those in the majority here are called > racist
> for saying such things.

You're making this stuff up.

>After blacks gained control of the South > African
> government, white employees were routinely replaced with blacks >throughout
> the country.

That statement just isn't true.

There was no criticism of this. After all, since South Africa
> belonged to the blacks (the majority), they should obviously have the jobs,
> money, and power. Of course, if a white (the majority) says that here, it is
> immediately called racism.

There are large numbers of white-owned businesses and farms in South
Africa. The white owners provide jobs for blacks. No one in South
Africa seems poised to change that and to do a full "Robert Mugabe" ala
Zimbabwe.

> Clearly, there is an absurd double-standard when
> it comes to the words "racism" and "racist."

...or there is a clear misunderstanding of what is taking place in
Africa (both inside and outside of your only example, South Africa) by
you.

Dave K8MN

1906. Re: ARRL has no FIRE for sale?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-29 16:42:33 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <Z5Snb.8994$X22.8986@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 81382

"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20031029012951.25815.00004071@mb-m07.aol.com...
> In article <YDGnb.8311$X22.4451@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>,
"Dan/W4NTI"
> <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> writes:
>
> >Poor Lennie....caught in ANOTHER LIE.
> >
> >Dan/W4NTI
>
> No Dannie boy, NOT a "lie." Go back a day to message that
> started this thread. ARRL had NO mention of the already-
> widespread California firestorms up to 1 PM EST.
>
> Have you learned to READ yet? Or are you still unable to
> cope with reality?
>
> LHA

Poor Lennie, not only caught in a lie, but now trying to cover it up. Not good for a Electronical Mechanic there Lennie.

Dan/W4NTI

1907. Re: ARRL has no FIRE for sale?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-29 16:44:13 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <x7Snb.8999$X22.1187@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 81383

"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message

> All the ARRL news seems to be AFTER-the-fact "reporting,"
>
> LHA

Thats what makes the ARRL a legitimate news source for Amateur Radio information. Not like CNN, which I am SURE you watch, that makes it up as they go.

Dan/W4NTI

1908. Re: ARRL has no FIRE for sale?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-29 16:44:48 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <48Snb.9003$X22.6505@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 81384

"charlesb" <n5pvl@sbcglobal.net> wrote in message
news:hnPnb.6660$x75.6282@newssvr27.news.prodigy.com...
>
> "Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20031029012952.25815.00004073@mb-m07.aol.com...
> >
> > That "news copy" was on the ARRL website opening page.
> >
> > There is NO corroboration of that information with any other
> > commercial news service.
>
> Gee, what an ignorant asshole!
>
> Charles Brabham, N5PVL
>
>

A world class DIPSHIT.

Dan/W4NTI

1909. Re: ARRL has no FIRE for sale?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-29 16:46:28 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <E9Snb.9009$X22.310@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 81385

"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20031029012952.25815.00004072@mb-m07.aol.com...
> In article <zCGnb.8308$X22.1223@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>,
"Dan/W4NTI"
> <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> writes:
>
> >JJ,
> >
> >In a language LHA can understand (assuming he actually was in the
> >military).......He is a DIPSHIT, or in Naval speak....he is a BLIVIT.
> >
> >Dan/W4NTI
>
> Poor Dan. We still haven't found the right replacement parts to
> fix his stupid.
>
> You need confirmation of my U. S. military service, Dannie?
> Contact NARA in St. Louis (National Archives and Records Agency).
> It's all there. Have them search for Army serial number RA16408336
> beginning March 13, 1952.
>
> LHA

Why bother Lennie? You know full well they were burned up in that fire. Or
don't you?

Dan/W4NTI

1910. Re: ARRL has no FIRE for sale?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-29 16:53:23 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <7gSnb.9032$X22.2508@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 81386

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3F9FD7AD.94946B4A@earthlink.net...
> Len Over 21 wrote:
> >
> > In article <c2356669.0310271339.15e7e1df@posting.google.com>,
N2EY@AOL.COM
> > (N2EY) writes:
> >
> > >http://www.arrl.org/news/stories/2003/10/27/2/?nc=1
> > >
> > >as of 1640 EST.
> > >
> > >Rest of Len's typical ARRL bashing snipped.
> >
> > Tsk, tsk, tsk. 5 1/2 days. Then, suddenly, "news" appears on
> > ARRL that Something Is Happening Out West...a bit over two
> > hours after I posted a No News Statement.
>
> It is obvious that someone from HQ--probably that pesky Ed Hare--saw
> your post and quickly threw something together for the ARRL web site,
> just to make you look silly.
>
> Dave K8MN

Could be Dave, but I think not. Lennie does a great job of showing how
silly he is all by himself.

He must be a lonely old man. With nothing to do in life but wait around to
die. And in the meantime annoy as many folks as possible.

He obviously hates ham radio. Probably because his 'higher' in the military
was a ham and made Lennie look silly......you think so?

Dan/W4NTI

1911. Re: Element 1, Code vs. No-code, and Dad

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-29 17:36:39 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0310290936.1e48e50@posting.google.com>
Source record: 81387

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20031029012950.25815.00004069@mb-m07.aol.com>...
> In article <20031028195937.25815.00004064@mb-m07.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
> writes:
>
> >> Try not to strain yourself putting words into others' messages.
> > >
> > >What "words have I put in others messages", Len?
> >
> > Those following -
> >
> > >It's clear from your many, many posts here that you want amateur radio to
> > >become a multiband version of cb.
> >
> > That's just your DELUSION and fantasy.

Not at all. It's the sum total of what you've been preaching here for
years and years. It explains the motive behind every single post
you've made here.

> > >You rail against "rank, status and privilege", and you make it clear you want
> > >one class of license, or no licenses at all.
> >
> > I've never been for "no license at all."

That's why I wrote: "one class of license, or no licenses at all".

So you want one class of license - just like cb used to have.

> > >You're against any sort of standards, values, or traditions in amateur radio.
> >
> > I'm not interested in the standards, values or traditions of the
> > Archaic Radiotelegraphy Service.

What is the "Archaic Radiotelegraphy Service"?

You obviously don't want any sort of standards, values, or traditions
in amateur radio - again, just like cb.
>
> > >You're constantly criticizing ARRL without justification, and even accusing
> > >them of fraud - again, with no evidence.
> >
> > Plenty of evidence of hypocrisy, false "representation," no verification
> > of their alleged ability to "know what is best for amateur radio."

You have presented no evidence of any of that, just League-bashing
based on your obvious desire for amateur to be without a strong

national organization. Cb never had a strong national organization....
>
> >You deny the homebrewing success of others, and the public service
> >contributions of radio amateurs.
>
> I've never "denied it," delusional fellow.

Yes, you have. When you repeatedly tell untruths about others' projects, even when corrected, that's denial. Or lying - take your pick.
>
> You've never offered proof YOUR wonderful amazing state-of-the-art
> homebrew radios worked...or even existed.

You'll just have to take my word for it, Len. Besides, you've made it quite clear that you would reject any "proof" offered by anyone.

And I've never claimed that any of my homebrew projects were "amazing" or "state-of-the-art".

Cb did not allow its users to homebrew legally.

> >Quite clear what you would like amateur radio to become, good buddy ;-)
>
> I'm NOT your "good buddy." Haven't you got your eyes in?

Y'know, Len, with that attitude you're not anyone's good buddy.

> >I'm simply pointing out where your many complaining posts lead. If all of the
> >things you complain about were eliminated from amateur radio, it would become
> >quite like cb. You'd like that, I think.
>
> No,

Yes. It's what you obviously want amateur radio to become. One license class, no homebrewing, no standards, values or traditions, no strong national organization, no public service.....
>
> >Not much. But by the time I became aware of it, I was repelled by the immature
> >behavior of some of the users there.
>
> How old were you in 1958?

Figure it out. Oh wait, you couldn't remember how old you were in 1948, nor what screen names you've used in rrap.

> How "mature" were you that you could "judge" others?

I didn't encounter cb until about 1965. And I found the on-air behavior of those involved to be extremely immature. I was mature enough to know I wanted no part of what I heard on the cb channels. So I just left it alone.

Who are you to judge others, Len? You don't act very mature in here.
In fact, you act here just like the classic schoolyard bully in search
of attention. Why?

> >What did YOU do to keep that service from becoming such a wasteland?
>
> Irrelevant.

It's very relevant. You are, or were, a cb user, weren't you?

> CB has far too many users for too little bandspace.

So it's not their fault? What about personal responsibility for ones'
actions? I guess you reject that, too. "Oh, there aren't enough
channels, so I'll break all the rules..."

> What have YOU done to eliminate CB or reduce all that waste?

Not my concern. I've never been a cb user. As long as those folks
don't have a negative affect on amateur radio, I really don't care
what they do on their channels.

And I've never said I wanted to eliminate cb.

> YOU seem to know all, be all, yet do nothing of value except
> extoll your own alleged expertise in OLD radio arts.

Len, you just described yourself perfectly.
>
> >> YOU've had 45 years to correct things.
> >
> >Not my responsibility, Len. I'm not a cb user. Never have been. All I did was
> >listen there, and tune away in disgust.
>
> Poor baby. "Disgust," is it? :-)

Yep. Disgust.

> >I'm know many cb users are fine people, but the service is a mess, has been
> >for decades, and it was a mistake to have ever been created.
>
> Poor thing. You could have DONE something for the betterment
> of mankind in 45 years, yet you have not...

Not my concern, Len.

> >What have YOU done to fix cb?
>
> Irrelevant.

In this case, I think you're saying "nothing".

>What needs to be "fixed?"

Simple - just have the users follow the rules.

> Restore it to radio amateurs?

That wouldn't fix it.

> You can always file a petition with FCC to abolish CB. Go ahead,
> make everyone's day. :-)

Not my concern. Amateur radio is my interest, not cb.

The fact is that the cb mess is partly *your* fault, Len. You have loudly proclaimed your status as a "PROFESSIONAL IN RADIO!!!!!!!!!!!" here many, many, many times.

Yet the reason FCC created Class C and Class D (27 MHz) cb was because Class A and Class B (UHF) cb weren't getting many users, due in large part to lack of suitable manufactured equipment.

The "PROFESSIONALS IN RADIO!!!!!!!!!!!" couldn't figure out how to build inexpensive UHF cb radio sets back in the '50s, so FCC created the 27 MHz version. You "PROFESSIONALS IN RADIO!!!!!!!!!!!" figured out how to make inexpensive 27 MHz sets. I've seen the schematics of those sets - they weren't "state of the art" 20 years before they were manufactured. But you "PROFESSIONALS IN RADIO!!!!!!!!!!!" made them, so the users bought them. And misused them. The rest is history.

It wasn't hams who made a mess of 11 meters. It was "PROFESSIONALS IN RADIO!!!!!!!!!!!" like you, Len. Now you want to do the same thing to amateur radio. No thanks.
>
> It might be done some time. It only took 24 years to make the first
> dent in the 40m problem with SW BC interfering with the "rightful
> ownership by hams" there. :-)

You can't even get the history of that problem right, Len.

1912. Re: ARRL has no FIRE for sale?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-29 18:00:03 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <aLGdnWCP9tmfnD2iRVn-iw@gbronline.com>
Source record: 81389

Dave Heil wrote:

>
> It is obvious that someone from HQ--probably that pesky Ed Hare--saw
> your post and quickly threw something together for the ARRL web site,
> just to make you look silly.
>
> Dave K8MN

Len can look silly enough on his own without any help from the ARRL web site.

1913. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-29 18:00:58 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0310291000.31bd069@posting.google.com>
Source record: 81388

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:<59Rnb.8766$X22.6760@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote:
> > Dwight Stewart wrote:
> > >
> > > (my comments here snipped)
> >
> > I'm looking for the facts. Some of those facts may not be
> > things anyone today is proud of. I'm not proud that the
> > founders could "proclaim liberty" and say "all men are
> > created equal" and then allow slavery to exist in their
> > country.
> >
> > In very broad terms, the problem was that the North
> > industrialized and the South stayed agrarian. The North
> > rejected slavery in favor of immigration, while the South
> > allowed slavery to grow to the extent that by 1860 in
> > at least two states the number of slaves exceeded the
> > number of free people.
>
>
> Blacks were obviosuly held as slaves in the South (nobody has denied that)
> and I've acknowledged that slavery played a role in the Civil War (the Emac.
> Proc. shows that). I simply don't agree slavery was the cause and have given
> some reasons why - which you've either ignored or tried to downplay.

Not at all, Dwight.

I say that slavery was the main cause - not the only cause. It was at
the root of many of the other causes.

> At the
> same time, you've pointed your finger at everyone else (the South, the
> founders, and just about anyone else you can think of) while ignoring or
> downplaying your own State's involvement in the slave trade.

Not at all, Dwight.

I've pointed out that by compromising with evil, the North enabled
slavery to flourish in the South. A Northern mill town might have no
slaves and decry the existence of slavery in the South - and then
proceed to use cotton grown by slaves.

> Above, you said
> the North rejected slavery.

Yep, they did, at various times and in various ways.

> In another message, you said they did so before
> they were forced to do so. Both are true.

There you are.

> But what you didn't say is that
> both are just barely true when it comes to your State. According to the
> Central Pennsylvania African American History Web Site
> (www.afrolumens.org/slavery/), quoting from the Pennsylvania State Archives
> (Harrisburg), slaves were owned in Pennsylvania as late as 1842, only 18
> years before the Civil War. Seems like your State got out of the slave trade
> just in the nick of time - just in the nick of time for you to look down
> your nose at others today.

Where am I "looking down my nose" at anyone by condemning slavery?

Slavery in Pennsylvania was "gradually abolished" in 1780. This meant
that some slaves were not freed - see the above website for a detailed
explanation of how the Act worked. It, too, was a compromise with
evil.

But it did not take a war or outside intervention to get the Act
approved. And from the day the Act was in place, the number of slaves
in Pennsylvania dwindled until in 1842 there were no more. Meanwhile,
the slave population in many of the states who seceded was growing.

Do you think there's no moral difference in those two cases?

> > > Only if you ignore indentured, bound, or apprentice,
> > > workers in the North.
> >
> > Those were not slaves.
>
> It was simply slavery by a different name.

No, it wasn't.

1914. Re: ARRL has no FIRE for sale?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-29 18:08:56 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <aLGdnWOP9tnHnj2iRVn-iw@gbronline.com>
Source record: 81390

Dan/W4NTI wrote:

>
> He obviously hates ham radio. Probably because his 'higher' in the military
> was a ham and made Lennie look silly......you think so?
>
> Dan/W4NTI

More likely because he couldn't pass the test for a ham licnese.

1915. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-29 18:47:20 UTC
From: groupk0hb@earthlink.net
Message-ID: <5ee63311.0310291047.5adb5b32@posting.google.com>
Source record: 81391

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote

> As I see it, your position is that whites should NOT have the
> jobs, money, or power exactly because they are the majority - much of it
> should be transferred to minorities instead.

Dwight,

You have a vivid imagination, but it's damned distorted! Since I haven't stated my position, whatever you "see" is something that you're making up on the fly. (In short, you don't have a clue.)

To save you the effort of further imagining, here is my position in three words.

"Race is irrelevant."

You seem to place great emphasis on race/ethnic background; ipso facto, you're a racist.

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

1916. Re: A Morsodist Challenge YKXWBSX7I6 01/03/2004

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-29 19:23:04 UTC
From: Dave Bushong <dbushong@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <ssUnb.133435$qj6.9802413@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 81392
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Hans,

I'm at a loss for words. I bow to the master.

73,
Dave

Hans K0HB wrote:
> [...]
>
> Dear Reverend Dave,
>
> I'm shocked that you haven't heard of one of the great religions of
> Amateur Radio. Morsodism has been widely discussed here on rrap, but
> you might be an ignorant newcomer here, so I'll fill you in.
>
> So you want to be a Morsodist. It's not easy, you know: you'll have to
> impose the stiffest constraints on your mind, accepting authority
> without question -- you will be subject to jeers and persecutions at
> the hands of the Spawn of NoCode, and you will suffer during your
> entire lifetime trying to throw pearls before the swine. But in the
> end, you will receive your reward from the Almighty in Heaven, and you
> will have the satisfaction of seeing all others being tossed into the
> Lake of Fire and QRM.
>
> But enough of that; you're not there yet. You must first prove
> yourself worthy of being a Morsodist.
>
> Lesson One: Developing Your Psyche
>
> Right now I would like you to relax. That's it -- just sit quietly and
> let your mind go blank. Concentrate on one thing and one thing only:
> concentrate on your thumb. Now that thumb is no ordinary
> run-of-the-mill thumb: what you see is THE THUMB. That Thumb is your
> world. Nothing besides that Thumb concerns you in the least. As far as
> you are concerned, that Thumb rules over all. The only thing that
> should be in your mind right now is your Thumb and its absolute
> authority over your life. Each and every line, ridge, wrinkle, and bit
> of cuticle is a Divine Mandate, eternal in its wisdom, power, and
> relevance. That Thumb was made by MORSE, and its sole purpose is to
> guide you to your Salvation.
>
> Now, while still concentrating on that Thumb, begin to think about the
> world around you. Careful! Don't try to take in everything at once:

> start with the rest of your fingers, and slowly spread from there. See
> how your fingers are connected with and dominated by your Thumb. Now,
> slowly extend your perception to embrace your forfinger. It too was
> created by Morse, and it is all guided by the Thumb. Between your
> thumb and forefinger lie all the secrets of The Keys of Morse. The
> rest of the universe is of no concern.
>
> Lesson Two: Establishing Your Doctrine
>
> Congratulations! You've come a long way, but you're not there yet.
> What I want you to do now is to go to the nearest book store and
> purchase a copy of the FCCRuleBook. Preferably, it should be bound in
> nice, shiny black leather, and should have gilt edges and a red silk
> ribbon. It should be fairly hefty in size, but not so large that you
> cannot hold it with one hand. Finally, it should have the words of
> Samuel in red letters, for as you know the Son of Morse only spoke
> using red letters.
>
> Now that you have yourFCCRuleBook, read it, and read it thoroughly. I
> imagine that some of it will fit in perfectly with your beliefs and
> morals, since you have been inspired by Maxim to attempt this
> indoctrination into Morsodism. As you read, you must remember that
> your beliefs are the ONLY right beliefs, and all others are falsehoods
> and are totally incompatible with Morse Divine Truth.
>
> Now you may be dismayed as you read through the FCCRuleBook to find
> that much of it is outside your beliefs, or may even contradict them.
> No problem! All you have to do is take a black marker pen and blot out
> those paragraphs which you don't like. Simplicity itself! Now don't
> you worry if it seems that more of the FCCRuleBook is blacked out than
> left behind: just remind yourself that the remaining words are
> emphasized all the more.
>
> Lesson Three: Living a Morsodist Lifestyle
>
> Well, I'm sure that you Novices are simply bursting with questions on
> how to apply your new-found faith to your lives. I am pleased by your
> enthusiasm: such zeal is a necessity if you want to begin to work your
> influence on this filthy and sinful world and mold it into a clean and
> upright one. Those Spawn of W5YI are simply itching to be preached at,
> whether they want it or not, so let's get cracking.
>
> First, obtain for thyself some sort of access to the internet
> newsgroups, specifically any (and all) newsgroups in the
> "rec.radio.amateur.*" lineage. Never mind that only one of them, the
> "policy" group is fit for Morsodists like yourself; you must spread
> the word ALL the heathen NoCodists. Crosspost like crazy, verily even
> if attacked by Horrible Herman, the Lord High Newsgroup Purity
> Defender.
>

> As you preach the word of Morse to others, you will inevitably run
> into those who not only doubt the veracity of your words, but who also
> pose trick arguments inspired by Lenny Liberal and his henchman, Crazy
> Charlie, the head Oracalist, in an attempt to trap and discredit you.
> This lesson deals with some of the major swords wielded by various
> tempters, and gives you some ideas on how to parry those weapons.
>
> Technobabble scholars: these vermin use their high-falootin' technical
> jargon and book-learning to pervert the words of the Morse and read
> things into Part 97 which aren't there. The FCCRuleBook was written by
> Morse for YOU to use, and contains EVERYTHING you need to know for
> Salvation, plainly stated in black and white and red. There is nothing
> magic or mystical about it: it speaks out in the Words of Morse and
> speaks directly to YOU, as you have personally modified it to your
> belief set.
>
> If other Spawn of NoCode say that the FCCRuleBook cannot speak the
> utter Truth because it is inconsistent in what it says, you can reply
> that there is no inconsistency in your FCCRuleBook: everything that
> you have in your FCCRuleBook perfectly supports your beliefs
> (remember Lesson Two). If they quote passages from the FCCRuleBook
> which they claim contradict your beliefs, you can reply that Oracle
> has inspired them to pervert the words of Morse and to twist their
> meaning around in order to try to subvert the Truth. If they say that
> you are being totally ignorant and irrational in your absolute belief
> in your Morsodist Doctrine, you can reply that they are being totally
> ignorant and irrational in their absolute refusal to believe in your
> Doctrine. And if they say that you are shutting your eyes to reality,
> you can reply that they are shutting their eyes to Morse.
>
> Peace to you!
>
> Hans, K0HB
> Lord High Liberator of the Blue Electric Smoke

1917. Re: Element 1, Code vs. No-code, and Dad

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-29 21:24:14 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031029162414.06226.00001243@mb-m19.aol.com>
Source record: 81504

In article <c2356669.0310290936.1e48e50@posting.google.com>, N2EY@AOL.COM
(N2EY) writes:

>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>news:<20031029012950.25815.00004069@mb-m07.aol.com>...
>> In article <20031028195937.25815.00004064@mb-m07.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com
>(N2EY)
>> writes:
>>
>> >> Try not to strain yourself putting words into others' messages.
>> >
>> >What "words have I put in others messages", Len?
>>
>> Those following -
>>
>> >It's clear from your many, many posts here that you want amateur radio to
>> >become a multiband version of cb.
>>
>> That's just your DELUSION and fantasy.
>
>Not at all. It's the sum total of what you've been preaching here for
>years and years. It explains the motive behind every single post
>you've made here.

Wrong. You are still in the delusion of living in PAST standards
and practices of amateur radio. Anything against your fraternal-
order idea of amateur radio is labeled by you as "wrong" or some
evil personified by Citizens Band Radio Service.

The FCC is not required to sanctify or regulate a fraternal order
as ordained by the ARRL. That is your fantasy and delusion.

Citizens Band Radio Service has been in existance for longer
than 45 years and several private land mobile radio services (now
collected under PLMRS) have been in existance longer than that.
Times have changed. ARRL can no longer assume guardianship
over US amateur radio service as it did before Internet and improved
citizen ability to communicate directly with the FCC. The OTHER
U.S. radio services have changed and adapted to modern times.

Why do you NEED all thsoe "classes" in an a voluntary, avocational
recreational radio activity? Is it just to give yourself an elitist "title
of nobility" to "sign" behind your name (or in lieu of it)? Do you
NEED the artificiality of class-distinction to "prove" yourself to the
world...or to prove you are "better" than others...so that you can
feel justified in putting down others?

It would seem that you DO have such a NEED.

I find all of radio and electronics in general to be a fascinating area of technology, so much so that I became a hobbyist in that a long time ago and made it my life's work...even though experienced and with an aptitude for a totally different kind of work. But, you and other "titled," self-important radio amateurs want to put that down, stoutly maintaining an absolute rigidity to the artificiality of rank, status, privilege AS IF amateur radio were the SAME as a guild or union. Everyone (according to yourself) MUST follow the "rules," not the regulations, but the "rules" as laid down by one membership organization which still is just a minority "representative" political action entity.

Do not deny that ARRL is a political-interest group. Their federal tax returns are evidence that they retain a lobbying service in DC as well as a law firm. They are NOT a government entity, just a large fraternal order that survives on publication and product resale and advertising profits. ARRL deludes you and others into thinking they are always "representative" of radio amateurs...but over the years of successful brainwashing through self-promotion, they remain a minority political entity on "representation."

You will not accept such a minority status yet it is obvious reality. The FCC has recognized this some time ago but you still support defend and sometimes "fight" for the ARRL on matters and blame the FCC for your perceived "evils" while turning hypocritical and extoling the ARRL as "doing the right thing" when decisions align themselves with your ARRL-influenced personal opinions.

Case in point: As of the close of 28 October 2003, the FCC ECFS had a total of 3,877 comments on 14 petitions for regulation changes on retention (7) or elimination (7) of the morse code test for U.S. amateur radio. Comments were from all over the nation, individuals to groups, licensed and unlicensed in amateur radio. There is far more access and FREEDOM for all citizens to make our grievances known to our government...directly if we desire, not having to use a "middleman" group to do our collective communications...a "middleman" that pretends to be "representative for all" yet is not, by all evidence, representative to any but a small coterie within that organization.

You desire to have such commentary CLOSED to any but the elite already-licensed. Such is against the very basic First Amendement to the United States Constitution. The FCC is not obligated in any way to sanctify its regulations in the maintenance of an essentially private fraternal order. Yet you insist that this "fraternal order" MUST be maintained. Others insist more fervently, ready to fight at all costs. Such a "must" is delusional, fantasyland imagining.

Amateur radio is a voluntary, avocational, recreational activity done for no pecuniary reason. A hobby. Fun. But some want to rule, to regulate the "fun" solely for their self-interests. Not technical

regulations but the activity itself and this strange absolute NEED to be just like a professional service group with rigid adherence to activity rules, jargon, even paper forms ("official" radiogram blanks). This strange NEED for rigid adherence extends to absolute honoring of tradition AND an intolerance to anything new that threatens the perceived glory and honor of any tradition or its history. All who have any interest whatsoever MUST be licensed to the imaginary "dedication and committment to the ARS community."

All who refuse to Believe in such a fantasy are heretics, lesser humans, worthy of contempt by the self-perceived nobility...as evidenced by all the archives in the Google.

The first message of this particular thread started off with an emotion-loaded play to readers of a father (authority figure) that was supposed to uphold tradition, honor, glory, etc. as a "positive attribute" or "family value" to pass along to generations. Over morse code proficiency that has been dropped or never considered by every other radio service? That's fantasy, delusional thinking, suitable only for fraternal orders looking for status quo stability.

My father and father-in-law would no doubt have great fun at such "important family values" to pass on had they been alive today. They were both born a year before the first radio signals crossed the Atlantic and three years before the Wright brothers successfully flew a heavier-than-air vehicle...and both saw the first humans set foot on the moon by live television from a quarter million miles away.

Change happened in their lifetimes. Great, profound changes. Change will continue to happen in many things and in many lives. We can all adapt and meld with the future, become part of it, or remain in the past in a fantasyland of old things, old ideas, old standards, old skills that no longer apply to the majority living in reality.

I am for the now, the future, reality and freedom. I will not live in your delusional fantasyland. Neither will millions of others.

LHA

1918. Re: FCC Regualtions & Public Entities Policies

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-29 21:24:15 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031029162415.06226.00001244@mb-m19.aol.com>
Source record: 81395

In article <5ee63311.0310282135.2255b289@posting.google.com>,
groupk0hb@earthlink.net (Hans K0HB) writes:

>Since a
>cell phone transmits a signal even when not placing a call, they can
>require that the unit be turned off at all times while on the
>premises.

It does? Oh, yes, the receiver's Local Oscillator "transmits" a
picayune picoWatt or so...severe QRM to anything within a
couple millimeters distance...

LHA

1919. Re: What If.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-29 21:24:15 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031029162415.06226.00001245@mb-m19.aol.com>
Source record: 81503

In article <5ee63311.0310290713.26cc5cfa@posting.google.com>,
groupk0hb@earthlink.net (Hans K0HB) writes:

>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote
>
>> Pity that the northeastern USA membership organization still
>> thinks it is the tyrannosaurus rex of radio when all it is is a little
>> lizard in an ancient back yard of morsemanship.
>
>The snarly Una-basher speaks again. He must have been scared
>(scarred?) by an ARRL diamond when he was a baby.

Tsk, tsk, tsk, you have to quit renting tapes of "Exorcist,"
ancient mariner. :-)

"Independence Day" is more your style. :-)

>ARRL is in fact very California-centric.
>
>There are more W6 ARRL members than any other call area.
>Two of the fifteen ARRL Divisions are in California.
>Ten of the seventy ARRL Sections are in California.

Ancient mariner, the ARRL Internet pages originate in the
northeast corner of the USA, diagonally oppoite California.
They couldn't be any more anti-west if they tried.

There are more licensed radio amateurs in California than
any other state because there are more US citizens in
California than any other state (one out of eight
Americans live here). The Pacific states are the center for
U. S. aerospace and electronics. "Silicon Valley" didn't
arise out any need for improved morse proficiency in radio.
Tektronix didn't start up to show RF envelopes to amateurs
and Bill Hewlett and Dave Packard started their place to
make good electronic instruments...for laboratories...only
much later did H-P evolve to more things.

Good luck on your study of voice-modulated spark
transmitters.

LHA

1920. Re: ARRL has no FIRE for sale?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-29 21:24:16 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031029162416.06226.00001246@mb-m19.aol.com>
Source record: 81399

In article <aLGdnWOP9tnHnj2iRVn-iw@gbronline.com>, JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
writes:

>> He obviously hates ham radio. Probably because his 'higher' in the military
>> was a ham and made Lennie look silly......you think so?
>>
>> Dan/W4NTI
>
>More likely because he couldn't pass the test for a ham licnese.

Yes. True. I went to the FDA and they could only certify me as
beef. :-)

I traveled 85 miles by rail to Chicago back in '56 (no snow that
March, kept my shoes on, no significant hills) and took a REAL
test ONCE. At an FCC field office in the Federal Building there.
Passed a First Phone test in one session. Only one of the four
parts of the test was multiple choice.

I'd send you a digitized image of that first First Phone license if
you had a real Internet address. But, you have no identity.

LHA

1921. Re: ARRL has no FIRE for sale?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-29 21:24:16 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031029162416.06226.00001247@mb-m19.aol.com>
Source record: 81502

In article <E9Snb.9009$X22.310@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dan/W4NTI"
<w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> writes:

>> You need confirmation of my U. S. military service, Dannie?
>> Contact NARA in St. Louis (National Archives and Records Agency).
>> It's all there. Have them search for Army serial number RA16408336
>> beginning March 13, 1952.
>>
>> LHA
>
>Why bother Lennie? You know full well they were burned up in that fire. Or
>don't you?

Not mine. Some, yes. Never had any problems with FBI, IRS, etc.
on any government agency corroborations of past service records.

Tsk, tsk, tsk, you should read ALL the pages at NARA's website,
not just the headlines.

Give yourself another title again.

LHA

1922. Re: ARRL has no FIRE for sale?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-29 21:24:17 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031029162417.06226.00001248@mb-m19.aol.com>
Source record: 81394

In article <48Snb.9003$X22.6505@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dan/W4NTI"
<w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> writes:

>A world class DIPSHIT.
>
>Dan/W4NTI

Don't give yourself titles...even if you deserve it.

LHA

1923. Re: ARRL has no FIRE for sale?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-29 21:24:18 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031029162418.06226.00001249@mb-m19.aol.com>
Source record: 81398

In article <x7Snb.8999$X22.1187@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dan/W4NTI"
<w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> writes:

>> All the ARRL news seems to be AFTER-the-fact "reporting,"
>>
>> LHA
>
>Thats what makes the ARRL a legitimate news source for Amateur Radio
>information.

So...you are saying that ALL amateur radio information is always
late?

Whatever happened to the National Traffic System? You know,
those dittyboppers still thinking that "CW" is the bestest thing
since sliced bread?

CNN, Fox, MSNBC, CBS, NBC, ABC are covering the California
Firestorms in real time, "live" as you civilian non-broadcasters
call it. Have ANY of those TV news services "covered" anything of
amateur radio emergency/disaster teams heroically working to
aid the public? When and where did they "work" that scene?

Feel free to report all tha news in a month, long after containment.

>Not like CNN, which I am SURE you watch, that makes it up as
>they go.

17 dead, over 1500 homes destroyed, over a million acres burned
(over 800 square miles), over $2 Billion in damages, and firestorms
are still raging in two major areas. One of NBC's remote vans got
caught in the fire and destroyed, crew (Chuck Henry at the mike)
saved by a fire crew. Live, on-air courtesy of another TV crew.

Hardly "making it up as they go along."

...and all you can do is mean-mouth individuals that don't love,
honor, and cherish morsemanship?

LHA

1924. Re: ARRL has no FIRE for sale?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-29 21:24:18 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031029162418.06226.00001250@mb-m19.aol.com>
Source record: 81400

In article <Z5Snb.8994$X22.8986@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dan/W4NTI"
<w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> writes:

>Poor Lennie, not only caught in a lie, but now trying to cover it up. Not
>good for a Electronical Mechanic there Lennie.

Poor Dan. Nobody can fix his stupid.

Go back and READ the first post in the thread.

NO "cover up." ARRL was LATE AGAIN with "news."

Now cover yourself with aluminum foil so the geomagnetic storm
won't hurt you or your code key.

LHA

1925. Re: ARRL has no FIRE for sale?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-29 21:24:19 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031029162419.06226.00001253@mb-m19.aol.com>
Source record: 81396

In article <3F9FD6D4.6D71A2CC@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>Why should the ARRL bother you? You aren't a member and you have
>nothing to do with amateur radio. On with your quest, Don Quixote!

Tsk, tsk, tsk, Sancho Panza sitting on his ass mouthing off
again...making the windmills turn with his remarks...

LHA

1926. Re: ARRL has no FIRE for sale?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-29 21:24:19 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031029162419.06226.00001252@mb-m19.aol.com>
Source record: 81397

In article <3F9FD7AD.94946B4A@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>It is obvious that someone from HQ--probably that pesky Ed Hare--saw
>your post and quickly threw something together for the ARRL web site,
>just to make you look silly.

Hardly, Sancho. Now get back on your ass and look for more
windmills.

Giddyap.

LHA

1927. Re: ARRL has no FIRE for sale?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-29 21:24:19 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031029162419.06226.00001251@mb-m19.aol.com>
Source record: 81501

In article <3F9FE50E.12DA818D@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>> To bad about your demotion in the United States Morse Codists
>> (USMC). You deserved it, though. Enjoy.
>
>Take your lithium.

Lithium Ion, sweetums. Battery. Replacement for my watch last
month. Good for another seven years.

Throw away your used-book-store "Physician's Desk Reference"
and that surplus Sharps box. You can't practice medicine with
an amateur radio license.

You can't even inject a good comment in here.

LHA

1928. Re: ARRL has no FIRE for sale?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-29 21:24:20 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031029162420.06226.00001254@mb-m19.aol.com>
Source record: 81393

In article <hnPnb.6660$x75.6282@newssvr27.news.prodigy.com>, "charlesb"
<n5pvl@sbcglobal.net> writes:

>"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20031029012952.25815.00004073@mb-m07.aol.com...
>>
>> That "news copy" was on the ARRL website opening page.
>>
>> There is NO corroboration of that information with any other
>> commercial news service.
>
>Gee, what an ignorant asshole!

It's not nice to call other commercial news services "assholes."

LHA

1929. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-29 21:50:19 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031029165019.21457.00001744@mb-m10.aol.com>
Source record: 81505

In article <5ee63311.0310291047.5adb5b32@posting.google.com>,
groupk0hb@earthlink.net (Hans K0HB) writes:

>"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote
>
>> As I see it, your position is that whites should NOT have the
>> jobs, money, or power exactly because they are the majority - much of it
>> should be transferred to minorities instead.
>
>Dwight,
>
>You have a vivid imagination, but it's damned distorted! Since I
>haven't stated my position, whatever you "see" is something that
>you're making up on the fly. (In short, you don't have a clue.)
>
>To save you the effort of further imagining, here is my position in
>three words.
>
> "Race is irrelevant."
>
>You seem to place great emphasis on race/ethnic background; ipso
>facto, you're a racist.

A review of any U.S. amateur radio periodical of the past half
century will show photographs that U.S. amateur radio
licensees are essentially white and male.

Ergo, U. S. amateur radio is racist? :-)

LHA

1930. Re: ARRL has no FIRE for sale?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-29 22:35:46 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <6hXnb.12430$FI2.2336@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 81506

"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20031029162418.06226.00001249@mb-m19.aol.com...
> In article <x7Snb.8999$X22.1187@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>,
"Dan/W4NTI"
> <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> writes:
>
> >> All the ARRL news seems to be AFTER-the-fact "reporting,"
> >>
> >> LHA
> >
> >Thats what makes the ARRL a legitimate news source for Amateur Radio
> >information.
>
> So...you are saying that ALL amateur radio information is always
> late?
>
> Whatever happened to the National Traffic System? You know,
> those dittyboppers still thinking that "CW" is the bestest thing
> since sliced bread?
>
> CNN, Fox, MSNBC, CBS, NBC, ABC are covering the California
> Firestorms in real time, "live" as you civilian non-broadcasters
> call it. Have ANY of those TV news services "covered" anything of
> amateur radio emergency/disaster teams heroically working to
> aid the public? When and where did they "work" that scene?
>
> Feel free to report all tha news in a month, long after containment.
>
> >Not like CNN, which I am SURE you watch, that makes it up as
> >they go.
>
> 17 dead, over 1500 homes destroyed, over a million acres burned
> (over 800 square miles), over $2 Billion in damages, and firestorms
> are still raging in two major areas. One of NBC's remote vans got
> caught in the fire and destroyed, crew (Chuck Henry at the mike)
> saved by a fire crew. Live, on-air courtesy of another TV crew.
>
> Hardly "making it up as they go along."
>
> ...and all you can do is mean-mouth individuals that don't love,
> honor, and cherish morsemanship?
>
> LHA

Poor Poor Lennie, he is getting worse and worse. He fails to comprehend that professional news reporters get paid, and by golly, its their job.

The ARRL is more interested in compilling the events and accuratly reporting the information to the amateur community. Not you Lennie, since you not a licensed operator.

And of course the ham operators are not in the news. They hardly ever are. Real emergency operators don't seek publicity. They are there to do a job and don't have time for talking with paid reporters. They are much too busy trying to save lives.

As for your 'swipe' at the National Traffic System. It is fine and going strong Lennie. I operate both SSB and CW sessions on a nightly basis. Not to mention my Military Affiliate Radio System networks.

Tell me Lennie....what do you contribute to your community and nation?

Dan/W4NTI

1931. Re: ARRL has no FIRE for sale?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-29 22:37:35 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <PiXnb.12443$FI2.2962@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 81507

"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20031029162416.06226.00001247@mb-m19.aol.com...
> In article <E9Snb.9009$X22.310@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>,
"Dan/W4NTI"
> <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> writes:
>
> >> You need confirmation of my U. S. military service, Dannie?
> >> Contact NARA in St. Louis (National Archives and Records Agency).
> >> It's all there. Have them search for Army serial number RA16408336
> >> beginning March 13, 1952.
> >>
> >> LHA
> >
> >Why bother Lennie? You know full well they were burned up in that fire.
Or
> >don't you?
>
> Not mine. Some, yes. Never had any problems with FBI, IRS, etc.
> on any government agency corroborations of past service records.
>
> Tsk, tsk, tsk, you should read ALL the pages at NARA's website,
> not just the headlines.
>
> Give yourself another title again.
>
> LHA

Poor Lennie, still not taking your meds as prescribed, eh?

Dan/W4NTI

1932. Re: If the written test elements are so easy, why are we all not extras?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-29 23:12:12 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0310291512.7dbf256b@posting.google.com>
Source record: 81508

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3F9FE086.5AD6AC6C@earthlink.net>...
> Len Over 21 wrote:
> >
> > In article <3F9DDB0F.E2285F7E@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> > writes:
> >
> > >Len Over 21 wrote:
> > >>
> > >> In article <20031026222935.06226.00001191@mb-m19.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com
> (N2EY)
> > >> writes:
> > >>
> > >> >In article <3F9C4870.20107@ix.netcom.com>, Robert Casey
> > >> ><wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
> > >> >writes:

> > >How would you know, Leonard? You aren't a radio amateur.
> >
> > I'm a PROFESSIONAL in radio, been one a helluval lot longer
> > than you and done far more.

Well...there we have it...

Lennie did it first or did it better...The WHOLE gist of his
rants.

> I'm impressed with your PROFESSIONAL status, Len. You've been a
> professional in radio longer because your were born earlier. As to
> whether you've done more, you have no way of knowing. That said, my
> comment was that you aren't a radio amateur. That statement is still
> completely accurate.

Accuracy is not one of Lennie's prefered traits. Being accurate
meand ruining his rants, and he can't have that!

> > Poor baby, got your state department shorts all knotted up?
>
> Why are you interested in my underwear? It would seem, Poor Baby, that
> you are upset about not being part of the amateur radio crowd.

He's REALLY upset that we do, WHAT we do and HOW we do it better
and without his "leadership".

Of course if we all followed Lennie's style of "leadership", we'd
be sucking on "Flavor-Ade" in a South American jungle commune.

> > >> >2) Some hams are not in a position to have an HF station
> > >>
> > >> No excuse. Real hams get on HF and work DX with CW.
> > >
> > >So far, you're the only individual making such statements. How would
> > >you know? You aren't involved in amateur radio.
> >
> > I'm not eager to "get involved" with working DX on HF with CW.
>
> I didn't write anything about your eagerness. I wrote that you are the
> only person making such statements and I asked how you'd know. You
> aren't involved in amateur radio.

You didn't expect a direct answer to a specific question, did
you, Dave...?!?!

> > That was done over a half century ago by others.
>
> It was done last night by others. When you write of anything involving
> amateur radio, it is all done by others.
>
> > Amateurs, and I use that in its most pejorative appelation, LIKE YOU
> > insist on reliving the past so that you can claim "pioneer" status when
> > you've never done a damn thing in that regard, including your famous
> > claim of "using CW as an order wire on an RTTY circuit in the 1980s"
> > while at state.
>
> I've never claimed pioneer status in amateur or professional radio.
> I don't live in the past and am currently quite active as a radio
> amateur.

Ya ever notice that Lennie is always quick to cite how he did
things "back when", followed by a rant about how we should respect him
for it, yet when an Amateur licensee does it, we are the "Archaic
Radiotelegraphy Service"...?!?!

Is it just me, or is he a two-faced twit?

> > >> >3) Some hams are not that interested in the relatively small amount of
> > >> >additional privileges an Extra provides
> > >>
> > >> Tsk, tsk, tsk, no "service traditions of honor, glory, and reward..."
> > >
> > >Huh?
> >
> > What do you mean, "Huh," dumbass? You can't read standard
> > English? You want me to type slower so you can lip-read as
> > the letters appear? TS.
>
> I read standard English just fine, Len. Maybe you could start writing
> some instead of including phrases which read like the rantings of some
> demented homeless person.

And please note Lennie's growing dependence on profanity in order
to express his "opinion"...

On the otherhand >>I<< noticed not one such epithet was used by
Dave in reference to Lennie.

Figures.

> > >> >4) Some hams have lost interest completely
> > >>
> > >> OBVIOUSLY not real hams.
> > >
> > >As defined by one not remotely involved in ham radio?
> >
> > As defined by idiots like yourself who only want to attack people,
> > not subjects.
>
> You wrote the phrase, Len. I didn't make such a definition so the
> sentence above makes no sense.
>
> > Heil, all you have left is Personal Attack of anyone who displeases
> > you.
>
> That's your mode, Len. It applies to anyone or any entity not in
> agreement with your views.
>
> > Typical dictatorial prussian.
>
> Neither applies to me. Maybe you could uses complete sentences and
> communicate what you mean.

Lennie refers to Dave's observations as "Personal Attack"
(capitalized, as if a formal program), yet in that exchage Lennie
refered to Dave as a "dumbass", and "idiot", and a "dictatorial
prussian".

Wonder how Lennie will defend THAT conduct.

> > I can't get inside minds to find out how
> > terribly deluded some are, like yourself, all caught up in the > "service"
> > aspects of a mythical "service" when all you are doing in enjoying
> > your hobby.
>
> No you can't get inside minds, Lamont Cranston. I'm enjoying my hobby
> but you aren't. You're not even involved in my hobby.

It's not "mythical" to FEMA, the Department of State, The
American Red Cross, the International Red Cross, Salvation Army

> > I suppose now you are going to come back with having to be a believer
> > in the ARRL bullshit. It will be some kind of stinky bullshit regardless.
>
> Your words are becoming less rational, old timer.

Even more profanity. And more frequent typographical errors.

> > >> >5) Some hams haven't yet heard about the rules changes, or don't
> understand
> > >> >them
> > >>
> > >> Inconcievable in an activity that is all about communication.
> > >
> > >It isn't any worse than a fellow who passes himself off as a
> > >"professional" writer and who can't spell "inconceivable".
> >
> > YOU are NOT paying for any of this, dumbass.
>
> No, I'm not paying. I wouldn't pay for the disjointed, inaccurate,
> misspelled rantings of some old fellow with inadequate knowledge of the
> subject matter.

Even more profanity. Sheesh.

> > Why don't you go
> > form a league of newsgroup Kops who argue minutae of typos
> > such as prissy Parson Jimmie?
>
> Oh, your errors consist of more than typos, Len. Trouble is, as
> fascinating as you are, we can't drum up enough support for
> alt.Len.Anderson.mistakes.

Is there enough bandwidth for it, Dave?

> > >What do you know of the schedule and location of amateur radio exams in
> > >relation to the location and schedules of those who may desire to
> > >upgrade?
> >
> > Who the hell cares about YOUR judgemental non-talents, Oberst
> > Heil.
>
> I didn't make a judgement. I asked a question.

"...judgemental non-talents..."

Is it me, Dave, or is this creep reaaaaaaaly stretching things to
find something he can hang on to...?!?!

> > All you care to do is PICK FIGHTS, flame fests, so you can appear
> > triumphant even in losing.
>
> Ahh, but Len, those are your specialties, despite your repeated claims
> to only desire civil debate.

Gee...I thought "dumbass", "idiot", "dictatorial prussion" and
"prissy Parson" were all accepted terms in civil debate, Dave...You
mean they AREN'T...?!?!

> > >They were probably getting on the air and operating. What were you
> > >doing for those several decades during which you've declared an interest
> > >in amateur radio?
> >
> > WORKING for a living IN radio and electronics, dumbass,doing > PROFESSIONAL work...

Using profanity in the conduct of "civil debate" is
"professional"...?!?!

> Did any of that preclude your taking part in amateur radio? Many,
> including myself have found time for both though few of us ever found it
> necessary to write "PROFESSIONAL" when describing our work.

Usually people who have to add those adjectives themselves have
some sort of perception of failure.

They are usually right.

> > applying for patents and gettin one,
>
> Others here have done the same but have found the time to become
> licensed hams. None of them have spent time frequently blowing their
> horns about a patent. You have.

A lady friend of mine obtained a patent for a propoese new-style
flower urn for grave markers that wouldn't overturn.

Took her an hour drawing her idea and $700 for the patent
attorney.

I have a patent pending for a device which will help to reduce
the incident of urinary tract infections in debilitated, diaper
wearing patients.

Can I crow like a rooster and use profanity to get my point
across if a patent is issued to ME...?!?!

> > going farther along the EM spectrum in radio communications than is > legal for US
amateurs.
>
> How does that preclude obtaining an amateur license?

It doesn't. Just more fodder for Lennie's rhetoric cannon.

> > Design engineering, you dumbass, not sitting around
> > shoveling bullshit about being some hobbyist in off-hours
> > pretending to
> > be a radio pioneer and "in the service of your country" by beeping
> > morse.
>
> So it appears that your decades-long declared interest in amateur radio
> is a sham. Your rambling, disjointed statement shows your lack of
> regard for those who are radio amateurs.

Not to mention an overwhelming lack of SELF respect for himself,
since he at once claims to be a "professional", interested solely in
"civil debate" of the code test issue, but then spins his wheels
making these obvioulsy infalmmatory personal attacked laced with
profanity and mistruths.

> > You LOST it Heil.
>
> I lost it? Reread your own rant above.
>
> > You don't have the proper prussian arrogance for
> > an oberst anymore. You are demoted to just a feldwebel, a minor-rank
> > NCO, in a fantasy life as a United States Morse Codist (USMC).
> >
> > Semper foo, herr feldwebel
>
> Is this the part where we're reduced to being your mere playthings,
> Leonard?

If it was, Dave, he failed.

If ever there was an overwhelming source of evidence of
UN-professionalism, it can be found in his own rants. Lennie
continues to be his own worst enemy.

73

Steve, K4YZ

1933. Re: If the written test elements are so easy, why are we all not extras?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-29 23:16:00 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0310291516.f52e7b5@posting.google.com>
Source record: 81509

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20031029012948.25815.00004068@mb-m07.aol.com>...
> In article <WYadnV56M5uqvQKiRVn-uA@comcast.com>, "Leland C. Scott"
> <no-spam@junk-mail.net> writes:

> >Leland C. Scott
> >KC8LDO
> >
> >ARRL Member
> >NCI Member
>
> Tsk, tsk, going to add stuff after the "signature" of "imporance?"
>
> I'm an NCI member also.
>
> I'm also a Life Member in the IEEE.

None of which is sufficient to grant you station license nor
operator authority in ANY radio service, let alone the AMATEUR radio
service
>
> >Don Ross (an extra who has never logged an HF
> >contact)
> >NL7CO/EM04
>
> What a nice coincidence. Sergeant First Class Donald A. Ross
> was the Maintenance NCOIC at Army Radio station ADA...(SNIP)

Sheesh...Is there ANYthing that can be discussed in this forum
that DOESN'T remind His Scumminess of his radio-clerk days in the
1950's era Army???

Steve, K4YZ

1934. Robeson Apology???

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-29 23:32:21 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0310291532.5229bc6c@posting.google.com>
Source record: 81510

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0310290754.5cf3733d@posting.google.com>...
> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0310280339.6e7f4015@posting.google.com>...
> > k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0310272052.3e2110b7@posting.google.com>...
> > > brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0310271533.27d2f0d7@posting.google.com>...
> > > > k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
>
> > > > > > > You failed to acknowledge and accept those conditions in this
> > > > > > > public forum, therefore you may no longer claim me as your "mentor".
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Not true, Stebe. I can claim anything I want. You do.
> > > > >
> > > > > Not true.
> > > > >
> > > > > I'll ask you to provide some relative post...?!?!
> > > >
> > > > You claim that your mental health is just fine, don't you?
> > >
> > > I'll STILL ask you to provide a relevent post.
> > >
> > > You didn't this time. Do you not understand the concept of a
> > > direct answer to a direct question?
> > >
> > > > > > Hey, I think you just mentored me a little more. Keep up the good work.
> > > > >
> > > > > Nope. Requires a voluntary interaction.
> > > >
> > > > I don't have a gun to your head.
> > >
> > > That's a very good thing, Brain, because I am the LAST person in
> > > the world YOU want to insinuate holding a firearm on...
> > >
> > > The LAST person...
> >
> > I'll repeat - "I don't have a gun to your head." That in no way
> > insinuates that I have a gun to your head, because I don't and I said
> > I don't.
>
> Just be sure your "insinuations" stay that way, Mr. Burke.

There never was an insinuation, Mr. Robeson. It was a case of your
misunderstanding and a dose of your wishful thinking.

> > Do you now understand that I don't have a gun to your head?
>
> Do YOU understand what I have said, Brain?

Do YOU understand what I said, Stebe?

> > Or don't you understand the contraction "don't?"
>
> I understand it fine.

Apparently you don't. See next line.

As I said...WATCH your insinuations,
> Brain.

And I said WATCH your misunderstandings and wishful thoughts, Stebe.

> > > > > You refused to accept the conditions...Anything else is a lie on your part...
> > > > > >
> > > > > But then you're USED to lying, aren't you, Brain?
> > > > >
> > > > Stebe, I'm used to your lies.
> > >
> > > You're free to itemize them, if you care, Brain...Other than
> > > refusing to delineate parts of my military service for yours or
> > > Lennie's edification, you have nothing to refer to.
> > >
> > > If THAT is the basis of your rants, sorry to leave you wanting.
> >
> > Was your military service a lie?
>
> Nope. Care to inquire of the Veteran's Administration? You are
> certainly at liberty to do so.
>
> In the mean time, we'll try and find the name of that "military
> commander" who allegedly gave you "permission" to operate Amateur
> Radio from a UN controlled zone without UN authorization.
>
> We'll even try to find someone who "worked" you from T5...
>
> > > > > Hardly.
> > > > >
> > > > > So there IS a gun to your head? I suggest you put it away and get some help..
> > > >
> > > > I'll reiterate so that there's NO misunderstanding, Brain...I am
> > > > the LAST person in the world that you want to insinuate holding a
> > > > weapon on or having a weapon held on...
> > > >
> > > > The LAST person...
> > >

> > Sounds like a threat, Stebe. Are you threatening me?
> >
> > I want you to withdraw your threat and apologize.
>
> Thre's no apology to offer, Brain.

There should be. Why do you assume yourself to being above making
mistakes, such as the one you made above?

> I am TELLING you that ANY insinuation of use of firearms on MY
> person IS a threat, and that it's the LAST thing you want to do.

I am telling you that there was no insinuation except in your capacity
to comprehend. And I still read a threat in your latest reply.

Now move on to your apology.

> Someone else in this forum tried that, and I can tell you that he
> found out that my reach exceeds the length of my arms to this
> keyboard...And the results were expensive AND quite legal.

I am not someone else in this forum.

Meanwhile, I still read a threat in your response.

Now move on to your apology.

> > > > > > > Sorry.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > Noted.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > Stebe is my mentor, I shall not want...
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Brian Burke is a liar...He'll ALWAYS want...
> > > > >
> > > > > I shall not want for a better mentor in misspelling people's names and lying.
> > > >
> > > > Well...so far I don't see where either applies. You're the
> > > > Brain, and no one contests that. And as for your allegations of me
> > > > lying, I once again invite you to provide the post...
> > >
> > > As Hans says..."Good Luck On This One Now..."
> > >
> > > Steve, K4YZ
> >
> > Stebe, you're the one who needs luck and help.
>
> No, Brain...On THIS one I am sure.

The fool is always so sure, especially when they're wrong.

> Anyone who posts in a public forum that he is "mentored" by a
> known pathological liar like Leonard H Anderson and then tries the
> wordsmitihing you've tried here in the last few days is a fool.

>
> THAT would be YOU. You stuck your foot in it, Brain, so now YOU
> get to wash it off. Sorry if you don't like the texture or smell.
>
> Steve, K4YZ

Gunny, you need to move on to your apology.

1935. Re: A Morsodist Challenge

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-29 23:40:12 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0310291540.76b71c9c@posting.google.com>
Source record: 81511

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0310290757.53ea18e6@posting.google.com>...
> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0310271528.33b3ef99@posting.google.com>...
>
> > Citation, please. Or else you're a liar.
>
> You want a $5M dollar Cessna business jet now?
>
> Sheeesh...what an idiot.
>
> Steve, K4YZ

Please remember, my mentor, that saying "produce X or you're a liar"
is your trademark.

Sheesh...an idiot.

1936. Re: If the written test elements are so easy, why are we all not extras?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-30 00:44:09 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <t9Znb.12618$FI2.3099@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 81512

"Steve Robeson, K4CAP" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
news:5c01b95b.0310291516.f52e7b5@posting.google.com...
> lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20031029012948.25815.00004068@mb-m07.aol.com>...
> > In article <WYadnV56M5uqvQKiRVn-uA@comcast.com>, "Leland C. Scott"
> > <no-spam@junk-mail.net> writes:
>
> > >Leland C. Scott
> > >KC8LDO
> > >
> > >ARRL Member
> > >NCI Member
> >
> > Tsk, tsk, going to add stuff after the "signature" of "imporance?"
> >
> > I'm an NCI member also.
> >
> > I'm also a Life Member in the IEEE.
>
> None of which is sufficient to grant you station license nor
> operator authority in ANY radio service, let alone the AMATEUR radio
> service
> >
> > >Don Ross (an extra who has never logged an HF
> > >contact)
> > >NL7CO/EM04
> >
> > What a nice coincidence. Sergeant First Class Donald A. Ross
> > was the Maintenance NCOIC at Army Radio station ADA...(SNIP)
>
> Sheesh...Is there ANYthing that can be discussed in this forum
> that DOESN'T remind His Scumminess of his radio-clerk days in the
> 1950's era Army???
>
> Steve, K4YZ

No. He is beyond help. Too bad someone out there in wacky land can't drop
by and comb his hair sometimes. I'm sure he is starving for attention.

Dan/W4NTI

1937. Re: ARRL has no FIRE for sale?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-30 01:00:22 UTC
From: Emmersome Bigguns <themsbig@boobs.com>
Message-ID: <GoZnb.179899$xx4.31238351@twister.neo.rr.com>
Source record: 81513

"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20031027135410.25517.00001648@mb-m15.aol.com...
> As of 1300 EST on 27 Oct 03, the ARRL news page has not one
> blah blah blah.......

Len, I feel sorry for you as there can be no telethon for you and people
like you.
There is just no cure for dumbass. :,-(

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.528 / Virus Database: 324 - Release Date: 10/16/2003

1938. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-30 02:20:16 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bns7bk$oub@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 81539

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:pqKnb.10966$FI2.5053@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> "N2EY" wrote:
> >
> > Then what's the answer? Shall we eliminate all immigration,
> > or just the illegals? Who gets to decide who should be kept
> > out and who should be admitted, other than obvious threats
> > to security? (snip)
> >
> > (snip) Almost 100 years ago, my grandparents came to the
> > United States from Italy. They left in part because of the 1906
> > earthquake, but mostly because they wanted a better life than
> > they could get in Italy at that time.
>
>
> Times change. Years ago, there were great open spaces throughout America
> just waiting for new immigrates to settle. Those shopkeepers, craftsmen,
> farmers, laborers, and so on, clearly benefited a new nation. The benefits
> today are subtle and the problems (job shortages and so on) more
pronounced.
> Because of that, we have to cut back on immigration at some point. We
can't
> have the entire world's population, or even a significant portion of it,
> living here. I think we've reached that point - the point where we cut
back
> on immigration except for the very most extreme cases. And when I say
> extreme cases, I mean extreme cases. Economic considerations would not
> qualify. Those facing persecution or death in their home country would
only
> be allowed to stay only as long as those threats exist, after which they
> must leave. To fill labor shortages here, we should retrain those already
> here.
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
>
>

Dwight, I don't know how it is where you are, but here there is no one
willing to do the work a lot of our immigrant population are willing to
do--and do.

I remember many times asking my teen-aged son to go get a job and, when he'd retort with, "there aren't any jobs," I would mention some of the things I knew were avaiable: farm work (building fences, etc.); any fast food chain, stock clerk, etc. He was indignant, at best, when he thought his mother would suggest such a thing to her own son...that was not work he was about to go do.

Now, I meet adults with the same attitude. I am very thankful for that part of my community with people who are willing to take on the immense task of the "physical labor" jobs that many of us wouldn't be caught doing. Very thankful indeed, for no one else would do them.

Kim W5TIT

1939. Re: If the written test elements are so easy, why are we all not extras?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-30 02:48:57 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <R7WdnV3v4fQa4D2iRVn-hQ@gbronline.com>
Source record: 81515

Steve Robeson, K4CAP wrote:

>
> He's REALLY upset that we do, WHAT we do and HOW we do it better
> and without his "leadership".

Along with the fact he can't pass the test.

1940. Re: Robeson Apology???

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-30 02:54:58 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0310291854.2292a6c2@posting.google.com>
Source record: 81514

brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0310291532.5229bc6c@posting.google.com>...
> k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0310290754.5cf3733d@posting.google.com>...

> > Just be sure your "insinuations" stay that way, Mr. Burke.
>
> There never was an insinuation, Mr. Robeson. It was a case of your
> misunderstanding and a dose of your wishful thinking.

I don't think that your previously archived comments might be
read that way.

For an offense to have occured, it onl;y requires that it be
perceived as such.

Personally, I think you were just pushing the limits of how
offensive you could be and still get away with it.

It didn't work.

> > Thre's no apology to offer, Brain.
>
> There should be. Why do you assume yourself to being above making
> mistakes, such as the one you made above?

As I pointed out, in order for an offense to have occured, the
person only need have PERCEIVED that a threat was rendered.

I have warned you off, but you keep barrelling right on in.

Were you born an idiot, or was this a life-long achievement?

> > I am TELLING you that ANY insinuation of use of firearms on MY
> > person IS a threat, and that it's the LAST thing you want to do.
>
> I am telling you that there was no insinuation except in your capacity
> to comprehend. And I still read a threat in your latest reply.

No threat. A warning. A thrat implies a violent, illegal
response. Trust me, if you keep this up, the result will be anything
BUT illegal...And expensive I might add.

> Now move on to your apology.

None will follow, unless YOU would care to express one for
uttering language that was perceived as a suggestion that you might
hold a gun to one's head, Brain.

And incase the last few hints didn't hit home with you, I suggest
you discuss with legal representation of your choice what can be
perceived as a threat.

> > Someone else in this forum tried that, and I can tell you that he
> > found out that my reach exceeds the length of my arms to this
> > keyboard...And the results were expensive AND quite legal.
>
> I am not someone else in this forum.

But you MIGHT be someone NEXT, Brain.

> Meanwhile, I still read a threat in your response.

A warning. I perceive your references to the holding of a gun to
my head as a threat. If you meant it any other way you may, in the
next response to this thread, express a retraction of that statement
and an apology for the anxiety it caused.

Otherwise I will assume your intent WAS to cause it, and I can
proceed accordingly if you insist.

> Now move on to your apology.

What apology?

> > No, Brain...On THIS one I am sure.
>
> The fool is always so sure, especially when they're wrong.

And in this case when he refuses to admit that he uttered words
that were percieved as threatening and offensive.

Which would be you...

> Gunny, you need to move on to your apology.

What apology?

Steve, K4YZ

1941. Re: Reflections on rrap

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-30 03:15:33 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0310291915.2be133e1@posting.google.com>
Source record: 81516

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20031023205902.23171.00001689@mb-m05.aol.com>...

>Assholes belong together.

Lennie, is there a special "professional engineers only" course
on "civil debate" techniques that you went to?

Is this the type of conduct that rates one a "life membership" in
the IEEE? If we were to send a compendium of "Len Over 21" postings to
your claimed friends, would what they say?

For the life of me, I've never seen anyone call YOU an "asshole",
yet you seem to like to roll out those types of epithets all-the-while
accusing Amateur Radio operators who annoy you of "personal attacks".

I have PARTICULARLY noticed that you make liberal use of this
term (amongst other profanity) against people who do NOT do the same
to you, ie: Dave Heil and Jim Miccolis.

Are the "rules" different for "professional engineers"...?!?!
You certainly take GREAT offense at any suggestion of a "perjorative"
employed against you.

I understand your conduct against me. YOU called me a Nazi,
among other things, and I threw it back in your face and refuse to
back down. I have offered to cool the jets before, only to have you
throw it back in my face, so WE (yes...the ROYAL "we"...) understand
that you are a "Do What I Say, Not Do What I Do" type person.

But you then state that you are only here for "civil debate" of a
subject which you have stated expresses absolutely no interest to you,
but then when somone DOES "engage" you, you roll out the profanity and
childish insults.

Is that what it takes for you to understand a conversation?

Are you SO old that you've regressed to that "second childhood"
stage, and you are determined to have the sand box all to yourself?

Personally, I just think you're a creep, but then opinions vary.

But so far, you've not done anything to change mine.

Steve, K4YZ

1942. Re: FCC Regualtions & Public Entities Policies

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-30 03:24:34 UTC
From: Phillip Michael <gtg154a@mail.gatech.edu>
Message-ID: <bnq0a4$d2g$1@news-int.gatech.edu>
Source record: 81517

Actually I wanted to specifically say cordless phone, because college policies also apply to any student living in a campus dorm.

Here is a link to GaTech's wireless policy.
http://www.oit.gatech.edu/inside_oit/policies_and_plans/policies/Wireless_Network_Usage_Policy_Rev1.9.cfm

They are doing two thing I don't agree with:
1) Banning wireless devices based on interference with their wireless network.
2) Giving themselves the right to regulate all wireless devices on campus property.

Phillip Michael
gtg154a @mail.gatech.edu

1943. Re: Robeson Apology???

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-30 03:45:13 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <dP%nb.12808$FI2.6962@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 81518

"Steve Robeson, K4CAP" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote

> A warning. I perceive your references to the holding of a gun to
> my head as a threat. If you meant it any other way you may, in the
> next response to this thread, express a retraction of that statement
> and an apology for the anxiety it caused.
>
> Otherwise I will assume your intent WAS to cause it, and I can
> proceed accordingly if you insist.

Proceed at will!

You have us all shaking in our non-spit-polished non-USMC-regulation boots!

You can see evidence of threats in your oatmeal bowl, if you look at it with the right mindset and expectations, so sue your Quaker Oats while you're at it.

The organ grinder has you dancing to his tune.

With kindest personal regards,

de Hans, K0HB

1944. Re: ARRL has no FIRE for sale?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-30 04:10:35 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <xnfcneeyarg.hnj2yjd.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>
Source record: 81519

On Mon, 27 Oct 2003 18:23:43 -0500, ARRL Sucks wrote:

>The ARRL is a Yankee organization, run by Yankees
>who think the center of the universe is New England.
>
>Hams in Hawaii have been asking for years to have
>QST bulk air-mailed to Hawaii, the same as all other
>publishers do to ensure timely delivery. ARRL has
>been farting off Hawaii hams for years. Screw the
>League!

This issue has been kicking around the ARRL Pacific Division "cabinet" for almost 15 years that I know of (I was in same until 4 years ago). The problem is that the Postal Service wants a big hunk of money for air mail to individual subscribers - the League would have to assess a healthy surcharge to Pacific Section members to make up the difference. You don't want that sort of "special treatment".

Conversely, contracting bulk-shipping and local mailing out to a third party is not cheap either - same surcharge problem, same "you don't want to have to pay it".

The third option that major periodicals take is to electronically ship the copy to Honolulu and print it there. That works only for large volume - not for the several thousand ARRL members in the Section.

I wish there was a better solution.

The glories of living in Paradise, eh?

>Aloha

M'halo.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

From a Clearing in the Silicon Forest
Beaverton (Washington County) Oregon

1945. Re: FCC Regualtions & Public Entities Policies

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-30 04:47:31 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <xnfcneeyarg.hnjrlvf.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>
Source record: 81520

On Wed, 29 Oct 2003 22:24:34 -0500, Phillip Michael wrote:

>Actually I wanted to specifically say cordless phone, because college
>policies also apply to any student living in a campus dorm.
>
>They are doing two thing I don't agree with:
>1) Banning wireless devices based on interference with their wireless
>network.
>2) Giving themselves the right to regulate all wireless devices on campus
>property.

You may not agree with them, but they are certainly within their
rights to regulate the use of electronic devices on their property
as a condition of allowing you to enter upon and use their property.

Did I say "THEIR" property enough ? <ggg>

Several of my law clients are radio site owners, and we put similar
clauses in all the leases.

Don't like it? Get off the property. No one is forcing you to be
there and to use those electronic devices.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

From a Clearing in the Silicon Forest
Beaverton (Washington County) Oregon

1946. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-30 04:51:23 UTC
From: groupk0hb@earthlink.net
Message-ID: <5ee63311.0310292051.486e9bfd@posting.google.com>
Source record: 81521

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote

>
> A review of any U.S. amateur radio periodical of the past half
> century will show photographs that U.S. amateur radio
> licensees are essentially white and male.
>
> Ergo, U. S. amateur radio is racist? :-)

Race is irrelevant. The spectrum doesn't care who transmits.

73, de Hans, K0HB
--
Grand Exhalted Liberator of the Electric Smoke

1947. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-30 07:07:43 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <3N2ob.10667$X22.1816@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 81522

"Hans K0HB" wrote:
>
> To save you the effort of further imagining, here is
> my position in three words.
>
> "Race is irrelevant."
>
> You seem to place great emphasis on race/ethnic
> background; ipso facto, you're a racist.

You only say that because I'm white. If that were not the case, you'd be saying the same thing to Condoleezza Rice (Nat, Sec, Advisor), Colin Powell (Sec, of State), Jesse Jackson, Al Sharpton, Mary Berry (Chair, US Com. on Civil Rights), and a very long list of other minorities who think race and race issues are very relevant in this country. Why should it be any less so for whites? In reality, your open criticism of whites who talk about race, without criticism of other races who do the same, only demonstrates your own racism towards other whites.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

1948. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-30 08:18:05 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <1P3ob.10721$X22.6089@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 81523

"Dave Heil" wrote:
> Dwight Stewart wrote:
> >
> > Americans working at those jobs would do the
> > same things (pay taxes and so on), Dave.
>
> Do some research on the number of retirees and the
> number of workers paying taxes to support those retirees.
>
> > Why do we need immigrants to do that?
>
> Because there aren't enough Americans born to do it.

What you fail to point out is how much those retirees paid into the system over several decades of their lives to help support their own retirement, only to have the government now say their isn't any money available because it was spent on something else. The problem isn't the number of retirees - it's the spending habits of this government. Now it's time for this government to put that money back by cutting some of today's spending (a few less military weapons should do it) instead of supposedly trying to gather more people to collect taxes from.

> No, that isn't correct. Moving dirt is menial work. Lifting
> boxes is menial. Clerking at a convenience store is menial.
> Employers choose not to pay folks in those positions more
> than the jobs are worth.

And, by having a ready supply of cheap labor to fill those jobs, employers ensure those jobs are not worth much. Employment and wages are simply matters of supply and demand, Dave. By creating a glut in the workforce, employers are able to pay less wages and still find employees to fill those jobs. After all, people have to work to survive and employers know it. Today, while business profits are astronomically high, working families are struggling to pay bills and cover their massive debts (while those business owners buy yachts and huge homes for their families). And now, to add insult to injury, those employers financially support political candidates that will pass legislation to enable millions of immigrants to enter the country, creating an even larger glut in the workforce so business can pay even less wages and make even higher profits. And if anyone objects to this massive immigration, they're called racist. You can call me racist all you want - it certainly isn't going to stop me from speaking out against this nonsense.

> So let's all make 30 bucks per hour and then wonder why
> the cost of everything skyrockets, huh? Americans want
> good pay and they want the price of everything to be dirt

> cheap. Tell us how to achieve both of those. (snip)

They've done it in other places around the world. Europeans make decent wages, pay no more taxes than here (when you add in ALL our taxes - local, state, federal, and so on), and consumer goods are not that much more expensive then here (gas prices in Europe are high solely because of government efforts to control pollution). They've done the same in the wealthy countries of Asia. Why is it so impossible for this great country to do what other countries have already done - provide decent wages for workers, provide decent (not astronomical) profits for business, and keep market prices reasonable?

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

1949. Re: ARRL has no FIRE for sale?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-30 11:30:07 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031030063007.21642.00002010@mb-m01.aol.com>
Source record: 81524

In article <20031028170206.15462.00003875@mb-m06.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) writes:

>In article <ntCdnfsHlvgkIAOiRVn-jA@gbronline.com>, JJ
><radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
>writes:
>
>>I have been a ham for over 40 years, so how long have you been one?
>
> I was on HF legally beginning in February 1953, a 1 KW BC-339,
> one of 36 total transmitters at Army station ADA...increased to 43
> by 1956.

All by yourself - or were there over 700 other personnel at that installation?

> I got my first radio operator license from a single test at
> an FCC field office in Chicago in March, 1956 (First Class
> Radiotelephone).

That's nice, Len. But it has nothing to do with amateur radio. As you say of others "You live in the past too much"

> I've never had, or tried to get, any amateur radio license.

On January 19, 2000, you proclaimed here that you 'were going for Extra right out of the box'. But you didn't say when, and in the ~46 months since then you haven't done it.

> Mostly because I've been a professional in radio-electronics for a half
> century.
>
Then why are you so interested in amateur radio policy? Everyone is allowed to be interested, of course, but it seems very odd that someone who has been "a professional in radio-electronics for a half century" and who makes so many posts to this amateur radio newsgroup would not have gotten a license and set up an amateur station in all that time.

> You know what? The FCC doesn't require any commissioners or
> staff to have amateur radio licenses in order to MAKE regulations
> concerning amateur radio. How about that!?

You've never worked for the FCC in any capacity, Len. You've never been a lawyer or a "regulator".

> You want my mailing address? Look in the FCC ECFS for the 14
> petitions for and against amateur radio code testing. You will find
> my name and address and comments in there, at least two documents

> per RM.

And if you try to read all of Len's verbiage, you'll need a bit of time, because most of his 'documents' are 14 to 20 pages long. Total commentary, most of it highly repititious, runs to several hundred pages.

Now of course anyone can flood the FCC with comments, but such wordiness is counterproductive. Some poor soul at FCC has to read all that stuff.
>
> Insufficient courage to reveal your identity "JJ?" Or are you going
> to rationalize your gutless fear somehow?
>
Maybe sufficient sense to avoid being harassed by you, Len. Like the time you sent me several unsolicited emails with very large attachments. Others received the same emails. I didn't bother to waste the connection time and disk space to download them, but others tell me that at least one of them was a picture of a naked man - fortunately not facing the camera. You thought it was "funny". Others did not.

1950. Re: FCC Regualtions & Public Entities Policies

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-30 13:42:01 UTC
From: Jud Heinman <jud@heinerxorg.net>
Message-ID: <bnr4hafpv0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 81525

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:xnfcneeyarg.hnjrlvf.pminews@netnews.comcast.net...
> On Wed, 29 Oct 2003 22:24:34 -0500, Phillip Michael wrote:
>
> >Actually I wanted to specifically say cordless phone, because college
> >policies also apply to any student living in a campus dorm.
> >
> >They are doing two thing I don't agree with:
> >1) Banning wireless devices based on interference with their wireless
> >network.
> >2) Giving themselves the right to regulate all wireless devices on campus
> >property.
>
> You may not agree with them, but they are certainly within their
> rights to regulate the use of electronic devices on their property
> as a condition of allowing you to enter upon and use their property.
>
> Did I say "THEIR" property enough ? <ggg>
>
> Several of my law clients are radio site owners, and we put similar
> clauses in all the leases.
>
> Don't like it? Get off the property. No one is forcing you to be
> there and to use those electronic devices.
>
> --
> 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane
>
> From a Clearing in the Silicon Forest
> Beaverton (Washington County) Oregon
>
>
FUCK YOU!

Get a Life

73 de Jud

1951. Re: ARRL has no FIRE for sale?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-30 13:47:13 UTC
From: Aloha <aloha@haolehq.org>
Message-ID: <bnr4ou$g70$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 81526

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:xnfcneeyarg.hnj2yjd.pminews@netnews.comcast.net...
> On Mon, 27 Oct 2003 18:23:43 -0500, ARRL Sucks wrote:
>
> >The ARRL is a Yankee organization, run by Yankees
> >who think the center of the universe is New England.
> >
> >Hams in Hawaii have been asking for years to have
> >QST bulk air-mailed to Hawaii, the same as all other
> >publishers do to ensure timely delivery. ARRL has
> >been farting off Hawaii hams for years. Screw the
> >League!
>
> This issue has been kicking around the ARRL Pacific Division
> "cabinet" for almost 15 years that I know of (I was in same until 4
> years ago). The problem is that the Postal Service wants a big hunk
> of money for air mail to individual subscribers - the League would
> have to assess a healthy surcharge to Pacific Section members to
> make up the difference. You don't want that sort of "special
> treatment".
>
> Conversely, contracting bulk-shipping and local mailing out to a
> third party is not cheap either - same surcharge problem, same "you
> don't want to have to pay it".
>
> The third option that major periodicals take is to electronically
> ship the copy to Honolulu and print it there. That works only
> for large volume - not for the several thousand ARRL members in the
> Section.
>
> I wish there was a better solution.
>
> The glories of living in Paradise, eh?
>
> >Aloha
>
> M'halo.
>
> --
> 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane
>
> From a Clearing in the Silicon Forest
> Beaverton (Washington County) Oregon
>

>

Duhhhhhhh, No Shit?

Get a Life!

Aloha de Kiko

1952. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-30 15:15:20 UTC
From: groupk0hb@earthlink.net
Message-ID: <5ee63311.0310300715.13c2843f@posting.google.com>
Source record: 81527

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:<3N2ob.10667$X22.1816@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> "Hans K0HB" wrote:
> >
> > To save you the effort of further imagining, here is
> > my position in three words.
> >
> > "Race is irrelevant."
> >
> > You seem to place great emphasis on race/ethnic
> > background; ipso facto, you're a racist.
>
>
> You only say that because I'm white.

Nope, I don't care what color you call yourself. I type slower so you
can read my lips -----

"R a c e i s i r r e l e v a n t."

With kindest personal regards,

de Hans, K0HB

1953. scanner online

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-30 16:00:05 UTC
From: "h.reijnierse" <reijnierse@home.nl>
Message-ID: <bnrcih$nj0$1@news4.tilbu1.nb.home.nl>
Source record: 81528

scanner online at my homepage
http://members.home.nl/reijnierse/

1954. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-30 17:13:02 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <dpydnQLbJrEy2jyiRVn-hA@gbronline.com>
Source record: 81529

Dwight Stewart wrote:

>
>
> You only say that because I'm white. If that were not the case, you'd be
> saying the same thing to Condoleezza Rice (Nat, Sec, Advisor), Colin Powell
> (Sec, of State), Jesse Jackson, Al Sharpton, Mary Berry (Chair, US Com. on
> Civil Rights), and a very long list of other minorities who think race and
> race issues are very relevant in this country. Why should it be any less so
> for whites? In reality, your open criticism of whites who talk about race,
> without criticism of other races who do the same, only demonstrates your own
> racism towards other whites.
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

Lets see, we can have an all black mayors conference, but just listen to
the uproar from all the Jesse Jackson idiots if we tried to have an all
white mayors conference. We can have a Miss Black America contest but
what a howl there would be if we attempted to have a Miss White America
contest. Yea Hans, it is just the whites that are racist.

1955. Re: ARRL has no FIRE for sale?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-30 17:17:46 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <bd-dnVG7nqRI1TyiRVn-vA@gbronline.com>
Source record: 81530

N2EY wrote:

> On January 19, 2000, you proclaimed here that you 'were going for Extra right
> out of the box'. But you didn't say when, and in the ~46 months since then you
> haven't done it.
>
>
>> Mostly because I've been a professional in radio-electronics for a half
>> century.

Means he can recognize a radio when he see one 35% of the time.

>
> Then why are you so interested in amateur radio policy? Everyone is allowed to
> be interested, of course, but it seems very odd that someone who has been "a
> professional in radio-electronics for a half century" and who makes so many
> posts to this amateur radio newsgroup would not have gotten a license and set
> up an amateur station in all that time.

He can't pass the test.

1956. Re: FCC Regualtions & Public Entities Policies

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-30 17:19:15 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <bd-dnVC7nqTS1DyiRVn-vA@gbronline.com>
Source record: 81531

Jud Heinman wrote:

> "Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
> news:xnfcneeyarg.hnjrlvf.pminews@netnews.comcast.net...
>
>>On Wed, 29 Oct 2003 22:24:34 -0500, Phillip Michael wrote:
>>
>>
>>>Actually I wanted to specifically say cordless phone, because college
>>>policies also apply to any student living in a campus dorm.
>>>
>>>They are doing two thing I don't agree with:
>>>1) Banning wireless devices based on interference with their wireless
>>>network.
>>>2) Giving themselves the right to regulate all wireless devices on campus
>>>property.
>>
>> You may not agree with them, but they are certainly within their
>> rights to regulate the use of electronic devices on their property
>> as a condition of allowing you to enter upon and use their property.
>>
>> Did I say "THEIR" property enough ? <ggg>
>>
>> Several of my law clients are radio site owners, and we put similar
>> clauses in all the leases.
>>
>> Don't like it? Get off the property. No one is forcing you to be
>> there and to use those electronic devices.
>>
>>--
>> 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane
>>
>> From a Clearing in the Silicon Forest
>> Beaverton (Washington County) Oregon
>>
>>
>
> FUCK YOU!
>
> Get a Life
>
> 73 de Jud
>
>

>
WOW! what an intelligent reply.

1957. Re: FCC Regualtions & Public Entities Policies

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-30 17:55:16 UTC
From: groupk0hb@earthlink.net
Message-ID: <5ee63311.0310300955.6d30447c@posting.google.com>
Source record: 81532

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote

> In article <5ee63311.0310282135.2255b289@posting.google.com>,
> groupk0hb@earthlink.net (Hans K0HB) writes:
>
> >Since a
> >cell phone transmits a signal even when not placing a call, they can
> >require that the unit be turned off at all times while on the
> >premises.
>
> It does?

Yes, Lenover, it does.

> Oh, yes, the receiver's Local Oscillator "transmits" a
> picayune picoWatt or so...

And much more than the picayunish oscillator leakage you allude to (if the receiver is even so crude as to have an actual Local Oscillator)......

As soon as a cell phone is powered up it immediately establishes radio communications with the MTSO over the control channel, comparing SID's, negotiating a registration request, and other similar housekeeping chores. This radio communications occurs even if you never actually place an outgoing call or recieve an incoming call.

Sunuvagun!

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB
--
http://home.earthlink.net/~k0hb

1958. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-30 18:24:36 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3FA15762.5515C2B3@earthlink.net>
Source record: 81533

Dwight Stewart wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" wrote:
> > Dwight Stewart wrote:
> > >
> > > Americans working at those jobs would do the
> > > same things (pay taxes and so on), Dave.
> > >
> > > Do some research on the number of retirees and the
> > > number of workers paying taxes to support those retirees.
> > >
> > > > Why do we need immigrants to do that?
> > >
> > > Because there aren't enough Americans born to do it.
>
> What you fail to point out is how much those retirees paid into the system
> over several decades of their lives to help support their own retirement,
> only to have the government now say their isn't any money available because
> it was spent on something else.

Lucky I failed to point that out because it simply isn't true. When
Social Security began, where did the money to pay retirees of its early
years come from? It didn't come from those folks because they never
paid much in. It came in advance from the coffers of government. What
was paid in by early workers covered under Social Security went to pay
for the retirement of future workers. Social Security was never, by the
way, designed to be a full retirement package. It was designed to
supplement what a worker saved.

> The problem isn't the number of retirees -
> it's the spending habits of this government. Now it's time for this
> government to put that money back by cutting some of today's spending (a few
> less military weapons should do it) instead of supposedly trying to gather
> more people to collect taxes from.

You've got a problem comprehending simple math. There are too few
workers contributing to the system and too many retirees drawing from
it.

> > No, that isn't correct. Moving dirt is menial work. Lifting
> > boxes is menial. Clerking at a convenience store is menial.
> > Employers choose not to pay folks in those positions more
> > than the jobs are worth.
>
> And, by having a ready supply of cheap labor to fill those jobs, employers

> ensure those jobs are not worth much.

Those jobs were never worth much and they'll never be worth much.

> Employment and wages are simply
> matters of supply and demand, Dave. By creating a glut in the workforce,
> employers are able to pay less wages and still find employees to fill those
> jobs.

Everybody wants high wages for any kind of work. High wages lead to
high prices for products and services. Yet no one wants to pay higher
prices for products and services because that would make their wages
worth less. Your stuck in an endless loop, Dwight.

> After all, people have to work to survive and employers know it.

...and workers know it.

> Today, while business profits are astronomically high, working families are
> struggling to pay bills and cover their massive debts (while those business
> owners buy yachts and huge homes for their families).

You're painting that picture from imagination, Dwight. I have a cousin
who owns a small town pharmacy which employs three people other than
himself. He has yet to buy his yacht and huge home but he has been in
business for almost twenty years. There is a fellow here in town who
owns a hardware store who will close it and retire next year because he
can find no one who will buy the business. He has no huge home and no
yacht. He has managed to make a living for some decades.

> And now, to add insult
> to injury, those employers financially support political candidates that
> will pass legislation to enable millions of immigrants to enter the country,
> creating an even larger glut in the workforce so business can pay even less
> wages and make even higher profits.

Both the Democrats and Republicans support continued immigration because
they can read the writing on the wall.

> And if anyone objects to this massive
> immigration, they're called racist.

Only if in objecting they raise an alarm only over Hispanic, Asian and
African immigrants.

> You can call me racist all you want - it
> certainly isn't going to stop me from speaking out against this nonsense.

You can be a racist all you want. That isn't going to stop me from
calling you one.

> > So let's all make 30 bucks per hour and then wonder why
> > the cost of everything skyrockets, huh? Americans want
> > good pay and they want the price of everything to be dirt
> > cheap. Tell us how to achieve both of those. (snip)

>
> They've done it in other places around the world. Europeans make decent
> wages, pay no more taxes than here (when you add in ALL our taxes - local,
> state, federal, and so on), and consumer goods are not that much more
> expensive then here (gas prices in Europe are high solely because of
> government efforts to control pollution).

Those holes in your knowledge base are gaping ones. My wife worked on the local economy in Finland in the mid-1990's. She paid 42% of her income in income tax. Her overtime was taxed at 50%. We paid 21% in Value Added Tax on most items and 17% VAT on food items.

We just got back from a trip to Finland. The same dishwashing liquid we buy here is double the price there. A 1.5 liter Pepsi sells for the price we pay for 3 liters. A half liter bottle of Scotch sells for $13.00 A tiny washing machine which would hold no more than half what our American machine holds runs $500. A mixed drink in the average bar runs ten bucks while a half liter beer will set you back about four clams. The cheapest car on the market, a Russian Lada (a Fiat clone) is $20,000. Gasoline prices are about $4.50 per gallon, not because of intent to reduce pollution but because a) Finland imports 100% of its petroleum and b) the Finnish government charges high additional taxes. Now, I'll entertain additional lectures from you on how the Europeans do things.

> They've done the same in the
> wealthy countries of Asia. Why is it so impossible for this great country to
> do what other countries have already done - provide decent wages for
> workers, provide decent (not astronomical) profits for business, and keep
> market prices reasonable?

Why not just quit whining, Dwight?

Dave K8MN

1959. Re: What If.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-30 20:51:54 UTC
From: dennis@wawa.juniper.net
Message-ID: <bnrtla$10r9$1@heap.juniper.net>
Source record: 81534

N2EY <n2ey@aol.com> wrote:
>Leo <nomail@nope.org> writes:
>>To propose that today would be quite
>>difficult to justify - most folks never even take the cover off their
>>radios anymore, let alone design one from scratch.....
>
>But some of us (ahem) *do* design them and build them from scratch. Amateur
>radio is probably the only radio service where a licensee can simply assemble a
>transmitter and put it on the air without any formal type-acceptance, approval
>or certification - at least here in the lower 50 provinces.

Part 15 allows this as well, though I guess one could debate whether
this qualifies as a "radio service":

Sec. 15.23 Home-built devices.

(a) Equipment authorization is not required for devices that are not
marketed, are not constructed from a kit, and are built in quantities of
five or less for personal use.
(b) It is recognized that the individual builder of home-built
equipment may not possess the means to perform the measurements for
determining compliance with the regulations. In this case, the builder
is expected to employ good engineering practices to meet the specified
technical standards to the greatest extent practicable. The provisions
of Sec. 15.5 apply to this equipment.

Dennis Ferguson

1960. Re: ARRL has no FIRE for sale?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-30 21:19:29 UTC
From: dennis@wawa.juniper.net
Message-ID: <bnrv91$15kp$1@heap.juniper.net>
Source record: 81535

Len Over 21 <lenover21@aol.com> wrote:
> It's also time that the Newington crowd recognized that MOST of
> the United States and MOST of the radio amateurs it is supposed
> to represent live WEST of the Mississippi.

?? From the FCC license data the AH0A web site finds 364,000 licensed amateurs live east of the Mississippi and 315,000 live west of the Mississippi (for the remaining few thousand the state apparently couldn't be determined).

Dennis Ferguson

1961. Re: ARRL has no FIRE for sale?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-30 21:37:40 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0310301337.6c96dca3@posting.google.com>
Source record: 81536

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20031027233514.28496.00001553@mb-m18.aol.com>...
> In article <3F9DD665.762EF867@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:

> >This leaves Len munching his brogans once again.
>
> Shut the hell up, you little USMC feldwebel. Learn to READ English.

Yet another of Lennie's examples of "professional engineering" civil debate.

Caught up in his own lying again.

Steve, K4YZ

1962. Re: ARRL has no FIRE for sale?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-30 22:52:48 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <4Dgob.14488$FI2.10620@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 81537

"Steve Robeson, K4CAP" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
news:5c01b95b.0310301337.6c96dca3@posting.google.com...
> lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20031027233514.28496.00001553@mb-m18.aol.com>...
> > In article <3F9DD665.762EF867@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
<k8mn@earthlink.net>
> > writes:
>
> > >This leaves Len munching his brogans once again.
> >
> > Shut the hell up, you little USMC feldwebel. Learn to READ English.
>
> Yet another of Lennie's examples of "professional engineering" civil
debate.
>
> Caught up in his own lying again.
>
> Steve, K4YZ

Steve,

I think 'JJ' is right...Lennie can't pass the test.

Dan/W4NTI

1963. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-30 23:28:04 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <88hob.11810$X22.6477@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 81538

"Dave Heil" wrote:
>
> Lucky I failed to point that out because it simply isn't
> true. When Social Security began, where did the
> money to pay retirees of its early years come from?
> It didn't come from those folks because they never
> paid much in. It came in advance from the coffers
> of government. (snip)

You really need to study up on Social Security, Dave. You have to pay so much into the system before you're eligible to collect a dime. When Social Security first started, people were not able to collect for several years (how many years depended on how much they were able to pay into the system each year). With the additional interest from that money, the system was supposed to pay for itself. Of course, there was no interest after the money was spent elsewhere.

> You've got a problem comprehending simple math.
> There are too few workers contributing to the system
> and too many retirees drawing from it.

Oh, I understand math very well. You just don't understand the Social Security system, which is why your math is flawed.

> Everybody wants high wages for any kind of work.
> High wages lead to high prices for products and
> services. (snip)

Nobody, other than you, is talking about "high" wages, Dave. What I'm talking about is "decent" wages that have not been artificially reduced by a created workforce glut. Today, even a two income family would have a hard time getting by on the minimum wage. They certainly wouldn't be able to put much money aside for their future so you can kill off that Social Security system you dislike so much. While you're traveling around town, take a good look at those minimum wage, or near minimum age, workers. A growing number of them are middle age or older (not young kids). Many were pushed out of decent paying jobs by industry moving overseas and a growing glut in the workforce here. How are these people going to provide for their families and still put away money for the future?

> Both the Democrats and Republicans support continued
> immigration because they can read the writing on the wall.

Both parties support immigration because it provides direct benefits to them and/or their financial supporters. It provides no benefit to the American worker or American families. Indeed, it harms both of those.

> Only if in objecting they raise an alarm only over Hispanic,
> Asian and African immigrants.

They're the primary immigrants today, Dave. When talking about immigration, who would you rather I talk about - Aboriginal Australians?

> Those holes in your knowledge base are gaping ones. My
> wife worked on the local economy in Finland in the mid-
> 1990's. She paid 42% of her income in income tax. Her
> overtime was taxed at 50%. We paid 21% in Value
> Added Tax on most items and 17% VAT on food items.
>
> We just got back from a trip to Finland. The same dish-
> washing liquid we buy here is double the price there. A
> 1.5 liter Pepsi sells for the price we pay for 3 liters. A half
> liter bottle of Scotch sells for $13.00 A tiny washing
> machine which would hold no more than half what our
> American machine holds runs $500.

And I've lived in Europe (Germany, Switzerland, Italy, and the UK) almost half of my adult life and worked for European companies for much of that time. While prices may be that high in Finland, what you say certainly is not the case throughout Europe. Taxes were never even close to that high and neither was the sales tax. As for your dishwashing liquid, I'm sure your imported liquid was fairly expensive, as are all imported products in any country. We paid more for our imported tea, but that doesn't mean there wasn't cheaper local brands on the store shelves. And, finally, if you paid that much for a washing machine, you got ripped off. We paid that much for stackable washer/dryer sets in both Germany and the UK. Either Finland has extraordinary prices or you need to learn how to shop better on the European economy.

> The cheapest car on the market, a Russian Lada (a Fiat clone)
> is $20,000. (snip)

Nonsense. Throughout Continental Europe, you can buy a BMW 315 or 318 for that price. The Fiat "duck" is only about $4,500 (my wife wanted one). While we were in Germany, we purchased a darn fast, and darn comfortable, French-made Citroen BX-19GT for less than $16,000 (loaded, with even air conditioning for those trips to Southern Europe).

> Why not just quit whining, Dwight?

Why not just quit listening, Dave?

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

1964. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-30 23:51:46 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bns895$q13@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 81540

"JJ" <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
news:dpydnQLbJrEy2jyiRVn-hA@gbronline.com...
> Dwight Stewart wrote:
>
> > >
> > >
> > > You only say that because I'm white. If that were not the case, you'd
be
> > > saying the same thing to Condoleezza Rice (Nat, Sec, Advisor), Colin
Powell
> > > (Sec, of State), Jesse Jackson, Al Sharpton, Mary Berry (Chair, US Com.
on
> > > Civil Rights), and a very long list of other minorities who think race
and
> > > race issues are very relevant in this country. Why should it be any less
so
> > > for whites? In reality, your open criticism of whites who talk about
race,
> > > without criticism of other races who do the same, only demonstrates your
own
> > > racism towards other whites.
> > >
> > >
> > > Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
> > >
> > > http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
>
> Lets see, we can have an all black mayors conference, but just listen to
> the uproar from all the Jesse Jackson idiots if we tried to have an all
> white mayors conference. We can have a Miss Black America contest but
> what a howl there would be if we attempted to have a Miss White America
> contest. Yea Hans, it is just the whites that are racist.
>

It behooves all of us to be just as indignant about racism in any venue,
regardless of ethnicity of the racist.

That having been said, I can understand some of the seclusion each race
enjoys from others, IF the purpose is cultural. What is specific to a black
mayors conference are those things specifically related to black issues in
the community(ies) they represent. I am certain that if there were issues
that needed addressing in a "whites only" venue, then you'd see a white
mayors conference and, honestly, I am not so sure there isn't one. What we
may find generally attractive in a representative for the United States in a
Miss America, is totally different from what the Black/Negro/Colored

(depending on the part of society and geographical/historical perspective you come from) find in a representative specific to Black America.

I also don't see those things as racist and I am wondering if you really do. I mean, the "race" card--as its so affectionately come to be known--can be played anywhere. And, there are people just stammering to be offended, no matter what. I disregard them. I don't see that a all male organization is necessarily discriminatory, either. Do you? I would hope not and, if you do not, then why is there a problem for you with a all _____ (whatever race) organization? What about a sports organization that won't allow women? What about.....???

Kim W5TIT

1965. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-31 00:49:27 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031030194927.07346.00001503@mb-m26.aol.com>
Source record: 81541

In article <1P3ob.10721$X22.6089@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> writes:

>"Dave Heil" wrote:
>> Dwight Stewart wrote:
>> >
>> > Americans working at those jobs would do the
>> > same things (pay taxes and so on), Dave.
>>
>> Do some research on the number of retirees and the
>> number of workers paying taxes to support those retirees.
>>
>> > Why do we need immigrants to do that?
>>
>> Because there aren't enough Americans born to do it.
>
> What you fail to point out is how much those retirees paid into the system
>over several decades of their lives to help support their own retirement,
>only to have the government now say their isn't any money available because
>it was spent on something else.

It's important to remember that the Social Security system doesn't just support retirees. Also, there is no "means test" - folks over a certain age get their SS retirement benefits no matter how much income they have, whether it be from investment or employment.

Another factor is that as our life expectancies increase, more and more people outlive their SS contributions. If you're in an mood to do a search or calculations, figure out the following hypothetical retiree:

- Current Age: 71
- SS contributions: Maximum required by law at the time, from age 22 to age 65
- Interest rate: 2.5%/yr

Figure out how much that person paid in over his.her working lifetime, and how much it would all add up to 6 years ago, when that person retired.

Then see how many years it will take that retiree to use up all of the money he/she paid in - with interest.

Then do the calcs agaib with an 81 year old.

>The problem isn't the number of retirees -
>it's the spending habits of this government.

Maybe. Some would say it't the taxing habits of the govt.

>Now it's time for this
>government to put that money back by cutting some of today's spending (a few
>less military weapons should do it) instead of supposedly trying to gather
>more people to collect taxes from.

You might want to look up where the military budget actually goes. A big
percentage of it is spent on pay and benefits to military personnel, retirees
and dependents.

And which weapons systems would you eliminate?
>
>> No, that isn't correct. Moving dirt is menial work. Lifting
>> boxes is menial. Clerking at a convenience store is menial.
>> Employers choose not to pay folks in those positions more
>> than the jobs are worth.
>
>And, by having a ready supply of cheap labor to fill those jobs, employers
>ensure those jobs are not worth much. Employment and wages are simply
>matters of supply and demand, Dave. By creating a glut in the workforce,
>employers are able to pay less wages and still find employees to fill those
>jobs. After all, people have to work to survive and employers know it.

Yep. All true - but it's not the whole story. There are lots of other factors
besides immigrants, such as:

- The decline in the percentage of unionized workers has made it possible for
employers to ease off on wages and benefits. This effect goes way beyond union
employees, because many employers will pay decent wages and benefits in order
to avoid becoming unionized.

- The influx of women and minorities into the labor force increases competition
for jobs and education. But it's better than discrimination!

- Many jobs have been exported to countries where labor is cheaper. Some big
companies have moved their customer service centers to places like India, the
Phillippines and Singapore, to name a few. Look inside your computer and see
where most of the components were made - it ain't the USA!

- Technology has reduced the number of unskilled and semi-skilled jobs, and
revolutionized the way much work is done.

When I first started in engineering, everything was drawn by hand, usually by
draftspeople who made a decent wage. Then came CADD systems, which at first
were very expensive and only used by large companies. Today hand drafting is
almost completely gone, and CADD systems are within reach of almost anyone with
a desktop. The draftsperson has been replace by the CADD operator, whose
productivity is much greater - meaning fewer of them are needed. Many CADD
tasks are done by designers and engineers themselves, too.

>Today, while business profits are astronomically high, working families are
>struggling to pay bills and cover their massive debts (while those business
>owners buy yachts and huge homes for their families).

SOME business profits are astronomically high. Others are struggling to survive. And don't forget ROI...

>And now, to add insult
>to injury, those employers financially support political candidates that
>will pass legislation to enable millions of immigrants to enter the country,
>creating an even larger glut in the workforce so business can pay even less
>wages and make even higher profits.

And people vote for those politicians because they're "pro-business".

>And if anyone objects to this massive
>immigration, they're called racist.

That depends on how the objection is raised.

If someone says that we need to limit immigration across the board, I don;t think anyone will call them a racist.

But if someone targets particular groups and points out that they have all or most of another continent....

>You can call me racist all you want - it
>certainly isn't going to stop me from speaking out against this nonsense.
>
>> So let's all make 30 bucks per hour and then wonder why
>> the cost of everything skyrockets, huh? Americans want
>> good pay and they want the price of everything to be dirt
>> cheap. Tell us how to achieve both of those. (snip)
>
> They've done it in other places around the world. Europeans make decent
>wages, pay no more taxes than here (when you add in ALL our taxes - local,
>state, federal, and so on), and consumer goods are not that much more
>expensive then here (gas prices in Europe are high solely because of
>government efforts to control pollution). They've done the same in the
>wealthy countries of Asia.

You might want to check into what the average person's standard of living is like in many of those countries - particularly when it comes to how much a house or car costs. Dave, K8MN has lived in many foreign countries...

>Why is it so impossible for this great country to
>do what other countries have already done - provide decent wages for
>workers, provide decent (not astronomical) profits for business, and keep
>market prices reasonable?
>
It's not impossible - the question is, what do you want to give up? Or should I Say - what are *we* willing to give up?

For example, tonight on NBC there is a popular half hour TV comedy whose 6 main characters are paid 1 million dollars each - per episode! Are we willing to give up the free market that makes such salaries possible?

Are we willing to give up low prices on imported goods and pay a lot more for American made things? Drive a smaller car, live in a smaller house, walk more,

fly less, own fewer things, make things last and last because we can't afford new ones?

Are we willing to have protectionist trade and labor policies and all that goes with them?

Lemme relate this to ham radio for ya.

I recall a time when imported amateur radio equipment was very rare here in the USA. Often it was disguised - the "Tempo One", sold by Henry Radio, was really a Yaesu FT-200. Many "Lafayette" items were imports. But most US hams used US-made ham gear.

And that equipment was expensive! Dig up an old catalog and see what a middle of the line station cost 25, 35, 45 years ago - and then adjust those costs to the income of an average family. Yes, there were hams with Collins gear - and just as many with much, much less.

In the early 1970s, imported ham gear began to take on the American market. The imported stuff was simply less expensive than USA-made equipment with the same features. Some old line US manufacturers got out of the amateur market, others fought on for a while, etc. One new manufacturer (Ten-Tec) made a go of it, but lags far behind Ikensu in total sales.

Now we have far fewer manufacturers of amateur equipment in the USA than 30+ years ago, even though the number of US hams is far greater. In the mid '60s, if you wanted a 100W class HF SSB transceiver that was "Made In USA", you could choose from Collins, Drake, Hallicrafters, National, SBE, and Heathkit, to name just the popular ones. Today you can choose Ten Tec or Elecraft.

Some say that American companies could not handle the transition to solid state, but the success of SBE (solid state in the early '60s) Ten Tec and rigs like the Drake TR-7 disprove that. The problem was simply economic - the Japanese could make ham gear of a given level of performance for less money.

Should the USA have enacted heavy import duties on electronics to protect the American manufacturers? Should American hams have simply refused to buy the imported stuff, no matter how good it was and how little it cost?

73 de Jim, N2EY

1966. Re: Tampa Turd Jail Dale's forgotten FELONY, Jessica too?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-31 03:42:01 UTC
From: joe2 <joe2@fake.com>
Message-ID: <iRkob.2361$un.221@bignews6.bellsouth.net>
Source record: 81542
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.swap,rec.radio.amateur.policy

The family that felons together, stays together???? Looks like KE4TEW is
the head of a large group of Florida Convicts.

joe2 wrote:

> Poor Jail Dale, a whole family full of convicts.
>
> Anonymous Sender wrote:
>
>> In article <20031029092618.03477.00000353@mb-m19.news.cs.com>
>> ke4tew@cs.com (KE4TEW) wrote:
>>
>>>
>>> I think it's obvious to anyone there's no basis for this.
>>
>>
>>
>> It's also obvious you are lying. How much weed were you intending to
>> distribute, Jail Dale?
>> Nickle bag, dime bag, a kilo?
>> Was your barrio whore Rita's income down that month because of her
>> hysterectomy and you needed the cash?
>>
>>
>>> There is NO record of me having a felony conviction.
>>
>>
>>
>> That's not what the records show, convicted drug dealer.
>>
>>
>>> Instead of posting BS anon, put your name to it
>>> and someone may believe it.
>>
>>
>>
>> It comes directly from the Hillsborough County Court Records,
>> Convicted FELON.
>>
>> The name and birthdate match yours on QRZ.com. It is YOU.
>>
>> James W Dale, KE4TEW
>> 9217 W Patterson
>> Tampa, FL 33615-2311

>> USA
>>
>> Class: General
>>
>> Previous Call: KC4VCS
>> Previous Class: Technician Plus
>> Birth date: 01-01-1941
>>
>> SSN: 262-60-XXXX
>>
>> DL: D40045941XXXX issued in Florida on 11/04/1998 expires 01/01/2005
>>
>> Your son, James Henry Dale born 11-20-1961 is also listed, looks like
>> he takes after you with the drug and alcohol abuse:
>>
>> First Name: JAMES
>> Middle Name: HENRY
>> Last Name: DALE
>> Date of Birth: 11/20/1961
>> Race: White
>> Sex: Male
>> Height:
>> Hair:
>> Eye Color:
>> --------------- Detail Charges Found ---------------
>> State: FLHLS
>> Case #: 03-CF-010310
>> County Name: HillsboroF
>> Description: DRIVING WHILE LICENSE REVOKED-HABITUAL OFFENDR
>> Class: FELONY THIRD DEGREE
>> Statute:
>> File Date: 06/19/2003
>>
>> The Dale family is one big lawbreaking jailbird family.
>>
>> The arrest of your son is the reason you had to hightail it back to
>> Tampa from Long Island.
>>
>>
>>
>>> Dimmy wrote: Subject: Tampa Turd Jail Dale's forgotten FELONY
>>> From: edo nobody@cryptorebels.net
>>> Date: 10/28/03 11:59 PM Eastern Standard Time
>>> Message-id: <e7cb3565549abffa134731375b000210@cryptorebels.net>
>>>
>>>
>>> Direct from the Hillsborough County Court Records:
>>>
>>> First Name: JAMES
>>> Middle Name: WILLIAM

>>> Last Name: DALE
>>> Date of Birth: 01/01/1941
>>> Race: White
>>> Sex: Male
>>> Height: 6'00"
>>> Hair:
>>> Eye Color:
>>> --------------- Detail Charges Found ---------------
>>> State: FLHLS
>>> Case #: 97-CF-004272
>>> County Name: HillsboroO
>>> Description: POSS OF MARIJUANA W/INTENT TO
>>> Class: FELONY FIRST DEGREE
>>> Statute:
>>> File Date: 02/19/1997
>>>
>>> Looks like he has no room to criticize W4AMP, and has a kinship
>>> chargewise with
>>> Donnie Anderson.
>>
>>
>>
>

1967. Re: Element 1, Code vs. No-code, and Dad

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-31 11:32:19 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031031063219.21232.00001715@mb-m13.aol.com>
Source record: 81544

In article <20031029162414.06226.00001243@mb-m19.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) writes:

>In article <c2356669.0310290936.1e48e50@posting.google.com>, N2EY@AOL.COM >(N2EY) writes:
>
>>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message >>news:<20031029012950.25815.00004069@mb-m07.aol.com>...
>>> In article <20031028195937.25815.00004064@mb-m07.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com >>(N2EY)
>>> writes:
>>>
>>> >> Try not to strain yourself putting words into others' messages.
>>> >
>>> >What "words have I put in others messages", Len?
>>>
>>> Those following -
>>>
>>> >It's clear from your many, many posts here that you want amateur radio to >>> >become a multiband version of cb.
>>>
>>> That's just your DELUSION and fantasy.
>>
>>Not at all. It's the sum total of what you've been preaching here for >>years and years. It explains the motive behind every single post >>you've made here.
>
> Wrong.

No, it's quite right. It's what you want for amateur radio, Len. You've been saying it for years now, and it goes far beyond code test elimination.

> You are still in the delusion of living in PAST standards
> and practices of amateur radio.

Be specific. What are YOUR standards and practices? What would YOUR standards and practices for the amateur radio service be?

> Anything against your fraternal-
> order idea of amateur radio is labeled by you as "wrong" or some
> evil personified by Citizens Band Radio Service.

Not at all. And the question is about YOUR proposed standards and practices. It's clear you will not stand for anyone to say anything that doesn't admire the way cb has evolved.

> The FCC is not required to sanctify or regulate a fraternal order
> as ordained by the ARRL. That is your fantasy and delusion.

So what do you suggest?

> Citizens Band Radio Service has been in existance for longer
> than 45 years and several private land mobile radio services (now
> collected under PLMRS) have been in existance longer than that.
> Times have changed.

What, exactly, does that mean? 27 MHz CB started out on 23 channels and got 17 more back in the '70s. Started out with AM and got SSB - both modes are still in use. Started out with licenses but dropped them in the 70s.

In fact, cb hasn't changed much since the '70s, has it?

The amateur radio of today is quite different from the amateur radio of 30 years ago, but the cb of today isn't much different from the cb of 30 years ago. Yet you would have the amateur radio service emulate the cb radio service. Why?

> ARRL can no longer assume guardianship
> over US amateur radio service as it did before Internet and improved
> citizen ability to communicate directly with the FCC.

We've alwyas had direct access to FCC. Didn't you know about typewriters and the post office?

> The OTHER
> U.S. radio services have changed and adapted to modern times.

You mean like cb has adapted?

Let's see, we hams have a wider variety of modes, equipment, and operating activities than ever before.
>
> Why do you NEED all thsoe "classes" in an a voluntary, avocational
> recreational radio activity?

License classes allow beginners to get started with an easy-to-get license and work their way up to full privileges over time. Of course if someone wants to get a full-privileges license "right out of the box", they can choose to do that, too. Right now, FCC thinks 3 classes is the right number.

Why does all this bother you? You don't have an amateur license and you don't seem to want one. In fact, you want to prevent people under the age of 14 from getting amateur licenses.

> Is it just to give yourself an elitist "title
> of nobility" to "sign" behind your name (or in lieu of it)?

It's an identifier. There may be other folks out there with a name similar to mine, but nobody else has my amateur radio callsign.

I *earned* the callsign N2EY by passing the required tests. I've held it and used it for 26 years and I'm proud of it. Is that wrong, Len? You seem to think

it's wrong for me to be proud of my accomplisments in amateur radio.

You've never had any amateur radio callsign and never operated any amateur radio station (as the control operator, anyway) yet you preach to us endlessly about amateur radio.

> Do you
> NEED the artificiality of class-distinction to "prove" yourself to the
> world...or to prove you are "better" than others...so that you can
> feel justified in putting down others?

Not at all.

Does my use of my callsign in postings cause you to feel "put down", Len? Poor baby!!!!!!

> It would seem that you DO have such a NEED.

Just your "delusion and fantasy", Len. Perhaps you're jealous.

All you're really saying is that you favor just one class of amateur license. Why not just come right out and say that? You're not being paid by the word.

> I find all of radio and electronics in general to be a fascinating area
> of technology, so much so that I became a hobbyist in that a long
> time ago and made it my life's work...even though experienced and
> with an aptitude for a totally different kind of work.

And you remind us that you're a "PROFESSIONAL IN RADIO!!!!!!!!!!!" in almost every posting here. Then you get mad because we don't bow down to you.

> But, you and
> other "titled," self-important radio amateurs want to put that down,
> stoutly maintaining an absolute rigidity to the artificiality of rank,
> status, privilege AS IF amateur radio were the SAME as a guild or
> union.

Is there something wrong with guilds or unions - particularly ones that anyone can join?

> Everyone (according to yourself) MUST follow the "rules,"
> not the regulations, but the "rules" as laid down by one membership
> organization which still is just a minority "representative" political
> action entity.

What *are* you talking about, Len? Give us an example of these "rules".

And what would YOUR "rules" be? Should we hams follow the example set by cb? You'd like that....
>
> Do not deny that ARRL is a political-interest group.

Where have I done that? It's a good thing ARRL is a political-interest group. Do you think anyone else could lead the fight against BPL? I sent them a check to do just that.

Oh wait - no strong national organization ever emerged for cb....

> Their federal
> tax returns are evidence that they retain a lobbying service in DC
> as well as a law firm.

So? Those are good things. (where's that checkbook?)

> They are NOT a government entity, just a
> large fraternal order that survives on publication and product
> resale and advertising profits.

And membership dues. Only $39/yr.

> ARRL deludes you and others into
> thinking they are always "representative" of radio amateurs...but
> over the years of successful brainwashing through self-promotion,
> they remain a minority political entity on "representation."
>
That's just your delusion and fantasy, Len. All anyone needs to do is to find out what ARRL policies are, and decide whether they agree or not. I don't agree with all ARRL policies, and I let the directors know that.

> You will not accept such a minority status yet it is obvious reality.

You're a minority of one, Len.

> The FCC has recognized this some time ago but you still support
> defend and sometimes "fight" for the ARRL on matters and blame
> the FCC for your perceived "evils" while turning hypocritical and
> extoling the ARRL as "doing the right thing" when decisions align
> themselves with your ARRL-influenced personal opinions.

You're just ARRL bashing again. Typical.
>
> Case in point: As of the close of 28 October 2003, the FCC ECFS
> had a total of 3,877 comments on 14 petitions for regulation
> changes on retention (7) or elimination (7) of the morse code test
> for U.S. amateur radio. Comments were from all over the nation,
> individuals to groups, licensed and unlicensed in amateur radio.

So? FCC has *always* accepted comments from all interested parties. Back in the '60s, when their were far fewer hams and commenting to FCC meant making an original and a pile of paper copies, FCC got over 6000 comments to their restructuring proposals.

> There is far more access and FREEDOM for all citizens to make
> our grievances known to our government...directly if we desire,
> not having to use a "middleman" group to do our collective
> communications...a "middleman" that pretends to be "representative
> for all" yet is not, by all evidence, representative to any but a small
> coterie within that organization.

The freedom has always been there, Len. We had typewriters and postal service back then. Anyone could comment. ARRL encouraged it then and they encourage it

now. So do I. You don't.
>
> You desire to have such commentary CLOSED to any but the elite
> already-licensed.

That's not correct. You are mistaken. In error. Flat out wrong.

I'm for anyone interested being able to comment.

I challenge you to show where I have been against *ANYONE* commenting to FCC.
Even you.

Of course, if someone expresses an opinion or comment, they have to be able to
"take the heat" of having others disagree with, and debate, their opinions and
commentary. You can't tolerate being disagreed with.

> Such is against the very basic First Amendement
> to the United States Constitution.

I'm for anyone interested being able to comment.

I challenge you to show where I have been against *ANYONE* commenting to FCC.
Even you.

Didn't you write:

"Shut the hell up, you little USMC feldwebel."

right here in rrap a day or so ago, Len? Is that in the spirit of the very
basic First Amendment to the United States Constitution?

If that's how "PROFESSIONALS IN RADIO!!!!" behave, I'll stick with amateurs,
thank you very much.

> The FCC is not obligated in any
> way to sanctify its regulations in the maintenance of an essentially
> private fraternal order. Yet you insist that this "fraternal order" MUST
> be maintained. Others insist more fervently, ready to fight at
> all costs. Such a "must" is delusional, fantasyland imagining.

So are you telling me to "shut the hell up"?
>
> Amateur radio is a voluntary, avocational, recreational activity done
> for no pecuniary reason. A hobby. Fun.

How would you know, Len? You aren't a ham and never have been.

> But some want to rule,
> to regulate the "fun" solely for their self-interests.

That would be you, Len.

> Not technical
> regulations but the activity itself and this strange absolute NEED to
> be just like a professional service group with rigid adherence to
> activity rules, jargon, even paper forms ("official" radiogram blanks).

> This strange NEED for rigid adherence extends to absolute honoring
> of tradition AND an intolerance to anything new that threatens the
> perceived glory and honor of any tradition or its history. All who
> have any interest whatsoever MUST be licensed to the imaginary
> "dedication and committment to the ARS community."

So what are YOUR standards and practices for the amateur radio service, Len?
How would you set things up?

You tell us endlessly what you don't like, but except for a constant insistence
on dropping the one remaining Morse code test and bashing ARRL and traditions
you don't tell us how *you* would order things. Oh wait, you wanted an age
requirement of 14 years for any amateur license. CB used to have an age
requirement, back when they had licenses....
>
> All who refuse to Believe in such a fantasy are heretics, lesser
> humans, worthy of contempt by the self-perceived nobility...as
> evidenced by all the archives in the Google.

Give us an example.
>
> The first message of this particular thread started off with an
> emotion-loaded play to readers of a father (authority figure) that
> was supposed to uphold tradition, honor, glory, etc. as a "positive
> attribute" or "family value" to pass along to generations.

I'm not him, Len.

How many children have you raised?

> Over
> morse code proficiency that has been dropped or never considered
> by every other radio service? That's fantasy, delusional thinking,
> suitable only for fraternal orders looking for status quo stability.

No, it was an observation of the value of standards. Maybe you don;t like those
standards - fine. Tell us, specifically, what *your* standards would be.

How many classes of license? Requirements for same? Callsigns? Operating
procedures? Subbands by mode and license class? Power limits? Authorized modes?

Get specific. This isn't a Zen experience where we describe things by saying
what they aren't.
>
> My father and father-in-law would no doubt have great fun at such
> "important family values" to pass on had they been alive today.

Were they radio amateurs? Did they even know what amateur radio is?

Are you going to tell us how they could cuss us out in foreign languages for
daring to disagree with them?

If my ancestors could outcuss your ancestors, would it make them right?

Would your ancestors be proud of you telling a complete stranger to:

"Shut the hell up, you little USMC feldwebel." ???

Those are *your* words, Len. No smiley, either.

Hey - I've got an idea! Let's start a thread that's a collection of quotes from "Len The Zen", where he shows us how "PROFESSIONALS IN RADIO" behave in "civil debate"! We can start out with that "USMC feldwebel" one, and add more as they are found.

> They were both born a year before the first radio signals crossed
> the Atlantic and three years before the Wright brothers successfully
> flew a heavier-than-air vehicle...and both saw the first humans set
> foot on the moon by live television from a quarter million miles away.

How does that make them somehow qualified to judge amateur radio policy today?

btw, it's been 31 years since any humans got to the moon. Commercial supersonic air travel has recently ended. If someone still as a working TV from 1969, they can still use it to watch today's programs...

And cb is still a mess.

> Change happened in their lifetimes. Great, profound changes.
> Change will continue to happen in many things and in many lives.
> We can all adapt and meld with the future, become part of it, or
> remain in the past in a fantasyland of old things, old ideas, old
> standards, old skills that no longer apply to the majority living in
> reality.

Give us some specifics besides dropping the Morse code test, Len.
>
> I am for the now, the future, reality and freedom.

Yeah, me too, Mom's apple pie, truth, justice and the American way...

> I will not live in
> your delusional fantasyland.

You often sound like you just visited the Magic Kingdom, Len....;-)

>Neither will millions of others.

Who are these "millions"? Do you claim to represent them? Talk about delusions and fantasies....

All that over a 5 wpm code test for a license in a radio service you have no interest in joining. Fascinating.

And what the heck is a "feldwebel"?

1968. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-31 11:32:23 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031031063223.21232.00001716@mb-m13.aol.com>
Source record: 81543

In article <pqKnb.10966$FI2.5053@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> writes:

>"N2EY" wrote:
>>
>> Then what's the answer? Shall we eliminate all immigration,
>> or just the illegals? Who gets to decide who should be kept
>> out and who should be admitted, other than obvious threats
>> to security? (snip)
>>
>> (snip) Almost 100 years ago, my grandparents came to the
>> United States from Italy. They left in part because of the 1906
>> earthquake, but mostly because they wanted a better life than
>> they could get in Italy at that time.
>
>
> Times change. Years ago, there were great open spaces throughout America
>just waiting for new immigrates to settle.

There are still great open spaces. The indigenous peoples who lived there for thousands of years might not agree that they were "just waiting to be settled".

And my grandparents didn't go there anyway. The wound up in New York City, Sea Isle City, NJ, and Philadelphia.

>Those shopkeepers, craftsmen,
>farmers, laborers, and so on, clearly benefited a new nation.

Some back then weren't happy to see lots of immigrants, competing for jobs and bringing their strange culture with them....

>The benefits
>today are subtle and the problems (job shortages and so on) more pronounced.
>Because of that, we have to cut back on immigration at some point.

If my grandparents had waited a few years, they would have been up against the quotas of the 1920s.

>We can't
>have the entire world's population, or even a significant portion of it,
>living here. I think we've reached that point - the point where we cut back
>on immigration except for the very most extreme cases. And when I say
>extreme cases, I mean extreme cases.

The hard question is...who gets to decide?

And one of the problems we face is that some of the "immigrants" are actually here "temporarily" on visas.

>Economic considerations would not
>qualify. Those facing persecution or death in their home country would only
>be allowed to stay only as long as those threats exist, after which they
>must leave. To fill labor shortages here, we should retrain those already
>here.

OK fine. You wanna do migrant farm labor?

73 de Jim, N2EY

1969. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-31 11:57:41 UTC
From: charlesb <n5pvl@sbcglobal.net>
Message-ID: <V6sob.9164$r63.66685022@newssvr21.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 81545

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:1P3ob.10721$X22.6089@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net...
>
> Why is it so impossible for this great country to
> do what other countries have already done - provide decent wages for
> workers, provide decent (not astronomical) profits for business, and keep
> market prices reasonable?

Government does not and cannot provide prosperity.

Charles Brabham, N5PVL

1970. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-31 13:38:08 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <4Btob.15273$FI2.2791@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 81546

"Kim W5TIT" wrote:
> It behooves all of us to be just as indignant about
> racism in any venue, regardless of ethnicity of the
> racist.

But whites are often the sole receipient of that indignation, Kim. Show me a message anywhere in any of these newsgroups at any time where you've expressed any indignation whatsoever about the racism of any other racial group. If you're typical, I seriously doubt you can do so. Instead, you attempt to explain away the racism of others like you've done below.

> That having been said, I can understand some of the
> seclusion each race enjoys from others, IF the purpose
> is cultural. What is specific to a black mayors
> conference are those things specifically related to black
> issues in the community(ies) they represent. (snip)

I thought a mayor is elected to represent the whole community, not solely the "black issues in the community(ies) they represent." What about the whites issues in the communities they represent? Why aren't those black mayors getting together to discuss those? Since those black mayors won't, who does address those issues? Absolutely nobody is the only answer. If a white mayor, or any other politician (black or white, police chief to president), expresses even a hint of concern for white issues, the word "racist" is immediately thrown around. In the end, a concern for whites is just about an ultimate sin in this government. And it is going to stay that way until whites start demanding some representation for their issues in this government.

> I am certain that if there were issues that needed addressing
> in a "whites only" venue, then you'd see a white mayors
> conference and, honestly, I am not so sure there isn't one.

Be serious, Kim. First, I suspect a conference like that would be considered illegal by the Justice Department - minorities can but whites cannot. Second, if such a conference were held, groups throughout the country would be out outraged, demonstrations would be held, lawsuits would be filed, and people like you would be running around screaming your indignation again.

> What we may find generally attractive in a representative for
> the United States in a Miss America, is totally different from
> what the Black/Negro/Colored (depending on the part of
> society and geographical/historical perspective you come from)
> find in a representative specific to Black America.

And that justifies the intentional and specific exclusion of other races in those pageants? Why would what you say not be true for whites, yet such an event held by whites which specificially excludes other races is illegal.

And I'll add to JJ's examples. What about black colleges which exclude other races? What about black owned businesses with not a single white employee in the entire building (many in my town alone)? What about the "Negro College Fund" which offers benefits only to blacks. What about "Black Entertainment Television?" I could list more. The point is that it would all be illegal (discrimination) if done by whites.

> I don't see that a all male organization is necessarily
> discriminatory, either. (snip)

If the goals of that male-only organization were to promote the political and/or social advancement of males, would you still hold that same opinion?

> What about a sports organization that won't allow women?

Based on physical strength, not racial, social, or ethnic, considerations, Kim. There is a huge difference.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

1971. Re: A Morsodist Challenge YKXWBSX7I6 01/03/2004

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-31 13:50:02 UTC
From: Nomen Nescio <nobody@dizum.com>
Message-ID: <0bb014a05a03f9c3dc9115a85611bce9@dizum.com>
Source record: 81547
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

In article <ssUnb.133435$qj6.9802413@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Dave Bushong <dbushong@adelphia.net> wrote:
>
>
> Hans,
>
> I'm at a loss for words. I bow to the master.
>
> 73,
> Dave

There's no confessionals or tithing required of this religion, is there?

>
> Hans K0HB wrote:
> > [...]
> >
> > Dear Reverend Dave,
> >
> > I'm shocked that you haven't heard of one of the great religions of
> > Amateur Radio. Morsodism has been widely discussed here on rrap, but
> > you might be an ignorant newcomer here, so I'll fill you in.
> >
> > So you want to be a Morsodist. It's not easy, you know: you'll have to
> > impose the stiffest constraints on your mind, accepting authority
> > without question -- you will be subject to jeers and persecutions at
> > the hands of the Spawn of NoCode, and you will suffer during your
> > entire lifetime trying to throw pearls before the swine. But in the
> > end, you will receive your reward from the Almighty in Heaven, and you
> > will have the satisfaction of seeing all others being tossed into the
> > Lake of Fire and QRM.
> >
> > But enough of that; you're not there yet. You must first prove
> > yourself worthy of being a Morsodist.
> >
> > Lesson One: Developing Your Psyche
> >
> > Right now I would like you to relax. That's it -- just sit quietly and
> > let your mind go blank. Concentrate on one thing and one thing only:
> > concentrate on your thumb. Now that thumb is no ordinary
> > run-of-the-mill thumb: what you see is THE THUMB. That Thumb is your
> > world. Nothing besides that Thumb concerns you in the least. As far as
> > you are concerned, that Thumb rules over all. The only thing that
> > should be in your mind right now is your Thumb and its absolute

> > authority over your life. Each and every line, ridge, wrinkle, and bit
> > of cuticle is a Divine Mandate, eternal in its wisdom, power, and
> > relevance. That Thumb was made by MORSE, and its sole purpose is to
> > guide you to your Salvation.
> >
> > Now, while still concentrating on that Thumb, begin to think about the
> > world around you. Careful! Don't try to take in everything at once:
> > start with the rest of your fingers, and slowly spread from there. See
> > how your fingers are connected with and dominated by your Thumb. Now,
> > slowly extend your perception to embrace your forfinger. It too was
> > created by Morse, and it is all guided by the Thumb. Between your
> > thumb and forefinger lie all the secrets of The Keys of Morse. The
> > rest of the universe is of no concern.
> >
> > Lesson Two: Establishing Your Doctrine
> >
> > Congratulations! You've come a long way, but you're not there yet.
> > What I want you to do now is to go to the nearest book store and
> > purchase a copy of the FCCRuleBook. Preferably, it should be bound in
> > nice, shiny black leather, and should have gilt edges and a red silk
> > ribbon. It should be fairly hefty in size, but not so large that you
> > cannot hold it with one hand. Finally, it should have the words of
> > Samuel in red letters, for as you know the Son of Morse only spoke
> > using red letters.
> >
> > Now that you have yourFCCRuleBook, read it, and read it thoroughly. I
> > imagine that some of it will fit in perfectly with your beliefs and
> > morals, since you have been inspired by Maxim to attempt this
> > indoctrination into Morsodism. As you read, you must remember that
> > your beliefs are the ONLY right beliefs, and all others are falsehoods
> > and are totally incompatible with Morse Divine Truth.
> >
> > Now you may be dismayed as you read through the FCCRuleBook to find
> > that much of it is outside your beliefs, or may even contradict them.
> > No problem! All you have to do is take a black marker pen and blot out
> > those paragraphs which you don't like. Simplicity itself! Now don't
> > you worry if it seems that more of the FCCRuleBook is blacked out than
> > left behind: just remind yourself that the remaining words are
> > emphasized all the more.
> >
> > Lesson Three: Living a Morsodist Lifestyle
> >
> > Well, I'm sure that you Novices are simply bursting with questions on
> > how to apply your new-found faith to your lives. I am pleased by your
> > enthusiasm: such zeal is a necessity if you want to begin to work your
> > influence on this filthy and sinful world and mold it into a clean and
> > upright one. Those Spawn of W5YI are simply itching to be preached at,
> > whether they want it or not, so let's get cracking.
> >
> > First, obtain for thyself some sort of access to the internet

> > newsgroups, specifically any (and all) newsgroups in the
> > "rec.radio.amateur.*" lineage. Never mind that only one of them, the
> > "policy" group is fit for Morsodists like yourself; you must spread
> > the word ALL the heathen NoCodists. Crosspost like crazy, verily even
> > if attacked by Horrible Herman, the Lord High Newsgroup Purity
> > Defender.
> >
> > As you preach the word of Morse to others, you will inevitably run
> > into those who not only doubt the veracity of your words, but who also
> > pose trick arguments inspired by Lenny Liberal and his henchman, Crazy
> > Charlie, the head Oracalist, in an attempt to trap and discredit you.
> > This lesson deals with some of the major swords wielded by various
> > tempters, and gives you some ideas on how to parry those weapons.
> >
> > Technobabble scholars: these vermin use their high-falootin' technical
> > jargon and book-learning to pervert the words of the Morse and read
> > things into Part 97 which aren't there. The FCCRuleBook was written by
> > Morse for YOU to use, and contains EVERYTHING you need to know for
> > Salvation, plainly stated in black and white and red. There is nothing
> > magic or mystical about it: it speaks out in the Words of Morse and
> > speaks directly to YOU, as you have personally modified it to your
> > belief set.
> >
> > If other Spawn of NoCode say that the FCCRuleBook cannot speak the
> > utter Truth because it is inconsistent in what it says, you can reply
> > that there is no inconsistency in your FCCRuleBook: everything that
> > you have in your FCCRuleBook perfectly supports your beliefs
> > (remember Lesson Two). If they quote passages from the FCCRuleBook
> > which they claim contradict your beliefs, you can reply that Oracle
> > has inspired them to pervert the words of Morse and to twist their
> > meaning around in order to try to subvert the Truth. If they say that
> > you are being totally ignorant and irrational in your absolute belief
> > in your Morsodist Doctrine, you can reply that they are being totally
> > ignorant and irrational in their absolute refusal to believe in your
> > Doctrine. And if they say that you are shutting your eyes to reality,
> > you can reply that they are shutting their eyes to Morse.
> >
> > Peace to you!
> >
> > Hans, K0HB
> > Lord High Liberator of the Blue Electric Smoke

1972. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-31 14:46:20 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <0Buob.15354$FI2.15268@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 81548

"Kim W5TIT" wrote:
>
> Dwight, I don't know how it is where you are, but
> here there is no one willing to do the work a lot of
> our immigrant population are willing to do--and do.

Nonsense, Kim. The reason most people aren't willing to do those jobs is because the wages are so low. Offer decent wages and people will gladly do those jobs. There are non-immigrant workers throughout this country busting their butts in construction jobs, laborer jobs, crappy jobs, and dangerious jobs. They do so because the wages are decent. My god, there are even people willing to walk into a nuclear reactor if the pay is good enough. Offer decent wages for almost ANY job and I'm fully convinced there will be plenty of non-immigrant workers willing to do those jobs. I see nothing to even suggest otherwise.

> I remember many times asking my teen-aged son to go
> get a job and, when he'd retort with, "there aren't any
> jobs," I would mention some of the things I knew were
> avaiable: farm work (building fences, etc.); any fast food
> chain, stock clerk, etc. He was indignant, at best, when
> he thought his mother would suggest such a thing to her
> own son...that was not work he was about to go do.

Why should he work? He's living at home with mommy where everything is free and he's spoiled rotten. When he is old enough, throw his butt out and watch how fast his work ethic changes. In the meantime, sharply reduce the money you give him (no car, no fancy school cloths, no expensive shoes, no music CD's, no stereo, and so on) and tell him to get a job if he wants those extras. After he throws a temper tantrum for a few months, wears out of the stuff he has now, and realises you're serious, a job will look much more appealing to him. He will have to do all this eventually anyway, so now is a good time to start properly preparing him for his future. Later, once he has to start paying for them, he'll miss the free food you gave him and the free shelter you provided.

> Now, I meet adults with the same attitude. I am very
> thankful for that part of my community with people who
> are willing to take on the immense task of the "physical
> labor" jobs that many of us wouldn't be caught doing.
> Very thankful indeed, for no one else would do them.

Like those other adults you mention, there are many jobs I will not do today, Kim. I can't afford to do those low paying jobs if I want to feed my family, live in a decent home, and make the car payments. And I'm certainly not willing to live twenty to a hotel room or apartment like you see so many

poor illegal immigrants doing today. And, lets face it, I just can't physically do some of those jobs anymore. But none of that suggests for a moment that I'm not willing to work. Likewise, none of that suggests there are no younger non-immigrants willing to do those jobs if the wages were decent.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

1973. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-31 15:02:43 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <nQuob.15396$FI2.10235@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 81549

"N2EY" wrote:
>
> OK fine. You wanna do migrant farm labor?

If I could still physically do it, I'd be thrilled to do so, Jim. My grandmother owned a huge farm in North Carolina and I truly enjoyed going there every summer during my teenage years to work. I worked side-by-side with the hired laborers and did every single job they did. However, because of the low wages for most of those jobs today, I certainly wouldn't do some those jobs today (even if I could physically do so). However, a few farmers in the area still pay well and they have no problems finding labor. If I could do it, I wouldn't mind doing one of those jobs one summer just for the fun of it.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

1974. Re: ARRL has no FIRE for sale?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-31 16:20:42 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3FA28BDF.67F9227D@earthlink.net>
Source record: 81550

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3F9FD6D4.6D71A2CC@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >Why should the ARRL bother you? You aren't a member and you have
> >nothing to do with amateur radio. On with your quest, Don Quixote!
>
> Tsk, tsk, tsk, Sancho Panza sitting on his ass mouthing off
> again...making the windmills turn with his remarks...

I believe you have it turned around again, Leonard. I've been a
licensed radio amateur for decades and have been a life member of the
ARRL for over 25 years. You are the non-radio amateur and non-ARRL
member sitting on whichever end you sit on and blowing hot air on topics
in which you have no part.

Dave K8MN

1975. Re: ARRL has no FIRE for sale?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-31 16:26:51 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3FA28D50.D8C79428@earthlink.net>
Source record: 81651

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3F9FD7AD.94946B4A@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >It is obvious that someone from HQ--probably that pesky Ed Hare--saw
> >your post and quickly threw something together for the ARRL web site,
> >just to make you look silly.
>
> Hardly, Sancho. Now get back on your ass and look for more
> windmills.
>
> Giddyap.

Perhaps you believe it to be an eastern headquartered organization's attempt to discredit you personally. ARRL isn't a broadcast news organization and you have no idea of what contributions radio amateurs have made in the efforts to douse California's fires. Your sniping from the sidelines makes you look silly.

Dave K8MN

1976. Must be an East Coast thing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-31 16:36:33 UTC
From: "Steven R. Adell - KF2TI" <kf2ti@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <MPG.1a0c9fc620c0712e989680@news.west.earthlink.net>
Source record: 81652

Behind the scenes at the NYC Marathon and ham radio operators are there.
No back slapping, no high 5's, no nattering naybobs of left coast
negativism Just doing what needs to be done, getting a sandwich and a
bottle of Poland Spring and then when it's over going home

USA Today... a MAJOR national publication

http://www.usatoday.com/usatonline/20031030/5635584s.htm

Steve Adell- KF2TI
Senior Staff since 1995
Elite Runners Medical Net

1977. Re: Must be an East Coast thing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-31 16:53:16 UTC
From: Gr&#65533;mw&#65533;tch th&#65533; &#65533;nfl&#65533;pp&#65533;bl&#65533; <Gr&#65533;mw&#65533;tch@NOSPAM.THANKS.IM.FULL.lycos.co.de>
Message-ID: <0swob.9690$RQ1.4029@newsread3.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 81653

You hadda know Mendelmouth would get his name in the paper!

73/88,

Barnabus Grumwitch Overbyte

--
"All persons, living or dead, are purely coincidental, and should not be
construed."

"Steven R. Adell - KF2TI" <kf2ti@arrl.net> wrote in message
news:MPG.1a0c9fc620c0712e989680@news.west.earthlink.net...
: Behind the scenes at the NYC Marathon and ham radio operators are there.
: No back slapping, no high 5's, no nattering naybobs of left coast
: negativism Just doing what needs to be done, getting a sandwich and a
: bottle of Poland Spring and then when it's over going home
:
: USA Today... a MAJOR national publication
:
: http://www.usatoday.com/usatonline/20031030/5635584s.htm
:
:
:
: Steve Adell- KF2TI
: Senior Staff since 1995
: Elite Runners Medical Net

1978. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-31 17:01:23 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3FA29563.8030502@psu.edu>
Source record: 81654

Dwight Stewart wrote:
> "N2EY" wrote:
>
>>OK fine. You wanna do migrant farm labor?
>
>
>
> If I could still physically do it, I'd be thrilled to do so, Jim. My
> grandmother owned a huge farm in North Carolina and I truly enjoyed going
> there every summer during my teenage years to work. I worked side-by-side
> with the hired laborers and did every single job they did. However, because
> of the low wages for most of those jobs today, I certainly wouldn't do some
> those jobs today (even if I could physically do so). However, a few farmers
> in the area still pay well and they have no problems finding labor. If I
> could do it, I wouldn't mind doing one of those jobs one summer just for the
> fun of it.

Here lies the rub, Dwight! Although I disagree with a lot of your views on race, you are spot on on this thread sub-subject.

The reason that this is "undesirable" work is simply because the producers are allowed to get away with paying such low wages. If they don't even pay minimum, how is a citizen even supposed to legally hold the job?

Heck, even Wal Mart is doing it now. They've been caught using illegal immigrant labor on contract for cleaning. (I can just hear Paul Harvey "You couldn't have a better neighbor, I suppose *they* can't afford to pay decent wages?

People picked crops as citizens long before it became "undesireable" work that could only be filled by illegal immigrants.

- Mike KB3EIA -

1979. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-31 17:04:57 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0310310904.1fc51c87@posting.google.com>
Source record: 81655

"Kim" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote in message news:<bns7bk$oub@library1.airnews.net>...
> "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
> news:pqKnb.10966$FI2.5053@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> > "N2EY" wrote:
> > >
> > > Then what's the answer? Shall we eliminate all immigration,
> > > or just the illegals? Who gets to decide who should be kept
> > > out and who should be admitted, other than obvious threats
> > > to security? (snip)
> > >
> > > (snip) Almost 100 years ago, my grandparents came to the
> > > United States from Italy. They left in part because of the 1906
> > > earthquake, but mostly because they wanted a better life than
> > > they could get in Italy at that time.

Y'know, it's interesting that so far nobody has directly answered the
question as to whether my grandparents should have been allowed into
the country...
> >
> > Times change. Years ago, there were great open spaces throughout America
> > just waiting for new immigrates to settle. Those shopkeepers, craftsmen,
> > farmers, laborers, and so on, clearly benefited a new nation. The benefits
> > today are subtle and the problems (job shortages and so on) more
> pronounced.
> > Because of that, we have to cut back on immigration at some point. We
> can't
> > have the entire world's population, or even a significant portion of it,
> > living here. I think we've reached that point - the point where we cut
> back
> > on immigration except for the very most extreme cases. And when I say
> > extreme cases, I mean extreme cases. Economic considerations would not
> > qualify. Those facing persecution or death in their home country would
> only
> > be allowed to stay only as long as those threats exist, after which they
> > must leave. To fill labor shortages here, we should retrain those already
> > here.
> >
> >
> > Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
> >
> > http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
> >
> >
>

> Dwight, I don't know how it is where you are, but here there is no one
> willing to do the work a lot of our immigrant population are willing to
> do--and do.
>
> I remember many times asking my teen-aged son to go get a job and, when he'd
> retort with, "there aren't any jobs," I would mention some of the things I
> knew were avaiable: farm work (building fences, etc.); any fast food chain,
> stock clerk, etc. He was indignant, at best, when he thought his mother
> would suggest such a thing to her own son...that was not work he was about
> to go do.

What was his problem? Did he feel the jobs were "beneath his dignity"
or some such?

What sort of work did he expect to do as a teenager without special
skills?

> Now, I meet adults with the same attitude. I am very thankful for that part
> of my community with people who are willing to take on the immense task of
> the "physical labor" jobs that many of us wouldn't be caught doing. Very
> thankful indeed, for no one else would do them.
>
The question that comes to mind is "why won't they do those jobs?"
Obviously ever worker with any sense is going to go for the "best" job
they can find, but when someone is unemployed for a considerable
length of time....

And there are some jobs which are hazardous enough to make one think
twice.

If you want a snapshot of how bad things can get, there's an excellent
book and PBS documentary on the building of Hoover Dam. I hope and
pray that I'm never, ever as desperate as some of those workers had to
be in order to take some of those jobs. Like drilling holes for
explosives in a rock face several hundred feet up, sitting on a
boatswain's chair with no safety harness, no net, not even a hard hat.
And if ya fell, they'd leave your dead body lying there until change
of shift (unless it was in the way, then they'd move it). Mustn't slow
down the work.

Or working in a diversion tunnel full of carbon monoxide exhaust fumes
because the company insisted on using internal combustion engines in
the tunnels, which lacked adequate ventilation systems.

The project was finished ahead of schedule and under budget. Project
manager got a bonus of something like $300,000, workers got a pink
slip. 65 workers died to build it. How many years' salary for an
average worker was $300,000 in those Depression times?

73 de Jim, N2EY

1980. Re: What If.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-31 17:23:39 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0310310923.9c6b258@posting.google.com>
Source record: 81656

dennis@wawa.juniper.net (Dennis Ferguson) wrote in message
news:<bnrtla$10r9$1@heap.juniper.net>...
> N2EY <n2ey@aol.com> wrote:
> >Leo <nomail@nope.org> writes:
> >>To propose that today would be quite
> >>difficult to justify - most folks never even take the cover off their
> >>radios anymore, let alone design one from scratch.....
> >
> >But some of us (ahem) *do* design them and build them from scratch. Amateur
> >radio is probably the only radio service where a licensee can simply assemble a
> >transmitter and put it on the air without any formal type-acceptance, approval
> >or certification - at least here in the lower 50 provinces.

I stand corrected! Thanks, Dennis, I'd forgotten about Part 15 systems.
>
> Part 15 allows this as well, though I guess one could debate whether
> this qualifies as a "radio service":
>
> Sec. 15.23 Home-built devices.
>
> (a) Equipment authorization is not required for devices that are not
> marketed, are not constructed from a kit, and are built in quantities of
> five or less for personal use.
> (b) It is recognized that the individual builder of home-built
> equipment may not possess the means to perform the measurements for
> determining compliance with the regulations. In this case, the builder
> is expected to employ good engineering practices to meet the specified
> technical standards to the greatest extent practicable. The provisions
> of Sec. 15.5 apply to this equipment.
>
I'd say the provisions of Sec 15.5 are quite restricting, though....

73 es tnx de Jim, N2EY

1981. Re: Opposing BPL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-31 17:28:20 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <GLadne5WZ-VWAT-iRVn-sg@gbronline.com>
Source record: 81658

Dick Carroll wrote:

> No wonder the BPL people are confident of a win. None of this is
> accidental.

Along with the high paying jobs they have probably offered those in the
FCC to push it through.

1982. Re: Element 1, Code vs. No-code, and Dad

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-31 17:32:48 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0310310932.1bcc779c@posting.google.com>
Source record: 81657

Answering my own question:

> And what the heck is a "feldwebel"?

"Corporal"

Godwin's Law invoked.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1983. Re: ARRL has no FIRE for sale?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-31 17:41:04 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0310310941.7e6ab832@posting.google.com>
Source record: 81659

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20031028170206.15462.00003875@mb-m06.aol.com>...

> YOU on the other hand, HIDE behind a couple letters and act tuff.

You mean like "LHA"?

Or like somebody who has used at least five different screennames
(there may be more, these are just the ones that I know) to post here,
none of which contained his last name:

nocwtest@aol.com
averyfine@aol.com
averyfineman@aol.com
lenof21@aol.com
lenover21@aol.com

You denied ever using the second name on that list until you were
proven wrong by some skillful googling. Then you attacked the
messenger for telling the truth.

No wonder "JJ" and "Leo" remain anonymous.

> No USA database lists any "JJ" as the name of any licensed radio
> amateur.

There's a Leonard H. Anderson in the USA amateur radio database but
he's not you.

1984. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-31 18:28:23 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <bRxob.15846$FI2.925@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 81660

"charlesb" <n5pvl@sbcglobal.net> wrote in message
news:V6sob.9164$r63.66685022@newssvr21.news.prodigy.com...
>
> "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
> news:1P3ob.10721$X22.6089@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> >
> > Why is it so impossible for this great country to
> > do what other countries have already done - provide decent wages for
> > workers, provide decent (not astronomical) profits for business, and
keep
> > market prices reasonable?
>
> Government does not and cannot provide prosperity.
>
> Charles Brabham, N5PVL
>
>
>
That question came from the far left field. They can not comprehend the
capatalist system. And they deny being socialist. I guess they are just
confused.

Dan/W4NTI

1985. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-31 19:41:07 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <nVyob.13564$X22.12727@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 81661

"N2EY" wrote:
>
> It's important to remember that the Social Security system
> doesn't just support retirees. Also, there is no "means test"
> - folks over a certain age get their SS retirement benefits
> no matter how much income they have, whether it be from
> investment or employment. (snip)

Many have wrestled with that for years. Some argue the wealthy don't need the benefits. Others argue if everyone pays into the system, everyone should collect later in life. In the end, if the goal is to provide a solid parachute, the current system is not that bad.

> Another factor is that as our life expectancies increase,
> more and more people outlive their SS contributions.
> (snip)

Another serious problem. It wouldn't have been so bad had the government invested that money over the years so it could bring in a healthy return, but they didn't. So what do we do now? First of all, money is available without raising taxes. The government collects billions of dollars in taxes each year. The question is where that money is spent. Do we buy new military hardware and finance art shows, or do we provide for the elderly? If we want to do all of that, we have to raise taxes. If we only want to do some of it, and cut some, we don't need to raise taxes. Some say cut the benefits for the elderly and keep the other stuff. I think we should cut some of the other stuff and keep the benefits for the elderly.

> You might want to look up where the military budget
> actually goes. A big percentage of it is spent on pay
> and benefits to military personnel, retirees and
> dependents.

That is less so today. Even though the military budget has continued to climb, the number of active duty personnel has decreased(less than half what is was twenty-five years ago). Likewise, benefits for dependents have also decreased. For example, dependents used to receive free medical care. Today, they pay fees for any medical treatment, with that treatment additionally subsidized by a medical plan paid for by the active duty spouse.

There is also a built-in inefficency in the military system today. For whatever reason, many of the jobs once done by active duty personnel (cooks, clerks, admin, maintenance, recreation, and medical) are now done by civilian employees, many earning much higher wages, benefits, and retirement. Likewise, many technical jobs are now handled by contract companies, whose employees also often earn much higher wages, benefits, and

retirement. As a result, it is now much more expensive to staff those jobs.

Some of the less skill oriented civilian jobs were once open to dependents. Sadly, even this is rarely the case anymore. In many places overseas, for example, dependents can no longer find work simply because most of the jobs (especially the ones that pay fairly well) are reserved for civilians (often local nationals). As a result, dependents are usually left with the part-time jobs at the BX/PX, snack bars, fast food joints, or they can bag groceries at the commissary.

> And people vote for those politicians because they're
> "pro-business".

People vote for those "pro-business" candidates because they're mislead about what "pro-business" really means. If any candidate actually told the truth and said he supports immigration because that would drive down wages for everybody and employers like low wages, that candidate probably wouldn't get more than a handful of votes (and most of those from business owners). Instead, candidates talk about supporting business to help stimulate the economy and create jobs. What is never said is that the only "economy" being stimulated is the profits of big business and the only jobs being created are low paying ones. Of course, since both political parties support big business, voters don't have an alternative choice anyway.

> You might want to check into what the average person's
> standard of living is like in many of those countries -
> particularly when it comes to how much a house or car
> costs. Dave, K8MN has lived in many foreign countries...

Homes are expensive because there are a lot of people living in a relatively small area. This happens anytime there are large numbers of people living in fairly crowded conditions (New York, for example). Apartment prices are not any higher. We pay more for our apartment now than we did in Germany (and this one is smaller). As for the cost of automobiles, I have no idea what Dave is talking about. Where I lived, car prices were nearly the same as here. If anything, there is a greater selection of lower priced models (our car prices are getting pretty darn high).

> It's not impossible - the question is, what do you want to
> give up? Or should I Say - what are *we* willing to give up?

I've already answer that - "immigration" and "decent (not astronomical) profits for business."

> For example, tonight on NBC there is a popular half hour
> TV comedy whose 6 main characters are paid 1 million
> dollars each - per episode! Are we willing to give up the
> free market that makes such salaries possible?

If it takes that to insure decent wages for all Americans, I'm certainly willing. But I don't think it is going to take that. Instead, we can cut immigration and take steps to prevent factories from moving overseas (one

way might be to require American companies that move factories overseas to pay import tariffs and duties just like any other foreign business). We could also put caps on corporate profits without much damage to the overall free market system (Bill Gates, as an extreme example, can survive on a little less money). Increasing the minimum wage to more realistic levels might help. And, if companies don't get the hint and try to pass that on to consumers while keeping profits extraordinarily high instead, we can start regulating major consumer goods (with the idea in the beginning of driving prices down). All this has been done, to some degree, in Europe and Asia with no ill effects. By the way, taxes in Europe have nothing to do with this discussion. If we continue to insist on no national health care system and few government aid programs like those seen in Europe, taxes won't have to be raised.

> Are we willing to give up low prices on imported goods
> and pay a lot more for American made things? Drive a
> smaller car, live in a smaller house, walk more, fly less,
> own fewer things, make things last and last because we
> can't afford new ones?

That is a gross exaggeration and you know it, Dave. Nothing that drastic will be required. I've already outlined some of the far less intrusive steps we can take in the previous paragraph.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

1986. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-31 19:50:38 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <i2zob.13571$X22.13287@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 81662

"charlesb" wrote:
>
> Government does not and cannot provide prosperity.

But government was created exactly to "...promote the general welfare and secure the blessings of liberty for ourselves and our posterity..." In my opinion, those blessings include a decent living and a fair share in the benefits of this country for all Americans (not just the wealthy).

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

1987. Re: ARRL has no FIRE for sale? The Newsline Has It!!!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-31 20:59:16 UTC
From: radiomaker@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031031155916.23287.00000083@mb-m20.aol.com>
Source record: 81663

The Newsline folks have an on the scene report from a Red Cross Shelter right near ther fireline. I guess thats the difference between being there or being 3000 miles away. Go to www.arnewsline.org and click on their newscast number at the top of thir page. Its in mp3 audio.

1988. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-31 21:37:14 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3FA2D60A.6030402@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 81664

Kim W5TIT wrote:

>Dwight, I don't know how it is where you are, but here there is no one
>willing to do the work a lot of our immigrant population are willing to
>do--and do.
>
>I remember many times asking my teen-aged son to go get a job and, when he'd
>retort with, "there aren't any jobs," I would mention some of the things I
>knew were available: farm work (building fences, etc.); any fast food chain,
>stock clerk, etc. He was indignant, at best, when he thought his mother
>would suggest such a thing to her own son...that was not work he was about
>to go do.
>
You don't want him working in a Wal Mart, do you ;-)

One thing these low paying crap jobs teach to teenagers is that they should
go to college and graduate so that they can get good jobs that pay well.
Before I graduated college (BSEE) I was worthless on the job market.
Then when graduation was only months away, my value suddenly went
up. And except for the past year or so (I'm voting for the Democrat
candidate,
whoever that might be), my value has been pretty good.

Just be sure that your son majors in something employers want to hire
(not much market for "Ancient Greek Physiology") that makes the trip
to college worthwhile.

>
>Now, I meet adults with the same attitude. I am very thankful for that part
>of my community with people who are willing to take on the immense task of
>the "physical labor" jobs that many of us wouldn't be caught doing. Very
>thankful indeed, for no one else would do them.
>
Well, I do mow my own lawn.....

1989. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-31 21:51:56 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <0QAob.13772$X22.4915@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 81665

"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
news:c2356669.0310310904.1fc51c87@posting.google.com...
> "Kim" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:<bns7bk$oub@library1.airnews.net>...
> > "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
> > news:pqKnb.10966$FI2.5053@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> > > "N2EY" wrote:
> > > >
> > > > Then what's the answer? Shall we eliminate all immigration,
> > > > or just the illegals? Who gets to decide who should be kept
> > > > out and who should be admitted, other than obvious threats
> > > > to security? (snip)
> > > >
> > > > (snip) Almost 100 years ago, my grandparents came to the
> > > > United States from Italy. They left in part because of the 1906
> > > > earthquake, but mostly because they wanted a better life than
> > > > they could get in Italy at that time.
>
> Y'know, it's interesting that so far nobody has directly answered the
> question as to whether my grandparents should have been allowed into
> the country...

The process by which individuals apply to legally enter the USA on
a resident basis is well defined already. The complaint of many, including
myself, is that too may people (good, bad or indiffernet) byass the
process and enter "illegally" while others do the right thing. I have a
friend who went through almost 2 years of approvals before he was
allowed to enter the USA as a resident alien...and he was born and
raised in the UK, is college educated, no police record, etc.

Back in whatever the year was that your (N2EY) granparents came to the
US, odds are they did so legally following the
legal process at the time. If so, then of course they should have
been allowed to come here.

> > > Times change. Years ago, there were great open spaces throughout
America
> > > just waiting for new immigrates to settle. Those shopkeepers,
craftsmen,
> > > farmers, laborers, and so on, clearly benefited a new nation. The
benefits
> > > today are subtle and the problems (job shortages and so on) more
> > pronounced.
> > > Because of that, we have to cut back on immigration at some point. We
> > can't

> > > have the entire world's population, or even a significant portion of
it,
> > > living here. I think we've reached that point - the point where we cut
> > back
> > > on immigration except for the very most extreme cases. And when I say
> > > extreme cases, I mean extreme cases. Economic considerations would not
> > > qualify. Those facing persecution or death in their home country would
> > only
> > > be allowed to stay only as long as those threats exist, after which
they
> > > must leave. To fill labor shortages here, we should retrain those
already
> > > here.
> > > Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
> > >
> >
> > Dwight, I don't know how it is where you are, but here there is no one
> > willing to do the work a lot of our immigrant population are willing to
> > do--and do.
> >
> > I remember many times asking my teen-aged son to go get a job and, when
he'd
> > retort with, "there aren't any jobs," I would mention some of the things
I
> > knew were avaiable: farm work (building fences, etc.); any fast food
chain,
> > stock clerk, etc. He was indignant, at best, when he thought his mother
> > would suggest such a thing to her own son...that was not work he was
about
> > to go do.
>
> What was his problem? Did he feel the jobs were "beneath his dignity"
> or some such?

Good question. The same attitude oftern seems to be in place
with welfare recipients. They only want to take jobs they approve
of.

> What sort of work did he expect to do as a teenager without special
> skills?

Ditto my last comments.

> > Now, I meet adults with the same attitude. I am very thankful for that
part
> > of my community with people who are willing to take on the immense task
of
> > the "physical labor" jobs that many of us wouldn't be caught doing.
Very
> > thankful indeed, for no one else would do them.
> >

> The question that comes to mind is "why won't they do those jobs?"
> Obviously every worker with any sense is going to go for the "best" job
> they can find, but when someone is unemployed for a considerable
> length of time....

Ditto again.

> And there are some jobs which are hazardous enough to make one think
> twice.

But those jobs usually aren't minimum wage jobs...they tend to pay
better wages because of the danger.

> If you want a snapshot of how bad things can get, there's an excellent
> book and PBS documentary on the building of Hoover Dam. I hope and
> pray that I'm never, ever as desperate as some of those workers had to
> be in order to take some of those jobs. Like drilling holes for
> explosives in a rock face several hundred feet up, sitting on a
> boatswain's chair with no safety harness, no net, not even a hard hat.
> And if ya fell, they'd leave your dead body lying there until change
> of shift (unless it was in the way, then they'd move it). Mustn't slow
> down the work.

Times were pretty tough then and there were almost
no safety regulations (OSHA, etc.)

> Or working in a diversion tunnel full of carbon monoxide exhaust fumes
> because the company insisted on using internal combustion engines in
> the tunnels, which lacked adequate ventilation systems.
>
> The project was finished ahead of schedule and under budget. Project
> manager got a bonus of something like $300,000, workers got a pink
> slip. 65 workers died to build it. How many years' salary for an
> average worker was $300,000 in those Depression times?

The Panama canal was another killer of workers...although more from illness
than accidents.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1990. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-31 21:57:54 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <CVAob.13792$X22.3547@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 81666

"Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
news:3FA29563.8030502@psu.edu...
> Dwight Stewart wrote:
> > "N2EY" wrote:
> >
> >>OK fine. You wanna do migrant farm labor?
> >
> > If I could still physically do it, I'd be thrilled to do so, Jim. My
> > grandmother owned a huge farm in North Carolina and I truly enjoyed
going
> > there every summer during my teenage years to work. I worked
side-by-side
> > with the hired laborers and did every single job they did. However,
because
> > of the low wages for most of those jobs today, I certainly wouldn't do
some
> > those jobs today (even if I could physically do so). However, a few
farmers
> > in the area still pay well and they have no problems finding labor. If I
> > could do it, I wouldn't mind doing one of those jobs one summer just for
the
> > fun of it.
>
> Here lies the rub, Dwight! Although I disagree with a lot of your views
> on race, you are spot on on this thread sub-subject.
>
> The reason that this is "undesirable" work is simply because the
> producers are allowed to get away with paying such low wages. If they
> don't even pay minimum, how is a citizen even supposed to legally hold
> the job?
>
> Heck, even Wal Mart is doing it now. They've been caught using illegal
> immigrant labor on contract for cleaning. (I can just hear Paul Harvey
> "You couldn't have a better neighbor, I suppose *they* can't afford to
> pay decent wages?

Why does WalMart have an obligation to "police" the pay scale of
a contractor's employees. As a homeowner, I "hire" contractors now
and then to do various jobs...it ain't my responsibility to know
how much Company X contractor pays its employees

> People picked crops as citizens long before it became "undesireable"
> work that could only be filled by illegal immigrants.

Heck, some folks PAY for the privilege of "pick your own" (enter appropriate farm product name).

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1991. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-31 22:00:47 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <jYAob.13804$X22.6643@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 81667

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:i2zob.13571$X22.13287@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> "charlesb" wrote:
> >
> > Government does not and cannot provide prosperity.
>
> But government was created exactly to "...promote the general welfare
and
> secure the blessings of liberty for ourselves and our posterity..." In my
> opinion, those blessings include a decent living and a fair share in the
> benefits of this country for all Americans (not just the wealthy).

But those that are unwilling to work when they are able to,
shouldn't expect the handout (IMHO).

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1992. Re: What If.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-31 22:11:42 UTC
From: dennis@wawa.juniper.net
Message-ID: <bnummu$21h2$1@heap.juniper.net>
Source record: 81668

N2EY <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote:
>dennis@wawa.juniper.net (Dennis Ferguson) wrote
>> determining compliance with the regulations. In this case, the builder
>> is expected to employ good engineering practices to meet the specified
>> technical standards to the greatest extent practicable. The provisions
>> of Sec. 15.5 apply to this equipment.
>>
>I'd say the provisions of Sec 15.5 are quite restricting, though....

It depends on the particulars of the application, and one's good luck,
I guess, since 15.5's primary effect is to make it uncertain whether
or not a Part 15 device will be (and will continue to be) usable. Given
the bizzilions of Part 15 transceivers sold to people who seem happy with
their purchase, however, it is clear that many have suffered no constraints
from 15.5 which bother them. For some applications the probability of
being constrained by 15.5 seems to be pretty small in practice.

Note too that the ARS is also (though differently) constrained with
respect to applications, particularly by 97.113 and 97.115. Whether
the ARS restrictions or the Part 15 restrictions are more onerous
depend a lot on what use you want to make of the devices you build.

Dennis Ferguson

1993. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-31 23:05:40 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <8VBob.16121$FI2.7777@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 81669

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:i2zob.13571$X22.13287@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> "charlesb" wrote:
> >
> > Government does not and cannot provide prosperity.
>
>
> But government was created exactly to "...promote the general welfare
and
> secure the blessings of liberty for ourselves and our posterity..." In my
> opinion, those blessings include a decent living and a fair share in the
> benefits of this country for all Americans (not just the wealthy).
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
>
>

I get it....the federal government takes from the states, the states take from its workers. The Federal government redistributes the monies received from the state and the people back to the states, that now redistributes it to the people.

Sounds like the failed Socialist system....just with one more step.

Sorry.....that ain't what is 'supposed' to happen in this country. Don't get me started on that one.

Dan/W4NTI

1994. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-31 23:08:27 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <LXBob.16125$FI2.531@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 81670

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:jYAob.13804$X22.6643@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net...
>
> "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
> news:i2zob.13571$X22.13287@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> > "charlesb" wrote:
> > >
> > > Government does not and cannot provide prosperity.
> >
> > But government was created exactly to "...promote the general welfare
> and
> > secure the blessings of liberty for ourselves and our posterity..." In
my
> > opinion, those blessings include a decent living and a fair share in the
> > benefits of this country for all Americans (not just the wealthy).
>
> But those that are unwilling to work when they are able to,
> shouldn't expect the handout (IMHO).
>
> Cheers,
> Bill K2UNK
>
>
>
>
>

In the beginning.....there was Philadelphia.

It was decided to have a looooooose confederation of states brought together under a weak Federal government. The purpose of which was to provide such things as; common roads, common monies, common rules and regulations pertaining to INTERSTATE commerce. And if needed to provide for the defense of one, or all of the states.

What the hell happened?

Dan/W4NTI

1995. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-31 23:39:51 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <bpCob.6768$P%1.5643335@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 81671

"charlesb" <n5pvl@sbcglobal.net> wrote in message
news:V6sob.9164$r63.66685022@newssvr21.news.prodigy.com...
>
> "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
> news:1P3ob.10721$X22.6089@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> >
> > Why is it so impossible for this great country to
> > do what other countries have already done - provide decent wages for
> > workers, provide decent (not astronomical) profits for business, and
keep
> > market prices reasonable?
>
> Government does not and cannot provide prosperity.
>
> Charles Brabham, N5PVL
>

I would like to add that very few companies make astronomical profits. Most
make just enough to manage to stay in business.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

1996. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-31 23:40:39 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <W4CdnRg7GIDXaT-iRVn-hA@gbronline.com>
Source record: 81672

Dwight Stewart wrote:

>
> Another serious problem. It wouldn't have been so bad had the government
> invested that money over the years so it could bring in a healthy return,
> but they didn't. So what do we do now? First of all, money is available
> without raising taxes. The government collects billions of dollars in taxes
> each year. The question is where that money is spent. Do we buy new military
> hardware and finance art shows, or do we provide for the elderly? If we want
> to do all of that, we have to raise taxes. If we only want to do some of it,
> and cut some, we don't need to raise taxes. Some say cut the benefits for
> the elderly and keep the other stuff. I think we should cut some of the
> other stuff and keep the benefits for the elderly.

If the government would stop the foreign aid to those countries where
that aid mainly supports little 2-bit dictators we would have enough
money to take care of the elderly.

1997. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-10-31 23:43:57 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <W4CdnRs7GIC6aD-iRVn-hA@gbronline.com>
Source record: 81673

Dee D. Flint wrote:

> "charlesb" <n5pvl@sbcglobal.net> wrote in message
> news:V6sob.9164$r63.66685022@newssvr21.news.prodigy.com...
>
>>"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
>>news:1P3ob.10721$X22.6089@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net...
>>
>>>Why is it so impossible for this great country to
>>>do what other countries have already done - provide decent wages for
>>>workers, provide decent (not astronomical) profits for business, and
>
> keep
>
>>>market prices reasonable?
>>
>>Government does not and cannot provide prosperity.
>>
>>Charles Brabham, N5PVL
>>
>
>
> I would like to add that very few companies make astronomical profits. Most
> make just enough to manage to stay in business.
>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>
It's the CEO's that make the astronomical profits in the form of
salaries, stock options, and other golden parachute benefits.

1998. Unrepetant Sinner, Was Re: Robeson Apology???

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-01 00:39:57 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0310311639.7b5be021@posting.google.com>
Source record: 81674

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0310291854.2292a6c2@posting.google.com>...
> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0310291532.5229bc6c@posting.google.com>...
> > k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0310290754.5cf3733d@posting.google.com>...
>
> > > Just be sure your "insinuations" stay that way, Mr. Burke.
> >
> > There never was an insinuation, Mr. Robeson. It was a case of your
> > misunderstanding and a dose of your wishful thinking.
>
> I don't think that your previously archived comments might be
> read that way.

And there-in lies your major problem, Stebe, you don't think.

> For an offense to have occured, it onl;y requires that it be
> perceived as such.

I perceive you to be an unbalanced person. See my numerous posting
asking you to seek help. Again, please seek help.

And I perceive an offense to have occured. You have threatened me in
full capitalization.

Additionally, you have misspelled the word, "onl;y," which according
to your own rules of netiquette, you are in a rage.

You as a trained and experienced US Marine Gunnery Sargeant, I
perceive those combinations of events to have placed me in a position
of harm.

I fear you, and I pray that you do not own a firearm.

> Personally, I think you were just pushing the limits of how
> offensive you could be and still get away with it.

What do you plan to do about it? I hope you don't kill me.

> It didn't work.

It must have. I am in fear of my life.

> > Thre's no apology to offer, Brain.

Another rageful misspelling. Geezus, is he going to hurt me? kill
me?

> > There should be. Why do you assume yourself to being above making
> > mistakes, such as the one you made above?
>
> As I pointed out, in order for an offense to have occured, the
> person only need have PERCEIVED that a threat was rendered.

You have convinced me. I am afraid that you are going to hurt me.

> I have warned you off, but you keep barrelling right on in.

I beg of you not to hurt me or my family.

> Were you born an idiot, or was this a life-long achievement?

Oh, thank goodness. You are merely going to call me names and not do
bodily harm to me or my family. I hope?

> > > I am TELLING you that ANY insinuation of use of firearms on MY
> > > person IS a threat, and that it's the LAST thing you want to do.
> >
> > I am telling you that there was no insinuation except in your capacity
> > to comprehend. And I still read a threat in your latest reply.
>
> No threat. A warning. A thrat implies a violent, illegal
> response.

Oh, damnit!!! Another mispelling. And a threat of doing something
illegal!!!

Are you going to assault me. Kill me? Kill my family???

Stebe, you've crossed the line!

I tell you to back off. Apologize.

Trust me, if you keep this up, the result will be anything
> BUT illegal...And expensive I might add.

Perhaps Extra-illegal? And funerals are so expensive. Thank goodness
I have burial insurance and the government will provide a flag for my
funeral.

> > Now move on to your apology.
>
> None will follow, unless YOU would care to express one for
> uttering language that was perceived as a suggestion that you might
> hold a gun to one's head, Brain.

I never expressed even as a suggestion that I would hold a gun to
one's head, let alone your head.

It is all in Google.

But by your rageful responses (by your own definition), I now fear for
my life.

> And incase the last few hints didn't hit home with you, I suggest
> you discuss with legal representation of your choice what can be
> perceived as a threat.

Noted and done. Hopefully you have done the same. Hopefully your
legal representation didn't recommend you do something "

> > > Someone else in this forum tried that, and I can tell you that he
> > > found out that my reach exceeds the length of my arms to this
> > > keyboard...And the results were expensive AND quite legal.
> >
> > I am not someone else in this forum.
>
> But you MIGHT be someone NEXT, Brain.

You've hurt others? Dear God, what kind of person am I dealing with?

> > Meanwhile, I still read a threat in your response.
>
> A warning. I perceive your references to the holding of a gun to
> my head as a threat. If you meant it any other way you may, in the
> next response to this thread, express a retraction of that statement
> and an apology for the anxiety it caused.

I never said, nor meant, nor insinuated that I would hold a gun to
your head. I refer you to the first reference, where I said I wasn't
holding a gun to your head. I wonder why anxiety was present if for
not some mental problem on your part.

Hopefully, you have no history of counseling that might suggest that
you are an anxious person.

Do you have a history of counseling?

> Otherwise I will assume your intent WAS to cause it, and I can
> proceed accordingly if you insist.

Your assumptions make for skunky gossip, nothing more. I suggest you
refer to real life. There was no intent to cause you anxiousness.

Are you a "naturally" anxious person?

> > Now move on to your apology.
>
> What apology?

The apology that I demand from you for putting me in fear of my life,
from a trained Marine who has stated that he would do something
violent and ILLEGAL (see above).

That apology.

> > > No, Brain...On THIS one I am sure.
> >
> > The fool is always so sure, especially when they're wrong.
>

> And in this case when he refuses to admit that he uttered words
> that were percieved as threatening and offensive.

Yes, those threats that you've been uttering. Those mispelling that indicate that you're in a rage. The training that you've received in the US Marine Corps to kill people from faraway places. Your words about doing something violent and illegal!

Those perceptions that I hold based upon your very own words.

...all of those things that you've uttered that I perceive as life-threatening.

> Which would be you...
>
> > Gunny, you need to move on to your apology.
>
> What apology?

The apology that you are about to render.

I'll give you an out - an out that many a thousand soldier has taken. No Captain's Mast. No Article 15. No prison time. No fine. No nothing.

In your next posting, simply state: "No excuse, Sir," and be done with it.

Nothing else.

Absolutely no shame in it.

Be a good soldier and get on with it.

Brian/N0iMD

1999. FS Hitlers Toothpick

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-01 00:46:41 UTC
From: twistedhed@webtv.net
Message-ID: <bnuvphjed1@news.x-echo.com>
Source record: 81675
Cross-posted to: rec.antiques,rec.radio.swap,rec.radio.amateur.policy

For Sale, toothpick used by Adolph Hitler. It is authentic because
there is a letter (signed by me) saying so. Comes with a photo of
Hitler with his hand near his face (no one can prove he is NOT using thi
s toothpick) as corroboration. I am asking $1500. If you don't like the
price, let's talk.Please email me at twistedhed@webtv.net.

=-
Article poste via Voila News - http://www.news.voila.fr
Le : Sat Nov 1 01:46:41 2003 depuis l'IP : ac816f32.ipt.aol.com [VIP 532284301978]

2000. Re: FS Hitlers Toothpick

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-01 00:51:23 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <fsDob.11501$MR1.2090@news01.roc.ny>
Source record: 81676
Cross-posted to: rec.antiques,rec.radio.swap,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Folks,

Read the headers. This is (obviously) not Twist. However, there is a line
as to where complaints can be sent in the headers if anyone is interested.

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

2001. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-01 00:51:33 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <psDob.532$Bf7.460860@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 81677

Bill Sohl wrote:
> "Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
> news:3FA29563.8030502@psu.edu...
>
>>Dwight Stewart wrote:
>>
>>>"N2EY" wrote:
>>>
>>>
>>>>OK fine. You wanna do migrant farm labor?
>>>
>>> If I could still physically do it, I'd be thrilled to do so, Jim. My
>>>grandmother owned a huge farm in North Carolina and I truly enjoyed
>
> going
>
>>>there every summer during my teenage years to work. I worked
>
> side-by-side
>
>>>with the hired laborers and did every single job they did. However,
>
> because
>
>>>of the low wages for most of those jobs today, I certainly wouldn't do
>
> some
>
>>>those jobs today (even if I could physically do so). However, a few
>
> farmers
>
>>>in the area still pay well and they have no problems finding labor. If I
>>>could do it, I wouldn't mind doing one of those jobs one summer just for
>
> the
>
>>>fun of it.
>>
>>Here lies the rub, Dwight! Although I disagree with a lot of your views
>>on race, you are spot on on this thread sub-subject.
>>
>>The reason that this is "undesirable" work is simply because the
>>producers are allowed to get away with paying such low wages. If they

>>don't even pay minimum, how is a citizen even supposed to legally hold
>>the job?
>>
>>Heck, even Wal Mart is doing it now. They've been caught using illegal
>>immigrant labor on contract for cleaning. (I can just hear Paul Harvey
>>"You couldn't have a better neighbor, I suppose *they* can't afford to
>>pay decent wages?
>
>
> Why does WalMart have an obligation to "police" the pay scale of
> a contractor's employees. As a homeowner, I "hire" contractors now
> and then to do various jobs...it ain't my responsibility to know
> how much Company X contractor pays its employees

For the same reason they might want a contractors employees tested for drugs. For the same reason you might not want to invest in an organization that has practices you don't like. Wal Mart has accountants, the accountants know - or should know - the hours needed to do a certain function, therefore they should have an idea what it should cost to contract out a service. If a bid comes in below what it should cost, the contract company is either not doing the job it should, is using illegal help, or is so incredibly efficient that the hiring company should have the contracting company do some seminars on how they got so efficient.

You might want to think about your practice of apathy toward subcontractors. One way that they can charge lower prices is to not carry insurance. I recently had tree work done, and we got several quotes. We asked the lowest couple quotes to provide proof of insurance. Guess what? No insurance. So I do want to know a few things about those who I hire. YMMV. For myself I won't try to stand up for something illegal.

- Mike KB3EIA -

2002. Re: Element 1, Code vs. No-code, and Dad

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-01 00:53:24 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0310311653.21bb5886@posting.google.com>
Source record: 81678

N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<c2356669.0310310932.1bcc779c@posting.google.com>...
> Answering my own question:
>
> > And what the heck is a "feldwebel"?
>
> "Corporal"
>
> Godwin's Law invoked.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

Now you have conversations with yourself.

Definitely past the bi-focal stage.

Let me know when you have discussions with Finley Morse.

I've got a few questions.

2003. Re: FCC Regualtions & Public Entities Policies

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-01 00:55:04 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <IvDob.11502$MR1.2569@news01.roc.ny>
Source record: 81679

Sir,

Mr. Kane has a life *and* an education.
Are you jealous?

Curious in Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

2004. Re: Amateur Radio in the 21st Century?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-01 00:55:08 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <MvDob.16255$FI2.5145@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 81680

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20031027222947.06226.00001204@mb-m19.aol.com...
> In article <Caknb.8872$FI2.7958@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Bill
Sohl"
> <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
>
> >"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
> >news:c2356669.0310270917.2668311b@posting.google.com...
> >> "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
> >news:<7O0nb.4484$X22.1484@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> >> > "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> >> > news:20031024182942.12300.00001303@mb-m20.aol.com...
> >> > > In article <3F993128.6080401@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
> >writes:
>
> >> KL7CC & Co. have already done so. Have you read their paper?
> >
> >No, is it on a web site?.
>
> http://www.qsl.net/al7fs/
>
> Second item down - "Amateur Radio in the 21st Century"
>
> You can skim through the code test stuff - we've agreed to disagree on
that.
> What is really interesting is the *other* ideas, such as what should
happen to
> the entry-level license class, free upgrades, written testing....
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

Jim, et al;

Some interesting and thought provoking suggestions/proposals.

I agree we'll just have to disagree on the code testing, but IF folks are
looking for a tp down revamp of licensing for US hams, Jim (KL7CC)
has certainly stirred the pot.

Maybe a good place to start would be the proposed "Communicator"
entry/beginners exam. Personally I think the applicant needs
some command of Part 97 rules...not all, but at least those that
would lay out the rules for Communicator license. I have always felt
memorizing
band edges makes little sense on a test because they do and have changed

over time. I'd like to know the applicant could at least read a frequency chart and be able to answer questions regarding the privileges for his/her license. That could be "open book" where the frequency chart is provided. Other basic questions probably should require some recallable knowledge (e.g. music is forbidden, etc.)

If you haven't read the KL7CC white paper, here's where you can find it:

http://www.qsl.net/al7fs/NCVECplan.doc

One interesting proposal sure to either enrage or please is the free upgrades for Tech and Advanced. Personally, and I have no stake in this as I'm already Extra, the idea of free upgrades doesn't bother me at all
if it ultimately results in a set of license classes that make sense with regard
to privileges vs requirements. The other two alternatives are:
(1) certain existing licenses would lose privileges (not a good track record on that as we saw in 1968) or
(2) we keep the existing licneses plus the newly defined ones and wait for the old licenses to go SK. Probably not what the FCC wants for enforcement and rules simplification.

Further commentary ad discussion welcome.

And a curse to the first person who introduces any of the lexicon of name calling rather than attempt credible dialog or debate.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2005. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-01 00:55:32 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <8wDob.534$Bf7.462158@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 81681

Dee D. Flint wrote:

> I would like to add that very few companies make astronomical profits. Most
> make just enough to manage to stay in business.

You would think they would pay their CEO's a tad less then!

- Mike KB3EIA -

2006. Re: What If.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-01 00:55:58 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0310311655.2cc76235@posting.google.com>
Source record: 81682

N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<c2356669.0310310923.9c6b258@posting.google.com>...
> >
> I'd say the provisions of Sec 15.5 are quite restricting, though....

Millions of dollars are spent each year saying they aren't....

Don't you wish you had a percentage?

2007. Re: Must be an East Coast thing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-01 01:01:05 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0310311701.5d69c38@posting.google.com>
Source record: 81683

"Grï¿½mwï¿½tch thï¿½ ï¿½nflï¿½ppï¿½blï¿½"
<Grï¿½mwï¿½tch@NOSPAM.THANKS.IM.FULL.lycos.co.de> wrote in message
news:<0swob.9690$RQ1.4029@newsread3.news.pas.earthlink.net>...
> You hadda know Mendelmouth would get his name in the paper!

What? No kudos for those that do?

Kudos for those who resent?

You've been flapped.

2008. Re: FCC Regualtions & Public Entities Policies

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-01 01:18:22 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0310311718.3e1296f1@posting.google.com>
Source record: 81684

"Phillip Michael" <gtg154a@mail.gatech.edu> wrote in message
news:<bnmm64$s4v$1@news-int.gatech.edu>...
> Is an entity such as a public school allowed to adopt a policy that allow
> them to confiscate any device on their property that interferes with their
> wireless devices?

Dunno. For example?

> For example:
> Both devices are Part 15.
> The school owns a wireless access point.
> A student owns a cordless phone.
>
> If a cordless phone interferes with a wireless access point and
> the school's policy says "they have the right to confiscate any device that
> interferes with their wireless network"
> Does the school really have the right to confiscate the cordless phone?

Not only can't they confiscate it, but they cannot even monitor it.

Since the Gingrich interception, the monitoring of cellular and
cordless phones has been illegal. But you knew that.

See any scanner catalog. Notice the really expensive scanners that
anyone overseas can purchase really cheap, but not you?

Those expensive scanners are for law enforcement agencies only. They
receive cellular frequencies. See the fine print.

To be able to monitor cellular or cordless phones requires a law
enforcement agency and a judge. The judge services the search
warrant/wire tap. Except for homeland security. I think just about
anything goes there.

Schools are not law enforcement agencies, or are they?

> Also if a student's device is under part 97 do you still have the right to
> confiscate it?

Barrister Phil should say no. But lately he's been saying all sorts
of things.

> Here is a phrase from Part 15.5.b
> interference must be accepted that may be caused by the operation of an
> authorized radio station
>
> Does this only apply to a device or to an individual using a device?

Are Part 15 devices authorized?

Part 15 says they are. Doesn't say "who" is authorized to use them.
I assume they are lawfully used by citizens, hams, school children,
and even Taliban.

I'm not a communications attorney, nor do I pretend to be one on
R.R.A.P., but Phil might be able to help you - if he's not mistaken.

2009. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-01 01:23:52 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031031202352.08626.00001528@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 81685

In article <LXBob.16125$FI2.531@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dan/W4NTI"
<w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> writes:

>In the beginning.....there was Philadelphia.

It's still here.
>
>It was decided to have a looooooose confederation of states brought together
>under a weak Federal government. The purpose of which was to provide such
>things as; common roads, common monies, common rules and regulations
>pertaining to INTERSTATE commerce. And if needed to provide for the defense
>of one, or all of the states.

Yep - Articles of Confederation.
>
>What the hell happened?

Simple - the founders discovered that the Articles simply didn't work. Without a strong central (federal) government, there was no way to force any of the states to work for the common good if they didn't want to.

Common roads, common monies, common rules and regulations pertaining to interstate commerce and defense of one, or all of the states all require a certain amount of central authority and funding. If New York's legislature decided they didn't want to honor money from South Carolina at face value, who was there to make them? Or if a ship from Maryland didn't want to take orders from an admiral from Maine, what authority was there to require them to do so?

And when it came to taxes.....

End result was another convention here in Philadelphia in 1787, when the Constitution was written and ratified by representatives from all of the states. Three did not sign - they refused to do so because there was no Bill of Rights in the original Constitution. That was rectified by the first ten amendments.

You may not like everyhting the Feds do - I know I sure don't! - but the founders tried the loose confederation idea and it didn't work.

And when it was tried again (1861-1865, 11 states) it ran into the same problems all over again.

In some ways the Feds have been moving towards a weaker central government, by cutting domestic spending - and letting the states take up the slack. Of course the Feds don't give up regulatory control, just funding....

What functions would you have the Feds turn over to the states?

73 de Jim, N2EY

2010. Re: FCC Regualtions & Public Entities Policies

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-01 01:35:18 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0310311735.1dc0018e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 81686

groupk0hb@earthlink.net (Hans K0HB) wrote in message
news:<5ee63311.0310300955.6d30447c@posting.google.com>...
> lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote
>
> > In article <5ee63311.0310282135.2255b289@posting.google.com>,
> > groupk0hb@earthlink.net (Hans K0HB) writes:
> >
> > >Since a
> > >cell phone transmits a signal even when not placing a call, they can
> > >require that the unit be turned off at all times while on the
> > >premises.
> >
> > It does?
>
> Yes, Lenover, it does.

To which question do you answer?

Transmitting a signal even when its not placing a call?

Requirement to turn off a -lawfully- allowed RF device?

Hopefully not yes to both.

> > Oh, yes, the receiver's Local Oscillator "transmits" a
> > picayune picoWatt or so...
>
> And much more than the picayunish oscillator leakage you allude to (if
> the receiver is even so crude as to have an actual Local
> Oscillator)......

Instead of the "DX" oscillator?

I've heard of cell site conmfirmation from 27 nm.

Thank goodness cell phones don't require a knowledge of Morse Code.

It would have been a monumental flop.

> As soon as a cell phone is powered up it immediately establishes radio
> communications with the MTSO over the control channel, comparing
> SID's, negotiating a registration request, and other similar
> housekeeping chores.

Just relax and call it handshaking.

This radio communications occurs even if you
> never actually place an outgoing call or recieve an incoming call.

Doesn't even rate a "duh!"

That's why you find guys at the other end of the tunnel standing by with computer controlled "law enforcement" scanners logging all the codes as you pop out the other side and handshake with the local cell site.

Then they sell them to Taliban operatives and drug dealers.

> Sunuvagun!
>
> With all kind wishes,
>
> de Hans, K0HB

Yeh. Dittos

Brian

2011. Re: Tampa Turd Jail Dale's forgotten FELONY, Jessica too?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-01 01:50:14 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0310311750.723fe2a4@posting.google.com>
Source record: 81687
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.swap,rec.radio.amateur.policy

joe2 <joe2@fake.com> wrote in message news:<iRkob.2361$un.221@bignews6.bellsouth.net>...
> The family that felons together, stays together???? Looks like KE4TEW is
> the head of a large group of Florida Convicts.
>
> joe2 wrote:
>
> > Poor Jail Dale, a whole family full of convicts.
> >
> > Anonymous Sender wrote:
> >
> >> In article <20031029092618.03477.00000353@mb-m19.news.cs.com>
> >> ke4tew@cs.com (KE4TEW) wrote:
> >>
> >>>
> >>> I think it's obvious to anyone there's no basis for this.
> >>
> >>
> >>
> >> It's also obvious you are lying. How much weed were you intending to
> >> distribute, Jail Dale?
> >> Nickle bag, dime bag, a kilo?
> >> Was your barrio whore Rita's income down that month because of her
> >> hysterectomy and you needed the cash?
> >>
> >>
> >>> There is NO record of me having a felony conviction.
> >>
> >>
> >>
> >> That's not what the records show, convicted drug dealer.
> >>
> >>
> >>> Instead of posting BS anon, put your name to it
> >>> and someone may believe it.
> >>
> >>
> >>
> >> It comes directly from the Hillsborough County Court Records,
> >> Convicted FELON.
> >>
> >> The name and birthdate match yours on QRZ.com. It is YOU.
> >>
> >> James W Dale, KE4TEW

> >> 9217 W Patterson
> >> Tampa, FL 33615-2311
> >> USA
> >>
> >> Class: General
> >>
> >> Previous Call: KC4VCS
> >> Previous Class: Technician Plus
> >> Birth date: 01-01-1941
> >>
> >> SSN: 262-60-XXXX
> >>
> >> DL: D40045941XXXX issued in Florida on 11/04/1998 expires 01/01/2005
> >>
> >> Your son, James Henry Dale born 11-20-1961 is also listed, looks like
> >> he takes after you with the drug and alcohol abuse:
> >>
> >> First Name: JAMES
> >> Middle Name: HENRY
> >> Last Name: DALE
> >> Date of Birth: 11/20/1961
> >> Race: White
> >> Sex: Male
> >> Height:
> >> Hair:
> >> Eye Color:
> >> --------------- Detail Charges Found ---------------
> >> State: FLHLS
> >> Case #: 03-CF-010310
> >> County Name: HillsboroF
> >> Description: DRIVING WHILE LICENSE REVOKED-HABITUAL OFFENDR
> >> Class: FELONY THIRD DEGREE
> >> Statute:
> >> File Date: 06/19/2003
> >>
> >> The Dale family is one big lawbreaking jailbird family.
> >>
> >> The arrest of your son is the reason you had to hightail it back to
> >> Tampa from Long Island.
> >>
> >>
> >>
> >>> Dimmy wrote: Subject: Tampa Turd Jail Dale's forgotten FELONY
> >>> From: edo nobody@cryptorebels.net
> >>> Date: 10/28/03 11:59 PM Eastern Standard Time
> >>> Message-id: <e7cb3565549abffa134731375b000210@cryptorebels.net>
> >>>
> >>>
> >>> Direct from the Hillsborough County Court Records:
> >>>

> >>> First Name: JAMES
> >>> Middle Name: WILLIAM
> >>> Last Name: DALE
> >>> Date of Birth: 01/01/1941
> >>> Race: White
> >>> Sex: Male
> >>> Height: 6'00"
> >>> Hair:
> >>> Eye Color:
> >>> --------------- Detail Charges Found ---------------
> >>> State: FLHLS
> >>> Case #: 97-CF-004272
> >>> County Name: HillsboroO
> >>> Description: POSS OF MARIJUANA W/INTENT TO
> >>> Class: FELONY FIRST DEGREE
> >>> Statute:
> >>> File Date: 02/19/1997
> >>>
> >>> Looks like he has no room to criticize W4AMP, and has a kinship
> >>> chargewise with
> >>> Donnie Anderson.

Joe, pahleeeze - take it all back to R.R.A.Misc.

Thanks for understanding.

I owe you. Name it. I'll even put your call on a 10m beacon (but you better reply the SWL cards).

Brian

2012. Re: Reflections on rrap

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-01 01:59:33 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0310311759.424e44d@posting.google.com>
Source record: 81688

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0310291915.2be133e1@posting.google.com>...
> lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20031023205902.23171.00001689@mb-m05.aol.com>...
>
> >Assholes belong together.
>
> Lennie, is there a special "professional engineers only" course
> on "civil debate" techniques that you went to?

Holy Moley!

Do you actually accept that Len attended -and- graduated from an engineering school?

This is huge progress in the history of RRAP.

Do we have an Historian?

Where is Rev. Jim when you need him?

Brian

(Next we'll address the meaning of "professional engineer (PE)."

2013. Re: If the written test elements are so easy, why are we all not extras?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-01 02:04:41 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0310311804.1a1cd64c@posting.google.com>
Source record: 81689

JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
news:<R7WdnV3v4fQa4D2iRVn-hQ@gbronline.com>...
> Steve Robeson, K4CAP wrote:

> > He's REALLY upset that we do, WHAT we do and HOW we do it better
> > and without his "leadership".
>
> Along with the fact he can't pass the test.

Why cast such doubts?

I'm reasonably sure that Dave has passed the test in any number of
countries, under any number of sunspot cycles or storms.

2014. Re: A Morsodist Challenge

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-01 02:06:37 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0310311806.74a9bac4@posting.google.com>
Source record: 81690

groupk0hb@earthlink.net (Hans K0HB) wrote in message
news:<5ee63311.0310271046.9eb0f02@posting.google.com>...
> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote
>
> >
> > Hans specifically invited DICK.
> >
>
> "and the rest of rrap". Hopefully I'll find N0IMD in my log between
> 012100Z Nov 03 and 030300Z Nov 03 also?
>
> 73, de Hans, K0HB

Hans, do you accept collect calls?

;^)

Brian

2015. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-01 03:26:16 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bnv97j$78f@library2.airnews.net>
Source record: 81691

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:4Btob.15273$FI2.2791@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> "Kim W5TIT" wrote:
> > It behooves all of us to be just as indignant about
> > racism in any venue, regardless of ethnicity of the
> > racist.
>
>
> But whites are often the sole receipient of that indignation, Kim. Show
me
> a message anywhere in any of these newsgroups at any time where you've
> expressed any indignation whatsoever about the racism of any other racial
> group. If you're typical, I seriously doubt you can do so. Instead, you
> attempt to explain away the racism of others like you've done below.
>
>

I doubt I am typical, Dwight. I also don't know if you'd find any posts
like you describe above. However, you're quite wrong about my being
indignant toward *any* form of discrimination. I am and always have been,
as far as I know. I remember even as a kid being offended by such things.
I am just as adamant about women bashing men as I am about anyone else
bashing based on gender, race, etc.

> >
> > That having been said, I can understand some of the
> > seclusion each race enjoys from others, IF the purpose
> > is cultural. What is specific to a black mayors
> > conference are those things specifically related to black
> > issues in the community(ies) they represent. (snip)
>
>
> I thought a mayor is elected to represent the whole community, not
solely
> the "black issues in the community(ies) they represent." What about the
> whites issues in the communities they represent? Why aren't those black
> mayors getting together to discuss those?
>

Dwight, for goodness sake. I am not going to get into a huge idiosynchratic
dialogue with you about this issue. Suffice it to say that days like Black
Mayoral Conferences are set aside to deal specifically with, well, specific
things. I have no doubt that someone who is on the up and up about their
position in a community--regardless of who they are--is doing their job as
they should be. It sounds like it's an issue for you, though. Sorry I

don't buy into it.

>
> Since those black mayors won't,
> who does address those issues? Absolutely nobody is the only answer.
>

Then, I doubt they'll be in office long. It's as simple as that.

>
> If a
> white mayor, or any other politician (black or white, police chief to
> president), expresses even a hint of concern for white issues, the word
> "racist" is immediately thrown around.
>

Sure. By nitwits who don't know their ass from a hole in the ground. Do
you choose to listen to them, believe them, appreciate or agree with them?
I don't.

>
> In the end, a concern for whites is
> just about an ultimate sin in this government. And it is going to stay
that
> way until whites start demanding some representation for their issues in
> this government.
>

I don't know, Dwight. That sounds pretty serious to me...and I haven't
really witnessed such a thing. You point out behaviors that are certainly
around--I won't deny that. But, they are in the minority and displayed by
blithering idiots.

>
> > I am certain that if there were issues that needed addressing
> > in a "whites only" venue, then you'd see a white mayors
> > conference and, honestly, I am not so sure there isn't one.
>
>
> Be serious, Kim. First, I suspect a conference like that would be
> considered illegal by the Justice Department - minorities can but whites
> cannot. Second, if such a conference were held, groups throughout the
> country would be out outraged, demonstrations would be held, lawsuits
would
> be filed, and people like you would be running around screaming your
> indignation again.
>

"People like me"? People like me?! Describe a "people like me" won't you?
I'm quite offended by the characterization there, Dwight, I'll tell you
that.

The chaos you describe above is that of movies and books. I think this country and the people in it have moved a little bit further ahead than the concepts which you depict above. We're all still quite capable of senseless rage once in a while--but, for the most part, we've become very civil in our dealings with each other. Thank goodness for that. And, we have a long, long way to go.

>
> > What we may find generally attractive in a representative for
> > the United States in a Miss America, is totally different from
> > what the Black/Negro/Colored (depending on the part of
> > society and geographical/historical perspective you come from)
> > find in a representative specific to Black America.
>
>
> And that justifies the intentional and specific exclusion of other races
> in those pageants?
>

Yeah. Probably.

>
> Why would what you say not be true for whites, yet such
> an event held by whites which specificially excludes other races is
illegal.
>

I doubt that quite seriuosly. Check out many clubs around this country and let me know how many non-white members you see. Hell, there are probably some golf courses Tiger Woods isn't allowed on, for goodness sake.

>
> And I'll add to JJ's examples. What about black colleges which exclude
> other races?
>

Are you as upset about gender specific schools? I gave some other examples, such as women's sports, Girl Scouts, Boy Scouts, Masons, Eastern Star--all and many more of which are specific to "types" of membership, Dwight. I've got pretty much no problem with them.

>
> What about black owned businesses with not a single white
> employee in the entire building (many in my town alone)?
>

Aw, c'mon. How many non-Chinese people are working at your local Chinese restaraunt? Have *you* applied for a positoin at the company you mention, above? Maybe no one's applied. Not saying they don't practice discrimination. If they do, then they're as wrong as wrong can be. Do something about it.

>
> What about the

> "Negro College Fund" which offers benefits only to blacks. What about
"Black
> Entertainment Television?" I could list more. The point is that it would
all
> be illegal (discrimination) if done by whites.
>

I think you're going way, way overboard. What about "SPIKE" TV? Ya upset
about that?

>
> > I don't see that a all male organization is necessarily
> > discriminatory, either. (snip)
>
>
> If the goals of that male-only organization were to promote the
political
> and/or social advancement of males, would you still hold that same
opinion?
>

Personally, I *hope* they *are* promoting the political and/or social
advancement of males. Seen the requirements of some finishing schools
lately?

>
> > What about a sports organization that won't allow women?
>
>
> Based on physical strength, not racial, social, or ethnic,
considerations,
> Kim. There is a huge difference.
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
>
>

Pah....there it is. Now, that is as discriminatory as you can get, Dwight.
And, I'm glad you walked right into what I was hoping I'd be able to
demonstrate. Based on your opinion of women as demure and refined (ok, I'm
going overboard there), you believe that sports organizations are keeping
women out for the reason of their weakness. That's crap. You don't think
there's women who could train and get pumped up enough to be on a male
basketball team? Football, etc.? Sorry, I've seen 'em in the Ladies' Room.

We are all people. I have every comfort in people feeling the need to
"separate" into their corners once in a while. It is when the separatism
becomes hateful that I have a problem...

Kim W5TIT

2016. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-01 03:30:23 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031031223023.12631.00002522@mb-m28.aol.com>
Source record: 81694

In article <nQuob.15396$FI2.10235@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> writes:

>"N2EY" wrote:
>>
>> OK fine. You wanna do migrant farm labor?

> If I could still physically do it, I'd be thrilled to do so, Jim. My
>grandmother owned a huge farm in North Carolina and I truly enjoyed going
>there every summer during my teenage years to work. I worked side-by-side
>with the hired laborers and did every single job they did. However, because
>of the low wages for most of those jobs today, I certainly wouldn't do some
>those jobs today (even if I could physically do so). However, a few farmers
>in the area still pay well and they have no problems finding labor. If I
>could do it, I wouldn't mind doing one of those jobs one summer just for the
>fun of it.
>
That would be farm work, but not migrant farm labor, Dwight. Migrant farm labor travels around the country, following the harvest and the crops, and has to support themselves on whatever they get paid.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2017. Re: Amateur Radio in the 21st Century?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-01 03:30:23 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031031223023.12631.00002521@mb-m28.aol.com>
Source record: 81695

In article <MvDob.16255$FI2.5145@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Bill Sohl"
<billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20031027222947.06226.00001204@mb-m19.aol.com...
>> In article <Caknb.8872$FI2.7958@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Bill
>Sohl"
>> <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
>>
>> >"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
>> >news:c2356669.0310270917.2668311b@posting.google.com...
>> >> "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
>> >news:<7O0nb.4484$X22.1484@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
>> >> > "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>> >> > news:20031024182942.12300.00001303@mb-m20.aol.com...
>> >> > > In article <3F993128.6080401@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
>> >writes:
>> >>
>> >> KL7CC & Co. have already done so. Have you read their paper?
>> >>
>> >No, is it on a web site?.
>> >>
>> http://www.qsl.net/al7fs/
>> >>
>> Second item down - "Amateur Radio in the 21st Century"
>> >>
>> You can skim through the code test stuff - we've agreed to disagree on
>that.
>> What is really interesting is the *other* ideas, such as what should
>happen to
>> the entry-level license class, free upgrades, written testing....
>> >>
>> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>>
>Jim, et al;
>>
>Some interesting and thought provoking suggestions/proposals.
>>
>I agree we'll just have to disagree on the code testing, but IF folks are
>looking for a tp down revamp of licensing for US hams, Jim (KL7CC)
>has certainly stirred the pot.

Agreed - but not in the best way, IMHO.
>
>Maybe a good place to start would be the proposed "Communicator"

>entry/beginners exam. Personally I think the applicant needs
>some command of Part 97 rules...not all, but at least those that
>would lay out the rules for Communicator license.

If anything needs to be a part of the test, it's the rules and regs.

>I have always felt
>memorizing
>band edges makes little sense on a test because they do and have changed
>over time. I'd like to know the applicant could at least read a frequency
>chart and be able to answer questions regarding the privileges for
>his/her license. That could be "open book" where the frequency chart is
>provided. Other basic questions probably should require some
>recallable knowledge (e.g. music is forbidden, etc.)

Power levels, modes allowed, knowing you can't cuss or jam others, etc.

I think there is some sort of legal precedent that if something isn't in the
test syllabus, a licensed violator may have an out wrt prosecution.

>If you haven't read the KL7CC white paper, here's where you
>can find it:
>
>http://www.qsl.net/al7fs/NCVECplan.doc
>
>One interesting proposal sure to either enrage or please is the
>free upgrades for Tech and Advanced. Personally, and I have no stake
>in this as I'm already Extra, the idea of free upgrades doesn't bother me at
>all
>if it ultimately results in a set of license classes that make sense with
>regard
>to privileges vs requirements.

Free upgrades have a lot of downsides. For example, suppose that a tech gets a
free upgrade to General without ever taking Element 3 or its equivalent.
Doesn't that prove that Element 3 contains nothing that is essential for
General class privileges? Couldn't somebody claim that requiring new hams to
pass Element 3 (or 4) but not requiring existing hams to do the same is
discriminatory?

>The other two alternatives are:
>(1) certain existing licenses would lose privileges (not a good track
>record on that as we saw in 1968) or
>(2) we keep the existing licneses plus the newly defined ones and
>wait for the old licenses to go SK. Probably not what the FCC wants
>for enforcement and rules simplification.

I don't see what the problem is with (2). FCC has kept three "cul de sac"
license classes active for almost 4 years now (Tech Plus/Novice/Advanced) with
no real problems. They're just entries in a database.

And FCC turned down ARRL's idea of free General upgrades for existing Novices
and Tech Pluses.

>
>Further commentary ad discussion welcome.
>
>And a curse to the first person who introduces any of the lexicon
>of name calling rather than attempt credible dialog or debate.

AGREED!

There's also the part about the "no homebrew no voltages over 30" for the Communicator. Not good ideas at all - nor are they realistic.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2018. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-01 03:30:24 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031031223024.12631.00002523@mb-m28.aol.com>
Source record: 81693

In article <i2zob.13571$X22.13287@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> writes:

>"charlesb" wrote:
>>
>> Government does not and cannot provide prosperity.

> But government was created exactly to "...promote the general welfare and
>secure the blessings of liberty for ourselves and our posterity..."

Yep. Which means to help those things along, not guarantee them.

Equality of opportunity doesn't mean equality of result.

>In my
>opinion, those blessings include a decent living and a fair share in the
>benefits of this country for all Americans (not just the wealthy).
>
I agree!

Now how should the govt. go about promoting that? We've already talked about reducing immigration to increase demand for workers, thereby decreasing unemployment and increasing pay/benefit packages.

The law of supply and demand says that higher prices will be the result of such a move.

What else should be done?

73 de Jim, N2EY

2019. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-01 03:30:25 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031031223025.12631.00002524@mb-m28.aol.com>
Source record: 81692

In article <CVAob.13792$X22.3547@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Bill Sohl"
<billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:

>Heck, some folks PAY for the privilege of "pick your own" (enter
>appropriate farm product name).
>
But they get to keep what they pick.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2020. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-01 03:34:44 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bnv9ne$gt0@library2.airnews.net>
Source record: 81696

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:0Buob.15354$FI2.15268@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> "Kim W5TIT" wrote:
> >
> > Dwight, I don't know how it is where you are, but
> > here there is no one willing to do the work a lot of
> > our immigrant population are willing to do--and do.
>
>
> Nonsense, Kim. The reason most people aren't willing to do those jobs is
> because the wages are so low. Offer decent wages and people will gladly do
> those jobs.
>

I don't know about you, but I sure don't want to be paying the price of your
philosophy noted above. Oh. And how dare you tell me "nonsense," Dwight.
I am relaying to you things from my own experience and you say to me,
"NONSENSE?" Do you know how much like Larry Roll you are sounding?

>
> There are non-immigrant workers throughout this country busting
> their butts in construction jobs, laborer jobs, crappy jobs, and
dangerious
> jobs. They do so because the wages are decent. My god, there are even
people
> willing to walk into a nuclear reactor if the pay is good enough. Offer
> decent wages for almost ANY job and I'm fully convinced there will be
plenty
> of non-immigrant workers willing to do those jobs. I see nothing to even
> suggest otherwise.
>

And you'd better be ready to not be able to afford almost anything you buy
cheaply right now BECAUSE of things as they are.

>
> > I remember many times asking my teen-aged son to go
> > get a job and, when he'd retort with, "there aren't any
> > jobs," I would mention some of the things I knew were
> > avaiable: farm work (building fences, etc.); any fast food
> > chain, stock clerk, etc. He was indignant, at best, when
> > he thought his mother would suggest such a thing to her
> > own son...that was not work he was about to go do.
>
>

> Why should he work? He's living at home with mommy where everything is
> free and he's spoiled rotten.
>

Uh, I don't know what home you're talking about, but my kids were not
spoiled rotten. They got no car unless they bought it themselves. They did
NOT get any monetary support from me for any of their wants or needs in any
area except school and clothing. And, they were told they could either
spend my $200.00 on one outfit at Gadzooks for the whole schoolyear, or they
could go to Wal-Mart and get several pairs of Rustler Jeans and some shirts
and shoes.

>
> When he is old enough, throw his butt out and
> watch how fast his work ethic changes. In the meantime, sharply reduce the
> money you give him (no car, no fancy school cloths, no expensive shoes, no
> music CD's, no stereo, and so on) and tell him to get a job if he wants
> those extras. After he throws a temper tantrum for a few months, wears out
> of the stuff he has now, and realises you're serious, a job will look much
> more appealing to him. He will have to do all this eventually anyway, so
now
> is a good time to start properly preparing him for his future. Later, once
> he has to start paying for them, he'll miss the free food you gave him and
> the free shelter you provided.
>

Like I said. Don't know whose home you've been peering into, but it ain't
mine. My sons are long from teen-aged any more.

>
> > Now, I meet adults with the same attitude. I am very
> > thankful for that part of my community with people who
> > are willing to take on the immense task of the "physical
> > labor" jobs that many of us wouldn't be caught doing.
> > Very thankful indeed, for no one else would do them.
>
>
> Like those other adults you mention, there are many jobs I will not do
> today, Kim. I can't afford to do those low paying jobs if I want to feed
my
> family, live in a decent home, and make the car payments. And I'm
certainly
> not willing to live twenty to a hotel room or apartment like you see so
many
> poor illegal immigrants doing today. And, lets face it, I just can't
> physically do some of those jobs anymore. But none of that suggests for a
> moment that I'm not willing to work. Likewise, none of that suggests there
> are no younger non-immigrants willing to do those jobs if the wages were
> decent.
>
>

> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
>
>

Didn't say you aren't willing to work. And you're comments above about how tough those jobs are for very little pay and how you wouldn't do them...just highlights exactly what I was saying.

Kim W5TIT

2021. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-01 03:38:05 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bnv9tn$j14@library2.airnews.net>
Source record: 81697

"Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
news:3FA29563.8030502@psu.edu...
> Dwight Stewart wrote:
> > "N2EY" wrote:
> >
> >>OK fine. You wanna do migrant farm labor?
> >
> >
> >
> > If I could still physically do it, I'd be thrilled to do so, Jim. My
> > grandmother owned a huge farm in North Carolina and I truly enjoyed
going
> > there every summer during my teenage years to work. I worked
side-by-side
> > with the hired laborers and did every single job they did. However,
because
> > of the low wages for most of those jobs today, I certainly wouldn't do
some
> > those jobs today (even if I could physically do so). However, a few
farmers
> > in the area still pay well and they have no problems finding labor. If I
> > could do it, I wouldn't mind doing one of those jobs one summer just for
the
> > fun of it.
>
>
> Here lies the rub, Dwight! Although I disagree with a lot of your views
> on race, you are spot on on this thread sub-subject.
>

No, the damned rub is in how much our products would cost if the jobs
migrant and transient workers do were paid at much higher pay
scales!!!!!!!!!!!! Not that I want to see anyone suffering...

However, I doubt you'd find the workforce needed to do the jobs even *with*
a higher payscale... Physical labor is an art these days.

Kim W5TIT

2022. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-01 03:43:46 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bnva8c$v6l@library2.airnews.net>
Source record: 81698

"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
news:c2356669.0310310904.1fc51c87@posting.google.com...
> "Kim" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:<bns7bk$oub@library1.airnews.net>...
> > "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
> > news:pqKnb.10966$FI2.5053@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> > > "N2EY" wrote:
> > > >
> > > > Then what's the answer? Shall we eliminate all immigration,
> > > > or just the illegals? Who gets to decide who should be kept
> > > > out and who should be admitted, other than obvious threats
> > > > to security? (snip)
> > > >
> > > > (snip) Almost 100 years ago, my grandparents came to the
> > > > United States from Italy. They left in part because of the 1906
> > > > earthquake, but mostly because they wanted a better life than
> > > > they could get in Italy at that time.
>
> Y'know, it's interesting that so far nobody has directly answered the
> question as to whether my grandparents should have been allowed into
> the country...
>

Well, I don't think you're looking for the answer from me...but, yes.

> > >
> > > Times change. Years ago, there were great open spaces throughout
America
> > > just waiting for new immigrates to settle. Those shopkeepers,
craftsmen,
> > > farmers, laborers, and so on, clearly benefited a new nation. The
benefits
> > > today are subtle and the problems (job shortages and so on) more
> > pronounced.
> > > Because of that, we have to cut back on immigration at some point. We
> > can't
> > > have the entire world's population, or even a significant portion of
it,
> > > living here. I think we've reached that point - the point where we cut
> > back
> > > on immigration except for the very most extreme cases. And when I say
> > > extreme cases, I mean extreme cases. Economic considerations would not
> > > qualify. Those facing persecution or death in their home country would
> > only
> > > be allowed to stay only as long as those threats exist, after which

they
> > > must leave. To fill labor shortages here, we should retrain those
already
> > > here.
> > >
> > >
> > > Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
> > >
> > > http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
> > >
> > >
> >
> > Dwight, I don't know how it is where you are, but here there is no one
> > willing to do the work a lot of our immigrant population are willing to
> > do--and do.
> >
> > I remember many times asking my teen-aged son to go get a job and, when
he'd
> > retort with, "there aren't any jobs," I would mention some of the things
I
> > knew were avaiable: farm work (building fences, etc.); any fast food
chain,
> > stock clerk, etc. He was indignant, at best, when he thought his mother
> > would suggest such a thing to her own son...that was not work he was
about
> > to go do.
>
> What was his problem? Did he feel the jobs were "beneath his dignity"
> or some such?
>

Yep. He was "better" than all that. And, his friends would see him!

>
> What sort of work did he expect to do as a teenager without special
> skills?
>

Kids want jobs behind computers these days...or at a minimum, with the least
amount of physical labor, and definitely "out of the elements."

> >
> > Now, I meet adults with the same attitude. I am very thankful for that
part
> > of my community with people who are willing to take on the immense task
of
> > the "physical labor" jobs that many of us wouldn't be caught doing.
Very
> > thankful indeed, for no one else would do them.
> >
> The question that comes to mind is "why won't they do those jobs?"

> Obviously ever worker with any sense is going to go for the "best" job
> they can find, but when someone is unemployed for a considerable
> length of time....
>

Heck *I* wouldn't do those jobs. When I worked farms as a teen ager up in
NY, I drove the tractor or leveled the silage delivery, etc. Ya think *I*
was going to lift those haybales into the wagon, scrape the cowpoop, etc.?
The older folks did all that stuff...we kids wouldn't do it! Well, at least
we kids who didn't have a vested interest in the farms...

>
> And there are some jobs which are hazardous enough to make one think
> twice.
>
> If you want a snapshot of how bad things can get, there's an excellent
> book and PBS documentary on the building of Hoover Dam. I hope and
> pray that I'm never, ever as desperate as some of those workers had to
> be in order to take some of those jobs. Like drilling holes for
> explosives in a rock face several hundred feet up, sitting on a
> boatswain's chair with no safety harness, no net, not even a hard hat.
> And if ya fell, they'd leave your dead body lying there until change
> of shift (unless it was in the way, then they'd move it). Mustn't slow
> down the work.
>
> Or working in a diversion tunnel full of carbon monoxide exhaust fumes
> because the company insisted on using internal combustion engines in
> the tunnels, which lacked adequate ventilation systems.
>
> The project was finished ahead of schedule and under budget. Project
> manager got a bonus of something like $300,000, workers got a pink
> slip. 65 workers died to build it. How many years' salary for an
> average worker was $300,000 in those Depression times?
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>

Work ethic was greater then, less when I was young and less even now
today...

Kim W5TIT

2023. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-01 04:32:59 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <%HGob.597$Bf7.523663@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 81699

N2EY wrote:

> In article <nQuob.15396$FI2.10235@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dwight
> Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> writes:
>
>
>>"N2EY" wrote:
>>
>>>OK fine. You wanna do migrant farm labor?
>
>
>> If I could still physically do it, I'd be thrilled to do so, Jim. My
>>grandmother owned a huge farm in North Carolina and I truly enjoyed going
>>there every summer during my teenage years to work. I worked side-by-side
>>with the hired laborers and did every single job they did. However, because
>>of the low wages for most of those jobs today, I certainly wouldn't do some
>>those jobs today (even if I could physically do so). However, a few farmers
>>in the area still pay well and they have no problems finding labor. If I
>>could do it, I wouldn't mind doing one of those jobs one summer just for the
>>fun of it.
>>
>
> That would be farm work, but not migrant farm labor, Dwight. Migrant farm labor
> travels around the country, following the harvest and the crops, and has to
> support themselves on whatever they get paid.

But is is a matter of what the producers are *allowed* to pay for the
help. They are *allowed* to break the law. Let's take another example.
The computer industry is undergoing a change now. Many of the good
paying tech support jobs are making a mass migration to India. Why?
because there are people there who will work for a fraction of what
companies were paying American help. Are those jobs that no American
wants to do? This isn't menial labor either.

This shipping of jobs offshore will probably continue until
accountant's jobs get shipped to India. Then we'll see how wedded they
are to their principles!! 8^)

- Mike KB3EIA -

2024. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-01 04:43:10 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <yRGob.600$Bf7.526991@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 81700

Kim W5TIT wrote:

> "Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
> news:3FA29563.8030502@psu.edu...
>
>>Dwight Stewart wrote:
>>
>>>"N2EY" wrote:
>>>
>>>
>>>>OK fine. You wanna do migrant farm labor?
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>> If I could still physically do it, I'd be thrilled to do so, Jim. My
>>>grandmother owned a huge farm in North Carolina and I truly enjoyed
>
> going
>
>>>there every summer during my teenage years to work. I worked
>
> side-by-side
>
>>>with the hired laborers and did every single job they did. However,
>
> because
>
>>>of the low wages for most of those jobs today, I certainly wouldn't do
>
> some
>
>>>those jobs today (even if I could physically do so). However, a few
>
> farmers
>
>>>in the area still pay well and they have no problems finding labor. If I
>>>could do it, I wouldn't mind doing one of those jobs one summer just for
>
> the
>
>>>fun of it.
>>
>>
>>Here lies the rub, Dwight! Although I disagree with a lot of your views

>>on race, you are spot on on this thread sub-subject.
>>
>
>
> No, the damned rub is in how much our products would cost if the jobs
> migrant and transient workers do were paid at much higher pay
> scales!!!!!!!!!!!! Not that I want to see anyone suffering...

But where do we stop? As I noted to Jim, there are new jobs "going away" from America, like those in some IT fields. Don't expect it to stop there. The companies can pay much less for the help in India, and I guess we are to be happy that our software may cost less. I'd pay a little more for tech help I can understand. Anymore, it is getting really hard to make out what the tech help is telling me.

- Mike KB3EIA -

2025. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-01 05:33:55 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <7BHob.14253$X22.12628@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 81701

"Kim W5TIT" wrote:
>
> Dwight, for goodness sake. I am not going to get
> into a huge idiosynchratic dialogue with you about
> this issue. Suffice it to say that days like Black
> Mayoral Conferences are set aside to deal
> specifically with, well, specific things. (snip)

But there cannot be a white mayors conference to discuss, well, specific things. There are laws against discrimination in this country which makes such events illegal. But those laws don't apply to blacks and other minorities. If it did, the Justice Department would have shut down the black mayors' conference.

> "People like me"? People like me?! Describe a
> "people like me" won't you? I'm quite offended by
> the characterization there, Dwight, I'll tell you
> that.

"People like you" are those who accuse a person of racism without giving that person an opportunity to explain anything you objected to. You did so in the very first message you posted to this thread. "People like you" are those who express indignation against one type of discrimination while trying to justify or explain away another.

> I doubt that quite seriuosly. (snip)

You doubt there are laws prohibiting discrimination? Where have you been for the last few decades? A white oriented event or activity that specifically excludes other races is, and has been for a number of years, illegal. Yet there are events and activities throughout this country each year (such as the black mayor's conference) that specifically exclude whites. Openly allowing discrimination against whites while asserting court litigation against whites who discriminate against minorities is patently unfair. If you want one to be illegal, both should be illegal. And I simply don't think that is a racist view.

> Are you as upset about gender specific schools? I gave
> some other examples, such as women's sports, Girl
> Scouts, Boy Scouts, Masons, Eastern Star--all and many
> more of which are specific to "types" of membership,
> Dwight. I've got pretty much no problem with them.

Most of those are private organizations, not political or business organizations, Kim. The courts say there is a huge difference. And I agree there is a huge difference, which is why I've not mentioned a single private

organization (black or otherwise) throughout this discussion. Instead, I've focused solely on business and political organizations.

> Aw, c'mon. How many non-Chinese people are working
> at your local Chinese restaraunt? Have *you* applied for
> a position at the company you mention above? Maybe no
> one's applied. (snip)

First of all, I don't work for others anymore. I own my own companies. However, to address your specific point, the courts have ruled that the simple absense of minority employees in a place of business can show a "practice of discrimination." But, as I've already said, that doesn't apply to black owned businesses which refuse to hire white employees - as far as I know, there has never been a single successful case against a black owned company for discrimination against whites.

> I think you're going way, way overboard. What about
> "SPIKE" TV? Ya upset about that?

What is there to be upset about? Are they excluding blacks in the television programs they show? Most of the shows I've seen on Spike TV have minorities in them.

> Pah....there it is. Now, that is as discriminatory as you can
> get, Dwight. And, I'm glad you walked right into what I was
> hoping I'd be able to demonstrate. Based on your opinion
> of women as demure and refined (ok, I'm going overboard
> there), you believe that sports organizations are keeping
> women out for the reason of their weakness. That's crap.
> You don't think there's women who could train and get
> pumped up enough to be on a male basketball team?
> Football, etc.? Sorry, I've seen 'em in the Ladies' Room.

That's not what I think, Kim. Actually, since I'm not involved in sports in any way, I haven't given it much thought at all. Regardless, as I understand it, the practice is based on studies that have shown that women are injured more when allowed to participate in extremely physical sports activities with men. That was backed up by medical studies that have shown that the typical woman's bone structure is not as strong as the typical man's, no matter how much she pumps up her muscles in the gym. Where those, and other physical differences, are significant, certain exclusions have been allowed by the courts. Where it is not significant, exclusions are not allowed.

Women participating in those sports activities seem to agree with the courts. Since few of the top women weight lifters, for example, can lift as much as a male in the same weight class, few have expressed any interest whatsoever in competing directly with men. That seems to be the case with most other similar sports activities.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

2026. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-01 06:19:13 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <Bflob.14276$X22.632@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 81702

"Mike Coslo" wrote:
>
> Here lies the rub, Dwight! Although I disagree with a
> lot of your views on race, you are spot on on this
> thread sub-subject.

Few people always agree with others on everything, Mike. It would be one darn boring world if we did, now wouldn't it?

> The reason that this is "undesirable" work is simply
> because the producers are allowed to get away with
> paying such low wages. If they don't even pay
> minimum, how is a citizen even supposed to legally
> hold the job?

I agree. Coming from a semi-farm background myself, I certainly know a little bit about the profits earned from farming and the business practices (including labor practices) used throughout the industry. My grandmother and I have talked about such things many times. Anyway, I've seen a slow decline in the wages paid over the years. And I'm not talking about the small family farms. Family farms don't hire that many outside workers. Instead, the practice is seen most often on the large, corporate owned, farms - the farms owned by industries generating billions of dollars in profits each year. And nobody is going to convince me these corporations cannot afford to pay higher wages. If my grandmother can do it and still make good profits, these much more wealthy corporations can certainly do so.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

2027. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-01 06:32:01 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <Brlob.14278$X22.5686@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 81703

"N2EY" wrote:
>
> Y'know, it's interesting that so far nobody has directly
> answered the question as to whether my grandparents
> should have been allowed into the country...

Sorry, Jim, I didn't realize you expected a direct answer to that. In a round about way, I did answer your question when I talked about how immigrates years ago clearly benefited this country. Nobody is criticizing past immigration. The issue is massive immigration today and where we go with it.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

2028. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-01 06:54:37 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <NMIob.14288$X22.8107@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 81704

"Dan/W4NTI" wrote:
>
> "Dwight Stewart" wrote:
> > But government was created exactly to "...promote the
> > general welfare and secure the blessings of liberty for
> > ourselves and our posterity..." In my opinion, those
> > blessings include a decent living and a fair share in the
> > benefits of this country for all Americans (not just the
> > wealthy).
>
> I get it....the federal government takes from the states, the
> states take from its workers. The Federal government
> redistributes the monies received from the state and the
> people back to the states, that now redistributes it to the
> people.
>
> Sounds like the failed Socialist system....just with one
> more step.
>
> Sorry.....that ain't what is 'supposed' to happen in this
> country. Don't get me started on that one.

No, you don't get it, Dan. There is nothing in my comment about the federal government or state governments taking anything. Throughout this discussion, I've only talked about government policies to stimulate fair wages and reasonable business practices. The government has been doing that, in some form or another, since just about the very first day this country was created (though, IMO, has been doing a fairly poor job of it lately).

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

2029. Re: Reflections on rrap

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-01 07:18:04 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0310312318.28ced864@posting.google.com>
Source record: 81705

brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0310311759.424e44d@posting.google.com>...
> k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0310291915.2be133e1@posting.google.com>...
> > lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20031023205902.23171.00001689@mb-m05.aol.com>...
> >
> > >Assholes belong together.
> >
> > Lennie, is there a special "professional engineers only" course
> > on "civil debate" techniques that you went to?
>
> Holy Moley!
>
> Do you actually accept that Len attended -and- graduated from an engineering school?

WHHHOOOOOOOOAAAAAAAAA there, Gumby!

Who said ANYthing about "graduating"...?!?!

I have already acknowledged that His Scumminess went to
school...fourteen years of it!

> This is huge progress in the history of RRAP.

Why?

> Do we have an Historian?

Of course we do....It's called "Google". I've "acknowledged"
Lennie's "education" on numerous occassions...Especially since I find
it interesting that a guy with no kids and who brags about his
financial solidity took 14 YEARS to complete a four year degree
program.

> Where is Rev. Jim when you need him?

Who's "Rev. Jim"...?!?! No one here is an ordained minister that
I am aware of, Brain.

> (Next we'll address the meaning of "professional engineer (PE)."

Why? Is there something about it you need explained to you?

Steve, K4YZ

2030. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-01 07:26:11 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3FA36013.70206@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 81706

Dwight Stewart wrote:

>
>Family farms don't hire that many outside workers. Instead, the
>practice is seen most often on the large, corporate owned, farms - the farms
>owned by industries generating billions of dollars in profits each year. And
>nobody is going to convince me these corporations cannot afford to pay
>higher wages. If my grandmother can do it and still make good profits, these
>much more wealthy corporations can certainly do so.
>
>
I'm a city boy, so I don't know much about farming, except for a vague
idea that farmers
grow stuff that gets converted to food sold at supermarkets. And that
there are massive
government subsidies for farmers. To make for cheap food in the USA.
Or something
like that........

>
>
>

2031. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-01 07:50:57 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <BBJob.14301$X22.9130@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 81707

"Kim W5TIT" wrote:
>
> I don't know about you, but I sure don't want to be
> paying the price of your philosophy noted above.
> Oh. And how dare you tell me "nonsense," Dwight.
> I am relaying to you things from my own experience
> and you say to me, "NONSENSE?"

The nonsense was directed at your conclusions, Kim. How can you possibly say "no one" is willing to do the work? As I said, the main reason most people aren't willing to (and actually cannot) do those jobs is because of the wages are too low, not because they're not willing to work. People are willing to work if the pay is decent.

> And you'd better be ready to not be able to afford
> almost anything you buy cheaply right now BECAUSE
> of things as they are.

I've already given several ways wages can be increased without significantly increasing the costs of consumer goods.

> Uh, I don't know what home you're talking about, but
> my kids were not spoiled rotten. (snip)

Your kid was used as a metaphor for all kids in general. That should have been obvious since it is clear I don't know your specific kid.

> Didn't say you aren't willing to work. (snip)

Actually, you did pretty much say that, Kim. About me and all other non-immigrant Americans. Your exact words were "no one is willing to do the work a lot of our immigrant population are willing to do." Of course, that simply isn't true (not even close).

> (snip) And you're comments above about how tough
> those jobs are for very little pay and how you wouldn't
> do them...just highlights exactly what I was saying.

I said nothing about how tough those jobs are. Those jobs are the venue of younger people without the aches and pains of older age. I did those jobs when I was younger, but have since moved on to more substantial work over the years to the point of owning my own businesses today. However, there are plenty of young people today more than willing to work. But, as I said, they're not going to be thrilled about working in jobs with wages so low they cannot feed their families and have to live twenty to a hotel room or apartment to help keep living costs down (like so many poor illegal immigrants do today). If this overall trend continues, Americans in the not

so distant future, perhaps your grandchildren, are going to be living just like people do in third-world countries. That's the real future we're leaving future generations.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

2032. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-01 07:54:07 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <zEJob.14304$X22.7836@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 81708

"N2EY" wrote:
>
> That would be farm work, but not migrant farm labor,
> Dwight. Migrant farm labor travels around the country,
> following the harvest and the crops, and has to support
> themselves on whatever they get paid.

There is no difference in the actual work done on the farm, Jim.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

2033. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-01 11:07:14 UTC
From: wa2si@arrl.net
Message-ID: <b7d1465c.0311010307.204ec70a@posting.google.com>
Source record: 81709

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<jYAob.13804$X22.6643@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> But those that are unwilling to work when they are able to,
> shouldn't expect the handout (IMHO).
>
> Cheers,
> Bill K2UNK

This, I gotta frame!

73 de Bert
WA2SI

2034. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-01 11:11:15 UTC
From: charlesb <n5pvl@sbcglobal.net>
Message-ID: <nxMob.11739$Ab7.6540@newssvr14.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 81710

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:NMIob.14288$X22.8107@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> "Dan/W4NTI" wrote:
>
> No, you don't get it, Dan. There is nothing in my comment about the
> federal government or state governments taking anything. Throughout this
> discussion, I've only talked about government policies to stimulate fair
> wages and reasonable business practices.

OH, I see! - You're talking about the government being intelligent enough to keep it's hands off of the economy so that it can mature and grow! I couldn't agree with you more. - And you have history on your side, in this arguement. Every recorded instance of governmental meddling with the parameters of the economy has resulted in fiasco, a net loss.

Keep swinging, Dwight! Let people out there know that trying to legislate prosperity is nothing short of gross stupidity, right up there on par with trying to legislate morality. Tell them that they might as well try to wrap up a gallon of water with a sheet of aluminum foil.

Charles Brabham, N5PVL

2035. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-01 11:33:57 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031101063357.14837.00003985@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 81711

In article <zEJob.14304$X22.7836@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> writes:

>"N2EY" wrote:
>>
>> That would be farm work, but not migrant farm labor,
>> Dwight. Migrant farm labor travels around the country,
>> following the harvest and the crops, and has to support
>> themselves on whatever they get paid.
>
>
> There is no difference in the actual work done on the farm, Jim.
>
Agreed! But there's a difference between doing it for a summer at a relative's place, and doing it all year long at various locations all over the country or all over a region. And there's a difference between doing it for a relative and doing it for one's living.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2036. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-01 13:02:52 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031101080252.29660.00001394@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 81712

In article <BBJob.14301$X22.9130@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> writes:

>"Kim" wrote:
>>
>> I don't know about you, but I sure don't want to be
>> paying the price of your philosophy noted above.
>> Oh. And how dare you tell me "nonsense," Dwight.
>> I am relaying to you things from my own experience
>> and you say to me, "NONSENSE?"
>
>
> The nonsense was directed at your conclusions, Kim. How can you possibly
>say "no one" is willing to do the work?

Dwight,

I think that when Kim writes "no one" in a context like that, she really means "almost no one" or "hardly anyone" rather than the literal standard meaning "not a single person" or "nobody at all".

Of course there's the economic concept, derived from supply-and-demand, that if you have something nobody seems to want, you have to make it more attractive. With a product, that can me a lower price; with a job, that can mean higher wages/better benefits.

Just MHO

73 de Jim, N2EY

73 de Jim, N2EY

2037. Re: Amateur Radio in the 21st Century?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-01 13:06:42 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <CdOob.6813$P%1.5777509@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 81713

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:MvDob.16255$FI2.5145@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
>
> One interesting proposal sure to either enrage or please is the
> free upgrades for Tech and Advanced. Personally, and I have no stake
> in this as I'm already Extra, the idea of free upgrades doesn't bother me
at
> all
> if it ultimately results in a set of license classes that make sense with
> regard
> to privileges vs requirements. The other two alternatives are:
> (1) certain existing licenses would lose privileges (not a good track
> record on that as we saw in 1968) or
> (2) we keep the existing licneses plus the newly defined ones and
> wait for the old licenses to go SK. Probably not what the FCC wants
> for enforcement and rules simplification.
>

But with the fact that the renewals are pretty much automated, there is very little burden on the FCC as it is. So why bother with changing the existing over to whatever new ones they come up with. Regardless of what they do about the code, the current three tier license system seems quite appropriate as is. I got my Extra under the 5 level system and even then I thought three would be the most appropriate. The current Tech, General, and Extra seem about right to me and also seem about right if the system should go codeless. Tech covers a decent range of the basics for someone to get started for a wide range of amateur activities. General is well within the reach of anyone with a only a moderate amount of effort. Naturally Extra should require a significant "extra" effort.

As far as enforcement being complicated by tracking the old Novice & Advanced in addition to the current three classes, it really doesn't seem to be much of a problem. If you read the published FCC enforcement letters, you see almost none of them going to Novice or Advanced licensees. That's probably because the majority of the Novice licensees are inactive while the Advanced category doesn't contain as many licensees as the others.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

2038. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-01 13:07:35 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <reOob.6814$P%1.5777951@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 81714

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:8wDob.534$Bf7.462158@news1.news.adelphia.net...
> Dee D. Flint wrote:
>
>
> > I would like to add that very few companies make astronomical profits.
Most
> > make just enough to manage to stay in business.
>
> You would think they would pay their CEO's a tad less then!
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -
>

You would think so but then again, the CEO's salary is only a drop in the
bucket as a percentage of their operating expenses.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

2039. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-01 13:14:26 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <SkOob.6816$P%1.5778784@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 81715

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20031031202352.08626.00001528@mb-m27.aol.com...
> In article <LXBob.16125$FI2.531@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>,
"Dan/W4NTI"
> <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> writes:
>
> >In the beginning.....there was Philadelphia.
>
> It's still here.
> >
> >It was decided to have a looooooose confederation of states brought
together
> >under a weak Federal government. The purpose of which was to provide
such
> >things as; common roads, common monies, common rules and regulations
> >pertaining to INTERSTATE commerce. And if needed to provide for the
defense
> >of one, or all of the states.
>
> Yep - Articles of Confederation.
> >
> >What the hell happened?
>
> Simple - the founders discovered that the Articles simply didn't work.
Without
> a strong central (federal) government, there was no way to force any of
the
> states to work for the common good if they didn't want to.
>
> Common roads, common monies, common rules and regulations
> pertaining to interstate commerce and defense of one, or all of the states
all
> require a certain amount of central authority and funding. If New York's
> legislature decided they didn't want to honor money from South Carolina at
face
> value, who was there to make them? Or if a ship from Maryland didn't want
to
> take orders from an admiral from Maine, what authority was there to
require
> them to do so?
>
> And when it came to taxes.....
>
> End result was another convention here in Philadelphia in 1787, when the

> Constitution was written and ratified by representatives from all of the
> states. Three did not sign - they refused to do so because there was no
Bill of
> Rights in the original Constitution. That was rectified by the first ten
> amendments.
>
> You may not like everyhting the Feds do - I know I sure don't! - but the
> founders tried the loose confederation idea and it didn't work.
>
> And when it was tried again (1861-1865, 11 states) it ran into the same
> problems all over again.
>
> In some ways the Feds have been moving towards a weaker central
government, by
> cutting domestic spending - and letting the states take up the slack. Of
course
> the Feds don't give up regulatory control, just funding....
>
> What functions would you have the Feds turn over to the states?
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

There has always been quite a debate over what the federal government should do versus what the state should do versus what should be left up to individuals. This is due to the fact that the Constitution has words in it to the effect that what is not explicitly allocated to the federal government is reserved to the states and what is not allocated to the states is reserved to the people. So there has always been a tug of war between those who want to see the federal government run more and those who think they should run less. Those who want the federal government to do everything are relying on the preamble's words about providing for the common good and interpreting that to mean carte blanche overlooking the fact that it is just a preamble and that the federal government's actual responsibilities, structure, etc is spelled out the clauses of the body of the Constitution, including the amendments.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

2040. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-01 13:30:24 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031101083024.23171.00001851@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 81716

In article <bnv9tn$j14@library2.airnews.net>, "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
writes:

>No, the damned rub is in how much our products would cost if the jobs
>migrant and transient workers do were paid at much higher pay
>scales!!!!!!!!!!!!

Do we really know how much a head of lettuce would cost if the farm workers got
better wages? Does anyone know how much of the cost of various food items goes
to those workers - and how much goes to the retailer, wholesaler,
transportation, processing, etc.?

Might be surprising.

> Not that I want to see anyone suffering...
>
>However, I doubt you'd find the workforce needed to do the jobs even *with*
>a higher payscale... Physical labor is an art these days.

Which explains a lot of modern society's problems...

73 de Jim, N2EY

2041. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-01 13:30:24 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031101083024.23171.00001850@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 81717

In article <bnva8c$v6l@library2.airnews.net>, "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
writes:

>"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
>news:c2356669.0310310904.1fc51c87@posting.google.com...
>> "Kim" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote in message
>news:<bns7bk$oub@library1.airnews.net>...
>> > "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
>> > news:pqKnb.10966$FI2.5053@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
>> > > "N2EY" wrote:
>> > > >
>> > > > Then what's the answer? Shall we eliminate all immigration,
>> > > > or just the illegals? Who gets to decide who should be kept
>> > > > out and who should be admitted, other than obvious threats
>> > > > to security? (snip)
>> > > >
>> > > > (snip) Almost 100 years ago, my grandparents came to the
>> > > > United States from Italy. They left in part because of the 1906
>> > > > earthquake, but mostly because they wanted a better life than
>> > > > they could get in Italy at that time.
>>
>> Y'know, it's interesting that so far nobody has directly answered the
>> question as to whether my grandparents should have been allowed into
>> the country...
>>
>
>Well, I don't think you're looking for the answer from me...

Actually, I was looking for an answer from anyone interested in commenting on
the subject.

>but, yes.

Thanks!

I'ms sure there were folks back in 1906 who weren't really happy to see another
boatload of "garlic eaters" from southern Italy, though...

>> What was his problem? Did he feel the jobs were "beneath his dignity"
>> or some such?
>
>Yep. He was "better" than all that. And, his friends would see him!

I must be getting old. When I was a teenager, I cannot remember anyone I knew
thinking a job was "beneath their dignity". There were some jobs that some kids
did not want to do for personal moral/ideological reasons, (like working for

the IRS ;-)) but those jobs weren't open to teens anyway.

>> What sort of work did he expect to do as a teenager without special
>> skills?
>
>Kids want jobs behind computers these days...or at a minimum, with the least
>amount of physical labor, and definitely "out of the elements."

Considering what the elements must be where you are in summer, I can understand
that part. But the rest I don't.

Remember the classic movie "A Christmas Story"?

There's a much lesser-known sequel called "Ollie Hopnoodle's Haven Of Bliss".
(named for where Ralphie's family goes on summer vacation during the last two
weeks of August).

In that film, Ralphie is a teenager and gets a summer job in a
furniture/appliance warehouse. Hilarious but also very good lesson. Ralphie's
attitude towards his dad completely changes.
>
>> > Now, I meet adults with the same attitude. I am very thankful for that
>>part
>> > of my community with people who are willing to take on the immense task
>of
>> > the "physical labor" jobs that many of us wouldn't be caught doing.
>Very
>> > thankful indeed, for no one else would do them.
>> >
>> The question that comes to mind is "why won't they do those jobs?"
>> Obviously ever worker with any sense is going to go for the "best" job
>> they can find, but when someone is unemployed for a considerable
>> length of time....

>Heck *I* wouldn't do those jobs. When I worked farms as a teen ager up in
>NY, I drove the tractor or leveled the silage delivery, etc. Ya think *I*
>was going to lift those haybales into the wagon, scrape the cowpoop, etc.?
>The older folks did all that stuff...we kids wouldn't do it! Well, at least
>we kids who didn't have a vested interest in the farms...

You didn't do it because they didn't make ya do it......
>
>> And there are some jobs which are hazardous enough to make one think
>> twice.

>> If you want a snapshot of how bad things can get, there's an excellent
>> book and PBS documentary on the building of Hoover Dam. I hope and
>> pray that I'm never, ever as desperate as some of those workers had to
>> be in order to take some of those jobs. Like drilling holes for
>> explosives in a rock face several hundred feet up, sitting on a
>> boatswain's chair with no safety harness, no net, not even a hard hat.
>> And if ya fell, they'd leave your dead body lying there until change
>> of shift (unless it was in the way, then they'd move it). Mustn't slow

>> down the work.
>>
>> Or working in a diversion tunnel full of carbon monoxide exhaust fumes
>> because the company insisted on using internal combustion engines in
>> the tunnels, which lacked adequate ventilation systems.
>>
>> The project was finished ahead of schedule and under budget. Project
>> manager got a bonus of something like $300,000, workers got a pink
>> slip. 65 workers died to build it. How many years' salary for an
>> average worker was $300,000 in those Depression times?

>Work ethic was greater then, less when I was young and less even now
>today...

I think the whole "work ethic" thing was dreamed up by the top dogs as a way to get the little dogs to work without questioning the system. A businessperson or government official with a pile of FYM salted away is in a differrent place than someone living paycheck to paycheck.

I'm not saying that a laborer's work on the dam was anywhere near as "valuable" as the project manager's - but the pay and risks were entirely out of line.

It wasn't that the work ethic was greater - the desperation was greater. What did your kid do for spending money without a job?

73 de Jim, N2EY

2042. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-01 13:57:10 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <WYOob.662$Bf7.674732@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 81718

Robert Casey wrote:
> Dwight Stewart wrote:
>
>>
>> Family farms don't hire that many outside workers. Instead, the
>> practice is seen most often on the large, corporate owned, farms - the
>> farms
>> owned by industries generating billions of dollars in profits each
>> year. And
>> nobody is going to convince me these corporations cannot afford to pay
>> higher wages. If my grandmother can do it and still make good profits,
>> these
>> much more wealthy corporations can certainly do so.
>>
>>
> I'm a city boy, so I don't know much about farming, except for a vague
> idea that farmers
> grow stuff that gets converted to food sold at supermarkets. And that
> there are massive
> government subsidies for farmers. To make for cheap food in the USA. Or
> something
> like that........

Right! Massive subsidies, a "wink and a grin" when it comes to hiring workers that legally can't be hired, etc, etc......

I remember a few years ago, there was a Dem candidate for some position, and it was found out that she and her husband had hired an illegal immigrant as a housekeeper. There was enough outrage that she withdrew herself from consideration for the position.

She was wrong to do what she did, of course. But was she more wrong than the corp farmer that hires illegal immigrant help?

- Mike KB3EIA -

2043. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-01 14:10:26 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <m9Pob.669$Bf7.678780@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 81719

N2EY wrote:

> In article <BBJob.14301$X22.9130@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dwight
> Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> writes:
>
>
>>"Kim" wrote:
>>
>>>I don't know about you, but I sure don't want to be
>>>paying the price of your philosophy noted above.
>>>Oh. And how dare you tell me "nonsense," Dwight.
>>>I am relaying to you things from my own experience
>>>and you say to me, "NONSENSE?"
>>
>>
>> The nonsense was directed at your conclusions, Kim. How can you possibly
>>say "no one" is willing to do the work?
>
>
> Dwight,
>
> I think that when Kim writes "no one" in a context like that, she really means
> "almost no one" or "hardly anyone" rather than the literal standard meaning
> "not a single person" or "nobody at all".
>
> Of course there's the economic concept, derived from supply-and-demand, that if
> you have something nobody seems to want, you have to make it more attractive.
> With a product, that can me a lower price; with a job, that can mean higher
> wages/better benefits.

Sure! Corning Glass which recently closed in my town, had this
situation. The "hot" end of the building had work which was hot and
fairly dangerous, as working with molten glass is going to be. To entice
workers there, they were paid quite well. Simple supply and demand.

They are history now, and won't come back, as they can't compete with
the foreign sources. The foreign sources are so heavily subsidized by
their respective governments that it is just about impossible to compete.

I wonder what we'll do when the last manufacturing jobs are gone from
the US? Run up a white flag? (made in some other country, of course!)

- Mike KB3EIA -

2044. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-01 14:28:12 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <0qPob.675$Bf7.683643@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 81720

N2EY wrote:
> In article <bnva8c$v6l@library2.airnews.net>, "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
> writes:

>>>What was his problem? Did he feel the jobs were "beneath his dignity"
>>>or some such?
>>
>>Yep. He was "better" than all that. And, his friends would see him!
>
>
> I must be getting old. When I was a teenager, I cannot remember anyone I knew
> thinking a job was "beneath their dignity". There were some jobs that some kids
> did not want to do for personal moral/ideological reasons, (like working for
> the IRS ;-)) but those jobs weren't open to teens anyway.

There are still plenty of young people willing to take "menial" labor.
My son worked all summer cleaning a warehouse and tearout and hefting
the new materials on flooring construction. There were other people his
age there too. His girlfriend has *two* jobs (which is way too much for
a high school senior, IMO)

>
>>>What sort of work did he expect to do as a teenager without special
>>>skills?
>>
>>Kids want jobs behind computers these days...or at a minimum, with the least
>>amount of physical labor, and definitely "out of the elements."

> Considering what the elements must be where you are in summer, I can understand
> that part. But the rest I don't.

I think its a big broad brush the situation is getting painted with
here. I don't know enough about all kids to know what all kids want to do.

an aside: I have seen a few other cases where an unemployed person was
above the jobs available. In each case, the underlying problem was
depression. Not to sound alarmist, but you might keep an eye out for
that, Kim.

> Remember the classic movie "A Christmas Story"?

"Mommy, Daddy's gonna kill Ralphie!" What a movie...

- Mike KB3EIA -

2045. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-01 14:38:49 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031101093849.08626.00001533@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 81721

In article <0QAob.13772$X22.4915@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Bill Sohl"
<billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:

>"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
>news:c2356669.0310310904.1fc51c87@posting.google.com...
>> "Kim" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote in message
>news:<bns7bk$oub@library1.airnews.net>...
>> > "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
>> > news:pqKnb.10966$FI2.5053@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
>> > > "N2EY" wrote:
>> > > >
>> > > > Then what's the answer? Shall we eliminate all immigration,
>> > > > or just the illegals? Who gets to decide who should be kept
>> > > > out and who should be admitted, other than obvious threats
>> > > > to security? (snip)
>> > > >
>> > > > (snip) Almost 100 years ago, my grandparents came to the
>> > > > United States from Italy. They left in part because of the 1906
>> > > > earthquake, but mostly because they wanted a better life than
>> > > > they could get in Italy at that time.
>>
>> Y'know, it's interesting that so far nobody has directly answered the
>> question as to whether my grandparents should have been allowed into
>> the country...
>
>The process by which individuals apply to legally enter the USA on
>a resident basis is well defined already. The complaint of many, including
>myself, is that too may people (good, bad or indiffernet) byass the
>process and enter "illegally" while others do the right thing. I have a
>friend who went through almost 2 years of approvals before he was
>allowed to enter the USA as a resident alien...and he was born and
>raised in the UK, is college educated, no police record, etc.

Agreed - that whole process needs to change.

Didja read about the woman who had been married several dozen times, so that
each husband could get a green card?
>
>Back in whatever the year was that your (N2EY) granparents came to the
>US, odds are they did so legally following the
>legal process at the time.

Yep, Ellis Island, the classic "your tired, your poor...." scenario.

>If so, then of course they should have
>been allowed to come here.

I think so too.

>> > > Times change. Years ago, there were great open spaces throughout
>America
>> > > just waiting for new immigrates to settle. Those shopkeepers,
>craftsmen,
>> > > farmers, laborers, and so on, clearly benefited a new nation. The
>benefits
>> > > today are subtle and the problems (job shortages and so on) more
>> > pronounced.
>> > > Because of that, we have to cut back on immigration at some point. We
>> > can't
>> > > have the entire world's population, or even a significant portion of
>it,
>> > > living here. I think we've reached that point - the point where we cut
>> > back
>> > > on immigration except for the very most extreme cases. And when I say
>> > > extreme cases, I mean extreme cases. Economic considerations would not
>> > > qualify. Those facing persecution or death in their home country would
>> > only
>> > > be allowed to stay only as long as those threats exist, after which
>they
>> > > must leave. To fill labor shortages here, we should retrain those
>already
>> > > here.
>> > > Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>> > >
>> >
>> > Dwight, I don't know how it is where you are, but here there is no one
>> > willing to do the work a lot of our immigrant population are willing to
>> > do--and do.
>> >
>> > I remember many times asking my teen-aged son to go get a job and, when
>he'd
>> > retort with, "there aren't any jobs," I would mention some of the things
>I
>> > knew were avaiable: farm work (building fences, etc.); any fast food
>chain,
>> > stock clerk, etc. He was indignant, at best, when he thought his mother
>> > would suggest such a thing to her own son...that was not work he was
>about
>> > to go do.
>>
>> What was his problem? Did he feel the jobs were "beneath his dignity"
>> or some such?
>
>Good question. The same attitude oftern seems to be in place
>with welfare recipients. They only want to take jobs they approve
>of.

I don't know what the attitudes of welfare recipients are. I do know that it's simply human nature to adapt to what a system provides. For example, if going

off welfare means giving up health care benefits for dependents with chronic illnesses, would you do it?
>
>> What sort of work did he expect to do as a teenager without special
>> skills?
>
>Ditto my last comments.

Mine too. If Mom and Dad provide a certain level of "lifestyle" without a job, why work to have that same "lifestyle" - particularly since having a job means having less time to enjoy it?
>
>> > Now, I meet adults with the same attitude. I am very thankful for that
>part
>> > of my community with people who are willing to take on the immense task
>of
>> > the "physical labor" jobs that many of us wouldn't be caught doing.
>Very
>> > thankful indeed, for no one else would do them.
>> >
>> The question that comes to mind is "why won't they do those jobs?"
>> Obviously every worker with any sense is going to go for the "best" job
>> they can find, but when someone is unemployed for a considerable
>> length of time....
>
>Ditto again.
>
>> And there are some jobs which are hazardous enough to make one think
>> twice.
>
>But those jobs usually aren't minimum wage jobs...they tend to pay
>better wages because of the danger.
>
In some cases yes. And that's due almost entirely to the long struggle of unionized labor.

>> If you want a snapshot of how bad things can get, there's an excellent
>> book and PBS documentary on the building of Hoover Dam. I hope and
>> pray that I'm never, ever as desperate as some of those workers had to
>> be in order to take some of those jobs. Like drilling holes for
>> explosives in a rock face several hundred feet up, sitting on a
>> boatswain's chair with no safety harness, no net, not even a hard hat.
>> And if ya fell, they'd leave your dead body lying there until change
>> of shift (unless it was in the way, then they'd move it). Mustn't slow
>> down the work.
>
>Times were pretty tough then and there were almost
>no safety regulations (OSHA, etc.)

All true - but there was also an attitude that the workers were expendable. There were even estimating formulas for how many lives a particular job would

take.

Did OSHA come about because employers or the marketplace suddenly got a conscience?

> >> Or working in a diversion tunnel full of carbon monoxide exhaust fumes
> >> because the company insisted on using internal combustion engines in
> >> the tunnels, which lacked adequate ventilation systems.
> >>
> >> The project was finished ahead of schedule and under budget. Project
> >> manager got a bonus of something like $300,000, workers got a pink
> >> slip. 65 workers died to build it. How many years' salary for an
> >> average worker was $300,000 in those Depression times?
> >
> >The Panama canal was another killer of workers...although more from illness
> >than accidents.

Yep - another excellent example, with documentaries. Yet ironically all those dead finally forced serious research into tropical diseases and resulted in changes that saved many lived and improved health in those areas.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2046. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-01 14:38:50 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031101093850.08626.00001534@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 81722

In article <BrIob.14278$X22.5686@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> writes:

>"N2EY" wrote:
>>
>> Y'know, it's interesting that so far nobody has directly
>> answered the question as to whether my grandparents
>> should have been allowed into the country...
>
>
> Sorry, Jim, I didn't realize you expected a direct answer to that. In a
>round about way, I did answer your question when I talked about how
>immigrates years ago clearly benefited this country.

OK, your answer is clear now.

>Nobody is criticizing
>past immigration.

I would point out that back in 1906 there were people criticizing the immigration of those times. Particularly immigrants who weren't from the "right" parts of northern and western Europe...

Every wave of immigration *was perceived* as a threat to those already here, because:

- they would usually work for lower wages and benefits
- they brought with them strange customs, clothes, languages and religions
- once Americanized, they added to the competition for jobs, education, etc.

Immigration quotas were enacted early in the 20th century for all these reasons and more.

Some folks feel that one reason slavery died out in the north was the northern tendency to encourage immigration as a source of cheap labor. IIRC, there were *antiwar* riots in New York City in 1863, in part because some folks (including recent immigrants) were afraid that freed slaves would migrate north and compete for jobs.

>The issue is massive immigration today and where we go
>with it.
>
I think that for the reason of national security alone, we have to:

- change the criteria for legal immigration
- reduce/eliminate illegal immigration and visa abuse
- work towards better labor practices through both government and marketplace

action

73 de Jim, N2EY

2047. Re: Tampa Turd Jail Dale's forgotten FELONY, Jessica too?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-01 15:00:38 UTC
From: gw@webhideout.com
Message-ID: <235a74db.0311010700.4f57fb14@posting.google.com>
Source record: 81723
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.swap,rec.radio.amateur.policy

brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0310311750.723fe2a4@posting.google.com>...
> joe2 <joe2@fake.com> wrote in message news:<iRkob.2361$un.221@bignews6.bellsouth.net>...
> > The family that felons together, stays together???? Looks like KE4TEW is
> > the head of a large group of Florida Convicts.
> >
> > joe2 wrote:
> >
> > > Poor Jail Dale, a whole family full of convicts.
> > >
> > > Anonymous Sender wrote:
> > >
> > >> In article <20031029092618.03477.00000353@mb-m19.news.cs.com>
> > >> ke4tew@cs.com (KE4TEW) wrote:
> > >>
> > >>>
> > >>> I think it's obvious to anyone there's no basis for this.
> > >>
> > >>
> > >>
> > >> It's also obvious you are lying. How much weed were you intending to
> > >> distribute, Jail Dale?
> > >> Nickle bag, dime bag, a kilo?
> > >> Was your barrio whore Rita's income down that month because of her
> > >> hysterectomy and you needed the cash?
> > >>
> > >>
> > >>> There is NO record of me having a felony conviction.
> > >>
> > >>
> > >>
> > >> That's not what the records show, convicted drug dealer.
> > >>
> > >>
> > >>> Instead of posting BS anon, put your name to it
> > >>> and someone may believe it.
> > >>
> > >>
> > >>
> > >> It comes directly from the Hillsborough County Court Records,
> > >> Convicted FELON.
> > >>
> > >> The name and birthdate match yours on QRZ.com. It is YOU.

> > >>
> > >> James W Dale, KE4TEW
> > >> 9217 W Patterson
> > >> Tampa, FL 33615-2311
> > >> USA
> > >>
> > >> Class: General
> > >>
> > >> Previous Call: KC4VCS
> > >> Previous Class: Technician Plus
> > >> Birth date: 01-01-1941
> > >>
> > >> SSN: 262-60-XXXX
> > >>
> > >> DL: D40045941XXXX issued in Florida on 11/04/1998 expires 01/01/2005
> > >>
> > >> Your son, James Henry Dale born 11-20-1961 is also listed, looks like
> > >> he takes after you with the drug and alcohol abuse:
> > >>
> > >> First Name: JAMES
> > >> Middle Name: HENRY
> > >> Last Name: DALE
> > >> Date of Birth: 11/20/1961
> > >> Race: White
> > >> Sex: Male
> > >> Height:
> > >> Hair:
> > >> Eye Color:
> > >> --------------- Detail Charges Found ---------------
> > >> State: FLHLS
> > >> Case #: 03-CF-010310
> > >> County Name: HillsboroF
> > >> Description: DRIVING WHILE LICENSE REVOKED-HABITUAL OFFENDR
> > >> Class: FELONY THIRD DEGREE
> > >> Statute:
> > >> File Date: 06/19/2003
> > >>
> > >> The Dale family is one big lawbreaking jailbird family.
> > >>
> > >> The arrest of your son is the reason you had to hightail it back to
> > >> Tampa from Long Island.
> > >>
> > >>
> > >>
> > >>> Dimmy wrote: Subject: Tampa Turd Jail Dale's forgotten FELONY
> > >>> From: edo nobody@cryptorebels.net
> > >>> Date: 10/28/03 11:59 PM Eastern Standard Time
> > >>> Message-id: <e7cb3565549abffa134731375b000210@cryptorebels.net>
> > >>>
> > >>>

> > >>> Direct from the Hillsborough County Court Records:
> > >>>
> > >>> First Name: JAMES
> > >>> Middle Name: WILLIAM
> > >>> Last Name: DALE
> > >>> Date of Birth: 01/01/1941
> > >>> Race: White
> > >>> Sex: Male
> > >>> Height: 6'00"
> > >>> Hair:
> > >>> Eye Color:
> > >>> --------------- Detail Charges Found ---------------
> > >>> State: FLHLS
> > >>> Case #: 97-CF-004272
> > >>> County Name: HillsboroO
> > >>> Description: POSS OF MARIJUANA W/INTENT TO
> > >>> Class: FELONY FIRST DEGREE
> > >>> Statute:
> > >>> File Date: 02/19/1997
> > >>>
> > >>> Looks like he has no room to criticize W4AMP, and has a kinship
> > >>> chargewise with
> > >>> Donnie Anderson.
>
> Joe, pahleeeze - take it all back to R.R.A.Misc.
>
> Thanks for understanding.
>
> I owe you. Name it. I'll even put your call on a 10m beacon (but you
> better reply the SWL cards).
>
> Brian

hmmm...is it legal for a convicted felon to have a ham license?

2048. Re: FS Hitlers Toothpick

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-01 15:02:38 UTC
From: gw@webhideout.com
Message-ID: <235a74db.0311010702.30c28c5b@posting.google.com>
Source record: 81724
Cross-posted to: rec.antiques,rec.radio.swap,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Jim Hampton" <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote in message
news:<fsDob.11501$MR1.2090@news01.roc.ny>...
> Folks,
>
> Read the headers. This is (obviously) not Twist. However, there is a line
> as to where complaints can be sent in the headers if anyone is interested.
>
> 73 from Rochester, NY
> Jim AA2QA

jimbo have you ever considered dropping some coin and buying you a big
ancient mary rig so you can disturb your neighbors and whatnot?

2049. Re: FS Hitlers Toothpick

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-01 16:19:50 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <G2Rob.11552$6U4.5717@news01.roc.ny>
Source record: 81725
Cross-posted to: rec.antiques,rec.radio.swap,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Naw,

I've used am back in the 60s, but consider it too wide a mode to be considerate of others. 10 meters, perhaps, as it is wide, but not the lower bands.

Why would I want to disturb the neighbors?

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim

"gw" <gw@webhideout.com> wrote in message news:235a74db.0311010702.30c28c5b@posting.google.com...
>
> jimbo have you ever considered dropping some coin and buying you a big
> ancient mary rig so you can disturb your neighbors and whatnot?

2050. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-01 18:25:08 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bo0tsj$20@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 81726

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:yRGob.600$Bf7.526991@news1.news.adelphia.net...
> Kim W5TIT wrote:
>
> > "Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
> > news:3FA29563.8030502@psu.edu...
> >
> >>Dwight Stewart wrote:
> >>
> >>>"N2EY" wrote:
> >>>
> >>>
> >>>>OK fine. You wanna do migrant farm labor?
> >>>
> >>>
> >>>
> >>> If I could still physically do it, I'd be thrilled to do so, Jim. My
> >>>grandmother owned a huge farm in North Carolina and I truly enjoyed
> >
> > going
> >
> >>>there every summer during my teenage years to work. I worked
> >
> > side-by-side
> >
> >>>with the hired laborers and did every single job they did. However,
> >
> > because
> >
> >>>of the low wages for most of those jobs today, I certainly wouldn't do
> >
> > some
> >
> >>>those jobs today (even if I could physically do so). However, a few
> >
> > farmers
> >
> >>>in the area still pay well and they have no problems finding labor. If
I
> >>>could do it, I wouldn't mind doing one of those jobs one summer just
for
> >
> > the
> >

> >>>fun of it.
> >>
> >>
> >>Here lies the rub, Dwight! Although I disagree with a lot of your views
> >>on race, you are spot on on this thread sub-subject.
> >>
> >
> >
> > No, the damned rub is in how much our products would cost if the jobs
> > migrant and transient workers do were paid at much higher pay
> > scales!!!!!!!!!!!!! Not that I want to see anyone suffering...
>
> But where do we stop? As I noted to Jim, there are new jobs "going away"
> from America, like those in some IT fields. Don't expect it to stop
> there. The companies can pay much less for the help in India, and I
> guess we are to be happy that our software may cost less. I'd pay a
> little more for tech help I can understand. Anymore, it is getting
> really hard to make out what the tech help is telling me.
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -
>

Well, the fact that jobs are moving away from this country is not new--it's been going on since I was in High School. And, while I don't like it, I'm not going to get all bent out of shape over it--because there's not a damned thing that's ever been done about and there will never be. The only way to stop it from happening is to have the "rest of the world's" standard of living raised. Or, ours lowered. It seems to me that as jobs have moved out of this country (industries, we should say); they are slowly replaced by others. That is to say that it seems almost a natural transition that has been happening for at least two generations now. Sure, there are great numbers of people displaced by the practice--but the economy and job markets have recovered in every instance.

Personally, I could never figure out why the computer industry was as it was in this country. When one considers that the technology of computers and its resulting industry can literally be transported over phone lines, how in the world is it that there was such a glut of computer, and telecom for that matter, in this country? Some tech support person from across the ocean can access my computer and help me fix it.

Consider this. I've been toying with the idea over the last few years that it will the "menial" (as was put by someone else--I don't agree with the term) jobs that will gradually grow to the higher paid jobs in this country...because there will be less and less people who *will* do them. The "services" of a migrant worker or a fast food person, or a municipal worker or construction worker will become so highly needed, that they will be able to demand a pretty penny for their work. Everyone will want the sit-down-in-the-AC jobs and no one will want to work outside--where the meat of our lives comes from.

Kim W5TIT

2051. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-01 18:28:10 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bo0u29$52r@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 81727

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:7BHob.14253$X22.12628@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> "Kim W5TIT" wrote:
> >
>
> > "People like me"? People like me?! Describe a
> > "people like me" won't you? I'm quite offended by
> > the characterization there, Dwight, I'll tell you
> > that.
>
>
> "People like you" are those who accuse a person of racism without giving
> that person an opportunity to explain anything you objected to. You did so
> in the very first message you posted to this thread. "People like you" are
> those who express indignation against one type of discrimination while
> trying to justify or explain away another.
>
>

And you rolled me up into your neat littlle "people like you" package,
Dwight. And, I don't think I've accused you at all of being a racist. I am
so sure of this, I won't even look back on the older posts from me.

So, forget about dialogue...we both know where the other stands.

Kim W5TIT

2052. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-01 18:33:03 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <z%Sob.6863$P%1.5839758@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 81730

"Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:bo0tsj$20@library1.airnews.net...
> Personally, I could never figure out why the computer industry was as it
was
> in this country. When one considers that the technology of computers and
> its resulting industry can literally be transported over phone lines, how
in
> the world is it that there was such a glut of computer, and telecom for
that
> matter, in this country? Some tech support person from across the ocean
can
> access my computer and help me fix it.
>

What I object to is that they put people in customer service who speaks the language so poorly that their help is worthless. I had this happen while I was trying to cancel one of those "free internet trial subscriptions." It took at least 15 minutes to get them to understand that I wanted it totally canceled.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

2053. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-01 19:07:08 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bo10bb$djn@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 81728

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20031101083024.23171.00001850@mb-m05.aol.com...
> In article <bnva8c$v6l@library2.airnews.net>, "Kim W5TIT"
<kimscliff@yahoo.com>
> writes:
>
> >"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
> >news:c2356669.0310310904.1fc51c87@posting.google.com...
> >> "Kim" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> >news:<bns7bk$oub@library1.airnews.net>...
> >> > "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
> >> > news:pqKnb.10966$FI2.5053@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> >> > > "N2EY" wrote:
> >> > > >
> >> > > > Then what's the answer? Shall we eliminate all immigration,
> >> > > > or just the illegals? Who gets to decide who should be kept
> >> > > > out and who should be admitted, other than obvious threats
> >> > > > to security? (snip)
> >> > > >
> >> > > > (snip) Almost 100 years ago, my grandparents came to the
> >> > > > United States from Italy. They left in part because of the 1906
> >> > > > earthquake, but mostly because they wanted a better life than
> >> > > > they could get in Italy at that time.
> >>
> >> Y'know, it's interesting that so far nobody has directly answered the
> >> question as to whether my grandparents should have been allowed into
> >> the country...
> >>
> >
> >Well, I don't think you're looking for the answer from me...
>
> Actually, I was looking for an answer from anyone interested in commenting
on
> the subject.
>
> >but, yes.
>
> Thanks!
>
> I'ms sure there were folks back in 1906 who weren't really happy to see
another
> boatload of "garlic eaters" from southern Italy, though...
>

I am real philosophical...to my detriment actually. I see the world through rose colored glasses and there's not much that can mess that up. I would like for anyone who would like to come to this country, come. I think they need to be willing to work; should not look to government funded programs for their livelihood; and should be willing and eventually able to accept American culture--which truly is a metling pot with very few "traditions" that aren't twists of things from the "motherland."

That this country would bulge with huge masses of people? It's doing that already. Look simply at what has happened in Miami, FL. A hugely Cuban population, in a matter of a few years. Did all the "Whites" from Miami die? Move? Get dumped in the ocean? Maybe they weren't particularly happy over what happened in their city/county, but it happened and some folks are still there, some have moved--I'm nearly sure; and some may even be on a campaign to "reown" their city--I don't know.

Fact is, this country is looked to by immigrants who come to our shores...the greatest nation in the world--even with its flaws and errors. And, I welcome each and every one who, as I said, has a dream with a vision and passion to see it happen--*without* (as I also said) government funding or tipping my tax dollars their way.

What *DOES* immensely disgust me is the amount of money this country sends out to others. I am so hugely angry when I think of that, that I can hardly see straight. $80 billion dollars to Iraq?????!!!!!! Indeed. And, that is just one tiny instance of what I'm speaking about. Tell you what: I'd rather see those folks here in this country as immigrants than be pumping those dollars (*our* tax dollars) out when our infrastructure is in such disaray.

> >>
> >> What was his problem? Did he feel the jobs were "beneath his dignity"
> >> or some such?
> >
> >Yep. He was "better" than all that. And, his friends would see him!
>
> I must be getting old. When I was a teenager, I cannot remember anyone I
knew
> thinking a job was "beneath their dignity". There were some jobs that some
kids
> did not want to do for personal moral/ideological reasons, (like working
for
> the IRS ;-)) but those jobs weren't open to teens anyway.
>

Well, see....I can't speak for other areas. But, of the friends and families I know and have known, there are more kids who think like my sons did than do not. And, part of it is this idea that mommies and daddies *had* to give the kids cars, a college education, life on a platter so-to-speak. Kind of like what Dwight was alluding to. *BUT* Dwight's characterization that it is "those" kids who think like that? I totally disagree. My sons, nor many of those children of friends and families I know, were not given a thing. And, they *still* had that opinion. My

theory is that they still thought like that because they "wanted" to be like those --rich-- kids and those rich kids think like that.

My sons also were not raised in a prejudiced home--yet my youngest son is one of the most bigoted people I know--no kidding.

> >>
> >> What sort of work did he expect to do as a teenager without special
> >> skills?
> >
> >Kids want jobs behind computers these days...or at a minimum, with the
least
> >amount of physical labor, and definitely "out of the elements."
>
> Considering what the elements must be where you are in summer, I can
understand
> that part. But the rest I don't.
>

Well, true. But, for instance. My husband's company that he's worked at for 27 years (a canvas awning shop) has just gone through quite a transition. It was a family-owned company that his mom sold a couple of years ago. The new owner saw the talent and skillset that my husband brings and took him off the installation truck and he's been an "inside" Gen Mgr ever since. Well, this year they saw a reduction in workforce (people quitting) and Cliff had to go back out on the truck a couple of months ago. I mentioned this to my youngest son and he said, "No way I'd do that. You tell Cliff to quit." His (my husband's) brother-in-law quit because he was being asked to work for a change--instead of his laziness being swept under the carpet because he's "f-a-m-i-l-y."

Most of us--those your and my age--are still in the generation that we "do what we gotta do." But, when one looks at it realistically and sees the writing on the wall--we are at the tail end of that kind of thought-pattern. Even we have less "gotta do it" than our parents have/had, because I know I've heard my father encourage things of us that make me think he is from another planet!

> >> >
> >> The question that comes to mind is "why won't they do those jobs?"
> >> Obviously ever worker with any sense is going to go for the "best" job
> >> they can find, but when someone is unemployed for a considerable
> >> length of time....
> >
> >Heck *I* wouldn't do those jobs. When I worked farms as a teen ager up
in
> >NY, I drove the tractor or leveled the silage delivery, etc. Ya think
I
> >was going to lift those haybales into the wagon, scrape the cowpoop,
etc.?
> >The older folks did all that stuff...we kids wouldn't do it! Well, at
least

> >we kids who didn't have a vested interest in the farms...
>
> You didn't do it because they didn't make ya do it......
>

Hmmmm. Nope. I think we didn't do it because we didn't want to do it. I learned real quick all I had to do was a pretty bad job at anything before I got that job taken away from me. I might get one that was thought of as a little worse--but that person's "worse" was, perhaps, something that I didn't mind doing so much. You know what I mean?

>
> >Work ethic was greater then, less when I was young and less even now
> >today...
>
> I think the whole "work ethic" thing was dreamed up by the top dogs as a
way to
> get the little dogs to work without questioning the system. A
businessperson or
> government official with a pile of FYM salted away is in a differrent
place
> than someone living paycheck to paycheck.
>
> I'm not saying that a laborer's work on the dam was anywhere near as
"valuable"
> as the project manager's - but the pay and risks were entirely out of
line.
>
> It wasn't that the work ethic was greater - the desperation was greater.
What
> did your kid do for spending money without a job?
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>

He went without. And, was apparently happy to do it. Now, I say he wouldn't work--he *did* end up with a job painting houses (interior) with a friend of mine. He was there every day and never was late, etc. I took him to work and picked him up until he had enough money to buy his car, his insurance, and all the things that go with it. He quit school, not with my blessing, but he quit. I told him that if he quit, he was to go immediately and get his GED--which he did--and he was to immediately get a job--which he did. The things that would have stopped me dead in my tracks from quitting school when I was a kid, were seen as very little hurdles to him.

I hated the job he had, because he was breathing paint fumes all day. So, I bought him a full fledged respirator and simply asked him to consider wearing it. He would, but only when they were doing varnish on wood cabinets. What I am getting at is--once again--why after all his "no's" was he so willing to take and stay at a job I considered very, very crappy? He was a 17-yr. old kid making nearly $12.00/hour. Plus his boss was a great

guy...really was. Was more of a pal than a boss and that's all it took for my kid to be a half-way decent employee. Now, near 30, he's still never made a huge success of himself, but he's a lot more ahead of those who were his friends in "those days." They are all welfare dads, standing on the corner every day waiting for someone to pick them up for a job, or they have several jobs a year. And, to get my kid to that point that he is took every bit out of me as a parent that I had to give. When you see a "good kid" these days? Look to the very beat up person behind them who has sacrificed and drained their emotions nearly to the end... ;)

Kim W5TIT

2054. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-01 19:07:48 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bo10cj$der@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 81729

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20031101083024.23171.00001851@mb-m05.aol.com...
> In article <bnv9tn$j14@library2.airnews.net>, "Kim W5TIT"
<kimscliff@yahoo.com>
> writes:
>
> >No, the damned rub is in how much our products would cost if the jobs
> >migrant and transient workers do were paid at much higher pay
> >scales!!!!!!!!!!!!
>
> Do we really know how much a head of lettuce would cost if the farm
workers got
> better wages? Does anyone know how much of the cost of various food items
goes
> to those workers - and how much goes to the retailer, wholesaler,
> transportation, processing, etc.?
>
> Might be surprising.
>
> > Not that I want to see anyone suffering...
> >
> >However, I doubt you'd find the workforce needed to do the jobs even
with
> >a higher payscale... Physical labor is an art these days.
>
> Which explains a lot of modern society's problems...
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

Yep. You got it.

Kim W5TIT

2055. Re: A Morsodist Challenge

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-01 19:43:17 UTC
From: groupk0hb@earthlink.net
Message-ID: <5ee63311.0311011143.3b655da0@posting.google.com>
Source record: 81731

brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote

>
> Hans, do you accept collect calls?
>

From VY1JA.

2056. Re: FCC Regualtions & Public Entities Policies

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-01 19:49:09 UTC
From: groupk0hb@earthlink.net
Message-ID: <5ee63311.0311011149.4120cc77@posting.google.com>
Source record: 81732

brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote

> > This radio communications occurs even if you
> > never actually place an outgoing call or recieve an incoming call.
>
> Doesn't even rate a "duh!"

You know that and I know that, but Lenover didn't even have a clue.

Sunuvagun!

With warmest personal regards,

de Hans, K0HB

2057. No Code General

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-01 23:31:16 UTC
From: Twistedhed <twistedhed@webtv.net>
Message-ID: <bo1fo4$5ai$1@news.x-echo.com>
Source record: 81733
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.swap

I am interested in expanding my freeband hobby but do not wish to take t
he General class hammie test until the code is dropped. My question is d
oes anyone know when the code will be dropped and how long woould I need
to wait until the written General test is simplified such as the Tech t
est is now?

Plase email me a WAV of morse code so I can hear what it sounded like wh
en the old hammies used it.
twistedhed@webtv.net

=-
Article poste via Voila News - http://www.news.voila.fr
Le : Sun Nov 2 00:31:15 2003 depuis l'IP : ac87591b.ipt.aol.com [VIP 532284301978]

2058. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-01 23:46:47 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <Q8OdnWyb2dFH2zmiRVn-uw@gbronline.com>
Source record: 81734

Kim W5TIT wrote:

> Consider this. I've been toying with the idea over the last few years that
> it will the "menial" (as was put by someone else--I don't agree with the
> term) jobs that will gradually grow to the higher paid jobs in this
> country...because there will be less and less people who *will* do them.
> The "services" of a migrant worker or a fast food person, or a municipal
> worker or construction worker will become so highly needed, that they will
> be able to demand a pretty penny for their work.

And when this happens your taco and a coke at Taco Bell will cost you $15.

2059. Re: No Code General

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-01 23:50:21 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <Q8OdnW-b2dFY2jmiRVn-uw@gbronline.com>
Source record: 81735
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.swap

Twistedhed wrote:

> I am interested in expanding my freeband hobby but do not wish to take t
> he General class hammie test until the code is dropped. My question is d
> oes anyone know when the code will be dropped and how long woould I need
> to wait until the written General test is simplified such as the Tech t
> est is now?
>
> Plase email me a WAV of morse code so I can hear what it sounded like wh
> en the old hammies used it.
> twistedhed@webtv.net

There is the twistie wanna-be posting from x-echo.com again.

2060. Re: No Code General

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-02 00:09:08 UTC
From: Landshark <S3Buell@jgkdls.com>
Message-ID: <EWXob.947$NJ3.639@newssvr29.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 81736
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.swap

Forge

"Twistedhed" <twistedhed@webtv.net> wrote in message news:bo1fo4$5ai$1@news.x-echo.com...
> I am interested in expanding my freeband hobby but do not wish to take t
> he General class hammie test until the code is dropped. My question is d
> oes anyone know when the code will be dropped and how long woould I need
> to wait until the written General test is simplified such as the Tech t
> est is now?
>
> Plase email me a WAV of morse code so I can hear what it sounded like wh
> en the old hammies used it.
> twistedhed@webtv.net
>
> =-
> Article poste via Voila News - http://www.news.voila.fr
> Le : Sun Nov 2 00:31:15 2003 depuis l'IP : ac87591b.ipt.aol.com [VIP 532284301978]

2061. Re: FCC Regualtions & Public Entities Policies

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-02 00:49:25 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <xnfcneeyarg.hnoz2f1.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>
Source record: 81737

On 31 Oct 2003 17:18:22 -0800, Brian wrote:

>> Also if a student's device is under part 97 do you still have the right to
>> confiscate it?
>
>Barrister Phil should say no.

Radio devices cannot be consfiscated by anyone because they are not
contraband as "controlled substances" are.

The school can seize (remove it from the student's possession) and
hold it for safekeeping until the student leaves the property only
if the student is on notice that this will happen if s/he does not
voluntarily turn it off or refrain from using it.

Of course the school will use the word "confiscate" but that's not
what's happening.

>But lately he's been saying all sorts of things.

In which of the two languages that I am fluent in, the one language
that I can stumble through, or the several languages in which I can
curse ??

>> Does this only apply to a device or to an individual using a device?
>
>Are Part 15 devices authorized?
>
>Part 15 says they are. Doesn't say "who" is authorized to use them.
>I assume they are lawfully used by citizens, hams, school children,
>and even Taliban.

There is a restriction that Part 15 devices cannot be used for any
unlawful purpose. Ordering a plate of hummus and ypreki (stuffed
grape leaves) or kibbe (ground lamb kebabs) is not unlawful.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

2062. Re: FCC Regualtions & Public Entities Policies

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-02 00:49:26 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <xnfcneeyarg.hnozah2.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>
Source record: 81738

On 31 Oct 2003 17:35:18 -0800, Brian wrote:

>That's why you find guys at the other end of the tunnel standing by
>with computer controlled "law enforcement" scanners logging all the
>codes as you pop out the other side and handshake with the local cell
>site.
>
>Then they sell them to Taliban operatives and drug dealers.

And they sell then to the guys who sell them to other guys who clone
cellphones which are sold to still other guys who set up curbside
"telephone booths" in immigrant neighborhoods to call relatives in
foreign countries at "discount rates".

At least they did have been doing those things for the last 10 years.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

2063. Re: Amateur Radio in the 21st Century?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-02 01:07:53 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <JNYob.1530$9M3.1433@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 81739

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20031031223023.12631.00002521@mb-m28.aol.com...
> In article <MvDob.16255$FI2.5145@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Bill
Sohl"
> <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
>
> >"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> >news:20031027222947.06226.00001204@mb-m19.aol.com...
> >> In article <Caknb.8872$FI2.7958@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>,
"Bill
> >Sohl"
> >> <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
> >>
> >> >"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
> >> >news:c2356669.0310270917.2668311b@posting.google.com...
> >> >> "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
> >> >news:<7O0nb.4484$X22.1484@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> >> >> > "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> >> >> > news:20031024182942.12300.00001303@mb-m20.aol.com...
> >> >> > > In article <3F993128.6080401@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
> >> >writes:
> >>
> >> >> KL7CC & Co. have already done so. Have you read their paper?
> >> >
> >> >No, is it on a web site?.
> >>
> >> http://www.qsl.net/al7fs/
> >>
> >> Second item down - "Amateur Radio in the 21st Century"
> >>
> >> You can skim through the code test stuff - we've agreed to disagree on
> >that.
> >> What is really interesting is the *other* ideas, such as what should
> >happen to
> >> the entry-level license class, free upgrades, written testing....
> >>
> >> 73 de Jim, N2EY
> >
> >Jim, et al;
> >
> >Some interesting and thought provoking suggestions/proposals.
> >
> >I agree we'll just have to disagree on the code testing, but IF folks are
> >looking for a tp down revamp of licensing for US hams, Jim (KL7CC)

> >has certainly stirred the pot.
>
> Agreed - but not in the best way, IMHO.

Are you saying discussion or stawman proposals are bad???

> >Maybe a good place to start would be the proposed "Communicator"
> >entry/beginners exam. Personally I think the applicant needs
> >some command of Part 97 rules...not all, but at least those that
> >would lay out the rules for Communicator license.
>
> If anything needs to be a part of the test, it's the rules and regs.

I agree...to a point as noted below.

> >I have always felt
> >memorizing
> >band edges makes little sense on a test because they do and have changed
> >over time. I'd like to know the applicant could at least read a
frequency
> >chart and be able to answer questions regarding the privileges for
> >his/her license. That could be "open book" where the frequency chart is
> >provided. Other basic questions probably should require some
> >recallable knowledge (e.g. music is forbidden, etc.)
>
> Power levels, modes allowed, knowing you can't cuss or jam others, etc.
>
> I think there is some sort of legal precedent that if something isn't in
the
> test syllabus, a licensed violator may have an out wrt prosecution.

No such legal precedent..rather, just the opposite...to wit,
ignorance of the lasw is not a valid defense to a violation charge.

> >If you haven't read the KL7CC white paper, here's where you
> >can find it:
> >
> >http://www.qsl.net/al7fs/NCVECplan.doc
> >
> >One interesting proposal sure to either enrage or please is the
> >free upgrades for Tech and Advanced. Personally, and I have no stake
> >in this as I'm already Extra, the idea of free upgrades doesn't bother me
at
> >all
> >if it ultimately results in a set of license classes that make sense with
> >regard
> >to privileges vs requirements.
>
> Free upgrades have a lot of downsides. For example, suppose that a tech
gets a
> free upgrade to General without ever taking Element 3 or its equivalent.
> Doesn't that prove that Element 3 contains nothing that is essential for

> General class privileges?

It proves nothing that definitive.

> Couldn't somebody claim that requiring new hams to
> pass Element 3 (or 4) but not requiring existing hams to do the same is
> discriminatory?

Someone can claim anything they want.

> >The other two alternatives are:
> >(1) certain existing licenses would lose privileges (not a good track
> >record on that as we saw in 1968) or
> >(2) we keep the existing licneses plus the newly defined ones and
> >wait for the old licenses to go SK. Probably not what the FCC wants
> >for enforcement and rules simplification.
>
> I don't see what the problem is with (2). FCC has kept three "cul de sac"
> license classes active for almost 4 years now (Tech Plus/Novice/Advanced)
with
> no real problems. They're just entries in a database.

They are more than just database entries. They also have specific
privileges which
differentiate them from the "lower" level licenses. IF the FCC granted
identical
privileges to Advanced rather than doing a "free upgrade" of Advanced to
Extra,
THEN the old licenses would be just a database differentiator.

> And FCC turned down ARRL's idea of free General upgrades for existing
Novices
> and Tech Pluses.

The FCC once was looking for a consensus of hams before it would
entertain dropping code speeds.

> >Further commentary ad discussion welcome.
> >
> >And a curse to the first person who introduces any of the lexicon
> >of name calling rather than attempt credible dialog or debate.
>
> AGREED!
>
> There's also the part about the "no homebrew no voltages over 30" for the
> Communicator. Not good ideas at all - nor are they realistic.

They may be more realistic then we may think. How many actual
"homebrew" Novice or Tech rigs have you seen?

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2064. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-02 01:31:46 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bo1ndd$eji@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 81741

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:z%Sob.6863$P%1.5839758@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
>
> "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> news:bo0tsj$20@library1.airnews.net...
> > Personally, I could never figure out why the computer industry was as it
> was
> > in this country. When one considers that the technology of computers
and
> > its resulting industry can literally be transported over phone lines,
how
> in
> > the world is it that there was such a glut of computer, and telecom for
> that
> > matter, in this country? Some tech support person from across the ocean
> can
> > access my computer and help me fix it.
> >
>
> What I object to is that they put people in customer service who speaks
the
> language so poorly that their help is worthless. I had this happen while
I
> was trying to cancel one of those "free internet trial subscriptions." It
> took at least 15 minutes to get them to understand that I wanted it
totally
> canceled.
>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>

You and I both, Dee. I consider myself an above-average patient person.
However, many times the communication barrier between myself and who is on
the phone to help far exceeds the frustration from the cause of my call!

Kim W5TIT

2065. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-02 01:32:39 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bo1nde$eji@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 81740

"JJ" <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
news:Q8OdnWyb2dFH2zmiRVn-uw@gbronline.com...
> Kim W5TIT wrote:
>
> > Consider this. I've been toying with the idea over the last few years
that
> > it will the "menial" (as was put by someone else--I don't agree with the
> > term) jobs that will gradually grow to the higher paid jobs in this
> > country...because there will be less and less people who *will* do them.
> > The "services" of a migrant worker or a fast food person, or a municipal
> > worker or construction worker will become so highly needed, that they
will
> > be able to demand a pretty penny for their work.
>
>
> And when this happens your taco and a coke at Taco Bell will cost you $15.
>

Yep, my point exactly...

Kim W5TIT

2066. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-02 01:53:18 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20031101205318.14837.00004005@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 81743

In article <fo1nb.4542$X22.1166@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> writes:

>
> If the Civil War was about slavery, then why was there a war at all? Prior
>to the war, the slave states were the majority in both the House and Senate,
>insuring no legislation could be passed to end slavery. Slavery was only
>abolished after the war by not allowing the former Confederate States (which
>included several, but not all, of the slave states) to participate in that
>vote.
>
>
>> (snip) why, in it's aftermath, did one of the most famous
>> Confederate Generals, Nathan Bedford Forrest,
>> organize the Ku Klux Klan? (snip)
>
>
> When you answer that, perhaps you can also answer why so many Northerners
>join the KKK.

Dwight:

I consider the KKK to be about racism, not slavery. It was originally started as a response to the heavy-handed political disenfranchisement of the former Confederate states by Northern "Carpetbaggers" who essentially swept into the South and took over in the aftermath of the Civil War. I don't believe that was right and never said so. However, the KKK, instead of targeting the mostly white Yankee politicians who violated the constitutional rights of the citizens of the Southern states, chose instead to target ethnic and religious groups, such as blacks, Catholics, and particularly Jews. Therefore, their motives were wrong from the start.

>> The South has a lot to answer for, IMHO. (snip)
>
>
> Why would they have any more to answer for than the Northern states that
>profited from the sale of slaves? Or more to answer for than those who used
>indentured or bound black workers in the North, even into the early 1900's?
>Or more to answer for than the many countries around the world which
>practiced slavery in this last century (the 1900's), the previous century,
>or in the many centuries before that?

I never said that slavery wasn't practiced in the North.

>> (snip) Modern-day Rebels with the Confederate flags on
>> their pickup trucks don't do much to heal the wounds of
>> the past. (snip)

> Perhaps because they have absolutely no responsibility for what happened
>in a past long before they were born.

However, in the context of our modern and presumably more enlightened
times, they represent something that is, best, an anachronistic example
of age-old prejudices. We should all be united under one flag, and that
flag has 50 stars and 13 stripes -- not a big "X" running through it.

73 de Larry, K3LT

2067. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-02 01:53:18 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20031101205318.14837.00004006@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 81744

In article <bnlq3n$12jjnj$4@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>, "Ryan, KC8PMX"
<REMOVETHISkc8pmx@diamondcs.net> writes:

>
>We also need to stop this crap of being the worlds Welfare payor! If you go
>back as far as 50 years ago, the amount of aid and "forgiven debts" would
>cancel out our national debt! Now we are going to give Iraq a ton of money
>after bombing them??? Screw 'em..... It's not our problem, and I as a
>taxpayer resent having to pay for it.
>
>Ryan

Ryan:

Right on. I think that at the very least, we should be getting a secure supply
of oil at VERY favorable prices from Iraq, as a result of liberating and
subsequently re-building (or just plain building) their country. As I said
before
the start of the Iraq War, if the war isn't about oil, then we had darn well
better find a way to make it be about oil! For all we have paid so far to
liberate Iraq, both in American lives and U.S. dollars, we should be enjoying
the world's lowest-priced gasoline for at least the lifetime of every American
living today.

America does not export terror. We export freedom, democracy, and
wealth. We're the good guys. We should not be afraid to be the strongest
nation on the planet, because through that strength, we can continue to
do good things for every other nation. Moreover, as long as the young
men and women who serve this nation are willing to sacrifice their lives
to help other countries achieve this freedom, it is only right that they
hold the expectation that by so doing, they will be gaining something
of tangible value for our nation as well.

73 de Larry, K3LT

2068. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-02 01:53:19 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20031101205319.14837.00004007@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 81742

In article <aSDnb.6340$Uv1.3126@news02.roc.ny>, "Jim Hampton"
<aa2qa@frontiernet.net> writes:

>
>Larry,
>
>I'd gently remind you that there wouldn't be any citizens (well, very few -
>only the decendents of the original folks after the revolutionary war) at
>all under those rules. My great-grandfather and my grandfather (when he was
>7) immigrated to the US in the late 1800s (my dads side). My mother's
>grandfather (my great-grandfather) immigrated from Canada. If their
>children couldn't become citizens, I wouldn't be one now. Heck, how could
>they hold a draft back in WWII with no citizens? Only draft foreigners?
>
>73 from Rochester, NY
>Jim AA2QA

Jim:

The United States, like any other nation, has a right and a responsibility
to control it's immigration policies. I don't believe that in these modern
times it makes sense to grant automatic, natural citizenship to the
children of people from other countries who have not undergone the
legal immigration and naturalization process. Yes, it is true that we
are all the descendants of immigrants; however, the immigrants I
descended from all came into this country legally, and were legally
naturalized under the existing law. Considering how much this country
has to offer, especially in terms of welfare benefits which would turn
a poor immigrant from an impoverished nation into a person who would
be wealthy by comparison to those from his home country, I don't
believe it is too much to ask for them to obey the law.

As I stated previously, liberal immigration policies usually serve a political
purpose, rather than a purely humanitarian one. For this reason, I
think closing some of the loopholes and requiring that those who wish
to come to the U.S. and become citizens to follow the correct immigration
and naturalization procedures, makes good sense from a "homeland
security" standpoint.

73 de Larry, K3LT

2069. Re: FCC Regualtions & Public Entities Policies

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-02 02:54:03 UTC
From: Donnie <duhhh@donnieduhhh.net>
Message-ID: <bo1rk4ln0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 81745

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:xnfcneeyarg.hnoz2f1.pminews@netnews.comcast.net...
> On 31 Oct 2003 17:18:22 -0800, Brian wrote:
>
> >> Also if a student's device is under part 97 do you still have the right
to
> >> confiscate it?
> >
> >Barrister Phil should say no.
>
> Radio devices cannot be consfiscated by anyone because they are not
> contraband as "controlled substances" are.
>
> The school can seize (remove it from the student's possession) and
> hold it for safekeeping until the student leaves the property only
> if the student is on notice that this will happen if s/he does not
> voluntarily turn it off or refrain from using it.
>
> Of course the school will use the word "confiscate" but that's not
> what's happening.
>
> >But lately he's been saying all sorts of things.
>
> In which of the two languages that I am fluent in, the one language
> that I can stumble through, or the several languages in which I can
> curse ??
>
> >> Does this only apply to a device or to an individual using a device?
> >
> >Are Part 15 devices authorized?
> >
> >Part 15 says they are. Doesn't say "who" is authorized to use them.
> >I assume they are lawfully used by citizens, hams, school children,
> >and even Taliban.
>
> There is a restriction that Part 15 devices cannot be used for any
> unlawful purpose. Ordering a plate of hummus and ypreki (stuffed
> grape leaves) or kibbe (ground lamb kebabs) is not unlawful.
>
> --
> 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane
>

You're full of shit too!

Get a Life !

73 de Donnie

2070. Re: FCC Regualtions & Public Entities Policies

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-02 02:58:38 UTC
From: Donnie <duhhh@donnieduhhh.net>
Message-ID: <bo1rsn$2de$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 81746

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:xnfcneeyarg.hnozah2.pminews@netnews.comcast.net...
> On 31 Oct 2003 17:35:18 -0800, Brian wrote:
>
> >That's why you find guys at the other end of the tunnel standing by
> >with computer controlled "law enforcement" scanners logging all the
> >codes as you pop out the other side and handshake with the local cell
> >site.
> >
> >Then they sell them to Taliban operatives and drug dealers.
>
> And they sell then to the guys who sell them to other guys who clone
> cellphones which are sold to still other guys who set up curbside
> "telephone booths" in immigrant neighborhoods to call relatives in
> foreign countries at "discount rates".
>
> At least they did have been doing those things for the last 10 years.
>
> --
> 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane
>
>

BULLSHIT! How do you know?

Get a Life!

73 de Donnie

2071. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-02 03:13:21 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <ID_ob.1667$9M3.1519@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 81747

"N2EY" wrote:
>
> I think that when Kim writes "no one" in a context like
> that, she really means "almost no one" or "hardly anyone"
> rather than the literal standard meaning "not a single
> person" or "nobody at all".

I know what she means, but it's not what she wrote, Jim. And if we can't get past the absoluteness of that "no one," there is little way to continue the discussion. If we're instead talking about "almost no one" or "hardly anyone," then the obvious question becomes why bring in immigrants to take even those few people's jobs or drive down their wages. Of course, I don't really expect Kim to answer those questions. Few seem to care about the Americans who are losing their jobs, or are seeing their wages reduced, as a result of immigration and other government policies. They have their pro-immigration blinders on and refuse to see the obvious fallout of these government policies.

I look around and see many in my hometown (a small town) unemployed or working in low paying jobs while every factory in the area closes and immigrants move in to take jobs. A friend, who has been doing lawn care for almost three decades, recently lost a long-standing contract to another out-of-state company using all immigrant employees. As a result, he filed for bankruptcy and had to fire his entire workforce - Americans who were willing to work.

I'm feeling the pressure right now. One of my companies (wetland maintenance) is facing competition from a company with almost all illegal immigrant employees. I just barely held onto a county contract last time, but profits are now dismal. To hold onto that contract next time, either I cut my employee's wages sharply or I replace them with illegal immigrants. The only other option is to not even bid at all, which means the other company (with it's illegal immigrants) is assured the contract (and I let employees go).

The economy of this country is quickly heading to hell in a handbasket and few seem to even notice or care.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

2072. I need a good radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-02 04:06:11 UTC
From: MW <27555@khzfreeband.net>
Message-ID: <bo1vrb$rl5$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 81748

"Steveo" <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com> wrote in message
news:20031031210003.340$0t@newsreader.com...
> I'm in the market for a used 10/11 meter mobile radio for my
> snow plow truck. It needs to be somewhat rugged because of
> the environment, and do decent SSB to 27.9 .
>
> Any suggestions?

2073. BUY SELL TRADE CB RADIOS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-02 04:07:24 UTC
From: MW <27555@khzfreeband.net>
Message-ID: <bo1vtk$s4g$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 81749

"KB9HGI" <qdarts@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:3fa162aa_4@newsfeed.slurp.net...
> Check out my message forums. Buy, Sell and Trade your CB gear! Just click
on
> the link below. All are welcome!
>
> www.quincydarts.com/kb9hgi
>
>

2074. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-02 04:13:57 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <9w%ob.1748$9M3.840@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 81750

"Robert Casey" wrote:
>
> I'm a city boy, so I don't know much about farming,
> except for a vague idea that farmers grow stuff that
> gets converted to food sold at supermarkets. And
> that there are massive government subsidies for farmers.
> To make for cheap food in the USA. Or something
> like that........

Most of those subsidies are in the form of market management, Robert. In other words, they're designed to prevent gluts or shortages of farm goods. Perhaps the easiest way to understand it is to look at an example. Lets say there is a shortage of green beans this year, which has driven up the costs (and, for the farmer, sale price) of green beans. At the same time, there are too many tomatoes on the store shelves this year, driving down costs (and the sale price for farmers). Obviously, farmers want to make maximum profits, so farmers throughout the country next year will decide not to grow tomatoes and to grow green beans instead.

Of course, if this happens, there is going to be an extreme shortage of tomatoes next year and way too many green beans. To prevent this, the government steps in to ask some farmers to grow tomatoes instead of green beans. But, to comply, the farmer has to give up any potential extra profit he might make if he can beat other farmers to market next year before the price of green beans fall as a result of the glut. And, of course, there won't be any extra profits from the sale of tomatoes next year if the government is successful in getting some farmers to grow them.

In the end, few farmers are going to agree to grow tomatoes. At this point, the government sweetens the deal by offering money to some farmers in the form of farm subsidies to encourage them to grow tomatoes instead. Since this extra money is a sure thing, the farmers agree to grow tomatoes. The end result is that there are both tomatoes and green beans on the store shelves next year.

This is one form of market management. It also happens when the profits of one product are always lower than the profits of another. For example, there is always more profit in growing corn than watermelons (even with the different prices in the stores). Watermelons are a low yield crop while corn is a high yield crop, meaning yon can grow much more corn then watermelons on the same amount of land. Without farm subsidies to encourage farmers to grow watermelons, very few farmers would.

End of Government Agriculture Management, Lesson 101. ;-)

As far as I know, my grandmother has never received farm subsidies. In fact, subsidies are rarely even available to farmers with family, small, or mid-size farms since their contributions to the overall market is relatively small. My grandmother's farm was considered a mid-sized farm.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

2075. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-02 05:14:59 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <np0pb.1787$9M3.772@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 81551

"N2EY" wrote:
>
> Agreed! But there's a difference between doing it
> for a summer at a relative's place, and doing it all
> year long at various locations all over the country
> or all over a region. And there's a difference
> between doing it for a relative and doing it for
> one's living.

Okay, if you want to make that fine of a distinction, while it is certainly true I never worked a farm laborer job as my sole income, let me also add that I did work for other farmers in the area while both a teenager and young adult, as nothing more than another paid laborer (no family connections). Many teenagers in the area did it during the summer to earn extra money and many young adults made a living as farm laborers (I continued to do it occasionally as a young adult to subsidize my income).

Of course, I just don't see the fine distinction you're suggesting here. A day, week, or month's work on the farm is a day, week, or month's work on the farm. If you're doing laborer work, the work doesn't change based on who you are or where you live other times of the year. If anything, while working for my grandmother, I felt I had to work harder to earn the other workers' respect of my worth to get the same pay (and to prove I wasn't just a city boy). And I continued to work after they went home for the day. Farm equipment had to be cleaned and put away. Machinery had to be cleaned, fueled, and oiled for the next days' work. Barns had to be monitored. The other normal chores around the farm continued. Later, after those laborers left for the year, fields had to be plowed for next years' crops. For the farmer, work doesn't end with just pulling the crops out of the fields.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

2076. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-02 05:45:18 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <OR0pb.1801$9M3.1226@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 81552

"N2EY" wrote:
>
> I would point out that back in 1906 there were
> people criticizing the immigration of those times.
> Particularly immigrants who weren't from the
> "right" parts of northern and western Europe...

Part of the problem was that immigration was being sold at the time as a way to grow and further tame the West, while many immigrants simply couldn't afford to move West once they got here - something the government seemed to have overlooked. The result was a flood of new immigrants into Eastern cities. Of course, the government did eventually get what it wanted as many in the East simply moved West to get away from the new immigrants. Just kidding (I think). ;-)

> Immigration quotas were enacted early in the 20th
> century for all these reasons and more.

Many of those quotas lasted well into the 1960's (my wife is a history major and she was just reading about them a few days ago).

> I think that for the reason of national security alone,
> we have to:
>
> - change the criteria for legal immigration
> - reduce/eliminate illegal immigration and visa abuse
> - work towards better labor practices through both
> government and marketplace action

I agree. There isn't going to be an easy solution. Multiple steps, in just the areas you describe, will have to be taken to insure a lasting solution instead of a quick fix that falls apart in a few months. Sadly, we don't seem to have any long term plans in this country - a game plan that stretches out beyond just the next year or so. Bush is gearing up for next year's election, but what about the month or year after that election? What about ten years from now?

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

2077. Re: No Code General

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-02 05:49:41 UTC
From: Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com>
Message-ID: <20031102004941.440$Re@newsreader.com>
Source record: 81553
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.swap

JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote:
> Twistedhed wrote:
>
> > I am interested in expanding my freeband hobby but do not wish to take
> > t he General class hammie test until the code is dropped. My question
> > is d oes anyone know when the code will be dropped and how long woould
> > I need
> > to wait until the written General test is simplified such as the Tech
> > t est is now?
> >
> > Plase email me a WAV of morse code so I can hear what it sounded like
> > wh en the old hammies used it.
> > twistedhed@webtv.net
>
> There is the twistie wanna-be posting from x-echo.com again.
>
His bait smells like the north end of a south bound mule.

2078. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-02 05:53:24 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <oZ0pb.1803$9M3.26@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 81554

"charlesb" wrote:
>
> OH, I see! - You're talking about the government
> being intelligent enough to keep it's hands off of the
> economy so that it can mature and grow! I couldn't
> agree with you more. - And you have history on
> your side, in this arguement. Every recorded instance
> of governmental meddling with the parameters of the
> economy has resulted in fiasco, a net loss. (snip)

I'm arguing for a change in the ways things are done now, Charles. Not for more of the same garbage. If you're truly that dissatisfied, you should want some form of change. Instead, you seem to arguing to keep the existing status quo.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

2079. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-02 05:58:13 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <0qadnVvE-LjFPTmiRVn-gg@gbronline.com>
Source record: 81555

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:

>
> However, in the context of our modern and presumably more enlightened
> times, they represent something that is, best, an anachronistic example
> of age-old prejudices. We should all be united under one flag, and that
> flag has 50 stars and 13 stripes -- not a big "X" running through it.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

Just saw on the news that more blacks are leaving the North for the
South than blacks leaving the South for the North. Reason? More jobs in
the South and less racism.

2080. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-02 06:32:27 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <%x1pb.1819$9M3.213@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 81556

"Larry Roll K3LT" wrote:
>
> I consider the KKK to be about racism, not
> slavery. It was originally started as a response
> to the heavy-handed political disenfranchisement
> of the former Confederate states by Northern
> "Carpetbaggers" who essentially swept into the
> South and took over in the aftermath of the Civil
> War. I don't believe that was right and never said
> so. However, the KKK, instead of targeting the
> mostly white Yankee politicians who violated the
> constitutional rights of the citizens of the Southern
> states, chose instead to target ethnic and religious
> groups, such as blacks, Catholics, and particularly
> Jews. (snip)

The "particularly Jews" is news to me. I know the KKK doesn't especially like Jews today (to put it mildly), but I've read a lot about the early KKK and don't remember seeing anything about Jews being targeted, especially "particularly" targeted. Can you provide a source where I can read more about this?

> However, in the context of our modern and presumably
> more enlightened times, they represent something that
> is, best, an anachronistic example of age-old prejudices.
> We should all be united under one flag, and that flag has
> 50 stars and 13 stripes -- not a big "X" running through it.

I think you're interpreting the whole thing wrong, Larry. Very few in the South see that flag as a statement about slavery or racism. From my observations, most see it as a way to stick up their middle finger at a government they don't particularly like. For example, the flag is displayed most often when a liberal is in the White House and less often when a conservative is in the White House. A few years ago, during the Clinton years, you could see that flag everywhere (vehicles, yards, and so on). Today, it has virtually disappeared. When another liberal gets in the White House, that flag will suddenly show up on everything again. The more liberal that person is, the more you'll see that flag displayed.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

2081. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-02 10:54:58 UTC
From: charlesb <n5pvl@sbcglobal.net>
Message-ID: <6o5pb.9912$wT7.109785251@newssvr21.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 81557

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:oZ0pb.1803$9M3.26@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> "charlesb" wrote:
> >
> > OH, I see! - You're talking about the government
> > being intelligent enough to keep it's hands off of the
> > economy so that it can mature and grow! I couldn't
> > agree with you more. - And you have history on
> > your side, in this arguement. Every recorded instance
> > of governmental meddling with the parameters of the
> > economy has resulted in fiasco, a net loss. (snip)
>
>
> I'm arguing for a change in the ways things are done now, Charles. Not
for
> more of the same garbage. If you're truly that dissatisfied, you should
want
> some form of change. Instead, you seem to arguing to keep the existing
> status quo.

Amazing that you can interpret all that from my post, which I had thought to be fairly straightforward and easy to understand.

Let's try again: The kind of economic manipulation that you are advocating has been tried many, many times, with consistently poor results. It is not "new" and further manipulations of this kind would not be a "change", as it has been tried extensively already. - Again; With consistently poor results.

A good "change" would be to adopt a more intelligent attitude about the market and resist the "Pollyanna" temptation to attempt to legislate prosperity.

Of course it could be that you will read this and conclude that I must mean that parrots are smarter than doves, so they would be the best thing to use for a messenger service... After your left-field response to my first post, I would not be at all surprised.

This may point out where some of our economic woes may originate.... Are all people who advocate manipulation of the economy by well-meaning fools functionally illiterate? Perhaps that is what keeps them from learning the simple lessons of history, tempting them to advocate old, bad ideas that are conspicuous for thier repeated failure?

Charles Brabham, N5PVL

2082. Re: No Code General

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-02 13:38:27 UTC
From: Royce Dean <swl3@ibm.net>
Message-ID: <nN7pb.84546$Fm2.63043@attbi_s04>
Source record: 81558
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.swap

The future of the code is still in limbo, and could be resolved in several months, or years. As far as the written, it is about as easy now, as it ever has been.

"Twistedhed" <twistedhed@webtv.net> wrote in message news:bo1fo4$5ai$1@news.x-echo.com...
> I am interested in expanding my freeband hobby but do not wish to take t
> he General class hammie test until the code is dropped. My question is d
> oes anyone know when the code will be dropped and how long woould I need
> to wait until the written General test is simplified such as the Tech t
> est is now?
>
> Plase email me a WAV of morse code so I can hear what it sounded like wh
> en the old hammies used it.
> twistedhed@webtv.net
>
> =-
> Article poste via Voila News - http://www.news.voila.fr
> Le : Sun Nov 2 00:31:15 2003 depuis l'IP : ac87591b.ipt.aol.com [VIP 532284301978]

2083. Amateur Radio Newsline™ Report 1368 – October 31 2003

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-02 14:03:36 UTC
From: radionews@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031102090336.26394.00000048@mb-m19.aol.com>
Source record: 81559

Amateur Radio Newsline™ Report 1368 – October 31 2003

A NOTE TO THOSE WHO ONLY “READ” AMATEUR RADIO NEWSLINE(tm)

For those of you who only know of the Amateur Radio Newsline (tm) as a text newsletter we would like to invite you to listen to the audio version. This Amateur Radio Newsline (tm) script is actually written for the “spoken word.” It is recorded each by professional broadcasters and is available for private listening or rebroadcast over your repeater. Two methods of delivery are available: FTP MP3 or dial-in telephone. Please visit our website at http://www.arnewsline.org for a list of telephone numbers (you have to pay your own long distance charges) and links to our voice newscast. Free FTP Downloads are available at our website by clicking on the newscast number at the top of the page.

de
The Newsline Production Team

Amateur Radio Newsline report number 1368 with a release date of Friday, October 31st 2003 to follow in 5-4-3-2-1.

The following is a Q-S-T. Ham radio comes to the rescue as southern California is swept by wildfires and a new Amateur Radio satellite will be launched early next year. Find out the details on Amateur Radio Newsline report number 1368 coming your way right now.

(Billboard Cart Here)

**

RESCUE RADIO: HAM RADIO AND THE SOCAL FIRES

From the Mexican border to the suburbs north of Los Angeles, large sections of the Southern California were under siege the past week. This, as ten major and several smaller wildfires blazed their way across the area.

Fanned by hot, dry Santa Ana winds gusting to 60 miles an hour, the wildfires dervored everything it their path. At least a eighteen people are dead and over 1500 homes and businesses have been destroyed. And as we go to air, well over 1 million acres have burned.

Gordon West, WB6NOA, has been at one of the busiest Red Cross evacuation centers for the past several days. He took time out to file this first hand report on how hams are aiding in fire relief efforts:

--
Audio report only. Hear it at www.arnewsline.org/quincy
--

As we go to air, ham radio operators continue their firefighting communications support efforts. More on their role in future Amateur Radio Newsline reports. (ARNewsline(tm))

**

RESCUE RADIO: KCOP REPORTS ON HAMS DOING FIRE DUTY

Los Angeles television station KCOP appears to be the only one so far to mention the role the role ham radio operators are playing in fighting the Southern California wildfires.

On Monday night October 27th, the stations 11 P.M. newscast showed video of a group of unidentified hams at their radios in the Los Angeles western suburb of Simi Valley. At the same time anchorman Rick Garcia read a brief synopsys of what the radio amateurs were doing. It explained how the hams could provide communications between the various relief agencies that could not speak directly with one another.

While short and simple, the report was well written, accurate and nicely done. KCOP is one of two Fox owned stations serving the Los Angeles area. (ARNewsline(tm))

**

RESCUE RADIO: CALIFORNIA WILDFIRES FROM SPACE

The wildfires that ravaged southern California were even impressive from space. Just before returning to Earth, NASA astronaut Ed Lu took photographs from 240 miles above the fires through the windows of the International Space Station. The photos taken on Sunday October 26th are on-line at www.spaceflight.nasa.gov/station. (NASA)

**

RADIO LAW: AUTHORITIES LOOKING FOR ALLEGED TOWER TERRORIST

Law enforcement authorities in northern California and southern Oregon are searching for a man seen tampering with electrical towers. This, as one official says that the incident smacks of being an act of domestic terrorism.

According to the CGC Communicator, the latest incident took place the week of October 20th just south of Redding California. It involved a heav-set man who used large wrenches to completely unbolt one leg of a four legged transmission tower.

Authorities say that he had half the bolts removed from a second leg when he was spotted and fled. Witnesses chased the suspect onto Interstate 5, where he

sped south into Tehama County and disappeared. As we go to air he is still at large.

According to a news release from the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the suspect is similar in description to a man seen removing bolts at another tower near Klamath Falls, Oregon earlier in the day. He is described as a white male, in his early 60's with long, blackish-gray hair and a salt-and-pepper beard.

More details on this story and the suspect are in cyberspace at: http://redding.com/top_stories/local/20031022toplo043.shtml (CGC Communicator)

**

Break 1

From the United States of America, We are the Amateur Radio Newsline, heard on bulletin stations around the world and this week recognizing the support of the Quarter Century Wireless Association and its chapters world-wide.

(5 sec pause here)

**

HAM RADIO IN SPACE: ECHO LAUNCH ANNOUNCED

Ham radio will soon have another new bird on orbit. This as AMSAT-North America announced that launch of the AMSAT OSCAR-E will take place on March 31st. Amateur Radio Newsline's Bruce Tennant, K6PZW, has more:

--

That's right. Some really good news on the ham radio space front. This, as word comes that the Echo ham radio microsat is now scheduled to launch on March 31, 2004.

Earlier plans had called for a May 2004 launch for the tiny bird. Echo Project team member Richard Hambly, W2GPS, reported at AMSAT-North America's Annual Meeting that the project has made significant progress in recent months. So much so that advancing the launch date was possible.

Echo is a fairly simple ham radio by todays standards. It has two UHF transmitters. Each one runs from 1 to 8 watts and the bird is capable of simultaneous operation. Also on board are four VHF receivers and a multiband, multimode receiver capable of operation on the 10 meters, 2 meter, 70 cm and 23 cm bands. This means all sorts of transmit and receive band combinations will be possible once the tiny ham-sat is in space. This includes PSK31 on a 10-meter SSB uplink.

Hambly says that the project team powered up the Echo flight hardware in late summer at Space Quest. Data communications, command and control, and attitude control subsystems were tested. Also checked out were the radio equipment, power systems and cabling. It all checked out and that's good news for hams waiting for this latest addition to its family of birds in space.

For the Amateur Radio Newsline, I’m Bruce Tennant, K6PZW, reporting.

--

A Russian rocket will carry the 10-inch-square satellite into a low-Earth orbit from the famed Baikonur Cosmodrome in Kazakhstan. (ANS)

**

PROPAGATION: ANOTHER CME AT SUNSPOT 486

More solar activity affecting ham radio. This, as one of the most powerful solar flares ever recorded erupted on the Sun the morning of October 28th.

It happened near giant sunspot 486. That’s the sunspot we reported on last week and this latest explosion hurled a coronal mass ejection or C-M-E directly toward Earth.

Based on the speed and recordings it was expected to to impact the Earth’s Magnetosphere at about 1500 U-T-C on October 29th. When it hit, the shock alone wold produce a G 3 level geomagnetic activity. A level high enough to produce bright auroras at high latitude sites such as Scandinavia, Alaska, and Canada.

As hams are well aware, a solar storm can fully disrupt communications on some bands while creating unexpected propagation on others. What this one is doing is still developing as we go to air. More on this story as the reports come in. (ASWLC)

**

DX DEBACLE: ANNABON ISLAND TEAM SPEAKS OUT

An update to the plight of the plight of the Dxpedition group forced to flea Annabon Island a few weeks ago. Jeramy Boot, G4NJH, is in Nottingham England with the rest of the story.

--

We reported two weeks ago that the 3C0V DXpedition to Annobon Island - off the west coast of Africa - had been forced to close down but at that time the reason for the enforced closure was not known. A press release has now been issued by the 3C0V team which says that all four operators - DJ9ZB, EA5YN, EA5FO and EA5BYP - are now back home safe and sound.

The press release says that each operator had proper individual licences and the group had written authorisation to import and operate amateur radio equipment on the island. However, on the 4th of October the military authorities there demanded that the group should dismantle the stations and leave for the Equatorial Guinea capital. Two days later DJ9ZB and EA5FO were allowed to leave the country but the other two team members remained in the capital until the 10th, when they were eventually able to return to Spain.

Jeramy Boot, G4NJH.

--

The complete press release is in cyberspace at www.tabarca.es.mn Wew will have more DX news later on in this weeks program. (GB2RS)

**

ENFORCEMENT: FCC WRITES TWO CITIES ABOUT INTERFERENCE TO THEIR HAMS

The FCC has contacted officials in two cities about interference to their local ham radio operators. The Agency’s Daryl Duckworth, NN0W, explains:

--

Duckworth: “The mayor of Lubbock Texas, along with copies to the Lubbock City Manager, the Lubbock City Attorney and Lubbock Power and Light have been sent a letter concerning interference to Brian Edwards, W5KFT. This interference, possibly from equipment operated by Lubbock Power and Light, dates back to 1998.

Along similar lines, the mayor of Gouverneur, New York, has a follow-up letter concerning the lack of response to a previous FCC notification of RFI to Morton Howard, W2ATO. The mayor has 15 days from receipt to reply.

This has been Daryl Duckworth, NN0W, reporting.”

--

Both mayors were invited to contact FCC Special Counsel Riley Hollingsworth if they have any questions concerning these matters. (FCC, RAIN)

**

ENFORCEMENT: FCC RAIDS SAN FRANCISCO UNLICENSED STATION

The Federal Communications Commission has raided the San Francisco couple's home and shut down an unlicensed radio station. The action removed Liberation Radio, a low-power alternative FM station that broadcasts political views and independent music programs from the airwaves.

The operation took place at the residence of Jim and Charlotte Hatch. The Hatch's had been told to take the station off the air before the raid. Their first warning came in July, when FCC investigators showed up at the couple's home and asked to inspect the equipment. They refused the FCC entry and were warned that they faced a potential $17,000 fine.

Instead, agents returned on Wednesday October 15th with a search warrant and more than a dozen federal marshals and confiscated the stations’ broadcast equipment. This included the transmitter, mixing console, computers, tape and CD players, turntables and even the rooftop antenna.

No charges have yet been filed against anyone associated with the station but further enforcement action is expected in this case. (Published news reports)

**

ENFORCEMENT: TEXAS FIRMS CITED FOR CB RADIO VIOLATIONS

The FCC has cited David P. Pace Jr of Nacogoches, Texas, for alleged violations of its rules dealing with the sale of 11 meter C-B gear. According to ther agency, Pace, doing business as Pacetronics and Pace Marketing was offering for sale more than three dozen types of non certificated CB transceivers under the guise of them being ham radio transceivers.

According to the ARRL Letter, the FCC evaluated similar radios and found that the devices at issue are not only amateur radios but can easily be altered for use as Citizens Band devices as well. The regulatory agency says that dual use CB and amateur radio gear cannot be certificated under its rules.

The FCC also warned Pace that its rules requires certification for external RF power amplifiers or amplifier kits capable of operation between 24 and 35 MHz. The FCC asked Pace to submit a written statement describing actions taken to correct the apparent violations. The FCC's Dallas office issued the citation. (ARRL)

**

COMMUNICATIONS CRIMES: FLORIDA MAN CONVICTED OF VIOLATING DMCA

A Boca Raton Florida man has been convicted of selling hardware to illegally tap into DirecTV satellite broadcasts. Following a four-day trial in federal court, a jury has found that Thomas Michael Whitehead guilty of one count of conspiracy, two counts of selling devices designed to unlawfully decrypt satellite television programming and three counts of violating the Digital Millennium Copyright Act.

The Digital Millennium Copyright Act is a 1998 federal law that makes it illegal to make or sell any technology designed to get around copy protection measures such as the electronic cards used by DirecTV to give consumers access to its programming. With his conviction, Whitehead becomes the first person to be found guilty by a jury under it. He faces a maximum sentence of 30 years in federal prison and up to up to $2.75 million in fines. (Published news reports)

**

BREAK 2

This is ham radio news for today’s radio amateur. From the United States of America, We are the Amateur Radio Newsline with links to the world from our only official website at www.arnewsline.org and being relayed by the volunteer services of the following radio amateur:

(5 sec pause here)

**

EMERGING TECHNOLOGY: GET READY FOR BOOK RFI

Remember those Radio Frequency I-D tags that are of such concern to ham radio? Well you will never guess where they are about to show up. Ken Butler, W1NNR, tells us:

--
The San Francisco Public Library's plans to track books by inserting an RFID

tag to each one. These are the same radio tags that hams tried to get the FCC to not deplioy earlier this year.

Now, library officials in the Bay area say that they will install the RFID's, into the roughly two million books, CDs and audio visual materials patrons can borrow. The system still needs funding and probably will not be ready for deployment until at least 2005.

--

So in a few years when you receive QRM to your ham radio operations, you might find that its coming from that novel you are reading late at night. (Science Today)

**

CONVENTIONS AND HAMFESTS: HAMVENTION 2004 WILL BE AT THE HARA

The Hamvention will remain at the HARA Arena through 2004. This, according to an announcement from the Dayton Amateur Radio Association which says that it has signed a one year contract that will keep Hamvention at the facility through next years outing.

The Hamvention planners are also looking for volunteers that want to help make Hambention 2004 a big success. To help gather support a new volunteer your services form is available at the Hamvention website. Its an on-line, fill in the blank form and you will find it at www.hamvention.org/volunteer.html. Just fill it out and the Hamvention folks will get back and let you know how you can assist.

The 53rd annual Hamvention will be held May 14th through the 16th, 2004, at the HARA Arena in the Dayton suburb of Trotwood Ohio. (DARA)

**

CONVENTIONS AND HAMFESTS: MICROWAVE MEET IN THE UK

Meantime, word that the Martlesham Microwave Round Table will take place on Saturday the 8th and Sunday the 9th of November. This, at the B-T Adastral Park, near the city of Ipswich in the United Kingdom. Featured will be a full program of talks and seminars including speakers from Europe and the United States along with a giant flea market. Full information is on-line at http://mmrt.homedns.org. There is no www in this URL address. (GB2RS)

**

ON THE AIR: THE 2003 SIX METER SPRINT

Last weekends 6 meter Sprint brought quite a bit of operation to the Magic Band. NEZ0P, one of the stations posting to the VHF Reflector says that he heard or contacted several semi rare stations for this time of the year. This included AA7J in grid DN-30, VE3CDP portable W9 in EM-58 and a couple of others. John adds that he held 34 Q-S-O's with stations in 25 grid squares during the short operating event. This included contacts into Maine, New Hampshire and Vermont. Not bad for a band that usually produces little

excitement at this time of year. (VHF eflector)

**

ON THE AIR: THE BAJA NET INVITES YOU

Berand Kirschner, WB0YCQ, reminds everyone that the The Baja Net meets daily at 08: 00 local California time on 7.238 Mhz. Kirschner describes the Baja Net as a friendly gathering spot for boaters. RV'ers and others who carry ham radio as they roam. (WB0YCQ)

**

DX

In D-X, word that ES1FB plans to be active as XW1FB. This, from Vientiane, Laos, threough the 4th of November. No word on times, frequencies or modes. (GB2RS)

Also on through November 4th will be K3BYV and N3CXM. They will are active as PZ5DX and PZ5JR respectively from Suriname. For both operations,. QSL as directed on the air. (GB2RS)

And GB50RAEN is on the air to celebrate the 50th anniversary of the founding of Raynet. Raynet is Great Britain'd equivlant of our ARES and RACES combined. The station is being operated by groups from West Midlands Raynet in the UK. (GB2RS)

Lastly, VK8NSB reports via Q-News that the Darwin Amateur Radio Club in Ausrtralia's Northern Territory will be operating a special event station to celebrate 25 years of self government. The station signing VI8NT will be on through the 31st of December. QSL directly to VK6NE or via the bureau. (Q-News)

**

THAT FINAL ITEM: ARNEWSLINE(tm) NAMES NT3V NEW CHAIR OF YHOTY COMMITTEE

And finally this week, we at the Amateur Radio Newsline are happy to announce the appointment of Mark Abramowicz, NT3V, as the new Chairman of our Young Ham of the Year Award Committee. Abramowicz replaces Larry Zettwoch, KR4IF, who served in that position the past 9 years.

For those of you not familiar with NT3V, Mark hails from Reading Pennsylvania, and happens to be the father of our 2002 Young Ham of the Year award recipient, Josh Abramowicz, KB3GWY. But Mark and Josh are not the only hams in the Abramowicz family. Mark's wife Suzanna is NZ3G and his daughter Amy holds the call sign KB3IJW. Only the two youngest members of the Amramowicz family -- sons Jonathan and Jordan are not licensed. At least not yet.

By profession, Mark is a news reporter and anchor at KYW radio in Philadelphia where he is known professionally as Mark Abrams. He is also is an adjunct professor at Temple University where he teaches writing for mass media and broadcast newswriting. And like his predecessor, Mark is very involved with the scouts and scouting program as are his two older children.

A very nice bio on Mark Anramowicz, NT3V, can be found at the KYW website. That U-R-L is http://www.kywam.com/staff/bios_detail.cfm?biosid=53 (ARNewsline(tm))

**

NEWSCAST CLOSE

With thanks to Alan Labs, AMSAT, the ARRL, the CGC Communicator, CQ Magazine, the FCC, the Ohio Penn DX Bulletin, Radio Netherlands, Rain, the RSGB and Australia's Q-News, that's all from the Amateur Radio Newsline(tm). Our e-mail address is newsline @arnewsline.org. More information is available at Amateur Radio Newsline's(tm) only official website located at www.arnewsline.org. You can also write to us or support us at Amateur Radio Newsline(tm), P.O. Box 660937, Arcadia, California 91066.

For now, with Bill Pasternak, WA6ITF, at the editors desk, I’m Jim Davis, W2JKD, saying 73 and we thank you for listening." Amateur Radio Newsline(tm) is Copyright 2003. All rights reserved.

2084. Re: No Code General

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-02 14:29:19 UTC
From: Topaz305RK <2smoore@nemontel.net>
Message-ID: <OOGdnaYJNdxXiTiiRVn-tw@vnet-inc.com>
Source record: 81560
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.swap

```
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

/
/
/
/
/
/
/
/
/
/
/
/
/
/

TROLL-O-METER
```

2085. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-02 15:04:44 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bo36dh$sko@library2.airnews.net>
Source record: 81561

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:lD_ob.1667$9M3.1519@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> "N2EY" wrote:
> >
> > I think that when Kim writes "no one" in a context like
> > that, she really means "almost no one" or "hardly anyone"
> > rather than the literal standard meaning "not a single
> > person" or "nobody at all".
>
>
> I know what she means, but it's not what she wrote, Jim. And if we can't
> get past the absoluteness of that "no one," there is little way to
continue
> the discussion. If we're instead talking about "almost no one" or "hardly
> anyone," then the obvious question becomes why bring in immigrants to take
> even those few people's jobs or drive down their wages.
>

And, if you want to argue symantecs, Dwight, then you have a roadblock that won't allow for reasonable discussion of the topic. I am telling you that my experience has been that people who are customarily born in this country feel that the jobs we are speaking of are beneath them. Period. Now, the only areas of this country that I have lived in with enough time to gather that opinion is in NE NY and down here in the DFW area. If your experience is different--sobeit. But, how dare you dismiss the experiences I have seen.

Not only am I basing the opinion I have off true experience and observations, I am also an above-average (or was) politically active person. When topics like this come up on radio talk-shows, television news magazine shows, and in Congress--which I used to spend hours and hours every day watching--the discussion is that "immigration" is killing jobs in this country vs. that the jobs in this country immigration fills are those that will not customarily be done by people born here.

I wish I could say to you, "prove to me that there are people born here who will ______" and you fill in the blank. But that is both unrealistic and not constructive. So, the only mechanism I have by which to comment on the topic *is* from my experience. I even added enough honesty into the discussion to say that, neither now or when I *was* young enough to do it, would *I* do those jobs. And, as Jim/N2EY pointed out, *immigrant* farming is a whole other ballgame than just farming. Immigrant farming involves migrant lifestyles that few of us are even familiar with--let alone willing to do.

>
> Of course, I don't
> really expect Kim to answer those questions. Few seem to care about the
> Americans who are losing their jobs, or are seeing their wages reduced, as
a
> result of immigration and other government policies. They have their
> pro-immigration blinders on and refuse to see the obvious fallout of these
> government policies.
>

And, how dare you again, Dwight. You are being as overhanded with your remarks about my character, related to this conversation as anyone like Larry Roll would be--so don't even bother calling him on the carpet for his behavior!! How dare you imply that I "don't care" about bad policies in this country. Have I once said I don't care? Furthermore, the obvious fallout that you believe is not what I see--and I've just told you I am basing that on experience. Go to the Unemployment lines. I haven't--but I *BET* the majority of people in those lines are not looking for work on farms, at Wal-Mart, with municipalities, landscape companies, construction firms, asbestos abatement firms, chemical and biological hazard waste firms, and our ever-famous convenience stores such as 7-Eleven--all of which need people constantly. I reiterate *CONSTANTLY* because there is no one who will "take" those jobs--*EXCEPT* people who recognize them as a job to take when one is desperate. (An aside--if you want to break off into symantecs and argue about defining "no one," go debate with yourself, Dwight).

Those jobs, and so many more that I could think of, are *generally* not taken by people who have been born in this country. There are some who do--and they are in what used to be the ethnic miniorities. All one need do is look around them to see where our youth find important and meaningful employment: McDonald's and other fast food joints, light dining restaraunts, and that's about it. Why did I break-out to light dining restaraunts? Because I don't see teen-agers in the "finer" dining restaraunts--and my husband and I love to eat out so we have some experience. Know why *I* think they (teen-agers) aren't there? Because there, the customer service is higher scale, which demands more personality, better etiquette, and of course--greater work ethic. Guess who we do see serving us in those restaraunts?

My husband has been at his formerly family-owned business for 27 years. His mom sold the company last year. For most of those 27 years, until about 10 years ago, they had a great crew of folks. Since then, the main focus of my husband's every day work has been to get someone in there who wants a job and will work. Know how many nieces nephews, and his own kids and my son, he has had through those years? Ten. Not one of them has ever, ever worked there. Know how many great nieces and nephews he has had who, of course, have been old enough to work through those years? They are just now getting in to their early-mid teens. A quick count of those that could work there is somewhere around seven. Not one has ever done it. Oh, I take that back. My husband's daugher worked there--for literally four days.

For goodness sake, here's a great example: I am privvy to a situation where I know a kid of coworker's who had "no prospect" (yeah, right) of a job after completing a 2-year program with one of these "tech" type training institutions. So, she's back living with mummy and daddy and pining and sighing every day. I have a co-worker who is from India. He's brought his wife over here and she'd been here for about, oh, three months before they both learned of the medical transcritption service industry that's been popping up over the past few years. He has a problem with his wife going out in the workforce, but she wanted to work to contribute to the recovery of costs it took to get her here, etc. She went to a 6-week (I think it was) school to learn medical transcription, blah, blah, blah, she now has her own home-business with her family doctor as her first customer and she'll get more, I'm sure. We were all talking about this at work. He mentions this to this coworker whose kid has no prospect for a job. Know what the kid's response was? I think you do.

So, it isn't only you who has your own company, Dwight, whose livelihood is at stake with things such as they are. I'll come full circle with my indignation again: how dare you imply that I don't care.

>
> I look around and see many in my hometown (a small town) unemployed or
> working in low paying jobs while every factory in the area closes and
> immigrants move in to take jobs.
>

If the factories are closing, then what jobs are the immigrants moving in to take? And, have you any friends or casual acquaintances that you can ask if they have tried to get those jobs? I am still curious to know if factories are closing, what jobs are available for anyone to take? I take your comment above to be pretty dismal. I've been in dismal (the NE when the oil crisis happened--talk about getting dismal) and I had to move down here to make it.

>
> A friend, who has been doing lawn care for
> almost three decades, recently lost a long-standing contract to another
> out-of-state company using all immigrant employees. As a result, he filed
> for bankruptcy and had to fire his entire workforce - Americans who were
> willing to work.
>

Well, excuse me for the honesty--you'll call it having my blinders on or not caring, maybe even because I am a "liberal"--but, if one contract put this company out of business, then perhaps the person should have gone on to some form of vocational or higher level training in business practices before they took such a jump. I've had my own company too, years ago. And, if I'd had just one "large" job/contract, I would have been in a constant state of panic. And, as an aside, if this person's seeing other companies get the contracts...then go get a job with those companies as a Salesperson, or whatever. Maybe he/she *won't* make the money he's accustomed to--but we gotta do whatever it takes to make adjustments to the things we have no control over. And, if we have no control over the employment situation in

this country--we don't whine about it. We knuckle under, get the menial jobs, sell the big house, get the little house, sell the SUV and get the Saturn, and we begin the task of seeing what we can do--if anything--to change the route of what we perceive as being awful.

> I'm feeling the pressure right now. One of my companies (wetland
> maintenance) is facing competition from a company with almost all illegal
> immigrant employees.

Then, report the company to INS. REPORT THEM. If the company is getting contracts based on their employment of illegeal aliens, then I am sure the firms they are doing services for will want to know this. For goodness sake, REPORT their ass.

> I just barely held onto a county contract last time,
> but profits are now dismal. To hold onto that contract next time, either I
> cut my employee's wages sharply or I replace them with illegal immigrants.

Don't you dare buy in to the illegal and unethical side of this. To join is not to change or conquer.

> The only other option is to not even bid at all, which means the other
> company (with it's illegal immigrants) is assured the contract (and I let
> employees go).

And, if it illegal immigration that is nulling you out, you use the laws and shouting as loud as you can shout to fight it.

> The economy of this country is quickly heading to hell in a handbasket
and
> few seem to even notice or care.
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
>

I don't know who's not noticing or caring. I see a lot of doing nothing to get involved against it, or to even lift a finger of their own to change it.

Kim W5TIT

2086. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-02 15:07:10 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bo36i3$nh1@library2.airnews.net>
Source record: 81562

"JJ" <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
news:0qadnVvE-LjFPTmiRVn-gg@gbronline.com...
> Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>
> >
> > However, in the context of our modern and presumably more enlightened
> > times, they represent something that is, best, an anachronistic example
> > of age-old prejudices. We should all be united under one flag, and that
> > flag has 50 stars and 13 stripes -- not a big "X" running through it.
> >
> > 73 de Larry, K3LT
> >
>
> Just saw on the news that more blacks are leaving the North for the
> South than blacks leaving the South for the North. Reason? More jobs in
> the South and less racism.
>

The news said that? That there's LESS racism? Compared to where and
where?! I come from NE NY and never really saw any racism.

Here, the topic is a part of every-day life.

Kim W5TIT

2087. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-02 15:13:05 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bo36t5$s5g@library2.airnews.net>
Source record: 81563

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:%x1pb.1819$9M3.213@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net...
>
> For example, the flag [the Rebel flag, sic] is displayed
> most often when a liberal is in the White House and less often when a
> conservative is in the White House. A few years ago, during the Clinton
> years, you could see that flag everywhere (vehicles, yards, and so on).
> Today, it has virtually disappeared.
>

Maybe that has more to do with the fact that Clinton was from the South and the flags were some form of "solidarity." You sure do see things from a weird perspective, in my opinion.

> When another liberal gets in the White
> House, that flag will suddenly show up on everything again. The more
liberal
> that person is, the more you'll see that flag displayed.
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
>
>

Perhaps it will be because the more Southern someone is, the more the Southerners feel more like they are being better represented? I mean, if we're going to come up with divisible concepts...let's make them good at least. Maybe the Norwegian Californians will start waving theirs.
<shrugging in disgust>

Kim W5TIT

2088. Re: A Morsodist Challenge

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-02 16:07:39 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0311020807.736b7355@posting.google.com>
Source record: 81564

groupk0hb@earthlink.net (Hans K0HB) wrote in message
news:<5ee63311.0311011143.3b655da0@posting.google.com>...
> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote
>
> > >
> > > Hans, do you accept collect calls?
> > >
>
> From VY1JA.

How about NA1SS...?!?!

Steve, K4YZ

2089. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-02 16:46:42 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <Sxapb.2049$Bf7.1132315@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 81565

Kim W5TIT wrote:

> won't allow for reasonable discussion of the topic. I am telling you that
> my experience has been that people who are customarily born in this country
> feel that the jobs we are speaking of are beneath them. Period.

It isn't everyone, Kim. I do agree that here in the US, that many people feel that some jobs are "too low class" for them. Educators (and many others in authority) have demeaned jobs they consider beneath dignity. I remember my high school principle personally taking me aside and telling me "Mike, you're a smart kid, why do you want to go to Vo-Tech?" I took the academic courses also, but he was worried about the "Tekker" image and what damage it could do to me. I was flattered for his concern and intervening in what should have been between my guidance counseler and myself, but I went to Vo-Tech anyhow.

> For goodness sake, here's a great example: I am privvy to a situation where
> I know a kid of coworker's who had "no prospect" (yeah, right) of a job
> after completing a 2-year program with one of these "tech" type training
> institutions. So, she's back living with mummy and daddy and pining and
> sighing every day.

But she has options! She can live with Mommy and Daddy and not work! I never considered that one of my options, so when I was young, I'd take whatever job would put food on the table. And that makes for a big difference in what job is demeaning, and what job isn't.

- Mike KB3EIA -

2090. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-02 16:51:35 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <rCapb.2050$Bf7.1133301@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 81566

Kim W5TIT wrote:

> "JJ" <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
> news:0qadnVvE-LjFPTmiRVn-gg@gbronline.com...
>
>>Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>>
>>
>>>However, in the context of our modern and presumably more enlightened
>>>times, they represent something that is, best, an anachronistic example
>>>of age-old prejudices. We should all be united under one flag, and that
>>>flag has 50 stars and 13 stripes -- not a big "X" running through it.
>>>
>>>73 de Larry, K3LT
>>>
>>
>>Just saw on the news that more blacks are leaving the North for the
>>South than blacks leaving the South for the North. Reason? More jobs in
>>the South and less racism.
>>
>
>
> The news said that? That there's LESS racism? Compared to where and
> where?! I come from NE NY and never really saw any racism.
>
> Here, the topic is a part of every-day life.

Yeah, I almost choked when I read that too! I wonder if that wasn't one
of the bogus headlines that Fox News was threatening to sue "The
Simpsons" creators about? (and yes, that would be Fox sueing itself)

- Mike KB3EIA -

2091. Re: Unrepetant Sinner, Was Re: Robeson Apology???

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-02 16:52:29 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0311020852.3982be72@posting.google.com>
Source record: 81567

brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0310311639.7b5be021@posting.google.com>...
> k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0310291854.2292a6c2@posting.google.com>...
> > brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0310291532.5229bc6c@posting.google.com>...
> > > k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0310290754.5cf3733d@posting.google.com>...
>
> > > > Just be sure your "insinuations" stay that way, Mr. Burke.
> > >
> > > There never was an insinuation, Mr. Robeson. It was a case of your
> > > misunderstanding and a dose of your wishful thinking.
> >
> > I don't think that your previously archived comments might be
> > read that way.
>
> And there-in lies your major problem, Stebe, you don't think.

I do think. I think you are a bit of the same "unbalanced" you
allege others to be...

> > For an offense to have occured, it onl;y requires that it be
> > perceived as such.
>
> I perceive you to be an unbalanced person. See my numerous posting
> asking you to seek help. Again, please seek help.

Please list for us your credentials in psychiatry or other mental
health disciplines that qualify you to make such a request, Brain.

Reading Lennie's Mrs's books over his shoulder does not count.

> And I perceive an offense to have occured. You have threatened me in
> full capitalization.
>
> Additionally, you have misspelled the word, "onl;y," which according
> to your own rules of netiquette, you are in a rage.

Geeeze, Brain...There you go getting your attributions WRONG
again.

That's LENNIE'S assertion...not mine. I have only made a point
of pointing out LENNIE'S typos since that's HIS schtick.

Please try to get it right.

> You as a trained and experienced US Marine Gunnery Sargeant, I
> perceive those combinations of events to have placed me in a position
> of harm.

If anything has put you in a "position of harm", Brain, it's your
big mouth and childish behaviour. That I was a Gunenry Sergeant and
and I was trained means I know how and when to apply what I learned.

You obviously haven't.

> I fear you, and I pray that you do not own a firearm.

I do own a firearm, and there is nothing to fear. If you "fear"
me, it's only because you know you were stupid enough to make the
comments you made in the first place.

Dumb brain...dumb brain...

> > Personally, I think you were just pushing the limits of how
> > offensive you could be and still get away with it.
>
> What do you plan to do about it? I hope you don't kill me.

Kill you...?!?!?!

BBWWHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHA
HA
! ! !

You do have a grandiose over-appreciation of your self worth,
don't you..?!?!

> > It didn't work.
>
> It must have. I am in fear of my life.

OK, Mark...I mean Brain... ! ! !

> > > > Thre's no apology to offer, Brain.
>
> Another rageful misspelling. Geezus, is he going to hurt me? kill
> me?

Your attributions are STILL wrong, Brain...refer to Lennie for
the "typo-rage" syndrome.

> > > There should be. Why do you assume yourself to being above making
> > > mistakes, such as the one you made above?
> >
> > As I pointed out, in order for an offense to have occured, the
> > person only need have PERCEIVED that a threat was rendered.
>
> You have convinced me. I am afraid that you are going to hurt me.

If I "hurt" you, Brain, it will be in the pocket book.

> > I have warned you off, but you keep barrelling right on in.
>
> I beg of you not to hurt me or my family.

I reiterate my comments about your foolish behaviour.

You're being foolish again. If ANYTHING is going to "hurt" your
family, it's the embarrassment of knowing how you conduct yourself in
a public forum.

> > Were you born an idiot, or was this a life-long achievement?
>
> Oh, thank goodness. You are merely going to call me names and not do
> bodily harm to me or my family. I hope?

I guess you STILL can't answer a direct question, Brain.

> > > > I am TELLING you that ANY insinuation of use of firearms on MY
> > > > person IS a threat, and that it's the LAST thing you want to do.
> > >
> > > I am telling you that there was no insinuation except in your capacity
> > > to comprehend. And I still read a threat in your latest reply.
> >
> > No threat. A warning. A thrat implies a violent, illegal
> > response.
>
> Oh, damnit!!! Another mispelling. And a threat of doing something
> illegal!!!

Third misattribution, Brain. Go find Lennie!

> Are you going to assault me. Kill me? Kill my family???
>
> Stebe, you've crossed the line!

Well, Brain, all I can say is copy all the posts. I have. If
you insist, we can continue this in court.

> I tell you to back off. Apologize.

Apologize for what? Telling you that your insinuation of holding
a gun to my head was uncaled for?

I don't think so.

> Trust me, if you keep this up, the result will be anything
> > BUT illegal...And expensive I might add.
>
> Perhaps Extra-illegal? And funerals are so expensive. Thank goodness
> I have burial insurance and the government will provide a flag for my
> funeral.

Nope...quite LEGAL.

> > > Now move on to your apology.
> >

> > None will follow, unless YOU would care to express one for
> > uttering language that was perceived as a suggestion that you might
> > hold a gun to one's head, Brain.
>
> I never expressed even as a suggestion that I would hold a gun to
> one's head, let alone your head.
>
> It is all in Google.

Yes, it is.

> But by your rageful responses (by your own definition), I now fear for
> my life.

Brain, Brain, Brain...Fourth time and still all wrong.

> > And incase the last few hints didn't hit home with you, I suggest
> > you discuss with legal representation of your choice what can be
> > perceived as a threat.
>
> Noted and done. Hopefully you have done the same. Hopefully your
> legal representation didn't recommend you do something "

=)

> > > > Someone else in this forum tried that, and I can tell you that he
> > > > found out that my reach exceeds the length of my arms to this
> > > > keyboard...And the results were expensive AND quite legal.
> > >
> > > I am not someone else in this forum.
> >
> > But you MIGHT be someone NEXT, Brain.
>
> You've hurt others? Dear God, what kind of person am I dealing with?

Only thier pocket books and only after I warned them to stop
doing what they were doing and they persisted

> > > Meanwhile, I still read a threat in your response.
> >
> > A warning. I perceive your references to the holding of a gun to
> > my head as a threat. If you meant it any other way you may, in the
> > next response to this thread, express a retraction of that statement
> > and an apology for the anxiety it caused.
>
> I never said, nor meant, nor insinuated that I would hold a gun to
> your head. I refer you to the first reference, where I said I wasn't
> holding a gun to your head. I wonder why anxiety was present if for
> not some mental problem on your part.

Because what can I expect from a guy who makes "prideful" boasts
about being mentored by the likes of Lennie Anderson...?!?!

> Hopefully, you have no history of counseling that might suggest that
> you are an anxious person.

Anxious to not have to deal with irresponsible people? Who
isn't..?!?!

> Do you have a history of counseling?

Nope. Do you...?!?!

> > Otherwise I will assume your intent WAS to cause it, and I can
> > proceed accordingly if you insist.
>
> Your assumptions make for skunky gossip, nothing more. I suggest you
> refer to real life. There was no intent to cause you anxiousness.

Then YOU are apologizing for YOUR comments...???

> Are you a "naturally" anxious person?

No more so than anyone who is trying to make heads/tails from
USENET posts from a guy who admires a pathological liar, Brain.

> > > Now move on to your apology.
> >
> > What apology?
>
> The apology that I demand from you for putting me in fear of my life,
> from a trained Marine who has stated that he would do something
> violent and ILLEGAL (see above).

Sorry, Brain.

I said nothing about ANYthing illegal. I said nothing about
ANYthing "violent" You are welcomed to cite the VERBATIM comments
where I threatened you with bodily harm.

> That apology.

Since you're hung up on an "apology", here's one for you, but I
am sure it's not what you wanted:

I AM sorry that I have helped you perpetuate your foolishness in
these exchanges. I AM sorry that you do not seem to have the ability
to keep track of attributions by USENET "authors" (especially since it
was the same guy you admire so...) And I AM sorry that you seem to
have a hard time taking anyone else's feelings other than your own
into consideration.

How's that?

> > > > No, Brain...On THIS one I am sure.
> > >
> > > The fool is always so sure, especially when they're wrong.
> >
> > And in this case when he refuses to admit that he uttered words

> > that were percieved as threatening and offensive.
>
> Yes, those threats that you've been uttering. Those mispelling that
> indicate that you're in a rage. The training that you've received in
> the US Marine Corps to kill people from faraway places. Your words
> about doing something violent and illegal!

Once again we have you making even MORE assertions about things
that are not true.

The "typo-rage" syndrome is Lennie's creation.

I have made no threats. I have warned you to stop any assertions
directed at me that involve firearms, or I may refer them for action.

I have never made ANY "threat" of violence or harm to you, save
via the recourses available to ANY citizen who feels they've been
wronged.

You ae AGAIN invited to cite any sentence where I "threatened"
you with bodily harm.

> Those perceptions that I hold based upon your very own words.
>
> ...all of those things that you've uttered that I perceive as
> life-threatening.

They are only "life-threatening" where your pocketbook is
concerned, Brain.

> > Which would be you...
> >
> > > Gunny, you need to move on to your apology.
> >
> > What apology?
>
> The apology that you are about to render.

Me thinks you jest too gladly in the shower, Sir Brain!

> I'll give you an out - an out that many a thousand soldier has taken.
> No Captain's Mast. No Article 15. No prison time. No fine. No
> nothing.
>
> In your next posting, simply state: "No excuse, Sir," and be done
> with it.
>
> Nothing else.
>
> Absolutely no shame in it.
>
> Be a good soldier and get on with it.

Whatever "apology" I rendered above is all you get, Brain.

Sorry if it's not what you wanted, but it's all you get.

Steve, K4YZ

2092. EMERGENCY! CD-ROM Document Library Released

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-02 17:28:35 UTC
From: davidvine1999@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <23e96779.0311020928.469c9d6f@posting.google.com>
Source record: 81568
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.med.ems,alt.radio.scanner,misc.survivalism

AIKEN, SOUTH CAROLINA -- David Vine, WA1EAW, has compiled a comprehensive and highly organized Adobe Acrobat format library of information and data in the fields of Emergency Communications, Natural Disasters, Emergency Planning and Search and Rescue on four CD-ROMs. Emergency services executives, operations personnel, volunteers and others interested in these subjects can instantly access this critical reference information anywhere, at any time, using a laptop computer.

CD-ROM 1 Communications contains 121 documents/5804 pages.
CD-ROM 2 Natural Disasters contains 88 documents/4536 pages.
CD-ROM 3 Planning contains 83 documents/pages.
CD-ROM 4 Search & Rescue contains 97 documents/6627 pages.

Individual CD-ROMs cost $19.95 and the complete set of four costs $54.95 plus shipping. Quantity pricing and site licenses are available. Credit card orders may be placed by calling 800-987-8743. A complete list of files on the four CD-ROMS can be obtained by sending a stamped, self-addressed envelope to David Vine Associates, LLC at 963 Dougherty Road, Aiken, SC 29803.

# # #

2093. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-02 17:54:25 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <lxbpb.2369$Oo4.244@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 81569

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20031101205318.14837.00004005@mb-m03.aol.com...
> In article <fo1nb.4542$X22.1166@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dwight
> Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> writes:
>
> >
> > If the Civil War was about slavery, then why was there a war at all?
Prior
> >to the war, the slave states were the majority in both the House and
Senate,
> >insuring no legislation could be passed to end slavery. Slavery was only
> >abolished after the war by not allowing the former Confederate States
(which
> >included several, but not all, of the slave states) to participate in
that
> >vote.
> >
> >
> >> (snip) why, in it's aftermath, did one of the most famous
> >> Confederate Generals, Nathan Bedford Forrest,
> >> organize the Ku Klux Klan? (snip)
> >
> >
> > When you answer that, perhaps you can also answer why so many
Northerners
> >join the KKK.
>
> Dwight:
>
> I consider the KKK to be about racism, not slavery. It was originally
> started as a response to the heavy-handed political disenfranchisement
> of the former Confederate states by Northern "Carpetbaggers" who
> essentially swept into the South and took over in the aftermath of the
> Civil War. I don't believe that was right and never said so. However,
> the KKK, instead of targeting the mostly white Yankee politicians
> who violated the constitutional rights of the citizens of the Southern
> states, chose instead to target ethnic and religious groups, such as
> blacks, Catholics, and particularly Jews. Therefore, their motives were
> wrong from the start.
>
> >> The South has a lot to answer for, IMHO. (snip)
> >
> >
> > Why would they have any more to answer for than the Northern states

that
> >profited from the sale of slaves? Or more to answer for than those who
used
> >indentured or bound black workers in the North, even into the early
1900's?
> >Or more to answer for than the many countries around the world which
> >practiced slavery in this last century (the 1900's), the previous
century,
> >or in the many centuries before that?
>
> I never said that slavery wasn't practiced in the North.
>
> >> (snip) Modern-day Rebels with the Confederate flags on
> >> their pickup trucks don't do much to heal the wounds of
> >> the past. (snip)
>
> > Perhaps because they have absolutely no responsibility for what
happened
> >in a past long before they were born.
>
> However, in the context of our modern and presumably more enlightened
> times, they represent something that is, best, an anachronistic example
> of age-old prejudices. We should all be united under one flag, and that
> flag has 50 stars and 13 stripes -- not a big "X" running through it.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

The flag of the confederacy is NOT the battle flag being displayed as the
flag of the Confederacy.

When the Tennessee Battle Flag is flown in the South, by real Southerners,
it is meant as a sign of respect for the fallen and a symbol of STATES
RIGHTS.

No one advocates seccession from the Union, or starting another war.

But....we get real tired of Northerners and blacks trying to tear the flag
down, especially since the reason they want to tear it down is they believe
it is a racist symbol.

If it IS a racist symbol to them. Then they have fallen for the big lie.
Govern yourself accordingly.

Dan/W4NTI

2094. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-02 17:57:22 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <6Abpb.2375$Oo4.502@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 81570

"Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:bo36i3$nh1@library2.airnews.net...
> "JJ" <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
> news:0qadnVvE-LjFPTmiRVn-gg@gbronline.com...
> > Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> >
> > >
> > > However, in the context of our modern and presumably more enlightened
> > > times, they represent something that is, best, an anachronistic
example
> > > of age-old prejudices. We should all be united under one flag, and
that
> > > flag has 50 stars and 13 stripes -- not a big "X" running through it.
> > >
> > > 73 de Larry, K3LT
> > >
> >
> > Just saw on the news that more blacks are leaving the North for the
> > South than blacks leaving the South for the North. Reason? More jobs in
> > the South and less racism.
> >
>
> The news said that? That there's LESS racism? Compared to where and
> where?! I come from NE NY and never really saw any racism.
>
> Here, the topic is a part of every-day life.
>
> Kim W5TIT
>
>

It is a part of everyday life, because it is in the interest of people like
Jesse Jackson, Sharpton, etc. to KEEP IT in everyday life. If the
'racism' issue was let to die a natural death, it would go away. As it
is....it is being pushed down everyones throat.

Dan/W4NTI

2095. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-02 18:02:29 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <VEbpb.2383$Oo4.90@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 81571

"Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:bo36t5$s5g@library2.airnews.net...
> "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
> news:%x1pb.1819$9M3.213@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> >
> > For example, the flag [the Rebel flag, sic] is displayed
> > most often when a liberal is in the White House and less often when a
> > conservative is in the White House. A few years ago, during the Clinton
> > years, you could see that flag everywhere (vehicles, yards, and so on).
> > Today, it has virtually disappeared.
> >
>
> Maybe that has more to do with the fact that Clinton was from the South
and
> the flags were some form of "solidarity." You sure do see things from a
> weird perspective, in my opinion.
>
> > When another liberal gets in the White
> > House, that flag will suddenly show up on everything again. The more
> liberal
> > that person is, the more you'll see that flag displayed.
> >
> >
> > Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
> >
> > http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
> >
> >
>
> Perhaps it will be because the more Southern someone is, the more the
> Southerners feel more like they are being better represented? I mean, if
> we're going to come up with divisible concepts...let's make them good at
> least. Maybe the Norwegian Californians will start waving theirs.
> <shrugging in disgust>
>
> Kim W5TIT
>
>

Most northerners I know that have crossed the Mason Dixon line and stayed in
the South for a period of time have 'adopted' their new surroundings. With
one major exception....those from NY.

Wonder why that is?

That is one of the main reasons I left South Florida. Bunches of New Yorkers bringing all their bad habits with them.

When I decided to stay here I was told by a good friend to do two things;

1. Pick a football team.

2. Don't try and change a thing.

Good advice.....Roll Tide.

Dan/W4NTI

2096. Re: No Code General

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-02 18:08:54 UTC
From: Eddie Haskel <wiseguy@clever.com>
Message-ID: <WKbpb.12454$Zx1.1017@newssvr14.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 81572
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.swap

Stay on Freeband.....we don't want YOU.....a happy "hammie"
"Twistedhed" <twistedhed@webtv.net> wrote in message
news:bo1fo4$5ai$1@news.x-echo.com...
> I am interested in expanding my freeband hobby but do not wish to take t
> he General class hammie test until the code is dropped. My question is d
> oes anyone know when the code will be dropped and how long woould I need
> to wait until the written General test is simplified such as the Tech t
> est is now?
>
> Plase email me a WAV of morse code so I can hear what it sounded like wh
> en the old hammies used it.
> twistedhed@webtv.net
>
> =-
> Article poste via Voila News - http://www.news.voila.fr
> Le : Sun Nov 2 00:31:15 2003 depuis l'IP : ac87591b.ipt.aol.com [VIP
532284301978]

2097. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-02 19:02:02 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <APqdncZj5798yDiiRVn-gg@gbronline.com>
Source record: 81573

Kim W5TIT wrote:
.
>>>
>>
>>Just saw on the news that more blacks are leaving the North for the
>>South than blacks leaving the South for the North. Reason? More jobs in
>>the South and less racism.
>>
>
>
> The news said that? That there's LESS racism? Compared to where and
> where?! I come from NE NY and never really saw any racism.

Ask the blacks, they are the ones leaving claiming more racism in the
North than the South.

2098. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-02 19:20:50 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <EoadnbRGXsBcxziiRVn-uw@gbronline.com>
Source record: 81574

Mike Coslo wrote:

> Kim W5TIT wrote:
>
>> "JJ" <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
>> news:0qadnVvE-LjFPTmiRVn-gg@gbronline.com...
>>
>>> Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>>>
>>>
>>>> However, in the context of our modern and presumably more enlightened
>>>> times, they represent something that is, best, an anachronistic example
>>>> of age-old prejudices. We should all be united under one flag, and
>>>> that
>>>> flag has 50 stars and 13 stripes -- not a big "X" running through it.
>>>>
>>>> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>>>>
>>>
>>> Just saw on the news that more blacks are leaving the North for the
>>> South than blacks leaving the South for the North. Reason? More jobs in
>>> the South and less racism.
>>>
>>
>>
>> The news said that? That there's LESS racism? Compared to where and
>> where?! I come from NE NY and never really saw any racism.
>>
>> Here, the topic is a part of every-day life.
>
>
> Yeah, I almost choked when I read that too! I wonder if that wasn't
> one of the bogus headlines that Fox News was threatening to sue "The
> Simpsons" creators about? (and yes, that would be Fox sueing itself)
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -
>

Suggest you and Kim read this:

http://www.msnbc.com/news/987498.asp?cp1=1

2099. Why We Freeband

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-02 19:38:59 UTC
From: Twistedhed <twistedhed@webtv.net>
Message-ID: <bo3mgj$1lt$1@news.x-echo.com>
Source record: 81575
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.swap

Organized, long term freebanders are very aware where they
operate and take great measure to ensure against talking on an amateur f
requency or one that isn't heavily used on the freeband.
If the non-U.S. stations can operate ssb there, why shouldn't I,
especially if I want to have a nice DX contact with one of them?

Many of us LIKE the law as it is, it keeps "yes men" off the freqs. Same
analogy as the gun issue...when guns are outlawed only
outlaws will have guns...no, yoo won't find many freebanders lobbying fo
r change to open the freqs because the law as it reads, doesn't bug us.

No rationalization is even needed except to reply to folks
that repeatedly ask over and over, "Why?" It is these folks
that feel they need a reason why we do what we do, not us.

=-
Article poste via Voila News - http://www.news.voila.fr
Le : Sun Nov 2 20:38:59 2003 depuis l'IP : aca3688f.ipt.aol.com [VIP 532284301978]

2100. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-02 19:53:21 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <Rgdpb.2125$Bf7.1181232@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 81576

JJ wrote:

>
> Suggest you and Kim read this:
>
> http://www.msnbc.com/news/987498.asp?cp1=1
>

Ancient liberal press trick of assigning reasons for something to
something else.

My read:
1. Earlier, a lot of Black people moved north for jobs.

2. Jobs go away, and next generation is better educated.

3. People move to where they can get a job.

The closest thing to a quote from an actual person who MOved south and
said this is why they moved south was from some dude in the urban
league. I hesitate to draw the same conclusions. YMMV

- Mike KB3EIA -

2101. Re: Why We Freeband

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-02 19:59:16 UTC
From: N8WWM <N8WWM@home.net>
Message-ID: <bo3nmk01ofq@drn.newsguy.com>
Source record: 81578
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

I agree, what's wrong with freebanding?

In article <bo3mgj$1lt$1@news.x-echo.com>, Twistedhed says...
>
>Organized, long term freebanders are very aware where they
>operate and take great measure to ensure against talking on an amateur f
>requency or one that isn't heavily used on the freeband.
>If the non-U.S. stations can operate ssb there, why shouldn't I,
>especially if I want to have a nice DX contact with one of them?
>
>Many of us LIKE the law as it is, it keeps "yes men" off the freqs. Same
> analogy as the gun issue...when guns are outlawed only
>outlaws will have guns...no, yoo won't find many freebanders lobbying fo
>r change to open the freqs because the law as it reads, doesn't bug us.
>
>
>No rationalization is even needed except to reply to folks
>that repeatedly ask over and over, "Why?" It is these folks
>that feel they need a reason why we do what we do, not us.
>
>
>=-
>Article poste via Voila News - http://www.news.voila.fr
>Le : Sun Nov 2 20:38:59 2003 depuis l'IP : aca3688f.ipt.aol.com [VIP
>532284301978]

2102. Re: Amateur Radio in the 21st Century?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-02 20:03:01 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0311021203.79616745@posting.google.com>
Source record: 81577

averyfineman@aol.com (Avery Fineman) wrote in message
news:<20031028175932.23307.00004007@mb-m29.aol.com>...

> >It proposes HF access after taking a 20 question quiz that is passable
> >by an "average" 6th grader.
>
> There is NO age restriction in US amateur radio. Sixth graders are
> 12 years old. The youngest hams were only 6 years old.

No thanks to a certain "radio engineering professional" who TRIED
to lobby the FCC into setting one despite 80+ years of successful and
productive licensure of children.

> Well, if you are "married" to your hobby, I'm sure you would be
> insulted one way or the other by allowing others to intrude on
> your very private domain.

But why should THAT matter to YOU, Lennie...?!?! You've
certainly made no bones about invading the "private domain" of others
for decades with no intention of using the front door.

> > >"Morse will probably retain most of it’s exclusive band segments, at
> > >least for now. We are not addressing this issue at this time. This
> > >may change in the future."
> >
> >I give them half a point for being half honest - whoops, maybe only a
> >quarter point for being only half right! Just how many "exclusive band
> >segments" are there for Morse? Which is telling me that as soon as they
> >have their way with getting the qualifications reduced for HF access,
> >they will be going after getting the narrowband segments opened up for
> >SSB. and if that isn't what they mean to do, why would they put that in
> >the piece?
>
> Have your ears and eyes checked again. There are NO black
> helicopters of conspirators waiting to attack old, cherished values.

And the only two "CW exclusive" segments are at 6 and 2 meters.
Funny how all the No Code proponents holler about how CW is employed
on HF, a part of the spectrum they have no privileges, yet there's not
been ONE attempt to have those two segements on 6 and 2 "re-farmed".

> You tell us, mighty keeper of the private domain that only belongs
> to old-values, anal retentive long-timers.

Nice example of "civil debate", Lennster.

> >Someone who make a statement like this has no place throwing out the
> >gratuitous insults they make towards those who believe that the Morse
> >tests should be retained. It is plain stupid, can't sugar coat that one!
>
> Tsk, tsk, tsk...how dare those 20 WPM code-tested Extras
> insult all you Extra-Lites, right?

Why insult "Extra-lites", who have passed the PRESENT licensure
structure to get there, when we have an UNlicensed creep like you to
kick around, Putzmaster?

> Have you been in another universe for a decade? In HERE, there
> was a MIGHTY HUE & CRY about age restrictions proposed by
> someone in 1999! CAN'T HAVE THAT!!!! cried the multitude!

No, we can't.

The system has worked well the way it's been for 80
years...Unless YOU know of some secret government plot to hide all
those pre-pubescent offenders from us?

> If a 6-year-old can pass an Extra exam, they are QUALIFIED!
> That's been said by the multitude in here, too.

Duuuuuh....Maybe because it's TRUE, Lennie...?!?!

Really rubs your hide to know there are pre-teens with more
access to the electromagnetic spectrum than you, Eh, "Mr. Radio
Professional"...?!?!

Maybe we can get one of them to let you on the air...but
remember, THEY will be supervising YOU, so BE-HAVE!

> 159-year-old morse code hasn't "turned on" many new folks...

And you know this from WHAT practical experience in the Amateur
Radio Service, Lennie?

> Why don't you go argue with Broose, the "Extra-Lite CB-plusser?"

As much as it chaps MY hide to say it, at least Bruce TOOK the
test, Lennie...

You have WHAT class of AMATEUR license...?!?!

Steve, K4YZ

2103. Double Licenses?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-02 20:59:14 UTC
From: "Ben K." <klausner@net.frijoles>
Message-ID: <Ceepb.239616$Of.35041@news.easynews.com>
Source record: 81579
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur

I finally went and did the paperwork to change my 1975 Technician + code license into a General ticket. I took the Extra written at the same time, with no expectation of really passing it on the first try.

But when I got the response from the FCC, there was a surprise. Two envelopes, each with an identical copy of a General license in my name! Additionally, the expiration date on both is March next year.

Doesn't paying the fee and having new paperwork generated result in a license renewal?

2104. Re: Why We Freeband

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-02 21:11:19 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <Xpepb.2759$Oo4.2418@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 81580
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

And why does this not surprise me? From a licensed ham, that is supposed to know the rules and regs. I rest my case.

Go ahead and rant and rave....you know you are wrong.

Better yet WWV, go ahead and operate there.

Dan/W4NTI

"N8WWM" <N8WWM@home.net> wrote in message news:bo3nmk01ofq@drn.newsguy.com...
> I agree, what's wrong with freebanding?
>
> In article <bo3mgj$1lt$1@news.x-echo.com>, Twistedhed says...
> >
> >Organized, long term freebanders are very aware where they
> >operate and take great measure to ensure against talking on an amateur f
> >requency or one that isn't heavily used on the freeband.
> >If the non-U.S. stations can operate ssb there, why shouldn't I,
> >especially if I want to have a nice DX contact with one of them?
> >
> >Many of us LIKE the law as it is, it keeps "yes men" off the freqs. Same
> > analogy as the gun issue...when guns are outlawed only
> >outlaws will have guns...no, yoo won't find many freebanders lobbying fo
> >r change to open the freqs because the law as it reads, doesn't bug us.
> >
> >
> >No rationalization is even needed except to reply to folks
> >that repeatedly ask over and over, "Why?" It is these folks
> >that feel they need a reason why we do what we do, not us.
> >
> >
> >=-
> >Article poste via Voila News - http://www.news.voila.fr
> >Le : Sun Nov 2 20:38:59 2003 depuis l'IP : aca3688f.ipt.aol.com [VIP
> >532284301978]
>

2105. Re: Why We Freeband

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-02 21:20:05 UTC
From: Randy <not-this-one@not-here.com>
Message-ID: <9yepb.30085$4k5.16701@twister.austin.rr.com>
Source record: 81581
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:Xpepb.2759$Oo4.2418@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> And why does this not surprise me? From a licensed ham, that is supposed
to
> know the rules and regs. I rest my case.
>
> Go ahead and rant and rave....you know you are wrong.
>
> Better yet WWV, go ahead and operate there.
>
> Dan/W4NTI

Dan, you took the bait...hook, line, sinker, and boat.

2106. Re: Why We Freeband

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-02 21:29:04 UTC
From: sir@oblivion.org
Message-ID: <5wepb.129950$UI.12025@fe12.atl2.webusenet.com>
Source record: 81582
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.swap

"Twistedhed" <twistedhed@webtv.net> wrote in message
news:bo3mgj$1lt$1@news.x-echo.com...
> Organized, long term freebanders are very aware where they
> operate and take great measure to ensure against talking on an amateur f
> requency or one that isn't heavily used on the freeband.
> If the non-U.S. stations can operate ssb there, why shouldn't I,
> especially if I want to have a nice DX contact with one of them?

I've been a so-called "freebander" since the late sixties but rarely for DX. The primary reason I talked outside of allotted frequencies was for privacy or to contact a specific distant station I wouldn't normally hear on the allotted band. We used to run Ch. 16 -5khz down and 15A a RC Channel running slightly above stock power on 3-4 element directional and easily talk 75-100 miles. I spoke all over the world with better than 1000 confirmed QSL contacts from a slightly peaked Golden Eagle Mark III/IV running through a 4 beam element at 60 feet from Central NJ.

2107. Re: Double Licenses?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-02 21:34:36 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <MLepb.2776$Oo4.88@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 81583

"Ben K." <klausner@net.frijoles> wrote in message
news:Ceepb.239616$Of.35041@news.easynews.com...
> I finally went and did the paperwork to change my 1975 Technician + code
> license into a General ticket. I took the Extra written at the same
> time, with no expectation of really passing it on the first try.
>
> But when I got the response from the FCC, there was a surprise. Two
> envelopes, each with an identical copy of a General license in my name!
> Additionally, the expiration date on both is March next year.
>
> Doesn't paying the fee and having new paperwork generated result in a
> license renewal?

No. Several years ago the FCC changed the way they handled all such
changes.
Your license expires on the day it was renewed plus 10 years. Interim
changes to the license (upgrades, address changes, vanity requests, etc)
do not change the expiration date.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2108. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-02 21:35:59 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031102163559.25815.00004177@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 81585

In article <OR0pb.1801$9M3.1226@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> writes:

>"N2EY" wrote:
>>
>> I would point out that back in 1906 there were
>> people criticizing the immigration of those times.
>> Particularly immigrants who weren't from the
>> "right" parts of northern and western Europe...

> Part of the problem was that immigration was being sold at the time as a
>way to grow and further tame the West, while many immigrants simply couldn't
>afford to move West once they got here - something the government seemed to
>have overlooked. The result was a flood of new immigrants into Eastern
>cities. Of course, the government did eventually get what it wanted as many
>in the East simply moved West to get away from the new immigrants. Just
>kidding (I think). ;-)

The "fill up the West" thing was a 19th century idea. Of course the West was already full of Native Americans, but that didn't faze a lot of people who weren't Native Americans.

By about the 1880s the West was considered "closed" by the government - not fully settled, but not a frontier anymore.

>> Immigration quotas were enacted early in the 20th
>> century for all these reasons and more.
>
> Many of those quotas lasted well into the 1960's (my wife is a history
>major and she was just reading about them a few days ago).

Look up what happened to refugees on the ship "St Louis" (I think that was the name) trying to escape Germany in 1938 or thereabouts.
>
>> I think that for the reason of national security alone,
>> we have to:
>>
>> - change the criteria for legal immigration
>> - reduce/eliminate illegal immigration and visa abuse
>> - work towards better labor practices through both
>> government and marketplace action
>
> I agree. There isn't going to be an easy solution. Multiple steps, in just
>the areas you describe, will have to be taken to insure a lasting solution
>instead of a quick fix that falls apart in a few months.

It will take years. There will be mistajes made in the process. But a better system can result, for both those who live here and those who want to immigrate.

>Sadly, we don't
>seem to have any long term plans in this country - a game plan that
>stretches out beyond just the next year or so.

And that's the *real* problem, when you get to the bottom of it. What's the long term plan for US involvement in places like the Balkans and Afghanistan (let alone Iraq)?

>Bush is gearing up for next
>year's election, but what about the month or year after that election? What
>about ten years from now?

Heck, most of the problems we have today are the result of not looking down the road at where decisions will take us.

Every so often in here, the "Amish" are cited as being "against technology" or "forbidding change" or some such nonsense. Actually the *real* Amish (at least the ones I've met) aren't like that at all. What they are really all about is looking at the effects of change in great detail before making changes. Some people might say they take the examination to an extreme. But at least they examine where a change will take them. To a very large extent, "modern" America doesn't do that.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2109. Re: Double Licenses?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-02 21:36:00 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031102163600.25815.00004178@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 81584

In article <Ceepb.239616$Of.35041@news.easynews.com>, "Ben K."
<klausner@net.frijoles> writes:

>I finally went and did the paperwork to change my 1975 Technician + code
> license into a General ticket. I took the Extra written at the same
>time, with no expectation of really passing it on the first try.

Congrats! Did you pass the Extra written?
>
>But when I got the response from the FCC, there was a surprise. Two
>envelopes, each with an identical copy of a General license in my name!

They made some kind of mistake there.

>Additionally, the expiration date on both is March next year.

I assume that's the same as it would have been if you'd done nothing.
>
>Doesn't paying the fee and having new paperwork generated result in a
>license renewal?

It used to, but not any more!

It's my understanding that FCC renews for only three reasons:

1) A license is going to expire within 90 days,

2) A license has expired but is within the 2 year "grace period"

3) A new vanity call has been issued.

When you changed license classes, FCC considered that a "modification", just
like an address change. Unless you also met one of the three criteria above,
you don't get a renewal

I know, it would cut down paperwork if they renewed for each modification, but
that would get sticky with the vanity call fee things...

Note that the fee you paid wasn't for the license itself - it was to reimburse
the VEs and the VECs for their expenses.

The good news in all this is that when your license gets within the 90 day
window, you can just fill in a form and mail it in, or renew online. No fee, no
visit to a VE session.

If you passed the Extra written but didn't get the license papers, a letter to
the FCC may be in order. But first check the database to see what license class
FCC has assigned to you.

73 es GL de Jim, N2EY

2110. Re: Why We Freeband

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-02 21:36:13 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <roKdnbjLE8035ziiRVn-sA@gbronline.com>
Source record: 81586
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.swap

Twistedhed wrote:

> Organized, long term freebanders are very aware where they
> operate and take great measure to ensure against talking on an amateur f
> requency or one that isn't heavily used on the freeband.
> If the non-U.S. stations can operate ssb there, why shouldn't I,
> especially if I want to have a nice DX contact with one of them?
>
> Many of us LIKE the law as it is, it keeps "yes men" off the freqs. Same
> analogy as the gun issue...when guns are outlawed only
> outlaws will have guns...no, yoo won't find many freebanders lobbying fo
> r change to open the freqs because the law as it reads, doesn't bug us.
>
>
> No rationalization is even needed except to reply to folks
> that repeatedly ask over and over, "Why?" It is these folks
> that feel they need a reason why we do what we do, not us.

You really are not very good at forgery, twit.

2111. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-02 21:38:19 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <roKdnbvLE82o5jiiRVn-sA@gbronline.com>
Source record: 81587

Mike Coslo wrote:

> JJ wrote:
>
>>
>> Suggest you and Kim read this:
>>
>> http://www.msnbc.com/news/987498.asp?cp1=1
>>
>
> Ancient liberal press trick of assigning reasons for something to
> something else.
>
> My read:
> 1. Earlier, a lot of Black people moved north for jobs.
>
> 2. Jobs go away, and next generation is better educated.
>
> 3. People move to where they can get a job.
>
>
>
> The closest thing to a quote from an actual person who MOved south and
> said this is why they moved south was from some dude in the urban
> league. I hesitate to draw the same conclusions. YMMV
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -
>
Why don't you ask the blacks that are moving back south and find out for
yourself? As usual, if your views agree with the press then the press is
correct, if not then the press is wrong.

2112. Re: Amateur Radio in the 21st Century?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-02 21:41:29 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <2fKdnUsUIZCX4TiiRVn-sQ@gbronline.com>
Source record: 81588

Steve Robeson, K4CAP wrote:

Lennie whinned and cried:
>
>> If a 6-year-old can pass an Extra exam, they are QUALIFIED!
>> That's been said by the multitude in here, too.
>
>
> Duuuuuh....Maybe because it's TRUE, Lennie...?!?!

It really gets under Lennieboy's skin that a 6 year old can pass the
test and he, a so self professed professional in electronics, can't.

2113. Re: Why We Freeband

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-02 21:43:45 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <2fKdnUoUIZAC4TiiRVn-sQ@gbronline.com>
Source record: 81589
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.swap

sir@oblivion.org wrote:

>
> I've been a so-called "freebander" since the late sixties but rarely for DX.
> The primary reason I talked outside of allotted frequencies was for privacy
> or to contact a specific distant station I wouldn't normally hear on the
> allotted band. We used to run Ch. 16 -5khz down and 15A a RC Channel running
> slightly above stock power on 3-4 element directional and easily talk 75-100
> miles. I spoke all over the world with better than 1000 confirmed QSL
> contacts from a slightly peaked Golden Eagle Mark III/IV running through a 4
> beam element at 60 feet from Central NJ.
>

So how do you feel about being a law breaker?

2114. Re: Why We Freeband

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-02 22:20:48 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0311021420.7478cc87@posting.google.com>
Source record: 81590
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Twistedhed <twistedhed@webtv.net> wrote in message news:<bo3mgj$1lt$1@news.x-echo.com>...

> Many of us LIKE the law as it is, it keeps "yes men" off the freqs. Same
> analogy as the gun issue...when guns are outlawed only
> outlaws will have guns...no, yoo won't find many freebanders lobbying fo
> r change to open the freqs because the law as it reads, doesn't bug us.

There's a big difference here, Buckaroo, and that is firearms are
LEGAL in most places in the United States.

The ILLEGAL use of a firearm is a felony.

Your operating of a radio transmitter on unauthorized frequencies
is ILLEGAL...PERIOD. It's NOT a "freedom" thing.

> No rationalization is even needed except to reply to folks
> that repeatedly ask over and over, "Why?" It is these folks
> that feel they need a reason why we do what we do, not us.

You're right..."...No rationalization is even needed..." It's
against the law for good reasons, the most significant being that you
have "stolen" those frequencies from other users of the spectrum who
are now forced to do thier business else where. That's expensive, and
sometimes it's dangerous.

If it were limited to 11 meters, it probably wouldn't be an
issue, but the "freebander blight" is spreading out to the Maritime
frequencies, both HF and VHF, military frequencies, and other business
users, among others.

I am persoanlly aware of numerous "interruptions" of traffic due
to some ignoramus trying to "break in" for a "signal report" on
military frequencies and Civil Air Patrol's frequencies.

Don't wrap yourself up in that "free spirit" crap. You're
breaking the law and disrupting the use of the spectrum.

Steve Robeson, K4YZ

2115. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-02 22:37:27 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <wdydnSRFzdglFziiRVn-gw@gbronline.com>
Source record: 81591

Mike Coslo wrote:

> JJ wrote:
>
>>
>> Suggest you and Kim read this:
>>
>> http://www.msnbc.com/news/987498.asp?cp1=1
>>
>
> Ancient liberal press trick of assigning reasons for something to
> something else.
>
> My read:
> 1. Earlier, a lot of Black people moved north for jobs.
>
> 2. Jobs go away, and next generation is better educated.
>
> 3. People move to where they can get a job.
>

I guess you failed to read this part, or you just ignored it because it
did not fit with what you want to believe.

"That movement north slowed as job opportunities dwindled and *racial
tensions rose* in northern cities in the 1960s and 1970s, Ross said."

2116. Numbnut Dumbass 8 Vomit

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-02 23:00:10 UTC
From: "Ohio Ham"
Message-ID: <vqb33q7ofmd8f9@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 81592
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Is a disgrace to the Amateur Radio Community, and needs to be retired from operating in the amateur spectrum.

2117. Re: Why We Freeband

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-02 23:31:45 UTC
From: Twistedhed <twistedhed@webtv.net>
Message-ID: <bo4451$r5l$1@news.x-echo.com>
Source record: 81593
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.swap

http://groups.google.com/groups?hl=en&lr=&ie=UTF-8&safe=off&selm=23079-3
CAB2151-7%40storefull-2315.public.lawson.webtv.net

=-
Article poste via Voila News - http://www.news.voila.fr
Le : Mon Nov 3 00:31:45 2003 depuis l'IP : ac8ede79.ipt.aol.com [VIP 532284301978]

2118. Re: Why We Freeband

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-02 23:32:22 UTC
From: sideband <AINO8SPAMW@cac.net>
Message-ID: <augpb.6994$P%1.6121322@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 81594
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Gotta be a forgery.

-SSB

N8WWM wrote:
> I agree, what's wrong with freebanding?
>

2119. Re: No Code General

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-02 23:39:18 UTC
From: Alun Palmer <alun@1stcounsel.com>
Message-ID: <Xns9427BDC21B7E7elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 81599
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.swap

Twistedhed <twistedhed@webtv.net> wrote in
news:bo1fo4$5ai$1@news.x-echo.com:

> I am interested in expanding my freeband hobby but do not wish to take
> t he General class hammie test until the code is dropped. My question
> is d oes anyone know when the code will be dropped and how long woould
> I need
> to wait until the written General test is simplified such as the Tech
> t
> est is now?
>
> Plase email me a WAV of morse code so I can hear what it sounded like
> wh en the old hammies used it.
> twistedhed@webtv.net
>
> =-
> Article poste via Voila News - http://www.news.voila.fr
> Le : Sun Nov 2 00:31:15 2003 depuis l'IP : ac87591b.ipt.aol.com [VIP
> 532284301978]

I will probably be dropped soon, but the FCC has to go through standard
procedures with all the pending petitions. The international requirement
was dropped on July 5th, so by next July it should probably be gone in the
US.

2120. Re: Why We Freeband

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-03 00:02:02 UTC
From: Twistedhed <twistedhed@webtv.net>
Message-ID: <bo45tq$s0r$1@news.x-echo.com>
Source record: 81595
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.swap

http://groups.google.com/groups?hl=en&lr=&ie=UTF-8&safe=off&selm=23079-3
CAB2151-7%40storefull-2315.public.lawson.webtv.net

=-
Article poste via Voila News - http://www.news.voila.fr
Le : Mon Nov 3 01:02:02 2003 depuis l'IP : ac8ede79.ipt.aol.com [VIP 532284301978]

2121. Re: A Morsodist Challenge

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-03 00:35:56 UTC
From: groupk0hb@earthlink.net
Message-ID: <5ee63311.0311021635.79e6b110@posting.google.com>
Source record: 81596

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote

>
> How about NA1SS...?!?!
>

Not until they count as a mult in SS.

dit dit

2122. Re: A Morsodist Challenge

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-03 00:38:48 UTC
From: groupk0hb@earthlink.net
Message-ID: <5ee63311.0311021638.54ad7389@posting.google.com>
Source record: 81597
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Hans K0HB" <k0hb@earthlink.net> wrote

> Dick,
>
> A simple straightforward challenge for you (and the rest of rrap).
>
> During the 30 hours starting at 2100Z on Nov 1st, 2003 I will be
> practicing Morsodism on the HF bands in the ARRL SS Radiosport event.
> Keep up with me if you can.
>

Looks like Dick couldn't make it. K0CKB and I stroked up K0RT and
made over 800 Q's. Among them were W4NTI and N2EY. No other rrap'ers
were evident.

dit dit

2123. Re: A Morsodist Challenge

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-03 00:57:56 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <oKhpb.2970$Oo4.738@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 81598
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Hans K0HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:5ee63311.0311021638.54ad7389@posting.google.com...
> "Hans K0HB" <k0hb@earthlink.net> wrote
>
> > Dick,
> >
> > A simple straightforward challenge for you (and the rest of rrap).
> >
> > During the 30 hours starting at 2100Z on Nov 1st, 2003 I will be
> > practicing Morsodism on the HF bands in the ARRL SS Radiosport event.
> > Keep up with me if you can.
> >
>
> Looks like Dick couldn't make it. K0CKB and I stroked up K0RT and
> made over 800 Q's. Among them were W4NTI and N2EY. No other rrap'ers
> were evident.
>
> dit dit

Good show Hans. And I also worked N2EY....wonder where the rest were ??
he he.

Dan/W4NTI

2124. Re: A Morsodist Challenge

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-03 01:10:07 UTC
From: Bert Craig <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM>
Message-ID: <PVhpb.76471$vX.17170231@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>
Source record: 81600
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Hans K0HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:5ee63311.0311021638.54ad7389@posting.google.com...
> Looks like Dick couldn't make it. K0CKB and I stroked up K0RT and
> made over 800 Q's. Among them were W4NTI and N2EY. No other rrap'ers
> were evident.
>
> dit dit

Where are you, Hans? I'll QSY. I just made my first SS QSO on 7040 kHz.

73 de Bert
WA2SI

2125. Re: Why We Freeband

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-03 01:12:55 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <rYhpb.2989$Oo4.1091@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 81601
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Randy" <not-this-one@not-here.com> wrote in message
news:9yepb.30085$4k5.16701@twister.austin.rr.com...
>
> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
> news:Xpepb.2759$Oo4.2418@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> > And why does this not surprise me? From a licensed ham, that is
supposed
> to
> > know the rules and regs. I rest my case.
> >
> > Go ahead and rant and rave....you know you are wrong.
> >
> > Better yet WWV, go ahead and operate there.
> >
> > Dan/W4NTI
>
> Dan, you took the bait...hook, line, sinker, and boat.
>
>

Say what you want. Nothing with the 'new hams' surprise me anymore.

Dan/W4NTI

2126. Re: Why We Freeband

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-03 01:36:54 UTC
From: jim <3carroll@optonline.net>
Message-ID: <3FA5B143.9090408@optonline.net>
Source record: 81602
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.swap

sir@oblivion.org wrote:
> "Twistedhed" <twistedhed@webtv.net> wrote in message
> news:bo3mgj$1lt$1@news.x-echo.com...
>
>>Organized, long term freebanders are very aware where they
>>operate and take great measure to ensure against talking on an amateur f
>>requency or one that isn't heavily used on the freeband.
>>If the non-U.S. stations can operate ssb there, why shouldn't I,
>>especially if I want to have a nice DX contact with one of them?
>
>
> I've been a so-called "freebander" since the late sixties but rarely for DX.
> The primary reason I talked outside of allotted frequencies was for privacy
> or to contact a specific distant station I wouldn't normally hear on the
> allotted band. We used to run Ch. 16 -5khz down and 15A a RC Channel running
> slightly above stock power on 3-4 element directional and easily talk 75-100
> miles. I spoke all over the world with better than 1000 confirmed QSL
> contacts from a slightly peaked Golden Eagle Mark III/IV running through a 4
> beam element at 60 feet from Central NJ.
>
>
>
actually a good point. if i were to use the freq's the u.s. gov said i can
then what is the problem with slipping +/- 5kc's between 'channels'? is
that freebanding?
better yet, who the hell is the u.s. gov to tell me what is legal or
not? if i were to float out to bermuda and xmit would i be freebanding
there? do our friends to the north and south really care what the fcc
says what americans can/cannot do? not likely....

2127. Re: No Code General

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-03 01:43:44 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031102204344.28745.00000135@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 81603

>I will probably be dropped soon, but the FCC has to go through standard
>procedures with all the pending petitions. The international requirement
>was dropped on July 5th, so by next July it should probably be gone in the
>US.
>

Then all you Brain Dead challenged knuckle Draggers can get you a new CBHam
License.

2128. Re: Why We Freeband

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-03 01:53:46 UTC
From: Brenda Ann <brendad@shinbiro.com>
Message-ID: <bo4a0omag1@news1.kornet.net>
Source record: 81604
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.swap

"jim" <3carroll@optonline.net> wrote in message
news:3FA5B143.9090408@optonline.net...
>

> actually a good point. if i were to use the freq's the u.s. gov said i can
> then what is the problem with slipping +/- 5kc's between 'channels'? is
> that freebanding?

The frequencies that the US govt. says you can are those specific
frequencies that constitute the 40 standard CB channels. The distance away
from the center of any channel is tightly regulated, and you can't be more
than 0.005% away from that center (~1.3 KHz), which is actually pretty broad
when compared to say, broadcast AM, which is only allowed a 20 Hz leeway).

> better yet, who the hell is the u.s. gov to tell me what is legal or
> not?

If you are a US citizen, they are granted that right by the constitution,
and by treaty.

if i were to float out to bermuda and xmit would i be freebanding
> there?

You would then be under the jurisdiction of whatever radio authority covers
Bermuda. Aren't they a British colony? The UK Radio Authority is much more
harsh than the FCC.

do our friends to the north and south really care what the fcc
> says what americans can/cannot do? not likely....

Actually, yes. The treaties for use of various frequencies are there to
protect all the various countries that are signatories to them. The
Canadians are pretty hard on pirates (though they also have some rules in
place to give greater latitude on some bands than we do). I don't know what
communications law is like in Mexico, but I imagine that they deal with
people operating out of band/off channel too.

>

2129. Re: Why We Freeband

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-03 02:06:32 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <IKipb.7382$P%1.6153243@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 81605
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.swap

"jim" <3carroll@optonline.net> wrote in message
news:3FA5B143.9090408@optonline.net...
>
>
> sir@oblivion.org wrote:
> > "Twistedhed" <twistedhed@webtv.net> wrote in message
> > news:bo3mgj$1lt$1@news.x-echo.com...
> >
> >>Organized, long term freebanders are very aware where they
> >>operate and take great measure to ensure against talking on an amateur f
> >>requency or one that isn't heavily used on the freeband.
> >>If the non-U.S. stations can operate ssb there, why shouldn't I,
> >>especially if I want to have a nice DX contact with one of them?
> >
> >
> > I've been a so-called "freebander" since the late sixties but rarely for
DX.
> > The primary reason I talked outside of allotted frequencies was for
privacy
> > or to contact a specific distant station I wouldn't normally hear on the
> > allotted band. We used to run Ch. 16 -5khz down and 15A a RC Channel
running
> > slightly above stock power on 3-4 element directional and easily talk
75-100
> > miles. I spoke all over the world with better than 1000 confirmed QSL
> > contacts from a slightly peaked Golden Eagle Mark III/IV running through
a 4
> > beam element at 60 feet from Central NJ.
> >
> >
> >
> actually a good point. if i were to use the freq's the u.s. gov said i can
> then what is the problem with slipping +/- 5kc's between 'channels'? is
> that freebanding?
> better yet, who the hell is the u.s. gov to tell me what is legal or
> not? if i were to float out to bermuda and xmit would i be freebanding
> there? do our friends to the north and south really care what the fcc
> says what americans can/cannot do? not likely....
>

There are international treaties also that regulate such things. So just
floating out to Bermuda doesn't help.

2130. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-03 02:30:14 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031102213014.21642.00002054@mb-m01.aol.com>
Source record: 81606

These are the number of unexpired FCC ARS
licenses held by individuals on the dates listed:

As of May 14, 2000:

Novice - 49,329
Tech - 205,394
Tech Plus - 128,860
General - 112,677
Advanced - 99,782
Extra - 78,750
Total - 674,792

As of October 31, 2003:

Novice - 32,939 (decrease of 16,390)
Technician - 257,987 (increase of 52,593)
Technician Plus - 64,302 (decrease of 64,558)
General - 141,315 (increase of 28,638)
Advanced - 82,460 (decrease of 17,322)
Extra - 104,706 (increase of 25,956)
Total - 683,709 (increase of 8,917)

73 de Jim, N2EY

2131. Re: Why We Freeband

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-03 02:33:47 UTC
From: jim <3carroll@optonline.net>
Message-ID: <3FA5BE98.5090506@optonline.net>
Source record: 81607
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.swap

Brenda Ann wrote:
> "jim" <3carroll@optonline.net> wrote in message
> news:3FA5B143.9090408@optonline.net...
>
>
>
>>actually a good point. if i were to use the freq's the u.s. gov said i can
>>then what is the problem with slipping +/- 5kc's between 'channels'? is
>>that freebanding?
>
>
> The frequencies that the US govt. says you can are those specific
> frequencies that constitute the 40 standard CB channels. The distance away
> from the center of any channel is tightly regulated, and you can't be more
> than 0.005% away from that center (~1.3 KHz), which is actually pretty broad
> when compared to say, broadcast AM, which is only allowed a 20 Hz leeway).
>

that is what the u.s. gov proclaims. my point is they have no say so
outside territorial waters. whether or not the gov abides by itu
standards on this matter is open.

>
>>better yet, who the hell is the u.s. gov to tell me what is legal or
>>not?
>
>
> If you are a US citizen, they are granted that right by the constitution,
> and by treaty.
>

please point out the constitutional section you mentioned.

> if i were to float out to bermuda and xmit would i be freebanding
>
>>there?
>
>
> You would then be under the jurisdiction of whatever radio authority covers
> Bermuda. Aren't they a British colony? The UK Radio Authority is much more
> harsh than the FCC.
>

right, the RA is tough. easier to monitor 65+/- million than appr 300
million

> do our friends to the north and south really care what the fcc
>
>>says what americans can/cannot do? not likely....
>
>
> Actually, yes. The treaties for use of various frequencies are there to
> protect all the various countries that are signatories to them. The
> Canadians are pretty hard on pirates (though they also have some rules in
> place to give greater latitude on some bands than we do). I don't know what
> communications law is like in Mexico, but I imagine that they deal with
> people operating out of band/off channel too.
>
>
treaties not withstanding have you heard 10 & 11 meters recently? the
developing world is looking for the cheapest way to communicate with
their expatriates (sp?) in the u.s. one way to do it is using a setup
that after an initial outlay for equipment is basically free. their
problem is propagation not the gov.

>
>
>
>

2132. Re: Why We Freeband

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-03 02:35:10 UTC
From: joseph mcdavid <jmcdavid@dixie-net.com>
Message-ID: <3FA5BEDE.75D77768@dixie-net.com>
Source record: 81608
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.swap

jim wrote:

> sir@oblivion.org wrote:
> > "Twistedhed" <twistedhed@webtv.net> wrote in message
> > news:bo3mgj$1lt$1@news.x-echo.com...
> >
> >>Organized, long term freebanders are very aware where they
> >>operate and take great measure to ensure against talking on an amateur f
> >>requency or one that isn't heavily used on the freeband.
> >>If the non-U.S. stations can operate ssb there, why shouldn't I,
> >>especially if I want to have a nice DX contact with one of them?
> >
> >
> > I've been a so-called "freebander" since the late sixties but rarely for DX.
> > The primary reason I talked outside of allotted frequencies was for privacy
> > or to contact a specific distant station I wouldn't normally hear on the
> > allotted band. We used to run Ch. 16 -5khz down and 15A a RC Channel running
> > slightly above stock power on 3-4 element directional and easily talk 75-100
> > miles. I spoke all over the world with better than 1000 confirmed QSL
> > contacts from a slightly peaked Golden Eagle Mark III/IV running through a 4
> > beam element at 60 feet from Central NJ.
> >
> >
> >
> actually a good point. if i were to use the freq's the u.s. gov said i can
> then what is the problem with slipping +/- 5kc's between 'channels'? is
> that freebanding?
> better yet, who the hell is the u.s. gov to tell me what is legal or
> not? if i were to float out to bermuda and xmit would i be freebanding
> there? do our friends to the north and south really care what the fcc
> says what americans can/cannot do? not likely....

just make it worse for every body next thing you know
they'll require a digatal id on all transmitters or they'll be
terrorist and arrested without due process.

2133. Re: No Code General

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-03 02:42:53 UTC
From: Bill <wdecker1@rochester.rr.com>
Message-ID: <Ngjpb.37860$ZC4.22608@twister.nyroc.rr.com>
Source record: 81609
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.swap

begone, foul beast, back under your bridge...

2134. Re: A Morsodist Challenge

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-03 03:26:06 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031102222606.00545.00002089@mb-m02.aol.com>
Source record: 81610

In article <5ee63311.0311021638.54ad7389@posting.google.com>,
groupk0hb@earthlink.net (Hans K0HB) writes:

>"Hans K0HB" <k0hb@earthlink.net> wrote
>
>> Dick,
>>
>> A simple straightforward challenge for you (and the rest of rrap).
>>
>> During the 30 hours starting at 2100Z on Nov 1st, 2003 I will be
>> practicing Morsodism on the HF bands in the ARRL SS Radiosport event.
>> Keep up with me if you can.
>>
>
>Looks like Dick couldn't make it. K0CKB and I stroked up K0RT and
>made over 800 Q's. Among them were W4NTI and N2EY. No other rrap'ers
>were evident.
>
You guys were burning up the bands from what I heard here. Sorry I didn't recognize the K0RT call at first. Dan has given me 'Bama in SS for so many years that I felt kinda disloyal working another AL first.

Lotta good signals, flares didn't do too much damage.. Towards the end I was hearing serials above 1300.

I put in 15-16 hours and got 367 QSOs in 74 sections. Gave the K2 a rest and used my homebrew rig (known as the 'Southgate Type 7' this year.

Boy was that fun. I gotta get in better shape for next year, though, I faded by 2 AM local.

Maybe I'll build an amplifier for the K2...lessee, single 811 in grounded cathode Class B, full wave bridge power supply with old TV transformer. Or perhaps it's time for me to dsign and build the 'Southgate Type 8'.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2135. Re: Why We Freeband

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-03 03:29:29 UTC
From: Landshark <S3Buell@jgkdls.com>
Message-ID: <tYjpb.2900$Su7.2879@newssvr27.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 81611
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.swap

Forge, not from twistedhed@webtv.net

"Twistedhed" <twistedhed@webtv.net> wrote in message news:bo3mgj$1lt$1@news.x-echo.com...
> Organized, long term freebanders are very aware where they
> operate and take great measure to ensure against talking on an amateur f
> requency or one that isn't heavily used on the freeband.
> If the non-U.S. stations can operate ssb there, why shouldn't I,
> especially if I want to have a nice DX contact with one of them?
>
> Many of us LIKE the law as it is, it keeps "yes men" off the freqs. Same
> analogy as the gun issue...when guns are outlawed only
> outlaws will have guns...no, yoo won't find many freebanders lobbying fo
> r change to open the freqs because the law as it reads, doesn't bug us.
>
>
> No rationalization is even needed except to reply to folks
> that repeatedly ask over and over, "Why?" It is these folks
> that feel they need a reason why we do what we do, not us.
>
>
> =-
> Article poste via Voila News - http://www.news.voila.fr
> Le : Sun Nov 2 20:38:59 2003 depuis l'IP : aca3688f.ipt.aol.com [VIP 532284301978]

2136. Re: ARRL has no FIRE for sale?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-03 03:43:39 UTC
From: Kimo <kimo@rhaawaiigig.org>
Message-ID: <bo4it1$6qm$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 81612

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
>
>
> This issue has been kicking around the ARRL Pacific Division
> "cabinet" for almost 15 years that I know of (I was in same until 4
> years ago). The problem is that the Postal Service wants a big hunk
> of money for air mail to individual subscribers - the League would
> have to assess a healthy surcharge to Pacific Section members to
> make up the difference. You don't want that sort of "special
> treatment".
>
> Conversely, contracting bulk-shipping and local mailing out to a
> third party is not cheap either - same surcharge problem, same "you
> don't want to have to pay it".
>
> The third option that major periodicals take is to electronically
> ship the copy to Honolulu and print it there. That works only
> for large volume - not for the several thousand ARRL members in the
> Section.
>
> I wish there was a better solution.
>
> The glories of living in Paradise, eh?
>
> >Aloha
>
> M'halo.
>
> --
> 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane
>
> From a Clearing in the Silicon Forest
> Beaverton (Washington County) Oregon
>
>

What a stupid moronic reply to the poster's remarks about
bulk air mail delivery to Hawaii. You missed the point.

Kimo
Royal Hawaiian DX Spotters
Still Waiting for my May 1999 QST, Where is it?

2137. Re: Amateur Radio in the 21st Century?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-03 03:49:50 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031102224950.21232.00001801@mb-m13.aol.com>
Source record: 81614

In article <JNYob.1530$9M3.1433@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Bill Sohl"
<billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20031031223023.12631.00002521@mb-m28.aol.com...
>> In article <MvDob.16255$FI2.5145@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Bill
>Sohl"
>> <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
>>
>> >"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>> >news:20031027222947.06226.00001204@mb-m19.aol.com...
>> >> In article <Caknb.8872$FI2.7958@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>,
>"Bill
>> >Sohl"
>> >> <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
>> >>
>> >> >"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
>> >> >news:c2356669.0310270917.2668311b@posting.google.com...
>> >> >> "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
>> >> >news:<7O0nb.4484$X22.1484@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
>> >> >> > "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>> >> >> > news:20031024182942.12300.00001303@mb-m20.aol.com...
>> >> >> > > In article <3F993128.6080401@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
>> >> >writes:
>> >> >>
>> >> >> KL7CC & Co. have already done so. Have you read their paper?
>> >> >
>> >> >No, is it on a web site?.
>> >> >>
>> >> >> http://www.qsl.net/al7fs/
>> >> >>
>> >> >> Second item down - "Amateur Radio in the 21st Century"
>> >> >>
>> >> >> You can skim through the code test stuff - we've agreed to disagree on
>> >> >that.
>> >> >> What is really interesting is the *other* ideas, such as what should
>> >> >happen to
>> >> >> the entry-level license class, free upgrades, written testing....
>> >> >>
>> >> >> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>> >> >
>> >> >Jim, et al;
>> >> >
>> >> >Some interesting and thought provoking suggestions/proposals.

>> >
>> >I agree we'll just have to disagree on the code testing, but IF folks are
>> >looking for a tp down revamp of licensing for US hams, Jim (KL7CC)
>> >has certainly stirred the pot.
>>
>> Agreed - but not in the best way, IMHO.
>
>Are you saying discussion or stawman proposals are bad???

No!

I'm saying that some of the proposal's ideas (not talking about the code test -
that's old news!) are not the best way to reach the desired results.
>
>> >Maybe a good place to start would be the proposed "Communicator"
>> >entry/beginners exam. Personally I think the applicant needs
>> >some command of Part 97 rules...not all, but at least those that
>> >would lay out the rules for Communicator license.
>>
>> If anything needs to be a part of the test, it's the rules and regs.
>
>I agree...to a point as noted below.
>
>> >I have always felt
>> >memorizing
>> >band edges makes little sense on a test because they do and have changed
>> >over time. I'd like to know the applicant could at least read a
>frequency
>> >chart and be able to answer questions regarding the privileges for
>> >his/her license. That could be "open book" where the frequency chart is
>> >provided. Other basic questions probably should require some
>> >recallable knowledge (e.g. music is forbidden, etc.)
>>
>> Power levels, modes allowed, knowing you can't cuss or jam others, etc.
>>
>> I think there is some sort of legal precedent that if something isn't in
>the
>> test syllabus, a licensed violator may have an out wrt prosecution.
>
>No such legal precedent..rather, just the opposite...to wit,
>ignorance of the lasw is not a valid defense to a violation charge.

My point is that if the govt. grants licenses that require tests, it makes
sense that the rules for that license be on the test.
>
>> >If you haven't read the KL7CC white paper, here's where you
>> >can find it:
>> >
>> >http://www.qsl.net/al7fs/NCVECplan.doc
>> >
>> >One interesting proposal sure to either enrage or please is the

>> >free upgrades for Tech and Advanced. Personally, and I have no stake
>> >in this as I'm already Extra, the idea of free upgrades doesn't bother me
>at
>> >all
>> >if it ultimately results in a set of license classes that make sense with
>> >regard
>> >to privileges vs requirements.
>>
>> Free upgrades have a lot of downsides. For example, suppose that a tech
>gets a
>> free upgrade to General without ever taking Element 3 or its equivalent.
>> Doesn't that prove that Element 3 contains nothing that is essential for
>> General class privileges?
>
>It proves nothing that definitive.

See below.
>
>> Couldn't somebody claim that requiring new hams to
>> pass Element 3 (or 4) but not requiring existing hams to do the same is
>> discriminatory?
>
>Someone can claim anything they want.

Consider this:

Prospective ham reads about the upcoming changes. Reads that on Date X, all Techs will get free upgrade to General. Crams for Tech and takes it a day or two before Date X. Passes Tech, gets General as a freebie. Is that fair? Does said newbie really have General class qualifications?
>
>> >The other two alternatives are:
>> >(1) certain existing licenses would lose privileges (not a good track
>> >record on that as we saw in 1968) or
>> >(2) we keep the existing licneses plus the newly defined ones and
>> >wait for the old licenses to go SK. Probably not what the FCC wants
>> >for enforcement and rules simplification.
>>
>> I don't see what the problem is with (2). FCC has kept three "cul de sac"
>> license classes active for almost 4 years now (Tech Plus/Novice/Advanced)
>with
>> no real problems. They're just entries in a database.
>
>They are more than just database entries. They also have specific
>privileges which
>differentiate them from the "lower" level licenses. IF the FCC granted
>identical
>privileges to Advanced rather than doing a "free upgrade" of Advanced to
>Extra,
>THEN the old licenses would be just a database differentiator.

Only difference is a few lines of rules - particularly the difference between
Advanced and Extra.
>
>> And FCC turned down ARRL's idea of free General upgrades for existing
>Novices
>> and Tech Pluses.
>
>The FCC once was looking for a consensus of hams before it would
>entertain dropping code speeds.

But that wasn't the issue - ARRL proposed 5 wpm for General, so all Tech Pluses
and Novices met that already. The sticking point was the written testing.
>
>> >Further commentary ad discussion welcome.
>> >
>> >And a curse to the first person who introduces any of the lexicon
>> >of name calling rather than attempt credible dialog or debate.
>>
>> AGREED!
>>
>> There's also the part about the "no homebrew no voltages over 30" for the
>> Communicator. Not good ideas at all - nor are they realistic.
>
>They may be more realistic then we may think. How many actual
>"homebrew" Novice or Tech rigs have you seen?

I've seen plenty! ;-)

The "no voltages over 30" means no line-powered rigs, no antenna tuners.....

73 de Jim, N2EY

2138. Re: Amateur Radio in the 21st Century?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-03 03:49:51 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031102224951.21232.00001802@mb-m13.aol.com>
Source record: 81613

In article <2fKdnUsUIZCX4TiiRVn-sQ@gbronline.com>, JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
writes:

>Steve Robeson, K4CAP wrote:
>
>Lennie whinned and cried:
>>
>>> If a 6-year-old can pass an Extra exam, they are QUALIFIED!
>>> That's been said by the multitude in here, too.
>>
>>
>> Duuuuuh....Maybe because it's TRUE, Lennie...?!?!
>
>It really gets under Lennieboy's skin that a 6 year old can pass the
>test and he, a so self professed professional in electronics, can't.

Remember the old saying "can't means won't"?
>
To my knowledge, no 6 year old has passed the Extra.

A 6 year old being homeschooled at the first-grade level passed the General
recently.

Several years back, befoe restructuring, an 8 year old in 3rd grade passed the
Extra - all 5 written tests and 20 wpm code. I have worked that amateur a few
times on CW - excellent operator.

And this isn't a new phenomenon. Way back in 1948, before there was a Novice or
Technician level license, a 9 year old passed the old Class B exam at the
Philadelphia FCC office. That exam required 13 wpm receiving and sending, plus
a written test that was not from a public pool that required essay-type answers
as well as multiple choice, and the drawing of schematic and block diagrams.

On the last page of his voluminous reply comments to the restructuring NPRM
back in 1999, Len requested that the FCC enact a minimum age requirement of 14
years for any class of amateur license. When challenged, however, he could not
give a single example of on-air violations by licensed radio amateurs under the
age of 14.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2139. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-03 04:35:24 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <gWkpb.2338$Bf7.1315183@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 81615

JJ wrote:

> Mike Coslo wrote:
>
>> JJ wrote:
>>
>>>
>>> Suggest you and Kim read this:
>>>
>>> http://www.msnbc.com/news/987498.asp?cp1=1
>>>
>>
>> Ancient liberal press trick of assigning reasons for something to
>> something else.
>>
>> My read:
>> 1. Earlier, a lot of Black people moved north for jobs.
>>
>> 2. Jobs go away, and next generation is better educated.
>>
>> 3. People move to where they can get a job.
>>
>>
>>
>> The closest thing to a quote from an actual person who MOved south and
>> said this is why they moved south was from some dude in the urban
>> league. I hesitate to draw the same conclusions. YMMV
>>
>> - Mike KB3EIA -
>>
> Why don't you ask the blacks that are moving back south and find out for
> yourself?
>

I don't really know any Blacks that are moving south. Does that make me
unqualified to have an opinion? If so, how many do you know?

If they moved to the north because they were told that there was no
racism there, then that information was wrong by your reasoning. So why
is this news blurb the truth?

> As usual, if your views agree with the press then the press is
> correct, if not then the press is wrong.

As usual? Don't know where you got that from me, I hardly ever comment
on the press.

If you want to know what I think of the press, I simply use what seems to be facts from them, and toss out the "conclusions" they make. That's why I listen to CNN, Fox, whatever major network happens to be on at the time, and even NPR. Guess what? they are all biased, and put their own spin on the news! My biggest disappointment in the whole batch is Fox news tho'. I don't mind a right wing slant to the news - indeed it is nice to balance out some of the others - but as of late, they seem to be taking the tack of sueing or threatening to sue people who disagree with them or satirize them. Like Mr. Franken, or amazingly enough, the Simpson's!!!!!! Seems they have a problem with free speech.

So if you want to believe whatever pabulum is served up by one new source, have at it! I'll make up my own mind.

- Mike KB3EIA -

2140. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-03 04:39:57 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <x_kpb.2340$Bf7.1316246@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 81616

JJ wrote:

> I guess you failed to read this part, or you just ignored it because it
> did not fit with what you want to believe.
>
> "That movement north slowed as job opportunities dwindled and *racial
> tensions rose* in northern cities in the 1960s and 1970s, Ross said."

I don't deny they got a few parts right.

Hey, you want a theory?

How about an effort made to get African Americans (traditionally Democrat)to move back to the south to balance out the political leanings of the area? We might be able to get some "authority" to say something like that.

- Mike KB3EIA

2141. Re: No Code General

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-03 04:41:29 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <Z%kpb.2342$Bf7.1312644@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 81617
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.swap

Alun Palmer wrote:

> I will probably be dropped soon, but the FCC has to go through standard
> procedures with all the pending petitions. The international requirement
> was dropped on July 5th, so by next July it should probably be gone in the
> US.

Hehhe. Alun, you should be on the welcoming committee for this dude!

- Mike KB3EIA -

2142. Re: Why We Freeband

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-03 04:45:04 UTC
From: Frank Gilliland <sparky@NOSPAMaimcomm.net>
Message-ID: <2smbqvcptcr4l857gi095dj9qdnc3srmn5@4ax.com>
Source record: 81618
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.swap

In <3FA5BE98.5090506@optonline.net>, jim <3carroll@optonline.net> wrote:

<snip>
>>>better yet, who the hell is the u.s. gov to tell me what is legal or
>>>not?
>>
>>
>> If you are a US citizen, they are granted that right by the constitution,
>> and by treaty.
>>
>
>please point out the constitutional section you mentioned.

Article VI.

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 100,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! =-----

2143. Re: Why We Freeband

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-03 04:50:31 UTC
From: keyclownzmustgo@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <17b206c0.0311022050.753e3328@posting.google.com>
Source record: 81619
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.swap

"Landshark" S3Buell@jgkdls.com wrote:
> Forge, not from twistedhed@webtv.net
>
>

What are you Twistedheds yes man?

>"Twistedhed" <twistedhed@webtv.net> wrote in message news:bo3mgj$1lt$1@news.x-echo.com...
>> Organized, long term freebanders are very aware where they
>> operate and take great measure to ensure against talking on an amateur
>f
>> requency or one that isn't heavily used on the freeband.
>> If the non-U.S. stations can operate ssb there, why shouldn't I,
>> especially if I want to have a nice DX contact with one of them?
>>
>> Many of us LIKE the law as it is, it keeps "yes men" off the freqs. Same
>> analogy as the gun issue...when guns are outlawed only
>> outlaws will have guns...no, yoo won't find many freebanders lobbying
>fo
>> r change to open the freqs because the law as it reads, doesn't bug us.
>>
>>
>> No rationalization is even needed except to reply to folks
>> that repeatedly ask over and over, "Why?" It is these folks
>> that feel they need a reason why we do what we do, not us.
>>
>>
>> =-
>> Article poste via Voila News - http://www.news.voila.fr
>> Le : Sun Nov 2 20:38:59 2003 depuis l'IP : aca3688f.ipt.aol.com [VIP
>532284301978]
>

2144. Re: Why We Freeband

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-03 06:25:55 UTC
From: Dave VanHorn <dvanhorn@cedar.net>
Message-ID: <jI2dnSEjkc5xaTiiRVn-tg@comcast.com>
Source record: 81620
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.swap

> just make it worse for every body next thing you know
> they'll require a digatal id on all transmitters or they'll be
> terrorist and arrested without due process.

I take it you haven't heard of transmitter fingerprinting then?
http://www.motron.com/TransmitterID.html

2145. Re: Why We Freeband

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-03 07:19:08 UTC
From: Brainbuster <brainbuster@lineone.net>
Message-ID: <bo4vp7ehs1@news7.svr.pol.co.uk>
Source record: 81621
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Steve Robeson, K4CAP wrote in message
<5c01b95b.0311021420.7478cc87@posting.google.com>...
>Twistedhed <twistedhed@webtv.net> wrote in message
news:<bo3mgj$1lt$1@news.x-echo.com>...
>
> Don't wrap yourself up in that "free spirit" crap. You're
>breaking the law and disrupting the use of the spectrum.

They are also forging and muck stirring... that was not "Twistedhed" and it
did not come through WebTV as the person would have you think...

> Message-ID: <bo3mgj$1lt$1@news.x-echo.com>
> NNTP-Posting-Host: news-front1.voila.fr
> X-Trace: news.x-echo.com 1067801939 1725
> 195.101.94.106 (2 Nov 2003 19:38:59 GMT)
> X-Complaints-To: abuse@x-echo.com

These people are purposely forging and cross posting in an attempt
to start flame wars and Ham vs CB wars.
Sometimes they post messages against illegal use, other times they post
messages praising it - using different names and forges. It's just a
childish game.

Regards,

Peter.

2146. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-03 12:32:20 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <oVrpb.3581$Oo4.2885@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 81622

"Kim W5TIT" wrote:
>
> (snip) I am telling you that my experience has been
> that people who are customarily born in this country
> feel that the jobs we are speaking of are beneath them.
> (snip) But, how dare you dismiss the experiences I have
> seen.

Again, I'm not dismissing your experiences. Instead, I'm questioning the conclusions you've made about those experiences. You say, based on your experiences with other people, nobody in this country other than immigrants is willing to do those jobs? How many of those non-immigrant people did you ask if they would take those jobs if the wages were better? I suspect just about all of them would at least consider, and many would gladly take, those jobs under different wage conditions. If I'm right, your conclusions are flat wrong - non-immigrants are willing to do those jobs. And, if you are wrong, to continue to perpetrate a myth that non-immigrants are either too lazy or too uppish to do that work is simply insulting.

> And, how dare you again, Dwight. (snip) How dare you
> imply that I "don't care" about bad policies in this country.
> Have I once said I don't care? (snip)

Lay off the false outrage, Kim. Nobody said you didn't care. I said "few seem to care," not "Kim doesn't care." If you apply those words to yourself, you do so in your own mind. If others want to apply those words to you, they'll do so after reading what you've said.

> (snip) and I've just told you I am basing that on experience. Go
> to the Unemployment lines. I haven't--but I *BET* the majority
> of people in those lines are not looking for work on farms, at
> Wal-Mart, with municipalities, landscape companies, construction
> firms, asbestos abatement firms, chemical and biological hazard
> waste firms, and our ever-famous convenience stores such as
> 7-Eleven--all of which need people constantly.

Your experiences are clearly somewhat limited. Walmart doesn't hire through state or outside employment agencies. Potential employees apply at the individual stores and there are rarely shortages of applicants. Municipalities tend to pay fairly well (with good benefits), hence rarely have a shortage of applicants (skilled applicants is another matter). Landscape companies, to keep costs down, are perhaps the largest employers of illegal immigrants. Construction companies only have problems finding skilled applicants (laborers are plentiful). The same with most other companies seeking skilled labor. Convenience store jobs are among the lowest paying, and most dangerous, in the country. In other words, none of these

tend to prove your point.

> (snip) All one need do is look around them to see where our
> youth find important and meaningful employment: McDonald's
> and other fast food joints, light dining restaurants, and that's
> about it. (snip)

You've got to be kidding, Kim. You consider employment at fast food joints, some of the lowest paying jobs in this country, to be "important and meaningful employment?"

> (snip) Why did I break-out to light dining restaurants? Because
> I don't see teen-agers in the "finer" dining restaraunts - and my
> husband and I love to eat out so we have some experience.
> Know why *I* think they (teen-agers) aren't there? Because
> there, the customer service is higher scale, which demands more
> personality, better etiquette, and of course--greater work ethic.

Or maybe the owners simply don't hire teenagers.

> Guess who we do see serving us in those restaurants?

Who, Kim? You've already said teenagers (immigrant and non-immigrant) don't work in these restaurants. That leaves only adults. I suppose you're now going to say immigrant adults have more personally, better etiquette, and a greater work ethic, than non-immigrant adults in this country, which is why immigrant adults, not non-immigrant adults, work in the restaurants you go to.

> My husband has been at his formerly family-owned business
> for 27 years. His mom sold the company last year. For most
> of those 27 years, until about 10 years ago, they had a great
> crew of folks. Since then, the main focus of my husband's
> every day work has been to get someone in there who wants
> a job and will work. Know how many nieces nephews, and
> his own kids and my son, he has had through those years?
> Ten. Not one of them has ever, ever worked there. (snip)

Perhaps that says more about your husband than the nieces, nephews, and kids. That's not intended as an insult. Instead, it's just to point out that few kids are willing to work for parents or immediate relatives - parents and relatives tend to be more demanding and more judgmental than the normal employer.

> If the factories are closing, then what jobs are the immigrants
> moving in to take? (snip) I am still curious to know if factories
> are closing, what jobs are available for anyone to take? (snip)

Didn't I pretty much answer that in the next paragraph of that message? There are obviously more jobs in town than just factory jobs, Kim. The elimination of those factory jobs simply adds to the competition for those remaining jobs.

> Well, excuse me for the honesty--you'll call it having my
> blinders on or not caring, maybe even because I am a
> "liberal"--but, if one contract put this company out of
> business, then perhaps the person should have gone on
> to some form of vocational or higher level training in
> business practices before they took such a jump. (snip)

It happened to be about a $450k per year contract, the loss of which his company could not absorb.

> (snip) if we have no control over the employment
> situation in this country--we don't whine about it. We
> knuckle under, get the menial jobs, sell the big house,
> get the little house, sell the SUV and get the Saturn,
> and we begin the task of seeing what we can do--if
> anything--to change the route of what we perceive as
> being awful. (snip)

Kim, as voters and citizens, we're supposed to have control over the employment situation in this country. We don't simply because too many choose to "knuckle under" instead of demanding better. Of course, they probably don't have that much of a choice as long as most people are heartless enough to think the solution for those people is to sell everything, take a menial job, and live in poverty.

> Then, report the company to INS. REPORT THEM. If
> the company is getting contracts based on their employment
> of illegeal aliens, then I am sure the firms they are doing
> services for will want to know this. For goodness sake,
> REPORT their ass.

I've already filed complaints. Sadly, it just doesn't work that way, Kim. When it comes to businesses hiring illegal immigrants, government agencies only take on a few, high profile, cases each year (such as Walmart recently). Because of that, you could complain until you're blue in the face and absolutely nothing will come of it. I truly wish it were different, but that's simply the way it is (which is exactly why so many companies are now willing to hire illegal immigrants).

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

2147. Re: A Morsodist Challenge

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-03 14:26:25 UTC
From: groupk0hb@earthlink.net
Message-ID: <5ee63311.0311030626.aef36e9@posting.google.com>
Source record: 81623
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote

> You guys were burning up the bands from what I heard here.

Conditions were pretty rough here. With the high A-index (100+), then an early AM solar flare creaming us, conditions seemed to be a bastard mix of "peak of the solar cycle" but modified by high absorption. The higher bands (10 & 15) were extremely long, so we sat here in the middle while the east coast worked the west coast with big signals and we could barely tell they were on the band. Unless you were south of about 43-degrees latitude, you also had to contend with the expanded auroral zone and resulting tough conditions on the lower bands, especially 75M. The result is that around here we were in a propagation black hole, and pretty much were squeezed into 20 and 40M bands. Most MWA scores look to be down about 20%.

73, de Hans, K0HB

2148. Re: Why We Freeband

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-03 14:26:33 UTC
From: N8WWM <N8WWM@home.net>
Message-ID: <bo5oip024vg@drn.newsguy.com>
Source record: 81624
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

In article <17b206c0.0311022050.753e3328@posting.google.com>, Citizens For A Keyclown-Free Newsgroup says...
>
>"Landshark" S3Buell@jgkdls.com wrote:
>> Forge, not from twistedhed@webtv.net
>>
>>
>
>What are you Twistedheds yes man?
>
>
Why do people forge Twistedhed so much, are they jealous?
>
>
>
>>"Twistedhed" <twistedhed@webtv.net> wrote in message
>>news:bo3mgj$1lt$1@news.x-echo.com...
>>> Organized, long term freebanders are very aware where they
>>> operate and take great measure to ensure against talking on an amateur
>>f
>>> requency or one that isn't heavily used on the freeband.
>>> If the non-U.S. stations can operate ssb there, why shouldn't I,
>>> especially if I want to have a nice DX contact with one of them?
>>>
>>> Many of us LIKE the law as it is, it keeps "yes men" off the freqs. Same
>>> analogy as the gun issue...when guns are outlawed only
>>> outlaws will have guns...no, yoo won't find many freebanders lobbying
>>fo
>>> r change to open the freqs because the law as it reads, doesn't bug us.
>>>
>>>
>>> No rationalization is even needed except to reply to folks
>>> that repeatedly ask over and over, "Why?" It is these folks
>>> that feel they need a reason why we do what we do, not us.
>>>
>>>
>>> =-
>>> Article poste via Voila News - http://www.news.voila.fr
>>> Le : Sun Nov 2 20:38:59 2003 depuis l'IP : aca3688f.ipt.aol.com [VIP
>>532284301978]
>>

2149. Re: Why We Freeband

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-03 15:02:13 UTC
From: N8WWM <N8WWM@home.net>
Message-ID: <bo5qll02b9c@drn.newsguy.com>
Source record: 81625
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Rules are made to be broken, even the Rain Report can't stop me!

http://groups.google.com/groups?q=n8wwm+%22rain+report%22&hl=en&lr=&ie=UTF-8&oe=UTF-8&selm=dc1baa4a.0302200920.2171992a%40posting.google.com&rnum=8

N8WWM guilty of FCC violations. According to the FCC, N8WWM, Dog Adair committed several violations over the air at the expense of the Toledo Amateur Radio Club by utilizing their repeater to break the law. The amateur club received a warning letter from the FCC concerning Adair's violations and were told to take steps to make certain the violations by Adair will not be repeated. Adair not only hurt the entire image of amateur radio with his inexcusable behavior, but damaged the reputation of yet another entity trying to further the good of amateur radio. It's a shame when bad apples like these make it so clubs can't even trust their own users to abide by the rules they were sworn to uphold. Adair is also an infamous presence on the internet. A google search of "N8WWM" reveals a peek into the world of the individual identified as Adair. In addition to FCC violations, Adair has, in the past, been accused of being a prolific spammer, breaking several internet laws and violating several terms of service agreements with internet providers.

In article <Xpepb.2759$Oo4.2418@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, Dan/W4NTI says...
>
>And why does this not surprise me? From a licensed ham, that is supposed to
>know the rules and regs. I rest my case.
>
>Go ahead and rant and rave....you know you are wrong.
>
>Better yet WWV, go ahead and operate there.
>
>Dan/W4NTI
>
>"N8WWM" <N8WWM@home.net> wrote in message
>news:bo3nmk01ofq@drn.newsguy.com...
>> I agree, what's wrong with freebanding?
>>
>> In article <bo3mgj$1lt$1@news.x-echo.com>, Twistedhed says...
>> >
>> >Organized, long term freebanders are very aware where they
>> >operate and take great measure to ensure against talking on an amateur f
>> >requency or one that isn't heavily used on the freeband.
>> >If the non-U.S. stations can operate ssb there, why shouldn't I,

>> >especially if I want to have a nice DX contact with one of them?
>> >
>> >Many of us LIKE the law as it is, it keeps "yes men" off the freqs. Same
>> > analogy as the gun issue...when guns are outlawed only
>> >outlaws will have guns...no, yoo won't find many freebanders lobbying fo
>> >r change to open the freqs because the law as it reads, doesn't bug us.
>> >
>> >
>> >No rationalization is even needed except to reply to folks
>> >that repeatedly ask over and over, "Why?" It is these folks
>> >that feel they need a reason why we do what we do, not us.
>> >
>> >
>> >=-
>> >Article poste via Voila News - http://www.news.voila.fr
>> >Le : Sun Nov 2 20:38:59 2003 depuis l'IP : aca3688f.ipt.aol.com [VIP
>> >532284301978]
>>
>
>

2150. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-03 15:40:58 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <eGupb.3664$Oo4.567@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 81626

"charlesb" wrote:
>
> Amazing that you can interpret all that from my post,
> which I had thought to be fairly straightforward and
> easy to understand. (snip)

There is no other possible way to interpret your comments. You're arguing against what you call "economic manipulation," which means you want no change from what exists now.

> Let's try again: The kind of economic manipulation that
> you are advocating has been tried many, many times,
> with consistently poor results. It is not "new" and further
> manipulations of this kind would not be a "change", as it
> has been tried extensively already. - Again; With
> consistently poor results. (snip)

It's easy to make rash statements when you offer nothing to support them. Where have the changes I've advocated been tried many times and in what way have the results been poor? The key words there "the changes I've advocated," not your fanciful interpretation of what I've advocated.

> This may point out where some of our economic woes
> may originate.... Are all people who advocate
> manipulation of the economy by well-meaning fools
> functionally illiterate? Perhaps that is what keeps them
> from learning the simple lessons of history, tempting
> them to advocate old, bad ideas that are conspicuous
> for thier repeated failure?

I don't have the time to exchange insults with someone who clearly has no intent to engage in a discussion, Charles. Get back with me when you have something worthwhile to add.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

2151. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-03 16:27:46 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <6mvpb.3698$Oo4.3416@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 81627

"N2EY" wrote:
>
> (snip) By about the 1880s the West was considered
> "closed" by the government - not fully settled, but not
> a frontier anymore.

The frontier just kept moving, right up to the late 50's and early 60's
with the push for workers to Alaska.

> Look up what happened to refugees on the ship "St Louis"
> (I think that was the name) trying to escape Germany in
> 1938 or thereabouts.

I'm in a rush today, so don't have time to look it up right now, Jim.
However, I'll guess that you're talking about the shipload of mostly Jews
which headed for Cuba somewhere around that time with the intent to
eventually enter the United States but were later turned away. If I remember
correctly, they docked in Cuba for several months and eventually returned to
Europe.

> And that's the *real* problem, when you get to the bottom
> of it. What's the long term plan for US involvement in places
> like the Balkans and Afghanistan (let alone Iraq)?

Yep, we often get ourselves into things and only think about how to get
out afterwards. We also tend to do things in spurts, in sometimes seemingly
opposite directions. If businesses were run like this, most would be
bankrupt in very short order.

> Every so often in here, the "Amish" are cited as being "against
> technology" or "forbidding change" or some such nonsense.
> Actually the *real* Amish (at least the ones I've met) aren't
> like that at all. What they are really all about is looking at the
> effects of change in great detail before making changes. Some
> people might say they take the examination to an extreme.
> But at least they examine where a change will take them. To
> a very large extent, "modern" America doesn't do that.

My wife lived next to an Amish community in Northern Indiana as a young
girl and went to an Amish school with the Amish children. She still speaks
fondly of those times (including the minor conflicts caused by the different
lifestyles).

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

2152. Re: Unrepetant Sinner, Was Re: Robeson Apology???

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-03 16:52:10 UTC
From: Bob Brock <bbrock@i-america.net>
Message-ID: <tq1dqvc3h27ng1fqegpog64k9u1jdkr5n2@4ax.com>
Source record: 81628

On 2 Nov 2003 08:52:29 -0800, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP)
wrote:

Snippo mucho bullshito...

>> Be a good soldier and get on with it.
>
> Whatever "apology" I rendered above is all you get, Brain.
>
> Sorry if it's not what you wanted, but it's all you get.
>
>Steve, K4YZ

If nothing else in this ng shows that you guys don't have a life, this
one is "it." Hey guys, no one's holding a gun to your heads ya know.

2153. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-03 17:08:20 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <8Yvpb.3784$Oo4.1563@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 81629

"Kim W5TIT" wrote:
>
> Maybe that has more to do with the fact that Clinton
> was from the South and the flags were some form of
> "solidarity." You sure do see things from a weird
> perspective, in my opinion. (snip)

I have a weird perspective, Kim? I seriously doubt any person other than you would have even come up with the notion that those flags might have been displayed in an effort to demonstrate some form of solidarity with Bill Clinton. Are your strange notions caused by a general lack of knowledge, an inability to reconcile your liberal values with your surroundings in Texas, some form of childhood trauma, or is your brain simply wired differently than most? ;-)

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

2154. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-03 17:29:18 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <Ofwpb.3830$Oo4.3327@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 81630

"Dan/W4NTI" wrote:
>
> Most northerners I know that have crossed the Mason
> Dixon line and stayed in the South for a period of time
> have 'adopted' their new surroundings. With one major
> exception....those from NY.
>
> Wonder why that is?

Lets not forget those from New Jersey. Many of them tend to be strangest, and most negative, of the whole bunch. There was one a few months back that sat on the radio every single night for at least two months telling anyone who would listen how much he disliked the people here, how much they disliked him, how nobody would hire him (all this while he was at work), and just how unhappy he was in general. I finally got fed up one night and told him he should either just kill himself or go back to New Jersey if he was really that darn miserable. Whatever I said must have worked because I never heard him on the radio again and was told a few days later that he had indeed moved back to New Jersey. However, as depressing as he was, he probably did kill himself shortly after arriving there.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

2155. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-03 18:08:47 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <PQwpb.3926$Oo4.1159@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 81631

"Kim W5TIT" wrote:
>
> The news said that? That there's LESS racism? Compared
> to where and where?! I come from NE NY and never really
> saw any racism.

The trend of blacks moving to the South has been covered in the news for many years.

> Here, the topic is a part of every-day life.

Exactly. More people here talk about race issues (all sides) openly and honestly instead of sweeping them under the rug like they doesn't exist (or trying to act like they don't exist). A friend (a reggie recording artist) and his wife just moved here from NY about four years ago. There isn't a week that goes by that we don't discuss, or even argue out, some racial issue or topic. I think we've both learned a lot from each other through this process. Regardless, the conversations are rarely boring and we've all become good friends over the last few years.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

2156. Re: A Morsodist Challenge

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-03 18:47:46 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <mpxpb.4027$Oo4.990@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 81632
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

"Hans K0HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:5ee63311.0311030626.aef36e9@posting.google.com...
> n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote
>
> > You guys were burning up the bands from what I heard here.
>
> Conditions were pretty rough here. With the high A-index (100+), then
> an early AM solar flare creaming us, conditions seemed to be a bastard
> mix of "peak of the solar cycle" but modified by high absorption. The
> higher bands (10 & 15) were extremely long, so we sat here in the
> middle while the east coast worked the west coast with big signals and
> we could barely tell they were on the band. Unless you were south of
> about 43-degrees latitude, you also had to contend with the expanded
> auroral zone and resulting tough conditions on the lower bands,
> especially 75M. The result is that around here we were in a
> propagation black hole, and pretty much were squeezed into 20 and 40M
> bands. Most MWA scores look to be down about 20%.
>
> 73, de Hans, K0HB

About 11.30 central a flare glanced off the Earth (Sunday). The whole band
(s) died. But not for long..

I put in about 12 hours. Got a bit over 500 qso's and missed SFL, YT,
Alaska, North Dakota, oh well. Can't have a clean sweep every year.

Good hearing you two. Sorry I missed the rest of ya.

Dan/W4NTI

2157. Re: Why We Freeband

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-03 19:19:27 UTC
From: keyclownzmustgo@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <17b206c0.0311031119.58239e6f@posting.google.com>
Source record: 81633
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Brainbuster" <brainbuster@lineone.net> wrote in message
news:<bo4vp7ehs1@news7.svr.pol.co.uk>...
> Steve Robeson, K4CAP wrote in message
> <5c01b95b.0311021420.7478cc87@posting.google.com>...
> >Twistedhed <twistedhed@webtv.net> wrote in message
> news:<bo3mgj$1lt$1@news.x-echo.com>...
> >
> > Don't wrap yourself up in that "free spirit" crap. You're
> >breaking the law and disrupting the use of the spectrum.
>
>
> They are also forging and muck stirring... that was not "Twistedhed" and it
> did not come through WebTV as the person would have you think...

Twirted stirs his own muck. He wrote it and he can't retract it:

http://tinyurl.com/thi0

2158. Attention hammies, I contact UFOs on freeband

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-03 19:38:59 UTC
From: Twistedhed <twistedhed@webtv.net>
Message-ID: <bo6asj$276$1@news.x-echo.com>
Source record: 81634
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.antenna

This is another myth that Lelnad and his gang of jealousy-infected breth
eren perpetuate, that I have talked with "saucer men", I assure you, not
hing is further from the truth. The lies and anger-motivated constructio
ns that Lelnad, Dogie, the false Sparky, and Mad Geo dream up on a daily
basis have
nothing whatsoever to do with my actual experiences in the realm of the
supernatural.

AO=AO=AO=Now this is all well documented mind you, I have contacted the
outer reaches of another dimension while calling skip on 555, and yes I
am well aware that the frequency falls outside the channels that the gov
erment deems preferable for use, but I am not one of the unwashed unawar
e rabble of
citizenry, never have been, hence I am not subject to the same laws as c
ommon, callow men. In college I was on the Deans List if that tells you
anything and my superior intellect won me the favors of many like-minded
individuals in both society and academia. But I shunned their transpare
nt and shallow attentions to pursue my own unglamorous but rewarding pat
h in the swamplands of the south. This unselfish pursuit and my canny na
tive instincts are what I believe has been responsible for opening the d
oor to contact with other dimensions in the continuum and my subsequent
elevation to a cherished confidante. If you doubt me then do so at your
peril for there are many things on heaven and earth that are not yet und
erstood so you would do well to pay your respect to an as yet undisprove
n phenomenon. Alas, here is the meat of it; the beings I have communicat
ed with by chance do in fact effect transport by spherical means. Yes, s
ome call it a saucer, but that is a
misnomer. If the media knew the truth then it would be the undoing of my
special status and the end of all social intercourse. Only on the freeb
and does one learn of such truths. Lelnad and his gang of hounds may sco
ff, and I say let them, for what does one expect from such unenlightened
commoners but
an ignorant barbaric yawp in the face of such great wisdom.=AO=AO=AO=AO

=-
Article poste via Voila News - http://www.news.voila.fr
Le : Mon Nov 3 20:38:59 2003 depuis l'IP : ac9160fe.ipt.aol.com [VIP 532284301978]

2159. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-03 23:40:25 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0311031540.62deeb2f@posting.google.com>
Source record: 81635

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:<6mvpb.3698$Oo4.3416@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> "N2EY" wrote:
> >
> > (snip) By about the 1880s the West was considered
> > "closed" by the government - not fully settled, but not
> > a frontier anymore.
>
> The frontier just kept moving, right up to the late 50's and early 60's
> with the push for workers to Alaska.

But "the West" was pretty much full. And immigrants didn't usually go
to Alaska.

The Michener book "Hawaii" deals with the same situation in the
islands.
>
> > Look up what happened to refugees on the ship "St Louis"
> > (I think that was the name) trying to escape Germany in
> > 1938 or thereabouts.
>
> I'm in a rush today, so don't have time to look it up right now, Jim.
> However, I'll guess that you're talking about the shipload of mostly Jews
> which headed for Cuba somewhere around that time with the intent to
> eventually enter the United States but were later turned away. If I remember
> correctly, they docked in Cuba for several months and eventually returned to
> Europe.

More like several weeks. They were turned away from the US.

Many of them died in the death camps in Germany.

> > And that's the *real* problem, when you get to the bottom
> > of it. What's the long term plan for US involvement in places
> > like the Balkans and Afghanistan (let alone Iraq)?
>
> Yep, we often get ourselves into things and only think about how to get
> out afterwards. We also tend to do things in spurts, in sometimes seemingly
> opposite directions. If businesses were run like this, most would be
> bankrupt in very short order.

Hasn't that been happening all along?
>
> > Every so often in here, the "Amish" are cited as being "against
> > technology" or "forbidding change" or some such nonsense.
> > Actually the *real* Amish (at least the ones I've met) aren't

> > like that at all. What they are really all about is looking at the
> > effects of change in great detail before making changes. Some
> > people might say they take the examination to an extreme.
> > But at least they examine where a change will take them. To
> > a very large extent, "modern" America doesn't do that.
>
> My wife lived next to an Amish community in Northern Indiana as a young
> girl and went to an Amish school with the Amish children. She still speaks
> fondly of those times (including the minor conflicts caused by the different
> lifestyles).
>
I can imagine....

Point is, the attitudes that newer is always better and that all
change is good have led to all sorts of problems.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2160. Re: Attention hammies, I contact UFOs on freeband

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-04 00:42:29 UTC
From: richcranus@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <c5ecbb69.0311031642.cff9064@posting.google.com>
Source record: 81636
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.antenna

Twistedhed <twistedhed@webtv.net> wrote in message news:<bo6asj$276$1@news.x-echo.com>...
> This is another myth that Lelnad and his gang of jealousy-infected breth
> eren perpetuate, that I have talked with "saucer men", I assure you, not
> hing is further from the truth. The lies and anger-motivated constructio
> ns that Lelnad, Dogie, the false Sparky, and Mad Geo dream up on a daily
> basis have
> nothing whatsoever to do with my actual experiences in the realm of the
> supernatural.
>
> AO=AO=AO=Now this is all well documented mind you, I have contacted the
> outer reaches of another dimension while calling skip on 555, and yes I
> am well aware that the frequency falls outside the channels that the gov
> erment deems preferable for use, but I am not one of the unwashed unawar
> e rabble of
> citizenry, never have been, hence I am not subject to the same laws as c
> ommon, callow men. In college I was on the Deans List if that tells you
> anything and my superior intellect won me the favors of many like-minded
> individuals in both society and academia. But I shunned their transpare
> nt and shallow attentions to pursue my own unglamorous but rewarding pat
> h in the swamplands of the south. This unselfish pursuit and my canny na
> tive instincts are what I believe has been responsible for opening the d
> oor to contact with other dimensions in the continuum and my subsequent
> elevation to a cherished confidante. If you doubt me then do so at your
> peril for there are many things on heaven and earth that are not yet und
> erstood so you would do well to pay your respect to an as yet undisprove
> n phenomenon. Alas, here is the meat of it; the beings I have communicat
> ed with by chance do in fact effect transport by spherical means. Yes, s
> ome call it a saucer, but that is a
> misnomer. If the media knew the truth then it would be the undoing of my
> special status and the end of all social intercourse. Only on the freeb
> and does one learn of such truths. Lelnad and his gang of hounds may sco
> ff, and I say let them, for what does one expect from such unenlightened
> commoners but
> an ignorant barbaric yawp in the face of such great wisdom.=AO=AO=AO=AO
>
>
>
> =-
> Article poste via Voila News - http://www.news.voila.fr
> Le : Mon Nov 3 20:38:59 2003 depuis l'IP : ac9160fe.ipt.aol.com [VIP 532284301978]

Proving only that Doug Adair N8WWM has way too much time on his hands.
And no common sense at all.

Pay no attention to the dork behind the curtain. It's not Twistedhed!

2161. Re: Unrepetant Sinner, Was Re: Robeson Apology???

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-04 01:18:37 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0311031718.154e9dbc@posting.google.com>
Source record: 81637

Bob Brock <bbrock@i-america.net> wrote in message
news:<tq1dqvc3h27ng1fqegpog64k9u1jdkr5n2@4ax.com>...
> On 2 Nov 2003 08:52:29 -0800, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP)
> wrote:
>
>
> Snippo mucho bullshito...
>
> >> Be a good soldier and get on with it.
> >
> > Whatever "apology" I rendered above is all you get, Brain.
> >
> > Sorry if it's not what you wanted, but it's all you get.
> >
> >Steve, K4YZ
>
> If nothing else in this ng shows that you guys don't have a life, this
> one is "it." Hey guys, no one's holding a gun to your heads ya know.

Glad we can keep you entertained.

Steve, K4YZ

2162. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-04 01:34:02 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20031103203402.29660.00001442@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 81638

In article <lxbpb.2369$Oo4.244@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dan/W4NTI"
<w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> writes:

>The flag of the confederacy is NOT the battle flag being displayed as the
>flag of the Confederacy.
>
>When the Tennessee Battle Flag is flown in the South, by real Southerners,
>it is meant as a sign of respect for the fallen and a symbol of STATES
>RIGHTS.

Dan:

When you "real Southerners" fly your Tennessee Battle Flag or whatever
you call it, everyone who isn't a "real Southerner" views it as waving a
banner of racism under their noses. Whether it is right or not, and whether
you like it or not, your flag is a problem for the rest of the country --
especially American Negroes (the proper term for black people in America --
considering the fact that none of them was born in Africa or ever lived
in any African country long enough to gain citizenship there). The white
"real Southern" rednecks with the "Tennessee Battle Flag" on their pickup
trucks are living in the past, at the expense of modern race relations.

>No one advocates seccession from the Union, or starting another war.

That's comforting.

>But....we get real tired of Northerners and blacks trying to tear the flag
>down, especially since the reason they want to tear it down is they believe
>it is a racist symbol.

While I was in the military, I had the saying "perception is reality" drummed
into me. The way we present ourselves to others forms their opinion of us
from the very start. In most cases, that's the only opinion they ever use to
judge us from that point onward. I think it's time for you and your fellow
"real Southerners" to face the fact that your flag needs to be taken off
your flagpoles and replaced with the real American flag -- the Stars and
Stripes. No one is questioning the fact that the South is part of the United
States, and it's time for the "real Southerners" to stop fighting the Civil War
and living in peace with the rest of their country.

>If it IS a racist symbol to them. Then they have fallen for the big lie.

One man's lie is another man's truth. If I were you, I'd concentrate on
making sure no one mistook me for a real American. Being a "real
Southerner" only leaves the impression that you don't feel as though
you belong to the greater whole of our nation.

>Govern yourself accordingly.

I do -- and I'm not the one flying any sort of state-specific "battle flag." I fly the flag of the UNITED States. One of the stars on the field of that flag belongs to Tennessee -- a beautiful state filled with free, united, and loyal Americans -- of all races, ethnic, and religious groups. They are my fellow American citizens, and I expect them to view me as one of theirs. I am living in the unified present-day reality of America -- not in the divided, suspicious, and hateful past. I invite you, my fellow American, to do likewise.

73 de Larry, K3LT

2163. Re: ARRL has no FIRE for sale?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-04 01:44:17 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <xnfcneeyarg.hnss0mc.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>
Source record: 81639

On Sun, 2 Nov 2003 22:43:39 -0500, Kimo wrote:

> What a stupid moronic reply to the poster's remarks about
>bulk air mail delivery to Hawaii. You missed the point.

WHO mised the point? The reply was that SOMEONE has to pay for the
extra service, one way or the other.

I was in on those discussions in the 1990s. Were you?

Do you have a better alternative that won't cost money? Do you
expect the League to eat the extra cost just because you live
halfway around the world? When I worked in the Middle East my QSTs
came by slow boat - literally - some 6 weeks later unless I wanted
them sent by air mail at my expense (which I did).

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane
Former ARRL Assistant Pacific Division Director

2164. Re: Why We Freeband

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-04 01:50:59 UTC
From: jim <3carroll@optonline.net>
Message-ID: <3FA70611.9010807@optonline.net>
Source record: 81640
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.swap

Frank Gilliland wrote:
> In <3FA5BE98.5090506@optonline.net>, jim <3carroll@optonline.net> wrote:
>
> <snip>
>
>>>>better yet, who the hell is the u.s. gov to tell me what is legal or
>>>>not?
>>>
>>>
>>>If you are a US citizen, they are granted that right by the constitution,
>>>and by treaty.
>>>
>>
>>please point out the constitutional section you mentioned.
>
>
>
> Article VI.
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
> -----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
> http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
> -----== Over 100,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! =-----

read the section you mentioned at the cornell website. it pertains to
the u.s. and its environs but no mention of people outside territorial
limits.
the world is a bigger place then what the u.s. dictates....

2165. Re: ARRL has no FIRE for sale?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-04 01:59:39 UTC
From: Kimo <kimo@hawfreeband.net>
Message-ID: <bo716e$74p$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 81641

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:xnfcneeyarg.hnss0mc.pminews@netnews.comcast.net...
> On Sun, 2 Nov 2003 22:43:39 -0500, Kimo wrote:
>
> > What a stupid moronic reply to the poster's remarks about
> >bulk air mail delivery to Hawaii. You missed the point.
>
> WHO mised the point? The reply was that SOMEONE has to pay for the
> extra service, one way or the other.
>
> I was in on those discussions in the 1990s. Were you?
>
> Do you have a better alternative that won't cost money? Do you
> expect the League to eat the extra cost just because you live
> halfway around the world? When I worked in the Middle East my QSTs
> came by slow boat - literally - some 6 weeks later unless I wanted
> them sent by air mail at my expense (which I did).
>
> --
> 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane
> Former ARRL Assistant Pacific Division Director
>
>

F U C K YOU TOO, HAOLE !

73 de Kimo
Royal Hawaiian DX Chasers
"And where is my July 1999 copy of QST" ??????

2166. Re: Why We Freeband

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-04 02:03:05 UTC
From: Brenda Ann <brendad@shinbiro.com>
Message-ID: <bo6uu3gpl1@news1.kornet.net>
Source record: 81642
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.swap

"jim" <3carroll@optonline.net> wrote in message
news:3FA70611.9010807@optonline.net...

> read the section you mentioned at the cornell website. it pertains to
> the u.s. and its environs but no mention of people outside territorial
> limits.
> the world is a bigger place then what the u.s. dictates....

This is so, but you asked specifically what right the US government had to set regulations, it was stated that if you were a US citizen, it was granted by the Constitution, and by treaty.

Further, the ITU does have worldwide jurisdiction, and they are the ones who write the treaties, and every country is a signatory.

>

2167. Re: Why We Freeband

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-04 02:45:19 UTC
From: jim <3carroll@optonline.net>
Message-ID: <3FA712CF.4060709@optonline.net>
Source record: 81643
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.swap

Brenda Ann wrote:
> "jim" <3carroll@optonline.net> wrote in message
> news:3FA70611.9010807@optonline.net...
>
>
>
>>read the section you mentioned at the cornell website. it pertains to
>>the u.s. and its environs but no mention of people outside territorial
>>limits.
>>the world is a bigger place then what the u.s. dictates....
>
>
> This is so, but you asked specifically what right the US government had to
> set regulations, it was stated that if you were a US citizen, it was granted
> by the Constitution, and by treaty.

we are reading the constitution differently.

>
> Further, the ITU does have worldwide jurisdiction, and they are the ones who
> write the treaties, and every country is a signatory.
>
the itu is good for somethings but when it comes to freebands they have
little or no enforcement capabilities.

>
>
>

2168. Re: Why We Freeband

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-04 02:50:06 UTC
From: Frank Gilliland <sparky@NOSPAMaimcomm.net>
Message-ID: <ku4eqvoduuqji789le5oaf50srljng5na3@4ax.com>
Source record: 81644
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.swap

In <3FA70611.9010807@optonline.net>, jim <3carroll@optonline.net> wrote:

>
>
>Frank Gilliland wrote:
>> In <3FA5BE98.5090506@optonline.net>, jim <3carroll@optonline.net> wrote:
>>
>> <snip>
>>
>>>>>better yet, who the hell is the u.s. gov to tell me what is legal or
>>>>>not?
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>If you are a US citizen, they are granted that right by the constitution,
>>>>and by treaty.
>>>>
>>>
>>>please point out the constitutional section you mentioned.
>>
>>
>>
>> Article VI.
>>
>>
>>
>>
>>
>>
>>
>>
>> -----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
>> http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
>> -----== Over 100,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! =-----
>
>read the section you mentioned at the cornell website. it pertains to
>the u.s. and its environs but no mention of people outside territorial
>limits.
>the world is a bigger place then what the u.s. dictates....

I shouldn't have to quote this twice:

>>>>If you are a US citizen......

And again with emphasis added:

>>>> =IF= you are a =US=CITIZEN=......

If you are still confused, call Twistedhed's imaginary shrink.

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 100,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! =-----

2169. Re: Attention hammies, I contact UFOs on freeband

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-04 02:58:15 UTC
From: Frank Gilliland <sparky@NOSPAMaimcomm.net>
Message-ID: <0c5eqv8ov86p30g8nv5j3lro3bish07fjk@4ax.com>
Source record: 81645
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.antenna

In <c5ecbb69.0311031642.cff9064@posting.google.com>, richcranus@yahoo.com
(Richard Cranium) wrote:

>Twistedhed <twistedhed@webtv.net> wrote in message news:<bo6asj$276$1@news.x-echo.com>...
>> This is another myth that Lelnad and his gang of jealousy-infected breth
>> eren perpetuate, that I have talked with "saucer men", I assure you, not
>> hing is further from the truth. The lies and anger-motivated constructio
>> ns that Lelnad, Dogie, the false Sparky, and Mad Geo dream up on a daily
>> basis have
>> nothing whatsoever to do with my actual experiences in the realm of the
>> supernatural.
>>
>> AO=AO=AO=Now this is all well documented mind you, I have contacted the
>> outer reaches of another dimension while calling skip on 555, and yes I
>> am well aware that the frequency falls outside the channels that the gov
>> erment deems preferable for use, but I am not one of the unwashed unawar
>> e rabble of
>> citizenry, never have been, hence I am not subject to the same laws as c
>> ommon, callow men. In college I was on the Deans List if that tells you
>> anything and my superior intellect won me the favors of many like-minded
>> individuals in both society and academia. But I shunned their transpare
>> nt and shallow attentions to pursue my own unglamorous but rewarding pat
>> h in the swamplands of the south. This unselfish pursuit and my canny na
>> tive instincts are what I believe has been responsible for opening the d
>> oor to contact with other dimensions in the continuum and my subsequent
>> elevation to a cherished confidante. If you doubt me then do so at your
>> peril for there are many things on heaven and earth that are not yet und
>> erstood so you would do well to pay your respect to an as yet undisprove
>> n phenomenon. Alas, here is the meat of it; the beings I have communicat
>> ed with by chance do in fact effect transport by spherical means. Yes, s
>> ome call it a saucer, but that is a
>> misnomer. If the media knew the truth then it would be the undoing of my
>> special status and the end of all social intercourse. Only on the freeb
>> and does one learn of such truths. Lelnad and his gang of hounds may sco
>> ff, and I say let them, for what does one expect from such unenlightened
>> commoners but
>> an ignorant barbaric yawp in the face of such great wisdom.=AO=AO=AO=AO
>>
>>
>>
>> =-
>> Article poste via Voila News - http://www.news.voila.fr
>> Le : Mon Nov 3 20:38:59 2003 depuis l'IP : ac9160fe.ipt.aol.com [VIP 532284301978]

>
>Proving only that Doug Adair N8WWM has way too much time on his hands.
>And no common sense at all.
>
>Pay no attention to the dork behind the curtain. It's not Twistedhed!

Quite right.... Twistedhed is the -ham- behind the curtain.

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
------== Over 100,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! =-----

2170. Re: Why We Freeband

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-04 03:00:51 UTC
From: jim <3carroll@optonline.net>
Message-ID: <3FA71673.5010002@optonline.net>
Source record: 81646
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.swap

Frank Gilliland wrote:
> In <3FA70611.9010807@optonline.net>, jim <3carroll@optonline.net> wrote:
>
>
>>
>>Frank Gilliland wrote:
>>
>>>In <3FA5BE98.5090506@optonline.net>, jim <3carroll@optonline.net> wrote:
>>>
>>><snip>
>>>
>>>>>better yet, who the hell is the u.s. gov to tell me what is legal or
>>>>>not?
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>If you are a US citizen, they are granted that right by the constitution,
>>>>>and by treaty.
>>>>>
>>>>
>>>>please point out the constitutional section you mentioned.
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>Article VI.
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>>>-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
>>>http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
>>>>>-----== Over 100,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! =-----
>>
>>read the section you mentioned at the cornell website. it pertains to
>>the u.s. and its environs but no mention of people outside territorial
>>limits.
>>the world is a bigger place then what the u.s. dictates....
>
>
>
> I shouldn't have to quote this twice:

>
>
>
>>>>>If you are a US citizen......
>>>>
>
>
> And again with emphasis added:
>
>
>
>>>>>=IF= you are a =US=CITIZEN=......
>>>>
>
>
> If you are still confused, call Twistedhed's imaginary shrink.
>
>
>
>
>
>
> -----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
> http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
> -----== Over 100,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! =-----

why are you so hung up on twisty?

2171. Re: A Morsodist Challenge

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-04 03:27:13 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <l0Fpb.7572$P%1.6417965@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 81647

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20031102222606.00545.00002089@mb-m02.aol.com...
> In article <5ee63311.0311021638.54ad7389@posting.google.com>,
> groupk0hb@earthlink.net (Hans K0HB) writes:
>
> >"Hans K0HB" <k0hb@earthlink.net> wrote
> >
> >> Dick,
> >>
> >> A simple straightforward challenge for you (and the rest of rrap).
> >>
> >> During the 30 hours starting at 2100Z on Nov 1st, 2003 I will be
> >> practicing Morsodism on the HF bands in the ARRL SS Radiosport event.
> >> Keep up with me if you can.
> >>
> >
> >Looks like Dick couldn't make it. K0CKB and I stroked up K0RT and
> >made over 800 Q's. Among them were W4NTI and N2EY. No other rrap'ers
> >were evident.
> >
> You guys were burning up the bands from what I heard here. Sorry I didn't
> recognize the K0RT call at first. Dan has given me 'Bama in SS for so many
> years that I felt kinda disloyal working another AL first.
>
> Lotta good signals, flares didn't do too much damage.. Towards the end I
was
> hearing serials above 1300.
>
> I put in 15-16 hours and got 367 QSOs in 74 sections. Gave the K2 a rest
and
> used my homebrew rig (known as the 'Southgate Type 7' this year.
>
> Boy was that fun. I gotta get in better shape for next year, though, I
faded by
> 2 AM local.
>
> Maybe I'll build an amplifier for the K2...lessee, single 811 in grounded
> cathode Class B, full wave bridge power supply with old TV transformer. Or
> perhaps it's time for me to dsign and build the 'Southgate Type 8'.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

I was there but since the OM and his favorite niece had birthdays on
Saturday and Sunday respectively, I didn't get in much time.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

2172. Re: Amateur Radio in the 21st Century?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-04 03:40:49 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <5dFpb.5540$Oo4.5400@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 81648

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20031102224950.21232.00001801@mb-m13.aol.com...
> In article <JNYob.1530$9M3.1433@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Bill
Sohl"
> <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
>
> >"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> >news:20031031223023.12631.00002521@mb-m28.aol.com...
> >> In article <MvDob.16255$FI2.5145@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>,
"Bill
> >Sohl"
> >> <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
> >>
> >> >"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> >> >news:20031027222947.06226.00001204@mb-m19.aol.com...
> >> >> In article <Caknb.8872$FI2.7958@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>,
> >"Bill
> >> >Sohl"
> >> >> <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
> >> >>
> >> >> >"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
> >> >> >news:c2356669.0310270917.2668311b@posting.google.com...
> >> >> >> "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
> >> >> >news:<7O0nb.4484$X22.1484@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> >> >> >> > "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> >> >> >> > news:20031024182942.12300.00001303@mb-m20.aol.com...
> >> >> >> > > In article <3F993128.6080401@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo
<mjc5@psu.edu>
> >> >> >writes:
> >> >>
> >> >> >> KL7CC & Co. have already done so. Have you read their paper?
> >> >> >
> >> >> >No, is it on a web site?.
> >> >>
> >> >> http://www.qsl.net/al7fs/
> >> >>
> >> >> Second item down - "Amateur Radio in the 21st Century"
> >> >>
> >> >> You can skim through the code test stuff - we've agreed to disagree
on
> >> >that.
> >> >> What is really interesting is the *other* ideas, such as what
should
> >> >happen to

> >> >> the entry-level license class, free upgrades, written testing....
> >> >>
> >> >> 73 de Jim, N2EY
> >> >
> >> >Jim, et al;
> >> >
> >> >Some interesting and thought provoking suggestions/proposals.
> >> >
> >> >I agree we'll just have to disagree on the code testing, but IF folks
are
> >> >looking for a tp down revamp of licensing for US hams, Jim (KL7CC)
> >> >has certainly stirred the pot.
> >>
> >> Agreed - but not in the best way, IMHO.
> >
> >Are you saying discussion or stawman proposals are bad???
>
> No!
>
> I'm saying that some of the proposal's ideas (not talking about the code
test -
> that's old news!) are not the best way to reach the desired results.

Hence the discussion and, I presume, you'll
offer better alternatives?

> >> >Maybe a good place to start would be the proposed "Communicator"
> >> >entry/beginners exam. Personally I think the applicant needs
> >> >some command of Part 97 rules...not all, but at least those that
> >> >would lay out the rules for Communicator license.
> >>
> >> If anything needs to be a part of the test, it's the rules and regs.
> >
> >I agree...to a point as noted below.
> >
> >> >I have always felt
> >> >memorizing
> >> >band edges makes little sense on a test because they do and have
changed
> >> >over time. I'd like to know the applicant could at least read a
> >frequency
> >> >chart and be able to answer questions regarding the privileges for
> >> >his/her license. That could be "open book" where the frequency chart
is
> >> >provided. Other basic questions probably should require some
> >> >recallable knowledge (e.g. music is forbidden, etc.)
> >>
> >> Power levels, modes allowed, knowing you can't cuss or jam others, etc.
> >>
> >> I think there is some sort of legal precedent that if something isn't
in

> >the
> >> test syllabus, a licensed violator may have an out wrt prosecution.
> >
> >No such legal precedent..rather, just the opposite...to wit,
> >ignorance of the lasw is not a valid defense to a violation charge.
>
> My point is that if the govt. grants licenses that require tests, it makes
> sense that the rules for that license be on the test.

I agree, but I don't much worry about memorizing band edges which
I believe should be readily available in anyone's shack. If you asked me
where the phne segment starts on 15 meters I have no idea,
but I can and would look it up before operatng phone on 15.
Even the band edges change over time as we saw with 80M novice
segment some years back.

> >> >If you haven't read the KL7CC white paper, here's where you
> >> >can find it:
> >> >
> >> >http://www.qsl.net/al7fs/NCVECplan.doc
> >> >
> >> >One interesting proposal sure to either enrage or please is the
> >> >free upgrades for Tech and Advanced. Personally, and I have no stake
> >> >in this as I'm already Extra, the idea of free upgrades doesn't bother
me
> >> >at all
> >> >if it ultimately results in a set of license classes that make sense
with
> >> >regard
> >> >to privileges vs requirements.
> >>
> >> Free upgrades have a lot of downsides. For example, suppose that a tech
> >gets a
> >> free upgrade to General without ever taking Element 3 or its
equivalent.
> >> Doesn't that prove that Element 3 contains nothing that is essential
for
> >> General class privileges?
> >
> >It proves nothing that definitive.
>
> See below.
> >
> >> Couldn't somebody claim that requiring new hams to
> >> pass Element 3 (or 4) but not requiring existing hams to do the same is
> >> discriminatory?
> >
> >Someone can claim anything they want.
>
> Consider this:
>

> Prospective ham reads about the upcoming changes. Reads that on Date X,
all
> Techs will get free upgrade to General. Crams for Tech and takes it a day
or
> two before Date X. Passes Tech, gets General as a freebie. Is that fair?
Does
> said newbie really have General class qualifications?

Is it fair? Depends on your outlook. As to qualifications, I have
said all along that most license privileges bear little or no
relavence to what the license tests for.

> >> >The other two alternatives are:
> >> >(1) certain existing licenses would lose privileges (not a good track
> >> >record on that as we saw in 1968) or
> >> >(2) we keep the existing licneses plus the newly defined ones and
> >> >wait for the old licenses to go SK. Probably not what the FCC wants
> >> >for enforcement and rules simplification.
> >>
> >> I don't see what the problem is with (2). FCC has kept three "cul de
sac"
> >> license classes active for almost 4 years now (Tech
Plus/Novice/Advanced)
> >with
> >> no real problems. They're just entries in a database.
> >
> >They are more than just database entries. They also have specific
> >privileges which
> >differentiate them from the "lower" level licenses. IF the FCC granted
> >identical
> >privileges to Advanced rather than doing a "free upgrade" of Advanced to
> >Extra,
> >THEN the old licenses would be just a database differentiator.
>
> Only difference is a few lines of rules - particularly the difference
between
> Advanced and Extra.

But then there's enforcement, etc. What you are
actually saying now is that an Advanced can operate as an Extra today and
never
expect to be called to task for operating in the Extra segments.

> >> And FCC turned down ARRL's idea of free General upgrades for existing
> >> Novices and Tech Pluses.
> >
> >The FCC once was looking for a consensus of hams before it would
> >entertain dropping code speeds.
>
> But that wasn't the issue - ARRL proposed 5 wpm for General, so all Tech
Pluses

> and Novices met that already. The sticking point was the written testing.

My point is that what was decided could or could not change. It
depends on the end goal and the FCC's considerations.

> >> >Further commentary ad discussion welcome.
> >> >
> >> >And a curse to the first person who introduces any of the lexicon
> >> >of name calling rather than attempt credible dialog or debate.
> >>
> >> AGREED!
> >>
> >> There's also the part about the "no homebrew no voltages over 30" for
the
> >> Communicator. Not good ideas at all - nor are they realistic.
> >
> >They may be more realistic then we may think. How many actual
> >"homebrew" Novice or Tech rigs have you seen?
>
> I've seen plenty! ;-)

> The "no voltages over 30" means no line-powered rigs, no antenna
tuners.....

Most folks use a 12 volt DC supply anyhow. Interesting point, however,
since anyone (ham/nonham) is allowed today to build there
own DC supply powered from 120 v AC. Perhaps the NO homebrew
would be limited to transmitters only.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2173. Re: I need a good radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-04 04:12:04 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20031103231204.29660.00001443@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 81649

In article <bo1vrb$rl5$0@pita.alt.net>, "MW" <27555@khzfreeband.net> writes:

>
>"Steveo" <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com> wrote in message
>news:20031031210003.340$0t@newsreader.com...
>> I'm in the market for a used 10/11 meter mobile radio for my
>> snow plow truck. It needs to be somewhat rugged because of
>> the environment, and do decent SSB to 27.9 .
>>
>> Any suggestions?

Yeah -- here's a suggestion: Go away!

2174. Re: Amateur Radio in the 21st Century?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-04 04:31:27 UTC
From: groupk0hb@earthlink.net
Message-ID: <5ee63311.0311032031.67c68779@posting.google.com>
Source record: 81650

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote

>
> They may be more realistic then we may think. How many actual
> "homebrew" Novice or Tech rigs have you seen?
>

Realistic? Surreal-istic is more like it!

This is the same mantra sung by NCI's ex Executive Director,
W5YI, and his fingerprints are all over this thing. He has
stated publicly that he feels that since people
who acquire entry level ham tickets invariably purchase their
equipment assembled these days, and send them in for
repairs when broken, they no longer need to possess the
knowledge needed to build good "home-brew" stations, nor
the knowledge to determine if their repairs/adjustments result
in proper on-the-air signals. Because of this fact, he thinks that
the majority of questions regarding math and theory (knowledge
mainly needed to build/repair/adjust equipment) should
be removed from entry level tests, and simply replaced with
questions on operating technique and regulations. If he had
his way, math and theory questions would only be part of
Amateur Extra examinations.

While I can't remember the last "fully homebrew" shack I saw (probably KG6AIG
back in the 60's, and even Luis had *some* commercial test equipment items lying
about), it is extremely uncommon to find a shack where every item is commercial
(or in it's original commercial state.) Homebrewing and modification to
commercial designs is especially alive and well in the QRP, contesting,
satelite, and microwave communities.

The QCAO (Quarter Century Appliance Operators club) and ASSOOBA (Amalgamated
Simple Shacks On Our Belt Association) would love it, but this idea would put
our service on an immediate slide into nothing more than another consumer
orientated Family Radio Service, and the consequent abolishment of Amateur
Radio.

The *single* unique element which differentiates our service from all the other
radio services is our authority to experiment, build, modify, and generally
tinker around and operate equipment which is not type accepted. The "technical"
aspect of our hobby comprises 3 of the 5 reasons (paragraph 97.1) for the
existence of the ARS, and removal of this requirement for licensing would tear
the heart and soul out of the hobby.

If amateurs were to be licensed without any requirement for electronics knowledge, then it follows that type acceptance of all amateur equipment would be a requirement for sale. Used equipment, if sold to "no-Tech" amateurs would need to be recertified and "mod-free", and repairs could only be accomplished by FCC-approved service facilities. The cost of new equipment would rise to commercial-service price levels, because of type-acceptance issues, and most vendors would probably leave the market.

Sorry, but you guys are out to lunch with this cockeyed notion.

Code-Free, then Tech-Free .... what next, license free? CU on eleven, good buddy.

73, de Hans, K0HB

2175. Re: Unrepetant Sinner, Was Re: Robeson Apology???

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-04 04:46:54 UTC
From: Bob Brock <bbrock@i-america.net>
Message-ID: <mobeqv0l9oo831tel1ereuaq3s7q03jdot@4ax.com>
Source record: 81751

On 3 Nov 2003 17:18:37 -0800, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP)
wrote:

>Bob Brock <bbrock@i-america.net> wrote in message
news:<tq1dqvc3h27ng1fqegpog64k9u1jdkr5n2@4ax.com>...
>> On 2 Nov 2003 08:52:29 -0800, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP)
>> wrote:
>>
>>
>> Snippo mucho bullshito...
>>
>> >> Be a good soldier and get on with it.
>> >
>> > Whatever "apology" I rendered above is all you get, Brain.
>> >
>> > Sorry if it's not what you wanted, but it's all you get.
>> >
>> >Steve, K4YZ
>>
>> If nothing else in this ng shows that you guys don't have a life, this
>> one is "it." Hey guys, no one's holding a gun to your heads ya know.
>
> Glad we can keep you entertained.
>
>Steve, K4YZ

Keep up the good work...

2176. Re: No Code General

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-04 05:06:02 UTC
From: Alun Palmer <alun@1stcounsel.com>
Message-ID: <Xns9429FED5506elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 81752
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.swap

Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in
news:Z%kpb.2342$Bf7.1312644@news1.news.adelphia.net:

> Alun Palmer wrote:
>
>
>> I will probably be dropped soon, but the FCC has to go through
>> standard procedures with all the pending petitions. The international
>> requirement was dropped on July 5th, so by next July it should
>> probably be gone in the US.
>
> Hehhe. Alun, you should be on the welcoming committee for this
> dude!
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -
>
>

It's a difficult question. Do we applaud him for wanting to go legal? Or
do we slam him for ever having operated illegally? I have known former
pirate radio ooperators whose behaviour on the ham bands after they got a
licence was exemplary.

2177. Re: Attention hammies, I contact UFOs on freeband

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-04 06:13:35 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <B_WdnenjD-142TqiRVn-iQ@gbronline.com>
Source record: 81753
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.antenna

Frank Gilliland wrote:

>>
>>Pay no attention to the dork behind the curtain. It's not Twistedhed!
>
>
> Quite right.... Twistedhed is the -ham- behind the curtain.

Naw, it's just dickiebird in drag.

2178. Re: A Morsodist Challenge

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-04 06:24:27 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <REMOVETHISkc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <bo8co3$1aok9h$1@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 81758
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Wrapped up in a blanket, doped up on cold/flu medications.......

Ryan

> Good show Hans. And I also worked N2EY....wonder where the rest were ??
> he he.
>
> Dan/W4NTI

2179. Re: ARRL has no FIRE for sale?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-04 06:59:43 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <REMOVETHISkc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <bo8co4$1aok9h$2@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 81759

I am gonna stab myself in the foot for this one before any of you all want to, but what I think Lennie is trying to get at, is that nowhere in the media has amateur radio taken any form of the spotlight on this event. I was sick for the past six or seven days and spent alot of time home watching tv between resting. Nowhere did I see anything mentioned about ham radio.

On a positive note, this would have been a great example of showing how valuable ham radio is supposed to be. It wouldn't cost the arrl much to send press releases of this to the major networks, Hell, I chip in for the stamps if that is the case!!!!!! Remember, a good defense is a good offense! (re: arrl claims to "defend" amateur radio)

This is one of those one in a million times I would even vaguely come close to agreeing with Lennie the License-less. I think I am gonna have nightmares now!

--
Ryan KC8PMX

Some people are like Slinkies . . . not really good for anything, but you still can't help but smile when you see one tumble down the stairs.

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message news:6hXnb.12430$FI2.2336@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
>
> "Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20031029162418.06226.00001249@mb-m19.aol.com...
> > In article <x7Snb.8999$X22.1187@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>,
> "Dan/W4NTI"
> > <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> writes:
> >
> > >> All the ARRL news seems to be AFTER-the-fact "reporting,"
> > >>
> > >> LHA
> > >
> > >Thats what makes the ARRL a legitimate news source for Amateur Radio
> > >information.
> >
> > So...you are saying that ALL amateur radio information is always
> > late?
> >
> > Whatever happened to the National Traffic System? You know,
> > those dittyboppers still thinking that "CW" is the bestest thing
> > since sliced bread?
> >
> > CNN, Fox, MSNBC, CBS, NBC, ABC are covering the California

> > Firestorms in real time, "live" as you civilian non-broadcasters
> > call it. Have ANY of those TV news services "covered" anything of
> > amateur radio emergency/disaster teams heroically working to
> > aid the public? When and where did they "work" that scene?
> >
> > Feel free to report all tha news in a month, long after containment.
> >
> > >Not like CNN, which I am SURE you watch, that makes it up as
> > >they go.
> >
> > 17 dead, over 1500 homes destroyed, over a million acres burned
> > (over 800 square miles), over $2 Billion in damages, and firestorms
> > are still raging in two major areas. One of NBC's remote vans got
> > caught in the fire and destroyed, crew (Chuck Henry at the mike)
> > saved by a fire crew. Live, on-air courtesy of another TV crew.
> >
> > Hardly "making it up as they go along."
> >
> > ...and all you can do is mean-mouth individuals that don't love,
> > honor, and cherish morsemanship?
> >
> > LHA
>
> Poor Poor Lennie, he is getting worse and worse. He fails to comprehend
> that professional news reporters get paid, and by golly, its their job.
>
> The ARRL is more interested in compilling the events and accuratly
reporting
> the information to the amateur community. Not you Lennie, since you not
a
> licensed operator.
>
> And of course the ham operators are not in the news. They hardly ever
are.
> Real emergency operators don't seek publicity. They are there to do a job
> and don't have time for talking with paid reporters. They are much too
busy
> trying to save lives.
>
> As for your 'swipe' at the National Traffic System. It is fine and going
> strong Lennie. I operate both SSB and CW sessions on a nightly basis.
Not
> to mention my Military Affiliate Radio System networks.
>
> Tell me Lennie....what do you contribute to your community and nation?
>
> Dan/W4NTI
>
>

2180. Re: EMERGENCY! CD-ROM Document Library Released

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-04 07:04:47 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <REMOVETHISkc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <bo8co6$1aok9h$3@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 81760
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.radio.scanner,misc.survivalism

This information either better be written by you OR have a release from the original publisher to SELL what is otherwise given out for free.....

"David Vine" <davidvine1999@yahoo.com> wrote in message news:23e96779.0311020928.469c9d6f@posting.google.com...
> AIKEN, SOUTH CAROLINA -- David Vine, WA1EAW, has compiled a
> comprehensive and highly organized Adobe Acrobat format library of
> information and data in the fields of Emergency Communications,
> Natural Disasters, Emergency Planning and Search and Rescue on four
> CD-ROMs. Emergency services executives, operations personnel,
> volunteers and others interested in these subjects can instantly
> access this critical reference information anywhere, at any time,
> using a laptop computer.
>
> CD-ROM 1 Communications contains 121 documents/5804 pages.
> CD-ROM 2 Natural Disasters contains 88 documents/4536 pages.
> CD-ROM 3 Planning contains 83 documents/pages.
> CD-ROM 4 Search & Rescue contains 97 documents/6627 pages.
>
> Individual CD-ROMs cost $19.95 and the complete set of four costs
> $54.95 plus shipping. Quantity pricing and site licenses are
> available. Credit card orders may be placed by calling 800-987-8743. A
> complete list of files on the four CD-ROMS can be obtained by sending
> a stamped, self-addressed envelope to David Vine Associates, LLC at
> 963 Dougherty Road, Aiken, SC 29803.
>
> # # #

2181. Re: FCC Regualtions & Public Entities Policies

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-04 07:09:03 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <REMOVETHISkc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <bo8co8$1aok9h$4@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 81761

Well, my mistake to think it was something like a high school or grade school.

If it indeed jepardized safety, maybe it would be an issue, as hospitals ban them (cell and other transcievers...) but if it is interfering with something else, especially part 15 devices, I don't think they would have alot of ground to stand on.... merely opinion though.

"Phillip Michael" <gtg154a@mail.gatech.edu> wrote in message news:bnq0a4$d2g$1@news-int.gatech.edu...
> Actually I wanted to specifically say cordless phone, because college
> policies also apply to any student living in a campus dorm.
>
> Here is a link to GaTech's wireless policy.
>
http://www.oit.gatech.edu/inside_oit/policies_and_plans/policies/Wireless_Network_Usage_Policy_Rev1.9.cfm
>
> They are doing two thing I don't agree with:
> 1) Banning wireless devices based on interference with their wireless
> network.
> 2) Giving themselves the right to regulate all wireless devices on campus
> property.
>
> Phillip Michael
> gtg154a @mail.gatech.edu
>
>

2182. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-04 07:20:54 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <REMOVETHISkc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <bo8co9$1aok9h$5@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 81762

But its perfectly okay to pay some union bum a ton of wages for doing a repetitive task, (a skill that same 14 y.o. that passed a ham test could do) therefore jacking the cost of a product, lets say a car for this example, to a ridiculous price??? (actually both the fast food worker and the person on the line at the factory ARE BOTH doing repetitive tasks....)

Believe it or not, there are alot more people out there trying to survive on the poverty level wages. Based strictly on my local region, that would be any job under 9-10 dollars per hour before taxes and if any, benefits. And unfortunately some of these people are NOT counted, in the unemployment or other job related statistics, if they are not participating in the various government programs like the employment security commision that Michigan has... (think its called MichiganWorks)

--
Ryan KC8PMX

All of us could take a lesson from the weather. It pays no
attention to criticism.

"JJ" <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
news:Q8OdnWyb2dFH2zmiRVn-uw@gbronline.com...
> Kim W5TIT wrote:
>
> > Consider this. I've been toying with the idea over the last few years
that
> > it will the "menial" (as was put by someone else--I don't agree with the
> > term) jobs that will gradually grow to the higher paid jobs in this
> > country...because there will be less and less people who *will* do them.
> > The "services" of a migrant worker or a fast food person, or a municipal
> > worker or construction worker will become so highly needed, that they
will
> > be able to demand a pretty penny for their work.
>
>
> And when this happens your taco and a coke at Taco Bell will cost you $15.
>

2183. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-04 07:24:37 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <REMOVETHISkc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <bo8cob$1aok9h$6@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 81763

But those currently busting their butts, 50-60 hours a week, trying to even hit the break-even point, who cannot get an even freakin' break, do not have any form of help.

--
Ryan KC8PMX

Give a person a fish and you feed them for a day; teach that person to use The Internet and they won't bother you for weeks.

> But those that are unwilling to work when they are able to,
> shouldn't expect the handout (IMHO).
>
> Cheers,
> Bill K2UNK
>
>
>
>
>

2184. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-04 07:27:36 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <REMOVETHISkc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <bo8cod$1aok9h$7@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 81764

That may have been true many years ago, but the Klan Klowns are pretty much against anything that does not fit into the Aryan nations views.....

--
Ryan KC8PMX

Never take life seriously. Nobody gets out alive anyway.

> Dwight:
>
> I consider the KKK to be about racism, not slavery. It was originally
> started as a response to the heavy-handed political disenfranchisement
> of the former Confederate states by Northern "Carpetbaggers" who
> essentially swept into the South and took over in the aftermath of the
> Civil War.

2185. Re: No Code General

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-04 07:46:35 UTC
From: Brenda Ann <brendad@shinbiro.com>
Message-ID: <bo7j2h$1mi$1@news1.kornet.net>
Source record: 81754
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.swap

"W7TI" <noway@nohow.com> wrote in message
news:taeeqvkkgomaqk8dean0t8elji9r0brhug@4ax.com...
> On 4 Nov 2003 05:06:02 GMT, Alun Palmer <alun@1stcounsel.com> wrote:
>
> >I have known former
> >pirate radio ooperators whose behaviour on the ham bands after they got a
> >licence was exemplary.
>
> ____
>
> Not sure what an "ooperator" is, but there are other criminals whose
> subsequent behavior is also exemplary. Should their past behavior be
> ignored? The difference is only in degree, not in kind.
>

If they have already been punished in some way by the courts, then the
answer to your query is (or should be) yes. If they have not been punished
in some way by the courts, then, de facto, they have not been found guilty
of any crime, and are to be presumed innocent.

2186. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-04 09:08:09 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <Z%Jpb.6807$Oo4.5819@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 81755

"N2EY" wrote:
>
> Point is, the attitudes that newer is always better and that all
> change is good have led to all sorts of problems.

Agreed.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

2187. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-04 11:09:32 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bo81c5$65l@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 81756

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:oVrpb.3581$Oo4.2885@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> "Kim W5TIT" wrote:
> >
> > (snip) I am telling you that my experience has been
> > that people who are customarily born in this country
> > feel that the jobs we are speaking of are beneath them.
> > (snip) But, how dare you dismiss the experiences I have
> > seen.
>
>
> Again, I'm not dismissing your experiences. Instead, I'm questioning the
> conclusions you've made about those experiences. You say, based on your
> experiences with other people, nobody in this country other than
immigrants
> is willing to do those jobs? How many of those non-immigrant people did
you
> ask if they would take those jobs if the wages were better?
>

Have you ever heard the phrase, "I wouldn't do that no matter how much they
paid me?" I haven't had to ask, Dwight. I am speaking of people that I
have personally been involved with either at casual get-togethers, work,
civic organizational meetings, or friends' socials.

>
> I suspect just
> about all of them would at least consider, and many would gladly take,
those
> jobs under different wage conditions. If I'm right, your conclusions are
> flat wrong - non-immigrants are willing to do those jobs.
>

I would not make such adamant comments based on supposition alone, Dwight.
And, I've tried to relay to you that I am referencing true/real-life
experiences--not just making casual observation.

>
> And, if you are
> wrong, to continue to perpetrate a myth that non-immigrants are either too
> lazy or too uppish to do that work is simply insulting.
>

Welp, sorry. Then be insulted.

>
> > And, how dare you again, Dwight. (snip) How dare you
> > imply that I "don't care" about bad policies in this country.
> > Have I once said I don't care? (snip)
>
> Lay off the false outrage, Kim. Nobody said you didn't care. I said "few
> seem to care," not "Kim doesn't care." If you apply those words to
yourself,
> you do so in your own mind. If others want to apply those words to you,
> they'll do so after reading what you've said.
>

Then, you lay off the analogy of my being wrong and not caring, Dwight.
You'd be as affected if I responded to a post by you saying that, "seems
like everyone is on the _______ bandwagon." You would--and rightly so--make
the connection that I was including you as one of those "everyones." Also,
it is not false outrage--once again you dismiss someone else's attitude.

>
> > (snip) and I've just told you I am basing that on experience. Go
> > to the Unemployment lines. I haven't--but I *BET* the majority
> > of people in those lines are not looking for work on farms, at
> > Wal-Mart, with municipalities, landscape companies, construction
> > firms, asbestos abatement firms, chemical and biological hazard
> > waste firms, and our ever-famous convenience stores such as
> > 7-Eleven--all of which need people constantly.
>
> Your experiences are clearly somewhat limited.
>

You know what, Dwight? You're right. And, you know what else? I have
told you that I don't know how many times now. I have clearly, clearly
told you from whence I am basing my opinons. DUH!!!!!!!!!! And, you what
else? SO ARE YOURS.

>
> Walmart doesn't hire
> through state or outside employment agencies. Potential employees apply at
> the individual stores and there are rarely shortages of applicants.
>

The phucking point is, Dwight, that people of whom you and I are
speaking--those that say they cannot find work, are not "looking" (i.e.,
going to take, consider, or toy with) the idea of employment at places like
Wal-Mart, etc.

>
> Municipalities tend to pay fairly well (with good benefits), hence rarely
> have a shortage of applicants (skilled applicants is another matter).
>

They have high turn-around, Dwight. Why? Because the work the ask folks to
do is generally considered to be far more work than many are willing to

do--even including police and fire work. And, even with the high turnaround--again--the people of generally US-born heritage do not look for or even consider work in those fields.

>
> Landscape companies, to keep costs down, are perhaps the largest employers
> of illegal immigrants. Construction companies only have problems finding
> skilled applicants (laborers are plentiful). The same with most other
> companies seeking skilled labor. Convenience store jobs are among the
lowest
> paying, and most dangerous, in the country. In other words, none of these
> tend to prove your point.
>

You are talking in circles, and ignoring good points I might add. My point is this: REGARDLESS of the reasons you list above, the FACT still remains that people who are in a non-immigrant class and generally US-born who you say are displaced by immigrants filling the jobs, will *not* generally look for or do the jobs listed above--and more. Whether you wish to believe that or not--whatever. I've heard it expressed, I've known people who feel that way, I've listened to it being discussed in public venues, and I've watched my own Congress debate the problems associated with it.

>
> > (snip) All one need do is look around them to see where our
> > youth find important and meaningful employment: McDonald's
> > and other fast food joints, light dining restaurants, and that's
> > about it. (snip)
>
> You've got to be kidding, Kim. You consider employment at fast food
> joints, some of the lowest paying jobs in this country, to be "important
and
> meaningful employment?"
>

For a phucking youth?????!!!!! Yes, I do, Dwight. The jobs filled at places like that build the background it takes to be a half-way decent employee as a young and professional adult.

>
> > (snip) Why did I break-out to light dining restaurants? Because
> > I don't see teen-agers in the "finer" dining restaraunts - and my
> > husband and I love to eat out so we have some experience.
> > Know why *I* think they (teen-agers) aren't there? Because
> > there, the customer service is higher scale, which demands more
> > personality, better etiquette, and of course--greater work ethic.
>
> Or maybe the owners simply don't hire teenagers.
>

Give a dog a bone and he buries it.

>
> > Guess who we do see serving us in those restaurants?
>
> Who, Kim? You've already said teenagers (immigrant and non-immigrant)
> don't work in these restaurants. That leaves only adults. I suppose you're
> now going to say immigrant adults have more personally, better etiquette,
> and a greater work ethic, than non-immigrant adults in this country, which
> is why immigrant adults, not non-immigrant adults, work in the restaurants
> you go to.
>

Yep, that's exactly what I'm saying. And, just for you and Jim I'll say
this: some.

>
> > My husband has been at his formerly family-owned business
> > for 27 years. His mom sold the company last year. For most
> > of those 27 years, until about 10 years ago, they had a great
> > crew of folks. Since then, the main focus of my husband's
> > every day work has been to get someone in there who wants
> > a job and will work. Know how many nieces nephews, and
> > his own kids and my son, he has had through those years?
> > Ten. Not one of them has ever, ever worked there. (snip)
>
> Perhaps that says more about your husband than the nieces, nephews, and
> kids. That's not intended as an insult. Instead, it's just to point out
that
> few kids are willing to work for parents or immediate relatives - parents
> and relatives tend to be more demanding and more judgmental than the
normal
> employer.
>

Give a dog a bone and he buries it.

OK, then, Dwight. Explain why in those years not only have the
nieces/nephews and great-nieces/nephews not worked there--in a time of our
country that unemployment is at the high it is, he (my husband) is begging
for employees? And, it happens that he is *always* begging for employees.
And, guess who generally fills that need? Not the people you say are out
there willing to take the job.

>
> > If the factories are closing, then what jobs are the immigrants
> > moving in to take? (snip) I am still curious to know if factories
> > are closing, what jobs are available for anyone to take? (snip)
>
> Didn't I pretty much answer that in the next paragraph of that message?
> There are obviously more jobs in town than just factory jobs, Kim. The
> elimination of those factory jobs simply adds to the competition for those
> remaining jobs.
>

Welcome to the real world, Dwight.

>
> > Well, excuse me for the honesty--you'll call it having my
> > blinders on or not caring, maybe even because I am a
> > "liberal"--but, if one contract put this company out of
> > business, then perhaps the person should have gone on
> > to some form of vocational or higher level training in
> > business practices before they took such a jump. (snip)
>
> It happened to be about a $450k per year contract, the loss of which his
> company could not absorb.
>

My point still remains. And, I've also gotta say: give a dog a bone and he buries it.

>
> > (snip) if we have no control over the employment
> > situation in this country--we don't whine about it. We
> > knuckle under, get the menial jobs, sell the big house,
> > get the little house, sell the SUV and get the Saturn,
> > and we begin the task of seeing what we can do--if
> > anything--to change the route of what we perceive as
> > being awful. (snip)
>
> Kim, as voters and citizens, we're supposed to have control over the
> employment situation in this country.

PAH!! Welcome to the real world, Dwight. And, "supposed to" and do is two entirely different things. We still don't sit around and whine about it. Like I said above--we do what we gotta do and then we *begin the task of seeing what we can do--if anything--to change the route of what we perceive as being awful.* Is there a part of that you did not understand?

>
> We don't simply because too many
> choose to "knuckle under" instead of demanding better. Of course, they
> probably don't have that much of a choice as long as most people are
> heartless enough to think the solution for those people is to sell
> everything, take a menial job, and live in poverty.
>

I am one of those who have mostly knuckled under. I used to try to change things. But, without change I've done pretty well. It's a sad commentary, but I and many are too busy knuckling under to try to change a thing--welcome to the reality of what's really going on.

>
> > Then, report the company to INS. REPORT THEM. If
> > the company is getting contracts based on their employment
> > of illegeal aliens, then I am sure the firms they are doing
> > services for will want to know this. For goodness sake,

> > REPORT their ass.
>
> I've already filed complaints. Sadly, it just doesn't work that way,
Kim.
> When it comes to businesses hiring illegal immigrants, government agencies
> only take on a few, high profile, cases each year (such as Walmart
> recently). Because of that, you could complain until you're blue in the
face
> and absolutely nothing will come of it. I truly wish it were different,
but
> that's simply the way it is (which is exactly why so many companies are
now
> willing to hire illegal immigrants).
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
>
>

Then figure out a way to be satisfied. Because you are absolutely right. The one thing you and I differ on is that I do *not* believe the immigrant/migrant/transient population in this country are displacing as many as you believe. I believe they are doing jobs that--no matter how bad it gets--"we" have been too spoiled to consider doing ourselves.

Kim W5TIT

2188. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-04 11:13:38 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bo81jp$lt5@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 81757

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:PQwpb.3926$Oo4.1159@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> "Kim W5TIT" wrote:
> >
> > The news said that? That there's LESS racism? Compared
> > to where and where?! I come from NE NY and never really
> > saw any racism.
>
>
> The trend of blacks moving to the South has been covered in the news for
> many years.
>
>
> > Here, the topic is a part of every-day life.
>
>
> Exactly. More people here talk about race issues (all sides) openly and
> honestly instead of sweeping them under the rug like they doesn't exist
(or
> trying to act like they don't exist).
>

I'm talking of friendly chats about the topic. I am speaking of racist
comments and ways of treating people.

>
> A friend (a reggie recording artist)
>

Isn't that reggae?

Kim W5TIT

2189. Re: Why We Freeband

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-04 14:30:03 UTC
From: lancer <lancer@lancer.web>
Message-ID: <3fa7b5d9.65806685@news.easynews.com>
Source record: 81765
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On Mon, 03 Nov 2003 20:48:10 -0600, Neil Down
<buckiewheat@assclown.com> wrote:

>Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com> wrote in news:20031103174708.791
>$G9@newsreader.com:
>
>> Neil Down <buckiewheat@assclown.com> wrote:
>>> N8WWM <N8WWM@home.net> wrote in news:bo5qll02b9c@drn.newsguy.com:
>>>
>>> > Rules are made to be broken, even the Rain Report can't stop me!
>>>
>>> That is pretty nice except that was nothing from the rain report
>>>
>
>
>> Bullshit. N8WWM was on the Rain Report FCC Enforcement Log,
>
>
>Yes he was his name was mentioned, yet the post I was referring to was
>not from the rain report it was from twistedsac.
>
>
>
> >and he didn't get there from his good deeds.
>
>wow do you worship the rain report? is it the bible of cb keyclowns?
>
>
>
>
>> Why are you an N8WWM apologist?
>
>Why are you a RETARD? He never was charged or nothing was taken further,
>now I suggest if you have some proof of any charges or fines eing levied
>by all means post them.
>
>
>

Is that what it takes? You have to be fined or convicted? If thats
the case, why are you constantly bitching about some of the members of
the R.R.C.B group? Have they been fined? You and Doug are
hypocrites. He can jam repeaters, and thats ok, but let someone
discuss how to bias an amp and you go nuts over it.

2190. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-04 16:28:09 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3FA7D399.4070605@psu.edu>
Source record: 81766

Kim W5TIT wrote:
> "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
> news:PQwpb.3926$Oo4.1159@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
>
>>"Kim W5TIT" wrote:
>>
>>>The news said that? That there's LESS racism? Compared
>>>to where and where?! I come from NE NY and never really
>>>saw any racism.
>>
>>
>> The trend of blacks moving to the South has been covered in the news for
>>many years.
>>
>>
>>
>>>Here, the topic is a part of every-day life.
>>
>>
>> Exactly. More people here talk about race issues (all sides) openly and
>>honestly instead of sweeping them under the rug like they doesn't exist
>
> (or
>
>>trying to act like they don't exist).
>>
>
>
> I'm talking of friendly chats about the topic. I am speaking of racist
> comments and ways of treating people.
>
>
>>A friend (a reggie recording artist)
>>
>
>
> Isn't that reggae?

Don't you remember the group "The Archies"? I think Reggie was a member.

- Mike KB3EIA -

2191. Re: ARRL has no FIRE for sale?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-04 16:36:11 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <%zQpb.8495$Oo4.21@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 81767

The ARRL leaves that up to the local Public Information Officers. These are
un-elected positions within the section.

The ball was dropped apparantly, or they were just too busy to bother.
Then after the event, the press isn't interested.

It's been like that for years. I agree...we need to start blowing our own
horns.

Dan/W4NTI

"Ryan, KC8PMX" <REMOVETHISkc8pmx@diamondcs.net> wrote in message
news:bo8co4$1aok9h$2@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de...
> I am gonna stab myself in the foot for this one before any of you all want
> to, but what I think Lennie is trying to get at, is that nowhere in the
> media has amateur radio taken any form of the spotlight on this event. I
> was sick for the past six or seven days and spent alot of time home
watching
> tv between resting. Nowhere did I see anything mentioned about ham radio.
>
> On a positive note, this would have been a great example of showing how
> valuable ham radio is supposed to be. It wouldn't cost the arrl much to
send
> press releases of this to the major networks, Hell, I chip in for the
stamps
> if that is the case!!!!!! Remember, a good defense is a good offense!
(re:
> arrl claims to "defend" amateur radio)
>
>
> This is one of those one in a million times I would even vaguely come
close
> to agreeing with Lennie the License-less. I think I am gonna have
> nightmares now!
>
>
>
> --
> Ryan KC8PMX
>
> Some people are like Slinkies . . . not really good for anything, but you
> still can't help but smile when you see one tumble down the stairs.
>
> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
> news:6hXnb.12430$FI2.2336@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...

> >
> > "Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
> > news:20031029162418.06226.00001249@mb-m19.aol.com...
> > > In article <x7Snb.8999$X22.1187@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>,
> > "Dan/W4NTI"
> > > <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> writes:
> > >
> > > >> All the ARRL news seems to be AFTER-the-fact "reporting,"
> > > >>
> > > >> LHA
> > > >
> > > >Thats what makes the ARRL a legitimate news source for Amateur Radio
> > > >information.
> > >
> > > So...you are saying that ALL amateur radio information is always
> > > late?
> > >
> > > Whatever happened to the National Traffic System? You know,
> > > those dittyboppers still thinking that "CW" is the bestest thing
> > > since sliced bread?
> > >
> > > CNN, Fox, MSNBC, CBS, NBC, ABC are covering the California
> > > Firestorms in real time, "live" as you civilian non-broadcasters
> > > call it. Have ANY of those TV news services "covered" anything of
> > > amateur radio emergency/disaster teams heroically working to
> > > aid the public? When and where did they "work" that scene?
> > >
> > > Feel free to report all tha news in a month, long after
containment.
> > >
> > > >Not like CNN, which I am SURE you watch, that makes it up as
> > > >they go.
> > >
> > > 17 dead, over 1500 homes destroyed, over a million acres burned
> > > (over 800 square miles), over $2 Billion in damages, and
firestorms
> > > are still raging in two major areas. One of NBC's remote vans got
> > > caught in the fire and destroyed, crew (Chuck Henry at the mike)
> > > saved by a fire crew. Live, on-air courtesy of another TV crew.
> > >
> > > Hardly "making it up as they go along."
> > >
> > > ...and all you can do is mean-mouth individuals that don't love,
> > > honor, and cherish morsemanship?
> > >
> > > LHA
> >
> > Poor Poor Lennie, he is getting worse and worse. He fails to
comprehend
> > that professional news reporters get paid, and by golly, its their job.

> >
> > The ARRL is more interested in compilling the events and accuratly
> reporting
> > the information to the amateur community. Not you Lennie, since you
not
> a
> > licensed operator.
> >
> > And of course the ham operators are not in the news. They hardly ever
> are.
> > Real emergency operators don't seek publicity. They are there to do a
job
> > and don't have time for talking with paid reporters. They are much too
> busy
> > trying to save lives.
> >
> > As for your 'swipe' at the National Traffic System. It is fine and
going
> > strong Lennie. I operate both SSB and CW sessions on a nightly basis.
> Not
> > to mention my Military Affiliate Radio System networks.
> >
> > Tell me Lennie....what do you contribute to your community and nation?
> >
> > Dan/W4NTI
> >
> >
>
>

2192. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-04 16:41:58 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <qFQpb.8505$Oo4.5962@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 81768

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20031103203402.29660.00001442@mb-m24.aol.com...
> In article <lxbpb.2369$Oo4.244@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>,
"Dan/W4NTI"
> <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> writes:
>
> >The flag of the confederacy is NOT the battle flag being displayed as the
> >flag of the Confederacy.
> >
> >When the Tennessee Battle Flag is flown in the South, by real
Southerners,
> >it is meant as a sign of respect for the fallen and a symbol of STATES
> >RIGHTS.
>
> Dan:
>
> When you "real Southerners" fly your Tennessee Battle Flag or whatever
> you call it, everyone who isn't a "real Southerner" views it as waving a
> banner of racism under their noses. Whether it is right or not, and
whether
> you like it or not, your flag is a problem for the rest of the country --
> especially American Negroes (the proper term for black people in
America --
> considering the fact that none of them was born in Africa or ever lived
> in any African country long enough to gain citizenship there). The white
> "real Southern" rednecks with the "Tennessee Battle Flag" on their pickup
> trucks are living in the past, at the expense of modern race relations.
>
> >No one advocates seccession from the Union, or starting another war.
>
> That's comforting.
>
> >But....we get real tired of Northerners and blacks trying to tear the
flag
> >down, especially since the reason they want to tear it down is they
believe
> >it is a racist symbol.
>
> While I was in the military, I had the saying "perception is reality"
drummed
> into me. The way we present ourselves to others forms their opinion of us
> from the very start. In most cases, that's the only opinion they ever use
to
> judge us from that point onward. I think it's time for you and your

fellow
> "real Southerners" to face the fact that your flag needs to be taken off
> your flagpoles and replaced with the real American flag -- the Stars and
> Stripes. No one is questioning the fact that the South is part of the
United
> States, and it's time for the "real Southerners" to stop fighting the
Civil War
> and living in peace with the rest of their country.
>
> >If it IS a racist symbol to them. Then they have fallen for the big lie.
>
> One man's lie is another man's truth. If I were you, I'd concentrate on
> making sure no one mistook me for a real American. Being a "real
> Southerner" only leaves the impression that you don't feel as though
> you belong to the greater whole of our nation.
>
> >Govern yourself accordingly.
>
> I do -- and I'm not the one flying any sort of state-specific "battle
flag."
> I fly the flag of the UNITED States. One of the stars on the field of
that
> flag belongs to Tennessee -- a beautiful state filled with free, united,
and
> loyal Americans -- of all races, ethnic, and religious groups. They are
> my fellow American citizens, and I expect them to view me as one of
> theirs. I am living in the unified present-day reality of America -- not
in
> the divided, suspicious, and hateful past. I invite you, my fellow
American,
> to do likewise.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT

There it is Larry, perception. The assholes that stole the symbol of
Southern Independence from the South, its flag. Have won....eh? Not
hardly my good man.

No, we WILL NOT remove the stars and bars from our flagpoles. And to show
how ignorant you are, and that you have fallen for Northern propaganda....AT
NO PLACE DOES THE CONFEDERATE FLY IN PLACE OF THE FLAG OF THE UNITED STATES.

If the Confederate flag is flown it is ALWAYS flown either away from the US
Flag, or BELOW the US FLAG. As it shoud be.

Again...the Confederate flag IS NOT A RACIST SYMBOL. If it is perceived as
such....it is YOUR PROBLEM, not ours.

Dan/W4NTI

2193. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-04 16:53:36 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <kQQpb.8538$Oo4.2961@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 81769

Oh, one more thing Larry. I fly the US Flag on my front porch . High and mighty. And I have the Confederate Battle Flag here in my shack, in the backyard. And when I get the tower up I will fly it off the tower.

Dan/W4NTI

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message news:20031103203402.29660.00001442@mb-m24.aol.com...
> In article <lxbpb.2369$Oo4.244@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dan/W4NTI"
> <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> writes:
>
> >The flag of the confederacy is NOT the battle flag being displayed as the
> >flag of the Confederacy.
> >
> >When the Tennessee Battle Flag is flown in the South, by real Southerners,
> >it is meant as a sign of respect for the fallen and a symbol of STATES
> >RIGHTS.
>
> Dan:
>
> When you "real Southerners" fly your Tennessee Battle Flag or whatever
> you call it, everyone who isn't a "real Southerner" views it as waving a
> banner of racism under their noses. Whether it is right or not, and whether
> you like it or not, your flag is a problem for the rest of the country --
> especially American Negroes (the proper term for black people in America --
> considering the fact that none of them was born in Africa or ever lived
> in any African country long enough to gain citizenship there). The white
> "real Southern" rednecks with the "Tennessee Battle Flag" on their pickup
> trucks are living in the past, at the expense of modern race relations.
>
> >No one advocates seccession from the Union, or starting another war.
>
> That's comforting.
>
> >But....we get real tired of Northerners and blacks trying to tear the flag
> >down, especially since the reason they want to tear it down is they believe
> >it is a racist symbol.
>
> While I was in the military, I had the saying "perception is reality"

drummed
> into me. The way we present ourselves to others forms their opinion of us
> from the very start. In most cases, that's the only opinion they ever use
to
> judge us from that point onward. I think it's time for you and your
fellow
> "real Southerners" to face the fact that your flag needs to be taken off
> your flagpoles and replaced with the real American flag -- the Stars and
> Stripes. No one is questioning the fact that the South is part of the
United
> States, and it's time for the "real Southerners" to stop fighting the
Civil War
> and living in peace with the rest of their country.
>
> >If it IS a racist symbol to them. Then they have fallen for the big lie.
>
> One man's lie is another man's truth. If I were you, I'd concentrate on
> making sure no one mistook me for a real American. Being a "real
> Southerner" only leaves the impression that you don't feel as though
> you belong to the greater whole of our nation.
>
> >Govern yourself accordingly.
>
> I do -- and I'm not the one flying any sort of state-specific "battle
flag."
> I fly the flag of the UNITED States. One of the stars on the field of
that
> flag belongs to Tennessee -- a beautiful state filled with free, united,
and
> loyal Americans -- of all races, ethnic, and religious groups. They are
> my fellow American citizens, and I expect them to view me as one of
> theirs. I am living in the unified present-day reality of America -- not
in
> the divided, suspicious, and hateful past. I invite you, my fellow
American,
> to do likewise.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT

2194. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-04 17:21:46 UTC
From: groupk0hb@earthlink.net
Message-ID: <5ee63311.0311040921.5fd45e4f@posting.google.com>
Source record: 81770

"Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote

> "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
> news:PQwpb.3926$Oo4.1159@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...

> >
> > A friend (a reggie recording artist)
> >
>
> Isn't that reggae?

Dwight prefers 'reggie' because it sounds, you know, less ..... black.

73, de Hans, K0HB
--
http://home.earthlink.net/~k0hb

2195. Re: Amateur Radio in the 21st Century?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-04 17:40:21 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0311040940.2d491afe@posting.google.com>
Source record: 81771

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<5dFpb.5540$Oo4.5400@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20031102224950.21232.00001801@mb-m13.aol.com...
> > In article <JNYob.1530$9M3.1433@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Bill
> Sohl"
> > <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
> >
> > >"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> > >news:20031031223023.12631.00002521@mb-m28.aol.com...
> > >> In article <MvDob.16255$FI2.5145@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>,
> "Bill
> Sohl"
> > >> <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
> > >>
> > >> >"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> > >> >news:20031027222947.06226.00001204@mb-m19.aol.com...
> > >> >> In article <Caknb.8872$FI2.7958@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>,
> "Bill
> Sohl"
> > >> >> <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
> > >> >>
> > >> >> >"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
> > >> >> >news:c2356669.0310270917.2668311b@posting.google.com...
> > >> >> >> "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
> news:<7O0nb.4484$X22.1484@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> > >> >> >> > "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> > >> >> >> > news:20031024182942.12300.00001303@mb-m20.aol.com...
> > >> >> >> > > In article <3F993128.6080401@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo
> <mjc5@psu.edu>
> > >> >> >writes:
>
> > >> >> >> KL7CC & Co. have already done so. Have you read their paper?
> > >> >> >
> > >> >> >No, is it on a web site?.
> > >> >>
> > >> >> http://www.qsl.net/al7fs/
> > >> >>
> > >> >> Second item down - "Amateur Radio in the 21st Century"
> > >> >>
> > >> >> You can skim through the code test stuff - we've agreed to disagree
> on
> that.
> > >> >> What is really interesting is the *other* ideas, such as what

> should
> happen to
> > >> >> the entry-level license class, free upgrades, written testing....
> > >> >>
> > >> >> 73 de Jim, N2EY
> > >> >
> > >> >Jim, et al;
> > >> >
> > >> >Some interesting and thought provoking suggestions/proposals.
> > >> >
> > >> >I agree we'll just have to disagree on the code testing, but IF folks
> are
> > >> >looking for a tp down revamp of licensing for US hams, Jim (KL7CC)
> > >> >has certainly stirred the pot.
> > >>
> > >> Agreed - but not in the best way, IMHO.
> > >
> > >Are you saying discussion or stawman proposals are bad???
> >
> > No!
> >
> > I'm saying that some of the proposal's ideas (not talking about the code
> test -
> > that's old news!) are not the best way to reach the desired results.
>
> Hence the discussion and, I presume, you'll
> offer better alternatives?

Of course - as usual.

But with the addy-tood that paper exhibits, I wonder how receptive the
"Gang" will be...

> > >> >Maybe a good place to start would be the proposed "Communicator"
> > >> >entry/beginners exam. Personally I think the applicant needs
> > >> >some command of Part 97 rules...not all, but at least those that
> > >> >would lay out the rules for Communicator license.
> > >>
> > >> If anything needs to be a part of the test, it's the rules and regs.
> > >
> > >I agree...to a point as noted below.
> > >
> > >> >I have always felt
> > >> >memorizing
> > >> >band edges makes little sense on a test because they do and have
> changed
> > >> >over time. I'd like to know the applicant could at least read a
> frequency
> > >> >chart and be able to answer questions regarding the privileges for
> > >> >his/her license. That could be "open book" where the frequency chart
> is

> > >> >provided. Other basic questions probably should require some
> > >> >recallable knowledge (e.g. music is forbidden, etc.)
> > >>
> > >> Power levels, modes allowed, knowing you can't cuss or jam others, etc.
> > >>
> > >> I think there is some sort of legal precedent that if something isn't
> in
> the
> > >> test syllabus, a licensed violator may have an out wrt prosecution.
> > >
> > >No such legal precedent..rather, just the opposite...to wit,
> > >ignorance of the lasw is not a valid defense to a violation charge.
> >
> > My point is that if the govt. grants licenses that require tests, it makes
> > sense that the rules for that license be on the test.
>
> I agree, but I don't much worry about memorizing band edges which
> I believe should be readily available in anyone's shack. If you asked me
> where the phne segment starts on 15 meters I have no idea,
> but I can and would look it up before operatng phone on 15.
> Even the band edges change over time as we saw with 80M novice
> segment some years back.

Your opinion noted but there's a couple of other sides to it.

I think a BIG reason all that bandedge stuff has been in the writtens
for so long is that once-upon-a-time some hams had a problem staying
inside the bands. And if you look at the enforcement letters, some
still do.

But the *big* problem with the "should be readily available in
anyone's shack" idea is that if you accept that idea for band edge
rules, why not for other rules as well? Say, the power limit on
various bands, or who can be a control operator, etc. Why shouldn't
"I'll just look it up when I need to know that" be good enough for
any FCC rule, if it's good enough for band edges?
>
> > >> >If you haven't read the KL7CC white paper, here's where you
> > >> >can find it:
> > >> >
> > >> >http://www.qsl.net/al7fs/NCVECplan.doc
> > >> >
> > >> >One interesting proposal sure to either enrage or please is the
> > >> >free upgrades for Tech and Advanced. Personally, and I have no stake
> > >> >in this as I'm already Extra, the idea of free upgrades doesn't bother
> me
> > >> >at all
> > >> >if it ultimately results in a set of license classes that make sense
> with
> > >> >regard
> > >> >to privileges vs requirements.

> > >>
> > >> Free upgrades have a lot of downsides. For example, suppose that a tech
> gets a
> > >> free upgrade to General without ever taking Element 3 or its
> equivalent.
> > >> Doesn't that prove that Element 3 contains nothing that is essential
> for
> > >> General class privileges?
> > >
> > >It proves nothing that definitive.
> >
> > See below.
> > >
> > >> Couldn't somebody claim that requiring new hams to
> > >> pass Element 3 (or 4) but not requiring existing hams to do the same is
> > >> discriminatory?
> > >
> > >Someone can claim anything they want.
> >
> > Consider this:
> >
> > Prospective ham reads about the upcoming changes. Reads that on Date X,
> all
> > Techs will get free upgrade to General. Crams for Tech and takes it a day
> or
> > two before Date X. Passes Tech, gets General as a freebie. Is that fair?
> Does
> > said newbie really have General class qualifications?
>
> Is it fair? Depends on your outlook.

I say it's inherently uunfair - but worse, if FCC did it, they'd be
saying there was nothing in the General test that a Tech really needed
to know in order to have General privileges. Bad precedent.

> As to qualifications, I have
> said all along that most license privileges bear little or no
> relavence to what the license tests for.

Then why test for those things?
>
> > >> >The other two alternatives are:
> > >> >(1) certain existing licenses would lose privileges (not a good track
> > >> >record on that as we saw in 1968) or
> > >> >(2) we keep the existing licneses plus the newly defined ones and
> > >> >wait for the old licenses to go SK. Probably not what the FCC wants
> > >> >for enforcement and rules simplification.
> > >>
> > >> I don't see what the problem is with (2). FCC has kept three "cul de
> sac"
> > >> license classes active for almost 4 years now (Tech

> Plus/Novice/Advanced)
> with
> > >> no real problems. They're just entries in a database.
> > >
> > >They are more than just database entries. They also have specific
> > >privileges which
> > >differentiate them from the "lower" level licenses. IF the FCC granted
> > >identical
> > >privileges to Advanced rather than doing a "free upgrade" of Advanced to
> > >Extra,
> > >THEN the old licenses would be just a database differentiator.
> >
> > Only difference is a few lines of rules - particularly the difference
> between
> > Advanced and Extra.
>
> But then there's enforcement, etc. What you are
> actually saying now is that an Advanced can operate as an Extra today and
> never
> expect to be called to task for operating in the Extra segments.

Not at all!

I'm saying that except for those few parts of 4 HF bands, some vanity callsign privs and some VE stuff, there's nothing that an Extra can do that an Advanced can't. Extras don't get more power, or more modes, or more bands - just some more kHz. Except for enforcing those few kHz, it's not much work for FCC. When's the last time an Advanced was cited for operating in the Extra subbands?

There's no question pools for those license classes anymore and no administration of exams for them, so no work for VEs and VECs.

All existing Advanceds have had almost 4 years to upgrade without any more code testing. Yet the number of Advanceds has dropped by only about 16% in that time - and at least half of that drop is expirations.

> > >> And FCC turned down ARRL's idea of free General upgrades for existing
> > >> Novices and Tech Pluses.
> > >
> > >The FCC once was looking for a consensus of hams before it would
> > >entertain dropping code speeds.
> >
> > But that wasn't the issue - ARRL proposed 5 wpm for General, so all Tech
> Pluses
> > and Novices met that already. The sticking point was the written testing.
>
> My point is that what was decided could or could not change. It
> depends on the end goal and the FCC's considerations.

Agreed.

My point is that there's no pressing need to make the "dead end"
license classes disappear. The KL7CC paper talks like it's a major
problem, but I can't see how that's true.

Tech Plus will simply disappear in (at most) 6 years, 5 months and 11
days even if no rules at all are changed, because FCC has been
renewing all Tech Pluses as Techs. And at the rate the number of
Novices is declining, they'll probably be gone by then too.

The "end goal" should be a better license structure.
>
> > >> >Further commentary ad discussion welcome.
> > >> >
> > >> >And a curse to the first person who introduces any of the lexicon
> > >> >of name calling rather than attempt credible dialog or debate.
> > >>
> > >> AGREED!
> > >>
> > >> There's also the part about the "no homebrew no voltages over 30" for
> the
> > >> Communicator. Not good ideas at all - nor are they realistic.
> > >
> > >They may be more realistic then we may think. How many actual
> > >"homebrew" Novice or Tech rigs have you seen?
> >
> > I've seen plenty! ;-)
>
> > The "no voltages over 30" means no line-powered rigs, no antenna
> tuners.....
>
> Most folks use a 12 volt DC supply anyhow.

Then why legislate it?

> Interesting point, however,
> since anyone (ham/nonham) is allowed today to build there
> own DC supply powered from 120 v AC. Perhaps the NO homebrew
> would be limited to transmitters only.

Again, why legislate it?

Consider - anyone can build their own receiver, too. In the vacuum
tube era, voltages of several hundred were common in receivers. So
were AC-DC supplies, voltage doublers, etc. So under those proposed
rules, it would be OK for a ham to have an old hot-chassis AC-DC rx
like the Hallicrafters S-38B, or a homebrew receiver on an open
chassis with hundreds of volts B+ - but not a manufactured rig with 50
volts on the transistor finals...

Doesn't make any sense.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2196. Re: ARRL has no FIRE for sale?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-04 18:02:04 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <aKCdndWmkbXLdjqiRVn-hQ@gbronline.com>
Source record: 81772

Ryan, KC8PMX wrote:
> I am gonna stab myself in the foot for this one before any of you all want
> to, but what I think Lennie is trying to get at, is that nowhere in the
> media has amateur radio taken any form of the spotlight on this event. I
> was sick for the past six or seven days and spent alot of time home watching
> tv between resting. Nowhere did I see anything mentioned about ham radio.

That dosen't mean that the hams were not involved. I would wager that
there were/are a lot of other volunteer orginizations involved also that
did not see any spotlite.

> On a positive note, this would have been a great example of showing how
> valuable ham radio is supposed to be. It wouldn't cost the arrl much to send
> press releases of this to the major networks, Hell, I chip in for the stamps
> if that is the case!!!!!! Remember, a good defense is a good offense! (re:
> arrl claims to "defend" amateur radio)
>
>
> This is one of those one in a million times I would even vaguely come close
> to agreeing with Lennie the License-less. I think I am gonna have
> nightmares now!

I saw on the news the other day, some homeland defense official (can't
recall who it was), was saying that they plan on making use of the
thousands of ham radio operators as part of homeland defense.

2197. Twisted's Mind Has Snapped

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-04 20:09:54 UTC
From: Twistedhed <twistedhed@webtv.net>
Message-ID: <bo912i$g8v$1@news.x-echo.com>
Source record: 81773
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

If you do a Google Search Groups for twistedhed the results are about 16 ,100 and most of them are his obsession with Leland Scott.

Twirted obsession with Leland Scott.....starting with accusing him of child molestation.....and posting and emailing his phone number with

intent to harass. Soon Twisted is off the deep end accusing Leland of everything under the sun. The newsgroup including Twisteds own friends Landshark and Randy begged him to stop. Too late for Twisteds mind has snapped.

==========

From: Twistedhed (Twistedhed@webtv.com)
Subject: Leland C. Scott, KC8LDO has molestation of children on his mind..AGAIN!
Date: 2002-05-09 08:20:37

==========

From: twistedhed@webtv.net (twistedhed)
Date: Sun, 8 Apr 2001 09:35:06 -0400 (EDT)
To: dont@agora.rdrop.com (Don Taylor)
Subject: Re: Altair 8800 for sale

CAll 248-589-**** ask for Leland.

==========

From: twistedhed (twistedhed@webtv.net)
Subject: Re: Cuban Romeo & Juliets FS
Newsgroups: alt.smokers.cigars.marketplace
Date: 2001-04-07 10:22:44

Email is overwhelmed. Serious inquiries only.

248-589-****. Ask for Leland, or stop buy at **** Concord Drive Blg 21 Apt. B Madison Heights, Michigan

==========

From: Twistedhed (twistedhed@webtv.net)
Subject: Re: More Twisted Lies
Date: 2002-11-25 06:15:17 PST

HE went searching the web on ME. HE came up with the Sporadic Waves article..HE posted it....HE crossposted it..HE hacked it...HE asked me into a hammie forum....HE forged me

==========

=-
Article poste via Voila News - http://www.news.voila.fr
Le : Tue Nov 4 21:09:54 2003 depuis l'IP : acd0ef2a.ipt.aol.com [VIP 532284301978]

2198. Re: No Code General

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-04 20:19:22 UTC
From: Brenda Ann <brendad@shinbiro.com>
Message-ID: <bo8v5t$6om$1@news1.kornet.net>
Source record: 81774
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.swap

"W7TI" <noway@nohow.com> wrote in message
news:2vkfqvg9lmnqg3vrr1t350n0sjpbtsm885@4ax.com...
> On Tue, 4 Nov 2003 16:46:35 +0900, "Brenda Ann" <brendad@shinbiro.com>
> wrote:
>
> >If they have already been punished in some way by the courts, then the
> >answer to your query is (or should be) yes. If they have not been
punished
> >in some way by the courts, then, de facto, they have not been found
guilty
> >of any crime, and are to be presumed innocent.
>
> ----------
>
> What a great concept! If they've been punished, then hands off. If
> they've NOT been punished, then hands off also.
>
> I'd say you're a natural-born criminal lawyer (in both senses of the
> word).
>

It's our system of law. They taught it to us in junior high school social
studies. I know I'm getting old, but I don't think things have changed all
that much...

2199. Re: No Code General

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-04 20:28:01 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3FA80BD1.1030200@psu.edu>
Source record: 81775
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.swap

Alun Palmer wrote:
> Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in
> news:Z%kpb.2342$Bf7.1312644@news1.news.adelphia.net:
>
>
>>Alun Palmer wrote:
>>
>>
>>
>>>I will probably be dropped soon, but the FCC has to go through
>>>standard procedures with all the pending petitions. The international
>>>requirement was dropped on July 5th, so by next July it should
>>>probably be gone in the US.
>>
>> Hehhe. Alun, you should be on the welcoming committee for this
>> dude!
>>
>> - Mike KB3EIA -
>>
>>
>
>
> It's a difficult question. Do we applaud him for wanting to go legal? Or
> do we slam him for ever having operated illegally? I have known former
> pirate radio ooperators whose behaviour on the ham bands after they got a
> licence was exemplary.

Then let us hope that he is a shining beacon of behavior for the cause
of those who do away for the code test!

- Mike KB3EIA -

2200. Re: FCC Regualtions & Public Entities Policies

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-04 21:11:38 UTC
From: dennis@wawa.juniper.net
Message-ID: <bo94ma$144d$1@heap.juniper.net>
Source record: 81777

Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote:
>On 31 Oct 2003 17:35:18 -0800, Brian wrote:
>
>>That's why you find guys at the other end of the tunnel standing by
>>with computer controlled "law enforcement" scanners logging all the
>>codes as you pop out the other side and handshake with the local cell
>>site.
>>
>>Then they sell them to Taliban operatives and drug dealers.
>
> And they sell then to the guys who sell them to other guys who clone
> cellphones which are sold to still other guys who set up curbside
> "telephone booths" in immigrant neighborhoods to call relatives in
> foreign countries at "discount rates".
>
> At least they did have been doing those things for the last 10 years.

I don't think this happens very often any more, however. All the digital phone standards I know about (CDMA, TDMA and GSM, I don't know about iDEN) use encryption, both on the control channel and for the voice payload. While I've seen academic criticism of the algorithms they use, I don't think there is a practical way for a guy with a scanner hearing the signals to crack this. Digital mobile phone service is still secure for practical purposes.

The cellphone cloners used to get their data from the AMPS control channel, which was unencrypted, but I'm pretty sure there are no cell phone companies left which sell exclusively analog phone service (it has probably been 5 years or more since you could buy an analog-only phone). AMPS support continues to exist, by FCC mandate, only to support off-network roaming, which means that pretty much the only AMPS users you're likely to find are people away from home in rural areas not covered by their provider's digital service. This is a small enough population that the reduced opportunities for fraud of this type hardly justify the cost of the equipment for programming the phones.

I think these days the bulk of cell phone fraud is subscriber fraud, where service is obtained using someone else's name and personal information.

Dennis Ferguson

2201. Re: Why We Freeband

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-04 21:21:13 UTC
From: lancer <lancer@lancer.web>
Message-ID: <3fa9161e.8217185@news.easynews.com>
Source record: 81776
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On Tue, 04 Nov 2003 14:48:09 -0600, Neil Down
<buckiewheat@assclown.com> wrote:

>lancer <lancer@lancer.web> wrote in
>news:3fa7b5d9.65806685@news.easynews.com:
>
>> On Mon, 03 Nov 2003 20:48:10 -0600, Neil Down
>> <buckiewheat@assclown.com> wrote:
>>
>>>Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com> wrote in
>>>news:20031103174708.791 $G9@newsreader.com:
>>>
>>>> Neil Down <buckiewheat@assclown.com> wrote:
>>>>> N8WWM <N8WWM@home.net> wrote in news:bo5qll02b9c@drn.newsguy.com:
>>>>>
>>>>> > Rules are made to be broken, even the Rain Report can't stop me!
>>>>>
>>>>> That is pretty nice except that was nothing from the rain report
>>>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>> Bullshit. N8WWM was on the Rain Report FCC Enforcement Log,
>>>
>>>
>>>Yes he was his name was mentioned, yet the post I was referring to was
>>>not from the rain report it was from twistedsac.
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>> >and he didn't get there from his good deeds.
>
>> Is that what it takes?
>
>
>
>Is that what what takes?

Too be investigated by the F.C.C. for jamming a repeater. Are you
having trouble keeping up?
>
> >You have to be fined or convicted?
>
>
>Exactly twsitedhed and company blow a gasket when you call them illegal

>or criminals.

And you blow a gasket when you call Doug the same thing. Has
Twistedhed and company been mentioned in a R.A.I.N. report?
No, but Doug has.

>
>
>> If thats
>> the case, why are you constantly bitching about some of the members of
>> the R.R.C.B group?

>> Have they been fined?
>
>Yes some have been. Has doug been fined? Ill answer for you a resounding
>NO!

Which ones in R.R.C.B.?

Has Twisty? I'll answer for you, a resounding
NO!

>
> >You and Doug are hypocrites. He can jam repeaters, and thats ok, but
>>let someone discuss how to bias an amp and you go nuts over it.
>
>
>
>Prove to me where it is said Doug Adair N8wwm jammed a repeater,it
>doesn't that makes you a liar and a troll.

He most certainly was mentioned in a report that he was being
questioned over it.

>
>Prove to the group where the FCC said he jammed repeaters, carefull your
>slip is showing.

Your still a hypocrite, You throw a fit when someone even talks about
an amp, when Dioug has already proven he is quite capable of
operating illegal and being a criminal.

My slip is only showing in your gay mind.

2202. Why n8 dogie is an idiot

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-04 23:27:16 UTC
From: Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com>
Message-ID: <20031104182715.587$sO_-_@newsreader.com>
Source record: 81778
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.dogie.is.an.idiot

lancer <lancer@lancer.web> wrote:
> Your still a hypocrite, You throw a fit when someone even talks about
> an amp, when Dioug has already proven he is quite capable of
> operating illegal and being a criminal.
>
> My slip is only showing in your gay mind.
>
>(N8WWM) Doug is a blowhard. I've asked him to meet me in his home town
numerous times, but he doesn't have enough sack to back up his
mouth... Years of this tripe!

In the mean time, he flames rec.radio.cb. Calls people all kinds
of filthy names, with mostly gay references. (wonder why the closet
walkie talkie operator hasn't come out in the open yet).

Now some jackass who claims to be an extra is defending him?

BAH!

2203. Why n8wwm is a radio hater.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-04 23:41:44 UTC
From: Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com>
Message-ID: <20031104184144.696$Ay_-_@newsreader.com>
Source record: 81779
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Neil Down <buckiewheat@assclown.com> wrote:
> Has doug been fined? Ill answer for you a resounding
> NO!
>
So by your reasoning, unless you're fined you're innocent.

That's odd coming from the re.radio.cb legal police. What about
all the keyclown name calling? No fine means innocent in your book$.

So until you produce evidence of fines, that the regular posters in
rec.radio.cb , have been charged with, please STFU.

2204. Re: No Code General

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-04 23:58:48 UTC
From: Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com>
Message-ID: <20031104185847.223$t1@newsreader.com>
Source record: 81780
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.swap

Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote:
> Alun Palmer wrote:
> > Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in
> > news:Z%kpb.2342$Bf7.1312644@news1.news.adelphia.net:
> >
> >
> > >>Alun Palmer wrote:
> > >>
> > >>
> > >> >>>I will probably be dropped soon, but the FCC has to go through
> > >> >>>standard procedures with all the pending petitions. The international
> > >> >>>requirement was dropped on July 5th, so by next July it should
> > >> >>>probably be gone in the US.
> > >>
> > >> >> Hehhe. Alun, you should be on the welcoming committee for this
> > >> >> dude!
> > >>
> > >> >> - Mike KB3EIA -
> > >>
> > >>
> > >
> > >
> > > It's a difficult question. Do we applaud him for wanting to go legal?
> > > Or do we slam him for ever having operated illegally? I have known
> > > former pirate radio ooperators whose behaviour on the ham bands after
> > > they got a licence was exemplary.
> >
> > Then let us hope that he is a shining beacon of behavior for the
> > cause of those who do away for the code test!
> >
> > - Mike KB3EIA -
> >
It will be like the Cingular commercial.."can you hear me now?" <g>

2205. Re: No Code General

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-05 00:05:29 UTC
From: Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com>
Message-ID: <20031104190529.011$LT@newsreader.com>
Source record: 81781
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

keyclownzmustgo@yahoo.com (Citizens For A Keyclown-Free Newsgroup) wrote:
> > Pretty good trick Twistie - reply to them only in rec.radio.cb WHICH
> THEY'RE NOT READING BECAUSE THEY'RE READING REC.RADIO.AMATEUR.POLICY
> so it makes it look like they are stunned silent by your post LOL.
>
Newsflash: Twist can't cross post. Remember that the next time
you forge him.

2206. Re: Why n8wwm is a radio hater.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-05 00:23:57 UTC
From: jim <3carroll@optonline.net>
Message-ID: <3FA84330.1000701@optonline.net>
Source record: 81782
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Steveo wrote:
> Neil Down <buckiewheat@assclown.com> wrote:
>
>>Has doug been fined? Ill answer for you a resounding
>>NO!
>>
>
> So by your reasoning, unless you're fined you're innocent.
>
> That's odd coming from the re.radio.cb legal police. What about
> all the keyclown name calling? No fine means innocent in your book$.
>
> So until you produce evidence of fines, that the regular posters in
> rec.radio.cb , have been charged with, please STFU.

makes sense...

2207. N8 bleeds from his gums

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-05 00:34:45 UTC
From: Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com>
Message-ID: <20031104193445.979$EE_-_@newsreader.com>
Source record: 81783
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

lancer <lancer@lancer.web> wrote:
> On Mon, 03 Nov 2003 20:48:10 -0600, Neil Down
> <buckiewheat@assclown.com> wrote:
>
> >Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com> wrote in news:20031103174708.791
> >$G9@newsreader.com:
> >
> >> Neil Down <buckiewheat@assclown.com> wrote:
> >>> N8WWM <N8WWM@home.net> wrote in news:bo5qll02b9c@drn.newsguy.com:
> >>>
> >>> > Rules are made to be broken, even the Rain Report can't stop me!
> >>>
> >>> That is pretty nice except that was nothing from the rain report
> >>>
> >>
> >>
> >> Bullshit. N8WWM was on the Rain Report FCC Enforcement Log,
> >>
> >>
> >Yes he was his name was mentioned, yet the post I was referring to was
> >not from the rain report it was from twistedsac.
> >
> >
> >
> > >and he didn't get there from his good deeds.
> >
> >wow do you worship the rain report? is it the bible of cb keyclowns?
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >> Why are you an N8WWM apologist?
> >
> >Why are you a RETARD? He never was charged or nothing was taken
> >further, now I suggest if you have some proof of any charges or fines
> >eing levied by all means post them.
> >
> >
> >
>
> Is that what it takes? You have to be fined or convicted? If thats
> the case, why are you constantly bitching about some of the members of
> the R.R.C.B group? Have they been fined? You and Doug are

> hypocrites. He can jam repeaters, and thats ok, but let someone
> discuss how to bias an amp and you go nuts over it.
>
Guys like n8wwm are a wart/virus on the radio hobby.

2208. N8WWM writes (was)Re: Gay keyqueen cock pumping Stevie Mopedophile's anus: IN,OUT,IN,OUT,IN,OUT

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-05 01:09:39 UTC
From: Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com>
Message-ID: <20031104200939.569$KG_-_@newsreader.com>
Source record: 81784
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

keyclownzmustgo@yahoo.com (Citizens For A Keyclown-Free Newsgroup) wrote:
> Steveo moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com wrote:
> >lancer <lancer@lancer.web> wrote:
> >> Your still a hypocrite, You throw a fit when someone even talks about
> >> an amp, when Dioug has already proven he is quite capable of
> >> operating illegal and being a criminal.
> >>
> >> My slip is only showing in your gay mind.
> >>
> >>(N8WWM) Doug is a blowhard. I've asked him to meet me in his home town
> >numerous times,
>
> Rule #1. N8 does not meet with gay men.
>
So ^ above ^ is n8wwm's response. You self policing Ham Operators must
be proud of this jackass.

2209. Good news

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-05 01:28:18 UTC
From: Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com>
Message-ID: <20031104202818.589$LX_-_@newsreader.com>
Source record: 81785
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.swap

Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com> wrote:
> Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote:
> > Then let us hope that he is a shining beacon of behavior for
> > the cause of those who do away for the code test!
> >
> > - Mike KB3EIA -
> >
> It will be like the Cingular commercial.."can you hear me now?" <g>
>
I just saved a ton of money on my auto insurance.

2210. Re: Double Licenses?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-05 02:08:50 UTC
From: Gary Danaher <gdanaher@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <3FA85BB6.9070701@comcast.net>
Source record: 81786
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur

They changed that a few years ago so that an upgrade does not change the
original expiration date.
Gary
AB5RM

Ben K. wrote:

> I finally went and did the paperwork to change my 1975 Technician + code
> license into a General ticket. I took the Extra written at the same
> time, with no expectation of really passing it on the first try.
>
> But when I got the response from the FCC, there was a surprise. Two
> envelopes, each with an identical copy of a General license in my name!
> Additionally, the expiration date on both is March next year.
>
> Doesn't paying the fee and having new paperwork generated result in a
> license renewal?
>

2211. Re: Why We Freeband

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-05 02:31:37 UTC
From: Lancer <Lancer@lancer.web>
Message-ID: <a9ogqvon6t15l10h6fumlf1j0q34dmui4f@4ax.com>
Source record: 81787
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On Tue, 04 Nov 2003 16:01:15 -0600, Neil Down
<buckiewheat@assclown.com> wrote:

>Below are your posts inculding the words gay, cock swallower, etc you
>have made quite an impression under your new screen name other than that
>it is still the same gay shit... lol >
>
>http://groups.google.com/groups?q=author:lancer%40lancer.web&start=30
>&hl=en&lr=&ie=UTF-8&oe=UTF-8&selm=75346dc4d85352e6dff08e9712ad5820%
>40news.teranews.com&rnum=31
>
>
>http://groups.google.com/groups?q=author:lancer%40lancer.web&start=30
>&hl=en&lr=&ie=UTF-8&oe=UTF-8&selm=e0f5652f64d986a8092c57bfa418e029%
>40news.teranews.com&rnum=32
>
>http://groups.google.com/groups?q=author:lancer%40lancer.web&start=20
>&hl=en&lr=&ie=UTF-8&oe=UTF-8&selm=3a7cf648ff9e06445f06c886f369ecfe%
>40news.teranews.com&rnum=26
>
>
>http://groups.google.com/groups?q=author:lancer%40lancer.web&start=10
>&hl=en&lr=&ie=UTF-8&oe=UTF-8&selm=8359dc0440380a5bf0faf3246f94feaa%
>40news.teranews.com&rnum=18

Should we now list yours WA3MOJ?

That list would take hours to read.

2212. Re: Why We Freeband

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-05 02:36:05 UTC
From: Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com>
Message-ID: <20031104213605.976$Ov@newsreader.com>
Source record: 81788
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Lancer <Lancer@lancer.web> wrote:
> On Tue, 04 Nov 2003 16:01:15 -0600, Neil Down
> <buckiewheat@assclown.com> wrote:
>
> >Below are your posts inculding the words gay, cock swallower, etc you
> >have made quite an impression under your new screen name other than that
> >it is still the same gay shit... lol >
> >
> >http://groups.google.com/groups?q=author:lancer%40lancer.web&start=30
> >&hl=en&lr=&ie=UTF-8&oe=UTF-8&selm=75346dc4d85352e6dff08e9712ad5820%
> >40news.teranews.com&rnum=31
> >
> >
> >http://groups.google.com/groups?q=author:lancer%40lancer.web&start=30
> >&hl=en&lr=&ie=UTF-8&oe=UTF-8&selm=e0f5652f64d986a8092c57bfa418e029%
> >40news.teranews.com&rnum=32
> >
> >http://groups.google.com/groups?q=author:lancer%40lancer.web&start=20
> >&hl=en&lr=&ie=UTF-8&oe=UTF-8&selm=3a7cf648ff9e06445f06c886f369ecfe%
> >40news.teranews.com&rnum=26
> >
> >
> >http://groups.google.com/groups?q=author:lancer%40lancer.web&start=10
> >&hl=en&lr=&ie=UTF-8&oe=UTF-8&selm=8359dc0440380a5bf0faf3246f94feaa%
> >40news.teranews.com&rnum=18
>
> Should we now list yours WA3MOJ?
>
> That list would take hours to read.
>
Heh, which nym?

2213. Re: Why We Freeband

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-05 02:37:59 UTC
From: Lancer <Lancer@lancer.web>
Message-ID: <alogqvoiu9jcbvmnji56ro2v5mc68qimcb@4ax.com>
Source record: 81789
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On Tue, 04 Nov 2003 16:01:15 -0600, Neil Down
<buckiewheat@assclown.com> wrote:

>lancer <lancer@lancer.web> wrote in news:3fa9161e.8217185
>@news.easynews.com:
>
>
>>>Exactly twsitedhed and company blow a gasket when you call them illegal
>>>or criminals.
>
>> And you blow a gasket when you call Doug the same thing.
>
>I DON'T CALL dOUG ANYTHING QUIT SLOBBERING ON THE KEYBOARD.
>

So I made a mistake and typed you instead of we, big deal.

At least I know when my caps locks are ON.

2214. N8WWM post <was> Re: Attn Keyqueenz --- AKC still owns the NG!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-05 02:42:15 UTC
From: Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com>
Message-ID: <20031104214215.673$Pm_-_@newsreader.com>
Source record: 81790
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

keyclownzmustgo@yahoo.com (Citizens For A Keyclown-Free Newsgroup) wrote:
> We own it dudes! You cannot stop us.
> We challenge
> you to stop us repeatedly, but you cannot. Impotence, it's not just
> for old farts, it's for keyclowns too.
>
> N8 doesn't even post anymore, and he certainly doesn't "do" personal
> appearances for gay men, no matter how much they cry. Here's one of the
> latest dispatches he sent. It's especially for Twithed. Enjoy.
>
> twit's dreaming of a cum drenched Christmas
> With every throbbing dick he sucks
> Where the peckers glisten
> And keyclowns listen
> To hear twithed suck and blow
>
> twit's dreaming of a cum drenched Christmas
> With every anal hole he licks
> He loves horny nutsacks
> And spread wide asscracks
> 'Ole twit loves to lick 'em all
>
> May you keyclowns have twit eat meat
> And may all your dick suckings be sweet
>
.
.
.
Step away from dads basement, n8wwm. You really need
to find another way to make an asshole out of yourself.

2215. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-05 03:13:12 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bo9qf9$fci@library2.airnews.net>
Source record: 81791

"Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
news:3FA7D399.4070605@psu.edu...
> Kim W5TIT wrote:
> > "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
> > news:PQwpb.3926$Oo4.1159@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> >
> >>"Kim W5TIT" wrote:
> >>
> >>>The news said that? That there's LESS racism? Compared
> >>>to where and where?! I come from NE NY and never really
> >>>saw any racism.
> >>
> >>
> >> The trend of blacks moving to the South has been covered in the news
for
> >>many years.
> >>
> >>
> >>
> >>>Here, the topic is a part of every-day life.
> >>
> >>
> >> Exactly. More people here talk about race issues (all sides) openly
and
> >>honestly instead of sweeping them under the rug like they doesn't exist
> >
> > (or
> >
> >>trying to act like they don't exist).
> >>
> >
> >
> > I'm talking of friendly chats about the topic. I am speaking of racist
> > comments and ways of treating people.
> >
> >
>>A friend (a reggie recording artist)
> >>
> >
> >
> > Isn't that reggae?
>
>
> Don't you remember the group "The Archies"? I think Reggie was a member.

>
> - Mike KB3EIA -
>

Whoops...and I meant to say "I'm NOT talking of friendly chats about the topic...

Kim W5TIT

2216. Re: Why We Freeband

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-05 03:17:36 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <QtudnTwzBuig7DWiRVn-tA@gbronline.com>
Source record: 81793
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Steveo wrote:

> Neil Down <buckiewheat@assclown.com> wrote:
>
>>I DON'T CALL dOUG ANYTHING
>>
>
> He must be your friend, you respond to anything about him.
>
>
>>QUIT SLOBBERING ON THE KEYBOARD.
>>
>
> Quit harassing CBer's.

That's about all they are good for.

2217. Re: Why We Harass Cber's

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-05 03:27:49 UTC
From: Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com>
Message-ID: <20031104222749.978$VD_-_@newsreader.com>
Source record: 81792
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Neil Down <buckiewheat@assclown.com> wrote:
>I am not wa3moj
>
Yes you are.

2218. Re: Why n8 dogie is an idiot

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-05 03:48:17 UTC
From: Lancer <Lancer@lancer.web>
Message-ID: <tqsgqv03akn872uu1cn8jh4pqk9q3ajbpc@4ax.com>
Source record: 81794
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.dogie.is.an.idiot

On Tue, 04 Nov 2003 21:27:51 -0600, Neil Down
<buckiewheat@assclown.com> wrote:

>Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com> wrote in news:20031104182715.587
>$sO_-_@newsreader.com:
>
>
>>
>> In the mean time, he flames rec.radio.cb. Calls people all kinds
>> of filthy names, with mostly gay references. (wonder why the closet
>> walkie talkie operator hasn't come out in the open yet).
>>
>> Now some jackass who claims to be an extra is defending him?
>>
>> BAH!
>
>Talk about a jackass you defend a blatant transexual, a liar, and several
>illegal federal criminals. Your a real saint huh?

Now when has Steve defended you and Doug?

2219. Re: Why We Freeband

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-05 03:50:02 UTC
From: Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com>
Message-ID: <20031104225002.217$7Z@newsreader.com>
Source record: 81795
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote:
> Steveo wrote:
>
> > Neil Down <buckiewheat@assclown.com> wrote:
> >
> >>I DON'T CALL dOUG ANYTHING
> >>
> >
> > He must be your friend, you respond to anything about him.
> >
> >
> >>QUIT SLOBBERING ON THE KEYBOARD.
> >>
> >
> > Quit harassing CBer's.
>
> That's about all they are good for.
>
That, and giving ham radio a bad example. Two bad apples
don't spoil the whole bunch. ;)

2220. Re: Why We Harass Cber's

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-05 04:05:40 UTC
From: Landshark <S3Buell@jgkdls.com>
Message-ID: <oG_pb.13874$Qu.4630@newssvr14.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 81796
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Steveo" <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com> wrote in message
news:20031104222749.978$VD_-_@newsreader.com...
> Neil Down <buckiewheat@assclown.com> wrote:
> >I am not wa3moj
> >
> Yes you are.

Of course he is. That's why he
admitted and was able to make a
complaint against Scott for using
the Nic WA3MOJ@AOL.Com
to Scott's ISP. He had to send a
complaint through his AOL account
to Scott's ISP, otherwise they would
just ignore the complaint.

Landshark

--
The battle, sir, is not to the strong alone;
it is to the vigilant, the active, the brave

2221. Re: Why n8wwm is a radio hater.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-05 04:05:40 UTC
From: Landshark <S3Buell@jgkdls.com>
Message-ID: <oG_pb.13875$Qu.9474@newssvr14.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 81799
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Steveo" <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com> wrote in message
news:20031104223834.836$xB@newsreader.com...
> Neil Down <buckiewheat@assclown.com> wrote:
> >stupid assclown. All outta
> > your assclown mouths no less.
> >
> You suffer from ass'y face'y. Get closer to your handheld.

Notice how he can't answer the
question? Of course he can't, he's wrong
and is AFRAID to admit it.

Landshark

--
The happy people are those who are producing something;
the bored people are those who are consuming much and
producing nothing.

2222. Re: Good news

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-05 04:05:41 UTC
From: Landshark <S3Buell@jgkdls.com>
Message-ID: <pG_pb.13876$Qu.858@newssvr14.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 81797
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.swap

"Steveo" <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com> wrote in message
news:20031104202818.589$LX_-_@newsreader.com...
> Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com> wrote:
> > Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote:
> > > Then let us hope that he is a shining beacon of behavior for
> > > the cause of those who do away for the code test!
> > >
> > > - Mike KB3EIA -
> > >
> > It will be like the Cingular commercial.."can you hear me now?" <g>
> >
> I just saved a ton of money on my auto insurance.

Watching a little more TV lately?

Landshark

--
We are men at work, we've got a job to do.
Neil Young

2223. Re: Why n8wwm dogie is an idiot

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-05 04:05:41 UTC
From: Landshark <S3Buell@jgkdls.com>
Message-ID: <pG_pb.13878$Qu.6381@newssvr14.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 81798
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.dogie.is.an.idiot

"Steveo" <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com> wrote in message
news:20031104223007.101$3X_-_@newsreader.com...
> Neil Down <buckiewheat@assclown.com> wrote:
> > Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com> wrote in news:20031104182715.587
> > $sO_-_@newsreader.com:
> >
> > >
> > > In the mean time, he flames rec.radio.cb. Calls people all kinds
> > > of filthy names, with mostly gay references. (wonder why the closet
> > > walkie talkie operator hasn't come out in the open yet).
> > >
> > > Now some jackass who claims to be an extra is defending him?
> > >
> > > BAH!
> >
> > Talk about a jackass you defend a blatant transexual, a liar, and several
> > illegal federal criminals. Your a real saint huh?
> >
> WHO are these people? ($ to Jerry)

LOL!!!!!

He's a troll, nothing more, a whole
lot less.

Landshark

--
You can stand tall without standing on someone. You can be a victor without having victims.

2224. Re: FCC Regualtions & Public Entities Policies

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-05 04:09:06 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <xnfcneeyarg.hnutkgl.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>
Source record: 81800

On 4 Nov 2003 21:11:38 GMT, Dennis Ferguson wrote:

>I think these days the bulk of cell phone fraud is subscriber fraud,
>where service is obtained using someone else's name and personal
>information.

That's what my sources tell me.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

2225. Re: Why We Freeband

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-05 04:21:56 UTC
From: Jerry Oxendine <joxendi@bellsouth.net>
Message-ID: <_V_pb.34301$SV2.16561@bignews3.bellsouth.net>
Source record: 81802
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.swap

jim <3carroll@optonline.net> wrote in message
news:3FA5BE98.5090506@optonline.net...
>
>
> Brenda Ann wrote:
> > "jim" <3carroll@optonline.net> wrote in message
> > news:3FA5B143.9090408@optonline.net...
> >
> >
> >
> >>actually a good point. if i were to use the freq's the u.s. gov said i
can
> >>then what is the problem with slipping +/- 5kc's between 'channels'? is
> >>that freebanding?
> >
> >
> > The frequencies that the US govt. says you can are those specific
> > frequencies that constitute the 40 standard CB channels. The distance
away
> > from the center of any channel is tightly regulated, and you can't be
more
> > than 0.005% away from that center (~1.3 KHz), which is actually pretty
broad
> > when compared to say, broadcast AM, which is only allowed a 20 Hz
leeway).
> >
>
> that is what the u.s. gov proclaims. my point is they have no say so
> outside territorial waters. whether or not the gov abides by itu
> standards on this matter is open.

The fact is the US Govt HAS signed on with ITU and honors *most* treaties.
>
> >
> >>better yet, who the hell is the u.s. gov to tell me what is legal or
> >>not?
> >
> >
> > If you are a US citizen, they are granted that right by the
constitution,
> > and by treaty.
> >
>

> please point out the constitutional section you mentioned.

Title 47, US Code and The Communications Act of 1934 voted upon by
Congress.
>
> > if i were to float out to bermuda and xmit would i be freebanding
> >
> >>there?

Sure, but I doubt the British authorities would appreciate that!
> >
> >
> > You would then be under the jurisdiction of whatever radio authority
covers
> > Bermuda. Aren't they a British colony? The UK Radio Authority is much
more
> > harsh than the FCC.
> >
>
Agreed.
> right, the RA is tough. easier to monitor 65+/- million than appr 300
> million
>
> > do our friends to the north and south really care what the fcc
> >
> >>says what americans can/cannot do? not likely....

WRT to "freebanding" within the US and its territories, all I can say is to
go
ahead and do it. If you get popped, you have only yourself to blame.

J
> >
> >
> > Actually, yes. The treaties for use of various frequencies are there to
> > protect all the various countries that are signatories to them. The
> > Canadians are pretty hard on pirates (though they also have some rules
in
> > place to give greater latitude on some bands than we do). I don't know
what
> > communications law is like in Mexico, but I imagine that they deal with
> > people operating out of band/off channel too.
> >
> >
> treaties not withstanding have you heard 10 & 11 meters recently? the
> developing world is looking for the cheapest way to communicate with
> their expatriates (sp?) in the u.s. one way to do it is using a setup
> that after an initial outlay for equipment is basically free. their
> problem is propagation not the gov.
>
> >

> >
> >
> >
>

2226. Re: Good news

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-05 04:22:05 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <NV_pb.22578$p.320465@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 81801
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.swap

Steveo wrote:
> Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com> wrote:
>
>>Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote:
>>
>>> Then let us hope that he is a shining beacon of behavior for
>>>the cause of those who do away for the code test!
>>>
>>> - Mike KB3EIA -
>>>
>>
>>It will be like the Cingular commercial.."can you hear me now?" <g>
>>
> I just saved a ton of money on my auto insurance.

AFLAC!

- Mike KB3EIA -

2227. Re: Good news

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-05 04:27:22 UTC
From: Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com>
Message-ID: <20031104232722.096$CY@newsreader.com>
Source record: 81803
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.swap

Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote:
> Steveo wrote:
> > Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com> wrote:
> >
> >>Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote:
> >>
> >>> Then let us hope that he is a shining beacon of behavior for
> >>>the cause of those who do away for the code test!
> >>>
> >>> - Mike KB3EIA -
> >>>
> >>
> >>It will be like the Cingular commercial.."can you hear me now?" <g>
> >>
> > I just saved a ton of money on my auto insurance.
>
> AFLAC!
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -
>
Gilbert at his best.

2228. Re: Good news

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-05 04:48:07 UTC
From: Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com>
Message-ID: <20031104234807.087$aT@newsreader.com>
Source record: 81804
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.swap

```
"Landshark" <S3Buell@jgkdls.com> wrote:
> "Steveo" <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com> wrote in message
> news:20031104202818.589$LX_-_@newsreader.com...
> > Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com> wrote:
> > > Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote:
> > > > Then let us hope that he is a shining beacon of behavior
> > > > for the cause of those who do away for the code test!
> > > >
> > > > - Mike KB3EIA -
> > > >
> > > It will be like the Cingular commercial.."can you hear me now?" <g>
> > >
> > I just saved a ton of money on my auto insurance.
>
> Watching a little more TV lately?
>
> Landshark
>
You too! ;)
```

2229. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-05 05:55:50 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3FA890E8.E59C356E@earthlink.net>
Source record: 81805

Hans K0HB wrote:
>
> "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote
>
> > "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
> > news:PQwpb.3926$Oo4.1159@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
>
> > >
> > > A friend (a reggie recording artist)
> > >
> >
> > Isn't that reggae?
>
> Dwight prefers 'reggie' because it sounds, you know, less ..... black.

That whitebread Elton John is a Reggie artist.

Dave K8MN

2230. Re: Why n8 dogie is an idiot

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-05 05:55:51 UTC
From: Radioman <radio@ptt.edu>
Message-ID: <3FA890E7.565A7275@ptt.edu>
Source record: 81806
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.dogie.is.an.idiot

> (wonder why the closet
> walkie talkie operator hasn't come out in the open yet).

Because if you hide in the closet when you jam the
repeater with your HT, no one can find you!!!

2231. Re: Why n8 dogie is an idiot

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-05 06:28:59 UTC
From: Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com>
Message-ID: <20031105012859.679$cO@newsreader.com>
Source record: 81807
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.dogie.is.an.idiot

```
Radioman <radio@ptt.edu> wrote:
> > (wonder why the closet
> > walkie talkie operator hasn't come out in the open yet).
>
> Because if you hide in the closet when you jam the
> repeater with your HT, no one can find you!!!
>
Your dogie might..
```

2232. Re: ARRL has no FIRE for sale?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-05 07:11:35 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <REMOVETHISkc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <boavuj$1btrmi$5@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 81825

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:%zQpb.8495$Oo4.21@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> The ARRL leaves that up to the local Public Information Officers. These
are
> un-elected positions within the section.
>
> The ball was dropped apparantly, or they were just too busy to bother.
> Then after the event, the press isn't interested.
>
> It's been like that for years. I agree...we need to start blowing our
own
> horns.
>
> Dan/W4NTI

We all can work with our local (within state) media outlets as either a club function or as an individual when our local groups are doing cool stuff or good things. We still could use the positive exposure when it comes to larger scale events like the wildfires or similar from the larger media outlets such as the press, and of course the large networks like CBS, ABC, NBC, FOX, MSNBC, CNN (and whatever other initials we can come up with. There inlies the need for a group, large in scale, allegedly like the Arrl, to do press releases or build contacts within the media etc. Groups like the arrl have the alleged clout and size to catch the attention of the larger media outlets.

Doing a comparison with another group that I am guessing that a good percentage of the group here is eligible for..... AARP! More people know a heck of alot more about the AARP than the ARRL..... And both are important to both groups.

--
Ryan KC8PMX

Some people are like Slinkies . . . not really good for anything, but you still can't help but smile when you see one tumble down the stairs.

>
> "Ryan, KC8PMX" <REMOVETHISkc8pmx@diamondcs.net> wrote in message
> news:bo8co4$1aok9h$2@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de...
> > I am gonna stab myself in the foot for this one before any of you all
want
> > to, but what I think Lennie is trying to get at, is that nowhere in the
> > media has amateur radio taken any form of the spotlight on this event.
I
> > was sick for the past six or seven days and spent alot of time home

> watching
> > tv between resting. Nowhere did I see anything mentioned about ham
radio.
> >
> > On a positive note, this would have been a great example of showing how
> > valuable ham radio is supposed to be. It wouldn't cost the arrl much to
> send
> > press releases of this to the major networks, Hell, I chip in for the
> stamps
> > if that is the case!!!!!! Remember, a good defense is a good offense!
> (re:
> > arrl claims to "defend" amateur radio)
> >
> >
> > This is one of those one in a million times I would even vaguely come
> close
> > to agreeing with Lennie the License-less. I think I am gonna have
> > nightmares now!
> >
> >
> >
> > --
> > Ryan KC8PMX
> >
> > Some people are like Slinkies . . . not really good for anything, but
you
> > still can't help but smile when you see one tumble down the stairs.
> >
> > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
> > news:6hXnb.12430$FI2.2336@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> > >
> > > "Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
> > > news:20031029162418.06226.00001249@mb-m19.aol.com...
> > > > In article <x7Snb.8999$X22.1187@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>,
> > > "Dan/W4NTI"
> > > > <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> writes:
> > > >
> > > > >> All the ARRL news seems to be AFTER-the-fact "reporting,"
> > > > >>
> > > > >> LHA
> > > > >
> > > > >Thats what makes the ARRL a legitimate news source for Amateur
Radio
> > > > >information.
> > > >
> > > > So...you are saying that ALL amateur radio information is always
> > > > late?
> > > >
> > > > Whatever happened to the National Traffic System? You know,
> > > > those dittyboppers still thinking that "CW" is the bestest thing

> > > > since sliced bread?
> > > >
> > > > CNN, Fox, MSNBC, CBS, NBC, ABC are covering the California
> > > > Firestorms in real time, "live" as you civilian non-broadcasters
> > > > call it. Have ANY of those TV news services "covered" anything
of
> > > > amateur radio emergency/disaster teams heroically working to
> > > > aid the public? When and where did they "work" that scene?
> > > >
> > > > Feel free to report all tha news in a month, long after
> containment.
> > > >
> > > > >Not like CNN, which I am SURE you watch, that makes it up as
> > > > >they go.
> > > >
> > > > 17 dead, over 1500 homes destroyed, over a million acres burned
> > > > (over 800 square miles), over $2 Billion in damages, and
> firestorms
> > > > are still raging in two major areas. One of NBC's remote vans
got
> > > > caught in the fire and destroyed, crew (Chuck Henry at the mike)
> > > > saved by a fire crew. Live, on-air courtesy of another TV crew.
> > > >
> > > > Hardly "making it up as they go along."
> > > >
> > > > ...and all you can do is mean-mouth individuals that don't love,
> > > > honor, and cherish morsemanship?
> > > >
> > > > LHA
> > >
> > > Poor Poor Lennie, he is getting worse and worse. He fails to
> comprehend
> > > that professional news reporters get paid, and by golly, its their
job.
> > >
> > > The ARRL is more interested in compilling the events and accuratly
> > reporting
> > > the information to the amateur community. Not you Lennie, since you
> not
> > a
> > > licensed operator.
> > >
> > > And of course the ham operators are not in the news. They hardly ever
> > are.
> > > Real emergency operators don't seek publicity. They are there to do a
> job
> > > and don't have time for talking with paid reporters. They are much
too
> > busy
> > > trying to save lives.

> > >
> > > As for your 'swipe' at the National Traffic System. It is fine and
> going
> > > strong Lennie. I operate both SSB and CW sessions on a nightly basis.
> > Not
> > > to mention my Military Affiliate Radio System networks.
> > >
> > > Tell me Lennie....what do you contribute to your community and nation?
> > >
> > > Dan/W4NTI
> > >
> > >
> >
> >
>
>

2233. Re: ARRL has no FIRE for sale?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-05 07:12:43 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <REMOVETHISkc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <boavul$1btrmi$6@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 81826

If ya remember, post something about that here if you can.

--
Ryan KC8PMX

Why is it one careless match can start a forest fire, but
it takes a whole box to start a barbecue?

> I saw on the news the other day, some homeland defense official (can't
> recall who it was), was saying that they plan on making use of the
> thousands of ham radio operators as part of homeland defense.
>

2234. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-05 08:05:11 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <Xa2qb.9997$9M3.9907@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 81808

"Kim W5TIT" wrote:
> "Dwight Stewart" wrote:
> > (snip) I suppose you're now going to say immigrant
> > adults have more personally, better etiquette, and a
> > greater work ethic, than non-immigrant adults in this
> > country, which is why immigrant adults, not non-immigrant
> > adults, work in the restaurants you go to.
>
> Yep, that's exactly what I'm saying. And, just for you and
> Jim I'll say this: some.

Your bigotry towards American workers (non-immigrants) is noted. However, we're straying off the subject with way too many personal anecdotes, so lets get back to the core of this issue.

Again, I firmly believe the ONLY reason some people won't do some jobs is because of the wages paid. There are people in this country (non-immigrants) willing to walk into the containment chamber of a nuclear reactor if the pay is good enough. There are people (non-immigrants) willing to walk 500 ft high steel girders of a building construction site if the pay is good enough. There are people (non-immigrants) willing to place their lives on the line to protect you from crime if the pay is good enough. There are people (non-immigrants) willing to lay their lives on the line to defend this country if the pay is good enough. In other words, there are people (non-immigrants) willing to do any job, no matter how bad or how dangerous, if the pay is good enough. For you to now say otherwise, and instead insist Americans just won't work because they're too lazy or too uppish (immigrants workers are needed instead), is a slap in the face of every hard working American.

If some of your friends and associates are different and won't work if the pay is good (which I highly doubt), that says more about the people you hang out with than it does about the American worker. The Americans I see all around me are willing to work. However, the key issue for all of them is the wages paid. It costs a lot of money to even be poor in this country today, Kim. Average rent prices are approaching $700 per month. Average utility prices are approaching $200 per month. Average car and insurance payments, even for an older used car, are approaching $250 per month. Average food prices, even for a young couple, are approaching $250 per month. That doesn't include cloths, medical expenses, gas for the car to get to work, car repairs, hair cuts, school costs for those who want to better their lives, and so on. And that certainly doesn't include luxuries or children (mentioned because some don't think the poor should even have children).

The average minimum wage worker is lucky to bring home $600 per month after taxes. With that, even a two income family will have to give up some of the basics of life (a car, a home, food, or something). Needless to say, even common sense suggests few people want to work in those low paying jobs and would rather hold out as long as possible for better paying jobs. You seem to interpret that as they're simply too lazy or too uppish to work.

Bringing in immigrants to fill those jobs is not the answer. That still leaves the people described above out of work and looking for jobs. Indeed, filling those lower paying jobs with immigrants only increases the glut of workers seeking slightly better paying jobs, driving wages down for those jobs too. And the cycle repeats for the next higher paying jobs as workers already in those slightly better paying jobs seek higher paying work to escape the glut in workers seeking their jobs. The ripple effect of this practice is undermining the entire American labor force. In the end, the inevitable result of all this is a much lower standard of living for all working class Americans. And those people are not going to be happy campers, even less so as they hear some describe them as too lazy or too uppish to work.

Increasing wages is the only answer. And if that drives some less efficient companies out of business, well too bad. There are no guarantees in this country (as Charles says) and, if the business is at all worthwhile, plenty of other, hopefully better managed, companies will quickly spring up to take their place.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

2235. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-05 08:55:36 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <cW2qb.10010$9M3.726@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 81809

"Kim W5TIT" wrote:
>
> I'm talking of friendly chats about the topic.
> I am speaking of racist comments and ways
> of treating people.

No, from what I've seen, you're speaking of your own interpretation of
those comments and then judging others based on that criteria alone.

> Isn't that reggae?

If you say so. I don't listen to that music.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

2236. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-05 09:00:35 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <T_2qb.10012$9M3.603@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 81810

"Hans K0HB" wrote:
>
> Dwight prefers 'reggie' because it sounds, you know,
> less ..... black.

And Hans prefers to make sly comments about a spelling error instead of discussing the topic.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

2237. Re: ARRL has no FIRE for sale?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-05 11:06:01 UTC
From: "S. Hanrahan" <aa7ya@hotmail.com>
Message-ID: <fulhqvg9mr46t69cnqo6319ftebkreh1k7@4ax.com>
Source record: 81811

On 28 Oct 2003 04:35:14 GMT, lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote:

> As of 1 PM EST on the 27th of October the ARRL website news
> page had NOTHING about the California wildfires. NOTHING.

Why would you depend on the ARRL website for "up to the minute" news when there are literally thousands of other news sources available; TV, radio, newspapers, the internet. The LA Times incidently also has a website of their own.

Let's see. There's the Fire Incident Headquarters, based out of Idaho, they have a website that updates page viewers on the progress of every conceivable fire in the United States, which the national media uses for a source of information on reporting fires.

The ARRL never mentions anything about the dozen Western states that are burning every summer for months on end. No big deal. Pick up a newspaper, turn a radio or TV on, or log on to the net, you can get far better results from thousands of sources at your disposal rather than trying to make this whole thing a non-issue of bashing the ARRL which you're not a member or.

I'm a member of the ARRL, and the last source of general breaking news I come to rely on is the ARRL.

Stacey/AA7YA

2238. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-05 11:08:02 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <boalli$uns@library2.airnews.net>
Source record: 81812

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:Xa2qb.9997$9M3.9907@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> "Kim W5TIT" wrote:
> > "Dwight Stewart" wrote:
> > > (snip) I suppose you're now going to say immigrant
> > > adults have more personally, better etiquette, and a
> > > greater work ethic, than non-immigrant adults in this
> > > country, which is why immigrant adults, not non-immigrant
> > > adults, work in the restaurants you go to.
> >
> > Yep, that's exactly what I'm saying. And, just for you and
> > Jim I'll say this: some.
>
>
> Your bigotry towards American workers (non-immigrants) is noted.
>

Uh huh...OK Lar--- I mean Dwight.

>
> However,
> we're straying off the subject with way too many personal anecdotes, so
lets
> get back to the core of this issue.
>
> Again, I firmly believe the ONLY reason some people won't do some jobs is
> because of the wages paid.
>

And, I believe your right, partly. I don't believe anything is that
concrete, Dwight. I am pretty sure there are lots of people who are like
you describe and I am pretty sure--certain in fact--that there are people
like I describe. Nevertheless, I certainly *don't* believe the immigrant
problem in this country is as bad as you believe.

>
> There are people in this country (non-immigrants)
> willing to walk into the containment chamber of a nuclear reactor if the
pay
> is good enough. There are people (non-immigrants) willing to walk 500 ft
> high steel girders of a building construction site if the pay is good
> enough. There are people (non-immigrants) willing to place their lives on
> the line to protect you from crime if the pay is good enough. There are
> people (non-immigrants) willing to lay their lives on the line to defend
> this country if the pay is good enough. In other words, there are people

> (non-immigrants) willing to do any job, no matter how bad or how
dangerous,
> if the pay is good enough. For you to now say otherwise, and instead
insist
> Americans just won't work because they're too lazy or too uppish
(immigrants
> workers are needed instead), is a slap in the face of every hard working
> American.
>

Whutevah...

>
> If some of your friends and associates are different and won't work if the
> pay is good (which I highly doubt), that says more about the people you
hang
> out with than it does about the American worker.
>

And, it's OK for you to call me a bigot because of my opinion, OK Larr---I
mean Dwight.

>
> The Americans I see all
> around me are willing to work. However, the key issue for all of them is
the
> wages paid. It costs a lot of money to even be poor in this country today,
> Kim.
>

Yes, it does, Dwight. And I am pretty sure I know more about that than you
do. Just 30 years ago I was a welfare mom with two kids, no car, a deadbeat
dad, was a High School Dropout, and lived in a town of less than 1K people.
My kids were raised on fried rice, rice casseroles that I came up with where
Cream of Mushroom Soup was a staple and meat was more a flavor--one piece
maybe two of chicken broke up and thrown into the recipe. Peanut butter
and jelly was often breakfast *and* lunch.

I watched all around me as people got "comfortable" with being bitter and
dismayed and beaten down about where they were. I watched them in my
rear-view mirror as I made decisions I sure enough didn't want to be making
about where I was going to live, what I was going to do for a living--all
the while telling these two kids "everything's OK." And, I watched all
around as people who'd become accustomed to being poor and sad were telling
me I was being a fool to ever think it was going to be any different. They
are probably still there.

>
> Average rent prices are approaching $700 per month. Average utility
> prices are approaching $200 per month. Average car and insurance payments,
> even for an older used car, are approaching $250 per month. Average food
> prices, even for a young couple, are approaching $250 per month. That

> doesn't include cloths, medical expenses, gas for the car to get to work,
> car repairs, hair cuts, school costs for those who want to better their
> lives, and so on. And that certainly doesn't include luxuries or children
> (mentioned because some don't think the poor should even have children).
>

And, I empathize with each and every one of the folks who start out young today. It's hard--extremely hard. But, you know what? Housekeeping pays high dollar these days...very high dollar. And, I am not talking about getting a job with a nitwit hog of a person who has a company paying minimum wage and getting people involved in the business. I am talking about jobs like childcare, housekeeping, medical transcription and other computer jobs, pooper scooper, dog walking, house sitting, all kinds of stuff people let go right by them every day--because they are too busy being sad.

There's folks like that, Dwight. Yep, you're right. There are folks who *will* do those jobs. But they are in the minority and how ironic. Because it is more the minority immigrant population that does those jobs than a lot of US citizens.

>
> The average minimum wage worker is lucky to bring home $600 per month
> after taxes. With that, even a two income family will have to give up some
> of the basics of life (a car, a home, food, or something). Needless to
say,
> even common sense suggests few people want to work in those low paying
jobs
> and would rather hold out as long as possible for better paying jobs. You
> seem to interpret that as they're simply too lazy or too uppish to work.
>

I know all about what the cost of living is, Dwight. And I know it from a poor perspective and the perspective I am at now. Or, should I say the perspective of believing nothing will ever change to making my own way to where I am comfortable? And, if need be, I'll start over again. Hell no, I wouldn't like it--I'd hate it--but I would do what I gotta do.

>
> Bringing in immigrants to fill those jobs is not the answer. That still
> leaves the people described above out of work and looking for jobs.
Indeed,
> filling those lower paying jobs with immigrants only increases the glut of
> workers seeking slightly better paying jobs, driving wages down for those
> jobs too. And the cycle repeats for the next higher paying jobs as workers
> already in those slightly better paying jobs seek higher paying work to
> escape the glut in workers seeking their jobs. The ripple effect of this
> practice is undermining the entire American labor force. In the end, the
> inevitable result of all this is a much lower standard of living for all
> working class Americans. And those people are not going to be happy
campers,
> even less so as they hear some describe them as too lazy or too uppish to
> work.

>

Yes, it is a vicious cycle...one more people need to jump on the bandwagon about and get pissed off enough to change. But they won't, Dwight. It's been this way for years--this is nothing new. Hell, you buy anything from China lately? You ever said to yourself you're going to stop buying things from China? BRING IMMIGRANTS IN?????? Hell, stop buying from China. Worry about the commies coming over here? Hell, stop buying from China.

>
> Increasing wages is the only answer. And if that drives some less
> efficient companies out of business, well too bad. There are no guarantees
> in this country (as Charles says) and, if the business is at all
worthwhile,
> plenty of other, hopefully better managed, companies will quickly spring
up
> to take their place.
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
>
>

If your answer is to simply increase wages...you're setting yourself up to be miserable. Companies are cutting back, trimming the fat, and freezing wages. And, that is going to be the trend for a few years. The more people want to deny that 9-11 "didn't affect us," the more they are putting their heads in the sand. Since 9-11, this country has been trying to recover. We'll do it...but we were and are a lot more affected than we admit--and Binnie over there knows it.

Oh, and I note that it's OK--from your perspective--to say "too bad" if your solution happens to drive some less efficient companies out of business (re: your remark above, "And if that drives some less efficient companies out of business, well too bad.") But you criticize and call me a bigot for my thoughts along the same lines, from my perspective.

Thanks, Lar---I mean Dwight.

Kim W5TIT

2239. Re: ARRL has no FIRE for sale?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-05 11:15:04 UTC
From: "S. Hanrahan" <aa7ya@hotmail.com>
Message-ID: <csmhqv4rc03o7nsl4f0cnudl0i2a8f0b70@4ax.com>
Source record: 81813

On 28 Oct 2003 03:41:13 GMT, lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote:

> Busy morose code users activate Nets
> and Prepare For The Worst. This last one really had an impact
> with all the "devestation" everywhere, didn't it?

This impacts your life how? Right, I thought so.

Stacey/AA7YA

2240. Re: ARRL has no FIRE for sale?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-05 11:24:18 UTC
From: "S. Hanrahan" <aa7ya@hotmail.com>
Message-ID: <u8nhqv802mcnhca6jt6jfb875142hu0h56@4ax.com>
Source record: 81814

On Thu, 30 Oct 2003 04:10:35 GMT, "Phil Kane"
<Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote:

> This issue has been kicking around the ARRL Pacific Division
> "cabinet" for almost 15 years that I know of (I was in same until 4
> years ago). The problem is that the Postal Service wants a big hunk
> of money for air mail to individual subscribers - the League would
> have to assess a healthy surcharge to Pacific Section members to
> make up the difference. You don't want that sort of "special
> treatment".

No doubt, every annual paying member, no matter where they are, would
be feeling the bite of higher member and subscription fees. It would
be the feasible thing to do to give "special treatment" to those in
the Pacific Division. This may in fact be another reason why the
Pacific Division isn't given "special treatment"

Stacey/AA7YA

2241. Re: CB Amplifiers For Sale

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-05 11:38:27 UTC
From: David Robbins <noone@nowhere.com>
Message-ID: <7cudndfji7nFfDWiRVn-sw@crocker.com>
Source record: 81815

"Gastonia Trailer Trash" <Freeband@islegalhams.net> wrote in message
news:boamamcss0@pita.alt.net...
> x-no-archive: yes
> > Oh yea...I can see they are running scared over at one stop.
> > Paint a target on your back?? How about www.cbamplifiers.com???? Jesus,
it
> > doesn't get any more blatant than that. I don't see Pascale
> worrying....Hammie
> > hero Riley Hollingsworth is too busy getting his nuts off sending out
> violation
> > notices to those bad old hammies who are moving and not changing their
> addresses.
> >
>
>

there is nothing there but a counter... you want amps, go here:
http://www.davemade.com/mobile.htm and here:
http://www.bigradios.com/shadow/page3.htm and for other modified cb's:
http://www.exportradios.com/, and who would need a 15kw capable mobile
antenna: http://users.cis.net/kingpop/Bigcoil.htm (unless they are running
davemade of course),

2242. Re: Why n8wwm dogie is an idiot

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-05 11:40:40 UTC
From: charlesb <n5pvl@sbcglobal.net>
Message-ID: <Yk5qb.57$mp4.35@newssvr14.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 81816
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.dogie.is.an.idiot

"Landshark" <S3Buell@jgkdls.com> wrote in message
news:pG_pb.13878$Qu.6381@newssvr14.news.prodigy.com...

Landshark: Are you the one who was knocking at our door last night, saying
"Candygram" in a muffled voice when we asked who it was?

Charles Brabham, N5PVL

2243. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-05 11:51:13 UTC
From: "S. Hanrahan" <aa7ya@hotmail.com>
Message-ID: <hrohqvsvskb6dsg1uro0gt5l85u2mkkhid@4ax.com>
Source record: 81817

On Sun, 26 Oct 2003 09:51:36 -0600, "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
wrote:

>"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
>news:20031025235048.07346.00001449@mb-m26.aol.com...
>> In article <43smb.1464$X22.446@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dwight
>> Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> writes:
>>
>> >
>> > Actually, the Civil War wasn't about slavery, but I'll avoid an
>> >unnecessary repetition of those facts. I'll instead point out that the
>> >majority of blacks in this country today are not decendents of American
>> >slaves - they, or their ancestors, entered this country in the 150 or so
>> >years after slavery was abolished (the majority of those within the last
>> >twenty years). Therefore, if you have a complaint, perhaps you should
>focus
>> >on those members of recent administrations who helped ease immigration
>> >requirements, not on something that happened many decades ago. Both
>> >political parties are responsible - the Democrats want voters and the
>> >Republicans want cheap labor for big business.
>>
>> I believe requirements for immigration and naturalization should be
>> extremely rigid, involving extensive background checks and a requirement
>> that the person immigrating have the means in place to make his/her
>> own living.
>>
>
>And, I believe the immigration laws are appropriate, although there is
>probably room for improvement in the areas of process and validation
>procedures. I think there are background checks in place as a matter of
>policy--they just aren't done or aren't done adequately enough. We can put
>all the laws and rules into place we want--it is getting them carried out
>that is the problem.

Typical politically correct liberal open-border policy. This is
written into the Democratic playbook. (pandering to minorities).

2244. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-05 12:01:28 UTC
From: "S. Hanrahan" <aa7ya@hotmail.com>
Message-ID: <99phqvo4anhf5qva6628rokkgivo2m8foo@4ax.com>
Source record: 81818

On Thu, 30 Oct 2003 07:07:43 GMT, "Dwight Stewart"
<stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote:

>"Hans K0HB" wrote:
>>
>> To save you the effort of further imagining, here is
>> my position in three words.
>>
>> "Race is irrelevant."
>>
>> You seem to place great emphasis on race/ethnic
>> background; ipso facto, you're a racist.
>
>
> You only say that because I'm white. If that were not the case, you'd be
>saying the same thing to Condoleezza Rice (Nat, Sec, Advisor), Colin Powell
>(Sec, of State), Jesse Jackson, Al Sharpton, Mary Berry (Chair, US Com. on
>Civil Rights), and a very long list of other minorities who think race and
>race issues are very relevant in this country. Why should it be any less so
>for whites? In reality, your open criticism of whites who talk about race,
>without criticism of other races who do the same, only demonstrates your own
>racism towards other whites.
>

Don't presume what Condi and Colin think just because of their skin
color. The only ones who make race an issue are Al Sharpton and Jesse
Jackson, both of whom who've never worked a day in their life or set
foot in a church.

Condi and Colin are where they are in life not because they didn't
shirk just to get ahead. On the other hand, in the civil rights
circles, every leader (Jesse, Al, and Kweisi Mfume) has used the race
issue to get where they are today, through tactics of intimidation and
extortion.

Does this make me racist? Hell no, it's the truth.

Stacey/AA7YA

2245. Re: NCI Petition for Rulemaking

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-05 12:24:48 UTC
From: "S. Hanrahan" <aa7ya@hotmail.com>
Message-ID: <1sqhqv4jh49sbnivjmeouou2i1bmaddkpc@4ax.com>
Source record: 81819

On 6 Sep 2003 07:23:43 -0700, brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote:

>S. Hanrahan <aa7ya@hotmail.com> wrote in message
news:<elrflv4h98fu0mq5nqeivn0851u9bn2oe4@4ax.com>...
>> On Thu, 04 Sep 2003 10:00:13 -0400, Bob Brock <bbrock@i-america.net>
>> wrote:
>>
>>
>> >Why would you want to foil computer copy?
>>
>> Because no law says you can't.
>>
>> >For you to do the test to
>> >make sure that it works and then advocate it's use, you can't really
>> >say that wasn't your intention.
>>
>> What if it was? Nothing you can do about it but learn the code.
>
>Oh, geez. Here's another Morse Elitist that apparently advocates
>sending code so piss poorly that it can't be computer copied. Hoo-ah!

At 5 WPM, you don't need a computer to copy good or poor code.

2246. Re: NCI Petition for Rulemaking

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-05 12:35:58 UTC
From: Bert Craig <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM>
Message-ID: <O86qb.1122$VW5.1323006@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>
Source record: 81820

"S. Hanrahan" <aa7ya@hotmail.com> wrote in message
news:1sqhqv4jh49sbnivjmeouou2i1bmaddkpc@4ax.com...
> On 6 Sep 2003 07:23:43 -0700, brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote:
> >Oh, geez. Here's another Morse Elitist that apparently advocates
> >sending code so piss poorly that it can't be computer copied. Hoo-ah!
>
> At 5 WPM, you don't need a computer to copy good or poor code.

I think you've just hit the nail on the head. It's really not how hard or easy 5-wpm is, it's the willingness (or lack thereof) to make the initial (i.e. "initiative") effort to learn the 43 required characters.

I came into the fray relatively unbiased re. the code vs. no-code debate. However, once you hear some of the arguments presented, it's hard not to see it for what it really is.

73 de Bert
WA2SI

2247. Re: ARRL you can Kiss my $39.00 a Year Good Bye

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-05 12:41:09 UTC
From: "S. Hanrahan" <aa7ya@hotmail.com>
Message-ID: <3rrhqvcaksqhf5p9q7bcm9hedno67livd3@4ax.com>
Source record: 81821

On Fri, 17 Oct 2003 23:19:54 GMT, "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
wrote:

>Yet 5wpm will even put me to sleep.

Me too. I can copy 45-50 WPM in my head, but I can't write it down
fast enough for a full complete one minute of copy.

Stacey/AA7YA

2248. Re: ARRL you can Kiss my $39.00 a Year Good Bye

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-05 12:44:36 UTC
From: "S. Hanrahan" <aa7ya@hotmail.com>
Message-ID: <lvrhqvgj3mqu3ue50besumo3mu7j582ppm@4ax.com>
Source record: 81822

On 18 Oct 2003 00:05:26 GMT, Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com>
wrote:

>
>That's where listening at considerably faster than you can
>copy comes in. You'd be surprised how fast your abilities
>improve. W1AW code practice sessions are good.

Yep. Listening to W1AW, if you can copy 7ï¿½ WPM or even 10 WPM, 5 WPM
comes easy.

When I tested for my 20 WPM back in 1993, I had code tapes that were
sending 22 WPM code, coupled with actual on-air QSO's and listening to
W1AW, the 20 WPM code test was a breeze.

Stacey/AA7YA

2249. Re: Why n8wwm dogie is an idiot

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-05 13:20:09 UTC
From: N8WWM <N8WWM@home.net>
Message-ID: <boate90u79@drn.newsguy.com>
Source record: 81823
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Please try to keep it in your pants, Rev Brabham. Beat your wife
lately?

In article <Yk5qb.57$mp4.35@newssvr14.news.prodigy.com>, charlesb says...
>
>
>"Landshark" <S3Buell@jgkdls.com> wrote in message
>news:pG_pb.13878$Qu.6381@newssvr14.news.prodigy.com...
>
>Landshark: Are you the one who was knocking at our door last night, saying
>"Candygram" in a muffled voice when we asked who it was?
>
>Charles Brabham, N5PVL
>
>

2250. Re: Why n8wwm is a radio hater.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-05 13:25:48 UTC
From: N8WWM <N8WWM@home.net>
Message-ID: <boatos0v94@drn.newsguy.com>
Source record: 81824
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

In article <Xns9429E58B410DE1234567890@216.196.97.136>, Neil Down says...
>
>jim <3carroll@optonline.net> wrote in news:3FA84330.1000701@optonline.net:
>
>>
>>
>> Steveo wrote:
>>> Neil Down <buckiewheat@assclown.com> wrote:
>>>
>>>>Has doug been fined? Ill answer for you a resounding
>>>>NO!
>>>>
>>>
>>> So by your reasoning, unless you're fined you're innocent.
>>>
>>> That's odd coming from the re.radio.cb legal police. What about
>>> all the keyclown name calling? No fine means innocent in your book$.
>>>
>>> So until you produce evidence of fines, that the regular posters in
>>> rec.radio.cb , have been charged with, please STFU.
>>
>> makes sense...
>
>
>
>to an ignoramous
>
True. I come from a long line of ignoramous's and it makes perfect sense to me.

2251. Re: ARRL you can Kiss my $39.00 a Year Good Bye

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-05 14:19:49 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3FA90705.6030102@psu.edu>
Source record: 81827

S. Hanrahan wrote:
> On Fri, 17 Oct 2003 23:19:54 GMT, "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
> wrote:
>
>
>
>>Yet 5wpm will even put me to sleep.
>
>
> Me too. I can copy 45-50 WPM in my head, but I can't write it down
> fast enough for a full complete one minute of copy.

I keep getting these images of you two listening to a ARRL Morse code CD to fall asleep to, instead of the music most people would use! 8^)

- Mike KB3EIA -

2252. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-05 17:15:09 UTC
From: Gr&#65533;mw&#65533;tch th&#65533; &#65533;nfl&#65533;pp&#65533;bl&#65533; <Gr&#65533;mw&#65533;tch@NOSPAM.THANKS.IM.FULL.lycos.co.de>
Message-ID: <xeaqb.1478$Z25.1269@newsread4.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 81828

--
"All persons, living or dead, are purely coincidental, and should not be
construed."
"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:Xa2qb.9997$9M3.9907@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net...

: Again, I firmly believe the ONLY reason some people won't do some jobs
is
: because of the wages paid. There are people in this country
(non-immigrants)
: willing to walk into the containment chamber of a nuclear reactor if the
pay
: is good enough. There are people (non-immigrants) willing to walk 500 ft
: high steel girders of a building construction site if the pay is good
: enough. There are people (non-immigrants) willing to place their lives on
: the line to protect you from crime if the pay is good enough. There are
: people (non-immigrants) willing to lay their lives on the line to defend
: this country if the pay is good enough. In other words, there are people
: (non-immigrants) willing to do any job, no matter how bad or how
dangerous,
: if the pay is good enough. For you to now say otherwise, and instead
insist
: Americans just won't work because they're too lazy or too uppish
(immigrants
: workers are needed instead), is a slap in the face of every hard working
: American.

&#65533;Holy frijol&#65533;?

&#65533;Are you saying that a resarant&#65533; dishwasher should be paid as nuclear
reactor worker?

I shall come to be on the next available transport!

BGO

2253. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-05 17:26:15 UTC
From: Gr&#65533;mw&#65533;tch th&#65533; &#65533;nfl&#65533;pp&#65533;bl&#65533; <Gr&#65533;mw&#65533;tch@NOSPAM.THANKS.IM.FULL.lycos.co.de>
Message-ID: <Xoaqb.1520$Z25.1374@newsread4.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 81829

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:88hob.11810$X22.6477@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net...
:
: > Only if in objecting they raise an alarm only over Hispanic,
: > Asian and African immigrants.
:
:
: They're the primary immigrants today, Dave. When talking about
: immigration, who would you rather I talk about - Aboriginal Australians?

"There is no racial bigotry here. I do not look down on niggers, kikes, wops
or greasers. Here, you are all equally worthless."

---Sgt. Hartman, Full Metal Jacket

2254. Re: ARRL you can Kiss my $39.00 a Year Good Bye

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-05 18:05:10 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0311051005.75dc59b9@posting.google.com>
Source record: 81830

Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message news:<3FA90705.6030102@psu.edu>...
> S. Hanrahan wrote:
> > On Fri, 17 Oct 2003 23:19:54 GMT, "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
> > wrote:
> >>Yet 5wpm will even put me to sleep.
> >
> > Me too. I can copy 45-50 WPM in my head, but I can't write it down
> > fast enough for a full complete one minute of copy.
>
> I keep getting these images of you two listening to a ARRL Morse code CD
> to fall asleep to, instead of the music most people would use! 8^)
>

Ahhhhhh! But Mike! To >>SOME<< of us it >>IS<< music to the ear!

=)

How's your fall looking? It's absolutely spectacular here this year!

73

Steve, K4YZ

2255. Re: Why Freebanders Are Not Cber's

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-05 18:34:10 UTC
From: keyclownzmustgo@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <17b206c0.0311051034.49ceb414@posting.google.com>
Source record: 81831
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Landshark" <S3Buell@jgkdls.com> wrote in message
news:<oG_pb.13874$Qu.4630@newssvr14.news.prodigy.com>...
> "Steveo" <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com> wrote in message
> news:20031104222749.978$VD_-_@newsreader.com...
> > Neil Down <buckiewheat@assclown.com> wrote:
> > >I am not wa3moj
> > >
> > Yes you are.
>
> Of course he is. That's why he
> admitted and was able to make a
> complaint against Scott for using
> the Nic WA3MOJ@AOL.Com
> to Scott's ISP. He had to send a
> complaint through his AOL account
> to Scott's ISP, otherwise they would
> just ignore the complaint.
>
> Landshark

MOJ has no AOL, if he did you would post his email to the ISP here.

PS: You dorks are not technically CBers, you are RADIO OUTLAWS and
FEDERAL CRIMINALS and therefore can be harassed at will.

2256. Re: ARRL you can Kiss my $39.00 a Year Good Bye

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-05 18:53:42 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3FA94736.9000706@psu.edu>
Source record: 81832

Steve Robeson, K4CAP wrote:
> Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message news:<3FA90705.6030102@psu.edu>...
>
>>S. Hanrahan wrote:
>>
>>>On Fri, 17 Oct 2003 23:19:54 GMT, "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
>>>wrote:
>>>
>>>>Yet 5wpm will even put me to sleep.
>>>
>>>Me too. I can copy 45-50 WPM in my head, but I can't write it down
>>>fast enough for a full complete one minute of copy.
>>
>>I keep getting these images of you two listening to a ARRL Morse code CD
>>to fall asleep to, instead of the music most people would use! 8^)
>>
>
>
> Ahhhhhh! But Mike! To >>SOME<< of us it >>IS<< music to the ear!

You know, I'm starting to get frustrated again. I can do nearly 20 wpm
listening to NuMorse with headphones and in a quiet room. But the leaast
bit of background noise, or the conditions on the air, and my speed
drops like a rock. I hope I'm not running up against my personal
limitations.

>
> How's your fall looking? It's absolutely spectacular here this year!

It started out looking like it was going to be pretty blah, with rain
and not much color. But then it did an about face, and got warm and
beautiful. The leaves decided not to listen to the newspaper"leaf color
experts" - whoever they are.

- Mike KB3EIA -

2257. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-05 19:12:12 UTC
From: groupk0hb@earthlink.net
Message-ID: <5ee63311.0311051112.2118b9a9@posting.google.com>
Source record: 81833

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote

> In reality, your open criticism of whites who talk about race,
> without criticism of other races who do the same, only demonstrates
> your own racism towards other whites.

No, it only shows my utter disdain for biggoted lowlifes, regardless
of complexion. If the foo shits.....

Read my lips: Race is irrelevant.

With warmest personal regards,

de Hans, K0HB
--
http://home.earthlink.net/~k0hb

2258. Re: Why Freebanders Are Not Cber's

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-05 19:15:52 UTC
From: lancer <lancer@lancer.web>
Message-ID: <3fa94bc2.87484716@news.easynews.com>
Source record: 81834
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On 5 Nov 2003 10:34:10 -0800, keyclownzmustgo@yahoo.com (Citizens For
A Keyclown-Free Newsgroup) wrote:

>"Landshark" <S3Buell@jgkdls.com> wrote in message
news:<oG_pb.13874$Qu.4630@newssvr14.news.prodigy.com>...
>> "Steveo" <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com> wrote in message
>> news:20031104222749.978$VD_-_@newsreader.com...
>> > Neil Down <buckiewheat@assclown.com> wrote:
>> > >I am not wa3moj
>> > >
>> > Yes you are.
>>
>> Of course he is. That's why he
>> admitted and was able to make a
>> complaint against Scott for using
>> the Nic WA3MOJ@AOL.Com
>> to Scott's ISP. He had to send a
>> complaint through his AOL account
>> to Scott's ISP, otherwise they would
>> just ignore the complaint.
>>
>> Landshark
>
>MOJ has no AOL, if he did you would post his email to the ISP here.
>
>PS: You dorks are not technically CBers, you are RADIO OUTLAWS and
>FEDERAL CRIMINALS and therefore can be harassed at will.

Now that looks like an admission that he is WA3MOJ.

2259. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-05 19:51:01 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <Fwcqb.11117$Oo4.2675@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 81835

"Kim W5TIT" wrote:
>
> (snip) There's folks like that, Dwight. Yep, you're
> right. There are folks who *will* do those jobs. But
> they are in the minority and how ironic. Because it is
> more the minority immigrant population that does
> those jobs than a lot of US citizens.

I give up, Kim. You've convinced yourself American workers are garbage, and immigrant workers are God's gift to the working world, and absolutely nothing is going to change your mind. This fits right into the thinking of many liberals who feel Americans deserve to be poor for all the bad things they've done, while those poor, downtrodden, immigrants deserve all the wealth they can get. And, while we sit here debating, wages for low to medium income workers continue to decline while profits for big business continues to grow - neither immigrants or a growing number of working Americans can get decent paying jobs. At the same time, the factories moving overseas are forcing more and more middle-aged and older workers out of their jobs, adding to the numbers forced into lower paying jobs. And the situation only gets increasingly hopeless as more and more people begin to think like you. Where do you think this is all going to end, Kim? Do you honestly believe big business is going to stop their efforts to drive down wages at your doorstep - that this is never going to affect you or yours? Even small businesses are going to feel the crunch as fewer can afford to buy their products. If you can't see the inevitable outcome to all this, you're simply not looking or are too shortsighted to see. And, with that, I give up as I said before.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

2260. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-05 20:39:30 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <6edqb.11413$Oo4.9859@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 81836

"Hans K0HB" wrote:
>
> No, it only shows my utter disdain for biggoted lowlifes,
> regardless of complexion. If the foo shits......

Read the definition of bigot and then explain how the sentence above
doesn't fit that definition, Hans.

Bigot (n.) One whose attitude or behavior expresses
intolerance, as because of race, religion, politics, etc.
(Funk & Wagnalls Standard Dictionary)

By the way, "bigoted" is spelled with a single "g."

> Read my lips: Race is irrelevant.

Repeating that is not going to change anything, Hans. Race issues are
everywhere in this country today and are not going to go away simply because
you want to bury your head in the sand and act like they don't exist.

While we're discussing definitions (and since you like to throw the word
"racism" around so much).

Racism (n.) An irrational belief or advocacy of the
superiority of a given group, people, or nation, usu.
ones own, on the basis of racial differences having
no scientific validity.
(Funk & Wagnalls Standard Dictionary)

Kindly show me where I've expressed a belief in or advocated the
superiority of a group in this discussion, Hans. Simply discussing a
race-related issue in a newsgroup is not racism. As such, your charge of
racism is as patently false as your charge of bigotry.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

2261. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-05 20:53:54 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <Crdqb.11038$9M3.8388@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 81837

The Grandious Vizard of South Carolina wrote:

> Bigot (n.) One whose attitude or behavior expresses
> intolerance, as because of race, religion, politics, etc.
> (Funk & Wagnalls Standard Dictionary)

> Racism (n.) An irrational belief or advocacy of the
> superiority of a given group, people, or nation, usu.
> ones own, on the basis of racial differences having
> no scientific validity.
> (Funk & Wagnalls Standard Dictionary)

Looks to me like Mr. Funk and Mr. Wagnall pretty much have you nailed dead
on.

With kindest personal regards,

de Hans, K0HB
--
http://home.earthlink.net/~k0hb

2262. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-05 21:01:16 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <wydqb.11052$9M3.3584@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 81838

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote

> And Hans prefers to make sly comments about a spelling error instead of
> discussing the topic.

I've stated my position, and you haven't persuaded me that I'm wrong.
Nothing is left to discuss.

In fact, every new post from you more eloquently makes my point than I
possibly could myself.

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB
--
http://home.earthlink.net/~k0hb

2263. Amusing ribbom "I support worldwide DX on the air waves"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-05 21:08:42 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3FA966D9.4040606@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 81839

http://www.bigradios.com/pics/wwdx.gif
Of course, as a properly licensed ham......

Though I suspect something else going on where this graphic is found:
http://www.bigradios.com/index_old2.html

;-)

2264. Re: CB Amplifiers For Sale

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-05 21:19:12 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3FA9694E.7020606@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 81840

David Robbins wrote:

>http://www.exportradios.com/
>
Why would anyone dial up a CB frequency on a "ham" radio?
<http://www.exportradios.com/prodpage.cfm?Cat_Selected=19&Subcat_Selected=49&Group_Selected=191&product_Selected=739>

2265. Re: ARRL you can Kiss my $39.00 a Year Good Bye

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-05 22:00:53 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <pqeqb.11527$Oo4.2657@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 81841

"Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
news:3FA94736.9000706@psu.edu...
> Steve Robeson, K4CAP wrote:
> > Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
news:<3FA90705.6030102@psu.edu>...
> >
> >>S. Hanrahan wrote:
> >>
> >>>On Fri, 17 Oct 2003 23:19:54 GMT, "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
> >>>wrote:
> >>>
> >>>>Yet 5wpm will even put me to sleep.
> >>>
> >>>Me too. I can copy 45-50 WPM in my head, but I can't write it down
> >>>fast enough for a full complete one minute of copy.
> >>
> >>I keep getting these images of you two listening to a ARRL Morse code CD
> >>to fall asleep to, instead of the music most people would use! 8^)
> >>
> >
> >
> > Ahhhhhh! But Mike! To >>SOME<< of us it >>IS<< music to the ear!
>
> You know, I'm starting to get frustrated again. I can do nearly 20 wpm
> listening to NuMorse with headphones and in a quiet room. But the leaast
> bit of background noise, or the conditions on the air, and my speed
> drops like a rock. I hope I'm not running up against my personal
> limitations.
>
>
>
>
> >
> > How's your fall looking? It's absolutely spectacular here this
year!
>
>
> It started out looking like it was going to be pretty blah, with rain
> and not much color. But then it did an about face, and got warm and
> beautiful. The leaves decided not to listen to the newspaper"leaf color
> experts" - whoever they are.
>
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -

>

Now that you KNOW you can actually copy International Morse Code. Throw out the canned stuff. Fire up the HF rig and use it.

You must teach your brain to 'isolate' and hear ONLY what you are trying to hear. It takes practice, but it certainly can be done.

Use the most narrow filter at first. Then widden it out. Picking up more and more interference, and try to pick out the characters.

Its fun.

Dan/W4NTI

2266. Re: CB Amplifiers For Sale

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-05 22:06:09 UTC
From: sarac <truck@saractrucknr.net>
Message-ID: <bobsa9$6i8$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 81842

"Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
news:3FA9694E.7020606@ix.netcom.com...
> David Robbins wrote:
>
> >http://www.exportradios.com/
> >
> Why would anyone dial up a CB frequency on a "ham" radio?
>
<http://www.exportradios.com/prodpage.cfm?Cat_Selected=19&Subcat_Selected=49
&Group_Selected=191&product_Selected=739>
>
>
>

Hey, thanks for posting those links. Several of the guys down
at the truck terminal in Montgomery have been looking for
linear amps for their base stations. I'll give them those links.

Good numbers,

sarac

2267. Re: Why We Freeband

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-05 23:48:53 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <F%fqb.7811$P%1.6833806@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 81843
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.swap

"Jerry Oxendine" <joxendi@bellsouth.net> wrote in message
news:_V_pb.34301$SV2.16561@bignews3.bellsouth.net...
>
> jim <3carroll@optonline.net> wrote in message
> news:3FA5BE98.5090506@optonline.net...
> >
> >
> > Brenda Ann wrote:
> > > "jim" <3carroll@optonline.net> wrote in message
> > > news:3FA5B143.9090408@optonline.net...
> > >
> > >
> > >
> > > >actually a good point. if i were to use the freq's the u.s. gov said i
> can
> > > >then what is the problem with slipping +/- 5kc's between 'channels'?
is
> > > >that freebanding?
> > >
> > >
> > > The frequencies that the US govt. says you can are those specific
> > > frequencies that constitute the 40 standard CB channels. The distance
> away
> > > from the center of any channel is tightly regulated, and you can't be
> more
> > > than 0.005% away from that center (~1.3 KHz), which is actually pretty
> broad
> > > when compared to say, broadcast AM, which is only allowed a 20 Hz
> leeway).
> > >
> >
> > that is what the u.s. gov proclaims. my point is they have no say so
> > outside territorial waters. whether or not the gov abides by itu
> > standards on this matter is open.
>
> The fact is the US Govt HAS signed on with ITU and honors *most* treaties.
> >
> > >
> > > >better yet, who the hell is the u.s. gov to tell me what is legal or
> > > >not?
> > >
> > >
> > > If you are a US citizen, they are granted that right by the

> constitution,
> > > and by treaty.
> > >
> >
> > please point out the constitutional section you mentioned.
>
> Title 47, US Code and The Communications Act of 1934 voted upon by
> Congress.

There is a major difference between Federal laws and the Constitution. The references that you cite are NOT sections of the Constitution. Please retake your civics and political science classes.

2268. Re: ARRL you can Kiss my $39.00 a Year Good Bye

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-05 23:55:30 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <S5gqb.7812$P%1.6835264@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 81844

"Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
news:3FA90705.6030102@psu.edu...
> S. Hanrahan wrote:
> > On Fri, 17 Oct 2003 23:19:54 GMT, "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
> > wrote:
> >
> >
> >
> >>Yet 5wpm will even put me to sleep.
> >
> >
> > Me too. I can copy 45-50 WPM in my head, but I can't write it down
> > fast enough for a full complete one minute of copy.
>
> I keep getting these images of you two listening to a ARRL Morse code CD
> to fall asleep to, instead of the music most people would use! 8^)
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -
>

My OM would practice Morse on the computer at night working to relearn Morse after I went to bed at night and sure enough, I drifted off to sleep to the sounds of the code!

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

2269. Re: ARRL you can Kiss my $39.00 a Year Good Bye

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-05 23:58:19 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <v8gqb.7813$P%1.6835886@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 81845

"Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
news:3FA94736.9000706@psu.edu...
> Steve Robeson, K4CAP wrote:
> > Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
news:<3FA90705.6030102@psu.edu>...
> >
> >>S. Hanrahan wrote:
> >>
> >>>On Fri, 17 Oct 2003 23:19:54 GMT, "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
> >>>wrote:
> >>>
> >>>>Yet 5wpm will even put me to sleep.
> >>>
> >>>Me too. I can copy 45-50 WPM in my head, but I can't write it down
> >>>fast enough for a full complete one minute of copy.
> >>
> >>I keep getting these images of you two listening to a ARRL Morse code CD
> >>to fall asleep to, instead of the music most people would use! 8^)
> >>
> >
> >
> > Ahhhhhh! But Mike! To >>SOME<< of us it >>IS<< music to the ear!
>
> You know, I'm starting to get frustrated again. I can do nearly 20 wpm
> listening to NuMorse with headphones and in a quiet room. But the leaast
> bit of background noise, or the conditions on the air, and my speed
> drops like a rock. I hope I'm not running up against my personal
> limitations.
>
>

Just keep at it. It probably means you're not quite solid at that speed
yet. Once again you may be expecting too much too soon. FYI, my comfort
zone is 15wpm although I passed the 20. I just don't work it enough to stay
at and be comfortable at 20.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

2270. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-06 00:00:45 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0311051600.62fc767f@posting.google.com>
Source record: 81846

"Ryan, KC8PMX" <REMOVETHISkc8pmx@diamondcs.net> wrote in message
news:<bo8co9$1aok9h$5@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>...
> But its perfectly okay to pay some union bum a ton of wages for doing a
> repetitive task, (a skill that same 14 y.o. that passed a ham test could
> do) therefore jacking the cost of a product, lets say a car for this
> example, to a ridiculous price??? (actually both the fast food worker and
> the person on the line at the factory ARE BOTH doing repetitive tasks....)

Hold on a sec....

"union bum"?

The basic concept that Dwight is talking about is a "living wage" -
meaning jobs that pay enough in wages and benefits to permit people to
live above the poverty line *without* government help. Yes, paying a
living wage makes products and services cost more, but it also removes
people from the govt. support system.

Some say "the marketplace" should set wages. But "the marketplace" is
tilted by a bunch of factors, such as the exportation of jobs and the
importation of workers.

The "living wage" concept and reality are largely a result of
organized labor unions leveling the playing field a bit by unifying
the many workers in negotiating with the relatively few employees. The
really smart employers learned to treat their workers well enough that
they wouldn't unionize.

Look at what working conditions were like in various industries
100-150 years ago, before organized labor had any real power.
>
> Believe it or not, there are alot more people out there trying to survive on
> the poverty level wages. Based strictly on my local region, that would be
> any job under 9-10 dollars per hour before taxes and if any, benefits. And
> unfortunately some of these people are NOT counted, in the unemployment or
> other job related statistics, if they are not participating in the various
> government programs like the employment security commision that Michigan
> has... (think its called MichiganWorks)

Yep. $20,000/yr isn't much at all anymore in many parts of the
country. Not to raise a family, anyway.

As for the $15 burrito and coke at Taco Bell, think about this:

At least here in EPA, we have a decent selection of independent diners
as an alternative to the fast food chains. The food in them is not
much more expensive than the chains, and usually better for you. The

workers in those places make at least as much as the fast food chains. One reason for their survival is that they don't spend bazillions on advertising. Another is local loyalty of customers.

So what's the answer, Dwight - Ryan - Kim?

73 de Jim, N2EY

2271. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-06 00:12:16 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <boc46q$n5a@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 81847

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:Fwcqb.11117$Oo4.2675@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> "Kim W5TIT" wrote:
> >
> > (snip) There's folks like that, Dwight. Yep, you're
> > right. There are folks who *will* do those jobs. But
> > they are in the minority and how ironic. Because it is
> > more the minority immigrant population that does
> > those jobs than a lot of US citizens.
>
>
> I give up, Kim. You've convinced yourself American workers are garbage,
> and immigrant workers are God's gift to the working world, and absolutely
> nothing is going to change your mind. This fits right into the thinking of
> many liberals who feel Americans deserve to be poor for all the bad things
> they've done, while those poor, downtrodden, immigrants deserve all the
> wealth they can get. And, while we sit here debating, wages for low to
> medium income workers continue to decline while profits for big business
> continues to grow - neither immigrants or a growing number of working
> Americans can get decent paying jobs. At the same time, the factories
moving
> overseas are forcing more and more middle-aged and older workers out of
> their jobs, adding to the numbers forced into lower paying jobs. And the
> situation only gets increasingly hopeless as more and more people begin to
> think like you. Where do you think this is all going to end, Kim? Do you
> honestly believe big business is going to stop their efforts to drive down
> wages at your doorstep - that this is never going to affect you or yours?
> Even small businesses are going to feel the crunch as fewer can afford to
> buy their products. If you can't see the inevitable outcome to all this,
> you're simply not looking or are too shortsighted to see. And, with that,
I
> give up as I said before.
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
>
>

And I give up trying to explain to you that I am affected, Dwight. I work
for and have worked for companies that export jobs out of the United
States--and a good number of employees are people who are here on work
Visas. But, Dwight--I don't have the same fatalist point of view that you

do. This is something that, as I've said, been around for years. Nothing's changed...it's the ebb and flow of the corporate environment.

And, you know what? Screw you for saying that I think American workers are garbage!!! Screw you!!! I think people who are fatalistic about the situation and want to make the situation 100% the fault of US Corporations and immigrants--illegal and not--are the ones who are garbage. Take that a smoke it, Dwight.

Kim W5TIT

2272. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-06 00:28:29 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <boc4i1$iu2@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 81848

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:6edqb.11413$Oo4.9859@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> "Hans K0HB" wrote:
> >
> > No, it only shows my utter disdain for biggoted lowlifes,
> > regardless of complexion. If the foo shits......
>
>
> Read the definition of bigot and then explain how the sentence above
> doesn't fit that definition, Hans.
>
> Bigot (n.) One whose attitude or behavior expresses
> intolerance, as because of race, religion, politics, etc.
> (Funk & Wagnalls Standard Dictionary)
>
> By the way, "bigoted" is spelled with a single "g."
>
>
> > Read my lips: Race is irrelevant.
>
>
> Repeating that is not going to change anything, Hans. Race issues are
> everywhere in this country today and are not going to go away simply
because
> you want to bury your head in the sand and act like they don't exist.
>
> While we're discussing definitions (and since you like to throw the word
> "racism" around so much).
>
> Racism (n.) An irrational belief or advocacy of the
> superiority of a given group, people, or nation, usu.
> ones own, on the basis of racial differences having
> no scientific validity.
> (Funk & Wagnalls Standard Dictionary)
>
> Kindly show me where I've expressed a belief in or advocated the
> superiority of a group in this discussion, Hans. Simply discussing a
> race-related issue in a newsgroup is not racism. As such, your charge of
> racism is as patently false as your charge of bigotry.
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

>
>

You have repeatedly heralded American workers at the expense of the immigrant population, Dwight--and irrationally so I might add. As a last word on this topic--because you seem incapable of a well-rounded discussion on it, let me say that the situation as it exists for *everyone*--not just employees but the corporations alike, in this country purely sucks.

I say there's more likelihood that an non-US born person will do a crappy job; and you say there's more likelihood that a US-born person will do a crappy job. That given, Dwight, then *WHY* praytell are there so many non-US born people doing the jobs? You want to say it's "because of wages." DUH!!!!! I am speaking from the whole picture. We can all stand around all we want and say, "if the wages were raised, US-born people would do the jobs." It ain't gonna happen any time soon.

You have been the one in this exchange that has been unreasonable, over judgmental, spiteful, hateful and quite impatient with the views of others--so much so that the gist of your whole contribution has been to condemn the way others believe while offering no real constructive contribution of your own. Have you offered any solutions? Have you reasoned any explanations for it being the way it is? Have you once, just once even *tried* to understand anything anyone else is saying? NO. You have done nothing but tell me that I think Americans are garbage.

I have provided clear reasons for why I believe the statistics would show that US-born people would be less likely to perform the jobs that a current immigrant population will and are performing. You've rebutted with no evidence to the contrary of what I am saying. You have rebutted also with nothing but indignation and name calling--or very near it--but haven't provided anything substantial to tell me that those news reports, radio talk-shows, news magazine shows, Congress, and real-life conversations I've been involved with pertaining to this issue, don't exist.

Like I said, we can be indignant all we want. But it won't change what's going on. We can whine all we want. But it won't change what's going on. All we can do is be mindful of the situation as it is and create contingencies for ourselves as we things get too close to home and we start being threatened. You act like I've never once been affected by the situation, Dwight. And, I have--a few times. But, each time I have done what I had to do to get through it. And, starting over again is not beyond me. It's become a sporting event for me now.

Take your righteousness and shove it. Right where the sun don't shine. But, before you do...why don't *you* think of some constructive ways to deal with the situation instead of all the whining and finger pointing you've been doing.

Kim W5TIT

2273. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-06 00:29:22 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <boc4jl$sjc@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 81849

"K&#65533;HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:wydqb.11052$9M3.3584@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net...
>
> "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote
>
> > And Hans prefers to make sly comments about a spelling error instead
of
> > discussing the topic.
>
> I've stated my position, and you haven't persuaded me that I'm wrong.
> Nothing is left to discuss.
>
> In fact, every new post from you more eloquently makes my point than I
> possibly could myself.
>
> With all kind wishes,
>
> de Hans, K0HB
> --
> http://home.earthlink.net/~k0hb
>
>

I absolutely agree, Hans.

Kim W5TIT

2274. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-06 00:39:43 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <boc573$1ds@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 81850

"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
news:c2356669.0311051600.62fc767f@posting.google.com...
> "Ryan, KC8PMX" <REMOVETHISkc8pmx@diamondcs.net> wrote in message
news:<bo8co9$1aok9h$5@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>...
> > But its perfectly okay to pay some union bum a ton of wages for doing a
> > repetitive task, (a skill that same 14 y.o. that passed a ham test
could
> > do) therefore jacking the cost of a product, lets say a car for this
> > example, to a ridiculous price??? (actually both the fast food worker
and
> > the person on the line at the factory ARE BOTH doing repetitive
tasks....)
>
> Hold on a sec....
>
> "union bum"?
>
> The basic concept that Dwight is talking about is a "living wage" -
> meaning jobs that pay enough in wages and benefits to permit people to
> live above the poverty line *without* government help. Yes, paying a
> living wage makes products and services cost more, but it also removes
> people from the govt. support system.
>
> Some say "the marketplace" should set wages. But "the marketplace" is
> tilted by a bunch of factors, such as the exportation of jobs and the
> importation of workers.
>
> The "living wage" concept and reality are largely a result of
> organized labor unions leveling the playing field a bit by unifying
> the many workers in negotiating with the relatively few employees. The
> really smart employers learned to treat their workers well enough that
> they wouldn't unionize.
>
> Look at what working conditions were like in various industries
> 100-150 years ago, before organized labor had any real power.
> >
> > Believe it or not, there are alot more people out there trying to
survive on
> > the poverty level wages. Based strictly on my local region, that would
be
> > any job under 9-10 dollars per hour before taxes and if any, benefits.
And
> > unfortunately some of these people are NOT counted, in the unemployment
or

> > other job related statistics, if they are not participating in the
various
> > government programs like the employment security commision that Michigan
> > has... (think its called MichiganWorks)
>
> Yep. $20,000/yr isn't much at all anymore in many parts of the
> country. Not to raise a family, anyway.
>
> As for the $15 burrito and coke at Taco Bell, think about this:
>
> At least here in EPA, we have a decent selection of independent diners
> as an alternative to the fast food chains. The food in them is not
> much more expensive than the chains, and usually better for you. The
> workers in those places make at least as much as the fast food chains.
> One reason for their survival is that they don't spend bazillions on
> advertising. Another is local loyalty of customers.
>
> So what's the answer, Dwight - Ryan - Kim?
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

I'm out of it...speculation won't solve a thing and I choose not to be as
depressed and bitter and hateful as others...

Kim W5TIT

2275. Speaking of Outrages

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-06 00:55:57 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <boc65g$rql@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 81901

Anyone else here this?

Commentary: Senate Took Easy Road to $87 Billion Package

Six senators debated this package. SIX! Get on your radios and talk about this! I am *not* commenting on supporting or not supporting the package--I am dismayed that only six senators debated the issue, and even more angry that a vote was "undercover."

Kim W5TIT

2276. Re: ARRL you can Kiss my $39.00 a Year Good Bye

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-06 02:36:56 UTC
From: "S. Hanrahan" <aa7ya@hotmail.com>
Message-ID: <jrcjqvk8neno2dr2o17lreqpon9g801v8q@4ax.com>
Source record: 81902

On Wed, 05 Nov 2003 09:19:49 -0500, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote:

>I keep getting these images of you two listening to a ARRL Morse code CD
>to fall asleep to, instead of the music most people would use! 8^)

I've worked pileups in my sleep the night after Field Day is over. heh
heh ;)

Stacey/AA7YA

2277. Re: NCI Petition for Rulemaking

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-06 02:57:50 UTC
From: "S. Hanrahan" <aa7ya@hotmail.com>
Message-ID: <k8djqvoacv3mngsimv0n8v0hg3699nj1dk@4ax.com>
Source record: 81903

On Wed, 05 Nov 2003 12:35:58 GMT, "Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM>
wrote:

>"S. Hanrahan" <aa7ya@hotmail.com> wrote in message
>news:1sqhqv4jh49sbnivjmeouou2i1bmaddkpc@4ax.com..
>> At 5 WPM, you don't need a computer to copy good or poor code.
>
>I think you've just hit the nail on the head. It's really not how hard or
>easy 5-wpm is, it's the willingness (or lack thereof) to make the initial
>(i.e. "initiative") effort to learn the 43 required characters.

Exactly. I look at it this way, if a person doesn't want to learn the
code, fine, if they want to fine, just don't come up to me and bitch
and moan that 5 WPM is a hurdle or mountain too high to climb.

I'm hearing impaired in both ears, and I can copy 45-50 WPM in my head
solidly, and attained the 20 before taking my General class written,
without waivers.

As I said, I can copy 45-50 WPM solidly. 99.9% of my casual CW
contacts are no faster than 18 WPM or adjusted accordingly if I'm
responding to someones else's CQ.

Stacey/AA7YA

2278. Re: ARRL has no FIRE for sale?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-06 03:20:06 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <xnfcneeyarg.hnw2fvo.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>
Source record: 81904

On Wed, 05 Nov 2003 04:24:18 -0700, S. Hanrahan wrote:

>> This issue has been kicking around the ARRL Pacific Division
>> "cabinet" for almost 15 years that I know of (I was in same until 4
>> years ago). The problem is that the Postal Service wants a big hunk
>> of money for air mail to individual subscribers - the League would
>> have to assess a healthy surcharge to Pacific Section members to
>> make up the difference. You don't want that sort of "special
>> treatment".
>
>No doubt, every annual paying member, no matter where they are, would
>be feeling the bite of higher member and subscription fees. It would
>be the feasible thing to do to give "special treatment" to those in
>the Pacific Division. This may in fact be another reason why the
>Pacific Division isn't given "special treatment"

Huh? "feasible thing to do to give "special treatment" to those in
the Pacific Division" ?? Do you mean "not feasible thing to do"?

Also, you are confusing the Pacific Division (Northern California,
Nevada, and Hawaii and other US territory in the Pacific) with the
Pacific Section which covers Hawaii and the other US territory in
the Pacific. The portion of the Pacific Division exclusive of the
Pacific Section does not need and has not asked for "special treatment".

The new Pacific Division Director, Bob Vallio, is a long-time friend
of mine who does not stand for any nonsense. We will see what will
happen, and anyhow I'm not in that Division any more so I have
no say in what will happen except to relay the history of this issue.

>
>Stacey/AA7YA

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

From a Clearing in the Silicon Forest
Beaverton (Washington County) Oregon
(ARRL Northwestern Division, Oregon Section)

2279. Re: ARRL you can Kiss my $39.00 a Year Good Bye

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-06 03:38:53 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <hnjqb.2501$gn1.310681@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 81905

S. Hanrahan wrote:
> On Wed, 05 Nov 2003 09:19:49 -0500, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote:
>
>
>>I keep getting these images of you two listening to a ARRL Morse code CD
>>to fall asleep to, instead of the music most people would use! 8^)
>
>
> I've worked pileups in my sleep the night after Field Day is over. heh
> heh ;)

I'm guilty if that too!

- Mike KB3EIA -

2280. Re: Speaking of Outrages

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-06 03:40:21 UTC
From: Arnie Macy <kt4stnospam@csam.net>
Message-ID: <bocfqa$1bjtvq$1@ID-166180.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 81906

"Kim W5TIT" wrote ...

Six senators debated this package. SIX! Get on your radios and talk about this! I am *not* commenting on supporting or not supporting the package--I am dismayed that only six senators debated the issue, and even more angry that a vote was "undercover."

They did it for political cover, Kim. It's an old trick used in Washington, DC.

Arnie -

2281. Re: Why Freebanders Are Not Cber's

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-06 03:52:20 UTC
From: Landshark <S3buell@Georgesobsession.com>
Message-ID: <Uzjqb.749$h15.97471603@newssvr21.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 81907
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"lancer" <lancer@lancer.web> wrote in message
news:3fa94bc2.87484716@news.easynews.com...
> On 5 Nov 2003 10:34:10 -0800, keyclownzmustgo@yahoo.com (Citizens For
> A Keyclown-Free Newsgroup) wrote:
>
> >"Landshark" <S3Buell@jgkdls.com> wrote in message
news:<oG_pb.13874$Qu.4630@newssvr14.news.prodigy.com>...
> >> "Steveo" <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com> wrote in message
> >> news:20031104222749.978$VD_-_@newsreader.com...
> >> > Neil Down <buckiewheat@assclown.com> wrote:
> >> > >I am not wa3moj
> >> > >
> >> > Yes you are.
> >>
> >> Of course he is. That's why he
> >> admitted and was able to make a
> >> complaint against Scott for using
> >> the Nic WA3MOJ@AOL.Com
> >> to Scott's ISP. He had to send a
> >> complaint through his AOL account
> >> to Scott's ISP, otherwise they would
> >> just ignore the complaint.
> >>
> >> Landshark
> >
> >MOJ has no AOL, if he did you would post his email to the ISP here.
> >
> >PS: You dorks are not technically CBers, you are RADIO OUTLAWS and
> >FEDERAL CRIMINALS and therefore can be harassed at will.
>
>
> Now that looks like an admission that he is WA3MOJ.

Actually his addy is WA3MOJ@AOL.Com
I do like how he defends himself under the anon name.

LOL!!!

Landshark

--
Hard things are put in our way,
not to stop us, but to call out our
courage and strength.

2282. Re: ARRL you can Kiss my $39.00 a Year Good Bye

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-06 06:08:26 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <REMOVETHISkc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <bodjre$1cdtil$3@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 81913

Hey Mike!

Believe it or not, that does work for some people. I do know of one person who took a different letter per night and used a program like NuMorse to send that letter/character for a certain length of time. (create a text file with enough characters to keep the program sending long enough, and have the program read from that file.) After a while he got 'em all.

--
Ryan KC8PMX

Why is it one careless match can start a forest fire, but
it takes a whole box to start a barbecue?

>
> I keep getting these images of you two listening to a ARRL Morse code CD
> to fall asleep to, instead of the music most people would use! 8^)
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -
>

2283. Re: Why We Freeband

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-06 07:24:48 UTC
From: Brainbuster <brainbuster@lineone.net>
Message-ID: <boctiait2@newsg1.svr.pol.co.uk>
Source record: 81908
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.swap

Brenda Ann wrote in message ...
>
>The UK Radio Authority is much more
>harsh than the FCC.

Sorry, but I have to disagree.

Even at the height of CB, when 100s of thousands of people were running illegal CB in one way or another, the yearly "bust" figures were just into double digits - it has remained in the 20s and 30s.

Most illegal CBers get ignored, some get a "Please don't do that" verbal warning, some may get a written warning,.
So, what do the very few big busts get... £1000s in fines? Prison?
No... a couple of hundred pound fine if any - and the illegal equipment snatched.

If the RA were "harsh", they would consider illegal CBers as "Pirates"... and give them the very large Pirate fine. Those using Amateur illegally would be hunted down like dogs and given the punisment available under UK law - prison.

When nearly everyone was using illegal antennas, they changed the antenna rules to make those antennas legal.
When CBers were illegally using the American frequencies, they legalised the band for CB use.
When they wanted American CBs out of the hands of CBers, they made it legal for Amateurs to convert the sets to 10 Metre - so they would buy them from CBers, make them legal, and save the RA the bother of chasing people.

If they were harsh, they would have put "No DX" and "no talking to foreigners" rules in place. They would ban the import and sales of the illegal CBs marked as "Amateur". They would ban the ownership or use of Amplifiers that work on CB.
America does all those - The UK does none of them.
I would say that our CB service has very few rules, and enforcement only as a last resort.

A few years back, a group of people set themselves up as self-appointed CB police. They went around looking for CB antennas and CBers - sending a list to the RA, for them to catch the licence dodgers.
You would think that the "bust" figure would have shot through the roof - but the RA couln't be arsed to do the chasing.
They now plan to remove the licence next year - so reducing the amount of illegal CBers even further.

Regards,

Peter.

2284. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-06 07:40:04 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <oVmqb.12337$9M3.12275@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 81909

"Kim W5TIT" wrote:
>
> You have repeatedly heralded American
> workers at the expense of the immigrant
> population, Dwight -- and irrationally so
> I might add. (snip)

I'm listening, Kim. Now explain how that is either racism or bigotry? And, before you make more of a fool of yourself, let me remind you American workers today (non-immigrants) include blacks, asians, hispanics, and people of just about all races, ethnic backgrounds, religions, and so on. Ignoring that, you and Hans decided to scream about racism and bigotry instead.

Because you refuse to see the larger picture, you're the one incapable of a reasonable discussion.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

2285. Re: ARRL you can Kiss my $39.00 a Year Good Bye

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-06 09:51:54 UTC
From: aaa@nu-ware.com
Message-ID: <ba2ef257.0311060151.6e83bf6d@posting.google.com>
Source record: 81910

Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message news:<3FA94736.9000706@psu.edu>...
> You know, I'm starting to get frustrated again. I can do nearly 20 wpm
> listening to NuMorse with headphones and in a quiet room. But the leaast
> bit of background noise, or the conditions on the air, and my speed
> drops like a rock. I hope I'm not running up against my personal
> limitations.
NuMorse Professional has a feature to add QRN in various flavors plus
QSB to the code. Tony. G4AUD. NuMorse developer.

2286. Re: Speaking of Outrages

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-06 12:15:04 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <boddup$l8n@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 81911

"Arnie Macy" <kt4stnospam@csam.net> wrote in message
news:bocfqa$1bjtvq$1@ID-166180.news.uni-berlin.de...
> "Kim W5TIT" wrote ...
>
> Six senators debated this package. SIX! Get on your radios and talk
about
> this! I am *not* commenting on supporting or not supporting the
package--I
> am dismayed that only six senators debated the issue, and even more angry
> that a vote was "undercover."
> ----------
>
> They did it for political cover, Kim. It's an old trick used in
Washington,
> DC.
>
> Arnie -
>
>

Yep, and this is the greater outrage that is taking place in this country. And, as was said--this was one of the most important emergency spending packages that's been on the table in our history.

If anyone wants to start changing things in America, they need to start changing politicians. And, I don't even care what "party" is changed--they are all essentially the same.

Kim W5TIT

2287. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-06 12:16:33 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bode1i$57p@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 81912

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:oVmqb.12337$9M3.12275@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> "Kim W5TIT" wrote:
> >
> > You have repeatedly heralded American
> > workers at the expense of the immigrant
> > population, Dwight -- and irrationally so
> > I might add. (snip)
>
> I'm listening, Kim. Now explain how that is either racism or bigotry?
And,
> before you make more of a fool of yourself, let me remind you American
> workers today (non-immigrants) include blacks, asians, hispanics, and
people
> of just about all races, ethnic backgrounds, religions, and so on.
Ignoring
> that, you and Hans decided to scream about racism and bigotry instead.
>
> Because you refuse to see the larger picture, you're the one incapable
of
> a reasonable discussion.
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
>
>

As any intelligent person will see, Dwight, Hans and I both commented from a perspective of balance. YOU are the irrational one for not being able to see that. YOU expressed bigotry--not us.

Kim W5TIT Signing Off.

2288. Re: NCI Petition for Rulemaking

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-06 15:13:17 UTC
From: Alun Palmer <alun@1stcounsel.com>
Message-ID: <Xns942B67F58BF24elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 81914

S. Hanrahan <aa7ya@hotmail.com> wrote in
news:k8djqvoacv3mngsimv0n8v0hg3699nj1dk@4ax.com:

> On Wed, 05 Nov 2003 12:35:58 GMT, "Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM>
> wrote:
>
>>"S. Hanrahan" <aa7ya@hotmail.com> wrote in message
>>news:1sqhqv4jh49sbnivjmeouou2i1bmaddkpc@4ax.com..
>>> At 5 WPM, you don't need a computer to copy good or poor code.
>>
>>I think you've just hit the nail on the head. It's really not how hard
or
>>easy 5-wpm is, it's the willingness (or lack thereof) to make the
initial
>>(i.e. "initiative") effort to learn the 43 required characters.
>
> Exactly. I look at it this way, if a person doesn't want to learn the
> code, fine, if they want to fine, just don't come up to me and bitch
> and moan that 5 WPM is a hurdle or mountain too high to climb.
>
> I'm hearing impaired in both ears, and I can copy 45-50 WPM in my head
> solidly, and attained the 20 before taking my General class written,
> without waivers.
>
> As I said, I can copy 45-50 WPM solidly. 99.9% of my casual CW
> contacts are no faster than 18 WPM or adjusted accordingly if I'm
> responding to someones else's CQ.
>
> Stacey/AA7YA
>

5 wpm is easy. I admit that. However, as you can copy 45-50 wpm, you are
so far to the other extreme end of the bell curve that I don't beleive you
really know that yourself. It would be like Michelle Kwan wondering how
beginners can fall over on the ice.

More to the point, a 5wpm test is slow enough to be pointless, as someone
who passes it doesn't really have much of a useful skill level. At 13 wpm
it was a significant hurdle, but at 5 it's merely a waste of time. Either
way, it still has no relevance to the use of a microphone.It's like
learning to ice skate to take part in a bicycle race.

2289. Re: NCI Petition for Rulemaking

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-06 16:27:37 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3FAA7679.1050701@psu.edu>
Source record: 81915

S. Hanrahan wrote:
> On Wed, 05 Nov 2003 12:35:58 GMT, "Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM>
> wrote:
>
>
>>"S. Hanrahan" <aa7ya@hotmail.com> wrote in message
>>news:1sqhqv4jh49sbnivjmeouou2i1bmaddkpc@4ax.com..
>>
>>>At 5 WPM, you don't need a computer to copy good or poor code.
>>
>>I think you've just hit the nail on the head. It's really not how hard or
>>easy 5-wpm is, it's the willingness (or lack thereof) to make the initial
>>(i.e. "initiative") effort to learn the 43 required characters.
>
>
> Exactly. I look at it this way, if a person doesn't want to learn the
> code, fine, if they want to fine, just don't come up to me and bitch
> and moan that 5 WPM is a hurdle or mountain too high to climb.
>
> I'm hearing impaired in both ears, and I can copy 45-50 WPM in my head
> solidly, and attained the 20 before taking my General class written,
> without waivers.

Now you have my attention, Stacey! What is the nature of your hearing loss, if I may ask? I have tinnitus and am about 60 db down compared to normal hearing, with several 100 db plus holes in various places. One of the weird things about my particular flavor of hearing loss is that all incoming sounds seem to get equal treatment in my brain. Whereas it appears that most people can filter out the good stuff from the noise, I end up treating all sounds equally. No mental DSP here, unfortunately! 8^)

At any rate, I've had to do a lot of work to get this far. Took 6 months of intense work to get to 5wpm, and I've been working daily on increasing my speed for the last month or so. I don't envy much, but I envy those who were able to pick Morse code up in a few weekends.

- Mike KB3EIA -

2290. Re: Speaking of Outrages

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-06 16:41:16 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <MQuqb.12637$Oo4.10559@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 81916

Source please?

Dan/W4NTI

"Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:boddup$l8n@library1.airnews.net...
> "Arnie Macy" <kt4stnospam@csam.net> wrote in message
> news:bocfqa$1bjtvq$1@ID-166180.news.uni-berlin.de...
> > "Kim W5TIT" wrote ...
> >
> > Six senators debated this package. SIX! Get on your radios and talk
> about
> > this! I am *not* commenting on supporting or not supporting the
> package--I
> > am dismayed that only six senators debated the issue, and even more
angry
> > that a vote was "undercover."
> > ____
> >
> > They did it for political cover, Kim. It's an old trick used in
> Washington,
> > DC.
> >
> > Arnie -
> >
> >
>
> Yep, and this is the greater outrage that is taking place in this country.
> And, as was said--this was one of the most important emergency spending
> packages that's been on the table in our history.
>
> If anyone wants to start changing things in America, they need to start
> changing politicians. And, I don't even care what "party" is
changed--they
> are all essentially the same.
>
> Kim W5TIT
>
>

2291. Re: ARRL you can Kiss my $39.00 a Year Good Bye

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-06 18:02:27 UTC
From: No.m@il.here
Message-ID: <3faa8c00$0$94481$45beb828@newscene.com>
Source record: 81917
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

If I were to give the world an enema... 225 Main Street Newington, CT is where I'd stick the hose.

2292. Re: Speaking of Outrages

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-06 19:02:35 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0311061102.34c6db91@posting.google.com>
Source record: 81918

"Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:<boddup$l8n@library1.airnews.net>...

> If anyone wants to start changing things in America, they need to start
> changing politicians. And, I don't even care what "party" is changed--they
> are all essentially the same.

I'll have to disagree with you a bit here, Kim...

I think before we change politicians, we have to change
ourselves...What we want from govenment, the kind of conduct we expect
and what we are willing to pay for with our taxes.

Americans will scream bloody murder about thier "rights" and the
amount of taxes they pay. Yet they scream even louder when a group of
men get together and commit a horrific act like September 11th and
they wonder why the government doesn't "do something".

Can you imagine the outpore of anger that would have occured if
those 20 men had been arrested on September TENTH...?!?! The ACLU, The
Arab-American League and who knows who all else would have been all
over the press about how we were infringing on thier rights.

But what gauls ME is how people will get indignant about how our
politicians SHOULD be, yet "we" allow someone like Bill Clinton off
the hook despite having been caught lying over and over. Then his
wife gets caught stealing "things" from the White House, and what do
they do? They elect her to the Senate of a state she enver held
residence in.

DO you know WHY she didn't run for office from her HOME state?

WHY should we NOT tolerate them lying about anything else if
we're going to send a message that it's "OK" for the President of the
United States to violate the very same "sexual harrassment" laws that
are now prevelant in every workplace save porno movies and stripper
bars?

As for the cost of things...Well, all I can say is you get what
you pay for. We hamstrung our intelligence agencies for almost 30
years and now we are wondering why they can't "know" certain things.
The business of intelligence is dirty, often conniving, and usually
ugly. Our adversaries know this. That's how they manage to stay in
step with us all too often.

73

Steve, K4YZ

2293. Re: Speaking of Outrages

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-06 20:08:53 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <pTxqb.12802$Oo4.2623@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 81919

"Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote

> Commentary: Senate Took Easy Road to $87 Billion Package
>
> Six senators debated this package. SIX! Get on your radios and talk
about
> this! I am *not* commenting on supporting or not supporting the
package--I
> am dismayed that only six senators debated the issue, and even more angry
> that a vote was "undercover."

This thing was a "no win" for the politicians.

They know they're putting money into the pockets of the likes of Halliburton and other Shrub buddies to modernize Iraq, yet we can't even find money to rebuild our own roads and bridges at home. On the other hand, if they vote against it (or try to separate out the pork) then they get accused of "not supporting our fighting forces".

73, de Hans, K0HB
--

&#65533;&#65533;&#65533; I found it!!!! http://www.home.earthlink.net/~k0hb/id7.html

2294. Re: NCI Petition for Rulemaking

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-06 21:13:11 UTC
From: wa2si@arrl.net
Message-ID: <b7d1465c.0311061313.9836a7f@posting.google.com>
Source record: 81920

Alun Palmer <alun@1stcounsel.com> wrote in message
news:<Xns942B67F58BF24elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>...
> S. Hanrahan <aa7ya@hotmail.com> wrote in
> news:k8djqvoacv3mngsimv0n8v0hg3699nj1dk@4ax.com:
>
> > On Wed, 05 Nov 2003 12:35:58 GMT, "Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM>
> > wrote:
> >
> >>"S. Hanrahan" <aa7ya@hotmail.com> wrote in message
> >>news:1sqhqv4jh49sbnivjmeouou2i1bmaddkpc@4ax.com..
> >>> At 5 WPM, you don't need a computer to copy good or poor code.
> >>
> >>I think you've just hit the nail on the head. It's really not how hard
> or
> >>easy 5-wpm is, it's the willingness (or lack thereof) to make the
> initial
> >>(i.e. "initiative") effort to learn the 43 required characters.
> >
> > Exactly. I look at it this way, if a person doesn't want to learn the
> > code, fine, if they want to fine, just don't come up to me and bitch
> > and moan that 5 WPM is a hurdle or mountain too high to climb.
> >
> > I'm hearing impaired in both ears, and I can copy 45-50 WPM in my head
> > solidly, and attained the 20 before taking my General class written,
> > without waivers.
> >
> > As I said, I can copy 45-50 WPM solidly. 99.9% of my casual CW
> > contacts are no faster than 18 WPM or adjusted accordingly if I'm
> > responding to someones else's CQ.
> >
> > Stacey/AA7YA
> >
>
> 5 wpm is easy. I admit that. However, as you can copy 45-50 wpm, you are
> so far to the other extreme end of the bell curve that I don't beleive you
> really know that yourself.

Well, then here's the voice of the other extreme.

> It would be like Michelle Kwan wondering how
> beginners can fall over on the ice.

I more liken it to requiring the beginner to learn the basics before
they can skate in the same rink with Michelle Kwan.

> More to the point, a 5wpm test is slow enough to be pointless, as someone
> who passes it doesn't really have much of a useful skill level.

The value is not so much in one's instant proficiency, it's in the exposure level sufficient to allow said newbie to make a truly educated decision as to whether or not s/he wishes to pursue CW any further. There is also the intangible feeling of accomplishment that comes with "earning" privileges by meeting a significant challenge. I truly don't consider a 35 or 50 question multiple choice test out of published Q&A pools of approx. six to eight hundred questions, much of a "challenge."

> At 13 wpm
> it was a significant hurdle, but at 5 it's merely a waste of time.

The more "challenging" the hurdle, the more "privileges earned." Most licenses aren't "rights," they're "privileges." That includes AR.

> Either
> way, it still has no relevance to the use of a microphone.

I don't want to reduce it to just that. There's a bigger picture. (Read: more rounded.)

> It's like
> learning to ice skate to take part in a bicycle race.

No, it's like learning the basics of cycling before being allowed to participate in the race. Most people take issue with the "being allowed to" part and try to give all sorts of lame reasons why they shouldn't be made to "jump through hoops" and hurdle "barriers." Like I said, when you peel away the layers of the onion...theres no substance at the core. And that's the sacrifice some are willing to accept for an "easier" ARS.

73 de Bert
WA2SI

2295. Re: FS Hitlers Toothpick

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-06 22:53:01 UTC
From: Jock <the-nospam-bloke@bigpond.net.au>
Message-ID: <hhAqb.181492$bo1.11844@news-server.bigpond.net.au>
Source record: 81922
Cross-posted to: rec.antiques,rec.radio.swap,rec.radio.amateur.policy

This should not be posted to rec.antiques - it's not a forum for selling. :P
Sounds like a great price though.
Jock
<twistedhed@webtv.net> wrote in message news:bnuvphjed1@news.x-echo.com...
> For Sale, toothpick used by Adolph Hitler. It is authentic because
> there is a letter (signed by me) saying so. Comes with a photo of
> Hitler with his hand near his face (no one can prove he is NOT using thi
> s toothpick) as corroboration. I am asking $1500. If you don't like the
> price, let's talk.Please email me at twistedhed@webtv.net.
>
>
> =-
> Article poste via Voila News - http://www.news.voila.fr
> Le : Sat Nov 1 01:46:41 2003 depuis l'IP : ac816f32.ipt.aol.com [VIP
532284301978]

2296. Re: NCI Petition for Rulemaking

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-06 22:54:01 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <diAqb.12951$Oo4.12060@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 81921

"Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.net> wrote in message
news:b7d1465c.0311061313.9836a7f@posting.google.com...
> Alun Palmer <alun@1stcounsel.com> wrote in message
news:<Xns942B67F58BF24elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>...
> > S. Hanrahan <aa7ya@hotmail.com> wrote in
> > news:k8djqvoacv3mngsimv0n8v0hg3699nj1dk@4ax.com:
> >
> > > On Wed, 05 Nov 2003 12:35:58 GMT, "Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM>
> > > wrote:
> > >
> > >>"S. Hanrahan" <aa7ya@hotmail.com> wrote in message
> > >>news:1sqhqv4jh49sbnivjmeouou2i1bmaddkpc@4ax.com..
> > >>> At 5 WPM, you don't need a computer to copy good or poor code.
> > >>
> > >>I think you've just hit the nail on the head. It's really not how hard
> > or
> > >>easy 5-wpm is, it's the willingness (or lack thereof) to make the
> > initial
> > >>(i.e. "initiative") effort to learn the 43 required characters.
> > >
> > > Exactly. I look at it this way, if a person doesn't want to learn the
> > > code, fine, if they want to fine, just don't come up to me and bitch
> > > and moan that 5 WPM is a hurdle or mountain too high to climb.
> > >
> > > I'm hearing impaired in both ears, and I can copy 45-50 WPM in my head
> > > solidly, and attained the 20 before taking my General class written,
> > > without waivers.
> > >
> > > As I said, I can copy 45-50 WPM solidly. 99.9% of my casual CW
> > > contacts are no faster than 18 WPM or adjusted accordingly if I'm
> > > responding to someones else's CQ.
> > >
> > > Stacey/AA7YA
> > >
> >
> > 5 wpm is easy. I admit that. However, as you can copy 45-50 wpm, you are
> > so far to the other extreme end of the bell curve that I don't beleive
you
> > really know that yourself.
>
> Well, then here's the voice of the other extreme.
>
> > It would be like Michelle Kwan wondering how
> > beginners can fall over on the ice.

>
> I more liken it to requiring the beginner to learn the basics before
> they can skate in the same rink with Michelle Kwan.
>
> > More to the point, a 5wpm test is slow enough to be pointless, as
someone
> > who passes it doesn't really have much of a useful skill level.
>
> The value is not so much in one's instant proficiency, it's in the
> exposure level sufficient to allow said newbie to make a truly
> educated decision as to whether or not s/he wishes to pursue CW any
> further. There is also the intangible feeling of accomplishment that
> comes with "earning" privileges by meeting a significant challenge. I
> truly don't consider a 35 or 50 question multiple choice test out of
> published Q&A pools of approx. six to eight hundred questions, much of
> a "challenge."
>
> > At 13 wpm
> > it was a significant hurdle, but at 5 it's merely a waste of time.
>
> The more "challenging" the hurdle, the more "privileges earned." Most
> licenses aren't "rights," they're "privileges." That includes AR.
>
> > Either
> > way, it still has no relevance to the use of a microphone.
>
> I don't want to reduce it to just that. There's a bigger picture.
> (Read: more rounded.)
>
> > It's like
> > learning to ice skate to take part in a bicycle race.
>
> No, it's like learning the basics of cycling before being allowed to
> participate in the race. Most people take issue with the "being
> allowed to" part and try to give all sorts of lame reasons why they
> shouldn't be made to "jump through hoops" and hurdle "barriers." Like
> I said, when you peel away the layers of the onion...theres no
> substance at the core. And that's the sacrifice some are willing to
> accept for an "easier" ARS.
>
> 73 de Bert
> WA2SI

Dang Bert....I've never hear it put so well. Thanks for illuminating the
playing field.

Dan/W4NTI

2297. Re: NCI Petition for Rulemaking

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-06 23:06:25 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <RtAqb.12965$Oo4.12057@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 81923

"Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.net> wrote

> No, it's like learning the basics of cycling before being allowed to
> participate in the race.

Did your Dad & Mom make you take a test before they bought you your first
bike?

But actually, Morse code is a bit like learning to ride a bike.... it's
sort of "self testing"..... if you want to use it, you'll learn how.

73, de Hans, K0HB
--
"Beware of the man who works hard to learn something, learns it,
and finds himself no wiser than before. He is full of murderous
resentment of people who are ignorant without having come by
their ignorance the hard way." --Bokonon

2298. Re: Speaking of Outrages

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-07 00:24:37 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <boep9s$3et@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 81925

"K�HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:pTxqb.12802$Oo4.2623@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
>
> "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote
>
> > Commentary: Senate Took Easy Road to $87 Billion Package
> >
> > Six senators debated this package. SIX! Get on your radios and talk
> about
> > this! I am *not* commenting on supporting or not supporting the
> package--I
> > am dismayed that only six senators debated the issue, and even more
angry
> > that a vote was "undercover."
>
> This thing was a "no win" for the politicians.
>
> They know they're putting money into the pockets of the likes of
Halliburton
> and other Shrub buddies to modernize Iraq, yet we can't even find money to
> rebuild our own roads and bridges at home. On the other hand, if they vote
> against it (or try to separate out the pork) then they get accused of "not
> supporting our fighting forces".
>
>
> 73, de Hans, K0HB
> --
>
> ��� I found it!!!! http://www.home.earthlink.net/~k0hb/id7.html
>

Your commentary noted, Hans--but I really wonder how much they really care about what we think any more; one way or the other. I don't know why they'd "hide" their vote. We the People aren't in their scope any more--they do as they please. Know what I think? I think the *only* responses they worry about is those from their big dollar spenders--not We the People. I know, I am preaching to the choir...

The mere revelation that only six were in the debate is enough to raise the question: "if you couldn't publicly support or express non-support this expense, then why would you think the US people should allow the expenditure?" Because, bottom line, the US people deserved more than they got out of this one.

Kim W5TIT

2299. Re: Amateur Radio in the 21st Century?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-07 00:24:58 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031106192458.11022.00001896@mb-m14.aol.com>
Source record: 81924

In article <5ee63311.0311032031.67c68779@posting.google.com>,
groupk0hb@earthlink.net (Hans K0HB) writes:

>"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote
>
>>
>> They may be more realistic then we may think. How many actual
>> "homebrew" Novice or Tech rigs have you seen?
>>
>
>Realistic? Surreal-istic is more like it!

I assume you've read the KL7CC paper, Hans
>
>This is the same mantra sung by NCI's ex Executive Director,
>W5YI, and his fingerprints are all over this thing. He has
>stated publicly that he feels that since people
>who acquire entry level ham tickets invariably purchase their
>equipment assembled these days, and send them in for
>repairs when broken, they no longer need to possess the
>knowledge needed to build good "home-brew" stations, nor
>the knowledge to determine if their repairs/adjustments result
>in proper on-the-air signals.

Bingo.

>Because of this fact, he thinks that
>the majority of questions regarding math and theory (knowledge
>mainly needed to build/repair/adjust equipment) should
>be removed from entry level tests, and simply replaced with
>questions on operating technique and regulations.

Or not replaced by anything.

>If he had
>his way, math and theory questions would only be part of
>Amateur Extra examinations.
>
If at all.

>While I can't remember the last "fully homebrew" shack I saw

I can. It's downstairs.... ;-)

Actually, it's not 100% homebrew - some nonhomebrew test gear, a little
surplus, and of course the K2. And I didn't build any of the telegraph keys.

But the main rig, power supplies, antenna tuner, antenna, table, shelves,
cables and control system are all homebrew. You and 366 others worked this
station during SS.

(probably KG6AIG
>back in the 60's, and even Luis had *some* commercial test equipment items
>lying
>about), it is extremely uncommon to find a shack where every item is
>commercial
>(or in it's original commercial state.) Homebrewing and modification to
>commercial designs is especially alive and well in the QRP, contesting,
>satelite, and microwave communities.

'zactly. Also kits and semi-kits.
>
>The QCAO (Quarter Century Appliance Operators club) and ASSOOBA (Amalgamated
>Simple Shacks On Our Belt Association) would love it, but this idea would put
>our service on an immediate slide into nothing more than another consumer
>orientated Family Radio Service, and the consequent abolishment of Amateur
>Radio.
>
>The *single* unique element which differentiates our service from all the
>other
>radio services is our authority to experiment, build, modify, and generally
>tinker around and operate equipment which is not type accepted.

There's also the widespread use of Morse code for communications purposes....

> The
>"technical"
>aspect of our hobby comprises 3 of the 5 reasons (paragraph 97.1) for the
>existence of the ARS, and removal of this requirement for licensing would
>tear the heart and soul out of the hobby.

(devil's advocate mode=ON)

But...but Hans....are you saying that all that theory stuff should be "shoved
down the throats" of hams who will never use it?
>
>If amateurs were to be licensed without any requirement for electronics
>knowledge, then it follows that type acceptance of all amateur equipment
>would
>be a requirement for sale.

Not at all. Just certification that a design was sound. Canada has this
already, and so does the UK.

How many rigs made in the past 20 years would not qualify for certification?

>Used equipment, if sold to "no-Tech" amateurs
>would
>need to be recertified and "mod-free", and repairs could only be accomplished
>by
>FCC-approved service facilities. The cost of new equipment would rise to

>commercial-service price levels, because of type-acceptance issues, and most
>vendors would probably leave the market.

Doesn't all new equipment have to be certified anyway?
>
>Sorry, but you guys are out to lunch with this cockeyed notion.

(devil's advocate mode=OFF)

On that we are agreed 100%
>
>Code-Free, then Tech-Free .... what next, license free? CU on eleven, good
>buddy.
>
One of the proposed ideas for the "Communicator" license is to remove most of the "radio law" questions from the test and instead simply require that applicants certify that they have a copy of Part 97, read and understand it. Where'd they get that idea?

You watch, Hans - those of us who resist these ideas will be called "elitist" and "stuck in the past" etc.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2300. Re: Speaking of Outrages

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-07 00:54:30 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <boeqem$494@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 81926

"Steve Robeson, K4CAP" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
news:5c01b95b.0311061102.34c6db91@posting.google.com...
> "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:<boddup$l8n@library1.airnews.net>...
>
> > If anyone wants to start changing things in America, they need to start
> > changing politicians. And, I don't even care what "party" is
changed--they
> > are all essentially the same.
>
> I'll have to disagree with you a bit here, Kim...
>
> I think before we change politicians, we have to change
> ourselves...What we want from govenment, the kind of conduct we expect
> and what we are willing to pay for with our taxes.
>

Well, I think that's almost a given...but I agree. Actually, as long as the
American people are represented again...and I don't think they really are
now...then I'd be happy with anything.

>
> Americans will scream bloody murder about thier "rights" and the
> amount of taxes they pay. Yet they scream even louder when a group of
> men get together and commit a horrific act like September 11th and
> they wonder why the government doesn't "do something".
>

I, for one, am getting tired of 9-11 being the barometer of how patriotic we
are. Leaving out the disaster, there is so much other stuff hurting this
country--even more than the blatant terrorism that is part of a bigger
picture. Terrorism is just easier to see and be offended by. What about
all the products we buy every day that are made in China--and even before
China "earned" back the most favored nation status. What *are* they doing
with all that money they get from the products they export to this country
and that we buy? That's just one example and I bet everyone could submit
their own pet peeve for dangers that encroach upon this country; leaving
blatant terrorism aside.

>
> Can you imagine the outpore of anger that would have occured if
> those 20 men had been arrested on September TENTH...?!?! The ACLU, The
> Arab-American League and who knows who all else would have been all
> over the press about how we were infringing on thier rights.
>

Well, I am outraged at the significance of those being held at at the US prison camp in Guantanamo Bay in Cuba. For just an example of this, see the news article at the BBC's website (add http:// to the following) news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/americas/2648547.stm. Yes, I know it seems outrageously un-American to have some empathy for these folks, but I do. And it galls me that the situation exists as it does.

> But what gauls ME is how people will get indignant about how our
> politicians SHOULD be, yet "we" allow someone like Bill Clinton off
> the hook despite having been caught lying over and over. Then his
> wife gets caught stealing "things" from the White House, and what do
> they do? They elect her to the Senate of a state she enver held
> residence in.

I didn't get all that riled up about the Clinton debaucle. Hell, I'm thinking they are probably swingers and that news just didn't come out. Don't know about Hillary stealing stuff...was *she* brought up on any charges? See the irony? The folks at Guantanamo Bay haven't been charged with a thing and they're sitting where they are. She gets caught red-handed--at least according to you--and she's now in the US Senate.

> DO you know WHY she didn't run for office from her HOME state?
>
> WHY should we NOT tolerate them lying about anything else if
> we're going to send a message that it's "OK" for the President of the
> United States to violate the very same "sexual harrassment" laws that
> are now prevelant in every workplace save porno movies and stripper
> bars?

Well, I don't believe "we" did send that message, Steve. I believe "they" decided how the whole thing would be handled and it got handled the way "they" wanted it. They being the politicians and people of preference.

> As for the cost of things...Well, all I can say is you get what
> you pay for. We hamstrung our intelligence agencies for almost 30
> years and now we are wondering why they can't "know" certain things.
> The business of intelligence is dirty, often conniving, and usually
> ugly. Our adversaries know this. That's how they manage to stay in
> step with us all too often.
>
> 73
>
> Steve, K4YZ

Aw, I'm not so sure we are or were all that hamstrung. Look back on history a few years back...ok a lot of few years' back, and look at the photos of Saddam shaking hands with...who is that?

There's more to outrage than meets the eye, Steve. You're right, though, we do need to decide what it is that is going to outrage us, *us* not them.

Kim W5TIT

2301. Re: Speaking of Outrages

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-07 01:08:41 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <tgCqb.21185$4i3.16540@news01.roc.ny>
Source record: 81927

Kim,

The only thing they care about is getting elected. Yes, it was a no-win situation, but this country is currently being run by "big money". I still can't believe a drug manufacturer can threaten to cut off Canadians who sell drugs to Americans. If this were a more modest size company, who knows how many laws would be brought to bear.

Frankly, if you are not aware, Congress couldn't care less what the average American thinks, as long as some good publicity, pork, and sound bites can get them re-elected.

Some thirty plus years ago, then Governor Rockefeller of New York made the statement which roughly went "I know our taxes are high, but they are affordable. If you take the typical family of four making $100,000 per year ...". Remember, this would likely be the equivalent of saying $500,000 per year today. Believe me, most politicians are clueless. Who, in their right mind, would consider a family of four making $500,000 per year average?

It is easier to blame the poor (welfare costs sky high), but if you examine the cost of medicare and medicaid, a lot of expense is due to high drug costs. We pay more than any other nation in the world for drugs, and the drug companies threaten to cut off other countries that would sell us those drugs (legitimate drugs, not patent infringing knock-offs) for less.

Here in New York, the courts ruled that the distribution of school aid was illegal (seems they counted kids in New York City as 7/10 or 8/10 of a person. Why?). Aid to the cities is down (and the cities generally have most of the kids with disabilities. I'd seen, over the years, a number of suburbs vote out allowing group homes for mentally impared folks, low income housing, and the list goes on). Here is my bet, now that Rochester has been Gerrymandered into Buffalo for one representative in Congress .... yep, the monied interests have won. No increase in property tax - but the sales tax is going from 8.25% up another .66% and likely higher. Here is my guess: within 10 years, there will be a lawsuit and you will see court ordered bussing around here and everyone will loose. Now you'll add the cost of the bussing to everything else. I can't wait to retire to Florida :)

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

"Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:boep9s$3et@library1.airnews.net...
> "K&#65533;HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:pTxqb.12802$Oo4.2623@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> >

> > "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote
> >
> > > Commentary: Senate Took Easy Road to $87 Billion Package
> > >
> > > Six senators debated this package. SIX! Get on your radios and talk
> > about
> > > this! I am *not* commenting on supporting or not supporting the
> > package--I
> > > am dismayed that only six senators debated the issue, and even more
> angry
> > > that a vote was "undercover."
> >
> > This thing was a "no win" for the politicians.
> >
> > They know they're putting money into the pockets of the likes of
> Halliburton
> > and other Shrub buddies to modernize Iraq, yet we can't even find money
to
> > rebuild our own roads and bridges at home. On the other hand, if they
vote
> > against it (or try to separate out the pork) then they get accused of
"not
> > supporting our fighting forces".
> >
> >
> > 73, de Hans, K0HB
> > --
> >
> > ��? I found it!!!! http://www.home.earthlink.net/~k0hb/id7.html
> >
>
> Your commentary noted, Hans--but I really wonder how much they really care
> about what we think any more; one way or the other. I don't know why
they'd
> "hide" their vote. We the People aren't in their scope any more--they do
as
> they please. Know what I think? I think the *only* responses they worry
> about is those from their big dollar spenders--not We the People. I know,
I
> am preaching to the choir...
>
> The mere revelation that only six were in the debate is enough to raise
the
> question: "if you couldn't publicly support or express non-support this
> expense, then why would you think the US people should allow the
> expenditure?" Because, bottom line, the US people deserved more than they
> got out of this one.
>
> Kim W5TIT

>
>

2302. Re: A Morsodist Challenge

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-07 01:29:09 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0311061729.2c89bc55@posting.google.com>
Source record: 81928

groupk0hb@earthlink.net (Hans K0HB) wrote in message
news:<5ee63311.0311021638.54ad7389@posting.google.com>...
> "Hans K0HB" <k0hb@earthlink.net> wrote

> Looks like Dick couldn't make it.

As prophesized.

2303. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-07 01:29:26 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031106202926.23307.00004222@mb-m29.aol.com>
Source record: 81929

In article <be0lb.7704$W16.7123@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Bill Sohl"
<billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:

>> Radio is but a small part of electrical engineering, and it keeps getting
>> smaller as other technologies come along. Heck, the hot subject in
>> communications today is fiber optics - which works by on-off keying!
>
>While it is true that fiber technology today is digitally based, fiber
>can actually be used for an analog transmisison function if someone
>wanted to.

Of course!

But in fact, the mode used in practically all fiber optic communications is
simple on-off keying of a "carrier".

Very similar, in fact, to landwire telegraph practice, speeded up and
automated, and using photons instead of electrons.

73 de Jim, N2EY

73 de Jim, N2EY

2304. Re: Amateur Radio in the 21st Century?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-07 01:42:43 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <nMCqb.13187$Oo4.5885@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 81930

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote

> But...but Hans....are you saying that all that theory stuff should be
"shoved
> down the throats" of hams who will never use it?

What the hell is it with you, Jim????? Halloween is over. Drag this
worn-out old strawman out to the curb with the trash. You sound like a
broken record.

Hans

2305. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-07 01:59:40 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <g0Dqb.13209$Oo4.964@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 81931

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote

> But in fact, the mode used in practically all fiber optic communications
is
> simple on-off keying of a "carrier".
>
> Very similar, in fact, to landwire telegraph practice, speeded up and
> automated, and using photons instead of electrons.

Jim, your credibility is fast evaporating!!!!!! This is the most wildly stretched and tortured analogy to hit rrap since FOREVER! Next you'll tell us that ..... aw never mind, I can't even read your stuff with a straight face anymore. You're funnier than Masatoka whatever-his-name-was. I think you must have done multiple sessions of boko-maru with him.

73, de Hans, K0HB

2306. Re: Speaking of Outrages

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-07 02:29:38 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <msDqb.8026$P%1.7105419@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 81932

"Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:boc65g$rql@library1.airnews.net...
> Anyone else here this?
>
> Commentary: Senate Took Easy Road to $87 Billion Package
>
> Six senators debated this package. SIX! Get on your radios and talk
about
> this! I am *not* commenting on supporting or not supporting the
package--I
> am dismayed that only six senators debated the issue, and even more angry
> that a vote was "undercover."
>
> Kim W5TIT
>
>

Hardly undercover when the upcoming vote was all over the news and the results afterwards were all over the news.

Although only 6 actively spoke, there were plenty of members in the Senate chamber to listen, weigh the comments and vote.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

2307. Re: ARRL you can Kiss my $39.00 a Year Good Bye

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-07 02:31:57 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <xuDqb.8027$P%1.7106165@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 81933

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:hnjqb.2501$gn1.310681@news1.news.adelphia.net...
> S. Hanrahan wrote:
> > On Wed, 05 Nov 2003 09:19:49 -0500, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote:
> >
> >
> > >>I keep getting these images of you two listening to a ARRL Morse code CD
> > >>to fall asleep to, instead of the music most people would use! 8^)
> >
> >
> > > I've worked pileups in my sleep the night after Field Day is over. heh
> > > heh ;)
>
> I'm guilty if that too!
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -
>

Although I am only a casual contester, sometimes I'll hear CW in my sleep if
I've worked one harder than normal.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

2308. Re: NCI Petition for Rulemaking

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-07 02:41:27 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <rDDqb.8029$P%1.7107610@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 81934

"Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
news:3FAA7679.1050701@psu.edu...
> S. Hanrahan wrote:
> > On Wed, 05 Nov 2003 12:35:58 GMT, "Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM>
> > wrote:
> >
> >
> >>"S. Hanrahan" <aa7ya@hotmail.com> wrote in message
> >>news:1sqhqv4jh49sbnivjmeouou2i1bmaddkpc@4ax.com..
> >>
> >>>At 5 WPM, you don't need a computer to copy good or poor code.
> >>
> >>I think you've just hit the nail on the head. It's really not how hard
or
> >>easy 5-wpm is, it's the willingness (or lack thereof) to make the
initial
> >>(i.e. "initiative") effort to learn the 43 required characters.
> >
> >
> > Exactly. I look at it this way, if a person doesn't want to learn the
> > code, fine, if they want to fine, just don't come up to me and bitch
> > and moan that 5 WPM is a hurdle or mountain too high to climb.
> >
> > I'm hearing impaired in both ears, and I can copy 45-50 WPM in my head
> > solidly, and attained the 20 before taking my General class written,
> > without waivers.
>
> Now you have my attention, Stacey! What is the nature of your hearing
> loss, if I may ask? I have tinnitus and am about 60 db down compared to
> normal hearing, with several 100 db plus holes in various places. One
> of the weird things about my particular flavor of hearing loss is that
> all incoming sounds seem to get equal treatment in my brain. Whereas it
> appears that most people can filter out the good stuff from the noise, I
> end up treating all sounds equally. No mental DSP here, unfortunately! 8^)
>
> At any rate, I've had to do a lot of work to get this far. Took 6 months
> of intense work to get to 5wpm, and I've been working daily on
> increasing my speed for the last month or so. I don't envy much, but I
> envy those who were able to pick Morse code up in a few weekends.
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -
>

We all envy those who can get it in a few hours. It takes a normal person 30 hours to get to 5wpm, 60 hours to get to 10wpm, 95 hours to get to 15wpm, and 150 hours to get to 20wpm (info from the book "Morse Code, The Essential Language"). Some of us will need more time and a few unusually talented people will get it in a lot less.

So don't be discouraged. Keep at it. Get on the air and make some QSOs even though you need to go slow. If you can tolerate the frustration, try a contest even if you have to listen to the other station repeatedly to pick out the info and then throw in your call. You'd very likely see a noticeable improvement in speed.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

2309. Re: Amateur Radio in the 21st Century?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-07 02:51:02 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <qMDqb.3896$gn1.689968@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 81935

N2EY wrote:

> You watch, Hans - those of us who resist these ideas will be called "elitist"
> and "stuck in the past" etc.

Aren't we already?

2310. Re: Speaking of Outrages

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-07 02:59:34 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20031106215934.07346.00001630@mb-m26.aol.com>
Source record: 81936

In article <boc65g$rql@library1.airnews.net>, "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
writes:

>Anyone else here this?
>
>Commentary: Senate Took Easy Road to $87 Billion Package
>
>Six senators debated this package. SIX! Get on your radios and talk about
>this! I am *not* commenting on supporting or not supporting the package--I
>am dismayed that only six senators debated the issue, and even more angry
>that a vote was "undercover."
>
>Kim W5TIT

Kim:

Care to provide a URL to the "commentary" you cited?

BTW -- I have no problem with Congress appropriating $87 Billion for
the War on Terror. They can take it out of whatever federal welfare
payments are being given to illegal immigrants.

73 de Larry, K3LT

2311. You may not be a rocket scientist....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-07 03:46:38 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <yAEqb.13327$Oo4.1944@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 81937
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

....but some rocket scientists are looking for help from hams.

See the URL http://www.astrosurf.com/lombry/qsl-iss-shadow.htm

73, de Hans, K0HB
--
Help support youth involved in Amateur Radio.
http://www.mnyarc.org
http://www.k0bsa.org

2312. Re: NCI Petition for Rulemaking

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-07 04:00:30 UTC
From: Bert Craig <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM>
Message-ID: <yNEqb.33081$o96.5072250@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>
Source record: 81938

"K�HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:RtAqb.12965$Oo4.12057@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> "Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.net> wrote
>
> > No, it's like learning the basics of cycling before being allowed to
> > participate in the race.
>
> Did your Dad & Mom make you take a test before they bought you your first
> bike?

Nope, only before I actually used it. It involved training wheels, lots of patience, and constant evaluation...even more so when I "earned the privilege" of being allowed to ride in the street. Good analogy, Hans. Thanks.

> But actually, Morse code is a bit like learning to ride a bike.... it's
> sort of "self testing"..... if you want to use it, you'll learn how.

I hope the "once you learn it, you never forget it" axiom holds true.

> 73, de Hans, K0HB
> --
> "Beware of the man who works hard to learn something, learns it,
> and finds himself no wiser than before. He is full of murderous
> resentment of people who are ignorant without having come by
> their ignorance the hard way." --Bokonon

Is this referring to the 5-wpm test? I don't think so. "Murderous resentment?" <ggg>

73 de Bert
WA2SI

2313. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-07 06:31:12 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <REMOVETHISkc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <boh9mn$1f99e9$5@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 81859

"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
news:c2356669.0311051600.62fc767f@posting.google.com...
> "Ryan, KC8PMX" <REMOVETHISkc8pmx@diamondcs.net> wrote in message
news:<bo8co9$1aok9h$5@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>...
> > But its perfectly okay to pay some union bum a ton of wages for doing a
> > repetitive task, (a skill that same 14 y.o. that passed a ham test
could
> > do) therefore jacking the cost of a product, lets say a car for this
> > example, to a ridiculous price??? (actually both the fast food worker
and
> > the person on the line at the factory ARE BOTH doing repetitive
tasks....)
>
> Hold on a sec....
>
> "union bum"?

Yep... there are a ton of them in this state..... collect a "phat" wage ($20 per hour or more) for a job a kid could do, brag about only working 2 of the 8 hours in a shift, and admit to stealing and other fraudulant practices..... .yeah, those are bums... Not all union workers are bums, but there are alot that are.

>
> The basic concept that Dwight is talking about is a "living wage" -
> meaning jobs that pay enough in wages and benefits to permit people to
> live above the poverty line *without* government help. Yes, paying a
> living wage makes products and services cost more, but it also removes
> people from the govt. support system.

So.... basically, one way or another people have to pay for it, be it in higher service/product costs or paying in taxes for a government program.

>
> Some say "the marketplace" should set wages. But "the marketplace" is
> tilted by a bunch of factors, such as the exportation of jobs and the
> importation of workers.

Yes, that is what is called an idealism, but in reality it doesn't work that way. Let's look at my county for example..... Republican owners of businesses and places to rent charge considerably higher for products, services and housing. These are also in most of the cases the employers in the area. For example, on average, a single bedroom apartment cannot be found for less than $350-400. That does not even include utilities. The average wage around here, what is considered the alleged "living" or minimum wage is between $5.25-6.00 per hour. Now, do the math on that. The first

of the normal 2 paychecks (paid every 2 weeks) each month barely even
covers the rent, let alone the utilities. Factor in transportation of any
means, and basic food needs, and that exceeds the second check. This does
not include for any savings, clothing or medicine purchases and of course
nothing in the "entertainment" category on the spreadsheet.
That is why alot of people around here are forced to work two jobs. Problem
there is, there is no time left over for family or even better, trying to
take classes to get a degree to get out of the ruts. Typically in my area
as well, certain market indicators such as milk, bread, gasoline etc, is at
least 10-20 percent higher than surrounding counties. Basically they want
you to work for as little as possible, but charge ya up the ying-yang for
everything. Guess that is the American way eh?

> The "living wage" concept and reality are largely a result of
> organized labor unions leveling the playing field a bit by unifying
> the many workers in negotiating with the relatively few employees. The
> really smart employers learned to treat their workers well enough that
> they wouldn't unionize.
>
> Look at what working conditions were like in various industries
> 100-150 years ago, before organized labor had any real power.

Just like they are for non-unionized labor now! hihi

> > Believe it or not, there are alot more people out there trying to
survive on
> > the poverty level wages. Based strictly on my local region, that would
be
> > any job under 9-10 dollars per hour before taxes and if any, benefits.
And
> > unfortunately some of these people are NOT counted, in the unemployment
or
> > other job related statistics, if they are not participating in the
various
> > government programs like the employment security commision that Michigan
> > has... (think its called MichiganWorks)
>
> Yep. $20,000/yr isn't much at all anymore in many parts of the
> country. Not to raise a family, anyway.

Or for a single person either..... that 20,000 grand is PRE-TAX and
PRE-BENEFIT (if any) and can quickly become as low as 13,000-15,000 dollars
depending on the circumstances.

> As for the $15 burrito and coke at Taco Bell, think about this:
>
> At least here in EPA, we have a decent selection of independent diners
> as an alternative to the fast food chains. The food in them is not
> much more expensive than the chains, and usually better for you. The

> workers in those places make at least as much as the fast food chains.
> One reason for their survival is that they don't spend bazillions on
> advertising. Another is local loyalty of customers.
>
> So what's the answer, Dwight - Ryan - Kim?
> \

I don't assume to have all of the answers, but I am sure that you can go through just about any company or organization and thin out the dead-wood. People who just are not returning equivalent value for the service they are supposed to provide as an employee. There is a case of 3 people who are "riding the clock out" in my full time employment place of work. And compared to the remainder of the department they are making more than twice our wages for similar/same work but just have been here a while. With those three people to finally retire or move on, that would allow for at least 4-5 more people to replace them, that will ACTUALLY WORK, and still allow for the rest of the department to get a $1.00 per hour raise, and STILL SAVE SOME MONEY on overall department wages. The math has been figured out here on this and it is true....

The other answer is for employers to finally see the value in helping the employee with training/education. If an employer is credible enough, the employee will stay with that employer with the new training they have recieved.

Even though people want to believe otherwise, there are more and more people having to, and trying to survive on what were supposed to be considered "high school kid" jobs.

--
Ryan KC8PMX

Never take life seriously. Nobody gets out alive anyway.

2314. Re: Speaking of Outrages

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-07 08:55:00 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0311070055.25832042@posting.google.com>
Source record: 81939

"Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:<boeqem$494@library1.airnews.net>...
> "Steve Robeson, K4CAP" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:5c01b95b.0311061102.34c6db91@posting.google.com...
> > "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> news:<boddup$l8n@library1.airnews.net>...
> >
> > > If anyone wants to start changing things in America, they need to start
> > > changing politicians. And, I don't even care what "party" is
> changed--they
> > > are all essentially the same.
> >
> > I'll have to disagree with you a bit here, Kim...
> >
> > I think before we change politicians, we have to change
> > ourselves...What we want from govenment, the kind of conduct we expect
> > and what we are willing to pay for with our taxes.
> >
>
> Well, I think that's almost a given...but I agree. Actually, as long as the
> American people are represented again...and I don't think they really are
> now...then I'd be happy with anything.

Ahhh! But Kim! THAT'S THE RUB ! ! ! !

Senator-hopeful Foghorn-Leghorn stumps the Lone Star State
promising he's "The People's Senator", so we elect him. Then we tell
him "Just get it done and don't bother us", then WE wonder why things
got so screwed up! It's cuz >>WE<< didn't supervise him !

> I, for one, am getting tired of 9-11 being the barometer of how patriotic we
> are. Leaving out the disaster, there is so much other stuff hurting this
> country--even more than the blatant terrorism that is part of a bigger
> picture. Terrorism is just easier to see and be offended by. What about
> all the products we buy every day that are made in China--and even before
> China "earned" back the most favored nation status. What *are* they doing
> with all that money they get from the products they export to this country
> and that we buy? That's just one example and I bet everyone could submit
> their own pet peeve for dangers that encroach upon this country; leaving
> blatant terrorism aside.

Well what do you THINK they are doing with it, Kim??? The Red
Chinese just put their first astronaut in orbit a few weeks ago. And
who do you think is supplying Kim il-Jong with most of >>HIS<<
play-pretties...?!?!

But just TRY and get Americans to buy more expensive clothes just
on the principle of International Politics and they will laugh at you.

> > Can you imagine the outpore of anger that would have occured if
> > those 20 men had been arrested on September TENTH...?!?! The ACLU, The
> > Arab-American League and who knows who all else would have been all
> > over the press about how we were infringing on thier rights.
> >
>
> Well, I am outraged at the significance of those being held at at the US
> prison camp in Guantanamo Bay in Cuba. For just an example of this, see the
> news article at the BBC's website (add http:// to the following)
> news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/americas/2648547.stm. Yes, I know it seems outrageously
> un-American to have some empathy for these folks, but I do. And it galls me
> that the situation exists as it does.

I have some empathy for them too, Kim. I have empathy for the
Palestinians who wake up to see Cobra helos hovering outside thier
homes and for the Israelis who can't ride a bus to work for fear it
will blow up.

That wasn't my point...My point was where do we draw the line
between NOT "impinging" our "rights", but still giving our law and
intelligence agencies the maneuvering room they need to stop these
scumbags?

> > But what gauls ME is how people will get indignant about how our
> > politicians SHOULD be, yet "we" allow someone like Bill Clinton off
> > the hook despite having been caught lying over and over. Then his
> > wife gets caught stealing "things" from the White House, and what do
> > they do? They elect her to the Senate of a state she enver held
> > residence in.
> >
>
> I didn't get all that riled up about the Clinton debaucle. Hell, I'm
> thinking they are probably swingers and that news just didn't come out.
> Don't know about Hillary stealing stuff...was *she* brought up on any
> charges? See the irony? The folks at Guantanamo Bay haven't been charged
> with a thing and they're sitting where they are. She gets caught
> red-handed--at least according to you--and she's now in the US Senate.

There's a difference between a combatant and a criminal suspect.
Those men are being held as combatants, not as "criminal suspects".

And that you didn't get "riled up" over the Clinton thing is part
of this nation's problems. We have made "sexual harrassment" so "PC"
that we can't even discuss it without offending someone, yet here's
the alleged leader of the free world doing ALL the things that would
give Gloria Steinman a coronary, and we just blew it off.

What kind of signal does that send?

If you or I invited a junior into the back office and suggested
that they might get some sort of preferential treatment for an hour's

worth of belly-tag, we'd get our butt's nailed to the wall.

> > DO you know WHY she didn't run for office from her HOME state?
> >
> > WHY should we NOT tolerate them lying about anything else if
> > we're going to send a message that it's "OK" for the President of the
> > United States to violate the very same "sexual harrassment" laws that
> > are now prevelant in every workplace save porno movies and stripper
> > bars?
>
> Well, I don't believe "we" did send that message, Steve. I believe "they"
> decided how the whole thing would be handled and it got handled the way
> "they" wanted it. They being the politicians and people of preference.

That doesn't wash with me...The document that empowers those
"they" says "We, The People...", and I believe if >>WE<< don't take
responsibility for and set the standards of what our government should
be, then we have no business complaining about it.

> > As for the cost of things...Well, all I can say is you get what
> > you pay for. We hamstrung our intelligence agencies for almost 30
> > years and now we are wondering why they can't "know" certain things.
> > The business of intelligence is dirty, often conniving, and usually
> > ugly. Our adversaries know this. That's how they manage to stay in
> > step with us all too often.
> >
> > 73
> >
> > Steve, K4YZ
> >
>
> Aw, I'm not so sure we are or were all that hamstrung. Look back on history
> a few years back...ok a lot of few years' back, and look at the photos of
> Saddam shaking hands with...who is that?
>
> There's more to outrage than meets the eye, Steve. You're right, though, we
> do need to decide what it is that is going to outrage us, *us* not them.

We KNOW what outrages us, Kim...The question is are we now going
to demonstrate the sustained will to keep it from happening
again...?!?!

73

Steve, K4YZ

2315. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-07 10:17:24 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031107051724.12300.00001489@mb-m20.aol.com>
Source record: 81940

In article <g0Dqb.13209$Oo4.964@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Kï¿½HB"
<groupk0hb@earthlink.net> writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote
>
>
>
>> But in fact, the mode used in practically all fiber optic communications
>is
>> simple on-off keying of a "carrier".
>>
>> Very similar, in fact, to landwire telegraph practice, speeded up and
>> automated, and using photons instead of electrons.
>
>Jim, your credibility is fast evaporating!!!!!! This is the most wildly
>stretched and tortured analogy to hit rrap since FOREVER!

How so?

The old original landwire telegraph used a single (usually iron) wire and
on-off keying of an electric current. Fiber optics uses a glass fiber and
on-off keying of an beam of light, usually from a laser. Both sent messages by
time-domain multiplexing.

>Next you'll tell
>us that ..... aw never mind, I can't even read your stuff with a straight
>face anymore. You're funnier than Masatoka whatever-his-name-was.

"Are you not entertained??? Is this not what you came here for??"*

>I think
>you must have done multiple sessions of boko-maru with him.

Aw, now you're getting insulting....

Be well.

73 de Jim, N2EY

* pop culture reference: Maximus to the crowd in the film "Gladiator"

2316. Re: Amateur Radio in the 21st Century?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-07 10:17:24 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031107051724.12300.00001490@mb-m20.aol.com>
Source record: 81941

In article <nMCqb.13187$Oo4.5885@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Kï¿½HB"
<groupk0hb@earthlink.net> writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote
>
>
>> But...but Hans....are you saying that all that theory stuff should be
>"shoved
>> down the throats" of hams who will never use it?
>
>What the hell is it with you, Jim????? Halloween is over. Drag this
>worn-out old strawman out to the curb with the trash. You sound like a
>broken record.
>
Apparently you didn't read the KL7CC paper, Hans.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2317. Re: Speaking of Outrages

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-07 10:26:33 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bofrv8$eak@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 81942

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:msDqb.8026$P%1.7105419@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
>
> "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> news:boc65g$rql@library1.airnews.net...
> > Anyone else here this?
> >
> > Commentary: Senate Took Easy Road to $87 Billion Package
> >
> > Six senators debated this package. SIX! Get on your radios and talk
> about
> > this! I am *not* commenting on supporting or not supporting the
> package--I
> > am dismayed that only six senators debated the issue, and even more
angry
> > that a vote was "undercover."
> >
> > Kim W5TIT
> >
> >
>
> Hardly undercover when the upcoming vote was all over the news and the
> results afterwards were all over the news.
>
> Although only 6 actively spoke, there were plenty of members in the Senate
> chamber to listen, weigh the comments and vote.
>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>

Nope...sorry. The vote was "secret." If you'd listened Daniel's commentary, that was stated. A senator does not have to tell you one way or the other how it was they voted. Daniel lives in Washington, D.C., so he did not have a senator to ask. He called another and did not get an answer.

The *issue* was not undercover, the vote was. And, again. As the introducer stated, there were *not* any more than six members *in the chamber* when the debate took place No comments were weighed at all...no one is accountable for how they voted--*either* way, I might add. US Senate Majority Leader Bill Frist and Senate Democratic LeaderTom Daschel worked the whole thing out, by the way. It's when they "get together" to work things like this out that make one sigh with resignation...

Kim W5TIT

2318. Re: Speaking of Outrages

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-07 10:30:41 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bofs6v$ip3@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 81943

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20031106215934.07346.00001630@mb-m26.aol.com...
> In article <boc65g$rql@library1.airnews.net>, "Kim W5TIT"
<kimscliff@yahoo.com>
> writes:
>
> >Anyone else here this?
> >
> >Commentary: Senate Took Easy Road to $87 Billion Package
> >
> >Six senators debated this package. SIX! Get on your radios and talk
about
> >this! I am *not* commenting on supporting or not supporting the
package--I
> >am dismayed that only six senators debated the issue, and even more angry
> >that a vote was "undercover."
> >
> >Kim W5TIT
>
> Kim:
>
> Care to provide a URL to the "commentary" you cited?
>
> BTW -- I have no problem with Congress appropriating $87 Billion for
> the War on Terror. They can take it out of whatever federal welfare
> payments are being given to illegal immigrants.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

The news can probably be had anywhere, but here is the link...and I've given
it a couple of times: npr.org/features/feature.php?wfId=1493745. Add, of
course http:// and www. to the address. And, by the way, why the quote
marks around commentary?

Kim W5TIT

2319. Re: NCI Petition for Rulemaking

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-07 10:35:49 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bofsgk$kvk@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 81944

"Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in message
news:yNEqb.33081$o96.5072250@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net...
> "K�HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:RtAqb.12965$Oo4.12057@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> > "Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.net> wrote
> >
> > > No, it's like learning the basics of cycling before being allowed to
> > > participate in the race.
> >
> > Did your Dad & Mom make you take a test before they bought you your
first
> > bike?
>
> Nope, only before I actually used it. It involved training wheels, lots of
> patience, and constant evaluation...even more so when I "earned the
> privilege" of being allowed to ride in the street. Good analogy, Hans.
> Thanks.
>
> > But actually, Morse code is a bit like learning to ride a bike.... it's
> > sort of "self testing"..... if you want to use it, you'll learn how.
>
> I hope the "once you learn it, you never forget it" axiom holds true.
>
> > 73, de Hans, K0HB
> > --
> > "Beware of the man who works hard to learn something, learns it,
> > and finds himself no wiser than before. He is full of murderous
> > resentment of people who are ignorant without having come by
> > their ignorance the hard way." --Bokonon
>
> Is this referring to the 5-wpm test? I don't think so. "Murderous
> resentment?" <ggg>
>
> 73 de Bert
> WA2SI
>

Heh heh...unless one need it for quick contacts, you only need to remember .
. . - - - . . .
Just joking...

Kim W5TIT

2320. Re: Speaking of Outrages

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-07 12:57:08 UTC
From: charlesb <n5pvl@sbcglobal.net>
Message-ID: <EEMqb.5530$zm.4183@newssvr25.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 81945

"Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:bofrv8$eak@library1.airnews.net...
>
> The *issue* was not undercover, the vote was.

The secret vote was a mechanism to allow democrats to vote on the issue in a rational fashion without getting in trouble for it among themselves. It worked, too!

> It's when they "get together" to work
> things like this out that make one sigh with resignation...

- Or a sigh of relief, depending on who and where you are.

Charles Brabham, N5PVL

2321. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-07 13:55:07 UTC
From: Clint <"rattlehead at computron dot net">
Message-ID: <vqn91v40vonb66@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 81946

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:x_kpb.2340$Bf7.1316246@news1.news.adelphia.net...
>
> Hey, you want a theory?
>
> How about an effort made to get African Americans (traditionally
> Democrat)to move back to the south to balance out the political leanings
> of the area?

That's a little far-fetched... a conspiracy to get millions to move just for
political reasons?

Would you up and move all the way across the country, family and ALL,
your entire LIFE change drastically, just so a ceratian politician will get
1 more vote?

Clint
KB5ZHT
--

--

45 Communist Goals for America

http://www.uhuh.com/nwo/communism/comgoals.htm

--

2322. Optical signals - Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-07 15:15:22 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <eGOqb.13993$Oo4.2526@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 81947

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20031107051724.12300.00001489@mb-m20.aol.com...
> In article <g0Dqb.13209$Oo4.964@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "K HB"
> <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> writes:
>
> >"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote
> >
> >
> >
> >> But in fact, the mode used in practically all fiber optic
communications
> >is
> >> simple on-off keying of a "carrier".
> >>
> >> Very similar, in fact, to landwire telegraph practice, speeded up and
> >> automated, and using photons instead of electrons.
> >
> >Jim, your credibility is fast evaporating!!!!!! This is the most wildly
> >stretched and tortured analogy to hit rrap since FOREVER!
>
> How so?
>
> The old original landwire telegraph used a single (usually iron) wire and
> on-off keying of an electric current. Fiber optics uses a glass fiber and
> on-off keying of an beam of light, usually from a laser. Both sent
messages by
> time-domain multiplexing.

Actually, in really high speed optical equipment it is both
time domain and wavelengths/frequency (sometimes called color) domains.
There is equipment out there that operates at 1.6 Terrabits/sec.

Cheers,
Bill

2323. Re: Amateur Radio in the 21st Century?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-07 15:19:17 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <VJOqb.14948$9M3.2034@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 81948

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote

> Apparently you didn't read the KL7CC paper, Hans.

Of course I read it. But rather than fixate on it, I dismissed it as
unworkable and without sufficient weight to gain any traction.

73, de Hans, K0HB

2324. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-07 17:12:39 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0311070912.3a233f77@posting.google.com>
Source record: 81949

"Kim" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote in message news:<boc573$1ds@library1.airnews.net>...
> "N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
> news:c2356669.0311051600.62fc767f@posting.google.com...
> > "Ryan, KC8PMX" <REMOVETHISkc8pmx@diamondcs.net> wrote in message
> news:<bo8co9$1aok9h$5@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>...
> > > But its perfectly okay to pay some union bum a ton of wages for doing a
> > > repetitive task, (a skill that same 14 y.o. that passed a ham test
> could
> > > do) therefore jacking the cost of a product, lets say a car for this
> > > example, to a ridiculous price??? (actually both the fast food worker
> and
> > > the person on the line at the factory ARE BOTH doing repetitive
> tasks....)
> >
> > Hold on a sec....
> >
> > "union bum"?
> >
> > The basic concept that Dwight is talking about is a "living wage" -
> > meaning jobs that pay enough in wages and benefits to permit people to
> > live above the poverty line *without* government help. Yes, paying a
> > living wage makes products and services cost more, but it also removes
> > people from the govt. support system.
> >
> > Some say "the marketplace" should set wages. But "the marketplace" is
> > tilted by a bunch of factors, such as the exportation of jobs and the
> > importation of workers.
> >
> > The "living wage" concept and reality are largely a result of
> > organized labor unions leveling the playing field a bit by unifying
> > the many workers in negotiating with the relatively few employees. The
> > really smart employers learned to treat their workers well enough that
> > they wouldn't unionize.
> >
> > Look at what working conditions were like in various industries
> > 100-150 years ago, before organized labor had any real power.
> > >
> > > Believe it or not, there are alot more people out there trying to
> survive on
> > > the poverty level wages. Based strictly on my local region, that would
> be
> > > any job under 9-10 dollars per hour before taxes and if any, benefits.
> And
> > > unfortunately some of these people are NOT counted, in the unemployment

> or
> > > other job related statistics, if they are not participating in the
> various
> > > government programs like the employment security commision that Michigan
> > > has... (think its called MichiganWorks)
> >
> > Yep. $20,000/yr isn't much at all anymore in many parts of the
> > country. Not to raise a family, anyway.
> >
> > As for the $15 burrito and coke at Taco Bell, think about this:
> >
> > At least here in EPA, we have a decent selection of independent diners
> > as an alternative to the fast food chains. The food in them is not
> > much more expensive than the chains, and usually better for you. The
> > workers in those places make at least as much as the fast food chains.
> > One reason for their survival is that they don't spend bazillions on
> > advertising. Another is local loyalty of customers.
> >
> > So what's the answer, Dwight - Ryan - Kim?
> >
> > 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
> I'm out of it...speculation won't solve a thing and I choose not to be as
> depressed and bitter and hateful as others...
>
Kim,

I hope you weren't referring to me....

73 de Jim, N2EY

2325. Re: Speaking of Outrages

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-07 17:32:44 UTC
From: JJ <radiiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <HrGdnXHwaMqkRTaiRVn-sA@gbronline.com>
Source record: 81950

Kim W5TIT wrote:

>
> I, for one, am getting tired of 9-11 being the barometer of how patriotic we
> are. Leaving out the disaster, there is so much other stuff hurting this
> country--even more than the blatant terrorism that is part of a bigger
> picture. Terrorism is just easier to see and be offended by. What about
> all the products we buy every day that are made in China--and even before
> China "earned" back the most favored nation status. What *are* they doing
> with all that money they get from the products they export to this country
> and that we buy?

They are building their armies and wepons for world dominance.

2326. Re: Speaking of Outrages

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-07 18:04:42 UTC
From: Gr&#65533;mw&#65533;tch th&#65533; &#65533;nfl&#65533;pp&#65533;bl&#65533; <Gr&#65533;mw&#65533;tch@NOSPAM.THANKS.IM.FULL.lycos.co.de>
Message-ID: <_8Rqb.1559$nz.19@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 81851

"Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:boeqem$494@library1.airnews.net...

: What about all the products we buy every day that are made in China--
: and even before China "earned" back the most favored nation status.
: What *are* they doing with all that money they get from the products
: they export to this country and that we buy?

Theyre building black helicopters. bwhahahahahahahah!

No, actually theyre buying new cars to replace their bicicle and new shoes
for their babies and shawls for their grandma and building new factories to
make more export goods. Theyre not going around attacking other countries
and having their young people sent home in body bags --- theyre not yet that
civilized.

BGO
--
"All persons, living or dead, are purely coincidental, and should not be
construed."

2327. Re: Amateur Radio in the 21st Century?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-07 21:47:43 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3FAC12FF.3020502@psu.edu>
Source record: 81852

N2EY wrote:
> In article <nMCqb.13187$Oo4.5885@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Kï¿½HB"
> <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> writes:
>
>
>>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote
>>
>>
>>
>>> But...but Hans....are you saying that all that theory stuff should be
>>
>>"shoved
>>
>>>down the throats" of hams who will never use it?
>>
>>What the hell is it with you, Jim????? Halloween is over. Drag this
>>worn-out old strawman out to the curb with the trash. You sound like a
>>broken record.
>>
>
> Apparently you didn't read the KL7CC paper, Hans.

I thought he did. I think what he wants you to do is to quit bringing
that point up.

Is it a strawman when there is a paper,suggesting that the testing
requirement be radically reduced?

It's there, the proposal has been made, and the authors rely on their
credentials, despite protestations to the contrary. Some strawman!

- Mike KB3EIA -

2328. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-07 21:52:37 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3FAC1425.5060007@psu.edu>
Source record: 81853

Clint wrote:
> "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
> news:x_kpb.2340$Bf7.1316246@news1.news.adelphia.net...
>
>>Hey, you want a theory?
>>
>>How about an effort made to get African Americans (traditionally
>>Democrat)to move back to the south to balance out the political leanings
>>of the area?
>
>
> That's a little far-fetched... a conspiracy to get millions to move just for
> political reasons?
>
> Would you up and move all the way across the country, family and ALL,
> your entire LIFE change drastically, just so a ceratian politician will get
> 1 more vote?

Not if that was the direct approach, but people with agendas tend to approach things obliquely on occasion.

I recall a few years back when some minorities encouraged lots of children so as to eventually become much less of a minority. I can think of some funny names to describe that process! 8^)

Life is so strange.....

- Mike KB3EIA -

2329. Re: Optical signals - Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-07 22:00:54 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0311071400.10808cf9@posting.google.com>
Source record: 81854

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<eGOqb.13993$Oo4.2526@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20031107051724.12300.00001489@mb-m20.aol.com...
> > In article <g0Dqb.13209$Oo4.964@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Kï¿½HB"
> > <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> writes:
> >
> > >"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote
> > >
> > >
> > >
> > >> But in fact, the mode used in practically all fiber optic
> communications
> is
> > >> simple on-off keying of a "carrier".
> > >>
> > >> Very similar, in fact, to landwire telegraph practice, speeded up and
> > >> automated, and using photons instead of electrons.
> > >
> > >Jim, your credibility is fast evaporating!!!!!! This is the most wildly
> > >stretched and tortured analogy to hit rrap since FOREVER!
> >
> > How so?
> >
> > The old original landwire telegraph used a single (usually iron) wire and
> > on-off keying of an electric current. Fiber optics uses a glass fiber and
> > on-off keying of an beam of light, usually from a laser. Both sent
> messages by
> > time-domain multiplexing.
>
> Actually, in really high speed optical equipment it is both
> time domain and wavelengths/frequency (sometimes called color) domains.

Multiple "carriers" (different light wavelengths) on the same fiber,
right? Kinda like multiple telegraph carriers of old.

But isn't the basic modulation scheme still on-off keying of the
light, rather than shifting its color or phase?

> There is equipment out there that operates at 1.6 Terrabits/sec.

lessee...10^12 bits/second...that's more than all of the RF spectrum
normally used for radio, right? And that's through *one* fiber that's
immune to EM fields, weather, ionospheric and tropospheric
propagation, EMI and almost everything else except shovels.

Now that's cool.

But it does have a downside. It permits a significant number of US jobs to be outsourced to places like India (or anywhere else that has a significant English-speaking population).

73 de Jim, N2EY

2330. Re: Amateur Radio in the 21st Century?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-07 22:02:45 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0311071402.38b84095@posting.google.com>
Source record: 81855

"Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<VJOqb.14948$9M3.2034@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote
>
> > Apparently you didn't read the KL7CC paper, Hans.
>
> Of course I read it.

OK

> But rather than fixate on it, I dismissed it as
> unworkable and without sufficient weight to gain any traction.

I hope you're right about that, and that the FCC agrees with you.
Otherwise we could have quite a bit of a pool-pah to deal with.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2331. Re: Amateur Radio in the 21st Century?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-07 22:34:50 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <e6Vqb.15541$Oo4.14210@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 81856

"Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote

> Is it a strawman when there is a paper,suggesting that the testing
> requirement be radically reduced?

> It's there, the proposal has been made, and the authors rely on their
> credentials, despite protestations to the contrary. Some strawman!

The paper is a self-admitted strawman, for Christ's sake!!!! Have you read
it?

Here is a direct quote: "It is intended as a way to help fellow Amateur
Radio operators understand some of the thought processes that led
us to where we are today. It is not a statement of the way things will
end up, but rather it is simply a plan, subject to change and
improvement. It is, in a word, someplace to start."

If that isn't the classic definition of a strawman then I don't know what
is!

73, de Hans, K0HB

2332. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-07 23:14:14 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <dNWcnezpuvoWujGiXTWc9g@ptd.net>
Source record: 81857

What does any of this have to do with BPL?????

Carl - wk3c

"Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
news:3FAC1425.5060007@psu.edu...
> Clint wrote:
> > "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
> > news:x_kpb.2340$Bf7.1316246@news1.news.adelphia.net...
> >
> >>Hey, you want a theory?
> >>
> >>How about an effort made to get African Americans (traditionally
> >>Democrat)to move back to the south to balance out the political leanings
> >>of the area?
> >
> >
> > That's a little far-fetched... a conspiracy to get millions to move just
for
> > political reasons?
> >
> > Would you up and move all the way across the country, family and ALL,
> > your entire LIFE change drastically, just so a ceratian politician will
get
> > 1 more vote?
>
> Not if that was the direct approach, but people with agendas tend to
> approach things obliquely on occasion.
>
> I recall a few years back when some minorities encouraged lots of
> children so as to eventually become much less of a minority. I can think
> of some funny names to describe that process! 8^)
>
> Life is so strange.....
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -
>

2333. Re: Amateur Radio in the 21st Century?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-07 23:20:20 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <J9Scnf7RaYVotTGiXTWc9g@ptd.net>
Source record: 81858

"Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
news:3FAC12FF.3020502@psu.edu...
> N2EY wrote:
> > In article <nMCqb.13187$Oo4.5885@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>,
"Kï¿½HB"
> > <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> writes:
> >
> >
> >>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote
> >>
> >>
> >>
> >>> But...but Hans....are you saying that all that theory stuff should be
> >>
> >>"shoved
> >>
> >>>down the throats" of hams who will never use it?
> >>
> >>What the hell is it with you, Jim????? Halloween is over. Drag this
> >>worn-out old strawman out to the curb with the trash. You sound like a
> >>broken record.

I have to agree with Hans on this. I have asked Jim privately to please
stop harping on the argument that the written tests are equally invalid
as the Morse tests (I know he's playing devil's advocate, but something
that's repeated often enough sometimes catches on and I don't want to
see Jim end up being the best salesman for something that I know he
doesn't want to see any more than I do ...)

Jim, please listen to Hans if you won't listen to me ...

> >>
> >
> > Apparently you didn't read the KL7CC paper, Hans.
>
> I thought he did. I think what he wants you to do is to quit bringing
> that point up.
>
> Is it a strawman when there is a paper,suggesting that the testing
> requirement be radically reduced?
>
> It's there, the proposal has been made, and the authors rely on their
> credentials, despite protestations to the contrary. Some strawman!
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -

The FCC has determined the ARS to be "primarily a technically oriented service" ... I really don't see ANY "no theory" proposal getting a lot of traction there ... and I will be right in there with Jim and most others fighting
that one.

Let's just stop advertising something we don't want to sell - there will be plenty of time to comment vigorously against it if the FCC ever were to lend any credence to such a proposal.

73,
Carl - wk3c

2334. Re: Amateur Radio in the 21st Century?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-08 00:43:34 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <W_Wqb.499$KN4.302757@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 81860

Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
> "Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
> news:3FAC12FF.3020502@psu.edu...
>
>>N2EY wrote:
>>
>>>In article <nMCqb.13187$Oo4.5885@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>,
>
> "Kï¿½HB"
>
>>><groupk0hb@earthlink.net> writes:
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>But...but Hans....are you saying that all that theory stuff should be
>>>>
>>>>"shoved
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>down the throats" of hams who will never use it?
>>>>
>>>>What the hell is it with you, Jim????? Halloween is over. Drag this
>>>>worn-out old strawman out to the curb with the trash. You sound like a
>>>>broken record.
>
>
> I have to agree with Hans on this. I have asked Jim privately to please
> stop harping on the argument that the written tests are equally invalid
> as the Morse tests (I know he's playing devil's advocate, but something
> that's repeated often enough sometimes catches on and I don't want to
> see Jim end up being the best salesman for something that I know he
> doesn't want to see any more than I do ...)
>
> Jim, please listen to Hans if you won't listen to me ...

>
>>>Apparently you didn't read the KL7CC paper, Hans.
>>
>>I thought he did. I think what he wants you to do is to quit bringing

>>that point up.
>>
>>Is it a strawman when there is a paper,suggesting that the testing
>>requirement be radically reduced?
>>
>>It's there, the proposal has been made, and the authors rely on their
>>credentials, despite protestations to the contrary. Some strawman!
>>
>>- Mike KB3EIA -
>
>
> The FCC has determined the ARS to be "primarily a technically oriented
> service" ... I really don't see ANY "no theory" proposal getting a lot of
> traction there ... and I will be right in there with Jim and most others
> fighting
> that one.

And that can change really quickly.

> Let's just stop advertising something we don't want to sell - there will
> be plenty of time to comment vigorously against it if the FCC ever were
> to lend any credence to such a proposal.

Ahh, our very own Maginot line!

Imagine how much less work it would have been to get rid of the Morse
code requirements if we just would have kept our mouths shut.

If in the future, if perhaps something like the KL7CC plan is adopted,
do you think this will be the PCTA's fault because we said something
like that may happen? Because we said it may happen?

- Mike KB3EIA -

2335. Re: Speaking of Outrages

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-08 00:51:03 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0311071651.5f885ef@posting.google.com>
Source record: 81861

"Grï¿½mwï¿½tch thï¿½ ï¿½nflï¿½ppï¿½blï¿½"
<Grï¿½mwï¿½tch@NOSPAM.THANKS.IM.FULL.lycos.co.de> wrote in message
news:<_8Rqb.1559$nz.19@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>...
> "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> news:boeqem$494@library1.airnews.net...
>
> : What about all the products we buy every day that are made in China--
> : and even before China "earned" back the most favored nation status.
> : What *are* they doing with all that money they get from the products
> : they export to this country and that we buy?
>
> Theyre building black helicopters. bwhahahahahahahah!
>
> No, actually theyre buying new cars to replace their bicicle and new shoes
> for their babies and shawls for their grandma and building new factories to
> make more export goods. Theyre not going around attacking other countries
> and having their young people sent home in body bags --- theyre not yet that
> civilized.

They chose to occupy countries with orange robed priests that chant a
lot and burn a little incense, but don't lob rpg's at the occupying
army.

You've been flapped again.

2336. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-08 00:56:03 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <DaXqb.503$KN4.306323@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 81862

Carl R. Stevenson wrote:

> What does any of this have to do with BPL?????
>
> Carl - wk3c

This topic drifted a long time before I ever started posting on it. It's had a lot of racism accusations, a lot of work ethic comparisons, and even some thought on how the guv'mint should be run. Probably more of that than BPL.

Chalk it up to topic drift.

- Mike KB3EIA -

2337. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-08 01:08:54 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bohgf1$mcb@library2.airnews.net>
Source record: 81866

"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
news:c2356669.0311070912.3a233f77@posting.google.com...
> "Kim" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:<boc573$1ds@library1.airnews.net>...
> > "N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
> >
> > > At least here in EPA, we have a decent selection of independent diners
> > > as an alternative to the fast food chains. The food in them is not
> > > much more expensive than the chains, and usually better for you. The
> > > workers in those places make at least as much as the fast food chains.
> > > One reason for their survival is that they don't spend bazillions on
> > > advertising. Another is local loyalty of customers.
> > >
> > > So what's the answer, Dwight - Ryan - Kim?
> > >
> > > 73 de Jim, N2EY
> >
> > I'm out of it...speculation won't solve a thing and I choose not to be
as
> > depressed and bitter and hateful as others...
> >
> Kim,
>
> I hope you weren't referring to me....
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

Oh goodness...no. I was specifically referring to Dwight...

Kim W5TIT

2338. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-08 01:11:41 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bohgf2$mcb@library2.airnews.net>
Source record: 81865

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:DaXqb.503$KN4.306323@news1.news.adelphia.net...
> Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
>
> > What does any of this have to do with BPL?????
> >
> > Carl - wk3c
>
> This topic drifted a long time before I ever started posting on it.
> It's had a lot of racism accusations, a lot of work ethic comparisons,
> and even some thought on how the guv'mint should be run. Probably more
> of that than BPL.
>
> Chalk it up to topic drift.
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -
>

Yep, and for me it's been more interesting... :o

Kim W5TIT

2339. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-08 01:20:00 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <4xXqb.8184$P%1.7333810@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 81864

"Ryan, KC8PMX" <REMOVETHISkc8pmx@diamondcs.net> wrote in message
news:boh9mn$1f99e9$5@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de...
>
> The
> average wage around here, what is considered the alleged "living" or
minimum
> wage is between $5.25-6.00 per hour.

Keep in mind that the minimum wage was NEVER intended to be a "living" wage.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

2340. Re: Speaking of Outrages

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-08 01:20:36 UTC
From: Gr&#65533;mw&#65533;tch th&#65533; &#65533;nfl&#65533;pp&#65533;bl&#65533; <Gr&#65533;mw&#65533;tch@NOSPAM.THANKS.IM.FULL.lycos.co.de>
Message-ID: <ExXqb.1592$6c3.297@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 81863

"Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
news:f45722ac.0311071651.5f885ef@posting.google.com...

:
: They chose to occupy countries with orange robed priests that chant a
: lot and burn a little incense, but don't lob rpg's at the occupying
: army.
:

If we must give choice between orange robed chanting priests and your
occupying army we will be pleased to welcome the priests.

You have been flopped again.

BGO
--
"All persons, living or dead, are purely coincidental, and should not be
construed."

2341. Re: Amateur Radio in the 21st Century?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-08 01:49:20 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0311071749.7b7a82a0@posting.google.com>
Source record: 81867

"Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
news:<J9Scnf7RaYVotTGiXTWc9g@ptd.net>...
> "Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
> news:3FAC12FF.3020502@psu.edu...
> > N2EY wrote:
> > > In article <nMCqb.13187$Oo4.5885@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>,
> "Kï¿½HB"
> > > <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> writes:
> > >
> > >
> > >>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote
> > >>
> > >>
> > >>
> > >>> But...but Hans....are you saying that all that theory stuff should be
> > >>
> > >>"shoved
> > >>
> > >>>down the throats" of hams who will never use it?
> > >>
> > >>What the hell is it with you, Jim????? Halloween is over. Drag this
> > >>worn-out old strawman out to the curb with the trash. You sound like a
> > >>broken record.
>
> I have to agree with Hans on this. I have asked Jim privately to please
> stop harping on the argument that the written tests are equally invalid
> as the Morse tests (I know he's playing devil's advocate, but something
> that's repeated often enough sometimes catches on and I don't want to
> see Jim end up being the best salesman for something that I know he
> doesn't want to see any more than I do ...)
>
> Jim, please listen to Hans if you won't listen to me ...

Carl, this is no different than Larry or Bruce wishing to destroy the
ARS because they couldn't have things their way.

Brian

2342. Re: Optical signals - Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-08 01:53:55 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0311071753.4e3d08b7@posting.google.com>
Source record: 81868

N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<c2356669.0311071400.10808cf9@posting.google.com>...

> lessee...10^12 bits/second...that's more than all of the RF spectrum
> normally used for radio, right? And that's through *one* fiber that's
> immune to EM fields, weather, ionospheric and tropospheric
> propagation, EMI and almost everything else except shovels.
>
> Now that's cool.
>
> But it does have a downside. It permits a significant number of US
> jobs to be outsourced to places like India (or anywhere else that has
> a significant English-speaking population).
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

Even engineering jobs.

Since 9/11, is Congress still letting in 250,000 foreign engineers
each year, or are they just piped in via fiber optics?

2343. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-08 02:08:48 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <QeYqb.542$KN4.319506@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 81869

Kim W5TIT wrote:

> "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
> news:DaXqb.503$KN4.306323@news1.news.adelphia.net...
>
>>Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
>>
>>
>>>What does any of this have to do with BPL?????
>>>
>>>Carl - wk3c
>>
>>This topic drifted a long time before I ever started posting on it.
>>It's had a lot of racism accusations, a lot of work ethic comparisons,
>>and even some thought on how the guv'mint should be run. Probably more
>>of that than BPL.
>>
>>Chalk it up to topic drift.
>>
>>- Mike KB3EIA -
>>
>
>
> Yep, and for me it's been more interesting... :o

Funny how some threads get better when this happens! 8^)

- Mike KB3EIA -

2344. Re: Optical signals - Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-08 03:21:00 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <wiZqb.16128$Oo4.12590@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 81870

"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
news:c2356669.0311071400.10808cf9@posting.google.com...
> "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<eGOqb.13993$Oo4.2526@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> > "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> > news:20031107051724.12300.00001489@mb-m20.aol.com...
> > > In article <g0Dqb.13209$Oo4.964@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>,
"K�HB"
> > > <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> writes:
> > >
> > > >"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote
> > > >
> > > >
> > > >
> > > >> But in fact, the mode used in practically all fiber optic
> > communications
> > is
> > > > > simple on-off keying of a "carrier".
> > > > >>
> > > > >> Very similar, in fact, to landwire telegraph practice, speeded up
and
> > > > > automated, and using photons instead of electrons.
> > > > >
> > > > >Jim, your credibility is fast evaporating!!!!!! This is the most
wildly
> > > > >stretched and tortured analogy to hit rrap since FOREVER!
> > > >
> > > > How so?
> > > >
> > > > The old original landwire telegraph used a single (usually iron) wire
and
> > > > on-off keying of an electric current. Fiber optics uses a glass fiber
and
> > > > on-off keying of an beam of light, usually from a laser. Both sent
> > messages by
> > > > time-domain multiplexing.
> > >
> > > Actually, in really high speed optical equipment it is both
> > time domain and wavelengths/frequency (sometimes called color) domains.
>
> Multiple "carriers" (different light wavelengths) on the same fiber,
> right? Kinda like multiple telegraph carriers of old.
>

> But isn't the basic modulation scheme still on-off keying of the
> light, rather than shifting its color or phase?

Yes. I wasn't disputing that point, just noting that the on/off time domain
muxing isn't the only way that increased data rates are obtained.

> > There is equipment out there that operates at 1.6 Terrabits/sec.
>
> lessee...10^12 bits/second...that's more than all of the RF spectrum
> normally used for radio, right? And that's through *one* fiber that's
> immune to EM fields, weather, ionospheric and tropospheric
> propagation, EMI and almost everything else except shovels.
>
> Now that's cool.
>
> But it does have a downside. It permits a significant number of US
> jobs to be outsourced to places like India (or anywhere else that has
> a significant English-speaking population).

New technology almost always has a downside for some group or groups.
Would you rather such advances not become reality?

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2345. Re: Optical signals - Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-08 03:35:22 UTC
From: Steve Stone <spfleck@zzcitlinkzz.net>
Message-ID: <_vZqb.780$9g1.131@news01.roc.ny>
Source record: 81871

>
> New technology almost always has a downside for some group or groups.
> Would you rather such advances not become reality?
>

No.. but how will we all pay for new toys if we are on the bread lines or
slicing baloney at Stop & Shop for a living ?

2346. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-08 03:54:55 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031107225455.25815.00004311@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 81872

In article <dNWcnezpuvoWujGiXTWc9g@ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
<wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:

>What does any of this have to do with BPL?????

Carl, this isn't a newsgroup, it's a CHAT ROOM for the regulars
and their buddies. All can talk on anydamnthingtheywant
because they got licensed as amateurs. One can only talk
about actual amateur radio policy issues someplace else... :-)

LHA

2347. Re: Speaking of Outrages

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-08 04:02:43 UTC
From: Clint <"rattlehead at computron dot net">
Message-ID: <vqoqoa31qkb8bb@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 81873

"Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:boddup$l8n@library1.airnews.net...

> If anyone wants to start changing things in America, they need to start
> changing politicians. And, I don't even care what "party" is
changed--they
> are all essentially the same.
>
> Kim W5TIT
>
>

not entirely accurate. Want real change? run off the left-wing commie pinko
liberals. Then you'll see this country really soar ahead of the rest of the
world
and leave it behind, economically and in every other way possible.

Clint
KB5ZHT

--

--

45 Communist Goals for America

http://www.uhuh.com/nwo/communism/comgoals.htm

--

2348. Re: Speaking of Outrages

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-08 04:05:52 UTC
From: Clint <"rattlehead at computron dot net">
Message-ID: <vqoqu95277735d@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 81874

"Steve Robeson, K4CAP" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
news:5c01b95b.0311061102.34c6db91@posting.google.com...
> "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:<boddup$l8n@library1.airnews.net>...
>
> > If anyone wants to start changing things in America, they need to start
> > changing politicians. And, I don't even care what "party" is
changed--they
> > are all essentially the same.
>
> I'll have to disagree with you a bit here, Kim...
>
> I think before we change politicians, we have to change
> ourselves...What we want from govenment, the kind of conduct we expect
> and what we are willing to pay for with our taxes.
>
> Americans will scream bloody murder about thier "rights" and the
> amount of taxes they pay. Yet they scream even louder when a group of
> men get together and commit a horrific act like September 11th and
> they wonder why the government doesn't "do something".
>
> Can you imagine the outpore of anger that would have occured if
> those 20 men had been arrested on September TENTH...?!?! The ACLU, The
> Arab-American League and who knows who all else would have been all
> over the press about how we were infringing on thier rights.

BINGO.

The American Snivel Liberties Union has really made a mockery of itself
and transformed a once good & useful organization into nothing more than
a corrupt, leftist-slanted outfit. You are 100% correct; had those people
been arrested previous to 9/11, there would have been the greatest outcry
and a claim that thier civil rights were violated.

Some say that there was sufficient evidence and that law enforcement
agencies
were simply dropping the ball and asleep at the wheel and allowed them to
do what they did; however, it is entirely possible that for the reasons I
mentioned,
they did NOT arrest them.

And over 3,000 people died for it.

Clint

--

--

45 Communist Goals for America

http://www.uhuh.com/nwo/communism/comgoals.htm

--

2349. Len straightens us out (was: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-08 04:26:44 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3FAC7074.969E96AA@earthlink.net>
Source record: 81875

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <dNWcnezpuvoWujGiXTWc9g@ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
> <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:
>
> >What does any of this have to do with BPL?????
>
> Carl, this isn't a newsgroup, it's a CHAT ROOM for the regulars
> and their buddies.

Nope, not even the use of CAPITAL LETTERS makes this a chat room. It is still a newsgroup.

> All can talk on anydamnthingtheywant
> because they got licensed as amateurs.

All can discuss any topic because it isn't outlawed. As you've been quick to point out, this is an unmoderated group. You've frequently gone quite far afield in your postings. We'll chalk this up as another "Do as I say and not as I do" comment.

> One can only talk
> about actual amateur radio policy issues someplace else... :-)

What's it to you? You aren't ivolved in amateur radio.

Dave K8MN

2350. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-08 07:29:10 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031108022910.06226.00001382@mb-m19.aol.com>
Source record: 81877

In article <4xXqb.8184$P%1.7333810@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> writes:

>"Ryan, KC8PMX" <REMOVETHISkc8pmx@diamondcs.net> wrote in message >news:boh9mn$1f99e9$5@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de...
>>
>> The
>> average wage around here, what is considered the alleged "living" or >minimum
>> wage is between $5.25-6.00 per hour.
>
>Keep in mind that the minimum wage was NEVER intended to be a "living" wage.
>
It wasn't? I'd be interested in a reference on that.

I think what we're really seeing is inflation outpacing the minimum wage.

Fun fact: In 1976 I started a job as a degreed engineer at the princely sum of about $12,000/yr - about $6 an hour. About minimum wage today, but back then the prices of most things (particularly housing and transportation) was so much lower that it was a lot of money - to me, anyway.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2351. Re: Optical signals - Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-08 07:29:11 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031108022911.06226.00001383@mb-m19.aol.com>
Source record: 81876

In article <wiZqb.16128$Oo4.12590@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:

>> > Actually, in really high speed optical equipment it is both
>> > time domain and wavelengths/frequency (sometimes called color) domains.
>>
>> Multiple "carriers" (different light wavelengths) on the same fiber,
>> right? Kinda like multiple telegraph carriers of old.
>>
>> But isn't the basic modulation scheme still on-off keying of the
>> light, rather than shifting its color or phase?
>
>Yes. I wasn't disputing that point, just noting that the on/off time domain
>muxing isn't the only way that increased data rates are obtained.

Agreed. Just like containerized shipping has revolutionized freight transportation, fiber optics has revolutionized communications.

>
>> > There is equipment out there that operates at 1.6 Terrabits/sec.
>>
>> lessee...10^12 bits/second...that's more than all of the RF spectrum
>> normally used for radio, right? And that's through *one* fiber that's
>> immune to EM fields, weather, ionospheric and tropospheric
>> propagation, EMI and almost everything else except shovels.
>>
>> Now that's cool.
>>
>> But it does have a downside. It permits a significant number of US
>> jobs to be outsourced to places like India (or anywhere else that has
>> a significant English-speaking population).
>
>New technology almost always has a downside for some group or groups.
>Would you rather such advances not become reality?

Not at all - but I'd rather have it that the downsides be explored more thoroughly *before* they occur.

73 de Jim, N2EY
>

2352. Amateur Radio Newsline™ Report 1369 – November 7, 2003

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-08 10:09:40 UTC
From: radionews@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031108050940.20615.00000111@mb-m10.aol.com>
Source record: 81878

Amateur Radio Newsline™ Report 1369 – November 7, 2003

Amateur Radio Newsline report number 1369 with a release date of Friday, November 7, 2003 to follow in 5-4-3-2-1.

The following is a Q-S-T. Rain brings the California wildfires under control but ham radio stays on the job. A report from the scene on Amateur Radio Newsline report number 1369 coming your way right now.

(Billboard Cart Here)

**

RESCUE RADIO: CALIFORNIA WILDFIRE COMMS WINDING DOWN

The Southern California wildfires are on their way to full control. This as the winter rains come early to the region. As a result, many hams who had been full time fire communications volunteers have gone back to their regular jobs and ham radio emergency communications efforts are winding down. Others are still on the front lines and now its time for assessment. Gordon West, W-B-6-N-O-A, spent most of last week at a Red Cross Shelter in the city of Fontana. He takes a look at the contributions made by the regions Amateur Radio communicators:

--
Audio report only. Hear it by downloading this weeks audio newscast file at http://www.arnewsline.org
--

Emergency service officials agree that having ham radio made a big difference in successfully handling this disaster situation. (ARNewsline(tm))

**

RESCUE RADIO: REPEATERS LOST IN SOCAL WILDFIRES

We all heard the grim statistics of the homes and businesses were destroyed by this years California wildfires over a million acres of land has been scorched. But there is one total that the mass media won’t report. That’s the number of ham radio repeaters knocked off the air by the blazes. While exact call signs are not yet available, we did ask reporter Matt Lechleiter, W6KGB, to find out which radio sites were most affected.

--
It's estimated that close to 30 repeater or remote base systems have been affected by the recent Southern California firestorm. These systems are either off-air, were before switching to backup power, or were destroyed by the fires. The number of systems actually destroyed by the fires is unknown - we'll follow

up on this in a subsequent report.

Communications sites affected include Oat Mountain just north of Los Angeles, Sunset Ridge and Heaps Peak to the East, and Mount Otay near San Diego to name a few. Each of these major sites lost power due to one of the fires. News reports say that it could be over a month before power is restored to these locations. Until then, battery and generator power are keeping the commercial and amateurs two-way systems on the air.

There are also several repeaters that are believed to be safe but which are still off the air. This is because they live at more remote mountaintop sites that also lost electrical service to the flames. And just like the more accessible sites that I mentioned, it might be a quite a while before commercial power is returned.

For the Amateur Radio Newsline, I'm Matt Lechliter, W6KGB reporting.

--

If you are a Southern California repeater operator whose system was affected by the firestorms, or if you know of one that was, please send the details to us. We will include it in an upcoming report. Our address in cyberspace is nerwsline@arnewsline.org (ARNewsline(tm))

**

HAM RADIO IN SPACE: NEW GEAR FOR THE ISS

Radio gear from some well known ham radio manufacturers is in space. This, as the group known as Amateur Radio on the International Space Station announces the delivery of the so-called Phase 2 ham equipment to the ISS. Norm Seeley, KI7UP, has the details in this report:

--
A Russian Progress supply rocket has delivered a Kenwood TM-D700E, dual band transceiver to the International Space Station. The installation of this new radio will mean a significant boost to the power output of the ARISS station from 5 watts to 25 watts.

The Chairman of Amateur Radio on the International Space Station is Frank Bauer, KA3HDO. He says that the software for the D700 has been programmed for five modes of operation. These are for standard F-M phone, crossband repeater, APRS, packet and an emergency mode. Bauer predicted that APRS probably will be the default mode when a crew member is not actively using the ham station.

Next up will be gear from Vertex-Standard, the Yaesu brand folks. Bauer says that a Yaesu FT-100D, some SSTV equipment, along with new headsets, will be taken to the space outpost on Progress Flight 14P. Look for it to launch in January.

But says Bauer, that will be the endof the transport of any more ham radio gear for quite a while. At least until the space shuttle returns to flight in September 2004.

But that in itself could be a blessing in disguise. KA3HDO says that the equipment still on the ground will be tested this month at the Service Module facility in Moscow. This will permit making sure that the Phase 1 and 2 systems are compatible. RF testing will also take place.

According to Bauer, current plans call for the current Expedition 8 crew of Mike Foale, KB5UAC, and Alex Kaleri, U8MIR, to install the new hardware after ground tests are complete. Previous crews already installed four Amateur Radio antennas to cover HF, 2 meters, 70 cm and microwave frequencies.

For the Amateur Radio Newsline, I’m Norm Seeley, KI7UP.

--

What about hams on the ground getting more chances to talk to the crew on the ISS? Bauer says he's been working with U-S and Russian space officials to have them dedicate a few additional hours each month for operation and amateur station maintenance. (ANS, ARISS K7CCC)

**

HAM RADIO IN SPACE: SPAIN SCHOOL CONTACT A BIG SUCCESS

Still with news of ham radio on board the International Space Station, word that the Ourense, Spain school contact on October 23 was very successful. 75 children and 25 parents gathered at Ceip Seixalbo school as European Space Agency astronaut Pedro Duque answered sixteen questions in Spanish using the ARISS radio system. All nationwide radio, TV broadcasters, and newspapers were present. Duque has since returned to Earth along with the Expedition 7 crew. (ANS, ARISS)

**

Break 1

From the United States of America, We are the Amateur Radio Newsline, heard on bulletin stations around the world including the N5LEZ linked repeaters serving Wichita Falls and Vernon Texas.

(5 sec pause here)

**

RADIO LAW: HAM ACCUSED OF AIRPORT SECURITY BEACH GETS CONGRESSIONAL SUPPORT

The ham who is accused of breaching airport security has gotten some unexpected congressional support. Amateur Radio Newsline’s Mark Abramovich, NT3V, has the rest of the story:

--
Leading Democrats have openly criticized federal authorities for prosecuting Nathaniel Heatwole, W-Zed-3-A-R. Hes the ham who admits to planting banned items on airliners, allegedly to show flaws in airport security. And some in congress think he is almost a hero for pointing out the Transportation Security Authority's inability to properly protect airline travelers.

Minority Leader Nancy Pelosi is quoted in print as saying: " "I don't think he had criminal intent. I think what he was trying to do was to show how exposed we are and what our vulnerability was, and he tried to tell TSA and he gave a trail to them."

Pelosi said that if theres any penalty imposed, it should be some kind of community service. And Representative Ed Markey, a powerful Democrat from Massachusetts agrees. In fact, Markey says that any community service sentence imposed on Heatwole should be with the TSA. And Markey adds that TSA officials should listen to him so that they know exactly how to prevent a terrorist from doing the very same thing.

And even the Republicans are getting into the act. Representative John Mica of Florida is chairman of the House aviation subcommittee. He said that prosecutors should concentrate on people who actually pose a threat, adding that Heatwole should not be the fall guy.

None of the politicians are not trying to excuse Heatwole’s action, but they more and more are beginning to agree with Pelosi and Markey who apparently believes that the punishment should fit the crime.

For the Amateur Radio Newsline, I’m Mark Abramowicz, NT3V, in Philadelphia.

--

Heatwole is headed back to court on November 10th for a preliminary hearing. What was not expected is the level of support of some in congress and the obvious pressure that puts on prosecutors working on the case. (From published news reports)

**

RADIO LAW: THE BPL WAR - THE ARRL VS. MANASSAS VA.

The ARRL has put officials in Manassas, Virginia, on notice that the League will act on behalf of its members. This, to ensure full compliance with FCC regulations when the city's Broadband over Power Line system starts up in a few months.

Manassas is a suburb of Washington, DC. The League said that it was responding to media reports that Manassas has approved plans for a citywide B-P-L rollout in the near future. As such, ARRL Executive Vice President David Sumner, K1ZZ, has faxed the Mayor of Manassas to point out the potential for RF interference from and to any Broadband over Power Line data distribution system. (ARRL)

**

ENFORCEMENT: FCC ISSUES 2ND LARGEST FINE IN HISTORY

Meantime, the FCC has proposed issuing the second largest fine ever for on a broadcast indecency issue. Amateur Radio Newsline’s Bruce Tennant, K6PZW, has the details:

--
The FCC wants to force Infinity Broadcasting to pay a fine of $357,000. This, for airing a shock jock radio segment in which a couple was said to been

involved in the most intimate of human experiences in New York City’s famed St. Patrick's Cathedral.

According to news reports, the FCC proposed record forfeiture is in response to complaints from the public following an August 2002 broadcast of the "Opie and Anthony" show and aired over thirteen Infinity owned radio stations. The nationally syndicated show was canceled a week later and hosts were fired.

Four commissioners voted for the fine. The fifth said the agency should have taken even stronger action. He said that the FCC should have gone after Infinity's radio licenses and taken their stations off the air.

Infinity has 30 days to pay the fine or appeal. The company has indicated that it will use the legal recourse.

For the Amateur Radio Newsline, I’m Bruce Tennant, K6PZW, in Los Angeles.

--

If upheld the amount paid would be second only to the $1.7 million dollars Infinity paid in 1995 to settle several cases against shock-jock Howard Stern. (FCC)

**

ENFORCEMENT: USERS RESPONSIBLE FOR REPEATER INTERFERENCE

Users and not the operator of a repeater are responsible for interference problems to another New Jersey repeater system. This is the gist of a September 12th letter to Andrew Woerner, K2ETN, who operates a repeater bearing his callsign.

Back on July 7th the agency notified Woerner that it had received complaints that his repeater, operating on the 146.355/146.955 MHz channel pair, was causing interference to the coordinated W2RAP repeater on the same frequencies. The complaints alleged that Woerner’s repeater was previously coordinated but that it has relocated since the coordination was issued.

The FCC requested that Woerner provide information in response to the complaints. He did, and in a follow-up letter, the FCC said that it has reviewed his information as well as detailed reports provided by the Metropolitan Coordination Association and the Area Repeater Coordination Council.

The FCC says that coordination does not appear to be an issue in this case. Rather, the interference problem seems to result from users of the K2ETN repeater, which is located in Northern New Jersey, attempting to access that repeater from locations in Southern N/ew Jersey. As such its repeater users who are interfering with the W2RAP repeater and not the person running the K2ETN machine.

The bottom line. The regulatory agency says that this situation does not appear to warrant its intervention. Instead its calling on everybody to work together to minimize any interference to the W2RAP machine. (FCC)

**

ENFORCEMENT: FCC PROPOSES $120,500 FOR ANTENNA STRUCTURE VIOLATIONS

Meantime, its the fine of all fines for radio tower violations. This, as the Federal Communications Commission releases a Notice of Apparent Liability on October 31st. One proposing a $120,500 forfeiture against SpectraSite Communications, Inc., of Cary, North Carolina for safety-related violations of the Communications Act and the Commission's antenna structure rules.

Specifically, the FCC is going after SpectraSite for its failure to register and light its antenna structures following an investigation conducted by the Commission's Norfolk, Virginia Field Office.

The FCC says that the amount of the proposed fine represents the statutory maximum available. The Commission says that it decided to propose a significantly higher forfeiture than generally used in such cases because SpectraSite has a prior history of antenna structure rules violations. It says that SpectraSite has received three previous forfeitures in less than three years for at least 13 instances of failure to comply with the antenna structure rules. (FCC)

**

RADO LAW: EMDERGENCY OFFICIALS CONCERNED ABOUT PUBLIC ACCESS TO "MIRT"

Emergency responders are concerned that MIRT, or mobile infra red transmitters are falling into the wrong hands. Mainly, into the hands of people not willing to obey traffic laws.

A mobile infra red transmitter allows personnel aboard emergency vehicles responding to emergency calls to quickly change specially-equipped traffic signals in their favor. That was fine until Internet websites began offering the same devices for use by the public for around $300 a pop.

Unlike radar jammers and certain laser detectors that emit radio signals, the mobile infra red transmitter and other signal changers send out a beam of invisible light. Since light is not controlled by the FCC the devices do not run afoul of the agency's rules.

Needless to say that this is causing concern for those who rely on the technology for legitimate needs. Don't be to surprised if states begin enacting their own laws to control the sale and purchase of the units.

More on the situation and the device is in cybrspace at www.detnews.com/2003/commuting/0310/26/a01-307303.htm and http://www.themirt.com (CGC, others)

**

COMMUNICATIONS CRIMES: INDUSTRY VS. IDENTITY THEFT

Microsoft and other technology giants have launched an industry alliance to thwart identity theft and boost confidence in e-commerce. The Coalition on Online Identity Theft will campaign to improve e-commerce record-keeping, beef up Internet security and enforce penalties against identity thieves. The

formation of this group comes in response to growing concern over the growing tine of identity theft crimes and government pressure on industry to help to thwart it. (Published news reports)

**

BREAK 2

This is ham radio news for today’s radio amateur. From the United States of America, We are the Amateur Radio Newsline with links to the world from our only official website at www.arnewsline.org and being relayed by the volunteer services of the following radio amateur:

(5 sec pause here)

**

T-HUNTING NEWS: THE BIRDS OF FALL

If you are into hidden transmitter hunting, listen up. This one is for you. Keeping track of over 300 migrating radio tagged birds. Joe Moell, K0OV, is here with the details.

--

Since 1998, you've heard me reporting on hams and scanner fans tracking Burrowing Owls that migrate from Canada to southern states and Mexico. Researchers are so impressed by the capabilities of hams to do this sort of thing that they are asking for help with other critters. Right now, we're starting our biggest ever project, with more birds and more states involved. Nick Myatt of the Arkansas Cooperative Fish and Wildlife Research unit has radio-tagged 360 American Woodcock in Minnesota, Wisconsin, and Michigan, and he wants hams to help him find out where they're going. They're heading out now, and the list of possible stopover and destination states is big, including Southern Minnesota, Southern Wisconsin, Southern Michigan, Iowa, Illinois, Indiana, Kentucky, Missouri, Eastern Kansas, Eastern Oklahoma, Arkansas, Tennessee, Mississippi, Alabama, Louisiana, and Eastern Texas. If that's where you live or travel, please check my Web site for the list of active frequencies, all between 150 and 152 MHz.

Also at this time, Dave Sherman, a Biologist with the Ohio Division of Wildlife, is looking for help in keeping track of two radio-tagged Sandhill Cranes that should be leaving Ohio about the time you hear this. More information, including the frequencies, is on the Web. Go to www.homingin.com

Besides the frequencies, you'll learn how to identify the special characteristics of a radio tag signal, and you can subscribe to an e-mail list for fastest notification of these studies. That's homingin -- one word -- homingin.com

From southern California, this is Joe Moell K-zero-Oscar-Victor, for Amateur Radio Newsline.

--

Again, more information is at Joe's website. Its in cyberspace at www.homingin.com. And remember: homingin is one word. (K0OV, ARNewsline(tm))

**

NAMES IN THE NEWS: QCWA SEEKS NEW G.M.

In other news, word that Jim Walsh, W7VLN is resigning as the General Manager of the Quarter Century Wireless Association and the groups Board of Directors is looking for a replacement. Among the responsibilities are attending all meetings of the QCWA board, keeping full records for the organization and conducting the general correspondence. A solicitation for nominees is on line. You will find it in cyberspace at www.qcwa.org/manager.htm (QCWA)

**

CONFERENCES: 30TH ANNUAL EASTERN VHF/UHF CONFERENCE

The 30th Annual Eastern VHF/UHF conference will be held next April 16th to the 18th, at the Radisson Hotel in Enfield, Connecticut. Planners say that the conference has been moved to the spring time to help alleviate numerous conflicts with other ham radio activities and vacation schedules in August. Guest speakers, proceedings, articles and overall volunteers are being solicited to help out. Prize donations are also being solicited from vendors and members. More information is available from conference chairman Bruce Wood, N2LIV, by e-mail to bdwood@erols.com (VHF Reflector)

**

BEACON NEWS: C6AFP COMING BACK ON THE AIR

Steve Rutledge, N4JQQ says over the VHF Reflector that the C6AFP beacon in grid square FL16, should be operational soon. This, thanks to W4WSR who rebuilt the old one that WZ8D originally supplied.

That one took a lightning hit last summer. Rutledge says that he was able to salvage the RF board but that was it.

Rutledge thanks C6AGN, whose Q-T-H the beacon now lives at. This is in Coco Bay, Green Turtle Cay, Abaco, The Bahamas. He says that Bill should be back on the island on or about the time this newscast hits air. Hopefully we will hear the beacon sometime later this month. (VHF Reflector)

**

INTERNATIONAL - INTRUDER WATCH: PIRATES OF THE PACIFIC

On the intruder watch scene, VK6XW in Albany Australia reports over 130 of them in the ham bands in recent days. The majority are foundd on 20 meters and appear to be Indonesians, with the rest being Asian Intruders including a number of fishing boats. VK6XW says that the boats also use Amateur Radio VHF frequencies for ship-to ship communication.

Meantime, Chris Wright, VK2UW in Lighthouse Beach New South Wales Australia reports on other pirates in the Pacific. This group is using Amateur Radio calls such as VK4ZLY, several Zed L calls and American calls -- portable VK.

These are also on 20 meters and Chris says that they have become a major headache to a number of regularly schedule ham radio nets. (Q-News)

**

DX

In D-X, word that XV9DT is active as 3W22S now until the 31st of December. The special callsign is to celebrate the 22nd South East Asian Games, hosted by Vietnam. (GB2RS)

Also, HB0/HA0HW/P and two other stations will be operating from a location 1350 meters above sea level in Liechtenstein through the 10th of November. The three operators will be active on 160 to 10 meters, with an emphasis on the low bands. Modes used will be CW, SSB and RTTY. QSL as directed on the air. (GB2RS)

**

THAT FINAL ITEM: NYC HAMS RUN THE RACE

Kenya again ruled the New York City Marathon but it was ham radio that kept the race running. Amateur Radio Newsline's Henry Feinberg, K2SSQ, takes a look at the November 2nd event and the radio amateurs who kept it moving along:

--

Steve Mendelsohn, W2ML: "When people say 'why do you do it' my answer is always the same. I'm in it for the T-shirts."

--

And after 27 years as Communications Director for the New York City Marathon, Steve Mendelsohn W2ML, has to have quite a collection. But Mendelsohn is also the first to tell you that he is only a small part of a big ham radio organization that keeps all the races within the New York City Marathon moving. And 2003 was no exception:

--
Mendelsohn: "At about 8 o'clock we went to the actual starting line at the Verrazno Narrows Bridge and Alan fired the air-horn that's starts the race for the athletes with disabilities. And, 15 minutes after that it was the start of the wheel-chair race; and 15 minutes after that was the start of the hand-cranked race and fifteen minutes after that the elite women. And finally, at 10:07 our operators climbed into vehicles -- because we maintain control of all of the vehicles on the course for safety purposes -- and we use Amateur Radio to do it -- and down the course we went.

At the other end, we climbed out of the vehicles; everyone went to do their next assignment and from the time that the male winner cross the finish line at roughly 12:15 p.m. until the time that we closed down the Family Reunion at 6:30 at night and started to tear down, 411 hams worked with the other 12,000 volunteers to make this the smoothest, best marathon ever."
--

The Alan that Steve referred to is Race Director Alan Steinfeld, W-2-T-N. They were but two of the 400 plus Amateur Radio volunteers who came out this year. And Mendelsohn says that the hams were kept very busy, especially in assisting in medical communications as runners fell by the wayside:

--

Mendelsohn: “We had people went down virtually everywhere on the course. The hams were there with the doctors to help and provided a great deal of medical communications back to the Family Reunion area. This allowed the families to know that a runner had dropped out: That they may have been taken to a hospital or that they were simply going home.”

--

Mendelsohn says that between 800 to 900 pieces of health and welfare traffic was passed between 10:07 a.m. and 4:40 p.m. He also says that 2003 was the years of APRS at the New York City Marathon. Ill have that part of the story next week.

With part of the course of the New York City Marathon in sight, I’m Henry Feinberg, K2SSQ, reporting for the Amateur Radio Newsline.

--

As for the race results. Kenya’s Martin Lel, running his first ever marathon won the Mens division. He timed in 2:10:30 beating out defending champion Rodgers Rop. Meantime Margaret Okayo smashed the course record. She won the race for the second time after crossing the line in 2 hours, 22 minutes, 31 seconds, shattering her own record by almost two minutes.

**

NEWSCAST CLOSE

With thanks to Alan Labs, AMSAT, the ARRL, the CGC Communicator, CQ Magazine, the FCC, the Ohio Penn DX Bulletin, Radio Netherlands, Rain, the RSGB and Australia's Q-News, that's all from the Amateur Radio Newsline(tm). Our e-mail address is newsline @arnewsline.org. More information is available at Amateur Radio Newsline's(tm) only official website located at www.arnewsline.org. You can also write to us or support us at Amateur Radio Newsline(tm), P.O. Box 660937, Arcadia, California 91066.

For now, with Bill Pasternak, WA6ITF, at the editors desk, I’m Jim Damron, N6TMW, and I’m Jeff Clark, K8JAC, saying 73 and we thank you for listening. Amateur Radio Newsline(tm) is Copyright 2003. All rights reserved.

2353. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-08 12:17:00 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <095rb.16348$Oo4.14514@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 81879

"Ryan, KC8PMX" wrote:
>
> So.... basically, one way or another people have to
> pay for it, be it in higher service/product costs or
> paying in taxes for a government program.

Let me start by saying I don't have all the answers either, Ryan. However, it is fairly easy to see where some of the biggest problems are. The most obvious is corporate profits today. Product quality is dropping (plastics), wages are relatively stagnated, product prices certainly haven't dropped much, but corporate profits have went through the roof. Perhaps a mechanism to reel in or put a cap on corporate profits is the answer. How to do that is the ten thousand dollar question (or, in this case, trillion dollar question). I'm somewhat radical, so I prefer the outright purge method - a cap on product price increases for several years and an immediate increase in overall wages (with caps on immigration or other negative factors effecting workers). This will drive some marginal companies out of business (the purge) and will slow down the economy sharply. But, over a several year period, more streamlined companies will eventually replace those put out of business and the economy will recover. At that point, the cap on product prices can be reduced, letting competition once again drive the market.

The second most obvious is the concentration of marketplaces. So, if the above isn't acceptable, perhaps this is the place to look. What I'm talking about here is larger corporations gobbling up whole market segments, driving smaller companies out of business. Lets take an example. Wal-Mart moves into a town offering a wide range of products. Of course, the new store doesn't offer a wide selection in any department, but it does carry the basics in each department - just enough to take away what local businesses call their bread-and-butter products (the products stores depend on to pay employees, rent, and so on). As that happens, local stores are forced to depend on the sale of high end products where sales are far less predictable. The inevitable result is that many smaller stores simply collapse. And this isn't just happening in the retail industry. It is happening in many industries (publishing, news, entertainment, manufacturing, transportation, and so on).

The next most obvious is credit. In many markets, high prices are supported only by massive credit activity. For example, the automobile market. Prices have climbed sharply mainly because credit is much easier to get, in much higher amounts, than just a few decades ago. Put a regulatory cap on credit in this market and prices have to drop if companies want to sell cars. Of course, the same is true for other markets (home construction, consumer goods, and so on). The biggest danger to this solution is the tendency for companies to pass on any initial losses to consumers (lower

quality products) and their own employees. The first will correct itself over time, but the second requires additional labor protections (wage increases, a cap on immigration, and efforts to prevent companies from moving overseas).

Like I said, I certainly don't have all the answers. Even some of the problems are elusive. However, it is clear that even minor regulatory modifications, not massive government programs, can have a dramatic impact. The idea offered in the first paragraph also has the advantage of keeping product prices down for consumers. The idea in the second paragraph requires more effort, but offers greater returns over a longer period of time. The idea in the third paragraph offers the most benefits, but will have the most negative impact on consumers in the short term. For a truly robust economy, perhaps parts of all three should be considered.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

2354. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-08 12:35:46 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <Cq5rb.16357$Oo4.10281@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 81880

"Dee D. Flint" wrote:
>
> Keep in mind that the minimum wage was NEVER
> intended to be a "living" wage.

I thought the minimum wage was exactly that - the minimum a single worker needs to maintain even the most basic standard of living. If it isn't that, what is it supposed to be?

The problem today, as more and more people become locked into lower wages, is that the minimum wage doesn't address the extra needs of the worker's family or future. Taxpayers pay a price for that down the road (welfare, food stamps, medical costs, student aid, and so on). If companies paid better wages, much of that would be sharply reduced.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

2355. Re: Speaking of Outrages

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-08 12:43:11 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0311080443.5c23fe8@posting.google.com>
Source record: 81881

"Grï¿½mwï¿½tch thï¿½ ï¿½nflï¿½ppï¿½blï¿½"
<Grï¿½mwï¿½tch@NOSPAM.THANKS.IM.FULL.lycos.co.de> wrote in message
news:<ExXqb.1592$6c3.297@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>...
> "Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
> news:f45722ac.0311071651.5f885ef@posting.google.com...
>
> :
> : They chose to occupy countries with orange robed priests that chant a
> : lot and burn a little incense, but don't lob rpg's at the occupying
> : army.
> :
>
> If we must give choice between orange robed chanting priests and your
> occupying army we will be pleased to welcome the priests.

Sorry, but you don't give choice. You've been flapped again.

2356. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-08 13:49:21 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <Bv6rb.16382$Oo4.5084@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 81882

"Kim W5TIT" wrote:
> "N2EY" wrote:
> > "Kim" wrote:
> > > I'm out of it...speculation won't solve a thing and I
> > > choose not to be as depressed and bitter and
> > > hateful as others...
> >
> > I hope you weren't referring to me....
>
> Oh goodness...no. I was specifically referring to Dwight.

Grow up, Kim. If you can't handle spirited discussion and debate, then you're clearly in the wrong place because most of these newsgroups were created for exactly that - not pleasant, dainty, little discussions that never offend your delicate, child-like, sensibilities. Regardless, if you post obstinate and contrary opinions in these newsgroups, then you should expect, and be prepared for, obstinate and contrary responses (without crying about it for days afterwards). Whatever the case, I wasn't put on this Earth to cater to your sensibilities, so will only consider that to a limited extent when responding to what you post (and it will be a cold day in Hades before I consider it at all when you attack me personally).

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

2357. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-08 14:38:20 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <boiv3i$l0t@library2.airnews.net>
Source record: 81883

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:Bv6rb.16382$Oo4.5084@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> "Kim W5TIT" wrote:
> > "N2EY" wrote:
> > > "Kim" wrote:
> > > > I'm out of it...speculation won't solve a thing and I
> > > > choose not to be as depressed and bitter and
> > > > hateful as others...
> > >
> > > I hope you weren't referring to me....
> >
> > Oh goodness...no. I was specifically referring to Dwight.
>
>
> Grow up, Kim. If you can't handle spirited discussion and debate, then
> you're clearly in the wrong place because most of these newsgroups were
> created for exactly that - not pleasant, dainty, little discussions that
> never offend your delicate, child-like, sensibilities. Regardless, if you
> post obstinate and contrary opinions in these newsgroups, then you should
> expect, and be prepared for, obstinate and contrary responses (without
> crying about it for days afterwards). Whatever the case, I wasn't put on
> this Earth to cater to your sensibilities, so will only consider that to a
> limited extent when responding to what you post (and it will be a cold day
> in Hades before I consider it at all when you attack me personally).
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
>
>

Dwight in training for the Larry Roll Project...

Kim W5TIT

2358. Re: Len straightens us out

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-08 15:08:16 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <AF7rb.710$KN4.502327@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 81884

Dave Heil wrote:

> Len Over 21 wrote:
>
>>In article <dNWcnezpuvoWujGiXTWc9g@ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
>><wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:
>>
>>
>>>What does any of this have to do with BPL?????
>>
>> Carl, this isn't a newsgroup, it's a CHAT ROOM for the regulars
>> and their buddies.
>
>
> Nope, not even the use of CAPITAL LETTERS makes this a chat room. It is
> still a newsgroup.
>
>
>> All can talk on anydamnthingtheywant
>> because they got licensed as amateurs.
>
>
> All can discuss any topic because it isn't outlawed. As you've been
> quick to point out, this is an unmoderated group. You've frequently
> gone quite far afield in your postings. We'll chalk this up as another
> "Do as I say and not as I do" comment.
>
>
>> One can only talk
>> about actual amateur radio policy issues someplace else... :-)
>
>
> What's it to you? You aren't ivolved in amateur radio.

Especially since the Carl's real intention behind his comment was based
(I think) on my being some minor irritant to him, rather than a desire
to keep the newsgroup pure and On Topic.

"Approchamentus Obliqautum"

- Mike KB3EIA -

2359. Re: Optical signals - Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-08 15:16:15 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <3N7rb.16492$Oo4.7118@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 81885

"Steve Stone" <spfleck@zzcitlinkzz.net> wrote in message
news:_vZqb.780$9g1.131@news01.roc.ny...
> >
> > New technology almost always has a downside for some group or groups.
> > Would you rather such advances not become reality?
> >
>
> No.. but how will we all pay for new toys if we are on the bread lines or
> slicing baloney at Stop & Shop for a living ?

The point is that any industry is always at risk. There is no
guarnteed life expectancy for almost any endeaver. The PC has
knocked down the number of secretaries needed to support
engineering groups. The auto all but eliminated blacksmiths.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2360. Re: Optical signals - Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-08 15:20:47 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <jR7rb.16496$Oo4.8941@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 81886

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20031108022911.06226.00001383@mb-m19.aol.com...
> In article <wiZqb.16128$Oo4.12590@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Bill
> Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:

SNIP

> >> > There is equipment out there that operates at 1.6 Terrabits/sec.
> >>
> >> lessee...10^12 bits/second...that's more than all of the RF spectrum
> >> normally used for radio, right? And that's through *one* fiber that's
> >> immune to EM fields, weather, ionospheric and tropospheric
> >> propagation, EMI and almost everything else except shovels.
> >>
> >> Now that's cool.
> >>
> >> But it does have a downside. It permits a significant number of US
> >> jobs to be outsourced to places like India (or anywhere else that has
> >> a significant English-speaking population).
> >
> >New technology almost always has a downside for some group or groups.
> >Would you rather such advances not become reality?
>
> Not at all - but I'd rather have it that the downsides be explored more
> thoroughly *before* they occur.

Surely you jest. Some company or person(s) develope a new
technology, invention, whatever...and you expect them to hold off
bringing that new whatever to market so the negative impacts to
other industries, groups, etc can first be studied?

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2361. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-08 15:28:59 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031108102859.05539.00002156@mb-m16.aol.com>
Source record: 81887

In article <095rb.16348$Oo4.14514@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> writes:

>"Ryan, KC8PMX" wrote:
>>
>> So.... basically, one way or another people have to
>> pay for it, be it in higher service/product costs or
>> paying in taxes for a government program.

> Let me start by saying I don't have all the answers either, Ryan. However,
>it is fairly easy to see where some of the biggest problems are. The most
>obvious is corporate profits today.

Hold on a sec, Dwight. "Corporate profits" are the basis of any capitalist system. Without 'em, our economy collapses.

>Product quality is dropping (plastics),

In some areas, yes. But people still buy the products!

>wages are relatively stagnated, product prices certainly haven't dropped
>much, but corporate profits have went through the roof.

How much corporate profit is excessive? If a company is worth $1 billion, and their profit is $100 million, that's a 10% return on investment. Is that excessive? Who decides?

>Perhaps a mechanism
>to reel in or put a cap on corporate profits is the answer. How to do that
>is the ten thousand dollar question (or, in this case, trillion dollar
>question).

But without the details it's a moot point. Suppose a company has a string of bad years and then a good year - should their profits in the good year be confiscated and a blind eye turned towards the bad years?

> I'm somewhat radical, so I prefer the outright purge method - a
>cap on product price increases for several years and an immediate increase
>in overall wages (with caps on immigration or other negative factors
>effecting workers).

Price controls were tried in the late '60s and early '70s to "Whip Infaltion Now". Didn't work in the long term.

>This will drive some marginal companies out of business
>(the purge) and will slow down the economy sharply.

At the very least. And the political and economic backlash will be overwhelming.

>But, over a several year
>period, more streamlined companies will eventually replace those put out of
>business and the economy will recover. At that point, the cap on product
>prices can be reduced, letting competition once again drive the market.

Except that it may not be the most "streamlined" companies who survive.

> The second most obvious is the concentration of marketplaces. So, if the
>above isn't acceptable, perhaps this is the place to look. What I'm talking
>about here is larger corporations gobbling up whole market segments, driving
>smaller companies out of business. Lets take an example. Wal-Mart moves into
>a town offering a wide range of products. Of course, the new store doesn't
>offer a wide selection in any department, but it does carry the basics in
>each department - just enough to take away what local businesses call their
>bread-and-butter products (the products stores depend on to pay employees,
>rent, and so on). As that happens, local stores are forced to depend on the
>sale of high end products where sales are far less predictable. The
>inevitable result is that many smaller stores simply collapse. And this
>isn't just happening in the retail industry. It is happening in many
>industries (publishing, news, entertainment, manufacturing, transportation,
>and so on).

Because the *market* (people who make the buying decisions) go to the Wal Mart instead of the local stores. That's where the real problem lies - people who do not think about the long-term economic results of their actions.
>
> The next most obvious is credit. In many markets, high prices are
>supported only by massive credit activity. For example, the automobile
>market. Prices have climbed sharply mainly because credit is much easier to
>get, in much higher amounts, than just a few decades ago. Put a regulatory
>cap on credit in this market and prices have to drop if companies want to
>sell cars.

Do you know this for a fact? Car price increases also reflect the enormous investment in engineering and tooling to build cars using the latest technology. Remember when most cars fell apart before reaching 10 years or 100,000 miles?

>Of course, the same is true for other markets (home construction,
>consumer goods, and so on).

As long as people are willing to pay the prices, the markets are driven that way. Supply and demand.

What about people trying to get started as homeowners? Raising the price of credit makes it impossible for them to buy a first house.

Some months back I refinanced the mortgage on this place. Took more than 5 years off the ultimate payback date *and* reduced my monthly payment by a few $$. Was that a good thing or a bad thing for me to do?

>The biggest danger to this solution is the
>tendency for companies to pass on any initial losses to consumers (lower
>quality products) and their own employees. The first will correct itself
>over time, but the second requires additional labor protections (wage
>increases, a cap on immigration, and efforts to prevent companies from
>moving overseas).

Import duties.
>
> Like I said, I certainly don't have all the answers. Even some of the
>problems are elusive. However, it is clear that even minor regulatory
>modifications, not massive government programs, can have a dramatic impact.
>The idea offered in the first paragraph also has the advantage of keeping
>product prices down for consumers. The idea in the second paragraph requires
>more effort, but offers greater returns over a longer period of time. The
>idea in the third paragraph offers the most benefits, but will have the most
>negative impact on consumers in the short term. For a truly robust economy,
>perhaps parts of all three should be considered.

But you also have to consider that the companies will find ways around such limitations. If the govt. is going to seize my "excess" profits, I simply won't have any - I'll set up deferred-compensation programs for myself and other bigwigs, buy down debt and buy back stock, do massive capital programs that *reduce* employment, invest in things to carry my company over the lean years to come, etc.

The big changes have to come from ordinary folks becoming educated and deciding how to spend their money. It's "voting with your wallet" and it's done every day.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2362. Re: Optical signals - Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-08 16:10:23 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <Pz8rb.721$KN4.517190@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 81888

Bill Sohl wrote:

> Surely you jest. Some company or person(s) develope a new
> technology, invention, whatever...and you expect them to hold off
> bringing that new whatever to market so the negative impacts to
> other industries, groups, etc can first be studied?

You mean like.....DDT? Thalidomide?

- Mike KB3EIA -

2363. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-08 17:21:45 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <JC9rb.8380$P%1.7500794@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 81889

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20031108022910.06226.00001382@mb-m19.aol.com...
> In article <4xXqb.8184$P%1.7333810@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D.
Flint"
> <deehays@qix.net> writes:
>
> >"Ryan, KC8PMX" <REMOVETHISkc8pmx@diamondcs.net> wrote in message
> >news:boh9mn$1f99e9$5@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de...
> >>
> >> The
> >> average wage around here, what is considered the alleged "living" or
> >minimum
> >> wage is between $5.25-6.00 per hour.
> >
> >Keep in mind that the minimum wage was NEVER intended to be a "living"
wage.
> >
> It wasn't? I'd be interested in a reference on that.
>
> I think what we're really seeing is inflation outpacing the minimum wage.
>
> Fun fact: In 1976 I started a job as a degreed engineer at the princely
sum of
> about $12,000/yr - about $6 an hour. About minimum wage today, but back
then
> the prices of most things (particularly housing and transportation) was so
much
> lower that it was a lot of money - to me, anyway.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>

And at that time minimum wage was about $1.50 per hour. It wasn't a living wage then either. Entry level jobs have never provided the income to support a family. Anyone that I have ever known in my lifetime (52 years) that made minimum wage either lived with their parents or other relatives, a group of roommates, or had a working spouse even back when I was a child. No adult male that I knew stayed in a minimum wage job any longer than it took to find something else because they could not pay groc, rent, and transportation on that. It has never been high enough to do so.

Wages versus costs is all relative. You have to look at how many hours it takes to buy something. The majority of items but not all take fewer hours of work to purchase than they did in 1976. The cost of electronics is down in terms of hours to buy. The cost of houses is about the same in terms of

hours.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

2364. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-08 17:35:28 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <AP9rb.8383$P%1.7504275@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 81890

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:095rb.16348$Oo4.14514@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> "Ryan, KC8PMX" wrote:
> >
> > So.... basically, one way or another people have to
> > pay for it, be it in higher service/product costs or
> > paying in taxes for a government program.
>
>
> Let me start by saying I don't have all the answers either, Ryan.
However,
> it is fairly easy to see where some of the biggest problems are. The most
> obvious is corporate profits today. Product quality is dropping
(plastics),
> wages are relatively stagnated, product prices certainly haven't dropped
> much, but corporate profits have went through the roof. Perhaps a
mechanism
> to reel in or put a cap on corporate profits is the answer. How to do that
> is the ten thousand dollar question (or, in this case, trillion dollar
> question). I'm somewhat radical, so I prefer the outright purge method - a
> cap on product price increases for several years and an immediate increase
> in overall wages (with caps on immigration or other negative factors
> effecting workers). This will drive some marginal companies out of
business
> (the purge) and will slow down the economy sharply. But, over a several
year
> period, more streamlined companies will eventually replace those put out
of
> business and the economy will recover. At that point, the cap on product
> prices can be reduced, letting competition once again drive the market.
>

You know Nixon tried wage and price controls and we started developing shortages. Other countries in the world have tried it too and also failed. Every where that has been tried, the standard of living dropped, goods and services became hard to get and unemployment rose. So why try what has already been proven to fail.

Please show that profits are obscene. Don't quote dollars, quote percentage of operating expenses. If expenses are say 100 trillion, then a profit of 1 trillion (1%) is so dangerously low that the company is on the verge of going bankrupt. Any company only making a 1% profit has difficulty getting investors, difficulty in getting expansion capital, and has no safety margin to ride out an economic downturn. On the other hand, let's take another case. If a small business has operating expenses of $100 and makes a profit

of $1000 then that is an obscene profit since it is 10 times the operating expense. So you see just quoting a dollar figure doesn't tell the whole story.

> [snip] However, it is clear that even minor regulatory
> modifications, not massive government programs, can have a dramatic impact.
> The idea offered in the first paragraph also has the advantage of keeping
> product prices down for consumers. The idea in the second paragraph requires
> more effort, but offers greater returns over a longer period of time. The
> idea in the third paragraph offers the most benefits, but will have the most
> negative impact on consumers in the short term. For a truly robust economy,
> perhaps parts of all three should be considered.

However, history has proven that it is not possible to predict the results of these "minor" regulatory actions. At this point in time no one is knowledgeable enough to do so and it's better to let the system react to the free market principles.

In addition, you have left out the most workable option. That is to work toward a world economy that enjoys a comparable standard to ours. Once that occurs, industry will find it more economical to produce more locally to trim shipping costs. Once it becomes equally costly to make a car in Japan as in the US for example, then the lower shipping cost means it's better to serve the US market with cars made in the US. The main drawback is the fact that it will take a very long time before the world standard of living matches ours.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

2365. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-08 17:50:23 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <z1arb.8385$P%1.7507248@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 81891

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:Cq5rb.16357$Oo4.10281@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> "Dee D. Flint" wrote:
> >
> > Keep in mind that the minimum wage was NEVER
> > intended to be a "living" wage.
>
>
> I thought the minimum wage was exactly that - the minimum a single
worker
> needs to maintain even the most basic standard of living. If it isn't
that,
> what is it supposed to be?
>

Only if you expect to live in a group setting (i.e. at home or with relatives or with roommates), have just barely enough clothes for work, eat basic foods (meat is NOT a daily item), and spend minimum on transportation (i.e. take the bus or have a junker car). It has never, ever risen to the level of allowing a person to support a family of four in their own home and own a moderately good car. It wasn't that high when implemented and has never gotten close to it.

The minimum wage is just high enough to keep a single person with no dependents from starving and freezing if they are willing to settle for bare bones survival. It's never been higher than that.

> The problem today, as more and more people become locked into lower
wages,
> is that the minimum wage doesn't address the extra needs of the worker's
> family or future. Taxpayers pay a price for that down the road (welfare,
> food stamps, medical costs, student aid, and so on). If companies paid
> better wages, much of that would be sharply reduced.
>

You are not supposed to stay in a minimum wage job. You get work experience, demonstrate your ability to be dependable, get recommendations (i.e "he/she is a hard worker") and move on.

The solution is not to mandate a higher wage but to actively seek out these people and get them ready to move on to the better jobs by making training, etc accessible.

When I was young (too long ago), I worked minimum wage jobs but I certainly knew that was not something I should consider doing lifelong.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

2366. Re: Optical signals - Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-08 17:54:27 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <n5arb.8386$P%1.7507916@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 81892

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:3N7rb.16492$Oo4.7118@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
>
> "Steve Stone" <spfleck@zzcitlinkzz.net> wrote in message
> news:_vZqb.780$9g1.131@news01.roc.ny...
> > >
> > > New technology almost always has a downside for some group or groups.
> > > Would you rather such advances not become reality?
> > >
> >
> > No.. but how will we all pay for new toys if we are on the bread lines
or
> > slicing baloney at Stop & Shop for a living ?
>
> The point is that any industry is always at risk. There is no
> guarnteed life expectancy for almost any endeaver. The PC has
> knocked down the number of secretaries needed to support
> engineering groups. The auto all but eliminated blacksmiths.
>
> Cheers,
> Bill K2UNK

But each also created new work. If the worker was smart enough to see it coming, they started preparing for the new application before it totally killed off the old. We may not have blacksmiths but the body shops keep pretty busy.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

2367. The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-08 18:01:50 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031108130150.21232.00001955@mb-m13.aol.com>
Source record: 81893

At the close of the ECFS on 7 November 2003, the number of
documents on public view are:

RM-10805: 214
RM-10806: 203
RM-10807: 167
RM-10808: 183
RM-10809: 169
RM-10810: 171
RM-10811: 923 Total: 2,030 (10811 has 45.5% of total)

RM-10781: 321
RM-10782: 271
RM-10783: 276
RM-10784: 254
RM-10785: 256
RM-10786: 422
RM-10787: 674 Total 2,474 (10787 has 27.2% of total)

Grand total: 4,504 documents for all 14 petitions.

The above does not represent the entirety of records submitted to the
FCC since some concerning RM-10805 through -10811 may not have
been fully checked for content or, if received by surface mail, may not
have been entered into the record.

Comment period for 10805 through 10811 is officially closed, but some
may be late-filed. It should be noted that FCC 98-143 comment
documents are still on public record and the last comment filed was in
September, 2003; official close of 98-143 comment period was 15
January, 1999.

FCC 03-104, the Docket on Broadband over Power Lines has 5,081
documents on record as of close of ECFS on 7 November 2003.

Control of the chat room is now returned to regulars for discussing the
vital interests of the regulars on such amateur radio policy topics as
the U.S. civil war, disadvantaged low-grade workers, U. S. foreign
policy, choo-choo trains, fast-food establishments, and the usual
outrage of regulars at other regulars not conceding their innate
superiority on all topics.

LHA

2368. Re: Optical signals - Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-08 21:17:19 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031108161719.12631.00002641@mb-m28.aol.com>
Source record: 81894

In article <n5arb.8386$P%1.7507916@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> writes:

>> The point is that any industry is always at risk. There is no
>> guarnteed life expectancy for almost any endeaver. The PC has
>> knocked down the number of secretaries needed to support
>> engineering groups. The auto all but eliminated blacksmiths.
>>
>> Cheers,
>> Bill K2UNK
>
>But each also created new work.

Sometimes - not always.

>If the worker was smart enough to see it
>coming, they started preparing for the new application before it totally
>killed off the old. We may not have blacksmiths but the body shops keep
>pretty busy.
>
True enough!

But when jobs are outsourced across the ocean, is enough new work created to compensate for the loss?

73 de Jim, N2EY

2369. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-08 21:17:22 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031108161722.12631.00002642@mb-m28.aol.com>
Source record: 81896

In article <AP9rb.8383$P%1.7504275@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> writes:

>You know Nixon tried wage and price controls and we started developing
>shortages. Other countries in the world have tried it too and also failed.
>Every where that has been tried, the standard of living dropped, goods and
>services became hard to get and unemployment rose. So why try what has
>already been proven to fail.

As I recall it, wage and price controls caused some shortages because certain costs could not be controlled. For example, the wellhead price of natural gas was regulated but the cost of drilling wasn't, so a lot of folks either stopped drilling altogether, or, when they were drilling for oil but hit only gas, they'd cap the well and take the loss in one lump rather than put the well into production and lose money on every cubic foot of gas produced.
>
>Please show that profits are obscene. Don't quote dollars, quote percentage
>of operating expenses. If expenses are say 100 trillion, then a profit of 1
>trillion (1%) is so dangerously low that the company is on the verge of
>going bankrupt. Any company only making a 1% profit has difficulty getting
>investors, difficulty in getting expansion capital, and has no safety margin
>to ride out an economic downturn. On the other hand, let's take another
>case. If a small business has operating expenses of $100 and makes a profit
>of $1000 then that is an obscene profit since it is 10 times the operating
>expense. So you see just quoting a dollar figure doesn't tell the whole
>story.

It's actually even more complex than that. Operating expenses are only one metric - there's also return on investment, market volatility, stock prices, regulatory controls, and a bunch of other factors.

For example, suppose a business with a total investment of $1 million has $10 million in operating expenses and $100,000 in profits. Profit is 1% of operating expenses but 10% of investment - is this company on rocky ground or not? If the operating expenses are fairly fixed, even a small drop in sales will put the company in the red. But if the operating expenses rise and fall in sync with sales, the company may be in a very solid position, profit wise.

There are all sorts of other examples. Some industries are so cyclic that they *need* high profits in good times to carry them through losses in bad times.

>> [snip] However, it is clear that even minor regulatory
>> modifications, not massive government programs, can have a dramatic
>> impact.
>> The idea offered in the first paragraph also has the advantage of keeping
>> product prices down for consumers. The idea in the second paragraph

>> requires
>> more effort, but offers greater returns over a longer period of time. The
>> idea in the third paragraph offers the most benefits, but will have the
>> most
>> negative impact on consumers in the short term. For a truly robust
>> economy,
>> perhaps parts of all three should be considered.
>
>However, history has proven that it is not possible to predict the results
>of these "minor" regulatory actions. At this point in time no one is
>knowledgeable enough to do so and it's better to let the system react to the
>free market principles.
>
"Law of Unexpected Consequences"

Look at the auto industry. Fuel prices were kept artificially low until the 1973 embargo, when they became artificially high, and the fuel itself became scarce.

Because the market had become used to a semingly inexhaustible supply of cheap fuel, the US auto industry did not develop fuel-efficient cars, and transportation alternatives like transit died off (or were actively killed to get rid of the competition to the private auto). This shortsightedness set the stage for massive inroads in the US market by foreign carmakers who *had* developed fuel-efficient cars.

>In addition, you have left out the most workable option. That is to work
>toward a world economy that enjoys a comparable standard to ours. Once that
>occurs, industry will find it more economical to produce more locally to
>trim shipping costs. Once it becomes equally costly to make a car in Japan
>as in the US for example, then the lower shipping cost means it's better to
>serve the US market with cars made in the US.

In the case of cars, this has already happened in some cases. Many Japanese companies (Honda, Subaru, Toyota, to name just a few) make cars in the USA because it's cheaper!

VW started that trend way back in the '70s by buying the Westmoreland, PA facility from Chrysler, and building Rabbits, Golfs and Jettas here instead of Germany. VW later sold that plant to Sony, who uses it to make CRTs (because it's cheaper to make them here!)

> The main drawback is the fact
>that it will take a very long time before the world standard of living
>matches ours.

So what do we do until then?

73 de Jim, N2EY

2370. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-08 21:17:24 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031108161724.12631.00002643@mb-m28.aol.com>
Source record: 81895

In article <JC9rb.8380$P%1.7500794@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D. Flint"
<deehays@qix.net> writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20031108022910.06226.00001382@mb-m19.aol.com...
>> In article <4xXqb.8184$P%1.7333810@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D.
>Flint"
>> <deehays@qix.net> writes:
>>
>> >"Ryan, KC8PMX" <REMOVETHISkc8pmx@diamondcs.net> wrote in message
>> >news:boh9mn$1f99e9$5@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de...
>> >>
>> >> The
>> >> average wage around here, what is considered the alleged "living" or
>> >minimum
>> >> wage is between $5.25-6.00 per hour.
>> >
>> >Keep in mind that the minimum wage was NEVER intended to be a "living"
>wage.
>> >
>> It wasn't? I'd be interested in a reference on that.
>>
>> I think what we're really seeing is inflation outpacing the minimum wage.
>>
>> Fun fact: In 1976 I started a job as a degreed engineer at the princely
>sum of
>> about $12,000/yr - about $6 an hour. About minimum wage today, but back
>then
>> the prices of most things (particularly housing and transportation) was so
>much
>> lower that it was a lot of money - to me, anyway.
>>
>> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>>
>
>And at that time minimum wage was about $1.50 per hour.

Actually a bit more, as I recall. But in any event we're talking $3000/yr to
$4000/yr, max..

>It wasn't a living
>wage then either. Entry level jobs have never provided the income to
>support a family.

Agreed - nor were they meant to. But it *was* possible for a person to live on them - probably more so than today.

>Anyone that I have ever known in my lifetime (52 years)
>that made minimum wage either lived with their parents or other relatives, a
>group of roommates, or had a working spouse even back when I was a child.

Pretty much the same here.

>No adult male that I knew stayed in a minimum wage job any longer than it
>took to find something else because they could not pay groc, rent, and
>transportation on that. It has never been high enough to do so.

'adult male'....ahem.....
>
>Wages versus costs is all relative. You have to look at how many hours it
>takes to buy something.

Exactly! And you also have to take into account things like creeping taxation (even if the laws don't change, inflation causes people to pay more of their income in taxes) and increases in the number of 'necessities'.

Taxes are a big part of the game, too. At one time the income tax rules were such that people on the bottom end who knew the rules could pay very little in taxes. I remember when:

- *all* interest paid (not just home mortgage interest) was deductible.
- *all* documented sales tax and *most* documented medical costs were deductible
- the various personal and dependent deductions were larger *in infaltion adjusted dollars*

>The majority of items but not all take fewer hours
>of work to purchase than they did in 1976.

In some cases, yes, in others, no.

>The cost of electronics is down
>in terms of hours to buy.

True to a point - but on the other end of the scale, those electronics are often non-repairable, and have limited useful lives, so that they must be replaced more often.

It it actually easier to restore ham gear that is 30-40-50 years old than much of the newer stuff, because parts for much of the newer stuff are simply unobtainable except from junker units. The displays in the popular TS-440S is one example - they are no longer made, and yet they are often one of the first major parts to fail, so your chances of lifting one from a junker are slim.

>The cost of houses is about the same in terms of
>hours.

A lot of that depends on the interest rate and taxes. Interest rates in the '70s were double-digit, approaching 17% in some markets at times - for home mortgages! But since all that interest was deductible, the *effective* interest

rate was less, depending on your tax bracket.

Escalating home prices makes it harder to get started, though, because the size of the down payment keeps growing. And since many of the fees involved with buying and selling are a percentage of the price, the amount of cash a first-timer needs gets really high.

Compare this to 40-50 years ago, when interest rates, taxes and down payments were low.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2371. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-08 22:04:09 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <tLdrb.8428$P%1.7559600@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 81897

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20031108161722.12631.00002642@mb-m28.aol.com...
> In article <AP9rb.8383$P%1.7504275@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D.
Flint"
> <deehays@qix.net> writes:
>
> As I recall it, wage and price controls caused some shortages because
certain
> costs could not be controlled. For example, the wellhead price of natural
gas
> was regulated but the cost of drilling wasn't, so a lot of folks either
stopped
> drilling altogether, or, when they were drilling for oil but hit only gas,
> they'd cap the well and take the loss in one lump rather than put the well
into
> production and lose money on every cubic foot of gas produced.

Exactly, people won't produce things they can't make a profit on. Thus it
results in shortages and job losses leading to reduced buying power leading
to layoffs in other industries and so on.

> [snip]
> It's actually even more complex than that. Operating expenses are only one
> metric - there's also return on investment, market volatility, stock
prices,
> regulatory controls, and a bunch of other factors.
>
> For example, suppose a business with a total investment of $1 million has
$10
> million in operating expenses and $100,000 in profits. Profit is 1% of
> operating expenses but 10% of investment - is this company on rocky ground
or
> not? If the operating expenses are fairly fixed, even a small drop in
sales
> will put the company in the red. But if the operating expenses rise and
fall in
> sync with sales, the company may be in a very solid position, profit wise.
>
> There are all sorts of other examples. Some industries are so cyclic that
they
> *need* high profits in good times to carry them through losses in bad
times.
>

I agree 100% but was just trying to keep it simple. It also illustrates
that it it too complex to try to regulate as we've discussed below.

> "Law of Unexpected Consequences"
>
> Look at the auto industry. Fuel prices were kept artificially low until
the
> 1973 embargo, when they became artificially high, and the fuel itself
became
> scarce.
>
> Because the market had become used to a semingly inexhaustible supply of
cheap
> fuel, the US auto industry did not develop fuel-efficient cars, and
> transportation alternatives like transit died off (or were actively killed
to
> get rid of the competition to the private auto). This shortsightedness set
the
> stage for massive inroads in the US market by foreign carmakers who *had*
> developed fuel-efficient cars.
>

Yup it sure did. I certainly remember when it seemed the roadways were
dominated by foreign cars.

> >In addition, you have left out the most workable option. That is to work
> >toward a world economy that enjoys a comparable standard to ours. Once
that
> >occurs, industry will find it more economical to produce more locally to
> >trim shipping costs. Once it becomes equally costly to make a car in
Japan
> >as in the US for example, then the lower shipping cost means it's better
to
> >serve the US market with cars made in the US.
>
> In the case of cars, this has already happened in some cases. Many
Japanese
> companies (Honda, Subaru, Toyota, to name just a few) make cars in the USA
> because it's cheaper!
>
> VW started that trend way back in the '70s by buying the Westmoreland, PA
> facility from Chrysler, and building Rabbits, Golfs and Jettas here
instead of
> Germany. VW later sold that plant to Sony, who uses it to make CRTs
(because
> it's cheaper to make them here!)
>
> > The main drawback is the fact
> >that it will take a very long time before the world standard of living
> >matches ours.
>
> So what do we do until then?

>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

As people have always done:
1) Some will whine and barely get by.
2) Some will simply make the best of what they have and do a bit better
3) Others will forge ahead and strive for their own personal best
development and productivity and will be reasonably comfortable.
4) Yet others will create an opportunity and become the next Bill Gates.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

2372. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-08 23:23:53 UTC
From: garigue <garigue@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <dWerb.148672$Fm2.131039@attbi_s04>
Source record: 81898

>
> Control of the chat room is now returned to regulars for discussing the
> vital interests of the regulars on such amateur radio policy topics as
> the U.S. civil war, disadvantaged low-grade workers, U. S. foreign
> policy, choo-choo trains, fast-food establishments, and the usual
> outrage of regulars at other regulars not conceding their innate
> superiority on all topics.
>
> LHA

Ah com'on Len ......You forgot CW always gets through, buggy whips,
Luddites, standard transmissions, breasts, military service, hair splitting,
horseback riding, whining, strawmen, redshirts, the religion of morse, OOK
in many and sundry forms and my choice for the most boring ....
pontificating rants by non hams.

73 God Bless Tom Popovic KI3R

2373. Re: NCI Petition for Rulemaking

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-08 23:44:35 UTC
From: Clint <"rattlehead at computron dot net">
Message-ID: <vqr00c8ctb1h58@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 81899

"S. Hanrahan" <aa7ya@hotmail.com> wrote in message
news:k8djqvoacv3mngsimv0n8v0hg3699nj1dk@4ax.com...

>
> Exactly. I look at it this way, if a person doesn't want to learn the
> code, fine, if they want to fine, just don't come up to me and bitch
> and moan that 5 WPM is a hurdle or mountain too high to climb.

not to worry, it won't be a hurdle or a mountain anymore when
the FCC removes the code testing requirement.

Clint
KB5ZHT

2374. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-09 00:52:42 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0311081652.3d5907a9@posting.google.com>
Source record: 81900

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20031108130150.21232.00001955@mb-m13.aol.com>...

> Control of the chat room...(SNIP)

Two problems here, Your Scuzziness.

First of all you seem to think you were in control of something.
You are not, nor have you ever been.

Secondly, this is not a "chat room". For one who is constantly
berating licensed Amateurs for not being aware of technology or it's
applications, you seem to have a problem with the concepts of various
Internet applications.

Strange. Buth then, you ARE the epitomy of strange.

Steve, K4YZ

2375. Re: Amateur Radio in the 21st Century?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-09 01:41:30 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0311081741.14edef8c@posting.google.com>
Source record: 81951

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20031102224951.21232.00001802@mb-m13.aol.com>...> On the last page of his voluminous reply comments to the restructuring NPRM
> back in 1999, Len requested that the FCC enact a minimum age requirement of 14
> years for any class of amateur license. When challenged, however, he could not
> give a single example of on-air violations by licensed radio amateurs under the
> age of 14.

Neither would he respond to questions about his parenting
experiences that might lead him to make such a suggestion.

Yet another example of Lennie's lack of experience in ANYthing he
cares to discuss about Amateur Radio.

73

Steve, K4YZ

2376. Re: Optical signals - Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-09 02:23:46 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <xnfcneeyarg.ho238v1.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>
Source record: 81952

On Sat, 08 Nov 2003 15:20:47 GMT, Bill Sohl wrote:

>Surely you jest. Some company or person(s) develope a new
>technology, invention, whatever...and you expect them to hold off
>bringing that new whatever to market so the negative impacts to
>other industries, groups, etc can first be studied?

Consider the consequemces if they don't.

I had the eyesight in one eye restored with an experimental
medication used in a very high tech procedure that was Phase 2 of a
study for FDA procedure approval. If the company that manufactured
the medication and proposed the procedure had not been required to
do Phase 1 (medication safety test) or indeed the entire approval
study first, what would have happened had the medication not proved
safe to use in the first place (permanent blindness, I was told).

In our field, consider the effects of headlong approval of BPL on
spectrum usability. Full speed ahead, damn the torpedoes.

Yes, Bill, I am 100% in favor of defining and eliminating or at least
guarding against the downsides before running off to market a la
Micro$**t Windows junk.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

From a Clearing in the Silicon Forest
Beaverton (Washington County) Oregon

2377. Re: Optical signals - Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-09 02:23:46 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <xnfcneeyarg.ho22qk0.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>
Source record: 81953

On Sat, 08 Nov 2003 15:16:15 GMT, Bill Sohl wrote:

>The point is that any industry is always at risk. There is no
>guarnteed life expectancy for almost any endeaver. The PC has
>knocked down the number of secretaries needed to support
>engineering groups.

And created an equal demand for CAD operators who also replaced
drafters.

>The auto all but eliminated blacksmiths.

And created an equal demand for "mechanics" who today are called
"technicians".

Same folks doing the same work......

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

From a Clearing in the Silicon Forest
Beaverton (Washington County) Oregon

2378. Re: Optical signals - Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-09 03:10:11 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <neirb.17627$Oo4.9169@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 81954

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:n5arb.8386$P%1.7507916@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
>
> "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
> news:3N7rb.16492$Oo4.7118@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> >
> > "Steve Stone" <spfleck@zzcitlinkzz.net> wrote in message
> > news:_vZqb.780$9g1.131@news01.roc.ny...
> > > >
> > > > New technology almost always has a downside for some group or
groups.
> > > > Would you rather such advances not become reality?
> > > >
> > >
> > > No.. but how will we all pay for new toys if we are on the bread lines
> or
> > > slicing baloney at Stop & Shop for a living ?
> >
> > The point is that any industry is always at risk. There is no
> > guarnteed life expectancy for almost any endeaver. The PC has
> > knocked down the number of secretaries needed to support
> > engineering groups. The auto all but eliminated blacksmiths.
> >
> > Cheers,
> > Bill K2UNK
>
> But each also created new work. If the worker was smart enough to see it
> coming, they started preparing for the new application before it totally
> killed off the old. We may not have blacksmiths but the body shops keep
> pretty busy.
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

Exactly!

I was just counter arguing Jim's concern of negative consequences
likly deriving from any new technology. The reality is, or should be,
as you state...BUT, too often the workers and/or other industry
leaders don't see it coming...or refuse to believe it.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2379. Who is John Galt? - Re: Optical signals - Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-09 03:18:52 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <wmirb.17631$Oo4.14551@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 81955

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20031108161719.12631.00002641@mb-m28.aol.com...
> In article <n5arb.8386$P%1.7507916@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D.
Flint"
> <deehays@qix.net> writes:
>
> >> The point is that any industry is always at risk. There is no
> >> guarnteed life expectancy for almost any endeaver. The PC has
> >> knocked down the number of secretaries needed to support
> >> engineering groups. The auto all but eliminated blacksmiths.
> >>
> >> Cheers,
> >> Bill K2UNK
> >
> >But each also created new work.
>
> Sometimes - not always.

Please provide an example of "not always".

> >If the worker was smart enough to see it
> >coming, they started preparing for the new application before it totally
> >killed off the old. We may not have blacksmiths but the body shops keep
> >pretty busy.
> >
> True enough!
>
> But when jobs are outsourced across the ocean, is enough new work created
to
> compensate for the loss?

Is it always one for one, or more created than lost? I don't
know and probably neither does anyone else. The point is that
when politics or socialistic intents are the basis for holding
up or limiting new technology, then a crutch on govenrment is created
which does no good in the long run (IMHO).

Ever read "Atlas Shrugged"?

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2380. Re: Optical signals - Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-09 03:18:53 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <xmirb.17632$Oo4.7031@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 81956

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:Pz8rb.721$KN4.517190@news1.news.adelphia.net...
> Bill Sohl wrote:
>
>
> > Surely you jest. Some company or person(s) develope a new
> > technology, invention, whatever...and you expect them to hold off
> > bringing that new whatever to market so the negative impacts to
> > other industries, groups, etc can first be studied?
>
> You mean like.....DDT? Thalidomide?

The "negative impacts" I mentioned were not intented to include
health or life threatening side effects. The discussion has been around
"negative
impacts" in the area of job displaceents and/or industries failing.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2381. Re: Optical signals - Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-09 03:24:40 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <Yrirb.17637$Oo4.1220@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 81957

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:xnfcneeyarg.ho238v1.pminews@netnews.comcast.net...
> On Sat, 08 Nov 2003 15:20:47 GMT, Bill Sohl wrote:
>
> >Surely you jest. Some company or person(s) develope a new
> >technology, invention, whatever...and you expect them to hold off
> >bringing that new whatever to market so the negative impacts to
> >other industries, groups, etc can first be studied?
>
> Consider the consequemces if they don't.
>
> I had the eyesight in one eye restored with an experimental
> medication used in a very high tech procedure that was Phase 2 of a
> study for FDA procedure approval. If the company that manufactured
> the medication and proposed the procedure had not been required to
> do Phase 1 (medication safety test) or indeed the entire approval
> study first, what would have happened had the medication not proved
> safe to use in the first place (permanent blindness, I was told).
>
> In our field, consider the effects of headlong approval of BPL on
> spectrum usability. Full speed ahead, damn the torpedoes.
>
> Yes, Bill, I am 100% in favor of defining and eliminating or at least
> guarding against the downsides before running off to market a la
> Micro$**t Windows junk.

The discussion has been on the economic downsides (jobs lost, industries
driven out of existence), not on bonafide health, life, or illegal
interference issues.

Another example. Would you have held back on digital photography
because it is negatively impacting the print film camera industry?

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2382. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-09 03:35:15 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031108223515.07346.00001650@mb-m26.aol.com>
Source record: 81958

In article <tLdrb.8428$P%1.7559600@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D. Flint"
<deehays@qix.net> writes:

>Exactly, people won't produce things they can't make a profit on.

More likely they simply can't produce those things.

>Thus it
>results in shortages and job losses leading to reduced buying power leading
>to layoffs in other industries and so on.

Exactly.

Even more recently, look at the mess that the electric power industry got into
in parts of California some time back because of botched "deregulation".

>> [snip]
>> It's actually even more complex than that. Operating expenses are only one
>> metric - there's also return on investment, market volatility, stock
>> prices, regulatory controls, and a bunch of other factors.
>>
>> For example, suppose a business with a total investment of $1 million has
>> $10
>> million in operating expenses and $100,000 in profits. Profit is 1% of
>> operating expenses but 10% of investment - is this company on rocky ground
>> or
>> not? If the operating expenses are fairly fixed, even a small drop in
>> sales
>> will put the company in the red. But if the operating expenses rise and
>> fall in
>> sync with sales, the company may be in a very solid position, profit wise.
>>
>> There are all sorts of other examples. Some industries are so cyclic that
>> they
>> *need* high profits in good times to carry them through losses in bad
>> times.
>
>I agree 100% but was just trying to keep it simple. It also illustrates
>that it it too complex to try to regulate as we've discussed below.

There *is* a need for regulation of industry - we just have to be very careful
as to how that regulation is done. For example, I don't think US companies
should have to compete head-to-head with foreign companies whose managements
don't have to worry about environmental rules, safety rules, child labor laws,
etc.
>

>> "Law of Unexpected Consequences"
>>
>> Look at the auto industry. Fuel prices were kept artificially low until
>> the
>> 1973 embargo, when they became artificially high, and the fuel itself
>> became scarce.
>>
>> Because the market had become used to a semingly inexhaustible supply of
>> cheap
>> fuel, the US auto industry did not develop fuel-efficient cars, and
>> transportation alternatives like transit died off (or were actively killed
>> to
>> get rid of the competition to the private auto). This shortsightedness set
>> the
>> stage for massive inroads in the US market by foreign carmakers who *had*
>> developed fuel-efficient cars.
>
>Yup it sure did. I certainly remember when it seemed the roadways were
>dominated by foreign cars.

In some ways they still are. Much of what we consider "American" cars are not
100% "Made in USA". In fact, many "foreign" cars have higher domestic
content...

In the past quarter century, my immediate family motor pool has included 2
Fords, 1 Saturn, 3 VWs, and 2 Hondas. All "Made in the USA".
>
>> >In addition, you have left out the most workable option. That is to work
>> >toward a world economy that enjoys a comparable standard to ours. Once
>> >that
>> >occurs, industry will find it more economical to produce more locally to
>> >trim shipping costs. Once it becomes equally costly to make a car in
>> >Japan
>> >as in the US for example, then the lower shipping cost means it's better
>> >to serve the US market with cars made in the US.
>>
>> In the case of cars, this has already happened in some cases. Many
>> Japanese
>> companies (Honda, Subaru, Toyota, to name just a few) make cars in the
>> USA because it's cheaper!
>>
>> VW started that trend way back in the '70s by buying the Westmoreland, PA
>> facility from Chrysler, and building Rabbits, Golfs and Jettas here
>> instead of
>> Germany. VW later sold that plant to Sony, who uses it to make CRTs
>> (because
>> it's cheaper to make them here!)
>>
>> > The main drawback is the fact
>> >that it will take a very long time before the world standard of living
>> >matches ours.

>>
>> So what do we do until then?
>>
>> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>As people have always done:
>1) Some will whine and barely get by.
>2) Some will simply make the best of what they have and do a bit better
>3) Others will forge ahead and strive for their own personal best
>development and productivity and will be reasonably comfortable.
>4) Yet others will create an opportunity and become the next Bill Gates.

I meant as a society.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2383. Re: Optical signals - Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-09 03:35:15 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031108223515.07346.00001651@mb-m26.aol.com>
Source record: 81959

In article <xnfcneeyarg.ho22qk0.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>, "Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> writes:

>On Sat, 08 Nov 2003 15:16:15 GMT, Bill Sohl wrote:
>
>>The point is that any industry is always at risk. There is no
>>guarnteed life expectancy for almost any endeaver. The PC has
>>knocked down the number of secretaries needed to support
>>engineering groups.
>
> And created an equal demand for CAD operators who also replaced
> drafters.

I don't think it's an equal demand. In most cases, a good CAD op can turn out the same work faster than an equally skilled manual drafter. This is particularly true if an existing drawing can be modified rather than drawing from scratch.

When I started in the design office at (undisclosed former employer), all work was by hand drafting. Now, in that industry, it is all CAD work - even to the point that the old linen tracings are usually scanned and treated as CAD files.

And that's for plain old 2D electrical/electronic stuff. The mechanical and architectural folks are the big shots in that department.

>>The auto all but eliminated blacksmiths.
>
> And created an equal demand for "mechanics" who today are called
> "technicians".

Which title they deserve, considering the level of technology they have to take care of.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2384. Re: Len straightens us out

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-09 04:21:49 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3FADC0D3.5AA59B44@earthlink.net>
Source record: 81960

Mike Coslo wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
>
> > Len Over 21 wrote:
> >
> >>In article <dNWcnezpuvoWujGiXTWc9g@ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
> >><wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:
> >>
> >>
> >>>What does any of this have to do with BPL?????
> >>
> >> Carl, this isn't a newsgroup, it's a CHAT ROOM for the regulars
> >> and their buddies.
> >
> >
> > Nope, not even the use of CAPITAL LETTERS makes this a chat room. It is
> > still a newsgroup.
> >
> >
> >> All can talk on anydamnthingtheywant
> >> because they got licensed as amateurs.
> >
> >
> > All can discuss any topic because it isn't outlawed. As you've been
> > quick to point out, this is an unmoderated group. You've frequently
> > gone quite far afield in your postings. We'll chalk this up as another
> > "Do as I say and not as I do" comment.
> >
> >
> >> One can only talk
> >> about actual amateur radio policy issues someplace else... :-)
> >
> >
> > What's it to you? You aren't ivolved in amateur radio.
>
> Especially since the Carl's real intention behind his comment was based
> (I think) on my being some minor irritant to him, rather than a desire
> to keep the newsgroup pure and On Topic.

I think you have a complete grasp of the situation. Carl had nothing to
say about BPL nor did Len.

Dave K8MN

2385. Re: Who is John Galt? - Re: Optical signals - Re: Wonder how licensing will c...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-09 07:28:59 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031109022859.25815.00004333@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 81961

In article <wmirb.17631$Oo4.14551@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20031108161719.12631.00002641@mb-m28.aol.com...
>> In article <n5arb.8386$P%1.7507916@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D. >Flint"
>> <deehays@qix.net> writes:
>>
>> >> The point is that any industry is always at risk. There is no
>> >> guarnteed life expectancy for almost any endeaver. The PC has
>> >> knocked down the number of secretaries needed to support
>> >> engineering groups. The auto all but eliminated blacksmiths.
>> >>
>> >> Cheers,
>> >> Bill K2UNK
>> >
>> >But each also created new work.
>>
>> Sometimes - not always.
>
>Please provide an example of "not always".

I recall a time when an office of any size had a "typing pool" and "file clerks" - jobs that were relatively unskilled but paid decent wages and benefits. Computerization almost eliminated those sorts of jobs but did not replace them with other jobs.

>
>> >If the worker was smart enough to see it
>> >coming, they started preparing for the new application before it totally
>> >killed off the old. We may not have blacksmiths but the body shops keep
>> >pretty busy.
>> >
>> True enough!
>>
>> But when jobs are outsourced across the ocean, is enough new work created
>> to compensate for the loss?
>
>Is it always one for one, or more created than lost? I don't
>know and probably neither does anyone else.

It depends on the situation. Sometimes it makes more sense to do a job elsewhere. Sometimes it's shortsighted.

>The point is that
>when politics or socialistic intents are the basis for holding
>up or limiting new technology, then a crutch on govenrment is created
>which does no good in the long run (IMHO).

Again, it all depends on the situation. And that game is played both ways - sometimes government backs an industry, often with unforseen consequences. For example, I'm old enough to remember being told that we would soon be flying all over the globe at supersonic speeds. But only the Concorde ever entered commercial service, and that era has ended. Supersonic flight for civilian air travel simply costs too much for the time saved. The Concorde *never* made money, as I understand it.

In fact, the whole airline industry totters on the edge of bankruptcy, propped up by massive government bailouts and subsidies, direct and indirect.

Or look at nuclear power. We were told over and over that it was "the future" and that a way would be found to deal with the radioactive waste. As if.

>Ever read "Atlas Shrugged"?

Many times. I have it in hardback. The chapter on what happened to the 20th Century Motor Company should be required reading. She hit at the core of what should be obvious but is often not understood, or openly denied: You cannot consume what isn't produced.

I think "The Fountainhead" is actually a better book, though.

But Ayn Rand's philosophy is seriously flawed because it simply ignores certain realities. Her characters are not realistic human beings. When you look at her own life, you see that even Ms. Rand did not live according to her own principles.

For example, no matter what her heroes do, none of them ever gets sick, hurt, or pregnant. None of her heroes ever finds that there is something they want to do that they are simply no good at. None of her heroes, or even main characters, has a good family relationship - most are orphans, or have only one relative, who is almost always antagonistic. None of her main characters has any children, or hobbies, or religion, or anything other than either their work (heroes) or the destruction of others' work (her villains).

The real world is far more complex than that.

btw, the inaugural train ride on the John Galt Line was derived from a head-end ride Ms. Rand took on the 20th Century Limited.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2386. Re: Who is John Galt? - Re: Optical signals - Re: Wonder how licensing will c...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-09 12:47:38 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0311090447.1908f1d9@posting.google.com>
Source record: 81962

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20031109022859.25815.00004333@mb-m07.aol.com>...
> In article <wmirb.17631$Oo4.14551@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Bill
> Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
>
> >"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> >news:20031108161719.12631.00002641@mb-m28.aol.com...
> >> In article <n5arb.8386$P%1.7507916@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D.
> Flint"
> >> <deehays@qix.net> writes:
> >>
> >> >> The point is that any industry is always at risk. There is no
> >> >> guarnteed life expectancy for almost any endeaver. The PC has
> >> >> knocked down the number of secretaries needed to support
> >> >> engineering groups. The auto all but eliminated blacksmiths.
> >> >>
> >> >> Cheers,
> >> >> Bill K2UNK
> >> >
> >> >But each also created new work.
> >>
> >> Sometimes - not always.
> >
> >Please provide an example of "not always".
>
> I recall a time when an office of any size had a "typing pool" and "file
> clerks" - jobs that were relatively unskilled but paid decent wages and
> benefits. Computerization almost eliminated those sorts of jobs but did not
> replace them with other jobs.

The "IT" department to keep all the PCs running.

> >> >If the worker was smart enough to see it
> >> >coming, they started preparing for the new application before it totally
> >> >killed off the old. We may not have blacksmiths but the body shops keep
> >> >pretty busy.
> >>
> >> True enough!
> >>
> >> But when jobs are outsourced across the ocean, is enough new work created
> >> to compensate for the loss?
> >
> >Is it always one for one, or more created than lost? I don't

> >know and probably neither does anyone else.
>
> It depends on the situation. Sometimes it makes more sense to do a job
> elsewhere. Sometimes it's shortsighted.
>
> >The point is that
> >when politics or socialistic intents are the basis for holding
> >up or limiting new technology, then a crutch on govenrment is created
> >which does no good in the long run (IMHO).
>
> Again, it all depends on the situation. And that game is played both ways -
> sometimes government backs an industry, often with unforseen consequences. For
> example, I'm old enough to remember being told that we would soon be flying all
> over the globe at supersonic speeds. But only the Concorde ever entered
> commercial service, and that era has ended. Supersonic flight for civilian air
> travel simply costs too much for the time saved. The Concorde *never* made
> money, as I understand it.
>
> In fact, the whole airline industry totters on the edge of bankruptcy, propped
> up by massive government bailouts and subsidies, direct and indirect.
>
> Or look at nuclear power. We were told over and over that it was "the future"
> and that a way would be found to deal with the radioactive waste. As if.

We just never found a way to deal with the environmentalist whacko's.

> >Ever read "Atlas Shrugged"?
>
> Many times. I have it in hardback. The chapter on what happened to the 20th
> Century Motor Company should be required reading. She hit at the core of what
> should be obvious but is often not understood, or openly denied: You cannot
> consume what isn't produced.
>
> I think "The Fountainhead" is actually a better book, though.
>
> But Ayn Rand's philosophy is seriously flawed because it simply ignores certain
> realities. Her characters are not realistic human beings. When you look at her
> own life, you see that even Ms. Rand did not live according to her own
> principles.
>
> For example, no matter what her heroes do, none of them ever gets sick, hurt,
> or pregnant. None of her heroes ever finds that there is something they want to
> do that they are simply no good at.

I wonder about her Morse Code use.

None of her heroes, or even main
> characters, has a good family relationship - most are orphans, or have only one
> relative, who is almost always antagonistic. None of her main characters has
> any children, or hobbies, or religion, or anything other than either their work
> (heroes) or the destruction of others' work (her villains).

>
> The real world is far more complex than that.
>
> btw, the inaugural train ride on the John Galt Line was derived from a head-end
> ride Ms. Rand took on the 20th Century Limited.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

You know way too much about Ayn.

2387. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-09 12:47:53 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <ZHqrb.8496$P%1.7683957@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 81963

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20031108223515.07346.00001650@mb-m26.aol.com...
> There *is* a need for regulation of industry - we just have to be very
careful
> as to how that regulation is done. For example, I don't think US companies
> should have to compete head-to-head with foreign companies whose
managements
> don't have to worry about environmental rules, safety rules, child labor
laws,
> etc.

And of course we need basic regulations such as preventing one company from selling temporarily at a loss to drive another company out of business and so on. However what I meant was that we do not know enough to manipulate the economy to create prosperity. I.e. The most productive approach is going to be the free market economy that has mechanisms in place to prevent unethical business practices (as described in my first sentence) and to prevent the drifting towards monopolies so that there are competing companies.

The items in the last sentence of your paragraph will change as these foreign countries become more prosperous. The US and European countries did not enact such laws themselves until we were our economies were strong enough to allow us to do so. This is part of what I was talking about when I said problem of foreign competition will eventally be solved when the foreign companies reach our level of prosperity. Of course in the meantime it does make it difficult for us. But who ever promised life would be easy?

>>>> [snip] the most workable option. That is to work
> >> >toward a world economy that enjoys a comparable standard to ours.
Once
> >> >that
> >> >occurs, industry will find it more economical to produce more locally
to
> >> >trim shipping costs. Once it becomes equally costly to make a car in
> >> >Japan
> >> >as in the US for example, then the lower shipping cost means it's
better
> >> >to serve the US market with cars made in the US.
> >>
> >> In the case of cars, this has already happened in some cases. Many
> >> Japanese
> >> companies (Honda, Subaru, Toyota, to name just a few) make cars in the
> >> USA because it's cheaper!
> >>

> >> VW started that trend way back in the '70s by buying the Westmoreland,
PA
> >> facility from Chrysler, and building Rabbits, Golfs and Jettas here
> >> instead of
> >> Germany. VW later sold that plant to Sony, who uses it to make CRTs
> >> (because
> >> it's cheaper to make them here!)
> >>
> >> > The main drawback is the fact
> >> >that it will take a very long time before the world standard of living
> >> >matches ours.
> >>
> >> So what do we do until then?
> >>
> >> 73 de Jim, N2EY
> >
> >As people have always done:
> >1) Some will whine and barely get by.
> >2) Some will simply make the best of what they have and do a bit better
> >3) Others will forge ahead and strive for their own personal best
> >development and productivity and will be reasonably comfortable.
> >4) Yet others will create an opportunity and become the next Bill Gates.
>
> I meant as a society.

Well it's not going to work to try to manipulate the economy and market place. So as a society, we have patience and help these other countries to become as prosperous as we are. And we deal individually with the hardships as we have always done in the ups and downs of life.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

2388. Re: Who is John Galt? - Re: Optical signals - Re: Wonder how licensing will c...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-09 12:53:41 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <pNqrb.8498$P%1.7684242@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 81964

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20031109022859.25815.00004333@mb-m07.aol.com...
>
> I recall a time when an office of any size had a "typing pool" and "file
> clerks" - jobs that were relatively unskilled but paid decent wages and
> benefits. Computerization almost eliminated those sorts of jobs but did
not
> replace them with other jobs.

No these jobs did not pay a decent wage. People in these jobs could not live independenly on that income and raise a family. They either were a second wage earner in a family or a single person living at home or with room mates. The pay was just barely above minimum wage and it was definitely not a "living wage".

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

2389. Re: Amateur Radio in the 21st Century?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-09 13:29:19 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031109082919.08626.00001645@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 81965

In article <J9Scnf7RaYVotTGiXTWc9g@ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
<wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:

>"Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
>news:3FAC12FF.3020502@psu.edu...
>> N2EY wrote:
>> > In article <nMCqb.13187$Oo4.5885@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>,
>"Kï¿½HB"
>> > <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> writes:

>> >>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote

>> >>> But...but Hans....are you saying that all that theory stuff should be
>> >>>"shoved down the throats" of hams who will never use it?
>> >>
>> >>What the hell is it with you, Jim????? Halloween is over. Drag this
>> >>worn-out old strawman out to the curb with the trash. You sound like a
>> >>broken record.

Note that Hans avoids my question.
>
>I have to agree with Hans on this.

You're avoiding my question too, Carl. Why is that?

>I have asked Jim privately to please
>stop harping on the argument that the written tests are equally invalid
>as the Morse tests

That's NOT what I've said at all! You're twisting my words into something
completely different.

I'm saying that the same arguments can be used - and will be used - by some
against both tests. The process is already started - see KL7CC's comments on
the recent petitions.

>(I know he's playing devil's advocate, but something
>that's repeated often enough sometimes catches on and I don't want to
>see Jim end up being the best salesman for something that I know he
>doesn't want to see any more than I do ...)

So you're just asking me to shut up. Is that what we have to look for in the
amateur radio of the 21st century?

Did you ask KL7CC and the other authors of that paper to shut up?
>
>Jim, please listen to Hans if you won't listen to me ...
>

I've never seen you guys more eager to get someone to be quiet about something. Tell it to W5YI. Oh, no, Fred's sacred - no one must criticize Fred - he's the Maximum Leader.

btw, his outfit sent me another one of those renewal packets. This time they want $6 to do what I can do myself with a few mouse clicks.

>> > Apparently you didn't read the KL7CC paper, Hans.

>> I thought he did. I think what he wants you to do is to quit bringing
>> that point up.

If you guys have an answer that simply quashes the KL7CC paper's bad ideas, why are you so afraid?

You didn't ask Hans to shut up with his 2 license class proposal.

You didn't ask Len to shut up with his age-requirement nonsense.

You haven't asked KL7CC et al to shut up with their bad ideas.

Only me. Interesting.

>> Is it a strawman when there is a paper,suggesting that the testing
>> requirement be radically reduced?

>> It's there, the proposal has been made, and the authors rely on their
>> credentials, despite protestations to the contrary. Some strawman!
>>
>> - Mike KB3EIA -
>
>The FCC has determined the ARS to be "primarily a technically oriented
>service"

Right. Now what the heck does that actually mean? How does it somehow prove the need for multiple license classes and written tests such as we have now? Why can't hams be left free to choose what parts of amateur radio to pursue?

> ... I really don't see ANY "no theory" proposal getting a lot of
>traction there ... and I will be right in there with Jim and most others
>fighting that one.

How will we fight it? Saying amateur radio is primarily a technical service doesn't prove anything more than the old "trained pool or operators" mantra.

Has taking and passing all those written exams caused anyone to decide to build a radio or be "more technical" than they would have been otherwise?
>
>Let's just stop advertising something we don't want to sell -

Sounds to me like you're afraid that there are plenty of folks out there who will *agree* with KL7CC.....

>there will
>be plenty of time to comment vigorously against it if the FCC ever were

>to lend any credence to such a proposal.
>
It's probably already too late.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2390. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-09 14:16:57 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <t%rrb.1130$KN4.845856@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 81966

N2EY wrote:
> In article <JC9rb.8380$P%1.7500794@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D. Flint"
> <deehays@qix.net> writes:
>
>
>>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>>news:20031108022910.06226.00001382@mb-m19.aol.com...
>>
>>>In article <4xXqb.8184$P%1.7333810@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D.
>>
>>Flint"
>>
>>>><deehays@qix.net> writes:
>>>
>>>
>>>>"Ryan, KC8PMX" <REMOVETHISkc8pmx@diamondcs.net> wrote in message
>>>>news:boh9mn$1f99e9$5@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de...
>>>>
>>>>>The
>>>>>average wage around here, what is considered the alleged "living" or
>>>>
>>>>minimum
>>>>
>>>>>wage is between $5.25-6.00 per hour.
>>>>
>>>>Keep in mind that the minimum wage was NEVER intended to be a "living"
>>
>>wage.
>>
>>>It wasn't? I'd be interested in a reference on that.
>>>
>>>I think what we're really seeing is inflation outpacing the minimum wage.
>>>
>>>Fun fact: In 1976 I started a job as a degreed engineer at the princely
>>
>>sum of
>>
>>>about $12,000/yr - about $6 an hour. About minimum wage today, but back
>>
>>then
>>
>>>the prices of most things (particularly housing and transportation) was so
>>
>>much

>>
>>>lower that it was a lot of money - to me, anyway.
>>>
>>>73 de Jim, N2EY
>>>
>>
>>And at that time minimum wage was about $1.50 per hour.
>
>
> Actually a bit more, as I recall. But in any event we're talking $3000/yr to
> $4000/yr, max..

In the summer of 1972, I got my first job after high school. It paid
$2.40 per hour. Minimum at that time was $2.20.
>
>>It wasn't a living
>>wage then either. Entry level jobs have never provided the income to
>>support a family.
>
>
> Agreed - nor were they meant to. But it *was* possible for a person to live on
> them - probably more so than today.

I lived on that $2.40 per hour. Not well, but okay.

>
>>Anyone that I have ever known in my lifetime (52 years)
>>that made minimum wage either lived with their parents or other relatives, a
>>group of roommates, or had a working spouse even back when I was a child.
>
>
> Pretty much the same here.

Folks, conservative ot liberal, there is a whole other world out there!
I know of a number of families that had both parents working at minimum
or close to it.

>>No adult male that I knew stayed in a minimum wage job any longer than it
>>took to find something else because they could not pay groc, rent, and
>>transportation on that. It has never been high enough to do so.
>
>
> 'adult male'....ahem.....

The age of the "adult male" as the breadwinner is long gone. Both
husband and wife now pretty much *need* to work. If a family is in the
situation where only one needs to work, then that's great. But let's
hope they don't gloat about it.

>>Wages versus costs is all relative. You have to look at how many hours it
>>takes to buy something.
>

>
> Exactly! And you also have to take into account things like creeping taxation
> (even if the laws don't change, inflation causes people to pay more of their
> income in taxes) and increases in the number of 'necessities'.
>
> Taxes are a big part of the game, too. At one time the income tax rules were
> such that people on the bottom end who knew the rules could pay very little in
> taxes. I remember when:
>
> - *all* interest paid (not just home mortgage interest) was deductible.
> - *all* documented sales tax and *most* documented medical costs were
> deductible
> - the various personal and dependent deductions were larger *in infaltion
> adjusted dollars*
>
>
>>The majority of items but not all take fewer hours
>>of work to purchase than they did in 1976.
>
>
> In some cases, yes, in others, no.

As I recall reading a while back, in 1950, it took 14 percent of an
average workers income to put a roof over "his head". That may have
changed a little bit! 8^)

And did you know they are doing seven year loans on cars? If all was
equal, wages and prices, we would still be doing 2 and 3 year loans on them.

There are two of the major outlays for the typical family. Add to that
education costs, which have outpaced inflation by in some cases 400
percent (in my area, we had an around 12 percent increase one year
recently) and you have a bit different picture!

>>The cost of electronics is down
>>in terms of hours to buy.
>
>
> True to a point - but on the other end of the scale, those electronics are
> often non-repairable, and have limited useful lives, so that they must be
> replaced more often.

It breaks, and you buy a new one. Break even at best.

> It it actually easier to restore ham gear that is 30-40-50 years old than much
> of the newer stuff, because parts for much of the newer stuff are simply
> unobtainable except from junker units. The displays in the popular TS-440S is
> one example - they are no longer made, and yet they are often one of the first
> major parts to fail, so your chances of lifting one from a junker are slim.
>
>
>>The cost of houses is about the same in terms of

>>hours.

disagree
>
> A lot of that depends on the interest rate and taxes. Interest rates in the
> '70s were double-digit, approaching 17% in some markets at times - for home
> mortgages! But since all that interest was deductible, the *effective* interest
> rate was less, depending on your tax bracket.
>
> Escalating home prices makes it harder to get started, though, because the size
> of the down payment keeps growing. And since many of the fees involved with
> buying and selling are a percentage of the price, the amount of cash a
> first-timer needs gets really high.
>
> Compare this to 40-50 years ago, when interest rates, taxes and down payments
> were low.

agree. I know some people who are paying over 50 percent of theie take
home pay in mortgage payment. Amazingly enough, their banks allowed them
to get into that situation.

- Mike KB3EIA -

2391. Re: KE4TEW, felony drug dealer good friends with Riley

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-09 14:40:36 UTC
From: bob <bob@bob.com>
Message-ID: <Cksrb.69856$un.458@bignews6.bellsouth.net>
Source record: 81967
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.swap,rec.radio.amateur.policy

bob wrote:

> When does your probation run out? How is Rita the crack whore? Are you
> taking your son smokes on visitation days? How is your good friend
> Riley? Do you score him a bag now and then? Is that why he reinstated
> your license after canceling it? How much pot did you give Riley to pull
> that off?
>
>
>

2392. Re: Amateur Radio in the 21st Century?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-09 16:06:57 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <BCtrb.2379$KN4.872935@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 81968

N2EY wrote:

> In article <J9Scnf7RaYVotTGiXTWc9g@ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
> <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:
>
>
>>"Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
>>news:3FAC12FF.3020502@psu.edu...
>>
>>>N2EY wrote:
>>>
>>>>In article <nMCqb.13187$Oo4.5885@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>,
>>
>>"Kï¿½HB"
>>
>>>>groupk0hb@earthlink.net> writes:
>
>
>>>>>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote
>
>
>>>>>But...but Hans....are you saying that all that theory stuff should be
>>>>>"shoved down the throats" of hams who will never use it?
>>>>>
>>>>>What the hell is it with you, Jim????? Halloween is over. Drag this
>>>>>worn-out old strawman out to the curb with the trash. You sound like a
>>>>>broken record.
>
>
> Note that Hans avoids my question.
>
>>I have to agree with Hans on this.
>
>
> You're avoiding my question too, Carl. Why is that?
>
>
>>I have asked Jim privately to please
>>stop harping on the argument that the written tests are equally invalid
>>as the Morse tests
>
>
> That's NOT what I've said at all! You're twisting my words into something
> completely different.

>
> I'm saying that the same arguments can be used - and will be used - by some
> against both tests. The process is already started - see KL7CC's comments on
> the recent petitions.
>
>
>>(I know he's playing devil's advocate, but something
>>that's repeated often enough sometimes catches on and I don't want to
>>see Jim end up being the best salesman for something that I know he
>>doesn't want to see any more than I do ...)
>
>
> So you're just asking me to shut up. Is that what we have to look for in the
> amateur radio of the 21st century?

That is how I read it also. You (we) are being told to just keep quiet,
and that if we say anything, it will be our fault if the things we are
warning about come to pass.

To which I would ask Carl and Hans:

Do you really think people are so stupid that they won't think of
something unless Jim Miccollis says it?

Nothing ever stands still. If the political currents happen to make the
entrance requirements for getting into the ARS easier, do those currents
stop once the original goal is met?

Face it, the people who want drastically reduced entrance requirements
or no requirements at all are a subset of those who want no Morse code
testing. Can you deny that?

>
> Did you ask KL7CC and the other authors of that paper to shut up?
>
>>Jim, please listen to Hans if you won't listen to me ...
>>
>
> I've never seen you guys more eager to get someone to be quiet about something.
> Tell it to W5YI. Oh, no, Fred's sacred - no one must criticize Fred - he's the
> Maximum Leader.

And his views do not reflect those of NCI...yeah, I know.

Why isn't he, if not asked to shut up, at least be asked to provide a
disclaimer. Instead, all we get is that his views do not reflect, yadayada.

> btw, his outfit sent me another one of those renewal packets. This time they
> want $6 to do what I can do myself with a few mouse clicks.
>
>
>>>>Apparently you didn't read the KL7CC paper, Hans.
>

>
>>>I thought he did. I think what he wants you to do is to quit bringing
>>>that point up.
>
>
> If you guys have an answer that simply quashes the KL7CC paper's bad ideas, why
> are you so afraid?

ahem....

> You didn't ask Hans to shut up with his 2 license class proposal.

nope....

> You didn't ask Len to shut up with his age-requirement nonsense.

nope....

> You haven't asked KL7CC et al to shut up with their bad ideas.

nope....

> Only me. Interesting.

Do you want to know why Jim? What you are saying is:

>>>>>> T H E T R U T H <<<<<<<<

And that makes some people very very uncomfortable.

I hear Hans telling you about his losing respect for you. I hear Carl
setting you up for taking the blame when the FCC starts seriously
looking at massive reductions in knowledge needed to get a license.

And how's this for getting the great unwashed worked up?:

"Testing for the Amateur Radio Service is an anachronism, a relic of
previous days of left wing Socialist ideas. Much of the regulatory
morass that such thinking has inflicted on us has already been swept
aside, witness the great success with deregulation in the broadcast
bands. It is time we complete the process, and eliminate such regressive
policies in the rest of the radio spectrum." This will truly turn the
Amateur bands into the.............

You think THAT wouldn't sell with some people in power? Another chance
to diss the hated regulators.

>
>>>Is it a strawman when there is a paper,suggesting that the testing
>>>requirement be radically reduced?
>
>
>>>It's there, the proposal has been made, and the authors rely on their
>>>credentials, despite protestations to the contrary. Some strawman!
>>>

>>>- Mike KB3EIA -
>>
>>The FCC has determined the ARS to be "primarily a technically oriented
>>service"
>
>
> Right. Now what the heck does that actually mean? How does it somehow prove the
> need for multiple license classes and written tests such as we have now? Why
> can't hams be left free to choose what parts of amateur radio to pursue?

Here is what I think it means (to some):

I know people who think that they are "high tech" because they use a
cell phone. Or a computer. Or a GPS reciever. They might not be able to
explain how any of those things work, but by just using them, they
consider themselves high tech. I never asked, but I would be that they
would take one look at my IC-745 with it's 30 some buttons and knobs,
and conclude that just knowing how to operate it was a major bit of
"primarily a technically oriented service"

Oh-Oh! A percon of average intelligence could indeed learn to operate my
rig if they read the manual. NO test required!

>>... I really don't see ANY "no theory" proposal getting a lot of
>>traction there ... and I will be right in there with Jim and most others
>>fighting that one.
>
>
> How will we fight it? Saying amateur radio is primarily a technical service
> doesn't prove anything more than the old "trained pool or operators" mantra.

We won't be able to fight it, will we? How on earth can Pro-Coders fight
it when we lost the last war against the arguments presented by the No
Coders, and how are the No-Coders going to fight against the same
arguments that they had once used so successfully?

> Has taking and passing all those written exams caused anyone to decide to build
> a radio or be "more technical" than they would have been otherwise?
>
>>Let's just stop advertising something we don't want to sell -
>
>
> Sounds to me like you're afraid that there are plenty of folks out there who
> will *agree* with KL7CC.....

No doubt there ARE plenty. But Jim, I think you are just being set up to
take the blame here. Once the movement has gained momentum, it will just
be one more thing to blame upon those arrogant "Pro-coders".

>
>>there will
>>be plenty of time to comment vigorously against it if the FCC ever were
>>to lend any credence to such a proposal.

>>
>
> It's probably already too late.

- Mike KB3EIA -

2393. Re: Optical signals - Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-09 16:31:39 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <xnfcneeyarg.ho27c62.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>
Source record: 81969

On Sun, 09 Nov 2003 03:24:40 GMT, Bill Sohl wrote:

>Another example. Would you have held back on digital photography
>because it is negatively impacting the print film camera industry?

Not when the leaders in the print film camera industry are some of
the heavy hitters in the digital photography industry.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

From a Clearing in the Silicon Forest
Beaverton (Washington County) Oregon

2394. Re: Amateur Radio in the 21st Century?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-09 18:31:12 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bom189$iir@library2.airnews.net>
Source record: 81970

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:BCtrb.2379$KN4.872935@news1.news.adelphia.net...
> N2EY wrote:
>
> > In article <J9Scnf7RaYVotTGiXTWc9g@ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
> > <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:
> >
> >
> >"Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
> >news:3FAC12FF.3020502@psu.edu...
> >>
> >>>N2EY wrote:
> >>>
> >>>In article <nMCqb.13187$Oo4.5885@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>,
> >>
> >>"K HB"
> >>
> >>><groupk0hb@earthlink.net> writes:
> >>>
> >>(I know he's playing devil's advocate, but something
> >>that's repeated often enough sometimes catches on and I don't want to
> >>see Jim end up being the best salesman for something that I know he
> >>doesn't want to see any more than I do ...)
> >>>
> >>>
> > So you're just asking me to shut up. Is that what we have to look for in
> the
> > amateur radio of the 21st century?
>
> That is how I read it also. You (we) are being told to just keep quiet,
> and that if we say anything, it will be our fault if the things we are
> warning about come to pass.
>

Yep. That's exactly the way I read, you (Mike) read it, and you (Jim) read it. Probably more than just us. BUT, are we surprised? That is status quo in at least this group of people--i.e. rather common practice in this newsgroup to desire that someone "shut up" if that opinion is coming from an opposite or challenging side.

>
> To which I would ask Carl and Hans:
>
> Do you really think people are so stupid that they won't think of

> something unless Jim Miccollis says it?
>

That's a good question, but it really isn't the point. *Whether* people "are so stupid that they won't think of something unless Jim Miccollis says it," or not, Jim has--anyone has--the perfect right to say whatever they'd like.

Kim W5TIT

2395. Re: Amateur Radio in the 21st Century?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-09 18:56:18 UTC
From: garigue <garigue@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <m5wrb.155238$Fm2.135681@attbi_s04>
Source record: 81971

> > How will we fight it? Saying amateur radio is primarily a technical service
> > doesn't prove anything more than the old "trained pool or operators" mantra.
>
> We won't be able to fight it, will we? How on earth can Pro-Coders fight
> it when we lost the last war against the arguments presented by the No
> Coders, and how are the No-Coders going to fight against the same
> arguments that they had once used so successfully?

Hello all .... The above represents some of the "soundest" logic I have read on this group. The groundwork has been laid over the last 10-15 years regarding change and the perceived or not necessity for it. Time will tell if the CW mode will stand on its own, wither and die or .....grow. I wish I could be more of an optimist regarding the service in the future. This feeling is based over what I have read over the years in this and other sources. The "love of radio" has been turned into the "love of computers-internet" This sounds corney but does the magic of radio have a counterpart in the computer-internet users ??? ....I don't have an answer here. What was once secure, or thought so, is now under attack on many fronts. Who wudda thunk that we would get begging letters from the ARRL who apparently took lessons from the NRA. People 50 years ago would have laughed if someone would have listed the infringments on a Constitutional right ....no that would never happen ... guess what folks. Add to that the fact that there is nothing in the bill of rights regarding pounding brass on 80 or yaking on 20.

It will be interesting however to see how the members of our community will react both pro and con to the issuing of cereal box licenses which I feel will eventually come based on the "proper - correct" philosophy of the day.

There is, on a good note, light at the end of the tunnel. This will be if a fiber optic system can pass the economic muster and render RF really antique. In our lifetime ???. I do wish for a long a happy life for the service and hope that it will continue to give others as much pleasure as it has for me over the last 40 years.

God Bless 73 Tom Popovic KI3R Belle Vernon Pa

2396. Re: NCI Petition for Rulemaking

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-09 19:06:31 UTC
From: garigue <garigue@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <Wewrb.155079$Tr4.410956@attbi_s03>
Source record: 81972

> > code, fine, if they want to fine, just don't come up to me and bitch
> > and moan that 5 WPM is a hurdle or mountain too high to climb.
>
> not to worry, it won't be a hurdle or a mountain anymore when
> the FCC removes the code testing requirement.
>
> Clint
> KB5ZHT

Hello there Clint .....

I agree it will all be a rather moot point but it will be the drip off the leaf that eventually runs into the sea of a no test amateur radio license. The future ham will just access the FCC site and type in the info and hit print. I am not a betting man but Clint I will send you a six pack of Iron City beer if testing doesn't turn into a 5 WPM like sham or isn't completely eliminated in 10-15 years.

God Bless 73 Tom Popovic KI3R Belle Vernon Pa.

2397. Re: Optical signals - Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-09 20:13:02 UTC
From: Lloyd <Lloyd@barfherbsj.net>
Message-ID: <bom74m$7uq$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 81973

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:xnfcneeyarg.ho27c62.pminews@netnews.comcast.net...
> On Sun, 09 Nov 2003 03:24:40 GMT, Bill Sohl wrote:
>
> >Another example. Would you have held back on digital photography
> >because it is negatively impacting the print film camera industry?
>
> Not when the leaders in the print film camera industry are some of
> the heavy hitters in the digital photography industry.
>
> --
> 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane
>
> From a Clearing in the Silicon Forest
> Beaverton (Washington County) Oregon
>

Phil often sees a conspiracy where no one else does.
Perhaps he should check into The Great Liberty Net and
share his thoughts with the rest of the conspiracy crowd.

Lloyd

2398. Re: Amateur Radio in the 21st Century?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-09 20:20:21 UTC
From: groupk0hb@earthlink.net
Message-ID: <5ee63311.0311091220.4b039cae@posting.google.com>
Source record: 81974

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote

>
> Note that Hans avoids my question.
>

Blatant foma, Jim. I have repeatedly posted the answer to that question in the words "The "Class A" license test would be of a difficulty level similar to the current Extra class test". If that doesn't answer your question, then you need a course in Remedial English Comprehension.

> Why can't hams be left free to choose what parts of amateur radio to pursue?

Last time I checked, FCC has not restricted which parts of amateur radio I can pursue. I checked with K0CKB who has a lower-class license than I, and she also feels completely free to chose what parts she wished to pursue.

> Sounds to me like you're afraid that there are plenty of folks out there who
> will *agree* with KL7CC.....

Have you seen a SINGLE PERSON on RRAP who has expressed that the KL7CC paper is "the way we ought to be licensed"? Sunuvagun! I haven't either. I guess you're preaching to the choir, Jim, and frankly the congregation is waiting to sing the "Amen Chorus".

73, de Hans, K0HB

2399. Re: NCI Petition for Rulemaking

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-09 23:11:14 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3FAEC991.1090906@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 81975

garigue wrote:

> I am not a betting man but Clint I will send you a six pack of Iron
>City beer if testing doesn't turn into a 5 WPM like sham or isn't completely
>eliminated in 10-15 years.
>
>
Iron City? Isn't that the worst beer known to man? I never had any
myself, but
I've heard hearsay about how awful it was.......

>
>

2400. Re: NCI Petition for Rulemaking

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-09 23:28:41 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <J4Arb.3373$KN4.980723@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 81976

garigue wrote:
>>>code, fine, if they want to fine, just don't come up to me and bitch
>>>and moan that 5 WPM is a hurdle or mountain too high to climb.
>>
>>not to worry, it won't be a hurdle or a mountain anymore when
>>the FCC removes the code testing requirement.
>>
>>Clint
>>KB5ZHT
>
>
>
> Hello there Clint .....
>
>
> I agree it will all be a rather moot point but it will be the drip off the
> leaf that eventually runs into the sea of a no test amateur radio license.
> The future ham will just access the FCC site and type in the info and hit
> print. I am not a betting man but Clint I will send you a six pack of Iron
> City beer if testing doesn't turn into a 5 WPM like sham or isn't completely
> eliminated in 10-15 years.

Here's another possibility, Tom. At some point in the near future, we
will *buy* our licenses from Clear Channel!

- Mike KB3EIA -

2401. Re: NCI Petition for Rulemaking

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-09 23:31:37 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <t7Arb.3426$KN4.981619@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 81977

Robert Casey wrote:

> garigue wrote:
>
>> I am not a betting man but Clint I will send you a six pack of Iron
>> City beer if testing doesn't turn into a 5 WPM like sham or isn't
>> completely
>> eliminated in 10-15 years.
>>
>>
> Iron City? Isn't that the worst beer known to man? I never had any
> myself, but
> I've heard hearsay about how awful it was.......

It is awful - if you like the Peewaa swill offered up by CorBuMil.
(note that CorBuMil is the same sort of thing as YaeComWood)

- Mike KB3EIA -

2402. Re: Amateur Radio in the 21st Century?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-09 23:36:56 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <scArb.3429$KN4.983230@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 81978

Kim W5TIT wrote:

> "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
> news:BCtrb.2379$KN4.872935@news1.news.adelphia.net...
>
>>N2EY wrote:
>>
>>
>>>In article <J9Scnf7RaYVotTGiXTWc9g@ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
>>><wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>>"Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
>>>>news:3FAC12FF.3020502@psu.edu...
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>N2EY wrote:
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>>In article <nMCqb.13187$Oo4.5885@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>,
>>>>
>>>>"Kï¿½HB"
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>><groupk0hb@earthlink.net> writes:
>>>
>>>>>>(I know he's playing devil's advocate, but something
>>>>>>that's repeated often enough sometimes catches on and I don't want to
>>>>>>see Jim end up being the best salesman for something that I know he
>>>>>>doesn't want to see any more than I do ...)
>>>
>>>
>>>>>So you're just asking me to shut up. Is that what we have to look for in
>
> the
>
>>>amateur radio of the 21st century?
>>
>>That is how I read it also. You (we) are being told to just keep quiet,
>>and that if we say anything, it will be our fault if the things we are
>>warning about come to pass.
>>
>

>
> Yep. That's exactly the way I read, you (Mike) read it, and you (Jim) read
> it. Probably more than just us. BUT, are we surprised?

Nope!

> That is status quo
> in at least this group of people--i.e. rather common practice in this
> newsgroup to desire that someone "shut up" if that opinion is coming from an
> opposite or challenging side.

hehe, then this isn't the place to be for them. I like to come here for
the different viewpoints.

And of course, shutting up isn't an option for me.

>
>>To which I would ask Carl and Hans:
>>
>>Do you really think people are so stupid that they won't think of
>>something unless Jim Miccollis says it?
>>
>
>
> That's a good question, but it really isn't the point. *Whether* people
> "are so stupid that they won't think of something unless Jim Miccollis says
> it," or not, Jim has--anyone has--the perfect right to say whatever they'd
> like.

Well, yes! But it would be yummy fun to hear their answer though. 8^)
I'm not going to hold my breath tho'

Sunavagun! 8^)

- Mike KB3EIA -

2403. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-10 00:31:02 UTC
From: bad cop/good cop <pipelin7@juno.com>
Message-ID: <1068424427.8737@newshost03.voicenet.com>
Source record: 81979

"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20031108130150.21232.00001955@mb-m13.aol.com...

> Control of the chat room is now returned to regulars for discussing the
> vital interests of the regulars on such amateur radio policy topics as
> the U.S. civil war, disadvantaged low-grade workers, U. S. foreign
> policy, choo-choo trains, fast-food establishments, and the usual
> outrage of regulars at other regulars not conceding their innate
> superiority on all topics.

One may hear the premium of that variety
of shi+ any weekend on 14.313 MHz.

(Just ask for the "mobile" master of
ceremonies from Georgia or the resident
frequency fool from Indiana)

Capt Truth IIV
Welcome Back My Friends To The Show That Never Ends...
Faceless, amorphous Raleigh-Durham, a series of interlocking
suburbs masquerading as a city. - Joe Queenan

"If only sheep could cook, we wouldn't need women at all!"

"I watched The Accused last night with Jodie Foster. Tough movie. I was
wondering what people felt as to whether or not they feel she deserved what
happened to her."

"Rule #5: Smack the living shit out of your children.
They deserve it anyway and god says it's OK too !"

2404. Re: Amateur Radio in the 21st Century?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-10 00:32:15 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <j0Brb.20645$9M3.9561@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 81980

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote

> To which I would ask Carl and Hans:
>
> Do you really think people are so stupid that they won't think of
> something unless Jim Miccollis says it?

No, I don't think there's anyone here that stupid.

But then again I didn't think there was anyone here stupid enough to ask
such a stupid question, and you've just proved me wrong.

Sunuvagun!

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

2405. Re: Amateur Radio in the 21st Century?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-10 00:50:18 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <ehBrb.20729$9M3.16409@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 81981

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote

> So you're just asking me to shut up. Is that what we have to look for in
the
> amateur radio of the 21st century?

I've never asked you to shut up. But I have repeatedly informed you that
you resemble a stray dog with three legs and one blind eye dragging around a
15-days-dead roadkilled stray cat and acting as if you've uncovered
something dangerous.

> If you guys have an answer that simply quashes the KL7CC paper's bad
ideas, why
> are you so afraid?

I'm not a bit afraid. Here's my answer which "simply quashes" your
pizza-shaped kitty.

If you have tendency to forgetfullness, simply bookmark
http://home.earthlink.net/~k0hb and click on the left hand menu item labeled
"FCC Comments".

II Proposal:

I propose that no new applicants be accepted for the current
license classes and that after some reasonable grace period, no
upgrades be available in the current licensing structure.

A. New License Classes:

I propose that new license applications be available
in two classes, namely "Class B" and "Class A".
The "Class B" license would have an entry-level test (basic
regulations, safety, operating procedures, basic DC and AC
electronics). This class would have full frequency and
mode privileges, power limited to 50W output. The license
would be issued for a period of 10 years, and be non-renewable.
holders of this license would be required to have 2 years
experience as a licensee ("time in grade") before being
eligible to upgrade to "Class A".

The "Class A" license test would be of a difficulty level
similar to the current Extra class test, and would have
full privileges at power levels up to 1500W, equivalent to
current Extra Class license holders. This license
would be issued permanently without requirement for
renewal.

B. Status of current licensees.

Current licenses could be renewed indefinitely, and would
retain their current operating privileges.
Current Novice, Technician, General, and Advanced class
licensees could up grade to "Class A" at any time.

> You didn't ask Hans to shut up with his 2 license class proposal.

Are you asking me to shut up with my 2 license class proposal, Jim?

73, de Hans, K0HB
--
"They called me mad, and I called them mad,
but damn them, they outvoted me."

2406. Re: Amateur Radio in the 21st Century?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-10 00:58:23 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <PoBrb.3454$KN4.998889@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 81982

Kï¿½HB wrote:
> "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote
>
>
>>To which I would ask Carl and Hans:
>>
>>Do you really think people are so stupid that they won't think of
>>something unless Jim Miccollis says it?
>
>
> No, I don't think there's anyone here that stupid.
>
> But then again I didn't think there was anyone here stupid enough to ask
> such a stupid question, and you've just proved me wrong.

If pleasantness is inversely related to intelligence, you kind sir, are
a genius. And this stupid person believes you are a genius.

Quite frankly, you are as pleasant as Lenover21.

- Mike KB3EIA -

2407. Re: Amateur Radio in the 21st Century?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-10 01:29:29 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031109202929.07346.00001664@mb-m26.aol.com>
Source record: 81983

In article <5c01b95b.0311081741.14edef8c@posting.google.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) writes:

>n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
>news:<20031102224951.21232.00001802@mb-m13.aol.com>...> On the last page of
>his voluminous reply comments to the restructuring NPRM
>> back in 1999, Len requested that the FCC enact a minimum age requirement of
>14
>> years for any class of amateur license. When challenged, however, he could
>not
>> give a single example of on-air violations by licensed radio amateurs under
>the
>> age of 14.
>
> Neither would he respond to questions about his parenting
>experiences that might lead him to make such a suggestion.

Steve,

Parent or not, everyone's entitled to an opinion about age limits for an amateur license. My opinion is that they're a bad idea.

But the main point is that Len was proposing a draconian solution to a nonexistent problem. It's not the under-14 hams that are causing problems - far from it! The fact that Len could not cite a *single* incident shows how empty his argument was.

Yet nobody told him to shut up.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2408. Re: Amateur Radio in the 21st Century?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-10 01:29:29 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031109202929.07346.00001663@mb-m26.aol.com>
Source record: 81984

In article <bom189$iir@library2.airnews.net>, "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
writes:

>"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
>news:BCtrb.2379$KN4.872935@news1.news.adelphia.net...
>> N2EY wrote:
>>
>> > In article <J9Scnf7RaYVotTGiXTWc9g@ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
>> > <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:
>> >
>> >
>> >>"Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
>> >>news:3FAC12FF.3020502@psu.edu...
>> >>
>> >>>N2EY wrote:
>> >>>
>> >>>>In article <nMCqb.13187$Oo4.5885@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>,
>> >>
>> >>"Kï¿½HB"
>> >>
>> >>>><groupk0hb@earthlink.net> writes:
>> >>>
>> >>(I know he's playing devil's advocate, but something
>> >>that's repeated often enough sometimes catches on and I don't want to
>> >>see Jim end up being the best salesman for something that I know he
>> >>doesn't want to see any more than I do ...)
>> >>
>> >>
>> > So you're just asking me to shut up. Is that what we have to look for in
>the
>> > amateur radio of the 21st century?
>>
>> That is how I read it also. You (we) are being told to just keep quiet,
>> and that if we say anything, it will be our fault if the things we are
>> warning about come to pass.
>
>Yep. That's exactly the way I read, you (Mike) read it, and you (Jim) read
>it. Probably more than just us. BUT, are we surprised? That is status quo
>in at least this group of people--i.e. rather common practice in this
>newsgroup to desire that someone "shut up" if that opinion is coming from an
>opposite or challenging side.

I don't think I've ever told anyone here to shut up.

But I have seen others do it. For example:

From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
Date: 28 Oct 2003 04:35:14 GMT

(in response to K8MN):

"Shut the hell up, you little USMC feldwebel. Learn to READ English."

Just the kind we want for newcomers, huh? New standards of civil debate.

>> To which I would ask Carl and Hans:
>>
>> Do you really think people are so stupid that they won't think of
>> something unless Jim Miccollis says it?

(One "L" in the name)
>
>That's a good question, but it really isn't the point. *Whether* people
>"are so stupid that they won't think of something unless Jim Miccollis says
>it," or not, Jim has--anyone has--the perfect right to say whatever they'd
>like.

Thanks, Kim.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2409. Re: Amateur Radio in the 21st Century?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-10 01:40:46 UTC
From: groupk0hb@earthlink.net
Message-ID: <5ee63311.0311091740.6f60ca7d@posting.google.com>
Source record: 81985

"Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote

>
> That's a good question, but it really isn't the point.
>

Actually it wasn't a very good question at all. In fact, I'm not sure it was even a question, but more a feeble attempt to troll, so I checked my Troll-O-Meter, and it didn't even budge up off the pin. Since Mike Coslo is an avid Morse Code operator like me, I expected a much better reading on the meter. Sigh..... truly disappointing.

> Jim has--anyone has--the perfect right to say whatever they'd
> like.

Bingo! Good answer, Kim! You nailed it dead on! And I have every right to tell Jim that he resembles a flea-bitten stray dog with three legs and one blind eye dragging around a 15-days-dead roadkilled stray cat and growling and posturing and acting as if he has uncovered something dangerous.

73, de Hans, K0HB

2410. Re: Amateur Radio in the 21st Century?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-10 01:56:29 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <hfCrb.19174$Oo4.12060@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 81986

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote

> Well, yes! But it would be yummy fun to hear their answer though. 8^)

Well, I gave you my answer. Are you having "yummy fun" now? Golly gee, I certainly hope so!

Sunuvagun!

73, de Hans, K0HB

2411. Re: Amateur Radio in the 21st Century?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-10 02:04:05 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <pmCrb.19204$Oo4.6447@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 81987

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote

> If pleasantness is inversely related to intelligence, you kind sir, are
> a genius. And this stupid person believes you are a genius.

Thank you! Why am I reminded of the old saw about "if you can't stand the heat....." My "pleasantness" to you was directly related to your "pleasantness" toward me, but I don't get even, I get ahead.

And just what the hell is "yummy fun" anyhow?

With kindest personal regards,

de Hans, K0HB

2412. Re: Amateur Radio in the 21st Century?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-10 02:05:31 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <LnCrb.3489$KN4.1010777@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 81988

N2EY wrote:

> (One "L" in the name)

Oops, Sorry Jim. But what about Jim Miccollis?

- Mike KB3EIA -

2413. Re: Amateur Radio in the 21st Century?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-10 02:13:49 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <xvCrb.3496$KN4.1012379@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 81989

Kï¿½HB wrote:

> "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote
>
>> Well, yes! But it would be yummy fun to hear their answer though. 8^)
>
>
> Well, I gave you my answer. Are you having "yummy fun" now? Golly gee, I
> certainly hope so!
>
> Sunuvagun!

Actually, if you think that calling me stupid is an answer, yes indeed
Hans, it was indeed yummy fun to hear you answer my question!

>>Do you really think people are so stupid that they won't think of
>>something unless Jim Miccollis (sic) says it?

>But then again I didn't think there was anyone here stupid enough to
>ask such a stupid question, and you've just proved me wrong.

Good reply! tks OM!

- Mike KB3EIA -

2414. Re: Amateur Radio in the 21st Century?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-10 02:33:23 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <TNCrb.3502$KN4.1015882@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 81990

Kï¿½HB wrote:

> "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote
>
>
>>If pleasantness is inversely related to intelligence, you kind sir, are
>>a genius. And this stupid person believes you are a genius.
>
>
> Thank you! Why am I reminded of the old saw about "if you can't stand the
> heat....."

huh?

My "pleasantness" to you was directly related to your
> "pleasantness" toward me, but I don't get even, I get ahead.

Perhaps I touched a nerve asking the question? mea maxima culpa

> And just what the hell is "yummy fun" anyhow?

Delicious irony. Like you finding it appropriate to call me stupid when
I ask a question. That you find it an appropriate answer is the key.

- Mike KB3EIA -

2415. Re: You may not be a rocket scientist....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-10 02:42:05 UTC
From: tad danley <nospam@atsbcglobal.net>
Message-ID: <3FAEFAFC.4030200@atsbcglobal.net>
Source record: 81991
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

Kï¿½HB wrote:
> ....but some rocket scientists are looking for help from hams.
>
> See the URL http://www.astrosurf.com/lombry/qsl-iss-shadow.htm
>
> 73, de Hans, K0HB
> --
> Help support youth involved in Amateur Radio.
> http://www.mnyarc.org
> http://www.k0bsa.org

There are a lot of hams involved in the high power rocketry hobby.
Check out the Discovery Channel right now -- 3 one hour specials on
the hobby. Also, http://www.flyrockets.com/

73,

--
* Do NOT use Reply *

Reply to K3TD via contesting dot com

Tad, K3TD

2416. Re: Amateur Radio in the 21st Century?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-10 02:45:28 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bono7u$qnn@library2.airnews.net>
Source record: 82005

"Hans K0HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:5ee63311.0311091740.6f60ca7d@posting.google.com...
> "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote
>
> >
> > That's a good question, but it really isn't the point.
> >
>
> Actually it wasn't a very good question at all. In fact, I'm not sure
> it was even a question, but more a feeble attempt to troll, so I
> checked my Troll-O-Meter, and it didn't even budge up off the pin.
> Since Mike Coslo is an avid Morse Code operator like me, I expected a
> much better reading on the meter. Sigh..... truly disappointing.
>
> > Jim has--anyone has--the perfect right to say whatever they'd
> > like.
>
> Bingo! Good answer, Kim! You nailed it dead on! And I have every
> right to tell Jim that he resembles a flea-bitten stray dog with three
> legs and one blind eye dragging around a 15-days-dead roadkilled stray
> cat and growling and posturing and acting as if he has uncovered
> something dangerous.
>
> 73, de Hans, K0HB
>

Well, yes. Yes, you do Hans. But it's not that that I am pondering upon.
It is that someone made a remark about "shutting up." That is what I am
pondering upon...

Kim W5TIT

2417. Re: NCI Petition for Rulemaking

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-10 03:08:29 UTC
From: garigue <garigue@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <NiDrb.116999$ao4.359623@attbi_s51>
Source record: 81992

> Iron City? Isn't that the worst beer known to man? I never had any
> myself, but
> I've heard hearsay about how awful it was.......

Na Bob ...local stuff ..accquired taste ...their lite beer blows away anything I have ever drank and don't mention that Coors Lite stuff. The rumor here is that they dilute regular Iron lager with 100 parts of water to make that stuff. Actually Bob a very good local beer is Stoney's but it has to be draught and fresh. They used to make it in Smithton Pa nr here but it is now made at the Iron City works. BTW Stoney was Shirley Jones's father.

Oh my God ....I have broken one of Len's chat room rules ..... excuse my off topic pontification ....

73 God Bless Tom Popovic KI3R Belle Vernon Pa

2418. Re: NCI Petition for Rulemaking

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-10 03:17:51 UTC
From: garigue <garigue@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <zrDrb.115686$275.334093@attbi_s53>
Source record: 81993

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:t7Arb.3426$KN4.981619@news1.news.adelphia.net...
> Robert Casey wrote:
>
> > garigue wrote:
> >
> >> I am not a betting man but Clint I will send you a six pack of Iron
> >> City beer if testing doesn't turn into a 5 WPM like sham or isn't
> >> completely
> >> eliminated in 10-15 years.
> >>
> >>
> > Iron City? Isn't that the worst beer known to man? I never had any
> > myself, but
> > I've heard hearsay about how awful it was.......
>
> It is awful - if you like the Peewaa swill offered up by CorBuMil.
> (note that CorBuMil is the same sort of thing as YaeComWood)
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -

Off topic pontification alarm is now on standby mode ....

Well Mike our choices in a lot of things in life get limited by success of
the big boys. One can really appreciate the brewing craft at some micro's
but again some put out a horse piss like product. I was in Eastern Europe
this summer and was impressed by some of the major labels there. But guess
what ..Urquill and Saris are owned by the Miller group which is out of South
Africa. Okeciem in Poland was excellent. The svelt (light) beer over there
is about the same 3-4% as our beer. Their regular is 12%.

alarm off ....

73 God Bless Tom Popovic KI3R Belle Vernon Pa

2419. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-10 03:27:15 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <nADrb.20994$9M3.19575@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 81994

"N2EY" wrote:
>"Dwight Stewart" writes:
> >
> > Product quality is dropping (plastics),
>
> In some areas, yes. But people still buy the products!

People don't have any choice. As an example, I went shopping for a fan recently (to replace the last one that quit). I couldn't find a well-built, metal, fan anywhere in the area. I ended up with a plastic fan that will fall apart in a month or two just like the last ones. I'm not saving any money because I have to keep buying this plastic garbage every few weeks.

> How much corporate profit is excessive? If a company
> is worth $1 billion, and their profit is $100 million, that's
> a 10% return on investment. Is that excessive? Who
> decides?

Are you not aware of our system of government, Jim? You know, the people we vote for to make exactly these types of decisions.

> But without the details it's a moot point. Suppose a
> company has a string of bad years and then a good
> year - should their profits in the good year be
> confiscated and a blind eye turned towards the bad
> years?

It's not my job to come up with all the details, Jim. I've already said I don't have all the answers. But why does that make an idea a moot point.

> Price controls were tried in the late '60s and early '70s
> to "Whip Infaltion Now". Didn't work in the long term.

I don't remember that.

> Because the *market* (people who make the buying
> decisions) go to the Wal Mart instead of the local stores.
> That's where the real problem lies - people who do not
> think about the long-term economic results of their actions.

Why should they? They're going to Wal-Mart to buy a power tool or whatever, not ponder the global economic implications of that purchase.

> Do you know this for a fact? Car price increases also
> reflect the enormous investment in engineering and tooling
> to build cars using the latest technology. Remember when
> most cars fell apart before reaching 10 years or 100,000

> miles?

Do I know putting a regulatory cap on credit in the car market will drive down auto prices? Absolutely. If people have to pay more cash up front, with less financed by credit, very few would be able to afford the prices of today's automobiles. Companies will be forced to cut prices if they want to continue selling automobiles and Americans will have more money in their pockets to spend elsewhere (benefiting a wider segment of the overall economy).

And, no, I don't remember when most cars fell apart before reaching 10 years or 100,000 miles. I've owned plenty of older cars in my life (certainly throughout the 60's and 70's) and I don't think any of them were less then 10 years old or had less than 100,000 miles on them. And all of them were built much better than today's models. My $35k SUV today is filled with plastic that is already starting to decay with only 40,000 miles on the vehicle. The Jeep I owned in 1972 had almost 200,000 miles on it with all original body parts (a little dented, but all original).

> As long as people are willing to pay the prices, the markets
> are driven that way. Supply and demand.

But, as always, companies control the supply. The difference is that today's monopolistic companies are not dependant on the daily sales of a single product, so are able to manipulate supply in an effort to raise prices. Since these companies often control whole market segments, consumer are left with only two choices - not purchase the goods they want or pay the higher prices. In today's economy, the concept of supply and demand seems rather quaint, Jim.

> What about people trying to get started as homeowners?
> Raising the price of credit makes it impossible for them to
> buy a first house.

I said nothing about raising the price of credit. I was referring to credit caps - a cap on the percentage of the total purchase price that could be financed or a cap on the percentage of a person's income that could be used to establish the monthly credit payments. Both were common in the fifties, sixties, and early seventies, and the economy and consumers did just fine.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

2420. Re: Amateur Radio in the 21st Century?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-10 03:29:30 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031109222930.12501.00003819@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 81997

In article <BCtrb.2379$KN4.872935@news1.news.adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo
<mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>
>> In article <J9Scnf7RaYVotTGiXTWc9g@ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
>> <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:

>>>"Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
>>>news:3FAC12FF.3020502@psu.edu...
>>>
>>>>N2EY wrote:
>>>>
>>>>>In article <nMCqb.13187$Oo4.5885@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>,
>>>
>>>"Kï¿½HB"
>>>
>>>>><groupk0hb@earthlink.net> writes:

>>>>>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote
>>
>>>>>>But...but Hans....are you saying that all that theory stuff should be
>>>>>>"shoved down the throats" of hams who will never use it?

>>>>>What the hell is it with you, Jim????? Halloween is over. Drag this
>>>>>worn-out old strawman out to the curb with the trash. You sound like a
>>>>>broken record.

>> Note that Hans avoids my question.
>>
>>>I have to agree with Hans on this.

>> You're avoiding my question too, Carl. Why is that?

>>>I have asked Jim privately to please
>>>stop harping on the argument that the written tests are equally invalid
>>>as the Morse tests

>> That's NOT what I've said at all! You're twisting my words into something
>> completely different.

Neither test is "invalid". Opinions vary on how necessary certain tests are,
however.
>>
>> I'm saying that the same arguments can be used - and will be used - by some
>> against both tests. The process is already started - see KL7CC's comments
>> on the recent petitions.

>>>(I know he's playing devil's advocate, but something
>>>that's repeated often enough sometimes catches on and I don't want to
>>>see Jim end up being the best salesman for something that I know he
>>>doesn't want to see any more than I do ...)
>
>> So you're just asking me to shut up. Is that what we have to look for in
>> the amateur radio of the 21st century?
>
>That is how I read it also. You (we) are being told to just keep quiet,
>and that if we say anything, it will be our fault if the things we are
>warning about come to pass.
>
>To which I would ask Carl and Hans:
>
>Do you really think people are so stupid that they won't think of
>something unless Jim Miccollis says it?
>
>Nothing ever stands still. If the political currents happen to make the
>entrance requirements for getting into the ARS easier, do those currents
>stop once the original goal is met?
>
>Face it, the people who want drastically reduced entrance requirements
>or no requirements at all are a subset of those who want no Morse code
>testing. Can you deny that?
>>
>> Did you ask KL7CC and the other authors of that paper to shut up?
>>
>>>Jim, please listen to Hans if you won't listen to me ...

>> I've never seen you guys more eager to get someone to be quiet about
>> something.
>> Tell it to W5YI. Oh, no, Fred's sacred - no one must criticize Fred - he's
>> the Maximum Leader.

Or KL7CC.
>
>And his views do not reflect those of NCI...yeah, I know.

No, they do not.

NCI's mission in the USA is to get rid of Element 1, nothing else. If/when FCC
dumps all code testing in the USA, NCI will cease to function in the USA.

That mission is demonstrated by NCI's petition, which asks FCC to drop all code
testing as a requirement, merge Tech and Tech Plus, and....nothing else.
>
>Why isn't he, if not asked to shut up, at least be asked to provide a
>disclaimer. Instead, all we get is that his views do not reflect, yadayada.

Fred et al ain't on rrap.

>> If you guys have an answer that simply quashes the KL7CC paper's bad ideas,
>> why are you so afraid?

>
>ahem....
>
>> You didn't ask Hans to shut up with his 2 license class proposal.
>
>nope....

Hans' proposal is nothing like what's in the KL7CC paper. But Hans' proposal has at least one major problem: forced upgrading.

I doubt FCC would ever again enact a ham license that wasn't renewable. They dumped that feature of the old Novice more than a quarter century ago.

But even if FCC *did* make the entry-level class nonrenewable, it wouldn't stay that way.
>
>> You didn't ask Len to shut up with his age-requirement nonsense.
>
>nope....
>
Len wants just one class of license.

>> You haven't asked KL7CC et al to shut up with their bad ideas.
>
>nope....
>
>> Only me. Interesting.
>
>Do you want to know why Jim? What you are saying is:
>
> >>>>>> T H E T R U T H <<<<<<<<
>
>And that makes some people very very uncomfortable.
>
>I hear Hans telling you about his losing respect for you. I hear Carl
>setting you up for taking the blame when the FCC starts seriously
>looking at massive reductions in knowledge needed to get a license.
>
>And how's this for getting the great unwashed worked up?:
>
>"Testing for the Amateur Radio Service is an anachronism, a relic of
>previous days of left wing Socialist ideas. Much of the regulatory
>morass that such thinking has inflicted on us has already been swept
>aside, witness the great success with deregulation in the broadcast
>bands. It is time we complete the process, and eliminate such regressive
>policies in the rest of the radio spectrum." This will truly turn the
>Amateur bands into the.............

Who the heck wrote *that*?? Not me! Not Hans or Carl, either!

Where's it from??

>You think THAT wouldn't sell with some people in power? Another chance
>to diss the hated regulators.

>>>>Is it a strawman when there is a paper,suggesting that the testing
>>>>requirement be radically reduced?

>>>>It's there, the proposal has been made, and the authors rely on their
>>>>credentials, despite protestations to the contrary. Some strawman!
>>>- Mike KB3EIA -
>>>
>>>The FCC has determined the ARS to be "primarily a technically oriented
>>>service"

>> Right. Now what the heck does that actually mean? How does it somehow prove
>> the
>> need for multiple license classes and written tests such as we have now?
>> Why
>> can't hams be left free to choose what parts of amateur radio to pursue?
>
>Here is what I think it means (to some):
>
>I know people who think that they are "high tech" because they use a
>cell phone. Or a computer. Or a GPS reciever. They might not be able to
>explain how any of those things work, but by just using them, they
>consider themselves high tech. I never asked, but I would be that they
>would take one look at my IC-745 with it's 30 some buttons and knobs,
>and conclude that just knowing how to operate it was a major bit of
>"primarily a technically oriented service"
>
They oughta try to use the Southgate Type 7....

>Oh-Oh! A percon of average intelligence could indeed learn to operate my
>rig if they read the manual. NO test required!

No test to use a computer....
>
>>>... I really don't see ANY "no theory" proposal getting a lot of
>>>traction there ... and I will be right in there with Jim and most others
>>>fighting that one.
>>
>> How will we fight it? Saying amateur radio is primarily a technical service
>> doesn't prove anything more than the old "trained pool or operators"
>> mantra.
>
>We won't be able to fight it, will we?

Sure we will - the question is how? That's what I want to know, so we're ready.

>How on earth can Pro-Coders fight
>it when we lost the last war against the arguments presented by the No
>Coders, and how are the No-Coders going to fight against the same
>arguments that they had once used so successfully?
>

My questions exactly.

>> Has taking and passing all those written exams caused anyone to decide to
>> build
>> a radio or be "more technical" than they would have been otherwise?
>>
>>>Let's just stop advertising something we don't want to sell -

>> Sounds to me like you're afraid that there are plenty of folks out there
>> who will *agree* with KL7CC.....

>No doubt there ARE plenty.

I hope there aren't. I don't see how my discussing a paper that is already in
the public domain on a website is going to change people's minds to agree with
said paper.

>But Jim, I think you are just being set up to
>take the blame here. Once the movement has gained momentum, it will just
>be one more thing to blame upon those arrogant "Pro-coders".

And it can be said that they were told to be quiet....

>>>there will
>>>be plenty of time to comment vigorously against it if the FCC ever were
>>>to lend any credence to such a proposal.

>> It's probably already too late.
>
I don't see what else there is to say. I've been working up a response to the
KL7CC paper.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2421. Re: Optical signals - Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-10 03:29:31 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031109222931.12501.00003820@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 81995

In article <xmirb.17632$Oo4.7031@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Bill Sohl"
<billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:

>"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
>news:Pz8rb.721$KN4.517190@news1.news.adelphia.net...
>> Bill Sohl wrote:
>>
>>
>> > Surely you jest. Some company or person(s) develope a new
>> > technology, invention, whatever...and you expect them to hold off
>> > bringing that new whatever to market so the negative impacts to
>> > other industries, groups, etc can first be studied?
>>
>> You mean like.....DDT? Thalidomide?
>
>The "negative impacts" I mentioned were not intented to include
>health or life threatening side effects. The discussion has been around
>"negative
>impacts" in the area of job displaceents and/or industries failing.
>

Losing one's job and not being able to find another can have serious health and
life-threatening side effects.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2422. Re: Who is John Galt? - Re: Optical signals - Re: Wonder how licensing will c..

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-10 03:29:31 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031109222931.12501.00003821@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 81996

In article <pNqrb.8498$P%1.7684242@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20031109022859.25815.00004333@mb-m07.aol.com...
>>
>> I recall a time when an office of any size had a "typing pool" and "file
>> clerks" - jobs that were relatively unskilled but paid decent wages and
>> benefits. Computerization almost eliminated those sorts of jobs but did
>not
>> replace them with other jobs.

That should read "did not replace *all of them* with the same number of other jobs"
>
>No these jobs did not pay a decent wage. People in these jobs could not
>live independenly on that income and raise a family. They either were a
>second wage earner in a family or a single person living at home or with
>room mates. The pay was just barely above minimum wage and it was
>definitely not a "living wage".

I agree that a person couldn't raise a family on those wages, but I knew a lot of people who lived independently on them. A lot depended on the employer, whether the job was union or not, etc.

Also a *big* variable was the cost-of-living in a particular area. It costs a lot more to live in, say, SF or NYC. But there's only one national minimum wage.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2423. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-10 03:38:01 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <tKDrb.21019$9M3.20281@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 81998

"Dee D. Flint" wrote:
>
> You know Nixon tried wage and price controls and we
> started developing shortages. Other countries in the
> world have tried it too and also failed. Every where that
> has been tried, the standard of living dropped, goods and
> services became hard to get and unemployment rose. So
> why try what has already been proven to fail.

Wage and price controls are commonplace in Europe and the standard of living did not drop, goods and services did not became hard to get, and unemployment did not rise.

> Please show that profits are obscene. Don't quote dollars,
> quote percentage of operating expenses. (snip)

I'm not going to quote anything, Dee. I gave my personal opinion. While you're certainly free to agree or disagree with that, there is no requirement whatsoever to prove an opinion. If, on the other hand, you think my opinion is that important, you're certainly free to prove it's wrong.

> In addition, you have left out the most workable option. That
> is to work toward a world economy that enjoys a comparable
> standard to ours. (snip)

You honestly think that is a workable option? It will take many decades, perhaps longer, to accomplish that. What happens to everyone else in the meantime?

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

2424. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-10 04:27:47 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <7tErb.21105$9M3.12224@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 81999

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote:
>
> In the case of cars, this has already happened in some cases.
> Many Japanese companies (Honda, Subaru, Toyota, to name
> just a few) make cars in the USA because it's cheaper!
>
> VW started that trend way back in the '70s by buying the
> Westmoreland, PA facility from Chrysler, and building Rabbits,
> Golfs and Jettas here instead of Germany. VW later sold that
> plant to Sony, who uses it to make CRTs (because it's cheaper
> to make them here!)

Wasn't that much more the result of our own import tariffs, significantly increased in the 80's to "protect" companies like Chrysler from foreign competition?

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

2425. Re: Amateur Radio in the 21st Century?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-10 05:07:06 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <_1Frb.19430$Oo4.4185@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 82000

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote

> Hans' proposal is nothing like what's in the KL7CC paper. But Hans' proposal
> has at least one major problem: forced upgrading.

Is forced upgrading a "major problem"? The Novice license is widely acknowledged to have been the best licensing idea the FCC ever had. It admitted people to the hobby with a sort of "learner permit" in which they could learn some skills and meet other experienced hams "on the air". It expired after one year and was not renewable. If it had any fault, it was that it tended to isolate newcomers into little "ghettos" mostly frequented by other newcomers.

My "learner permit" is different than the old Novice license in 4 ways:

1) Rather than isolate the newcomers into narrow little band segments crowded with mostly other newcomers, it gives them expanded privileges on all bands.

2) Rather than expiring in 1 year, it would expire after 10 years, giving them more time to "gain their wings".

3) Power would be limited to 50 watts (in line with prevailing RF exposure doctrine.)

What "major problem" lies in that? (Give me **your**version of the problem, not what you think the FCC version of the problem would be.)

73, de Hans, K0HB

2426. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-10 05:10:26 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <65Frb.8900$P%1.7879328@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 82001

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:7tErb.21105$9M3.12224@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote:
> >
> > In the case of cars, this has already happened in some cases.
> > Many Japanese companies (Honda, Subaru, Toyota, to name
> > just a few) make cars in the USA because it's cheaper!
> >
> > VW started that trend way back in the '70s by buying the
> > Westmoreland, PA facility from Chrysler, and building Rabbits,
> > Golfs and Jettas here instead of Germany. VW later sold that
> > plant to Sony, who uses it to make CRTs (because it's cheaper
> > to make them here!)
>
>
> Wasn't that much more the result of our own import tariffs,
significantly
> increased in the 80's to "protect" companies like Chrysler from foreign
> competition?
>

Nope. It was a result of two things. One, the US automakers buckled down and reduced their production costs to be competitive. Secondly in the case of Japanese automobiles, the Japanese government quit subsidizing car production when their automakers succeeded in obtaining a significant percentage of the US market (their government then put the money into subsidizing other industries they wanted to get off the ground). Once that happened the prices of Japanese cars rose. The net result was that US and Japanese automakers were now on a "level playing field" and the customers could once again pick a car from a US auto company without a major difference in cost.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

2427. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-10 05:56:41 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <tMFrb.21170$9M3.12906@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 82002

"N2EY" wrote:
>
> In some ways they still are. Much of what we
> consider "American" cars are not 100% "Made
> in USA". In fact, many "foreign" cars have higher
> domestic content...
>
> In the past quarter century, my immediate family
> motor pool has included 2 Fords, 1 Saturn, 3 VWs,
> and 2 Hondas. All "Made in the USA".

When shopping for a car, how can you tell which are made in the USA? My wife's Plymouth was made in Mexico and my Ford was made in Canada. I didn't find that out until the vehicles were actually delivered. The purchase of these "American" cars certainly didn't help US automobile workers much.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

2428. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-10 06:17:07 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <D3Grb.21185$9M3.9412@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 82003

"Dee D. Flint" wrote:
>
> (snip) The minimum wage is just high enough to keep a
> single person with no dependents from starving and
> freezing if they are willing to settle for bare bones survival.
> It's never been higher than that.

Well, it's hardly even that today. While going to college in the early 70's, my near minimum wage paycheck was enough to rent a one bedroom duplex w/garage ($100 per month) just outside LA (Ontario), furnish that duplex, finance a car, feed the two of us, and pay for some school books ($320 per month from the VA paid the tuition and other school costs). Today, my wife pays almost as much for books and lab fees each semester as I paid for tuition.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

2429. Re: KE4TEW, riley hollingsworth smokes pot?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-10 06:36:44 UTC
From: "R. Belcher" <randy.belcher@verizon.net>
Message-ID: <0mGrb.18339$E9.1718@nwrddc01.gnilink.net>
Source record: 82004
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.swap,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Riley Hollingsworth of the FCC smokes marijuana ???
Wow, learn something new every day....
That's too bad.

--

=

"bob" <bob@bob.com> wrote in message
news:Cksrb.69856$un.458@bignews6.bellsouth.net...
>
>
> bob wrote:
>
> > When does your probation run out? How is Rita the crack whore? Are you
> > taking your son smokes on visitation days? How is your good friend
> > Riley? Do you score him a bag now and then? Is that why he reinstated
> > your license after canceling it? How much pot did you give Riley to pull
> > that off?
> >
> >
> >
>

2430. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-10 10:17:34 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bonomm$nfo@library2.airnews.net>
Source record: 82006

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:nADrb.20994$9M3.19575@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> "N2EY" wrote:
> >"Dwight Stewart" writes:
> > >
> > > Product quality is dropping (plastics),
> >
> > In some areas, yes. But people still buy the products!
>
>
> People don't have any choice. As an example, I went shopping for a fan
> recently (to replace the last one that quit). I couldn't find a
well-built,
> metal, fan anywhere in the area. I ended up with a plastic fan that will
> fall apart in a month or two just like the last ones. I'm not saving any
> money because I have to keep buying this plastic garbage every few weeks.
>

Try JC Whitney. That's at least one of many links that came up when I did
an Altavista Search for metal fan. There's loads of other choices. $24.99.

Kim W5TIT

2431. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-10 10:19:54 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bonor1$n0m@library2.airnews.net>
Source record: 82007

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:tKDrb.21019$9M3.20281@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> "Dee D. Flint" wrote:
> >
> > You know Nixon tried wage and price controls and we
> > started developing shortages. Other countries in the
> > world have tried it too and also failed. Every where that
> > has been tried, the standard of living dropped, goods and
> > services became hard to get and unemployment rose. So
> > why try what has already been proven to fail.
>
>
> Wage and price controls are commonplace in Europe and the standard of
> living did not drop, goods and services did not became hard to get, and
> unemployment did not rise.
>
>
> > Please show that profits are obscene. Don't quote dollars,
> > quote percentage of operating expenses. (snip)
>
>
> I'm not going to quote anything, Dee. I gave my personal opinion. While
> you're certainly free to agree or disagree with that, there is no
> requirement whatsoever to prove an opinion. If, on the other hand, you
think
> my opinion is that important, you're certainly free to prove it's wrong.
>

That's true Dee. I gave him my opinion, *with* the reasons behind it...such
as an overwhelming public opinion that there are jobs our immigrant
population will do before the average American...and he chose to ignore
those facts also...

Kim W5TIT

2432. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-10 10:48:45 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <h2Krb.19551$Oo4.8044@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 82008

"Dee D. Flint" wrote:
>
> "Dwight Stewart" wrote:
> > Wasn't that much more the result of our own import
> > tariffs, significantly increased in the 80's to "protect"
> > companies like Chrysler from foreign competition?
>
> Nope. It was a result of two things. One, the US automakers
> buckled down and reduced their production costs to be
> competitive. Secondly in the case of Japanese automobiles,
> the Japanese government quit subsidizing car production when
> their automakers succeeded in obtaining a significant
> percentage of the US market (their government then put the
> money into subsidizing other industries they wanted to get off
> the ground). Once that happened the prices of Japanese cars
> rose. The net result was that US and Japanese automakers
> were now on a "level playing field" (snip)

I don't understand. Does the U.S. collect tariffs on imported foreign products? If so, how can U.S. and Japanese automakers possibly be on a "level playing field" if everything else you say above (no subsidies in Japan) is true? Japanese automakers have the added burden of shipping vehicles from Japan and the added costs of the import tariffs. They were obviously willing to absorb the extra shipping costs prior to the increase in tariffs during the 80's. So, with all that in mind, it appears the tariffs is actually what drove a few Japanese automakers to build cars here.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

2433. Re: Amateur Radio in the 21st Century?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-10 11:29:17 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031110062917.14837.00004162@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 82009

In article <_1Frb.19430$Oo4.4185@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote
>
>> Hans' proposal is nothing like what's in the KL7CC paper. But Hans'
>> proposal has at least one major problem: forced upgrading.
>
>Is forced upgrading a "major problem"?

It was for the old Novice.

>The Novice license is widely
>acknowledged to have been the best licensing idea the FCC ever had.

Wasn't FCC's idea, but that's beside the point.

If it was such a great idea, why was it closed to new license issues in 2000?

>It
>admitted people to the hobby with a sort of "learner permit" in which they
>could learn some skills and meet other experienced hams "on the air". It
>expired after one year and was not renewable.

Only from 1951 to 1967. And not only was it nonrenewable, it was "nonretakeable" - one Novice license to a customer, and if you'd ever had any class of ham license before, you couldn't have a Novice.

In 1967, the Novice went to 2 years, nonrenewable, still "nonretakeable". The reason given back then was "too many dropouts"

In the early-to-mid 1970s, the Novice went through a period of quick changes. First, the FCC allowed folks who had been unlicensed for at least a year to get a Novice, regardless of prior licensure. This meant a ham could be a Novice forever - two years on, one year off, new callsign and license each time. Again the reason given was "too many dropouts".

Then the one-year-unlicensed requirement was dropped. And the reason given was...

Finally the Novice was made 5 years renewable, like all the other license classes of the time. That was more than a quarter century ago.

>If it had any fault, it was
>that it tended to isolate newcomers into little "ghettos" mostly frequented
>by other newcomers.

The reasons for the limited privileges were:

- to simplify the "ideal" Novice station. 75 watts, xtal control, 3 HF bands CW only meant that almost anybody could have a half-decent station that wasn't much worse than anybody else's. High point was reached with Heathkit's <$100 HW-16 "shack in a box" that needed only a key, speaker, xtals and antenna.

- to encourage homebrewing/tinkering (what a concept). Lot of newbies built their own rigs, either from scratch (ahem) or simple kits.

- to minimize the chances of Novices straying outside the ham bands. Thus the xtals. This was not well-thought-out by FCC, because while the xtal requirement kept Novices inside the bands on the fundamentals, the harmonics fell outside the bands. Also required a different xtal for each band.

- to keep the level of activity high. Novices could count on other Novices being on the air on nearby frequencies almost 24/7.

>My "learner permit" is different than the old Novice license in 4 ways:
>
> 1) Rather than isolate the newcomers into narrow little band segments
> crowded with mostly other newcomers, it gives them expanded privileges
> on all bands.

I thought it gave them all privileges on all modes on all bands - just limited power.

The old Novice license got higher power and VFO control in the '70s, too. More bands and modes in the '80s. Didn't help much.

> 2) Rather than expiring in 1 year, it would expire after 10 years, giving
> them more time to "gain their wings".

Sure. And that's the problem. See below.

> 3) Power would be limited to 50 watts (in line with prevailing RF exposure
>doctrine.)

Not many non-QRP rigs out there limited to 50 watts out. Would it be acceptable to simply reduce the power level on a 100 W rig?
>
>What "major problem" lies in that? (Give me **your**version of the problem,
>not what you think the FCC version of the problem would be.)

First off, the FCC *is* an issue, because there are some things they simply won't enact. IMHO, they won't enact a nonrenewable nonretakeable ham license.

Second, you're pretty vague about the test requirements. How much test for each license? How many questions, and from what pools? If the entry license is kept simple and easy, then the step to Extra is gonna be a *big* one.

But that's not what you asked.

Let's say your idea catches on and the FCC enacts it pretty much as you propose. And let's say the learner's permit (LP) license is popular, because it gives lotsa choices for just a simple written test.

Some folks will upgrade, of course. Some will drop out. The problem will be with the third group - those who are active hams but who are satisfied with their "LP" licenses. If the jump from "LP" to Extra is not trivial, and requires some real learning (just like the old Novice-to-General written jump did), you're gonna have active hams forced off the air at the end of their 10 year terms because they just won't be able to pass the Extra written. Or they won't try, or they can't get to a VE session, yada yada yada.

And the cry will arise: "why are active hams with clean records being forced off the air?" Then you'll see history repeat itself, as the "LP" license becomes renewable, just like the old Novice, to avoid losing those hams.

Since the only difference between your two proposed classes is the power level, there will be quite logical arguments that such a system forces hams who don't want to run high power to "jump through a written test hoop" to gain privilges they have no intention of using. That's gonna be a tough argument to defeat.

Then there's the whole issue of the conversion of existing ham licenses to the two new classes. How many will drop out rather than take the test?

Just my opinion. But it's based on historical fact and long-term trends.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2434. Re: Amateur Radio in the 21st Century?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-10 15:19:38 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <e0Orb.19764$Oo4.1653@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 82010

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote

> Let's say your idea catches on and the FCC enacts it pretty much as you
> propose. And let's say the learner's permit (LP) license is popular,
because it
> gives lotsa choices for just a simple written test.
>
> Some folks will upgrade, of course. Some will drop out. The problem will
be
> with the third group - those who are active hams but who are satisfied
with
> their "LP" licenses. If the jump from "LP" to Extra is not trivial, and
> requires some real learning (just like the old Novice-to-General written
jump
> did), you're gonna have active hams forced off the air at the end of their
10
> year terms because they just won't be able to pass the Extra written. Or
they
> won't try, or they can't get to a VE session, yada yada yada.

This is precisely why I suggest a 10-year term. Right from the get-go,
these new hams know that they have 10 years to prepare to "re-enlist", and
that it will require some real learning. If they can't cut it after a
10-year apprenticeship, then they weren't meant to be hams. The FCC didn't
"stick to their guns" on the original Novice concept, and I lay that at the
feet of the "entitlement" mentality of the 60s-70s.

> And the cry will arise: "why are active hams with clean records being
forced
> off the air?" Then you'll see history repeat itself, as the "LP" license
> becomes renewable, just like the old Novice, to avoid losing those hams.

This will sound cold, and the IOoDHW (International Order of Dismayed Hand
Wringers) will convene a special session to condemn me, but who really CARES
if we lose those learners-permit holders.

> Since the only difference between your two proposed classes
> is the power level, there will be quite logical arguments that such
> a system forces hams who don't want to run high power to "jump
> through a written test hoop" to gain privilges they have no intention
> of using.

Sorry Jim, but you're waving the same old roadkill again.

> Then there's the whole issue of the conversion of existing ham licenses to
the

> two new classes. How many will drop out rather than take the test?

Read my proposal again, Jim. You'll see how I've completely avoided that problem.

As a closing note..... I really don't have a problem with a high dropout rate among newcomers. I'd be happy to see a million people "have a look at ham radio" and if just 20% stick around, well so be it. That would give us 200,000 new qualified hams. To the 800,000 who left, I say "I hope you had a good time, and it's been nice meeting you. Sorry this ham radio thing wasn't your bag." They're not "bad people" or "quitters" --- they just don't have the same interest in hobbies that you and I do.

73, de Hans, K0HB

2435. Re: Amateur Radio in the 21st Century?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-10 15:27:31 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3FAFAE63.5040000@psu.edu>
Source record: 82011

N2EY wrote:
> In article <BCtrb.2379$KN4.872935@news1.news.adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo

>>That is how I read it also. You (we) are being told to just keep quiet,
>>and that if we say anything, it will be our fault if the things we are
>>warning about come to pass.
>>
>>To which I would ask Carl and Hans:
>>
>>Do you really think people are so stupid that they won't think of
>>something unless Jim Miccollis says it?

And I was always told that there is no such thing as a stupid question!
Good thing I was set straight on this! ;^)

>>Nothing ever stands still. If the political currents happen to make the
>>entrance requirements for getting into the ARS easier, do those currents
>>stop once the original goal is met?
>>
>>Face it, the people who want drastically reduced entrance requirements
>>or no requirements at all are a subset of those who want no Morse code
>>testing. Can you deny that?
>>
>>>Did you ask KL7CC and the other authors of that paper to shut up?
>>>
>>>
>>>>Jim, please listen to Hans if you won't listen to me ...
>>>
>
>
>>>I've never seen you guys more eager to get someone to be quiet about
>>>something.
>>>Tell it to W5YI. Oh, no, Fred's sacred - no one must criticize Fred - he's
>>>the Maximum Leader.
>>
>
> Or KL7CC.
>
>>And his views do not reflect those of NCI...yeah, I know.
>
>
> No, they do not.
>
> NCI's mission in the USA is to get rid of Element 1, nothing else. If/when FCC
> dumps all code testing in the USA, NCI will cease to function in the USA.

So I've heard. We shall see. Organizations have a way of morphing, and
are notoriously resistant to organizational self dissolving.

> That mission is demonstrated by NCI's petition, which asks FCC to drop all code
> testing as a requirement, merge Tech and Tech Plus, and....nothing else.
>
>>Why isn't he, if not asked to shut up, at least be asked to provide a
>>disclaimer. Instead, all we get is that his views do not reflect, yadayada.
>
>
> Fred et al ain't on rrap.

True enough Jim. Remember I was replying to your rhetorical question
with another one!

>>>If you guys have an answer that simply quashes the KL7CC paper's bad ideas,
>>>why are you so afraid?
>>
>>ahem....
>>
>>
>>>You didn't ask Hans to shut up with his 2 license class proposal.
>>
>>nope....
>
>
> Hans' proposal is nothing like what's in the KL7CC paper. But Hans' proposal
> has at least one major problem: forced upgrading.
>
> I doubt FCC would ever again enact a ham license that wasn't renewable. They
> dumped that feature of the old Novice more than a quarter century ago.
>
> But even if FCC *did* make the entry-level class nonrenewable, it wouldn't stay
> that way.
>
>>>You didn't ask Len to shut up with his age-requirement nonsense.
>>
>>nope....
>>
>
> Len wants just one class of license.

From what I can gather, I'm not so sure he wants any license, or at
least the equivalent of that.

>
>
>>>You haven't asked KL7CC et al to shut up with their bad ideas.
>>
>>nope....
>>
>>
>>>Only me. Interesting.

>>
>>Do you want to know why Jim? What you are saying is:
>>
>>
>>>>>>>>T H E T R U T H <<<<<<<<
>>>>>>>
>>And that makes some people very very uncomfortable.
>>
>>I hear Hans telling you about his losing respect for you. I hear Carl
>>setting you up for taking the blame when the FCC starts seriously
>>looking at massive reductions in knowledge needed to get a license.
>>
>>And how's this for getting the great unwashed worked up?:
>>
>>"Testing for the Amateur Radio Service is an anachronism, a relic of
>>previous days of left wing Socialist ideas. Much of the regulatory
>>morass that such thinking has inflicted on us has already been swept
>>aside, witness the great success with deregulation in the broadcast
>>bands. It is time we complete the process, and eliminate such regressive
>>policies in the rest of the radio spectrum." This will truly turn the
>>Amateur bands into the.............
>
>
> Who the heck wrote *that*?? Not me! Not Hans or Carl, either!
>
> Where's it from??

That is something that I came up with while I was typing out the reply.
It has a number of qualities that would appeal to some people that are
in power now:

It speaks to lowering or elimination of regulations. This is a very big
thing with some people. It relates itself to the "The government that
governs best governs least" worldview.

It speaks to the continuance of a process that has been going on for a
few years now where less constraints have been put on radio
broadcasters. A disaster IMO, but to some a great thing. I'm talking
about relaxation of broadcaster regs, leading to outfits like Clear
channel owning all the radio stations in town. But as I say, there are
plenty who would think that this would be good.

Spin city, IOW. It is ridiculous, but ridiculous can sell big sometimes.

>>You think THAT wouldn't sell with some people in power? Another chance
>>to diss the hated regulators.
>
>
>
>>>>>Is it a strawman when there is a paper,suggesting that the testing
>>>>>requirement be radically reduced?
>>>>

>
>
>>>>>It's there, the proposal has been made, and the authors rely on their
>>>>>credentials, despite protestations to the contrary. Some strawman!
>>>>
>>>>- Mike KB3EIA -
>>>>
>>>>The FCC has determined the ARS to be "primarily a technically oriented
>>>>service"
>>>
>
>
>>>Right. Now what the heck does that actually mean? How does it somehow prove
>>>the
>>>need for multiple license classes and written tests such as we have now?
>>>Why
>>>can't hams be left free to choose what parts of amateur radio to pursue?
>>
>>Here is what I think it means (to some):
>>
>>I know people who think that they are "high tech" because they use a
>>cell phone. Or a computer. Or a GPS reciever. They might not be able to
>>explain how any of those things work, but by just using them, they
>>consider themselves high tech. I never asked, but I would be that they
>>would take one look at my IC-745 with it's 30 some buttons and knobs,
>>and conclude that just knowing how to operate it was a major bit of
>>"primarily a technically oriented service"
>>
>
> They oughta try to use the Southgate Type 7....
>
>
>>Oh-Oh! A percon of average intelligence could indeed learn to operate my
>>rig if they read the manual. NO test required!
>
>
> No test to use a computer....
>
>>>>... I really don't see ANY "no theory" proposal getting a lot of
>>>>traction there ... and I will be right in there with Jim and most others
>>>>fighting that one.
>>>
>>>How will we fight it? Saying amateur radio is primarily a technical service
>>>doesn't prove anything more than the old "trained pool or operators"
>>>mantra.
>>
>>We won't be able to fight it, will we?
>
>
> Sure we will - the question is how? That's what I want to know, so we're ready.

Perhaps I should have said "fight successfully"

>>How on earth can Pro-Coders fight
>>it when we lost the last war against the arguments presented by the No
>>Coders, and how are the No-Coders going to fight against the same
>>arguments that they had once used so successfully?
>>
>
> My questions exactly.

And that leads us back to a question I posed a while back. Why didn't
the peolpe who were officially agitating for the elimination of the
Morse code test have some simultaneous proposals to fill the vacuum that
would be created when the requirement went away?. It's called
responsibillity.

And here we DO have some people with some ideas, who ARE making
proposals. Who are they?

>>>Has taking and passing all those written exams caused anyone to decide to
>>>build
>>>a radio or be "more technical" than they would have been otherwise?
>>>
>>>
>>>>Let's just stop advertising something we don't want to sell -
>>>
>
>
>>>Sounds to me like you're afraid that there are plenty of folks out there
>>>who will *agree* with KL7CC.....
>>
>
>>No doubt there ARE plenty.
>
>
> I hope there aren't. I don't see how my discussing a paper that is already in
> the public domain on a website is going to change people's minds to agree with
> said paper.

Of course it doesn't. The whole concept of your devil's advocacy
serving as the seed for a no-test movement is at best amusing.

More likely you are making some people feel very uncomfortable.
Certainly my questions make some people unconfortable.

>>But Jim, I think you are just being set up to
>>take the blame here. Once the movement has gained momentum, it will just
>>be one more thing to blame upon those arrogant "Pro-coders".
>
>
> And it can be said that they were told to be quiet....

And that and 50 cents will get you a down payment on a cup of coffee.
It will be much too late by that time.

>
>>>>there will
>>>>be plenty of time to comment vigorously against it if the FCC ever were
>>>>to lend any credence to such a proposal.
>>>
>
>
>>>It's probably already too late.
>>
> I don't see what else there is to say. I've been working up a response to the
> KL7CC paper.

I'll be happy to publish said paper on the web.

- Mike KB3EIA -

2436. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-10 15:41:22 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3FAFB1A2.5040005@psu.edu>
Source record: 82012

Dwight Stewart wrote:
> "Dee D. Flint" wrote:
>
>>(snip) The minimum wage is just high enough to keep a
>>single person with no dependents from starving and
>>freezing if they are willing to settle for bare bones survival.
>> It's never been higher than that.
>
>
>
> Well, it's hardly even that today. While going to college in the early
> 70's, my near minimum wage paycheck was enough to rent a one bedroom duplex
> w/garage ($100 per month) just outside LA (Ontario), furnish that duplex,
> finance a car, feed the two of us, and pay for some school books ($320 per
> month from the VA paid the tuition and other school costs). Today, my wife
> pays almost as much for books and lab fees each semester as I paid for
> tuition.

In 1972, my $2.40 per hour kept me in an apartment, food, clothing, and
even allowed me to buy a motorcycle. That was .20 above the minimum wage.

- Mike KB3EIA -

2437. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-10 17:07:20 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0311100907.29220c41@posting.google.com>
Source record: 82013

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:<D3Grb.21185$9M3.9412@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> "Dee D. Flint" wrote:
> >
> > (snip) The minimum wage is just high enough to keep a
> > single person with no dependents from starving and
> > freezing if they are willing to settle for bare bones survival.
> > It's never been higher than that.
>
>
> Well, it's hardly even that today. While going to college in the early
> 70's, my near minimum wage paycheck was enough to rent a one bedroom duplex
> w/garage ($100 per month) just outside LA (Ontario), furnish that duplex,
> finance a car, feed the two of us, and pay for some school books ($320 per
> month from the VA paid the tuition and other school costs). Today, my wife
> pays almost as much for books and lab fees each semester as I paid for
> tuition.

Let's do the math, shall we?

Say you were making $4000/yr (about $2/hr,) back then. That's
$334/month. Out of that came rent ($100), furnishing ($20/mo?) food
($100?) car ($100 including gas and insurance?). Leaves $13.

That $320 from the VA was almost equal to your salary.

At $2/hr, the rent cost 50 hours' work. I presume utilities were
included.
Today 50 hrs work at minimum wage is what - $300?

And then there's taxes....

73 de Jim, N2EY

2438. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-10 17:14:02 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0311100914.1d2e066e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 82014

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:<7tErb.21105$9M3.12224@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote:
> >
> > In the case of cars, this has already happened in some cases.
> > Many Japanese companies (Honda, Subaru, Toyota, to name
> > just a few) make cars in the USA because it's cheaper!
> >
> > VW started that trend way back in the '70s by buying the
> > Westmoreland, PA facility from Chrysler, and building Rabbits,
> > Golfs and Jettas here instead of Germany. VW later sold that
> > plant to Sony, who uses it to make CRTs (because it's cheaper
> > to make them here!)
>
>
> Wasn't that much more the result of our own import tariffs, significantly
> increased in the 80's to "protect" companies like Chrysler from foreign
> competition?

As I understand the tariffs, they were/are only imposed beyond a certain number of vehicles/yr imported. Vehicles *exported* reduce the total. Toyota, for example, set up a line to build Corolla sedans in Japan and Corolla wagons in the USA (might have been the other way around, but the principle is the same). Cars were actually *exported* to Japan - but the Japanese did not count them that way because they were made by a Japanese company.

VW's trick was to build power assemblies in Germany but the rest of the car in the US, Canada, and Mexico. Final assembly was in the PA plant.

There are rules which determine whether a car is "domestic" or "imported" based on how much of its content is made here. The companies are careful to stay above the limit.

Also, the cost of transporting larger cars is greater, so at some point it makes sense to build plants here.

Then there's Saturn, a domestic company (actually a GM division) that turns out a quality car for a competitive price. Only problem is they don't have a complete line - yet.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2439. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-10 17:27:03 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0311100927.4ae8bf97@posting.google.com>
Source record: 82015

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:<ZHqrb.8496$P%1.7683957@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>...
> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20031108223515.07346.00001650@mb-m26.aol.com...
> > There *is* a need for regulation of industry - we just have to be very
> careful
> > as to how that regulation is done. For example, I don't think US companies
> > should have to compete head-to-head with foreign companies whose
> managements
> > don't have to worry about environmental rules, safety rules, child labor
> laws,
> > etc.
>
> And of course we need basic regulations such as preventing one company from
> selling temporarily at a loss to drive another company out of business and
> so on.

Why? A company that does such things risks running itself into the
ground.

> However what I meant was that we do not know enough to manipulate
> the economy to create prosperity. I.e. The most productive approach is going
> to be the free market economy that has mechanisms in place to prevent
> unethical business practices (as described in my first sentence) and to
> prevent the drifting towards monopolies so that there are competing
> companies.

Almost *anything* we do manipulates the market. Except for out-and-out
fraud, you're going to see disagreement on what constitutes an
unethical business practice. For example, take that "temporarily
selling at a loss" thing. Why is that unethical? Most new businesses
see a loss for the first X months of operation - for some, it's years.
Same for when a new store comes to town.

Are monopolies always bad? I'm not sure - think about when there was
only one phone company. They were heavily regulated to keep the cost
of a basic 'phone low. They made it up on long distance and premium
services, which most people did without.
>
> The items in the last sentence of your paragraph will change as these
> foreign countries become more prosperous. The US and European countries did
> not enact such laws themselves until we were our economies were strong
> enough to allow us to do so. This is part of what I was talking about when
> I said problem of foreign competition will eventally be solved when the
> foreign companies reach our level of prosperity. Of course in the meantime

> it does make it difficult for us. But who ever promised life would be easy?

So should we let our domestic industry be destroyed by foreign
competition that places no value on those things? If we do that,
aren't we exporting the hazards of production as well as the jobs?

Remember Bhopal? (chemical plant in India where an accident killed
many people).

>
> >>>> [snip] the most workable option. That is to work
> > >> >toward a world economy that enjoys a comparable standard to ours.
> Once
> > >> >that
> > >> >occurs, industry will find it more economical to produce more locally
> to
> > >> >trim shipping costs. Once it becomes equally costly to make a car in
> > >> >Japan
> > >> >as in the US for example, then the lower shipping cost means it's
> better
> > >> >to serve the US market with cars made in the US.
> > >>
> > >> In the case of cars, this has already happened in some cases. Many
> > >> Japanese
> > >> companies (Honda, Subaru, Toyota, to name just a few) make cars in the
> > >> USA because it's cheaper!
> > >>
> > >> VW started that trend way back in the '70s by buying the Westmoreland,
> PA
> > >> facility from Chrysler, and building Rabbits, Golfs and Jettas here
> > >> instead of
> > >> Germany. VW later sold that plant to Sony, who uses it to make CRTs
> > >> (because
> > >> it's cheaper to make them here!)
> > >>
> > >> > The main drawback is the fact
> > >> >that it will take a very long time before the world standard of living
> > >> >matches ours.
> > >>
> > >> So what do we do until then?
> > >>
> > >> 73 de Jim, N2EY
> > >
> > >As people have always done:
> > >1) Some will whine and barely get by.
> > >2) Some will simply make the best of what they have and do a bit better
> > >3) Others will forge ahead and strive for their own personal best
> > >development and productivity and will be reasonably comfortable.
> > >4) Yet others will create an opportunity and become the next Bill Gates.
> >
> > I meant as a society.

>
> Well it's not going to work to try to manipulate the economy and market
> place.

We already do, and have done for generations. Pick almost any
industry, and the marketplace is manipulated with laws and taxpayer
dollars.

> So as a society, we have patience and help these other countries to
> become as prosperous as we are.

And until that happens, we watch jobs flow overseas.

> And we deal individually with the hardships
> as we have always done in the ups and downs of life.

Sounds good until *your* job disappears.....

I say there's more we can do.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2440. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-10 17:51:07 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0311100951.40114623@posting.google.com>
Source record: 82016

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:<nADrb.20994$9M3.19575@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> "N2EY" wrote:
> >"Dwight Stewart" writes:
> > >
> > > Product quality is dropping (plastics),
> >
> > In some areas, yes. But people still buy the products!
>
> People don't have any choice. As an example, I went shopping for a fan
> recently (to replace the last one that quit). I couldn't find a well-built,
> metal, fan anywhere in the area. I ended up with a plastic fan that will
> fall apart in a month or two just like the last ones. I'm not saving any
> money because I have to keep buying this plastic garbage every few weeks.

As Kim points out, look elsewhere. The 'net gives us a powerful tool
to find other sources. The problem is that you may have to wait for
the item, and pay more for it (delivery vs. sales tax).

> > How much corporate profit is excessive? If a company
> > is worth $1 billion, and their profit is $100 million, that's
> > a 10% return on investment. Is that excessive? Who
> > decides?
>
>
> Are you not aware of our system of government, Jim? You know, the people
> we vote for to make exactly these types of decisions.

But they do not always make them wisely.
>
> > But without the details it's a moot point. Suppose a
> > company has a string of bad years and then a good
> > year - should their profits in the good year be
> > confiscated and a blind eye turned towards the bad
> > years?
>
> It's not my job to come up with all the details, Jim. I've already said I
> don't have all the answers.

The devil is in the details. A good idea can be ruined by bad details.

> But why does that make an idea a moot point.

Because whether such ideas work or not is largely dependent on those
details.

>
> > Price controls were tried in the late '60s and early '70s
> > to "Whip Infaltion Now". Didn't work in the long term.

> I don't remember that.
>
I do. First Nixon, then Ford. Basically came down to denying reality.

The USA economy had been built since at least the end of WW2 on
several concepts:

- lack of foreign competition
- cheap, abundant oil for energy
- high investment of tax dollars in certain technologies (highways and
air transport, military hardware, nukes) and low/nonexistent
investment in other, competing technology (railroads/transit/ships,
domestic electronics, energy conservation and alternative sources).
- unquestioned belief in unlimited growth and consumption, as well as
disposability of almost anything

When the slack ran in, US industry was poorly prepared. Look at the
oil situation alone - gasoline prices had been stable at less than 25
cents/gallon for decades until 1973. Then they doubled overnight, and
5-6 years later doubled again. So did all other petroleum fuel
products. Those increases dominoed through US industry.

> > Because the *market* (people who make the buying
> > decisions) go to the Wal Mart instead of the local stores.
> > That's where the real problem lies - people who do not
> > think about the long-term economic results of their actions.
>
>
> Why should they?

Because it's their responsibility. Part of a free market economy is
being a *customer*, not a *consumer*.

> They're going to Wal-Mart to buy a power tool or
> whatever, not ponder the global economic implications of that purchase.

Then they should not complain when the hardware store and the American
power tool plants shut down, quality degrades, unemployment rises,
etc.
>
> > Do you know this for a fact? Car price increases also
> > reflect the enormous investment in engineering and tooling
> > to build cars using the latest technology. Remember when
> > most cars fell apart before reaching 10 years or 100,000
> > miles?
>
>
> Do I know putting a regulatory cap on credit in the car market will drive
> down auto prices? Absolutely. If people have to pay more cash up front, with
> less financed by credit, very few would be able to afford the prices of

> today's automobiles. Companies will be forced to cut prices if they want to
> continue selling automobiles and Americans will have more money in their
> pockets to spend elsewhere (benefiting a wider segment of the overall
> economy).

And the auto companies will be in trouble because their sales are off.

However, I agree with your concept, now that I understand what you
meant. See below.
>
> And, no, I don't remember when most cars fell apart before reaching 10
> years or 100,000 miles. I've owned plenty of older cars in my life
> (certainly throughout the 60's and 70's) and I don't think any of them were
> less then 10 years old or had less than 100,000 miles on them. And all of
> them were built much better than today's models. My $35k SUV today is filled
> with plastic that is already starting to decay with only 40,000 miles on the
> vehicle. The Jeep I owned in 1972 had almost 200,000 miles on it with all
> original body parts (a little dented, but all original).

Those aren't cars - they're trucks.

By "cars" I mean ordinary American passenger cars. And until they had
to deal with foreign competition, they would not last as long as they
do today.

However, note that where and how a car is used makes a big difference.
Those of us in snowy, seaside and humid climates will have far more
trouble with rust than those in arid climes. A car driven 100,000
miles in stop-and-go city traffic has a lot more stresses on it than a
car driven 250,000 miles on the highway. In fact, I've often thought
cars should have running time meters and startup counters in addition
to odometers. Because miles and years don't begin to tell the whole
story.

> > As long as people are willing to pay the prices, the markets
> > are driven that way. Supply and demand.
>
>
> But, as always, companies control the supply. The difference is that
> today's monopolistic companies are not dependant on the daily sales of a
> single product, so are able to manipulate supply in an effort to raise
> prices. Since these companies often control whole market segments, consumer
> are left with only two choices - not purchase the goods they want or pay the
> higher prices.

There are *always* other sources. That's why I built an Elecraft
rather than buy Ikensu.

> In today's economy, the concept of supply and demand seems
> rather quaint, Jim.
>
Are you saying Adam Smith is obsolete? I disagree.

> > What about people trying to get started as homeowners?
> > Raising the price of credit makes it impossible for them to
> > buy a first house.
>
> I said nothing about raising the price of credit. I was referring to
> credit caps - a cap on the percentage of the total purchase price that could
> be financed or a cap on the percentage of a person's income that could be
> used to establish the monthly credit payments.

Now *that* makes sense - and I agree! Would prevent a lot of
bankruptcies.

> Both were common in the
> fifties, sixties, and early seventies, and the economy and consumers did
> just fine.

Maybe in the 50s and 60s, but not in the '70s! But the 70s problems
were definitely not caused by excessive borrowing by ordinary people.

But it all comes down to a level of personal responsibility,
education, and being a customer, not a consumer.

And accepting that there *are* limits to growth, and what we can
afford. People are not necessarily happier with, say, a bigger house,
if they have to go up to their necks in hock to buy it and take care
of it.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2441. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-10 20:18:59 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3FAFF2B3.7070103@psu.edu>
Source record: 82017

N2EY wrote:
> "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:<ZHqrb.8496$P%1.7683957@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>...

<a whole bunch of snippage>

> And until that happens, we watch jobs flow overseas.
>
>
>>And we deal individually with the hardships
>>as we have always done in the ups and downs of life.
>
>
> Sounds good until *your* job disappears.....
>
> I say there's more we can do.

The present paradigm will undoubtably hold sway until accountants see
thier jobs shipped out to a third world country.

Which, by the way, will be a whole lot easier than shipping
manufacturing jobs out of the country!

I believe in a free market with minimal but critical constraints.
Although I agree with a lot of what Dee says, I'm curious what she
thinks will happen when we have almost *no* domestic manufacturing.

A side note: Cars and housing cost (relatively) a good deal more than
they did when I was a child. When I was 6, my parents bought a house for
$7000.00 and paid it off in 10 yeas IIRC.

Rather than compare costs, it is best to look at the repay periods. Now
a typical mortgage is 30 years, and cars are often now leased, or
financed for amazingly long periods of time, like 6 or seven years -
which used to be most of the lifetime of a car.

- Mike KB3EIA -

2442. Houston, we have a solution

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-10 20:26:03 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <vvSrb.21917$9M3.14159@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 82018
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

N2EY and others may enjoy this URL.

http://tinyurl.com/ue35

--
&#65533;&#65533;&#65533; 73, de Hans, K0HB
Grand Exhalted Sniffer of the Fumes of Solder

2443. Re: Amateur Radio in the 21st Century?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-10 20:50:42 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <CSSrb.21969$9M3.11321@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 82019

--
&#65533;&#65533;&#65533; 73, de Hans, K0HB
--
Help support youth involved in Amateur Radio.
http://www.mnyarc.org
http://www.k0bsa.org
"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote

> In the early-to-mid 1970s, the Novice went through a period of quick
changes.
> First, the FCC allowed folks who had been unlicensed for at least a year
to get
> a Novice, regardless of prior licensure. This meant a ham could be a
Novice
> forever - two years on, one year off, new callsign and license each time.
Again
> the reason given was "too many dropouts".

See my other post about "too many dropouts".

> Then the one-year-unlicensed requirement was dropped. And the reason given
> was...

> Finally the Novice was made 5 years renewable, like all the other license
> classes of the time. That was more than a quarter century ago.

You're right, Jim, it was more than a quarter century ago. And over a
quarter century ago FCC thought that 13 and 20 WPM code tests were a good
idea, and a no-code license was a bad idea. Seems FCC no longer holds those
views, so I think we can safely ignore your argument about what they thought
back then on this matter also.

Do YOU think learners permits ought to be renewable beyond 10 years?

73, de Hans, K0HB

2444. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-10 21:59:45 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <ITTrb.22115$9M3.16230@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 82020

"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote

> Then they should not complain when the hardware store and the American
> power tool plants shut down, quality degrades, unemployment rises,
> etc.

Whoever can deliver the best value for my dollar (note I didn't say "cheapest"), regardless of what imaginary boundary drawn on the surface of the globe they inhabit, will capture my business. I do that in my business and I do it in my personal life. If every commercial enterprise built their business model on that principle then the best would flourish and the poorest would wither. What a concept!

73, de Hans, K0HB

2445. Re: Who is John Galt? - Re: Optical signals - Re: Wonder how licensing will c..

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-10 23:03:18 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <xnfcneeyarg.ho5cjz5.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>
Source record: 82021

> I recall a time when an office of any size had a "typing pool" and "file
> clerks" - jobs that were relatively unskilled but paid decent wages and
> benefits. Computerization almost eliminated those sorts of jobs but did
> not replace them with other jobs.

Remember also that that was at a time when young ladies coming into
the job force became nurses, teachers, social workers, telephone
operators, or clerical workers, or else they married young and stayed
home raising kids.

The era of such young ladies becoming technicians or office managers
in any great number was yet to come, let alone becoming professionals
(physicians, engineers, lawyers, etc) or taking "man's jobs" such as
firefighters, police officers, and construction trade / craft workers.

Technology was not the only reason for such changes. Our society
changed.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

2446. Re: Who is John Galt? - Re: Optical signals - Re: Wonder how licensing will c..

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-10 23:30:38 UTC
From: Bert Craig <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM>
Message-ID: <ycVrb.3296$LV4.3174063@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>
Source record: 82022

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:xnfcneeyarg.ho5cjz5.pminews@netnews.comcast.net...
> The era of such young ladies becoming technicians or office managers
> in any great number was yet to come, let alone becoming professionals
> (physicians, engineers, lawyers, etc) or taking "man's jobs" such as
> firefighters, police officers, and construction trade / craft workers.
>
> Technology was not the only reason for such changes. Our society
> changed.
>
> --
> 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

Hi Phil,

I hate to ask the proverbial "loaded question," but do you think "our society has changed" for the better or worse wrt the aforementioned subject matter?

Good natured query, I assure you. :-)

73 de Bert
WA2SI

2447. Re: Who is John Galt? - Re: Optical signals - Re: Wonder how licensing will c..

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-11 00:46:48 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <YjWrb.22363$9M3.6257@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 82023

"Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote

> I hate to ask the proverbial "loaded question," but do you think "our
> society has changed" for the better or worse wrt the aforementioned
subject
> matter?

I'll chime in here, and suggest that it is very much for the better. Many employees in my group are female in traditionally male job titles (engineers, managers, etc.). Their performance, professionalism, and contributions to our success are completely comparable to their male counterparts.

On a more personal note, one of my daughters no longer has a husband and is raising 4 fine kids comfortably because she pursued a technical education and career. In the "good old days" she would not have been able to do so, and her financial picture would have been much more bleak.

73, de Hans, K0HB

2448. Re: Who is John Galt? - Re: Optical signals - Re: Wonder how licensing will c..

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-11 01:20:59 UTC
From: Bert Craig <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM>
Message-ID: <%PWrb.4311$LV4.3642576@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>
Source record: 82024

"K�HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:YjWrb.22363$9M3.6257@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> "Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote
>
> > I hate to ask the proverbial "loaded question," but do you think "our
> > society has changed" for the better or worse wrt the aforementioned
> subject
> > matter?
>
> I'll chime in here

Chime on in, Hans. "All are welcome!"

> , and suggest that it is very much for the better. Many
> employees in my group are female in traditionally male job titles
> (engineers, managers, etc.). Their performance, professionalism, and
> contributions to our success are completely comparable to their male
> counterparts.

I agree.

> On a more personal note, one of my daughters no longer has a husband and
is
> raising 4 fine kids comfortably because she pursued a technical education
> and career. In the "good old days" she would not have been able to do so,
> and her financial picture would have been much more bleak.

Hats off to your daughter and my wishes for her continued success. I have a precocious six year old who has proclaimed that she wants to be an eye doctor. While far to early for any of us (Particularly said precocious one.) to be really know what career path she'll eventually take, we ARE thankful that said path is there for her to choose.

> 73, de Hans, K0HB

73 de Bert
WA2SI

2449. Re: Who is John Galt? - Re: Optical signals - Re: Wonder how licensing will c..

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-11 01:25:21 UTC
From: Bert Craig <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM>
Message-ID: <5UWrb.4364$LV4.3666726@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>
Source record: 82025

Oops, that's "While far too early for any of us" :-o

"Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in message
news:%PWrb.4311$LV4.3642576@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net...
>
> "K�HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:YjWrb.22363$9M3.6257@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> > "Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote
> >
> > > I hate to ask the proverbial "loaded question," but do you think "our
> > > society has changed" for the better or worse wrt the aforementioned
> > subject
> > > matter?
> >
> > I'll chime in here
>
> Chime on in, Hans. "All are welcome!"
>
> > , and suggest that it is very much for the better. Many
> > employees in my group are female in traditionally male job titles
> > (engineers, managers, etc.). Their performance, professionalism, and
> > contributions to our success are completely comparable to their male
> > counterparts.
>
> I agree.
>
> > On a more personal note, one of my daughters no longer has a husband and
> is
> > raising 4 fine kids comfortably because she pursued a technical
education
> > and career. In the "good old days" she would not have been able to do
so,
> > and her financial picture would have been much more bleak.
>
> Hats off to your daughter and my wishes for her continued success. I have
a
> precocious six year old who has proclaimed that she wants to be an eye
> doctor. While far to early for any of us (Particularly said precocious
one.)
> to be really know what career path she'll eventually take, we ARE thankful
> that said path is there for her to choose.
>

> > 73, de Hans, K0HB
>
> 73 de Bert
> WA2SI
>
>

2450. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-11 01:29:32 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031110202932.23171.00001992@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 82026

In article <lTTrb.22115$9M3.16230@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> writes:

>"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote
>
>> Then they should not complain when the hardware store and the American
>> power tool plants shut down, quality degrades, unemployment rises,
>> etc.
>
>Whoever can deliver the best value for my dollar (note I didn't say
>"cheapest"), regardless of what imaginary boundary drawn on the surface of
>the globe they inhabit, will capture my business. I do that in my business
>and I do it in my personal life. If every commercial enterprise built
>their business model on that principle then the best would flourish and the
>poorest would wither. What a concept!
>
How do you determine "best value"?

Does it include things like whether the producers used environmentally-friendly processes, the working conditions of the workers who actually make the product, etc.?

Or is it based solely on the product itself, with no concern about its production process?

73 de Jim, N2EY

2451. Re: Who is John Galt? - Re: Optical signals - Re: Wonder how licensing will c..

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-11 02:52:01 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <xnfcneeyarg.ho5txu6.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>
Source record: 82027

On Mon, 10 Nov 2003 23:30:38 GMT, Bert Craig wrote:

>I hate to ask the proverbial "loaded question," but do you think "our
>society has changed" for the better or worse wrt the aforementioned subject
>matter?
>
>Good natured query, I assure you. :-)

Much for the better for exactly the reasons that you and Hans
articulated earlier.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

2452. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-11 03:41:43 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <XTYrb.20940$Oo4.19562@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 82028

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote

> How do you determine "best value"?

Depending on the product it can be a variety of things, sometimes a very complex mix of parameters determines "value". My factory purchases products of many different types, complexities, which they range from pure "commodities" like solder to specialty products like custom chips, plastic moldings, and similar "proprietary" materials which find there way into our finished goods.

Obviously price factors into the mix, and all other things being equal, price wins.

But "all other things" are almost never equal. For example, some suppliers have earned "dock to stock" status with us because their outgoing quality control is good enough that we do not have to perform incoming quality control. This saves us money (inspection labor) and time (no delay in inspection) so we favor such suppliers even if they may charge slightly higher prices, and they benefit by earlier payment because their invoice is not held pending QA acceptance of their product. Other favorable factors would be their willingness to deal with us on a "consigned inventory" basis, shield us from part shortage allocations, and similar "pipeline" issues. Suppliers with a "track record" are generally favored over "new guys", but new guys who can demonstrate "value added" (which can be a host of things) will certainly be given some business to prove their case. Within reason, we will favor enterprises "close to home" because we feel an obligation to contribute to the communities where we live and work, and there is an obvious advantage to dealing with a supplier who you can quickly meet for lunch to discuss issues, rather than by telecommunications or strapping a 757 to your ass for several hours.

As you can see, "best value" encompasses many factors and issues beyond the actual physical product which you touch and feel.

> Does it include things like whether the producers used
> environmentally-friendly processes, the working
> conditions of the workers who actually make the product,
> etc.?

No ethical company would ignore those issues. Certainly we will not knowingly deal with suppliers who pollute the environment or mistreat their workers, but we are not staffed with EPA-like or OSHA-like inspectors and evaluators In cases where we are qualifying a new significant new supplier, we perform on-site evaluations which give us some visibility of working conditions, etc., but it is naturally not an in depth review of

their HR practices, or validating their compliance with EPA standards. Were we a huge conglomerate like General Motors or IBM, I'm sure we'd have more formal means of dealing with this issue, but in the meantime they obviously are subject to the usual state, federal, provincial (or whatever) regulatory constraints. We make a special effort in the area of supplier diversity, and support many regional Supplier Diversity Councils, such as Chicago Minority Business Development Council, Dallas/Ft. Worth Minority Business Development Council, Georgia Minority Supplier Development Council, Minnesota Minority Supplier Development Council, Virginia Regional Minority Supplier Development Council, Southern California Regional Purchasing Councils, Inc., and others. This context includes woman-owned or veteran-owned enterprises.

73, de Hans, K0HB

2453. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-11 04:08:12 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <MgZrb.9051$P%1.8115756@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 82029

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:h2Krb.19551$Oo4.8044@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> "Dee D. Flint" wrote:
> >
> > "Dwight Stewart" wrote:
> > > Wasn't that much more the result of our own import
> > > tariffs, significantly increased in the 80's to "protect"
> > > companies like Chrysler from foreign competition?
> >
> > Nope. It was a result of two things. One, the US automakers
> > buckled down and reduced their production costs to be
> > competitive. Secondly in the case of Japanese automobiles,
> > the Japanese government quit subsidizing car production when
> > their automakers succeeded in obtaining a significant
> > percentage of the US market (their government then put the
> > money into subsidizing other industries they wanted to get off
> > the ground). Once that happened the prices of Japanese cars
> > rose. The net result was that US and Japanese automakers
> > were now on a "level playing field" (snip)
>
>
> I don't understand. Does the U.S. collect tariffs on imported foreign
> products? If so, how can U.S. and Japanese automakers possibly be on a
> "level playing field" if everything else you say above (no subsidies in
> Japan) is true? Japanese automakers have the added burden of shipping
> vehicles from Japan and the added costs of the import tariffs. They were
> obviously willing to absorb the extra shipping costs prior to the increase
> in tariffs during the 80's. So, with all that in mind, it appears the
> tariffs is actually what drove a few Japanese automakers to build cars
here.
>

Let me make this as plain as possible. At one time (prior to the 1980s),
the Japanese government actually gave Japanese automakers money from
government coffers so that the automakers could sell their product at a
price less than it actually cost to get it to market. The goal was to
penetrate the market. Once they penetrated it, they believed that they
could hold a significant share of it as the consumers would be used to
buying their product. Once they penetrated the market, the Japanese
government classified autos as a mature industry and quit subsidizing it.
Once the automakers had to make profits without the benefit of subsidies,
the US companies were able to compete and the Japanese found that they
needed to have manufacturing sites in the US to continue to stay in the
market. The tariffs were never high enough to make much difference in the

situation.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

2454. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-11 04:32:26 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <uDZrb.9055$P%1.8120974@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 82030

"Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
news:3FAFF2B3.7070103@psu.edu...
>
>
> N2EY wrote:
> > "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:<ZHqrb.8496$P%1.7683957@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>...
>
>
> <a whole bunch of snippage>
>
>
>
> > And until that happens, we watch jobs flow overseas.
> >
> >
> >>And we deal individually with the hardships
> >>as we have always done in the ups and downs of life.
> >
> >
> > Sounds good until *your* job disappears.....
> >
> > I say there's more we can do.
>

By the way, one of my jobs DID disappear. The company I was working for
decided they could serve the engineering needs of their US customers from
Japan. So I hunted until I found a new job.

>
> The present paradigm will undoubtably hold sway until accountants see
> *thier* jobs shipped out to a third world country.
>
> Which, by the way, will be a whole lot easier than shipping
> manufacturing jobs out of the country!
>
> I believe in a free market with minimal but critical constraints.
> Although I agree with a lot of what Dee says, I'm curious what she
> thinks will happen when we have almost *no* domestic manufacturing.

Show me a plan with well thought out details (as Jim stated, the devil is in
the details) and I might buy it. Just saying we have to do something and
them mumbling about fuzzy, undefined plans isn't going to get the job done.
Until we have such a plan and have a well developed analysis to show that
the cure isn't worse than the disease, we need to leave the market alone.

>
> A side note: Cars and housing cost (relatively) a good deal more than
> they did when I was a child. When I was 6, my parents bought a house for
> $7000.00 and paid it off in 10 yeas IIRC.
>
> Rather than compare costs, it is best to look at the repay periods. Now
> a typical mortgage is 30 years, and cars are often now leased, or
> financed for amazingly long periods of time, like 6 or seven years -
> which used to be most of the lifetime of a car.
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -
>

Looking at repay periods or relative costs isn't really the way to go either. You have to include a comparison of the features that you get for that cost. People simply want more on their "starter" houses and cars. Today's starter house has relatively more features than those of the past. For example, the typical tract house had no cabinets of any type in the bathroom at that time. The homeowner added them later as time and money permitted. They did not have air conditioning. Now you just about can't sell any new home, even low end starter one, unless it has A/C and so on. Comparing the past to the present is very difficult. Too much has changed and it's like comparing apples to oranges.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

2455. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-11 04:43:35 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <XNZrb.9056$P%1.8123280@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 82031

"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
news:c2356669.0311100927.4ae8bf97@posting.google.com...
> "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:<ZHqrb.8496$P%1.7683957@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>...
> > And we deal individually with the hardships
> > as we have always done in the ups and downs of life.
>
> Sounds good until *your* job disappears.....
>
> I say there's more we can do.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

My job did disappear. One company that I worked for decided it could support it's US engineering needs from the headquarters in Japan. I dug in and found a new job.

As you have said in one of your other posts, the devil is in the details. Until someone can come up with those details and those details can stand up to a rigorous analysis to show that the cure won't be worse than the disease, we need to keep our hands off the economy, market, and manufacturing base.

Also keep in mind that the situation will be self-correcting in the long run. i.e. The foreign makers need the US market and if they kill our economy they will be hurting just as badly as the US.

I stand by my philosophy. The solution is to get the bulk of the world up to our standard so that manufacturing will be more competitive if the products are built closer to the market (i.e. goods for the US built in the US).

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

2456. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-11 06:01:37 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <5X_rb.22854$9M3.6173@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 82032

"N2EY" wrote:
>
> As Kim points out, look elsewhere. The 'net gives
> us a powerful tool to find other sources. The problem
> is that you may have to wait for the item, and pay
> more for it (delivery vs. sales tax).

But I shouldn't have to do that, Jim. I don't think a quality fan should be an esoteric item requiring a nation-wide search. Yet that is exactly the case. And this was only one example - I run into similar situations just about every day of the week. By the way, the fans are purchased locally because that's in the contract.

> Because whether such ideas work or not is largely
> dependent on those details.

I wasn't aware we were here to make a particular idea work. This is a general discussion in a newsgroup. Anything more than that would require considerable time (which I place a high value on) and a research & development budget (which I haven't seen anyone offer).

> Because it's their responsibility. Part of a free market
> economy is being a *customer*, not a *consumer*.

Again, shoppers are going to the store to ponder the global economic implications of the purchases they make. It is absurd to even expect them to do so (see my next paragraph below).

> Then they should not complain when the hardware store
> and the American power tool plants shut down, quality
> degrades, unemployment rises, etc.

Jim, short of setting up a dictatorship, you're never going to get even a significant portion of the 280 million people in this country to shop the way you want. Consumers in general have neither the business awareness or economic awareness to make those types of decisions on their own. And they also certainly don't have the time or money to fully research an industry each time they want to go shopping for something. Business darn well knows all that, which is exactly why they point to consumer spending as the main cause of a poor economy. Doing so absolves business of any responsibility for that economic situation and instead places the entire nation's economic burden, and sole blame for a bad economy (and blame for the things you list above), on consumers alone. Business has some responsibility in all this. Your argument gives them a free ride when it comes to that responsibility.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

2457. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-11 06:04:37 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <VZ_rb.22858$9M3.8101@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 82033

"Kim W5TIT" wrote:
>
> Try JC Whitney. That's at least one of many links that
> came up when I did an Altavista Search for metal fan.
> There's loads of other choices. $24.99.

To save time, I decided to consolidate my responses. Therefore, see my response to Jim for more about this, Kim.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

2458. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-11 08:40:48 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <REMOVETHISkc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <borq9m$1gm7n3$6@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 82156

Yeah..... that may be true but circumstances now have forced many to suffer
with it as a "living" wage.

--
Ryan KC8PMX

Why is it one careless match can start a forest fire, but
it takes a whole box to start a barbecue?

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:4xXqb.8184$P%1.7333810@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
>
> "Ryan, KC8PMX" <REMOVETHISkc8pmx@diamondcs.net> wrote in message
> news:boh9mn$1f99e9$5@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de...
> >
> > The
> > average wage around here, what is considered the alleged "living" or
> minimum
> > wage is between $5.25-6.00 per hour.
>
> Keep in mind that the minimum wage was NEVER intended to be a "living"
wage.
>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>

2459. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-11 08:52:48 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <REMOVETHISkc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <borq9n$1gm7n3$7@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 82157

Dee,

You must be living in a "fairy tale" world if yo believe this to be still true. It is a simple fact that there is not the same type of jobs available that were around in the 1965-1980's range of time. The changes in the employment economy and shifts in employment trends are why. Take GM for instance..... At least up here in the Tri- Cities and Flint, GM is constantly cutting back, and even closing plants, not the opposite. Hell, locally speaking, Dow Chemical and Dow Corning also have cut more than half their workforce in the past 15 years or so.

Construction jobs around here suck, unless you hold "paper" you are nothing and still making the under 8 dollar an hour range wage, before taxes. I can bring up more examples if you want referring to my area if ya want.

--
Ryan KC8PMX

All of us could take a lesson from the weather. It pays no
attention to criticism.

>
> And at that time minimum wage was about $1.50 per hour. It wasn't a
living
> wage then either. Entry level jobs have never provided the income to
> support a family. Anyone that I have ever known in my lifetime (52 years)
> that made minimum wage either lived with their parents or other relatives,
a
> group of roommates, or had a working spouse even back when I was a child.
> No adult male that I knew stayed in a minimum wage job any longer than it
> took to find something else because they could not pay groc, rent, and
> transportation on that. It has never been high enough to do so.
>
> Wages versus costs is all relative. You have to look at how many hours it
> takes to buy something. The majority of items but not all take fewer
hours
> of work to purchase than they did in 1976. The cost of electronics is
down
> in terms of hours to buy. The cost of houses is about the same in terms
of
> hours.
>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>

2460. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-11 09:02:02 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <REMOVETHISkc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <borq9o$1gm7n3$8@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 82158

>
> The minimum wage is just high enough to keep a single person with no
> dependents from starving and freezing if they are willing to settle for
bare
> bones survival. It's never been higher than that.

The hell it is.... to get by without living almost an institutional type of life, a person needs to work at least 65 hours a week, every week to break even.

>
>
> > The problem today, as more and more people become locked into lower
> wages,
> > is that the minimum wage doesn't address the extra needs of the worker's
> > family or future. Taxpayers pay a price for that down the road (welfare,
> > food stamps, medical costs, student aid, and so on). If companies paid
> > better wages, much of that would be sharply reduced.
> >
>
> You are not supposed to stay in a minimum wage job. You get work
> experience, demonstrate your ability to be dependable, get recommendations
> (i.e "he/she is a hard worker") and move on.

Pure bullshit, and more proof that some people live in a fairy tale world. Employees are expendable as toilet paper regardless of how well you are as an employee. I know many people who would make excellent candidates as the "employee of the year," but still get passed up, or worse yet, let go because of the fact they were merely nothing but a number on a balance sheet/statement.

>
> The solution is not to mandate a higher wage but to actively seek out
these
> people and get them ready to move on to the better jobs by making
training,
> etc accessible.
>
> When I was young (too long ago), I worked minimum wage jobs but I
certainly
> knew that was not something I should consider doing lifelong.
>

Once again, fairy tale world?? Most of the people who are not high school/college students feel the same way, but are stuck in a rut that never seems to fill in. Yes, education is a key, but the problem there is if you

are working 60+ hours or more per week, chances are there is not opportunities to even take these classes. Fact number two, there is something called financial aid, but it DOES NOT cover all of the educational expenses, which are not going to be able to come out of those "minimum" wages.

--
Ryan KC8PMX

Give a person a fish and you feed them for a day; teach that person to use The Internet and they won't bother you for weeks.

2461. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-11 10:39:06 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <boqeav$j07@library2.airnews.net>
Source record: 82034

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:5X_rb.22854$9M3.6173@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> "N2EY" wrote:
> >
> > As Kim points out, look elsewhere. The 'net gives
> > us a powerful tool to find other sources. The problem
> > is that you may have to wait for the item, and pay
> > more for it (delivery vs. sales tax).
>
>
> But I shouldn't have to do that, Jim. I don't think a quality fan should
> be an esoteric item requiring a nation-wide search. Yet that is exactly
the
> case. And this was only one example - I run into similar situations just
> about every day of the week. By the way, the fans are purchased locally
> because that's in the contract.
>

Now I see what you are doing. You are OVER reacting to any little thing
just to try and hang on to whatever concept it is you have, Dwight.
"Nationwide search?" That is hysterical! It took me less than one minute
to find that fan--and that was at the top of the search list; there were
hundreds to look at.

It took me less than 2 minutes to "happen" to look last night while I was at
Wal-Mart. Now, true, they are a nationwide outlet so you may have to travel
the nation before you find one of those stores--but they had more than one
choice of metal fans. So, don't know why you can't find 'em.

>
> > Because whether such ideas work or not is largely
> > dependent on those details.
>

>
> I wasn't aware we were here to make a particular idea work. This is a
> general discussion in a newsgroup. Anything more than that would require
> considerable time (which I place a high value on) and a research &
> development budget (which I haven't seen anyone offer).
>

'Scuse me? Surely you are basing the content of your opinions on at least
some kind of facts that you've either experienced or heard, or whatever,
over the course of your life. In fact, I bet I can find a comment you made
to me in this thread that lends itself to not basing my opinions from out of
thin air! And, if you wish to be a proponent of something, it's nearly

imperative that you be able to convince others why it's a good idea. Maybe that's why your ideas flop; and why the American people don't change things as they need to be changed.

> > > Because it's their responsibility. Part of a free market
> > > economy is being a *customer*, not a *consumer*.
> >
> > Again, shoppers are going to the store to ponder the global economic
> > implications of the purchases they make. It is absurd to even expect them
> to
> > do so (see my next paragraph below).
> >

I think you probably meant "aren't" above. And, while I don't ponder global economic implications with every shopping experience, I certainly do a lot of the time. I don't buy strictly "American," either. One blaring example is that since the Exxon Valdez oil spill, I have never bought gasoline from Exxon. Now, have researched what other companies own or are owned by Exxon? No. It would probably frustrate the heck out of me to realize it, though. I feel personally gratified by not buying their gasoline. I don't really do it to make a statement to the world--but I should.

> > > Then they should not complain when the hardware store
> > > and the American power tool plants shut down, quality
> > > degrades, unemployment rises, etc.
> >
> >
> > Jim, short of setting up a dictatorship, you're never going to get even
> a
> > significant portion of the 280 million people in this country to shop the
> > way you want.
> >

See Jim? Give a dog a bone and he buries it. When someone submits something contrary to the way Dwight wants everything to be--*without* substantiated concepts I might add--by *his* own admission--he suddenly gets short and impatient with others.

> > Consumers in general have neither the business awareness or
> > economic awareness to make those types of decisions on their own.
> >

So, as in real debate, let's bring this full-circle. You are stating that consumers--presumably *American* consumers--are too lazy and/or incapable of business or economic awareness to decide "smart" shopping decisions?! And, just leaving that by itself, you blare out at *ME* for the idea that immigrant workers are more willing to do the jobs of "less importance" than most Americans will do?! Ludicrous at best.

>
> And they
> also certainly don't have the time or money to fully research an industry
> each time they want to go shopping for something.
>

They sure do. And many do. We live in an information glut these days. If someone can't get information they are looking for, they need to ask someone how to find it--because it's pretty much there and it's there fairly quickly.

>
> Business darn well knows
> all that, which is exactly why they point to consumer spending as the main
> cause of a poor economy. Doing so absolves business of any responsibility
> for that economic situation and instead places the entire nation's
economic
> burden, and sole blame for a bad economy (and blame for the things you
list
> above), on consumers alone. Business has some responsibility in all this.
> Your argument gives them a free ride when it comes to that responsibility.
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
>
>

Oh OK. It's always going to be the corporate entity's fault. Now, speak of liberal slinging...

Kim W5TIT

2462. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-11 10:40:05 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <boqecq$c1q@library2.airnews.net>
Source record: 82035

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:VZ_rb.22858$9M3.8101@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net...
>
> "Kim W5TIT" wrote:
> >
> > Try JC Whitney. That's at least one of many links that
> > came up when I did an Altavista Search for metal fan.
> > There's loads of other choices. $24.99.
>
>
> To save time, I decided to consolidate my responses. Therefore, see my
> response to Jim for more about this, Kim.
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
>
>

Yeah...I did. The post from you, above, makes more sense than that one did.

Kim W5TIT

2463. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-11 10:48:02 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <C73sb.23060$9M3.13034@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 82036

"Kim W5TIT" wrote:
>
> That's true Dee. I gave him my opinion, (snip) and he
> chose to ignore those facts also...

I didn't ignore your opinions, Kim. I read and responded to them for a solid week. Instead, what I did was disagree with almost every one of those opinions (after all, they were simply wrong). As for facts, I saw very little of that from you.

Anyway, since you keep bringing up my name in your conversations with others, it's clear you cannot accept the notion that someone might actually disagree with you. Try to get over it and move on, Kim. Your ongoing attempts to find solace from others now is truly not very becoming.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

2464. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-11 11:16:34 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <my3sb.23071$9M3.2615@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 82037

"N2EY" wrote:
>
> Let's do the math, shall we?
>
> Say you were making $4000/yr (about $2/hr,) back then.

I don't remember what I was paid back then (that was a long time, and a lot of jobs, ago). All I do remember is that it was just barely above minimum wage. But, for the purposes of your example, that salary figure is probably good enough.

> That's $334/month. Out of that came rent ($100), furnishing
> ($20/mo?) food ($100?) car ($100 including gas and insurance?).
> Leaves $13.

Hey, we were hippies back then - we didn't pay that much for furniture and much of what we had was homemade. ;-)

The car payments were also less than that. No insurance and about a tank of gas a week (we rode bicycles almost as much as we drove the car - another hippy thing).

> That $320 from the VA was almost equal to your salary.

Yes, it was. And it was a real disaster when that check didn't arrive on time for whatever reason (it didn't twice).

> At $2/hr, the rent cost 50 hours' work. I presume utilities
> were included.

I think everything except gas was included. We paid the gas bill separately. But that was about it (we couldn't afford a phone).

> Today 50 hrs work at minimum wage is what - $300?

Can you imagine even trying to rent an apartment in Southern California for $300 today (just that - forget the other stuff)? I guess one could be found but I probably wouldn't want to live in it. It would probably take about a hundred hours of work at minimum wage today to find a decent apartment in that area.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

2465. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-11 11:24:12 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <wF3sb.23080$9M3.12729@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 82038

"Mike Coslo" wrote:
>
> In 1972, my $2.40 per hour kept me in an apartment,
> food, clothing, and even allowed me to buy a motorcycle.
> That was .20 above the minimum wage.

Yep, that sounds right. You know, thinking back, I believe I was actually happier back then. I didn't have much, but I don't remember feeling anything was missing in my life. Perhaps I'm getting too old to remember things back then clearly. Maybe I'll start a late mid-life crisis and go looking for those youthful days again. I remember this one girl...

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

2466. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-11 11:30:55 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <PL3sb.23083$9M3.22571@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 82039

"Dee D. Flint" wrote:
>
> Let me make this as plain as possible. (snip)

You explained it just fine in the last message. I just don't agree subsidies alone were the deciding factors - I suspect tariffs played a much bigger role than you suggest.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

2467. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-11 11:33:24 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <8O3sb.23084$9M3.13650@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 82040

"N2EY" wrote:
>
> As I understand the tariffs, they were/are only
> imposed beyond a certain number of vehicles/yr
> imported. (snip)

I don't know the details of the various tariffs, so I'll take your word
for it, Jim.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

2468. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-11 11:51:09 UTC
From: Bert Craig <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM>
Message-ID: <N24sb.5009$B9.1221559@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>
Source record: 82041

"Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:boqeav$j07@library2.airnews.net...
> See Jim? Give a dog a bone and he buries it. When someone submits
> something contrary to the way Dwight wants everything to be--*without*
> substantiated concepts I might add--by *his* own admission--he suddenly
gets
> short and impatient with others.
>
> Kim W5TIT

Kim, you made my morning with this little tidbit. "Give a dog a bone and he
buries it." I can hardly type, I'm laughing so hard.

73 de Bert
WA2SI

P.S. Tried to e-mail you. Could you drop me one, if possible?

2469. Happy Veterans Day

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-11 12:40:56 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0311110440.714cb88c@posting.google.com>
Source record: 82042

May this day find you and yours safe, and may the Grace of God bring
our Brothers and Sisters-in-arms home safely soon.

Semper Fidelis

73

Steve Robeson, LPN
GySgt USMC(ret'd)

2470. Re: Happy Veterans Day

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-11 13:15:36 UTC
From: Bert Craig <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM>
Message-ID: <Yh5sb.5908$B9.1453291@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>
Source record: 82043

"Steve Robeson, K4CAP" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
news:5c01b95b.0311110440.714cb88c@posting.google.com...
> May this day find you and yours safe, and may the Grace of God bring
> our Brothers and Sisters-in-arms home safely soon.
>
> Semper Fidelis
>
> 73
>
> Steve Robeson, LPN
> GySgt USMC(ret'd)

Ditto and a very grateful thanks you to all who've served and continue to serve with pride and distinction while protecting our nation's freedoms and interests. I'll be taking Dad out to dinner tonight. (USN ret., WWII)

73 de Bert
WA2SI

2471. Re: KE4TEW, felony drug dealer good friends with Riley

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-11 15:05:28 UTC
From: bob <bob@bob.com>
Message-ID: <8U6sb.183$jA6.61@bignews6.bellsouth.net>
Source record: 82044
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.swap,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,alt.radio.fcc.corruption,rec.radio.amateur.dx

Have Bribemoney will travel wrote:
> "bob" <bob@bob.com> wrote in message
> news:Wisrb.69855$un.30856@bignews6.bellsouth.net...
> When does your probation run out? How is Rita the crack whore? Are you
> taking your son smokes on visitation days? How is your good friend
> Riley? Do you score him a bag now and then? Is that why he reinstated
> your license after canceling it? How much pot did you give Riley to pull
> that off?
> ----------
>

So how much pot did KE4TEW give Riley to get his license back?

Read below, if you can read.

TAMPA, FL: The FCC has requested that General class licensee James W. Dale, KE4TEW, retake the General class examination elements under the supervision of FCC personnel by July 30, 1999, or his license will be canceled.

At:

http://www.arrl.org/news/stories/1999/06/23/1/

TAMPA, FL [UPDATE]: The FCC notified James W. Dale, formerly KE4TEW, on August 3, 1999, canceling his General Amateur Radio license. The FCC had notified Dale on June 18, 1999, requiring him to retake his Amateur Radio examinations prior to July 30, 1999, under the supervision of FCC personnel in Tampa, Florida. According to FCC Attorney Riley Hollingsworth, K4ZDH, Dale failed to appear for reexamination, and his license was consequently canceled. Hollingsworth also warned Dale about continued operation of radio transmitting equipment.

At:
http://www.arrl.org/news/stories/1999/08/11/2/

Now, the "Miracle"

TAMPA, FL [UPDATE]: The FCC notified General licensee James W. Dale, KE4TEW, on September 28, 1999, that it was reinstating his Amateur Radio license with a short-term renewal date of September 29, 2000. Dale had failed to appear for reexamination after being notified by the FCC on

June 18 to retake his Amateur Radio examinations prior to July 30, and his license was canceled on August 3, 1999. FCC Legal Adviser for Enforcement Riley Hollingsworth said the FCC has "since reviewed and accepted" Dale's detailed response and his explanation for failing to appear for retesting. Hollingsworth said the FCC was reinstating Dale's General license "pursuant to our agreement with you," but the FCC letter did not elaborate. Hollingsworth told Dale that if there are "no valid complaints about your use of Amateur Radio" over the next year, he may apply for a routine license renewal at the end of his current term.

At:
http://www.arrl.org/news/stories/1999/10/07/5/

Thus, KE4TEW, a convicted felon who jammed HF frequencies for years while id'ing, did not show up for a retest. Why? That's easy. He paid for his license. Then Riley does what he has done with the others who did not show up, he cancels the license. Good Riddance to this nuisance. Then almost two months later, Riley reinstates the license, WITHOUT THE ORIGINAL RETEST!!!! "Pursuant to our agreement with you" What the hell does that mean?? In other words, even though we know you are not qualified to be on the air, go ahead anyway???? What the hell kind of enforcement is this? It's biased enforcement, Riley's trademark style. So what was the agreement? Harass people on the Internet 24/7? Continue to jam the Liberty Net? Is he paying Riley a monthly fee to be on Amateur Radio? Riley's little slush fund. Did TEW give Riley a large amount of illicit drugs? What was it that made Riley reinstate this known drug dealers ticket that was fraudulent in the first place? Maybe Riley does Rita on weekends?

If you are wondering what kind of ethics violation Riley committed in granting TEW's ticket back under the table contact the Inspector General of the FCC as several already have. Ask Mr. Feaster to add your name to the ethics probe of the KE4TEW case. Then one day you too will know how to bribe an FCC official and make him make unethical decisions on your behalf.

Feaster, H Walker III OIG (202) 418-0476

or wfeaster@fcc.gov

2472. KE4TEW and his good friend Riley

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-11 15:28:28 UTC
From: bob <bob@bob.com>
Message-ID: <yd7sb.601$jA6.117@bignews6.bellsouth.net>
Source record: 82045
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.swap,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

So how much pot did KE4TEW give Riley to get his license back?

Read below, if you can read.

TAMPA, FL: The FCC has requested that General class licensee James W. Dale, KE4TEW, retake the General class examination elements under the supervision of FCC personnel by July 30, 1999, or his license will be canceled.

At:

http://www.arrl.org/news/stories/1999/06/23/1/

TAMPA, FL [UPDATE]: The FCC notified James W. Dale, formerly KE4TEW, on August 3, 1999, canceling his General Amateur Radio license. The FCC had notified Dale on June 18, 1999, requiring him to retake his Amateur Radio examinations prior to July 30, 1999, under the supervision of FCC personnel in Tampa, Florida. According to FCC Attorney Riley Hollingsworth, K4ZDH, Dale failed to appear for reexamination, and his license was consequently canceled. Hollingsworth also warned Dale about continued operation of radio transmitting equipment.

At:
http://www.arrl.org/news/stories/1999/08/11/2/

Now, the "Miracle"

TAMPA, FL [UPDATE]: The FCC notified General licensee James W. Dale, KE4TEW, on September 28, 1999, that it was reinstating his Amateur Radio license with a short-term renewal date of September 29, 2000. Dale had failed to appear for reexamination after being notified by the FCC on June 18 to retake his Amateur Radio examinations prior to July 30, and his license was canceled on August 3, 1999. FCC Legal Adviser for Enforcement Riley Hollingsworth said the FCC has "since reviewed and accepted" Dale's detailed response and his explanation for failing to appear for retesting. Hollingsworth said the FCC was reinstating Dale's General license "pursuant to our agreement with you," but the FCC letter did not elaborate. Hollingsworth told Dale that if there are "no valid complaints about your use of Amateur Radio" over the next year, he may apply for a routine license renewal at the end of his current term.

At:
http://www.arrl.org/news/stories/1999/10/07/5/

Thus, KE4TEW, a convicted felon who jammed HF frequencies for years while id'ing, did not show up for a retest. Why? That's easy. He paid for his license. Then Riley does what he has done with the others who did not show up, he cancels the license. Good Riddance to this nuisance. Then almost two months later, Riley reinstates the license, WITHOUT THE ORIGINAL RETEST!!!! "Pursuant to our agreement with you" What the hell does that mean?? In other words, even though we know you are not qualified to be on the air, go ahead anyway???? What the hell kind of enforcement is this? It's biased enforcement, Riley's trademark style. So what was the agreement? Harass people on the Internet 24/7? Continue to jam the Liberty Net? Is he paying Riley a monthly fee to be on Amateur Radio? Riley's little slush fund. Did TEW give Riley a large amount of illicit drugs? What was it that made Riley reinstate this known drug dealers ticket that was fraudulent in the first place? Maybe Riley does Rita on weekends?

If you are wondering what kind of ethics violation Riley committed in granting TEW's ticket back under the table contact the Inspector General of the FCC as several already have. Ask Mr. Feaster to add your name to the ethics probe of the KE4TEW case. Then one day you too will know how to bribe an FCC official and make him make unethical decisions on your behalf.

Feaster, H Walker III OIG (202) 418-0476

or wfeaster@fcc.gov

2473. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-11 15:54:02 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <uC7sb.23456$9M3.14168@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 82046

"Kim W5TIT" wrote:
>
> Now I see what you are doing. You are OVER reacting
> to any little thing just to try and hang on to whatever
> concept it is you have, Dwight. "Nationwide search?"
> That is hysterical! (snip)

Kim, at least try to think before posting. When you search for something on the internet, you're not exactly limiting your search to your hometown, now are you? The search is nation-wide, and even world-wide. Duh!

> It took me less than 2 minutes to "happen" to look last night
> while I was at Wal-Mart. Now, true, they are a nationwide
> outlet so you may have to travel the nation before you find
> one of those stores--but they had more than one choice of
> metal fans. So, don't know why you can't find 'em.

Please provide the names of those fans. I've searched Wal-Mart several times, and taken several of their fans apart, and they do not have an all metal fan. The motor is the most critical part since that is what wears out so quickly. In each of the fans I took apart, major internal parts (gears, bearings, motor mounts, and so on) were plastic, not metal. Of course, I don't expect much more than that from Wal-Mart. They sell cheap fans. But I even found similar materials in much more expensive fans at stores that specialize in products targeted towards business and industry.

> 'Scuse me? Surely you are basing the content of your
> opinions on at least *some* kind of facts that you've
> either experienced or heard, or whatever, over the course
> of your life. In fact, I bet I can find a comment you made
> to me in this thread that lends itself to not basing my
> opinions from out of thin air! (snip)

Do so, Kim. Show me where I've said anything of the sort to you (the actual message, not a quote you've taken out of context). While I've occasionally asked someone for details on something he or she claims to be fact, I don't believe I've ever asked anyone to provide facts to support an opinion.

> And, if you wish to be a proponent of something, it's
> nearly imperative that you be able to convince others
> why it's a good idea. Maybe that's why your ideas
> flop; and why the American people don't change things
> as they need to be changed.

I'm also not here to be a proponent of anything, Kim. When are you going to understand this is just a newsgroup, not a meeting of Congress? None of us have the power to change anything by simply posting to this newsgroup. Instead, we're simply discussing issues, comparing opinions, and perhaps getting a difference insight in the process.

> See Jim? Give a dog a bone and he buries it. When
> someone submits something contrary to the way Dwight
> wants everything to be--*without* substantiated
> concepts I might add--by *his* own admission--he
> suddenly gets short and impatient with others.

Hello? Where have I been short and impatient with anyone other than you, Kim? I stated what I believe to be bloody obvious - "short of setting up a dictatorship, you're never going to get even a significant portion of the 280 million people in this country to shop the way you want." I don't think Jim would disagree with that and you don't even address it in your response.

> So, as in real debate, let's bring this full-circle. You
> are stating that consumers--presumably *American*
> consumers--are too lazy and/or incapable of business
> or economic awareness to decide "smart" shopping
> decisions?! (snip)

No, that is not what I said, Kim. I said exactly what I meant - "consumers in general [and, since I'm a consumer, that would certainly include me] have neither the business awareness or economic awareness to make those types of decisions on their own." I'm certainly not aware of all the business activities and interactions of the many companies whose products I purchase. Likewise, I'm not fully aware of the economic policies and practices of this country or the countries we trade with. Such an awareness would require an army of employees and the financial resources of the government just to research. Court cases involving such issues, centering on just a single large company, have taken years to resolve.

> They sure do. And many do. We live in an information
> glut these days. If someone can't get information they
> are looking for, they need to ask someone how to find it-
> -because it's pretty much there and it's there fairly
> quickly.

Is that true, Kim? You said to ask someone. Okay, since you claim such information can be easily and quickly found, I'll ask you and put your claim to the test. I'm going shopping this morning to buy six products - Mary Jane Bread, Jiffy Pop Popcorn, Pam Cooking Spray, Brawney Napkins, and some screws and plywood from Home Depot (whatever brands they carry). Please provide me with information about each of these products, the companies, and the overall industries, involved. This should include all information needed to be a truly informed, "concerned," shopper - manufacturing processes, product safety, environmental issues, financial information, ties with other companies both here and overseas, markets, details and backgrounds of owners and senior management, employee composition, and so on. Since the information is so easily and quickly found, this shouldn't take you more

than a few minutes (with the results posted here today). When you're finished with that, then you can start on this evening's shopping lists - my wife is going grocery shopping for a few dozen products and we're both later going to the mall for another half dozen or so products.

> Oh OK. It's always going to be the corporate entity's fault.
> Now, speak of liberal slinging...

Did you suddenly lose the ability to comprehend what you've read, Kim? I clearly said, "Business has _SOME_ responsibility in all this." Only you could read that as "It's always..." their "...fault."

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

2474. Re: Amateur Radio in the 21st Century?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-11 15:55:00 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0311110755.19b1774e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 82047

"Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<CSSrb.21969$9M3.11321@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> --
> ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½ 73, de Hans, K0HB
> --
> Help support youth involved in Amateur Radio.
> http://www.mnyarc.org
> http://www.k0bsa.org
> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote
>
> > In the early-to-mid 1970s, the Novice went through a period of quick
> > changes.
> > First, the FCC allowed folks who had been unlicensed for at least a year
> > to get
> > a Novice, regardless of prior licensure. This meant a ham could be a
> > Novice
> > forever - two years on, one year off, new callsign and license each time.
> > Again
> > the reason given was "too many dropouts".
>
> See my other post about "too many dropouts".

Will do.
>
> > Then the one-year-unlicensed requirement was dropped. And the reason given
> > was...
>
> > Finally the Novice was made 5 years renewable, like all the other license
> > classes of the time. That was more than a quarter century ago.
>
> You're right, Jim, it was more than a quarter century ago. And over a
> quarter century ago FCC thought that 13 and 20 WPM code tests were a good
> idea, and a no-code license was a bad idea.

And a lot of other things, like secret tests given by FCC examiners,
extreme limits on vanity calls and repeaters, yada yada yada.

> Seems FCC no longer holds those
> views, so I think we can safely ignore your argument about what they thought
> back then on this matter also.
>
That's one way to look at it.

Another way to look at it is to note that since that time, FCC has
consistently made it *easier* and *more convenient* to get and keep an

amateur radio license - of *any* class. As long as said changes mean less work for FCC, that is.

That's been a consistent policy from then to now. Forced upgrading would go against that tide.

One thing I'm not clear on, though. If an LP reached the end of the 10 years but couldn't pass the upgrade test, could they take the LP test and get another 10 years (as with driver's license LPs) or is it one-LP-to-a-customer, as the old Novice was?

> Do YOU think learners permits ought to be renewable beyond 10 years?

I think *all* amateur licenses are essentially "permits to learn". And I think *all* classes of amateur license should be renewable. Just my opinion.

If your proposed LP is going to allow all authorized modes on all authorized freqs from 1.8 MHz on up, it's going to need a rather considerable written test, doncha think? The power limit removes the need for lots of RF exposure and other safety questions, and the VE stuff, but what about almost all the rest?

73 de Jim, N2EY

2475. Re: KE4TEW and his good friend Riley

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-11 16:32:35 UTC
From: Ken Bessler <kg0wxIHATESPAM@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bor2ut$1heaiv$1@ID-213023.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 82048
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.swap,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

"bob" <bob@bob.com> wrote in message
news:yd7sb.601$jA6.117@bignews6.bellsouth.net...
> So how much pot did KE4TEW give Riley to get his license back?
>
> Read below, if you can read.

Ahhh.... new news rule #27: If the subject line contains

"KE4TEW"

Delete it.....

Also, another idiot for the killfile.....

PLONK.

2476. Re: KE4TEW and his good friend Riley

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-11 16:43:37 UTC
From: bob <bob@bob.com>
Message-ID: <%j8sb.1980$jA6.1262@bignews6.bellsouth.net>
Source record: 82049
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.swap,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

Ken Bessler wrote:

So how much pot did KE4TEW give Riley to get his license back?

Read below, if you can read.

TAMPA, FL: The FCC has requested that General class licensee James W. Dale, KE4TEW, retake the General class examination elements under the supervision of FCC personnel by July 30, 1999, or his license will be canceled.

At:

http://www.arrl.org/news/stories/1999/06/23/1/

TAMPA, FL [UPDATE]: The FCC notified James W. Dale, formerly KE4TEW, on August 3, 1999, canceling his General Amateur Radio license. The FCC had notified Dale on June 18, 1999, requiring him to retake his Amateur Radio examinations prior to July 30, 1999, under the supervision of FCC personnel in Tampa, Florida. According to FCC Attorney Riley Hollingsworth, K4ZDH, Dale failed to appear for reexamination, and his license was consequently canceled. Hollingsworth also warned Dale about continued operation of radio transmitting equipment.

At:
http://www.arrl.org/news/stories/1999/08/11/2/

Now, the "Miracle"

TAMPA, FL [UPDATE]: The FCC notified General licensee James W. Dale, KE4TEW, on September 28, 1999, that it was reinstating his Amateur Radio license with a short-term renewal date of September 29, 2000. Dale had failed to appear for reexamination after being notified by the FCC on June 18 to retake his Amateur Radio examinations prior to July 30, and his license was canceled on August 3, 1999. FCC Legal Adviser for Enforcement Riley Hollingsworth said the FCC has "since reviewed and accepted" Dale's detailed response and his explanation for failing to appear for retesting. Hollingsworth said the FCC was reinstating Dale's General license "pursuant to our agreement with you," but the FCC letter did not elaborate. Hollingsworth told Dale that if there are "no valid complaints about your use of Amateur Radio" over the next year, he may apply for a routine license renewal at the end of his current term.

At:
http://www.arrl.org/news/stories/1999/10/07/5/

Thus, KE4TEW, a convicted felon who jammed HF frequencies for years while id'ing, did not show up for a retest. Why? That's easy. He paid for his license. Then Riley does what he has done with the others who did not show up, he cancels the license. Good Riddance to this nuisance. Then almost two months later, Riley reinstates the license, WITHOUT THE ORIGINAL RETEST!!!! "Pursuant to our agreement with you" What the hell does that mean?? In other words, even though we know you are not qualified to be on the air, go ahead anyway???? What the hell kind of enforcement is this? It's biased enforcement, Riley's trademark style. So what was the agreement? Harass people on the Internet 24/7? Continue to jam the Liberty Net? Is he paying Riley a monthly fee to be on Amateur Radio? Riley's little slush fund. Did TEW give Riley a large amount of illicit drugs? What was it that made Riley reinstate this known drug dealers ticket that was fraudulent in the first place? Maybe Riley does Rita on weekends?

If you are wondering what kind of ethics violation Riley committed in granting TEW's ticket back under the table contact the Inspector General of the FCC as several already have. Ask Mr. Feaster to add your name to the ethics probe of the KE4TEW case. Then one day you too will know how to bribe an FCC official and make him make unethical decisions on your behalf.

Feaster, H Walker III OIG (202) 418-0476

or wfeaster@fcc.gov

2477. Re: Amateur Radio in the 21st Century?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-11 16:46:27 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <Dn8sb.23517$9M3.15013@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 82050

"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote

> One thing I'm not clear on, though. If an LP reached the end of the 10
> years but couldn't pass the upgrade test, could they take the LP test
> and get another 10 years (as with driver's license LPs) or is it
> one-LP-to-a-customer, as the old Novice was?

One to a customer. If you can't "get it" in 10 years, then you probably
aren't going to be able to "get it" in 20 or 30 years.

BTW, drivers license permits are not renewable here, although you can retest
for a new one.

73, de Hans, K0HB

2478. Re: Happy Veterans Day

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-11 16:55:01 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <Fv8sb.21444$Oo4.5676@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 82151

"Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in message
news:Yh5sb.5908$B9.1453291@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net...
> "Steve Robeson, K4CAP" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:5c01b95b.0311110440.714cb88c@posting.google.com...
> > May this day find you and yours safe, and may the Grace of God bring
> > our Brothers and Sisters-in-arms home safely soon.
> >
> > Semper Fidelis
> >
> > 73
> >
> > Steve Robeson, LPN
> > GySgt USMC(ret'd)
>
> Ditto and a very grateful thanks you to all who've served and continue to
> serve with pride and distinction while protecting our nation's freedoms
and
> interests. I'll be taking Dad out to dinner tonight. (USN ret., WWII)
>
> 73 de Bert
> WA2SI
>
>

When you see a man or women in uniform, tell them thanks for their service.
It will go a long, long way.

I would have really enjoyed that in the sixties, I am sure it will mean a
lot to them.

Dan/W4NTI, Veteran USAF and USARMY

2479. Re: Happy Veterans Day

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-11 19:16:38 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <qAasb.23705$9M3.15277@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 82152

http://tinyurl.com/uksv

73, de Hans, K0HB
Master Chief Radioman, US Navy

2480. Re: Amateur Radio in the 21st Century?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-11 19:47:52 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0311111147.4eb3b9b@posting.google.com>
Source record: 82153

"Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<e0Orb.19764$Oo4.1653@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote
>
> > Let's say your idea catches on and the FCC enacts it pretty much as you
> > propose. And let's say the learner's permit (LP) license is popular,
> because it
> > gives lotsa choices for just a simple written test.
> >
> > Some folks will upgrade, of course. Some will drop out. The problem will
> be
> > with the third group - those who are active hams but who are satisfied
> with
> > their "LP" licenses. If the jump from "LP" to Extra is not trivial, and
> > requires some real learning (just like the old Novice-to-General written
> jump
> > did), you're gonna have active hams forced off the air at the end of their
> 10
> > year terms because they just won't be able to pass the Extra written. Or
> they
> > won't try, or they can't get to a VE session, yada yada yada.
>
> This is precisely why I suggest a 10-year term. Right from the get-go,
> these new hams know that they have 10 years to prepare to "re-enlist", and
> that it will require some real learning.

OK, fine. No surprises.

> If they can't cut it after a
> 10-year apprenticeship, then they weren't meant to be hams.

Try to sell *that* to the amateur community (including the FCC)!!

> The FCC didn't
> "stick to their guns" on the original Novice concept, and I lay that at the
> feet of the "entitlement" mentality of the 60s-70s.

I think you're just toying with us, Hans...;-)

FCC "stuck to their guns" for almost 25 years with the "no renewal, no
retake" Novice.

As for "entitlement mentality of the 60s-70s", those were the times
that gave us incentive licensing and significantly raised the
requirements (both code and written) for a full-privs license. In fact
the written requirements were raised more than the code....

But that's all ancient history. The main question is how you're gonna
sell the "up or out" concept to FCC and the amateur community.

>
> > And the cry will arise: "why are active hams with clean records being
> > forced
> > off the air?" Then you'll see history repeat itself, as the "LP" license
> > becomes renewable, just like the old Novice, to avoid losing those hams.
>
> This will sound cold, and the IOoDHW (International Order of Dismayed Hand
> Wringers) will convene a special session to condemn me, but who really CARES
> if we lose those learners-permit holders.

Those who don't want to see them leave the air and the ARS will care.
And if there are enough of them, they may simply outvote everyone
else.
>
> > Since the only difference between your two proposed classes
> > is the power level, there will be quite logical arguments that such
> > a system forces hams who don't want to run high power to "jump
> > through a written test hoop" to gain privilges they have no intention
> > of using.
>
> Sorry Jim, but you're waving the same old roadkill again.

How is that argument not valid?
>
> > Then there's the whole issue of the conversion of existing ham licenses to
> the
> > two new classes. How many will drop out rather than take the test?
>
> Read my proposal again, Jim. You'll see how I've completely avoided that
> problem.

I did and you did. Which means FCC will have to keep the existing
database going. It also sets up the unique situation where a new ham
faces a challenge/requirement that no existing ham has to face.
Somebody may holler 'discrimination'....
>
> As a closing note..... I really don't have a problem with a high dropout
> rate among newcomers. I'd be happy to see a million people "have a look at
> ham radio" and if just 20% stick around, well so be it. That would give us
> 200,000 new qualified hams. To the 800,000 who left, I say "I hope you had
> a good time, and it's been nice meeting you. Sorry this ham radio thing
> wasn't your bag." They're not "bad people" or "quitters" --- they just
> don't have the same interest in hobbies that you and I do.

OK, fine. The problem is, how you gonna get those million people to
take the look? We've had an easy-to-get nocodetest ham license for
12-1/2 years now, the old Novice for half a century, and we've gotten
maybe 30,000 new hams per year tops. (check AH0A stats on new
licenses).

In ten years that works out to maybe 300,000 "taking a look", not 1,000,000. If your 20% rate is correct, we'll see drastic reductions in the size of the ARS in the USA 10 years down the road as LPs expire. Is that a good thing?

Most of all, how you gonna sell the idea to the FCC and the rest of ham radio?

Perhaps you should send the ideas directly to FCC and see if you can get an RM number for it. I know you used it in a comment, but why not go for the RM? One more on top of the existing 14 won't hurt anything.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2481. Re: Amateur Radio in the 21st Century?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-11 20:02:38 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <yfbsb.23731$9M3.1252@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 82154

"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote

> I did and you did. Which means FCC will have to keep the existing
> database going. It also sets up the unique situation where a new ham
> faces a challenge/requirement that no existing ham has to face.
> Somebody may holler 'discrimination'....

Somebody is always hollering 'discrimination' --- BFD. Life's a bitch, and then you die and they give all your toys away.

It's clear that you don't like my "up or out" proposal, and it's clear that I'll not persuade you to like it, and it's **really** certain that you'll not persuade me to change it. Now all we're left doing is picking the fly shit out of the pepper pot. I don't play that non-productive game. Have a nice day.

73, de Hans, K0HB

2482. Re: Amateur Radio in the 21st Century?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-11 21:11:14 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <Sfcsb.23790$9M3.318@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 82155

N2EY Wrote:

> I doubt FCC would ever again enact a ham license that wasn't renewable.
> They dumped that feature of the old Novice more than a quarter century
> ago.

And I count that as one of largest mistakes the FCC ever made, even worse than dis-incentive licensing in 1968.

In my mind the non-renewable nature of the Novice license was the very reason ham radio still survives today. People were given an almost-free pass into the hobby, and they flocked in by the droves. If they liked it, they were forced to qualify for a real license or hit the bricks. I know that notion spins you up big time, something about "we can't afford to lose them", but frankly my dear, we never had them in the first place if they couldn't manage to take the next baby step up to General/Conditional/Technician. (When Technician meant "technician", not "beginner".)

73, de Hans, K0HB

2483. Re: Why We Freeband

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-11 23:38:11 UTC
From: keyclownzmustgo@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <17b206c0.0311111538.1bb3e8f4@posting.google.com>
Source record: 82159
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.swap

jim 3carroll@optonline.net
I dont know the
>Its human nature to nonconform especially
>concerning something as trivial as this.

You are an assclown.

2484. Re: KE4TEW and his good friend Riley

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-11 23:56:02 UTC
From: Roger <NoEmail@AnonlymousRemailer.co>
Message-ID: <borsuj$p5a$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 82160
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.swap,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

"bob" <bob@bob.com> wrote in message
news:%j8sb.1980$jA6.1262@bignews6.bellsouth.net...

Ken Bessler wrote:

So how much pot did KE4TEW give Riley to get his license back?

Read below, if you can read.

TAMPA, FL: The FCC has requested that General class licensee James W.
Dale, KE4TEW, retake the General class examination elements under the
supervision of FCC personnel by July 30, 1999, or his license will be
canceled.

At:

http://www.arrl.org/news/stories/1999/06/23/1/

TAMPA, FL [UPDATE]: The FCC notified James W. Dale, formerly KE4TEW, on
August 3, 1999, canceling his General Amateur Radio license. The FCC had
notified Dale on June 18, 1999, requiring him to retake his Amateur
Radio examinations prior to July 30, 1999, under the supervision of FCC
personnel in Tampa, Florida. According to FCC Attorney Riley
Hollingsworth, K4ZDH, Dale failed to appear for reexamination, and his
license was consequently canceled. Hollingsworth also warned Dale about
continued operation of radio transmitting equipment.

At:
http://www.arrl.org/news/stories/1999/08/11/2/

Now, the "Miracle"

TAMPA, FL [UPDATE]: The FCC notified General licensee James W. Dale,
KE4TEW, on September 28, 1999, that it was reinstating his Amateur Radio
license with a short-term renewal date of September 29, 2000. Dale had
failed to appear for reexamination after being notified by the FCC on
June 18 to retake his Amateur Radio examinations prior to July 30, and
his license was canceled on August 3, 1999. FCC Legal Adviser for
Enforcement Riley Hollingsworth said the FCC has "since reviewed and
accepted" Dale's detailed response and his explanation for failing to
appear for retesting. Hollingsworth said the FCC was reinstating Dale's
General license "pursuant to our agreement with you," but the FCC letter
did not elaborate. Hollingsworth told Dale that if there are "no valid
complaints about your use of Amateur Radio" over the next year, he may

apply for a routine license renewal at the end of his current term.

At:
http://www.arrl.org/news/stories/1999/10/07/5/

Thus, KE4TEW, a convicted felon who jammed HF frequencies for years while id'ing, did not show up for a retest. Why? That's easy. He paid for his license. Then Riley does what he has done with the others who did not show up, he cancels the license. Good Riddance to this nuisance. Then almost two months later, Riley reinstates the license, WITHOUT THE ORIGINAL RETEST!!!! "Pursuant to our agreement with you" What the hell does that mean?? In other words, even though we know you are not qualified to be on the air, go ahead anyway???? What the hell kind of enforcement is this? It's biased enforcement, Riley's trademark style. So what was the agreement? Harass people on the Internet 24/7? Continue to jam the Liberty Net? Is he paying Riley a monthly fee to be on Amateur Radio? Riley's little slush fund. Did TEW give Riley a large amount of illicit drugs? What was it that made Riley reinstate this known drug dealers ticket that was fraudulent in the first place? Maybe Riley does Rita on weekends?

If you are wondering what kind of ethics violation Riley committed in granting TEW's ticket back under the table contact the Inspector General of the FCC as several already have. Ask Mr. Feaster to add your name to the ethics probe of the KE4TEW case. Then one day you too will know how to bribe an FCC official and make him make unethical decisions on your behalf.

Feaster, H Walker III OIG (202) 418-0476

or wfeaster@fcc.gov

.....

...and the stalking continues.

2485. Re: Don't Apply this package from the Microsoft

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-12 00:16:34 UTC
From: Ron Andrews <randrew1@rochesterDOTrr.com>
Message-ID: <CZesb.67616$ji3.5375@twister.nyroc.rr.com>
Source record: 82161
Cross-posted to: rec.music.makers.marketplace,rec.pets.dogs.health,rec.pets.dogs.misc,rec.photo.equipment.35mm,rec.photo.equipment.large-format,rec.photo.equipment.medium-format,rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.swap

This warning is probably superfluous, but just in case someone has been living in a cave for the past few weeks, these messages are not from Microsoft and they contain viruses

--
Ron Andrews
http://members.hostedscripts.com/antispam.html

2486. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-12 00:32:31 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <zcfsb.9188$P%1.8310788@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 82162

"Ryan, KC8PMX" <REMOVETHISkc8pmx@diamondcs.net> wrote in message
news:borq9m$1gm7n3$6@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de...
> Yeah..... that may be true but circumstances now have forced many to
suffer
> with it as a "living" wage.
>

Yeah that's the same "victim" argument some of my friends made when I went to college and they didn't. But I sacrificed to go to college. My parents didn't pay for it.

I worked a minimum wage job, lived at home, did not buy a car, did not buy records and so on. I put the money aside and did without so I could go to college. So that "circumstances" argument is pretty shakey. And don't try the "pregnant and alone teenager" argument either. I knew some of them in college and they made it too.

People allow themselves to fail and become victims of circumstance.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

>
> --
> Ryan KC8PMX
>
> Why is it one careless match can start a forest fire, but
> it takes a whole box to start a barbecue?
>
> "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
> news:4xXqb.8184$P%1.7333810@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
> >
> > "Ryan, KC8PMX" <REMOVETHISkc8pmx@diamondcs.net> wrote in message
> > news:boh9mn$1f99e9$5@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de...
> > >
> > > The
> > > average wage around here, what is considered the alleged "living" or
> > minimum
> > > wage is between $5.25-6.00 per hour.
> >
> > Keep in mind that the minimum wage was NEVER intended to be a "living"
> wage.
> >
> > Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
> >
>
>

2487. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-12 00:39:52 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <sjfsb.9190$P%1.8312401@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 82164

"Ryan, KC8PMX" <REMOVETHISkc8pmx@diamondcs.net> wrote in message
news:borq9n$1gm7n3$7@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de...
> Dee,
>
> You must be living in a "fairy tale" world if yo believe this to be still
> true. It is a simple fact that there is not the same type of jobs
available
> that were around in the 1965-1980's range of time. The changes in the
> employment economy and shifts in employment trends are why. Take GM for
> instance..... At least up here in the Tri- Cities and Flint, GM is
> constantly cutting back, and even closing plants, not the opposite. Hell,
> locally speaking, Dow Chemical and Dow Corning also have cut more than
half
> their workforce in the past 15 years or so.
>

Economies, markets and jobs are always changing. This is nothing new. A lot of us have had to change with them, rebuild our skills and move to not only different jobs but different locations in the country to stay employed.

I've faced and made some hard economic choices in my life and did not and do not expect the government to fix it for me or the world to stay static. Security is and always has been an illusion. I've faced that a long time ago and dealt with it.

> Construction jobs around here suck, unless you hold "paper" you are
nothing
> and still making the under 8 dollar an hour range wage, before taxes. I
can
> bring up more examples if you want referring to my area if ya want.
>
>

So if they suck, why don't the people go elsewhere. People have traditionally followed the job markets to get ahead. You can't make the market come to you. That is an unrealistic fairy tail and illusion.

By the way, check the tax tables. Someone making $8 per hour or under and has a family probably won't be paying any significant income taxes unless their spouse is also working but even then their tax burden is still minimal.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

2488. Re: Happy Veterans Day

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-12 00:41:58 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <qlfsb.21922$Oo4.21721@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 82163

Enlightning Hans.

Dan/W4NTI

"K&#65533;HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:qAasb.23705$9M3.15277@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> http://tinyurl.com/uksv
>
> 73, de Hans, K0HB
> Master Chief Radioman, US Navy
>
>
>
>

2489. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-12 00:43:16 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <Emfsb.9191$P%1.8313006@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 82165

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:PL3sb.23083$9M3.22571@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net...
>
> "Dee D. Flint" wrote:
> >
> > Let me make this as plain as possible. (snip)
>
>
> You explained it just fine in the last message. I just don't agree
> subsidies alone were the deciding factors - I suspect tariffs played a
much
> bigger role than you suggest.
>
>

Well I go by what the auto industry journals said at the time since they
were circulated around the workplace. I give more credence to those
analysts than I would my personal opinions as they had the actual data.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

2490. Re: KE4TEW and his good friend Riley

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-12 00:45:13 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <tofsb.21928$Oo4.1062@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 82166
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.swap,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

What the hell is wrong with you people? You don't even know Jim, KE4TEW.
You listen to the made up bullshit from ten years ago, and continue to
demean him. What the hell is wrong with you people?

This is not ham radio. Hell it's not even CB. It is just plain vicious
slander.

Dan/W4NTI

"Roger" <NoEmail@AnonlymousRemailer.co> wrote in message
news:borsuj$p5a$0@pita.alt.net...
>
> "bob" <bob@bob.com> wrote in message
> news:%j8sb.1980$jA6.1262@bignews6.bellsouth.net...
>
>
> Ken Bessler wrote:
>
>
> So how much pot did KE4TEW give Riley to get his license back?
>
> Read below, if you can read.
>
>
> TAMPA, FL: The FCC has requested that General class licensee James W.
> Dale, KE4TEW, retake the General class examination elements under the
> supervision of FCC personnel by July 30, 1999, or his license will be
> canceled.
>
> At:
>
> http://www.arrl.org/news/stories/1999/06/23/1/
>
> ---
>
> TAMPA, FL [UPDATE]: The FCC notified James W. Dale, formerly KE4TEW, on
> August 3, 1999, canceling his General Amateur Radio license. The FCC had
> notified Dale on June 18, 1999, requiring him to retake his Amateur
> Radio examinations prior to July 30, 1999, under the supervision of FCC
> personnel in Tampa, Florida. According to FCC Attorney Riley
> Hollingsworth, K4ZDH, Dale failed to appear for reexamination, and his
> license was consequently canceled. Hollingsworth also warned Dale about
> continued operation of radio transmitting equipment.
>

> At:
> http://www.arrl.org/news/stories/1999/08/11/2/
> ---
--
>
> Now, the "Miracle"
>
> TAMPA, FL [UPDATE]: The FCC notified General licensee James W. Dale,
> KE4TEW, on September 28, 1999, that it was reinstating his Amateur Radio
> license with a short-term renewal date of September 29, 2000. Dale had
> failed to appear for reexamination after being notified by the FCC on
> June 18 to retake his Amateur Radio examinations prior to July 30, and
> his license was canceled on August 3, 1999. FCC Legal Adviser for
> Enforcement Riley Hollingsworth said the FCC has "since reviewed and
> accepted" Dale's detailed response and his explanation for failing to
> appear for retesting. Hollingsworth said the FCC was reinstating Dale's
> General license "pursuant to our agreement with you," but the FCC letter
> did not elaborate. Hollingsworth told Dale that if there are "no valid
> complaints about your use of Amateur Radio" over the next year, he may
> apply for a routine license renewal at the end of his current term.
>
> At:
> http://www.arrl.org/news/stories/1999/10/07/5/
>
> ---
-
> Thus, KE4TEW, a convicted felon who jammed HF frequencies for years
> while id'ing, did not show up for a retest. Why? That's easy. He paid
> for his license. Then Riley does what he has done with the others who
> did not show up, he cancels the license. Good Riddance to this nuisance.
> Then almost two months later, Riley reinstates the license, WITHOUT THE
> ORIGINAL RETEST!!!! "Pursuant to our agreement with you" What the hell
> does that mean?? In other words, even though we know you are not
> qualified to be on the air, go ahead anyway???? What the hell kind of
> enforcement is this? It's biased enforcement, Riley's trademark style.
> So what was the agreement? Harass people on the Internet 24/7? Continue
> to jam the Liberty Net? Is he paying Riley a monthly fee to be on
> Amateur Radio? Riley's little slush fund. Did TEW give Riley a large
> amount of illicit drugs? What was it that made Riley reinstate this
> known drug dealers ticket that was fraudulent in the first place?
> Maybe Riley does Rita on weekends?
>
> If you are wondering what kind of ethics violation Riley committed in
> granting TEW's ticket back under the table contact the Inspector General
> of the FCC as several already have. Ask Mr. Feaster to add your name to
> the ethics probe of the KE4TEW case. Then one day you too will know how
> to bribe an FCC official and make him make unethical decisions on your
> behalf.
>
>

> Feaster, H Walker III OIG (202) 418-0476
>
> or wfeaster@fcc.gov
>
> ....
>
> ...and the stalking continues.
>
>

2491. Re: Why We Freeband

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-12 01:02:30 UTC
From: Randy <not-this-one@not-here.com>
Message-ID: <GEfsb.64286$KY1.50794@twister.austin.rr.com>
Source record: 82167
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.swap

"Citizens For A Keyclown-Free Newsgroup" <keyclownzmustgo@yahoo.com> wrote
in message news:17b206c0.0311111538.1bb3e8f4@posting.google.com...
> jim 3carroll@optonline.net
> I dont know the
> >Its human nature to nonconform especially
> >concerning something as trivial as this.
>
> You are an assclown.

And you are an assclown ranger. Really Doug, why don't you find a cause that matters? You spend your time here posting useless attacks and searching Google to find shit that matters to no one 'cept you. Why is it that you have no life? You think you bother folks here? All you really are is a punching bag for those of us that choose to reply to you, nothing more...nothing at all. You have no information in that is not available to anyone with Web access. Really man, with all your gay references and knowledge, think of the good you could do spouting all your information on some anti-aids or similar such website. Get a clue.

2492. Re: Why We Freeband

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-12 01:14:29 UTC
From: keyclownzmustgo@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <17b206c0.0311111714.64e4d3e0@posting.google.com>
Source record: 82168
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.swap

"Randy" not-this-one@not-here.com
>Date: Tue, Nov 11, 2003 5:02 PM
>Message-id: <GEfsb.64286$KY1.50794@twister.austin.rr.com>
>
>
>"Citizens For A Keyclown-Free Newsgroup" <keyclownzmustgo@yahoo.com> wrote
>in message news:17b206c0.0311111538.1bb3e8f4@posting.google.com...
>> jim 3carroll@optonline.net
>> >Its human nature to nonconform especially
>> >concerning something as trivial as this.
>>
>> You are an assclown.
>
>
>And you are an assclown ranger. Really Doug, why don't you find a cause
>that
>matters? You spend your time here posting useless attacks and searching
>Google to find shit that matters to no one 'cept you. Why is it that you
>have no life? You think you bother folks here? All you really are is a
>punching bag for those of us that choose to reply to you, nothing
>more...nothing at all. You have no information in that is not available
>to
>anyone with Web access. Really man, with all your gay references and
>knowledge, think of the good you could do spouting all your information
>on
>some anti-aids or similar such website. Get a clue.

Hey Chapwoman, take your keyqueen buddy "jam3carrotsinmyass"'s advice:

"Its human nature to nonconform especially
concerning something as trivial as this."

Go back to yer coke sniffing faggotry.

2493. Re: Why We Freeband

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-12 01:14:43 UTC
From: jim <3carroll@optonline.net>
Message-ID: <3FB18997.5020502@optonline.net>
Source record: 82169
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.swap

Randy wrote:
> "Citizens For A Keyclown-Free Newsgroup" <keyclownzmustgo@yahoo.com> wrote
> in message news:17b206c0.0311111538.1bb3e8f4@posting.google.com...
>
>>jim 3carroll@optonline.net
>>I dont know the
>>
>>>Its human nature to nonconform especially
>>>concerning something as trivial as this.
>>
>>You are an assclown.
>
>
>
> And you are an assclown ranger. Really Doug, why don't you find a cause that
> matters? You spend your time here posting useless attacks and searching
> Google to find shit that matters to no one 'cept you. Why is it that you
> have no life? You think you bother folks here? All you really are is a
> punching bag for those of us that choose to reply to you, nothing
> more...nothing at all. You have no information in that is not available to
> anyone with Web access. Really man, with all your gay references and
> knowledge, think of the good you could do spouting all your information on
> some anti-aids or similar such website. Get a clue.
>
>
exactally.....

2494. Re: KE4TEW and his good friend Riley

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-12 01:19:54 UTC
From: Eric <NoEmail@Anonuser.co>
Message-ID: <bos1rq$8dv$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 82170
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.swap,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:tofsb.21928$Oo4.1062@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
What the hell is wrong with you people? You don't even know Jim, KE4TEW.
You listen to the made up bullshit from ten years ago, and continue to
demean him. What the hell is wrong with you people?

This is not ham radio. Hell it's not even CB. It is just plain vicious
slander.

Dan/W4NTI

Dan. It's just more crap from Wogie Wussman and Dimmy O'Brainless.
What do you expect from the likes of them?

"Roger" <NoEmail@AnonlymousRemailer.co> wrote in message
news:borsuj$p5a$0@pita.alt.net...
>
> "bob" <bob@bob.com> wrote in message
> news:%j8sb.1980$jA6.1262@bignews6.bellsouth.net...
>
>
> Ken Bessler wrote:
>
>
> So how much pot did KE4TEW give Riley to get his license back?
>
> Read below, if you can read.
>
>
> TAMPA, FL: The FCC has requested that General class licensee James W.
> Dale, KE4TEW, retake the General class examination elements under the
> supervision of FCC personnel by July 30, 1999, or his license will be
> canceled.
>
> At:
>
> http://www.arrl.org/news/stories/1999/06/23/1/
>
> --
>
> TAMPA, FL [UPDATE]: The FCC notified James W. Dale, formerly KE4TEW, on
> August 3, 1999, canceling his General Amateur Radio license. The FCC had
> notified Dale on June 18, 1999, requiring him to retake his Amateur
> Radio examinations prior to July 30, 1999, under the supervision of FCC

> personnel in Tampa, Florida. According to FCC Attorney Riley
> Hollingsworth, K4ZDH, Dale failed to appear for reexamination, and his
> license was consequently canceled. Hollingsworth also warned Dale about
> continued operation of radio transmitting equipment.
>
> At:
> http://www.arrl.org/news/stories/1999/08/11/2/
> ---
--
>
> Now, the "Miracle"
>
> TAMPA, FL [UPDATE]: The FCC notified General licensee James W. Dale,
> KE4TEW, on September 28, 1999, that it was reinstating his Amateur Radio
> license with a short-term renewal date of September 29, 2000. Dale had
> failed to appear for reexamination after being notified by the FCC on
> June 18 to retake his Amateur Radio examinations prior to July 30, and
> his license was canceled on August 3, 1999. FCC Legal Adviser for
> Enforcement Riley Hollingsworth said the FCC has "since reviewed and
> accepted" Dale's detailed response and his explanation for failing to
> appear for retesting. Hollingsworth said the FCC was reinstating Dale's
> General license "pursuant to our agreement with you," but the FCC letter
> did not elaborate. Hollingsworth told Dale that if there are "no valid
> complaints about your use of Amateur Radio" over the next year, he may
> apply for a routine license renewal at the end of his current term.
>
> At:
> http://www.arrl.org/news/stories/1999/10/07/5/
>
> ---
-
> Thus, KE4TEW, a convicted felon who jammed HF frequencies for years
> while id'ing, did not show up for a retest. Why? That's easy. He paid
> for his license. Then Riley does what he has done with the others who
> did not show up, he cancels the license. Good Riddance to this nuisance.
> Then almost two months later, Riley reinstates the license, WITHOUT THE
> ORIGINAL RETEST!!!! "Pursuant to our agreement with you" What the hell
> does that mean?? In other words, even though we know you are not
> qualified to be on the air, go ahead anyway???? What the hell kind of
> enforcement is this? It's biased enforcement, Riley's trademark style.
> So what was the agreement? Harass people on the Internet 24/7? Continue
> to jam the Liberty Net? Is he paying Riley a monthly fee to be on
> Amateur Radio? Riley's little slush fund. Did TEW give Riley a large
> amount of illicit drugs? What was it that made Riley reinstate this
> known drug dealers ticket that was fraudulent in the first place?
> Maybe Riley does Rita on weekends?
>
> If you are wondering what kind of ethics violation Riley committed in
> granting TEW's ticket back under the table contact the Inspector General
> of the FCC as several already have. Ask Mr. Feaster to add your name to

> the ethics probe of the KE4TEW case. Then one day you too will know how
> to bribe an FCC official and make him make unethical decisions on your
> behalf.
>
>
> Feaster, H Walker III OIG (202) 418-0476
>
> or wfeaster@fcc.gov
>
> ....
>
> ...and the stalking continues.
>
>

2495. Re: Amateur Radio in the 21st Century?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-12 01:21:22 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031111202122.23307.00004313@mb-m29.aol.com>
Source record: 82171

In article <yfbsb.23731$9M3.1252@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> writes:

>"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote
>
>> I did and you did. Which means FCC will have to keep the existing
>> database going. It also sets up the unique situation where a new ham
>> faces a challenge/requirement that no existing ham has to face.
>> Somebody may holler 'discrimination'....
>
>Somebody is always hollering 'discrimination' --- BFD. Life's a bitch, and
>then you die and they give all your toys away.

Sometimes they're right to holler it, too.

>
>It's clear that you don't like my "up or out" proposal, and it's clear that
>I'll not persuade you to like it, and it's **really** certain that you'll
>not persuade me to change it.

Doesn't matter whether I like it or not. I got my Extra 33 years ago and there hasn't been a day since then that I couldn't pass the required tests to get another one if that were required.

I'm actually trying to help you refine it, Hans. Because the problem isn't hams like me, who would gladly retest every coupla years just to show we still got it. The problem is how you're gonna sell the idea to FCC and the rest of the ARS.

>Have a
>nice day.

You too, Hans. And think about sending that proposal to FCC for an RM number. Who knows - it might gain widespread support and I'd be dead wrong about it.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2496. Re: Amateur Radio in the 21st Century?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-12 01:21:23 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031111202123.23307.00004314@mb-m29.aol.com>
Source record: 82172

In article <Sfcsb.23790$9M3.318@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> writes:

>N2EY Wrote:
>
>> I doubt FCC would ever again enact a ham license that wasn't renewable.
>> They dumped that feature of the old Novice more than a quarter century
>> ago.
>
>And I count that as one of largest mistakes the FCC ever made, even worse
>than dis-incentive licensing in 1968.

How were the changes in 1968 a "dis-incentive"?

>
>In my mind the non-renewable nature of the Novice license was the very
>reason ham radio still survives today.

How so? That feature went away a quarter century ago.

>People were given an almost-free
>pass into the hobby, and they flocked in by the droves.

So 5 wpm code is an "almost-free pass"? I agree! ;-)

oh wait - back in those days we had to send *and* receive....

Plus a 25 question written that was mostly about the regs.

As for the droves, back in those days the number of Novices was about 15,000-18,000 per year.

>If they liked it,
>they were forced to qualify for a real license or hit the bricks.

You mean the Novice wasn't a real license? If so, then those Novices weren't real hams?

> I know
>that notion spins you up big time, something about "we can't afford to lose
>them", but frankly my dear, we never had them in the first place if they
>couldn't manage to take the next baby step up to
>General/Conditional/Technician. (When Technician meant "technician", not
>"beginner".)

I had one of those 2 year one-shot Novices. I got my Advanced (ahem) less than a year after passing the Novice. I was 14. Yer preachin' to the choir, Hans.

But ya still haven't told us how to sell your idea to the FCC and the rest of the ARS.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2497. Re: Amateur Radio in the 21st Century?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-12 01:21:24 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031111202124.23307.00004315@mb-m29.aol.com>
Source record: 82173

In article <Dn8sb.23517$9M3.15013@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> writes:

>"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote
>
>> One thing I'm not clear on, though. If an LP reached the end of the 10
>> years but couldn't pass the upgrade test, could they take the LP test
>> and get another 10 years (as with driver's license LPs) or is it
>> one-LP-to-a-customer, as the old Novice was?
>
>One to a customer.

Understood.

>If you can't "get it" in 10 years, then you probably
>aren't going to be able to "get it" in 20 or 30 years.

All depends what's going on in those 10 years.

I know plenty of hams who were quite active until something significant happened in their lives like military service, a major illness in the family, marriage, divorce, children, relocation, new career, etc. Then, in accordance with "The Amateur Is Balanced", they put amateur radio on hold for anywhere from months to decades. Then, when their lives permitted, they came back in a big way. A few let their licenses lapse, but most kept renewing and modifying.

Case in point: Amateur licensed in high school, got a bachelor's degree, worked a year or two, then decided to become a doctor. For the next 7 years his life was med school/residency/fellowship. Not a lot of time in there for ham radio, but he had an HT and kept in touch. And now he's an M.D. and hamming in a big way.

His 10 years as a ham hit somewhere towards the end of medical school. Under today's rules, he just renewed and kept on going. Under your proposal, he would have lost his license and had to go all the way to Extra in one go if he ever wanted to be a ham again.

Is that really what's best for the ARS?

>BTW, drivers license permits are not renewable here, although you can retest
>for a new one.

Same deal here, AFAIK. So why not the same deal for hams?

73 de Jim, N2EY

2498. Re: Best Alternative to eBay for banned 10 meter gear

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-12 01:22:04 UTC
From: N8WWM <N8WWM@home.nut>
Message-ID: <bos1vs0102a@drn.newsguy.com>
Source record: 82174
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

In article <17b206c0.0311111700.2aefb9e8@posting.google.com>, Citizens For A Keyclown-Free Newsgroup says...
>
>dream@alumni.utexas.net (Darren418) wrote in message
>news:<f9c1c3e6.0311102301.5ea53166@posting.google.com>...
>> I emailed eBay and they
>> basically said the HR2600 has been deemed by
>> the FCC to be an illegal
>> radio since it's used frequently for out-of-band pirate operation.
>
>It's pirates, freebanders and keyclowns who are responsible for the
>"ban" in the first place, yet they are the ones who bitch the loudest
>about the "unfair" eBay and FCC.
>
I only jammed a few repeaters and people got their panties all in a bunch.
What's so bad about freebanding anyway?

2499. Re: Why We Freeband

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-12 02:00:19 UTC
From: Randy <not-this-one@not-here.com>
Message-ID: <Tugsb.29861$Mc.4487@twister.austin.rr.com>
Source record: 82175
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.swap

"Citizens For A Keyclown-Free Newsgroup" <keyclownzmustgo@yahoo.com> wrote
in message news:17b206c0.0311111714.64e4d3e0@posting.google.com...
> "Randy" not-this-one@not-here.com
> >Date: Tue, Nov 11, 2003 5:02 PM
> >Message-id: <GEfsb.64286$KY1.50794@twister.austin.rr.com>
> >
> >
> >"Citizens For A Keyclown-Free Newsgroup" <keyclownzmustgo@yahoo.com>
wrote
> >in message news:17b206c0.0311111538.1bb3e8f4@posting.google.com...
> >> jim 3carroll@optonline.net
> >> >Its human nature to nonconform especially
> >> >concerning something as trivial as this.
> >>
> >> You are an assclown.
> >
> >
> >And you are an assclown ranger. Really Doug, why don't you find a cause
> >that
> >matters? You spend your time here posting useless attacks and searching
> >Google to find shit that matters to no one 'cept you. Why is it that you
> >have no life? You think you bother folks here? All you really are is a
> >punching bag for those of us that choose to reply to you, nothing
> >more...nothing at all. You have no information in that is not available
> >to
> >anyone with Web access. Really man, with all your gay references and
> >knowledge, think of the good you could do spouting all your information
> >on
> >some anti-aids or similar such website. Get a clue.
>
> Hey Chapwoman, take your keyqueen buddy "jam3carrotsinmyass"'s advice:
>
> "Its human nature to nonconform especially
> concerning something as trivial as this."
>
> Go back to yer coke sniffing faggotry.

My God! Cut me to the quick why don't 'cha!

Still, the question remains, have you found yourself? And I don't mean your
little thingy. Have you found a cause that matters?

2500. Re: Amateur Radio in the 21st Century?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-12 02:39:27 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <z3hsb.24228$9M3.9390@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 82176

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote

> You mean the Novice wasn't a real license? If so, then those Novices
weren't
> real hams?

Leading question noted. And dismissed without response.

> But ya still haven't told us how to sell your idea to the FCC and the rest
of
> the ARS.

Since you've expressed nothing but disdain for the idea, you wouldn't sell
it to the FCC even if I told you how, so the best advice I can give you is
"hide and watch".

73, de Hans, K0HB

2501. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-12 02:49:10 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <Gchsb.22700$KN4.1728051@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 82177

Dwight Stewart wrote:
> "Mike Coslo" wrote:
>
>>In 1972, my $2.40 per hour kept me in an apartment,
>>food, clothing, and even allowed me to buy a motorcycle.
>>That was .20 above the minimum wage.
>
>
>
> Yep, that sounds right. You know, thinking back, I believe I was actually
> happier back then. I didn't have much, but I don't remember feeling anything
> was missing in my life. Perhaps I'm getting too old to remember things back
> then clearly. Maybe I'll start a late mid-life crisis and go looking for
> those youthful days again. I remember this one girl...

I don't know if I was happier then, but I was having a blast.

As for a mid-life crisis, remember you worked hard for it, you deserve
it, and no one is going to deprive you of it! 8^)

I hear the MLC car of choice is a BMW Z3. Almost makes me want to have
one so I can pick one up.

- Mike KB3EIA -

2502. Re: Amateur Radio in the 21st Century?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-12 02:52:12 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <wfhsb.24238$9M3.13334@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 82178

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote

> Doesn't matter whether I like it or not.

Correct.

> I got my Extra 33 years ago

Didn't know we were running a seniority contest here, but if we are you lose
by 7 years.

> ...and there hasn't been a day since then that I couldn't pass
> the required tests to get another one if that were required.

The point being? I'd expect that's true of most licensees.

> I'm actually trying to help you refine it, Hans.

It's already refined, thank you very much.

> The problem is how you're gonna sell the idea to FCC and the rest of the
> ARS.

At least it's a problem in **your** mind, but you don't count. The FCC
counts.

> And think about sending that proposal to FCC for an RM number.
> Who knows - it might gain widespread support and I'd be dead wrong about
it.

You are dead wrong about it, and it doesn't need "widespread support", just
the support of FCC.

2503. Re: Houston, we have a solution

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-12 02:57:06 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <6khsb.8103$gG7.4744@news01.roc.ny>
Source record: 82179
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Hans,

I thought everyone used electrical tape :)

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA
(ok, ok ... duct tape too)

"K�HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:vvSrb.21917$9M3.14159@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> N2EY and others may enjoy this URL.
>
> http://tinyurl.com/ue35
>
> --
> ��� 73, de Hans, K0HB
> Grand Exhalted Sniffer of the Fumes of Solder
>
>
>
>

2504. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-12 03:08:13 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bos8qr$fpb@library2.airnews.net>
Source record: 82180

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:uC7sb.23456$9M3.14168@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net...
>
> Is that true, Kim? You said to ask someone. Okay, since you claim such
> information can be easily and quickly found, I'll ask you and put your
claim
> to the test. I'm going shopping this morning to buy six products - Mary
Jane
> Bread, Jiffy Pop Popcorn, Pam Cooking Spray, Brawney Napkins, and some
> screws and plywood from Home Depot (whatever brands they carry). Please
> provide me with information about each of these products, the companies,
and
> the overall industries, involved. This should include all information
needed
> to be a truly informed, "concerned," shopper - manufacturing processes,
> product safety, environmental issues, financial information, ties with
other
> companies both here and overseas, markets, details and backgrounds of
owners
> and senior management, employee composition, and so on. Since the
> information is so easily and quickly found, this shouldn't take you more
> than a few minutes (with the results posted here today). When you're
> finished with that, then you can start on this evening's shopping lists -
my
> wife is going grocery shopping for a few dozen products and we're both
later
> going to the mall for another half dozen or so products.
>

Nope. Do it yourself. I've told you the information is there to be
had--and it's that simple. People get paid good money to do what you're
asking me to do, above. If you do it, Dwight, maybe you'll have some facts
behind your opinions...

Kim W5TIT

>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
>
>

2505. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-12 03:10:26 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bos8qs$fpb@library2.airnews.net>
Source record: 82181

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:Emfsb.9191$P%1.8313006@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
>
> "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
> news:PL3sb.23083$9M3.22571@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> >
> > "Dee D. Flint" wrote:
> > >
> > > Let me make this as plain as possible. (snip)
> >
> >
> > You explained it just fine in the last message. I just don't agree
> > subsidies alone were the deciding factors - I suspect tariffs played a
> much
> > bigger role than you suggest.
> >
> >
>
> Well I go by what the auto industry journals said at the time since they
> were circulated around the workplace. I give more credence to those
> analysts than I would my personal opinions as they had the actual data.
>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>

Quite simply, it's easy to live in an alternate reality when one goes around
"just not agreeing" with things that are staring them in the face... I used
to do it, but I grew up...

Kim W5TIT

2506. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-12 03:29:38 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031111222938.02537.00001529@mb-m23.aol.com>
Source record: 82183

In article <boh9mn$1f99e9$5@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>, "Ryan, KC8PMX"
<REMOVETHISkc8pmx@diamondcs.net> writes:

>"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
>news:c2356669.0311051600.62fc767f@posting.google.com...
>> "Ryan, KC8PMX" <REMOVETHISkc8pmx@diamondcs.net> wrote in message
>news:<bo8co9$1aok9h$5@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>...
>> > But its perfectly okay to pay some union bum a ton of wages for doing a
>> > repetitive task, (a skill that same 14 y.o. that passed a ham test
>could
>> > do) therefore jacking the cost of a product, lets say a car for this
>> > example, to a ridiculous price??? (actually both the fast food worker
>and
>> > the person on the line at the factory ARE BOTH doing repetitive
>tasks....)
>>
>> Hold on a sec....
>>
>> "union bum"?
>
>Yep... there are a ton of them in this state..... collect a "phat" wage ($20
>per hour or more) for a job a kid could do, brag about only working 2 of the
>8 hours in a shift, and admit to stealing and other fraudulant
>practices..... .yeah, those are bums... Not all union workers are bums, but
>there are alot that are.

Then they're bums, pure and simple - not "union bums".

As for "a job a kid could do", rest assured that if some employers could use
child labor, they would - and pay 'em less than minimum wage, too.

>> The basic concept that Dwight is talking about is a "living wage" -
>> meaning jobs that pay enough in wages and benefits to permit people to
>> live above the poverty line *without* government help. Yes, paying a
>> living wage makes products and services cost more, but it also removes
>> people from the govt. support system.
>
>So.... basically, one way or another people have to pay for it, be it in
>higher service/product costs or paying in taxes for a government program.

Sure. But which is more efficient economically - private industry or the govt.
programs?
>
>> Some say "the marketplace" should set wages. But "the marketplace" is
>> tilted by a bunch of factors, such as the exportation of jobs and the
>> importation of workers.

>
>Yes, that is what is called an idealism, but in reality it doesn't work that
>way. Let's look at my county for example..... Republican owners of
>businesses and places to rent charge considerably higher for products,
>services and housing. These are also in most of the cases the employers in
>the area. For example, on average, a single bedroom apartment cannot be
>found for less than $350-400. That does not even include utilities.

That's actually quite inexpensive compared to a lot of places.

>The
>average wage around here, what is considered the alleged "living" or minimum
>wage is between $5.25-6.00 per hour. Now, do the math on that. The first
>of the normal 2 paychecks (paid every 2 weeks) each month barely even
>covers the rent, let alone the utilities. Factor in transportation of any
>means, and basic food needs, and that exceeds the second check.

Sure - but that's if you live alone.

>This does
>not include for any savings, clothing or medicine purchases and of course
>nothing in the "entertainment" category on the spreadsheet.
>That is why alot of people around here are forced to work two jobs. Problem
>there is, there is no time left over for family or even better, trying to
>take classes to get a degree to get out of the ruts. Typically in my area
>as well, certain market indicators such as milk, bread, gasoline etc, is at
>least 10-20 percent higher than surrounding counties. Basically they want
>you to work for as little as possible, but charge ya up the ying-yang for
>everything. Guess that is the American way eh?

Supply and demand. Obviously there's no labor shortage there, so the employers
control the wages. The answer is to vote with your feet.

>> The "living wage" concept and reality are largely a result of
>> organized labor unions leveling the playing field a bit by unifying
>> the many workers in negotiating with the relatively few employees. The
>> really smart employers learned to treat their workers well enough that
>> they wouldn't unionize.
>>
>> Look at what working conditions were like in various industries
>> 100-150 years ago, before organized labor had any real power.
>
>Just like they are for non-unionized labor now! hihi

Because of the weakening of the unions.

>> Yep. $20,000/yr isn't much at all anymore in many parts of the
>> country. Not to raise a family, anyway.
>
>Or for a single person either..... that 20,000 grand is PRE-TAX and
>PRE-BENEFIT (if any) and can quickly become as low as 13,000-15,000 dollars
>depending on the circumstances.

The trick is to go where the good jobs are...

>> As for the $15 burrito and coke at Taco Bell, think about this:

>> At least here in EPA, we have a decent selection of independent diners
>> as an alternative to the fast food chains. The food in them is not
>> much more expensive than the chains, and usually better for you. The
>> workers in those places make at least as much as the fast food chains.
>> One reason for their survival is that they don't spend bazillions on
>> advertising. Another is local loyalty of customers.

>> So what's the answer, Dwight - Ryan - Kim?

>I don't assume to have all of the answers, but I am sure that you can go
>through just about any company or organization and thin out the dead-wood.

That depends on the company. Many are constantly doing just that.

>People who just are not returning equivalent value for the service they are
>supposed to provide as an employee. There is a case of 3 people who are
>"riding the clock out" in my full time employment place of work. And
>compared to the remainder of the department they are making more than twice
>our wages for similar/same work but just have been here a while. With those
>three people to finally retire or move on, that would allow for at least 4-5
>more people to replace them, that will ACTUALLY WORK, and still allow for
>the rest of the department to get a $1.00 per hour raise, and STILL SAVE
>SOME MONEY on overall department wages.

How?

If there are 3 people slacking, they could probably be replaced by 1 or 2 good
workers, not 4 or 5.

>The math has been figured out here
>on this and it is true....
>
>The other answer is for employers to finally see the value in helping the
>employee with training/education. If an employer is credible enough, the
>employee will stay with that employer with the new training they have
>recieved.

Both my present and former employers do that.

>Even though people want to believe otherwise, there are more and more people
>having to, and trying to survive on what were supposed to be considered
>"high school kid" jobs.

Why?

Do they refuse to relocate?
Do they lack education and other qualifications?

One thing *has* changed in the past 30-odd years. There used to be a lot of
jobs that a kid with a high-school diploma could get, that would lead up the
ladder to better paying jobs. Today those jobs take a college degree. Call it
education inflation or whatever, it's a fact.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2507. Re: Amateur Radio in the 21st Century?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-12 03:29:40 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031111222940.02537.00001530@mb-m23.aol.com>
Source record: 82184

In article <3FAFAE63.5040000@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>>>And his views do not reflect those of NCI...yeah, I know.
>>
>> No, they do not.
>>
>> NCI's mission in the USA is to get rid of Element 1, nothing else. If/when
>> FCC dumps all code testing in the USA, NCI will cease to function in the
USA.
>
>So I've heard. We shall see. Organizations have a way of morphing, and
>are notoriously resistant to organizational self dissolving.

I think they mean it.
>
>> That mission is demonstrated by NCI's petition, which asks FCC to drop all
>> code
>> testing as a requirement, merge Tech and Tech Plus, and....nothing else.

Just ask Carl or Bill.

>> Len wants just one class of license.
>
> From what I can gather, I'm not so sure he wants any license, or at
>least the equivalent of that.

In a recent post where I pointed out that Len wants amateur radio to
essentially become a multiband high power version of cb, he denied wanting no
license at all. Then he railed about multiple license classes. Logical
conclusion (if one can ever apply logic to his posts here) is that he wants one
class of license.

Look up the post - couple days ago, aimed at me, something about needing
multiple classes of license for egos or some tripe like that.
>

>>>"Testing for the Amateur Radio Service is...(snip)

>> Who the heck wrote *that*?? Not me! Not Hans or Carl, either!
>>
>> Where's it from??
>
> That is something that I came up with while I was typing out the reply.

>It has a number of qualities that would appeal to some people that are
>in power now:

Put it away before the wrong person reads it and takes it seriously!
>
> It speaks to lowering or elimination of regulations. This is a very big

>thing with some people. It relates itself to the "The government that
>governs best governs least" worldview.

Yep.
>
> It speaks to the continuance of a process that has been going on for a
>few years now where less constraints have been put on radio
>broadcasters. A disaster IMO, but to some a great thing. I'm talking
>about relaxation of broadcaster regs, leading to outfits like Clear
>channel owning all the radio stations in town. But as I say, there are
>plenty who would think that this would be good.

Mike Powell is one of them.
>
> Spin city, IOW. It is ridiculous, but ridiculous can sell big
sometimes.
>
To some people it's not ridiculous. Look how many books Ann Coulter and Rush
Limbaugh have sold....
>
>>>You think THAT wouldn't sell with some people in power? Another chance
>>>to diss the hated regulators.

boo...hissss....

>>>Here is what I think it means (to some):
>>>
>>>I know people who think that they are "high tech" because they use a
>>>cell phone. Or a computer. Or a GPS reciever. They might not be able to
>>>explain how any of those things work, but by just using them, they
>>>consider themselves high tech. I never asked, but I would be that they
>>>would take one look at my IC-745 with it's 30 some buttons and knobs,
>>>and conclude that just knowing how to operate it was a major bit of
>>>"primarily a technically oriented service"

>> They oughta try to use the Southgate Type 7....

>>>Oh-Oh! A percon of average intelligence could indeed learn to operate my
>>>rig if they read the manual. NO test required!

There ya go!

>> No test to use a computer....
>
>Perhaps I should have said "fight successfully"

We'll sure try.

> And that leads us back to a question I posed a while back. Why didn't
>the peolpe who were officially agitating for the elimination of the
>Morse code test have some simultaneous proposals to fill the vacuum that

>would be created when the requirement went away?. It's called
>responsibillity.

Because they didn't think it needed to be replaced with anything.
>
> And here we DO have some people with some ideas, who ARE making
>proposals. Who are they?

A committee of NCVEC.

>>>No doubt there ARE plenty.

>> I hope there aren't. I don't see how my discussing a paper that is already
>> in the public domain on a website is going to change people's minds to agree
>> with said paper.

In the words of the great Flip Wilson (as Geraldine Jones):

"the DEVIL made me do it!"

> Of course it doesn't. The whole concept of your devil's advocacy
>serving as the seed for a no-test movement is at best amusing.

And at worst, possible.

> More likely you are making some people feel very uncomfortable.
>Certainly my questions make some people unconfortable.

If you want to make people hate you, cause them to think....

>>>But Jim, I think you are just being set up to
>>>take the blame here. Once the movement has gained momentum, it will just
>>>be one more thing to blame upon those arrogant "Pro-coders".

>> And it can be said that they were told to be quiet....

> And that and 50 cents will get you a down payment on a cup of coffee.
>It will be much too late by that time.

Might be already. The trend is in place - has been for a long time.

>I've been working up a response to
>the KL7CC paper.
>
>
> I'll be happy to publish said paper on the web.

When I get it done I'll send it to KL7CC and post it here.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2508. Re: Amateur Radio in the 21st Century?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-12 03:29:41 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031111222941.02537.00001531@mb-m23.aol.com>
Source record: 82182

In article <LnCrb.3489$KN4.1010777@news1.news.adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>
>
>> (One "L" in the name)
>
>Oops, Sorry Jim. But what about Jim Miccollis?

He'd probably agree with me.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2509. Re: Happy Veterans Day

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-12 04:01:11 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20031111230111.12300.00001571@mb-m20.aol.com>
Source record: 82185

In article <5c01b95b.0311110440.714cb88c@posting.google.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) writes:

>May this day find you and yours safe, and may the Grace of God bring
>our Brothers and Sisters-in-arms home safely soon.
>
>Semper Fidelis
>
>73
>
>Steve Robeson, LPN
>GySgt USMC(ret'd)

Steve:

Amen. I extend my thanks to all Veteran's in this newsgroup for your service to the cause of freedom.

73,

Lawrence J. Roll, MSgt, USAF (Retired)

2510. Re: Happy Veterans Day

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-12 04:01:11 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20031111230111.12300.00001570@mb-m20.aol.com>
Source record: 82186

In article <qAasb.23705$9M3.15277@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> writes:

>http://tinyurl.com/uksv
>
>73, de Hans, K0HB
>Master Chief Radioman, US Navy

Master Chief Brakob:

Thanks for that very poignant reminder of the meaning of this day. It should be read by our Commander In Chief to a joint session of Congress. Thank you for your service in the cause of freedom, and God Bless you and your family. May the memory of all of our comrades who gave the ultimate sacrifice in the cause of freedom live forever in a place of highest honor. May all of those who take their freedom for granted never have to know what it is like to live without it.

73,

Lawrence J. Roll, MSgt, USAF (Retired)

2511. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-12 04:04:56 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <Ijisb.22724$KN4.1746427@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 82187

N2EY wrote:

> As for "a job a kid could do", rest assured that if some employers could use
> child labor, they would - and pay 'em less than minimum wage, too.

Hehe, that brings us to one of the reasons that U****S got started in the first place. The employers *were* using children, *were* paying them almost nothing, and abusing them most terribly.

So the people who argue that raising the minimum wage is putting young people out of work do know what they are talking about!

- Mike KB3EIA -

2512. The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-12 04:42:29 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031111234229.05539.00002230@mb-m16.aol.com>
Source record: 82188

As of 6 PM EST on 11 November 2003, the number of ECFS
documents on public view are:

RM-10805: 229
RM-10806: 214
RM-10807: 174
RM-10808: 191
RM-10809: 179
RM-10810: 178
RM-10811: 956 Total: 2,121 (10811 has 45.1% of total)

RM-10781: 321
RM-10782: 271
RM-10783: 276
RM-10784: 254
RM-10785: 256
RM-10786: 423
RM-10787: 674 Total 2,475 (10787 has 27.2% of total)

Grand total: 4,596 documents for all 14 petitions.

The Public Notice declaring 10781 through 10787 as open for
comments for 30 days was posted on 29 August 2003.

The Public Notice declaring 10805 through 10811 as open for
comments for 30 days was posted on 8 October 2003.

Docket 03-104 (Broadband over Power Lines) is still open for
comments and can be reached under the Consumer page at the
FCC for manually typed-in commentary rather than go to the ECFS
upload page. 03-104 had 5,086 comments on record.

FCC 03-104, the Docket on Broadband over Power Lines has 5,081
documents on record as of close of ECFS on 7 November 2003.

LHA

2513. Re: Don't Apply this package from the Microsoft

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-12 08:50:13 UTC
From: la8ak.xnd@online.no
Message-ID: <3fb1f3c1.56539498@news.online.no>
Source record: 82189
Cross-posted to: rec.music.makers.marketplace,rec.pets.dogs.health,rec.pets.dogs.misc,rec.photo.equipment.35mm,rec.photo.equipment.large-format,rec.photo.equipment.medium-format,rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.swap

On Wed, 12 Nov 2003 00:16:34 GMT, "Ron Andrews"
<randrew1@rochesterDOTrr.com> wrote:

> This warning is probably superfluous, but just in case someone has been
>living in a cave for the past few weeks, these messages are not from
>Microsoft and they contain viruses
>
you can never underestimate other users enough, it is just incredible
to learn how stupid somebody is when it comes to data and collecting
infected mail which any idiot should easily have understood was a
problem

--
remove ,xnd to reply (Spam precaution!)

2514. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-12 10:15:14 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <SKnsb.22312$Oo4.2695@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 82190

"Kim W5TIT" wrote:
>
> Nope. Do it yourself. I've told you the information is
> there to be had--and it's that simple. People get paid
> good money to do what you're asking me to do, above.
> If you do it, Dwight, maybe you'll have some facts
> behind your opinions...

You and I both knew you couldn't do it, Kim. The information it not that easily available and it would take considerable effort for consumers to research the products they purchase each day, week, or year. In spite of your claims otherwise, you don't do it. I certainly don't do it. And I don't know anyone who does. But someone has to have some responsibility for which products are sold and effects on the overall economy. Since it is beyond the abilities of the average consumer, the burden automatically falls on business, the government, and the courts.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

2515. Re: Houston, we have a solution

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-12 10:15:29 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bot1al$3j4@library2.airnews.net>
Source record: 82191

"Jim Hampton" <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote in message
news:6khsb.8103$gG7.4744@news01.roc.ny...
> Hans,
>
> I thought everyone used electrical tape :)
>
>
> 73 from Rochester, NY
> Jim AA2QA
> (ok, ok ... duct tape too)
>
>

Duct tape, Jim. Duct tape!

Kim W5TIT

2516. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-12 10:57:26 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <qmosb.22321$Oo4.2915@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 82192

"Mike Coslo" wrote:
>
> (snip) As for a mid-life crisis, remember you worked
> hard for it, you deserve it, and no one is going to
> deprive you of it! 8^)

LOL. Oh, I think my wife might certainly try.

> I hear the MLC car of choice is a BMW Z3. Almost
> makes me want to have one so I can pick one up.

Anything white and expensive will do the job ("cute" is a bonus). I don't know why, but women seem to love white vehicles. I suspect it has something to do with the reason why women who would never do so elsewhere so easily shed their cloths around water. Of course, this is clearly not the reason I drive a white vehicle today - white is just a safer color on the road. ;-)

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

2517. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-12 11:29:33 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031112062933.14837.00004192@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 82193

In article <t%rrb.1130$KN4.845856@news1.news.adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo
<mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:

>In the summer of 1972, I got my first job after high school. It paid
>$2.40 per hour. Minimum at that time was $2.20.

You might want to check

http://www.dol.gov/esa/minwage/chart.htm

>>>It wasn't a living
>>>wage then either. Entry level jobs have never provided the income to
>>>support a family.
>
>> Agreed - nor were they meant to. But it *was* possible for a person to live
>> on them - probably more so than today.
>
>I lived on that $2.40 per hour. Not well, but okay.

>>>Anyone that I have ever known in my lifetime (52 years)
>>>that made minimum wage either lived with their parents or other relatives,
>>>a group of roommates, or had a working spouse even back when I was a
>>>child.

>> Pretty much the same here.
>
>Folks, conservative ot liberal, there is a whole other world out there!
>I know of a number of families that had both parents working at minimum
>or close to it.
>
>>>No adult male that I knew stayed in a minimum wage job any longer than it
>>>took to find something else because they could not pay groc, rent, and
>>>transportation on that. It has never been high enough to do so.

>> 'adult male'....ahem.....
>
>The age of the "adult male" as the breadwinner is long gone. Both
>husband and wife now pretty much *need* to work.

Yep. Think about why that is.

>If a family is in the
>situation where only one needs to work, then that's great. But let's
>hope they don't gloat about it.

A lot has to do with choices made and their individual circumstances.

Besides the economic concerns, in a lot of professions today, a person cannot simply stop working for several years and expect to be employable when they return.
>
>>>Wages versus costs is all relative. You have to look at how many hours it
>>>takes to buy something.

>> Exactly! And you also have to take into account things like creeping
>> taxation
>> (even if the laws don't change, inflation causes people to pay more of
>> their
>> income in taxes) and increases in the number of 'necessities'.
>>
>> Taxes are a big part of the game, too. At one time the income tax rules
>> were
>> such that people on the bottom end who knew the rules could pay very little
>> in
>> taxes. I remember when:
>>
>> - *all* interest paid (not just home mortgage interest) was deductible.
>> - *all* documented sales tax and *most* documented medical costs were
>> deductible
>> - the various personal and dependent deductions were larger *in infaltion
>> adjusted dollars*

>>>The majority of items but not all take fewer hours
>>>of work to purchase than they did in 1976.

>> In some cases, yes, in others, no.
>
> As I recall reading a while back, in 1950, it took 14 percent of an
>average workers income to put a roof over "his head". That may have
>changed a little bit! 8^)

It changed big time. Same for medical and education costs.
>
>And did you know they are doing seven year loans on cars? If all was
>equal, wages and prices, we would still be doing 2 and 3 year loans on them.
>
Part of that is people *choosing* to buy bigger and more luxurious cars.

>There are two of the major outlays for the typical family. Add to that
>education costs, which have outpaced inflation by in some cases 400
>percent (in my area, we had an around 12 percent increase one year
>recently) and you have a bit different picture!

Precisely. And a college degree is much more of a necessity today.

>>>The cost of electronics is down
>>>in terms of hours to buy.

>> True to a point - but on the other end of the scale, those electronics are
>> often non-repairable, and have limited useful lives, so that they must be
>> replaced more often.

>
>It breaks, and you buy a new one. Break even at best.

Yep - and a losing game at worst.
>
>> It it actually easier to restore ham gear that is 30-40-50 years old than
>> much
>> of the newer stuff, because parts for much of the newer stuff are simply
>> unobtainable except from junker units. The displays in the popular TS-440S
>> is
>> one example - they are no longer made, and yet they are often one of the
>> first
>> major parts to fail, so your chances of lifting one from a junker are slim.
>
>>>The cost of houses is about the same in terms of
>>>hours.
>
>disagree
>>
>> A lot of that depends on the interest rate and taxes. Interest rates in the
>> '70s were double-digit, approaching 17% in some markets at times - for home
>> mortgages! But since all that interest was deductible, the *effective*
>> interest
>> rate was less, depending on your tax bracket.
>>
>> Escalating home prices makes it harder to get started, though, because the
>> size
>> of the down payment keeps growing. And since many of the fees involved with
>> buying and selling are a percentage of the price, the amount of cash a
>> first-timer needs gets really high.
>>
>> Compare this to 40-50 years ago, when interest rates, taxes and down
>> payments were low.
>
>agree. I know some people who are paying over 50 percent of theie take
>home pay in mortgage payment. Amazingly enough, their banks allowed them
>to get into that situation.

Personal bankruptcies are going up, too.
>
And that's part of what Dwight would reform! (lack of caps on how much debt a
person can get into)

73 de Jim, N2EY

2518. Re: Happy Veterans Day

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-12 14:00:20 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0311120600.34d939cb@posting.google.com>
Source record: 82194

"Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<qAasb.23705$9M3.15277@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>...

> http://tinyurl.com/uksv
>
> 73, de Hans, K0HB
> Master Chief Radioman, US Navy

That was strong stuff, Hans...I wish more non-military folks
could read it and get a better appreciation of how being in the Armed
Forces is an "all-hands" job.

Semper Fidelis.

The Gunny

2519. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-12 14:06:13 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0311120606.3facd301@posting.google.com>
Source record: 82195

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20031111234229.05539.00002230@mb-m16.aol.com>...

> As of 6 PM EST on 11 November 2003, the number of ECFS
> documents on public view are:...(SNIP)

I noticed that you couldn't find time to join in the Veteran's
Day greetings in another thread, although you profess admiration and
respect for them. Matter of fact, I don't believe I've >>EVER<< seen
you partake in any sincere regards on either Veteran's Day, Armed
Forces Day or Memorial Day.

Another LennieRant unravelled.

Steve, K4YZ

2520. Re: Amateur Radio in the 21st Century?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-12 14:24:53 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <Vorsb.24962$9M3.12136@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 82196

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20031111202124.23307.00004315@mb-m29.aol.com...
> In article <Dn8sb.23517$9M3.15013@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>,
"K&#65533;HB"
> <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> writes:
>
> >"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote
> >
> >> One thing I'm not clear on, though. If an LP reached the end of the 10
> >> years but couldn't pass the upgrade test, could they take the LP test
> >> and get another 10 years (as with driver's license LPs) or is it
> >> one-LP-to-a-customer, as the old Novice was?
> >
> >One to a customer.
>
> Understood.
>
> >If you can't "get it" in 10 years, then you probably
> >aren't going to be able to "get it" in 20 or 30 years.
>
> All depends what's going on in those 10 years.
>
> I know plenty of hams who were quite active until something significant
> happened in their lives like military service, a major illness in the
family,
> marriage, divorce, children, relocation, new career, etc. Then, in
accordance
> with "The Amateur Is Balanced", they put amateur radio on hold for
anywhere
> from months to decades. Then, when their lives permitted, they came back
in a
> big way. A few let their licenses lapse, but most kept renewing and
modifying.

You can put me in that catagory from about 1961 until 1990 or so. I always renewed the license, sometimes subscribed and/or bought CG or QST, but was not on the air at all.

> Case in point: Amateur licensed in high school, got a bachelor's degree,
worked
> a year or two, then decided to become a doctor. For the next 7 years his
life
> was med school/residency/fellowship. Not a lot of time in there for ham
radio,

> but he had an HT and kept in touch. And now he's an M.D. and hamming in a
big
> way.
>
> His 10 years as a ham hit somewhere towards the end of medical school.
Under
> today's rules, he just renewed and kept on going. Under your proposal, he
would
> have lost his license and had to go all the way to Extra in one go if he
ever
> wanted to be a ham again.
>
> Is that really what's best for the ARS?
>
> >BTW, drivers license permits are not renewable here, although you can
retest
> >for a new one.
>
> Same deal here, AFAIK. So why not the same deal for hams?

Works for me.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2521. Re: KE4TEW and his good friend Riley

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-12 14:32:41 UTC
From: "Rev. P.P. Fartgas" <fartingpreacher550@nospam.yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <1068648526.534280@newshost03.voicenet.com>
Source record: 82197
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"bob" <bob@bob.com> wrote in message
news:yd7sb.601$jA6.117@bignews6.bellsouth.net...
> So how much pot did KE4TEW give Riley to get his license back?

(much bullshit snipped)

This crap is over 4+ years old.

Why are some ham op's so often obsessed with nonsense
that happened years (..and in some cases, decades!) ago
on the stupid radio? 14.313 is a perfect example. There's more
than a few clowns on there still outgassing about the nonsense
that took place on there during the 1990's!

Really makes you wonder if a prerequisite for operating
on parts of 20 or 75 Meters for some, is a diagnosis of
a mental illness.

jeezus h christ, give it a rest and get a life
or just go outside and sniff the fresh air.

2522. Re: Amateur Radio in the 21st Century?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-12 14:36:11 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <vzrsb.25017$9M3.4145@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 82198

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20031111222940.02537.00001530@mb-m23.aol.com...
> In article <3FAFAE63.5040000@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:
>
> >N2EY wrote:
> >>>And his views do not reflect those of NCI...yeah, I know.
> >>
> >> No, they do not.
> >>
> >> NCI's mission in the USA is to get rid of Element 1, nothing else.
If/when
> >> FCC dumps all code testing in the USA, NCI will cease to function in
the
> USA.
> >
> >So I've heard. We shall see. Organizations have a way of morphing, and
> >are notoriously resistant to organizational self dissolving.
>
> I think they mean it.

As one of their directors, I certainly mean it...although the objective of
NCI
is not solely focused on USA morse testing alone.

> >> That mission is demonstrated by NCI's petition, which asks FCC to drop
all
> >> code
> >> testing as a requirement, merge Tech and Tech Plus, and....nothing
else.
>
> Just ask Carl or Bill.

See Bill's comment above... :-).

> >> Len wants just one class of license.
> >
> > From what I can gather, I'm not so sure he wants any license, or at
> >least the equivalent of that.
>
> In a recent post where I pointed out that Len wants amateur radio to
> essentially become a multiband high power version of cb, he denied wanting
no
> license at all. Then he railed about multiple license classes. Logical
> conclusion (if one can ever apply logic to his posts here) is that he
wants one

> class of license.
>
> Look up the post - couple days ago, aimed at me, something about needing
> multiple classes of license for egos or some tripe like that.
>
> >>>"Testing for the Amateur Radio Service is...(snip)
>
> >> Who the heck wrote *that*?? Not me! Not Hans or Carl, either!
> >>
> >> Where's it from??
> >
> > That is something that I came up with while I was typing out the reply.
>
> >It has a number of qualities that would appeal to some people that are
> >in power now:
>
> Put it away before the wrong person reads it and takes it seriously!
> >
> > It speaks to lowering or elimination of regulations. This is a very big
> >thing with some people. It relates itself to the "The government that
> >governs best governs least" worldview.
>
> Yep.
> >
> > It speaks to the continuance of a process that has been going on for a
> >few years now where less constraints have been put on radio
> >broadcasters. A disaster IMO, but to some a great thing. I'm talking
> >about relaxation of broadcaster regs, leading to outfits like Clear
> >channel owning all the radio stations in town. But as I say, there are
> >plenty who would think that this would be good.
>
> Mike Powell is one of them.
> >
> > Spin city, IOW. It is ridiculous, but ridiculous can sell big
> sometimes.
> >
> To some people it's not ridiculous. Look how many books Ann Coulter and
Rush
> Limbaugh have sold....
> >
> >>>You think THAT wouldn't sell with some people in power? Another chance
> >>>to diss the hated regulators.
>
> boo...hissss....
>
>
> >>>Here is what I think it means (to some):
> >>>
> >>>I know people who think that they are "high tech" because they use a
> >>>cell phone. Or a computer. Or a GPS reciever. They might not be able to

> >>>explain how any of those things work, but by just using them, they
> >>>consider themselves high tech. I never asked, but I would be that they
> >>>would take one look at my IC-745 with it's 30 some buttons and knobs,
> >>>and conclude that just knowing how to operate it was a major bit of
> >>>"primarily a technically oriented service"
>
> >> They oughta try to use the Southgate Type 7....
>
> >>>Oh-Oh! A percon of average intelligence could indeed learn to operate
my
> >>>rig if they read the manual. NO test required!
>
> There ya go!
>
> >> No test to use a computer....
> >
> >Perhaps I should have said "fight successfully"
>
> We'll sure try.
>
> > And that leads us back to a question I posed a while back. Why didn't
> >the peolpe who were officially agitating for the elimination of the
> >Morse code test have some simultaneous proposals to fill the vacuum that
> >would be created when the requirement went away?. It's called
> >responsibillity.
>
> Because they didn't think it needed to be replaced with anything.
> >
> > And here we DO have some people with some ideas, who ARE making
> >proposals. Who are they?
>
> A committee of NCVEC.
>
> >>>No doubt there ARE plenty.
>
> >> I hope there aren't. I don't see how my discussing a paper that is
already
> >> in the public domain on a website is going to change people's minds to
agree
> >> with said paper.
>
> In the words of the great Flip Wilson (as Geraldine Jones):
>
> "the DEVIL made me do it!"
>
> > Of course it doesn't. The whole concept of your devil's advocacy
> >serving as the seed for a no-test movement is at best amusing.
>
> And at worst, possible.
>

> > More likely you are making some people feel very uncomfortable.
> >Certainly my questions make some people unconfortable.
>
> If you want to make people hate you, cause them to think....
>
> >>>But Jim, I think you are just being set up to
> >>>take the blame here. Once the movement has gained momentum, it will
just
> >>>be one more thing to blame upon those arrogant "Pro-coders".
>
> >> And it can be said that they were told to be quiet....
>
> > And that and 50 cents will get you a down payment on a cup of coffee.
> >It will be much too late by that time.
>
> Might be already. The trend is in place - has been for a long time.
>
> >I've been working up a response to
> >the KL7CC paper.
> >
> > I'll be happy to publish said paper on the web.
>
> When I get it done I'll send it to KL7CC and post it here.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

How much longer 'till it is done?

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2523. Re: Happy Veterans Day

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-12 14:36:12 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <wzrsb.25018$9M3.25014@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 82199

"Steve Robeson, K4CAP" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
news:5c01b95b.0311110440.714cb88c@posting.google.com...
> May this day find you and yours safe, and may the Grace of God bring
> our Brothers and Sisters-in-arms home safely soon.
>
> Semper Fidelis
> 73
> Steve Robeson, LPN
> GySgt USMC(ret'd)

Cheers to all who served and special thoughts and prayers for
those that made the ultimate sacrifice.

Bill K2UNK, Petty Officer 2nd Class, Electronic Tech-Communications, US
Navy 66-70

2524. Re: Happy Veterans Day

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-12 14:46:39 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <jJrsb.25038$9M3.9127@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 82200

"If ye love wealth better than liberty,
the tranquility of servitude better than the animating conquest of
freedom,
go home from us in peace.

We ask not your counsel or arms.
Crouch down and lick the hands which feed you.
May your chains set lightly upon you,
and may posterity forget that ye were our countrymen."

Samuel Adams, speech on 1st August 1776.

2525. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-12 15:01:27 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <bXrsb.22728$Oo4.11302@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 82201

"N2EY" wrote:
> Mike Coslo writes:
>
> > In the summer of 1972, I got my first job after
> > high school. It paid $2.40 per hour. Minimum
> > at that time was $2.20.
>
> You might want to check
>
> http://www.dol.gov/esa/minwage/chart.htm

The difference really isn't that unusual, Jim. You're obviously forgetting state minimum wage laws which can add to the federal minimum wage. Perhaps Mike lived in a state with it's own minimum wage laws at the time. As you probably know, state minimum wage laws were a growing trend in the 70's, but that growth has pretty much died out over the years. In fact, I'm not even sure any state still has an active minimum wage law today.

> (snip) Personal bankruptcies are going up, too.
>
> And that's part of what Dwight would reform! (lack
> of caps on how much debt a person can get into)

Hey, now wait a minute, Jim. I realize what you meant. But, before you confuse people, watch how you word that. I'm not running for political office, so I'm not likely to reform anything. Anyway, I do think this is one of the areas that has to be addressed in any serious reform effort. It is amazing how much debt is floating around out there. I see college students who have not worked a day in their life graduating with debts exceeding twenty, thirty, and even forty, thousand dollars (student and personal loans). I see people buying homes and cars that are far beyond what they can reasonably afford on their incomes. I've seen reports of average credit card debts exceeding $8,000 today. Clearly, something has to be done to reel in this madness. A cap on the percentage of a person's income that can be used to establish monthly payments for all loans seems logical (and the least intrusive) to me.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

2526. Re: Happy Veterans Day

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-12 15:27:44 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <Qjssb.22785$Oo4.5168@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 82202

"Steve Robeson, K4CAP" wrote:
> May this day find you and yours safe, and may the
> Grace of God bring our Brothers and Sisters-in-arms
> home safely soon.

Well said, Steve. And let me also add a very warm thanks to all who are serving and have served.

Dwight Stewart
U.S. Army (1970-73)
U.S. Coast Guard Auxiliary
U.S. Dept. of Homeland Security (Founding Member)

2527. Re: KE4TEW and his good friend Riley

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-12 16:33:33 UTC
From: Radioman <radio@ptt.edu>
Message-ID: <3FB260DD.8EA293C5@ptt.edu>
Source record: 82203
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Rev. P.P. Fartgas" wrote:

> jeezus h christ, give it a rest and get a life
> or just go outside and sniff the fresh air.

There ain't no fresh air left, you already passed through.

2528. Re: Happy Veterans Day

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-12 17:28:13 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <N4usb.22959$Oo4.1602@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 82204

"Steve Robeson, K4CAP" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
news:5c01b95b.0311120600.34d939cb@posting.google.com...
> "K�HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<qAasb.23705$9M3.15277@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
>
> > http://tinyurl.com/uksv
> >
> > 73, de Hans, K0HB
> > Master Chief Radioman, US Navy
>
> That was strong stuff, Hans...I wish more non-military folks
> could read it and get a better appreciation of how being in the Armed
> Forces is an "all-hands" job.
>
> Semper Fidelis.
>
> The Gunny

Man ain't that the truth.

Dan/W4NTI

2529. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-12 17:38:35 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0311120938.62548b63@posting.google.com>
Source record: 82205

"Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<XTYrb.20940$Oo4.19562@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote
>
> > How do you determine "best value"?
>
> Depending on the product it can be a variety of things, sometimes a very
> complex mix of parameters determines "value". My factory purchases
> products of many different types, complexities, which they range from pure
> "commodities" like solder to specialty products like custom chips, plastic
> moldings, and similar "proprietary" materials which find there way into our
> finished goods.
>
> Obviously price factors into the mix, and all other things being equal,
> price wins.
>
> But "all other things" are almost never equal. For example, some suppliers
> have earned "dock to stock" status with us because their outgoing quality
> control is good enough that we do not have to perform incoming quality
> control. This saves us money (inspection labor) and time (no delay in
> inspection) so we favor such suppliers even if they may charge slightly
> higher prices, and they benefit by earlier payment because their invoice is
> not held pending QA acceptance of their product. Other favorable factors
> would be their willingness to deal with us on a "consigned inventory" basis,
> shield us from part shortage allocations, and similar "pipeline" issues.

All of which are essentially "price" issues because you wind up
paying, one way or another.

> Suppliers with a "track record" are generally favored over "new guys", but
> new guys who can demonstrate "value added" (which can be a host of things)
> will certainly be given some business to prove their case.

Plus it keeps you from becoming totally dependent on one supplier.

> Within reason,
> we will favor enterprises "close to home" because we feel an obligation to
> contribute to the communities where we live and work, and there is an
> obvious advantage to dealing with a supplier who you can quickly meet for
> lunch to discuss issues, rather than by telecommunications or strapping a
> 757 to your ass for several hours.
>
> As you can see, "best value" encompasses many factors and issues beyond the
> actual physical product which you touch and feel.

Exactly! And I agree with all of these policies 100%.
>
> > Does it include things like whether the producers used
> > environmentally-friendly processes, the working
> > conditions of the workers who actually make the product,
> > etc.?
>
> No ethical company would ignore those issues. Certainly we will not
> knowingly deal with suppliers who pollute the environment or mistreat their
> workers, but we are not staffed with EPA-like or OSHA-like inspectors and
> evaluators In cases where we are qualifying a new significant new
> supplier, we perform on-site evaluations which give us some visibility
> of working conditions, etc., but it is naturally not an in depth review of
> their HR practices, or validating their compliance with EPA standards.

Sounds like a very reasonable approach. And if a supplier were
deficient in those areas, or tried to hide things, I bet your company
wouldn't do business with them - even if it meant paying more,
elsewhere.

> Were we a huge conglomerate like General Motors or IBM, I'm sure
> we'd have more formal means of dealing with this issue, but in the
> meantime they obviously are subject to the usual state, federal,
> provincial (or whatever) regulatory constraints. We make a special
> effort in the area of supplier diversity, and support many regional
> Supplier Diversity Councils, such as Chicago Minority Business
> Development Council, Dallas/Ft. Worth Minority Business Development
> Council, Georgia Minority Supplier Development Council, Minnesota
> Minority Supplier Development Council, Virginia Regional Minority
> Supplier Development Council, Southern California Regional
> Purchasing Councils, Inc., and others. This context includes woman-owned
> or veteran-owned enterprises.

Thanks for a complete and concise answer, Hans. And for showing that
it's not just the bottom line that drives business decisions.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2530. Re: Who is John Galt? - Re: Optical signals - Re: Wonder how licensing will c..

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-12 17:52:22 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0311120952.2342e126@posting.google.com>
Source record: 82206

"Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<YjWrb.22363$9M3.6257@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> "Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote
>
> > I hate to ask the proverbial "loaded question," but do you think "our
> > society has changed" for the better or worse wrt the aforementioned
> subject
> > matter?
>
> I'll chime in here, and suggest that it is very much for the better. Many
> employees in my group are female in traditionally male job titles
> (engineers, managers, etc.). Their performance, professionalism, and
> contributions to our success are completely comparable to their male
> counterparts.
>
> On a more personal note, one of my daughters no longer has a husband and is
> raising 4 fine kids comfortably because she pursued a technical education
> and career. In the "good old days" she would not have been able to do so,
> and her financial picture would have been much more bleak.

Agreed. I had to put real work into making sure all three of my daughters had technical degrees of various flavors for exactly the reason you cite and I'm resting much easier now than I would be if I hadn't leaned on 'em about getting degrees. Leaned hard in one case but I prevailed. It's been statistically obvious for years that "significant others" amongst those in their reproductive years have a propensity for coming and going seemingly at will vs. "the good old days". Two of my daughters dragged the wrong pieces of male sludge home and when push came to shove it got down to "I don't need you, hit the road, I'm taking my name back" and they went back into their profe$$ions.

>
> 73, de Hans, K0HB

w3rv

2531. Re: KE4TEW and his good friend Riley

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-12 19:19:00 UTC
From: "Rev. P.P. Fartgas" <fartingpreacher550@nospam.yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <1068665705.928101@newshost03.voicenet.com>
Source record: 82207
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Radioman" <radio@ptt.edu> wrote in message
news:3FB260DD.8EA293C5@ptt.edu...
> "Rev. P.P. Fartgas" wrote:
>
> > jeezus h christ, give it a rest and get a life
> > or just go outside and sniff the fresh air.
>
> There ain't no fresh air left, you already passed through.

I will admit that that was a very good comeback.
Congratulations! You win a free Burger and Beer
to be awarded at the Dayton 2004 Hamvention.
(assuming it takes place of course as 2003 had the
least attendance and most useless junk for sale
I've seen in my 11 years of attending the same)

Rev P.P.F.
MS-Div BME BMS BMF BMW 36ï¿½
Honorary Rectoir and Kazaa
Third Online Church of JR "Bob" Dobbs Inc (reg US Pat Off)

2532. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-12 19:20:04 UTC
From: Bert Craig <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM>
Message-ID: <EJvsb.9152$hn3.3187776@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>
Source record: 82208

"Rupert" <big@bird.sesame.street> wrote in message
news:Govsb.10542$6c3.633@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net...
> Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> > As of 6 PM EST on 11 November 2003, the number of ECFS
> > documents on public view are:
>
> What would be interesting is to find out how many are for the change,
> and how many want to keep the code.

Me too. All this roundabout bravo sierra could be bypassed if there was a ballot sent to all approx. 700,000 U.S. licensed hams. As long as quorum is met, it's on! This concept (Democracy) frightens the bejesus out of many folks who claim to speak for those not yet licensed.

But that's an empty argument. Get licensed and vote, tah dah! The big bad "barrier" does not preclude anyone from getting their no-code Tech ticket and executing a vote.

Simply announce a "record date" by which one must be licensed (To give those "yet to be licensed a fair shot at a voice in the process.) and send a ballot out to all those licensed "of record." Makes too much sense and requires some effort. IOW, against the contemporary trend.

73 de Bert
WA2SI

2533. Re: Houston, we have a solution

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-12 20:48:04 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <80xsb.9242$_s3.7350@news01.roc.ny>
Source record: 82209

Thanks, Kim.

Do I have it right in case I have to take my test again?
If it moves and shouldn't - "duct tape"
If it doesn't move and should - "WD-40"

I think I've got it, by jove!

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim
(ps - you *don't* want to see the makeshift dipole in my attic :) - it does work, however. Electrical tape special.)

"Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote in message news:bot1al$3j4@library2.airnews.net...
> "Jim Hampton" <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote in message
> news:6khsb.8103$gG7.4744@news01.roc.ny...
> > Hans,
> >
> > I thought everyone used electrical tape :)
> >
> >
> > 73 from Rochester, NY
> > Jim AA2QA
> > (ok, ok ... duct tape too)
> >
> >
>
> Duct tape, Jim. Duct tape!
>
> Kim W5TIT
>
>

2534. Re: Amateur Radio in the 21st Century?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-12 23:29:46 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031112182946.12300.00001592@mb-m20.aol.com>
Source record: 82210

In article <z3hsb.24228$9M3.9390@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Kï¿½HB"
<groupk0hb@earthlink.net> writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote
>
>> You mean the Novice wasn't a real license? If so, then those Novices
>> weren't real hams?
>
>Leading question noted. And dismissed without response.

You wrote of the Novice being a learner's permit to a "real license", Hans...

>
>> But ya still haven't told us how to sell your idea to the FCC and the rest
>> of the ARS.
>
>Since you've expressed nothing but disdain for the idea, you wouldn't sell
>it to the FCC even if I told you how, so the best advice I can give you is
>"hide and watch".

I don't have "disdain" for the idea, Hans. I simply don't think FCC will enact
it, for reasons previously listed. YMMV.

So I'll watch and see what happens.

73 de Jim, N2EY
>

2535. Re: Amateur Radio in the 21st Century?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-12 23:29:46 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031112182946.12300.00001591@mb-m20.aol.com>
Source record: 82211

In article <wfhsb.24238$9M3.13334@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Kï¿½HB"
<groupk0hb@earthlink.net> writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote
>
>> Doesn't matter whether I like it or not.
>
>Correct.
>
>> I got my Extra 33 years ago
>
>Didn't know we were running a seniority contest here, but if we are you lose
>by 7 years.

Were you in high school when you got yours? ;-)
>
>> ...and there hasn't been a day since then that I couldn't pass
>> the required tests to get another one if that were required.
>
>The point being?

That it's no big deal to my license. Or your license. But it may be a big deal
to prospective hams.

> I'd expect that's true of most licensees.

The author of the paper which is the this thread's title says he couldn't. He
almost sounds proud of the fact.

>> I'm actually trying to help you refine it, Hans.
>
>It's already refined, thank you very much.

You're welcome. Then I won't comment on it any more.
>
>> The problem is how you're gonna sell the idea to FCC and the rest of the
>> ARS.
>
>At least it's a problem in **your** mind, but you don't count.
>
I don't count? Sounds a bit hostile and elitist to me.

>The FCC counts.

So let's see what they do.

>> And think about sending that proposal to FCC for an RM number.
>> Who knows - it might gain widespread support and I'd be dead wrong about
>> it.
>
>You are dead wrong about it, and it doesn't need "widespread support", just
>the support of FCC.
>
I doubt FCC will enact such a radical change without widespread support in the amateur radio community. So far I haven't seen a single rrapper in favor of it. But FCC may be different.

Note that if FCC did enact your LP idea, they'd have to maintain a permanent database of everyone who ever held an LP license, to make sure they didn't get another one. Extra admin work for FCC - to solve what problem?

Good luck on selling your ideas to FCC

73 de Jim, N2EY

2536. Re: Happy Veterans Day

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-12 23:34:06 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0311121534.17abad08@posting.google.com>
Source record: 82212

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<jJrsb.25038$9M3.9127@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> "If ye love wealth better than liberty,
> the tranquility of servitude better than the animating conquest of
> freedom,
> go home from us in peace.
>
> We ask not your counsel or arms.
> Crouch down and lick the hands which feed you.
> May your chains set lightly upon you,
> and may posterity forget that ye were our countrymen."
>
> Samuel Adams, speech on 1st August 1776.

Not everyone likes veterans or thinks they are due any particular
thanks.

Concerning the "Bonus Army" of 1932, where veterans of The War to End
All Wars (1917/1918) were due a bonus in 1945, but wanted payment
early because they lost their homes in the Great Depression, Franklin
Roosevelt is to have said:

In the end, some money was paid to veterans but not without further
difficulties. Within a year of the Bonus Army Incident, President
Roosevelt imposed the Economy Act of 1933 which cut veterans
disability allowances by 25%. In the effort to cut federal expenses,
veterans were viewed as having inordinate special status over
civilians. During the 1932 election campaign, he had publicly
proclaimed: "No one [merely] because he wore a uniform must therefore
be placed in a special class of beneficiaries over and above all other
citizens. The fact of wearing a uniform does not mean that he can
demand and receive from his government a benefit which no other
citizen receives."

Read all about it at:

http://www.islandnet.com/~citizenx/bonus.html

2537. Armistice Day was re: Happy Vets Day

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-13 00:04:59 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0311121604.3190d75e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 82213

Steve, everyone makes mistakes, but the Armistice goof got me thinking about the veterans of WWI, and what happened to them during the Great Depression. Like any other citizen, they lost their jobs, lost their homes, their businesses. But they had earned a bonus for their sacrifices in Europe, payable in 1945.

They marched on Washington to pressure congress to pay them now, not later.

Here's some links and snips:

http://college.hmco.com/history/readerscomp/gahff/html/ff_022600_bonusarmy.htm

[Bonus Army
a group of unemployed World War I veterans who demonstrated during the Great Depression. The Bonus Law of 1924 had given every veteran a certificate payable in 1945, but the veterans wanted the bonus immediately. In June 1932, about 15,000 of them and their families marched on Washington, D.C., in a futile effort to pressure the Senate into passing a bill to grant immediate payments. President Herbert Hoover called upon Gen. Douglas MacArthur and federal troops to disperse the Bonus Army and drive them out of the capital. The use of armed troops against unarmed men, women, and children shocked the nation.]

http://www.islandnet.com/~citizenx/bonus.html

[Within a year of the Bonus Army Incident, President Roosevelt imposed the Economy Act of 1933 which cut veterans disability allowances by 25%. In the effort to cut federal expenses, veterans were viewed as having inordinate special status over civilians. During the 1932 election campaign, he had publicly proclaimed: "No one [merely] because he wore a uniform must therefore be placed in a special class of beneficiaries over and above all other citizens. The fact of wearing a uniform does not mean that he can demand and receive from his government a benefit which no other citizen receives."]

http://www.msys.net/cress/ballots2/bonus.htm

[In the summer of 1932 the Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces ordered the U.S. Army into action--to attack the veterans of the U.S. Army. General Douglas MacArthur, Colonel Dwight D. Eisenhower, and Major George S. Patton led the mounted soldiers, who wielded billy clubs and tear gas canisters. When it was all over the veterans' shanties and tents lay in smoldering piles. Proud veterans of World War I were driven from the nation's capital. "We were heroes in 1917," said one veteran bitterly, "but we're bums now."]

http://www.lewrockwell.com/elkins/elkins9.html

[The Bonus Army
by Jeff Elkins

June 18, 1878

CHAP. 263 ï¿½ An act making appropriations for the support of the Army
for the fiscal year ending June thirtieth, eighteen hundred and
seventy-nine, and for other purposes.

SEC. 15. From and after the passage of this act it shall not be lawful
to employ any part of the Army of the United States, as a posse
comitatus, or otherwise, for the purpose of executing the lawsï¿½

Mostly forgotten today, the Bonus March incident of 1932 provided one
of the more instructive lessons in the naked power of the State and
just how meaningless the State views its laws and contracts with
citizens.]

http://members.aol.com/vetsofamer/bonus2.htm

http://www.soundprint.org/radio/display_show/ID/228/name/Bonus+Army+March

[In 1932, in the depths of the Depression, thousands of hungry and
disgruntled veterans of WW I marched on Washington, D.C. demanding
that Congress pay them the bonus for their military service that had
been promised years before. Banding together, unemployed Oregon
cannery workers marched with Pennsylvania coal miners and Alabama
cotton pickers, as more than 20 thousand "bonus marchers" participated
in the biggest rally to date in the nation's capital. And they stayed
for weeks, setting up tent cities, living in cardboard shanties, and
shaking the nerves of President Hoover. Find out how they played a
role in defeating Hoover in the fall election, and improving the
government's treatment of veterans after WW II.]

In article <8updnd$9ut$1@nnrp1.deja.com>,
K0HB <k0hb@my-deja.com> wrote:

> In article <8ujeuo$t6a$1@nnrp1.deja.com>,
> Steven J Robeson, K4YZ <k4yz@my-deja.com> wrote:
>
> > On the eleventh hour of the eleventh day of the eleventh month,
> > the warring parties in what was then known as "The War To End All
> > Wars" was brought to an Amnesty.
>
> Sunuvagun! So that's why it used to be called "Amnesty Day".
> <grinnin' duckin', & runnin'>

Damn...he got me...!!!

Said "amnesty", meant "armistice"....sorry folks....I goofed.

Steve

2538. Re: Amateur Radio in the 21st Century?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-13 00:34:24 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <kkAsb.352$m84.257115@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 82215

N2EY wrote:
> In article <3FAFAE63.5040000@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:
>
>
>>N2EY wrote:
>>
>>>>And his views do not reflect those of NCI...yeah, I know.
>>>
>>>No, they do not.
>>>
>>>NCI's mission in the USA is to get rid of Element 1, nothing else. If/when
>>>FCC dumps all code testing in the USA, NCI will cease to function in the
>
> USA.
>
>>So I've heard. We shall see. Organizations have a way of morphing, and
>>are notoriously resistant to organizational self dissolving.
>
>
> I think they mean it.

Perhaps they do. Right now. But I've been involved in enough
organizations to know that everything can change almost overnight.

Organizational suicide is quite rare.

>>>That mission is demonstrated by NCI's petition, which asks FCC to drop all
>>>code
>>>testing as a requirement, merge Tech and Tech Plus, and....nothing else.
>
>
> Just ask Carl or Bill.

Or W5YI?

>
>>>Len wants just one class of license.
>>
>> From what I can gather, I'm not so sure he wants any license, or at
>>least the equivalent of that.
>
>
> In a recent post where I pointed out that Len wants amateur radio to
> essentially become a multiband high power version of cb, he denied wanting no
> license at all. Then he railed about multiple license classes. Logical
> conclusion (if one can ever apply logic to his posts here) is that he wants one

> class of license.
>
> Look up the post - couple days ago, aimed at me, something about needing
> multiple classes of license for egos or some tripe like that.

Who knows?

>
>>>>"Testing for the Amateur Radio Service is...(snip)
>
>
>
>>>Who the heck wrote *that*?? Not me! Not Hans or Carl, either!
>>>
>>>Where's it from??
>>
>> That is something that I came up with while I was typing out the reply.
>
>
>>It has a number of qualities that would appeal to some people that are
>>in power now:
>
>
> Put it away before the wrong person reads it and takes it seriously!

Just like my thoughts on your devil's advocacy toward testing using the
arguments used to get rid of the Morse CW requirement, this idea
couldn't stay covered up.

I find it chilling because it would be compelling to some.

>
>> It speaks to lowering or elimination of regulations. This is a very big
>
>
>>thing with some people. It relates itself to the "The government that
>>governs best governs least" worldview.
>
>
> Yep.
>
>> It speaks to the continuance of a process that has been going on for a
>>few years now where less constraints have been put on radio
>>broadcasters. A disaster IMO, but to some a great thing. I'm talking
>>about relaxation of broadcaster regs, leading to outfits like Clear
>>channel owning all the radio stations in town. But as I say, there are
>>plenty who would think that this would be good.
>
>
> Mike Powell is one of them.

Bingo! Sounding ominous, eh?

>
>> Spin city, IOW. It is ridiculous, but ridiculous can sell big
>
> sometimes.
>
> To some people it's not ridiculous. Look how many books Ann Coulter and Rush
> Limbaugh have sold....

Bingo again!

>>>>You think THAT wouldn't sell with some people in power? Another chance
>>>>to diss the hated regulators.
>
> boo...hissss....

Aint that the truff? Truly scary stuff!

- Mike KB3EIA -

2539. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-13 00:42:22 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <OrAsb.355$m84.258212@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 82214

Dwight Stewart wrote:

> "Mike Coslo" wrote:
>
>>(snip) As for a mid-life crisis, remember you worked
>>hard for it, you deserve it, and no one is going to
>>deprive you of it! 8^)
>
>
>
> LOL. Oh, I think my wife might certainly try.
>
>
>
>>I hear the MLC car of choice is a BMW Z3. Almost
>>makes me want to have one so I can pick one up.
>
>
>
> Anything white and expensive will do the job ("cute" is a bonus). I don't
> know why, but women seem to love white vehicles. I suspect it has something
> to do with the reason why women who would never do so elsewhere so easily
> shed their cloths around water. Of course, this is clearly not the reason I
> drive a white vehicle today - white is just a safer color on the road. ;-)

Side story, in 1980, I bought my first brand new car, a 1980 Fiesta. In
a fit of I don't know what, I bout it in a bright orange. Darn car was
run into by more people than any other car I've ever owned! 8^)

- Mike KB3EIA -

2540. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-13 01:06:56 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bouli2$bvo@library2.airnews.net>
Source record: 82216

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:SKnsb.22312$Oo4.2695@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> "Kim W5TIT" wrote:
> >
> > Nope. Do it yourself. I've told you the information is
> > there to be had--and it's that simple. People get paid
> > good money to do what you're asking me to do, above.
> > If you do it, Dwight, maybe you'll have some facts
> > behind your opinions...
>
> You and I both knew you couldn't do it, Kim. The information it not that
> easily available and it would take considerable effort for consumers to
> research the products they purchase each day, week, or year. In spite of
> your claims otherwise, you don't do it. I certainly don't do it. And I
don't
> know anyone who does. But someone has to have some responsibility for
which
> products are sold and effects on the overall economy. Since it is beyond
the
> abilities of the average consumer, the burden automatically falls on
> business, the government, and the courts.
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
>
>

Dwight, are you calling me a liar? Yes, I have done it, and yes it is not
all that difficult to do. Anyone on the internet has the capability and
it's not difficult at all. Try these sites, since you're apparently too
damned lazy to take the effort. You will have to add the typical front end
to each of these addresses:

ethicalconsumer.org (check out the research link)
epa.gov/tri (toxic release inventory)
greenchoices.org (has some links to fairly every-day things we buy)
corpgov.net (good primer on the topic)

I might also remind you of something, truly stupid I might add, that you
said above: "since it is beyond the abilities of the average consumer, the
burden automatically falls on business, the government, and the courts."
This in a follow-up to a brilliant observation you made: "...someone has to
have some responsibility for which products are sold and the effects on the
overall economy."

For cryin' out loud, Dwight, who the phucking (HansTM) hell do you think is going to keep "business, the government, and the courts" responsible?

And, let me further make a suggestion: before *you* make yourself look any more stupid, get some education on the topic we've been discussing in this thread. Jim and Dee are far better at me than history and perspective and you've repeatedly negated their points of view--even going so far as to say [paraphrasing here] that you don't have to have facts because we are "just debating." Go "just debate" with the Kindergartners...I take this subject far more seriously.

Kim W5TIT

2541. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-13 01:29:13 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031112202913.23171.00002034@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 82217

In article <3FAFF2B3.7070103@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>> "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
>news:<ZHqrb.8496$P%1.7683957@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>...

>> And until that happens, we watch jobs flow overseas.

>>>And we deal individually with the hardships
>>>as we have always done in the ups and downs of life.
>
>> Sounds good until *your* job disappears.....
>>
>> I say there's more we can do.
>
> The present paradigm will undoubtably hold sway until accountants see
>*thier* jobs shipped out to a third world country.

Bingo.
>
> Which, by the way, will be a whole lot easier than shipping
>manufacturing jobs out of the country!

Trouble is finding foreigners who are knowledgeable about American accounting practices - particularly for tax purposes.

> I believe in a free market with minimal but critical constraints.
>Although I agree with a lot of what Dee says, I'm curious what she
>thinks will happen when we have almost *no* domestic manufacturing.

How much have we lost already? Try to buy consumer electronics that are "Made In USA".
>
> A side note: Cars and housing cost (relatively) a good deal more than
>they did when I was a child. When I was 6, my parents bought a house for
>$7000.00 and paid it off in 10 yeas IIRC.

How much house on how much of an income? What was the interest rate?
>
>Rather than compare costs, it is best to look at the repay periods. Now
>a typical mortgage is 30 years, and cars are often now leased, or
>financed for amazingly long periods of time, like 6 or seven years -
>which used to be most of the lifetime of a car.
>
But cars also last longer - at least the ones I've dealt with.

For example, my first car was a 1974 Ford. Actually had two of them in the family, same model, same year. Needed a complete tuneup (points, plugs, condenser, rotor, timing) every 6 months to run anywhere close to right. Neither one made it to 100,000 miles or 10 years due to rust, even though I kept fixing them. In fact, by 8 years of age/85,000 miles they were both junkers.

Fast forward to 1991. Honda sedan. Put over 100K on it in 10 years. Tuneups were much less frequent and much less involved. Better gas mileage and performance than the Fords. and when it was sold it was not only running great but had zero rust.

1994 Saturn, bought used in 1997 with 27K on it, is over 82K now, running great as it approaches its 10th birthday.

Adjusted for inflation, the newer cars cost more to buy - but much less to operate.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2542. Re: Houston, we have a solution

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-13 01:31:21 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <boumvs$5vj@library2.airnews.net>
Source record: 82218

"Jim Hampton" <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote in message
news:80xsb.9242$_s3.7350@news01.roc.ny...
> Thanks, Kim.
>
> Do I have it right in case I have to take my test again?
> If it moves and shouldn't - "duct tape"
> If it doesn't move and should - "WD-40"
>
> I think I've got it, by jove!
>
>
> 73 from Rochester, NY
> Jim
> (ps - you *don't* want to see the makeshift dipole in my attic :) - it
does
> work, however. Electrical tape special.)
>

Two true stories:
Duct tape used to "seal" a leaking radiator hose when I was traveling around in Summertime down here in Texas. Kept telling myself I'd buy another hose and get it on soon...it was still on through the Winter and into Spring, when I finally broke down (not the car) and bought a new hose.

Electrical tape: on the way up to NY for a vacation, on the East side of Dallas (still very easy to get back home to Ft Worth--mind you), the car's carbeurator housing starts leaking and float starts sticking. I remember using teflon plumbing tape when I make plumbing repairs around the house and convince my then-husband to use electrical tape around the threads of the fuel line connection to the carbeurator. He thinks I am absolutely friggin' out of my mind. We removed the float valve, I applied the electrical tape very carefully (like only a woman could do)--even making sure to back it off from the first couple of rounds of threading so that the gasoline won't melt the electrical tape and really cause a problem. Total repair took about a half-hour and we happily drove the rest of the way to CT and NY. When we got to CT, my trucker brother-in-law lifted the hood of the car as my hubby was explaining what I made him do. My bil is all smiling and grinning and shaking his head, and he looks at my hubby and says, "if it'd been one of us that had come with that idea, it never would've worked." ROFLMAO!!!

When we got to NY, my dad used some kind of naval glue he'd been carrying around for years. The car ran for several more years with no float valve--it was the rear end that finally went on that one...

Yep, duct tape and electrical tape. Gotta have it.

Hey, check this out:

ducttapefashion.com

And, guaranteed blast here:

ducttapeguys.com (my favorite is the "Stuck in Traffic Entries" on the
dropdown link)

Kim W5TIT

>
> "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> news:bot1al$3j4@library2.airnews.net...
> > "Jim Hampton" <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote in message
> > news:6khsb.8103$gG7.4744@news01.roc.ny...
> > > Hans,
> > >
> > > I thought everyone used electrical tape :)
> > >
> > >
> > > 73 from Rochester, NY
> > > Jim AA2QA
> > > (ok, ok ... duct tape too)
> > >
> > >
> >
> > Duct tape, Jim. Duct tape!
> >
> > Kim W5TIT
> >
> >
>
>

2543. Re: Happy Veterans Day

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-13 01:43:58 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <ylBsb.26679$9M3.25574@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 82219

"Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote

> Not everyone likes veterans or thinks they are due any particular
> thanks.
>
> Concerning the "Bonus Army" of 1932, where veterans of The War to End
> All Wars (1917/1918) were due a bonus in 1945, but wanted payment
> early because they lost their homes in the Great Depression, Franklin
> Roosevelt is to have said:

....bunch of ancient rhetoric clipped.

Brian, my boy, don't look now but old Franklin, and Eleanor who probably put those words in his mouth, since Franklin is widely reckoned to have been more than just a little bit pussy-whipped, are both dead and buried and rotted now these almost 60 years ago. Do you suggest that these views should be endorsed by the current Commander in Chief?

73, de Hans, K0HB

2544. Re: Amateur Radio in the 21st Century?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-13 01:53:30 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <uuBsb.26692$9M3.16274@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 82220

N2EY wrote:

> Good luck on selling your ideas to FCC

Luck will have nothing to do with it.

73, de Hans, K0HB

2545. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-13 02:04:44 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <0FBsb.26731$9M3.19416@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 82221

N2EY wrote:

> Thanks for a complete and concise answer, Hans. And for showing that
> it's not just the bottom line that drives business decisions.

Ah, but I think you missed the best part of the whole message, Jim. Every action I described has a tendency to reduce my overall cost of goods sold, either in reducing fixed factory costs, in reduced variable costs, in higher inventory turns, in shorter manufacturing cycles, in better cash flow, or in reduced headcount. All of that DOES drop directly to my bottom line.

73, de Hans, K0HB

2546. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-13 02:10:58 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <SKBsb.26747$9M3.8073@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 82222

"Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote

> The present paradigm will undoubtably hold sway until accountants see
> *thier* jobs shipped out to a third world country.

Don't look now, but accounting is one of the "back office" functions which most manufacturing companies have outsourced to India and similar places a ***long*** time ago.

73, de Hans, K0HB

2547. Re: Amateur Radio in the 21st Century?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-13 03:29:14 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031112222914.15462.00004243@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 82223

In article <uuBsb.26692$9M3.16274@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>
>> Good luck on selling your ideas to FCC
>
>Luck will have nothing to do with it.

I am reminded of the Mae West line...

73 de Jim, N2EY

2548. Re: KE4TEW and his good friend Riley

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-13 03:37:39 UTC
From: George Orwell <nobody@mixmaster.it>
Message-ID: <749ffb4809d91ab46dcb382508f66fe1@mixmaster.it>
Source record: 82224
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.swap,rec.radio.amateur.policy

In article <borsuj$p5a$0@pita.alt.net>
"Roger" <NoEmail@AnonlymousRemailer.co> wrote:
>
>
>
> "bob" <bob@bob.com> wrote in message
> news:%j8sb.1980$jA6.1262@bignews6.bellsouth.net...
>
>
> Ken Bessler wrote:
>
>
> So how much pot did KE4TEW give Riley to get his license back?
>
> Read below, if you can read.
>
>
> TAMPA, FL: The FCC has requested that General class licensee James W.
> Dale, KE4TEW, retake the General class examination elements under the
> supervision of FCC personnel by July 30, 1999, or his license will be
> canceled.
>
> At:
>
> http://www.arrl.org/news/stories/1999/06/23/1/
>
> ---
>
> TAMPA, FL [UPDATE]: The FCC notified James W. Dale, formerly KE4TEW, on
> August 3, 1999, canceling his General Amateur Radio license. The FCC had
> notified Dale on June 18, 1999, requiring him to retake his Amateur
> Radio examinations prior to July 30, 1999, under the supervision of FCC
> personnel in Tampa, Florida. According to FCC Attorney Riley
> Hollingsworth, K4ZDH, Dale failed to appear for reexamination, and his
> license was consequently canceled. Hollingsworth also warned Dale about
> continued operation of radio transmitting equipment.
>
> At:
> http://www.arrl.org/news/stories/1999/08/11/2/
> --
>
> Now, the "Miracle"
>

> TAMPA, FL [UPDATE]: The FCC notified General licensee James W. Dale,
> KE4TEW, on September 28, 1999, that it was reinstating his Amateur Radio
> license with a short-term renewal date of September 29, 2000. Dale had
> failed to appear for reexamination after being notified by the FCC on
> June 18 to retake his Amateur Radio examinations prior to July 30, and
> his license was canceled on August 3, 1999. FCC Legal Adviser for
> Enforcement Riley Hollingsworth said the FCC has "since reviewed and
> accepted" Dale's detailed response and his explanation for failing to
> appear for retesting. Hollingsworth said the FCC was reinstating Dale's
> General license "pursuant to our agreement with you," but the FCC letter
> did not elaborate. Hollingsworth told Dale that if there are "no valid
> complaints about your use of Amateur Radio" over the next year, he may
> apply for a routine license renewal at the end of his current term.
>
> At:
> http://www.arrl.org/news/stories/1999/10/07/5/
>
> ---
> Thus, KE4TEW, a convicted felon who jammed HF frequencies for years
> while id'ing, did not show up for a retest. Why? That's easy. He paid
> for his license. Then Riley does what he has done with the others who
> did not show up, he cancels the license. Good Riddance to this nuisance.
> Then almost two months later, Riley reinstates the license, WITHOUT THE
> ORIGINAL RETEST!!!! "Pursuant to our agreement with you" What the hell
> does that mean?? In other words, even though we know you are not
> qualified to be on the air, go ahead anyway???? What the hell kind of
> enforcement is this? It's biased enforcement, Riley's trademark style.
> So what was the agreement? Harass people on the Internet 24/7? Continue
> to jam the Liberty Net? Is he paying Riley a monthly fee to be on
> Amateur Radio? Riley's little slush fund. Did TEW give Riley a large
> amount of illicit drugs? What was it that made Riley reinstate this
> known drug dealers ticket that was fraudulent in the first place?
> Maybe Riley does Rita on weekends?
>
> If you are wondering what kind of ethics violation Riley committed in
> granting TEW's ticket back under the table contact the Inspector General
> of the FCC as several already have. Ask Mr. Feaster to add your name to
> the ethics probe of the KE4TEW case. Then one day you too will know how
> to bribe an FCC official and make him make unethical decisions on your
> behalf.
>
>
> Feaster, H Walker III OIG (202) 418-0476
>
> or wfeaster@fcc.gov
>
> ....
>
> ...and the stalking continues.

So does your stupidity.

2549. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-13 03:43:08 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <g5Dsb.9375$P%1.8576572@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 82225

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20031111222938.02537.00001529@mb-m23.aol.com...
>
> One thing *has* changed in the past 30-odd years. There used to be a lot
of
> jobs that a kid with a high-school diploma could get, that would lead up
the
> ladder to better paying jobs. Today those jobs take a college degree. Call
it
> education inflation or whatever, it's a fact.
>

That's because all too often these days that high school diploma is
insufficient to prove the applicant can even read and write.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

2550. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-13 03:49:30 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <ebDsb.9376$P%1.8578015@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 82226

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20031112062933.14837.00004192@mb-m03.aol.com...
> In article <t%rrb.1130$KN4.845856@news1.news.adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo
> <mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:
>
> > As I recall reading a while back, in 1950, it took 14 percent of an
> >average workers income to put a roof over "his head". That may have
> >changed a little bit! 8^)
>
> It changed big time. Same for medical and education costs.

However as noted in later in this same post for cars (now snipped), people now demand more features in that house and more room in that house that was common in 1950. So it's an apples to oranges comparison.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

2551. new jammer on 146.640 tampa bay florida

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-13 05:13:15 UTC
From: hamradioman2000@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <e95066a4.0311122113.54359624@posting.google.com>
Source record: 82227

the ron wright N9EE 146.640 repeater in tampa bay florida is home to a new jammer, he proudly says his call KG4LEG AKA coy roy on CB

www.QRZ.com reports him to be
Roy A Lepelletier
1703 Cypress Avenue
Belleair FL 33756
USA

roy will pick fights with other amateurs.
roy will key up and cary on an imaginary "full duplex" conversation with suposid CB'ers on channel 35.
he claims he has lots of friends on cb that are listening to him on 146.640 while they are talking back to him on CB ch 35. (that is total BS) hes just doing it to agitate the normal folk on 640. several people heard him keying up on CB 35 while claiming to talk full duplex on ham, wich would not be effective to talk to cbers anyway.
(basically roy is lieing about his intentions.)
he also will ramble on and on to himself that there are people making death threats against him. he also claims a guy named dickie or dicky hendricson or hendrickson is a child molester, and goes into deatail over the air what this dicky had suposidly done to childeren (fairly graphic and not apropriate)
in other times he will say this hendricson is his friend. one amateur don KG4COQ tried to nicely get roy to change to another repeater and wanted to talk to roy about the guys that roy is talking about on that other repeater. roy turns it all around and says roy doesnot need any help with these people that are after him, but if anyone wanted to help, they could send roy cash. (roy said that several times)
when don continued nicely to try to get roy to change repeaters, roy twisted around this words and accused the don of wanting to meet up with him to start a fight, but don didnot say anything like that, then roy accused don of wanting to meet up with roy for some homosexual encounter, wich again don NEVER said anything about. roy has also commented about having been in the marines out in california, something about a "jar head" flight wing kind of position, but didnot go into detail about why hes out. he claims hes retired and wants to stay that way. roy also was throwing out the "im gonna sue you" to alot of people also. he was saying people were saying bad things when they wernt. new people would get on the repeater, and he would initiate a conversation with them, but immideatly jump into a platform about how hes on cb and running 200 watts, just like everyone else does on CB. he says things over and over. if everyone leaves him alone, he would usually key up every minite or 2 making a stupid CB comment or CB slang.

thias guy is a head case, hes off his medication and someone needs to
get him to the mental hospital :)

2552. Re: Happy Veterans Day

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-13 05:20:54 UTC
From: charlesb <n5pvl@sbcglobal.net>
Message-ID: <WwEsb.694$UX4.32229430@newssvr21.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 82228

"Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
news:f45722ac.0311121534.17abad08@posting.google.com...
>
> Concerning the "Bonus Army" of 1932, where veterans of The War to End
> All Wars (1917/1918) were due a bonus in 1945, but wanted payment
> early because they lost their homes in the Great Depression, Franklin
> Roosevelt is to have said:
>

"Is to have said?" I would think that Roosevelt has pretty well said what he is going to, by now!

Also: It's not amazing that Roosevelt would short-change veterans. When the S.F. dockworkers went on strike during WW2, refusing to load ammo and supplies for our troops, Roosevelt ordered the shipping companies to cave to the union demands instead of having a few of the union ringleaders imprisoned, beaten or shot, as any reasonable person would do with socialist traitors who attempt to extort and undermine the country during a time of war.

Charles Brabham, N5PVL

2553. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-13 05:23:42 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <REMOVETHISkc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <bp01u4$1j4jgd$1@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 82239

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:zcfsb.9188$P%1.8310788@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
>
> "Ryan, KC8PMX" <REMOVETHISkc8pmx@diamondcs.net> wrote in message
> news:borq9m$1gm7n3$6@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de...
> > Yeah..... that may be true but circumstances now have forced many to
> suffer
> > with it as a "living" wage.
> >
>
> Yeah that's the same "victim" argument some of my friends made when I went
> to college and they didn't. But I sacrificed to go to college. My
parents
> didn't pay for it.
>

Thats assuming a certain age too. I have sacraficed as well, but do the math, at 5-7 bucks an hour, trying to support your self, in the minimal of settings, (housing, transportation etc.) and also have funds to pay for college does not always work as conviently as you prescribe. I have been working on my degree since 1989, and am almost done. Unfortunately you live in some type of world where kids are allowed to live with the parents above the age of 18. Myself, as well as many others do not have that luxury.

> I worked a minimum wage job, lived at home, did not buy a car, did not buy
> records and so on. I put the money aside and did without so I could go to
> college. So that "circumstances" argument is pretty shakey. And don't
try
> the "pregnant and alone teenager" argument either. I knew some of them in
> college and they made it too.

Again, not all people have the luxury of living off the parents beyond graduation of high school. To expect every person to have been in the exact same circumstances as you is also pretty shakey as well. As far as the pregnant teenager issue, I wasn't gonna mention that one either.

>
> People allow themselves to fail and become victims of circumstance.

Following that logic, then the people IN the WTC buildings are also as well then......

Ryan KC8PMX

2554. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-13 05:29:03 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <xnfcneeyarg.ho9htff.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>
Source record: 82229

On 13 Nov 2003 01:29:13 GMT, N2EY wrote:

>Trouble is finding foreigners who are knowledgeable about American accounting
>practices - particularly for tax purposes.

Ten years ago there were few if any qualified computer professionals
in those third-world countres to which we now "offshore" more and
more of our technical expertise. Now there is a plethora of same.

Finding trained "foreign professionals" is no big deal anymore. I
have met many US-qualified accountants from the Pacific Rim when I
lived in a neighborhood adjacent to one with a large population of
such immmigrants in California.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

2555. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-13 05:33:52 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <REMOVETHISkc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <bp01u5$1j4jgd$2@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 82240

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:sjfsb.9190$P%1.8312401@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
>
> "Ryan, KC8PMX" <REMOVETHISkc8pmx@diamondcs.net> wrote in message
> news:borq9n$1gm7n3$7@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de...
> > Dee,
> >
> > You must be living in a "fairy tale" world if yo believe this to be
still
> > true. It is a simple fact that there is not the same type of jobs
> available
> > that were around in the 1965-1980's range of time. The changes in the
> > employment economy and shifts in employment trends are why. Take GM for
> > instance..... At least up here in the Tri- Cities and Flint, GM is
> > constantly cutting back, and even closing plants, not the opposite.
Hell,
> > locally speaking, Dow Chemical and Dow Corning also have cut more than
> half
> > their workforce in the past 15 years or so.
> >
>
> Economies, markets and jobs are always changing. This is nothing new. A
> lot of us have had to change with them, rebuild our skills and move to not
> only different jobs but different locations in the country to stay
employed.

Yep..... no problem with that statement, as many of us do. You just must
seem to think that there is an abundance of those wonderful high paying jobs
out there, when that is not the case. Overall, the economy is moving
towards the "basic service" type of jobs as opposed to the manufacturing
jobs of the past.

>
> I've faced and made some hard economic choices in my life and did not and
do
> not expect the government to fix it for me or the world to stay static.
> Security is and always has been an illusion. I've faced that a long time
> ago and dealt with it.
>
> > Construction jobs around here suck, unless you hold "paper" you are
> nothing
> > and still making the under 8 dollar an hour range wage, before taxes. I
> can
> > bring up more examples if you want referring to my area if ya want.
> >

> >
>
> So if they suck, why don't the people go elsewhere. People have
> traditionally followed the job markets to get ahead. You can't make the
> market come to you. That is an unrealistic fairy tail and illusion.

Construction is not my field, but know others that work in that field.

>
> By the way, check the tax tables. Someone making $8 per hour or under and
> has a family probably won't be paying any significant income taxes unless
> their spouse is also working but even then their tax burden is still
> minimal.

Yeah, if they are supporting a family that may be true, but it is still taking from the paycheck till the following April. Also, if there is any form of a miracle that this job gives any benefits like health, that is also subtracted from the takehome.

If you are so damned good, and have a great grip on employment issues, then you oughta come up this way. You could make a fortune helping others, working on a finders fee! LOL

Also, get it out of your head that most of what I have been responding to in this is directly an example of what I am dealing with personally as your attacks indicate, but observations of what is going on around here.

Ryan KC8PMX

2556. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-13 05:43:15 UTC
From: charlesb <n5pvl@sbcglobal.net>
Message-ID: <TREsb.700$hn5.33963063@newssvr21.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 82230

Hey, I hate to interrupt the historical and political discussion, but I have a Ham Radio - related question.

Sorry to abruptly drift back on-topic like this, but what is the latest poop on the BPL rollout in Virginia? There has been more than enough time for something to have happened... So what happened?

Charles Brabham, N5PVL

2557. Re: new jammer on 146.640 tampa bay florida

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-13 06:12:39 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031113011239.00715.00000112@mb-m28.aol.com>
Source record: 82231

>the ron wright N9EE 146.640 repeater in tampa bay florida is home to a
>new jammer, he proudly says his call KG4LEG AKA coy roy on CB
>

Why are you complaining, hes just another typical No-Code. Isnt that what all
you No-Coders wanted.

2558. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-13 06:33:58 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <REMOVETHISkc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <bp01u7$1j4jgd$3@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 82241

I didn't think Jim would every go that "low" but a kid to me is someone
almost in the college years! (somewhere between 18-21..... hi hi) Never
would have implied child labor (under 14.)

--
Ryan KC8PMX

Never take life seriously. Nobody gets out alive anyway.

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:Ijisb.22724$KN4.1746427@news1.news.adelphia.net...
> N2EY wrote:
>
>
> > As for "a job a kid could do", rest assured that if some employers could
use
> > child labor, they would - and pay 'em less than minimum wage, too.
>
> Hehe, that brings us to one of the reasons that U****S got started in
> the first place. The employers *were* using children, *were* paying them
> almost nothing, and abusing them most terribly.
>
> So the people who argue that raising the minimum wage is putting young
> people out of work do know what they are talking about!
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -
>

2559. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-13 07:32:33 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <REMOVETHISkc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <bp01u8$1j4jgd$4@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 82242

>
> Then they're bums, pure and simple - not "union bums".

If they are bums, and part of a union, then the logic displayed here by
certain others dictates they are by definition then, "union bums."
I don't get any union protection whatsoever... why should they?

>
> As for "a job a kid could do", rest assured that if some employers could
use
> child labor, they would - and pay 'em less than minimum wage, too.

Hmmm, did I say child labor or kids..... kids in reference to me was
referring to the teeny boppers up til around somewhere between 18-21.

>
> >> The basic concept that Dwight is talking about is a "living wage" -
> >> meaning jobs that pay enough in wages and benefits to permit people to
> >> live above the poverty line *without* government help. Yes, paying a
> >> living wage makes products and services cost more, but it also removes
> >> people from the govt. support system.
> >
> >So.... basically, one way or another people have to pay for it, be it in
> >higher service/product costs or paying in taxes for a government program.
>
> Sure. But which is more efficient economically - private industry or the
govt.
> programs?

Not really sure, but if the costs were about the same, I am not really sure
if there would be a difference.
Not saying I support government intervention either....

> >
> >> Some say "the marketplace" should set wages. But "the marketplace" is
> >> tilted by a bunch of factors, such as the exportation of jobs and the
> >> importation of workers.
> >
> >Yes, that is what is called an idealism, but in reality it doesn't work
that
> >way. Let's look at my county for example..... Republican owners of
> >businesses and places to rent charge considerably higher for products,
> >services and housing. These are also in most of the cases the employers
in
> >the area. For example, on average, a single bedroom apartment cannot be
> >found for less than $350-400. That does not even include utilities.

>
> That's actually quite inexpensive compared to a lot of places.

Yeah... but the "living wage, or prevailing minimum wage" is higher in those "other places" I would have to imagine.

>
> >The
> >average wage around here, what is considered the alleged "living" or minimum
> >wage is between $5.25-6.00 per hour. Now, do the math on that. The first
> >of the normal 2 paychecks (paid every 2 weeks) each month barely even
> >covers the rent, let alone the utilities. Factor in transportation of any
> >means, and basic food needs, and that exceeds the second check.
>
> Sure - but that's if you live alone.

Yeah..... true, but so far I have not seen anything around here like some type of "roommate arranger" or anything like that. In fact I am almost hesitant to roommate with anyone I do not know almost as well as I know family members. When living in the crotch of Michigan, otherwise known as Flint, I lost everything to my name because of one of the two roommates had some outstanding debt to some shady characters, that I wasn't even aware of because on the surface the person seemed as credible as most anyone in this newsgroup. Lost all my photography gear, computer, SCUBA gear, and DJ equipment and music collection at the time, to a tune of almost $10,000 worth of stuff.

And as another posted in this thread somewhere, it is not always feasable to "mooch off the parents" for alot of people, although some are fortunate enough to do so.

>
> >This does
> >not include for any savings, clothing or medicine purchases and of course
> >nothing in the "entertainment" category on the spreadsheet.
> >That is why alot of people around here are forced to work two jobs. Problem
> >there is, there is no time left over for family or even better, trying to
> >take classes to get a degree to get out of the ruts. Typically in my area
> >as well, certain market indicators such as milk, bread, gasoline etc, is at
> >least 10-20 percent higher than surrounding counties. Basically they want
> >you to work for as little as possible, but charge ya up the ying-yang for
> >everything. Guess that is the American way eh?
>
> Supply and demand. Obviously there's no labor shortage there, so the employers

> control the wages. The answer is to vote with your feet.
> >> The "living wage" concept and reality are largely a result of
> >> organized labor unions leveling the playing field a bit by unifying
> >> the many workers in negotiating with the relatively few employees. The
> >> really smart employers learned to treat their workers well enough that
> >> they wouldn't unionize.
> >>
> >> Look at what working conditions were like in various industries
> >> 100-150 years ago, before organized labor had any real power.
> >
> >Just like they are for non-unionized labor now! hihi
>
> Because of the weakening of the unions.

Only if all jobs had union protectionism schemes helping them.

>
>
> >> Yep. $20,000/yr isn't much at all anymore in many parts of the
> >> country. Not to raise a family, anyway.
> >
> >Or for a single person either..... that 20,000 grand is PRE-TAX and
> >PRE-BENEFIT (if any) and can quickly become as low as 13,000-15,000
dollars
> >depending on the circumstances.
>
> The trick is to go where the good jobs are...

Again, that is not always feasable as well. My last move cost almost $1,000
that I have recently paid off to a friend who was generous enough to loan me
the money to do so. (fortunately he allowed me to stretch the payments
out.)

>
> >> As for the $15 burrito and coke at Taco Bell, think about this:
>
> >> At least here in EPA, we have a decent selection of independent diners
> >> as an alternative to the fast food chains. The food in them is not
> >> much more expensive than the chains, and usually better for you. The
> >> workers in those places make at least as much as the fast food chains.
> >> One reason for their survival is that they don't spend bazillions on
> >> advertising. Another is local loyalty of customers.
>
> >> So what's the answer, Dwight - Ryan - Kim?
>
> >I don't assume to have all of the answers, but I am sure that you can go
> >through just about any company or organization and thin out the
dead-wood.
>
> That depends on the company. Many are constantly doing just that.
>

> >People who just are not returning equivalent value for the service they
are
> >supposed to provide as an employee. There is a case of 3 people who are
> >"riding the clock out" in my full time employment place of work. And
> >compared to the remainder of the department they are making more than
twice
> >our wages for similar/same work but just have been here a while. With
those
> >three people to finally retire or move on, that would allow for at least
4-5
> >more people to replace them, that will ACTUALLY WORK, and still allow for
> >the rest of the department to get a $1.00 per hour raise, and STILL SAVE
> >SOME MONEY on overall department wages.
>
> How?
>
> If there are 3 people slacking, they could probably be replaced by 1 or 2
good
> workers, not 4 or 5.

Yes, but the 3 people are also by raises and cost of living allowances (COLA's) are making almost 15 bucks per hour, (45 dollars per hour total) and in the same positions, and same level of responsibility, but just have been around quite a while and never moved anywhere within the department..

Now hiring at least four people at say 8 bucks an hour to start, (higher than they normally do right now) makes 32 dollars an hour, plus giving the other 6 people a dollar an hour raise which would bring all employees up to at least 8 dollars or more per hour, which now gives us a total of 38 dollars an hour cost for the four new people and giving the existing ones a raise, which would boost the moral as well. Still leaves a savings of about 7 bucks per hour, or they could spend 1 dollar more per hour and have a total of five people and use up that seven an hour savings. That would give us 5 actually working employees instead of 3 that don't do much.

>
> >The math has been figured out here
> >on this and it is true....
> >
> >The other answer is for employers to finally see the value in helping the
> >employee with training/education. If an employer is credible enough, the
> >employee will stay with that employer with the new training they have
> >recieved.
>
> Both my present and former employers do that.

Not the majority around here. There are some that are intelligent enough to see the value in training and continuing education. I myself pursue at least 120-150 hours each year in continuing education credits.

>
> >Even though people want to believe otherwise, there are more and more

people
> >having to, and trying to survive on what were supposed to be considered
> >"high school kid" jobs.
>
> Why?
>
> Do they refuse to relocate?

Unless it is something new, I have yet to see any organization, public or private that assists with moving/relocation costs. Someone making less than 10 bucks per hour pre-tax/pre-benefit cannot afford to pick up and move across the country that easy.

> Do they lack education and other qualifications?

That is a possibility, but I cannot speak for others. There is the "who you know" factor as well. Many unqualified people get those jobs where a qualified person didn't, merely by who they knew. (or what butt they kissed)

>
> One thing *has* changed in the past 30-odd years. There used to be a lot
of
> jobs that a kid with a high-school diploma could get, that would lead up
the
> ladder to better paying jobs. Today those jobs take a college degree. Call
it
> education inflation or whatever, it's a fact.

That is true 100%. I have been working on my degree since 1989, as finances allow.

--
Ryan KC8PMX

Health is merely the slowest possible rate at which one can die.

2560. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-13 10:08:57 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bovlaa$t2t@library2.airnews.net>
Source record: 82232

"K&#65533;HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:SKBsb.26747$9M3.8073@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> "Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote
>
> > The present paradigm will undoubtably hold sway until accountants see
> > *thier* jobs shipped out to a third world country.
>
> Don't look now, but accounting is one of the "back office" functions which
> most manufacturing companies have outsourced to India and similar places a
> ***long*** time ago.
>
> 73, de Hans, K0HB
>
>

Yep, sure have and did! And, along with that, customer service/support is "shipped"overseas quite often. When you call the "local" help group for a service you're purchasing, or product, it's likely you're talking to someone in the Phillipines.

Kim W5TIT

2561. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-13 10:11:33 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bovlf7$lkr@library2.airnews.net>
Source record: 82233

"charlesb" <n5pvl@sbcglobal.net> wrote in message
news:TREsb.700$hn5.33963063@newssvr21.news.prodigy.com...
>
> Hey, I hate to interrupt the historical and political discussion, but I
have
> a Ham Radio - related question.
>
> Sorry to abruptly drift back on-topic like this, but what is the latest
poop
> on the BPL rollout in Virginia? There has been more than enough time for
> something to have happened... So what happened?
>
> Charles Brabham, N5PVL
>
>

Haven't a clue...

Kim W5TIT

2562. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-13 10:18:23 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bovls0$at6@library2.airnews.net>
Source record: 82234

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:ebDsb.9376$P%1.8578015@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
>
> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20031112062933.14837.00004192@mb-m03.aol.com...
> > In article <t%rrb.1130$KN4.845856@news1.news.adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo
> > <mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:
> >
> > > As I recall reading a while back, in 1950, it took 14 percent of an
> > >average workers income to put a roof over "his head". That may have
> > >changed a little bit! 8^)
> >
> > It changed big time. Same for medical and education costs.
>
> However as noted in later in this same post for cars (now snipped), people
> now demand more features in that house and more room in that house that
was
> common in 1950. So it's an apples to oranges comparison.
>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>

Yeah, I am glad you re-brought that back up, Dee. I have often wondered how "close" a comparison it is when we start comparing the wage:cost of living ratio from yesteryears and today. Because, we do have "bigger, better" ideas in our products today.

I mean, today in a newly built home, and "upgrade" package is turning one of the common areas into a media room! And, who would have ever thought that we'd be able to buy a vehicle that would have an on-screen map (OK, it's called GPS...grin), or even that we'd be able to push a button and talk to someone in an office who can remember to buy our spouse the anniversary flowers?!

I think if we stripped down, maybe from a perspective of percentage (?), dollar for dollar we are not that much more "inflated" than we were years ago. OK, a loaf of bread was 20 cents and today it's a buck fifty. But the 20 cents is probably near or equal to the same "earn" value as the buck fifty.

Well, anyway, economics have always fascinated me...but not enough to drive me to be able to understand it all :)

Kim W5TIT

2563. Language Rules from FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-13 10:21:05 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bovm12$901@library2.airnews.net>
Source record: 82235

A neighbor tells me that the FCC has recently ruled that broadcast radio stations are now "legally" able to "say the F word" on the air, as long as it isn't sexual. Yeah, I know, go figure.

But, when I did a quick search on the FCC website, I found nothing of it. Anyone know of this...my thoughts are on what will happen in amateur radio now. The broadcast arena has always been the barometer of what people are allowed to say on the air, hasn't it?

Kim W5TIT

2564. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-13 13:07:05 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <ZILsb.27197$9M3.17699@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 82236

"Kim W5TIT" wrote:
>
> Dwight, are you calling me a liar? (snip)

Well, call it what you want, Kim. You told me that you're an informed consumer that routinely researches the products you buy. It seems to me that if one routinely researches products, the locations of sites with such information would be instantly familiar. But, when I then asked you for information about several products, you didn't offer the sites you supposedly use - you had to search the internet to find sites. By the way, the sites you finally did list certainly didn't dispute my claim that reliable info is not that easy for consumers to get (see next paragraph below).

> ethicalconsumer.org (check out the research link)
> epa.gov/tri (toxic release inventory)
> greenchoices.org (has some links to fairly every-day things we buy)
> corpgov.net (good primer on the topic)

Is this really where you get your information from, Kim? I stopped looking after seeing the prominent "Boycott Bush" link on the www.ethicalconsumer.org home page. If this site is at all typical of the others, these are sites pushing their own little agendas, not sources of accurate and reliable consumer information.

> For cryin' out loud, Dwight, who the phucking (HansTM) hell
> do you think is going to keep "business, the government, and
> the courts" responsible?

Well, isn't that just an astonishing revelation, Kim? Did you just now realize this entire discussion is all within the context of this country, it's people, and their system of government? That's what's going on in this thread, Kim - people discussing what they think their government should do.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

2565. Re: Happy Veterans Day

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-13 13:23:13 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0311130523.7d83223e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 82237

"Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<ylBsb.26679$9M3.25574@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> "Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote
>
> > Not everyone likes veterans or thinks they are due any particular
> > thanks.
> >
> > Concerning the "Bonus Army" of 1932, where veterans of The War to End
> > All Wars (1917/1918) were due a bonus in 1945, but wanted payment
> > early because they lost their homes in the Great Depression, Franklin
> > Roosevelt is to have said:
>
> ....bunch of ancient rhetoric clipped.
>
> Brian, my boy, don't look now but old Franklin, and Eleanor who probably put
> those words in his mouth, since Franklin is widely reckoned to have been
> more than just a little bit pussy-whipped, are both dead and buried and
> rotted now these almost 60 years ago. Do you suggest that these views
> should be endorsed by the current Commander in Chief?
>
> 73, de Hans, K0HB

Clinton.

2566. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-13 13:37:05 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <5OLsb.27211$9M3.3013@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 82238

"Mike Coslo" wrote:
>
> Side story, in 1980, I bought my first brand new
> car, a 1980 Fiesta. In a fit of I don't know what,
> I bought it in a bright orange. Darn car was run
> into by more people than any other car I've ever
> owned! 8^)

Bright orange, huh? Interesting color choice. Anyway, didn't you notice the number of orange cones littering the highways around construction sites? I don't know if people just can't see them or they intentionally run over them. I worked at a truck rental place many years ago and a customer returned a truck one afternoon with an orange cone dangling under the front. When I asked him about it, he said it must have come from the construction site he went through up the road. Obviously, he wasn't even aware that he had run over it. Hopefully there was no worker standing near that cone. If so, he fell off before the truck got to our location. ;-)

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

2567. Important Research at TAPR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-13 13:49:54 UTC
From: charlesb <n5pvl@sbcglobal.net>
Message-ID: <6_Lsb.8738$xt6.2194@newssvr29.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 82243

According to the latest TAPR "Packet Status Register", thier quarterly newsletter, the folks at TAPR have discovered that they are adrift, with no purpose and direction to guide their activities. As is often the case, the "leadership" at TAPR were the last ones to acknowlege a situation that hams have been noticing and remarking upon for over a decade.

It appears the TAPR BoD put their heads together, discussed the question thoroughly, and discovered that they still had no idea as to what TAPR is supposed to be doing. At last they threw up thier hands and hired somebody to investigate - To try to determine what TAPR might be good for.

"Uh, TAPR does technical stuff." was the conclusion the investigator returned.

It is revealing that during the entire article describing the confusion and debate as to what TAPR might be good for and the "answer" thier investigator eventually turned up, the words "packet radio" were never even mentioned.

That's right; At no time did anybody in the TAPR organization or the investigator they hired mention the words "packet radio" while working to solve the mystery as to what TAPR might be good for. Those words also are lacking in the investigator's conclusion, "Uh, TAPR does technical stuff."

- So why do some people think of TAPR as a packet radio organization?

TAPR doesn't.

Charles Brabham, N5PVL
Director: USPacket.Net
http://www.uspacket.net
n5pvl@uspacket.net

2568. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-13 13:53:16 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3FB38CCC.9000204@psu.edu>
Source record: 82244

Kï¿½HB wrote:
> "Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote
>
>
>>The present paradigm will undoubtably hold sway until accountants see
>>*thier* jobs shipped out to a third world country.
>
>
> Don't look now, but accounting is one of the "back office" functions which
> most manufacturing companies have outsourced to India and similar places a
> ***long*** time ago.

Hadn't heard of that. Any idea who and when?

- Mike KB3EIA -

2569. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-13 13:55:56 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3FB38D6C.3060109@psu.edu>
Source record: 82245

Kim W5TIT wrote:
> "Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:SKBsb.26747$9M3.8073@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net...
>
>>"Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote
>>
>>
>>>The present paradigm will undoubtably hold sway until accountants see
>>>*thier* jobs shipped out to a third world country.
>>
>>Don't look now, but accounting is one of the "back office" functions which
>>most manufacturing companies have outsourced to India and similar places a
>>***long*** time ago.
>>
>>73, de Hans, K0HB
>>
>>
>
>
> Yep, sure have and did! And, along with that, customer service/support is
> "shipped"overseas quite often. When you call the "local" help group for a
> service you're purchasing, or product, it's likely you're talking to someone
> in the Phillipines.

What outfits use accounting in India? no question that tech support has
in large part moved there.

- Mike KB3EIA -

2570. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-13 14:08:24 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3FB39058.40704@psu.edu>
Source record: 82246

Dee D. Flint wrote:
> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20031112062933.14837.00004192@mb-m03.aol.com...
>
>>In article <t%rrb.1130$KN4.845856@news1.news.adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo
>><mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:
>>
>>
>>>As I recall reading a while back, in 1950, it took 14 percent of an
>>>average workers income to put a roof over "his head". That may have
>>>changed a little bit! 8^)
>>
>>It changed big time. Same for medical and education costs.
>
>
> However as noted in later in this same post for cars (now snipped), people
> now demand more features in that house and more room in that house that was
> common in 1950. So it's an apples to oranges comparison.

Well if we cant compare houses to houses because houses to houses is
apples to oranges.............

C'mon, Dee - there has to be *some* sort of comparison that can be
made! If my comments about people paying 50 percent or more of their
take home pay to put a roof over their head compared to 14 percent way
back when are irrelevant, and if people doing 30 year mortgages vs 10 or
15 year mortgages are irrelevant, than I guess you are saying that
buying a house in 1950 is the exact equivalent of buying one in 2003?

......but it isn't because it's an apples to oranges comparison?

- Mike KB3EIA -

2571. Re: KE4TEW and his good friend Riley

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-13 14:26:09 UTC
From: "privacy.at Anonymous Remailer" <mixmaster@remailer.privacy.at>
Message-ID: <fb0ce8d1fd0a018186c97ab18152c2af@remailer.privacy.at>
Source record: 82247
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.swap,rec.radio.amateur.policy

In article <bos1rq$8dv$0@pita.alt.net>
"Eric" <NoEmail@Anonuser.co> wrote:
>
(followup corrected)

Hey, stupid, why'd you put this newsgroup in your followup three
times?

>
> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
> news:tofsb.21928$Oo4.1062@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> What the hell is wrong with you people? You don't even know Jim, KE4TEW.
> You listen to the made up bullshit from ten years ago, and continue to
> demean him. What the hell is wrong with you people?
>
> This is not ham radio. Hell it's not even CB. It is just plain vicious
> slander.
>
> Dan/W4NTI

Slander is spoken defamation, LIBEL is written defamation,
stupid.

>
> Dan. It's just more crap from Wogie Wussman and Dimmy O'Brainless.
> What do you expect from the likes of them?

Aww, poor thing, when the convicted drug dealer the Tampa Turd
is caught lying, more liars step up and defend him.
Aren't those online criminal background checks wonderful?

First Name: JAMES
Middle Name: WILLIAM
Last Name: DALE
Date of Birth: 01/01/1941
Race: White
Sex: Male
Height: 6'0''
Hair:
Eye Color:
--------------- Detail Charges Found ---------------
State: FLHLS
Case #: 97-CF-004272
County Name: HillsboroO
Description: POSS OF MARIJUANA W/INTENT TO

Class: FELONY FIRST DEGREE
Statute:
File Date: 02/19/1997

2572. Re: KE4TEW and his good friend Riley

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-13 14:51:59 UTC
From: charlesb <n5pvl@sbcglobal.net>
Message-ID: <jUMsb.13188$dJ2.3654@newssvr25.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 82248
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.swap,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"privacy.at Anonymous Remailer" <mixmaster@remailer.privacy.at> wrote in
message news:fb0ce8d1fd0a018186c97ab18152c2af@remailer.privacy.at...
>
> In article <bos1rq$8dv$0@pita.alt.net>
> "Eric" <NoEmail@Anonuser.co> wrote:
> >
> (followup corrected)
>
> Hey, stupid, why'd you put this newsgroup in your followup three
> times?
>

If you gentlemen cannot play nice, then kindly take a hike. This is a
newsgroup dedicated to topics related to ham radio, not a contest to see who
can be the biggest jerk. Take your garbage elsewhere, right now.

Charles Brabham, N5PVL

2573. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-13 17:26:02 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0311130926.38f4f950@posting.google.com>
Source record: 82249

"Kim" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote in message news:<bovls0$at6@library2.airnews.net>...
> "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
> news:ebDsb.9376$P%1.8578015@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
> >
> > "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> > news:20031112062933.14837.00004192@mb-m03.aol.com...
> > > In article <t%rrb.1130$KN4.845856@news1.news.adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo
> > > <mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:
> > >
> > > > As I recall reading a while back, in 1950, it took 14 percent of an
> > > >average workers income to put a roof over "his head". That may have
> > > >changed a little bit! 8^)
> > >
> > > It changed big time. Same for medical and education costs.
> >
> > However as noted in later in this same post for cars (now snipped), people
> > now demand more features in that house and more room in that house that
> > was common in 1950. So it's an apples to oranges comparison.
> >
> > Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

> Yeah, I am glad you re-brought that back up, Dee. I have often wondered how
> "close" a comparison it is when we start comparing the wage:cost of living
> ratio from yesteryears and today. Because, we do have "bigger, better"
> ideas in our products today.

Sure - in fact, my current home (built 1950-51) is a case study in the
differences. I doubt anyone would build a house like mine new today in
a similar neighborhood, but a half-century ago it was a pretty
standard "little box made of ticky-tacky" design. And most of the
differences (more bathrooms, bigger, more feature-filled kitchen, AC
from the getgo) cost more than just simple square footage add-ons.

But if you strip away the features differences, the costs are still
more. When I bought the house in 1999, it was well maintained but
essentially unchanged from its original 1951 state (original heater,
kitchen remodeled but not upgraded, etc.) But its cost-to-buy and
cost-to-keep are a lot more now, even adjusted for inflation.
>
> I mean, today in a newly built home, and "upgrade" package is turning one of
> the common areas into a media room! And, who would have ever thought that
> we'd be able to buy a vehicle that would have an on-screen map (OK, it's
> called GPS...grin), or even that we'd be able to push a button and talk to
> someone in an office who can remember to buy our spouse the anniversary
> flowers?!

All of those things were predicted decades ago. Not in the exact form
they take today, but the same concepts. For example, I recall reading
in the early 1960s that we'd all have computer access "someday soon",
although it was usually presented that we'd all be connected to a
central mainframe (remember them?) instead of having our own PCs. Car
phones, "intelligent highways", all sorts of stuff.
>
> I think if we stripped down, maybe from a perspective of percentage (?),
> dollar for dollar we are not that much more "inflated" than we were years
> ago.

I disagree. Some things have gotten cheaper, others more expensive. It
all depends on the particular item - example, gasoline today is less
expensive (adjusted for inflation).

> OK, a loaf of bread was 20 cents and today it's a buck fifty. But the
> 20 cents is probably near or equal to the same "earn" value as the buck
> fifty.

My bread is 25 cents a loaf.
>
> Well, anyway, economics have always fascinated me...but not enough to drive
> me to be able to understand it all :)

And there are so many variables and unknowns! For example, look at the
tax situation. There's federal income tax - and social security tax,
and medicare tax, and state income tax in some places, and local wage
taxes, and sales taxes...And the deduction/withholding rules change so
that what used to be not much of a burden on the average person is now
a big chunk out of the paycheck.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2574. Re: Language Rules from FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-13 17:35:44 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0311130935.7970e9b@posting.google.com>
Source record: 82250

"Kim" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote in message news:<bovm12$901@library2.airnews.net>...
> A neighbor tells me that the FCC has recently ruled that broadcast radio
> stations are now "legally" able to "say the F word" on the air, as long as
> it isn't sexual. Yeah, I know, go figure.

I think it was in response to some rock star accepting an award and
saying it was "[expletive deleted]ing wonderful" or some such. FCC
said it wasn't a violation in that case. But if he'd said he was so
happy he wanted to [expletive deleted] the presenter, it would be a
violation.

Yeah, go figure.
>
> But, when I did a quick search on the FCC website, I found nothing of it.

Of course not. They're not gonna advertise it because then everybody
would be saying it.

> Anyone know of this...my thoughts are on what will happen in amateur radio
> now.

Nothing, I hope.

> The broadcast arena has always been the barometer of what people are
> allowed to say on the air, hasn't it?

Nope. FCC has completely different rules for different services. The
fact that somebody gets away with something in the broadcast services
doesn't mean it's OK in the ARS.

FCC regulates all electronic communications, not just radio waves.
Cable TV as well as broadcast TV, for example. Yet there are things
the cable folks can show that the broadcat folks can't. The thinking
is that people sign up for cable only if they want it, and it's a
private system, not the public airways. Broadcast TV is public
property. So it's like the difference between what's allowed in a
strip club and what's allowed on the street.

Between broadcasting and amatuer radio is the question of scheduling
and predictability. All broadcasters publish advance schedules, with
content warnings. So you can know what you're likely to see and hear
before tuning in to Howard Stern or the Victoria's Secret Fashion
Special. Not the case in amateur radio.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2575. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-13 18:05:07 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0311131005.59cba160@posting.google.com>
Source record: 82051

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:<5X_rb.22854$9M3.6173@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> "N2EY" wrote:
> >
> > As Kim points out, look elsewhere. The 'net gives
> > us a powerful tool to find other sources. The problem
> > is that you may have to wait for the item, and pay
> > more for it (delivery vs. sales tax).
>
> But I shouldn't have to do that, Jim.

Why not, Dwight?

> I don't think a quality fan should
> be an esoteric item requiring a nation-wide search. Yet that is exactly the
> case.

That's today's reality, brought about by a number of factors such as
the willingness of people to buy cheap stuff.

> And this was only one example - I run into similar situations just
> about every day of the week. By the way, the fans are purchased locally
> because that's in the contract.

Then the contract should be changed because it's not cost-effective in
the long run.

> > Because whether such ideas work or not is largely
> > dependent on those details.
>
> I wasn't aware we were here to make a particular idea work. This is a
> general discussion in a newsgroup. Anything more than that would require
> considerable time (which I place a high value on) and a research &
> development budget (which I haven't seen anyone offer).

I'm simply saying that the hard work is in the details.
>
> > Because it's their responsibility. Part of a free market
> > economy is being a *customer*, not a *consumer*.
>
> Again, shoppers are going to the store to ponder the global economic
> implications of the purchases they make. It is absurd to even expect them to
> do so (see my next paragraph below).

I think it's perfectly reasonable to expect them to do so! It's part
of life in a modern industrialized society with global trade.
>

> > Then they should not complain when the hardware store
> > and the American power tool plants shut down, quality
> > degrades, unemployment rises, etc.
>
> Jim, short of setting up a dictatorship, you're never going to get even a
> significant portion of the 280 million people in this country to shop the
> way you want.

No dictatorship needed. Just education. Look at how Hans' company deals with suppliers - all those principles apply to individuals as well. Sure, we individuals aren't going to make detailed investigations of every product we buy, but we *can* become better educated about them and make better choices. Just like Hans' and many other companies do.

> Consumers in general have neither the business awareness or
> economic awareness to make those types of decisions on their own.

Then they need to learn. Just like our ancestors had to learn how to deal with their environment.

> And they
> also certainly don't have the time or money to fully research an industry
> each time they want to go shopping for something.

They don't have to. The govt. requires all sorts of labels on all sorts of items, which means all one needs to know is how to interpret those labels. Outfits like Consumer's Union do product testing so we don't have to. And the 'net gives us access to enormous amounts of information.

> Business darn well knows
> all that, which is exactly why they point to consumer spending as the main
> cause of a poor economy.

Do you think they're going to blame themselves?

> Doing so absolves business of any responsibility
> for that economic situation and instead places the entire nation's economic
> burden, and sole blame for a bad economy (and blame for the things you list
> above), on consumers alone.

I disagree. All businesses are regulated to some degree - many to a very high degree. And in many cases it's justified, on the basis of safety.

> Business has some responsibility in all this.
> Your argument gives them a free ride when it comes to that responsibility.

Not at all.

My point is that *everyone* has some responsibility in all this. Business, government, and customers are all part of it. Every purchase we make is "voting with our wallets". But some people don't want that

responsibility, because it takes some effort and it detracts from the perfect images we see in advertisements.

For example, it doesn't take a degree in nutrition to know that if someone eats 3000 calories a day and only burns off 2000 calories a day, they're going to gain weight and keep gaining it until something changes. And the required changes (eating less, eating differently, becoming more active) may not be 100% fun. In fact, they may be 0% fun.

And it doesn't take a degree in economics to know that if enough people stop going to Ma's Diner and instead patronize Taco Heaven, that Ma's is going to go out of business.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2576. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-13 19:32:18 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3FB3DC42.6030601@psu.edu>
Source record: 82052

N2EY wrote:
> "Kim" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote in message news:<bovls0$at6@library2.airnews.net>...
>
>>"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
>>news:ebDsb.9376$P%1.8578015@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
>>
>>>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>>>news:20031112062933.14837.00004192@mb-m03.aol.com...
>>>
>>>>In article <t%rrb.1130$KN4.845856@news1.news.adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo
>>>><mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>As I recall reading a while back, in 1950, it took 14 percent of an
>>>>>average workers income to put a roof over "his head". That may have
>>>>>changed a little bit! 8^)
>>>>
>>>>It changed big time. Same for medical and education costs.
>>>
>>>However as noted in later in this same post for cars (now snipped), people
>>>now demand more features in that house and more room in that house that
>>>was common in 1950. So it's an apples to oranges comparison.
>>>
>>>Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>>
>
>
>>Yeah, I am glad you re-brought that back up, Dee. I have often wondered how
>>"close" a comparison it is when we start comparing the wage:cost of living
>>ratio from yesteryears and today. Because, we do have "bigger, better"
>>ideas in our products today.
>
>
> Sure - in fact, my current home (built 1950-51) is a case study in the
> differences. I doubt anyone would build a house like mine new today in
> a similar neighborhood, but a half-century ago it was a pretty
> standard "little box made of ticky-tacky" design. And most of the
> differences (more bathrooms, bigger, more feature-filled kitchen, AC
> from the getgo) cost more than just simple square footage add-ons.

If you want a recent document with an outline of relative housing costs:

http://www.census.gov/hhes/www/housing/hsgaffrd/afford95/afford95.html

It shows over a recent time period what I have noted over a longer time period, which is that less people can afford to buy a modestly priced house. In 1995, it was 44 percent could not afford to do this, an increase from 40 percent in 1988.

- Mike KB3EIA -

2577. Re: Language Rules from FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-13 20:07:33 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3FB3E483.2050302@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 82053

Kim W5TIT wrote:

>A neighbor tells me that the FCC has recently ruled that broadcast radio
>stations are now "legally" able to "say the F word" on the air, as long as
>it isn't sexual. Yeah, I know, go figure.
>
>But, when I did a quick search on the FCC website, I found nothing of it.
>Anyone know of this...my thoughts are on what will happen in amateur radio
>now. The broadcast arena has always been the barometer of what people are
>allowed to say on the air, hasn't it?
>
>
>
Dispite what the f ing FCC says, I'm not going to say the f ing f word
on f ing ham radio! ;-)

>
>

2578. CASH MONEY PAID!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-13 20:39:02 UTC
From: Rat Out Twistedhed <rewardfortwisty@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bp0q56$964$1@news.x-echo.com>
Source record: 82054
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

CASH MONEY PAID!

For information leading to the identification of twistedhed@webtv.net

http://xrl.us/rewardfortwisty

CASH MONEY PAID!

For information leading to the identification of twistedhed@webtv.net

http://xrl.us/rewardfortwisty

CASH MONEY PAID!

For information leading to the identification of twistedhed@webtv.net

http://xrl.us/rewardfortwisty

CASH MONEY PAID!

For information leading to the identification of twistedhed@webtv.net

http://xrl.us/rewardfortwisty

=-
Article poste via Voila News - http://www.news.voila.fr
Le : Thu Nov 13 21:39:02 2003 depuis l'IP : ac9f0ef0.ipt.aol.com [VIP 532284301978]

2579. REWARD for info on TWISTEDHED

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-13 20:41:24 UTC
From: Rat Out Twistedhed <rewardfortwisty@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bp0q9kbrp1@news.x-echo.com>
Source record: 82055
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

CASH MONEY PAID!

For information leading to the identification of twistedhed@webtv.net

http://xrl.us/rewardfortwisty

CASH MONEY PAID!

For information leading to the identification of twistedhed@webtv.net

http://xrl.us/rewardfortwisty

CASH MONEY PAID!

For information leading to the identification of twistedhed@webtv.net

http://xrl.us/rewardfortwisty

CASH MONEY PAID!

For information leading to the identification of twistedhed@webtv.net

http://xrl.us/rewardfortwisty

=-
Article poste via Voila News - http://www.news.voila.fr
Le : Thu Nov 13 21:41:24 2003 depuis l'IP : ac9f0ef0.ipt.aol.com [VIP 532284301978]

2580. Re: Re: EMERGENCY! CD-ROM Document Library Released

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-13 20:42:13 UTC
From: RoDog <beta686@hotmail.com>
Message-ID: <u4r7rvoblcttr9hceh7vgb8n9m15ckjej4@4ax.com>
Source record: 82056
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.radio.scanner,misc.survivalism

scam

On Tue, 4 Nov 2003 02:04:47 -0500, "Ryan, KC8PMX"
<REMOVETHISkc8pmx@diamondcs.net> wrote:

>This information either better be written by you OR have a release from the
>original publisher to SELL what is otherwise given out for free.......
>
>
>"David Vine" <davidvine1999@yahoo.com> wrote in message
>news:23e96779.0311020928.469c9d6f@posting.google.com...
>> AIKEN, SOUTH CAROLINA -- David Vine, WA1EAW, has compiled a
>> comprehensive and highly organized Adobe Acrobat format library of
>> information and data in the fields of Emergency Communications,
>> Natural Disasters, Emergency Planning and Search and Rescue on four
>> CD-ROMs. Emergency services executives, operations personnel,
>> volunteers and others interested in these subjects can instantly
>> access this critical reference information anywhere, at any time,
>> using a laptop computer.
>>
>> CD-ROM 1 Communications contains 121 documents/5804 pages.
>> CD-ROM 2 Natural Disasters contains 88 documents/4536 pages.
>> CD-ROM 3 Planning contains 83 documents/pages.
>> CD-ROM 4 Search & Rescue contains 97 documents/6627 pages.
>>
>> Individual CD-ROMs cost $19.95 and the complete set of four costs
>> $54.95 plus shipping. Quantity pricing and site licenses are
>> available. Credit card orders may be placed by calling 800-987-8743. A
>> complete list of files on the four CD-ROMS can be obtained by sending
>> a stamped, self-addressed envelope to David Vine Associates, LLC at
>> 963 Dougherty Road, Aiken, SC 29803.
>>
>> # # #
>

2581. Re: Happy Veterans Day

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-13 21:02:15 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0311131302.415ba43@posting.google.com>
Source record: 82057

"charlesb" <n5pvl@sbcglobal.net> wrote in message
news:<WwEsb.694$UX4.32229430@newssvr21.news.prodigy.com>...
> "Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
> news:f45722ac.0311121534.17abad08@posting.google.com...
> >
> > Concerning the "Bonus Army" of 1932, where veterans of The War to End
> > All Wars (1917/1918) were due a bonus in 1945, but wanted payment
> > early because they lost their homes in the Great Depression, Franklin
> > Roosevelt is to have said:
> >
>
> "Is to have said?" I would think that Roosevelt has pretty well said what
> he is going to, by now!

Does FDR still talk to you?

That's very possible, but I was quoting someone elses research, so
have not verified that is what FDR actually said from a direct source.

But thanks for your interest.

Brian

2582. Re: new jammer on 146.640 tampa bay florida

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-13 21:47:56 UTC
From: Donnie <"look me up"@qrz.com>
Message-ID: <mhu7rvc0q4ummhj1s3qe9l2jjhh8d7hm44@4ax.com>
Source record: 82058

On 12 Nov 2003 21:13:15 -0800, hamradioman2000@yahoo.com (private) wrote:

>the ron wright N9EE 146.640 repeater in tampa bay florida is home to a
>new jammer, he proudly says his call KG4LEG AKA coy roy on CB
>
>www.QRZ.com reports him to be
>Roy A Lepelletier
>1703 Cypress Avenue
>Belleair FL 33756
>USA
>
>
>roy will pick fights with other amateurs.
>roy will key up and cary on an imaginary "full duplex" conversation
>with suposid CB'ers on channel 35.
>he claims he has lots of friends on cb that are listening to him on
>146.640 while they are talking back to him on CB ch 35. (that is total
>BS) hes just doing it to agitate the normal folk on 640. several
>people heard him keying up on CB 35 while claiming to talk full duplex
>on ham, wich would not be effective to talk to cbers anyway.
>(basically roy is lieing about his intentions.)
>he also will ramble on and on to himself that there are people making
>death threats against him. he also claims a guy named dickie or dicky
>hendricson or hendrickson is a child molester, and goes into deatail
>over the air what this dicky had suposidly done to childeren (fairly
>graphic and not apropriate)
>in other times he will say this hendricson is his friend. one amateur
>don KG4COQ tried to nicely get roy to change to another repeater and
>wanted to talk to roy about the guys that roy is talking about on that
>other repeater. roy turns it all around and says roy doesnot need any
>help with these people that are after him, but if anyone wanted to
>help, they could send roy cash. (roy said that several times)
>when don continued nicely to try to get roy to change repeaters, roy
>twisted around this words and accused the don of wanting to meet up
>with him to start a fight, but don didnot say anything like that, then
>roy accused don of wanting to meet up with roy for some homosexual
>encounter, wich again don NEVER said anything about. roy has also
>commented about having been in the marines out in california,
>something about a "jar head" flight wing kind of position, but didnot
>go into detail about why hes out. he claims hes retired and wants to
>stay that way. roy also was throwing out the "im gonna sue you" to
>alot of people also. he was saying people were saying bad things when
>they wernt. new people would get on the repeater, and he would
>initiate a conversation with them, but immideatly jump into a platform

>about how hes on cb and running 200 watts, just like everyone else
>does on CB. he says things over and over. if everyone leaves him
>alone, he would usually key up every minite or 2 making a stupid CB
>comment or CB slang.
>
>thias guy is a head case, hes off his medication and someone needs to
>get him to the mental hospital :)

Where is the control operator for the 146.640 repeater? If he was so concerned he should have taken
the machine off the air until this bozo is dealt with? Ultimately the owner/control operator is the
responsible person when it boils down to misbehavior on a machine. I say go unplug the damn thing,
it may cause problems for some but it will cure another. It will probally get rid of the CB Rambo.

I don't know about you guys down in Florida.
Thats ''yous guys'' for the transplanted hams.

Donnie (N4JZH)

''Behold how good and well brethren dwell together in unity''

2583. Re: REWARD for info on TWISTEDHED

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-13 22:02:26 UTC
From: Radioman <radio@ptt.edu>
Message-ID: <3FB3FF72.B2DCD792@ptt.edu>
Source record: 82059
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

> =-
> Article poste via Voila News - http://www.news.voila.fr
> Le : Thu Nov 13 21:41:24 2003 depuis l'IP : ac9f0ef0.ipt.aol.com [VIP 532284301978]

You'll have to come up with a lot more then $41.07.

2584. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-13 22:47:29 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0311131447.1c33de52@posting.google.com>
Source record: 82060

Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message news:<3FB3DC42.6030601@psu.edu>...
> N2EY wrote:
> > "Kim" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote in message news:<bovls0$at6@library2.airnews.net>...
> >
> >>"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
> >>news:ebDsb.9376$P%1.8578015@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
> >>
> >>>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> >>>news:20031112062933.14837.00004192@mb-m03.aol.com...
> >>>
> >>>>In article <t%rrb.1130$KN4.845856@news1.news.adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo
> >>>><mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:
> >>>>
> >>>>
> >>>>>As I recall reading a while back, in 1950, it took 14 percent of an
> >>>>>average workers income to put a roof over "his head". That may have
> >>>>>changed a little bit! 8^)
> >>>>
> >>>>It changed big time. Same for medical and education costs.
> >>>
> >>>However as noted in later in this same post for cars (now snipped), people
> >>>now demand more features in that house and more room in that house that
> >>>was common in 1950. So it's an apples to oranges comparison.
> >>>
> >>>Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

> >>Yeah, I am glad you re-brought that back up, Dee. I have often wondered how
> >>"close" a comparison it is when we start comparing the wage:cost of living
> >>ratio from yesteryears and today. Because, we do have "bigger, better"
> >>ideas in our products today.

> > Sure - in fact, my current home (built 1950-51) is a case study in the
> > differences. I doubt anyone would build a house like mine new today in
> > a similar neighborhood, but a half-century ago it was a pretty
> > standard "little box made of ticky-tacky" design. And most of the
> > differences (more bathrooms, bigger, more feature-filled kitchen, AC
> > from the getgo) cost more than just simple square footage add-ons.

My point being that you *can* find a house today that's comparable to
what was on the market 50 years ago, and doesn't have all the
bigger-better features. But it won't be a new house. And it will be
less affordable than it was 50 years ago because not only have
property values in many areas gone up faster than wages, but the fees
and other costs have risen disproportionately as well.

For example, in this township there's a 1% real estate transfer fee (tax), which is split equally between buyer and seller at closing. On a $250,000 house (the low end of the market), buyer and seller have to cough up $1,250 *each* just to make the township happy. And that tax is *not* deductible - and it's just one line item on the HUD-1 form.

End result is that a home buyer has to come up with a *lot* of cash up-front, as well as the mortgage, taxes, etc. each month.

> If you want a recent document with an outline of relative housing costs:
>
> http://www.census.gov/hhes/www/housing/hsgaffrd/afford95/afford95.html
>
> It shows over a recent time period what I have noted over a longer time
> period, which is that less people can afford to buy a modestly priced
> house.

Note that a "modestly priced house" is defined as one that is priced at 25% of the market range. IOW, the price where 25% of the houses in a given area are less expensive and 75% are more expensive. That's not a mansion!

> In 1995, it was 44 percent could not afford to do this, an
> increase from 40 percent in 1988.

Exactly. Note also that even large decreases in the interest rates did not help a lot. And that the affordability analyses used involved things like 5% down payments.

One of the smartest/luckiest things I ever did was to buy a house at an early age (24) and kept my moves down to 2 in the years since then.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2585. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-13 22:58:19 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0311131458.5317af91@posting.google.com>
Source record: 82061

"Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<0FBsb.26731$9M3.19416@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> N2EY wrote:
>
> > Thanks for a complete and concise answer, Hans. And for showing that
> > it's not just the bottom line that drives business decisions.
>
> Ah, but I think you missed the best part of the whole message, Jim.

I didn't miss it, but perhaps I wasn't clear about my appreciation of
it. I wrote about how those policies were all "price" policies because
they worked to reduce the true cost of things bought. (If you have to
spend a nickel to inspect every 10 cent widget you buy, it's actually
cheaper to buy a 12 cent widget that doesn't need incoming
inspection). Etc.

> Every
> action I described has a tendency to reduce my overall cost of goods sold,
> either in reducing fixed factory costs, in reduced variable costs, in
> higher inventory turns, in shorter manufacturing cycles, in better cash
> flow, or in reduced headcount. All of that DOES drop directly to my bottom
> line.

Not every action! The ethical concerns you mentioned would tend to
raise it, if:

1) you spend money to check out suppliers
2) you would refuse a lower priced supplier on ethical grounds alone -
even if the supplier wasn't breaking any laws.
3) you spend more money to buy from local and minority/woman owned
companies, etc.

Of course all three can be looked upon as long-term investments that
will ultimately benefit the bottom line 'someday'. Much better than
taking a short-term view that ultimately winds up costing more in the
long term.

And I agree with all those actions 100%.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2586. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-13 23:28:02 UTC
From: dennis@wawa.juniper.net
Message-ID: <bp1422$1o91$1@heap.juniper.net>
Source record: 82062

Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote:
>N2EY wrote:
>> "Kim" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote in message
>>>Yeah, I am glad you re-brought that back up, Dee. I have often wondered how
>>>"close" a comparison it is when we start comparing the wage:cost of living
>>>ratio from yesteryears and today. Because, we do have "bigger, better"
>>>ideas in our products today.
>>
>>
>> Sure - in fact, my current home (built 1950-51) is a case study in the
>> differences. I doubt anyone would build a house like mine new today in
>> a similar neighborhood, but a half-century ago it was a pretty
>> standard "little box made of ticky-tacky" design. And most of the
>> differences (more bathrooms, bigger, more feature-filled kitchen, AC
>> from the getgo) cost more than just simple square footage add-ons.
>
>If you want a recent document with an outline of relative housing costs:
>
>http://www.census.gov/hhes/www/housing/hsgaffrd/afford95/afford95.html
>
> It shows over a recent time period what I have noted over a longer time
>period, which is that less people can afford to buy a modestly priced
>house. In 1995, it was 44 percent could not afford to do this, an
>increase from 40 percent in 1988.

Not really a recent-enough time period, however. Housing affordability
is volatile since it strongly depends on things like mortgage interest
rates and non-salary income, which can vary greatly. Obviously interest
rates have varied greatly in the downward direction in very recent years,
and we had a few good capital gains years before that.

If you look at this one

http://www.census.gov/hhes/www/housing/hvs/q303tab5.html

you'll see that the rate of home ownership in the US, which varied
between 63% and 66% for the 30 years prior to 1995, took a jump starting
in about 1997 and was at 68.4% in the quarter just ended. It seems
hard to argue that houses have gotten less affordable over the long
term when the fraction of people who demonstrate they can afford
to own a house by doing so remained fairly constant for so long and
actually took a significant upturn in the last few years.

Dennis Ferguson

2587. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-13 23:43:11 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0311131543.93ecfc8@posting.google.com>
Source record: 82063

Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message news:<3FB3DC42.6030601@psu.edu>...

> If you want a recent document with an outline of relative housing costs:
>
> http://www.census.gov/hhes/www/housing/hsgaffrd/afford95/afford95.html
>
> It shows over a recent time period what I have noted over a longer time
> period, which is that less people can afford to buy a modestly priced
> house. In 1995, it was 44 percent could not afford to do this, an
> increase from 40 percent in 1988.
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -

They must be buying immodestly priced houses, then, because there are
more homeowners than ever before.

2588. Re: Important Research at TAPR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-13 23:51:48 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0311131551.7c6aaa42@posting.google.com>
Source record: 82064

"charlesb" <n5pvl@sbcglobal.net> wrote in message
news:<6_Lsb.8738$xt6.2194@newssvr29.news.prodigy.com>...
> According to the latest TAPR "Packet Status Register", thier quarterly
> newsletter, the folks at TAPR have discovered that they are adrift, with no
> purpose and direction to guide their activities. As is often the case, the
> "leadership" at TAPR were the last ones to acknowlege a situation that hams
> have been noticing and remarking upon for over a decade.
>
> It appears the TAPR BoD put their heads together, discussed the question
> thoroughly, and discovered that they still had no idea as to what TAPR is
> supposed to be doing. At last they threw up thier hands and hired somebody
> to investigate - To try to determine what TAPR might be good for.
>
> "Uh, TAPR does technical stuff." was the conclusion the investigator
> returned.
>
> It is revealing that during the entire article describing the confusion and
> debate as to what TAPR might be good for and the "answer" thier investigator
> eventually turned up, the words "packet radio" were never even mentioned.
>
> That's right; At no time did anybody in the TAPR organization or the
> investigator they hired mention the words "packet radio" while working to
> solve the mystery as to what TAPR might be good for. Those words also are
> lacking in the investigator's conclusion, "Uh, TAPR does technical stuff."
>
> - So why do some people think of TAPR as a packet radio organization?
>
> TAPR doesn't.
>
> Charles Brabham, N5PVL
> Director: USPacket.Net
> http://www.uspacket.net
> n5pvl@uspacket.net

Chuck, I'm not so sure about that.

The official mouthpiece for the ARS in the USA just published
(December 2003, pg 77), "The Best (ARRL/TAPR) DCC (Digital
Communications Conference) EVER!"

Shirley you misread the Packet Status Register.

Brian

2589. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-13 23:52:42 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <ePUsb.751$m84.598511@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 82065

Dennis Ferguson wrote:

> Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote:
>
>>N2EY wrote:
>>
>>>"Kim" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote in message
>>>
>>>>Yeah, I am glad you re-brought that back up, Dee. I have often wondered how
>>>>"close" a comparison it is when we start comparing the wage:cost of living
>>>>ratio from yesteryears and today. Because, we do have "bigger, better"
>>>>ideas in our products today.
>>>
>>>
>>>Sure - in fact, my current home (built 1950-51) is a case study in the
>>>differences. I doubt anyone would build a house like mine new today in
>>>a similar neighborhood, but a half-century ago it was a pretty
>>>standard "little box made of ticky-tacky" design. And most of the
>>>differences (more bathrooms, bigger, more feature-filled kitchen, AC
>>>from the getgo) cost more than just simple square footage add-ons.
>>
>>If you want a recent document with an outline of relative housing costs:
>>
>>http://www.census.gov/hhes/www/housing/hsgaffrd/afford95/afford95.html
>>
>> It shows over a recent time period what I have noted over a longer time
>>period, which is that less people can afford to buy a modestly priced
>>house. In 1995, it was 44 percent could not afford to do this, an
>>increase from 40 percent in 1988.
>
>
> Not really a recent-enough time period, however. Housing affordability
> is volatile since it strongly depends on things like mortgage interest
> rates and non-salary income, which can vary greatly. Obviously interest
> rates have varied greatly in the downward direction in very recent years,
> and we had a few good capital gains years before that.
>
> If you look at this one
>
> http://www.census.gov/hhes/www/housing/hvs/q303tab5.html
>
> you'll see that the rate of home ownership in the US, which varied
> between 63% and 66% for the 30 years prior to 1995, took a jump starting
> in about 1997 and was at 68.4% in the quarter just ended. It seems

> hard to argue that houses have gotten less affordable over the long
> term when the fraction of people who demonstrate they can afford
> to own a house by doing so remained fairly constant for so long and
> actually took a significant upturn in the last few years.

Interesting. In comparing between the years that are specified in the other document, they also show an increase! I wonder what causes the discrepancy?

My link: 1995 ~56% 1894 ~60 %
Your link 1995 ~65% 1984 ~64.8%

Perhaps the difference is that many people are living in houses that they can't afford? There is some data there, but I haven't had time to check it out.

- Mike KB3EIA -

2590. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-14 00:08:51 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <n2Vsb.27886$9M3.12179@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 82066

"N2EY" wrote:
>
> Then the contract should be changed because
> it's not cost-effective in the long run.

It often costs more to change a contract than it does to simply live with a minor inefficiency. Nobody is losing that much money. It's just an irratation to constantly buy new fans.

> I think it's perfectly reasonable to expect them
> to do so! It's part of life in a modern industrialized
> society with global trade.

I've been going in circles with Kim over this very subject. People (consumers) purchase hundreds of items each year. Products constantly change, meaning ongoing research for each item would be required. Because of that, consumers simply don't have the time or the informational resources to even superficially research each of the items they purchase. I certainly don't do it and I seriously doubt you do either (however, Kim says she does).

> They don't have to. The govt. requires all sorts of
> labels on all sorts of items, which means all one
> needs to know is how to interpret those labels.
> Outfits like Consumer's Union do product testing
> so we don't have to. And the 'net gives us access
> to enormous amounts of information.

Do remember we're talking about the economy. Labels are not going to tell us which companies are moving factories overseas, or which are paying their employees decent wages, or which are using illegal immigrants, or which are using materials made overseas, which are using sweatshop labor, or so on. And the internet does give us access to enormous amounts of information - most of it biased, agenda-filled, garbage. Getting accurate and reliable information is the hard part. Government at least tries to offer info about larger corporations, but who offers that info when it comes to the stores, businesses, and factories, in my hometown (or in hometowns around the country)?

> And it doesn't take a degree in economics to know
> that if enough people stop going to Ma's Diner and
> instead patronize Taco Heaven, that Ma's is going
> to go out of business.

Consumers don't act as a single body, Jim. When was the last time you pondered what other consumers are doing when you went to a restaurant?

Without doing so, there is no way to know other people have stopped going to Ma's Diner. Instead, you go to Taco Heaven assuming everything is just fine over at Ma's Diner. Other consumers do the same. Most only discover there's a problem at Ma's Diner when they see the going out of business sign. The same pattern plays out in other markets (Wal-Mart versus local stores and so on).

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

2591. Re: Houston, we have a solution

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-14 00:47:15 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031113194715.12501.00003949@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 82067

In article <vvSrb.21917$9M3.14159@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Ki¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> writes:

>N2EY and others may enjoy this URL.
>
>http://tinyurl.com/ue35

Yeah, great stuff. Another challenge of microgravity!

73 de Jim, N2EY

2592. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-14 02:42:54 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bp1fi4$9d4@library2.airnews.net>
Source record: 82068

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:ZlLsb.27197$9M3.17699@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> "Kim W5TIT" wrote:
> >
> > Dwight, are you calling me a liar? (snip)
>
>
> Well, call it what you want, Kim. You told me that you're an informed
> consumer that routinely researches the products you buy.
>

No, Dwight. I did *not* say that at all. In fact, here is what I said:

"And, while I don't ponder global
economic implications with every shopping experience, I certainly do a lot
of the time."

>
> Is this really where you get your information from, Kim? I stopped
looking
> after seeing the prominent "Boycott Bush" link on the
> www.ethicalconsumer.org home page. If this site is at all typical of the
> others, these are sites pushing their own little agendas, not sources of
> accurate and reliable consumer information.
>

Then, get your own damned sites, Dwight. Point is, become smart about what
you're buying. And if you're going to disregard all of something just
because of a part of it you don't like, then you'll never get
anywhere--other than where you are right now: able to spew a bunch of crap
with no basis in fact or reality.

You really are lazy, eh, Dwight?

> > For cryin' out loud, Dwight, who the phucking (HansTM) hell
> > do you think is going to keep "business, the government, and
> > the courts" responsible?
>
> Well, isn't that just an astonishing revelation, Kim? Did you just now
> realize this entire discussion is all within the context of this country,
> it's people, and their system of government? That's what's going on in
this
> thread, Kim - people discussing what they think their government should
do.
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
>
>

Gads, you're an ass Dwight...

Kim W5TIT

2593. Re: Important Research at TAPR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-14 02:44:47 UTC
From: charlesb <n5pvl@sbcglobal.net>
Message-ID: <zkXsb.28$RQ3.0@newssvr13.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 82069

"Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
news:f45722ac.0311131551.7c6aaa42@posting.google.com...
>
> Shirley you misread the Packet Status Register.

It's online... Read it for yourself. They ALWAYS say the last CC was "the
best one ever".

Charles Brabham, N5PVL

2594. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-14 02:46:44 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bp1fp4$qtv@library2.airnews.net>
Source record: 82070

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:n2Vsb.27886$9M3.12179@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> "N2EY" wrote:
> >
> > Then the contract should be changed because
> > it's not cost-effective in the long run.
>
>
> It often costs more to change a contract than it does to simply live
with
> a minor inefficiency. Nobody is losing that much money. It's just an
> irratation to constantly buy new fans.
>
>
> > I think it's perfectly reasonable to expect them
> > to do so! It's part of life in a modern industrialized
> > society with global trade.
>
>
> I've been going in circles with Kim over this very subject. People
> (consumers) purchase hundreds of items each year. Products constantly
> change, meaning ongoing research for each item would be required. Because
of
> that, consumers simply don't have the time or the informational resources
to
> even superficially research each of the items they purchase. I certainly
> don't do it and I seriously doubt you do either (however, Kim says she
> does).
>

No, Dwight, Kim does not say that. She says, "And, while I don't ponder
global
economic implications with every shopping experience, I certainly do a lot
of the time."

You know what? It is so blatantly obvious that you just don't know what the
hell you're talking about. And, it's also quite obvious you're going to
cling to your desperate ideas no matter what anyone tries to help you with
to pull yourself up from the downunder you're in... You're not even making
the little sense you were a few posts back.

Kim W5TIT

2595. Re: KE4TEW and his good friend Riley

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-14 02:49:09 UTC
From: "privacy.at Anonymous Remailer" <mixmaster@remailer.privacy.at>
Message-ID: <b8f83498366db6106ac713684832aa7c@remailer.privacy.at>
Source record: 82071
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.swap,rec.radio.amateur.policy

```
In article <jUMsb.13188$dJ2.3654@newssvr25.news.prodigy.com>
"charlesb" <n5pvl@sbcglobal.net> wrote:
>

Prodigy.com...are they even still around, they are the worst isp
on the net.

>
> "privacy.at Anonymous Remailer" <mixmaster@remailer.privacy.at> wrote in
> message news:fb0ce8d1fd0a018186c97ab18152c2af@remailer.privacy.at...
> >
> > In article <bos1rq$8dv$0@pita.alt.net>
> > "Eric" <NoEmail@Anonuser.co> wrote:
> > >
> > (followup corrected)
> >
> > Hey, stupid, why'd you put this newsgroup in your followup three
> > times?
> >
>
> If you gentlemen cannot play nice, then kindly take a hike. This is a
> newsgroup dedicated to topics related to ham radio, not a contest to see who
> can be the biggest jerk. Take your garbage elsewhere, right now.
>
> Charles Brabham, N5PVL

Nobody is forcing you to read them, Chucky baby....kindly go
fuck yourself.
```

2596. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-14 03:15:55 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bp1hfr$fs0@library2.airnews.net>
Source record: 82073

"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
news:c2356669.0311131005.59cba160@posting.google.com...
> "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:<5X_rb.22854$9M3.6173@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> > "N2EY" wrote:
>
> Then the contract should be changed because it's not cost-effective in
> the long run.
>
> > > Because whether such ideas work or not is largely
> > > dependent on those details.
> >
> > I wasn't aware we were here to make a particular idea work. This is a
> > general discussion in a newsgroup. Anything more than that would require
> > considerable time (which I place a high value on) and a research &
> > development budget (which I haven't seen anyone offer).
>
> I'm simply saying that the hard work is in the details.
>

heh I bet Dwight couldn't handle the idea that he's probably more
manipulated by subliminal advertising than the "average joe." :)

Kim W5TIT

2597. Re: REWARD for info on TWISTEDHED

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-14 03:17:53 UTC
From: keyclownzmustgo@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <17b206c0.0311131917.6f7e69a1@posting.google.com>
Source record: 82072
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Radioman <radio@ptt.edu> wrote in message news:<3FB3FF72.B2DCD792@ptt.edu>...
> > =-
> > Article poste via Voila News - http://www.news.voila.fr
> > Le : Thu Nov 13 21:41:24 2003 depuis l'IP : ac9f0ef0.ipt.aol.com [VIP 532284301978]
> http://xrl.us/rewardfortwisty
>
>
> You'll have to come up with a lot more then $41.07.

That is almost a week's pay for GW.

2598. Re: Language Rules from FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-14 03:22:43 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <xnfcneeyarg.hobei6h.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>
Source record: 82074

On Thu, 13 Nov 2003 04:21:05 -0600, Kim W5TIT wrote:

>A neighbor tells me that the FCC has recently ruled that broadcast radio
>stations are now "legally" able to "say the F word" on the air, as long as
>it isn't sexual. Yeah, I know, go figure.
>
>But, when I did a quick search on the FCC website, I found nothing of it.
>Anyone know of this...my thoughts are on what will happen in amateur radio
>now. The broadcast arena has always been the barometer of what people are
>allowed to say on the air, hasn't it?

The Commish, in its infinite wisdom, decidied to take no action on
the situation (i.e. they just hid from their responsibilities once
again).

This is vastly different from saying that it's OK to use that
language. This also does not create any precedent that anyone can
rely on.

The next sitution may result in full-fledged prosecution - who is to
say it won't? Nowadays one can't predict what they will do.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

From a Clearing in the Silicon Forest
Beaverton (Washington County) Oregon

2599. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-14 03:22:43 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <xnfcneeyarg.hoazadg.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>
Source record: 82075

On Thu, 13 Nov 2003 08:55:56 -0500, Mike Coslo wrote:

>> Yep, sure have and did! And, along with that, customer service/support is
>> "shipped"overseas quite often. When you call the "local" help group for a
>> service you're purchasing, or product, it's likely you're talking to someone
>> in the Phillipines.

Mostly India now.
>
>
> What outfits use accounting in India? no question that tech support has
>in large part moved there.

The only time I legitimately expected offshore customer support, and
got it, was when I needed warranty repair on a kitchen appliance
made in and branded as from Australia. The lady's Aussi accent at
the end of the 800 number transfer string was unmistakable.

She referred me to the service department of my local dealer, of
course. Not like Seiko which wanted me to contact the local dealer
who would have to ship the defective watch (30 years old) back to Japan
for service. I canned it and bought a Timex.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

From a Clearing in the Silicon Forest
Beaverton (Washington County) Oregon

2600. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-14 03:39:09 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031113223909.29660.00001594@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 82077

In article <TREsb.700$hn5.33963063@newssvr21.news.prodigy.com>, "charlesb"
<n5pvl@sbcglobal.net> writes:

>Hey, I hate to interrupt the historical and political discussion, but I have
>a Ham Radio - related question.
>
>Sorry to abruptly drift back on-topic like this, but what is the latest poop
>on the BPL rollout in Virginia? There has been more than enough time for
>something to have happened... So what happened?
>
>Charles Brabham, N5PVL

Docket 03-104 is still active. As of the close of the day on Thursday,
13 November 2003, there were 5,088 documents in the ECFS on BPL.

FCC 03-104 isn't an NPRM (Notice of Proposed Rulemaking). All the
Commission wanted was some guidance from all on what standards
should be imposed when they DO issue an NPRM. Go to the ECFS
and look at the end of the list for the FCC documents originally
issued.

By now the Commission has gotten at least 4500 comments from all
sorts of folks saying IT IS NOT A GOOD THING. BPL isn't a good
thing. It is a bad thing for everyone except a minority of would-be
profit makers wanting to soak the public for BPL access to the
Internet.

LHA

2601. Re: Language Rules from FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-14 03:39:09 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031113223909.29660.00001593@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 82080

In article <bovm12$901@library2.airnews.net>, "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
writes:

>A neighbor tells me that the FCC has recently ruled that broadcast radio
>stations are now "legally" able to "say the F word" on the air, as long as
>it isn't sexual. Yeah, I know, go figure.
>
>But, when I did a quick search on the FCC website, I found nothing of it.
>Anyone know of this...my thoughts are on what will happen in amateur radio
>now. The broadcast arena has always been the barometer of what people are
>allowed to say on the air, hasn't it?

Kim, you are welcome to look IN DETAIL all throughout Title 47 C.F.R.
and you are NOT going to find those "words." [it's a 5-volume set on
paper from the G.P.O.]

There is NO such "word list."

All that you can find are some generalized statements about obscenity
and so forth in the rules, ALL rules and regulations.

The only "words" in broadcasting are at the NAB, the National
Association of Broadcasters...and the individual Standards
groups at individual broadcasting networks.

LHA

2602. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-14 03:39:10 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031113223910.29660.00001595@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 82079

In article <EJvsb.9152$hn3.3187776@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>, "Bert Craig"
<wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> writes:

>"Rupert" <big@bird.sesame.street> wrote in message
>news:Govsb.10542$6c3.633@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net...
>> Len Over 21 wrote:
>>
>> > As of 6 PM EST on 11 November 2003, the number of ECFS
>> > documents on public view are:
>>
>> What would be interesting is to find out how many are for the change,
>> and how many want to keep the code.
>
>Me too. All this roundabout bravo sierra could be bypassed if there was a
>ballot sent to all approx. 700,000 U.S. licensed hams. As long as quorum is
>met, it's on! This concept (Democracy) frightens the bejesus out of many
>folks who claim to speak for those not yet licensed.
>
>But that's an empty argument. Get licensed and vote, tah dah! The big bad
>"barrier" does not preclude anyone from getting their no-code Tech ticket
>and executing a vote.

Egbert, according to the First Amendment of the United States
Constitution, there's NO "license membership requirement" to
petition our government for the redress of grievances. None at all.

You seem to be confusing the FCC with the ARRL. Try to
separate church from state.

Good luck on becoming unconfused.

LHA

2603. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-14 03:39:11 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031113223911.29660.00001596@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 82076

In article <Govsb.10542$6c3.633@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>, Rupert <big@bird.sesame.street> writes:

>Len Over 21 wrote:
>
>> As of 6 PM EST on 11 November 2003, the number of ECFS
>> documents on public view are:
>
> What would be interesting is to find out how many are for the change,
>and how many want to keep the code.

There are only 4,600 documents in the ECFS as of the end of the day on the east coast, this Thursday. If you have a large hard disk and lots of time, feel free to collect ALL of them and view them, or categorize them as you want. They are all in PDF and most browsers will automatically invoke at least an Acrobat Reader (free download from Adobe) if you click on the lower left underline of each listing box.

Disregarding the RM-10811 comments, I'd say that the opinions are roughly split evenly as to retention or elimination, based on spot-checking the short (1-page) comments and reading all of the comments over 1 page.

RM-10811 was submitted by FISTS and their website encourages affirmative one-liners by all members. Over half of the FISTS petition comments are such one or two sentence "support" statements. According to the latest ARRL news blog, RM-10811 is the only one that counts (FISTS is solidly pro-code) and Joe Speroni (a decided PCTA) is the only acknowledged "petition statistician" in the ARRL biased viewpoint.

Oddly enough, Speroni, AH0A, is responsible for RM-10808 which gathered only 191 comments. The FISTS petition comment total stands at 959.

The official Comment period for all petitions ended last week.

LHA

2604. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-14 03:39:12 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031113223912.29660.00001597@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 82078

In article <5c01b95b.0311120606.3facd301@posting.google.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) writes:

>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>news:<20031111234229.05539.00002230@mb-m16.aol.com>...
>
>> As of 6 PM EST on 11 November 2003, the number of ECFS
>> documents on public view are:...(SNIP)
>
> I noticed that you couldn't find time to join in the Veteran's
>Day greetings in another thread, although you profess admiration and
>respect for them. Matter of fact, I don't believe I've >>EVER<< seen
>you partake in any sincere regards on either Veteran's Day, Armed
>Forces Day or Memorial Day.

1. You are NOT, nor ever were, my commanding officer or even
ranking superior anywhere, including this newsgroup.
You are just rank.

2. I was elsewhere Sunday through Wednesday, taking part in
veterans memorial services or visiting the VA hospital here in
the Valley. Such visiting doesn't end after Veterans Day since
those guys (and a couple gals) aren't going anywhere else.
It's NOT like your own hypocritcal "sincerity" suddenly turning
on during an official holiday and then definitely turning OFF
all "sincerity" and so forth for the rest of the year.

3. This thread is solely about the 14 petitions against/for morse
code testing in the U.S. amateur radio license test regulations.
It was posted as a "heads up" for those who have not been
tracking the numbers of comments on the 14 petitions. Try
staying with the program.

4. Back under your bridge little troll.

LHA

2605. Re: Armistice Day was re: Happy Vets Day

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-14 03:51:50 UTC
From: elektros@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <ae406dc2.0311131951.1bfae642@posting.google.com>
Source record: 82081

brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0311121604.3190d75e@posting.google.com>...
> Steve, everyone makes mistakes, but the Armistice goof got me thinking
> about the veterans of WWI, and what happened to them during the Great
> Depression. Like any other citizen, they lost their jobs, lost their
> homes, their businesses. But they had earned a bonus for their
> sacrifices in Europe, payable in 1945.
>
> They marched on Washington to pressure congress to pay them now, not
> later.
>
> Here's some links and snips:
>
> http://college.hmco.com/history/readerscomp/gahff/html/ff_022600_bonusarmy.htm
>
> [Bonus Army
> a group of unemployed World War I veterans who demonstrated during the
> Great Depression. The Bonus Law of 1924 had given every veteran a
> certificate payable in 1945, but the veterans wanted the bonus
> immediately. In June 1932, about 15,000 of them and their families
> marched on Washington, D.C., in a futile effort to pressure the Senate
> into passing a bill to grant immediate payments. President Herbert
> Hoover called upon Gen. Douglas MacArthur and federal troops to
> disperse the Bonus Army and drive them out of the capital. The use of
> armed troops against unarmed men, women, and children shocked the
> nation.]
>
> http://www.islandnet.com/~citizenx/bonus.html
>
> [Within a year of the Bonus Army Incident, President Roosevelt imposed
> the Economy Act of 1933 which cut veterans disability allowances by
> 25%. In the effort to cut federal expenses, veterans were viewed as
> having inordinate special status over civilians. During the 1932
> election campaign, he had publicly proclaimed: "No one [merely]
> because he wore a uniform must therefore be placed in a special class
> of beneficiaries over and above all other citizens. The fact of
> wearing a uniform does not mean that he can demand and receive from
> his government a benefit which no other citizen receives."]
>
> http://www.msys.net/cress/ballots2/bonus.htm
>
> [In the summer of 1932 the Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces
> ordered the U.S. Army into action--to attack the veterans of the U.S.
> Army. General Douglas MacArthur, Colonel Dwight D. Eisenhower, and

> Major George S. Patton led the mounted soldiers, who wielded billy
> clubs and tear gas canisters. When it was all over the veterans'
> shanties and tents lay in smoldering piles. Proud veterans of World
> War I were driven from the nation's capital. "We were heroes in 1917,"
> said one veteran bitterly, "but we're bums now."]
>
> http://www.lewrockwell.com/elkins/elkins9.html
>
> [The Bonus Army
> by Jeff Elkins
>
> June 18, 1878
>
> CHAP. 263 ? An act making appropriations for the support of the Army
> for the fiscal year ending June thirtieth, eighteen hundred and
> seventy-nine, and for other purposes.
>
> SEC. 15. From and after the passage of this act it shall not be lawful
> to employ any part of the Army of the United States, as a posse
> comitatus, or otherwise, for the purpose of executing the laws?
>
> Mostly forgotten today, the Bonus March incident of 1932 provided one
> of the more instructive lessons in the naked power of the State and
> just how meaningless the State views its laws and contracts with
> citizens.]
>
> http://members.aol.com/vetsofamer/bonus2.htm
>
> http://www.soundprint.org/radio/display_show/ID/228/name/Bonus+Army+March
>
> [In 1932, in the depths of the Depression, thousands of hungry and
> disgruntled veterans of WW I marched on Washington, D.C. demanding
> that Congress pay them the bonus for their military service that had
> been promised years before. Banding together, unemployed Oregon
> cannery workers marched with Pennsylvania coal miners and Alabama
> cotton pickers, as more than 20 thousand "bonus marchers" participated
> in the biggest rally to date in the nation's capital. And they stayed
> for weeks, setting up tent cities, living in cardboard shanties, and
> shaking the nerves of President Hoover. Find out how they played a
> role in defeating Hoover in the fall election, and improving the
> government's treatment of veterans after WW II.]
>
>
> ---
> In article <8updnd$9ut$1@nnrp1.deja.com>,
> K0HB <k0hb@my-deja.com> wrote:
>
> > In article <8ujeuo$t6a$1@nnrp1.deja.com>,
> > Steven J Robeson, K4YZ <k4yz@my-deja.com> wrote:
> > >

> > > On the eleventh hour of the eleventh day of the eleventh month,
> > > the warring parties in what was then known as "The War To End All
> > > Wars" was brought to an Amnesty.
> >
> > Sunuvagun! So that's why it used to be called "Amnesty Day".
> > <grinnin' duckin', & runnin'>
>
> Damn...he got me...!!!
>
> Said "amnesty", meant "armistice"....sorry folks....I goofed.
>
> Steve

It still is Armistice Day where I come from (the UK), but they now
celebrate Armistice Sunday on the nearest Sunday instead.

2606. Re: new jammer on 146.640 tampa bay florida

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-14 04:25:41 UTC
From: hamradioman2000@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <e95066a4.0311132025.60295772@posting.google.com>
Source record: 82082

well the control operator is ron N9EE, he did shut the repeater off several times, but whenever it came back up coy roy was there.

on nov the 13, coy roy was back, and ron tried to make peace with roy, tried to pursuade him to fit in, and all has been forgotten and that he is welcome on the repeater anytime, and ron was handleing the situation quite well. roy did stop the agitation for several hours after the conversation.

coy roy also talks about another CB'er MENTAL MIKEY
other phrases he loves to use are "fag boy" "punk boy"

alot of this post is for archiving purposes in the newsgroups, so if people down the road have a problem with him, they can search the newsgroups and history will come up. the newsgroups are an invaluable tool of past history.
an archive system spanning several decades, and still growing every hour.

2607. Re: Happy Veterans Day

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-14 04:46:50 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3FB45E36.25E5C512@earthlink.net>
Source record: 82083

Brian wrote:
>
> "charlesb" <n5pvl@sbcglobal.net> wrote in message
news:<WwEsb.694$UX4.32229430@newssvr21.news.prodigy.com>...
> > "Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
> > news:f45722ac.0311121534.17abad08@posting.google.com...
> > >
> > > Concerning the "Bonus Army" of 1932, where veterans of The War to End
> > > All Wars (1917/1918) were due a bonus in 1945, but wanted payment
> > > early because they lost their homes in the Great Depression, Franklin
> > > Roosevelt is to have said:
> > >
> >
> > "Is to have said?" I would think that Roosevelt has pretty well said what
> > he is going to, by now!
>
> Does FDR still talk to you?
>
> That's very possible, but I was quoting someone elses research, so
> have not verified that is what FDR actually said from a direct source.
>
> But thanks for your interest.

Your first clue that the quote is not from Roosevelt is that he is
unlikely to have referred to himself as "President Roosevelt".

Dave K8MN

2608. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-14 04:53:25 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3FB45FC0.9AA858C4@earthlink.net>
Source record: 82084

Dennis Ferguson wrote:
>
> Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote:
> >N2EY wrote:
> >> "Kim" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> >>>Yeah, I am glad you re-brought that back up, Dee. I have often wondered how
> >>>"close" a comparison it is when we start comparing the wage:cost of living
> >>>ratio from yesteryears and today. Because, we do have "bigger, better"
> >>>ideas in our products today.
> >>
> >>
> >> Sure - in fact, my current home (built 1950-51) is a case study in the
> >> differences. I doubt anyone would build a house like mine new today in
> >> a similar neighborhood, but a half-century ago it was a pretty
> >> standard "little box made of ticky-tacky" design. And most of the
> >> differences (more bathrooms, bigger, more feature-filled kitchen, AC
> >> from the getgo) cost more than just simple square footage add-ons.
> >
> >If you want a recent document with an outline of relative housing costs:
> >
> >http://www.census.gov/hhes/www/housing/hsgaffrd/afford95/afford95.html
> >
> > It shows over a recent time period what I have noted over a longer time
> >period, which is that less people can afford to buy a modestly priced
> >house. In 1995, it was 44 percent could not afford to do this, an
> >increase from 40 percent in 1988.
>
> Not really a recent-enough time period, however. Housing affordability
> is volatile since it strongly depends on things like mortgage interest
> rates and non-salary income, which can vary greatly. Obviously interest
> rates have varied greatly in the downward direction in very recent years,
> and we had a few good capital gains years before that.
>
> If you look at this one
>
> http://www.census.gov/hhes/www/housing/hvs/q303tab5.html
>
> you'll see that the rate of home ownership in the US, which varied
> between 63% and 66% for the 30 years prior to 1995, took a jump starting
> in about 1997 and was at 68.4% in the quarter just ended. It seems
> hard to argue that houses have gotten less affordable over the long
> term when the fraction of people who demonstrate they can afford
> to own a house by doing so remained fairly constant for so long and
> actually took a significant upturn in the last few years.

I don't think it hard to argue at all, Dennis. Years back, people were advised not to spend more than 25% of their income on housing. Later this was revised to 33%. Today it is not uncommon for folks with two incomes paying *half* of their combined income for housing.

In my area, houses are being given away and property taxes are very low. Wait until you're near retirement before buying here though. You have to bring your own money.

Dave K8MN

2609. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-14 05:09:40 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3FB4638E.F9ACAF57@earthlink.net>
Source record: 82085

Dwight Stewart wrote:
>
> "N2EY" wrote:
> >
> > Then the contract should be changed because
> > it's not cost-effective in the long run.
>
> It often costs more to change a contract than it does to simply live with
> a minor inefficiency. Nobody is losing that much money. It's just an
> irratation to constantly buy new fans.

If the old one was that great, why isn't it still running?

> > I think it's perfectly reasonable to expect them
> > to do so! It's part of life in a modern industrialized
> > society with global trade.
>
> I've been going in circles with Kim over this very subject. People
> (consumers) purchase hundreds of items each year. Products constantly
> change, meaning ongoing research for each item would be required. Because of
> that, consumers simply don't have the time or the informational resources to
> even superficially research each of the items they purchase. I certainly
> don't do it and I seriously doubt you do either (however, Kim says she
> does).

It isn't necessary to research each and every item you buy, Dwight.
I certainly do research before I make big purchases and I make my
decision after weighing a number of factors including quality, where an
item is made and how much it costs. With items like TV's and VCR's, I
only worry about quality and price. There haven't been any of those
devices made in this country in years.

Take amateur radio gear as an example. Did you buy the "plastic fan" of
amateur radio equipment? Was it made in the U.S.? I run Ten-Tec gear
despite price. I get a superior performance from a transceiver made in
the U.S. I could have gotten a cheaper radio made in Japan.

> > And it doesn't take a degree in economics to know
> > that if enough people stop going to Ma's Diner and
> > instead patronize Taco Heaven, that Ma's is going
> > to go out of business.
>
> Consumers don't act as a single body, Jim. When was the last time you
> pondered what other consumers are doing when you went to a restaurant?
> Without doing so, there is no way to know other people have stopped going to
> Ma's Diner. Instead, you go to Taco Heaven assuming everything is just fine

> over at Ma's Diner. Other consumers do the same. Most only discover there's
> a problem at Ma's Diner when they see the going out of business sign. The
> same pattern plays out in other markets (Wal-Mart versus local stores and so
> on).

Then no one who isn't eating at Ma's should wring his hands when it closes if they've spent their money Taco Heaven. I buy major appliances from a local fellow. Part of it is good will. Part of it pure selfishness on my part. When something breaks, the local fellow comes right out to make repairs. I don't have to schedule a visit by a fellow 40 miles away. I just bought a quarter of beef. The steer was standing out in a field a few days ago. I paid $2.00/lb and the only middle man is the fellow who cut, wrapped and froze it.

By the way, we've noticed no BPL rollout here in West, by God, Virginia.

Dave K8MN

2610. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-14 05:14:34 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3FB464B5.5D8E8150@earthlink.net>
Source record: 82086

Phil Kane wrote:
She referred me to the service department of my local dealer, of
> course. Not like Seiko which wanted me to contact the local dealer
> who would have to ship the defective watch (30 years old) back to Japan
> for service. I canned it and bought a Timex.

I dunno Phil. I just took delivery of a piece of bound carpet and two runners for our dining room. It took Lowe's eighty days after my order and payment to deliver it. I could have had a Turk hand weave the thing and personally deliver it in that period.

Dave K8MN

2611. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-14 05:16:57 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3FB46546.AF3EBC4D@earthlink.net>
Source record: 82087

Len Over 21 wrote:

> Egbert, according to the First Amendment of the United States
> Constitution, there's NO "license membership requirement" to
> petition our government for the redress of grievances. None at all.

From which particular grievance are you seeking redress, Leonard?

Dave K8MN

2612. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-14 05:57:20 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <REMOVETHISkc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <bp2o3p$1ki73m$2@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 82096

Around here in this county I live in, home ownership is next to impossible, except for spending at least $75,000 or better. The average small 3 bedroom house, no basement or garage (slab built) on a half to full acre runs *at least* 75 grand or better. Go immediately outside of the county lines of this county, and the similar/equivalent structure is anywhere from 25-50% less. I guess it is something about Midland county I guess.

Ryan

> If you want a recent document with an outline of relative housing costs:
>
> http://www.census.gov/hhes/www/housing/hsgaffrd/afford95/afford95.html
>
> It shows over a recent time period what I have noted over a longer time
> period, which is that less people can afford to buy a modestly priced
> house. In 1995, it was 44 percent could not afford to do this, an
> increase from 40 percent in 1988.
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -
>

2613. Re: Happy Veterans Day

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-14 06:07:34 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <Gi_sb.28399$9M3.10944@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 82088

LHA(jg) wrote

>> Do you suggest that these views
>> should be endorsed by the current Commander in Chief?

> Clinton.

I'm not a democrat, but I must admit that I saw more than one increase in
veterans/retired military benefits during his administration.

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

2614. Re: Language Rules from FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-14 06:08:45 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <REMOVETHISkc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <bp2o3q$1ki73m$3@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 82097

> > But, when I did a quick search on the FCC website, I found nothing of
it.
>
> Of course not. They're not gonna advertise it because then everybody
> would be saying it.

Geee..... didn't Carlin cover this??? (i.e. George Carlin?)

>
> > Anyone know of this...my thoughts are on what will happen in amateur
radio
> > now.
>
> Nothing, I hope.
>
> > The broadcast arena has always been the barometer of what people are
> > allowed to say on the air, hasn't it?
>
> Nope. FCC has completely different rules for different services. The
> fact that somebody gets away with something in the broadcast services
> doesn't mean it's OK in the ARS.

Generally the terminology states soemething to the effect of "good amateur practice." My ONLY PROBLEM with that is WHO gets to decide what the benchmark is for good amateur practice..... If the FCC, who issues our licenses are not going to do it, then who?

As for specific words??? Dunno, is there a list?? :) Who makes the list then? Are other things other than the known "7 dirty words" included? If someone is of say, for instance a different faith than you, do you get to determine anything they say religiously is offensive and should be banned speech? I am sure there are other examples one could come up with.....

--
Ryan KC8PMX

"Some people are like Slinkies . . . not really good for anything, but you still can't help but smile when you see one tumble down the stairs."

2615. Re: Important Research at TAPR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-14 06:10:10 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.58.0311140608180.7834@kd6lvw.ampr.org>
Source record: 82089

```
On Thu, 13 Nov 2003, charlesb wrote:
> According to the latest TAPR ...
>
> - So why do some people think of TAPR as a packet radio organization?
>
> TAPR doesn't.
>
> Charles Brabham, N5PVL
```

A more important question: Why do you think WE care?

2616. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-14 06:14:49 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <tp_sb.28406$9M3.12464@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 82090

"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote

> BPL isn't a good thing. It is a bad thing for
> everyone except a minority of would-be
> profit makers wanting to soak the public
> for BPL access to the Internet.

Since I am never reluctant to express my disagreement with Len, in the interest of fairness I must take a moment to express my hearty agreement with him on this matter.

73, de Hans, K0HB

2617. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-14 06:25:24 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0311132225.40b82cbb@posting.google.com>
Source record: 82091

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20031113223912.29660.00001597@mb-m24.aol.com>...
> In article <5c01b95b.0311120606.3facd301@posting.google.com>, k4yz@aol.com
> (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) writes:

> > I noticed that you couldn't find time to join in the Veteran's
> >Day greetings in another thread, although you profess admiration and
> >respect for them. Matter of fact, I don't believe I've >>EVER<< seen
> >you partake in any sincere regards on either Veteran's Day, Armed
> >Forces Day or Memorial Day.
>
> 1. You are NOT, nor ever were, my commanding officer or even
> ranking superior anywhere, including this newsgroup.
> You are just rank.

An answer I expected.

Usual LennieRanting.

You SHOULD thank God that I never WAS your "commanding officer"
under any circumstances. I never would have put up with your
broggadacio and lying.

> 2. I was elsewhere Sunday through Wednesday, taking part in
> veterans memorial services or visiting the VA hospital here in
> the Valley. Such visiting doesn't end after Veterans Day since
> those guys (and a couple gals) aren't going anywhere else.
> It's NOT like your own hypocritcal "sincerity" suddenly turning
> on during an official holiday and then definitely turning OFF
> all "sincerity" and so forth for the rest of the year.

YadaYadaYada.

Excuses of the lamest kind...again, an answer I would expect from
you. Others took the time to put a kind reply in there, even on the
"official" day

I do not believe you. I doubt you were ANYwhere near ANY veteran
for the purpose of supporting ANY veteran. Your track record of
untruthfulness lends itself to this doubt. You cannot be trusted.

You spend hundreds of hours yearly in THIS forum, yet when "kind
words" are being exchanged, even amongst the "opponents", you are
nowhere to be found.

> 3. This thread is solely about the 14 petitions against/for morse
> code testing in the U.S. amateur radio license test regulations.

> It was posted as a "heads up" for those who have not been
> tracking the numbers of comments on the 14 petitions. Try
> staying with the program.

As if you ever let a thread topic stop YOU from ranting on for
days about YOUR pet theme.

> 4. Back under your bridge little troll.

After you get out from under it, big troll.

You're a scumbag, Lennie Anderson. This just made it even a bit
more evident...

Steve, K4YZ

2618. Re: Important Research at TAPR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-14 09:18:27 UTC
From: charlesb <n5pvl@sbcglobal.net>
Message-ID: <D51tb.10152$G54.6438@newssvr29.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 82092

"D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> wrote in message
news:Pine.LNX.4.58.0311140608180.7834@kd6lvw.ampr.org...
> On Thu, 13 Nov 2003, charlesb wrote:
> > - So why do some people think of TAPR as a packet radio organization?
> >
> > TAPR doesn't.
> >
> > Charles Brabham, N5PVL
>
> A more important question: Why do you think WE care?

Another mental case who thinks that his screwed-up opinion represents
everybody else's thinking.

They call that - meglomania.

Sorry to be the one to have break it to you, "D.", but there are thousands
of packet radio operators in the U.S. who DO care about the hobby.

The nastygram opinions of disruptive, anti-ham jerkoffs such as yourself
have no significance whatsoever.

Charles Brabham, N5PVL

2619. Re: Important Research at TAPR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-14 11:11:50 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0311140311.74a95eb5@posting.google.com>
Source record: 82093

"charlesb" <n5pvl@sbcglobal.net> wrote in message
news:<zkXsb.28$RQ3.0@newssvr13.news.prodigy.com>...
> "Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
> news:f45722ac.0311131551.7c6aaa42@posting.google.com...
> >
> > Shirley you misread the Packet Status Register.
>
> It's online... Read it for yourself.

But, but... both of them can't be right!

They ALWAYS say the last CC was "the
> best one ever".
>
> Charles Brabham, N5PVL

Or my favorite, "A good time was had by all."

2620. Re: Happy Veterans Day

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-14 11:15:43 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0311140315.5fbc9364@posting.google.com>
Source record: 82094

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3FB45E36.25E5C512@earthlink.net>...
> Brian wrote:
> >
> > "charlesb" <n5pvl@sbcglobal.net> wrote in message
news:<WwEsb.694$UX4.32229430@newssvr21.news.prodigy.com>...
> > > "Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
> > > news:f45722ac.0311121534.17abad08@posting.google.com...
> > > >
> > > > Concerning the "Bonus Army" of 1932, where veterans of The War to End
> > > > All Wars (1917/1918) were due a bonus in 1945, but wanted payment
> > > > early because they lost their homes in the Great Depression, Franklin
> > > > Roosevelt is to have said:
> > > >
> > >
> > > "Is to have said?" I would think that Roosevelt has pretty well said what
> > > he is going to, by now!
> >
> > Does FDR still talk to you?
> >
> > That's very possible, but I was quoting someone elses research, so
> > have not verified that is what FDR actually said from a direct source.
> >
> > But thanks for your interest.
>
> Your first clue that the quote is not from Roosevelt is that he is
> unlikely to have referred to himself as "President Roosevelt".
>
> Dave K8MN

Dave, follow the link (i.e., point and click) in the "Armistice Day"
thread and read it yourself.

Good luck on that one now.

Brian

2621. Re: Armistice Day was re: Happy Vets Day

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-14 11:20:11 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0311140320.19b3477a@posting.google.com>
Source record: 82095

elektros@yahoo.com (elektros) wrote in message
news:<ae406dc2.0311131951.1bfae642@posting.google.com>...
>
> It still is Armistice Day where I come from (the UK), but they now
> celebrate Armistice Sunday on the nearest Sunday instead.

In the USA, its the only remembrance day not moved to/celebrated on
friday or monday. The masses think they are being cheated out of a
three day holiday. It really pisses off some of them.

2622. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-14 18:07:15 UTC
From: dennis@wawa.juniper.net
Message-ID: <bp35kjsma1@heap.juniper.net>
Source record: 82098

Ryan, KC8PMX <REMOVETHISkc8pmx@diamondcs.net> wrote:
>Around here in this county I live in, home ownership is next to impossible,
>except for spending at least $75,000 or better. The average small 3 bedroom
>house, no basement or garage (slab built) on a half to full acre runs *at
>least* 75 grand or better. Go immediately outside of the county lines of
>this county, and the similar/equivalent structure is anywhere from 25-50%
>less. I guess it is something about Midland county I guess.

The cost of a home always seems to be "next to impossible" relative to
the place it is located in, with the "next to" part being key. The other
constant since the end of World War II has been that the "next to impossible"
price very often looks cheap when viewed in retrospect, though I'm not sure
one should count on this being true everywhere forever.

As an example of how "next to impossible" can vary with location, the
house next door to me in Palo Alto, CA, which sold a few months ago after
a few years of unpleasant economy here, sounds a lot like yours. It's
a 1,300 square foot bungalow, no basement, 50 years old. It does have a
one-car detached garage, but the lot is only 8,000 square feet. It was
listed at $885,000, and it sold for that on the first day it was listed.
They didn't even put a sign up.

If there were $75,000 houses where I lived and intended to stay I think
I'd struggle to buy one. You have to live somewhere, and even if the
post-WW2 trend doesn't hold the prices other places have a lot further
to fall.

Dennis Ferguson

2623. Re: Happy Veterans Day

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-14 18:51:14 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3FB52414.B67125BB@earthlink.net>
Source record: 82099

Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3FB45E36.25E5C512@earthlink.net>...
> > Brian wrote:
> > >
> > > "charlesb" <n5pvl@sbcglobal.net> wrote in message
news:<WwEsb.694$UX4.32229430@newssvr21.news.prodigy.com>...
> > > > "Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
> > > > news:f45722ac.0311121534.17abad08@posting.google.com...
> > > > >
> > > > > Concerning the "Bonus Army" of 1932, where veterans of The War to End
> > > > > All Wars (1917/1918) were due a bonus in 1945, but wanted payment
> > > > > early because they lost their homes in the Great Depression, Franklin
> > > > > Roosevelt is to have said:
> > > > >
> > > >
> > > > "Is to have said?" I would think that Roosevelt has pretty well said what
> > > > he is going to, by now!
> > >
> > > Does FDR still talk to you?
> > >
> > > That's very possible, but I was quoting someone elses research, so
> > > have not verified that is what FDR actually said from a direct source.
> > >
> > > But thanks for your interest.
> >
> > Your first clue that the quote is not from Roosevelt is that he is
> > unlikely to have referred to himself as "President Roosevelt".

>
> Dave, follow the link (i.e., point and click) in the "Armistice Day"
> thread and read it yourself.
>
> Good luck on that one now.

You posted it *here*. If you didn't copy it correctly, say so.
If you did copy it correctly, whoever posted it is likely in error.

Good luck has nothing to do with it. Just use your noggin.

Dave K8MN

2624. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-14 18:53:58 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <ax9tb.444$Rk5.290@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 82100

"Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote

> They must be buying immodestly priced houses, then, because there are
> more homeowners than ever before.

As a percentage of the population there are less homeowners than ever
before, and the percentage is trending downward even in this time of
unusually low mortgage interest rates.

de Hans, K0HB

2625. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-14 18:57:36 UTC
From: dennis@wawa.juniper.net
Message-ID: <bp38j0$1670$1@heap.juniper.net>
Source record: 82101

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote:
>Dennis Ferguson wrote:
>> If you look at this one
>>
>> http://www.census.gov/hhes/www/housing/hvs/q303tab5.html
>>
>> you'll see that the rate of home ownership in the US, which varied
>> between 63% and 66% for the 30 years prior to 1995, took a jump starting
>> in about 1997 and was at 68.4% in the quarter just ended. It seems
>> hard to argue that houses have gotten less affordable over the long
>> term when the fraction of people who demonstrate they can afford
>> to own a house by doing so remained fairly constant for so long and
>> actually took a significant upturn in the last few years.
>
>I don't think it hard to argue at all, Dennis. Years back, people were
>advised not to spend more than 25% of their income on housing. Later
>this was revised to 33%. Today it is not uncommon for folks with two
>incomes paying *half* of their combined income for housing.

That's very true, but my strong bias towards arguments which can be
supported by existence proofs requires me to argue that the fraction of
one's income spent on housing which is "affordable" isn't necessarily
a fixed number, but instead depends on the fraction of one's income that
doesn't need to be spent on everything else one requires to live. The
fact that those people ended up in houses despite the chunk of income
this took says to me the chunk was still affordable, though at that
level of investment it would be sad if the value of the house dropped.

>In my area, houses are being given away and property taxes are very low.
>Wait until you're near retirement before buying here though. You have
>to bring your own money.

I noticed that. In fact at one point in my life I noticed that I
could swap a townhouse in Arlington, VA just about even for nearly
half a mountain, in a pricier end of your state at that, and came
very close to doing something about it. It was only the conclusion
that the commute to work in northern Virginia would kill me, even
if I didn't do it every day, which kept me in the townhouse.

Dennis Ferguson

2626. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-14 20:42:37 UTC
From: Steve Stone <spfleck@zzcitlinkzz.net>
Message-ID: <17btb.18256$re5.9423@news02.roc.ny>
Source record: 82102

"Ryan, KC8PMX" <REMOVETHISkc8pmx@diamondcs.net> wrote in message
news:bp2o3p$1ki73m$2@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de...
> Around here in this county I live in, home ownership is next to
impossible,
> except for spending at least $75,000 or better. The average small 3
bedroom
> house, no basement or garage (slab built) on a half to full acre runs *at
> least* 75 grand or better.

I live 70 miles northwest of New York City, downwind from the largest dairy farm in the county and with a gravel mine 1/4 mile down the road. 1 acre lots and the typical 3 bedroom home will set you back at least $250,000 with matching property taxes.

2627. Re: Language Rules from FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-14 21:18:03 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3FB54689.5050104@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 82103

Ryan, KC8PMX wrote:

>Geee..... didn't Carlin cover this??? (i.e. George Carlin?)
>
>
>
>
>As for specific words??? Dunno, is there a list?? :) Who makes the list
>then? Are other things other than the known "7 dirty words" included? If
>someone is of say, for instance a different faith than you, do you get to
>determine anything they say religiously is offensive and should be banned
>speech? I am sure there are other examples one could come up with......
>
>
>
Heard (possible urban legend) that the FCC in "case law" refers to
George Carlin's list
but doesn't actually list the words. George Carlin's recorded comedy
bit is a "published
work", like that of a book, and thus can be referred to in another
document. I'm no
lawyer, so the above could be BS.....

2628. Re: Armistice Day was re: Happy Vets Day

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-14 21:40:43 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <xnfcneeyarg.hoct36j.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>
Source record: 82104

On 14 Nov 2003 03:20:11 -0800, Brian wrote:

>> It still is Armistice Day where I come from (the UK), but they now
>> celebrate Armistice Sunday on the nearest Sunday instead.
>
>In the USA, its the only remembrance day not moved to/celebrated on
>friday or monday.

Not quite - Independance Day (July 4), Xmas (Dec. 25), and New
Year's Day (Jan. 1) are not moved, and they all are "remembrance"
days of one thing or another.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

From a Clearing in the Silicon Forest
Beaverton (Washington County) Oregon

2629. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-14 21:40:44 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <xnfcneeyarg.hoctdhk.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>
Source record: 82105

On Fri, 14 Nov 2003 00:57:20 -0500, Ryan, KC8PMX wrote:

>Around here in this county I live in, home ownership is next to impossible,
>except for spending at least $75,000 or better. The average small 3 bedroom
>house, no basement or garage (slab built) on a half to full acre runs *at
>least* 75 grand or better. Go immediately outside of the county lines of
>this county, and the similar/equivalent structure is anywhere from 25-50%
>less. I guess it is something about Midland county I guess.

Be happy. What you describe would cost four times that here (less
if on a quarter acre), and easily ten times that in any developed
part of California and many other states.

As to Dennis' comment about the house in Palo Alto (CA) - earlier
this year my daughter sold her telephone-booth-sized condo apartment
in Hercules (CA - East Bay) the same day she put it up for sale - it
didn't even make the Multiple Listing register. She got well into
six figures.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

From a Clearing in the Silicon Forest
Beaverton (Washington County) Oregon

2630. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-14 21:40:44 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <xnfcneeyarg.hoctpsl.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>
Source record: 82106

On Fri, 14 Nov 2003 05:14:34 GMT, Dave Heil wrote:

>I dunno Phil. I just took delivery of a piece of bound carpet and two
>runners for our dining room. It took Lowe's eighty days after my order
>and payment to deliver it. I could have had a Turk hand weave the thing
>and personally deliver it in that period.

From what I understand, the furniture industry is somewhat like
that. If what you want is out of stock you may have to wait some
time until the next cutting cycle for that model. This is basically
independent of where it's made.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

From a Clearing in the Silicon Forest
Beaverton (Washington County) Oregon

2631. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-15 00:14:32 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <ldetb.1167$m84.942475@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 82108

Dennis Ferguson wrote:
> Ryan, KC8PMX <REMOVETHISkc8pmx@diamondcs.net> wrote:
>
>>Around here in this county I live in, home ownership is next to impossible,
>>except for spending at least $75,000 or better. The average small 3 bedroom
>>house, no basement or garage (slab built) on a half to full acre runs *at
>>least* 75 grand or better. Go immediately outside of the county lines of
>>this county, and the similar/equivalent structure is anywhere from 25-50%
>>less. I guess it is something about Midland county I guess.
>
>
> The cost of a home always seems to be "next to impossible" relative to
> the place it is located in, with the "next to" part being key. The other
> constant since the end of World War II has been that the "next to impossible"
> price very often looks cheap when viewed in retrospect, though I'm not sure
> one should count on this being true everywhere forever.

In my little city, State College PA, there is 1 lower cost housing development (actually about ten miles out of town, and of the locals, all who are employed in the retail trade (save the owners) live outside of town. It is not next to impossible, it truly is. It has caused a strange anomaly. The only houses being built at this time are houses from around 500K to the 2 million dollar range.

Note I use words like impossible and only. I don't doubt you might find a 250 thousand dollar (low end) house being built around here, and there is no doubt some people who work at the local Megalo-Mart and live near town in a trailer, but that is certainly the trend around here

> If there were $75,000 houses where I lived and intended to stay I think
> I'd struggle to buy one. You have to live somewhere, and even if the
> post-WW2 trend doesn't hold the prices other places have a lot further
> to fall.

Hoowwee! Your not kidding! If you can get a house around these parts for 75K, it is probably a major fixer-upper, or a mobile home.

- Mike KB3EIA -

2632. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-15 00:28:17 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <Bqetb.1180$m84.944302@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 82107

Dennis Ferguson wrote:

> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote:
>
>>Dennis Ferguson wrote:
>>
>>>If you look at this one
>>>
>>> http://www.census.gov/hhes/www/housing/hvs/q303tab5.html
>>>
>>>you'll see that the rate of home ownership in the US, which varied
>>>between 63% and 66% for the 30 years prior to 1995, took a jump starting
>>>in about 1997 and was at 68.4% in the quarter just ended. It seems
>>>hard to argue that houses have gotten less affordable over the long
>>>term when the fraction of people who demonstrate they can afford
>>>to own a house by doing so remained fairly constant for so long and
>>>actually took a significant upturn in the last few years.
>>
>>I don't think it hard to argue at all, Dennis. Years back, people were
>>advised not to spend more than 25% of their income on housing. Later
>>this was revised to 33%. Today it is not uncommon for folks with two
>>incomes paying *half* of their combined income for housing.
>
>
> That's very true, but my strong bias towards arguments which can be
> supported by existence proofs requires me to argue that the fraction of
> one's income spent on housing which is "affordable" isn't necessarily
> a fixed number, but instead depends on the fraction of one's income that
> doesn't need to be spent on everything else one requires to live.The
> fact that those people ended up in houses despite the chunk of income
> this took says to me the chunk was still affordable, though at that
> level of investment it would be sad if the value of the house dropped.

Right! What these people consider "affordable" does indeed vary. I had some neighbors some years ago who were so hell bent on having a desirable hous in a desirable neighborhood that they financially destroyed themselves. They spent way more than they could afford for the house in the first place, then borrowed money for the down payment, then ended up paying well over 50 percent of their take home for their mortgage payments. It wrecked them, lock stock and barrel. I rmember them right before they moved, chuckling how they put one over on the bank. They were *so* fixated on thier goal, that they sacrificed everything else for that house.

There is much more to life than having a house, come hell or high water. The owners must have enough capital left over that they can participate in being a consumer. If a person is "house poor", they get to stay home and enjoy their house, but lots of the extras, which help drive the econnomy, go wanting.

On the other hand, despite the wailing and gnashing of teeth of the real estate agents, I spent about 50K less than what I was approved for for a house, choosing to enjoy my hobbies, provide extras for the wife and kid, and put money into retirement accounts.

So they ended up selling the house (I think they went bankrupt, but am not sure). I'm still here, living a tad more modestly, but putting money in the bank. Different ideas on what is affordable? You bet!

- Mike KB3EIA -

- Mike KB3EIA -

2633. N8WWM, Doug Adair begs for more.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-15 00:51:32 UTC
From: Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com>
Message-ID: <20031114195132.237$IE_-_@newsreader.com>
Source record: 82109
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.dogie.is.an.idiot

steviefageetzboner@yahoo.com (Stevie was dumped for Rover) wrote:
> HARDEEHHARRHARRRHARRR...LIFE IS GOOD WHEN YOU AINT FAGGOT ASS STEVIE
> PARKS!!!
>
> http://www.geocities.com/mrsstevieparks/Mrs_Parks_gets_some.html
>
Here's a fine example of a no-code tech showing his jealousy of
a much superior CB station.(shame)

2634. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-15 01:34:40 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <Qoftb.9925$P%1.8988131@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 82110

"Ryan, KC8PMX" <REMOVETHISkc8pmx@diamondcs.net> wrote in message
news:bp01u4$1j4jgd$1@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de...
>
> "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
> news:zcfsb.9188$P%1.8310788@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
> >
> > "Ryan, KC8PMX" <REMOVETHISkc8pmx@diamondcs.net> wrote in message
> > news:borq9m$1gm7n3$6@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de...
> > > Yeah..... that may be true but circumstances now have forced many to
> > suffer
> > > with it as a "living" wage.
> > >
> >
> > Yeah that's the same "victim" argument some of my friends made when I
went
> > to college and they didn't. But I sacrificed to go to college. My
> parents
> > didn't pay for it.
> >
>
> Thats assuming a certain age too. I have sacraficed as well, but do the
> math, at 5-7 bucks an hour, trying to support your self, in the minimal of
> settings, (housing, transportation etc.) and also have funds to pay for
> college does not always work as conviently as you prescribe. I have been
> working on my degree since 1989, and am almost done. Unfortunately you
live
> in some type of world where kids are allowed to live with the parents
above
> the age of 18. Myself, as well as many others do not have that luxury.
>

Once I started college, I was only at home in the summers and paid all my
own expenses when not at home.

Due to various ups and downs in life, my daughter is going to college
entirely on her own nickel today and will graduate in May. She has not
lived at home at all since the age of 18.

>
>
> > I worked a minimum wage job, lived at home, did not buy a car, did not
buy
> > records and so on. I put the money aside and did without so I could go
to
> > college. So that "circumstances" argument is pretty shakey. And don't

> try
> > the "pregnant and alone teenager" argument either. I knew some of them
in
> > college and they made it too.
>
> Again, not all people have the luxury of living off the parents beyond
> graduation of high school. To expect every person to have been in the
exact
> same circumstances as you is also pretty shakey as well. As far as the
> pregnant teenager issue, I wasn't gonna mention that one either.
>

There are still ways even if they can't live at home. My daughter is a case
in point.

> >
> > People allow themselves to fail and become victims of circumstance.
>
> Following that logic, then the people IN the WTC buildings are also as
well
> then......
>

No it does not follow. The people in the WTC buildings were subject to a
circumstance that no one could ever have even guessed might happen or
foreseen might happen. That was not within their power to prevent or solve.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

2635. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-15 01:42:02 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <Kvftb.9927$P%1.8989257@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 82112

"Ryan, KC8PMX" <REMOVETHISkc8pmx@diamondcs.net> wrote in message
news:bp01u5$1j4jgd$2@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de...
>
> Also, get it out of your head that most of what I have been responding to
in
> this is directly an example of what I am dealing with personally as your
> attacks indicate, but observations of what is going on around here.
>

Never meant to imply that I thought it was something you were dealing with. If I did so that was an accident. My point, which I didn't make well apparently, is that it isn't going to do the people you talk about any good to try to control wages and prices and force the economy. It's got to correct itself and people have got to take what steps they need to so they can continue to be productively employed. Well meaning people who try to control national and international economics cannot change it.

And yes if you are willing to move, there are sufficient jobs for people. But vast numbers of people won't do that.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

2636. Re: Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-15 01:42:58 UTC
From: charlesb <n5pvl@sbcglobal.net>
Message-ID: <Cwftb.225$Xc1.103@newssvr13.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 82111

Not trying to sound like a broken record, but is there any news about the situation in Virginia with the BPL rollout?

What's the scoop, folks? Anybody hear anything?

Charles Brabham, N5PVL

2637. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-15 01:50:17 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0311141750.6debc524@posting.google.com>
Source record: 82113

"Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<ax9tb.444$Rk5.290@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> "Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote
>
> > They must be buying immodestly priced houses, then, because there are
> > more homeowners than ever before.
>
>
> As a percentage of the population there are less homeowners than ever
> before, and the percentage is trending downward even in this time of
> unusually low mortgage interest rates.
>
> de Hans, K0HB

Disallowed.

The PCTA say there are more Morsemen today than at any time in
history, including the heydays of Morse, when Morse was the about the
only form of long distance communication.

Thusly, we are not allowed to participate in "per capita" discussions.

Your strawman is now chicken litter - poop-poop.

didit.

2638. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-15 01:58:21 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0311141758.5d071173@posting.google.com>
Source record: 82114

Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:<ePUsb.751$m84.598511@news1.news.adelphia.net>...

> Interesting. In comparing between the years that are specified in the
> other document, they also show an increase! I wonder what causes the
> discrepancy?

Confounding variables?

> My link: 1995 ~56% 1894 ~60 %
> Your link 1995 ~65% 1984 ~64.8%
>
> Perhaps the difference is that many people are living in houses that
> they can't afford?

Perhaps that is what I meant by "immodestly" affordable housing?

There is some data there, but I haven't had time to
> check it out.

Nor did you check out my response, which sstated what you just said.

Perhaps we accept more debt today (as a ratio to income) than ever before.

2639. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-15 02:01:03 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <zNftb.9933$P%1.8992692@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 82115

"Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message news:3FB39058.40704@psu.edu...
>
>
> Dee D. Flint wrote:
> > "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> > news:20031112062933.14837.00004192@mb-m03.aol.com...
> >
> >>In article <t%rrb.1130$KN4.845856@news1.news.adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo
> >><mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:
> >>
> >>
> >>>As I recall reading a while back, in 1950, it took 14 percent of an
> >>>average workers income to put a roof over "his head". That may have
> >>>changed a little bit! 8^)
> >>
> >>It changed big time. Same for medical and education costs.
> >
> >
> > However as noted in later in this same post for cars (now snipped),
people
> > now demand more features in that house and more room in that house that
was
> > common in 1950. So it's an apples to oranges comparison.
>
> Well if we cant compare houses to houses because houses to houses is
> apples to oranges.............
>
> C'mon, Dee - there has to be *some* sort of comparison that can be
> made! If my comments about people paying 50 percent or more of their
> take home pay to put a roof over their head compared to 14 percent way
> back when are irrelevant, and if people doing 30 year mortgages vs 10 or
> 15 year mortgages are irrelevant, than I guess you are saying that
> buying a house in 1950 is the exact equivalent of buying one in 2003?
>
>
> ......but it isn't because it's an apples to oranges comparison?
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -
>

What I am saying is that it takes a lot more detailed analysis before you
can make a legitimate comparison. It's not as different as a surface
analysis may lead people to believe. People are choosing the 30 year
mortgage. The mortgage companies went this route not to make it easier to

buy a house but to make more money off that loan. By the way, no mortgage company that I've had contact with would ever allow the payment + insurance + taxes to be as high as 50%. They would not approve the loan. Today's starter house has airconditioning. The 1950s starter house did not. But today's consumer has chosen the more expensive version of the product and very, very few will buy a house without it so now it's not comparable without doing a whole lot deeper analysis. Somehow you've got to add an allowance for air conditioning to the older house.

Another example, take the cost to drive drive. Cost of gasoline is not the only element to consider. You must factor in the fact that cars now last longer not just how far the price has risen. You must also factor in that the average car today gets far better mileage than the average car then. You need to somehow factor in the fact that you can't even buy a stripped down car now although they were the norm in the 1950s. People became more and more reluctant to buy them and the makers responded. The market (i.e. consumer) has chosen to have an inherently more expensive vehicle.

Simplistic analyses won't do it.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

2640. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-15 02:04:46 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <2Rftb.1212$m84.962279@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 82116

Dee D. Flint wrote:

> "Ryan, KC8PMX" <REMOVETHISkc8pmx@diamondcs.net> wrote in message
> news:bp01u5$1j4jgd$2@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de...
>
>>Also, get it out of your head that most of what I have been responding to
>
> in
>
>>this is directly an example of what I am dealing with personally as your
>>attacks indicate, but observations of what is going on around here.
>>
>
>
> Never meant to imply that I thought it was something you were dealing with.
> If I did so that was an accident. My point, which I didn't make well
> apparently, is that it isn't going to do the people you talk about any good
> to try to control wages and prices and force the economy. It's got to
> correct itself and people have got to take what steps they need to so they
> can continue to be productively employed. Well meaning people who try to
> control national and international economics cannot change it.

Dee, Capitalism is the best darn economic system to ever hit the earth.
Period. And supply and demand is a better bet than anyone's deity being
the real one.

But, our country's economy is not really what I think you think it is.
Unbridled capitalism tends toward major boom and bust cycles, and can
produce some particulary nasty characters, as the running motive behind
it at times alllows one small group or person to grab all the cookies so
to speak. Capitalism turns a basic human characteristic, greed, into a
pretty good thing. But all by itself, greed turns into something else
than what we might want.

Our economic system has plenty of controls on it to help avoid the
greediest to own it all. And it works pretty darn well IMO.

> And yes if you are willing to move, there are sufficient jobs for people.
> But vast numbers of people won't do that.

Are you saying that if all the unemployed moved someplace they would
all get jobs? Sounds oversimplified to me.

- Mike KB3EIA -

2641. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-15 02:04:47 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <3Rftb.9935$P%1.8993217@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 82117

"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
news:c2356669.0311130926.38f4f950@posting.google.com...
> And there are so many variables and unknowns! For example, look at the
> tax situation. There's federal income tax - and social security tax,
> and medicare tax, and state income tax in some places, and local wage
> taxes, and sales taxes...And the deduction/withholding rules change so
> that what used to be not much of a burden on the average person is now
> a big chunk out of the paycheck.
>

And this is the real killer. When the Federal Income tax was first initiated, the average person's tax rate was only 3%. The average RATE is now much higher. So the Feds are getting a bigger percentage of an inflated wage. So the tax income rises at a rate greater than wages and inflaction.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

2642. Re: Happy Veterans Day

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-15 02:07:30 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0311141807.57798842@posting.google.com>
Source record: 82118

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3FB52414.B67125BB@earthlink.net>...
> Brian wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3FB45E36.25E5C512@earthlink.net>...
> > > Brian wrote:
> > > >
> > > > "charlesb" <n5pvl@sbcglobal.net> wrote in message
news:<WwEsb.694$UX4.32229430@newssvr21.news.prodigy.com>...
> > > > > "Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
> > > > > news:f45722ac.0311121534.17abad08@posting.google.com...
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Concerning the "Bonus Army" of 1932, where veterans of The War to End
> > > > > > All Wars (1917/1918) were due a bonus in 1945, but wanted payment
> > > > > > early because they lost their homes in the Great Depression, Franklin
> > > > > > Roosevelt is to have said:
> > > > > >
> > > > >
> > > > > "Is to have said?" I would think that Roosevelt has pretty well said what
> > > > > he is going to, by now!
> > > >
> > > > Does FDR still talk to you?
> > > >
> > > > That's very possible, but I was quoting someone elses research, so
> > > > have not verified that is what FDR actually said from a direct source.
> > > >
> > > > But thanks for your interest.
> > >
> > > Your first clue that the quote is not from Roosevelt is that he is
> > > unlikely to have referred to himself as "President Roosevelt".
> >
> > Dave, follow the link (i.e., point and click) in the "Armistice Day"
> > thread and read it yourself.
> >
> > Good luck on that one now.
>
> You posted it *here*. If you didn't copy it correctly, say so.

Dave, you didn't read it correctly. Not my problem.

I say so.

> If you did copy it correctly, whoever posted it is likely in error.

I copied it, I posted it.

"Likely" leaves room for your errors. I simply won't accept your errors as mine.

> Good luck has nothing to do with it. Just use your noggin.
>
> Dave K8MN

Ditto.

Now go follow the link in the "Armistice Day" thread and quit bugging me with your self-imposed stupidity.

2643. Re: Language Rules from FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-15 02:09:16 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0311141809.15e064@posting.google.com>
Source record: 82119

"Ryan, KC8PMX" <REMOVETHISkc8pmx@diamondcs.net> wrote in message news:<bp2o3q$1ki73m$3@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>...
> > > But, when I did a quick search on the FCC website, I found nothing of
> it.
> >
> > Of course not. They're not gonna advertise it because then everybody
> > would be saying it.
>
> Geee..... didn't Carlin cover this??? (i.e. George Carlin?)

Yep, 1970's. George and Buddy got rich off of being nasty.

2644. Re: Armistice Day was re: Happy Vets Day

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-15 02:12:02 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0311141812.c287643@posting.google.com>
Source record: 82120

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:<xnfcneeyarg.hoct36j.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>...
> On 14 Nov 2003 03:20:11 -0800, Brian wrote:
>
> >> It still is Armistice Day where I come from (the UK), but they now
> >> celebrate Armistice Sunday on the nearest Sunday instead.
> >
> >In the USA, its the only remembrance day not moved to/celebrated on
> >friday or monday.
>
> Not quite - Independance Day (July 4), Xmas (Dec. 25), and New
> Year's Day (Jan. 1) are not moved, and they all are "remembrance"
> days of one thing or another.

Jesus was a fallen soldier?

2645. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-15 02:12:06 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <WXftb.9936$P%1.8994428@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 82121

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:n2Vsb.27886$9M3.12179@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> Consumers don't act as a single body, Jim. When was the last time you
> pondered what other consumers are doing when you went to a restaurant?
> Without doing so, there is no way to know other people have stopped going
to
> Ma's Diner. Instead, you go to Taco Heaven assuming everything is just
fine
> over at Ma's Diner. Other consumers do the same. Most only discover
there's
> a problem at Ma's Diner when they see the going out of business sign. The
> same pattern plays out in other markets (Wal-Mart versus local stores and
so
> on).
>

So you're saying we should go to "Ma's Diner" for the sole purpose of
keeping them in business?? I don't think so.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

2646. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-15 02:22:23 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <z5gtb.9940$P%1.8995873@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 82122

"Dennis Ferguson" <dennis@wawa.juniper.net> wrote in message
news:bp35kjsma1@heap.juniper.net...
> Ryan, KC8PMX <REMOVETHISkc8pmx@diamondcs.net> wrote:
> >Around here in this county I live in, home ownership is next to
impossible,
> >except for spending at least $75,000 or better. The average small 3
bedroom
> >house, no basement or garage (slab built) on a half to full acre runs *at
> >least* 75 grand or better. Go immediately outside of the county lines of
> >this county, and the similar/equivalent structure is anywhere from 25-50%
> >less. I guess it is something about Midland county I guess.

Adjusted for inflation, that's far LESS than I paid for a comparable house
outside of Seattle in 1974 except that it only had a standard size lot not
anything as luxurious as a half an acre.

So 1973/1974:
Engineers fresh out of college starting wage approximately $10,000
House cost approximately $35,000 in Seattle.

Now in 2003:
Engineers fresh out of college starting wage approximately $45,000
House quoted above comparable to the one in Seattle costing $75,000

Wages went up 4.5 times and comparable house just over twice as expensives.
Hmm yup houses cost more today relatively speaking.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

2647. N8WWM begs for another lesson in radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-15 02:26:07 UTC
From: Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com>
Message-ID: <20031114212607.334$CH_-_@newsreader.com>
Source record: 82123
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.dogie.is.an.idiot

But I feel sorry for the useless Fuck, just look at how pathetic
he is. I don't want to rip the handicapped.

http://www.geocities.com/picsrfun2003/n8-jpeg.JPG

2648. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-15 02:27:28 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <kagtb.9942$P%1.8996579@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 82125

"Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:ax9tb.444$Rk5.290@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
>
>
> "Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote
>
> > They must be buying immodestly priced houses, then, because there are
> > more homeowners than ever before.
>
>
> As a percentage of the population there are less homeowners than ever
> before, and the percentage is trending downward even in this time of
> unusually low mortgage interest rates.
>
> de Hans, K0HB

The situation will be self correcting just as in the past. Housing prices will fall to where more people can afford them and buy them.

Another factor affecting home ownership is that there are today a larger percentage of people who choose not to own a home for various reasons. If you can't keep it for several years, you will probably lose money. Seven years ago, I lost my job in Illinois and had to sell my house at a net loss since I needed what equity I could get to move to the next job. I'd only had it a couple of years and the value of the house had not had time to increase enough to cover the realtor's fee. So although I could have bought a house when I moved to South Dakota, I chose not to. There was insufficient information for me to estimate how long I would be there. It turned out to be a good decision because three years later I moved to Michigan.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

2649. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-15 02:28:14 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0311141828.6ae9b540@posting.google.com>
Source record: 82124

"Ryan, KC8PMX" <REMOVETHISkc8pmx@diamondcs.net> wrote in message
news:<bp2o3p$1ki73m$2@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>...
> Around here in this county I live in, home ownership is next to impossible,
> except for spending at least $75,000 or better. The average small 3 bedroom
> house, no basement or garage (slab built) on a half to full acre runs *at
> least* 75 grand or better. Go immediately outside of the county lines of
> this county, and the similar/equivalent structure is anywhere from 25-50%
> less. I guess it is something about Midland county I guess.
>
> Ryan

Ryan, I went to QRZ and looked up your address, so you get one more
hit at QRZ.com. Apparently you're betw the Baycityrollers and
Saginaw.

Where I live, a 75K home is called a crack-house and a public
nuisance.

Location(cubed).

If you have housing available at 75K, and it is suitable to your
desires, and you have a steady job, go see your mortgage lender today!

Try to locate in a non-restricted neighborhood so that you can play
radio.

Brian

2650. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-15 02:32:49 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <lfgtb.1218$m84.968090@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 82126

Brian wrote:

> Nor did you check out my response, which sstated what you just said.

Sorry Brian, but the posts don't always come in right in order.

> Perhaps we accept more debt today (as a ratio to income) than ever before.

Perhaps "we" will get what we deserve for running our finances so close
to the edge. 8^)

- Mike KB3EIA -

2651. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-15 02:39:18 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031114213918.07346.00001726@mb-m26.aol.com>
Source record: 82127

In article <bp2o3p$1ki73m$2@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>, "Ryan, KC8PMX"
<REMOVETHISkc8pmx@diamondcs.net> writes:

>Around here in this county I live in, home ownership is next to impossible,
>except for spending at least $75,000 or better.

That;s very inexpensive, Ryan.

>The average small 3 bedroom
>house, no basement or garage (slab built) on a half to full acre runs *at
>least* 75 grand or better.

What would you consider reasonable?

Check out

http://www.realtor.com

for an idea what houses cost in other parts of the country. You can search by
zip code, town name, etc. Set limits on house size, price, etc.

You don't want to know what a house costs around here.

>Go immediately outside of the county lines of
>this county, and the similar/equivalent structure is anywhere from 25-50%
>less. I guess it is something about Midland county I guess.

Under $50,000? Amazing. But remember the three most important things about real
estate....

What are the taxes like?

73 de Jim, N2EY

2652. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-15 02:47:26 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <2tgtb.9946$P%1.9000078@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 82128

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:2Rftb.1212$m84.962279@news1.news.adelphia.net...
>
> Dee, Capitalism is the best darn economic system to ever hit the earth.
> Period. And supply and demand is a better bet than anyone's deity being
> the real one.
>
> But, our country's economy is not really what I think you think it is.
> Unbridled capitalism tends toward major boom and bust cycles, and can
> produce some particulary nasty characters, as the running motive behind
> it at times alllows one small group or person to grab all the cookies so
> to speak. Capitalism turns a basic human characteristic, greed, into a
> pretty good thing. But all by itself, greed turns into something else
> than what we might want.
>
> Our economic system has plenty of controls on it to help avoid the
> greediest to own it all. And it works pretty darn well IMO.
>

No I never said we should have unbridled capitalism. I'm quite aware of the problems that result from that. What I am saying is that the controls must be minimal and well thought out. Things like the practice of a large company with significant reserve capital choosing to sell at a loss to drive their smaller competitor out of the market cannot and is not allowed (assuming they get caught at it of course). I agree that today's system of controls achieves a pretty good balance. That's why we have to be very careful about any changes so that we don't throw it out of whack and create a new problem possibly much worse than what we face today.

>
> > And yes if you are willing to move, there are sufficient jobs for
people.
> > But vast numbers of people won't do that.
>
> Are you saying that if all the unemployed moved someplace they would
> all get jobs? Sounds oversimplified to me.
>

Not quite. Some people are simply chronically unemployable. But many would indeed be in better shape if they were willing to bite the bullet and move.

I know people who have been waiting decades in southern Ohio, and are still waiting, for "the steel mills to return" and refused to even think about going where there was work because of it. They decided to get by with whatever combination of odd jobs, welfare, etc they could manage to put

together.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

2653. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-15 03:00:15 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <3Fgtb.1015$Rk5.385@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 82129

"Kim W5TIT" wrote:
> "Dwight Stewart" wrote:
> >
> > Well, call it what you want, Kim. You told me that
> > you're an informed consumer that routinely researches
> > the products you buy.
>
> No, Dwight. I did *not* say that at all. In fact, here is
> what I said: (snip)

Kim, just two or three messages ago, I said:
"You and I both knew you couldn't do it, Kim.

The information it not that easily available and it

would take considerable effort for consumers to
research the products they purchase each day,

week, or year. In spite of your claims otherwise,

you don't do it." (snip)

You responded directly to that with:
"Dwight, are you calling me a liar? Yes, I have

done it, and yes it is not all that difficult to do."

> Then, get your own damned sites, Dwight. Point is,

> become smart about what you're buying. (snip)

Kim, when it comes to mainstream consumer information, I'm as well
educated as most anyone else, most certainly including you. But we were
talking about the economy - more specifically, the impact of consumer
purchasing trends on the economy ("shoppers not going to the store to ponder
global economic implications," "economic awareness," and so on) and how
difficult it is to find substantial economics-related information (which
companies are moving factories overseas, foreign business investments, and
so on). We were (I was) not talking about environmental issues (the Exxon
Valdez oil spill you mentioned) or other such topics. Now, just like
everyone else, you're certainly free to bring up those other topics, but
please don't apply something I've said about economics to those topics.

> Gads, you're an ass Dwight...

Only when speaking with one, Kim.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

2654. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-15 03:28:50 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031114222850.21642.00002336@mb-m01.aol.com>
Source record: 82130

In article <WXftb.9936$P%1.8994428@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> writes:

>Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
>news:n2Vsb.27886$9M3.12179@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net...
>> Consumers don't act as a single body, Jim. When was the last time you
>> pondered what other consumers are doing when you went to a restaurant?
>> Without doing so, there is no way to know other people have stopped going
>to
>> Ma's Diner. Instead, you go to Taco Heaven assuming everything is just
>fine
>> over at Ma's Diner. Other consumers do the same. Most only discover
>there's
>> a problem at Ma's Diner when they see the going out of business sign. The
>> same pattern plays out in other markets (Wal-Mart versus local stores and
>so
>> on).
>>
>
>So you're saying we should go to "Ma's Diner" for the sole purpose of
>keeping them in business??

Nope.

I'm saying that if people decide to go to Taco Heaven instead of Ma's Diner, they should not be complaining when Ma's closes down and the only places left are chains like Taco Heaven.

73 de Jim, N2EY

> I don't think so.
>

2655. Re: Language Rules from FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-15 03:34:40 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20031114223440.01893.00001741@mb-m22.aol.com>
Source record: 82131

In article <c2356669.0311130935.7970e9b@posting.google.com>, N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) writes:

>Between broadcasting and amatuer radio is the question of scheduling
>and predictability. All broadcasters publish advance schedules, with
>content warnings. So you can know what you're likely to see and hear
>*before* tuning in to Howard Stern or the Victoria's Secret Fashion
>Special. Not the case in amateur radio.

Jim:

Precisely. On amateur radio, one never knows when one will encounter something which may make someone think twice about our hobby being a wholesome and proper activity for a young person. When that happens, whether or not what was said was "legal" within the letter of the law, the potential exists for the effect to bring the ARS "...one step closer to extinction."

73 de Larry, K3LT

2656. Re: Language Rules from FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-15 03:34:40 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20031114223440.01893.00001740@mb-m22.aol.com>
Source record: 82132

In article <bovm12$901@library2.airnews.net>, "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
writes:

>A neighbor tells me that the FCC has recently ruled that broadcast radio
>stations are now "legally" able to "say the F word" on the air, as long as
>it isn't sexual. Yeah, I know, go figure.
>
>But, when I did a quick search on the FCC website, I found nothing of it.
>Anyone know of this...my thoughts are on what will happen in amateur radio
>now. The broadcast arena has always been the barometer of what people are
>allowed to say on the air, hasn't it?
>
>Kim W5TIT

Kim:

You apparently couldn't care less about whether or not sexually-suggestive,
objectionable language used in the context of poor individual judgment is
used on-the-air. If you did, you would have taken Mr. Hollingsworth's
admonishment to heart, and changed your call sign. However, if it makes
you feel better, in recent weeks I've heard the words "piss" and "shit" used
on prime-time TV programs. The effect that had on me was to make me
pick up my infrared transmitting device and QSY to The History Channel.

73 de Larry, K3LT

2657. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-15 03:47:12 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bp47mb$mug@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 82134

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:3Fgtb.1015$Rk5.385@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> "Kim W5TIT" wrote:
> > "Dwight Stewart" wrote:
> > >
> > > Well, call it what you want, Kim. You told me that
> > > you're an informed consumer that routinely researches
> > > the products you buy.
> > >
> > No, Dwight. I did *not* say that at all. In fact, here is
> > what I said: (snip)
>
>
> Kim, just two or three messages ago, I said:
> "You and I both knew you couldn't do it, Kim.
>
> The information it not that easily available and it
>
> would take considerable effort for consumers to
> research the products they purchase each day,
>
> week, or year. In spite of your claims otherwise,
>
> you don't do it." (snip)
>
>
>
> You responded directly to that with:
> "Dwight, are you calling me a liar? Yes, I have
>
> done it, and yes it is not all that difficult to do."
>
>

It's a far stretch from the above, to stating that *I* said I am an informed
consumer that routinely researches the products I buy. I stated nothing of
the sort. Have it your way, though, Dwight. You're desperate to be
right...so be it.

>
>
> > Then, get your own damned sites, Dwight. Point is,
>
> > become smart about what you're buying. (snip)
>

>
> Kim, when it comes to mainstream consumer information, I'm as well
> educated as most anyone else, most certainly including you. But we were
> talking about the economy - more specifically, the impact of consumer
> purchasing trends on the economy ("shoppers not going to the store to
ponder
> global economic implications," "economic awareness," and so on) and how
> difficult it is to find substantial economics-related information (which
> companies are moving factories overseas, foreign business investments, and
> so on). We were (I was) not talking about environmental issues (the Exxon
> Valdez oil spill you mentioned) or other such topics. Now, just like
> everyone else, you're certainly free to bring up those other topics, but
> please don't apply something I've said about economics to those topics.
>
>
> > Gads, you're an ass Dwight...
>
>
> Only when speaking with one, Kim.
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
>
>

I don't think Jim's an ass, Dwight...

Kim W5TIT

2658. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-15 03:49:37 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <lnhtb.1087$Rk5.61@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 82133

"Kim W5TIT" wrote:
> "Dwight Stewart" wrote:
> > (snip) Because of that, consumers simply don't have
> > the time or the informational resources to even
> > superficially research each of the items they purchase.
> > I certainly don't do it and I seriously doubt you do
> > either (however, Kim says she does).
>
>
> No, Dwight, Kim does not say that. (snip)

And, in another message, I quoted the exact words where you did indeed say that, Kim.

> You know what? It is so blatantly obvious that you just
> don't know what the hell you're talking about. (snip)

That's just about exactly what I was thinking about you (with perhaps a slightly less favorable opinion of you).

> (snip) And, it's also quite obvious you're going to cling to
> your desperate ideas no matter what anyone tries to help
> you with to pull yourself up from the downunder you're
> in... (snip)

You seriously need to climb off your high horse, Kim. Who in the heck asked you to "help" anyone in this newsgroup? I came to this newsgroup to discuss various topics - not be lectured by you with a mandate to drop my opinions in favor of yours. So, if you're sitting around waiting for that to happen, you're going to be one very, very, tired old woman long before there's even a glimmer of hope.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

2659. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-15 03:59:15 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <nwhtb.10069$P%1.9015523@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 82135

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20031114222850.21642.00002336@mb-m01.aol.com...
> In article <WXftb.9936$P%1.8994428@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D.
Flint"
> <deehays@qix.net> writes:
>
> >Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
> >news:n2Vsb.27886$9M3.12179@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> >> Consumers don't act as a single body, Jim. When was the last time you
> >> pondered what other consumers are doing when you went to a restaurant?
> >> Without doing so, there is no way to know other people have stopped
going
> >to
> >> Ma's Diner. Instead, you go to Taco Heaven assuming everything is just
> >fine
> >> over at Ma's Diner. Other consumers do the same. Most only discover
> >there's
> >> a problem at Ma's Diner when they see the going out of business sign.
The
> >> same pattern plays out in other markets (Wal-Mart versus local stores
and
> >so
> >> on).
> >>
> >
> >So you're saying we should go to "Ma's Diner" for the sole purpose of
> >keeping them in business??
>
> Nope.
>
> I'm saying that if people decide to go to Taco Heaven instead of Ma's
Diner,
> they should not be complaining when Ma's closes down and the only places
left
> are chains like Taco Heaven.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
> > I don't think so.

Exactly what I meant. If "Ma's Diner" isn't selling what I want then I'm
not going to buy regardless of small store, large chain or whatever. I
thought however the original post was Dwight's not yours. He seems to be
advocating that the government "fix" consumer's purchasing habits so that

the local stores stay in business.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

2660. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-15 04:04:22 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <aBhtb.10095$P%1.9016908@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 82136

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:lnhtb.1087$Rk5.61@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> You seriously need to climb off your high horse, Kim. Who in the heck
> asked you to "help" anyone in this newsgroup? I came to this newsgroup to
> discuss various topics - not be lectured by you with a mandate to drop my
> opinions in favor of yours. So, if you're sitting around waiting for that
to
> happen, you're going to be one very, very, tired old woman long before
> there's even a glimmer of hope.
>

While I normally disagree with a great many of Kim's posts. Here she is fundamentally correct. Consumers do have the choice to be informed if they really want to. If they don't want to go to that much work, then it is their own problem. Government should NOT be doing your research for you. I certainly don't want MY taxes to go for the checks on goods and information dissemination that you seem to think the government should do for you.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

2661. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-15 04:08:49 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <lFhtb.1111$Rk5.778@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 82137

"Dave Heil" wrote:
> Dwight Stewart wrote:
> >
> > It often costs more to change a contract than it
> > does to simply live with a minor inefficiency. Nobody
> > is losing that much money. It's just an irratation to
> > constantly buy new fans.
>
> If the old one was that great, why isn't it still running?

You obviously missed some of the conversation, Dave. I was complaining about the quality of plastic fans today and how I couldn't find better ones locally. When Jim asked why I bought fans locally (instead of shopping on the internet), I explained the fans were purchased under the terms of a business contract. Jim suggested the contract should be changed. And this is about where you came in to read my reply above.

> It isn't necessary to research each and every item you
> buy, Dwight. (snip)

Actually, I was trying to make the point that we wouldn't have to so diligently research products if government and business was held to a higher standard when it comes to the economy. I've posted more details about that in other messages, so I won't repeat it again here.

> By the way, we've noticed no BPL rollout here in West,
> by God, Virginia.

Yep, this thread has covered just about everything except that recently, hasn't it? As you know, it's pretty much the nature of these newsgroups to stray off into other topics in any given thread.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

2662. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-15 04:11:24 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bp493c$cd3@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 82138

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:nwhtb.10069$P%1.9015523@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
>
> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20031114222850.21642.00002336@mb-m01.aol.com...
> > In article <WXftb.9936$P%1.8994428@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D.
> Flint"
> > <deehays@qix.net> writes:
> >
> > >Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
> > >news:n2Vsb.27886$9M3.12179@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> > >> Consumers don't act as a single body, Jim. When was the last time
you
> > >> pondered what other consumers are doing when you went to a
restaurant?
> > >> Without doing so, there is no way to know other people have stopped
> going
> > >to
> > >> Ma's Diner. Instead, you go to Taco Heaven assuming everything is
just
> > >fine
> > >> over at Ma's Diner. Other consumers do the same. Most only discover
> > >there's
> > >> a problem at Ma's Diner when they see the going out of business sign.
> The
> > >> same pattern plays out in other markets (Wal-Mart versus local stores
> and
> > >so
> > >> on).
> > >>
> > >
> > >So you're saying we should go to "Ma's Diner" for the sole purpose of
> > >keeping them in business??
> >
> > Nope.
> >
> > I'm saying that if people decide to go to Taco Heaven instead of Ma's
> Diner,
> > they should not be complaining when Ma's closes down and the only places
> left
> > are chains like Taco Heaven.
> >
> > 73 de Jim, N2EY
> >

> > > I don't think so.
>
> Exactly what I meant. If "Ma's Diner" isn't selling what I want then I'm
> not going to buy regardless of small store, large chain or whatever. I
> thought however the original post was Dwight's not yours. He seems to be
> advocating that the government "fix" consumer's purchasing habits so that
> the local stores stay in business.
>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>

Yep. You got it...at least that's what I get out of what he's advocating. Anyway, you guys communicate it to him--I give up. He's about like trying to get an answer from the local "we got answers" store...

Kim W5TIT

2663. Re: Why n8wwm is a radio hater.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-15 04:27:15 UTC
From: Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com>
Message-ID: <20031114232715.565$qv@newsreader.com>
Source record: 82139
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com> wrote:
>> So until you produce evidence of fines, that the regular posters in
> rec.radio.cb have been charged with, please STFU.
>
Still waiting. Care to see n8wwm's rain report again?

2664. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-15 04:29:38 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <SYhtb.1124$Rk5.865@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 82140

"Dee D. Flint" wrote:
>
> So you're saying we should go to "Ma's Diner" for
> the sole purpose of keeping them in business?? I
> don't think so.

No, it was just a simplistic example to illustrate that consumers don't always realize what other consumers are doing, or the impact that might have on a particular business (or the economy if this overall example is applied more widely). In this case, a customers decides he's bored of the delicious steak dinners at "Ma's Diner" and decides to eat over at "Taco Heaven" for a while (perhaps to even save some money). But, if enough of "Ma's" customers do that at the same time, the effects would be devastating on "Ma's Diner" (even though that customer, and none of the other customers, ever intended that).

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

2665. Re: Happy Veterans Day

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-15 05:04:10 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3FB5B3C8.70728E0E@earthlink.net>
Source record: 82141

```
Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3FB52414.B67125BB@earthlink.net>...
> > Brian wrote:
> > >
> > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3FB45E36.25E5C512@earthlink.net>...
> > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > "charlesb" <n5pvl@sbcglobal.net> wrote in message
news:<WwEsb.694$UX4.32229430@newssvr21.news.prodigy.com>...
> > > > > > "Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
> > > > > > news:f45722ac.0311121534.17abad08@posting.google.com...
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > Concerning the "Bonus Army" of 1932, where veterans of The War to End
> > > > > > > All Wars (1917/1918) were due a bonus in 1945, but wanted payment
> > > > > > > early because they lost their homes in the Great Depression, Franklin
> > > > > > > Roosevelt is to have said:
> > > > > > >
> > > > > >
> > > > > > "Is to have said?" I would think that Roosevelt has pretty well said what
> > > > > > he is going to, by now!
> > > > > >
> > > > > Does FDR still talk to you?
> > > > >
> > > > > That's very possible, but I was quoting someone elses research, so
> > > > > have not verified that is what FDR actually said from a direct source.
> > > > >
> > > > > But thanks for your interest.
> > > >
> > > > Your first clue that the quote is not from Roosevelt is that he is
> > > > unlikely to have referred to himself as "President Roosevelt".
> > >
> > >
> > > Dave, follow the link (i.e., point and click) in the "Armistice Day"
> > > thread and read it yourself.
> > >
> > > Good luck on that one now.
> >
> > You posted it *here*. If you didn't copy it correctly, say so.
>
> Dave, you didn't read it correctly. Not my problem.
>
```

> I say so.

A quote of what you posted reveals otherwise:

"...Franklin
Roosevelt is to have said:

In the end, some money was paid to veterans but not without further
difficulties. Within a year of the Bonus Army Incident, President
Roosevelt imposed the Economy Act of 1933 which cut veterans
disability allowances by 25%..."

> > If you did copy it correctly, whoever posted it is likely in error.
>
> I copied it, I posted it.

...and, as revealed by the quote from your own post, you blew it.

> "Likely" leaves room for your errors. I simply won't accept your
> errors as mine.

...since you have plenty of your own to worry about.

> > Good luck has nothing to do with it. Just use your noggin.

> Ditto.
>
> Now go follow the link in the "Armistice Day" thread and quit bugging
> me with your self-imposed stupidity.

I'm not the individual who bungled copying material from a web page.

Dave K8MN

2666. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-15 05:08:10 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <_witb.1167$Rk5.528@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 82142

"Kim W5TIT" wrote:
>
> heh I bet Dwight couldn't handle the idea that
> he's probably more manipulated by subliminal
> advertising than the "average joe." :)

Kim, you really have no idea what we were talking about, do you? Before you sidetracked the discussion with this type of nonsense, we were talking about the economy and economic-related issues and information, not general consumer product information. Therefore, nothing I've said about that (the economy) has anything whatsoever to do with "subliminal advertising" or anything of the sort. Do at least try to figure out the subject being discussed before going off on one of your silly rants.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

2667. Re: REWARD for info on TWISTEDHED

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-15 05:19:55 UTC
From: Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com>
Message-ID: <20031115001955.357$hg@newsreader.com>
Source record: 82143
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.dogie.is.an.idiot

keyclownzmustgo@yahoo.com (Citizens For A Keyclown-Free Newsgroup) wrote:
>> Stevie has anger issues due to being frustrated at his inability to do
> ANYTHING at all to stop the akc.
>
WTF does the American Kennel Club have to do with you, jackass?

2668. Re: REWARD for info on TWISTEDHED

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-15 05:29:17 UTC
From: Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com>
Message-ID: <20031115002917.371$GA@newsreader.com>
Source record: 82144
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.dogie.is.an.idiot

keyclownzmustgo@yahoo.com (Citizens For A Keyclown-Free Newsgroup) wrote:
> Steveo moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com wrote:
> >keyclownzmustgo@yahoo.com (Citizens For A Keyclown-Free Newsgroup)
> >wrote:
> >>> Stevie has anger issues due to being frustrated at his inability to
> >>> do
> >> ANYTHING at all to stop the akc.
> >>
> >WTF can't I call the American Kennel Club and have them
> >get a german shepherd to fuck me in the ass?
>
> Answer yer email, scrotum breath.
>
I did, and I got my 6M rig up and running too, dipshit.

2669. Re: Language Rules from FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-15 05:33:52 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <fKqdnebEou1rXSiiRVn-tg@gbronline.com>
Source record: 82146

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:

> Precisely. On amateur radio, one never knows when one will encounter
> something which may make someone think twice about our hobby being
> a wholesome and proper activity for a young person. When that happens,
> whether or not what was said was "legal" within the letter of the law, the
> potential exists for the effect to bring the ARS "...one step closer to
> extinction."
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT

Larry, our society has pretty much come to the point that people don't care what others think of them any more. Foul, vulgar language is used so much now that it is spoken in homes as if it were accepted language and the kids pick up on it. I have heard five year olds use words that I would never dared to speak in front of an adult when I was a youngster. I have had my mouth washed out with soap (by a teacher at school no less, would like to see one try that now), for saying much less.

I grew up in a farming community and when around the men, sure a few cuss words would fly occasionally, especially when the wrench slipped and a busted knuckle was the result, or over at the local shop where the farmers gathered as their trucks and tractors were being serviced, a hell or damn was pretty common, but never in a public place where women and children were around. There was respect for others then. It isn't uncommon for me to step into an elevator with my wife and hear others using very vulgar language with no regards to who is listening and may be offended by such language. The sad part is, they think it is just accepted that everyone has lowered themselves to such a common level.

Ever set at the mall and just watch the people pass by? Look at the sloppy dress, some look like they stepped out of a cartoon. Few have pride in themselves anymore. And if you really want to see some sloppyness, go to a ham fest. It is a sad commentary on our society today.

2670. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-15 05:47:18 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <G5jtb.1233$Rk5.165@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 82145

"Dee D. Flint" wrote:
>
> While I normally disagree with a great many of
> Kim's posts. Here she is fundamentally correct.
> Consumers do have the choice to be informed
> if they really want to. If they don't want to go to
> that much work, then it is their own problem.
> Government should NOT be doing your research
> for you. I certainly don't want MY taxes to go
> for the checks on goods and information
> dissemination that you seem to think the
> government should do for you.

First of all, do understand that we're talking about the economy, not consumer product information. Kim seems to forget that. Anyway, my position is that, when it comes to the economy, we pretty much have to depend on the government at the moment. Business does not generally make it's decisions (moving factories overseas, overseas investments, investments from overseas, material purchases, and so on) well known to the general public. It would be a massive effort for one person to reseach what they do offer to the public now (and I don't think they offer nearly enough). Take a single industry - the automobile industry, for example. It would take years for one person to research what is going on at this very moment in that industry. What is even worse, and as I've said before, much of the information is not that easy to obtain. Even if you want to break this research down to just a single purchase, it is not always that easy. I purchased an "American" car. That "American" car turned out to be made in Canada (and I didn't know that until it was delivered). Who knows where the parts in that "American" car were made. Therefore, as I've also said before, it's just not realistic to simply expect consumers to be "informed" enough to make wise economic shopping decisions. As consumers, as Americans, we have to demand government manage the economy better (as I've previously outlined).

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

2671. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-15 06:27:39 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <vHjtb.1294$Rk5.701@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 82147

"Dee D. Flint" wrote:
>
> (snip) He seems to be advocating that the
> government "fix" consumer's purchasing habits
> so that the local stores stay in business.

First, please don't assume what anyone's position is, Dee. Jim made a specific comment and I was responding to that specific comment alone, not the topic as a whole. My response was an explanation of the process at play as I see it, not a "fix" of any kind. Second, I'm not really "advocating" anything at all. There isn't enough of us here in this newsgroup to even do so. If I wanted to advocate something, I would do so in a much more "audience rich" environment. Instead, we're simply discussing another one of the many topics we routinely discuss in this newsgroup.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

2672. Re: Language Rules from FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-15 07:37:31 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <%Iktb.1328$Rk5.1198@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 82148

"JJ" wrote:
>
> (snip) I have heard five year olds use words that
> I would never dared to speak in front of an adult
> when I was a youngster. (snip)

I've heard five year olds use words that I, as an adult, would not say in front of other adults today. I'm certainly not a prude, but I just don't see how vulgar language improves communications or one's impression of another.

> I have had my mouth washed out with soap (by
> a teacher at school no less, would like to see
> one try that now), for saying much less.

My mother preferred dishwashing liquid (claimed it was safer than some hand or body soaps). Once was enough for me, but my brother went on a foul language spree one summer and "got the treatment" probably five or six times. My sister got it when she was about sixteen or seventeen.

> (snip) It isn't uncommon for me to step into an
> elevator with my wife and hear others using very
> vulgar language with no regards to who is
> listening and may be offended by such language.
> (snip)

There was a guy and his wife (girlfriend or whatever) in line behind us at Office Max the other day. I've never heard so much foul language in such a short amount of time (seemed like every second or third word out of his mouth). And I'm talking nasty stuff - women's body parts, his wife's body parts, body parts in general, negative words for men and women, and so on. I finally asked him to keep his voice down. When that didn't work, I asked him not to use such language. When I finally got the register, he started it again. In anger (and since there was nobody else in line), I had the casher go with me to search for printer ink behind another counter and made sure we had a nice little conversation. We even talked about his language. When he finally went to another line, we returned to the register to complete my purchase. Less than ten seconds later, the guy rushed towards the register to get behind us again. However, the casher saw him coming and put the register closed sign up before he got there. As he walked away, and I was picking up my bag to leave, she smiled real big and told us to have a nice day. This was one of the few times I truly believed a casher meant those words when said.

> And if you really want to see some sloppyness,
> go to a ham fest. (snip)

I can accept a certain level of sloppyness at a ham fest or other casual event (as opposed to the mall, restaurant, work, or other such places). Or perhaps I should say that I dress more sloppily at a ham fest than I would at work or so forth. I just don't really see an overwhelming reason to dress up for a ham fest.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

2673. Re: Happy Veterans Day

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-15 11:07:46 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0311150307.203b74d1@posting.google.com>
Source record: 82149

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3FB5B3C8.70728E0E@earthlink.net>...
> Brian wrote:
> >

> > Now go follow the link in the "Armistice Day" thread and quit bugging
> > me with your self-imposed stupidity.
>
> I'm not the individual who bungled copying material from a web page.

Whew!...I thouhgt I was the only one who appreciated Brain's
unique posting habits ! ! ! !

73

Steve, K4YZ

2674. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-15 12:19:07 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031115071907.11891.00002295@mb-m11.aol.com>
Source record: 82150

In article <Cwftb.225$Xc1.103@newssvr13.news.prodigy.com>, "charlesb" <n5pvl@sbcglobal.net> writes:

>Not trying to sound like a broken record, but is there any news about the
>situation in Virginia with the BPL rollout?
>
>What's the scoop, folks? Anybody hear anything?
>

Charles,

It's probably too soon to tell. "announcing a rollout" doesn't mean the system is installed and operating over a wide area - yet. It just means they've done the paperwork.

I have read reports from WK3C, W1RFI and others that the level of noise from at least some BPL systems varies dramatically over time, and is apparently related to the amount of data being passed over the system. So even if the system is installed and working, if it's feeding one residential customer who spends an hour a day online the noise will be far less than if there are, say, 20 customers spending far more time swapping MPGs.

And as WK3C emphasizes, it's important that any interference be positively identified as BPL-created *before* we complain about it. Otherwise we become "the hams who cried wolf" and our credibility drops.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2675. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-15 12:26:17 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <JXotb.10157$P%1.9074155@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 82251

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:G5jtb.1233$Rk5.165@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
>As consumers, as Americans, we have to demand government manage
> the economy better (as I've previously outlined).

This would be the ruination of the economy. The government is not, never
has been, and never will be competent to manage the economy.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

2676. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-15 12:35:22 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <e4ptb.10158$P%1.9075666@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 82252

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:vHjtb.1294$Rk5.701@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> "Dee D. Flint" wrote:
> >
> > (snip) He seems to be advocating that the
> > government "fix" consumer's purchasing habits
> > so that the local stores stay in business.
>
>
> First, please don't assume what anyone's position is, Dee. Jim made a
> specific comment and I was responding to that specific comment alone, not
> the topic as a whole. My response was an explanation of the process at
play
> as I see it, not a "fix" of any kind. Second, I'm not really "advocating"
> anything at all. There isn't enough of us here in this newsgroup to even
do
> so. If I wanted to advocate something, I would do so in a much more
> "audience rich" environment. Instead, we're simply discussing another one
of
> the many topics we routinely discuss in this newsgroup.

Please note I did NOT assume anything. I did not state that you ARE
advocating that but that it SEEMS that you are. There is a difference.
I.e. the statements in your posts can lead the reader to that conclusion
although the position is not definitively stated.

Why bother to enter the discussion if you are not advocating your position
(or conversely playing "devil's advocate")? The size of the audience should
not matter. You never know in what venue you may find a person or group of
persons who have the ability to initiate and/or implement change.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

2677. Re: Happy Veterans Day

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-15 13:26:31 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0311150526.7136affe@posting.google.com>
Source record: 82253

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3FB5B3C8.70728E0E@earthlink.net>...
> Brian wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3FB52414.B67125BB@earthlink.net>...
> > > Brian wrote:
> > > >
> > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3FB45E36.25E5C512@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > > >
> > > > > > "charlesb" <n5pvl@sbcglobal.net> wrote in message
news:<WwEsb.694$UX4.32229430@newssvr21.news.prodigy.com>...
> > > > > > > "Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
> > > > > > > news:f45722ac.0311121534.17abad08@posting.google.com...
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > Concerning the "Bonus Army" of 1932, where veterans of The War to End
> > > > > > > > All Wars (1917/1918) were due a bonus in 1945, but wanted payment
> > > > > > > > early because they lost their homes in the Great Depression, Franklin
> > > > > > > > Roosevelt is to have said:
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > "Is to have said?" I would think that Roosevelt has pretty well said what
> > > > > > > he is going to, by now!
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > Does FDR still talk to you?
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > That's very possible, but I was quoting someone elses research, so
> > > > > > have not verified that is what FDR actually said from a direct source.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > But thanks for your interest.
> > > > > >
> > > > > Your first clue that the quote is not from Roosevelt is that he is
> > > > > unlikely to have referred to himself as "President Roosevelt".
> >
> > > > >
> > > > Dave, follow the link (i.e., point and click) in the "Armistice Day"
> > > > thread and read it yourself.
> > > >
> > > Good luck on that one now.
> > >
> > You posted it *here*. If you didn't copy it correctly, say so.
> >
> Dave, you didn't read it correctly. Not my problem.

> >
> > I say so.
>
> A quote of what you posted reveals otherwise:
>
> "...Franklin
> Roosevelt is to have said:
>
> ------------
> In the end, some money was paid to veterans but not without further
> difficulties. Within a year of the Bonus Army Incident, President
> Roosevelt imposed the Economy Act of 1933 which cut veterans
> disability allowances by 25%..."
>
> > > If you did copy it correctly, whoever posted it is likely in error.
> >
> > I copied it, I posted it.
>
> ...and, as revealed by the quote from your own post, you blew it.
>
> > "Likely" leaves room for your errors. I simply won't accept your
> > errors as mine.
>
> ...since you have plenty of your own to worry about.
>
> > > Good luck has nothing to do with it. Just use your noggin.
>
> > Ditto.
> >
> > Now go follow the link in the "Armistice Day" thread and quit bugging
> > me with your self-imposed stupidity.
>
> I'm not the individual who bungled copying material from a web page.
>
> Dave K8MN

Dave, you're hopeless.

If you should ever have something of interest, which is almost never,
please get back with me.

If not, just keep it to yourself - please.

Thanks, Brian

2678. Re: KE4TEW and his good friend Riley

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-15 13:41:18 UTC
From: bob <bob@bob.com>
Message-ID: <y%ptb.9395$rV.4842@bignews5.bellsouth.net>
Source record: 82254
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.swap,rec.radio.amateur.policy

TEW has been stalking a lot lately. Maybe that is the agreement he made
with Riley.

George Orwell wrote:

> In article <borsuj$p5a$0@pita.alt.net>
> "Roger" <NoEmail@AnonlymousRemailer.co> wrote:
>
>>
>>
>>"bob" <bob@bob.com> wrote in message
>>news:%j8sb.1980$jA6.1262@bignews6.bellsouth.net...
>>
>>
>>Ken Bessler wrote:
>>
>>
>>So how much pot did KE4TEW give Riley to get his license back?
>>
>>Read below, if you can read.
>>
>>
>>TAMPA, FL: The FCC has requested that General class licensee James W.
>>Dale, KE4TEW, retake the General class examination elements under the
>>supervision of FCC personnel by July 30, 1999, or his license will be
>>canceled.
>>
>>At:
>>
>>http://www.arrl.org/news/stories/1999/06/23/1/
>>
>>--
>>
>>TAMPA, FL [UPDATE]: The FCC notified James W. Dale, formerly KE4TEW, on
>>August 3, 1999, canceling his General Amateur Radio license. The FCC had
>>notified Dale on June 18, 1999, requiring him to retake his Amateur
>>Radio examinations prior to July 30, 1999, under the supervision of FCC
>>personnel in Tampa, Florida. According to FCC Attorney Riley
>>Hollingsworth, K4ZDH, Dale failed to appear for reexamination, and his
>>license was consequently canceled. Hollingsworth also warned Dale about
>>continued operation of radio transmitting equipment.
>>
>>At:
>>http://www.arrl.org/news/stories/1999/08/11/2/

>>--
>>
>>Now, the "Miracle"
>>
>>TAMPA, FL [UPDATE]: The FCC notified General licensee James W. Dale,
>>KE4TEW, on September 28, 1999, that it was reinstating his Amateur Radio
>>license with a short-term renewal date of September 29, 2000. Dale had
>>failed to appear for reexamination after being notified by the FCC on
>>June 18 to retake his Amateur Radio examinations prior to July 30, and
>>his license was canceled on August 3, 1999. FCC Legal Adviser for
>>Enforcement Riley Hollingsworth said the FCC has "since reviewed and
>>accepted" Dale's detailed response and his explanation for failing to
>>appear for retesting. Hollingsworth said the FCC was reinstating Dale's
>>General license "pursuant to our agreement with you," but the FCC letter
>>did not elaborate. Hollingsworth told Dale that if there are "no valid
>>complaints about your use of Amateur Radio" over the next year, he may
>>apply for a routine license renewal at the end of his current term.
>>
>>At:
>>http://www.arrl.org/news/stories/1999/10/07/5/
>>
>>--
>>Thus, KE4TEW, a convicted felon who jammed HF frequencies for years
>>while id'ing, did not show up for a retest. Why? That's easy. He paid
>>for his license. Then Riley does what he has done with the others who
>>did not show up, he cancels the license. Good Riddance to this nuisance.
>>Then almost two months later, Riley reinstates the license, WITHOUT THE
>>ORIGINAL RETEST!!!! "Pursuant to our agreement with you" What the hell
>>does that mean?? In other words, even though we know you are not
>>qualified to be on the air, go ahead anyway???? What the hell kind of
>>enforcement is this? It's biased enforcement, Riley's trademark style.
>>So what was the agreement? Harass people on the Internet 24/7? Continue
>>to jam the Liberty Net? Is he paying Riley a monthly fee to be on
>>Amateur Radio? Riley's little slush fund. Did TEW give Riley a large
>>amount of illicit drugs? What was it that made Riley reinstate this
>>known drug dealers ticket that was fraudulent in the first place?
>>Maybe Riley does Rita on weekends?
>>
>>If you are wondering what kind of ethics violation Riley committed in
>>granting TEW's ticket back under the table contact the Inspector General
>>of the FCC as several already have. Ask Mr. Feaster to add your name to
>>the ethics probe of the KE4TEW case. Then one day you too will know how
>>to bribe an FCC official and make him make unethical decisions on your
>>behalf.
>>
>>
>> Feaster, H Walker III OIG (202) 418-0476
>>
>>or wfeaster@fcc.gov
>>

>>................
>>
>>...and the stalking continues.
>
>
> So does your stupidity.
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>

>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>

2679. Re: KE4TEW and his good friend Riley

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-15 13:45:12 UTC
From: bob <bob@bob.com>
Message-ID: <n3qtb.9398$rV.7254@bignews5.bellsouth.net>
Source record: 82255
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.swap,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Who left you usenet ruler? This is about amateur radio, dumbass. If you
do not want to read it, or cannot comprehend it, do not read it.

charlesb, Lord God and Ruler of usenet, opened up his coffin and croaked:

> "privacy.at Anonymous Remailer" <mixmaster@remailer.privacy.at> wrote in
> message news:fb0ce8d1fd0a018186c97ab18152c2af@remailer.privacy.at...
>
>>In article <bos1rq$8dv$0@pita.alt.net>
>>"Eric" <NoEmail@Anonuser.co> wrote:
>>
>>(followup corrected)
>>
>>Hey, stupid, why'd you put this newsgroup in your followup three
>>times?
>>
>
>
> If you gentlemen cannot play nice, then kindly take a hike. This is a
> newsgroup dedicated to topics related to ham radio, not a contest to see who
> can be the biggest jerk. Take your garbage elsewhere, right now.
>
> Charles Brabham, N5PVL
>
>

2680. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-15 15:18:28 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bp5g63$lvq@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 82256

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:lFhtb.1111$Rk5.778@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> "Dave Heil" wrote:
>
> > It isn't necessary to research each and every item you
> > buy, Dwight. (snip)
>
>
> Actually, I was trying to make the point that we wouldn't have to so
> diligently research products if government and business was held to a
higher
> standard when it comes to the economy. I've posted more details about that
> in other messages, so I won't repeat it again here.
>

But, you've already stated, Dwight, that people [paraphrasing] are too stupid and don't have the time to research their shopping products. So, how in the world are they going to be smart enough to choose the right people for government to "a-d-v-i-s-e" the public on what they should be shopping for? Hell, the government *and* business--the corporate world--are two of the most corrupt entities!! You apparently haven't been paying a bit of attention for the last couple of years.

You want to throw out these wild statements and then you follow up with some kind of clue that you don't have one (a clue).

Kim W5TIT

2681. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-15 15:32:48 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bp5h0v$3oo@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 82258

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:aBhtb.10095$P%1.9016908@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
>
> "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
> news:lnhtb.1087$Rk5.61@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> > You seriously need to climb off your high horse, Kim. Who in the heck
> > asked you to "help" anyone in this newsgroup? I came to this newsgroup
to
> > discuss various topics - not be lectured by you with a mandate to drop
my
> > opinions in favor of yours. So, if you're sitting around waiting for
that
> to
> > happen, you're going to be one very, very, tired old woman long before
> > there's even a glimmer of hope.
> >
>
> While I normally disagree with a great many of Kim's posts. Here she is
> fundamentally correct. Consumers do have the choice to be informed if
they
> really want to. If they don't want to go to that much work, then it is
> their own problem. Government should NOT be doing your research for you.
I
> certainly don't want MY taxes to go for the checks on goods and
information
> dissemination that you seem to think the government should do for you.
>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>

Dee, the one thing I think I can say about you--and, to tell you the truth I attribute it to the fact that you are a woman and I just plain believe that women think a lot more logically most of the time--is that whenever you and I have "disagreed" there's never been the exchange that we witness from some of (your welcome Jim) men here in this newsgroup.

You may disagree with a lot of *how* I say something, but I think you and I probably would agree on a lot more than you may realize. I am a very "tough love" kind of person. I spent too much time in my life feeling sorry for, or empathetic for, people who had no desire whatsoever to lift themselves up and change what makes them miserable--those that have the capability and ability to do so, that is.

So, that having been said--it seems very apparent to me that Dwight has some ideas for which he has no real basis in fact. (And, that's not to say that

my ideas are all based in fact--but I at least admit it). And, I can't believe that he expects people to accept--let alone agree--with him that we are too busy and stupid to do our own research to make ethical purchase decisions; yet we should warm up to the idea that government and business can be held to a high enough standard (uh, even though we are too busy and stupid to research what the standard should be) that they can "do it for us." And, that's not even bringing into the equation that I've seen Dwight rail against the "liberals" for big government principles--yet here he is espousing to a huge government *and* rolling the corporate world up into it. The "conservatives" woud have a field day for that blessing!!

I agree with you--and I'll even take it further than how you put it to include Dwight's ill-fated thoughts: if consumers in a "free" society are too stupid, too lazy, or too apathetic, or too *whatever* to take it upon themselves to be informed, then they deserve whatever they get--including a government such as what would occur if we all thought like Dwight.

By the way...you've probably been astute enough to see this. Do you notice that I've told someone they are right? I try to always remember to tell people whether I agree or disagree with something they say--but I try never to presume they are right or wrong. Whatever they think is right for them, correct? ;)

Kim W5TIT

2682. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-15 15:35:00 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <EIrtb.1410$m84.1149752@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 82257

Dee D. Flint wrote:
> "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
> news:2Rftb.1212$m84.962279@news1.news.adelphia.net...
>
>>Dee, Capitalism is the best darn economic system to ever hit the earth.
>>Period. And supply and demand is a better bet than anyone's deity being
>>the real one.
>>
>>But, our country's economy is not really what I think you think it is.
>>Unbridled capitalism tends toward major boom and bust cycles, and can
>>produce some particulary nasty characters, as the running motive behind
>>it at times alllows one small group or person to grab all the cookies so
>>to speak. Capitalism turns a basic human characteristic, greed, into a
>>pretty good thing. But all by itself, greed turns into something else
>>than what we might want.
>>
>>Our economic system has plenty of controls on it to help avoid the
>>greediest to own it all. And it works pretty darn well IMO.
>>
>
>
> No I never said we should have unbridled capitalism. I'm quite aware of the
> problems that result from that. What I am saying is that the controls must
> be minimal and well thought out. Things like the practice of a large
> company with significant reserve capital choosing to sell at a loss to drive
> their smaller competitor out of the market cannot and is not allowed
> (assuming they get caught at it of course). I agree that today's system of
> controls achieves a pretty good balance. That's why we have to be very
> careful about any changes so that we don't throw it out of whack and create
> a new problem possibly much worse than what we face today.
>
>
>
>>>And yes if you are willing to move, there are sufficient jobs for
>
> people.
>
>>>But vast numbers of people won't do that.
>>
>>Are you saying that if all the unemployed moved someplace they would
>>all get jobs? Sounds oversimplified to me.
>>
>
>

> Not quite. Some people are simply chronically unemployable. But many would
> indeed be in better shape if they were willing to bite the bullet and move.
Right, and they may be moving to a place to get that minimum wage job!

There are a lot of other things involved in the jobless situation.
During my first job, the economy tanked. I lost my job, and despite
attempts on my part, it was about a year and a half before I could get
another. Most people were up front about it:

First choice goes to married vets
Second choice goes to vets
Third choice is married.

Remember there were a fair number of vets coming home from Vietnam. As
an unmarried 19 year old, I was nowhere on their radar screen.
Unemployable. I think I probably interviewd for 30-40 jobs in a
depressed job market. I was just about to enlist when I got my current job.

> I know people who have been waiting decades in southern Ohio, and are still
> waiting, for "the steel mills to return" and refused to even think about
> going where there was work because of it. They decided to get by with
> whatever combination of odd jobs, welfare, etc they could manage to put
> together.

2683. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-15 15:35:39 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bp5h6a$6ab@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 82259

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:_witb.1167$Rk5.528@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> "Kim W5TIT" wrote:
> >
> > heh I bet Dwight couldn't handle the idea that
> > he's probably more manipulated by subliminal
> > advertising than the "average joe." :)
>
>
> Kim, you really have no idea what we were talking about, do you? Before
> you sidetracked the discussion with this type of nonsense, we were talking
> about the economy and economic-related issues and information, not general
> consumer product information. Therefore, nothing I've said about that (the
> economy) has anything whatsoever to do with "subliminal advertising" or
> anything of the sort. Do at least try to figure out the subject being
> discussed before going off on one of your silly rants.
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
>

Larry, meet Dwight. Dwight, meet Larry. Dwight, welcome to a perfect
vision of yourself...

Kim W5TIT

2684. Re: Language Rules from FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-15 15:51:31 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bp5i43$f2n@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 82260

"JJ" <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
news:fKqdnebEou1rXSiiRVn-tg@gbronline.com...
> Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>
> > Precisely. On amateur radio, one never knows when one will encounter
> > something which may make someone think twice about our hobby being
> > a wholesome and proper activity for a young person. When that happens,
> > whether or not what was said was "legal" within the letter of the law,
the
> > potential exists for the effect to bring the ARS "...one step closer to
> > extinction."
> >
> > 73 de Larry, K3LT
>
> Larry, our society has pretty much come to the point that people don't
> care what others think of them any more.
>

I think we all care, JJ, it's just that we've lost our ability to "tolerate"
because it's become a very jealous world.

>
> Foul, vulgar language is used
> so much now that it is spoken in homes as if it were accepted language
> and the kids pick up on it. I have heard five year olds use words that I
> would never dared to speak in front of an adult when I was a youngster.
> I have had my mouth washed out with soap (by a teacher at school no
> less, would like to see one try that now), for saying much less.
>
> I grew up in a farming community and when around the men, sure a few
> cuss words would fly occasionally, especially when the wrench slipped
> and a busted knuckle was the result, or over at the local shop where the
> farmers gathered as their trucks and tractors were being serviced, a
> hell or damn was pretty common, but never in a public place where women
> and children were around.
>

JJ, leaving the children aside because I agree with you on that one...but,
let me assure that in the dairy land where I grew up--we women on the farms
were quite capable of being just as foul-mouthed as any man. Nope, we
didn't do it in front of the men--Heaven forbid they realize we weren't the
demure, dainty pieces they thought we were, but we did it.

And, in my opinion, words don't hurt anyone. It's actions that hurt. I
don't care to hear a little kid running around cursing; I don't even care to

hear it from a man or me. But I also believe that it is our *concept* of it being so terrible that makes it so. I really mean that. It is the expression being felt or communicated through a word that is the "bad" thing. If I say, "I HATE YOU" in the same tone of voice as "I LOVE YOU" you are going to perceive that you are getting a double message there: you are going to at least wonder if there is some negative emotion being expressed as I am saying "I LOVE YOU." George Carlin's skit on words had precisely that lesson in it. It isn't the word--it's the emotion behind it.

> There was respect for others then. It isn't
> uncommon for me to step into an elevator with my wife and hear others
> using very vulgar language with no regards to who is listening and may
> be offended by such language. The sad part is, they think it is just
> accepted that everyone has lowered themselves to such a common level.
>

I agree. But, I hope you'll understand that there's a fine line between having respect for others, and others then being able to "dictate" how I should behave. For instance, I totally respect anyone's opinion that cursing in public is offensive to them. So, I generally don't curse in public. Out loud anyway :o But, when I am in my house, or in my "corner of the world with friends of like mind," then I'm going to curse away if I'm so inclined. Would you dictate that I am rolled up into your opinion with the others you mention above--or am I being disrespectful to you for cursing at any time?

> Ever set at the mall and just watch the people pass by? Look at the
> sloppy dress, some look like they stepped out of a cartoon. Few have
> pride in themselves anymore. And if you really want to see some
> sloppyness, go to a ham fest. It is a sad commentary on our society today.
>

Oh, now see. There's where you and I would definitely disagree. I really don't care how someone is dressed--although I've found myself at times having to get over an initial reaction, if you know what I mean. If I walk into a business office and see someone with a t-shirt and jeans on--I am initially taken off guard. But, I quickly get *myself* over that and continue with whatever I walked in for. I hate, absolutely hate that I work in a corporate environment with dark suits around me all day...gosh I hate that. In other words, I've seen people in very sloppy dress with wonderful mannerisms and respect for others...and I've seen some people in very fancy and "respectful" garb that are completely without feelings for anything or anyone around them.

By the way...you wouldn't be describing mostly youth, above, would you?

Kim W5TIT

2685. Re: Language Rules from FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-15 16:08:28 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bp5j3r$mln@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 82261

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:%Iktb.1328$Rk5.1198@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> "JJ" wrote:
> >
> > (snip) I have heard five year olds use words that
> > I would never dared to speak in front of an adult
> > when I was a youngster. (snip)
>
> I've heard five year olds use words that I, as an adult, would not say
in
> front of other adults today. I'm certainly not a prude, but I just don't
see
> how vulgar language improves communications or one's impression of
another.
>
> > I have had my mouth washed out with soap (by
> > a teacher at school no less, would like to see
> > one try that now), for saying much less.
>
> My mother preferred dishwashing liquid (claimed it was safer than some
> hand or body soaps). Once was enough for me, but my brother went on a foul
> language spree one summer and "got the treatment" probably five or six
> times. My sister got it when she was about sixteen or seventeen.
>
> > (snip) It isn't uncommon for me to step into an
> > elevator with my wife and hear others using very
> > vulgar language with no regards to who is
> > listening and may be offended by such language.
> > (snip)
>
> There was a guy and his wife (girlfriend or whatever) in line behind us
at
> Office Max the other day. I've never heard so much foul language in such a
> short amount of time (seemed like every second or third word out of his
> mouth). And I'm talking nasty stuff - women's body parts, his wife's body
> parts, body parts in general, negative words for men and women, and so on.
I
> finally asked him to keep his voice down. When that didn't work, I asked
him
> not to use such language. When I finally got the register, he started it
> again. In anger (and since there was nobody else in line), I had the
casher
> go with me to search for printer ink behind another counter and made sure
we

> had a nice little conversation. We even talked about his language. When he
> finally went to another line, we returned to the register to complete my
> purchase. Less than ten seconds later, the guy rushed towards the register
> to get behind us again. However, the casher saw him coming and put the
> register closed sign up before he got there. As he walked away, and I was
> picking up my bag to leave, she smiled real big and told us to have a nice
> day. This was one of the few times I truly believed a casher meant those
> words when said.
>
>
> > And if you really want to see some sloppyness,
> > go to a ham fest. (snip)
>
>
> I can accept a certain level of sloppyness at a ham fest or other casual
> event (as opposed to the mall, restaurant, work, or other such places). Or
> perhaps I should say that I dress more sloppily at a ham fest than I would
> at work or so forth. I just don't really see an overwhelming reason to
dress
> up for a ham fest.
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
>

I would have asked to visit with the Shift Manager and would have explained the situation to him/her and asked what the store intended to do about it. *If* the conversation had been loud enough for the clerk to make a decision on your complaint, then it was loud enough for her to witness to the Shift Manager. What would I expect as a consumer? I would expect the store to ask the people to leave if they persist in offensive behavior in public. There are laws against it. We probably have to take some form of personal responsibility--and we may be too stupid or lazy to do so, I don't know--for those laws to work but, failing that, my action would have been to place my products down on the counter and walk out of the store.

That is what Jim means by shopping with our wallets. On a small, teeny, tiny scale, I just had a meeting with that company's BoD. And, more people need to start having that meeting with the BoD. You call it "local" or whatever. But that BoD makes investment decisions for its shareholders. And, whether I am a shareholder or not, if me, and you, and him, and her, and them, and those people over there, and all of us combined start affecting the bottom dollar of a company's stock price--then we've also have a very effective meeting with the BoD.

And, the greatest thing is, you could choose to leave without ever saying a word to anyone--either way you choose to act; *as long as you leave without purchase* has the same affect.

Kim W5TIT

2686. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-15 16:09:19 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bp5j5e$l5r@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 82262

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:JXotb.10157$P%1.9074155@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
>
> "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
> news:G5jtb.1233$Rk5.165@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> >As consumers, as Americans, we have to demand government manage
> > the economy better (as I've previously outlined).
>
> This would be the ruination of the economy. The government is not, never
> has been, and never will be competent to manage the economy.
>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>

HERE HERE

Kim W5TIT

2687. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-15 16:10:42 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bp5j80$1e8@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 82263

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:e4ptb.10158$P%1.9075666@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
>
> "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
> news:vHjtb.1294$Rk5.701@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> > "Dee D. Flint" wrote:
> > >
> > > (snip) He seems to be advocating that the
> > > government "fix" consumer's purchasing habits
> > > so that the local stores stay in business.
> > >
> >
> > First, please don't assume what anyone's position is, Dee. Jim made a
> > specific comment and I was responding to that specific comment alone,
not
> > the topic as a whole. My response was an explanation of the process at
> play
> > as I see it, not a "fix" of any kind. Second, I'm not really
"advocating"
> > anything at all. There isn't enough of us here in this newsgroup to even
> do
> > so. If I wanted to advocate something, I would do so in a much more
> > "audience rich" environment. Instead, we're simply discussing another
one
> of
> > the many topics we routinely discuss in this newsgroup.
>
> Please note I did NOT assume anything. I did not state that you ARE
> advocating that but that it SEEMS that you are. There is a difference.
> I.e. the statements in your posts can lead the reader to that conclusion
> although the position is not definitively stated.
>
> Why bother to enter the discussion if you are not advocating your position
> (or conversely playing "devil's advocate")? The size of the audience
should
> not matter. You never know in what venue you may find a person or group
of
> persons who have the ability to initiate and/or implement change.
>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>

I agree wholeheartedly... and I think I've stated so. You, Dee, seem to be
as disconcerted by Dwight's contribution to this topic as I have been.

Kim W5TIT

2688. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-15 16:13:54 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <6hstb.2072$Wy4.513@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 82264

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote

>
> First choice goes to married vets
> Second choice goes to vets
> Third choice is married.
>

I think you were guaranteed any job you wanted if you were a black female
disabled Vietnam vet with a Spanish surname. <grin>

73, Hans, K0HB

2689. Re: Language Rules from FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-15 17:56:06 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <Pc6dndwyxbvj9yuiRVn-sw@gbronline.com>
Source record: 82265

Dwight Stewart wrote:

>
>>And if you really want to see some sloppyness,
>>go to a ham fest. (snip)
>
>
>
> I can accept a certain level of sloppyness at a ham fest or other casual
> event (as opposed to the mall, restaurant, work, or other such places). Or
> perhaps I should say that I dress more sloppily at a ham fest than I would
> at work or so forth. I just don't really see an overwhelming reason to dress
> up for a ham fest.
>

Casual is OK, but there is a differenc between casual and sloppy.
Clothes that have obviously been worn for several days and smelly are
sloppy. I have seen a lot of that at ham fest. Seems that to some hams,
the acquiring of a license means they now only have to take a bath once
a month or less.

2690. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-15 17:57:21 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <Pc6dnd8yxbtS9yuiRVn-sw@gbronline.com>
Source record: 82266

Dee D. Flint wrote:

>
>
> This would be the ruination of the economy. The government is not, never
> has been, and never will be competent to manage the economy.
>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>

But that never stops them from trying.

2691. Re: Language Rules from FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-15 19:07:05 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bp5tin$f4a@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 82267

"JJ" <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
news:Pc6dndwyxbvj9yuiRVn-sw@gbronline.com...
> Dwight Stewart wrote:
>
> >
> >>And if you really want to see some sloppyness,
> >>go to a ham fest. (snip)
> >
> >
> >
> > I can accept a certain level of sloppyness at a ham fest or other
casual
> > event (as opposed to the mall, restaurant, work, or other such places).
Or
> > perhaps I should say that I dress more sloppily at a ham fest than I
would
> > at work or so forth. I just don't really see an overwhelming reason to
dress
> > up for a ham fest.
> >
>
> Casual is OK, but there is a differenc between casual and sloppy.
> Clothes that have obviously been worn for several days and smelly are
> sloppy. I have seen a lot of that at ham fest. Seems that to some hams,
> the acquiring of a license means they now only have to take a bath once
> a month or less.
>

<snicker> I don't think "hams" have cornered the market on stinking...

Kim W5TIT

2692. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-15 19:14:04 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bp5tvr$l0t@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 82268

"Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:bp5h0v$3oo@library1.airnews.net...
> "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
> news:aBhtb.10095$P%1.9016908@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
> >
> > "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
> > news:lnhtb.1087$Rk5.61@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> > > You seriously need to climb off your high horse, Kim. Who in the
heck
> > > asked you to "help" anyone in this newsgroup? I came to this newsgroup
> to
> > > discuss various topics - not be lectured by you with a mandate to drop
> my
> > > opinions in favor of yours. So, if you're sitting around waiting for
> that
> > to
> > > happen, you're going to be one very, very, tired old woman long before
> > > there's even a glimmer of hope.
> > >
> >
> > While I normally disagree with a great many of Kim's posts. Here she is
> > fundamentally correct. Consumers do have the choice to be informed if
> they
> > really want to. If they don't want to go to that much work, then it is
> > their own problem. Government should NOT be doing your research for
you.
> I
> > certainly don't want MY taxes to go for the checks on goods and
> information
> > dissemination that you seem to think the government should do for you.
> >
> > Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
> >
>
> Dee, the one thing I think I can say about you--and, to tell you the truth
I
> attribute it to the fact that you are a woman and I just plain believe
that
> women think a lot more logically most of the time--is that whenever you
and
> I have "disagreed" there's never been the exchange that we witness from
some
> of (your welcome Jim) men here in this newsgroup.
>

> You may disagree with a lot of *how* I say something, but I think you and
I
> probably would agree on a lot more than you may realize. I am a very
"tough
> love" kind of person. I spent too much time in my life feeling sorry for,
> or empathetic for, people who had no desire whatsoever to lift themselves
up
> and change what makes them miserable--those that have the capability and
> ability to do so, that is.
>
> So, that having been said--it seems very apparent to me that Dwight has
some
> ideas for which he has no real basis in fact. (And, that's not to say
that
> my ideas are all based in fact--but I at least admit it). And, I can't
> believe that he expects people to accept--let alone agree--with him that
we
> are too busy and stupid to do our own research to make ethical purchase
> decisions; yet we should warm up to the idea that government and business
> can be held to a high enough standard (uh, even though we are too busy and
> stupid to research what the standard should be) that they can "do it for
> us." And, that's not even bringing into the equation that I've seen
Dwight
> rail against the "liberals" for big government principles--yet here he is
> espousing to a huge government *and* rolling the corporate world up into
it.
> The "conservatives" woud have a field day for that blessing!!
>
> I agree with you--and I'll even take it further than how you put it to
> include Dwight's ill-fated thoughts: if consumers in a "free" society are
> too stupid, too lazy, or too apathetic, or too *whatever* to take it upon
> themselves to be informed, then they deserve whatever they get--including
a
> government such as what would occur if we all thought like Dwight.
>
> By the way...you've probably been astute enough to see this. Do you
notice
> that I've told someone they are right? I try to always remember to tell
> people whether I agree or disagree with something they say--but I try
never
> to presume they are right or wrong. Whatever they think is right for
them,
> correct? ;)
>
> Kim W5TIT
>
>

The above should read: "Do you notice that I've rarely if ever told someone
they are right?"

Kim W5TIT

2693. Ma's Diner (was Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-15 19:55:52 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031115145552.12631.00002855@mb-m28.aol.com>
Source record: 82269

In article <bp5j5e$l5r@library1.airnews.net>, "Kim " <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
writes:

>> "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
>> news:G5jtb.1233$Rk5.165@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
>> >As consumers, as Americans, we have to demand government manage
>> > the economy better (as I've previously outlined).
>>
>> This would be the ruination of the economy. The government is not, never
>> has been, and never will be competent to manage the economy.
>>
>> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>>
>
>HERE HERE
>
That's all well and good, but you're missing a plain, simple fact: You haven't
defined what "manage the economy" means.

If you define it as Soviet-style central economic planning, then almost anyone
with any sense will agree that it's a recipe for economic disaster, as
demonstrated by what happened in the USSR. (Largest country in the world, huge
amounts of some of the best if not THE best farmland on earth, and after 70+
years of total control they can't even feed themselves?)

But if you define it as "help things go well", it gets a lot murkier. For
example, in the days following 9-11, the Feds helped out the airline industry
in a big way with low interest loans. They were concerned that the loss of
business in the wake of the events of that terrible day would have caused the
collapse of several major airlines. Was that good management of the economy or
not?

Or look at your federal income taxes. Those of us who are home owners and who
meet certain criteria can deduct home mortgage interest and real estate taxes
on up to 2 residences. This effectively reduces the cost of buying/owning a
home. Would you take that deduction away? Doing so would almost certainly slow
down home sales and construction, and reduce property values all over the
country.

I'm old enough to remember when *all* consumer interest and sales taxes were
deductible on your income taxes if certain criteria were met. That deduction
pushed consumer spending because it reduced the effective cost of buying on
time. It encouraged people to go into debt, particularly in inflationary times,
because they could pay for today's fun with tomorrow's less-valuable dollars,
and deduct the interest and tax costs. But those deductions were removed in
order to "get the government off your back" (and pump more money into the

coffers without 'raising' taxes).

Or look where your taxes are spent. NASA's launch facilities for manned space flights are in Florida - because the orbital mechanics and safety considerations make Florida about the optimum place for a launch facility located in CONUS. But the manned flight center is in Houston Texas - because that's were LBJ was from. How many extra billions of dollars that contributed nothing to the space flight efforts have been spent over the decades because the two facilities are so far apart?

No matter what the government does about the economy, the effects are widespread and have the effect, wanted or not, of "managing" the economy in some way or another.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2694. Re: Language Rules from FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-15 20:16:48 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031115151648.12300.00001625@mb-m20.aol.com>
Source record: 82270

In article <bp2o3q$1ki73m$3@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>, "Ryan, KC8PMX"
<REMOVETHISkc8pmx@diamondcs.net> writes:

>Geee..... didn't Carlin cover this??? (i.e. George Carlin?)

His "seven words" bit is where the list originated. No such list existed in the
FCC rules.

>> > Anyone know of this...my thoughts are on what will happen in amateur
>> > radio now.
>>
>> Nothing, I hope.
>>
>> > The broadcast arena has always been the barometer of what people are
>> > allowed to say on the air, hasn't it?
>>
>> Nope. FCC has completely different rules for different services. The
>> fact that somebody gets away with something in the broadcast services
>> doesn't mean it's OK in the ARS.
>
>Generally the terminology states soemething to the effect of "good amateur
>practice." My ONLY PROBLEM with that is WHO gets to decide what the
>benchmark is for good amateur practice..... If the FCC, who issues our
>licenses are not going to do it, then who?

Here's one guide:

http://members.aol.com/berrymanp/alyrics/fword.html

>As for specific words??? Dunno, is there a list?? :) Who makes the list
>then? Are other things other than the known "7 dirty words" included? If
>someone is of say, for instance a different faith than you, do you get to
>determine anything they say religiously is offensive and should be banned
>speech? I am sure there are other examples one could come up with.....

Common sense and good taste used to be the guide. But I guess such concepts are
old-fashioned nowadays, from what some folks tell me when I oppose the use of
such language on the air and in newsgropups.....

73 de Jim, N2EY

2695. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-15 20:56:05 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <Fpwtb.2386$Wy4.2143@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 82271

```
"Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:bp5h6a$6ab@library1.airnews.net...
> "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
> news:_witb.1167$Rk5.528@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> > "Kim W5TIT" wrote:
> > >
> > > heh I bet Dwight couldn't handle the idea that
> > > he's probably more manipulated by subliminal
> > > advertising than the "average joe." :)
> >
> >
> > Kim, you really have no idea what we were talking about, do you?
Before
> > you sidetracked the discussion with this type of nonsense, we were
talking
> > about the economy and economic-related issues and information, not
general
> > consumer product information. Therefore, nothing I've said about that
(the
> > economy) has anything whatsoever to do with "subliminal advertising" or
> > anything of the sort. Do at least try to figure out the subject being
> > discussed before going off on one of your silly rants.
> >
> >
> > Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
> >
> > http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
> >
>
> Larry, meet Dwight. Dwight, meet Larry. Dwight, welcome to a perfect
> vision of yourself...
>
> Kim W5TIT
>
>

And everyone else meet W5TWIT, otherwise known as 'hug and chalk'.

Dan/W4NTI
```

2696. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-15 21:28:59 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031115162859.02537.00001594@mb-m23.aol.com>
Source record: 82272

In article <uDZrb.9055$P%1.8120974@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> writes:

>Looking at repay periods or relative costs isn't really the way to go
>either.

I think it is - IF you allow for other factors as mentioned below.

>You have to include a comparison of the features that you get for
>that cost. People simply want more on their "starter" houses and cars.

Some people...

>Today's starter house has relatively more features than those of the past.
>For example, the typical tract house had no cabinets of any type in the
>bathroom at that time. The homeowner added them later as time and money
>permitted. They did not have air conditioning. Now you just about can't
>sell any new home, even low end starter one, unless it has A/C and so on.

If you're talking about new homes, I agree in general, because the developers/builders have a pretty set idea of "what people want" and that's what they build. Of course if you have a new house built to your specification, you can get almost anything that meets code.

>Comparing the past to the present is very difficult. Too much has changed
>and it's like comparing apples to oranges.

Sometimes. But you can make comparisons based on intelligent adjustments.

For example, the house I'm in now was built in 1950 or 1951 and I moved here in 1999. At that time it still had the original gravity heater and no AC. Also no dishwasher. In fact, it was not substantially different from when it was built - just well-maintained. To me it's a "new" house because it was built after WW2 and uses essentially the same techniques as new houses today, vs. the older techniques of houses I've owned previously (built in 1923 and 1900).

In 2000 I had a good HVAC contractor install a new heating/AC system. Cost me just under $7000 and worth every penny. The cost of the new system was figured (mentally) into the price of the house when I bought it.

In 2001 I put in a dishwasher (DIY) and again that cost was figured (mentally) into the price of the house when I bought it.

Same type of thing can be applied to almost any house.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2697. Re: EMERGENCY! CD-ROM Document Library Released

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-15 21:32:50 UTC
From: davidvine1999@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <23e96779.0311151332.4f214f0a@posting.google.com>
Source record: 82273
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.radio.scanner,misc.survivalism

Please be advised that you have made a serious misstatement bordering on slander in your Newsgroup post regarding our CD-ROM product. Most of the material is in the public domain and has been carefully and thoughtfully selected, edited and indexed. The remainder (a small amount of copyrighted material) is used with permission.

2698. Re: Ma's Diner (was Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-15 23:42:33 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0311151542.3d4f4e0c@posting.google.com>
Source record: 82274

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20031115145552.12631.00002855@mb-m28.aol.com>...
> In article <bp5j5e$l5r@library1.airnews.net>, "Kim " <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
> writes:
>
> >> "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
> >> news:G5jtb.1233$Rk5.165@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> >> >As consumers, as Americans, we have to demand government manage
> >> > the economy better (as I've previously outlined).
> >>
> >> This would be the ruination of the economy. The government is not, never
> >> has been, and never will be competent to manage the economy.
> >>
> >> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
> >>
> >
> >HERE HERE
> >
> That's all well and good, but you're missing a plain, simple fact: You haven't
> defined what "manage the economy" means.

I recall not so long ago the Al Greenspan "had" to put the brakes on
the USA economy. Pffft.

> If you define it as Soviet-style central economic planning, then almost anyone
> with any sense will agree that it's a recipe for economic disaster, as
> demonstrated by what happened in the USSR.

Economic disaster can also occur in an unregulated economy, re: 1929.

(Largest country in the world, huge
> amounts of some of the best if not THE best farmland on earth, and after 70+
> years of total control they can't even feed themselves?)
>
> But if you define it as "help things go well", it gets a lot murkier. For
> example, in the days following 9-11, the Feds helped out the airline industry
> in a big way with low interest loans. They were concerned that the loss of
> business in the wake of the events of that terrible day would have caused the
> collapse of several major airlines. Was that good management of the economy or
> not?

Like Governors giving Tax Exemptions to large corporations that locate
in their state. After 10 years, when the tax exemptions go away, the
large corporation outsources their work to China/India.

> Or look at your federal income taxes. Those of us who are home owners and who
> meet certain criteria can deduct home mortgage interest and real estate taxes
> on up to 2 residences. This effectively reduces the cost of buying/owning a
> home. Would you take that deduction away? Doing so would almost certainly slow
> down home sales and construction, and reduce property values all over the
> country.

So is home ownership more or less "affordable" than ever?

> I'm old enough to remember when *all* consumer interest and sales taxes were
> deductible on your income taxes if certain criteria were met. That deduction
> pushed consumer spending because it reduced the effective cost of buying on
> time. It encouraged people to go into debt, particularly in inflationary times,
> because they could pay for today's fun with tomorrow's less-valuable dollars,
> *and* deduct the interest and tax costs. But those deductions were removed in
> order to "get the government off your back" (and pump more money into the
> coffers without 'raising' taxes).

But the government inflates. Why shouldn't citizens try to beat the
gov't at their own money game?

> Or look where your taxes are spent. NASA's launch facilities for manned space
> flights are in Florida - because the orbital mechanics and safety
> considerations make Florida about the optimum place for a launch facility
> located in CONUS. But the manned flight center is in Houston Texas - because
> that's were LBJ was from. How many extra billions of dollars that contributed
> nothing to the space flight efforts have been spent over the decades because
> the two facilities are so far apart?

We could outsourse to China and save even more billions, right?

> No matter what the government does about the economy, the effects are
> widespread and have the effect, wanted or not, of "managing" the economy in
> some way or another.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

True.

2699. Re: Happy Veterans Day

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-15 23:50:19 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0311151550.18aa6c8c@posting.google.com>
Source record: 82275

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0311150307.203b74d1@posting.google.com>...
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3FB5B3C8.70728E0E@earthlink.net>...
> > Brian wrote:
> > >
>
> > > Now go follow the link in the "Armistice Day" thread and quit bugging
> > > me with your self-imposed stupidity.
> >
> > I'm not the individual who bungled copying material from a web page.
>
> Whew!...I thouhgt I was the only one who appreciated Brain's
> unique posting habits ! ! ! !
>
> 73
>
> Steve, K4YZ

I hope you aren't stalking me.

2700. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-16 01:28:42 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031115202842.11022.00002079@mb-m14.aol.com>
Source record: 82276

In article <EJvsb.9152$hn3.3187776@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>, "Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> writes:

>"Rupert" <big@bird.sesame.street> wrote in message
>news:Govsb.10542$6c3.633@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net...
>> Len Over 21 wrote:
>>
>> > As of 6 PM EST on 11 November 2003, the number of ECFS
>> > documents on public view are:
>>
>> What would be interesting is to find out how many are for the change,
>> and how many want to keep the code.
>
>Me too. All this roundabout bravo sierra could be bypassed if there was a
>ballot sent to all approx. 700,000 U.S. licensed hams. As long as quorum is
>met, it's on! This concept (Democracy) frightens the bejesus out of many
>folks who claim to speak for those not yet licensed.
>
>But that's an empty argument. Get licensed and vote, tah dah! The big bad
>"barrier" does not preclude anyone from getting their no-code Tech ticket
>and executing a vote.
>
>Simply announce a "record date" by which one must be licensed (To give those
>"yet to be licensed a fair shot at a voice in the process.) and send a
>ballot out to all those licensed "of record." Makes too much sense and
>requires some effort. IOW, against the contemporary trend.
>
Perhaps, but you might find that it's more complex than it appears at first.

Suppose someone did, indeed, poll everyone with a US ham license.

First off, there'd be a considerable number of ballots returned because the license holder was either dead, dropped out, or didn't have a current address in the database. Note that the last in that list is a rules violation.....

Second, the survey would have to be carefully constructed to get accurate results. And you'd probably find that there's a wider diversity of opinion than just "keep the code test/dump the code test". Yet at the same time you'd want the survey to be simple.

Perhaps something like this:

"What is your opinion of code testing for an amateur license?"

1) It should be totally abolished
2) It should be required only for Extra

3) It should be required only for Extra and General
4) It should be required for any license with HF privileges
5) It should be required for any amateur license
6) No opinion/don't care

Yet this question doesn't address code speed or medical waivers, or other possibilities like "choose the code test or a special written test".

The more choices given, the greater the possibility that none of them would be a majority answer, or even a clear plurality. Then you'd be right back where you were before.

Or you might find that the majority opinion was 6). What happens in that case?

73 de Jim, N2EY

2701. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-16 02:09:31 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031115210931.23171.00002114@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 82277

In article <nwhtb.10069$P%1.9015523@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> writes:

>If "Ma's Diner" isn't selling what I want then I'm
>not going to buy regardless of small store, large chain or whatever.

Works for me!

>I
>thought however the original post was Dwight's not yours. He seems to be
>advocating that the government "fix" consumer's purchasing habits so that
>the local stores stay in business.

I don't read it that way at all, but I could be mistaken. I think Dwight's simply calling attention to the fact that there are some economic trends going on that don't bode well for the economic future of our country - long term or short term.

While I think government has a role to play in changing those trends, I don't think the whole thing can be left up to them to "fix".

73 de Jim, N2EY

2702. Re: Do Hams get 11 Meters Back

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-16 03:35:52 UTC
From: OOTMAN <ootman@usaor.net>
Message-ID: <vrds2mkuem63bc@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 82278
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.cb

W hy in hell would they want it back??????????

2703. Re: Happy Veterans Day

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-16 05:43:14 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0311152143.74447b81@posting.google.com>
Source record: 82279

brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0311151550.18aa6c8c@posting.google.com>...
> k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0311150307.203b74d1@posting.google.com>...
> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3FB5B3C8.70728E0E@earthlink.net>...
> > > Brian wrote:
> > > >
>
> > > > Now go follow the link in the "Armistice Day" thread and quit bugging
> > > > me with your self-imposed stupidity.
> > >
> > > I'm not the individual who bungled copying material from a web page.
> >
> > Whew!...I thouhgt I was the only one who appreciated Brain's
> > unique posting habits ! ! ! !
> >
> > 73
> >
> > Steve, K4YZ
>
> I hope you aren't stalking me.

If I do, I'll just need to follow the little slime trail in the
sand, Brain...No problem...

Steve, K4YZ

2704. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-16 07:47:02 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <WXFtb.2770$Rk5.1497@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 82280

"Dee D. Flint" wrote:
>
> This would be the ruination of the economy. The
> government is not, never has been, and never will
> be competent to manage the economy.

The government has managed the economy in some form or another since the very beginning. And, in spite of what you say, this country with that government has done pretty darn well over those many years.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

2705. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-16 09:06:34 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <u6Htb.2890$Rk5.579@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 82281

"Kim W5TIT" wrote:
>
> (snip) So, that having been said--it seems very
> apparent to me that Dwight has some ideas for
> which he has no real basis in fact. (And, that's
> not to say that my ideas are all based in fact-
> -but I at least admit it). And, I can't believe that
> he expects people to accept--let alone agree--
> with him that we are too busy and stupid to do
> our own research to make ethical purchase
> decisions; yet we should warm up to the idea
> that government and business can be held to a
> high enough standard (uh, even though we are
> too busy and stupid to research what the
> standard should be) that they can "do it for
> us." And, that's not even bringing into the
> equation that I've seen Dwight rail against the
> "liberals" for big government principles--yet here
> he is espousing to a huge government *and* rolling
> the corporate world up into it. The "conservatives"
> woud have a field day for that blessing!! (snip)

Kim, I've repeatedly said I don't have all the answers, am offering my opinions only, that I don't "expect" anything from anybody, and that this is a simple discussion (not a proclamation or mandate for all to agree). Now, either you haven't read that (which means you have no idea what I've said), can't understand it (too stupid), or are so determined to argue you don't really care what I've actually said.

I've also repeatedly told you that my comments were limited solely to the economy, not "ethical purchase decisions," the environment (Exxon), or whatever other issues you want to throw in. In spite of that, you still try to twist my words to apply to other things. I've also never said consumers are "too busy and stupid" to do research. What I've actually said is that information is not that easily available for consumers to do that research (economic research, not anything else) and that such research is simply too massive to truly expect consumers to do. You've offered nothing substantial to challenge that assesment.

I'm also not "espousing to a huge government." What I've said is that government should pass regulations to insure consumers have better access to the information they need to make wise economic purchasing decisions, that government better monitor business to insure that information is correct, that government offer the information they collected to consumers in condensed form, that immigration be better managed, that curbs should be put

on credit, that corporate profits be capped, rules changed to prevent factories and industry moving overseas, and so on. Even if you don't agree, none of these are exactly radical new ideas - all have been widely discussed for many years.

This is the last time I will say all of this. If you continue to misrepresent my position after this, then I'll assume you're doing so simply to be dishonest and will respond accordingly.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

2706. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-16 09:16:03 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <nfHtb.2899$Rk5.1585@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 82282

"Kim W5TIT" wrote:
>
> But, you've already stated, Dwight, that people
> [paraphrasing] are too stupid and don't have the
> time to research their shopping products. (snip)

No, Kim, you're not paraphrasing - you're flat out lying.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

2707. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-16 09:19:13 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <liHtb.2913$Rk5.2082@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 82283

"Kim W5TIT" wrote:
>
> Larry, meet Dwight. Dwight, meet Larry.
> Dwight, welcome to a perfect vision of
> yourself...

Kim, I would introduce you to someone like yourself, but I simply haven't met anyone that stupid and dishonest yet.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

2708. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-16 10:14:07 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <P5ltb.3103$Rk5.2010@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 82284

"Dee D. Flint" wrote:
>
> Please note I did NOT assume anything. I did
> not state that you ARE advocating that but that
> it SEEMS that you are. There is a difference.
> I.e. the statements in your posts can lead the
> reader to that conclusion although the position is
> not definitively stated.
>
> Why bother to enter the discussion if you are not
> advocating your position (or conversely playing
> "devil's advocate")? (snip)

It shouldn't be that difficult to figure out, Dee. People do it all the time - talk to friends or sposes about events half way around the world that has no direct bearing on any of them, talk about criminal trials when they have influence whatsoever on that trial, talk about what they might do if they had a million dollars, talk about the economy when they have no real intent at the moment to do anything about it, and so on. It's simply conversation. Few are ever 100 percent right or wrong in these discussions. Instead, they hear different perspectives, re-enforce some views, change other views, and hopefully walk away slightly entertained by the experience.

> (snip) The size of the audience should not matter.
> You never know in what venue you may find a
> person or group of persons who have the ability to
> initiate and/or implement change.

I wish there was someone like that in this newsroup. I'm sure we could all give him or her an earful. However, after six or seven years in this newsgroup, I haven't seen even a hint of such a person. As for the regular newsgroup participants (including the guesstimated lurkers), we're not really large enough in numbers to impact even a small town's elections (much less impact national issues).

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

2709. Re: Language Rules from FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-16 10:26:39 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <zhltb.3150$Rk5.3112@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 82285

"Kim W5TIT" wrote:
>
> (snip) I would have asked to visit with the Shift
> Manager and would have explained the situation
> to him/her and asked what the store intended to
> do about it. *If* the conversation had been loud
> enough for the clerk to make a decision on your
> complaint, then it was loud enough for her to
> witness to the Shift Manager. What would I
> expect as a consumer? I would expect the store
> to ask the people to leave if they persist in
> offensive behavior in public. (snip)

With the possibility of lawsuits, I doubt many stores would be that overt today. Many of the offensive language laws of the past have been struck down as unconstitutional (enough that few stores would want to take much of a chance pushing the issue)

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

2710. Re: Do Hams get 11 Meters Back

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-16 10:56:52 UTC
From: charlesb <n5pvl@sbcglobal.net>
Message-ID: <UJItb.1188$5X1.413@newssvr13.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 82286
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.cb

"OOTMAN" <ootman@usaor.net> wrote in message
news:vrds2mkuem63bc@corp.supernews.com...
> W hy in hell would they want it back??????????
>

Better utilization of HF spectrum, and more spectrum for hams. All the
non-ham stuff should be VHF or UHF, for the obvious reason.

Charles Brabham, N5PVL

2711. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-16 11:01:31 UTC
From: charlesb <n5pvl@sbcglobal.net>
Message-ID: <fOItb.1189$IY1.349@newssvr13.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 82287

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:P5Itb.3103$Rk5.2010@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> "Dee D. Flint" wrote:
> > (snip) The size of the audience should not matter.
> > You never know in what venue you may find a
> > person or group of persons who have the ability to
> > initiate and/or implement change.
>
>
> I wish there was someone like that in this newsroup.

I can initiate change, but don't expect me to put my money into your project. Pony up, and I'll see what I can do.

Like the ARRL, I work on a sliding scale: The more money you send, the better results you can expect.

Charles Brabham, N5PVL

2712. Re: Language Rules from FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-16 11:53:35 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <3zJtb.3378$Rk5.1592@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 82288

"JJ" wrote:
>
> Casual is OK, but there is a differenc between
> casual and sloppy. Clothes that have obviously
> been worn for several days and smelly are
> sloppy. I have seen a lot of that at ham fest.
> Seems that to some hams, the acquiring of a
> license means they now only have to take a
> bath once a month or less.

I've seen it too, JJ. But, since it's pretty much a personal choice, there isn't much that can be done except to set a higher standard for ourselves. In our case (my wife and I), that's easy. We lived in Europe for ten years, in a country where people tend to dress relatively well in public and keep their homes and neighborhoods clean. We picked up that habit and now find it uncomfortable to do anything less. When we first returned, my relatives constantly complained we were overdressed. That surprised us since we were wearing the cloths we wore daily in Germany (our nice cloths were still packed). Many of our friends and family still think we're a little eccentric (the actual word two of them used) for keeping our home so clean. We've since started wearing more casual cloths, and are not so rigid on the house cleaning, but not anywhere near what I see around us. My wife's brother visited last summer and commented that our house looked like a museum. While the house was cleaned for the visit, I certainly wouldn't go that far when describing it.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

2713. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-16 11:59:10 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <iEJtb.3380$Rk5.3135@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 82289

"charlesb" wrote:
>
> I can initiate change, but don't expect me to put
> my money into your project. Pony up, and I'll see
> what I can do.
>
> Like the ARRL, I work on a sliding scale: The more
> money you send, the better results you can expect.

LOL. I just made the car payment. How much change can I get for the twenty bucks remaining? Twenty-five cents in change?

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

2714. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-16 12:24:21 UTC
From: charlesb <n5pvl@sbcglobal.net>
Message-ID: <V%Jtb.23809$C47.14860@newssvr25.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 82290

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:iEJtb.3380$Rk5.3135@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> "charlesb" wrote:
> >
> > I can initiate change, but don't expect me to put
> > my money into your project. Pony up, and I'll see
> > what I can do.
> >
> > Like the ARRL, I work on a sliding scale: The more
> > money you send, the better results you can expect.
>
>
> LOL. I just made the car payment. How much change can I get for the
twenty
> bucks remaining? Twenty-five cents in change?

I may initiate change, but seldom do I ever return any! ;-D

Charles Brabham, N5PVL

2715. Re: Important Research at TAPR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-16 12:49:14 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.58.0311161245580.8194@kd6lvw.ampr.org>
Source record: 82291

On Fri, 14 Nov 2003, charlesb wrote:
> "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> wrote in message
> news:Pine.LNX.4.58.0311140608180.7834@kd6lvw.ampr.org...
> > On Thu, 13 Nov 2003, charlesb wrote:
> > > - So why do some people think of TAPR as a packet radio organization?
> > >
> > > TAPR doesn't.
> > >
> > > Charles Brabham, N5PVL
> >
> > A more important question: Why do you think WE care?
>
> Another mental case who thinks that his screwed-up opinion represents
> everybody else's thinking.
>
> They call that - meglomania.
>
> Sorry to be the one to have break it to you, "D.", but there are thousands
> of packet radio operators in the U.S. who DO care about the hobby.

I don't dispute that. However, there are plenty of packet operators who also know that TAPR has been a non-functional group long before a decade ago. What you posted isn't news to anyone (nor does it really belong on the "policy" group - there are packet specific groups).

> The nastygram opinions of disruptive, anti-ham jerkoffs such as yourself
> have no significance whatsoever.
>
> Charles Brabham, N5PVL

And you do? By starting this thread, you have proved only that you are and shall always remain a legend in your own mind.

2716. Re: Language Rules from FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-16 13:55:34 UTC
From: fharting lemhurs <mulras7001w@cobblestonel.com>
Message-ID: <1068991946.988489@newshost03.voicenet.com>
Source record: 82292

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20031114223440.01893.00001741@mb-m22.aol.com...

> Precisely. On amateur radio, one never knows when one will encounter
> something which may make someone think twice about our hobby being
> a wholesome and proper activity for a young person. When that happens,
> whether or not what was said was "legal" within the letter of the law,
the
> potential exists for the effect to bring the ARS "...one step closer to
> extinction."
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT

As long as you keep the froot-loops all
in one place then I see no problem.
For an example, the historically amusing ham
frequency of 14.313 MHz. is becoming alive again
with the sound of screwballs (..as opposed to the
sound of music) on the weekends like clockwork again.
You know it's gonna be there like Monday Night Football.
I have observed for 20+ yrs that as long as the screwballs, bootleggers
and kooks among our ranks KNOW where they
can go for their weekend dose of juvenile
amusement, they will gravitate to the same
and leave the rest of us *alone*. It's like the
red light district in town. Every medium city needs
one where the dregs of society can go to fulfill
their needs and perverse desires. 14.313 and one
or two freqs on 75 Meters do just that and act
as a steam poppet valve for the rest of the hobby.
Logical, ain't it?

2717. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-16 14:37:27 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bp81tp$k7g@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 82293

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:u6Htb.2890$Rk5.579@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
>
> I've also never said consumers
> are "too busy and stupid" to do research.
>

Well, that's true. You never said consumers are "too busy and stupid." I specifically stated that I was paraphrasing what you actually said:

"Consumers in general have neither the business awareness or economic awareness to make those types of decisions on their own. And they also certainly don't have the time or money to fully research an industry each time they want to go shopping for something."

Maybe, Dwight, you can put what you said a different way, so that it doesn't sound like you are thinking consumers are too busy and stupid. Could ya do that for me?

I don't know who it is you think is not reading and understanding your posts, Dwight. I think I've been fairly accurate. If I misrepresented your position on exactly what it is you are saying, I'd like to see what it is you actually intended the message to say.

Kim W5TIT

2718. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-16 14:51:17 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bp82no$djr@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 82295

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:u6Htb.2890$Rk5.579@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
>
> This is the last time I will say all of this. If you continue to
> misrepresent my position after this, then I'll assume you're doing so
simply
> to be dishonest and will respond accordingly.
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>

Yeah, Dwight, that's me...sitting around thinking of ways I can be dishonest. I think you're just up against a wall on this one and you're choosing the only way out you know...which is certainly your choice. At least one other person who's posted comments to this thread has had the same interpretation of what you're saying...and you've not been as "upset" about those interpretations. And, I daresay there's been two, but not so sure about how it is that Jim has interpreted your comments. I've just been a whole lot less diplomatic and far more blunt.

So, whatever...

Kim W5TIT

2719. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-16 14:52:00 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bp82p2$6ku@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 82294

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:liHtb.2913$Rk5.2082@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> "Kim W5TIT" wrote:
> >
> > Larry, meet Dwight. Dwight, meet Larry.
> > Dwight, welcome to a perfect vision of
> > yourself...
>
>
> Kim, I would introduce you to someone like yourself, but I simply
haven't
> met anyone that stupid and dishonest yet.
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>

Aw, now this is real cute and grown up, Dwight...

Kim W5TIT

2720. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-16 14:53:03 UTC
From: Alun <alun@1stcounsel.com>
Message-ID: <Xns9435648BE82D2elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 82296

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in
news:5c01b95b.0311132225.40b82cbb@posting.google.com:

> lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
> news:<20031113223912.29660.00001597@mb-m24.aol.com>...
>> In article <5c01b95b.0311120606.3facd301@posting.google.com>,
>> k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) writes:
>
>> > I noticed that you couldn't find time to join in the Veteran's
>> >Day greetings in another thread, although you profess admiration and
>> >respect for them. Matter of fact, I don't believe I've >>EVER<< seen
>> >you partake in any sincere regards on either Veteran's Day, Armed
>> >Forces Day or Memorial Day.
>>
>> 1. You are NOT, nor ever were, my commanding officer or even
>> ranking superior anywhere, including this newsgroup.
>> You are just rank.
>
> An answer I expected.
>
> Usual LennieRanting.
>
> You SHOULD thank God that I never WAS your "commanding officer"
> under any circumstances. I never would have put up with your
> broggadacio and lying.
>
>> 2. I was elsewhere Sunday through Wednesday, taking part in
>> veterans memorial services or visiting the VA hospital here in
>> the Valley. Such visiting doesn't end after Veterans Day
>> since those guys (and a couple gals) aren't going anywhere
>> else. It's NOT like your own hypocritcal "sincerity" suddenly
>> turning on during an official holiday and then definitely
>> turning OFF all "sincerity" and so forth for the rest of the
>> year.
>
> YadaYadaYada.
>
> Excuses of the lamest kind...again, an answer I would expect from
> you. Others took the time to put a kind reply in there, even on the
> "official" day
>
> I do not believe you. I doubt you were ANYwhere near ANY veteran
> for the purpose of supporting ANY veteran. Your track record of
> untruthfulness lends itself to this doubt. You cannot be trusted.

>
> You spend hundreds of hours yearly in THIS forum, yet when "kind
> words" are being exchanged, even amongst the "opponents", you are
> nowhere to be found.
>
>> 3. This thread is solely about the 14 petitions against/for morse
>> code testing in the U.S. amateur radio license test
>> regulations. It was posted as a "heads up" for those who have
>> not been tracking the numbers of comments on the 14 petitions.
>> Try staying with the program.
>
> As if you ever let a thread topic stop YOU from ranting on for
> days about YOUR pet theme.
>
>> 4. Back under your bridge little troll.
>
> After you get out from under it, big troll.
>
> You're a scumbag, Lennie Anderson. This just made it even a bit
> more evident...
>
> Steve, K4YZ
>

This thread does have nothing to do with veterans. I would hope that the main message of November 11th is that too many people have died in senseless wars. BTW, I was in the local Veteran's Day parade with the scouts.

This seems like a tactic to divert the thread from the no-code petitions.

2721. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-16 14:55:03 UTC
From: Alun <alun@1stcounsel.com>
Message-ID: <Xns943564E221DAAelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 82298

"Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in
news:EJvsb.9152$hn3.3187776@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net:

> "Rupert" <big@bird.sesame.street> wrote in message
> news:Govsb.10542$6c3.633@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net...
>> Len Over 21 wrote:
>>
>> > As of 6 PM EST on 11 November 2003, the number of ECFS documents on
>> > public view are:
>>
>> What would be interesting is to find out how many are for the change,
>> and how many want to keep the code.
>
> Me too. All this roundabout bravo sierra could be bypassed if there was
> a ballot sent to all approx. 700,000 U.S. licensed hams. As long as
> quorum is met, it's on! This concept (Democracy) frightens the bejesus
> out of many folks who claim to speak for those not yet licensed.
>
> But that's an empty argument. Get licensed and vote, tah dah! The big
> bad "barrier" does not preclude anyone from getting their no-code Tech
> ticket and executing a vote.
>
> Simply announce a "record date" by which one must be licensed (To give
> those "yet to be licensed a fair shot at a voice in the process.) and
> send a ballot out to all those licensed "of record." Makes too much
> sense and requires some effort. IOW, against the contemporary trend.
>
> 73 de Bert
> WA2SI
>
>
>

Those who have not obtained a licence because of the code trest are just
as entitled to express their opinion to the FCC as you or I.

2722. Re: Language Rules from FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-16 14:55:56 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bp830f$nsu@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 82297

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:zhItb.3150$Rk5.3112@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
>
> "Kim W5TIT" wrote:
> >
> > (snip) I would have asked to visit with the Shift
> > Manager and would have explained the situation
> > to him/her and asked what the store intended to
> > do about it. *If* the conversation had been loud
> > enough for the clerk to make a decision on your
> > complaint, then it was loud enough for her to
> > witness to the Shift Manager. What would I
> > expect as a consumer? I would expect the store
> > to ask the people to leave if they persist in
> > offensive behavior in public. (snip)
>
>
> With the possibility of lawsuits, I doubt many stores would be that
overt
> today. Many of the offensive language laws of the past have been struck
down
> as unconstitutional (enough that few stores would want to take much of a
> chance pushing the issue)
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>

You always seem to come up with some reason not to effect change, Dwight. At the end of the post you have a little bit of above, I even stated that you could put the items down and leave--without ever saying a thing to anyone.

How do you feel about doing that? If you totally disagree with how the people were behaving, say nothing to anyone, and just simply walk out of the store; then you be sure that you enlighten others as to this way of doing something in our litigious society today, what do you think the potential is of making some true changes in our society and in the businesses that we do business with?

Oh, I forgot...never mind...I'm lying...

Kim W5TIT

2723. Re: No Code General

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-16 15:02:26 UTC
From: Ronny Julian <k4rjj@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <N62dnTcgpLUvDCqiRVn-gg@comcast.com>
Source record: 82300
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.swap

That's the other Inferior spectrum user VERIZON

"Steveo" <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com> wrote in message
news:20031104185847.223$t1@newsreader.com...
> Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote:
> > Alun Palmer wrote:
> > > Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in
> > > news:Z%kpb.2342$Bf7.1312644@news1.news.adelphia.net:
> > >
> > >
> > >>Alun Palmer wrote:
> > >>
> > >>
> > >>
> > >>>I will probably be dropped soon, but the FCC has to go through
> > >>>standard procedures with all the pending petitions. The international
> > >>>requirement was dropped on July 5th, so by next July it should
> > >>>probably be gone in the US.
> > >>
> > >> Hehhe. Alun, you should be on the welcoming committee for this
> > >> dude!
> > >>
> > >> - Mike KB3EIA -
> > >>
> > >>
> > >>
> > >
> > > It's a difficult question. Do we applaud him for wanting to go legal?
> > > Or do we slam him for ever having operated illegally? I have known
> > > former pirate radio ooperators whose behaviour on the ham bands after
> > > they got a licence was exemplary.
> >
> > Then let us hope that he is a shining beacon of behavior for the
> > cause of those who do away for the code test!
> >
> > - Mike KB3EIA -
> >
> It will be like the Cingular commercial.."can you hear me now?" <g>

2724. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-16 15:02:36 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031116100236.12501.00003993@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 82299

In article <wF3sb.23080$9M3.12729@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> writes:

>You know, thinking back, I believe I was actually
>happier back then. I didn't have much, but I don't remember feeling anything
>was missing in my life. Perhaps I'm getting too old to remember things back
>then clearly.

I think it's something else, Dwight. I think a big part of happiness is baased on our expectations vs. our reality. And a lot of us Americans allow ourselves to develop tremendously high expectations, and then aren't so happy when they aren't met.

The person who expected to be living in a 4000 sf house by a certain age may be quite disappointed that they are now past that age and living in a 2500 sf house, and they're maxed out (can't really afford to move or add on). Never mind that the 2500 sf house is a nice place, etc., etc. (Just one example 'cause we've been talking about houses).

>Maybe I'll start a late mid-life crisis and go looking for
>those youthful days again. I remember this one girl...
>
Sometimes it's a good thing that 'the one that got away', did.

Friend of mine says:

"To a large extent, we're as happy as we allow ourselves to be"

73 de Jim, N2EY

2725. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-16 15:40:39 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <XTMtb.2570$m84.1485913@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 82301

charlesb wrote:
> "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
> news:iEJtb.3380$Rk5.3135@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
>
>>"charlesb" wrote:
>>
>>>I can initiate change, but don't expect me to put
>>>my money into your project. Pony up, and I'll see
>>>what I can do.
>>>
>>>Like the ARRL, I work on a sliding scale: The more
>>>money you send, the better results you can expect.
>>
>>
>> LOL. I just made the car payment. How much change can I get for the
>
> twenty
>
>>bucks remaining? Twenty-five cents in change?
>
>
> I may initiate change, but seldom do I ever return any! ;-D

Keep the change as payment for the quote of the week, Charles! 8^)

- Mike KB3EIA

2726. Re: Important Research at TAPR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-16 15:57:38 UTC
From: charlesb <n5pvl@sbcglobal.net>
Message-ID: <S7Ntb.31806$ZL6.12076@newssvr27.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 82302

"D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> wrote in message
news:Pine.LNX.4.58.0311161245580.8194@kd6lvw.ampr.org...
> > >
> > > A more important question: Why do you think WE care?
> >
> > Another mental case who thinks that his screwed-up opinion represents
> > everybody else's thinking.
> >
> > They call that - meglomania.
> >
> > Sorry to be the one to have break it to you, "D.", but there are
thousands
> > of packet radio operators in the U.S. who DO care about the hobby.
>
> I don't dispute that. However, there are plenty of packet operators who
also
> know that TAPR has been a non-functional group long before a decade ago.
What
> you posted isn't news to anyone (nor does it really belong on the "policy"
> group - there are packet specific groups).

There you go again, assuming that your screwed-up opinion represents
everybody else's thinking.

They call that - meglomania. Maybe you should mention this to your
physician.

>
> > The nastygram opinions of disruptive, anti-ham jerkoffs such as yourself
> > have no significance whatsoever.
> >
> > Charles Brabham, N5PVL
>
> And you do? By starting this thread, you have proved only that you are
and
> shall always remain a legend in your own mind.

Hey, I'm just reporting a bit of news that not everyone may have been aware
of. You'd be amazed how many hams think of TAPR as a packet radio
organization, even in the ARRL. That's the extent of the significance of my
post.

Code/No-Code has no place in a "policy" newsgroup either, but guess what?

Charles Brabham, N5PVL

2727. Re: Language Rules from FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-16 16:04:33 UTC
From: garigue <garigue@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <leNtb.166438$9E1.841070@attbi_s52>
Source record: 82303

>
> Larry, our society has pretty much come to the point that people don't
> care what others think of them any more. Foul, vulgar language is used
> so much now that it is spoken in homes as if it were accepted language
> and the kids pick up on it. I have heard five year olds use words that I
> would never dared to speak in front of an adult when I was a youngster.
> I have had my mouth washed out with soap (by a teacher at school no
> less, would like to see one try that now), for saying much less.
>
> I grew up in a farming community and when around the men, sure a few
> cuss words would fly occasionally, especially when the wrench slipped
> and a busted knuckle was the result, or over at the local shop where the
> farmers gathered as their trucks and tractors were being serviced, a
> hell or damn was pretty common, but never in a public place where women
> and children were around. There was respect for others then. It isn't
> uncommon for me to step into an elevator with my wife and hear others
> using very vulgar language with no regards to who is listening and may
> be offended by such language. The sad part is, they think it is just
> accepted that everyone has lowered themselves to such a common level.
>
> Ever set at the mall and just watch the people pass by? Look at the
> sloppy dress, some look like they stepped out of a cartoon. Few have
> pride in themselves anymore. And if you really want to see some
> sloppyness, go to a ham fest. It is a sad commentary on our society today.

Zactly ...Our society has become the "bum society". It is now the vogue to have baby showers in the school for the 15 yr old girl instead of her whispered trip to her aunt Mary's in Ohio that resulted in Aunt Mary raising a child the proper way. We proclaim liberty and freedom in the old USA but fail miserably to protect the unborn to the tune of millions a year. Then the people wonder where the respect for human life has gone. Our TV has become a cess pool instead of a resource. Did you ever see the "new" cartoons? Vulgarity begins to be accepted as norm at a young age let alone the Springer type shows out there. Common manners are gone. Who would have ever eaten at home or a restaurant with a baseball cap on? Language .... the liberal use of Sponge Bob's "sentence enhancers" is every where and accepted as norm. It is of no surprise that ham radio manifests the same in on air activities and "cute" calls. I however can escape to a venue where I do not find this happening ...call it what you may ...I call it CW.

OOPs got me again ...Pontification filter is on

God Bless 73 KI3R Tom Popovic Belle Vernon Pa

2728. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-16 16:19:33 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0311160819.9a9849@posting.google.com>
Source record: 82304

Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:<lfgtb.1218$m84.968090@news1.news.adelphia.net>...
> Brian wrote:

> > Perhaps we accept more debt today (as a ratio to income) than ever before.
>
> Perhaps "we" will get what we deserve for running our finances so close
> to the edge. 8^)
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -

Some do.

And that's why this country fears lay-offs so much. There is so very
little slop in one's income to expenses that even a couple of months
out of work spells ruination.

No rainy-day accounts either.

But bankruptcy is easy to get, so everyone else ends up paying for
their houses, SUVs, and big-screen TVs.

2729. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-16 16:36:06 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031116113606.23171.00002120@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 82305

In article <Xns943564E221DAAelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun
<alun@1stcounsel.com> writes:

>"Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in
>news:EJvsb.9152$hn3.3187776@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net:
>
>> "Rupert" <big@bird.sesame.street> wrote in message
>> news:Govsb.10542$6c3.633@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net...
>>> Len Over 21 wrote:
>>>
>>> > As of 6 PM EST on 11 November 2003, the number of ECFS documents on
>>> > public view are:
>>>
>>> What would be interesting is to find out how many are for the change,
>>> and how many want to keep the code.
>>
>> Me too. All this roundabout bravo sierra could be bypassed if there was
>> a ballot sent to all approx. 700,000 U.S. licensed hams. As long as
>> quorum is met, it's on! This concept (Democracy) frightens the bejesus
>> out of many folks who claim to speak for those not yet licensed.
>>
>> But that's an empty argument. Get licensed and vote, tah dah! The big
>> bad "barrier" does not preclude anyone from getting their no-code Tech
>> ticket and executing a vote.
>>
>> Simply announce a "record date" by which one must be licensed (To give
>> those "yet to be licensed a fair shot at a voice in the process.) and
>> send a ballot out to all those licensed "of record." Makes too much
>> sense and requires some effort. IOW, against the contemporary trend.
>>
>> 73 de Bert
>> WA2SI
>>
>>
>>
>
>Those who have not obtained a licence because of the code trest are just
>as entitled to express their opinion to the FCC as you or I.
>
Sure - nobody is saying that should change.

However, note that there has been an amateur radio license with no code test
available here in the USA for almost 13 years now. That license gives full
VHF/UHF operating privileges and requires only a 35 question written test.

A code test is only required for access to the HF/MF amateur bands.

So anyone who wants to obtain an amateur license can do so without any code test.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2730. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-16 17:07:29 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <l9Otb.5052$Wy4.4575@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 82306

"Kim W5TIT" wrote:
>
> Maybe, Dwight, you can put what you said
> a different way, so that it doesn't sound like
> you are thinking consumers are too busy
> and stupid. Could ya do that for me?

No. I've clarified what I said at least five or six times. I have no intention of doing so again.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

2731. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-16 17:39:50 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <GDOtb.5070$Wy4.4488@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 82307

"charlesb" wrote:
>
> I may initiate change, but seldom do I ever return
> any! ;-D

Well said. :-)

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

2732. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-16 18:07:39 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <L1Ptb.5088$Wy4.1895@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 82308

"N2EY" wrote:
>
> I think it's something else, Dwight. I think a big part
> of happiness is based on our expectations vs. our
> reality. And a lot of us Americans allow ourselves
> to develop tremendously high expectations, and
> then aren't so happy when they aren't met.
>
> The person who expected to be living in a 4000 sf
> house by a certain age may be quite disappointed
> that (snip)

In my case, I've never stayed in one place long enough to have those type of expectations. I've traveled most of my life (both as a kid and later as an adult). I'm just in a mood right now to settle down somewhere. The problem is that I haven't figured out where to settle down at. I haven't lived in one place long enough to really call it home. My family is spread out across the country (the same with my wife's family). Because of all that, we never get to the point of thinking about a house - we're too busy looking around the country for an area. And that is perhaps where our expectations are simply too high.

> Sometimes it's a good thing that 'the one that got
> away', did.

Been there and done that. We went across the country a few years ago looking up old friends and the places we once lived. We were shocked at the many changes (in the people and the places). After that, we decided not to do so again with the remaining people and places - it's simply best to remember them in our minds the way they were.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

2733. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-16 18:13:54 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bp8ek2$cq@library2.airnews.net>
Source record: 82309

"Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
news:f45722ac.0311160819.9a9849@posting.google.com...
> Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:<lfgtb.1218$m84.968090@news1.news.adelphia.net>...
> > Brian wrote:
>
> > > Perhaps we accept more debt today (as a ratio to income) than ever
before.
> >
> > Perhaps "we" will get what we deserve for running our finances so close
> > to the edge. 8^)
> >
> > - Mike KB3EIA -
>
> Some do.
>
> And that's why this country fears lay-offs so much. There is so very
> little slop in one's income to expenses that even a couple of months
> out of work spells ruination.
>
> No rainy-day accounts either.
>
> But bankruptcy is easy to get, so everyone else ends up paying for
> their houses, SUVs, and big-screen TVs.
>

I couldn't agree more on that, Brian! For sure, as they would say. I am shopping for a new home and my husband and I have decided what we are comfortable spending, what we need and desire in a new place, what kind of interest rate we'll accept, and what payment we want. Know what? One mortgage company so far has told us, "you have a lot of room to move," meaning that we can get into something much bigger and more expensive than we are looking for. They seem shocked that we aren't interested in "maxxing" out our limit!!

And, you're right about bankruptcy, too. When I said to a lender that we weren't comfortable with the expense they were suggesting, they said we could afford it and didn't know what the problem was. I told them I think about things like potentially losing my job or my husband losing his. The come back was that we always have bankruptcy available!!!

Good grief...

Kim W5TIT

2734. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-16 18:16:09 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bp8eo8$30k@library2.airnews.net>
Source record: 82310

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:l9Otb.5052$Wy4.4575@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> "Kim W5TIT" wrote:
> >
> > Maybe, Dwight, you can put what you said
> > a different way, so that it doesn't sound like
> > you are thinking consumers are too busy
> > and stupid. Could ya do that for me?
>
>
> No. I've clarified what I said at least five or six times. I have no
> intention of doing so again.
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>

Yeah, it's always the easy way out...

Kim W5TIT

2735. Re: Language Rules from FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-16 18:25:09 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <9iPtb.5095$Wy4.1231@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 82311

"Kim W5TIT" wrote:
>
> (snip) At the end of the post you have a little
> bit of above, I even stated that you could put
> the items down and leave--without ever saying
> a thing to anyone.
>
> (snip) How do you feel about doing that? (snip)

Don't be so defensive, Kim. Most would agree one could simply walk out of the store. Because of that, there was really nothing much to add to that part of the conversation. Instead, I added to what you said in another part of your message, which obviously gave you an opportunity to address that. After all, if you're going to approach the manager, that is going to be on his mind.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

2736. Re: Language Rules from FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-16 18:28:16 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <4lPtb.5097$Wy4.1551@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 82312

"fharting lemhurs" wrote:
>
> As long as you keep the froot-loops all
> in one place (snip)

Fruit. ;-)

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

2737. Re: Language Rules from FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-16 18:39:46 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bp8g4i$kdo@library2.airnews.net>
Source record: 82313

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:9iPtb.5095$Wy4.1231@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> "Kim W5TIT" wrote:
> >
> > (snip) At the end of the post you have a little
> > bit of above, I even stated that you could put
> > the items down and leave--without ever saying
> > a thing to anyone.
> >
> > (snip) How do you feel about doing that? (snip)
>
>
> Don't be so defensive, Kim. Most would agree one could simply walk out
of
> the store. Because of that, there was really nothing much to add to that
> part of the conversation. Instead, I added to what you said in another
part
> of your message, which obviously gave you an opportunity to address that.
> After all, if you're going to approach the manager, that is going to be on
> his mind.
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>

Defensive? I don't know where you got that. While the Manager may be thinking of legality and lawsuit issues, it would not come to a legal issue by simply approaching a manager about the issue. What that does is give one the opportunity to "field" what reactions will be at the idea of a consumer complaining about behaviors of others in a store. If it's determined, through experience, that we can't do things people-to-people because of fear of retribution, then there's all opportunity in, as I said, simply lying down the products you were going to purchase and walking out. One could even follow-up with a letter or email (anonymous or not) to the corporate headquarters of the company.

I think I was probably of the thought you were being dismissive of the *whole* idea simply because of fear of reprimand. Fear of reprimand is some of what has paralyzed people in this country from demanding the behaviors we wish to see from others (personal or business). There are ways around fear of reprimand.

Kim W5TIT

2738. Re: Do Hams get 11 Meters Back

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-16 21:01:24 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3FB7E5A0.4070308@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 82314
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.cb

charlesb wrote:

>"OOTMAN" <ootman@usaor.net> wrote in message
>news:vrds2mkuem63bc@corp.supernews.com...
>
>
>>W hy in hell would they want it back??????????
>>
>>
>>
>
>Better utilization of HF spectrum, and more spectrum for hams. All the
>non-ham stuff should be VHF or UHF, for the obvious reason.
>
>Charles Brabham, N5PVL
>
>
>
>
But 10 meters is rarely crowded, getting 11 back, though nice, isn't
that critical.
More bandwidth on 20 or 40 I would prefer.

2739. Re: Do Hams get 11 Meters Back

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-16 21:09:23 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <ztidnamXPsSpdSqi4p2dnA@gbronline.com>
Source record: 82315
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.cb

charlesb wrote:

> "OOTMAN" <ootman@usaor.net> wrote in message
> news:vrds2mkuem63bc@corp.supernews.com...
>
>>W hy in hell would they want it back??????????
>>
>
>
> Better utilization of HF spectrum, and more spectrum for hams. All the
> non-ham stuff should be VHF or UHF, for the obvious reason.
>
> Charles Brabham, N5PVL
>
>
The hams hardly used 11 meters when they had it, what makes you think
they would use it now if they got it back? Besides, the cbers have made
such a mess of it, it would take years to clean the filth out.

2740. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-16 21:15:39 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <ztidnaiXPsREdCqi4p2dnA@gbronline.com>
Source record: 82316

Dwight Stewart wrote:

> "Kim W5TIT" wrote:
>
>>Maybe, Dwight, you can put what you said
>>a different way, so that it doesn't sound like
>>you are thinking consumers are too busy
>>and stupid. Could ya do that for me?
>
>
>
> No. I've clarified what I said at least five or six times. I have no
> intention of doing so again.
>

Might as well give it up Dwight, I find it futile to discuss class or
good taste with someone who choses a call sign like Kim's.

2741. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-16 21:28:36 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031116162836.11891.00002325@mb-m11.aol.com>
Source record: 82317

In article <bp8ek2$cq@library2.airnews.net>, "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
writes:

>I am
>shopping for a new home and my husband and I have decided what we are
>comfortable spending, what we need and desire in a new place, what kind of
>interest rate we'll accept, and what payment we want.

Weren't you folks having a place built, Kim? Or are we talking about the same
thing?

>Know what? One
>mortgage company so far has told us, "you have a lot of room to move,"
>meaning that we can get into something much bigger and more expensive than
>we are looking for. They seem shocked that we aren't interested in
>"maxxing" out our limit!!

Sure. I've encountered that, too, in all sorts of transactions, Their focus is
very narrow. And their fees and commissions are based on the selling price.

And note that reselling mortgages is pretty standard, so the people who sold
you the house and mortgage won't be holding the bag if you do default.
>
>And, you're right about bankruptcy, too. When I said to a lender that we
>weren't comfortable with the expense they were suggesting, they said we
>could afford it and didn't know what the problem was.

Of course not. It's not their money or their house!

>I told them I think
>about things like potentially losing my job or my husband losing his. The
>come back was that we always have bankruptcy available!!!

Now *that's* a new one! ;-)

Point is that the lenders &tc won't protect us from ourselves. *We* have to do
that.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2742. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-16 21:28:36 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031116162836.11891.00002324@mb-m11.aol.com>
Source record: 82318

In article <WXFtb.2770$Rk5.1497@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> writes:

>"Dee D. Flint" wrote:
>>
>> This would be the ruination of the economy. The
>> government is not, never has been, and never will
>> be competent to manage the economy.
>
>
> The government has managed the economy in some form or another since the
>very beginning. And, in spite of what you say, this country with that
>government has done pretty darn well over those many years.
>
Agreed!

But has the country's economy done well because of the government's influence, or in spite of that influence?

73 de Jim, N2EY

2743. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-16 21:28:37 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031116162837.11891.00002326@mb-m11.aol.com>
Source record: 82319

In article <L1Ptb.5088$Wy4.1895@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> writes:

>"N2EY" wrote:
>>
>> I think it's something else, Dwight. I think a big part
>> of happiness is based on our expectations vs. our
>> reality. And a lot of us Americans allow ourselves
>> to develop tremendously high expectations, and
>> then aren't so happy when they aren't met.
>>
>> The person who expected to be living in a 4000 sf
>> house by a certain age may be quite disappointed
>> that (snip)
>
> In my case, I've never stayed in one place long enough to have those type
>of expectations.

Then the house example wasn't a good one for what you are talking about.

Then consider the fan example. Your expectation is that finding a fan which will not wear out in X hours of use should not require a wide search. You expect to be able to find one locally without a lot of hassle. But you can't, and that's a disappointment.

Same principle, different specifics.

>I've traveled most of my life (both as a kid and later as
>an adult). I'm just in a mood right now to settle down somewhere. The
>problem is that I haven't figured out where to settle down at. I haven't
>lived in one place long enough to really call it home. My family is spread
>out across the country (the same with my wife's family). Because of all
>that, we never get to the point of thinking about a house - we're too busy
>looking around the country for an area. And that is perhaps where our
>expectations are simply too high.

Could be - what is it that you expect?

73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>
>> Sometimes it's a good thing that 'the one that got
>> away', did.
>
>
> Been there and done that. We went across the country a few years ago

>looking up old friends and the places we once lived. We were shocked at the
>many changes (in the people and the places). After that, we decided not to
>do so again with the remaining people and places - it's simply best to
>remember them in our minds the way they were.
>

2744. Re: Do Hams get 11 Meters Back

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-16 21:43:21 UTC
From: jim <3carroll@optonline.net>
Message-ID: <3FB7EF86.3090503@optonline.net>
Source record: 82320
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.cb

```
JJ wrote:
> charlesb wrote:
>
>> "OOTMAN" <ootman@usaor.net> wrote in message
>> news:vrds2mkuem63bc@corp.supernews.com...
>>
>>> W hy in hell would they want it back??????????
>>>
>>
>>
>> Better utilization of HF spectrum, and more spectrum for hams. All the
>> non-ham stuff should be VHF or UHF, for the obvious reason.
>>
>> Charles Brabham, N5PVL
>>
>>
> The hams hardly used 11 meters when they had it, what makes you think
> they would use it now if they got it back? Besides, the cbers have made
> such a mess of it, it would take years to clean the filth out.
>

equating cb'ers and filth eh? in your limited world hams dont freeband?
guess you havn't heard the cw contests on 11 meters. so much for your
post...
```

2745. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-16 22:09:34 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bp8sdt$doa@library2.airnews.net>
Source record: 82321

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20031116162836.11891.00002325@mb-m11.aol.com...
> In article <bp8ek2$cq@library2.airnews.net>, "Kim W5TIT"
<kimscliff@yahoo.com>
> writes:
>
> >I am
> >shopping for a new home and my husband and I have decided what we are
> >comfortable spending, what we need and desire in a new place, what kind
of
> >interest rate we'll accept, and what payment we want.
>
> Weren't you folks having a place built, Kim? Or are we talking about the
same
> thing?
>

No, no! We're not having a place built...we are ordering a manufactured home (trailer, whatever-you-want-to-call-it). We are all set with land, and explored building. But, for some reason, neither of us is particularly interested in dealing with having one built (there's not one good experience we've ever had relayed about dealing with builders...LOL).

> >
> >Know what? One
> >mortgage company so far has told us, "you have a lot of room to move,"
> >meaning that we can get into something much bigger and more expensive
than
> >we are looking for. They seem shocked that we aren't interested in
> >"maxxing" out our limit!!
>
> Sure. I've encountered that, too, in all sorts of transactions, Their
focus is
> very narrow. And their fees and commissions are based on the selling
price.
>
> And note that reselling mortgages is pretty standard, so the people who
sold
> you the house and mortgage won't be holding the bag if you do default.
> >

Yep, we've already been told as soon as the "deal is done," the mortgage will be sold.

> >
> >And, you're right about bankruptcy, too. When I said to a lender that we
> >weren't comfortable with the expense they were suggesting, they said we
> >could afford it and didn't know what the problem was.
>
> Of course not. It's not their money or their house!
>

Or the accomplishment of having excellent credit!

> >
> >I told them I think
> >about things like potentially losing my job or my husband losing his.
The
> >come back was that we always have bankruptcy available!!!
>
> Now *that's* a new one! ;-)
>
> Point is that the lenders &tc won't protect us from ourselves. *We* have
to do
> that.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

Precisely what we're doing...

Kim W5TIT

2746. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-16 22:10:45 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bp8sg5$6gn@library2.airnews.net>
Source record: 82322

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20031116162836.11891.00002324@mb-m11.aol.com...
> In article <WXFtb.2770$Rk5.1497@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dwight
> Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> writes:
>
> >"Dee D. Flint" wrote:
> >>
> >> This would be the ruination of the economy. The
> >> government is not, never has been, and never will
> >> be competent to manage the economy.
> >
> >
> > The government has managed the economy in some form or another since
the
> >very beginning. And, in spite of what you say, this country with that
> >government has done pretty darn well over those many years.
> >
> Agreed!
>
> But has the country's economy done well because of the government's
influence,
> or in spite of that influence?
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>

I'm not so sure this country's done all that "well." I think it's quite
obvious we are all paying for that right now...

But, Dwight has other ideas...

Kim W5TIT

2747. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-16 22:12:16 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bp8siv$77d@library2.airnews.net>
Source record: 82323

"JJ" <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
news:ztidnaiXPsREdCqi4p2dnA@gbronline.com...
> Dwight Stewart wrote:
>
> > "Kim W5TIT" wrote:
> >
> >>Maybe, Dwight, you can put what you said
> >>a different way, so that it doesn't sound like
> >>you are thinking consumers are too busy
> >>and stupid. Could ya do that for me?
> >
> >
> >
> > No. I've clarified what I said at least five or six times. I have no
> > intention of doing so again.
> >
>
> Might as well give it up Dwight, I find it futile to discuss class or
> good taste with someone who choses a call sign like Kim's.
>

Yeah, there's few who can handle a woman with good sense...

Kim W5TIT

2748. Re: Do Hams get 11 Meters Back

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-16 23:30:30 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <jNydnRnSN5nVIiWi4p2dnA@gbronline.com>
Source record: 82325
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.cb

jim wrote:

>
>
> JJ wrote:
>
>> charlesb wrote:
>>
>>> "OOTMAN" <ootman@usaor.net> wrote in message
>>> news:vrds2mkuem63bc@corp.supernews.com...
>>>
>>>> W hy in hell would they want it back??????????
>>>>
>>>
>>>
>>> Better utilization of HF spectrum, and more spectrum for hams. All the
>>> non-ham stuff should be VHF or UHF, for the obvious reason.
>>>
>>> Charles Brabham, N5PVL
>>>
>>>
>> The hams hardly used 11 meters when they had it, what makes you think
>> they would use it now if they got it back? Besides, the cbers have
>> made such a mess of it, it would take years to clean the filth out.
>>
>
> equating cb'ers and filth eh? in your limited world hams dont freeband?
> guess you havn't heard the cw contests on 11 meters. so much for your
> post...
>

In my world, *real* hams don't (notice I put the ' in don't) freeband
(there is no "freeband" in case you haven't noticed), just those cb
types who happen to hold a ham license. So much for your post..........

2749. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-16 23:31:16 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <8NTtb.2725$m84.1610630@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 82324

Kim W5TIT wrote:
> "Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
> news:f45722ac.0311160819.9a9849@posting.google.com...
>
>>Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
>
> news:<lfgtb.1218$m84.968090@news1.news.adelphia.net>...
>
>>>Brian wrote:
>>
>>>>Perhaps we accept more debt today (as a ratio to income) than ever
>
> before.
>
>>>Perhaps "we" will get what we deserve for running our finances so close
>>>to the edge. 8^)
>>>
>>>- Mike KB3EIA -
>>
>>Some do.
>>
>>And that's why this country fears lay-offs so much. There is so very
>>little slop in one's income to expenses that even a couple of months
>>out of work spells ruination.
>>
>>No rainy-day accounts either.
>>
>>But bankruptcy is easy to get, so everyone else ends up paying for
>>their houses, SUVs, and big-screen TVs.
>>
>
>
> I couldn't agree more on that, Brian! For sure, as they would say. I am
> shopping for a new home and my husband and I have decided what we are
> comfortable spending, what we need and desire in a new place, what kind of
> interest rate we'll accept, and what payment we want. Know what? One
> mortgage company so far has told us, "you have a lot of room to move,"
> meaning that we can get into something much bigger and more expensive than
> we are looking for. They seem shocked that we aren't interested in
> "maxxing" out our limit!!
>
> And, you're right about bankruptcy, too. When I said to a lender that we
> weren't comfortable with the expense they were suggesting, they said we
> could afford it and didn't know what the problem was. I told them I think

> about things like potentially losing my job or my husband losing his. The
> come back was that we always have bankruptcy available!!!
>
> Good grief...

They do soooo love their commission, and the more you spend, the more they make. A person is better served by thinking of the real estate agent as their enemy, rather than friend. We went through several agents, one I left after telling them if they showed us one more house that cost more than what we were looking for I was walking. Yup, the next house was more! There should be an i.q. portion of that test they take!

- Mike KB3EIA -

2750. Re: Do Hams get 11 Meters Back

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-17 00:05:57 UTC
From: jim <3carroll@optonline.net>
Message-ID: <3FB810F2.5060806@optonline.net>
Source record: 82326
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.cb

```
JJ wrote:
> jim wrote:
>
>>
>>
>> JJ wrote:
>>
>>> charlesb wrote:
>>>
>>>> "OOTMAN" <ootman@usaor.net> wrote in message
>>>> news:vrds2mkuem63bc@corp.supernews.com...
>>>>
>>>>> W hy in hell would they want it back??????????
>>>>>
>>>>
>>>>
>>>> Better utilization of HF spectrum, and more spectrum for hams. All the
>>>> non-ham stuff should be VHF or UHF, for the obvious reason.
>>>>
>>>> Charles Brabham, N5PVL
>>>>
>>>>
>>> The hams hardly used 11 meters when they had it, what makes you think
>>> they would use it now if they got it back? Besides, the cbers have
>>> made such a mess of it, it would take years to clean the filth out.
>>>
>>
>> equating cb'ers and filth eh? in your limited world hams dont freeband?
>> guess you havn't heard the cw contests on 11 meters. so much for your
>> post...
>>
>
> In my world, *real* hams don't (notice I put the ' in don't) freeband
> (there is no "freeband" in case you haven't noticed), just those cb
> types who happen to hold a ham license. So much for your post..........
>

lol you are a bigot....
```

2751. Re: Armistice Day was re: Happy Vets Day

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-17 00:37:32 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hognwa3.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>
Source record: 82327

On 14 Nov 2003 18:12:02 -0800, Brian wrote:

>> >In the USA, its the only remembrance day not moved to/celebrated on
>> >friday or monday.
>>
>> Not quite - Independance Day (July 4), Xmas (Dec. 25), and New
>> Year's Day (Jan. 1) are not moved, and they all are "remembrance"
>> days of one thing or another.
>
>Jesus was a fallen soldier?

You didn't say "military remembrance", did you ???

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

2752. Re: Language Rules from FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-17 00:37:32 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hogq6m5.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>
Source record: 82328

On Sat, 15 Nov 2003 09:51:31 -0600, Kim W5TIT wrote:

>> Ever set at the mall and just watch the people pass by? Look at the
>> sloppy dress, some look like they stepped out of a cartoon. Few have
>> pride in themselves anymore. And if you really want to see some
>> sloppyness, go to a ham fest. It is a sad commentary on our society today.

>By the way...you wouldn't be describing mostly youth, above, would you?

In both suburban areas that I have lived in the last 35+ years, in
the sumnmer one could sit and see "dress" that makes the Victoria's
Secret showroom look demure by comparison.

Fortunately my daughter never bought into that sort of conduct
although she could have been a "spectacle" had she done so. She
has too much respect for herself for that.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

From a Clearing in the Silicon Forest
Beaverton (Washington County) Oregon

2753. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-17 00:37:32 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hogou64.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>
Source record: 82330

On Sat, 15 Nov 2003 02:12:06 GMT, Dee D. Flint wrote:

>So you're saying we should go to "Ma's Diner" for the sole purpose of
>keeping them in business?? I don't think so.

There are/were several "Ma's Diner" level establishments that we
patronize(d) for just that reason. Some of them didn't survive, but
that wasn't because we didn't go there.

OTOH, there are several "successful" enterprises that we just
wouldn't patronize - Wal-Mart leads that list.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

From a Clearing in the Silicon Forest
Beaverton (Washington County) Oregon

2754. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-17 00:37:33 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hogrlu7.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>
Source record: 82329

On 16 Nov 2003 01:28:42 GMT, N2EY wrote:

>>Me too. All this roundabout bravo sierra could be bypassed if there was a
>>ballot sent to all approx. 700,000 U.S. licensed hams.

>Suppose someone did, indeed, poll everyone with a US ham license.

First question: who is going to front the six figures required to
send out the ballots even by bulk mail? The FCC?

No way - contrary to urban legend, for the last 10 years or so, all
government agencies pay full postage rates on everything they mail -
except for Congressional mailings, of course.

>"What is your opinion of code testing for an amateur license?"
>
>1) It should be totally abolished
>2) It should be required only for Extra
>3) It should be required only for Extra and General
>4) It should be required for any license with HF privileges
>5) It should be required for any amateur license
>6) No opinion/don't care
>
>Or you might find that the majority opinion was 6). What happens in
>that case?

Or it's a tie between #6 and no response ???

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

2755. Re: Language Rules from FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-17 00:37:33 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hogqpu6.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>
Source record: 82331

On 15 Nov 2003 20:16:48 GMT, N2EY wrote:

>>> > The broadcast arena has always been the barometer of what people are
>>> > allowed to say on the air, hasn't it?
>>>
>>> Nope. FCC has completely different rules for different services. The
>>> fact that somebody gets away with something in the broadcast services
>>> doesn't mean it's OK in the ARS.

Quite a while back, there was a case against an amateur operator in
Los Angeles, and the ALJ ruled that the standards of broadcast
indecency articulated in the _Pacifica_ case (the "Seven Dirty Words"
case) also applied to the ARS because ARS transmissions are readily
available to the general public (i.e. are not protected by privacy
or secrecy statutes).

>>Generally the terminology states soemething to the effect of "good amateur
>>practice." My ONLY PROBLEM with that is WHO gets to decide what the
>>benchmark is for good amateur practice..... If the FCC, who issues our
>>licenses are not going to do it, then who?

Amen, brother.

>>As for specific words??? Dunno, is there a list?? :)

No.

>>Who makes the list then?

George Carlin, at last count.

>Common sense and good taste used to be the guide. But I guess such
>concepts are old-fashioned nowadays, from what some folks tell me when
>I oppose the use of such language on the air and in newsgropups.....

Agreed.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

2756. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-17 00:54:51 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <v%Utb.10641$P%1.9424730@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 82332

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:WXFtb.2770$Rk5.1497@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> "Dee D. Flint" wrote:
> >
> > This would be the ruination of the economy. The
> > government is not, never has been, and never will
> > be competent to manage the economy.
>
>
> The government has managed the economy in some form or another since the
> very beginning. And, in spite of what you say, this country with that
> government has done pretty darn well over those many years.

No it's more a case of the economy has done well despite the government.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

2757. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-17 01:08:51 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <DcVtb.10670$P%1.9427370@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 82333

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:cuvyxnansvbet.hogou64.pminews@netnews.comcast.net...
> On Sat, 15 Nov 2003 02:12:06 GMT, Dee D. Flint wrote:
>
> >So you're saying we should go to "Ma's Diner" for the sole purpose of
> >keeping them in business?? I don't think so.
>
> There are/were several "Ma's Diner" level establishments that we
> patronize(d) for just that reason. Some of them didn't survive, but
> that wasn't because we didn't go there.
>
> OTOH, there are several "successful" enterprises that we just
> wouldn't patronize - Wal-Mart leads that list.

I would go if they had a product I wanted but see no reason to do so if they
are not selling the products that I want.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

2758. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-17 01:11:20 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <YeVtb.10677$P%1.9427794@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 82334

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:cuvyxnansvbet.hogrlu7.pminews@netnews.comcast.net...
> On 16 Nov 2003 01:28:42 GMT, N2EY wrote:
>
> >>Me too. All this roundabout bravo sierra could be bypassed if there was
a
> >>ballot sent to all approx. 700,000 U.S. licensed hams.
>
> >Suppose someone did, indeed, poll everyone with a US ham license.
>
> First question: who is going to front the six figures required to
> send out the ballots even by bulk mail? The FCC?
>
> No way - contrary to urban legend, for the last 10 years or so, all
> government agencies pay full postage rates on everything they mail -
> except for Congressional mailings, of course.
>
> >"What is your opinion of code testing for an amateur license?"
> >
> >1) It should be totally abolished
> >2) It should be required only for Extra
> >3) It should be required only for Extra and General
> >4) It should be required for any license with HF privileges
> >5) It should be required for any amateur license
> >6) No opinion/don't care
> >
> >Or you might find that the majority opinion was 6). What happens in
> >that case?
>
> Or it's a tie between #6 and no response ???
>
> --
> 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

No response would probably be the commonest item even if the ballots come
with return postage paid by the government.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

2759. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-17 01:28:47 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031116202847.00545.00002355@mb-m02.aol.com>
Source record: 82336

In article <bp8sg5$6gn@library2.airnews.net>, "Kim" kimscliff@yahoo.com>
writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20031116162836.11891.00002324@mb-m11.aol.com...
>> In article <WXFtb.2770$Rk5.1497@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dwight
>> Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> writes:
>>
>> >"Dee D. Flint" wrote:
>> >>
>> >> This would be the ruination of the economy. The
>> >> government is not, never has been, and never will
>> >> be competent to manage the economy.
>> >
>> >
>> > The government has managed the economy in some form or another since
>the
>> >very beginning. And, in spite of what you say, this country with that
>> >government has done pretty darn well over those many years.
>> >
>> Agreed!
>>
>> But has the country's economy done well because of the government's
>> influence, or in spite of that influence?
>>
>> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>>
>
>I'm not so sure this country's done all that "well."

All depends what you compare us to, Kim.

>I think it's quite
>obvious we are all paying for that right now...

I'm not sure what you mean. Please elaborate.

>But, Dwight has other ideas...

I think Dwight just thinks we can do better than we're doing these days, that's
all.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2760. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-17 01:28:48 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031116202848.00545.00002357@mb-m02.aol.com>
Source record: 82335

These are the number of unexpired FCC ARS
licenses held by individuals on the dates listed:

As of May 14, 2000:

Novice - 49,329
Tech - 205,394
Tech Plus - 128,860
General - 112,677
Advanced - 99,782
Extra - 78,750
Total - 674,792

As of November 16, 2003:

Novice - 32,875 (decrease of 16,454)
Technician - 258,433 (increase of 53,039)
Technician Plus - 63,976 (decrease of 64,884)
General - 141,350 (increase of 28,673)
Advanced - 82,323 (decrease of 17,459)
Extra - 104,728 (increase of 25,978)
Total - 683,685 (increase of 8,893)

73 de Jim, N2EY

2761. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-17 01:28:48 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031116202848.00545.00002356@mb-m02.aol.com>
Source record: 82337

In article <bp8sdt$doa@library2.airnews.net>, "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
writes:

>> Weren't you folks having a place built, Kim? Or are we talking about the
>> same thing?
>
>No, no! We're not having a place built...we are ordering a manufactured
>home (trailer, whatever-you-want-to-call-it). We are all set with land, and
>explored building. But, for some reason, neither of us is particularly
>interested in dealing with having one built (there's not one good experience
>we've ever had relayed about dealing with builders...LOL).

I lump buying/setting up a new manufactured or modular home in with building,
though obviously they're not exactly the same. Main thing is you're talking
about the same project (getting a new place).

>> >Know what? One
>> >mortgage company so far has told us, "you have a lot of room to move,"
>> >meaning that we can get into something much bigger and more expensive
>> >than
>> >we are looking for. They seem shocked that we aren't interested in
>> >"maxxing" out our limit!!
>>
>> Sure. I've encountered that, too, in all sorts of transactions, Their
>> focus is
>> very narrow. And their fees and commissions are based on the selling
>> price.
>>
>> And note that reselling mortgages is pretty standard, so the people who
>> sold you the house and mortgage won't be holding the bag if you do default.

>Yep, we've already been told as soon as the "deal is done," the mortgage
>will be sold.

I wonder how those folks make their money, with all the paperwork involved, but
I suppose that if somebody handles ten million dollars in mortagages per month
and gets 0.1% commission, it adds up...
>
>> >And, you're right about bankruptcy, too. When I said to a lender that we
>> >weren't comfortable with the expense they were suggesting, they said we
>> >could afford it and didn't know what the problem was.
>>
>> Of course not. It's not their money or their house!

>Or the accomplishment of having excellent credit!

Right! You shoulda seen the looks on their faces when I started reciting my credit history.....
>
>> >I told them I think
>> >about things like potentially losing my job or my husband losing his.
>> >The
>> >come back was that we always have bankruptcy available!!!
>>
>> Now *that's* a new one! ;-)
>>
>> Point is that the lenders &tc won't protect us from ourselves. *We* have
>> to do that.
>>
>Precisely what we're doing...
>
And a good thing too....

Here's another one for ya: I bet neither of us would have any problem getting a 30 year mortgage, even though we'd be nearly 80 when said mortage was paid off (barring any advance payments). Huh?

73 de Jim, N2EY

2762. Re: Do Hams get 11 Meters Back

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-17 01:35:45 UTC
From: richcranus@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <c5ecbb69.0311161735.5e3dcc62@posting.google.com>
Source record: 82338
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.cb

JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
news:<jNydnRnSN5nVliWi4p2dnA@gbronline.com>...
> jim wrote:
>
> >
> >
> > JJ wrote:
> >
> >> charlesb wrote:
> >>
> >>> "OOTMAN" <ootman@usaor.net> wrote in message
> >>> news:vrds2mkuem63bc@corp.supernews.com...
> >>>
> >>>> W hy in hell would they want it back??????????
> >>>>
> >>>
> >>>
> >>> Better utilization of HF spectrum, and more spectrum for hams. All the
> >>> non-ham stuff should be VHF or UHF, for the obvious reason.
> >>>
> >>> Charles Brabham, N5PVL
> >>>
> >>>
> >> The hams hardly used 11 meters when they had it, what makes you think
> >> they would use it now if they got it back? Besides, the cbers have
> >> made such a mess of it, it would take years to clean the filth out.
> >>
> >
> > equating cb'ers and filth eh? in your limited world hams dont freeband?
> > guess you havn't heard the cw contests on 11 meters. so much for your
> > post...
> >
>
> In my world, *real* hams don't (notice I put the ' in don't) freeband
> (there is no "freeband" in case you haven't noticed), just those cb
> types who happen to hold a ham license. So much for your post..........

"Your" world does not equal the "real" world, JJ, in case you haven't noticed.
So much for your TROLL.

Still can't find 10 meters? I know where it is, if you need help!

2763. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-17 01:47:38 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bp996o$lc1@library2.airnews.net>
Source record: 82339

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20031116202848.00545.00002356@mb-m02.aol.com...
> In article <bp8sdt$doa@library2.airnews.net>, "Kim W5TIT"
<kimscliff@yahoo.com>
> writes:
>
> >> Weren't you folks having a place built, Kim? Or are we talking about
the
> >> same thing?
> >
> >No, no! We're not having a place built...we are ordering a manufactured
> >home (trailer, whatever-you-want-to-call-it). We are all set with land,
and
> >explored building. But, for some reason, neither of us is particularly
> >interested in dealing with having one built (there's not one good
experience
> >we've ever had relayed about dealing with builders...LOL).
>
> I lump buying/setting up a new manufactured or modular home in with
building,
> though obviously they're not exactly the same. Main thing is you're
talking
> about the same project (getting a new place).
>
> >> >Know what? One
> >> >mortgage company so far has told us, "you have a lot of room to move,"
> >> >meaning that we can get into something much bigger and more expensive
> >> >than
> >> >we are looking for. They seem shocked that we aren't interested in
> >> >"maxxing" out our limit!!
> >>
> >> Sure. I've encountered that, too, in all sorts of transactions, Their
> >> focus is
> >> very narrow. And their fees and commissions are based on the selling
> >> price.
> >>
> >> And note that reselling mortgages is pretty standard, so the people who
> >> sold you the house and mortgage won't be holding the bag if you do
default.
>
> >Yep, we've already been told as soon as the "deal is done," the mortgage
> >will be sold.
>
> I wonder how those folks make their money, with all the paperwork

involved, but
> I suppose that if somebody handles ten million dollars in mortagages per
month
> and gets 0.1% commission, it adds up...
> >
> >> >And, you're right about bankruptcy, too. When I said to a lender that
we
> >> >weren't comfortable with the expense they were suggesting, they said
we
> >> >could afford it and didn't know what the problem was.
> >>
> >> Of course not. It's not their money or their house!
>
> >Or the accomplishment of having excellent credit!
>
> Right! You shoulda seen the looks on their faces when I started reciting
my
> credit history.....
> >
> >> >I told them I think
> >> >about things like potentially losing my job or my husband losing his.
> >> >The
> >> >come back was that we always have bankruptcy available!!!
> >>
> >> Now *that's* a new one! ;-)
> >>
> >> Point is that the lenders &tc won't protect us from ourselves. *We*
have
> >> to do that.
> >>
> >Precisely what we're doing...
> >
> And a good thing too....
>
> Here's another one for ya: I bet neither of us would have any problem
getting a
> 30 year mortgage, even though we'd be nearly 80 when said mortage was paid
off
> (barring any advance payments). Huh?
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>

<snicker> Well, believe it or not, that is what we're going for. We thought about the 15-year but what we decided is we'd rather double/triple payments at our own control...just for the very reason of potential job loss.

I need to send you an email on another, personal note... I'll do it soon, remind me if I don't!

Kim W5TIT

2764. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-17 01:49:24 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bp99a2$e5g@library2.airnews.net>
Source record: 82340

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:v%Utb.10641$P%1.9424730@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
>
> "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
> news:WXFtb.2770$Rk5.1497@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> > "Dee D. Flint" wrote:
> > >
> > > This would be the ruination of the economy. The
> > > government is not, never has been, and never will
> > > be competent to manage the economy.
> >
> >
> > The government has managed the economy in some form or another since
the
> > very beginning. And, in spite of what you say, this country with that
> > government has done pretty darn well over those many years.
>
> No it's more a case of the economy has done well despite the government.
>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>

Watchit Dee! You're going to piss 'im off... :o

Kim W5TIT

2765. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-17 02:04:54 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <a1Wtb.2770$m84.1653551@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 82341

N2EY wrote:
> Here's another one for ya: I bet neither of us would have any problem getting a
> 30 year mortgage, even though we'd be nearly 80 when said mortage was paid off
> (barring any advance payments). Huh?

My xyl works in the housing industry. There are people who are in their
60's and up getting those mortgages. Go figure.

- Mike KB3EIA -

2766. Re: Language Rules from FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-17 02:17:00 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20031116211700.21232.00002102@mb-m13.aol.com>
Source record: 82342

In article <fKqdnebEou1rXSiiRVn-tg@gbronline.com>, JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
writes:

>
>Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>
>> Precisely. On amateur radio, one never knows when one will encounter
>> something which may make someone think twice about our hobby being
>> a wholesome and proper activity for a young person. When that happens,
>> whether or not what was said was "legal" within the letter of the law, the
>> potential exists for the effect to bring the ARS "...one step closer to
>> extinction."
>>
>> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>
>Larry, our society has pretty much come to the point that people don't
>care what others think of them any more.

JJ:

<sigh> Yes, isn't that the truth?

>Foul, vulgar language is used
>so much now that it is spoken in homes as if it were accepted language
>and the kids pick up on it.

Every time I run into one of those potty-mouthed kids, I feel like feeding them
the business end of a baseball bat -- after it had been accelerated to home-run
hitting velocity!

>I have heard five year olds use words that I
>would never dared to speak in front of an adult when I was a youngster.

>I have had my mouth washed out with soap (by a teacher at school no
>less, would like to see one try that now), for saying much less.

I remember one time I called one of my brothers a bastard. I was too young
to even know what the word meant. My father overheard me -- he immediately
made me go to my room, say an Act of Contrition, and immediately go to
bed for the rest of the evening. Before slamming the door of my bedroom,
he asked if I knew what a "bastard" was, and I said no. Now I do. To this
very day I wish I'd looked in the dictionary before using that word!

>I grew up in a farming community and when around the men, sure a few
>cuss words would fly occasionally, especially when the wrench slipped
>and a busted knuckle was the result, or over at the local shop where the
>farmers gathered as their trucks and tractors were being serviced, a

>hell or damn was pretty common, but never in a public place where women
>and children were around.

As a youth in my mid-teens, I used to hang around one of the local gas stations myself, so I can certainly identify with the colorful language. However, whenever a female customer came in, everyone was strictly on their best behaviour. One day this past summer, I was at a local gas/convenience store, and a lady walked in and said to the young girl behind the counter, "How come that ____ing pump won't ____ing turn on for me?" I immediately replied, "because it's probably turned off by your foul language!" You can imagine how she responded, but it's not printable here, even with a lot of blank spaces.

>There was respect for others then. It isn't
>uncommon for me to step into an elevator with my wife and hear others
>using very vulgar language with no regards to who is listening and may
>be offended by such language. The sad part is, they think it is just
>accepted that everyone has lowered themselves to such a common level.

Indeed. I myself, partly due to my having been exposed to the common element during my military service, used to occasionally allow my language to ripen a bit. I am now extremely cautious about that, and try to present myself in a very polite, considerate manner at all times.

>Ever set at the mall and just watch the people pass by? Look at the
>sloppy dress, some look like they stepped out of a cartoon. Few have
>pride in themselves anymore. And if you really want to see some
>sloppyness, go to a ham fest. It is a sad commentary on our society today.

Yes. I myself like to dress comfortably; my off-duty "uniform" consists almost exclusively of kakhis and a pullover shirt, and New Balance trainers. But my clothes are always clean and in good order -- I wouldn't want to be caught dead dressed in the sloppy, baggy, totally disorganized manner young people seem to prefer these days. I wonder who they think they're impressing. Anyone dressed like that coming to me for a job is only going to get my standard warning about the door.

73 de Larry, K3LT

2767. Re: Important Research at TAPR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-17 02:32:39 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.58.0311170227120.8383@kd6lvw.ampr.org>
Source record: 82343

On Sun, 16 Nov 2003, charlesb wrote:
> "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> wrote in message
> news:Pine.LNX.4.58.0311161245580.8194@kd6lvw.ampr.org...
> > > >
> > > > A more important question: Why do you think WE care?
> > >
> > > Another mental case who thinks that his screwed-up opinion represents
> > > everybody else's thinking.
> > >
> > > They call that - meglomania.
> > >
> > > Sorry to be the one to have break it to you, "D.", but there are
> thousands
> > > of packet radio operators in the U.S. who DO care about the hobby.
> >
> > I don't dispute that. However, there are plenty of packet operators who
> also
> > know that TAPR has been a non-functional group long before a decade ago.
> What
> > you posted isn't news to anyone (nor does it really belong on the "policy"
> > group - there are packet specific groups).
>
> There you go again, assuming that your screwed-up opinion represents
> everybody else's thinking.
>
> They call that - meglomania. Maybe you should mention this to your
> physician.

If you bothered to do any research, you would know that it's not just my opinion, but the opinion of almost every packeteer in my region. It's common knowledge that we ALL know, and have known for years (in excess of a decade).

> > > The nastygram opinions of disruptive, anti-ham jerkoffs such as yourself
> > > have no significance whatsoever.
> > >
> > > Charles Brabham, N5PVL
> >
> > And you do? By starting this thread, you have proved only that you are
> and
> > shall always remain a legend in your own mind.
>
> Hey, I'm just reporting a bit of news that not everyone may have been aware
> of. You'd be amazed how many hams think of TAPR as a packet radio
> organization, even in the ARRL. That's the extent of the significance of my
> post.

But it's not news. It's been known for years. If this is new to you, then you need to get out from under your rock more often and look around. However, I'm certain that others will agree with me; we'd just assume that you don't come out at all because you (along with a few others) never seem to have anything worthwhile to say (and/or nothing that anyone wants to listen to).

> Code/No-Code has no place in a "policy" newsgroup either, but guess what?

Actually, as it relates to the rules and testing, it does belong in the policy group. Policy is often reflected in the rules.

2768. Re: Important Research at TAPR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-17 03:09:21 UTC
From: charlesb <n5pvl@sbcglobal.net>
Message-ID: <BZWtb.31926$BK1.13353@newssvr27.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 82344

"D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> wrote in message
news:Pine.LNX.4.58.0311170227120.8383@kd6lvw.ampr.org...
> On Sun, 16 Nov 2003, charlesb wrote:
> > "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> wrote in message
> > news:Pine.LNX.4.58.0311161245580.8194@kd6lvw.ampr.org...
> > > > > >
> > > > > > A more important question: Why do you think WE care?
> > > > >
> > > > > Another mental case who thinks that his screwed-up opinion
represents
> > > > > everybody else's thinking.
> > > > >
> > > > > They call that - meglomania.
> > > > >
> > > > > Sorry to be the one to have break it to you, "D.", but there are
> > thousands
> > > > > of packet radio operators in the U.S. who DO care about the hobby.
> > > >
> > > > I don't dispute that. However, there are plenty of packet operators
who
> > also
> > > > know that TAPR has been a non-functional group long before a decade
ago.
> > What
> > > > you posted isn't news to anyone (nor does it really belong on the
"policy"
> > > > group - there are packet specific groups).
> > >
> > There you go again, assuming that your screwed-up opinion represents
> > everybody else's thinking.
> >
> > They call that - meglomania. Maybe you should mention this to your
> > physician.
>
> If you bothered to do any research, you would know that it's not just my
> opinion, but the opinion of almost every packeteer in my region. It's
common
> knowledge that we ALL know, and have known for years (in excess of a
decade).

There you go again... Yep, after three in a row I'd say it's definately a
case of meglomania. I think they make a new drug for that, maybe you should
ask your physician.

>
> > > > The nastygram opinions of disruptive, anti-ham jerkoffs such as
yourself
> > > > have no significance whatsoever.
> > > >
> > > > Charles Brabham, N5PVL
> > >
> > > And you do? By starting this thread, you have proved only that you
are
> > and
> > > shall always remain a legend in your own mind.
> >
> > Hey, I'm just reporting a bit of news that not everyone may have been
aware
> > of. You'd be amazed how many hams think of TAPR as a packet radio
> > organization, even in the ARRL. That's the extent of the significance of
my
> > post.
>
> But it's not news. It's been known for years.

Not really. The events I described in the post were reported in the last TAPR PSR, concerning actions of the TAPR BoD last month, not ten years ago. Everybody else figured out that TAPR was adrift ten years ago as you say, but the TAPR BoD only figured it out recently. They're a little slow, but they finally figured it out.

That was the story. I don't see how you could have failed to be amused by their antics, actually appointing somebody to uncover the mystery of what TAPR is good for. The BoD put their heads together and tried, but they couldn't figure it out for themselves.

Now that's entertainment! Don't tell me that you didn't get a giggle out of all that!

> If this is new to you, then you
> need to get out from under your rock more often and look around. However,
I'm
> certain that others will agree with me; we'd just assume that you don't
come out
> at all because you (along with a few others) never seem to have anything
> worthwhile to say (and/or nothing that anyone wants to listen to).

Blah blah blah; Ya Ya Yah. Whatever. Twenty-three skidoo, back on you. Nya nyah!

>
> > Code/No-Code has no place in a "policy" newsgroup either, but guess
what?
>
> Actually, as it relates to the rules and testing, it does belong in the
policy
> group. Policy is often reflected in the rules.

Yes, and TAPR has mistakenly been viewed as the "National Packet Organization" by the ARRL and most average hams for quite some time, adversely affecting policy regarding digital modes and packet radio.

Unfortunately, your meglomanaical view that everybody in the world agrees with whatever you happen to be thinking is not supported by the evidence. In fact, opinions among hams tend to vary quite a bit, on any number of subjects.

Crawl out from under your rock, OM; Take a look around! :-p

For those of you who are unfamiliar with D. Stussy, he is a bit of a curiosity... A hardcore "LandLine Lid" who doesn't like TAPR... That is most unusual, because the whole idea of being a LandLine Lid was more or less invented at TAPR, and most LandLine Lids (digital) identify strongly with the organization. After all, the Internet is the latest advance in the art of radio, right?

LandLine Lid: Hams who communicate over the Internet and pretend that it is amateur radio.

Charles Brabham, N5PVL

2769. Re: Do Hams get 11 Meters Back

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-17 04:50:43 UTC
From: gw@webhideout.com
Message-ID: <235a74db.0311162050.56e12d38@posting.google.com>
Source record: 82345
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.cb

JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
news:<jNydnRnSN5nVliWi4p2dnA@gbronline.com>...
> jim wrote:
>
> >
> >
> > JJ wrote:
> >
> >> charlesb wrote:
> >>
> >>> "OOTMAN" <ootman@usaor.net> wrote in message
> >>> news:vrds2mkuem63bc@corp.supernews.com...
> >>>
> >>>> W hy in hell would they want it back??????????
> >>>>
> >>>
> >>>
> >>> Better utilization of HF spectrum, and more spectrum for hams. All the
> >>> non-ham stuff should be VHF or UHF, for the obvious reason.
> >>>
> >>> Charles Brabham, N5PVL
> >>>
> >>>
> >> The hams hardly used 11 meters when they had it, what makes you think
> >> they would use it now if they got it back? Besides, the cbers have
> >> made such a mess of it, it would take years to clean the filth out.
> >>
> >
> > equating cb'ers and filth eh? in your limited world hams dont freeband?
> > guess you havn't heard the cw contests on 11 meters. so much for your
> > post...
> >
>
> In my world, *real* hams don't (notice I put the ' in don't) freeband
> (there is no "freeband" in case you haven't noticed), just those cb
> types who happen to hold a ham license. So much for your post..........

well if the hams took back 11 meters....what would they do about all
the skip talkers on channel 6???? those old black men would not like
you hammies trying to run them off and they would jump up and down and
stomp a radiowave mudhole in the back of your necks and walk it
dry.....no doubt about it.....

2770. Re: Important Research at TAPR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-17 07:41:32 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.58.0311170733300.8464@kd6lvw.ampr.org>
Source record: 82346

On Mon, 17 Nov 2003, charlesb wrote:
> "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> wrote in message
> news:Pine.LNX.4.58.0311170227120.8383@kd6lvw.ampr.org...
> > On Sun, 16 Nov 2003, charlesb wrote:
> > > "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> wrote in message
> > > news:Pine.LNX.4.58.0311161245580.8194@kd6lvw.ampr.org...
> > > > >
> > > > > A more important question: Why do you think WE care?
> > > > >
> > > > Another mental case who thinks that his screwed-up opinion
> represents
> > > > everybody else's thinking.
> > > >
> > > They call that - meglomania.
> > > >
> > > > Sorry to be the one to have break it to you, "D.", but there are
> > > thousands
> > > > of packet radio operators in the U.S. who DO care about the hobby.
> > > >
> > > I don't dispute that. However, there are plenty of packet operators
> who
> > > also
> > > > know that TAPR has been a non-functional group long before a decade
> ago.
> > > What
> > > > you posted isn't news to anyone (nor does it really belong on the
> "policy"
> > > > group - there are packet specific groups).
> > >
> > There you go again, assuming that your screwed-up opinion represents
> > everybody else's thinking.
> >
> > They call that - meglomania. Maybe you should mention this to your
> > physician.
> >
> > If you bothered to do any research, you would know that it's not just my
> > opinion, but the opinion of almost every packeteer in my region. It's
> common
> > knowledge that we ALL know, and have known for years (in excess of a
> decade).
>
> There you go again... Yep, after three in a row I'd say it's definately a
> case of meglomania. I think they make a new drug for that, maybe you should
> ask your physician.

That's right - just keep believing that..... And pigs fly too.

> >
> > > > > The nastygram opinions of disruptive, anti-ham jerkoffs such as
> yourself
> > > > > > have no significance whatsoever.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Charles Brabham, N5PVL
> > > > >
> > > > > And you do? By starting this thread, you have proved only that you
> are
> > > > and
> > > > > shall always remain a legend in your own mind.
> > > >
> > > Hey, I'm just reporting a bit of news that not everyone may have been
> aware
> > > of. You'd be amazed how many hams think of TAPR as a packet radio
> > > organization, even in the ARRL. That's the extent of the significance of
> my
> > > post.
> >
> > But it's not news. It's been known for years.
>
> Not really. The events I described in the post were reported in the last
> TAPR PSR, concerning actions of the TAPR BoD last month, not ten years ago.
> Everybody else figured out that TAPR was adrift ten years ago as you say,
> but the TAPR BoD only figured it out recently. They're a little slow, but
> they finally figured it out.
>
> That was the story. I don't see how you could have failed to be amused by
> their antics, actually appointing somebody to uncover the mystery of what
> TAPR is good for. The BoD put their heads together and tried, but they
> couldn't figure it out for themselves.
>
> Now that's entertainment! Don't tell me that you didn't get a giggle out of
> all that!

Nope. I couldn't care less. Same with everyone else - no one else cares
either.

> > If this is new to you, then you
> > need to get out from under your rock more often and look around. However,
> I'm
> > certain that others will agree with me; we'd just assume that you don't
> come out
> > at all because you (along with a few others) never seem to have anything
> > worthwhile to say (and/or nothing that anyone wants to listen to).
>
> Blah blah blah; Ya Ya Yah. Whatever. Twenty-three skidoo, back on you. Nya
> nyah!

Well, that certainly demonstrates to anyone who had any doubt about you to now add you to their twit filter.

> > > Code/No-Code has no place in a "policy" newsgroup either, but guess
> what?
> >
> > Actually, as it relates to the rules and testing, it does belong in the
> policy
> > group. Policy is often reflected in the rules.
>
> Yes, and TAPR has mistakenly been viewed as the "National Packet
> Organization" by the ARRL and most average hams for quite some time,
> adversely affecting policy regarding digital modes and packet radio.

They have NEVER been viewed as such in this region of the country, nor do I have any evidence that what you state directly above was ever true, nor do I care.

> Unfortunately, your meglomanaical view that everybody in the world agrees
> with whatever you happen to be thinking is not supported by the evidence. In
> fact, opinions among hams tend to vary quite a bit, on any number of
> subjects.

I don't see anyone else refuting my view.....

> Crawl out from under your rock, OM; Take a look around! :-p
>
> For those of you who are unfamiliar with D. Stussy, he is a bit of a
> curiosity... A hardcore "LandLine Lid" who doesn't like TAPR... That is
> most unusual, because the whole idea of being a LandLine Lid was more or
> less invented at TAPR, and most LandLine Lids (digital) identify strongly
> with the organization. After all, the Internet is the latest advance in the
> art of radio, right?

Wrong again. I have never substituted a wireline link of any sort for a wireless one, nor have I claimed to. What is your source that says that I have?

I never said that I didn't like (or dislike) TAPR. I don't live anywhere near Tucson, Arizona, nor have I ever. It is your misguided belief that they are more than a local organization that has confused the issue. They were and always have been nothing more than a local group of people with a common hobby, and to give them anything remotely resembling regional let alone national credence is simply delusional.

> LandLine Lid: Hams who communicate over the Internet and pretend that it is
> amateur radio.

I know what it means - and so does everyone else here (you don't see anyone asking, do you?).

2771. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-17 09:34:35 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031117043435.12501.00004007@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 82347

In article <bp996o$lc1@library2.airnews.net>, "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
writes:

>> Here's another one for ya: I bet neither of us would have any problem
>> getting a
>> 30 year mortgage, even though we'd be nearly 80 when said mortage was
>> paidoff (barring any advance payments). Huh?

>> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
><snicker> Well, believe it or not, that is what we're going for. We
>thought about the 15-year but what we decided is we'd rather double/triple
>payments at our own control...just for the very reason of potential job
>loss.

Get yerself an amortization printout and notice how little you pay off the
principal each month on a 30 year. Which means if you can come up with just
that much extra each month, you can take a month off for each month - or more.
And as you say, if you run into trouble you just don't put in the extra for a
while.

There's also a completely opposite philosophy that some folks use. They figure
it's *better* to *not* pay off the mortgage any faster than you have to,
because the interest is deductible if you itemize, and the lowest rate the
average person can get is for a first mortgage of their primary residence.
Instead, they say, pay off all your other debt or don't get into it in the
first place.
>
>I need to send you an email on another, personal note... I'll do it soon,
>remind me if I don't!
>
Consider yourself reminded!

73 es GL in the new place de Jim, N2EY

2772. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-17 09:34:36 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031117043436.12501.00004008@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 82348

In article <cuvyxnansvbet.hogrlu7.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>, "Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> writes:

>On 16 Nov 2003 01:28:42 GMT, N2EY wrote:
>
>>>Me too. All this roundabout bravo sierra could be bypassed if there was a
>>>ballot sent to all approx. 700,000 U.S. licensed hams.
>
>>Suppose someone did, indeed, poll everyone with a US ham license.
>
> First question: who is going to front the six figures required to
> send out the ballots even by bulk mail? The FCC?

Never happen. And with return postage guaranteed it could get close to seven figures.

>
> No way - contrary to urban legend, for the last 10 years or so, all
> government agencies pay full postage rates on everything they mail -
> except for Congressional mailings, of course.

Isn't it neat how Congress passes all sorts of rules for everyone else but exempts itself from those very rules? Classic case of "do as I say, not as I do"...

>>"What is your opinion of code testing for an amateur license?"
>>
>>1) It should be totally abolished
>>2) It should be required only for Extra
>>3) It should be required only for Extra and General
>>4) It should be required for any license with HF privileges
>>5) It should be required for any amateur license
>>6) No opinion/don't care
>>
>>Or you might find that the majority opinion was 6). What happens in
>>that case?
>
> Or it's a tie between #6 and no response ???

'zactly. But I don't think it would be that bad.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2773. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-17 11:31:12 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <4k2ub.6092$Wy4.2894@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 82349

"N2EY" wrote:
>
> But has the country's economy done well because
> of the government's influence, or in spite of that
> influence?

I guess the answer to that lies in whether you've personally benefited from that influence or not (or, to some extent, which piece of that influence you focus on). Certainly corporations and taxpayers aren't always thrilled by the influence, but those who benefited from the "New Deal," cheap transportation on modern highways, the minimum wage, women's participation in the workplace, and other things that impacted the economy, may have a slightly different opinion.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

2774. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-17 11:33:19 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <3m2ub.6093$Wy4.1816@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 82350

"Dee D. Flint" wrote:
>
> No it's more a case of the economy has done well
> despite the government.

Addressed that in my reply to Jim's message.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

2775. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-17 11:40:54 UTC
From: Alun <alun@1stcounsel.com>
Message-ID: <Xns943643F1E8DC6elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 82401

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in
news:20031116113606.23171.00002120@mb-m05.aol.com:

> In article <Xns943564E221DAAelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun
> <alun@1stcounsel.com> writes:
>
>>"Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in
>>news:EJvsb.9152$hn3.3187776@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net:
>>
>>> "Rupert" <big@bird.sesame.street> wrote in message
>>> news:Govsb.10542$6c3.633@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net...
>>>> Len Over 21 wrote:
>>>>
>>>> > As of 6 PM EST on 11 November 2003, the number of ECFS documents
>>>> > on public view are:
>>>>
>>>> What would be interesting is to find out how many are for the
>>>> change, and how many want to keep the code.
>>>
>>> Me too. All this roundabout bravo sierra could be bypassed if there
>>> was a ballot sent to all approx. 700,000 U.S. licensed hams. As long
>>> as quorum is met, it's on! This concept (Democracy) frightens the
>>> bejesus out of many folks who claim to speak for those not yet
>>> licensed.
>>>
>>> But that's an empty argument. Get licensed and vote, tah dah! The big
>>> bad "barrier" does not preclude anyone from getting their no-code
>>> Tech ticket and executing a vote.
>>>
>>> Simply announce a "record date" by which one must be licensed (To
>>> give those "yet to be licensed a fair shot at a voice in the
>>> process.) and send a ballot out to all those licensed "of record."
>>> Makes too much sense and requires some effort. IOW, against the
>>> contemporary trend.
>>>
>>> 73 de Bert
>>> WA2SI
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>
>>Those who have not obtained a licence because of the code trest are
>>just as entitled to express their opinion to the FCC as you or I.
>>

> Sure - nobody is saying that should change.
>
> However, note that there has been an amateur radio license with no code
> test available here in the USA for almost 13 years now. That license
> gives full VHF/UHF operating privileges and requires only a 35 question
> written test.
>
> A code test is only required for access to the HF/MF amateur bands.
>
> So anyone who wants to obtain an amateur license can do so without any
> code test.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>
>
>

Technically, that's true, but there's no longer any ITU requirement for a code test for any band. I think at one time there were a lot of people who wanted HF who would have been waiting for the code test to go. This is probably no longer true, as the hobby has lost a lot of it's popularity since the Internet, and as the test speed is now only 5wpm.

However, my point is just that polling only licenced hams is just not appropriate, as hams are not the only interested parties.

2776. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-17 12:03:29 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <IO2ub.6096$Wy4.2249@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 82402

"JJ" wrote:
>
> Might as well give it up Dwight, I find it futile
> to discuss class or good taste with someone
> who choses a call sign like Kim's.

I'm still waiting for her "wicca friends" to cast a spell on me to prove they actually can (a conversation we had many months ago). I posted that challenge after she expressed support for wiccan beliefs and got angry when I said it was all nonsense. After the challenge, she claimed Wicca's don't believe in spells. I then showed at least a dozen web sites, out of hundreds, where Wicca's do indeed claim they can cast spells and charms (including the type of spell in my challenge).

As for her callsign, Larry has taken that just about as far as it can go. I'm not offended by her callsign, but I certainly do think she could have made a better choice.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

2777. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-17 12:08:16 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <QS2ub.6098$Wy4.3254@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 82403

"Phil Kane" wrote:
>>
> From a Clearing in the Silicon Forest
> Beaverton (Washington County) Oregon

Hey, when did you move to Oregon, Phil? You were in SF the last time we talked, weren't you? If so, you move more then we do.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

2778. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-17 12:18:35 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <v03ub.6103$Wy4.1796@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 82404

"N2EY" wrote:
>
> Could be - what is it that you expect?

Ah, you ought to know the answer to that, Jim. Absolutely everything! I want to live in the country but have all the benefits of the city as close as possible. I want warm weather, but not too warm. I want a business nearby, but don't want to live near anywhere with enough traffic to actually support that business. I want to live near family, but certainly not too close (and haven't decide what too close is). I want to live near water, but don't want to pay the premium prices often associated with living near water. I think you get the idea. ;-)

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

2779. Re: Language Rules from FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-17 12:27:24 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <M83ub.6109$Wy4.3191@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 82405

"Larry Roll K3LT" wrote:
>
> (snip) One day this past summer, I was at a local
> gas/convenience store, and a lady walked in and
> said to the young girl behind the counter, "How
> come that ____ing pump won't ____ing turn on
> for me?" I immediately replied, "because it's
> probably turned off by your foul language!" You
> can imagine how she responded, but it's not
> printable here, even with a lot of blank spaces.

LOL. That is funny, Larry. I would have paid to have been there to see
that.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

2780. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-17 15:48:43 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3FB8EDDB.7080604@psu.edu>
Source record: 82406

Kim W5TIT wrote:
> "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
> news:l9Otb.5052$Wy4.4575@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net...
>
>>"Kim W5TIT" wrote:
>>
>>>Maybe, Dwight, you can put what you said
>>>a different way, so that it doesn't sound like
>>>you are thinking consumers are too busy
>>>and stupid. Could ya do that for me?
>>
>>
>> No. I've clarified what I said at least five or six times. I have no
>>intention of doing so again.
>>
>>
>>Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>>
>
>
> Yeah, it's always the easy way out...
>
> Kim W5TIT

It's easy all right, until the person tries to get things going again. I worked with a person who's SO declared bankruptcy after getting into a dumb purchase. It took years to get their credit back to something like normal. The one partner had to separate their credit from the other's, and then work the whole way up from the bottom. And that didn't help the person who went bankrupt, only allowed the other to get credit.

- Mike KB3EIA -

2781. RRAP call signs in SS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-17 17:22:50 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <Kt7ub.5041$Rk5.4706@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 82407

Worked N8UZE and W4NTI this past weekend. Where were the rest of you? I coulda used the Q's!

I think the ionosphere was tilted because there was a LOT of one way propagation. Maybe someone put diodes in my transmission lines?

&#65533;&#65533;&#65533; 73, de Hans, K0HB
--
Help support youth involved in Amateur Radio.
http://www.mnyarc.org
http://www.k0bsa.org

2782. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-17 17:43:24 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <0N7ub.5053$Rk5.2380@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 82408

"Rupert" <big@bird.sesame.street> wrote in message

>Simply announce a "record date" by which one must be licensed (To give
those
>"yet to be licensed a fair shot at a voice in the process.) and send a
>ballot out to all those licensed "of record." Makes too much sense and
>requires some effort. IOW, against the contemporary trend.

Regulatory matters are not decided by ballot or popularity polls. They are decided by an unemotional look at the facts and what is in the public interest. Thus the *quantity* of comments on the petitions is of no consequence --- all that matters are the facts and arguments presented. Most of the comments I have read are noticeably short on persuasive arguments for either side of the issue.

73, de Hans, K0HB

PS: Even if it were decided by "vote", the vote would be by the entire citizenry, not only those few already favored with a license.

2783. Re: Do Hams get 11 Meters Back

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-17 18:01:07 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <J86dnTh7fcKSkySiRVn-jw@gbronline.com>
Source record: 82409
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.cb

gw wrote:
> JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
news:<jNydnRnSN5nVliWi4p2dnA@gbronline.com>...
>
>>jim wrote:
>>
>>
>>>
>>>JJ wrote:
>>>
>>>
>>>>charlesb wrote:
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>"OOTMAN" <ootman@usaor.net> wrote in message
>>>>>news:vrds2mkuem63bc@corp.supernews.com...
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>W hy in hell would they want it back??????????
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>Better utilization of HF spectrum, and more spectrum for hams. All the
>>>>>non-ham stuff should be VHF or UHF, for the obvious reason.
>>>>>
>>>>>Charles Brabham, N5PVL
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>
>>>>The hams hardly used 11 meters when they had it, what makes you think
>>>>they would use it now if they got it back? Besides, the cbers have
>>>>made such a mess of it, it would take years to clean the filth out.
>>>>
>>>
>>>equating cb'ers and filth eh? in your limited world hams dont freeband?
>>>guess you havn't heard the cw contests on 11 meters. so much for your
>>>post...
>>>
>>
>>In my world, *real* hams don't (notice I put the ' in don't) freeband
>>(there is no "freeband" in case you haven't noticed), just those cb
>>types who happen to hold a ham license. So much for your post.....
>

>
>
> well if the hams took back 11 meters....what would they do about all
> the skip talkers on channel 6???? those old black men would not like
> you hammies trying to run them off and they would jump up and down and
> stomp a radiowave mudhole in the back of your necks and walk it
> dry.........no doubt about it......

You seem to have a reading comprehension problem. I will type slowly so
you maybe can understand. T H E H A M S D O N O T W A N T
E L E V E N M E T E R S B A C K. To use your silly cb lingo, "no
doubt about it".

2784. Re: Do Hams get 11 Meters Back

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-17 18:14:38 UTC
From: charlesb <n5pvl@sbcglobal.net>
Message-ID: <ie8ub.26064$CC6.24389@newssvr25.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 82410
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.cb

"JJ" <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
news:J86dnTh7fcKSkySiRVn-jw@gbronline.com...
>
> You seem to have a reading comprehension problem. I will type slowly so
> you maybe can understand. T H E H A M S D O N O T W A N T
> E L E V E N M E T E R S B A C K. To use your silly cb lingo, "no
> doubt about it".
>

Speak for yourself, OM!

Charles Brabham, N5PVL

2785. Re: Do Hams get to use 11 Meters

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-17 19:13:39 UTC
From: Radioman <radio@ptt.edu>
Message-ID: <3FB91DE3.F17DEBDE@ptt.edu>
Source record: 82411
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.cb

> > You seem to have a reading comprehension problem. I will type slowly so
> > you maybe can understand. T H E H A M S D O N O T W A N T
> > E L E V E N M E T E R S B A C K. To use your silly cb lingo, "no
> > doubt about it".
> >
>
> Speak for yourself, OM!
>
> Charles Brabham, N5PVL

Do you want it back? You can still use CB if you have an amateur ticket.
You're just not supposed to use your ham radio on it or cuss like a sailor.

2786. Re: Do Hams get 11 Meters Back

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-17 19:18:43 UTC
From: Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com>
Message-ID: <20031117141843.154$s1@newsreader.com>
Source record: 82412
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.cb

JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote:
> You seem to have a reading comprehension problem. I will type slowly so
> you maybe can understand. T H E H A M S D O N O T W A N T
> E L E V E N M E T E R S B A C K. To use your silly cb lingo, "no
> doubt about it".
>
This is true. They don't even use 10 meters much.

2787. Re: Do Hams get 11 Meters Back

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-17 19:45:22 UTC
From: N8WWM@dickmysuck.com
Message-ID: <f92f4353.0311171145.38e5a530@posting.google.com>
Source record: 82413
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.cb

richcranus@yahoo.com (Richard Cranium) wrote in message
news:<c5ecbb69.0311161735.5e3dcc62@posting.google.com>...
> JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
news:<jNydnRnSN5nVliWi4p2dnA@gbronline.com>...
> > jim wrote:
> >
> > >
> > >
> > > JJ wrote:
> > >
> > >> charlesb wrote:
> > >>
> > >>> "OOTMAN" <ootman@usaor.net> wrote in message
> > >>> news:vrds2mkuem63bc@corp.supernews.com...
> > >>>
> > >>>> W hy in hell would they want it back??????????
> > >>>>
> > >>>
> > >>>
> > >>> Better utilization of HF spectrum, and more spectrum for hams. All the
> > >>> non-ham stuff should be VHF or UHF, for the obvious reason.
> > >>>
> > >>> Charles Brabham, N5PVL
> > >>>
> > >>>
> > >> The hams hardly used 11 meters when they had it, what makes you think
> > >> they would use it now if they got it back? Besides, the cbers have
> > >> made such a mess of it, it would take years to clean the filth out.
> > >>
> > >
> > > equating cb'ers and filth eh? in your limited world hams dont freeband?
> > > guess you havn't heard the cw contests on 11 meters. so much for your
> > > post...
> > >
> >
> > In my world, *real* hams don't (notice I put the ' in don't) freeband
> > (there is no "freeband" in case you haven't noticed), just those cb
> > types who happen to hold a ham license. So much for your post.....
>
> "Your" world does not equal the "real" world, JJ, in case you haven't noticed.
> So much for your TROLL.
>
> Still can't find 10 meters? I know where it is, if you need help!

I bet you do know, cranus the anus. "Freeband" operators are slime, and so are you...who cares if they have a ham license or not...they are all slime. You keykweenz use that bit about hams going there too to try to negate your own guilt, that's all.

2788. Re: RRAP call signs in SS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-17 22:28:16 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3FB94B7E.8050407@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 82414

Kï¿½HB wrote:

>Worked N8UZE and W4NTI this past weekend. Where were the rest of you? I
>coulda used the Q's!
>
I was on briefly, but had to do the leaves in the yard.

>
>I think the ionosphere was tilted because there was a LOT of one way
>propagation. Maybe someone put diodes in my transmission lines?
>
>
>
I've had that happen fairly often as well. My rig's receiver seems to
"hear further" than
my rigs transmitter can "shout". But I heard a local ham also not get
heard by some
DX that didn't hear me. Probably a few too many contesters QRMing each
other.
It happens, no malice assumed or expected.

2789. Re: Language Rules from FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-17 22:35:13 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3FB94D1F.8020208@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 82415

Phil Kane wrote:

>>>>
>>>>
>
> Quite a while back, there was a case against an amateur operator in
> Los Angeles, and the ALJ ruled that the standards of broadcast
> indecency articulated in the _Pacifica_ case (the "Seven Dirty Words"
> case) also applied to the ARS because ARS transmissions are readily
> available to the general public (i.e. are not protected by privacy
> or secrecy statutes).
>
Well, today I heard the f word and the s word on an FM broadcast station
WLIR at about 12:50PM.
In a song. And it's not a RAP station. Oddly enough civilization did
not end at 1PM.....

>
>
>
>>>Who makes the list then?
>>>
>>>
>
> George Carlin, at last count.
>
>
Is it an urban legend, or is there a reference to George Carlin's
published work
that contains that list in FCC "case law" or in an FCC rule? That way,
the FCC
doesn't have to mention directly the bad words, but just refers to a
reference?

>
>

2790. Re: Language Rules from FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-17 23:01:36 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3FB9534F.3010202@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 82416

>
>
>
>
>>Foul, vulgar language is used
>>so much now that it is spoken in homes as if it were accepted language
>>and the kids pick up on it.
>>
>>
>
>Every time I run into one of those potty-mouthed kids, I feel like feeding them
>the business end of a baseball bat -- after it had been accelerated to home-run
>hitting velocity!
>
>
Way back in the late 60's when I was in Catholic high school, and away
from adults
with direct authority over us (parents or teachers or cops) we sometimes
had
contests to who could out-vulgar each other. Like yelling dirty
comments from the
school bus as we passed our arch rival (football league) school.
Probably as
"venting steam" when away from the excessive discipline they used to do
in Catholic
schools back then (each nun was issued 15 inch rulers...). What they
call "child
abuse" nowadays. If "fear-loathing-hatred" = "respect", then we "respected"
authority. It didn't help things any when the entire class got punished for
something, whether or not if you individually were guilty of whatever it
was.

/rant

Anyway, the kids are likely just blowing off steam, purposly being
annoying to adults as a kind of payback for their teachers and parents
annoying them. You see it say when high school kids walk in the street
partially blocking traffic in areas where sidewalks are avaliable.
And kids using bad language in the Mall, "what are they gonna do
to us?".

Most young adults grow out of this by the time they get real jobs
(not McJobs) and ham licenses.

2791. Re: Happy Veterans Day

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-17 23:32:07 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0311171532.124bff21@posting.google.com>
Source record: 82417

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0311152143.74447b81@posting.google.com>...
> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0311151550.18aa6c8c@posting.google.com>...
> > k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0311150307.203b74d1@posting.google.com>...
> > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3FB5B3C8.70728E0E@earthlink.net>...
> > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > >
>
> > > > > Now go follow the link in the "Armistice Day" thread and quit bugging
> > > > > me with your self-imposed stupidity.
> > > >
> > > > I'm not the individual who bungled copying material from a web page.
> > >
> > > Whew!...I thouhgt I was the only one who appreciated Brain's
> > > unique posting habits ! ! ! !
> > >
> > > 73
> > >
> > > Steve, K4YZ
> >
> > I hope you aren't stalking me.
>
> If I do, I'll just need to follow the little slime trail in the
> sand, Brain...No problem...
>
> Steve, K4YZ

Stebe, you could try standing up on your hind legs, like a man, and
make your crappy little comments directly to me. And for what its
worth, no one appreciates your unique posting habits. No one. Nada.
Zip. Zed. Zero.

Don't believe me? Just ask.

didit?

2792. Re: RRAP call signs in SS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-17 23:55:45 UTC
From: John Siegel <JohnASiegel@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3FB95FFE.90208@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 82418

Kï¿½HB wrote:
> Worked N8UZE and W4NTI this past weekend. Where were the rest of you? I
> coulda used the Q's!
>
> I think the ionosphere was tilted because there was a LOT of one way
> propagation. Maybe someone put diodes in my transmission lines?
>
> ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½ 73, de Hans, K0HB
> --
> Help support youth involved in Amateur Radio.
> http://www.mnyarc.org
> http://www.k0bsa.org
>
>
>
Wasn't able to get on until Sunday afternoon and just for a short while.
I did give you a QSO.
73, John K4BNC

2793. Re: RRAP call signs in SS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-18 00:18:27 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <nzdub.5514$Rk5.5429@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 82419

Short skip was really loud on 20 on Saturday. You were slammin in here.

I use a vertical loop at about 45 feet to the top. Really does well on NVIS stuff.

Great hearing you.

Don't think I heard Dee.

Dan/W4NTI

"K&#65533;HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:Kt7ub.5041$Rk5.4706@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> Worked N8UZE and W4NTI this past weekend. Where were the rest of you? I
> coulda used the Q's!
>
> I think the ionosphere was tilted because there was a LOT of one way
> propagation. Maybe someone put diodes in my transmission lines?
>
> &#65533;&#65533;&#65533; 73, de Hans, K0HB
> --
> Help support youth involved in Amateur Radio.
> http://www.mnyarc.org
> http://www.k0bsa.org
>
>
>

2794. James Dale and the family of convicts. Did Jessica get her boombox back?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-18 00:20:27 UTC
From: bob <bob@bob.com>
Message-ID: <kAdub.23957$oo.3606@bignews4.bellsouth.net>
Source record: 82420
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.swap,rec.radio.amateur.policy

From the Hillsborough County Court Records:

First Name: JAMES
Middle Name: WILLIAM
Last Name: DALE
Date of Birth: 01/01/1941
Race: White
Sex: Male
Height: 6'00"
Hair:
Eye Color:
--------------- Detail Charges Found ---------------
State: FLHLS
Case #: 97-CF-004272
County Name: HillsboroO
Description: POSS OF MARIJUANA W/INTENT TO
Class: FELONY FIRST DEGREE
Statute:
File Date: 02/19/1997

>> LOL Write your
>> letters, felon and I can prove you are, unlike your dreams of me
being a felon.
>> Turn it over to the NSC. They might appoint a special investigator.

First Name: JAMES
Middle Name: WILLIAM
Last Name: DALE
Date of Birth: 01/01/1941
Race: White
Sex: Male
Height: 6'00"
Hair:
Eye Color:
--------------- Detail Charges Found ---------------
State: FLHLS
Case #: 97-CF-004272
County Name: HillsboroO
Description: POSS OF MARIJUANA W/INTENT TO
Class: FELONY FIRST DEGREE
Statute:
File Date: 02/19/1997

You are a convicted FELON, MUHAHAHAHAHA

And why didn't you show up at my door, you mealy-mouthed, yellow
son of a bitch?

>> bob
>>
wrote:--
>> ------
>> Thus, KE4TEW, a convicted felon who jammed HF frequencies for years
>> while id'ing, did not show up for a retest. Why? That's easy. He paid
>> for his license. Then Riley does what he has done with the others who
>> did not show up, he cancels the license. Good Riddance to this nuisance.
>> Then almost two months later, Riley reinstates the license, WITHOUT THE
>> ORIGINAL RETEST!!!! "Pursuant to our agreement with you" What the hell
>> does that mean?? In other words, even though we know you are not
>> qualified to be on the air, go ahead anyway???? What the hell kind of
>> enforcement is this? It's biased enforcement, Riley's trademark style.
>> So what was the agreement? Harass people on the Internet 24/7? Continue
>> to jam the Liberty Net? Is he paying Riley a monthly fee to be on
>> Amateur Radio? Riley's little slush fund. Did TEW give Riley a large
>> amount of illicit drugs? What was it that made Riley reinstate this
>> known drug dealers ticket that was fraudulent in the first place?
>> Maybe Riley does Rita on weekends?
>>
>> If you are wondering what kind of ethics violation Riley committed in
>> granting TEW's ticket back under the table contact the Inspector General
>> of the FCC as several already have. Ask Mr. Feaster to add your name to
>> the ethics probe of the KE4TEW case. Then one day you too will know how
>> to bribe an FCC official and make him make unethical decisions on your
>> behalf.

KE4TEW wrote:
> An article in this mornings paper said James O'Brien has been convicted of
> stealing money by deception and will soon be serving time in the correctional
> unit where license plates are made. Apparently Mr. O'Brien ripped off quite a
> few people. The article didn't say if CBers or Hams were involved. Shades of
> broken T-Bird winders!!! The picture looked like his head was shaved. Maybe
> prep for the 'lectric chair??? This article was on pg. 4 of the NY daily news,
> today.

2795. Re: LOL!!! KE4TEW is a convict and so is his son!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-18 00:23:38 UTC
From: bob <bob@bob.com>
Message-ID: <uDdub.23972$oo.22393@bignews4.bellsouth.net>
Source record: 82421
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.swap,rec.radio.amateur.policy

KE4TEW took time from dealing drugs and bribing Riley and posted the the
following lies:

From the Hillsborough County Court Records:

First Name: JAMES
Middle Name: WILLIAM
Last Name: DALE
Date of Birth: 01/01/1941
Race: White
Sex: Male
Height: 6'00"
Hair:
Eye Color:
--------------- Detail Charges Found ---------------
State: FLHLS
Case #: 97-CF-004272
County Name: HillsboroO
Description: POSS OF MARIJUANA W/INTENT TO
Class: FELONY FIRST DEGREE
Statute:
File Date: 02/19/1997

>> LOL Write your
>> letters, felon and I can prove you are, unlike your dreams of me
being a felon.
>> Turn it over to the NSC. They might appoint a special investigator.

First Name: JAMES
Middle Name: WILLIAM
Last Name: DALE
Date of Birth: 01/01/1941
Race: White
Sex: Male
Height: 6'00"
Hair:
Eye Color:
--------------- Detail Charges Found ---------------
State: FLHLS
Case #: 97-CF-004272
County Name: HillsboroO
Description: POSS OF MARIJUANA W/INTENT TO
Class: FELONY FIRST DEGREE
Statute:

File Date: 02/19/1997

You are a convicted FELON, MUHAHAHAHAHA

And why didn't you show up at my door, you mealy-mouthed, yellow
son of a bitch?

>> bob
>>
wrote:----------
>> ------
>> Thus, KE4TEW, a convicted felon who jammed HF frequencies for years
>> while id'ing, did not show up for a retest. Why? That's easy. He paid
>> for his license. Then Riley does what he has done with the others who
>> did not show up, he cancels the license. Good Riddance to this nuisance.
>> Then almost two months later, Riley reinstates the license, WITHOUT THE
>> ORIGINAL RETEST!!!! "Pursuant to our agreement with you" What the hell
>> does that mean?? In other words, even though we know you are not
>> qualified to be on the air, go ahead anyway???? What the hell kind of
>> enforcement is this? It's biased enforcement, Riley's trademark style.
>> So what was the agreement? Harass people on the Internet 24/7? Continue
>> to jam the Liberty Net? Is he paying Riley a monthly fee to be on
>> Amateur Radio? Riley's little slush fund. Did TEW give Riley a large
>> amount of illicit drugs? What was it that made Riley reinstate this
>> known drug dealers ticket that was fraudulent in the first place?
>> Maybe Riley does Rita on weekends?
>>
>> If you are wondering what kind of ethics violation Riley committed in
>> granting TEW's ticket back under the table contact the Inspector General
>> of the FCC as several already have. Ask Mr. Feaster to add your name to
>> the ethics probe of the KE4TEW case. Then one day you too will know how
>> to bribe an FCC official and make him make unethical decisions on your
>> behalf.

>
>
> Subject: Re: LOL!!!
> From: Lloyd@no.spammmmm (Lloyd)
> Date: 11/16/03 5:14 PM Eastern Standard Time
> Message-id: <2096778.1618989@taranews.net>
>
> On Sun, 16 Nov 2003 16:04:45 -0500 (EST), An Metet
> <anmetet@liberty.gmsociety.org> wrote:
>
>>In article <20031114132741.28987.00000215@mb-m17.news.cs.com>
>>ke4tew@cs.com (KE4TEW) wrote:
>>
>>>
>>>>I entered the addy given by the convicted felon and got " No such site"
>>
>>So in other words, you ARE too stupid to do a search by yourself.

>>
>>When I entered it I got several, including:
>>http://www.hillsclerk.com/
>>which is the county Clerk's ofice.
>
>
> Went to that one; entered "Dale" into the search form, and the site
> came up with a "nothing found" message.
>
>
>>http://www.fdle.state.fl.us/CriminalHistory/
>>If you want to get it directly from the Florida Dept. of Law
>>Enforcement.
>
>
> Looked at that one, but the records search would have cost $23 --
> money which would undoubtedly have been thrown away.
>
> Instead, I like this FREE URL: http://tinyurl.com/v90l
>
> It gives complete sentencing details for two stalkers that you
> probably know. Why can't you come up with the same kind of thing for
> TEW?
>
> Answer: You'll never be able to do it 'cause you're a belly-crawling,
> dirt-sucking, maggot-eating, flea-infested liar.
>
> (Well, at least that's what your Mom used to say.)

2796. Re: Jimmy Dale convicted felon

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-18 00:26:40 UTC
From: bob <bob@bob.com>
Message-ID: <9Gdub.23975$oo.6318@bignews4.bellsouth.net>
Source record: 82422
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.swap,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Arf! Arf! sucked off Danny Dews, wiped his chin, and vomited :

From the Hillsborough County Court Records:

First Name: JAMES
Middle Name: WILLIAM
Last Name: DALE
Date of Birth: 01/01/1941
Race: White
Sex: Male
Height: 6'00"
Hair:
Eye Color:
--------------- Detail Charges Found ---------------
State: FLHLS
Case #: 97-CF-004272
County Name: HillsboroO
Description: POSS OF MARIJUANA W/INTENT TO
Class: FELONY FIRST DEGREE
Statute:
File Date: 02/19/1997

>> LOL Write your
>> letters, felon and I can prove you are, unlike your dreams of me
being a felon.
>> Turn it over to the NSC. They might appoint a special investigator.

First Name: JAMES
Middle Name: WILLIAM
Last Name: DALE
Date of Birth: 01/01/1941
Race: White
Sex: Male
Height: 6'00"
Hair:
Eye Color:
--------------- Detail Charges Found ---------------
State: FLHLS
Case #: 97-CF-004272
County Name: HillsboroO
Description: POSS OF MARIJUANA W/INTENT TO
Class: FELONY FIRST DEGREE
Statute:
File Date: 02/19/1997

You are a convicted FELON, MUHAHAHAHAHA

And why didn't you show up at my door, you mealy-mouthed, yellow
son of a bitch?

>> bob
>>
wrote:----------
>> ------
>> Thus, KE4TEW, a convicted felon who jammed HF frequencies for years
>> while id'ing, did not show up for a retest. Why? That's easy. He paid
>> for his license. Then Riley does what he has done with the others who
>> did not show up, he cancels the license. Good Riddance to this nuisance.
>> Then almost two months later, Riley reinstates the license, WITHOUT THE
>> ORIGINAL RETEST!!!! "Pursuant to our agreement with you" What the hell
>> does that mean?? In other words, even though we know you are not
>> qualified to be on the air, go ahead anyway???? What the hell kind of
>> enforcement is this? It's biased enforcement, Riley's trademark style.
>> So what was the agreement? Harass people on the Internet 24/7? Continue
>> to jam the Liberty Net? Is he paying Riley a monthly fee to be on
>> Amateur Radio? Riley's little slush fund. Did TEW give Riley a large
>> amount of illicit drugs? What was it that made Riley reinstate this
>> known drug dealers ticket that was fraudulent in the first place?
>> Maybe Riley does Rita on weekends?
>>
>> If you are wondering what kind of ethics violation Riley committed in
>> granting TEW's ticket back under the table contact the Inspector General
>> of the FCC as several already have. Ask Mr. Feaster to add your name to
>> the ethics probe of the KE4TEW case. Then one day you too will know how
>> to bribe an FCC official and make him make unethical decisions on your
>> behalf.

2797. Re: James Dale and the family of convicts. Did Jessica get her boombox back?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-18 00:33:42 UTC
From: Dimmy Dale <Dimmy@flajail.com>
Message-ID: <LMdub.24016$oo.16815@bignews4.bellsouth.net>
Source record: 82424
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.swap,rec.radio.amateur.policy

So true!!!!

bob wrote:

>
> From the Hillsborough County Court Records:
>
> First Name: JAMES
> Middle Name: WILLIAM
> Last Name: DALE
> Date of Birth: 01/01/1941
> Race: White
> Sex: Male
> Height: 6'00"
> Hair:
> Eye Color:
> --------------- Detail Charges Found ---------------
> State: FLHLS
> Case #: 97-CF-004272
> County Name: HillsboroO
> Description: POSS OF MARIJUANA W/INTENT TO
> Class: FELONY FIRST DEGREE
> Statute:
> File Date: 02/19/1997
>
>
>
> >> LOL Write your
> >> letters, felon and I can prove you are, unlike your dreams of me
> being a felon.
> >> Turn it over to the NSC. They might appoint a special investigator.
>
>
> First Name: JAMES
> Middle Name: WILLIAM
> Last Name: DALE
> Date of Birth: 01/01/1941
> Race: White
> Sex: Male
> Height: 6'00"
> Hair:
> Eye Color:
> --------------- Detail Charges Found ---------------

> State: FLHLS
> Case #: 97-CF-004272
> County Name: HillsboroO
> Description: POSS OF MARIJUANA W/INTENT TO
> Class: FELONY FIRST DEGREE
> Statute:
> File Date: 02/19/1997
>
> You are a convicted FELON, MUHAHAHAHAHA
>
> And why didn't you show up at my door, you mealy-mouthed, yellow
> son of a bitch?
>
>
>
> >> bob
> >>
> wrote:----------
> >> ------
> >> Thus, KE4TEW, a convicted felon who jammed HF frequencies for years
> >> while id'ing, did not show up for a retest. Why? That's easy. He paid
> >> for his license. Then Riley does what he has done with the others who
> >> did not show up, he cancels the license. Good Riddance to this
> nuisance.
> >> Then almost two months later, Riley reinstates the license, WITHOUT THE
> >> ORIGINAL RETEST!!!! "Pursuant to our agreement with you" What the
> hell
> >> does that mean?? In other words, even though we know you are not
> >> qualified to be on the air, go ahead anyway???? What the hell kind of
> >> enforcement is this? It's biased enforcement, Riley's trademark style.
> >> So what was the agreement? Harass people on the Internet 24/7? Continue
> >> to jam the Liberty Net? Is he paying Riley a monthly fee to be on
> >> Amateur Radio? Riley's little slush fund. Did TEW give Riley a large
> >> amount of illicit drugs? What was it that made Riley reinstate this
> >> known drug dealers ticket that was fraudulent in the first place?
> >> Maybe Riley does Rita on weekends?
> >>
> >> If you are wondering what kind of ethics violation Riley committed in
> >> granting TEW's ticket back under the table contact the Inspector
> General
> >> of the FCC as several already have. Ask Mr. Feaster to add your name to
> >> the ethics probe of the KE4TEW case. Then one day you too will know how
> >> to bribe an FCC official and make him make unethical decisions on your
> >> behalf.
>
>
> KE4TEW wrote:
>
>> An article in this mornings paper said James O'Brien has been
>> convicted of

>> stealing money by deception and will soon be serving time in the
>> correctional
>> unit where license plates are made. Apparently Mr. O'Brien ripped off
>> quite a
>> few people. The article didn't say if CBers or Hams were involved.
>> Shades of
>> broken T-Bird winders!!! The picture looked like his head was shaved.
>> Maybe
>> prep for the 'lectric chair??? This article was on pg. 4 of the NY
>> daily news,
>> today.
>
>

2798. Re: LOL!!! KE4TEW is a convict and so is his son!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-18 00:33:58 UTC
From: Dimmy Dale <Dimmy@flajail.com>
Message-ID: <%Mdub.24020$oo.14360@bignews4.bellsouth.net>
Source record: 82423
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.swap,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Let the truth be known!!!

bob wrote:

>
>
> KE4TEW took time from dealing drugs and bribing Riley and posted the the
> following lies:
>
>
>
> From the Hillsborough County Court Records:
>
> First Name: JAMES
> Middle Name: WILLIAM
> Last Name: DALE
> Date of Birth: 01/01/1941
> Race: White
> Sex: Male
> Height: 6'00"
> Hair:
> Eye Color:
> --------------- Detail Charges Found ---------------
> State: FLHLS
> Case #: 97-CF-004272
> County Name: HillsboroO
> Description: POSS OF MARIJUANA W/INTENT TO
> Class: FELONY FIRST DEGREE
> Statute:
> File Date: 02/19/1997
>
>
>
> >> LOL Write your
> >> letters, felon and I can prove you are, unlike your dreams of me
> being a felon.
> >> Turn it over to the NSC. They might appoint a special investigator.
>
>
> First Name: JAMES
> Middle Name: WILLIAM
> Last Name: DALE
> Date of Birth: 01/01/1941
> Race: White

> Sex: Male
> Height: 6'00"
> Hair:
> Eye Color:
> --------------- Detail Charges Found ---------------
> State: FLHLS
> Case #: 97-CF-004272
> County Name: HillsboroO
> Description: POSS OF MARIJUANA W/INTENT TO
> Class: FELONY FIRST DEGREE
> Statute:
> File Date: 02/19/1997
>
> You are a convicted FELON, MUHAHAHAHAHA
>
> And why didn't you show up at my door, you mealy-mouthed, yellow
> son of a bitch?
>
>
>
> >> bob
> >>
> wrote:--
> >> ------
> >> Thus, KE4TEW, a convicted felon who jammed HF frequencies for years
> >> while id'ing, did not show up for a retest. Why? That's easy. He paid
> >> for his license. Then Riley does what he has done with the others who
> >> did not show up, he cancels the license. Good Riddance to this
> nuisance.
> >> Then almost two months later, Riley reinstates the license, WITHOUT THE
> >> ORIGINAL RETEST!!!! "Pursuant to our agreement with you" What the
> hell
> >> does that mean?? In other words, even though we know you are not
> >> qualified to be on the air, go ahead anyway???? What the hell kind of
> >> enforcement is this? It's biased enforcement, Riley's trademark style.
> >> So what was the agreement? Harass people on the Internet 24/7? Continue
> >> to jam the Liberty Net? Is he paying Riley a monthly fee to be on
> >> Amateur Radio? Riley's little slush fund. Did TEW give Riley a large
> >> amount of illicit drugs? What was it that made Riley reinstate this
> >> known drug dealers ticket that was fraudulent in the first place?
> >> Maybe Riley does Rita on weekends?
> >>
> >> If you are wondering what kind of ethics violation Riley committed in
> >> granting TEW's ticket back under the table contact the Inspector
> General
> >> of the FCC as several already have. Ask Mr. Feaster to add your name to
> >> the ethics probe of the KE4TEW case. Then one day you too will know how
> >> to bribe an FCC official and make him make unethical decisions on your
> >> behalf.
>

>>
>>
>> Subject: Re: LOL!!!
>> From: Lloyd@no.spammmmm (Lloyd)
>> Date: 11/16/03 5:14 PM Eastern Standard Time
>> Message-id: <2096778.1618989@taranews.net>
>>
>> On Sun, 16 Nov 2003 16:04:45 -0500 (EST), An Metet
>> <anmetet@liberty.gmsociety.org> wrote:
>>
>>> In article <20031114132741.28987.00000215@mb-m17.news.cs.com>
>>> ke4tew@cs.com (KE4TEW) wrote:
>>>
>>>>
>>>> I entered the addy given by the convicted felon and got " No such site"
>>>
>>>
>>> So in other words, you ARE too stupid to do a search by yourself.
>>>
>>> When I entered it I got several, including:
>>> http://www.hillsclerk.com/
>>> which is the county Clerk's ofice.
>>
>>
>>
>> Went to that one; entered "Dale" into the search form, and the site
>> came up with a "nothing found" message.
>>
>>
>>> http://www.fdle.state.fl.us/CriminalHistory/
>>> If you want to get it directly from the Florida Dept. of Law
>>> Enforcement.
>>
>>
>>
>> Looked at that one, but the records search would have cost $23 --
>> money which would undoubtedly have been thrown away.
>>
>> Instead, I like this FREE URL: http://tinyurl.com/v90l
>> It gives complete sentencing details for two stalkers that you
>> probably know. Why can't you come up with the same kind of thing for
>> TEW?
>>
>> Answer: You'll never be able to do it 'cause you're a belly-crawling,
>> dirt-sucking, maggot-eating, flea-infested liar.
>>
>> (Well, at least that's what your Mom used to say.)
>
>

2799. Re: Jimmy Dale convicted felon

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-18 00:34:12 UTC
From: Dimmy Dale <Dimmy@flajail.com>
Message-ID: <dNdub.24023$oo.5413@bignews4.bellsouth.net>
Source record: 82425
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.swap,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Gotta love it!!!

bob wrote:

>
>
> Arf! Arf! sucked off Danny Dews, wiped his chin, and vomited :
>
>
> From the Hillsborough County Court Records:
>
> First Name: JAMES
> Middle Name: WILLIAM
> Last Name: DALE
> Date of Birth: 01/01/1941
> Race: White
> Sex: Male
> Height: 6'00"
> Hair:
> Eye Color:
> --------------- Detail Charges Found ---------------
> State: FLHLS
> Case #: 97-CF-004272
> County Name: HillsboroO
> Description: POSS OF MARIJUANA W/INTENT TO
> Class: FELONY FIRST DEGREE
> Statute:
> File Date: 02/19/1997
>
>
>
> >> LOL Write your
> >> letters, felon and I can prove you are, unlike your dreams of me
> being a felon.
> >> Turn it over to the NSC. They might appoint a special investigator.
>
>
> First Name: JAMES
> Middle Name: WILLIAM
> Last Name: DALE
> Date of Birth: 01/01/1941
> Race: White
> Sex: Male
> Height: 6'00"

> Hair:
> Eye Color:
> --------------- Detail Charges Found ---------------
> State: FLHLS
> Case #: 97-CF-004272
> County Name: HillsboroO
> Description: POSS OF MARIJUANA W/INTENT TO
> Class: FELONY FIRST DEGREE
> Statute:
> File Date: 02/19/1997
>
> You are a convicted FELON, MUHAHAHAHAHA
>
> And why didn't you show up at my door, you mealy-mouthed, yellow
> son of a bitch?
>
>
>
> >> bob
> >>
> wrote:---
> >> ------
> >> Thus, KE4TEW, a convicted felon who jammed HF frequencies for years
> >> while id'ing, did not show up for a retest. Why? That's easy. He paid
> >> for his license. Then Riley does what he has done with the others who
> >> did not show up, he cancels the license. Good Riddance to this
> nuisance.
> >> Then almost two months later, Riley reinstates the license, WITHOUT THE
> >> ORIGINAL RETEST!!!! "Pursuant to our agreement with you" What the
> hell
> >> does that mean?? In other words, even though we know you are not
> >> qualified to be on the air, go ahead anyway???? What the hell kind of
> >> enforcement is this? It's biased enforcement, Riley's trademark style.
> >> So what was the agreement? Harass people on the Internet 24/7? Continue
> >> to jam the Liberty Net? Is he paying Riley a monthly fee to be on
> >> Amateur Radio? Riley's little slush fund. Did TEW give Riley a large
> >> amount of illicit drugs? What was it that made Riley reinstate this
> >> known drug dealers ticket that was fraudulent in the first place?
> >> Maybe Riley does Rita on weekends?
> >>
> >> If you are wondering what kind of ethics violation Riley committed in
> >> granting TEW's ticket back under the table contact the Inspector
> General
> >> of the FCC as several already have. Ask Mr. Feaster to add your name to
> >> the ethics probe of the KE4TEW case. Then one day you too will know how
> >> to bribe an FCC official and make him make unethical decisions on your
> >> behalf.
>
>

2800. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-18 01:17:44 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20031117201744.12300.00001704@mb-m20.aol.com>
Source record: 82426

In article <bp82p2$6ku@library1.airnews.net>, "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
writes:

>> Kim, I would introduce you to someone like yourself, but I simply
>haven't
>> met anyone that stupid and dishonest yet.
>>
>>
>> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>>
>
>Aw, now this is real cute and grown up, Dwight...
>
>Kim W5TIT

Right, Kim -- the same things you're NOT.

73 de Larry, K3LT

2801. Re: RRAP call signs in SS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-18 01:22:00 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <Yueub.7157$Wy4.6540@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 82427

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote

> Short skip was really loud on 20 on Saturday. You were slammin in here.
>
> I use a vertical loop at about 45 feet to the top. Really does well on
NVIS
> stuff.

North/South paths were excellent, but East/West paths were non-symmetrical, which suggests a tilted ionosphere. The further north you were, the more exaggerated the effect was. I was hearing the W7/VE7's weak and watery, but they reported my signal as huge. Meanwhile W1/VE1's who I had 20-over were CQ'ing in my face.

Can't wait for CQWWCW!!! Maybe the freckles-del-Sol will be more cooperative.

73, de Hans, K0HB

2802. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-18 01:29:27 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <XBeub.7172$Wy4.6438@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 82428

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:YeVtb.10677$P%1.9427794@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
>
> "Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
> news:cuvyxnansvbet.hogrlu7.pminews@netnews.comcast.net...
> > On 16 Nov 2003 01:28:42 GMT, N2EY wrote:
> >
> > >>Me too. All this roundabout bravo sierra could be bypassed if there
was
> a
> > >>ballot sent to all approx. 700,000 U.S. licensed hams.
> >
> > >Suppose someone did, indeed, poll everyone with a US ham license.
> >
> > First question: who is going to front the six figures required to
> > send out the ballots even by bulk mail? The FCC?
> >
> > No way - contrary to urban legend, for the last 10 years or so, all
> > government agencies pay full postage rates on everything they mail -
> > except for Congressional mailings, of course.
> >
> > >"What is your opinion of code testing for an amateur license?"
> > >
> > >1) It should be totally abolished
> > >2) It should be required only for Extra
> > >3) It should be required only for Extra and General
> > >4) It should be required for any license with HF privileges
> > >5) It should be required for any amateur license
> > >6) No opinion/don't care
> > >
> > >Or you might find that the majority opinion was 6). What happens in
> > >that case?
> >
> > Or it's a tie between #6 and no response ???
> >
> > --
> > 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane
>
> No response would probably be the commonest item even if the ballots come
> with return postage paid by the government.
>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

Bottom line, who cares since the entire concept
is a joke anyway and stands NO chance of ever
happening.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2803. Re: Jimmy Dale convicted felon

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-18 01:33:49 UTC
From: Noon-Air <noon-air@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <_vWdnXlf4Zdj6ySiRVn-gQ@comcast.com>
Source record: 82429
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.swap,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Bob,

You offend and bore the hell out of me, not to mention the waste of
bandwidth.
plonk

"bob" <bob@bob.com> wrote in message
news:9Gdub.23975$oo.6318@bignews4.bellsouth.net...
>
>
> Arf! Arf! sucked off Danny Dews, wiped his chin, and vomited :
>
>
> From the Hillsborough County Court Records:
>
> First Name: JAMES
> Middle Name: WILLIAM
> Last Name: DALE
> Date of Birth: 01/01/1941
> Race: White
> Sex: Male
> Height: 6'00"
> Hair:
> Eye Color:
> --------------- Detail Charges Found ---------------
> State: FLHLS
> Case #: 97-CF-004272
> County Name: HillsboroO
> Description: POSS OF MARIJUANA W/INTENT TO
> Class: FELONY FIRST DEGREE
> Statute:
> File Date: 02/19/1997
>
>
>
> >> LOL Write your
> >> letters, felon and I can prove you are, unlike your dreams of me
> being a felon.
> >> Turn it over to the NSC. They might appoint a special investigator.
>
>
> First Name: JAMES
> Middle Name: WILLIAM
> Last Name: DALE

> Date of Birth: 01/01/1941
> Race: White
> Sex: Male
> Height: 6'00"
> Hair:
> Eye Color:
> --------------- Detail Charges Found ---------------
> State: FLHLS
> Case #: 97-CF-004272
> County Name: HillsboroO
> Description: POSS OF MARIJUANA W/INTENT TO
> Class: FELONY FIRST DEGREE
> Statute:
> File Date: 02/19/1997
>
> You are a convicted FELON, MUHAHAHAHAHA
>
> And why didn't you show up at my door, you mealy-mouthed, yellow
> son of a bitch?
>
>
>
> >> bob
> >>
> wrote:---
> >> ------
> >> Thus, KE4TEW, a convicted felon who jammed HF frequencies for years
> >> while id'ing, did not show up for a retest. Why? That's easy. He paid
> >> for his license. Then Riley does what he has done with the others who
> >> did not show up, he cancels the license. Good Riddance to this
nuisance.
> >> Then almost two months later, Riley reinstates the license, WITHOUT
THE
> >> ORIGINAL RETEST!!!! "Pursuant to our agreement with you" What the
hell
> >> does that mean?? In other words, even though we know you are not
> >> qualified to be on the air, go ahead anyway???? What the hell kind of
> >> enforcement is this? It's biased enforcement, Riley's trademark style.
> >> So what was the agreement? Harass people on the Internet 24/7?
Continue
> >> to jam the Liberty Net? Is he paying Riley a monthly fee to be on
> >> Amateur Radio? Riley's little slush fund. Did TEW give Riley a large
> >> amount of illicit drugs? What was it that made Riley reinstate this
> >> known drug dealers ticket that was fraudulent in the first place?
> >> Maybe Riley does Rita on weekends?
> >>
> >> If you are wondering what kind of ethics violation Riley committed in
> >> granting TEW's ticket back under the table contact the Inspector
General
> >> of the FCC as several already have. Ask Mr. Feaster to add your name

to
> >> the ethics probe of the KE4TEW case. Then one day you too will know
how
> >> to bribe an FCC official and make him make unethical decisions on your
> >> behalf.
>
>

2804. Re: LOL!!! KE4TEW is a convict and so is his son!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-18 01:37:15 UTC
From: Noon-Air <noon-air@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <f_6dnWPm7qtR6iSi4p2dnA@comcast.com>
Source record: 82430
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.swap,rec.radio.amateur.policy

We know the truth, that truth being that you are wasting my time and
bandwidth

PLONK

"Dimmy Dale" <Dimmy@flajail.com> wrote in message
news:%Mdub.24020$oo.14360@bignews4.bellsouth.net...
> Let the truth be known!!!
>
> bob wrote:
>
> >
> >
> > KE4TEW took time from dealing drugs and bribing Riley and posted the the
> > following lies:
> >
> >
> >
> > From the Hillsborough County Court Records:
> >
> > First Name: JAMES
> > Middle Name: WILLIAM
> > Last Name: DALE
> > Date of Birth: 01/01/1941
> > Race: White
> > Sex: Male
> > Height: 6'00"
> > Hair:
> > Eye Color:
> > --------------- Detail Charges Found ---------------
> > State: FLHLS
> > Case #: 97-CF-004272
> > County Name: HillsboroO
> > Description: POSS OF MARIJUANA W/INTENT TO
> > Class: FELONY FIRST DEGREE
> > Statute:
> > File Date: 02/19/1997
> >
> >
> >
> > >> LOL Write your
> > >> letters, felon and I can prove you are, unlike your dreams of me
> > being a felon.
> > >> Turn it over to the NSC. They might appoint a special investigator.

> >
> >
> > First Name: JAMES
> > Middle Name: WILLIAM
> > Last Name: DALE
> > Date of Birth: 01/01/1941
> > Race: White
> > Sex: Male
> > Height: 6'00"
> > Hair:
> > Eye Color:
> > --------------- Detail Charges Found ---------------
> > State: FLHLS
> > Case #: 97-CF-004272
> > County Name: HillsboroO
> > Description: POSS OF MARIJUANA W/INTENT TO
> > Class: FELONY FIRST DEGREE
> > Statute:
> > File Date: 02/19/1997
> >
> > You are a convicted FELON, MUHAHAHAHAHA
> >
> > And why didn't you show up at my door, you mealy-mouthed, yellow
> > son of a bitch?
> >
> >
> >
> > >> bob
> > >>
> >
wrote:--
> > >> ------
> > >> Thus, KE4TEW, a convicted felon who jammed HF frequencies for years
> > >> while id'ing, did not show up for a retest. Why? That's easy. He
paid
> > >> for his license. Then Riley does what he has done with the others
who
> > >> did not show up, he cancels the license. Good Riddance to this
> > nuisance.
> > >> Then almost two months later, Riley reinstates the license, WITHOUT
THE
> > >> ORIGINAL RETEST!!!! "Pursuant to our agreement with you" What the
> > hell
> > >> does that mean?? In other words, even though we know you are not
> > >> qualified to be on the air, go ahead anyway???? What the hell kind
of
> > >> enforcement is this? It's biased enforcement, Riley's trademark
style.
> > >> So what was the agreement? Harass people on the Internet 24/7?
Continue

> > >> to jam the Liberty Net? Is he paying Riley a monthly fee to be on
> > >> Amateur Radio? Riley's little slush fund. Did TEW give Riley a large
> > >> amount of illicit drugs? What was it that made Riley reinstate this
> > >> known drug dealers ticket that was fraudulent in the first place?
> > >> Maybe Riley does Rita on weekends?
> > >>
> > >> If you are wondering what kind of ethics violation Riley committed
in
> > >> granting TEW's ticket back under the table contact the Inspector
> > General
> > >> of the FCC as several already have. Ask Mr. Feaster to add your name
to
> > >> the ethics probe of the KE4TEW case. Then one day you too will know
how
> > >> to bribe an FCC official and make him make unethical decisions on
your
> > >> behalf.
> > >
> >>
> >>
> >> Subject: Re: LOL!!!
> >> From: Lloyd@no.spammmmm (Lloyd)
> >> Date: 11/16/03 5:14 PM Eastern Standard Time
> >> Message-id: <2096778.1618989@taranews.net>
> >>
> >> On Sun, 16 Nov 2003 16:04:45 -0500 (EST), An Metet
> >> <anmetet@liberty.gmsociety.org> wrote:
> >>
> >>> In article <20031114132741.28987.00000215@mb-m17.news.cs.com>
> >>> ke4tew@cs.com (KE4TEW) wrote:
> >>>
> >>>>
> >>>> I entered the addy given by the convicted felon and got " No such
site"
> >>>
> >>>
> >>> So in other words, you ARE too stupid to do a search by yourself.
> >>>
> >>> When I entered it I got several, including:
> >>> http://www.hillsclerk.com/
> >>> which is the county Clerk's ofice.
> >>
> >>
> >>
> >> Went to that one; entered "Dale" into the search form, and the site
> >> came up with a "nothing found" message.
> >>
> >>
> >>> http://www.fdle.state.fl.us/CriminalHistory/
> >>> If you want to get it directly from the Florida Dept. of Law

> >>> Enforcement.
> >>
> >>
> >>
> >> Looked at that one, but the records search would have cost $23 --
> >> money which would undoubtedly have been thrown away.
> >>
> >> Instead, I like this FREE URL: http://tinyurl.com/v90l
> >> It gives complete sentencing details for two stalkers that you
> >> probably know. Why can't you come up with the same kind of thing for
> >> TEW?
> >>
> >> Answer: You'll never be able to do it 'cause you're a belly-crawling,
> >> dirt-sucking, maggot-eating, flea-infested liar.
> >>
> >> (Well, at least that's what your Mom used to say.)
> >
> >
>

2805. Re: RRAP call signs in SS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-18 01:41:54 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3FB978E0.7090306@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 82431

>
>
>>
>>
>
>North/South paths were excellent, but East/West paths were non-symmetrical,
>which suggests a tilted ionosphere. The further north you were, the more
>exaggerated the effect was. I was hearing the W7/VE7's weak and watery,
>but they reported my signal as huge. Meanwhile W1/VE1's who I had 20-over
>were CQ'ing in my face.
>
>
>
Didn't think that could happen. I thought light (here radio waves)
would propagate
equally as well going as well as coming back. Like "If you can see my
face I also
can see your face".

2806. Re: Happy Veterans Day

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-18 01:58:29 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3FB97CC4.5A958465@earthlink.net>
Source record: 82432

```
Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3FB5B3C8.70728E0E@earthlink.net>...
> > Brian wrote:
> > >
> > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3FB52414.B67125BB@earthlink.net>...
> > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3FB45E36.25E5C512@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > "charlesb" <n5pvl@sbcglobal.net> wrote in message
news:<WwEsb.694$UX4.32229430@newssvr21.news.prodigy.com>...
> > > > > > > > "Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
> > > > > > > > news:f45722ac.0311121534.17abad08@posting.google.com...
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > Concerning the "Bonus Army" of 1932, where veterans of The War to End
> > > > > > > > > All Wars (1917/1918) were due a bonus in 1945, but wanted payment
> > > > > > > > > early because they lost their homes in the Great Depression, Franklin
> > > > > > > > > Roosevelt is to have said:
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > "Is to have said?" I would think that Roosevelt has pretty well said what
> > > > > > > > he is going to, by now!
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > Does FDR still talk to you?
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > That's very possible, but I was quoting someone elses research, so
> > > > > > > > have not verified that is what FDR actually said from a direct source.
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > But thanks for your interest.
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > Your first clue that the quote is not from Roosevelt is that he is
> > > > > > > > unlikely to have referred to himself as "President Roosevelt".
> > >
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > Dave, follow the link (i.e., point and click) in the "Armistice Day"
> > > > > > > thread and read it yourself.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > Good luck on that one now.
> > > > >
```

> > > > You posted it *here*. If you didn't copy it correctly, say so.
> > > >
> > > Dave, you didn't read it correctly. Not my problem.
> > > >
> > > I say so.
> > >
> > A quote of what you posted reveals otherwise:
> > >
> > "...Franklin
> > Roosevelt is to have said:
> > >
> > ------------
> > In the end, some money was paid to veterans but not without further
> > difficulties. Within a year of the Bonus Army Incident, President
> > Roosevelt imposed the Economy Act of 1933 which cut veterans
> > disability allowances by 25%..."
> > >
> > > > If you did copy it correctly, whoever posted it is likely in error.
> > > >
> > > I copied it, I posted it.
> > >
> > ...and, as revealed by the quote from your own post, you blew it.
> > >
> > > "Likely" leaves room for your errors. I simply won't accept your
> > > errors as mine.
> > >
> > ...since you have plenty of your own to worry about.
> > >
> > > > Good luck has nothing to do with it. Just use your noggin.
> > >
> > > Ditto.
> > > >
> > > Now go follow the link in the "Armistice Day" thread and quit bugging
> > > me with your self-imposed stupidity.
> > >
> > I'm not the individual who bungled copying material from a web page.

> Dave, you're hopeless.

How does your posting of an incorrect bit of information make me
hopeless?

> If you should ever have something of interest, which is almost never,
> please get back with me.

I have numerous items of interest, Brian. I'm not sure that they'd be
of interest to you or that you'd understand them.

> If not, just keep it to yourself - please.

You've never come up with a straight answer for an explanation about
Frankline Roosevelt referring to himself as "President Roosevelt".

Dave K8MN

2807. Re: Happy Veterans Day

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-18 02:31:35 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <bwfub.7298$Wy4.181@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 82433

"Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote

> Stebe, you could try standing up on your hind legs, like a man, and
> make your crappy little comments directly to me. And for what its
> worth, no one appreciates your unique posting habits. No one. Nada.
> Zip. Zed. Zero.

Sunuvagun!!!

That makes you two guys exactly even!

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

2808. Re: RRAP call signs in SS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-18 02:46:59 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <DKfub.7317$Wy4.6861@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 82434

"Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote

>>
> >>
> >>
> >
> >North/South paths were excellent, but East/West paths were
non-symmetrical,
> >which suggests a tilted ionosphere. The further north you were, the more
> >exaggerated the effect was. I was hearing the W7/VE7's weak and watery,
> >but they reported my signal as huge. Meanwhile W1/VE1's who I had
20-over
> >were CQ'ing in my face.
> >
> >
> >
> Didn't think that could happen. I thought light (here radio waves)
> would propagate equally as well going as well as coming back.
> Like "If you can see my face I also can see your face".

Imagine that the ionosphere is an imperfect mirror which reflects signals best when they arrive at some specific angle, and reflects less well when the signals do not arrive at that optimum angle. Now imagine that the "mirror" is tilted to favor one direction (your signals arrive at mirror at the right angle, but mine arrive at a more oblique angle and are consequently refracted more than reflected, and at the same time the reflection angle is such that my signals pass "over your head" to a more distant point.). I will hear you well, but my signal will be attenuated. From my end the skip appears "short", but from your end the skip will appear "long".

Only when the mirror is equidistant between us and when it is "flat" will the path be symmetrical and relative signal strengths reciprocal.

73, de Hans, K0HB

2809. Re: KG4LEG new jammer in tampa bay on 146.640 N9EE wide area repeater

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-18 02:50:12 UTC
From: hamradioman2000@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <e95066a4.0311171850.49971322@posting.google.com>
Source record: 82435
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.swap

>
> Wasn't he called Grimmee or something? They even had a rap song about
> him. He used to make threats to kill people with a .45 pistol.

yes people would make fun of james carter then KE4CRM (pronounced
crummy)
james would go crazy when people would get him fired up, but after
many years of people jerking him, he finally listened to the other
users of the repeater when they had told him soooooo many times to
ignore the jammers and they will go away. finally he listened. now jim
doesnot give the jammers anything. they dont bother him much. one
jammer that has been on for years is "squeaky" he still tries jim
sometimes. the guy that made songs about jim is cedric, but i dont
know his last name or callsign, i have heard of the songs, some names
i remember are 640sucks (a take off of a rap song) another is
moproblems (a takeoff of the mo money mo problems song) theway (take
off of a eminem song, mentions coolaid, more about that in a bit). i
think they got played alot in 1999-2000 time line. jim carter changed
his callsign at some point to WA8JSC. one of jim carters worst
jammers, michael callanan has now taken the call KE4CRM (how about
that! the jammer took the old call of the guy he jammed) michael
callanans old call was KD4YOQ. callanan nolonger lives in the tampa
bay area, QRZ shows callanan now lives in newyork, that is if you look
up the call KE4CRM. another "crummy" jammer was a "steven f stout" or
"steve stout" now and then this steven stout guy will jam the
repeater, because from time to time someone will point out a type of
jamming as that of steven stout. stout has a criminal record also.
stout still lives in florida, i think his criminal record can be found
on the usenet by looking up his exact name in quotations. steven stout
never got a ham license, he likes radios but was not smart enough to
actually take the test. he was also an accomplice of michael callanan,
they cause all kinds of trouble when they get together, stout
considers himself a businessman, he has a website www.stevenstout.com
but it has been off line for a while now. "his saying on the main page
was "you had better check your financial books, because i think you
owe me money" stout was also associated with a group of guys that
started the site www.coldsex.com wich i think also comes up under a
usenet search that was part of a junk email someone got and posted to
the usenet. (this is just search information for the newsgroups).

this new KG4LEG guy is a real piece of work, (atleast jim wanted to
fit in with the group when people werent jerking him) this "coy roy"
guy doesnot even want to fit in, the repeater has been upside down for
5 days now! he just wont stop, no matter how much people try to get

him to fit in he wont. hes just a "mental midget" as some have called him. he talks to himself, he jams people, accuses people of using profanity with him, when no one did. one ham did some research on him, claims that KG4LEG calls the belleair bluffs police quite abit whenever people go driving buy his house, one ham had a CB expierence with roy 4 months ago, this ham decided to pay roy a visit, all he wanted to do was talk to roy in person, but roy called the police, roys wife told the police that he was threating them with a hand gun, and that got alot of heat on this particular ham, but when it was all said and done, this ham never had a gun, and the cops finally realized that. this morning roy was saying the "PUNK BOY" and "FAG BOY" frazes quite a bit to anyone, he was threating people and keying over them. numerous people have contacted the FCC, noone has said they FCC said they would do anything about ti. RON the repeater owner has said he has sent KG4LEG a letter stating roy must stop using the repeater, but roy claims he wont stop unless the FCC tells him, wich we all know will likely not happen. thats the update today.

2810. Re: RRAP call signs in SS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-18 02:50:59 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <nOfub.7320$Wy4.2878@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 82436

"John Siegel" <JohnASiegel@worldnet.att.net> wrote

> Wasn't able to get on until Sunday afternoon and just for a short while.
> I did give you a QSO.

> 73, John K4BNC

Thanks!!!

I remember the QSO because of your suffix. Was tempted to make a wise remark like "Hey, thanks for the nice connection!", but was struggling for points at that time, so I didn't slow down for chit-chat. Sorry I didn't recognize it was you.

73, de Hans, K0HB

2811. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-18 03:29:00 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031117222900.29815.00001758@mb-m21.aol.com>
Source record: 82437

In article <a1Wtb.2770$m84.1653551@news1.news.adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>> Here's another one for ya: I bet neither of us would have any problem
>> getting a 30 year mortgage, even though we'd be nearly 80 when said
>> mortage was paid off
>> (barring any advance payments). Huh?
>
> My xyl works in the housing industry. There are people who are in their

>60's and up getting those mortgages. Go figure.

Actually, now that I think about it, there is a certain twisted logic to it. In general, people are living longer now, so the chances of someone actually paying off the mortgage is better than before. Conversely, if the person dies, the mortgage company gets their money quickly, from the estate.

On top of all this, such policies insure that the mortgage companies don't have to worry about claims of age discrimination.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2812. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-18 03:29:00 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031117222900.29815.00001759@mb-m21.aol.com>
Source record: 82438

In article <lO2ub.6096$Wy4.2249@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> writes:

>"JJ" wrote:
>>
>> Might as well give it up Dwight, I find it futile
>> to discuss class or good taste with someone
>> who choses a call sign like Kim's.
>
>
> I'm still waiting for her "wicca friends" to cast a spell on me to prove
>they actually can (a conversation we had many months ago).

How do you know they haven't?

>I posted that
>challenge after she expressed support for wiccan beliefs and got angry when
>I said it was all nonsense.

Well, would you like it someone called a religion you respect "all nonsense"?

>After the challenge, she claimed Wicca's don't
>believe in spells. I then showed at least a dozen web sites, out of
>hundreds, where Wicca's do indeed claim they can cast spells and charms
>(including the type of spell in my challenge).

I wonder what the Book of Bokonon has to say about all that...

73 de Jim, N2EY

2813. Re: Do Hams get 11 Meters Back

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-18 03:35:43 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <jsgub.10889$P%1.9677012@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 82439
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.cb

"Steveo" <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com> wrote in message
news:20031117141843.154$s1@newsreader.com...
> JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote:
> > You seem to have a reading comprehension problem. I will type slowly so
> > you maybe can understand. T H E H A M S D O N O T W A N T
> > E L E V E N M E T E R S B A C K. To use your silly cb lingo, "no
> > doubt about it".
> >
> This is true. They don't even use 10 meters much.

10 meters is quite dependent on the status of the sunspot cycle. When the
solar flux is good, the band is indeed heavily used but when the flux is
down, it won't support long distance communications.

2814. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-18 03:41:02 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <ixgub.10892$P%1.9677761@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 82440

"Alun" <alun@1stcounsel.com> wrote in message
news:Xns943643F1E8DC6elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
>
> However, my point is just that polling only licenced hams is just not
> appropriate, as hams are not the only interested parties.
>

How would you then define the group to be polled? Even polling just the licensed hams would be prohibitive in terms of postage as mentioned in other posts.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

2815. Re: RRAP call signs in SS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-18 03:46:31 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <rCgub.10893$P%1.9679299@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 82441

"Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:Kt7ub.5041$Rk5.4706@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> Worked N8UZE and W4NTI this past weekend. Where were the rest of you? I
> coulda used the Q's!
>
> I think the ionosphere was tilted because there was a LOT of one way
> propagation. Maybe someone put diodes in my transmission lines?
>
> ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½ 73, de Hans, K0HB
> --
> Help support youth involved in Amateur Radio.
> http://www.mnyarc.org
> http://www.k0bsa.org
>

Was it me or my OM working the mike? Our goal was the clean sweep but we
just didn't get the propagation. I heard the PAC section but to weak for me
to be able to get through the pile up and we never did hear NT from here.
We ended up 10 sections short. Last year, when we weren't even trying we
were only 3 sections short.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

2816. Re: RRAP call signs in SS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-18 03:50:45 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <pGgub.10895$P%1.9679778@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 82442

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:nzdub.5514$Rk5.5429@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> Short skip was really loud on 20 on Saturday. You were slammin in here.
>
> I use a vertical loop at about 45 feet to the top. Really does well on
NVIS
> stuff.
>
> Great hearing you.
>
> Don't think I heard Dee.
>
> Dan/W4NTI
>

Didn't hear you either according to my log. Maybe another time.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

2817. Re: RRAP call signs in SS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-18 03:51:52 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <sHgub.10896$P%1.9680316@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 82443

"Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:Yueub.7157$Wy4.6540@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote
>
> > Short skip was really loud on 20 on Saturday. You were slammin in here.
> >
> > I use a vertical loop at about 45 feet to the top. Really does well on
> NVIS
> > stuff.
>
> North/South paths were excellent, but East/West paths were
non-symmetrical,
> which suggests a tilted ionosphere. The further north you were, the more
> exaggerated the effect was. I was hearing the W7/VE7's weak and watery,
> but they reported my signal as huge. Meanwhile W1/VE1's who I had 20-over
> were CQ'ing in my face.
>
> Can't wait for CQWWCW!!! Maybe the freckles-del-Sol will be more
> cooperative.
>
> 73, de Hans, K0HB

That's consistent with what I experienced and with what the propagation
prediction software showed.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

2818. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-18 03:59:07 UTC
From: Alun <alun@1stcounsel.com>
Message-ID: <Xns9436E9CF58BC8elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 82444

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in
news:ixgub.10892$P%1.9677761@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com:

>
> "Alun" <alun@1stcounsel.com> wrote in message
> news:Xns943643F1E8DC6elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
>>
>> However, my point is just that polling only licenced hams is just not
>> appropriate, as hams are not the only interested parties.
>>
>
> How would you then define the group to be polled? Even polling just
> the licensed hams would be prohibitive in terms of postage as mentioned
> in other posts.
>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>
>

If I thought it should be decided by a poll, and I'm by no means sure of
that, then it should be done on-line. Just have a web page where you click
your chosen response. Chicago voters might be a problem, though.

2819. Re: RRAP call signs in SS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-18 04:52:22 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <aAhub.8241$Wy4.7933@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 82445

"Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote

>>
> >>
> >>
> >
> >North/South paths were excellent, but East/West paths were
non-symmetrical,
> >which suggests a tilted ionosphere. The further north you were, the more
> >exaggerated the effect was. I was hearing the W7/VE7's weak and watery,
> >but they reported my signal as huge. Meanwhile W1/VE1's who I had
20-over
> >were CQ'ing in my face.
> >
> >
> >
> Didn't think that could happen. I thought light (here radio waves)
> would propagate equally as well going as well as coming back.
> Like "If you can see my face I also can see your face".

Imagine that the ionosphere is an imperfect mirror which reflects signals best when they arrive at some specific angle, and reflects less well when the signals do not arrive at that optimum angle. Now imagine that the "mirror" is tilted to favor one direction (your signals arrive at mirror at the right angle, but mine arrive at a more oblique angle and are consequently refracted more than reflected, and at the same time the reflection angle is such that my signals pass "over your head" to a more distant point.). I will hear you well, but my signal will be attenuated. From my end the skip appears "short", but from your end the skip will appear "long".

Only when the mirror is equidistant between us and when it is "flat" will the path be symmetrical and relative signal strengths reciprocal.

73, de Hans, K0HB

2820. Re: RRAP call signs in SS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-18 04:58:39 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3Ghub.8249$Wy4.3813@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 82446

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote

> Was it me or my OM working the mike?

Musta been the OM, because I remember at the time thinking "that's Dee's call" but then I had a mental disconnect because the op didn't sound all that feminine. Sure glad I didn't say "Hi Sweetie"!!!! <grin>

73, de Hans, K0HB

2821. Re: RRAP call signs in SS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-18 05:17:52 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3FB9AB82.94934A12@earthlink.net>
Source record: 82447

"Kï¿½HB" wrote:
>
> Worked N8UZE and W4NTI this past weekend. Where were the rest of you?

Cincinnati.

Dave K8MN

2822. Re: RRAP call signs in SS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-18 07:15:08 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3FB9C6FB.3010104@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 82448

Kï¿½HB wrote:

>
>Only when the mirror is equidistant between us and when it is "flat" will
>the path be symmetrical and relative signal strengths reciprocal.
>
>
>
Somehow I would have thought that light (radio waves) could travel
either direction
on the same exact path. And that attenuation either way would be identical.
Same for the same set of multiple paths.

But it's been years since Physics class......

>
>

2823. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-18 09:02:52 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <REMOVETHISkc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <bpdi5m$1n9ab4$4@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 82353

If your interest rate is less than 5%, the best loan to get is a 30 year!
It's cheap money. Paying off a house quick is foolish. And the monthly
rate is usually a hell of alot less too. Spend the difference of that
paying off bills or invest it in a mutual fund or something.

Instead of paying off that low interest loan quickly, one is smarter paying
off the higher interest loans like automobiles, department and credit card
charges, and other loans/debts.

--
Ryan KC8PMX

"Why is it one careless match can start a forest fire, but
it takes a whole box to start a barbecue?"

> <snicker> Well, believe it or not, that is what we're going for. We
> thought about the 15-year but what we decided is we'd rather double/triple
> payments at our own control...just for the very reason of potential job
> loss.
>
> I need to send you an email on another, personal note... I'll do it soon,
> remind me if I don't!
>
> Kim W5TIT
>
>

2824. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-18 09:13:01 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <REMOVETHISkc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <bpdi5n$1n9ab4$5@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 82354

(sarcasm mode on)
Well, you all better get on this guy around here with a call like W8SEX as
well as others I have seen listed as available for vanity calls.. ......
thats just plain dirty, and leads a person to think about sex!"
(sarcasm mode off)

--
Ryan KC8PMX

"All of us could take a lesson from the weather. It pays no
attention to criticism."

> As for her callsign, Larry has taken that just about as far as it can
go.
> I'm not offended by her callsign, but I certainly do think she could have
> made a better choice.
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
>

2825. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-18 09:26:09 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <REMOVETHISkc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <bpdi5p$1n9ab4$6@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 82355

I think what Jim was trying to say, that if a meal at Ma's diner averages say for instance $5.50, (and a good meal too) and the corporate conglomerate Taco Heaven is around $4.50 for instance, in some cases it is worthwhile supporting the locally owned, Ma's place versus some criminally corporate organization like Taco Heaven. Support the local business before supporting the corporate ones.....

And if you find out that all the corporate ones have squeezed out the family and/or locally owned ones, then what ever you have left is your own fault if you didn't support the local ones.

Maybe I am wrong, but that's what I got out of Jim's message, and might not have explained it the best. Myself? I believe in supporting the local businessperson whenever and where ever I can FIRST, then supporting the corporations when a locally owned option is not available. Granted there are some exceptions to the rule, as for instance, gasoline. At least I research to find out which ones are locally owned/franchised as opposed to true corporately owned gas stations.

Screw Corporate Amerika! (before they screw you)

--
Ryan KC8PMX

"All of us could take a lesson from the weather. It pays no
attention to criticism."

> Exactly what I meant. If "Ma's Diner" isn't selling what I want then I'm
> not going to buy regardless of small store, large chain or whatever. I
> thought however the original post was Dwight's not yours. He seems to be
> advocating that the government "fix" consumer's purchasing habits so that
> the local stores stay in business.
>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>

2826. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-18 09:26:14 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <WAlub.5924$Rk5.2290@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 82449

"N2EY" wrote:
>
> How do you know they haven't?

Because absolutely nothing has happened.

> Well, would you like if someone called a
> religion you respect "all nonsense"?

If it were a ligitimate religion, no. However, it is a little hard to perceive wicca as a ligitimate religion. Since little is really known of the old pagan religions (especially directly), wicca practices today cannot seriously be linked to paganism. Instead, the practices today mostly seem made up from images and stories in movies, television, and fiction books (old and new). And the people involved often take on the personas of characters directly from those fiction stories. Further, their claims of spells, charms, and so on, are simply hogwash (childish hogwash). Everyone is certainly free to believe what they want, including those who consider the whole thing absolutely ludicrous.

By the way, this is not "us versus them." I have no specific religious beliefs, so pointing to a ligitimate religion is not really going to change my opinions of wicca. All religions have their faults and doubters, but I have no doubts about my opinions of wicca. :-)

> I wonder what the Book of Bokonon has to
> say about all that...

Wasn't it supposedly Books (plural) of Bokonon? Anyway, I'm not so sure all this (wicca) is exactly harmless untruths.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

2827. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-18 09:34:05 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <REMOVETHISkc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <bpdi5q$1n9ab4$7@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 82356

> Adjusted for inflation, that's far LESS than I paid for a comparable house
> outside of Seattle in 1974 except that it only had a standard size lot not
> anything as luxurious as a half an acre.
>
> So 1973/1974:
> Engineers fresh out of college starting wage approximately $10,000
> House cost approximately $35,000 in Seattle.
>
> Now in 2003:
> Engineers fresh out of college starting wage approximately $45,000
> House quoted above comparable to the one in Seattle costing $75,000
>
> Wages went up 4.5 times and comparable house just over twice as
expensives.
> Hmm yup houses cost more today relatively speaking.

That last paragraph is also assuming the facts listed above. If you were referring to my statistical data, I was referring to what would be called a "dump" by 90% of this newsgroup, and would post pics of an example if my newsserver allowed it.....

--
Ryan KC8PMX

"Give a person a fish and you feed them for a day; teach that
person to use The Internet and they won't bother you for weeks."

2828. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-18 09:45:15 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <REMOVETHISkc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <bpdi5s$1n9ab4$8@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 82357

"Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
news:f45722ac.0311141828.6ae9b540@posting.google.com...
> "Ryan, KC8PMX" <REMOVETHISkc8pmx@diamondcs.net> wrote in message
news:<bp2o3p$1ki73m$2@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>...
> > Around here in this county I live in, home ownership is next to
impossible,
> > except for spending at least $75,000 or better. The average small 3
bedroom
> > house, no basement or garage (slab built) on a half to full acre runs
*at
> > least* 75 grand or better. Go immediately outside of the county lines
of
> > this county, and the similar/equivalent structure is anywhere from
25-50%
> > less. I guess it is something about Midland county I guess.
> >
> > Ryan
>
> Ryan, I went to QRZ and looked up your address, so you get one more
> hit at QRZ.com. Apparently you're betw the Baycityrollers and
> Saginaw.

Yeah, sorta. Midland is the third city making up what is known around here
as the "Tri-Cities."

>
> Where I live, a 75K home is called a crack-house and a public
> nuisance.

Same here.... Although the math is regionally different around the country,
that 75K can buy an WONDERFUL home in Bay City or Saginaw, but barely buy an
empty lot in Midland in some or alot of cases.

>
> Location(cubed).
>
> If you have housing available at 75K, and it is suitable to your
> desires, and you have a steady job, go see your mortgage lender today!

My lender, is willing to back me to the amount of 40K, no money down,
stretched over 30 years! Now the hard part is finding a property within
Midland County that is close to that. Dilapidated trailers (literally
falling apart), with slimy welfare trash neighbors (renters not owners) with
more crap strewn within the yard still gets 50K or better!!!!!

(((I almost had a really cute 2 bedroom (very large bedrooms) about 2 months ago, after a long bidding war with the people that held the estate. They had it listed for 56K and I countered first with 35K. They countered with 47,500K. I countered again with 37,500 and they countered with 45K but would not budge from that. Now, since it was an estate, and I would be offering them CASH (yes, actual real paper money) for my last offer of 40K, ya think they would have jumped on that?? Problem there was about 6 people in the estate (the kids of the deceased) and not one could agree apparantely.)))

>
> Try to locate in a non-restricted neighborhood so that you can play
> radio.

Of course!! Dipoles strewn around the yard enough to catch birds with like it was an overgrown spiders web! LOL

--
Ryan KC8PMX

"Health is merely the slowest possible rate at which one can die."

2829. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-18 09:52:28 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <wZlub.5929$Rk5.4370@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 82450

"N2EY" wrote:
>
> Actually, now that I think about it, there is a
> certain twisted logic to it. In general, people
> are living longer now, so the chances of
> someone actually paying off the mortgage is
> better than before. Conversely, if the person
> dies, the mortgage company gets their money
> quickly, from the estate.
>
> On top of all this, such policies insure that the
> mortgage companies don't have to worry
> about claims of age discrimination.

Or, even better, if the mortgage isn't paid off, the mortgage company can foreclose and resell the house for a very tidy profit. That alone is enough to attract many mortgage companies to the elderly. This may also be why some mortgage companies actually seem to seek out those who will likely not fully pay off a mortgage (excessive debt, a history of bad credit, or whatever). After the mortgagor has partially paid down the amount owed on the property, the mortgage company can foreclose and retain the property for a much lower amount than they would have paid in an outright purchase.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

2830. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-18 10:20:10 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <REMOVETHISkc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <bpdi5t$1n9ab4$9@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 82358

Well to answer the questions below Jim, I guess an actual example of the houses I am referring to in this thread is more relevant to the conversation. A two or three bedroom house can actually take on different shapes and sizes.

The message originally was a comparision to the immediate surrounding counties and the property values in this county of which I live. It is merely something about Midland County!!!!!! In surrounding counties, that same 75K can get twice the house!!!!

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20031114213918.07346.00001726@mb-m26.aol.com...
> In article <bp2o3p$1ki73m$2@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>, "Ryan, KC8PMX"
> <REMOVETHISkc8pmx@diamondcs.net> writes:
>
> >Around here in this county I live in, home ownership is next to
impossible,
> >except for spending at least $75,000 or better.
>
> That;s very inexpensive, Ryan.
>
> >The average small 3 bedroom
> >house, no basement or garage (slab built) on a half to full acre runs *at
> >least* 75 grand or better.
>
> What would you consider reasonable?
>
> Check out
>
> http://www.realtor.com
>
> for an idea what houses cost in other parts of the country. You can search
by
> zip code, town name, etc. Set limits on house size, price, etc.
>
> You don't want to know what a house costs around here.

Yeah.... probably not.... Guess it would depend on what you are getting.

>
>
> >Go immediately outside of the county lines of
> >this county, and the similar/equivalent structure is anywhere from 25-50%
> >less. I guess it is something about Midland county I guess.
>

> Under $50,000? Amazing. But remember the three most important things about
real
> estate....

Yeah... most all of the properties I have considered are in the townships outside of the county seat/City of Midland which do not have all the benefits of certain things like city water, sewage, trash pickup, and in some case road maintenance as that is usually left up to the county. These are areas where the value listed is merely a function of how much the real estate agent wants to get as a commision on the property. The more he/she wants to make the higher the property value/listing price needs to be.....

>
> What are the taxes like?

Between 500 and 1000 dolllars yearly depending on what is on the property. (size etc.)

--
Ryan KC8PMX

"Health is merely the slowest possible rate at which one can die."

2831. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-18 10:23:22 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <REMOVETHISkc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <bpdi5v$1n9ab4$10@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 82359

> > > People allow themselves to fail and become victims of circumstance.
> >
> > Following that logic, then the people IN the WTC buildings are also as
> well
> > then......
> >
>
> No it does not follow. The people in the WTC buildings were subject to a
> circumstance that no one could ever have even guessed might happen or
> foreseen might happen. That was not within their power to prevent or
solve.
>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>

According to your statement, an absolutism, yes they were in control. THEY chose to work in that building. THEY chose to go to work that day, not calling in sick or taking a vacation day.

--
Ryan KC8PMX

"Never take life too seriously. Nobody gets out alive anyway."

2832. Re: Language Rules from FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-18 10:29:22 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <REMOVETHISkc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <bpdi60$1n9ab4$11@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 82360

The George Carlin thing was meant more of a jab at humor rather than fact...
:)

--
Ryan KC8PMX

"Some people are like Slinkies . . . not really good for anything, but you
still can't help but smile when you see one tumble down the stairs."

"Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
news:3FB54689.5050104@ix.netcom.com...
> Ryan, KC8PMX wrote:
>
> >Geee..... didn't Carlin cover this??? (i.e. George Carlin?)
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >As for specific words??? Dunno, is there a list?? :) Who makes the list
> >then? Are other things other than the known "7 dirty words" included? If
> >someone is of say, for instance a different faith than you, do you get to
> >determine anything they say religiously is offensive and should be banned
> >speech? I am sure there are other examples one could come up with......
> >
> >
> >
> Heard (possible urban legend) that the FCC in "case law" refers to
> George Carlin's list
> but doesn't actually list the words. George Carlin's recorded comedy
> bit is a "published
> work", like that of a book, and thus can be referred to in another
> document. I'm no
> lawyer, so the above could be BS.....
>

2833. Re: Language Rules from FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-18 10:33:10 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <REMOVETHISkc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <bpdi62$1n9ab4$12@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 82361

Jim.... of all the people here I thought for sure you would see where I was going with that..... it goes well beyond the "dirty words" and could extend to any speech undesireable by others that could be deemed offensive and therefor punishable. Heck, we have organizations in the US already trying that..... not a small step to extend to ham radio!
Like I said.... look beyond the cuss words, and there is a ton of things that some radical freaks could oppose.

--
Ryan KC8PMX

"Some people are like Slinkies . . . not really good for anything, but you still can't help but smile when you see one tumble down the stairs."

> >As for specific words??? Dunno, is there a list?? :) Who makes the list
> >then? Are other things other than the known "7 dirty words" included? If
> >someone is of say, for instance a different faith than you, do you get to
> >determine anything they say religiously is offensive and should be banned
> >speech? I am sure there are other examples one could come up with......
>
> Common sense and good taste used to be the guide. But I guess such concepts are
> old-fashioned nowadays, from what some folks tell me when I oppose the use of
> such language on the air and in newsgropups.....
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>
>

2834. Re: Language Rules from FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-18 10:36:11 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <REMOVETHISkc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <bpdi63$1n9ab4$13@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 82362

Alrighty then.... I am sick and tired and feel it is patently offensive to hear about old fart's bowel conditions, regardless if they cuss when discussing those..... let's make that banned speech! After all it's good amateur practice!

--
Ryan KC8PMX

"Some people are like Slinkies . . . not really good for anything, but you still can't help but smile when you see one tumble down the stairs."

> Jim:
>
> Precisely. On amateur radio, one never knows when one will encounter
> something which may make someone think twice about our hobby being
> a wholesome and proper activity for a young person. When that happens,
> whether or not what was said was "legal" within the letter of the law, the
> potential exists for the effect to bring the ARS "...one step closer to
> extinction."
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

2835. Re: Language Rules from FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-18 10:42:18 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <REMOVETHISkc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <bpdi65$1n9ab4$14@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 82363

My guess is that some moron years ago decided that these damned hamfest MUST occur at like 8am and that the guys going to them figured, " to hell with a shower! I will be back in a while"

I am sorry if this offends, but I shower twice a day, use deodorant/antiperspirant and wear clean, laundered clothing even if it is a t-shirt and shorts or jeans. Not saying having to dress in the sunday best but.....

I have seen better dressed homeless people in some cases!

--
Ryan KC8PMX

"Why is it one careless match can start a forest fire, but it takes a whole box to start a barbecue?"

> > And if you really want to see some sloppyness,
> > go to a ham fest. (snip)
>
>
> I can accept a certain level of sloppyness at a ham fest or other casual
> event (as opposed to the mall, restaurant, work, or other such places). Or
> perhaps I should say that I dress more sloppily at a ham fest than I would
> at work or so forth. I just don't really see an overwhelming reason to
dress
> up for a ham fest.
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
>

2836. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-18 15:00:14 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <2uqub.6054$Rk5.3507@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 82351

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote

> I wonder what the Book of Bokonon has to say about all that...

from the Last Rites of Bokonism....

God made mud.
God got lonesome.
So God said to some of the mud, "Sit up!"
"See all I've made," said God, "the hills, the sea, the sky, the stars."
And I was some of the mud that got to sit up and look around.
Lucky me, lucky mud.
I, mud, sat up and saw what a nice job God had done.
Nice going, God.
Nobody but you could have done it, God! I certainly couldn't have.
I feel very unimportant compared to You.
The only way I can feel the least bit important is to think of all the mud
that didn't even get to sit up and look around.
I got so much, and most mud got so little.
Thank you for the honor!
Now mud lies down again and goes to sleep.
What memories for mud to have!
What interesting other kinds of sitting-up mud I met!
I loved everything I saw!
Good night.
I will go to heaven now.
I can hardly wait...
To find out for certain what my wampeter was...
And who was in my karass...
And all the good things our karass did for you.
Amen.

--
I found it! http://tinyurl.com/upn9

2837. Re: EMERGENCY! CD-ROM Document Library Released

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-18 15:10:57 UTC
From: knk_ca@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <f7181ce8.0311180710.253eb731@posting.google.com>
Source record: 82352
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.radio.scanner,misc.survivalism

You state that this information is given out for free,,, who do I
contact or how can I obtain a copy of it?
Kirk

"Ryan, KC8PMX" <REMOVETHISkc8pmx@diamondcs.net> wrote in message
news:<bo8co6$1aok9h$3@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>...
> This information either better be written by you OR have a release from the
> original publisher to SELL what is otherwise given out for free.......

2838. Re: RRAP call signs in SS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-18 17:04:24 UTC
From: groupk0hb@earthlink.net
Message-ID: <5ee63311.0311180904.7710d408@posting.google.com>
Source record: 82364

Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote

> Somehow I would have thought that light (radio waves) could travel
> either direction on the same exact path.

You'd think so, but 'taint so.

And if you spend any time on HF during disturbed solar condx, you will
receive many vivid demonstrations of non-reciprocal/non-symmetrical
propagation paths.

73, de Hans, K0HB
--
There is no voodoo or magic associated with RF
propagation. There are several perfectly sound
technical reasons why it is beneficial to occasionally
sacrifice a goat in your antenna field.

2839. Re: EMERGENCY! CD-ROM Document Library Released

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-18 17:26:12 UTC
From: On-Liner <Silly@sods.com>
Message-ID: <bpdknb$1moq3g$1@ID-202175.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 82365
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.radio.scanner,misc.survivalism

"Kirk" wrote
> You state that this information is given out for free,,, who do I
> contact or how can I obtain a copy of it?

http://www.google.com/search?hl=en&ie=UTF-8&oe=UTF-8&q=us+army+field+manuals

Google.com - almost 72,000 results for US Army Field Manuals

2840. Re: RRAP call signs in SS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-18 18:16:55 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <rmtub.6540$Rk5.5361@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 82366

"K�HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:Yueub.7157
>
> Can't wait for CQWWCW!!! Maybe the freckles-del-Sol will be more
> cooperative.
>
> 73, de Hans, K0HB
>
>
>

Looks like that super sunspot will be rotating back towards earth. It may seriously trash the polar paths. Oh well....we will see when we get there.

Dan/W4NTI

2841. Re: RRAP call signs in SS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-18 18:22:01 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <drtub.6572$Rk5.6271@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 82367

"Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
news:3FB978E0.7090306@ix.netcom.com...
> >
> >
> >>
> >>
> >
> >North/South paths were excellent, but East/West paths were
non-symmetrical,
> >which suggests a tilted ionosphere. The further north you were, the more
> >exaggerated the effect was. I was hearing the W7/VE7's weak and watery,
> >but they reported my signal as huge. Meanwhile W1/VE1's who I had
20-over
> >were CQ'ing in my face.
> >
> >
> >
> Didn't think that could happen. I thought light (here radio waves)
> would propagate
> equally as well going as well as coming back. Like "If you can see my
> face I also
> can see your face".
>
I know this is not 'one way skip', but for a bit of interest... I used to
run skeds into VK land (Australia). During the null of a cycle. There
were times that when I beamed over the SOUTH POLE it was better than the
direct path.

I'm not sure it should be called 'one way skip'. But for lack of a better
term..hi.

Dan/W4NTI

2842. Re: RRAP call signs in SS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-18 18:26:20 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <gvtub.6596$Rk5.341@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 82368

"Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
news:3FB9C6FB.3010104@ix.netcom.com...
> K�HB wrote:
>
> >
> >Only when the mirror is equidistant between us and when it is "flat" will
> >the path be symmetrical and relative signal strengths reciprocal.
> >
> >
> >
> Somehow I would have thought that light (radio waves) could travel
> either direction
> on the same exact path. And that attenuation either way would be
identical.
> Same for the same set of multiple paths.
>
> But it's been years since Physics class.....
>
> >
> >
>
>

The ionosphere is not like a mirror, as Hans stated. And from what I understand the waves don't actually bounce, but they are bent back towards earth.

Dan/W4NTI

2843. Re: RRAP call signs in SS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-18 18:32:48 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <kBtub.6628$Rk5.3158@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 82369

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:pGgub.10895$P%1.9679778@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
>
> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
> news:nzdub.5514$Rk5.5429@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> > Short skip was really loud on 20 on Saturday. You were slammin in here.
> >
> > I use a vertical loop at about 45 feet to the top. Really does well on
> NVIS
> > stuff.
> >
> > Great hearing you.
> >
> > Don't think I heard Dee.
> >
> > Dan/W4NTI
> >
>
> Didn't hear you either according to my log. Maybe another time.
>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>

Yep, I wasn't feeling too well on Saturday. My other op couldn't make it.
So I did mostly search and pounce on Saturday.

On Sunday towards the mid day I started CQing. Managed 434 qso's, 76 out
of 80 sections. Not good. But considering it all...hi.

See ya down the log.

Dan/W4NTI

2844. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-18 18:37:33 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3FBA66ED.5070205@psu.edu>
Source record: 82370

Ryan, KC8PMX wrote:
> If your interest rate is less than 5%, the best loan to get is a 30 year!
> It's cheap money. Paying off a house quick is foolish. And the monthly
> rate is usually a hell of alot less too. Spend the difference of that
> paying off bills or invest it in a mutual fund or something.

Ahh, a financial truism! This belongs with:

The stock market ALWAYS goes up!

(It soitanly do, but over long time periods that are not relevant to
most of us who don't live over 150 years. More importantly it is what
the market is doing around the time you take your money out.)

Move your money into high yield accounts shortly before you retire, that
way you'll have more money when you retire!

I've listened to investment consultants actually pull this one out of
their hats. I know some older folk who have done this and now have
almost no retirement funds.

I have to chuckle at your truism. first, because your friend the real
estate agent uses those sort of arguments to talk you into buying
several thousand or tens of thousands more dollars worht of house.
Second is that You are saying a person who gets out of debt is foolish.

Best way to not be a fool is to not go heavily into debt in the first
place. I have a 5 percent loan, but I'll pay it off quickly, I think.

> Instead of paying off that low interest loan quickly, one is smarter paying
> off the higher interest loans like automobiles, department and credit card
> charges, and other loans/debts.

Again, it's better to not get into a situation where you would have to
choose which loan you're paying off early.

- Mike KB3EIA -

2845. Re: Language Rules from FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-18 18:53:15 UTC
From: John Smith <djfinn2@nobellspsoutham.net>
Message-ID: <zTtub.526$gU2.363@bignews6.bellsouth.net>
Source record: 82371

"Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:bovm12$901@library2.airnews.net...
> A neighbor tells me that the FCC has recently ruled that broadcast radio
> stations are now "legally" able to "say the F word" on the air, as long as
> it isn't sexual. Yeah, I know, go figure.
>
> But, when I did a quick search on the FCC website, I found nothing of it.
> Anyone know of this...my thoughts are on what will happen in amateur radio
> now. The broadcast arena has always been the barometer of what people are
> allowed to say on the air, hasn't it?
>
> Kim W5TIT

What about language rules attached to callsigns?

2846. Re: RRAP call signs in SS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-18 19:01:06 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <S%tub.6780$Rk5.4794@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 82372

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote

> I know this is not 'one way skip', but for a bit of interest... I used to
> run skeds into VK land (Australia). During the null of a cycle. There
> were times that when I beamed over the SOUTH POLE it was better than the
> direct path.
>
> I'm not sure it should be called 'one way skip'. But for lack of a better
> term..hi.

That's "skew path" propagation. It's actually pretty common, but you don't notice it so much when we're high in the sunspot cycle curve. At solar-flux minimum, however, it becomes more noticed because you are more likely to "tweak" your beam azimuth to wring that last little half-dB of signal strength. Also, it seems more prevalent on the lower bands, below 10MHz, which otherwise can get hammered by auroral zone absorption.

From here in the midwest, the skew path to EU is toward western Africa, almost 45 degrees of the normal azimuth. During CQWW I often work from W0AIH's superstation (http://www.qth.com/w0aih/), and use the Africa rhombic to work Europe --- it's non-intuitive, but you can really roll up a score on 80M!

73, de Hans, K0HB

2847. Re: Language Rules from FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-18 19:37:33 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <1yuub.6838$Rk5.6679@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 82373

Dan Finn wrote

>
> What about language rules attached to callsigns?
>

Oh crap, here we go again!

With all kind wishes,
de Hans, K0HB

--
"The dust will not settle in our time. And when it does some great roaring
machine will come and whirl it all sky-high again."
--Samuel Beckett

2848. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-18 20:25:41 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hok4uwa.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>
Source record: 82376

On 17 Nov 2003 01:28:48 GMT, N2EY wrote:

>Here's another one for ya: I bet neither of us would have any problem getting a
>30 year mortgage, even though we'd be nearly 80 when said mortage was paid off
>(barring any advance payments). Huh?

We got a 30-year mortgage four years ago notwithstanding that I was
retired on a moderate pension, my wife was an independent contract
employee close to retirement age, and both of us would be over 90
when it matured.

Not only that, we refinanced it last year starting a new 30 year
clock.

In reality we rent the place from Fannie May or Freddy Mac, whomever
wound up with the paper..... We know it, they know it.....

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

From a Clearing in the Silicon Forest
Beaverton (Washington County) Oregon

2849. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-18 20:25:42 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hok55eb.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>
Source record: 82374

On Mon, 17 Nov 2003 12:08:16 GMT, Dwight Stewart wrote:

>"Phil Kane" wrote:
>>>
>> From a Clearing in the Silicon Forest
>> Beaverton (Washington County) Oregon
>
>
> Hey, when did you move to Oregon, Phil? You were in SF the last time we
>talked, weren't you? If so, you move more then we do.

September 1999 - four years ago. Last major move before that was to
the SF area in 1967.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

2850. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-18 20:25:42 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hok4hc9.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>
Source record: 82375

On Mon, 17 Nov 2003 01:08:51 GMT, Dee D. Flint wrote:

>> OTOH, there are several "successful" enterprises that we just
>> wouldn't patronize - Wal-Mart leads that list.
>
>I would go if they had a product I wanted but see no reason to do so if they
>are not selling the products that I want.

We do not shop there because we do not like their business attitudes
in specific areas - hiring folks desperate for a job but only for 19
hours a week not to exceed two years' tenure, thereby avoiding
paying much above minimum wage and granting no employee benefits,
certain shenanigans about forced unpaid hours (subject of several
lawsuits across the country), and trashing the local merchants and
moving on whenever they pleased, leaving disaster in their wake.

Our choice.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

From a Clearing in the Silicon Forest
Beaverton (Washington County) Oregon

2851. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-18 21:24:43 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3FBA8E1B.2080005@psu.edu>
Source record: 82377

Phil Kane wrote:
> On Mon, 17 Nov 2003 01:08:51 GMT, Dee D. Flint wrote:
>
>
>>> OTOH, there are several "successful" enterprises that we just
>>> wouldn't patronize - Wal-Mart leads that list.
>>
>>I would go if they had a product I wanted but see no reason to do so if they
>>are not selling the products that I want.
>
>
> We do not shop there because we do not like their business attitudes
> in specific areas - hiring folks desperate for a job but only for 19
> hours a week not to exceed two years' tenure, thereby avoiding
> paying much above minimum wage and granting no employee benefits,
> certain shenanigans about forced unpaid hours (subject of several
> lawsuits across the country), and trashing the local merchants and
> moving on whenever they pleased, leaving disaster in their wake.
>
> Our choice.

Don't forget they hire illegal aliens to do some of the work..... Oh hey! that ws one of the original OT parts of this thread. Here we go full circle!

- Mike KB3EIA -

2852. Greeting

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-18 22:00:29 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <1Ewub.9290$Wy4.3562@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 82378

http://www.jacquielawson.com/viewcard.asp?code=0183913358

Turn up the sound and put on your dancing shoes.

Happy Thanksgiving from K0HB & K0CKB

2853. Re: KG4LEG new jammer in tampa bay on 146.640 N9EE wide area repeater

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-18 22:59:51 UTC
From: hamradioman2000@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <e95066a4.0311181459.64ef2e58@posting.google.com>
Source record: 82379
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.swap

ok, heres an update, i have been all over the net tracking down info
on this cedric jammer guy, got lots of info now..
his real name is cedric harris
he has a email address of coolaidcb13@hotmail.com
he has a callsign KF4ZCG
he has several websites (one of wich has some anti 146.640 repeater
songs)
http://geocities.com/kf4zcg/ (current site)
http://www.angelfire.com/on2/rifleman (older site and not up)

his CB information is

Coolaid Kid (213)
Tampa Florida
Former Host of the 27.115 Beer Break

QRZ shows cedric's callsign and address to be

KF4ZCG Lookups: 1101 (looked up on 11/17/03)
Cedric C Harris
2119 29 Ave N
Saint Petersburg FL 33713
USA

Hi all, Thanks for looking me up. I am 18 years old, I have been into
ham radio since 1998 and I have been into electronics for over a
decade now. I am usually on 2,10,15, or 40 meters. I talk everywhere
though. Seeya on the air.
And don't forget to check into the Sparc Nightly Net on 147.060 at
6:30PM!
73 Cedric KF4ZCG

finally kg4leg has been at it again today, N0JAM shannon (calls it the
"fell sorry for me net")
kg4leg also hates KF4GAH (and likewise) they apparently rant back and
forth on CB. kg4leg was rebroadcasting a spot on cb over the 146.640
repeater when KF4GAH was yelling at him over the CB last night

will keep the post updated for archiving purposes

2854. Re: RRAP call signs in SS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-18 23:47:33 UTC
From: John Siegel <JohnASiegel@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <3FBAAF91.4030808@worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 82380

Kï¿½HB wrote:
> "John Siegel" <JohnASiegel@worldnet.att.net> wrote
>
>
>>Wasn't able to get on until Sunday afternoon and just for a short while.
>> I did give you a QSO.
>
>
>>73, John K4BNC
>
>
> Thanks!!!
>
> I remember the QSO because of your suffix. Was tempted to make a wise
> remark like "Hey, thanks for the nice connection!", but was struggling for
> points at that time, so I didn't slow down for chit-chat. Sorry I didn't
> recognize it was you.
>
> 73, de Hans, K0HB
>
>
Too bad I can't get a royalty for each BNC used by a ham!
John

2855. 27.285 Amtor

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-19 00:08:13 UTC
From: Herb <14313@thegangherb.net>
Message-ID: <bpec94$25a$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 82381

"David" <dbaldwin@infogen.net.nz> wrote in message
news:nphjrvsht5f67n9iarh1e2purosnsol263@4ax.com...
> On Tue, 18 Nov 2003 20:10:32 +1300, David <dbaldwin@infogen.net.nz>
> wrote:
>
> that's 27.355 to 27.285 sorry
> >who is transmitting amtor on ch35
>

Same signal is being xmitted on 14313 and popular pirate
frequencies in the 6 & 7 mHz bands. Too bad nobody gives
a rat's rear end enough to correlate this data.

Herb

2856. Re: RRAP call signs in SS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-19 00:40:00 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0311181640.6978d6bd@posting.google.com>
Source record: 82382

Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
news:<3FB9C6FB.3010104@ix.netcom.com>...
> Kï¿½HB wrote:

> >Only when the mirror is equidistant between us and when it is "flat" will
> >the path be symmetrical and relative signal strengths reciprocal.

> Somehow I would have thought that light (radio waves) could travel
> either direction
> on the same exact path. And that attenuation either way would be identical.
> Same for the same set of multiple paths.
>
> But it's been years since Physics class......
>
As W4NTI points out, the ionosphere isn't really a reflector - it's a
refractor. The waves are bent, not bounced.

When the ionosphere is stable and uniform, it behaves *like* a mirror,
and the 2 way reciprocity thing works well. But when it's tilted,
twisted or otherwise distorted, the refraction in one direction may be
different than in the opposite direction.

As an analogy, think of "one way" mirrors in optics and how they
behave under the right conditions.

73 de Jim, N2EY

"If it happens, it must be possible"

73 de Jim, N2EY

2857. Re: Do Hams get 11 Meters Back

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-19 00:55:14 UTC
From: Jerry Oxendine <joxendi@bellsouth.net>
Message-ID: <u9zub.2314$Cc6.2090@bignews1.bellsouth.net>
Source record: 82383
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.cb

"Steveo" <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com> wrote in message
news:20031117141843.154$s1@newsreader.com...
> JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote:
> > You seem to have a reading comprehension problem. I will type slowly so
> > you maybe can understand. T H E H A M S D O N O T W A N T
> > E L E V E N M E T E R S B A C K. To use your silly cb lingo, "no
> > doubt about it".
> >
> This is true. They don't even use 10 meters much.

BOY! How much you THINK you know! It gets used
a LOT! And some of it is in a "language" you are unlikely to
understand----you know, them pesky "dots and dashes" in addition to SSB, AM
and FM.

J

2858. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-19 01:01:40 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <Uhzub.3943$m84.2314787@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 82384

Dwight Stewart wrote:
> "N2EY" wrote:
>
>>Actually, now that I think about it, there is a
>>certain twisted logic to it. In general, people
>>are living longer now, so the chances of
>>someone actually paying off the mortgage is
>>better than before. Conversely, if the person
>>dies, the mortgage company gets their money
>>quickly, from the estate.
>>
>>On top of all this, such policies insure that the
>>mortgage companies don't have to worry
>>about claims of age discrimination.
>
>
>
> Or, even better, if the mortgage isn't paid off, the mortgage company can
> foreclose and resell the house for a very tidy profit. That alone is enough
> to attract many mortgage companies to the elderly.

It's not as lucrative as you make it sound, Dwight. Also, these people
are reasonably well off, retiring with money equivalent to upper middle
class or better.

> This may also be why some
> mortgage companies actually seem to seek out those who will likely not fully
> pay off a mortgage (excessive debt, a history of bad credit, or whatever).
> After the mortgagor has partially paid down the amount owed on the property,
> the mortgage company can foreclose and retain the property for a much lower
> amount than they would have paid in an outright purchase.

Hmm, there are some places I've seen that seem to cater to those
without stellar credit ratings, but they are places like
furniture/appliance/electronics rental places. Plus deadbeats have a
tendency to default pretty quickly, so a mortgage company would have a
real nuisance on thie hands.

- Mike KB3EIA -

2859. Re: Do Hams get 11 Meters Back

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-19 01:02:22 UTC
From: Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com>
Message-ID: <20031118200222.392$3K@newsreader.com>
Source record: 82385
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.cb

"Jerry Oxendine" <joxendi@bellsouth.net> wrote:
> "Steveo" <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com> wrote in message
> news:20031117141843.154$s1@newsreader.com...
> > JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote:
> > > You seem to have a reading comprehension problem. I will type slowly
> > > so you maybe can understand. T H E H A M S D O N O T W A N T
> > > E L E V E N M E T E R S B A C K. To use your silly cb lingo, "no
> > > doubt about it".
> > >
> > This is true. They don't even use 10 meters much.
>
> BOY! How much you THINK you know! It gets used
> a LOT! And some of it is in a "language" you are unlikely to
> understand----you know, them pesky "dots and dashes" in addition to SSB,
> AM and FM.
>
> J
>
Are you kidding me, Jerry? You spen all of your time listening
for trucker's on 10.

2860. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-19 01:04:04 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <8kzub.3944$m84.2316406@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 82386

Alun wrote:

> If I thought it should be decided by a poll, and I'm by no means sure of
> that, then it should be done on-line. Just have a web page where you click
> your chosen response. Chicago voters might be a problem, though.

Do you remember Hank the Angry, Drunken Dwarf?

- Mike KB3EIA -

2861. Re: RRAP call signs in SS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-19 01:17:16 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0311181717.2de9c6cc@posting.google.com>
Source record: 82387

"Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<Kt7ub.5041$Rk5.4706@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>...

> Worked N8UZE and W4NTI this past weekend. Where were the rest of you? I
> coulda used the Q's!

Sincere apologies here, Hans...Got called in to work. Wudda MUCH
rather been working the radio than wading through body parts...

73

Steve, K4YZ

2862. Re: Do Hams get 11 Meters Back

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-19 01:19:40 UTC
From: Jerry Oxendine <joxendi@bellsouth.net>
Message-ID: <Rvzub.2509$Cc6.1658@bignews1.bellsouth.net>
Source record: 82388
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.cb

"Steveo" <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com> wrote in message
news:20031118200222.392$3K@newsreader.com...
> "Jerry Oxendine" <joxendi@bellsouth.net> wrote:
> > "Steveo" <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com> wrote in message
> > news:20031117141843.154$s1@newsreader.com...
> > > JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote:
> > > > You seem to have a reading comprehension problem. I will type slowly
> > > > so you maybe can understand. T H E H A M S D O N O T W A N T
> > > > E L E V E N M E T E R S B A C K. To use your silly cb lingo, "no
> > > > doubt about it".
> > > >
> > > This is true. They don't even use 10 meters much.
> > >
> > BOY! How much you THINK you know! It gets used
> > a LOT! And some of it is in a "language" you are unlikely to
> > understand----you know, them pesky "dots and dashes" in addition to SSB,
> > AM and FM.
> >
> > J
> >
> Are you kidding me, Jerry? You spen all of your time listening
> for trucker's on 10.

Again, it STILL shows how much you know about 10 meters. There are lots of
operators that have regular QSOs on 10 whether the "skip" is runnning or
not. Many groups gather on various frequencies for nightly chats. These
chat groups do so at ranges of 5-50 miles--sometimes more. We are NOT
always looking from
truckers. They are not supposed to be there anyhow.
But you can be sure of one thing: sources tell me that
there are more of them fixin' to get a "surprise". LOL!
J

2863. Re: Do Hams get 11 Meters Back

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-19 01:24:20 UTC
From: Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com>
Message-ID: <20031118202420.715$Kg@newsreader.com>
Source record: 82389
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.cb

"Jerry Oxendine" <joxendi@bellsouth.net> wrote:
> "Steveo" <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com> wrote in message
> news:20031118200222.392$3K@newsreader.com...
> > "Jerry Oxendine" <joxendi@bellsouth.net> wrote:
> > > "Steveo" <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com> wrote in message
> > > news:20031117141843.154$s1@newsreader.com...
> > > > JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote:
> > > > > You seem to have a reading comprehension problem. I will type
> > > > > slowly so you maybe can understand. T H E H A M S D O N O T W
> > > > > A N T E L E V E N M E T E R S B A C K. To use your silly cb
> > > > > lingo, "no doubt about it".
> > > > >
> > > > This is true. They don't even use 10 meters much.
> > > >
> > > BOY! How much you THINK you know! It gets used
> > > a LOT! And some of it is in a "language" you are unlikely to
> > > understand----you know, them pesky "dots and dashes" in addition to
> > > SSB, AM and FM.
> > >
> > > J
> > >
> > Are you kidding me, Jerry? You spen all of your time listening
> > for trucker's on 10.
>
> Again, it STILL shows how much you know about 10 meters. There are lots
> of operators that have regular QSOs on 10 whether the "skip" is runnning
> or not. Many groups gather on various frequencies for nightly chats.
> These chat groups do so at ranges of 5-50 miles--sometimes more.
>
Sounds like 11 meters.
>
> We are
> NOT always looking from
> truckers.
> They are not supposed to be there anyhow.
>
I agree.
>
> But you can be sure of one thing: sources tell me that
> there are more of them fixin' to get a "surprise". LOL!
> J
>
Obsess much?

2864. Re: Happy Veterans Day

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-19 01:28:33 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0311181728.26490c4b@posting.google.com>
Source record: 82390

brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0311171532.124bff21@posting.google.com>...

> Stebe, you could try standing up on your hind legs, like a man, and
> make your crappy little comments directly to me.

I've been addressing you in the third party, Brain?

Seems to me that I've addressed each and every comment ABOUT you
TO you, unless of course you can prove otherwise, INCLUDING the one
you refered to here wherein I suggested that IF I wanted to stalk you
(you seem to be anxious for me to do it...) that I'd just follow the
slime trail in the sand.

Nothing deceitful or misleading about it. It was a reply in
direct response to a comment you made. Are you having a problem
following the posting trail? The credit line on Google shows that
only you and I were involved in the exchange.

Are you hearing voices?

> And for what its
> worth, no one appreciates your unique posting habits. No one. Nada.
> Zip. Zed. Zero.

You'll be so kind as to quote me where I said I was
concerned...???

Trying to get that snide swipe in? Nice try, but who cares?
Where do you want me to mail the money for the phone call so you can
call someone who cares?

> Don't believe me? Just ask.

What's to believe, Brain? Your track record is less than
exemplary in the truth and accuracy department.

> didit?

I am sure that's the extent of your proficiency in Morse Code.
Twenty five more letters to go...

Steve, K4YZ

2865. Re: Happy Veterans Day

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-19 01:30:42 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0311181730.41b9d013@posting.google.com>
Source record: 82391

brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0311150526.7136affe@posting.google.com>...
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3FB5B3C8.70728E0E@earthlink.net>...

> > I'm not the individual who bungled copying material from a web page.
> >
> > Dave K8MN
>
> Dave, you're hopeless.
>
> If you should ever have something of interest, which is almost never,
> please get back with me.
>
> If not, just keep it to yourself - please.

I am sure you'd like for Dave, myself, and others to stop rubbing
YOUR nose in YOUR mistakes, Brain, but it's just soooooooo much fun.

Steve, K4YZ

2866. No!!! Re: Do Hams get 11 Meters Back

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-19 01:56:56 UTC
From: High SWR <m@il.here>
Message-ID: <I5Aub.182685$9E1.958199@attbi_s52>
Source record: 82392
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.shortwave

No, the CB'ers get the Ham bands. Thanks ARRL for your work in dumbing things down.

CQ Breaker, CQ Breaker, any 20 meter good-buddies got yer ears on, come on back. Ten-Four, Ten-Four, good buddy, Got ya twenty pounds. No Doubt yer gettin out, come on back...

High SWR

2867. Re: Language Rules from FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-19 02:41:17 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031118214117.07578.00001705@mb-m25.aol.com>
Source record: 82393

In article <cuvyxnansvbet.hogqpu6.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>, "Phil Kane"
<Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> writes:

>On 15 Nov 2003 20:16:48 GMT, N2EY wrote:
>
>>>> > The broadcast arena has always been the barometer of what people are
>>>> > allowed to say on the air, hasn't it?
>>>>
>>>> Nope. FCC has completely different rules for different services. The
>>>> fact that somebody gets away with something in the broadcast services
>>>> doesn't mean it's OK in the ARS.
>
> Quite a while back, there was a case against an amateur operator in
> Los Angeles, and the ALJ ruled that the standards of broadcast
> indecency articulated in the _Pacifica_ case (the "Seven Dirty Words"
> case) also applied to the ARS because ARS transmissions are readily
> available to the general public (i.e. are not protected by privacy
> or secrecy statutes).

Sure - but as I read that, (insert standard "layman, not a lawyer" disclaimer
here) that means the ARS cannot go beyond what the BC services can do. IOW the
ARS "lower bound of decency" cannot be lower than that of the BC services.
>
>>>Generally the terminology states soemething to the effect of "good amateur
>>>practice." My ONLY PROBLEM with that is WHO gets to decide what the
>>>benchmark is for good amateur practice..... If the FCC, who issues our
>>>licenses are not going to do it, then who?
>
> Amen, brother.

Yea, verily.

>>>As for specific words??? Dunno, is there a list?? :)
>
> No.
>
>>>Who makes the list then?
>
> George Carlin, at last count.

More like nobody. How did we all get to hear that routine?
>
>>Common sense and good taste used to be the guide. But I guess such
>>concepts are old-fashioned nowadays, from what some folks tell me when
>>I oppose the use of such language on the air and in newsgropups.....
>

> Agreed.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2868. Re: Language Rules from FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-19 02:41:18 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031118214118.07578.00001706@mb-m25.aol.com>
Source record: 82395

In article <bpdi62$1n9ab4$12@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>, "Ryan, KC8PMX"
<REMOVETHISkc8pmx@diamondcs.net> writes:

>Jim.... of all the people here I thought for sure you would see where I was
>going with that.......

Of course.

>it goes well beyond the "dirty words" and could
>extend to any speech undesireable by others that could be deemed offensive
>and therefor punishable.

I still believe in common sense and good taste, old-fashioned as that may seem.
Discussing one's gastrointestinal problems in detail on the air may be legal
but that doesn't make it acceptable....

I never hear that sort of stuff in CW ragchews, btw.

>Heck, we have organizations in the US already
>trying that..... not a small step to extend to ham radio!

You mean like folks who say the press is "liberally biased" or "beholden to big
business" when it reports things they don't like?

>Like I said.... look beyond the cuss words, and there is a ton of things
>that some radical freaks could oppose.
>
Sure. But limiting what can be said on the amateur bands is not an incursion
into free speech, because the amateur bands are public property.

73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>"Some people are like Slinkies . . . not really good for anything, but you
>still can't help but smile when you see one tumble down the stairs."
>
>> >As for specific words??? Dunno, is there a list?? :) Who makes the list
>> >then? Are other things other than the known "7 dirty words" included? If
>> >someone is of say, for instance a different faith than you, do you get to
>> >determine anything they say religiously is offensive and should be banned
>> >speech? I am sure there are other examples one could come up with......
>>
>> Common sense and good taste used to be the guide. But I guess such
>concepts are
>> old-fashioned nowadays, from what some folks tell me when I oppose the use
>of
>> such language on the air and in newsgropups.....
>>

>> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>>

2869. Re: Language Rules from FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-19 02:41:19 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031118214119.07578.00001707@mb-m25.aol.com>
Source record: 82394

In article <1yuub.6838$Rk5.6679@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> writes:

>Dan Finn wrote
>
>>
>> What about language rules attached to callsigns?
>>
>
>Oh

[expletive deleted]

>here we go again!
>
That sort of talk will tale rrap "one step closer...."

You know the rest.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2870. Re: 27.285 Amtor

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-19 03:11:18 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <qbBub.9928$Wy4.51@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 82396

"Herb" <14313@thegangherb.net> wrote

> Same signal is being xmitted on 14313

Bullshit! Purely and simply bullshit. Come back when you have rented a
clue about what goes on in the ham bands.

With kindest personal regards,

de Hans, K0HB

2871. Re: Need info: Cobra 75

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-19 03:14:01 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <ZdBub.9933$Wy4.9528@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 82397

"Herb" <14313@thegangherb.net> wrote

> >
> > Does anyone know if any mods exist for this compact handheld to expand
the
> > channels and add FM coverage?
> >

Yes, there are precise step-by-step instructions at
http://www.amishrakefight.org/gfy

73, de Hans, K0HB

2872. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-19 03:20:00 UTC
From: Alun <alun@1stcounsel.com>
Message-ID: <Xns9437E32E58226elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 82398

Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in
news:8kzub.3944$m84.2316406@news1.news.adelphia.net:

> Alun wrote:
>
>
>> If I thought it should be decided by a poll, and I'm by no means sure
>> of that, then it should be done on-line. Just have a web page where
>> you click your chosen response. Chicago voters might be a problem,
>> though.
>
> Do you remember Hank the Angry, Drunken Dwarf?
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -
>
>

No. Can't say I do. Enlighten me!

2873. Australia

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-19 03:32:42 UTC
From: Alun <alun@1stcounsel.com>
Message-ID: <Xns9437E5554901Eelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 82399

VK is abolishing code testing effective January 1st. One more down...

2874. Re: No!!! Re: Do Hams get 11 Meters Back

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-19 05:27:03 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3FBAFF1A.6050303@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 82400
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.shortwave

High SWR wrote:

>No, the CB'ers get the Ham bands. Thanks ARRL for your work in dumbing
>things down.
>
>CQ Breaker, CQ Breaker, any 20 meter good-buddies got yer ears on, come on
>back. Ten-Four, Ten-Four, good buddy, Got ya twenty pounds. No Doubt yer
>gettin out, come on back...
>
>
Yeah, right. I haven't heard lingo like that on any ham bands, even
since restructuring
happened......

CQ no kids, lids or space cadets......

2875. Re: Do Hams get 11 Meters Back

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-19 09:58:13 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <REMOVETHISkc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <bpfrcc$1ns0sh$5@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 82454
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

Okay.... I'll take a stab at this one..... Who the hell said it's required to be long distance to be useful??

I know personally of some people around here in the Lower Peninsula who on a regular basis communicate on 10 meters and one is near Midland and the other is near Traverse City. And yes, these are pcta extra class licensee's. Guesstimation of around 50-75 miles with 100-200 watts.......

It's not necessarily the quantity of the QSO, as much as the QUALITY of the QSO in my book. If I can have a really enjoyable conversation with someone, even to the level of earning the ragchew award, and to where I learn about that person and their likes, dislikes, hobbies and interests and so on, that to me is the most rewarding conversation.

--
Ryan KC8PMX

"Never take too life seriously. Nobody gets out alive anyway."

> > This is true. They don't even use 10 meters much.
>
> 10 meters is quite dependent on the status of the sunspot cycle. When the
> solar flux is good, the band is indeed heavily used but when the flux is
> down, it won't support long distance communications.
>
>

2876. Re: Greeting

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-19 10:00:59 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <REMOVETHISkc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <bpfrcd$1ns0sh$6@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 82455

Have a wonderful Thanksgiving holiday, and I think this is about one of the
few times where telling you to go "get stuffed" wouldn't necessarily be a
bad thing! :) hihi

Gobble! Gobble!

--
Ryan KC8PMX

"Health is merely the slowest possible rate at which one can die."

"K&#65533;HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:1Ewub.9290$Wy4.3562@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> http://www.jacquielawson.com/viewcard.asp?code=0183913358
>
> Turn up the sound and put on your dancing shoes.
>
> Happy Thanksgiving from K0HB & K0CKB
>
>
>
>

2877. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-19 10:06:42 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <REMOVETHISkc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <bpfrce$1ns0sh$7@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 82456

Actually Jim, I think the things I am gonna mention are what are called reverse mortgages.

My dad (going on 68) is contemplating taking both of his residences and reverse mortgaging them. Apparently the bank gives him money ahead of time for the value of the house (a little less than market value) and upon his death, the property is immediately transferred to the mortgage company. I may be a little bit off on the explanation but it is kinda my understanding of how it works. I guess this way he gets the opportunity to enjoy the money/value of the residences now, while he is still alive, as opposed to leaving it to my sister and I.

--
Ryan KC8PMX

"Give a person a fish and you feed them for a day; teach that
person to use The Internet and they won't bother you for weeks."

> >60's and up getting those mortgages. Go figure.
>
> Actually, now that I think about it, there is a certain twisted logic to it. In
> general, people are living longer now, so the chances of someone actually
> paying off the mortgage is better than before. Conversely, if the person dies,
> the mortgage company gets their money quickly, from the estate.
>
> On top of all this, such policies insure that the mortgage companies don't have
> to worry about claims of age discrimination.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

2878. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-19 10:14:54 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <REMOVETHISkc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <bpfrcf$1ns0sh$8@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 82457

"Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
news:3FBA66ED.5070205@psu.edu...
> Ryan, KC8PMX wrote:
> > If your interest rate is less than 5%, the best loan to get is a 30
year!
> > It's cheap money. Paying off a house quick is foolish. And the monthly
> > rate is usually a hell of alot less too. Spend the difference of that
> > paying off bills or invest it in a mutual fund or something.
>
>
>
> Ahh, a financial truism! This belongs with:
>
> The stock market ALWAYS goes up!

What goes up must come down as well too. But that is the beauty of the
stock market. It is a cyclical thing. Ideally it would be like a good
sinus rhythm. It is just merely the knowledge of where to jump in at.

>
> (It soitanly do, but over long time periods that are not relevant to
> most of us who don't live over 150 years. More importantly it is what
> the market is doing around the time you take your money out.)
>
> Move your money into high yield accounts shortly before you retire, that
> way you'll have more money when you retire!

Only if you know what you are doing and have a really good grasp of the
market.

>
> I've listened to investment consultants actually pull this one out of
> their hats. I know some older folk who have done this and now have
> almost no retirement funds.

Yep... not for the weak or feable to try on thier own if not knowledgeable.

>
> I have to chuckle at your truism. first, because your friend the real
> estate agent uses those sort of arguments to talk you into buying
> several thousand or tens of thousands more dollars worht of house.
> Second is that You are saying a person who gets out of debt is foolish.

Actually the person I got this truism from and believe in it is Bruce
Williams, the talkshow host. If you do the math, it is fairly true.

>
> Best way to not be a fool is to not go heavily into debt in the first
> place. I have a 5 percent loan, but I'll pay it off quickly, I think.

I wouldn't but thats me. What I would do is see if you can refinance at all to a lower rate. I have actually seen a interest rate recently somewhere in the 3 percent range!! Talk about a cheap loan, hell, I would refinance/remortgage my neighbors house if I could legally get away with it! LOL

>
> > Instead of paying off that low interest loan quickly, one is smarter paying
> > off the higher interest loans like automobiles, department and credit card
> > charges, and other loans/debts.
>
> Again, it's better to not get into a situation where you would have to
> choose which loan you're paying off early.

Well, its not paying the principle that kills ya, its the interest that does over a long time. The lesser the interest rate, the less I am interested in rushing to pay it off extra early. Either way, one needs to do the math or find someone who does understand real estate finance and other financal calculations to make sure in their own individual circumstances.

--
Ryan KC8PMX

"All of us could take a lesson from the weather. It pays no attention to criticism."

2879. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-19 11:29:02 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031119062902.29660.00001675@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 82451

In article <0N7ub.5053$Rk5.2380@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> writes:

>"Rupert" <big@bird.sesame.street> wrote in message
>
>>Simply announce a "record date" by which one must be licensed (To give
>those
>>"yet to be licensed a fair shot at a voice in the process.) and send a
>>ballot out to all those licensed "of record." Makes too much sense and
>>requires some effort. IOW, against the contemporary trend.
>
>Regulatory matters are not decided by ballot or popularity polls.

In some cases, they are. And in most cases the popularity of an issue has at least some influence.

Do you think we'd still have code testing in the USA today if, back in 1998, there had been an overwhelming majority of support for NCI's "5 wpm and sunset clause" idea?

>They are
>decided by an unemotional look at the facts and what is in the public
>interest.

Ideally, yes. In practice, that's rare. For example, is the homogenization of broadcast radio brought about by "deregulation" of ownership in the public interest? How about BPL and the prophecy of 'broadband nirvana" - is that in the public interest?

If such matters "are decided by an unemotional look at the facts and what is in the public interest", why do so commenters/petitioners give a biography of their education and experience in their commentary? Shouldn't the facts speak for themselves, and not depend on who is saying them?

>Thus the *quantity* of comments on the petitions is of no
>consequence --- all that matters are the facts and arguments presented.

I disagree. Of course, popularity alone is not the deciding factor. Nor should it be. But popularity does have an effect in most regulatory decisions.

>Most
>of the comments I have read are noticeably short on persuasive arguments for
>either side of the issue.
>
Agreed!

>Even if it were decided by "vote", the vote would be by the entire
>citizenry, not only those few already favored with a license.

Anyone can petition to or comment to the FCC, but in amateur license matters there are very few outside of licensed amateurs, amateur organizations and manufacturers of amater equipment who bother to comment.

Almost *anyone* can pass the Technician test and get a license - that's been proven by the licensing of young children. So almost anyone who is really interested in being included in such a poll can get a license, just as almost any citizen over 18 who is interested in voting can register to vote.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2880. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-19 11:47:06 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <_KIub.10173$Wy4.4677@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 82452

"Phil Kane" wrote:
> Dwight Stewart wrote:
> >
> > Hey, when did you move to Oregon, Phil? You
> > were in SF the last time we talked, weren't you?
> > If so, you move more then we do.
>
> September 1999 - four years ago. Last major move
> before that was to the SF area in 1967.

Well, I know we've talked more recently than four years ago. I guess I just didn't know about the move. Anyway, we considered moving to the Grants Pass/Medford/Ashland area a few years ago, or perhaps even Coos Bay (in other words, the Southwestern part of the State). In fact, we may still do so - it's on the short list of possible places to move. I was in Sacramento in 1967.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

2881. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-19 12:43:38 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <_zJub.10194$Wy4.8391@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 82453

"Mike Coslo" wrote:
>
> It's not as lucrative as you make it sound, Dwight.
> Also, these people are reasonably well off, retiring
> with money equivalent to upper middle class or
> better. (snip)

I have no idea how lucrative it is. An acquaintance (hard to call this guy a friend) works for a mortgage company and just loves to talk about the shady side of that industry. The company he works for (a nation-wide franchise chain) just switched to more agressive foreclosure practices and, based on the stories he tells, I most certainly would not want to be a customer of that company. Of course, this company has always had questionable (in my opinion) foreclosure practices. He told me years ago (late 80's, early 90's) that, mainly because of increasing property values, it was far more profitable to foreclose on older properties than to maintain the mortgage. As such, the company used every opportunity to foreclose on those mortgages. Today, according to him, long term mortgage foreclosure offers the most gain. Therefore, they now actively seek those who have the greatest possibility of foreclosure years from now, such as the elderly, those with speading habits that suggest possible credit problems down the road, and so on. Now, since I don't work in that industry, I have no idea if this is entirely true or even widespread. But, I've seen enough written about these types of practices to suggest there is at least some truth to it.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

2882. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-19 14:03:05 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3FBB7819.5020101@psu.edu>
Source record: 82458

Alun wrote:
> Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in
> news:8kzub.3944$m84.2316406@news1.news.adelphia.net:
>
>
>>Alun wrote:
>>
>>
>>
>>>If I thought it should be decided by a poll, and I'm by no means sure
>>>of that, then it should be done on-line. Just have a web page where
>>>you click your chosen response. Chicago voters might be a problem,
>>>though.
>>
>> Do you remember Hank the Angry, Drunken Dwarf?
>>
>> - Mike KB3EIA -
>>
>>
>>
>
>
> No. Can't say I do. Enlighten me!

A couple years back, People Magazine ran an online vote for "Most Beautiful Person of the Year" on their website. This was shortly after the movie "Titanic" was released. People's "choice " was for Leonardo DeCaprio to run away with the honors (go figure!)

Well the word got around in the newsgroups that this was going on, and the suggestion was made to all newsgroupies to go to the page and do a write-in vote for "Hank, the angry drunken dwarf"

http://www.hankthedwarf.com/plain/frameset.html

Hank was definitely NOT one of the "beautiful people", and was a perfect foil for the shallow business of celebrity worship as practiced by the likes of People magazine. Unfortunately, Hank's "lifestyle" caught up with him at an amazingly early age, and he is no longer with us.

But he and hundreds of thousands of newsgroupies spanked People magazine a good one:

http://www.hankthedwarf.com/flash_dynamic/news.html

Quote:

PEOPLE ONLINE
MAY 1998
Hank the Angry Drunken Dwarf wins People Online's Most Beautiful Person in the World Poll receiving 230,169 votes dwarfing runner up Leonardo DiCaprio and Rick Flair by over 200,000 votes.

People Online's articles after the spectacle said: "Though we're hardly novices at handling online polls--this was out sixth--nothing could have prepared us for the agony, the ecstacyï¿½and well, the angry, drunken dwarf."

But my point in all this is:

Internet polls mean absolutely nothing whatsoever! I voted for Hank three times in that poll, and if it happened today, I could vote for him five times without trying. If I tried, I suppose I could give him around 300 votes or so.

This is the internet, and online voting won't work.

- Mike KB3EIA -

2883. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-19 14:23:07 UTC
From: Alun <alun@1stcounsel.com>
Message-ID: <Xns94385F749D805elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 82459

Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in news:3FBB7819.5020101@psu.edu:

> Alun wrote:
>> Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in
>> news:8kzub.3944$m84.2316406@news1.news.adelphia.net:
>>
>>
>>>Alun wrote:
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>>If I thought it should be decided by a poll, and I'm by no means sure
>>>>of that, then it should be done on-line. Just have a web page where
>>>>you click your chosen response. Chicago voters might be a problem,
>>>>though.
>>>
>>> Do you remember Hank the Angry, Drunken Dwarf?
>>>
>>> - Mike KB3EIA -
>>>
>>>
>>
>>
>> No. Can't say I do. Enlighten me!
>
> A couple years back, People Magazine ran an online vote for "Most
> Beautiful Person of the Year" on their website. This was shortly after
> the movie "Titanic" was released. People's "choice " was for Leonardo
> DeCaprio to run away with the honors (go figure!)
>
> Well the word got around in the newsgroups that this was going on,
> and
> the suggestion was made to all newsgroupies to go to the page and do a
> write-in vote for "Hank, the angry drunken dwarf"
>
> http://www.hankthedwarf.com/plain/frameset.html
>
> Hank was definitely NOT one of the "beautiful people", and was a
> perfect foil for the shallow business of celebrity worship as practiced
> by the likes of People magazine. Unfortunately, Hank's "lifestyle"
> caught up with him at an amazingly early age, and he is no longer with
> us.
>

> But he and hundreds of thousands of newsgroupies spanked People
> magazine a good one:
>
> http://www.hankthedwarf.com/flash_dynamic/news.html
>
>
> Quote:
>
> PEOPLE ONLINE
> MAY 1998
> Hank the Angry Drunken Dwarf wins People Online's Most Beautiful Person
> in the World Poll receiving 230,169 votes dwarfing runner up Leonardo
> DiCaprio and Rick Flair by over 200,000 votes.
>
> People Online's articles after the spectacle said: "Though we're hardly
> novices at handling online polls--this was out sixth--nothing could
> have prepared us for the agony, the ecstacy&#65533;and well, the angry,
> drunken dwarf."
>
>
>
> But my point in all this is:
>
> Internet polls mean absolutely nothing whatsoever! I voted for Hank
> three times in that poll, and if it happened today, I could vote for
> him five times without trying. If I tried, I suppose I could give him
> around 300 votes or so.
>
> This is the internet, and online voting won't work.
>
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -
>
>

That's why I mentionned 'Chicago voters'. With apologies to anyone reading this in Chicago, the town is famous for voting fraud. The term 'Chicago voter' has been used to mean someone casting a vote on behalf of a dead person. As you point out, in most Internet polls that isn't even necessary, as no ID is submitted. That doesn't mean that there is no solution, though. Some form of pre-registration process would be needed.

2884. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-19 15:54:29 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <VmMub.8036$Rk5.3410@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 82460

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote

> If such matters "are decided by an unemotional look at the facts and what
is in
> the public interest", why do so commenters/petitioners give a biography of
> their education and experience in their commentary?

Because it gives them a sense of self-importance, I suppose.

> So almost anyone who is really interested in being included
> in such a poll can get a license, ...

Ah yes, "I got mine, now you get yours; then you can comment"!!!! (Just
when I was looking for a good example of a "sense of self-importance"!)

73, de Hans, K0HB

2885. Re: No!!! Re: Do Hams get 11 Meters Back

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-19 16:16:07 UTC
From: "Church of The Divine Looney LtD." <vvinnes300@nospam.yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <1069259600.420413@newshost03.voicenet.com>
Source record: 82461
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.shortwave

"Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
news:3FBAFF1A.6050303@ix.netcom.com...
> High SWR wrote:
>
> >No, the CB'ers get the Ham bands. Thanks ARRL for your work in dumbing
> >things down.
> >
> >CQ Breaker, CQ Breaker, any 20 meter good-buddies got yer ears on, come
on
> >back. Ten-Four, Ten-Four, good buddy, Got ya twenty pounds. No Doubt
yer
> >gettin out, come on back...
> >
> >
> Yeah, right. I haven't heard lingo like that on any ham bands, even
> since restructuring
> happened......

Check out 14.313 USB just about any weekend during daylight hours.

> CQ no kids, lids or space cadets......

The *original* w2-y has been dead for over 36 Years.

Amazing how things NEVER EVER EVER change
on ham radio. Even their brand of "humor" is just as lame and
pathetic as it was 3 Decades ago.

The only REAL spark of potential inspiration to happen to ham radio was the
late
WA4D. (SK) Now there was a Ham Radio Messiah if there
ever was one !!!!! Of course, just like the other guy, he was
nailed to a tree by the bluebloods and stinky cheeses at
the ARRL, the Sanhedrin of Ham Radio. I count myself as very fortunate
having worked
ole Mike WA4D before he passed on. I even have one of his VERY
COLLECTABLE signed and autographed QSL Cards.
The famous QSL where he was standing outside the Laurel Md
FCC Monitoring station with a flag in hand and a shit-eating
grin on his face. That card is on my radio room wall in a brass and glass
picture frame with a light over it. It's right alongside my autographed
8 by 10 Photo of Bill and Hillary which I rcvd at a luncheon I was
invited to.

Is this World f-cked up or what??

2886. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-19 17:03:18 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <qnNub.8076$Rk5.2293@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 82462

"Ryan, KC8PMX" <REMOVETHISkc8pmx@diamondcs.net> wrote

> If your interest rate is less than 5%, the best loan to get is a 30 year!
> It's cheap money. Paying off a house quick is foolish.

You've been brainwashed!!!

> Instead of paying off that low interest loan quickly, one is smarter
paying
> off the higher interest loans like automobiles, department and credit card
> charges, and other loans/debts.

Then there are the rocket scientists (NOT!!!!) who refinance their house,
grab some equity cash, and pay off the remaining 3 year loan on their SUV
that they really couldn't afford in the first place. Now they're paying for
30 years on a truck that will be 25-years in the scrap-yard before it's paid
off. Brilliant financial wizards!!!

73, de Hans, K0HB

2887. Re: Australia

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-19 17:31:00 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0311190931.314e3e91@posting.google.com>
Source record: 82463

Alun <alun@1stcounsel.com> wrote in message
news:<Xns9437E5554901Eelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>...
> VK is abolishing code testing effective January 1st. One more down...

How many down - and how many to go?

73 de Jim, N2EY

2888. Re: No!!! Re: Do Hams get 11 Meters Back

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-19 20:58:23 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3FBBD96F.2000302@psu.edu>
Source record: 82464
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.shortwave

Church of The Divine Looney LtD. wrote:

> The only REAL spark of potential inspiration to happen to ham radio was the
> late
> WA4D. (SK) Now there was a Ham Radio Messiah if there
> ever was one !!!!! Of course, just like the other guy, he was
> nailed to a tree by the bluebloods and stinky cheeses at
> the ARRL, the Sanhedrin of Ham Radio. I count myself as very fortunate
> having worked ole Mike WA4D before he passed on.

Okay, this sounds like a interesting story. Do elaborate please!

- mike KB3EIA -

2889. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-19 21:01:40 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3FBBDA34.1030506@psu.edu>
Source record: 82465

Ryan, KC8PMX wrote:
> Actually Jim, I think the things I am gonna mention are what are called
> reverse mortgages.
>
> My dad (going on 68) is contemplating taking both of his residences and
> reverse mortgaging them. Apparently the bank gives him money ahead of time
> for the value of the house (a little less than market value) and upon his
> death, the property is immediately transferred to the mortgage company. I
> may be a little bit off on the explanation but it is kinda my understanding
> of how it works. I guess this way he gets the opportunity to enjoy the
> money/value of the residences now, while he is still alive, as opposed to
> leaving it to my sister and I.

Trust me, that is a better solution.

- Mike KB3EIA -

2890. Re: Language Rules from FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-19 21:43:44 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hom0r4c.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>
Source record: 82466

On Tue, 18 Nov 2003 05:36:11 -0500, Ryan, KC8PMX wrote:

>Alrighty then.... I am sick and tired and feel it is patently offensive to
>hear about old fart's bowel conditions, regardless if they cuss when
>discussing those..... let's make that banned speech! After all it's good
>amateur practice!

It's indecency only when it raises purient interest. Does
someone's bowel surgery raise purient interest in you ?? <ggg>

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

2891. Re: Language Rules from FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-19 21:43:49 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hom1ead.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>
Source record: 82467

On 19 Nov 2003 02:41:17 GMT, N2EY wrote:

>>>>As for specific words??? Dunno, is there a list?? :)
>>
>> No.
>>
>>>>Who makes the list then?
>>
>> George Carlin, at last count.
>
>More like nobody. How did we all get to hear that routine?

Believe it or not, the comedy routine was aired as part of an academic program series on how language affects civilization, not in an attempt by the station to flaut "authority".

The FCC, in response to the listener's complaint, sent Pacifica Foundation (the licensee) a letter in essence saying "take care not to overstep the boundary of indecency". When the FCC declined to define the boundary (almost the venerable "you'll know it when it happens" stance so popular in that time), Pacifica, not the FCC, took the matter to court to force the issue.

The "unintended consequences" are well known.....

The text of the routine, BTW, is printed out in full as an attachment to the decision of the Supreme Court of the U.S. (Pacifica v FCC).

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

2892. Re: CB Linears For Freebanding

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-19 22:15:26 UTC
From: David Robbins <noone@nowhere.com>
Message-ID: <puqdnS9p-MIUdiaiRVn-gg@crocker.com>
Source record: 82468

"San Hedrin" <Jud@sanloserscb.net> wrote in message
news:bpgmfl$7j7$0@pita.alt.net...
> x-no-archive: yes
>
> www.loudmouthcb.com
>
>
>

the proper response when you see one of these:

The following is the information you requested from the FCC Consumer Center.
Thank you for your inquiry.

FCC CONSUMER ALERT

Federal Communications Commission

Consumer and Governmental Affairs Bureau

445 12th Street, SW Washington, DC 20554

1-888-CALL-FCC (voice)

1-888-835-5322 (TTY)

www.fcc.gov/cgb

UNAUTHORIZED EQUIPMENT SOLD ON INTERNET AND IN PUBLICATIONS

The Federal Communications Commission receives hundreds of complaints about
alleged illegal (non-FCC certified) equipment being offered for sale on the
Internet or in publications. The Commission is monitoring this situation
carefully and requests your assistance. If you have any information about
illegal or uncertified equipment being offered for sale, please forward it
to the FCC. Useful information for the FCC includes:

* An original advertisement or Web address where the illegal equipment is

being advertised or offered for sale with the types of equipment about which

the allegations are being made, highlighted.

* If it is a Web-auction we will need the name of the auction site, the
exact

item number, and auction opening and closing dates.

* Name and address of the individual or business offering the item(s) for sale.

* Complainant's name and telephone number in the event follow-up is necessary.

This information can remain confidential, if requested.

* Specifically, why you think the equipment is not in compliance with FCC rules.

* Number of pieces or types of equipment about which the allegations are being

made (one piece, five pieces, how many models, etc.).

Information can be mailed to the FCC at the address below or e-mailed to fccinfo@fcc.gov.

###

To receive information on this and other FCC consumer topics through the

Commission's electronic subscriber service, click on

www.fcc.gov/cgb/emailservice.html

010626

END OF MESSAGE

2893. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-19 22:40:02 UTC
From: Steve Nosko <suteuve.nosukowicuz@moutouroula.com>
Message-ID: <bpgrj2fbc1@newshost.mot.com>
Source record: 82488

Yep. That's it. The bank loans him a little bit of money each month (or whatever period) and adds it to the loan balance. If he lasts long enough he will be paid the full amount of the house and the bank owns it.
Steve K;9;d;c;i

"Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message news:3FBBDA34.1030506@psu.edu...
> Ryan, KC8PMX wrote:
> > Actually Jim, I think the things I am gonna mention are what are called
> > reverse mortgages.
> >
> > My dad (going on 68) is contemplating taking both of his residences and
> > reverse mortgaging them. Apparently the bank gives him money ahead of time
> > for the value of the house (a little less than market value) and upon his
> > death, the property is immediately transferred to the mortgage company. I
> > may be a little bit off on the explanation but it is kinda my understanding
> > of how it works. I guess this way he gets the opportunity to enjoy the
> > money/value of the residences now, while he is still alive, as opposed to
> > leaving it to my sister and I.
>
> Trust me, that is a better solution.
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -
>

2894. Re: Language Rules from FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-19 22:45:15 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <%nSub.8865$Rk5.3579@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 82469

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote

> On Tue, 18 Nov 2003 05:36:11 -0500, Ryan, KC8PMX wrote:
>
> >Alrighty then.... I am sick and tired and feel it is patently offensive
to
> >hear about old fart's bowel conditions, regardless if they cuss when
> >discussing those..... let's make that banned speech! After all it's good
> >amateur practice!
>
> It's indecency only when it raises purient interest. Does
> someone's bowel surgery raise purient interest in you ?? <ggg>

Dammit Phil, I wish I'd have said that! Good answer!

73, de Hans, K0HB

2895. Re: CB Linears For Freebanding

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-19 23:19:23 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3FBBFA79.3020202@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 82470

San Hedrin wrote:

>x-no-archive: yes
>
>www.loudmouthcb.com
>
>
>
>
>
Well, aside from the web address having "cb" embedded in it, they don't
specify that these things are not intended for ham radio service.... ;-)
Though I've never seen ham equipment with model numbers like
"SUPER CHICKEN SNUFFER", "FROG STRANGLER 5 PILL",
"WIDOWMAKER 16 PILL", and "DIRTY DOZEN 12 PILL". That last
may describe that item well if it generates lots of harmonics.

And they didn't mention how much drive is needed to work these amps.
It may be less than the usual 100W a ham transciever puts out. ;-)

2896. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-19 23:33:34 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031119183334.12631.00002913@mb-m28.aol.com>
Source record: 82471

In article <VmMub.8036$Rk5.3410@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Kï¿½HB"
<groupk0hb@earthlink.net> writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote
>
>> If such matters "are decided by an unemotional look at the facts and what
>is in
>> the public interest", why do so commenters/petitioners give a biography of
>> their education and experience in their commentary?
>
>Because it gives them a sense of self-importance, I suppose.

That's certainly one reason.

But I have it on good authority that FCC does place some value on the
"credentials" of the person making the comments.

Perhaps K2ASP would comment on this.
>
>> So almost anyone who is really interested in being included
>> in such a poll can get a license, ...
>
>Ah yes, "I got mine, now you get yours; then you can comment"!!!! (Just
>when I was looking for a good example of a "sense of self-importance"!)
>
Not at all.

More like "I'm interested enough in the ARS to join".

Do you place much credence in the political opinions of someone who could
legally vote, but won't even take the time to register?

73 de Jim, N2EY

2897. Re: Happy Veterans Day

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-20 01:22:33 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0311191722.3e863167@posting.google.com>
Source record: 82472

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0311181728.26490c4b@posting.google.com>...
> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0311171532.124bff21@posting.google.com>...
>
> > Stebe, you could try standing up on your hind legs, like a man, and
> > make your crappy little comments directly to me.
>
> I've been addressing you in the third party, Brain?

Who is Brain? Do you pass third party traffic for him?

> Seems to me that I've addressed each and every comment ABOUT you
> TO you, unless of course you can prove otherwise, INCLUDING the one
> you refered to here

No. You haven't.

How many backchannels did you receive stating that your posting
practices ARE appreciated?

Post them.

2898. Re: Happy Veterans Day

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-20 01:44:28 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0311191744.774adc1e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 82473

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3FB97CC4.5A958465@earthlink.net>...

> You've never come up with a straight answer for an explanation about
> Frankline Roosevelt referring to himself as "President Roosevelt".
>
>
> Dave K8MN

I took an excerpt from someone else's material. The part in the quotation marks is Franklin[e] Roosevelt's quote. You typically find quotes within quatation marks, or at least I do. Do you have trouble identifying quotation marks? Please let me help you.

They look like this: "quoted material"

Please notice that the quoted material really is within the quotation marks.

The material is then referenced to a web site where I encouraged readers to click and read the entire article for themselves. Do you have trouble clicking on a hyperlink? Please let me help you.

Using the mouse, navigate your cursor to the location of the hyperlink. When the cursor is over the hyperlink, left click once. It really is that simple, and I'm glad to have been of assistance.

After this little episode of educating you yet another time, your self-imposed stupidity cannot be excused any longer. Please deal with it in a more constructive manner.

2899. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-20 01:47:47 UTC
From: Gary Sanford <sanford1@sprynet.com>
Message-ID: <a87orv86uguauq2q8puapmiernd91gru8q@4ax.com>
Source record: 82474

On 14 Nov 2003 03:39:11 GMT, lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote:

>In article <Govsb.10542$6c3.633@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>, Rupert
><big@bird.sesame.street> writes:
>
>>Len Over 21 wrote:
>>
>>> As of 6 PM EST on 11 November 2003, the number of ECFS
>>> documents on public view are:
>>
>> What would be interesting is to find out how many are for the change,
>>and how many want to keep the code.
>
> There are only 4,600 documents in the ECFS as of the end of the
> day on the east coast, this Thursday. If you have a large hard disk
> and lots of time, feel free to collect ALL of them and view them, or
> categorize them as you want. They are all in PDF and most
> browsers will automatically invoke at least an Acrobat Reader (free
> download from Adobe) if you click on the lower left underline of each
> listing box.
>
> Disregarding the RM-10811 comments, I'd say that the opinions are
> roughly split evenly as to retention or elimination, based on spot-
> checking the short (1-page) comments and reading all of the comments
> over 1 page.
>
> RM-10811 was submitted by FISTS and their website encourages
> affirmative one-liners by all members. Over half of the FISTS petition
> comments are such one or two sentence "support" statements.
> According to the latest ARRL news blog, RM-10811 is the only one
> that counts (FISTS is solidly pro-code) and Joe Speroni (a decided
> PCTA) is the only acknowledged "petition statistician" in the ARRL
> biased viewpoint.
>
> Oddly enough, Speroni, AH0A, is responsible for RM-10808 which
> gathered only 191 comments. The FISTS petition comment total
> stands at 959.
>
> The official Comment period for all petitions ended last week.
>
> LHA

Element 1 will be gone next year. Face it.

~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~
Gary Sanford
sanford1@attglobal.net
~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~

2900. Re: Australia

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-20 01:53:39 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <D8Vub.9307$Rk5.725@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 82475

"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
news:c2356669.0311190931.314e3e91@posting.google.com...
> Alun <alun@1stcounsel.com> wrote in message
news:<Xns9437E5554901Eelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>...
> > VK is abolishing code testing effective January 1st. One more down...
>
> How many down - and how many to go?
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

What difference does it make? The number of countries that
have ended or are scheduled to end code testing can
only increase. Not a single of those countries is ever
likly to change back (IMHO).

So I ask again, what difference does it make?

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2901. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-20 02:16:02 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <CtVub.11016$Wy4.9328@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 82476

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote

> >> So almost anyone who is really interested in being included
> >> in such a poll can get a license, ...
> >
> >Ah yes, "I got mine, now you get yours; then you can comment"!!!! (Just
> >when I was looking for a good example of a "sense of self-importance"!)
> >

> Not at all.
>
> More like "I'm interested enough in the ARS to join".
>
> Do you place much credence in the political opinions of someone who could
> legally vote, but won't even take the time to register?
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

First off, your analogy is flaccid at best. In order to register to vote, I generally need only to reveal my place of residence (with evidence like an ID card, or be vouched for by another person registered to vote in the jurisdiction). I need not take any written or skills test, nor pay any examination fee, nor demonstrate any particular knowledge of the issues. (In fact such impediments to registering/voting used to exist in some jurisdictions, notably in the south, and are deemed unconstitutional.) It speaks volumes that you'd suggest such impediments to comment on something as mundane as regulations regarding a hobby radio service.

Second off, regardless of the applicability of your analogy, I do not judge a persons political opinion based on whether he/she has taken the time to register to vote. (I don't even raise that question, because it is irrelevant to the value I place on their opinion.) I attach credence to their opinion based on their ability to make well constructed arguments, to succinctly state their views without resort to emotion or clich&#65533;, and evidence that they may have considered alternate or opposing views.

The fact that you have an amateur license suggests that you will have an opinion about amateur radio regulation, but it gives no credence in and of itself whether your opinion is or is not worthy of consideration. Similarly a non-licensed individual may have an opinion but lack of a license similarly gives no credence in and of itself whether that opinion is or is not worthy of consideration.

Thus your "almost anyone who is really interested in being included in such a poll can get a license" strikes me as just another version of the discredited practice of 'poll taxes' by which privileged persons attempted

to limit the influence of 'lesser' (in their pecking order) persons in political affairs.

I don't see how your mileage can vary.

73, de Hans, K0HB

2902. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-20 03:28:14 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031119222814.07346.00001830@mb-m26.aol.com>
Source record: 82477

In article <a87orv86uguauq2q8puapmiernd91gru8q@4ax.com>, Gary Sanford <sanford1@sprynet.com> writes:

>Element 1 will be gone next year. Face it.

Maybe. It's been almost half a year since WRC 2003 removed the treaty requirement, yet less than a dozen countries have dropped or have announced the dropping of code tests. The US isn't one of them.

Some say FCC could announce the suspension of Element 1 tomorrow. Others say it takes a full NPRM process. Typical NPRM cycle in the ARS takes so long that we're talking 2005.....just look at 98-143. The NPRM appeared somewhere in the middle of 1998 but the changes that resulted weren't effective until April of 2000.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2903. Re: Australia

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-20 03:28:15 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031119222815.07346.00001831@mb-m26.aol.com>
Source record: 82478

In article <D8Vub.9307$Rk5.725@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Bill Sohl"
<billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:

>"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
>news:c2356669.0311190931.314e3e91@posting.google.com...
>> Alun <alun@1stcounsel.com> wrote in message
>news:<Xns9437E5554901Eelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>...
>> > VK is abolishing code testing effective January 1st. One more down...
>>
>> How many down - and how many to go?
>>
>> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>What difference does it make?

Just trying to keep tabs on how things are going.

>The number of countries that
>have ended or are scheduled to end code testing can
>only increase.

Probably.

>Not a single of those countries is ever
>likly to change back (IMHO).
>
>So I ask again, what difference does it make?
>
It will be interesting to see what happens to amateur radio in the countries
where code testing has been eliminated. For example, will we see a sustained
increase in growth?

73 de Jim, N2EY

2904. Re: Australia

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-20 04:00:41 UTC
From: Gr&#65533;mw&#65533;tch th&#65533; &#65533;nfl&#65533;pp&#65533;bl&#65533; <Gr&#65533;mw&#65533;tch@NOSPAM.THANKS.IM.FULL.lycos.co.de>
Message-ID: <J%Wub.6581$sb4.1703@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 82479

"Alun" <alun@1stcounsel.com> wrote in message
news:Xns9437E5554901Eelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...

: VK is abolishing code testing effective January 1st. One more down...

That's one story..... here's another floating around over here in EU...

Respectfully,

Your fateful friend,

Barnabus Grumwitch Overbyte
--
"All persons, living or dead, are purely coincidental, and should not be
construed."

- -

G'Day Folks,

If there is NO CW requirement for ANY ham license
in Australia, some VK hams don't yet know about it
and I'm one of them.

The ACA (Australian Communications Authority) had
many meetings all over Australia in the last few months.
Their purpose was to present their proposed rule changes
which were many. Dropping all CW requirements was
one item. Faulting the ham for EVERY problem of
interference with ANYTHING was another. The
latter caused quite a stir and threatened to incite a
rebellion! Few seemed to care about CW one way
or another.

The many issues, I've mentioned only two, are still
under advisement as best my associates in OZ know.
No action is expected for a couple years.

OK, that's what I've heard. I may be wrong, if so
please let me know and please cite a verifiable source!

Cheers,

Bill VK6KM

2905. Re: Speaking of Outrages

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-20 04:09:26 UTC
From: Gr&#65533;mw&#65533;tch th&#65533; &#65533;nfl&#65533;pp&#65533;bl&#65533; <Gr&#65533;mw&#65533;tch@NOSPAM.THANKS.IM.FULL.lycos.co.de>
Message-ID: <W7Xub.6600$sb4.1607@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 82480

"Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
news:f45722ac.0311080443.5c23fe8@posting.google.com...

:
: Sorry, but you don't give choice. You've been flapped again.
:

Be sorry for your own self, as I am Gr&#65533;mw&#65533;tch th&#65533; &#65533;nfl&#65533;pp&#65533;bl&#65533;

BGO
--
"All persons, living or dead, are purely coincidental, and should not be
construed."

2906. Re: Australia

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-20 04:47:33 UTC
From: Alun <alun@1stcounsel.com>
Message-ID: <Xns9438F205CC1B7elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 82481

"Gr�mw�tch th� �nfl�pp�bl�" <Gr�mw�tch@NOSPAM.THANKS.IM.FULL.lycos.co.de>
wrote in news:J%Wub.6581$sb4.1703@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net:

```
>
> "Alun" <alun@1stcounsel.com> wrote in message
> news:Xns9437E5554901Eelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
>
>: VK is abolishing code testing effective January 1st. One more down...
>
> That's one story..... here's another floating around over here in
EU...
>
> Respectfully,
>
> Your fateful friend,
>
> Barnabus Grumwitch Overbyte
> --
> "All persons, living or dead, are purely coincidental, and should not be
> construed."
>
> - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
>
> G'Day Folks,
>
> If there is NO CW requirement for ANY ham license
> in Australia, some VK hams don't yet know about it
> and I'm one of them.
>
> The ACA (Australian Communications Authority) had
> many meetings all over Australia in the last few months.
> Their purpose was to present their proposed rule changes
> which were many. Dropping all CW requirements was
> one item. Faulting the ham for EVERY problem of
> interference with ANYTHING was another. The
> latter caused quite a stir and threatened to incite a
> rebellion! Few seemed to care about CW one way
> or another.
>
> The many issues, I've mentioned only two, are still
> under advisement as best my associates in OZ know.
> No action is expected for a couple years.
>
> OK, that's what I've heard. I may be wrong, if so
```

> please let me know and please cite a verifiable source!
>
> Cheers,
>
> Bill VK6KM
>
>
>

It's on the ACA web site. No code test effective 1st January. Take a look.

2907. Re: Happy Veterans Day

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-20 05:23:45 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3FBC4FE3.D2067EC6@earthlink.net>
Source record: 82482

Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3FB97CC4.5A958465@earthlink.net>...
>
> > You've never come up with a straight answer for an explanation about
> > Frankline Roosevelt referring to himself as "President Roosevelt".
> >
> >
> > Dave K8MN
>
> I took an excerpt from someone else's material. The part in the
> quotation marks is Franklin[e] Roosevelt's quote. You typically find
> quotes within quatation marks, or at least I do. Do you have trouble
> identifying quotation marks? Please let me help you.
>
> They look like this: "quoted material"
>
> Please notice that the quoted material really is within the quotation
> marks.
>
> The material is then referenced to a web site where I encouraged
> readers to click and read the entire article for themselves. Do you
> have trouble clicking on a hyperlink? Please let me help you.
>
> Using the mouse, navigate your cursor to the location of the
> hyperlink. When the cursor is over the hyperlink, left click once.
> It really is that simple, and I'm glad to have been of assistance.
>
> After this little episode of educating you yet another time, your
> self-imposed stupidity cannot be excused any longer. Please deal with
> it in a more constructive manner.

Sorry, little electrolyte, you wrote "Franklin Roosevelt is to have
said:". That was followed by more material copied from a web site by
you. Just because you provide links to material does not obligate me to
use them or even to feign interest in doing so. Now, let's take a look
at what you cribbed and posted:

Quote
Concerning the "Bonus Army" of 1932, where veterans of The War to End
All Wars (1917/1918) were due a bonus in 1945, but wanted payment
early because they lost their homes in the Great Depression, Franklin
Roosevelt is to have said:

In the end, some money was paid to veterans but not without further difficulties. Within a year of the Bonus Army Incident, President Roosevelt imposed the Economy Act of 1933 which cut veterans disability allowances by 25%. In the effort to cut federal expenses, veterans were viewed as having inordinate special status over civilians. During the 1932 election campaign, he had publicly proclaimed: "No one [merely] because he wore a uniform must therefore be placed in a special class of beneficiaries over and above all other citizens. The fact of wearing a uniform does not mean that he can demand and receive from his government a benefit which no other citizen receives."
end quote ======================

Now, what do you make of that colon hanging at the end of "Franklin Roosevelt is to have said:"? What does it indicate to you.

You can't place blame on me because you can't get your act together. If what you posted wasn't what you meant to convey or if the words aren't yours (since you've ignored common English rules for quoting someone else), perhaps you'll want to look the material over next time.

Dave K8MN

2908. Re: Australia

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-20 05:25:53 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3FBC5065.BF826173@earthlink.net>
Source record: 82483

Bill Sohl wrote:
>
> "N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
> news:c2356669.0311190931.314e3e91@posting.google.com...
> > Alun <alun@1stcounsel.com> wrote in message
> news:<Xns9437E5554901Eelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>...
> > > VK is abolishing code testing effective January 1st. One more down...
> >
> > How many down - and how many to go?
> >
> > 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
> What difference does it make? The number of countries that
> have ended or are scheduled to end code testing can
> only increase. Not a single of those countries is ever
> likly to change back (IMHO).
>
> So I ask again, what difference does it make?

It makes no more difference than Alun's pointing out that Australia is
doing away with morse testing.

Dave K8MN

2909. Re: Australia

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-20 05:35:47 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <ToYub.9540$Rk5.7858@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 82484

"Gr&#65533;mw&#65533;tch th&#65533; &#65533;nfl&#65533;pp&#65533;bl&#65533;" <Gr&#65533;mw&#65533;tch@NOSPAM.THANKS.IM.FULL.lycos.co.de> wrote

> That's one story..... here's another floating around over here in EU...

Hey, Barney,

Flap over this one then......

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

Commonwealth of Australia
AUSTRALIAN COMMUNICATIONS AUTHORITY

REVIEW OF AMATEUR SERVICE REGULATION

The Australian Communications Authority (ACA) is reviewing regulatory and licensing arrangements for the amateur service. A discussion paper was released
in August 2003, and public meetings were held in 10 cities around Australia. As a result of this extensive public consultation process, the ACA has decided
to discontinue the Morse code proficiency requirement for the amateur service.

Background

Article 25 of the Radio Regulations of the International Telecommunication Union (ITU) sets out the international arrangements for the amateur service. The
World Radiocommunication Conference (WRC) held from 9 June to 4 July 2003 in Geneva fundamentally changed Article 25.

The changes to Article 25 have provided the ACA with an opportunity to review
and simplify the current regulatory and licensing arrangements for the amateur service. In August 2003 the ACA released a discussion paper that looked at
the changes made to Article 25, as well as exploring future options for the amateur service in Australia.

Morse code proficiency requirement to be removed

As a result of an extensive public consultation process, the ACA has decided to discontinue the Morse code proficiency requirement for the amateur service.

This decision was made considering public comments at the meetings and initial analysis of submissions to the discussion paper.

The ACA will make interim changes to legislative instruments which will immediately allow access to privileges previously available only to those satisfying Morse code proficiency requirements.

The ACA is in the process of amending the amateur radio licence conditions specified in the Radiocommunications Licence Conditions (Amateur Licence) Determination No. 1 of 1997 to reflect this decision. The amendments will give:
holders of Intermediate and Limited Amateur licences access to the same frequency bands as Unrestricted Amateur licensees; and holders of the Novice Limited Amateur licence access to the same frequency bands as Novice licensees. The
interim arrangements are expected to come into force on 1 January 2004.

For more details about the arrangements, please refer to the <A HREF="http://www.aca.gov.au/aca_home/issues_for_comment/discussion/archive/FAQ_morse_removal.pdf">Frequently Asked
Questions</A>.

Public Meetings

As part of the consultation process for this review, the ACA held public meetings in cities around Australia. Over 700, or approximately 5% of the 14,000
licensed amateur radio operators in Australia, attended the meetings to discuss the proposals in the discussion paper and seek clarification on particular
issues.

The ACA would like to thank everyone who attended the meetings, especially those who travelled long distances to attend. The ACA received some useful and
constructive feedback on the proposals contained in the discussion paper, and
will consider this feedback when considering the proposals.

Submissions

Submissions to the discussion paper closed on 31 October 2003.

The ACA would like to thank everyone who submitted comments to the discussion
paper. Approximately 1400 submissions were received, and the ACA will work through them over the next few months.

The ACA hopes to have submissions published on the website by Christmas.

For further information on the review please contact:

Email: <A HREF="mailto:amateurs@aca.gov.au">amateurs@aca.gov.au</A>
Phone: (02) 6219 5578

2910. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-20 06:18:26 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3FBC5CAE.1020009@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 82485

>
>
>
> Oddly enough, Speroni, AH0A, is responsible for RM-10808 which
> gathered only 191 comments. The FISTS petition comment total
> stands at 959.
>
>
>
The FCC doesn't go by the number of "votes" on a petition. One well
reasoned
comment can out-rule many "me too" comments.

2911. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-20 06:42:43 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <REMOVETHISkc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <bpief1$1mkclc$8@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 82496

"Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
news:3FBBDA34.1030506@psu.edu...
> Ryan, KC8PMX wrote:
> > Actually Jim, I think the things I am gonna mention are what are called
> > reverse mortgages.
> >
> > My dad (going on 68) is contemplating taking both of his residences and
> > reverse mortgaging them. Apparently the bank gives him money ahead of
time
> > for the value of the house (a little less than market value) and upon
his
> > death, the property is immediately transferred to the mortgage company.
I
> > may be a little bit off on the explanation but it is kinda my
understanding
> > of how it works. I guess this way he gets the opportunity to enjoy the
> > money/value of the residences now, while he is still alive, as opposed
to
> > leaving it to my sister and I.
>
> Trust me, that is a better solution.
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -

Reffering to the old man leaving money to the kids, versus enjoying it now??
He stated a long time ago, that my sister gets everything! Don't really
care as long as he doesn't leave expenses we might be liable for. I have
actually provided for myself since I moved out after I turned 18. Now if
others want to leave me in their will, that is just fine HIHI! :)

--
Ryan KC8PMX

"All of us could take a lesson from the weather. It pays no
attention to criticism."

2912. Re: Happy Veterans Day

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-20 06:51:43 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0311192251.549c86ed@posting.google.com>
Source record: 82486

brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0311191744.774adc1e@posting.google.com>...

> After this little episode of educating you yet another time, your
> self-imposed stupidity cannot be excused any longer. Please deal with
> it in a more constructive manner.

WHAT A CARD!

Geeze, Burke, you'e always good for yet another laugh!

YOU lecturing ANYONE about "self-imposed stupidity" is like
Jeffery Dahmer lecturing the Galloping Gourmet on culinary skills.

Thanks! It was a slow day!

Steve, K4YZ

2913. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-20 06:54:55 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <REMOVETHISkc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <bpief2$1mkclc$9@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 82497

"K&#65533;HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:qnNub.8076$Rk5.2293@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> "Ryan, KC8PMX" <REMOVETHISkc8pmx@diamondcs.net> wrote
>
> > If your interest rate is less than 5%, the best loan to get is a 30
year!
> > It's cheap money. Paying off a house quick is foolish.
>
> You've been brainwashed!!!

Not necessarily.... do the math.

>
> > Instead of paying off that low interest loan quickly, one is smarter
> paying
> > off the higher interest loans like automobiles, department and credit
card
> > charges, and other loans/debts.
>
> Then there are the rocket scientists (NOT!!!!) who refinance their house,
> grab some equity cash, and pay off the remaining 3 year loan on their SUV
> that they really couldn't afford in the first place. Now they're paying
for
> 30 years on a truck that will be 25-years in the scrap-yard before it's
paid
> off. Brilliant financial wizards!!!
>

Well, overpurchasing is another different symptom alltogether..... I see that all the time around here. People buying 300K-500K homes, and 50K or more in vehicles, and another 25-100K in recreational type of vehicles (boats, quadrunners, motorcycles, snowmobiles etc.) but only making 75K-100K per year!!!! Hmmmm maybe it would be wiser to save up for some of these purchases other than the residence. Who knows.....

As far as the residence, and again I state that I am referring to local conditions, a person can find a really nice 3 or 4 bedroom house, with basement and garage, in a decent neighborhood for around 130-170K. Wouldn't it make more sense to live in that house for a while and then when move up as your finances truly allow as opposed to buying houses (or vehicles for that matter) that are way over what wages allow, being way over in debt, just to impress either oneself or others???

The type of house I was referring to in the earlier thread, the under 75K house would be more along the lines of somewhere a bit out of the ghetto

(generically based comment and not racially intended as there are ghettos in almost all towns and cities) but definitely not the mid or higher value neighborhoods. Hell, out in the country around here, even an old 14x70 trailer/mobile home on a half/three-quarter/full acre lot still commands a price of over 50K!!!!!!!!! Again, regional differences must be recognized.....

--
Ryan KC8PMX

"Give a person a fish and you feed them for a day; teach that person to use The Internet and they won't bother you for weeks."

2914. Re: Happy Veterans Day

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-20 06:58:55 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0311192258.2999ac84@posting.google.com>
Source record: 82487

brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0311191722.3e863167@posting.google.com>...

> Who is Brain? Do you pass third party traffic for him?

I am sure ANY traffic passed TO you or BY you is garbled.

> > Seems to me that I've addressed each and every comment ABOUT you
> > TO you, unless of course you can prove otherwise, INCLUDING the one
> > you refered to here
>
> No. You haven't.

Yes, I have.

> How many backchannels did you receive stating that your posting
> practices ARE appreciated?
>
> Post them.

Post what? Something I haven't received? Something I've never
claimed?

Question is, how many "backchannel" messages have YOU received
"praising" your "posting style", Brain...??? From Lennie, perhaps?
Vipul? Bruce?

Steve, K4YZ

2915. Re: Language Rules from FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-20 07:05:23 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <REMOVETHISkc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <bpief3$1mkclc$10@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 82498

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20031118214118.07578.00001706@mb-m25.aol.com...
> In article <bpdi62$1n9ab4$12@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>, "Ryan, KC8PMX"
> <REMOVETHISkc8pmx@diamondcs.net> writes:
>
> >Jim.... of all the people here I thought for sure you would see where I
was
> >going with that.......
>
> Of course.

I was hoping so.... you are, at least IMHO, one of the stable "anchors" of
this newsgroup.

>
> >it goes well beyond the "dirty words" and could
> >extend to any speech undesireable by others that could be deemed
offensive
> >and therefor punishable.
>
> I still believe in common sense and good taste, old-fashioned as that may
seem.
> Discussing one's gastrointestinal problems in detail on the air may be
legal
> but that doesn't make it acceptable....

I would agree for the most part. Now..... can you cite specific rules that
state what might be "old fashioned" in exact examples not just speaking of
generalities??? :)

>
> I never hear that sort of stuff in CW ragchews, btw.

Just had to get that CW jab in there eh? :) :)

>
> >Heck, we have organizations in the US already
> >trying that..... not a small step to extend to ham radio!
>
> You mean like folks who say the press is "liberally biased" or "beholden
to big
> business" when it reports things they don't like?

No, actually, the opposite. The right-wingers who want to control others
thoughts, what they read, what they believe in, what people should do to
their bodies and put in their bodies, and make it damn near a profession of

forcing this on others. Hmmm.... Rush Limbaugh, our nation's largest hypocrite, is a prime example. (do as I say, not do as I do mentality) Hmmm.... Pat Buchanan was a Republicrat, and also, if Hitler was alive and well today, and living in the US, he most likely would have been a Republican/Republicrat.

>
> >Like I said.... look beyond the cuss words, and there is a ton of things
> >that some radical freaks could oppose.
> >
> Sure. But limiting what can be said on the amateur bands is not an incursion
> into free speech, because the amateur bands are public property.

Actually, if one is truly a person that believes in the most of limiting government intrusions of our lives etc., then that person should actually be against all licensing of radio waves. Really, when you get to the point of it, NO ONE actually OWNS the airwaves. But in reality, there is a need for some type of regulation otherwise the chaos that would be there if it wasn't would be tremendous. I personally believe, if the acronym is correct, the ECPA should be deemed illegal. (refernce the ban on cell phone recption.)

--
Ryan KC8PMX

"Health is merely the slowest possible rate at which one can die."

2916. Re: Language Rules from FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-20 07:07:53 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <REMOVETHISkc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <bpief5$1mkclc$11@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 82499

Well Phil.... there are just some things I just don't need to hear about! I am sure you can cite some examples exclusive to you as well. :) :) I have even heard one old dude describing the quality and consistency of the material moved within the bowel movements he was having..... some things are just too gross.

--
Ryan KC8PMX

"Why is it one careless match can start a forest fire, but
it takes a whole box to start a barbecue?"

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:cuvyxnansvbet.hom0r4c.pminews@netnews.comcast.net...
> On Tue, 18 Nov 2003 05:36:11 -0500, Ryan, KC8PMX wrote:
>
> >Alrighty then.... I am sick and tired and feel it is patently offensive
to
> >hear about old fart's bowel conditions, regardless if they cuss when
> >discussing those..... let's make that banned speech! After all it's good
> >amateur practice!
>
> It's indecency only when it raises purient interest. Does
> someone's bowel surgery raise purient interest in you ?? <ggg>
>
> --
> 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane
>
>

2917. Re: Language Rules from FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-20 07:09:43 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <REMOVETHISkc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <bpief7$1mkclc$12@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 82500

> The FCC, in response to the listener's complaint, sent Pacifica
> Foundation (the licensee) a letter in essence saying "take care not
> to overstep the boundary of indecency". When the FCC declined to
> define the boundary (almost the venerable "you'll know it when it
> happens" stance so popular in that time), Pacifica, not the FCC,
> took the matter to court to force the issue.

That was kinda the intent of what I was speaking of. And of course, who
makes the decisions on that if it is not the FCC.

--
Ryan KC8PMX

"Give a person a fish and you feed them for a day; teach that
person to use The Internet and they won't bother you for weeks."

2918. Re: Need info: Cobra 75

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-20 07:10:19 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <REMOVETHISkc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <bpief8$1mkclc$13@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 82501

Couldn't have said it better myself Hans!

Ryan

"K&#65533;HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:ZdBub.9933$Wy4.9528@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> "Herb" <14313@thegangherb.net> wrote
>
> > >
> > > Does anyone know if any mods exist for this compact handheld to expand
> the
> > > channels and add FM coverage?
> > >
>
> Yes, there are precise step-by-step instructions at
> http://www.amishrakefight.org/gfy
>
> 73, de Hans, K0HB
>
>
>
>
>

2919. Re: Australia

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-20 07:14:19 UTC
From: Paul Keinanen <keinanen@sci.fi>
Message-ID: <kooorv4lcrjr1miq8r895rgrlonat11b7v@4ax.com>
Source record: 82489

On Thu, 20 Nov 2003 01:53:39 GMT, "Bill Sohl"
<billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote:

>> > VK is abolishing code testing effective January 1st. One more down...
>>
>> How many down - and how many to go?

>What difference does it make? The number of countries that
>have ended or are scheduled to end code testing can
>only increase. Not a single of those countries is ever
>likly to change back (IMHO).
>
>So I ask again, what difference does it make?

It makes a difference especially in areas, where people frequently
travel or move abroad.

During the transition period, when some countries have removed the
Morse test requirement and some have not, there is quite a mess where
it is possible to operate on HF without a Morse test.

The legal status of the CEPT recommendations T/R 61-01 and T/R 61-02
is unknown, since updated version is still on the (hopefully) final
request for comments period, which ends at the end of this month. When
Finland removed the Morse test requirement starting at November 1st,
the initially proposed regulatory text contained references to the
updated CEPT recommendations, but since these recommendations were not
final at the end of last month, the references to these
recommendations were removed from the Finnish regulatory text.

My guess is that at least most European countries will remove the
Morse test requirement within the next two years, during which period
there is going to be a mess for all those travelling abroad. There was
already a mess a few years ago with the HAREC licenses, when some
countries dropped the speed from 12 WPM to 5 WPM before the HAREC
recommendation was updated.

After this transitional period there will still be countries that will
require "forever" the Morse test. These are most likely countries that
insisted prior to WRC03 that the wording in RR should allow each
administration to decide if the Morse test is required or not (while
most countries supported completely removing the requirement from the
Radio Regulations).

Especially for new hams that have never taken any Morse tests,
travelling to such countries would probably require taking a Morse
test in that country for HF access. There might be some problem taking

the test in the local language (and possibly using the Morse alphabet used in that country).

Paul OH3LWR

2920. Re: Australia

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-20 09:56:38 UTC
From: Alun <alun@1stcounsel.com>
Message-ID: <Xns94393247ACBCEelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 82490

Paul Keinanen <keinanen@sci.fi> wrote in
news:kooorv4lcrjr1miq8r895rgrlonat11b7v@4ax.com:

> On Thu, 20 Nov 2003 01:53:39 GMT, "Bill Sohl"
> <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote:
>
>>> > VK is abolishing code testing effective January 1st. One more
down...
>>>
>>> How many down - and how many to go?
>
>>What difference does it make? The number of countries that
>>have ended or are scheduled to end code testing can
>>only increase. Not a single of those countries is ever
>>likly to change back (IMHO).
>>
>>So I ask again, what difference does it make?
>
> It makes a difference especially in areas, where people frequently
> travel or move abroad.
>
> During the transition period, when some countries have removed the
> Morse test requirement and some have not, there is quite a mess where
> it is possible to operate on HF without a Morse test.
>
> The legal status of the CEPT recommendations T/R 61-01 and T/R 61-02
> is unknown, since updated version is still on the (hopefully) final
> request for comments period, which ends at the end of this month. When
> Finland removed the Morse test requirement starting at November 1st,
> the initially proposed regulatory text contained references to the
> updated CEPT recommendations, but since these recommendations were not
> final at the end of last month, the references to these
> recommendations were removed from the Finnish regulatory text.
>
> My guess is that at least most European countries will remove the
> Morse test requirement within the next two years, during which period
> there is going to be a mess for all those travelling abroad. There was
> already a mess a few years ago with the HAREC licenses, when some
> countries dropped the speed from 12 WPM to 5 WPM before the HAREC
> recommendation was updated.
>
> After this transitional period there will still be countries that will
> require "forever" the Morse test. These are most likely countries that
> insisted prior to WRC03 that the wording in RR should allow each

> administration to decide if the Morse test is required or not (while
> most countries supported completely removing the requirement from the
> Radio Regulations).
>
> Especially for new hams that have never taken any Morse tests,
> travelling to such countries would probably require taking a Morse
> test in that country for HF access. There might be some problem taking
> the test in the local language (and possibly using the Morse alphabet
> used in that country).
>
> Paul OH3LWR
>

I am not sure you are entirely right, Paul. Where reciprocal agreements are in place, someone with the stipulated class of licence will be able to operate with the agreed priviledges, regardless of how they obtained the licence (saving any nationality or residence restrictions, or limitations on using a reciprocal licence to gain further reciprocal priviledges).

If the Morse test is abolished in one's own country, and you obtain a licence without passing a code test, you will be able to operate HF in countries that honour your licence under a reciprocal agreement, even if a Morse test is still required in that country.

This will create many odd anomalies, of course.

CEPT may work out slightly differently. Classes 1 and 2 have been merged, but most national regulations still refer to them seperately, and most licences still refer to one or the other. So, for a while, codeless hams may not get HF priviledges under CEPT when they travel. If their licence refers to a non-existent class 2, and the regs of the host country say that the non-existent class 2s can only operate above 144 MHz, then that's all they get.

Once their licence no longer says class 1 or class 2, I assume they would get class 1 priviledges, even if the national rules of where they are going remain unchanged and there is still a Morse test there.

Of course, the US issues a separate CEPT letter that you can download, but the FCC hasn't abolished code testing yet, so I doubt that the text of the letter will be altered yet. It's a good question, though. Presumably the FCC should alter the letter anyway, to simply give Techs and above CEPT operation. This is theoretically unrelated to whether code testing still exists in the US.

There again, the FCC letter contains limitations on citizenship, even though there are none in the CEPT agreement, and never have been. There is an FCC rule that you must be a citizen of the country that issued your licence to operate in the US under the CEPT, mirroring a similar rule applying to reciprocal agreements. However, the letter says you must be a US citizen to operate using a US licence under CEPT, even though there is nothing to that effect either in FCC rules or in the CEPT agreement. This

additional limitation exists only in the letter itself, and nowhere else.

2921. Amateur Radio Newsline™ Report 1370 - November 14, 2003

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-20 09:58:21 UTC
From: radionews@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031120045821.27838.00000625@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 82491

Amateur Radio Newsline™ Report 1370 - November 14, 2003

Amateur Radio Newsline report number 1370 with a release date of Friday, November 14, 2003 to follow in 5-4-3-2-1.

The following is a Q-S-T.

Internationally sponsored ham radio training begins in Albania, UOSat-14 goes QRT for good and ARISS honors the late Roy Neal, K6DUE, with an on the air -- space to ground event. The details on Amateur Radio Newsline report number 1370 coming your way right now.

(Billboard Cart Here)

**

BREAKING NEWS: AUSTRALIA TO BE CODE FREE

The Australian Communications Authority has announced to QNEWS that as of January First 2004 CW will no longer be a requirement for Amateurs to operate on the HF bands. From Monday November 17th, the ACA website will have the press release under the signature of Dr. Bob Horton. Full details on next weeks Amateur Radio Newsline report. (Q-News)

**

RADIO EDUCATION: AMATEUR RADIO PROGRAM OPENS IN ALBANIA

We told you a few weeks ago that it was going to happen and now it has. Ham radio training is now available in Albania. Jeramy Boot, G4NJH, in the U.K. takes an in-depth look at the new internationally sponsored training program:

--

A unique amateur radio program started in Tirana, Albania the 9th of November. Thirty-four third and fourth-year university students began a five-week amateur radio course using RSGB study material as the reference books.

The course will culminate in CEPT license examinations. It is being run in cooperation with Mr. Spartak Poci, the Albanian Minister of Telecommunications, and the Polytechnic University of Tirana.

A unique part of the program is the way in which amateur radio is being integrated into the regular university courses. The course will not only teach amateur radio up to the RAE Full-license standard, but also the role of amateur radio in society, QSL'ing practices and successful Dxpeditioning.

During the five-week period, ZA1A will be active on many bands and modes while demonstrating amateur radio to local telecom and education administrators, as well as to the students. Multiple locations will be used and several stations may be active at the same time. After the course, all the donated equipment will serve the amateur community.

Jeramy Boot, G4NJH, in Nottingham, the U.K.
--

This unique, one-of-a-kind ham radio training program is supported by Region 1 of the International Amateur Radio Union. Additional assistance comes from several national ham radio societies, the Northern California D-X Foundation, Vertex Standard, Fluidmotion Corporation, Malev Airlines and the Rogner Europark Hotel in Tirana Albania. (RSGB, OH2BH)

**

RESTRUCTURING: SWEDEN MAY GO CODEFREE

Sweden could be next nation to drop the Morse requirement for ham radio licensing and end C-W testing.

The November issue of the Swedish national amateur radio society's magazine, QTC, says -- and we quote: "Soon - very soon - the requirement for knowledge of C-W for High Frequency band access will be dropped for the country's would-be amateurs and current Class 2 amateurs".

SM0SMK is the President of the Swedish national society. He says that they hope the Morse code test requirement will be removed at the end of the year. (GB2RS)

**

HAM RADIO IN SPACE: OSCAR 14 GOES SILENT

One of ham radios most popular emergency communications Easy Sats has gone Q-R-T. This with word from the Surrey Space Center that U-Oh-Sat Oscar 14 has finally reached the end of its mission after an amazing 14 years in day to day service.

Launched in January of 1990, U-Oh-14 was the first 9.6 kilobit per second amateur digital communications satellite. It literally pioneered the packet satellite or PacSat concept.

After about 14 months on-orbit, U-Oh-14 was switched to commercial frequencies for humanitarian service by an organization called Satelife. It was used by them until 1997 when it was returned to Amateur Radio service and configured as an F-M repeater in space.

A failure of one of the cells of its on-board battery supply is keeping the entire pack from recharging from the satellites solar array. This causes the transmitter to shut down shortly after it is commanded on. This situation lead to the decision by controllers to terminate the

micro satellites mission after more than 72,000 orbits of the planet. (RSGB)

**

RADIO HONORS: ARISS TO CELEBRATE THE LEGACY OF ROY NEAL, K6DUE

The Amateur Radio on the International Space Station team will be honoring the memory and the legacy of the late Roy Neal, K6DUE. This, with an operating event involving the crew on the orbiting outpost and hams on the ground. Amateur Radio Newsline's Norm Seeley is here with the details:

--

In a joint release, Frank Bauer, KA3HDO and Sergej Samburov, RV3DR of the ARISS International team say that the event is being held to commemorate Roy Neal's vision and dedication. This, in the development of manned Amateur Radio space communications.

And as a celebration of Roy's contributions ARISS has requested that the current I-S-S crew take to the airwaves the weekend of November 29th and 30th to communicate with as many ground based amateur radio operators as they can. After the initial two days, the operation will continue through the month of December using both voice and packet.

Ham radio from the International Space Station signals will be on the usual frequencies. These are 145.80 MHz as the worldwide voice and packet downlink. That's where you listen.

The worldwide packet radio uplink channel is 145.99 MHz. 144.49 MHz is the voice uplink for the America's and the Pacific while 145.20 MHz is where to call if you are in Europe, Central Asia and Africa.

Roy Neal, K6DUE, died last August 15th due to complications following heart valve replacement surgery. He is very much missed by everyone in the world wide ham radio community especially by us here it the Amateur Radio Newsline where he was a friend and colleague.

The full text of the ARISS International release about this special operation commemorating Roy Neal's contributions to manned ham radio in space is now at our website. That URL is www.arnewsline.org. Scroll down to the new "This Just In" area and you will find it there.

For the Amateur Radio Newsline, I'm Norm Seeley, KI7UP.

--

According to Bauer and Samburov hams making contact with the Roy Neal Commemorative Operation will be eligible for a special certificate. More ham radio in space news later on in this weeks report. (ARISS)

**

Break 1

From the United States of America, We are the Amateur Radio Newsline, heard on bulletin stations around the world including the W9EAR repeater of the EARS Repeater Network serving Indiana, Kentucky and Illinois.

(5 sec pause here)

**
AN ARNEWSLINE(tm) EDITORIAL: AN ANONYMOUS NOTES OR E-MAIL PLEASE

I'm Bill Pasternak, WA6ITF, with a short editorial comment. Actually, its more of a reminder that the Amateur Radio Newsline does not accept anonymous letters and e-mail as valid information or story leads.

Every so often, a letter or e-mail will arrive making all sorts of claims. It might deal will allegations that a ham radio test session is corrupt, or identifying someone as the purported jammer of a net or that a ham is doing business over a local repeater. This past week we received two such notes. One claimed that a repeater was discriminating against a group of individuals. The other claimed corruption in the management of a ham radio convention. Both had something in common -- they were unsigned. And here's our policy in dealing with unsigned correspondence. Ready?

(Sound of actual letters being torn up and toss in the trash basket.)

That's right, you just heard me rip it up and toss it in the garbage can. And the reason is simple. If the person sending the letter or the e-mail does not have the courage to sign it, then the chances are that he or she is attempting to use us and you in a personal vendetta. And friends, we are not going to let ourselves or you to be used in someone's private war. That's been our policy since our days as the Westlink Radio Network and it is still our policy today.

The bottom line. If you are going to send us information you must provide identification and be ready to take responsibility for your words and actions. I you are not willing to do so, please save us the time and effort of doing this -- and tossing it in the trash.

This has been an infrequent Amateur Radio Newsline editorial. In Los Angeles, I'm Bill Pasternak, WA6ITF. (ARNewsline(tm))

**

ENFORCEMENT: ALLEGED TOWER UNBOLTER CAUGHT

A follow-up to a story we aired two weeks ago about a man trying to unbolt power transmission towers in three western states. He has now been captured.

According to news reports, the suspect is identified as Michael Poulin. He claims that his actions illustrate how vulnerable the power grid might be to acts of terrorism. At airtime, charges against him are pending. (Published news reports)

**

ENFORCEMENT: IRLP HARASSMENT

A pair of mid-West hams are being asked to explain their actions their on the air activities. The FCC's Daryl Duckworth, NN0W, tells us who and why:

--

Duckworth: "Two Oklahoma amateurs; Johnny Adams, KD5QJG, of Dell City and Jack Stokes, KE5KR, of Oklahoma City have been queried regarding complaints of deliberate interference and harassment of repeater users on W5QO, 144.650 and 145.250 MHz."

--

The FCC says that at the time the incident occurred, the W5QO repeater was functioning as an IRLP node. Adams and Stokes were given 20 days from the day that they received the FCC's letter to answer the charges. They were also warned that failure to respond could result in the revocation of Amateur station license and suspension of operator privileges. (FCC, RAIN)

**

ENFORCEMENT: HEY YOU LEFT THE RADIO ON

The FCC also wants to know why a ham may have walked away from his car with his rig running as a cross band repeater. Again, the FCC's Daryl Duckworth, NN0V:

--

Duckworth: "A complaint of two hours of interference on September 16th, coming from an amateur transceiver unit, in a car, unidentified, unattended, and operating in crossband mode has prompted the Enforcement Bureau to inquire of the vehicle's owner, KG6QKR, Angel Carballo, of Freemont California. The vehicles was located at Hamilton and Bascon Avenue's in San Jose (California) at the time of the interference to 145.23 and 146.94 MHz."

--

Like Adams and Stokes, Carballo was also given 20 days from the date he received the FCC's letter to file a response. (FCC, RAIN)

**

RADIO LAW: A CLARIFICATION ON EQUIPMENT SEIZURES

Phil Kane, K2ASP, says in the CGC Communicator that the FCC does not confiscate equipment.

Kane, now an attorney in Oregon is the retired District Director of the FCC in San Francisco California. He says that he served many times as an on-scene supervisor during events such as the recent raid on an unlicensed broadcaster where equipment was taken. According to Kane,

seizures are made by the U.S. Marshal Service executing an order of the Federal District Court. Any items taken are held pending court action of forfeiture of the equipment to the Government.

According to Kane, the FCC agents on scene are there only as technical experts. They identify to the Marshals what equipment falls under the purview of the seizure warrant. (CGC)

**

RADIO RULES: THE FEDS ON FRS

Federal government entities have been authorized to purchase and operate radios certified by the FCC in the Family Radio Service. This, according to the May 2003 Manual of Regulations and Procedures for Federal Radio Frequency Management.

The manual says that pursuant to Part 95 Subpart B of the FCC Rules and Regulations, government users will be accorded the same privileges as non-federal users. Also, since FRS users must share each channel and no user is assured protection from interference caused by another authorized user, federal entities may not purchase and operate F-R-S radios for planned communications operations that safeguard human life or property.

The Manual of Regulations and Procedures for Federal Radio Frequency Management is a great publication that has a ton of useful information. The only drawback is that it costs $342.00 new. However it is available for viewing and download, chapter by chapter, at www.ntia.doc.gov/osmhome/redbook/redbook.html (CGC)

**

HAM EDUCATION: NEW ON-LINE HELP FOR INSTRUCTORS

The American Radio Relay League's Field and Educational Services branch has announced a new resource for active Volunteer Instructors. Titled the Online Instructor Primer, it's a new compilation by Linda Mullally, KB1HSV, that's jam-packed with helpful tips, links, and tutorials sure to help instructors eager to try new ideas and approaches. More information about it is at the ARRL website. Just take the link to www.arrl.org/FandES/ead/instructor/oip (ARRL)

**

NAMES IN THE NEWS: PATRIOT NAME CHANGE

Turning to this weeks names in the news. Word that the Patriot DX Association has changed its name to the New England DXCC with a new mission. That of fostering participation in DX'ing and the DXCC program.

The group has also announced the creation of a new operating event called the N-E-D-X-C-C Challenge. According to an October 27th press

release the purpose of the Challenge is to stimulate on-the-air operating activity among club members to make contact with many DXCC countries as possible during the prescribed activity periods. More information is on the web at www.nedxcc.org (Via e-mail)

**

BREAK 2

This is ham radio news for today's radio amateur. From the United States of America, We are the Amateur Radio Newsline with links to the world from our only official website at www.arnewsline.org and being relayed by the volunteer services of the following radio amateur:

(5 sec pause here)

**

EMERGING TECHNOLOGY: SOUND OF A BLACK HOLE

From the science page this question. Did you know that the voice of a black hole is a deep, deep bass? In fact, its 57 octaves below middle C. It is and Jim Meachen, ZL2BHF, has more:

--

The Chandra X-ray Observatory has picked up sound waves for the first time from a cluster of galaxies 250 million light years away. Astronomers at the Institute of Astronomy in Cambridge, England, discovered the sound waves while analyzing the Chandra images of the Perseus cluster. This is an immense grouping of galaxies held in formation by the powerful tug of a super massive black hole.

Andy Fabian is a professor at the Institute of Astronomy. He says that a close study of the fine detail collected by Chandra shows ripples in the X-ray pattern that are caused by sound waves excited by the energy from the black hole.

Fabiam says that the sound produced by the black hole is a B flat, the same pitch as a key near middle C on the piano. But the song of the Presses Black Hole is 57 octaves below that middle C. This is a tone or frequency more than a million, billion times deeper than the limits of the human ear,. Fabian says that makes it the lowest note known in the universe.

For the Amateur Radio Newsline I'm Jim Meachen, ZL2BHF, in New Zealand.

--

Scientists expect more insight on this as the experiments progress. (Science Today)

**

EMERGING TECHNOLOGY: NEW FRACTILE ANTENNA DESIGN

Engineers at Pennsylvania State have developed innovative design methods for a new class of antennas. One composed of an array of fractal-shaped tiles that offer anywhere from a 4 to 1 to 8 to 1 improvement in bandwidth compared to their conventional counterparts.

According to Space Daily, the new broadband antennas are composed of irregular but self-similar, repeated fractal-shaped unit tiles called "fractiles." These "fractiles" cover an entire plane without any gaps or overlaps.

While fractal concepts have been used previously in antenna design, the Penn State research team are the first to introduce a design approach for broadband phased array antenna systems. One that combines aspects of tiling theory with fractal geometry. (ANS, Space Daily)

**

HAM RADIO IN SPACE: AMSAT UK DONATES TO LAUNCH FUNDS

AMSAT-UK is funding the development of two new amateur radio satellites by donating œ10,000 to each of two projects in the USA and Germany. In accordance with their constitution, at their meeting on Saturday October 25th, AMSAT UK decided to make an immediate donation of œ10,000 to the AMSAT North America's Project Echo Launch Campaign Fund.

Also at the meeting AMSAT U-K decided to earmark another œ10,000 for transfer to AMSAT Germany to support the Phase 3 Express project. This, when a suitable component for funding can be identified.

Project Echo satellite is due to be launched next March 31st. The Phase 3 E Express ham satellite is likely to get a ride to orbit in the 2005 to 2006 time frame. (ANS)

**

BEACON NEWS: UK PROP BEACONS BACK ON

If you are a microwave D-X'er, listen up. This one is for you. It comes from the United Kingdom and says that two of that nations highest frequency beacons are back in full time operation.

Both are part of the South Coast microwave beacon complex. GB3SCX operates on 10 GHz and GB3SCK on 24 Ghz. The two units are again operational following a major rebuild. Both have had their output power increased, raising them at least 10 dB above their previous levels. And there's more.

GB3SCK has been retuned to transmit on 24,048.905 MHz in order to comply with the new 24 GHz bandplan, which will come into force at the beginning of 2004. Also, the GB3SCC which is on 5760.905 MHz has had its keying duty cycle adjusted. It now transmits callsign and location details, followed by plain carrier for a total of 45 seconds. It then stops transmitting for 15 seconds to permit cooling before resuming its operation. Reception reports on any of these beacons go to John Fell, G0API, at his Callbook address. (GB2RS)

**

DX

In D-X, MW0USK reports over QRZ.com that M1DAZ, who is on active duty with the British Forces Broadcast Services in Iraq, has obtained official authority to operate with the callsign YI9DAZ. Darran will be active around the bands for the next couple of weeks using a Yaesu FT-100 and Atas aerial from the Southern part of the country. Most of his operation will be on P-S-K 31 so that he does not disturb his room mate who is the presenter of the early morning radio show. QSL direct to M1DAZ at his home address. (qrz.com)

F6BUM will be active on CW, SSB and RTTY from various regions of Peru. This, between the 5th of November and the 5th of December. He will be using the callsign OA, followed by a district number, stroke F6BUM. (GB2RS)

Also, three operators from Japan will be active from Kathmandu, Nepal, between the 16th and 22nd of November. The callsigns will be 9N7AU, 9N7LN and 9N7SZ. They will operate on 40 to 6 metres using two HF rigs and a 6-metre rig. (GB2RS)

And, a VHF DXpedition to La Palma in Square IL18, should be active through November 19th. This, with DJ6JJ and DL1EJA operating during the ARRL EME Contest and scatter during the Leonids meteor shower. Their station is reportedly using use high power to four 12-element Yagis with full elevation control. For all of these operations please QSL as directed on the air. (GB2RS)

**

THAT FINAL ITEM: THE TECH SIDE OF THE NYC MARATHON

And finally this week a look at two other ham radio aspect of the New York City Marathon. The way hams organize and the technology that they use. Here's Henry Feinberg, K2SSQ:

--
Last week Communications Coordinator Steve Mendelsohn, W2ML, told us that it takes 411 radio amateurs to keep the New York City Marathon moving along. This week W2ML says that it also takes a lot of well organized ham radio networks to keep the messages flowing:

--

Audio only. Hear the newscast in mp3 at www.arnewsline.org

--

According to Mendelsohn, ham radio communicators are aided by a lot of modern technology. Its science that literally gives them a leg up on the contestants:

--

Audio only. Hear the newscast in mp3 at www.arnewsline.org

--

And this year ham radio expanded the use of its own kind of digital positioning technology:

--

Audio only. Hear the newscast in mp3 at www.arnewsline.org

--

According to Mendelsohn, it's human beings -- trained ham radio communicators that makes for a smooth race.

In New York, I'm Henry Feinberg, K2SSQ, for the Amateur Radio Newsline.

--

Next week, how it all gets put together. Please be with us. (ARNewsline)

**

NEWSCAST CLOSE

With thanks to Alan Labs, AMSAT, the ARRL, the CGC Communicator, CQ Magazine, the FCC, the Ohio Penn DX Bulletin, Radio Netherlands, Rain, the RSGB and Australia's Q-News, that's all from the Amateur Radio Newsline(tm). Our e-mail address is newsline @arnewsline.org. More information is available at Amateur Radio Newsline's(tm) only official website located at www.arnewsline.org. You can also write to us or support us at Amateur Radio Newsline(tm), P.O. Box 660937, Arcadia, California 91066.

For now, with Bill Pasternak, WA6ITF, at the editors desk, I'm Don Wilbanks, AE5DW, saying 73 and we thank you for listening." Amateur Radio Newsline(tm) is Copyright 2003. All rights reserved.

2922. Re: CB Linears For Freebanding

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-20 11:34:12 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <UE1vb.9681$Rk5.9102@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 82492

"Robert Casey" wrote:
>
> Well, aside from the web address having
> "cb" embedded in it, they don't specify
> that these things are not intended for ham
> radio service.... ;-) (snip)

It doesn't matter whether these things are intended for the ham radio service or not. If they're at all capable of operating on the frequencies in and/or around the CB band, they're illegal to sell under existing FCC rules. Likewise, when it comes to the frequencies near the CB band (including the ham frequencies - the 10m band, for example), there are now even restrictions on how many amplifiers a licensed ham can sell, even to other licensed hams. The rules have changed over the last few years. It would be wise to keep up with those changes.

> And they didn't mention how much drive is
> needed to work these amps. It may be less
> than the usual 100W a ham transciever puts
> out. ;-)

Not relevant to this issue under the existing rules.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

2923. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-20 11:34:32 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031120063432.25517.00002235@mb-m15.aol.com>
Source record: 82493

In article <qnNub.8076$Rk5.2293@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> writes:

>"Ryan, KC8PMX" <REMOVETHISkc8pmx@diamondcs.net> wrote
>
>> If your interest rate is less than 5%, the best loan to get is a 30 year!
>> It's cheap money. Paying off a house quick is foolish.
>
>You've been brainwashed!!!

Not necessarily. It all depends on the situation. Lots of factors to consider.

I do agree, though, that simple rules like "If your interest rate is less than 5%, the best loan to get is a 30 year" and "Paying off a house quick is foolish." are too simple to be useful unless a lot of other information is considered.

>> Instead of paying off that low interest loan quickly, one is smarter
>> paying
>> off the higher interest loans like automobiles, department and credit card
>> charges, and other loans/debts.

Sometimes - not always.
>
>Then there are the rocket scientists (NOT!!!!) who refinance their house,
>grab some equity cash, and pay off the remaining 3 year loan on their SUV
>that they really couldn't afford in the first place. Now they're paying for
>30 years on a truck that will be 25-years in the scrap-yard before it's paid
>off. Brilliant financial wizards!!!

Yep - but that was obvious when they bought the SUV that they couldn't afford in the first place.

In reality, it does take a bit of financial wizardry to figure out what the best deal is *for you* at the time and in *your* situation. For example, if someone can reasonably expect for their income to grow faster than inflation, long term debt may make more sense than paying off quicker and depleting savings. Mortgage interest is tax-deductible while other interest is not, so there may be an advantage to consolidating debt.

But ya gotta work the numbers! And there's no wizardry that's gonna fix living beyond one's means.

73 de Jim, N2EY
>

2924. Re: Happy Veterans Day

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-20 12:56:08 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0311200456.4763758c@posting.google.com>
Source record: 82494

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0311192258.2999ac84@posting.google.com>...
> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0311191722.3e863167@posting.google.com>...
>
> > Who is Brain? Do you pass third party traffic for him?
>
> I am sure ANY traffic passed TO you or BY you is garbled.
>
> > > Seems to me that I've addressed each and every comment ABOUT you
> > > TO you, unless of course you can prove otherwise, INCLUDING the one
> > > you refered to here
> >
> > No. You haven't.
>
> Yes, I have.
>
> > How many backchannels did you receive stating that your posting
> > practices ARE appreciated?
> >
> > Post them.
>
> Post what? Something I haven't received? Something I've never
> claimed?
>
> Question is, how many "backchannel" messages have YOU received
> "praising" your "posting style", Brain...??? From Lennie, perhaps?
> Vipul? Bruce?
>
> Steve, K4YZ

The point is, Steve, you don't have a cheering section. No one
appreciates your constant, over the top, insanity.

2925. Re: Happy Veterans Day

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-20 12:58:14 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0311200458.7e679162@posting.google.com>
Source record: 82495

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3FBC4FE3.D2067EC6@earthlink.net>...
> Brian wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3FB97CC4.5A958465@earthlink.net>...
> >
> > > You've never come up with a straight answer for an explanation about
> > > Frankline Roosevelt referring to himself as "President Roosevelt".
> > >
> > >
> > > Dave K8MN
> >
> > I took an excerpt from someone else's material. The part in the
> > quotation marks is Franklin[e] Roosevelt's quote. You typically find
> > quotes within quatation marks, or at least I do. Do you have trouble
> > identifying quotation marks? Please let me help you.
> >
> > They look like this: "quoted material"
> >
> > Please notice that the quoted material really is within the quotation
> > marks.
> >
> > The material is then referenced to a web site where I encouraged
> > readers to click and read the entire article for themselves. Do you
> > have trouble clicking on a hyperlink? Please let me help you.
> >
> > Using the mouse, navigate your cursor to the location of the
> > hyperlink. When the cursor is over the hyperlink, left click once.
> > It really is that simple, and I'm glad to have been of assistance.
> >
> > After this little episode of educating you yet another time, your
> > self-imposed stupidity cannot be excused any longer. Please deal with
> > it in a more constructive manner.
>
> Sorry, little electrolyte, you wrote "Franklin Roosevelt is to have
> said:". That was followed by more material copied from a web site by
> you. Just because you provide links to material does not obligate me to
> use them or even to feign interest in doing so. Now, let's take a look
> at what you cribbed and posted:
>
> Quote
> Concerning the "Bonus Army" of 1932, where veterans of The War to End
> All Wars (1917/1918) were due a bonus in 1945, but wanted payment
> early because they lost their homes in the Great Depression, Franklin

> Roosevelt is to have said:
>
> ------------
> In the end, some money was paid to veterans but not without further
> difficulties. Within a year of the Bonus Army Incident, President
> Roosevelt imposed the Economy Act of 1933 which cut veterans
> disability allowances by 25%. In the effort to cut federal expenses,
> veterans were viewed as having inordinate special status over
> civilians. During the 1932 election campaign, he had publicly
> proclaimed: "No one [merely] because he wore a uniform must therefore
> be placed in a special class of beneficiaries over and above all other
> citizens. The fact of wearing a uniform does not mean that he can
> demand and receive from his government a benefit which no other
> citizen receives."
> end quote ======================
>
> Now, what do you make of that colon hanging at the end of "Franklin
> Roosevelt is to have said:"? What does it indicate to you.
>
> You can't place blame on me because you can't get your act together. If
> what you posted wasn't what you meant to convey or if the words aren't
> yours (since you've ignored common English rules for quoting someone
> else), perhaps you'll want to look the material over next time.
>
> Dave K8MN

Dave, you just revealed that you really did understand the post, and
that your sel-imposed stupidity is just another act for us to be
amused with. Congratulations.

2926. 35fd001 hompepage updated

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-20 14:57:36 UTC
From: Lloyd <Lloyd@wheresherb.net>
Message-ID: <bpikolqgq0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 82502

"Karl" <35fd001@gmx.net> wrote in message
news:agumrv02enh7m60ush42pdehpaio1co5po@4ax.com...
> http://35fd001.9cy.com

2927. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-20 15:40:24 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <CVqdndchu4c9fSGiXTWc9g@ptd.net>
Source record: 82503

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20031119062902.29660.00001675@mb-m24.aol.com...
>
> Do you think we'd still have code testing in the USA today if, back in
1998,
> there had been an overwhelming majority of support for NCI's "5 wpm and
sunset
> clause" idea?

Yes, I do ... because the FCC was bound by S25.5 of the ITU Radio
Regulations.
(The ONLY reason they gave for keeping the 5 wpm requirement at the time.)

NCI asked the FCC to eliminate code testing if they could see their way
clear,
but we frankly were not surprised by the outcome.

73,
Carl - wk3c

2928. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-20 15:42:20 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <O1qdnQQcP8-OfCGiXTWc9g@ptd.net>
Source record: 82504

"Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:VmMub.8036$Rk5.3410@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote
>
> > If such matters "are decided by an unemotional look at the facts and
what
> is in
> > the public interest", why do so commenters/petitioners give a biography
of
> > their education and experience in their commentary?
>
> Because it gives them a sense of self-importance, I suppose.

Actually, outlining some experience/qualifications to render a view lends
a certain degree of credibility to comments. It also helps to establish
one's
status as an "interested party" in the legal sense.

73,
Carl - wk3c

2929. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-20 15:49:40 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3FBCE294.5040509@psu.edu>
Source record: 82505

Kï¿½HB wrote:

> First off, your analogy is flaccid at best. In order to register to vote, I
> generally need only to reveal my place of residence (with evidence like an
> ID card, or be vouched for by another person registered to vote in the
> jurisdiction). I need not take any written or skills test, nor pay any
> examination fee, nor demonstrate any particular knowledge of the issues.
> (In fact such impediments to registering/voting used to exist in some
> jurisdictions, notably in the south, and are deemed unconstitutional.) It
> speaks volumes that you'd suggest such impediments to comment on something
> as mundane as regulations regarding a hobby radio service.
>
> Second off, regardless of the applicability of your analogy, I do not judge
> a persons political opinion based on whether he/she has taken the time to
> register to vote. (I don't even raise that question, because it is
> irrelevant to the value I place on their opinion.) I attach credence to
> their opinion based on their ability to make well constructed arguments, to
> succinctly state their views without resort to emotion or clichï¿½, and
> evidence that they may have considered alternate or opposing views.

Hans, do you consider your occasional foray into profanity, referring to
Jim's anology as flaccid, or calling me stupid as something other than
emotional responses?

Of course, I'm stupid, so I might not know th edifference!! 8^)

- Mike KB3EIA -

2930. Re: Australia

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-20 15:50:59 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3FBCE2E3.7030809@psu.edu>
Source record: 82506

Bill Sohl wrote:
> "N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
> news:c2356669.0311190931.314e3e91@posting.google.com...
>
>>Alun <alun@1stcounsel.com> wrote in message
>
> news:<Xns9437E5554901Eelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>...
>
>>>VK is abolishing code testing effective January 1st. One more down...
>>
>>How many down - and how many to go?
>>
>>73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>
> What difference does it make? The number of countries that
> have ended or are scheduled to end code testing can
> only increase. Not a single of those countries is ever
> likly to change back (IMHO).
>
> So I ask again, what difference does it make?

Alun enjoys tweaking us evey once in a while. Just innocent fun, I guess.

- Mike KB3EIA -

2931. Re: No!!! Re: Do Hams get 11 Meters Back

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-20 16:18:20 UTC
From: "Stephen M.H. Lawrence" <7.3steve@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <gP5vb.11687$Wy4.4805@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 82507
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.shortwave

One day 3 weeks ago, I listened from 28.000 - 28.150, and
I counted over a dozen of 'em. Truckers in particular have been
"using" our ten - meter band illegally, and Riley Hollingsworth
has been doing something about it. Make no mistake, this is
happening.

73,

Steve Lawrence
Burnsville, MN

"Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
news:3FBAFF1A.6050303@ix.netcom.com...
| High SWR wrote:
|
| >No, the CB'ers get the Ham bands. Thanks ARRL for your work in dumbing
| >things down.
| >
| >CQ Breaker, CQ Breaker, any 20 meter good-buddies got yer ears on, come
on
| >back. Ten-Four, Ten-Four, good buddy, Got ya twenty pounds. No Doubt yer
| >gettin out, come on back...
| >
| >
| Yeah, right. I haven't heard lingo like that on any ham bands, even
| since restructuring
| happened......
|
| CQ no kids, lids or space cadets......
|

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.542 / Virus Database: 336 - Release Date: 11/18/03

2932. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-20 16:19:46 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <CQ5vb.9972$Rk5.6170@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 82508

"Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote

> Actually, outlining some experience/qualifications to render a view lends
> a certain degree of credibility to comments.

And a distinct image of pompousness.

73, de Hans, K0HB

2933. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-20 16:37:12 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <Y46vb.9988$Rk5.3458@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 82509

"Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote

> Hans, do you consider your occasional foray into profanity, referring to
> Jim's anology as flaccid, or calling me stupid as something other than
> emotional responses?

That's a stupid question. (Regardless of the old bromide about "there ain't
no such thing as....")

73, de Hans, K0HB

2934. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-20 19:02:50 UTC
From: groupk0hb@earthlink.net
Message-ID: <5ee63311.0311201102.248cfa12@posting.google.com>
Source record: 82510

Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote

> Hans, do you consider your .... referring to Jim's anology as flaccid .....
> as something other than emotional responses?

I call it descriptive (certainly it's not emotional!!).

According to my Funk and Wagnalls (gotta love a guy with a funky name
like that!):

====> flaccid: adj. soft and limp: (example: flaccid biceps)

In other words, without strength, weak, ie., "flaccid analogy"

If that strikes an emotional chord with you, then you must truly be a
"sensitive" guy!

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

2935. test - pls ignore

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-20 19:33:15 UTC
From: TOM BLACKWELL <decision@sbcglobal.net>
Message-ID: <3FBD16F7.A4F11306@sbcglobal.net>
Source record: 82511

test

2936. Re: FCC POWELL SETS STAGE FOR EXIT IN INTERVIEW - Drudge report

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-20 19:47:28 UTC
From: TOM BLACKWELL <decision@sbcglobal.net>
Message-ID: <3FBD1A14.39F2450C@sbcglobal.net>
Source record: 82512

Michael Powell's administration has made about as much sense as the decision on the 2000 Florida balloting.

I attended a presentation by Chairman Powell in January, where he was talking about band changes and the need to "share spectrum." I think there are some things he does not understand.

Plus - - I see the ARRL becoming less and less effective on issues like this.

Powell was brought to us by those who voted for either Bush or Ralph Nader. (A vote for Nader was effectively a vote for Bush - - a trick and a backfire that was not an effective way for voters to protest.)

Rob Kemp wrote:

> http://drudgereport.com/flash3.htm?powell
>
> FCC POWELL SETS STAGE FOR EXIT IN INTERVIEW: 'I HAVE A TIRED FAMILY,
> TIRED CHILDREN AND A TIRED SPOUSE'
> Sun Sep 21 2003 17:25:30 ET

--
Regards, TOM BLACKWELL, PO Box 25403, Dallas, Texas 75225
http://pages.sbcglobal.net/tom.blackwell/

2937. 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-20 20:03:57 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031120150357.28496.00002154@mb-m18.aol.com>
Source record: 82513

At the close of the ECFS on 19 November 2003, the number of
documents on public view are:

RM-10805: 231
RM-10806: 217
RM-10807: 176
RM-10808: 193
RM-10809: 181
RM-10810: 180
RM-10811: 991 Total: 2,169 (10811 has 45.7% of total)

RM-10781: 321
RM-10782: 271
RM-10783: 276
RM-10784: 254
RM-10785: 256
RM-10786: 424
RM-10787: 674 Total 2,476 (10787 has 27.2% of total)

Grand total: 4,645 documents for all 14 petitions.

RM-10811 records include two sets of 6 postcards each, the reverse
side pre-printed with "FISTS" and fill-in blanks for a short comment,
name and address. Those are the USPS type of postcards.

Comment period for 10805 through 10811 is officially closed, but some
may be late-filed. It should be noted that FCC 98-143 comment
documents are still on public record and the last comment filed was in
September, 2003; official close of 98-143 comment period was 15
January, 1999. That last filer is Peter Alterman, PhD, W2CDO.
[Way to go, higher education! :-)]

FCC 03-104, the Docket on Broadband over Power Lines has 5,105
documents on record as of close of ECFS on 19 November 2003.

LHA

2938. Re: Australia

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-20 20:05:36 UTC
From: Paul Keinanen <keinanen@sci.fi>
Message-ID: <9j6qrvoq35j9kn0d4rafvop08ualsfefj5@4ax.com>
Source record: 82514

On 20 Nov 2003 09:56:38 GMT, Alun <alun@1stcounsel.com> wrote:

>I am not sure you are entirely right, Paul. Where reciprocal agreements
>are in place, someone with the stipulated class of licence will be able to
>operate with the agreed priviledges, regardless of how they obtained the
>licence (saving any nationality or residence restrictions, or limitations
>on using a reciprocal licence to gain further reciprocal priviledges).
>
>If the Morse test is abolished in one's own country, and you obtain a
>licence without passing a code test, you will be able to operate HF in
>countries that honour your licence under a reciprocal agreement, even if a
>Morse test is still required in that country.

I hope you are right.

However, do you have any concrete examples about this ?

At least the IARU seems to be quite cautious in their statements:

http://www.iaru-r1.org/overseas-licences.html

<CEPT 1/2>

>Once their licence no longer says class 1 or class 2, I assume they would
>get class 1 priviledges, even if the national rules of where they are
>going remain unchanged and there is still a Morse test there.

Based on my experience with the HAREC 12/5 WPM transition, I would be
quite sceptic about that, but if you have any observations, I would be
very interested to hear about them, so that I could inform hams
planning to go abroad.

Paul OH3LWR

2939. Re: No!!! Re: Do Hams get 11 Meters Back

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-20 20:54:56 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3FBD2A1E.8030001@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 82515
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.shortwave

Stephen M.H. Lawrence wrote:

>One day 3 weeks ago, I listened from 28.000 - 28.150, and
>I counted over a dozen of 'em. Truckers in particular have been
>"using" our ten - meter band illegally, and Riley Hollingsworth
>has been doing something about it. Make no mistake, this is
>happening.
>
>
Right now (nov 20 20:50 zulu) on 28.085 I hear CB like comms (AM).
Sounds as
crowded as a regular legal CB channel. None of it really copyable, with
all the
power mics and ratchet-jaw lingo. QTH in NNJ, nothing over S3.

2940. Re: No!!! Re: Do Hams get 11 Meters Back

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-20 20:58:39 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3FBD2AFE.4050606@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 82516
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.shortwave

Robert Casey wrote:

> High SWR wrote:
>
>> No, the CB'ers get the Ham bands. Thanks ARRL for your work in
>> dumbing things down.
>>
>> CQ Breaker, CQ Breaker, any 20 meter good-buddies got yer ears on,
>> come on back. Ten-Four, Ten-Four, good buddy, Got ya twenty pounds.
>> No Doubt yer gettin out, come on back...
>>
>>
> Yeah, right. I haven't heard lingo like that on any ham bands, even
> since restructuring
> happened......

Exception: Right now on 28.085 I hear CB like comms in AM mode. But
none sound like
hams. Besides AM isn't permitted here, this is a data/code subband.

2941. Re: FCC POWELL SETS STAGE FOR EXIT IN INTERVIEW - Drudge report

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-20 21:33:19 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <zqavb.10861$Rk5.4977@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 82517

Don't try and spin the incompetence of appointed officials and blame Bush. I understand your a braindead democrat and as such is unable to logically look at a situation, without a nodd from queen Hillary that is. So I will not dwell on that.

As for a 'official of the FCC'. They have been going downhill for over 20 years. None of them have a clue as to what the hell ham radio is, or is supposed to be. Seeing how they support BPL is proof enough of their incompetence. Maybe they should consider hiring a electronical enkineer to help them out. Or get some free advice from a CB freebander. Anything is better than what they have now....zero.

Dan/W4NTI

"TOM BLACKWELL" <decision@sbcglobal.net> wrote in message news:3FBD1A14.39F2450C@sbcglobal.net...
> Michael Powell's administration has made about as much sense as the
> decision on the 2000 Florida balloting.
>
> I attended a presentation by Chairman Powell in January, where he was
> talking about band changes and the need to "share spectrum." I think
> there are some things he does not understand.
>
> Plus - - I see the ARRL becoming less and less effective on issues
> like this.
>
> Powell was brought to us by those who voted for either Bush or Ralph
> Nader. (A vote for Nader was effectively a vote for Bush - - a
> trick and a backfire that was not an effective way for voters to
> protest.)
>
>
> Rob Kemp wrote:
>
> > http://drudgereport.com/flash3.htm?powell
> >
> > FCC POWELL SETS STAGE FOR EXIT IN INTERVIEW: 'I HAVE A TIRED FAMILY,
> > TIRED CHILDREN AND A TIRED SPOUSE'
> > Sun Sep 21 2003 17:25:30 ET
>
>
> --
> Regards, TOM BLACKWELL, PO Box 25403, Dallas, Texas 75225
> http://pages.sbcglobal.net/tom.blackwell/
>

2942. Electronic QSL's

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-20 22:08:51 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <TXavb.12146$Wy4.11112@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 82518
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.misc

http://lists.contesting.com/_cq-contest/2003-11/msg00327.html

--
&#65533;&#65533;&#65533; 73, de Hans, K0HB
--
Help support youth involved in Amateur Radio.
http://www.mnyarc.org
http://www.k0bsa.org

2943. Re: Happy Veterans Day

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-20 22:20:18 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0311201420.412d4151@posting.google.com>
Source record: 82519

brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0311200458.7e679162@posting.google.com>...

> Dave, you just revealed that you really did understand the post, and
> that your sel-imposed stupidity is just another act for us to be
> amused with. Congratulations.

And once again, Brain, Dave gave you an "out", quoted you
precisely, and once again helped to demonstrate just exactly how silly
you look in a publi forum.

Why do you persist in making a fool out of yourself over and over
and over.....?!?!?

You insist that OTHERS "admit" to mistakes when the mistakes were
yours and make "apologies" where apologies are clearly YOUR due...

Please...make ANOTHER "demand" for apologies and "insist" that
anyone EXCEPT you is suffering "sel-imposed stupidity". (I love it
when a LennieClone makes typos while claiming another person is
"stupid" ! ! ! !)

Sheeesh!

Steve, K4YZ

2944. Re: Happy Veterans Day

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-20 22:23:45 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0311201423.332d918f@posting.google.com>
Source record: 82520

brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0311200456.4763758c@posting.google.com>...

> The point is, Steve, you don't have a cheering section. No one
> appreciates your constant, over the top, insanity.

And >>MY<< point, Brain, is that I don't care.

What I >>DO<< care about is that I am quite obviously getting
under your skin by (accurately) rubbing your nose in YOUR mistakes.

Perhaps, in some enlightened moment of clarity, you'll get the
BIG picture and realize what you're doing to yourself.

But then again, perhaps not...

Steve, K4YZ

2945. Re: Happy Veterans Day

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-20 23:09:12 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <sQbvb.10973$Rk5.9643@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 82521

Gunny Robeson wants to be CO of rrap and LHA(jg) wants to be his XO. Why don't you two lovebirds take you're interminable romantic spat to private email and we could use this space for amateur radio policy discussions.

With kindest personal regards and best wishes for a long and happy life together,

de Hans, K0HB

2946. Re: No!!! Re: Do Hams get 11 Meters Back

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-20 23:36:58 UTC
From: Brian Hill <jonnysocko@jps.net>
Message-ID: <vrqk1vs05s4icb@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 82522
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.shortwave

Oh! Boy!
--
73 and good DXing!

Brian's Radio Universe
http://home.jps.net/~jonnysocko/

"Barry OGrady" wrote in message >
I can't imagine any ham wanting to go back to meters after getting used to
LCD displays.
> I have a 1 meter 2 metre radio, but it's pretty old.
>
>
> -Barry

2947. Re: Language Rules from FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-21 00:19:43 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031120191943.08626.00001845@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 82523

In article <bpief3$1mkclc$10@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>, "Ryan, KC8PMX"
<REMOVETHISkc8pmx@diamondcs.net> writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20031118214118.07578.00001706@mb-m25.aol.com...
>> In article <bpdi62$1n9ab4$12@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>, "Ryan, KC8PMX"
>> <REMOVETHISkc8pmx@diamondcs.net> writes:
>>
>> >Jim.... of all the people here I thought for sure you would see where I
>was
>> >going with that.......
>>
>> Of course.
>
>I was hoping so.... you are, at least IMHO, one of the stable "anchors" of
>this newsgroup.

Thanks!

>> >it goes well beyond the "dirty words" and could
>> >extend to any speech undesireable by others that could be deemed
>> >offensive and therefor punishable.
>>
>> I still believe in common sense and good taste, old-fashioned as that may
>> seem.
>> Discussing one's gastrointestinal problems in detail on the air may be
>> legal but that doesn't make it acceptable....

Perhaps a better term would be "appropriate"

>I would agree for the most part. Now..... can you cite specific rules that
>state what might be "old fashioned" in exact examples not just speaking of
>generalities??? :)

Specific rules? Not really, because the wording of the regulations is so vague.

But here's a general guideline:

Imagine that your transmissions are recorded and transcribed.

Would you be proud or embarrassed to have them replayedto, or read by, your
spouse/SO/person you'd like to have in that role? Children? Parents?
Employer/employees? Clergyperson? Neighbors? FCC? WRC committees? Enemies of
amateur radio?

Unless you can answer "proud" or at least "not embarrassed" in all cases,
there's something inappropriate going on. Because you never know who is

listening - or recording. Just my opinion.

>> I never hear that sort of stuff in CW ragchews, btw.
>
>Just had to get that CW jab in there eh? :) :)

No jab, just fact.

>> >Heck, we have organizations in the US already
>> >trying that..... not a small step to extend to ham radio!
>>
>> You mean like folks who say the press is "liberally biased" or "beholden
>> to big business" when it reports things they don't like?
>
>No, actually, the opposite.

Those two *are* opposites! Some "conservatives" say the media has a liberal
bias, while some "liberals" say it is beholden to big business too much.

>The right-wingers who want to control others
>thoughts, what they read, what they believe in, what people should do to
>their bodies and put in their bodies, and make it damn near a profession of
>forcing this on others.

There are left wingers who do exactly the same things, too. Me, I try to stay
"middle of the bird" (Pat Paulsen said it first, though).

The terms "liberal" and "conservative" have been corrupted to the point that
they are almost useless today. Perhaps a better way to look at things in that
area is whether someone wants to restrict what an individual or small group can
do, vs. restricting what a large group/institution can do. Or has to do.

>Hmmm.... Rush Limbaugh, our nation's largest
>hypocrite, is a prime example. (do as I say, not do as I do mentality)

You mean about drug abuse?

>Hmmm.... Pat Buchanan was a Republicrat, and also, if Hitler was alive and
>well today, and living in the US, he most likely would have been a
>Republican/Republicrat.

You're awful close to Godwin's Law there, Ryan!

Actually Hitler was neither "liberal" nor "conservative" in the American sense.
He was a fascist, wanting the state to have absolute power in all areas, with
no checks or balances, nor individual rights, nor institutional rights. Only
government power, and concentrated in a single leader.

>> >Like I said.... look beyond the cuss words, and there is a ton of things
>> >that some radical freaks could oppose.
>> >
>> Sure. But limiting what can be said on the amateur bands is not an
>> incursion
>> into free speech, because the amateur bands are public property.

>
>Actually, if one is truly a person that believes in the most of limiting
>government intrusions of our lives etc., then that person should actually be
>against all licensing of radio waves.

Not at all!

>Really, when you get to the point of
>it, NO ONE actually OWNS the airwaves.

Just the opposite - Everyone owns them. They're public property. And as such, government has the role of regulating and divvying up the spectrum so that the owners (that's all of us) get the maximum benefit from a limited, shared resource.

That's fundamental radio law, (insert standard I'm-not-a-lawyer disclaimer here). The rest is details.

>But in reality, there is a need for
>some type of regulation otherwise the chaos that would be there if it wasn't
>would be tremendous.

And the result would be that the resource would not be used for the public benefit.

>I personally believe, if the acronym is correct, the
>ECPA should be deemed illegal. (refernce the ban on cell phone recption.)
>
Which ban? You mean the one where it's illegal to listen in, or the one where private property owners can require that cell phones be turned off?

73 de Jim, N2EY

2948. Re: No!!! Re: Do Hams get 11 Meters Back

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-21 00:29:57 UTC
From: Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com>
Message-ID: <20031120192957.435$Bt@newsreader.com>
Source record: 82524
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.shortwave

Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote:
> Stephen M.H. Lawrence wrote:
>
> >One day 3 weeks ago, I listened from 28.000 - 28.150, and
> >I counted over a dozen of 'em. Truckers in particular have been
> >"using" our ten - meter band illegally, and Riley Hollingsworth
> >has been doing something about it. Make no mistake, this is
> >happening.
> >
> >
> Right now (nov 20 20:50 zulu) on 28.085 I hear CB like comms (AM).
> Sounds as
> crowded as a regular legal CB channel. None of it really copyable, with
> all the
> power mics and ratchet-jaw lingo. QTH in NNJ, nothing over S3.
>
You speak Spanish? ;)

2949. Re: Language Rules from FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-21 00:33:47 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hoo4sr0.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>
Source record: 82525

On Thu, 20 Nov 2003 02:07:53 -0500, Ryan, KC8PMX wrote:

>Well Phil.... there are just some things I just don't need to hear about! I
>am sure you can cite some examples exclusive to you as well. :) :) I have
>even heard one old dude describing the quality and consistency of the
>material moved within the bowel movements he was having..... some things
>are just too gross.
>
If the law doesn;t make it illegal it's legal.

Is your receiver one-channel crystal-controlled with no off-switch?

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

2950. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-21 00:33:47 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hoo51z1.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>
Source record: 82526

On 19 Nov 2003 23:33:34 GMT, N2EY wrote:

>But I have it on good authority that FCC does place some value on the
>"credentials" of the person making the comments.
>
>Perhaps K2ASP would comment on this.

The same is true in any professional field. It's called "credibility".

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

2951. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-21 00:33:47 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hoo5i22.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>
Source record: 82527

On Thu, 20 Nov 2003 15:42:20 -0000, Carl R. Stevenson wrote:

>Actually, outlining some experience/qualifications to render a view lends
>a certain degree of credibility to comments. It also helps to establish
>one's status as an "interested party" in the legal sense.

And, as I know full well, sometimes it is legally required to
disclose one's background and present status to avoid claims of
"conflict of interest" based on present or past associations with
the matter or the agency.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

2952. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-21 00:51:38 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <ukdvb.11098$Rk5.8595@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 82528

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote

> Perhaps K2ASP would comment on this.

I'd BET on it!!! And I'll bet on his answer too. It'll have an anecdote
to some incident back when he had a life.

73, de Hans, K0HB

2953. Re: KG4LEG new jammer in tampa bay on 146.640 N9EE wide area repeater

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-21 01:08:33 UTC
From: jackofalltrades2001@hotmail.com
Message-ID: <b6ef7950.0311201708.34dfdbf9@posting.google.com>
Source record: 82529
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.swap

KG4LEG was given a letter from ron, N9EE stated that coy roy has been kicked off the repeater. coy roy has been on a little less now in day 8 or 9 since his first sighting on 146.640. KF4GAH was talking about roys situation more today, he added that coy roys wife actually sits with coy roy and coaches him on how to piss people off.

we could also take this as a time to promote the 146.640 repeater.

the 146.640 group has a website,
www.the64machine.org
640 has echolink too
the group meets the first saturday of each month at the NPR N.P.R new port richey HOOTERS on the water.
repeater is up 1175 feet on the channel 10 tv broadcasat tower in holiday floida in the holiday lake estates subdivision.
other repeaters on the tower are 147.150, 444.425, and various commercial.
the tower site is maintained by WB8ONY wb8ony@arrl.net
www.qrz.com shows his information to be

WB8ONY Lookups: 194
Michael W Whitmore
1820 Solar Dr
Holiday FL 34691
USA

i once asked him if he could donate some space on the tower for a very small repeater, he said there was no room, and the tower is WAY OVERCROWDED as it is. several months later ron N9EE got a new GMRS repeater up on that tower, i think it is 462.650 not 100% sure. HMMMMMMM, can you say POLITICS? ron has political ham radio muscle, me? not.

other people who frequent the 146.640 repeater
N9EE (ownwer)
N0JAM shannon pleasant guy
WD4PZD/W4PZD pappy, very nice older guy talks often.
KG4COQ don one of the most wellknown hams on the repeater, always willing to help someone out, he organizes get togethers in J.B Starkey park in pasco county. DON is also known as "twinkle toes" and "the voice of weekie watchee"
KG4ORS red great guy, doesnot get on the repeater much but a good guy to talk to about the military.
WA8JSC/KE4CRM jim nice guy to talk to, he also will help anyone who needs it.

KA3YAE
KF4IQH jim talks about scanners, mabe ran a scanner net?
KG4LEG "mental midget" enuf said.
K4XS bill.
KF4EVJ kevin, talks alot about working for the phone company
KU4QO mike
N4WWX lives in sarasota
N9BK talks to KG4COQ
W4TPH talks alot about working at busch gardens.
W3GLL
KG4VET
KG4WLI doesnot talk much, usually calls for don
W4MDW
KA1WBE moved to georgia, but would be on alot when he lived in tampa
KA3ZAI
KC8NPA
KD4PYM
KD4VLX
KF4GAH
KF4GZE "Keep Fighting 4 Giant Zeebras Everywhere"
W4CBJ joe maritime mobile on 34 ft boat off cortez fla talks often
vessel "ham shack"
KFOLA
KF4RTE
KF4UJS
KG4OHH
KG4SBX girlfriend of KG4SBW
KG4SBW
KG4YMB
KI4AAH
KG4YYT
KG4YYU maritime mobile
WB4NFP

2954. Re: No!!! Re: Do Hams get 11 Meters Back

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-21 02:50:01 UTC
From: Jerry Oxendine <joxendi@bellsouth.net>
Message-ID: <v%evb.16249$ow5.3028@bignews2.bellsouth.net>
Source record: 82530
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

"Stephen M.H. Lawrence" <7.3steve@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:gP5vb.11687$Wy4.4805@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> One day 3 weeks ago, I listened from 28.000 - 28.150, and
> I counted over a dozen of 'em. Truckers in particular have been
> "using" our ten - meter band illegally, and Riley Hollingsworth
> has been doing something about it. Make no mistake, this is
> happening.
>
> 73,
>
> Steve Lawrence
> Burnsville, MN

And YOU can help! Get out there and listen on the road.
Get the tag # of the tractor (not of the trailer), date, time,
highway, milepost or exit number. Send this info to rholling@fcc.gov .
Make a difference: this is how those
other truckers got warned--individual hams who quietly
listened and accurately reported the above data. RH will
then respond IF, again, the info is accurate. Each ham
can make a difference and stop that "tan-fer thar, drivah,
ah know you rah't, fer-tan thar SQUEAK!!" If we don't, we will eventually
hear them beeping and squeaking their
way along on 17 Meters.

The way to "trap" a driver is to quietly cruise along. Do NOT talk to them
or get into an argument! Simply overtake a trucker who *may* be operating
on 28.085 AM. As you pass, or he passes you, he may be curious
about "them 'funny antenners' thar" and comment to you
about it (or other truckers). It is then you copy down the
tag # on the FRONT of the tractor, the DOT # (this confirms the identity of
the truck), the direction of travel and milepost (or exit), date and time.
Also the company name. Send it in! Done correctly, the "man" will send out
a warning notice to the company holding THEM responsible for their drivers'
actions. It is legal and enforc-able.

73

Jerry

73

Jerry
>
> "Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message

> news:3FBAFF1A.6050303@ix.netcom.com...
> | High SWR wrote:
> |
> | >No, the CB'ers get the Ham bands. Thanks ARRL for your work in dumbing
> | >things down.
> | >
> | >CQ Breaker, CQ Breaker, any 20 meter good-buddies got yer ears on, come
> on
> | >back. Ten-Four, Ten-Four, good buddy, Got ya twenty pounds. No Doubt
yer
> | >gettin out, come on back...
> | >
> | >
> | Yeah, right. I haven't heard lingo like that on any ham bands, even
> | since restructuring
> | happened......
> |
> | CQ no kids, lids or space cadets......
> |
>
>
> ---
> Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
> Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
> Version: 6.0.542 / Virus Database: 336 - Release Date: 11/18/03
>
>

2955. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-21 03:28:50 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031120222850.08626.00001857@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 82532

In article <CVqdndchu4c9fSGiXTWc9g@ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
<wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20031119062902.29660.00001675@mb-m24.aol.com...
>>
>> Do you think we'd still have code testing in the USA today if, back in
>1998,
>> there had been an overwhelming majority of support for NCI's "5 wpm and
>sunset
>> clause" idea?
>
>Yes, I do ... because the FCC was bound by S25.5 of the ITU Radio
>Regulations.
>(The ONLY reason they gave for keeping the 5 wpm requirement at the time.)

You misunderstood me, Carl. Sorry if I wasn't clear.

Note that I wrote "still have code testing in the USA today" (emphasis on
"today")

IIRC, NCI asked for 5 wpm right away and a sunset clause that would dump
Element 1 if/when S25.5 removed the treaty requirement. FCC did the 5 wpm thing
but did not enact the sunset provision.

My point was that I think if there had been overwhelming support of both parts
of the NCI proposal, FCC would have done the sunset clause thing and code
testing would have disappeeared in the USA more than five months ago. YMMV.
>
>NCI asked the FCC to eliminate code testing if they could see their way
>clear,
>but we frankly were not surprised by the outcome.
>
Was there not a request for a sunset clause that would do it automatically?

73 de Jim, N2EY

2956. Re: No!!! Re: Do Hams get 11 Meters Back

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-21 03:28:51 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031120222851.08626.00001858@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 82531

In article <4gfprv011ssr26ur54vj7m9av4r2iu4d5f@4ax.com>, Barry OGrady <god_freee_jones@hotmail.com> writes:

>I can't imagine any ham wanting to go back to meters after getting used to >LCD displays.

I much prefer an analog meter to a bar graph or other LCD/LED display of the same information.

YMMV

73 de Jim, N2EY

2957. Re: Happy Veterans Day

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-21 03:57:07 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0311201957.419c7788@posting.google.com>
Source record: 82533

"Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<sQbvb.10973$Rk5.9643@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>...

> Gunny Robeson wants to be CO of rrap....(SNIP)

Untrue, but I am sure it makes you feel better to think so.

>...(UNSNIP)and LHA(jg) wants to be his XO. Why
> don't you two lovebirds take you're interminable romantic spat to private
> email and we could use this space for amateur radio policy discussions.

Un huh...Like the hundreds of OTHER "valid" "amateur radio policy
discussions" that take place here, Hans?

The irrepressible re-workings of the same Code-vs-No Code
arguments of the last 10 years...is THAT the "amateur radio policy
discussions" to which you refer...?!?!

Because I SURE don't see too many other "valid" discussions, by
you or anyone else. We keep re-hashing th Code issue, or whose census
numbers are right.

> With kindest personal regards and best wishes for a long and happy life
> together,

I think you spent too many long showers on USS GrayGayBang,
Hans...Forgot to let that soap slide when she heeled over, didn't
you...?!?!

Steve, K4YZ

2958. Re: Happy Veterans Day

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-21 04:02:05 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3FBD8E3D.F33CD558@earthlink.net>
Source record: 82534

Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3FBC4FE3.D2067EC6@earthlink.net>...
> > Brian wrote:
> > >
> > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3FB97CC4.5A958465@earthlink.net>...
> > >
> > > > You've never come up with a straight answer for an explanation about
> > > > Frankline Roosevelt referring to himself as "President Roosevelt".
> > > >
> > > >
> > > > Dave K8MN
> > >
> > > I took an excerpt from someone else's material. The part in the
> > > quotation marks is Franklin[e] Roosevelt's quote. You typically find
> > > quotes within quatation marks, or at least I do. Do you have trouble
> > > identifying quotation marks? Please let me help you.
> > >
> > > They look like this: "quoted material"
> > >
> > > Please notice that the quoted material really is within the quotation
> > > marks.
> > >
> > > The material is then referenced to a web site where I encouraged
> > > readers to click and read the entire article for themselves. Do you
> > > have trouble clicking on a hyperlink? Please let me help you.
> > >
> > > Using the mouse, navigate your cursor to the location of the
> > > hyperlink. When the cursor is over the hyperlink, left click once.
> > > It really is that simple, and I'm glad to have been of assistance.
> > >
> > > After this little episode of educating you yet another time, your
> > > self-imposed stupidity cannot be excused any longer. Please deal with
> > > it in a more constructive manner.
> >
> > Sorry, little electrolyte, you wrote "Franklin Roosevelt is to have
> > said:". That was followed by more material copied from a web site by
> > you. Just because you provide links to material does not obligate me to
> > use them or even to feign interest in doing so. Now, let's take a look
> > at what you cribbed and posted:
> >
> > Quote

> > Concerning the "Bonus Army" of 1932, where veterans of The War to End
> > All Wars (1917/1918) were due a bonus in 1945, but wanted payment
> > early because they lost their homes in the Great Depression, Franklin
> > Roosevelt is to have said:
> >
> > ------------
> > In the end, some money was paid to veterans but not without further
> > difficulties. Within a year of the Bonus Army Incident, President
> > Roosevelt imposed the Economy Act of 1933 which cut veterans
> > disability allowances by 25%. In the effort to cut federal expenses,
> > veterans were viewed as having inordinate special status over
> > civilians. During the 1932 election campaign, he had publicly
> > proclaimed: "No one [merely] because he wore a uniform must therefore
> > be placed in a special class of beneficiaries over and above all other
> > citizens. The fact of wearing a uniform does not mean that he can
> > demand and receive from his government a benefit which no other
> > citizen receives."
> > end quote ======================
> >
> > Now, what do you make of that colon hanging at the end of "Franklin
> > Roosevelt is to have said:"? What does it indicate to you.
> >
> > You can't place blame on me because you can't get your act together. If
> > what you posted wasn't what you meant to convey or if the words aren't
> > yours (since you've ignored common English rules for quoting someone
> > else), perhaps you'll want to look the material over next time.
> >
> > Dave K8MN
>
> Dave, you just revealed that you really did understand the post, and
> that your sel-imposed stupidity is just another act for us to be
> amused with. Congratulations.

You'll recall that I asked if you thought Franklin Roosevelt called
himself "President Roosevelt". That didn't indicate confusion on my
part. It pointed out an inconsistency in your post. Now you've spent
days attempting to defend your error.

Dave K8MN

2959. Re: No!!! Re: Do Hams get 11 Meters Back

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-21 06:33:55 UTC
From: BDK <kingratboyoboy@buckeye-express.com>
Message-ID: <MPG.1a277be066956c6989809@news.buckeye-express.com>
Source record: 82535
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.shortwave

In article <20031120192957.435$Bt@newsreader.com>, moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com says...
> Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote:
> > Stephen M.H. Lawrence wrote:
> >
> > >One day 3 weeks ago, I listened from 28.000 - 28.150, and
> > >I counted over a dozen of 'em. Truckers in particular have been
> > >"using" our ten - meter band illegally, and Riley Hollingsworth
> > >has been doing something about it. Make no mistake, this is
> > >happening.
> > >
> > >
> > Right now (nov 20 20:50 zulu) on 28.085 I hear CB like comms (AM).
> > Sounds as
> > crowded as a regular legal CB channel. None of it really copyable, with
> > all the
> > power mics and ratchet-jaw lingo. QTH in NNJ, nothing over S3.
> >
> You speak Spanish? ;)
>

Ooooooooooohla! Ooooooooohla!

BDK

2960. Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-21 07:11:35 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <HUivb.11516$Rk5.6844@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 82536

Is there anyone out there who actually believes Michael Jackson is really innocent of this latest charge? There is a long list of questionable behavior that suggests otherwise - his "relationship" with 14 year old Brook Shields (including at least one date to a Hollywood awards ceremony), rumors of sleeping in bed with children, music videos targeting children with images of him grabbing his crotch, a multi-million dollar payoff of a family with similar accusations, admissions of sleeping in bed with children, an interview showing a 13 year old boy leaning against him like some kind of lover, and now these accusations.

Michael Jackson has all the classic symptoms of the typical pedophile. Pedophiles often attempt to attract children to their homes using candy, toys, or play equipment. Michael Jackson did this large with Neverland. Pedophiles often dress up as clowns or similar characters. Michael Jackson has had cosmetic surgery to change his (now clown-like) appearance. Pedophiles often describe their actions as innocent and loving, and insist others just don't understand the questionable behavior. Michael Jackson has said all of these. Pedophiles often hide their behavior behind claims of just trying to "help" children. Michael Jackson has done the same. All this, with the behavior described in the first paragraph, points strongly towards pedophilia.

Given all this, perhaps the real question is whether Michael Jackson will ever be convicted? This is already shaping up to be another O.J. Simpson-like court case with accusations of racism towards the police, fingers pointed at the victim and victim's family, and claims (by his brother) of "a modern day lynching." Does anyone want to make a prediction at this point?

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

2961. Re: Happy Veterans Day

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-21 11:07:19 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0311210307.102a8b7e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 82537

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3FBD8E3D.F33CD558@earthlink.net>...
> Brian wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3FBC4FE3.D2067EC6@earthlink.net>...
> > > Brian wrote:
> > > >
> > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3FB97CC4.5A958465@earthlink.net>...
> > > >
> > > > > You've never come up with a straight answer for an explanation about
> > > > > Frankline Roosevelt referring to himself as "President Roosevelt".
> > > > >
> > > > >
> > > > > Dave K8MN
> > > >
> > > > I took an excerpt from someone else's material. The part in the
> > > > quotation marks is Franklin[e] Roosevelt's quote. You typically find
> > > > quotes within quatation marks, or at least I do. Do you have trouble
> > > > identifying quotation marks? Please let me help you.
> > > >
> > > > They look like this: "quoted material"
> > > >
> > > > Please notice that the quoted material really is within the quotation
> > > > marks.
> > > >
> > > > The material is then referenced to a web site where I encouraged
> > > > readers to click and read the entire article for themselves. Do you
> > > > have trouble clicking on a hyperlink? Please let me help you.
> > > >
> > > > Using the mouse, navigate your cursor to the location of the
> > > > hyperlink. When the cursor is over the hyperlink, left click once.
> > > > It really is that simple, and I'm glad to have been of assistance.
> > > >
> > > > After this little episode of educating you yet another time, your
> > > > self-imposed stupidity cannot be excused any longer. Please deal with
> > > > it in a more constructive manner.
> > >
> > > Sorry, little electrolyte, you wrote "Franklin Roosevelt is to have
> > > said:". That was followed by more material copied from a web site by
> > > you. Just because you provide links to material does not obligate me to
> > > use them or even to feign interest in doing so. Now, let's take a look
> > > at what you cribbed and posted:
> > >

> > > Quote
> > > Concerning the "Bonus Army" of 1932, where veterans of The War to End
> > > All Wars (1917/1918) were due a bonus in 1945, but wanted payment
> > > early because they lost their homes in the Great Depression, Franklin
> > > Roosevelt is to have said:
> > >
> > > ------------
> > > In the end, some money was paid to veterans but not without further
> > > difficulties. Within a year of the Bonus Army Incident, President
> > > Roosevelt imposed the Economy Act of 1933 which cut veterans
> > > disability allowances by 25%. In the effort to cut federal expenses,
> > > veterans were viewed as having inordinate special status over
> > > civilians. During the 1932 election campaign, he had publicly
> > > proclaimed: "No one [merely] because he wore a uniform must therefore
> > > be placed in a special class of beneficiaries over and above all other
> > > citizens. The fact of wearing a uniform does not mean that he can
> > > demand and receive from his government a benefit which no other
> > > citizen receives."
> > > end quote ======================
> > >
> > > Now, what do you make of that colon hanging at the end of "Franklin
> > > Roosevelt is to have said:"? What does it indicate to you.
> > >
> > > You can't place blame on me because you can't get your act together. If
> > > what you posted wasn't what you meant to convey or if the words aren't
> > > yours (since you've ignored common English rules for quoting someone
> > > else), perhaps you'll want to look the material over next time.
> > >
> > > Dave K8MN
> >
> > Dave, you just revealed that you really did understand the post, and
> > that your sel-imposed stupidity is just another act for us to be
> > amused with. Congratulations.
>
> You'll recall that I asked if you thought Franklin Roosevelt called
> himself "President Roosevelt". That didn't indicate confusion on my
> part. It pointed out an inconsistency in your post. Now you've spent
> days attempting to defend your error.
>
> Dave K8MN

You've spent days dumb-assing your way through this and now you say
you didn't know if FDR referred to himself as "President Roosevelt."

Don't give up your retirement. You'd never make it in the real world.

2962. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-21 11:28:23 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031121062823.23171.00002226@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 82538

In article <CtVub.11016$Wy4.9328@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote
>
>> >> So almost anyone who is really interested in being included
>> >> in such a poll can get a license, ...
>> >
>> >Ah yes, "I got mine, now you get yours; then you can comment"!!!! (Just
>> >when I was looking for a good example of a "sense of self-importance"!)
>> >
>
>> Not at all.
>>
>> More like "I'm interested enough in the ARS to join".
>>
>> Do you place much credence in the political opinions of someone who could
>> legally vote, but won't even take the time to register?

>In order to register to vote, I
>generally need only to reveal my place of residence (with evidence like an
>ID card, or be vouched for by another person registered to vote in the
>jurisdiction).

That's right. Also proof of age.

> I need not take any written or skills test, nor pay any
>examination fee, nor demonstrate any particular knowledge of the issues.
>(In fact such impediments to registering/voting used to exist in some
>jurisdictions, notably in the south, and are deemed unconstitutional.)

That's right - because voting is a right, not a privilege.

However, no matter how interested someone is in politics, that person can *only* vote where he/she resides. IOW the price of voting is having to join a community by living there.

For years I worked in Philadelphia and paid Philadelphia wage tax (over 4% of gross pay). But I lived in Delaware County and could not vote in Philadelphia elections. (I met Mayor John Street once, years ago, but that's another story).

Or consider the recent election of a movie actor with no experience as a government official to the governorship of California. (Thinly veiled way around term limits for Pete Wilson, of course.) Why couldn't I vote in that election? How about when Minnesota governor Jesse Ventura was elected?

So there's definitely a precedent of "if you want to vote, join us first"

>It
>speaks volumes that you'd suggest such impediments to comment on something
>as mundane as regulations regarding a hobby radio service.

It speaks volumes that you have lost track of the discussion. WA2SI's idea, which is what we are discussing, is to have a one-time poll/survey about a single issue (code testing). Not about commenting or petitions or proposals at all.

I have never said that anyone should be restricted from commenting or petitioning.
>
>Second off, regardless of the applicability of your analogy, I do not judge
>a persons political opinion based on whether he/she has taken the time to
>register to vote. (I don't even raise that question, because it is
>irrelevant to the value I place on their opinion.) I attach credence to
>their opinion based on their ability to make well constructed arguments, to
>succinctly state their views without resort to emotion or clichï¿½, and
>evidence that they may have considered alternate or opposing views.

Good for you!
>
>The fact that you have an amateur license suggests that you will have an
>opinion about amateur radio regulation, but it gives no credence in and of
>itself whether your opinion is or is not worthy of consideration.

Yes, it does.

In general, what happens to the amateur radio service has a greater effect on licensed amateurs and those who want to be licensed amateurs than on the general public.

>Similarly
>a non-licensed individual may have an opinion but lack of a license
>similarly gives no credence in and of itself whether that opinion is or is
>not worthy of consideration.

One word: motivation.

>Thus your "almost anyone who is really interested in being included in such
>a poll can get a license" strikes me as just another version of the
>discredited practice of 'poll taxes' by which privileged persons attempted
>to limit the influence of 'lesser' (in their pecking order) persons in
>political affairs.

Nope. It's exactly analagous to the rule of "if you want to vote in this community, you have to join it".

Who are the people who would want to participate in a one-time survey on Morse code testing but who cannot even pass the Technician written test?

Do you really think the 35 question Tech test is a 'barrier' to anyone that wants to be a ham?
>
>I don't see how your mileage can vary.

>
Yet it does.

And we're talking about a survey on a single subject, not comments to FCC.

Good luck on this one, now.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2963. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-21 11:28:24 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031121062824.23171.00002228@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 82539

In article <cuvyxnansvbet.hoo5i22.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>, "Phil Kane"
<Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> writes:

>On Thu, 20 Nov 2003 15:42:20 -0000, Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
>
>>Actually, outlining some experience/qualifications to render a view lends
>>a certain degree of credibility to comments. It also helps to establish
>>one's status as an "interested party" in the legal sense.
>
> And, as I know full well, sometimes it is legally required to
> disclose one's background and present status to avoid claims of
> "conflict of interest" based on present or past associations with
> the matter or the agency.
>
Thanks, Phil and Carl, for explaining it far better than I did.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2964. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-21 11:34:30 UTC
From: wa2si@arrl.net
Message-ID: <b7d1465c.0311210334.5fee2b15@posting.google.com>
Source record: 82540

Alun <alun@1stcounsel.com> wrote in message
news:<Xns943564E221DAAelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>...
> "Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in
> news:EJvsb.9152$hn3.3187776@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net:
>
> > "Rupert" <big@bird.sesame.street> wrote in message
> > news:Govsb.10542$6c3.633@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net...
> >> Len Over 21 wrote:
> >>
> >> > As of 6 PM EST on 11 November 2003, the number of ECFS documents on
> >> > public view are:
> >>
> >> What would be interesting is to find out how many are for the change,
> >> and how many want to keep the code.
> >
> > Me too. All this roundabout bravo sierra could be bypassed if there was
> > a ballot sent to all approx. 700,000 U.S. licensed hams. As long as
> > quorum is met, it's on! This concept (Democracy) frightens the bejesus
> > out of many folks who claim to speak for those not yet licensed.
> >
> > But that's an empty argument. Get licensed and vote, tah dah! The big
> > bad "barrier" does not preclude anyone from getting their no-code Tech
> > ticket and executing a vote.
> >
> > Simply announce a "record date" by which one must be licensed (To give
> > those "yet to be licensed a fair shot at a voice in the process.) and
> > send a ballot out to all those licensed "of record." Makes too much
> > sense and requires some effort. IOW, against the contemporary trend.
> >
> > 73 de Bert
> > WA2SI
> >
> >
> >
>
> Those who have not obtained a licence because of the code trest are just
> as entitled to express their opinion to the FCC as you or I.

I agree, Alun. The Technician license requires no code test.

73 de Bert
WA2SI

2965. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-21 11:45:50 UTC
From: wa2si@arrl.net
Message-ID: <b7d1465c.0311210345.3cb6d6a8@posting.google.com>
Source record: 82541

Alun <alun@1stcounsel.com> wrote in message
news:<Xns943643F1E8DC6elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>...
> n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in
> news:20031116113606.23171.00002120@mb-m05.aol.com:
>
> > In article <Xns943564E221DAAelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun
> > <alun@1stcounsel.com> writes:
> >
> >>"Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in
> >>news:EJvsb.9152$hn3.3187776@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net:
> >>
> >>> "Rupert" <big@bird.sesame.street> wrote in message
> >>> news:Govsb.10542$6c3.633@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net...
> >>>> Len Over 21 wrote:
> >>>>
> >>>> > As of 6 PM EST on 11 November 2003, the number of ECFS documents
> >>>> > on public view are:
> >>>>
> >>>> What would be interesting is to find out how many are for the
> >>>> change, and how many want to keep the code.
> >>>
> >>> Me too. All this roundabout bravo sierra could be bypassed if there
> >>> was a ballot sent to all approx. 700,000 U.S. licensed hams. As long
> >>> as quorum is met, it's on! This concept (Democracy) frightens the
> >>> bejesus out of many folks who claim to speak for those not yet
> >>> licensed.
> >>>
> >>> But that's an empty argument. Get licensed and vote, tah dah! The big
> >>> bad "barrier" does not preclude anyone from getting their no-code
> >>> Tech ticket and executing a vote.
> >>>
> >>> Simply announce a "record date" by which one must be licensed (To
> >>> give those "yet to be licensed a fair shot at a voice in the
> >>> process.) and send a ballot out to all those licensed "of record."
> >>> Makes too much sense and requires some effort. IOW, against the
> >>> contemporary trend.
> >>>
> >>> 73 de Bert
> >>> WA2SI
> >>>
> >>>
> >>>
> >>
> >>Those who have not obtained a licence because of the code trest are

> >>just as entitled to express their opinion to the FCC as you or I.
> >>
> > Sure - nobody is saying that should change.
> >
> > However, note that there has been an amateur radio license with no code
> > test available here in the USA for almost 13 years now. That license
> > gives full VHF/UHF operating privileges and requires only a 35 question
> > written test.
> >
> > A code test is only required for access to the HF/MF amateur bands.
> >
> > So anyone who wants to obtain an amateur license can do so without any
> > code test.
> >
> > 73 de Jim, N2EY
> >
> >
> >
> >
>
> Technically, that's true, but there's no longer any ITU requirement for a
> code test for any band. I think at one time there were a lot of people who
> wanted HF who would have been waiting for the code test to go. This is
> probably no longer true, as the hobby has lost a lot of it's popularity
> since the Internet, and as the test speed is now only 5wpm.
>
> However, my point is just that polling only licenced hams is just not
> appropriate, as hams are not the only interested parties.

I heartily disagree. While ARO's may not be the only "interested"
parties, they are the party that currently defines the hobby/service
from a cultural standpoint. Thus, licensed ARO's are the constituenct
that must lean on those who define the hobby/service from a regulatory
standpoint, the FCC.

Wow, is a 35 multiple-choice question written, for which the Q&A pool
is published, really too much to ask for the <Carefully chosen words
follow, don't miss 'em.> *right* to vote concerning the *requirements*
to *earn* *privileges?!*

Perhaps the path is clearer than we thought.

73 de Bert
WA2SI

2966. Re: FCC POWELL SETS STAGE FOR EXIT IN INTERVIEW - Drudge report

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-21 12:20:28 UTC
From: TOM BLACKWELL <decision@sbcglobal.net>
Message-ID: <3FBDDB87.23FC673F@sbcglobal.net>
Source record: 82542

It seems the FCC Commissioners you say you are concerned about are appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate. If you don't believe me - - call your friend Rush Limbaugh.

Dan/W4NTI wrote:

> Don't try and spin the incompetence of appointed officials and blame Bush.
> I understand your a braindead democrat and as such is unable to logically
> look at a situation, without a nodd from queen Hillary that is. So I will
> not dwell on that.
>
> As for a 'official of the FCC'. They have been going downhill for over 20
> years. None of them have a clue as to what the hell ham radio is, or is
> supposed to be. Seeing how they support BPL is proof enough of their
> incompetence. Maybe they should consider hiring a electronical enkineer to
> help them out. Or get some free advice from a CB freebander. Anything is
> better than what they have now....zero.
>
> Dan/W4NTI
>
> "TOM BLACKWELL" <decision@sbcglobal.net> wrote in message
> news:3FBD1A14.39F2450C@sbcglobal.net...
> > Michael Powell's administration has made about as much sense as the
> > decision on the 2000 Florida balloting.
> >
> > I attended a presentation by Chairman Powell in January, where he was
> > talking about band changes and the need to "share spectrum." I think
> > there are some things he does not understand.
> >
> > Plus - - I see the ARRL becoming less and less effective on issues
> > like this.
> >
> > Powell was brought to us by those who voted for either Bush or Ralph
> > Nader. (A vote for Nader was effectively a vote for Bush - - a
> > trick and a backfire that was not an effective way for voters to
> > protest.)
> >
> >
> > Rob Kemp wrote:
> >
> > > http://drudgereport.com/flash3.htm?powell
> > >
> > > FCC POWELL SETS STAGE FOR EXIT IN INTERVIEW: 'I HAVE A TIRED FAMILY,
> > > TIRED CHILDREN AND A TIRED SPOUSE'
> > > Sun Sep 21 2003 17:25:30 ET

> >
> >
> > --
> > Regards, TOM BLACKWELL, PO Box 25403, Dallas, Texas 75225
> > http://pages.sbcglobal.net/tom.blackwell/
> >

--
Regards, TOM BLACKWELL, PO Box 25403, Dallas, Texas 75225
http://pages.sbcglobal.net/tom.blackwell/

2967. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-21 12:55:54 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <daacnaVZOe0KliOiXTWc9g@ptd.net>
Source record: 82543

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20031120222850.08626.00001857@mb-m27.aol.com...
> In article <CVqdndchu4c9fSGiXTWc9g@ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
> <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:
>
> >"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> >news:20031119062902.29660.00001675@mb-m24.aol.com...
> >>
> >> Do you think we'd still have code testing in the USA today if, back in
> >1998,
> >> there had been an overwhelming majority of support for NCI's "5 wpm and
> >sunset
> >> clause" idea?
> >
> >Yes, I do ... because the FCC was bound by S25.5 of the ITU Radio
> >Regulations.
> >(The ONLY reason they gave for keeping the 5 wpm requirement at the
time.)
>
> You misunderstood me, Carl. Sorry if I wasn't clear.
>
> Note that I wrote "still have code testing in the USA today" (emphasis on
> "today")
>
> IIRC, NCI asked for 5 wpm right away and a sunset clause that would dump
> Element 1 if/when S25.5 removed the treaty requirement. FCC did the 5 wpm
thing
> but did not enact the sunset provision.

Actually, we asked them to be rid of code testing then, or, in the
alternative if
they could not find a legitimate "out" on S25.5, to drop the code test to
the
minimum they thought necessary to meet that obligation and enact a sunset
clause.

> My point was that I think if there had been overwhelming support of both
parts
> of the NCI proposal, FCC would have done the sunset clause thing and code
> testing would have disappeeared in the USA more than five months ago.
YMMV.
> >
> >NCI asked the FCC to eliminate code testing if they could see their way
> >clear,
> >but we frankly were not surprised by the outcome.

> >
> Was there not a request for a sunset clause that would do it
automatically?

Yes, but we weren't surprised that they did not adopt it ... the agency
typically
doesn't like to prejudge the future ...
however, the old addage "Don't ask, don't get." has some truth to it ... so
we asked anyway.

73,
Carl - wk3c

2968. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-21 13:20:39 UTC
From: K7JEB <k7jeb.remove_this@qsl.net>
Message-ID: <fjovb.2564$o9.1150@fed1read07>
Source record: 82544

Dwight Stewart, W5NET, wrote:

> Is there anyone out there who actually believes
> Michael Jackson is really innocent of this latest charge?

I think I'll hang onto the legal convention of 'innocent
until proven guilty' but my personal grand jury has
coughed up an indictment.

> Given all this, perhaps the real question is whether
> Michael Jackson will ever be convicted? This is already
> shaping up to be another O.J. Simpson-like court case
> with accusations of racism towards the police, fingers
> pointed at the victim and victim's family, and claims (by
> his brother) of "a modern day lynching." Does anyone want
> to make a prediction at this point?

"Celebrity Justice" will break into prime-time and Court-TV
will buy CBS.

<Smirk>

Jim, K7JEB

2969. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-21 13:28:29 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031121082829.07578.00001764@mb-m25.aol.com>
Source record: 82545

In article <Xns943643F1E8DC6elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun
<alun@1stcounsel.com> writes:

>However, my point is just that polling only licenced hams is just not
>appropriate, as hams are not the only interested parties.
>
Who are the non-hams who are interested in the code test issue?

73 de Jim, N2EY

2970. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-21 13:50:18 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3FBE181A.6090008@psu.edu>
Source record: 82546

Bert Craig wrote:
> Alun <alun@1stcounsel.com> wrote in message
news:<Xns943643F1E8DC6elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>...

<some snippage>

>>Technically, that's true, but there's no longer any ITU requirement for a
>>code test for any band. I think at one time there were a lot of people who
>>wanted HF who would have been waiting for the code test to go. This is
>>probably no longer true, as the hobby has lost a lot of it's popularity
>>since the Internet, and as the test speed is now only 5wpm.
>>
>>However, my point is just that polling only licenced hams is just not
>>appropriate, as hams are not the only interested parties.
>
>
> I heartily disagree. While ARO's may not be the only "interested"
> parties, they are the party that currently defines the hobby/service
> from a cultural standpoint. Thus, licensed ARO's are the constituenct
> that must lean on those who define the hobby/service from a regulatory
> standpoint, the FCC.
>
> Wow, is a 35 multiple-choice question written, for which the Q&A pool
> is published, really too much to ask for the <Carefully chosen words
> follow, don't miss 'em.> *right* to vote concerning the *requirements*
> to *earn* *privileges?!*
>
> Perhaps the path is clearer than we thought.

There will always be some for whom any amount of testing is too much.
Right now, we're sort of catering to that group.

After all almost everyone uses a two-way radio now, and we don't have to
be very smart to use a cell phone, (proven every day) do we? So why are
all those stuck-up Hams making like they are so hot and smart? 8^)

- Mike KB3EIA -

2971. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-21 14:00:00 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3FBE1A60.9000607@psu.edu>
Source record: 82547

Dwight Stewart wrote:
> Is there anyone out there who actually believes Michael Jackson is really
> innocent of this latest charge? There is a long list of questionable
> behavior that suggests otherwise - his "relationship" with 14 year old Brook
> Shields (including at least one date to a Hollywood awards ceremony), rumors
> of sleeping in bed with children, music videos targeting children with
> images of him grabbing his crotch, a multi-million dollar payoff of a family
> with similar accusations, admissions of sleeping in bed with children, an
> interview showing a 13 year old boy leaning against him like some kind of
> lover, and now these accusations.
>
> Michael Jackson has all the classic symptoms of the typical pedophile.
> Pedophiles often attempt to attract children to their homes using candy,
> toys, or play equipment. Michael Jackson did this large with Neverland.
> Pedophiles often dress up as clowns or similar characters. Michael Jackson
> has had cosmetic surgery to change his (now clown-like) appearance.
> Pedophiles often describe their actions as innocent and loving, and insist
> others just don't understand the questionable behavior. Michael Jackson has
> said all of these. Pedophiles often hide their behavior behind claims of
> just trying to "help" children. Michael Jackson has done the same. All this,
> with the behavior described in the first paragraph, points strongly towards
> pedophilia.
>
> Given all this, perhaps the real question is whether Michael Jackson will
> ever be convicted? This is already shaping up to be another O.J.
> Simpson-like court case with accusations of racism towards the police,
> fingers pointed at the victim and victim's family, and claims (by his
> brother) of "a modern day lynching." Does anyone want to make a prediction
> at this point?

I predict he will be convicted, since this is the second time he's been involved officially in this sort of thing. We'll have to see how the evidence plays out, but right now it doesn't look too good for him.

As for sentencing, that is a different thing. I think loonyland has a minimum 3 year sentence per incident, but envisioning him in a state prison is hard to do. Perhaps if it happens, they will try to get him sent to Juvy?

- Mike KB3EIA -

2972. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-21 14:28:45 UTC
From: Steve Stone <spfleck@zzcitlinkzz.net>
Message-ID: <xipvb.1957$3p2.1221@news01.roc.ny>
Source record: 82548

So what does this have to do with ham radio.

2973. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-21 15:45:58 UTC
From: Alun <alun@1stcounsel.com>
Message-ID: <Xns943A6D811D68Aelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 82549

wa2si@arrl.net (Bert Craig) wrote in
news:b7d1465c.0311210334.5fee2b15@posting.google.com:

> Alun <alun@1stcounsel.com> wrote in message
> news:<Xns943564E221DAAelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>...
>> "Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in
>> news:EJvsb.9152$hn3.3187776@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net:
>>
>> > "Rupert" <big@bird.sesame.street> wrote in message
>> > news:Govsb.10542$6c3.633@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net...
>> >> Len Over 21 wrote:
>> >>
>> >> > As of 6 PM EST on 11 November 2003, the number of ECFS documents
>> >> > on public view are:
>> >>
>> >> What would be interesting is to find out how many are for the
>> >> change, and how many want to keep the code.
>> >
>> > Me too. All this roundabout bravo sierra could be bypassed if there
>> > was a ballot sent to all approx. 700,000 U.S. licensed hams. As long
>> > as quorum is met, it's on! This concept (Democracy) frightens the
>> > bejesus out of many folks who claim to speak for those not yet
>> > licensed.
>> >
>> > But that's an empty argument. Get licensed and vote, tah dah! The
>> > big bad "barrier" does not preclude anyone from getting their
>> > no-code Tech ticket and executing a vote.
>> >
>> > Simply announce a "record date" by which one must be licensed (To
>> > give those "yet to be licensed a fair shot at a voice in the
>> > process.) and send a ballot out to all those licensed "of record."
>> > Makes too much sense and requires some effort. IOW, against the
>> > contemporary trend.
>> >
>> > 73 de Bert
>> > WA2SI
>> >
>> >
>> >
>>
>> Those who have not obtained a licence because of the code trest are
>> just as entitled to express their opinion to the FCC as you or I.
>
> I agree, Alun. The Technician license requires no code test.

>
> 73 de Bert
> WA2SI
>

True, but some don't take it because they only want HF, not because they couldn't answer the questions. All I'm saying is that they should have a vote in any poll.

73 de Alun, N3KIP

2974. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-21 15:47:52 UTC
From: Alun <alun@1stcounsel.com>
Message-ID: <Xns943A6DD3BC7B2elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 82550

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in news:20031121082829.07578.00001764@mb-m25.aol.com:

> In article <Xns943643F1E8DC6elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun
> <alun@1stcounsel.com> writes:
>
>>However, my point is just that polling only licenced hams is just not
>>appropriate, as hams are not the only interested parties.
>>
> Who are the non-hams who are interested in the code test issue?
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>
>

Anyone who has been thinking of becoming a ham, I would imagine

2975. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-21 15:57:42 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <WBqvb.13381$Wy4.12153@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 82551

"K7JEB" wrote:
>
> I think I'll hang onto the legal convention
> of 'innocent until proven guilty' but my
> personal grand jury has coughed up an
> indictment.

When asking the question in the subject line, I was thinking more alone the lines of personal opinion than legal guilt or innocence. We're obviously not a court. The last paragraph had to do with predictions about any potential court ruling.

> "Celebrity Justice" will break into prime-time
> and Court-TV will buy CBS.

Interesting prediction. :-)

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

2976. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-21 16:06:30 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <aKqvb.13387$Wy4.11178@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 82552

"Mike Coslo" wrote:
>
> I predict he will be convicted, since this is
> the second time he's been involved officially
> in this sort of thing. (snip)

I don't know, Mike. Up until the very last few days of the trial, I was fully convinced O.J. would be found guilty.

> As for sentencing, that is a different thing. I think
> loonyland has a minimum 3 year sentence per
> incident, but envisioning him in a state prison is
> hard to do. (snip)

Okay, I'll give my own prediction. Will he be found guilty? Probably not. If found guilty, how much time will he spend? I agree three years is pushing it (which is why I doubt he'll be found guilty). But, since three years is the minimum, he'll have to serve that. But I seriously doubt it will be much more than that.

> Perhaps if it happens, they will try to get him
> sent to Juvy?

Someone asked last night on CNN (I think) if he will be tried as an adult of minor.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

2977. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-21 16:10:31 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <XNqvb.13391$Wy4.3605@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 82553

"Steve Stone" wrote:
> So what does this have to do with ham radio.

I'm a ham radio operator and I asked it. I also asked other ham operators. There's room in this newsgroup for less formal discussions between ham operators too. The subject line is clear, so you should be able to easily skip the discussion if you're not interested.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

2978. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-21 16:42:34 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <_frvb.11808$Rk5.6475@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 82554

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote

> Who are the non-hams who are interested in the code test issue?

Why that's pretty simple, Jim, I'm surprised you didn't know. It's all
those non-hams who might consider becoming licensed.

73, de Hans, K0HB

2979. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-21 16:49:43 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3FBE4227.4080508@psu.edu>
Source record: 82555

Steve Stone wrote:
> So what does this have to do with ham radio.

three

2980. Re: test - pls ignore

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-21 16:52:03 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3FBE42B3.9070800@psu.edu>
Source record: 82556

TOM BLACKWELL wrote:
> test

UR RST 599, OM! 8^)

- Mike KB3EIA -

2981. Re: Happy Veterans Day

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-21 16:54:58 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3FBE4362.5050704@psu.edu>
Source record: 82557

Steve Robeson, K4CAP wrote:
> "Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<sQbvb.10973$Rk5.9643@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
>
>
>>Gunny Robeson wants to be CO of rrap....(SNIP)
>
>
> Untrue, but I am sure it makes you feel better to think so.

Has Hans seemed a little, um , testy lately Steve? A little early for
cabin fever I think.

- Mike KB3EIA -

2982. Re: No!!! Re: Do Hams get 11 Meters Back

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-21 17:00:23 UTC
From: N8WWM@dickmysuck.com
Message-ID: <f92f4353.0311210900.41d88343@posting.google.com>
Source record: 82558
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.shortwave

Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com> wrote in message
news:<20031120192957.435$Bt@newsreader.com>...
> Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote:
> > Stephen M.H. Lawrence wrote:
> >
> > >One day 3 weeks ago, I listened from 28.000 - 28.150, and
> > >I counted over a dozen of 'em. Truckers in particular have been
> > >"using" our ten - meter band illegally, and Riley Hollingsworth
> > >has been doing something about it. Make no mistake, this is
> > >happening.
> > >
> > >
> > Right now (nov 20 20:50 zulu) on 28.085 I hear CB like comms (AM).
> > Sounds as
> > crowded as a regular legal CB channel. None of it really copyable, with
> > all the
> > power mics and ratchet-jaw lingo. QTH in NNJ, nothing over S3.
> >
> You speak Spanish? ;)

He might not, but you speak FAGLISH...you rimmer.

FCC rule 2.815(b): After APR 27, 1978, no person shall manufacture,
sell or lease, offer for sale or lease (including advertising for
sale or lease), or import, ship, or distribute for the purpose of
selling or leasing or offering for sale or lease, any external radio
frequency amplifier or amplifier kit capable of operation on any
frequency or frequencies between 24 and 35 MHz.

2983. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-21 18:07:09 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <hvsvb.11864$Rk5.4833@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 82559

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote

> However, no matter how interested someone is in politics, that person can
> *only* vote where he/she resides. IOW the price of voting is having to
join a
> community by living there.

Your analogy remains flaccid. Amateur radio exists in the community in
which we all live. It has an effect on all of us, whether we are licensed
or not, and the regulations concerning qualification to participate in it
even more so.

My friend, W4OYI, ex-President of ARRL, compares the ARS to a public park; a
place in the spectrum set aside for citizens to pursue the avocation of
radio. What you are proposing is that persons already in this 'park' by
virtue of having paid some entry price be the only ones allowed to vote on
the conditions under which other citizens can fully participate in every
area of park activities. IOW, "I got mine, now you get yours, and then you
can vote."

> Or consider the recent election of a movie actor with no experience as a
> government official to the governorship of California.

Are you suggesting that "experience as a government official" should be a
qualification for election to office in the USA? The Constitution contains
no such language. My daughter was recently elected to public office, and
she has no previous experience as a government official. Should she and
Arnold be denied their office? Should only existing or previous government
officials be allowed to be elected?

Or should there be some sort of 'incentive licensing' of government
officials in which you must first be elected to an entry level office, let's
say Canine Capture Technician. Then after gaining the skill and experience
to capture 5 dogs per minute, they be allowed to run for office at some more
responsible level, all the way up to President, and only those already
elected would be allowed to vote for them? What a concept!

>>>>>>>>The fact that you have an amateur license suggests
>>>>>>>> that you will have an opinion about amateur radio
>>>>>>>>regulation, but it gives no credence in and of
>>>>>>>>itself whether your opinion is or is not worthy of consideration.

>>>>>>> Yes, it does. (N2EY)
>>>>>>No, doesn't (K0HB)

>>>>>> Yes, it does. (N2EY)
>>>>>No, doesn't (K0HB)

>>>>> Yes, it does. (N2EY)
>>>>No, doesn't (K0HB)

>>> Yes, it does. (N2EY)
>>No, doesn't (K0HB)

> Yes, it does. (N2EY)
No, doesn't (K0HB)

...we could go on and on....

> In general, what happens to the amateur radio service has a greater effect
on
> licensed amateurs and those who want to be licensed amateurs than on the
> general public.

But we weren't talking about "in general". Wahtoosey was proposing a poll to vote on the code test as a qualfication for entry (to HF). Since you "already have yours", such a poll (were it binding on FCC) would not effect your entry into amateur radio, but would have a far greater effect on those not yet licensed (the general public). Thus we could much more convincingly argue that you should *not* be eligible to vote in the poll, but the general (non-licensed) public *should* be eligible.

> One word: motivation.

Ah, yes, the old "motivation" card. We dealt with that back in 1996 at

http://groups.google.com/groups?selm=836389087.AA06738%40hamlink.mn.org&oe=U
TF-8&output=gplain

> Who are the people who would want to participate in a one-time survey on
Morse
> code testing but who cannot even pass the Technician written test?

Wahtoosey didn't suggest a 'survey'. He talks about a poll where people vote and democracy rules.

And the discussion was not about those who 'cannot even pass'. It was about those who (for whatever reason of their own) have not become licensees. More of your "I've got mine, now you get yours" mindset showing.

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

2984. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-21 18:42:54 UTC
From: mikewalton55@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <d2701d5a.0311211042.6471721b@posting.google.com>
Source record: 82560

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:<WBqvb.13381$Wy4.12153@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> "K7JEB" wrote:
> >
> > I think I'll hang onto the legal convention
> > of 'innocent until proven guilty' but my
> > personal grand jury has coughed up an
> > indictment.
>

That's premature, Jackson is not into ejaculating with 12 year old Cancer Patients.

http://jackson.alturl.com

2985. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-21 19:55:45 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0311211155.5d6bfaa5@posting.google.com>
Source record: 82561

Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message news:<3FBE1A60.9000607@psu.edu>...

> As for sentencing, that is a different thing. I think loonyland has a
> minimum 3 year sentence per incident, but envisioning him in a state
> prison is hard to do. Perhaps if it happens, they will try to get him
> sent to Juvy?

That would be just like California...Send a pedophile to juvy.

That would be like sending Richard Speck to Chino Women's
Correctional Facility.

Steve

2986. Re: CB Linears For Freebanding

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-21 19:57:54 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3FBE6E41.6070106@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 82562

Dwight Stewart wrote:

>"Robert Casey" wrote:
>
>
>>Well, aside from the web address having
>>"cb" embedded in it, they don't specify
>>that these things are not intended for ham
>>radio service.... ;-) (snip)
>>
>>
>
>
> It doesn't matter whether these things are intended for the ham radio
>service or not. If they're at all capable of operating on the frequencies in
>and/or around the CB band, they're illegal to sell under existing FCC rules.
>Likewise, when it comes to the frequencies near the CB band (including the
>ham frequencies - the 10m band, for example), there are now even
>restrictions on how many amplifiers a licensed ham can sell, even to other
>licensed hams. The rules have changed over the last few years. It would be
>wise to keep up with those changes.
>
>
>
In theory, the way the web site is written, these amps might work on say
80 meters.
And not be usable between 24 and 35MHz. Maybe have an easily removable trap
centered around 27MHz to make it legal to sell. Sure. The web site
doesn't say what
frequencies these amps will work on. But I think everyone can guess
what these
amps will really do.

2987. Re: Happy Veterans Day

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-21 19:58:35 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0311211158.60065ac1@posting.google.com>
Source record: 82563

brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0311210307.102a8b7e@posting.google.com>...

> You've spent days dumb-assing your way through this and now you say
> you didn't know if FDR referred to himself as "President Roosevelt."

MinnieLennie "making his point" with more profanities and insults.

> Don't give up your retirement. You'd never make it in the real world.

And YOU would know WHAT about "the real world", Brain...?!?!

Steve, K4YZ

2988. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-21 20:16:30 UTC
From: wa2si@arrl.net
Message-ID: <b7d1465c.0311211216.574c7dde@posting.google.com>
Source record: 82564

Alun <alun@1stcounsel.com> wrote in message
news:<Xns943A6D811D68Aelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>...
> wa2si@arrl.net (Bert Craig) wrote in
> news:b7d1465c.0311210334.5fee2b15@posting.google.com:
>
> > Alun <alun@1stcounsel.com> wrote in message
> > news:<Xns943564E221DAAelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>...
> >> "Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in
> >> news:EJvsb.9152$hn3.3187776@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net:
> >>
> >> > "Rupert" <big@bird.sesame.street> wrote in message
> >> > news:Govsb.10542$6c3.633@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net...
> >> >> Len Over 21 wrote:
> >> >>
> >> >> > As of 6 PM EST on 11 November 2003, the number of ECFS documents
> >> >> > on public view are:
> >> >>
> >> >> What would be interesting is to find out how many are for the
> >> >> change, and how many want to keep the code.
> >> >
> >> > Me too. All this roundabout bravo sierra could be bypassed if there
> >> > was a ballot sent to all approx. 700,000 U.S. licensed hams. As long
> >> > as quorum is met, it's on! This concept (Democracy) frightens the
> >> > bejesus out of many folks who claim to speak for those not yet
> >> > licensed.
> >> >
> >> > But that's an empty argument. Get licensed and vote, tah dah! The
> >> > big bad "barrier" does not preclude anyone from getting their
> >> > no-code Tech ticket and executing a vote.
> >> >
> >> > Simply announce a "record date" by which one must be licensed (To
> >> > give those "yet to be licensed a fair shot at a voice in the
> >> > process.) and send a ballot out to all those licensed "of record."
> >> > Makes too much sense and requires some effort. IOW, against the
> >> > contemporary trend.
> >> >
> >> > 73 de Bert
> >> > WA2SI
> >> >
> >> >
> >> >
> >>
> >> Those who have not obtained a licence because of the code trest are
> >> just as entitled to express their opinion to the FCC as you or I.

> >
> > I agree, Alun. The Technician license requires no code test.
> >
> > 73 de Bert
> > WA2SI
> >
>
> True, but some don't take it because they only want HF, not because they
> couldn't answer the questions. All I'm saying is that they should have a
> vote in any poll.
>
> 73 de Alun, N3KIP

Hmm, sounds like a motivational issue. If you want HF, the road to the General and Extra begins with the Technician exam...no matter what. If they're truly "interested" in participating in participating in the process of this change, you'd think the Tech exam would be...wait a sec, lemme stop. I just remembered whom we're talking about. Kinda sad. :-(

No, Alun. I really DO believe that Amateur Radio operators should define Amateur Radio. What a concept, eh?

73 de Bert
WA2SI

2989. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-21 20:35:36 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <sGuvb.11969$Rk5.6617@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 82565

"Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.net> wrote

> No, Alun. I really DO believe that Amateur Radio operators should
> define Amateur Radio. What a concept, eh?

Let the participants alone write the rules? They have that concept live on
27MHz. Be careful what you wish for.... you might get it.

73, de Hans, K0HB

2990. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-21 21:39:40 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <wCvvb.8813$m84.3238961@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 82566

Steve Robeson, K4CAP wrote:
> Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message news:<3FBE1A60.9000607@psu.edu>...
>
>
>> As for sentencing, that is a different thing. I think loonyland has a
>>minimum 3 year sentence per incident, but envisioning him in a state
>>prison is hard to do. Perhaps if it happens, they will try to get him
>>sent to Juvy?
>
>
> That would be just like California...Send a pedophile to juvy.

Ayup!

If he's convicted, the kid's parents should be nailed with something too. Anyone who allows a pubescent child that a 40 something guy wants to pick up, take to his amusement park home and hop into bed with the kid (all those things are widely known) should be held responsible.

> That would be like sending Richard Speck to Chino Women's
> Correctional Facility.

That would be one way of cutting down on prison population!

- Mike KB3EIA -

2991. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-21 23:53:51 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0311211553.7c4ef34a@posting.google.com>
Source record: 82567

"Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<hvsvb.11864$Rk5.4833@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote
>
> > However, no matter how interested someone is in politics, that person can
> > *only* vote where he/she resides. IOW the price of voting is having to
> > join a community by living there.
>
> Your analogy remains flaccid.

Your description of my analogy remains inaccurate.

> Amateur radio exists in the community in
> which we all live. It has an effect on all of us, whether we are licensed
> or not, and the regulations concerning qualification to participate in it
> even more so.

The regulations affect those who are hams the most.
>
> My friend, W4OYI, ex-President of ARRL, compares the ARS to a public park; a
> place in the spectrum set aside for citizens to pursue the avocation of
> radio.

That's a passable analogy.

In most of the public parks I know, what you can do is limited. And
you need a permit/license to do certain things in the park.

> What you are proposing is that persons already in this 'park' by
> virtue of having paid some entry price be the only ones allowed to vote on
> the conditions under which other citizens can fully participate in every
> area of park activities. IOW, "I got mine, now you get yours, and then you
> can vote."

No, that's not it at all. You misunderstand what Bert and I are
saying.

What we're saying is that on the single issue of continued Morse code
testing, it would be interesting to know what the opinions of *all*
licensed US hams, (not just a vocal minority) really are. That
includes amateurs of *all* license classes, not just those who have
passed a code test.

To use your park analogy, it's like polling those who actually use a
park whether a specific change should be made.

Nowhere is it proposed that the ability of others to comment would be
changed.

Of course this is simply a discussion point because there's no one who
would actually pay the expenses to conduct such a poll.
>
> > Or consider the recent election of a movie actor with no experience as a
> > government official to the governorship of California.
>
> Are you suggesting that "experience as a government official" should be a
> qualification for election to office in the USA?

Nope.

I'm saying that I find it incredible that the allegedly most qualified
candidate for the highest office in the most populous and most in debt
state in
the Union is a movie actor with no real experience as a government
official.

> The Constitution contains
> no such language.

I know. And nowhere do I say it should be a requirement. But do you
really think the new governor is going to better than the old one?

> My daughter was recently elected to public office, and
> she has no previous experience as a government official.

Did she start out as Governor or as something with a little less
responsibility?

> Should she and
> Arnold be denied their office?

Nope. The electorate will get what they asked for.

> Should only existing or previous government
> officials be allowed to be elected?

Not at all.

Do you really think the new governor of California is the most
qualified for the job? I don't.

But because I don't live there, I can't vote there.
>
> Or should there be some sort of 'incentive licensing' of government
> officials in which you must first be elected to an entry level office, let's
> say Canine Capture Technician. Then after gaining the skill and experience
> to capture 5 dogs per minute, they be allowed to run for office at some more
> responsible level, all the way up to President, and only those already
> elected would be allowed to vote for them? What a concept!

How about the electorate considering qualifications?
>

> >>>>>>>>The fact that you have an amateur license suggests
> >>>>>>>> that you will have an opinion about amateur radio
> >>>>>>>>regulation, but it gives no credence in and of
> >>>>>>>>itself whether your opinion is or is not worthy of consideration.
>
> >>>>>>> Yes, it does. (N2EY)
> >>>>>>No, doesn't (K0HB)
>
> >>>>>> Yes, it does. (N2EY)
> >>>>>No, doesn't (K0HB)
>
> >>>>> Yes, it does. (N2EY)
> >>>>No, doesn't (K0HB)
>
> >>> Yes, it does. (N2EY)
> >>No, doesn't (K0HB)
>
> > Yes, it does. (N2EY)
> No, doesn't (K0HB)
>
> ...we could go on and on....

No we couldn't.

>
> > In general, what happens to the amateur radio service has a greater effect
> on
> > licensed amateurs and those who want to be licensed amateurs than on the
> > general public.
>
> But we weren't talking about "in general".

OK - then talk about the specific case of a specific poll, which was
what WA2SI was proposing.

> Wahtoosey was proposing a poll
> to vote on the code test as a qualfication for entry (to HF). Since you
> "already have yours", such a poll (were it binding on FCC) would not effect
> your entry into amateur radio, but would have a far greater effect on those
> not yet licensed (the general public).

Who said it would be binding on the FCC?

And remember the other conditions of the poll: *Any* ham would have
the same vote.

> Thus we could much more convincingly
> argue that you should *not* be eligible to vote in the poll, but the general
> (non-licensed) public *should* be eligible.

By that same logic, you should not be allowed to propose your
two-class learner permit system, because you've already "got yours".
And you "got yours" under far less draconian rules than you propose

for others.
>
> > One word: motivation.
>
> Ah, yes, the old "motivation" card. We dealt with that back in 1996 at
>
> http://groups.google.com/groups?selm=836389087.AA06738%40hamlink.mn.org&oe=U
> TF-8&output=gplain

I wasn't online back then. Besides, would you want things to always
remain as they were in 1996?
>
>
> > Who are the people who would want to participate in a one-time survey on
> Morse
> > code testing but who cannot even pass the Technician written test?
>
> Wahtoosey

WHO?

> didn't suggest a 'survey'. He talks about a poll where people
> vote and democracy rules.

Is that bad? Are you against direct democracy and polling of those
most affected?
>
> And the discussion was not about those who 'cannot even pass'. It was about
> those who (for whatever reason of their own) have not become licensees.

You're avoiding the central issue. I think you know that if such a
poll were actually taken, you might not like the results.

> More of your "I've got mine, now you get yours" mindset showing.

Not me. I EARNED mine. I encourage others to EARN theirs. Is that bad?
Shall I apologize for my accomplishments and sit idly by while others
try to trash a community I belong to?

Not gonna happen, Hans. No matter how much you try to twist what I
wrote.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2992. Re: No!!! Re: Do Hams get 11 Meters Back

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-22 00:03:57 UTC
From: richcranus@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <c5ecbb69.0311211603.73f021b9@posting.google.com>
Source record: 82568
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.shortwave

N8WWM@dickmysuck.com (AntiKeyclown) wrote in message
news:<f92f4353.0311210900.41d88343@posting.google.com>...
> Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com> wrote in message
news:<20031120192957.435$Bt@newsreader.com>...
> > Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote:
> > > Stephen M.H. Lawrence wrote:
> > >
> > > >One day 3 weeks ago, I listened from 28.000 - 28.150, and
> > > >I counted over a dozen of 'em. Truckers in particular have been
> > > >"using" our ten - meter band illegally, and Riley Hollingsworth
> > > >has been doing something about it. Make no mistake, this is
> > > >happening.
> > > >
> > > >
> > > Right now (nov 20 20:50 zulu) on 28.085 I hear CB like comms (AM).
> > > Sounds as
> > > crowded as a regular legal CB channel. None of it really copyable, with
> > > all the
> > > power mics and ratchet-jaw lingo. QTH in NNJ, nothing over S3.
> > >
> > You speak Spanish? ;)
>
> He might not, but you speak FAGLISH...you rimmer.
>
> FCC rule 2.815(b): After APR 27, 1978, no person shall manufacture,
> sell or lease, offer for sale or lease (including advertising for
> sale or lease), or import, ship, or distribute for the purpose of
> selling or leasing or offering for sale or lease, any external radio
> frequency amplifier or amplifier kit capable of operation on any
> frequency or frequencies between 24 and 35 MHz.

Poor obcessed Georgie-girl Busch WA3MOJ. He simply cannot have a civil
conversation. Ever. He has to push his perverted gay agenda all the
time.

Amplifiers are not illegal. Certain uses of certain equipment may be
considered illegal.

Georgie-girl's use of a computer in a public newsgroup should be
considered illegal!

2993. Re: No!!! Re: Do Hams get 11 Meters Back

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-22 00:06:19 UTC
From: richcranus@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <c5ecbb69.0311211606.7491c9cf@posting.google.com>
Source record: 82569
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

"Jerry Oxendine" <joxendi@bellsouth.net> wrote in message
news:<v%evb.16249$ow5.3028@bignews2.bellsouth.net>...
> "Stephen M.H. Lawrence" <7.3steve@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:gP5vb.11687$Wy4.4805@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> > One day 3 weeks ago, I listened from 28.000 - 28.150, and
> > I counted over a dozen of 'em. Truckers in particular have been
> > "using" our ten - meter band illegally, and Riley Hollingsworth
> > has been doing something about it. Make no mistake, this is
> > happening.
> >
> > 73,
> >
> > Steve Lawrence
> > Burnsville, MN
>
>
>
> And YOU can help! Get out there and listen on the road.
> Get the tag # of the tractor (not of the trailer), date, time,
> highway, milepost or exit number. Send this info to rholling@fcc.gov .
> Make a difference: this is how those
> other truckers got warned--individual hams who quietly
> listened and accurately reported the above data. RH will
> then respond IF, again, the info is accurate. Each ham
> can make a difference and stop that "tan-fer thar, drivah,
> ah know you rah't, fer-tan thar SQUEAK!!" If we don't, we will eventually
> hear them beeping and squeaking their
> way along on 17 Meters.
>
> The way to "trap" a driver is to quietly cruise along. Do NOT talk to them
> or get into an argument! Simply overtake a trucker who *may* be operating
> on 28.085 AM. As you pass, or he passes you, he may be curious
> about "them 'funny antenners' thar" and comment to you
> about it (or other truckers). It is then you copy down the
> tag # on the FRONT of the tractor, the DOT # (this confirms the identity of
> the truck), the direction of travel and milepost (or exit), date and time.
> Also the company name. Send it in! Done correctly, the "man" will send out
> a warning notice to the company holding THEM responsible for their drivers'
> actions. It is legal and enforc-able.
>
> 73
>
> Jerry

Great idea, Jerry! Pile Riley's desk full with all sorts of false reports so he won't believe any of you!

may?? You better be damned certain when you file a report! Entrapment is also a crime, goodbuddy.

2994. Community Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-22 00:43:07 UTC
From: Ray <rwb@noneanonrad.org>
Message-ID: <bpmber$8l9$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 82570

Heard a guy on 2 meters say there is going to be a large get together of community low power FM broadcast enthusiasts this weekend at the North Hills Mall & Plaza in Raleigh NC. Equipment will be for sale which will allow one to set up an unlicensed FM community radio station. According to the guy, they are expecting a large crowd. I might drive down there just to see what this stuff is all about. Seems like these stations are sprouting up all over the U.S.

73,

Ray
Norfolk

2995. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-22 00:53:12 UTC
From: "Vince Fiscus, KB7ADL" <vlfiscus@nospam.mcn.net>
Message-ID: <Yryvb.206539$ao4.732539@attbi_s51>
Source record: 82571

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in
news:HUivb.11516$Rk5.6844@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net:

>
> Is there anyone out there who actually believes Michael Jackson is
> really innocent of this latest charge?

I'll let you know after the trail.

KB7ADL

2996. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-22 01:22:23 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <jTyvb.12278$Rk5.10392@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 82572

"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote

>
> Not me. I EARNED mine. I encourage others to EARN theirs. Is that bad?
> Shall I apologize for my accomplishments and sit idly by while others
> try to trash a community I belong to?
>

Well, I knew it would all eventually get down to that simple statement.

(To focus "on topic", the question was if there should
be a vote on whether or not the FCC should retain
Morse code as a test for HF licensing.)

N2EY asserts he has EARNED his HF access, presumably because he passed a
Morse test, and he encourages others to EARN it by the same means. I
support his right to have that opinion, and he need not apologize for it.

What I do not support is his assertion that 'others' (IOW, those who do not
share his opinion on Morse testing) are trying to 'trash' amateur radio.

73, de Hans, K0HB

PS: N2EY pleads ignorance about the 1966 statement on this topic since he
was "not online", so I will take the liberty to repeat it here.

Hang around here long enough, and you will see someone write
something like:

" A really tough written test would surely separate those who
really have an interest in the hobby.", or..

" Other, more relevant, methods can establish an applicant's
dedication to the service.", or..

" ..... the key to maintaining the quality of hamming
is making it something to work for."

All of the above quotations, gathered from a recent thread,
were made by serious and well-intentioned licensees who want the
best for the Amateur Radio Service.

All of the above quotations also completely miss the mark, in
that they suggest that the examination process is the key to
ensuring that "the right kind of people" (those who are "worthy")
become licensed and, by extension, that "the wrong kind of people"
get filtered out.

First, the testing procedure is an "entrance" exam, not a
"graduation" exam.

Second, while "interest", "dedication", and "hard work" are
certainly hallmarks of good amateurs, the FCC and ITU regulations
do not specify levels of interest, dedication, hard work or other
measures of "worthiness" as requisites for a license. Therefor it
is not the function of the examination process to determine (even
if it could) if an applicant is "worthy" but rather to determine if
he/she is QUALIFIED to use the spectrum assigned. There should
be no "dumbing down", but neither can there be a requirement
that the examination process screens out lack of commitment.

Don't get me wrong here folks. I believe that the examination
process ought to be rigorous enough to determine proper knowledge
and skills so that a new licensee does not inadvertently trash the
bands, hurt themselves, or harm other users/uses of the spectrum,
but I have no expectation that the examination can filter out
"unworthy" applicants.

Even if it could, who then would become the arbiter of
"worthy"?

: Not gonna happen, Hans. No matter how much you try to twist what I
: wrote.
:
: 73 de Jim, N2EY

2997. Re: Happy Veterans Day

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-22 02:27:00 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3FBEC972.F3478CFC@earthlink.net>
Source record: 82573

Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3FBD8E3D.F33CD558@earthlink.net>...
> > Brian wrote:
> > >
> > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3FBC4FE3.D2067EC6@earthlink.net>...
> > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3FB97CC4.5A958465@earthlink.net>...
> > > > >
> > > > > > You've never come up with a straight answer for an explanation about
> > > > > > Frankline Roosevelt referring to himself as "President Roosevelt".
> > > > > >
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Dave K8MN
> > > > >
> > > > > I took an excerpt from someone else's material. The part in the
> > > > > quotation marks is Franklin[e] Roosevelt's quote. You typically find
> > > > > quotes within quatation marks, or at least I do. Do you have trouble
> > > > > identifying quotation marks? Please let me help you.
> > > > >
> > > > > They look like this: "quoted material"
> > > > >
> > > > > Please notice that the quoted material really is within the quotation
> > > > > marks.
> > > > >
> > > > > The material is then referenced to a web site where I encouraged
> > > > > readers to click and read the entire article for themselves. Do you
> > > > > have trouble clicking on a hyperlink? Please let me help you.
> > > > >
> > > > > Using the mouse, navigate your cursor to the location of the
> > > > > hyperlink. When the cursor is over the hyperlink, left click once.
> > > > > It really is that simple, and I'm glad to have been of assistance.
> > > > >
> > > > > After this little episode of educating you yet another time, your
> > > > > self-imposed stupidity cannot be excused any longer. Please deal with
> > > > > it in a more constructive manner.
> > > >
> > > > Sorry, little electrolyte, you wrote "Franklin Roosevelt is to have
> > > > said:". That was followed by more material copied from a web site by
> > > > you. Just because you provide links to material does not obligate me to

> > > > use them or even to feign interest in doing so. Now, let's take a look
> > > > at what you cribbed and posted:
> > > >
> > > > Quote
> > > > Concerning the "Bonus Army" of 1932, where veterans of The War to End
> > > > All Wars (1917/1918) were due a bonus in 1945, but wanted payment
> > > > early because they lost their homes in the Great Depression, Franklin
> > > > Roosevelt is to have said:
> > > >
> > > > ------------
> > > > In the end, some money was paid to veterans but not without further
> > > > difficulties. Within a year of the Bonus Army Incident, President
> > > > Roosevelt imposed the Economy Act of 1933 which cut veterans
> > > > disability allowances by 25%. In the effort to cut federal expenses,
> > > > veterans were viewed as having inordinate special status over
> > > > civilians. During the 1932 election campaign, he had publicly
> > > > proclaimed: "No one [merely] because he wore a uniform must therefore
> > > > be placed in a special class of beneficiaries over and above all other
> > > > citizens. The fact of wearing a uniform does not mean that he can
> > > > demand and receive from his government a benefit which no other
> > > > citizen receives."
> > > > end quote ======================
> > > >
> > > > Now, what do you make of that colon hanging at the end of "Franklin
> > > > Roosevelt is to have said:"? What does it indicate to you.
> > > >
> > > > You can't place blame on me because you can't get your act together. If
> > > > what you posted wasn't what you meant to convey or if the words aren't
> > > > yours (since you've ignored common English rules for quoting someone
> > > > else), perhaps you'll want to look the material over next time.
> > > >
> > > > Dave K8MN
> > >
> > > Dave, you just revealed that you really did understand the post, and
> > > that your sel-imposed stupidity is just another act for us to be
> > > amused with. Congratulations.
> >
> > You'll recall that I asked if you thought Franklin Roosevelt called
> > himself "President Roosevelt". That didn't indicate confusion on my
> > part. It pointed out an inconsistency in your post. Now you've spent
> > days attempting to defend your error.

>
> You've spent days dumb-assing your way through this and now you say
> you didn't know if FDR referred to himself as "President Roosevelt."

Your logic is quite unique. You screw up and that is, in some way,
supposed to reflect badly on me for noticing. Fact is, you didn't post
what old Franklin is to have said.

> Don't give up your retirement.

Did you have an idea that I had such a desire? If I was working and noticed your error, would things somehow be different?

> You'd never make it in the real world.

I did make it and in several fields. What has that to do with your error? Are you still finding it difficult to admit it?

Dave K8MN

2998. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-22 02:31:32 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3FBECA84.3FC0F056@earthlink.net>
Source record: 82574

Alun wrote:
>
> n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in news:20031121082829.07578.00001764@mb-
> m25.aol.com:
>
> > In article <Xns943643F1E8DC6elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun
> > <alun@1stcounsel.com> writes:
> >
> >>However, my point is just that polling only licenced hams is just not
> >>appropriate, as hams are not the only interested parties.
> >>
> > Who are the non-hams who are interested in the code test issue?
> >
> > 73 de Jim, N2EY
> >
> >
> >
>
> Anyone who has been thinking of becoming a ham, I would imagine

Maybe a fellow like Leonard H. Anderson! He's been mulling it over for decades.

Dave K8MN

2999. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-22 02:41:24 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3FBECCD3.64A871C5@earthlink.net>
Source record: 82575

"Kï¿½HB" wrote:
>
> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote
>
> > However, no matter how interested someone is in politics, that person can
> > *only* vote where he/she resides. IOW the price of voting is having to
> join a
> > community by living there.
>
> Your analogy remains flaccid. Amateur radio exists in the community in
> which we all live. It has an effect on all of us, whether we are licensed
> or not, and the regulations concerning qualification to participate in it
> even more so.

I can't agree, Hans. My cousin lives down the road a few miles and runs
the local pharmacy. Ham radio has no effect on his life at all. He has
several employees. They too are completely uneffected by amateur radio.
None of them know anything about amateur radio or care a whit about
amateur radio.

Dave K8MN

3000. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-22 03:41:56 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <8WAvb.12585$Rk5.6283@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 82576

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote

> My cousin lives down the road a few miles and runs
> the local pharmacy. Ham radio has no effect
> on his life at all.
>.....
> None of them know anything about amateur
> radio or care a whit about amateur radio.

And you still allow him to remain your cousin! You should be ashamed!

73, de Hans, K0HB

3001. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-22 03:45:36 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <AZAvb.8956$m84.3312325@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 82577

N2EY wrote:

> "Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<hvsvb.11864$Rk5.4833@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
>
>>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote
>>
>>
>>> However, no matter how interested someone is in politics, that person can
>>>*only* vote where he/she resides. IOW the price of voting is having to
>>>join a community by living there.
>>
>>Your analogy remains flaccid.
>
>
> Your description of my analogy remains inaccurate.

ahhh, flaccidity!

>
>>Amateur radio exists in the community in
>>which we all live. It has an effect on all of us, whether we are licensed
>>or not, and the regulations concerning qualification to participate in it
>>even more so.
>
>
> The regulations affect those who are hams the most.

I always thought that self determination was a good thing.

>>My friend, W4OYI, ex-President of ARRL, compares the ARS to a public park; a
>>place in the spectrum set aside for citizens to pursue the avocation of
>>radio.
>
>
> That's a passable analogy.
>
> In most of the public parks I know, what you can do is limited. And
> you need a permit/license to do certain things in the park.
>
>
>>What you are proposing is that persons already in this 'park' by
>>virtue of having paid some entry price be the only ones allowed to vote on
>>the conditions under which other citizens can fully participate in every
>>area of park activities. IOW, "I got mine, now you get yours, and then you
>>can vote."

>
>
> No, that's not it at all. You misunderstand what Bert and I are
> saying.

Not to mention, a drastic oversimplification of the whole subject.
Comparison of a technical avocation such as the ARS to something like
buying a pavilion permit so you can have a picnic in one, falls apart
pretty quickly.

> What we're saying is that on the single issue of continued Morse code
> testing, it would be interesting to know what the opinions of *all*
> licensed US hams, (not just a vocal minority) really are. That
> includes amateurs of *all* license classes, not just those who have
> passed a code test.

But they might not like what they hear.

> To use your park analogy, it's like polling those who actually use a
> park whether a specific change should be made.

DOH!

> Nowhere is it proposed that the ability of others to comment would be
> changed.
>
> Of course this is simply a discussion point because there's no one who
> would actually pay the expenses to conduct such a poll.
>
>>>Or consider the recent election of a movie actor with no experience as a
>>>government official to the governorship of California.
>>
>>Are you suggesting that "experience as a government official" should be a
>>qualification for election to office in the USA?
>
>
> Nope.
>
> I'm saying that I find it incredible that the allegedly most qualified
> candidate for the highest office in the most populous and most in debt
> state in
> the Union is a movie actor with no real experience as a government
> official.

I think it fits like a glove! Loonyland is a unique place, and needs to
be governed by unique people.

>
>>The Constitution contains
>>no such language.
>
>
> I know. And nowhere do I say it should be a requirement. But do you

> *really* think the new governor is going to better than the old one?

He has more experience wit' the ladies!

Am I the only one that sees the amazing hypocrisy in that little gem?

<a whole bunch of snippage>

> You're avoiding the central issue. I think you know that if such a
> poll were actually taken, you might not like the results.

Bingo! This issue seems to run along "party lines". I'm just about certain that the more non-amateurs included in any poll, the lower the support for Morse code, and vice versa.

Let's have NASCAR fans determine ARS policy. And we can determine NASCAR's rules. 8^)
>
>>More of your "I've got mine, now you get yours" mindset showing.

Perhaps "I've got mine, here is yours, have fun!" would be more appropriate?

> Not me. I EARNED mine. I encourage others to EARN theirs. Is that bad?
> Shall I apologize for my accomplishments and sit idly by while others
> try to trash a community I belong to?

> Not gonna happen, Hans. No matter how much you try to twist what I
> wrote.

- Mike KB3EIA -

3002. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-22 03:54:05 UTC
From: Alun <alun@1stcounsel.com>
Message-ID: <Xns943AE8F62DA6Belektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 82578

wa2si@arrl.net (Bert Craig) wrote in
news:b7d1465c.0311211216.574c7dde@posting.google.com:

> Alun <alun@1stcounsel.com> wrote in message
> news:<Xns943A6D811D68Aelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>...
>> wa2si@arrl.net (Bert Craig) wrote in
>> news:b7d1465c.0311210334.5fee2b15@posting.google.com:
>>
>> > Alun <alun@1stcounsel.com> wrote in message
>> > news:<Xns943564E221DAAelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>...
>> >> "Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in
>> >> news:EJvsb.9152$hn3.3187776@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net:
>> >>
>> >> > "Rupert" <big@bird.sesame.street> wrote in message
>> >> > news:Govsb.10542$6c3.633@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net...
>> >> >> Len Over 21 wrote:
>> >> >>
>> >> >> > As of 6 PM EST on 11 November 2003, the number of ECFS
>> >> >> > documents on public view are:
>> >> >>
>> >> >> What would be interesting is to find out how many are for the
>> >> >> change, and how many want to keep the code.
>> >> >
>> >> > Me too. All this roundabout bravo sierra could be bypassed if
>> >> > there was a ballot sent to all approx. 700,000 U.S. licensed
>> >> > hams. As long as quorum is met, it's on! This concept (Democracy)
>> >> > frightens the bejesus out of many folks who claim to speak for
>> >> > those not yet licensed.
>> >> >
>> >> > But that's an empty argument. Get licensed and vote, tah dah! The
>> >> > big bad "barrier" does not preclude anyone from getting their
>> >> > no-code Tech ticket and executing a vote.
>> >> >
>> >> > Simply announce a "record date" by which one must be licensed (To
>> >> > give those "yet to be licensed a fair shot at a voice in the
>> >> > process.) and send a ballot out to all those licensed "of
>> >> > record." Makes too much sense and requires some effort. IOW,
>> >> > against the contemporary trend.
>> >> >
>> >> > 73 de Bert
>> >> > WA2SI
>> >> >
>> >> >
>> >> >

>> >>
>> >> Those who have not obtained a licence because of the code trest are
>> >> just as entitled to express their opinion to the FCC as you or I.
>> >
>> > I agree, Alun. The Technician license requires no code test.
>> >
>> > 73 de Bert
>> > WA2SI
>> >
>>
>> True, but some don't take it because they only want HF, not because
>> they couldn't answer the questions. All I'm saying is that they should
>> have a vote in any poll.
>>
>> 73 de Alun, N3KIP
>
> Hmm, sounds like a motivational issue. If you want HF, the road to the
> General and Extra begins with the Technician exam...no matter what. If
> they're truly "interested" in participating in participating in the
> process of this change, you'd think the Tech exam would be...wait a
> sec, lemme stop. I just remembered whom we're talking about. Kinda
> sad. :-(
>
> No, Alun. I really DO believe that Amateur Radio operators should
> define Amateur Radio. What a concept, eh?
>
> 73 de Bert
> WA2SI
>

Well, I guess that's a religeous issue, so I won't be able to convince you otherwise.

If you look me up you'll see I'm an Extra, and you'll be able to figure out that I passed 20 wpm. What you won't see, is that I've been a ham since 1980, not 1992, as I'm not originally from this country.

However, ham radio is not a job or a vocation, just a hobby. I welcome the unmotivated as much as I would welcome anyone else. Why shouldn't they have fun too? If someone wants HF and doesn't want to learn code, why should they bother to study for a VHF and above licence, when they could be scuba diving or building model railroads or what have you? (Not hobbies of mine, personally, but whatever turns you on). I know this is sacrilege to true beleivers, but so what?

The notion that only hams should decide the future of ham radio is just that, a notion. I can absolutely guarantee that it is not a point of view shared by the FCC, and it makes little sense to me either. At the very least all prospective hams have a vested interest, irregardless of the reasons they don't have a licence, reasonable or otherwise. I'm sure the FCC would cast their net a lot wider than that.

73 de Alun, N3KIP

3003. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-22 03:55:33 UTC
From: Alun <alun@1stcounsel.com>
Message-ID: <Xns943AE936622A1elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 82579

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in
news:3FBECA84.3FC0F056@earthlink.net:

> Alun wrote:
>>
>> n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in news:20031121082829.07578.00001764@mb-
>> m25.aol.com:
>>
>> > In article <Xns943643F1E8DC6elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun
>> > <alun@1stcounsel.com> writes:
>> >
>> >>However, my point is just that polling only licenced hams is just not
>> >>appropriate, as hams are not the only interested parties.
>> >>
>> > Who are the non-hams who are interested in the code test issue?
>> >
>> > 73 de Jim, N2EY
>> >
>> >
>> >
>>
>> Anyone who has been thinking of becoming a ham, I would imagine
>
> Maybe a fellow like Leonard H. Anderson! He's been mulling it over for
> decades.
>
> Dave K8MN
>

Sure, why not? I think the FCC should even take his point of view into
account.

3004. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-22 04:22:05 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3FBEE46E.3DA2DC86@earthlink.net>
Source record: 82580

"Kï¿½HB" wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote
>
> > My cousin lives down the road a few miles and runs
> > the local pharmacy. Ham radio has no effect
> > on his life at all.
> >.....
> > None of them know anything about amateur
> > radio or care a whit about amateur radio.
>
> And you still allow him to remain your cousin! You should be ashamed!

The answer is quite simple. I get my prescriptions at cost.

Dave K8MN

3005. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-22 04:24:50 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3FBEE512.30A33EC9@earthlink.net>
Source record: 82581

Alun wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in
> news:3FBECA84.3FC0F056@earthlink.net:
>
> > Alun wrote:
> >>
> >> n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in news:20031121082829.07578.00001764@mb-
> >> m25.aol.com:
> >>
> >> > In article <Xns943643F1E8DC6elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun
> >> > <alun@1stcounsel.com> writes:
> >> >
> >> >>However, my point is just that polling only licenced hams is just not
> >> >>appropriate, as hams are not the only interested parties.
> >> >>
> >> > Who are the non-hams who are interested in the code test issue?
> >> >
> >> > 73 de Jim, N2EY
> >> >
> >> >
> >> >
> >>
> >> Anyone who has been thinking of becoming a ham, I would imagine
> >
> > Maybe a fellow like Leonard H. Anderson! He's been mulling it over for
> > decades.

>
> Sure, why not? I think the FCC should even take his point of view into
> account.

The Commission is forced by law to accept his input. Nothing forces the
FCC to act on it.

Dave K8MN

3006. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-22 04:44:50 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <6RBvb.14766$Wy4.2543@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 82582

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net>

> The answer is quite simple. I get my prescriptions at cost.

Are you retired Fed guys eligible for TMOP? Check it out. If you are,
you'll dump your cousin in a hurry.

73, Hans, K0HB

3007. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-22 06:06:15 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20031122010615.23307.00004501@mb-m29.aol.com>
Source record: 82583

In article <HUivb.11516$Rk5.6844@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> writes:

> Given all this, perhaps the real question is whether Michael Jackson will
>ever be convicted? This is already shaping up to be another O.J.
>Simpson-like court case with accusations of racism towards the police,
>fingers pointed at the victim and victim's family, and claims (by his
>brother) of "a modern day lynching." Does anyone want to make a prediction
>at this point?
>
>
>Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

Dwight:

I think M. J.'s brother Jermaine has pretty much set the tone for what will happen during the trial through his use of the term "modern day lynching." In spite of Michael's obvious attempt to look like a "white" (caucasian) person, the race card will be played, and M. J.'s "blackness" will once again emerge, inspite of the fact that his face looks like it was painted with Sherman Williams Flat Latex (White). This whole thing will be turned into a referendum on whether or not a "black" celebrity can actually be held accountable for even the most heinous crime, and, in order to keep the streets of USA from burning, once more some judge will be given the same mission of Judge Lance Ito -- to make damn sure that this black celebrity gets away with murder -- or in this case, child molestation. I have no doubt that Johnny Cochran has already been placed on alert to mobilize a "dream team" for Jackson's defense.

Michael Jackson will not be convicted. The race card will be played to the maximum extent possible, and the black public will be placed on standby to over-react to any possible negative outcome for Jackson. Therefore, to save life and property, the O. J. Simpson debacle will have to be repeated. This may not be justice, but it will be necessary in order to ensure that many innocent people aren't killed in the riotous aftermath of his possible conviction.

73 de Larry, K3LT

3008. Re: Happy Veterans Day

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-22 10:04:25 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0311220204.6c393478@posting.google.com>
Source record: 82584

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3FBEC972.F3478CFC@earthlink.net>...
> Brian wrote:
> >

> > You'd never make it in the real world.
>
> I did make it and in several fields. What has that to do with your
> error? Are you still finding it difficult to admit it?

Brain's still stymied by "authorization" and "acceptance".

73

Steve, K4YZ

3009. Re: CB Linears For Freebanding

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-22 10:53:21 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <BeHvb.16102$Wy4.8941@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 82585

"Robert Casey" wrote:
>
> In theory, the way the web site is written, these
> amps might work on say 80 meters. And not be
> usable between 24 and 35MHz. Maybe have
> an easily removable trap centered around
> 27MHz to make it legal to sell. Sure. The web
> site doesn't say what frequencies these amps
> will work on. But I think everyone can guess
> what these amps will really do.

Even that would not make the amps legal. Under the existing rules, even equipment that can be modified to operate in or around the CB band is illegal to sell. The devices must be built with those frequencies firmly locked out, with no way to restore those frequencies without major modifications to the device. This is the same mentality as used for scanners and cellular frequencies - the scanner must be designed at the core level (software, hardware, or both) not to accept those frequencies (a simple jumper or resister lock out is not enough because it can be easily modified).

Of course, a rule is only as good as the enforcement. In the case of CB devices, the FCC has been rather lackluster in their efforts to enforce those rules. Because of that, only the major manufacturers (Cobra, Uniden, etc) have complied. Easily modified equipment from lesser manufacturers, and so-called imported equipment, is widely available through CB radio catalogs and retail stores (and home-built amps are available in just about every town).

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3010. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-22 11:06:09 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <BqHvb.16154$Wy4.13982@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 82586

"Mike Walton" wrote:
>
> That's premature, Jackson is not into ejaculating
> with 12 year old Cancer Patients.

Ejaculation is not required for a conviction. When it comes to children,
even inappropriate fondling or touching is illegal.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3011. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-22 11:06:34 UTC
From: white rover <danda95@ntlworld.com>
Message-ID: <arHvb.1538$B03.1155402@newsfep2-win.server.ntli.net>
Source record: 82587

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:HUivb.11516$Rk5.6844@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
>
> Is there anyone out there who actually believes Michael Jackson is
really
> innocent of this latest charge? There is a long list of questionable
> behavior that suggests otherwise - his "relationship" with 14 year old
Brook
> Shields (including at least one date to a Hollywood awards ceremony),
rumors
> of sleeping in bed with children, music videos targeting children with
> images of him grabbing his crotch, a multi-million dollar payoff of a
family
> with similar accusations, admissions of sleeping in bed with children, an
> interview showing a 13 year old boy leaning against him like some kind of
> lover, and now these accusations.
>
> Michael Jackson has all the classic symptoms of the typical pedophile.
> Pedophiles often attempt to attract children to their homes using candy,
> toys, or play equipment. Michael Jackson did this large with Neverland.
> Pedophiles often dress up as clowns or similar characters. Michael Jackson
> has had cosmetic surgery to change his (now clown-like) appearance.
> Pedophiles often describe their actions as innocent and loving, and insist
> others just don't understand the questionable behavior. Michael Jackson
has
> said all of these. Pedophiles often hide their behavior behind claims of
> just trying to "help" children. Michael Jackson has done the same. All
this,
> with the behavior described in the first paragraph, points strongly
towards
> pedophilia.
>
> Given all this, perhaps the real question is whether Michael Jackson
will
> ever be convicted? This is already shaping up to be another O.J.
> Simpson-like court case with accusations of racism towards the police,
> fingers pointed at the victim and victim's family, and claims (by his
> brother) of "a modern day lynching." Does anyone want to make a prediction
> at this point?
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

>

What parents in there right minds would still send their children up to
Netherlamds after the first court case

3012. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-22 11:27:26 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <yKHvb.16237$Wy4.5673@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 82588

"Mike Coslo" wrote:
>
> If he's convicted, the kid's parents should be
> nailed with something too. Anyone who allows
> a pubescent child that a 40 something guy
> wants to pick up, take to his amusement park
> home and hop into bed with the kid (all those
> things are widely known) should be held
> responsible. (snip)

I've thought about that too. But, how would we hold them responsible - stupidity isn't a crime in this country? Letting a child sleep with an adult is certainly stupid, but we'd have to prove more than that to actually hold the parents responsible. And I can't think of anything specific in the laws we can apply to the parents in this case. Child endangerment is the only thing that comes close, but I don't even think that would fly. To convict, you'd have to show the parents should have known there was a clear and present danger. Since JUST sleeping with an adult is not illegal, that may be a tough case to prove. Anyway, since you said "something" in the first paragraph (not anything specific), perhaps you're having the same problem I'm having.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3013. Re: Happy Veterans Day

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-22 11:47:44 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0311220347.6c5e6d5b@posting.google.com>
Source record: 82589

"Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<sQbvb.10973$Rk5.9643@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> Gunny Robeson wants to be CO of rrap and LHA(jg) wants to be his XO. Why
> don't you two lovebirds take you're interminable romantic spat to private
> email and we could use this space for amateur radio policy discussions.
>
> With kindest personal regards and best wishes for a long and happy life
> together,
>
> de Hans, K0HB

No thanks.

3014. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-22 12:22:14 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <WxIvb.16407$Wy4.9415@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 82590

"Larry Roll K3LT" wrote:
>
> I think M. J.'s brother Jermaine has pretty much
> set the tone for what will happen during the trial
> through his use of the term "modern day lynching."
> In spite of Michael's obvious attempt to look like
> a "white" (caucasian) person, the race card will
> be played, and M. J.'s "blackness" will once
> again emerge, inspite of the fact that his face looks
> like it was painted with Sherman Williams Flat
> Latex (White). (snip)

Well, I truly hope race doesn't become an issue. But, like you, I suspect it will.

> Michael Jackson will not be convicted. The race
> card will be played to the maximum extent possible,
> and the black public will be placed on standby to
> over-react to any possible negative outcome for
> Jackson. Therefore, to save life and property, the
> O. J. Simpson debacle will have to be repeated.
> This may not be justice, but it will be necessary in
> order to ensure that many innocent people aren't
> killed in the riotous aftermath of his possible
> conviction. (snip)

And I also hope we don't see riots and other violence after a conviction. But, with the news coverage this case is going to get, that is certainly a possibility. However, because of the timing, I don't think it will happen. This court case will probably not start until sometime next summer and many will be watching the activities surrounding the coming elections instead.

By the way, on the issue of riots and innocent people being killed, my brother was killed (in FL) less than a week after the LA riots (Rodney King), by two black guys who reportedly watched the riots enthusiastically on television and later told two family members, supposedly in a joking manner, that they were going to kill a white guy. About fourty-five minutes later, my brother died with two bullets in his brain, fired from a gun held less then six inches from his head. The other employees in the office (three young black men) were not injured, but did identify the attackers. The two men pled guilty to a lesser charge. Because some money (less than $20), and a small amount of drugs (suspected), was taken, this crime was reported as a robbery (possibly drug related), not a race crime. Clearly, I don't want to see a repeat of that (for anybody).

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3015. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-22 13:18:45 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <VmJvb.16582$Wy4.9876@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 82591

"N2EY" wrote:
>
> (snip) What we're saying is that on the single
> issue of continued Morse code testing, (snip)
>
> (snip) Not me. I EARNED mine. I encourage
> others to EARN theirs. Is that bad? Shall I
> apologize for my accomplishments and sit idly
> by while others try to trash a community I
> belong to?

If what you're demanding to "earn" that license is unnecessary and based on a false premise, then I think it is bad. You haven't established, at least not to my satisfaction (nor the satisfaction of the ITU, FCC, and several countries around the world), why Morse code is necessary (notice I said necessary, not enjoyable) for ham radio today. And there is no truth whatsoever to the premise that those without code skills in the ham radio community are trashing anything. Instead, the vast majority are dedicated, well-behaved, enthusiastic, participants of this community.

Several countries around the world have moved, or are moving, forward to eliminate the Morse Code testing requirement while the United States sits back and watches. Is this the actions of a modern, progressive, country with feet planted firmly on today and eyes on the future? It's time to move on, Jim. Morse code is going to be even less necessary in the future. As such, Morse Code testing has no ligitimate place in that future.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3016. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-22 14:20:31 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <PgKvb.16802$Wy4.7484@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 82592

"Mike Coslo" wrote:
> N2EY wrote:
> > (snip) Is that bad? Are you against direct
> > democracy and polling of those most affected?
> >
> > (snip) You're avoiding the central issue. I think
> > you know that if such a poll were actually taken,
> > you might not like the results. (snip)
>
> Bingo! This issue seems to run along "party lines".
> I'm just about certain that the more non-amateurs
> included in any poll, the lower the support for
> Morse code, and vice versa.

I think you and Jim are both (perhaps intentionally) missing the point. This issue is not limited to just the ham radio community. The frequencies we use don't belong just to us - they belong to the entire country (all Americans). As such, the FCC has to take all Americans into account when making the rules and regulations to govern the use of those frequencies, and the license requirements for those frequencies. Therefore, Hans is right - if you're going to instead propose some type of poll to help establish what those license requirements might be, it should include all Americans.

As for myself, if you're going to ask Amateur Radio Operators if code testing is necessary today to meet the goals and purposes of the Amateur Radio Service (as defined in Part 97) and serves some valid need as far as the American public is concerned, then I would love to see the results of that poll - it would be very interesting to see how many (or how few) operators would actually place the goals and purposes of the Amateur Radio Service, and the needs of the American public, above their own desire to keep a code testing requirement.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3017. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-22 14:26:46 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <GmKvb.16827$Wy4.3328@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 82593

"Bert Craig" wrote:
>
> (snip) No, Alun. I really DO believe that
> Amateur Radio operators should define
> Amateur Radio. What a concept, eh?

And where does the rest of the American people fall into that, Bert? The frequencies we use belong to all Americans, not just us. Do you plan to take them into account when defining Amateur Radio, like the FCC must do when regulating this radio service (including it's license requirements)?

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3018. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-22 14:46:15 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031122094615.16483.00000604@mb-m23.aol.com>
Source record: 82594

> Ejaculation is not required for a conviction. When it comes to children,
>even inappropriate fondling or touching is illegal.
>
>
>Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

Rumor has it MJ is also a No Code CBplusser. I wonder if he is an NCI Member?

3019. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-22 15:05:05 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <BWKvb.16954$Wy4.9965@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 82595

"white rover" wrote:
>
> What parents in there right minds would still
> send their children up to Netherlamds after
> the first court case?

Were you watching Fox television yesterday? They had a woman on who is still planning to send her son to sleep over with Jackson, even after all that has happened over the last few days. Don't ask me why she would do it. I have absolutely no idea why anyone would do something that stupid.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3020. Re: CB Linears For Freebanding

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-22 15:17:40 UTC
From: BA <none@baentx.net>
Message-ID: <bpnuml$jd3$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 82596

Been to any road side flea markets lately? Flea markets are literal bonanzas of modified CB equipment, linear amps, modified ham gear for use in ham bands or any frequecy for that matter. I have seen ham & commercial uhf-vhf gear modified for use on any frrequency being sold at fleas markets. For that matter, I have even seen complete FM stations being sold and touted as "start your very own FM broadcasting station, no license required." The supply of illegal and modified equipment is beyond comprehension and hams running around acting as self-appointed enforcement officers are not only fooling themselves but are treading on dangerous ground, considering the unsavory types of people who often buy and operate this type of gear.

BA

3021. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-22 15:30:13 UTC
From: Alun <alun@1stcounsel.com>
Message-ID: <Xns943B6AD8E73D9elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 82597

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in
news:WxIvb.16407$Wy4.9415@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net:

> "Larry Roll K3LT" wrote:
>>
>> I think M. J.'s brother Jermaine has pretty much
>> set the tone for what will happen during the trial
>> through his use of the term "modern day lynching."
>> In spite of Michael's obvious attempt to look like
>> a "white" (caucasian) person, the race card will
>> be played, and M. J.'s "blackness" will once
>> again emerge, inspite of the fact that his face looks
>> like it was painted with Sherman Williams Flat
>> Latex (White). (snip)
>
>
> Well, I truly hope race doesn't become an issue. But, like you, I
> suspect
> it will.
>
>
>> Michael Jackson will not be convicted. The race
>> card will be played to the maximum extent possible, and the black
>> public will be placed on standby to over-react to any possible
>> negative outcome for Jackson. Therefore, to save life and property,
>> the O. J. Simpson debacle will have to be repeated.
>> This may not be justice, but it will be necessary in
>> order to ensure that many innocent people aren't
>> killed in the riotous aftermath of his possible conviction.
>> (snip)
>
>
> And I also hope we don't see riots and other violence after a
> conviction.
> But, with the news coverage this case is going to get, that is
> certainly a possibility. However, because of the timing, I don't think
> it will happen. This court case will probably not start until sometime
> next summer and many will be watching the activities surrounding the
> coming elections instead.
>
> By the way, on the issue of riots and innocent people being killed,
> my
> brother was killed (in FL) less than a week after the LA riots (Rodney
> King), by two black guys who reportedly watched the riots

> enthusiastically on television and later told two family members,
> supposedly in a joking manner, that they were going to kill a white
> guy. About fourty-five minutes later, my brother died with two bullets
> in his brain, fired from a gun held less then six inches from his head.
> The other employees in the office (three young black men) were not
> injured, but did identify the attackers. The two men pled guilty to a
> lesser charge. Because some money (less than $20), and a small amount
> of drugs (suspected), was taken, this crime was reported as a robbery
> (possibly drug related), not a race crime. Clearly, I don't want to see
> a repeat of that (for anybody).
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
>
>

I don't know what to say, Dwight. You have my sympathy, FWIW.

Wacko Jacko used to be black, but he isn't anymore. He blames it on a skin disease, but nobody beleives him. If I were black, I would just be thankful that the alleged molester was a white guy! If ever there were someone who deserved to be disowned, it is he.

3022. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-22 15:31:10 UTC
From: Alun <alun@1stcounsel.com>
Message-ID: <Xns943B6B02B5F12elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 82598

wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) wrote in
news:20031122094615.16483.00000604@mb-m23.aol.com:

>> Ejaculation is not required for a conviction. When it comes to
>> children, even inappropriate fondling or touching is illegal.
>>
>>
>>Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> Rumor has it MJ is also a No Code CBplusser. I wonder if he is an NCI
> Member?
>

You go too far. Plonk.

3023. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-22 16:12:31 UTC
From: wa2si@arrl.net
Message-ID: <b7d1465c.0311220812.6b215b0@posting.google.com>
Source record: 82599

Alun <alun@1stcounsel.com> wrote in message
news:<Xns943AE936622A1elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>...
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in
> news:3FBECA84.3FC0F056@earthlink.net:
>
> > Alun wrote:
> >>
> >> n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in news:20031121082829.07578.00001764@mb-
> >> m25.aol.com:
> >>
> >> > In article <Xns943643F1E8DC6elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun
> >> > <alun@1stcounsel.com> writes:
> >> >
> >> >>However, my point is just that polling only licenced hams is just not
> >> >>appropriate, as hams are not the only interested parties.
> >> >>
> >> > Who are the non-hams who are interested in the code test issue?
> >> >
> >> > 73 de Jim, N2EY
> >> >
> >> >
> >> >
> >>
> >> Anyone who has been thinking of becoming a ham, I would imagine
> >
> > Maybe a fellow like Leonard H. Anderson! He's been mulling it over for
> > decades.
> >
> > Dave K8MN
> >
>
> Sure, why not? I think the FCC should even take his point of view into
> account.

Some of us are even counting on it. ;-)

73 de Bert
WA2SI

3024. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-22 17:28:28 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031122122828.12631.00002991@mb-m28.aol.com>
Source record: 82604

In article <bpfrce$1ns0sh$7@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>, "Ryan, KC8PMX"
<REMOVETHISkc8pmx@diamondcs.net> writes:

>Actually Jim, I think the things I am gonna mention are what are called
>reverse mortgages.
>
>My dad (going on 68) is contemplating taking both of his residences and
>reverse mortgaging them. Apparently the bank gives him money ahead of time
>for the value of the house (a little less than market value) and upon his
>death, the property is immediately transferred to the mortgage company. I
>may be a little bit off on the explanation but it is kinda my understanding
>of how it works. I guess this way he gets the opportunity to enjoy the
>money/value of the residences now, while he is still alive, as opposed to
>leaving it to my sister and I.
>
Yep, those are reverse mortgages, and they're a useful tool. Essentially they
let a person get the equity out of a paid-off house without selling it.

But there are certain things to check very carefully. For example, what
interest rate is used and what are the tax ramifications? What happens if,
heaven forbid, you dad signs the papers and passes away a few days/weeks/months
later? Or, what about just the opposite, if he outlives the mortgage? (I know a
93-year-old still active and living alone in his own, paid-off house).

There's also the issue of what happens if he has to go into a nursing home-type
situation somewhere down the road.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3025. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-22 17:28:30 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031122122830.12631.00002992@mb-m28.aol.com>
Source record: 82601

In article <bpief2$1mkclc$9@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>, "Ryan, KC8PMX"
<REMOVETHISkc8pmx@diamondcs.net> writes:

>"Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
>news:qnNub.8076$Rk5.2293@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
>> "Ryan, KC8PMX" <REMOVETHISkc8pmx@diamondcs.net> wrote
>>
>> > If your interest rate is less than 5%, the best loan to get is a 30
>year!
>> > It's cheap money. Paying off a house quick is foolish.
>>
>> You've been brainwashed!!!
>
>Not necessarily.... do the math.

OK, let's do the math.

Suppose someone goes out and buys a new car and finances $10,000 of its price at, say, 8% for 4 years. Their monthly payment will be $244.13 (thank you, Quicken98) and the total cost of that $10,000 will be $11,718.24. $1718.24 of interest.

Now suppose instead they tacked $10,000 onto a home refinance and bought the car for cash. Suppose they can get 5% for 30 years. Their monthly payment increases by only $53.68 - but it does so for three decades! Total cost of that $10,000 is $19324.80 - that's $9324.80 of interest, even though the rate is much lower.

Of course the situation is muddied by the fact that you pay over a much longer period of time, but it's doubtful that the car will last 30 years. It's further muddied by tax considerations, and whether/when the borrowers can expect increases in their income.

Most of all, there's the philosophical question of incurring long-term debt for a short-term purchase.

>
>> > Instead of paying off that low interest loan quickly, one is smarter
>> > paying
>> > off the higher interest loans like automobiles, department and credit
>> > card
>> > charges, and other loans/debts.

In general, I agree - you want to pay off the worst deals first. But a better scheme is to not go into that sort of debt in the first place.

>>
>> Then there are the rocket scientists (NOT!!!!) who refinance their house,

>> grab some equity cash, and pay off the remaining 3 year loan on their SUV
>> that they really couldn't afford in the first place. Now they're paying
>> for
>> 30 years on a truck that will be 25-years in the scrap-yard before it's
>> paid
>> off. Brilliant financial wizards!!!

A truck's useful life is only 5 years?
>>
>
>Well, overpurchasing is another different symptom alltogether..... I see
>that all the time around here. People buying 300K-500K homes, and 50K or
>more in vehicles, and another 25-100K in recreational type of vehicles
>(boats, quadrunners, motorcycles, snowmobiles etc.) but only making
>75K-100K per year!!!! Hmmmm maybe it would be wiser to save up for some of
>these purchases other than the residence. Who knows.....

That's a Yankee frugality philosphy. I've been repeatedly told it's
"old-fashioned" and "out of date"....
>
>As far as the residence, and again I state that I am referring to local
>conditions, a person can find a really nice 3 or 4 bedroom house, with
>basement and garage, in a decent neighborhood for around 130-170K.

That's very very inexpensive compared to around here.

>Wouldn't
>it make more sense to live in that house for a while and then when move up
>as your finances truly allow as opposed to buying houses (or vehicles for
>that matter) that are way over what wages allow, being way over in debt,
>just to impress either oneself or others???

Bingo!

The problem is that some folks begin to discover that they don't actually
"need" all the latest gadgets, and that they can have a very enjoyable life
without them.
>
>The type of house I was referring to in the earlier thread, the under 75K
>house would be more along the lines of somewhere a bit out of the ghetto
>(generically based comment and not racially intended as there are ghettos in
>almost all towns and cities) but definitely not the mid or higher value
>neighborhoods. Hell, out in the country around here, even an old 14x70
>trailer/mobile home on a half/three-quarter/full acre lot still commands a
>price of over 50K!!!!!!!!! Again, regional differences must be
>recognized.....
>
Sure. A half-acre is a huge lot in many areas. Taxes are all over the place.
Energy and commuting costs are all over the map, too. What really matters is
"total cost to live". And what the jobs pay in that area.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3026. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-22 17:28:31 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031122122831.12631.00002993@mb-m28.aol.com>
Source record: 82603

In article <Xns943AE8F62DA6Belektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun
<alun@1stcounsel.com> writes:

>However, ham radio is not a job or a vocation, just a hobby.

For many hams that's true.

But does that mean there should be no standards or requirements to join?

>I welcome the
>unmotivated as much as I would welcome anyone else. Why shouldn't they
>have fun too?

OK, fine.

What do you think of this idea, Alun:

Require all new hams to pass the Extra written in 10 years or less or they get
tossed off the amateur bands.

Is that a good idea or a bad idea?

>If someone wants HF and doesn't want to learn code, why
>should they bother to study for a VHF and above licence, when they could
>be scuba diving or building model railroads or what have you? (Not hobbies
>of mine, personally, but whatever turns you on). I know this is sacrilege
>to true beleivers, but so what?

OK, fine.

If someone wants to operate radios rather than build them, why must they learn
a lot of theory stuff that they are not interested in? To suit someone else's
idea of what amateur radio should be?

Why is a Technician Plus class licensee qualified to do anything allowed by the
rules on 2 meters, but not on 20 meters? What special knowledge is imparted by
the General and Extra class written tests?
>
>The notion that only hams should decide the future of ham radio is just
>that, a notion. I can absolutely guarantee that it is not a point of view
>shared by the FCC, and it makes little sense to me either. At the very
>least all prospective hams have a vested interest, irregardless of the
>reasons they don't have a licence, reasonable or otherwise. I'm sure the
>FCC would cast their net a lot wider than that.
>
Actually the FCC won't cast their net at all. They don't do polls or surveys -
just comments, petitions and proposals.

How many comments did the last restructuring get - 2500? Almost all of them were from already-licensed hams. Less than 1/2 of 1%, too.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3027. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-22 17:28:32 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031122122832.12631.00002994@mb-m28.aol.com>
Source record: 82600

In article <VmJvb.16582$Wy4.9876@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> writes:

>"N2EY" wrote:
>>
>> (snip) What we're saying is that on the single
>> issue of continued Morse code testing, (snip)
>>
>> (snip) Not me. I EARNED mine. I encourage
>> others to EARN theirs. Is that bad? Shall I
>> apologize for my accomplishments and sit idly
>> by while others try to trash a community I
>> belong to?
>
>
> If what you're demanding to "earn" that license is unnecessary and based
>on a false premise, then I think it is bad.

OK, fine.

>You haven't established, at
>least not to my satisfaction (nor the satisfaction of the ITU, FCC, and
>several countries around the world), why Morse code is necessary (notice I
>said necessary, not enjoyable) for ham radio today.

You mean the code itself, or the test?

>And there is no truth
>whatsoever to the premise that those without code skills in the ham radio
>community are trashing anything. Instead, the vast majority are dedicated,
>well-behaved, enthusiastic, participants of this community.

I wasn't just talking about the end of code testing "trashing ham radio". There are a lot of other bad ideas out there.
>
> Several countries around the world have moved, or are moving, forward to
>eliminate the Morse Code testing requirement while the United States sits
>back and watches.

What's the count now?

How many countries have eliminated the code test, vs. how many have retained it so far?

>Is this the actions of a modern, progressive, country with
>feet planted firmly on today and eyes on the future?

What does all that mean, exactly? Besides the removal of the last remaining vestige of code testing?

> It's time to move on, Jim.

To what?

Let's say that tomorrow FCC just dumps Element 1. One sentence: "Element 1 is waived for all applicants, pending revision of the rules". Could happen, y'know.

What happens next?

>Morse code is going to be even less necessary in the future. As such,
>Morse Code testing has no ligitimate place in that future.

My mileage varies on that...

73 de Jim, N2EY

3028. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-22 17:28:33 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031122122833.12631.00002995@mb-m28.aol.com>
Source record: 82602

In article <PgKvb.16802$Wy4.7484@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> writes:

>I think you and Jim are both (perhaps intentionally) missing the point.
>This issue is not limited to just the ham radio community. The frequencies
>we use don't belong just to us - they belong to the entire country (all
>Americans). As such, the FCC has to take all Americans into account when
>making the rules and regulations to govern the use of those frequencies, and
>the license requirements for those frequencies. Therefore, Hans is right -
>if you're going to instead propose some type of poll to help establish what
>those license requirements might be, it should include all Americans.

Almost all Americans can become hams without a code test. Been that way for almost 13 years.
>
> As for myself, if you're going to ask Amateur Radio Operators if code
>testing is necessary today to meet the goals and purposes of the Amateur
>Radio Service (as defined in Part 97) and serves some valid need as far as
>the American public is concerned, then I would love to see the results of
>that poll - it would be very interesting to see how many (or how few)
>operators would actually place the goals and purposes of the Amateur Radio
>Service, and the needs of the American public, above their own desire to
>keep a code testing requirement.

So you assume that the goals and purposes of the ARS are incompatible with any code testing at all?

And let's consider a basic principle of Hans' "learner's permit" proposal: forced upgrading.

If FCC adopted his proposal, all new hams would have to either get Extras within 10 years or leave ham radio. He's said that if 80% of newcomers drop out under such a system, that's OK with him.

IOW, a 5 wpm code test is an unreasonable burden, but having to pass the Extra written within isn't.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3029. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-22 18:10:24 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <kENvb.15216$Rk5.10350@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 82605

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote

> What special knowledge is imparted by
> the General and Extra class written tests?

The tests aren't designed to 'impart' knowledge. They are designed to
determine if an applicant meets some predetermined minimum qualifications
for the level of license being sought. (I'd have thought you knew that.)

> What do you think of this idea, Alun:

> Require all new hams to pass the Extra written in 10
> years or less or they get tossed off the amateur bands.

I don't know what Alun thinks, but I think it is a superb idea. In fact,
I've suggested it to the regulators.

73, de Hans, K0HB

3030. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-22 18:14:53 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <xINvb.15219$Rk5.808@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 82606

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote

> IOW, a 5 wpm code test is an unreasonable burden, but having to
> pass the Extra written within isn't.

You finally got it! Congratulations, Jim. That's almost absolutely
correct, and would be spot-on accurate if you change the word 'unreasonable'
to 'unnecessary'.

73, de Hans, K0HB

3031. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-22 19:01:40 UTC
From: N8WWM <N8WWM@home.nut>
Message-ID: <bpobqk01ba0@drn.newsguy.com>
Source record: 82608

I'm a no code tech and a Michael Jackson fan too. don't be mean to my hero.

In article <20031122094615.16483.00000604@mb-m23.aol.com>, WA8ULX says...
>
>> Ejaculation is not required for a conviction. When it comes to children,
>>even inappropriate fondling or touching is illegal.
>>
>>
>>Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
>Rumor has it MJ is also a No Code CBplusser. I wonder if he is an NCI Member?

3032. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-22 19:02:50 UTC
From: N8WWM <N8WWM@home.nut>
Message-ID: <bpobsq01bjg@drn.newsguy.com>
Source record: 82609

i wish i could sleep over jackos house.

In article <BWKvb.16954$Wy4.9965@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>, Dwight Stewart says...
>
>"white rover" wrote:
>>
>> What parents in there right minds would still
>> send their children up to Netherlamds after
>> the first court case?
>
>
> Were you watching Fox television yesterday? They had a woman on who is
>still planning to send her son to sleep over with Jackson, even after all
>that has happened over the last few days. Don't ask me why she would do it.
>I have absolutely no idea why anyone would do something that stupid.
>
>
>Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
>http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
>

3033. Re: No!!! Re: Do Hams get 11 Meters Back

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-22 19:17:16 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <0DOvb.12159$P%1.10553614@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 82607
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

"Richard Cranium" <richcranus@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:c5ecbb69.0311211606.7491c9cf@posting.google.com...
> "Jerry Oxendine" <joxendi@bellsouth.net> wrote in message
news:<v%evb.16249$ow5.3028@bignews2.bellsouth.net>...
> > "Stephen M.H. Lawrence" <7.3steve@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > news:gP5vb.11687$Wy4.4805@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> > > One day 3 weeks ago, I listened from 28.000 - 28.150, and
> > > I counted over a dozen of 'em. Truckers in particular have been
> > > "using" our ten - meter band illegally, and Riley Hollingsworth
> > > has been doing something about it. Make no mistake, this is
> > > happening.
> > >
> > > 73,
> > >
> > > Steve Lawrence
> > > Burnsville, MN
> >
> >
> >
> > And YOU can help! Get out there and listen on the road.
> > Get the tag # of the tractor (not of the trailer), date, time,
> > highway, milepost or exit number. Send this info to rholling@fcc.gov .
> > Make a difference: this is how those
> > other truckers got warned--individual hams who quietly
> > listened and accurately reported the above data. RH will
> > then respond IF, again, the info is accurate. Each ham
> > can make a difference and stop that "tan-fer thar, drivah,
> > ah know you rah't, fer-tan thar SQUEAK!!" If we don't, we will
eventually
> > hear them beeping and squeaking their
> > way along on 17 Meters.
> >
> > The way to "trap" a driver is to quietly cruise along. Do NOT talk to
them
> > or get into an argument! Simply overtake a trucker who *may* be
operating
> > on 28.085 AM. As you pass, or he passes you, he may be curious
> > about "them 'funny antenners' thar" and comment to you
> > about it (or other truckers). It is then you copy down the
> > tag # on the FRONT of the tractor, the DOT # (this confirms the identity
of
> > the truck), the direction of travel and milepost (or exit), date and
time.

> > Also the company name. Send it in! Done correctly, the "man" will send
out
> > a warning notice to the company holding THEM responsible for their
drivers'
> > actions. It is legal and enforc-able.
> >
> > 73
> >
> > Jerry
>
> Great idea, Jerry! Pile Riley's desk full with all sorts of false
> reports so he won't believe any of you!
>
> *may*?? You better be damned certain when you file a report!
> Entrapment is also a crime, goodbuddy.

If you are just observing (and reporting what you hear and see) and not
talking, that is not entrapment.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

3034. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-22 19:18:50 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <uEOvb.12160$P%1.10553911@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 82610

"Alun" <alun@1stcounsel.com> wrote in message
news:Xns9436E9CF58BC8elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
> "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in
> news:ixgub.10892$P%1.9677761@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com:
>
> >
> > "Alun" <alun@1stcounsel.com> wrote in message
> > news:Xns943643F1E8DC6elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
> >>
> >> However, my point is just that polling only licenced hams is just not
> >> appropriate, as hams are not the only interested parties.
> >>
> >
> > How would you then define the group to be polled? Even polling just
> > the licensed hams would be prohibitive in terms of postage as mentioned
> > in other posts.
> >
> > Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
> >
> >
>
> If I thought it should be decided by a poll, and I'm by no means sure of
> that, then it should be done on-line. Just have a web page where you click
> your chosen response. Chicago voters might be a problem, though.
>

Yeah I don't think they have internet access in their grave yards yet.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

3035. Re: RRAP call signs in SS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-22 19:20:29 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <1GOvb.12161$P%1.10554094@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 82611

"Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3Ghub.8249$Wy4.3813@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote
>
> > Was it me or my OM working the mike?
>
> Musta been the OM, because I remember at the time thinking "that's Dee's
> call" but then I had a mental disconnect because the op didn't sound all
> that feminine. Sure glad I didn't say "Hi Sweetie"!!!! <grin>
>
> 73, de Hans, K0HB

Yes he's got a nice sounding tenor voice although being an alto my voice
isn't too much higher than his but it is noticeably different.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

3036. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-22 19:30:34 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <uPOvb.12164$P%1.10555978@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 82612

"Ryan, KC8PMX" <REMOVETHISkc8pmx@diamondcs.net> wrote in message
news:bpdi5v$1n9ab4$10@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de...
>
>
> > > > People allow themselves to fail and become victims of circumstance.
> > >
> > > Following that logic, then the people IN the WTC buildings are also as
> > well
> > > then......
> > >
> >
> > No it does not follow. The people in the WTC buildings were subject to
a
> > circumstance that no one could ever have even guessed might happen or
> > foreseen might happen. That was not within their power to prevent or
> solve.
> >
> > Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
> >
>
> According to your statement, an absolutism, yes they were in control.
THEY
> chose to work in that building. THEY chose to go to work that day, not
> calling in sick or taking a vacation day.
>
>

No you are misinterpreting my point of view. There was no data for them to base a choice on so no choice was truly possible and there was no possibility for them to control their fate. The WTC terror allowed no more choice than a lightning bolt does.

However people who chose to stay on welfare instead of move when the local economy in their area crashed, have chosen to fail. They have data. The local business closed. They can evaluate or guess whether it will ever reopen. They can choose to follow the jobs or they can choose to stay there and be poor. There are still people in Portsmouth, Ohio waiting for the steel mills to reopen. These mills closed decades ago yet people are still waiting.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

3037. Re: RRAP call signs in SS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-22 19:33:27 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <bSOvb.12165$P%1.10556322@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 82613

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:gvtub.6596$Rk5.341@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
>
> "Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
> news:3FB9C6FB.3010104@ix.netcom.com...
> > Kï¿½HB wrote:
> >
> > > >
> > > >Only when the mirror is equidistant between us and when it is "flat"
will
> > > >the path be symmetrical and relative signal strengths reciprocal.
> > > >
> > > >
> > > > Somehow I would have thought that light (radio waves) could travel
> > > either direction
> > > on the same exact path. And that attenuation either way would be
> identical.
> > > Same for the same set of multiple paths.
> > >
> > > But it's been years since Physics class......
> > >
> > > >
> > > >
> > >
> > >
>
> The ionosphere is not like a mirror, as Hans stated. And from what I
> understand the waves don't actually bounce, but they are bent back
towards
> earth.
>
> Dan/W4NTI

Yes they are refracted like light through a prism rather than bouncing like
light off a mirror.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

3038. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-22 19:36:44 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3FBFBACA.8080205@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 82614

Dwight Stewart wrote:

> Is there anyone out there who actually believes Michael Jackson is really
>innocent of this latest charge?
>
Don't know, wasn't there.....

>There is a long list of questionable
>behavior that suggests otherwise - his "relationship" with 14 year old Brook
>Shields (including at least one date to a Hollywood awards ceremony), rumors
>of sleeping in bed with children, music videos targeting children with
>images of him grabbing his crotch, a multi-million dollar payoff of a family
>with similar accusations, admissions of sleeping in bed with children, an
>interview showing a 13 year old boy leaning against him like some kind of
>lover, and now these accusations.
>
Two possibilities: he's molesting kids, and thus guilty, or
he just likes the (non molesting) company of kids. But not smart enough
to avoid getting "shaken down" by unscrupulous people. He should
have just played with the kids in the amusement park, in the living room,
and such, in the presence of their parents and other responsible adults
and not let the kids into the bedroom.

Anyway, I thought he looked better being black....

Does he have a ham license?

3039. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-22 19:38:08 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <AWOvb.12166$P%1.10557112@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 82615

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:cuvyxnansvbet.hok4uwa.pminews@netnews.comcast.net...
> On 17 Nov 2003 01:28:48 GMT, N2EY wrote:
>
> >Here's another one for ya: I bet neither of us would have any problem
getting a
> >30 year mortgage, even though we'd be nearly 80 when said mortage was
paid off
> >(barring any advance payments). Huh?
>
> We got a 30-year mortgage four years ago notwithstanding that I was
> retired on a moderate pension, my wife was an independent contract
> employee close to retirement age, and both of us would be over 90
> when it matured.
>
> Not only that, we refinanced it last year starting a new 30 year
> clock.
>
> In reality we rent the place from Fannie May or Freddy Mac, whomever
> wound up with the paper..... We know it, they know it.....
>

But there are advantages. As the owner (even though heavily mortgaged), you
can put up antennas or remodel or whatever without asking the landlord. And
since the interest is tax deductable, you can have a nicer place for the
same money than if it was just a rental.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

3040. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-22 19:47:14 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <63Pvb.12190$P%1.10558581@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 82616

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:_zJub.10194$Wy4.8391@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> "Mike Coslo" wrote:
> >
> > It's not as lucrative as you make it sound, Dwight.
> > Also, these people are reasonably well off, retiring
> > with money equivalent to upper middle class or
> > better. (snip)
>
>
> I have no idea how lucrative it is. An acquaintance (hard to call this
guy
> a friend) works for a mortgage company and just loves to talk about the
> shady side of that industry. The company he works for (a nation-wide
> franchise chain) just switched to more agressive foreclosure practices
and,
> based on the stories he tells, I most certainly would not want to be a
> customer of that company. Of course, this company has always had
> questionable (in my opinion) foreclosure practices. He told me years ago
> (late 80's, early 90's) that, mainly because of increasing property
values,
> it was far more profitable to foreclose on older properties than to
maintain
> the mortgage. As such, the company used every opportunity to foreclose on
> those mortgages. Today, according to him, long term mortgage foreclosure
> offers the most gain. Therefore, they now actively seek those who have the
> greatest possibility of foreclosure years from now, such as the elderly,
> those with speading habits that suggest possible credit problems down the
> road, and so on. Now, since I don't work in that industry, I have no idea
if
> this is entirely true or even widespread. But, I've seen enough written
> about these types of practices to suggest there is at least some truth to
> it.

The key to being successful is having some way of estimating who would be in
trouble approximately 5 years or more down the road not the person who is
currently in trouble or on the ragged edge of currently being in trouble.
Then the property has had time to appreciate enough to be able to turn a
profit.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

3041. Re: No!!! Re: Do Hams get 11 Meters Back

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-22 19:54:57 UTC
From: Jerry Oxendine <joxendi@bellsouth.net>
Message-ID: <n7Pvb.5888$6c3.2828@bignews1.bellsouth.net>
Source record: 82617
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

```
"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:0DOvb.12159$P%1.10553614@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
>
> "Richard Cranium" <richcranus@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> news:c5ecbb69.0311211606.7491c9cf@posting.google.com...
> > "Jerry Oxendine" <joxendi@bellsouth.net> wrote in message
> news:<v%evb.16249$ow5.3028@bignews2.bellsouth.net>...
> > > "Stephen M.H. Lawrence" <7.3steve@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > > news:gP5vb.11687$Wy4.4805@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> > > > One day 3 weeks ago, I listened from 28.000 - 28.150, and
> > > > I counted over a dozen of 'em. Truckers in particular have been
> > > > "using" our ten - meter band illegally, and Riley Hollingsworth
> > > > has been doing something about it. Make no mistake, this is
> > > > happening.
> > > >
> > > > 73,
> > > >
> > > > Steve Lawrence
> > > > Burnsville, MN
> > >
> > >
> > >
> > > And YOU can help! Get out there and listen on the road.
> > > Get the tag # of the tractor (not of the trailer), date, time,
> > > highway, milepost or exit number. Send this info to rholling@fcc.gov
.
> > > Make a difference: this is how those
> > > other truckers got warned--individual hams who quietly
> > > listened and accurately reported the above data. RH will
> > > then respond IF, again, the info is accurate. Each ham
> > > can make a difference and stop that "tan-fer thar, drivah,
> > > ah know you rah't, fer-tan thar SQUEAK!!" If we don't, we will
> eventually
> > > hear them beeping and squeaking their
> > > way along on 17 Meters.
> > >
> > > The way to "trap" a driver is to quietly cruise along. Do NOT talk
to
> them
> > > or get into an argument! Simply overtake a trucker who *may* be
> operating
> > > on 28.085 AM. As you pass, or he passes you, he may be curious
> > > about "them 'funny antenners' thar" and comment to you
```

> > > about it (or other truckers). It is then you copy down the
> > > tag # on the FRONT of the tractor, the DOT # (this confirms the
identity
> of
> > > the truck), the direction of travel and milepost (or exit), date and
> time.
> > > Also the company name. Send it in! Done correctly, the "man" will send
> out
> > > a warning notice to the company holding THEM responsible for their
> drivers'
> > > actions. It is legal and enforc-able.
> > >
> > > 73
> > >
> > > Jerry
> >
> > Great idea, Jerry! Pile Riley's desk full with all sorts of false
> > reports so he won't believe any of you!
> >
> > *may*?? You better be damned certain when you file a report!
> > Entrapment is also a crime, goodbuddy.
>
> If you are just observing (and reporting what you hear and see) and not
> talking, that is not entrapment.
>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

EXACTLY!! You are simply a "witness" or a "bystander". You have not done
anything to entrap
anybody. Ain't it neat? LOL!~

Jerry
>

3042. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-22 19:58:04 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031122145804.11891.00002450@mb-m11.aol.com>
Source record: 82618

In article <HUivb.11516$Rk5.6844@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> writes:

> Is there anyone out there who actually believes Michael Jackson is really >innocent of this latest charge?

He is obviously GUILTY because he has never taken an amateur radio test or earned that epitome of radio respect: Morsemanship.

I will suggest that you contact the FCC and put forth a petition to have Jackson permanently banned from having anything to do with U.S. amateur radio.

dit dit

3043. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-22 19:58:06 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031122145806.11891.00002451@mb-m11.aol.com>
Source record: 82619

In article <Xns943AE8F62DA6Belektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun
<alun@1stcounsel.com> writes:

>wa2si@arrl.net (Bert Craig) wrote in
>news:b7d1465c.0311211216.574c7dde@posting.google.com:
>
>> Alun <alun@1stcounsel.com> wrote in message
>> news:<Xns943A6D811D68Aelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>...
>>> wa2si@arrl.net (Bert Craig) wrote in
>>> news:b7d1465c.0311210334.5fee2b15@posting.google.com:
>>>
>>> > Alun <alun@1stcounsel.com> wrote in message
>>> > news:<Xns943564E221DAAelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>...
>>> >> "Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in
>>> >> news:EJvsb.9152$hn3.3187776@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net:
>>> >>
>>> >> > "Rupert" <big@bird.sesame.street> wrote in message
>>> >> > news:Govsb.10542$6c3.633@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net...
>>> >> >> Len Over 21 wrote:
>>> >> >>
>>> >> >> > As of 6 PM EST on 11 November 2003, the number of ECFS
>>> >> >> > documents on public view are:
>>> >> >>
>>> >> >> What would be interesting is to find out how many are for the
>>> >> >> change, and how many want to keep the code.
>>> >> >
>>> >> > Me too. All this roundabout bravo sierra could be bypassed if
>>> >> > there was a ballot sent to all approx. 700,000 U.S. licensed
>>> >> > hams. As long as quorum is met, it's on! This concept (Democracy)
>>> >> > frightens the bejesus out of many folks who claim to speak for
>>> >> > those not yet licensed.
>>> >> >
>>> >> > But that's an empty argument. Get licensed and vote, tah dah! The
>>> >> > big bad "barrier" does not preclude anyone from getting their
>>> >> > no-code Tech ticket and executing a vote.
>>> >> >
>>> >> > Simply announce a "record date" by which one must be licensed (To
>>> >> > give those "yet to be licensed a fair shot at a voice in the
>>> >> > process.) and send a ballot out to all those licensed "of
>>> >> > record." Makes too much sense and requires some effort. IOW,
>>> >> > against the contemporary trend.
>>> >> >
>>> >> > 73 de Bert
>>> >> > WA2SI

>>> >> >
>>> >> >
>>> >> >
>>> >>
>>> >> Those who have not obtained a licence because of the code trest are
>>> >> just as entitled to express their opinion to the FCC as you or I.
>>> >
>>> > I agree, Alun. The Technician license requires no code test.
>>> >
>>> > 73 de Bert
>>> > WA2SI
>>> >
>>>
>>> True, but some don't take it because they only want HF, not because
>>> they couldn't answer the questions. All I'm saying is that they should
>>> have a vote in any poll.
>>>
>>> 73 de Alun, N3KIP
>>
>> Hmm, sounds like a motivational issue. If you want HF, the road to the
>> General and Extra begins with the Technician exam...no matter what. If
>> they're truly "interested" in participating in participating in the
>> process of this change, you'd think the Tech exam would be...wait a
>> sec, lemme stop. I just remembered whom we're talking about. Kinda
>> sad. :-(
>>
>> No, Alun. I really DO believe that Amateur Radio operators should
>> define Amateur Radio. What a concept, eh?
>>
>> 73 de Bert
>> WA2SI
>>
>
>Well, I guess that's a religeous issue, so I won't be able to convince you
>otherwise.
>
>If you look me up you'll see I'm an Extra, and you'll be able to figure
>out that I passed 20 wpm. What you won't see, is that I've been a ham
>since 1980, not 1992, as I'm not originally from this country.

Alun, with all due respect, such experience ist VERBOTEN in this
chat room.

The requirement to exist in this chat room requires a struct obediance
to morsemanship, tradition forever rooted in old ways back before all
the morseodist regulars ever existed.

>However, ham radio is not a job or a vocation, just a hobby.

In this chat room, the REGULARS maintain a LIFESTYLE of devotion,
obediance to love honor and obey amateur radio in all its past glory.

LIFESTYLES take precedence over logic, common sense, and
anything else not associated with amateur radio (except Michael
Jackson, foreign policy, overall economic decisions by government
and partisan politics).

Ham radio to the regulars is far more than a vocation. Vocations
in radio are to be pejorated, denigrated, spat upon, reviled, made fun
of and other niceties of the TURF where chat room homies consider
their 'hood.

There are NO First Amendment "rights" for chat room homies.
Their only constitution is that of the ARRL. E pluribus Sumner..

>I welcome the
>unmotivated as much as I would welcome anyone else. Why shouldn't they
>have fun too? If someone wants HF and doesn't want to learn code, why
>should they bother to study for a VHF and above licence, when they could
>be scuba diving or building model railroads or what have you? (Not hobbies
>of mine, personally, but whatever turns you on). I know this is sacrilege
>to true beleivers, but so what?

So, Alun, such heretical statements against the True Beliefs of the
morseodist chat room homies are, and will be, reviled, castigated,
denigrated, and shown the door with an angry last phrase of "don't
let it hit your ass on the way out!"

THIS venue is the chat room homies' TURF, Alun. Territorial imperative.

None can venture into this place unless they are of Groupthink,
secure in their Beliefs of the Group.

>The notion that only hams should decide the future of ham radio is just
>that, a notion.

NOT here. This is morseodist TURF, their neighborhood. NONE may
challenge morseodist groupthink. NONE.

>I can absolutely guarantee that it is not a point of view
>shared by the FCC, and it makes little sense to me either.

Heresy.

All know that ham radio is governed by the BoD at Newington.

So it shall always be.

Amen.

dit dit

3044. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-22 20:12:16 UTC
From: Alun <alun@1stcounsel.com>
Message-ID: <Xns943B9AA93B098elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 82620

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in
news:20031122122831.12631.00002993@mb-m28.aol.com:

> In article <Xns943AE8F62DA6Belektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun
> <alun@1stcounsel.com> writes:
>
>>However, ham radio is not a job or a vocation, just a hobby.
>
> For many hams that's true.
>
> But does that mean there should be no standards or requirements to
> join?
>

Not atall. I think the current theory tests are reasonable

>>I welcome the
>>unmotivated as much as I would welcome anyone else. Why shouldn't they
>>have fun too?
>
> OK, fine.
>
> What do you think of this idea, Alun:
>
> Require all new hams to pass the Extra written in 10 years or less or
> they get tossed off the amateur bands.
>
> Is that a good idea or a bad idea?

It's a pretty silly idea. If we can let someone on the air with a Tech
licence today, then why not 11 years later? Time limitations have always
been artificial. I may think it's a waste if someone stays a Tech for
decades. I will almost certainly encourage them to upgrade, but I don't
think their licence should be cancelled.

>
>>If someone wants HF and doesn't want to learn code, why
>>should they bother to study for a VHF and above licence, when they
>>could be scuba diving or building model railroads or what have you?
>>(Not hobbies of mine, personally, but whatever turns you on). I know
>>this is sacrilege to true beleivers, but so what?
>
> OK, fine.
>
> If someone wants to operate radios rather than build them, why must
> they learn a lot of theory stuff that they are not interested in? To

> suit someone else's idea of what amateur radio should be?
>

They can actually do that on CB, FRS, etc. I have no problem with that. Of course, there are tight limitations on what they can do, designed to ensure that they are harmless with their lack of knowledge, and unfortunately often ignored on 27 MHz.

> Why is a Technician Plus class licensee qualified to do anything
> allowed by the rules on 2 meters, but not on 20 meters?

Because they know a bit less, and their signals will mostly only be heard locally, hence limiting the potential effects. Granted that the additional privileges of the Tech+ are not entirely consistent with that theory.

> What special
> knowledge is imparted by the General and Extra class written tests?

The General doesn't impart much in that way. The Extra does, however require a better knowledge of radio theory.

I'm not sure that the present licence classes are very well tailored, but politically it could be hard to change.

Personally, I'm in favour of a two tier system, where those who pass the easier test stay above 30 MHz, or at least above 28 and maybe with access to 1.8, but I don't actually think it's going to happen quite like that. Too much inertia.

>>
>>The notion that only hams should decide the future of ham radio is just
>>that, a notion. I can absolutely guarantee that it is not a point of
>>view shared by the FCC, and it makes little sense to me either. At the
>>very least all prospective hams have a vested interest, irregardless of
>>the reasons they don't have a licence, reasonable or otherwise. I'm
>>sure the FCC would cast their net a lot wider than that.
>>
> Actually the FCC won't cast their net at all. They don't do polls or
> surveys - just comments, petitions and proposals.
>

Agreed

I was just commenting why I don't think a 'hams only' poll is the right idea

> How many comments did the last restructuring get - 2500? Almost all of
> them were from already-licensed hams. Less than 1/2 of 1%, too.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>

It is, however, important that others could file a comment if they wanted to.

73 de Alun, N3KIP

3045. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-22 20:27:27 UTC
From: Alun <alun@1stcounsel.com>
Message-ID: <Xns943B9D3CC8D00elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 82621

<snip>
>> Several countries around the world have moved, or are moving, forward
>> to
>>eliminate the Morse Code testing requirement while the United States
>>sits back and watches.
>
> What's the count now?

I think they include at least the UK, Belgium, Germany, Switzerland, the Netherlands, Norway, Singapore, Papua New Guinea and Australia (not until Jan 1st). New Zealand may actually do it before Australia, as they have said it would be before the end of the year, but have given no date. I am pretty sure I have missed a couple out, too.

>
> How many countries have eliminated the code test, vs. how many have
> retained it so far?
>

Most do still retain it, but I think this has far more to do with bureaucracy than intent

>>Is this the actions of a modern, progressive, country with feet planted
>>firmly on today and eyes on the future?
>
> What does all that mean, exactly? Besides the removal of the last
> remaining vestige of code testing?
>
>> It's time to move on, Jim.
>
> To what?
>
> Let's say that tomorrow FCC just dumps Element 1. One sentence:
> "Element 1 is waived for all applicants, pending revision of the
> rules". Could happen, y'know.
>

Probably will

> What happens next?
>

Lots of upgrades, plus no-coders on 10m the next day

>>Morse code is going to be even less necessary in the future. As such,
>>Morse Code testing has no ligitimate place in that future.
>

> My mileage varies on that...
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>
>

73 de Alun, N3KIP

3046. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-22 20:29:37 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <RGPvb.12193$P%1.10565484@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 82622

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20031122122831.12631.00002993@mb-m28.aol.com...
> In article <Xns943AE8F62DA6Belektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun
> Actually the FCC won't cast their net at all. They don't do polls or
surveys -
> just comments, petitions and proposals.
>
> How many comments did the last restructuring get - 2500? Almost all of
them
> were from already-licensed hams. Less than 1/2 of 1%, too.

Actually one could consider the opportunity to post comments as functionally equivalent to a poll. Anyone can file a comment, licensed or not, citizen or not. That's as democratic as it gets.

All interested persons have the opportunity to know that these issues are up for comment since they are listed on publicly available government pages.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

3047. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-22 20:31:38 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <KIPvb.12194$P%1.10565474@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 82623

"Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:xINvb.15219$Rk5.808@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote
>
> > IOW, a 5 wpm code test is an unreasonable burden, but having to
> > pass the Extra written within isn't.
>
> You finally got it! Congratulations, Jim. That's almost absolutely
> correct, and would be spot-on accurate if you change the word
'unreasonable'
> to 'unnecessary'.
>
> 73, de Hans, K0HB

Having to pass the Extra is both unreasonable and unnecessary to be a ham or
remain a ham.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

3048. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-22 20:33:34 UTC
From: Alun <alun@1stcounsel.com>
Message-ID: <Xns943B9E45CFD69elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 82624

Alun <alun@1stcounsel.com> wrote in
news:Xns943B9D3CC8D00elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4:

> <snip>
>>> Several countries around the world have moved, or are moving,
>>> forward to
>>>eliminate the Morse Code testing requirement while the United States
>>>sits back and watches.
>>
>> What's the count now?
>
> I think they include at least the UK, Belgium, Germany, Switzerland,
> the Netherlands, Norway, Singapore, Papua New Guinea and Australia (not
> until Jan 1st). New Zealand may actually do it before Australia, as
> they have said it would be before the end of the year, but have given
> no date. I am pretty sure I have missed a couple out, too.
>
>>
>> How many countries have eliminated the code test, vs. how many have
>> retained it so far?
>>
>
> Most do still retain it, but I think this has far more to do with
> bureaucracy than intent
>
>>>Is this the actions of a modern, progressive, country with feet
>>>planted firmly on today and eyes on the future?
>>
>> What does all that mean, exactly? Besides the removal of the last
>> remaining vestige of code testing?
>>
>>> It's time to move on, Jim.
>>
>> To what?
>>
>> Let's say that tomorrow FCC just dumps Element 1. One sentence:
>> "Element 1 is waived for all applicants, pending revision of the
>> rules". Could happen, y'know.
>>
>
> Probably will
>
>> What happens next?
>>

>
> Lots of upgrades, plus no-coders on 10m the next day
>
>>>Morse code is going to be even less necessary in the future. As such,
>>>Morse Code testing has no ligitimate place in that future.
>>
>> My mileage varies on that...
>>
>> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>>
>>
>>
>
> 73 de Alun, N3KIP
>

This just in. The code test was abolished in Finland on the 1st of November.

3049. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-22 21:45:21 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <RNQvb.9548$m84.3562391@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 82625

Dwight Stewart wrote:

> "Mike Coslo" wrote:
>
>>N2EY wrote:
>>
>>>(snip) Is that bad? Are you against direct
>>>democracy and polling of those most affected?
>>>
>>>(snip) You're avoiding the central issue. I think
>>>you know that if such a poll were actually taken,
>>>you might not like the results. (snip)
>>
>>Bingo! This issue seems to run along "party lines".
>>I'm just about certain that the more non-amateurs
>>included in any poll, the lower the support for
>>Morse code, and vice versa.
>
>
>
> I think you and Jim are both (perhaps intentionally) missing the point.

Well, I don't know if disagreeing with the point is intentionally
"missing it" but okay.

> This issue is not limited to just the ham radio community. The frequencies
> we use don't belong just to us - they belong to the entire country (all
> Americans).

If you want to be more precise, they belong to the world.

> As such, the FCC has to take all Americans into account when
> making the rules and regulations to govern the use of those frequencies, and
> the license requirements for those frequencies. Therefore, Hans is right -
> if you're going to instead propose some type of poll to help establish what
> those license requirements might be, it should include all Americans.

How you gonna educate them? Most people wouldn't have a clue what we
would be talking about. Do you propose an education system without
either Pro or Anti-code bias?

Should this poll include more input altogether, such as business
interests that would probably prefer us pesky hams to just go away?

Would the results of a poll consisting of people who knew nothing about
the ARS be representative of anything.

How are you going to approach anything like a knowledgable poll pool?

- Mike KB3EIA -

3050. My son is a chip off the old block

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-22 21:56:59 UTC
From: Dimmy Dale <Dimmy@flajail.com>
Message-ID: <HXQvb.3175$87.2040@bignews6.bellsouth.net>
Source record: 82627
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.swap

http://www.hcso.tampa.fl.us/pub/default.asp?/online/qdisp/BN=03058540

3051. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-22 21:57:06 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <SYQvb.9550$m84.3565171@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 82626

N2EY wrote:

> That's a Yankee frugality philosphy. I've been repeatedly told it's
> "old-fashioned" and "out of date"....

And will continue to be old fashioned and out of date well after the proponents of the "New accounting" are in the breadlines.

- Mike KB3EIA -

3052. Re: My son is a chip off the old block

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-22 22:03:00 UTC
From: N8WWM <N8WWM@home.nut>
Message-ID: <bpomek02j3i@drn.newsguy.com>
Source record: 82631
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.swap

He's cute.

In article <HXQvb.3175$87.2040@bignews6.bellsouth.net>, Dimmy Dale says...
>
>http://www.hcso.tampa.fl.us/pub/default.asp?/online/qdisp/BN=03058540
>

3053. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-22 22:03:30 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <S2Rvb.9553$m84.3566290@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 82628

N8WWM wrote:

> i wish i could sleep over jackos house.

Too old?

- Mike KB3EIA -

3054. Re: My son is a chip off the old block

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-22 22:10:36 UTC
From: Dimmy Dale <Dimmy@flajail.com>
Message-ID: <B8Rvb.3181$87.1266@bignews6.bellsouth.net>
Source record: 82629
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.swap

I got one on the run too:

http://www.hcso.tampa.fl.us/pub/default.asp?/Online/pwar/WD=20740542

Dimmy Dale wrote:
> http://www.hcso.tampa.fl.us/pub/default.asp?/online/qdisp/BN=03058540
>

3055. Re: My son is a chip off the old block

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-22 22:14:05 UTC
From: Dimmy Dale <Dimmy@flajail.com>
Message-ID: <JbRvb.3187$87.945@bignews6.bellsouth.net>
Source record: 82630
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.swap

What kind of bird don't fly?

A Dale bird!

http://www.hcso.tampa.fl.us/pub/default.asp?/online/FULLPHOTO/URL?bn=03058540&name=DALE,JOHN%20MICHAEL&race=W&vex=@QE@Q!%3E!EMEQ

Dimmy Dale wrote:

> http://www.hcso.tampa.fl.us/pub/default.asp?/online/qdisp/BN=03058540
>

3056. Re: My son is a chip off the old block

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-22 22:33:03 UTC
From: Dimmy Dale <Dimmy@flajail.com>
Message-ID: <vtRvb.3197$87.2435@bignews6.bellsouth.net>
Source record: 82632
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.swap

I bet Bubba thinks so!

N8WWM wrote:

> He's cute.
>
> In article <HXQvb.3175$87.2040@bignews6.bellsouth.net>, Dimmy Dale says...
>
>>http://www.hcso.tampa.fl.us/pub/default.asp?/online/qdisp/BN=03058540
>>
>
>

3057. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-22 22:33:03 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031122173303.29149.00000817@mb-m10.aol.com>
Source record: 82633

>I'm a no code tech and a Michael Jackson fan too. don't be mean to my hero.
>

Are all you CBplussers like MJ?

3058. Hudson Division Director Race

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-22 22:38:33 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3FBFE56E.A97738FF@earthlink.net>
Source record: 82634

"SB QST ARL ARLB067
ARLB067 Fallon Retains Hudson Division Directorship

Frank Fallon, N2FF, retained his seat as Director of the League's
Hudson Division, defeating Vice Director Steve Mendelsohn, W2ML,
1933 to 1470..."

Sometimes the gods smile.

Dave K8MN

3059. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-22 23:02:33 UTC
From: N8WWM <N8WWM@home.nut>
Message-ID: <bpopu902tjn@drn.newsguy.com>
Source record: 82635

I can't speak for all of them. Whats not to like?

In article <20031122173303.29149.00000817@mb-m10.aol.com>, WA8ULX says...
>
>>I'm a no code tech and a Michael Jackson fan too. don't be mean to my hero.
>>
>
>Are all you CBplussers like MJ?

3060. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-22 23:24:13 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0311221524.5b925c28@posting.google.com>
Source record: 82636

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20031122145806.11891.00002451@mb-m11.aol.com>...
> In article <Xns943AE8F62DA6Belektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun
> <alun@1stcounsel.com> writes:

> >I can absolutely guarantee that it is not a point of view
> >shared by the FCC, and it makes little sense to me either.
>
> Heresy.
>
> All know that ham radio is governed by the BoD at Newington.
>
> So it shall always be.
>
> Amen.
>
> dit dit

Praise be to Hiram.

didit

3061. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-22 23:28:09 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3FBFF10D.A7FF425A@earthlink.net>
Source record: 82637

Brian wrote:
>
> lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20031122145806.11891.00002451@mb-m11.aol.com>...
> > In article <Xns943AE8F62DA6Belektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun
> > <alun@1stcounsel.com> writes:
>
> > >I can absolutely guarantee that it is not a point of view
> > >shared by the FCC, and it makes little sense to me either.
> >
> > Heresy.
> >
> > All know that ham radio is governed by the BoD at Newington.
> >
> > So it shall always be.
> >
> > Amen.
> >
> > dit dit
>
> Praise be to Hiram.
>
> didit

Always nice to have an affirmation from Len's Little Electrolyte.

Dave K8MN

3062. Re: Happy Veterans Day

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-22 23:31:37 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0311221531.4e1ac14c@posting.google.com>
Source record: 82638

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0311201957.419c7788@posting.google.com>...
> "Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<sQbvb.10973$Rk5.9643@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
>
> > Gunny Robeson wants to be CO of rrap....(SNIP)
>
> Untrue, but I am sure it makes you feel better to think so.

Agreed. Obviously untrue. Steve doesn't know the diff between a CO and a JAFO.

3063. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-22 23:36:13 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3FBFF2F1.56F4AFA4@earthlink.net>
Source record: 82639

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <HUivb.11516$Rk5.6844@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dwight
> Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> writes:
>
> > Is there anyone out there who actually believes Michael Jackson is really
> >innocent of this latest charge?
>
> He is obviously GUILTY because he has never taken an amateur
> radio test or earned that epitome of radio respect: Morsemanship.

Sounds like the resident of Neverland meets a resident of Fantasyland.

> I will suggest that you contact the FCC and put forth a petition to
> have Jackson permanently banned from having anything to do with
> U.S. amateur radio.
>
> dit dit

To the best of my knowledge, Michael has never spent any time
pontificating here. You, on the other hand...

Dave K8MN

3064. Re: Happy Veterans Day

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-22 23:37:29 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0311221537.6f3aacd2@posting.google.com>
Source record: 82640

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3FBEC972.F3478CFC@earthlink.net>...
> Brian wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3FBD8E3D.F33CD558@earthlink.net>...
> > > Brian wrote:
> > > >
> > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3FBC4FE3.D2067EC6@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3FB97CC4.5A958465@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > >
> > > > > > > You've never come up with a straight answer for an explanation about
> > > > > > > Frankline Roosevelt referring to himself as "President Roosevelt".
> > > > > >
> > > > > >
> > > > > > > Dave K8MN
> > > > > >
> > > > > > I took an excerpt from someone else's material. The part in the
> > > > > > quotation marks is Franklin[e] Roosevelt's quote. You typically find
> > > > > > quotes within quatation marks, or at least I do. Do you have trouble
> > > > > > identifying quotation marks? Please let me help you.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > They look like this: "quoted material"
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Please notice that the quoted material really is within the quotation
> > > > > > marks.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > The material is then referenced to a web site where I encouraged
> > > > > > readers to click and read the entire article for themselves. Do you
> > > > > > have trouble clicking on a hyperlink? Please let me help you.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Using the mouse, navigate your cursor to the location of the
> > > > > > hyperlink. When the cursor is over the hyperlink, left click once.
> > > > > > It really is that simple, and I'm glad to have been of assistance.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > After this little episode of educating you yet another time, your
> > > > > > self-imposed stupidity cannot be excused any longer. Please deal with
> > > > > > it in a more constructive manner.
> > > > >
> > > > > Sorry, little electrolyte, you wrote "Franklin Roosevelt is to have
> > > > > said:". That was followed by more material copied from a web site by

> > > > > you. Just because you provide links to material does not obligate me to
> > > > > use them or even to feign interest in doing so. Now, let's take a look
> > > > > at what you cribbed and posted:
> > > > >
> > > > > Quote
> > > > > Concerning the "Bonus Army" of 1932, where veterans of The War to End
> > > > > All Wars (1917/1918) were due a bonus in 1945, but wanted payment
> > > > > early because they lost their homes in the Great Depression, Franklin
> > > > > Roosevelt is to have said:
> > > > >
> > > > > ------------
> > > > > In the end, some money was paid to veterans but not without further
> > > > > difficulties. Within a year of the Bonus Army Incident, President
> > > > > Roosevelt imposed the Economy Act of 1933 which cut veterans
> > > > > disability allowances by 25%. In the effort to cut federal expenses,
> > > > > veterans were viewed as having inordinate special status over
> > > > > civilians. During the 1932 election campaign, he had publicly
> > > > > proclaimed: "No one [merely] because he wore a uniform must therefore
> > > > > be placed in a special class of beneficiaries over and above all other
> > > > > citizens. The fact of wearing a uniform does not mean that he can
> > > > > demand and receive from his government a benefit which no other
> > > > > citizen receives."
> > > > > end quote ======================
> > > > >
> > > > > Now, what do you make of that colon hanging at the end of "Franklin
> > > > > Roosevelt is to have said:"? What does it indicate to you.
> > > > >
> > > > > You can't place blame on me because you can't get your act together. If
> > > > > what you posted wasn't what you meant to convey or if the words aren't
> > > > > yours (since you've ignored common English rules for quoting someone
> > > > > else), perhaps you'll want to look the material over next time.
> > > > >
> > > > > Dave K8MN
> > > >
> > > > Dave, you just revealed that you really did understand the post, and
> > > > that your sel-imposed stupidity is just another act for us to be
> > > > amused with. Congratulations.
> > >
> > > You'll recall that I asked if you thought Franklin Roosevelt called
> > > himself "President Roosevelt". That didn't indicate confusion on my
> > > part. It pointed out an inconsistency in your post. Now you've spent
> > > days attempting to defend your error.
> >
> >
> > You've spent days dumb-assing your way through this and now you say
> > you didn't know if FDR referred to himself as "President Roosevelt."
>
> Your logic is quite unique. You screw up and that is, in some way,
> supposed to reflect badly on me for noticing. Fact is, you didn't post
> what old Franklin is to have said.

Dave, yes, it does reflect badly on you, but not for noticing. But for playing the idiot as if you didn't understand the intent of the post and asking stupid questions. Too bad for you. You just keep playing your idiot self.

3065. Re: Happy Veterans Day

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-22 23:44:38 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0311221544.42db7a00@posting.google.com>
Source record: 82641

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0311220204.6c393478@posting.google.com>...

> Brain's still stymied by "authorization" and "acceptance".
>
> 73
>
> Steve, K4YZ

Stebe remains stymied by "CO" and "JAFO." Maybe next time he plays
CAP JAFO he can visit the Judge Advocate and have his ignorance
removed at no charge. It's a pity to remain ignorant for so long when
free resources are available.

3066. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-22 23:44:45 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.horthi0.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>
Source record: 82642

On Sat, 22 Nov 2003 19:38:08 GMT, Dee D. Flint wrote:

>> In reality we rent the place from Fannie May or Freddy Mac, whomever
>> wound up with the paper..... We know it, they know it.....
>>
>
>But there are advantages. As the owner (even though heavily mortgaged), you
>can put up antennas or remodel or whatever without asking the landlord. And
>since the interest is tax deductable, you can have a nicer place for the
>same money than if it was just a rental.

That's why we bought when we first got together (discounting the
four months it took for us to merge our separate rented apartments
and find what we wanted). When we bought our present place, it
helped that we came in with 50% equity....

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

From a Clearing in the Silicon Forest
Beaverton (Washington County) Oregon

3067. Re: test - pls ignore

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-22 23:45:56 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0311221545.1cc4415f@posting.google.com>
Source record: 82643

TOM BLACKWELL <decision@sbcglobal.net> wrote in message
news:<3FBD16F7.A4F11306@sbcglobal.net>...
> test

Read you Lima Charlie how you me over?

3068. Re: 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-22 23:55:32 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0311221555.50f92dfc@posting.google.com>
Source record: 82644

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20031120150357.28496.00002154@mb-m18.aol.com>...

> It should be noted that FCC 98-143 comment
> documents are still on public record and the last comment filed was in
> September, 2003; official close of 98-143 comment period was 15
> January, 1999. That last filer is Peter Alterman, PhD, W2CDO.
> [Way to go, higher education! :-)]

Len, he may have been a post-restructuring PhD.

You know they now give 'em out in cereal boxes. I think Bruce got one.

3069. Re: No!!! Re: Do Hams get 11 Meters Back

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-23 00:09:32 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3FBFFABC.8050703@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 82645
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.shortwave

>
>
>>
>>
>>
>You speak Spanish? ;)
>
>

No, but that could explain my inability to copy any of the comms.
Foreign languages all sound like random noise to me.

3070. Re: Hudson Division Director Race

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-23 00:11:55 UTC
From: Tommy Toothless <hfstbum78909@nospam.yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <1069547373.785132@newshost03.voicenet.com>
Source record: 82646
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.shortwave

I find this all 2-B rather curious.

There are 28,913 Hams in the Hudson Division. (ARRL census)

Of these 28,913 only a paltry 3,403 bothered
to vote in this election.

Am I missing something here or is this really
worth giving two shi+s about..?

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3FBFE56E.A97738FF@earthlink.net...
> "SB QST ARL ARLB067
> ARLB067 Fallon Retains Hudson Division Directorship
>
> Frank Fallon, N2FF, retained his seat as Director of the League's
> Hudson Division, defeating Vice Director Steve Mendelsohn, W2ML,
> 1933 to 1470..."
>
> Sometimes the gods smile.
>
> Dave K8MN

3071. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-23 00:44:20 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <EpTvb.17568$Wy4.11613@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 82647

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:PgKvb.16802$Wy4.7484@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> "Mike Coslo" wrote:
> > N2EY wrote:
> > > (snip) Is that bad? Are you against direct
> > > democracy and polling of those most affected?
> > >
> > > (snip) You're avoiding the central issue. I think
> > > you know that if such a poll were actually taken,
> > > you might not like the results. (snip)
> >
> > Bingo! This issue seems to run along "party lines".
> > I'm just about certain that the more non-amateurs
> > included in any poll, the lower the support for
> > Morse code, and vice versa.
>
> I think you and Jim are both (perhaps intentionally) missing the point.
> This issue is not limited to just the ham radio community. The frequencies
> we use don't belong just to us - they belong to the entire country (all
> Americans). As such, the FCC has to take all Americans into account when
> making the rules and regulations to govern the use of those frequencies,
and
> the license requirements for those frequencies. Therefore, Hans is right -
> if you're going to instead propose some type of poll to help establish
what
> those license requirements might be, it should include all Americans.
>
> As for myself, if you're going to ask Amateur Radio Operators if code
> testing is necessary today to meet the goals and purposes of the Amateur
> Radio Service (as defined in Part 97) and serves some valid need as far as
> the American public is concerned, then I would love to see the results of
> that poll - it would be very interesting to see how many (or how few)
> operators would actually place the goals and purposes of the Amateur Radio
> Service, and the needs of the American public, above their own desire to
> keep a code testing requirement.
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

Why Dwight, you doubt that all hams wouldn't "vote" based on common
sense, logic and what is rational as a requirement in the 21st century??
:-) :-)

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

3072. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-23 00:49:27 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <ruTvb.17573$Wy4.4258@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 82648

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:VmJvb.16582$Wy4.9876@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> "N2EY" wrote:
> >
> > (snip) What we're saying is that on the single
> > issue of continued Morse code testing, (snip)
> >
> > (snip) Not me. I EARNED mine. I encourage
> > others to EARN theirs. Is that bad? Shall I
> > apologize for my accomplishments and sit idly
> > by while others try to trash a community I
> > belong to?
>
> If what you're demanding to "earn" that license is unnecessary and based
> on a false premise, then I think it is bad. You haven't established, at
> least not to my satisfaction (nor the satisfaction of the ITU, FCC, and
> several countries around the world),

Actually, that would be ALL countries since not one country asserted a
position
of retaining the mandatory code knowledge for all HF hams.

9 countries as of Nov 14th.

> ...why Morse code is necessary (notice I
> said necessary, not enjoyable) for ham radio today. And there is no truth
> whatsoever to the premise that those without code skills in the ham radio
> community are trashing anything. Instead, the vast majority are dedicated,
> well-behaved, enthusiastic, participants of this community.
>
> Several countries around the world have moved, or are moving, forward to
> eliminate the Morse Code testing requirement while the United States sits
> back and watches.

The list is available at:

http://www.rsgb.org/licensing/nomorse.htm

> Is this the actions of a modern, progressive, country with
> feet planted firmly on today and eyes on the future? It's time to move on,
> Jim. Morse code is going to be even less necessary in the future. As such,
> Morse Code testing has no ligitimate place in that future
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

Agree completely!

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

3073. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-23 00:54:47 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <rzTvb.17581$Wy4.5232@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 82649

"Alun" <alun@1stcounsel.com> wrote in message
news:Xns943B9D3CC8D00elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
> <snip>
> >> Several countries around the world have moved, or are moving, forward
> >> to
> >>eliminate the Morse Code testing requirement while the United States
> >>sits back and watches.
> >
> > What's the count now?
>
> I think they include at least the UK, Belgium, Germany, Switzerland, the
> Netherlands, Norway, Singapore, Papua New Guinea and Australia (not until
> Jan 1st). New Zealand may actually do it before Australia, as they have
> said it would be before the end of the year, but have given no date. I am
> pretty sure I have missed a couple out, too.

See the list at:

http://www.rsgb.org/licensing/nomorse.htm

> > How many countries have eliminated the code test, vs. how many have
> > retained it so far?
>
> Most do still retain it, but I think this has far more to do with
> bureaucracy than intent

The changes to government regulations, in the USAand in many other
countries, take time. Did Jim expect an overnight change in the 100+
countries? Frankly, I'm pretty amazed at the ones that have been able to
do so on such a short time interval.

> >>Is this the actions of a modern, progressive, country with feet planted
> >>firmly on today and eyes on the future?
> >
> > What does all that mean, exactly? Besides the removal of the last
> > remaining vestige of code testing?
> >
> >> It's time to move on, Jim.
> >
> > To what?
> >
> > Let's say that tomorrow FCC just dumps Element 1. One sentence:
> > "Element 1 is waived for all applicants, pending revision of the
> > rules". Could happen, y'know.

Bring it on!!!

> Probably will
>
> > What happens next?
>
> Lots of upgrades, plus no-coders on 10m the next day

Works for me. Anyone see a problem in that?

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

3074. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-23 01:15:52 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3FC00A4B.BB1885EB@earthlink.net>
Source record: 82650

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <Xns943AE8F62DA6Belektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun
> <alun@1stcounsel.com> writes:

> >Well, I guess that's a religeous issue, so I won't be able to convince you
> >otherwise.
> >
> >If you look me up you'll see I'm an Extra, and you'll be able to figure
> >out that I passed 20 wpm. What you won't see, is that I've been a ham
> >since 1980, not 1992, as I'm not originally from this country.
>
> Alun, with all due respect, such experience ist VERBOTEN in this
> chat room.

Len, with all the respect that you feel you're due, this still isn't a
chat room.

> The requirement to exist in this chat room requires a struct obediance
> to morsemanship, tradition forever rooted in old ways back before all
> the morseodist regulars ever existed.

That flies in the face of evidence that there are a wide number of views
expressed here. Once again, this isn't a chat room.

> >However, ham radio is not a job or a vocation, just a hobby.

Hobby, avocation, interest, passion--it still boils down to the fact
that you aren't involved in it.

> In this chat room, the REGULARS maintain a LIFESTYLE of devotion,
> obediance to love honor and obey amateur radio in all its past glory.

This isn't a chat room and I submit that you have no way of knowing what
regulars who post here do in amateur radio. You don't have a close
friendship with any of them and you aren't connected to amateur radio.
By the way, aren't YOU a regular here?

> LIFESTYLES take precedence over logic, common sense, and
> anything else not associated with amateur radio (except Michael
> Jackson, foreign policy, overall economic decisions by government
> and partisan politics).

It would be interesting to see you come up with proof of the LIFESTYLES
claim or of your peculiar ideas about logic, common sense, etc. If
logic and common sense prevailed, you'd likely not haunt this newgroup
at all.

> Ham radio to the regulars is far more than a vocation.

Excuse me, aren't you a regular? Do you believe that ham radio is more
than a vocation? Has anyone else here told you that they believe it?

> Vocations
> in radio are to be pejorated, denigrated, spat upon, reviled, made fun
> of and other niceties of the TURF where chat room homies consider
> their 'hood.

Now you're blowing smoke. I can't remember anyone taking shots at my
voacation in communications except YOU. So the guy complaining about
others not respecting his work in radio is the same guy insulting my
work in radio. Isn't that precious?

Good old Len "Do As I say and not as I do" Anderson!

Dave K8MN

3075. Re: Happy Veterans Day

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-23 01:24:01 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3FC00C33.4E178A26@earthlink.net>
Source record: 82701

Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3FBEC972.F3478CFC@earthlink.net>...
> > Brian wrote:
> > >
> > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3FBD8E3D.F33CD558@earthlink.net>...
> > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3FBC4FE3.D2067EC6@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3FB97CC4.5A958465@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > You've never come up with a straight answer for an explanation about
> > > > > > > > Frankline Roosevelt referring to himself as "President Roosevelt".
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > Dave K8MN
> > > > > >
> > > > > > I took an excerpt from someone else's material. The part in the
> > > > > > quotation marks is Franklin[e] Roosevelt's quote. You typically find
> > > > > > quotes within quatation marks, or at least I do. Do you have trouble
> > > > > > identifying quotation marks? Please let me help you.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > They look like this: "quoted material"
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Please notice that the quoted material really is within the quotation
> > > > > > marks.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > The material is then referenced to a web site where I encouraged
> > > > > > readers to click and read the entire article for themselves. Do you
> > > > > > have trouble clicking on a hyperlink? Please let me help you.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Using the mouse, navigate your cursor to the location of the
> > > > > > hyperlink. When the cursor is over the hyperlink, left click once.
> > > > > > It really is that simple, and I'm glad to have been of assistance.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > After this little episode of educating you yet another time, your
> > > > > > self-imposed stupidity cannot be excused any longer. Please deal with
> > > > > > it in a more constructive manner.

> > > > > >
> > > > > > Sorry, little electrolyte, you wrote "Franklin Roosevelt is to have
> > > > > > said:". That was followed by more material copied from a web site by
> > > > > > you. Just because you provide links to material does not obligate me to
> > > > > > use them or even to feign interest in doing so. Now, let's take a look
> > > > > > at what you cribbed and posted:
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Quote
> > > > > > Concerning the "Bonus Army" of 1932, where veterans of The War to End
> > > > > > All Wars (1917/1918) were due a bonus in 1945, but wanted payment
> > > > > > early because they lost their homes in the Great Depression, Franklin
> > > > > > Roosevelt is to have said:
> > > > > >
> > > > > > ------------
> > > > > > In the end, some money was paid to veterans but not without further
> > > > > > difficulties. Within a year of the Bonus Army Incident, President
> > > > > > Roosevelt imposed the Economy Act of 1933 which cut veterans
> > > > > > disability allowances by 25%. In the effort to cut federal expenses,
> > > > > > veterans were viewed as having inordinate special status over
> > > > > > civilians. During the 1932 election campaign, he had publicly
> > > > > > proclaimed: "No one [merely] because he wore a uniform must therefore
> > > > > > be placed in a special class of beneficiaries over and above all other
> > > > > > citizens. The fact of wearing a uniform does not mean that he can
> > > > > > demand and receive from his government a benefit which no other
> > > > > > citizen receives."
> > > > > > end quote ======================
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Now, what do you make of that colon hanging at the end of "Franklin
> > > > > > Roosevelt is to have said:"? What does it indicate to you.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > You can't place blame on me because you can't get your act together. If
> > > > > > what you posted wasn't what you meant to convey or if the words aren't
> > > > > > yours (since you've ignored common English rules for quoting someone
> > > > > > else), perhaps you'll want to look the material over next time.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Dave K8MN
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Dave, you just revealed that you really did understand the post, and
> > > > > > that your sel-imposed stupidity is just another act for us to be
> > > > > > amused with. Congratulations.
> > > > >
> > > > > You'll recall that I asked if you thought Franklin Roosevelt called
> > > > > himself "President Roosevelt". That didn't indicate confusion on my
> > > > > part. It pointed out an inconsistency in your post. Now you've spent
> > > > > days attempting to defend your error.
> > >
> > > > You've spent days dumb-assing your way through this and now you say
> > > > you didn't know if FDR referred to himself as "President Roosevelt."
> >

> > Your logic is quite unique. You screw up and that is, in some way,
> > supposed to reflect badly on me for noticing. Fact is, you didn't post
> > what old Franklin is to have said.
>
> Dave, yes, it does reflect badly on you, but not for noticing.

I can't agree.

> But
> for playing the idiot as if you didn't understand the intent of the
> post and asking stupid questions. Too bad for you. You just keep
> playing your idiot self.

You post something which claims to quote Roosevelt. It doesn't quote
Roosevelt. I point it out. That makes me an idiot. Is that pretty much
your view? I'm starting to get the hang of the way you think.

Dave K8MN

3076. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-23 01:25:52 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031122202552.00773.00000859@mb-m28.aol.com>
Source record: 82703

>I can't speak for all of them. Whats not to like?
>

Yea thats what I thought.

3077. Re: Hudson Division Director Race

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-23 01:26:05 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3FC00CB2.CAA3582B@earthlink.net>
Source record: 82702
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.shortwave

Tommy Toothless wrote:
>
> I find this all 2-B rather curious.
>
> There are 28,913 Hams in the Hudson Division. (ARRL census)
>
> Of these 28,913 only a paltry 3,403 bothered
> to vote in this election.
>
> Am I missing something here or is this really
> worth giving two shi+s about..?

You're missing something and you're rude.

Dave K8MN

> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:3FBFE56E.A97738FF@earthlink.net...
> > "SB QST ARL ARLB067
> > ARLB067 Fallon Retains Hudson Division Directorship
> >
> > Frank Fallon, N2FF, retained his seat as Director of the League's
> > Hudson Division, defeating Vice Director Steve Mendelsohn, W2ML,
> > 1933 to 1470..."
> >
> > Sometimes the gods smile.
> >
> > Dave K8MN

3078. Re: Union Thugs at work in Wal-Mart

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-23 01:35:15 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <m9Uvb.2452$Z61.1120@news01.roc.ny>
Source record: 82704

Yep, one can tell the "conservatives". Always oppose change. Frankly, I am glad that a few folks wanted some change. Folks like Washington, Jefferson, Adams, Hancock ... to name a few. I assume you wish we were part of the United Kingdom, right? Certainly not *left* (gasp!).

Maybe, if what you suggest is true, they should adapt a slogan. Maybe "I am not a crook" would do (thanx and a tip o' the hat to Richard Nixon).

BTW, this is just a tad off topic, no?

Oh well ... feed the trolls.

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

"Democrap Party" <democrats@suckliberals.org> wrote in message
news:bph68v$c34$0@pita.alt.net...
> x-no-archive: yes
> "Billary" <Billary@vastrightwingconspiracy.org> wrote in message
> news:NNOub.13539$KI4.8873@twister.tampabay.rr.com...
> > All the news about Wal-mart is nothing but standard Union Thug
> Unionization
> > tactics at work. I've seen these Union tactics before. There are three
> or
> > four standard tactics:
> >
> > (a) Fudge the overtime issue by having your shills work overtime without
> > punching the clock and without the boss knowing. Then when you have
> enough
> > "evidence" go to the feds and make a case of "forced overtime". (b) Buy
> $$$
> > off the employees who oppose the unionization effort or (c) threaten the
> > guys who oppose the unionization effort. (d) Have a 3rd party contractor
> > hire some illegals, then inform the feds that "Wal-Mart" is employing
> > illegals. Then go to the papers with the "Illegals" story.
> >
> > We *KNOW* what's really going on at Wal-mart. We ain't no silly rabbits
> out
> > here in fly over country ya know...neither is the rest of conservative
> > America.
> >
> >
>
>

3079. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-23 02:03:00 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <ozUvb.2453$4l1.611@news01.roc.ny>
Source record: 82705

Hello, Dwight.

Although way off topic (as are many threads here), I couldn't resist this one.

They say where there is smoke, there is fire. The smoke is so thick around Michael Jackson that they will probably argue that the smoke is too thick so you can't see and therefore prove fire. I'll grant the one arguement that will come up - there will be folks out to make money. But it would appear that this may well not be the case this time. What really galls me is that some folks that have a *lot* of money (I'm talking hundreds of millions of dollars) or political connections appear to be able to buy their way out of nasty situations (Whitewater comes to mind here as well as OJ).

Personally, I think the guy is right off his rocker, but the name of the game should be to protect society (especially kids). Since his close call in the early 90s hasn't seemed to have any effect on him, he is going to have to be put away somewhere where he can't cause more damage(assuming he is convicted). I still worry about what money can buy. If he isn't able to buy out the victim, he can sure afford to buy a ton of attourneys. How does one district attourney with a staff of attourneys that are already very busy deal with someone who can keep a stable full of attourneys coming in from every direction?

I also believe that he married Lisa Marie Presley as a smoke screen. How many divorces so far? I believe, and please correct me if I am wrong, that he was never married until that mess 10 years ago or so. Suddenly, he gets married. And divorced. And ... so on and so on.

Frankly, I don't care what someone does in bed - as long as they leave kids and non-consenting adults out of it; especially kids.

I totally agree with your accessment as to classic symptoms of a pedophile. Neverland should be renamed Never - Ever land. Why just the kids and not the whole family? I believe he was paying his security guards $18.00 per hour over 10 years ago. For the wealthy, this may well be normal - but it also tends to keep those guards' mouths shut.

Sorry for the long ramblings. I suspect, as do you, that this case is going to be another media circus court case. In all honesty, where are they going to find jurors? Oh - I forgot, the Michael Jackson fans. I'd be hard put to be impartial with all of the other known facts (none of which is that he actually molested a kid, but, as I mentioned, there is a ton of smoke and I guarantee there is a fire).

If he isn't convicted, how old do these characters get before their libido finally slows down?

Sorry for being so long winded, Dwight, but this case has me quite upset
(and I think most folks should be upset).

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

3080. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-23 02:05:03 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <jBUvb.2454$G82.118@news01.roc.ny>
Source record: 82706

'cmon. Read the headers. You just fed a troll :)

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20031122173303.29149.00000817@mb-m10.aol.com...
> >I'm a no code tech and a Michael Jackson fan too. don't be mean to my
hero.
> >
>
> Are all you CBplussers like MJ?

3081. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-23 02:08:33 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <BEUvb.2455$Hu2.1540@news01.roc.ny>
Source record: 82707

Dwight,

I almost agree with you except on that "clear and present danger". I wouldn't want my kid to go near that place; then again, you mention there is no law against stupidity. Sigh ...

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

3082. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-23 02:09:44 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bpp5g6$rs7@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 82709

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:WxIvb.16407$Wy4.9415@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> "Larry Roll K3LT" wrote:
> >
> > I think M. J.'s brother Jermaine has pretty much
> > set the tone for what will happen during the trial
> > through his use of the term "modern day lynching."
> > In spite of Michael's obvious attempt to look like
> > a "white" (caucasian) person, the race card will
> > be played, and M. J.'s "blackness" will once
> > again emerge, inspite of the fact that his face looks
> > like it was painted with Sherman Williams Flat
> > Latex (White). (snip)
>
>
> Well, I truly hope race doesn't become an issue. But, like you, I
suspect
> it will.
>

Uh, 'scuse me. Knock knock. Larry just made race the issue from his
perspective? Hellooooooo.

>
> > Michael Jackson will not be convicted. The race
> > card will be played to the maximum extent possible,
> > and the black public will be placed on standby to
> > over-react to any possible negative outcome for
> > Jackson. Therefore, to save life and property, the
> > O. J. Simpson debacle will have to be repeated.
> > This may not be justice, but it will be necessary in
> > order to ensure that many innocent people aren't
> > killed in the riotous aftermath of his possible
> > conviction. (snip)
>
>
> And I also hope we don't see riots and other violence after a
conviction.
> But, with the news coverage this case is going to get, that is certainly a
> possibility. However, because of the timing, I don't think it will happen.
> This court case will probably not start until sometime next summer and
many
> will be watching the activities surrounding the coming elections instead.
>

Oh good grief. This is ludicrous! Do you realize what a mockery you are making of the United States legal system? Not to mention how idiotic this thread is!!

> By the way, on the issue of riots and innocent people being killed, my
> brother was killed (in FL) less than a week after the LA riots (Rodney
> King), by two black guys who reportedly watched the riots enthusiastically
> on television and later told two family members, supposedly in a joking
> manner, that they were going to kill a white guy. About fourty-five minutes
> later, my brother died with two bullets in his brain, fired from a gun held
> less then six inches from his head. The other employees in the office (three
> young black men) were not injured, but did identify the attackers. The two
> men pled guilty to a lesser charge. Because some money (less than $20), and
> a small amount of drugs (suspected), was taken, this crime was reported as a
> robbery (possibly drug related), not a race crime. Clearly, I don't want to
> see a repeat of that (for anybody).
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
>

From Michael Jackson's arrest to the above. Can it get any more hilarious?

Kim W5TIT

3083. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-23 02:12:43 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <vlUvb.2457$mt2.2148@news01.roc.ny>
Source record: 82708

:))

Thanx for a chuckle, Mike!

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:S2Rvb.9553$m84.3566290@news1.news.adelphia.net...
> N8WWM wrote:
>
> > i wish i could sleep over jackos house.
>
> Too old?
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -
>

3084. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-23 02:29:06 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bpp609$2vo@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 82710

"Jim Hampton" <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote in message
news:ozUvb.2453$4l1.611@news01.roc.ny...
> Hello, Dwight.
>
> Although way off topic (as are many threads here), I couldn't resist this
> one.
>
> They say where there is smoke, there is fire. The smoke is so thick
around
> Michael Jackson that they will probably argue that the smoke is too thick
so
> you can't see and therefore prove fire. I'll grant the one arguement that
> will come up - there will be folks out to make money. But it would appear
> that this may well not be the case this time. What really galls me is
that
> some folks that have a *lot* of money (I'm talking hundreds of millions of
> dollars) or political connections appear to be able to buy their way out
of
> nasty situations (Whitewater comes to mind here as well as OJ).
>
> Personally, I think the guy is right off his rocker, but the name of the
> game should be to protect society (especially kids). Since his close call
> in the early 90s hasn't seemed to have any effect on him, he is going to
> have to be put away somewhere where he can't cause more damage(assuming he
> is convicted). I still worry about what money can buy. If he isn't able
to
> buy out the victim, he can sure afford to buy a ton of attourneys. How
does
> one district attourney with a staff of attourneys that are already very
busy
> deal with someone who can keep a stable full of attourneys coming in from
> every direction?
>
> I also believe that he married Lisa Marie Presley as a smoke screen. How
> many divorces so far? I believe, and please correct me if I am wrong,
that
> he was never married until that mess 10 years ago or so. Suddenly, he
gets
> married. And divorced. And ... so on and so on.
>
> Frankly, I don't care what someone does in bed - as long as they leave
kids
> and non-consenting adults out of it; especially kids.
>

> I totally agree with your accessment as to classic symptoms of a
pedophile.
> Neverland should be renamed Never - Ever land. Why just the kids and not
> the whole family? I believe he was paying his security guards $18.00 per
> hour over 10 years ago. For the wealthy, this may well be normal - but it
> also tends to keep those guards' mouths shut.
>
> Sorry for the long ramblings. I suspect, as do you, that this case is
going
> to be another media circus court case. In all honesty, where are they
going
> to find jurors? Oh - I forgot, the Michael Jackson fans. I'd be hard put
> to be impartial with all of the other known facts (none of which is that
he
> actually molested a kid, but, as I mentioned, there is a ton of smoke and
I
> guarantee there is a fire).
>
> If he isn't convicted, how old do these characters get before their libido
> finally slows down?
>
> Sorry for being so long winded, Dwight, but this case has me quite upset
> (and I think most folks should be upset).
>
>
> 73 from Rochester, NY
> Jim AA2QA
>

Well, personally, I think it's rather interesting that it is the Michael Jackson story that draws such a debate--when the Catholic priests, bishops, and whomever else in the Catholic Church, have been in the news for at least the last two years...and with increasing evidence, admitted guilt, admitted "sweeping it under the rug," and adults who were kids when they were raped by the priests!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!! In the Michael Jackson case(s), there have been no convictions--only speculation and rumors thusfar.

I am not pointing up innocence or guilt--only puzzled by the weirdness of frenzy for the Michael Jackson story; when we have a whole host of tragedies--*proven* not just supposed--from the Catholic Church... I just don't get you folks...

Kim W5TIT

3085. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-23 03:39:26 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <OZVvb.15836$Rk5.10832@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 82711

"Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote:

> Oh good grief. This is ludicrous! Do you realize what a mockery you are
> making of the United States legal system?

The US legal system has made a mockery of itself, without any help from Larry & Dwight. OJ walked, MJ will walk, Malvo will cop insanity, Scott Peterson will walk, and Zacarias Moussaoui is making a fool of our inept Attorney General Ashcroft.

73, Hans, K0HB

3086. Re: KG4LEG new jammer in tampa bay on 146.640 N9EE wide area repeater

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-23 04:21:55 UTC
From: hamradioman2000@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <e95066a4.0311222021.19cd948@posting.google.com>
Source record: 82712
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.swap

heres an example of the saturday night traders net that 146.640 has.
it is an elcelent place to buy and sell items, and is quite popular
with the checkins..

Hello All:
Here is the listing for November 22, 2003

Jim WA8JSC has a 20 Ft Pushup Pole with a 10 Ft Mast Pipe, Radio Shack
Rotor and 2 Two Element Quads for 2 Meters. All for $75.00.
Contact: 64 Repeater

Don W4TQL is looking for a TS-180 tuner for an Icom 706M2G.
Contact: 352-854-3327

Ev W4IMU is looking for an HF Vertical Antenna that covers 10 - 80
Meters.
Contact: epowell@tampbay.rr.com

Phil W4AIG is looking for a Rotor for VHF.
Contact:philipvelderssr@juno.com

Jay W0JAY has a Separation cable for an Icom 207H. Make Offer.
Contact: w0jay@cs.com

Loren W9LBW has a Dentron GLA-1000B HF Amp. Covers 10-80 Meters.
500-600 Watts output. $250.00
Contact: w9lbw@tampbay.rr.com

Shannon N0JAM has a Radio Shack 30' Pushup Pole and 50' of 9913 Coax.
Both for $30.00 or trade for a Base Scanner.
Contact: n0jam@hotmail.com

Pete KA1WBE is looking for a Kenwood TS-820 for parts.
Contact: ka1wbe@hotmail.com

73 to All
Bobby
KE4YFJ

Check out the Official 64 Repeater Web Site. www.the64machine.org
Dont forget to Vote on the start time of the Traders Net on the web
site.

3087. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-23 04:40:48 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20031122234048.29815.00001912@mb-m21.aol.com>
Source record: 82713

In article <BWKvb.16954$Wy4.9965@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> writes:

> Were you watching Fox television yesterday? They had a woman on who is
>still planning to send her son to sleep over with Jackson, even after all
>that has happened over the last few days. Don't ask me why she would do it.
>I have absolutely no idea why anyone would do something that stupid.
>
>
>Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

Dwight:

I hope she was wearing a strait jacket, and being attended by two of those nice young men in the clean white coats while she was giving that interview.

73 de Larry, K3LT

3088. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-23 04:40:48 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20031122234048.29815.00001911@mb-m21.aol.com>
Source record: 82714

In article <20031122145804.11891.00002450@mb-m11.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) writes:

> He is obviously GUILTY because he has never taken an amateur
> radio test or earned that epitome of radio respect: Morsemanship.
>
> I will suggest that you contact the FCC and put forth a petition to
> have Jackson permanently banned from having anything to do with
> U.S. amateur radio.
>
> dit dit

Lennie:

This thread is off-topic, by the admission of the poster who initiated it. So far, everyone except Bruce, Kim, and yourself has recognized that fact and has replied accordingly.

That's all I'm going to say; I'll allow everyone else to draw their own conclusions.

73 de Larry, K3LT

3089. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-23 04:40:49 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20031122234049.29815.00001913@mb-m21.aol.com>
Source record: 82716

In article <20031122094615.16483.00000604@mb-m23.aol.com>, wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) writes:

>Rumor has it MJ is also a No Code CBplusser. I wonder if he is an NCI Member?

Bruce:

MJ is a sick, emotionally-twisted weirdo. What does that have to do with being an NCI member? NCI members are simply people who disagree with the concept of Morse code testing as a licensing requirement in the ARS. There's nothing illegal or mentally ill about taking such a stand. To say that there is only allows them to make the same claim about those of us on the PCTA side.

Statements such as the one you made above are nothing less than pure silliness, and do not serve to advance any legitimate cause.

73 de Larry, K3LT

3090. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-23 04:40:50 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20031122234050.29815.00001914@mb-m21.aol.com>
Source record: 82715

I've thought about that too. But, how would we hold them responsible - stupidity isn't a crime in this country? Letting a child sleep with an adult is certainly stupid, but we'd have to prove more than that to actually hold the parents responsible. And I can't think of anything specific in the laws we can apply to the parents in this case. Child endangerment is the only thing that comes close, but I don't even think that would fly. To convict, you'd have to show the parents should have known there was a clear and present danger. Since JUST sleeping with an adult is not illegal, that may be a tough case to prove. Anyway, since you said "something" in the first paragraph (not anything specific), perhaps you're having the same problem I'm having.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

Dwight:

Any adult, other than a parent, sleeping with a child is just plain sick -- period, End Of Story. Even in the case of parents, it is definitely not a good idea and should be discouraged to the greatest extent possible, although there are occasional, and rare, times when it may be OK to comfort the child in unusual circumstances causing emotional stress.

Any parent permitting their child to attend "Neverland" ranch, with it's accused child molester and world-famous weirdo in residence, is simply exercising nothing less than a criminal level of negligence. Criminal charges should be sought against the parents of the 12-year old boy in question, and he should be immediately removed from that home and placed in protective custody in a registered foster care facility.

73 de Larry, K3LT

3091. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-23 04:40:50 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20031122234050.29815.00001915@mb-m21.aol.com>
Source record: 82717

In article <bpp5g6$rs7@library1.airnews.net>, "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
writes:

>> By the way, on the issue of riots and innocent people being killed, my
>> brother was killed (in FL) less than a week after the LA riots (Rodney
>> King), by two black guys who reportedly watched the riots enthusiastically
>> on television and later told two family members, supposedly in a joking
>> manner, that they were going to kill a white guy. About fourty-five
>minutes
>> later, my brother died with two bullets in his brain, fired from a gun
>held
>> less then six inches from his head. The other employees in the office
>(three
>> young black men) were not injured, but did identify the attackers. The two
>> men pled guilty to a lesser charge. Because some money (less than $20),
>and
>> a small amount of drugs (suspected), was taken, this crime was reported as
>a
>> robbery (possibly drug related), not a race crime. Clearly, I don't want
>to
>> see a repeat of that (for anybody).
>>
>>
>> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>>
>> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
>>
>
>From Michael Jackson's arrest to the above. Can it get any more hilarious?
>
>Kim W5TIT

Well, folks, here we are now faced with a dual tragedy -- the fact that
Dwight's brother was brutally murdered in a heinous crime of violence,
and the fact that Kim thinks it's "hilarious."

Dwight, you have my heartfelt sympathy and most sincere condolences.

Kim, I can only hope that, as usual, you simply weren't thinking before
you let your fingers spout off their usual gibberish. If you truly meant
what you said, you are beneath contempt.

73 de Larry, K3LT

3092. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-23 05:00:07 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <r9Xvb.15940$Rk5.4212@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 82718

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote

> Even in the case of parents, it is definitely not a good
> idea and should be discouraged to the greatest extent possible...

Larry,

When you become a parent I suspect you'll change your mind. Obviously there is an age where it is not longer appropriate, but I can assure you without reservation that having a couple of fresh bathed toddlers in 'jammies' warm from the dryer snuggle into bed between you and your spouse is one of the most beautiful rewards of parenthood that you could imagine. Until they were school age, we always let our kids to feel free to leave their beds and clamber in with us if the mood struck them. Didn't need to be some dire need of comfort from emotional stress.

73, Hans, K0HB

3093. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-23 05:11:49 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031123001149.02171.00000774@mb-m16.aol.com>
Source record: 82719

>What does that have to do with
>being an NCI member?

Nothing, I just asked if he was a NCI Member, I didnt say he was.

>Statements such as the one you made above are nothing less than pure
>silliness, and do not serve to advance any legitimate cause.
>
>73 de Larry, K3LT
>
>

Larry there is no legitimate cause left, the No-Code, CBplusser, Knuckle Draggers have WON. END of case.

3094. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-23 05:13:24 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031123001324.02171.00000775@mb-m16.aol.com>
Source record: 82720

>So far, everyone except Bruce, Kim, and yourself has recognized that
>fact and has replied accordingly.
>

Who cares Larry, the guy is a FRUIT CAKE.

3095. Re: My Dimmy is a chip off the old block

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-23 05:59:27 UTC
From: Arf! Arf! <DoggieDaze@Liberalz.com>
Message-ID: <bppibs$81m$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 82721
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Dimmy Dale" <Dimmy@flajail.com> wrote in message
news:HXQvb.3175$87.2040@bignews6.bellsouth.net...
http://www.hcso.tampa.fl.us/pub/default.asp?/online/qdisp/BN=03058540

Above post sponsored by a two time felon, Dimmy O'Brainless and his
back-door neophyte, Wogie Wussyman...a mentally unstable hermit currently
under treatment for ongoing mental problems.
Recent legal actions and conviction of Dimmy are available on the Web.
O'Brainless has a Court Order hanging over his head in which he has been
ordered to seek mental health counseling.
Wussyman is curently undergoing similar treatment and has several
prescription drugs he is to take on a daily basis.
Birds of a feather....

3096. Amateur Radio Newsline™ Report 1371 - November 21, 2003

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-23 07:57:18 UTC
From: radionews@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031123025718.00947.00000852@mb-m28.aol.com>
Source record: 82722

Amateur Radio Newsline™ Report 1371 - November 21, 2003

Amateur Radio Newsline report number 1371 with a release date of Friday, November 21, 2003 to follow in 5-4-3-2-1.

The following is a Q-S-T. Australia says goodbye to the Morse code and the FCC says hello to a new way to regulate interference. Find out the details on Amateur Radio Newsline report number 1371 coming your way right now.

(Billboard Cart Here)

**

RESTRUCTURING: AUSTRALIA GOES CODE FREE

Australia is joining the no-code revolution. Q-News Graham Kemp, VK4BB is down-under with the details:

--

The Australian Communications Authority (ACA) is reviewing regulatory and licensing arrangements for the amateur service. A discussion paper was released in August 2003, and public meetings were held in 10 cities around Australia. As a result of this extensive public consultation process, the ACA has decided to discontinue the Morse code proficiency requirement for the amateur service.

Background: Article 25 of the Radio Regulations of the International Telecommunication Union sets out the international arrangements for the amateur service.

The World Radiocommunication Conference (WRC) held from 9 June to 4 July 2003 in Geneva fundamentally changed Article 25. The changes to Article 25 have provided the ACA with an opportunity to review and simplify the current regulatory and licensing arrangements for the amateur service. In August 2003 the ACA released a discussion paper that looked at the changes made to Article 25, as well as exploring future options for the amateur service in Australia.
Morse code proficiency requirement to be removed As a result of an extensive public consultation process, the ACA has decided to discontinue the Morse code proficiency requirement for the amateur service. This decision was made considering public comments at the meetings and initial analysis of submissions to the discussion paper.

The ACA will make interim changes to legislative instruments which will immediately allow access to privileges previously available only to those satisfying Morse code proficiency requirements. The ACA is in the

process of amending the amateur radio licence conditions specified in the Radiocommunications Licence Conditions (Amateur Licence) Determination No. 1 of 1997 to reflect this decision. The amendments will give holders of Intermediate and Limited Amateur licences access to the same frequency bands as Unrestricted Amateur licensees; and holders of the Novice Limited Amateur licence access to the same frequency bands as Novice licensees.

The interim arrangements are expected to come into force on 1 January 2004.

I'm Graham Kemp, VK4BB, of Q-News Australia for the Amateur Radio Newsline.

--

More on this in future Amateur Radio Newsline reports. (Q-News: Note: Print version is expanded from audio report)

**

RADIO LAW: FCC LOOKING AT NEW INTERFERENCE STANDARD

Turning to regulatory news here at home, word that the FCC is looking at another way of determining what it calls acceptable interference levels. Termed "interference temperature," the Commission says that this is a new model for addressing interference that takes into account the actual cumulative R-F energy from transmissions of spectrum-based devices. It would also set a maximum cap on the aggregate of these transmissions.

To test the potential usefulness and applicability of this approach the agency has issued a Notice of Proposed Rulemaking. FCC docket item 03-289 seeks comment on various technical rules that would establish procedures and use the interference temperature model on a limited basis in the 6525 to 6700 MHz and portions of the 12.75 to 13.25 GHz bands.

According to the FCC, the "interference temperature" approach may facilitate more intensive use of the radio spectrum, creating the opportunities for new services and improving the predictability of any interference to existing services. The current approach for managing interference focuses on specifying and limiting the transmit powers of individual spectrum based devices. What impact the adoption of an "interference temperature" standard might have on Amateur Radio operations has yet to be determined. (CGC Communicator, ARNewsline(tm), other published reports)

**

REGULATORY NEWS: FCC APPROVES WIRELESS INTERNET IN HAM SPACE BAND

The FCC has turned down an ARRL request to keep so-called wireless Internet connections out of the 5.650 to 5.670 Gigahertz to avoid interference with the Amateur Satellite Service. This, as the regulatory agency makes another 255 MHz of spectrum available for Wi Fi use. Bill

Pasternak, WA6ITF, reports:

--

In a Report and Order in ET Docket 03-122 released on November 18th, the FCC says it was taking action to alleviate crowding in existing wireless Internet allocations. Also, that it wanted to align wireless Internet connectivity here in the United States with the rest of the world.

Amateur Radio has a secondary allocation from 5.650 to 5.925 Gigahertz. That includes a 20 Megahertz wide satellite downlink segment from 5.830 to 5.850 Gigahertz.

An ARRL Bulletin says that back in September the League expressed concerns about the potential for interference from these wireless devices to Amateur Radio space operations. But in releasing its decision, the FCC says that its dynamic frequency selection and transmitter power control requirements should be adequate to protect amateur operations. This, even though the FCC admits that they are not specifically designed to do so.

For the Amateur Radio Newsline, I'm Bill Pasternak, WA6ITF, in Los Angeles.

--

In rendering its decision the FCC said that it was not persuaded that it should either add to or modify its proposed rules as requested by ARRL. The Federal government itself is the primary user of the entire band. (ARRL Bulletin, FCC)

**

RADIO LAW: FCC COMMISSIONER'S OFFICE CLARIFIES HER "BROADBAND NIRVANA" REMARKS

The office of FCC Commissioner Kathleen Abernathy has expressed regrets that her remarks in a September speech may have failed to make her concerns about potential interference from Broadband over Power Line sufficiently clear. Responding to complaints from the ARRL and individual amateurs, Abernathy's Senior Legal Adviser Matthew A. Brill said that her office is sorry that the Commissioner's remarks may have been interpreted as suggesting an absence of concern over harmful interference.

The ARRL Letter says Brill has assured the League that ensuring that B-P-L and all new technologies avoids causing harmful interference to licensed R-F users is important to Abernathy. Brill termed it as a bedrock position for the Commissioner.

Last September 22nd, in a speech to the United Powerline Council's annual conference Abernathy expressed personal enthusiasm for B-P-L calling it a Broadband nirvana. That position was quickly challenged by the ARRL and others in the ham radio community. (ARRL)

**

Break 1

From the United States of America, We are the Amateur Radio Newsline, heard on bulletin stations around the world including the W3UU repeater of the Harrisburg Radio Amateur Club serving Harrisburg Pennsylvania.

(5 sec pause here)

**
BREAKING NEWS: EARTH HIT BY SEVERE GEOMAGNETIC STORM

A severe G-4 class geomagnetic storm is in progress as we go to air. This, due to the arrival of coronal hole mass ejections related to the returning sunspot group 484, now numbered 501 astronomers.

Thomas Hood, N-W-7-U-S, is the Propagation Editor for C-Q Magazine. In a November 20th posting to the V-H-F Reflector, Hood says that some reporting stations show a K index of 9. The current planetary K index is 8 and the Aurora index is 10. This means that there could be visual Aurora is possible at low-latitudes.

What does this mean to ham radio operations? During the storm HF conditions are poor. So will those on the Medium Wave broadcast bands. But in the world of 50 Mhz and above anything could happen and usually does. Keep your ears open, your radio on and enjoy it while you can.

Now long will this geomagnetic storm last and are more sunspots on the way? Ongoing information is in cyberspace at http://prop.hfradio.org and on the W6YX VHF Reflector.

For the Amateur Radio Newsline, I'm Bill Pasternak, WA6ITF. (VHF REflector)

**

ENFORCEMENT: HAM ACCUSED IN WISCONSIN INTERFERENCE CASE

A peason described by authorities as a Wisconsin ham has been arrested and charged with some high tech interference to public service communications. Amateur Radio Newsline's Bruce Tennent, K6PZW, has the rest of the story:

--

The Wisconsin State Journal reports that a ham radio operator is being accused of interfering with emergency radio channels in the city of Madison over the past nine months. According to the Journal, authorities charge that twenty-five year old Rajib K. Mitra, a University of Wisconsin Madison student, may have broadcast audio from pornographic movies over the Madison Police Department airwaves.

The news article describes Mitra is a ham radio operator with a degree in computer science. He was arrested Thursday November 13th after police showed up at his apartment with a search warrant looking for radio and

computer equipment and pornographic audio.

According to a Madison police spokesperson, the interference usually left the radio system dead for stretches from a few seconds to about 20 minutes but never on a regular schedule. Al Schwoegler, the Madison Communication Operations Supervisor said that this intermittant operation added to the difficulty of tracking the source.

The interference came at times when police were dispatched on calls. Authorities believe that the person jamming may have monitored police radio traffic.

Helping to track down Mitra was Ralph Pellegrini. The newspaper article identified Pellegrini is a ham operator and technician for Sprint PCS who assisted police. Authorities approached Pellegrini for assistance when they thought the interference might be coming from a Sprint cellular tower. Pellegrini in turn gave a lot of credit for Mitra's capture to those he termed as the Madison radio guys. He notes that they were able to hunt down Mitra in a city R-F environment that's pretty bad.

Mitra was in the Dane County Wisconson jail as of Friday November 14th. He has been tentatively charged with 16 felony counts of computer crimes and could also face federal charges, according to Madison police.

For the Amateur Radio newsline, I'm Bruce Tennant, K6PZW, reporting.

--

Authorities hope that Mitra's arrest will end months of frustrating interference to their radio communications system. The complete story is on-line at http://www.madison.com/wisconsinstatejournal/local/61321.php (Wisconsin State Journal, QRZ.com, others)

**

ENFORCEMENT: SKYWARN INTERFERENCE

The FCC has told an Indiana ham that he is to stay off of a 2 meter repeater dedicated to emergency alerting operations. This, in a letter to Christopher Smith, KC9CAU, of South Bend.

In the note, the agency says that it has received a complaint about Smith's on the air operation on a repeater system participating in the St. Joseph County Skywarn system. The complaint alleges deliberate interference and harassment to the repeater and refusal to refrain from attempting communications on that system.

The FCC's letter tells Smith that it expects him to abide by any demand that he stay off the repeater, as well as any other repeater where such request is made by a repeater control operator or the system licensee. Smith was given the customary 20 days from the date of the FCC's letter to reply. (FCC)

**

ENFORCEMENT: ECHOLINK EXPLANATION SOUGHT

A Florida ham has some explaining to do for comments made over a linked repeater system. The FCC's Daryl Duckworth, NN0W, explains:

--

Duckworth: "An inquiry went to WA3QCV, Timothy Horvath, of Flagler Beeach, Florida, concerning operation on two repeaters: WB2IXR at 157.015 Mhz and KG4IDD at 145.47 Mhz that are linked through the Echolink system. The inquiry involves alleged threats and obscene language."

--

The FCC also gave Horvath 20 days from the date of its letter for him to respond. (FCC)

**

RADIO LAW: ANTI-PIRACT BROADCAST FLAG APPROVED

The government has approved a new anti-piracy system that will theoretically make it harder for computer users to illegally distribute digital TV programs on the Internet. This, with the goal is to speed the transition to higher quality digital broadcasts and ensure such programming remains free.

The five-member FCC voted unanimously to allow a "broadcast flag" to be added to digital programming to block broader distribution on the Internet on November 4th. Broadcasters and the movie industry had urged the Federal Communications Commission to take such action, while consumer groups said it will force some people to purchase new electronics. (FCC, others)

**

ON THE MOVE: HF NET RELOCATING TO IRLP

Call it a sign of the times we live in. This as Tom Mc Glinn, KO6HA, reports over QRZ.com website on big change for a long established high frequency net that's taking to a different way to communicate.

Mc Glinn says that due to the urban lifestyle of many of the members of the USS Hornet Amateur Radio Club, the group has decided to move its weekly Net from 80 Meters to repeaters that are interconnected using I-R-L-P. That's the Internet Radio Linking Project which permits the world wide interconnecting of repeaters over the World Wide Web.

According to Mc Glinn, the net has been conducting tests and they have worked out most of the bugs involved with such a move. Once completed, the U-S-S Hornet Net will hold the weekly gathering in the San Francisco Bay Area using the facilities of the 147.210 repeater in near-by Oakland. Those outside the area we will be linked in using the I-R-L-P

Western Reflector.

Mc Glinn adds that anyone on the planet who has I-R-L-P access to link to the Western Reflector Subchannel 1, node 9251, on Mondays at 2030 Pacific time is invited to check in on the Net. He says that you do not need to be a member of the club to take part. (QRZ.com)

**

CONFERENCES: CSVHFS IN ONTARIO CANADA NEXT JULY

The Ontario VHF Association and the Toronto VHF Society will be hosting the 38th annual Central States VHF Society Conference. The dates are July 22nd to the 25th at the Delta Meadowvale Resort and Conference Center in Mississauga, Ontario, Canada.

2004 marks only the second time that this conference has been held outside of the USA. More information and a registration form will be available shortly in cyberspace at www.csvhfs.org and www.ovhfa.com (VHF REflector)

**

HAMVENTION 2004: AWARD NOMINATING PERIOD OPENS

Meantime, the planners of Hamvention 2004 say that the nominating period is now open for its Radio Amateur of the Year, Technical Excellence and Special Achievement awards program. The Radio Amateur of the Year is described as that special person who has made a long term commitment to the advancement of amateur radio. A well-rounded individual who has contributed most of his or her lifetime to our hobby in some very outstanding way.

A nominee for the Technical Excellence award should be a person who has made an outstanding technical advancement in the field of amateur radio. Something like a revolutionary new equipment design or mode of operation that has impacted positively on the day to day operation of many hams.

Last but by no means least, a nominee for the Hamvention's Special Achievement is the kind of special person who has made an outstanding contribution to the advancement of amateur radio. This award is usually given to a respected amateur who spearheaded a single significant project.

Documentation is beneficial. Magazine articles, newsletters, newspaper clippings, videos, etc. will better inform the Awards Committee of your candidate's accomplishments. All materials become the property of the Hamvention and cannot be returned.

The nomination deadline is January 31 2004. You can fill out the on-line form found at www.hamvention.org by clicking your mouse on the words award nominations. Printed nominations go to the Awards Committee, Hamvention 2004, PO Box 964, Dayton Ohio, 45401.

And oh yes. The deadline for all submissions is January 31st, 2004 (Dayton Hamvention)

**

BREAK 2

This is ham radio news for today's radio amateur. From the United States of America, We are the Amateur Radio Newsline with links to the world from our only official website at www.arnewsline.org and being relayed by the volunteer services of the following radio amateur:

(5 sec pause here)

**

NAMES IN THE NEWS: KB2GSD VS. WJMK - PART 2

A follow up to an earlier story involving retired CBS newsman Walter Cronkite, KB2GSD, and a Florida television production company that he says misled him and tarnished his reputation. This, when it persuaded him to appear in videos that promoted prescription drugs and other products.

The company, WJMK, filed suit last September after Cronkite tried to end a contract he had signed to appear as the host of a series of videos, including some called American Medical Review. In their legal brief responding to the WJMK action, Cronkite's lawyers say WJMK had assured him that the videos would be educational and would not promote corporate products. These are claims that his lawyers say Cronkite subsequently learned were false.

An attorney representing W-J-M-K, says that Cronkite's charges had no merit and that Cronkite's lawyers were trying to disparage the other side in the media. Meantime, KB2GSD has filed a counter claim seeking $25 million in damages from WJMK. (Published news reports)

**

NAMES IN THE NEWS: LONG TO AMSAT JOURNAL

Ed Long, WA4SWJ, is the new Editor in Chief of the AMSAT Journal. A licensed amateur since 1970, Ed holds a BSEE from West Virginia University and an MBA from Duke. He is currently employed by SPX Process Equipment in Delavan, Wisconsin. He can be reached by e-mail to wa4swj@amsat.org (AMSAT-NA)

**

EMERGING TECHNOLOGY: SAFETYCAST BROADCAST TO YOUR CAR

Police or fire engines may soon be able to override the radio in your car. This, as Jacksonville Florida based SafetyCast announces that it will soon test a new mobile alert system. One that will allow a police officer or ambulance driver to take over a car radio within a distance of about 1000 feet and broadcast a brief alert tone and warning message.

Emergency services officials are praising the development. They claim that there is a warning crisis because motorists in today's sound-proofed vehicles can't hear sirens, or just aren't paying attention.

But the CGC Communicator reports hearing from one engineer who's worried about the Special Temporary Authority the FCC gave for the trial. He says his studios and E-A-S receivers are located 100 feet from a highway and one block from a hospital. He feels that SafetyCast might jam an Emergency Alert System messages that are coming in. (CGC Communicator)

**

SPACE: FRENCH AND RUSSIAN LAUNCH ACCORD

France and Russia approved an accord intended to pave the way for the eventual launch of Russian rockets from a French launch pad in South America. The agreement, signed on November 11th is the first of its kind between Russia and a European Union country and is a step toward the launch of Russian Soyuz-ST rockets from the E-S-A Kourou launch pad in French Guyana. Most ham radio satellites are orbited from the Kourou facility. (Published reports)

**

INTERNATIONAL - HOLLAND: RADIO NETHERLANDS BROADCAST CHANGE

Radio Netherlands says that its shifting the frequency of its Dutch language transmission to the Far East, East and Southeast Asia at 1300 U-T-C. This broadcast can now be heard on 7 point 380 MHz. The reason for the change is to avoid interference to the transmission. (Media Network)

**

DX

In D-X, word that ON4LAC, is active portable 3B8 from Marutius through November 23rd. His activity has been mainly on 20 and 15 meters using SSB and PSK, but is expected to be on RTTY as well. He will leave Msrutius and head to Reunion Island to be active as FR5 stroke ON4LAC during the period of November 26th and December 15th. After this activity, he will head back to Mauritius and will be active again between December 17th and 27th. QSL direct to his home callsign. (OPDX)

Also, K5LB has announced that he will be going to Swaziland next March and is looking for several operators to tag along. His plans include a trip through the Kruger Game Park. If interested, contact him at frosty1@pdq.net (OPDX)

**

THAT FINAL ITEM: VOLUNTEERISM AND THE NYC MARATHON

For the last two weeks New York City Marathon Communications Coordinator Steve Mendelsohn, W2ML, has been sharing with us the behind the scenes

story of how 411 hams move the race along. In our final part in this series Henry Feinberg, K2SSQ, takes a look at the volunteers that make it all hapen:

--

The ham radio communications effort for the New York City Marathon is volunteer driven. And, as with any event, volunteers do come and go. We asked the lead volunteer, Steve Merndelsohn, W2ML, to explain how this situation gets covered:

--
Audio only. Hear the newscast in mp3 at www.arnewsline.org
--

It's primerally the local clubs that supply the volunteer ham radio communicators. W2ML says that he has a special way of introducing them to what Marathon communications is all about:

--
Audio only. Hear the newscast in mp3 at www.arnewsline.org
--

And speaking about volunteers, we asked Steve what about his own role in all this. How much of his life does he devote to setting up this all volunteer communications effort? His answer may astound you:

--
Audio only. Hear the newscast in mp3 at www.arnewsline.org
--

And there you have it. An insiders look at the massive all volunteer ham radio communications network that literally runs the New York City Marathon. It's a view that only someone who has been there every year since Amateur Radio has been involved, can give.

For the Amateur Radio Newsline, I'm Henry Feinberg, K2SSQ

--

Our thanks to Steve Mendelsohn, W2ML, for sharing his experiences with us, and with you.

**

NEWSCAST CLOSE

With thanks to Alan Labs, AMSAT, the ARRL, the CGC Communicator, CQ Magazine, the FCC, the Ohio Penn DX Bulletin, Radio Netherlands, Rain, the RSGB and Australia's Q-News, that's all from the Amateur Radio Newsline(tm). Our e-mail address is newsline @arnewsline.org. More information is available at Amateur Radio Newsline's(tm) only official website located at www.arnewsline.org. You can also write to us or support us at Amateur Radio Newsline(tm), P.O. Box 660937, Arcadia, California 91066.

For now, with Bill Pasternak, WA6ITF, at the editors desk, I'm Don Wilbanks, AE5DW, saying Happy Thanksgiving, 73 and we thank you for listening." Amateur Radio Newsline(tm) is Copyright 2003. All rights reserved.

3097. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-23 13:58:42 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0311230558.61cf95a6@posting.google.com>
Source record: 82723

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20031122145806.11891.00002451@mb-m11.aol.com>...

> Vocations
> in radio are to be pejorated, denigrated, spat upon, reviled, made fun
> of and other niceties of the TURF where chat room homies consider
> their 'hood.

You mean like this sort of thing, Len?

BEGIN GOOGLE QUOTE

From: lenof21@aol.com (Lenof21)
Subject: Re: Morse monkeys are the worst!
Date: 2000/03/28
Message-ID: <20000328122107.02129.00001001@nso-fp.aol.com>
References: <8bokskosu1@news.hawaii.edu>
Organization: AOL http://www.aol.com
Newsgroups: rec.radio.amateur.policy
X-Admin: news@aol.com

In article <8bokskosu1@news.hawaii.edu>, jeffreyh@Hawaii.Edu (Jeffrey Herman)
writes:

>Jim <kh2d@my-deja.com> wrote:
>>jeffreyh@Hawaii.Edu (Jeffrey Herman) wrote:

>>>Gee, I was originally WA6QIJ (from '76). Two-by-three calls *can* be an
>>>OTer's call.
>>>Jeff KH6O (formerly WA6QIJ WH6AEQ NH6IL KH2PZ KH6OO WH6U)

>>Yeah, Jeff. But you're different. You talk the talk, but you don't
>>walk the walk......
>>73, Jim KH2D
>
>I don't "walk the walk," eh? Try 12 hours on, 12 hours off for four
>years straight, copying CW. 12 and 16 MHz in the left earphone, and 22
>and 26 MHz in the right during the day, or 4 and 6 in the left, and 8
>and 12 in the right at night -- the Collins receivers automatically
>scanning the calling segments in each of those bands.
>
>Pile-ups? How about one every six hours around the clock -- hundreds of
>ships calling so as to pass their time-sensitive WX observations; at
>the same time let's not forget that several ships are standing by with
>distress situations -- medical emergencies, mechanical difficulties,
>engine room fires, men overboard, shifted cargo / listing due to heavy
>seas and taking on water. You'd wet your pants sitting one hour of a

>typical shift. It wasn't a contest where you could turn off the radio and
>take a nap if it got too stressful -- this was the real life stuff --
>lives being lost or saved.

That's all very nice and dramatic but this was the United States
Coast Guard, right? The same USCG that gave you food, lodging,
shelter, and free clothes that you could wet in as needed? The
same USCG that taught you morse code cognition? It wasn't
amateur radio, was it?

Jeff, the time for demanding Medals for Meritorious Service in
the USCG is past for you. That was not amateur radio, it was
PROFESSIONAL radio. You were paid for what you did (in
several ways). It was your JOB. I'm sure that the USCG did
not put you on watch if you couldn't cut it. I don't see how
all that makes you some Number One Ichiban HAM Honcho
NOW.

>HF CW too much for you? Okay, sit the evening MF CW watch, instead.
>500 kHz in the left phone, 499 in the right (even you're bright enough
>to figure out why). What's that? An Auto-Alarm? Don't wet your pants
>again, Jim, just realize that those twelve four-second dashes with
>one-second pauses are setting off alarm bells on board every ship
>in the Pacific within radio range -- the ship's in grave distress,
>breaking up in heavy seas. Imagine the intensity of a storm that
>would rip a ship in half. Have you ever heard what a transmitter
>sounds like when the radio room gets flooded with sea water? It
>emits a scream-like sound -- here are the final words the RO was
>sending to me at the moment his transmitter screamed:
>
>SOS NMO DE D*** HV TO LEAVE SHIP NOW TU OM FER <high pitched whine>
>
>That's where the log entry ends.

Transmitters don't "scream" Jeff. They are inanimate things that
run on electricity. When the radio room on that unfortunate ship
flooded, many things could have temporarily put the transmitter
on full Continuous Wave and also to shift frequency slightly.
The "scream" you heard, if it was not in your head alone, could
have been a true CW with a frequency shift just enough to make
it sound something like a "scream."

>Now sit there, Jim, and try your best to comprehend that the man
>you were just in QSO with has drowned; he was one of the last men
>aboard the ship -- most of the others had taken to lifeboats.

You were safe on shore, listening to a radio...provided by the
USCG, the same military service that provided you with food,
lodging, shelter, clothes (to wet in), and a modest monetary
stipend each month for your JOB. I'll bet you even got Rank
with that USCG service.

Meanwhile, in time NOW, the last officer in charge has only
to start the GMDSS...which will send distress call AND the
position of the sinking ship. As accurate as possible without
having to wet pants or make some heroic, dramatic act out
of it. No "screaming" transmitters.

>Maybe the voice position is more to your level of ability. Now don't
>be overwhelmed -- you'll have to listen to about 30 voice channels:
>2182 kHz, 2670 kHz, the 4, 6, 8, 12, 16, and 22 high seas maritime
>and aeronautical SSB channels, and four remote VHF sites, with each
>site piping in marine channels 6, 12, 16, 22, and 23. Don't worry,
>each of the 30 speakers has a little LED which will flash so you'll
>know which transmitter to key up to answer someone's call. Let's
>see how good you are at juggling: You have a sinking motorboat on
>Kauai ch. 16 with too many family members and not enough life jackets
>-- listen to those screams in the background, Jim. You'll have to
>phone the air-station to launch a helo and phone CG station Kauai to
>launch their 41 footer, all the while extracting as much info from
>the downing family as possible. What now? The Maui ch.16 speaker has
>someone yelling for help -- he's aground on a reef; phone Maui fire
>department so they can launch their helo and rescue boat. Whoops -- now
>you've got a ship on 12 MHz SSB with a medical emergency -- crewman with a
>burst appendicitis; get USPHS on the phone and set up a phone patch
>between the duty doctor and the ship. Now you've got the helo and 41
>footer on channel 23 asking you to take their radio guard while they're
>enroute to the drowning family. Uh oh -- the two-tone SSB Auto Alarm on
>2182; oh, it's just the drunk Mexican fishermen again, playing with their
>radios and singing to each other; but don't touch that volume control --
>you'll have to listen to their singing all night long.
>
>What was your comment again?

...you knew the job was dangerous when you took it...

As I said, the time for Medals For Meritorious Radio Service in
the USCG is past for you, Jeff. You were safe on shore, no
lifeboats needed, and, when your watch was over, you could
go off duty, hit the bunk, or chow down on USCG food after
changing your pants.

>>Yeah, Jeff. But you're different. You talk the talk, but you don't
>>walk the walk......
>>73, Jim KH2D
>
>You're right, Jim, I didn't walk any walk; I ran a marathon each
>shift, a marathon that would have left you exhausted at the *starting*
>line.

Thank you Superham, once more you've saved Metropolis.

Of course, if you want some "comparisons," you can always
hang around a TRACON sometime at a busy Center if
radio "marathons" are your cuppa. Plenty "runners" in that

radio "marathon," a whole room full plus lots in the sky,
all doing things on voice. If there be "screams," then
they can be heard on cockpit voice recorders.

>Enjoy your little walk, Jim. And change your wet pants.
>
>Jeff KH6O

Jeff, you've never been under Incoming, have you? While
trying to get return artillery support on a radio while your
ears, your whole body is numbed by HE infall on your
position? Most folks in that position don't wet their
pants...every sphincter tightens up, ears go deaf, eyes
close tight, and every breath may be the last.

I just helped plant my bro-in-law, another veteran.
Why don't you quit the shore station histrionics and go
back to ancient radio history. It will ease your troubled
mind...and keep your pants dry.

Len Anderson
ex-RA16408336

END GOOGLE QUOTE

3098. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-23 14:06:59 UTC
From: Bert Craig <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM>
Message-ID: <7a3wb.15689$Hb.5415717@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>
Source record: 82724

"Alun" <alun@1stcounsel.com> wrote in message
news:Xns943AE8F62DA6Belektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
> wa2si@arrl.net (Bert Craig) wrote in
> news:b7d1465c.0311211216.574c7dde@posting.google.com:
>
> > Alun <alun@1stcounsel.com> wrote in message
> > news:<Xns943A6D811D68Aelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>...
> >> wa2si@arrl.net (Bert Craig) wrote in
> >> news:b7d1465c.0311210334.5fee2b15@posting.google.com:
> >>
> >> > Alun <alun@1stcounsel.com> wrote in message
> >> > news:<Xns943564E221DAAelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>...
> >> >> "Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in
> >> >> news:EJvsb.9152$hn3.3187776@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net:
> >> >>
> >> >> > "Rupert" <big@bird.sesame.street> wrote in message
> >> >> > news:Govsb.10542$6c3.633@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net...
> >> >> >> Len Over 21 wrote:
> >> >> >>
> >> >> >> > As of 6 PM EST on 11 November 2003, the number of ECFS
> >> >> >> > documents on public view are:
> >> >> >>
> >> >> >> What would be interesting is to find out how many are for the
> >> >> >> change, and how many want to keep the code.
> >> >> >
> >> >> > Me too. All this roundabout bravo sierra could be bypassed if
> >> >> > there was a ballot sent to all approx. 700,000 U.S. licensed
> >> >> > hams. As long as quorum is met, it's on! This concept (Democracy)
> >> >> > frightens the bejesus out of many folks who claim to speak for
> >> >> > those not yet licensed.
> >> >> >
> >> >> > But that's an empty argument. Get licensed and vote, tah dah! The
> >> >> > big bad "barrier" does not preclude anyone from getting their
> >> >> > no-code Tech ticket and executing a vote.
> >> >> >
> >> >> > Simply announce a "record date" by which one must be licensed (To
> >> >> > give those "yet to be licensed a fair shot at a voice in the
> >> >> > process.) and send a ballot out to all those licensed "of
> >> >> > record." Makes too much sense and requires some effort. IOW,
> >> >> > against the contemporary trend.
> >> >> >
> >> >> > 73 de Bert
> >> >> > WA2SI
> >> >> >

> >> >> >
> >> >> >
> >> >>
> >> >> Those who have not obtained a licence because of the code trest are
> >> >> just as entitled to express their opinion to the FCC as you or I.
> >> >
> >> > I agree, Alun. The Technician license requires no code test.
> >> >
> >> > 73 de Bert
> >> > WA2SI
> >> >
> >>
> >> True, but some don't take it because they only want HF, not because
> >> they couldn't answer the questions. All I'm saying is that they should
> >> have a vote in any poll.
> >>
> >> 73 de Alun, N3KIP
> >
> > Hmm, sounds like a motivational issue. If you want HF, the road to the
> > General and Extra begins with the Technician exam...no matter what. If
> > they're truly "interested" in participating in participating in the
> > process of this change, you'd think the Tech exam would be...wait a
> > sec, lemme stop. I just remembered whom we're talking about. Kinda
> > sad. :-(
> >
> > No, Alun. I really DO believe that Amateur Radio operators should
> > define Amateur Radio. What a concept, eh?
> >
> > 73 de Bert
> > WA2SI
> >
>
> Well, I guess that's a religeous issue

Alun, if this were a religeous issue I'd be trying to convince you that all real hams must use the code. I'm not trying to convince anybody of anything. I'm merely stating my beliefs re. the retention of the 5-wpm Morse code exam a.k.a. Element 1 for HF privies.

> , so I won't be able to convince you
> otherwise.

Two years ago, I made a decision to get my AR license. I'd heard some rumblings of a code vs. no-code debate, but I didn't care. I wanted my ticket. I had precious little spare time between a new house, a newborn child, (Our second.) and a promotion at the job along with the increased responsibilities, but I didn't care. I wanted my ticket. My XYL also needed help (read: "free labor") getting her business off the ground and that ate up spare time as well, but I didn't care. I wanted my ticket.

See a recurring theme? I wanted my ticket.
1. Research the requirements.
2. Meet said requirements.
3. Enjoy the privileges that come from meeting said requirements.

I decided that I'd get up early each day and spend 15 to 20 mins. practicing with the ARRL code CD's. Additionally, I managed to sneak in an evening or two before turning in. It never occured to me that someone was oppressing me by forcing me to do this. I viewed it as an investment in bettering myself. All because...yep, you guessed it, I wanted my ticket.

So no, Alun. You will NEVER convince me that 5-wpm Morse code test is a "barrier" to anyone. 13-wpm? Maybe 20-wpm? Yeah, very likely. However, 5-wpm just isn't. Not because I (or anybody else) say(s) so, just because it isn't. Ask a Handi-Ham. Now there's an example of "motivated" individuals.

> If you look me up you'll see I'm an Extra, and you'll be able to figure
> out that I passed 20 wpm.

Congratulations, that's a significant accomplishment.

> What you won't see, is that I've been a ham
> since 1980, not 1992, as I'm not originally from this country.

I kinda picked up on that from your website. Nice job, BTW.

> However, ham radio is not a job or a vocation, just a hobby.

So? Some would disagree, but let's proceed on the premise that it's only a hobby. (We'll ignore the service aspect.) Why sould we lower the standards for our hobby?

> I welcome the
> unmotivated as much as I would welcome anyone else.

Why on Earth would one want to welcome the unmotivated? How many other aspects of AR can we apply the "don't get in the way of my fun" mindset? How about rules and regs, or gentleman's agreements re. voluntary bandplans, or how 'bout them writtens? Why should I demonstrate knowledge of digital modes when I'm only interested in running SSB?

> Why shouldn't they
> have fun too?

No one's preventing anybody from having fun. Ex. An AR lives in an antenna resticted apartment and laments how his/her options are limited. I'd hang a retractable wire from the window at night, run a counterpoise, and operate 40m CW QRP via a tuner in a heartbeat...all for about $200, less than many dual-bander V/UHF h/t's. You know how 40 is at night, yes? So where's the real limiting factor? Um hmm.

> If someone wants HF and doesn't want to learn code, why
> should they bother to study for a VHF and above licence, when they could
> be scuba diving or building model railroads or what have you? (Not hobbies
> of mine, personally, but whatever turns you on).

Thank you, Alun. I couldn't have said it better myself.

> I know this is sacrilege
> to true beleivers, but so what?
>
> The notion that only hams should decide the future of ham radio is just
> that, a notion. I can absolutely guarantee that it is not a point of view
> shared by the FCC, and it makes little sense to me either. At the very
> least all prospective hams have a vested interest, irregardless of the
> reasons they don't have a licence, reasonable or otherwise. I'm sure the
> FCC would cast their net a lot wider than that.
>
> 73 de Alun, N3KIP

Gotta run for breakfast. It's cool to agree to disagree, Alun. Take care OM.

73 de Bert
WA2SI

3099. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-23 14:13:09 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bpqfbk$oik@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 82725

"K�HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:OZVvb.15836$Rk5.10832@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote:
>
> > Oh good grief. This is ludicrous! Do you realize what a mockery you
are
> > making of the United States legal system?
>
> The US legal system has made a mockery of itself, without any help from
> Larry & Dwight. OJ walked, MJ will walk, Malvo will cop insanity, Scott
> Peterson will walk, and Zacarias Moussaoui is making a fool of our inept
> Attorney General Ashcroft.
>
> 73, Hans, K0HB
>
>

The US legal system may not be perfect, but it's a whole lot better than anywhere else I'd rather *not* be for legal matters. In some of those cases you mention above, I am not so certain there weren't reasons (inside reasons we'll never know about) for the things happening the way they did.

My point is that in this country, one is innocent until proven guilty. That is, *unless* we don't believe in the legal system at all--and we cannot pick and choose when we decide to do that. We either believe in it or we don't. Period. I do. So, the price we pay for that--and, again, I think it's a whole lot better than anywhere else--is that we must endure as people go free that we, as non-participants in that person's legal matters, may feel are not innocent.

It's just like being a Public Defender. There may be times when people who are just as guilty as all get out. But, if they were "victims" of processes--which we all, by the way, have a part in by our voting privileges in this country--that were not followed correctly and to the tee, then I hope the Public Defender is a darned good one. Why? Because if I am ever wrongly accused or unjustly brought to our legal system, I want the Public Defenders to be able to "get me off."

Inherrently, people decisions can and will go wrong. That is also why I don't believe in the death penalty. Our legal system is "supposed" to be such that when someone walks outside those courtroom doors, they are on the same level as the rest of us--having been judged by their peers. We *have* to believe in and, more importantly, support that or our legal system is a mockery.

Kim W5TIT

3100. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-23 14:22:06 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bpqfsh$438@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 82726

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20031122234050.29815.00001915@mb-m21.aol.com...
> In article <bpp5g6$rs7@library1.airnews.net>, "Kim W5TIT"
<kimscliff@yahoo.com>
> writes:
>
> >> By the way, on the issue of riots and innocent people being killed,
my
> >> brother was killed (in FL) less than a week after the LA riots (Rodney
> >> King), by two black guys who reportedly watched the riots
enthusiastically
> >> on television and later told two family members, supposedly in a joking
> >> manner, that they were going to kill a white guy. About fourty-five
> >minutes
> >> later, my brother died with two bullets in his brain, fired from a gun
> >held
> >> less then six inches from his head. The other employees in the office
> >(three
> >> young black men) were not injured, but did identify the attackers. The
two
> >> men pled guilty to a lesser charge. Because some money (less than $20),
> >and
> >> a small amount of drugs (suspected), was taken, this crime was reported
as
> >a
> >> robbery (possibly drug related), not a race crime. Clearly, I don't
want
> >to
> >> see a repeat of that (for anybody).
> >>
> >>
> >> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
> >>
> >> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
> >>
> >
> >From Michael Jackson's arrest to the above. Can it get any more
hilarious?
> >
> >Kim W5TIT
>
> Well, folks, here we are now faced with a dual tragedy -- the fact that
> Dwight's brother was brutally murdered in a heinous crime of violence,
> and the fact that Kim thinks it's "hilarious."

>
> Dwight, you have my heartfelt sympathy and most sincere condolences.
>
> Kim, I can only hope that, as usual, you simply weren't thinking before
> you let your fingers spout off their usual gibberish. If you truly meant
> what you said, you are beneath contempt.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

Larry, you're an ass, as usual. For anyone but those who *choose* to be miserable, such as yourself--it is quite understood that the loss of human life is a tragedy. And, for anyone with even half a brain, *not* such as yourself--it is a given that I would not express such assinine thoughts as that the death of someone--*anyone* I might add--is hilarious.

Go ahead, though, keep being miserable.

Kim W5TIT

3101. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-23 14:26:30 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bpqg4o$rjf@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 82727

"Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:bpp5g6$rs7@library1.airnews.net...
> "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
> news:WxIvb.16407$Wy4.9415@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> > "Larry Roll K3LT" wrote:
> > >
> > > I think M. J.'s brother Jermaine has pretty much
> > > set the tone for what will happen during the trial
> > > through his use of the term "modern day lynching."
> > > In spite of Michael's obvious attempt to look like
> > > a "white" (caucasian) person, the race card will
> > > be played, and M. J.'s "blackness" will once
> > > again emerge, inspite of the fact that his face looks
> > > like it was painted with Sherman Williams Flat
> > > Latex (White). (snip)
> > >
> > >
> > Well, I truly hope race doesn't become an issue. But, like you, I
> suspect
> > it will.
> > >
> >
> Uh, 'scuse me. Knock knock. Larry just made race the issue from his
> perspective? Hellooooooo.
>
> >
> > > Michael Jackson will not be convicted. The race
> > > card will be played to the maximum extent possible,
> > > and the black public will be placed on standby to
> > > over-react to any possible negative outcome for
> > > Jackson. Therefore, to save life and property, the
> > > O. J. Simpson debacle will have to be repeated.
> > > This may not be justice, but it will be necessary in
> > > order to ensure that many innocent people aren't
> > > killed in the riotous aftermath of his possible
> > > conviction. (snip)
> > >
> > >
> > And I also hope we don't see riots and other violence after a
> conviction.
> > But, with the news coverage this case is going to get, that is certainly
a
> > possibility. However, because of the timing, I don't think it will
happen.

> > This court case will probably not start until sometime next summer and
> many
> > will be watching the activities surrounding the coming elections
instead.
> >
>
> Oh good grief. This is ludicrous! Do you realize what a mockery you are
> making of the United States legal system? Not to mention how idiotic this
> thread is!!
>
> >
> > By the way, on the issue of riots and innocent people being killed, my
> > brother was killed (in FL) less than a week after the LA riots (Rodney
> > King), by two black guys who reportedly watched the riots
enthusiastically
> > on television and later told two family members, supposedly in a joking
> > manner, that they were going to kill a white guy. About fourty-five
> minutes
> > later, my brother died with two bullets in his brain, fired from a gun
> held
> > less then six inches from his head. The other employees in the office
> (three
> > young black men) were not injured, but did identify the attackers. The
two
> > men pled guilty to a lesser charge. Because some money (less than $20),
> and
> > a small amount of drugs (suspected), was taken, this crime was reported
as
> a
> > robbery (possibly drug related), not a race crime. Clearly, I don't want
> to
> > see a repeat of that (for anybody).
> >
> >
> > Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
> >
> > http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
> >
>
> From Michael Jackson's arrest to the above. Can it get any more
hilarious?
>
> Kim W5TIT
>
>

Oh, and by the way, Dwight. In the event that you would be (and I don't think you would) as childish as Larry, *if* you took the above to think that I was including the story of your brother in my "hilarious" comment, then you would be wrong; however I apologize to you if I implied that.

Kim W5TIT

3102. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-23 15:29:39 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031123102939.01893.00001849@mb-m22.aol.com>
Source record: 82730

In article <bpdi5p$1n9ab4$6@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>, "Ryan, KC8PMX"
<REMOVETHISkc8pmx@diamondcs.net> writes:

>I think what Jim was trying to say, that if a meal at Ma's diner averages
>say for instance $5.50, (and a good meal too) and the corporate conglomerate
>Taco Heaven is around $4.50 for instance, in some cases it is worthwhile
>supporting the locally owned, Ma's place versus some criminally corporate
>organization like Taco Heaven. Support the local business before supporting
>the corporate ones.....

That's part of it. But the main point is that we *do* have choices, and if we
choose TH over Ma's enough times, TH will survive and Ma's won't. And we
shouldn't gripe if that happens and we're the cause.
>
>And if you find out that all the corporate ones have squeezed out the family
>and/or locally owned ones, then what ever you have left is your own fault if
>you didn't support the local ones.
>
Exactly.

>Maybe I am wrong, but that's what I got out of Jim's message, and might not
>have explained it the best. Myself? I believe in supporting the local
>businessperson whenever and where ever I can FIRST, then supporting the
>corporations when a locally owned option is not available. Granted there are
>some exceptions to the rule, as for instance, gasoline. At least I research
>to find out which ones are locally owned/franchised as opposed to true
>corporately owned gas stations.
>
>
>Screw Corporate Amerika! (before they screw you)
>
Not about "screwing" anybody - just about making informed buying choices.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3103. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-23 15:29:40 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031123102940.01893.00001851@mb-m22.aol.com>
Source record: 82729

In article <cuvyxnansvbet.hok4uwa.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>, "Phil Kane"
<Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> writes:

>On 17 Nov 2003 01:28:48 GMT, N2EY wrote:
>
>>Here's another one for ya: I bet neither of us would have any problem
>getting a
>>30 year mortgage, even though we'd be nearly 80 when said mortage was paid
>off
>>(barring any advance payments). Huh?
>
> We got a 30-year mortgage four years ago notwithstanding that I was
> retired on a moderate pension, my wife was an independent contract
> employee close to retirement age, and both of us would be over 90
> when it matured.
>
> Not only that, we refinanced it last year starting a new 30 year
> clock.
>
> In reality we rent the place from Fannie May or Freddy Mac, whomever
> wound up with the paper..... We know it, they know it.....
>
Sure. But you guys and your property are a good risk, you put up serious
equity, and you've got predictable income ahead.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3104. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-23 15:29:40 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031123102940.01893.00001850@mb-m22.aol.com>
Source record: 82733

In article <cuvyxnansvbet.hok4hc9.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>, "Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> writes:

>On Mon, 17 Nov 2003 01:08:51 GMT, Dee D. Flint wrote:
>
>>> OTOH, there are several "successful" enterprises that we just
>>> wouldn't patronize - Wal-Mart leads that list.
>>
>>I would go if they had a product I wanted but see no reason to do so if they
>>are not selling the products that I want.
>
> We do not shop there because we do not like their business attitudes
> in specific areas - hiring folks desperate for a job but only for 19
> hours a week not to exceed two years' tenure, thereby avoiding
> paying much above minimum wage and granting no employee benefits,
> certain shenanigans about forced unpaid hours (subject of several
> lawsuits across the country), and trashing the local merchants and
> moving on whenever they pleased, leaving disaster in their wake.
>
> Our choice.
>
Exactly. That's what I call behaving like a "customer" rather than a "consumer".

73 de Jim, N2EY

3105. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-23 15:29:42 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031123102942.01893.00001853@mb-m22.aol.com>
Source record: 82731

In article <AWOvb.12166$P%1.10557112@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> writes:

>But there are advantages. As the owner (even though heavily mortgaged), you
>can put up antennas or remodel or whatever without asking the landlord.

If not prohibited by the HOA, codes, ordinances, zoning, or other expressions of the Gladys Kravitz effect.

>And
>since the interest is tax deductable, you can have a nicer place for the
>same money than if it was just a rental.
>
Which is one *big* way our government "manages" the economy - with tax laws.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3106. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-23 15:29:42 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031123102942.01893.00001852@mb-m22.aol.com>
Source record: 82732

In article <bpfrcf$1ns0sh$8@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>, "Ryan, KC8PMX"
<REMOVETHISkc8pmx@diamondcs.net> writes:

>"Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
>news:3FBA66ED.5070205@psu.edu...
>> Ryan, KC8PMX wrote:
>> > If your interest rate is less than 5%, the best loan to get is a 30
>year!
>> > It's cheap money. Paying off a house quick is foolish. And the monthly
>> > rate is usually a hell of alot less too. Spend the difference of that
>> > paying off bills or invest it in a mutual fund or something.
>>
>>
>>
>> Ahh, a financial truism! This belongs with:
>>
>> The stock market ALWAYS goes up!
>
>What goes up must come down as well too.

Not necessarily. Look at where the Dow was when Bill Clinton took office in
1992...

>But that is the beauty of the
>stock market. It is a cyclical thing. Ideally it would be like a good
>sinus rhythm. It is just merely the knowledge of where to jump in at.
>
Just as important is knowing when to jump *out*.
>>
>> (It soitanly do, but over long time periods that are not relevant to
>> most of us who don't live over 150 years. More importantly it is what
>> the market is doing around the time you take your money out.)
>>
>> Move your money into high yield accounts shortly before you retire, that
>> way you'll have more money when you retire!
>
Buy high, sell low, go broke...
>
>Only if you know what you are doing and have a really good grasp of the
>market.

Which absolutely no one has.
>
>> I've listened to investment consultants actually pull this one out of
>> their hats. I know some older folk who have done this and now have

>> almost no retirement funds.
>
>Yep... not for the weak or feable to try on thier own if not knowledgeable.
>
The term is "risk tolerance"- a fancy way of saying how ready you are to lose money. And the rule is simple: the closer you are to actually needing the money, the less your risk tolerance should be.
>>
>> I have to chuckle at your truism. first, because your friend the real
>> estate agent uses those sort of arguments to talk you into buying
>> several thousand or tens of thousands more dollars worht of house.
>> Second is that You are saying a person who gets out of debt is foolish.
>
>Actually the person I got this truism from and believe in it is Bruce
>Williams, the talkshow host. If you do the math, it is fairly true.

I did the math and it's false enough to be a worthless truism.
>
>> Best way to not be a fool is to not go heavily into debt in the first
>> place. I have a 5 percent loan, but I'll pay it off quickly, I think.
>
>I wouldn't but thats me. What I would do is see if you can refinance at all
>to a lower rate. I have actually seen a interest rate recently somewhere in
>the 3 percent range!! Talk about a cheap loan, hell, I would
>refinance/remortgage my neighbors house if I could legally get away with it!
>LOL
>
Sure - because a house is something you need anyway, it's insured and not likely to wind up obsolete or useless in a few years. Most of all, almost no one can afford to buy a house for cash.

>> > Instead of paying off that low interest loan quickly, one is smarter
>> > paying
>> > off the higher interest loans like automobiles, department and credit
>> > card
>> > charges, and other loans/debts.
>>
>> Again, it's better to not get into a situation where you would have to
>> choose which loan you're paying off early.
>
>Well, its not paying the principle that kills ya, its the interest that does
>over a long time. The lesser the interest rate, the less I am interested in
>rushing to pay it off extra early. Either way, one needs to do the math or
>find someone who does understand real estate finance and other financal
>calculations to make sure in their own individual circumstances.
>
Exactly - it's all in the numbers for your particular situation.

The biggest financial boo-boos people make are:

- confusing "wants" and "needs" (you may need a car, but you want a new SUV)
- not having a budget, or not having one based on real data
- looking at their income out-of-context and saying "I can afford X" without doing the numbers.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3107. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-23 15:29:43 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031123102943.01893.00001854@mb-m22.aol.com>
Source record: 82728

In article <SYQvb.9550$m84.3565171@news1.news.adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo
<mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>
>> That's a Yankee frugality philosphy. I've been repeatedly told it's
>> "old-fashioned" and "out of date"....
>
> And will continue to be old fashioned and out of date well after the
>proponents of the "New accounting" are in the breadlines.

That's always been my plan.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3108. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-23 15:38:04 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <wv4wb.10188$m84.3790794@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 82734

Kim W5TIT wrote:
> "Jim Hampton" <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote in message
> news:ozUvb.2453$4l1.611@news01.roc.ny...
>
>>Hello, Dwight.
>>
>>Although way off topic (as are many threads here), I couldn't resist this
>>one.
>>
>>They say where there is smoke, there is fire. The smoke is so thick
>
> around
>
>>Michael Jackson that they will probably argue that the smoke is too thick
>
> so
>
>>you can't see and therefore prove fire. I'll grant the one arguement that
>>will come up - there will be folks out to make money. But it would appear
>>that this may well not be the case this time. What really galls me is
>
> that
>
>>some folks that have a *lot* of money (I'm talking hundreds of millions of
>>dollars) or political connections appear to be able to buy their way out
>
> of
>
>>nasty situations (Whitewater comes to mind here as well as OJ).
>>
>>Personally, I think the guy is right off his rocker, but the name of the
>>game should be to protect society (especially kids). Since his close call
>>in the early 90s hasn't seemed to have any effect on him, he is going to
>>have to be put away somewhere where he can't cause more damage(assuming he
>>is convicted). I still worry about what money can buy. If he isn't able
>
> to
>
>>buy out the victim, he can sure afford to buy a ton of attourneys. How
>
> does
>
>>one district attourney with a staff of attourneys that are already very
>

> busy
>
>>deal with someone who can keep a stable full of attourneys coming in from
>>every direction?
>>
>>I also believe that he married Lisa Marie Presley as a smoke screen. How
>>many divorces so far? I believe, and please correct me if I am wrong,
>
> that
>
>>he was never married until that mess 10 years ago or so. Suddenly, he
>
> gets
>
>>married. And divorced. And ... so on and so on.
>>
>>Frankly, I don't care what someone does in bed - as long as they leave
>
> kids
>
>>and non-consenting adults out of it; especially kids.
>>
>>I totally agree with your accessment as to classic symptoms of a
>
> pedophile.
>
>>Neverland should be renamed Never - Ever land. Why just the kids and not
>>the whole family? I believe he was paying his security guards $18.00 per
>>hour over 10 years ago. For the wealthy, this may well be normal - but it
>>also tends to keep those guards' mouths shut.
>>
>>Sorry for the long ramblings. I suspect, as do you, that this case is
>
> going
>
>>to be another media circus court case. In all honesty, where are they
>
> going
>
>>to find jurors? Oh - I forgot, the Michael Jackson fans. I'd be hard put
>>to be impartial with all of the other known facts (none of which is that
>
> he
>
>>actually molested a kid, but, as I mentioned, there is a ton of smoke and
>
> I
>
>>guarantee there is a fire).
>>

>>If he isn't convicted, how old do these characters get before their libido
>>finally slows down?
>>
>>Sorry for being so long winded, Dwight, but this case has me quite upset
>>(and I think most folks should be upset).
>>
>>
>>73 from Rochester, NY
>>Jim AA2QA
>>
>
>
> Well, personally, I think it's rather interesting that it is the Michael
> Jackson story that draws such a debate--when the Catholic priests, bishops,
> and whomever else in the Catholic Church, have been in the news for at least
> the last two years...and with increasing evidence, admitted guilt, admitted
> "sweeping it under the rug," and adults who were kids when they were raped
> by the priests!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!! In the Michael Jackson
> case(s), there have been no convictions--only speculation and rumors
> thusfar.
>
> I am not pointing up innocence or guilt--only puzzled by the weirdness of
> frenzy for the Michael Jackson story; when we have a whole host of
> tragedies--*proven* not just supposed--from the Catholic Church... I just
> don't get you folks...

I guess it depends where you are at, Kim. In this neck of the woods,
there has been a HUGE amount of press and talk about the abusive
priests. Just about every radio and TV station, multiple daily newspaper
stories. couldn't get away from it if you tried. It has slowed a bit
now, as the issue is in a interim stage. But you can count on 10-20
stories per week.

- Mike KB3EIA -

3109. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-23 15:42:57 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <5A4wb.10191$m84.3791440@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 82735

Kim W5TIT wrote:

> "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
> news:WxIvb.16407$Wy4.9415@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net...
>
>>"Larry Roll K3LT" wrote:
>>
>>>I think M. J.'s brother Jermaine has pretty much
>>>set the tone for what will happen during the trial
>>>through his use of the term "modern day lynching."
>>>In spite of Michael's obvious attempt to look like
>>>a "white" (caucasian) person, the race card will
>>>be played, and M. J.'s "blackness" will once
>>>again emerge, inspite of the fact that his face looks
>>>like it was painted with Sherman Williams Flat
>>>Latex (White). (snip)
>>
>>
>> Well, I truly hope race doesn't become an issue. But, like you, I
>
> suspect
>
>>it will.
>>
>
>
> Uh, 'scuse me. Knock knock. Larry just made race the issue from his
> perspective? Hellooooooo.
>
>
>>>Michael Jackson will not be convicted. The race
>>>card will be played to the maximum extent possible,
>>>and the black public will be placed on standby to
>>>over-react to any possible negative outcome for
>>>Jackson. Therefore, to save life and property, the
>>>O. J. Simpson debacle will have to be repeated.
>>>This may not be justice, but it will be necessary in
>>>order to ensure that many innocent people aren't
>>>killed in the riotous aftermath of his possible
>>>conviction. (snip)
>>
>>
>> And I also hope we don't see riots and other violence after a
>

> conviction.
>
>>But, with the news coverage this case is going to get, that is certainly a
>>possibility. However, because of the timing, I don't think it will happen.
>>This court case will probably not start until sometime next summer and
>
> many
>
>>will be watching the activities surrounding the coming elections instead.
>>
>
>
> Oh good grief. This is ludicrous! Do you realize what a mockery you are
> making of the United States legal system? Not to mention how idiotic this
> thread is!!
>
>
>> By the way, on the issue of riots and innocent people being killed, my
>>brother was killed (in FL) less than a week after the LA riots (Rodney
>>King), by two black guys who reportedly watched the riots enthusiastically
>>on television and later told two family members, supposedly in a joking
>>manner, that they were going to kill a white guy. About fourty-five
>
> minutes
>
>>later, my brother died with two bullets in his brain, fired from a gun
>
> held
>
>>less then six inches from his head. The other employees in the office
>
> (three
>
>>young black men) were not injured, but did identify the attackers. The two
>>men pled guilty to a lesser charge. Because some money (less than $20),
>
> and
>
>>a small amount of drugs (suspected), was taken, this crime was reported as
>
> a
>
>>robbery (possibly drug related), not a race crime. Clearly, I don't want
>
> to
>
>>see a repeat of that (for anybody).
>>
>>
>>Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

>>
>>http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
>>
>
>
> From Michael Jackson's arrest to the above. Can it get any more hilarious?

Aww jeesh, Kim! I can't find one single thing about Dwight's brother
being killed hilarious. Shame, shame.
- Mike KB3EIA -

3110. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-23 15:48:56 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <IF4wb.10198$m84.3792297@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 82736

Kim W5TIT wrote:

> Oh, and by the way, Dwight. In the event that you would be (and I don't
> think you would) as childish as Larry, *if* you took the above to think that
> I was including the story of your brother in my "hilarious" comment, then
> you would be wrong; however I apologize to you if I implied that.

Sure is what it looked like, but okay, I'll accept that you didn't mean
that.

What did you mean?

- Mike KB3EIA -

3111. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-23 16:19:08 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <065wb.16399$Rk5.7694@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 82737

"Ryan, KC8PMX" <REMOVETHISkc8pmx@diamondcs.net> wrote

> Screw Corporate Amerika! (before they screw you)

EXACTLY!!!!!! You've got it all figured out for sure!

Who the hell do General Motors and Ford and Mercedes think they are anyhow --- we used to have hundreds of different auto manufacturers? Let's open a blacksmith shop in our village and build our own cars, like our grandfathers did! And, yeah, quit buying computers from Dell and Gateway --- we have sand in our neighborhood --- we can make our own silicon chips just as well as Intel does! Dole pineapples --- who needs them anyhow, I bet we can grow perfectly good pineapples here in Minnesota. Who needs all this corporate crap anyhow?

73, de Hans, K0HB

3112. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-23 16:23:26 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <2a5wb.10210$m84.3800775@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 82738

N2EY wrote:

> In article <bpfrcf$1ns0sh$8@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>, "Ryan, KC8PMX"
> <REMOVETHISkc8pmx@diamondcs.net> writes:
>
>
>>"Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
>>news:3FBA66ED.5070205@psu.edu...
>>
>>>Ryan, KC8PMX wrote:
>>>
>>>>If your interest rate is less than 5%, the best loan to get is a 30
>>
>>year!
>>
>>>>It's cheap money. Paying off a house quick is foolish. And the monthly
>>>>rate is usually a hell of alot less too. Spend the difference of that
>>>>paying off bills or invest it in a mutual fund or something.
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>Ahh, a financial truism! This belongs with:
>>>
>>>The stock market ALWAYS goes up!
>>
>>What goes up must come down as well too.
>
>
> Not necessarily. Look at where the Dow was when Bill Clinton took office in
> 1992...
>
>
>>But that is the beauty of the
>>stock market. It is a cyclical thing. Ideally it would be like a good
>>sinus rhythm. It is just merely the knowledge of where to jump in at.
>>
>
> Just as important is knowing when to jump *out*.

And there is the problem for those playing the market for their
retirements. They know about when they are going to jump out, but if the
market doesn't cooperate....oh oh!
>
>>>(It soitanly do, but over long time periods that are not relevant to
>>>most of us who don't live over 150 years. More importantly it is what

>>>the market is doing around the time you take your money out.)
>>>
>>>Move your money into high yield accounts shortly before you retire, that
>>>way you'll have more money when you retire!
>>
> Buy high, sell low, go broke...
>
>>Only if you know what you are doing and have a really good grasp of the
>>market.
>
>
> Which absolutely no one has.
>
>>>I've listened to investment consultants actually pull this one out of
>>>their hats. I know some older folk who have done this and now have
>>>almost no retirement funds.
>>
>>Yep... not for the weak or feable to try on thier own if not knowledgeable.
>>
>
> The term is "risk tolerance"- a fancy way of saying how ready you are to lose
> money. And the rule is simple: the closer you are to actually needing the
> money, the less your risk tolerance should be.
>
>>>I have to chuckle at your truism. first, because your friend the real
>>>estate agent uses those sort of arguments to talk you into buying
>>>several thousand or tens of thousands more dollars worht of house.
>>>Second is that You are saying a person who gets out of debt is foolish.
>>
>>Actually the person I got this truism from and believe in it is Bruce
>>Williams, the talkshow host. If you do the math, it is fairly true.
>
> I did the math and it's false enough to be a worthless truism.

If you look at the total dollars spent, you can still pay less money on
some of the higher interest lower cost loans than lower interest higher
priced loans. (although I'd never suggest doing that) It's just the
sheer amount of dollars. So the best bet is to pay all the loans off as
quickly as possible.

>>>Best way to not be a fool is to not go heavily into debt in the first
>>>place. I have a 5 percent loan, but I'll pay it off quickly, I think.
>>
>>I wouldn't but thats me. What I would do is see if you can refinance at all
>>to a lower rate. I have actually seen a interest rate recently somewhere in
>>the 3 percent range!! Talk about a cheap loan, hell, I would
>>refinance/remortgage my neighbors house if I could legally get away with it!
>>LOL
>>
>
> Sure - because a house is something you need anyway, it's insured and not

> likely to wind up obsolete or useless in a few years. Most of all, almost no
> one can afford to buy a house for cash.
>
>
>>>>Instead of paying off that low interest loan quickly, one is smarter
>>>>paying
>>>>off the higher interest loans like automobiles, department and credit
>>>>card
>>>>charges, and other loans/debts.
>>>
>>>Again, it's better to not get into a situation where you would have to
>>>choose which loan you're paying off early.
>>
>>Well, its not paying the principle that kills ya, its the interest that does
>>over a long time. The lesser the interest rate, the less I am interested in
>>rushing to pay it off extra early. Either way, one needs to do the math or
>>find someone who does understand real estate finance and other financal
>>calculations to make sure in their own individual circumstances.
>>
>
> Exactly - it's all in the numbers for your particular situation.
>
> The biggest financial boo-boos people make are:
>
> - confusing "wants" and "needs" (you may need a car, but you want a new SUV)
> - not having a budget, or not having one based on real data
> - looking at their income out-of-context and saying "I can afford X" without
> doing the numbers.

Don't forget succumbing to the credit card problem. It's soooo easy to
live life large when you have 10 credit cards with a 20 thousand liimit
on each card.

One of those nifty little life secrets I've found out is that if you
are willing to avoid spending credit money like a drunken sailor while
you are young, you will have much more money for your toys when you get
older.

- Mike KB3EIA -

3113. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-23 16:31:30 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <Ch5wb.16432$Rk5.12466@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 82739

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote

> ....avoid spending credit money like a drunken sailor....

And how does a drunken sailor spend differently from a drunken marine or a drunken soldier or a drunken airman or a drunken draft-dodger? Or do you just have a thing about sailors? Or do you even have a clue, Mike?

With kindest personal regards,

de Hans, K0HB

3114. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-23 16:52:57 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <JB5wb.10275$m84.3806529@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 82740

Kï¿½HB wrote:

> "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote
>
>
>>....avoid spending credit money like a drunken sailor....
>
>
> And how does a drunken sailor spend differently from a drunken marine or a
> drunken soldier or a drunken airman or a drunken draft-dodger? Or do you
> just have a thing about sailors?

You've never heard the term, Hans? since you took the time to write
this, I'll elaborate:

Sailors on leave have been known to be avery exciting bunch for years.
They spend a lot of their lives at sea, and when they get to land often
have a fair amount of discretionary cash to spend, and a lot of steam to
work off. So sailors often spend their money at an alarming pace, thus
the phrase.

And where did I refere to the Navy? A sailor is a generic term for:

1. One who serves in a navy or works on a ship.
2. One who travels by water.
3. A low-crowned straw hat with a flat top and flat brim.

It wasn't number three, so it was numbers one and two.

> Or do you even have a clue, Mike?

Proudly serving my Navy and country since 1976.....

- Mike KB3EIA

3115. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-23 17:04:57 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <ZM5wb.16458$Rk5.10990@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 82741

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote

> And where did I refere to the Navy?

Do what?!?!?

Who mentioned 'Navy'? (DOS Hint: It wasn't me!)

Sunvuagun!

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB
Master Chief Radioman, US Navy
--
For details, go to http://www.home.earthlink.net/~k0hb/id5.html

3116. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-23 17:11:24 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031123121124.25815.00004665@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 82743

In article <aBhtb.10095$P%1.9016908@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> writes:

>"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
>news:lnhtb.1087$Rk5.61@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
>> You seriously need to climb off your high horse, Kim. Who in the heck
>> asked you to "help" anyone in this newsgroup? I came to this newsgroup to
>> discuss various topics - not be lectured by you with a mandate to drop my
>> opinions in favor of yours. So, if you're sitting around waiting for that
>to
>> happen, you're going to be one very, very, tired old woman long before
>> there's even a glimmer of hope.
>>
>
>While I normally disagree with a great many of Kim's posts. Here she is
>fundamentally correct. Consumers do have the choice to be informed if they
>really want to. If they don't want to go to that much work, then it is
>their own problem.

AGREED!

> Government should NOT be doing your research for you.

I disagree. Govt. has a legitimate role in making sure products are reasonably safe and that claims made for them are not false.

But providing information isn't the same thing as "protecting consumers" from every imaginable hazard.

>I
>certainly don't want MY taxes to go for the checks on goods and information
>dissemination that you seem to think the government should do for you.
>
Remember what cars were like when we were kids, Dee? No seat belts, no head restraints, single brake systems. Roofs that would crush in a rollover and solid steering posts that would spear the driver in even a mild crash. Sharp metal objects all over the inside and outside of the car.

All of these were easily avoidable hazards whose remedies required govt. intervention in the form of safety legislation. Something as simple as seat belts was aggressively fought by all of the major US carmakers. Not just on a cost issue, either - they did not like the psychological impact that they believed seat belts would create in the minds of car buyers.

Would you want to go back to the kinds of cars we had back then?

73 de Jim, N2EY

3117. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-23 17:11:25 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031123121125.25815.00004666@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 82742

In article <wZlub.5929$Rk5.4370@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> writes:

>if the mortgage isn't paid off, the mortgage company can
>foreclose and resell the house for a very tidy profit. That alone is enough
>to attract many mortgage companies to the elderly. This may also be why some
>mortgage companies actually seem to seek out those who will likely not fully
>pay off a mortgage (excessive debt, a history of bad credit, or whatever).
>After the mortgagor has partially paid down the amount owed on the property,
>the mortgage company can foreclose and retain the property for a much lower
>amount than they would have paid in an outright purchase.

Only if the total costs of doing all that do not exceed the recovered value after the sale.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3118. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-23 17:11:26 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031123121126.25815.00004667@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 82744

In article <WAlub.5924$Rk5.2290@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> writes:

>"N2EY" wrote:
>>
>> How do you know they haven't?

> Because absolutely nothing has happened.

Exactly.

Perhaps something really bad would have happened, but the spell prevented it. Who can ever say?

>> Well, would you like if someone called a
>> religion you respect "all nonsense"?

> If it were a ligitimate religion, no.

Who determines what is a "legitimate" religion and what isn't? Who *can* determine such a thing (other than God?)

>However, it is a little hard to
>perceive wicca as a ligitimate religion.

Why not? People have come up with new religions all over the map. Who is to say they were not "legitimate" because their beliefs are different?

>Since little is really known of the
>old pagan religions (especially directly), wicca practices today cannot
>seriously be linked to paganism.

Probably not. Doesn't mean wicca is or isn't legitimate, though. From what little I know, they are trying to reconnect with the *spirit* of those old pagans.

>Instead, the practices today mostly seem
>made up from images and stories in movies, television, and fiction books
>(old and new). And the people involved often take on the personas of
>characters directly from those fiction stories.

Couldn't the same be said of almost all religions now in existence? Most are based on a book or series of books written hundreds or thousands of years ago. Most describe events of the long past that are not provable to be fact or fiction in any way.

Would you say they weren't legitimate?

>Further, their claims of
>spells, charms, and so on, are simply hogwash (childish hogwash).

Would you say the same thing about the power of prayer, miracles,
transubstantiation, and other central beliefs of modern Christianity?

>Everyone
>is certainly free to believe what they want, including those who consider
>the whole thing absolutely ludicrous.
>
Everyone is free to believe up to a point. That point is where someone's purely
religious beliefs begin to infringe on the rights of others for reasons based
purely on belief and not provable scientific fact.

As an extreme example, a religion that required the human sacrifice of
unbelievers can't coexist with others. (There have been forms of Christianity
that fit this description, btw).

> By the way, this is not "us versus them." I have no specific religious
>beliefs, so pointing to a ligitimate religion is not really going to change
>my opinions of wicca. All religions have their faults and doubters, but I
>have no doubts about my opinions of wicca. :-)

Fine - but then why discriminate between "legitimate" and "illegitimate"
religions?
>
>> I wonder what the Book of Bokonon has to
>> say about all that...
>
>
> Wasn't it supposedly Books (plural) of Bokonon? Anyway, I'm not so sure
>all this (wicca) is exactly harmless untruths.
>
Couldn't that be said of many religions?

What harm does wicca do?

73 de Jim, N2EY

3119. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-23 17:41:18 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <2j6wb.16494$Rk5.605@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 82745

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote

> Would you want to go back to the kinds of cars we had back then?

In a heartbeat!!!!! Most wonderful car I ever owned is a 1962 Chev Corvair Corsa convertible.

Big-brother government killed all the really good cars, trying to protect against stupidity like poor driving habits. We could use a lot LESS government around these parts. We'd have a lot less stupid people.

The world is methodically being dumbed down by government efforts to protect us from stupid people.

Stupid drivers don't recognize the dangers of speed, so they drive too fast and kill themselves. The government regulates speed, so now more stupid people survive.

Stupid pedestrians don't know enough to not step out into a busy street, so they get injured and killed trying to cross the street. The government makes laws giving them the right-of-way, so now more stupid people survive.

Stupid parents don't recognize the value of childhood inoculations. The government makes them vaccinate their children before entering school, so now more stupid people survive.

Stupid hams don't know enough to keep their fingers out of 3KV plate transformers, so they get fried in their own juice. Some would have the government protect them, and more stupid people would survive.

In the ways of Mother Nature, stupidity was kept in check because stupid people generally didn't survive to breeding age, thus our species tended to get smarter over time.

But stupidity begets stupidity, so we are being overwhelmed by a tsunami of stupidity. The tsunami is triggered by the government protection of stupid people, which allows them to survive to reproduce.

Ergo, less government regulations makes a smarter populace.

73, de Hans, K0HB

3120. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-23 17:55:06 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <_v6wb.10300$m84.3822166@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 82746

Kï¿½HB wrote:
> "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote
>
>
>>And where did I refere to the Navy?
>
>
> Do what?!?!?
>
> Who mentioned 'Navy'? (DOS Hint: It wasn't me!)

You wrote earlier:

>> And how does a drunken sailor spend differently from a drunken marine or a
>> drunken soldier or a drunken airman or a drunken draft-dodger? Or do you
>> just have a thing about sailors? Or do you even have a clue, Mike?

Hans, even if you didn't refer to "sailor" as navy, and certainly within the context of the statement, you referred to Marines, Soldiers, Airmen, and even draft dodgers (hint: if you didn't, you need to arrange the sentence differently)

but.......... The Marines are *indeed* part of the Navy, so yes, Hans, you very much *did* mention Navy. (All apologies to the Marines in here that know that the navy is actually a subset of the Marines!) 8^) hehe.

> Sunvuagun!

Huzzanga!

- Mike KB3EIA -

3121. Re: Looks like both sons are jailbirds like Daddy Jaildale

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-23 18:11:11 UTC
From: Arf! Arf! <user@domain.com>
Message-ID: <WJ6wb.5221$87.4098@bignews6.bellsouth.net>
Source record: 82747
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.swap,rec.radio.amateur.policy

KE4TEW popped some pills, gave II some money for crack, sent the other boy some cigarette money, and vomited :

Crap snip

GOT DRUGS???

http://www.hcso.tampa.fl.us/pub/default.asp?/online/qdisp/BN=03058540

http://www.hcso.tampa.fl.us/pub/default.asp?/online/FULLPHOTO/URL?bn=03058540&name=DALE,JOHN%20MICHAEL&race=W&vex=UYGPYIXIGBGI

http://www.hcso.tampa.fl.us/pub/default.asp?/Online/qdisp/bn=03035679

http://www.hcso.tampa.fl.us/BookPhoto/MUGImageASP.ASP?WCI=RetrieveImage&WCE=F03035679&WCU

3122. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-23 18:21:50 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20031123132150.05539.00002535@mb-m16.aol.com>
Source record: 82748

In article <bpqfsh$438@library1.airnews.net>, "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
writes:

>> >Kim W5TIT
>>
>> Well, folks, here we are now faced with a dual tragedy -- the fact that
>> Dwight's brother was brutally murdered in a heinous crime of violence,
>> and the fact that Kim thinks it's "hilarious."
>>
>> Dwight, you have my heartfelt sympathy and most sincere condolences.
>>
>> Kim, I can only hope that, as usual, you simply weren't thinking before
>> you let your fingers spout off their usual gibberish. If you truly meant
>> what you said, you are beneath contempt.
>>
>> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>>
>
>Larry, you're an ass, as usual. For anyone but those who *choose* to be
>miserable, such as yourself--it is quite understood that the loss of human
>life is a tragedy.

Kim:

Correct -- which is why I never refer to it as "hilarious," such as you did.

>And, for anyone with even half a brain, *not* such as
>yourself--it is a given that I would not express such assinine thoughts as
>that the death of someone--*anyone* I might add--is hilarious.

Except for the fact that you did, indeed, use that exact word directly in
reference to the death of Dwight's brother.

>Go ahead, though, keep being miserable.

Why should I work your side of the street?

Whether you've noticed it by now or not, Kim, I have already acknowledged
the fact that you could have made a mistake in the use of the word "hilarious"
in it's given context. However, your reaction is, as usual, to go on the
defensive, not accept responsibility for your mistake, and attempt to backpedal
your way to a position of good standing. Did it ever occur to simply take
responsibility for your mistake, offer Dwight and the rest of the newsgroup
a simple, heartfelt apology, and take your fat little fingers off the keyboard
for a while? I didn't think so -- and the results were as predictable as ever.

73 de Larry, K3LT

3123. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-23 18:21:50 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20031123132150.05539.00002534@mb-m16.aol.com>
Source record: 82750

In article <r9Xvb.15940$Rk5.4212@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Kï¿½HB"
<groupk0hb@earthlink.net> writes:

>
>> Even in the case of parents, it is definitely not a good
>> idea and should be discouraged to the greatest extent possible...
>
>Larry,
>
>When you become a parent I suspect you'll change your mind. Obviously there
>is an age where it is not longer appropriate, but I can assure you without
>reservation that having a couple of fresh bathed toddlers in 'jammies' warm
>from the dryer snuggle into bed between you and your spouse is one of the
>most beautiful rewards of parenthood that you could imagine. Until they
>were school age, we always let our kids to feel free to leave their beds and
>clamber in with us if the mood struck them. Didn't need to be some dire
>need of comfort from emotional stress.
>
>73, Hans, K0HB

Hansl:

I am not a parent, and at my age I have my doubts that I'll ever be one.
I come from a very large family, and like about half of my brothers and
sisters, I guess I had enough child-rearing early in my life to make me
not particularly curious to do any of my own. Spending most of my
adult life moving from one country to another every year or two didn't
help much either. However, I don't think I am totally unqualified to make
a statement such as I did in the message you replied to. Children
belong in their own beds, period. I listen to radio talk show and
degreed, licensed family counsellor Dr. Laura Schlessinger all the time, and
she has addressed this issue many times, always stating the same thing
I did. Therefore, we will have to agree to disagree. All I know is, I never
slept in my parent's bed as a child, for any reason, and neither did any
of my 4 brothers or 4 sisters. Quite frankly, I don't know anyone who
ever did.

73 de Larry, K3LT

3124. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-23 18:21:51 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20031123132151.05539.00002536@mb-m16.aol.com>
Source record: 82749

In article <bpqg4o$rjf@library1.airnews.net>, "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
writes:

>>
>> From Michael Jackson's arrest to the above. Can it get any more
>hilarious?
>>
>> Kim W5TIT
>>
>>
>
>Oh, and by the way, Dwight. In the event that you would be (and I don't
>think you would) as childish as Larry, *if* you took the above to think that
>I was including the story of your brother in my "hilarious" comment, then
>you would be wrong; however I apologize to you if I implied that.
>
>Kim W5TIT

Kim:

You said, (quoting above) "From Michael Jackson's arrest to the above.
Can it get any more hilarious?" Well, Kim, "the above" included the
shocking story of how Dwight's brother was brutally murdered. You'll
have to forgive me, but I cannot find anything "hilarious" about that!

I have already acknowledged that you may have let that word fly without
realizing that it included the story of Dwight's brother. I am not making
any attempt to grind any axe with you; I just want you to at least begin
to TRY to think things through a bit better before making reactionary
replies to well-considered postings by others.

One more thing -- it would have gone a long way toward helping you
establish some scintilla of credibility if you could have simply accepted
responsibility for your mistake without the accompanying backpedalling.
Perhaps, some day when you grow up intellectually and emotionally,
you may become aware of such things.

73 de Larry, K3LT

3125. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-23 18:34:49 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <c57wb.2623$IH6.220@news01.roc.ny>
Source record: 82651

Kim,

There is a lot of ongoing coverage of the problems with the Church. What I don't understand is how Michael Jackson keeps having kids over at Neverland - and he has admitted having them in his bed (which is not a crime in itself, but raises a lot of doubt).

Priests are not known for being rich; Michael Jackson is. Yes, problems were swept under the carpet for a long time as the Church is big, but the individual parashes and priests didn't have the wherewithal to keep it hidden forever. I also don't think the individual priests would have kept their 'secrets' for any length of time had they had the visibility that Jackson has.

Speaking of news stories - whatever happened to that pharmacist that diluted the cancer drugs down to 1% and got rich doing it? Sure didn't hear about that much more, did we? Personally, I'd trust drugs out of Canada more than drugs in the USA. Too much leeway and welfare for big business. I notice that the drug companies can force the government as to how they buy drugs. Let a small company try that LOL. Just my opinion.

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

"Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:bpp609$2vo@library1.airnews.net...
> Well, personally, I think it's rather interesting that it is the Michael
> Jackson story that draws such a debate--when the Catholic priests,
bishops,
> and whomever else in the Catholic Church, have been in the news for at
least
> the last two years...and with increasing evidence, admitted guilt,
admitted
> "sweeping it under the rug," and adults who were kids when they were raped
> by the priests!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!! In the Michael Jackson
> case(s), there have been no convictions--only speculation and rumors
> thusfar.
>
> I am not pointing up innocence or guilt--only puzzled by the weirdness of
> frenzy for the Michael Jackson story; when we have a whole host of
> tragedies--*proven* not just supposed--from the Catholic Church... I just
> don't get you folks...
>
> Kim W5TIT
>
>

3126. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-23 18:38:23 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bpqusv$f0e@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 82652

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:wv4wb.10188$m84.3790794@news1.news.adelphia.net...
> Kim W5TIT wrote:
> >
> >
> > Well, personally, I think it's rather interesting that it is the Michael
> > Jackson story that draws such a debate--when the Catholic priests,
bishops,
> > and whomever else in the Catholic Church, have been in the news for at
least
> > the last two years...and with increasing evidence, admitted guilt,
admitted
> > "sweeping it under the rug," and adults who were kids when they were
raped
> > by the priests!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!! In the Michael Jackson
> > case(s), there have been no convictions--only speculation and rumors
> > thusfar.
> >
> > I am not pointing up innocence or guilt--only puzzled by the weirdness
of
> > frenzy for the Michael Jackson story; when we have a whole host of
> > tragedies--*proven* not just supposed--from the Catholic Church... I
just
> > don't get you folks...
>
> I guess it depends where you are at, Kim. In this neck of the woods,
> there has been a HUGE amount of press and talk about the abusive
> priests. Just about every radio and TV station, multiple daily newspaper
> stories. couldn't get away from it if you tried. It has slowed a bit
> now, as the issue is in a interim stage. But you can count on 10-20
> stories per week.
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -
>

Really. That's interesting. The issue's gotten *some* play down here but
not like I thought it would have been--given the immensity of the problem.
Also, I've not heard of one arrest or upcoming trial, etc.

Kim W5TIT

3127. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-23 18:44:15 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bpqv7v$cpe@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 82653

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:IF4wb.10198$m84.3792297@news1.news.adelphia.net...
> Kim W5TIT wrote:
>
>
> > Oh, and by the way, Dwight. In the event that you would be (and I don't
> > think you would) as childish as Larry, *if* you took the above to think
that
> > I was including the story of your brother in my "hilarious" comment,
then
> > you would be wrong; however I apologize to you if I implied that.
>
> Sure is what it looked like, but okay, I'll accept that you didn't mean
> that.
>
> What did you mean?
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -
>

Oh, fer cryin' out loud. Take out the last paragraph, the one about Dwight's brother-in-law. The reaction to the Michael Jackson story, as depicted by Dwight in *all but* his relay about his brother's death, is way too much.

In contrast, there is the Catholic Church stories around the same issue. While I haven't read this newsgroup very often over the past year or so, *except* for about the last what--three/four months--I don't recall seeing any "I'm Shocked" posts on those rapes and abuses.

Leave the story about Dwight's brother out of it. And, this is the last I'll say about that part of it--it has nothing to do with what my comments were about. I don't think there's anyone I've seen post in this newsgroup that is *that* heartless. Nearly, but not quite.

Kim W5TIT

3128. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-23 18:51:27 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bpqvlg$usv@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 82655

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20031123132150.05539.00002535@mb-m16.aol.com...
>
> Whether you've noticed it by now or not, Kim, I have already acknowledged
> the fact that you could have made a mistake in the use of the word
"hilarious"
> in it's given context. However, your reaction is, as usual, to go on the
> defensive, not accept responsibility for your mistake, and attempt to
backpedal
> your way to a position of good standing. Did it ever occur to simply take
> responsibility for your mistake, offer Dwight and the rest of the
newsgroup
> a simple, heartfelt apology, and take your fat little fingers off the
keyboard
> for a while? I didn't think so -- and the results were as predictable as
ever.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

Y'know what, Larry? Phuck (HansTM) you and your patriarchal high horse you ride around on. I owe *you* nor anyone else, *but* possibly Dwight, an apology. I can nearly guarantee you that Dwight would know that I was not commenting on the part about his brother. Now sit the phuck down and shut the phuck up.

Kim W5TIT

3129. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-23 18:52:15 UTC
From: Bert Craig <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM>
Message-ID: <zl7wb.18205$Hb.6392413@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>
Source record: 82654

"K�HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:2j6wb.16494$Rk5.605@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote
>
> > Would you want to go back to the kinds of cars we had back then?
>
> In a heartbeat!!!!! Most wonderful car I ever owned is a 1962 Chev
Corvair
> Corsa convertible.

Woo-hoo, lemme have a 1969 Super-Bee! Alas, all I had was a 1973 Dart with a 318. I would've loved to have a 340 Dart with the bumble bee stripe. <sigh>

One other car that is probably my all time favorite is the 1973 European Ford Capri. Not terribly fast, but wonderfully quick and pretty agile too. I had the 2000cc 4 cyl. model but I'd love to drop a modern Ford 3.8l V6 in one, if I could find one in acceptable cond'n.

73 de Bert
WA2SI

3130. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-23 19:20:02 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bpr1b2$9r5@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 82656

"Jim Hampton" <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote in message
news:c57wb.2623$IH6.220@news01.roc.ny...
> Kim,
>
> There is a lot of ongoing coverage of the problems with the Church. What
I
> don't understand is how Michael Jackson keeps having kids over at
> Neverland - and he has admitted having them in his bed (which is not a
crime
> in itself, but raises a lot of doubt).
>

Yes, but Jim, don't you think there is a potential for an inordinate amount of fanaticism from both sides of the fence on the Michael Jackson story? For instance, true or not I can't tell ya, but when they were interviewing Jackson on that special back a few months ago, with one of those kids who visits him all the time, he was asked about the kids sleeping "with" him. Even his initial answers were far too direct for me. Openly stating that he always sleeps with kids, etc. BUT, something finally clicked with Michael when something was said about the whole thing and he "caught on" to question was the interviewer talking about kids being *in bed* with him. The kid next to him *and* Michael both stated that they never were in bed together. Michael lets the kid up into his bed, and he (Michael) sleeps on the floor--not much different than having a sleep-over, if you will. Now, both of them may be lying through their teeth, I don't know. But all I have to go on is what I heard.

Yes, that raises doubt by the way. I am even doubtful. BUT, I don't think any of us has the right to indict through having doubt...goodness imagine if we did that with everything we doubt? Jackson probably "deserves" whatever he gets for living life as he lives; but it's uniquely his choice to live as he sees fit. He *does not* uniquely have the right to hurt anyone or even to do anything illegal (to cancel out any misery from Larry or others about me supporting Michael Jackson raping kids--<SIGH>), but I don't any of us knows for sure whether he has done anything illegal or not.

Also, I see nothing wrong at all with kids being in bed with adults. I wouldn't like it myself, never even let my own kids in bed with me--but only because that was beyond *my* comfort level. I have no problem with kids and adults sleeping together. We've become overtly sensitive to the issue. And, I am speaking from the perspective even of having been raped on more than one occasion as a child--so it's not because I "haven't been there" so to speak. Been there, done that, threw away the tee-shirt because who'd want a souvenir?

>
> Priests are not known for being rich; Michael Jackson is.
>

I'm not sure why you brought this up.

>
> Yes, problems
> were swept under the carpet for a long time as the Church is big, but the
> individual parashes and priests didn't have the wherewithal to keep it
> hidden forever.
>

Hmmmm, not sure I'm grasping the introduction of this train of thought.
Neither has Michael Jackson been able to sweep things under the carpet.
While I've not paid much attention, hasn't there been news stories about
Jackson and this for the past 3-4 years anyway; and even a court trial
that's already happened once?

>
> I also don't think the individual priests would have kept
> their 'secrets' for any length of time had they had the visibility that
> Jackson has.
>

Ah, duh. I could've read that before I made my comment above, but I'll
still leave it in. BUT, would people be so inclined to be as vociferous on
the topic of the Catholic Church? I think I mean by that, that we jump on
the bandwagon quicker with the Jackson story because of the reasons I
mentioned above: fanaticism. Love 'im or hate 'im, you know what I mean?

>
> Speaking of news stories - whatever happened to that pharmacist that
diluted
> the cancer drugs down to 1% and got rich doing it? Sure didn't hear about
> that much more, did we? Personally, I'd trust drugs out of Canada more
than
> drugs in the USA. Too much leeway and welfare for big business. I notice
> that the drug companies can force the government as to how they buy drugs.
> Let a small company try that LOL. Just my opinion.
>
> 73 from Rochester, NY
> Jim AA2QA
>

I wish I could figure out a way to get my prescriptions from Canada. I
won't do things illegally and if there is even the slightest chance that
it's illegal, I don't want to even try. 'Cause I am with you, I trust the
drugs coming from there just as much as I do from here--they are all the
same companies (for the most part). There isn't another "recipe" just
because it's a Canadian drug. :)

Kim W5TIT

3131. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-23 19:34:08 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <QY7wb.16666$Rk5.1731@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 82657

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote'

> I listen to radio talk show and degreed, licensed family
> counsellor Dr. Laura Schlessinger all the time, and
> she has addressed this issue many times, always
> stating the same thing I did.

Larryl,

Don't believe everything you hear on the radio. Dr. Laura is wrong, and you're wrong. Colleen and I have 5 great, well adjusted children who prove you flat wrong. You're a sibling, not a parent, and you don't have even a trace of a clue.

Sunuvagun.

73, de Hans (no "L" in Hans)

3132. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-23 20:06:32 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <cr8wb.16727$Rk5.3689@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 82658

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote

> degreed, licensed family counsellor Dr. Laura Schlessinger
> all the time

OBTW, Larryl, I should point out that one of our daughters, Gretchen, is also a "degreed, licensed" child counsellor, and she actually practices in the real world as opposed to chatting about it on the radio. And her three little tykes are regularly found in the same bed with their parents. Sorry, Larryl, but in this discussion you're kinda like someone arguing about Morse code but has never learned it themselves.

Sunuvagun!

73, de Hans, K0HB

3133. Re: Svenno's new hero

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-23 20:18:36 UTC
From: Arf! Arf! <user@domain.com>
Message-ID: <my8wb.31725$ow5.11880@bignews2.bellsouth.net>
Source record: 82659
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Stagger Lee wrote:
GOT DRUGS???

http://www.hcso.tampa.fl.us/pub/default.asp?/online/qdisp/BN=03058540

http://www.hcso.tampa.fl.us/pub/default.asp?/online/FULLPHOTO/URL?bn=03058540&name=DALE,JOHN%20MICHAEL&race=W&vex=UYGPYIXIGBGI

http://www.hcso.tampa.fl.us/pub/default.asp?/Online/qdisp/bn=03035679

http://www.hcso.tampa.fl.us/BookPhoto/MUGImageASP.ASP?WCI=RetrieveImage&WCE=F03035679&WCU

3134. Re: Looks like both sons are jailbirds like Daddy Jaildale

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-23 20:19:44 UTC
From: Arf! Arf! <user@domain.com>
Message-ID: <pz8wb.31732$ow5.17882@bignews2.bellsouth.net>
Source record: 82660
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.swap,rec.radio.amateur.policy

KE4TEW wrote:

GOT DRUGS???

http://www.hcso.tampa.fl.us/pub/default.asp?/online/qdisp/BN=03058540

http://www.hcso.tampa.fl.us/pub/default.asp?/online/FULLPHOTO/URL?bn=03058540&name=DALE,JOHN%20MICHAEL&race=W&vex=UYGPYIXIGBGI

http://www.hcso.tampa.fl.us/pub/default.asp?/Online/qdisp/bn=03035679

http://www.hcso.tampa.fl.us/BookPhoto/MUGImageASP.ASP?WCI=RetrieveImage&WCE=F03035679&WCU

3135. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent? Is KE4TEW a father of felons? YES

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-23 20:23:46 UTC
From: Arf! Arf! <user@domain.com>
Message-ID: <bD8wb.31761$ow5.29510@bignews2.bellsouth.net>
Source record: 82661
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.swap

Is Michael a ham? I think not.

GOT DRUGS???

http://www.hcso.tampa.fl.us/pub/default.asp?/online/qdisp/BN=03058540

http://www.hcso.tampa.fl.us/pub/default.asp?/online/FULLPHOTO/URL?bn=03058540&name=DALE,JOHN%20MICHAEL&race=W&vex=UYGPYIXIGBGI

http://www.hcso.tampa.fl.us/pub/default.asp?/Online/qdisp/bn=03035679

http://www.hcso.tampa.fl.us/BookPhoto/MUGImageASP.ASP?WCI=RetrieveImage&WCE=F03035679&WCU

Kim W5TIT wrote:

> "Jim Hampton" <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote in message
> news:c57wb.2623$IH6.220@news01.roc.ny...
>
>>Kim,
>>
>>There is a lot of ongoing coverage of the problems with the Church. What
>
> I
>
>>don't understand is how Michael Jackson keeps having kids over at
>>Neverland - and he has admitted having them in his bed (which is not a
>
> crime
>
>>in itself, but raises a lot of doubt).
>>
>
>
> Yes, but Jim, don't you think there is a potential for an inordinate amount
> of fanaticism from both sides of the fence on the Michael Jackson story?
> For instance, true or not I can't tell ya, but when they were interviewing
> Jackson on that special back a few months ago, with one of those kids who
> visits him all the time, he was asked about the kids sleeping "with" him.
> Even his initial answers were far too direct for me. Openly stating that he
> always sleeps with kids, etc. BUT, something finally clicked with Michael
> when something was said about the whole thing and he "caught on" to question
> was the interviewer talking about kids being *in bed* with him. The kid
> next to him *and* Michael both stated that they never were in bed together.
> Michael lets the kid up into his bed, and he (Michael) sleeps on the
> floor--not much different than having a sleep-over, if you will. Now, both

> of them may be lying through their teeth, I don't know. But all I have to
> go on is what I heard.
>
> Yes, that raises doubt by the way. I am even doubtful. BUT, I don't think
> any of us has the right to indict through having doubt...goodness imagine if
> we did that with everything we doubt? Jackson probably "deserves" whatever
> he gets for living life as he lives; but it's uniquely his choice to live as
> he sees fit. He *does not* uniquely have the right to hurt anyone or even
> to do anything illegal (to cancel out any misery from Larry or others about
> me supporting Michael Jackson raping kids--<SIGH>), but I don't any of us
> knows for sure whether he has done anything illegal or not.
>
> Also, I see nothing wrong at all with kids being in bed with adults. I
> wouldn't like it myself, never even let my own kids in bed with me--but only
> because that was beyond *my* comfort level. I have no problem with kids and
> adults sleeping together. We've become overtly sensitive to the issue.
> And, I am speaking from the perspective even of having been raped on more
> than one occasion as a child--so it's not because I "haven't been there" so
> to speak. Been there, done that, threw away the tee-shirt because who'd
> want a souvenir?
>
>
>>Priests are not known for being rich; Michael Jackson is.
>>
>
>
> I'm not sure why you brought this up.
>
>
>
>>Yes, problems
>>were swept under the carpet for a long time as the Church is big, but the
>>individual parashes and priests didn't have the wherewithal to keep it
>>hidden forever.
>>
>
>
> Hmmmm, not sure I'm grasping the introduction of this train of thought.
> Neither has Michael Jackson been able to sweep things under the carpet.
> While I've not paid much attention, hasn't there been news stories about
> Jackson and this for the past 3-4 years anyway; and even a court trial
> that's already happened once?
>
>
>>I also don't think the individual priests would have kept
>>their 'secrets' for any length of time had they had the visibility that
>>Jackson has.
>>
>
>

> Ah, duh. I could've read that before I made my comment above, but I'll
> still leave it in. BUT, would people be so inclined to be as vociferous on
> the topic of the Catholic Church? I think I mean by that, that we jump on
> the bandwagon quicker with the Jackson story because of the reasons I
> mentioned above: fanaticism. Love 'im or hate 'im, you know what I mean?
>
>
>>Speaking of news stories - whatever happened to that pharmacist that
>
> diluted
>
>>the cancer drugs down to 1% and got rich doing it? Sure didn't hear about
>>that much more, did we? Personally, I'd trust drugs out of Canada more
>
> than
>
>>drugs in the USA. Too much leeway and welfare for big business. I notice
>>that the drug companies can force the government as to how they buy drugs.
>>Let a small company try that LOL. Just my opinion.
>>
>>73 from Rochester, NY
>>Jim AA2QA
>>
>
>
> I wish I could figure out a way to get my prescriptions from Canada. I
> won't do things illegally and if there is even the slightest chance that
> it's illegal, I don't want to even try. 'Cause I am with you, I trust the
> drugs coming from there just as much as I do from here--they are all the
> same companies (for the most part). There isn't another "recipe" just
> because it's a Canadian drug. :)
>
> Kim W5TIT
>
>

3136. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-23 20:29:47 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bpr5dr$ig@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 82662

"K HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:QY7wb.16666$Rk5.1731@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> "Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote'
>
> > I listen to radio talk show and degreed, licensed family
> > counsellor Dr. Laura Schlessinger all the time, and
> > she has addressed this issue many times, always
> > stating the same thing I did.
>
>
> Larryl,
>
> Don't believe everything you hear on the radio. Dr. Laura is wrong, and
> you're wrong. Colleen and I have 5 great, well adjusted children who
prove
> you flat wrong. You're a sibling, not a parent, and you don't have even a
> trace of a clue.
>
> Sunuvagun.
>
> 73, de Hans (no "L" in Hans)
>

"Dr.," which she is not I hear, Laura is so far out of reality it's not even humorous to listen to her...

An aside to the whole thing: Larry has (how many times?) berated people for their opinion of CW, or ham radio, or whatever, for their having no experience. Well, you're right Hans. He's not a parent, so he doesn't have clue, nor would he know where to find one.

Kim W5TIT

3137. Re: CB Linears For Freebanding

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-23 21:54:19 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <f0awb.18911$Wy4.11307@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 82663

"BA" wrote:
>
> (snip) hams running around acting as self-
> appointed enforcement officers are not only
> fooling themselves but are treading on
> dangerous ground, considering the unsavory
> types of people who often buy and operate
> this type of gear.

Perhaps all the more reason for Ham Operators, and anyone else, to want these guys off this country's radio frequencies.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3138. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-23 21:54:21 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <h0awb.16916$Rk5.15731@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 82664

"Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote

> In some of those cases you mention above,
> I am not so certain there weren't reasons (inside reasons
> we'll never know about) for the things happening the way
> they did.

You're being brainwashed.

As for me, I'm sick and ph**king tired of "inside reasons".

For "inside reasons", Zacarias Moussaoui will probably suffer nothing more than deportation on immigration charges.

Robert Hanssen, a long time trusted FBI agent, spied on his own agency for the Soviet Union. Dozens of agents, many of them Americans, were executed as a result of his treason. Instead of a quick and merciful administration of a lethal injection, for "inside reasons" he sits in a nice comfy federal facility, and his family lives on a comfortable federal pension at our expense. (If I'm ever convicted of a felony --- ANY felony, let alone TREASON --- my family will see zippo-squat-nothing of my federal pension.)

I don't want to hear about any "inside reasons".

73, de Hans, K0HB

3139. Re: CB Linears For Freebanding

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-23 22:20:45 UTC
From: hams 'r us <hams@hamrustoys.org>
Message-ID: <bprbrr$j1l$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 82665

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:f0awb.18911$Wy4.11307@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net...
>
> "BA" wrote:
> >
> > (snip) hams running around acting as self-
> > appointed enforcement officers are not only
> > fooling themselves but are treading on
> > dangerous ground, considering the unsavory
> > types of people who often buy and operate
> > this type of gear.
>
>
> Perhaps all the more reason for Ham Operators, and anyone else, to want
> these guys off this country's radio frequencies.
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>

Yes, I'm sure your concerns are on America's list of
national priorities. In fact, I think you should contact
George W Bush & the U.S. Congress immediately and
request they act on this now!

ROTFLMAO!

3140. Re: Need Drugs?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-23 22:21:28 UTC
From: Arf! Arf! <DoggieDaze@lLiberalz.com>
Message-ID: <Bmawb.10408$6c3.2929@bignews1.bellsouth.net>
Source record: 82666
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.misc

Mick Slater wrote:

GOT DRUGS???

http://www.hcso.tampa.fl.us/pub/default.asp?/online/qdisp/BN=03058540

http://www.hcso.tampa.fl.us/pub/default.asp?/online/FULLPHOTO/URL?bn=03058540&name=DALE,JOHN%20MICHAEL&race=W&vex=UYGPYIXIGBGI

http://www.hcso.tampa.fl.us/pub/default.asp?/Online/qdisp/bn=03035679

http://www.hcso.tampa.fl.us/BookPhoto/MUGImageASP.ASP?WCI=RetrieveImage&WCE=F03035679&WCU

3141. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-23 22:44:35 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <nLawb.19028$Wy4.9046@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 82667

"N2EY" wrote:
>
> Perhaps something really bad would have
> happened, but the spell prevented it.
> Who can ever say?

The specific spell requested could only have resulted in something bad.

> Who determines what is a "legitimate" religion
> and what isn't? Who *can* determine such a
> thing (other than God?)

You just love to ask the "who determines" question, don't you? Especially when the answer is bloody obvious - like with most other things, people do. People either decide it's a legitimate religion or not. A small, fringe, group of supposed believers don't make a religion legitimate (Hale-Bop's Heaven's Gate cult, for example), especially when the vast majority believe it's a load of crap (and I do suspect the vast majority don't really believe wiccas can actually cast spells, charms, and so on).

> Why not?

Already answered in the paragraph you quoted (the paragraph taken as a whole, not sliced up into individual sentences).

> Couldn't the same be said of almost all religions
> now in existence? Most are based on a book or
> series of books written hundreds or thousands
> of years ago. (snip)

However, the practices of today's wiccas seem mostly made up from images and stories in FICTIONAL movies, television, and books, not religious material and literature written by those who practice that religion. In other words, since so little is known of the old pagan religions, wiccas simply 'borrowed' things like black robes, symbols, supposed spells, and so on, from relatively modern day fiction.

> Would you say the same thing about the power
> of prayer, miracles, transubstantiation, and other
> central beliefs of modern Christianity?

It is one thing to pray for assistance from a God and quite another to actually claim to have personal powers to cast spells, charms, and so on. I would ask for similar proof from anyone, in any religion, who claimed to have such powers (any powers).

> Fine - but then why discriminate between "legitimate"
> and "illegitimate" religions?

Words alone do not discriminate, Jim. Nobody has been deprived of anything by my words.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3142. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-23 22:49:51 UTC
From: Arf! Arf! <DoggieDaze@lLiberalz.com>
Message-ID: <cNawb.10501$6c3.5419@bignews1.bellsouth.net>
Source record: 82668

And how does this dictate or involve policy?

Dwight Stewart wrote:

> "N2EY" wrote:
>
>>Perhaps something really bad would have
>>happened, but the spell prevented it.
>>Who can ever say?
>
>
>
> The specific spell requested could only have resulted in something bad.
>
>
>
>>Who determines what is a "legitimate" religion
>>and what isn't? Who *can* determine such a
>>thing (other than God?)
>
>
>
> You just love to ask the "who determines" question, don't you? Especially
> when the answer is bloody obvious - like with most other things, people do.
> People either decide it's a legitimate religion or not. A small, fringe,
> group of supposed believers don't make a religion legitimate (Hale-Bop's
> Heaven's Gate cult, for example), especially when the vast majority believe
> it's a load of crap (and I do suspect the vast majority don't really believe
> wiccas can actually cast spells, charms, and so on).
>
>
>
>>Why not?
>
>
>
> Already answered in the paragraph you quoted (the paragraph taken as a
> whole, not sliced up into individual sentences).
>
>
>
>>Couldn't the same be said of almost all religions
>>now in existence? Most are based on a book or
>>series of books written hundreds or thousands
>>of years ago. (snip)

>
>
>
> However, the practices of today's wiccas seem mostly made up from images
> and stories in FICTIONAL movies, television, and books, not religious
> material and literature written by those who practice that religion. In
> other words, since so little is known of the old pagan religions, wiccas
> simply 'borrowed' things like black robes, symbols, supposed spells, and so
> on, from relatively modern day fiction.
>
>
>
>>Would you say the same thing about the power
>>of prayer, miracles, transubstantiation, and other
>>central beliefs of modern Christianity?
>
>
>
> It is one thing to pray for assistance from a God and quite another to
> actually claim to have personal powers to cast spells, charms, and so on. I
> would ask for similar proof from anyone, in any religion, who claimed to
> have such powers (any powers).
>
>
>
>>Fine - but then why discriminate between "legitimate"
>>and "illegitimate" religions?
>
>
>
> Words alone do not discriminate, Jim. Nobody has been deprived of anything
> by my words.
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
>

3143. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-23 23:06:08 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <A3bwb.19051$Wy4.15749@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 82669

"Jim Hampton" wrote:
>
> I almost agree with you except on that
> "clear and present danger". I wouldn't
> want my kid to go near that place; then
> again, you mention there is no law
> against stupidity. Sigh ...

Note we're talking about the subject (young boy) of the current legal proceedings. Since there were no actual criminal charges in the first incident ten years ago, and nothing actually proven, it would be difficult to prove a clear and present danger existed for this boy. However, since criminal charges now exist and are widely known, it should be easier to prove a clear and present danger existed when it comes to parents who allow their kids to sleep with MJ in the future.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3144. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-23 23:18:48 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <sfbwb.19070$Wy4.6833@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 82670

"Larry Roll K3LT" wrote:
>
> Any adult, other than a parent, sleeping
> with a child is just plain sick -- period,
> End Of Story. (snip)

You may think that, but it doesn't necessarily make it a crime. Something more has to exist before it reaches that level. In the case of Michael Jackson, it appears that something more did exist (making that a criminal matter).

> Even in the case of parents, it is definitely
> not a good idea and should be discouraged
> to the greatest extent possible, although
> there are occasional, and rare, times when
> it may be OK to comfort the child in unusual
> circumstances causing emotional stress.

I have to agree with the others on this. I just don't see any real risks associated with a young child sleeping a parent or parents.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3145. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-23 23:22:00 UTC
From: Alun <alun@1stcounsel.com>
Message-ID: <Xns943CBAD374BC7elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 82671

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in
news:rzTvb.17581$Wy4.5232@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net:

>
> "Alun" <alun@1stcounsel.com> wrote in message
> news:Xns943B9D3CC8D00elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
>> <snip>
>> >> Several countries around the world have moved, or are moving,
>> >> forward to
>> >>eliminate the Morse Code testing requirement while the United States
>> >>sits back and watches.
>> >
>> > What's the count now?
>>
>> I think they include at least the UK, Belgium, Germany, Switzerland,
>> the Netherlands, Norway, Singapore, Papua New Guinea and Australia
>> (not until Jan 1st). New Zealand may actually do it before Australia,
>> as they have said it would be before the end of the year, but have
>> given no date. I am pretty sure I have missed a couple out, too.
>
> See the list at:
>
> http://www.rsgb.org/licensing/nomorse.htm
>

OK - The RSGB list has UK, Switzerland, Belgium, Germany, Norway, the
Netherlands, Ireland, Singapore and Luxembourg. However, I'm also aware of
Papua New Guinea and Finland who have abolished the code test already,
Australia who have announced a date of Jan 1st, and New Zealand, who say
sometime before the new year (but no date). So that's actually 11 so far,
and at least 13 by the new year, probably more. I don't think we will know
which countries might keep a code test until at least July (i.e 12 months
after the ITU decision), and I don't think they will be a majority (?).

>> > How many countries have eliminated the code test, vs. how many have
>> > retained it so far?
>>
>> Most do still retain it, but I think this has far more to do with
>> bureaucracy than intent
>
> The changes to government regulations, in the USAand in many other
> countries, take time. Did Jim expect an overnight change in the 100+
> countries? Frankly, I'm pretty amazed at the ones that have been able
> to do so on such a short time interval.
>

>> >>Is this the actions of a modern, progressive, country with feet
>> >>planted firmly on today and eyes on the future?
>> >
>> > What does all that mean, exactly? Besides the removal of the last
>> > remaining vestige of code testing?
>> >
>> >> It's time to move on, Jim.
>> >
>> > To what?
>> >
>> > Let's say that tomorrow FCC just dumps Element 1. One sentence:
>> > "Element 1 is waived for all applicants, pending revision of the
>> > rules". Could happen, y'know.
>
> Bring it on!!!
>
>> Probably will
>>
>> > What happens next?
>>
>> Lots of upgrades, plus no-coders on 10m the next day
>
> Works for me. Anyone see a problem in that?
>
> Cheers,
> Bill K2UNK
>
>
>

3146. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-23 23:23:46 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <6kbwb.19089$Wy4.15721@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 82672

"Jim Hampton" wrote:
> 'cmon. Read the headers. You just fed a troll :)

Those who have known me over the last five or six years in this newsgroup also know I don't troll, Jim. This topic has received massive coverage in the news over the last few days. Because of that, I thought it was an interesting topic to introduce in the newsgroup (something different to talk about).

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3147. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-23 23:25:58 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <ambwb.19094$Wy4.8032@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 82673

"Alun" wrote:
>
> I don't know what to say, Dwight. You have
> my sympathy, FWIW.

It was a long time ago, Alun. Thanks anyway, though.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3148. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-23 23:28:34 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <Cobwb.19102$Wy4.11490@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 82674

"Kï¿½HB" wrote:
>
> The US legal system has made a mockery
> of itself, without any help from Larry &
> Dwight. (snip)

Amen, Hans.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3149. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-23 23:28:41 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031123182841.29815.00001932@mb-m21.aol.com>
Source record: 82676

In article <2a5wb.10210$m84.3800775@news1.news.adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo
<mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>
>> In article <bpfrcf$1ns0sh$8@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>, "Ryan, KC8PMX"
>> <REMOVETHISkc8pmx@diamondcs.net> writes:
>>
>>
>>>"Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
>>>news:3FBA66ED.5070205@psu.edu...
>>>
>>>>Ryan, KC8PMX wrote:
>>>>
>>>>>If your interest rate is less than 5%, the best loan to get is a 30
>>>
>>>year!
>>>
>>>>>It's cheap money. Paying off a house quick is foolish. And the monthly
>>>>>rate is usually a hell of alot less too. Spend the difference of that
>>>>>paying off bills or invest it in a mutual fund or something.
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>Ahh, a financial truism! This belongs with:
>>>>
>>>>The stock market ALWAYS goes up!
>>>
>>>What goes up must come down as well too.
>>
>>
>> Not necessarily. Look at where the Dow was when Bill Clinton took office in
>> 1992...
>>
>>
>>>But that is the beauty of the
>>>stock market. It is a cyclical thing. Ideally it would be like a good
>>>sinus rhythm. It is just merely the knowledge of where to jump in at.
>>>
>>
>> Just as important is knowing when to jump *out*.
>
> And there is the problem for those playing the market for their
>retirements. They know about when they are going to jump out, but if the

>market doesn't cooperate....oh oh!
>>
>>>>(It soitanly do, but over long time periods that are not relevant to
>>>>most of us who don't live over 150 years. More importantly it is what
>>>>the market is doing around the time you take your money out.)
>>>>
>>>>Move your money into high yield accounts shortly before you retire, that
>>>>way you'll have more money when you retire!
>>>
>> Buy high, sell low, go broke...
>>
>>>Only if you know what you are doing and have a really good grasp of the
>>>market.
>>
>>
>> Which absolutely no one has.
>>
>>>>I've listened to investment consultants actually pull this one out of
>>>>their hats. I know some older folk who have done this and now have
>>>>almost no retirement funds.
>>>
>>>Yep... not for the weak or feable to try on thier own if not knowledgeable.
>>>
>>
>> The term is "risk tolerance"- a fancy way of saying how ready you are to
>lose
>> money. And the rule is simple: the closer you are to actually needing the
>> money, the less your risk tolerance should be.
>>
>>>>I have to chuckle at your truism. first, because your friend the real
>>>>estate agent uses those sort of arguments to talk you into buying
>>>>several thousand or tens of thousands more dollars worht of house.
>>>>Second is that You are saying a person who gets out of debt is foolish.
>>>
>>>Actually the person I got this truism from and believe in it is Bruce
>>>Williams, the talkshow host. If you do the math, it is fairly true.
>>
>> I did the math and it's false enough to be a worthless truism.
>
>If you look at the total dollars spent, you can still pay less money on
>some of the higher interest lower cost loans than lower interest higher
>priced loans. (although I'd never suggest doing that) It's just the
>sheer amount of dollars.

Yep. That's why you have to calculate the options.

>So the best bet is to pay all the loans off as
>quickly as possible.

Not always.

Suppose you're in a situation where money is tight but you can expect big
increases some time in the future. (example: kids are small and one parent is
home with them, but when the youngest reaches school age both parents will be
working full time). In a case like that, having a lower monthly payment may be
the best alternative even if it requires a longer loan term.
>
>>>>Best way to not be a fool is to not go heavily into debt in the first
>>>>place. I have a 5 percent loan, but I'll pay it off quickly, I think.
>>>
>>>I wouldn't but thats me. What I would do is see if you can refinance at
>all
>>>to a lower rate. I have actually seen a interest rate recently somewhere
>in
>>>the 3 percent range!! Talk about a cheap loan, hell, I would
>>>refinance/remortgage my neighbors house if I could legally get away with
>it!
>>>LOL
>>>
>>
>> Sure - because a house is something you need anyway, it's insured and not
>> likely to wind up obsolete or useless in a few years. Most of all, almost
>no
>> one can afford to buy a house for cash.
>>
>>
>>>>>Instead of paying off that low interest loan quickly, one is smarter
>>>>>paying
>>>>>off the higher interest loans like automobiles, department and credit
>>>>>card
>>>>>charges, and other loans/debts.
>>>>
>>>>Again, it's better to not get into a situation where you would have to
>>>>choose which loan you're paying off early.
>>>
>>>Well, its not paying the principle that kills ya, its the interest that
>does
>>>over a long time. The lesser the interest rate, the less I am interested
>in
>>>rushing to pay it off extra early. Either way, one needs to do the math
>or
>>>find someone who does understand real estate finance and other financal
>>>calculations to make sure in their own individual circumstances.
>>>
>>
>> Exactly - it's all in the numbers for your particular situation.
>>
>> The biggest financial boo-boos people make are:
>>
>> - confusing "wants" and "needs" (you may need a car, but you want a new
>SUV)
>> - not having a budget, or not having one based on real data

>> - looking at their income out-of-context and saying "I can afford X"
>without
>> doing the numbers.
>
> Don't forget succumbing to the credit card problem. It's soooo easy to

>live life large when you have 10 credit cards with a 20 thousand liimit
>on each card.

That's simply another version of looking at their income out-of-context and saying "I can afford X" without doing the numbers. If you can't afford to pay off the credit cards at the end of the month, you really can't afford the purchase made on them.

I consider credit cards as "payment cards", nothing more.
>
> One of those nifty little life secrets I've found out is that if you
>are willing to avoid spending credit money like a drunken sailor while
>you are young, you will have much more money for your toys when you get
>older.

New verse to an old song:

What shall we do with a drunken sailor
What shall we do with a drunken sailor
What shall we do with a drunken sailor
Ear-lie in the morning?

Put 'im in charge of an Exxon tanker
Put 'im in charge of an Exxon tanker
Put 'im in charge of an Exxon tanker
Ear-lie in the morning!

73 de Jim, N2EY

3150. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-23 23:28:43 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031123182843.29815.00001933@mb-m21.aol.com>
Source record: 82675

In article <QY7wb.16666$Rk5.1731@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> writes:

>"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote'
>
>> I listen to radio talk show and degreed, licensed family
>> counsellor Dr. Laura Schlessinger all the time, and
>> she has addressed this issue many times, always
>> stating the same thing I did.

Larry,

You might want to look up "Dr." Laura's credentials and see what subject she holds a doctorate in.

You might also be interested in the qualfications required to be a "family counselor" in the state where she practices.

The good "Doctor" offers quick, authoritarian solutions to selected problems (note that all calls are well-screened first). Her callers are simply not allowed to disagree or present opposing data, nor to deal with anything in-depth. The good "Dr." always has her finger poised on the hangup button.

Most of all, there is no followup to see how well the advice worked out.
>
>Larryl,
>
>Don't believe everything you hear on the radio. Dr. Laura is wrong, and
>you're wrong.

On the subject of children sleeping with parents, you can find degreed, licensed experts that endorse the entire spectrum from "never, ever!" to the "family bed" concept.

>Colleen and I have 5 great, well adjusted children who prove
>you flat wrong.

What those 5 prove is that simply that the sum total of their nature plus nurture worked out well. And that says a lot.

How many children has "Dr." Laura raised?

>You're a sibling, not a parent, and you don't have even a
>trace of a clue.

Can we apply that same standard to those who want to do away with Morse code testing even though they don't know the mode and have never used it?

>Sunuvagun.
>
Exactly.

73 de Jim, N2EY
>

3151. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-23 23:30:06 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <2qbwb.10443$m84.3898627@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 82677

Kï¿½HB wrote:

> "Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote'
>
>
>>I listen to radio talk show and degreed, licensed family
>>counsellor Dr. Laura Schlessinger all the time, and
>>she has addressed this issue many times, always
>>stating the same thing I did.
>
>
>
> Larryl,
>
> Don't believe everything you hear on the radio. Dr. Laura is wrong, and
> you're wrong. Colleen and I have 5 great, well adjusted children who prove
> you flat wrong. You're a sibling, not a parent, and you don't have even a
> trace of a clue.

Dr Laura is an entertainer. I was entertained by her show for about 2 weeks.

Gotta wonder about the people that call her. (if indeed they are real
people) If they are real, the first diagnosis is that they are masochists.

- Mike KB3EIA -

3152. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-23 23:35:04 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <lubwb.17139$Rk5.5484@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 82678

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote

> A small, fringe, group of supposed believers don't make
> a religion legitimate, especially when the vast majority believe
> it's a load of crap.

Since no single religion in the world enjoys a "vast majority" of the
population as "supposed believers", then it follows that the "vast majority"
of the worlds population on average believes that Judaism, Islam,
Christianity, Hinduism, Shintoism, Scientism, Buddhism, etc. are each
individually a "load of crap" also, and not really legitimate. I think
I'll just believe in all of them to make sure my bases are covered.

Sunuvagun!

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

3153. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-23 23:35:32 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <8vbwb.19122$Wy4.18965@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 82679

"Kim W5TIT" wrote:
>
> (snip) My point is that in this country, one is
> innocent until proven guilty. (snip)

One is innocent under the law until proven guilty in a court of law. That does not suggest even for a moment that people cannot have their own opinions or beliefs concerning the guilt or innocence of a person, or voice those opinions or beliefs.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3154. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-23 23:37:51 UTC
From: Alun <alun@1stcounsel.com>
Message-ID: <Xns943CBD83D456Aelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 82680

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in
news:sfbwb.19070$Wy4.6833@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net:

> "Larry Roll K3LT" wrote:
>>
>> Any adult, other than a parent, sleeping
>> with a child is just plain sick -- period,
>> End Of Story. (snip)
>
>
> You may think that, but it doesn't necessarily make it a crime.
> Something
> more has to exist before it reaches that level. In the case of Michael
> Jackson, it appears that something more did exist (making that a
> criminal matter).
>
>
>> Even in the case of parents, it is definitely
>> not a good idea and should be discouraged
>> to the greatest extent possible, although
>> there are occasional, and rare, times when
>> it may be OK to comfort the child in unusual circumstances causing
>> emotional stress.
>
>
> I have to agree with the others on this. I just don't see any real
> risks
> associated with a young child sleeping a parent or parents.
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
>
>

I agree with the latter, although it is a nuisance when you can't get the kids out of your bed, so not a good idea to encourage them. Any harm is likely to be to the parents, not the kids!

Now, if one spouse is not a biological parent, that's potentially a different ball game, but I won't go there.

I don't necessarily think that a child sleeping with a non-parent is always a problem, but in Jacko's case the circumstances are highly

worrying and suspicious.

3155. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-23 23:39:33 UTC
From: Arf! Arf! <DoggieDaze@lLiberalz.com>
Message-ID: <Ovbwb.10695$6c3.1971@bignews1.bellsouth.net>
Source record: 82681

And it's connection to ham radio policy is...

Dwight Stewart wrote:

> "Jim Hampton" wrote:
>
>>'cmon. Read the headers. You just fed a troll :)
>
>
>
> Those who have known me over the last five or six years in this newsgroup
> also know I don't troll, Jim. This topic has received massive coverage in
> the news over the last few days. Because of that, I thought it was an
> interesting topic to introduce in the newsgroup (something different to talk
> about).
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
>

3156. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-23 23:53:45 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <dMbwb.19139$Wy4.6795@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 82682

"Kim W5TIT" wrote:
>
> Uh, 'scuse me. Knock knock. Larry just
> made race the issue from his perspective?
> Hellooooooo. (snip)

Do try to separate the discussion in this newsgroup from potential court proceedings, Kim. Larry was talking about the use of race as part of the defense of Michael Jackson in any eventual court proceedings. I responded to that. Since I seriously doubt either Larry or myself will be involved in any court proceedings against Michael Jackson, any mention of race here is not going to make race an issue there (in that court room).

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3157. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-23 23:55:36 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <YNbwb.17168$Rk5.8475@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 82683

"Alun" <alun@1stcounsel.com> wrote

>
> Now, if one spouse is not a biological parent, that's potentially a
> different ball game, but I won't go there.
>

Hell, I'll go there, because to not "go there" just panders to people with twisted dirty little minds who think "something must be going on there". Just to make it interesting, let's say that the child is adopted. Those of us who are parents (and I think most who aren't parents) understand the unconditional love parents have for their children, be they "natural", "step", or "adopted". Until the very recent past, perhaps less than 150 years in this country, and much more recent than that in less developed parts of the world, families didn't live in 3 and 4 bedroom homes where each person had their own "space". Not only did Dad and Mom and the kids sleep in the same place, but also Grandpa and Grandma and the occasional cousin or Auntie or Uncle who might be without their own nuclear family to spend the night with. Dr. Laura would likely have a heart attack if she saw how some people live today in places outside her privileged neighborhood.

Sunuvagun!

73, de Hans, K0HB

3158. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-23 23:57:24 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <EPbwb.11252$m84.3906010@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 82684

N2EY wrote:

> In article <2a5wb.10210$m84.3800775@news1.news.adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo
> <mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:

<some snippage>

>>If you look at the total dollars spent, you can still pay less money on
>>some of the higher interest lower cost loans than lower interest higher
>>priced loans. (although I'd never suggest doing that) It's just the
>>sheer amount of dollars.
>
>
> Yep. That's why you have to calculate the options.
>
>
>>So the best bet is to pay all the loans off as
>>quickly as possible.
>
>
> Not always.
>
> Suppose you're in a situation where money is tight but you can expect big
> increases some time in the future. (example: kids are small and one parent is
> home with them, but when the youngest reaches school age both parents will be
> working full time). In a case like that, having a lower monthly payment may be
> the best alternative even if it requires a longer loan term.

Well, a qualified yes. I've found people, including myself, sometimes
too optimistic when dealing with "future" things, like earnings and
expenditures. While what you sat is true, I'll take the tack of either
paying the thing off ASAP, or go without. Maybe even save for what I
want. (Modern Heresy Alert!)

>>>>>Best way to not be a fool is to not go heavily into debt in the first
>>>>>place. I have a 5 percent loan, but I'll pay it off quickly, I think.
>>>>
>>>>I wouldn't but thats me. What I would do is see if you can refinance at
>>
>>all
>>
>>>>to a lower rate. I have actually seen a interest rate recently somewhere
>>
>>in
>>
>>>>the 3 percent range!! Talk about a cheap loan, hell, I would

>>>>refinance/remortgage my neighbors house if I could legally get away with
>>
>>it!
>>
>>>>LOL
>>>>
>>>
>>>Sure - because a house is something you need anyway, it's insured and not
>>>likely to wind up obsolete or useless in a few years. Most of all, almost
>>
>>no
>>
>>>one can afford to buy a house for cash.
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>>>>Instead of paying off that low interest loan quickly, one is smarter
>>>>>>paying
>>>>>>off the higher interest loans like automobiles, department and credit
>>>>>>card
>>>>>>charges, and other loans/debts.
>>>>>
>>>>>Again, it's better to not get into a situation where you would have to
>>>>>choose which loan you're paying off early.
>>>>
>>>>Well, its not paying the principle that kills ya, its the interest that
>>
>>does
>>
>>>>over a long time. The lesser the interest rate, the less I am interested
>>
>>in
>>
>>>>rushing to pay it off extra early. Either way, one needs to do the math
>>
>>or
>>
>>>>find someone who does understand real estate finance and other financal
>>>>calculations to make sure in their own individual circumstances.
>>>>
>>>
>>>Exactly - it's all in the numbers for your particular situation.
>>>
>>>The biggest financial boo-boos people make are:
>>>
>>>- confusing "wants" and "needs" (you may need a car, but you want a new
>>
>>SUV)
>>
>>>- not having a budget, or not having one based on real data

>>>- looking at their income out-of-context and saying "I can afford X"
>>
>>without
>>
>>>doing the numbers.
>>
>> Don't forget succumbing to the credit card problem. It's soooo easy to
>
>
>>live life large when you have 10 credit cards with a 20 thousand liimit
>>on each card.
>
>
> That's simply another version of looking at their income out-of-context and
> saying "I can afford X" without doing the numbers. If you can't afford to pay
> off the credit cards at the end of the month, you really can't afford the
> purchase made on them.
>
> I consider credit cards as "payment cards", nothing more.
>
>> One of those nifty little life secrets I've found out is that if you
>>are willing to avoid spending credit money like a drunken sailor while
>>you are young, you will have much more money for your toys when you get
>>older.
>
>
> New verse to an old song:
>
> What shall we do with a drunken sailor
> What shall we do with a drunken sailor
> What shall we do with a drunken sailor
> Ear-lie in the morning?
>
> Put 'im in charge of an Exxon tanker
> Put 'im in charge of an Exxon tanker
> Put 'im in charge of an Exxon tanker
> Ear-lie in the morning!
>

HeHe!

- Mike KB3EIA -

3159. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-24 00:24:33 UTC
From: Arf! Arf! <DoggieDaze@lLiberalz.com>
Message-ID: <%9cwb.10865$6c3.3756@bignews1.bellsouth.net>
Source record: 82685

connection to ham radio is?
Maybe you need a new group: rec.boring.nolife.discussion

Mike Coslo wrote:

> N2EY wrote:
>
>> In article <2a5wb.10210$m84.3800775@news1.news.adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo
>> <mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:
>
>
> <some snippage>
>
>>> If you look at the total dollars spent, you can still pay less money
>>> on some of the higher interest lower cost loans than lower interest
>>> higher priced loans. (although I'd never suggest doing that) It's
>>> just the sheer amount of dollars.
>>
>>
>>
>> Yep. That's why you have to calculate the options.
>>
>>
>>> So the best bet is to pay all the loans off as quickly as possible.
>>
>>
>>
>> Not always.
>>
>> Suppose you're in a situation where money is tight but you can expect big
>> increases some time in the future. (example: kids are small and one
>> parent is
>> home with them, but when the youngest reaches school age both parents
>> will be
>> working full time). In a case like that, having a lower monthly
>> payment may be
>> the best alternative even if it requires a longer loan term.
>
>
> Well, a qualified yes. I've found people, including myself,
> sometimes too optimistic when dealing with "future" things, like
> earnings and expenditures. While what you sat is true, I'll take the
> tack of either paying the thing off ASAP, or go without. Maybe even save
> for what I want. (Modern Heresy Alert!)
>

>
>>>>>> Best way to not be a fool is to not go heavily into debt in the first
>>>>>> place. I have a 5 percent loan, but I'll pay it off quickly, I think.
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>> I wouldn't but thats me. What I would do is see if you can
>>>>> refinance at
>>>
>>>
>>> all
>>>
>>>>> to a lower rate. I have actually seen a interest rate recently
>>>>> somewhere
>>>
>>>
>>> in
>>>
>>>>> the 3 percent range!! Talk about a cheap loan, hell, I would
>>>>> refinance/remortgage my neighbors house if I could legally get away
>>>>> with
>>>
>>>
>>> it!
>>>
>>>>> LOL
>>>>>
>>>>
>>>> Sure - because a house is something you need anyway, it's insured
>>>> and not
>>>> likely to wind up obsolete or useless in a few years. Most of all,
>>>> almost
>>>
>>>
>>> no
>>>
>>>> one can afford to buy a house for cash.
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>>> Instead of paying off that low interest loan quickly, one is smarter
>>>>>>> paying
>>>>>>> off the higher interest loans like automobiles, department and
>>>>>>> credit
>>>>>>> card
>>>>>>> charges, and other loans/debts.
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>> Again, it's better to not get into a situation where you would
>>>>>> have to
>>>>>> choose which loan you're paying off early.

>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>> Well, its not paying the principle that kills ya, its the interest
>>>>> that
>>>
>>>
>>> does
>>>
>>>>> over a long time. The lesser the interest rate, the less I am
>>>>> interested
>>>
>>>
>>> in
>>>
>>>>> rushing to pay it off extra early. Either way, one needs to do
>>>>> the math
>>>
>>>
>>> or
>>>
>>>>> find someone who does understand real estate finance and other
>>>>> financal
>>>>> calculations to make sure in their own individual circumstances.
>>>>>
>>>>
>>>> Exactly - it's all in the numbers for your particular situation.
>>>> The biggest financial boo-boos people make are:
>>>>
>>>> - confusing "wants" and "needs" (you may need a car, but you want a new
>>>
>>>
>>> SUV)
>>>
>>>> - not having a budget, or not having one based on real data
>>>> - looking at their income out-of-context and saying "I can afford X"
>>>
>>>
>>> without
>>>
>>>> doing the numbers.
>>>
>>>
>>> Don't forget succumbing to the credit card problem. It's soooo
>>> easy to
>>
>>
>>
>>> live life large when you have 10 credit cards with a 20 thousand
>>> liimit on each card.
>>

>>
>>
>> That's simply another version of looking at their income
>> out-of-context and
>> saying "I can afford X" without doing the numbers. If you can't afford
>> to pay
>> off the credit cards at the end of the month, you really can't afford the
>> purchase made on them.
>>
>> I consider credit cards as "payment cards", nothing more.
>>
>>> One of those nifty little life secrets I've found out is that if
>>> you are willing to avoid spending credit money like a drunken sailor
>>> while you are young, you will have much more money for your toys when
>>> you get older.
>>
>>
>>
>> New verse to an old song:
>>
>> What shall we do with a drunken sailor
>> What shall we do with a drunken sailor
>> What shall we do with a drunken sailor
>> Ear-lie in the morning?
>>
>> Put 'im in charge of an Exxon tanker
>> Put 'im in charge of an Exxon tanker
>> Put 'im in charge of an Exxon tanker
>> Ear-lie in the morning!
>>
>
> HeHe!
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -
>

3160. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-24 00:38:15 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <Xpcwb.19227$Wy4.773@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 82686

"Kim W5TIT" wrote:
>
> Oh, and by the way, Dwight. In the event that
> you would be (and I don't think you would) as
> childish as Larry, *if* you took the above to
> think that I was including the story of your
> brother in my "hilarious" comment, then you
> would be wrong; however I apologize to you
> if I implied that.

No apology needed, Kim. I interpreted that as you thinking it hilarious that I would mention my brother's death in a discussion about Michael Jackson. And perhaps it was not the best place to bring the subject up. However, since Larry had mentioned race-riots, it gave me a very rare opportunity to point out the wider impact of these riots (consequences far outside the immediate area). I took advantage of that opportunity. In my brother's case, the consequences were felt all the way across the country in Florida. This message gives me an opportunity to also point out that these wider consequences are rarely reported in the news.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3161. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-24 00:46:08 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <kxcwb.12067$m84.3918384@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 82687

Arf! Arf! wrote:

> connection to ham radio is?
> Maybe you need a new group: rec.boring.nolife.discussion

I've seen your other ng posts mr anonymous, yours are as relevant as this thread.

p.s. if you let me know your mailreader, I can send you instructions on how to filter us out.

- Mike KB3EIA -

3162. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-24 00:48:25 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <tzcwb.12069$m84.3918795@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 82688

Kï¿½HB wrote:

> "Alun" <alun@1stcounsel.com> wrote
>
>
>>Now, if one spouse is not a biological parent, that's potentially a
>>different ball game, but I won't go there.
>>
>
>
> Hell, I'll go there, because to not "go there" just panders to people with
> twisted dirty little minds who think "something must be going on there".
> Just to make it interesting, let's say that the child is adopted. Those of
> us who are parents (and I think most who aren't parents) understand the
> unconditional love parents have for their children, be they "natural",
> "step", or "adopted". Until the very recent past, perhaps less than 150
> years in this country, and much more recent than that in less developed
> parts of the world, families didn't live in 3 and 4 bedroom homes where each
> person had their own "space". Not only did Dad and Mom and the kids sleep
> in the same place, but also Grandpa and Grandma and the occasional cousin or
> Auntie or Uncle who might be without their own nuclear family to spend the
> night with. Dr. Laura would likely have a heart attack if she saw how some
> people live today in places outside her privileged neighborhood.

I wonder how they had all those kids if they shared the bed?

- Mike KB3EIA -

3163. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-24 00:49:53 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <RAcwb.19259$Wy4.17498@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 82689

"Kim W5TIT" wrote:
>
> (snip) In contrast, there is the Catholic Church
> stories around the same issue. While I haven't
> read this newsgroup very often over the past
> year or so, *except* for about the last what--
> three/four months--I don't recall seeing any
> "I'm Shocked" posts on those rapes and
> abuses. (snip)

Actually, if I remember correctly, there have been several discussions in this newsgroup over the last couple of years about the sexual abuse of young men within the Catholic Church. Of course, since this situation involves a widely known person, it is natural for this situation to garnish far more public attention.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3164. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-24 00:55:52 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bprlkr$5ha@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 82693

"K�HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:h0awb.16916$Rk5.15731@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote
>
> > In some of those cases you mention above,
> > I am not so certain there weren't reasons (inside reasons
> > we'll never know about) for the things happening the way
> > they did.
>
> You're being brainwashed.
>
> As for me, I'm sick and ph**king tired of "inside reasons".
>
> For "inside reasons", Zacarias Moussaoui will probably suffer nothing
more
> than deportation on immigration charges.
>
> Robert Hanssen, a long time trusted FBI agent, spied on his own agency for
> the Soviet Union. Dozens of agents, many of them Americans, were
executed
> as a result of his treason. Instead of a quick and merciful
administration
> of a lethal injection, for "inside reasons" he sits in a nice comfy
federal
> facility, and his family lives on a comfortable federal pension at our
> expense. (If I'm ever convicted of a felony --- ANY felony, let alone
> TREASON --- my family will see zippo-squat-nothing of my federal pension.)
>
> I don't want to hear about any "inside reasons".
>
> 73, de Hans, K0HB
>
>

I didn't say they were right...

Kim W5TIT

3165. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-24 00:59:57 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <hKcwb.19293$Wy4.777@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 82690

"Mike Coslo" wrote:
> N8WWM wrote:
>
> > i wish i could sleep over jackos house.
>
> Too old?

He acts childish enough at times, Mike. Since Michael Jackson thinks of himself as a kid, perhaps N8WWM can also convince Michael Jackson that he's a kid too. I'll certainly vouch for you, N8WWM. ;-)

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3166. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-24 01:01:23 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bprlks$5ha@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 82692

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:8vbwb.19122$Wy4.18965@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> "Kim W5TIT" wrote:
> >
> > (snip) My point is that in this country, one is
> > innocent until proven guilty. (snip)
>
>
> One is innocent under the law until proven guilty in a court of law.
That
> does not suggest even for a moment that people cannot have their own
> opinions or beliefs concerning the guilt or innocence of a person, or
voice
> those opinions or beliefs.
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
>

Nope, sure doesn't. Moreover if it meets with one's agenda...

Kim W5TIT

3167. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-24 01:03:57 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <1Ocwb.17249$Rk5.17063@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 82691

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote

> I wonder how they had all those kids if they shared the bed?

Damn, Mike, you sure lack imagination!

3168. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-24 01:04:49 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bprlkt$5ha@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 82694

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:Xpcwb.19227$Wy4.773@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> "Kim W5TIT" wrote:
> >
> > Oh, and by the way, Dwight. In the event that
> > you would be (and I don't think you would) as
> > childish as Larry, *if* you took the above to
> > think that I was including the story of your
> > brother in my "hilarious" comment, then you
> > would be wrong; however I apologize to you
> > if I implied that.
>
>
> No apology needed, Kim. I interpreted that as you thinking it hilarious
> that I would mention my brother's death in a discussion about Michael
> Jackson. And perhaps it was not the best place to bring the subject up.
> However, since Larry had mentioned race-riots, it gave me a very rare
> opportunity to point out the wider impact of these riots (consequences far
> outside the immediate area). I took advantage of that opportunity. In my
> brother's case, the consequences were felt all the way across the country
in
> Florida. This message gives me an opportunity to also point out that these
> wider consequences are rarely reported in the news.
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
>

Well.... I am quite refreshed, Dwight. I would have lost all hope of
sanity for you if you'd pandered off the same crap Larry handed out...

Thanks...

Kim W5TIT

3169. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-24 01:26:40 UTC
From: Arf! Arf! <DoggieDaze@lLiberalz.com>
Message-ID: <d4dwb.11388$6c3.8709@bignews1.bellsouth.net>
Source record: 82695

What the hell does this bullshit have to do with ham radio? Ever heard
of a FAQ for this group?

Kim W5TIT wrote:
> "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
> news:Xpcwb.19227$Wy4.773@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net...
>
>>"Kim W5TIT" wrote:
>>
>>>Oh, and by the way, Dwight. In the event that
>>>you would be (and I don't think you would) as
>>>childish as Larry, *if* you took the above to
>>>think that I was including the story of your
>>>brother in my "hilarious" comment, then you
>>>would be wrong; however I apologize to you
>>>if I implied that.
>>
>>
>> No apology needed, Kim. I interpreted that as you thinking it hilarious
>>that I would mention my brother's death in a discussion about Michael
>>Jackson. And perhaps it was not the best place to bring the subject up.
>>However, since Larry had mentioned race-riots, it gave me a very rare
>>opportunity to point out the wider impact of these riots (consequences far
>>outside the immediate area). I took advantage of that opportunity. In my
>>brother's case, the consequences were felt all the way across the country
>
> in
>
>>Florida. This message gives me an opportunity to also point out that these
>>wider consequences are rarely reported in the news.
>>
>>
>>Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>>
>>http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
>>
>
>
> Well.... I am quite refreshed, Dwight. I would have lost all hope of
> sanity for you if you'd pandered off the same crap Larry handed out...
>
> Thanks...
>
> Kim W5TIT

>
>

3170. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-24 01:28:37 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031123202837.29815.00001934@mb-m21.aol.com>
Source record: 82696

In article <YNbwb.17168$Rk5.8475@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> writes:

>"Alun" <alun@1stcounsel.com> wrote
>
>>
>> Now, if one spouse is not a biological parent, that's potentially a
>> different ball game, but I won't go there.
>>
>
>Hell, I'll go there, because to not "go there" just panders to people with
>twisted dirty little minds who think "something must be going on there".
>Just to make it interesting, let's say that the child is adopted. Those of
>us who are parents (and I think most who aren't parents) understand the
>unconditional love parents have for their children, be they "natural",
>"step", or "adopted".

Yup.

Of course, there are a notorious few who abuse children. They are the rare exception, not the rule.

>Until the very recent past, perhaps less than 150
>years in this country, and much more recent than that in less developed
>parts of the world, families didn't live in 3 and 4 bedroom homes where each
>person had their own "space". Not only did Dad and Mom and the kids sleep
>in the same place, but also Grandpa and Grandma and the occasional cousin or
>Auntie or Uncle who might be without their own nuclear family to spend the
>night with.

Yup.

And due to all sorts of diseases and the risks of childbirth, "blended families" were extremely common. In some cases, the youngest children in a family would have no blood relation to the oldest ones.

The concept of the "nuclear family" is extremely new.

Here's another situation for you: Lots of people I know go tent camping with their kids. One tent per family. Bunch of sleeping bags on the floor of the tent, or in the back of the minivan. Not exactly "the same bed" but not much privacy either.

Are all those folks damaging their kids? I don't think so!

>Dr. Laura would likely have a heart attack if she saw how some
>people live today in places outside her privileged neighborhood.

"Dr." Laura would likely have a heart attack if she saw how some people live today in places *inside* her privileged neighborhood.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3171. Re: Need Drugs?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-24 01:30:03 UTC
From: Arf! Arf! <DoggieDaze@lLiberalz.com>
Message-ID: <p7dwb.11430$6c3.1576@bignews1.bellsouth.net>
Source record: 82697
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.swap

Looks like your two dopin' bastards are out of business:

GOT DRUGS???

http://www.hcso.tampa.fl.us/pub/default.asp?/online/qdisp/BN=03058540

http://www.hcso.tampa.fl.us/pub/default.asp?/online/FULLPHOTO/URL?bn=03058540&name=DALE,JOHN%20MICHAEL&race=W&vex=UYGPYIXIGBGI

http://www.hcso.tampa.fl.us/pub/default.asp?/Online/qdisp/bn=03035679

http://www.hcso.tampa.fl.us/BookPhoto/MUGImageASP.ASP?WCI=RetrieveImage&WCE=F03035679&WCU

KE4TEW wrote:

Please send me cigarette money for my two doper failures!??

3172. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-24 01:35:23 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <vfdwb.17357$Rk5.11208@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 82698

"Arf! Arf!" <DoggieDaze@lLiberalz.com> wrote

> What the hell does this bullshit have to do with ham radio? Ever heard
> of a FAQ for this group?

I think it's located at http://www.amishrakefight.org/gfy

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

3173. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent? Who gives a sweet shit?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-24 01:43:48 UTC
From: Arf! Arf! <DoggieDaze@lLiberalz.com>
Message-ID: <ikdwb.11583$6c3.2602@bignews1.bellsouth.net>
Source record: 82699

Now back to Michael Jackson....

Kï¿½HB wrote:

> "Arf! Arf!" <DoggieDaze@lLiberalz.com> wrote
>
>
>>What the hell does this bullshit have to do with ham radio? Ever heard
>>of a FAQ for this group?
>
>
> I think it's located at http://www.amishrakefight.org/gfy
>
> With all kind wishes,
>
> de Hans, K0HB
>
>
>
>
>
>
>

3174. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-24 01:44:52 UTC
From: Arf! Arf! <DoggieDaze@lLiberalz.com>
Message-ID: <ildwb.11593$6c3.382@bignews1.bellsouth.net>
Source record: 82700

Hell Hans probaly blew the pedophile..

Kï¿½HB wrote:

> "Arf! Arf!" <DoggieDaze@lLiberalz.com> wrote
>
>
>>What the hell does this bullshit have to do with ham radio? Ever heard
>>of a FAQ for this group?
>
>
> I think it's located at http://www.amishrakefight.org/gfy
>
> With all kind wishes,
>
> de Hans, K0HB
>
>
>
>
>
>
>

3175. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-24 01:56:28 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hottqd2.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>
Source record: 82751

"KØHB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message

> [Robert Hanssen's] family lives on a comfortable federal pension at our
> expense. (If I'm ever convicted of a felony --- ANY felony, let alone
> TREASON --- my family will see zippo-squat-nothing of my federal pension.)

Remember that a civilian pension is an annuity that the employee
BUYS (is not "given") with after-tax money contributions. After
five years of service, the employee is entitled to the annuity
based on number of years of service and last 3-year high salary.

UNLESS the employee is convicted of treason, the Federal Civil
Service pension annuity must be paid regardless of other criminal
convictions and penalties.

If Hanssen was convicted of treason, the annutity would not be paid
whether he was granted probation/parole, served time or was executed.
If he was executed for some crime other than treason the annutity
would be have to be paid to his surviving spouse.

Your military pension may be different (you may not have been
required to make contributions, for instance) and may have
different terms of retention.

> I don't want to hear about any "inside reasons".

I agree though - Hanssen got off very easy - probably because he
knew where important counter-espionage bones were buried and a plea
bargain was the only legal way to get the info from him. So much
for "inside reasons".

Now back to our regular code/nocode bashing.....

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

From a Clearing in the Silicon Forest
Beaverton (Washington County) Oregon

3176. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-24 02:47:57 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <xjewb.19419$Wy4.19244@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 82752

"Jim Hampton" wrote:
>
> Although way off topic (as are many threads
> here), I couldn't resist this one.

Obviously, I couldn't resist the topic either (it appears the same is true for others). And, yes, it is certainly off-topic. However, I hope there is room in this newgroup for less formal discussions also. After all, as ham operators, we do like to talk, in some way or another, with others. However, for those who are not interested, I made sure the topic was very clear in the subject line so they can easily skip the discussion.

> (snip) I'll grant the one arguement that will
> come up - there will be folks out to make
> money. (snip)

Oh, you can bet your bottom dollar on that. Lawyer fees. Advertising for the news organizations. Lawsuits. Book deals. Interviews. The lecture circuit. Paparazzi. The tabloids. Money is going to be flying everywhere.

> Personally, I think the guy is right off his rocker,
> but the name of the game should be to protect
> society (especially kids). (snip)

Yep. That's why I tried to avoid anything outside that in my original message. If the guy wants to sleep in an oxygen tent (or not), more power to him (even if I do think it's a little strange).

> (snip) I believe, and please correct me if I am
> wrong, that he was never married until that mess
> 10 years ago or so. Suddenly, he gets married.
> And divorced. And ... so on and so on.

I also found his sudden desire to get married somewhat questionable.

> I totally agree with your accessment as to
> classic symptoms of a pedophile. Neverland
> should be renamed Never - Ever land. Why
> just the kids and not the whole family? (snip)

I've always been interested in detective mysteries (in the Sherlock Holmes style), so have read a lot (both fiction and non-fiction) on the subject of criminals and law enforcement. Based on what I've read, Michael Jackson seems to fit the classic picture of a pedophile.

> Sorry for the long ramblings. I suspect, as do
> you, that this case is going to be another media

> circus court case. (snip)

What you wrote was well thought out, so was a joy to read. As for the media circus, this case may reach an all time high (or low depending on your perspective).

> If he isn't convicted, how old do these characters
> get before their libido finally slows down? (snip)

Based on what I've read, quite old. Note that we're talking about a diverse group here. Not all pedophiles seek actual sexual intercourse with children. Some limit their activities to just looking at images of, or photographing, young children. Others prefer to touch or fondle children or have children touch or fondle them, but may never go beyond that. And, of course, some are seeking sexual intercourse. Whatever the case, the sex drive tends to mirror the sex drive of a normal person. In general, attempts at actual sexual intercourse tends to slow down by the late thirties to early fifties, but fondling and touching may continue for many years after that. Some pedophiles have been arrested in their seventies or even eighties.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3177. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-24 03:00:59 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <Lvewb.19425$Wy4.10687@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 82753

"N2EY" wrote:
>
> So you assume that the goals and purposes
> of the ARS are incompatible with any
> code testing at all?

Yes.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3178. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-24 03:08:41 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <ZCewb.19435$Wy4.3245@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 82754

"Mike Coslo" wrote:
>
> How you gonna educate them? Most people
> wouldn't have a clue what we would be talking
> about. Do you propose an education system
> without either Pro or Anti-code bias?
>
> (snip)
>
> How are you going to approach anything like
> a knowledgable poll pool?

Actually, I'm not proposing anything at all. In my opinion, the FCC is doing a fine job of regulating the Amateur Radio Service. If someone is going to propose a poll to influence that, then the poll should take into account everything the FCC must take into account (that includes all Americans, not just those currently licensed in a particular radio service).

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3179. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-24 03:11:28 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <AFewb.19441$Wy4.12096@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 82755

"Bill Sohl" wrote:
>
> Why Dwight, you doubt that all hams wouldn't
> "vote" based on common sense, logic and
> what is rational as a requirement in the 21st
> century?? :-) :-)

Well.... No comment!

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3180. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-24 03:20:44 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <gOewb.19460$Wy4.4625@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 82756

"N2EY" wrote:
> "Dwight Stewart" writes:
>
> >You haven't established, at least not to my
> > satisfaction (nor the satisfaction of the ITU,
> > FCC, and several countries around the
> > world), why Morse code is necessary
> > (notice I said necessary, not enjoyable)
> > for ham radio today.
>
> You mean the code itself, or the test?

In the context of that sentence, code itself.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3181. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-24 03:24:23 UTC
From: Alun <alun@1stcounsel.com>
Message-ID: <Xns943CE3EB1526Felektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 82757

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in
news:20031123202837.29815.00001934@mb-m21.aol.com:

> In article <YNbwb.17168$Rk5.8475@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>,
> "K HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> writes:
>
>>"Alun" <alun@1stcounsel.com> wrote
>>
>>>
>>> Now, if one spouse is not a biological parent, that's potentially a
>>> different ball game, but I won't go there.
>>>
>>
>>Hell, I'll go there, because to not "go there" just panders to people
>>with twisted dirty little minds who think "something must be going on
>>there". Just to make it interesting, let's say that the child is
>>adopted. Those of us who are parents (and I think most who aren't
>>parents) understand the unconditional love parents have for their
>>children, be they "natural", "step", or "adopted".
>
> Yup.
>
> Of course, there are a notorious few who abuse children. They are the
> rare exception, not the rule.
>
>>Until the very recent past, perhaps less than 150
>>years in this country, and much more recent than that in less developed
>>parts of the world, families didn't live in 3 and 4 bedroom homes where
>>each person had their own "space". Not only did Dad and Mom and the
>>kids sleep in the same place, but also Grandpa and Grandma and the
>>occasional cousin or Auntie or Uncle who might be without their own
>>nuclear family to spend the night with.
>
> Yup.
>
> And due to all sorts of diseases and the risks of childbirth, "blended
> families" were extremely common. In some cases, the youngest children
> in a family would have no blood relation to the oldest ones.
>
> The concept of the "nuclear family" is extremely new.
>
> Here's another situation for you: Lots of people I know go tent camping
> with their kids. One tent per family. Bunch of sleeping bags on the

> floor of the tent, or in the back of the minivan. Not exactly "the same
> bed" but not much privacy either.
>
> Are all those folks damaging their kids? I don't think so!
>
>>Dr. Laura would likely have a heart attack if she saw how some people
>>live today in places outside her privileged neighborhood.
>
> "Dr." Laura would likely have a heart attack if she saw how some
> people live today in places *inside* her privileged neighborhood.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>

Well, you know, we go camping all in one tent. There are partitions, but they are only made of canvas. It's private enough when the kids are asleep, though. For that matter, even if you are in different tents you can hear everything. I imagine that where everyone shares one room it's a matter of waiting until everyone is asleep and being very quiet.

3182. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-24 03:32:08 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <YYewb.12144$m84.3957104@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 82758

Alun wrote:
> n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in
> news:20031123202837.29815.00001934@mb-m21.aol.com:
>
>
>>In article <YNbwb.17168$Rk5.8475@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>,
>>"Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> writes:
>>
>>
>>>"Alun" <alun@1stcounsel.com> wrote
>>>
>>>
>>>>Now, if one spouse is not a biological parent, that's potentially a
>>>>different ball game, but I won't go there.
>>>>
>>>
>>>Hell, I'll go there, because to not "go there" just panders to people
>>>with twisted dirty little minds who think "something must be going on
>>>there". Just to make it interesting, let's say that the child is
>>>adopted. Those of us who are parents (and I think most who aren't
>>>parents) understand the unconditional love parents have for their
>>>children, be they "natural", "step", or "adopted".
>>
>>Yup.
>>
>>Of course, there are a notorious few who abuse children. They are the
>>rare exception, not the rule.
>>
>>
>>>Until the very recent past, perhaps less than 150
>>>years in this country, and much more recent than that in less developed
>>>parts of the world, families didn't live in 3 and 4 bedroom homes where
>>>each person had their own "space". Not only did Dad and Mom and the
>>>kids sleep in the same place, but also Grandpa and Grandma and the
>>>occasional cousin or Auntie or Uncle who might be without their own
>>>nuclear family to spend the night with.
>>
>>Yup.
>>
>>And due to all sorts of diseases and the risks of childbirth, "blended
>>families" were extremely common. In some cases, the youngest children
>>in a family would have no blood relation to the oldest ones.
>>
>>The concept of the "nuclear family" is extremely new.

>>
>>Here's another situation for you: Lots of people I know go tent camping
>>with their kids. One tent per family. Bunch of sleeping bags on the
>>floor of the tent, or in the back of the minivan. Not exactly "the same
>>bed" but not much privacy either.
>>
>>Are all those folks damaging their kids? I don't think so!
>>
>>
>>>Dr. Laura would likely have a heart attack if she saw how some people
>>>live today in places outside her privileged neighborhood.
>>
>>"Dr." Laura would likely have a heart attack if she saw how some
>>people live today in places *inside* her privileged neighborhood.

>>73 de Jim, N2EY
>>
>
>
> Well, you know, we go camping all in one tent. There are partitions, but
> they are only made of canvas. It's private enough when the kids are
> asleep, though. For that matter, even if you are in different tents you
> can hear everything. I imagine that where everyone shares one room it's a
> matter of waiting until everyone is asleep and being very quiet.

Oy! I had to chuckle when I read that, Alun! Quiet? I mean I guess that
must happen, but I think I'll opt for privacy. 8^)

- Mike KB3EIA -

3183. Re: Happy Veterans Day

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-24 03:38:16 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0311231938.31e254d2@posting.google.com>
Source record: 82759

brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message

> Agreed. Obviously untrue. Steve doesn't know the diff between a CO and a JAFO.

I know Brainy needs to join the real world rather than quoting
lines from 20+ year old action movies.

And I'll never be a JAFO, Brainy...they sit in the right seat and
twiddle the knobs...I get to fly.

Steve, K4YZ

3184. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-24 03:38:45 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <93fwb.19494$Wy4.116@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 82760

"N2EY" wrote:
> "Dwight Stewart" writes:
>
> > It's time to move on, Jim.
>
> To what?

I meant to answer that in the last message. Anyway, it's time to move on to something besides just endlessly debating the Morse Code testing requirement. This debate has sharply divided the Amateur Radio community and I think that alone is having a major impact on any attempts to further the goals and purposes of the Amateur Radio Service (we can't discuss anything without this topic constantly interfering).

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3185. Re: Happy Veterans Day

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-24 03:42:18 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0311231942.4d0c7ff5@posting.google.com>
Source record: 82761

brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message

> Stebe remains stymied by "CO" and "JAFO." Maybe next time he plays
> CAP JAFO he can visit the Judge Advocate and have his ignorance
> removed at no charge. It's a pity to remain ignorant for so long when
> free resources are available.

Somewhere in there Brainy had a point to make.

Quite funny...or should I say pitiful...coming from an alleged
veteran who STILL has not acknowledged the difference between a
"commander", as in the senior officer of a military unit, and a
Commnader, Naval paygrade O-5.

Nor can he differentiate "authorization" from "acceptance"...Now
CAN you, Brainy?

Please...another quick and witty rhetorical quip to dazzle us
with, Brainy.

Steve, K4YZ

3186. Re: Happy Veterans Day

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-24 03:49:11 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <Xcfwb.17482$Rk5.5895@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 82762

"Steve Robeson, K4CAP" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote

> Commnader, Naval paygrade O-5.

Do they call them that because they have size 5 'nads?

73, de Hans, K0HB

3187. Re: No!!! Re: Do Hams get 11 Meters Back

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-24 04:27:01 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <xJGdnRo_NsOMEVyiRVn-uw@gbronline.com>
Source record: 82763
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

Dickiebird Craniumless slobbered over his keyboard and blathered:

>
> *may*?? You better be damned certain when you file a report!
> Entrapment is also a crime, goodbuddy.

You need to get out there and see if you can "entrap" a brain, goodbuddy.

3188. Re: No!!! Re: Do Hams get 11 Meters Back

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-24 04:31:04 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <xJGdnRU_NsO8EFyiRVn-uw@gbronline.com>
Source record: 82764
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

Jerry Oxendine wrote:

> "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
> news:0DOvb.12159$P%1.10553614@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
>
>>"Richard Cranium" <richcranus@yahoo.com> wrote in message
>>news:c5ecbb69.0311211606.7491c9cf@posting.google.com...
>>
>>>"Jerry Oxendine" <joxendi@bellsouth.net> wrote in message
>>
>>news:<v%evb.16249$ow5.3028@bignews2.bellsouth.net>...
>>
>>>>"Stephen M.H. Lawrence" <7.3steve@earthlink.net> wrote in message
>>>>news:gP5vb.11687$Wy4.4805@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net...
>>>>
>>>>>One day 3 weeks ago, I listened from 28.000 - 28.150, and
>>>>>I counted over a dozen of 'em. Truckers in particular have been
>>>>>"using" our ten - meter band illegally, and Riley Hollingsworth
>>>>>has been doing something about it. Make no mistake, this is
>>>>>happening.
>>>>>
>>>>>73,
>>>>>
>>>>>Steve Lawrence
>>>>>Burnsville, MN
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>And YOU can help! Get out there and listen on the road.
>>>>Get the tag # of the tractor (not of the trailer), date, time,
>>>>highway, milepost or exit number. Send this info to rholling@fcc.gov
>
> .
>
>>>>Make a difference: this is how those
>>>>other truckers got warned--individual hams who quietly
>>>>listened and accurately reported the above data. RH will
>>>>then respond IF, again, the info is accurate. Each ham
>>>>can make a difference and stop that "tan-fer thar, drivah,
>>>>ah know you rah't, fer-tan thar SQUEAK!!" If we don't, we will
>>
>>eventually
>>

>>>>hear them beeping and squeaking their
>>>>way along on 17 Meters.
>>>>
>>>>The way to "trap" a driver is to quietly cruise along. Do NOT talk
>
> to
>
>>them
>>
>>>>or get into an argument! Simply overtake a trucker who *may* be
>>
>>operating
>>
>>>>on 28.085 AM. As you pass, or he passes you, he may be curious
>>>>about "them 'funny antenners' thar" and comment to you
>>>>about it (or other truckers). It is then you copy down the
>>>>tag # on the FRONT of the tractor, the DOT # (this confirms the
>
> identity
>
>>of
>>
>>>>the truck), the direction of travel and milepost (or exit), date and
>>
>>time.
>>
>>>>Also the company name. Send it in! Done correctly, the "man" will send
>>
>>out
>>
>>>>a warning notice to the company holding THEM responsible for their
>>
>>drivers'
>>
>>>>actions. It is legal and enforc-able.
>>>>
>>>>73
>>>>
>>>>Jerry
>>>
>>>Great idea, Jerry! Pile Riley's desk full with all sorts of false
>>>reports so he won't believe any of you!
>>>
>>>*may*?? You better be damned certain when you file a report!
>>>Entrapment is also a crime, goodbuddy.
>>
>>If you are just observing (and reporting what you hear and see) and not
>>talking, that is not entrapment.
>>
>>Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

>
>
> EXACTLY!! You are simply a "witness" or a "bystander". You have not done
> anything to entrap
> anybody. Ain't it neat? LOL!~
>
> Jerry
>
>
>
It is really difficult to explain simple logic to someone (dickhead
crainumless) who can't even find the 10 meter band.

3189. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-24 04:33:29 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <xJGdnRQ_NsNYEFyiRVn-uw@gbronline.com>
Source record: 82768

WA8ULX wrote:

>>So far, everyone except Bruce, Kim, and yourself has recognized that
>>fact and has replied accordingly.
>>
>
>
> Who cares Larry, the guy is a FRUIT CAKE.

I think you just insulted the fruit cake.

3190. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-24 04:48:01 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20031123234801.07346.00001888@mb-m26.aol.com>
Source record: 82766

In article <bpqvlg$usv@library1.airnews.net>, "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
writes:

>
>Y'know what, Larry? Phuck (HansTM) you and your patriarchal high horse you
>ride around on. I owe *you* nor anyone else, *but* possibly Dwight, an
>apology. I can nearly guarantee you that Dwight would know that I was not
>commenting on the part about his brother. Now sit the phuck down and shut
>the phuck up.
>
>Kim W5TIT

Kim:

I neither stand nor speak while I'm typing at my computer keyboard.
And you're still a childish, boorish, ignorant person. You screwed up
and you'll never admit it, because you are totally self-centered. Whether
Dwight took offense or not, others have -- and that is what you should
be apologizing for. However, you're too self-centered to ever be able
to figure that out. You're pitiful.

73 de Larry, K3LT

3191. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-24 04:48:01 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20031123234801.07346.00001889@mb-m26.aol.com>
Source record: 82767

In article <QY7wb.16666$Rk5.1731@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Kï¿½HB"
<groupk0hb@earthlink.net> writes:

>
>Larryl,
>
>Don't believe everything you hear on the radio. Dr. Laura is wrong, and
>you're wrong. Colleen and I have 5 great, well adjusted children who prove
>you flat wrong. You're a sibling, not a parent, and you don't have even a
>trace of a clue.
>
>Sunuvagun.
>
>73, de Hans (no "L" in Hans)
>

Hanss:

Noel? Nice to see you're already in the X-mas spirit!

73 de Larry, K3LT

3192. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-24 04:48:02 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20031123234802.07346.00001890@mb-m26.aol.com>
Source record: 82765

In article <cr8wb.16727$Rk5.3689@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Kï¿½HB"
<groupk0hb@earthlink.net> writes:

>
>"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote
>
>> degreed, licensed family counsellor Dr. Laura Schlessinger
>> all the time
>
>OBTW, Larryl, I should point out that one of our daughters, Gretchen, is
>also a "degreed, licensed" child counsellor, and she actually practices in
>the real world as opposed to chatting about it on the radio. And her three
>little tykes are regularly found in the same bed with their parents. Sorry,
>Larryl, but in this discussion you're kinda like someone arguing about Morse
>code but has never learned it themselves.
>
>Sunuvagun!
>
>73, de Hans, K0HB

Well, Hansl, I guess we'll just have to agree to disagree.

73 de Larryl, K3LT

3193. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-24 10:04:50 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bpsl6g$l9t@library2.airnews.net>
Source record: 82769

Well, I notice you keep reading...

Kim W5TIT

"Arf! Arf!" <DoggieDaze@lLiberalz.com> wrote in message
news:d4dwb.11388$6c3.8709@bignews1.bellsouth.net...
> What the hell does this bullshit have to do with ham radio? Ever heard
> of a FAQ for this group?
>

3194. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-24 10:06:57 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bpslae$k1@library2.airnews.net>
Source record: 82770

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20031123202837.29815.00001934@mb-m21.aol.com...
> In article <YNbwb.17168$Rk5.8475@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "K HB"
> <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> writes:
>
>
> >Dr. Laura would likely have a heart attack if she saw how some
> >people live today in places outside her privileged neighborhood.
>
> "Dr." Laura would likely have a heart attack if she saw how some
> people live today in places *inside* her privileged neighborhood.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>

Whew! Definitely. That woman is so far detached from reality it's
scarey...

Kim W5TIT

3195. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-24 10:12:49 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bpslle$11k@library2.airnews.net>
Source record: 82772

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:YYewb.12144$m84.3957104@news1.news.adelphia.net...
> Alun wrote:
> >
> > Well, you know, we go camping all in one tent. There are partitions, but
> > they are only made of canvas. It's private enough when the kids are
> > asleep, though. For that matter, even if you are in different tents you
> > can hear everything. I imagine that where everyone shares one room it's
a
> > matter of waiting until everyone is asleep and being very quiet.
>
> Oy! I had to chuckle when I read that, Alun! Quiet? I mean I guess that
> must happen, but I think I'll opt for privacy. 8^)
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -
>

ROFLMAO! TMI, Mike, TMI!!!!

Kim W5TIT

3196. Re: Look at that internet package

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-24 10:14:47 UTC
From: Carol Andrus <caroljean52@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <3FC1DA13.6070901@yahoo.com>
Source record: 82771
Cross-posted to: pdaxs.services.children,alt.binaries.clip-art,alt.business.home,alt.games.final-fantasy,alt.binaries.pictures.erotica.male.military,rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.alien.visitors,microsoft.public.vb.deployment,ott.events,donbass.commerce.fido

That was a virus. Don't those things get filtered out?

3197. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-24 10:19:54 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bpsm2o$11c@library2.airnews.net>
Source record: 82773

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20031123234801.07346.00001888@mb-m26.aol.com...
> In article <bpqvlg$usv@library1.airnews.net>, "Kim W5TIT"
<kimscliff@yahoo.com>
> writes:
>
> >
> >Y'know what, Larry? Phuck (HansTM) you and your patriarchal high horse
you
> >ride around on. I owe *you* nor anyone else, *but* possibly Dwight, an
> >apology. I can nearly guarantee you that Dwight would know that I was
not
> >commenting on the part about his brother. Now sit the phuck down and
shut
> >the phuck up.
> >
> >Kim W5TIT
>
> Kim:
>
> I neither stand nor speak while I'm typing at my computer keyboard.
> And you're still a childish, boorish, ignorant person. You screwed up
> and you'll never admit it, because you are totally self-centered. Whether
> Dwight took offense or not, others have -- and that is what you should
> be apologizing for. However, you're too self-centered to ever be able
> to figure that out. You're pitiful.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>
>

As stated, no one (*other* than possibly Dwight) was owed an apology. Have
you ever seen me demand an apology for being offended by you, Larry? And,
as has come to pass, Dwight was quite reasonable (something which you
neither understand nor are capable of) about how he understood the post.

And, as to your opinion of me--or anyone else, Larry--you are the last soul
on this Earth with whom I find any merit for anything done or not done by
others. Now, back to forgetting about responding to you since you drone on
with your impish, childish, boring, self-centered ignorance...

You and your *"Dr."* should have some tea...

Kim W5TIT

3198. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-24 11:22:15 UTC
From: N8WWM <N8WWM@home.nut>
Message-ID: <bpspl702tm5@drn.newsguy.com>
Source record: 82776

In article <hKcwb.19293$Wy4.777@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>, Dwight Stewart says...
>
>
>"Mike Coslo" wrote:
>> N8WWM wrote:
>>
>> > i wish i could sleep over jackos house.
>>
>> Too old?
>
>
> He acts childish enough at times, Mike. Since Michael Jackson thinks of
>himself as a kid, perhaps N8WWM can also convince Michael Jackson that he's
>a kid too. I'll certainly vouch for you, N8WWM. ;-)
>
>
>Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
>http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
>
Im not childish I just like michaels music. Why cant we just leave his personal life out of this? He's innocent until proven guilty just like i am. The rain report claimed I jammed repeaters but they didn't prove it.

3199. Re: Look at that internet package

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-24 11:49:39 UTC
From: nemo <nemo@naughtylass2.wet>
Message-ID: <nfmwb.160381$qu.8820@news-lhr.blueyonder.co.uk>
Source record: 82774
Cross-posted to: pdaxs.services.children,alt.binaries.clip-art,alt.business.home,alt.games.final-fantasy,alt.binaries.pictures.erotica.male.military,rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.alien.visitors,microsoft.public.vb.deployment,ott.events,donbass.commerce.fido

Carol Andrus <caroljean52@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:3FC1DA13.6070901@yahoo.com...
> That was a virus. Don't those things get filtered out?
>
Apparently not. And they don't get noticed until it's too late unless we
highlight them really well.

3200. Re: Look at that internet package - VIRUS ALERT - W32.Swen.A@mm Worm - VIRUS ALERT - VIRUS ALERT - VIRUS ALERT - VIRUS ALERT

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-24 11:50:24 UTC
From: nemo <nemo@naughtylass2.wet>
Message-ID: <4gmwb.160393$qu.77874@news-lhr.blueyonder.co.uk>
Source record: 82775
Cross-posted to: pdaxs.services.children,alt.binaries.clip-art,alt.business.home,alt.games.final-fantasy,alt.binaries.pictures.erotica.male.military,rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.alien.visitors,microsoft.public.vb.deployment,ott.events,donbass.commerce.fido

VIRUS ALERT - W32.Swen.A@mm Worm - VIRUS ALERT - VIRUS ALERT - VIRUS ALERT - VIRUS ALERT

If any experienced users find these alerts irritating please remember that there are many less experienced users out there who might well be caught out by these viruses and it is these who the alerts are intended for.

It is also necessary to leave the cross-posts in place as it is not practicable to post separate warnings to each group.

There are now three new viruses rampant at the moment. This one, arriving as an email or NG message with a very authentic looking web page with an EXE or ZIP file attached to it which pretends to be a patch or upgrade from Microsoft. Don't run the file. It's the W32.Swen.A@mm Worm virus.

The second arrives attached to several different emails or NG messages, all with very rude subject lines. It appears as a SCR file (screensaver) or as a link to an SCR file. Either way it's the Win32.Spybot Worm. Don't open or click the link

Here are some of the subject lines:

Last nights a**l orgy pics
My Sister M*****b**ing
Neighbor Tanning Nude
Pics of my Girlfriend topless
Rubber Fetish Pics
Christina Aguilera Nude
HOT HOT HOT
3WJoVQ HOT HOT HOT celebs 3WJoVQ(,
also Christina Aguilera with a bit of code at either end.
Hillery_Duff.scr Nude
Halle_berry.scr Nude
Re: Jessica_Simpson.scr Nude

Watch out for new subject lines for this one. Don't run *any* screensaver unless you're 110% sure it's bona fide. Infected *.scr files will work just the same as *.exe files and can do just as much damage.

And now we've got:

Hi, Maness, Your Account at Dell.com has expired.

containing the W32.HLLW.Torvel.B@mm worm.

X-Complaints-To: abuse@supernews.com

Nemo

3201. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-24 11:56:57 UTC
From: Lloyd <Lloyd@dinlloydnet.net>
Message-ID: <bpsrm4nsr0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 82777

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:cuvyxnansvbet.hottqd2.pminews@netnews.comcast.net...
"K&#65533;HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message

> [Robert Hanssen's] family lives on a comfortable federal pension at our
> expense. (If I'm ever convicted of a felony --- ANY felony, let alone
> TREASON --- my family will see zippo-squat-nothing of my federal
pension.)

Remember that a civilian pension is an annuity that the employee
BUYS (is not "given") with after-tax money contributions. After
five years of service, the employee is entitled to the annuity
based on number of years of service and last 3-year high salary.

UNLESS the employee is convicted of treason, the Federal Civil
Service pension annuity must be paid regardless of other criminal
convictions and penalties.

If Hanssen was convicted of treason, the annutity would not be paid
whether he was granted probation/parole, served time or was executed.
If he was executed for some crime other than treason the annutity
would be have to be paid to his surviving spouse.

Your military pension may be different (you may not have been
required to make contributions, for instance) and may have
different terms of retention.

> I don't want to hear about any "inside reasons".

I agree though - Hanssen got off very easy - probably because he
knew where important counter-espionage bones were buried and a plea
bargain was the only legal way to get the info from him. So much
for "inside reasons".

Now back to our regular code/nocode bashing.....

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

Hey Kane, they were talking about you on 14275 yesterday.

73 de Lloyd

3202. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-24 13:34:48 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031124083448.12252.00000731@mb-m25.aol.com>
Source record: 82778

>I think you just insulted the fruit cake.
>

Big Deal, hes probably a CBplusser

3203. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-24 13:37:15 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <REMOVETHISkc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <bptj03$1st6i0$8@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 82785

Well, of course there is no such thing as a simple one sentence answer in these regards. Specific details would have to be investigated for each person. In my old man's case..... he feels it is a good deal. And the funds that he would be recieving would go to his investments which would yield a better dividend to him, and if things get really hairy, he can always utilize those funds for care. Again, not the same for others.

--
Ryan KC8PMX

"Why is it one careless match can start a forest fire, but
it takes a whole box to start a barbecue?"

>
> But there are certain things to check very carefully. For example, what
> interest rate is used and what are the tax ramifications? What happens if,
> heaven forbid, you dad signs the papers and passes away a few
days/weeks/months
> later? Or, what about just the opposite, if he outlives the mortgage? (I
know a
> 93-year-old still active and living alone in his own, paid-off house).
>
> There's also the issue of what happens if he has to go into a nursing
home-type
> situation somewhere down the road.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>

3204. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-24 13:58:37 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <h8owb.12462$P%1.10931090@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 82779

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:gOewb.19460$Wy4.4625@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> "N2EY" wrote:
> > "Dwight Stewart" writes:
> >
> > >You haven't established, at least not to my
> > > satisfaction (nor the satisfaction of the ITU,
> > > FCC, and several countries around the
> > > world), why Morse code is necessary
> > > (notice I said necessary, not enjoyable)
> > > for ham radio today.
> >
> > You mean the code itself, or the test?
>
>
> In the context of that sentence, code itself.
>

Just a few short weeks ago, auroral activity imposed so much distortion on HF voice that it was not useable. At the same time, the distortion on the HF computer operated digital modes was great enough that the computer could not decipher them. Of the computer operated digital modes, the newest one, PSK31, failed first. RTTY held up a bit longer but it also failed. Although distortion on the HF CW/Morse signal also existed, the human brain version of a computer could and did decipher the signals into intelligible, useful data when all other modes were useless. The choice was operate code or turn off the HF radio. If code is not necessary in ham radio today, then neither is HF itself.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

3205. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-24 13:58:46 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <REMOVETHISkc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <bptj04$1st6i0$9@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 82786

But in regards to the math..... compare a 10,000 dollar mortgage versus the 10,000 car loan with applicable rates. Nowhere did I say that one should use refinancing money to pay off other debts. The other debts themselves to be paid off quicker if at a higher interest rate is what I said, even if I didn't make that painfully clear.

Ryan

> OK, let's do the math.
>
> Suppose someone goes out and buys a new car and finances $10,000 of its price
> at, say, 8% for 4 years. Their monthly payment will be $244.13 (thank you,
> Quicken98) and the total cost of that $10,000 will be $11,718.24. $1718.24 of
> interest.
>
> Now suppose instead they tacked $10,000 onto a home refinance and bought the
> car for cash. Suppose they can get 5% for 30 years. Their monthly payment
> increases by only $53.68 - but it does so for three decades! Total cost of that
> $10,000 is $19324.80 - that's $9324.80 of interest, even though the rate is
> much lower.
>
> Of course the situation is muddied by the fact that you pay over a much longer
> period of time, but it's doubtful that the car will last 30 years. It's further
> muddied by tax considerations, and whether/when the borrowers can expect
> increases in their income.
>
> Most of all, there's the philosophical question of incurring long-term debt for
> a short-term purchase.
> >

3206. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-24 14:04:05 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <pdowb.12464$P%1.10931982@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 82780

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:h8owb.12462$P%1.10931090@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
>
> "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
> news:gOewb.19460$Wy4.4625@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> > "N2EY" wrote:
> > > "Dwight Stewart" writes:
> > >
> > > >You haven't established, at least not to my
> > > > satisfaction (nor the satisfaction of the ITU,
> > > > FCC, and several countries around the
> > > > world), why Morse code is necessary
> > > > (notice I said necessary, not enjoyable)
> > > > for ham radio today.
> > >
> > > You mean the code itself, or the test?
> >
> >
> > In the context of that sentence, code itself.
> >
>
>
> Just a few short weeks ago, auroral activity imposed so much distortion on
> HF voice that it was not useable. At the same time, the distortion on the
> HF computer operated digital modes was great enough that the computer
could
> not decipher them. Of the computer operated digital modes, the newest one,
> PSK31, failed first. RTTY held up a bit longer but it also failed.
Although
> distortion on the HF CW/Morse signal also existed, the human brain version
> of a computer could and did decipher the signals into intelligible, useful
> data when all other modes were useless. The choice was operate code or
turn
> off the HF radio. If code is not necessary in ham radio today, then
neither
> is HF itself.
>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>
>

While I try to avoid posting to my own comments, I see that I need to add
additional information.

This phenomenon becomes more severe the further north that your station is. It was quite noticeable here in Michigan but it would have been less severe in places like South Carolina where QRZ shows Dwight lives. Southern stations may merely have noticed the absence of northern stations on the air if they noticed anything at all.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

3207. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-24 14:10:05 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <REMOVETHISkc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <bptj05$1st6i0$10@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 82787

> >
> >What goes up must come down as well too.
>
> Not necessarily. Look at where the Dow was when Bill Clinton took office
in
> 1992...

Actually, I am not sure about the Dow, but my fund of which is comprised of alot of the DJIA stocks, had increased substantially from the early 90's till about the time baby Bush was elected.

>
> >But that is the beauty of the
> >stock market. It is a cyclical thing. Ideally it would be like a good
> >sinus rhythm. It is just merely the knowledge of where to jump in at.
> >
> Just as important is knowing when to jump *out*.

Yeah... after sending that message I forgot to add that line..... To use the ghetto vernacular..... My Bad!

> >>
> >> (It soitanly do, but over long time periods that are not relevant to
> >> most of us who don't live over 150 years. More importantly it is what
> >> the market is doing around the time you take your money out.)
> >>
> >> Move your money into high yield accounts shortly before you retire,
that
> >> way you'll have more money when you retire!
> >
> Buy high, sell low, go broke...
> >
> >Only if you know what you are doing and have a really good grasp of the
> >market.
>
> Which absolutely no one has.
> >
> >> I've listened to investment consultants actually pull this one out of
> >> their hats. I know some older folk who have done this and now have
> >> almost no retirement funds.
> >
> >Yep... not for the weak or feable to try on thier own if not
knowledgeable.
> >
> The term is "risk tolerance"- a fancy way of saying how ready you are to

lose
> money. And the rule is simple: the closer you are to actually needing the
> money, the less your risk tolerance should be.

Which should be the case as nearing closer to the retirement age. Less time
to "make up" the losses if they occur then.

> >>
> >> I have to chuckle at your truism. first, because your friend the real
> >> estate agent uses those sort of arguments to talk you into buying
> >> several thousand or tens of thousands more dollars worht of house.
> >> Second is that You are saying a person who gets out of debt is foolish.
> >
> >Actually the person I got this truism from and believe in it is Bruce
> >Williams, the talkshow host. If you do the math, it is fairly true.
>
> I did the math and it's false enough to be a worthless truism.

Yeah... but you also added something to the equation that was not there in
the first place.

--
Ryan KC8PMX

"Never take too life seriously. Nobody gets out alive anyway."

3208. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-24 14:12:50 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <REMOVETHISkc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <bptj06$1st6i0$11@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 82788

> Don't forget succumbing to the credit card problem. It's soooo easy to
> live life large when you have 10 credit cards with a 20 thousand liimit
> on each card.

One card with a 500 dollar limit here.... used for emergencies and the
occaisional on-line purchase.

>
> One of those nifty little life secrets I've found out is that if you
> are willing to avoid spending credit money like a drunken sailor while
> you are young, you will have much more money for your toys when you get
> older.

Bingo.... keep money going into savings and then take the funds out when you
need to purchase, but that is an idealism that most cannot grasp.

--
Ryan KC8PMX

"Health is merely the slowest possible rate at which one can die."

3209. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-24 14:33:49 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <REMOVETHISkc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <bptj09$1st6i0$12@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 82789

Well since you brought up the auto manufacturers..... Obviously there are some cases where we have no choice in the matter. But in my own personal case, I will NEVER buy a new car from the auto manufacturers.... I will however buy one at least one year old, and from a private party, not a dealership.

There are other obvious cases as well where conceding in this issue is almost unavoidable. Obviously if your situation requires you to have an automobile, then purchasing fuel would be an at least occaisional requirement. Still in those cases, I choose to support the locally owned franchisee's as opposed to truly corporate owned gas stations.

--
Ryan KC8PMX

"Give a person a fish and you feed them for a day; teach that person to use The Internet and they won't bother you for weeks."

"K&#65533;HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:065wb.16399$Rk5.7694@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> "Ryan, KC8PMX" <REMOVETHISkc8pmx@diamondcs.net> wrote
>
> > Screw Corporate Amerika! (before they screw you)
>
> EXACTLY!!!!!! You've got it all figured out for sure!
>
> Who the hell do General Motors and Ford and Mercedes think they are
> anyhow --- we used to have hundreds of different auto manufacturers? Let's
> open a blacksmith shop in our village and build our own cars, like our
> grandfathers did! And, yeah, quit buying computers from Dell and
> Gateway --- we have sand in our neighborhood --- we can make our own silicon
> chips just as well as Intel does! Dole pineapples --- who needs them
> anyhow, I bet we can grow perfectly good pineapples here in Minnesota. Who
> needs all this corporate crap anyhow?
>
> 73, de Hans, K0HB
>
>
>
>
>

3210. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-24 14:39:52 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <REMOVETHISkc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <bptj0a$1st6i0$13@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 82790

Isn't it funny that a original post that had NOTHING to do with AMATEUR
RADIO is getting more exposure than the old code/no code debate???

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:xjewb.19419$Wy4.19244@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> "Jim Hampton" wrote:
> >
> > Although way off topic (as are many threads
> > here), I couldn't resist this one.
>
>
> Obviously, I couldn't resist the topic either (it appears the same is
true
> for others). And, yes, it is certainly off-topic. However, I hope there is
> room in this newgroup for less formal discussions also. After all, as ham
> operators, we do like to talk, in some way or another, with others.
However,
> for those who are not interested, I made sure the topic was very clear in
> the subject line so they can easily skip the discussion.
>
>
> > (snip) I'll grant the one arguement that will
> > come up - there will be folks out to make
> > money. (snip)
>
>
> Oh, you can bet your bottom dollar on that. Lawyer fees. Advertising for
> the news organizations. Lawsuits. Book deals. Interviews. The lecture
> circuit. Paparazzi. The tabloids. Money is going to be flying everywhere.
>
>
> > Personally, I think the guy is right off his rocker,
> > but the name of the game should be to protect
> > society (especially kids). (snip)
>
>
> Yep. That's why I tried to avoid anything outside that in my original
> message. If the guy wants to sleep in an oxygen tent (or not), more power
to
> him (even if I do think it's a little strange).
>
>
> > (snip) I believe, and please correct me if I am
> > wrong, that he was never married until that mess

> > 10 years ago or so. Suddenly, he gets married.
> > And divorced. And ... so on and so on.
>
>
> I also found his sudden desire to get married somewhat questionable.
>
>
> > I totally agree with your accessment as to
> > classic symptoms of a pedophile. Neverland
> > should be renamed Never - Ever land. Why
> > just the kids and not the whole family? (snip)
>
>
> I've always been interested in detective mysteries (in the Sherlock
Holmes
> style), so have read a lot (both fiction and non-fiction) on the subject
of
> criminals and law enforcement. Based on what I've read, Michael Jackson
> seems to fit the classic picture of a pedophile.
>
>
> > Sorry for the long ramblings. I suspect, as do
> > you, that this case is going to be another media
> > circus court case. (snip)
>
>
> What you wrote was well thought out, so was a joy to read. As for the
> media circus, this case may reach an all time high (or low depending on
your
> perspective).
>
>
> > If he isn't convicted, how old do these characters
> > get before their libido finally slows down? (snip)
>
>
> Based on what I've read, quite old. Note that we're talking about a
> diverse group here. Not all pedophiles seek actual sexual intercourse with
> children. Some limit their activities to just looking at images of, or
> photographing, young children. Others prefer to touch or fondle children
or
> have children touch or fondle them, but may never go beyond that. And, of
> course, some are seeking sexual intercourse. Whatever the case, the sex
> drive tends to mirror the sex drive of a normal person. In general,
attempts
> at actual sexual intercourse tends to slow down by the late thirties to
> early fifties, but fondling and touching may continue for many years after
> that. Some pedophiles have been arrested in their seventies or even
> eighties.
>

>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
>

3211. Re: Happy Veterans Day

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-24 14:43:18 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0311240643.5074efbf@posting.google.com>
Source record: 82781

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0311231938.31e254d2@posting.google.com>...
> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
>
> > Agreed. Obviously untrue. Steve doesn't know the diff between a CO and a JAFO.
>
> I know Brainy needs to join the real world rather than quoting
> lines from 20+ year old action movies.

You still don't know the diff.

> And I'll never be a JAFO, Brainy...they sit in the right seat and
> twiddle the knobs...I get to fly.
>
> Steve, K4YZ

Do tell?

3212. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-24 17:07:30 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0311240907.641303f9@posting.google.com>
Source record: 82782

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:<93fwb.19494$Wy4.116@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> "N2EY" wrote:
> > "Dwight Stewart" writes:
> >
> > > It's time to move on, Jim.
> >
> > To what?
>
> I meant to answer that in the last message. Anyway, it's time to move on
> to something besides just endlessly debating the Morse Code testing
> requirement.

OK, fine. Let's do just that.

The issue will be decided one way or another by the FCC at some point
anyway.

> This debate has sharply divided the Amateur Radio community

I don't see that at all in "real life" amateur radio outside
newsgroups and such.

> and
> I think that alone is having a major impact on any attempts to further the
> goals and purposes of the Amateur Radio Service

We'll have to agree to disagree about that)

>(we can't discuss anything
> without this topic constantly interfering).

I say the opposite is true. We can try, anyway.

Here's a selection of topics:

- Regardless of code test requirements, should there continue to be
separate HF subbands for voice/image and cw/data modes in the USA?

- Is there a need to change the entry-level license requirements and
privileges?

- What can/should be done about CC&Rs?

- What can be done to increase the visibility of the ARS to the
general public?

- Are contests a good thing or a bad thing for the ARS?

- Is homebrewing by hams dead or dying?

- Should there be a minimum age requirement for a ham license?

- Should there be an experience requirement for upgrading?

- How many classes of ham license should exist, and what should the requirements/privileges be (other than code test/no code test)?

Pick one or more, or sugghest your own, and let's go!

73 de Jim, N2EY

3213. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-24 17:32:27 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <Lgrwb.20098$Wy4.18592@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 82783

"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote

> - Regardless of code test requirements, should there continue to be
> separate HF subbands for voice/image and cw/data modes in the USA?

Yes.

> - Is there a need to change the entry-level license requirements and
> privileges?

Yes. See http://tinyurl.com/wce9 for the needed change.

> - What can/should be done about CC&Rs?

Hire a good lawyer.

> - What can be done to increase the visibility of the ARS to the
> general public?

Large antennas high in the sky.

> - Are contests a good thing or a bad thing for the ARS?

Yes.

> - Is homebrewing by hams dead or dying?

Yes.

> - Should there be a minimum age requirement for a ham license?

No.

> - Should there be an experience requirement for upgrading?

Yes.

> - How many classes of ham license should exist, and what should the
> requirements/privileges be (other than code test/no code test)?

Two classes. See http://tinyurl.com/wce9 for details.

OK, now that's all settled. What should we decide next?

73, de Hans, K0HB

3214. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-24 17:57:15 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <%Drwb.20141$Wy4.12310@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 82784

"K&#65533;HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote

>> - Are contests a good thing or a bad thing for the ARS?

> Yes.

That answer should have been "They are a GOOD thing for the ARS"

73, de Hans, K0HB

RadioSport Minnesota: http://www.w0aa.org

3215. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-24 19:29:24 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <o_swb.20295$Wy4.7841@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 82791

"Ryan, KC8PMX" <REMOVETHISkc8pmx@diamondcs.net> wrote

> "Give a person a fish and you feed them for a day; teach that
> person to use The Internet and they won't bother you for weeks."

"Give a person a fish and you feed them for a day; teach that
person to fish, and they'll sit out on the lake all day drinking
beer."

73, de Hans, K0HB

3216. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-24 19:36:03 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3FC25DA3.1010303@psu.edu>
Source record: 82792

Ryan, KC8PMX wrote:
>>Don't forget succumbing to the credit card problem. It's soooo easy to
>>live life large when you have 10 credit cards with a 20 thousand liimit
>>on each card.
>
>
> One card with a 500 dollar limit here.... used for emergencies and the
> occaisional on-line purchase.

I confess I have several, but one is a card which gives a discount on
gasoline - but ya have to pay it off!!! - and some others, but they get
paid off pronto.

I'll bet that P****s the companies off!

>
>>One of those nifty little life secrets I've found out is that if you
>>are willing to avoid spending credit money like a drunken sailor while
>>you are young, you will have much more money for your toys when you get
>>older.
>
>
> Bingo.... keep money going into savings and then take the funds out when you
> need to purchase, but that is an idealism that most cannot grasp.

A pity, that.
>
> --
> Ryan KC8PMX
>
> "Health is merely the slowest possible rate at which one can die."

hehe, good one, Ryan!

- Mike KB3EIA -

3217. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-24 20:55:08 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <rpqdnR_YfpAN71-i4p2dnA@gbronline.com>
Source record: 82793

N8WWM wrote:

> In article <hKcwb.19293$Wy4.777@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>, Dwight
> Stewart says...
>
>>
>>"Mike Coslo" wrote:
>>
>>>N8WWM wrote:
>>>
>>>
>>>>i wish i could sleep over jackos house.
>>>
>>>Too old?
>>

>>
>
> Im not childish I just like michaels music.

Anyone would have to be very childish to like his noise he attempts to
pass off as music.

3218. Re: Hudson Division Director Race

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-24 21:17:35 UTC
From: n2ah@hotmail.com
Message-ID: <774a2c02.0311241317.b20af38@posting.google.com>
Source record: 82794
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.shortwave

"Tommy Toothless" wrote:

> There are 28,913 Hams in the Hudson Division. (ARRL census)
>
> Of these 28,913 only a paltry 3,403 bothered
> to vote in this election.
>
> Am I missing something here or is this really
> worth giving two shi+s about..?

Considering the 10-year license term:

How many of those 28,913 hams are still alive?

How many are still active?

And most importantly, how many are ARRL members (only ones who can vote)?

Art N2AH

3219. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-24 21:56:13 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3FC27E60.7E03550F@earthlink.net>
Source record: 82795

"Kï¿½HB" wrote:
>
> "Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote
>
> >> - Are contests a good thing or a bad thing for the ARS?
>
> > Yes.
>
> That answer should have been "They are a GOOD thing for the ARS"
>
> 73, de Hans, K0HB

Don't be too hasty, Hans. I'm a contester too and I think your first
answer may have hit the nail on the head.

Dave K8MN

3220. Re: Happy Veterans Day

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-24 22:02:26 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0311241402.5987b999@posting.google.com>
Source record: 82796

brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0311240643.5074efbf@posting.google.com>...

> You still don't know the diff.

If you insist, Brain. YOUR track record for accuracy in this
forum would leave others to doubt your assessment, though.

> > And I'll never be a JAFO, Brainy...they sit in the right seat and
> > twiddle the knobs...I get to fly.

> Do tell?

Check the FAA Airman's Certification Branch, Brain. Just like
Prego, "It's In There"....

Steve, K4YZ

3221. Re: Happy Veterans Day

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-24 22:03:49 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0311241403.b87062@posting.google.com>
Source record: 82797

"Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<Xcfwb.17482$Rk5.5895@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> "Steve Robeson, K4CAP" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote
>
> > Commnader, Naval paygrade O-5.
>
> Do they call them that because they have size 5 'nads?

Don't know, Hans...There was only one Commander that I was ever
interested in how SHE appeared without attire...

73

Steve, K4YZ

3222. Re: Happy Veterans Day

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-24 22:12:58 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <Knvwb.18562$Rk5.5404@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 82798

"Steve Robeson, K4CAP" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
news:5c01b95b.0311241403.b87062@posting.google.com...
> "K&#65533;HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<Xcfwb.17482$Rk5.5895@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> > "Steve Robeson, K4CAP" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote
> >
> > > Commnader, Naval paygrade O-5.
> >
> > Do they call them that because they have size 5 'nads?
>
> Don't know, Hans...There was only one Commander that I was ever
> interested in how SHE appeared without attire...
>
> 73
>
> Steve, K4YZ

You may want to stand up, then go back and read the entire exchange from a standing position, 'cuz it went over your head the first time.

I'll repeat..... "Do they call them that because they have size 5 'nads?"

73, K0HB

3223. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-24 22:44:34 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <mRvwb.20476$Wy4.1176@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 82799

"Ryan, KC8PMX" wrote:
>
> Isn't it funny that a original post that had
> NOTHING to do with AMATEUR
> RADIO is getting more exposure than
> the old XXXX/no XXXX debate???

Please don't mention that word, Ryan. If we're careful, we may get the record for the longest time without any significant discussion of that subject. ;-)

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3224. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-24 23:18:29 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0311241518.453fa134@posting.google.com>
Source record: 82800

"Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<o_swb.20295$Wy4.7841@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> "Ryan, KC8PMX" <REMOVETHISkc8pmx@diamondcs.net> wrote
>
> > "Give a person a fish and you feed them for a day; teach that
> > person to use The Internet and they won't bother you for weeks."
>
> "Give a person a fish and you feed them for a day; teach that
> person to fish, and they'll sit out on the lake all day drinking
> beer."

What's the downside?

I don't see any.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3225. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-24 23:35:33 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0311241535.5b4e2a68@posting.google.com>
Source record: 82801

"Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<Lgrwb.20098$Wy4.18592@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> "N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote
>
> > - Regardless of code test requirements, should there continue to be
> > separate HF subbands for voice/image and cw/data modes in the USA?
>
> Yes.

Agreed!
>
> > - Is there a need to change the entry-level license requirements and
> > privileges?
>
> Yes. See http://tinyurl.com/wce9 for the needed change.

Saw 'em. Wonder what others think?
>
> > - What can/should be done about CC&Rs?
>
> Hire a good lawyer.

BEFORE you sign on the dotted line!
>
> > - What can be done to increase the visibility of the ARS to the
> > general public?
>
> Large antennas high in the sky.

AGREED!

>
> > - Are contests a good thing or a bad thing for the ARS?
>
> Yes.

(a good thing per followup post)

Agreed!
>
> > - Is homebrewing by hams dead or dying?
>
> Yes.

Which is it? It's not dead at my house. Nor dying.

>
> > - Should there be a minimum age requirement for a ham license?
>
> No.

Agreed/
>
> > - Should there be an experience requirement for upgrading?
>
> Yes.

How much? No such requirement that I can see at

http://tinyurl.com/wce9
>
> > - How many classes of ham license should exist, and what should the
> > requirements/privileges be (other than code test/no code test)?
>
> Two classes. See http://tinyurl.com/wce9 for details.

Been there, done that.

But how much experience? Looks like someone could waltz in and get a
full-privs ticket right away under that proposed system.
>
> OK, now that's all settled. What should we decide next?
>
See what others think...

73 de Jim, N2EY

3226. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-24 23:48:30 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <iNwwb.20613$Wy4.10991@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 82802

"Kim W5TIT" wrote:
>
> As stated, no one (*other* than possibly
> Dwight) was owed an apology. Have
> you ever seen me demand an apology for
> being offended by you, Larry? And, as
> has come to pass, Dwight was quite
> reasonable (something which you neither
> understand nor are capable of) about
> how he understood the post. (snip)

Perhaps it might be a good idea to simply drop the matter while you're still ahead, Kim. Your words were certainly questionable and could easily be interpreted the way many others did. But I made a choice to interpret those words differently to avoid additional confrontation. But that doesn't mean that my chosen interpretation is really what you meant, or is now a defense of what you said. Enough said.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3227. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-24 23:48:45 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <xNwwb.18681$Rk5.9897@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 82803

"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote

> But how much experience? Looks like someone could waltz in and get a
> full-privs ticket right away under that proposed system.

Then you didn't notice the following sentence

--- Holders of this license would be required to have 2 years experience as
a licensee ("time in grade") before being eligible to upgrade to "Class A".

73, K0HB

3228. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-25 00:02:37 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <x_wwb.20633$Wy4.17518@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 82804

"Dwight Stewart" wrote:
>
> Is there anyone out there who actually believes
> Michael Jackson is really innocent of this latest
> charge? (snip)

Has anyone noticed the Jackson spin machine in action lately? In just the last few days on the talk shows, I've seen or heard from Michael Jackson's brother, father, sister, several fans, his ex-spiritual advisor (?), his ex-magician (?), and so on. Did you also notice they all seem to be using the exact same words ("he's a child himself," "its' normal for him to sleep with kids," "it's all totally innocent," "they're out to get him because he's famous," and so on). Too bad the victim's family doesn't have that type of support on those talk shows.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3229. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-25 00:24:21 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <Vixwb.20694$Wy4.6826@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 82805

"Dee D. Flint" wrote:
>
> Just a few short weeks ago, auroral activity
> imposed so much distortion on HF voice
> that it was not useable. (snip)

Perhaps you mean HF voice was limited, not unusable. I wasn't aware that all HF voice communications, including short range, was impossible during that period. Regardless, a very temporary condition doesn't make a mode itself necessary in the overall scheme of Amateur Radio. Amateur Radio continued on during that period, even for those HF operators who simply decided to turn the radio off or to other frequencies during that period. At the same time, I heard no reports of emergency services, or other similar Amateur Radio activities, being seriously disrupted.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3230. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-25 00:32:14 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bpu8gh$33b@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 82809

"Ryan, KC8PMX" <REMOVETHISkc8pmx@diamondcs.net> wrote in message
news:bptj0a$1st6i0$13@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de...
> Isn't it funny that a original post that had NOTHING to do with AMATEUR
> RADIO is getting more exposure than the old code/no code debate???
>

I think it goes to boredom with that topic...

Kim W5TIT

3231. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-25 00:37:34 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <ivxwb.23031$m84.4235651@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 82806

Kim W5TIT wrote:

> "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
> news:YYewb.12144$m84.3957104@news1.news.adelphia.net...
>
>>Alun wrote:
>>
>>>Well, you know, we go camping all in one tent. There are partitions, but
>>>they are only made of canvas. It's private enough when the kids are
>>>asleep, though. For that matter, even if you are in different tents you
>>>can hear everything. I imagine that where everyone shares one room it's
>
> a
>
>>>matter of waiting until everyone is asleep and being very quiet.
>>
>>Oy! I had to chuckle when I read that, Alun! Quiet? I mean I guess that
>>must happen, but I think I'll opt for privacy. 8^)
>>
>>- Mike KB3EIA -
>>
>
>
> ROFLMAO! TMI, Mike, TMI!!!!

Hehe, yeah, probably. Ohh what a strange thread!

- Mike KB3EIA -

3232. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-25 00:39:08 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <Mwxwb.23032$m84.4235915@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 82807

Ryan, KC8PMX wrote:

> Isn't it funny that a original post that had NOTHING to do with AMATEUR
> RADIO is getting more exposure than the old code/no code debate???

Kind of refreshing in an OT sort of way........

- Mike KB3EIA -

3233. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-25 00:39:18 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bpu8gj$33b@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 82808

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:iNwwb.20613$Wy4.10991@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> "Kim W5TIT" wrote:
> >
> > As stated, no one (*other* than possibly
> > Dwight) was owed an apology. Have
> > you ever seen me demand an apology for
> > being offended by you, Larry? And, as
> > has come to pass, Dwight was quite
> > reasonable (something which you neither
> > understand nor are capable of) about
> > how he understood the post. (snip)
>
>
> Perhaps it might be a good idea to simply drop the matter while you're
> still ahead, Kim. Your words were certainly questionable and could easily
be
> interpreted the way many others did. But I made a choice to interpret
those
> words differently to avoid additional confrontation. But that doesn't mean
> that my chosen interpretation is really what you meant, or is now a
defense
> of what you said. Enough said.
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
>

Dwight, I certainly don't mean to imply you are "defending" anything I said.
I'd hardly want that and would be quite surprised by it. And, I didn't see
anyone else but Larry have the reaction to it...well, maybe Mike I think.
So, I don't define that as many. It's a pretty near given that I (nor many
others in this newsgroup) would find anything like the death of someone else
"hilarious."

At any rate, it disappoints that you chose to interpret something because
you wanted to avoid additional confrontation. I would hope you'd never
modify what you say, apart from what you truly believe, because of avoiding
confrontation. Ya sure won't find that from me...

Kim W5TIT

3234. Re: Happy Veterans Day

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-25 00:44:19 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0311241644.101d5938@posting.google.com>
Source record: 82810

"Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<Xcfwb.17482$Rk5.5895@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> "Steve Robeson, K4CAP" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote
>
> > Commnader, Naval paygrade O-5.
>
> Do they call them that because they have size 5 'nads?
>
> 73, de Hans, K0HB

Good eye, Hans.

Or it might be a codeword for Commrad Nader.

3235. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-25 01:41:28 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <kOmdnVCS88hIKI-iRVn-hA@gbronline.com>
Source record: 82811

Kim W5TIT wrote:

>
> Dwight, I certainly don't mean to imply you are "defending" anything I said.
> I'd hardly want that and would be quite surprised by it. And, I didn't see
> anyone else but Larry have the reaction to it...well, maybe Mike I think.

Because Larry said first what many others thought.

3236. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-25 02:18:56 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <k_ywb.2783$hl7.1290@news01.roc.ny>
Source record: 82812

Sorry, Dwight.

I wasn't referring to you. I think I put the response in the wrong place.
I was referring to fact that someone is trying to pretend he is N8WWM.

No, this is certainly different and much better than the old saw about the
boy scouts or cub scouts (is Michael up to 2 packs a day now?).

The fingers were out typing my poor brain box :)

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:6kbwb.19089$Wy4.15721@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net...
>
> "Jim Hampton" wrote:
> > 'cmon. Read the headers. You just fed a troll :)
>
>
> Those who have known me over the last five or six years in this
newsgroup
> also know I don't troll, Jim. This topic has received massive coverage in
> the news over the last few days. Because of that, I thought it was an
> interesting topic to introduce in the newsgroup (something different to
talk
> about).
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
>

3237. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-25 03:09:15 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20031124220915.11022.00002251@mb-m14.aol.com>
Source record: 82816

In article <bpsrm4nsr0@pita.alt.net>, "Lloyd" <Lloyd@dinlloydnet.net> writes:

>
>
>Hey Kane, they were talking about you on 14275 yesterday.
>
>73 de Lloyd

That's MISTER Kane to you, numbnuts.

73 de Larry, K3LT

3238. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-25 03:09:17 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20031124220917.11022.00002253@mb-m14.aol.com>
Source record: 82813

In article <bpsm2o$11c@library2.airnews.net>, "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
writes:

>> Kim:
>>
>> I neither stand nor speak while I'm typing at my computer keyboard.
>> And you're still a childish, boorish, ignorant person. You screwed up
>> and you'll never admit it, because you are totally self-centered. Whether
>> Dwight took offense or not, others have -- and that is what you should
>> be apologizing for. However, you're too self-centered to ever be able
>> to figure that out. You're pitiful.
>>
>> 73 de Larry, K3LT

>As stated, no one (*other* than possibly Dwight) was owed an apology.

Kim:

On the contrary, your faux pas was offensive to many others. What made it
so is the fact that, as usual, it was posted with little or no thought given to
it's possible effect. And, in a nutshell, that's your main problem. You don't
seem to have any process of careful, thoughtful contemplation involved in
your postings. You simply make ill-considered, off-the-cuff reactions which,
invariably, get you in trouble. You have no intellectual credibility in this
newsgroup, and, I dare say, that is most likely the case in the rest of your
interpersonal and working relationships as well.

>Have
>you ever seen me demand an apology for being offended by you, Larry?

No, but I've never said anything to or about you which could be considered
offensive, Kim -- just truthful.

>And,
>as has come to pass, Dwight was quite reasonable (something which you
>neither understand nor are capable of) about how he understood the post.

I was impressed with Dwight's restraint -- too bad you didn't exercise any
yourself, or we wouldn't be having this discussion now.

>And, as to your opinion of me--or anyone else, Larry--you are the last soul
>on this Earth with whom I find any merit for anything done or not done by
>others.

I require no validation of my qualification to judge your behavior and
actions, Kim. I am an intelligent and educated person, who has developed
mature judgement and the ability to express myself with clarity and

conviction. OTOH, you have clearly demonstrated that you are none of the above. Therefore, you're only wasting your time if you think you can possibly discredit me in any way.

>Now, back to forgetting about responding to you since you drone on
>with your impish, childish, boring, self-centered ignorance...

Suit yourself.

>You and your *"Dr."* should have some tea...

I would consider it an honor and a privilege to have tea with Dr. Laura Schlessinger. If that fine day should ever come, rest assured, your name will not be mentioned. I don't need her help in dealing with the likes of you.

73 de Larry, K3LT

3239. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-25 03:09:17 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20031124220917.11022.00002252@mb-m14.aol.com>
Source record: 82814

In article <bpspl702tm5@drn.newsguy.com>, N8WWM <N8WWM@home.nut> writes:

>> He acts childish enough at times, Mike. Since Michael Jackson thinks of
>>himself as a kid, perhaps N8WWM can also convince Michael Jackson that he's
>>a kid too. I'll certainly vouch for you, N8WWM. ;-)
>>
>>
>>Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>>
>>http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
>>
>Im not childish I just like michaels music. Why cant we just leave his
>personal
>life out of this? He's innocent until proven guilty just like i am. The rain
>report claimed I jammed repeaters but they didn't prove it.

Mike:

I'll attempt to explain. As a public figure, Mr. Jackson has the ability to
influence people on the basis of his personal behavior. His actions cannot
be separated from his music simply for the convenience of his audience.
A lot of young, impressionable people view him as an idol or a role model.
When his personal behavior turns out to show him to be a man of
highly suspect morality (if not sanity), then his influence immediately
turns negative -- or at least, it should. Like all public figures, Mr. Jackson
will have supporters and detractors. Personally, I find little about his
personal life which would incline me toward considering him to be anything
but a hedonistic, emotionally-incompetent, and potentially dangerous
person, who should never be given access to anyone's children.

Yes, at one time, I liked his music, and I do not deny his talent as an
entertainer. However, that is not enough. He now resides in the garbage
disposal of my esteem, along with the Dixie Chicks.

73 de Larry, K3LT

3240. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-25 03:09:18 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20031124220918.11022.00002254@mb-m14.aol.com>
Source record: 82815

In article <bpu8gj$33b@library1.airnews.net>, "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
writes:

> It's a pretty near given that I (nor many
>others in this newsgroup) would find anything like the death of someone else
>"hilarious."

Kim:

Ahem -- care to look over the above sentence and, perhaps, add something
to it? Or "not"?

73 de Larry, K3LT

3241. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-25 04:49:00 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <0bBwb.12637$P%1.11088972@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 82817

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:Vixwb.20694$Wy4.6826@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> "Dee D. Flint" wrote:
> >
> > Just a few short weeks ago, auroral activity
> > imposed so much distortion on HF voice
> > that it was not useable. (snip)
>
>
> Perhaps you mean HF voice was limited, not unusable. I wasn't aware that
> all HF voice communications, including short range, was impossible during
> that period. Regardless, a very temporary condition doesn't make a mode
> itself necessary in the overall scheme of Amateur Radio. Amateur Radio
> continued on during that period, even for those HF operators who simply
> decided to turn the radio off or to other frequencies during that period.
At
> the same time, I heard no reports of emergency services, or other similar
> Amateur Radio activities, being seriously disrupted.
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
>

For local communications, one has many choices and although one could use HF there are better frequencies for that and experienced hams know that. The choice for local work is generally going to be VHF. So when hams are talking about HF propagation and usage, they are talking about other than local communications.

Long distance HF voice was unusable during that time for many locations (the north is affected worse by auroral but geomagnetic disturbances seem to have an equal effect everywhere). Such "temporary conditions" can happen several times a year. If one wants or needs to make other than local contacts then yes code is necessary. We've had several such occurrences in the last month. Auroral conditions and other items like geomagnetic storms can affect all the HF frequencies simultaneously. So for long distance communications under such conditions, changing bands or frequencies within HF is often of little help. Yes one could turn off the radio if they didn't know code but why place that limit on one's self? If the choice is to turn off the radio or use code then I'd say that code is indeed necessary whether or not it is an emergency.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

3242. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-25 05:30:46 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <28ydnS3AVdW5b1-iRVn-hg@gbronline.com>
Source record: 82818

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:

> Personally, I find little about his
> personal life which would incline me toward considering him to be anything
> but a hedonistic, emotionally-incompetent, and potentially dangerous
> person, who should never be given access to anyone's children.

I wonder what kind of parent would allow their children to spend the
night with MJ?

3243. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-25 07:05:11 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <REMOVETHISkc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <bpvqdi$1t9o3l$2@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 82830

"Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
news:3FC25DA3.1010303@psu.edu...
> Ryan, KC8PMX wrote:
> >>Don't forget succumbing to the credit card problem. It's soooo easy to
> >>live life large when you have 10 credit cards with a 20 thousand liimit
> >>on each card.
> >
> >
> > One card with a 500 dollar limit here.... used for emergencies and the
> > occaisional on-line purchase.
>
> I confess I have several, but one is a card which gives a discount on
> gasoline - but ya have to pay it off!!! - and some others, but they get
> paid off pronto.
>
>
> I'll bet that P****s the companies off!

I just feel that the credit cards "trap" a person..... not only with dealing with paying the damned things off but as a way of thinking when purchasing. "Gee, I don't have enough money in my wallet, but wait! I have my credit cards!!"
Thats why I have the one card... with a lower limit.

>
>
> >
> >>One of those nifty little life secrets I've found out is that if you
> >>are willing to avoid spending credit money like a drunken sailor while
> >>you are young, you will have much more money for your toys when you get
> >>older.
> >
> >
> > Bingo.... keep money going into savings and then take the funds out when
you
> > need to purchase, but that is an idealism that most cannot grasp.
>
> A pity, that.

True, that.!

> >
> > --
> > Ryan KC8PMX
> >

> > "Health is merely the slowest possible rate at which one can die."
>
> hehe, good one, Ryan!
>

Yeah, I like a good tagline and always looking for more! My favorite one is below.

--
Ryan KC8PMX

"Some people are like Slinkies . . . not really good for anything, but you still can't help but smile when you see one tumble down the stairs."

3244. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-25 07:06:23 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <REMOVETHISkc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <bpvqdj$1t9o3l$3@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 82831

Isn't the fishing the main excuse for drinking beer anyways?? Fishing is something I used to do while drinking! LOL

--
Ryan KC8PMX

"Never take too life seriously. Nobody gets out alive anyway."

"K�HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:o_swb.20295$Wy4.7841@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> "Ryan, KC8PMX" <REMOVETHISkc8pmx@diamondcs.net> wrote
>
> > "Give a person a fish and you feed them for a day; teach that
> > person to use The Internet and they won't bother you for weeks."
>
> "Give a person a fish and you feed them for a day; teach that
> person to fish, and they'll sit out on the lake all day drinking
> beer."
>
> 73, de Hans, K0HB
>
>
>
>

3245. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-25 07:09:52 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <REMOVETHISkc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <bpvqdl$1t9o3l$4@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 82832

Michael Jackson was actually cool at one point in his life, but that was back when he was actually black, male and straight. Now I am not sure what to call him..... is he male or female, black/african-american or white, gay or straight?? I think he should assume a symbol like Prince did, but Mikey Jackson's should be a question mark!!!!!!!!!

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message news:x_wwb.20633$Wy4.17518@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> "Dwight Stewart" wrote:
> >
> > Is there anyone out there who actually believes
> > Michael Jackson is really innocent of this latest
> > charge? (snip)
>
>
> Has anyone noticed the Jackson spin machine in action lately? In just the
> last few days on the talk shows, I've seen or heard from Michael Jackson's
> brother, father, sister, several fans, his ex-spiritual advisor (?), his
> ex-magician (?), and so on. Did you also notice they all seem to be using
> the exact same words ("he's a child himself," "its' normal for him to sleep
> with kids," "it's all totally innocent," "they're out to get him because
> he's famous," and so on). Too bad the victim's family doesn't have that type
> of support on those talk shows.
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
>

3246. Re: EMERGENCY! CD-ROM Document Library Released

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-25 09:04:38 UTC
From: Steve Silverwood <kb6ojs@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <MPG.1a284315d7fb6bab98968f@news.west.earthlink.net>
Source record: 82819
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.radio.scanner,misc.survivalism

In article <bpdknb$1moq3g$1@ID-202175.news.uni-berlin.de>,
Silly@sods.com says...
>
> "Kirk" wrote
> > You state that this information is given out for free,,, who do I
> > contact or how can I obtain a copy of it?
>
> http://www.google.com/search?hl=en&ie=UTF-8&oe=UTF-8&q=us+army+field+manuals
>
> Google.com - almost 72,000 results for US Army Field Manuals

Using that URL, Google says it's now 121,000 results!

--

-- //Steve//

Steve Silverwood, KB6OJS
Fountain Valley, CA
Email: kb6ojs@arrl.net
Web: http://home.earthlink.net/~kb6ojs_steve

3247. Re: ARRL you can Kiss my $39.00 a Year Good Bye

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-25 09:04:45 UTC
From: Steve Silverwood <kb6ojs@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <MPG.1a28757699c12cd398969c@news.west.earthlink.net>
Source record: 82820
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

In article <3faa8c00$0$94481$45beb828@newscene.com>, No.m@il.here
says...
>
> If I were to give the world an enema... 225 Main Street Newington, CT is
> where I'd stick the hose.

OK, I missed the earlier part of this thread, and I'm probably opening a
huge can of worms by asking this, but....

What do you have against the ARRL? I've had nothing but good
experiences with them, both at HQ and with their representatives
locally.

--

-- //Steve//

Steve Silverwood, KB6OJS
Fountain Valley, CA
Email: kb6ojs@arrl.net
Web: http://home.earthlink.net/~kb6ojs_steve

3248. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-25 10:29:12 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <Y9Gwb.21355$Wy4.13027@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 82821

"Jim Hampton" wrote:
>
> Sorry, Dwight.
>
> I wasn't referring to you. I think I put the
> response in the wrong place. I was referring
> to fact that someone is trying to pretend he
> is N8WWM. (snip)

Enough said, Jim. Sorry for being so defensive.

Hey, wait a minute. Is this the right newsgroup? Nobody ever says they're sorry in rec.radio.amateur.policy. But here, the word "sorry" is being thrown around enough to be almost obnoxious. Let's not take this too far, okay people? ;-)

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3249. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-25 10:46:32 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <cqGwb.21360$Wy4.4865@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 82822

"Kim W5TIT" wrote:
>
> (snip) At any rate, it disappoints that you
> chose to interpret something because you
> wanted to avoid additional confrontation.
> I would hope you'd never modify what you
> say, apart from what you truly believe,
> because of avoiding confrontation. Ya sure
> won't find that from me...

Well, I tend to value my conversations with others in this newsgroup (including you), so will rarely engage in open confrontation with any single person for very long. I figured I've argued with you enough over the last couple of weeks or so, so decided to avoid yet another argument this time. Call it a temporary truce, but obviously don't expect it to last forever. :-)

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3250. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-25 10:53:58 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <axGwb.21361$Wy4.8851@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 82823

"Mike Coslo" wrote:
>
> Hehe, yeah, probably. Ohh what a strange thread!

I'm still waiting for more details on what happens in that camping tent after the kids fall asleep. Were you and your wife the two staying in the tent next to us last year (4th of July weekend)? If so, trust me when I say you two weren't all that quiet. ;-)

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3251. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-25 12:07:26 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bpvgo9$sud@library2.airnews.net>
Source record: 82824

"JJ" <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
news:kOmdnVCS88hIKl-iRVn-hA@gbronline.com...
> Kim W5TIT wrote:
>
>
> >
> > Dwight, I certainly don't mean to imply you are "defending" anything I
said.
> > I'd hardly want that and would be quite surprised by it. And, I didn't
see
> > anyone else but Larry have the reaction to it...well, maybe Mike I
think.
>
> Because Larry said first what many others thought.
>

Oh. So now you're a mind reader.

Kim W5TIT

3252. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-25 12:11:29 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bpvgvs$iqn@library2.airnews.net>
Source record: 82825

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20031124220918.11022.00002254@mb-m14.aol.com...
> In article <bpu8gj$33b@library1.airnews.net>, "Kim W5TIT"
<kimscliff@yahoo.com>
> writes:
>
> > It's a pretty near given that I (nor many
> >others in this newsgroup) would find anything like the death of someone
else
> >"hilarious."
>
> Kim:
>
> Ahem -- care to look over the above sentence and, perhaps, add something
> to it? Or "not"?
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>
>

Nope. You see? Your question proves that you understood what it is I
meant to say, asshole...

Kim W5TIT

3253. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-25 12:14:09 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bpvh4s$h9d@library2.airnews.net>
Source record: 82826

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:cqGwb.21360$Wy4.4865@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> "Kim W5TIT" wrote:
> >
> > (snip) At any rate, it disappoints that you
> > chose to interpret something because you
> > wanted to avoid additional confrontation.
> > I would hope you'd never modify what you
> > say, apart from what you truly believe,
> > because of avoiding confrontation. Ya sure
> > won't find that from me...
>
>
> Well, I tend to value my conversations with others in this newsgroup
> (including you), so will rarely engage in open confrontation with any
single
> person for very long. I figured I've argued with you enough over the last
> couple of weeks or so, so decided to avoid yet another argument this time.
> Call it a temporary truce, but obviously don't expect it to last forever.
> :-)
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
>

OK. Well, I'll start then. I wish you'd review how much you sound like
Larry here recently... Really. Read your posts without looking at them as
being from you. You'll confuse yourself as to who, exactly, posted them...
You did not *used* to post like that...

Kim W5TIT

3254. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-25 12:19:31 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bpvheu$luq@library2.airnews.net>
Source record: 82827

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20031124220918.11022.00002254@mb-m14.aol.com...
> In article <bpu8gj$33b@library1.airnews.net>, "Kim W5TIT"
<kimscliff@yahoo.com>
> writes:
>
> > It's a pretty near given that I (nor many
> >others in this newsgroup) would find anything like the death of someone
else
> >"hilarious."
>
> Kim:
>
> Ahem -- care to look over the above sentence and, perhaps, add something
> to it? Or "not"?
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>
>

Oh, hell, let me go ahead and do it:

It's a pretty near given that I, nor many others in this newsgroup, would find anything like the death of someone else "hilarious." There, maybe the parentheses confused Larry...

Kim W5TIT

3255. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-25 13:07:43 UTC
From: Alun <alun@1stcounsel.com>
Message-ID: <Xns943E52AD49228elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 82828

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in
news:axGwb.21361$Wy4.8851@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net:

> "Mike Coslo" wrote:
>>
>> Hehe, yeah, probably. Ohh what a strange thread!
>
>
> I'm still waiting for more details on what happens in that camping
> tent
> after the kids fall asleep. Were you and your wife the two staying in
> the tent next to us last year (4th of July weekend)? If so, trust me
> when I say you two weren't all that quiet. ;-)
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
>
>

You will have to wait a long time if you expect me to post more than that.

Didn't go camping over the 4th of July, so it must have been someone else!

3256. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-25 13:28:49 UTC
From: Alun <alun@1stcounsel.com>
Message-ID: <Xns943E5640C8EFFelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 82829

N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in
news:c2356669.0311240907.641303f9@posting.google.com:

> "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
> news:<93fwb.19494$Wy4.116@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
>> "N2EY" wrote:
>> > "Dwight Stewart" writes:
>> >
>> > > It's time to move on, Jim.
>> >
>> > To what?
>>
>> I meant to answer that in the last message. Anyway, it's time to
>> move on
>> to something besides just endlessly debating the Morse Code testing
>> requirement.
>
> OK, fine. Let's do just that.
>
> The issue will be decided one way or another by the FCC at some point
> anyway.
>
>> This debate has sharply divided the Amateur Radio community
>
> I don't see that at all in "real life" amateur radio outside
> newsgroups and such.
>

That's because in real life and on the air most people don't discuss it,
but once it is raised, you find that there is a fault line where most hams
fall on one side or the other.

>> and
>> I think that alone is having a major impact on any attempts to further
>> the goals and purposes of the Amateur Radio Service
>
> We'll have to agree to disagree about that)
>
>>(we can't discuss anything without this topic constantly interfering).
>
> I say the opposite is true. We can try, anyway.
>
> Here's a selection of topics:
>
> - Regardless of code test requirements, should there continue to be

> separate HF subbands for voice/image and cw/data modes in the USA?
>

Yes, although I beleive they should be the same in all countries

> - Is there a need to change the entry-level license requirements and
> privileges?
>

Requirements, no

Privileges - I'm not sure, but I expect them to change when element 1 is
dumped, whether it's needed or not

> - What can/should be done about CC&Rs?
>

PRB-1 should be extended to include them

> - What can be done to increase the visibility of the ARS to the
> general public?
>

Don't know

> - Are contests a good thing or a bad thing for the ARS?
>

Good, because they boost activity (which, of course annoys all those who
think they have exclusive use of a frequency)

> - Is homebrewing by hams dead or dying?
>

Yes, unfortunately

> - Should there be a minimum age requirement for a ham license?
>

No

> - Should there be an experience requirement for upgrading?

No

>
> - How many classes of ham license should exist, and what should the
> requirements/privileges be (other than code test/no code test)?
>

Either one or two

Requirements should be theory tests

Privileges should not involve subbands like the current system, and should
not give someone a band if they can't use the bands on either side of it

(e.g. as in Canada). Nor should someone be given some modes and not others on any particular band. I am, however in favour of a power restriction for a lower tier licence, even though it would be hard to enforce.

A lower tier licence might allow use of, say, 160m, 10m, VHF and UHF, all at reduced power.

> Pick one or more, or sugghest your own, and let's go!
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>

73 de Alun, N3KIP

3257. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-25 17:11:06 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <5rOdnToJEIviEF6iRVn-hg@gbronline.com>
Source record: 82833

Kim W5TIT wrote:

> "JJ" <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
> news:kOmdnVCS88hIKl-iRVn-hA@gbronline.com...
>
>>Kim W5TIT wrote:
>>
>>
>>
>>>Dwight, I certainly don't mean to imply you are "defending" anything I
>
> said.
>
>>>I'd hardly want that and would be quite surprised by it. And, I didn't
>
> see
>
>>>anyone else but Larry have the reaction to it...well, maybe Mike I
>
> think.
>
>>Because Larry said first what many others thought.
>>
>
>
> Oh. So now you're a mind reader.
>
> Kim W5TIT

No, I am neither psychedelic nor do I have espn. Backpeddle all you want
but you made a really stupid statement.

3258. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-25 17:17:05 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0311250917.52e76e74@posting.google.com>
Source record: 82834

"Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<xNwwb.18681$Rk5.9897@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
>
> --- Holders of this license would be required to have 2 years experience as
> a licensee ("time in grade") before being eligible to upgrade to "Class A".
>
Works for me!

Would any sort of radio license count, or only amateur licenses?

Would the experience have to be current? (not "my license expired 5 years ago")

73 de Jim, N2EY

3259. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-25 19:22:52 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <g_Nwb.21716$Wy4.14801@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 82835

"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote

> Would any sort of radio license count, or only amateur licenses?

> Would the experience have to be current? (not "my license expired 5 years ago")

My inclination would be amateur experience only (insert here LHA and LHA(jg) rotors being spun up in mock indignation), and experience need not be current.

73, Hans, K0HB

3260. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-25 22:23:56 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0311251423.3cbb7d3b@posting.google.com>
Source record: 82836

"Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<g_Nwb.21716$Wy4.14801@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> "N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote
>
> > Would any sort of radio license count, or only amateur licenses?
>
> > Would the experience have to be current? (not "my license expired 5 years
> ago")
>
> My inclination would be amateur experience only

I agree again!

Of course, this isn;t a new idea - the old Extra required at least two
years as a General, Conditional or Advanced before they'd even let you
try the Extra test. A good idea that was abandoned about the same time
the Novice became full-term renewable.

Even further back (70 years) the old Class A required a year's
experience.

Everything old is new again.

>(insert here LHA and LHA(jg)
> rotors being spun up in mock indignation),

I wanna be around when you explain to them that their "PROFESSIONAL"
experience doesn't mean diddly-squat towards that requirement. And
that an elementary-school child with 2 years amateur experience is
qualified to take the test, but non-ham PROFESSIONALS aren't.

Sunuvagun!!

DO you really think it's mock indignation?

> and experience need not be
> current.

Now that I think about it, acceptance of noncurrent experience would
be a logical consequence of "one learner's permit to a customer". If
someone got an LP and didn't upgrade within 10 years for whatever
reason, but then later was able to pass the full-privs test, their old
experience would need to be accepted, otherwise they'd be locked out
of ham radio forever.

Personally I favor a three-level system, with a year experience at the
entry and intermediate levels. I know you see that as unnecessarily
complex. Point is, the principle is the same.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3261. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-25 22:23:56 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0311251423.72b8a500@posting.google.com>
Source record: 82837

"Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<g_Nwb.21716$Wy4.14801@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> "N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote
>
> > Would any sort of radio license count, or only amateur licenses?
>
> > Would the experience have to be current? (not "my license expired 5 years
> ago")
>
> My inclination would be amateur experience only

I agree again!

Of course, this isn;t a new idea - the old Extra required at least two years as a General, Conditional or Advanced before they'd even let you try the Extra test. A good idea that was abandoned about the same time the Novice became full-term renewable.

Even further back (70 years) the old Class A required a year's experience.

Everything old is new again.

>(insert here LHA and LHA(jg)
> rotors being spun up in mock indignation),

I wanna be around when you explain to them that their "PROFESSIONAL" experience doesn't mean diddly-squat towards that requirement. And that an elementary-school child with 2 years amateur experience is qualified to take the test, but non-ham PROFESSIONALS aren't.

Sunuvagun!!

DO you really think it's mock indignation?

> and experience need not be
> current.

Now that I think about it, acceptance of noncurrent experience would be a logical consequence of "one learner's permit to a customer". If someone got an LP and didn't upgrade within 10 years for whatever reason, but then later was able to pass the full-privs test, their old experience would need to be accepted, otherwise they'd be locked out of ham radio forever.

Personally I favor a three-level system, with a year experience at the entry and intermediate levels. I know you see that as unnecessarily complex. Point is, the principle is the same.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3262. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-26 00:38:33 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <dCSwb.19992$Rk5.15874@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 82838

"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote

>
> DO you really think it's mock indignation?
>

No other explanation is believeable.

73, de Hans, K0HB

3263. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-26 01:52:26 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <uHTwb.20059$Rk5.3840@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 82839

"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote

> Even further back (70 years) the old Class A required a year's
> experience.
>
> Everything old is new again.

Even further back (in 1919) the old Amateur First Grade was required to pass a 10WPM test in Continental Morse

Even even further back (in 1913) the old Amateur First Grade was required to pass a 5WPM test in Continental Morse

Even even even further back (in 1912) the old Amateur First Grade "must be able to transmit and receive in Continental Morse, but no speed rate will be prescribed." (Presumably 1 word per fortnight was sufficient.)

Everything old is new again.

Sunuvagun!

de Hans, K0HB

3264. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-26 02:20:57 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bq12pd$5ka@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 82840

"JJ" <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
news:5rOdnToJEIviEF6iRVn-hg@gbronline.com...
> Kim W5TIT wrote:
>
> > "JJ" <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
> > news:kOmdnVCS88hIKl-iRVn-hA@gbronline.com...
> >
> >>Kim W5TIT wrote:
> >>
> >>
> >>
> >>>Dwight, I certainly don't mean to imply you are "defending" anything I
> >
> > said.
> >
> >>>I'd hardly want that and would be quite surprised by it. And, I didn't
> >
> > see
> >
> >>>anyone else but Larry have the reaction to it...well, maybe Mike I
> >
> > think.
> >
> >>Because Larry said first what many others thought.
> >>
> >
> >
> > Oh. So now you're a mind reader.
> >
> > Kim W5TIT
>
> No, I am neither psychedelic nor do I have espn. Backpeddle all you want
> but you made a really stupid statement.
>

OK, JJ. Put up or shut up. Where am I/have I backpedaled? I said what I
said and haven't denied saying it. I also meant what I said and haven't
said that I did not mean it. The *only* thing I have said is that the story
of Dwight's brother's death was not meant to be wrapped up as what I would
define as hilarious. So, where's the backpedaling?

Your arrogance and audacity precede you...

Kim W5TIT

3265. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-26 02:28:52 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20031125212852.23171.00002341@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 82841

In article <28ydnS3AVdW5b1-iRVn-hg@gbronline.com>, JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
writes:

>Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>
>> Personally, I find little about his
>> personal life which would incline me toward considering him to be anything
>> but a hedonistic, emotionally-incompetent, and potentially dangerous
>> person, who should never be given access to anyone's children.
>
>I wonder what kind of parent would allow their children to spend the
>night with MJ?

JJ:

Good question. I would define them as "parents" only in the biological
sense of the term. Unfortunately, there are a lot of sick people out there,
and they have a way of finding each other.

73 de Larry, K3LT

3266. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-26 02:28:53 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20031125212853.23171.00002342@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 82842

In article <bpvgvs$iqn@library2.airnews.net>, "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
writes:

>> In article <bpu8gj$33b@library1.airnews.net>, "Kim W5TIT"
><kimscliff@yahoo.com>
>> writes:
>>
>> > It's a pretty near given that I (nor many
>> >others in this newsgroup) would find anything like the death of someone
>else
>> >"hilarious."
>>
>> Kim:
>>
>> Ahem -- care to look over the above sentence and, perhaps, add something
>> to it? Or "not"?
>>
>> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>>
>>
>
>Nope. You see? Your question proves that you understood what it is I
>*meant* to say, asshole...
>
>Kim W5TIT

Kim:

The problem is, the way you constructed the sentence in question,
anyone who didn't know you would simply take at face value, to your
discredit. I'm just trying to help you out, here, but you still need to
call me names. Pitiful.

73 de Larry, K3LT

3267. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-26 02:28:54 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20031125212854.23171.00002343@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 82843

In article <bpvheu$luq@library2.airnews.net>, "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
writes:

>> In article <bpu8gj$33b@library1.airnews.net>, "Kim W5TIT"
><kimscliff@yahoo.com>
>> writes:
>>
>> > It's a pretty near given that I (nor many
>> >others in this newsgroup) would find anything like the death of someone
>else
>> >"hilarious."
>>
>> Kim:
>>
>> Ahem -- care to look over the above sentence and, perhaps, add something
>> to it? Or "not"?
>>
>> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>>
>>
>
>Oh, hell, let me go ahead and do it:
>
>It's a pretty near given that I, nor many others in this newsgroup, would
>find anything like the death of someone else "hilarious." There, maybe the
>parentheses confused Larry...
>
>Kim W5TIT

Kim:

Yawn! Ok, apparently you need some help here. I *think* that what you
meant to say goes something like this: "It's a pretty near given that
<neither> I, nor many others in this newsgroup, would find anything like
the death of someone else "hilarious.""

An alternative version would be: "It's a pretty near given that
I, or any others in this newsgroup, would <not> find anything like
the death of someone else "hilarious.""

Is that what you meant to say, Kim? If so, I think that you could benefit
from some basic classes on English composition, with an emphasis on
sentence structure.

73 de Larry, K3LT

3268. Re: ARRL you can Kiss my $39.00 a Year Good Bye

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-26 04:14:32 UTC
From: Bill Newkirk <wnewkirk@bellsouth.net>
Message-ID: <SKVwb.1727$i8.1190@bignews3.bellsouth.net>
Source record: 82844
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

Probably thinks they're responsible for the demise of 73 magazine...

even tho Wayne's traditional subjects (keeping call sign when moving, etc.) pretty much have all been addressed and even Wayne at the end was stuck for editorials for amateur radio - resorting to pushing quack medicine and other crap..

"Steve Silverwood" <kb6ojs@arrl.net> wrote in message news:MPG.1a28757699c12cd398969c@news.west.earthlink.net...
> In article <3faa8c00$0$94481$45beb828@newscene.com>, No.m@il.here
> says...
> >
> > If I were to give the world an enema... 225 Main Street Newington, CT is
> > where I'd stick the hose.
>
> OK, I missed the earlier part of this thread, and I'm probably opening a
> huge can of worms by asking this, but....
>
> What do you have against the ARRL? I've had nothing but good
> experiences with them, both at HQ and with their representatives
> locally.
>
> --
>
> -- //Steve//
>
> Steve Silverwood, KB6OJS
> Fountain Valley, CA
> Email: kb6ojs@arrl.net
> Web: http://home.earthlink.net/~kb6ojs_steve

3269. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-26 05:08:57 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <JzWwb.20256$Rk5.6682@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 82845

"Ryan, KC8PMX" wrote:
> Isn't the fishing the main excuse for drinking
> beer anyways?? Fishing is something I used
> to do while drinking! LOL

It's a proven fact that beer actually improves fishing - the fish caught, and the ones that got away, are a _LOT_ bigger while one is drinking. If you don't believe me, just ask any fisherman. ;-)

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3270. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-26 05:32:51 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <7WWwb.20270$Rk5.20165@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 82846

"Kim W5TIT" wrote:
>
> OK. Well, I'll start then. I wish you'd review
> how much you sound like Larry here recently...
> Really. Read your posts without looking at
> them as being from you. You'll confuse
> yourself as to who, exactly, posted them...
> You did not *used* to post like that...

Perhaps much of that impression is caused by whether you agree or disagree with what being said at the moment. I agree with Larry on some things, and don't on others. I agree with you on some things, and don't on others. When anybody agrees with another, their comments are going to, of course, sound similar. When I agree with you, Larry accuses me of sounding like you. You're now accusing me of sounding like Larry. Unless I agree with everything each has to say, I can't possibly satisfy both of you.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3271. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-26 05:43:52 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <s4Xwb.20274$Rk5.14990@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 82847

"Ryan, KC8PMX" wrote:
>
> Michael Jackson was actually cool at one point
> in his life, but that was back when he was actually
> black, male and straight. Now I am not sure what
> to call him..... is he male or female, black/african-
> american or white, gay or straight?? I think he
> should assume a symbol like Prince did, but Mikey
> Jackson's should be a question mark!!!!!!!!!

He used to wear a white glove as a symbol of something. However, I've noticed recently that he's now wearing a black glove. Perhaps this signifies some significant change in his life. Exactly what is another question mark.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3272. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-26 05:46:43 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <77Xwb.20277$Rk5.9922@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 82848

"Alun" wrote:
>
> You will have to wait a long time if you
> expect me to post more than that.

Chicken.

> Didn't go camping over the 4th of July,
> so it must have been someone else!

I didn't either. I only posted that to add a little more humor.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3273. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-26 05:49:38 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <S9Xwb.20278$Rk5.11421@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 82849

"Kim W5TIT" wrote:
>
> Nope. You see? Your question proves
> that you understood what it is I *meant*
> to say, asshole...

Such language, Kim. And you talk about me posting differently than I used to. ;-)

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3274. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-26 05:54:32 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3FC4401C.248B002E@earthlink.net>
Source record: 82850

Dwight Stewart wrote:

> He used to wear a white glove as a symbol of something. However, I've
> noticed recently that he's now wearing a black glove. Perhaps this signifies
> some significant change in his life. Exactly what is another question mark.

Sheesh, Dwight! White just isn't worn after Labor Day.

Dave K8MN

3275. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-26 06:05:54 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <6pXwb.20284$Rk5.8604@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 82851

"Larry Roll K3LT" wrote:
>
> Yawn! Ok, apparently you need some help
> here. I *think* that what you meant to say
> goes something like this: "It's a pretty near
> given that <neither> I, nor many others in
> this newsgroup, would find anything like the
> death of someone else "hilarious."" (snip)

You must be getting old or something, Larry. You gave up much too quickly.
It was surely a mistake when she first wrote it, but a real surprise when
she actually wrote it again without catching the mistake.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3276. Probably gonna catch hell for this one but..... (found them in a different newsgroup)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-26 06:31:54 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <REMOVETHISkc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <bq2ee2$1uarlc$2@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 82861

Michael Jackson Jokes
Q: How do you know when it's bedtime at the Jackson residence?
A: When thebig hand touches the little hand...

Q: What is Michael Jackson's favorite gospel song?
A: "And then he touched me"

Q: Have you heard about Michael Jackson's New Book?
A: It's called, "The In's and Out's of Child Rearing

Q: What do Michael Jackson and the New York Mets have in common?
A: They're both walking around with one glove on their hand for no apparent reason whatsoever!!

Q: What's the difference between Michael Jackson and a grocery bag?
A: One is white, made out of plastic, and dangerous for kids to play with and the other you carry your groceries in !!

Q: Why was Michael Jackson spotted at K-Mart?
A: He heard boys' pants were half-off !!

Q: What's brown and in a baby's diaper?
A: Michael Jackson's hand !!

Q: What's white and in Michael Jackson's pocket?
A: His other hand !!

Q: How can you tell if Michael Jackson has company?
A: There's a big wheel parked outside his house!!

Q: Heard about Michael Jackson's new songs?
A: I'm forever blowing bubbles!

Knock Knock!
Who's There?
Little boy blue!
Little boy blue who?
Michael Jackson!!

Q: Did you hear that Michael Jackson and Tonya Harding have decided to begin training racehorses together?
A: Yeah, she's gonna do all the handicapping and he's gonna ride all the three-year-olds!

Q: Why does Michael Jackson arrange for private shopping?
A: So his guests won't be accompanied by guardians!

Q: What do Michael Jackson and a Big Mac have in common?
A: They're both 30 year old meat between 10 year old buns!

Q:Why isn't all the controversy bothering Michael?
A:He doesn't mind reaching bottom.

Q:What's Michael's favorite Canadian TV show?
A:The Kids in the Hall.

Q: Who does Michael Jackson consider a Perfect "10"?
A: Two 5 year olds.

Q: Why are Michael Jackson's pants so small?
A: Because they aren't his!

`Did you hear about Michael Jackson's toaster?
~The bread goes in brown, and comes out white.

`What does Michael Jackson call a circumcision?
~Foreplay.

Q: How does Michael Jackson pick his nose?
A: From a catalogue.

`What does Michael Jackson reminisce about when he gets nostalgic?
~Blowing his first nose.

Q: What's the difference between Richard Pryor and Michael Jackson?
A: Richard Pryor got burnt on coke, Michael Jackson got burnt on Pepsi!

Q: Why did Michael Jackson get upset after he called Boyz-2-Men??
A: He found out they were'nt a delivery service.

Michael said to Debbie one night, "I fancy some entertainment, what shall we
do?".
To which Debbie replied " I know we'll get a video".
Michael then said " Great, Ill get Aladdin".
Debbie said speedily "No Michael, You have been in trouble for that before"

`What's black and comes in little white cans?
~Michael Jackson

`What famous celebrity had the most children over the last 10 years?
~Michael Jackson.

Prince Michael Jackson, Jr. --- you know in a few years they'll probably
change his name to:
The Child Formerly Known as Michael Jackson's Baby

`What do Michael Jackson & Michael Jordan have in common?
~They both play ball in the Minor League.

`What's the difference between them?
~One is in the Minors, the other is into Minors.

`Why was Michael Jackson relieved of his Cub Scout Leader duties?
~He was up to a pack a day.

`What happens when Michael talks about sex?
~It's all very tongue in cheek.

`What has 18 balls and 3 pubic hairs?
~A Michael Jackson slumber party.

The Pope has issued a proclamation on Michael Jackson. If he hears any more allegations about little boys, the Pope says he'll have no choice but to make him a priest.

`What do Michael Jackson and Willie Shoemaker have in common?
~Both ride 4 year olds.

`How do we know Michael Jackson is ready to release another album?
~He has a lot of stuff in the can.

`What will they call Michael's new TV series?
~Anus and Andy.

I understand that Micheal decided to have a boy of his own because it's too expensive to rent them at $2 Million a pop.

What do Michael and Mrs. Perot have in common?
~Both f**k little assholes.

`Why doesn't Michael sleep with boys anymore?
~He's tired of all the cracks.

`Did you know they're putting out a Michael Jackson stamp?
~Fans get to vote for the white or black Michael Jackson.

`Why did Michael go to college?
~To get his Bachelor of Arse degree.

`Why's Michael trying out for the NBA?
~He's a crack shooter.

`Who's Michael Jackson's favorite poet?
~Emily Dick in son.

`What does Michael call an orgy?
~A fruit salad.

`What's the difference between Michael and a proctologist?
~A proctologist doesn't pay for the assholes he's poked around in.

`Why doesn't Michael have orgasms?
~The big payoff comes a couple of months later.

`Why has Michael been appearing on children's shows lately?
~He has a lot to plug.

`What's the worst stain to try to remove from a little boy's underpants?
~Michael Jackson's makeup.

`Hear about the new "Michael Jackson" candy bar?
~It's made from white chocolate, and contains no nuts.

Michael Jackson and Woody Allen on "Child Psychology":
"Spare the rod, and spoil the child."

`What did Michael Jackson say to Woody Allen?
~Got two fives for a ten?

`What is Michael Jackson's Alma Matter?
~Bring-em Young.

`Did you hear about the duet by Michael Jackson and Elton John?
~It is titled "Don't let your son go down on me."

`What's the difference between Mr. Potato Head and Michael Jackson?
~Michael Jackson has had more noses.

`What did Michael Jackson suffer from as a kid?
~Clitoris envy.

`Why did Michael invite MacCauly Caulkin to the house?
~He's like the little boy he never had.

`Why does Michael really need to go to rehab?
~He's a crack addict.

`What's Michael Jackson's favorite nursery rhyme?
~"Little Boy Blew."

`Did you know that Michael Jackson just turned 35?
~Yeah, but he still feels like a 13 year old.

`How did Michael get in trouble?
~He was feeling a little Randy.

`How is Michael dealing with his problems?
~He's holding his own.

`How are Michael's friends dealing with the problem?
~They're all standing behind him.

`How did Michael actually proposition the little boy?
~It was just a slip of the tongue.

`What's sex like for Michael?
~Child's Play.

`How is Michael now?
~Feeling a little crotchety.

`Hear about the new Michael Jackson doll?
~It comes in a little can.

`Why does Michael like children so much?
~He knows how they feel.

`Did you hear Michael Jackson was running a "blue-light" special at a local
K-Mart?
~Little boys' pants were half off!

`What makes Michael Jackson so unique?
~It's the little boy inside him.

`How does Michael like to party?
~He sips a couple of Tall Boys.

`What's Michael's favorite snack?
~Slim Jims.

`What's Michael's favorite fast food?
~Big Boys.

`How do we know Michael is guilty?
~Several children have fingered him.

`Why is Michael so tough?
~He can lick any kid on the block.

`What's the new movie about Michael Jackson called?
~"The Hand that Robs the Cradle."

`What's the difference between Nixon and Michael Jackson?
~One was a consummate asshole, the other a consummated asshole.

McDonald's is bringing out a new burger ..."Micheal Jackson Burger"... It
has 35 yr old meat inside 5 yr old buns.

`WHAT DID MICHAEL JACKSON SAY WHEN HE GOT BACK TO NEVERLAND RANCH FROM DRUG
REHAB?
~ YOU KNOW, I FEEL LIKE A NEW BOY!

What are Michael Jackson's favorite sayings?
1) There's a sucker born every minute.
2) Kids do the darndest things.
3) Tricks are for kids.

`What's Michaels' next movie?
~Honey I Blew the Kid.

`What's Michaels' favorite group?
~New Kids on the Cock.

`What do Michael and Gaylord Perry have in common?
~Both have held lots of wet balls in their hands.

`What's sex like for Michael?
~Like candy from a baby.

`What psychological problem does Michael still suffer from?
~Anal retention.

`What do Michael and Catholic school nuns have in common?
~Both are a pain in the ass to kids.

`What's the difference between Michael and Connie Chung?
~Michael's been able to have kids.

`What's Michael's favorite dish?
~Creamed shrimp.

`Why's Michael cutting down on public appearances?
~He wants to spend more time with the kids.

`How will they ensure that Michael gets a thorough body search?
~Hire a Catholic priest to do it.

`What will they call the upcoming movie about Michael Jackson?
~"The African Queen."

Michael Jackson and Pee Wee Herman are have come out with a new video called... "I'll beat it for you."

A confused nine year old boy goes up to his mother and asks, "Is God male or female?"
After thinking for a moment, his mother responds, "Well, God is both male and female."
This confuses the little boy so he asks, "Is God black or white?"
"Well, God is both black and white."
This further confuses the boy so he asks, "Is God gay or straight?"
At this the mother is getting concerned, but answers none the less, "Honey, God is both gay and straight."
At this, the boy's face lights up with understanding and he triumphantly asks, "Is God Michael Jackson?"

3277. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-26 06:33:16 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <MOXwb.20297$Rk5.19971@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 82852

"Dee D. Flint" wrote:
>
> (snip) If one wants or needs to make other
> than local contacts then yes code is
> necessary. (snip) If the choice is to turn
> off the radio or use code then I'd say that
> code is indeed necessary whether or not
> it is an emergency.

I think you missed the point. Other than the emergency or public services we offer, any contact whatsoever is an avocation, not a necessity. Therefore, any mode needed to facilitate that would also not be a necessity. If one wants to use code during those periods, one can do so by learning code on his/her own. It is not necessary for the goals and purposes of the Amateur Radio Service at this point to mandate that learning through a testing requirement.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3278. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-26 12:09:34 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <2K0xb.22555$Wy4.12702@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 82853

"Dave Heil" wrote:
>
> Sheesh, Dwight! White just isn't worn
> after Labor Day.

Well, gee, Dave. If people are going to run around wearing a single glove for decoration, there has to be some rules of etiquette. I just have to wonder what Ms. Manners would say about all this.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3279. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-26 12:23:25 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bq261m$u3n@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 82854

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20031125212854.23171.00002343@mb-m05.aol.com...
> In article <bpvheu$luq@library2.airnews.net>, "Kim W5TIT"
<kimscliff@yahoo.com>
> writes:
>
> >> In article <bpu8gj$33b@library1.airnews.net>, "Kim W5TIT"
> ><kimscliff@yahoo.com>
> >> writes:
> >>
> >> > It's a pretty near given that I (nor many
> >> >others in this newsgroup) would find anything like the death of
someone
> >else
> >> >"hilarious."
> >>
> >> Kim:
> >>
> >> Ahem -- care to look over the above sentence and, perhaps, add
something
> >> to it? Or "not"?
> >>
> >> 73 de Larry, K3LT
> >>
> >>
> >
> >Oh, hell, let me go ahead and do it:
> >
> >It's a pretty near given that I, nor many others in this newsgroup, would
> >find anything like the death of someone else "hilarious." There, maybe
the
> >parentheses confused Larry...
> >
> >Kim W5TIT
>
> Kim:
>
> Yawn! Ok, apparently you need some help here. I *think* that what you
> meant to say goes something like this: "It's a pretty near given that
> <neither> I, nor many others in this newsgroup, would find anything like
> the death of someone else "hilarious.""
>

Yeah. You're correct. *IF* you want to give the appearance of being rather archaic in the use of the English Language. I believe an English professor would bear me out that by the use of the word "nor" directly after the word "I" is the proper way in which to construct that sentence. If I am wrong, and I don't think I am, then you are absolutely correct.

>
> An alternative version would be: "It's a pretty near given that
> I, or any others in this newsgroup, would <not> find anything like
> the death of someone else "hilarious.""
>

Good grief, that's miserably constructed and you'd be one of those who would construct a sentence thusly, not I.

>
> Is that what you meant to say, Kim? If so, I think that you could benefit
> from some basic classes on English composition, with an emphasis on
> sentence structure.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

Uh huh. Who could?

Kim W5TIT

3280. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-26 12:31:33 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bq26gt$pd@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 82855

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:7WWwb.20270$Rk5.20165@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> "Kim W5TIT" wrote:
> >
> > OK. Well, I'll start then. I wish you'd review
> > how much you sound like Larry here recently...
> > Really. Read your posts without looking at
> > them as being from you. You'll confuse
> > yourself as to who, exactly, posted them...
> > You did not *used* to post like that...
>
>
> Perhaps much of that impression is caused by whether you agree or
disagree
> with what being said at the moment.
>

Dwight, I am not like that. I can totally dislike someone and totally agree with what they are saying. The *reason* I don't like Larry--or people like him--isn't because of their opinion. It is because of their arrogance and dictatorial style of impression that everyone must think just like them. It is also that, once again, the *impression* is given that anyone who thinks differently than they are somehow of less stature than they.

Whether I agree or disagree with someone has no bearing on how I accept their message. For instance, someone could be exactly of the thought of Larry and preach the thought and I am all for engagement on an intellectual level. But, when someone begins preaching their thoughts while at the same time acting as though they are superior because of them--all I want to is reach out and bitch slap 'em. I can get just as lofty as anyone else on an intellectual level and be very articulate about how I communicate. I can also get down at the level of someone such as Larry if I need to--or just plain want to.

>
> I agree with Larry on some things, and
> don't on others. I agree with you on some things, and don't on others.
When
> anybody agrees with another, their comments are going to, of course, sound
> similar. When I agree with you, Larry accuses me of sounding like you.
> You're now accusing me of sounding like Larry. Unless I agree with
> everything each has to say, I can't possibly satisfy both of you.
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
>

Nope, you are incorrect. I don't care whether you agree with me or not. It is when you start telling me things that depict the nature of a personality *because* of something I am saying that you'll see me pushing back in like manner.

Kim W5TIT

3281. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-26 12:33:38 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bq26kq$gh@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 82856

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:S9Xwb.20278$Rk5.11421@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> "Kim W5TIT" wrote:
> >
> > Nope. You see? Your question proves
> > that you understood what it is I *meant*
> > to say, asshole...
>
>
> Such language, Kim. And you talk about me posting differently than I
used
> to. ;-)
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
>

Oooo, I know. I sure am getting short with people lately. Y'know why, I think? It's kind of like all those who are nearly always as good as we can possibly be--at the *expense* of ourselves around all the creeps in this world. I am getting tired of it--and I ain't takin' it no more...

<GRIN>

Kim W5TIT

3282. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-26 12:34:18 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bq26m2$k76@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 82857

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:6pXwb.20284$Rk5.8604@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> "Larry Roll K3LT" wrote:
> >
> > Yawn! Ok, apparently you need some help
> > here. I *think* that what you meant to say
> > goes something like this: "It's a pretty near
> > given that <neither> I, nor many others in
> > this newsgroup, would find anything like the
> > death of someone else "hilarious."" (snip)
>
>
> You must be getting old or something, Larry. You gave up much too
quickly.
> It was surely a mistake when she first wrote it, but a real surprise when
> she actually wrote it again without catching the mistake.
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
>

Ask an English professor, Dwight.

Kim W5TIT

3283. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-26 12:56:52 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bq280c$sl6@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 82858

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:6pXwb.20284$Rk5.8604@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> "Larry Roll K3LT" wrote:
> >
> > Yawn! Ok, apparently you need some help
> > here. I *think* that what you meant to say
> > goes something like this: "It's a pretty near
> > given that <neither> I, nor many others in
> > this newsgroup, would find anything like the
> > death of someone else "hilarious."" (snip)
>
>
> You must be getting old or something, Larry. You gave up much too
quickly.
> It was surely a mistake when she first wrote it, but a real surprise when
> she actually wrote it again without catching the mistake.
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
>

I meant to add that I'll check with our grammar department today...

Kim W5TIT

3284. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-26 13:47:25 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <N92xb.12798$P%1.11361189@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 82859

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:MOXwb.20297$Rk5.19971@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> "Dee D. Flint" wrote:
> >
> > (snip) If one wants or needs to make other
> > than local contacts then yes code is
> > necessary. (snip) If the choice is to turn
> > off the radio or use code then I'd say that
> > code is indeed necessary whether or not
> > it is an emergency.
>
>
> I think you missed the point. Other than the emergency or public
services
> we offer, any contact whatsoever is an avocation, not a necessity.
> Therefore, any mode needed to facilitate that would also not be a
necessity.
> If one wants to use code during those periods, one can do so by learning
> code on his/her own. It is not necessary for the goals and purposes of the
> Amateur Radio Service at this point to mandate that learning through a
> testing requirement.
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

A. I was discussing the USE of code itself not the testing. So the last
two sentences in the above paragraph are not relevant to this discussion.

B. No you missed the point. My point is that if you want to communicate
then code can sometimes be necessary. I was not discussing emergency coms.
I was discussing the pursuit of my hobby. I believe in minimizing the
impact that propagation has on MY choice of when to participate in that
hobby. The "choice" of turning off the radio simply because of not knowing
code is not really a choice and is unacceptable.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

3285. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-26 14:16:28 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3FC4B5BC.5090206@psu.edu>
Source record: 82860

N2EY wrote:
> "Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<g_Nwb.21716$Wy4.14801@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
>
>>"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote
>>
>>
>>>Would any sort of radio license count, or only amateur licenses?
>>
>>
>>
>>>Would the experience have to be current? (not "my license expired 5 years
>>
>>ago")
>>
>>My inclination would be amateur experience only
>
>
> I agree again!
>
> Of course, this isn;t a new idea - the old Extra required at least two
> years as a General, Conditional or Advanced before they'd even let you
> try the Extra test. A good idea that was abandoned about the same time
> the Novice became full-term renewable.
>
> Even further back (70 years) the old Class A required a year's
> experience.
>
> Everything old is new again.
>
>
>>(insert here LHA and LHA(jg)
>>rotors being spun up in mock indignation),
>
>
> I wanna be around when you explain to them that their "PROFESSIONAL"
> experience doesn't mean diddly-squat towards that requirement. And
> that an elementary-school child with 2 years amateur experience is
> qualified to take the test, but non-ham PROFESSIONALS aren't.

That is where Nelson Muntz comes in.

> Sunuvagun!!

Oh Gaw, not another one!

>
> DO you really think it's mock indignation?
>
>
>>and experience need not be
>>current.
>
>
> Now that I think about it, acceptance of noncurrent experience would
> be a logical consequence of "one learner's permit to a customer". If
> someone got an LP and didn't upgrade within 10 years for whatever
> reason, but then later was able to pass the full-privs test, their old
> experience would need to be accepted, otherwise they'd be locked out
> of ham radio forever.

I can't think of any circumstances where this sort of thing would or
should be allowed to happen. I would be a prime candidate for a person
losing out on a license. I was interrested in radio when I was in high
school, and got out of it for many years thereafter. If I had recieved
the "learners permit" license at that point, that would likely be the case.

> Personally I favor a three-level system, with a year experience at the
> entry and intermediate levels. I know you see that as unnecessarily
> complex. Point is, the principle is the same.

It's good to see that some are considering the "time in grade" idea.

- Mike KB3EIA -

3286. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-26 14:46:53 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3FC4BCDD.50505@psu.edu>
Source record: 82862

Dwight Stewart wrote:
> "Dave Heil" wrote:
>
>>Sheesh, Dwight! White just isn't worn
>>after Labor Day.
>
>
>
> Well, gee, Dave. If people are going to run around wearing a single glove
> for decoration, there has to be some rules of etiquette. I just have to
> wonder what Ms. Manners would say about all this.

"ICK"?

- Mike KB3EIA -

3287. Re: THE LIMP ONE LIST - 3 SO FAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-26 15:33:39 UTC
From: Doug Davis <dougd@buckeye-horsenose-express.com>
Message-ID: <XqudncLeU7itVVmiRVn-hg@buckeye-express.com>
Source record: 82863
Cross-posted to: alt.ham-radio.hf,alt.ham-radio.ssb,alt.radio.amateur,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Is this all you have to do, you piece of shit?

"BIG-AL@3894.5-LSB-75-METERS" <BIG-AL -003894.5-LSB-75-METERS@
BIG-AL -003894.5-LSB-75-METERS> wrote in message
news:vn6pet1b11o0fc@corp.supernews.com...
> NUMBER ONE ON THE LIST IS (DRUM ROLL)
>
> LEO
>
> WHY. WELL FOR BEING JUST PLAIN EASY TO TROLL.
>
>
> NUMBER TWO (DRUM ROLL)
>
> RENE
>
> WHY. WELL FOR BEING JUST PLAIN DUMB. HEY KIDO, NOBODY CARES. GET IT???
>
> NUMBER THREE (FART SOUND)
>
> CONCERNED OF USENET
>
> WHY. WELL THIS PERSON HAS TO BE THE BIGGEST IDIOT ON HERE. DOES IT THINK
> THAT POSTING PUBLIC HEADERS IN A MESSAGE IS GOING TO AMOUNT TO ANYTHING.
> WELL I GUESS HE/SHE DOESN'T HAVE A CLUE.
>
>
>
>

3288. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-26 16:59:58 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0311260859.25985aa0@posting.google.com>
Source record: 82864

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:<MOXwb.20297$Rk5.19971@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> "Dee D. Flint" wrote:
> >
> > (snip) If one wants or needs to make other
> > than local contacts then yes code is
> > necessary. (snip) If the choice is to turn
> > off the radio or use code then I'd say that
> > code is indeed necessary whether or not
> > it is an emergency.
>
>
> I think you missed the point. Other than the emergency or public services
> we offer, any contact whatsoever is an avocation, not a necessity.
> Therefore, any mode needed to facilitate that would also not be a necessity.

OK, fine.

Then SSB, AM, FM, RTTY, PSK-31, etc. are all non-necessities.

And the same can be said for any particular technologies used by hams.
For example, there is no absolute necessity to use a PLL-type
synthesized rig. It's just an operator choice.

> If one wants to use code during those periods, one can do so by learning
> code on his/her own.

If one wants to use any other mode or technology, one can do so by
learning
it on his/her own.

> It is not necessary for the goals and purposes of the
> Amateur Radio Service at this point to mandate that learning through a
> testing requirement.

Then it logically follows that it is not necessary for the goals and
purposes of the Amateur Radio Service at this point to mandate that
learning through a
testing requirement.

In fact, except for the most basic of rules and regulations, your
argument leads to the inescapable conclusion that it is not necessary
for the goals and purposes of the Amateur Radio Service at this point
to mandate *any* learning through a testing requirement.

Can you prove otherwise?

73 de Jim, N2EY

3289. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-26 17:15:32 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bq2n1o$4di@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 82865

"Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:bq280c$sl6@library1.airnews.net...
> "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
> news:6pXwb.20284$Rk5.8604@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> > "Larry Roll K3LT" wrote:
> > >
> > > Yawn! Ok, apparently you need some help
> > > here. I *think* that what you meant to say
> > > goes something like this: "It's a pretty near
> > > given that <neither> I, nor many others in
> > > this newsgroup, would find anything like the
> > > death of someone else "hilarious."" (snip)
> > >
> > >
> > You must be getting old or something, Larry. You gave up much too
> quickly.
> > It was surely a mistake when she first wrote it, but a real surprise
when
> > she actually wrote it again without catching the mistake.
> > >
> > >
> > Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
> > >
> > http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
> > >
>
> I meant to add that I'll check with our grammar department today...
>
> Kim W5TIT
>
>

ACK!!! Man, I am still stunned over this one--I *must* be getting old. The grammar department indeed reminded me of the old "either/neither" "neither/nor" argument to be used in deciding upon correct grammar! So, yes, Larry was correct! Wow, what a hoot! Larry being correct <Big Evil Grin>. However, it was stated that, in a casual conversation, inference is 98% of the communication. Deductive reasoning would lend itself to knowing what was intended to be said (sorry, Jim). I did remind them that I do not consider this venue as much "casual" as I do a debate environment. So, they said in a debate I'd lose points. Consider the points lost.

Anyway, yep, the sentence should have been as Larry stated in the above reposted, reposted, reposted(?) post. All I can say is I am proud to have given Larry the opportunity to be correct *and* intellectual, for

once...<Big Evil Grin> again. What a hoot, eh? Oh wait, upon review, could it look to JJ like I am backpedaling? Hmmm.....nope, don't think so...

Now, back to cooking a fine, fine cook-ahead Thanksgiving dinner that neither I nor anyone could deny being delightfully delicious! ;)

Kim W5TIT

3290. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-26 18:51:21 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <JC6xb.20648$Rk5.12553@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 82866

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote

> ..... any mode needed to facilitate that would also not be a necessity.

I'll be participating in the CQWW CW RadioSport event this weekend from
W0SOC, and later from W0AIH. It is a necessity that I know Morse in order
to participate.

With warm personal regards,

de Hans, K0HB

3291. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-26 19:44:03 UTC
From: Bert Craig <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM>
Message-ID: <7o7xb.11725$AA.5642212@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>
Source record: 82867

"K&#65533;HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:JC6xb.20648$Rk5.12553@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote
>
> > ..... any mode needed to facilitate that would also not be a necessity.
>
> I'll be participating in the CQWW CW RadioSport event this weekend from
> W0SOC, and later from W0AIH. It is a necessity that I know Morse in order
> to participate.
>
> With warm personal regards,
>
> de Hans, K0HB

Hans,

Please give me an idea of what freqs you'll frequent. Having just moved into our new QTH, I have nothing substantial really set up yet, however, I'd love to toss a wire up in one of the trees and let the autotuner in the K1 handle the rest. (Don't know if 5 Watts'll do it, but am more than game to try.) Take care and have a Happy Thanksgiving. :-)

73 de Bert
WA2SI

3292. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-26 19:50:24 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <4u7xb.20703$Rk5.6611@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 82868

"Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote

> Hans,
>
> Please give me an idea of what freqs you'll frequent. Having just moved
into
> our new QTH, I have nothing substantial really set up yet, however, I'd
love
> to toss a wire up in one of the trees and let the autotuner in the K1
handle
> the rest. (Don't know if 5 Watts'll do it, but am more than game to try.)

Look for W0SOC Friday evening and all day Sunday on whatever bands are open
to DX.

Look for W0AIH all weekend on every band 160-10 (less WARC AND 60M).

But since this is a DX event, WA2SI is a zero-point QSO.

73, Hans, K0HB

3293. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-26 19:53:32 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <0x7xb.20708$Rk5.10314@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 82869

"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote

> In fact, except for the most basic of rules and regulations, your
> argument leads to the inescapable conclusion that it is not necessary
> for the goals and purposes of the Amateur Radio Service at this point
> to mandate *any* learning through a testing requirement.

Jim,

If you want people to quit making fun of you, quit posting such laughable
reductio ad absurdum arguments.

73, de Hans, K0HB

3294. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-26 19:56:39 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hox8fy1.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>
Source record: 82870

On Mon, 24 Nov 2003 04:06:57 -0600, Kim W5TIT wrote:

>> "Dr." Laura would likely have a heart attack if she saw how some
>> people live today in places *inside* her privileged neighborhood.
>>
>Whew! Definitely. That woman is so far detached from reality it's
>scarey...

This topic was kicked around in depth several months ago in the
ba.broadcast group, where she is usually referred to as "Quack-tor
Laura".

As expected, we came up with the same conclusion as you did above...

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

From a Clearing in the Silicon Forest
Beaverton (Washington County) Oregon

3295. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-26 20:42:35 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <%e8xb.12858$P%1.11413842@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 82871

"Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:0x7xb.20708$Rk5.10314@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> "N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote
>
> > In fact, except for the most basic of rules and regulations, your
> > argument leads to the inescapable conclusion that it is not necessary
> > for the goals and purposes of the Amateur Radio Service at this point
> > to mandate *any* learning through a testing requirement.
>
> Jim,
>
> If you want people to quit making fun of you, quit posting such laughable
> reductio ad absurdum arguments.
>
> 73, de Hans, K0HB

Given some of the things I've read on the internet I'm not so sure that it is a reductio ad absurdum argument. We may actually be heading inexorably in that direction.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

3296. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-26 21:14:16 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <II8xb.22995$Wy4.11174@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 82872

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:N92xb.12798$P%1.11361189@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
>
> "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
> news:MOXwb.20297$Rk5.19971@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> > "Dee D. Flint" wrote:
> > >
> > > (snip) If one wants or needs to make other
> > > than local contacts then yes code is
> > > necessary. (snip) If the choice is to turn
> > > off the radio or use code then I'd say that
> > > code is indeed necessary whether or not
> > > it is an emergency.
> > >
> > >
> > I think you missed the point. Other than the emergency or public
> services
> > we offer, any contact whatsoever is an avocation, not a necessity.
> > Therefore, any mode needed to facilitate that would also not be a
> necessity.
> > If one wants to use code during those periods, one can do so by learning
> > code on his/her own. It is not necessary for the goals and purposes of
the
> > Amateur Radio Service at this point to mandate that learning through a
> > testing requirement.
> > >
> > >
> > Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> A. I was discussing the USE of code itself not the testing. So the last
> two sentences in the above paragraph are not relevant to this discussion.
>
> B. No you missed the point. My point is that if you want to communicate
> then code can sometimes be necessary. I was not discussing emergency
coms.
> I was discussing the pursuit of my hobby. I believe in minimizing the
> impact that propagation has on MY choice of when to participate in that
> hobby. The "choice" of turning off the radio simply because of not
knowing
> code is not really a choice and is unacceptable.
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

I presume YOU mean it is "unacceptable" to YOU. It is perfectly acceptable
to me and many others. It is, clearly, a personal choice and that is as it

should be. It is the type of thing I am Thankfull for on
Thanksgiving...i.e.
we live in a country that allows for such individual opinions and choices.

Cheers and don't eat too much tomorrow :-) burp
Bill K2UNK

3297. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-26 21:18:37 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0311261318.4d860540@posting.google.com>
Source record: 82873

Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message news:<3FC4B5BC.5090206@psu.edu>...
> N2EY wrote:
> > "Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<g_Nwb.21716$Wy4.14801@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> >
> >>"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote

> >>>Would any sort of radio license count, or only amateur licenses?

> >>>Would the experience have to be current? (not "my license expired 5 years
> >>ago")

> >>My inclination would be amateur experience only

> > I agree again!

> > Of course, this isn;t a new idea - the old Extra required at least two
> > years as a General, Conditional or Advanced before they'd even let you
> > try the Extra test. A good idea that was abandoned about the same time
> > the Novice became full-term renewable.

> > Even further back (70 years) the old Class A required a year's
> > experience.

> > Everything old is new again.

> >>(insert here LHA and LHA(jg)
> >>rotors being spun up in mock indignation),

btw, who is (jg)?

> > I wanna be around when you explain to them that their "PROFESSIONAL"
> > experience doesn't mean diddly-squat towards that requirement. And
> > that an elementary-school child with 2 years amateur experience is
> > qualified to take the test, but non-ham PROFESSIONALS aren't.

Can you imagine it, Mike?

> That is where Nelson Muntz comes in.

I gotta ask - WHO?

> > Now that I think about it, acceptance of noncurrent experience would
> > be a logical consequence of "one learner's permit to a customer". If
> > someone got an LP and didn't upgrade within 10 years for whatever
> > reason, but then later was able to pass the full-privs test, their old
> > experience would need to be accepted, otherwise they'd be locked out
> > of ham radio forever.
>

> I can't think of any circumstances where this sort of thing would or
> should be allowed to happen.

Which thing?

A key part of Hans' idea is that a newbie gets one and only one entry level license (with 10 year term). No renewals, no retests, either upgrade to the full-privs license in the 8 year window between when you have the required 2 years experience and when the license expires, or yer out until ya pass the full-privs exam.

This is kinda like how the old Novice worked. One to a customer, no renewals, no retests for another term. 1951-1967 it was one year, then it was two years, then in the '70s they went through a bunch of changes whose details I won't bore ya with. By 1976 it was same term and renewability as the other licenses.

The idea was that newbies would spend the Novice year or two learning and passing the General or Advanced. Which many, many of us did.

Of course back then someone could just go straight for Tech, General or Advanced. But not Extra - until the mid-70s it required two years' experience as a General or above. (Guess who was at the FCC office the first exam day after the 2 years were up).

Argue it with Hans, not me!

> I would be a prime candidate for a person
> losing out on a license. I was interrested in radio when I was in high
> school, and got out of it for many years thereafter. If I had recieved
> the "learners permit" license at that point, that would likely be the case.

All you'd have to do is pass the full-privs written in that case.
>
> > Personally I favor a three-level system, with a year experience at the
> > entry and intermediate levels. I know you see that as unnecessarily
> > complex. Point is, the principle is the same.
>
> It's good to see that some are considering the "time in grade" idea.
>
I always thought it was a good idea, but it went out of fashion.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3298. It ain't about the test.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-26 21:21:38 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <CP8xb.20782$Rk5.10687@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 82874

..... it's about the qualifications.

The incessant arguments here on rrap surround the question of whether or not there should be a Morse TEST for access to HF.

Well, that's the wrong question.

The real question is whether or not you should be Morse qualified for access to HF.

If there is no regulatory need for Morse qualification, then there is no need for Morse testing.

The need for Morse qualification, as clearly stated in the 1913 radio regulations was "The applicant must be able to transmit and receive in Continental Morse, at a speed sufficient to enable him to recognize distress calls or the official "keep-out" signals." Since that qualification need has long since disappeared, then so has the need for the qualification test.

73, de Hans, K0HB

3299. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-26 21:22:53 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0311261322.773985c2@posting.google.com>
Source record: 82875

"Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<dCSwb.19992$Rk5.15874@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> "N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote
>
> > DO you really think it's mock indignation?
>
> No other explanation is believeable.

HAW! That's a good one!

Doesn't all that mock indignation begin to remind you of Jonathan
Harris' role as "Dr. Smith" on the old TV show "Lost In Space"?

73 de Jim, N2EY

3300. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-26 21:27:58 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <yV8xb.23005$Wy4.21181@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 82876

"Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in message
news:zl7wb.18205$Hb.6392413@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net...
> "K�HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:2j6wb.16494$Rk5.605@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> > "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote
> >
> > > Would you want to go back to the kinds of cars we had back then?
> >
> > In a heartbeat!!!!! Most wonderful car I ever owned is a 1962 Chev
> > Corvair Corsa convertible.
>
> Woo-hoo, lemme have a 1969 Super-Bee! Alas, all I had was a 1973 Dart with
a
> 318. I would've loved to have a 340 Dart with the bumble bee stripe.
<sigh>
>
> One other car that is probably my all time favorite is the 1973 European
> Ford Capri. Not terribly fast, but wonderfully quick and pretty agile too.
I
> had the 2000cc 4 cyl. model but I'd love to drop a modern Ford 3.8l V6 in
> one, if I could find one in acceptable cond'n.

Personally, as much as I like "certain" older cars (I have several
antiques),
the reality is that today's vehicles are pretty incredible. Better gas
mileage,
far better handling and they do last much longer in terms of total
mileage and/or years of age. My first new car, a 1964 Chevy Impala
convertible with 283 V8 generally got 18mpg. My 2003 Chevy Silverado,
4x4, Extended cab with a 327 V8 gets about 16-17 on average.

The more recent new cars I've owned have all made it well beyond the
150K miles before being sold or junked. Several went 200K+.
The new cars can run at 75mph all day and not falter in the
heat of summer or cold of winter.

Yes, I love the car club and occasional jaunt alone in my '61 Triumph TR-3,
but
it is the time warp element that makes it the fun event...plus the always
positive comments from bystanders at stopping point...that driving the
TR-3 is. For my day-to-day commute, however, I stick to my new
truck.

Happy Thanksgiving to all. If you like it, drive it.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

3301. Re: Electronic QSL's

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-26 21:37:11 UTC
From: Bob 9V1GO <rmread@attglobal.net>
Message-ID: <3fc4bbc1$1@news.starhub.net.sg>
Source record: 82877
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.misc

Hello Hans,

Back in the DX frame again and QSLing is one of the hazards. I paper QSL 100% but also upload all my logs to LoTW and eQSL hoping to ease the burden. It isn't helping as I get about a dozen in the mail every day. Just took delivery of 3,000 cards and have shipped out about 500 in a week so probably will need more.

JA's are chronic QSL'ers but hey, they must need the paper or they wouldn't be sending them.

73

Bob G4VGO 9V1GO

3302. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-26 21:46:50 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <eb9xb.20801$Rk5.17193@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 82878

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote

> My 2003 Chevy Silverado, 4x4, Extended cab with a 327 V8 gets about 16-17
on average.

Your engine is too small.

My 2003 Silverado 2500HD turbo-charged 32-valve 6.6L V8 gets around 21-22
MPG on the highway, and 18MPG around town.

But my 1962 Corvair turbo-charged 12-valve H-6 got only around 13 MPG, but
it was a LOT more fun to drive, and the chicks dug it!

73, de Hans, K0HB

3303. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-26 21:53:28 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <sh9xb.23024$Wy4.21938@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 82879

"K�HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:eb9xb.20801$Rk5.17193@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote
>
> > My 2003 Chevy Silverado, 4x4, Extended cab with a 327 V8 gets about
16-17
> on average.
>
> Your engine is too small.

It has no problem towing a 5000 pound travel trailer around the northeast...
including the appalachians of PA.

> My 2003 Silverado 2500HD turbo-charged 32-valve 6.6L V8 gets around 21-22
> MPG on the highway, and 18MPG around town.
>
> But my 1962 Corvair turbo-charged 12-valve H-6 got only around 13 MPG, but
> it was a LOT more fun to drive, and the chicks dug it!

Like I originally said....for my daily commute, I'll take the truck.
Give me a nice two lane country road meandering about the hillsides
and I'll take the TR-3 (if it is a nice sunny and dry day). Rain and
the TR (or almost any vintage British sports car) are natural
opposites. :-) :-)

Cheers
Bill K2UNK

3304. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-26 22:03:23 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <Lq9xb.20818$Rk5.4866@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 82880

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote :
> "K&#65533;HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:eb9xb.20801$Rk5.17193@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> > "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote
> >
> > > My 2003 Chevy Silverado, 4x4, Extended cab with a 327 V8 gets about
> 16-17
> > on average.
> >
> > Your engine is too small.
>
> It has no problem towing a 5000 pound travel trailer around the
northeast...
> including the appalachians of PA.

Your trailer is too small too!

> > My 2003 Silverado 2500HD turbo-charged 32-valve 6.6L V8 gets around
21-22
> > MPG on the highway, and 18MPG around town.

Has no problem pulling my 9,500 pound 5th-wheel camper AND my 2,500 pound
boat around all over, including the Rockies of CO, NM, AZ, etc.

Your engine is too small. ;-)

73, de Hans, K0HB

3305. Re: It ain't about the test.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-26 22:10:49 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031126171049.12215.00000688@mb-m25.aol.com>
Source record: 82881

Nor is there any reason for the MEMORY Written TEST. No knowledge needed anymore, lets just call it what it is," THE NEW CB HAM SERVICE"

3306. Re: Electronic QSL's

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-26 22:20:02 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <mG9xb.20841$Rk5.3664@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 82882
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.misc

"Bob 9V1GO" <rmread@attglobal.net> wrote in message
news:3fc4bbc1$1@news.starhub.net.sg...

Hello Hans,
>
> Back in the DX frame again and QSLing is one of the hazards. I paper QSL
> 100% but also upload all my logs to LoTW and eQSL hoping to ease the
burden.
> It isn't helping as I get about a dozen in the mail every day. Just took
> delivery of 3,000 cards and have shipped out about 500 in a week so
probably
> will need more.
>
> JA's are chronic QSL'ers but hey, they must need the paper or they
wouldn't
> be sending them.

Printing QSL's in JA must be a lucrative endeavor. Those guys sure do send
a lot of cards.

And MOST coincidentally, while I'm sitting here reading this, I faintly hear
an OK1R-something calling you on 160, around 1825.45 or so. Would love to
bag 9V1 on 160, but my inverted-L ain't gonna make the trip (even if I could
hear you which I can't!).

73, de Hans, K0HB

3307. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-26 22:41:46 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <K_9xb.12874$P%1.11430415@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 82883

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:II8xb.22995$Wy4.11174@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net...
>
> "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
> news:N92xb.12798$P%1.11361189@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
> >
> > "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
> > news:MOXwb.20297$Rk5.19971@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> > > "Dee D. Flint" wrote:
> > > >
> > > > (snip) If one wants or needs to make other
> > > > than local contacts then yes code is
> > > > necessary. (snip) If the choice is to turn
> > > > off the radio or use code then I'd say that
> > > > code is indeed necessary whether or not
> > > > it is an emergency.
> > >
> > >
> > > I think you missed the point. Other than the emergency or public
> > services
> > > we offer, any contact whatsoever is an avocation, not a necessity.
> > > Therefore, any mode needed to facilitate that would also not be a
> > necessity.
> > > If one wants to use code during those periods, one can do so by
learning
> > > code on his/her own. It is not necessary for the goals and purposes of
> the
> > > Amateur Radio Service at this point to mandate that learning through a
> > > testing requirement.
> > >
> > >
> > > Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
> >
> > A. I was discussing the USE of code itself not the testing. So the
last
> > two sentences in the above paragraph are not relevant to this
discussion.
> >
> > B. No you missed the point. My point is that if you want to
communicate
> > then code can sometimes be necessary. I was not discussing emergency
> coms.
> > I was discussing the pursuit of my hobby. I believe in minimizing the
> > impact that propagation has on MY choice of when to participate in that

> > hobby. The "choice" of turning off the radio simply because of not
> knowing
> > code is not really a choice and is unacceptable.
> > Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>
> I presume YOU mean it is "unacceptable" to YOU. It is perfectly
acceptable
> to me and many others. It is, clearly, a personal choice and that is as
it
> should be. It is the type of thing I am Thankfull for on
> Thanksgiving...i.e.
> we live in a country that allows for such individual opinions and choices.
>
> Cheers and don't eat too much tomorrow :-) burp
> Bill K2UNK

I was simply countering the argument that code itself is unnecessary. As long as there are people who do not want to turn off the radio when conditions are poor, code will continue to be necessary for those people. Yes it is unacceptable to me to be so constrained.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

3308. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-26 22:52:21 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0311261452.68a33081@posting.google.com>
Source record: 82884

"Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<0x7xb.20708$Rk5.10314@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> "N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote
>
> > In fact, except for the most basic of rules and regulations, your
> > argument leads to the inescapable conclusion that it is not necessary
> > for the goals and purposes of the Amateur Radio Service at this point
> > to mandate *any* learning through a testing requirement.

> If you want people to quit making fun of you, quit posting such laughable
> reductio ad absurdum arguments.

So far the only people I see "making fun" of Jim Miccolis are
those who cannot adequately argue the topic being debated, Hans.
There ARE those who make an arguement that the Amateur Radio
license should be nothing more than an expensive permit. It's been
archived here, Hans, and remains an "on-the-fringe" concept, but worse
ideas have made it into law.

As you are well aware, part of the FCC's Basis and Purpose of the
Amateur Radio Service is an expectation of technical learning. We are
effectively eliminating much of the "skill" reqirements, so how hard a
stretch is it to see some element of society arguing to eliminate any
technical knowledge, too...?!?!

73

Steve, K4YZ

3309. Re: Electronic QSL's

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-26 22:54:49 UTC
From: Bob 9V1GO <rmread@attglobal.net>
Message-ID: <3fc4cdf3$1@news.starhub.net.sg>
Source record: 82885
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.misc

I faintly hear an OK1R-something calling you on 160, around 1825.45 or so.
Would love to
bag 9V1 on 160, but my inverted-L ain't gonna make the trip (even if I could
hear you which I can't!).

Hans,

Worked him and a bunch of other EU's on 160m, the ONLY band!!! Here two
months on the air and have 44 DXCC on Top Band.

73

Bob 9V1GO

3310. Where Did THIS Come From...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-26 23:03:39 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0311261503.8443715@posting.google.com>
Source record: 82886

Message 85 in thread
From: Brian (brianburke@juno.com)
Subject: Re: ARRL you can Kiss my $39.00 a Year Good Bye

FROM A MISSED REPLY:
QUOTE:
View this article only
Newsgroups: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-19 11:30:16 PST

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0309171347.183aec38@posting.google.com>...
> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0309131147.2090071e@posting.google.com>...
> > k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
> > > Perhaps because the other poster didn't make a lot of assinine
> > > assertions that are not substantiated by facts, Brain.
> >
> > The ARS has improved since 1984. That's plain for everyone to see.
>
> Then where does all this "Ham Radio Is Going To Hell" traffic
> come from, Brain? Mostly from trolls, you and Lennie.
>
> > > You may refer to "fact" in Websters to find out what they are,
> > > Brain...You DO seem to have a problem with the concept.
> >
> > Not at all. As Ronald Reagan said, "Facts are stupid things."
>
> I'd expect notning less from you, Brain...You're nothing if not
> consistent.
>
> Thanks.
>
> Steve, K4YZ

Steve, not my fault that Ron said it, and I liked Ron. But his quote
applied in your declaration that amateur radio has not improved since
1984.

That is not fact.

UNQUOTE.

Sorry I missed this before!

Brain, how in the WORLD did YOU come up with the assertion that >>I<< said that Amateur Radio has not improved since 1984...?!?!

You really ARE the idiot I imagined!

Just one more mangled episode of cranial flatulence on your part, Brain. I'm just sorry I missed it the first time, however it's also one more example of why I take great fun in sarcastically calling you "Brain".

Hope you have a Happy Thanksgiving...And by the way, when Mrs Brain says something like "It's time to carve the turkey", don't sweat it...she's talking about the bird on the table...not the one sitting next to her...

Steve, K4YZ

3311. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-26 23:08:22 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <Gnaxb.20891$Rk5.5397@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 82887

"Steve Robeson, K4CAP" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote

> ..... how hard a stretch is it to see some element
> of society arguing to eliminate any technical knowledge, too...?!?!

No stretch at all, since N2EY has been advocating that argument here for several months now, and is making himself the poster child for NTI (No Theory International).

73, Hans, K0HB

3312. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-26 23:18:48 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0311261518.54165c18@posting.google.com>
Source record: 82888

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20031122145806.11891.00002451@mb-m11.aol.com>...
> In article <Xns943AE8F62DA6Belektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun
> <alun@1stcounsel.com> writes:

> >If you look me up you'll see I'm an Extra, and you'll be able to figure
> >out that I passed 20 wpm. What you won't see, is that I've been a ham
> >since 1980, not 1992, as I'm not originally from this country.
>
> Alun, with all due respect, such experience ist VERBOTEN in this
> chat room.

Way to go, Lennie...Ate up 90 lines of bandwidth to make a one
sentence reponse to which the quoted material offered nothing.

> The requirement to exist in this chat room requires a struct obediance
> to morsemanship, tradition forever rooted in old ways back before all
> the morseodist regulars ever existed.

And again you demonstrate your persistent ignorance.

This is NOT a chat room. YOU'RE supposed to be Mr Technology...I
thought you'd at least try to be a LITTLE right once in a while.

> >However, ham radio is not a job or a vocation, just a hobby.

More ignorance, exacerbated by lack of practical experience.

> In this chat room, the REGULARS maintain a LIFESTYLE of devotion,
> obediance to love honor and obey amateur radio in all its past glory.

And CURRENT "glory", Lennie.

One that you are not part of parcel of.

> LIFESTYLES take precedence over logic, common sense, and
> anything else not associated with amateur radio (except Michael
> Jackson, foreign policy, overall economic decisions by government
> and partisan politics).

If YOU were to actually exercise ANY "logic" or "common sense",
you'd not keep making a fool of yourself in a public forum.

However pathological liars and antagonists are hardly ever
accused of being "logical" or possessing any "common sense".

Surely YOU haven't.

> Ham radio to the regulars is far more than a vocation. Vocations
> in radio are to be pejorated, denigrated, spat upon, reviled, made fun
> of and other niceties of the TURF where chat room homies consider
> their 'hood.

Lennie trying to "rap with the jive", but it all comes out white
trash stupid.

> There are NO First Amendment "rights" for chat room homies.
> Their only constitution is that of the ARRL. E pluribus Sumner..

More ignorance.

The First Amendment prevents the GOVERNMENT from suppressing
"free speech".

To the best of my knowledge, no agency of the federal government
has suppressed ANYTHING of yours, has it Lennie...?!?!

> >I welcome the
> >unmotivated as much as I would welcome anyone else. Why shouldn't they
> >have fun too? If someone wants HF and doesn't want to learn code, why
> >should they bother to study for a VHF and above licence, when they could
> >be scuba diving or building model railroads or what have you? (Not hobbies
> >of mine, personally, but whatever turns you on). I know this is sacrilege
> >to true beleivers, but so what?
>
> So, Alun, such heretical statements against the True Beliefs of the
> morseodist chat room homies are, and will be, reviled, castigated,
> denigrated, and shown the door with an angry last phrase of "don't
> let it hit your ass on the way out!"

More profanity, Lennie...?!?! The only way you can make your
"point" anymore?

And as for Alun's comments, the "unmotivated" are not going to
get an Amateur Radio license, code test or not.

Take yourself for example...

> THIS venue is the chat room homies' TURF, Alun. Territorial imperative.

What chat room?

> None can venture into this place unless they are of Groupthink,
> secure in their Beliefs of the Group.

Having a vested interest and some practical experience prior to
making the silly suggestions you offer might help, Lennie...But you
ARE in teh Serious Screwball Mode.

> >The notion that only hams should decide the future of ham radio is just
> >that, a notion.
>
> NOT here. This is morseodist TURF, their neighborhood. NONE may
> challenge morseodist groupthink. NONE.

The only people who SHOULD have a "notion" to change ANYTHING in
our society should fall to those who would be impacted by it, whetehr
we are talking Amateur Radio, Medicare, or putting speed bumps in a
subdivision.

> >I can absolutely guarantee that it is not a point of view
> >shared by the FCC, and it makes little sense to me either.
>
> Heresy.
>
> All know that ham radio is governed by the BoD at Newington.

Oh? I would ask you to again produce some verifyable validation
of this assertion, but since it was just an antagonistic swipe at
something you so revile anyway, why waste the time?

The pile of questions you have refused to answer in response to
YOUR assertions is already neck-high.

> So it shall always be.
>
> Amen.
>
> dit dit

Another LennieRant...and just before Thanksgiving...How
thoughtful.

Putz.

3313. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-26 23:26:41 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0311261526.4785222@posting.google.com>
Source record: 82889

"Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<0x7xb.20708$Rk5.10314@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> "N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote
>
> > In fact, except for the most basic of rules and regulations, your
> > argument leads to the inescapable conclusion that it is not necessary
> > for the goals and purposes of the Amateur Radio Service at this point
> > to mandate *any* learning through a testing requirement.
>
> Jim,
>
> If you want people to quit making fun of you, quit posting such laughable
> reductio ad absurdum arguments.
>
> 73, de Hans, K0HB

(classic sour grapes)

3314. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-26 23:55:30 UTC
From: virtualgraham@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <c67c681c.0311261555.7046b61b@posting.google.com>
Source record: 82890

Here is a link to a site that has lotts of information about the
molestation laws in california. Also it has information and photos
from the Jackson case...

http://www.geocities.com/theTruthAbout288a

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:<cuvyxnansvbet.hox8fy1.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>...
> On Mon, 24 Nov 2003 04:06:57 -0600, Kim W5TIT wrote:
>
> >> "Dr." Laura would likely have a heart attack if she saw how some
> >> people live today in places *inside* her privileged neighborhood.
> >>
> >Whew! Definitely. That woman is so far detached from reality it's
> >scarey...
>
> This topic was kicked around in depth several months ago in the
> ba.broadcast group, where she is usually referred to as "Quack-tor
> Laura".
>
> As expected, we came up with the same conclusion as you did above...

3315. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-27 00:48:27 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <vRbxb.34696$m84.4931354@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 82891

N2EY wrote:
> Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message news:<3FC4B5BC.5090206@psu.edu>...

> btw, who is (jg)?

Officer LHA.

>
>>>I wanna be around when you explain to them that their "PROFESSIONAL"
>>>experience doesn't mean diddly-squat towards that requirement. And
>>>that an elementary-school child with 2 years amateur experience is
>>>qualified to take the test, but non-ham PROFESSIONALS aren't.
>
>
> Can you imagine it, Mike?
>
>
>> That is where Nelson Muntz comes in.
>
>
> I gotta ask - WHO?

Nelson is one of the kids on "The Simpsons". He's the one that shows up
at odd times to mock one of the other characters when something doesn't
go their way. Uses kind of a nasal ha-haw sound. Best experienced, not
described!

>>>Now that I think about it, acceptance of noncurrent experience would
>>>be a logical consequence of "one learner's permit to a customer". If
>>>someone got an LP and didn't upgrade within 10 years for whatever
>>>reason, but then later was able to pass the full-privs test, their old
>>>experience would need to be accepted, otherwise they'd be locked out
>>>of ham radio forever.
>>
>> I can't think of any circumstances where this sort of thing would or
>>should be allowed to happen.
>
>
> Which thing?

getting locked out of the ARS. Let's say I got my license in 1970, when
I was in High school. It would have expired in 1980. My interest in the
ARS did not come back until 1999. If I couldn't take the test again
because it had expired......

> A key part of Hans' idea is that a newbie gets one and only one entry
> level license (with 10 year term). No renewals, no retests, either
> upgrade to the full-privs license in the 8 year window between when
> you have the required 2 years experience and when the license expires,
> or yer out until ya pass the full-privs exam.

But now this is slightly different than noted above. Here a ham could
presumably get their license later. Even so, in my case, I would
probably want to re-test at the lower level, since radio has changed a
bit since the late 60's - early 70's.

Note this is all hypothetical, as I didn't have a license then.

> This is kinda like how the old Novice worked. One to a customer, no
> renewals, no retests for another term. 1951-1967 it was one year, then
> it was two years, then in the '70s they went through a bunch of
> changes whose details I won't bore ya with. By 1976 it was same term
> and renewability as the other licenses.
>
> The idea was that newbies would spend the Novice year or two learning
> and passing the General or Advanced. Which many, many of us did.
>
> Of course back then someone could just go straight for Tech, General
> or Advanced. But not Extra - until the mid-70s it required two years'
> experience as a General or above. (Guess who was at the FCC office the
> first exam day after the 2 years were up).
>
> Argue it with Hans, not me!

A'm too dum fer that! ;^)

>>I would be a prime candidate for a person
>>losing out on a license. I was interrested in radio when I was in high
>>school, and got out of it for many years thereafter. If I had recieved
>>the "learners permit" license at that point, that would likely be the case.
>
>
> All you'd have to do is pass the full-privs written in that case.

Which still brings us back to how much radio changes over a ten year
period. A ten year forced upgrade is simply over too long a time period
- not that I like the idea at all.

What would it accomplish?

- Mike KB3EIA -

3316. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-27 01:06:31 UTC
From: Bert Craig <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM>
Message-ID: <r6cxb.16383$AA.6827804@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>
Source record: 82892

"K�HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:4u7xb.20703$Rk5.6611@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
>
>
> "Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote
>
> > Hans,
> >
> > Please give me an idea of what freqs you'll frequent. Having just moved
> into
> > our new QTH, I have nothing substantial really set up yet, however, I'd
> love
> > to toss a wire up in one of the trees and let the autotuner in the K1
> handle
> > the rest. (Don't know if 5 Watts'll do it, but am more than game to
> try.)
>
> Look for W0SOC Friday evening and all day Sunday on whatever bands are
> open
> to DX.
>
> Look for W0AIH all weekend on every band 160-10 (less WARC AND 60M).

Ok, I'l listen out for you, GL OM.

> But since this is a DX event, WA2SI is a zero-point QSO.

Oops, my bad. I'm really not very contest oriented. I just wanted to add K0HB to my RRAP QSL wall. <hihi> I don't want to slow you down either. I'm sure I'll catch you OTA sooner or later down the road.

> 73, Hans, K0HB

73 de Bert
WA2SI

3317. FCC'S Wireless Bureau announces reorganization

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-27 01:26:47 UTC
From: johnbartley@email.com
Message-ID: <f90c7f43.0311261726.2dc1be2f@posting.google.com>
Source record: 82893
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur,rec.radio.amateur.policy

November 24, 2003
FCC'S WIRELESS BUREAU ANNOUNCES REORGANIZATION
FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE
NEWS MEDIA CONTACT: Chelsea Fallon at (202) 418-7991

FCC'S WIRELESS BUREAU ANNOUNCES REORGANIZATION Washington, D.C. ï¿½ The Wireless Telecommunications Bureau (Bureau) announced today that it has realigned its organizational structure to more effectively support the FCC's strategic goals ï¿½ Broadband, Competition, Spectrum, Media, Homeland Security and Modernizing the FCC.

The Bureau's portfolios have been redistributed along the lines of the strategic goals, consolidating similar functions to focus resources better. While improving the Bureau's ability to fulfill its mission, the reorganization also provides several benefits for managing a large and diverse organization. The scope and size of the Bureau's larger Divisions are reduced to improve managerial oversight, and organizational substructures, such as separate branches under the Division level, are eliminated. Eliminating branches provides each Division's management with greater flexibility to employ resources and create teams to address specific issues and projects. The overall result is a flatter, more flexible organization that the FCC believes will be more responsive to changes in wireless technology and the telecommunications business environment. The reorganization does not add or remove functions from the Bureau's portfolio.

From a personnel standpoint, the reorganization has been accomplished through the redeployment of existing positions. "This reorganization provides the Wireless Bureau with a structure to address the dynamic challenges facing a 21st century regulatory agency," stated John Muleta, Chief of the Bureau. "The result is a mission-driven team that will be innovative in its approach to regulatory policies and customer service."

As part of the reorganization, the Bureau now includes the following six Divisions:

o Auctions and Spectrum Access Division ï¿½ Promotes transparent, efficient and effective access to spectrum, through the development of policy initiatives and legal analysis, as well as procedures and administrative capability, to implement the FCC's competitive bidding authority and the transition of spectrum to new and innovative uses. Addresses issues relating to statutory authority and objectives, Commission rules and policies, and the planning, design, and conduct of spectrum auctions. Margaret Wiener, formerly Chief of the Auctions

and Industry Analysis Division, will be the Division Chief.

o Broadband Division ï¿½ Facilitates the rapid, widespread deployment of wireless broadband services to rural and metropolitan areas. Consolidates the policy, regulatory and licensing functions for wireless broadband services, excluding public safety and critical infrastructure services. Joel Taubenblatt, formerly Deputy Chief of the Policy Division, will be the Division Chief.

o Mobility Division ï¿½ Promotes competitive and innovative mobile radio services and maximizes efficient use of the mobile radio spectrum. Consolidates the policy, regulatory and licensing functions for wireless mobile services, excluding public safety and critical infrastructure services. Roger Noel, formerly Deputy Chief of the Commercial Wireless Division, will be the Division Chief.

o Public Safety and Critical Infrastructure Division ï¿½ Consolidates wireless homeland security and public safety issues and outreach within one Division, including E911 and interoperability issues, as well as policy, regulatory and licensing functions for both public safety entities and the nation's critical infrastructure industries. D'Wana Terry, formerly Chief of the Public Safety and Private Wireless Division, will be the Division Chief.

o Spectrum and Competition Policy Division ï¿½ Formulates and implements innovative spectrum, competition, and infrastructure policies that promote access to and efficient use of radio spectrum for wireless telecommunications and encourage competition in the communications marketplace. Issues include Spectrum Policy Task Force implementation, wireless/wireline convergence, secondary markets, wireless consumer policy, competition reporting, facilities and tower siting, and broad policy guidance for future technological developments. William Kunze, formerly Chief of the Commercial Wireless Division, will be the Division Chief.

o Spectrum Management Resources and Technologies Division ï¿½ Combines the bureau's information technology, licensing support, and auctions support and outreach functions (currently divided between two Divisions) in order to improve planning and implementation of the Bureau's unique and highly integrated system needs. John Chudovan, formerly Chief of the Data Management Division, will be the Division Chief.

The reorganization of the Bureau was approved by the Commission November 13, 2003. An organizational chart reflecting the realignment of the Bureau is attached. Future information concerning overall implementation, division leadership and specific responsibilities will be periodically updated on the Bureau's web site at wireless.fcc.gov. ï¿½ FCC ï¿½

<http://hraunfoss.fcc.gov/edocs_public/attachmatch/DOC-241586A1.doc>
<http://hraunfoss.fcc.gov/edocs_public/attachmatch/DOC-241586A1.pdf>

3318. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-27 01:34:33 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bq41a1$7m9@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 82902

"K&#65533;HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:eb9xb.20801$Rk5.17193@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote
>
> > My 2003 Chevy Silverado, 4x4, Extended cab with a 327 V8 gets about
16-17
> on average.
>
> Your engine is too small.
>
> My 2003 Silverado 2500HD turbo-charged 32-valve 6.6L V8 gets around 21-22
> MPG on the highway, and 18MPG around town.
>
> But my 1962 Corvair turbo-charged 12-valve H-6 got only around 13 MPG, but
> it was a LOT more fun to drive, and the chicks dug it!
>
> 73, de Hans, K0HB
>
>

A Corvair?!!??!! And you say chicks dug it??!!?? Ewww, I have never liked those cars--they are my number one pick of yuckos, right behind Studebaker which is the number one uglymobile... Most of us "chicks" in my hometown felt the same way about those two makes of vehicles.

Kim W5TIT

3319. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-27 01:36:09 UTC
From: Bert Craig <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM>
Message-ID: <dycxb.16577$AA.6945246@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>
Source record: 82894

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:yV8xb.23005$Wy4.21181@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net...
>
> Yes, I love the car club and occasional jaunt alone in my '61 Triumph
TR-3,
> but
> it is the time warp element that makes it the fun event...plus the always
> positive comments from bystanders at stopping point...that driving the
> TR-3 is. For my day-to-day commute, however, I stick to my new
> truck.

Agreed. I was lucky enough to be able to buy a 1:18 scale model of "my baby"
and it is likely as close as I'll ever come to owning an older Capri. The
link is shown below. For my day-to-day...the Mustang does quite nicely...but
savin' up for a Saleen ;-)

http://www.fordcapri.de/Modellautos/Page17546/Page17546/page175461.html

> Happy Thanksgiving to all. If you like it, drive it.

Same to you, Bill.

> Cheers,
> Bill K2UNK

73 de Bert
WA2SI

3320. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-27 02:40:16 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0311261840.e40bea8@posting.google.com>
Source record: 82895

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20031122145804.11891.00002450@mb-m11.aol.com>...
> In article <HUivb.11516$Rk5.6844@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dwight
> Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> writes:
>
> > Is there anyone out there who actually believes Michael Jackson is really
> >innocent of this latest charge?
>
> He is obviously GUILTY...(SNIP)

His Scumminess Lord Lennie the Last once again pontification on
yet another subject for which I am sure he has even LESS experience
than Amateur Radio or child rearing.

Two scumbags...Mikey and Lennie...both Midwest imports to the
Left Coast. And Mikey trying his best to look white, Lennie doing his
"Jive Rap" in RRAP.

A coincidence...?!?! YOU decide...! ! !

Steve

3321. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-27 02:42:53 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <Nwdxb.21326$Rk5.13736@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 82896

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote

>
> What would it accomplish?
>

At the end of a ten-year period with a learning permit, it would bottom-blow
those persons who through either lack of interest or lack of aptitude had
not met the qualifications for a standard ham license.

73, de Hans, K0HB

3322. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-27 03:43:11 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <jpexb.35094$m84.4964117@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 82897

Kï¿½HB wrote:

> "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote
>
>
>> What would it accomplish?
>>
>
>
> At the end of a ten-year period with a learning permit, it would bottom-blow
> those persons who through either lack of interest or lack of aptitude had
> not met the qualifications for a standard ham license.

True, although I think a large number of those would just simply not
renew their licenses.

- Mike KB3EIA -

3323. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-27 03:51:53 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hozjfy4.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>
Source record: 82898

On Wed, 26 Nov 2003 01:52:26 GMT, KØHB wrote:

>Even further back (in 1919) the old Amateur First Grade was required to pass
>a 10WPM test in Continental Morse
>
>Even even further back (in 1913) the old Amateur First Grade was required to
>pass a 5WPM test in Continental Morse
>
>Even even even further back (in 1912) the old Amateur First Grade "must be
>able to transmit and receive in Continental Morse, but no speed rate will be
>prescribed." (Presumably 1 word per fortnight was sufficient.)

Wasn't "Continental Morse" the contemporary name for what we now
call "International Morse", as distinguished from "American Morse" ?

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

From a Clearing in the Silicon Forest
Beaverton (Washington County) Oregon

3324. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-27 04:19:58 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <OXexb.21517$Rk5.1066@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 82899

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote

> Wasn't "Continental Morse" the contemporary name for what we now
> call "International Morse", as distinguished from "American Morse" ?

That's correct.

73, de Hans, K0HB

3325. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-27 04:26:15 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <H1fxb.21547$Rk5.4006@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 82900

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote

> True, although I think a large number of those would just simply not
> renew their licenses.

In this case, as in the case of the original Novice "learners permit", renewal would not be allowed. My plan is much more generous, giving the novice a 10-year period to qualify as opposed to the 1-year term of the original Novice license.

73, de Hans, K0HB

3326. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-27 04:41:34 UTC
From: Lloyd <lloyd@harvradiox.net>
Message-ID: <bq3v9j$k03$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 82901

Hey Kane, they were talking about you again today
on 14275. Is it true what they were saying about the
"great radar gun caper"?

Lloyd

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:cuvyxnansvbet.hox8fy1.pminews@netnews.comcast.net...
> On Mon, 24 Nov 2003 04:06:57 -0600, Kim W5TIT wrote:
>
> >> "Dr." Laura would likely have a heart attack if she saw how some
> >> people live today in places *inside* her privileged neighborhood.
> >>
> >Whew! Definitely. That woman is so far detached from reality it's
> >scarey...
>
> This topic was kicked around in depth several months ago in the
> ba.broadcast group, where she is usually referred to as "Quack-tor
> Laura".
>
> As expected, we came up with the same conclusion as you did above...
>
> --
> 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane
>
> From a Clearing in the Silicon Forest
> Beaverton (Washington County) Oregon
>
>

3327. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-27 05:34:03 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3FC58CD0.5B9F4656@earthlink.net>
Source record: 82903

Mike Coslo wrote:
>
> N2EY wrote:
> > Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message news:<3FC4B5BC.5090206@psu.edu>...
>
>
>
> > > btw, who is (jg)?
>
> Officer LHA.

Brian Burke, LHA junior grade.

Dave K8MN

3328. norberter, a violent individual

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-27 07:27:21 UTC
From: Bruce Reilly <bruha@igifw.com>
Message-ID: <9D74C14E.242160E8@news.hufwo.com.com>
Source record: 82904

Dear Judges, Lawyers, Policemen, Guards, Counselors, Taxpayers, et. al.,

We are here. Like it or not, for good or bad, we are here. Who are we? We are the downtrodden and dispossesed, the self-torturing, the disenfranchised convicts, drug and alcohol addicts, the unemployed and unemployable. We are the children of poverty, financial and spiritual. We have and will have children of our own, grandchildren too. We are ex-cons, uninsured, homeless, of many colors and speaking many tongues. We are the enemy in what has become a domestic war against ourselves.

And who are you? You who like the tough talk of Tough on Crime? You who watch as budgets are cut in education and health care while you militarize a police force? Bullet-proof vests, automatic weapons, helicopters, tanks, robots ... the testosterone is oozing through the streets, more prisons, longer sentences, tighten the belt, spartan conditions, task forces, gang units, gun courts. And what is there to show for it? Unemployent stays low because half the population oversees those "out of the workforce", the dregs, the rabble, the enemy? Please tell me there is a deeper reason. Do you feel safer? More humane? More like a cohesive society with a shared sense of purpose, who can identify Us and Them? Do you live in a gated community or gentrified neighborhood? By the way, have you read the Declaration of Independence and US Constitution - or do you only know the first phrases?

It's about time we got together. Please know that I have yet to meet a convict who wants their child to be a thief, an addict, a dealer, a prostitute, or a violent individual. Most of us still have hope for ourselves even when stuck in the darkest dilemmas, ruts and catch-22s. Most of us believe in crafting laws and instilling order. Many of us have burrowed beneath the surface to find a spiritual sense of being, an understanding force at least as powerful as those we succumbed to, and many of use wouldn't escape if you opened the front door. Did you know that approximately 10 million Americans are either incarcerated, on probation, on parole or once were in those categories? Each of those 10 million have families, friends, neighbors ... and so closer and closer does the We interface with the You. Don't you think it's time we talked?

Are you ready? Can you accept that the road we are travelling points toward a grim and painful future? Do you have the heart to face monumental failures while bravely struggling beyond where we are now? I know that some of you are, and that some of us are, and this is what gives me hope. You need our insights just as we need your structure. It is never over, especially when a real solution, a real treatment for our sickness, is yet to begin.

In Solidarity,

Bruce Reilly (a.k.a Bruha)
P.O.Box 8274
Cranston, RI 02920 USA

P.S. - I am trying to conceptualize an effective guerilla media campaign to promote this cause. Ideas are welcome. Collaboration is prayed.

do not use a world-wide newsgroup!
Messages in misc.misc that say "This is a test" are likely to cause large numbers of caustic messages to flow into your mailbox. There are newsgroups that are local to your computer or area that should be used. Your system administrator can tell you what they are.

Be familiar with the group you are posting to before you post! You shouldn't post to groups you do not read, or post to groups you've only read a few articles from -- you may not be familiar with the on-going conventions and themes of the group. One normally does not join a conversation by just walking up and talking. Instead, you listen first and then join in if you have something pertinent to contribute.

Remember that the Usenet newsgroup system is designed to allow readers to choose which messages they see, not to allow posters to choose sets of readers to target. When choosing which newsgroup(s) to post in, ask yourself, "Which newsgroups contain readers who would want to read my message" rather than "Which newsgroups have readers to whom I want to send my message?"

Be Careful with Humor and Sarcasm.

Without the voice inflections and body language of personal communications, it is easy for a remark meant to be funny to be misinterpreted.

3329. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-27 12:31:03 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031127073103.23171.00002375@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 82905

In article <bq41a1$7m9@library1.airnews.net>, "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
writes:

>> But my 1962 Corvair turbo-charged 12-valve H-6 got only around 13 MPG, but
>> it was a LOT more fun to drive, and the chicks dug it!

>A Corvair?!!??!! And you say chicks dug it??!!??

If it happens, it must be possible.

>Ewww, I have never liked
>those cars--they are my number one pick of yuckos, right behind Studebaker
>which is the number one uglymobile... Most of us "chicks" in my hometown
>felt the same way about those two makes of vehicles.
>
Perhaps Hans is mistaken. Perhaps it wasn't the *car* that the chicks dug at
all.....

73 de Jim, N2EY

3330. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-27 13:13:49 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <hMmxb.23872$Wy4.18041@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 82906

"Bill Sohl" wrote:
>
> Like I originally said....for my daily commute,
> I'll take the truck. Give me a nice two lane
> country road meandering about the hillsides
> and I'll take the TR-3 (if it is a nice sunny
> and dry day). Rain and the TR (or almost
> any vintage British sports car) are natural
> opposites. :-) :-)

The very best thing about European sports cars (including the British ones) is that they're just agile enough to get you out of trouble when you've done something stupid, like overestimated the car's, or your own, abilities. Many years ago, I went though an intersection at about 85 mph (the stupid part) in an MGB convertible. It was a narrow two lane road crossing a four lane highway, the road didn't go straight through the intersection (the road other side of the intersection was offset by about twenty feet), and, very much to my surprise, the middle of the intersection was considerably raised.

If I went straight though the intersection, I'd end up in a farmer's field about twenty feet lower than the road's surface. If I overcompensated, I'd hit the cars waiting on the other side. I had no doubts I could make the slight twist in the road. What I didn't count on was the hump in the middle of the intersection - hardly noticeable at normal speeds, but, at 80 mph, enough to almost launch the car into the air.

As I went through the intersection, I hit that hump and felt the car shoot into the air. I turned the steering wheel and the front tires simply squealed. The farmer's field got a lot closer than I wanted. The car dropped, the front wheels grabbed, and I was sliding sideways (straight towards the cars on the other side). The car bounced into the air again. I turned the steering wheel the opposite direction and the front tires squealed again. The car came back down, the wheels gripped, and I slid sideways into the lane I was supposed to be in. As the sliding stopped, I was able to straighten out and continue on down the road.

During all that, as I shot past one of the cars waiting at the intersection in the other lane, I got a quick glace of a smiling driver clapping his hands. I, on the other hand, was not exactly a happy camper at that particular moment (terror springs to mind). I never tried another stunt like that. Any more playing around would be at a much safer location, under much more predictable conditions. But I never got over my amazement of that car's ability to handle the road.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3331. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-27 13:37:40 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <E6nxb.23898$Wy4.15003@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 82907

"Kï¿½HB" wrote:
> "Bill Sohl" wrote :
>
> > It has no problem towing a 5000 pound
> > travel trailer around the northeast...
> > including the appalachians of PA.
>
> Your trailer is too small too!

I'm not that impressed either. My V-6 Ford Explorer Sport will tow a 5000 pound travel trailer. I tow a 4000-4500 pound boat several times a week. The main problem is the short wheelbase, not engine power. But, while the short wheelbase isn't so hot on the open road, it's perfect for getting around town at slower speeds in traffic (and getting the boat into the water fast at smaller, out of the way, boat ramps). But, to be fair to Bill, he did say including mountains. My V-6 clearly isn't going to handle mountains very well with that type of load and the gas milege will certainly reflect that.

> Has no problem pulling my 9,500 pound 5th-
> wheel camper AND my 2,500 pound boat
> around all over, including the Rockies of CO,
> NM, AZ, etc.

Now a 9500 pound 5th-wheel is impressive. The only vehicle I've owned that could handle that type of load was the Ford F-250 extended cab diesel pickup I had before this vehicle. It supposedly could tow 11000 pounds, though I never pulled anything close to that weight.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3332. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-27 13:54:12 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <8mnxb.23910$Wy4.13762@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 82908

"Kim W5TIT" wrote:
>
> Nope, you are incorrect. I don't care whether
> you agree with me or not. It is when you start
> telling me things that depict the nature of a
> personality *because* of something I am saying
> that you'll see me pushing back in like
> manner.

Well, that doesn't always come across so clearly in what you post in the newsgroup. We can't read your mind, only your words. And, in those words, I often see you giving as much as you get. Larry does like to throw punches at you, but I've seen you throw a few at him too. At this point, which one started first is somewhat hard to determine. Instead, most simply go with whatever is being said at the moment.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3333. Re: It ain't about the test.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-27 13:58:16 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031127085816.23307.00004642@mb-m29.aol.com>
Source record: 82909

In article <CP8xb.20782$Rk5.10687@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> writes:

>..... it's about the qualifications.
>
>The incessant arguments here on rrap surround the question of whether or not
>there should be a Morse TEST for access to HF.
>
>
>Well, that's the wrong question.
>
>
>The real question is whether or not you should be Morse qualified for access
>to HF.
>
>If there is no regulatory need for Morse qualification, then there is no
>need for Morse testing.
>
>The need for Morse qualification, as clearly stated in the 1913 radio
>regulations was "The applicant must be able to transmit and receive in
>Continental Morse, at a speed sufficient to enable him to recognize distress
>calls or the official "keep-out" signals." Since that qualification need
>has long since disappeared, then so has the need for the qualification test.
>

Hans,

If you want people to quit making fun of you, quit posting such laughable reductio ad absurdum arguments.

That stated 1913 need for Morse code qualifications is not the only reason such qualifications were kept in the rules all these years. There are lots more.

The original 1913 reason for technical qualifications was to prevent interference to nonamateurs caused by improper adjustment of amateur transmitters.

How much interference to nonamateurs is caused by improper adjustment of amateur transmitters today? Reading the FCC enforcement letters, such interference today seems to be more a case of intentional modification of amateur equipment by a lawless few to operate on nonamateur frequencies.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3334. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-27 13:58:17 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031127085817.23307.00004643@mb-m29.aol.com>
Source record: 82910

In article <5c01b95b.0311261452.68a33081@posting.google.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) writes:

>"Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
>news:<0x7xb.20708$Rk5.10314@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
>> "N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote
>>
>> > In fact, except for the most basic of rules and regulations, your
>> > argument leads to the inescapable conclusion that it is not necessary
>> > for the goals and purposes of the Amateur Radio Service at this point
>> > to mandate *any* learning through a testing requirement.
>
>> If you want people to quit making fun of you, quit posting such laughable
>> reductio ad absurdum arguments.

As anyone who understands formal logic knows, reductio ad absurdum is a valid way of evaluating the validity of an assertion.

It works like this: An assertion is analyzed by logical methods, and if the result is an absurdity, the original statement must be false.

> So far the only people I see "making fun" of Jim Miccolis are
>those who cannot adequately argue the topic being debated, Hans.

That says it all right there, Steve. Ridicule the messenger rather than deal with the message.

> There ARE those who make an arguement that the Amateur Radio
>license should be nothing more than an expensive permit. It's been
>archived here, Hans, and remains an "on-the-fringe" concept, but worse
>ideas have made it into law.

Yup. And the way it's being done is a little step at a time - just like other requirements were eliminated. Like nonrenewable entry level licenses, tests conducted by the FCC from a nonpublished test pool, experience requirements, etc.

> As you are well aware, part of the FCC's Basis and Purpose of the
>Amateur Radio Service is an expectation of technical learning.

Of course. But does that mean *all* hams must be *forced* to do some, just to get the license? Can't technical learning stand on its own merits without a Federally mandated welfare/support program?

Part of our B&P is public service comms, but there's no requirement that hams learn how to do them or participate in them to get or keep a license.

>We are
>effectively eliminating much of the "skill" reqirements,

I think you mean "all"...

>so how hard a
>stretch is it to see some element of society arguing to eliminate any
>technical knowledge, too...?!?!

More important - how can those arguments be countered?

73 de Jim, N2EY

3335. Re: Probably gonna catch hell for this one but..... (found them in a different newsgroup)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-27 14:06:37 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <Nxnxb.23985$Wy4.16088@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 82911

"Ryan, KC8PMX" wrote:
>
> Michael Jackson Jokes
> Q: How do you know when it's bedtime at
> the Jackson residence?
> A: When the big hand touches the little hand...

Oh, my. Sick. Discusting. Horrible. Funny!! Thanks, Ryan. A copy is now on my hard drive. I'm sure my wife will get a laugh out of some of them too.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3336. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-27 14:09:11 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <bAnxb.23994$Wy4.18601@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 82912

"Mike Coslo" wrote:
>
> "Dwight Stewart wrote:
> >
> > Well, gee, Dave. If people are going to run
> > around wearing a single glove for decoration,
> > there has to be some rules of etiquette. I just
> > have to wonder what Ms. Manners would
> > say about all this.
>
>
> "ICK"?

Yep. That about covers it. :-)

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3337. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-27 14:13:43 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <rEnxb.24006$Wy4.18720@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 82913

"Kim W5TIT" wrote:
>
> Oooo, I know. I sure am getting short with
> people lately. Y'know why, I think? It's kind
> of like all those who are nearly always as good
> as we can possibly be--at the *expense* of
> ourselves around all the creeps in this world. I
> am getting tired of it--and I ain't takin' it no more...

Yea, but, if you're going to declare war, you're supposed to fly the
"Don't Tread On Me" flag or something first.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3338. Re: Where Did THIS Come From...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-27 14:20:33 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0311270620.22701d58@posting.google.com>
Source record: 82914

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0311261503.8443715@posting.google.com>...
> Message 85 in thread
> From: Brian (brianburke@juno.com)
> Subject: Re: ARRL you can Kiss my $39.00 a Year Good Bye
>
> FROM A MISSED REPLY:
> QUOTE:
> View this article only
> Newsgroups: rec.radio.amateur.policy
> Date: 2003-09-19 11:30:16 PST
>
>
> k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0309171347.183aec38@posting.google.com>...
> > brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0309131147.2090071e@posting.google.com>...
> > > k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
> > > > Perhaps because the other poster didn't make a lot of assinine
> > > > assertions that are not substantiated by facts, Brain.
> > >
> > > The ARS has improved since 1984. That's plain for everyone to see.
> >
> > Then where does all this "Ham Radio Is Going To Hell" traffic
> > come from, Brain? Mostly from trolls, you and Lennie.
> >
> > > > You may refer to "fact" in Websters to find out what they are,
> > > > Brain...You DO seem to have a problem with the concept.
> > >
> > > Not at all. As Ronald Reagan said, "Facts are stupid things."
> >
> > I'd expect notning less from you, Brain...You're nothing if not
> > consistent.
> >
> > Thanks.
> >
> > Steve, K4YZ
>
> Steve, not my fault that Ron said it, and I liked Ron. But his quote
> applied in your declaration that amateur radio has not improved since
> 1984.
>
> That is not fact.
>

> UNQUOTE.
>
>
> Sorry I missed this before!
>
> Brain, how in the WORLD did YOU come up with the assertion that
> >>I<< said that Amateur Radio has not improved since 1984...?!?!
>
> You really ARE the idiot I imagined!
>
> Just one more mangled episode of cranial flatulence on your part,
> Brain. I'm just sorry I missed it the first time, however it's also
> one more example of why I take great fun in sarcastically calling you
> "Brain".
>
> Hope you have a Happy Thanksgiving...And by the way, when Mrs
> Brain says something like "It's time to carve the turkey", don't sweat
> it...she's talking about the bird on the table...not the one sitting
> next to her...
>
> Steve, K4YZ

Hey Steve, you are quoting ME saying that:

"The ARS has improved since 1984. That's plain for everyone to see."

And that's plain for everyone to see.

Happy Thanksgiving to you. I hope you are with your loved ones today
and give thanks for what you have, and for the system of government
that enables you to have it.

God bless GW Bush, Ron Reagan, and the troops deployed to hotspots the
around the world. The world is a better place because of them and we
cannot lose the faith.

I hope John Hinkley is eating institutionalized turkey cubes, canned
gravy, and instant mashed potatos on this thanksgiving day (such as
the meal I had in 1979), and that his parents have to come back
tomorrow during normal visiting hours to see him.

73, Brian/N0iMD

3339. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-27 14:22:24 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bq5194$7bb@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 82915

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:8mnxb.23910$Wy4.13762@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> "Kim W5TIT" wrote:
> >
> > Nope, you are incorrect. I don't care whether
> > you agree with me or not. It is when you start
> > telling me things that depict the nature of a
> > personality *because* of something I am saying
> > that you'll see me pushing back in like
> > manner.
>
>
> Well, that doesn't always come across so clearly in what you post in the
> newsgroup. We can't read your mind, only your words. And, in those words,
I
> often see you giving as much as you get. Larry does like to throw punches
at
> you, but I've seen you throw a few at him too. At this point, which one
> started first is somewhat hard to determine. Instead, most simply go with
> whatever is being said at the moment.
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
>

The key phrase up there, Dwight, is: "give as much as you get." That is why
I said I will push back in like manner.

Kim W5TIT

3340. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-27 14:34:50 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <eYnxb.24084$Wy4.10305@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 82916

"Kim W5TIT" wrote:
>
> Ask an English professor, Dwight.

Writing is something I greatly enjoy, Kim. As written, your sentence, without the reference to others, basically says "it's a pretty near given that I would find anything like the death of someone else "hilarious."" Clearly, something else is needed to change that to fit your intent (for example, "...I would NOT find..."). With your reference to others, the missing "neither" is necessary (the basic "neither/nor" grammar rule, as in "neither I nor others would find").

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3341. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-27 14:38:45 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <V%nxb.24087$Wy4.18618@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 82917

"Kim W5TIT" wrote:
>
> ACK!!! Man, I am still stunned over this
> one--I *must* be getting old. The grammar
> department indeed reminded me of the old
> "either/neither" "neither/nor" argument to be
> used in deciding upon correct grammar! So,
> yes, Larry was correct! Wow, what a hoot!
> Larry being correct <Big Evil Grin>. (snip)

Ah, I see you've already figured it out. Ignore my last message.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3342. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-27 14:44:47 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <z5oxb.24099$Wy4.5021@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 82918

"Dee D. Flint" wrote:
>
> A. I was discussing the USE of code itself
> not the testing. So the last two sentences in
> the above paragraph are not relevant to this
> discussion.

Isn't this overall discussion about the code test?

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3343. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-27 14:45:34 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bq52ki$l6t@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 82919

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:rEnxb.24006$Wy4.18720@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> "Kim W5TIT" wrote:
> >
> > Oooo, I know. I sure am getting short with
> > people lately. Y'know why, I think? It's kind
> > of like all those who are nearly always as good
> > as we can possibly be--at the *expense* of
> > ourselves around all the creeps in this world. I
> > am getting tired of it--and I ain't takin' it no more...
>
>
> Yea, but, if you're going to declare war, you're supposed to fly the
> "Don't Tread On Me" flag or something first.
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
>

Hmmm, not only no, but hell no. I can be treaded on all "they" want. I've declared war on the road, tell ya that. I travel a good number of miles to work. And, it's so bad "out there" that when I do 70-75 (in a 60 zone), there will be creeps that pull up behind me and start this moving to the left so they're on the shoulder and can see the traffic around the front of me; or flashing their headlights so I'll move outta "their" way; or pulling up so close that all I see of their lights behind me is a halo because they're only about 2' distance from my rear bumper. Or, they'll do the ultimate stupidity and pass then pull into the spot that I have created in front of me so that they can start leapfrogging from one lane to the next. Well, used to be I'd move. No more. I sit right there. And, they still go around but now I creep up just ever so slightly (still maintain a safe distance from the vehicle in front of me) and see if they'll still dare slide in. Well, sometimes they do. So, since they've usually been behind me flashing their headlights, I'll go the lazy man's route and just leave mine on high beam--and I've got some bright lights.

Then, there's the folks in the store. You'll know who I'm talking about here. The folks who walk up behind you and have a couple of things in their hands and start practically doing calisthenics (sp) to careen in front of you so you'll see they only have a couple of things and let them go ahead. Used to do that, too. No more. It's my turn dammit and they can wait. Now, don't get me wrong: if I happen to turn to one side or the other and I notice someone patiently waiting their turn, I let them go ahead. But these

creeps who think that they are entitled to getting around just because they are far more important than anyone else...nope, not doin' it any more. And, depending upon how showy they are about how important they are is how slow I am to slowly unload my cart, slowly find my checkbook, confirm the price however many times it needs confirming, very carefully write my check, etc.

Or, the teeny-bopper eh-heh couple that thinks everyone wants to see them practically making love in public. If we are all in a line at a store or something and I see another person who is as dismayed by this as me, I'll say something like, "thank goodness for birth control." The other person will usually say something back (having just *waited* for the opportunity) like, "doesn't look like they use it." Or some such thing. For some reason, *that* is when these creeps get embarrassed.

Then, there's what I call the "buddy" creeps. The philosophy is to shop in pairs and have one stand in line while the other keeps going back and getting things that were "forgotten." And, the one standing in line will keep turning and saying please excuse us...<giggle>. I used to just throw a fake smile. Not any more. Now I say, "no, I won't excuse you, you are holding all of us up here and it's rude and inconsiderate of you."

And restaurants. Oh my goodness how many times have you been at an eatery, only to have some creep's misbehaving little future creep keep popping up over the booth seat to let out a shrill of a scream with laughter right behind--over and over and over again...or let the little tyrant run rampant while the beautiful couple (yeah right) sits and eats in peace while their monster runs to every table standing there like you're supposed to applaud them or something. I used to grin and bear that, too. Now, I get up, and I'll actually say something to the parents about how disruptive their "child" (term used loosely) is being to everyone else's table--so can I sit at theirs. That one there gets real sneers. Ask me if I care. They don't, I ain't gonna.

Well, as I've been doing this more and more over the past 5-6 months or so, I am also noticing that there are others doing this. I don't know that it's always been done by others and I've just never noticed, but I notice that there *are* others who are doing it. I am refreshed by that. I am tired of always being the friendly, patient, kind one--just to keep getting stepped on by the creeps...

Maybe we've all had it... <grin>

Kim W5TIT

3344. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-27 14:57:30 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <uhoxb.12940$P%1.11551246@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 82920

"Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:H1fxb.21547$Rk5.4006@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote
>
>
> > True, although I think a large number of those would just simply not
> > renew their licenses.
>
> In this case, as in the case of the original Novice "learners permit",
> renewal would not be allowed. My plan is much more generous, giving the
> novice a 10-year period to qualify as opposed to the 1-year term of the
> original Novice license.
>
> 73, de Hans, K0HB

Since the uninterested would generally let it lapse anyway, it's not worth the effort to change to change the rules to have a 10 year non-renewable "learner's permit."

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

3345. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-27 15:04:30 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <2ooxb.12941$P%1.11552045@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 82921

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:z5oxb.24099$Wy4.5021@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> "Dee D. Flint" wrote:
> >
> > A. I was discussing the USE of code itself
> > not the testing. So the last two sentences in
> > the above paragraph are not relevant to this
> > discussion.
>
>
> Isn't this overall discussion about the code test?
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

My response was to your statement that code itself was unnecessary and I made that clear that I was addressing that issue only. You elected to attempt to take it back to the code test. Taking it back to the code test does not refute the necessity of code itself.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

3346. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-27 15:28:26 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <uKoxb.24144$Wy4.4522@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 82922

"N2EY" wrote:
>
> Then SSB, AM, FM, RTTY, PSK-31, etc.
> are all non-necessities. (snip)

Absolutely. Which is exactly why there is no test of the actual ability to use those modes - only a written test covering the fundamentals of those modes and the rules associated with them. Morse code should join those modes in that regard.

> In fact, except for the most basic of rules
> and regulations, your argument leads to the
> inescapable conclusion that it is not necessary
> for the goals and purposes of the Amateur
> Radio Service at this point to mandate *any*
> learning through a testing requirement.
>
> Can you prove otherwise?

What is there to prove? Isn't that exactly the intent of the license exams - the fundamentals of radio and electronics, safety, rules and regulations, and so on. When it comes to Amateur Radio, the FCC is not a school and nobody graduates with a degree in radio or electronics when they're handed a ham license. That license exams (and licenses) are simply entrances into the various levels of Amateur Radio - the real learning comes with what is done afterwards (operating, building, experimenting, reading, practice, and the resulting experence from any or all of that). The FCC has never has never purported, or even suggested, that the Amateur Radio exams, and resulting licenses, are anything beyond that (only a few self-important hams have done so).

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3347. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-27 15:28:36 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <EKoxb.37079$m84.5092084@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 82923

Kim W5TIT wrote:

< a whole bunch snipped>

> Well, as I've been doing this more and more over the past 5-6 months or so,
> I am also noticing that there are others doing this. I don't know that it's
> always been done by others and I've just never noticed, but I notice that
> there *are* others who are doing it. I am refreshed by that. I am tired of
> always being the friendly, patient, kind one--just to keep getting stepped
> on by the creeps...

Well, we can all react to the world as we wish. I find that a rude reaction to rudity just validates all the rudity. Of course we can't be all well mannered all the time, but IMO, its best to try. Grace is a habit. And the best revenge is living well.

Illegitemi non Carborundum!

3348. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-27 15:37:11 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <HSoxb.24153$Wy4.1944@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 82924

"Steve Robeson, K4CAP" wrote:
>
> As you are well aware, part of the FCC's
> Basis and Purpose of the Amateur Radio Service
> is an expectation of technical learning. (snip)

Learning is part of the basis and purpose of the Amateur Radio Service, not the basis and purpose of the license exams. The basis and purpose of the license exams is to make possible the basis and purpose of the Amateur Radio Service. In other words, to bring people into the Amateur Radio Service so they can learn. The real learning comes after the exams in what we actually do.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3349. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-27 15:41:16 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <wWoxb.24159$Wy4.15791@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 82925

"Kï¿½HB" wrote:
> "Dwight Stewart" wrote:
>
> > ..... any mode needed to facilitate that would
> > also not be a necessity.
>
> I'll be participating in the CQWW CW RadioSport
> event this weekend from W0SOC, and later from
> W0AIH. It is a necessity that I know Morse in
> order to participate.

From the perspective of an FCC license requirement, is it necessary for you to participate in that event?

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3350. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-27 15:49:17 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031127104917.07578.00001878@mb-m25.aol.com>
Source record: 82926

In article <uhoxb.12940$P%1.11551246@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> writes:

>> In this case, as in the case of the original Novice "learners permit",
>> renewal would not be allowed. My plan is much more generous, giving the
>> novice a 10-year period to qualify as opposed to the 1-year term of the
>> original Novice license.
>>
>> 73, de Hans, K0HB
>
>Since the uninterested would generally let it lapse anyway, it's not worth
>the effort to change to change the rules to have a 10 year non-renewable
>"learner's permit."
>
Dee,

It's not just about "interest" but about "qualifications".

Hans thinks that *all* hams should be qualified (eventually) at at least the Extra class written level. The purpose of his proposed LP license is to give newbies a sample of what ham radio is like, and a 10-year opportunity to learn enough to get a full-privileges license. Just like the old 1 and 2 year one-to-a-customer Novice licenses did.

IOW, upgrade or leave the amateur bands. Hans' proposal is that simple. LPs would have an 8 year window of opportunity to do so.

Part of the concept is the idea that if somebody can't hack the Extra test - for whatever reason - before their 10 year LP license runs out, too bad, game over, thanks for playing. Of course at any future time after the LP license runs out, such a person could take the Extra written and get the license.

The idea is that "LPs" are not really qualified hams - the license class would exist so that they could become qualified.

Of course the only difference in privs would be power level - LPs would be limited to 50 watts out. No word on vanity calls, tho.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3351. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-27 16:14:44 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <Uppxb.37403$m84.5105207@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 82927

N2EY wrote:

<snippage>

> As anyone who understands formal logic knows, reductio ad absurdum is a valid
> way of evaluating the validity of an assertion.
>
> It works like this: An assertion is analyzed by logical methods, and if the
> result is an absurdity, the original statement must be false.

Or absurd! I like to apply this logic to as much as possible in life.
And many ideas do not fare well!

<more snippage>

> Yup. And the way it's being done is a little step at a time - just like other
> requirements were eliminated. Like nonrenewable entry level licenses, tests
> conducted by the FCC from a nonpublished test pool, experience requirements,
> etc.
>
>
>> As you are well aware, part of the FCC's Basis and Purpose of the
>>Amateur Radio Service is an expectation of technical learning.
>
>
> Of course. But does that mean *all* hams must be *forced* to do some, just to
> get the license? Can't technical learning stand on its own merits without a
> Federally mandated welfare/support program?
>
> Part of our B&P is public service comms, but there's no requirement that hams
> learn how to do them or participate in them to get or keep a license.
>
>
>>We are
>>effectively eliminating much of the "skill" reqirements,
>
>
> I think you mean "all"...
>
>
>>so how hard a
>>stretch is it to see some element of society arguing to eliminate any
>>technical knowledge, too...?!?!
>
>
> More important - how can those arguments be countered?

IMO, the only way to counter them is to attempt a consensus of just how much "quality" and technical acumen is desired in a Ham. It's what you and I are doing yapping about what Ham radio might become. It's what Hans is doing. I don't like everything he proposes, but I could live with it.

We have to bark about every attempt at reducing the knowledge or skills needed to become a Ham. We need to also guard against trying to set the bar too high - though I doubt that that will be much of a problem!

When a VEC group publishes what they want the ARS to become, and what they want is a drastic reduction in knowledge, at the same time granting priveliges for that reduction, we have to yell loud and strong.

We have to realize that when we are told to shut up, it means that our arguments are good, and that "shut up" is the best argument the other side has to give.

We have to realize that while we may lose this fight no matter how hard we work at it, if we sit still and shut up, there is no doubt of the outcome. Entropy will take over.

We have to get those that believe that Morse code testing should go away to realize and admit that something must fill the vacuum created by its elimination. That something could be *nothing*, which results in a dramatic reduction in skill level. They also need to realize that there are people out there who want even less in the way of admission requirements. "Nobody wants licenses just given away" or the like is a naive statement.

Why? Because I could hand my wife the checkbook, turn her loose in AES or similar store, and after purchasing whatever the clerk reccomends, within a week or two she could be on the air. There really is no impediment too a person whose extent of rf knowledgfe is that you recieve by twisting the knob, and to transmit, you push the push to talk button. There is no technical requirement any more, at least to simply "get on the air". We have to generate our own requirements.

- Mike KB3EIA -

3352. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-27 16:15:50 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <Wqpxb.37413$m84.5105490@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 82928

Dwight Stewart wrote:

> "Dee D. Flint" wrote:
>
>>A. I was discussing the USE of code itself
>>not the testing. So the last two sentences in
>>the above paragraph are not relevant to this
>>discussion.
>
>
>
> Isn't this overall discussion about the code test?

The code test is part of it, but overall it is about many of the technical issues that will shape where the ARS goes in the future.

- Mike KB3EIA -

3353. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-27 17:28:55 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031127122855.29660.00001797@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 82929

In article <bpvqdi$1t9o3l$2@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>, "Ryan, KC8PMX" <REMOVETHISkc8pmx@diamondcs.net> writes:

>I just feel that the credit cards "trap" a person..... not only with dealing >with paying the damned things off but as a way of thinking when purchasing.

A problem with any new technology (credit cards are simply a financial technology) is that new forms of thinking and acting have to be developed by those who use the technology.

In a cash-only environment, I cannot spend money I don't have yet. With checks, I can sometimes play games with 'getting to the bank before they do', but that's pretty limited. With true credit cards, a new level of thinking and discipline are needed to avoid digging oneself into a hole.

I think of credit cards as "instant debt" cards, which helps me avoid using them! Instead, I use debit cards.

The "human nature/psychology" factor is a real thing, though. It's a different thing to count out several hundred dollars in cash and hand it over, compared to simply flashing the plastic.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3354. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-27 18:14:55 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <t_CdnT33z4L1oluiRVn-tA@gbronline.com>
Source record: 82930

Ryan, KC8PMX wrote:

.
>
> I just feel that the credit cards "trap" a person..... not only with dealing
> with paying the damned things off but as a way of thinking when purchasing.
> "Gee, I don't have enough money in my wallet, but wait! I have my credit
> cards!!"
> Thats why I have the one card... with a lower limit.

Only if you allow it to "trap" you. Charge only what you can pay off at
the end of the billing cycle. It is really stupid to pay the interst on
a credit card. I see my credit card as a handy way not to have to pay
cash or write checks and have a good record of my purchases, but *never*
go into debt with it, always pay the full balance. If you can't pay the
full balance you are buying more than you need.

3355. Dimmy Dale and his family of convicts

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-27 20:18:46 UTC
From: Arf! Arf! <DoggieDaze@lLiberalz.com>
Message-ID: <4Ysxb.2930$Qc.2929@bignews5.bellsouth.net>
Source record: 82931
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.swap

GOT DRUGS???

http://www.hcso.tampa.fl.us/pub/default.asp?/online/qdisp/BN=03058540

http://www.hcso.tampa.fl.us/pub/default.asp?/online/FULLPHOTO/URL?bn=03058540&name=DALE,JOHN%20MICHAEL&race=W&vex=UYGPYIXIGBGI

http://www.hcso.tampa.fl.us/pub/default.asp?/Online/qdisp/bn=03035679

http://www.hcso.tampa.fl.us/BookPhoto/MUGImageASP.ASP?WCI=RetrieveImage&WCE=F03035679&WCU

KE4TEW wrote:

Riley Hollingsworth reinstated my ticket. Are'nt you glad that he did?

http://www.arrl.org/htdig/?method=and&words=ke4tew&x=8&y=12

3356. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-27 22:15:34 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031127171534.07961.00000159@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 82933

In article <HSoxb.24153$Wy4.1944@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> writes:

>> As you are well aware, part of the FCC's
>> Basis and Purpose of the Amateur Radio Service
>> is an expectation of technical learning. (snip)
>
> Learning is part of the basis and purpose of the Amateur Radio Service,
>not the basis and purpose of the license exams. The basis and purpose of the
>license exams is to make possible the basis and purpose of the Amateur Radio
>Service. In other words, to bring people into the Amateur Radio Service so
>they can learn. The real learning comes after the exams in what we actually
>do.

So, "real" radio operating experience can ONLY be done in
AMATEUR radio?

LHA

3357. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-27 22:15:36 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031127171536.07961.00000160@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 82932

In article <Uppxb.37403$m84.5105207@news1.news.adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo
<mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>
><snippage>
>
>> As anyone who understands formal logic knows, reductio ad absurdum is a
valid
>> way of evaluating the validity of an assertion.
>>
>> It works like this: An assertion is analyzed by logical methods, and if the
>> result is an absurdity, the original statement must be false.
>
>Or absurd! I like to apply this logic to as much as possible in life.
>And many ideas do not fare well!

You WANT absurdity?

><more snippage>
>
>>>so how hard a
>>>stretch is it to see some element of society arguing to eliminate any
>>>technical knowledge, too...?!?!
>>
>> More important - how can those arguments be countered?
>
> IMO, the only way to counter them is to attempt a consensus of just how

>much "quality" and technical acumen is desired in a Ham. It's what you
>and I are doing yapping about what Ham radio might become. It's what
>Hans is doing. I don't like everything he proposes, but I could live
>with it.

DOS tip: The FCC determines what it requires in licensing of radio
operators, NOT the "amateur community" or the "communities" of
any other radio service that require radio operators.

> We have to bark about every attempt at reducing the knowledge or skills

>needed to become a Ham. We need to also guard against trying to set the
>bar too high - though I doubt that that will be much of a problem!

You can always petiiton the FCC for a complete change in scope and
description of U.S. amateur radio. I'd suggest you change the name to
"Archaic Radiotelegraphy Service" for below-30-MHz. Make morse the
prime definition of HF amateur radio.

> When a VEC group publishes what they want the ARS to become, and what
>they want is a drastic reduction in knowledge, at the same time granting
>priveliges for that reduction, we have to yell loud and strong.

Has anyone seen YOUR opposition to a "VEC group publishing what
they want?"

> We have to realize that when we are told to shut up, it means that our
>arguments are good, and that "shut up" is the best argument the other
>side has to give.

Don't try to rationalize a weak argument of yours as "more noble, logical,
in the best interests of the service," etc., etc. by feigning outrage at
"improper acts of others."

> We have to realize that while we may lose this fight no matter how hard

>we work at it, if we sit still and shut up, there is no doubt of the
>outcome. Entropy will take over.

Don't worry, 981 commenters on RM-10811 (largest number of respondents
of the 14 petitions) have been busy stating things in public.

> We have to get those that believe that Morse code testing should go
>away to realize and admit that something must fill the vacuum created by
>its elimination.

WHY?

You are just about to fall over the edge of the "I had to do it so everyone
else has to do it in the future" non-argument.

>That something could be *nothing*, which results in a
>dramatic reduction in skill level.

"Dramatic?!?!?" Only if you are a morseman is such a thing "dramatic."

:-)

>They also need to realize that there
>are people out there who want even less in the way of admission
>requirements. "Nobody wants licenses just given away" or the like is a
>naive statement.

Translation: You had to do something but if others in the future
don't do as you did, they are getting something "free?"

> Why? Because I could hand my wife the checkbook, turn her loose in AES
>or similar store, and after purchasing whatever the clerk reccomends,
>within a week or two she could be on the air. There really is no
>impediment too a person whose extent of rf knowledgfe is that you
>recieve by twisting the knob, and to transmit, you push the push to talk
>button. There is no technical requirement any more, at least to simply
>"get on the air". We have to generate our own requirements.

Okay, begin with some fundamentals:

1. A radio boot camp where all "novices" have to learn to take orders from their "superior" license class holders, march in ranks to beep music determined by long-ago-dead-amateurs, know vacuum tube lore by heart, learn how to memorize all the radio ads in QST and desire each item.

2. Swear an oath of allegiance to amateur radio and the constitution of the ARRL, salute each vertical diamond logo as it passes in front of your eyes. Loyalty, fraternity, etc.

3. Wear cute little radio uniforms when operating, have shiny radio shields in a special holder giving you "authority" anyplace. Uniforms are a good place to show RANK and TIME IN GRADE while "in the (radio) service."

4. Demand immediate obeyance by all "civilians" not in your "service" as superior in the radio arts. Reject all those who do not think as you do. Remember that the First Amendment of the United States Constitution does NOT apply to citizens on amateur radio matters...unless said citizen is licensed in amateur radio.

5. Petition the FCC for an immediate change of the HF amateur radio service to "Archaic Radiotelegraphy Service," or perhaps "Archaic Radiotelegraphy Society." That way you can keep the beloved code test and force all in the future to do exactly as you had to do.

6. Always remember that YOUR efforts in getting that amateur license were so awesome, overpowering, enobling that the individual efforts of mere "civilians" not into amateur radio are forever poor and puny by comparison.

7. Amateurs RULE. Professionals must obey the amateurs.

LHA

3358. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-27 22:15:37 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031127171537.07961.00000161@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 82935

In article <Wqpxb.37413$m84.5105490@news1.news.adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:

>Dwight Stewart wrote:
>
>> "Dee D. Flint" wrote:
>>
>>>A. I was discussing the USE of code itself
>>>not the testing. So the last two sentences in
>>>the above paragraph are not relevant to this
>>>discussion.
>>
>> Isn't this overall discussion about the code test?
>
>The code test is part of it, but overall it is about many of the
>technical issues that will shape where the ARS goes in the future.

The CODE TEST is a MAJOR PART of every one of the 14
petitions before the Commission [RM-10781 thru RM-10787,
RM-10805 thru RM-10811].

Everyone's future happens right after now.

LHA

"today is the tomorrow you worried about yesterday..." :-)

3359. Re: It ain't about the test.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-27 22:15:38 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031127171538.07961.00000162@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 82934

In article <20031127085816.23307.00004642@mb-m29.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
writes:

>In article <CP8xb.20782$Rk5.10687@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Kï¿½HB"
><groupk0hb@earthlink.net> writes:
>
>>..... it's about the qualifications.
>>
>>The incessant arguments here on rrap surround the question of whether or not
>>there should be a Morse TEST for access to HF.
>>
>>Well, that's the wrong question.
>>
>>The real question is whether or not you should be Morse qualified for access
>>to HF.
>>
>>If there is no regulatory need for Morse qualification, then there is no
>>need for Morse testing.
>>
>>The need for Morse qualification, as clearly stated in the 1913 radio
>>regulations was "The applicant must be able to transmit and receive in
>>Continental Morse, at a speed sufficient to enable him to recognize distress
>>calls or the official "keep-out" signals." Since that qualification need
>>has long since disappeared, then so has the need for the qualification test.
>
>Hans,
>
>If you want people to quit making fun of you, quit posting such laughable
>reductio ad absurdum arguments.

Incorrect. The necessity for tested demonstration of morsemanship FOR
LICENSING of any radio operator, any radio service, has disappeared in
the 90 years of time since 1913.

>That stated 1913 need for Morse code qualifications is not the only reason
such
>qualifications were kept in the rules all these years. There are lots more.

Not to the FCC.

In 1913 (or 1912) there was ONLY on-off keying of so-called CW
RF sources. Despite the Fessenden demonstration of 1906 on
Christmas Eve (done with an ALTERNATOR RF source, NOT a
"spark" transmitter), there was no great rush for establishment
of sound/voice transmissions. TTY was just getting started in
replacing landline manual telegraphy, no facsimile or other "data"

sources. Vacuum tubes were barely out of the laboratory after
5 years from invention...makers were still trying to get good QC in
the "tube factories."

>The original 1913 reason for technical qualifications was to prevent
>interference to nonamateurs caused by improper adjustment of amateur
>transmitters.

Baloney. IMPROPER OPERATION, not "adjustment," and not
just "by amateurs."

Were there bandplans in 1913? I don't think so. Were there any
specific frequencies (wavelengths) assigned then for everyone in
radio? I think not, but you will no doubt explain away "how it was"
from personal experience in 1913. :-)

The exile of U.S. radio amateurs to the "short waves" (shorter
than 200 m) came AFTER World War 1, not before.

>How much interference to nonamateurs is caused by improper adjustment of
>amateur transmitters today? Reading the FCC enforcement letters, such
>interference today seems to be more a case of intentional modification of
>amateur equipment by a lawless few to operate on nonamateur frequencies.

In 1913 there was NO Internet to contact the FCC. There wasn't any
FCC until 1934. There was very little landline long-distance telephony
to contact the three different radio regulatory agencies that existed
between 1912 and 1934. "Communications" with any radio regulatory
agency in 1913 was by surface mail...or the "telegram" (a new term
for the mostly-manual-telegraphic message sent via landlines).

So, in the world of today (if you can tear yourself away from the
beloved past), HOW is a continuing requirement of a morse code test
going to "stop" all that improper radio operation?

Answer: It won't. Improper operation isn't due to the mode. It isn't
due to the presence or absence of a code test.

LHA

3360. Riley restores KE4TEW ticket AFTER he misses retest! Way to go!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-27 22:33:28 UTC
From: Arf! Arf! <DoggieDaze@lLiberalz.com>
Message-ID: <SXuxb.1389$P7.365@bignews6.bellsouth.net>
Source record: 82936
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.swap,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Arf! Arf! wrote:

http://www.arrl.org/htdig/?method=and&words=ke4tew&x=8&y=12

3361. Re: Dimmy Dale and his family of convicts

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-27 22:34:08 UTC
From: Arf! Arf! <DoggieDaze@lLiberalz.com>
Message-ID: <tYuxb.1390$P7.880@bignews6.bellsouth.net>
Source record: 82937
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.swap

http://www.arrl.org/htdig/?method=and&words=ke4tew&x=8&y=12

Arf! Arf! wrote:

> GOT DRUGS???
>
> http://www.hcso.tampa.fl.us/pub/default.asp?/online/qdisp/BN=03058540
>
> http://www.hcso.tampa.fl.us/pub/default.asp?/online/FULLPHOTO/URL?bn=03058540&name=DALE,
JOHN%20MICHAEL&race=W&vex=UYGPYIXIGBGI
>
>
> http://www.hcso.tampa.fl.us/pub/default.asp?/Online/qdisp/bn=03035679
>
>
http://www.hcso.tampa.fl.us/BookPhoto/MUGImageASP.ASP?WCI=RetrieveImage&WCE=F03035679&WCU
>
>
>
> KE4TEW wrote:
>
> Riley Hollingsworth reinstated my ticket. Are'nt you glad that he did?
>
> http://www.arrl.org/htdig/?method=and&words=ke4tew&x=8&y=12
>

3362. Re: Where Did THIS Come From...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-28 01:16:15 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0311271716.2564ee6b@posting.google.com>
Source record: 82938

brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0311270620.22701d58@posting.google.com>...
> k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0311261503.8443715@posting.google.com>...
> > Message 85 in thread
> > From: Brian (brianburke@juno.com)
> > Subject: Re: ARRL you can Kiss my $39.00 a Year Good Bye
> >
> > FROM A MISSED REPLY:
> > QUOTE:
> > View this article only
> > Newsgroups: rec.radio.amateur.policy
> > Date: 2003-09-19 11:30:16 PST
> >
> >
> > k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0309171347.183aec38@posting.google.com>...
> > > brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0309131147.2090071e@posting.google.com>...
> > > > k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
> > > > > Perhaps because the other poster didn't make a lot of assinine
> > > > > assertions that are not substantiated by facts, Brain.
> > > >
> > > > The ARS has improved since 1984. That's plain for everyone to see.
> > >
> > > Then where does all this "Ham Radio Is Going To Hell" traffic
> > > come from, Brain? Mostly from trolls, you and Lennie.
> > >
> > > > You may refer to "fact" in Websters to find out what they are,
> > > > Brain...You DO seem to have a problem with the concept.
> > > >
> > > > Not at all. As Ronald Reagan said, "Facts are stupid things."
> > >
> > > I'd expect notning less from you, Brain...You're nothing if not
> > > consistent.
> > >
> > > Thanks.
> > >
> > > Steve, K4YZ
> >
> > Steve, not my fault that Ron said it, and I liked Ron. But his quote
> > applied in your declaration that amateur radio has not improved since
> > 1984.
> >

> > That is not fact.
> >
> > UNQUOTE.
> >
> >
> > Sorry I missed this before!
> >
> > Brain, how in the WORLD did YOU come up with the assertion that
> > >>I<< said that Amateur Radio has not improved since 1984...?!?!
> >
> > You really ARE the idiot I imagined!
> >
> > Just one more mangled episode of cranial flatulence on your part,
> > Brain. I'm just sorry I missed it the first time, however it's also
> > one more example of why I take great fun in sarcastically calling you
> > "Brain".
> >
> > Hope you have a Happy Thanksgiving...And by the way, when Mrs
> > Brain says something like "It's time to carve the turkey", don't sweat
> > it...she's talking about the bird on the table...not the one sitting
> > next to her...

> Hey Steve, you are quoting ME saying that:
>
> "The ARS has improved since 1984. That's plain for everyone to see."
>
> And that's plain for everyone to see.

You're out-of-order again, but considering the day, we'll let it
slide this time.
>
> Happy Thanksgiving to you. I hope you are with your loved ones today
> and give thanks for what you have, and for the system of government
> that enables you to have it.

Having spent more than a few days protecting it myself, I should
say I do.

And I did get to spend some time at home,
thank-you...Unfortunately working in an ER is a 24/7 proposition.
Luckily it was a "slow" day.

> God bless GW Bush, Ron Reagan, and the troops deployed to hotspots the
> around the world. The world is a better place because of them and we
> cannot lose the faith.

Neat trick, GW showing up in Iraq, wasn't it? I think it's great
we FINALLY have a Commander-in-Chief that makes you proud to render
that salute again.

> I hope John Hinkley is eating institutionalized turkey cubes, canned
> gravy, and instant mashed potatos on this thanksgiving day (such as

> the meal I had in 1979), and that his parents have to come back
> tomorrow during normal visiting hours to see him.

And for many more years to come. Maybe he can share desert with
Sirhan Sirhan some day.

Steve, K4YZ

3363. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-28 01:59:09 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031127205909.08626.00001939@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 82940

In article <bq52ki$l6t@library1.airnews.net>, "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
writes:

>Hmmm, not only no, but hell no. I can be treaded on all "they" want. I've
>declared war on the road, tell ya that. I travel a good number of miles to
>work. And, it's so bad "out there" that when I do 70-75 (in a 60 zone),
>there will be creeps that pull up behind me and start this moving to the
>left so they're on the shoulder and can see the traffic around the front of
>me; or flashing their headlights so I'll move outta "their" way; or pulling
>up so close that all I see of their lights behind me is a halo because
>they're only about 2' distance from my rear bumper.

What lane are you in when they do this?

>Or, they'll do the
>ultimate stupidity and pass then pull into the spot that I have created in
>front of me so that they can start leapfrogging from one lane to the next.
>Well, used to be I'd move. No more. I sit right there. And, they still go
>around but now I creep up just ever so slightly (still maintain a safe
>distance from the vehicle in front of me) and see if they'll still dare
>slide in. Well, sometimes they do. So, since they've usually been behind
>me flashing their headlights, I'll go the lazy man's route and just leave
>mine on high beam--and I've got some bright lights.

And if an accident occurs, you'll hit them, and the judgement may be that it
was *your* fault!

I go on the "Duel" philosophy (from the old TV movie by Speilberg): I'd rather
have a nutcase driver in front of me, where I can watch him/her, than behind
me. I've actually pulled over and let 'em go by rather than have them follow
me.
>
>Then, there's the folks in the store. You'll know who I'm talking about
>here. The folks who walk up behind you and have a couple of things in their
>hands and start practically doing calisthenics (sp) to careen in front of
>you so you'll see they only have a couple of things and let them go ahead.

I haven't encountered that yet. Must be a Texas thing...

>Used to do that, too. No more. It's my turn dammit and they can wait.
>Now, don't get me wrong: if I happen to turn to one side or the other and I
>notice someone patiently waiting their turn, I let them go ahead. But these
>creeps who think that they are entitled to getting around just because they
>are far more important than anyone else...nope, not doin' it any more. And,
>depending upon how showy they are about how important they are is how slow I
>am to slowly unload my cart, slowly find my checkbook, confirm the price

>however many times it needs confirming, very carefully write my check, etc.

I use a different approach completely in stores. I call it the CQT (Cuteness Queueing Theory) method. Works like this:

Whenever you're in a store that has two or more checkout lines, choose which line to be in by how attractive/cute/sexy/whatever the checkout person is. Doesn't matter how long the line is - get in the line with the checkout person you find most attractive. For some reason, that line always seems to move the fastest.
>
>Or, the teeny-bopper eh-heh couple that thinks everyone wants to see them
>practically making love in public. If we are all in a line at a store or
>something and I see another person who is as dismayed by this as me, I'll
>say something like, "thank goodness for birth control." The other person
>will usually say something back (having just *waited* for the opportunity)
>like, "doesn't look like they use it." Or some such thing. For some
>reason, *that* is when these creeps get embarrassed.

I like that! Here's another, copied from the "Seinfeld" episode, but you have to be with your SO to do it. Simply start talking all sweet to each other (the episode had Jerry and his girlfriend calling each other "schmoopie"). Folks of our age look ancient to many kids that age, and when we behave that way it drives them nuts. Of course, it takes some discipline to keep a straight face while calling each other "Bunny" and "Huggybear" and such, plus you hafta have the right person with you to do it at all.

>Then, there's what I call the "buddy" creeps. The philosophy is to shop in
>pairs and have one stand in line while the other keeps going back and
>getting things that were "forgotten." And, the one standing in line will
>keep turning and saying please excuse us...<giggle>. I used to just throw a
>fake smile. Not any more. Now I say, "no, I won't excuse you, you are
>holding all of us up here and it's rude and inconsiderate of you."

I don't mind a thing or two, but after that it's a different story.
>
>And restaurants. Oh my goodness how many times have you been at an eatery,
>only to have some creep's misbehaving little future creep keep popping up
>over the booth seat to let out a shrill of a scream with laughter right
>behind--over and over and over again...or let the little tyrant run rampant
>while the beautiful couple (yeah right) sits and eats in peace while their
>monster runs to every table standing there like you're supposed to applaud
>them or something. I used to grin and bear that, too. Now, I get up, and
>I'll actually say something to the parents about how disruptive their
>"child" (term used loosely) is being to everyone else's table--so can I sit
>at theirs. That one there gets real sneers. Ask me if I care. They don't,
>I ain't gonna.

Fortunately I haven't run into that very much. Yet.
>
>Well, as I've been doing this more and more over the past 5-6 months or so,
>I am also noticing that there are others doing this. I don't know that it's

>always been done by others and I've just never noticed, but I notice that
>there *are* others who are doing it. I am refreshed by that. I am tired of
>always being the friendly, patient, kind one--just to keep getting stepped
>on by the creeps...
>
>Maybe we've all had it... <grin>

One can be assertive without being nasty, though.

It sure sounds like people are in one heck of a hurry down there, though...

73 de Jim, N2EY

3364. Re: It ain't about the test.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-28 01:59:11 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031127205911.08626.00001940@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 82939

In article <20031127171538.07961.00000162@mb-m03.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com
(Len Over 21) fresh from spamming the living daylights out of the ECFS system,
writes:

>In article <20031127085816.23307.00004642@mb-m29.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com
>(N2EY)
>writes:
>
>>In article <CP8xb.20782$Rk5.10687@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Kï¿½HB"
>><groupk0hb@earthlink.net> writes:
>>
>>>..... it's about the qualifications.
>>>
>>>The incessant arguments here on rrap surround the question of whether or
>not
>>>there should be a Morse TEST for access to HF.
>>>
>>>Well, that's the wrong question.
>>>
>>>The real question is whether or not you should be Morse qualified for
>access
>>>to HF.
>>>
>>>If there is no regulatory need for Morse qualification, then there is no
>>>need for Morse testing.
>>>
>>>The need for Morse qualification, as clearly stated in the 1913 radio
>>>regulations was "The applicant must be able to transmit and receive in
>>>Continental Morse, at a speed sufficient to enable him to recognize
>distress
>>>calls or the official "keep-out" signals." Since that qualification need
>>>has long since disappeared, then so has the need for the qualification
>test.
>>
>>Hans,
>>
>>If you want people to quit making fun of you, quit posting such laughable
>>reductio ad absurdum arguments.
>
> Incorrect.

Why?

> The necessity for tested demonstration of morsemanship FOR
> LICENSING of any radio operator, any radio service, has disappeared in

> the 90 years of time since 1913.

No, it hasn't.

>>That stated 1913 need for Morse code qualifications is not the only reason
>>such
>>qualifications were kept in the rules all these years. There are lots more.
>
> Not to the FCC.

Then why didn't FCC just drop Element 1 back in July, when the international
treaty requirement went away?
>
> In 1913 (or 1912) there was ONLY on-off keying of so-called CW
> RF sources.

No, that's not true at all.

Spark transmitters were not CW sources - they generated damped (modulated)
waves.

> Despite the Fessenden demonstration of 1906 on
> Christmas Eve (done with an ALTERNATOR RF source, NOT a
> "spark" transmitter),

Fessenden demonstrated voice modulated spark operation as early as 1900. His
methods have been verified by actual tests using replica transmitters and dummy
loads.

Fessenden had a two-way transatlantic radiotelephone setup in operation by
November of 1906 using alternator RF sources.

The demo of Christmas Eve 1906 was repeated a week later (New Year's Eve).

These events are well documented.

> there was no great rush for establishment
> of sound/voice transmissions.

So?

> TTY was just getting started in
> replacing landline manual telegraphy, no facsimile or other "data"
> sources.

So?

> Vacuum tubes were barely out of the laboratory after
> 5 years from invention...makers were still trying to get good QC in
> the "tube factories."

So?
>
>>The original 1913 reason for technical qualifications was to prevent
>>interference to nonamateurs caused by improper adjustment of amateur

>>transmitters.
>
> Baloney.

No, it's a fact.

> IMPROPER OPERATION, not "adjustment," and not
> just "by amateurs."

Same thing.
>
> Were there bandplans in 1913? I don't think so.

Yes, there were. See below.

> Were there any
> specific frequencies (wavelengths) assigned then for everyone in
> radio?

Yes, there were, for most stations.

> I think not, but you will no doubt explain away "how it was"
> from personal experience in 1913. :-)

I wasn't there. Neither were you. But I obviously know far more about how it was than you do, Leonard.

Do grow up a tiny bit and accept correction like a man, rather than a spoiled child who cannot bear being told he is wrong. ;-) ;-) ;-) ;-) ;-)
>
> The exile of U.S. radio amateurs to the "short waves" (shorter
> than 200 m) came AFTER World War 1, not before.

On August 17, 1912, a new radio law was signed into law by President Taft. It had been passed by the Senate on May 12 of that year and by the House on August 9.

This bill, a revision of the earlier Alexander Bill, required that:

- all transmitting stations be operated in accordance with licenses granted by the Department of Commerce (a Federal agency)

- all operators of transmitting stations be licensed

- every station designate a normal operating wavelength below 600 or above 1600 meters

- ship stations were designated 450 to 600 meters

- amateur stations use wavelengths not exceeding 200 meters, and transformer power not in excess of 1 kW

- special exceptions to the rules could be authorized by the Secretary.

The professionals of the day said that the long-distance effectiveness of waves decreased as the wavelength decreased, so the longest wavelengths were

generally assigned to the longest distance services. Amateurs were assigned the thought-to-be-worthless-for-DX wavelengths shorter than 200 meters. Most amateurs clustered on or near 200 meters because they believed the erroneous theories of the professionals.

The above is all well documented.

>>How much interference to nonamateurs is caused by improper adjustment of
>>amateur transmitters today? Reading the FCC enforcement letters, such
>>interference today seems to be more a case of intentional modification of
>>amateur equipment by a lawless few to operate on nonamateur frequencies.
>
> In 1913 there was NO Internet to contact the FCC.

So what?

How much interference to nonamateurs is caused by improper adjustment of amateur transmitters today?

> There wasn't any FCC until 1934.

So what?

There were regulatory predecessors to the FCC all the way back to 1912. They had licenses, tests, radio inspectors, callsigns, the works. The Department of Commerce performed those functions back in 1913.

> There was very little landline long-distance telephony
> to contact the three different radio regulatory agencies that existed
> between 1912 and 1934.

So what?

> "Communications" with any radio regulatory
> agency in 1913 was by surface mail...or the "telegram" (a new term
> for the mostly-manual-telegraphic message sent via landlines).

Of what import is any of this?

How much interference to nonamateurs is caused by improper adjustment of amateur transmitters today?
>
> So, in the world of today (if you can tear yourself away from the
> beloved past), HOW is a continuing requirement of a morse code test
> going to "stop" all that improper radio operation?

You obviously misunderstand what I wrote, Leonard. The adjustment/operation discussion is about the need for written tests.
>
> Answer: It won't. Improper operation isn't due to the mode. It isn't
> due to the presence or absence of a code test.

Then why do so many FCC enforcement actions against amateurs involve amateurs using voice modes, and so few against amateurs using Morse code?

The discrepancy far exceeds the difference in mode popularity.

3365. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-28 01:59:12 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031127205912.08626.00001941@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 82941

In article <uKoxb.24144$Wy4.4522@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> writes:

>"N2EY" wrote:
>>
>> Then SSB, AM, FM, RTTY, PSK-31, etc.
>> are all non-necessities. (snip)

> Absolutely. Which is exactly why there is no test of the actual ability to
>use those modes - only a written test covering the fundamentals of those
>modes and the rules associated with them.

Why is such a written test necessary? The use of any of those modes is entirely optional.

>Morse code should join those modes in that regard.

We'll have to agree to disagree on that.

>> In fact, except for the most basic of rules
>> and regulations, your argument leads to the
>> inescapable conclusion that it is not necessary
>> for the goals and purposes of the Amateur
>> Radio Service at this point to mandate *any*
>> learning through a testing requirement.
>>
>> Can you prove otherwise?
>
> What is there to prove?

Prove the necessity for a written test beyond the most basic rules and regulations.

For example, Technicians are allowed to use all authorized modes on the six meter band at up to 1500 W output. This includes all modes allowed on the HF/MF bands. Therefore, the Technician test must, by definition, be adequate to insure that those who pass it are qualified on all authorized HF/MF modes and the use of transmitters up to 1500 W output on six meters MHz.

Since the hazards of RF exposure on HF/MF are less than those on 50 MHz, and the modes authorized on HF/MF are a subset of those authorized on six, it logically follows that those who pass the Tech test are *mostly* qualified to operate HF/MF. The exceptions are those few things which are specific to HF/MF, such as propagation.

But the General and Extra writtens go far beyond HF/MF propagation in their technical material. Why is that stuff necessary?

>Isn't that exactly the intent of the license
>exams - the fundamentals of radio and electronics, safety, rules and
>regulations, and so on.

Sure. The basics. So prove why the tests must go beyond those basics.

>When it comes to Amateur Radio, the FCC is not a
>school and nobody graduates with a degree in radio or electronics when
>they're handed a ham license.

That's right.

And nobody with a degree is handed a ham license either.

>That license exams (and licenses) are simply
>entrances into the various levels of Amateur Radio - the real learning comes
>with what is done afterwards (operating, building, experimenting, reading,
>practice, and the resulting experence from any or all of that).

Sure. So what's the point of all that written testing? Why is a General
qualified to use 1500 W on 14,026 kHz but not on 14,024?

>The FCC has
>never has never purported, or even suggested, that the Amateur Radio exams,
>and resulting licenses, are anything beyond that (only a few self-important
>hams have done so).

Yet in the past there have been repeated instances where qualifed
radio-electronics people were needed on short notice and they were recruited
from the ranks of amateur radio.

If what matters is the learning that happens *after* the license is in hand,
why all the fuss about written tests?

73 de Jim, N2EY

3366. Re: It ain't about the test.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-28 05:24:15 UTC
From: Alun <alun@1stcounsel.com>
Message-ID: <Xns9441417DFAFEelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 82942

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in
news:20031127171538.07961.00000162@mb-m03.aol.com:

> In article <20031127085816.23307.00004642@mb-m29.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com
> (N2EY) writes:
>
>>In article <CP8xb.20782$Rk5.10687@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>,
>>"K HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> writes:
>>
>>>..... it's about the qualifications.
>>>
>>>The incessant arguments here on rrap surround the question of whether
>>>or not there should be a Morse TEST for access to HF.
>>>
>>>Well, that's the wrong question.
>>>
>>>The real question is whether or not you should be Morse qualified for
>>>access to HF.
>>>
>>>If there is no regulatory need for Morse qualification, then there is
>>>no need for Morse testing.
>>>
>>>The need for Morse qualification, as clearly stated in the 1913 radio
>>>regulations was "The applicant must be able to transmit and receive in
>>>Continental Morse, at a speed sufficient to enable him to recognize
>>>distress calls or the official "keep-out" signals." Since that
>>>qualification need has long since disappeared, then so has the need
>>>for the qualification test.
>>
>>Hans,
>>
>>If you want people to quit making fun of you, quit posting such
>>laughable reductio ad absurdum arguments.
>
> Incorrect. The necessity for tested demonstration of morsemanship
> FOR LICENSING of any radio operator, any radio service, has
> disappeared in the 90 years of time since 1913.
>
>>That stated 1913 need for Morse code qualifications is not the only
>>reason such qualifications were kept in the rules all these years.
>>There are lots more.
>
> Not to the FCC.

>
> In 1913 (or 1912) there was ONLY on-off keying of so-called CW
> RF sources. Despite the Fessenden demonstration of 1906 on
> Christmas Eve (done with an ALTERNATOR RF source, NOT a
> "spark" transmitter),

The alternator was driving a spark gap, so it was a spark transmitter. Not only that, but there was a circuit known before that to keep a spark gap continuously energised without using an alternator, and that had actually been used by Duddell to transmit voice, although originally invented by someone else for arc lights (much the same thing as spark tansmitters in many ways, anyway!).

Fessenden's innovation was to run the alternator at 80 kHz, i.e. well above audio. Before that, only telegraphy transmitters could use alternators, which enabled you to run kilowatts instead of just a few watts, amplifiers having yet to be invented and detectors of the day being very 'deaf'.

> there was no great rush for establishment
> of sound/voice transmissions. TTY was just getting started in
> replacing landline manual telegraphy, no facsimile or other "data"
> sources. Vacuum tubes were barely out of the laboratory after
> 5 years from invention...makers were still trying to get good QC in
> the "tube factories."
>
>>The original 1913 reason for technical qualifications was to prevent
>>interference to nonamateurs caused by improper adjustment of amateur
>>transmitters.
>
> Baloney. IMPROPER OPERATION, not "adjustment," and not
> just "by amateurs."
>
> Were there bandplans in 1913? I don't think so. Were there any
> specific frequencies (wavelengths) assigned then for everyone in
> radio? I think not, but you will no doubt explain away "how it was"
> from personal experience in 1913. :-)
>
> The exile of U.S. radio amateurs to the "short waves" (shorter
> than 200 m) came AFTER World War 1, not before.
>
>>How much interference to nonamateurs is caused by improper adjustment
>>of amateur transmitters today? Reading the FCC enforcement letters,
>>such interference today seems to be more a case of intentional
>>modification of amateur equipment by a lawless few to operate on
>>nonamateur frequencies.
>
> In 1913 there was NO Internet to contact the FCC. There wasn't any
> FCC until 1934. There was very little landline long-distance
> telephony to contact the three different radio regulatory agencies
> that existed between 1912 and 1934. "Communications" with any radio

> regulatory agency in 1913 was by surface mail...or the "telegram" (a
> new term for the mostly-manual-telegraphic message sent via
> landlines).
>
> So, in the world of today (if you can tear yourself away from the
> beloved past), HOW is a continuing requirement of a morse code test
> going to "stop" all that improper radio operation?
>
> Answer: It won't. Improper operation isn't due to the mode. It
> isn't due to the presence or absence of a code test.
>
> LHA
>

3367. Re: It ain't about the test.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-28 05:35:29 UTC
From: Alun <alun@1stcounsel.com>
Message-ID: <Xns94415FF33DEEelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 82943

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in
news:20031127205911.08626.00001940@mb-m27.aol.com:

> In article <20031127171538.07961.00000162@mb-m03.aol.com>,
> lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) fresh from spamming the living
> daylights out of the ECFS system, writes:
>
>>In article <20031127085816.23307.00004642@mb-m29.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com
>>(N2EY)
>>writes:
>>
>>>In article <CP8xb.20782$Rk5.10687@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>,
>>>"K&#65533;HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> writes:
>>>
>>>>..... it's about the qualifications.
>>>>
>>>>The incessant arguments here on rrap surround the question of whether
>>>>or not there should be a Morse TEST for access to HF.
>>>>
>>>>Well, that's the wrong question.
>>>>
>>>>The real question is whether or not you should be Morse qualified for
>>>>access to HF.
>>>>
>>>>If there is no regulatory need for Morse qualification, then there is
>>>>no need for Morse testing.
>>>>
>>>>The need for Morse qualification, as clearly stated in the 1913 radio
>>>>regulations was "The applicant must be able to transmit and receive
>>>>in Continental Morse, at a speed sufficient to enable him to
>>>>recognize distress calls or the official "keep-out" signals." Since
>>>>that qualification need has long since disappeared, then so has the
>>>>need for the qualification test.
>>>
>>>Hans,
>>>
>>>If you want people to quit making fun of you, quit posting such
>>>laughable reductio ad absurdum arguments.
>>
>> Incorrect.
>
> Why?
>

>> The necessity for tested demonstration of morsemanship FOR
>> LICENSING of any radio operator, any radio service, has disappeared
>> in the 90 years of time since 1913.
>
> No, it hasn't.
>
>>>That stated 1913 need for Morse code qualifications is not the only
>>>reason such qualifications were kept in the rules all these years.
>>>There are lots more.
>>
>> Not to the FCC.
>
> Then why didn't FCC just drop Element 1 back in July, when the
> international treaty requirement went away?
>>
>> In 1913 (or 1912) there was ONLY on-off keying of so-called CW
>> RF sources.
>
> No, that's not true at all.
>
> Spark transmitters were not CW sources - they generated damped
> (modulated) waves.
>
>> Despite the Fessenden demonstration of 1906 on
>> Christmas Eve (done with an ALTERNATOR RF source, NOT a "spark"
>> transmitter),
>
> Fessenden demonstrated voice modulated spark operation as early as
> 1900. His methods have been verified by actual tests using replica
> transmitters and dummy loads.

Fessenden transmitted voice over one mile during December 1900, possibly
on the 12th, on Cobb Island, Maryland.

>
> Fessenden had a two-way transatlantic radiotelephone setup in operation
> by November of 1906 using alternator RF sources.
>
> The demo of Christmas Eve 1906 was repeated a week later (New Year's
> Eve).
>
> These events are well documented.

As is DeForrest's later voice coverage of the New York yacht race, using a
spark transmitter of the earlier type (no alternator) but using a
regenerative detector with a triode tube. I can't remember when that took
place, although it is in several books, but the triode (audion) patent
discloses the regenerative detector and was issued in 1907, so the yacht
race must have taken place around that period.

>
>> there was no great rush for establishment of sound/voice
>> transmissions.
>
> So?
>
>> TTY was just getting started in
>> replacing landline manual telegraphy, no facsimile or other "data"
>> sources.
>
> So?
>
>> Vacuum tubes were barely out of the laboratory after
>> 5 years from invention...makers were still trying to get good QC in
>> the "tube factories."
>
> So?
>>
>>>The original 1913 reason for technical qualifications was to prevent
>>>interference to nonamateurs caused by improper adjustment of amateur
>>>transmitters.
>>
>> Baloney.
>
> No, it's a fact.
>
>> IMPROPER OPERATION, not "adjustment," and not just "by amateurs."
>
> Same thing.
>>
>> Were there bandplans in 1913? I don't think so.
>
> Yes, there were. See below.
>
>> Were there any
>> specific frequencies (wavelengths) assigned then for everyone in
>> radio?
>
> Yes, there were, for most stations.
>
>> I think not, but you will no doubt explain away "how it was" from
>> personal experience in 1913. :-)
>
> I wasn't there. Neither were you. But I obviously know far more about
> how it was than you do, Leonard.
>
> Do grow up a tiny bit and accept correction like a man, rather than a
> spoiled child who cannot bear being told he is wrong. ;-) ;-) ;-) ;-)
> ;-)
>>
>> The exile of U.S. radio amateurs to the "short waves" (shorter than

>> 200 m) came AFTER World War 1, not before.
>
> On August 17, 1912, a new radio law was signed into law by President
> Taft. It had been passed by the Senate on May 12 of that year and by
> the House on August 9.
>
> This bill, a revision of the earlier Alexander Bill, required that:
>
> - all transmitting stations be operated in accordance with licenses
> granted by the Department of Commerce (a Federal agency)
>
> - all operators of transmitting stations be licensed
>
> - every station designate a normal operating wavelength below 600 or
> above 1600 meters
>
> - ship stations were designated 450 to 600 meters
>
> - amateur stations use wavelengths not exceeding 200 meters, and
> transformer power not in excess of 1 kW
>
> - special exceptions to the rules could be authorized by the Secretary.
>
> The professionals of the day said that the long-distance effectiveness
> of waves decreased as the wavelength decreased, so the longest
> wavelengths were generally assigned to the longest distance services.
> Amateurs were assigned the thought-to-be-worthless-for-DX wavelengths
> shorter than 200 meters. Most amateurs clustered on or near 200 meters
> because they believed the erroneous theories of the professionals.
>
> The above is all well documented.
>
>>>How much interference to nonamateurs is caused by improper adjustment
>>>of amateur transmitters today? Reading the FCC enforcement letters,
>>>such interference today seems to be more a case of intentional
>>>modification of amateur equipment by a lawless few to operate on
>>>nonamateur frequencies.
>>
>> In 1913 there was NO Internet to contact the FCC.
>
> So what?
>
> How much interference to nonamateurs is caused by improper adjustment
> of amateur transmitters today?
>
>> There wasn't any FCC until 1934.
>
> So what?
>
> There were regulatory predecessors to the FCC all the way back to 1912.

> They had licenses, tests, radio inspectors, callsigns, the works. The
> Department of Commerce performed those functions back in 1913.
>
>> There was very little landline long-distance telephony
>> to contact the three different radio regulatory agencies that
>> existed between 1912 and 1934.
>
> So what?
>
>> "Communications" with any radio regulatory
>> agency in 1913 was by surface mail...or the "telegram" (a new term
>> for the mostly-manual-telegraphic message sent via landlines).
>
> Of what import is any of this?
>
> How much interference to nonamateurs is caused by improper adjustment
> of amateur transmitters today?
>>
>> So, in the world of today (if you can tear yourself away from the
>> beloved past), HOW is a continuing requirement of a morse code test
>> going to "stop" all that improper radio operation?
>
> You obviously misunderstand what I wrote, Leonard. The
> adjustment/operation discussion is about the need for written tests.
>>
>> Answer: It won't. Improper operation isn't due to the mode. It
>> isn't due to the presence or absence of a code test.
>
> Then why do so many FCC enforcement actions against amateurs involve
> amateurs using voice modes, and so few against amateurs using Morse
> code?
>
> The discrepancy far exceeds the difference in mode popularity.
>
>

3368. Re: Probably gonna catch hell for this one but..... (found them in a different newsgroup)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-28 05:36:17 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <REMOVETHISkc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <bq90ls$202dfe$1@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 82981

No problem... a little laughter is a good thing once in a while. Had to do
a little cleanup with the file, due to some F words etc.....

Ryan

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:Nxnxb.23985$Wy4.16088@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> "Ryan, KC8PMX" wrote:
> >
> > Michael Jackson Jokes
> > Q: How do you know when it's bedtime at
> > the Jackson residence?
> > A: When the big hand touches the little hand...
>
>
> Oh, my. Sick. Discusting. Horrible. Funny!! Thanks, Ryan. A copy is now
on
> my hard drive. I'm sure my wife will get a laugh out of some of them too.
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
>

3369. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-28 11:58:01 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031128065801.23307.00004689@mb-m29.aol.com>
Source record: 82944

In article <Uppxb.37403$m84.5105207@news1.news.adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo
<mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>
><snippage>
>
>> As anyone who understands formal logic knows, reductio ad absurdum is a
>valid
>> way of evaluating the validity of an assertion.
>>
>> It works like this: An assertion is analyzed by logical methods, and if the
>> result is an absurdity, the original statement must be false.
>
>Or absurd! I like to apply this logic to as much as possible in life.
>And many ideas do not fare well!

Exactly.
>
><more snippage>
>
>> Yup. And the way it's being done is a little step at a time - just like
>> other
>> requirements were eliminated. Like nonrenewable entry level licenses, tests
>> conducted by the FCC from a nonpublished test pool, experience
>> requirements, etc.

And of course there's debate as to whether the old way was better.

>>> As you are well aware, part of the FCC's Basis and Purpose of the
>>>Amateur Radio Service is an expectation of technical learning.

>> Of course. But does that mean *all* hams must be *forced* to do some, just
>> to
>> get the license? Can't technical learning stand on its own merits without a
>> Federally mandated welfare/support program?
>>
>> Part of our B&P is public service comms, but there's no requirement that
>> hams
>> learn how to do them or participate in them to get or keep a license.
>
>>>We are
>>>effectively eliminating much of the "skill" reqirements,

>> I think you mean "all"...

>>>so how hard a
>>>stretch is it to see some element of society arguing to eliminate any
>>>technical knowledge, too...?!?!

>> More important - how can those arguments be countered?
>
> IMO, the only way to counter them is to attempt a consensus of just how

>much "quality" and technical acumen is desired in a Ham.

But even that will not *prove* that the requirements for a license need to be such-and-so. For example, we can get a consensus that it's desirable for all hams to know Morse code, CPR, and the formula for inductance of a single-layer solenoid coil. Does that mean Morse code, CPR, and the formula for inductance of a single-layer solenoid coil *must* be test requirements? Of course not!

>It's what you
>and I are doing yapping about what Ham radio might become. It's what
>Hans is doing. I don't like everything he proposes, but I could live
>with it.

I like some of the things Hans proposes and dislike other things. The biggest problem I see in his proposals are the

> We have to bark about every attempt at reducing the knowledge or skills

>needed to become a Ham. We need to also guard against trying to set the
>bar too high - though I doubt that that will be much of a problem!

Some say that the bar is already too high. For example, Hans' proposal says that it's necessary and reasonable for all hams to have to pass the Extra written to stay on the air more than 10 years, but that it's *not* necessary or reasonable to require any code test at all.
>
> When a VEC group publishes what they want the ARS to become, and what
>they want is a drastic reduction in knowledge, at the same time granting
>priveliges for that reduction, we have to yell loud and strong.

I'd say we have to present strong, reasoned arguments.

> We have to realize that when we are told to shut up, it means that our
>arguments are good, and that "shut up" is the best argument the other
>side has to give.
>
Exactly. Which is perhaps the most important point of this whole exercise. Note how many times I've been told to shut up about this, called "poster boy for NTI" and other names, etc. Says a lot, doesn't it?

> We have to realize that while we may lose this fight no matter how hard

>we work at it, if we sit still and shut up, there is no doubt of the
>outcome. Entropy will take over.

Maybe it already has.
>

> We have to get those that believe that Morse code testing should go
>away to realize and admit that something must fill the vacuum created by
>its elimination.

How?

Many will say that no such vacuum is created, and there's nothing to replace. Others will say that the writtens are *harder* today than they were in the past. Etc.

>That something could be *nothing*, which results in a
>dramatic reduction in skill level.

I've been repeatedly told here that there should not be *any* skills tests for a ham license.

>They also need to realize that there
>are people out there who want even less in the way of admission
>requirements. "Nobody wants licenses just given away" or the like is a
>naive statement.

Sure. And there's also the concept of what constitutes a giveaway. Heck, the old 20 wpm/5 written test Extra has been passed by several children in their pre-teen years - how hard could it have been?

> Why? Because I could hand my wife the checkbook, turn her loose in AES
>or similar store, and after purchasing whatever the clerk reccomends,
>within a week or two she could be on the air.

Some would say "That's a good thing!"

>There really is no
>impediment too a person whose extent of rf knowledgfe is that you
>recieve by twisting the knob, and to transmit, you push the push to talk
>button. There is no technical requirement any more, at least to simply
>"get on the air". We have to generate our own requirements.

And how do you *prove* they are necessary, in a modern-day environment where even the self-proclaimed "professionals in radio" are using or will use manufactured rigs that are virtually foolproof?

73 de Jim, N2EY

3370. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-28 13:41:50 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bq7k5l$1sj@library2.airnews.net>
Source record: 82945

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:EKoxb.37079$m84.5092084@news1.news.adelphia.net...
> Kim W5TIT wrote:
>
> < a whole bunch snipped>
>
> > Well, as I've been doing this more and more over the past 5-6 months or
so,
> > I am also noticing that there are others doing this. I don't know that
it's
> > always been done by others and I've just never noticed, but I notice
that
> > there *are* others who are doing it. I am refreshed by that. I am
tired of
> > always being the friendly, patient, kind one--just to keep getting
stepped
> > on by the creeps...
>
> Well, we can all react to the world as we wish. I find that a rude
> reaction to rudity just validates all the rudity. Of course we can't be
> all well mannered all the time, but IMO, its best to try. Grace is a
> habit. And the best revenge is living well.
>
> Illegitemi non Carborundum!
>

Yeah....well, my years of Grace ain't done a damned thing to correct a
thing. So, I am tired of being "correct."

Kim W5TIT

3371. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-28 14:04:41 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bq7kka$hs9@library2.airnews.net>
Source record: 82946

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20031127205909.08626.00001939@mb-m27.aol.com...
> In article <bq52ki$l6t@library1.airnews.net>, "Kim W5TIT"
<kimscliff@yahoo.com>
> writes:
>
> >Hmmm, not only no, but hell no. I can be treaded on all "they" want.
I've
> >declared war on the road, tell ya that. I travel a good number of miles
to
> >work. And, it's so bad "out there" that when I do 70-75 (in a 60 zone),
> >there will be creeps that pull up behind me and start this moving to the
> >left so they're on the shoulder and can see the traffic around the front
of
> >me; or flashing their headlights so I'll move outta "their" way; or
pulling
> >up so close that all I see of their lights behind me is a halo because
> >they're only about 2' distance from my rear bumper.
>
> What lane are you in when they do this?
>

The far left--the "fast" lane as it is called. Funny thing is, if you mention to people at the office or wherever, that it doesn't mean the "break the speed limit lane," you ought to hear the validations for people doing just that. The argument is along the lines that this is the lane where, if someone needs to pass, speeding is legal to get around them; or, this is the lane where if the majority of drivers wants to go a little faster than the flow of traffic, they do it there! There's more validations, but that's the gist of it...!!

Note that I let you know that I am already speeding, as it is. Up to about 15 MPH over the posted speed.

> >
> >Or, they'll do the
> >ultimate stupidity and pass then pull into the spot that I have created
in
> >front of me so that they can start leapfrogging from one lane to the
next.
> >Well, used to be I'd move. No more. I sit right there. And, they still
go
> >around but now I creep up just ever so slightly (still maintain a safe
> >distance from the vehicle in front of me) and see if they'll still dare
> >slide in. Well, sometimes they do. So, since they've usually been

behind
> >me flashing their headlights, I'll go the lazy man's route and just leave
> >mine on high beam--and I've got some bright lights.
>
> And if an accident occurs, you'll hit them, and the judgement may be that
it
> was *your* fault!
>

I hope I've got enough leverage between them and me. I prefer, and usually
can manage to, approx. 6 or more carlengths in front of me. More if I can
maintain it, but that's hard.

>
> I go on the "Duel" philosophy (from the old TV movie by Speilberg): I'd
rather
> have a nutcase driver in front of me, where I can watch him/her, than
behind
> me. I've actually pulled over and let 'em go by rather than have them
follow
> me.
>

Know what happens here? If one is cautiously staying behind a fruitcake
driver, all the hurry-up-and-get-me-knowwhere nitiwits start passing like
they are the charging brigade--never taking just a moment to see what they
are pulling up on (a very dangerous situation with a driver ahead way too
close to the vehicle in front of them) or someone who's been doing a bit of
weaving; or whatever. So, depending upon the situation, letting this person
stay in front instead of taking the first opportunity to get around them,
can be more hazardous.

> >
> >Then, there's the folks in the store. You'll know who I'm talking about
> >here. The folks who walk up behind you and have a couple of things in
their
> >hands and start practically doing calisthenics (sp) to careen in front of
> >you so you'll see they only have a couple of things and let them go
ahead.
>
> I haven't encountered that yet. Must be a Texas thing...
>

Wow. Really? Maybe I just need to move. This is so commonplace down here,
you're considered the idiot if you don't let these folks get ahead.

> >
> >Used to do that, too. No more. It's my turn dammit and they can wait.
> >Now, don't get me wrong: if I happen to turn to one side or the other and
I
> >notice someone patiently waiting their turn, I let them go ahead. But
these

> >creeps who think that they are entitled to getting around just because th
ey
> >are far more important than anyone else...nope, not doin' it any more.
And,
> >depending upon how showy they are about how important they are is how
slow I
> >am to slowly unload my cart, slowly find my checkbook, confirm the price
> >however many times it needs confirming, very carefully write my check,
etc.
>
> I use a different approach completely in stores. I call it the CQT
(Cuteness
> Queueing Theory) method. Works like this:
>
> Whenever you're in a store that has two or more checkout lines, choose
which
> line to be in by how attractive/cute/sexy/whatever the checkout person is.
> Doesn't matter how long the line is - get in the line with the checkout
person
> you find most attractive. For some reason, that line always seems to move
the
> fastest.
> >

Now, Jim. Forgive me for being non-male here, but I don't generally find
myself "checking out" at the check out. <GRIN>

> >
> >Or, the teeny-bopper eh-heh couple that thinks everyone wants to see them
> >practically making love in public. If we are all in a line at a store or
> >something and I see another person who is as dismayed by this as me, I'll
> >say something like, "thank goodness for birth control." The other person
> >will usually say something back (having just *waited* for the
opportunity)
> >like, "doesn't look like they use it." Or some such thing. For some
> >reason, *that* is when these creeps get embarrassed.
>
> I like that! Here's another, copied from the "Seinfeld" episode, but you
have
> to be with your SO to do it. Simply start talking all sweet to each other
(the
> episode had Jerry and his girlfriend calling each other "schmoopie").
Folks of
> our age look ancient to many kids that age, and when we behave that way it
> drives them nuts. Of course, it takes some discipline to keep a straight
face
> while calling each other "Bunny" and "Huggybear" and such, plus you hafta
have
> the right person with you to do it at all.
>

Hey, now. I like that one!! My darlin' would never do that, though. He's still in the phase that he puts up with this stuff and then crabs about it later--the phase I used to be in. BUT, it'd be neat to get in line with one of my girlfriends and start acting gay! If I get the courage to do that, and have one of my girlfriends who'll join in, I'll have to let you know how it turns out. I love that scene in "Ghost" with (was it?) Meg Ryan simulating an orgasm at the restaraunt table! I cracked up.

> >
> >Then, there's what I call the "buddy" creeps. The philosophy is to shop in
> >pairs and have one stand in line while the other keeps going back and
> >getting things that were "forgotten." And, the one standing in line will
> >keep turning and saying please excuse us...<giggle>. I used to just throw a
> >fake smile. Not any more. Now I say, "no, I won't excuse you, you are
> >holding all of us up here and it's rude and inconsiderate of you."
>
> I don't mind a thing or two, but after that it's a different story.
>

I've gotten disgusted enough with all this crappy behavior that no one gets the benefit of the doubt anymore, either. And, it's not just me. I've talked to folks at the office and they are all the same way. In fact, we've all forgiven each other for our behavior ahead of time...;o

> >
> >And restaurants. Oh my goodness how many times have you been at an eatery,
> >only to have some creep's misbehaving little future creep keep popping up
> >over the booth seat to let out a shrill of a scream with laughter right
> >behind--over and over and over again...or let the little tyrant run rampant
> >while the beautiful couple (yeah right) sits and eats in peace while their
> >monster runs to every table standing there like you're supposed to applaud
> >them or something. I used to grin and bear that, too. Now, I get up, and
> >I'll actually say something to the parents about how disruptive their
> >"child" (term used loosely) is being to everyone else's table--so can I sit
> >at theirs. That one there gets real sneers. Ask me if I care. They don't,
> >I ain't gonna.
>
> Fortunately I haven't run into that very much. Yet.
>

Yeah, I tried to take my parents out to a very nice dinner and there was one of these kids in the "booth" (yeah, I know...a booth at a nice restaraunt, go figure) next to us. Well, this kid was directly behind my parents.

After about the 3rd or 4th time the kid kept doing this, I became the obnoxious one. I kept saying, "SIR!" over and over again until the dad, who was trying his hardest to ignore me, looked at me and I said, "could you keep your kid reigned in? We are trying to have a family dinner ourselves over here." Well, these folks were so offended that they demonstratively got up, and abruptly left. As they were walking away I thanked them. I hope they talk about that for the next 20 years.

> >
> >Well, as I've been doing this more and more over the past 5-6 months or so,
> >I am also noticing that there are others doing this. I don't know that it's
> >always been done by others and I've just never noticed, but I notice that
> >there *are* others who are doing it. I am refreshed by that. I am tired of
> >always being the friendly, patient, kind one--just to keep getting stepped
> >on by the creeps...
> >
> >Maybe we've all had it... <grin>
>
> One can be assertive without being nasty, though.
>
> It sure sounds like people are in one heck of a hurry down there, though...
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>

Yes. They are. And, while my behavior is not "forgiveable," I am no where as nasty as these folks are being.

Kim W5TIT

3372. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-28 14:07:27 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bq7kpg$vt8@library2.airnews.net>
Source record: 82947

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:HSoxb.24153$Wy4.1944@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> "Steve Robeson, K4CAP" wrote:
> >
> > As you are well aware, part of the FCC's
> > Basis and Purpose of the Amateur Radio Service
> > is an expectation of technical learning. (snip)
>
>
> Learning is part of the basis and purpose of the Amateur Radio Service,
> not the basis and purpose of the license exams. The basis and purpose of
the
> license exams is to make possible the basis and purpose of the Amateur
Radio
> Service. In other words, to bring people into the Amateur Radio Service so
> they can learn. The real learning comes after the exams in what we
actually
> do.
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
>

Wow. Good point, Dwight. Maybe that idea of a term limitation license makes more sense than ever. I haven't been in favor of it...but maybe there's a part of it I haven't thought of, such as your comment above.

Kim W5TIT

3373. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-28 14:29:49 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <xZIxb.13051$P%1.11717782@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 82948

"Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:bq7k5l$1sj@library2.airnews.net...
> "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
> news:EKoxb.37079$m84.5092084@news1.news.adelphia.net...
> > Kim W5TIT wrote:
> >
> > < a whole bunch snipped>
> >
> > > Well, as I've been doing this more and more over the past 5-6 months
or
> so,
> > > I am also noticing that there are others doing this. I don't know
that
> it's
> > > always been done by others and I've just never noticed, but I notice
> that
> > > there *are* others who are doing it. I am refreshed by that. I am
> tired of
> > > always being the friendly, patient, kind one--just to keep getting
> stepped
> > > on by the creeps...
> >
> > Well, we can all react to the world as we wish. I find that a rude
> > reaction to rudity just validates all the rudity. Of course we can't be
> > all well mannered all the time, but IMO, its best to try. Grace is a
> > habit. And the best revenge is living well.
> >
> > Illegitemi non Carborundum!
> >
>
> Yeah....well, my years of Grace ain't done a damned thing to correct a
> thing. So, I am tired of being "correct."
>
> Kim W5TIT

You cannot know that. One kind or encouraging word could have changed the
direction of someone's life and you would never know it. If even a single
person has been inspired by any word or act of mine, then I have indeed had
an impact on the world.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

3374. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-28 14:37:41 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <V4Jxb.13052$P%1.11719103@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 82949

"Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:bq7kka$hs9@library2.airnews.net...
>
> The far left--the "fast" lane as it is called. Funny thing is, if you
> mention to people at the office or wherever, that it doesn't mean the
"break
> the speed limit lane," you ought to hear the validations for people doing
> just that. The argument is along the lines that this is the lane where,
if
> someone needs to pass, speeding is legal to get around them; or, this is
the
> lane where if the majority of drivers wants to go a little faster than the
> flow of traffic, they do it there! There's more validations, but that's
the
> gist of it...!!
>
> Note that I let you know that I am already speeding, as it is. Up to
about
> 15 MPH over the posted speed.
>
>

It just goes to show the exams for a driver's license are not tough enough.

The "going over the speed limit to complete passing" applies ONLY to TWO lane highways not multi-lane highways. Some states don't even allow that. In those states, if you can't safely pass and stay within the speed limit, you aren't supposed to pass at all.

According to state laws, the speed limit is the maximum that one is supposed to drive even in the "fast lane" with the exception of passing on a TWO lane highway in some states.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

3375. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-28 17:37:21 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <lJLxb.41454$m84.5418659@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 82951

N2EY wrote:

> In article <Uppxb.37403$m84.5105207@news1.news.adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo
> <mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:
>
>
>>N2EY wrote:
>>
>><snippage>
>>
>>>As anyone who understands formal logic knows, reductio ad absurdum is a
>>
>>valid
>>
>>>way of evaluating the validity of an assertion.
>>>
>>>It works like this: An assertion is analyzed by logical methods, and if the
>>>result is an absurdity, the original statement must be false.
>>
>>Or absurd! I like to apply this logic to as much as possible in life.
>>And many ideas do not fare well!
>
>
> Exactly.
>
>><more snippage>
>>
>>>Yup. And the way it's being done is a little step at a time - just like
>>>other
>>>requirements were eliminated. Like nonrenewable entry level licenses, tests
>>>conducted by the FCC from a nonpublished test pool, experience
>>>requirements, etc.
>
>
> And of course there's debate as to whether the old way was better.
>
>
>>>> As you are well aware, part of the FCC's Basis and Purpose of the
>>>>Amateur Radio Service is an expectation of technical learning.
>
>
>
>>>Of course. But does that mean *all* hams must be *forced* to do some, just
>>>to

>>>get the license? Can't technical learning stand on its own merits without a
>>>Federally mandated welfare/support program?
>>>
>>>Part of our B&P is public service comms, but there's no requirement that
>>>hams
>>>learn how to do them or participate in them to get or keep a license.
>>
>>>>We are
>>>>effectively eliminating much of the "skill" reqirements,
>
>
>>>I think you mean "all"...
>
>
>
>>>>so how hard a
>>>>stretch is it to see some element of society arguing to eliminate any
>>>>technical knowledge, too...?!?!
>
>
>
>>>More important - how can those arguments be countered?
>>
>> IMO, the only way to counter them is to attempt a consensus of just how
>
>
>>much "quality" and technical acumen is desired in a Ham.
>
>
> But even that will not *prove* that the requirements for a license need to be
> such-and-so. For example, we can get a consensus that it's desirable for all
> hams to know Morse code, CPR, and the formula for inductance of a single-layer
> solenoid coil. Does that mean Morse code, CPR, and the formula for inductance
> of a single-layer solenoid coil *must* be test requirements? Of course not!

Glad you brought that up! Article 25, paragraph 6 refers to
administrators verifying operational and technical qualifications. It
refers to "guidance" that can be taken from Recommendation ITU-R-M.1544.
Ouch! "Guidance and "Reccomendations"? What have we here? That
administrations can bend the rules as they wish, with W1AW making
broadcasts, (which I support, BTW) third party operations between
schoolkids and the International space station, just to name a few. So
if they can bend rules, imagine their needed reaction to "guidelines".

I'm saying that the framework for NTI is in place, and no treaty changes
are needed. Maybe that deregulation argument I brough up the other day
isn't so far fetched after all.

>>It's what you
>>and I are doing yapping about what Ham radio might become. It's what
>>Hans is doing. I don't like everything he proposes, but I could live

>>with it.
>
>
> I like some of the things Hans proposes and dislike other things. The biggest
> problem I see in his proposals are the

Misssd something there Jim! 8^)

>
>> We have to bark about every attempt at reducing the knowledge or skills
>>needed to become a Ham. We need to also guard against trying to set the
>>bar too high - though I doubt that that will be much of a problem!
>
>
> Some say that the bar is already too high. For example, Hans' proposal says
> that it's necessary and reasonable for all hams to have to pass the Extra
> written to stay on the air more than 10 years, but that it's *not* necessary or
> reasonable to require any code test at all.

>> When a VEC group publishes what they want the ARS to become, and what
>>they want is a drastic reduction in knowledge, at the same time granting
>>priveliges for that reduction, we have to yell loud and strong.
>
>
> I'd say we have to present strong, reasoned arguments.

Sure, strong, well reasoned, loud and strong. 8^)
>
>> We have to realize that when we are told to shut up, it means that our
>>arguments are good, and that "shut up" is the best argument the other
>>side has to give.
>>
>
> Exactly. Which is perhaps the most important point of this whole exercise. Note
> how many times I've been told to shut up about this, called "poster boy for
> NTI" and other names, etc. Says a lot, doesn't it?

Classic blame the messenger.

>> We have to realize that while we may lose this fight no matter how hard
>>we work at it, if we sit still and shut up, there is no doubt of the
>>outcome. Entropy will take over.
>
>
> Maybe it already has.
>
>> We have to get those that believe that Morse code testing should go
>>away to realize and admit that something must fill the vacuum created by
>>its elimination.
>
>
> How?

>
> Many will say that no such vacuum is created, and there's nothing to replace.
> Others will say that the writtens are *harder* today than they were in the
> past. Etc.
>
>
>>That something could be *nothing*, which results in a
>>dramatic reduction in skill level.
>
>
> I've been repeatedly told here that there should not be *any* skills tests for
> a ham license.
>
>
>>They also need to realize that there
>>are people out there who want even less in the way of admission
>>requirements. "Nobody wants licenses just given away" or the like is a
>>naive statement.
>
>
> Sure. And there's also the concept of what constitutes a giveaway. Heck, the
> old 20 wpm/5 written test Extra has been passed by several children in their
> pre-teen years - how hard could it have been?

All I can say is that I studied over 6 months to get to 5 wpm. I have
been working now for the past 4 months to get my speed up. I've tried
several different methods, and am just now getting to the point where I
can pick out some of the words on the air. at least an hour a day, seven
days a week doing both computer and on the air, and I still suck. The
only thing that keeps me working at it is the personal challenge.

So while I am happy for those children that have learned 20 wpm Morse,
I have to say that it just ain't the same for everybody. If those rules
from long ago were still in effect, I'd probably have to have a
different hobby! My Novice ticket would run out, and that would be it.

>
>> Why? Because I could hand my wife the checkbook, turn her loose in AES
>>or similar store, and after purchasing whatever the clerk reccomends,
>>within a week or two she could be on the air.
>
>
> Some would say "That's a good thing!"

HAH! Some hobby!

- Mike KB3EIA -

3376. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-28 17:37:28 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0311280937.3bee1cab@posting.google.com>
Source record: 82950

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20031127171536.07961.00000160@mb-m03.aol.com>...
> In article <Uppxb.37403$m84.5105207@news1.news.adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo
> <mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:

> >Or absurd! I like to apply this logic to as much as possible in life.
> >And many ideas do not fare well!
>
> You WANT absurdity?

We HAVE "absurdity", Lennie...

Just look up ANYTHING posted by "Lenover21", "Lenof21", "NoCWTest"
(the old one), "Avery Fineman", etc etc etc.

> DOS tip: The FCC determines what it requires in licensing of radio
> operators, NOT the "amateur community" or the "communities" of
> any other radio service that require radio operators.

The FCC determines what is required for licensing AFTER it asks
the public what it thinks. The FCC is not allowed, by law, to
arbitrarily make those determinations.

> You can always petiiton the FCC for a complete change in scope and
> description of U.S. amateur radio. I'd suggest you change the name to
> "Archaic Radiotelegraphy Service" for below-30-MHz. Make morse the
> prime definition of HF amateur radio.

Why?

You continue to make this assinine assertion, Your Scumbagginess,
howevr posts from even the most staunch of CW supportes indicates that
none of them are SOLELY CW operators. Even Larry Roll, who probably
IS the most staunch supporter, has discussed other digital mods at
length.

Your suggestion is therefore an antagonistic swipe at Amateur
Radio and yet another attempt to villify something you cannot or will
not understand.

Considering your alleged and proclaimed "professional" history in
"radio", this is illogical.

> Don't try to rationalize a weak argument of yours as "more noble, logical,
> in the best interests of the service," etc., etc. by feigning outrage at
> "improper acts of others."

Lennie, you should be the LAST person in this forum to insist
someone else "stop rationalizing" ANYthing...you ahve yet to make one
valid argument as to why Morse Code testing should be deleted other
than "no one else does it"...

> Don't worry, 981 commenters on RM-10811 (largest number of respondents
> of the 14 petitions) have been busy stating things in public.

And those 981 commenters have probably had more of an impact on
Amateur Radio than ALL of your ranting in here, Lennie.

> > We have to get those that believe that Morse code testing should go
> >away to realize and admit that something must fill the vacuum created by
> >its elimination.
>
> WHY?
>
> You are just about to fall over the edge of the "I had to do it so everyone
> else has to do it in the future" non-argument.

Again, YOU keep insisting on this "argument", Lennie, yet I've
not seen a single person utter that sentiment.

Why do YOU keep insisting on it when it's a non-argument?

> >That something could be *nothing*, which results in a
> >dramatic reduction in skill level.
>
> "Dramatic?!?!?" Only if you are a morseman is such a thing "dramatic."

The second-most used method of international communications IS
dramatic, Lennie. It is the only other real-time mode Amateurs can
use that allow persons of disimilar (sp?) languages to communicate,
even on a very basic level.

> :-)

Laugh at yourself, Lennie...We're certainly laughing at you.

> >They also need to realize that there
> >are people out there who want even less in the way of admission
> >requirements. "Nobody wants licenses just given away" or the like is a
> >naive statement.
>
> Translation: You had to do something but if others in the future
> don't do as you did, they are getting something "free?"

Yet another statement against adequate testing requirements,
technical, operational, or otherwise.

> > Why? Because I could hand my wife the checkbook, turn her loose in AES
> >or similar store, and after purchasing whatever the clerk reccomends,
> >within a week or two she could be on the air. There really is no
> >impediment too a person whose extent of rf knowledgfe is that you
> >recieve by twisting the knob, and to transmit, you push the push to talk

> >button. There is no technical requirement any more, at least to simply
> >"get on the air". We have to generate our own requirements.
>
> Okay, begin with some fundamentals:
>
> 1. A radio boot camp where all "novices" have to learn to take
> orders from their "superior" license class holders, march in
> ranks to beep music determined by long-ago-dead-amateurs,
> know vacuum tube lore by heart, learn how to memorize all
> the radio ads in QST and desire each item.

Sheesh...here we are with the "march in ranks" crap again.

I bet Mrs. Lennie has one of those Nazi sex-slave outfits like
Madelin Kahn wore in "High Anxiety", huh Lennie...???

> 2. Swear an oath of allegiance to amateur radio and the
> constitution of the ARRL, salute each vertical diamond logo
> as it passes in front of your eyes. Loyalty, fraternity, etc.

You do have a thing for "swearing" about or over things, don't
you.

> 3. Wear cute little radio uniforms when operating, have shiny
> radio shields in a special holder giving you "authority"
> anyplace. Uniforms are a good place to show RANK and
> TIME IN GRADE while "in the (radio) service."

Digging yourself into the "scumbag" hole, Lennie.

> 4. Demand immediate obeyance by all "civilians" not in your
> "service" as superior in the radio arts. Reject all those
> who do not think as you do. Remember that the First
> Amendment of the United States Constitution does NOT
> apply to citizens on amateur radio matters...unless said
> citizen is licensed in amateur radio.

The First Amendment applies to the Government enacting laws
against free speech in the press...NOT citizens.

So much for all that night school you are alleged to have taken.

> 5. Petition the FCC for an immediate change of the HF amateur
> radio service to "Archaic Radiotelegraphy Service," or perhaps
> "Archaic Radiotelegraphy Society." That way you can keep
> the beloved code test and force all in the future to do exactly
> as you had to do.

Discussed above, and still as irrelevent as then too...

> 6. Always remember that YOUR efforts in getting that amateur
> license were so awesome, overpowering, enobling that the
> individual efforts of mere "civilians" not into amateur radio
> are forever poor and puny by comparison.

As compared to what tests YOU have taken in the Amateur Radio Service, Lennie...?!?!

> 7. Amateurs RULE. Professionals must obey the amateurs.

Nope...as you pointed out, the FCC RULES...And EVERYONE must obey. Too bad you haven't gotten this figured out yet Lennie.

> LHA

(L)ying (H)am-baiting (A)ntagonist

I like "PUTZ" better...it's so "you"...

Steve, K4YZ

3377. Re: Where Did THIS Come From...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-28 21:04:55 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hp2nho7.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>
Source record: 82952

On 27 Nov 2003 17:16:15 -0800, Steve Robeson, K4CAP wrote:

> Neat trick, GW showing up in Iraq, wasn't it?

"There's no business like show business....."

How much did that little stunt cost in planning and expenses for aircraft operation, fuel, overtime, adrenaline and breath-holding for the military and civilian personnel who have to protect him and his followers whatever sensible or nonsensical things that they do?

Resources that could have been applied to newer and better equipment for our troops "over there" and for veterans' care, for instance? Not to mention the needs of the civilian population within our country.

Or to just plain getting our business done there in a more expedential manner and bringing our folks back home in one piece.

Happy Holiday to all.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

3378. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-28 22:04:28 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031128170428.22081.00002174@mb-m17.aol.com>
Source record: 82953

In article <20031127205912.08626.00001941@mb-m27.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
writes:

>In article <uKoxb.24144$Wy4.4522@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dwight
>Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> writes:
>
>>"N2EY" wrote:
>>>
>>> Then SSB, AM, FM, RTTY, PSK-31, etc.
>>> are all non-necessities. (snip)
>
>> Absolutely. Which is exactly why there is no test of the actual ability to
>>use those modes - only a written test covering the fundamentals of those
>>modes and the rules associated with them.
>
>Why is such a written test necessary? The use of any of those modes is
>entirely optional.

Tsk, tsk, tsk. Circularity. USE of morse code is ALSO optional
yet the manual, "receive-by-ear" code test remains.

You are trying to have it both ways and knot yourself up...

>>Morse code should join those modes in that regard.
>
>We'll have to agree to disagree on that.

Amazing for you to admit that. :-)

>>The FCC has
>>never has never purported, or even suggested, that the Amateur Radio exams,
>>and resulting licenses, are anything beyond that (only a few self-important
>>hams have done so).
>
>Yet in the past there have been repeated instances where qualifed
>radio-electronics people were needed on short notice and they were recruited
>from the ranks of amateur radio.

Time today is NOT the "past" and the rest of the radio world has
advanced beyond hanging a carbon microphone in an antenna
lead and saying it is a "voice transmitter." :-)

>If what matters is the learning that happens *after* the license is in hand,
>why all the fuss about written tests?

Tsk, tsk, tsk...back to the circularity again (you are going around in
circles vainly trying to "prove you are right" and you aren't...).

The FCC determines what THEY need in ANY radio operator license or station license. The "amateur community" doesn't license anyone. U.S. radio amateurs are still free to make their desires known to the Commission...as are any U.S. citizens, licensed or not, in any civil radio service.

Amateur radio licensing is just a regulatory tool of the FCC. It isn't some kind of certificate of achievement like a degree, diploma, etc. Neither is it some "pass" into a New Lifestyle. It is nothing more than a permission to legally operate by certain allocated modes in certain allocated frequency bands. Your "lifestyle" commentary is just your own, not some divine dictate of morals or ethics in an avocation. If you want to live, breathe, give over your life to amateurism, that is your personal choice and yours alone. You have NO "right" to determine what others "should" enjoy or disagree...despite an insistence that you wish to dictate.

The FCC makes on-off keying CW mode OPTIONAL to U.S. radio amateurs. Yet the morse code test remains a NON-option for any amateur license class having below-30-MHz transmitting privileges. That is logically incompatible.

If the morse code test "must" stay, then the optionality of on-off keying morse code mode should be removed. If the option of using on-off keying remains, the morse code test should be removed.

To paraphrase Apollo 13 Flight Director Gene Kranz, "Option is not a failure."

LHA

3379. Re: It ain't about the test.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-28 22:04:30 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031128170430.22081.00002175@mb-m17.aol.com>
Source record: 82954

In article <Xns9441417DFAFEelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun
<alun@1stcounsel.com> writes:

>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in
>news:20031127171538.07961.00000162@mb-m03.aol.com:
>
>> In article <20031127085816.23307.00004642@mb-m29.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com
>> (N2EY) writes:
>>
>>>In article <CP8xb.20782$Rk5.10687@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>,
>>>"Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> writes:
>>>
>>>>..... it's about the qualifications.
>>>>
>>>>The incessant arguments here on rrap surround the question of whether
>>>>or not there should be a Morse TEST for access to HF.
>>>>
>>>>Well, that's the wrong question.
>>>>
>>>>The real question is whether or not you should be Morse qualified for
>>>>access to HF.
>>>>
>>>>If there is no regulatory need for Morse qualification, then there is
>>>>no need for Morse testing.
>>>>
>>>>The need for Morse qualification, as clearly stated in the 1913 radio
>>>>regulations was "The applicant must be able to transmit and receive in
>>>>Continental Morse, at a speed sufficient to enable him to recognize
>>>>distress calls or the official "keep-out" signals." Since that
>>>>qualification need has long since disappeared, then so has the need
>>>>for the qualification test.
>>>
>>>Hans,
>>>
>>>If you want people to quit making fun of you, quit posting such
>>>laughable reductio ad absurdum arguments.
>>
>> Incorrect. The necessity for tested demonstration of morsemanship
>> FOR LICENSING of any radio operator, any radio service, has
>> disappeared in the 90 years of time since 1913.
>>
>>That stated 1913 need for Morse code qualifications is not the only
>>reason such qualifications were kept in the rules all these years.
>>There are lots more.

>>
>> Not to the FCC.
>>
>> In 1913 (or 1912) there was ONLY on-off keying of so-called CW
>> RF sources. Despite the Fessenden demonstration of 1906 on
>> Christmas Eve (done with an ALTERNATOR RF source, NOT a
>> "spark" transmitter),
>
>The alternator was driving a spark gap, so it was a spark transmitter. Not
>only that, but there was a circuit known before that to keep a spark gap
>continuously energised without using an alternator, and that had actually
>been used by Duddell to transmit voice, although originally invented by
>someone else for arc lights (much the same thing as spark tansmitters in
>many ways, anyway!).

The Thomas H. White "Early Radio History" pages on the Internet
give the details on Fessenden's audio experiments and includes
several photographs. [I've given the website address in here]

The carbon-arc lamp was not a Fessenden innovation nor is it related
to "radio." :-)

>Fessenden's innovation was to run the alternator at 80 kHz, i.e. well
>above audio. Before that, only telegraphy transmitters could use
>alternators, which enabled you to run kilowatts instead of just a few
>watts, amplifiers having yet to be invented and detectors of the day being
>very 'deaf'.

From what I can see in the history, Reginald Fessenden's only
"innovation" was to connect a specially-designed carbon
microphone in series with the LF transmitter's antenna lead and
then say it was a "voice and music transmitter." :-)

Let's just say that the great voice broadcast of 1906 was
PRIMITIVE insofar as technology was concerned. :-)

Even if the early radio receivers were also of low sensitivity, they
could receive AM. Most of the radio amateur's spark transmitters
of those pre-WW1 times used arc repetition rates of less than a
KiloHertz and were therefore distinguishable from atmospheric
noise...they were, essentially, AM detectors.

There isn't any recorded radio industry history of any rush to get
into radio broadcasting by the Fessenden "AM" of 1900 through
into the post-WW1 period, regardless of the high-tech of those
times. Broadcasting would have to wait for improvement of the
vacuum tube...and broadcasting was the driving industry of radio
development up to 1920 or so. Voice and music broadcasting,
not by morse code. :-) ...and not by having high-heat mikes
sitting in antenna leads series modulating the amplitude of the
transmitters... :-) :-) :-) :-)

The deliberate misdirection of a few regulars in here is to get well away from the subject of morse code and any test requirement. The nit-picking on the type/kind of Fessenden AM transmitter is one thing and those regulars distort recorded historical information on voice transmission. One even goes so far to introduce cellular telephones with the insistence that "turning on a cell phone handset automatically establishes contact with the nearest cell site" which it does NOT. Such is misdirection from the difference between the power-on control with the actual call/transmit control on the handset. Such things result in lots of "angry" words of denunciation occupying lots of time NOT about the code test.

The claim that proficiency in morse code results in "more ethical, more polite radio operators" is another one of the misdirections, along with all the other pre-WW2 mythos and fairystories about morse code pervading the psyches of devout morsemen. :-)

Happy holidays, Alun,
LHA

3380. Re: Where Did THIS Come From...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-28 22:21:32 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <MTPxb.27718$Wy4.3604@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 82955

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:cuvyxnansvbet.hp2nho7.pminews@netnews.comcast.net...
> On 27 Nov 2003 17:16:15 -0800, Steve Robeson, K4CAP wrote:
>
> > Neat trick, GW showing up in Iraq, wasn't it?
>
> "There's no business like show business....."
>
> How much did that little stunt cost in planning and expenses for
> aircraft operation, fuel, overtime, adrenaline and breath-holding
> for the military and civilian personnel who have to protect him and
> his followers whatever sensible or nonsensical things that they do?
>
> Resources that could have been applied to newer and better equipment
> for our troops "over there" and for veterans' care, for instance? Not
> to mention the needs of the civilian population within our country.
>
> Or to just plain getting our business done there in a more
> expedential manner and bringing our folks back home in one piece.
>
> Happy Holiday to all.
>
> --
> 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane
>
>

I think it was a hell of a good thing to do. It showed the ragheads he has
the gonads, and is willing to put it out in front.

It looked to me the troopers were quite impressed. Which is a good thing.
Moral is a very fragile thing, and when it starts to crumble...it all falls
apart.

But then that is what some people want in this country. Good to see the
comander in chief isn't one of them.

Dan/W4NTI

3381. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-28 22:24:31 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <zWPxb.25206$Rk5.20882@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 82956

"Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote

> A Corvair?!!??!! And you say chicks dug it??!!?? Ewww, I have never
liked
> those cars--they are my number one pick of yuckos, right behind Studebaker
> which is the number one uglymobile... Most of us "chicks" in my hometown
> felt the same way about those two makes of vehicles.

Red 1962 Corvair Spyder convertible, white top, white interior! It was a
chick magnet, but paled alongside my cousins Studebaker Avanti! Discerning
chicks flocked all over that beauty!

Chicks in your hometown musta been kinda automotively backwards..... maybe
they liked Nash tanks in which the seats relined all the way to horizontal?

73, de Hans, K0HB

3382. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-28 22:42:33 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <tbQxb.27752$Wy4.9150@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 82957

"Kim W5TIT" wrote:
>
> Maybe we've all had it... <grin>

Well, did you get it all out of your system? Is there anyone else you
missed? :-)

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3383. Re: It ain't about the test.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-28 22:45:20 UTC
From: Alun <alun@1stcounsel.com>
Message-ID: <Xns9441B499DF3elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 82958

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in
news:20031128170430.22081.00002175@mb-m17.aol.com:

> In article <Xns9441417DFAFEelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun
> <alun@1stcounsel.com> writes:
>
>>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in
>>news:20031127171538.07961.00000162@mb-m03.aol.com:
>>
>>> In article <20031127085816.23307.00004642@mb-m29.aol.com>,
>>> n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) writes:
>>>
>>>>In article <CP8xb.20782$Rk5.10687@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>,
>>>>"K HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> writes:
>>>>
>>>>..... it's about the qualifications.
>>>>
>>>>The incessant arguments here on rrap surround the question of
>>>>whether or not there should be a Morse TEST for access to HF.
>>>>
>>>>Well, that's the wrong question.
>>>>
>>>>The real question is whether or not you should be Morse qualified
>>>>for access to HF.
>>>>
>>>>If there is no regulatory need for Morse qualification, then there
>>>>is no need for Morse testing.
>>>>
>>>>The need for Morse qualification, as clearly stated in the 1913
>>>>radio regulations was "The applicant must be able to transmit and
>>>>receive in Continental Morse, at a speed sufficient to enable him to
>>>>recognize distress calls or the official "keep-out" signals." Since
>>>>that qualification need has long since disappeared, then so has the
>>>>need for the qualification test.
>>>>
>>>>Hans,
>>>>
>>>>If you want people to quit making fun of you, quit posting such
>>>>laughable reductio ad absurdum arguments.
>>>
>>> Incorrect. The necessity for tested demonstration of morsemanship
>>> FOR LICENSING of any radio operator, any radio service, has
>>> disappeared in the 90 years of time since 1913.

>>>
>>>>That stated 1913 need for Morse code qualifications is not the only
>>>>reason such qualifications were kept in the rules all these years.
>>>>There are lots more.
>>>
>>> Not to the FCC.
>>>
>>> In 1913 (or 1912) there was ONLY on-off keying of so-called CW
>>> RF sources. Despite the Fessenden demonstration of 1906 on
>>> Christmas Eve (done with an ALTERNATOR RF source, NOT a "spark"
>>> transmitter),
>>
>>The alternator was driving a spark gap, so it was a spark transmitter.
>>Not only that, but there was a circuit known before that to keep a
>>spark gap continuously energised without using an alternator, and that
>>had actually been used by Duddell to transmit voice, although
>>originally invented by someone else for arc lights (much the same thing
>>as spark tansmitters in many ways, anyway!).
>
> The Thomas H. White "Early Radio History" pages on the Internet
> give the details on Fessenden's audio experiments and includes
> several photographs. [I've given the website address in here]
>
> The carbon-arc lamp was not a Fessenden innovation nor is it related
> to "radio." :-)
>

Try reading what I actually said a bit more carefully, Len. What I said was that a previous circuit was known that was borrowed from arc lamp technology, which enabled a spark to be continuous, in turn allowing 'phone to be transmitted by spark. This was done by Prof Duddell, FRS, and pre-dated Fessenden's 1900 experiment. I did not say that Fessenden used this system in this experiment, but it is known that he was familiar with it.

The cutting edge state of the art for telegraphy at the time was to excite a spark gap with an alternator, which allowed a large power output (kW) in those days before amplifiers. Spark phone was known, as per Duddell's system, but if you tried to use an alternator the problem was that the output frequency of any normal alternator was in the audible range, and constiuted a whine drowning out your voice, whereas in telegraphy it just gave each station's dits and dahs a distinctive tone.

Fessenden overcame this problem by having special high frequency alternators built to order by Poulsen, who was also considered to be a major figure in the early days of radio.

>>Fessenden's innovation was to run the alternator at 80 kHz, i.e. well
>>above audio. Before that, only telegraphy transmitters could use
>>alternators, which enabled you to run kilowatts instead of just a few
>>watts, amplifiers having yet to be invented and detectors of the day

>>being very 'deaf'.
>
> From what I can see in the history, Reginald Fessenden's only
> "innovation" was to connect a specially-designed carbon
> microphone in series with the LF transmitter's antenna lead and
> then say it was a "voice and music transmitter." :-)
>

I'm afraid you are completely mistaken. This is a subject that I have researched quite a bit. There is a very old book by someone called Laughter that goes into a great deal of detail, and another informative work by Fleming, who just happens to also be the inventor of the vacuum tube. I have photocopied the relevant parts of both books. Neither are these my sole sources. Fessenden patented exactly this same system, and as I am a patent agent, it should not surprise you that I have read the patent. I have also read through the archives kept in the house where the experiments took place, and have discussed it all at length on the air with Bob Jeter, AG3B, a resident of the island. I do, in fact, live in the same county myself, so it is local history.

> Let's just say that the great voice broadcast of 1906 was
> PRIMITIVE insofar as technology was concerned. :-)
>
> Even if the early radio receivers were also of low sensitivity, they
> could receive AM. Most of the radio amateur's spark transmitters
> of those pre-WW1 times used arc repetition rates of less than a
> KiloHertz and were therefore distinguishable from atmospheric
> noise...they were, essentially, AM detectors.
>
> There isn't any recorded radio industry history of any rush to get
> into radio broadcasting by the Fessenden "AM" of 1900 through
> into the post-WW1 period, regardless of the high-tech of those
> times. Broadcasting would have to wait for improvement of the
> vacuum tube...and broadcasting was the driving industry of radio
> development up to 1920 or so. Voice and music broadcasting,
> not by morse code. :-) ...and not by having high-heat mikes
> sitting in antenna leads series modulating the amplitude of the
> transmitters... :-) :-) :-) :-)
>
> --------
>
> The deliberate misdirection of a few regulars in here is to get well
> away from the subject of morse code and any test requirement.

I am against code testing, as you ought to know by now. I am just pointing out that you have an erroneous understanding of Fessenden's work.

> The nit-picking on the type/kind of Fessenden AM transmitter is one
> thing and those regulars distort recorded historical information on
> voice transmission.

If you post something inaccurate on Usenet, nitpicking will follow like night follows day. That's the way it is.

> One even goes so far to introduce cellular
> telephones with the insistence that "turning on a cell phone handset
> automatically establishes contact with the nearest cell site" which
> it does NOT. Such is misdirection from the difference between the
> power-on control with the actual call/transmit control on the
> handset. Such things result in lots of "angry" words of denunciation
> occupying lots of time NOT about the code test.
>
> The claim that proficiency in morse code results in "more ethical,
> more polite radio operators" is another one of the misdirections,
> along with all the other pre-WW2 mythos and fairystories about morse
> code pervading the psyches of devout morsemen. :-)
>
> Happy holidays, Alun,
> LHA
>
>

3384. Re: Where Did THIS Come From...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-28 22:52:22 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <GkQxb.25230$Rk5.12231@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 82959

"Steve Robeson, K4CAP" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote

> I think it's great we FINALLY have a Commander-in-Chief
> that makes you proud to render that salute again.

Speak for yourself. Dubya is an idiot. John McCain should be
Commander-in-Chief.

73, Hans, K0HB

3385. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-28 23:04:50 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0311281504.3c3f5279@posting.google.com>
Source record: 82960

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20031127171534.07961.00000159@mb-m03.aol.com>...

> So, "real" radio operating experience can ONLY be done in
> AMATEUR radio?

No...But AMATEUR RADIO OPERATING can only be learned by practical
experience in the AMATEUR RADIO service. I can TELL you what othes
"say" about being a maritime operator, etc, but without that bit of
on-hands experience, it's just a story being re-told...

Kinda like YOUR posts on just about everything from Amateur
Radio, to aerial navigation, to child rearing, Lennie.

Ya PUTZ.

Steve, K4YZ

3386. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-28 23:17:26 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <aIQxb.27770$Wy4.13312@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 82961

"Dee D. Flint" wrote:
> "Kim W5TIT" writes:
> >
> > The far left--the "fast" lane as it is called. Funny
> > thing is, if you mention to people at the office or
> > wherever, that it doesn't mean the "break the
> > speed limit lane," you ought to hear the validations
> > for people doing just that. The argument is along
> > the lines that this is the lane where, if someone
> > needs to pass, speeding is legal to get around
> > them; or, this is the lane where if the majority of
> > drivers wants to go a little faster than the flow of
> > traffic, they do it there! (snip)
>
>
> It just goes to show the exams for a driver's license
> are not tough enough.
>
> The "going over the speed limit to complete passing"
> applies ONLY to TWO lane highways not multi-lane
> highways. Some states don't even allow that. In
> those states, if you can't safely pass and stay within
> the speed limit, you aren't supposed to pass at all.
>
> According to state laws, the speed limit is the
> maximum that one is supposed to drive even in the
> "fast lane" with the exception of passing on a TWO
> lane highway in some states.

However, in most states, the laws also say slower traffic on multi-lane highways must move to the right lane to allow others to pass. There are usually no exceptions to those laws, such as not moving over for speeders. It is law enforcement's job to enforce the speed limits, not other drivers. Vehicles impeding other traffic, causing traffic jams and others to take risks to pass the slower vehicle, is a very common cause of accidents on multi-lane highways.

In Europe, it's routine to see maximum and minimum speed limits for each lane of a multi-lane highway. In some countries, you can often get a ticket faster for going too slow rather than too fast. They also have the requirement to move to the right to allow faster vehicles to pass. The general idea of all this is to prevent accidents by keeping traffic in each lane flowing smoothly, without excessive congestions (crowding) behind slower moving vehicles.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3387. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-28 23:37:57 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0311281537.1a98f8c8@posting.google.com>
Source record: 82962

"Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:<bq7kpg$vt8@library2.airnews.net>...
> "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
> news:HSoxb.24153$Wy4.1944@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> > "Steve Robeson, K4CAP" wrote:
> > >
> > > As you are well aware, part of the FCC's
> > > Basis and Purpose of the Amateur Radio Service
> > > is an expectation of technical learning. (snip)
> > >
> > Learning is part of the basis and purpose of the Amateur Radio Service,
> > not the basis and purpose of the license exams. The basis and purpose of
> the
> > license exams is to make possible the basis and purpose of the Amateur
> Radio
> > Service. In other words, to bring people into the Amateur Radio Service so
> > they can learn. The real learning comes after the exams in what we
> actually
> > do.
> >
> > Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> Wow. Good point, Dwight. Maybe that idea of a term limitation license
> makes more sense than ever. I haven't been in favor of it...but maybe
> there's a part of it I haven't thought of, such as your comment above.
>
> Kim W5TIT

This is where some of the OF's say that all learning must occur prior
to the exam. Basically, nothing more can be learned after the Extra
exam. Except when they "earned" thir commercial licenses. Except
when Len brings up his commercial experience.

See what I mean?

I'm not buying it - never have.

3388. Re: Where Did THIS Come From...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-28 23:44:09 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hp2xgj1.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>
Source record: 82963

On Fri, 28 Nov 2003 22:21:32 GMT, Dan/W4NTI wrote:

>I think it was a hell of a good thing to do. It showed the ragheads he has
>the gonads, and is willing to put it out in front.

There are better ways to show the Habibi that we can kick the
charra out of them, such as by doing it. My people did it in '67
(MY war). Surely the US - the biggest army in the world - can do it
if the politicians get out of the way.

>It looked to me the troopers were quite impressed. Which is a good thing.
>Moral is a very fragile thing, and when it starts to crumble...it all falls
>apart.

"There's no business like show business....."

One of the members of our congregation is a National Guard
infantryman who is back home this weekend for a two-week R&R
between eight month tours over in the Middle East (iraq and Kuwait).
He was very clear - the stunt didn't impress him at all.

Getting the job done and coming home in one piece is what impresses
him.

>But then that is what some people want in this country.

Lowest Common Denominator. That, more than anything else, will
wreck this country.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

From a Clearing in the Silicon Forest
Beaverton (Washington County) Oregon

3389. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-28 23:48:34 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <m9Rxb.27796$Wy4.3058@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 82964

"Dee D. Flint" wrote:
>
> My response was to your statement that
> code itself was unnecessary and I made
> that clear that I was addressing that issue
> only. (snip)

But my entire message, including the argument in that sentence, was about the code test. However, within that context, it is indeed true that Morse code is not "necessary" for Amateur Radio today. The key word is "necessary," not enjoyable, not great recreation, not useful to make contacts with friends when conditions are bad, or whatever. Necessary. And, therefore, if Morse code is not uniquely necessary, it should join the other modes on the written tests without a unique testing requirement.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3390. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-29 00:26:51 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bq8p5e$t39@library2.airnews.net>
Source record: 82965

"K&#65533;HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:zWPxb.25206$Rk5.20882@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
>
>
> "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote
>
> > A Corvair?!!??!! And you say chicks dug it??!!?? Ewww, I have never
> liked
> > those cars--they are my number one pick of yuckos, right behind
Studebaker
> > which is the number one uglymobile... Most of us "chicks" in my
hometown
> > felt the same way about those two makes of vehicles.
>
> Red 1962 Corvair Spyder convertible, white top, white interior! It was a
> chick magnet, but paled alongside my cousins Studebaker Avanti!
Discerning
> chicks flocked all over that beauty!
>
> Chicks in your hometown musta been kinda automotively backwards.....
maybe
> they liked Nash tanks in which the seats relined all the way to
horizontal?
>
> 73, de Hans, K0HB
>
>

Naw...in the town I grew up in, we had better sense than that. It was the boy-wimps who thought a vehcile was for making love. Those of us with good sense knew that a vehicle was for nothing but getting from Point A to Point B. And, in my hometown, the chicks knew better than to let anything magnetize us...

Kim W5TIT

3391. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-29 00:35:13 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <5RRxb.13101$P%1.11823086@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 82966

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:m9Rxb.27796$Wy4.3058@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> "Dee D. Flint" wrote:
> >
> > My response was to your statement that
> > code itself was unnecessary and I made
> > that clear that I was addressing that issue
> > only. (snip)
>
>
> But my entire message, including the argument in that sentence, was
about
> the code test. However, within that context, it is indeed true that Morse
> code is not "necessary" for Amateur Radio today. The key word is
> "necessary," not enjoyable, not great recreation, not useful to make
> contacts with friends when conditions are bad, or whatever. Necessary.
And,
> therefore, if Morse code is not uniquely necessary, it should join the
other
> modes on the written tests without a unique testing requirement.
>

Morse code is uniquely necessary. And it has the unique characteristic that
you can't take advantage of it until you have acquired a basic skill level.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

3392. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-29 00:45:26 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <G_Rxb.27838$Wy4.22808@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 82967

"N2EY" wrote:
>
> Why is such a written test necessary? The
> use of any of those modes is entirely
> optional.

Considering the power levels, the number of frequencies and bands, the overall safety considerations, the desirability of proper operation when using the various operating modes, and the importance of the rules associated with all that, the necessity of the written exams is clearly obvious. Can you establish a similar necessity for the Morse code test?

> Prove the necessity for a written test beyond
> the most basic rules and regulations.

I've already explained the necessity of the written test in the previous message and in the paragraph above.

> Sure. The basics. So prove why the tests must
> go beyond those basics.

Since you keep asking this, do you have a point to make, Jim? This is a discussion about the code test. I have no desire to expand that into a discussion about the written exams, including a review of those exams. Further, I think the value of the written exams is bloody obvious to all. Therefore, there is nothing to prove.

> If what matters is the learning that happens
> *after* the license is in hand, why all the fuss
> about written tests?

Read my first paragraph above.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3393. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-29 01:07:32 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <ojSxb.27855$Wy4.26114@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 82968

"Kim W5TIT" wrote:
>
> Wow. Good point, Dwight. Maybe that
> idea of a term limitation license makes more
> sense than ever. I haven't been in favor of
> it...but maybe there's a part of it I haven't
> thought of, such as your comment above.

Learning is one aspect of the basis and purpose of the Amateur Radio Service, not the total sum. When discussing term limits on license class, all aspects of that should be considered. And, when it comes to those other aspects, there is no real benefit from term limits. Indeed, one could argue that it may actually harm those other things (reducing our overall numbers, for example).

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3394. Re: Where Did THIS Come From...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-29 01:14:08 UTC
From: Kane Trolls <Jerk@noneorgwho.net>
Message-ID: <bq8rt1$cr1$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 82969

FUCK YOU KANE !

Oh, Happy Hollidays too.

ROTFLMAO! What an asshole.

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:cuvyxnansvbet.hp2xgj1.pminews@netnews.comcast.net...
> On Fri, 28 Nov 2003 22:21:32 GMT, Dan/W4NTI wrote:
>
> >I think it was a hell of a good thing to do. It showed the ragheads he
has
> >the gonads, and is willing to put it out in front.
>
> There are better ways to show the Habibi that we can kick the
> charra out of them, such as by doing it. My people did it in '67
> (MY war). Surely the US - the biggest army in the world - can do it
> if the politicians get out of the way.
>
> >It looked to me the troopers were quite impressed. Which is a good
thing.
> >Moral is a very fragile thing, and when it starts to crumble...it all
falls
> >apart.
>
> "There's no business like show business....."
>
> One of the members of our congregation is a National Guard
> infantryman who is back home this weekend for a two-week R&R
> between eight month tours over in the Middle East (iraq and Kuwait).
> He was very clear - the stunt didn't impress him at all.
>
> Getting the job done and coming home in one piece is what impresses
> him.
>
> >But then that is what some people want in this country.
>
> Lowest Common Denominator. That, more than anything else, will
> wreck this country.
>
> --
> 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane
>
> From a Clearing in the Silicon Forest
> Beaverton (Washington County) Oregon

>
>

3395. Enlisted Troops Laud President Bush's Visit

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-29 01:31:31 UTC
From: Uri <none@uriknowswho.net>
Message-ID: <bq8stjfch0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 82970

>
>
> http://www.drudgereport.com/flashbb.htm
>
> here is something I got off the Drudge web site.
>
> Following are quotes from three random soldiers:
>
> Private Stephen Henderson, 19, of Inglewood, Calif., an Army
> infantryman, part of 1st Armored Division, 1st Brigade, 1st Battalion,
> 36th Infantry (136 Spartans), Task Force 137 ? has been in Iraq 1.5
> week and expects to be here five or six more month.
>
> "I've never been so surprised. I had no idea ? not a clue. I feel
> uplifted. I almost forgot I was even here."
>
> Xxx
>
> PFC Mark Hansen, 29, of Hillsborough, N.J., an Army field artillery
> surveyor (sorry no unit ?my bad), re the President, "I never thought
> he would be here. I'm proud to have him as the commander-in-chief. You
> can't beat it." Re Iraq: "It's frightening. Once you here the first
> shot, your adrenaline is pumping and you're in the game."
>
> Xxx
>
> Staff Sgt. Gerrie (cq) Stokes Holloman, 34, of Baltimore, who is
> stationed in Wiesbaden, Germany, with the 1st Armored Division, 141
> Signal Battalion, a multichannel communications specialist?her sons,
> Andrew, 10, and Marcus, 6, and husband Michael Holloman are back in
> Germany. She left them 45 days ago and expects to be here until April.
> "I think it's great. It shows that he cares about us and is thinking
> about us. It's not easy being here. Every day you're over here, you
> feel depressed anyway. But it's especially hard on a holiday and this
> is the kickoff of the holidays. For the most part people are tired,
> and want to go home. But the support and encouragement we get from our
> leadership builds a bond with our soldiers."
>
> Xxx

3396. Bush's History Making Trip to Baghdad

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-29 01:35:34 UTC
From: Uri <none@uriknowswho.net>
Message-ID: <bq8t57$g4g$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 82971

> By TERENCE HUNT, AP White House Correspondent
>
> BAGHDAD, Iraq - President Bush (news - web sites) made a surprise
> Thanksgiving visit to American troops in Baghdad Thursday, flying
> secretly to violence-scarred Iraq (news - web sites) to thank U.S.
> forces for serving there. It was the first trip ever by an American
> president to Iraq - a mission tense with concern about his safety.
>
> "You are defending the American people from danger and we are
> grateful," Bush told some 600 soldiers who were stunned and delighted
> by his appearance.
>
> The president's plane - its lights darkened and windows closed to
> minimize chances of making it a target - landed under a crescent moon
> at Baghdad International Airport.
>
> Bush flew in on the plane he most often uses, and White House
> officials went to extraordinary lengths to keep the trip a secret,
> fearing its disclosure would prompt terrorist attempts to kill him.
>
> The news of Bush's trip was not released until he was in the air on
> the way back to the United States. "If this breaks while we're in the
> air we're turning around," White House communications director Dan
> Bartlett told reporters on the flight to Baghdad.
>
> While here, Bush spoke with soldiers from the 1st Armored Division and
> the 82nd Airborne Division at an airport mess hall. "You are defeating
> the terrorists here in Iraq," he said, "so we don't have to face them
> in our own country."
>
> Terrorists are testing America's resolve, Bush said, and "they hope we
> will run."
>
> "We did not charge hundreds of miles into the heart of Iraq, pay a
> bitter cost of casualties, defeat a ruthless dictator and liberate 25
> million people only to retreat before a band of thugs and assassins,"
> the president said, prompting a standing ovation and cheers.
>
> Wearing an exercise jacket with a 1st Armored Division patch, Bush
> stood in a chow line and dished out sweet potatoes and corn for
> Thanksgiving dinner and posed with a platter of a fresh-baked turkey.
>
> Plans for the trip were tightly held among a handful of senior aides.
> First lady Laura Bush, preparing a Thanksgiving Day dinner, was not

> told until Tuesday or Wednesday. Bush's parents, former President
> George H.W. Bush and Barbara Bush, were invited to his ranch for the
> holiday but were not informed.
>
> As for Bush taking the risk of a trip to Baghdad, Bartlett said it was
> appropriate for the president to visit troops on Thanksgiving. "It is
> also appropriate that the president travel in a way that his safety
> and security will not be compromised," he said.
>
> Security fears were heightened by an attack last Saturday in which a
> missile struck a DHL cargo plane, forcing it to make an emergency
> landing at the airport with its wing aflame.
>
> Bush spent about two and a half hours on the ground, limiting his
> visit to the airport dinner with U.S. forces. The troops had been told
> that the VIP guests would be L. Paul Bremer, the U.S. administrator in
> Iraq, and Lt. Gen. Ricardo Sanchez, commander of coalition forces in
> Iraq.
>
> In a ruse staged in the name of security, the White House had put out
> word that Bush would be spending Thanksgiving at his ranch in
> Crawford, Texas with Mrs. Bush and his parents and other family
> members. Even the dinner menu was announced.
>
> Instead, Bush slipped away from his home without notice Wednesday
> evening and flew to Washington to pick up aides and a handful of
> reporters sworn to secrecy. Plans called for the trip to be abandoned
> if word had leaked out in advance.
>
> Within the White House only a handful of senior aides knew about the
> trip, officials said.
>

3397. Well Done Mr President, Thank You From the Troops

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-29 01:39:13 UTC
From: Uri <none@uriknowswho.net>
Message-ID: <bq8tc1gnv0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 82972

> http://www.usatoday.com/news/world/iraq/2003-11-27-bush-iraq_x.htm
>
> Bush makes surprise visit to Iraq for Thanksgiving holiday
>
> BAGHDAD, Iraq (AP) - President Bush made a surprise Thanksgiving visit to
> American troops in Baghdad Thursday, flying secretly to violence-scarred
> Iraq to thank U.S. forces for serving there. It was the first trip ever by
> an American president to Iraq - a mission tense with concern about his
> safety.
> "You are defending the American people from danger and we are grateful,"
> Bush told some 600 soldiers who were stunned and delighted by his
> appearance.
>
> The president's plane - its lights darkened and windows closed to minimzie
> chances of making it a target - landed under a crescent moon at Bagdad
> International Airport.
>
> Bush flew in on the plane he most often uses, and White House officials
went
> to extraordinary lengths to keep the trip a secret, fearing its disclosure
> would prompt terrorist attempts to kill him.
>
> The news of Bush's trip was not released until he was in the air on the
way
> back to the United States. "If this breaks while we're in the air we're
> turning around," White House communications director Dan Bartlett told
> reporters on the flight to Baghdad.
>
> Security fears were heightened by an attack last Saturday in which a
missile
> struck a DHL cargo plane, forcing it to make an emergency landing at the
> airport with its wing aflame.
>
> Bush spent only about two hours on the ground, limiting his visit to the
> airport dinner with U.S. forces. The troops had been told that the VIP
> guests would be L. Paul Bremer, the U.S. administrator in Iraq, and Lt.
Gen.
> Ricardo Sanchez, commander of coalition forces in Iraq.
>
> In a ruse staged in the name of security, the White House had put out word
> that Bush would be spending Thanksgiving at his ranch in Crawford, Texas,
> with his wife, Laura, his parents and other family members. Even the
dinner
> menu was announced.

>
> Instead, Bush slipped away from his home without notice Wednesday evening
> and flew to Washington to pick up aides and a handful of reporters sworn
to
> secrecy. Plans called for the trip to be abandoned if word had leaked out
in
> advance.
>
> Within the White House only a handful of senior aides knew about the trip,
> officials said.

3398. Florida Poll: Bush Tops Dems by 20-Point Margin

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-29 01:40:57 UTC
From: Uri <none@uriknowswho.net>
Message-ID: <bq8tfa$gv3$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 82973

>
> Florida Poll: Bush Tops Dems by 20-Point Margin
>
> NewsMax.com's Fr. Mike Reilly checks the latest polling on President
> Bush in Florida, and weighs in with some surprising results.
>
> Don't look for a rerun of Florida's 2000 presidential election fiasco
> come November 2004, at least not if the latest survey conducted by
> Mason-Dixon Polling and Research is any indication.
>
> President Bush now holds a 20-point lead in the state over his nearest
> Democratic Party rival, the Mason-Dixon poll finds, with 54 percent of
> Floridians backing his handling of the Iraq war and 52 percent saying
> he's done a good job with the economy.
>
> "It's not a very pretty picture for Democrats," M-D pollster Brad
> Coker told the Orlando Sentinel, which commissioned the poll earlier
> this week.
>
> Among the top-tier candidates, the Democrat who comes closest to Bush
> is Sen. Joe Lieberman. But he trails 56 percent to 36 percent in the
> M-D poll. Democratic front-runner Howard Dean does slightly worse with
> Floridians, trailing Bush by 23 points, 59 percent to 36 percent.
>
> Bringing up the rear is Gen. Wesley Clark, who gets just 33 percent to
> Bush's 56 percent.
>
> Noting the turnaround from 2000, GOP political consultant Ed Goeas
> told the Sentinel, "The cards are very much in the president's favor."

3399. GOP To Sweep South in 2004

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-29 01:47:27 UTC
From: Uri <none@uriknowswho.net>
Message-ID: <bq8trghru0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 82974

> http://www.washtimes.com/national/20031124-120312-1084r.htm
>
> GOP eyes even more solid South
>
>
> By Donald Lambro
> THE WASHINGTON TIMES
>
>
> The battle for control of the Senate next year has dramatically
> shifted in favor of Republicans because of Democratic retirements
> across the South and high-level White House recruiting.
> Election analysts now believe that the Republicans will not only
> significantly expand their 51-48 Senate majority by two or three
> seats, and possibly more, but will strengthen the Republican Party's
> growing political dominance in the Southern and border states for the
> remainder of this decade.
> The 100th seat is held by a Democrat-leaning independent.
> The senatorial lineup in the 13 Southern and border states
> currently stands at 19 Republicans and seven Democrats. Republican
> strategists say they will be able to sharply increase their numbers in
> the region for two reasons: the open seats are in politically
> conservative states that President Bush won in 2000, in most cases by
> wide margins, and because it is a region where he receives his highest
> voter-approval scores.
> If Mr. Bush wins a second term, a larger Senate majority would
> significantly boost his chances of getting the rest of his legislative
> agenda and his blocked judicial nominations approved.
> "The South is shaping up to be very fertile territory for us, with
> the Democrats forced to defend at least four open seats, and with
> President Bush at the top of the ticket, he will help all of our
> candidates," said Dan Allen, chief spokesman for the National
> Republican Senatorial Committee.
> The four Senate Democrats who have announced they will not seek
> re-election are Sens. Zell Miller of Georgia, who says he will support
> Mr. Bush next year; presidential candidate John Edwards of North
> Carolina; Bob Graham of Florida, who abandoned his candidacy for the
> White House; and Ernest F. Hollings of South Carolina, who is ending
> his sixth term and a 38-year career in office.
> They could be joined by a fifth Democrat, Sen. John B. Breaux of
> Louisiana, who has yet to say whether he will seek a fourth term amid
> widespread speculation that he will step down.
> The Republican Party's growing political strength in the South,
> together with a bonanza of open Democratic seats, could dramatically

> redraw the political map in the South, strategists say.
> "If the Republicans win Senate seats in the Carolinas and Georgia
> next year (all quite possible), they'll hold all of the U.S. Senate
> seats in seven contiguous Southern states starting in Virginia and
> stretching around to Mississippi," elections analyst Stuart Rothenberg
> wrote in Roll Call, the Capitol Hill newspaper.
> Meanwhile, two Republican senators also have announced that they
> will not seek re-election: Sens. Don Nickles of Oklahoma and Peter G.
> Fitzgerald of Illinois, a heavily Democratic state.
> Democratic strategists say that Mr. Fitzgerald's seat is their
> best shot at a pickup next year, .along with that of Sen. Lisa
> Murkowski, Alaska Republican, who has been fighting charges of
> nepotism after her father, Gov. Frank H. Murkowski, appointed her to
> finish his unexpired term.
> Among the four Southern open races, Republicans believe their
> strongest chances are in Georgia and North and South Carolina.
> Among those vying for the Republican nomination in Georgia are
> Reps. Johnny Isakson and Mac Collins and Godfather's Pizza executive
> Herman Cain. Mr. Isakson, a prolific fund-raiser with $3 million in
> his campaign war chest, is the front-runner in the race. Democrats,
> meantime, have had a hard time finding a heavyweight candidate to run.
> Former Atlanta Mayor Andrew Young considered running, but decided
> against it.
> In South Carolina, Rep. Jim DeMint is the Republican Party's
> front-runner, followed by former state Attorney General Charlie
> Condon, Myrtle Beach Mayor Mark McBride and developer Thomas Ravenel.
> On the Democratic side is state Superintendent of Education Inez
> Tenenbaum.
> Former Clinton White House Chief of Staff Erskine Bowles is the
> Democrats' leading contender in North Carolina, even though he badly
> lost his previous Senate race against Republican Elizabeth Dole in
> 2002 by 54 percent to 45 percent. The Republican Party's nominee will
> be Rep. Richard M. Burr, who already has $4 million in cash on hand
> for his campaign.
> Four Democrats have announced their candidacies for Mr. Graham's
> seat in Florida: Reps. Peter Deutsch and Allen Boyd, Miami-Dade Mayor
> Alex Penelas and former state Education Commissioner Betty Castor.
> Republicans, who have not yet been able to find a top candidate to
> run in Florida, were cheered by the recent news that Housing and Urban
> Development Secretary Mel Martinez, who had declined White House pleas
> to run, was now reconsidering his decision. Republican strategists say
> he would be their strongest candidate and Mr. Bush has pledged to
> aggressively campaign for him.
>

3400. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-29 01:47:30 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <SUSxb.27923$Wy4.5445@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 82975

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote

> And it has the unique characteristic that
> you can't take advantage of it until you
> have acquired a basic skill level.

Unique? What's unique about Morse in that regard. There is no mode which
you can use without some basic skill level in that mode.

73, Hans, K0HB

3401. Re: Dean Trumps Bush's Visit to Baghdad

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-29 01:49:32 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <MWSxb.2403$4c5.1816@news01.roc.ny>
Source record: 82976

Obviously, you didn't have the 'honor' of serving in Vietnam.

Bush took a calculated risk ... a big risk. I won't worry too much about his motives. It was nice that he actually visited the troops. I remember Bob Hope visiting Guam. He visited a lot of war zones in his career and he had no political agenda (and I am *not* detracting from President Bush - please don't read anything into my post)

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

"Uri" <none@uriknowswho.net> wrote in message
news:bq8sgnedg0@pita.alt.net...
>
> x-no-archive: yes
> > ���� DEAN PAYS SURPRISE VISIT TO BAATHISTS IN IRAQ ����
> >
> > By LAWRENCE E BURT, AP Political Correspondent BAGHDAD, Iraq - Howard
> > Dean flew to Iraq under extraordinary secrecy and security Thursday to
> > spend the end of Ramadan with former Baathists and thank them for
> > "defending the Iraqi people from American Imperilaism."
> >
> > The unannounced visit brought wild cheers from battle-worn Hussein
> > loyalists, stunned the nation and even surprised Dean's wife, Dr.
> > Judith Steinberg, who had been expecting him at the Thanksgiving table
> > at Dean's boyhood home on Park Avenue in Manhattan.
> >
> > Dean, the first presidential candidate to visit enemy combatants,
> > promised that insurgents testing America's commitment will surely be
> > rewarded with a U.S. retreat should Dean shock pundits and get elected
> > president.
> >
> > "I feel your pain," Dean told the cheering members of the Iraqi
> > Republican Guard, noting "if I had my way, you would still be in
> > power."
> >
> > The diners had been told only that they were gathered for dinner with
> > a VIP guest in the mess hall at Al-Aqalaba Mosque. "I know that Islam
> > means peace," Dean told the grateful crowd, calling again for a more
> > "even-handed" approach to Middle East policy.
> >
> > Dean's remarks were extremely well received. Imam Muhammmad Atta said
> > "He will stand up to the Zionists imperialist Americans who oppose our
> > jihad."

> >
> > Dean handed out food to the locals, though as a vegan he himself did
> > not partake in the meal. Dean bought the crowd to its feet when he
> > said "I would be happy to join your fight, but for this painful back
> > condition which has even hampered my skiiing."
> >
> > .
> > .
> > .
>
>

3402. Re: Where Did THIS Come From...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-29 01:58:17 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031128205817.12501.00004230@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 82978

In article <cuvyxnansvbet.hp2nho7.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>, "Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> writes:

>On 27 Nov 2003 17:16:15 -0800, Steve Robeson, K4CAP wrote:
>
>> Neat trick, GW showing up in Iraq, wasn't it?
>
> "There's no business like show business....."

Hillary made a big show of going, so Dubya trumped her. Neat trick.
>
> How much did that little stunt cost in planning and expenses for
> aircraft operation, fuel, overtime, adrenaline and breath-holding
> for the military and civilian personnel who have to protect him and
> his followers whatever sensible or nonsensical things that they do?
>
> Resources that could have been applied to newer and better equipment
> for our troops "over there" and for veterans' care, for instance? Not
> to mention the needs of the civilian population within our country.

Or maybe a little thing called the deficit? Or homeland security?
>
> Or to just plain getting our business done there in a more
> expedential manner and bringing our folks back home in one piece.

Exactly.
>
> Happy Holiday to all.
>
And to our service people - spending next Thanksgiving with their families at home.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3403. Re: Where Did THIS Come From...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-29 01:58:18 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031128205818.12501.00004231@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 82977

In article <GkQxb.25230$Rk5.12231@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Ki¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> writes:

>"Steve Robeson, K4CAP" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote
>
>> I think it's great we FINALLY have a Commander-in-Chief
>> that makes you proud to render that salute again.
>
>Speak for yourself. Dubya is an idiot. John McCain should be
>Commander-in-Chief.
>
What about Wesley Clark?

73 de Jim, N2EY

3404. Re: Where Did THIS Come From...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-29 02:00:41 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <d5Txb.2406$Qe5.946@news01.roc.ny>
Source record: 82979

Heheheeee ... Phil, I know you're an attourney and I suspect you have tried a couple of cases in your lifetime. Yep, there are two sides to every story.

I love the way the county in my area wants to dump on the city as they don't want to raise property taxes. I swear I'm going to ask them how come George M. C. Fisher (the former CEO of Kodak) bought property for 2.2 million and sold it for 2.24 million and the property is *still* accessed for 1.4 million. Yep, nothing like it. The big question is whether they will raise the property tax again or raise the sales tax to the highest in the state. It is simply amazing. Just follow the dollar$ and you will have your answer. Yes, the Repooblicans in Pittsford accessed George M. C. Fisher at 1.4 million when he bought the house at 2.2 million and sold it for 2.24 million. I doubt the other folks in Pittsford (where I lived as a kid) with homes worth perhaps 120,000 to 160,000 get such a break. My parents now live in Florida where the taxes aren't such a problem.

Lovely country, eh?

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message news:cuvyxnansvbet.hp2nho7.pminews@netnews.comcast.net...
> On 27 Nov 2003 17:16:15 -0800, Steve Robeson, K4CAP wrote:
>
> > Neat trick, GW showing up in Iraq, wasn't it?
>
> "There's no business like show business....."
>
> How much did that little stunt cost in planning and expenses for
> aircraft operation, fuel, overtime, adrenaline and breath-holding
> for the military and civilian personnel who have to protect him and
> his followers whatever sensible or nonsensical things that they do?
>
> Resources that could have been applied to newer and better equipment
> for our troops "over there" and for veterans' care, for instance? Not
> to mention the needs of the civilian population within our country.
>
> Or to just plain getting our business done there in a more
> expedential manner and bringing our folks back home in one piece.
>
> Happy Holiday to all.
>
> --

> 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane
>
>

3405. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-29 02:15:21 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <6tudnexRqIo6mVWiRVn-hA@gbronline.com>
Source record: 82980

Kï¿½HB wrote:
> "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote
>
>
>>A Corvair?!!??!! And you say chicks dug it??!!?? Ewww, I have never
>
> liked
>
>>those cars--they are my number one pick of yuckos, right behind Studebaker
>>which is the number one uglymobile... Most of us "chicks" in my hometown
>>felt the same way about those two makes of vehicles.
>
>
> Red 1962 Corvair Spyder convertible, white top, white interior! It was a
> chick magnet, but paled alongside my cousins Studebaker Avanti! Discerning
> chicks flocked all over that beauty!
>
> Chicks in your hometown musta been kinda automotively backwards..... maybe
> they liked Nash tanks in which the seats relined all the way to horizontal?
>
> 73, de Hans, K0HB

In Kim's local, if it isn't/wasn't a pickup with some vulgar kicker
sticker on the back window, they weren't interested.

3406. Re: Where Did THIS Come From...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-29 02:36:06 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0311281836.5ef3c2e0@posting.google.com>
Source record: 82982

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0311271716.2564ee6b@posting.google.com>...
> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0311270620.22701d58@posting.google.com>...

> > God bless GW Bush, Ron Reagan, and the troops deployed to hotspots the
> > around the world. The world is a better place because of them and we
> > cannot lose the faith.
>
> Neat trick, GW showing up in Iraq, wasn't it? I think it's great
> we FINALLY have a Commander-in-Chief that makes you proud to render
> that salute again.

I'm listening t all the crappola on the news about this being an
election year stunt, wrecklessly endangering the Office of the
President, blah, blah, blah.

His daddy came to see us in Somalia, on Air Force One, after the
election that he lost. No election stunt. Nothing to be gained.
Just because he cared.

> > I hope John Hinkley is eating institutionalized turkey cubes, canned
> > gravy, and instant mashed potatos on this thanksgiving day (such as
> > the meal I had in 1979), and that his parents have to come back
> > tomorrow during normal visiting hours to see him.
>
> And for many more years to come. Maybe he can share desert with
> Sirhan Sirhan some day.

I'd rather he share desert with Jack Ruby.

> Steve, K4YZ

bb

3407. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-29 02:58:17 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <dXTxb.27970$Wy4.17288@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 82983

"N2EY" wrote:
>
> (snip) Hans thinks that *all* hams should
> be qualified (eventually) at at least the
> Extra class written level. The purpose of
> his proposed LP license is to give newbies
> a sample of what ham radio is like, and a
> 10-year opportunity to learn enough to get
> a full-privileges license. (snip)

And I think Hans is barking up the wrong tree with his idea. I don't see any benefit whatsoever. It doesn't really serve a specific need within the Amateur Radio community. It doesn't serve the regulatory needs of the FCC. And it doesn't really serve the basis and purpose of the Amateur Radio Service.

Hans seems to be basing his idea on 97.1(c) and 97.1(d). The first talks about, "Encouragement and improvement of the amateur service through rules which provide for advancing skills in both communications and technical phases of the art." The second talks about, "Expansion of the existing reservoir within the amateur radio service of trained operators, technicians, and electronics experts." Neither of these even suggest the need for a requirement to advance in license class or get out. And neither suggests a need for a requirement to learn to a specific level or get out.

Hans also seems to be basing his idea on the faulty premise that one must advance in license class to learn, advance skills, or increase the reservoir of trained operators, technicians, and electronics experts. Of course, that premise is simply untrue. For example, one can learn about satellite communications, at least all that one can learn though Amateur Radio, with a Technician license (no license advancement required). The same with digital communications. The same with microwave communications. And the same with moonbounce, SSB, FM repeaters, and a long list of other skills, abilities, and radio arts.

Finally, I think Hans' idea would have a chilling effect on the Amateur Radio Service - assigning newcomers (once again) to an outside the mainstream, subordinate, sub-class with sharp limits on their participation. If I took my first look at Amateur radio, and saw that as my only option, I would probably not so politely say where you could stick it. The 'advance or get out' idea would make that almost a certainty (indeed, why even invest time, or in radio equipment, if there is even the slightest possibility of being forced out of something I know so little about at that particular moment - a potential newcomer).

Luckily, I think the FCC would have enough common sense to realize this idea is absurd. Sadly, it does seem to have it's supporters within the Amateur Radio community.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3408. Re: Where Did THIS Come From...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-29 03:22:11 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0311281922.16679732@posting.google.com>
Source record: 82984

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:<cuvyxnansvbet.hp2nho7.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>...
> On 27 Nov 2003 17:16:15 -0800, Steve Robeson, K4CAP wrote:
>
> > Neat trick, GW showing up in Iraq, wasn't it?
>
> "There's no business like show business....."
>
> How much did that little stunt cost in planning and expenses for
> aircraft operation, fuel, overtime, adrenaline and breath-holding
> for the military and civilian personnel who have to protect him and
> his followers whatever sensible or nonsensical things that they do?
>
> Resources that could have been applied to newer and better equipment
> for our troops "over there" and for veterans' care, for instance? Not
> to mention the needs of the civilian population within our country.
>
> Or to just plain getting our business done there in a more
> expedential manner and bringing our folks back home in one piece.
>
> Happy Holiday to all.

Hey Phil, you have self-admitted no experience whatsoever in military
science.

So your opinion of our Commander in Chief's trip to Iraq is of no
concern to you. None. Unless the double standard applies.

Just bill the Feds for your usual $400/hour advisory fees and call it
quits.

Merry Christmas to those who have never served and never risked a
damned thing but are full of opinions about what motivates fighting
men (and women) to get their business done, and what equipment they
might need.

3409. Re: Where Did THIS Come From...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-29 03:27:06 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0311281927.4a2ab944@posting.google.com>
Source record: 82985

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:<cuvyxnansvbet.hp2xgj1.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>...
> On Fri, 28 Nov 2003 22:21:32 GMT, Dan/W4NTI wrote:
>
> >I think it was a hell of a good thing to do. It showed the ragheads he has
> >the gonads, and is willing to put it out in front.
>
> There are better ways to show the Habibi that we can kick the
> charra out of them, such as by doing it. My people did it in '67
> (MY war). Surely the US - the biggest army in the world - can do it
> if the politicians get out of the way.

Do detail your experiences in your war.

> >It looked to me the troopers were quite impressed. Which is a good thing.
> >Moral is a very fragile thing, and when it starts to crumble...it all falls
> >apart.
>
> "There's no business like show business....."
>
> One of the members of our congregation is a National Guard
> infantryman who is back home this weekend for a two-week R&R
> between eight month tours over in the Middle East (iraq and Kuwait).
> He was very clear - the stunt didn't impress him at all.

Your infantryman is singularly unimpressive. GW's daddy visited the
troops in Somalia after he lost the election. No show biddness.
Nothing to be gained.

> Getting the job done and coming home in one piece is what impresses
> him.

Hopefully he will do both.

> >But then that is what some people want in this country.
>
> Lowest Common Denominator. That, more than anything else, will
> wreck this country.

Some people want us to tuck tail and head home (in one peice).

3410. Re: Where Did THIS Come From...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-29 03:31:02 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0311281931.55460046@posting.google.com>
Source record: 82986

"Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<GkQxb.25230$Rk5.12231@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> "Steve Robeson, K4CAP" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote
>
> > I think it's great we FINALLY have a Commander-in-Chief
> > that makes you proud to render that salute again.
>
> Speak for yourself. Dubya is an idiot. John McCain should be
> Commander-in-Chief.
>
> 73, Hans, K0HB

McCain failed. He got captured.

I really question everyone calling that scenario a hero, and
definitely not Commander-in-Chief material.

3411. Re: Where Did THIS Come From...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-29 03:34:38 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0311281934.2deeda0@posting.google.com>
Source record: 82987

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:<cuvyxnansvbet.hp2xgj1.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>...
> On Fri, 28 Nov 2003 22:21:32 GMT, Dan/W4NTI wrote:
>
> >I think it was a hell of a good thing to do. It showed the ragheads he has
> >the gonads, and is willing to put it out in front.
>
> There are better ways to show the Habibi that we can kick the
> charra out of them, such as by doing it. My people did it in '67
> (MY war). Surely the US - the biggest army in the world - can do it
> if the politicians get out of the way.
>
> >It looked to me the troopers were quite impressed. Which is a good thing.
> >Moral is a very fragile thing, and when it starts to crumble...it all falls
> >apart.
>
> "There's no business like show business....."
>
> One of the members of our congregation is a National Guard
> infantryman who is back home this weekend for a two-week R&R
> between eight month tours over in the Middle East (iraq and Kuwait).
> He was very clear - the stunt didn't impress him at all.
>
> Getting the job done and coming home in one piece is what impresses
> him.
>
> >But then that is what some people want in this country.
>
> Lowest Common Denominator. That, more than anything else, will
> wreck this country.

Blowhard libs have tried soooo hard to wreck this country. They've
nearly succeeded, but there are still a few people who give a damn
about America, and GW is one of them.

3412. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-29 03:38:47 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0311281938.2d867d9c@posting.google.com>
Source record: 82988

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20031127073103.23171.00002375@mb-m05.aol.com>...
> In article <bq41a1$7m9@library1.airnews.net>, "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
> writes:

> >Ewww, I have never liked
> >those cars--they are my number one pick of yuckos, right behind Studebaker
> >which is the number one uglymobile... Most of us "chicks" in my hometown
> >felt the same way about those two makes of vehicles.
> >
> Perhaps Hans is mistaken. Perhaps it wasn't the *car* that the chicks dug at
> all.....
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

Cudda been that swave and deboner future masterchief...

3413. Re: Where Did THIS Come From...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-29 03:58:32 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <IPUxb.28042$Wy4.16674@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 82989

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote

> What about Wesley Clark?

I don't trust him. He seems to have problems keeping his stories straight.

I worked for Senator McCains dad, Admiral John McCain II, when he was CincPAC and John III was a guest at the Hanoi Hilton. Later I worked for Capt Dick Stratton, a fellow 'guest' in Hanoi, and met John III on a couple of occasions. Him, I trust.

73, Hans, K0HB

3414. Re: Where Did THIS Come From...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-29 04:04:17 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <5VUxb.28060$Wy4.719@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 82990

"Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote

>
> He got captured.
>

Yup, he was a long time guest at Hanoi Hilton, and Dubya couldn't quite seem
to figure out where his National Guard unit was located.

Sunuvagun!

73, de Hans, K0HB

3415. Re: Where Did THIS Come From...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-29 04:09:34 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <2_Uxb.28065$Wy4.17867@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 82991

"Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote

> GW's daddy visited the troops in Somalia after he lost the election.

GW's Dad is the authentic article. His son doesn't measure up to the
standards he set.

73, de Hans, K0HB

3416. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-29 04:30:42 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <ShVxb.28085$Wy4.7277@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 82992

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote

> And I think Hans is barking up the wrong tree with his idea.

I don't bark, and I'm not a dog.

> I don't see any benefit whatsoever.

That bothers me not at all. It's the Commission I need to persuade.

> Hans also seems to be basing his idea on the faulty premise that one must
> advance in license class to learn.....

I don't support that premise at all. Where did you read such off-target drivel? For more than 40 years I've been an outspoken critic of (dis)incentive licensing. My plan calls for a very simplified license structure of a broad-privileged learners permit to gain qualification, and a single license class after becoming qualified.

> Finally, I think Hans' idea would have a chilling effect on the Amateur
> Radio Service - assigning newcomers (once again) to an outside the
> mainstream......

On the contrary, my plan puts newcomers dead center in the mainstream of amateur radio, with all the same privileges of EVERY other licensee, just at a more modest power level of 50watts. No more limited-mode isolated and restricted ghettos like the former Novice class, and greatly expanded privileges beyond those enjoyed by todays entry-level Technicians.

It's clear to me that you haven't even taken the time to read the proposal I've made to the FCC. You can view a copy at my website http://www.home.earthlink.net/~k0hb .... click on the left hand column link to 'FCC Comments'. When you've taken the trouble to actually read what I've proposed, come back here with reasoned arguments against it. Until then you are not prepared and ill-qualified to comment.

73, de Hans, K0HB

3417. Re: Where Did THIS Come From...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-29 05:03:22 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0311282103.4d2337a3@posting.google.com>
Source record: 82993

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:<cuvyxnansvbet.hp2nho7.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>...
> On 27 Nov 2003 17:16:15 -0800, Steve Robeson, K4CAP wrote:
>
> > Neat trick, GW showing up in Iraq, wasn't it?

After some snippage...:

> Resources that could have been applied to newer and better equipment
> for our troops "over there" and for veterans' care, for instance? Not
> to mention the needs of the civilian population within our country.

Phil, after 8 years of dealing with a president who was willing
to commit our Armed Forces to battle without giving a drat about
"them", it's a breath of fresh air to have one who would do this.

The dollars and cents not withstanding, the military commanders
in the field will reap far greater results due to an increase in
morale than an extra box of bullets would have provided.

Steve, K4YZ

3418. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-29 05:04:44 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <MNVxb.25617$Rk5.7547@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 82994

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20031127205912.08626.00001941@mb-m27.aol.com...
> In article <uKoxb.24144$Wy4.4522@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>,
"Dwight
> Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> writes:
>
> >"N2EY" wrote:
> >>
> >> Then SSB, AM, FM, RTTY, PSK-31, etc.
> >> are all non-necessities. (snip)
>
> > Absolutely. Which is exactly why there is no test of the actual ability
to
> >use those modes - only a written test covering the fundamentals of those
> >modes and the rules associated with them.
>
> Why is such a written test necessary?
> The use of any of those modes is entirely optional.

Which is also the reason why failing to correctly answer any one or two
questions about any individual mode does not result in failing the test.

> >Morse code should join those modes in that regard.
>
> We'll have to agree to disagree on that.

Certainly seems incnsitent to me....on a mode for mode
comparison basis.

> >> In fact, except for the most basic of rules
> >> and regulations, your argument leads to the
> >> inescapable conclusion that it is not necessary
> >> for the goals and purposes of the Amateur
> >> Radio Service at this point to mandate *any*
> >> learning through a testing requirement.
> >>
> >> Can you prove otherwise?
> >
> > What is there to prove?
>
> Prove the necessity for a written test beyond the most basic rules and
> regulations.

Noneed to. The FCC rules require it and I'm content with that.
If you (Jim N2EY) feel otherwise, then petition the FCC for the
change. Unless you or someone else does othat, this is just academic

futility. The code TEST however, has already been acknowledged by
the FCC as not being needed anymore...so the burden of proof to retain
a code test falls on those that wish to keep 5 wpm.

<SNIP of additional comparisons of license requirements vs
license privileges>

I have also noted that perhaps it is time for some "revamping"
of licensing such that the privileges bear some relationship
to the level of license granted. It will, if that path is
taken, be a protracted process (IMHO).

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

3419. Re: Where Did THIS Come From...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-29 05:05:02 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0311282105.62818423@posting.google.com>
Source record: 82995

"Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<GkQxb.25230$Rk5.12231@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> "Steve Robeson, K4CAP" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote
>
> > I think it's great we FINALLY have a Commander-in-Chief
> > that makes you proud to render that salute again.
>
> Speak for yourself. Dubya is an idiot. John McCain should be
> Commander-in-Chief.

That's why ya get to voice your choice again in 11 months, Hans.

Be there or be square.

Steve, K4YZ

3420. Re: It ain't about the test.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-29 05:09:11 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <XRVxb.25619$Rk5.14405@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 82996

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20031127085816.23307.00004642@mb-m29.aol.com...
> In article <CP8xb.20782$Rk5.10687@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>,
"K�HB"
> <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> writes:
>
> >..... it's about the qualifications.
> >
> >The incessant arguments here on rrap surround the question of whether or
not
> >there should be a Morse TEST for access to HF.
> >
> >
> >Well, that's the wrong question.
> >
> >
> >The real question is whether or not you should be Morse qualified for
access
> >to HF.
> >
> >If there is no regulatory need for Morse qualification, then there is no
> >need for Morse testing.
> >
> >The need for Morse qualification, as clearly stated in the 1913 radio
> >regulations was "The applicant must be able to transmit and receive in
> >Continental Morse, at a speed sufficient to enable him to recognize
distress
> >calls or the official "keep-out" signals." Since that qualification need
> >has long since disappeared, then so has the need for the qualification
test.
> >
>
> Hans,
>
> If you want people to quit making fun of you, quit posting such laughable
> reductio ad absurdum arguments.
>
> That stated 1913 need for Morse code qualifications is not the only reason
such
> qualifications were kept in the rules all these years. There are lots
more.

Assuming you are referencing the myriad of reasons put forth
during 98-143...all of which fell short of FCC buy-in, just what else
is there>

> The original 1913 reason for technical qualifications was to prevent
> interference to nonamateurs caused by improper adjustment of amateur
> transmitters.
>
> How much interference to nonamateurs is caused by improper adjustment of
> amateur transmitters today? Reading the FCC enforcement letters, such
> interference today seems to be more a case of intentional modification of
> amateur equipment by a lawless few to operate on nonamateur frequencies.

Agreed.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

3421. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-29 05:09:17 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0311282109.25558b35@posting.google.com>
Source record: 82997

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20031127171537.07961.00000161@mb-m03.aol.com>...

> Everyone's future happens right after now.

Everyone EXCEPT you, Lennie...

Steve, K4YZ

3422. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-29 05:23:24 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <g3Wxb.28222$Wy4.11976@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 82998

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote

> I have also noted that perhaps it is time for some "revamping"
> of licensing such that the privileges bear some relationship
> to the level of license granted. It will, if that path is
> taken, be a protracted process (IMHO).

A straightforward plan is already written and in the hands of the FCC.
http://tinyurl.com/wce9

73, de Hans, K0HB

3423. Since We Were Mentioning "Absurdity"...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-29 05:39:09 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0311282139.2fb5ec27@posting.google.com>
Source record: 82999

IN A QUOTE FROM ANOTHER THREAD...

Message 65 in thread
From: N2EY (n2ey@aol.com)
Subject: Re: The 14 Petitions

View this article only
Newsgroups: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-27 05:58:53 PST

In article <5c01b95b.0311261452.68a33081@posting.google.com>,
k4yz@aol.com
(Steve Robeson, K4CAP) writes:

>"Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
>news:<0x7xb.20708$Rk5.10314@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
>> "N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote
>>
>> > In fact, except for the most basic of rules and regulations,
your
>> > argument leads to the inescapable conclusion that it is not
necessary
>> > for the goals and purposes of the Amateur Radio Service at this
point
>> > to mandate *any* learning through a testing requirement.
>> If you want people to quit making fun of you, quit posting such
laughable
>> reductio ad absurdum arguments.

As anyone who understands formal logic knows, reductio ad absurdum is
a valid
way of evaluating the validity of an assertion.

It works like this: An assertion is analyzed by logical methods, and
if the
result is an absurdity, the original statement must be false.
>
> So far the only people I see "making fun" of Jim Miccolis are
>those who cannot adequately argue the topic being debated, Hans.

That says it all right there, Steve. Ridicule the messenger rather
than deal
with the message.

> There ARE those who make an arguement that the Amateur Radio
>license should be nothing more than an expensive permit. It's been
>archived here, Hans, and remains an "on-the-fringe" concept, but

worse
>ideas have made it into law.

Yup. And the way it's being done is a little step at a time - just like other
requirements were eliminated. Like nonrenewable entry level licenses, tests
conducted by the FCC from a nonpublished test pool, experience requirements,
etc.

END OF QUOTE...

I was reading my December 2003 "CQ" magazine and found an item penned by Jim Wiley KL7CC, Scott Neustadter W4WW, and the snake oil salesman of Amateur Radio...Fred Maia W5YI.

The whole jist of the article is aimed at creating yet another Amateur Radio license, and the article suggests numerous "snips" of other requirements from the regulatory, theory, practice and safety regulations in order to "make" a slimmed-down beginners' license.

See if you can remember where their following suggestion was once an actual practice of the Federal Communications Commission, and how well it worked in practice:

(From page 36, December 2003 "CQ") QUOTE "Remove some of the math from the license exams. Remove some or even most of the "radio law" type questions. Instead require the applicants to sign a statement that they have read the Part 97 rulebook, and that they ahve a copy (available for free via web download). Yes, some of the applicants will "skate" and not read it when they signed that they did. But most will, and even among those who dont, eventually, probablysooner rather than later, they will get around to it. Some never will. That's human nature. We're not looking for saints, just people who can become producetive hams". UNQUOTE

My first question for these brain surgeons is HOW IN THE BLUE BLAZES CAN SOMEONE BE "PRODUCTIVE" IF THEY DON"T KNOW THE RULES...?!?!

These people are in a position of responsibility for mentoring the next generation of Amateurs..?!?!

We'd be better off letting Michael Jackson be their sand lot supervisor! ! !

While I am a big proponent of CLOSING the question pools and thereby requiring potential licensees to actually LEARN something, including regulations, even our present system of open pools and rote memorization will ingrain SOME understanding of the most of the basic rules of the service!

Of course I can't help but believe this is another W5YI initiative to help perpetuate his "publishing" business, especially

since it will soon lose part of it's subject matter (code tapes).

One more new license would be yet another "text" he could get around to selling.

Read the whole article. It's a really poorly thought out concept and one that's been beaten over and over again.

73

Steve, K4YZ

3424. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-29 06:27:00 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <U_Wxb.13129$P%1.11871251@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 83000

"Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:SUSxb.27923$Wy4.5445@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote
>
> > And it has the unique characteristic that
> > you can't take advantage of it until you
> > have acquired a basic skill level.
>
> Unique? What's unique about Morse in that regard. There is no mode which
> you can use without some basic skill level in that mode.
>
> 73, Hans, K0HB

None of the other modes requires any skill at all beyond connecting the pieces per the diagrams and typing on the keyboard or pushing a mike button. Although typing is a skill, it is not radio specific and the hunt & peck typist gets by. Virtually anyone can put set up & run in an afternoon once they have acquired the equipment. The skill requirement to operate other modes is insignificant. I've operated both RTTY and packet and other digital modes and found them totally boring but I have had experience with them and there simply is no specific skill required.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

3425. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-29 06:43:22 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <eeXxb.25694$Rk5.22660@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 83001

"Kï¿½HB" wrote:
> "Dwight Stewart" wrote
>
> > Hans also seems to be basing his idea
> > on the faulty premise that one must
> > advance in license class to learn.....
>
> I don't support that premise at all. Where
> did you read such off-target drivel? (snip)

Well, lets see where I could have gotten that from. First, you propose a non-renewable license with a specific time limit to upgrade to a higher license class. That certainly fits what I said. Second, you justify the entire proposal by claiming the current tests are "not adequate to insure a high level of expertise in new applicants." This introduces the idea of raising the level of learning. And, finally, you set the license test all must take to upgrade at "a difficulty level similar to the current Extra class test." Those three together only suggest one thing - you don't think the lower class operators today re knowledgeable enough, you feel all should be forced to improve on that, and you offer the most difficult license test available today as the sole means to accomplish it. Perhaps you can explain where I'm wrong in that.

> (snip) My plan calls for a very simplified
> license structure of a broad-privileged
> learners permit (snip)

The test proposal for new applicants makes the least sense of all. You introduced the proposal by claiming the current tests "are not adequate to insure a high level of expertise in new applicants." But you later propose a greatly simplified test for those new applicants (much more basic than today's Technician test). How can you "insure a high level of expertise in new applicants" by offering a even more simplified test?

> On the contrary, my plan puts newcomers
> dead center in the mainstream of amateur
> radio, with all the same privileges of EVERY
> other licensee, just at a more modest power
> level of 50watts. (snip)

More modest power levels? That 50 watts you propose is 1,450 watts less than what Technicians can use today. That's a pretty significant hit, not a modest one. As for privileges, once the code test is gone, Technicians can gain considerable HF privileges by taking the General written. Your proposal would intentionally take that away by setting the bar to upgrade even higher (the Extra class test). And, if newcomers fail to reach that higher bar, out

they go - their non-renewable license is gone.

And if this isn't all about assigning newcomers to a subordinate class, why don't you change the names of those new licenses you propose - Class A for the entry license class and Class B for the other license class? As it is, it's clear only someone who has taken an Extra class-like test can be a "Class A" Amateur Radio Operator.

> It's clear to me that you haven't even taken
> the time to read the proposal I've made to
> the FCC. (snip)

I've read the proposal and what you've said about the proposal in this newsgroup. I stand by what I've said here and in the previous message.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3426. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-29 06:59:04 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <YsXxb.25734$Rk5.5191@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 83002

"Dee D. Flint" wrote:
>
> Morse code is uniquely necessary. (snip)

Saying so doesn't make it true, Dee. Within the goals and purposes of the Amateur Radio Service, and to justify a unique testing requirement, how is Morse code uniquely necessary today? Do remember recreational use is not sufficient enough to justify a unique testing requirement (recreational use is equally applicable to all modes and they don't have a unique testing requirement).

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3427. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-29 07:21:13 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <JNXxb.25804$Rk5.2857@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 83003

"Dee D. Flint" wrote:
>
> None of the other modes requires any skill
> at all beyond connecting the pieces per the
> diagrams and typing on the keyboard or
> pushing a mike button. (snip)

Really? You mean all those things I did to get a properly operating station (putting coax and connectors together, waterproofing, antenna tuning, SWR tests, ground radials, masts, guy wires, wiring a microphone, equipment grounding, lightning protection, RF exposure level estimates, and so on) wasn't really needed and didn't really require any skills to do properly? Well, I guess I'll just forget about all that stuff in the future.

> (snip) Virtually anyone can put set up & run in
> an afternoon once they have acquired the
> equipment. (snip)

In an afternoon? You mean I wasted all those days it took to get everything in my station working just right, not counting all the time I've spent fiddling around to get even better performance since then. Well, you're obviously a much more gifted operator than I am.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3428. Re: Where Did THIS Come From...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-29 10:15:12 UTC
From: Simon Schuluster <ssa@sentrolleval.org>
Message-ID: <bq9rjg$tg2$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 83004

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message

> "There's no business like show business.....">
> How much did that little stunt cost in planning and expenses for

//Kane Troll Snipped here & flushed///

TROLL - O - METER
0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
/
/
/
/
/
/
/
/
/
(trolls rated on a one to ten scale)

3429. Re: Where Did THIS Come From...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-29 10:51:13 UTC
From: Alan <unk@alanunkorg.net>
Message-ID: <bq9tn1$2fr$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 83005

In the last week, Phil has indicated his negative opinions
toward Microsoft, Walmart, & Dr Laura. So, I mean, is it any
real surprise Phil has negative opinions about Commander-In-Chief
Bush? You must live a very negative opinion life Phil?

73 de Alan
Los Angeles

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:cuvyxnansvbet.hp2nho7.pminews@netnews.comcast.net...
> On 27 Nov 2003 17:16:15 -0800, Steve Robeson, K4CAP wrote:
>
> > Neat trick, GW showing up in Iraq, wasn't it?
>
> "There's no business like show business....."
>
> How much did that little stunt cost in planning and expenses for
> aircraft operation, fuel, overtime, adrenaline and breath-holding
> for the military and civilian personnel who have to protect him and
> his followers whatever sensible or nonsensical things that they do?
>
> Resources that could have been applied to newer and better equipment
> for our troops "over there" and for veterans' care, for instance? Not
> to mention the needs of the civilian population within our country.
>
> Or to just plain getting our business done there in a more
> expedential manner and bringing our folks back home in one piece.
>
> Happy Holiday to all.
>
> --
> 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane
>
>

3430. Bush Thrills Troops, Hillary Doesn't

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-29 11:04:38 UTC
From: Top <anon@anontopsgtorg.net>
Message-ID: <bq9ug6$44q$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 83006

>
> Bush Thrills Troops, Hillary Doesn't
>
> While 600 G.I.s leapt to their feet at the sight of President Bush
> appearing onstage in Baghdad to praise their service and share their
> Thanksgiving, soldiers at Bagram Air Force base in Afghanistan seemed
> considerably less enthusiastic to have New York Sen. Hillary Clinton
> in their midst.
>
> "The G.I.s here at the Bagram base were reasonably excited, I think
> it's fair to say, to see the former first lady," reported Fox News
> Channel's Geraldo Rivera.
>
> But in the next breath Rivera added, "They were even more impressed
> with their turkey dinner."
>
> An African-American female G.I. seconded the Fox reporter's
> assessment, agreeing that the food was more of a morale booster than
> Mrs. Clinton. Another female soldier at the table concurred.
>
> Meanwhile, back in Baghdad soldiers couldn't say enough about their
> encounter with their Commander-in-Chief.
>
> "I was totally shocked," one female G.I. told Fox News. "It was a
> wonderful moment. I think everyone there was so overjoyed just to see
> the president."
>
> A male soldier told Fox that Bush's visit "really meant a lot to me
> personally, as I know it did to a lot of the other soldiers, that the
> Commander-in-Chief was here in person to talk to us on this day when
> he should be with his family . . . And here in Iraq, the first time
> ever that a U.S. president's been here."
>
> The New York Democrat has lately taken to accusing President Bush of
> not appreciating soldiers' sacrifices, and even covering-up
> battlefield casualties.
>
> Three weeks ago Sen. Clinton secretly visited wounded soliders at
> Walter Reed Army Hospital, then told Democrats gathered in Iowa that
> the troops she met were paying the price for Bush's "failed policy" in
> Iraq.
>
> Clinton also has a spot airing on MSNBC this weekend where she
> delivers a Thanksgiving message of appreciation to the troops serving

> in Iraq and Afghanistan.

3431. Bush Thrills Troops, Hillary Doesn't

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-29 11:53:17 UTC
From: Top <anon@anontopsgtorg.net>
Message-ID: <bqa1bd$9ug$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 83007

> Bush Thrills Troops, Hillary Doesn't
>
> While 600 G.I.s leapt to their feet at the sight of President Bush
> appearing onstage in Baghdad to praise their service and share their
> Thanksgiving, soldiers at Bagram Air Force base in Afghanistan seemed
> considerably less enthusiastic to have New York Sen. Hillary Clinton
> in their midst.
>
> "The G.I.s here at the Bagram base were reasonably excited, I think
> it's fair to say, to see the former first lady," reported Fox News
> Channel's Geraldo Rivera.
>
> But in the next breath Rivera added, "They were even more impressed
> with their turkey dinner."
>
> An African-American female G.I. seconded the Fox reporter's
> assessment, agreeing that the food was more of a morale booster than
> Mrs. Clinton. Another female soldier at the table concurred.
>
> Meanwhile, back in Baghdad soldiers couldn't say enough about their
> encounter with their Commander-in-Chief.
>
> "I was totally shocked," one female G.I. told Fox News. "It was a
> wonderful moment. I think everyone there was so overjoyed just to see
> the president."
>
> A male soldier told Fox that Bush's visit "really meant a lot to me
> personally, as I know it did to a lot of the other soldiers, that the
> Commander-in-Chief was here in person to talk to us on this day when
> he should be with his family . . . And here in Iraq, the first time
> ever that a U.S. president's been here."
>

3432. Re: Where Did THIS Come From...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-29 12:37:30 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031129073730.21232.00002441@mb-m13.aol.com>
Source record: 83008

In article <IPUxb.28042$Wy4.16674@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Ki¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote
>
>> What about Wesley Clark?
>
>I don't trust him. He seems to have problems keeping his stories straight.
>
>I worked for Senator McCains dad, Admiral John McCain II, when he was
>CincPAC and John III was a guest at the Hanoi Hilton. Later I worked for
>Capt Dick Stratton, a fellow 'guest' in Hanoi, and met John III on a couple
>of occasions. Him, I trust.

Fair enough!

73 de Jim, N2EY

3433. Freebanders on Echo Link

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-29 12:43:33 UTC
From: Ernie <ernie@woooders.net>
Message-ID: <bqa49j$h1m$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 83009

Heard my first 11 meter freebander on Echo Link
today. Am wondering what the impact of this will be?
Sort of like a blending of technologies. It could be a
good thing.

Ernie

3434. Freebanders on Echo Link

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-29 12:50:43 UTC
From: Ernie <ernie@wooooders.net>
Message-ID: <bqa4n2$hv0$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 83010

Heard my first 11 meter freebander on Echo Link today.
Wonder what the impact of this will be ? Sort of like a
blending of technologies. Could be a good thing for the
hobby.

Ernie

3435. Re: Where Did THIS Come From...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-29 13:08:37 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0311290508.75fcc1ad@posting.google.com>
Source record: 83011

"Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<2_Uxb.28065$Wy4.17867@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> "Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote
>
> > GW's daddy visited the troops in Somalia after he lost the election.
>
> GW's Dad is the authentic article. His son doesn't measure up to the
> standards he set.
>
> 73, de Hans, K0HB

Perhaps. But he is much closer to the mark than Clinton.

3436. Re: Where Did THIS Come From...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-29 13:12:44 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0311290512.6afe3724@posting.google.com>
Source record: 83012

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20031128205817.12501.00004230@mb-m04.aol.com>...

> And to our service people - spending next Thanksgiving with their families at
> home.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

Jim, do you know how impossible your wish is?

Or are you just trying to feel good?

3437. Re: Where Did THIS Come From...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-29 13:20:33 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <B21yb.26192$Rk5.24497@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 83013

"Alan" wrote:
> In the last week, Phil has indicated his negative
> opinions toward Microsoft, Walmart, & Dr Laura.
> So, I mean, is it any real surprise Phil has negative
> opinions about Commander-In-Chief Bush? (snip)

And I'd say Phil's views hasn't been that far out of the mainstream on each. A lot of people don't like Microsoft. Wal-Mart just got caught in a rather unethical business activity. A lot of people also think Dr. Laura is a fruitcake. And, while I like and have openly supported Bush, his trip (sneaking into Iraq to pose for cameras) was an expensive, even childish, stunt (something I would not have expected from him, or any other president).

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3438. Re: Where Did THIS Come From...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-29 13:22:38 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0311290522.3bf9407@posting.google.com>
Source record: 83014

"Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<5VUxb.28060$Wy4.719@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> "Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote
>
> >
> > He got captured.
> >
>
> Yup, he was a long time guest at Hanoi Hilton, and Dubya couldn't quite seem
> to figure out where his National Guard unit was located.
>
> Sunuvagun!
>
> 73, de Hans, K0HB

McCain can't remember which political party he belongs to.

3439. Re: Where Did THIS Come From...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-29 13:28:10 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0311290528.46f032e6@posting.google.com>
Source record: 83015

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:<cuvyxnansvbet.hp2xgj1.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>...
> On Fri, 28 Nov 2003 22:21:32 GMT, Dan/W4NTI wrote:
>
> >I think it was a hell of a good thing to do. It showed the ragheads he has
> >the gonads, and is willing to put it out in front.
>
> There are better ways to show the Habibi that we can kick the
> charra out of them, such as by doing it. My people did it in '67
> (MY war).

Phil, when did you become an American citizen? Or haven't you?

3440. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-29 13:34:30 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031129083430.12501.00004243@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 83016

In article <SUSxb.27923$Wy4.5445@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> writes:

>"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote
>
>> And it has the unique characteristic that
>> you can't take advantage of it until you
>> have acquired a basic skill level.
>
>Unique? What's unique about Morse in that regard. There is no mode which
>you can use without some basic skill level in that mode.

What's unique is that most people old enough to pass the amateur radio license exams do not already have Morse skills, and will have to learn Morse skills in order to use the mode. But the vast majority of those same people already posess the skills to use other modes.

So what it comes down to is that a little serious skill-learning is required to use Morse on the air, except for a very few people who have learned Morse elsewhere. I think that plain, simple fact bothers some of the most vociferous and abusive anti-code-test folks.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3441. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-29 13:34:31 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031129083431.12501.00004244@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 83017

In article <JNXxb.25804$Rk5.2857@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> writes:

>"Dee D. Flint" wrote:
>>
>> None of the other modes requires any skill
>> at all beyond connecting the pieces per the
>> diagrams and typing on the keyboard or
>> pushing a mike button. (snip)
>
>
> Really? You mean all those things I did to get a properly operating
>station (putting coax and connectors together, waterproofing, antenna
>tuning, SWR tests, ground radials, masts, guy wires, wiring a microphone,
>equipment grounding, lightning protection, RF exposure level estimates, and
>so on) wasn't really needed and didn't really require any skills to do
>properly?

Not at all. Just that all those things (except RF exposure estimate) were optional and your choice, determined by the technologies you decided to use.

And most of them were not on your license tests. You figured out how to do them as a matter of practical necessity, not to pass a test.

> Well, I guess I'll just forget about all that stuff in the future.

>> (snip) Virtually anyone can put set up & run in
>> an afternoon once they have acquired the
>> equipment. (snip)

> In an afternoon? You mean I wasted all those days it took to get
>everything in my station working just right, not counting all the time I've
>spent fiddling around to get even better performance since then. Well,
>you're obviously a much more gifted operator than I am.

I've set up a complete Field Day station in much less than an afternoon. Again, almost none of the skills needed were on the license tests.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3442. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-29 13:34:32 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031129083432.12501.00004245@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 83018

In article <eeXxb.25694$Rk5.22660@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> writes:

>"Kï¿½HB" wrote:
>> "Dwight Stewart" wrote
>>
>> > Hans also seems to be basing his idea
>> > on the faulty premise that one must
>> > advance in license class to learn.....
>>
>> I don't support that premise at all. Where
>> did you read such off-target drivel? (snip)
>
>
> Well, lets see where I could have gotten that from. First, you propose a
>non-renewable license with a specific time limit to upgrade to a higher
>license class.

Just like the old Novice class license that brought hundreds of thousands of new hams into amateur radio. Hans' proposal recycles that old idea.

>That certainly fits what I said. Second, you justify the
>entire proposal by claiming the current tests are "not adequate to insure a
>high level of expertise in new applicants." This introduces the idea of
>raising the level of learning. And, finally, you set the license test all
>must take to upgrade at "a difficulty level similar to the current Extra
>class test." Those three together only suggest one thing - you don't think
>the lower class operators today re knowledgeable enough, you feel all should
>be forced to improve on that, and you offer the most difficult license test
>available today as the sole means to accomplish it. Perhaps you can explain
>where I'm wrong in that.

Looks right to me. Point is, newcomers would have a decade to do so.
>
>> (snip) My plan calls for a very simplified
>> license structure of a broad-privileged
>> learners permit (snip)
>
> The test proposal for new applicants makes the least sense of all. You
>introduced the proposal by claiming the current tests "are not adequate to
>insure a high level of expertise in new applicants." But you later propose a
>greatly simplified test for those new applicants (much more basic than
>today's Technician test). How can you "insure a high level of expertise in
>new applicants" by offering a even more simplified test?

The idea isn't that they'll have a high level of expertise right off, but that they'll reach that level through the 'incentive' of having to either upgrade or leave the air.
>
>> On the contrary, my plan puts newcomers
>> dead center in the mainstream of amateur
>> radio, with all the same privileges of EVERY
>> other licensee, just at a more modest power
>> level of 50watts. (snip)
>
> More modest power levels? That 50 watts you propose is 1,450 watts less
>than what Technicians can use today. That's a pretty significant hit, not a
>modest one.

Sure. But at the same time, they will have all frequencies and all modes. That's a pretty significant increase.

>As for privileges, once the code test is gone, Technicians can
>gain considerable HF privileges by taking the General written.

Right now, Technicians can gain almost all priviliges by passing the General written (only 35 questions) and the 5 wpm code receiving test. Been that way for almost three years.

>Your proposal
>would intentionally take that away by setting the bar to upgrade even higher
>(the Extra class test). And, if newcomers fail to reach that higher bar, out
>they go - their non-renewable license is gone.

Exactly.

But they would have 10 years to do it.

In the bad old days, a new ham had to pass the old General written (which was split into the Tech and General writtens in 1987) to get a permanent/renewable license of any class. The old Novice was meant as a learning tool, not a permanent license.

> And if this isn't all about assigning newcomers to a subordinate class,
>why don't you change the names of those new licenses you propose - Class A
>for the entry license class and Class B for the other license class? As it
>is, it's clear only someone who has taken an Extra class-like test can be a
>"Class A" Amateur Radio Operator.

Yup!
>
>> It's clear to me that you haven't even taken
>> the time to read the proposal I've made to
>> the FCC. (snip)
>
> I've read the proposal and what you've said about the proposal in this
>newsgroup. I stand by what I've said here and in the previous message.
>
I think you missed the major contradiction/paradox of Hans' proposal, Dwight.

He proposes a simplified test for the LP license, yet all LPs would be allowed all frequencies and modes.

So the simplified test has to be adequate for the LPs to use all freqs and modes - just not full power.

How can a simplifed test do that?

And if the simplified test *is* adequate, why should the higher-class test require more than the additional stuff needed to run high power?

73 de Jim, N2EY

3443. More 11m Freebanders on Echo Link

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-29 13:36:58 UTC
From: Arnie Voobner <anon@voobnerarn.net>
Message-ID: <bqa7dp$o5l$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 83019

Anyone have further info on all the 11 m freeband
activity on Echo Link?

Arnie

3444. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-29 14:15:12 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <QR1yb.28997$Wy4.10040@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 83020

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:U_Wxb.13129$P%1.11871251@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
>
> "K�HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:SUSxb.27923$Wy4.5445@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> > "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote
> >
> > > And it has the unique characteristic that
> > > you can't take advantage of it until you
> > > have acquired a basic skill level.
> >
> > Unique? What's unique about Morse in that regard. There is no mode
which
> > you can use without some basic skill level in that mode.
> >
> > 73, Hans, K0HB
>
> None of the other modes requires any skill at all beyond connecting the
> pieces per the diagrams and typing on the keyboard or pushing a mike
button.
> Although typing is a skill, it is not radio specific and the hunt & peck
> typist gets by. Virtually anyone can put set up & run in an afternoon
once
> they have acquired the equipment.

One can also use morse code with a "decoding" sheet to send and
recieve at very slow speeds,

> The skill requirement to operate other
> modes is insignificant.

The same can be said for morse...unless you want to operate at
other than a basic level. For some reason, this discussion always
seems to presume one must be code literate at speeds well above
even 5 wpm for code to be useful to anyone. If one can "hunt & peck"
via a keyboard, the same can be done for morse using a "cheat sheet"
to send and receive morse at slow speeds.

> I've operated both RTTY and packet and other
> digital modes and found them totally boring but I have had experience with
> them and there simply is no specific skill required.

Even "hunt & peck" requires an ability to use the keyboard
at a very minimal level. You may not think that it is any
skill level at all, but it is.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

3445. Re: Since We Were Mentioning "Absurdity"...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-29 14:35:44 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <492yb.4512$zL1.339481@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 83021

Steve Robeson, K4CAP wrote:

> I was reading my December 2003 "CQ" magazine and found an item
> penned by Jim Wiley KL7CC, Scott Neustadter W4WW, and the snake oil
> salesman of Amateur Radio...Fred Maia W5YI.
>
> The whole jist of the article is aimed at creating yet another
> Amateur Radio license, and the article suggests numerous "snips" of
> other requirements from the regulatory, theory, practice and safety
> regulations in order to "make" a slimmed-down beginners' license.
>
> See if you can remember where their following suggestion was once
> an actual practice of the Federal Communications Commission, and how
> well it worked in practice:
>
> (From page 36, December 2003 "CQ") QUOTE "Remove some of the
> math from the license exams. Remove some or even most of the "radio
> law" type questions. Instead require the applicants to sign a
> statement that they have read the Part 97 rulebook, and that they ahve
> a copy (available for free via web download). Yes, some of the
> applicants will "skate" and not read it when they signed that they
> did. But most will, and even among those who dont, eventually,
> probablysooner rather than later, they will get around to it. Some
> never will. That's human nature. We're not looking for saints, just
> people who can become producetive hams". UNQUOTE
>
> My first question for these brain surgeons is HOW IN THE BLUE
> BLAZES CAN SOMEONE BE "PRODUCTIVE" IF THEY DON"T KNOW THE RULES...?!?!
>
> These people are in a position of responsibility for mentoring
> the next generation of Amateurs..?!?!
>
> We'd be better off letting Michael Jackson be their sand lot
> supervisor! ! !
>
> While I am a big proponent of CLOSING the question pools and
> thereby requiring potential licensees to actually LEARN something,
> including regulations, even our present system of open pools and rote
> memorization will ingrain SOME understanding of the most of the basic
> rules of the service!
>
> Of course I can't help but believe this is another W5YI
> initiative to help perpetuate his "publishing" business, especially
> since it will soon lose part of it's subject matter (code tapes).

>
> One more new license would be yet another "text" he could get
> around to selling.
>
> Read the whole article. It's a really poorly thought out concept
> and one that's been beaten over and over again.

But.....But.....But Steve!!!! No one could have written that! Didn't they tell you? No one wants amateur radio simplified! Just because we've seen it written on the web, and now in CQ magazine, no one *really* feels that way! (tongue in cheek mode off)

I guess this is one of those cases where they say "I wasn't sayin', I was just sayin'".....

Oh them lumberjacks, chippin' away.

- Mike KB3EIA -

3446. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-29 14:38:55 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3c2yb.4513$zL1.340545@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 83022

Kï¿½HB wrote:

> On the contrary, my plan puts newcomers dead center in the mainstream of
> amateur radio, with all the same privileges of EVERY other licensee, just at
> a more modest power level of 50watts.

How are you going to enforce that?

- Mike KB3EIA -

3447. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-29 14:59:31 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <nv2yb.4519$zL1.345067@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 83023

Kï¿½HB wrote:

> A straightforward plan is already written and in the hands of the FCC.
> http://tinyurl.com/wce9

It really isn't too bad a plan, although there are a few weaknesses that are a bit bothersome.

That 50 watt limit for the class B license is simply unenforcable, save some sort of training wheel governor device that they would have to put on their transmitters.

If you want to put a time limit on upgrading, it really should be a lot shorter, like 3 years. Ten years is simply way too long. The prospective class A Ham almost certainly will upgrade in a year or two.

But I still don't like the idea of a forced retirement. It brings up an absurdity like a person that operates exclusivly QRP having to upgrade so that he/she is now allowed to use 1.5 kW. That's all they get. So they are forced to upgrade and spend money for something that means nothing to them - save keeping their license.

I really do like the idea of "time in grade". It is one of the best ideas ever abandoned by the FCC.

A lifetime grant license? Well, I'm not too sure. I guess it is a pretty good thing. If you don't have to renew it, there aren't processing costs.

- Mike KB3EIA -

3448. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-29 15:37:00 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bqaecq$ea0@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 83024

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:5RRxb.13101$P%1.11823086@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
>
> "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
> news:m9Rxb.27796$Wy4.3058@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> > "Dee D. Flint" wrote:
> > >
> > > My response was to your statement that
> > > code itself was unnecessary and I made
> > > that clear that I was addressing that issue
> > > only. (snip)
> >
> >
> > But my entire message, including the argument in that sentence, was
> about
> > the code test. However, within that context, it is indeed true that
Morse
> > code is not "necessary" for Amateur Radio today. The key word is
> > "necessary," not enjoyable, not great recreation, not useful to make
> > contacts with friends when conditions are bad, or whatever. Necessary.
> And,
> > therefore, if Morse code is not uniquely necessary, it should join the
> other
> > modes on the written tests without a unique testing requirement.
> >
>
> Morse code is uniquely necessary. And it has the unique characteristic
that
> you can't take advantage of it until you have acquired a basic skill
level.
>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>

I personally don't have the desire to "take advantage of" CW. I haven't
been interested in CW since I was first introduced to it and found it
nothing more than a necessary evil--a means to an end--to licensing in
amateur radio. I also found it uniquely lacking in any pertinent
application to the process of amateur radio, overall.

CW is a wonderful skill to have if one enjoys communicating with it. It is
also an art and a traditional part of the ARS that I would like to see stick
around. I believe there are enough interested individuals to keep it that
way--and I used to see new folks all the time who were interested in it.
Can't speak for lately because I've really been out of the ARS scene for

quite some time now. But, it'd be my guess that there are still people excited by CW and who will learn it, use it, and enjoy it.

I don't believe any of the above is enough merit to have it as part of the licensing requirement, though...

Kim W5TIT

3449. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-29 15:40:53 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bqaek3$em@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 83025

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:ojSxb.27855$Wy4.26114@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> "Kim W5TIT" wrote:
> >
> > Wow. Good point, Dwight. Maybe that
> > idea of a term limitation license makes more
> > sense than ever. I haven't been in favor of
> > it...but maybe there's a part of it I haven't
> > thought of, such as your comment above.
>
>
> Learning is one aspect of the basis and purpose of the Amateur Radio
> Service, not the total sum. When discussing term limits on license class,
> all aspects of that should be considered. And, when it comes to those
other
> aspects, there is no real benefit from term limits. Indeed, one could
argue
> that it may actually harm those other things (reducing our overall
numbers,
> for example).
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
>

Well, what I would support would be something like a pretty simple test--I mean darned simple--with a minimal operating privilege built in with it. At the end of something like a year or 2 years, then one would either have to upgrade with a more technical and knowledge-based test and a higher, permanent license class. I still would leave CW out of the mix, too...

However, I don't think there's going to be any major changes to the licensing or testing structure for another couple of years. Jim, I think it was, had a thread going with the predictions of when CW would be taken out and I think I had a couple of years while others were guessing pretty quick. I think CW testing is here to stay for a while.

Kim W5TIT

3450. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-29 15:43:05 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <d83yb.4535$zL1.353339@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 83026

N2EY wrote:

> In article <eeXxb.25694$Rk5.22660@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dwight
> Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> writes:

<snippage>

>>Your proposal
>>would intentionally take that away by setting the bar to upgrade even higher
>>(the Extra class test). And, if newcomers fail to reach that higher bar, out
>>they go - their non-renewable license is gone.
>
>
> Exactly.
>
> But they would have 10 years to do it.
>
> In the bad old days, a new ham had to pass the old General written (which was
> split into the Tech and General writtens in 1987) to get a permanent/renewable
> license of any class. The old Novice was meant as a learning tool, not a
> permanent license.

Just because an idea was old, doesn't mean it wasn't bad! 8^) I would
have to suspect that the old Novice non-renewable was probably to allow
the prospective "permanent" ham to hone his or her Morse CW skills
rather than learn the writtens of the time. So the big question is what
is going to be different about this new class gap that ten years is an
appropriate time lag.

For a hobby, ten years is just too long a time. If there are going to be
limits, they should be reasonable ones.

>> And if this isn't all about assigning newcomers to a subordinate class,
>>why don't you change the names of those new licenses you propose - Class A
>>for the entry license class and Class B for the other license class? As it
>>is, it's clear only someone who has taken an Extra class-like test can be a
>>"Class A" Amateur Radio Operator.
>
>
> Yup!
>
>>>It's clear to me that you haven't even taken
>>>the time to read the proposal I've made to
>>>the FCC. (snip)
>>
>> I've read the proposal and what you've said about the proposal in this

>>newsgroup. I stand by what I've said here and in the previous message.
>>
>
> I think you missed the major contradiction/paradox of Hans' proposal, Dwight.
>
> He proposes a simplified test for the LP license, yet all LPs would be allowed
> all frequencies and modes.
>
> So the simplified test has to be adequate for the LPs to use all freqs and
> modes - just not full power.
>
> How can a simplifed test do that?

And how are we going to take care of the "shack on a belt" crowd. A
awful lot of hams are quite happy with their Technician licenses. A
forced upgrade with absolutely no advantage for a person that only does
public events, and uses the local repeater once in a while is not going
to be very popular with them. And "they" are a pretty large percentage.
Yes of course that is among people already licensed, but my point is
that this proposal is very HF-centric.

> And if the simplified test *is* adequate, why should the higher-class test
> require more than the additional stuff needed to run high power?

And of course, how ya gonna enforce that 50 watt limit? Enacting
unenforceable laws is a great way to breed disrespect for laws.

- Mike KB3EIA -

3451. Re: More 11m Freebanders on Echo Link

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-29 15:44:17 UTC
From: KMA <kma@kma.org>
Message-ID: <vshfmjra0uun8f@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 83027

"Arnie Voobner" <anon@voobnerarn.net> wrote in message
news:bqa7dp$o5l$0@pita.alt.net...
> Anyone have further info on all the 11 m freeband
> activity on Echo Link?
>
> Arnie
>
>

I'm surprised it took this long for the "Freebanders" to show up on
"Echolink", aka "Echocrap".

3452. Re: Where Did THIS Come From...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-29 15:45:37 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <Ba3yb.4537$zL1.353994@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 83028

Simon Schuluster wrote:

> "Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
>
>
>> "There's no business like show business.....">
>> How much did that little stunt cost in planning and expenses for
>
>
> //Kane Troll Snipped here & flushed///
>
>
> TROLL - O - METER
> 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
> /
> /
> /
> /
> /
> /
> /
> /
> /
> (trolls rated on a one to ten scale)
>

WOW! it bent the needle on the meter! 8^)

- Mike KB3EIA -

3453. Re: Dean Trumps Bush's Visit to Baghdad

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-29 16:02:59 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bqafth$80s@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 83029

Jim, the below "article" that was posted is quite suspicious. I can find no evidence anywhere that Dean went to Iraq.

Kim W5TIT

"Jim Hampton" <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote in message
news:MWSxb.2403$4c5.1816@news01.roc.ny...
> Obviously, you didn't have the 'honor' of serving in Vietnam.
>
> Bush took a calculated risk ... a big risk. I won't worry too much about
> his motives. It was nice that he actually visited the troops. I remember
> Bob Hope visiting Guam. He visited a lot of war zones in his career and
he
> had no political agenda (and I am *not* detracting from President Bush -
> please don't read anything into my post)
>
>
> 73 from Rochester, NY
> Jim AA2QA
>
>
> "Uri" <none@uriknowswho.net> wrote in message
> news:bq8sgnedg0@pita.alt.net...
> >
> > x-no-archive: yes
> > > ???? DEAN PAYS SURPRISE VISIT TO BAATHISTS IN IRAQ ????
> > >
> > > By LAWRENCE E BURT, AP Political Correspondent BAGHDAD, Iraq - Howard
> > > Dean flew to Iraq under extraordinary secrecy and security Thursday to
> > > spend the end of Ramadan with former Baathists and thank them for
> > > "defending the Iraqi people from American Imperilaism."
> > >
> > > The unannounced visit brought wild cheers from battle-worn Hussein
> > > loyalists, stunned the nation and even surprised Dean's wife, Dr.
> > > Judith Steinberg, who had been expecting him at the Thanksgiving table
> > > at Dean's boyhood home on Park Avenue in Manhattan.
> > >
> > > Dean, the first presidential candidate to visit enemy combatants,
> > > promised that insurgents testing America's commitment will surely be
> > > rewarded with a U.S. retreat should Dean shock pundits and get elected
> > > president.
> > >
> > > "I feel your pain," Dean told the cheering members of the Iraqi
> > > Republican Guard, noting "if I had my way, you would still be in

> > > power."
> > >
> > > The diners had been told only that they were gathered for dinner with
> > > a VIP guest in the mess hall at Al-Aqalaba Mosque. "I know that Islam
> > > means peace," Dean told the grateful crowd, calling again for a more
> > > "even-handed" approach to Middle East policy.
> > >
> > > Dean's remarks were extremely well received. Imam Muhammmad Atta said
> > > "He will stand up to the Zionists imperialist Americans who oppose our
> > > jihad."
> > >
> > > Dean handed out food to the locals, though as a vegan he himself did
> > > not partake in the meal. Dean bought the crowd to its feet when he
> > > said "I would be happy to join your fight, but for this painful back
> > > condition which has even hampered my skiiing."
> > >
> > > .
> > > .
> > > .
> >
> >
>
>

3454. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-29 16:04:03 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bqafvg$qht@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 83030

"JJ" <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
news:6tudnexRqIo6mVWiRVn-hA@gbronline.com...
> K&#65533;HB wrote:
> > "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote
> >
> >
> > >>A Corvair?!!??!! And you say chicks dug it??!!?? Ewww, I have never
> >
> > liked
> >
> > >>those cars--they are my number one pick of yuckos, right behind
Studebaker
> > >>which is the number one uglymobile... Most of us "chicks" in my
hometown
> > >>felt the same way about those two makes of vehicles.
> >
> >
> > Red 1962 Corvair Spyder convertible, white top, white interior! It was
a
> > chick magnet, but paled alongside my cousins Studebaker Avanti!
Discerning
> > chicks flocked all over that beauty!
> >
> > Chicks in your hometown musta been kinda automotively backwards.....
maybe
> > they liked Nash tanks in which the seats relined all the way to
horizontal?
> >
> > 73, de Hans, K0HB
>
> In Kim's local, if it isn't/wasn't a pickup with some vulgar kicker
> sticker on the back window, they weren't interested.
>

Still bitter, eh, JJ?

Kim W5TIT

3455. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-29 16:12:53 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bqagg3$d1a@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 83031

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:3c2yb.4513$zL1.340545@news1.news.adelphia.net...
> K&#65533;HB wrote:
>
>
> > On the contrary, my plan puts newcomers dead center in the mainstream of
> > amateur radio, with all the same privileges of EVERY other licensee,
just at
> > a more modest power level of 50watts.
>
> How are you going to enforce that?
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -
>

Well, no matter what Hans believes on this, power level enforcement or even monitoring just can't be done--unless there'd be a whole lot more dollars and effort going to it and we all know that's not going to happen.

Kim W5TIT

3456. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-29 16:24:49 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031129112449.29660.00001854@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 83033

In article <bq7kka$hs9@library2.airnews.net>, "Kim" <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20031127205909.08626.00001939@mb-m27.aol.com...
>> In article <bq52ki$l6t@library1.airnews.net>, "Kim "
><kimscliff@yahoo.com>
>> writes:
>>
>> >Hmmm, not only no, but hell no. I can be treaded on all "they" want.
>> >I've declared war on the road, tell ya that. I travel a good number of
miles
>> >to work.

By your own choice.

>> >And, it's so bad "out there" that when I do 70-75 (in a 60 zone),
>> >there will be creeps that pull up behind me and start this moving to the
>> >left so they're on the shoulder and can see the traffic around the front
>> >of me; or flashing their headlights so I'll move outta "their" way; or
>> >pulling
>> >up so close that all I see of their lights behind me is a halo because
>> >they're only about 2' distance from my rear bumper.
>>
>> What lane are you in when they do this?
>
>The far left--the "fast" lane as it is called. Funny thing is, if you
>mention to people at the office or wherever, that it doesn't mean the "break
>the speed limit lane," you ought to hear the validations for people doing
>just that.

But you're already speeding, Kim. And not by an amount that can be
explained by the usual inaccuraccies and imperfections of speedometers.

Yet your getting ticked off because someone wants to go even faster.

>The argument is along the lines that this is the lane where, if
>someone needs to pass, speeding is legal to get around them;

Ah - but why does someone *need* to pass?

As Dee points out, on a two-lane, two direction road, it may be necessary to
go fast to get out of a tough passing situation. But on a multilane divided
highway where traffic is already zooming at the speed limit or above, why does
anyone not in a life-and-death emergency situation *need* to pass?

>or, this is the
>lane where if the majority of drivers wants to go a little faster than the
>flow of traffic, they do it there! There's more validations, but that's the
>gist of it...!!

And they take the risk of being fined, or worse.
>
>Note that I let you know that I am already speeding, as it is. Up to about
>15 MPH over the posted speed.

Right.

So you have justified such speeding to yourself, even though it violates the
law. The person behind you who wants to go 20-25 MPH over the limit has
almost certainly justified their behavior to him/herself, even though it also
violates the law.

>> >Or, they'll do the
>> >ultimate stupidity and pass then pull into the spot that I have created
>> >in
>> >front of me so that they can start leapfrogging from one lane to the
>> >next.
>> >Well, used to be I'd move. No more. I sit right there. And, they still
>> >go
>> >around but now I creep up just ever so slightly (still maintain a safe
>> >distance from the vehicle in front of me) and see if they'll still dare
>> >slide in. Well, sometimes they do. So, since they've usually been
>> >behind
>> >me flashing their headlights, I'll go the lazy man's route and just leave
>> >mine on high beam--and I've got some bright lights.
>>
>> And if an accident occurs, you'll hit them, and the judgement may be that
>> it was *your* fault!
>
>I hope I've got enough leverage between them and me.

I hope so too, but if they don't, you might be in a bad spot. Particularly if
someone dies or is seriously injured. Try arguing your high beams at a
graveside....

>I prefer, and usually
>can manage to, approx. 6 or more carlengths in front of me. More if I can
>maintain it, but that's hard.

That's good.
>
>> I go on the "Duel" philosophy (from the old TV movie by Speilberg): I'd
>> rather
>> have a nutcase driver in front of me, where I can watch him/her, than
>> behind
>> me. I've actually pulled over and let 'em go by rather than have them
>> follow me.
>

>Know what happens here? If one is cautiously staying behind a fruitcake
>driver, all the hurry-up-and-get-me-knowwhere nitiwits start passing like
>they are the charging brigade--never taking just a moment to see what they
>are pulling up on (a very dangerous situation with a driver ahead way too
>close to the vehicle in front of them) or someone who's been doing a bit of
>weaving; or whatever. So, depending upon the situation, letting this person
>stay in front instead of taking the first opportunity to get around them,
>can be more hazardous.

I disagree. I simply pull over and let the whacko get farther ahead. Miles, if necessary. At 60 MPH, one minute of delay buys me a mile of space. I can spare that minute.

>
>> >Then, there's the folks in the store. You'll know who I'm talking about
>> >here. The folks who walk up behind you and have a couple of things in
>> >their
>> >hands and start practically doing calisthenics (sp) to careen in front of
>> >you so you'll see they only have a couple of things and let them go
>> >ahead.
>>
>> I haven't encountered that yet. Must be a Texas thing...
>
>Wow. Really?

Honest. Stores here mostly have express lanes (10 items or less) - some have two or even three levels of express (8 items or less, 15 items or less, etc.). And they enforce the item count.

>Maybe I just need to move. This is so commonplace down here,
>you're considered the idiot if you don't let these folks get ahead.

I've never encountered that sort of behavior. Line discipline/courtesy around here is really very good, even around the holidays. Maybe it *is* a regional thing.

>> >Used to do that, too. No more. It's my turn dammit and they can wait.
>> >Now, don't get me wrong: if I happen to turn to one side or the other and
>> >I
>> >notice someone patiently waiting their turn, I let them go ahead. But
>> >these
>> >creeps who think that they are entitled to getting around just because th
>> >ey
>> >are far more important than anyone else...nope, not doin' it any more.
>> >And,
>> >depending upon how showy they are about how important they are is how
>> >slow I
>> >am to slowly unload my cart, slowly find my checkbook, confirm the price
>> >however many times it needs confirming, very carefully write my check,
>> >etc.

Passive aggressive behavior, IOW.
>>

>> I use a different approach completely in stores. I call it the CQT
>> (Cuteness Queueing Theory) method. Works like this:
>>
>> Whenever you're in a store that has two or more checkout lines, choose
>> which
>> line to be in by how attractive/cute/sexy/whatever the checkout person is.
>> Doesn't matter how long the line is - get in the line with the checkout
>> person
>> you find most attractive. For some reason, that line always seems to move
>> the fastest.

It may not be the fastest, but it sure seems that way!
>
>Now, Jim. Forgive me for being non-male here, but I don't generally find
>myself "checking out" at the check out. <GRIN>

Try it. Enjoy the scenery. Why not? And remember, the criteria of
attractiveness is yours alone.
>
>> >Or, the teeny-bopper eh-heh couple that thinks everyone wants to see them
>> >practically making love in public. If we are all in a line at a store or
>> >something and I see another person who is as dismayed by this as me, I'll
>> >say something like, "thank goodness for birth control." The other person
>> >will usually say something back (having just *waited* for the
>> >opportunity)
>> >like, "doesn't look like they use it." Or some such thing. For some
>> >reason, *that* is when these creeps get embarrassed.
>>
>> I like that! Here's another, copied from the "Seinfeld" episode, but you
>> have
>> to be with your SO to do it. Simply start talking all sweet to each other
>> (the
>> episode had Jerry and his girlfriend calling each other "schmoopie").
>> Folks of
>> our age look ancient to many kids that age, and when we behave that way it
>> drives them nuts. Of course, it takes some discipline to keep a straight
>> face
>> while calling each other "Bunny" and "Huggybear" and such, plus you hafta
>> have the right person with you to do it at all.

"Snookums" causes wide-area gagging and retching if done right.
>
>Hey, now. I like that one!! My darlin' would never do that, though.

Doesn't have to be your spouse...

>He's
>still in the phase that he puts up with this stuff and then crabs about it
>later--the phase I used to be in. BUT, it'd be neat to get in line with one
>of my girlfriends and start acting gay!

"Not that there's anyhting wrong with that!" (also from Seinfeld)

>If I get the courage to do that,
>and have one of my girlfriends who'll join in, I'll have to let you know how
>it turns out.

bwaahaahaa

>I love that scene in "Ghost" with (was it?) Meg Ryan
>simulating an orgasm at the restaraunt table! I cracked up.

That was Meg Ryan and Billy Crystal in "When Harry Met Sally". He had said she
couldn't convincingly fake it.

The topper to her performance was the little old lady (played by the director's
real-life mom) who said "I'll have what she's having"...

There was also a Seinfeld about faking....
>
>> >
>> >Then, there's what I call the "buddy" creeps. The philosophy is to shop
>> >in
>> >pairs and have one stand in line while the other keeps going back and
>> >getting things that were "forgotten." And, the one standing in line will
>> >keep turning and saying please excuse us...<giggle>. I used to just
>> >throw a
>> >fake smile. Not any more. Now I say, "no, I won't excuse you, you are
>> >holding all of us up here and it's rude and inconsiderate of you."
>>
>> I don't mind a thing or two, but after that it's a different story.

Such shenanigans are unknown around here. I've seen people one cart from the
belt pull out of line and go to the rear because they forgot something.

>I've gotten disgusted enough with all this crappy behavior that no one gets
>the benefit of the doubt anymore, either. And, it's not just me. I've
>talked to folks at the office and they are all the same way. In fact, we've
>all forgiven each other for our behavior ahead of time...;o

The problem is that your anger makes *you* miserable.
> >
>> >And restaurants. Oh my goodness how many times have you been at an
>> >eatery,
>> >only to have some creep's misbehaving little future creep keep popping up
>> >over the booth seat to let out a shrill of a scream with laughter right
>> >behind--over and over and over again...or let the little tyrant run
>> >rampant
>> >while the beautiful couple (yeah right) sits and eats in peace while
>> >their
>> >monster runs to every table standing there like you're supposed to
>> >applaud
>> >them or something. I used to grin and bear that, too. Now, I get up,
>> >and
>> >I'll actually say something to the parents about how disruptive their
>> >"child" (term used loosely) is being to everyone else's table--so can I
>> >sit

>> >at theirs. That one there gets real sneers. Ask me if I care. They
>> >don't, I ain't gonna.
>>
>> Fortunately I haven't run into that very much. Yet.
>
>Yeah, I tried to take my parents out to a very nice dinner and there was one
>of these kids in the "booth" (yeah, I know...a booth at a nice restaraunt,
>go figure) next to us. Well, this kid was directly behind my parents.
>After about the 3rd or 4th time the kid kept doing this, I became the
>obnoxious one. I kept saying, "SIR!" over and over again until the dad, who
>was trying his hardest to ignore me, looked at me and I said, "could you
>keep your kid reigned in? We are trying to have a family dinner ourselves
>over here." Well, these folks were so offended that they demonstratively
>got up, and abruptly left. As they were walking away I thanked them. I
>hope they talk about that for the next 20 years.

That was a pretty good example of being assertive, I think.
>
>> >Well, as I've been doing this more and more over the past 5-6 months or
>> >so,
>> >I am also noticing that there are others doing this. I don't know that
>> >it's
>> >always been done by others and I've just never noticed, but I notice that
>> >there *are* others who are doing it. I am refreshed by that. I am tired
>> >of
>> >always being the friendly, patient, kind one--just to keep getting
>> >stepped on by the creeps...
>> >
>> >Maybe we've all had it... <grin>
>>
>> One can be assertive without being nasty, though.
>>
>> It sure sounds like people are in one heck of a hurry down there,
>> though...

>Yes. They are.

I wonder why?

>And, while my behavior is not "forgiveable," I am no where
>as nasty as these folks are being.
>
Isn't that an entirely subjective judgement?

73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>

3457. Re: Where Did THIS Come From...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-29 16:24:50 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031129112450.29660.00001855@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 83032

In article <f45722ac.0311290512.6afe3724@posting.google.com>,
brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:

>n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
>news:<20031128205817.12501.00004230@mb-m04.aol.com>...
>
>> And to our service people - spending next Thanksgiving with their families
>at
>> home.
>>
>> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>Jim, do you know how impossible your wish is?

Brian, do you know how bad your English is?

A thing is either possible or impossible.

A lot of things once considered "impossible" have become reality.

Live with it.

3458. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-29 16:54:46 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <pb4yb.13152$P%1.11936246@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 83034

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:YsXxb.25734$Rk5.5191@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
>
> "Dee D. Flint" wrote:
> >
> > Morse code is uniquely necessary. (snip)
>
>
> Saying so doesn't make it true, Dee. Within the goals and purposes of
the
> Amateur Radio Service, and to justify a unique testing requirement, how is
> Morse code uniquely necessary today? Do remember recreational use is not
> sufficient enough to justify a unique testing requirement (recreational
use
> is equally applicable to all modes and they don't have a unique testing
> requirement).
>

Well Dwight saying it isn't doesn't make that true either Dwight. I speak from personal experience. How much HF experience have you had? How much weak signal VHF experience have you had? Again keep in mind that I have said Morse is necessary. While I happen to believe that testing should be maintained that is NOT the point I am debating at this time and you keep trying to drag it back to testing. I am stating that Morse code itself is necessary.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

3459. Re: Where Did THIS Come From...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-29 16:58:07 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031129115807.23307.00004755@mb-m29.aol.com>
Source record: 83035

In article <f45722ac.0311281934.2deeda0@posting.google.com>,
brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:

>Blowhard libs have tried soooo hard to wreck this country.

So have blowhard conservatives.

>They've nearly succeeded,

How is this country "wrecked", compared to how things used to be?

>but there are still a few people who give a damn
>about America, and GW is one of them.

There are lots of others, including many who disagree with Mr. Bush.

It's the methods, not the person.

>

3460. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-29 17:04:47 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <Pk4yb.13155$P%1.11937916@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 83036

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:JNXxb.25804$Rk5.2857@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> "Dee D. Flint" wrote:
> >
> > None of the other modes requires any skill
> > at all beyond connecting the pieces per the
> > diagrams and typing on the keyboard or
> > pushing a mike button. (snip)
>
>
> Really? You mean all those things I did to get a properly operating
> station (putting coax and connectors together, waterproofing, antenna
> tuning, SWR tests, ground radials, masts, guy wires, wiring a microphone,
> equipment grounding, lightning protection, RF exposure level estimates,
and
> so on) wasn't really needed and didn't really require any skills to do
> properly? Well, I guess I'll just forget about all that stuff in the
future.
>

Soldering requires some modest skill but one can hire that done if desired.
The other items are necessary but no skill is required just taking the time
to do it.

>
> > (snip) Virtually anyone can put set up & run in
> > an afternoon once they have acquired the
> > equipment. (snip)
>
>
> In an afternoon? You mean I wasted all those days it took to get
> everything in my station working just right, not counting all the time
I've
> spent fiddling around to get even better performance since then. Well,
> you're obviously a much more gifted operator than I am.
>

Doesn't require a gift merely knowing what to do and when to do it. Most
people don't try to set up the station and all the options at once. They
generally work at it in stages gaining experience as the go.

You will find that most experienced hams could set up a complete station,
including antennas, digital modes etc within a matter of hours. Many do so
for single station operation in Field Day.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

3461. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-29 17:08:48 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <Ao4yb.13157$P%1.11937950@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 83037

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20031129083430.12501.00004243@mb-m04.aol.com...
> In article <SUSxb.27923$Wy4.5445@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Kï¿½HB"
> <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> writes:
>
> >"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote
> >
> >> And it has the unique characteristic that
> >> you can't take advantage of it until you
> >> have acquired a basic skill level.
> >
> >Unique? What's unique about Morse in that regard. There is no mode
which
> >you can use without some basic skill level in that mode.
>
> What's unique is that most people old enough to pass the amateur radio
license
> exams do not already have Morse skills, and will have to learn Morse
skills in
> order to use the mode. But the vast majority of those same people already
> posess the skills to use other modes.
>
> So what it comes down to is that a little serious skill-learning is
required to
> use Morse on the air, except for a very few people who have learned Morse
> elsewhere. I think that plain, simple fact bothers some of the most
vociferous
> and abusive anti-code-test folks.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

Excellent summary there, Jim. I think that is what many of us are trying to
say but not finding the right words.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

3462. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-29 17:16:07 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <rv4yb.13158$P%1.11940230@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 83038

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:QR1yb.28997$Wy4.10040@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net...
>
> "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
> news:U_Wxb.13129$P%1.11871251@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
> [snip]
> The same can be said for morse...unless you want to operate at
> other than a basic level. For some reason, this discussion always
> seems to presume one must be code literate at speeds well above
> even 5 wpm for code to be useful to anyone. If one can "hunt & peck"
> via a keyboard, the same can be done for morse using a "cheat sheet"
> to send and receive morse at slow speeds.
>

No 5wpm is useful just a tedious for the listener. Learning it to a
higher speed simply makes it easier to communicate and increases the
probability that the person will not forget his/her code over time.

However, using a "cheat sheet" won't even let you go 5wpm as it takes too
long to look up the letters.

> > I've operated both RTTY and packet and other
> > digital modes and found them totally boring but I have had experience
with
> > them and there simply is no specific skill required.
>
> Even "hunt & peck" requires an ability to use the keyboard
> at a very minimal level. You may not think that it is any
> skill level at all, but it is.
>

In today's world, most people have to learn that skill at a minimmal anyway
whether or not they wish to be radio Amateurs so do not include that as
something unique to Amateur Radio.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

3463. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-29 17:20:21 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <pz4yb.13159$P%1.11941034@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 83039

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:3c2yb.4513$zL1.340545@news1.news.adelphia.net...
> Kï¿½HB wrote:
>
>
> > On the contrary, my plan puts newcomers dead center in the mainstream of
> > amateur radio, with all the same privileges of EVERY other licensee,
just at
> > a more modest power level of 50watts.
>
> How are you going to enforce that?
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -
>

Mike, You and I know it can't be enforced without invasion of privacy. You have to go on the operator's property and make local field strength measurements. Just reading the signal strength from another station won't do it as we've all experienced working a QRP station when propagation was good and receiving them at 10 over S9.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

3464. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-29 17:23:43 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <yC4yb.13160$P%1.11941003@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 83040

"Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:bqaecq$ea0@library1.airnews.net...
> "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
> news:5RRxb.13101$P%1.11823086@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
> >
> > "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
> > news:m9Rxb.27796$Wy4.3058@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> > > "Dee D. Flint" wrote:
> > > >
> > > > My response was to your statement that
> > > > code itself was unnecessary and I made
> > > > that clear that I was addressing that issue
> > > > only. (snip)
> > >
> > >
> > > But my entire message, including the argument in that sentence, was
> > about
> > > the code test. However, within that context, it is indeed true that
> Morse
> > > code is not "necessary" for Amateur Radio today. The key word is
> > > "necessary," not enjoyable, not great recreation, not useful to make
> > > contacts with friends when conditions are bad, or whatever. Necessary.
> > And,
> > > therefore, if Morse code is not uniquely necessary, it should join the
> > other
> > > modes on the written tests without a unique testing requirement.
> > >
> >
> > Morse code is uniquely necessary. And it has the unique characteristic
> that
> > you can't take advantage of it until you have acquired a basic skill
> level.
> >
> > Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
> >
>
> I personally don't have the desire to "take advantage of" CW. I haven't
> been interested in CW since I was first introduced to it and found it
> nothing more than a necessary evil--a means to an end--to licensing in
> amateur radio. I also found it uniquely lacking in any pertinent
> application to the process of amateur radio, overall.
>

I believe you have previously stated that once you tried HF, you did not care for it and have since stayed primarily with VHF FM. There's nothing wrong with that. However, those who work a lot of HF are really shortchanging themselves if they are unable to use CW.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

3465. Re: Where Did THIS Come From...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-29 17:50:40 UTC
From: Alun <alun@1stcounsel.com>
Message-ID: <Xns944282A0D69C5elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 83041

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in news:20031129115807.23307.00004755@mb-m29.aol.com:

> In article <f45722ac.0311281934.2deeda0@posting.google.com>,
> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
>
>>Blowhard libs have tried soooo hard to wreck this country.
>
> So have blowhard conservatives.
>
>>They've nearly succeeded,
>
> How is this country "wrecked", compared to how things used to be?
>
>>but there are still a few people who give a damn about America, and GW
>>is one of them.
>
> There are lots of others, including many who disagree with Mr. Bush.
>
> It's the methods, not the person.
>
>>
>
>
>

Well, I'm a foreigner in your country, but you can't deny that the economy boomed under Clinton and is now on it's knees.

I'm not fond of the present government, but mainly for other reasons. Civil liberties and John Ashcroft, mostly.

All in all, I can't really think of anything GW Bush has done domestically that is anything to shout about. Tax cuts for the rich. Deficit spending. I'm really trying to think of anything good (honestly), but nothing comes to mind.

As for the war, why open that can of worms? Yes, Saddam is/was a very bad guy. Do I beleive the reasons given for going to war? No. And yes, Blair went along with it, but I don't like him a lot either.

... but then I'm an anti-code test liberal, so what did you expect?

However, I actually do think it was a nice gesture for Dubbya to go to Baghdad for Thanksgiving.

I'm sure this post will draw the usual 'love it or leave it' garbage from at least someone, but never mind. I can take it.

3466. Re: It ain't about the test.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-29 17:58:14 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031129125814.12501.00004247@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 83042

In article <Xns94415FF33DEEelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun
<alun@1stcounsel.com> writes:

>> Fessenden demonstrated voice modulated spark operation as early as
>> 1900. His methods have been verified by actual tests using replica
>> transmitters and dummy loads.
>
>Fessenden transmitted voice over one mile during December 1900, possibly
>on the 12th, on Cobb Island, Maryland.

Yep. You can even listen to re-creations of what it may have sounded like
on-line. I posted the urls here some time back.

By 1903, he had reached 50 miles.

Of course in a way *almost all* spark transmitters use alternators, because
except for simple spark coils, they *all* use AC generated by alternators...

Fessenden's innovation was to use AC above the voice frequency range.

Brilliant guy. Over 500 patents, in a variety of fields.
>
>> Fessenden had a two-way transatlantic radiotelephone setup in operation
>> by November of 1906 using alternator RF sources.
>>
>> The demo of Christmas Eve 1906 was repeated a week later (New Year's
>> Eve).
>>
>> These events are well documented.
>
>As is DeForrest's later voice coverage of the New York yacht race, using a
>spark transmitter of the earlier type (no alternator) but using a
>regenerative detector with a triode tube. I can't remember when that took
>place, although it is in several books, but the triode (audion) patent
>discloses the regenerative detector and was issued in 1907, so the yacht
>race must have taken place around that period.

Practical regenerative detection is generally credited to Armstrong in 1915.
However, DeForest's use of voice communication at such an early date is another
historic fact.

Seems to me that Fessenden's transatlantic 2 way radiotelephone operation is
the most significant of these early developments. Less than 5 years after
Marconi claimed one-time one-way reception of a single coded letter, Fessenden
had practical, repeatable, two-way voice transatlantic radio communications
over a longer path, using much less power.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3467. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-29 18:05:36 UTC
From: Alun <alun@1stcounsel.com>
Message-ID: <Xns9442852918101elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 83043

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in
news:5RRxb.13101$P%1.11823086@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com:

>
> "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
> news:m9Rxb.27796$Wy4.3058@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net...
>> "Dee D. Flint" wrote:
>> >
>> > My response was to your statement that
>> > code itself was unnecessary and I made
>> > that clear that I was addressing that issue only. (snip)
>>
>>
>> But my entire message, including the argument in that sentence, was
>> about
>> the code test. However, within that context, it is indeed true that
>> Morse code is not "necessary" for Amateur Radio today. The key word is
>> "necessary," not enjoyable, not great recreation, not useful to make
>> contacts with friends when conditions are bad, or whatever. Necessary.
>> And, therefore, if Morse code is not uniquely necessary, it should
>> join the other modes on the written tests without a unique testing
>> requirement.
>>
>
> Morse code is uniquely necessary. And it has the unique characteristic
> that you can't take advantage of it until you have acquired a basic
> skill level.
>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>
>

Amateur radio itself isn't even necessary. I've been a ham for 23 years,
nearly 24, and I've never used CW. So it's 'necessary' for me to use CW?
Right.

3468. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-29 18:07:08 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <PN6dnT305qlVfVWiRVn-tw@gbronline.com>
Source record: 83044

Kim W5TIT wrote:

>
> Still bitter, eh, JJ?
>
> Kim W5TIT
>
>
About what? Not having someone who has such low class and taste to
choose a call sign like yours follow me around? Not hardly.

3469. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-29 18:24:36 UTC
From: Alun <alun@1stcounsel.com>
Message-ID: <Xns944288614CAD1elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 83045

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in
news:Ao4yb.13157$P%1.11937950@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com:

>
> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20031129083430.12501.00004243@mb-m04.aol.com...
>> In article <SUSxb.27923$Wy4.5445@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>,
>> "K HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> writes:
>>
>> >"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote
>> >
>> >> And it has the unique characteristic that
>> >> you can't take advantage of it until you have acquired a basic
>> >> skill level.
>> >
>> >Unique? What's unique about Morse in that regard. There is no mode
>> >which you can use without some basic skill level in that mode.
>>
>> What's unique is that most people old enough to pass the amateur radio
>> license exams do not already have Morse skills, and will have to learn
>> Morse skills in order to use the mode. But the vast majority of those
>> same people already posess the skills to use other modes.
>>
>> So what it comes down to is that a little serious skill-learning is
>> required to use Morse on the air, except for a very few people who
>> have learned Morse elsewhere. I think that plain, simple fact bothers
>> some of the most vociferous and abusive anti-code-test folks.
>>
>> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
> Excellent summary there, Jim. I think that is what many of us are
> trying to say but not finding the right words.
>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>
>

What is annoying is that a skill test is foisted on those who don't have
the desire to use the skill. Learning the theory of modes you don't want
to use is not too onerous, but having to pass a typing test to use phone
would be just as annoying and stupid as having to pass a code test to use
phone, for example. Besides, having to know about other modes is
reasonable, but actually learning to use them is another matter. Also, if
I hear CW on my frequency I may be able to read it with some difficulty,

but if I hear RTTY or PSK31 there is no chance.

3470. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-29 18:29:37 UTC
From: Alun <alun@1stcounsel.com>
Message-ID: <Xns9442893B06064elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 83046

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in
news:pb4yb.13152$P%1.11936246@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com:

>
> "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
> news:YsXxb.25734$Rk5.5191@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
>>
>> "Dee D. Flint" wrote:
>> >
>> > Morse code is uniquely necessary. (snip)
>>
>>
>> Saying so doesn't make it true, Dee. Within the goals and purposes
>> of the
>> Amateur Radio Service, and to justify a unique testing requirement,
>> how is Morse code uniquely necessary today? Do remember recreational
>> use is not sufficient enough to justify a unique testing requirement
>> (recreational use is equally applicable to all modes and they don't
>> have a unique testing requirement).
>>
>
> Well Dwight saying it isn't doesn't make that true either Dwight. I
> speak from personal experience. How much HF experience have you had?
> How much weak signal VHF experience have you had? Again keep in mind
> that I have said Morse is necessary. While I happen to believe that
> testing should be maintained that is NOT the point I am debating at
> this time and you keep trying to drag it back to testing. I am stating
> that Morse code itself is necessary.
>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>
>

I don't know about Dwight, but I use HF a lot, and I have done weak signal
work on VHF in the past. For the former I have never found CW to be
necessary, as it has never been necessary that I make any particular QSO.
As for the latter, I have never even heard any CW above 30 MHz, except
repeater IDs! This includes VHF contests. You may be using it, but I guess
I can't hear your sigs.

3471. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-29 18:35:29 UTC
From: Alun <alun@1stcounsel.com>
Message-ID: <Xns94428A3961C57elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 83047

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in
news:yC4yb.13160$P%1.11941003@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com:

>
> "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> news:bqaecq$ea0@library1.airnews.net...
>> "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
>> news:5RRxb.13101$P%1.11823086@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
>> >
>> > "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
>> > news:m9Rxb.27796$Wy4.3058@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net...
>> > > "Dee D. Flint" wrote:
>> > > >
>> > > > My response was to your statement that
>> > > > code itself was unnecessary and I made
>> > > > that clear that I was addressing that issue only. (snip)
>> > >
>> > >
>> > > But my entire message, including the argument in that sentence,
>> > > was about the code test. However, within that context, it is
>> > > indeed true that Morse
>> > > code is not "necessary" for Amateur Radio today. The key word is
>> > > "necessary," not enjoyable, not great recreation, not useful to
>> > > make contacts with friends when conditions are bad, or whatever.
>> > > Necessary. And, therefore, if Morse code is not uniquely
>> > > necessary, it should join the other modes on the written tests
>> > > without a unique testing requirement.
>> > >
>> >
>> > Morse code is uniquely necessary. And it has the unique
>> > characteristic that you can't take advantage of it until you have
>> > acquired a basic skill level.
>> >
>> > Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>> >
>>
>> I personally don't have the desire to "take advantage of" CW. I
>> haven't been interested in CW since I was first introduced to it and
>> found it nothing more than a necessary evil--a means to an end--to
>> licensing in amateur radio. I also found it uniquely lacking in any
>> pertinent application to the process of amateur radio, overall.
>>
>
> I believe you have previously stated that once you tried HF, you did

> not care for it and have since stayed primarily with VHF FM. There's
> nothing wrong with that. However, those who work a lot of HF are
> really shortchanging themselves if they are unable to use CW.
>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>
>

I work a lot of HF, relatively speaking, and I have considered wiring up a key from time to time, but decided against it. Shortchanging myself? I don't think so. I'm happy to stay on phone. Now, I have met people who don't like phone, and I'm fine with that. It just so happens that I don't like CW, in the sense of I have no desire to use it. That should be OK too, but for some reason it bothers you. Why?

3472. Re: ARRL you can Kiss my $39.00 a Year Good Bye

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-29 18:40:34 UTC
From: Roger Gt <Xenot@pacbell.net>
Message-ID: <CK5yb.27754$Pa2.911@newssvr29.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 83048
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

When did this happen. I got my 73 in Oct as usual, and my subscription runs out in 2006!

K7DUP

"Bill Newkirk" <wnewkirk@bellsouth.net> wrote in message news:SKVwb.1727$i8.1190@bignews3.bellsouth.net...
> Probably thinks they're responsible for the demise of 73 magazine...
>
> even tho Wayne's traditional subjects (keeping call sign when moving, etc.)
> pretty much have all been addressed and even Wayne at the end was stuck for
> editorials for amateur radio - resorting to pushing quack medicine and other
> crap..
>
>
> "Steve Silverwood" <kb6ojs@arrl.net> wrote in message
> news:MPG.1a28757699c12cd398969c@news.west.earthlink.net...
> > In article <3faa8c00$0$94481$45beb828@newscene.com>, No.m@il.here
> > says...
> > >
> > > If I were to give the world an enema... 225 Main Street Newington, CT is
> > > where I'd stick the hose.
> >
> > OK, I missed the earlier part of this thread, and I'm probably opening a
> > huge can of worms by asking this, but....
> >
> > What do you have against the ARRL? I've had nothing but good
> > experiences with them, both at HQ and with their representatives
> > locally.
> >
> > --
> >
> > -- //Steve//
> >
> > Steve Silverwood, KB6OJS
> > Fountain Valley, CA
> > Email: kb6ojs@arrl.net
> > Web: http://home.earthlink.net/~kb6ojs_steve
>

>

3473. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-29 18:58:46 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031129135846.12300.00001906@mb-m20.aol.com>
Source record: 83050

In article <G_Rxb.27838$Wy4.22808@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> writes:

>"N2EY" wrote:
>>
>> Why is such a written test necessary? The
>> use of any of those modes is entirely
>> optional.
>
> Considering the power levels, the number of frequencies and bands, the
>overall safety considerations, the desirability of proper operation when
>using the various operating modes, and the importance of the rules
>associated with all that, the necessity of the written exams is clearly
>obvious.

No, it isn't.

You're avoiding my question, Dwight.

Why must hams be forced to learn about *any* modes and technologies whose use is strictly optional? Indeed, someone who cannot speak and is totally deaf cannot use voice modes - yet the written exams are full of questions on AM, SSB, FM, etc. Why are such tests *necessary*?

Why is *any* written test beyond the basics of rules, regulations and safety *necessary*?

Or consider this:

Techs are permitted to use all authorized (amateur) modes and frequencies above 30 MHz - at full authorized power. This authorization is based on the successful passing of a single 35 question written test. FCC says so - in fact, almost four years ago they drastically reduced the written testing needed to get a Tech license.

Yet to have full privileges, a ham must pass additional written tests. Sure, the addtional tests include rules and regs a Tech doesn't need to know, as well as some things like HF/MF propagation. Buty those tests go far beyond the additional regs and propagation. Why is that sort of thing *necessary*, since a Tech has already shown that he/she is qualified on all authorized modes at full authorized power?

>Can you establish a similar necessity for the Morse code test?

Sure. Here goes:

Considering the many advantages of Morse code, the number of frequencies and bands on which it is used, the number of amateurs who

use it on the air and their exemplary conformance to the rules, regulations and operating procedures of the ARS, the necessity of the Morse code exam is clearly obvious.

There you go.

>> Prove the necessity for a written test beyond
>> the most basic rules and regulations.
>
> I've already explained the necessity of the written test in the previous
>message and in the paragraph above.

No, you haven't. You've explained why *a* written test on the most basic rules and regulations is desirable, and maybe even necessary, not why we must have the written tests we have today..
>
>> Sure. The basics. So prove why the tests must
>> go beyond those basics.
>
>
> Since you keep asking this, do you have a point to make, Jim?

Yes.

The point is that some folks apply a double standard when deciding which tests to keep and which to get rid of.

>This is a
>discussion about the code test.

Sure. And I've shown that if the same criteria you are using to justify dumping the code test can also be used to justify dumping almost all of the content of the written tests.

And so far I haven't seen anything to disprove my argument. Just "it's obvious".

>I have no desire to expand that into a
>discussion about the written exams, including a review of those exams.

I can understand why.

>Further, I think the value of the written exams is bloody obvious to all.

So you really don't have a counter argument when someone doesn't find it obvious.

>Therefore, there is nothing to prove.

Just the opposite.

>> If what matters is the learning that happens
>> *after* the license is in hand, why all the fuss
>> about written tests?
>

> Read my first paragraph above.
>
I have. Doesn't answer my question.

I don't want the written tests to go away or be watered down further. But I cannot come
up with solid counterarguments *rpoving* that all of their content is necessary. And I
suspect that others can't, either - or they would present those arguments.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3474. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-29 18:58:47 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031129135847.12300.00001907@mb-m20.aol.com>
Source record: 83049

In article <3c2yb.4513$zL1.340545@news1.news.adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:

>Kï¿½HB wrote:
>
>
>> On the contrary, my plan puts newcomers dead center in the mainstream of
>> amateur radio, with all the same privileges of EVERY other licensee, just
>at
>> a more modest power level of 50watts.
>
> How are you going to enforce that?

Same way all the other power limits are enforced.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3475. Re: It ain't about the test.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-29 19:12:55 UTC
From: Alun <alun@1stcounsel.com>
Message-ID: <Xns94429091F1550elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 83051

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in
news:20031129125814.12501.00004247@mb-m04.aol.com:

> In article <Xns94415FF33DEEelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun
> <alun@1stcounsel.com> writes:
>
>>> Fessenden demonstrated voice modulated spark operation as early as
>>> 1900. His methods have been verified by actual tests using replica
>>> transmitters and dummy loads.
>>
>>Fessenden transmitted voice over one mile during December 1900,
>>possibly on the 12th, on Cobb Island, Maryland.
>
> Yep. You can even listen to re-creations of what it may have sounded
> like on-line. I posted the urls here some time back.
>
> By 1903, he had reached 50 miles.
>
> Of course in a way *almost all* spark transmitters use alternators,
> because except for simple spark coils, they *all* use AC generated by
> alternators...
>
> Fessenden's innovation was to use AC above the voice frequency range.
>
> Brilliant guy. Over 500 patents, in a variety of fields.
>>
>>> Fessenden had a two-way transatlantic radiotelephone setup in
>>> operation by November of 1906 using alternator RF sources.
>>>
>>> The demo of Christmas Eve 1906 was repeated a week later (New Year's
>>> Eve).
>>>
>>> These events are well documented.
>>
>>As is DeForrest's later voice coverage of the New York yacht race,
>>using a spark transmitter of the earlier type (no alternator) but using
>>a regenerative detector with a triode tube. I can't remember when that
>>took place, although it is in several books, but the triode (audion)
>>patent discloses the regenerative detector and was issued in 1907, so
>>the yacht race must have taken place around that period.
>
> Practical regenerative detection is generally credited to Armstrong in
> 1915.

'Empire of the Air' (both the TV show and the book) claimed that Armstrong came up with regeneration in 1911. De Forrest's patent pre-dated that by another four years, and he won the court case. How could it ever have been in doubt, when Armstrong's 'eureka' moment was four years after DeForrest had the patent in his hand?

Armstrong seemed to rely on the argument that DeForrest didn't understand what he had done, which is a lame argument to say the least. Maybe he didn't understand what he had done, but he still did it first.

> However, DeForest's use of voice communication at such an early
> date is another
> historic fact.
>
> Seems to me that Fessenden's transatlantic 2 way radiotelephone
> operation is the most significant of these early developments. Less
> than 5 years after Marconi claimed one-time one-way reception of a
> single coded letter, Fessenden had practical, repeatable, two-way voice
> transatlantic radio communications over a longer path, using much less
> power.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>
>

Undoubtedly. Do you know what types of transmitter and receiver were used in 1906?

73 de Alun, N3KIP

3476. Re: Where Did THIS Come From...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-29 19:43:38 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <KF6yb.13193$P%1.11967600@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 83052

"Alun" <alun@1stcounsel.com> wrote in message
news:Xns944282A0D69C5elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
> n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in news:20031129115807.23307.00004755@mb-
> m29.aol.com:
>
> > In article <f45722ac.0311281934.2deeda0@posting.google.com>,
> > brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
> >
> >>Blowhard libs have tried soooo hard to wreck this country.
> >
> > So have blowhard conservatives.
> >
> >>They've nearly succeeded,
> >
> > How is this country "wrecked", compared to how things used to be?
> >
> >>but there are still a few people who give a damn about America, and GW
> >>is one of them.
> >
> > There are lots of others, including many who disagree with Mr. Bush.
> >
> > It's the methods, not the person.
> >
> >>
> >
> >
> >
>
> Well, I'm a foreigner in your country, but you can't deny that the economy
> boomed under Clinton and is now on it's knees.
>

The "Clinton boom" was a result of the building economy from the previous
administrations. The fall in the economy is a result of various economic
issues that developed in the latter part of the Clinton administration and
only began to be felt after he left office. I'm not blaming anyone mind you
but the economy started tanking right after the change in administration
BEFORE the whammy from 9/11 and the current administration hadn't yet
changed anything. The economy as a whole takes time to react. You have to
examine the several preceding years to find the causes not the current year.

> I'm not fond of the present government, but mainly for other reasons.
> Civil liberties and John Ashcroft, mostly.
>
> All in all, I can't really think of anything GW Bush has done domestically

> that is anything to shout about. Tax cuts for the rich. Deficit spending.
> I'm really trying to think of anything good (honestly), but nothing comes
> to mind.
>

The tax cuts went to the people paying taxes. How can you give cuts to
people who don't pay.

> As for the war, why open that can of worms? Yes, Saddam is/was a very bad
> guy. Do I beleive the reasons given for going to war? No. And yes, Blair
> went along with it, but I don't like him a lot either.
>
> ... but then I'm an anti-code test liberal, so what did you expect?
>
> However, I actually do think it was a nice gesture for Dubbya to go to
> Baghdad for Thanksgiving.
>

Agree 100%. A leader shows his people that they are important. And that
was the purpose of his trip.

>
> I'm sure this post will draw the usual 'love it or leave it' garbage from
> at least someone, but never mind. I can take it.

Not from me that's for sure. We all have the right to work to make it
better even if we don't agree on what "better" is.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

3477. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-29 19:53:35 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <3P6yb.13195$P%1.11969347@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 83053

"Alun" <alun@1stcounsel.com> wrote in message
news:Xns9442852918101elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
> "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in
> news:5RRxb.13101$P%1.11823086@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com:
>
> >
> > "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
> > news:m9Rxb.27796$Wy4.3058@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> >> "Dee D. Flint" wrote:
> >> >
> >> > My response was to your statement that
> >> > code itself was unnecessary and I made
> >> > that clear that I was addressing that issue only. (snip)
> >>
> >>
> >> But my entire message, including the argument in that sentence, was
> >> about
> >> the code test. However, within that context, it is indeed true that
> >> Morse code is not "necessary" for Amateur Radio today. The key word is
> >> "necessary," not enjoyable, not great recreation, not useful to make
> >> contacts with friends when conditions are bad, or whatever. Necessary.
> >> And, therefore, if Morse code is not uniquely necessary, it should
> >> join the other modes on the written tests without a unique testing
> >> requirement.
> >>
> >
> > Morse code is uniquely necessary. And it has the unique characteristic
> > that you can't take advantage of it until you have acquired a basic
> > skill level.
> >
> > Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
> >
> >
>
> Amateur radio itself isn't even necessary. I've been a ham for 23 years,
> nearly 24, and I've never used CW. So it's 'necessary' for me to use CW?
> Right.

For anyone individual and their operating style it may not be necessary.
However that decision needs to be based on knowledge and experience not "I
don't want to learn" arguments.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

3478. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-29 19:56:58 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <eS6yb.13196$P%1.11969797@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 83054

"Alun" <alun@1stcounsel.com> wrote in message
news:Xns944288614CAD1elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
> "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in
> news:Ao4yb.13157$P%1.11937950@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com:
>
> Also, if
> I hear CW on my frequency I may be able to read it with some difficulty,
> but if I hear RTTY or PSK31 there is no chance.

Which is why in an emergency situation, if voice is unusable, I would pick CW rather than RTTY, PSK31, etc. There are more ops out there listening and although some are rusty on their code since they don't use it much they could still help even if the code had to be sent really slowly.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

3479. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-29 19:59:38 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <KU6yb.13197$P%1.11970231@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 83055

"Alun" <alun@1stcounsel.com> wrote in message
news:Xns94428A3961C57elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
> "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in
> news:yC4yb.13160$P%1.11941003@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com:
>
> >
> > "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> > news:bqaecq$ea0@library1.airnews.net...
> >> I personally don't have the desire to "take advantage of" CW. I
> >> haven't been interested in CW since I was first introduced to it and
> >> found it nothing more than a necessary evil--a means to an end--to
> >> licensing in amateur radio. I also found it uniquely lacking in any
> >> pertinent application to the process of amateur radio, overall.
> >>
> >
> > I believe you have previously stated that once you tried HF, you did
> > not care for it and have since stayed primarily with VHF FM. There's
> > nothing wrong with that. However, those who work a lot of HF are
> > really shortchanging themselves if they are unable to use CW.
> >
> > Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
> >
> >
>
> I work a lot of HF, relatively speaking, and I have considered wiring up a
> key from time to time, but decided against it. Shortchanging myself? I
> don't think so. I'm happy to stay on phone. Now, I have met people who
> don't like phone, and I'm fine with that. It just so happens that I don't
> like CW, in the sense of I have no desire to use it. That should be OK
> too, but for some reason it bothers you. Why?

No it does not bother me that someone who has learned it chooses not to use
it. They have made that decision from a position of knowledge and
experience. This is radically different from a person judging it and saying
they will never use it when they do not have that knowledge and experience
to draw on.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

3480. Re: Where Did THIS Come From...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-29 20:14:07 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0311291214.469b0d7e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 83056

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:<cuvyxnansvbet.hp2xgj1.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>...

> One of the members of our congregation is a National Guard
> infantryman who is back home this weekend for a two-week R&R
> between eight month tours over in the Middle East (iraq and Kuwait).
> He was very clear - the stunt didn't impress him at all.

And there are people who say the Holocaust never occured. I
don't make much of THIER opinion either.

If you look around, you'll find people who can find a reason to
villify the creation of penecillin.

MY point is that there will always be "someone" with a
counter-opinion to everything...

YOUR point?

Steve

3481. Re: Where Did THIS Come From...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-29 20:28:19 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0311291228.386f336f@posting.google.com>
Source record: 83057

brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0311281931.55460046@posting.google.com>...
> "Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<GkQxb.25230$Rk5.12231@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> > "Steve Robeson, K4CAP" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote
> >
> > > I think it's great we FINALLY have a Commander-in-Chief
> > > that makes you proud to render that salute again.
> >
> > Speak for yourself. Dubya is an idiot. John McCain should be
> > Commander-in-Chief.
> >
> > 73, Hans, K0HB
>
> McCain failed. He got captured.
>
> I really question everyone calling that scenario a hero, and
> definitely not Commander-in-Chief material.

Getting caught..?!?! perhaps not.

The "Commander-in-Chief" material comes from the strength of
character it took to not fold to interrogator's deamnds, to have not
lost faith with his comrades, and that he came home alive despite the
ordeal.

Yes...John McCain is an American Hero. Several times over...

And MY respect for the current Commander-in-Chief comes from the
fact that, wether you agree with him or not, when he's in the news,
it's about the business of the nation...Not who he's "doing" on the
sly or what nefarious deals his spouse is engaged in.

Had Billary stood up to the first accusations against him
(protesting the Viet Nam war while in England) and said, "Yes, I
protested the war. It was my right to do so as a citizen", even the
most right-wing Hawks would have had to give him credit as being
truthful. He didn't...he tried to lie his way out of it and was
proven to be a liar. Every SUBSEQUENT accusation that erupted also
had the opportunity for him to "stand up" and be counted, but he tried
to lie his way out of those, too.

Our present Commander-in-Chief may not be the smoothest orator or
do everything "right", but I have far greater respect for a man who
can try, fail, and admit to it than one who tries to lie his way out
of his actions.

Steve, K4YZ

3482. Re: More 11m Freebanders on Echo Link

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-29 21:21:06 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3FC90DC1.4030201@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 83058

Arnie Voobner wrote:

>Anyone have further info on all the 11 m freeband
>activity on Echo Link?
>
>
>
How are they getting in? Are they registering using an unsuspecting ham's
call and name? Or did they hack into it another way?

>
>
>
>
>

3483. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-29 21:29:20 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031129162920.08626.00001957@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 83059

In article <d83yb.4535$zL1.353339@news1.news.adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo
<mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>
>> In article <eeXxb.25694$Rk5.22660@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>,
>"Dwight
>> Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> writes:
>
><snippage>
>
>>>Your proposal
>>>would intentionally take that away by setting the bar to upgrade even
>higher
>>>(the Extra class test). And, if newcomers fail to reach that higher bar,
>out
>>>they go - their non-renewable license is gone.

>> Exactly.

>> But they would have 10 years to do it.

>> In the bad old days, a new ham had to pass the old General written (which
>was
>> split into the Tech and General writtens in 1987) to get a
>permanent/renewable
>> license of any class. The old Novice was meant as a learning tool, not a
>> permanent license.
>
> Just because an idea was old, doesn't mean it wasn't bad! 8^)

Watta concept!

>I would
>have to suspect that the old Novice non-renewable was probably to allow
>the prospective "permanent" ham to hone his or her Morse CW skills
>rather than learn the writtens of the time.

You suspect wrong!

The old Novice was meant as a learner's permit for both the code and written -
in fact, more for the written than the code. A Novice could upgrade to Tech
with no more written skills (both licenses always required just 5 wpm code).
But upgrading to *any* permanent/renewable license required the
General/Tech/Conditional written test, which was much more involved than the
old Novice written.

The old Novice privileges included 2 meters (145-147 MHz) code and AM voice (until 1967). The idea was that some Novices would go on to General and others to Tech, depending on whether they were primarily interested in HF or VHF.

>So the big question is what
>is going to be different about this new class gap that ten years is an
>appropriate time lag.

The idea is that the jump will be all the way to Extra-level written testing. The ten-year term is meant to be a generous allotment of time, plus the current license term is ten years.
>
>For a hobby, ten years is just too long a time. If there are going to be
>limits, they should be reasonable ones.

Why is 10 years unreasonable? I recall Hans saying that if someone can't or won't reach the level required for a full-privs license in 10 years, they probably aren't that interested. (Correct me if I'm mistaken on that, Hans).
>
>>> And if this isn't all about assigning newcomers to a subordinate class,
>>>why don't you change the names of those new licenses you propose - Class A
>>>for the entry license class and Class B for the other license class? As it
>>>is, it's clear only someone who has taken an Extra class-like test can be a
>>>"Class A" Amateur Radio Operator.
>>
>>
>> Yup!
>>
>>>>It's clear to me that you haven't even taken
>>>>the time to read the proposal I've made to
>>>>the FCC. (snip)
>>>
>>> I've read the proposal and what you've said about the proposal in this
>>>newsgroup. I stand by what I've said here and in the previous message.
>>>
>>
>> I think you missed the major contradiction/paradox of Hans' proposal,
>Dwight.
>>
>> He proposes a simplified test for the LP license, yet all LPs would be
>> allowed
>> all frequencies and modes.
>>
>> So the simplified test has to be adequate for the LPs to use all freqs and
>> modes - just not full power.
>>
>> How can a simplifed test do that?
>
> And how are we going to take care of the "shack on a belt" crowd. A
>awful lot of hams are quite happy with their Technician licenses.

Hans' proposal would not affect any existing hams' privileges. Those with existing licenses other than Extra could keep them, renew them and modify them as long as they retain interest. Existing Techs could stay Tech forever - no problem.

>A
>forced upgrade with absolutely no advantage for a person that only does
>public events, and uses the local repeater once in a while is not going
>to be very popular with them. And "they" are a pretty large percentage.
>Yes of course that is among people already licensed, but my point is
>that this proposal is very HF-centric.

They wouldn't have to change anything.

But it only applies to existing hams. Newbies might get ticked off that the same options weren't open to them.
>
>> And if the simplified test *is* adequate, why should the higher-class test
>> require more than the additional stuff needed to run high power?
>
> And of course, how ya gonna enforce that 50 watt limit? Enacting
>unenforceable laws is a great way to breed disrespect for laws.
>
What stops me from running 5 kW? or more than the allowed power on 30 meters or the Novice bands?

73 de Jim, N2EY

3484. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-29 21:49:47 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <%v8yb.4670$zL1.432117@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 83060

Dee D. Flint wrote:

> "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> news:bqaecq$ea0@library1.airnews.net...
>
>>"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
>>news:5RRxb.13101$P%1.11823086@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
>>
>>>"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
>>>news:m9Rxb.27796$Wy4.3058@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net...
>>>
>>>>"Dee D. Flint" wrote:
>>>>
>>>>>My response was to your statement that
>>>>>code itself was unnecessary and I made
>>>>>that clear that I was addressing that issue
>>>>>only. (snip)
>>>>
>>>>
>>>> But my entire message, including the argument in that sentence, was
>>>
>>>about
>>>
>>>>the code test. However, within that context, it is indeed true that
>>
>>Morse
>>
>>>>code is not "necessary" for Amateur Radio today. The key word is
>>>>"necessary," not enjoyable, not great recreation, not useful to make
>>>>contacts with friends when conditions are bad, or whatever. Necessary.
>>>
>>>And,
>>>
>>>>therefore, if Morse code is not uniquely necessary, it should join the
>>>
>>>other
>>>
>>>>modes on the written tests without a unique testing requirement.
>>>>
>>>
>>>Morse code is uniquely necessary. And it has the unique characteristic
>>
>>that
>>

>>>you can't take advantage of it until you have acquired a basic skill
>>
>>level.
>>
>>>Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>>>
>>
>>I personally don't have the desire to "take advantage of" CW. I haven't
>>been interested in CW since I was first introduced to it and found it
>>nothing more than a necessary evil--a means to an end--to licensing in
>>amateur radio. I also found it uniquely lacking in any pertinent
>>application to the process of amateur radio, overall.
>>
>
>
> I believe you have previously stated that once you tried HF, you did not
> care for it and have since stayed primarily with VHF FM. There's nothing
> wrong with that. However, those who work a lot of HF are really
> shortchanging themselves if they are unable to use CW.

More so as the bands deteriorate due to the approaching minimum. As conditions become worse, those who have waited for the MOrse code to go away will (especially if my 4 year prediction pans out) get on the air, and wonder just what the heck the big deal is about the ARS. Just one of the reasons I've been flogging myself to learn Morse with some proficiency.

- Mike KB3EIA -

3485. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-29 22:14:38 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031129171438.29660.00001856@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 83061

In article <bptj04$1st6i0$9@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>, "Ryan, KC8PMX" <REMOVETHISkc8pmx@diamondcs.net> writes:

>But in regards to the math..... compare a 10,000 dollar mortgage versus the >10,000 car loan with applicable rates.

That's the point explained below. In some cases, it may make more financial sense to pay cash for the car and have a bigger mortgage.

>Nowhere did I say that one should
>use refinancing money to pay off other debts.

Sure - but it's often a better deal to do just that.

>The other debts themselves to
>be paid off quicker if at a higher interest rate is what I said, even if I >didn't make that painfully clear.

The point I'm making is that you have to actually do the numbers to get the clear picture.

In fact it often makes a lot of sense to consolidate high interest indebtedness into a mortgage (first or second). Here's an example:

Suppose someone has gotten themselves into the following situation:

Mortgage: 6.5%, $100,000 unpaid principal, 25 years left on a 30 year loan. Monthly P&I payment: $675.21

Credit cards: 15%, $25,000 total. 4 year payoff requires monthly payment of $658.35

Car loan: 7%, $10,000 unpaid principal, 4 year payoff requires monthly payment of $239.46

(note - the above is not an exaggeration - some people are in worse holes than this!)

Left alone, the person will have to pay $1573.02 per month for the next four years to pay off the car and credit cards, then they'll be on the hook for $675.21 per month for the following 21 years to pay off the house. Total payments of $245657.88 over the next quarter century, with $75,504.96 due in the next 48 months.

Calculation of deductible vs. nondeductible interest is left as an exercise for the reader.

Now suppose the person can get a 15 year refi at 5%. And suppose they refi the whole mess, paying off the high interest nonmortgage loans immediately. Total

mortgage of $135,000. Monthly payment of $1067.57 for the next 15 years. Total payments of $192,162.60 over the next 15 years.

That means an immeidate reduction in monthly payments of over $500, total payout reduced by over $53,000 and total ownership of the house 10 years earlier.

Again, calculation of deductible vs. nondeductible interest is left as an exercise for the reader.

Now some folks might say that it's not a good idea to fold short-term items like cars and credit cards into longterm stuff like mortgages. OK, fine - then watch this:

Suppose we get a new 25 year mortgage of $100,000 at 5.5%. Monthly payment is $567.79 That saves over $100 per month right off.

And suppose we also get a 15 year mortgage/consolidation loan for $35,000 at 5.5%. Monthly payment $285.98. But we pay off this loan at the rate of $813.98 per month - which will result in it being paid off in four years.

Under this plan, total monthly payment is $1381.77 - a monthly saving of almost $200 per month and a long-term monthly saving of over $100 per month. And *all* of the interest is tax deductible.

Of course the *best* deal is not to get into such a hole in the first place. And the people who do dig themselves such holes will often have a hard time being financially disciplined enough to pay off their loans ahead of time rather than spending the difference.

And people say math is boring....

73 de Jim, N2EY

3486. My girlfriend is a felon

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-29 22:40:17 UTC
From: N8WWM <N8WWM@home.nut>
Message-ID: <bqb78h03lv@drn.newsguy.com>
Source record: 83062
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,

My girlfriend is a convicted felon whos name is Kathleen Lee KC8QJP. She is also a no code tech like me. Check out her public record and also check out me getting caught jamming repeaters in the enforcement log. We are both losers.

http://acc.ohio.gov/dhearing.html

http://acc.ohio.gov/bdmn0401.html

3487. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-29 23:13:02 UTC
From: garigue <garigue@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <2K9yb.255694$9E1.1366805@attbi_s52>
Source record: 83063

>
> I personally don't have the desire to "take advantage of" CW.

No problem ....

> nothing more than a necessary evil--a means to an end--to licensing in
> amateur radio.

Evil .... Satan is evil .... I find no mention of CW in the Bible being the preferred mode of the anti-Christ ....

I also found it uniquely lacking in any pertinent
> application to the process of amateur radio, overall.

Pertenent as of pertaining to ...I suggest Kim that you turn on your receiver and listen to the CW activity that is there ...albeit contesting. Wall to wall signals and on 30 meters essentially likewise for those who don't contest. I really get tired of the old CW is dead ...AKA pertinent to ham radio. Especially since the squashing of this myth is just a turn of the knob away for those who have the ambition to do so instead of repeating untrue crap.

> CW is a wonderful skill to have if one enjoys communicating with it.

What you don't use you loose but in a lot of ops cases they will never loose it because they never had it to begin with ..... therein lies the real sadness.

God Bless 73 Tom Popovic KI3R Belle Vernon Pa

3488. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-29 23:24:47 UTC
From: garigue <garigue@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <3V9yb.251920$mZ5.1875586@attbi_s54>
Source record: 83064

>I personally don't have the desire to "take advantage" of CW

No problem ....

>nothing more that a necessary evil--a means to an end--to licensing in amateur radio.

Evil ...Satan is evil ... I find no mention of CW in the Bible being the preferred mode of the anti-Christ ..

>I also find it uniquely lacking in any pertinent application to the process of amateur radio, overall.

Pertinent as of pertaining to .. I suggest Kim that you turn on your receiver and listen to the CW activity that is there ...albeit contesting. Wall to wall signals and on 30 meters essentially likewise for those who don't contest. I really get tired of the old CW is dead .....AKA pertinent to ham radio. Especially since the squashing of this myth is just a turn of the knob away for those who have the ambition to do so instead of repeating untrue crap.

>CW is a wonderful skill to have if one enjoys communicating with it.

What you don't use you loose but in a lot of ops cases they will never loose it because they never had it to begin with ..... therein lies the real sadness.

God Bless 73 Tom Popovic KI3R Belle Vernon Pa

3489. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-29 23:37:49 UTC
From: Alun <alun@1stcounsel.com>
Message-ID: <Xns9442BD7B8FD06elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 83065

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in
news:KU6yb.13197$P%1.11970231@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com:

>
> "Alun" <alun@1stcounsel.com> wrote in message
> news:Xns94428A3961C57elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
>> "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in
>> news:yC4yb.13160$P%1.11941003@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com:
>>
>> >
>> > "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote in message
>> > news:bqaecq$ea0@library1.airnews.net...
>> >> I personally don't have the desire to "take advantage of" CW. I
>> >> haven't been interested in CW since I was first introduced to it
>> >> and found it nothing more than a necessary evil--a means to an
>> >> end--to licensing in amateur radio. I also found it uniquely
>> >> lacking in any pertinent application to the process of amateur
>> >> radio, overall.
>> >>
>> >
>> > I believe you have previously stated that once you tried HF, you did
>> > not care for it and have since stayed primarily with VHF FM.
>> > There's nothing wrong with that. However, those who work a lot of
>> > HF are really shortchanging themselves if they are unable to use CW.
>> >
>> > Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>> >
>> >
>>
>> I work a lot of HF, relatively speaking, and I have considered wiring
>> up a key from time to time, but decided against it. Shortchanging
>> myself? I don't think so. I'm happy to stay on phone. Now, I have met
>> people who don't like phone, and I'm fine with that. It just so
>> happens that I don't like CW, in the sense of I have no desire to use
>> it. That should be OK too, but for some reason it bothers you. Why?
>
> No it does not bother me that someone who has learned it chooses not to
> use it. They have made that decision from a position of knowledge and
> experience. This is radically different from a person judging it and
> saying they will never use it when they do not have that knowledge and
> experience to draw on.
>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>

>

And yet you say code is "necessary"? As an unqualified blanket statement
that is laughable.

3490. Re: The Pool

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-29 23:58:20 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031129185820.15462.00004607@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 83067

So far (note that two predicted dates are in the pas, with two more only weeks away):

WA2SI: September 13, 2003
KF6TPT: September 29, 2003
KC8EPO: December 31, 2003
K2UNK: January 1, 2004
K2ASP: March 15, 2004
AA2QA: April 1, 2004
N2EY: April 15, 2004
N3KIP: May 1, 2004
KC8PMX: July 1, 2004
K3LT: September 15, 2004
KB3EIA: July 5, 2007 ("minimum 4 years from date of requirement drop")
Kim: June 1, 2008

If I missed anybody, please add your guess to the list.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3491. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-29 23:58:21 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031129185821.15462.00004608@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 83066

In article <nv2yb.4519$zL1.345067@news1.news.adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo
<mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:

>Kï¿½HB wrote:
>
>> A straightforward plan is already written and in the hands of the FCC.
>> http://tinyurl.com/wce9
>
> It really isn't too bad a plan, although there are a few weaknesses
>that are a bit bothersome.
>
> That 50 watt limit for the class B license is simply unenforcable, save

>some sort of training wheel governor device that they would have to put
>on their transmitters.

Why would it be any more complex than what we have now?

And in the old days, there was no big deal about enforcing Novices' use of no
more than 75 watts input and crystal control.
>
> If you want to put a time limit on upgrading, it really should be a lot

>shorter, like 3 years. Ten years is simply way too long. The prospective
> class A Ham almost certainly will upgrade in a year or two.

Maybe not! Look how many Tech Pluses are still on the books today, even though
for the past 42 months they've been able to upgrade with just a single written
- or in many cases, no test at all. And the number of Tech Pluses has also been
dropping by renewals as Techs.....
>
> But I still don't like the idea of a forced retirement. It brings up an

>absurdity like a person that operates exclusivly QRP having to upgrade
>so that he/she is now allowed to use 1.5 kW. That's all they get. So
>they are forced to upgrade and spend money for something that means
>nothing to them - save keeping their license.

The same was true in the old days if a ham simply wanted to operate in the
Novice bands with xtal control and 75 watts...

When incentive licensing was reinstituted in 1968, a lot of hams had to upgrade
just to do what they'd been doing for years.

> I really do like the idea of "time in grade". It is one of the best
>ideas ever abandoned by the FCC.

Me too, but it's an uphill climb to get it back.
>
> A lifetime grant license? Well, I'm not too sure. I guess it is a
>pretty good thing. If you don't have to renew it, there aren't
>processing costs.

The big problem is that the license won't expire even if its holder does. The database will contain more and more entries of long-dead or lost-interest hams.

Perhaps that's part of Hans' plan - the number of hams with that class of license will grow and grow and grow...

FCC will cancel a license if proper paperwork is done. Usually this takes the form of a family member sending in a death certificate so that the SK's call can be reassigned to a friend, club or relative.

Given the 10 year license term and such things as online renewal, I don't see renewal costs as a big line item in the FCC budget.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3492. Re: Since We Were Mentioning "Absurdity"...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-30 01:02:06 UTC
From: mikewalton55@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <d2701d5a.0311291702.63891d3a@posting.google.com>
Source record: 83068

Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:<492yb.4512$zL1.339481@news1.news.adelphia.net>...
> Steve Robeson, K4CAP wrote:
>
> > I was reading my December 2003 "CQ" magazine and found an item
> > penned by Jim Wiley KL7CC, Scott Neustadter W4WW, and the snake oil
> > salesman of Amateur Radio...Fred Maia W5YI.
> >
> > The whole jist of the article is aimed at creating yet another
> > Amateur Radio license, and the article suggests numerous "snips" of
> > other requirements from the regulatory, theory, practice and safety
> > regulations in order to "make" a slimmed-down beginners' license.
> >
> > See if you can remember where their following suggestion was once
> > an actual practice of the Federal Communications Commission, and how
> > well it worked in practice:
> >
> > (From page 36, December 2003 "CQ") QUOTE "Remove some of the
> > math from the license exams. Remove some or even most of the "radio
> > law" type questions. Instead require the applicants to sign a
> > statement that they have read the Part 97 rulebook, and that they ahve
> > a copy (available for free via web download). Yes, some of the
> > applicants will "skate" and not read it when they signed that they
> > did. But most will, and even among those who dont, eventually,
> > probablysooner rather than later, they will get around to it. Some
> > never will. That's human nature. We're not looking for saints, just
> > people who can become producetive hams". UNQUOTE
> >
> > My first question for these brain surgeons is HOW IN THE BLUE
> > BLAZES CAN SOMEONE BE "PRODUCTIVE" IF THEY DON"T KNOW THE RULES...?!?!
> >
> > These people are in a position of responsibility for mentoring
> > the next generation of Amateurs..?!?!
> >
> > We'd be better off letting Michael Jackson be their sand lot
> > supervisor! ! !
Stop picking on the King odf Pop, it's not fair:

http://www.geocities.com/tom5515/frame.htm

Actually, it's kinfd of outrageous, wasn't Hugh Hefner a target of
Nixon's Justice Department in the 1970's --i think this is equally
political.

3493. Re: Where Did THIS Come From...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-30 01:19:03 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <bAbyb.26833$Rk5.11994@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 83069

"K�HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:GkQxb.25230$Rk5.12231@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> "Steve Robeson, K4CAP" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote
>
> > I think it's great we FINALLY have a Commander-in-Chief
> > that makes you proud to render that salute again.
>
> Speak for yourself. Dubya is an idiot. John McCain should be
> Commander-in-Chief.
>
> 73, Hans, K0HB
>
>
>
>
>
If he is such an 'idiot' and McCain is so smart...then how come the 'idiot'
is the President?

Oh, I know. The Republicans stole the election, right?

Lets not even go down that street again.

Dan/W4NTI

3494. Re: Where Did THIS Come From...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-30 01:19:46 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <SAbyb.26834$Rk5.13133@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 83070

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20031128205818.12501.00004231@mb-m04.aol.com...
> In article <GkQxb.25230$Rk5.12231@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>,
"K�HB"
> <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> writes:
>
> >"Steve Robeson, K4CAP" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote
> >
> >> I think it's great we FINALLY have a Commander-in-Chief
> >> that makes you proud to render that salute again.
> >
> >Speak for yourself. Dubya is an idiot. John McCain should be
> >Commander-in-Chief.
> >
> What about Wesley Clark?
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>

Wesley Clark reminds me of Admiral Stockdale.

Dan/W4NTI

3495. Re: Where Did THIS Come From...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-30 01:21:56 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <UCbyb.26837$Rk5.14755@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 83071

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20031129073730.21232.00002441@mb-m13.aol.com...
> In article <lPUxb.28042$Wy4.16674@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>,
"K&#65533;HB"
> <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> writes:
>
> >"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote
> >
> >> What about Wesley Clark?
> >
> >I don't trust him. He seems to have problems keeping his stories
straight.
> >
> >I worked for Senator McCains dad, Admiral John McCain II, when he was
> >CincPAC and John III was a guest at the Hanoi Hilton. Later I worked for
> >Capt Dick Stratton, a fellow 'guest' in Hanoi, and met John III on a
couple
> >of occasions. Him, I trust.
>
> Fair enough!
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

Well I don't trust a man that can't figure out what party he is in.

McCain is a Republican in name only.

Dan/W4NTI

3496. Re: Where Did THIS Come From...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-30 01:24:03 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <TEbyb.26843$Rk5.3363@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 83072

"Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
news:f45722ac.0311281931.55460046@posting.google.com...
> "K�HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<GkQxb.25230$Rk5.12231@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> > "Steve Robeson, K4CAP" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote
> >
> > > I think it's great we FINALLY have a Commander-in-Chief
> > > that makes you proud to render that salute again.
> >
> > Speak for yourself. Dubya is an idiot. John McCain should be
> > Commander-in-Chief.
> >
> > 73, Hans, K0HB
>
> McCain failed. He got captured.
>
> I really question everyone calling that scenario a hero, and
> definitely not Commander-in-Chief material.

I disagree with that comment Brian. He didn't fail. The government failed him by forcing the pilots to fly the pocket. No deviation. No way to not get hit. It was stupid. All McCain did was follow orders.

Dan/W4NTI

3497. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-30 01:24:35 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <nFbyb.13229$P%1.12019509@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 83073

"Alun" <alun@1stcounsel.com> wrote in message
news:Xns9442BD7B8FD06elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
> "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in
> news:KU6yb.13197$P%1.11970231@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com:
>
> >
> > "Alun" <alun@1stcounsel.com> wrote in message
> > news:Xns94428A3961C57elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
> >> "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in
> >> news:yC4yb.13160$P%1.11941003@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com:
> >>
> >> >
> >> > "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> >> > news:bqaecq$ea0@library1.airnews.net...
> >> >> I personally don't have the desire to "take advantage of" CW. I
> >> >> haven't been interested in CW since I was first introduced to it
> >> >> and found it nothing more than a necessary evil--a means to an
> >> >> end--to licensing in amateur radio. I also found it uniquely
> >> >> lacking in any pertinent application to the process of amateur
> >> >> radio, overall.
> >> >>
> >> >
> >> > I believe you have previously stated that once you tried HF, you did
> >> > not care for it and have since stayed primarily with VHF FM.
> >> > There's nothing wrong with that. However, those who work a lot of
> >> > HF are really shortchanging themselves if they are unable to use CW.
> >> >
> >> > Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
> >> >
> >> >
> >>
> >> I work a lot of HF, relatively speaking, and I have considered wiring
> >> up a key from time to time, but decided against it. Shortchanging
> >> myself? I don't think so. I'm happy to stay on phone. Now, I have met
> >> people who don't like phone, and I'm fine with that. It just so
> >> happens that I don't like CW, in the sense of I have no desire to use
> >> it. That should be OK too, but for some reason it bothers you. Why?
> >
> > No it does not bother me that someone who has learned it chooses not to
> > use it. They have made that decision from a position of knowledge and
> > experience. This is radically different from a person judging it and
> > saying they will never use it when they do not have that knowledge and
> > experience to draw on.
> >

> > Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
> >
> >
>
> And yet you say code is "necessary"? As an unqualified blanket statement
> that is laughable.

Nope it is not laughable. There are many necessary things in life that people do not do. They choose for reasons of their own to omit them. Annual physicals are a "necessary" item for people of middle age and older but I know quite a few people who do not get them. Keeping one's weight under control is "necessary" but there's a lot of us carrying more weight than we should.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

3498. Re: Where Did THIS Come From...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-30 01:27:27 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <3Ibyb.26847$Rk5.7526@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 83074

"Steve Robeson, K4CAP" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
news:5c01b95b.0311291228.386f336f@posting.google.com...
> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0311281931.55460046@posting.google.com>...
> > "K&#65533;HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<GkQxb.25230$Rk5.12231@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> > > "Steve Robeson, K4CAP" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote
> > >
> > > > I think it's great we FINALLY have a Commander-in-Chief
> > > > that makes you proud to render that salute again.
> > >
> > > Speak for yourself. Dubya is an idiot. John McCain should be
> > > Commander-in-Chief.
> > >
> > > 73, Hans, K0HB
> >
> > McCain failed. He got captured.
> >
> > I really question everyone calling that scenario a hero, and
> > definitely not Commander-in-Chief material.
>
> Getting caught..?!?! perhaps not.
>
> The "Commander-in-Chief" material comes from the strength of
> character it took to not fold to interrogator's deamnds, to have not
> lost faith with his comrades, and that he came home alive despite the
> ordeal.
>
> Yes...John McCain is an American Hero. Several times over...
>
> And MY respect for the current Commander-in-Chief comes from the
> fact that, wether you agree with him or not, when he's in the news,
> it's about the business of the nation...Not who he's "doing" on the
> sly or what nefarious deals his spouse is engaged in.
>
> Had Billary stood up to the first accusations against him
> (protesting the Viet Nam war while in England) and said, "Yes, I
> protested the war. It was my right to do so as a citizen", even the
> most right-wing Hawks would have had to give him credit as being
> truthful. He didn't...he tried to lie his way out of it and was
> proven to be a liar. Every SUBSEQUENT accusation that erupted also
> had the opportunity for him to "stand up" and be counted, but he tried
> to lie his way out of those, too.

>
> Our present Commander-in-Chief may not be the smoothest orator or
> do everything "right", but I have far greater respect for a man who
> can try, fail, and admit to it than one who tries to lie his way out
> of his actions.
>
> Steve, K4YZ

Exactly....if that Klintoon Klown would have showed a bit of back bone, and slapped the crap out of Hillary he would have earned my respect.

I remember how he treated the military....and how the vets turned their backs on him at Arlington. Etc. Etc.

Now we have a man in charge. Not perfect, but a man none the less.

Dan/W4NTI

3499. Re: Where Did THIS Come From...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-30 01:30:58 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <mLbyb.26851$Rk5.18181@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 83075

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:cuvyxnansvbet.hp2xgj1.pminews@netnews.comcast.net...
> On Fri, 28 Nov 2003 22:21:32 GMT, Dan/W4NTI wrote:
>
> >I think it was a hell of a good thing to do. It showed the ragheads he
has
> >the gonads, and is willing to put it out in front.
>
> There are better ways to show the Habibi that we can kick the
> charra out of them, such as by doing it. My people did it in '67
> (MY war). Surely the US - the biggest army in the world - can do it
> if the politicians get out of the way.
>
> >It looked to me the troopers were quite impressed. Which is a good
thing.
> >Moral is a very fragile thing, and when it starts to crumble...it all
falls
> >apart.
>
> "There's no business like show business....."
>
> One of the members of our congregation is a National Guard
> infantryman who is back home this weekend for a two-week R&R
> between eight month tours over in the Middle East (iraq and Kuwait).
> He was very clear - the stunt didn't impress him at all.
>
> Getting the job done and coming home in one piece is what impresses
> him.
>
> >But then that is what some people want in this country.
>
> Lowest Common Denominator. That, more than anything else, will
> wreck this country.
>
> --
> 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane
>
> From a Clearing in the Silicon Forest
> Beaverton (Washington County) Oregon
>
>

Sorry Phil. Unadultrated bullshit. "Your War" was also "My War". Don't
try to BS me.

That war was a discrace and the way the people of this country acted was a worse discrace.

Then a draft dodging jerk is elected and people 'still' support him. You ought to be ashamed Phil.

I guess 'your war' and 'my war' were a bit different.

Dan/W4NTI

3500. Re: Where Did THIS Come From...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-30 01:32:58 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <eNbyb.26852$Rk5.4475@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 83076

"Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
news:f45722ac.0311290508.75fcc1ad@posting.google.com...
> "K&#65533;HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<2_Uxb.28065$Wy4.17867@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> > "Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote
> >
> > > GW's daddy visited the troops in Somalia after he lost the election.
> >
> > GW's Dad is the authentic article. His son doesn't measure up to the
> > standards he set.
> >
> > 73, de Hans, K0HB
>
> Perhaps. But he is much closer to the mark than Clinton.

Or Gore, or Hillary, or ....etc.

Dan/W4NTI

3501. Re: Where Did THIS Come From...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-30 01:38:00 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <YRbyb.26855$Rk5.25932@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 83077

"Alun" <alun@1stcounsel.com> wrote in message
news:Xns944282A0D69C5elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
> n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in news:20031129115807.23307.00004755@mb-
> m29.aol.com:
>
> > In article <f45722ac.0311281934.2deeda0@posting.google.com>,
> > brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
> >
> >>Blowhard libs have tried soooo hard to wreck this country.
> >
> > So have blowhard conservatives.
> >
> >>They've nearly succeeded,
> >
> > How is this country "wrecked", compared to how things used to be?
> >
> >>but there are still a few people who give a damn about America, and GW
> >>is one of them.
> >
> > There are lots of others, including many who disagree with Mr. Bush.
> >
> > It's the methods, not the person.
> >
> >>
> >
> >
> >
>
> Well, I'm a foreigner in your country, but you can't deny that the economy
> boomed under Clinton and is now on it's knees.
>
> I'm not fond of the present government, but mainly for other reasons.
> Civil liberties and John Ashcroft, mostly.
>
> All in all, I can't really think of anything GW Bush has done domestically
> that is anything to shout about. Tax cuts for the rich. Deficit spending.
> I'm really trying to think of anything good (honestly), but nothing comes
> to mind.
>
> As for the war, why open that can of worms? Yes, Saddam is/was a very bad
> guy. Do I beleive the reasons given for going to war? No. And yes, Blair
> went along with it, but I don't like him a lot either.
>
> ... but then I'm an anti-code test liberal, so what did you expect?

>
> However, I actually do think it was a nice gesture for Dubbya to go to
> Baghdad for Thanksgiving.
>
> I'm sure this post will draw the usual 'love it or leave it' garbage from
> at least someone, but never mind. I can take it.

The economy was taking a downturn BEFORE Clinton got out of office. The economic policy of the Clinton presidency was what ??? Right, there was none. He was riding on the coat tails of Reagan/Bush one.

Has everyone forgotten about 9/11? We are at war. Or has that little detail been forgotten also?

It was not our choice to have some ragheads plow three jets into buildings, and one into the ground and kill nearly 3000 innocents. Some of which were MUSLIM.

But it is our choice how to respond. If you think Sadam didn't have anything to do with it. Let me sell you a bridge in NYC.

Dan/W4NTI

3502. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-30 02:08:17 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <licyb.4748$zL1.485665@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 83078

N2EY wrote:

> In article <3c2yb.4513$zL1.340545@news1.news.adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo
> <mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:
>
>
>>Kï¿½HB wrote:
>>
>>
>>
>>>On the contrary, my plan puts newcomers dead center in the mainstream of
>>>amateur radio, with all the same privileges of EVERY other licensee, just
>>
>>at
>>
>>>a more modest power level of 50watts.
>>
>> How are you going to enforce that?
>
>
> Same way all the other power limits are enforced.

I imagine you're being a bit glib about that. If a ham is running way too much power at the KW end of the scale, there will be possibilities of TVI or RFI. There will be a local discernable problem with other hams too.

But the difference between 50 and 100 watts? Not all that much that is detectable. For this plan to work, (work means compliance) the equipment manufacturers will have to throttle their transcievers to 50 watts.

- Mike KB3EIA -

3503. Re: Since We Were Mentioning "Absurdity"...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-30 02:13:39 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <nncyb.4749$zL1.486842@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 83079

Mike Walton wrote:

> Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:<492yb.4512$zL1.339481@news1.news.adelphia.net>...
>
>>Steve Robeson, K4CAP wrote:
>>
>>
>>> I was reading my December 2003 "CQ" magazine and found an item
>>>penned by Jim Wiley KL7CC, Scott Neustadter W4WW, and the snake oil
>>>salesman of Amateur Radio...Fred Maia W5YI.
>>>
>>> The whole jist of the article is aimed at creating yet another
>>>Amateur Radio license, and the article suggests numerous "snips" of
>>>other requirements from the regulatory, theory, practice and safety
>>>regulations in order to "make" a slimmed-down beginners' license.
>>>
>>> See if you can remember where their following suggestion was once
>>>an actual practice of the Federal Communications Commission, and how
>>>well it worked in practice:
>>>
>>> (From page 36, December 2003 "CQ") QUOTE "Remove some of the
>>>math from the license exams. Remove some or even most of the "radio
>>>law" type questions. Instead require the applicants to sign a
>>>statement that they have read the Part 97 rulebook, and that they ahve
>>>a copy (available for free via web download). Yes, some of the
>>>applicants will "skate" and not read it when they signed that they
>>>did. But most will, and even among those who dont, eventually,
>>>probablysooner rather than later, they will get around to it. Some
>>>never will. That's human nature. We're not looking for saints, just
>>>people who can become producetive hams". UNQUOTE
>>>
>>> My first question for these brain surgeons is HOW IN THE BLUE
>>>BLAZES CAN SOMEONE BE "PRODUCTIVE" IF THEY DON"T KNOW THE RULES...?!?!
>>>
>>> These people are in a position of responsibility for mentoring
>>>the next generation of Amateurs..?!?!
>>>
>>> We'd be better off letting Michael Jackson be their sand lot
>>>supervisor! ! !
>
> Stop picking on the King odf Pop, it's not fair:
>
> http://www.geocities.com/tom5515/frame.htm

>
> Actually, it's kinfd of outrageous, wasn't Hugh Hefner a target of
> Nixon's Justice Department in the 1970's --i think this is equally
> political.

DUDE! I didn't write one thing that you qouted! Gotta get your
attributes correct....

- Mike KB3EIA -

3504. Re: Where Did THIS Come From...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-30 02:26:40 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hp4vcr5.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>
Source record: 83080

On 28 Nov 2003 19:34:38 -0800, Brian wrote:

>> Lowest Common Denominator. That, more than anything else, will
>> wreck this country.

>Blowhard libs have tried soooo hard to wreck this country.

That lets me off the hook - I'm certainly not one of them.

>They've
>nearly succeeded, but there are still a few people who give a damn
>about America, and GW is one of them.

He's a living example of the Lowest Common Denominator -= no class
at all.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

3505. Re: Where Did THIS Come From...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-30 02:26:40 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hp4uy23.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>
Source record: 83081

On 28 Nov 2003 19:22:11 -0800, Brian wrote:

>Hey Phil, you have self-admitted no experience whatsoever in military
>science.

Does being employed by DoD for almost 10 years at duty stations
which were prime targets for a Soviet ICBM first- or second-strikes
during the '50s and '60s count for anything?

It's not my fault that I was rejected when I was drafted - yes,
drafted. After that I was a civilian employee for SAC at SAC Hq
and several AF bases, all prime targets.

My butt was on the line, my friend. Every day when the nation was
'sposed to be "at peace".

>So your opinion of our Commander in Chief's trip to Iraq is of no
>concern to you. None. Unless the double standard applies.

It is of major concern to me. Even though I wasn't wearing a blue
suit the POTUS was -my- CiC as well, and even to this day I pay
taxes which fund such things.

>Just bill the Feds for your usual $400/hour advisory fees and call it quits.

In your dreams. My "fees" were more like $1.50/hour when I started
with DoD and $4/hour when I left the military end of Federal
business in 1964. Even up to this day I was never a "consultant" or
"advisor" to the Feds. I was one of the working troops.

>Merry Christmas to those who have never served and never risked a
>damned thing but are full of opinions about what motivates fighting
>men (and women) to get their business done, and what equipment they
>might need.

That doesn't fit me at all. I dealt with those issues quite a bit.

Remove head from rectum and have a happy whatever you celebrate.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

3506. Re: Where Did THIS Come From...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-30 02:26:41 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hp4v7b4.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>
Source record: 83082

On 28 Nov 2003 19:27:06 -0800, Brian wrote:

>Do detail your experiences in your war.

You are confusing me with someone else.

>> Lowest Common Denominator. That, more than anything else, will
>> wreck this country.
>
>Some people want us to tuck tail and head home (in one peice).

I'm not in that category. I strongly believe that the Habibi need
the charra kicked out of them for a lot of reasons, including the
expulsion of a branch of my family from what is now Iraq in the 13th
Century (no, I don't want the family villa back but it was tempting).

I don't want this to turn into another Vietnam, either.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

3507. Re: Where Did THIS Come From...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-30 02:26:41 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hp4w1e7.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>
Source record: 83083

On 29 Nov 2003 01:58:17 GMT, N2EY wrote:

>>> Neat trick, GW showing up in Iraq, wasn't it?
>>
>> "There's no business like show business....."
>
>Hillary made a big show of going, so Dubya trumped her. Neat trick.

Another bozo.

What gets me about that maneuver is that when he flew from Tex-as to Andrews to pick up the standby plane using the cover excuse that the plane was going back there for maintenance, SOP is to fly the replacement to where the one going in for maintenance is BEFORE the move is made. Any plane-watcher hobbyist could have picked up on that. Ditto for the facilities of White House Communications Agency (a branch of the military).

And what about the two AF fighters which always accompany the plane when POTUS is aboard? Another dead giveaway.

Good trick....

>> Resources that could have been applied to newer and better equipment
>> for our troops "over there" and for veterans' care, for instance? Not
>> to mention the needs of the civilian population within our country.
>
>Or maybe a little thing called the deficit? Or homeland security?

Hey, that trip will probably delay my friend's brother getting a decent wheelchair for another six months, to get it down to the nitty gritty. So much for the VN vets.

>> Happy Holiday to all.
>>
>And to our service people - spending next Thanksgiving with their
>families at home.

Amen, brother.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

3508. Re: Where Did THIS Come From...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-30 02:26:41 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hp4vi96.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>
Source record: 83086

On 28 Nov 2003 21:03:22 -0800, Steve Robeson, K4CAP wrote:

> Phil, after 8 years of dealing with a president who was willing
>to commit our Armed Forces to battle without giving a drat about
>"them", it's a breath of fresh air to have one who would do this.

Two wrongs don't make a right. Clinton was a bozo. GW is a bozo.
I wish that we could have voted "none of thr above" both times.

As my overseas friends say "is this the best that you could come up
with?"

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

3509. Re: Where Did THIS Come From...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-30 02:26:42 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hp4wfa8.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>
Source record: 83084

On Sat, 29 Nov 2003 02:00:41 GMT, Jim Hampton wrote:

>Heheheeee ... Phil, I know you're an attourney and I suspect you have tried
>a couple of cases in your lifetime. Yep, there are two sides to every
>story.

(good story on selective assessment clipped)

>Lovely country, eh?

Of course the other side of the coin is where the voters get fed up
with paying for what they expect the state and local governments to
give them and enact a cap on property tax increases which also
includes a provision that when a property changes hands out of the
immediate family it is assessed at the sale price. California calls
this Proposition 13 and Oregon calls it Measure 5. We got whacked
when my family bought a house in California before the provision
went in but after the cut-off date when the assessments were
"referenced back". For 10 years we lived in a house that was
identical in size, age, and condition to the house next door, and we
paid twice as much taxes as they did.

Lovely country. eh ? You're so right.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

3510. Re: Where Did THIS Come From...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-30 02:26:42 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hp4wk59.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>
Source record: 83085

On Sat, 29 Nov 2003 03:58:32 GMT, KØHB wrote:

>I worked for Senator McCains dad, Admiral John McCain II, when he was
>CincPAC and John III was a guest at the Hanoi Hilton. Later I worked for
>Capt Dick Stratton, a fellow 'guest' in Hanoi, and met John III on a couple
>of occasions. Him, I trust.

My kid brother, who is active in Republican politics in Arizona,
agrees with your assessment. HIM I trust also.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

3511. Re: Where Did THIS Come From...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-30 02:26:42 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hp4xa8a.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>
Source record: 83087

On 29 Nov 2003 05:22:38 -0800, Brian wrote:

>McCain can't remember which political party he belongs to.

That's why I trust him.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

3512. Re: Where Did THIS Come From...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-30 02:26:43 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hp4yrkd.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>
Source record: 83088

On 29 Nov 2003 05:28:10 -0800, Brian wrote:

>Phil, when did you become an American citizen? Or haven't you?

Rest assured that I am one. Detailed answer sent by e-mail.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

3513. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-30 02:37:14 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <uJcyb.4754$zL1.493445@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 83089

N2EY wrote:

> In article <d83yb.4535$zL1.353339@news1.news.adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo
> <mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:
>
>
>>N2EY wrote:
>>
>>
>>>In article <eeXxb.25694$Rk5.22660@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>,
>>
>>"Dwight
>>
>>>Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> writes:
>>
>><snippage>
>>
>>>>Your proposal
>>>>would intentionally take that away by setting the bar to upgrade even
>>
>>higher
>>
>>>>(the Extra class test). And, if newcomers fail to reach that higher bar,
>>
>>out
>>
>>>>they go - their non-renewable license is gone.
>
>
>
>>>Exactly.
>
>
>
>>>But they would have 10 years to do it.
>
>
>
>>>In the bad old days, a new ham had to pass the old General written (which
>>
>>was
>>
>>>split into the Tech and General writtens in 1987) to get a
>>

>>permanent/renewable
>>
>>>license of any class. The old Novice was meant as a learning tool, not a
>>>permanent license.
>>
>> Just because an idea was old, doesn't mean it wasn't bad! 8^)
>
>
> Watta concept!

Thought you would like that.....

>>I would
>>have to suspect that the old Novice non-renewable was probably to allow
>>the prospective "permanent" ham to hone his or her Morse CW skills
>>rather than learn the writtens of the time.
>
>
> You suspect wrong!
>
> The old Novice was meant as a learner's permit for both the code and written -
> in fact, more for the written than the code. A Novice could upgrade to Tech
> with no more written skills (both licenses always required just 5 wpm code).
> But upgrading to *any* permanent/renewable license required the
> General/Tech/Conditional written test, which was much more involved than the
> old Novice written.
>
> The old Novice privileges included 2 meters (145-147 MHz) code and AM voice
> (until 1967). The idea was that some Novices would go on to General and others
> to Tech, depending on whether they were primarily interested in HF or VHF.

Perhaps I am looking at it from a different view, because of my
difficulties with Morse, but from what I've seen, the new tests aren't
that hard - and well, what I've been able to glean is that the old tests
were'nt that har either. So I may be a prejudiced observer. But how many
people needed all that time to prepare for the writtens? And wasn't the
General 12 wpm?

>>So the big question is what
>>is going to be different about this new class gap that ten years is an
>>appropriate time lag.
>
>
> The idea is that the jump will be all the way to Extra-level written testing.
> The ten-year term is meant to be a generous allotment of time, plus the current
> license term is ten years.
>
>>For a hobby, ten years is just too long a time. If there are going to be
>>limits, they should be reasonable ones.
>
>

> Why is 10 years unreasonable? I recall Hans saying that if someone can't or
> won't reach the level required for a full-privs license in 10 years, they
> probably aren't that interested. (Correct me if I'm mistaken on that, Hans).

Because they will probably be disinterested a lot sooner than ten years.
Why not three? Why not one? Why not make the sorry you're out date the
same time as the time in grade?

>
>>>>And if this isn't all about assigning newcomers to a subordinate class,
>>>>why don't you change the names of those new licenses you propose - Class A
>>>>for the entry license class and Class B for the other license class? As it
>>>>is, it's clear only someone who has taken an Extra class-like test can be a
>>>>"Class A" Amateur Radio Operator.
>>>
>>>
>>>Yup!
>>>
>>>
>>>>>It's clear to me that you haven't even taken
>>>>>the time to read the proposal I've made to
>>>>>the FCC. (snip)
>>>>
>>>>I've read the proposal and what you've said about the proposal in this
>>>>newsgroup. I stand by what I've said here and in the previous message.
>>>>
>>>
>>>I think you missed the major contradiction/paradox of Hans' proposal,
>>
>>Dwight.
>>
>>>He proposes a simplified test for the LP license, yet all LPs would be
>>>allowed
>>>all frequencies and modes.
>>>
>>>So the simplified test has to be adequate for the LPs to use all freqs and
>>>modes - just not full power.
>>>
>>>How can a simplifed test do that?
>>
>> And how are we going to take care of the "shack on a belt" crowd. A
>>awful lot of hams are quite happy with their Technician licenses.
>
>
> Hans' proposal would not affect any existing hams' privileges. Those with
> existing licenses other than Extra could keep them, renew them and modify them
> as long as they retain interest. Existing Techs could stay Tech forever - no
> problem.

It is most *certainly* a problem with new hams who have the same goals
as those who are happy being technicians now.

So we get rid of Morse code because of the poor souls who are kept out
of it because it is there, and then we force them to upgrade because of
why? We kick them out because of why?

And there it is. WHY?

If a ham is perfectly capable of operating on HF at 10 years licensing,
whay is he/she not qualified at 10 years and one day?

WHY? It's arbitrary, and unfair. and in the end, a touch absurd.

>>A
>>forced upgrade with absolutely no advantage for a person that only does
>>public events, and uses the local repeater once in a while is not going
>>to be very popular with them. And "they" are a pretty large percentage.
>>Yes of course that is among people already licensed, but my point is
>>that this proposal is very HF-centric.
>
>
> They wouldn't have to change anything.
>
> But it only applies to existing hams. Newbies might get ticked off that the
> same options weren't open to them.

Uh-huh! The old Techs get to keep their licenses forever, (do they have
to reregister after ten years, or are they techs forever with no renewal
if they want to be) but the new class B's are this long-term one-shot deal.

>
>>>And if the simplified test *is* adequate, why should the higher-class test
>>>require more than the additional stuff needed to run high power?
>>
>> And of course, how ya gonna enforce that 50 watt limit? Enacting
>>unenforceable laws is a great way to breed disrespect for laws.
>>
>
> What stops me from running 5 kW? or more than the allowed power on 30 meters or
> the Novice bands?

Go ahead and fire up that 5kW station! I bet you can be found fairly
quickly.

But seriously, the really big difference is that for you to run 5 kW,
you have to do something above and beyond the ordinary, like put
together or purchase an amplifier, tuner, and the like.

Class B person simply has to turn that little RF power knob up past 50
watts. Perhaps the manufacturers will be forced to limit the output
power to 50 watts?

- Mike KB3EIA -

3514. Re: Since We Were Mentioning "Absurdity"...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-30 02:49:30 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0311291849.4f58bdd1@posting.google.com>
Source record: 83090

Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:<492yb.4512$zL1.339481@news1.news.adelphia.net>...
> Steve Robeson, K4CAP wrote:

> > Read the whole article. It's a really poorly thought out concept
> > and one that's been beaten over and over again.
>
>
> But.....But.....But Steve!!!! No one could have written that! Didn't
> they tell you? No one wants amateur radio simplified! Just because we've
> seen it written on the web, and now in CQ magazine, no one *really*
> feels that way! (tongue in cheek mode off)
>
> I guess this is one of those cases where they say "I wasn't sayin', I
> was just sayin'".....
>
> Oh them lumberjacks, chippin' away.

It makes me sick to say this, but LoosieBroocie may ahve been
closer to the truth than we care to admit!

Steve, K4YZ

3515. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-30 02:50:13 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <FVcyb.4756$zL1.496707@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 83091

N2EY wrote:

> In article <nv2yb.4519$zL1.345067@news1.news.adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo
> <mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:
>
>
>>Kï¿½HB wrote:
>>
>>
>>>A straightforward plan is already written and in the hands of the FCC.
>>>http://tinyurl.com/wce9
>>
>> It really isn't too bad a plan, although there are a few weaknesses
>>that are a bit bothersome.
>>
>> That 50 watt limit for the class B license is simply unenforcable, save
>
>
>>some sort of training wheel governor device that they would have to put
>>on their transmitters.
>
>
> Why would it be any more complex than what we have now?
>
> And in the old days, there was no big deal about enforcing Novices' use of no
> more than 75 watts input and crystal control.

I think the old days were a bit different than today.

I don't think that people drove thier cars 30-35 miles per hour over
the speed limit as a routine thing. We just opend a new double laned
road in the area. Has a 40 mph speed limit. The first day, there were
something like ten people pulled over for going 75 mph and up on it. The
local bypass is 55. I am regularly passed by cars going 100 mph. At
least twice every trip. I'm going 70 and I'm a target. Going the speed
limit is tantamount to suicide.

My point is that if the radio can do 100 watts, that's where they are
going to put it. And that being the case, forgo the useless regulation.

>> If you want to put a time limit on upgrading, it really should be a lot
>
>
>>shorter, like 3 years. Ten years is simply way too long. The prospective
>> class A Ham almost certainly will upgrade in a year or two.
>

>
> Maybe not! Look how many Tech Pluses are still on the books today, even though
> for the past 42 months they've been able to upgrade with just a single written
> - or in many cases, no test at all. And the number of Tech Pluses has also been
> dropping by renewals as Techs.....

And this hurts what?

>> But I still don't like the idea of a forced retirement. It brings up an
>
>
>>absurdity like a person that operates exclusivly QRP having to upgrade
>>so that he/she is now allowed to use 1.5 kW. That's all they get. So
>>they are forced to upgrade and spend money for something that means
>>nothing to them - save keeping their license.
>
>
> The same was true in the old days if a ham simply wanted to operate in the
> Novice bands with xtal control and 75 watts...

Perhaps, but it doesn't make it any less absurd.

> When incentive licensing was reinstituted in 1968, a lot of hams had to upgrade
> just to do what they'd been doing for years.

Is this like 3 lefts make a right? 8^)

>
>> I really do like the idea of "time in grade". It is one of the best
>>ideas ever abandoned by the FCC.
>
>
> Me too, but it's an uphill climb to get it back.
>
>> A lifetime grant license? Well, I'm not too sure. I guess it is a
>>pretty good thing. If you don't have to renew it, there aren't
>>processing costs.
>
>
> The big problem is that the license won't expire even if its holder does. The
> database will contain more and more entries of long-dead or lost-interest hams.

True enough, kind of like JA

> Perhaps that's part of Hans' plan - the number of hams with that class of
> license will grow and grow and grow...
>
> FCC will cancel a license if proper paperwork is done. Usually this takes the
> form of a family member sending in a death certificate so that the SK's call
> can be reassigned to a friend, club or relative.
>
> Given the 10 year license term and such things as online renewal, I don't see
> renewal costs as a big line item in the FCC budget.

>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

3516. Re: More 11m Freebanders on Echo Link

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-30 03:15:16 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <IKydndy7R77v-VSi4p2dnA@gbronline.com>
Source record: 83093

Robert Casey wrote:
> Arnie Voobner wrote:
>
>> Anyone have further info on all the 11 m freeband
>> activity on Echo Link?
>>
>>
>>
> How are they getting in? Are they registering using an unsuspecting ham's
> call and name? Or did they hack into it another way?

You can always count on the cb types to mess up anything they can.

3517. Re: Where Did THIS Come From...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-30 03:29:54 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hp50zbf.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>
Source record: 83092

On Sun, 30 Nov 2003 01:30:58 GMT, Dan/W4NTI wrote:

>> There are better ways to show the Habibi that we can kick the
>> charra out of them, such as by doing it. My people did it in '67
>> (MY war).

>Sorry Phil. Unadultrated bullshit. "Your War" was also "My War". Don't
>try to BS me.

YOU were in the Six Day War (June 5-11, 1967)? The one where Israel
kicked the living charra out of the Habibi in Egypt, Jordan, and
Syria and would have continued on to Iraq had not the US and the
USSR intervened. Which side were you on?

I thought that I knew most of the very few Americans who were involved...

Then again your reply indicated that you do not know the good Arabic
terms "Habibi" and "charra".....

But you are awarded the Olympic Bronze Medal in Conclusion Jumping
for form if not for accuracy.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

3518. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-30 05:03:06 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <eSeyb.27327$Rk5.1983@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 83094

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote

> And how are we going to take care of the "shack on a belt" crowd. A
> awful lot of hams are quite happy with their Technician licenses.

And under my plan they are free to keep their Technician license.

> A forced upgrade with absolutely no advantage for a person
> that only does public events, and uses the local repeater once
> in a while is not going to be very popular with them.

I don't propose to force them to upgrade. Technicians are perfectly free to renew their current license.

> And of course, how ya gonna enforce that 50 watt limit? Enacting
> unenforceable laws is a great way to breed disrespect for laws.

There are currently many examples of limited power in the rules. How do we enforce the current 50W limit which exists for EVERYONE on some HF frequencies? How do we enforce the current 200W limit in the Novice sub-bands? How did we enforce the old 75W limit for Novices? How did we enforce the old 50W limits on 160 meters? How do we enforce the current 200W limit on 30 meters? How do we enforce the 50W PEP limit on 219-220MHz? How do we enforce the current Novice 5W limit on 23 cm? How do we enforce the current 25W limit for Novices on 1.25 cm? As a matter of fact, how do we enforce the current 1.5KW limit? Are you suggesting that FCC discard all these limits because they breed disrespect? What a 'novel' idea!!!! (I quit using the word 'stupid'.)

73, de Hans, K0HB

3519. Re: More 11m Freebanders on Echo Link

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-30 05:10:30 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031130001030.03399.00001243@mb-m29.aol.com>
Source record: 83095

>You can always count on the cb types to mess up anything they can

Or CBplussers

3520. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-30 05:35:00 UTC
From: groupk0hb@earthlink.net
Message-ID: <5ee63311.0311292135.71550511@posting.google.com>
Source record: 83096

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote

> you feel all should
> be forced to improve on that

Nope, not at all. Under my proposal you'd be free to keep renewing
your Technician (what a misnomer!) license until you assume room
temperature.

> The test proposal for new applicants makes the least sense of all.

> More modest power levels? That 50 watts you propose is 1,450 watts less
> than what Technicians can use today. That's a pretty significant hit, not a
> modest one.

Technicians could continue to renew their current license until they
assume room temperature.

> As for privileges, once the code test is gone, Technicians can
> gain considerable HF privileges by taking the General written.

My proposal would allow them a transition period to do just that.
Then they could continue to renew their no-code General test until
they assumed room temperature.

73, de Hans, K0HB

3521. Amateur Radio Newsline™ Report 1372 – November 28, 2003

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-30 05:47:48 UTC
From: radionews@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031130004748.29219.00001243@mb-m10.aol.com>
Source record: 83097

Amateur Radio Newsline™ Report 1372 – November 28, 2003

Amateur Radio Newsline report number 1372 with a release date of Friday, November 28, 2003 to follow in 5-4-3-2-1.

The following is a Q-S-T. Australia plans a celebration to welcome no-code, a New Zealand ham plans an Amateur Radio replacement for a frequency standard station and the U-S-A is on the verge of banning unsolicited junk e-mail. Find out the details on Amateur Radio Newsline report number 1372 coming your way right now.

(Billboard Cart Here)

**

RESTRUCTURING: WELCOMING NO CODE “DOWN-UNDER”

Last week Australia’s decided to abolish code exams on the 1st of January. Now its planning a world-wide on-the-air celebration as 2003 gives way to 2004 and Morse testing disappears. Jim Linton, VK3PC, has the story and an invitation for you to take part:

--

On New Year's Day 2004 Australian radio amateurs will gain access to the High Frequency bands using licenses that don't require the passing of Morse code telegraphy tests. The Wireless Institute of Australia invites the world's amateur radio fraternity to join an on-air celebration of this special occasion.

To celebrate the event, there will be a "WIA Welcome to HF QSO Party" beginning at 0001 Australian Eastern Daylight Time and conclude at 2400 UTC on New Year's Day - a total of 35 hours. The VK radio amateurs appearing on HF bands for the first time can be identified by three-letter VK callsign suffixes that begin with the letters H, T, U, X, Y and Z.

WIA amateur stations will be on air to join the HF QSO Party, and these have two-letter callsign suffixes "WI" or three letter suffixes starting with "WI." Listen for the call "CQ WIA Welcome to HF QSO Party".

For the Amateur Radio Newsline, I’m Jim Linton VK3PC.

--

Many in Amateur Radio have been campaigning for years to have code tests removed as a license requirement to operate on amateur bands below 30 MHz. For Australia this will happen on the 1st of January, 2004 with this very special on-the-air celebration.

(DO NOT READ. Find out more by e-mailing hfqsoparty@wiavic.org.au (Q-News))

**

INTERNATIONAL - NEW ZEALAND: A PROPOSAL TO REPLACE VNG

Still down-under, word that well known "Digital Modes" Amateur, Murray Greenman, ZL1BPU, has proposed that New Zealand and Australian hams put together a network of simple and inexpensive transmitters. This, to provide a high accuracy Standard Frequency Service to replace the VNG standards station that has now gone QRT. Amateur Radio Newslines Jim Meachen ZL2BHF is in Auckland with the details:

--

Amateurs in the South Pacific have for many years relied on VNG transmissions as a prime source of accurate frequency reference. With the closure of VNG in December 2002, the sole remaining precision signal source in our area is WWVH, in Hawaii. Unfortunately the WWVH signal quality in the South Pacific is generally too poor for reliable use, either to zero beat a simple calibrator, or using more sophisticated computer based techniques.

ZL1BPU says that a series of tests over the last two years has shown that simple low power carrier transmissions on the 80m band would fulfill most of the requirements of a Standard Frequency Service:

--

Greenman: “Using simple HF transmitters that I've designed, we have confirmed that low power transmissions are very useful, for both calibration and propagation study, up to at least 3000 km range.

Anyone can monitor these signals, using a stable receiver and freely available software to look for small frequency shifts that accompany each propagation path. Classic effects such as multiple paths with different refractive indices for different signal polarization’s are easily observable.

Doppler shift is particularly marked around sunrise and sunset. Observing these signals gives a better understanding of propagation, which is the key to accurate on-air frequency measurement.”

--

The Service now operates on a test basis with transmissions from a high precision local reference on an exact kHz point 80m frequency using a carrier power of 1-5W. The Transmissions are identified in Morse every 30 minutes. Operation is from a different geographical location each weekend. Transmission times are announced and coordinated beforehand by e-mail.

Reporting from Auckland New Zealand I'm Jim Meachen ZL2BHF for Newsline

--

ZL1BPU adds that these are privately owned, operated and attended test transmissions, not beacons. Establishing a Standard Frequency Service formally, perhaps under the auspices of the NZART, might be considered in the

future. (NZART News)

**

COMMUNICATIONS LAW: HOUSE PASSES ANTI-SPAM LAW

Here in the U-S-A, Congress has moved closer to passing the first-ever federal protections against unwanted commercial e-mails. This, with the House passing a bill on Saturday, November 22nd that would impose new limits on sending direct advertising offers -- commonly called spam mail.

Approved on a 392 to 5 vote, the measure would prohibit senders of unsolicited commercial e-mail from disguising their identity by using a false return address or misleading subject line. It would also prohibit bulk mailers from harvesting addresses off websites and require such e-mails to include a mechanism so recipients can indicate they do not want future mass mailings. Penalties for failure to comply could be up to five years in prison in some circumstances.

The House bill largely mirrors ant-Spam legislation the Senate approved last month. Supporters hope that slight differences between the two measures can be resolved before Congress adjourns for the year. The Bush administration says that it supports the anti-spam efforts. (Published news reports)

**

Break 1

From the United States of America, We are the Amateur Radio Newsline, heard on bulletin stations around the world including the Montgomery Amateur Radio Club repeater serving Rockville Maryland.

(5 sec pause here)

**

RADIO LAW: THE FCC ON PRIVACY OF INFORMATION

The FCC has put in place a temporary policy that will keep the public from knowing who is facing enforcement action by that agency. Amateur Radio Newsline’s Bruce Tennant, K6PZW, picks up the story:

--

Don’t look for names and call signs of alleged regulatory violators to be released by the FCC anymore. At least not for a while. This is because the agency has revised the format in which it's supplying the media and the public with information regarding alleged regulatory scofflaws, including those in the Amateur Radio service.

The revised temporary policy is based on privacy concerns within the FCC. Until further notice, the agency says that it will only provide the location where a violator lives along with a very brief synopsis of the action taken.

Following a policy review now taking place the FCC says it will announce a new privacy policy for all future information releases.

For the Amateur Radio Newsline, I'm Bruce Tennant, K6PZW, reporting.

--

No timetable has been announced for the privacy policy review to be completed. (FCC)

**

ENFORCEMENT: NO MORE ADS AND WE RENEW YOUR LICENSE

And without mentioning any name or callsign, the FCC has acted in a pending non-certified radio equipment marketing case. This, as a Tomah, Wisconsin, licensee is informed that renewal of his Technician license would be granted on the condition that he permanently remove from the World-Wide-Web certain information.

The FCC says what it wants removed includes any advertisements for, or references to, the sale of transmitting equipment that operates, or is intended to operate, on frequencies in the Citizens Band service. Also references to gear for any other radio service requiring the use of certified transmitting equipment but which has not been certificated by the regulatory agency.

If he says O-K, he gets his ticket renewed. If he refuses to comply, the FCC says that his renewal will be designated for hearing before Administrative Law judge. (FCC)

**

ENFORCEMENT: PA REPEATER PROBLEM

The FCC has also warned a Lewistown, Pennsylvania, Extra class licensee that he must heed the request by a repeater owner to stay off that system and that technical problems with his own repeater must be corrected immediately.

And in an Order issued by Philadelphia FCC office that licensee was told that his repeater could not operate under automatic control until further notice. He was also requested to provide operational information about the repeater, including names and addresses of control operators. (FCC)

**

ENFORCEMENT: TOWER VANDAL FACES 27 MONTHS IN PRISON

And you can just about write the words "the end" to the case of a Washington man accused of tampering with more than 20 high voltage power towers in four western states that we have been reporting on. 62-year-old Michael Poulin has admitted the charges and has entered a plea bargain agreement with federal prosecutors. As a result, he will serve no more than 27 months in prison. He also faces a possible fine of $500,000. Without the plea agreement he could have been sentenced to jail for up to 10 years. (CGC)

**

RADIO LAW FOLLOW-UP: THE NEVADA HIGHWAY PATROL VS THE FCC

Some enforcement news of a different kind by way of the Reno Gazzette Journal and the C-G-C Communicator. Both bring word that the Nevada Highway Patrol has turned over a 255 page investigative report and 2,500 pages of supporting documentation to that states Attorney General's office. The Attorney General will now consider the possibility of criminal charges will be determined in connection with the police agency’s use of a radio system on frequencies for which it holds no licenses.

As previously reported, the highway patrol launched the investigation earlier this year when it was discovered that it didn’t have the proper licenses to operate the $14 million communications system built for it in 2000. The FCC has threatened to fine Nevada and block the states future license requests if the Nevada Highway Patrol does not quickly abandon use of the unauthorized frequencies. (CGC)

**

WITH THE ARRL: 2004 ELECTION RESULTS

The ARRL has announced that Frank Fallon, N2FF, retained his seat as Director of the League's Hudson Division. This, by defeating Vice Director Steve Mendelsohn, W2ML, by a vote of 1933 to 1470.

Ballots were counted November 21 at ARRL Headquarters. The Hudson Division's was the sole contested seat in the current director-vice director election cycle.

Incumbents running in the Central, New England, Northwestern and Roanoke Divisions ran unopposed and were declared elected. Joyce Birmingham, KA2ANF, was the lone candidate for the vice director's seat that W2ML vacated to run for the division's top spot and was also declared as elected.

And don’t look for as many League elections to take place in the future as in years past. These candidates were elected to serve three-year terms of office that begin at noon on January 1, 2004. The change from two year to three year terms was instituted by the ARRL Board a few years ago. (ARRL)

**

REQUIRED READING: SURGE PROTECTION - SEPARATING MYTH FROM FACT

If you think that $2.98 bargain basement power strip will protect your ham gear from power line spikes, you could be in for a rude and very expensive awakening. This is the gist of a feature article in the December issue of Popular Communications Magazine titled Surge Protection: Separating Myth From Fact.

The author is Popcom Editor Harold Ort, N2RLL. In it, Ort takes you on a mind boggling journey into the world of powerline surge protectors. He tells you why power surges take place and what really works to protect your station -- and -- what does not.

The article is must reading for any ham that operates his station from mains power. You can find Popular Communications on many newsstands worldwide or subscribe over the web at www dot popular dash communications dot com. (ARNewsline(tm))

**

INDUSTRY NEWS: ROHN ANNOUNCES ASSET PURCHASE AGREEMENT

Amateur Radio and telecommunications industry tower manufacturer ROHN Industries has announced that it's entered into an asset purchase agreement. This with SPX Corporation which is described as a global, multi-industry company.

According to the ARRL Letter, ROHN filed for Chapter 11 debtor-in-possession relief in the US Bankruptcy Court for the Southern District of Indiana on September 16. The deal, if approved by the court would include ROHN subsidiaries that are party to the bankruptcy proceeding. (WA6KLA, ARRL)

**

BREAK 2

This is ham radio news for today’s radio amateur. From the United States of America, We are the Amateur Radio Newsline with links to the world from our only official website at www.arnewsline.org and being relayed by the volunteer services of the following radio amateur:

(5 sec pause here)

**

WITH ARNEWSLINE: YOUR INPUT NEEDED

Amateur Radio Newsline will be holding its annual Board of Directors meeting in early December and those in charge want to find out what you would like from us in 2004 and beyond. If you have any ideas on how to improve the newscast, the Young Ham of the Year Award, funding, or any aspect of our operation, we welcome your thoughts. E-mail is best. You reach us at newsline@arnewsline.org. (ARNewsline(tm))

**

HAM HELP: DX SOUND BITE NEEDED

Did you have a tape recorder running the weekend of the CQ World Wide SSB contest? If you did then Glen Lowery, K2FF needs to hear what you have.

The reason? Well, it seems that Daryl Goldman, KD5CQT, and Randy Becnel, W5UE , spent a week in Suriname in October. Goldman operated as PZ5CQ while Becnel was on as PZ5UE. The duo also activated PZ5A in the contest.

Anyhow, when the team got back home they realized that they had recorded everyone on tape except PZ5UE. And now there is a presentation planned for early December and audio of Becnel in QSO is needed to complete the show.

If you happened to be listening in and have the one missing station recorded, please contact Glen Lowery by e-mail to k2ff@aol.ccm Everyone involved will be very appreciative if one of you can help out.

More is on the web at www.mdxa.org/pz_2003.html (OPDX)

**

EMERGING TECHNOLOGY: CELL PHONES WILL POSSESS LOCATION-BASED BEHAVIOR

According to a report on the National Institute of Standards and Technology website, your cell phone may one day be able to adjust its behavior or call handling based upon where it determines you are located. Such phones could, for example, advise you of the closest bank, dial the nearest emergency specialist or automatically forward your calls while you're in a conference room. The N-I-S-T website carries many other interesting stories too. Its updated regularly and is in cyberspace at www.nist.gov (CGC)

**

HAM RADIO IN SPACE: ARISS GEAR PASSES PREFLIGHT TEST

Some exciting news on new ham radio hardware slated to be carried to the International Space Station. We have more in this report:

--

ARISS International Chairman Frank Bauer, KA3HDO, reports that he and other members of the USA team just returned from Russia where we they were supporting a series of meetings and tests at the Energia facility.

According to Bauer, the primary reason for the US team visit was to complete the testing of the Phase 1 Ericsson 2 meter and 70 cm radios, along with the Phase 2 Kenwood D 700 radio system using a set of flight identical ARISS antenna systems.

The tests were performed in the KIS facility at Energia that houses all their flight equipment. Inside the KIS is a flight equivalent Service Module. The good news is that the group not only successfully completed the end-to-end testing of the Kenwood and Ericsson radio systems but the SSTV system as well.

The successful completion of these end-to-end tests was a requirement by the Russian team. This, to clear these radio systems for use in the on-orbit Service Module.

For the Amateur Radio Newsline, I’m Norm Seeley, KI7UP.

--

By the way, the International Space Station celebrated its fifth anniversary in Earth orbit on November 20th. (ARISS)

**

ON THE AIR: NEW SPANISH LANGUAGE IRLP REFLECTOR

A Spanish language reflector has come to the Internet Repeater Linking Project. This, with word that Reflector 9201 is in full operation and all users with Spanish skills are invited to join in the fun.

Jay Santiago, KP4EOP, is the operator of node 7040. He and the Chicago based Asociacion Iberoamericana de Radio Aficionados are the people behind the project. They say that 9201 is not closed to non-Spanish speakers. Rather it is a place in ham radio cyberspace where the Spanish language will be primary.

Up until now, IRLP- has been dominated English and French speaking nodes and reflectors. This left a large portion of the worlds Spanish only speakers out of communications over the very popular repeater linking system -- a problem that’s now been corrected thanks to the Asociacion Iberoamericana de Radio Aficionados. (K9DC)

**

PROPAGATION TECHNOLOGY: NEW SOLAR FLARE THEORY

The recent series of solar storms to hit Earth may be caused by the sun's iron-rich interior. So says one solar researcher who theorizes that the sun's core is made of iron rather than hydrogen.

Dr. Oliver Manuel is a professor of nuclear chemistry. He believes that iron, not hydrogen, is the sun's most abundant element. And, in a paper accepted for publication in the Journal of Fusion Energy, Manuel asserts that the standard solar model which assumes that the sun's core is made of hydrogen has led to misunderstandings of how such solar flares occur.

As ever ham knows, these flares can play havoc with high frequency communications while turning some VHF frequencies into world-wide D-X bands. (ANS and Space Daily)

**

DX

And speaking about DX, word that OK1TN will operate portable KP2 from St. Thomas in the Virgin Islands through the 13th of December. If you make contact, QSL as directed on the air.

Also, K3JT is active as 5X1X from Uganda for the five or six weeks. Sorry. No other information on this operation is available at this time.

Lastly, the Council of Europe Radio Amateur Club, has launched a competition open to all radio amateurs. This, to commemorate the 18th anniversary of its establishment in June 1986. The challenge involves sending a list of all contacts made with their club station TP2CE using its various special prefixes before the end of June 2004. Complete rules can be found on the Internet at ewwa.free.fr

(This weeks DX news provided by OPDX, GB2RS and Modern DX’er)

**

THAT FINAL ITEM: T-HUNT TIME AGAIN

And finally this week, whether you're young or old, you could become a champion at hidden transmitter hunting. It's time to start training now, as you'll hear in this report from Amateur Radio Newsline's Joe Moell K-Zero-Oh-V

--
USA's best on-foot hidden transmitter hunters will be heading west next summer. The fourth annual USA ARDF Championships will begin June 16 near Santa Barbara, California. Get ready for practice sessions followed by separate days of intense competition on the two meter and 80 meter bands. Medals will be awarded in nine age and gender categories, following the rules of the International Amateur Radio Union.

The competitive courses are open to anyone of any age, experienced or not. Here's your chance to learn from experts like Jay Thompson W6JAY, Newsline's Young ham of the year. He was a medal winner at this year's Championships in Ohio.

These USA Championships will take place just in time for final selection of Team USA members who will travel to the Czech Republic for the ARDF World Championships in September.

Event sponsor for 2004 is the Santa Barbara Amateur Radio club. General Chair is Marvin Johnston KE6HTS, a member of USA's first team to the World Championships back in 1998 and winner of medals at the last two USA Championships.

The official Web site of the 2004 Championships is now being prepared, announcing the location of event headquarters, rules and technical details. Meanwhile, you can find out all about championship direction finding, and how your can have events in your home town, at the "Homing In" Web site, www.homingin.com

You'll learn the rules for this fast-growing sport, meet some of the current champions, get equipment suggestions and find out how to get on an e-mail list for the latest radio-orienteering news. That's homingin, one word, homingin.com

From southern California, where we have regular on-foot foxhunts and everyone is invited, this is Joe Moell K-Zero-Oscar-Victor for Amateur Radio Newsline.

--

Again, for more information take your web browser to www.homingin.com (K0OV, ARNewsline(tm))

**

NEWSCAST CLOSE

With thanks to Alan Labs, AMSAT, the ARRL, the CGC Communicator, CQ Magazine, the FCC, the Ohio Penn DX Bulletin, Radio Netherlands, Rain, the RSGB and Australia's Q-News, that's all from the Amateur Radio Newsline(tm). Our e-mail address is newsline @arnewsline.org. More information is available at Amateur Radio Newsline's(tm) only official website located at www.arnewsline.org. You can also write to us or support us at Amateur Radio Newsline(tm), P.O. Box

660937, Arcadia, California 91066.

For now, with Bill Pasternak, WA6ITF, at the editors desk, I’m Jim Damron, N8TMW and I’m Jeff Clark, K8JAC, saying we hope you had a great Thanksgiving, 73 and we thank you for listening." Amateur Radio Newsline(tm) is Copyright 2003. All rights reserved.

3522. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-30 06:30:00 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bqc3js$dbm@library2.airnews.net>
Source record: 83098

"JJ" <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
news:PN6dnT305qlVfVWiRVn-tw@gbronline.com...
> Kim W5TIT wrote:
>
>
> >
> > Still bitter, eh, JJ?
> >
> > Kim W5TIT
> >
> >
> About what? Not having someone who has such low class and taste to
> choose a call sign like yours follow me around? Not hardly.
>

Good. So you admit to liking being followed around. That's all I
figured...

Kim W5TIT

3523. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-30 06:47:48 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bqc3p2$b5r@library2.airnews.net>
Source record: 83099

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20031129112449.29660.00001854@mb-m24.aol.com...
> In article <bq7kka$hs9@library2.airnews.net>, "Kim" <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
> writes:
>
> >"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> >news:20031127205909.08626.00001939@mb-m27.aol.com...
> >> In article <bq52ki$l6t@library1.airnews.net>, "Kim "
> ><kimscliff@yahoo.com>
> >> writes:
> >>
> >> >Hmmm, not only no, but hell no. I can be treaded on all "they" want.
> >> >I've declared war on the road, tell ya that. I travel a good number
of
> miles
> >> >to work.
>
> By your own choice.
>

Didn't make the point because I don't like the drive. I made the point to
illustrate that I have a lot of exposure to the topic I was going to post
about.

> >>
> >> What lane are you in when they do this?
> >
> >The far left--the "fast" lane as it is called. Funny thing is, if you
> >mention to people at the office or wherever, that it doesn't mean the
"break
> >the speed limit lane," you ought to hear the validations for people doing
> >just that.
>
> But you're already speeding, Kim. And not by an amount that can be
> explained by the usual inaccuraccies and imperfections of speedometers.
>
> Yet your getting ticked off because someone wants to go even faster.
>

Nope. Not at all. I am ticked because they think I should move for them.
I am already going faster than the posted speed is my point. Why should
someone expect me to move if I am already going faster than I should be?

> >
> >The argument is along the lines that this is the lane where, if

> >someone needs to pass, speeding is legal to get around them;
>
> Ah - but why does someone *need* to pass?
>

That's the proverbial 60 million dollar question--and yes, why does someone *need* to pass someone else who's already speeding?

>
> As Dee points out, on a two-lane, two direction road, it may be necessary to
> go fast to get out of a tough passing situation. But on a multilane divided
> highway where traffic is already zooming at the speed limit or above, why does
> anyone not in a life-and-death emergency situation *need* to pass?
>

This is a four lane divided highway--two lanes in each direction. And, I ask the same question.

> >
> >or, this is the
> >lane where if the majority of drivers wants to go a little faster than the
> >flow of traffic, they do it there! There's more validations, but that's the
> >gist of it...!!
>
> And they take the risk of being fined, or worse.
> >

Well, myself included, one does not think of these things (tickets) happening when one is breaking the speed limit.

> >
> >Note that I let you know that I am already speeding, as it is. Up to about
> >15 MPH over the posted speed.
>
> Right.
>
> So you have justified such speeding to yourself, even though it violates the
> law. The person behind you who wants to go 20-25 MPH over the limit has
> almost certainly justified their behavior to him/herself, even though it also
> violates the law.
>

Exactly, but if I happened upon someone who's already breaking the speek limit, I am not going to act like an idiot behind them--expecting them to

get out of my way.

> >
> >> I go on the "Duel" philosophy (from the old TV movie by Speilberg): I'd
> >> rather
> >> have a nutcase driver in front of me, where I can watch him/her, than
> >> behind
> >> me. I've actually pulled over and let 'em go by rather than have them
> >> follow me.
> >
> >Know what happens here? If one is cautiously staying behind a fruitcake
> >driver, all the hurry-up-and-get-me-knowwhere nitiwits start passing like
> >they are the charging brigade--never taking just a moment to see what
they
> >are pulling up on (a very dangerous situation with a driver ahead way too
> >close to the vehicle in front of them) or someone who's been doing a bit
of
> >weaving; or whatever. So, depending upon the situation, letting this
person
> >stay in front instead of taking the first opportunity to get around them,
> >can be more hazardous.
>
> I disagree. I simply pull over and let the whacko get farther ahead.
Miles, if
> necessary. At 60 MPH, one minute of delay buys me a mile of space. I can
spare
> that minute.
> >

Your patience serves you well.

> >>
> >> I haven't encountered that yet. Must be a Texas thing...
> >
> >Wow. Really?
>
> Honest. Stores here mostly have express lanes (10 items or less) - some
have
> two or even three levels of express (8 items or less, 15 items or less,
etc.).
> And they enforce the item count.
>

OH...well, they have those here, too. WHEN they are open...<grin>

>
> >> >Used to do that, too. No more. It's my turn dammit and they can
wait.
> >> >Now, don't get me wrong: if I happen to turn to one side or the other
and
> >> >I
> >> >notice someone patiently waiting their turn, I let them go ahead. But

> >> >these
> >> >creeps who think that they are entitled to getting around just because
th
> >> >ey
> >> >are far more important than anyone else...nope, not doin' it any more.
> >> >And,
> >> >depending upon how showy they are about how important they are is how
> >> >slow I
> >> >am to slowly unload my cart, slowly find my checkbook, confirm the
price
> >> >however many times it needs confirming, very carefully write my check,
> >> >etc.
>
> Passive aggressive behavior, IOW.
>

Yep, 'zackly.

>
> >And, while my behavior is not "forgiveable," I am no where
> >as nasty as these folks are being.
> >
> Isn't that an entirely subjective judgement?
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
> >
> >

Yep. And it's mine...(grin)

Kim W5TIT

3524. Re: Where Did THIS Come From...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-30 11:47:57 UTC
From: Brett <bre@brettsplat.net>
Message-ID: <bqcldbmvl0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 83100

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message >
>
> Does being employed by DoD for almost 10 years at duty stations
> which were prime targets for a Soviet ICBM first- or second-strikes
> during the '50s and '60s count for anything?
>

No! In fact, this is the definition of a
"Rear Echelon Commando" But of course to you this was
probably front line combat duty. Feel free to apply for your
"Cold War" combat certificate though.

> It's not my fault that I was rejected when I was drafted - yes,
> drafted. After that I was a civilian employee for SAC at SAC Hq
> and several AF bases, all prime targets.

Cry us a river of tears!

>
> My butt was on the line, my friend. Every day when the nation was
> 'sposed to be "at peace".

We are sure you engaged the "enemy" in many many
fire fights, while trying to be first to the time clock at the end
of your eight hour "combat" tour of duty!

> It is of major concern to me. Even though I wasn't wearing a blue
> suit the POTUS was -my- CiC as well, and even to this day I pay
> taxes which fund such things.

Oh my, another concerned citizen who pays taxes.
Get In Line!

> Remove head from rectum and have a happy whatever you celebrate.

This was a typical remark we would hear from Rear Echelon
Commandos is Saigon, attempting to justify their "importance,"
while sitting at the bar in their pressed uniforms, shiny boots,
and chest full of ribbons.

> --
> 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane
>
>

3525. Re: Where Did THIS Come From...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-30 11:58:49 UTC
From: Brett <bre@brettsplat.net>
Message-ID: <bqcm1mouq0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 83101

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message

> What gets me about that maneuver is that when he flew from Tex-as to
> Andrews to pick up the standby plane using the cover excuse that the
> plane was going back there for maintenance, SOP is to fly the
> replacement to where the one going in for maintenance is BEFORE the
> move is made. Any plane-watcher hobbyist could have picked up on
> that. Ditto for the facilities of White House Communications Agency
> (a branch of the military).

Cry us a river of tears, as you second guess command decisions
from the comfort of your living room! Oh, I forgot, you are
a "taxpayer." LOL LOL LOL LOL

>
> And what about the two AF fighters which always accompany the plane
> when POTUS is aboard? Another dead giveaway.

See above, keep second guessing.

>
> Hey, that trip will probably delay my friend's brother getting a
> decent wheelchair for another six months, to get it down to the
> nitty gritty. So much for the VN vets.
>

And it could very well delay a new artificial limb for my friend
who was on board the USS LIBERTY which was attacked by the
JEWS. So what? What's your point? Or do you just like
whining and crying all the time?

Happy Holidays,

Brett

> --
> 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane
>
>

3526. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-30 12:00:14 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <iZkyb.31498$Wy4.14099@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 83102

"N2EY" wrote:
> "Dwight Stewart" writes:
> >
> > Considering the power levels, the number
> > of frequencies and bands, the overall
> > safety considerations, (snip)
>
> You're avoiding my question, Dwight.

No, you just don't like the answer given. If anything, I'm ignoring a fanciful, long-winded, exchange that cannot add anything of real substance to the discussion about Morse code testing (see below).

> > Since you keep asking this, do you
> > have a point to make, Jim?
>
> Yes.
>
> The point is that some folks apply a double
> standard when deciding which tests to keep
> and which to get rid of.

The only double standard that exists is not having the same testing for all operating modes. Unless there is a justification to do otherwise, either have skill testing for all modes or no skill testing for any mode. There is no longer any justification today for a unique test solely for Morse code. That opinion is consistent with recent FCC published statements. As such, the unique Morse code test should be eliminated.

Not willing to accept that, you ignore the obvious double standard and instead try conjure up an imaginary double standard relating to the written tests. No such double standard exists. Those written tests, and their contents, serve a valid purpose today. None here, including you, have said otherwise. The same cannot be said about the Morse code test.

With all that in mind, I have no desire to engage in a fanciful discussion about the contents of the written tests, especially when that discussion cannot possibly lead to a valid point - no conflict or double standard exists concerning the written tests. As such, I've ignored the rest of your message and have instead addressed the specific point you've acknowledged trying to make.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3527. Re: Where Did THIS Come From...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-30 12:00:34 UTC
From: Brett <bre@brettsplat.net>
Message-ID: <bqcm4v$p55$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 83103

Kane trolls on with his usual Bullshit!

Happy Holidays,

Brett

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:cuvyxnansvbet.hp50zbf.pminews@netnews.comcast.net...
> On Sun, 30 Nov 2003 01:30:58 GMT, Dan/W4NTI wrote:
>
> >> There are better ways to show the Habibi that we can kick the
> >> charra out of them, such as by doing it. My people did it in '67
> >> (MY war).
>
> >Sorry Phil. Unadultrated bullshit. "Your War" was also "My War".
Don't
> >try to BS me.
>
> YOU were in the Six Day War (June 5-11, 1967)? The one where Israel
> kicked the living charra out of the Habibi in Egypt, Jordan, and
> Syria and would have continued on to Iraq had not the US and the
> USSR intervened. Which side were you on?
>
> I thought that I knew most of the very few Americans who were
involved...
>
> Then again your reply indicated that you do not know the good Arabic
> terms "Habibi" and "charra".....
>
> But you are awarded the Olympic Bronze Medal in Conclusion Jumping
> for form if not for accuracy.
>
> --
> 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane
>
>

3528. Re: Where Did THIS Come From...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-30 12:01:46 UTC
From: Brett <bre@brettsplat.net>
Message-ID: <bqcm76$p9d$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 83104

Kane trolls on.

73 de Brett

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:cuvyxnansvbet.hp4vcr5.pminews@netnews.comcast.net...
> On 28 Nov 2003 19:34:38 -0800, Brian wrote:
>
> >> Lowest Common Denominator. That, more than anything else, will
> >> wreck this country.
>
> >Blowhard libs have tried soooo hard to wreck this country.
>
> That lets me off the hook - I'm certainly not one of them.
>
> >They've
> >nearly succeeded, but there are still a few people who give a damn
> >about America, and GW is one of them.
>
> He's a living example of the Lowest Common Denominator -= no class
> at all.
>
> --
> 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane
>
>

3529. Re: Where Did THIS Come From...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-30 12:04:56 UTC
From: Brett <bre@brettsplat.net>
Message-ID: <bqcmd5ptj0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 83105

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:cuvyxnansvbet.hp4v7b4.pminews@netnews.comcast.net...
> On 28 Nov 2003 19:27:06 -0800, Brian wrote:
>
> >Do detail your experiences in your war.
>
> You are confusing me with someone else.
>
> >> Lowest Common Denominator. That, more than anything else, will
> >> wreck this country.
> >
> >Some people want us to tuck tail and head home (in one peice).
>
> I'm not in that category. I strongly believe that the Habibi need
> the charra kicked out of them for a lot of reasons, including the
> expulsion of a branch of my family from what is now Iraq in the 13th
> Century (no, I don't want the family villa back but it was tempting).

Ahhhhh, now the "REAL" reasons are exposed!

>
> I don't want this to turn into another Vietnam, either.

You don't know squat about Viet Nam. You can't even
spell it correctly.

73 de Brett

>
> --
> 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane
>
>

3530. Re: Where Did THIS Come From...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-30 12:07:56 UTC
From: Brett <bre@brettsplat.net>
Message-ID: <bqcmip$q8g$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 83106

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message

>
> One of the members of our congregation is a National Guard
> infantryman who is back home this weekend for a two-week R&R
> between eight month tours over in the Middle East (iraq and Kuwait).
> He was very clear - the stunt didn't impress him at all.
>

And what kind of "Stunt" should we call the UNPROVOKED
attack by the JEWS on the USS LIBERTY?????????

> --
> 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane
>
> From a Clearing in the Silicon Forest
> Beaverton (Washington County) Oregon
>
>

3531. Re: Where Did THIS Come From...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-30 12:11:04 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0311300411.6ae37e23@posting.google.com>
Source record: 83107

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:<cuvyxnansvbet.hp4v7b4.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>...
> On 28 Nov 2003 19:27:06 -0800, Brian wrote:
>
> >Do detail your experiences in your war.
>
> You are confusing me with someone else.
>
> >> Lowest Common Denominator. That, more than anything else, will
> >> wreck this country.
> >
> >Some people want us to tuck tail and head home (in one peice).
>
> I'm not in that category.

Your part-time soldier may be in that category.

I strongly believe that the Habibi need
> the charra kicked out of them for a lot of reasons, including the
> expulsion of a branch of my family from what is now Iraq in the 13th
> Century (no, I don't want the family villa back but it was tempting).

The 13th century??? You're as nuts as they are.

> I don't want this to turn into another Vietnam, either.

We'd need a hell of a climate change for that to happen.

In ever conflict that we engage in, we need to see it through to the bitter end.

3532. Re: Where Did THIS Come From...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-30 12:14:26 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0311300414.3e2a7cca@posting.google.com>
Source record: 83108

Alun <alun@1stcounsel.com> wrote in message
news:<Xns944282A0D69C5elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>...
> n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in news:20031129115807.23307.00004755@mb-
> m29.aol.com:
>
> > In article <f45722ac.0311281934.2deeda0@posting.google.com>,
> > brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
> >
> >>Blowhard libs have tried soooo hard to wreck this country.
> >
> > So have blowhard conservatives.
> >
> >>They've nearly succeeded,
> >
> > How is this country "wrecked", compared to how things used to be?
> >
> >>but there are still a few people who give a damn about America, and GW
> >>is one of them.
> >
> > There are lots of others, including many who disagree with Mr. Bush.
> >
> > It's the methods, not the person.
> >
> >>
> >
> >
> >
>
> Well, I'm a foreigner in your country, but you can't deny that the economy
> boomed under Clinton and is now on it's knees.
>
> I'm not fond of the present government, but mainly for other reasons.
> Civil liberties and John Ashcroft, mostly.
>
> All in all, I can't really think of anything GW Bush has done domestically
> that is anything to shout about. Tax cuts for the rich. Deficit spending.
> I'm really trying to think of anything good (honestly), but nothing comes
> to mind.
>
> As for the war, why open that can of worms? Yes, Saddam is/was a very bad
> guy. Do I beleive the reasons given for going to war? No. And yes, Blair
> went along with it, but I don't like him a lot either.
>
> ... but then I'm an anti-code test liberal, so what did you expect?

>
> However, I actually do think it was a nice gesture for Dubbya to go to
> Baghdad for Thanksgiving.
>
> I'm sure this post will draw the usual 'love it or leave it' garbage from
> at least someone, but never mind. I can take it.

Do you really believe that Clinton had anything to do with the
economy?

I think if Clinton had come in to office with the economy waning and a
terrorist attack around the corner he would have performed extremely
poorly.

3533. Re: Where Did THIS Come From...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-30 12:20:04 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0311300420.3b5600c1@posting.google.com>
Source record: 83109

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:<KF6yb.13193$P%1.11967600@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>...
> "Alun" <alun@1stcounsel.com> wrote in message
> news:Xns944282A0D69C5elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...

> >
> > Well, I'm a foreigner in your country, but you can't deny that the economy
> > boomed under Clinton and is now on it's knees.
> >
>
> The "Clinton boom" was a result of the building economy from the previous
> administrations. The fall in the economy is a result of various economic
> issues that developed in the latter part of the Clinton administration and
> only began to be felt after he left office. I'm not blaming anyone mind you
> but the economy started tanking right after the change in administration

Not quite. It was the best kept "secret" of that election. I just
read where the GDP has increased at a "blistering 8.1%" last quarter.
Last time I heard that kind of talk we had Alan Greenspan putting the
brakes on the economy.

> BEFORE the whammy from 9/11 and the current administration hadn't yet
> changed anything. The economy as a whole takes time to react. You have to
> examine the several preceding years to find the causes not the current year.
>
> > I'm not fond of the present government, but mainly for other reasons.
> > Civil liberties and John Ashcroft, mostly.
> >
> > All in all, I can't really think of anything GW Bush has done domestically
> > that is anything to shout about. Tax cuts for the rich. Deficit spending.
> > I'm really trying to think of anything good (honestly), but nothing comes
> > to mind.
>
> The tax cuts went to the people paying taxes. How can you give cuts to
> people who don't pay.

Welfare.

> > As for the war, why open that can of worms? Yes, Saddam is/was a very bad
> > guy. Do I beleive the reasons given for going to war? No. And yes, Blair
> > went along with it, but I don't like him a lot either.
> >
> > ... but then I'm an anti-code test liberal, so what did you expect?
> >
> > However, I actually do think it was a nice gesture for Dubbya to go to
> > Baghdad for Thanksgiving.

>
> Agree 100%. A leader shows his people that they are important. And that
> was the purpose of his trip.
>
> >
> > I'm sure this post will draw the usual 'love it or leave it' garbage from
> > at least someone, but never mind. I can take it.
>
> Not from me that's for sure. We all have the right to work to make it
> better even if we don't agree on what "better" is.
>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

I disagree that a national guardsman speaking at his local church
about how he doesn't want to go to Iraq is a good thing for America.

3534. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-30 12:22:19 UTC
From: Bert Craig <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM>
Message-ID: <%hlyb.28363$iU5.7315591@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>
Source record: 83110

"K&#65533;HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:SUSxb.27923$Wy4.5445@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote
>
> > And it has the unique characteristic that
> > you can't take advantage of it until you
> > have acquired a basic skill level.
>
> Unique? What's unique about Morse in that regard. There is no mode which
> you can use without some basic skill level in that mode.
>
> 73, Hans, K0HB

There's no cheat sheet for learning Morse code. If and when someone decideds to do it, they must rise up off their kiester and "learn" it. Herein lies the burr in the saddle.

No matter how much more difficult the writtens become, as long as the Q&A pool are published, passing a written element will continue to require no more than a study guide and a highlighter...and perhaps a day or two of "study." Notice I didn't say "learn" the material in order to pass.

This is why some folks consider it a filter. It's been said it filters out lids, CBers, etc...but in reality, it only filters out those who are not motivated enough to make the effort in the first place.

Decode Morse code with a decoding chart at very slode speeds? Possible...not realistic, but possible.

73 de Bert
WA2SI

3535. Re: Where Did THIS Come From...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-30 12:24:46 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0311300424.65799997@posting.google.com>
Source record: 83111

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:<B21yb.26192$Rk5.24497@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> "Alan" wrote:
> > In the last week, Phil has indicated his negative
> > opinions toward Microsoft, Walmart, & Dr Laura.
> > So, I mean, is it any real surprise Phil has negative
> > opinions about Commander-In-Chief Bush? (snip)
>
>
> And I'd say Phil's views hasn't been that far out of the mainstream on
> each. A lot of people don't like Microsoft. Wal-Mart just got caught in a
> rather unethical business activity. A lot of people also think Dr. Laura is
> a fruitcake. And, while I like and have openly supported Bush, his trip
> (sneaking into Iraq to pose for cameras) was an expensive, even childish,
> stunt (something I would not have expected from him, or any other
> president).
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

I never did see the pictures of Dr. Laura...

Wonder if she could get a month on the GGLiddy's calendar?

3536. Re: Where Did THIS Come From...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-30 12:30:08 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0311300430.7f0e1d69@posting.google.com>
Source record: 83112

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<TEbyb.26843$Rk5.3363@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> "Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
> news:f45722ac.0311281931.55460046@posting.google.com...
> > "Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:<GkQxb.25230$Rk5.12231@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> > > "Steve Robeson, K4CAP" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote
> > >
> > > > I think it's great we FINALLY have a Commander-in-Chief
> > > > that makes you proud to render that salute again.
> > >
> > > Speak for yourself. Dubya is an idiot. John McCain should be
> > > Commander-in-Chief.
> > >
> > > 73, Hans, K0HB
> >
> > McCain failed. He got captured.
> >
> > I really question everyone calling that scenario a hero, and
> > definitely not Commander-in-Chief material.
>
> I disagree with that comment Brian. He didn't fail. The government failed
> him by forcing the pilots to fly the pocket. No deviation. No way to not
> get hit. It was stupid. All McCain did was follow orders.
>
> Dan/W4NTI

I accept that. And it meshes with what Phil said about not wanting
this to become another Vietnam. I don't want our government to fail
our soldiers in Iraq.

3537. Re: Where Did THIS Come From...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-30 12:39:22 UTC
From: Brett <bre@brettsplat.net>
Message-ID: <bqcodn$481$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 83113

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
>
>
> One of the members of our congregation is a National Guard
> infantryman who is back home this weekend for a two-week R&R
> between eight month tours over in the Middle East (iraq and Kuwait).
> He was very clear - the stunt didn't impress him at all.
>

Really? Well, if true, you might want to "clearly" inform your
national guard buddy he just violated the UCMJ.
Nevermind, you or he probably don't know what that is.

>
> 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane
>
> From a Clearing in the Silicon Forest
> Beaverton (Washington County) Oregon
>
>

3538. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-30 12:41:50 UTC
From: Bert Craig <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM>
Message-ID: <iAlyb.28717$iU5.7375071@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>
Source record: 83114

"Alun" <alun@1stcounsel.com> wrote in message
news:Xns944288614CAD1elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
> What is annoying is that a skill test is foisted on those who don't have
> the desire to use the skill.

Alan, I'm gonna let you in on a secret...although I know that you're already aware of it. Preparing for and passing the 5-wpm Elemnt 1 test does NOT leave one ready to use the skill OTA. It only gives one a taste so that one may make an educated choice as to whether or not they wish to persue CW any further.

The majority of newbies I've worked sent at approx. 8 to 10-wpm. (That's right, just below the plateau.) We seem to gravitate to one another. Ok, the Novice/Tech"+" sub-bands help bring us together. My point is that those who actually get OTA are putting in more effort than needed just to pass Element 1. Those who pass Element 1 and wish to go no further with CW have made a truly educated dicision because they now have a little "practical" experience with the mode under their belt on which to base their decision...and are not just simply talking from their @$$!

> Learning the theory of modes you don't want
> to use is not too onerous, but having to pass a typing test to use phone
> would be just as annoying and stupid as having to pass a code test to use
> phone, for example. Besides, having to know about other modes is
> reasonable, but actually learning to use them is another matter.

As I mentioned in another post, the mode is really not the issue...the having to really learn it is. Do away with the published Q&A pools and watch the whining escalate.

> Also, if
> I hear CW on my frequency I may be able to read it with some difficulty,
> but if I hear RTTY or PSK31 there is no chance.

You may have just touched on a selling point for CW.

73 de Bert
WA2SI

3539. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-30 12:53:20 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <4Llyb.31533$Wy4.7606@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 83115

"Dee D. Flint" wrote:
>
> (snip) Again keep in mind that I have said
> Morse is necessary. While I happen to
> believe that testing should be maintained that
> is NOT the point I am debating at this time
> and you keep trying to drag it back to testing.
> I am stating that Morse code itself is necessary.

We wouldn't be having this discussion if it were not for the code testing debate, Dee. That is why this mode is being discussed as opposed to some other mode or discussions about the weather. I've acknowledged that Morse code is enjoyable, entertaining, useful, and perhaps even necessary for you to make some of the contacts you want to make. But we're not just talking about you or the contacts you want to make. Your communications are recreational or avocational in nature, not a necessity. And, as long as your communications are not necessary, your use of Morse code in those communications is not necessary.

This brings us back to the code testing debate. If Morse code is not necessary to meet the goals and purposes of the Amateur Radio Service today, Morse code testing should be eliminated. The _use_ of Morse code not an issue here. You will still be able to use that mode when you find it necessary to make the contacts you want. Others will still be able to learn code if they want. But the test itself, as a license requirement, should end.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3540. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-30 12:57:56 UTC
From: Bert Craig <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM>
Message-ID: <oPlyb.29000$iU5.7424460@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>
Source record: 83116

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:KU6yb.13197$P%1.11970231@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
>
> "Alun" <alun@1stcounsel.com> wrote in message
> news:Xns94428A3961C57elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
> > It just so happens that I don't
> > like CW, in the sense of I have no desire to use it. That should be OK
> > too, but for some reason it bothers you. Why?
>
> No it does not bother me that someone who has learned it chooses not to
use
> it. They have made that decision from a position of knowledge and
> experience. This is radically different from a person judging it and
saying
> they will never use it when they do not have that knowledge and experience
> to draw on.
>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

Right on the money, Dee. Larry pointed this out earlier, but not as
eloquently as you.

73 de Bert
WA2SI

3541. Response to "21st Century" Part Three (Communicator License)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-30 13:28:22 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031130082822.15462.00004618@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 83117

This is a response to the paper "Amateur Radio in the 21st Century", prepared by Jim Wiley, KL7CC, with assistance from other members of NCVEC working on changes to the US Amateur rules. This response is intended to evaluate and constructively comment on the merits of the various ideas and changes presented in the paper, regardless of their source.

For purposes of clarity and brevity, the introductions and executive summaries are not reproduced here.

"Part One" dealt with the code test. "Part Two" and "Part Three" deal with the proposed "Communicator" license.

Since the style of the paper is conversational, I inserted my comments into the original paper in the same style, so that the paper reads like a conversation between KL7CC and myself. My comments are preceded with "N2EY". The main text of the original paper is preceded by "KL7CC".

Here is my response to "Amateur Radio In the 21st Century"

Part Three

KL7CC: How about those who feel insulted that these new hams are gaining "free" access to bands that "they had to work hard for". Excuse me? Do we recognize that times have changed and move on, or not?

N2EY: Excuse me? What exactly does "that times have changed and move on" mean in this context? Are you saying that those who disagree with you should simply shut up?

KL7CC: Following that argument to it's logical end, isn't it reasonable to say that if the newcomers have to learn the old stuff before they can have a license, then the existing licensees should have to give back their tickets until they could show they had mastered all the newer techniques too? Wouldn't that be fair? I'm sure it seems reasonable to a newcomer. Sauce for the goose, and all that, right?

N2EY: Wrong. Licenses are granted for a specific term. They are renewed based on the licensee having a clean record. It is part of the "conditions of grant" that licensees will stay current with changes in rules and regulations as they apply to their license.

KL7CC: A timetable:

As we all know, several petitions requesting that the FCC remove Morse code testing have been filed. Depending on how soon a NPRM is issued, assuming it is at all, then we have to wait while they slog their way through the rule making process. One of the things that will happen is that comments, both pro and con, will begin to accumulate. After a several weeks or at most a few months,

and assuming the majority of comments are in favor of eliminating the code as a licensing requirement, then we plan to file for a waiver asking for an immediate end to code testing. Obviously, this can only be done if there are enough favorable comments on file for the FCC to justify granting such a waiver. The actual change in the FCC rules will still be in progress, but if we can show that there is enough interest, and that such a waiver will be beneficial to Amateur Radio as a whole, then there is a good chance it would be granted.

N2EY: It is also possible that FCC will go through the entire NPRM process before dropping Element 1.

KL7CC: Very soon (a few days at most) after the Morse requirement disappears, assuming it does, then we plan to file for the creation of the "Communicator" license, as detailed elsewhere in this discussion. We will follow the same procedure as before, filing a petition for a NPRM, and starting the clock on that issue. Assuming the comments on that issue are also favorable, after a reasonable time has elapsed, we will file a petition to upgrade Techs to General, and Advanced to Extra, as explained earlier.

We will probably not be able to accelerate the creation of the "Communicator" license, since it would involve a complete restructure of the present system, but in case that option should become available, we would likewise pursue that end.

Next, once the "Communicator" proposal started to look like it would become reality, we would file another petition asking that the Novice HF assignments be re-allocated, also as per the previous discussion. We would further ask that the re-allocation take place at the same time as the implementation date of the new license, so that those who passed their tests would have a place to operate.

N2EY: Why all the steps and delays? Look how long the last restructuring took! And there are still petitions on the table for refarming the Novice bands.

If the Communicator is a good idea, then it should be openly discussed and developed in the entire amateur community now, and a comprehensive proposal put together so that everything is handled in one NPRM cycle.

KL7CC: In all cases, because this is a multiple step process, useful information will be gained as each part moves forward. This is actually a benefit, because we may very well find that some of the present ideas need revision before being submitted.

All this will take some time, perhaps spanning several years. Mixed in with these proposals, but not part of them, will be the issue of how to best implement other changes to the amateur regulations that came out of WRC-2003, such as the 40 meter readjustment. These issues have their own timetable, of course, but those issues and the topics discussed in the possible petitions mentioned here do interact to varying degrees.

In other words, nothing is going to happen next week, and everyone will have ample time to offer his or her own suggestions as to how to proceed. There

will be no "rush to judgment". All the present actions have done, or can do, is to get something out there for consideration. There is absolutely no guarantee that the FCC, or the ham community at large, will accept these proposals.

N2EY: The thing to do is develop them out in the open, with input from all interested parties. Otherwise, you are cutting yourself off from the community whose support you need to make the proposal work.

KL7CC: You have heard a lot about what we are planning. Now, how about some of the things we are not addressing at this time:

We are not addressing the issue of reallocation of bands or sub-bands, either by mode or license class, with the sole exception of using the former Novice CW sub-bands on 80, 40, 15 and 10 meters to create working space for new Communicator licensees. By the way, don't forget that this adjustment will create more phone space for General, Advanced, and Extra operators at the same time. And, in the case of 40 meters, when the WRC-2003 re-allocation adds another 100 KHz the band in regions 1 and 3 (that is to say, adding 7100-7200 to the present 7000-7100 world wide Amateur allocation), there will be a 100 KHz phone band overlap all ready to go!

N2EY: Communicators need more than those 4 bands on HF.

KL7CC: We are not suggesting that the CW sub-bands, or the exclusive CW bands for Extra licensees, be eliminated or otherwise adjusted. Again, with the exception of Novice CW, we are not proposing any change whatsoever to the present band plans or allocations.

N2EY: There are NO exclusive CW subbands in amateur HF or MF. All are shared with data modes.

With all due respect, if someone doesn't know that simple fact, or cannot bother to write "CW/data subbands", that person really shouldn't be proposing policy changes. Just my opinion.

Using terms like "CW bands" and "exclusive CW subbands" has caused some hams to believe that other modes are not allowed there.

KL7CC: We are not addressing the issue of the relative split between General, Advanced, and Extra allocations at HF.

We feel that these issues are best dealt with only after some period of experience with both the proposed new license and a completely code free licensing structure give us more insight on the best way to proceed. This intermediate stage may take a while to properly evaluate. These issues may be best addressed at the time that reallocation of the 40 meter band (per decisions made at WRC 2003) takes place. According to the present schedule, that is not likely to happen sooner than 5 or 6 years from now. By that time, we will have accumulated enough data to tell us whether additional adjustments are in order, or not.

OK, there you have it, the "master plan". Will it actually turn out this way? Probably not. Just as there are thousands of hams, there will be lots of

suggestions, pro and con, about which is the best way to go. When (and if) a petition is filed, and a Notice of Proposed Rule Making (NPRM) is posted, offer your comments and suggestions.

N2EY: That last sentence sounds like you are saying that no one except NCVEC should file a petition, or comment, until an NPRM is posted by FCC. I hope I am mistaken in that interpretation.

KL7CC: The FCC will consider all sides before changing anything. If a majority of comments indicate that hams want thing to stay the way they are, then that's what will happen.

N2EY: That is not what happened with the Restructuring NPRM (98-143). The majority of comments wanted 2 or 3 code test speeds, but FCC went with just 1 code test speed. The minority opinion was accepted by FCC and the majority opinion rejected. Perhaps it will be different next time. But there is a precedent for FCC to reject majority opinion.

KL7CC: If hams want change, and their arguments make sense, then that's what will happen. In almost no other country in the world are the governed given the chance to affect the rules that do the governing. Use that power if you wish. But don't just sit there and complain if you don't act.

A few final words:

There are no black helicopters.

N2EY: I do not place any credibility in conspiracy theories.

KL7CC: This is not a plot by ARRL or Fred (W5YI) or anyone else to sell more books, antennas, radios, or (fill in the blank). Yes, ARRL will gain some new members, the W5YI group will sell a few more books, and possibly some of the manufacturers and vendors will peddle a few more sets. Is this bad? How?

N2EY: It's a bad thing if quality is sacrificed as part of an ill-fated quest for quantity.

Suppose the numbers do not increase dramatically - will NCVEC admit they were wrong and petition to put back the old system?

KL7CC: It looks like growth of our beloved hobby from here.

N2EY: It looks like some good ideas and some bad ideas from here.

KL7CC: By the way, did you know Fred sold his company some time back? He does not particularly stand to gain anything from this effort, nor do any of the other committee members. Do you suppose the committee members just want to see our wonderful hobby prosper? Wouldn't that be an odd reason for doing what they are doing?

N2EY: I don't know any of the committee members personally, nor do I assume anyhting about their motivations. The mere fact that someone wants the ARS to prosper doesn't mean their ideas and proposals are good ones.

KL7CC: Just thought you'd like to know. Thanks for taking the time to read this somewhat long explanation, and in the truest sense, 73.

Thanks you for reading my rebuttal

73 de Jim, N2EY

Respectfully submitted by Jim Wiley, KL7CC

With assistance from Fred Maia, W5YI, and Scott Neustadter, W4WW
++++++++++++++++++++

N2EY: A few closing observations:

All of the above seems focused on the idea of "growth in the ARS" - specifically, getting more new hams. The license tests in general and the code test in particular are being cited as causes of low growth. The above discussion seems to promise lots of new hams if the code test is dropped and the entry level license requirements reduced. What if the proposed changes are made and there is no significant long term change in growth?
Will we revert to the previous system?

Back in 2000, code testing was reduced from three speeds to one (5 wpm) and the written test requirements reduced considerably. There was an initial surge of new hams and upgrades, but in the 3-1/2 years since the changes were made effective, the number of US hams has only grown by about 10,000. The growth rate now is about the same as it was before the changes.

What is being overlooked in these discussions are other factors limiting the growth of the ARS. These factors have far more impact than the license tests, code or written. Two factors come immediately to mind: Lack of publicity about the ARS in the mainstream media, and CC&Rs making the installation of an effective amateur station too difficult for many prospective amateurs.

Thank you for reading my comments.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3542. Response to "21st Century" Part Two (Communicator License)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-30 13:28:29 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031130082829.15462.00004619@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 83119

This is a response to the paper "Amateur Radio in the 21st Century", prepared by Jim Wiley, KL7CC, with assistance from other members of NCVEC working on changes to the US Amateur rules. This response is intended to evaluate and constructively comment on the merits of the various ideas and changes presented in the paper, regardless of their source.

For purposes of clarity and brevity, the introductions and executive summaries are not reproduced here.

"Part One" dealt with the code test. "Part Two" and "Part Three" deal with the proposed "Communicator" license.

Since the style of the paper is conversational, I inserted my comments into the original paper in the same style, so that the paper reads like a conversation between KL7CC and myself. My comments are preceded with "N2EY". The main text of the original paper is preceded by "KL7CC".

Here is my response to "Amateur Radio In the 21st Century" (Part Two)

KL7CC: OK, what about that new license class - why in the heck are we even thinking about it at all?

Let me give you a chill. Think, seriously, for a moment what this means: For every ham under the age of 20 we are attracting, 2 (or more) hams over the age of 50 either die or leave the hobby. Hmmmmm. It shouldn't take a genius to see where that is going. In 10 years, we may not even have ham radio. Wait! Wait!, you say, I'm only 45 (or whatever age you are), and I'll be around longer than that. Great - but there might very well be no ham radio.

N2EY: Where do these statistics come from? The total number of licensed hams has been growing since the late 1960s. Right now the FCC license data base shows well over 680,000 US hams. When I started out in 1967 there were only about 250,000 US hams. How many do we need to make amateur radio viable?

What about the age group from 20 to 50? Are we not getting any new amateurs from that age group?

The total number of US hams is at or near an all-time high. How many is "enough"?

KL7CC: Why? You think I'm kidding, right? What is the fastest growing sector of our economy today? The answer is Information Technology (IT). And what does IT need to succeed and grow? Interconnection, that's what. And increasingly, wireless interconnection. And what does wireless interconnection need? Spectrum. Radio spectrum -- Lots of it. And who has lots of spectrum, most of it unused? Go to your bathroom and look in the mirror. That's who. Now, what happens to that spectrum when (not if) you become a silent key - and

there is no one to take your place?

N2EY: And what spectrum do the IT folks want? VHF/UHF/microwaves - and all of the amateur bands in that part of the spectrum have been wide open without any code test requirement for more than 12 years.

All of this discussion is about access to amateur HF/MF, not VHF/UHF. The IT folks want, and are getting, more VHF/UHF space.

KL7CC: What happens when there are so few hams that we become insignificant? What happens when there are so few hams that manufacturers can no longer afford to amortize the engineering costs needed to bring you a new radio?

N2EY: I repeat - the number of US hams is at or near an all-time high. Over 680,000 - that's triple what it was in the late 1950s. There is a wider variety of amateur gear available today than ever before, and in inflation-adjusted dollars it's far less expensive than in the past.

KL7CC: Oh, pardon me - you always build everything from scratch?

N2EY: Yes - or from kits, or I restore older gear. Is that a bad thing? Am I somehow a problem because I don't buy my rigs from Japanese manufacturers?

KL7CC: Great! Who, exactly, are you going to talk to?

N2EY: Other hams, same as I have done for decades.

KL7CC: Most of the rest of us opt for the practical approach, and purchase a rig from one of the several companies that cater to hams. If there are no manufacturers, then there are no new rigs. Hard to carry on a QSO if no one is there.

N2EY: "Practical approach"? You mean you think amateurs can't build their own equipment anymore? If that's true, how can we hams possibly justify our existence as a "fundamentally technical service"?

KL7CC: One of the primary goals of the new license we are going to propose is a true entry-level ticket. Limited power, limited frequencies, but still useful, with enough of the essence of Amateur Radio to attract beginners and show them what lies ahead when they upgrade. Simpler exam. WAIT! - - WAIT! - - WHAT WAS THAT??!!

Yes, I said simpler exam. Hopefully 20 questions. Aimed at a young person aged 12 or more. That means a 6th grade education. Also fits teens, high schoolers, home schoolers. You know, fresh ideas, new blood, people that can actually see their radios without having to put on glasses - what a concept! 20 questions, simple enough to get someone started in a responsible way, pointed in the right direction, all that stuff.

That sure sounds like "dumbing down", doesn't it? Keep reading.

N2EY: It doesn't sound like "dumbing down" at all. It sounds exactly like the old Novice license concept. An entry level license with limited privileges that's easy to get. So far so good.

The current and previous license tests have been passed by young children. I know of a six-year-old who passed the General and an eight-year-old who passed the Extra - the OLD extra, with 5 written tests and 20 wpm code. Granted, these were very bright young people. But their example makes it a bit harder to accept the idea that the current 35 question Technician test is above the level of a 12 year old's ability.

KL7CC: Here is what we are thinking, and some of the rationale behind it. We, however, don't have all the good ideas, in fact we may not even have most of them, so input from others is welcome. Make that rational input. Invective and obviously impractical stuff will get filed immediately in 13.

First consideration: Lower power. 2 reasons. First, everyone at the recent NCVEC meeting expressed concern about letting brand new hams loose with 1500 watts of VHF or UHF. That's dangerous, no doubt about it. Cook your neighbor's cat type stuff. Not funny. So, we are thinking about a license that allows enough power to be useful, but not enough to be unsafe. It turns out that 50 watts above 24 MHz and 100 watts below 24 MHz allows hams to operate without having to worry about RF safety issues or evaluations. Transmitters at those power levels are presumed safe. If there are no RF safety issues, then there is no need to ask questions about those issues, and we can have a smaller exam. Second, those power levels represent the vast majority of commercially manufactured (or kit) radios offered for sale. The 100-watt HF set is everywhere, and very few VHF/UHF mobiles exceed 50 watts. Yes, some sets run more power, but the overwhelming majority meet the 100W HF / 50W VHF standard.

N2EY: OK, fine - and most amateurs don't run much more power than that, anyway. Staying under the RF exposure evaluation limit takes a lot of questions out of the pool.

KL7CC: Another idea: Restrict radios (for this license class only) to a maximum of 30 Volts on the final stage. Why? 30 volts is the generally accepted point that defines the split between low and high voltage. Virtually all-solid state sets use less than 30V on the PA stage, most being, of course, 12 volts. Less chance of an inexperienced ham injuring him or herself. Oops - no vacuum tubes! OK, we know that. Also lets out lots of used gear. We know that too.

N2EY: Also no line-powered equipment - it has 110 AC in it. No antenna tuners - they may have high voltages present when transmitting.

The voltage-limitation thing is a very bad idea. Not only is it overly limiting, it's unenforceable. Worse, it does not guarantee that inexperienced hams won't hurt themselves. The power supply for a 100 watt solid state amateur transceiver is typically 13.8 volts at 25 amps or so. Get a tool, wire or piece of metal across that 13.8 volt line and see what happens.

And while 100 watts of RF is not considered an RF exposure hazard, direct contact with it can be very hazardous to your health.

The 100W/50W power restriction makes sense. The 30 volt restriction does not. Forget about it. You might as well propose requiring licenses for personal computers - they have high voltages inside, particularly the CRT-type monitors.

KL7CC: All a ham has to do is upgrade, and the restriction goes away.

N2EY: If it's no big deal, why do we need a new entry-level license?

KL7CC: However, to upgrade, he or she must pass another test, which involves, among other things, RF safety questions, power safety questions, and other appropriate stuff. Remember that we are aiming this entry-level ticket at 12 year olds. Do you have kids? Grandkids? Wouldn't you be happier if their new radio had very little chance of harming them? I would.

N2EY: The 30 volt restriction won't protect people from hurting themselves. There's no license required to work with 110 volt house current.

KL7CC: Remove some of the math.

N2EY: There's no need for math above the 6th grade level in an entry level test.

KL7CC: Remove some or even most of the "radio law" type questions.

N2EY: Removing any of the questions on applicable regulations is simply unacceptable. If there is ANY subject which MUST be part of an amateur license exam, it's the applicable rules and regulations. No exceptions for any license class.

However, the privileges of the new license can be such that the applicable regulations are not very extensive. If the privileges are kept simple, the rules questions are also simplified.

KL7CC: Instead, require applicants to sign a statement that they have read the Part 97 rulebook, and that they have a copy (available for free via web download). Yes, some of the applicants will "skate" - and not read it when they signed that they did. But, most will, and even among those that don't, eventually, probably sooner than later, they will get around to it. Some never will. That's human nature - we're not looking for saints, just people that can become productive hams.

N2EY: BAD IDEA! There are simply no other words for it.

If you will accept a signed statement from a 12-year-old beginner with no radio experience, why not take all of the radio law questions out of all of the written exams and simply require the same statement from all hams?

This idea is part of what made cb go downhill. It's a very bad idea. It's simply unacceptable.

In a word: NO! If they don't know the regs, they are not qualified to be hams. It's that simple.

KL7CC: The 35-question exam is shrinking. 20 questions seem in reach.

Take out one or two more theory questions. We're not making engineers, at least not yet. Put in a couple of additional practical questions about operating your radio. A poke here, a cut there, and we're done. A 20-question exam that covers all a beginner really needs to know. Finish up with a few words about how to find the information needed to advance one's

skills, how to find an "Elmer", and how to find more about the hobby on the internet.

By the way - the Novice license of old, the one that many of us used to get started - was a 20 question exam.

N2EY: And it later became a 25 question exam, and finally a 30 question exam. The number of questions isn't the biggest concern, it's the content. Leave in the regs and go for 25 questions.

KL7CC: For most of it's existence, the Novice exam had no questions about antennas, propagation, feed lines, or most of the other questions that the present "entry level" exam has. Yet, somehow, a great many hams who entered via that license became active, productive, vital members of the Amateur Radio community. How could that have been possible?

N2EY: Simple. Most hams back then started out with a shortwave receiver and listened to the amateur bands before they ever got their license. That's how most of us discovered amateur radio and learned the code. Many of us built our first receivers, learning a lot of theory in the process. By the time we went for our exams, all we needed was a transmitter to go on the air.

The old Novice by-mail license process was so slow that a ham could build a complete station while waiting for the various FCC paperwork processes. And because the old Novice was a one-time one- or two-year license, there was tremendous incentive to upgrade before the license ran out.

KL7CC: Take a moment to think back. I'll be willing to bet you didn't just drop out of a tree all ready to go, knowing everything that you know about ham radio today, did you?

N2EY: Nope.

KL7CC: It took time; study, listening to other hams, all the rest, to get where you are today.

N2EY: Sure. Now, how do we make sure that sort of thing keeps on happening?

KL7CC: Were you nervous on your first contact? Did you get over it? Did you make a couple of dumb mistakes; maybe even accidentally violate the rules once, or maybe even twice? These people will too. It's called learning.

N2EY: Sure - but it is essential that they know some basics before getting the license and going on the air. The old Novice limited us to small parts of a few bands, 75 watts input, and crystal control. Oh yes - and Morse code only.

KL7CC: What do you think is better for our hobby - lots of enthusiastic newcomers, or an ever-declining number of increasingly older hams? Answer the question honestly, not just in light of your favorite band getting more crowded.

N2EY: Newcomers of all ages are always needed - and welcome! But we need to insure that newcomers know certain basic things before they are granted a license. The privileges granted should match the testing required.

This is not a trivial matter. We amateurs enjoy unprecedented and unequalled freedom compared to other radio services. Our rules are relatively simple, our choice of bands and modes enormous, and we are allowed to use non-type-accepted and non-certified equipment on the air at considerable power levels.

This freedom carries with it the price of responsibility, which means knowing the rules and following them. It means behaving ourselves on the air without a lot of enforcement from FCC. And it means not interfering with other services or each other when such interference can be avoided.

KL7CC: And another thing - if the bands get more crowded, doesn't that help make a case for increased spectrum? And guess what? All those new hams vote (or will soon enough), and Congress pays attention to numbers. Numbers become very important when we are in competition with commercial interests for spectrum space.

N2EY: How many amateurs are "enough", then? We have over 680,000 hams in the USA today, at or near the all-time high.

Compared to the total population of the USA, we are a small group - and that is not going to change no matter what the license requirements are, because radio as an end in itself does not interest everyone.

KL7CC: And maybe the prices of new radio gear will decline, if manufacturers can spread fixed costs over a larger sales base. And maybe some brand new manufacturers will be encouraged to bring something to market. Will that be bad?

N2EY: Amateur equipment costs less in inflation-adjusted dollars today than at any time in the past. There are more manufacturers and a wider variety than ever before - including kits and homebrew parts suppliers.

KL7CC: OK, now we've got a brand new ham.

N2EY: Maybe. You haven't explained how you're going to get more people to know about amateur radio by simply changing the requirements for an entry-level license.

KL7CC: Whether we call them a "Communicator", or some other name, what's next? Where are they going to operate? Are you going to get run over by a horde of newcomers? Help! I'm sinking in a sea of QRM!

Ahem. We have a plan. It probably won't turn out to be exactly the way things come down, but it's a start. Someone else may very well come up with a better suggestion. That's OK, too.

Whatever we come up with, it will have to fit within the FCC budget. This probably means that in all likelihood what will happen, assuming that the idea of a beginner's class license is even accepted at all, is that they (the FCC) will juggle the existing 3 classes to accommodate the new structure. Technician will change from what it is now to the basic license. It may be named "Communicator" or simply left as Technician. Let's assume it gets the name "Communicator".

N2EY: The FCC database currently maintains six different classes of amateur license. FCC seems to have no problems with maintaining 3 old classes of license that are no longer issued to new hams.

Since the proposed "Communicator" is really just a 21st century version of the old Novice, just reopen the Novice to new issues and close off the Technician. Existing Novices could get the new "Communicator" privileges so there is no difference between "old" and "new" Novices.

KL7CC: All existing Techs will be upgraded to General.

N2EY: Why?

KL7CC: Assuming that the Morse requirement is removed first, our opinion is that most of the Techs will take (and hopefully pass) the element 3 exam as soon as they can, thus becoming General class licensees.

N2EY: If that happens, there is no reason for a free upgrade. If it doesn't, Techs can always upgrade to General by taking the required test.

Recall that a free upgrade of existing Novices and Technician Pluses to General was proposed by ARRL in 1998 - and soundly rejected.

KL7CC: Remember, that before the changes that created the present no-code tech, the General and Tech exams were identical.

N2EY: This is not correct! The General and Technician shared the same written exam until March of 1987 - four years before the Tech lost its code test.

KL7CC: Only the code separated them, and even there it was only the difference between 5 and 13 WPM.

N2EY: As the rules stand right now, all pre-March-21-1987 Technicians get credit for Elements 1 and 3 (5 wpm code and the General class written test) - even if they let their licenses expire!

There is no reason to hand out free upgrades to Techs who have not passed the General written. Those Techs who have passed the General written need only provide documentation (old license, old Callbook page, data retrieved from old databases) and they can get a General with no additional testing.

Is the current 35 question General class written exam so difficult?

KL7CC: All Advanced licenses will be upgraded to Extra, and if there are any remaining Novice tickets out there, they will become "Communicators". Now we have 3 classes: (1) Communicator, (2) General, and (3) Extra.

N2EY: Again - WHY? All existing Advanceds are able to upgrade to Extra by taking Element 4 - no additional code.

KL7CC: The exams will be adjusted to combine element 2 and 3 into a new element 3, probably with a 50-question exam, using the existing pools. Element 1 (Code) disappears. A new Element 2 is created, which becomes the Communicator exam.

N2EY: OK so far.

KL7CC: Element 4 remains as is, or maybe becomes even harder, in the event we (all hams) indicate that the extra exam should really be a test that "separates the men from the boys" (apologies to the YL's - JW). Many would agree that this is already the case, and that no changes are required here.

N2EY: The third-grader who earned the Extra was an 8 year old girl at the time.

KL7CC: Kind of sounds like a bunch of folks are going to get something for free, something that you might have worked hard for, doesn't it? How can we justify this?

N2EY: The simple fact is, you can't justify it. Is there really a problem maintaining the existing license classes in the database? What is the urgency of combining license classes that are no longer issued to newcomers?

The instant upgrade scenarios also create the problem of "bargain hunting" among newcomers because the changes will be discussed and announced long before they become reality. So a new ham could get a Tech before the change occurs, then simply get a free upgrade to General when the change happens. Same thing with existing Techs and Advanceds - just wait for the change. What would be created is a disincentive to learning more and passing the tests for the next higher grade of license, because if they just wait a bit they'll get a free upgrade. Not a good thing from a license structure that it supposed to encourage learning!

KL7CC: Well, maybe it won't happen that way at all. Maybe instead of "instant upgrades", the Techs will have to pass their element 3 exam or be downgraded to Communicator licensees, and Advanced licensees will have to pass element 4 or be downgraded to General. That goes in the face of our desire to have this whole thing take place with no net loss to any existing licensee, but if enough people object to the idea of "free" upgrades, then there is one alternative (but probably unlikely) solution. Another is to continue the Technician and Advanced licenses "as is", until they upgrade. Maybe even make upgrading mandatory for renewal. Using that plan, they will all either upgrade or disappear within 10 years, with no further effort on the part of the FCC.

N2EY: There's no reason to force upgrades or give free ones. FCC has maintained a 6 class database with 3 'dead' classes for 3-1/2 years now - what's the problem? What's the urgency to force all hams, new and existing, into just 3 license classes?

If you want a new entry level license, here's how to do it with minimal problems:

Reopen Novice with new test and privileges proposed for "Communicator".
Close off existing Technician to new issues.
All Technicians get "Communicator" privileges on HF/MF
Old Technician and General writtens combine into a single written test of about 60 questions
Everybody can keep their existing license class, callsign and privileges except that the Novice/Tech HF privileges are made the same as "Communicator".

Simple and easy. No big changes for existing hams nor rules. No instant upgrades or license class changes.

KL7CC: OK, now the license classes have been tuned up, and the exams adjusted, what's next?

We need some place where these new licensees can get their feet wet, where they can participate in Amateur Radio in a meaningful way. All of ham radio, not just local repeaters.

N2EY: Do you think VHF/UHF is just local repeaters? That's simply not the case.

KL7CC: What we need is a few spare kilohertz.

N2EY: Why?

KL7CC: I wonder where we can find some? New band? Probably not. So, what do we have that can be reworked to fit our need? How about the present HF novice bands?

Suppose, just for a moment, that a petition got filed requesting that the FCC make the following changes: Take the present HF Novice bands on 80, 40, 15, and 10 meters and reassign them to voice operation. Move the corresponding phone segments down by the appropriate amount. Change the segments open to various classes of license to fit, and let the new "Communicator" licensees have access to the HF bands in 50 or 100 KHz blocks. For example, and this is just an illustration, 40 meters could end up looking something like this:

7000 - 7025 Extra, CW and data only
7025 - 7100 All classes, including communicator, CW and data only
7100 - 7150 Extra, all modes
7150 - 7250 Extra and General, all modes
7250 - 7300 All classes, including communicator, all modes

Similar adjustments would be done at 80, 15, and 10 meters. Actually, 10 meters is already pretty much set and ready to go. We might do only 50 KHz on 15 meters, leaving the other 50 as a "DX window". There could be, or not be, consideration of allowing communicators on the other HF bands (160, 30, 20, 17, 12). Not too sure what to do about the new 60-meter band yet. Have to think about that one for a while. Perhaps we start here (with 80, 40, 15, and 10), and after a few years experience, revisit the issue and decide whether granting access to parts of the other HF bands is a good idea or not. Time will tell.

In other words, what we will have done is to "slide" the phone bands down the equivalent amount of the former novice segment, and allowed the new communicators access to the top 50 KHz of the voice band. Traditionally, higher-class licensees have been given access to the lower frequency segments within a band, and this would remain true.

N2EY: Very bad idea. There is no need for more 'phone space on HF. Such a plan robs the spectrum-efficient modes and favors the spectrum-inefficient modes.

Look at the 40 meter plan proposed. It acts as a disincentive to use CW and data, by increasing crowding of those modes and driving the Region 2 DX phones even further below 7150. The same thing will be true of Regions 1 and 3 when they get 7100-7200.

In addition, there is not much incentive for the Communicator CW or data operator to upgrade unless he/she wants more power or the lowest 25 kHz - and those lowest 25 kHz require an Extra.

What Communicators need is a good assortment of bands and modes to start out with, and a reason to upgrade. At the very least, slices of all HF/MF bands should be included. 30, 17 and 12 meters are so narrow that it makes sense to give Communicators all of them (at the appropriate power level). This results in less crowding and more flexibility.

Here's 40 for an example of how to handle the non-WARC bands:

7000-7150 CW and data only, 7150-7300 CW, analog phone and image

7000-7025 Extra only
7025-7050 Extra, General, Advanced only
7050-7150 All classes of license
7150-7225 Extra and Advanced only
7225-7250 Extra, Advanced and General only
7250-7300 All classes of license

KL7CC: No one loses anything!

N2EY: Yes, they do! The CW and data operators get squeezed and the 'phone operators rewarded for using modes that take up a lot more spectrum. That's just wrong.

There is no reason to widen the 'phone/image bands if the newcomers are allowed enough space on each band. It's a mistake to limit Communicators to just 80/40/15 and 10, particularly as the sunspot cycle declines.

KL7CC: Generals and Extras get some new phone bands, even former Novices, (now upgraded to Communicator) get more room in the CW segment, and access to a portion of the phone band.

Communicators operate with their 100-watt limit, General and Extra can use 1500 if they wish. Again, no one loses!

N2EY: The current power level allowed to Novices and Tech Pluses on HF is more than 100 watts.

KL7CC: No hassle like many of us remember over "incentive licensing" all those many years ago.

N2EY: Trust me - there will be hassles. The free upgrade idea will cause a lot of them.

KL7CC: If a "Communicator" wants to run more power, he or she simply upgrades to General, and away they go. We (hams in general) might decide that voluntary power restrictions in the "communicator" segments are appropriate, but time will tell. That is another issue, not part of the 3-part plan we are working on.

VHF and UHF privileges would be given to the communicator licensees. We are suggesting 50 watts max for the bands 50 to 450 MHz inclusive, with no operation on the higher UHF or microwave bands.

N2EY: The power limit makes sense.

KL7CC: An alternative solution, which has been adopted in other parts of the world, would be to grant Communicators the same frequency privileges as Generals, but with the lower power limits discussed above. The United Kingdom has implemented this approach in their Foundation license, which has become the fastest growing license in the UK's history.

N2EY: The UK system is very different from ours once you get into the details. For example, all UK licenses require taking an approved amateur radio training course before the license tests are taken. No exceptions, even for a Ph.D. in EE who can do 50 wpm Morse. And the UK writtens are not 20-35 questions from a published pool.

Do you want a system where every new ham has to go through an approved training course? Why not? That's a core part of the UK system.

Granting full General privileges but limited power is not a good idea, either. If the power limit is set fairly high (say, 100/50 watts) then there is less incentive to upgrade because most US hams don't run much more than 100 watts. If the limit is set at QRP levels, new hams are at a severe operational disadvantage, particularly if they have to use compromise antennas.

KL7CC: Will anyone have any problems with these proposals? Of course. Inevitably, it will turn out that someone's favorite net is in the "communicator" area. Maybe the net members will decide to move, maybe they will stay where they are and attract hundreds of new members. Someone's favorite spot will suddenly turn out to be open to new modes. OK, so what? Where does it say that anyone is given exclusive rights to one particular spot or another? Pretty much every radio available today has a VFO. Use it. You might even meet a new friend or two.

N2EY: It is important to have incentives to use more spectrum-efficient modes, like PSK-31 and CW. Widening the 'phone bands reduces those incentives.

(continued in Part Three)

73 de Jim, N2EY

3543. Response to "21st Century" Part One (Code Test)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-30 13:28:36 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031130082836.15462.00004620@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 83118

This is a response to the paper "Amateur Radio in the 21st Century", prepared by Jim Wiley, KL7CC, with assistance from other members of NCVEC working on changes to the US Amateur rules. This response is intended to evaluate and constructively comment on the merits of the various ideas and changes presented in the paper, regardless of their source.

For purposes of clarity and brevity, the introductions and executive summaries are not reproduced here.

"Part One" deals with the code test. "Part Two" and "Part Three" deal with the proposed "Communicator" license.

Since the style of the paper is conversational, I inserted my comments into the original paper in the same style, so that the paper reads like a conversation between KL7CC and myself. My comments are preceded with "N2EY". The main text of the original paper is preceded by "KL7CC".

Here is my response to "Amateur Radio In the 21st Century" (Part One)

N2EY: I'm a longtime active amateur, licensed 36 years. I was first licensed at the age of 13 in 1967, and in less than three years had reached the Extra class license. Amateur radio led me to earn bachelor's and master's degrees in electrical engineering, and to an EE career.

KL7CC: Some of the thought processes, and the reasoning behind them:

Lets consider the matter of the Morse code. Even before anything else, keep in mind the fact that every person on the committee that drafted the NCVEC petition, now known as RM-10787, to remove the Morse code requirement, and also every person on the committee that is working on the new entry level license, is a "20 WPM" Extra class licensee. And, most if not all of them would list Morse as one of their favorite modes, if not indeed the favorite mode. My own favorite modes, in order, are Morse, AM Phone, SSB, and VHF FM. I also operate occasionally on other modes, such as RTTY, packet, satellite, and I am thinking about learning how to use PSK31. DXCC? Yes, about 200 officially, with another 60 or 70 worked but not submitted yet. Most of them were on Morse Code. One of our committee members, Fred, W5YI holds DXCC- CW only. Another, Scotty, W4WW holds 5 Band DXCC and has been on the DXCC Honor Roll. John, W3BE, uses CW almost daily, using it for traffic handling and chasing DX.

So, there are no "Morse code haters" on the committee. There is no conspiracy, no secret agenda, no kickback from the manufacturers, no "black plan" from the ARRL, no anything. Just some guys that want nothing more than to see our great hobby prosper for the next hundred years, or longer.

N2EY: That's good to know. However, these ideas need to be considered on their merits, not on the personalities of those who wrote them.

KL7CC: Will dropping the Morse requirement remove a "filter" that keeps out poor operators, "CB Radio" types, scofflaws, and so on? I think not. Listen to 75 meters on any given evening, or 20 meters above 14300 during the day, and all too often what you hear is a cacophony of indecent language, illegal operation, intentional interference, music, poor sportsmanship, you name it. And every one of those characters passed a code test! Whether it was 5 or 13 or 20 WPM, they all passed a test. Some filter, huh?

N2EY: There are several problems with that line of thought:

First, no test will ever be a perfect "filter" of "bad apples". Particularly not a one-time test, often taken decades ago. That doesn't mean there is no filtering effect at all, just that it's not perfect.

Second, all of the violators you hear - indeed, all amateurs of any license class - also took and passed several written tests to get their licenses. The written tests have always contained questions about permissible on-air behavior. If any test can be a "filter", shouldn't we expect those written tests to have filtered out the "bad apples" even more so than the code test? Yet you do not say "some filter, huh?" about the written tests. You do not propose eliminating the written tests, even though it should logically be the written tests' job to filter out such "bad apples".

Third, what mode are the violators using? It's not Morse code! They're almost all on voice modes. Look at any listing of FCC enforcement actions, and you will see that the overwhelming majority of behavior-type violations are by hams using voice modes. The discrepancy is much, much more than can be explained by the relative popularity of various modes. When was the last time FCC had a similar enforcement problem with hams using Morse code?

Some might try to explain the discrepancy by saying "it's easier to behave that way on voice". Maybe that's true - but so what? If a mode somehow promotes better on-air behavior, isn't that a reason to support that mode?

Fourth, if you think some of the HF stuff is bad, look at some of the recent FCC enforcement actions against hams using VHF. For example, four amateurs in the 4th call district were recently cited for making illegal transmissions on police frequencies. If that's not bad enough, a few months ago, there was the case of the new amateur who made false distress calls on a VHF marine frequency using a modified amateur transceiver. These weren't "newbie mistakes" - they were deliberate and repeated violations, using voice modes and modified amateur equipment. Read the FCC enforcement letters - they're not a good advertisement for the ARS.

KL7CC: Will removing the Morse requirement let in some "bad apples"? Yes, it will. But I firmly believe the number will be very small in comparison to the gain our hobby will receive from decent, law abiding, talented, and enthusiastic new hams. Just as letting code free new hams on to our VHF bands has not, for the most part, resulted in chaos, the same will be true of our HF assignments.

N2EY: The dropping of the code test for the Tech license in 1991 did not result in a large, sustained growth increase in the number of hams, either. Compare the growth in the 1980s with that in the 1990s. There was a surge of new hams

after the code test was dropped for Technician in 1991 - and then the growth rate dropped back to only slightly more than what it was before.

Since the reduction of the code test to 5 wpm in 2000, the total number of US hams has grown by less than 10,000. That's less than 2% in 3-1/2 years. If the 5 wpm code test is removed, and growth in the 3-1/2 years following is less than 2%, will the code test be put back?

KL7CC: It will be up to us, as the "experts", to guide newcomers, passing on the traditions of our hobby, the skills and operating techniques that make up a ham that we can all point to and say "that is a good operator".

N2EY: That has always been the case. But there is only so much that Elmering can do - otherwise, we wouldn't need licenses at all, just Elmers.

KL7CC: Will Morse code go away? Probably not in our lifetimes. Remember that Morse code is still the easiest way to get on the air, the most effective means of communicating under poor conditions, and where most of the DX will still be.

N2EY: That alone is justification for a basic test of Morse code skill.

KL7CC: We are not making Morse Code illegal; we are just making it equal to any other mode that hams might enjoy. We don't have special tests before a ham can operate SSB, or RTTY, or SSTV, or any other mode, so why for Morse code?

N2EY: Because only Morse Code requires a skill that most people do not possess before getting an amateur license. And it cannot be learned by reading a book, watching a video, or passively attending a few classes. The Morse code test cannot be passed by memorization or word association of a published pool of questions and answers.

Morse code is also the second most popular mode on amateur HF/MF, far ahead of the data and image modes and only slightly behind SSB voice.

But Morse code is only useful if an operator has acquired the skills to use it.

KL7CC: When most operators (admit it, it's true) operate voice or data.

N2EY: It's also true that most operators also use manufactured equipment. Shall we remove the theory questions from all of the written tests because most hams don't build their own equipment? Which is more popular among hams - building ham rigs or operating using Morse code?

KL7CC: Morse will probably retain most of it's exclusive band segments, at least for now.

N2EY: There are NO exclusive band segments for Morse in any of the HF/MF amateur bands. The only exclusive band segments for Morse code are, ironically, the lowest 100 kHz of 6 and 2 meters. All of the non-phone subbands on amateur HF are shared with data modes. They are CW/data subbands, not exclusive band segments.

KL7CC: We are not addressing this issue at this time. This may change in the future. Several countries no longer have exclusive segments, but depend instead on voluntary band plans.

N2EY: Other countries (except Japan) also have far fewer radio amateurs than the USA. Crowding of the HF amateur bands is much less of a problem in the rest of the world.

KL7CC: In fact, our 160-meter band works this way today, with surprisingly few problems.

N2EY: There are also relatively few amateurs on 160 meters at any given time, due a number of factors such as the relatively large antennas needed. The lack of mode and license class subbands on 160 is a result of the fractured nature of the band when it was shared with LORAN.

KL7CC: Remember that when Ham Radio started, Morse code was all there was. It wasn't even CW - we all used spark gap transmitters!

N2EY: Who is "we"? I wasn't on the air back in the spark days - were you?

N2EY: Besides, that state of affairs ended with World War 1. When amateurs were allowed back on the air in 1919, some of them were using "CW" (tube oscillator) transmitters instead of spark. Some of them began using voice modes - in fact, the very first broadcasting stations were amateur stations.

KL7CC: One of the justifications for Amateur Radio, from the government's point of view, is that we continue to lead, or at least follow closely behind, advancements in the "state of the art" of electronic communications. That means advancing, not standing still.

N2EY: What, exactly, is meant by "advancing, not standing still"? Does it mean amateurs must stop doing what they think is best for amateur radio because of changes in other services? For example, should amateurs stop using HF for point-to-point nonemergency communication between fixed stations because almost all other radio services have done so? That has been other radio services' "advance", yet hams have "stood still" by still using HF for routine, point-to-point (fixed) communications.

KL7CC: And by the way, the only reason there was ever a Morse requirement for Amateur licensing in the first place is because of spark transmissions.

N2EY: This is incorrect. The Morse test requirement for amateurs was not even a part of international regulations until 1927 - long after amateurs had stopped using spark.

KL7CC: It was necessary for amateurs to understand the code so that they could be told to stand by in case their transmissions were interfering with critical government traffic, perhaps involving safety of life. Spark, by its very nature, covers up a lot of frequencies - thus putting everyone, hams and government alike, effectively on the same channel.

N2EY: Again, that state of affairs ended with World War 1, if indeed it ever existed. The introduction of tuned receivers and the assignment of specific wavelengths for different services effectively ended that situation by 1912. Remember "200 Meters And Down"? Amateurs were not allowed on marine or government wavelengths after 1912. Spark was outlawed for hams in 1927. Hams had abandoned it years before then. Yet the code tests remaincd long after.

KL7CC: By the way, most hams use the terms "CW" and "Morse Code" interchangeably, but if a person were to be picky, they are not the same. CW means "Continuous Wave", or a continuous, unmodulated signal. Spark emissions used a "damped wave", with a "high decrement", rich in harmonics and with wide sidebands, which caused great amounts of interference. CW transmissions, on the other hand, are restricted to a single frequency, or at least to a very narrow range. Morse code, as used in most Amateur Radio situations, involves keying a CW transmitter on and off in specific patterns, which we recognize as letters, numbers, punctuation, and other symbols. However, to simplify things and save on space, I will also use the terms interchangeably, as most Amateur Radio operators do in everyday usage.

Will we lose something because we will no longer have the knowledge that all hams can at least understand and send CW, even if very slowly? Maybe, maybe not.

N2EY: We have already lost that knowledge. It happened more than a dozen years ago.

KL7CC: You would be surprised at the number of applicants I see that actually want to learn CW - they think it will be fun. There's a novel concept - someone learning a skill because it is fun, not because the government says you must do it.

N2EY: It's neither a surprise nor a novel concept. Will you also apply the same criteria to the written tests - that a person should not be required to learn anything they are not immediately interested in?

KL7CC: Well, OK, that is all well and good, you say, but are there any reasons we could offer that might support the idea of removing the Morse testing requirement, and what are some of the expected implications?

Obviously, removing the Morse test requirement will make it easier for thousands of interested persons to join our hobby.

N2EY: But will thousands more join? Eliminating the 13 and 20 wpm code tests and reducing the written tests from 5 to 3 has resulted in growth of less than 2% in the past 3-1/2 years. If the removal of the last remaining vestige of morse code testing does not result in significantly more growth, will the test be put back?

KL7CC: There are many, who for whatever reason have a real, not imagined, problem with learning the code. Call it stage fright, a psychological block, hearing problems, poor recognition skills, whatever you want; there are indeed those who literally cannot master the code, no matter how hard they try. Lazy, you say? Anyone can make it to 5 WPM, you say? They just don't try, you say?

N2EY: I don't say any of those things. Not ever.

KL7CC: Apparently you have not participated at hundreds of exam sessions. I have.

N2EY: How many hundreds? From when to when?

KL7CC: I have seen grown men and women with tears in their eyes, frustrated, angry, sometimes back next time, sometimes giving up on ham radio altogether. Where's the gain in having someone give up?

N2EY: What is the failure rate of the code test compared to the written tests? Does no one ever fail the writtens, or have extreme difficulty passing them? How many people have not been able to pass the 5 wpm code test after giving it serious study with modern learning tools?

If enough people who fail the Extra written come to you with 'tears in their eyes', will you petition FCC to eliminate the Extra class written test?

The 5 wpm code test is not "mastery" by any definition. It's learning a skill at the most basic level. The skill required is the ability to translate 43 sound patterns into letters, given 2.4 seconds per sound pattern. It's like learning to recognize 43 words in a new language, nothing more. And the test requires only the recognition of 25 of the sound patterns, not all 43.

KL7CC: Are you proud that you "made it"?

N2EY: Yes. Is there something wrong with pride of accomplishment? Should I be ashamed?

KL7CC: Can you not find something that another person can do that you would find extremely difficult if not impossible? Could you win the Tour de France bicycle race - even if you trained every day for the rest of your life? Could you invent the Laser? Could you paint the Mona Lisa?

N2EY: That's a completely invalid set of analogies. You are comparing world-class feats of excellence with the acquisition of a skill at an extremely basic level. 5 wpm is not equivalent to winning the Tour de France, or inventing a laser, or painting the Mona Lisa. It's more the equivalent of riding a bicycle at 5 mph for a mile on a level road, or assembling a flashlight, or painting a recognizable human face. Not everyone can learn to do those things, either.

Why do you exaggerate the difficulty of passing the code test?

KL7CC: Not that painting a work of art or riding a bicycle has all that much to do with radio, it's just to point out that while you may have been able to master the code with some degree of success, that doesn't necessarily mean that everyone has the same ability as you.

N2EY: Morse code, however, has a lot to do with amateur radio. Also, 5 wpm is not mastery.

KL7CC: I would argue that the ability to master the code has no apparent connection with how "good" a ham a person is.

N2EY: The same can be said of the written tests. Shall they be stripped down to the barest minimum, or eliminated entirely? They are not a 100% effective filter for "bad apples". There are some people who would make great hams who have real problems with math, with test phobia, with remembering details like band edges and electronic symbols. Why are they being kept out of amateur radio?

KL7CC: What we want, I think you will agree, is someone who will respect our traditions, follow the rules, bring enthusiasm and vigor to the hobby, and make a positive contribution.

N2EY: I agree 100% on that. How do we attract such people to amateur radio.

KL7CC: So, who's to say that mastering Morse code skills makes a better ham?

N2EY: Who is to say they do not? Either way, it's merely an opinion. Is it wrong, or electro-politically incorrect, to express such an opinion?

KL7CC: I would not be so arrogant as to think such a thing. Every time I get to feeling superior, I look around, and guess what? - - - I can find someone who is better at something, anything, than me. I can also name several individuals that I think are in one way or another "better hams" than I, better operators, better engineers, better at some aspect of our hobby than me. Might that be true with you too?

N2EY: Expressing an opinion on what the license requirements should be is neither arrogant nor feeling superior. It's just an opinion. Saying that Morse code skills do not make a better ham is just as arrogant as saying they do.

KL7CC: CW is a great mode. It's fun. I enjoy it. And, it's time to move on.

N2EY: What exactly does "time to move on" mean in this context? Should hams stop using Morse code? Why? What are we supposed to "move on" towards?

KL7CC: We no longer require applicants to draw schematic diagrams, demonstrate how to neutralize a triode vacuum tube amplifier, lots of other things.

N2EY: Schematic drawing was eliminated because they required a trained examiner to grade, and also because it was not a 100% objective measure. Neutralization questions were removed from the test because relatively few hams use transmitters requiring neutralization adjustments. The written exams have been revised over the years to reflect the technologies in general amateur use.

And a lot of hams today use Morse code. Particularly on the HF/MF amateur bands.

KL7CC: Lets be gentlemen and give CW a decent, respectful, wave. Remembering our old friend, but looking forward, not backward.

N2EY: What exactly does all that mean? You say "give CW a decent, respectful wave" and "look forward, not backward" - does that mean no more Morse code test, or no more Morse code?

KL7CC: Morse code will live forever. As long as someone cares about the history and mystery of early radio, and lots of hams do, CW will be around. Like anything else, when a person finds he or she has a need to use Morse code, they will learn it. Want to work DX, or QRP, or weak signal VHF, or Moon-bounce? Better learn the code, or you won't have a very satisfying experience.

N2EY: I hope that's true. But previously you wrote: "Will Morse code go away? Probably not in our lifetimes." Now you say it will live forever. Which is it?

What will you say to someone who wants to remove everything but the basic rules, regs and safety from the written tests? How do you answer a prospective ham who says "I don't need to learn all that theory and propagation and other stuff now, for any class of license - when I find I have a need for it, I'll learn it"?

KL7CC: Are we "dumbing down" amateur radio? Are you kidding? Have you looked at the new Extra class tests?

N2EY: Yes, I have. They're not very hard if someone knows a little about radio. They have been passed by grade-school children.

KL7CC: Could you honestly say you could pass one, picked at random, "cold"?

N2EY: Without reservation, I can honestly say "YES - I CAN!"

KL7CC: I couldn't, at least not without some serious study of the books.

N2EY: Why not?

Part of the understanding between the FCC and licensees is that we will at least keep current enough to pass the exams we expect others to take to become hams. With all due respect, if a licensed amateur cannot pass the current tests for the license they hold without serious study, then I think that amateur should reconsider whether they should be in a position to make amateur radio policy decisions. Just my opinion.

If experienced hams can't pass the current written tests for the licenses they hold, why must new hams be required to pass them? Sounds like a case of "do as I say, not as I do".

Do you begin to see why some folks use terms like "dumbing-down"?

KL7CC: I have been licensed since the late 50's, went through all of the steps, starting at Novice, and getting my Extra in the 70's. Even had a "First Class" commercial radiotelephone, with both the radar and aircraft endorsements - passed all the elements in one sitting, missed at most 3 or 4 questions on any given section - a couple were perfect. And, except for the Novice, did this while sitting in front of the FCC themselves, no less. Never flunked a FCC code or theory exam. Never. So what? That and a dollar will get me a cup of coffee. I learned about ham radio from my peers, from watching and listening, not from tests.

N2EY: It sounds like you're making a case to eliminate almost all testing, not just code. If the result of all that testing is a "so what", why should new hams have to do it?

I've been licensed since 1967, and Extra since 1970. There has never been a time when I could not pass the then-current license tests without any special preparation. I say "Bring 'em on!"

KL7CC: Will ham radio turn into CB? No, it won't.

N2EY: How do you know for sure? Nobody really knows what will happen. When FCC created 27 MHz CB in 1958, no one thought that it would turn out the way it did. How can you guarantee what will happen in the future?

KL7CC: In the first place, CB is essentially an unlicensed service. Secondly, there are still the written exams, and add to that peer pressure from other hams, and the fact that hams must use call signs, instead of "handles", and there is just no comparison.
It isn't even an "apples and oranges" argument - it's more of an "apples and cement mixers" discussion - there just isn't any common ground between the two services. Hams will literally refuse to talk to someone without a call sign - and a call sign removes the anonymity of CB.

N2EY: When CB was created, its users were required to obtain licenses and callsigns, and had to certify that they had read, understood, and would comply with all FCC rules of their service. Widespread disregard for the rules in the CB service caused FCC to give up on trying to enforce those rules, and ultimately to change them so that callsigns and licenses were no longer issued.

If enough hams misbehave on the air - and it doesn't take many to cause real problems - FCC will either have to shut down the amateur service or allow things to go the way they did with cb.

Hopefully this won't happen to amateur radio. But it did happen to cb, despite licenses, callsigns, clear FCC rules for the service, and much, much more FCC enforcement than has ever been expended on the amateur bands. In my opinion, the reason it happened to cb was simply that many cb users had no personal investment or commitment to their radio service. They simply didn't care to follow the rules, and FCC and the rules-abiding cb users were simply overwhelmed by sheer numbers.

How do we insure that most new licenses will have adequate personal investment or commitment to the ARS?

KL7CC: Break the rules on the ham bands, and you will get caught, and fined or even sent to jail.

N2EY: You cannot guarantee that. Neither can FCC.

KL7CC: We even have an "enforcer", in the person of Riley Hollingsworth, of the FCC's enforcement division. Riley and his helpers do an excellent job of keeping the ham bands clean, and his efforts in cooperation with Amateur Radio volunteers, such as the ARRL's Official Observer corps, do the job. Yes, he knows about the problems on 75 and 20, as well as elsewhere - and he is working on them as you read this. He has a problem common to all law enforcement types - he has to follow the rules, and the violators don't - but he will catch up with them in the end, trust me on that. I have visited with Riley one on one, and listened to him speak. He is a great guy, funny, personable, very sharp, and dead serious about his job. I surely wouldn't want him mad at me!

N2EY: The problems in certain parts of the voice subbands on 75 and 20 are of long standing. Where was FCC enforcement when those problems started? Why have they been allowed to fester for so many years? Riley is trying his best and doing great things - but he's only one person, trying to do an extremely difficult job.

You cannot guarantee that Riley will catch all of the trouble makers or even most of the worst ones. Particularly if their numbers increase. He's doing all

he can but his resources are finite. And the problems are not limited to 75 and 20 meters.

Most amateurs follow the rules not because they're afraid of Riley or the FCC but because they have a personal investment or commitment to the ARS.

And remember what modes almost all of those bad apples are using. It isn't Morse code!

(End of Part One - see Parts Two and Three for "Communicator" discussion)

73 de Jim, N2EY

3544. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-30 13:53:43 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <HDmyb.31570$Wy4.14461@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 83120

"N2EY" wrote:
>
> (snip) And most of them were not on your
> license tests. You figured out how to do
> them as a matter of practical necessity, not
> to pass a test. (snip)

Actually, most of them (coax, connectors, antenna tuning, SWR tests, equipment grounding, lightning protection, and RF exposure level estimates) were in the Novice/Technician question pool I studied (7/1/97~7/1/01 version). Just glancing through the question pool, here are some of the related questions I stumbled across...

N4A06 ~ N4A11 - Station & antenna grounding
T4A08 ~ T4A16 - Station & antenna grounding
N4C01 ~ N4C11 - SWR measurements
T9B09 ~ T9B12 - SWR measurements
N4A04 ~ N4A05 - Lightning protection
N9A09 ~ N9A13 - Antenna tuning
N9C01 ~ N9C12 - Feed lines (coax and others)
T9C01 ~ T9C03 - Connectors
N0B01 ~ N0C27 - RF Safety (exposure levels)
T0A01 ~ T0C22 - RF Safety (exposure levels)

The study guide I used (Now You're Talking!) pretty much covered the rest (waterproofing, ground radials, masts, guy wires, and so on). Of course, I then had to transfer that written information into real world applications.

> I've set up a complete Field Day station in
> much less than an afternoon. (snip)

Most of us have set up in remote locations, for various purposes.

> Again, almost none of the skills needed were
> on the license tests.

If true, you must have taken some really basic tests back when you got your license years ago. The test I took seems much more comprehensive than what you describe.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3545. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-30 14:10:44 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <ETmyb.4961$zL1.638884@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 83123

Kï¿½HB wrote:
> "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote
>
>
>>And how are we going to take care of the "shack on a belt" crowd. A
>>awful lot of hams are quite happy with their Technician licenses.
>
>
> And under my plan they are free to keep their Technician license.

And new people that intend to operate in this fashiion will have a very
different set up.

>>A forced upgrade with absolutely no advantage for a person
>>that only does public events, and uses the local repeater once
>>in a while is not going to be very popular with them.
>
>
> I don't propose to force them to upgrade. Technicians are perfectly free to
> renew their current license.

So you are saying that present licenses will continue with the ten year
operating cycle? This is beginning to look like there will be 5 classes
of license in the end.

>
>>And of course, how ya gonna enforce that 50 watt limit? Enacting
>>unenforceable laws is a great way to breed disrespect for laws.
>
>
> There are currently many examples of limited power in the rules. How do we
> enforce the current 50W limit which exists for EVERYONE on some HF
> frequencies? How do we enforce the current 200W limit in the Novice
> sub-bands? How did we enforce the old 75W limit for Novices? How did we
> enforce the old 50W limits on 160 meters? How do we enforce the current
> 200W limit on 30 meters? How do we enforce the 50W PEP limit on 219-220MHz?
> How do we enforce the current Novice 5W limit on 23 cm? How do we enforce
> the current 25W limit for Novices on 1.25 cm? As a matter of fact, how do
> we enforce the current 1.5KW limit? Are you suggesting that FCC discard
> all these limits because they breed disrespect? What a 'novel' idea!!!! (I
> quit using the word 'stupid'.)

Just because an idea is bad, doesn't mean it isn't repeated, eh? BTW,
you forgot ro add the ERP power limit on 60 meters. Rolling back the
output power to 50 watts when most HF transcievers will do 100 watts is
simply not going to work (if you want it to work that is)

Perhaps it is just as easy to detect someone running at 100 watts as it is at 3kilowatts?

But okay, perhaps you have the evidence of all the Technicians that have been injured by using 100 watts of RF power? What is the basis for 50 watts? Is it safety? Or is it arbitrary?

- Mike KB3EIA -

3546. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-30 14:13:12 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <YVmyb.4968$zL1.638948@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 83122

Hans K0HB wrote:

> My proposal would allow them a transition period to do just that.
> Then they could continue to renew their no-code General test until
> they assumed room temperature.

So we'll have Novice, General, Technician, Extra, Advanced, and Class A
and B. Simplification by complication.

- Mike KB3EIA -

3547. Zionists have sucked us in again; still, as always - WE ARE SUCKERS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-30 14:30:29 UTC
From: x-ray <xray@breakrayone.org>
Message-ID: <bqcuu6iec0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 83121

"Jackeroo" <Jackeroo@nospam.net.au> wrote in message
news:p2byb.33012$aT.28398@news-server.bigpond.net.au...
> Israel's Blitzkrieg on Middle East Oil
> "Operation Shekhinah a.k.a. Operation Iraqi Freedom"
> Copyright Joe Vialls, 17 April 2003 & 20 October 2003
>
> 20 Oct 2003: First Tacit American Admission of Defeat in Iraq, Scroll Down
> to Red Update
> On 21 March 2003, the British and Australian Special Air Services
> Regiments [SAS] were unwittingly tasked with protecting "Israeli Assets"
H2
> and H3 in Iraq's Western Desert. Their British and Australian political
> masters stood these elite troops into clear and present danger, without
ever
> explaining the real reason for their presence.
> When Part One of Operation Shekhinah was first published
in
> January 2002, it was viewed by many as a work of complete fiction. "Where
is
> the proof," my mainly Jewish critics asked, "that Israel intends to
> illegally invade Iraq and steal its strategic oil reserves?"
>
http://homepage.ntlworld.com/steveseymour/joeviallscouk/subliminalsuggestion
/oil2.html
>
>

3548. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-30 16:30:46 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bqd5u1$j11@library2.airnews.net>
Source record: 83124

"Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in message
news:oPlyb.29000$iU5.7424460@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net...
> "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
> news:KU6yb.13197$P%1.11970231@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
> >
> > "Alun" <alun@1stcounsel.com> wrote in message
> > news:Xns94428A3961C57elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
> > > It just so happens that I don't
> > > like CW, in the sense of I have no desire to use it. That should be OK
> > > too, but for some reason it bothers you. Why?
> >
> > No it does not bother me that someone who has learned it chooses not to
> use
> > it. They have made that decision from a position of knowledge and
> > experience. This is radically different from a person judging it and
> saying
> > they will never use it when they do not have that knowledge and
experience
> > to draw on.
> >
> > Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>
> Right on the money, Dee. Larry pointed this out earlier, but not as
> eloquently as you.
>
> 73 de Bert
> WA2SI
>
>

It fascinates me that you won't accept someone's plain and simple truth that they don't like CW--even if they don't have experience with it--because you reason that they need to have "knowledge and experience" with it. Well, I know people who are quite well-versed in CW who don't like it, people who haven't ever even tried it and don't like it, and people who have taken and passed a 5wpm test and don't like it. I also know people from those same three categories that do like CW operation.

It's pretty much as simple as folks who do or don't like most other things in life. Either ya like it or ya don't.

Kim W5TIT

3549. Re: Where Did THIS Come From...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-30 16:39:47 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0311300839.3b1efd87@posting.google.com>
Source record: 83125

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:<cuvyxnansvbet.hp4w1e7.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>...
> On 29 Nov 2003 01:58:17 GMT, N2EY wrote:
>
> >>> Neat trick, GW showing up in Iraq, wasn't it?
> >>
> >> "There's no business like show business....."
> > >
> > >Hillary made a big show of going, so Dubya trumped her. Neat trick.
> >
> > Another bozo.

Or bozoette?

Point is, she got trumped soundly by Dubya's move.
>
> What gets me about that maneuver is that when he flew from Tex-as to
> Andrews to pick up the standby plane using the cover excuse that the
> plane was going back there for maintenance, SOP is to fly the
> replacement to where the one going in for maintenance is BEFORE the
> move is made. Any plane-watcher hobbyist could have picked up on
> that. Ditto for the facilities of White House Communications Agency
> (a branch of the military).
>
> And what about the two AF fighters which always accompany the plane
> when POTUS is aboard? Another dead giveaway.

Sure. But in any such move there's always a risk.
>
> Good trick....
>
> >> Resources that could have been applied to newer and better equipment
> >> for our troops "over there" and for veterans' care, for instance? Not
> >> to mention the needs of the civilian population within our country.
> > >
> > >Or maybe a little thing called the deficit? Or homeland security?
> >
> > Hey, that trip will probably delay my friend's brother getting a
> > decent wheelchair for another six months, to get it down to the
> > nitty gritty. So much for the VN vets.

"Forgotten heroes of a forgotten war" (from the song "And The Band
Played Waltzing Matilda")
>
> >> Happy Holiday to all.

> >>
> >And to our service people - spending next Thanksgiving with their
> >families at home.
>
> Amen, brother.

Regardless of politics or policies, our prayers and thoughts are with them.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3550. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-30 16:51:53 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0311300851.387ccd04@posting.google.com>
Source record: 83126

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:<iZkyb.31498$Wy4.14099@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> "N2EY" wrote:
> > "Dwight Stewart" writes:
> > >
> > > Considering the power levels, the number
> > > of frequencies and bands, the overall
> > > safety considerations, (snip)
> >
> > You're avoiding my question, Dwight.
>
>
> No, you just don't like the answer given.

Would you accept "it's obvious" as an answer to "why a code test"?

Didn't think so.

> If anything, I'm ignoring a
> fanciful, long-winded, exchange that cannot add anything of real substance
> to the discussion about Morse code testing (see below).
>
> > > Since you keep asking this, do you
> > > have a point to make, Jim?
> >
> > Yes.
> >
> > The point is that some folks apply a double
> > standard when deciding which tests to keep
> > and which to get rid of.
>
>
> The only double standard that exists is not having the same testing for
> all operating modes.
> Unless there is a justification to do otherwise, either
> have skill testing for all modes or no skill testing for any mode.

I disagree. Would you have skill testing for modes that few hams use,
like EME or TV, on an equal par with those that are widely used, like
voice and Morse?

> There is
> no longer any justification today for a unique test solely for Morse code.

I disagree. YMMV.

In the end, it's simply an opinion question.

> That opinion is consistent with recent FCC published statements.

Does that mean FCC is always right?

Was FCC right when they required 20 wpm for full privs and no waivers?

> As such,
> the unique Morse code test should be eliminated.

And perhaps it will be - someday.
>
> Not willing to accept that, you ignore the obvious double standard and
> instead try conjure up an imaginary double standard relating to the written
> tests.

Nope.

I simply point out that the same arguments used against the code test
can be used against most of the written tests.

But most people support the written tests as they are for opinion
reasons, nothing more.

> No such double standard exists. Those written tests, and their
> contents, serve a valid purpose today.

What valid purpose do the General and Extra written tests serve? Why
is *all* of their content necessary to operate HF beyond the small
sample of privileges granted to Novices and Tech Pluses?

> None here, including you, have said
> otherwise.

I've simply used the same arguments against them as are used against
the code test.

> The same cannot be said about the Morse code test.
>
Sure it can. I've done it.

> With all that in mind, I have no desire to engage in a fanciful discussion
> about the contents of the written tests, especially when that discussion
> cannot possibly lead to a valid point - no conflict or double standard
> exists concerning the written tests. As such, I've ignored the rest of your
> message and have instead addressed the specific point you've acknowledged
> trying to make.

You choose to ignore it because you don't have a definitive
counterargument. You cannot prove that most of the content of the
writtens, particularly the General and Extra writtens, are
necessary.

IOW, you know that if the same criteria of "is it necessary?" were
applied to most of the written questions, the answer would be the same

as you get for the code test.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3551. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-30 16:56:26 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <_ipyb.28271$Rk5.23090@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 83127

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:rv4yb.13158$P%1.11940230@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
>
> "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
> news:QR1yb.28997$Wy4.10040@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> >
> > "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
> > news:U_Wxb.13129$P%1.11871251@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
> > [snip]
> > The same can be said for morse...unless you want to operate at
> > other than a basic level. For some reason, this discussion always
> > seems to presume one must be code literate at speeds well above
> > even 5 wpm for code to be useful to anyone. If one can "hunt & peck"
> > via a keyboard, the same can be done for morse using a "cheat sheet"
> > to send and receive morse at slow speeds.
> >
>
> No 5wpm is useful just a tedious for the listener. Learning it to a
> higher speed simply makes it easier to communicate and increases the
> probability that the person will not forget his/her code over time.
>
> However, using a "cheat sheet" won't even let you go 5wpm as it takes too
> long to look up the letters.

So what? The point is that anyone could use a cheat sheet to send
and recieve morse. I never claimed it could be done at 5wpm.
In reality, there is NO minimum code speed required for
on-the-air use of the mode. The test requirement
is only that...a test requirement. If two non-code hams decide to
QSO on 2 meter simplex sometime, there is NO FCC rule
requiring any specific minimum sending speed be used.

> > > I've operated both RTTY and packet and other
> > > digital modes and found them totally boring but I have had experience
> with
> > > them and there simply is no specific skill required.
> >
> > Even "hunt & peck" requires an ability to use the keyboard
> > at a very minimal level. You may not think that it is any
> > skill level at all, but it is.
>
> In today's world, most people have to learn that skill at a minimmal
anyway
> whether or not they wish to be radio Amateurs so do not include that as
> something unique to Amateur Radio.

And the converse is true for morse. There is no
longer any international treaty requirement and the FCC has
already stated they see no rational for code testing to be
retained. Ergo... no need for specific amateur testing
of morse for HF licensning...IMHO

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

3552. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-30 17:04:31 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <zqpyb.28290$Rk5.22547@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 83128

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20031129135846.12300.00001906@mb-m20.aol.com...
> In article <G_Rxb.27838$Wy4.22808@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>,
"Dwight
> Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> writes:
>
> >"N2EY" wrote:
> >>
> >> Why is such a written test necessary? The
> >> use of any of those modes is entirely
> >> optional.
> >>
> > Considering the power levels, the number of frequencies and bands, the
> >overall safety considerations, the desirability of proper operation when
> >using the various operating modes, and the importance of the rules
> >associated with all that, the necessity of the written exams is clearly
> >obvious.
>
> No, it isn't.
>
> You're avoiding my question, Dwight.
>
> Why must hams be forced to learn about *any* modes and technologies whose
use
> is strictly optional? Indeed, someone who cannot speak and is totally deaf
> cannot use voice modes - yet the written exams are full of questions on
AM,
> SSB, FM, etc. Why are such tests *necessary*?
>
> Why is *any* written test beyond the basics of rules, regulations and
safety
> *necessary*?

BUT none of these other modes has its own separate pass/fail
test. Not any specific subject area either. Miss all the questions
on RTTY and you can still pass the test.

> Or consider this:
>
> Techs are permitted to use all authorized (amateur) modes and frequencies
above
> 30 MHz - at full authorized power. This authorization is based on the
> successful passing of a single 35 question written test. FCC says so - in
fact,
> almost four years ago they drastically reduced the written testing needed

to
> get a Tech license.

Additiionally, those same techs can use Morse even if
they never passed a morse test.

> Yet to have full privileges, a ham must pass additional written tests.
Sure,
> the addtional tests include rules and regs a Tech doesn't need to know, as
well
> as some things like HF/MF propagation. Buty those tests go far beyond the
> additional regs and propagation. Why is that sort of thing *necessary*,
since a
> Tech has already shown that he/she is qualified on all authorized modes at
full
> authorized power?

I have previously agreed that the alignment of privileges vs license class
makes little sense these days.

> >Can you establish a similar necessity for the Morse code test?
>
> Sure. Here goes:
>
> Considering the many advantages of Morse code, the number of
> frequencies and bands on which it is used, the number of amateurs who
> use it on the air and their exemplary conformance to the rules,
regulations
> and operating procedures of the ARS, the necessity of the Morse code
> exam is clearly obvious.
>
> There you go.

So how come the FCC didn't buy it in 98-143. How come
no-code techs are NOT forbidden from using morse even though
hey never passed a morse test.

By the way..."their exemplary conformance to the rulkes" is a
real stretch since most rule breakers seem to be coded hams
anyway.

Cheers,
Bill

3553. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-30 17:11:41 UTC
From: Alun <alun@1stcounsel.com>
Message-ID: <Xns94437C0384F43elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 83129

```
"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in
news:nFbyb.13229$P%1.12019509@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com:

>
> "Alun" <alun@1stcounsel.com> wrote in message
> news:Xns9442BD7B8FD06elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
>> "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in
>> news:KU6yb.13197$P%1.11970231@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com:
>>
>> >
>> > "Alun" <alun@1stcounsel.com> wrote in message
>> > news:Xns94428A3961C57elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
>> >> "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in
>> >> news:yC4yb.13160$P%1.11941003@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com:
>> >>
>> >> >
>> >> > "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote in message
>> >> > news:bqaecq$ea0@library1.airnews.net...
>> >> >> I personally don't have the desire to "take advantage of" CW. I
>> >> >> haven't been interested in CW since I was first introduced to it
>> >> >> and found it nothing more than a necessary evil--a means to an
>> >> >> end--to licensing in amateur radio. I also found it uniquely
>> >> >> lacking in any pertinent application to the process of amateur
>> >> >> radio, overall.
>> >> >>
>> >> >
>> >> > I believe you have previously stated that once you tried HF, you
>> >> > did not care for it and have since stayed primarily with VHF FM.
>> >> > There's nothing wrong with that. However, those who work a lot
>> >> > of HF are really shortchanging themselves if they are unable to
>> >> > use CW.
>> >> >
>> >> > Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>> >> >
>> >> >
>> >>
>> >> I work a lot of HF, relatively speaking, and I have considered
>> >> wiring up a key from time to time, but decided against it.
>> >> Shortchanging myself? I don't think so. I'm happy to stay on phone.
>> >> Now, I have met people who don't like phone, and I'm fine with
>> >> that. It just so happens that I don't like CW, in the sense of I
>> >> have no desire to use it. That should be OK too, but for some
>> >> reason it bothers you. Why?
>> >
```

>> > No it does not bother me that someone who has learned it chooses not
>> > to use it. They have made that decision from a position of
>> > knowledge and experience. This is radically different from a person
>> > judging it and saying they will never use it when they do not have
>> > that knowledge and experience to draw on.
>> >
>> > Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>> >
>> >
>>
>> And yet you say code is "necessary"? As an unqualified blanket
>> statement that is laughable.
>
> Nope it is not laughable. There are many necessary things in life that
> people do not do. They choose for reasons of their own to omit them.
> Annual physicals are a "necessary" item for people of middle age and
> older but I know quite a few people who do not get them. Keeping one's
> weight under control is "necessary" but there's a lot of us carrying
> more weight than we should.
>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>
>

So, let me get this straight, you are saying it's necessary for me to use CW, and comparing not doing it with failing to get a physical. I don't think that argument will hold water. The consequences of not using CW are what, exactly?

3554. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-30 17:14:26 UTC
From: Alun <alun@1stcounsel.com>
Message-ID: <Xns94437C7B9F730elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 83130

Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in
news:licyb.4748$zL1.485665@news1.news.adelphia.net:

> N2EY wrote:
>
>> In article <3c2yb.4513$zL1.340545@news1.news.adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo
>> <mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:
>>
>>
>>>>>K&#65533;HB wrote:
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>>>>>On the contrary, my plan puts newcomers dead center in the mainstream
>>>>>>>of amateur radio, with all the same privileges of EVERY other
>>>>>>>licensee, just
>>>
>>>>>>at
>>>
>>>>>>>a more modest power level of 50watts.
>>>
>>>> How are you going to enforce that?
>>
>>
>> Same way all the other power limits are enforced.
>
> I imagine you're being a bit glib about that. If a ham is running
> way
> too much power at the KW end of the scale, there will be possibilities
> of TVI or RFI. There will be a local discernable problem with other
> hams too.
>
> But the difference between 50 and 100 watts? Not all that much that is
> detectable. For this plan to work, (work means compliance) the
> equipment manufacturers will have to throttle their transcievers to 50
> watts.
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -
>
>

It would be a better plan to make the limit 100W, i.e. base it on the
equipment, not vicea versa.

3555. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-30 17:16:14 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031130121614.02537.00001886@mb-m23.aol.com>
Source record: 83131

In article <nFbyb.13229$P%1.12019509@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> writes:

>"Alun" <alun@1stcounsel.com> wrote in message
>news:Xns9442BD7B8FD06elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
>> "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in
>> news:KU6yb.13197$P%1.11970231@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com:
>>

>> And yet you say code is "necessary"? As an unqualified blanket statement
>> that is laughable.
>
>Nope it is not laughable. There are many necessary things in life that
>people do not do. They choose for reasons of their own to omit them.
>Annual physicals are a "necessary" item for people of middle age and older
>but I know quite a few people who do not get them. Keeping one's weight
>under control is "necessary" but there's a lot of us carrying more weight
>than we should.

Okay, so now morse code skill makes one "healthy?!?" :-)

Yes, morse code skill is absolutely necessary to get rid of invading space aliens. [see movie "Independence Day"]

Morse code skill is absolutely necessary to aid the survivors of the next Titanic sinking or get away from icebergs. [see movie "Titanic"]

Morse code skill is absolutely necessary for ALL emergency and disaster communications...and that is why all the public safety folks depend on morse code skill for all their communications involving life and death situations.

Right.

LHA

3556. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-30 17:18:59 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0311300918.2bd67bd2@posting.google.com>
Source record: 83132

"Kim" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote in message news:<bqc3p2$b5r@library2.airnews.net>...
> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20031129112449.29660.00001854@mb-m24.aol.com...
> > In article <bq7kka$hs9@library2.airnews.net>, "Kim" <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
> > writes:
> >
> > >"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> > >news:20031127205909.08626.00001939@mb-m27.aol.com...
> > >> In article <bq52ki$l6t@library1.airnews.net>, "Kim "
> <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
> > >> writes:
> > >>
> > >> >Hmmm, not only no, but hell no. I can be treaded on all "they" want.
> > >> >I've declared war on the road, tell ya that. I travel a good number
> of
> miles
> > >> >to work.
> >
> > By your own choice.
> >
>
> Didn't make the point because I don't like the drive. I made the point to
> illustrate that I have a lot of exposure to the topic I was going to post
> about.

OK, fine.

I'm making the point that you have a long commute because of where you
choose to live.
>
> >> What lane are you in when they do this?
> > >
> > >The far left--the "fast" lane as it is called. Funny thing is, if you
> > >mention to people at the office or wherever, that it doesn't mean the
> "break
> > >the speed limit lane," you ought to hear the validations for people doing
> > >just that.
> >
> > But you're already speeding, Kim. And not by an amount that can be
> > explained by the usual inaccuraccies and imperfections of speedometers.
> >
> > Yet your getting ticked off because someone wants to go even faster.
> >
>
> Nope. Not at all. I am ticked because they think I should move for them.

Why shouldn't you move?

If it's OK for you to go 15 mph above the limit, why isn't it OK for them to go 20 mph above the limit? By refusing to move, you're enforcing your own personal judgement on what the speed limit should be.

Suppose you're sailing along on your 60 mph 4-lane-divided (2 lanes each way) road and you come across two (non police) cars side-by-side going exactly the speed limit.

What would you do? Would their behavior bother you?

> I am already going faster than the posted speed is my point. Why should
> someone expect me to move if I am already going faster than I should be?

Because you're preventing them from going as fast as *they* want, even though you're going as fast as *you* want.

> > >The argument is along the lines that this is the lane where, if
> > >someone needs to pass, speeding is legal to get around them;
> >
> > Ah - but why does someone *need* to pass?
>
> That's the proverbial 60 million dollar question--and yes, why does someone
> *need* to pass someone else who's already speeding?

Why does anyone *need* to speed in a nonemergency situation? How much time does going 70-75 save vs. 60 on that same road?
>
> > As Dee points out, on a two-lane, two direction road, it may be necessary
> > to
> > go fast to get out of a tough passing situation. But on a multilane
> > divided
> > highway where traffic is already zooming at the speed limit or above, why
> > does
> > anyone not in a life-and-death emergency situation *need* to pass?
> >
>
> This is a four lane divided highway--two lanes in each direction. And, I
> ask the same question.
>
See above.
>
> > >or, this is the
> > >lane where if the majority of drivers wants to go a little faster than
> the
> > >flow of traffic, they do it there! There's more validations, but that's
> the
> > >gist of it...!!
> >
> > And they take the risk of being fined, or worse.
> > >

>
> Well, myself included, one does not think of these things (tickets)
> happening when one is breaking the speed limit.

I think about 'em all the time. Not just the fine but the points.

> > >Note that I let you know that I am already speeding, as it is. Up to
> > > about
> > >15 MPH over the posted speed.
> >
> > Right.
> >
> > So you have justified such speeding to yourself, even though it violates
> > the
> > law. The person behind you who wants to go 20-25 MPH over the limit has
> > almost certainly justified their behavior to him/herself, even though it
> > also
> > violates the law.
> >
>
> Exactly, but if I happened upon someone who's already breaking the speek
> limit, I am not going to act like an idiot behind them--expecting them to
> get out of my way.

What if they're going the speed limit?

Why is it OK for you to go 15 over but not OK for someone else to go
20 over?
>
> > >
> > >> I go on the "Duel" philosophy (from the old TV movie by Speilberg): I'd
> > >> rather
> > >> have a nutcase driver in front of me, where I can watch him/her, than
> > >> behind
> > >> me. I've actually pulled over and let 'em go by rather than have them
> > >> follow me.
> > >
> > >Know what happens here? If one is cautiously staying behind a fruitcake
> > >driver, all the hurry-up-and-get-me-knowwhere nitiwits start passing like
> > >they are the charging brigade--never taking just a moment to see what
> they
> > >are pulling up on (a very dangerous situation with a driver ahead way too
> > >close to the vehicle in front of them) or someone who's been doing a bit
> of
> > >weaving; or whatever. So, depending upon the situation, letting this
> person
> > >stay in front instead of taking the first opportunity to get around them,
> > >can be more hazardous.
> >
> > I disagree. I simply pull over and let the whacko get farther ahead.
> Miles, if

> > necessary. At 60 MPH, one minute of delay buys me a mile of space. I can
> spare
> > that minute.
> > >
>
> Your patience serves you well.

I've seen too many accidents where it could have been me.
>
> > >> I haven't encountered that yet. Must be a Texas thing...
> > >
> > >Wow. Really?
> >
> > Honest. Stores here mostly have express lanes (10 items or less) - some
> > have
> > two or even three levels of express (8 items or less, 15 items or less,
> > etc.).
> > And they enforce the item count.
>
> OH...well, they have those here, too. WHEN they are open...<grin>
>
They're always open when a store is busy here. They don't want
customers waiting. The managers know that if the Acme (pronounced
"Ack-ah-me") gets a rep for lines, folks will go to Genuardi's. Etc.

> > >> >Used to do that, too. No more. It's my turn dammit and they can
> wait.
> > >> >Now, don't get me wrong: if I happen to turn to one side or the other
> and
> > >> >I
> > >> >notice someone patiently waiting their turn, I let them go ahead. But
> > >> >these
> > >> >creeps who think that they are entitled to getting around just because
> th
> > >> >ey
> > >> >are far more important than anyone else...nope, not doin' it any more.
> > >> >And,
> > >> >depending upon how showy they are about how important they are is how
> > >> >slow I
> > >> >am to slowly unload my cart, slowly find my checkbook, confirm the
> price
> > >> >however many times it needs confirming, very carefully write my check,
> > >> >etc.
> > >
> > Passive aggressive behavior, IOW.
> > >
>
> Yep, 'zackly.

Well, there you have it.
>

> > >And, while my behavior is not "forgiveable," I am no where
> > >as nasty as these folks are being.
> > >
> > Isn't that an entirely subjective judgement?
> >
> Yep. And it's mine...(grin)
>
HAW!

I do believe some of all this is regional, however.

And I've done a few tricks myself....

Way back in the late '80s, I had reason to go back and forth between Philly and Washington, DC about every other weekend. I noticed that the aggressiveness of drivers increased in direct proportion to proximity to the nation's capital.

The worst part of the run was the BWP (Baltimore Washington Parkway), a no-trucks 4 lane road with trees on both sides, and also between the northbound and southbound lanes. Lots of traffic on a Friday night, and as one approached The District the cars got more expensive and the drivers more aggressive.

Back then the limit was 55 and traffic tended to stay below about 59 because enforcement was pretty good, and there were lots of places for the troopers to hide in the trees, around curves, etc. The troopers would not go after anyone below about 62 because speedometers and radar are not 100% accurate. Above that they were ruthless, and above 65 the fines went up and up and up...

I got to know their whereabouts pretty good by observing where others got tickets. (I was *never* stopped, in part because my 1980 Rabbit Diesel looked like it couldn't even go the speed limit anyway). Radar detectors were illegal in MD back then, too, and they'd do things like set up a radar gun on an overpass and watch whose brake lights came on for no reason....

One night I'm sailing down the BWP in the *right* lane, and up behind me comes a new Saab (Saabs were the hot car back then among the yuppie-but-no-Beemer crowd). Dude flashes his brights at me - he wants *me* to get in the *left* lane so he can pass without having to change lanes!

So I ease up on the throttle and slow down to 53...52....51....

He gets ticked and crawls up but now I'm down to 50...49...

Flashes the brights, gets ticked, and I keep easing up....

Finally he gets ticked and goes into the left lane. Whereupon I start speeding up again...52...55...58...62...

He pulls alongside and now is really steamed because it is taking far more effort to get past me than he expected. So he drops down a gear and stomps it and goes off in a cloud of dust, over the next rise and around the curve.....

and I bring it back down to the limit...

and I wave as I go by him, because he's now stopped by a trooper for going WAY over the limit.....

I wouldn't play games like that today, though...

73 de Jim, N2EY

3557. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-30 17:23:39 UTC
From: Alun <alun@1stcounsel.com>
Message-ID: <Xns94437E0B940DDelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 83133

"Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in
news:iAlyb.28717$iU5.7375071@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net:

>
> "Alun" <alun@1stcounsel.com> wrote in message
> news:Xns944288614CAD1elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
>> What is annoying is that a skill test is foisted on those who don't
>> have the desire to use the skill.
>
> Alan, I'm gonna let you in on a secret...although I know that you're
> already aware of it. Preparing for and passing the 5-wpm Elemnt 1 test
> does NOT leave one ready to use the skill OTA. It only gives one a
> taste so that one may make an educated choice as to whether or not they
> wish to persue CW any further.
>

5 wpm is certainly too slow to prove much, but it only still exists at
that level as a residual requirement to meet the old s25.5, which has
since been changed so that no code test is required atall. If the FCC
truly thought that a CW test was necessary, the speed would be higher.

> The majority of newbies I've worked sent at approx. 8 to 10-wpm.
> (That's right, just below the plateau.) We seem to gravitate to one
> another. Ok, the Novice/Tech"+" sub-bands help bring us together. My
> point is that those who actually get OTA are putting in more effort
> than needed just to pass Element 1. Those who pass Element 1 and wish
> to go no further with CW have made a truly educated dicision because
> they now have a little "practical" experience with the mode under their
> belt on which to base their decision...and are not just simply talking
> from their @$$!
>
>> Learning the theory of modes you don't want
>> to use is not too onerous, but having to pass a typing test to use
>> phone would be just as annoying and stupid as having to pass a code
>> test to use phone, for example. Besides, having to know about other
>> modes is reasonable, but actually learning to use them is another
>> matter.
>
> As I mentioned in another post, the mode is really not the issue...the
> having to really learn it is. Do away with the published Q&A pools and
> watch the whining escalate.
>

Well, I think that the real issue is that it's a different kind of test.

>> Also, if
>> I hear CW on my frequency I may be able to read it with some
>> difficulty, but if I hear RTTY or PSK31 there is no chance.
>
> You may have just touched on a selling point for CW.
>
> 73 de Bert
> WA2SI
>
>
>

Whilst that is true, the point I was making is actually that since I can't read RTTY or PSK by ear, and they are legal modes, it doesn't help all that much that I can read CW (albeit not terribly well, since I never use it).

73 de Alun, N3KIP

3558. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-30 17:31:01 UTC
From: Alun <alun@1stcounsel.com>
Message-ID: <Xns94437F4AF796Belektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 83134

"Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote in
news:bqd5u1$j11@library2.airnews.net:

> "Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in message
> news:oPlyb.29000$iU5.7424460@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net...
>> "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
>> news:KU6yb.13197$P%1.11970231@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
>> >
>> > "Alun" <alun@1stcounsel.com> wrote in message
>> > news:Xns94428A3961C57elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
>> > > It just so happens that I don't
>> > > like CW, in the sense of I have no desire to use it. That should
>> > > be OK too, but for some reason it bothers you. Why?
>> >
>> > No it does not bother me that someone who has learned it chooses not
>> > to use it. They have made that decision from a position of
>> > knowledge and experience. This is radically different from a person
>> > judging it and saying they will never use it when they do not have
>> > that knowledge and experience to draw on.
>> >
>> > Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>>
>> Right on the money, Dee. Larry pointed this out earlier, but not as
>> eloquently as you.
>>
>> 73 de Bert
>> WA2SI
>>
>>
>
> It fascinates me that you won't accept someone's plain and simple truth
> that they don't like CW--even if they don't have experience with
> it--because you reason that they need to have "knowledge and
> experience" with it. Well, I know people who are quite well-versed in
> CW who don't like it, people who haven't ever even tried it and don't
> like it, and people who have taken and passed a 5wpm test and don't
> like it. I also know people from those same three categories that do
> like CW operation.
>
> It's pretty much as simple as folks who do or don't like most other
> things in life. Either ya like it or ya don't.
>
> Kim W5TIT
>

>
>

I think that you have hit upon a very important point there, Kim. A good analogy might be not liking an item of food that you haven't tried, because it looks disgusting on your plate. If you eat some you might like it, or not, but there are probably all kinds of other things that contain the same nutrition. These guys are like a parent telling a child that they have to eat their brocolli. But they aren't my parents and I don't like brocolli, or CW. I take vitamins, and work phone.

3559. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-30 17:34:32 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <ISpyb.13300$P%1.12148528@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 83135

"Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:bqd5u1$j11@library2.airnews.net...
> Well, I
> know people who are quite well-versed in CW who don't like it, people who
> haven't ever even tried it and don't like it, and people who have taken
and
> passed a 5wpm test and don't like it. I also know people from those same
> three categories that do like CW operation.

It is impossible to tell if you like CW if you've never tried. Reading the
ingredients on a recipe will not tell you how it tastes.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

3560. Re: Where Did THIS Come From...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-30 17:43:47 UTC
From: Alun <alun@1stcounsel.com>
Message-ID: <Xns9443817547386elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 83136

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in
news:YRbyb.26855$Rk5.25932@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net:

>
> "Alun" <alun@1stcounsel.com> wrote in message
> news:Xns944282A0D69C5elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
>> n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in news:20031129115807.23307.00004755@mb-
>> m29.aol.com:
>>
>> > In article <f45722ac.0311281934.2deeda0@posting.google.com>,
>> > brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
>> >
>> >>Blowhard libs have tried soooo hard to wreck this country.
>> >
>> > So have blowhard conservatives.
>> >
>> >>They've nearly succeeded,
>> >
>> > How is this country "wrecked", compared to how things used to be?
>> >
>> >>but there are still a few people who give a damn about America, and
>> >>GW is one of them.
>> >
>> > There are lots of others, including many who disagree with Mr. Bush.
>> >
>> > It's the methods, not the person.
>> >
>> >>
>> >
>> >
>> >
>>
>> Well, I'm a foreigner in your country, but you can't deny that the
>> economy boomed under Clinton and is now on it's knees.
>>
>> I'm not fond of the present government, but mainly for other reasons.
>> Civil liberties and John Ashcroft, mostly.
>>
>> All in all, I can't really think of anything GW Bush has done
>> domestically that is anything to shout about. Tax cuts for the rich.
>> Deficit spending. I'm really trying to think of anything good
>> (honestly), but nothing comes to mind.
>>
>> As for the war, why open that can of worms? Yes, Saddam is/was a very

>> bad guy. Do I beleive the reasons given for going to war? No. And yes,
>> Blair went along with it, but I don't like him a lot either.
>>
>> ... but then I'm an anti-code test liberal, so what did you expect?
>>
>> However, I actually do think it was a nice gesture for Dubbya to go to
>> Baghdad for Thanksgiving.
>>
>> I'm sure this post will draw the usual 'love it or leave it' garbage
>> from at least someone, but never mind. I can take it.
>
> The economy was taking a downturn BEFORE Clinton got out of office.
> The economic policy of the Clinton presidency was what ??? Right,
> there was none. He was riding on the coat tails of Reagan/Bush one.
>
> Has everyone forgotten about 9/11? We are at war. Or has that little
> detail been forgotten also?
>
> It was not our choice to have some ragheads plow three jets into
> buildings, and one into the ground and kill nearly 3000 innocents.
> Some of which were MUSLIM.
>
> But it is our choice how to respond. If you think Sadam didn't have
> anything to do with it. Let me sell you a bridge in NYC.
>
> Dan/W4NTI
>
>
>

Just because I think he had nothing to do with it doesn't mean I'm in the market to buy the Brooklyn Bridge. Quite the reverse, in fact. It's a bad mistake to automatically assume that two bad guys who happen to have nominally the same religion and live in roughly the same region are in league together. They had their own agendas. It's just too easy to lump all arabs together, but the middlle East is just more complicated than that.

3561. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-30 17:51:57 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <17qyb.13304$P%1.12151731@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 83137

"Alun" <alun@1stcounsel.com> wrote in message
news:Xns94437C0384F43elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
> "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in
> news:nFbyb.13229$P%1.12019509@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com:
>
> >> And yet you say code is "necessary"? As an unqualified blanket
> >> statement that is laughable.
> >
> > Nope it is not laughable. There are many necessary things in life that
> > people do not do. They choose for reasons of their own to omit them.
> > Annual physicals are a "necessary" item for people of middle age and
> > older but I know quite a few people who do not get them. Keeping one's
> > weight under control is "necessary" but there's a lot of us carrying
> > more weight than we should.
> >
> > Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
> >
> >
>
> So, let me get this straight, you are saying it's necessary for me to use
> CW, and comparing not doing it with failing to get a physical. I don't
> think that argument will hold water. The consequences of not using CW are
> what, exactly?

No I did not say it is necessary for you to use code only necessary for people to learn it before deciding its usefulness for them. If one doesn't know it, one can't make an enlightened decision. Thus it is a necessary part of amateur radio whether or not it is used by any particular individual.

The consequences of not using code are simple and that is having to cease HF communications earlier than those who do use code when propagation falls off. Regardless of the relative magnitude of this consequence it is nevertheless a consequence.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

3562. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-30 18:12:47 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <zqqyb.5621$zL1.695070@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 83138

Alun wrote:

> Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in
> news:licyb.4748$zL1.485665@news1.news.adelphia.net:
>
>
>>N2EY wrote:
>>
>>
>>>In article <3c2yb.4513$zL1.340545@news1.news.adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo
>>><mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>>Kï¿½HB wrote:
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>On the contrary, my plan puts newcomers dead center in the mainstream
>>>>>of amateur radio, with all the same privileges of EVERY other
>>>>>licensee, just
>>>>
>>>>at
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>a more modest power level of 50watts.
>>>>
>>>> How are you going to enforce that?
>>>
>>>
>>>Same way all the other power limits are enforced.
>>
>> I imagine you're being a bit glib about that. If a ham is running
>> way
>>too much power at the KW end of the scale, there will be possibilities
>>of TVI or RFI. There will be a local discernable problem with other
>>hams too.
>>
>>But the difference between 50 and 100 watts? Not all that much that is
>>detectable. For this plan to work, (work means compliance) the
>>equipment manufacturers will have to throttle their transcievers to 50
>>watts.
>>

>> - Mike KB3EIA -
>>
>>
>
>
> It would be a better plan to make the limit 100W, i.e. base it on the
> equipment, not vicea versa.

BINGO! All plans have to incorporate some history and what is going on at the moment. If a new ARS was to be made from nothing starting right now, there would be no problem whatsoever dictating that the maximum power for the so called class B license is to be 50 watts, or 48.7654 watts for that matter. But for years now, the standard max power for most HF rigs has been 100 watts.

- Mike KB3EIA -

3563. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-30 18:32:43 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031130133243.25517.00002504@mb-m15.aol.com>
Source record: 83142

In article <Xns94437C0384F43elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun
<alun@1stcounsel.com> writes:

>"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in
>news:nFbyb.13229$P%1.12019509@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com:
>
>>
>> "Alun" <alun@1stcounsel.com> wrote in message
>> news:Xns9442BD7B8FD06elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
>>> "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in
>>> news:KU6yb.13197$P%1.11970231@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com:
>>>
>>> >
>>> > "Alun" <alun@1stcounsel.com> wrote in message
>>> > news:Xns94428A3961C57elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
>>> >> "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in
>>> >> news:yC4yb.13160$P%1.11941003@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com:
>>> >>
>>> >> >
>>> >> > "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote in message
>>> >> > news:bqaecq$ea0@library1.airnews.net...
>>> >> >> I personally don't have the desire to "take advantage of" CW. I
>>> >> >> haven't been interested in CW since I was first introduced to it
>>> >> >> and found it nothing more than a necessary evil--a means to an
>>> >> >> end--to licensing in amateur radio. I also found it uniquely
>>> >> >> lacking in any pertinent application to the process of amateur
>>> >> >> radio, overall.
>>> >> >
>>> >> > I believe you have previously stated that once you tried HF, you
>>> >> > did not care for it and have since stayed primarily with VHF FM.
>>> >> > There's nothing wrong with that. However, those who work a lot
>>> >> > of HF are really shortchanging themselves if they are unable to
>>> >> > use CW.
>>> >> >
>>> >> > Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>>> >>
>>> >> I work a lot of HF, relatively speaking, and I have considered
>>> >> wiring up a key from time to time, but decided against it.
>>> >> Shortchanging myself? I don't think so. I'm happy to stay on phone.
>>> >> Now, I have met people who don't like phone, and I'm fine with
>>> >> that. It just so happens that I don't like CW, in the sense of I
>>> >> have no desire to use it. That should be OK too, but for some
>>> >> reason it bothers you. Why?
>>> >

>>> > No it does not bother me that someone who has learned it chooses not
>>> > to use it. They have made that decision from a position of
>>> > knowledge and experience. This is radically different from a person
>>> > judging it and saying they will never use it when they do not have
>>> > that knowledge and experience to draw on.
>>> >
>>> > Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>>>
>>> And yet you say code is "necessary"? As an unqualified blanket
>>> statement that is laughable.
>>
>> Nope it is not laughable. There are many necessary things in life that
>> people do not do. They choose for reasons of their own to omit them.
>> Annual physicals are a "necessary" item for people of middle age and
>> older but I know quite a few people who do not get them. Keeping one's
>> weight under control is "necessary" but there's a lot of us carrying
>> more weight than we should.
>>
>> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>
>So, let me get this straight, you are saying it's necessary for me to use
>CW, and comparing not doing it with failing to get a physical. I don't
>think that argument will hold water. The consequences of not using CW are
>what, exactly?

It is unhealthy for Dee's state of mind not to love CW. :-)

LHA

3564. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-30 18:32:46 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031130133246.25517.00002505@mb-m15.aol.com>
Source record: 83141

In article <c2356669.0311300851.387ccd04@posting.google.com>, N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) writes:

>"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message >news:<iZkyb.31498$Wy4.14099@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
>> "N2EY" wrote:
>> > "Dwight Stewart" writes:
>> > >
>> > > Considering the power levels, the number
>> > > of frequencies and bands, the overall
>> > > safety considerations, (snip)
>> >
>> > You're avoiding my question, Dwight.
>>
>> No, you just don't like the answer given.
>
>Would you accept "it's obvious" as an answer to "why a code test"?

Nobody would accept "it's obvious." :-)

>Didn't think so.
>
>> If anything, I'm ignoring a
>> fanciful, long-winded, exchange that cannot add anything of real substance
>> to the discussion about Morse code testing (see below).

Your methods of misdirection are doing quite well. You can make up all kinds of fanciful, long-winded exchanges about OTHER alleged improprieties...and that directs folks attention away from the "necessity" of a code test.

That was your whole purpose anyway (visible to all who can read).

>> > > Since you keep asking this, do you
>> > > have a point to make, Jim?
>> >
>> > Yes.
>> >
>> > The point is that some folks apply a double
>> > standard when deciding which tests to keep
>> > and which to get rid of.
>>
>>
>> The only double standard that exists is not having the same testing for
>> all operating modes.
>> Unless there is a justification to do otherwise, either

>> have skill testing for all modes or no skill testing for any mode.
>
>I disagree. Would you have skill testing for modes that few hams use,
>like EME or TV, on an equal par with those that are widely used, like
>voice and Morse?

This is NOT about "skill testing for modes that few hams use."

This is about the CODE TEST.

>> There is
>> no longer any justification today for a unique test solely for Morse code.
>
>I disagree. YMMV.
>
>In the end, it's simply an opinion question.

No, it's about CONTROL. It's about keeping the SAME standards
(forever) that YOU had to meet...even when those standards won't
apply to you or your privileges.

Where is all the morse code use in all the public safety agencies
and distress-emergency communications means elsewhere in the
larger world of radio? GONE. Only some radio amateurs use it.

You will argue that other radio isn't the "same" as amateur radio.
The only bolster for that argument is your previous rationalizations
which are a disguise for requiring all in the future to do just as you
did in the past. That's the "control" part. That's keeping the OLD
standards because, if the old standards are reduced or gone, you
don't have any claim of "superiority" over others in amateur radio.

>> That opinion is consistent with recent FCC published statements.
>
>Does that mean FCC is always right?
>
>Was FCC right when they required 20 wpm for full privs and no waivers?

No. It only means that, LONG AGO, the FCC gave into ARRL
demands, lobbying, and pressure. Way back, before Internet, the
ARRL was a mighty influence in DC. No longer.

>> As such,
>> the unique Morse code test should be eliminated.
>
>And perhaps it will be - someday.

Amateur radio is the last hurrah for morse code.

The Archaic Radiotelegraphy Society (ARS) will be no more than
a memory...and countless articles of "the old days" in amateur
magazines when the editors of same can't publish technical
articles about "advancing the state of the amateur radio art."

>> Not willing to accept that, you ignore the obvious double standard and
>> instead try conjure up an imaginary double standard relating to the written
>> tests.
>
>Nope.
>
>I simply point out that the same arguments used against the code test
>can be used against most of the written tests.

Your "pointing" only points to subjects NOT under discussion and
you refuse to "point" to the subject.

>But most people support the written tests as they are for opinion
>reasons, nothing more.

Then make your "point" to the VEC QPC. They are the ones who
make up the written questions. They also generate the code test
source.

The "14 petitions" are almost exclusively about the CODE TEST.

>> No such double standard exists. Those written tests, and their
>> contents, serve a valid purpose today.
>
>What valid purpose do the General and Extra written tests serve? Why
>is *all* of their content necessary to operate HF beyond the small
>sample of privileges granted to Novices and Tech Pluses?

Your "pointing vector" is not in the same direction as it should be.

Try to stay focussed on the CODE TEST.

>> None here, including you, have said
>> otherwise.
>
>I've simply used the same arguments against them as are used against
>the code test.

You have misdirected mightily.

>> The same cannot be said about the Morse code test.
>>
>Sure it can. I've done it.

You've done everything. :-)

>> With all that in mind, I have no desire to engage in a fanciful discussion
>> about the contents of the written tests, especially when that discussion
>> cannot possibly lead to a valid point - no conflict or double standard
>> exists concerning the written tests. As such, I've ignored the rest of your
>> message and have instead addressed the specific point you've acknowledged
>> trying to make.
>
>You choose to ignore it because you don't have a definitive
>counterargument. You cannot prove that most of the content of the

>writtens, particularly the General and Extra writtens, are
>*necessary*.

Tsk, tsk, you are still misdirecting.

The subject is the CODE TEST and the 14 petitions.

You want to argue written questions because you have NO
counter argument to keep the CODE TEST...in this millennium.

>IOW, you know that if the same criteria of "is it necessary?" were
>applied to most of the written questions, the answer would be the same
>as you get for the code test.

Your misdirection is getting absurd. This isn't about the written
questions. It is about the CODE TEST.

Hello? Earth to Jimmie, come in, spaceman spoof...find any aliens
ready to invade earth that can be destroyed through using morse
code for communications? :-)

If you are so all-fired concerned about the writtens, why don't you
contact the VEC QPC? Or file a petition with the FCC on the
amateur writtens. FCC will accept lots of things. They did with the
14 PETITIONS now closed for comment.

LHA

3565. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-30 18:32:47 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031130133247.25517.00002506@mb-m15.aol.com>
Source record: 83139

In article <ETmyb.4961$zL1.638884@news1.news.adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo
<mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:

>Kï¿½HB wrote:
>> "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote
>>
>>
>>>And how are we going to take care of the "shack on a belt" crowd. A
>>>awful lot of hams are quite happy with their Technician licenses.
>>
>>
>> And under my plan they are free to keep their Technician license.
>
> And new people that intend to operate in this fashiion will have a very

>different set up.
>
>>>A forced upgrade with absolutely no advantage for a person
>>>that only does public events, and uses the local repeater once
>>>in a while is not going to be very popular with them.
>>
>>
>> I don't propose to force them to upgrade. Technicians are perfectly free
>to
>> renew their current license.
>
> So you are saying that present licenses will continue with the ten year

>operating cycle? This is beginning to look like there will be 5 classes
>of license in the end.
>
>
>>
>>>And of course, how ya gonna enforce that 50 watt limit? Enacting
>>>unenforceable laws is a great way to breed disrespect for laws.
>>
>>
>> There are currently many examples of limited power in the rules. How do we
>> enforce the current 50W limit which exists for EVERYONE on some HF
>> frequencies? How do we enforce the current 200W limit in the Novice
>> sub-bands? How did we enforce the old 75W limit for Novices? How did we
>> enforce the old 50W limits on 160 meters? How do we enforce the current
>> 200W limit on 30 meters? How do we enforce the 50W PEP limit on
>219-220MHz?
>> How do we enforce the current Novice 5W limit on 23 cm? How do we enforce

>> the current 25W limit for Novices on 1.25 cm? As a matter of fact, how do
>> we enforce the current 1.5KW limit? Are you suggesting that FCC discard
>> all these limits because they breed disrespect? What a 'novel' idea!!!!
>(I
>> quit using the word 'stupid'.)
>
> Just because an idea is bad, doesn't mean it isn't repeated, eh? BTW,
>you forgot ro add the ERP power limit on 60 meters. Rolling back the
>output power to 50 watts when most HF transcievers will do 100 watts is
>simply not going to work (if you want it to work that is)
>
> Perhaps it is just as easy to detect someone running at 100 watts as it

>is at 3kilowatts?
>
> But okay, perhaps you have the evidence of all the Technicians that
>have been injured by using 100 watts of RF power? What is the basis for
>50 watts? Is it safety? Or is it arbitrary?

It is all about injury to Hans' pride that all don't rush over and
celebrate his Grande Plan. :-)

LHA

3566. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-30 18:32:48 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031130133248.25517.00002507@mb-m15.aol.com>
Source record: 83140

In article <4Llyb.31533$Wy4.7606@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> writes:

>"Dee D. Flint" wrote:
>>
>> (snip) Again keep in mind that I have said
>> Morse is necessary. While I happen to
>> believe that testing should be maintained that
>> is NOT the point I am debating at this time
>> and you keep trying to drag it back to testing.
>> I am stating that Morse code itself is necessary.
>
>
> We wouldn't be having this discussion if it were not for the code testing
>debate, Dee. That is why this mode is being discussed as opposed to some
>other mode or discussions about the weather. I've acknowledged that Morse
>code is enjoyable, entertaining, useful, and perhaps even necessary for you
>to make some of the contacts you want to make. But we're not just talking
>about you or the contacts you want to make. Your communications are
>recreational or avocational in nature, not a necessity. And, as long as your
>communications are not necessary, your use of Morse code in those
>communications is not necessary.

Dwight, amateur radio is a SERVICE...to the nation in times of need
and "everyone knows" that ONLY morse code can get through when
nothing else can, ergo it is "necessary" to have it. That's why all the
other public safety and distress-emergency communications users and
providers still use morse code.

> This brings us back to the code testing debate. If Morse code is not
>necessary to meet the goals and purposes of the Amateur Radio Service today,
>Morse code testing should be eliminated. The _use_ of Morse code not an
>issue here. You will still be able to use that mode when you find it
>necessary to make the contacts you want. Others will still be able to learn
>code if they want. But the test itself, as a license requirement, should
>end.

The TEST and the USE cannot be separated, Dwight. It is "necessary"
to keep the test forever and ever so that there will be this "pool of
trained operators (in CW)" to help earth survive on the next invasion
of spacefaring aliens.

:-)

LHA

3567. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-30 18:58:05 UTC
From: Bert Craig <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM>
Message-ID: <15ryb.33166$iU5.8797254@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>
Source record: 83143

"Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:bqd5u1$j11@library2.airnews.net...
> "Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in message
> news:oPlyb.29000$iU5.7424460@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net...
> > "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
> > news:KU6yb.13197$P%1.11970231@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
> > >
> > > "Alun" <alun@1stcounsel.com> wrote in message
> > > news:Xns94428A3961C57elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
> > > > It just so happens that I don't
> > > > like CW, in the sense of I have no desire to use it. That should be
OK
> > > > too, but for some reason it bothers you. Why?
> > > >
> > > No it does not bother me that someone who has learned it chooses not
to
> > use
> > > it. They have made that decision from a position of knowledge and
> > > experience. This is radically different from a person judging it and
> > saying
> > > they will never use it when they do not have that knowledge and
> experience
> > > to draw on.
> > > >
> > > Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
> > >
> > Right on the money, Dee. Larry pointed this out earlier, but not as
> > eloquently as you.
> >
> > 73 de Bert
> > WA2SI
> >
> >
>
> It fascinates me that you won't accept someone's plain and simple truth
that
> they don't like CW--even if they don't have experience with it--because
you
> reason that they need to have "knowledge and experience" with it.

I don't know what's so fascinating about it, Kim. It stands to reason that
to make an "educated" decision regarding anything, one should be...well,
somewhat educated on the subject. That includes some practical experience.
One certainly need not be an expert, and appropriately, the 5-wpm Element 1

test is not an expert level test.

> Well, I
> know people who are quite well-versed in CW who don't like it,

Educated decision.

> people who
> haven't ever even tried it and don't like it,

That's why we have the no-code Techician license.

> and people who have taken and
> passed a 5wpm test and don't like it.

Again, an educated decision. What's the point?

> I also know people from those same
> three categories that do like CW operation.

I seem to have found them...on the bottom of 40. Interestingly enough, I've even heard interested folks who've yet to pass Element 1 practice their code (Legally) on CB ch. 14 using 100mW Part 15 devices.

> It's pretty much as simple as folks who do or don't like most other things
> in life. Either ya like it or ya don't.

...And that's certainly fine by me, Kim. However, many of these anti-code folks are about to diminish the value (As a whole.) of a hobby I dearly love...despite having a very generous chunk of no-code RF real estate.

I've had the advantage of seeing this whole code vs. no-code debacle unfold before me through the eyes of a relatively unbiased newbie. If you remove the passion and whining from both sides of the equation, it becomes very clear what the issue is really about...because it damn sure ain't that 5-wpm code exam.

> Kim W5TIT

73 de Bert
WA2SI

3568. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-30 19:19:30 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031130141930.02537.00001887@mb-m23.aol.com>
Source record: 83144

In article <17qyb.13304$P%1.12151731@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> writes:

>"Alun" <alun@1stcounsel.com> wrote in message
>news:Xns94437C0384F43elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
>> "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in
>> news:nFbyb.13229$P%1.12019509@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com:
>>
>> >> And yet you say code is "necessary"? As an unqualified blanket
>> >> statement that is laughable.
>> >
>> > Nope it is not laughable. There are many necessary things in life that
>> > people do not do. They choose for reasons of their own to omit them.
>> > Annual physicals are a "necessary" item for people of middle age and
>> > older but I know quite a few people who do not get them. Keeping one's
>> > weight under control is "necessary" but there's a lot of us carrying
>> > more weight than we should.
>> >
>> > Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>>
>> So, let me get this straight, you are saying it's necessary for me to use
>> CW, and comparing not doing it with failing to get a physical. I don't
>> think that argument will hold water. The consequences of not using CW are
>> what, exactly?
>
>No I did not say it is necessary for you to use code only necessary for
>people to learn it before deciding its usefulness for them. If one doesn't
>know it, one can't make an enlightened decision. Thus it is a necessary
>part of amateur radio whether or not it is used by any particular
>individual.

Wow, a Morseodist Believer! Morse code is NECESSARY!!!!

Can anyone spell "Archaic Radiotelegraphy Society?" :-)

>The consequences of not using code are simple and that is having to cease HF
>communications earlier than those who do use code when propagation falls
>off. Regardless of the relative magnitude of this consequence it is
>nevertheless a consequence.

Really? You should have channeled the U.S. military and, in particular,
the Army Command and Administrative Network (ACAN) way back in
1943 or so when it was formed.

I had three years of direct experience on HF at ACAN's station ADA
back a half century ago. It did ALL its long-distance communications

(over 200 thousand messages a month) on HF, trans-Pacific. Only ONE time (late 1955) was there ever a total radio blackout for three hours...which disrupted everyone on HF radio in middle Pacific due to a solar storm. Otherwise ADA was on-the-air 24 hours a day, 7 days a week on HF. Not one circuit was "CW" or used morse code.

Maybe today's sunspots are ever so much "stronger" than they used to was? :-)

There's lots of ham bands on HF, Dee. You and anyone else are all free to use whatever band you want if your license privileges allow. "QSY" is the trick...or are you rock-bound on only one band?

beep, beep

LHA

3569. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-30 19:19:31 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031130141931.02537.00001888@mb-m23.aol.com>
Source record: 83145

In article <Xns94437F4AF796Belektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun
<alun@1stcounsel.com> writes:

>"Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote in
>news:bqd5u1$j11@library2.airnews.net:
>
>> "Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in message
>> news:oPlyb.29000$iU5.7424460@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net...
>>> "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
>>> news:KU6yb.13197$P%1.11970231@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
>>> >
>>> > "Alun" <alun@1stcounsel.com> wrote in message
>>> > news:Xns94428A3961C57elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
>>> > > It just so happens that I don't
>>> > > like CW, in the sense of I have no desire to use it. That should
>>> > > be OK too, but for some reason it bothers you. Why?
>>> >
>>> > No it does not bother me that someone who has learned it chooses not
>>> > to use it. They have made that decision from a position of
>>> > knowledge and experience. This is radically different from a person
>>> > judging it and saying they will never use it when they do not have
>>> > that knowledge and experience to draw on.
>>> >
>>> > Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>>>
>>> Right on the money, Dee. Larry pointed this out earlier, but not as
>>> eloquently as you.
>>>
>>> 73 de Bert
>>> WA2SI
>>
>> It fascinates me that you won't accept someone's plain and simple truth
>> that they don't like CW--even if they don't have experience with
>> it--because you reason that they need to have "knowledge and
>> experience" with it. Well, I know people who are quite well-versed in
>> CW who don't like it, people who haven't ever even tried it and don't
>> like it, and people who have taken and passed a 5wpm test and don't
>> like it. I also know people from those same three categories that do
>> like CW operation.
>>
>> It's pretty much as simple as folks who do or don't like most other
>> things in life. Either ya like it or ya don't.
>>
>> Kim W5TIT

>
>I think that you have hit upon a very important point there, Kim. A good
>analogy might be not liking an item of food that you haven't tried,
>because it looks disgusting on your plate. If you eat some you might like
>it, or not, but there are probably all kinds of other things that contain
>the same nutrition. These guys are like a parent telling a child that they
>have to eat their brocolli. But they aren't my parents and I don't like
>brocolli, or CW. I take vitamins, and work phone.

Excellent analogy, Kim and Alun!

[...shades of "Mommie Dearest" I used some months ago... :-)]

Morse code is 159 years old. It was first used in COMMERCIAL
messaging back in 1844. It has quite a lot of history of use to base
an effectiveness of communications. That base and history is why
morse code is only used in amateur radio today. All the commercial
and military users have dropped morse code use in the rest of the
radio world. Morse just isn't as effective as its believers think.

Dee insists that "enlightened" folks "have to experience something"
before stating an opinion on it.

Okay, so all the obstetricians have to be female and parents before
being allowed to supervise birthing? All gynecologists have to be
female in order to treat women patients? Same logic.

Catholic priests will have to have been married at one time in order to
advise engaged couples about to marry. Military people will have to
go out and engage in combat, killing someone FIRST before they can
state an "enlightened" opinion on war. Absolutely NO ONE can voice
any "enlightened" opinion on politics, foreign policy, economics, or
homosexuality unless they have DONE any of those things... :-)

Absolutely nothing NEW can be done because no one has any
experience in doing it. The ONLY way to stay "enlightened" is to
remain in status quo forever. :-)

Was Thomas Edison "enlightened?" :-)

Some of these pro-coders are a little too enlighted in the head.

LHA

3570. Re: Since We Were Mentioning "Absurdity"...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-30 19:24:53 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0311301124.2743b66f@posting.google.com>
Source record: 83146

Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:<nncyb.4749$zL1.486842@news1.news.adelphia.net>...
> Mike Walton wrote:
>
> > Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:<492yb.4512$zL1.339481@news1.news.adelphia.net>...

> >>> We'd be better off letting Michael Jackson be their sand lot
> >>>supervisor! ! !
> >
> > Stop picking on the King odf Pop, it's not fair:
> >
> > http://www.geocities.com/tom5515/frame.htm
> >
> > Actually, it's kinfd of outrageous, wasn't Hugh Hefner a target of
> > Nixon's Justice Department in the 1970's --i think this is equally
> > political.
>
>
> DUDE! I didn't write one thing that you qouted! Gotta get your
> attributes correct....

Correct-a-mundo..I did!

I was a big MJ fan until he started the plastic/whitewash crap.
A "nose job" or tummy tuck notwithstanding, you expect that from
Hollywierd...But I absolutely can't stand to look at him anymore.
He's nauseating.

Also, he's where others have "evolved" in thier art, he's not put
out one decent thing in 10 years. Too bad. He cudda been a
contender.

As for being a "justice department" target, the charges came from
private individuals...>>IF<< he's a target of anything (assuming for a
second he really is innocent) he's the target of golddiggers and
charaltans. Otherwise I think he's probably getting what he deserves.

73

Steve, K4YZ

3571. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-30 19:31:24 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <gAryb.28451$Rk5.179@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 83147

"Alun" <alun@1stcounsel.com> wrote

> It would be a better plan to make the limit 100W, i.e. base it on the
> equipment, not vicea versa.

That's a 'novel' idea! In that case the power limit should be 2.5KW,
because that's how much output my homebrew linear will produce if I supply
enough drive. If I build an even bigger linear, will FCC raise my power
limit? (Or will they expect me to obey the regulations?)

And we should make the speed limits in my town 140MPH, because that's how
fast my supercharged Ssei will run. (Try that one in front of the judge!)

Sunuvagun!

73, de Hans, K0HB

3572. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-30 19:51:26 UTC
From: Bert Craig <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM>
Message-ID: <2Tryb.904$vq1.96953@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>
Source record: 83148

"Alun" <alun@1stcounsel.com> wrote in message
news:Xns94437E0B940DDelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
> "Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in
> news:iAlyb.28717$iU5.7375071@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net:
>
> >
> > "Alun" <alun@1stcounsel.com> wrote in message
> > news:Xns944288614CAD1elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
> >> What is annoying is that a skill test is foisted on those who don't
> >> have the desire to use the skill.
> >
> > Alan, I'm gonna let you in on a secret...although I know that you're
> > already aware of it. Preparing for and passing the 5-wpm Elemnt 1 test
> > does NOT leave one ready to use the skill OTA. It only gives one a
> > taste so that one may make an educated choice as to whether or not they
> > wish to persue CW any further.
> >
>
> 5 wpm is certainly too slow to prove much, but it only still exists at
> that level as a residual requirement to meet the old s25.5, which has
> since been changed so that no code test is required atall. If the FCC
> truly thought that a CW test was necessary, the speed would be higher.

Agreed, I was pointing out a very beneficial secondary benefit. It
"requires" one to place themselves in a position from which to make an
educated decision.

> > As I mentioned in another post, the mode is really not the issue...the
> > having to really learn it is. Do away with the published Q&A pools and
> > watch the whining escalate.
>
> Well, I think that the real issue is that it's a different kind of test.

Exactly.

> >> Also, if
> >> I hear CW on my frequency I may be able to read it with some
> >> difficulty, but if I hear RTTY or PSK31 there is no chance.
> >
> > You may have just touched on a selling point for CW.
> >
> > 73 de Bert
> > WA2SI
>
> Whilst that is true, the point I was making is actually that since I can't

> read RTTY or PSK by ear, and they are legal modes, it doesn't help all
> that much that I can read CW (albeit not terribly well, since I never use
> it).
>
> 73 de Alun, N3KIP

I understand the point you were making. If I could just ask you why you bothered to take the code test(s)?

73 de Bert
WA2SI

3573. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-30 19:55:47 UTC
From: Bert Craig <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM>
Message-ID: <7Xryb.972$vq1.109343@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>
Source record: 83149

"Alun" <alun@1stcounsel.com> wrote in message
news:Xns94437F4AF796Belektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
> "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote in
> news:bqd5u1$j11@library2.airnews.net:
>
> > "Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in message
> > news:oPlyb.29000$iU5.7424460@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net...
> >> "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
> >> news:KU6yb.13197$P%1.11970231@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
> >> >
> >> > "Alun" <alun@1stcounsel.com> wrote in message
> >> > news:Xns94428A3961C57elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
> >> > > It just so happens that I don't
> >> > > like CW, in the sense of I have no desire to use it. That should
> >> > > be OK too, but for some reason it bothers you. Why?
> >> >
> >> > No it does not bother me that someone who has learned it chooses not
> >> > to use it. They have made that decision from a position of
> >> > knowledge and experience. This is radically different from a person
> >> > judging it and saying they will never use it when they do not have
> >> > that knowledge and experience to draw on.
> >> >
> >> > Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
> >>
> >> Right on the money, Dee. Larry pointed this out earlier, but not as
> >> eloquently as you.
> >>
> >> 73 de Bert
> >> WA2SI
> >>
> >>
> > >
> > > It fascinates me that you won't accept someone's plain and simple truth
> > > that they don't like CW--even if they don't have experience with
> > > it--because you reason that they need to have "knowledge and
> > > experience" with it. Well, I know people who are quite well-versed in
> > > CW who don't like it, people who haven't ever even tried it and don't
> > > like it, and people who have taken and passed a 5wpm test and don't
> > > like it. I also know people from those same three categories that do
> > > like CW operation.
> > >
> > > It's pretty much as simple as folks who do or don't like most other
> > > things in life. Either ya like it or ya don't.
> > >

> > Kim W5TIT
> >
> >
> >
>
> I think that you have hit upon a very important point there, Kim. A good
> analogy might be not liking an item of food that you haven't tried,
> because it looks disgusting on your plate. If you eat some you might like
> it, or not, but there are probably all kinds of other things that contain
> the same nutrition. These guys are like a parent telling a child that they
> have to eat their brocolli. But they aren't my parents and I don't like
> brocolli, or CW. I take vitamins, and work phone.

Slight difference, Alun. Nobody's forcing anybody to learn code. There exists a no-code Technician license for those who do not wish to have to pass the 5-wpm code exam.

73 de Bert
WA2SI

3574. Re: Where Did THIS Come From...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-30 19:58:11 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031130145811.02537.00001889@mb-m23.aol.com>
Source record: 83150

In article <bAbyb.26833$Rk5.11994@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>,
"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> writes:

>If he is such an 'idiot' and McCain is so smart...then how come the 'idiot'
>is the President?
>
>Oh, I know. The Republicans stole the election, right?
>
Nope.

The person you have to thank or blame is Ralph Nader. By splitting the support for Gore, he managed to put Dubya in the Oval Office.

Talk about irony - the author of "Unsafe At Any Speed" managed to put a Texas oil man in the White House.

Exit polls across the nation during the 2000 election showed that the following response when asked what they would have done if Nader had not run, or had quit:

About 1/4 said they'd vote for Bush
About 1/4 said they'd stay home, vote for another 3rd part candidate, etc.
About 1/2 said they'd vote for Gore.

Ralph got about 3 million votes across the country, so if 750,000 had gone for Bush and 1.5 million for Gore, it would have been a very different election. State-by-state analysis shows that several close states - particularly Florida - would have been solid for Gore.

The situation was similar to what Perot did, only this time the Republicans were the beneficiaries.

Thanks, Ralph

73 de Jim, N2EY

3575. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-30 20:07:21 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031130150721.11022.00002361@mb-m14.aol.com>
Source record: 83251

In article <15ryb.33166$iU5.8797254@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>, "Bert Craig"
<wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> writes:

>"Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote in message
>news:bqd5u1$j11@library2.airnews.net...
>> "Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in message
>> news:oPlyb.29000$iU5.7424460@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net...
>> > "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
>> > news:KU6yb.13197$P%1.11970231@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
>> > >
>> > > "Alun" <alun@1stcounsel.com> wrote in message
>> > > news:Xns94428A3961C57elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
>> > > > It just so happens that I don't
>> > > > like CW, in the sense of I have no desire to use it. That should be
>OK
>> > > > too, but for some reason it bothers you. Why?
>> > > >
>> > > No it does not bother me that someone who has learned it chooses not to
>> > use
>> > > it. They have made that decision from a position of knowledge and
>> > > experience. This is radically different from a person judging it and
>> > saying
>> > > they will never use it when they do not have that knowledge and
>> experience
>> > > to draw on.
>> > >
>> > > Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>> >
>> > Right on the money, Dee. Larry pointed this out earlier, but not as
>> > eloquently as you.
>> >
>> > 73 de Bert
>> > WA2SI
>>
>> It fascinates me that you won't accept someone's plain and simple truth that
>> they don't like CW--even if they don't have experience with it--because you
>> reason that they need to have "knowledge and experience" with it.
>
>I don't know what's so fascinating about it, Kim. It stands to reason that
>to make an "educated" decision regarding anything, one should be...well,
>somewhat educated on the subject. That includes some practical experience.
>One certainly need not be an expert, and appropriately, the 5-wpm Element 1
>test is not an expert level test.
>

>> Well, I
>> know people who are quite well-versed in CW who don't like it,
>
>Educated decision.
>
>> people who
>> haven't ever even tried it and don't like it,
>
>That's why we have the no-code Techician license.
>
>> and people who have taken and
>> passed a 5wpm test and don't like it.
>
>Again, an educated decision. What's the point?
>
>> I also know people from those same
>> three categories that do like CW operation.
>
>I seem to have found them...on the bottom of 40. Interestingly enough, I've
>even heard interested folks who've yet to pass Element 1 practice their code
>(Legally) on CB ch. 14 using 100mW Part 15 devices.
>
>> It's pretty much as simple as folks who do or don't like most other things
>> in life. Either ya like it or ya don't.
>
>...And that's certainly fine by me, Kim. However, many of these anti-code
>folks are about to diminish the value (As a whole.) of a hobby I dearly
>love...despite having a very generous chunk of no-code RF real estate.

"Love?"

If you are looking for love, such is hard to find in debate about
law matters.

If you love, cherish, honor, and obey morse code, then you should
be content with that inner love. You have found your avocational
soul-mate.

>I've had the advantage of seeing this whole code vs. no-code debacle unfold
>before me through the eyes of a relatively unbiased newbie. If you remove
>the passion and whining from both sides of the equation, it becomes very
>clear what the issue is really about...because it damn sure ain't that 5-wpm
>code exam.

Sorry, Bert, but the 14 PETITIONS is almost entirely concerned with
morse code and morse code testing.

As to "real estate" in regards to the EM spectrum, I can safely say
that I've probably seen a lot more of it than you have...and operated
there. Hardly anyone else in the radio world is using morse code
modes that are 159 years old. From VLF on up to Ku-band, I've never
ever needed or had to use any morse code for radio transmission for

over a half century.

I might agree in part with what you say. Those who dearly love the old, the comfortable no-change-whatsoever status quo, will HATE removal of the code test. Such (to them) would be an abomination of the soul, heresy, defamation of the almighty, etc. Righteousness isn't "love," it is just rationalized control over others.

The morse code test hasn't left amateur radio license exams in 91 years. Devout morseodists demand a continuing "love" for a mode which started fading back before they were born. Such equate amateur radio and morse code with an inflexible bond...and such a bond is not physical but a mental glue that needs a solvent for softening for all those of the future.

Feel free to continue pejoratives against the no-coders, Egbert. Your "love" keeps you strong. Amateur radio as-it-is is YOURS and belongs to YOU, no one else...unless they believe as you do.

Morse: Love it or leave it.

LHA

>
>> Kim W5TIT
>
>73 de Bert
>WA2SI

3576. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-30 20:16:28 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031130151628.21457.00002433@mb-m10.aol.com>
Source record: 83252

In article <7Xryb.972$vq1.109343@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>, "Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> writes:

>Slight difference, Alun. Nobody's forcing anybody to learn code. There >exists a no-code Technician license for those who do not wish to have to >pass the 5-wpm code exam.

Slight difference, Egbert. Nobody's forcing you to ride in the front of the bus. Get back in the back, all you heretic infidels who don't love morse!

You have any more "enlightened" reasoning to offer?

LHA

3577. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-30 20:16:28 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031130151628.21457.00002434@mb-m10.aol.com>
Source record: 83253

In article <gAryb.28451$Rk5.179@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> writes:

>And we should make the speed limits in my town 140MPH, because that's how >fast my supercharged Ssei will run.

Your speed is too slow for Daytona. Get more supercharging..

LHA

3578. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-30 20:32:46 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <Otsyb.28532$Rk5.28460@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 83254

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote'

> But for years now, the standard max power for
> most HF rigs has been 100 watts.

In Japan, where there is a 10W power limit on one class of HF operators, there is a plethora of 10W rigs available, most exactly the same as their 100W cousins except with a 10W final stage. As an example, the Icom 760 which is identical to the Icom 761 except it runs 10W. If the regulations created a market for 50W-max HF radios, they'd be on the shelves of HRO in time for Christmas giving.

73, de Hans, K0HB

3579. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-30 20:34:43 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <Dvsyb.6004$zL1.724761@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 83255

Kï¿½HB wrote:

> "Alun" <alun@1stcounsel.com> wrote
>
>
>>It would be a better plan to make the limit 100W, i.e. base it on the
>>equipment, not vicea versa.
>
>
> That's a 'novel' idea! In that case the power limit should be 2.5KW,
> because that's how much output my homebrew linear will produce if I supply
> enough drive. If I build an even bigger linear, will FCC raise my power
> limit? (Or will they expect me to obey the regulations?)
>
> And we should make the speed limits in my town 140MPH, because that's how
> fast my supercharged Ssei will run. (Try that one in front of the judge!)

Are you seriously suggesting this is an appropriate reply to what Alun
wrote?

1. Who cares what your homebrew amp can run? You or I can make a larger
amp than that. You are arguing past people like Alun and myself. The
argument isn't about how much smoke any one person can put on the air.
The argument is about making a power limit that is accomodating of the
way that equipment has been made for quite a while and is still made
today. In fact if you were to call for a power limit of 100 watts, I
would say "that's fine."

2. I've been waiting for someone to bring up the automobile power
thing. That argument is completely irrelevant to this discussion. If
automobiles were made that could only go the speed limit and no more,
then they would have very little power. If ham transcievers were
comparable in any way to cars, we would have to start our transmissiona
at a high rate of power, and reduce power as we get up to whatever it is
we would have to get up to. The two just aren't related.

- Mike KB3EIA -

3580. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-30 20:59:43 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3Tsyb.28633$Rk5.26902@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 83256

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote

> Are you seriously suggesting this is an appropriate reply to what Alun
> wrote?

Yes.

73, de Hans, K0HB

3581. Re: Where Did THIS Come From...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-30 21:15:39 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0311301315.6d84ad92@posting.google.com>
Source record: 83257

"Brett" <bre@brettsplat.net> wrote in message news:<bqcodn$481$0@pita.alt.net>...
> "Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
> >
> >
> > One of the members of our congregation is a National Guard
> > infantryman who is back home this weekend for a two-week R&R
> > between eight month tours over in the Middle East (iraq and Kuwait).
> > He was very clear - the stunt didn't impress him at all.
> >
>
>
> Really? Well, if true, you might want to "clearly" inform your
> national guard buddy he just violated the UCMJ.
> Nevermind, you or he probably don't know what that is.

How so? I know the UCMJ fairly well, and expressing his opinion
(as inappropriate as it may ahve seemed) is not a violation of the
UCMJ in this instance.

Now...had it been an OFFICER being interviewed on TV, then it
could ahve been, especially had it been that Arab network in Qatar.

Steve, K4YZ

3582. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-30 21:26:56 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <Agtyb.6132$zL1.734008@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 83258

Kï¿½HB wrote:

> "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote
>
>
>>Are you seriously suggesting this is an appropriate reply to what Alun
>>wrote?
>
>
> Yes.

That says quite a lot.

- Mike KB3EIA -

3583. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-30 21:36:47 UTC
From: groupk0hb@earthlink.net
Message-ID: <5ee63311.0311301336.21434909@posting.google.com>
Source record: 83259

Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote

> What is the basis for 50 watts?

NCRP Report No. 86, "Biological Effects and Exposure Criteria for Radiofrequency Electromagnetic Fields", Copyright 1986, National Council on Radiation Protection and Measurements, and ANSI/IEEE C95.1-1992, "Safety Levels with Respect to Human Exposure to Radio Frequency Electromagnetic Fields, 3 kHz to 300 GHz", Copyright 1992, IEEE, Inc.

73, de Hans, K0HB

3584. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-30 21:46:12 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <Eytyb.28682$Rk5.18551@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 83260

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote

> That says quite a lot.

You asked a reasonable direct question. "Yes" is a reasonable direct answer, hard for anyone to misinterpret for "No" or "Maybe" or "Depends on what 'is' means".

73, de Hans, K0HB

3585. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-30 21:55:57 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <NHtyb.6198$zL1.739103@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 83261

Hans K0HB wrote:

> Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote
>
>
>>What is the basis for 50 watts?
>
>
>
> NCRP Report No. 86, "Biological Effects and Exposure Criteria for
> Radiofrequency Electromagnetic Fields", Copyright 1986, National
> Council on Radiation Protection and Measurements, and ANSI/IEEE
> C95.1-1992, "Safety Levels with Respect to Human Exposure to Radio
> Frequency Electromagnetic Fields, 3 kHz to 300 GHz", Copyright 1992,
> IEEE, Inc.

And that 50 watts affects calss A different than Class B?

I seriously doubt that a person that cannot handle 100 watts shild have any license. Maybe class A shouldn't be alloed to have antennas over 10 feet off the ground either. Nasy falls.

- Mike KB3EIA -

3586. Re: Where Did THIS Come From...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-30 21:58:27 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031130165827.12501.00004274@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 83262

In article <YRbyb.26855$Rk5.25932@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>,
"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> writes:

>The economy was taking a downturn BEFORE Clinton got out of office.

But the real mess started when the dotcom bubble burst. Then came the Enron and other scandals.

>The
>economic policy of the Clinton presidency was what ??? Right, there was
>none. He was riding on the coat tails of Reagan/Bush one.

Whose economic policy was - none.

In terms of economic policy, Clinton almost out-Republicaned the Republicans.
>
>Has everyone forgotten about 9/11? We are at war. Or has that little
>detail been forgotten also?

Not at all. It's another big factor. GWB has been kinda busy with wars in Afghanistan, Iraq and against terror.

>It was not our choice to have some ragheads plow three jets into buildings,
>and one into the ground and kill nearly 3000 innocents. Some of which were
>MUSLIM.

Exactly. But it *was* our choice who to let into the USA...

>But it is our choice how to respond. If you think Sadam didn't have
>anything to do with it. Let me sell you a bridge in NYC.

There's been no definitive proof Saddam had anything to do 9/11. Nor that he had WMDs prior to Gulf War 2. That's been admitted publicly by the current administration.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3587. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-30 21:59:50 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <qLtyb.6207$zL1.739781@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 83263

Kï¿½HB wrote:

> "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote
>
>
>> That says quite a lot.
>
>
> You asked a reasonable direct question. "Yes" is a reasonable direct
> answer, hard for anyone to misinterpret for "No" or "Maybe" or "Depends on
> what 'is' means".

It tells me what you think is a serious answer. I though you were
perhaps being facetious or obtuse. You were not, and that tells me a lot.

- Mike KB3EIA -

3588. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-30 22:24:07 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <b6uyb.28711$Rk5.24123@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 83264

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote

> And that 50 watts affects calss A different than Class B?

Of course not. (This is another of those 'novel' questions.)

But my intention is that the Class B (learners permit with training wheels) test be ultra simple, to allow as many applicants as possible. For that reason, requiring qualification in esoterica like "Biological Effects and Exposure Criteria for Radiofrequency Electromagnetic Fields" is inappropriate. Thus the 50W power level recommended by the NCRP and ANSI/IEEE ensures a modicum of safety for these beginners.

In the process of preparing for Class A (without training wheels) license, the candidate would need to explore the RF-exposure safety issues which would be on the qualification test. Then we could expect that they'd have some appreciation of the hazards and how to ensure that their station is engineered in compliance with the MPE criteria mandated by 97.13(c).

73, de Hans, K0HB

3589. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-30 23:01:10 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031130180110.07346.00001967@mb-m26.aol.com>
Source record: 83265

In article <NHtyb.6198$zL1.739103@news1.news.adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo
<mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:

>Hans K0HB wrote:
>
>> Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote
>>
>>>What is the basis for 50 watts?
>>
>> NCRP Report No. 86, "Biological Effects and Exposure Criteria for
>> Radiofrequency Electromagnetic Fields", Copyright 1986, National
>> Council on Radiation Protection and Measurements, and ANSI/IEEE
>> C95.1-1992, "Safety Levels with Respect to Human Exposure to Radio
>> Frequency Electromagnetic Fields, 3 kHz to 300 GHz", Copyright 1992,
>> IEEE, Inc.

Hans dropped in a nice bibliographic note but did NOT say HOW
he arrived at his magical 50 W limit. :-)

Way too many variables in the amateur radio "station" arrangement
to say with some kind of certainty that 50 W is THE limit for any
class. FCC already showed that with a survey of some typical
California ham stations along with measurements of fields courtesy
of a couple of other government agencies and the hams who let them
all prowl around their property.

>And that 50 watts affects calss A different than Class B?
>
>I seriously doubt that a person that cannot handle 100 watts shild have
>any license. Maybe class A shouldn't be alloed to have antennas over 10
>feet off the ground either. Nasy falls.

100 Watts in a 50 Ohm system has an RMS RF Voltage of 70.7.
That's on the verge of burning human skin tissue.

50 Watts in a 50 Ohm system has 50 V RMS RF...still on the verge
of burning human skin tissue, although not as badly.

100 W of RF is little, piddly stuff to what I'm used to...like 15 KW up-
close-and-personal on HF, including walking around in antenna
fields of many and varied HF emitters...and 40 KW PEP HF stuff in
antenna fields in 1955. Most of us being personal with such powers
weren't suffering ill effects and almost all of us weren't licensed in
any "classes." We got the messages through.

For some really in-depth looks at radio frequency radiation, go to the Brooks AFB website and the documents at the USAF School of Aerospace Medicine. The following is the cover page for one of the shorter documents released in 1996:

http://www.brooks.af.mil/afrl/HED/hedr/reports/human-exposure/cover.gif.html

That document title number is AL/OE-TR-1996-0035. It was prepared in 1994. Be prepared to do a little math to find the permissible RF field strengths...not much, just a little.

There's also FCC Office of Engineering and Technology Bulletins 56 and 65 available on the FCC RF Safety webpage. Only a few ANSI standards are free for download (if available), the same with the IEEE site.

Maybe Hans will reveal what kind of aluminum suit he wears when he fires up his "2.5 KW with increased drive" HF amplifier. :-)

LHA

3590. Re: Where Did THIS Come From...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-30 23:16:06 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hp6jbuj.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>
Source record: 83266

On 30 Nov 2003 04:11:04 -0800, Brian wrote:

>> I strongly believe that the Habibi need
>> the charra kicked out of them for a lot of reasons, including the
>> expulsion of a branch of my family from what is now Iraq in the 13th
>> Century (no, I don't want the family villa back but it was tempting).
>
>The 13th century??? You're as nuts as they are.

You have no concept or understanding of what drives folks in the
Middle East or of Middle East heritage, then. But then again, look
at the Anglo-Irish conflict going back 800 years - that's the 13th
Century as well.

>In ever conflict that we engage in, we need to see it through to the
>bitter end.

That's what I've been saying all along. Pay attention.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

3591. Re: Where Did THIS Come From...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-30 23:16:07 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hp6jn7k.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>
Source record: 83267

On 30 Nov 2003 04:20:04 -0800, Brian wrote:

>I disagree that a national guardsman speaking at his local church

Synagogue, not church...

>about how he doesn't want to go to Iraq is a good thing for America.

Who ever said he didn't want to go? He wants to go back, finish
what we started albeit a decade or two too late, and come home in
one piece when it is time for him to come home, not in a plastic bag
next week courtesy of some suicidal nut.

He just was clear-eyed enough to see the stunt for what it was.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

3592. Re: Where Did THIS Come From...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-30 23:16:07 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hp6jpsl.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>
Source record: 83269

On 30 Nov 2003 04:24:46 -0800, Brian wrote:

>I never did see the pictures of Dr. Laura...

You didn't miss anything.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

3593. Re: Where Did THIS Come From...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-30 23:16:08 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hp6jrym.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>
Source record: 83268

On 30 Nov 2003 04:30:08 -0800, Brian wrote:

>I accept that. And it meshes with what Phil said about not wanting
>this to become another Vietnam. I don't want our government to fail
>our soldiers in Iraq.

Neither do I.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

3594. Re: Where Did THIS Come From...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-30 23:16:08 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hp6koro.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>
Source record: 83270

On 30 Nov 2003 08:39:47 -0800, N2EY wrote:

>> >Hillary made a big show of going, so Dubya trumped her. Neat trick.
>>
>> Another bozo.
>
>Or bozoette?

It's accurate to call her that. I prefer the gender-neutral version <ggg>

>Point is, she got trumped soundly by Dubya's move.

Serves her right.

>"Forgotten heroes of a forgotten war" (from the song "And The Band
>Played Waltzing Matilda")

Yup.

>> >And to our service people - spending next Thanksgiving with their
>> >families at home.
>>
>> Amen, brother.
>
>Regardless of politics or policies, our prayers and thoughts are with
>them.

Mine also.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

3595. Re: Where Did THIS Come From...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-11-30 23:16:08 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hp6kfcn.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>
Source record: 83271

On Sun, 30 Nov 2003 06:58:49 -0500, Brett wrote:

> And it could very well delay a new artificial limb for my friend
> who was on board the USS LIBERTY

The same USS LIBERTY about which the United States National Security Agency told the Israeli Kirya (the equivalent of the Pentagon) THREE TIMES "it's not ours" even after the second time the Israelis warned the Pentagon that "if it isn't yours we are going to blast it out of the water"?

The same USS LIBERTY that, when the Mirages came over to assess the damage caused by the first strike, THEN showed the US flag and the Mirages pulled back.

The same USS LIBERTY about which the US government has never come clean about the cover-up with either the public or the troops that were aboard, and even in the release of the formerly-classified communications transcripts a few months ago never 'fessed up to their part in getting the ship attacked?

>which was attacked by the JEWS.

Ah. now we are getting down to your agenda......

Don't bother to reply. It's not going to be read.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

3596. Re: Where Did THIS Come From...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-01 00:19:39 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0311301619.577f380e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 83272

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20031130145811.02537.00001889@mb-m23.aol.com>...
> In article <bAbyb.26833$Rk5.11994@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>,
> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> writes:
>
> >If he is such an 'idiot' and McCain is so smart...then how come the 'idiot'
> >is the President?
> >
> >Oh, I know. The Republicans stole the election, right?
> >
> Nope.
>
> The person you have to thank or blame is Ralph Nader. By splitting the support
> for Gore, he managed to put Dubya in the Oval Office.
>
> Talk about irony - the author of "Unsafe At Any Speed" managed to put a Texas
> oil man in the White House.
>
> Exit polls across the nation during the 2000 election showed that the following
> response when asked what they would have done if Nader had not run, or had
> quit:
>
> About 1/4 said they'd vote for Bush
> About 1/4 said they'd stay home, vote for another 3rd part candidate, etc.
> About 1/2 said they'd vote for Gore.
>
> Ralph got about 3 million votes across the country, so if 750,000 had gone for
> Bush and 1.5 million for Gore, it would have been a very different election.
> State-by-state analysis shows that several close states - particularly Florida
> - would have been solid for Gore.
>
> The situation was similar to what Perot did, only this time the Republicans
> were the beneficiaries.
>
> Thanks, Ralph
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

Jim, ever hear of a Texas oil-man named Ross Perot?

That's how we got slick Willie the first time.

3597. Re: Where Did THIS Come From...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-01 00:38:06 UTC
From: TT <anon@anonttmail.net>
Message-ID: <bqe2ha$8pe$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 83273

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:cuvyxnansvbet.hp6kfcn.pminews@netnews.comcast.net...
>
>
> The same USS LIBERTY about which the United States National
> Security Agency told the Israeli Kirya (the equivalent of the
> Pentagon) THREE TIMES "it's not ours" even after the second time
> the Israelis warned the Pentagon that "if it isn't yours we are going
> to blast it out of the water"?
>

Of COURSE you are not going to reply Kane, For the simple
reason you have no source or proof for what you are saying,
other than your own "spin." The NSA said no such thing.
A holiday ensign (An AMERICAN flag FOUR
times the size of a normal flag) was hoisted on the USS
LIBERTY after JEW torpedo boats & aircraft made threatening
moves toward the USS LIBERTY. Moreover, the USS LIBERTY
was continually calling on international radio frequencies to advise
the Jew attackers they were coming near an AMERICAN
vessel. Oh, Jews do speak English don't they Kane? Even
then, the radio hailing was being done in Hebrew & French.
Incidentally, the NSA does NOT ever communicate with foreign
governments under the conditions you describe.
BBZZZZZZZZT! You are full of crapola!

> The same USS LIBERTY that, when the Mirages came over to assess the
> damage caused by the first strike, THEN showed the US flag and the
> Mirages pulled back.

Wrong Again! See above. The USS LIBERTY was flying
highly visible AMERICAN identification from the very
git go! And the JEW jets did not pull back after seeing the
American identification. They came in to kill more innocent
American sailors with JEW rockets and bullets, given to
Israel by the people of the United States.

>
> The same USS LIBERTY about which the US government has never come
> clean about the cover-up with either the public or the troops that
> were aboard, and even in the release of the formerly-classified
> communications transcripts a few months ago never 'fessed up to
> their part in getting the ship attacked?
>

A U.S. coverup???? LOL LOL LOL LOL LOL
Pullllleeeeeeeze now. The Jews stonewalled every attempt to
investigate the incident AND still are !!!!!!!!!!

> >which was attacked by the JEWS.
>
> Ah. now we are getting down to your agenda......
>

NO! If there is any "agenda," that is your perception
entirely. The truth knows no "agenda." However,
you DO have an agenda.

> Don't bother to reply. It's not going to be read.

Nobody in this group gives a flying f..k what you read or
don't read.

JEWS deliberately killed 37 innocent American sailors on the
USS LIBERTY, wounded 153 and to this day Israel continues
to lie, stonewall, and coverup the truth.

73 de TW

> --
> 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane
>
>

3598. Re: Where Did THIS Come From...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-01 00:49:11 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0311301649.5f2bc175@posting.google.com>
Source record: 83274

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:<cuvyxnansvbet.hp4uy23.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>...
> On 28 Nov 2003 19:22:11 -0800, Brian wrote:
>
> >Hey Phil, you have self-admitted no experience whatsoever in military
> >science.
>
> Does being employed by DoD for almost 10 years at duty stations
> which were prime targets for a Soviet ICBM first- or second-strikes
> during the '50s and '60s count for anything?

Depends. Did you photograph those Soviet ICBMs as they flew overhead?
Had you, you might be able to claim "real military experience" as
another regular poster on rrap has done.

> It's not my fault that I was rejected when I was drafted - yes,
> drafted. After that I was a civilian employee for SAC at SAC Hq
> and several AF bases, all prime targets.

Sorry to hear that.

> My butt was on the line, my friend. Every day when the nation was
> 'sposed to be "at peace".

Not exactly. No more than anyone elses.

> >So your opinion of our Commander in Chief's trip to Iraq is of no
> >concern to you. None. Unless the double standard applies.
>
> It is of major concern to me. Even though I wasn't wearing a blue
> suit the POTUS was -my- CiC as well, and even to this day I pay
> taxes which fund such things.

When GW takes off his CIC hat and puts on his El Presidente' hat, you
might want to take it up with him then. But not before - unless you
invoke the double standard.

> >Just bill the Feds for your usual $400/hour advisory fees and call it quits.
>
> In your dreams. My "fees" were more like $1.50/hour when I started
> with DoD and $4/hour when I left the military end of Federal
> business in 1964. Even up to this day I was never a "consultant" or
> "advisor" to the Feds. I was one of the working troops.

You were on the payroll? Big mistake.

> >Merry Christmas to those who have never served and never risked a
> >damned thing but are full of opinions about what motivates fighting
> >men (and women) to get their business done, and what equipment they
> >might need.
>
> That doesn't fit me at all. I dealt with those issues quite a bit.

So does a visit from the CIC not motivate fighting men?

Sounds like they got their bag limit today (46 bad guys killed,
20something wounded, 8 captured in two separate actions).

> Remove head from rectum and have a happy whatever you celebrate.

Back atcha.

3599. Re: Where Did THIS Come From...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-01 01:10:16 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0311301710.51204dba@posting.google.com>
Source record: 83275

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20031129112450.29660.00001855@mb-m24.aol.com>...
> In article <f45722ac.0311290512.6afe3724@posting.google.com>,
> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
>
> >n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
> >news:<20031128205817.12501.00004230@mb-m04.aol.com>...
> >
> >> And to our service people - spending next Thanksgiving with their families
> at
> >> home.
> >>
> >> 73 de Jim, N2EY
> >
> >Jim, do you know how impossible your wish is?
>
> Brian, do you know how bad your English is?

Oh, my. Oh, dear.

> A thing is either possible or impossible.

And you are the judge of what is possible and what is impossible?

> A lot of things once considered "impossible" have become reality.

Your Thanksgiving wish is impossible. Did wishing it make you feel
better?

> Live with it.

Are you making a wager?

The wager being: "All US service people will be home with their
families on Thanksgiving 2004."

Just send the Red Lobster gift certificate to my callbook address.

3600. Re: Where Did THIS Come From...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-01 01:19:08 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0311301719.2522d18e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 83276

N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<c2356669.0311300839.3b1efd87@posting.google.com>...
> "Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:<cuvyxnansvbet.hp4w1e7.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>...
> > On 29 Nov 2003 01:58:17 GMT, N2EY wrote:

> > >And to our service people - spending next Thanksgiving with their
> > >families at home.
> >
> > Amen, brother.
>
> Regardless of politics or policies, our prayers and thoughts are with
> them.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

There you go, Jim. Your prayers and moral support is all that you can
give to those deployed. Tearing down their CIC hurts them, not helps
them, and won't bring them home any sooner for Thanksgiving or
anything else. There will always be deployed service people over
Thanksgiving and Christmas holidays. That's just the way it works
when you raise your right hand and swear in. And all the people who
raise their right hands know it.

3601. Re: Since We Were Mentioning "Absurdity"...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-01 01:23:04 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0311301723.b6af115@posting.google.com>
Source record: 83277

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message news:<5c01b95b.0311301124.2743b66f@posting.google.com>...

> I was a big MJ fan until

I thought he was going to be bigger than Elvis. Now he is a joke. Sad.

3602. Re: Response to "21st Century" Part One (Code Test)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-01 01:34:26 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0311301734.276be025@posting.google.com>
Source record: 83278

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20031130082836.15462.00004620@mb-m06.aol.com>...

> So, there are no "Morse code haters" on the committee. There is no conspiracy,
> no secret agenda, no kickback from the manufacturers, no "black plan" from the
> ARRL, no anything. Just some guys that want nothing more than to see our great
> hobby prosper for the next hundred years, or longer.
>
> N2EY: That's good to know. However, these ideas need to be considered on their
> merits, not on the personalities of those who wrote them.

Jim, it would appear, at least on the surface, that you would also
welcome the comments of Len Anderson.

I guess that saying the right thing is important, even if you don't
mean it, or even if it's impossible. It makes everyone feel good.

3603. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-01 01:54:00 UTC
From: Alun <alun@1stcounsel.com>
Message-ID: <Xns9443D49135CC2elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 83279

"Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in
news:2Tryb.904$vq1.96953@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net:

> "Alun" <alun@1stcounsel.com> wrote in message
> news:Xns94437E0B940DDelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
>> "Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in
>> news:iAlyb.28717$iU5.7375071@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net:
>>
>> >
>> > "Alun" <alun@1stcounsel.com> wrote in message
>> > news:Xns944288614CAD1elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
>> >> What is annoying is that a skill test is foisted on those who don't
>> >> have the desire to use the skill.
>> >
>> > Alan, I'm gonna let you in on a secret...although I know that you're
>> > already aware of it. Preparing for and passing the 5-wpm Elemnt 1
>> > test does NOT leave one ready to use the skill OTA. It only gives
>> > one a taste so that one may make an educated choice as to whether or
>> > not they wish to persue CW any further.
>> >
>>
>> 5 wpm is certainly too slow to prove much, but it only still exists at
>> that level as a residual requirement to meet the old s25.5, which has
>> since been changed so that no code test is required atall. If the FCC
>> truly thought that a CW test was necessary, the speed would be higher.
>
> Agreed, I was pointing out a very beneficial secondary benefit. It
> "requires" one to place themselves in a position from which to make an
> educated decision.
>
>> > As I mentioned in another post, the mode is really not the
>> > issue...the having to really learn it is. Do away with the published
>> > Q&A pools and watch the whining escalate.
>>
>> Well, I think that the real issue is that it's a different kind of
>> test.
>
> Exactly.
>
>> >> Also, if
>> >> I hear CW on my frequency I may be able to read it with some
>> >> difficulty, but if I hear RTTY or PSK31 there is no chance.
>> >
>> > You may have just touched on a selling point for CW.

>> >
>> > 73 de Bert
>> > WA2SI
>>
>> Whilst that is true, the point I was making is actually that since I
>> can't read RTTY or PSK by ear, and they are legal modes, it doesn't
>> help all that much that I can read CW (albeit not terribly well, since
>> I never use it).
>>
>> 73 de Alun, N3KIP
>
> I understand the point you were making. If I could just ask you why you
> bothered to take the code test(s)?
>
> 73 de Bert
> WA2SI
>
>
>

To get all the _phone_ frequencies

3604. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-01 01:57:24 UTC
From: Alun <alun@1stcounsel.com>
Message-ID: <Xns9443D524F4743elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 83280

"Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in
news:7Xryb.972$vq1.109343@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net:

> "Alun" <alun@1stcounsel.com> wrote in message
> news:Xns94437F4AF796Belektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
>> "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote in
>> news:bqd5u1$j11@library2.airnews.net:
>>
>> > "Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in message
>> > news:oPlyb.29000$iU5.7424460@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net...
>> >> "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
>> >> news:KU6yb.13197$P%1.11970231@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
>> >> >
>> >> > "Alun" <alun@1stcounsel.com> wrote in message
>> >> > news:Xns94428A3961C57elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
>> >> > > It just so happens that I don't
>> >> > > like CW, in the sense of I have no desire to use it. That
>> >> > > should be OK too, but for some reason it bothers you. Why?
>> >> >
>> >> > No it does not bother me that someone who has learned it chooses
>> >> > not to use it. They have made that decision from a position of
>> >> > knowledge and experience. This is radically different from a
>> >> > person judging it and saying they will never use it when they do
>> >> > not have that knowledge and experience to draw on.
>> >> >
>> >> > Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>> >>
>> >> Right on the money, Dee. Larry pointed this out earlier, but not as
>> >> eloquently as you.
>> >>
>> >> 73 de Bert
>> >> WA2SI
>> >>
>> >>
>> >
>> > It fascinates me that you won't accept someone's plain and simple
>> > truth that they don't like CW--even if they don't have experience
>> > with it--because you reason that they need to have "knowledge and
>> > experience" with it. Well, I know people who are quite well-versed
>> > in CW who don't like it, people who haven't ever even tried it and
>> > don't like it, and people who have taken and passed a 5wpm test and
>> > don't like it. I also know people from those same three categories
>> > that do like CW operation.
>> >

>> > It's pretty much as simple as folks who do or don't like most other
>> > things in life. Either ya like it or ya don't.
>> >
>> > Kim W5TIT
>> >
>> >
>> >
>>
>> I think that you have hit upon a very important point there, Kim. A
>> good analogy might be not liking an item of food that you haven't
>> tried, because it looks disgusting on your plate. If you eat some you
>> might like it, or not, but there are probably all kinds of other
>> things that contain the same nutrition. These guys are like a parent
>> telling a child that they have to eat their brocolli. But they aren't
>> my parents and I don't like brocolli, or CW. I take vitamins, and work
>> phone.
>
> Slight difference, Alun. Nobody's forcing anybody to learn code. There
> exists a no-code Technician license for those who do not wish to have
> to pass the 5-wpm code exam.
>
> 73 de Bert
> WA2SI
>
>
>

Not really true. No HF privileges with that licence, as we all know.

3605. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-01 03:53:52 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <kXyyb.7025$zL1.799004@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 83281

Kï¿½HB wrote:

> "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote
>
>
>> And that 50 watts affects calss A different than Class B?
>
>
> Of course not. (This is another of those 'novel' questions.)
>
> But my intention is that the Class B (learners permit with training wheels)
> test be ultra simple, to allow as many applicants as possible. For that
> reason, requiring qualification in esoterica like "Biological Effects and
> Exposure Criteria for Radiofrequency Electromagnetic Fields" is
> inappropriate. Thus the 50W power level recommended by the NCRP and
> ANSI/IEEE ensures a modicum of safety for these beginners.

I would counter that it is a good idea for the initiate to know right
off the blocks that RF has some potential problems associated with it.

And while everyone talks about RF exposure, there are other problems
associated with RF that a person should know before they are allowed to
legally operate a rig. I had a problem trying to tune a longwire once,
and my trusty MFJ tuner nailed me good - bad knob design - it shouldn't
have the metal rim on the knob, which allows for some capacitive
coupling, so it seems. RF burns hurt! Power was probably around 50 watts.

I think the responsible thing to do, if safety is a concern, would be
to get those safety guidelines out of the way BEFORE going to advanced
licenses.

I also hope that your regulations would prohibit the Class B hams from
making or using a magloop antenna. I just did some calcs on a small
magloop for 40 meters, and at 50 Watts there is almost 5 kV across the
tuning cap. Ouch!

> In the process of preparing for Class A (without training wheels) license,
> the candidate would need to explore the RF-exposure safety issues which
> would be on the qualification test. Then we could expect that they'd have
> some appreciation of the hazards and how to ensure that their station is
> engineered in compliance with the MPE criteria mandated by 97.13(c).

I think the candidate needs to know the safety issues long before this.
If the potential ham is smart enough to learn them for class A, they
should be smart enough to learn them for class B. If safety is first,
they shouldn't learn it second.

3606. Re: Where Did THIS Come From...?!?!a

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-01 04:07:54 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <u8zyb.7027$zL1.800394@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 83282

Phil Kane wrote:

> On 30 Nov 2003 04:11:04 -0800, Brian wrote:
>
>
>>> I strongly believe that the Habibi need
>>> the charra kicked out of them for a lot of reasons, including the
>>> expulsion of a branch of my family from what is now Iraq in the 13th
>>> Century (no, I don't want the family villa back but it was tempting).
>>
>>The 13th century??? You're as nuts as they are.
>
>
> You have no concept or understanding of what drives folks in the
> Middle East or of Middle East heritage, then. But then again, look
> at the Anglo-Irish conflict going back 800 years - that's the 13th
> Century as well.

I understand, but do not accept. Tat line of thinking of course is why the human race is almost certainly doomed. Over thousands of years, there is plenty of time for each side to make a little bank account of transgressions that they can call upon to provoke righteous outrage. And it will not go away until there is only one person left in whatever the conflict was.

One of the most civilized things that the USofA does is that we have made a habit of burying the hatchet with our onetime enemies. Something I doubt that people who are mad because of what someone did to them a thousand years ago can understand.

- Mike KB3EIA -

3607. Re: Where Did THIS Come From...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-01 04:12:03 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <nczyb.7028$zL1.801107@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 83283

Phil Kane wrote:

> On 30 Nov 2003 04:24:46 -0800, Brian wrote:
>
>
>>I never did see the pictures of Dr. Laura...
>
>
> You didn't miss anything.

Ahh, she wans't bad looking. (actually she still is good looking) But looks don't have anything to do with it. Anne Coulter is an attractive woman too, but there is something seriously wrong with her. 8^)

- Mike KB3EIA -

3608. Re: Response to "21st Century" Part One (Code Test)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-01 04:27:02 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031130232702.12501.00004281@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 83285

In article <f45722ac.0311301734.276be025@posting.google.com>,
brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:

>Jim, it would appear, at least on the surface, that you would also
>welcome the comments of Len Anderson.

HAH!!! :-)

>I guess that saying the right thing is important, even if you don't
>mean it, or even if it's impossible. It makes everyone feel good.

LHA

3609. Re: Where Did THIS Come From...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-01 04:27:02 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031130232702.12501.00004280@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 83286

In article <cuvyxnansvbet.hp6kfcn.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>, "Phil Kane"
<Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> writes:

>On Sun, 30 Nov 2003 06:58:49 -0500, Brett wrote:
>
>> And it could very well delay a new artificial limb for my friend
>> who was on board the USS LIBERTY
>
> The same USS LIBERTY about which the United States National
> Security Agency told the Israeli Kirya (the equivalent of the
> Pentagon) THREE TIMES "it's not ours" even after the second time
> the Israelis warned the Pentagon that "if it isn't yours we are going
> to blast it out of the water"?
>
> The same USS LIBERTY that, when the Mirages came over to assess the
> damage caused by the first strike, THEN showed the US flag and the
> Mirages pulled back.
>
> The same USS LIBERTY about which the US government has never come
> clean about the cover-up with either the public or the troops that
> were aboard, and even in the release of the formerly-classified
> communications transcripts a few months ago never 'fessed up to
> their part in getting the ship attacked?

You can find a good accounting of the USS Liberty in Chapter 7,
"Blood," in James Bamford's "Body of Secrets," Doubleday, 2001.

As to "coming clean," Bamford blew you out of the water on the
details over two years ago.

LHA

3610. Re: Where Did THIS Come From...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-01 04:27:03 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031130232703.12501.00004282@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 83284

In article <f45722ac.0311301719.2522d18e@posting.google.com>,
brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:

>> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>There you go, Jim. Your prayers and moral support is all that you can
>give to those deployed. Tearing down their CIC hurts them, not helps
>them, and won't bring them home any sooner for Thanksgiving or
>anything else. There will always be deployed service people over
>Thanksgiving and Christmas holidays. That's just the way it works
>when you raise your right hand and swear in. And all the people who
>raise their right hands know it.

...he isn't aware of that "know," Brian.

It's one thing to know OF it, quite another to DO it.

I was away for four Thanksgivings and three Christmases.

<salute>

LHA

3611. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-01 05:43:59 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <zyAyb.32710$Wy4.4889@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 83287

"N2EY" wrote:
>
> (snip) The idea isn't that they'll have a high
> level of expertise right off, but that they'll reach
> that level through the 'incentive' of having to
> either upgrade or leave the air. (snip)

To me, the entire idea is a solution seeking a problem. Since I don't think the current license holders are lacking, I don't see any real benefit (and I don't think the FCC will either). Regardless, his proposal would require a complete re-write of all the rules relating to license class, when a single sentence added to the existing rules would accomplish virtually the same thing - "All license holders, except Extra, must obtain the next higher license class within five years of obtaining their current license." Another sentence might describe what will happen if that doesn't occur.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3612. Re: ARRL you can Kiss my $39.00 a Year Good Bye

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-01 06:03:00 UTC
From: Steve Silverwood <kb6ojs@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <MPG.1a344432a86c03b2989688@news-server.socal.rr.com>
Source record: 83288
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

In article <CK5yb.27754$Pa2.911@newssvr29.news.prodigy.com>,
Xenot@pacbell.net says...
> When did this happen. I got my 73 in Oct as usual, and my subscription runs
> out in 2006!

The news just came out this month that Wayne Green was closing down the
magazine.

--

-- //Steve//

Steve Silverwood, KB6OJS
Fountain Valley, CA
Email: kb6ojs@arrl.net

3613. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-01 06:16:51 UTC
From: Bert Craig <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM>
Message-ID: <n1Byb.3560$PD3.1554930@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>
Source record: 83289

"Alun" <alun@1stcounsel.com> wrote in message
news:Xns9443D49135CC2elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
> "Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in
> news:2Tryb.904$vq1.96953@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net:
>
> > "Alun" <alun@1stcounsel.com> wrote in message
> > news:Xns94437E0B940DDelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
> >> "Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in
> >> news:iAlyb.28717$iU5.7375071@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net:
> >>
> >> >
> >> > "Alun" <alun@1stcounsel.com> wrote in message
> >> > news:Xns944288614CAD1elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
> >> >> What is annoying is that a skill test is foisted on those who don't
> >> >> have the desire to use the skill.
> >> >
> >> > Alan, I'm gonna let you in on a secret...although I know that you're
> >> > already aware of it. Preparing for and passing the 5-wpm Elemnt 1
> >> > test does NOT leave one ready to use the skill OTA. It only gives
> >> > one a taste so that one may make an educated choice as to whether or
> >> > not they wish to persue CW any further.
> >> >
> >>
> >> 5 wpm is certainly too slow to prove much, but it only still exists at
> >> that level as a residual requirement to meet the old s25.5, which has
> >> since been changed so that no code test is required atall. If the FCC
> >> truly thought that a CW test was necessary, the speed would be higher.
> >
> > Agreed, I was pointing out a very beneficial secondary benefit. It
> > "requires" one to place themselves in a position from which to make an
> > educated decision.
> >
> >> > As I mentioned in another post, the mode is really not the
> >> > issue...the having to really learn it is. Do away with the published
> >> > Q&A pools and watch the whining escalate.
> >>
> >> Well, I think that the real issue is that it's a different kind of
> >> test.
> >
> > Exactly.
> >
> >> >> Also, if
> >> >> I hear CW on my frequency I may be able to read it with some
> >> >> difficulty, but if I hear RTTY or PSK31 there is no chance.

> >> >
> >> > You may have just touched on a selling point for CW.
> >> >
> >> > 73 de Bert
> >> > WA2SI
> >>
> >> Whilst that is true, the point I was making is actually that since I
> >> can't read RTTY or PSK by ear, and they are legal modes, it doesn't
> >> help all that much that I can read CW (albeit not terribly well, since
> >> I never use it).
> >>
> >> 73 de Alun, N3KIP
> >
> > I understand the point you were making. If I could just ask you why you
> > bothered to take the code test(s)?
> >
> > 73 de Bert
> > WA2SI
>
> To get all the _phone_ frequencies

Ah, good...for increased privileges. Obviously, noted by your class of license, you did NOT find this to be an insurmountable hurdle. After all, nobody forced you to either upgrade your ticket or aim for the General or Extra right from the starting gate. You *wanted* more *privileges* and these were a sufficient *incentive* for you to decide to make the effort to *earn* them. That's not being forced to do anything, Alun. Them's good old-fashioned values...and the basis for a principle that I'd be glad to see my kids apply to ALL of their endeavors in life.

This whole issue is not really over the Morse code test. It's about ANY requirement that causes an applicant to really have to expend some mental elbow grease and/or impede his/her path toward instant gratification. Like I said before, pull those published Q&A pools and make 'em learn the subject matter and actually apply the principles and theory to pass the writtens...and witness the whine factor grow. Preparing to pass the 5-wpm Exam cannot even be called cerebral, it's rote memorization. The faster speeds become purely reflex oriented. Nobody's thinkin' when they copy hi-speed Morse.

So all this blather about "jumping through hoops" and "barriers" is a bunch of hot air. Folks have just figured out a way to gain a *privilege* in a <perceived> easier fashion, collectively whine. It stands a great chance too. After all, the Gov't. agency they must cajole shares their goal, less work. So with great glee, their proponents espouse "the FCC doesn't agree that Morse is necessary." The "regulatory" angle is just that, an angle. If you ignore the angle, you realise that it was never about Element 1 in the first place.

Why must our beloved hobby/service be reduced to the lowest common denominator?

73 de Bert
WA2SI

3614. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-01 06:17:22 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <S1Byb.32719$Wy4.14687@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 83290

"Hans K0HB" wrote:
>
> Nope, not at all. Under my proposal you'd
> be free to keep renewing your Technician
> (what a misnomer!) license until you assume
> room temperature.

Why is that a misnomer, Hans? Is that (you don't like "Technician" as the name for this license) the real reason behind your attempt to change the names of the various licenses? Regardless, I've read about Technicians in your proposal. That still doesn't change any of my previous questions or comments about how potential newcomers will be affected by the changes suggested in that proposal.

By the way, since we're discussing why here, perhaps you can explain why your proposal is needed at all. Exactly what are you trying to accomplish with the proposal and what evidence do you have that would suggest that need?

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3615. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-01 06:38:40 UTC
From: Bert Craig <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM>
Message-ID: <QIByb.3749$PD3.1640819@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>
Source record: 83291

"Alun" <alun@1stcounsel.com> wrote in message
news:Xns9443D524F4743elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
> "Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in
> news:7Xryb.972$vq1.109343@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net:
>
> > "Alun" <alun@1stcounsel.com> wrote in message
> > news:Xns94437F4AF796Belektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
> >> "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote in
> >> news:bqd5u1$j11@library2.airnews.net:
> >>
> >> > "Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in message
> >> > news:oPlyb.29000$iU5.7424460@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net...
> >> >> "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
> >> >> news:KU6yb.13197$P%1.11970231@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
> >> >> >
> >> >> > "Alun" <alun@1stcounsel.com> wrote in message
> >> >> > news:Xns94428A3961C57elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
> >> >> > > It just so happens that I don't
> >> >> > > like CW, in the sense of I have no desire to use it. That
> >> >> > > should be OK too, but for some reason it bothers you. Why?
> >> >> >
> >> >> > No it does not bother me that someone who has learned it chooses
> >> >> > not to use it. They have made that decision from a position of
> >> >> > knowledge and experience. This is radically different from a
> >> >> > person judging it and saying they will never use it when they do
> >> >> > not have that knowledge and experience to draw on.
> >> >> >
> >> >> > Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
> >> >>
> >> >> Right on the money, Dee. Larry pointed this out earlier, but not as
> >> >> eloquently as you.
> >> >>
> >> >> 73 de Bert
> >> >> WA2SI
> >> >>
> >> >>
> >> >
> >> > It fascinates me that you won't accept someone's plain and simple
> >> > truth that they don't like CW--even if they don't have experience
> >> > with it--because you reason that they need to have "knowledge and
> >> > experience" with it. Well, I know people who are quite well-versed
> >> > in CW who don't like it, people who haven't ever even tried it and
> >> > don't like it, and people who have taken and passed a 5wpm test and
> >> > don't like it. I also know people from those same three categories

> >> > that do like CW operation.
> >> >
> >> > It's pretty much as simple as folks who do or don't like most other
> >> > things in life. Either ya like it or ya don't.
> >> >
> >> > Kim W5TIT
> >> >
> >> >
> >> >
> >>
> >> I think that you have hit upon a very important point there, Kim. A
> >> good analogy might be not liking an item of food that you haven't
> >> tried, because it looks disgusting on your plate. If you eat some you
> >> might like it, or not, but there are probably all kinds of other
> >> things that contain the same nutrition. These guys are like a parent
> >> telling a child that they have to eat their brocolli. But they aren't
> >> my parents and I don't like brocolli, or CW. I take vitamins, and work
> >> phone.
> >
> > Slight difference, Alun. Nobody's forcing anybody to learn code. There
> > exists a no-code Technician license for those who do not wish to have
> > to pass the 5-wpm code exam.
> >
> > 73 de Bert
> > WA2SI
>
> Not really true.

Very true, Alun...very true.

> No HF privileges with that licence, as we all know.

As with most things in life, increased *privileges* requires increased effort. The ARS is but a microsm or society as a whole. Despite the efforts of some to reduce it to "just a hobby" status, the values and principles we learn in our "avocations" will likely carry over into the other aspects of our lives. Many here were first licensed as children or young adults, that's no accident.

The kids of today are referred to as the Nintendo generation, kinda hard to compete with. However, in our quest to gain quantity, we appear to be courting a slightly older prospective ham...products of the newer "I want it now" society. So what can we do, villify the "speed bump" of our licensing structure in an effort to remove any "barriers." I kinda liken it to kids that are graduating HS with a 5th, 6th, or 7th grade reading level. Gee, how'd they get through? Check out the recent regents debacle. Not enough kids pass, it must be to hard...so we'll throw 'em a curve. See the cycle there. Had someone had the courage to NOT throw some of these kids their earlier curves in the first place, their Regents scores would be higher.

What does this have to do with amateur radio? Human nature. What we learn to do as we practice our avocation early in life, we tend to apply to other

aspects later in life. Still believe this is about a 5-wpm Morse code test?

Why must we reduce our beloved hobby/service to the lowest commen denominator?

73 de Bert
WA2SI

3616. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-01 06:51:22 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0311302251.5b3a6f97@posting.google.com>
Source record: 83292

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20031130180110.07346.00001967@mb-m26.aol.com>...

> 100 W of RF is little, piddly stuff to what I'm used to...like 15 KW up-
> close-and-personal on HF, including walking around in antenna
> fields of many and varied HF emitters...and 40 KW PEP HF stuff in
> antenna fields in 1955. Most of us being personal with such powers
> weren't suffering ill effects and almost all of us weren't licensed in
> any "classes." We got the messages through.

I have no doubt whatsoever that your proximity to high RF sources
has made you the "man" you are today, Lennie.

No doubt what so ever!

Steve, K4YZ

PS: Perhaps this is why we hear you talking about child rearing but
never hear about YOUR child-rearing experiences???

SR

3617. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-01 07:09:28 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <IOByb.32731$Wy4.30927@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 83293

"N2EY" wrote:
>
> (snip) So what it comes down to is that
> a little serious skill-learning is required to
> use Morse on the air, except for a very
> few people who have learned Morse
> elsewhere. I think that plain, simple fact
> bothers some of the most vociferous
> and abusive anti-code-test folks.

That fact, as you call it, ignores other very real facts. Few people today (especially boys and men) have not learned code, or at least played around with it, at some point in their lives. When we were kids, many of us sent messages to friends using flashlights or walkie-talkies with code printed on the side. Many other games and toys over the years have featured messages, secret or otherwise, sent by Morse code. Others learned code in groups like the Boy Scouts. Still others learned it in the military. In reality, most adults today are familiar enough with code to know whether they have any real interest in it. Clearly, those with no interest are not exactly highly motivated to study up for a license exam. But the fact that some have no interest in code, and would freely choose not to learn it, really seems to bother some of the "most vociferous and abusive" pro-code folks.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3618. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-01 07:37:21 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <RcCyb.32746$Wy4.29317@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 83294

"N2EY" wrote:
>
> Would you accept "it's obvious" as an
> answer to "why a code test"?

I didn't offer "it's obvious" as an answer. Instead, I wrote...

"Considering the power levels, the number
of frequencies and bands, the overall safety
considerations, the desirability of proper
operation when using the various operating
modes, and the importance of the rules
associated with all that, the necessity of the
written exams is clearly obvious."

> I disagree. Would you have skill testing for modes
> that few hams use, like EME or TV, on an equal
> par with those that are widely used, like voice and
> Morse?

Those modes are already on equal par with voice (written with no skills
test). What you haven't explained is why that shouldn't be the case with
Morse.

> IOW, you know that if the same criteria of "is it
> necessary?" were applied to most of the written
> questions, the answer would be the same as you
> get for the code test.

Nonsense. But you're darn fool, or think I'm one, if you expect me to get
into a point-by-point discussion with you about the several hundred
questions in the question pool to prove otherwise. Enough said.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3619. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-01 07:52:14 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <OqCyb.32752$Wy4.5229@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 83295

"Len Over 21" wrote:
>
> (snip) The TEST and the USE cannot be
> separated, Dwight. It is "necessary" to keep
> the test forever and ever so that there will be
> this "pool of trained operators (in CW)" to
> help earth survive on the next invasion of
> spacefaring aliens.

LOL. Those darn aliens have had their eyes on Earth for some time now. Luckily, CW keeps us well prepared for any stunt they might try. I've even heard of a secret Air Force project to study the effects of CW on captured aliens. ;-)

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3620. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-01 08:32:07 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <b0Dyb.32761$Wy4.22977@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 83296

"Dee D. Flint" wrote:
>
> "Dwight Stewart" wrote:
> > Really? You mean all those things I did
> > to get a properly operating station (putting
> > coax and connectors together, water-
> > proofing, antenna tuning, SWR tests,
> > ground radials, masts, guy wires, wiring a
> > microphone, equipment grounding,
> > lightning protection, RF exposure level
> > estimates, and so on) wasn't really needed
> > and didn't really require any skills to do
> > properly? (snip)
>
> Soldering requires some modest skill but one
> can hire that done if desired. The other items
> are necessary but no skill is required just
> taking the time to do it. (snip)

If you truly believe there is no skill involved to do those things
properly, I suspect you haven't done most of them (at least not properly).

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3621. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-01 08:53:02 UTC
From: Alun <alun@1stcounsel.com>
Message-ID: <Xns94442777C95Eelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 83297

```
"Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in
news:n1Byb.3560$PD3.1554930@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net:

> "Alun" <alun@1stcounsel.com> wrote in message
> news:Xns9443D49135CC2elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
>> "Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in
>> news:2Tryb.904$vq1.96953@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net:
>>
>> > "Alun" <alun@1stcounsel.com> wrote in message
>> > news:Xns94437E0B940DDelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
>> >> "Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in
>> >> news:iAlyb.28717$iU5.7375071@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net:
>> >>
>> >> >
>> >> > "Alun" <alun@1stcounsel.com> wrote in message
>> >> > news:Xns944288614CAD1elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
>> >> >> What is annoying is that a skill test is foisted on those who
>> >> >> don't have the desire to use the skill.
>> >> >
>> >> > Alan, I'm gonna let you in on a secret...although I know that
>> >> > you're already aware of it. Preparing for and passing the 5-wpm
>> >> > Elemnt 1 test does NOT leave one ready to use the skill OTA. It
>> >> > only gives one a taste so that one may make an educated choice as
>> >> > to whether or not they wish to persue CW any further.
>> >> >
>> >>
>> >> 5 wpm is certainly too slow to prove much, but it only still exists
>> >> at that level as a residual requirement to meet the old s25.5,
>> >> which has since been changed so that no code test is required
>> >> atall. If the FCC truly thought that a CW test was necessary, the
>> >> speed would be higher.
>> >
>> > Agreed, I was pointing out a very beneficial secondary benefit. It
>> > "requires" one to place themselves in a position from which to make
>> > an educated decision.
>> >
>> >> > As I mentioned in another post, the mode is really not the
>> >> > issue...the having to really learn it is. Do away with the
>> >> > published Q&A pools and watch the whining escalate.
>> >>
>> >> Well, I think that the real issue is that it's a different kind of
>> >> test.
>> >
>> > Exactly.
```

>> >
>> >> >> Also, if
>> >> >> I hear CW on my frequency I may be able to read it with some
>> >> >> difficulty, but if I hear RTTY or PSK31 there is no chance.
>> >> >
>> >> > You may have just touched on a selling point for CW.
>> >> >
>> >> > 73 de Bert
>> >> > WA2SI
>> >>
>> >> Whilst that is true, the point I was making is actually that since
>> >> I can't read RTTY or PSK by ear, and they are legal modes, it
>> >> doesn't help all that much that I can read CW (albeit not terribly
>> >> well, since I never use it).
>> >>
>> >> 73 de Alun, N3KIP
>> >
>> > I understand the point you were making. If I could just ask you why
>> > you bothered to take the code test(s)?
>> >
>> > 73 de Bert
>> > WA2SI
>>
>> To get all the _phone_ frequencies
>
> Ah, good...for increased privileges. Obviously, noted by your class of
> license, you did NOT find this to be an insurmountable hurdle. After
> all, nobody forced you to either upgrade your ticket or aim for the
> General or Extra right from the starting gate. You *wanted* more
> *privileges* and these were a sufficient *incentive* for you to decide
> to make the effort to *earn* them. That's not being forced to do
> anything, Alun. Them's good old-fashioned values...and the basis for a
> principle that I'd be glad to see my kids apply to ALL of their
> endeavors in life.
>

I think you're missing the point. I took _code_ tests to get _phone_
subbands. There's no logic in that. Never was, even from the beginning.

> This whole issue is not really over the Morse code test. It's about ANY
> requirement that causes an applicant to really have to expend some
> mental elbow grease and/or impede his/her path toward instant
> gratification.

No, it's about learning code skills to use other modes.

> Like I said before, pull those published Q&A pools and
> make 'em learn the subject matter and actually apply the principles and
> theory to pass the writtens...and witness the whine factor grow.
> Preparing to pass the 5-wpm Exam cannot even be called cerebral, it's
> rote memorization. The faster speeds become purely reflex oriented.

> Nobody's thinkin' when they copy hi-speed Morse.
>
> So all this blather about "jumping through hoops" and "barriers" is a
> bunch of hot air.

Learning an unrelated skill is a prime example of "jumping through hoops"
(your phrase, not mine)

> Folks have just figured out a way to gain a
> *privilege* in a <perceived> easier fashion, collectively whine. It
> stands a great chance too. After all, the Gov't. agency they must
> cajole shares their goal, less work. So with great glee, their
> proponents espouse "the FCC doesn't agree that Morse is necessary." The
> "regulatory" angle is just that, an angle. If you ignore the angle, you
> realise that it was never about Element 1 in the first place.
>

It has always been about the code test. No angles. If you think it's just
a bid to reduce the requirements in general, then you just couldn't be
more wrong.

> Why must our beloved hobby/service be reduced to the lowest common
> denominator?
>
> 73 de Bert
> WA2SI
>
>
>

3622. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-01 09:03:15 UTC
From: Alun <alun@1stcounsel.com>
Message-ID: <Xns94442932D1FE7elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 83298

"Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in
news:QlByb.3749$PD3.1640819@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net:

> "Alun" <alun@1stcounsel.com> wrote in message
> news:Xns9443D524F4743elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
>> "Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in
>> news:7Xryb.972$vq1.109343@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net:
>>
>> > "Alun" <alun@1stcounsel.com> wrote in message
>> > news:Xns94437F4AF796Belektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
>> >> "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote in
>> >> news:bqd5u1$j11@library2.airnews.net:
>> >>
>> >> > "Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in message
>> >> > news:oPlyb.29000$iU5.7424460@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net...
>> >> >> "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
>> >> >> news:KU6yb.13197$P%1.11970231@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
>> >> >> >
>> >> >> > "Alun" <alun@1stcounsel.com> wrote in message
>> >> >> > news:Xns94428A3961C57elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
>> >> >> > > It just so happens that I don't
>> >> >> > > like CW, in the sense of I have no desire to use it. That
>> >> >> > > should be OK too, but for some reason it bothers you. Why?
>> >> >> >
>> >> >> > No it does not bother me that someone who has learned it
>> >> >> > chooses not to use it. They have made that decision from a
>> >> >> > position of knowledge and experience. This is radically
>> >> >> > different from a person judging it and saying they will never
>> >> >> > use it when they do not have that knowledge and experience to
>> >> >> > draw on.
>> >> >> >
>> >> >> > Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>> >> >>
>> >> >> Right on the money, Dee. Larry pointed this out earlier, but not
>> >> >> as eloquently as you.
>> >> >>
>> >> >> 73 de Bert
>> >> >> WA2SI
>> >> >>
>> >> >>
>> >> >
>> >> > It fascinates me that you won't accept someone's plain and simple
>> >> > truth that they don't like CW--even if they don't have experience
>> >> > with it--because you reason that they need to have "knowledge and

>> >> > experience" with it. Well, I know people who are quite
>> >> > well-versed in CW who don't like it, people who haven't ever even
>> >> > tried it and don't like it, and people who have taken and passed
>> >> > a 5wpm test and don't like it. I also know people from those
>> >> > same three categories that do like CW operation.
>> >> >
>> >> > It's pretty much as simple as folks who do or don't like most
>> >> > other things in life. Either ya like it or ya don't.
>> >> >
>> >> > Kim W5TIT
>> >> >
>> >> >
>> >> >
>> >>
>> >> I think that you have hit upon a very important point there, Kim. A
>> >> good analogy might be not liking an item of food that you haven't
>> >> tried, because it looks disgusting on your plate. If you eat some
>> >> you might like it, or not, but there are probably all kinds of
>> >> other things that contain the same nutrition. These guys are like a
>> >> parent telling a child that they have to eat their brocolli. But
>> >> they aren't my parents and I don't like brocolli, or CW. I take
>> >> vitamins, and work phone.
>> >
>> > Slight difference, Alun. Nobody's forcing anybody to learn code.
>> > There exists a no-code Technician license for those who do not wish
>> > to have to pass the 5-wpm code exam.
>> >
>> > 73 de Bert
>> > WA2SI
>>
>> Not really true.
>
> Very true, Alun...very true.
>
>> No HF privileges with that licence, as we all know.
>
> As with most things in life, increased *privileges* requires increased
> effort. The ARS is but a microsm or society as a whole. Despite the
> efforts of some to reduce it to "just a hobby" status, the values and
> principles we learn in our "avocations" will likely carry over into the
> other aspects of our lives. Many here were first licensed as children
> or young adults, that's no accident.
>
> The kids of today are referred to as the Nintendo generation, kinda
> hard to compete with. However, in our quest to gain quantity, we appear
> to be courting a slightly older prospective ham...products of the newer
> "I want it now" society. So what can we do, villify the "speed bump" of
> our licensing structure in an effort to remove any "barriers."

If you admit that you view the code test as a "speed bump", then you are admitting it's not relevant, but just there to slow down the traffic. You view that as desirable, and I don't, which is one of the differences between us.

> I kinda
> liken it to kids that are graduating HS with a 5th, 6th, or 7th grade
> reading level. Gee, how'd they get through? Check out the recent
> regents debacle. Not enough kids pass, it must be to hard...so we'll
> throw 'em a curve. See the cycle there. Had someone had the courage to
> NOT throw some of these kids their earlier curves in the first place,
> their Regents scores would be higher.
>
> What does this have to do with amateur radio?

Very little. It's like saying that allowing people to get a licence without a code test will affect their knowledge of RF.

> Human nature. What we
> learn to do as we practice our avocation early in life, we tend to
> apply to other aspects later in life. Still believe this is about a
> 5-wpm Morse code test?
>

Yes. No hidden agenda here.

> Why must we reduce our beloved hobby/service to the lowest commen
> denominator?
>
> 73 de Bert
> WA2SI
>
>
>

3623. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-01 10:02:43 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <7lEyb.32793$Wy4.27999@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 83299

"Bert Craig" wrote:
>
> (snip) I kinda liken it to kids that are graduating
> HS with a 5th, 6th, or 7th grade reading level.
> Gee, how'd they get through? Check out the
> recent regents debacle. Not enough kids pass,
> it must be to hard...so we'll throw 'em a curve.
> See the cycle there. Had someone had the
> courage to NOT throw some of these kids their
> earlier curves in the first place, their Regents
> scores would be higher.
>
> What does this have to do with amateur radio?
> Human nature. What we learn to do as we
> practice our avocation early in life, we tend to
> apply to other aspects later in life. (snip)

It is not Amateur Radio's job or mandate to correct society's ills, Bert. Indeed, the current members of this avocation are not different enough from society overall to even have the moral high ground to attempt to do so. We're not gods or priests - we're simply radio operators. By the way, the word "too," as in "too hard," has more than one "o."

> Why must we reduce our beloved hobby/service
> to the lowest commen denominator?

There is nothing in code testing that insures the highest common denominator, or anything more than a lowest common denominator. Incidentally, one would reasonably expect no spelling mistakes in a message written by a person bold enough to point out the limited educational skills of others. The word "common" is spelled with an "o," not an "e."

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3624. Re: Where Did THIS Come From...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-01 10:58:38 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031201055838.12631.00003126@mb-m28.aol.com>
Source record: 83151

In article <f45722ac.0311301719.2522d18e@posting.google.com>,
brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:

>N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in message
>news:<c2356669.0311300839.3b1efd87@posting.google.com>...
>> "Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
>news:<cuvyxnansvbet.hp4w1e7.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>...
>> > On 29 Nov 2003 01:58:17 GMT, N2EY wrote:
>
>> > >And to our service people - spending next Thanksgiving with their
>> > >families at home.
>> >
>> > Amen, brother.
>>
>> Regardless of politics or policies, our prayers and thoughts are with
>> them.
>>
>> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>There you go, Jim. Your prayers and moral support is all that you can
>give to those deployed.

No, there's more.

>Tearing down their CIC hurts them, not helps
>them, and won't bring them home any sooner for Thanksgiving or
>anything else.

So no one should criticize the president whenever there are troops deployed
anywhere? That's what you seem to be saying.

Who sent American military personnel to the Balkans? Should no one have
criticized him until they all came home?

>There will always be deployed service people over
>Thanksgiving and Christmas holidays.

Why must it be that way?

I was told growing up that there would *always* be a need for more and more
nuclear weapons and delivery systems, because we had to counter the Soviet
threat, and they'd *never* agree to dismantling their weapons or even seriously
reducing their numbers. SAC bombers in the air, boomers on patrol under the
sea, ICBMs in silos all over the country - and there was serious talk of
development of space-based systems, hypersonic cruise missiles, and many other
systems.

How much threat is the the old Soviet Union now? The biggest threat they pose is if some of their weapons wind up in a terrorist's hands.

Recall that Gorbachev proposed massive dismantling of nukes 20 years ago but Reagan would not agree because Gorby tied a ban on serious SDI development to it.

>That's just the way it works
>when you raise your right hand and swear in. And all the people who
>raise their right hands know it.
>
A lot of things thought to be impossible have become reality, though.

3625. Re: Where Did THIS Come From...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-01 10:58:39 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031201055839.12631.00003127@mb-m28.aol.com>
Source record: 83300

In article <nczyb.7028$zL1.801107@news1.news.adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo
<mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:

>Phil Kane wrote:
>
>> On 30 Nov 2003 04:24:46 -0800, Brian wrote:
>>
>>
>>>I never did see the pictures of Dr. Laura...
>>
>>
>> You didn't miss anything.
>
>Ahh, she wans't bad looking. (actually she still is good looking) But
>looks don't have anything to do with it. Anne Coulter is an attractive
>woman too, but there is something seriously wrong with her. 8^)
>
Well said, Mike!

73 de Jim, N2EY

3626. Re: Response to "21st Century" Part One (Code Test)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-01 10:58:40 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031201055840.12631.00003128@mb-m28.aol.com>
Source record: 83152

In article <f45722ac.0311301734.276be025@posting.google.com>,
brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:

>n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
>news:<20031130082836.15462.00004620@mb-m06.aol.com>...
>
>> So, there are no "Morse code haters" on the committee. There is no
>conspiracy,
>> no secret agenda, no kickback from the manufacturers, no "black plan" from
>the
>> ARRL, no anything. Just some guys that want nothing more than to see our
>great
>> hobby prosper for the next hundred years, or longer.
>>
>> N2EY: That's good to know. However, these ideas need to be considered on
>their
>> merits, not on the personalities of those who wrote them.
>
>Jim, it would appear, at least on the surface, that you would also
>welcome the comments of Len Anderson.

I used to, Brian.

But for years, Mr. Anderson has used his "comments" as a way to voice unprovoked insults and denigration of those who oppose his views. His "comments" are rarely if ever without such ad hominem attacks. He is particularly nasty to those who prove him to be mistaken on any point of radio theory or history, as I have done many times.

Thus, his credibility in this newsgroup has been eroded over the years, to the point where it does not exist at all any more.

Your credibility is also eroded, for similar reasons.

The authors of the "21st Century" paper are trying to bolster the credibility of their ideas by pointing to their own personalities rather than the merits of their arguments.

>I guess that saying the right thing is important, even if you don't
>mean it, or even if it's impossible. It makes everyone feel good.

Try considering what I wrote in the context of a reply to the authors of the 21st Century paper.

3627. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-01 10:58:40 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031201055840.12631.00003129@mb-m28.aol.com>
Source record: 83153

In article <Xns94442777C95Eelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun
<alun@1stcounsel.com> writes:

>I think you're missing the point. I took _code_ tests to get _phone_
>subbands. There's no logic in that. Never was, even from the beginning.

Sure there is. Here it is, though you may argue that it doesn't hold much water
today:

'Phone signals take up far more spectrum than code signals. Back in the days
when full carrier DSB AM was king, the ratio was even worse than it is with
SSB. Ten to twenty code signals in the space of one AM 'phone signal is about
right. Not to mention the whistles from heterodyning carriers.

If you're going to argue about non-related privs, then why should anyone have
to learn about VHF/UHF to use HF, or vice versa? Why require knowledge of
'phone and image to operate CW? Why require theory to operate manufactured
equipment?

Why require anyone to learn anything they don't think they'll use? Or anyhting
they don't like?

73 de Jim, N2EY

3628. Re: Where Did THIS Come From...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-01 11:43:38 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0312010343.4b689672@posting.google.com>
Source record: 83154

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:<cuvyxnansvbet.hp6jbuj.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>...
> On 30 Nov 2003 04:11:04 -0800, Brian wrote:
>
> >> I strongly believe that the Habibi need
> >> the charra kicked out of them for a lot of reasons, including the
> >> expulsion of a branch of my family from what is now Iraq in the 13th
> >> Century (no, I don't want the family villa back but it was tempting).
> >
> >The 13th century??? You're as nuts as they are.
>
> You have no concept or understanding of what drives folks in the
> Middle East or of Middle East heritage, then.

These people are barely literate. What from the 13th century could
drive their hatred? How could they possibly know?

They are being told to hate by their clerics.

You are being told to hate by your clerics.

But then again, look
> at the Anglo-Irish conflict going back 800 years - that's the 13th
> Century as well.

I'm of Irish descent. I'm Catholic as well. Who am I supposed to
hate?

> >In ever conflict that we engage in, we need to see it through to the
> >bitter end.
>
> That's what I've been saying all along. Pay attention.

I was paying attention. How does one win a war that he is not a
combattant in?

3629. Re: Where Did THIS Come From...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-01 11:58:01 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031201065801.25517.00002515@mb-m15.aol.com>
Source record: 83156

In article <Xns944282A0D69C5elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun
<alun@1stcounsel.com> writes:

>n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in news:20031129115807.23307.00004755@mb-
>m29.aol.com:
>
>> In article <f45722ac.0311281934.2deeda0@posting.google.com>,
>> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
>>
>>>Blowhard libs have tried soooo hard to wreck this country.
>>
>> So have blowhard conservatives.
>>
>>>They've nearly succeeded,
>>
>> How is this country "wrecked", compared to how things used to be?
>>
>>>but there are still a few people who give a damn about America, and GW
>>>is one of them.
>>
>> There are lots of others, including many who disagree with Mr. Bush.
>>
>> It's the methods, not the person.
>>
>>>
>>
>>
>>
>
>Well, I'm a foreigner in your country, but you can't deny that the economy
>boomed under Clinton and is now on it's knees.

Sure - but for reasons that have little to do with Clinton, his predecessors or
successors.

>I'm not fond of the present government, but mainly for other reasons.
>Civil liberties and John Ashcroft, mostly.

The USA's open-door policies are one reason terror groups were able at come
here and operate the way they did on Sept 11.

>All in all, I can't really think of anything GW Bush has done domestically
>that is anything to shout about.

He's been kinda busy, fighting three wars (Afghanistan, Iraq, anti-terror)

>Tax cuts for the rich.

Why is anyone surprised at that?

>Deficit spending.

Goes hand-in-hand with reduced reveues from a struggling economy.

>I'm really trying to think of anything good (honestly), but nothing comes
>to mind.
>
>As for the war, why open that can of worms? Yes, Saddam is/was a very bad
>guy. Do I beleive the reasons given for going to war? No. And yes, Blair
>went along with it, but I don't like him a lot either.

The important question is "what next"?
>
>... but then I'm an anti-code test liberal, so what did you expect?
>
HAW! That's a good one!

>However, I actually do think it was a nice gesture for Dubbya to go to
>Baghdad for Thanksgiving.
>
>I'm sure this post will draw the usual 'love it or leave it' garbage from
>at least someone, but never mind. I can take it.
>
What is often forgotten is that "loving it" takes many forms.Disagreement is
not necessarily disloyalty.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3630. Re: Where Did THIS Come From...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-01 11:58:02 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031201065802.25517.00002516@mb-m15.aol.com>
Source record: 83155

In article <cuvyxnansvbet.hp6koro.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>, "Phil Kane"
<Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> writes:

>On 30 Nov 2003 08:39:47 -0800, N2EY wrote:
>
>>> >Hillary made a big show of going, so Dubya trumped her. Neat trick.
>>>
>>> Another bozo.
>>
>>Or bozoette?
>
> It's accurate to call her that. I prefer the gender-neutral version <ggg>

See "I Think We're All Bozos On This Bus" (Firesign Theatre)
>
>>Point is, she got trumped soundly by Dubya's move.
>
> Serves her right.
>
'zactly. Her attempt at free publicity got lost in the noise.

>>"Forgotten heroes of a forgotten war" (from the song "And The Band
>>Played Waltzing Matilda")
>
> Yup.
>
>>> >And to our service people - spending next Thanksgiving with their
>>> >families at home.
>>>
>>> Amen, brother.
>>
>>Regardless of politics or policies, our prayers and thoughts are with
>>them.
>
> Mine also.
>
73 de Jim, N2EY

3631. Re: Where Did THIS Come From...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-01 11:59:57 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0312010359.1ecc3e82@posting.google.com>
Source record: 83157

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20031130165827.12501.00004274@mb-m04.aol.com>...
> In article <YRbyb.26855$Rk5.25932@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>,
> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> writes:
>
>
> >The economy was taking a downturn BEFORE Clinton got out of office.
>
> But the real mess started when the dotcom bubble burst. Then came the Enron and
> other scandals.

I recall the Dems scrambling in the last few hours of the campaign to
come up with even -higher- surplus revenue dollars. Surplus dollars
that never existed, even when they knew they would never come to
fruition because of the slipping economy.

What did they say in 91? "It's the economy, Stupid."

> >The
> >economic policy of the Clinton presidency was what ??? Right, there was
> >none. He was riding on the coat tails of Reagan/Bush one.
>
> Whose economic policy was - none.
>
> In terms of economic policy, Clinton almost out-Republicaned the Republicans.
> >
> >Has everyone forgotten about 9/11? We are at war. Or has that little
> >detail been forgotten also?
>
> Not at all. It's another big factor. GWB has been kinda busy with wars in
> Afghanistan, Iraq and against terror.

Kind of?

> >It was not our choice to have some ragheads plow three jets into buildings,
> >and one into the ground and kill nearly 3000 innocents. Some of which were
> >MUSLIM.
>
> Exactly. But it *was* our choice who to let into the USA...

Not really. They're still coming in when we now have "tight"
security.

> >But it is our choice how to respond. If you think Sadam didn't have
> >anything to do with it. Let me sell you a bridge in NYC.
>

> There's been no definitive proof Saddam had anything to do 9/11. Nor that he
> had WMDs prior to Gulf War 2. That's been admitted publicly by the current
> administration.

But there sure are lots of terrorist-like activities in Iraq, in
defense of Saddam and in attempts to repel the Americans.

If there wasn't anything prior to 9/11, there sure is now.

3632. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-01 12:58:10 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031201075810.00545.00002659@mb-m02.aol.com>
Source record: 83158

In article <nLawb.19028$Wy4.9046@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> writes:

>"N2EY" wrote:
>>
>> Perhaps something really bad would have
>> happened, but the spell prevented it.
>> Who can ever say?
>
> The specific spell requested could only have resulted in something bad.

OK, fine.

Then possibly something really good was going to happen to you, but the spell prevented it.

Point is, proving cause and effect or lack thereof is more difficult than "nothing happened".
>
>> Who determines what is a "legitimate" religion
>> and what isn't? Who *can* determine such a
>> thing (other than God?)
>
> You just love to ask the "who determines" question, don't you?

It's a very important question.

>Especially
>when the answer is bloody obvious - like with most other things, people do.
>People either decide it's a legitimate religion or not.

Which people?

There have been times and places where religions like Christianity and Judaism were not "legitimate religions" because "people" said they weren't.

Are the spiritual beliefs of Native Americans "not legitimate"?

>A small, fringe,
>group of supposed believers don't make a religion legitimate (Hale-Bop's
>Heaven's Gate cult, for example), especially when the vast majority believe
>it's a load of crap (and I do suspect the vast majority don't really believe
>wiccas can actually cast spells, charms, and so on).

I disagree! Popularity is not a basis for such decisions. Ask Galileo about the validity of the "vast majority"..
>
>> Couldn't the same be said of almost all religions

>> now in existence? Most are based on a book or
>> series of books written hundreds or thousands
>> of years ago. (snip)
>
> However, the practices of today's wiccas seem mostly made up from images
>and stories in FICTIONAL movies, television, and books, not religious
>material and literature written by those who practice that religion. In
>other words, since so little is known of the old pagan religions, wiccas
>simply 'borrowed' things like black robes, symbols, supposed spells, and so
>on, from relatively modern day fiction.

So? Can anyone *prove* that the old books upon whioch many "legitimate"
religions are based are not fictional - or at least partly fictional? Yet
millions believe they are literally true.

There are plenty of people who will argue with you that the earth, sun , solar
system and everything else are no more than a bit over 6000 years old, because
they interpret their Book that way. Is their religion not legitimate?
>
>> Would you say the same thing about the power
>> of prayer, miracles, transubstantiation, and other
>> central beliefs of modern Christianity?
>
> It is one thing to pray for assistance from a God and quite another to
>actually claim to have personal powers to cast spells, charms, and so on.

How are they different?

>I
>would ask for similar proof from anyone, in any religion, who claimed to
>have such powers (any powers).
>
And what if they can't demonstrate them? Prayers aren't always answered the way
we want, yet the faith of the people praying is not diminished because God's
responses aren't 100% in line with human desires. Does this mean religions that
involve prayer-for-divine-intervention aren't legitimate?
>
>> Fine - but then why discriminate between "legitimate"
>> and "illegitimate" religions?
>
> Words alone do not discriminate, Jim. Nobody has been deprived of anything
>by my words.
>
Sure they have. You divide religions into two groups according to your
judgement.

Would you want your religion, or lack thereof, labeled "not legitimate"?

73 de Jim, N2EY

3633. Morse Yes or No ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-01 15:07:10 UTC
From: Code <code@codeyesno.net>
Message-ID: <bqflemgia0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 83159

Should Morse code be retained as a requirement to
obtain an amateur radio license in the U.S.?

73

Code Yes or No

3634. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-01 15:29:09 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3FCB5E45.4060901@psu.edu>
Source record: 83160

Dee D. Flint wrote:

> However that decision needs to be based on knowledge and experience not "I
> don't want to learn" arguments.

There are some people who would like to have a Ham license, but will
say "I don't want to learn what is on the written tests."

- Mike KB3EIA -

3635. Re: Where Did THIS Come From...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-01 15:47:37 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <toJyb.161$Qd6.65@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 83161

"Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message

> But there sure are lots of terrorist-like activities in Iraq, in
> defense of Saddam and in attempts to repel the Americans.
>
> If there wasn't anything prior to 9/11, there sure is now.

And if the truth be known that has been the plan all along. It is far
better to kill terrorists in Bagdad instead of Boston.

Dan/W4NTI

3636. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-01 15:50:04 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3FCB632C.8000606@psu.edu>
Source record: 83162

Dwight Stewart wrote:
> "Hans K0HB" wrote:
>
>>Nope, not at all. Under my proposal you'd
>>be free to keep renewing your Technician
>>(what a misnomer!) license until you assume
>>room temperature.
>
>
>
> Why is that a misnomer, Hans? Is that (you don't like "Technician" as the
> name for this license) the real reason behind your attempt to change the
> names of the various licenses? Regardless, I've read about Technicians in
> your proposal. That still doesn't change any of my previous questions or
> comments about how potential newcomers will be affected by the changes
> suggested in that proposal.
>
> By the way, since we're discussing why here, perhaps you can explain why
> your proposal is needed at all. Exactly what are you trying to accomplish
> with the proposal and what evidence do you have that would suggest that
> need?

My thoughts exactly! I tend to prefer a system something like what we have now, preseumably sans the Morse code test, with something added to at least the General test, and likely the Extra test also.

I want added test material for the advanced licenses to fill the vacuum left by the departure of Morse Code testing. I don't want the additions as a way of keeping people out - indeed if there are some more questions, it is just a matter of studying a little more. I want it to show that we are not just getting rid of things, and thereby simply making things easier to get a ticket.

Seems like a much easier to implement system to me.

- Mike KB3EIA -

3637. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-01 17:00:33 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0312010900.65bb371b@posting.google.com>
Source record: 83163

These are the number of unexpired FCC ARS
licenses held by individuals on the dates listed:

As of May 14, 2000:

Novice - 49,329
Tech - 205,394
Tech Plus - 128,860
General - 112,677
Advanced - 99,782
Extra - 78,750
Total - 674,792

As of November 30, 2003:

Novice - 32,830 (decrease of 16,499)
Technician - 258,967 (increase of 53,573)
Technician Plus - 63,689 (decrease of 65,171)
General - 141,387 (increase of 28,710)
Advanced - 82,209 (decrease of 17,573)
Extra - 104,750 (increase of 26,000)
Total - 683,832 (increase of 9,040)

73 de Jim, N2EY

3638. Re: Since We Were Mentioning "Absurdity"...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-01 17:39:30 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0312010939.6e9396bc@posting.google.com>
Source record: 83164

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0311282139.2fb5ec27@posting.google.com>...

> I was reading my December 2003 "CQ" magazine and found an item
> penned by Jim Wiley KL7CC, Scott Neustadter W4WW, and the snake oil
> salesman of Amateur Radio...Fred Maia W5YI.

What did they call it?

Is it the same article that's on the AL7FS website ("Amateur Radio for
the 21st Century"?
>
> The whole jist of the article is aimed at creating yet another
> Amateur Radio license, and the article suggests numerous "snips" of
> other requirements from the regulatory, theory, practice and safety
> regulations in order to "make" a slimmed-down beginners' license.

They envision replacing the existing Tech with the new license class.
>
> See if you can remember where their following suggestion was once
> an actual practice of the Federal Communications Commission, and how
> well it worked in practice:
>
> (From page 36, December 2003 "CQ") QUOTE "Remove some of the
> math from the license exams. Remove some or even most of the "radio
> law" type questions. Instead require the applicants to sign a
> statement that they have read the Part 97 rulebook, and that they ahve
> a copy (available for free via web download). Yes, some of the
> applicants will "skate" and not read it when they signed that they
> did. But most will, and even among those who dont, eventually,
> probablysooner rather than later, they will get around to it. Some
> never will. That's human nature. We're not looking for saints, just
> people who can become productive hams". UNQUOTE

Yep. A very bad idea.
>
> My first question for these brain surgeons is HOW IN THE BLUE
> BLAZES CAN SOMEONE BE "PRODUCTIVE" IF THEY DON"T KNOW THE RULES...?!?!

Heck, how can they even be *legal* if they don't know the rules?

And if we're supposed to accept a signed statement from a 12 year old
(the article repeatedly talks about aiming the license at the 6th
grade level) as proof of rules compliance, why do the rest of the
license classes require actually passing tests?
>

> These people are in a position of responsibility for mentoring
> the next generation of Amateurs..?!?!

I don't *think* so!

You may wish to read my rebuttal to that paper, posted here in 3
parts. Perhaps I should send it to CQ as well....

> While I am a big proponent of CLOSING the question pools and
> thereby requiring potential licensees to actually LEARN something,
> including regulations, even our present system of open pools and rote
> memorization will ingrain SOME understanding of the most of the basic
> rules of the service!

Exactly. And of all subjects that should be in the tests, the
rules/regs are #1 priority.
>
> Of course I can't help but believe this is another W5YI
> initiative to help perpetuate his "publishing" business, especially
> since it will soon lose part of it's subject matter (code tapes).

He sold that business.
>
> One more new license would be yet another "text" he could get
> around to selling.
>
He's not in that business any more.

> Read the whole article. It's a really poorly thought out concept
> and one that's been beaten over and over again.

Actually the basic concept boils down to revamping the old Novice for
the 21st century. Fine - let's do just that, call it the Novice, and
use it as the entry level instead of the Tech.

If it's the same article, it has a few good ideas and some very bad
ones.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3639. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-01 18:09:15 UTC
From: groupk0hb@earthlink.net
Message-ID: <5ee63311.0312011009.5cf3dff2@posting.google.com>
Source record: 83165

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote

> Why is that a misnomer, Hans?

Because it is misleading. "Technician" implies an emphasis on technical training, skills, and qualifications. While the original Technician license stressed those areas and was specifically designed to encourage amateur experimentation in VHF/UHF portions of the spectrum, that charter has long shifted to the point that Technician is the entry level license to our service, and the qualfication process gives little more than a "wink and a nod" to technical training and experimentation.

The name should be "Communicator".

73, Hans, K0HB

3640. Re: Where Did THIS Come From...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-01 18:29:12 UTC
From: Robbie <democreeps@democrapfools.org>
Message-ID: <bqg19ikgj0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 83166

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:toJyb.161$Qd6.65@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
>
> "Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
>
> > But there sure are lots of terrorist-like activities in Iraq, in
> > defense of Saddam and in attempts to repel the Americans.
> >
> > If there wasn't anything prior to 9/11, there sure is now.
>
> And if the truth be known that has been the plan all along. It is far
> better to kill terrorists in Bagdad instead of Boston.
>
> Dan/W4NTI
>
>
Dan,

Problem is you will never convince the extreme leftists who
presently control the Democratic party of that fact. Their
hatred of Bush blinds them to any reality. The good news is
our men & women in the U.S. military now know
they have a real CIC. Don't look for the leftists to figure
that one out though, since they are too busy "loathing" the
military. OH, but they DO "support the troops." U.S.
Senator Zell Miller has it right, "The Democratic Party,
A National Party No More."

Robbie

3641. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-01 19:23:13 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031201142313.01893.00001932@mb-m22.aol.com>
Source record: 83173

In article <3FCB632C.8000606@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:

>Dwight Stewart wrote:
>> "Hans K0HB" wrote:
>>
>>>Nope, not at all. Under my proposal you'd
>>>be free to keep renewing your Technician
>>>(what a misnomer!) license until you assume
>>>room temperature.
>>
>> Why is that a misnomer, Hans? Is that (you don't like "Technician" as the
>> name for this license) the real reason behind your attempt to change the
>> names of the various licenses? Regardless, I've read about Technicians in
>> your proposal. That still doesn't change any of my previous questions or
>> comments about how potential newcomers will be affected by the changes
>> suggested in that proposal.
>>
>> By the way, since we're discussing why here, perhaps you can explain why
>> your proposal is needed at all. Exactly what are you trying to accomplish
>> with the proposal and what evidence do you have that would suggest that
>> need?
>
>
> My thoughts exactly! I tend to prefer a system something like what we
>have now, preseumably sans the Morse code test, with something added to
>at least the General test, and likely the Extra test also.
>
> I want added test material for the advanced licenses to fill the vacuum

>left by the departure of Morse Code testing. I don't want the additions
>as a way of keeping people out - indeed if there are some more
>questions, it is just a matter of studying a little more. I want it to
>show that we are not just getting rid of things, and thereby simply
>making things easier to get a ticket.
>
> Seems like a much easier to implement system to me.

The FCC is not chartered to be an educational institution.

The amateur radio license test is NOT a certificate of achievement,
although some think it is so.

There is NO "requirement" that all prospective radio amateurs
"prove themselves" to the "amateur community" in order to
satisfy YOUR demands of hard work, dedication, and application
of "what is 'good' for amateur radio."

It's amazing the amount of self-righteousness that exists among the already licensed in here. All newcomers MUST do as they did in order for "acceptance" to the group.

LHA

3642. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-01 19:23:14 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031201142314.01893.00001933@mb-m22.aol.com>
Source record: 83170

In article <20031201055840.12631.00003129@mb-m28.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
writes:

>In article <Xns94442777C95Eelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun
><alun@1stcounsel.com> writes:
>
>>I think you're missing the point. I took _code_ tests to get _phone_
>>subbands. There's no logic in that. Never was, even from the beginning.
>
>Sure there is. Here it is, though you may argue that it doesn't hold much
>water today:
>
>'Phone signals take up far more spectrum than code signals. Back in the days
>when full carrier DSB AM was king, the ratio was even worse than it is with
>SSB. Ten to twenty code signals in the space of one AM 'phone signal is about
>right. Not to mention the whistles from heterodyning carriers.

If you wish to BAN "wide bandwidth signals" in the U.S. amateur
bands, then submit a PETITION for such banishment.

Take everything back to 1950 or thereabouts, maybe even 1930.
BAN all those newfangled modes and modulations that don't meet
the criteria of simple, narrowband on-off keying. I keep suggesting
you also include in your petition a name change of the hobby to

Archaic Radiotelegraphy Service

If you feel "insulted" by such extremism, then change 'archaic' to
Amateur. You have the liberty to do that.

"Extremism in the defense of liberty is no vice..."

Guess who said that? :-)

LHA

3643. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-01 19:23:15 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031201142315.01893.00001934@mb-m22.aol.com>
Source record: 83168

In article <7lEyb.32793$Wy4.27999@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> writes:

>"Bert Craig" wrote:
>>
>> (snip) I kinda liken it to kids that are graduating
>> HS with a 5th, 6th, or 7th grade reading level.
>> Gee, how'd they get through? Check out the
>> recent regents debacle. Not enough kids pass,
>> it must be to hard...so we'll throw 'em a curve.
>> See the cycle there. Had someone had the
>> courage to NOT throw some of these kids their
>> earlier curves in the first place, their Regents
>> scores would be higher.
>>
>> What does this have to do with amateur radio?
>> Human nature. What we learn to do as we
>> practice our avocation early in life, we tend to
>> apply to other aspects later in life. (snip)
>
> It is not Amateur Radio's job or mandate to correct society's ills, Bert.
>Indeed, the current members of this avocation are not different enough from
>society overall to even have the moral high ground to attempt to do so.
>We're not gods or priests - we're simply radio operators. By the way, the
>word "too," as in "too hard," has more than one "o."

Dwight, you cannot argue with Believers.

Their self-righteousness knows no bounds.

They are correct by their own definitions.

They KNOW what is best for amateur radio...and that is a maintenance
of morse code proficiency forever and ever.

A morse code test for amateur radio licensing has "always" been in
the regulations (91 years) and it must always be there.

>> Why must we reduce our beloved hobby/service
>> to the lowest commen denominator?
>
> There is nothing in code testing that insures the highest common
>denominator, or anything more than a lowest common denominator.
>Incidentally, one would reasonably expect no spelling mistakes in a message
>written by a person bold enough to point out the limited educational skills
>of others. The word "common" is spelled with an "o," not an "e."

Messaging sometimes goes down to the "lowest common
denominator" in writing... :-)

LHA

3644. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-01 19:23:16 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031201142316.01893.00001936@mb-m22.aol.com>
Source record: 83169

In article <b0Dyb.32761$Wy4.22977@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> writes:

>"Dee D. Flint" wrote:
>>
>> "Dwight Stewart" wrote:
>> > Really? You mean all those things I did
>> > to get a properly operating station (putting
>> > coax and connectors together, water-
>> > proofing, antenna tuning, SWR tests,
>> > ground radials, masts, guy wires, wiring a
>> > microphone, equipment grounding,
>> > lightning protection, RF exposure level
>> > estimates, and so on) wasn't really needed
>> > and didn't really require any skills to do
>> > properly? (snip)
>>
>> Soldering requires some modest skill but one
>> can hire that done if desired. The other items
>> are necessary but no skill is required just
>> taking the time to do it. (snip)
>
> If you truly believe there is no skill involved to do those things
>properly, I suspect you haven't done most of them (at least not properly).

Dwight, morse code proficiency overrules all other things. It doesn't matter in other skills. Only one thing counts - morse code skill.

LHA

3645. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-01 19:23:16 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031201142316.01893.00001935@mb-m22.aol.com>
Source record: 83172

In article <Xns94442777C95Eelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun
<alun@1stcounsel.com> writes:

>"Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in
>news:n1Byb.3560$PD3.1554930@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net:
>
>> "Alun" <alun@1stcounsel.com> wrote in message
>> news:Xns9443D49135CC2elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
>>> "Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in
>>> news:2Tryb.904$vq1.96953@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net:
>>>
>>> > "Alun" <alun@1stcounsel.com> wrote in message
>>> > news:Xns94437E0B940DDelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
>>> >> "Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in
>>> >> news:iAlyb.28717$iU5.7375071@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net:
>>> >>
>>> >> >
>>> >> > "Alun" <alun@1stcounsel.com> wrote in message
>>> >> > news:Xns944288614CAD1elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
>>> >> >> What is annoying is that a skill test is foisted on those who
>>> >> >> don't have the desire to use the skill.

>> Folks have just figured out a way to gain a
>> *privilege* in a <perceived> easier fashion, collectively whine. It
>> stands a great chance too. After all, the Gov't. agency they must
>> cajole shares their goal, less work. So with great glee, their
>> proponents espouse "the FCC doesn't agree that Morse is necessary." The
>> "regulatory" angle is just that, an angle. If you ignore the angle, you
>> realise that it was never about Element 1 in the first place.
>
>It has always been about the code test. No angles. If you think it's just
>a bid to reduce the requirements in general, then you just couldn't be
>more wrong.

Alun, a morseodist will NEVER admit they are wrong or are defeated.

A morse code test has "always" been in regulations (always = 91 years)
so, therefore, by morseodist logic, it must ALWAYS be there.

Any demands, however slight, to reduce or eliminate the code test
are a blatant insult to individual Believers-in-Morse, heresy, an
abomination unto the god of ham, and other assorted pejoratives.

MISDIRECTION in replies in here is now an SOP. Sigh.

>> Why must our beloved hobby/service be reduced to the lowest common
>> denominator?

A "lowest common denominator" is unity. One.

United States amateur radio was created for only One. All must do as
that One did. Forever and ever.

Belief is love. Ergo, anything against the One is an insult.

Lots of insults in here, especially by the Loving Believers who will not,
ever, accept anything against their Beliefs of the One.

LHA.

3646. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-01 19:23:17 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031201142317.01893.00001937@mb-m22.aol.com>
Source record: 83167

In article <OqCyb.32752$Wy4.5229@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> writes:

>"Len Over 21" wrote:
>>
>> (snip) The TEST and the USE cannot be
>> separated, Dwight. It is "necessary" to keep
>> the test forever and ever so that there will be
>> this "pool of trained operators (in CW)" to
>> help earth survive on the next invasion of
>> spacefaring aliens.
>
> LOL. Those darn aliens have had their eyes on Earth for some time now.
>Luckily, CW keeps us well prepared for any stunt they might try. I've even
>heard of a secret Air Force project to study the effects of CW on captured
>aliens. ;-)

...probably at "Area 51." :-)

I just hope everyone in "the pool" can stand all the chlorine necessary to keep it sanitary... :-)

For anyone wanting serious thinking (a novel concept in here), there's always Brooks AFB in San Antonio, the USAF School of Aerospace Medicine. So far, the folks at Brooks haven't touched on aliens, not even the green-card types.

LHA

3647. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-01 19:23:18 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031201142318.01893.00001938@mb-m22.aol.com>
Source record: 83174

In article <IOByb.32731$Wy4.30927@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> writes:

>"N2EY" wrote:
>>
>> (snip) So what it comes down to is that
>> a little serious skill-learning is required to
>> use Morse on the air, except for a very
>> few people who have learned Morse
>> elsewhere. I think that plain, simple fact
>> bothers some of the most vociferous
>> and abusive anti-code-test folks.
>
> That fact, as you call it, ignores other very real facts. Few people today
>(especially boys and men) have not learned code, or at least played around
>with it, at some point in their lives. When we were kids, many of us sent
>messages to friends using flashlights or walkie-talkies with code printed on
>the side. Many other games and toys over the years have featured messages,
>secret or otherwise, sent by Morse code. Others learned code in groups like
>the Boy Scouts. Still others learned it in the military.

I was in the U.S. military for 8 years. Never learned any morse code, never had to.

I used real walkie-talkies and handie-talkies (AN/PRC-8 and AN/PRC-6, respectively). Never needed any morse code proficiency to use those.

I even transmitted on HF with many KiloWatts of RF power, never had to use any morse code proficiency thing for that.

The only "code" I learned as a kid was deciphering "secret messages" sent over a radio show (Captain Midnight?) which amounted to "drink Ovaltine." :-)

>In reality, most
>adults today are familiar enough with code to know whether they have any
>real interest in it.

Morse code manual telegraphy is 159 years old. It shows up in old-time movies and TV shows, especially Westerns.

>Clearly, those with no interest are not exactly highly
>motivated to study up for a license exam.

Sloth! Abomination unto the god of ham!

Clearly such infidels have NO reason for existance!

>But the fact that some have no
>interest in code, and would freely choose not to learn it, really seems to
>bother some of the "most vociferous and abusive" pro-code folks.

Antichrist = anticode? :-)

LHA

3648. Re: Response to "21st Century" Part One (Code Test)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-01 19:23:19 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031201142319.01893.00001939@mb-m22.aol.com>
Source record: 83171

In article <20031201055840.12631.00003128@mb-m28.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
writes:

>In article <f45722ac.0311301734.276be025@posting.google.com>,
>brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
>
>>n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
>>news:<20031130082836.15462.00004620@mb-m06.aol.com>...
>>
>>> So, there are no "Morse code haters" on the committee. There is no
>>conspiracy,
>>> no secret agenda, no kickback from the manufacturers, no "black plan" from
>>the
>>> ARRL, no anything. Just some guys that want nothing more than to see our
>>great
>>> hobby prosper for the next hundred years, or longer.
>>>
>>> N2EY: That's good to know. However, these ideas need to be considered on
>>their
>>> merits, not on the personalities of those who wrote them.
>>
>>Jim, it would appear, at least on the surface, that you would also
>>welcome the comments of Len Anderson.
>
>I used to, Brian.
>
>But for years, Mr. Anderson has used his "comments" as a way to voice
>unprovoked insults and denigration of those who oppose his views. His
>"comments" are rarely if ever without such ad hominem attacks. He is
>particularly nasty to those who prove him to be mistaken on any point of
>radio theory or history, as I have done many times.

Believers can seldom coexist with infidels, heretics against Their
Beliefs.

Morseodists are ALWAYS right...by their own definitions.

>Thus, his credibility in this newsgroup has been eroded over the years, to
>the point where it does not exist at all any more.

All-time high for Jimmie's self-righteousness! :-)

>Your credibility is also eroded, for similar reasons.

Ah, more self-righteousness. The Fury of the Reverend is at a peak.

The Sermon on the Antenna Mount continues...

>The authors of the "21st Century" paper are trying to bolster the credibility
>of their ideas by pointing to their own personalities rather than the merits
>of their arguments.

Obviously, those 20 WPM code tested VECs are not of the True
Beliefs!

>>I guess that saying the right thing is important, even if you don't
>>mean it, or even if it's impossible. It makes everyone feel good.
>
>Try considering what I wrote in the context of a reply to the authors of the
>21st Century paper.

Step up the brightness on your True Light, Reverend.

Show us all the Way to Salvation, the Righteous Path of Morse.

Amen.

LHA

3649. Re: Where Did THIS Come From...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-01 20:32:18 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0312011232.e801d53@posting.google.com>
Source record: 83175

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20031201055838.12631.00003126@mb-m28.aol.com>...
> In article <f45722ac.0311301719.2522d18e@posting.google.com>,
> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
>
> >N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in message
> >news:<c2356669.0311300839.3b1efd87@posting.google.com>...
> >> "Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
> news:<cuvyxnansvbet.hp4w1e7.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>...
> >> > On 29 Nov 2003 01:58:17 GMT, N2EY wrote:
>
> >> > >And to our service people - spending next Thanksgiving with their
> >> > >families at home.
> >> >
> >> > Amen, brother.
> >>
> >> Regardless of politics or policies, our prayers and thoughts are with
> >> them.
> >>
> >> 73 de Jim, N2EY
> >
> >There you go, Jim. Your prayers and moral support is all that you can
> >give to those deployed.
>
> No, there's more.

Do tell.

> >Tearing down their CIC hurts them, not helps
> >them, and won't bring them home any sooner for Thanksgiving or
> >anything else.
>
> So no one should criticize the president whenever there are troops deployed
> anywhere? That's what you seem to be saying.
>
> Who sent American military personnel to the Balkans? Should no one have
> criticized him until they all came home?
>
> >There will always be deployed service people over
> >Thanksgiving and Christmas holidays.
>
> Why must it be that way?
>
> I was told growing up that there would *always* be a need for more and more
> nuclear weapons

There is. China has them. India has them. Pakistan has them. South
Africa?

North Korea has them. Iraq was trying hard to build them. Iran is
trying hard to build them.

See? Everyone needs nukes.

and delivery systems, because we had to counter the Soviet
> threat, and they'd *never* agree to dismantling their weapons or even seriously
> reducing their numbers. SAC bombers in the air, boomers on patrol under the
> sea, ICBMs in silos all over the country - and there was serious talk of
> development of space-based systems, hypersonic cruise missiles, and many other
> systems.

I agree with GW - we need to get star wars going before we become
vulnerable to the Chinese.

> How much threat is the the old Soviet Union now?

The very same as prior to the "peace dividend" that got spent on
welfare.

The biggest threat they pose
> is if some of their weapons wind up in a terrorist's hands.

That is a different threat.

> Recall that Gorbachev proposed massive dismantling of nukes 20 years ago but
> Reagan would not agree because Gorby tied a ban on serious SDI development to
> it.

Yes, yes. And now GW is going forward w/o their OK.

> >That's just the way it works
> >when you raise your right hand and swear in. And all the people who
> >raise their right hands know it.
> >
> A lot of things thought to be impossible have become reality, though.

Like my gift certificate to Red Lobster is going to be.

3650. Re: Response to "21st Century" Part One (Code Test)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-01 20:41:21 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0312011241.63e54419@posting.google.com>
Source record: 83176

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20031201055840.12631.00003128@mb-m28.aol.com>...
> In article <f45722ac.0311301734.276be025@posting.google.com>,
> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
>
> >n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
> >news:<20031130082836.15462.00004620@mb-m06.aol.com>...
> >
> >> So, there are no "Morse code haters" on the committee. There is no
> conspiracy,
> >> no secret agenda, no kickback from the manufacturers, no "black plan" from
> the
> >> ARRL, no anything. Just some guys that want nothing more than to see our
> great
> >> hobby prosper for the next hundred years, or longer.
> >>
> >> N2EY: That's good to know. However, these ideas need to be considered on
> their
> >> merits, not on the personalities of those who wrote them.
> >
> >Jim, it would appear, at least on the surface, that you would also
> >welcome the comments of Len Anderson.
>
> I used to, Brian.
>
> But for years, Mr. Anderson has used his "comments" as a way to voice
> unprovoked insults and denigration of those who oppose his views. His
> "comments" are rarely if ever without such ad hominem attacks. He is
> particularly nasty to those who prove him to be mistaken on any point of radio
> theory or history, as I have done many times.
>
> Thus, his credibility in this newsgroup has been eroded over the years, to the
> point where it does not exist at all any more.

Some things impossible are now possible, right?

> Your credibility is also eroded, for similar reasons.

More feel-good wishes?

> The authors of the "21st Century" paper are trying to bolster the credibility
> of their ideas by pointing to their own personalities rather than the merits
> of their arguments.
> >
> >I guess that saying the right thing is important, even if you don't

> >mean it, or even if it's impossible. It makes everyone feel good.
>
> Try considering what I wrote in the context of a reply to the authors of the
> 21st Century paper.

Jim, you might be suprised to learn that the authors of the 21st Paper felt it necessary to to bolster their credibility because of the ad hominem attacks on them - as code haters, CB Plussers, and desirous of destroying the ARS. I'm sure that you know what I mean.

So they present not only ideas with merit, but also personal and professional credibility.

If their credibility is so bothersome to you, just wish it away.

3651. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-01 21:15:53 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3FCBAF87.5080802@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 83177

N2EY wrote:

>These are the number of unexpired FCC ARS
>licenses held by individuals on the dates listed:
>
>As of May 14, 2000:
>
>
>

Why select May 14th 2000? Restructuring took effect a month earlier. I upgraded from tech + to extra on April 15, 2000 and the paperwork reached the FCC just a few days later the next week. Thus I would show up as an extra in the May 14th 2000. If your objective is to show the effects of restructuring, you need to list the numbers for April14, 2000.

3652. Re: Morse Yes or No ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-01 22:50:29 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0312011450.49a587d5@posting.google.com>
Source record: 83178

"Code" <code@codeyesno.net> wrote in message news:<bqflemgia0@pita.alt.net>...
> Should Morse code be retained as a requirement to
> obtain an amateur radio license in the U.S.?
>
> 73
>
> Code Yes or No

YES!

73 de Jim, N2EY

3653. Re: Since We Were Mentioning "Absurdity"...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-01 22:52:36 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0312011452.677b660@posting.google.com>
Source record: 83179

brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0311301723.b6af115@posting.google.com>...
> k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0311301124.2743b66f@posting.google.com>...
>
> > I was a big MJ fan until
>
> I thought he was going to be bigger than Elvis. Now he is a joke. Sad.

FINALLY! Something we can completely agree on!

This guy WAS one heck of an entertainer, and I even enjoy
listening to his music on the radio. But what's with the face...?!?!
I've seen more human-looking scarecrows!

73

Steve, K4YZ

3654. Re: Morse Yes or No ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-01 22:58:47 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <HIPyb.519$Oe5.78@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 83180

"Code" <code@codeyesno.net> wrote

> Should Morse code be retained as a requirement to
> obtain an amateur radio license in the U.S.?

It's hasn't been a requirement for over a decade.

73, de Hans, K0HB

3655. Re: Morse Yes or No ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-01 23:00:23 UTC
From: Bert Craig <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM>
Message-ID: <bKPyb.11205$_j6.2650884@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>
Source record: 83181

"K�HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:HIPyb.519$Oe5.78@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> "Code" <code@codeyesno.net> wrote
>
> > Should Morse code be retained as a requirement to
> > obtain an amateur radio license in the U.S.?
>
> It's hasn't been a requirement for over a decade.
>
> 73, de Hans, K0HB

Here here!

73 de Bert
WA2SI

3656. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-01 23:13:40 UTC
From: Bert Craig <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM>
Message-ID: <EWPyb.11634$_j6.2707195@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>
Source record: 83182

"Alun" <alun@1stcounsel.com> wrote in message
news:Xns94442932D1FE7elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
> "Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in
> news:QlByb.3749$PD3.1640819@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net:
>
> > "Alun" <alun@1stcounsel.com> wrote in message
> > news:Xns9443D524F4743elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
> >> "Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in
> >> news:7Xryb.972$vq1.109343@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net:
> >>
> >> > "Alun" <alun@1stcounsel.com> wrote in message
> >> > news:Xns94437F4AF796Belektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
> >> >> "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote in
> >> >> news:bqd5u1$j11@library2.airnews.net:
> >> >>
> >> >> > "Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in message
> >> >> > news:oPlyb.29000$iU5.7424460@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net...
> >> >> >> "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
> >> >> >> news:KU6yb.13197$P%1.11970231@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
> >> >> >> >
> >> >> >> > "Alun" <alun@1stcounsel.com> wrote in message
> >> >> >> > news:Xns94428A3961C57elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
> >> >> >> > > It just so happens that I don't
> >> >> >> > > like CW, in the sense of I have no desire to use it. That
> >> >> >> > > should be OK too, but for some reason it bothers you. Why?
> >> >> >> >
> >> >> >> > No it does not bother me that someone who has learned it
> >> >> >> > chooses not to use it. They have made that decision from a
> >> >> >> > position of knowledge and experience. This is radically
> >> >> >> > different from a person judging it and saying they will never
> >> >> >> > use it when they do not have that knowledge and experience to
> >> >> >> > draw on.
> >> >> >> >
> >> >> >> > Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
> >> >> >>
> >> >> >> Right on the money, Dee. Larry pointed this out earlier, but not
> >> >> >> as eloquently as you.
> >> >> >>
> >> >> >> 73 de Bert
> >> >> >> WA2SI
> >> >> >>
> >> >> >>
> >> >> >
> >> >> > It fascinates me that you won't accept someone's plain and simple

> >> >> > truth that they don't like CW--even if they don't have experience
> >> >> > with it--because you reason that they need to have "knowledge and
> >> >> > experience" with it. Well, I know people who are quite
> >> >> > well-versed in CW who don't like it, people who haven't ever even
> >> >> > tried it and don't like it, and people who have taken and passed
> >> >> > a 5wpm test and don't like it. I also know people from those
> >> >> > same three categories that do like CW operation.
> >> >> >
> >> >> > It's pretty much as simple as folks who do or don't like most
> >> >> > other things in life. Either ya like it or ya don't.
> >> >> >
> >> >> > Kim W5TIT
> >> >> >
> >> >> >
> >> >> >
> >> >>
> >> >> I think that you have hit upon a very important point there, Kim. A
> >> >> good analogy might be not liking an item of food that you haven't
> >> >> tried, because it looks disgusting on your plate. If you eat some
> >> >> you might like it, or not, but there are probably all kinds of
> >> >> other things that contain the same nutrition. These guys are like a
> >> >> parent telling a child that they have to eat their brocolli. But
> >> >> they aren't my parents and I don't like brocolli, or CW. I take
> >> >> vitamins, and work phone.
> >> >
> >> > Slight difference, Alun. Nobody's forcing anybody to learn code.
> >> > There exists a no-code Technician license for those who do not wish
> >> > to have to pass the 5-wpm code exam.
> >> >
> >> > 73 de Bert
> >> > WA2SI
> >>
> >> Not really true.
> >
> > Very true, Alun...very true.
> >
> >> No HF privileges with that licence, as we all know.
> >
> > As with most things in life, increased *privileges* requires increased
> > effort. The ARS is but a microsm or society as a whole. Despite the
> > efforts of some to reduce it to "just a hobby" status, the values and
> > principles we learn in our "avocations" will likely carry over into the
> > other aspects of our lives. Many here were first licensed as children
> > or young adults, that's no accident.
> >
> > The kids of today are referred to as the Nintendo generation, kinda
> > hard to compete with. However, in our quest to gain quantity, we appear
> > to be courting a slightly older prospective ham...products of the newer
> > "I want it now" society. So what can we do, villify the "speed bump" of
> > our licensing structure in an effort to remove any "barriers."

>
> If you admit that you view the code test as a "speed bump", then you are
> admitting it's not relevant, but just there to slow down the traffic. You
> view that as desirable, and I don't, which is one of the differences
> between us.
>
> > I kinda
> > liken it to kids that are graduating HS with a 5th, 6th, or 7th grade
> > reading level. Gee, how'd they get through? Check out the recent
> > regents debacle. Not enough kids pass, it must be to hard...so we'll
> > throw 'em a curve. See the cycle there. Had someone had the courage to
> > NOT throw some of these kids their earlier curves in the first place,
> > their Regents scores would be higher.
> >
> > What does this have to do with amateur radio?
>
> Very little. It's like saying that allowing people to get a licence
> without a code test will affect their knowledge of RF.

It's not about the code Alun, it's about the effort.

> > Human nature. What we
> > learn to do as we practice our avocation early in life, we tend to
> > apply to other aspects later in life. Still believe this is about a
> > 5-wpm Morse code test?
> >
>
> Yes. No hidden agenda here.

No, there's no hidden agenda. If you take away the passion and whining from BOTH sides of the equation, it becomes obvious that the code test is really not the issue. It's the effort. If the writtens were made more difficult and the published Q&A pools eliminated, the whining would then continue. The common denominator...the effort involved.

> > Why must we reduce our beloved hobby/service to the lowest commen
> > denominator?

Oops, my bad. That should read "common." Gotta pay more attention. <hihi>

> > 73 de Bert
> > WA2SI

Like I said before, Alun. It's ok to just agree to disagree. Take care.

73 de Bert
WA2SI

3657. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-02 01:24:51 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <DRRyb.703$Oe5.193@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 83183

"Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:bqagg3$d1a@library1.airnews.net...
> "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
> news:3c2yb.4513$zL1.340545@news1.news.adelphia.net...
> > K&#65533;HB wrote:
> >
> >
> > > On the contrary, my plan puts newcomers dead center in the mainstream
of
> > > amateur radio, with all the same privileges of EVERY other licensee,
> just at
> > > a more modest power level of 50watts.
> >
> > How are you going to enforce that?
> >
> > - Mike KB3EIA -
>
> Well, no matter what Hans believes on this, power level enforcement or
even
> monitoring just can't be done--unless there'd be a whole lot more dollars
> and effort going to it and we all know that's not going to happen.
>
> Kim W5TIT

While enforcement might prove difficult, the implementation
of a power limit would, I believe, not be violated by the
majority of hams. Those of us that were Novices at one time
lived with a 75 watt limit. Did some novices violate
that? Probably, but by and large, most stayed within the
legal limit.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

3658. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-02 01:36:58 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031201203658.07578.00001962@mb-m25.aol.com>
Source record: 83185

In article <EPbwb.11252$m84.3906010@news1.news.adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo
<mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>
>> In article <2a5wb.10210$m84.3800775@news1.news.adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo
>> <mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:
>
><some snippage>
>
>>>If you look at the total dollars spent, you can still pay less money on
>>>some of the higher interest lower cost loans than lower interest higher
>>>priced loans. (although I'd never suggest doing that) It's just the
>>>sheer amount of dollars.
>>
>>
>> Yep. That's why you have to calculate the options.
>>
>>
>>>So the best bet is to pay all the loans off as
>>>quickly as possible.
>>
>>
>> Not always.
>>
>> Suppose you're in a situation where money is tight but you can expect big
>> increases some time in the future. (example: kids are small and one parent
>is
>> home with them, but when the youngest reaches school age both parents will
>be
>> working full time). In a case like that, having a lower monthly payment may
>be
>> the best alternative even if it requires a longer loan term.
>
> Well, a qualified yes. I've found people, including myself, sometimes
>too optimistic when dealing with "future" things, like earnings and
>expenditures.

Too true! Again, the ppeople who can do all this stuff realistically usually
don;t get themselves in a hole in the first place.

>While what you sat is true, I'll take the tack of either
>paying the thing off ASAP, or go without. Maybe even save for what I
>want. (Modern Heresy Alert!)
>

Works for me!

73 de Jim, N2EY

3659. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-02 01:36:59 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031201203659.07578.00001963@mb-m25.aol.com>
Source record: 83184

In article <Iubwb.17139$Rk5.5484@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Kï¿½HB"
<groupk0hb@earthlink.net> writes:

>"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote
>
>> A small, fringe, group of supposed believers don't make
>> a religion legitimate, especially when the vast majority believe
>> it's a load of crap.
>
>Since no single religion in the world enjoys a "vast majority" of the
>population as "supposed believers", then it follows that the "vast majority"
>of the worlds population on average believes that Judaism, Islam,
>Christianity, Hinduism, Shintoism, Scientism, Buddhism, etc. are each
>individually a "load of crap" also, and not really legitimate.

Thank you, Hans, for explaining it so clearly and concisely.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3660. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-02 02:32:07 UTC
From: Alun <alun@1stcounsel.com>
Message-ID: <Xns9444DB06E844Aelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 83186

"Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in
news:EWPyb.11634$_j6.2707195@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net:

> "Alun" <alun@1stcounsel.com> wrote in message
> news:Xns94442932D1FE7elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
>> "Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in
>> news:QlByb.3749$PD3.1640819@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net:
>>
>> > "Alun" <alun@1stcounsel.com> wrote in message
>> > news:Xns9443D524F4743elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
>> >> "Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in
>> >> news:7Xryb.972$vq1.109343@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net:
>> >>
>> >> > "Alun" <alun@1stcounsel.com> wrote in message
>> >> > news:Xns94437F4AF796Belektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
>> >> >> "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote in
>> >> >> news:bqd5u1$j11@library2.airnews.net:
>> >> >>
>> >> >> > "Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in message
>> >> >> > news:oPlyb.29000$iU5.7424460@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net...
>> >> >> >> "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
>> >> >> >> news:KU6yb.13197$P%1.11970231@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
>> >> >> >> >
>> >> >> >> > "Alun" <alun@1stcounsel.com> wrote in message
>> >> >> >> > news:Xns94428A3961C57elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
>> >> >> >> > > It just so happens that I don't
>> >> >> >> > > like CW, in the sense of I have no desire to use it. That
>> >> >> >> > > should be OK too, but for some reason it bothers you.
>> >> >> >> > > Why?
>> >> >> >> >
>> >> >> >> > No it does not bother me that someone who has learned it
>> >> >> >> > chooses not to use it. They have made that decision from a
>> >> >> >> > position of knowledge and experience. This is radically
>> >> >> >> > different from a person judging it and saying they will
>> >> >> >> > never use it when they do not have that knowledge and
>> >> >> >> > experience to draw on.
>> >> >> >> >
>> >> >> >> > Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>> >> >> >>
>> >> >> >> Right on the money, Dee. Larry pointed this out earlier, but
>> >> >> >> not as eloquently as you.
>> >> >> >>
>> >> >> >> 73 de Bert
>> >> >> >> WA2SI

>> >> >> >>
>> >> >> >>
>> >> >> >
>> >> >> > It fascinates me that you won't accept someone's plain and
>> >> >> > simple truth that they don't like CW--even if they don't have
>> >> >> > experience with it--because you reason that they need to have
>> >> >> > "knowledge and experience" with it. Well, I know people who
>> >> >> > are quite well-versed in CW who don't like it, people who
>> >> >> > haven't ever even tried it and don't like it, and people who
>> >> >> > have taken and passed a 5wpm test and don't like it. I also
>> >> >> > know people from those same three categories that do like CW
>> >> >> > operation.
>> >> >> >
>> >> >> > It's pretty much as simple as folks who do or don't like most
>> >> >> > other things in life. Either ya like it or ya don't.
>> >> >> >
>> >> >> > Kim W5TIT
>> >> >> >
>> >> >> >
>> >> >> >
>> >> >>
>> >> >> I think that you have hit upon a very important point there,
>> >> >> Kim. A good analogy might be not liking an item of food that you
>> >> >> haven't tried, because it looks disgusting on your plate. If
>> >> >> you eat some you might like it, or not, but there are probably
>> >> >> all kinds of other things that contain the same nutrition. These
>> >> >> guys are like a parent telling a child that they have to eat
>> >> >> their brocolli. But they aren't my parents and I don't like
>> >> >> brocolli, or CW. I take vitamins, and work phone.
>> >> >
>> >> > Slight difference, Alun. Nobody's forcing anybody to learn code.
>> >> > There exists a no-code Technician license for those who do not
>> >> > wish to have to pass the 5-wpm code exam.
>> >> >
>> >> > 73 de Bert
>> >> > WA2SI
>> >>
>> >> Not really true.
>> >
>> > Very true, Alun...very true.
>> >
>> >> No HF privileges with that licence, as we all know.
>> >
>> > As with most things in life, increased *privileges* requires
>> > increased effort. The ARS is but a microsm or society as a whole.
>> > Despite the efforts of some to reduce it to "just a hobby" status,
>> > the values and principles we learn in our "avocations" will likely
>> > carry over into the other aspects of our lives. Many here were first
>> > licensed as children or young adults, that's no accident.
>> >

>> > The kids of today are referred to as the Nintendo generation, kinda
>> > hard to compete with. However, in our quest to gain quantity, we
>> > appear to be courting a slightly older prospective ham...products of
>> > the newer "I want it now" society. So what can we do, villify the
>> > "speed bump" of our licensing structure in an effort to remove any
>> > "barriers."
>>
>> If you admit that you view the code test as a "speed bump", then you
>> are admitting it's not relevant, but just there to slow down the
>> traffic. You view that as desirable, and I don't, which is one of the
>> differences between us.
>>
>> > I kinda
>> > liken it to kids that are graduating HS with a 5th, 6th, or 7th
>> > grade reading level. Gee, how'd they get through? Check out the
>> > recent regents debacle. Not enough kids pass, it must be to
>> > hard...so we'll throw 'em a curve. See the cycle there. Had someone
>> > had the courage to NOT throw some of these kids their earlier curves
>> > in the first place, their Regents scores would be higher.
>> >
>> > What does this have to do with amateur radio?
>>
>> Very little. It's like saying that allowing people to get a licence
>> without a code test will affect their knowledge of RF.
>
> It's not about the code Alun, it's about the effort.

I think the effort would be better placed doing something else.

>
>> > Human nature. What we
>> > learn to do as we practice our avocation early in life, we tend to
>> > apply to other aspects later in life. Still believe this is about a
>> > 5-wpm Morse code test?
>> >
>>
>> Yes. No hidden agenda here.
>
> No, there's no hidden agenda. If you take away the passion and whining
> from BOTH sides of the equation, it becomes obvious that the code test
> is really not the issue. It's the effort.

It's the misplaced effort

> If the writtens were made
> more difficult and the published Q&A pools eliminated, the whining
> would then continue. The common denominator...the effort involved.
>

You can chose to beleive that it's about the effort, but it isn't

>> > Why must we reduce our beloved hobby/service to the lowest commen
>> > denominator?
>
> Oops, my bad. That should read "common." Gotta pay more attention.
> <hihi>
>
>> > 73 de Bert
>> > WA2SI
>
> Like I said before, Alun. It's ok to just agree to disagree. Take care.
>
> 73 de Bert
> WA2SI
>
>
>

3661. Re: Where Did THIS Come From...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-02 02:38:24 UTC
From: Alun <alun@1stcounsel.com>
Message-ID: <Xns9444DC1898263elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 83187

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in
news:20031201065801.25517.00002515@mb-m15.aol.com:

> In article <Xns944282A0D69C5elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun
> <alun@1stcounsel.com> writes:
>
>>n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in news:20031129115807.23307.00004755@mb-
>>m29.aol.com:
>>
>>> In article <f45722ac.0311281934.2deeda0@posting.google.com>,
>>> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
>>>
>>>>Blowhard libs have tried soooo hard to wreck this country.
>>>
>>> So have blowhard conservatives.
>>>
>>>>They've nearly succeeded,
>>>
>>> How is this country "wrecked", compared to how things used to be?
>>>
>>>>but there are still a few people who give a damn about America, and
>>>>GW is one of them.
>>>
>>> There are lots of others, including many who disagree with Mr. Bush.
>>>
>>> It's the methods, not the person.
>>>
>>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>
>>Well, I'm a foreigner in your country, but you can't deny that the
>>economy boomed under Clinton and is now on it's knees.
>
> Sure - but for reasons that have little to do with Clinton, his
> predecessors or successors.

You may be right

>>
>>I'm not fond of the present government, but mainly for other reasons.
>>Civil liberties and John Ashcroft, mostly.
>
> The USA's open-door policies are one reason terror groups were able at

> come here and operate the way they did on Sept 11.

Actually, US immigration is amongst the toughest in the world. I can't help but smile to see it called 'open door'.

>>
>>All in all, I can't really think of anything GW Bush has done
>>domestically that is anything to shout about.
>
> He's been kinda busy, fighting three wars (Afghanistan, Iraq,
> anti-terror)
>
>>Tax cuts for the rich.
>
> Why is anyone surprised at that?

I'm not

>
>>Deficit spending.
>
> Goes hand-in-hand with reduced reveues from a struggling economy.
>
>>I'm really trying to think of anything good (honestly), but nothing
>>comes to mind.
>>
>>As for the war, why open that can of worms? Yes, Saddam is/was a very
>>bad guy. Do I beleive the reasons given for going to war? No. And yes,
>>Blair went along with it, but I don't like him a lot either.
>
> The important question is "what next"?

Indeed it is. I think if it had been approached differently a lot more countries would have been willing to help. As it is, Bush and Blair, etc. have got themselves into a hole.

>>
>>... but then I'm an anti-code test liberal, so what did you expect?
>>
> HAW! That's a good one!
>
>>However, I actually do think it was a nice gesture for Dubbya to go to
>>Baghdad for Thanksgiving.
>>
>>I'm sure this post will draw the usual 'love it or leave it' garbage
>>from at least someone, but never mind. I can take it.
>>
> What is often forgotten is that "loving it" takes many
> forms.Disagreement is not necessarily disloyalty.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>

>

Agreed

3662. Re: Morse Yes or No ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-02 02:39:20 UTC
From: Alun <alun@1stcounsel.com>
Message-ID: <Xns9444DC413ECA1elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 83188

"Code" <code@codeyesno.net> wrote in news:bqflemgia0@pita.alt.net:

> Should Morse code be retained as a requirement to
> obtain an amateur radio license in the U.S.?
>
> 73
>
> Code Yes or No
>
>
>

No N3KIP

3663. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-02 03:40:24 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0312011940.7b3f5b64@posting.google.com>
Source record: 83189

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20031201142318.01893.00001938@mb-m22.aol.com>...

> I was in the U.S. military for 8 years. Never learned any morse code,
> never had to.

You were never in the Amateur Radio Service. That is the focus
of this Newsgroup. Your service in the Armed Forces is not.

> I used real walkie-talkies and handie-talkies (AN/PRC-8 and AN/PRC-6,
> respectively). Never needed any morse code proficiency to use those.

Neither of those radios were commonplace in the Amateur Radio
Service. That is the focus of this Newsgroup. Army surplus is not.

> I even transmitted on HF with many KiloWatts of RF power, never had
> to use any morse code proficiency thing for that.

You did not require Morse Code proficiency since radio clerks
didn't require it. Again you try to analogize your military service
with Amateur Radio. They are not comparable.

> The only "code" I learned as a kid was deciphering "secret messages"
> sent over a radio show (Captain Midnight?) which amounted to "drink
> Ovaltine."

Most of your "practical experience" in any phase of radio comes
from the 1950's and 1960's. Amateur Radio has long since left those
decades.

You should too.

> Morse code manual telegraphy is 159 years old. It shows up in old-
> time movies and TV shows, especially Westerns.

The "telegraphy" demonstrated on those old movies was not the
Morse Code employed by the Amateur Radio Service in the 21st century.
Please try and look past YOUR past, Lennie.

Lennie, do you have ANYTHING constructive to offer this forum,
other than to try and continue beating a long since expired horse?

Steve, K4YZ

3664. Re: Response to "21st Century" Part One (Code Test)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-02 03:45:31 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0312011945.2cf0683a@posting.google.com>
Source record: 83190

Attention One And All:

Sir Lennie of Putzonia shall now demonstrate how "Professional
Electrical Engineers" engage in "civil debate" (his description of how
he conducts himself in this forum).

You will please note the complete lack of any substantial
discussion and the liberal use of sarcastic adjectives in order to
overcome his lack of any meaningful discussion.

Again.

Steve, K4YZ

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20031201142319.01893.00001939@mb-m22.aol.com>...
> In article <20031201055840.12631.00003128@mb-m28.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
> writes:
>
> >In article <f45722ac.0311301734.276be025@posting.google.com>,
> >brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
> >
> >>n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
> >>news:<20031130082836.15462.00004620@mb-m06.aol.com>...
> >>
> >>> So, there are no "Morse code haters" on the committee. There is no
> conspiracy,
> >>> no secret agenda, no kickback from the manufacturers, no "black plan" from
> the
> >>> ARRL, no anything. Just some guys that want nothing more than to see our
> great
> >>> hobby prosper for the next hundred years, or longer.
> >>>
> >>> N2EY: That's good to know. However, these ideas need to be considered on
> their
> >>> merits, not on the personalities of those who wrote them.
> >>
> >>Jim, it would appear, at least on the surface, that you would also
> >>welcome the comments of Len Anderson.
> >
> >I used to, Brian.
> >
> >But for years, Mr. Anderson has used his "comments" as a way to voice
> >unprovoked insults and denigration of those who oppose his views. His
> >"comments" are rarely if ever without such ad hominem attacks. He is
> >particularly nasty to those who prove him to be mistaken on any point of

> >radio theory or history, as I have done many times.
>
> Believers can seldom coexist with infidels, heretics against Their
> Beliefs.
>
> Morseodists are ALWAYS right...by their own definitions.
>
> >Thus, his credibility in this newsgroup has been eroded over the years, to
> >the point where it does not exist at all any more.
>
> All-time high for Jimmie's self-righteousness! :-)
>
> >Your credibility is also eroded, for similar reasons.
>
> Ah, more self-righteousness. The Fury of the Reverend is at a peak.
>
> The Sermon on the Antenna Mount continues...
>
> >The authors of the "21st Century" paper are trying to bolster the credibility
> >of their ideas by pointing to their own personalities rather than the merits
> >of their arguments.
>
> Obviously, those 20 WPM code tested VECs are not of the True
> Beliefs!
>
> >>I guess that saying the right thing is important, even if you don't
> >>mean it, or even if it's impossible. It makes everyone feel good.
> >
> >Try considering what I wrote in the context of a reply to the authors of the
> >21st Century paper.
>
> Step up the brightness on your True Light, Reverend.
>
> Show us all the Way to Salvation, the Righteous Path of Morse.
>
> Amen.
>
> LHA

3665. Re: Since We Were Mentioning "Absurdity"...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-02 03:55:43 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0312011955.2350f4bf@posting.google.com>
Source record: 83191

N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<c2356669.0312010939.6e9396bc@posting.google.com>...
> k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0311282139.2fb5ec27@posting.google.com>...
>
> > I was reading my December 2003 "CQ" magazine and found an item
> > penned by Jim Wiley KL7CC, Scott Neustadter W4WW, and the snake oil
> > salesman of Amateur Radio...Fred Maia W5YI.
>
> What did they call it?
>
> Is it the same article that's on the AL7FS website ("Amateur Radio for
> the 21st Century"?

That's the one. It's in "CQ's" OP-ED" column.

> > The whole jist of the article is aimed at creating yet another
> > Amateur Radio license, and the article suggests numerous "snips" of
> > other requirements from the regulatory, theory, practice and safety
> > regulations in order to "make" a slimmed-down beginners' license.
>
> They envision replacing the existing Tech with the new license class.

Same silliness as Stewart Teaze. Yet another "Colt" or whatever
class license Stewie dreamt up.

> > See if you can remember where their following suggestion was once
> > an actual practice of the Federal Communications Commission, and how
> > well it worked in practice:
> >
> > (From page 36, December 2003 "CQ") QUOTE "Remove some of the
> > math from the license exams. Remove some or even most of the "radio
> > law" type questions. Instead require the applicants to sign a
> > statement that they have read the Part 97 rulebook, and that they ahve
> > a copy (available for free via web download). Yes, some of the
> > applicants will "skate" and not read it when they signed that they
> > did. But most will, and even among those who dont, eventually,
> > probablysooner rather than later, they will get around to it. Some
> > never will. That's human nature. We're not looking for saints, just
> > people who can become productive hams". UNQUOTE
>
> Yep. A very bad idea.

To say teh least.

> > My first question for these brain surgeons is HOW IN THE BLUE
> > BLAZES CAN SOMEONE BE "PRODUCTIVE" IF THEY DON"T KNOW THE RULES...?!?!
>
> Heck, how can they even be *legal* if they don't know the rules?
>
> And if we're supposed to accept a signed statement from a 12 year old
> (the article repeatedly talks about aiming the license at the 6th
> grade level) as proof of rules compliance, why do the rest of the
> license classes require actually passing tests?

We already have literally thousands of examples of elementary and
middle school kids passing not only the Technician, but the General
and the Extra.

> > These people are in a position of responsibility for mentoring
> > the next generation of Amateurs..?!?!
>
> I don't *think* so!
>
> You may wish to read my rebuttal to that paper, posted here in 3
> parts. Perhaps I should send it to CQ as well....

Please do. I sent an e mail to "CQ" and routed copies to the
three authors. I actually got a very nice response from KL7CC.

I doubt Maia will ever respond.

> > While I am a big proponent of CLOSING the question pools and
> > thereby requiring potential licensees to actually LEARN something,
> > including regulations, even our present system of open pools and rote
> > memorization will ingrain SOME understanding of the most of the basic
> > rules of the service!
>
> Exactly. And of all subjects that should be in the tests, the
> rules/regs are #1 priority.

AB-SA-LOOT-A-MUNDO!

> > Of course I can't help but believe this is another W5YI
> > initiative to help perpetuate his "publishing" business, especially
> > since it will soon lose part of it's subject matter (code tapes).
>
> He sold that business.

So I found out, and I responded to KL7CC with an "I stand
corrected".

> > One more new license would be yet another "text" he could get
> > around to selling.
> >
> He's not in that business any more.

As I was saying...!

> > Read the whole article. It's a really poorly thought out concept
> > and one that's been beaten over and over again.
>
> Actually the basic concept boils down to revamping the old Novice for
> the 21st century. Fine - let's do just that, call it the Novice, and
> use it as the entry level instead of the Tech.
>
> If it's the same article, it has a few good ideas and some very bad
> ones.

I am all for a GOOD "Novice" class proposal as long as it
represents some RESPONSIBLE ideas. Deleting rules and regulations and
safety issues is NOT it!

Unfortunately it's the FCC's past track record to latch on to
some really bad ideas...

73

Steve, K4YZ

3666. Re: Where Did THIS Come From...?!?!a

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-02 04:05:50 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0312012005.49d2f5ac@posting.google.com>
Source record: 83192

Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:<u8zyb.7027$zL1.800394@news1.news.adelphia.net>...
> Phil Kane wrote:
>
> > On 30 Nov 2003 04:11:04 -0800, Brian wrote:
> >
> >
> > >>> I strongly believe that the Habibi need
> > >>> the charra kicked out of them for a lot of reasons, including the
> > >>> expulsion of a branch of my family from what is now Iraq in the 13th
> > >>> Century (no, I don't want the family villa back but it was tempting).
> > >>
> > >>The 13th century??? You're as nuts as they are.
> > >
> > >
> > > You have no concept or understanding of what drives folks in the
> > > Middle East or of Middle East heritage, then. But then again, look
> > > at the Anglo-Irish conflict going back 800 years - that's the 13th
> > > Century as well.
>
> I understand, but do not accept. Tat line of thinking of course is why
> the human race is almost certainly doomed. Over thousands of years,
> there is plenty of time for each side to make a little bank account of
> transgressions that they can call upon to provoke righteous outrage. And
> it will not go away until there is only one person left in whatever the
> conflict was.

Had al-Queda not used the Palestinian cause as it's justification
for the attacks on WTC, I'd send a letter to Washington and tell them
to let Israel duke it out on their own.

President Bush recently said the US has no greater friend than
Isreal, but the only thing >>I<< see from our association with them is
death, violence and war.

> One of the most civilized things that the USofA does is that we have
> made a habit of burying the hatchet with our onetime enemies. Something
> I doubt that people who are mad because of what someone did to them a
> thousand years ago can understand.

Yep. We infused billions of dollars into Japan and Germany, and
look where they are today.

I think it takes a really narrow-minded person to NOT be able to
see the parallels between the way the WW2 era Germans treated Jews,
and how Jews presently treat Palestinians. Thank God there's no

concentration camps, but I am more than a little bit embarrassed when I see yet another fugitive camp being patrolled with soldiers carrying M-16's or AH-1W Cobras.

Steve, K4YZ

3667. Re: Dean Trumps Bush's Visit to Baghdad

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-02 04:09:49 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0312012009.167463b5@posting.google.com>
Source record: 83193

"Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:<bqafth$80s@library1.airnews.net>...

> Jim, the below "article" that was posted is quite suspicious. I can find no
> evidence anywhere that Dean went to Iraq.

Kim...Ya looking to buy some off-shore residential property in
Florida? Perhaps a bridge in New York? Need a cast for that leg that
was being pulled?

88 =)

Steve, K4YZ

3668. Re: Morse Yes or No ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-02 04:47:31 UTC
From: KU2S <ku2s@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <1l6osvgrtqb3jtcaoskffllnod13q7dqib@4ax.com>
Source record: 83194

On Mon, 1 Dec 2003 10:07:10 -0500, "Code" <code@codeyesno.net> wrote:

>Should Morse code be retained as a requirement to
>obtain an amateur radio license in the U.S.?
>
>73
>
>Code Yes or No
>
>

Morse is not required to obtain an amateur radio license in the US.
It is only required to obtain the General class license (and by
inference the Extra class license, which has the General class license
as a prerequisite). Morse has not been a licensing requirement in the
US for several years now.
Raymond Sirois KU2S
SysOp: The Lost Chord BBS
607-733-5745
telnet://thelostchord.dns2go.com:6000

3669. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-02 04:58:18 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031201235818.12631.00003140@mb-m28.aol.com>
Source record: 83195

In article <3FCBAF87.5080802@ix.netcom.com>, Robert Casey
<wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>
>>These are the number of unexpired FCC ARS
>>licenses held by individuals on the dates listed:
>>
>>As of May 14, 2000:
>>
>>
>>
>Why select May 14th 2000?

Two reasons:

1) I happened to have those numbers recorded

2) By that date, it's reasonable to expect that all of the backlog from before
the April 15 changes had gone through FCC.

> Restructuring took effect a month
>earlier. I upgraded from tech + to extra on April 15, 2000 and
>the paperwork reached the FCC just a few days later the next week.
>Thus I would show up as an extra in the May 14th 2000. If your
>objective is to show the effects of restructuring, you need to list
>the numbers for April14, 2000.
>
If you have them, I'll show them.

73 de Jim, N2EY

>

3670. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-02 10:41:23 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bqhq6q$q9h@library2.airnews.net>
Source record: 83196

"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
news:c2356669.0311300918.2bd67bd2@posting.google.com...
> "Kim" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:<bqc3p2$b5r@library2.airnews.net>...
> > > >
> > > >The far left--the "fast" lane as it is called. Funny thing is, if
you
> > > >mention to people at the office or wherever, that it doesn't mean the
> > "break
> > > >the speed limit lane," you ought to hear the validations for people
doing
> > > >just that.
> > >
> > > But you're already speeding, Kim. And not by an amount that can be
> > > explained by the usual inaccuraccies and imperfections of
speedometers.
> > >
> > > Yet your getting ticked off because someone wants to go even faster.
> > >
> >
> > Nope. Not at all. I am ticked because they think I should move for
them.
>
> Why shouldn't you move?
>
> If it's OK for you to go 15 mph above the limit, why isn't it OK for
> them to go 20 mph above the limit? By refusing to move, you're
> enforcing your own personal judgement on what the speed limit should
> be.
>

It's fine for them to go 20 mph above the speed limit. It's fine if they
want to go 30-40 mph above the speed limit. But, they won't find me moving
out of their way; they'll have to go around because I am not moving into a
lane where I have to slow down, or even get "stuck" there for a while, if
there happens to be more than one vehicle that wants to go past.

This is an "every morning" thing. If they want to get to where they are
going quicker, then they need to adjust their scheduling, not make others on
the road cater to their needs. I would not think of being obnoxious because
I have to get somewhere quicker than anyone else--I would make the decision
to get on the road earlier.

>
> Suppose you're sailing along on your 60 mph 4-lane-divided (2 lanes

> each way) road and you come across two (non police) cars side-by-side
> going exactly the speed limit.
>
> What would you do? Would their behavior bother you?
>

Yes, their behavior would bother me--*but* they're the cops...and they have that latitude. What would I do? I'd follow along, in the left hand lane. The fun part would be when someone angrily pulls out to the right and would be jumping up alongside to go around before they'd notice that they were acting like that with cops right there. <GRIN>

> >
> > I am already going faster than the posted speed is my point. Why should
> > someone expect me to move if I am already going faster than I should be?
>
> Because you're preventing them from going as fast as *they* want, even
> though you're going as fast as *you* want.
>

Then they should have gotten out earlier than me. It's the same principle as someone who's standing in the "fast" lane (misnomer most of the time--GRIN) at the grocery store and I am ahead of them with 10 items and they only have one or two. If they're prone to it, they'll tap their foot; sigh real loud, etc. Practically fall over trying to get me to notice that they only have "just this little bit." And, how dare I *not* yield to them and let them go ahead...and the next with one or two...and the next, etc. Hey, next time, get there before me.

>
> Why does anyone *need* to speed in a nonemergency situation? How much
> time does going 70-75 save vs. 60 on that same road?
> >

Actually, none...and I learned that in Driver's Education in High School. It was proven out a few times, too. I don't know if I am really speeding because of having to get somewhere quicker--in fact in the mornings that would be probably not. I leave 45 min. ahead of time most of the time, to get to a 20-25 min. destination. I leave early enough to account for traffic also. And, I am very fortunate to have a job that doesn't make me punch the timeclock.

In my case, my 70-75 mph (more near 70 most of the time) is probably more due to the fact that, that is where my foot lands on the gas pedal. And, it is the predominant flow of traffic...70-75, with the exception of those obnoxious folks we're discussing here.

> >
> > Well, myself included, one does not think of these things (tickets)
> > happening when one is breaking the speed limit.
>
> I think about 'em all the time. Not just the fine but the points.

>

I should probably count my blessings here, because this will jinx me. I've
been stopped three times in my driving "career." Little enough that I still
don't "know the routine" when I do get stopped. Only once I've been
ticketed and that was for taking a turn onto a street that doesn't allow
those turns at the time of morning I was doing it.

> > >
> >
> > Exactly, but if I happened upon someone who's already breaking the speek
> > limit, I am not going to act like an idiot behind them--expecting them
to
> > get out of my way.
>
> What if they're going the speed limit?
>
> Why is it OK for you to go 15 over but not OK for someone else to go
> 20 over?
> >

If they are going the speed limit where I am at (in the left lane), I'd
still calmly make the move to the right lane and go around them--when it was
safe to--and wouldn't act like an idiot to them. It is not any more "right"
for me to speed than the next person--it's just that they'd better decide to
go around, because I will not be moving for them just because they are going
to act like an idiot. I will move if I decide to...and I usually don't.
But it's just as OK for them to be speeding as me...I don't care. You seem
to be stuck on the idea that I think they are wrong to speed faster than I
speed. No. We're all just as wrong as each other for speeding, no matter
how fast. But, I don't like their "I gotta get there faster than you gotta
get there" attitude. And, since I am the one in the lead at that
point--well, then, my attitude is the one that's important <GRIN>.

> >
> > > >And, while my behavior is not "forgiveable," I am no where
> > > >as nasty as these folks are being.
> > > >
> > > Isn't that an entirely subjective judgement?
> > >
> > Yep. And it's mine...(grin)
> >
> HAW!
>
> I do believe some of all this is regional, however.
>
> And I've done a few tricks myself....
>
> Way back in the late '80s, I had reason to go back and forth between
> Philly and Washington, DC about every other weekend. I noticed that
> the aggressiveness of drivers increased in direct proportion to

> proximity to the nation's capital.
>
> The worst part of the run was the BWP (Baltimore Washington Parkway),
> a no-trucks 4 lane road with trees on both sides, and also between the
> northbound and southbound lanes. Lots of traffic on a Friday night,
> and as one approached The District the cars got more expensive and the
> drivers more aggressive.
>

Heh, heh...funny you should mention that.

>
> Back then the limit was 55 and traffic tended to stay below about 59
> because enforcement was pretty good, and there were lots of places for
> the troopers to hide in the trees, around curves, etc. The troopers
> would not go after anyone below about 62 because speedometers and
> radar are not 100% accurate. Above that they were ruthless, and above
> 65 the fines went up and up and up...
>
> I got to know their whereabouts pretty good by observing where others
> got tickets. (I was *never* stopped, in part because my 1980 Rabbit
> Diesel looked like it couldn't even go the speed limit anyway). Radar
> detectors were illegal in MD back then, too, and they'd do things like
> set up a radar gun on an overpass and watch whose brake lights came on
> for no reason....
>
> One night I'm sailing down the BWP in the *right* lane, and up behind
> me comes a new Saab (Saabs were the hot car back then among the
> yuppie-but-no-Beemer crowd). Dude flashes his brights at me - he wants
> *me* to get in the *left* lane so he can pass without having to change
> lanes!
>
> So I ease up on the throttle and slow down to 53...52....51....
>
> He gets ticked and crawls up but now I'm down to 50...49...
>
> Flashes the brights, gets ticked, and I keep easing up....
>
> Finally he gets ticked and goes into the left lane. Whereupon I start
> speeding up again...52...55...58...62...
>
> He pulls alongside and now is really steamed because it is taking far
> more effort to get past me than he expected. So he drops down a gear
> and stomps it and goes off in a cloud of dust, over the next rise and
> around the curve.....
>
> and I bring it back down to the limit...
>
> and I wave as I go by him, because he's now stopped by a trooper for
> going WAY over the limit.....
>

> I wouldn't play games like that today, though...
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>

Yeah, that was what I did a few...OK, more than a few...years ago. I'd always do just that, as a matter of fact. BUT, one day, this guy began throwing things out his window at me when I did finally move over and let him go passed me! Scared the heck outta me...he was throwing anything loose in his car, bottle caps, cracker jack box, etc. Thank goodness he didn't come across the bottle! That's another reason I'm not so sure about letting creepy people get ahead of me...it may be me having to come upon them once again...

Kim W5TIT

3671. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-02 10:55:52 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bqhr29$9v8@library2.airnews.net>
Source record: 83197

"Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in message
news:15ryb.33166$iU5.8797254@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net...
> "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> news:bqd5u1$j11@library2.airnews.net...
> >
> > It fascinates me that you won't accept someone's plain and simple truth
> that
> > they don't like CW--even if they don't have experience with it--because
> you
> > reason that they need to have "knowledge and experience" with it.
>
> I don't know what's so fascinating about it, Kim. It stands to reason that
> to make an "educated" decision regarding anything, one should be...well,
> somewhat educated on the subject. That includes some practical experience.
> One certainly need not be an expert, and appropriately, the 5-wpm Element
1
> test is not an expert level test.
>

The concept is genuine, I am sure. However, it doesn't hold water across the board for me, so it doesn't hold water for the CW testing in the ARS venue, either. If I know I am not going to like something--say for example jumping out of a plane--then I am not interested in trying it. I know I will not like CW usage, based on the time it took me to learn it and the misunderstanding I have about using it for communicating when speaking is my preferred mode of communication. And, other than declarations to the contrary, I have not seen--and will not buy--that it (CW testing) creates any better a ham in *any* way.

> >
> > Well, I
> > know people who are quite well-versed in CW who don't like it,
>
> Educated decision.
>
> > people who
> > haven't ever even tried it and don't like it,
>
> That's why we have the no-code Techician license.
>

Ahem. And the coded-Tech+ license. And, did you know that a Tech who has passed their 5 wpm CW can stay there forever (and get on at least the Tech+ portion of the 10-M phone band)? It's just that their CW endorsement for license upgrade to General is only good for one year.

And, I like the fact that 5 wpm gets folks onto a little HF phone. It's a very small portion of a very large chunk of spectrum.

> I seem to have found them...on the bottom of 40. Interestingly enough, I've
> even heard interested folks who've yet to pass Element 1 practice their code
> (Legally) on CB ch. 14 using 100mW Part 15 devices.

Oh, cool. Yeah, hearing CW on CB is what I've heard expose a lot of folks to amateur radio--when the questions start getting asked about what "that" is and why it's being practiced, etc.

> > It's pretty much as simple as folks who do or don't like most other things
> > in life. Either ya like it or ya don't.
> ...And that's certainly fine by me, Kim. However, many of these anti-code
> folks are about to diminish the value (As a whole.) of a hobby I dearly
> love...despite having a very generous chunk of no-code RF real estate.

I don't know about "dearly" loving the ARS...LOL However, I also don't think the non-CW test gang diminishes the value of the ARS--except to those who value CW. And, that is quite contrary. Your value of CW is greatly recognized by more non-CW folks than you apparently realize. I'd never infringe on your valuation of it, never infringe--and would defend--frequency allocation for CW, and also would always be a proponent of its tradition in amateur radio. My experience shows me that more of us non-CW folks believe that, than not.

> I've had the advantage of seeing this whole code vs. no-code debacle unfold
> before me through the eyes of a relatively unbiased newbie. If you remove
> the passion and whining from both sides of the equation, it becomes very
> clear what the issue is really about...because it damn sure ain't that 5-wpm
> code exam.
>
> 73 de Bert
> WA2SI
>
>

Well, you hit the nail on the head with that one. The CW vs. no-CW debate, for the most part, has nothing to do with the "love" of the mode and way more to do with attitude; and that has a lot to do with how strongly one becomes motivated by the debate, I might add.

Kim W5TIT

3672. Re: Dean Trumps Bush's Visit to Baghdad

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-02 10:56:45 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bqhr3u$t7p@library2.airnews.net>
Source record: 83198

"Steve Robeson, K4CAP" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
news:5c01b95b.0312012009.167463b5@posting.google.com...
> "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:<bqafth$80s@library1.airnews.net>...
>
> > Jim, the below "article" that was posted is quite suspicious. I can
find no
> > evidence anywhere that Dean went to Iraq.
>
> Kim...Ya looking to buy some off-shore residential property in
> Florida? Perhaps a bridge in New York? Need a cast for that leg that
> was being pulled?
>
> 88 =)
>
> Steve, K4YZ

Heh heh....well, I am not...but apparently the fella posting the "news"
story was!!!

73/88, to you!!

Kim W5TIT

3673. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-02 11:48:29 UTC
From: Bert Craig <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM>
Message-ID: <h__yb.9260$N.1637149@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>
Source record: 83199

"Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:bqhr29$9v8@library2.airnews.net...
> "Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in message
> news:15ryb.33166$iU5.8797254@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net...
> > "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> > news:bqd5u1$j11@library2.airnews.net...
> > >
> > > It fascinates me that you won't accept someone's plain and simple
truth
> > that
> > > they don't like CW--even if they don't have experience with
it--because
> > you
> > > reason that they need to have "knowledge and experience" with it.
> > >
> > I don't know what's so fascinating about it, Kim. It stands to reason
that
> > to make an "educated" decision regarding anything, one should be...well,
> > somewhat educated on the subject. That includes some practical
experience.
> > One certainly need not be an expert, and appropriately, the 5-wpm
Element
> 1
> > test is not an expert level test.
> >
>
> The concept is genuine, I am sure. However, it doesn't hold water across
> the board for me, so it doesn't hold water for the CW testing in the ARS
> venue, either. If I know I am not going to like something--say for
example
> jumping out of a plane--then I am not interested in trying it. I know I
> will not like CW usage, based on the time it took me to learn it and the
> misunderstanding I have about using it for communicating when speaking is
my
> preferred mode of communication. And, other than declarations to the
> contrary, I have not seen--and will not buy--that it (CW testing) creates
> any better a ham in *any* way.

I guess I just feel differently about it. You're 100% correct re. skydiving
tho. <hihi>

> > > Well, I
> > > know people who are quite well-versed in CW who don't like it,
> > >
> > Educated decision.

> >
> > > people who
> > > haven't ever even tried it and don't like it,
> >
> > That's why we have the no-code Techician license.
> >
>
> Ahem. And the coded-Tech+ license. And, did you know that a Tech who has
> passed their 5 wpm CW can stay there forever (and get on at least the
Tech+
> portion of the 10-M phone band)? It's just that their CW endorsement for
> license upgrade to General is only good for one year.

I know, Kim. That's why I didn't just write Technician, I specified no-code
Technician.

> And, I like the fact that 5 wpm gets folks onto a little HF phone. It's a
> very small portion of a very large chunk of spectrum.

I do too. I think they're gonna get it without the 5-wpm test tho. Perhaps
Element 1 shall be retained for the General and Extra?

> > I seem to have found them...on the bottom of 40. Interestingly enough,
> I've
> > even heard interested folks who've yet to pass Element 1 practice their
> code
> > (Legally) on CB ch. 14 using 100mW Part 15 devices.
> >
>
> Oh, cool. Yeah, hearing CW on CB is what I've heard expose a lot of folks
> to amateur radio--when the questions start getting asked about what "that"
> is and why it's being practiced, etc.

I used it ther for a while with a neice. We used a whopping 100mW and
traversed approx. 15 mi. through some pretty CBish QRM. That kinda got my
attention. I have heard higher speed ops on ch. 38, however, I suspect
they're not using Part 15 devices.

> > > It's pretty much as simple as folks who do or don't like most other
> things
> > > in life. Either ya like it or ya don't.
> >
> > ...And that's certainly fine by me, Kim. However, many of these
anti-code
> > folks are about to diminish the value (As a whole.) of a hobby I dearly
> > love...despite having a very generous chunk of no-code RF real estate.
> >
>
> I don't know about "dearly" loving the ARS...LOL However, I also don't
> think the non-CW test gang diminishes the value of the ARS--except to
those
> who value CW. And, that is quite contrary. Your value of CW is greatly

> recognized by more non-CW folks than you apparently realize. I'd never
> infringe on your valuation of it, never infringe--and would
> defend--frequency allocation for CW, and also would always be a proponent
of
> its tradition in amateur radio. My experience shows me that more of us
> non-CW folks believe that, than not.

Reasonable enough.

> > I've had the advantage of seeing this whole code vs. no-code debacle
> unfold
> > before me through the eyes of a relatively unbiased newbie. If you
remove
> > the passion and whining from both sides of the equation, it becomes very
> > clear what the issue is really about...because it damn sure ain't that
> 5-wpm
> > code exam.
> >
> > 73 de Bert
> > WA2SI
> >
> >
>
> Well, you hit the nail on the head with that one. The CW vs. no-CW
debate,
> for the most part, has nothing to do with the "love" of the mode and way
> more to do with attitude; and that has a lot to do with how strongly one
> becomes motivated by the debate, I might add.
>
> Kim W5TIT

Sadly true...but hey, that's what R.R.A.P'S here for, right? ;-)

Vy 73 de Bert
WA2SI

3674. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-02 12:26:09 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <Bx%yb.1150$Qd6.411@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 83200

"N2EY" wrote:
>
> OK, fine.
>
> Then possibly something really good was
> going to happen to you, but the spell
> prevented it.

I'm very surprised you would argue this. Do you really believe these people have the power to cast spells? Witches, spells, charms, and other such nonsense, are superstitions, not religions.

> Which people?
>
> There have been times and places where
> religions like Christianity and Judaism
> were not "legitimate religions" because
> "people" said they weren't.

In those places and those times, perhaps Christianity and Judaism were not legitimate religions for those people. Religions are people, Jim. One cannot exist without the other. Therefore, people are the only ones who can possibly decide what is and what is not a legitimate religion. If that is not going to be the case, if people cannot decide for themselves which is and which isn't a ligitimate religion, exactly who or what would you suggest should - an empty courtroom without people?

Or, to get back to your specific question, if the people of those times and places didn't believe in, or accept, Christianity or Judaism, why should they be judged negatively for that? They have just as much right to believe in, or not believe in, what they want as Christians or Jews do.

> Are the spiritual beliefs of Native Americans
> "not legitimate"?

Not for me. Those beliefs might be legitimate for someone else. But, beyond their right to practice those beliefs, why should I have any interest whatsoever? None of it becomes an issue for me until it is advocated towards me and others. At that point, I have a right to participate in the discussion - including a right to say it is hogwash.

> I disagree! Popularity is not a basis for such
> decisions. Ask Galileo about the validity of
> the "vast majority"..

So, again, what is the basis for such decisions? If people cannot do so, exactly who or what should decide?

> So? Can anyone *prove* that the old books
> upon whioch many "legitimate" religions are
> based are not fictional - or at least partly
> fictional? Yet millions believe they are literally
> true.

Religious material and literature written by those who practice a religion are certainly more far more legitimate than images and stories from fictional movies, television, and books. I'm not saying mainstream religious material and literature is accurate or truthful, just far more legitimate as far as religion is concerned. When a religion's material and literature can only be traced back to cult figures (using fictional movies, television, and books as a basis, such as with the wiccas), it does lack credibility as far as I'm concerned.

> How are they different?

I've already answered that - people from most ligitimate religions don't claim to have personal powers, especially powers they can't prove when asked to do so. As I've said before, I would ask for similar proof from anyone, in any religion, who claimed to have such powers (any powers).

> Sure they have. You divide religions into
> two groups according to your judgement.

According to the dictionary, discrimination is the "unfair treatment of a person or group on the basis of prejudice." Since no "treatment of a person or group" is involved, words cannot discriminate in this sense. Prejudice is also not involved. Instead, I've researched a subject and formed an opinion.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3675. Re: Here it is-BPL full rollout in Va

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-02 12:40:50 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <mL%yb.1159$Qd6.793@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 83201

"N2EY" wrote:
> "Kï¿½HB" writes:
> > Since no single religion in the world enjoys
> > a "vast majority" of the population as
> > "supposed believers", then it follows that
> > the "vast majority" of the worlds population
> > on average believes that Judaism, Islam,
> > Christianity, Hinduism, Shintoism, Scientism,
> > Buddhism, etc. are each individually a "load
> > of crap" also, and not really legitimate.
>
> Thank you, Hans, for explaining it so clearly
> and concisely.

Hans didn't explain it at all. Instead, he side-stepped the issue of personal opinion with nonsense about the world's population. I don't have the power to judge the ligitimacy of a religion as far as the world's population is concerned, nor have I ever claimed to be trying to do so. Instead, I've offered my personal opinion based on my research into this subject. Hans has said nothing whatsoever to change that.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3676. Re: Morse Yes or No ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-02 12:51:46 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <CV%yb.1166$Qd6.910@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 83202

"Code" wrote:
>
> Should Morse code be retained as
> a requirement to obtain an amateur
> radio license in the U.S.?

To "retain" something, it has to exist. Morse code, as "a requirement to obtain an amateur radio license," hasn't existed for quite a few years. Perhaps you should rephrase that to fit the current reality.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3677. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-02 13:38:12 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0312020538.1cd77131@posting.google.com>
Source record: 83203

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20031201142315.01893.00001934@mb-m22.aol.com>...

> They KNOW what is best for amateur radio...and that is a maintenance
> of morse code proficiency forever and ever.
>
> A morse code test for amateur radio licensing has "always" been in
> the regulations (91 years) and it must always be there.

You are once again making assinine assertions unsubstantiated by
facts, Lennie.

Why do you keep doing this in the face of facts to the contrary?

Is looking like an idiot in public your intent?

If so, carry on. You are succeeding. Superbly, even.

> Messaging sometimes goes down to the "lowest common
> denominator" in writing...

The lowest common LennieFactor would seem to be "swing at
everything, you'll hit something"

Putz.

Steve, K4YZ

3678. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-02 13:40:52 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <ED0zb.1194$Qd6.56@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 83204

"Mike Coslo" wrote:
>
> (snip) I want added test material for the
> advanced licenses to fill the vacuum left
> by the departure of Morse Code testing.
> I don't want the additions as a way of
> keeping people out - indeed if there are
> some more questions, it is just a matter
> of studying a little more. I want it to show
> that we are not just getting rid of things,
> and thereby simply making things easier
> to get a ticket. (snip)

Several have said that, but I just don't see what can be added that wouldn't fundamentality change the nature of the Amateur Radio Service. As I see it, this is an amateur activity designed with three basic goals in mind - provide some radio services to others (public service), some benefit to the participants (recreational radio activities), and a mild introduction to the field of electronics. Since the first two (and international goodwill) don't seem to be a consideration, I'll ignore those for now.

This leaves the last and a question about how far that should be taken. Most are not clear at all about that. Some seem to suggest we add content to more closely fit a college degree program. If so, do we add science, history, social studies, general math, politics, language, art, economics, health, and the other things colleges require? If not, can we honestly claim the license is comprehensive training? But if we add those things, what happens to the avocational nature of this activity?

I've looked over the current written tests. I just don't see where they're lacking as far as the existing goals and purposes of the Amateur Radio Service are concerned.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3679. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-02 13:58:42 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <mU0zb.1198$Qd6.570@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 83205

"Hans K0HB" wrote:
> "Dwight Stewart" wrote
>
>
> > Why is that a misnomer, Hans?
>
> Because it is misleading. "Technician"
> implies an emphasis on technical training,
> skills, and qualifications. (snip)

That's a tired, old, debate, Hans. One that I'm rather surprised would still bother you. It's a "Technician" license in an "Amateur" Radio Service. That hardly suggests an overwhelming degree of training, skills, or qualifications. If you want to make those names into something more that that, some would certainly object to "Extra" as an adverb meaning unusual or exceptional. You're far from exceptional.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3680. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-02 14:09:13 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <d21zb.1200$Oe5.122@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 83206

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote

> some would certainly object to "Extra" as an adverb
> meaning unusual or exceptional.

I agree that some would, which is why my proposal has simple alphabetic characters to designate the two license levels.

> You're far from exceptional.

K0CKB disagrees with you.

73, de Hans, K0HB

3681. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-02 14:14:32 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <c71zb.1209$Oe5.953@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 83207

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote

> I've looked over the current written tests. I just don't see where they're
> lacking as far as the existing goals and purposes of the Amateur Radio
> Service are concerned.

Translation: "After over 6 years as a Technician, I've almost got the
General Class test memorized. Don't set me back by making me memorize a
whole different set of questions."

73, de Hans, K0HB

3682. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-02 14:16:38 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <a91zb.1208$Qd6.76@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 83208

"Len Over 21" wrote:
>
> I just hope everyone in "the pool" can stand
> all the chlorine necessary to keep it sanitary... :-)
>
> For anyone wanting serious thinking (a novel
> concept in here), there's always Brooks AFB in
> San Antonio, the USAF School of Aerospace
> Medicine. So far, the folks at Brooks haven't
> touched on aliens, not even the green-card
> types.

As for the chlorine, you might want to poke around Northeastern Utah and Southeastern Idaho. The Defense Department in that area has been hiring a lot of people with biology and chemistry degrees over the last decade or so. Considering the number of job listings, I cannot help but wonder what they're up to.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3683. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-02 14:37:42 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <Ws1zb.1225$Qd6.360@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 83209

"Len Over 21" wrote:
> "Dwight Stewart" writes:
> > (snip) Clearly, those with no interest are not
> > exactly highly motivated to study up for a
> > license exam.
>
> Sloth! Abomination unto the god of ham!
>
> Clearly such infidels have NO reason for existance!
>
> > But the fact that some have no interest in code,
> > and would freely choose not to learn it, really
> > seems to bother some of the "most vociferous and
> > abusive" pro-code folks.
>
> Antichrist = anticode? :-)

A vision of Samuel Morse told me to go forth and spread those words. I doubted my vision, so I prayed in front of my radio, but saw no more visions. I then crossed myself in the shape of a code key and posted what I had been told. ;-)

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3684. Thankgiving for the troops

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-02 14:52:03 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <nG1zb.1223$Oe5.740@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 83210

The U.S. Government really cares about their soldiers in Iraq. Why, for the soldiers' Thanksgiving dinner, they even flew in a turkey all the way from Texas.

3685. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-02 15:08:05 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <pV1zb.1244$Qd6.112@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 83211

"Kï¿½HB" wrote:
>
> Translation: "After over 6 years as a Technician,
> I've almost got the General Class test memorized.
> Don't set me back by making me memorize a
> whole different set of questions."

Very funny, Hans. However, as previously stated, I have no interest in getting the General at this time. In fact, I'm not even that active with my current license. I've looked over the license tests several times over the last few years, the most recent to was when the tests were redone to see if any significant changes were made.

Only one situation might immediately cause me to consider a new license class - if there was a possibility for us to go overseas again for a length of time where getting another license would be difficult. In that case, I would get a General, and perhaps even the Extra, in case I might want that capability while overseas.

Other than that, my interest in the other license classes will probably not go beyond casual curiosity anytime soon.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3686. Re: Dean Trumps Bush's Visit to Baghdad

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-02 16:59:27 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <Px3zb.1304$Oe5.321@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 83212

"Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:bqhr3u$t7p@library2.airnews.net...
> "Steve Robeson, K4CAP" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:5c01b95b.0312012009.167463b5@posting.google.com...
> > "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> news:<bqafth$80s@library1.airnews.net>...
> >
> > > Jim, the below "article" that was posted is quite suspicious. I can
> find no
> > > evidence anywhere that Dean went to Iraq.
> >
> > > Kim...Ya looking to buy some off-shore residential property in
> > > Florida? Perhaps a bridge in New York? Need a cast for that leg that
> > > was being pulled?
> >
> > > 88 =)
> >
> > > Steve, K4YZ
>
>
> Heh heh....well, I am not...but apparently the fella posting the "news"
> story was!!!
>
> 73/88, to you!!
>
> Kim W5TIT
>
>

An ole 'hug and chalk' slinks back into her world of ..... ????

Dan/W4NTI

3687. Re: Thankgiving for the troops

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-02 17:04:46 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <OC3zb.1307$Oe5.155@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 83213

"K�HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:nG1zb.1223$Oe5.740@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> The U.S. Government really cares about their soldiers in Iraq. Why, for
> the soldiers' Thanksgiving dinner, they even flew in a turkey all the way
> from Texas.
>
>

Yeah but don't forget....she went to Afghanistan first.

Dan/W4NTI

3688. Re: Where Did THIS Come From...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-02 17:07:48 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <EF3zb.1309$Oe5.552@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 83214

"Robbie" <democreeps@democrapfools.org> wrote in message
news:bqg19ikgj0@pita.alt.net...
>
> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
> news:toJyb.161$Qd6.65@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> >
> > "Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
> >
> > > But there sure are lots of terrorist-like activities in Iraq, in
> > > defense of Saddam and in attempts to repel the Americans.
> > >
> > > If there wasn't anything prior to 9/11, there sure is now.
> >
> > And if the truth be known that has been the plan all along. It is far
> > better to kill terrorists in Bagdad instead of Boston.
> >
> > Dan/W4NTI
> >
> >
> Dan,
>
> Problem is you will never convince the extreme leftists who
> presently control the Democratic party of that fact. Their
> hatred of Bush blinds them to any reality. The good news is
> our men & women in the U.S. military now know
> they have a real CIC. Don't look for the leftists to figure
> that one out though, since they are too busy "loathing" the
> military. OH, but they DO "support the troops." U.S.
> Senator Zell Miller has it right, "The Democratic Party,
> A National Party No More."
>
> Robbie
>
>
>

I know Robbie...but you know what? That is what we are counting on. The left, getting more extreme, thus totally allienating the rest of the country.

I see where the 'Hollywood elite' are getting all geared up for the major whine-a-thon. Weren't they gonna leave the country a couple years ago ?

Dan/W4NTI

3689. Re: Where Did THIS Come From...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-02 17:12:27 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <%J3zb.1310$Oe5.626@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 83215

"Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
news:f45722ac.0312011232.e801d53@posting.google.com...
> n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20031201055838.12631.00003126@mb-m28.aol.com>...
> > In article <f45722ac.0311301719.2522d18e@posting.google.com>,
> > brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
> >
> > >N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in message
> > >news:<c2356669.0311300839.3b1efd87@posting.google.com>...
> > >> "Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
> > news:<cuvyxnansvbet.hp4w1e7.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>...
> > >> > On 29 Nov 2003 01:58:17 GMT, N2EY wrote:
> >
> > >> > >And to our service people - spending next Thanksgiving with their
> > >> > >families at home.
> > >> >
> > >> > Amen, brother.
> > >>
> > >> Regardless of politics or policies, our prayers and thoughts are with
> > >> them.
> > >>
> > >> 73 de Jim, N2EY
> > >
> > >There you go, Jim. Your prayers and moral support is all that you can
> > >give to those deployed.
> >
> > No, there's more.
>
> Do tell.
>
> > >Tearing down their CIC hurts them, not helps
> > >them, and won't bring them home any sooner for Thanksgiving or
> > >anything else.
> >
> > So no one should criticize the president whenever there are troops
deployed
> > anywhere? That's what you seem to be saying.
> >
> > Who sent American military personnel to the Balkans? Should no one have
> > criticized him until they all came home?
> >
> > >There will always be deployed service people over
> > >Thanksgiving and Christmas holidays.
> >

> > Why must it be that way?
> >
> > I was told growing up that there would *always* be a need for more and
more
> > nuclear weapons
>
> There is. China has them. India has them. Pakistan has them. South
> Africa?
>
> North Korea has them. Iraq was trying hard to build them. Iran is
> trying hard to build them.
>
> See? Everyone needs nukes.
>
> and delivery systems, because we had to counter the Soviet
> > threat, and they'd *never* agree to dismantling their weapons or even
seriously
> > reducing their numbers. SAC bombers in the air, boomers on patrol under
the
> > sea, ICBMs in silos all over the country - and there was serious talk of
> > development of space-based systems, hypersonic cruise missiles, and many
other
> > systems.
>
> I agree with GW - we need to get star wars going before we become
> vulnerable to the Chinese.
>
> > How much threat is the the old Soviet Union now?
>
> The very same as prior to the "peace dividend" that got spent on
> welfare.
>
> The biggest threat they pose
> > is if some of their weapons wind up in a terrorist's hands.
>
> That is a different threat.
>
> > Recall that Gorbachev proposed massive dismantling of nukes 20 years ago
but
> > Reagan would not agree because Gorby tied a ban on serious SDI
development to
> > it.
>
> Yes, yes. And now GW is going forward w/o their OK.
>
> > >That's just the way it works
> > >when you raise your right hand and swear in. And all the people who
> > >raise their right hands know it.
> > >
> > A lot of things thought to be impossible have become reality, though.

>
> Like my gift certificate to Red Lobster is going to be.

The Soviet Union never reduced their nukes one little bit. The Soviet Union went extinct and the Russians reduced them. Course there was no choice, since most of them were...and still are...in the Ukraine.

If you think the Russians are not a threat...wait till they get out of their depression. They are just waiting on the US to self destruct, so they can take over.

I wouldn't trust that ex KGB agent in Moscow any more that I trusted Bill Klintoon.

Dan/W4NTI

3690. Re: Where Did THIS Come From...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-02 17:15:50 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <aN3zb.1314$Oe5.1259@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 83216

"Alun" <alun@1stcounsel.com> wrote in message
news:Xns9444DC1898263elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
> n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in
> news:20031201065801.25517.00002515@mb-m15.aol.com:
>
> > In article <Xns944282A0D69C5elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun
> > <alun@1stcounsel.com> writes:
> >
> >n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in news:20031129115807.23307.00004755@mb-
> >m29.aol.com:
> >>
> >>> In article <f45722ac.0311281934.2deeda0@posting.google.com>,
> >>> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
> >>>
> >>>>Blowhard libs have tried soooo hard to wreck this country.
> >>>
> >>> So have blowhard conservatives.
> >>>
> >>>>They've nearly succeeded,
> >>>
> >>> How is this country "wrecked", compared to how things used to be?
> >>>
> >>>>but there are still a few people who give a damn about America, and
> >>>>GW is one of them.
> >>>
> >>> There are lots of others, including many who disagree with Mr. Bush.
> >>>
> >>> It's the methods, not the person.
> >>>
> >>>>
> >>>
> >>>
> >>>
> >>
> >>Well, I'm a foreigner in your country, but you can't deny that the
> >>economy boomed under Clinton and is now on it's knees.
> >
> > Sure - but for reasons that have little to do with Clinton, his
> > predecessors or successors.
>
> You may be right
>
> >>
> >>I'm not fond of the present government, but mainly for other reasons.

> >>Civil liberties and John Ashcroft, mostly.
> >
> > The USA's open-door policies are one reason terror groups were able at
> > come here and operate the way they did on Sept 11.
>
> Actually, US immigration is amongst the toughest in the world. I can't
> help but smile to see it called 'open door'.
>
> >>
> >>All in all, I can't really think of anything GW Bush has done
> >>domestically that is anything to shout about.
> >
> > He's been kinda busy, fighting three wars (Afghanistan, Iraq,
> > anti-terror)
> >
> >>Tax cuts for the rich.
> >
> > Why is anyone surprised at that?
>
> I'm not
>
> >
> >>Deficit spending.
> >
> > Goes hand-in-hand with reduced reveues from a struggling economy.
> >
> >>I'm really trying to think of anything good (honestly), but nothing
> >>comes to mind.
> >>
> >>As for the war, why open that can of worms? Yes, Saddam is/was a very
> >>bad guy. Do I beleive the reasons given for going to war? No. And yes,
> >>Blair went along with it, but I don't like him a lot either.
> >
> > The important question is "what next"?
>
> Indeed it is. I think if it had been approached differently a lot more
> countries would have been willing to help. As it is, Bush and Blair, etc.
> have got themselves into a hole.
>
> >>
> >>... but then I'm an anti-code test liberal, so what did you expect?
> >>
> > HAW! That's a good one!
> >
> >>However, I actually do think it was a nice gesture for Dubbya to go to
> >>Baghdad for Thanksgiving.
> >>
> >>I'm sure this post will draw the usual 'love it or leave it' garbage
> >>from at least someone, but never mind. I can take it.
> >>

> > What is often forgotten is that "loving it" takes many
> > forms.Disagreement is not necessarily disloyalty.
> >
> > 73 de Jim, N2EY
> >
> >
>
> Agreed

It is not the 'immigration policy' that is so bad. Its the wide open borders that are a real problem.

Dan/W4NTI

3691. Re: Where Did THIS Come From...?!?!a

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-02 17:19:37 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <JQ3zb.1321$Oe5.1121@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 83217

"Steve Robeson, K4CAP" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
news:5c01b95b.0312012005.49d2f5ac@posting.google.com...
> Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:<u8zyb.7027$zL1.800394@news1.news.adelphia.net>...
> > Phil Kane wrote:
> >
> > > On 30 Nov 2003 04:11:04 -0800, Brian wrote:
> > >
> > >
> > >> I strongly believe that the Habibi need
> > >> the charra kicked out of them for a lot of reasons, including the
> > >> expulsion of a branch of my family from what is now Iraq in the
13th
> > >> Century (no, I don't want the family villa back but it was
tempting).
> > >>
> > >>The 13th century??? You're as nuts as they are.
> > >
> > >
> > > You have no concept or understanding of what drives folks in the
> > > Middle East or of Middle East heritage, then. But then again, look
> > > at the Anglo-Irish conflict going back 800 years - that's the 13th
> > > Century as well.
> >
> > I understand, but do not accept. Tat line of thinking of course is why
> > the human race is almost certainly doomed. Over thousands of years,
> > there is plenty of time for each side to make a little bank account of
> > transgressions that they can call upon to provoke righteous outrage. And
> > it will not go away until there is only one person left in whatever the
> > conflict was.
>
> Had al-Queda not used the Palestinian cause as it's justification
> for the attacks on WTC, I'd send a letter to Washington and tell them
> to let Israel duke it out on their own.
>
> President Bush recently said the US has no greater friend than
> Isreal, but the only thing >>I<< see from our association with them is
> death, violence and war.
>
> > One of the most civilized things that the USofA does is that we have
> > made a habit of burying the hatchet with our onetime enemies. Something
> > I doubt that people who are mad because of what someone did to them a
> > thousand years ago can understand.
>

> Yep. We infused billions of dollars into Japan and Germany, and
> look where they are today.
>
> I think it takes a really narrow-minded person to NOT be able to
> see the parallels between the way the WW2 era Germans treated Jews,
> and how Jews presently treat Palestinians. Thank God there's no
> concentration camps, but I am more than a little bit embarrassed when
> I see yet another fugitive camp being patrolled with soldiers carrying
> M-16's or AH-1W Cobras.
>
> Steve, K4YZ

Excuse me Steve, but I don't remember the Jews of Europe, in the pre NAZI days, sending in human bombs. Or shooting at soldiers, or declaring that Isreal has no right to exist.

I think your compairison is flawed.

Israel has no choice but to fight. If they do not they will indeed cease to exist.

Dan/W4NTI

3692. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-02 17:24:52 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <MqSdnSw1cIhmV1Gi4p2dnA@gbronline.com>
Source record: 83218

Kim W5TIT the texas twit wrote:

>
> It's fine for them to go 20 mph above the speed limit. It's fine if they
> want to go 30-40 mph above the speed limit. But, they won't find me moving
> out of their way; they'll have to go around because I am not moving into a
> lane where I have to slow down, or even get "stuck" there for a while, if
> there happens to be more than one vehicle that wants to go past.
>
> This is an "every morning" thing. If they want to get to where they are
> going quicker, then they need to adjust their scheduling, not make others on
> the road cater to their needs. I would not think of being obnoxious because
> I have to get somewhere quicker than anyone else--I would make the decision
> to get on the road earlier.

So why do you go 20 mph over the speed limit as you admit to? Why don't
you get on the road earlier so you can drive within the speed limit to
get where you need to on time?
I suppose if someone is going 10 mph over the limit, you expect them to
get out of your way so you can do 20 mph over, right?

3693. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-02 17:38:07 UTC
From: Bert Craig <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM>
Message-ID: <364zb.12776$N.2776624@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>
Source record: 83219

"K&#65533;HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:c71zb.1209$Oe5.953@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote
>
> > I've looked over the current written tests. I just don't see where
they're
> > lacking as far as the existing goals and purposes of the Amateur Radio
> > Service are concerned.
>
> Translation: "After over 6 years as a Technician, I've almost got the
> General Class test memorized. Don't set me back by making me memorize a
> whole different set of questions."
>
> 73, de Hans, K0HB

"Hammer, meet nail."

I don't even think we need to change the questions. Eliminate the published
Q&A pools and reorder the answers, that'll do it.

Q. Do what?

A. Require just a hair more cerebral activity than rote memorization.

73 de Bert
WA2SI

3694. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-02 17:54:13 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <9l4zb.1343$Oe5.178@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 83220

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:ED0zb.1194$Qd6.56@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...

> As I see it, this is an amateur activity designed with three basic goals
in
> mind - provide some radio services to others (public service), some
benefit
> to the participants (recreational radio activities), and a mild
introduction
> to the field of electronics.

That may well be as *you* see it, but according to their rules going back at least 50 years, FCC goals aren't about "a mild introduction" to electronics. From 1950's Part 12, paragraph 12.0(d) "Expansion of the existing reservoir within the amateur radio service of ..... ELECTRONICS EXPERTS". From the contemporary Part 97, paragraph 97.1(d) "Expansion of the existing reservoir within the amateur radio service of ..... ELECTRONICS EXPERTS".

> Some seem to suggest we add content to
> more closely fit a college degree program.

I haven't seen any such suggestion here (or anywhere else). My proposal suggests that the standard full-privilege qualifications should be essentially equivalent to the current Amateur Extra written examination. Since there are numerous examples of pre-teen children who have met that level of qualification, it certainly doesn't rise to the level of a "college degree program".

73, de Hans, K0HB

3695. Stuck?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-02 18:34:52 UTC
From: Jerry Oxendine <joxendi@bellsouth.net>
Message-ID: <jW4zb.13486$5d.13441@bignews4.bellsouth.net>
Source record: 83221

This is not exactly Amateur Radio, but I thought I would run it by and see what you thought.

I know there are "odd" ducks on the internet, and every once in a while, one accidentally runs across a website that is perplexing to say the least. Yesterday, I ran across a website run by a Mr. "Sir Stuck Alot", and it is devoted to becoming mired in the mud with both new and old pictures. Surely, some of these pictures showed people hopeless bogged down and some of them in real predicaments. Some would make one wonder how they got into such a fix, or why they were in that particular locale in the first place. I mean, *most* reasonable people wouldn't drive into creeks, rivers, bogs, pastures snowbanks, etc.

When I was a child, we kids thought it was VERY funny
when our parents got stuck and we helped to push them with excited glee. The muddier, the better, the more stuck
we were, the funnier it was, and we were fascinated by spinning wheels. We would even contrive ways for people to stick up----such as jacking up a parent's car and putting a block under the wheel (good way to tear up a transmission, but we were 11 years and didn't know), or by putting a scooped-out watermelon rind under the
rear wheel. All so we could see Fred's '49 Ford spin a
bit until it wore out the rind and caught traction. Not to
mention the puzzled reaction of poor Fred who was wondering why his car wouldn't move on DRY ground.
Back in the '50s, side roads often were not paved and turned into seas of mud into which our school busses slid
and got stuck up; indeed, we grammar school kids would
rock back and forth trying to cause the thing to slide in the ditch. We LOVED to be late for school on such mornings! In the morning, to the smell of coal and hiss of
steam radiators, the principal would also announce over the PA, "The following busses are late on account of being stuck up (in a mudhole)". All this was great fun--
when you are a kid. We imitated cars with paper plates
(for steering wheels), and ran around the yard pretending we were stuck, gunning our "engines" and rocking our 'cars' back and forth (like Daddy did when he got mired). We'd "push" each other, one of us resisting while the other leaned against the other with all his might, and making loud motor noises (Ung, Ung, Ung, UUUUUUNNH! and clashing his gears)--sort of a tug-of-war in reverse.
Sometimes, failing to unstick (move the stronger kid) the "car", another buddy would join in and push with all HIS might--all while making all this racket (ungh, ungh,
UNGH, UNNNNNNNNNGH!) as if we were a 50 Chevy six-cyl! LOL!

Now. Most of us grew up, got licenses, drove cars, got
married, had kids, etc,go ham licenses, and forgot about childish play. We drove prudently (well, not always) except for the occasional burn-out or donut in the high school parking lot, and eventually forgot about being "stuck". Indeed, we avoided becoming stuck, going around mudholes, staying out of snowdrifts, and, well,
just not going where we figured we might not make it.

Perhaps the person that put up that website is grown, perhaps not (maybe still a kid) or, perhaps, an adult that is immature? As we get older, we (I hope) retain a sense of humor, but things such as being stuck up in the mud fails to invoke humor to me. I haven't gotten in such a fix
in YEARS because I'd like to think I exercise caution and
maturity enough not to go into a place that might not be
"safe".

So, while it could be mildly funny to see a friend bog down in the mud or get stuck up in a snowdrift, is this website really telling me that there are people that never grow up? The site strikes me as silly and very immature. Or am I missing something here?

73

Jerry
K4KWH

3696. Re: Stuck?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-02 18:57:22 UTC
From: Fred <fred@fredsbarnbrew.net>
Message-ID: <bqina7fcr0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 83222

"Jerry Oxendine" <joxendi@bellsouth.net> wrote in message
news:jW4zb.13486$5d.13441@bignews4.bellsouth.net...
> This is not exactly Amateur Radio, but I thought I would run it by and see
> what you thought.
>
> I know there are "odd" ducks on the internet, and every once in a while,
one
> accidentally runs across a website that is perplexing to say the least.
> Yesterday, I ran across a website run by a Mr. "Sir Stuck Alot", and it is
> devoted to becoming mired in the mud with both new and old pictures.
> Surely, some of these pictures showed people hopeless bogged down and some
> of them in real predicaments. Some would make one wonder how they got into
> such a fix, or why they were in that particular locale in the first place.
I
> mean, *most* reasonable people wouldn't drive into creeks, rivers, bogs,
> pastures snowbanks, etc.
>
> When I was a child, we kids thought it was VERY funny
> when our parents got stuck and we helped to push them with excited glee.
> The muddier, the better, the more stuck
> we were, the funnier it was, and we were fascinated by spinning wheels.
We
> would even contrive ways for people to stick up----such as jacking up a
> parent's car and putting a block under the wheel (good way to tear up
> a transmission, but we were 11 years and didn't know), or by putting a
> scooped-out watermelon rind under the
> rear wheel. All so we could see Fred's '49 Ford spin a
> bit until it wore out the rind and caught traction. Not to
> mention the puzzled reaction of poor Fred who was wondering why his car
> wouldn't move on DRY ground.
> Back in the '50s, side roads often were not paved and turned into seas of
> mud into which our school busses slid
> and got stuck up; indeed, we grammar school kids would
> rock back and forth trying to cause the thing to slide in the ditch. We
> LOVED to be late for school on such mornings! In the morning, to the
smell
> of coal and hiss of
> steam radiators, the principal would also announce over the PA, "The
> following busses are late on account of being stuck up (in a mudhole)".
All
> this was great fun--
> when you are a kid. We imitated cars with paper plates
> (for steering wheels), and ran around the yard pretending we were stuck,
> gunning our "engines" and rocking our 'cars' back and forth (like Daddy

did
> when he got mired). We'd "push" each other, one of us resisting while the
> other leaned against the other with all his might, and making loud motor
> noises (Ung, Ung, Ung, UUUUUUNNH! and clashing his gears)--sort of a
> tug-of-war in reverse.
> Sometimes, failing to unstick (move the stronger kid) the "car", another
> buddy would join in and push with all HIS might--all while making all this
> racket (ungh, ungh,
> UNGH, UNNNNNNNNNGH!) as if we were a 50 Chevy six-cyl! LOL!
>
> Now. Most of us grew up, got licenses, drove cars, got
> married, had kids, etc,go ham licenses, and forgot about childish play. We
> drove prudently (well, not always) except for the occasional burn-out or
> donut in the high school parking lot, and eventually forgot about being
> "stuck". Indeed, we avoided becoming stuck, going around mudholes,
staying
> out of snowdrifts, and, well,
> just not going where we figured we might not make it.
>
> Perhaps the person that put up that website is grown, perhaps not (maybe
> still a kid) or, perhaps, an adult that is immature? As we get older, we
(I
> hope) retain a sense of humor, but things such as being stuck up in the
mud
> fails to invoke humor to me. I haven't gotten in such a fix
> in YEARS because I'd like to think I exercise caution and
> maturity enough not to go into a place that might not be
> "safe".
>
> So, while it could be mildly funny to see a friend bog down in the mud or
> get stuck up in a snowdrift, is this website really telling me that there
> are people that never grow up? The site strikes me as silly and very
> immature. Or am I missing something here?
>
> 73
>
> Jerry
> K4KWH
>
>
No more immature than a grown man who chases trucks up and
down interstate highways, trying to figure out what CB channel
they are transmitting on. Then constantly pestering a busy federal
official with childish "reports" of such activity. Errrr, sound like
an immature person you know Ox?

Fred's Barn

3697. Re: Stuck?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-02 19:05:37 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <5o5zb.1382$Oe5.33@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 83223

"Jerry Oxendine" <joxendi@bellsouth.net> wrote

> So, while it could be mildly funny to see a friend bog down in the mud or
> get stuck up in a snowdrift, is this website really telling me that there
> are people that never grow up? The site strikes me as silly and very
> immature. Or am I missing something here?

Growing older is mandatory. Growing up is optional. You're jeremiad
suggests that you have grown up. A pity!

If "silly" is mildly offensive to you as it seems in this case, then by all
means avoid silliness. In my world, silliness is the lubrication which
eases the daily grind, and I'm disappointed that you didn't provide a URL so
I could see the antics of Sir Stuck Alot.

73, de Hans, K0HB

"the most wasted of all days is one without laughter." --e.e. cummings

"A person's maturity consists in having found again the seriousness one
had as a child, at play." --Friedrich Nietzsche

3698. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-02 19:35:40 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <gQ5zb.1512$Qd6.1291@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 83224

"Kï¿½HB" wrote:
>
> That may well be as *you* see it, but
> according to their rules going back at
> least 50 years, FCC goals aren't about
> "a mild introduction" to electronics.
> From 1950's Part 12, paragraph 12.0
> (d) "Expansion of the existing reservoir
> within the amateur radio service of ......
> ELECTRONICS EXPERTS". From
> the contemporary Part 97, paragraph
> 97.1(d) "Expansion of the existing
> reservoir within the amateur radio
> service of ...... ELECTRONICS
> EXPERTS".

Nice editing to fit an agenda, Hans. However, the actual wording of 97.1(d) talks about expanding the existing reservoir of "trained operators, technicians, and electronics experts," not just "electronics experts." The FCC never intended for this radio service to be made up of electronics experts, or for all operators to become electronics experts. Thanks to the introduction to electronics Amateur Radio offers, some will become interested enough to seek outside education in some field of electronics - the real experts. Most will never be interested enough to go that far (home-brewing or lesser electronics jobs). And perhaps the vast majority will happily go through life as trained operators. Whatever the case, the goals of 97.1(d) are fulfilled.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3699. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-02 20:08:03 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3FCCF123.70308@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 83225

N2EY wrote:

>In article <3FCBAF87.5080802@ix.netcom.com>, Robert Casey
><wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> writes:
>
>
>
>>N2EY wrote:
>>
>>
>>
>>>These are the number of unexpired FCC ARS
>>>licenses held by individuals on the dates listed:
>>>
>>>As of May 14, 2000:
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>Why select May 14th 2000?
>>
>>
>
>Two reasons:
>
>1) I happened to have those numbers recorded
>
>2) By that date, it's reasonable to expect that all of the backlog from before
>the April 15 changes had gone through FCC.
>
>
>
>>Restructuring took effect a month
>>earlier. I upgraded from tech + to extra on April 15, 2000 and
>>the paperwork reached the FCC just a few days later the next week.
>>Thus I would show up as an extra in the May 14th 2000. If your
>>objective is to show the effects of restructuring, you need to list
>>the numbers for April14, 2000.
>>
>>
>>
>If you have them, I'll show them.
>

>
>
Okay, that makes sense, especially reason #2. There would be some
cross leakage, but probably not enough to matter in determining long term
trends.

73s Bob

PS, I don't have the numbers myself, but as you mentioned, they would miss
the backlog of activity before April 15th.

>
>
>
>
>
>

3700. Re: It ain't about the test.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-02 20:20:27 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3FCCF409.2000707@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 83226

N2EY wrote:

>
>The original 1913 reason for technical qualifications was to prevent
>interference to nonamateurs caused by improper adjustment of amateur
>transmitters.
>
>How much interference to nonamateurs is caused by improper adjustment of
>amateur transmitters today? Reading the FCC enforcement letters, such
>interference today seems to be more a case of intentional modification of
>amateur equipment by a lawless few to operate on nonamateur frequencies.
>
>
>
It seems that you have to violate rules "on purpose" several times
before the FCC
starts working on it. Modern equipment rarely causes problems (like
excessive
splatter or harmonics). I'm talking about stuff from the major
manufacturers
(Yeacomwood), not the "freeband" "linayes".
And who hasn't, by mistake, operate the wrong mode in some subband? Like
answering a foreign phone CQ on 7140? Oops... Most people will not make
a habit of doing that, but once or twice over the years. The FCC
realizes that
errors do happen, and that most people will realize the error and
correct it themselves
without the FCC having to do anything about it.

jgjyujklo;fgd
stevegordon@sandvideo.com

>
>

3701. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-02 20:47:23 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <vT6zb.1468$Oe5.71@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 83227

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote

> From the perspective of an FCC license requirement, is it necessary for
> you to participate in that event?

Yes, it is required by 97.1(e).

73, de Hans, K0HB

3702. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-02 21:01:58 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <a57zb.1485$Oe5.1413@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 83228

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote

> Nice editing to fit an agenda, Hans.

I have no agenda.

> And perhaps the vast majority will happily go through life as trained
operators.

This convenient ploy is the rallying cry of the QCAO but it
lacks any foundation of credibility when you consider that
the successful applicant for *any* amateur license is authorized
to build his own station. Would you want me putting my homebrewed
"creation" on your favorite VHF band if I hadn't even demonstrated
a working knowledge of Th&#65533;v&#65533;nins theorum? Get real!

73, de Hans, K0HB

News Release:

QCAO Reorganizes

The Quarter Century Appliance Operators was founded in the
early 1950's by a small group of Amateur Radio operators from
the Pacific Northwest. They had been active in their hobby for
over 25 years, yet still lacked the basic knowledge of radio
electronics and had no idea of how their equipment worked.

They banded together to try and protect each others honor
and pride. At radio gatherings and club meetings in the 1950s
one was considered unworthy of the name Ham Radio Operator if
he or she couldn't not only name components, but know how to
solder them together and make a radio work, or fix a broken set!

When faced with insults and dreision, those few hardy
pioneers banded together and formed the First Chapter and
National Organization of the QCAO. This was known as the "Cold
Solder" Chapter. They even coined the now-famous club byword
"e pluribus ignoramae" which is Latin for "We don't have to know
how to solder, we just wanna talk on our radios."

No veterans of that first chapter are known to be active on
the air today. In the late 1950s and early '60s, with the
worldwide interest in science and space and technology, the QCAO
membership went underground.

It is with great pride and dignity that today in the 21st Century the revived QCAO stands ready to rise from the ashes, and become the standard of mediocrity it once proudly was. In honor of those first pioneering members, QCAO hereby invites all eligible applicants to step forward and join!

The benefits of QCAO include not only the pride of membership. Think of the warm glow you will feel at club meetings and gatherings showing off your new all-plastic imprinted QCAO pocket protector! And that's not all! For your minimal membership fee, you will also receive a handsome, suitable-for-framing, certificate of honor, with hand-lettered name and Charter Membership Number. Other QCAO memorabilia will soon be available for members, including T-shirts, caps, pins, etc. At this date charter membership numbers are still available. Membership requires a 25 years (more or less) interest in Amateur Radio, coupled with a basic ignorance of how radios work and how to repair them.

Think of meeting other QCAO members on the air! No more embarrassing pauses when someone in the QSO mentions an RF choke or a parasitic bleeder...Be able to exchange meaningful sharing, talk about real things, yes, even swap QCAO numbers with each other! And soon perhaps . . . a worldwide QCAO contest!

You no longer have to shrink to the back of the room at post-meeting sessions of your radio club. Just display your QCAO protector and others will be able to identify you immediately. Who knows? Perhaps one of the originals from that old QCAO Chapter is just waiting for you to find him. Join now! Remember "We don't have to know how to solder, we just wanna talk on our radios"! Don't let technoids embarrass you and kick jargon in your face. Stand up for what's right! Join QCAO!

"e pluribus ignoramae"

3703. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-02 21:29:11 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <Hu7zb.1632$Qd6.1607@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 83229

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote

> Mike, You and I know it can't be enforced without invasion of privacy.
You
> have to go on the operator's property and make local field strength
> measurements.

The rules have a wide assortment of power level restrictions below 100W,
some as low as 2.5W, Many of them apply to every license class. Can I
presume from your flip answer that we can safely ignore those limits because
it would be an "invasion of privacy" for FCC to enforce them?

73, de Hans, K0HB

3704. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-02 21:31:55 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3FCD04CB.8010701@psu.edu>
Source record: 83230

Bill Sohl wrote:
> "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote in message

<some snippage>

>>Well, no matter what Hans believes on this, power level enforcement or
>>even
>>monitoring just can't be done--unless there'd be a whole lot more dollars
>>and effort going to it and we all know that's not going to happen.
>>
>>Kim W5TIT
>
>
> While enforcement might prove difficult, the implementation
> of a power limit would, I believe, not be violated by the
> majority of hams. Those of us that were Novices at one time
> lived with a 75 watt limit. Did some novices violate
> that? Probably, but by and large, most stayed within the
> legal limit.

But even if that is the case, it would seem to me to make more sense to us a limit that is easily handled by virtue of equipment that will handle the limit already on the market.

Would the manufacturers make equipment that only put out 50 watts? Possibly, but what will be the resale value of the equipment? So the new Class A ham has to go out and buy a new rig to make use of his or her new priveliges? Remember not everyone wants to run a lot of power. 100 watts is something most people are comfortable with.

And the rationale for the reduction of power needs to be proven to me anyway. How many Technicians have been hurt by using more than 50 watts power?

And do you think that the prospective ham should not know about RF safety until they reach the equivalent of an Extra? This plan seems to advocate that.

- Mike KB3EIA -

3705. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-02 21:43:37 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3FCD0789.1090408@psu.edu>
Source record: 83232

Dwight Stewart wrote:
> "Mike Coslo" wrote:
>
>>(snip) I want added test material for the
>>advanced licenses to fill the vacuum left
>>by the departure of Morse Code testing.
>>I don't want the additions as a way of
>>keeping people out - indeed if there are
>>some more questions, it is just a matter
>>of studying a little more. I want it to show
>>that we are not just getting rid of things,
>>and thereby simply making things easier
>>to get a ticket. (snip)
>
>
>
> Several have said that, but I just don't see what can be added that
> wouldn't fundamentality change the nature of the Amateur Radio Service. As I
> see it, this is an amateur activity designed with three basic goals in
> mind - provide some radio services to others (public service), some benefit
> to the participants (recreational radio activities), and a mild introduction
> to the field of electronics. Since the first two (and international
> goodwill) don't seem to be a consideration, I'll ignore those for now.

Could be simply some more questions added to the test.

> This leaves the last and a question about how far that should be taken.
> Most are not clear at all about that. Some seem to suggest we add content to
> more closely fit a college degree program. If so, do we add science,
> history, social studies, general math, politics, language, art, economics,
> health, and the other things colleges require? If not, can we honestly claim
> the license is comprehensive training? But if we add those things, what
> happens to the avocational nature of this activity?

Wow, you slippery sloped that one pretty well, Dwight! I'm not looking
for the equivalent of an engineering degree, and would never suggest
such a thing. I don't think that the addition of some relevant questions
to the writtens is at all a bad thing. And even an EE degree is only
partly relevant to the ARS.

> I've looked over the current written tests. I just don't see where they're
> lacking as far as the existing goals and purposes of the Amateur Radio
> Service are concerned.

This brings up something that I have wondered about for a while. What
is the basis for so many people avoiding education with a passion? It

isn't like even the Extra test is all that difficult. Takes some study
and time, but it isn't like the SAT's or the like.

- Mike KB3EIA -

3706. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-02 21:46:01 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <tK7zb.1645$Qd6.1074@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 83231

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote

> And there it is. WHY?

Mike, I know it scares the bejeebers out of the professional-entry-level licensees out there who have essentially zero interest in whatever electrical thing happens when they mash the PPT switch, but by their license grant they are responsible for a ensuring that their transmitted signal meets a set of technical parameters beyond what the little blinky digits on the faceplate read.

The current qualification process is woefully inadequate to ensure they can fulfill that responsibility. The current rules have kept most of these QCAO members in parts of the spectrum which have mostly local propagation, even with 1.5KW output.

However, we can soon expect rules changes which may extend their turf to parts of the spectrum where their ignorance can have worldwide visibility and consequences. And that scares the bejeebers out of me.

73, de Hans, K0HB
--
Pee equals eye-squared are. It's not just a good idea, it's the law!

3707. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-02 21:51:23 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3FCD095B.6000304@psu.edu>
Source record: 83234

Bert Craig wrote:
> "Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:c71zb.1209$Oe5.953@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net...
>
>>"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote
>>
>>
>>>I've looked over the current written tests. I just don't see where
>>
> they're
>
>>>lacking as far as the existing goals and purposes of the Amateur Radio
>>>Service are concerned.
>>
>>Translation: "After over 6 years as a Technician, I've almost got the
>>General Class test memorized. Don't set me back by making me memorize a
>>whole different set of questions."
>>
>>73, de Hans, K0HB
>
>
> "Hammer, meet nail."

When you're only tool is a hammer, everything looks like a nail! 8^)

>
> I don't even think we need to change the questions. Eliminate the published
> Q&A pools and reorder the answers, that'll do it.

Big deal! There will have to be a study guide, which will have the
answers in it in text form. I'd read it and know it. Probably quicker
and better than the pools

BTW, Bert, did you know that they change the order of the answers in the
actual test as compared to the question pool?

> Q. Do what?
>
> A. Require just a hair more cerebral activity than rote memorization.

Maybe for some.

- Mike KB3EIA -

3708. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-02 21:55:20 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <cT7zb.1654$Qd6.1527@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 83233

"Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote

> Would the manufacturers make equipment that only put out 50 watts?

I think they would if the market existed. In JA there is a class of 10W HF hams, and there are all sorts of nice 10W HF rigs available there.

But let's just suppose that the manufacturers continue to build only 100W HF rigs for the US market. It's not the manufacturers responsibility to comply with the power limits. That responsibility lies with each individual licensee.

In my experience, hams are almost universally scrupulous in observing the limitations that their license grant imposes on them.

73, de Hans, K0HB

3709. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-02 22:13:07 UTC
From: groupk0hb@earthlink.net
Message-ID: <5ee63311.0312021413.632f08bd@posting.google.com>
Source record: 83235

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote

> All newcomers MUST do as they
> did in order for "acceptance" to the group.

Not at all, Len. I am proposing a huge increase in newcomer privileges with an entry level test far more elementary than the current entry-level examination.

But I am also recommending, after a generous period with 'training wheels', a more strenuous qualification for standard privileges than currently exists. The QCAO and IOoDHW cries of "the unfairness of it all" are deafening.

73, de Hans, K0HB

3710. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-02 22:27:30 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <ml8zb.1682$Qd6.1299@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 83236

"Kï¿½HB" wrote:
>
> I have no agenda.

Sure you do, Hans. Aren't you promoting an alternative licensing system with stiffer tests for newcomers? This points to an obvious reason why you would focus on the "electronics expert" portion of 97.1(d) while ignoring the rest.

> (snip) it lacks any foundation of credibility
> when you consider that the successful
> applicant for *any* amateur license is
> authorized to build his own station. (snip)

The key word is authorized, not expected, required, obligated, compelled, obliged, or whatever. A person can build radio equipment if he or she wants, but there is no mandate to do so.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3711. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-02 22:45:35 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <jC8zb.1689$Qd6.1196@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 83237

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote

> Sure you do, Hans. Aren't you promoting an alternative licensing system
> with stiffer tests for newcomers?

Nope. My proposal has a dramatically less strenuous set of qualifications
for newcomers.

> The key word is authorized, not expected, required, obligated, compelled,
> obliged, or whatever. A person can build radio equipment if he or she
wants,
> but there is no mandate to do so.

But there IS a mandate that each licensee is directly responsible for the
proper adjustment and operation of their equipment, including all sorts of
QCAO-unfriendly things like signal purity, etc. 97.307(a) thru (e) come to
mind. Personally, I don't believe that your (misnamed) Technician
qualification examination is adequate to ensure that you can carry out that
mandate.

73, de Hans, K0HB

3712. Dust off your DIGITAL skills this weekend

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-02 23:07:08 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <wW8zb.1696$Qd6.477@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 83238

The Michigan DX Association Death Match RadioSporting event is this coming weekend.

Rules at http://www.mdxa1.org/deathmatch

&#65533;&#65533;&#65533; 73, de Hans, K0HB

3713. Re: Stuck?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-02 23:07:47 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <l5OdnTKRW78VhlCiRVn-hg@gbronline.com>
Source record: 83239

Fred wrote:

>>
>
> No more immature than a grown man who chases trucks up and
> down interstate highways, trying to figure out what CB channel
> they are transmitting on. Then constantly pestering a busy federal
> official with childish "reports" of such activity. Errrr, sound like
> an immature person you know Ox?
>
> Fred's Barn

Well, freddieboy, you are wrong, Jerry doesn't try to figure out what CB channel they are transmitting on, he couldn't care less what CB channel they are on. He reports those who operate illegally in the 10 meter band(those are *not* CB channels in case you didn't know). I do the same thing, want to make something of it? Maybe you been sleeping in the barn with the cows to long.

3714. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-02 23:20:06 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <G69zb.1706$Qd6.900@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 83240

"Mike Coslo" wrote:
>
> Wow, you slippery sloped that one pretty
> well, Dwight! I'm not looking for the
> equivalent of an engineering degree, and
> would never suggest such a thing. I don't
> think that the addition of some relevant
> questions to the writtens (snip)

If you've been following the discussion in this thread, and in general over the last couple of years, it wasn't slippery sloped that much. It was only a very slight exaggeration of what some (I'm not saying you) seem to want.

> This brings up something that I have wondered
> about for a while. What is the basis for so many
> people avoiding education with a passion? It
> isn't like even the Extra test is all that difficult.
> Takes some study and time, but it isn't like the
> SAT's or the like.

I can't speak for others, Mike. But, in our case, it's not avoiding education per se. Education is a routine in this household. We're both college graduates. Correspondence courses, college courses, and technical seminars, are endless. We're both looking towards retirement and want to change directions in our lives. To do that, we've both recently went back to school. I just completed an associate degree in electronics (thought I'd play around with it a little more seriously) and my wife just completed a BA (math major/history minor) and will start her masters degree program in January (secondary education). On top of that, we own several businesses, have a full social life, and have several volunteer activities we're involved in. Plus we like to have a little time for other things (like this newsgroup, spending time together, and so on). That leaves very little time for other things. Since we don't really have a place to fully exploit HF, and don't want to waste time learning code, getting another license class is just not that high on our list of things to do.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3715. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-02 23:24:06 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <qa9zb.1708$Qd6.531@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 83241

"Kï¿½HB" wrote:
>
> Yes, it is required by 97.1(e).

Well, goodwill is certainly important. So, by all means, go. :-)

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3716. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-02 23:43:09 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <hs9zb.1722$Qd6.666@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 83242

"Kï¿½HB" wrote:
>
> (snip) ...by their license grant they are
> responsible for a ensuring that their
> transmitted signal meets a set of technical
> parameters beyond what the little blinky
> digits on the faceplate read.
>
> The current qualification process is
> woefully inadequate to ensure they can
> fulfill that responsibility. (snip)

Yet there are no widespread problems, reported by the FCC or other organizations, relating to that. How can that be, Hans? Perhaps you're wrong about your assessment of a large portion of this radio community.

> The current rules have kept most... (snip)
> ...in parts of the spectrum which have
> mostly local propagation, even with 1.5KW
> output.

Out of band emissions, and so on, are not dependant on HF, Hans. Again, no widespread problems relating to that.

> However, we can soon expect rules changes
> which may extend their turf to parts of the
> spectrum where their ignorance can have
> worldwide visibility and consequences. And
> that scares the bejeebers out of me.

Yet that very thing is happening in many countries around the world, with none yet reporting any problems whatsoever. Or is it just American operators (their "ignorance") that scares the "bejeebers" out of you?

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3717. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-03 00:12:30 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <OT9zb.1757$Qd6.226@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 83243

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote

> Or is it just American operators (their "ignorance") that scares the
"bejeebers" out of you?

I am not eligible to petition the regulators in other countries, so my
proposal will only affect license applicants under FCC jurisdiction.
Hopefully there are responsible hams in other countries who will attempt to
ensure adequate qualification levels are maintained in most countries.

73, de Hans, K0HB

3718. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-03 00:22:32 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <c1azb.8099$zL1.1462267@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 83245

Kï¿½HB wrote:

> "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote
>
>
>> Nice editing to fit an agenda, Hans.
>
>
> I have no agenda.

But it was clever editing nonetheless.

- Mike KB3EIA -

3719. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-03 00:29:50 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <28azb.8102$zL1.1463744@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 83244

Kï¿½HB wrote:
> "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote
>
>
>>Mike, You and I know it can't be enforced without invasion of privacy.
>
> You
>
>>have to go on the operator's property and make local field strength
>>measurements.
>
>
> The rules have a wide assortment of power level restrictions below 100W,
> some as low as 2.5W, Many of them apply to every license class. Can I
> presume from your flip answer that we can safely ignore those limits because
> it would be an "invasion of privacy" for FCC to enforce them?

You muddy the waters. The point as I see it is that Technicians now
have access to much higher power levels. Equipment is already out that
has 100 watts, and you can be hurt by 50 watt units as well as 100 watt
units. And it makes an unenforceable power level for no real purpose. No
reason why the first class of license can't have enough RF information
that it is expected to know that it can safely operate 100 watts.

I presume there is evidence that Technicians are harming themselves now?
If not, you have a pretty weak argument.

- Mike KB3EIA -

3720. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-03 01:00:26 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <KAazb.1840$Qd6.1531@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 83246

"Kï¿½HB" wrote:
>
> But there IS a mandate that each licensee
> is directly responsible for the proper
> adjustment and operation of their
> equipment, (snip) ...like signal purity, etc.
> 97.307(a) thru (e) come to mind.
> Personally, I don't believe that your
> (misnamed) Technician qualification
> examination is adequate to ensure that
> you can carry out that mandate.

Really? The FCC does think it is adequate. Regardless, I only saw a few questions in the Extra question pool (July, 2002) about signal purity (measurements and so on), none having to with the actual adjustment of equipment. That hardly makes someone with your license an expert in this regard.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3721. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-03 01:05:48 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <MFazb.1853$Qd6.901@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 83247

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote

> And it makes an unenforceable power level for no real purpose.

Two points:

POINT A

This "unenforceable" mantra is a weak argument, which does not gain strength by the repetition.

Of course it's enforceable, or at least just as enforceable as power levels have ever been. "Unenforceable" is a complete cop out. If power level is not enforceable at 50W, then it's not enforceable at 2.5W, 25W, 50W ERP, 100W, 200W, or 1.5KW, all of which are power currently exist in FCC Amateur Radio regulations.

POINT B

That particular power level has a real purpose. The purpose is two-fold.

Purpose #1) It allows us to institute a "learners permit" class of license in which we can limit power to a level which FCC has stated is safe for both the user and unknowing passers-by.

Purpose #2) It allows us to institute a "learners permit" class of license in which the power level minimizes the unwanted side-effects of granting broad spectrum access to relatively underqualified operators. Now, before you spin up your rotors about "but QRP operators work around the world", bear in mind that most of the "bad" signals heard on HF are the result of ignorant operators trying to run a lot of power, and the consequent splatter, flat-topping, birdies, over-compression, etc. On the other hand, I've never heard a distorted or crappy QRP station. In further support of the idea is the fact that all these 100W-class rigs you keep harping on are running at near their designed-in upper capability, making them more likely to become purveyors of all the crappy-signal symptoms I just talked about. At 50W they are much less likely to be straining their design specifications and consequently radiating cleaner signals. In the hands of even a QCAO life-member it would be hard to splatter/chirp/over-modulate when you're running at half the design limit of the rig.

73, de Hans, K0HB

3722. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-03 01:11:12 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <QKazb.1865$Qd6.468@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 83248

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote

>
> But it was clever editing nonetheless.
>

Yes, it certainly was. Thank you for noticing.

73, de Hans, K0HB

3723. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-03 01:11:45 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <lLazb.1867$Qd6.1657@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 83249

"Hans K0HB" wrote:
>
> (snip) But I am also recommending, after
> a generous period with 'training wheels',
> a more strenuous qualification for
> standard privileges than currently exists.
> The QCAO and IOoDHW cries of "the
> unfairness of it all" are deafening.

The only thing I've heard is cries for proof that your license proposal actually addresses a real need within the Amateur Radio Service - something that fits the goals and purposes of that. What you've offered so far has certainly not provided that proof.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3724. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-03 01:16:11 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <vPazb.1875$Qd6.603@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 83250

"Kï¿½HB" wrote:
> "Dwight Stewart" wrote
>
> > Or is it just American operators (their
> > "ignorance") that scares the "bejeebers"
> > out of you?
>
> I am not eligible to petition the regulators in
> other countries, so my proposal will only
> affect license applicants under FCC
>jurisdiction. (snip)

I'll leave that answer to speak for itself.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3725. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-03 01:20:51 UTC
From: Bert Craig <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM>
Message-ID: <TTazb.13700$N.4597672@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>
Source record: 83301

"Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
news:3FCD095B.6000304@psu.edu...
>
>
> Bert Craig wrote:
> > "K�HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > news:c71zb.1209$Oe5.953@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> >
> >>"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote
> >>
> >>
> >>>I've looked over the current written tests. I just don't see where
> >>
> > they're
> >
> >>>lacking as far as the existing goals and purposes of the Amateur Radio
> >>>Service are concerned.
> >>
> >>Translation: "After over 6 years as a Technician, I've almost got the
> >>General Class test memorized. Don't set me back by making me memorize a
> >>whole different set of questions."
> >>
> >>73, de Hans, K0HB
> >
> >
> > "Hammer, meet nail."
>
> When you're only tool is a hammer, everything looks like a nail! 8^)

Lol.

> > I don't even think we need to change the questions. Eliminate the
published
> > Q&A pools and reorder the answers, that'll do it.
>
> Big deal! There will have to be a study guide, which will have the
> answers in it in text form. I'd read it and know it. Probably quicker
> and better than the pools

I'd bet you would too. I had a slightly unfair advantage, a college avionics
curriculum that culminated in a GROL. However, in order to earn our
sheepskins, we had to pass screening exams...no published Q&A pools. Same
applied to our FAA exams.

> BTW, Bert, did you know that they change the order of the answers in the
> actual test as compared to the question pool?

Didn't really notice. Once you review the Q&A pool, the correct answer stands out like a sore thumb. I reviewed the Q&A pool twice and drove and hour so to Yonkers, NY...for approx. six minutes of actual exam time. (& that gave me privies to 1500 Watts on 50 MHz and up?!)

> > Q. Do what?
> >
> > A. Require just a hair more cerebral activity than rote memorization.
>
>
> Maybe for some.

You're right, maybe.

> - Mike KB3EIA -

73 de Bert
WA2SI

3726. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-03 01:25:20 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <4Yazb.1897$Qd6.284@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 83302

"Mike Coslo" wrote:
>
> (snip) I presume there is evidence that
> Technicians are harming themselves now?
> If not, you have a pretty weak argument.

Of course there isn't any evidence of that, Mike. As I said earlier, Hans' proposal appears to be a solution looking for a problem (an answer looking for a question). Actually, after reading what he's said about it in this thread, his proposal really appears to be nothing more than a way for Hans to build up his own self-image by belittling Technicians (and to a lesser extent Generals).

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3727. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-03 01:35:46 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <S5bzb.1907$Qd6.1384@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 83303

"Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
news:3FCD04CB.8010701@psu.edu...
> Bill Sohl wrote:
> > "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote in message
>
>
> <some snippage>
>
>
> >>Well, no matter what Hans believes on this, power level enforcement or
> >>even
> >>monitoring just can't be done--unless there'd be a whole lot more
dollars
> >>and effort going to it and we all know that's not going to happen.
> >>
> >>Kim W5TIT
> >
> >
> > While enforcement might prove difficult, the implementation
> > of a power limit would, I believe, not be violated by the
> > majority of hams. Those of us that were Novices at one time
> > lived with a 75 watt limit. Did some novices violate
> > that? Probably, but by and large, most stayed within the
> > legal limit.
>
> But even if that is the case, it would seem to me to make more sense to
> us a limit that is easily handled by virtue of equipment that will
> handle the limit already on the market.

I agree, see more below.

> Would the manufacturers make equipment that only put out 50 watts?
> Possibly, but what will be the resale value of the equipment? So the new
> Class A ham has to go out and buy a new rig to make use of his or her
> new priveliges? Remember not everyone wants to run a lot of power. 100
> watts is something most people are comfortable with.

And that's a logical threshold point in my opinion.

> And the rationale for the reduction of power needs to be proven to me
> anyway. How many Technicians have been hurt by using more than 50 watts
> power?

None I know of.

> And do you think that the prospective ham should not know about RF
> safety until they reach the equivalent of an Extra? This plan seems to
> advocate that.

Actually, I think they SHOULD know about the basics of RF,
RF hazards, etc

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

3728. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-03 01:39:04 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <Y8bzb.1912$Qd6.613@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 83304

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote

> What you've offered so far has
> certainly not provided that proof.

Stewart, there's no polite way for me to say this. With your QCAO agenda so thoroughly clouding your thought processes, you wouldn't recognize proof if Mr. Proof in a monogrammed sweater jumped out of your computer screen and bit you square on the nose. So you cling to your "unfairness" and "unenforceable" jeremiads, even though they have both been refuted and discredited here with elementary logic.

The beauty of the situation is that I don't have to prove anything to you anyhow. I just have to persuade the FCC. ('Oh dear,' says God, 'I hadn't thought of that,' and promptly vanishes in a puff of logic. -- Douglas Adams, THGttG)

With kindest personal regards,

de Hans, K0HB

3729. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-03 01:49:53 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <5jbzb.1920$Qd6.1403@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 83305

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote

> Actually, after reading what he's said about it in this
> thread, his proposal really appears to be nothing more than a way for Hans
> to build up his own self-image by belittling Technicians (and to a lesser
> extent Generals).

In the inbred world of rrap, there is no self-image to build.

And of course I haven't belittled any amateurs. I've only pointed out the inadequacies of the current qualification process and suggested an alternative. That you have decided to start bringing personality into the argument speaks volumes about the inadequacy of your arguments and logic skills.

With kindest personal regards,

de Hans, K0HB

3730. Re: Morse Yes or No ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-03 02:45:40 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20031202214540.22081.00002258@mb-m17.aol.com>
Source record: 83306

In article <bqflemgia0@pita.alt.net>, "Code" <code@codeyesno.net> writes:

>
>Should Morse code be retained as a requirement to
>obtain an amateur radio license in the U.S.?
>
>73
>
>Code Yes or No

Yes. All U.S. Amateur Radio licensing requirements should be restored to those which were in place prior to February 15, 1991. All "no-code" Technician-
class licenses should be retroactively suspended for two years, in order to give those who hold them the time to meet the newly-reinstated licensing requirements. At the end of the two year "grace" period, those licenses would be revoked. Of course, this would not apply to anyone who upgraded to General, Advanced, or Amateur Extra prior to April 1, 2000, having taken and passed the requisite 5, 13, and 20 WPM code tests for their respective license classes.

73 de Larry, K3LT

3731. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-03 02:45:40 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20031202214540.22081.00002259@mb-m17.aol.com>
Source record: 83307

In article <6pXwb.20284$Rk5.8604@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> writes:

> You must be getting old or something, Larry. You gave up much too quickly.
>It was surely a mistake when she first wrote it, but a real surprise when
>she actually wrote it again without catching the mistake.
>
>
>Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
>http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

Dwight:

Yes, she did make a mistake, but I recognized it as such, and instead of beating up on her, I made an attempt to help her out. I now find it necessary to go a step farther, and say that since she did make a simple (and common) grammatical error, that I apologize to Kim for the inference that she would have found the death of your brother to be "hilarious." Of course, had she not used that term in the first place, the confusion never would have occurred. Perhaps she will be more careful in the future.

73 de Larry, K3LT

3732. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-03 02:45:41 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20031202214541.22081.00002260@mb-m17.aol.com>
Source record: 83308

In article <bq2n1o$4di@library1.airnews.net>, "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
writes:

>> > "Larry Roll K3LT" wrote:
>> > >
>> > > Yawn! Ok, apparently you need some help
>> > > here. I *think* that what you meant to say
>> > > goes something like this: "It's a pretty near
>> > > given that <neither> I, nor many others in
>> > > this newsgroup, would find anything like the
>> > > death of someone else "hilarious."" (snip)
>> >
>> >
>> > You must be getting old or something, Larry. You gave up much too
>> quickly.
>> > It was surely a mistake when she first wrote it, but a real surprise
>when
>> > she actually wrote it again without catching the mistake.
>> >
>> >
>> > Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>> >
>> > http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
>> >
>>
>> I meant to add that I'll check with our grammar department today...
>>
>> Kim W5TIT
>>
>>
>
>ACK!!! Man, I am still stunned over this one--I *must* be getting old. The
>grammar department indeed reminded me of the old "either/neither"
>"neither/nor" argument to be used in deciding upon correct grammar! So,
>yes, Larry was correct! Wow, what a hoot! Larry being correct . However,
>it was stated that, in a casual conversation, inference is
>98% of the communication. Deductive reasoning would lend itself to knowing
>what was intended to be said (sorry, Jim). I did remind them that I do not
>consider this venue as much "casual" as I do a debate environment. So, they
>said in a debate I'd lose points. Consider the points lost.
>
>Anyway, yep, the sentence should have been as Larry stated in the above
>reposted, reposted, reposted(?) post. All I can say is I am proud to have
>given Larry the opportunity to be correct *and* intellectual, for

>once... again. What a hoot, eh? Oh wait, upon review, could
>it look to JJ like I am backpedaling? Hmmm.....nope, don't think so...
>
>Now, back to cooking a fine, fine cook-ahead Thanksgiving dinner that
>neither I nor anyone could deny being delightfully delicious! ;)
>
>Kim W5TIT

Well, how about THAT? Kim, in her own way, actually admitting that she was wrong about something! Gee, if only this would become a trend…

73 de Larry, K3LT

3733. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-03 03:54:25 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <R7dzb.8310$zL1.1500126@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 83309

Bert Craig wrote:

> "Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
> news:3FCD095B.6000304@psu.edu...
>
>>
>>Bert Craig wrote:
>>
>>>"Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
>>>news:c71zb.1209$Oe5.953@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net...
>>>
>>>
>>>>"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>I've looked over the current written tests. I just don't see where
>>>>
>>>they're
>>>
>>>
>>>>>lacking as far as the existing goals and purposes of the Amateur Radio
>>>>>Service are concerned.
>>>>
>>>>Translation: "After over 6 years as a Technician, I've almost got the
>>>>General Class test memorized. Don't set me back by making me memorize a
>>>>whole different set of questions."
>>>>
>>>>73, de Hans, K0HB
>>>
>>>
>>>"Hammer, meet nail."
>>
>>When you're only tool is a hammer, everything looks like a nail! 8^)
>
>
> Lol.
>
>
>>>I don't even think we need to change the questions. Eliminate the
>
> published
>
>>>Q&A pools and reorder the answers, that'll do it.

>>
>>Big deal! There will have to be a study guide, which will have the
>>answers in it in text form. I'd read it and know it. Probably quicker
>>and better than the pools
>
>
> I'd bet you would too. I had a slightly unfair advantage, a college avionics
> curriculum that culminated in a GROL. However, in order to earn our
> sheepskins, we had to pass screening exams...no published Q&A pools. Same
> applied to our FAA exams.
>
>
>>BTW, Bert, did you know that they change the order of the answers in the
>>actual test as compared to the question pool?
>
>
> Didn't really notice. Once you review the Q&A pool, the correct answer
> stands out like a sore thumb. I reviewed the Q&A pool twice and drove and
> hour so to Yonkers, NY...for approx. six minutes of actual exam time. (&
> that gave me privies to 1500 Watts on 50 MHz and up?!)

Reminds me of the first time I took the General test. I got up early
and drove to the Hamfest in Butler PA from State College PA. Drank
several cups of coffee on the way. I took the writtens first, and no
problem acing it. Then the combination of the trip and too much coffee
kicked in as I sat down for the Morse code test. As they say in the
Bronx fuggitaboudit! So I had to wait a while for my ticket.

Which makes me wonder, I do not do Morse well under stress. I wonder how
some of those who had to do it under some awful condx ever managed.

- Mike KB3EIA -

3734. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-03 03:55:55 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <f9dzb.8311$zL1.1500414@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 83310

Bill Sohl wrote:

> "Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
> news:3FCD04CB.8010701@psu.edu...
>
>>Bill Sohl wrote:
>>
>>>"Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote in message
>>
>>
>><some snippage>
>>
>>
>>>>Well, no matter what Hans believes on this, power level enforcement or
>>>>even
>>>>monitoring just can't be done--unless there'd be a whole lot more
>
> dollars
>
>>>>and effort going to it and we all know that's not going to happen.
>>>>
>>>>Kim W5TIT
>>>
>>>
>>>While enforcement might prove difficult, the implementation
>>>of a power limit would, I believe, not be violated by the
>>>majority of hams. Those of us that were Novices at one time
>>>lived with a 75 watt limit. Did some novices violate
>>>that? Probably, but by and large, most stayed within the
>>>legal limit.
>>
>>But even if that is the case, it would seem to me to make more sense to
>>us a limit that is easily handled by virtue of equipment that will
>>handle the limit already on the market.
>
>
> I agree, see more below.
>
>
>>Would the manufacturers make equipment that only put out 50 watts?
>>Possibly, but what will be the resale value of the equipment? So the new
>>Class A ham has to go out and buy a new rig to make use of his or her
>>new priveliges? Remember not everyone wants to run a lot of power. 100
>>watts is something most people are comfortable with.

>
>
> And that's a logical threshold point in my opinion.
>
>
>>And the rationale for the reduction of power needs to be proven to me
>>anyway. How many Technicians have been hurt by using more than 50 watts
>>power?
>
>
> None I know of.
>
>
>>And do you think that the prospective ham should not know about RF
>>safety until they reach the equivalent of an Extra? This plan seems to
>>advocate that.
>
>
> Actually, I think they SHOULD know about the basics of RF,
> RF hazards, etc

Seems like we're pretty much on the same page here! 8^)

- Mike KB3EIA -

3735. Re: Where Did THIS Come From...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-03 05:15:36 UTC
From: Alun <alun@1stcounsel.com>
Message-ID: <Xns94462A42285elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 83311

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in
news:aN3zb.1314$Oe5.1259@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net:

>
> "Alun" <alun@1stcounsel.com> wrote in message
> news:Xns9444DC1898263elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
>> n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in
>> news:20031201065801.25517.00002515@mb-m15.aol.com:
>>
>> > In article <Xns944282A0D69C5elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun
>> > <alun@1stcounsel.com> writes:
>> >
>> >>n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in news:20031129115807.23307.00004755@mb-
>> >>m29.aol.com:
>> >>
>> >>> In article <f45722ac.0311281934.2deeda0@posting.google.com>,
>> >>> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
>> >>>
>> >>>>Blowhard libs have tried soooo hard to wreck this country.
>> >>>
>> >>> So have blowhard conservatives.
>> >>>
>> >>>>They've nearly succeeded,
>> >>>
>> >>> How is this country "wrecked", compared to how things used to be?
>> >>>
>> >>>>but there are still a few people who give a damn about America,
>> >>>>and GW is one of them.
>> >>>
>> >>> There are lots of others, including many who disagree with Mr.
>> >>> Bush.
>> >>>
>> >>> It's the methods, not the person.
>> >>>
>> >>>>
>> >>>
>> >>>
>> >>>
>> >>
>> >>Well, I'm a foreigner in your country, but you can't deny that the
>> >>economy boomed under Clinton and is now on it's knees.
>> >
>> > Sure - but for reasons that have little to do with Clinton, his
>> > predecessors or successors.

>>
>> You may be right
>>
>> >>
>> >>I'm not fond of the present government, but mainly for other
>> >>reasons. Civil liberties and John Ashcroft, mostly.
>> >
>> > The USA's open-door policies are one reason terror groups were able
>> > at come here and operate the way they did on Sept 11.
>>
>> Actually, US immigration is amongst the toughest in the world. I can't
>> help but smile to see it called 'open door'.
>>
>> >>
>> >>All in all, I can't really think of anything GW Bush has done
>> >>domestically that is anything to shout about.
>> >
>> > He's been kinda busy, fighting three wars (Afghanistan, Iraq,
>> > anti-terror)
>> >
>> >>Tax cuts for the rich.
>> >
>> > Why is anyone surprised at that?
>>
>> I'm not
>>
>> >
>> >>Deficit spending.
>> >
>> > Goes hand-in-hand with reduced reveues from a struggling economy.
>> >
>> >>I'm really trying to think of anything good (honestly), but nothing
>> >>comes to mind.
>> >>
>> >>As for the war, why open that can of worms? Yes, Saddam is/was a
>> >>very bad guy. Do I beleive the reasons given for going to war? No.
>> >>And yes, Blair went along with it, but I don't like him a lot
>> >>either.
>> >
>> > The important question is "what next"?
>>
>> Indeed it is. I think if it had been approached differently a lot more
>> countries would have been willing to help. As it is, Bush and Blair,
>> etc. have got themselves into a hole.
>>
>> >>
>> >>... but then I'm an anti-code test liberal, so what did you expect?
>> >>
>> > HAW! That's a good one!
>> >

>> >>However, I actually do think it was a nice gesture for Dubbya to go
>> >>to Baghdad for Thanksgiving.
>> >>
>> >>I'm sure this post will draw the usual 'love it or leave it' garbage
>> >>from at least someone, but never mind. I can take it.
>> >>
>> > What is often forgotten is that "loving it" takes many
>> > forms.Disagreement is not necessarily disloyalty.
>> >
>> > 73 de Jim, N2EY
>> >
>> >
>>
>> Agreed
>
> It is not the 'immigration policy' that is so bad. Its the wide open
> borders that are a real problem.
>
> Dan/W4NTI
>
>
>

Well, the border with Mexico seems to be almost impossible to close, from what I've seen. Probably the only way to fix the problem is to try to help fix the Mexican economy. Don't ask me how.

I saw a documentary on TV about migrants moving to work in factories just across the border on the Mexican side, and most of them seem to live in conditions that are as bad as anything we had in the Victorian era, i.e. during the original industrial revolution. What is interesting is that a minority of enlightened factory owners have built nice houses for their workers - exactly as happened over 100 years ago. However, most of the factory workers seem to live in shanties, places where water is something that is delivered by a truck.

It's no wonder that many of them would rather go a few miles further and cross the border if they can.

3736. Re: Stuck?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-03 09:04:35 UTC
From: Fred <fred@fredsbarnbrew.net>
Message-ID: <bqk8uoei0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 83312

"JJ" <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
news:l5OdnTKRW78VhlCiRVn-hg@gbronline.com...
> Fred wrote:
>
> >>
> > > No more immature than a grown man who chases trucks up and
> > > down interstate highways, trying to figure out what CB channel
> > > they are transmitting on. Then constantly pestering a busy federal
> > > official with childish "reports" of such activity. Errrr, sound like
> > > an immature person you know Ox?
> > >
> > > Fred's Barn
> >
> Well, freddieboy, you are wrong, Jerry doesn't try to figure out what CB
> channel they are transmitting on, he couldn't care less what CB channel
> they are on. He reports those who operate illegally in the 10 meter
> band(those are *not* CB channels in case you didn't know). I do the same
> thing, want to make something of it? Maybe you been sleeping in the barn
> with the cows to long.
>

Wow! How many "ARRL Member" stickers do you have on
your car? How many hammie call sign badges do you wear?
Do you display a "junior FCC G-man" badge? Most of all
though, do you have a life? How many antennas are
swangin' all over your junker? Do your kids know you?

Fred's CB Barn

3737. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-03 09:56:12 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031203045612.29660.00001915@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 83313

In article <3FCD04CB.8010701@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:

>But even if that is the case, it would seem to me to make more sense to
>us a limit that is easily handled by virtue of equipment that will
>handle the limit already on the market.

Exisitng equipment could still be used by LP licensees - they just have to turn it down by 3 dB.

>
> Would the manufacturers make equipment that only put out 50 watts?
>Possibly, but what will be the resale value of the equipment? So the new
>Class A ham has to go out and buy a new rig to make use of his or her
>new priveliges? Remember not everyone wants to run a lot of power. 100
>watts is something most people are comfortable with.

When the Novice was created back in 1951, the power limit was 75 watts input. Which works out to about 50 watts output.

In a short time there were many manufacturers making transmitters for the Novice market. Their resale value was good because there were always new Novices coming along looking for a bargain.

And those manufacturers had to compete with homebrew and surplus rigs which were in abundance back then. (One of the reasons Novices were limited to 75 w xtal control was so that homebrew rigs used by Novices would be kept simple).

In fact many Novices used less than the full power allowed.

Let's see...there was the Ameco AC-1, the Heath AT-1, DX-20, DX-35, DX-40, d DX-60 and HW-16, the Johnson Adventurer, Challenger, Navigator and Ranger, the Drake 2-NT, the Hallicrafters HT-40.......to name just a few.

And this was when the amateur radio market was a lot smaller than it is today.

>
> And the rationale for the reduction of power needs to be proven to me
>anyway. How many Technicians have been hurt by using more than 50 watts
>power?
>
Under Hans' plan, no existing hams would lose any privileges. So they don't have to worry.

>And do you think that the prospective ham should not know about RF
>safety until they reach the equivalent of an Extra? This plan seems to
>advocate that.

Until a few years ago there were no questions about RF exposure at all in the pools.

One question is being overlooked, though: Why are most manufactured rigs rated 100 watts? Why not 50 watts, or 250 watts, or something else? (A very few are rated at other power levels). Why 100.

The answer is about 50 years old.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3738. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-03 11:56:34 UTC
From: Bert Craig <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM>
Message-ID: <Sbkzb.15490$N.6980669@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>
Source record: 83314

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:R7dzb.8310$zL1.1500126@news1.news.adelphia.net...
> Bert Craig wrote:
>
> > "Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
> > news:3FCD095B.6000304@psu.edu...
> >
> >>
> >>Bert Craig wrote:
> >>
> >>>"K&#65533;HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> >>>news:c71zb.1209$Oe5.953@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> >>>
> >>>
> >>>>"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote
> >>>>
> >>>>
> >>>>
> >>>>>I've looked over the current written tests. I just don't see where
> >>>>
> >>>they're
> >>>
> >>>
> >>>>>lacking as far as the existing goals and purposes of the Amateur
Radio
> >>>>>Service are concerned.
> >>>>
> >>>>Translation: "After over 6 years as a Technician, I've almost got the
> >>>>General Class test memorized. Don't set me back by making me memorize
a
> >>>>whole different set of questions."
> >>>>
> >>>>73, de Hans, K0HB
> >>>
> >>>
> >>>"Hammer, meet nail."
> >>
> >>When you're only tool is a hammer, everything looks like a nail! 8^)
> >
> >
> > Lol.
> >
> >

> >>>I don't even think we need to change the questions. Eliminate the
> >
> > published
> >
> >>>Q&A pools and reorder the answers, that'll do it.
> >>
> >>Big deal! There will have to be a study guide, which will have the
> >>answers in it in text form. I'd read it and know it. Probably quicker
> >>and better than the pools
> >
> >
> > I'd bet you would too. I had a slightly unfair advantage, a college
avionics
> > curriculum that culminated in a GROL. However, in order to earn our
> > sheepskins, we had to pass screening exams...no published Q&A pools.
Same
> > applied to our FAA exams.
> >
> >
> >>BTW, Bert, did you know that they change the order of the answers in the
> >>actual test as compared to the question pool?
> >
> >
> > Didn't really notice. Once you review the Q&A pool, the correct answer
> > stands out like a sore thumb. I reviewed the Q&A pool twice and drove
and
> > hour so to Yonkers, NY...for approx. six minutes of actual exam time. (&
> > that gave me privies to 1500 Watts on 50 MHz and up?!)
>
> Reminds me of the first time I took the General test. I got up early
> and drove to the Hamfest in Butler PA from State College PA. Drank
> several cups of coffee on the way. I took the writtens first, and no
> problem acing it. Then the combination of the trip and too much coffee
> kicked in as I sat down for the Morse code test. As they say in the
> Bronx fuggitaboudit! So I had to wait a while for my ticket.
>
> Which makes me wonder, I do not do Morse well under stress. I wonder how
> some of those who had to do it under some awful condx ever managed.
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -

I actually had a pretty good experience with Element 1...once it began. I had actually kinda over-prepped and was getting pretty nervous. Dick, N0BK (God rest his soul.) told me to stop practicing, get off my ar$e, and just give it a whirl.

When I arrived, it was all I could do NOT to throw up, until the code characters started flowing. I had practiced with the ARRL CD's and they turned out to be a tad faster than the actual exam. It was like gettin' ready to bat in the world series only to have the pitcher throw cantaloupe

sized balls in slow-motion...underhand. I went into immediate $hit-eating grin mode.

Then there's gettin' OTA...whole 'nutha story. ;-)

73 de Bert
WA2SI

3739. spam

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-03 12:52:11 UTC
From: 8fez <8fezes2002@nospam.yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <52f7e$3fcddc84$d1cc4942$2036@allthenewsgroups.com>
Source record: 83315

The BlackSpot Sneaker
Spam that links you to a spyware URL when you open it.

Run Ad-Aware asap if you opened the original message.

3740. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-03 12:58:07 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031203075807.02537.00001939@mb-m23.aol.com>
Source record: 83316

In article <bqhq6q$q9h@library2.airnews.net>, "Kim" <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
writes:

>"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
>news:c2356669.0311300918.2bd67bd2@posting.google.com...
>> "Kim" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote in message
>news:<bqc3p2$b5r@library2.airnews.net>...
>> > > >
>> > > >The far left--the "fast" lane as it is called. Funny thing is, if
>you
>> > > >mention to people at the office or wherever, that it doesn't mean the
>> > "break
>> > > >the speed limit lane," you ought to hear the validations for people
>doing
>> > > >just that.
>> > >
>> > > But you're already speeding, Kim. And not by an amount that can be
>> > > explained by the usual inaccuraccies and imperfections of
>speedometers.
>> > >
>> > > Yet your getting ticked off because someone wants to go even faster.
>> > >
>> >
>> > Nope. Not at all. I am ticked because they think I should move for
>them.
>>
>> Why shouldn't you move?
>>
>> If it's OK for you to go 15 mph above the limit, why isn't it OK for
>> them to go 20 mph above the limit? By refusing to move, you're
>> enforcing your own personal judgement on what the speed limit should
>> be.
>>
>
>It's fine for them to go 20 mph above the speed limit. It's fine if they
>want to go 30-40 mph above the speed limit. But, they won't find me moving
>out of their way; they'll have to go around because I am not moving into a
>lane where I have to slow down, or even get "stuck" there for a while, if
>there happens to be more than one vehicle that wants to go past.

Ah, I see. The right lane is going 60-65, the left lane (with you in it by
yourself) is going 70-75, and you're not going to lose a few seconds in order
to accomodate someone who wants to go 80-85.
>
>This is an "every morning" thing. If they want to get to where they are

>going quicker, then they need to adjust their scheduling, not make others on
>the road cater to their needs. I would not think of being obnoxious because
>I have to get somewhere quicker than anyone else--I would make the decision
>to get on the road earlier.
>
Sure.

Then why not apply that philosophy to yourself and get on the road early enough
that the right lane gets you there on time?
>>
>> Suppose you're sailing along on your 60 mph 4-lane-divided (2 lanes
>> each way) road and you come across two (non police) cars side-by-side
>> going exactly the speed limit.
>>
>> What would you do? Would their behavior bother you?
>
>Yes, their behavior would bother me--*but* they're the cops...

No, they're not!

I wrote: " two (non police) cars". Sorry if that wasn't clear!

What I meant was two ordinary drivers in ordinary vehicles - not police or
officials of any kind. Just two folks who decided to go the posted speed limit
and no faster.

What would you do?

>and they have
>that latitude. What would I do? I'd follow along, in the left hand lane.
>The fun part would be when someone angrily pulls out to the right and would
>be jumping up alongside to go around before they'd notice that they were
>acting like that with cops right there. <GRIN>

Except they're not cops.
>
>> > I am already going faster than the posted speed is my point. Why should
>> > someone expect me to move if I am already going faster than I should be?
>>
>> Because you're preventing them from going as fast as *they* want, even
>> though you're going as fast as *you* want.
>
>Then they should have gotten out earlier than me.

Why should *they* move to accomodate *you*? *You* won't accomodate them!

>It's the same principle
>as someone who's standing in the "fast" lane (misnomer most of the
>time--GRIN) at the grocery store and I am ahead of them with 10 items and
>they only have one or two. If they're prone to it, they'll tap their foot;
>sigh real loud, etc. Practically fall over trying to get me to notice that
>they only have "just this little bit." And, how dare I *not* yield to them
>and let them go ahead...and the next with one or two...and the next, etc.

Must be another regional thing - I've never encountered that around here.

>Hey, next time, get there before me.

Different situation and principle.

>> Why does anyone *need* to speed in a nonemergency situation? How much
>> time does going 70-75 save vs. 60 on that same road?
>
>Actually, none...and I learned that in Driver's Education in High School.
>It was proven out a few times, too. I don't know if I am really speeding
>because of having to get somewhere quicker--in fact in the mornings that
>would be probably not. I leave 45 min. ahead of time most of the time, to
>get to a 20-25 min. destination. I leave early enough to account for
>traffic also. And, I am very fortunate to have a job that doesn't make me
>punch the timeclock.

But you still speed.
>
>In my case, my 70-75 mph (more near 70 most of the time) is probably more
>due to the fact that, that is where my foot lands on the gas pedal.

?? "Where your foot lands"?

Two words: Cruise control.

>And, it
>is the predominant flow of traffic...70-75, with the exception of those
>obnoxious folks we're discussing here.

In both lanes?

>> > Well, myself included, one does not think of these things (tickets)
>> > happening when one is breaking the speed limit.
>>
>> I think about 'em all the time. Not just the fine but the points.
>
>I should probably count my blessings here, because this will jinx me. I've
>been stopped three times in my driving "career." Little enough that I still
>don't "know the routine" when I do get stopped. Only once I've been
>ticketed

I wonder why....;-)

> and that was for taking a turn onto a street that doesn't allow
>those turns at the time of morning I was doing it.

About 20 years ago, on a cold rainy Sunday night, I made a wrong turn onto a one way street in Philly. No "One Way" sign at the intersection, no "No Right Turn", just a stop sign. No cars on the street either.

Of course it didn't take long after the turn to realize something wasn't right, so I did a quick three-point turn. But it wasn't quick enough to avoid the notice of two of Philadelphia's finest, who turned on the lights and pulled me over.

By the time he got to my car I had the license, registration and insurance card out, both hands on the wheel, and the window down so he could talk to me.

He took my papers and proceeded to run them through the computer in his patrol car.

Meanwhile, the young lady who was with me started giving me the third degree as to how I was going to handle the cop, how it wasn't my fault, how I should "be a man" and "stand up to him" and "talk my way out of it". I held up one hand and said "Be quiet. I'm the driver, it's my car and my license, and I don't argue with the police over something as minor as a ticket. That's what traffic court is for."

Officer came back, asked if I knew why he stopped me. I said "I was going the wrong way on a one-way street because there's no sign at the intersection with Pine Street. I turned around as soon as I realized it was a one-way street, but you were right to stop me and I can understand if you decide to give me a ticket."

Officer handed me back my papers and said: "No ticket for you, your papers are all in order. We know all about the sign. Just be careful."

The young lady kept quiet, which was quite a miracle.

IOW, he was just waiting for somebody to give him a hard time.

>> > Exactly, but if I happened upon someone who's already breaking the speek
>> > limit, I am not going to act like an idiot behind them--expecting them
>to
>> > get out of my way.
>>
>> What if they're going the speed limit?
>>
>> Why is it OK for you to go 15 over but not OK for someone else to go
>> 20 over?
>
>If they are going the speed limit where I am at (in the left lane), I'd
>still calmly make the move to the right lane and go around them--when it was
>safe to--and wouldn't act like an idiot to them.

What if there was another car on the right and you couldn't go around?

> It is not any more "right"
>for me to speed than the next person--it's just that they'd better decide to
>go around, because I will not be moving for them just because they are going
>to act like an idiot. I will move if I decide to...and I usually don't.
>But it's just as OK for them to be speeding as me...I don't care. You seem
>to be stuck on the idea that I think they are wrong to speed faster than I
>speed.

Nope.

I'm stuck on the idea that you want to control the speed on the road.

> No. We're all just as wrong as each other for speeding, no matter
>how fast. But, I don't like their "I gotta get there faster than you gotta
>get there" attitude.

But that's *your* attitude, too. Otherwise you'd be in the right lane.

> And, since I am the one in the lead at that
>point--well, then, my attitude is the one that's important <GRIN>.
>
>> > > >And, while my behavior is not "forgiveable," I am no where
>> > > >as nasty as these folks are being.
>> > > >
>> > > Isn't that an entirely subjective judgement?
>> > >
>> > Yep. And it's mine...(grin)
>> >
>> HAW!
>>
>> I do believe some of all this is regional, however.
>>
>> And I've done a few tricks myself....
>>
>> Way back in the late '80s, I had reason to go back and forth between
>> Philly and Washington, DC about every other weekend. I noticed that
>> the aggressiveness of drivers increased in direct proportion to
>> proximity to the nation's capital.
>>
>> The worst part of the run was the BWP (Baltimore Washington Parkway),
>> a no-trucks 4 lane road with trees on both sides, and also between the
>> northbound and southbound lanes. Lots of traffic on a Friday night,
>> and as one approached The District the cars got more expensive and the
>> drivers more aggressive.
>>
>
>Heh, heh...funny you should mention that.

It happened way too many times.
>
>>
>> Back then the limit was 55 and traffic tended to stay below about 59
>> because enforcement was pretty good, and there were lots of places for
>> the troopers to hide in the trees, around curves, etc. The troopers
>> would not go after anyone below about 62 because speedometers and
>> radar are not 100% accurate. Above that they were ruthless, and above
>> 65 the fines went up and up and up...
>>
>> I got to know their whereabouts pretty good by observing where others
>> got tickets. (I was *never* stopped, in part because my 1980 Rabbit
>> Diesel looked like it couldn't even go the speed limit anyway). Radar
>> detectors were illegal in MD back then, too, and they'd do things like
>> set up a radar gun on an overpass and watch whose brake lights came on
>> for no reason....

>>
>> One night I'm sailing down the BWP in the *right* lane, and up behind
>> me comes a new Saab (Saabs were the hot car back then among the
>> yuppie-but-no-Beemer crowd). Dude flashes his brights at me - he wants
>> *me* to get in the *left* lane so he can pass without having to change
>> lanes!
>>
>> So I ease up on the throttle and slow down to 53...52....51....
>>
>> He gets ticked and crawls up but now I'm down to 50...49...
>>
>> Flashes the brights, gets ticked, and I keep easing up....
>>
>> Finally he gets ticked and goes into the left lane. Whereupon I start
>> speeding up again...52...55...58...62...
>>
>> He pulls alongside and now is really steamed because it is taking far
>> more effort to get past me than he expected. So he drops down a gear
>> and stomps it and goes off in a cloud of dust, over the next rise and
>> around the curve.....
>>
>> and I bring it back down to the limit...
>>
>> and I wave as I go by him, because he's now stopped by a trooper for
>> going WAY over the limit.....
>>
>> I wouldn't play games like that today, though...
>>
>> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>>
>
>Yeah, that was what I did a few...OK, more than a few...years ago. I'd
>always do just that, as a matter of fact. BUT, one day, this guy began
>throwing things out his window at me when I did finally move over and let
>him go passed me! Scared the heck outta me...he was throwing anything loose
>in his car, bottle caps, cracker jack box, etc. Thank goodness he didn't
>come across the bottle!

Or the gun.

> That's another reason I'm not so sure about letting
>creepy people get ahead of me...it may be me having to come upon them once
>again...
>
Better than having them behind you...

73 de Jim, N2EY

3741. Re: Where Did THIS Come From...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-03 12:58:08 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031203075808.02537.00001940@mb-m23.aol.com>
Source record: 83317

In article <Xns9444DC1898263elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun
<alun@1stcounsel.com> writes:

>n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in
>news:20031201065801.25517.00002515@mb-m15.aol.com:
>
>> In article <Xns944282A0D69C5elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun
>> <alun@1stcounsel.com> writes:
>>
>>>n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in news:20031129115807.23307.00004755@mb-
>>>m29.aol.com:
>>>
>>>> In article <f45722ac.0311281934.2deeda0@posting.google.com>,
>>>> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
>>>>
>>>>>Blowhard libs have tried soooo hard to wreck this country.
>>>>
>>>> So have blowhard conservatives.
>>>>
>>>>>They've nearly succeeded,
>>>>
>>>> How is this country "wrecked", compared to how things used to be?
>>>>
>>>>>but there are still a few people who give a damn about America, and
>>>>>GW is one of them.
>>>>
>>>> There are lots of others, including many who disagree with Mr. Bush.
>>>>
>>>> It's the methods, not the person.
>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>
>>>
>>>Well, I'm a foreigner in your country, but you can't deny that the
>>>economy boomed under Clinton and is now on it's knees.
>>
>> Sure - but for reasons that have little to do with Clinton, his
>> predecessors or successors.
>
>You may be right

"Success has a thousand fathers but failure is an orphan"

In very broad terms, I think the long economic boom of the past decade-plus was driven by the combined factors of increased productivity, cheap and plentiful oil, the computer/telecom booms, low inflation and a *perception* of decreasing international political tension (Berlin Wall falls, Soviet bloc disintegrates, increasing trade with China).

A lot of that seems kinda quaint now, huh?

Still, the DJIA was around 3600 when Clinton took office and it's trying to bust 10,000 now...
>
>>>
>>>I'm not fond of the present government, but mainly for other reasons.
>>>Civil liberties and John Ashcroft, mostly.
>>
>> The USA's open-door policies are one reason terror groups were able at
>> come here and operate the way they did on Sept 11.
>
>Actually, US immigration is amongst the toughest in the world. I can't
>help but smile to see it called 'open door'.

I don't mean immigration policies. I mean the the way the USA allows people in on visas, and doesn't control those who stay illegally.

How did the 9/11 terrorists get into the USA? How much trouble was it for them to get past INS and set up shop here?

As for tough immigration, check out what is required to immigrate to New Zealand.
>
>>>
>>>All in all, I can't really think of anything GW Bush has done
>>>domestically that is anything to shout about.
>>
>> He's been kinda busy, fighting three wars (Afghanistan, Iraq,
>> anti-terror)
>>
>>>Tax cuts for the rich.
>>
>> Why is anyone surprised at that?
>
>I'm not
>
A key taxation question (which is almost never answered) is: "How much of a family's income is spent on taxes, and where does it go?" It would be very interesting to see the total tax burden percentages of a family of four making $50K, $100K, $150K, etc..

My guess is that the lower end would be dominated by Medicare, SS, and sales tax while the top end by real estate and income tax.
>>
>>>Deficit spending.
>>

>> Goes hand-in-hand with reduced reveues from a struggling economy.
>>
>>>I'm really trying to think of anything good (honestly), but nothing
>>>comes to mind.
>>>
>>>As for the war, why open that can of worms? Yes, Saddam is/was a very
>>>bad guy. Do I beleive the reasons given for going to war? No. And yes,
>>>Blair went along with it, but I don't like him a lot either.
>>
>> The important question is "what next"?
>
>Indeed it is. I think if it had been approached differently a lot more
>countries would have been willing to help. As it is, Bush and Blair, etc.
>have got themselves into a hole.

I think a lot of countries would have been willing to wait some more years.

The tough question in my mind is why the UN was willing to wait so many years
while SH defied the 1991 agreements.

The *first* time weapons inspectors were denied access to *anything* in Iraq,
they should have packed their bags and gone home. And as soon as the last
inspector was out of the country, coalition forces should have leveled the
denied facility with smart weapons. IOW, "if you don't let us inspect it, we'll
know you're hiding something".

Easy to Monday-morning quarterback, tho.

>>>... but then I'm an anti-code test liberal, so what did you expect?
>>>
>> HAW! That's a good one!
>>
>>>However, I actually do think it was a nice gesture for Dubbya to go to
>>>Baghdad for Thanksgiving.
>>>
>>>I'm sure this post will draw the usual 'love it or leave it' garbage
>>>from at least someone, but never mind. I can take it.
>>>
>> What is often forgotten is that "loving it" takes many
>> forms.Disagreement is not necessarily disloyalty.
>>
>Agreed
>
73 de Jim, N2EY

3742. Dust off your homebrew rig this weekend

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-03 15:50:57 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <BDnzb.2496$Qd6.1721@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 83318

Holiday Spirits Homebrew CW Sprint--sponsored by the QRP ARCI, 2000Z - 2400Z Dec 7. Frequencies (MHz)--1.810, 3.560, 7.040, 14.060, 21.060, 28.060 kHz. Categories: SOAB, SOSB, SO20-10, SO160-40, MOAB, DX stations are SOAB only. Exchange: RST, S/P/C, and Power or QRP ARCI number. QSO Points: members--5 pts, non-members/different continent--4 pts, non-members/same cont.--2 pts. Score: QSO points x S/P/C (counted once per band) x Power multiplier (<250mW x 15, 250mW--1W x 10, 1--5W x7, >5W x 1) + Bonus Points (2000 for homebrew (HB) xmtr, 3000 HB rcvr, 5000 HB xcvr). For more information: http://personal.palouse.net/rfoltz/arci/holispr.htm. Logs due 30 days after the contest to rfoltz@turbonet.com or Randy Foltz, K7TQ, Attn: Holiday Spirits Sprint, 809 Leith St, Moscow, ID 83843.

3743. Re: Where Did THIS Come From...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-03 17:40:57 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <Jepzb.2604$Qd6.1853@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 83319

"Alun" <alun@1stcounsel.com> wrote in message
news:Xns94462A42285elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in
> news:aN3zb.1314$Oe5.1259@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net:

> >> >
> >>
> >> Agreed
> >
> > It is not the 'immigration policy' that is so bad. Its the wide open
> > borders that are a real problem.
> >
> > Dan/W4NTI
> >
> >
> >
>
> Well, the border with Mexico seems to be almost impossible to close, from
> what I've seen. Probably the only way to fix the problem is to try to help
> fix the Mexican economy. Don't ask me how.
>
> I saw a documentary on TV about migrants moving to work in factories just
> across the border on the Mexican side, and most of them seem to live in
> conditions that are as bad as anything we had in the Victorian era, i.e.
> during the original industrial revolution. What is interesting is that a
> minority of enlightened factory owners have built nice houses for their
> workers - exactly as happened over 100 years ago. However, most of the
> factory workers seem to live in shanties, places where water is something
> that is delivered by a truck.
>
> It's no wonder that many of them would rather go a few miles further and
> cross the border if they can.

At the probability of ticking off everyone again.....that is not our
problem. (USA).

It is the problem of and the fault of the corupt Mexican governments.
Notice I said governments.

They have oil, they have a beautiful tourist location. But the officials
are too busy pocketing the gringo dollars.

I say put up a fence like the Berlin wall. And issue orders to shoot to
kill. That will end it.

Dan/W4NTI

3744. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-03 17:51:04 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031203125104.15923.00002300@mb-m12.aol.com>
Source record: 83322

In article <28azb.8102$zL1.1463744@news1.news.adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo
<mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:

>Kï¿½HB wrote:
>> "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote
>>
>>
>>>Mike, You and I know it can't be enforced without invasion of privacy.
>>
>> You
>>
>>>have to go on the operator's property and make local field strength
>>>measurements.
>>
>>
>> The rules have a wide assortment of power level restrictions below 100W,
>> some as low as 2.5W, Many of them apply to every license class. Can I
>> presume from your flip answer that we can safely ignore those limits
>because
>> it would be an "invasion of privacy" for FCC to enforce them?
>
> You muddy the waters. The point as I see it is that Technicians now
>have access to much higher power levels. Equipment is already out that
>has 100 watts, and you can be hurt by 50 watt units as well as 100 watt
>units. And it makes an unenforceable power level for no real purpose. No
>reason why the first class of license can't have enough RF information
>that it is expected to know that it can safely operate 100 watts.
>
>I presume there is evidence that Technicians are harming themselves now?
>If not, you have a pretty weak argument.

3745. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-03 17:51:05 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031203125105.15923.00002301@mb-m12.aol.com>
Source record: 83321

In article <jC8zb.1689$Qd6.1196@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Kï¿½HB"
<groupk0hb@earthlink.net> writes:

>"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote
>
>> Sure you do, Hans. Aren't you promoting an alternative licensing system
>> with stiffer tests for newcomers?
>
>Nope. My proposal has a dramatically less strenuous set of qualifications
>for newcomers.
>
>
>> The key word is authorized, not expected, required, obligated, compelled,
>> obliged, or whatever. A person can build radio equipment if he or she
>wants,
>> but there is no mandate to do so.
>
>But there IS a mandate that each licensee is directly responsible for the
>proper adjustment and operation of their equipment, including all sorts of
>QCAO-unfriendly things like signal purity, etc. 97.307(a) thru (e) come to
>mind. Personally, I don't believe that your (misnamed) Technician
>qualification examination is adequate to ensure that you can carry out that
>mandate.

3746. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-03 17:51:06 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031203125106.15923.00002302@mb-m12.aol.com>
Source record: 83320

In article <ml8zb.1682$Qd6.1299@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> writes:

>"Kï¿½HB" wrote:
>>
>> I have no agenda.
>
>
> Sure you do, Hans. Aren't you promoting an alternative licensing system
>with stiffer tests for newcomers? This points to an obvious reason why you
>would focus on the "electronics expert" portion of 97.1(d) while ignoring
>the rest.
>
>
>> (snip) it lacks any foundation of credibility
>> when you consider that the successful
>> applicant for *any* amateur license is
>> authorized to build his own station. (snip)
>
>
> The key word is authorized, not expected, required, obligated, compelled,
>obliged, or whatever. A person can build radio equipment if he or she wants,
>but there is no mandate to do so.

3747. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-03 18:38:45 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <xnfcneeyarg.hpbs190.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>
Source record: 83323

On Wed, 03 Dec 2003 03:54:25 GMT, Mike Coslo wrote:

>Which makes me wonder, I do not do Morse well under stress. I wonder how
>some of those who had to do it under some awful condx ever managed.

I was at a hearing once where a shipboard operator was accused of
slugging the captain in the radio room. The other operator on duty
was being questioned as a witness, and was asked "did you see or hear
Mr. X have a fist-fight with the captain?". His reply: "when I sit
and copy the telegraph code that's all I concentrate on".

Not being a "morseman" as others call it, I admire someone who can
do that sort of concentration. (I've done it on 'phone, though.)

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

From a Clearing in the Silicon Forest
Beaverton (Washington County) Oregon

3748. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-03 18:48:51 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031203134851.25815.00004872@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 83324

In article <5jbzb.1920$Qd6.1403@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Kï¿½HB"
<groupk0hb@earthlink.net> writes:

>"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote
>
>> Actually, after reading what he's said about it in this
>> thread, his proposal really appears to be nothing more than a way for Hans
>> to build up his own self-image by belittling Technicians (and to a lesser
>> extent Generals).
>
>In the inbred world of rrap, there is no self-image to build.
>
>And of course I haven't belittled any amateurs. I've only pointed out the
>inadequacies of the current qualification process and suggested an
>alternative. That you have decided to start bringing personality into the
>argument speaks volumes about the inadequacy of your arguments and logic
>skills.

3749. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-03 18:48:51 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031203134851.25815.00004871@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 83325

In article <5jbzb.1920$Qd6.1403@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> writes:

>"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote
>
>> Actually, after reading what he's said about it in this
>> thread, his proposal really appears to be nothing more than a way for Hans
>> to build up his own self-image by belittling Technicians (and to a lesser
>> extent Generals).
>
>In the inbred world of rrap, there is no self-image to build.

Tell that to the regulars. :-) :-) :-)

>And of course I haven't belittled any amateurs. I've only pointed out the
>inadequacies of the current qualification process and suggested an
>alternative.

Gosh yes, heap big chief. :-)

>That you have decided to start bringing personality into the
>argument speaks volumes about the inadequacy of your arguments and logic
>skills.

Tsk, tsk, the nerve of some who wish to defy a radio god. :-)

LHA

3750. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-03 18:48:52 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031203134852.25815.00004874@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 83326

In article <4Yazb.1897$Qd6.284@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> writes:

>"Mike Coslo" wrote:
>>
>> (snip) I presume there is evidence that
>> Technicians are harming themselves now?
>> If not, you have a pretty weak argument.
>
> Of course there isn't any evidence of that, Mike. As I said earlier, Hans'
>proposal appears to be a solution looking for a problem (an answer looking
>for a question). Actually, after reading what he's said about it in this
>thread, his proposal really appears to be nothing more than a way for Hans
>to build up his own self-image by belittling Technicians (and to a lesser
>extent Generals).

...that's how the incentive license plan got started... :-)

LHA

3751. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-03 18:48:52 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031203134852.25815.00004873@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 83329

In article <Y8bzb.1912$Qd6.613@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Kï¿½HB"
<groupk0hb@earthlink.net> writes:

>"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote
>
>> What you've offered so far has
>> certainly not provided that proof.
>
>Stewart, there's no polite way for me to say this. With your QCAO agenda so
>thoroughly clouding your thought processes, you wouldn't recognize proof if
>Mr. Proof in a monogrammed sweater jumped out of your computer screen and
>bit you square on the nose. So you cling to your "unfairness" and
>"unenforceable" jeremiads, even though they have both been refuted and
>discredited here with elementary logic.

WHAT "logic" heap big chief?

All you've done so far is to ISSUE ORDERS OF THE DAY. No "logic,"
simply a set of demands which are labeled "TRUTH."

>The beauty of the situation is that I don't have to prove anything to you
>anyhow. I just have to persuade the FCC.

Fine. Convince the Commission you are god.

I'll be waiting, heap big chief. :-)

LHA

3752. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-03 18:48:54 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031203134854.25815.00004876@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 83330

In article <ml8zb.1682$Qd6.1299@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> writes:

>"Kï¿½HB" wrote:
>>
>> I have no agenda.
>
> Sure you do, Hans. Aren't you promoting an alternative licensing system
>with stiffer tests for newcomers? This points to an obvious reason why you
>would focus on the "electronics expert" portion of 97.1(d) while ignoring
>the rest.

Sounds like Hans is promoting a "BAA" (Bachelor of Amateur Arts) degree diploma in lieu of a license. :-)

BAA...say I. :-)

>> (snip) it lacks any foundation of credibility
>> when you consider that the successful
>> applicant for *any* amateur license is
>> authorized to build his own station. (snip)
>
> The key word is authorized, not expected, required, obligated, compelled,
>obliged, or whatever. A person can build radio equipment if he or she wants,
>but there is no mandate to do so.

Incorrect, Dwight. There MUST be a MANDATE to conform to the wishes of the "QCAO" and their needs to be the CONTROLLING elements in amateur radio activities.

In this case, "option IS a failure."

MANDATE. Control. Issue orders. Comply. Conform.

LHA

3753. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-03 18:48:54 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031203134854.25815.00004875@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 83331

In article <MFazb.1853$Qd6.901@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Kï¿½HB"
<groupk0hb@earthlink.net> writes:

>"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote
>
>> And it makes an unenforceable power level for no real purpose.
>
>Two points:
>
>POINT A
>------------
>
>This "unenforceable" mantra is a weak argument, which does not gain strength
>by the repetition.
>
>Of course it's enforceable, or at least just as enforceable as power levels
>have ever been. "Unenforceable" is a complete cop out. If power level is
>not enforceable at 50W, then it's not enforceable at 2.5W, 25W, 50W ERP,
>100W, 200W, or 1.5KW, all of which are power currently exist in FCC Amateur
>Radio regulations.

Then WHY have it?

Simply ISSUING ORDERS is a stupid idea without some reasoning
behind it.

So...why is the "maximum power" under your plan 50 W instead of
100 W?

Show your work.

>
>POINT B
>------------
>
>That particular power level has a real purpose. The purpose is two-fold.

Well, if YOU said it, it must have a "real purpose." :-)

>Purpose #1) It allows us to institute a "learners permit" class of license
>in which we can limit power to a level which FCC has stated is safe for both
>the user and unknowing passers-by.

What do you mean "we," white man?

I think you think you think more than the OET and the IEEE and the
USAF and the ANSI.

>Purpose #2) It allows us to institute a "learners permit" class of license
>in which the power level minimizes the unwanted side-effects of granting
>broad spectrum access to relatively underqualified operators. Now, before
>you spin up your rotors about "but QRP operators work around the world",
>bear in mind that most of the "bad" signals heard on HF are the result of
>ignorant operators trying to run a lot of power, and the consequent
>splatter, flat-topping, birdies, over-compression, etc. On the other hand,
>I've never heard a distorted or crappy QRP station. In further support of
>the idea is the fact that all these 100W-class rigs you keep harping on are
>running at near their designed-in upper capability, making them more likely
>to become purveyors of all the crappy-signal symptoms I just talked about.
>At 50W they are much less likely to be straining their design specifications
>and consequently radiating cleaner signals. In the hands of even a QCAO
>life-member it would be hard to splatter/chirp/over-modulate when you're
>running at half the design limit of the rig.

Of course. A "learner's permit." As if the ONLY radio emitters in
the world came from amateur radio stations. :-)

Geez...for a work manager supposedly with a degree you sure don't
know much about equipment that can go wrong, be misadjusted, and
lots of other little nasties lurking inside electronics boxes. Tsk, tsk.

"In the hands of you QCAO members," the "expertise" in radio
matters went out the window if you think that RF power output is the
ONLY thing causing splatter/chirp/over-modulation (etc.).

Someone do something nasty in your wheaties this morning? :-)

LHA

3754. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-03 18:48:55 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031203134855.25815.00004877@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 83328

In article <jC8zb.1689$Qd6.1196@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Kï¿½HB"
<groupk0hb@earthlink.net> writes:

>"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote
>
>> Sure you do, Hans. Aren't you promoting an alternative licensing system
>> with stiffer tests for newcomers?
>
>Nope. My proposal has a dramatically less strenuous set of qualifications
>for newcomers.

"Dramatic?" :-)

Okay, I'm sure there is great "drama" in having to get together the
requisite cash to go out and buy NEW equipment so as to meet
the the NEW RF power output levels.

Meanwhile, ol Hans can fire up his 2.5 KW rig (with higher drive
level input) and be as safe as a bug in a rug...

>> The key word is authorized, not expected, required, obligated, compelled,
>> obliged, or whatever. A person can build radio equipment if he or she wants,
>> but there is no mandate to do so.
>
>But there IS a mandate that each licensee is directly responsible for the
>proper adjustment and operation of their equipment, including all sorts of
>QCAO-unfriendly things like signal purity, etc. 97.307(a) thru (e) come to
>mind. Personally, I don't believe that your (misnamed) Technician
>qualification examination is adequate to ensure that you can carry out that
>mandate.

Heaven forbid that anyone offend any "QCAO" members who hold
title, fief, and divine rule over amateurspace. :-)

LHA

3755. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-03 18:48:56 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031203134856.25815.00004878@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 83327

In article <28azb.8102$zL1.1463744@news1.news.adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo
<mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:

>Kï¿½HB wrote:
>> "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote
>>
>>>Mike, You and I know it can't be enforced without invasion of privacy.
>>
>> You
>>
>>>have to go on the operator's property and make local field strength
>>>measurements.
>>
>>
>> The rules have a wide assortment of power level restrictions below 100W,
>> some as low as 2.5W, Many of them apply to every license class. Can I
>> presume from your flip answer that we can safely ignore those limits because
>> it would be an "invasion of privacy" for FCC to enforce them?
>
> You muddy the waters. The point as I see it is that Technicians now
>have access to much higher power levels. Equipment is already out that
>has 100 watts, and you can be hurt by 50 watt units as well as 100 watt
>units. And it makes an unenforceable power level for no real purpose. No
>reason why the first class of license can't have enough RF information
>that it is expected to know that it can safely operate 100 watts.
>
>I presume there is evidence that Technicians are harming themselves now?
>If not, you have a pretty weak argument.

"Technicians" are harming Hans' concept of what is "harmful." :-)

Hans hasn't shown his work proving that 50 W is okay while 100 W
is "harmful."

But...he still thinks the first recognized 1906 voice transmission was
done with a spark-gap transmitter...and that all modern cellphones
power-up by talking to cell sites automatically. :-)

LHA

3756. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-03 19:08:39 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3FCE34B7.6000306@psu.edu>
Source record: 83335

Kï¿½HB wrote:
> "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote
>
>
>
>>And it makes an unenforceable power level for no real purpose.
>
>
> Two points:
>
> POINT A
> ------------
>
> This "unenforceable" mantra is a weak argument, which does not gain strength
> by the repetition.
>
> Of course it's enforceable, or at least just as enforceable as power levels
> have ever been. "Unenforceable" is a complete cop out. If power level is
> not enforceable at 50W, then it's not enforceable at 2.5W, 25W, 50W ERP,
> 100W, 200W, or 1.5KW, all of which are power currently exist in FCC Amateur
> Radio regulations.

It's not a cop out, it's a statement of truth.

> POINT B
> ------------
>
> That particular power level has a real purpose. The purpose is two-fold.
>
> Purpose #1) It allows us to institute a "learners permit" class of license
> in which we can limit power to a level which FCC has stated is safe for both
> the user and unknowing passers-by.

A ten year license is hardly a learners permit.

>
> Purpose #2) It allows us to institute a "learners permit" class of license
> in which the power level minimizes the unwanted side-effects of granting
> broad spectrum access to relatively underqualified operators.

The operators should be qualified.

> Now, before
> you spin up your rotors about "but QRP operators work around the world",
> bear in mind that most of the "bad" signals heard on HF are the result of
> ignorant operators trying to run a lot of power, and the consequent

> splatter, flat-topping, birdies, over-compression, etc.

And some of them are Generals and Extras. So a proposal to allow new
people on HF with less qualifications is probably not going to improve
the situation.

> On the other hand,
> I've never heard a distorted or crappy QRP station.

Ya want to operate qrp succesfully, you need to do things right. These
QRP'ers are not operating QRP because they are beginners. I suspect most
if not all of them are high quality, experienced ops.

> In further support of
> the idea is the fact that all these 100W-class rigs you keep harping on are
> running at near their designed-in upper capability, making them more likely
> to become purveyors of all the crappy-signal symptoms I just talked about.
> At 50W they are much less likely to be straining their design specifications
> and consequently radiating cleaner signals.

And that is quite irrelevent to the situation. If it was relevant
limiting them to 25 watts would be even better.

- mike KB3EIA -

3757. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-03 19:09:28 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <lxqzb.2609$Oe5.889@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 83332

"Kï¿½HB" wrote:
> "Dwight Stewart" wrote
>
> > What you've offered so far has
> > certainly not provided that proof.
>
> (snip) So you cling to your "unfairness" and
> "unenforceable" jeremiads, even though they
> have both been refuted and discredited here
> with elementary logic.
>
> The beauty of the situation is that I don't have
> to prove anything to you anyhow. I just have
> to persuade the FCC. (snip)

Considering your nonsense about QCAO, negative comments about Technicians, the lack of any valid reason for your proposal, the lack of any evidence supporting your claims, and so forth, I think your real intent was proven very nicely. If you've offered the same to the FCC, I suspect they will just as easily see through your proposal.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3758. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-03 19:09:37 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3FCE34F1.7070100@psu.edu>
Source record: 83334

Kï¿½HB wrote:
> "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote
>
>
>> But it was clever editing nonetheless.
>>
>
>
> Yes, it certainly was. Thank you for noticing.

Thanks! My teachers tell me I'm very observant - if a little annoying..

- Mike KB3EIA -

3759. Re: Stuck?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-03 19:13:16 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <yOudnS_Ro4Smq1OiRVn-vA@gbronline.com>
Source record: 83333

Fred wrote:

> Wow! How many "ARRL Member" stickers do you have on
> your car?

None freddieboy, don't belong to the ARRL.

How many hammie call sign badges do you wear?

None freddieboy, don't need any call sign badges. Don't even have call
license plates.

> Do you display a "junior FCC G-man" badge?

Don't need any badge to report illegal operators to the FCC.

> Most of all
> though, do you have a life?

More of a life that you have.

>How many antennas are
> swangin' all over your junker?

Since I am not a cber I don't 'swang' anything.

> Do your kids know you?

Very well...sorry to dissappoint you on all accounts.
>
> Fred's CB Barn

When are you going to get an indoor toilet in that barn you live in?

3760. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-03 19:34:25 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <5Vqzb.2634$Oe5.1449@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 83336

"Kï¿½HB" wrote:
>
> And of course I haven't belittled any amateurs.

Of course you have. Your very proposal, recommending the Extra exam as the sole license exam for full privileges, suggests everyone except Extras are not educated enough and are therefore not qualified to be Amateur Radio operators. It also suggests the material covered on the first three written tests (Novice, Tech, and General), most of it not repeated in the Extra test, is not necessary - only the material in the Extra test is needed to be an Amateur Radio operator. Your proposal is the most elitest piece of garbage I've ever seen promoted in this radio service.

> I've only pointed out the inadequacies of the current
> qualification process and suggested an alternative.

Don't be silly, Hans. You haven't pointed out any inadequacies at all. Indeed, that is where the main objection to your proposal exists.

> That you have decided to start bringing personality into
> the argument speaks volumes about the inadequacy of
> your arguments and logic skills.

Your personality, your views, your bias, is at the very heart of your proposal, and therefore any discussion about this proposal.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3761. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-03 19:40:49 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3FCE3C41.10103@psu.edu>
Source record: 83337

Kï¿½HB wrote:
> "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote
>
>
>>What you've offered so far has
>>certainly not provided that proof.
>
>
> Stewart, there's no polite way for me to say this. With your QCAO agenda <snip>

I'm almost afraid to ask, Hans. What is QCAO?

- Mike KB3EIA -

3762. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-03 20:08:13 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <Norzb.2658$Oe5.1215@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 83338

"Mike Coslo" wrote:
> Bill Sohl wrote:
> > "Mike Coslo" wrote:
> >> And do you think that the prospective ham
> >> should not know about RF safety until they
> >> reach the equivalent of an Extra? This plan
> >> seems to advocate that.
> >
> > Actually, I think they SHOULD know about the
> > basics of RF, RF hazards, etc
>
> Seems like we're pretty much on the same page
> here! 8^)

Actually, read over the Extra question pool, Mike. It doesn't extensively cover RF exposure safety. Most of that is already covered in the Novice, Tech, and General, and only lightly repeated in the Extra pools (with perhaps one or two additions). Remember that each test builds onto the info in the previous tests (Techs take both the Novice and Tech tests). All tests now include some RF exposure safety questions to insure those who missed it on earlier tests (a General that didn't get the latest info on tests taken twenty years ago, for example) gets that info when they take the next test. And, finally, remember that Hans' proposal would entirely drop the Novice, Tech, and General (losing everything on those tests), making the Extra the sole license test for full privileges.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3763. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-03 20:13:18 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <ytrzb.2662$Oe5.2053@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 83339

"Len Over 21" writes:
>
> - nothing -

Len, a lot of your messages lately are coming through with no reply added
(just the quote from the message you're replying to).

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3764. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-03 20:16:42 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <Kwrzb.2664$Oe5.1154@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 83340

"Len Over 21" wrote:
>
> "Technicians" are harming Hans' concept of
> what is "harmful." :-)

LOL!! Exactly. And harming his vision of self. :-)

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3765. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-03 20:39:20 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3FCE49F8.3030303@psu.edu>
Source record: 83341

N2EY wrote:
> In article <3FCD04CB.8010701@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:
>
>
>>But even if that is the case, it would seem to me to make more sense to
>>us a limit that is easily handled by virtue of equipment that will
>>handle the limit already on the market.
>
>
> Exisitng equipment could still be used by LP licensees - they just have to turn
> it down by 3 dB.

Yes, of course.

>> Would the manufacturers make equipment that only put out 50 watts?
>>Possibly, but what will be the resale value of the equipment? So the new
>>Class A ham has to go out and buy a new rig to make use of his or her
>>new priveliges? Remember not everyone wants to run a lot of power. 100
>>watts is something most people are comfortable with.
>
>
> When the Novice was created back in 1951, the power limit was 75 watts input.
> Which works out to about 50 watts output.
>
> In a short time there were many manufacturers making transmitters for the
> Novice market. Their resale value was good because there were always new
> Novices coming along looking for a bargain.
>
> And those manufacturers had to compete with homebrew and surplus rigs which
> were in abundance back then. (One of the reasons Novices were limited to 75 w
> xtal control was so that homebrew rigs used by Novices would be kept simple).
>
> In fact many Novices used less than the full power allowed.
>
> Let's see...there was the Ameco AC-1, the Heath AT-1, DX-20, DX-35, DX-40, d
> DX-60 and HW-16, the Johnson Adventurer, Challenger, Navigator and Ranger, the
> Drake 2-NT, the Hallicrafters HT-40.......to name just a few.
>
> And this was when the amateur radio market was a lot smaller than it is today.

No argument with any of your points, Jim. But that isn't today. Today
the standard HF rig puts out 100 watts.

>> And the rationale for the reduction of power needs to be proven to me
>>anyway. How many Technicians have been hurt by using more than 50 watts

>>power?
>>
>
> Under Hans' plan, no existing hams would lose any privileges. So they don't
> have to worry.

But that isn't answering my question. Perhaps I should phrase it
better. If technicians, who are allowed to toy with 1500 Watts, are not
being harmed by their hobby, then what is the reason for limiting their
power? More on this in a minute

>>And do you think that the prospective ham should not know about RF
>>safety until they reach the equivalent of an Extra? This plan seems to
>>advocate that.
>
>
> Until a few years ago there were no questions about RF exposure at all in the
> pools.

Are you arguing for or against this, Jim? If there were no questions on
RF exposure, and hams did okay, but we should limit new hams to 50 watts
because of safety concerns - it just isn't a good argument to me.

> One question is being overlooked, though: Why are most manufactured rigs rated
> 100 watts? Why not 50 watts, or 250 watts, or something else? (A very few are
> rated at other power levels). Why 100.
>
> The answer is about 50 years old.

Sometimes change is good, and sometimes change is not so good.

All change comes from within the framework of what exists at the time of
the change.

If we were to propose a class A class B system from scratch, then I
might say this is a good idea.

But it isn't a system from scratch, it's a tack-on to another system.

So we'll end up with:

1. Technicians - 1.5 kW privileges but no HF privileges, license period
10 years renewable.

2. Generals - HF plus 1.5 kW privileges, but no access to Extra
sections. License period ten years renewable.

3. Extras - all privileges, license period ten years renewable.

4. Class B - all privileges, 50 watt power limit, license period 10
years non renewable.

5. Class A - All privileges, full power, non expiring license.

Now I would like to know why this is a better system than what I would propose, a 3 tier system in which the setup is much like today. The only difference would be that if Morse code testing were to go away, the writtens would be beefed up a bit.

I suspect this system would more likely find favor with the FCC. No new databases, and similar to something already in place.

All the safety issues are moot. I haven't seen the harm done by over 50 watts. In fact, is it even that *good* of an idea to look at limiting power on the basis of "safety"? I mean if 50 Watts is safer than 100, maybe 25 is safer than 50. Maybe the FCC should look very closely at the power levels that hams use. Maybe all hams should be limited in power so we don't hurt ourselves with RF. Could be a real can of worms to open.

- Mike KB3EIA -

3766. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-03 21:56:08 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3FCE5BF8.7030802@psu.edu>
Source record: 83342

Dwight Stewart wrote:
> "Mike Coslo" wrote:
>
>>Bill Sohl wrote:
>>
>>>"Mike Coslo" wrote:
>>>
>>>>And do you think that the prospective ham
>>>>should not know about RF safety until they
>>>>reach the equivalent of an Extra? This plan
>>>>seems to advocate that.
>>>
>>>Actually, I think they SHOULD know about the
>>>basics of RF, RF hazards, etc
>>
>>Seems like we're pretty much on the same page
>>here! 8^)
>
>
>
> Actually, read over the Extra question pool, Mike. It doesn't extensively
> cover RF exposure safety. Most of that is already covered in the Novice,
> Tech, and General, and only lightly repeated in the Extra pools (with
> perhaps one or two additions). Remember that each test builds onto the info
> in the previous tests (Techs take both the Novice and Tech tests). All tests
> now include some RF exposure safety questions to insure those who missed it
> on earlier tests (a General that didn't get the latest info on tests taken
> twenty years ago, for example) gets that info when they take the next test.
> And, finally, remember that Hans' proposal would entirely drop the Novice,
> Tech, and General (losing everything on those tests), making the Extra the
> sole license test for full privileges.

I think that is what I was saying, Dwight. FR safety should be one of
the first things learned, not the final lesson! 8^)

- Mike KB3EIA -

3767. Re: Stuck?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-03 22:07:42 UTC
From: Fred <fred@fredsbarnbrew.net>
Message-ID: <bqlmr1$pn7$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 83343

"JJ" <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
news:yOudnS_Ro4Smq1OiRVn-vA@gbronline.com...
> Fred wrote:
>
>
> > Wow! How many "ARRL Member" stickers do you have on
> > your car?
>
> None freddieboy, don't belong to the ARRL.
>
> How many hammie call sign badges do you wear?
>
> None freddieboy, don't need any call sign badges. Don't even have call
> license plates.
>
> > Do you display a "junior FCC G-man" badge?
>
> Don't need any badge to report illegal operators to the FCC.
>
> > Most of all
> > though, do you have a life?
>
> More of a life that you have.
>
> >How many antennas are
> > swangin' all over your junker?
>
> Since I am not a cber I don't 'swang' anything.
>
> > Do your kids know you?
>
> Very well...sorry to dissappoint you on all accounts.
> >
> > Fred's CB Barn
>
> When are you going to get an indoor toilet in that barn you live in?
>

How sad! Worst case of TCA* I've seen in recent years.
If you don't get help at Charter, get help somewhere. You
owe it to your loved ones.

*Truck Chasing Addiction

Fred's CB Barn
Special on mobile 1KW linear this month

3768. Re: Stuck?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-03 22:12:38 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <JYKdnSFGfqQx_FOiRVn-uw@gbronline.com>
Source record: 83344

Fred wrote:

>
> How sad! Worst case of TCA* I've seen in recent years.
> If you don't get help at Charter, get help somewhere. You
> owe it to your loved ones.
>
> *Truck Chasing Addiction
>
> Fred's CB Barn
> Special on mobile 1KW linear this month
>

You can go back to your chicken band now with the other little children
who like to splatter the rf spectrum with crappy equipment, vulguarities
and noise toys. The hams are quite a bit above your standards.
How many times a day do you holler
"aaaaaaaaaauuuuuuuuuddddddddddiiiiiiooooo" with one of them thar lenears?

3769. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-04 01:51:23 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3FCE931E.E81D0EEE@earthlink.net>
Source record: 83345

Len, Way Over 21 wrote nothing but offered up copies of this and a
couple of other exchanges:
>
> In article <28azb.8102$zL1.1463744@news1.news.adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo
> <mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:
>
> >Kï¿½HB wrote:
> >> "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote
> >>
> >>
> >>>Mike, You and I know it can't be enforced without invasion of privacy.
> >>
> >> You
> >>
> >>>have to go on the operator's property and make local field strength
> >>>measurements.
> >>
> >>
> >> The rules have a wide assortment of power level restrictions below 100W,
> >> some as low as 2.5W, Many of them apply to every license class. Can I
> >> presume from your flip answer that we can safely ignore those limits
> >because
> >> it would be an "invasion of privacy" for FCC to enforce them?
> >
> > You muddy the waters. The point as I see it is that Technicians now
> >have access to much higher power levels. Equipment is already out that
> >has 100 watts, and you can be hurt by 50 watt units as well as 100 watt
> >units. And it makes an unenforceable power level for no real purpose. No
> >reason why the first class of license can't have enough RF information
> >that it is expected to know that it can safely operate 100 watts.
> >
> >I presume there is evidence that Technicians are harming themselves now?
> >If not, you have a pretty weak argument.

Another snarl of tape in the Anderson home communications center, Len
old boy?

Dave K8MN

3770. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-04 01:56:55 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3FCE9468.D73E1596@earthlink.net>
Source record: 83346

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <Y8bzb.1912$Qd6.613@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Kï¿½HB"
> <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> writes:
>
> >"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote
> >
> >> What you've offered so far has
> >> certainly not provided that proof.
> >
> >Stewart, there's no polite way for me to say this. With your QCAO agenda so
> >thoroughly clouding your thought processes, you wouldn't recognize proof if
> >Mr. Proof in a monogrammed sweater jumped out of your computer screen and
> >bit you square on the nose. So you cling to your "unfairness" and
> >"unenforceable" jeremiads, even though they have both been refuted and
> >discredited here with elementary logic.
>
> WHAT "logic" heap big chief?

Power levels have been set by the FCC for decades. Perhaps you can
adequately logical reasons why such would be considered unfair or
unenforceable, kinly old gent.

> All you've done so far is to ISSUE ORDERS OF THE DAY. No "logic,"
> simply a set of demands which are labeled "TRUTH."

I must have missed the demands part, Len. Why not clarify it for us?

> >The beauty of the situation is that I don't have to prove anything to you
> >anyhow. I just have to persuade the FCC.
>
> Fine. Convince the Commission you are god.
>
> I'll be waiting, heap big chief. :-)

...not on the ham bands, you won't. You aren't involved in amateur
radio.

Dave K8MN

3771. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-04 02:01:58 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3FCE9597.FB11A02B@earthlink.net>
Source record: 83347

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <MFazb.1853$Qd6.901@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Kï¿½HB"
> <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> writes:
>
> >"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote

> >
> >POINT B
> >------------
> >
> >That particular power level has a real purpose. The purpose is two-fold.
>
> Well, if YOU said it, it must have a "real purpose." :-)
>
> >Purpose #1) It allows us to institute a "learners permit" class of license
> >in which we can limit power to a level which FCC has stated is safe for both
> >the user and unknowing passers-by.
>
> What do you mean "we," white man?

He added "unknowing passers-by". That pretty well covers you.

> I think you think you think more than the OET and the IEEE and the
> USAF and the ANSI.
>
> >Purpose #2) It allows us to institute a "learners permit" class of license
> >in which the power level minimizes the unwanted side-effects of granting
> >broad spectrum access to relatively underqualified operators. Now, before
> >you spin up your rotors about "but QRP operators work around the world",
> >bear in mind that most of the "bad" signals heard on HF are the result of
> >ignorant operators trying to run a lot of power, and the consequent
> >splatter, flat-topping, birdies, over-compression, etc. On the other hand,
> >I've never heard a distorted or crappy QRP station. In further support of
> >the idea is the fact that all these 100W-class rigs you keep harping on are
> >running at near their designed-in upper capability, making them more likely
> >to become purveyors of all the crappy-signal symptoms I just talked about.
> >At 50W they are much less likely to be straining their design specifications
> >and consequently radiating cleaner signals. In the hands of even a QCAO
> >life-member it would be hard to splatter/chirp/over-modulate when you're
> >running at half the design limit of the rig.
>
> Of course. A "learner's permit." As if the ONLY radio emitters in
> the world came from amateur radio stations. :-)

A learner's permit for amateur radio to be used in the pursuit of
amateur radio. You know, it's one of those things in life of which you
are not a part.

> Geez...for a work manager supposedly with a degree you sure don't
> know much about equipment that can go wrong, be misadjusted, and
> lots of other little nasties lurking inside electronics boxes. Tsk, tsk.
>
> "In the hands of you QCAO members," the "expertise" in radio
> matters went out the window if you think that RF power output is the
> ONLY thing causing splatter/chirp/over-modulation (etc.).

Without RF power output, you wouldn't notice it, Len :-) :-)

Dave K8MN

3772. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-04 02:22:16 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031203212216.00545.00002705@mb-m02.aol.com>
Source record: 83348

In article <3FCE49F8.3030303@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>> In article <3FCD04CB.8010701@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:

>>>But even if that is the case, it would seem to me to make more sense to
>>>us a limit that is easily handled by virtue of equipment that will
>>>handle the limit already on the market.

>> Exisitng equipment could still be used by LP licensees - they just have to
>> turn it down by 3 dB.
>
>Yes, of course.
>
So what's the problem?

>>> Would the manufacturers make equipment that only put out 50 watts?
>>>Possibly, but what will be the resale value of the equipment? So the new
>>>Class A ham has to go out and buy a new rig to make use of his or her
>>>new priveliges? Remember not everyone wants to run a lot of power. 100
>>>watts is something most people are comfortable with.
>>
>> When the Novice was created back in 1951, the power limit was 75 watts
>> input. Which works out to about 50 watts output.
>>
>> In a short time there were many manufacturers making transmitters for the
>> Novice market. Their resale value was good because there were always new
>> Novices coming along looking for a bargain.
>>
>> And those manufacturers had to compete with homebrew and surplus rigs
>> which were in abundance back then. (One of the reasons Novices were
>> limited to 75 w xtal control was so that homebrew rigs used by Novices would
>> be kept simple).
>>
>> In fact many Novices used less than the full power allowed.

In another post there was discussion about QRPers being mostly experienced,
operators, not beginners.

But back in 1967, when I got my Novice at the age of 13, my first transmitter
(homebrew, of course) ran all of 10 watts input. Output was maybe 5 to 7 watts,
antenna was a wire out to the crab apple tree in the back yard. Had a lot of
fun on 80 CW with that setup, even though I was not very skilled back then.
>>
>> Let's see...there was the Ameco AC-1, the Heath AT-1, DX-20, DX-35,
>> DX-40, DX-60 and HW-16, the Johnson Adventurer, Challenger, Navigator

>> and Ranger, the
>> Drake 2-NT, the Hallicrafters HT-40.......to name just a few.
>>
>> And this was when the amateur radio market was a lot smaller than it is
>>today.
>
> No argument with any of your points, Jim. But that isn't today. Today
>the standard HF rig puts out 100 watts.

My point is simply that when the new license appeared, the manufacturers
quickly came up with rigs that matched the privileges of the license.

How much time do you think it would take Ikensu to come up with 40-50 watt
versions of their rigs? Heck, they already make 10 watt versions for their
domestic market.
>
>>> And the rationale for the reduction of power needs to be proven to me
>>>anyway. How many Technicians have been hurt by using more than 50 watts
>>>power?
>>
>> Under Hans' plan, no existing hams would lose any privileges. So they don't
>> have to worry.
>
> But that isn't answering my question. Perhaps I should phrase it
>better. If technicians, who are allowed to toy with 1500 Watts, are not
>being harmed by their hobby, then what is the reason for limiting their
>power? More on this in a minute
>
One reason is to simplify the test. If the power level is kept low enough, many
of the RF exposure questions can be eliminated from the test.

>>>And do you think that the prospective ham should not know about RF
>>>safety until they reach the equivalent of an Extra? This plan seems to
>>>advocate that.
>>
>> Until a few years ago there were no questions about RF exposure at all in
>> the pools.
>
> Are you arguing for or against this, Jim? If there were no questions on

>RF exposure, and hams did okay, but we should limit new hams to 50 watts
>because of safety concerns - it just isn't a good argument to me.

The hazards of RF exposure, even at relatively low levels, are better
understood now than before. But there is still a lot of work to be done.
Meanwhile, it makes sense to reduce exposure when possible.
>
>> One question is being overlooked, though: Why are most manufactured rigs
>> rated
>> 100 watts? Why not 50 watts, or 250 watts, or something else? (A very few
>> are
>> rated at other power levels). Why 100.

>>
>> The answer is about 50 years old.
>
>Sometimes change is good, and sometimes change is not so good.

All progress requires change, but all change is not progress.
>
>All change comes from within the framework of what exists at the time of
>the change.

Sometimes the framework is demolished by the change, though.
>
>If we were to propose a class A class B system from scratch, then I
>might say this is a good idea.
>
>But it isn't a system from scratch, it's a tack-on to another system.
>
>So we'll end up with:
>
>1. Technicians - 1.5 kW privileges but no HF privileges, license period
>10 years renewable.
>
>2. Generals - HF plus 1.5 kW privileges, but no access to Extra
>sections. License period ten years renewable.
>
>3. Extras - all privileges, license period ten years renewable.
>
>4. Class B - all privileges, 50 watt power limit, license period 10
>years non renewable.
>
>5. Class A - All privileges, full power, non expiring license.

I see it differently. First off, Extra and Class A will probably be merged
because there's essentially no difference. Maybe when an Extra renews, he/she
would get a nonexpiring Class A

Second, we'd still have Novices and Advanceds as well as the other classes,
until the last of those licenses expires or upgrades.
>
> Now I would like to know why this is a better system than what I would
>propose, a 3 tier system in which the setup is much like today.

Have you seen my three-tier system proposal?

>The only
>difference would be that if Morse code testing were to go away, the
>writtens would be beefed up a bit.

That's going to be a very hard sell. In fact the "21st Century" folks want the
opposite, at least for the entry level license.
>
>I suspect this system would more likely find favor with the FCC. No new

>databases, and similar to something already in place.

They're currently maintaining a six-class database system.

> All the safety issues are moot. I haven't seen the harm done by over 50

>watts. In fact, is it even that *good* of an idea to look at limiting
>power on the basis of "safety"? I mean if 50 Watts is safer than 100,
>maybe 25 is safer than 50. Maybe the FCC should look very closely at the
>power levels that hams use. Maybe all hams should be limited in power so
>we don't hurt ourselves with RF. Could be a real can of worms to open.
>
It was done 7 years ago. In detail. That's how we got the curent rules.

I don't agree with all of Hans' proposal, but he *does* present some fresh new ideas, rather than simply patching up the old 1951 vintage system one more time.

And his proposal isn't just another "get rid of the code test and everything will be fine" things, either.

It's really fascinating to read the reactions, too.

--

And now the answer to the "why 100 watts?" question.

The following is Just My Opinion.

Back about 1950 or so, RCA announced a new transmitting tube, the 6146. It had been designed to eliminate many of the problems encountered with other tubes of similar power rating, like the 807. Its design was based in part on comments and suggestions from ARRL Technical Editor George Grammer (SK)

The 6146 was an instant hit with hams, because its electrical and mechanical characteristics were just what hams were looking for. A single tube would produce 50-60 watts on HF at full ratings, and a pair would do 100-120 watts output. Both homebrewers and manufacturers used the 6146 and its cousins (6883, 6159, etc.) in a variety of ham rigs. The most popular setup was a pair of them, producing a nominal 100 watts. Many small rigs used one tube, and at least two (Johnson Viking Valiant, Yaesu FT-102) used three of them. Of all the ham rigs made with tube finals, probably the most popular setup was "a pair of 6146s".

(but none of the Southgate rigs use that tube!)

When SSB transceivers became popular, almost all of them followed the lead set by Collins in the KWM-1 and KWM-2, and used a pair of 6146s to get 100 W.

One noticeable exception was Drake, who used sweep tubes. Oddly enough, many Drake owners are converting their rigs to use (you guessed it) 6146s.

So when transistors began to replace tubes in the final stages of ham rigs, most of the manufacturers designed for the 100 W power level.

On top of all this was the development of grounded-grid zero bias "Class B" (actually, Class AB2) linear amplifiers for amateur SSB use in the 1950s and '60s. Most designs required "50 to 100 watts" of drive power - perfect match for the usual 100W rig. A quad of 811As, pair of 572Bs, a single or pair of 3-400Zs or 3-500Zs, or a single 3-1000Z were (and still are) common designs. Now ee have ceramic-metal indirectly heated tubes like the 3CX800A7 which require less drive, but the old habits die hard...

73 de Jim, N2EY

3773. Re: Where Did THIS Come From...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-04 02:56:29 UTC
From: Alun <alun@1stcounsel.com>
Message-ID: <Xns9446DF3225ECBelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 83349

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in
news:20031203075808.02537.00001940@mb-m23.aol.com:

> In article <Xns9444DC1898263elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun
> <alun@1stcounsel.com> writes:
>
>>n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in
>>news:20031201065801.25517.00002515@mb-m15.aol.com:
>>
>>> In article <Xns944282A0D69C5elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun
>>> <alun@1stcounsel.com> writes:
>>>
>>>>n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in news:20031129115807.23307.00004755@mb-
>>>>m29.aol.com:
>>>>
>>>> In article <f45722ac.0311281934.2deeda0@posting.google.com>,
>>>> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
>>>>
>>>>>Blowhard libs have tried soooo hard to wreck this country.
>>>>
>>>> So have blowhard conservatives.
>>>>
>>>>>They've nearly succeeded,
>>>>
>>>> How is this country "wrecked", compared to how things used to be?
>>>>
>>>>>but there are still a few people who give a damn about America, and
>>>>>GW is one of them.
>>>>
>>>> There are lots of others, including many who disagree with Mr.
>>>> Bush.
>>>>
>>>> It's the methods, not the person.
>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>Well, I'm a foreigner in your country, but you can't deny that the
>>>>>economy boomed under Clinton and is now on it's knees.
>>>
>>> Sure - but for reasons that have little to do with Clinton, his
>>> predecessors or successors.

>>
>>You may be right
>
> "Success has a thousand fathers but failure is an orphan"
>
> In very broad terms, I think the long economic boom of the past
> decade-plus was driven by the combined factors of increased
> productivity, cheap and plentiful oil, the computer/telecom booms, low
> inflation and a *perception* of decreasing international political
> tension (Berlin Wall falls, Soviet bloc disintegrates, increasing trade
> with China).
>
> A lot of that seems kinda quaint now, huh?
>
> Still, the DJIA was around 3600 when Clinton took office and it's
> trying to bust 10,000 now...
>>
>>>>
>>>>I'm not fond of the present government, but mainly for other reasons.
>>>>Civil liberties and John Ashcroft, mostly.
>>>
>>> The USA's open-door policies are one reason terror groups were able
>>> at come here and operate the way they did on Sept 11.
>>
>>Actually, US immigration is amongst the toughest in the world. I can't
>>help but smile to see it called 'open door'.
>
> I don't mean immigration policies. I mean the the way the USA allows
> people in on visas, and doesn't control those who stay illegally.

The main strategy to control this is the I-9 form that everyone fills in to get a job, even US citizens. The easiest way around that is probably to work "off the books" for cash. I'm not sure how this could ever be stopped.

In the case of student visas, as were used in the 911 attacks, it does seem that immigration ought to check with colleges to see if the students are still there.

>
> How did the 9/11 terrorists get into the USA?

On student visas

> How much trouble was it
> for them to get past INS and set up shop here?

Not much, as it happens. Doing it legally is much more difficult.

>
> As for tough immigration, check out what is required to immigrate to
> New Zealand.

>>
>>>>
>>>>All in all, I can't really think of anything GW Bush has done
>>>>domestically that is anything to shout about.
>>>
>>> He's been kinda busy, fighting three wars (Afghanistan, Iraq,
>>> anti-terror)
>>>
>>>>Tax cuts for the rich.
>>>
>>> Why is anyone surprised at that?
>>
>>I'm not
>>
> A key taxation question (which is almost never answered) is: "How much
> of a family's income is spent on taxes, and where does it go?" It would
> be very interesting to see the total tax burden percentages of a family
> of four making $50K, $100K, $150K, etc..
>
> My guess is that the lower end would be dominated by Medicare, SS, and
> sales tax while the top end by real estate and income tax.
>>>
>>>>Deficit spending.
>>>
>>> Goes hand-in-hand with reduced reveues from a struggling economy.
>>>
>>>>I'm really trying to think of anything good (honestly), but nothing
>>>>comes to mind.
>>>>
>>>>As for the war, why open that can of worms? Yes, Saddam is/was a very
>>>>bad guy. Do I beleive the reasons given for going to war? No. And
>>>>yes, Blair went along with it, but I don't like him a lot either.
>>>
>>> The important question is "what next"?
>>
>>Indeed it is. I think if it had been approached differently a lot more
>>countries would have been willing to help. As it is, Bush and Blair,
>>etc. have got themselves into a hole.
>
> I think a lot of countries would have been willing to wait some more
> years.
>
> The tough question in my mind is why the UN was willing to wait so many
> years while SH defied the 1991 agreements.
>
> The *first* time weapons inspectors were denied access to *anything* in
> Iraq, they should have packed their bags and gone home. And as soon as
> the last inspector was out of the country, coalition forces should have
> leveled the denied facility with smart weapons. IOW, "if you don't let
> us inspect it, we'll know you're hiding something".

>
> Easy to Monday-morning quarterback, tho.
>
>>>>... but then I'm an anti-code test liberal, so what did you expect?
>>>>
>>> HAW! That's a good one!
>>>
>>>>However, I actually do think it was a nice gesture for Dubbya to go
>>>>to Baghdad for Thanksgiving.
>>>>
>>>>I'm sure this post will draw the usual 'love it or leave it' garbage
>>>>from at least someone, but never mind. I can take it.
>>>>
>>> What is often forgotten is that "loving it" takes many
>>> forms.Disagreement is not necessarily disloyalty.
>>>
>>Agreed
>>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>

3774. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-04 03:44:59 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031203224459.12501.00004338@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 83350

In article <ytrzb.2662$Oe5.2053@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> writes:

> Len, a lot of your messages lately are coming through with no reply added
>(just the quote from the message you're replying to).

My bad. The "lot" was all of three messages.

:-)

Vehicular operation warning to mathematicians: "Never drink and derive."

3775. Fallacy - Morse code is still the easiest way to get on the air,

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-04 04:25:22 UTC
From: Rod Anderson <roda@dimensional.com>
Message-ID: <rqatsvg3lo3caqgps7h12vklu9l1rodhmt@4ax.com>
Source record: 83501

I keep hearing the claim that Morse code is still the easiest way to get on the air,but it isn't so. Most radios come with a microphone and all you have to do is look up the power and antenna. to operate worse code. You also have to buy a key and the operating requirements are more stringent,

For operating phone, you can set the radio up on a table. Next to your easy chair.To operate Morse code, you need a good table to hold the key,and raced your arm on and a chair to keep you in the proper posture.

On the other hand, some people require even more equipment to operate Morse code, Because I have Parkinson's disease I am unable to use a manual key or and if I were to use Morse: I would either need a computer keyboard with good macros or modify a speech to text program to provide my input, and since I can't write five words a minute and would either need a Morse to text converter or at the least a keyboard with a notebook program, I would be better off using RTTY or some other digital modes rather than Morse code.

As far as learning Morse code what is the point? I will never be able to use it and in my case, why should I waste time learning it,

Speech to text programs generate some interesting typos, I hope I caught them all.

Rod Anderson
W0RCA

3776. Re: Stuck?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-04 04:59:55 UTC
From: Jerry Oxendine <joxendi@bellsouth.net>
Message-ID: <p8zzb.589$i83.129@bignews5.bellsouth.net>
Source record: 83502

"JJ" <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
news:JYKdnSFGfqQx_FOiRVn-uw@gbronline.com...

> >
> > Fred's CB Barn
> > Special on mobile 1KW linear this month
> >
>
> You can go back to your chicken band now with the other little children
> who like to splatter the rf spectrum with crappy equipment, vulguarities
> and noise toys. The hams are quite a bit above your standards.
> How many times a day do you holler
> "aaaaaaaaaauuuuuuuuuddddddddddiiiiiiooooo" with one of them thar lenears?

JJ,

Let him stew in it; it isn't worth the argument. Sounds to me he's sort of
afeered that the new FCC offensive might
mess up his playhouse. He spends so much time trying
to insult people (doesn't work), it sounds like he is actually worried they
might get some of them thar dri'vahs
thar SQUEAK!!

Amazing how small people can try so hard to belittle others without knowing
a damn thing about them. I've got more hobbies than he's got hemorhoids (he
must have
a "pile" {pun intended}of 'em based on his feeble attempts to garner
attention. I'll have to tell you my ride in a North American T-6 Texan
sometime. Now There's a
hobby! LOL!

Jerry

3777. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-04 08:52:10 UTC
From: Alun <alun@1stcounsel.com>
Message-ID: <Xns9447275B14282elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 83503

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in
news:20031203212216.00545.00002705@mb-m02.aol.com:

> In article <3FCE49F8.3030303@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
> writes:
>
>>N2EY wrote:
>>> In article <3FCD04CB.8010701@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
>>> writes:
>
>>>>But even if that is the case, it would seem to me to make more sense
>>>>to us a limit that is easily handled by virtue of equipment that will
>>>>handle the limit already on the market.
>
>>> Exisitng equipment could still be used by LP licensees - they just
>>> have to turn it down by 3 dB.
>>
>>Yes, of course.
>>
> So what's the problem?
>
>>>> Would the manufacturers make equipment that only put out 50
>>>> watts?
>>>>Possibly, but what will be the resale value of the equipment? So the
>>>>new Class A ham has to go out and buy a new rig to make use of his or
>>>>her new priveliges? Remember not everyone wants to run a lot of
>>>>power. 100 watts is something most people are comfortable with.
>>>
>>> When the Novice was created back in 1951, the power limit was 75
>>> watts input. Which works out to about 50 watts output.
>>>
>>> In a short time there were many manufacturers making transmitters for
>>> the Novice market. Their resale value was good because there were
>>> always new Novices coming along looking for a bargain.
>>>
>>> And those manufacturers had to compete with homebrew and surplus rigs
>>> which were in abundance back then. (One of the reasons Novices were
>>> limited to 75 w xtal control was so that homebrew rigs used by
>>> Novices would be kept simple).
>>>
>>> In fact many Novices used less than the full power allowed.
>
> In another post there was discussion about QRPers being mostly
> experienced, operators, not beginners.

>
> But back in 1967, when I got my Novice at the age of 13, my first
> transmitter (homebrew, of course) ran all of 10 watts input. Output was
> maybe 5 to 7 watts, antenna was a wire out to the crab apple tree in
> the back yard. Had a lot of fun on 80 CW with that setup, even though I
> was not very skilled back then.
>>>
>>> Let's see...there was the Ameco AC-1, the Heath AT-1, DX-20, DX-35,
>>> DX-40, DX-60 and HW-16, the Johnson Adventurer, Challenger, Navigator
>>> and Ranger, the
>>> Drake 2-NT, the Hallicrafters HT-40.......to name just a few.
>>>
>>> And this was when the amateur radio market was a lot smaller than it
>>> is today.
>>
>> No argument with any of your points, Jim. But that isn't today.
>> Today
>>the standard HF rig puts out 100 watts.
>
> My point is simply that when the new license appeared, the
> manufacturers quickly came up with rigs that matched the privileges of
> the license.
>
> How much time do you think it would take Ikensu to come up with 40-50
> watt versions of their rigs? Heck, they already make 10 watt versions
> for their domestic market.
>>
>>>> And the rationale for the reduction of power needs to be proven
>>>> to me
>>>>anyway. How many Technicians have been hurt by using more than 50
>>>>watts power?
>>>
>>> Under Hans' plan, no existing hams would lose any privileges. So they
>>> don't have to worry.
>>
>> But that isn't answering my question. Perhaps I should phrase it
>>better. If technicians, who are allowed to toy with 1500 Watts, are not
>>being harmed by their hobby, then what is the reason for limiting their
>>power? More on this in a minute
>>
> One reason is to simplify the test. If the power level is kept low
> enough, many of the RF exposure questions can be eliminated from the
> test.
>
>>>>And do you think that the prospective ham should not know about RF
>>>>safety until they reach the equivalent of an Extra? This plan seems
>>>>to advocate that.
>>>
>>> Until a few years ago there were no questions about RF exposure at
>>> all in the pools.

>>
>> Are you arguing for or against this, Jim? If there were no
>> questions on
>
>>RF exposure, and hams did okay, but we should limit new hams to 50
>>watts because of safety concerns - it just isn't a good argument to me.
>
> The hazards of RF exposure, even at relatively low levels, are better
> understood now than before. But there is still a lot of work to be
> done. Meanwhile, it makes sense to reduce exposure when possible.
>>
>>> One question is being overlooked, though: Why are most manufactured
>>> rigs rated 100 watts? Why not 50 watts, or 250 watts, or something
>>> else? (A very few are rated at other power levels). Why 100.
>>>
>>> The answer is about 50 years old.
>>
>>Sometimes change is good, and sometimes change is not so good.
>
> All progress requires change, but all change is not progress.
>>
>>All change comes from within the framework of what exists at the time
>>of the change.
>
> Sometimes the framework is demolished by the change, though.
>>
>>If we were to propose a class A class B system from scratch, then I
>>might say this is a good idea.
>>
>>But it isn't a system from scratch, it's a tack-on to another system.
>>
>>So we'll end up with:
>>
>>1. Technicians - 1.5 kW privileges but no HF privileges, license
>>period 10 years renewable.
>>
>>2. Generals - HF plus 1.5 kW privileges, but no access to Extra
>>sections. License period ten years renewable.
>>
>>3. Extras - all privileges, license period ten years renewable.
>>
>>4. Class B - all privileges, 50 watt power limit, license period 10
>>years non renewable.
>>
>>5. Class A - All privileges, full power, non expiring license.
>
> I see it differently. First off, Extra and Class A will probably be
> merged because there's essentially no difference. Maybe when an Extra
> renews, he/she would get a nonexpiring Class A
>

> Second, we'd still have Novices and Advanceds as well as the other
> classes, until the last of those licenses expires or upgrades.
>>
>> Now I would like to know why this is a better system than what I
>> would
>>propose, a 3 tier system in which the setup is much like today.
>
> Have you seen my three-tier system proposal?
>
>>The only
>>difference would be that if Morse code testing were to go away, the
>>writtens would be beefed up a bit.
>
> That's going to be a very hard sell. In fact the "21st Century" folks
> want the opposite, at least for the entry level license.
>>
>>I suspect this system would more likely find favor with the FCC. No new
>>databases, and similar to something already in place.
>
> They're currently maintaining a six-class database system.
>
>> All the safety issues are moot. I haven't seen the harm done by
>> over 50
>
>>watts. In fact, is it even that *good* of an idea to look at limiting
>>power on the basis of "safety"? I mean if 50 Watts is safer than 100,
>>maybe 25 is safer than 50. Maybe the FCC should look very closely at
>>the power levels that hams use. Maybe all hams should be limited in
>>power so we don't hurt ourselves with RF. Could be a real can of worms
>>to open.
>>
> It was done 7 years ago. In detail. That's how we got the curent rules.
>
> I don't agree with all of Hans' proposal, but he *does* present some
> fresh new ideas, rather than simply patching up the old 1951 vintage
> system one more time.
>
> And his proposal isn't just another "get rid of the code test and
> everything will be fine" things, either.
>
> It's really fascinating to read the reactions, too.
>
> --
>
> And now the answer to the "why 100 watts?" question.
>
> The following is Just My Opinion.
>
> Back about 1950 or so, RCA announced a new transmitting tube, the 6146.
> It had been designed to eliminate many of the problems encountered with

> other tubes of similar power rating, like the 807. Its design was based
> in part on comments and suggestions from ARRL Technical Editor George
> Grammer (SK)
>
> The 6146 was an instant hit with hams, because its electrical and
> mechanical characteristics were just what hams were looking for. A
> single tube would produce 50-60 watts on HF at full ratings, and a pair
> would do 100-120 watts output. Both homebrewers and manufacturers used
> the 6146 and its cousins (6883, 6159, etc.) in a variety of ham rigs.
> The most popular setup was a pair of them, producing a nominal 100
> watts. Many small rigs used one tube, and at least two (Johnson Viking
> Valiant, Yaesu FT-102) used three of them. Of all the ham rigs made
> with tube finals, probably the most popular setup was "a pair of
> 6146s".
>
> (but none of the Southgate rigs use that tube!)
>
> When SSB transceivers became popular, almost all of them followed the
> lead set by Collins in the KWM-1 and KWM-2, and used a pair of 6146s to
> get 100 W.
>
> One noticeable exception was Drake, who used sweep tubes. Oddly enough,
> many Drake owners are converting their rigs to use (you guessed it)
> 6146s.
>
> So when transistors began to replace tubes in the final stages of ham
> rigs, most of the manufacturers designed for the 100 W power level.
>
> On top of all this was the development of grounded-grid zero bias
> "Class B" (actually, Class AB2) linear amplifiers for amateur SSB use
> in the 1950s and '60s. Most designs required "50 to 100 watts" of drive
> power - perfect match for the usual 100W rig. A quad of 811As, pair of
> 572Bs, a single or pair of 3-400Zs or 3-500Zs, or a single 3-1000Z were
> (and still are) common designs. Now ee have ceramic-metal indirectly
> heated tubes like the 3CX800A7 which require less drive, but the old
> habits die hard...
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>

You might be right about needing a 100W rig to drive most linears, but not about the 6146s. A pair of 6146 tubes will deliver 280W upto 30 MHz and half that upto 60MHz acoording to the spec. The old Yaesu FTDX-560 was rated at 280W out with a pair off 6146s (560W input power, hence the model number).

73 de Alun, N3KIP

3778. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-04 10:37:53 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bqn2nt$dcs@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 83504

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20031203075807.02537.00001939@mb-m23.aol.com...
> In article <bqhq6q$q9h@library2.airnews.net>, "Kim" <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
> writes:
>
> >
> >It's fine for them to go 20 mph above the speed limit. It's fine if they
> >want to go 30-40 mph above the speed limit. But, they won't find me
moving
> >out of their way; they'll have to go around because I am not moving into
a
> >lane where I have to slow down, or even get "stuck" there for a while, if
> >there happens to be more than one vehicle that wants to go past.
>
> Ah, I see. The right lane is going 60-65, the left lane (with you in it by
> yourself) is going 70-75, and you're not going to lose a few seconds in
order
> to accomodate someone who wants to go 80-85.
> >

It's not the matter of being kind and courteous and moving over so someone
who's acting like an idiot can go by. It's the principle of the matter that
because of the way they are being self-important, it's going to be *them*
that does the moving around. I.E., I see them in kind of like the "bully"
role of a little kid. Well, I'm not giving in to the bully.

> >This is an "every morning" thing. If they want to get to where they are
> >going quicker, then they need to adjust their scheduling, not make others
on
> >the road cater to their needs. I would not think of being obnoxious
because
> >I have to get somewhere quicker than anyone else--I would make the
decision
> >to get on the road earlier.
> >
> Sure.
>
> Then why not apply that philosophy to yourself and get on the road early
enough
> that the right lane gets you there on time?
> >>
> >> Suppose you're sailing along on your 60 mph 4-lane-divided (2 lanes
> >> each way) road and you come across two (non police) cars side-by-side
> >> going exactly the speed limit.
> >>

> >> What would you do? Would their behavior bother you?
> >
> >Yes, their behavior would bother me--*but* they're the cops...
>
> No, they're not!
>
> I wrote: " two (non police) cars". Sorry if that wasn't clear!
>

Whoops, yeah, I missed that. You were clear.

>
> What I meant was two ordinary drivers in ordinary vehicles - not police or
> officials of any kind. Just two folks who decided to go the posted speed
limit
> and no faster.
>
> What would you do?
>

Regardless of who it is that is driving, I don't act like an idiot to them, around them, about them, or anything. I would pace myself at my comfort zone behind them--6, 7, or more carglengths, and cruise with them.

> >
> >Then they should have gotten out earlier than me.
>
> Why should *they* move to accomodate *you*? *You* won't accomodate them!
>

Yeah, I suppose...but my justification is that they can accommodate themselves, by moving around. A) We are both speeding; B) At the point this person is behind me wanting me to move over so he/she can get by, it's a given that it's because we're both around a driver(s) in the right lane that are going slower, right? So, what is it about the driver behind me...practically shoving their hood up under my vehicle...that would compel me to slow down, move over, reposition myself, when all they have to do is allow *both* of us to keep speeding, i.e., stay above a speed limit we don't want to drive, and wait the bit of time it will take to get passed the "slower" traffic?

> >It's the same principle
> >as someone who's standing in the "fast" lane (misnomer most of the
> >time--GRIN) at the grocery store and I am ahead of them with 10 items and
> >they only have one or two. If they're prone to it, they'll tap their
foot;
> >sigh real loud, etc. Practically fall over trying to get me to notice
that
> >they only have "just this little bit." And, how dare I *not* yield to
them
> >and let them go ahead...and the next with one or two...and the next, etc.
>

> Must be another regional thing - I've never encountered that around here.
>
> >Hey, next time, get there before me.
>
> Different situation and principle.
>

I think the priniciple is the same. The root of my angst toward the driver we are speaking of, is their attitude. The attitude that has them convinced that they need to speed faster than someone else. Or that where they are going is far more important than where I am going (when neither of us has that information available to us).

> >
> >In my case, my 70-75 mph (more near 70 most of the time) is probably more
> >due to the fact that, that is where my foot lands on the gas pedal.
>
> ?? "Where your foot lands"?
>
> Two words: Cruise control.
>

Yeah. I thought when I got my truck with that on it, that I would always be using it. I don't like it...don't know where to put my foot that I can still have the same tactile feel with the brake pedal and gas pedal in alignment with my placement of the foot. I don't feel "safe" with cruise control engaged--plus the speeds of drivers is so erradic that one must keep disengaging and reengaging it anyway. Never fails...set it to the flow of traffic and 5-6 miles down the road, set it again.

> >
> >I should probably count my blessings here, because this will jinx me.
I've
> >been stopped three times in my driving "career." Little enough that I
still
> >don't "know the routine" when I do get stopped. Only once I've been
> >ticketed
>
> I wonder why....;-)
>

Once when I was speeding. And, by all rights that cop should have nailed me. It was 11:30 at night, and my registration sticker (of which the new one was at home) was out, inspection sticker was out--which I'd not paid any attention to, *and* I couldn't find my insurance card. But, he let me go! WOW!

> > and that was for taking a turn onto a street that doesn't allow
> >those turns at the time of morning I was doing it.
>
> About 20 years ago, on a cold rainy Sunday night, I made a wrong turn onto
a

> one way street in Philly. No "One Way" sign at the intersection, no "No
Right
> Turn", just a stop sign. No cars on the street either.
>
> Of course it didn't take long after the turn to realize something wasn't
right,
> so I did a quick three-point turn. But it wasn't quick enough to avoid the
> notice of two of Philadelphia's finest, who turned on the lights and
pulled me
> over.
>
> By the time he got to my car I had the license, registration and insurance
card
> out, both hands on the wheel, and the window down so he could talk to me.
>
> He took my papers and proceeded to run them through the computer in his
patrol
> car.
>
> Meanwhile, the young lady who was with me started giving me the third
degree as
> to how I was going to handle the cop, how it wasn't my fault, how I should
"be
> a man" and "stand up to him" and "talk my way out of it". I held up one
hand
> and said "Be quiet. I'm the driver, it's my car and my license, and I
don't
> argue with the police over something as minor as a ticket. That's what
traffic
> court is for."
>
> Officer came back, asked if I knew why he stopped me. I said "I was going
the
> wrong way on a one-way street because there's no sign at the intersection
with
> Pine Street. I turned around as soon as I realized it was a one-way
street, but
> you were right to stop me and I can understand if you decide to give me a
> ticket."
>
> Officer handed me back my papers and said: "No ticket for you, your papers
are
> all in order. We know all about the sign. Just be careful."
>
> The young lady kept quiet, which was quite a miracle.
>
> IOW, he was just waiting for somebody to give him a hard time.
>

Uh, I have a problem with cops in general. Most I've encountered are not friendly. However, most I've encountered in a casual setting are great guys/gals. I don't like the military form of communication--stern, expressionless, etc., and it puts me on edge.

> >
> >If they are going the speed limit where I am at (in the left lane), I'd
> >still calmly make the move to the right lane and go around them--when it
was
> >safe to--and wouldn't act like an idiot to them.
>
> What if there was another car on the right and you couldn't go around?
>

Same as the non police (grin) scenario you gave me. I'd pace myself and cruise. I also don't care or get all upset about traffic jams. I look at them as an example to notice the birds flying around, look up under the bridges to see if there's a poor homeless person up under there, look at all the beauty I usually don't get to pay a whole lot of attention to--in fact the traffic jam gives me the opportunity to find some sense of pleasantry in places that really do require "closer inspection" to find it...(grin)

> > It is not any more "right"
> >for me to speed than the next person--it's just that they'd better decide
to
> >go around, because I will not be moving for them just because they are
going
> >to act like an idiot. I will move if I decide to...and I usually don't.
> >But it's just as OK for them to be speeding as me...I don't care. You
seem
> >to be stuck on the idea that I think they are wrong to speed faster than
I
> >speed.
>
> Nope.
>
> I'm stuck on the idea that you want to control the speed on the road.
>

Hmmm. You see it as me wanting to control the speed, I only think of it as not giving in to the way I perceive someone to be acting.

>
> >> > Yep. And it's mine...(grin)
> >> >
> >> HAW!
> >>
> >> I do believe some of all this is regional, however.
> >>
> >> And I've done a few tricks myself....
> >>
> >> Way back in the late '80s, I had reason to go back and forth between
> >> Philly and Washington, DC about every other weekend. I noticed that

> >> the aggressiveness of drivers increased in direct proportion to
> >> proximity to the nation's capital.
> >>
> >> The worst part of the run was the BWP (Baltimore Washington Parkway),
> >> a no-trucks 4 lane road with trees on both sides, and also between the
> >> northbound and southbound lanes. Lots of traffic on a Friday night,
> >> and as one approached The District the cars got more expensive and the
> >> drivers more aggressive.
> >>
> >
> >Heh, heh...funny you should mention that.
>
> It happened way too many times.
> >

Sir, this is "Dallas" Texas, where arrogance and extravagance are not rare
things... BUT, I gotta say, I've never, ever seen a stretch limo or
"driven" car acting like that...they are generally over in the right lane!
This discussion just made me realize that, I think.

> >>
> >> Back then the limit was 55 and traffic tended to stay below about 59
> >> because enforcement was pretty good, and there were lots of places for
> >> the troopers to hide in the trees, around curves, etc. The troopers
> >> would not go after anyone below about 62 because speedometers and
> >> radar are not 100% accurate. Above that they were ruthless, and above
> >> 65 the fines went up and up and up...
> >>
> >> I got to know their whereabouts pretty good by observing where others
> >> got tickets. (I was *never* stopped, in part because my 1980 Rabbit
> >> Diesel looked like it couldn't even go the speed limit anyway). Radar
> >> detectors were illegal in MD back then, too, and they'd do things like
> >> set up a radar gun on an overpass and watch whose brake lights came on
> >> for no reason....
> >>
> >> One night I'm sailing down the BWP in the *right* lane, and up behind
> >> me comes a new Saab (Saabs were the hot car back then among the
> >> yuppie-but-no-Beemer crowd). Dude flashes his brights at me - he wants
> >> *me* to get in the *left* lane so he can pass without having to change
> >> lanes!
> >>
> >> So I ease up on the throttle and slow down to 53...52....51....
> >>
> >> He gets ticked and crawls up but now I'm down to 50...49...
> >>
> >> Flashes the brights, gets ticked, and I keep easing up....
> >>
> >> Finally he gets ticked and goes into the left lane. Whereupon I start
> >> speeding up again...52...55...58...62...
> >>
> >> He pulls alongside and now is really steamed because it is taking far

> >> more effort to get past me than he expected. So he drops down a gear
> >> and stomps it and goes off in a cloud of dust, over the next rise and
> >> around the curve.....
> >>
> >> and I bring it back down to the limit...
> >>
> >> and I wave as I go by him, because he's now stopped by a trooper for
> >> going WAY over the limit.....
> >>

Oh, I forgot to add when you originally noted this story...I toot and wave!

> >>
> >> I wouldn't play games like that today, though...
> >>
> >> 73 de Jim, N2EY
> >>
> >
> >Yeah, that was what I did a few...OK, more than a few...years ago. I'd
> >always do just that, as a matter of fact. BUT, one day, this guy began
> >throwing things out his window at me when I did finally move over and let
> >him go passed me! Scared the heck outta me...he was throwing anything
loose
> >in his car, bottle caps, cracker jack box, etc. Thank goodness he didn't
> >come across the bottle!
>
> Or the gun.
>

Yeah, for sure :(

> >
> > That's another reason I'm not so sure about letting
> >creepy people get ahead of me...it may be me having to come upon them
once
> >again...
> >
> Better than having them behind you...
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>

To each his own...unless they're acting like an idiot ;)

Kim W5TIT

3779. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-04 11:51:47 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3FCF1FD4.10D2653A@earthlink.net>
Source record: 83505

Alun wrote:
>
> n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in
> news:20031203212216.00545.00002705@mb-m02.aol.com:
>
> > In article <3FCE49F8.3030303@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
> > writes:

> > On top of all this was the development of grounded-grid zero bias
> > "Class B" (actually, Class AB2) linear amplifiers for amateur SSB use
> > in the 1950s and '60s. Most designs required "50 to 100 watts" of drive
> > power - perfect match for the usual 100W rig. A quad of 811As, pair of
> > 572Bs, a single or pair of 3-400Zs or 3-500Zs, or a single 3-1000Z were
> > (and still are) common designs. Now ee have ceramic-metal indirectly
> > heated tubes like the 3CX800A7 which require less drive, but the old
> > habits die hard...

>
> You might be right about needing a 100W rig to drive most linears, but not
> about the 6146s. A pair of 6146 tubes will deliver 280W upto 30 MHz and
> half that upto 60MHz acoording to the spec.

You're mistaken, Alun. A single 6146B is rated at 61 watts output in
AB1. So a pair would be at the 120w level.

> The old Yaesu FTDX-560 was
> rated at 280W out with a pair off 6146s (560W input power, hence the model
> number).

You're half right. The FT-DX560 was rated at 560w PEP input power but
it used television sweep tubes.

Dave K8MN

3780. Re: Stuck?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-04 12:11:55 UTC
From: Butch <poor@oxchasescbs.net>
Message-ID: <bqn89scmn0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 83506

Has anybody figured out who the Straight Man and
who the Funny Man is in the JJ - Ox duet?

LOL

Butch

3781. 6146s?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-04 12:25:25 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031204072525.28496.00002462@mb-m18.aol.com>
Source record: 83507

In article <Xns9447275B14282elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun
<alun@1stcounsel.com> writes:

>You might be right about needing a 100W rig to drive most linears, but not
>about the 6146s.

Check the ratings. You'll find that I'm right. Sorry, Alun, but I checked my
info before posting and it's accurate.

>A pair of 6146 tubes will deliver 280W upto 30 MHz and
>half that upto 60MHz acoording to the spec.

The 6146 is rugged, but not that rugged.

The maximum rated power output of a pair of 6146s in Class AB2 *audio* service
is 131 watts. Typical Class AB1 RF service will deliver less.

6146Bs can deliver a bit more. But even at maximum ratings, a pair of 6146Bs is
only rated at 240 watts *input* (Class C).

>The old Yaesu FTDX-560 was
>rated at 280W out with a pair off 6146s (560W input power, hence the model
>number).

560 W input is more than three times the maximum rated input power for 6146s
and more than twice the rated input power for 6146Bs.
>
The FTDX-560/570 (570 was a deluxe model rated 10 W more) and the earlier
FTDX400 did not use 6146s or any member of the 6146 family.

Those old Yaesus all used 6KD6 sweep tubes, as did the FL-2000 amplifier. (The
FL-2000 was based on a QST article of about 1968 in which up to six 6KD6s were
used in a low-cost amplifier).

But don't take my word for it. NJ7P has a neat tube database, and there are web
pages devoted to early Yaesus.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3782. Re: A New Concept: Virtual Spectrum

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-04 13:38:36 UTC
From: Stewart Bryant <stbryant@cisco.com>
Message-ID: <1070545051.516267@sj-nntpcache-5>
Source record: 83508
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.antiques.radio+phono,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc

We have been running a community receiver for the
136KHz band for a couple of years in the UK.

A number of amateurs had trouble with noise on the
band (TV, a data ciruit into a hospital and a
mobile phone base-station with faulty SM PSUs just
to name three).

We have a receiver located in a quite part of Crawley
(at our radio club station), and this relays the
whole of the 136Khz band on 2m (135.4KHz = 144.9854MHz)

This is done with an FT-847 running in satellite
mode with the two IFs linked together. We get
quite good coverage over the SE, and good dynamic range.
We are proposing as an experiment to try relaying
a 6KHz segment of the CW segment of 40m band for a
few weeks to get a better feel on the dynamic range
issues.

The system is MB7LF and is licienced as a data
system.

73

Stewart G3YSX

3783. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-04 14:29:50 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0312040629.3d320da8@posting.google.com>
Source record: 83509

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20031203224459.12501.00004338@mb-m04.aol.com>...
> In article <ytrzb.2662$Oe5.2053@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dwight
> Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> writes:
>
> > Len, a lot of your messages lately are coming through with no reply added
> >(just the quote from the message you're replying to).
>
> My bad. The "lot" was all of three messages.

Well...we can add THESE three messages to the numerous other
times you've done the same thing.

Last time it was some phantom friend's software that caused the
glitch.

Must be kinda embarrassing for a "professional" electronics
"engineer" such as yourself, eh Lennie...???

Steve, K4YZ

3784. Re: Dust off your homebrew rig this weekend

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-04 16:59:24 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0312040859.631c39ef@posting.google.com>
Source record: 83510

Can't - there's no dust on my homebrew rigs.

"Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote non-members/same cont.--2 pts.
Score: QSO points x
> S/P/C (counted once per band) x Power multiplier (<250mW x 15,
> 250mW--1W x 10, 1--5W x7, >5W x 1) + Bonus Points (2000 for homebrew
> (HB) xmtr, 3000 HB rcvr, 5000 HB xcvr).

All I have to do is make one contact and I have over 5000 points.

> For more information:
> http://personal.palouse.net/rfoltz/arci/holispr.htm.

Says "if you built it, it is homebrew". Does that mean kits? My
definition of homebrew excludes kits - but they may not be using my
definition.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3785. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-04 17:16:23 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0312040916.727354fd@posting.google.com>
Source record: 83511

Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
news:<3FCCF123.70308@ix.netcom.com>...
> N2EY wrote:
>
> >In article <3FCBAF87.5080802@ix.netcom.com>, Robert Casey
> ><wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> writes:

> >>N2EY wrote:

> >>>These are the number of unexpired FCC ARS
> >>>licenses held by individuals on the dates listed:

> >>>As of May 14, 2000:

> >>Why select May 14th 2000?
> >
> >Two reasons:
> >
> >1) I happened to have those numbers recorded
> >
> >2) By that date, it's reasonable to expect that all of the backlog from before
> >the April 15 changes had gone through FCC.
> >
> >>Restructuring took effect a month
> >>earlier. I upgraded from tech + to extra on April 15, 2000 and
> >>the paperwork reached the FCC just a few days later the next week.
> >>Thus I would show up as an extra in the May 14th 2000. If your
> >>objective is to show the effects of restructuring, you need to list
> >>the numbers for April14, 2000.

> >>
> >If you have them, I'll show them.
>
> >
> Okay, that makes sense, especially reason #2. There would be some
> cross leakage, but probably not enough to matter in determining long term
> trends.

Yep. One can look at the AH0A site for monthly numbers as well.

FCC and the various VECs got pretty backlogged around then, too. Some
folks didn't see actual database changes for a few weeks.
>
> PS, I don't have the numbers myself, but as you mentioned, they would miss
> the backlog of activity before April 15th.

Yup. I know a bunch of hams who strove to upgrade *before* April 15, for various reasons (such as getting an Advanced before they were gone forever).

--

What I find interesting is how *little* the numbers have changed in almost 4 years. For example, at the end of March, 2000, there were a little over 103,000 Advanceds. Now there's something over 80,000, even though the 20 wpm code test is gone. In similar fashion, look how many Tech Pluses still exist despite the fact that they need never take another code test, and that many of them already have credit for the General written as well. And FCC has been renewing Tech Plus as Tech since April 15, 2000, too.

IOW, perhaps the code test wasn't the "barrier" it was proclaimed to be.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3786. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-04 17:18:48 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0312040918.74cdb0ac@posting.google.com>
Source record: 83512

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20031203224459.12501.00004338@mb-m04.aol.com>...
> In article <ytrzb.2662$Oe5.2053@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dwight
> Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> writes:
>
> > Len, a lot of your messages lately are coming through with no reply added
> >(just the quote from the message you're replying to).
>
> My bad. The "lot" was all of three messages.

Actually at least four messages.

But why should there be any?

3787. Re: It ain't about the test.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-04 17:26:52 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0312040926.6865c96b@posting.google.com>
Source record: 83513

Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
news:<3FCCF409.2000707@ix.netcom.com>...
> N2EY wrote:
>
> >
> >The original 1913 reason for technical qualifications was to prevent
> >interference to nonamateurs caused by improper adjustment of amateur
> >transmitters.
> >
> >How much interference to nonamateurs is caused by improper adjustment of
> >amateur transmitters today? Reading the FCC enforcement letters, such
> >interference today seems to be more a case of intentional modification of
> >amateur equipment by a lawless few to operate on nonamateur frequencies.
> >
> It seems that you have to violate rules "on purpose" several times
> before the FCC
> starts working on it.

I think it all comes down to complaints, too.

> Modern equipment rarely causes problems (like
> excessive
> splatter or harmonics). I'm talking about stuff from the major
> manufacturers
> (Yeacomwood), not the "freeband" "linayes".

That's very true.

And it raises the question of "why should hams have to know all sorts
of theory stuff when the original reason for that knowledge is largely
gone"

(similar to the above anticodetest argument - and just as incomplete).

> And who hasn't, by mistake, operate the wrong mode in some subband?

Me. I've *never* done that. Not by mistake, not intentionally either.

> Like
> answering a foreign phone CQ on 7140?

Not even once.

> Oops... Most people will not make
> a habit of doing that, but once or twice over the years.

Mistakes happen. But when you read the FCC enforcement letters, it
becomes clear that mistakes, particularly technical ones, aren't

really much of a problem anymore in the ARS.

> The FCC realizes that
> errors do happen, and that most people will realize the error and
> correct it themselves
> without the FCC having to do anything about it.

That's why we have OOs. The OO program was instituted so that hams
would find out about such problem from each other rather than FCC.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3788. Re: Stuck?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-04 18:07:09 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <DMidnXRirIqj5VKiRVn-sA@gbronline.com>
Source record: 83514

Jerry Oxendine wrote:

> JJ,
>
> Let him stew in it; it isn't worth the argument. Sounds to me he's sort of
> afeered that the new FCC offensive might
> mess up his playhouse. He spends so much time trying
> to insult people (doesn't work), it sounds like he is actually worried they
> might get some of them thar dri'vahs
> thar SQUEAK!!
>
> Amazing how small people can try so hard to belittle others without knowing
> a damn thing about them. I've got more hobbies than he's got hemorhoids (he
> must have
> a "pile" {pun intended}of 'em based on his feeble attempts to garner
> attention.

Yea, he is the typical chicken bander. Probably needs to air out that
barn of his.

> I'll have to tell you my ride in a North American T-6 Texan
> sometime. Now There's a
> hobby! LOL!

Would love to hear about it. There is a group that comes hear a couple
of times a year to offer rides in one, the wife has been trying to talk
me into it for a birthday present. Would love to get ahold of the stick
of one of those.

3789. Re: Stuck?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-04 18:09:57 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <DMidnXdirIpk5VKiRVn-sA@gbronline.com>
Source record: 83515

Freddy wrote:

> x-no-archive: yes
> Sure Ox sure. Ever get the leaks in your double-wide fixed,
> or are you too busy chasing trucks up & down the interstate,
> trying to figure out what channel they're talking on?
> LOL LOL LOL LOL LOL !!!!
> From what I heard, your "Ox Reports" go right into the
> delete file. hahahahahahahahhahahahahahahahhah
>
> Fred's CB Barn
> Special trucker sale on 1KW amps this month
>

Now you post is archived.

3790. Re: Stuck?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-04 18:27:45 UTC
From: Fred <fred@oxchasescbs.net>
Message-ID: <bqnuah$q7r$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 83516

"JJ" <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
news:DMidnXdirIpk5VKiRVn-sA@gbronline.com...
> Freddy wrote:
>
> > x-no-archive: yes
> > Sure Ox sure. Ever get the leaks in your double-wide fixed,
> > or are you too busy chasing trucks up & down the interstate,
> > trying to figure out what channel they're talking on?
> > LOL LOL LOL LOL LOL !!!!
> > From what I heard, your "Ox Reports" go right into the
> > delete file. hahahahahahahahhahahahahahahahhah
> >
> > Fred's CB Barn
> > Special trucker sale on 1KW amps this month
> >
>
> Now you post is archived.
>

Thank you. You are indeed a well trained little puppy dog!

Fred

3791. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-04 19:41:11 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3FCF8DD7.8060705@psu.edu>
Source record: 83517

N2EY wrote:
> In article <3FCE49F8.3030303@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:
>
>
>>N2EY wrote:
>>
>>>In article <3FCD04CB.8010701@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:
>>
>
>
>>>>But even if that is the case, it would seem to me to make more sense to
>>>>us a limit that is easily handled by virtue of equipment that will
>>>>handle the limit already on the market.
>>>
>
>
>>>Exisitng equipment could still be used by LP licensees - they just have to
>>>turn it down by 3 dB.
>>
>>Yes, of course.
>>
>
> So what's the problem?

It's more of a problem than having a maximum of 100 watts, which just happens to be what is the standard now.

I've gone over what I think are possible problems, such as the likelihood of a ham to simply crank up the power if he or she is having trouble getting through, or simply wanting to.

It's the apparent lack of Technicians being harmed by their allowed power levels.

It's that the newly licensed class A will find their rig won't drive a number of linear amps to full power.

I think that the rationale behind the lower limit, based on some rf safety report, is not correct. If RF safety is important, and it is, Then that should be the first thing taught to the prospective amateur.

I think that no amateur should be allowed to "mash that PTT" button unless the testing authority is pretty darn sure that they are educated enough that they can safely operate a 100 watt station.

I think that people can find creative ways to harm themselves.

I think allowing them 50 watts output without proper RF safety
instruction is irresponsible.

I think that once you have enough RF safety savvy to operate 50 watts,
you have enough RF safety savvy to run 100 watts.

I think all these things argue toward testing more for RF safety, and
since the new amateur would then have some knowledge of RF safety, the
new amateur would be qualified to run 100 watts, which just happens to
be the level that most HF rigs are already putting out.

I think you disagree.

>> No argument with any of your points, Jim. But that isn't today. Today
>>the standard HF rig puts out 100 watts.
>
>
> My point is simply that when the new license appeared, the manufacturers
> quickly came up with rigs that matched the privileges of the license.
>
> How much time do you think it would take Ikensu to come up with 40-50 watt
> versions of their rigs? Heck, they already make 10 watt versions for their
> domestic market.

Why should they, if all you have to do is turn down the output power?
Don't you trust these people? 8^)

>>>> And the rationale for the reduction of power needs to be proven to me
>>>>anyway. How many Technicians have been hurt by using more than 50 watts
>>>>power?
>>>
>>>Under Hans' plan, no existing hams would lose any privileges. So they don't
>>>have to worry.
>>
>> But that isn't answering my question. Perhaps I should phrase it
>>better. If technicians, who are allowed to toy with 1500 Watts, are not
>>being harmed by their hobby, then what is the reason for limiting their
>>power? More on this in a minute
>>
>
> One reason is to simplify the test. If the power level is kept low enough, many
> of the RF exposure questions can be eliminated from the test.

And My opinion is that eliminating *those* questions is
counterproductive and not the most responsible thing to do. And you
already know what I think about simplifying the tests.

>>>>And do you think that the prospective ham should not know about RF
>>>>safety until they reach the equivalent of an Extra? This plan seems to
>>>>advocate that.
>>>
>>>Until a few years ago there were no questions about RF exposure at all in
>>>the pools.
>>

>> Are you arguing for or against this, Jim? If there were no questions on
>
>
>>RF exposure, and hams did okay, but we should limit new hams to 50 watts
>>because of safety concerns - it just isn't a good argument to me.
>
>
> The hazards of RF exposure, even at relatively low levels, are better
> understood now than before. But there is still a lot of work to be done.
> Meanwhile, it makes sense to reduce exposure when possible.

And this ties right into the part of my last post that you snipped.
Maybe in the interests of RF safety, and among people who think that it
makes sense to reduce exposure, it might seem like a good idea to limit
all hams maximum power. Let that dog sleep!

The idea is no more outlandish than the idea that the tests could be
getting simplified bit by bit to the point of giving up on testing
altogether.

sooooo...

People could be trotted out to expound on their QRP exploits around the
world. The success of 60 meters and it's lowered power limits are
another arguing point. I can hear it now: "After seeing the successful
operation of Amateur Radio operators under these circumstances, and the
general safety problems which Amateurs concede is a problem, it is only
prudent, sensible and reasonable to reduce transmitter power to 50 Watts
or perhaps less. This is in line with published tests dealing with RF
Safety. Coupled with these lowered and safer power limits, we can now
eliminate the regulatory morass of Amateur Radio testing altogether, and
turn our Amateur spectrum into a service that can be accessed safely by
all Americans."

Oh frabjous day!

<snippage>

- Mike KB3EIA -

3792. Re: It ain't about the test.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-04 20:11:11 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <xnfcneeyarg.hpdqk40.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>
Source record: 83518

On 4 Dec 2003 09:26:52 -0800, N2EY wrote:

>Mistakes happen. But when you read the FCC enforcement letters, it
>becomes clear that mistakes, particularly technical ones, aren't
>really much of a problem anymore in the ARS.

Technical mistakes were, and I would guess still are, handled by
less formal warnings (a phone call or an Advisory Notice rather than
a Notice of Violation or a Notice of Apparent Liability to
Forfeiture, for instance) at least the first time around.

Whatever works.....

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

From a Clearing in the Silicon Forest
Beaverton (Washington County) Oregon

3793. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-04 20:16:53 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3FCF9638.7B651050@earthlink.net>
Source record: 83519

"Steve Robeson, K4CAP" wrote:
>
> lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20031203224459.12501.00004338@mb-m04.aol.com>...
> > In article <ytrzb.2662$Oe5.2053@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dwight
> > Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> writes:
> >
> > > Len, a lot of your messages lately are coming through with no reply added
> > >(just the quote from the message you're replying to).
> >
> > My bad. The "lot" was all of three messages.
>
> Well...we can add THESE three messages to the numerous other
> times you've done the same thing.
>
> Last time it was some phantom friend's software that caused the
> glitch.
>
> Must be kinda embarrassing for a "professional" electronics
> "engineer" such as yourself, eh Lennie...???

He's not embarrassed, Steve. We've simply fallen into another of his
carefully laid traps :-) :-) :-)

Dave K8MN

3794. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-04 21:02:26 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3FCFA0E4.FBEEBBF0@earthlink.net>
Source record: 83520

Kim W5TIT wrote:

> It's not the matter of being kind and courteous and moving over so someone
> who's acting like an idiot can go by. It's the principle of the matter that
> *because* of the way they are being self-important, it's going to be *them*
> that does the moving around. I.E., I see them in kind of like the "bully"
> role of a little kid. Well, I'm not giving in to the bully.

At least you're consistent. This is much the way you've defined your
behavior at cocktail parties and sporting events. It is also similar to
the way you act here.

> Yeah, I suppose...but my justification is that they can accommodate
> themselves, by moving around. A) We are both speeding; B) At the point this
> person is behind me wanting me to move over so he/she can get by, it's a
> given that it's because we're both around a driver(s) in the right lane that
> are going slower, right? So, what is it about the driver behind
> me...practically shoving their hood up under my vehicle...that would compel
> me to slow down, move over, reposition myself, when all they have to do is
> allow *both* of us to keep speeding, i.e., stay above a speed limit we don't
> want to drive, and wait the bit of time it will take to get passed the
> "slower" traffic?

> I think the priniciple is the same. The root of my angst toward the driver
> we are speaking of, is their attitude. The attitude that has them convinced
> that they need to speed faster than someone else.

They need to speed faster than someone else? Aren't you speeding in
order to go faster than those who aren't speeding? Please express the
subtle nuances which make your case different.

> Or that where they are
> going is far more important than where I am going (when neither of us has
> that information available to us).

I can't believe that these things cross your mind. You actually believe
that someone behind you has it in his head that where he's going is more
important than where you're going?

> Yeah. I thought when I got my truck with that on it, that I would always be
> using it. I don't like it...don't know where to put my foot that I can
> still have the same tactile feel with the brake pedal and gas pedal in
> alignment with my placement of the foot. I don't feel "safe" with cruise
> control engaged--plus the speeds of drivers is so erradic that one must keep
> disengaging and reengaging it anyway. Never fails...set it to the flow of
> traffic and 5-6 miles down the road, set it again.

That's why they make it easy to cancel and set.

> Once when I was speeding. And, by all rights that cop should have nailed
> me. It was 11:30 at night, and my registration sticker (of which the new
> one was at home) was out, inspection sticker was out--which I'd not paid any
> attention to, *and* I couldn't find my insurance card. But, he let me go!
> WOW!

> Uh, I have a problem with cops in general. Most I've encountered are not
> friendly.

That runs counter to those I've encountered. Maybe it's all in your
attitude toward them.

> However, most I've encountered in a casual setting are great
> guys/gals. I don't like the military form of communication--stern,
> expressionless, etc., and it puts me on edge.

> Same as the non police (grin) scenario you gave me. I'd pace myself and
> cruise. I also don't care or get all upset about traffic jams. I look at
> them as an example to notice the birds flying around, look up under the
> bridges to see if there's a poor homeless person up under there, look at all
> the beauty I usually don't get to pay a whole lot of attention to--in fact
> the traffic jam gives me the opportunity to find some sense of pleasantry in
> places that really do require "closer inspection" to find it...(grin)

> Hmmm. You see it as me wanting to control the speed, I only think of it as
> not giving in to the way I perceive someone to be acting.

Why should someone have to give in to the way they perceive you to be
acting?

Dave K8MN

3795. Re: Stuck?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-04 21:19:14 UTC
From: Jerry Oxendine <joxendi@bellsouth.net>
Message-ID: <rvNzb.167$V7.85@bignews3.bellsouth.net>
Source record: 83521

"Freddy" <fred@fredcbbard.org> wrote in message
news:bqn4pb$6qf$0@pita.alt.net...
> x-no-archive: yes
> Sure Ox sure. Ever get the leaks in your double-wide fixed,
> or are you too busy chasing trucks up & down the interstate,
> trying to figure out what channel they're talking on?
> LOL LOL LOL LOL LOL !!!!
> From what I heard, your "Ox Reports" go right into the
> delete file. hahahahahahahahhahahahahahahahhah

Keep believing that! Keep hoping that. Hmm, there's a
place not too far from here called the CB Barn. Maybe I ought to check it
out and put a little bug in Riley's ear and
SEE if it goes into the trash bin. LOLOLOLOLOL!

J
> Fred's CB Barn
> Special trucker sale on 1KW amps this month
>
>
>
> "Jerry Oxendine" <joxendi@bellsouth.net> wrote in message
> news:p8zzb.589$i83.129@bignews5.bellsouth.net...
> >
> > Let him stew in it; it isn't worth the argument. Sounds to me he's sort
> of
> > afeered that the new FCC offensive might
> > mess up his playhouse. He spends so much time trying
> > to insult people (doesn't work), it sounds like he is actually worried
> they
> > might get some of them thar dri'vahs
> > thar SQUEAK!!
> >
> > Amazing how small people can try so hard to belittle others without
> knowing
> > a damn thing about them. I've got more hobbies than he's got hemorhoids
> (he
> > must have
> > a "pile" {pun intended}of 'em based on his feeble attempts to garner
> > attention. I'll have to tell you my ride in a North American T-6 Texan
> > sometime. Now There's a
> > hobby! LOL!
> >
> >
> > Jerry

> >
> >
>
>

3796. Re: Bush Thrills Troops, Hillary Doesn't

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-04 22:12:43 UTC
From: ggg <loch-schwarz@bayern-mail.de>
Message-ID: <bqobgv$b50$1@svr7.m-online.net>
Source record: 83522

> Bush Thrills Troops

so fucking what ?

3797. Re: Stuck?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-04 22:27:58 UTC
From: Jerry Oxendine <joxendi@bellsouth.net>
Message-ID: <ZuOzb.585$E7.29@bignews5.bellsouth.net>
Source record: 83523

"JJ" <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
news:DMidnXRirIqj5VKiRVn-sA@gbronline.com...
> Jerry Oxendine wrote:
>
> > JJ,
> >
> > Let him stew in it; it isn't worth the argument. Sounds to me he's sort
of
> > afeered that the new FCC offensive might
> > mess up his playhouse. He spends so much time trying
> > to insult people (doesn't work), it sounds like he is actually worried
they
> > might get some of them thar dri'vahs
> > thar SQUEAK!!
> >
> > Amazing how small people can try so hard to belittle others without
knowing
> > a damn thing about them. I've got more hobbies than he's got hemorhoids
(he
> > must have
> > a "pile" {pun intended}of 'em based on his feeble attempts to garner
> > attention.
>
> Yea, he is the typical chicken bander. Probably needs to air out that
> barn of his.
>
> > I'll have to tell you my ride in a North American T-6 Texan
> > sometime. Now There's a
> > hobby! LOL!
>
> Would love to hear about it. There is a group that comes hear a couple
> of times a year to offer rides in one, the wife has been trying to talk
> me into it for a birthday present. Would love to get ahold of the stick
> of one of those.

That was a few years ago but it was a neat ride. Probably one of the things
that led me to fly in later
years (soloed at 21 in 1970). The Civil Air Patrol Wing had one, and one
day, they were giving rides to the cadets. Competition for riding in a T-6
was pretty high
because of time restraints of the pilot (s), but I stood hopefully in line
not figuring I would get the chance. Two
buddies in front of me were scared and began to talk themselves out of
flying. To my surprise, they stepped OUT of line and I was next!

Now my first airplane ride was in a Piper Cherokee 180
followed by a few sorties in a J-3/L-4. This didn't prepare me for what
happened next! When the pilot shoved the throttle in, I could feel the
tremendous torque
push me back in the seat! I wasn't used to such power--
and this was only an advanced trainer. Climbing out
amid the roar and clatter of that huge engine, we were at
3,000 feet in NO time--this was definitely not your Father's Oldsmobile, er
uh, Cessna!

The pilot asked me if I was OK and I said, "Sure". Next
thing I am looking up at the sky, I can't lift my hand off the armrest and
my jaws feel like they are being pulled down to my shoulders! I CAN'T move!
Up, up, up, clatter, clatter, clatter, we went thru an inside loop, and
SNAP! A snap roll to the left. I banged my head against
the canopy! Ouch! Then I am looking directly at the ground, then up, up up,
UP again as the airplane slowed,
slowed and WHAM! A stall! (no that's NOT when the
engine quits; it's when the airframe stops flying and begins
to free fall) Looking at the ground again. Three turns of
a spin as I am held upwards as if weightless. Then a hard, 60 degree turn
with my butt pushed ever harder down into the seat and my jaws are distended
with the
increasing G forces. Level flight as I get my breath utterly
fascinated, but panting and beginning to sweat. Then
the pilot tells me to get on the controls as he tells me, a
total greenhorn what the controls do, how to turn left, how to turn right,
what the rudder does, points out the
wing surfaces, the flaps, tells me about the ailerons, etc.
And this kid was in HEAVEN! If we had augered into
the ground, I wouldn't have cared because flying became
a MUST for me. It didn't make me sick, either. Rather, it
kindled a passion within that remains to this day. I let my
medical lapse some years ago when it became MORE than I could afford. When
fuel went beyond $1.50 gal (and that has been some years ago, I just
couldn't justify
the expense to remain current. But during the years I DID fly, I had a
ball. Cessnas, Bonanzas, Pipers, DC-3
(that was fun, too!) There was a friend that ran a radio shop in the
field--certified avionics. Sometimes, he would
come to me and ask me to go up and fly while he made
critical adjustments to the radios/navcomms. I never actually got my
multi-engine ticket, but I would fly with
Jimmy while he did his thing. Lots of "free" flying back then!

Take that flight, you won't regret it! And incidently, there
is a big celebration at Kitty Hawk, NC to mark the 100th
anniversary of the Wright Bros flight in 1903. I wouldn't
miss that for anything.

Jerry

3798. over 3,000 repeaters/simplex nodes now connected to the internet

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-04 22:36:08 UTC
From: g3zhi@hotmail.com
Message-ID: <3fe2b689.801108@news.btinternet.com>
Source record: 83524

over 3,000 repeaters/simplex nodes now connected to the internet

the full list of links on

rlp
echolink
echoirlp

can be downloaded from my web site

73 Ian G3ZHI

http://www.qsl.net/g3zhi - has many ham radio links

G4NJI IRLP 5200 Echolink 135909
Rotherham simplex 145.2875mhz

GB3XN IRLP 5708 Echolink 153126

Ian Abel G3ZHI
52 Hollytree Ave
Maltby
Rotherham
Yorkshire
S66 8DY

Tel: 01709 799911
Mobile 0776 481 3363

3799. Re: Stuck?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-05 00:23:55 UTC
From: Jerry Oxendine <joxendi@bellsouth.net>
Message-ID: <pdQzb.1120$V7.1059@bignews6.bellsouth.net>
Source record: 83525

Gonna blame me for this one? LOLOLOLOL!

and (as you said)HAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHA!

J

Before the

Federal Communications Commission

Washington, D.C. 20554

In the Matter of)

)

William A. Woods) File No. EB-02-ST-244

Tacoma, Washington) NAL/Acct. No. 200332980003

) FRN 0007-9944-78

)

FORFEITURE ORDER

Adopted: September 15, 2003 Released: September 17, 2003

By the Chief, Enforcement Bureau:

I. INTRODUCTION

In this Forfeiture Order ("Order"), we issue a monetary forfeiture in the amount of five hundred dollars ($500) to William A. Woods, Tacoma, Washington, for willful violation of Section 303(n) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, ("Act") and Section 95.426 of the Commission's Rules ("Rules"). The noted violations involve Mr. Woods' failure to make his CB radio station available for inspection at the request of authorized Commission personnel.

On December 30, 2002, the Commission's Seattle, Washington, Field Office ("Seattle Office") issued a Notice of Apparent Liability for Forfeiture ("NAL") to Mr. Woods for a forfeiture in the amount of seven thousand dollars ($7,000). Mr. Woods responded to the NAL on February 10, 2003.

II. BACKGROUND

On September 3, 2002, the Seattle Office received a report from the City of Tacoma, Washington, concerning complaints about interference to home entertainment equipment in the 3000 block of South Madison Street in Tacoma,

Washington.

On October 29, 2002, FCC agents from the Seattle Office, using mobile direction finding equipment, determined that an interfering signal on CB frequency 27.025 MHz was emanating from the residence of William A. Woods at 3005 S. Madison Street, Tacoma, Washington. The agents observed signal strength levels significantly higher than those expected from an authorized CB transmitter.

On November 5, 2002, the agents again observed transmissions on 27.025 MHz with signal strength levels significantly exceeding those expected from an authorized CB transmitter. Using mobile direction finding equipment, they again determined that the transmissions emanated from Woods' residence. After locating the source of the transmissions on November 5, 2002, the agents, who were accompanied by two police officers, requested that Mr. Woods make his CB station available for inspection. After a delay, Mr. Woods allowed the agents but not the police officers to enter his residence. Once the agents began an inspection of Mr. Woods' CB station, Mr. Woods changed his mind and refused to allow the inspection to continue. The agents then informed Mr. Woods that his refusal to allow an inspection could result in a monetary forfeiture.

On December 30, 2002, the Seattle Office issued a NAL for a $7,000 forfeiture to William A. Woods for refusing to allow an inspection of his CB radio station, in willful violation of Section 303(n) of the Act and Section 95.426 of the Rules. In his response to the NAL, Mr. Woods claims that the agents who came to his residence on November 5, 2002, did not present any identification and that he did not refuse to allow the agents to inspect his station. In addition, Mr. Woods submitted financial documentation concerning his inability to pay the proposed monetary forfeiture and also stated that he had taken medication before the agents arrived at his house.

DISCUSSION

The proposed forfeiture amount in this case was assessed in accordance with Section 503(b) of the Act, Section 1.80 of the Rules, and The Commission's Forfeiture Policy Statement and Amendment of Section 1.80 of the Rules to Incorporate the Forfeiture Guidelines, 12 FCC Rcd 17087 (1997), recon. denied, 15 FCC Rcd 303 (1999) ("Policy Statement"). In examining Mr. Woods' response, Section 503(b) of the Act requires that the Commission take into account the nature, circumstances, extent and gravity of the violation and, with respect to the violator, the degree of culpability, any history of prior offenses, ability to pay, and other such matters as justice may require.

Section 303(n) of the Act authorizes the Commission to inspect radio stations and Section 95.426 of the Rules requires CB operators to make their stations available for inspection upon the request of Commission personnel. The agents who attempted to inspect Mr. Woods' station flatly contradict his claims that they did not present any identification and that Mr. Woods did not refuse to allow the inspection. The agents state that they presented identification indicating that they are FCC agents and that, after allowing

the inspection to begin, Mr. Woods became extremely agitated and then told the agents that they could not continue with the inspection. We conclude that Mr. Woods violated Sections 303(n) of the Act and 95.426 of the Rules by refusing to make his CB radio station available for inspection. We also conclude these violations were "willful" within the meaning of Section 503(b) of the Act.

Mr. Woods claims to have taken the medication "Olanzapine" before the arrival of FCC agents at his house on May 8, 2002. Mr. Woods does not contend that this medication contributed to his refusal to permit an inspection; indeed, he flatly denies refusing to permit an inspection. Furthermore, it is unclear from the information provided whether this medication would have any affect on Mr. Woods' actions or state of mind.

Upon review of the financial documentation presented by Mr. Woods, we conclude that the forfeiture amount should be reduced to $500 on the basis of financial hardship.

Mr. Woods presented several additional arguments in his response to the NAL, such as his claim that he did not operate his station on October 29, 2002, and his attempts to discredit the complainants. These additional arguments have no bearing upon the matters at issue in this proceeding: whether Mr. Woods failed to allow a station inspection, in violation of Section 303(n) of the Act and Section 95.426 of the Rules; whether a forfeiture should be imposed for those violations; and the amount of any such forfeiture. Accordingly, we find that these additional arguments are not material to this proceeding and we will not consider them.

We have examined the response to the NAL pursuant to the statutory factors above, and in conjunction with the Policy Statement as well. As a result of our review, we conclude that Mr. Woods willfully violated Section 303(n) of the Act and Section 95.426 of the Rules and we find that, while there is no basis for cancellation of the proposed monetary forfeiture, a reduction to $500 is warranted on the basis of financial hardship.

IV. ORDERING CLAUSES

Accordingly, IT IS ORDERED that, pursuant to Section 503 of the Act, and Sections 0.111, 0.311 and 1.80(f)(4) of the Rules, William A. Woods IS LIABLE FOR A MONETARY FORFEITURE in the amount of five hundred dollars ($500) for willful violation of Section 303(n) of the Act and Section 95.426 of the Rules.

Payment of the forfeiture shall be made in the manner provided for in Section 1.80 of the Rules within 30 days of the release of this Order. If the forfeiture is not paid within the period specified, the case may be referred to the Department of Justice for collection pursuant to Section 504(a) of the Act. Payment may be made by mailing a check or similar instrument, payable to the order of the Federal Communications Commission, to the Federal Communications Commission, P.O. Box 73482, Chicago, Illinois 60673-7482. The payment should reference NAL/Acct. No. 200332980003 and FRN 0007-9944-78. Requests for full payment under an installment plan should be

sent to: Chief, Revenue and Receivables Operations Group, 445 12th Street, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20554.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that a copy of this Order shall be sent by first class mail and certified mail, return receipt requested, to William. A. Woods, 3005 S. Madison Street, Tacoma, Washington 98409.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

David H. Solomon

Chief, Enforcement Bureau

"Fred" <fred@oxchasescbs.net> wrote in message
news:bqnuah$q7r$0@pita.alt.net...
>
> "JJ" <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
> news:DMidnXdirIpk5VKiRVn-sA@gbronline.com...
> > Freddy wrote:
> >
> > > x-no-archive: yes
> > > Sure Ox sure. Ever get the leaks in your double-wide fixed,
> > > or are you too busy chasing trucks up & down the interstate,
> > > trying to figure out what channel they're talking on?
> > > LOL LOL LOL LOL LOL !!!!
> > > From what I heard, your "Ox Reports" go right into the
> > > delete file. hahahahahahahahhahahahahahahahhah
> > >
> > > Fred's CB Barn
> > > Special trucker sale on 1KW amps this month
> > >
> >
> > Now you post is archived.
> >
>
>
> Thank you. You are indeed a well trained little puppy dog!
>
> Fred
>
>
>

3800. Re: Stuck?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-05 00:27:26 UTC
From: Jerry Oxendine <joxendi@bellsouth.net>
Message-ID: <IgQzb.1123$V7.1071@bignews6.bellsouth.net>
Source record: 83526

Keep laughing (knock, knock!!)

J

(If you can dish it out, ya gotta take it!)

Before the

Federal Communications Commission

Washington, D.C. 20554

In the Matter of)

)

Frank Kluz) File No. EB-02-DT-610

Lancaster, Ohio) NAL/Acct. No. 200232360008

) FRN 0007-4207-22

)

FORFEITURE ORDER

Adopted: August 12, 2003 Released: August 14, 2003

By the Chief, Enforcement Bureau:

I. INTRODUCTION

In this Forfeiture Order ("Order"), we issue a monetary forfeiture in the amount of five hundred dollars ($500) to Frank Kluz, Lancaster, Ohio, for willful violation of Section 95.411 of the Commission's Rules ("Rules"). The noted violation involves Mr. Kluz's use of an external radio frequency power amplifier ("linear amplifier") as part of his Citizens Band ("CB") radio station.

On July 23, 2002, the Commission's Detroit, Michigan Field Office ("Detroit Office") issued a Notice of Apparent Liability for Forfeiture ("NAL") to Mr. Kluz in the amount of five thousand dollars ($5,000). A letter responding to the NAL was filed on Mr. Kluz's behalf on October 3, 2002.

II. BACKGROUND

On June 22, 2001, the City of Lancaster, Ohio, Office of the Law Director and City Prosecutor Office, sent a complaint letter to the Detroit Office. The complaint alleged that a CB radio station operated by Mr. Kluz was causing interference to home electronics equipment, such as televisions,

radios and telephones, in his neighborhood.

On July 19, 2001, the Detroit Office sent a Quiet Hours letter to Mr. Kluz directing him, his family, and any guests visiting him, not to operate any base or mobile radio transmitter from his property or adjacent roadways from the time the letter was received until he contacted the Detroit Office to make arrangements for an inspection of his CB radio facility.

On August 1, 2001, Mr. Kluz sent a response to the Detroit Office. In this response, Mr. Kluz indicated that he would comply with the order not to operate his CB radio station, but did not make arrangements for an inspection of his CB station.

On October 16, 2001, the City of Lancaster, Ohio, Office of the Law Director and City Prosecutor Office, sent a second complaint letter to the Detroit Office. The complaint alleged that Mr. Kluz's CB radio transmissions continued to cause interference to neighborhood televisions, radios and telephones, thereby violating the Quiet Hours letter.

On October 31, 2001, an agent from the Detroit Office traveled to Lancaster, Ohio and monitored for transmissions from Mr. Kluz's CB station, but did not observe any transmissions from his station at that time. The agent went to 245 Talmadge Avenue, Lancaster, Ohio, the address stated in the complaints as Mr. Kluz's residence. The agent inspected Mr. Kluz's CB station and found it to be in compliance with applicable FCC rules and regulations. Accordingly, on November 14, 2001, the Detroit Office sent a letter to Mr. Kluz releasing him from the conditions that had been imposed on his operation of the CB station by the Quiet Hours letter.

On January 21, 2002, the Office of Congressman David L. Hobson referred a complaint to the Detroit Office from his constituents regarding interference to telephones and home electronic equipment allegedly caused by Mr. Kluz's CB radio station.

On June 10, 2002, the Detroit Office received a complaint from a resident in Lancaster, Ohio. The complaint alleged that Mr. Kluz's CB radio station was causing interference to neighborhood home electronics equipment.

On June 25, 2002, agents from the Detroit Office traveled to Lancaster, Ohio and monitored CB transmissions using a mobile direction finding vehicle. The agents detected CB transmissions on 27.185 MHz (CB Channel 19) and, at approximately 8:26 p.m., positively identified the source of the transmissions to be a residence at 245 Talmadge Avenue. The agents then proceeded to the residence at 245 Talmadge Avenue, interviewed Mr. Kluz, and inspected his CB radio station. The agents observed a Palomar TX-200B linear amplifier attached to Mr. Kluz's CB transceiver. Mr. Kluz told the agents that he had obtained the linear amplifier from a friend two days earlier and was checking it out for his friend. Measurements taken by the agents indicated that the linear amplifier had an output power that ranged from 12.5 watts to 75 watts, which exceeds the permissible power limits specified in Section 95.410 of the Rules.

On July 23, 2002, the Detroit Office issued a NAL for a $5,000 forfeiture to Mr. Kluz for using a linear amplifier as part of his CB radio station in willful violation of Section 95.411 of the Rules. Mr. Kluz did not respond to the NAL. However, on October 3, 2002, the Commission received a letter from Dr. James LeSar, M.D., responding to the NAL on behalf of Mr. Kluz. In this letter, Dr. LeSar asserts that due to the nature of his medical problems, Mr. Kluz is unable to understand and unable to willfully violate Section 95.411 by having a linear amplifier attached to his CB station. According to Dr. LeSar, Mr. Kluz suffers from several medical conditions, including dementia and a possible brain tumor, and has poor reading comprehension. Dr. LeSar's letter indicates that he did not personally examine Mr. Kluz. Dr. LeSar wrote that he was including documentation to demonstrate to the Enforcement Bureau that Mr. Kluz was unable to willfully violate Section 95.411; however, no documentation was included.

On June 17, 2003, the Enforcement Bureau sent a letter to Dr. LeSar requesting the referenced documentation. We received Dr. LeSar's response to our letter on June 30, 2003.

Accompanying Dr. LeSar's response was an evaluation of Mr. Kluz taken by Dr. Marc Miller for the Bureau of Disability Determination, on February 6, 2002. In the evaluation, Dr. Miller concluded that Mr. Kluz suffers from depression, cognitive difficulties, dementia, and memory problems. The evaluation further indicated that Mr. Kluz had a driver's license, drove to the evaluation appointment, and is able to manage his own funds. The evaluation did not state that Mr. Kluz was unable to willfully violate Section 95.411, or that Mr. Kluz was unable to know the actions he takes.

DISCUSSION

The proposed forfeiture amount in this case was assessed in accordance with Section 503(b) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, ("Act"), Section 1.80 of the Rules, and The Commission's Forfeiture Policy Statement and Amendment of Section 1.80 of the Rules to Incorporate the Forfeiture Guidelines, 12 FCC Rcd 17087 (1997), recon. denied, 15 FCC Rcd 303 (1999) ("Policy Statement"). In examining Mr. Kluz's response, Section 503(b) of the Act requires that the Commission take into account the nature, circumstances, extent and gravity of the violation and, with respect to the violator, the degree of culpability, any history of prior offenses, ability to pay, and other such matters as justice may require.

Section 95.411 of the Rules prohibits attaching a power amplifier to a CB transmitter in any way. Furthermore, under Section 95.411(c) of the Rules, there is a presumption that a linear or other external RF power amplifier has been used if it is found in the possession of, or on the premises of, the CB radio station operator and there is other evidence that the CB station was operated with more power than allowed by the rules. On June 25, 2002, FCC agents positively identified Mr. Kluz's CB station as the source of CB transmissions on 27.185 MHz (CB Channel 19) and immediately thereafter inspected his CB station. This inspection revealed that the station consisted of a CB transceiver with an attached linear amplifier and power indicator meter. Mr. Kluz acknowledged at the time of the inspection that he had been operating the CB station with the attached linear amplifier.

Accordingly, we conclude that Mr. Kluz violated Section 95.411 of the Rules by operating a CB radio station with a linear amplifier.

We also conclude that this violation was willful within the meaning of Section 503(b) of the Act. The term "willful," as used in Section 503(b) of the Act, does not require a finding that the rule violation was intentional or that the violator was aware that it was committing a rule violation. Rather, the term "willful" simply requires that the violator knew it was taking the action in question, irrespective of any intent to violate the Commission's rules. Dr. LeSar asserts in his letter that Mr. Kluz is unable to understand and unable to willfully violate Section 95.411 because he suffers from several medical conditions, including dementia and a possible brain tumor, and has poor reading comprehension. Dr. LeSar does not indicate, however, that Mr. Kluz was ever examined or questioned specifically to determine whether he understands what a linear amplifier is or how to turn it on. Moreover, based on correspondence from Mr. Kluz to the Detroit Office and the agents' interview of Mr. Kluz, at the time of the inspection, Mr. Kluz clearly knew that he had hooked up a linear amplifier to his CB radio station because he admitted to the agents that he was checking it out for a friend. Finally, we determine that the information provided by Dr. LeSar and Dr. Miller concerning Mr. Kluz's inability to act willfully is not sufficient to overcome our conclusion that Mr. Kluz knew he was using a linear amplifier. Specifically the psychological evaluation does not state that Mr. Kluz is unable to know the actions he takes, and therefore the evaluation does not refute Mr. Kluz's own statement that he was operating a linear amplifier. Accordingly, based on the evidence in the record, we find that Mr. Kluz willfully violated Section 95.411 of the Rules.

We have examined Mr. Kluz's information, relating to his ability to pay, and determined that the proposed $5,000 forfeiture would impose a financial hardship on Mr. Kluz. Therefore, we will reduce the forfeiture amount from $5,000 to $500.

Finally, we note that we have not received any recent complaints concerning Mr. Kluz's use of a linear amplifier. However, if we receive further complaints stemming from Mr. Kluz's improper use of a linear amplifier, we will take appropriate additional enforcement action.

IV. ORDERING CLAUSES

Accordingly, IT IS ORDERED that, pursuant to Section 503 of the Act, and Sections 0.111, 0.311 and 1.80(f)(4) of the Rules, Frank Kluz IS LIABLE FOR A MONETARY FORFEITURE in the amount of five hundred dollars ($500) for willful violation of Section 95.411 of the Rules.

Payment of the forfeiture shall be made in the manner provided for in Section 1.80 of the Rules within 30 days of the release of this Order. If the forfeiture is not paid within the period specified, the case may be referred to the Department of Justice for collection pursuant to Section 504(a) of the Act. Payment may be made by mailing a check or similar instrument, payable to the order of the Federal Communications Commission,

to the Federal Communications Commission, P.O. Box 73482, Chicago, Illinois 60673-7482. The payment should reference NAL/Acct. No. 200232360008 and FRN 0007-4207-22. Requests for full payment under an installment plan should be sent to: Chief, Revenue and Receivables Operations Group, 445 12th Street, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20554.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that a copy of this Order shall be sent by first class mail and certified mail, return receipt requested, to Frank Kluz, 245 Talmadge Avenue, Lancaster, Ohio 43130.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

David H. Solomon

Chief, Enforcement Bureau

"Fred" <fred@oxchasescbs.net> wrote in message
news:bqnuah$q7r$0@pita.alt.net...
>
> "JJ" <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
> news:DMidnXdirIpk5VKiRVn-sA@gbronline.com...
> > Freddy wrote:
> >
> > > x-no-archive: yes
> > > Sure Ox sure. Ever get the leaks in your double-wide fixed,
> > > or are you too busy chasing trucks up & down the interstate,
> > > trying to figure out what channel they're talking on?
> > > LOL LOL LOL LOL LOL !!!!
> > > From what I heard, your "Ox Reports" go right into the
> > > delete file. hahahahahahahahhahahahahahahahhah
> > >
> > > Fred's CB Barn
> > > Special trucker sale on 1KW amps this month
> > >
> >
> > Now you post is archived.
> >
>
>
> Thank you. You are indeed a well trained little puppy dog!
>
> Fred
>
>
>

3801. Re: Dimmy can TOO dance! And so do his doper boys!!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-05 00:30:02 UTC
From: Arf! Arf! <DoggieDaze@lLiberalz.com>
Message-ID: <qiQzb.409$V7.79@bignews3.bellsouth.net>
Source record: 83527
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest

Arf! Arf! wrote:
He taught his whole family!

http://www.hcso.tampa.fl.us/pub/default.asp?/Online/qdisp/bn=03035679

http://www.hcso.tampa.fl.us/pub/default.asp?/online/qdisp/BN=03058540

3802. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-05 00:36:44 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <wqQzb.13918$P%1.12994707@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 83528

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:IOByb.32731$Wy4.30927@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> Few people today
> (especially boys and men) have not learned code, or at least played around
> with it, at some point in their lives. When we were kids, many of us sent
> messages to friends using flashlights or walkie-talkies with code printed
on
> the side. Many other games and toys over the years have featured messages,
> secret or otherwise, sent by Morse code. Others learned code in groups
like
> the Boy Scouts. Still others learned it in the military. In reality, most
> adults today are familiar enough with code to know whether they have any
> real interest in it.

Strange where do you come up with this "fact" that most adults are familiar with the code. The Boy Scouts that I knew did not except for one or two individuals who went for a merit badge. In the military, only those who went for radio might have had any introduction to it and not all of those. My neighborhood friends when I was a kid did not play around with sending Morse code with flashlights.

Of the adults that I have talked to, only those in ham radio had any familiarity with Morse code.

So please cite the statistical data that shows people have had enough exposure to Morse code to be able to evaluate it even though they don't know it.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

3803. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-05 00:38:02 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <KrQzb.13919$P%1.12994867@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 83529

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:b0Dyb.32761$Wy4.22977@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> "Dee D. Flint" wrote:
> >
> > "Dwight Stewart" wrote:
> > > Really? You mean all those things I did
> > > to get a properly operating station (putting
> > > coax and connectors together, water-
> > > proofing, antenna tuning, SWR tests,
> > > ground radials, masts, guy wires, wiring a
> > > microphone, equipment grounding,
> > > lightning protection, RF exposure level
> > > estimates, and so on) wasn't really needed
> > > and didn't really require any skills to do
> > > properly? (snip)
> >
> > Soldering requires some modest skill but one
> > can hire that done if desired. The other items
> > are necessary but no skill is required just
> > taking the time to do it. (snip)
>
>
> If you truly believe there is no skill involved to do those things
> properly, I suspect you haven't done most of them (at least not properly).
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
>
>

Done them many times and done them properly.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

3804. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-05 00:43:49 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <9xQzb.13921$P%1.12995789@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 83530

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20031201055840.12631.00003129@mb-m28.aol.com...
> In article <Xns94442777C95Eelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun
> <alun@1stcounsel.com> writes:
>
> >I think you're missing the point. I took _code_ tests to get _phone_
> >subbands. There's no logic in that. Never was, even from the beginning.
>
> Sure there is. Here it is, though you may argue that it doesn't hold much
water
> today:
>

In addition, anyone one who thinks they took the code tests to get phone subbands isn't really viewing it from the right perspective anyway. The code test, as well as the additional writtens, was to get HF privileges or should have been. It happens that phone privileges are included when one earns HF privileges.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

3805. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-05 01:04:13 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <hQQzb.13925$P%1.12998882@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 83531

"Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:d21zb.1200$Oe5.122@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote
>
> > some would certainly object to "Extra" as an adverb
> > meaning unusual or exceptional.
>
> I agree that some would, which is why my proposal has simple alphabetic
> characters to designate the two license levels.

Going with letter designations don't get around perceptions. Class "A"
would be perceived as "better" than "Class B" so what's the point in
renaming the classes.

Extra simply means that they did "extra" testing and have "extra"
privileges. Seems pretty simple to me.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

3806. Re: It ain't about the test.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-05 01:20:11 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3FCFDD49.9080908@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 83532

N2EY wrote:

>Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
news:<3FCCF409.2000707@ix.netcom.com>...
>
>
>>N2EY wrote:
>>
>>
>>
>>>The original 1913 reason for technical qualifications was to prevent
>>>interference to nonamateurs caused by improper adjustment of amateur
>>>transmitters.
>>>
>>>How much interference to nonamateurs is caused by improper adjustment of
>>>amateur transmitters today? Reading the FCC enforcement letters, such
>>>interference today seems to be more a case of intentional modification of
>>>amateur equipment by a lawless few to operate on nonamateur frequencies.
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>It seems that you have to violate rules "on purpose" several times
>>before the FCC
>>starts working on it.
>>
>>
>
>I think it all comes down to complaints, too.
>
>
>
>>Modern equipment rarely causes problems (like
>>excessive
>>splatter or harmonics). I'm talking about stuff from the major
>>manufacturers
>>(Yeacomwood), not the "freeband" "linayes".
>>
>>
>
>That's very true.
>
>And it raises the question of "why should hams have to know all sorts
>of theory stuff when the original reason for that knowledge is largely
>gone"

>
Well, the FCC allows us to build and modify equipment for use on the ham bands, and
it would be a good idea if we know what we are doing. At least be able to recognize
things like wrong frequency (like out of band), severe harmonics, splatter, TVI, and
such. Cell phone users don't have licenses, but they're not allowed to modify their
equipment either. Same for CBers. A CBer isn't supposed to modify his radio to
operate on 10m, but a ham could. It becomes a "ham radio set" and no longer a "CB set".
If and when the FCC says "no homebrewing or modifying, off the shelf 'type accepted'
rigs only, then the theory requirement gets weaker. I doubt the FCC would ever do
that, as one of our reasons for existing is to encourage learning about radio and
electronics.

3807. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-05 01:22:06 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <25Rzb.13928$P%1.13001922@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 83533

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:R7dzb.8310$zL1.1500126@news1.news.adelphia.net...
[snip]
Reminds me of the first time I took the General test. I got up early
> and drove to the Hamfest in Butler PA from State College PA. Drank
> several cups of coffee on the way. I took the writtens first, and no
> problem acing it. Then the combination of the trip and too much coffee
> kicked in as I sat down for the Morse code test. As they say in the
> Bronx fuggitaboudit! So I had to wait a while for my ticket.
>
> Which makes me wonder, I do not do Morse well under stress. I wonder how
> some of those who had to do it under some awful condx ever managed.
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -
>

Those who can hold it together under stress come in two types: a - nerves
of steel (only a few of those around) OR b - they've done it so long that
it's no more stressful than talking (probably the more common reason).

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

3808. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-05 01:45:27 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bqonu2$5do@library2.airnews.net>
Source record: 83534

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:9xQzb.13921$P%1.12995789@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
>
> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20031201055840.12631.00003129@mb-m28.aol.com...
> > In article <Xns94442777C95Eelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun
> > <alun@1stcounsel.com> writes:
> >
> > >I think you're missing the point. I took _code_ tests to get _phone_
> > >subbands. There's no logic in that. Never was, even from the beginning.
> >
> > Sure there is. Here it is, though you may argue that it doesn't hold
much
> water
> > today:
> >
>
> In addition, anyone one who thinks they took the code tests to get phone
> subbands isn't really viewing it from the right perspective anyway. The
> code test, as well as the additional writtens, was to get HF privileges or
> should have been. It happens that phone privileges are included when one
> earns HF privileges.
>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>

I endured the study of and took the test for CW *just* for the phone
privleges on 10M, specifically to join in on a nightly ragchew with a whole
bunch of local folks--which is no longer going on but it was neat while it
did. That is the *only* reason I did anything involving CW. So, you can
word it any way you want, Dee, but what compels one person to work with CW
at all, may not be what compels someone else.

Kim W5TIT

3809. Re: Stuck?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-05 02:37:55 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <m6ydncQh0dgcblKi4p2dnA@gbronline.com>
Source record: 83535

Jerry Oxendine wrote:

> In addition, Mr. Woods submitted financial documentation concerning
> his inability to pay the proposed monetary forfeiture and also stated that
> he had taken medication before the agents arrived at his house.

Just like a welfare cber. Has plenty of welfare money to buy lots of crappy cb radios and those big lenyars to splatter all over the rf spectrum and cause havoc, but dosen't have enough money to pay up when caught. They should make him sell all that crappy equipment and the trailer house he lives in to apply to the original fine.

3810. Re: Stuck?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-05 02:50:40 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <jqadnTftYpNDa1Ki4p2dnA@gbronline.com>
Source record: 83536

Jerry Oxendine wrote:

> Mr. Kluz told the agents
> that he had obtained the linear amplifier from a friend two days earlier and
> was checking it out for his friend.

Yea right, what a laugh!!! ROTFLM!!!!!!!!

> On July 23, 2002, the Detroit Office issued a NAL for a $5,000 forfeiture to
> Mr. Kluz for using a linear amplifier as part of his CB radio station in
> willful violation of Section 95.411 of the Rules. Mr. Kluz did not respond
> to the NAL. However, on October 3, 2002, the Commission received a letter
> from Dr. James LeSar, M.D., responding to the NAL on behalf of Mr. Kluz. In
> this letter, Dr. LeSar asserts that due to the nature of his medical
> problems, Mr. Kluz is unable to understand and unable to willfully violate
> Section 95.411 by having a linear amplifier attached to his CB station.

The clown was "unable to willfully violate Section 95.411 by having a
linear amplifier attached to his CB station". But he was cabable of
hooking it up and "check it out for a friend. LOLOLOLO!!!

> According to Dr. LeSar, Mr. Kluz suffers from several medical conditions,
> including dementia and a possible brain tumor, and has poor reading
> comprehension. Dr. LeSar's letter indicates that he did not personally
> examine Mr. Kluz. Dr. LeSar wrote that he was including documentation to
> demonstrate to the Enforcement Bureau that Mr. Kluz was unable to willfully
> violate Section 95.411; however, no documentation was included.

Ever notice how all these cb clowns who get caught have some kind of
medical problem? Must be something in them cb radio waves that effects
these morons. His medical problem evidently did not keep him from
assembling an illegal station and operating in violation of the FCC
rules. What a crock!!!

3811. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-05 02:56:50 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <D9ydneyT48bgZVKi4p2dnA@gbronline.com>
Source record: 83537

Mike Coslo wrote:

>
> Which makes me wonder, I do not do Morse well under stress. I wonder how
> some of those who had to do it under some awful condx ever managed.
>

Try it after getting up at 3am to drive 5 hrs to the nearest FCC office
and set there in front of an FCC examiner. I managed it OK but the other
guy going for General was so nervous that when he was asked to send he
could only get out a string of meaningless dots and dashes. The exam
officer told him to go get a cup of coffee while he had me do my sending
test then come back and try again. He did make it, but just under the wire.

3812. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-05 03:58:29 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <FnTzb.4691$Oe5.1207@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 83538

"Dee D. Flint" wrote:
>
> So please cite the statistical data that shows
> people have had enough exposure to Morse
> code to be able to evaluate it even though
> they don't know it.

I'll tell you what, Dee. You show me where such statistical data is collected and I'll cite it for you. Until then, it is clear that my comments were nothing more than opinions. Of course, you knew that before responding.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3813. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-05 04:40:45 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <h%Tzb.9134$zL1.2061837@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 83539

Dee D. Flint wrote:
> "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
> news:R7dzb.8310$zL1.1500126@news1.news.adelphia.net...
> [snip]
> Reminds me of the first time I took the General test. I got up early
>
>>and drove to the Hamfest in Butler PA from State College PA. Drank
>>several cups of coffee on the way. I took the writtens first, and no
>>problem acing it. Then the combination of the trip and too much coffee
>>kicked in as I sat down for the Morse code test. As they say in the
>>Bronx fuggitaboudit! So I had to wait a while for my ticket.
>>
>>Which makes me wonder, I do not do Morse well under stress. I wonder how
>>some of those who had to do it under some awful condx ever managed.
>>
>>- Mike KB3EIA -
>>
>
>
> Those who can hold it together under stress come in two types: a - nerves
> of steel (only a few of those around) OR b - they've done it so long that
> it's no more stressful than talking (probably the more common reason).

I still think there is a fundamental problem I have with Morse code - although I have come a long way, the effort I have to put in compared to what others apparently have to do is nothing short of phenomenal. A half hour at lunch, another half hour to an hour in the evening, 6 days a week, and I am still struggling. I know I am nowhere near stupid, and I've tried enough different methods to know that there is something somewhere that makes my brain process sounds a bit differently than those that find Morse easy.

But in most matters, I am one of those steely nerved types, and consider myself too dumb to panic.

But, I persevere! I'm starting to catch whole words on the air (at faster speeds) now, and it is exciting, despite my whining about it!

8^)

- Mike KB3EIA -

3814. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-05 05:38:19 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <fRUzb.4386$Qd6.3651@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 83540

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote

> And, finally, remember that Hans' proposal would entirely drop the Novice,
> Tech, and General (losing everything on those tests), making the Extra the
> sole license test for full privileges.

Nope, you keep getting it wrong, Dwight. I'd also drop the Extra
examination, and institute a **new** Class A examination, similar in
difficulty (but with obviously different content) than the current Extra.

73, de Hans, K0HB

3815. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-05 05:46:07 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <zYUzb.4390$Qd6.3533@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 83541

"Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote

> Maybe the FCC should look very closely at the
> power levels that hams use.

They recently did just that, and as a result the rules now include 97.13(c) which require YOU to perform an environmental evaluation of your station if you intend to use QRO, and certify that evaluation on your renewal application. The "can of worms" is open.

73, de Hans, K0HB

3816. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-05 05:57:12 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <Y6Vzb.4397$Qd6.2675@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 83542

"Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote

>
> I think you disagree.
>

Yes, I do, but that doesn't make you (or me) a bad person. I appreciate
your input.

73, de Hans, K0HB

3817. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-05 10:18:12 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bqplut$inf@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 83543

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:FnTzb.4691$Oe5.1207@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net...
>
> "Dee D. Flint" wrote:
> >
> > So please cite the statistical data that shows
> > people have had enough exposure to Morse
> > code to be able to evaluate it even though
> > they don't know it.
>
>
> I'll tell you what, Dee. You show me where such statistical data is
> collected and I'll cite it for you. Until then, it is clear that my
comments
> were nothing more than opinions. Of course, you knew that before
responding.
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
>

The angle of argument that Dee is trying to use is old, tired and *yawn*....

Kim W5TIT

3818. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-05 10:35:02 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <qbZzb.133$7p2.121@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 83544

"Kï¿½HB" wrote:
>
> Nope, you keep getting it wrong, Dwight.
> I'd also drop the Extra examination, and
> institute a **new** Class A examination,
> similar in difficulty (but with obviously
> different content) than the current Extra.

I don't think so, Hans. You're advocating a test "similar in difficulty" to the Extra. However, an Extra hasn't just taken that one test - he also took the Tech and General prior to that. The material on each test is different, with later tests building on the material in the earlier tests. To cover the same material an Extra has covered today ("similar difficulty"), your new test would have to include the material covered in all three current tests (with over 120 questions in one sitting). So, are you advocating that, advocating some type of reduced content test (less questions), or did you simply forget the material on the first two tests?

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3819. Re: It ain't about the test.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-05 11:44:24 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031205064424.25815.00004912@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 83545

In article <3FCFDD49.9080908@ix.netcom.com>, Robert Casey
<wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> writes:

>>And it raises the question of "why should hams have to know all sorts
>>of theory stuff when the original reason for that knowledge is largely
>>gone"
>>
>Well, the FCC allows us to build and modify equipment for use on the ham
>bands, and it would be a good idea if we know what we are doing.

Sure.

Just like how the FCC allows us to send and receive Morse code on the ham
bands, and it would be a good idea if we know what we are doing.

Neither the use of Morse code nor the construction/modification of equipment is
mandatory. Many hams enjoy amateur radio without doing either.

>At least be able to recognize
>things like wrong frequency (like out of band), severe harmonics,
>splatter, TVI, and such.

Sure.

Just like being at least be able to recognize most of the 43 symbols of the
Morse Code when sent at the very slow speed of 5 wpm.

>Cell phone users don't have licenses, but they're not allowed to
>modify their equipment either. Same for CBers. A CBer isn't supposed to
>modify his radio to
>operate on 10m, but a ham could.

Yet they often do just that.

>It becomes a "ham radio set" and no
>longer a "CB set".
>If and when the FCC says "no homebrewing or modifying, off the shelf
>'type accepted'
>rigs only, then the theory requirement gets weaker.

Usually such modifications require the high level of technical skill required
to cut the blue wire or crush diode D17....

And such modifications are not mandatory at all. Most hams today use certified
equipment, do they not?

Which is more common on the amateur HF bands: hams using homebrew/seriously
modified equipment, or hams using Morse code?

Do you really think the written exams adequately test whether a ham can build or modify amateur radio equipment - particularly considering the wide range of bands, modes and technologies usable by hams?

>I doubt the FCC
>would ever do
>that, as one of our reasons for existing is to encourage learning about
>radio and
>electronics.
>
IMHO they've been gradually watering down the theory tests for over 25 years.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3820. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-05 13:26:37 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3FD0878D.902@psu.edu>
Source record: 83546

Dwight Stewart wrote:
> "Kï¿½HB" wrote:
>
>>Nope, you keep getting it wrong, Dwight.
>>I'd also drop the Extra examination, and
>>institute a **new** Class A examination,
>>similar in difficulty (but with obviously
>>different content) than the current Extra.
>
>
>
> I don't think so, Hans. You're advocating a test "similar in difficulty"
> to the Extra. However, an Extra hasn't just taken that one test - he also
> took the Tech and General prior to that. The material on each test is
> different, with later tests building on the material in the earlier tests.
> To cover the same material an Extra has covered today ("similar
> difficulty"), your new test would have to include the material covered in
> all three current tests (with over 120 questions in one sitting). So, are
> you advocating that, advocating some type of reduced content test (less
> questions), or did you simply forget the material on the first two tests?

Well said, Dwight. Everything is built on what went before it. So now what sounded kind of easy is not so easy. Someone here, perhaps Jim, pointed out how the Extra license tests did not address RF safety much if at all. But wait! the Class B tests are apparently not going to address RF safety either because the power is limited to a "safe" amount. So now safety related learning is confined to the second test for class A.

Dat's gonna be one big test!

- Mike KB3EIA -

3821. Re: Where Did THIS Come From...?!?!a

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-05 14:51:45 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0312050651.4642472f@posting.google.com>
Source record: 83547

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<JQ3zb.1321$Oe5.1121@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> "Steve Robeson, K4CAP" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:5c01b95b.0312012005.49d2f5ac@posting.google.com...

> Excuse me Steve, but I don't remember the Jews of Europe, in the pre NAZI
> days, sending in human bombs. Or shooting at soldiers, or declaring that
> Isreal has no right to exist.
>
> I think your compairison is flawed.
>
> Israel has no choice but to fight. If they do not they will indeed cease to
> exist.

Perhaps it was an unbalanced comparison, Dan, but there's several
things that rub me the wrong way.

The first is that the State of Israel was formed, for the most
part, by people who we not born there. They came, they saw, they took
what they wanted and the natives were just "S.O.L.". Yes...I know
this is the same way the US evolved, but it still doesn't make it
right.

Secondly, the State of Israel is no stranger to spreading a bit
of terror around itself. If you doubt me, do a bit of research on the
Likud Party and one of it's more famous members, Menachim Begin.
Before he got himself elected Prime Minister and invited to break
bread at Camp David, ole Menachim took some special pleasure in
dispatching Palestinians and British alike. Some of the "tactics" you
may recognize as those that the State of Isreal currently cries foul
over now...

Lastly, the Israelis, in my opinion anyway, still have a lot of
explaining to do for the way they do business with their "friends",
specifically us and the USS Liberty affair. Thier "misidentification"
story still doesn't wash.

My point is this...there's a circle of violence that is occuring
in the Middle East...it's been going on since prehistoric times and
will probably continue until the sun goes nova, so we ought to cut our
losses and leave them to thier lifestyle. They'd not know how to act
any other way.

Our only valid interest in that region is maintaining the
petroleum flow and free navigation via the Suez Canal. If geological
studies are correct, Russia has petroleum reserves that exceed

anything the Arabs have, so I think rather than sending arms to Israel and money to the Arabs, we should be investing our engineering resources farther north. The Arabs would go broke which would relegate them back to bedouin tents in a generation. No money means no guns, and the Israelis would no longer need OUR weapons.

Of course that would tick off the Germans who'd be selling a lot fewer Mercedes and Audis, but they'd make up the slack on the back end selling them in Moscow ! ! !

73

Steve, K4YZ

3822. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-05 14:59:35 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <r31Ab.319$7p2.81@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 83548

"Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote

>
> Dat's gonna be one big test!
>

Back when I took the Extra exam it had 100 questions. Seems about right to
me.

73, de Hans, K0HB

3823. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-05 15:18:27 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <7I1Ab.335$7p2.123@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 83549

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote

> To cover the same material an Extra has covered today ("similar
> difficulty"), your new test would have to include the material covered in
> all three current tests (with over 120 questions in one sitting).

I expect it would be a longer test than todays Extra, but probably not 120 questions (since some things, like band segments for example, would be the same as for the learner-permit level), and perhaps not necessarily in one sitting -- could be structured to be taken in 2 (or 3?) sessions for those who are intimidated by lengthy exams or have weak bladders.

My Extra exam was 100 questions. You were allowed 3.5 hours to complete it.

73, de Hans, K0HB

3824. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-05 15:34:10 UTC
From: Alun <alun@1stcounsel.com>
Message-ID: <Xns94486B829910Belektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 83550

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in
news:9xQzb.13921$P%1.12995789@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com:

>
> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20031201055840.12631.00003129@mb-m28.aol.com...
>> In article <Xns94442777C95Eelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun
>> <alun@1stcounsel.com> writes:
>>
>> >I think you're missing the point. I took _code_ tests to get _phone_
>> >subbands. There's no logic in that. Never was, even from the
>> >beginning.
>>
>> Sure there is. Here it is, though you may argue that it doesn't hold
>> much water today:
>>
>
> In addition, anyone one who thinks they took the code tests to get
> phone subbands isn't really viewing it from the right perspective
> anyway. The code test, as well as the additional writtens, was to get
> HF privileges or should have been. It happens that phone privileges
> are included when one earns HF privileges.
>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>
>

It's only the wrong perspective because it's not your perspective

3825. Dem boyz fum 3865

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-05 15:44:20 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <oJ1Ab.360$7p2.95@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 83401
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Ooops. I finger-faulted that. The correct URL is http://tinyurl.com/xtuj

Enjoy.

de Hans, K0HB

3826. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-05 17:19:25 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0312050919.61f73a0a@posting.google.com>
Source record: 83402

"Kim" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote in message news:<bqonu2$5do@library2.airnews.net>...
> "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
> news:9xQzb.13921$P%1.12995789@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
> >
> > "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> > news:20031201055840.12631.00003129@mb-m28.aol.com...
> > > In article <Xns94442777C95Eelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun
> > > <alun@1stcounsel.com> writes:
> > >
> > > >I think you're missing the point. I took _code_ tests to get _phone_
> > > >subbands. There's no logic in that. Never was, even from the beginning.
> > >
> > > Sure there is. Here it is, though you may argue that it doesn't hold
> much
> water
> > > today:
> > >
> >
> > In addition, anyone one who thinks they took the code tests to get phone
> > subbands isn't really viewing it from the right perspective anyway. The
> > code test, as well as the additional writtens, was to get HF privileges or
> > should have been. It happens that phone privileges are included when one
> > earns HF privileges.
> >
> > Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
> >
>
> I endured the study of and took the test for CW *just* for the phone
> privleges on 10M, specifically to join in on a nightly ragchew with a whole
> bunch of local folks--which is no longer going on but it was neat while it
> did. That is the *only* reason I did anything involving CW. So, you can
> word it any way you want, Dee, but what compels one person to work with CW
> at all, may not be what compels someone else.

Exactly!

And consider this:

I know hams who "endured" the study and *written* tests for the
Technician, General, Advanced and Extra, because they wanted the
CW/data privileges. (Code test was no problem for them).

Hans' proposal would cause all new hams to "endure" the study for and
taking of a written test just to *keep* an amateur license beyond 10
years.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3827. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-05 17:31:34 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <IqudnSwaG4XVXE2i4p2dnA@gbronline.com>
Source record: 83403

Mike Coslo wrote:

> I still think there is a fundamental problem I have with Morse code
> - although I have come a long way, the effort I have to put in compared
> to what others apparently have to do is nothing short of phenomenal. A
> half hour at lunch, another half hour to an hour in the evening, 6 days
> a week, and I am still struggling. I know I am nowhere near stupid, and
> I've tried enough different methods to know that there is something
> somewhere that makes my brain process sounds a bit differently than
> those that find Morse easy.
>
> But in most matters, I am one of those steely nerved types, and
> consider myself too dumb to panic.
>
> But, I persevere! I'm starting to catch whole words on the air (at
> faster speeds) now, and it is exciting, despite my whining about it!

It's like anything else, some things come easy for some people, some things don't.

3828. Re: Where Did THIS Come From...?!?!a

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-05 17:50:39 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <Pz3Ab.370$Ho3.320@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 83404

"Steve Robeson, K4CAP" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
news:5c01b95b.0312050651.4642472f@posting.google.com...
> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<JQ3zb.1321$Oe5.1121@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> > "Steve Robeson, K4CAP" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
> > news:5c01b95b.0312012005.49d2f5ac@posting.google.com...
>
> > Excuse me Steve, but I don't remember the Jews of Europe, in the pre
NAZI
> > days, sending in human bombs. Or shooting at soldiers, or declaring
that
> > Isreal has no right to exist.
> >
> > I think your compairison is flawed.
> >
> > Israel has no choice but to fight. If they do not they will indeed
cease to
> > exist.
>
> Perhaps it was an unbalanced comparison, Dan, but there's several
> things that rub me the wrong way.
>
> The first is that the State of Israel was formed, for the most
> part, by people who we not born there. They came, they saw, they took
> what they wanted and the natives were just "S.O.L.". Yes...I know
> this is the same way the US evolved, but it still doesn't make it
> right.

Your right, what you say don't make it right. However what really happened
was the UN, by RESOLUTION created the state of Israel. It was carved out
of Palestine which was being vacated by the British. This was about 1947.
Of course the fine ragheads were trying to kill all the Jews before that
happened.
Remember our fine friends over there now...the Jordanians? They were
marching on the Jews as the Brits left. And if the truth be known the
reason Jordan had the butt is they wanted to be in charge of the Jews, i.e.
part of the Kingdom of Jordan. And really didn't want the palestinians
anyway. Just like today. Except they don't want to be in charge, they
just hope the Jews don't get the arse and come over and kick theirs. Ah
how times have changed.

>
> Secondly, the State of Israel is no stranger to spreading a bit
> of terror around itself. If you doubt me, do a bit of research on the
> Likud Party and one of it's more famous members, Menachim Begin.

> Before he got himself elected Prime Minister and invited to break
> bread at Camp David, ole Menachim took some special pleasure in
> dispatching Palestinians and British alike. Some of the "tactics" you
> may recognize as those that the State of Isreal currently cries foul
> over now...

I never claimed the Isralies were sheep or Mr. Nice Guy. You fight fire
with fire, period. It must work....Israel is still here and stronger than
ever.

>
> Lastly, the Israelis, in my opinion anyway, still have a lot of
> explaining to do for the way they do business with their "friends",
> specifically us and the USS Liberty affair. Thier "misidentification"
> story still doesn't wash.

Agreed.

>
> My point is this...there's a circle of violence that is occuring
> in the Middle East...it's been going on since prehistoric times and
> will probably continue until the sun goes nova, so we ought to cut our
> losses and leave them to thier lifestyle. They'd not know how to act
> any other way.

No arguement here.

>
> Our only valid interest in that region is maintaining the
> petroleum flow and free navigation via the Suez Canal. If geological
> studies are correct, Russia has petroleum reserves that exceed
> anything the Arabs have, so I think rather than sending arms to Israel
> and money to the Arabs, we should be investing our engineering
> resources farther north. The Arabs would go broke which would
> relegate them back to bedouin tents in a generation. No money means
> no guns, and the Israelis would no longer need OUR weapons.

Good theory.....but the Israelis don't need OUR weapons. They have their
own.

>
> Of course that would tick off the Germans who'd be selling a lot
> fewer Mercedes and Audis, but they'd make up the slack on the back end
> selling them in Moscow ! ! !
>
> 73
>
> Steve, K4YZ

3829. Amateur Radio Newsline(tm) Report 1373 - December 5, 2003

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-05 19:43:03 UTC
From: radionews@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031205144303.01603.00000171@mb-m20.aol.com>
Source record: 83405

Amateur Radio Newsline(tm) Report 1373 - December 5, 2003

Closed Circuit Advisory

This is a closed-circuit advisory, and is not for re-transmission. Repeat, not for broadcast.

This is Andy Jarema, N6TCQ, Newsline Support Fund Administrator. As we move into the holiday season, we ask that you include Newsline on your list of giving. This is the first request we've made since April, and we'll be back in the following weeks to thank everyone that helped in that campaign. But with support in the months since that campaign only averaging between $200 and $250, and with our normal monthly expenses of between $600 and $800 each month to bring you the latest news on Amateur Radio, you can see where the math is headed.

The address for the Newsline Support Fund is Newsline, PO Box 660937, Arcadia, CA 91066. If you missed that, it will be given again at the end of today's newscast. And now the latest news:

**

Amateur Radio Newsline report number 1373 with a release date of Friday, December 5, 2003 to follow in 5-4-3-2-1.

The following is a Q-S-T. Hams in space fail to show up for a highly publicized operating event while hams on the ground save a life. Find out the details on Amateur Radio Newsline report number 1373 coming your way right now.

(Billboard Cart Here)

**

ON THE AIR: ISS ASTRO-HAMS A NO-SHOW FOR K6DUE COMMEMORATIVE EVENT.

What if you planned a party but your host never showed up to open the door and turn on the music. This is essentially what happened to the ARISS folks the weekend of November 29th and 30th in regard to the kickoff of its NA1SS special event tribute to the life of Roy Neal, K6DUE. But it was not completely unexpected. Amateur Radio Newsline's Norm Seeley, KI7UP, has the rest of the story:

The event was to get underway on Saturday, November 29th during as the space station passed over the US West Coast. ARISS International Chairman Frank Bauer, KA3HDO, says that Expedition 8 Commander Mike

Foale, KB5UAC, had even been supplied with a list of potentially good radio passes and the frequencies where to call the I-S-S had been published world wide a few weeks ago. Stations on the ground were even asked to keep their Q-S-O's as brief as possible so that the greatest number of hams possible could make contact with the space travelers.

And so it was that hams world wide were ready to honor K6DUE by making contact with the station in space that his years of effort helped to create. But over the entire weekend there were no reports of voice contacts with either Foale or his crewmate Alex Kaleri, U8MIR. Nor was the RS0ISS automated packet robot station activated either.

Why the crew was a no-show remains a mystery. Frank Bauer is certain that Foale knew about the event. In fact a message was received from KB5UAC that said he would try to be on the air for about 2 passes each weekend of December for the event. Bauer also received confirmation that final information regarding this past weekend was uplinked to the ISS crew on Friday, November 28th.

Bauer says that ARISS has discussed the situation with NASA. He says that there are two events that could have kept Foale from getting on the air. The first revolves around a broken exercise treadmill that KB5UAC reportedly spent a lot of his own time fixing this past weekend. The other is the widely reported crushing noise heard by the crew last week. It was in the aft end of the Service Module and its possible that the crew might have gotten instructions from the Russian team to determine the cause. This is being checked out.

Either way, Bauer reminds everyone that last weekend was only the kickoff and that the event commemorating K6DUE's contributions to manned ham radio space operations and that the event continues through the end of the month. He also says that ARISS will alert the ham radio community of potential opportunities for contacts as they become available.

For the Amateur Radio Newsline, Norm Seeley, KI7UP, in Scottsdale, Arizona for the Amateur Radio Newsline.

--

It should be noted that when it made the original announcement several weeks ago, ARISS said that crew participation in the event was completely contingent on the schedule of the on-orbit duties and other issues that might crop up on board the orbiting space station. (ARISS)

**

RESCUE RADIO: LA HAMS ASSIST CARDIAC VICTIM

Ham radio has helped to save the life of one of its own. This, as members of a Southern California repeater respond to a users call for assistance. Amateur Radio Newsline's Mert Garlick, N6AWE, has the details:

--
Almost every ham has heard of the Los Angeles 147.435 MHz repeater. Some call it notorious. Others have given it the nickname of "the animal farm" for the lack of discipline of its users. But on Sunday night, November 23rd, some of the tarnish turned to silver as bad manners gave way to human kindness and a life was saved.

--
Elmer: "We were all sitting around and listening to the radio as we usually do in an evening. All of the sudden, an individual keyed up a microphone whom we were all aware was having some health problems. One of our listeners, Alan Sanchez, KC6QXA, immediately noticed the distress in this persons vloice. He keyed up the mic and asked if he was OK. He indicated he was having some difficulty breathing and needed help. So, Alan immediately called Faith Gonzales who said to call 911 immediately because she was also very familiar with thisd gentlemans health problems
--

That's Gary Elmer is KG6DVO. He recently took over the system. And according to Elmer, the work of his users did not end there. While medical aid was in route, Mike Stavropoulos, KD6JTD, headed over to where the stricken ham lives. He helped him get up, opened the security gate for the paramedics and directed them to the apartment. Mike then followed the ambulance to the hospital and filled medics in on the hams condition.

Later that evening, the hospitalized ham went into cardiac arrest. He was revived by his doctors. Had he been at home the chances are that he would now be a silent key now. Gary Elmer says that he is very proud of his users:

--

Elmer: "You know we like to tear it up and cut up, and have a good time. And you know that some people might of the fun we have. And yes, we have been in trouble with the FCC, but you know, when called upon, we too can rise to the occasion as evidenced by the actions of those three amateurs the other night."

--

As we go to air Elmer says that the ham is still in the hospital recovering. More important he is alive thanks to his friends on the Los Angeles 147.435 MHz repeater.

For the Amateur Radio Newsline, I'm Mert Garlick, N6AWE, also in the City of Angels.

--

In past years the Los Angeles 4-3-5 repeater has received a lot of negative press. This time the press is positive because this time it and its users probably saved a life. (ARNewsline(tm))

**

COORDINATION: REVISED SOCAL 2-METER BANDPLAN NEARING APPROVAL

Still in the Golden state, December 6th was the date set for a vote on a revised 2 Meter bandplan proposed by TASMA, Southern California's Two Meter Area Spectrum Management Association. Amateur Radio Newslines Bruce Tennant, K6PZW, gives us a sneak peak:

--

Among the problems the revised bandplan seeks to correct is recognition of the work of neighboring coordination councils. TASMA has always officially acknowledged the Northern Amateur Relay Council of California, but not those serving the states of Arizona and Nevada. California shares borders and R-F with those states and the revised TASMA bandplan will provide for such political recognition.

Also to be considered will be frequency assignments for specific modes and updating the recognized manned space operations listings. This to conform the Southern California bandplan with the world in relation to current Amateur Radio International Space Station operations.

This revised plan is the product of 2 years of hard work by the regional coordination body written with significant input from the areas Amateur Radio community. It already received a thorough public review at the 2003 ARRL Southwestern Division Convention last September.

For the Amateur Radio Newsline, I'm Bruce Tennant, K6PZW, in Los Angeles.

--

For more information please visit www.tasma.org. (TASMA, ARRL SW Commuinicator)

**

Break 1

We are the Amateur Radio Newsline, heard on bulletin stations around the world including the W6JW repeater serving Santa Clarita California.

(5 sec pause here)

**

RESTRUCTURING - SOUTH AFRICA: PROPOSED CHANGES TO LICENSE REQUIREMENTS AND PRIVILEGES

Another nation has taken the first steps in restructuring its Amateur Radio service. We have this report on what South Africa has done so far in welcoming codefree operations:

--

South Africa is taking a look at how to handle the question of Morse code testing until such time as it goes away and it looks as if it has an answer. It comes in a proposal to lower the Morse requirement from 12 to 5 words per minute. That is until applicants for the South African Zed U license will no longer need be tested for proficiency in Morse code.

Also proposed is the introduction of a new license class with the callsign prefix ZT. This license will not have any Morse code requirement. Rather, the holders of ZT licenses would have full VHF privileges and will be permitted to transmit with a maximum power output of 100 W on portions of the 160, 80, 40 and 15 meter bands.

For the Amateur Radio Newsline, I'm Ken Locke, N8PJN.

--

This interim solution would hold in South Africa until a final disposition on the future of Morse testing is made by that nations telecommunications regulators. (Q-News)

**

THE VEC PROGRAM: NEW GENERAL CLASS QUESTION POOL RELEASED

If you are planning to take a United States General Class written exam after next July 1st or know someone who is, then listen up. On and after that date tests will be based on a new set of questions just released by the Question Pool Committee of the National Conference of Volunteer Examiner Coordinators.

According to a news release from the committee, changeinclude the number of questions increased to 432 and release pf the pool in both Microsoft Word and ASCII text formats with no graphic files. Look for the new questions in cyberspace at www.arrl.org/arrlvec/pools.html. (W4WW, NCVEC)

**

RADIO LAW: COMPLAINT LEVELS TO FCC RISE

The United States FCC has released a report on the inquiries and complaints processed by its Consumer & Governmental Affairs Bureau during the third quarter of 2003. According to the report complaint activity increased within all major areas except cable during the third quarter.

The largest increase occurred within Radio and Broadcasting where a total of 19,920 indecency and obscenity complaints were received. Complaint activity was also higher in all five top wireless categories, with the largest percentage increases coming in the service quality and equipment section. Its all in cyberspace at http://hraunfoss.fcc.gov/edocs_public/attachmatch/DOC-241435A1.doc (CGC)

**

ENFORCEMENT: YET ANOTHER TOWER FINE

The fines for tower related violations continue. The latest is an $8000 fine issued to the Barinowski Investment Company, L P. Barinowski is the owner of a tower located near Savannah, Georgia. It was cited for failure to clean and repaint its antenna structure to maintain good visibility. (FCC)

**

EMERGING TECHNOLOGY: NET-BY-PHONE NOW PLAYS MP3

The HandiHams say that there is now an MP3 file playback feature on the Net-By-Phone service that allows blind users who do not own a computer to access the Internet. This, by using a plain old vanilla telephone.

By way of example, a Net-By-Phone user accessing a website like Amateur Radio Newsline that has a link to an MP3 file can hear that file over the phone by simply selecting it. The system does not play the file right away, but it will download the file in the background and send you an e-mail when it is ready. When you retrieve the e-mail, the file will automatically play, just as a voice e-mail from a Net-By-Phone customer plays automatically.

Net-By-Phone is located in Chicago and is a fee based subscription service. You can find out more on the web at www.net-by-phone.com or call the toll free demonstration line at 1-800-358-7858. (HandiHams)

**

HAM TRAINING: TRAIN THE TRAINER

49 youngsters are now licensed hams and are the newest members of Pennsylvania's Trinity High School Radio Club. This, thanks to a program called "Train the Trainer" by Pete Di Volpi, K3PD, a teacher named Sean Barnes, N3JQ and the Harrisburg Radio Amateurs Club V-E Team.

TheTrinity High School Radio Club operators station KB3JAG. Barnes started the radio club so lower classmen could get exposure to the hobby before they attend his physics class. He notes that the schools physics program and the principals of amateur radio teend to integrate very well.

The Harrisburg Radio Amateurs Club is a Special Services club in central Pennsylvania. It has only 100 members, but has seen over 100 new licensees produced in the last two years from their V-E and Train the Trainer programs. Teachers that are interested in Sean Barnes curriculum can e-mail him to SeanBarnesPolo@aol.com (W3UU, K3PD)

**

HAMFESTS AND CONVENTIONS: FT.TUTHILL BECOMES WILLIAMS HAMFEST

The Ft. Tuthill Arizona hamfest has changed its name, its location and its date. Now the Williams Hamfest and ARRL Arizona State Convention, this premiere event will be held next July 2nd to the 4th, at the Williams Rodeo Grounds, Williams Arizona.

According to a news release from Mark Keshauer, N7KKQ, the move means that the hamfest sponsors can provide lower fees for tailgaters and campers, bigger spaces, a fireworks display and free admission. Most important, the famed Saturday night B-B-Q which is a staple of this show -- will continue. Sorry, that's not free but is among the best feeds found at any hamfest in the United States.

More information is on-line at www.arca-az.org/arca/images/press%20release (N7KKQ)

**

HAMVENTION 2004: THE YEAR OF THE CONTACT

Hamvention planners have announced that the theme for 2004 will be the "Year of the Contact," and they are starting out by improving their own. Amateur Radio Newsline's Bill Pasternak, WA6ITF, has the details:

--
According to Hamvention General Chairman Gary Des Combes, N-8-E-M-O, his team has been making numerous changes to the shows web site, This, so that things like exhibits, general admission ticket sales and Flea Market spaces can be handled on line and the necessary forms simply downloaded.

And yes, we did say Flea Market rather than Outside Exhibits. As regular listeners know, a number of years ago the Hamvention made the name change to Outside Exhibits. Only one problem. The ham radio public never bought in to that new upscale title.

Hams have always referred to the Hamvention Flea Market as -- well -- the Flea Market. So, taking a cue from the many radio amateurs who have responded to the Hamvention request for input, show planners have gone back to the future. Des Combes says that as of now, the Flea Market is the Flea Market, once again.

Gary Des Combes tells Amateur Radio Newsline that this is only the first of a number of "Going Back to the Future" changes that the public has asked for and that they will get. In fact, "Going Back to the Future" will be a sub theme during Hamvention 2004.

The dates are next May 14th to the 16th. The location is the HARA Arena in Trotwood Ohio just outside the city of Dayton.

For the Amateur Radio Newsline, I'm Bill Pasternak, WA6ITF, reporting.

--

Lots more information is on-line at www.hamvention.org. (Hamventionr)

**

BREAK 2

This is ham radio news for today's radio amateur. From the United States of America, We are the Amateur Radio Newsline with links to the world from our only official website at www.arnewsline.org and being relayed by the volunteer services of the following radio amateur:

(5 sec pause here)

**

HAMS HELPING: THE NORTH POLE NETWORK

The holiday season brings hams a great opportunity. What better way could there be to introduce hospitalized children and their families to the magic of Amateur Radio--and to spread holiday cheer--than to arrange to have Santa visit them via Amateur Radio? Newsline's Joe Moell, K0OV, tells us about the North Pole Network.

--

Kids at Childrens Hospital of Orange County get holiday visits from clowns, carolers, firemen, baseball players and rock stars. But nobody is more welcome and anticipated than the ten Amateur Radio operators who arrive on the weekend just before Christmas. They come to establish a special ham radio link that makes it possible for patients to talk directly to the "real" Santa in his office next to the big toy workshop at the North Pole.

Members of the Hospital Disaster Support Communications System have been visiting children and adults in Orange County hospitals for over 25 years, and we think there's no better way than this to spread holiday cheer while showing our hobby in the best possible light.

Will your club be part of the North Pole network this year? If so, we have some suggestions for you. For instance, personalize each QSO. It would be easy to just put the mike in front of a little girl and instruct her to tell Santa her name and where she lives. But imagine how much better the QSO will be if Santa calls her by name right from the start. He's Santa Claus, so he should know! Before each year's North Pole Network session begins, the hospital therapists provide our North Pole station with the list of names for every room and bed, along with plenty of other tidbits about the kids that make good conversation starters for Santa.

You'll find lots of other hints for your best North Pole Network ever at our group's special Web site. The URL is long, but you can get to it with one click from the Hospital Disaster Support Communications System site at www.hdscs.org

The most important hint we have for you is: Don't miss the miracles. Every year, we have had at least one extra-special encounter that astonished families, staff and the hams. In a Santa QSO, children have spoken for the first time following brain trauma. Fevers have broken shortly after North Pole Network visits. A head injury patient started

to eat after being encouraged to do so by Santa, and so forth. We don't know exactly how much the personal contact with Father Christmas has aided in patients' recoveries, but we are always grateful that our hobby can add a little joy and holiday spirit to patients and their families.

Again, the Web spot to visit is HDSCS.org, short for Hospital Disaster Support Communications System. From southern California, this is Joe Moell Kay-zero-Oscar-Victor for Amateur Radio Newsline.

--

More on this and other ham radio holiday activities in the coming weeks. (K0OV, ARNewsline(tm))

**

INTERNATIONAL - AUSTRALIA: VK2BVS HONORED BY VK PRIME MINISTER

Australia's Prime Minister John Howard and Foreign Minister Alexander Downer expresses gratitude for Australian ham radio training in developing countries. This, by way of a certificate sent to Sam Voron VK2BVS in which the Australian Government expresses its gratitude to Voron for a valued contribution towards assisting developing countries to reduce poverty and achieve sustainable development.

The honor was bestowed on Voron for the six months he spent in Somalia where he organized an Amateur Radio training course. In addition to Howard and Downer, the certificate was signed by Dr. Brendan Nelson who is a member of Australia's Parliamentary House of Representatives. (QRZ.COM)

**

INTERNATIONAL - SWEDEN: NEW PAN-EUROPEN TV SHOW ON ITS WAY

Ham radio in Europe will soon have a TV show of its own. Jeramy Boot, G4NJH, is in Nottingham, the UK, with the rest of the story:

--
The Swedish-based 'Club-TV' wishes to establish a monthly amateur radio magazine programme to be transmitted via digital satellite TV to most of Europe. Club-TV wants to cover all aspects of amateur radio and thinks there is a number of amateurs around Europe who can handle a video camera and edit the result.

Videos of 10 to 20 minutes would be perfect. There is no cost involved other than the tape as the broadcasts receive commercial sponsorship.

During the past year Club-TV has carried out a number of tests and broadcast a couple of programmes. The transmission is via the Sirius 2 satellite at 5 degrees East with a Symbol Rate of 6667 and FEC 1/2.

Jeramy boot, G4NJH.

--

Jeramy says that inquiries go to Ben Jockert, SM6CKU, by e-mail to sm6cku@parabolic.se. (GB2RS)

**

ON THE AIR: NEW VHF/UHF PROPAGATION BEACONS NEAR ATLANTA

Back in the United States, Gary Bailey, WA4IOB, invites VHF operators to listen for his new 2 meter and 70 centimeter beacons. The transmitter are located in grid E M 73 near Snellville, Georgia about 25 miles east of Atlanta. The mode is CW on 144.285 MHz and 432.352 MHz with 2 watts output on each band. The 2 meter transmitter feeds a horizontal square loop. The 70-centimeter antenna is 4 half wave dipoles in a 90-degree horizontal quadrature configuration feedwith a 4-way power splitter. Both sign the call B B B W-A-4-I-O-B slash E M 73. Signal reports go to grb734@bellsouth.net (VHF Reflector)

**

DX

In D-X, LA5RIA will be active as JW5RIA from Bear Island until June of JW5RIA will operate on 160 to 6 metres CW, SSB and digital modes. Q-S-L as directed on the air. (RSGB)

Also, eight American operators are active from Christmas Island, East Kiribati, until the 7th of December. Call signs to listen for are T32MP, T32WW, and several others on all bands using all modes. They will have three stations with amplifiers and a large selection of antennas to pipe their signals worldwide. (RSGB)

**

THAT FINAL ITEM: A KILLER RENEWAL

And finally this week, the story of a ham who might have a hard time attending a license renewal hearing. Thats because he is in jail. Amateur Radio Newsline's Don Wilbanks, AE5DW, has more:

--

According to the ARRL Letter, the FCC has issued an Order to Show Cause to a Texas ham who is currently serving a 32-year prison sentence for the 1996 murder of his wife. The order released November 21st is the governments opening salvo in a hearing process that could end with the revocation of the Advanced class license of Roger Thomas Scaggs, W-5-E-B-C.

The FCC says that Scaggs' murder conviction raises very serious questions as to whether he possesses the requisite character qualifications to remain a Commission licensee. It also causes the agency to question whether his license should be revoked.

Scaggs is 64. He apparently was able to renew his ham ticket in the spring of 1998. This is the same year in which he was later convicted of murdering his wife. The FCC granted Scaggs' application for an

administrative update. In this case, apparently a change of address from Austin to Gatesville, Texas.

The FCC only recently became aware of Scaggs' murder conviction, which could keep him behind bars at least until he's 75. Assuming that Scaggs indicates that he will appear for or be represented at a formal hearing, the FCC will follow up with a Hearing Designation Order.

The session itself will be held before an Administrative Law Judge and would consider evidence concerning the effect of Scaggs' felony conviction on his qualifications to remain an FCC licensee. If no action is taken Scaggs license will next expire in 2008.

For the Amateur Radio Newsline, I'm Don Wilbanks, AE5DW, in New Orleans.

--

Scaggs was given the customary 30 days to let the FCC know whether he plans to appear at the hearing. (ARRL)

**

NEWSCAST CLOSE

With thanks to Alan Labs, AMSAT, the ARRL, the CGC Communicator, CQ Magazine, the FCC, the Ohio Penn DX Bulletin, Radio Netherlands, Rain, the RSGB and Australia's Q-News, that's all from the Amateur Radio Newsline(tm). Our e-mail address is newsline @arnewsline.org. More information is available at Amateur Radio Newsline's(tm) only official website located at www.arnewsline.org. You can also write to us or support us at Amateur Radio Newsline(tm), P.O. Box 660937, Arcadia, California 91066.

For now, with Bill Pasternak, WA6ITF, at the editors desk, I'm Jim Meachen, ZL2BHF, saying 73 and we thank you for listening. Amateur Radio Newsline(tm) is Copyright 2003. All rights reserved.

3830. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-05 23:34:40 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <kC8Ab.14060$P%1.13149912@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 83406

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:FnTzb.4691$Oe5.1207@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net...
>
> "Dee D. Flint" wrote:
> >
> > So please cite the statistical data that shows
> > people have had enough exposure to Morse
> > code to be able to evaluate it even though
> > they don't know it.
>
>
> I'll tell you what, Dee. You show me where such statistical data is
> collected and I'll cite it for you. Until then, it is clear that my
comments
> were nothing more than opinions. Of course, you knew that before
responding.
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

You made a statement that most people had such exposure and while I naturally knew that was only your opinion, you stated it as if it were a fact. Therefore I was justified in asking you to provide the data to support that statement.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

3831. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-05 23:37:51 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <jF8Ab.14063$P%1.13150417@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 83407

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:h%Tzb.9134$zL1.2061837@news1.news.adelphia.net...
>
> But, I persevere! I'm starting to catch whole words on the air (at
> faster speeds) now, and it is exciting, despite my whining about it!
>

That puts you ahead of me. I still don't catch whole words just the individual letters and catch the letters as they come. There are some exceptions to that though. "CQ" and "CQ TEST" come through immediately as words.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

3832. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-05 23:40:50 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <6I8Ab.14064$P%1.13150979@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 83408

"Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:bqplut$inf@library1.airnews.net...
> "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
> news:FnTzb.4691$Oe5.1207@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> >
> > "Dee D. Flint" wrote:
> > >
> > > So please cite the statistical data that shows
> > > people have had enough exposure to Morse
> > > code to be able to evaluate it even though
> > > they don't know it.
> >
> >
> > I'll tell you what, Dee. You show me where such statistical data is
> > collected and I'll cite it for you. Until then, it is clear that my
> comments
> > were nothing more than opinions. Of course, you knew that before
> responding.
> >
> >
> > Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
> >
> > http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
> >
>
> The angle of argument that Dee is trying to use is old, tired and
yawn....
>
> Kim W5TIT

No Kim it is not. He made a statement as if it were fact rather than his personal opinion that most people had had exposure to Morse code. I challenged him to prove it. This is standard operating procedure in debate. Since he is the originator of the statement, then in a debate, he must be prepared to back it with facts. That the subject here is Morse code does not negate debate procedures even if he wishes it did.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

3833. Re: It ain't about the test.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-05 23:55:49 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <9W8Ab.670$Ho3.628@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 83409

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20031205064424.25815.00004912@mb-m07.aol.com...
> In article <3FCFDD49.9080908@ix.netcom.com>, Robert Casey
> <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> writes:
>
> >>And it raises the question of "why should hams have to know all sorts
> >>of theory stuff when the original reason for that knowledge is largely
> >>gone"
> >>
> >Well, the FCC allows us to build and modify equipment for use on the ham
> >bands, and it would be a good idea if we know what we are doing.
>
> Sure.
>
> Just like how the FCC allows us to send and receive Morse code on the ham
> bands, and it would be a good idea if we know what we are doing.

Bzzt, passing a code test is NOT required to use morse code
on ALL ham bands. A "no-code" tech is free touse morse
at whatever speed or skill level (or lack of skill level) one
wants to. I have no recollection of anyone ever being cited by
the FCC for "sloppy" or too slow a code speed. Have you?

> >At least be able to recognize
> >things like wrong frequency (like out of band), severe harmonics,
> >splatter, TVI, and such.
>
> Sure.
>
> Just like being at least be able to recognize most of the 43 symbols of
the
> Morse Code when sent at the very slow speed of 5 wpm.

That isn't a requirement in terms of actual use of morse.

> >Cell phone users don't have licenses, but they're not allowed to
> >modify their equipment either. Same for CBers. A CBer isn't supposed to
> >modify his radio to
> >operate on 10m, but a ham could.
>
> Yet they often do just that.

You know anyone that modified their cellphone? CBs we know about,
cellphones...I doubt it.

> >It becomes a "ham radio set" and no
> >longer a "CB set".
> >If and when the FCC says "no homebrewing or modifying, off the shelf
> >'type accepted'
> >rigs only, then the theory requirement gets weaker.
>
> Usually such modifications require the high level of technical skill
required
> to cut the blue wire or crush diode D17....
>
> And such modifications are not mandatory at all. Most hams today use
certified
> equipment, do they not?

Certified against what?

> Which is more common on the amateur HF bands: hams using
homebrew/seriously
> modified equipment, or hams using Morse code?
>
> Do you really think the written exams adequately test whether a ham can
build
> or modify amateur radio equipment - particularly considering the wide
range of
> bands, modes and technologies usable by hams?

Did the novice test, even in 1960 adequuately do that? I say no, yet
those novices were also free to "homebrew" or build it themselves.

> >I doubt the FCC
> >would ever do
> >that, as one of our reasons for existing is to encourage learning about
> >radio and
> >electronics.
> >
> IMHO they've been gradually watering down the theory tests for over 25
years.

Frankly, the General test of 1960 wasn't all that theory difficult. Many of
us just memorized some formulas and some circuit diagrams.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

3834. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-05 23:59:02 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <aZ8Ab.673$Ho3.149@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 83410

"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
news:c2356669.0312040916.727354fd@posting.google.com...
> Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
news:<3FCCF123.70308@ix.netcom.com>...
> > N2EY wrote:
> >
> > >In article <3FCBAF87.5080802@ix.netcom.com>, Robert Casey
> > ><wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> writes:
>
> > >>N2EY wrote:
>
> > >>>These are the number of unexpired FCC ARS
> > >>>licenses held by individuals on the dates listed:
>
> > >>>As of May 14, 2000:
>
> > >>Why select May 14th 2000?
> > >
> > >Two reasons:
> > >
> > >1) I happened to have those numbers recorded
> > >
> > >2) By that date, it's reasonable to expect that all of the backlog from
before
> > >the April 15 changes had gone through FCC.
> > >
> > >>Restructuring took effect a month
> > >>earlier. I upgraded from tech + to extra on April 15, 2000 and
> > >>the paperwork reached the FCC just a few days later the next week.
> > >>Thus I would show up as an extra in the May 14th 2000. If your
> > >>objective is to show the effects of restructuring, you need to list
> > >>the numbers for April14, 2000.
>
> > >>
> > >If you have them, I'll show them.
> >
> > >
> > Okay, that makes sense, especially reason #2. There would be some
> > cross leakage, but probably not enough to matter in determining long
term
> > trends.
>
> Yep. One can look at the AH0A site for monthly numbers as well.
>

> FCC and the various VECs got pretty backlogged around then, too. Some
> folks didn't see actual database changes for a few weeks.
> >
> > PS, I don't have the numbers myself, but as you mentioned, they would
miss
> > the backlog of activity before April 15th.
>
> Yup. I know a bunch of hams who strove to upgrade *before* April 15,
> for various reasons (such as getting an Advanced before they were gone
> forever).
>
> What I find interesting is how *little* the numbers have changed in
> almost 4 years. For example, at the end of March, 2000, there were a
> little over 103,000 Advanceds. Now there's something over 80,000, even
> though the 20 wpm code test is gone. In similar fashion, look how many
> Tech Pluses still exist despite the fact that they need never take
> another code test, and that many of them already have credit for the
> General written as well. And FCC has been renewing Tech Plus as Tech
> since April 15, 2000, too.
>
> IOW, perhaps the code test wasn't the "barrier" it was proclaimed to
> be.

Good thing I never made the argument about code testing
being a barrier. I have always strictly viewed the code test
as simply no longer necessary as a test requirement.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

3835. Re: Bush Thrills Troops, Hillary Doesn't

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-06 01:10:40 UTC
From: horseshoe7@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <5f4fe4c2.0312051710.7e4ff70f@posting.google.com>
Source record: 83411

"ggg" <loch-schwarz@bayern-mail.de> wrote in message
news:<bqobgv$b50$1@svr7.m-online.net>...
> > Bush Thrills Troops
>
> so fucking what ?

How'd you like us to cancel that little NATO agreement, and let the
BEARS or POLES place your ungrateful socialist-leaning ass under their
rule?

Then, those pansy-assed French will start waving the white flags.

Faggots.

3836. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-06 01:52:09 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031205205209.07578.00002024@mb-m25.aol.com>
Source record: 83412

In article <qbZzb.133$7p2.121@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> writes:

>"Kï¿½HB" wrote:
>>
>> Nope, you keep getting it wrong, Dwight.
>> I'd also drop the Extra examination, and
>> institute a **new** Class A examination,
>> similar in difficulty (but with obviously
>> different content) than the current Extra.
>
>
> I don't think so, Hans. You're advocating a test "similar in difficulty"
>to the Extra. However, an Extra hasn't just taken that one test - he also
>took the Tech and General prior to that.

Depending on when someone gets their Extra, they may have taken as many as 5 separate written tests (Novice, Tech, General, Advanced, Extra - March 1987 to April 2000) or as few as two (General and Extra, 1951 to 1967)

The total number of questions has varied similarly, but the current total is the lowest since the 1951 restructuring.

>The material on each test is
>different, with later tests building on the material in the earlier tests.

Depends on the subject.

>To cover the same material an Extra has covered today ("similar
>difficulty"), your new test would have to include the material covered in
>all three current tests (with over 120 questions in one sitting).

"Similar difficulty" doesn't mean the same material. Obviously a lot of the basics would be covered in the Class B. And with the simplified structure, some of the questions like subbands-by-license-class would go away.

However, since the Class B would be a simplified test, the Class A would probably need to be 150 questions...

>So, are
>you advocating that, advocating some type of reduced content test (less
>questions), or did you simply forget the material on the first two tests?

I suggest something different.

There's no need to retest what has been already tested.

Also, a big test should be broken down into pieces-by-subject and graded that way. IOW, a safety part, a regs part, a theory part, etc. And you have to pass each part (subelement) to pass the test - aceing the theory shouldn't allow you to get all the safety questions wrong, for example.

--

Related question for Hans: Would existing Extras get Class A licenses automatically, or would they have to retest?

73 de Jim, N2EY

3837. Re: Stuck?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-06 05:09:51 UTC
From: Jerry Oxendine <joxendi@bellsouth.net>
Message-ID: <DudAb.968$rG.823@bignews3.bellsouth.net>
Source record: 83413

JJ,

Suddenly "Freddys" chicken band barn got awfully quiet,
didn't he? Can dish it out but can't take it! LOLOLOL!

Jerry
"JJ" <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
news:jqadnTftYpNDa1Ki4p2dnA@gbronline.com...
> Jerry Oxendine wrote:
>
>
> > Mr. Kluz told the agents
> > that he had obtained the linear amplifier from a friend two days earlier
and
> > was checking it out for his friend.
>
> Yea right, what a laugh!!! ROTFLM!!!!!!!!
>
>
> > On July 23, 2002, the Detroit Office issued a NAL for a $5,000
forfeiture to
> > Mr. Kluz for using a linear amplifier as part of his CB radio station in
> > willful violation of Section 95.411 of the Rules. Mr. Kluz did not
respond
> > to the NAL. However, on October 3, 2002, the Commission received a
letter
> > from Dr. James LeSar, M.D., responding to the NAL on behalf of Mr. Kluz.
In
> > this letter, Dr. LeSar asserts that due to the nature of his medical
> > problems, Mr. Kluz is unable to understand and unable to willfully
violate
> > Section 95.411 by having a linear amplifier attached to his CB station.
>
> The clown was "unable to willfully violate Section 95.411 by having a
> linear amplifier attached to his CB station". But he was cabable of
> hooking it up and "check it out for a friend. LOLOLOLO!!!
>
> > According to Dr. LeSar, Mr. Kluz suffers from several medical
conditions,
> > including dementia and a possible brain tumor, and has poor reading
> > comprehension. Dr. LeSar's letter indicates that he did not personally
> > examine Mr. Kluz. Dr. LeSar wrote that he was including documentation to
> > demonstrate to the Enforcement Bureau that Mr. Kluz was unable to
willfully
> > violate Section 95.411; however, no documentation was included.

>
> Ever notice how all these cb clowns who get caught have some kind of
> medical problem? Must be something in them cb radio waves that effects
> these morons. His medical problem evidently did not keep him from
> assembling an illegal station and operating in violation of the FCC
> rules. What a crock!!!
>
>

3838. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-06 05:51:10 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <i7eAb.1245$7p2.893@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 83414

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote

> Related question for Hans: Would existing Extras get Class
> A licenses automatically, or would they have to retest?

My inclination would be for current Extras to remain Extras unless they took the new test. Lots of guys (Larry comes to mind) attach a certain cachet to their current license, having "done it the old way". I've no problem with honoring that.

And I like your notion of splitting the Class A test into broad subject areas --- off the top of my head "Electronics/Communications theory", "Regulations and Safety", and "Operating Practices" would make a nice three way division with perhaps 35 questions per segment.

73, de Hans, K0HB

3839. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-06 06:03:15 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <DieAb.1061$Ho3.300@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 83415

"Dee D. Flint" wrote:
>
> You made a statement that most people
> had such exposure and while I naturally
> knew that was only your opinion, you
> stated it as if it were a fact. Therefore I
> was justified in asking you to provide the
> data to support that statement.

That doesn't change my response. Again, show me where such statistical data is collected and I'll cite it for you. Of course, you know it isn't collected, and therefore my comment could not have been based on that, so your question was clearly disingenuous.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3840. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-06 06:17:16 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <MveAb.1070$Ho3.213@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 83416

"Dee D. Flint" wrote:
>
> No Kim it is not. He made a statement as
> if it were fact rather than his personal opinion
> that most people had had exposure to Morse
> code. I challenged him to prove it. This is
> standard operating procedure in debate.
> Since he is the originator of the statement,
> then in a debate, he must be prepared to
> back it with facts. That the subject here is
> Morse code does not negate debate
> procedures even if he wishes it did.

This is a newsgroup, not a debating society, Dee. As such, there are no debate procedures. Instead, simple common sense applies in newsgroup discussions (as in most discussions). Since you're aware that nobody collects such data, simple common sense should have prevented you from even asking for that.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3841. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-06 06:20:29 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <NyeAb.1072$Ho3.97@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 83417

"Mike Coslo" wrote:
>
> (snip) Dat's gonna be one big test!

Yep. And covering a massive variety of information.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3842. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-06 06:42:35 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <vTeAb.1087$Ho3.439@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 83418

"Kï¿½HB" wrote:
>
> I expect it would be a longer test than
> todays Extra, but probably not 120
> questions (since some things, like band
> segments for example, would be the
> same as for the learner-permit level),
> and perhaps not necessarily in one
> sitting -- could be structured to be taken
> in 2 (or 3?) sessions for those who are
> intimidated by lengthy exams or have
> weak bladders.

In the end, I've described several, what I consider, serious faults in your proposal, and that's without even getting into what I think the FCC's perspective might be. I don't even think you're being realistic at this point. Because of that, I don't think your proposal has a chance in Hades of getting any further than a passing discussion in this newsgroup. As such, I'll pass on any further discussion about it until something more substantial is added to the discussion.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3843. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-06 06:46:50 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <uXeAb.1156$_r6.992@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 83419

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote

> I'll pass on any further discussion about it until something more
> substantial is added to the discussion.

Thank you. I was kind of hoping you might have something to add but so far you've only been a detractor, so it's probably just as well that you have decided to withdraw from the discussion.

Have a great holiday season.

73, de Hans, K0HB

3844. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-06 06:49:46 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <e_eAb.14184$P%1.13210748@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 83420

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:DieAb.1061$Ho3.300@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> "Dee D. Flint" wrote:
> >
> > You made a statement that most people
> > had such exposure and while I naturally
> > knew that was only your opinion, you
> > stated it as if it were a fact. Therefore I
> > was justified in asking you to provide the
> > data to support that statement.
>
>
> That doesn't change my response. Again, show me where such statistical
> data is collected and I'll cite it for you. Of course, you know it isn't
> collected, and therefore my comment could not have been based on that, so
> your question was clearly disingenuous.
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
>

No I was illustrating that your statement was clearly disingenuous. Hiding an opinion by making a statement that was couched in terms to make it appear as if it were a fact. Therefore as a debater it is not only my right but my duty to challenge it and ask you for proof. And you can't provide it. Instead, you attempt to ask me to prove your statement, which is an invalid debating technique.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

3845. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-06 06:51:12 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <A%eAb.14185$P%1.13210536@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 83421

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:MveAb.1070$Ho3.213@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> "Dee D. Flint" wrote:
> >
> > No Kim it is not. He made a statement as
> > if it were fact rather than his personal opinion
> > that most people had had exposure to Morse
> > code. I challenged him to prove it. This is
> > standard operating procedure in debate.
> > Since he is the originator of the statement,
> > then in a debate, he must be prepared to
> > back it with facts. That the subject here is
> > Morse code does not negate debate
> > procedures even if he wishes it did.
>
>
> This is a newsgroup, not a debating society, Dee. As such, there are no
> debate procedures. Instead, simple common sense applies in newsgroup
> discussions (as in most discussions). Since you're aware that nobody
> collects such data, simple common sense should have prevented you from
even
> asking for that.
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>

Since you are aware that nobody collects such data, simple common sense
should have prevented you from making such an unprovable statement in the
first place.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
>

3846. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-06 07:06:54 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <iefAb.1103$Ho3.952@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 83422

"N2EY" wrote:
>
> Depending on when someone gets their Extra,
> they may have taken as many as 5 separate
> written tests (snip)

Of course, Jim. However, I was under the impression we were talking about the present (the three written tests).

> "Similar difficulty" doesn't mean the same material.
> Obviously a lot of the basics would be covered in
> the Class B. (snip)

I've looked over the existing exams and there isn't a lot of repeated material. By the way, are the "Class B" operators going to be prohibited from building their own equipment also? If not, how would one really make the test simplier?

> And with the simplified structure, some of the
> questions like subbands-by-license-class
> would go away. (snip)

So we're now going to restructure the sub-bands also? This whole thing is getting more absurd with each message posted.

> Related question for Hans: Would existing Extras
> get Class A licenses automatically, or would they
> have to retest?

Oh, you know Extras are going to be grandfathered into the new license structure, Jim. Hans has no intention of messing with his fellow, perfect as is, Extras (just the rest of the ham community).

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3847. Re: Bush Thrills Troops, Hillary Doesn't

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-06 07:18:23 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <3pfAb.1106$Ho3.906@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 83423

"stewart" wrote:
>
> How'd you like us to cancel that little
> NATO agreement, and let the BEARS
> or POLES place your ungrateful
> socialist-leaning ass under their rule?

If put to a vote today, I think many Europeans would be thrilled to end NATO. Of course, since it benefits us (the USA), this country would strongly resist that. In other words, what you say is nothing more than a shallow threat (and the Europeans know it).

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3848. Re: Do Hams get 11 Meters Back

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-06 10:15:25 UTC
From: Doug Davis <dougd@despammed.com>
Message-ID: <Pd2dnYzGJPujMUyiRVn-gg@buckeye-express.com>
Source record: 83424
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.cb

Yes, he always has a poopy smell about him :)

Ellen

"jim" <3carroll@optonline.net> wrote in message
news:3FB7EF86.3090503@optonline.net...
>
>
> JJ wrote:
> > charlesb wrote:
> >
> >> "OOTMAN" <ootman@usaor.net> wrote in message
> >> news:vrds2mkuem63bc@corp.supernews.com...
> >>
> >>> W hy in hell would they want it back??????????
> >>>
> >>
> >>
> >> Better utilization of HF spectrum, and more spectrum for hams. All the
> >> non-ham stuff should be VHF or UHF, for the obvious reason.
> >>
> >> Charles Brabham, N5PVL
> >>
> >>
> > The hams hardly used 11 meters when they had it, what makes you think
> > they would use it now if they got it back? Besides, the cbers have made
> > such a mess of it, it would take years to clean the filth out.
> >
>
> equating cb'ers and filth eh? in your limited world hams dont freeband?
> guess you havn't heard the cw contests on 11 meters. so much for your
> post...
>

3849. Re: Do Hams get 11 Meters Back

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-06 10:19:05 UTC
From: Doug Davis <dougd@despammed.com>
Message-ID: <AcOdncUJSuyGMEyiRVn-hA@buckeye-express.com>
Source record: 83425
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.cb

I don't think you can speak for all hams, Mr. Poopy Butt :)

Peace on Earth to you,

Ellen

"JJ" <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
news:J86dnTh7fcKSkySiRVn-jw@gbronline.com...
> gw wrote:
> > JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
news:<jNydnRnSN5nVliWi4p2dnA@gbronline.com>...
> >
> >>jim wrote:
> >>
> >>
> >>>
> >>>JJ wrote:
> >>>
> >>>
> >>>>
> >>>>charlesb wrote:
> >>>>
> >>>>
> >>>>>"OOTMAN" <ootman@usaor.net> wrote in message
> >>>>>news:vrds2mkuem63bc@corp.supernews.com...
> >>>>>
> >>>>>
> >>>>>>W hy in hell would they want it back??????????
> >>>>>>
> >>>>>>
> >>>>>>>Better utilization of HF spectrum, and more spectrum for hams. All
the
> >>>>>>non-ham stuff should be VHF or UHF, for the obvious reason.
> >>>>>>
> >>>>>>Charles Brabham, N5PVL
> >>>>>>
> >>>>>>
> >>>>>>
> >>>>The hams hardly used 11 meters when they had it, what makes you think
> >>>>they would use it now if they got it back? Besides, the cbers have
> >>>>made such a mess of it, it would take years to clean the filth out.
> >>>>
> >>>
> >>>equating cb'ers and filth eh? in your limited world hams dont freeband?

> >>>guess you havn't heard the cw contests on 11 meters. so much for your
> >>>post...
> >>>
> >>
> >>In my world, *real* hams don't (notice I put the ' in don't) freeband
> >>(there is no "freeband" in case you haven't noticed), just those cb
> >>types who happen to hold a ham license. So much for your post..........
> >
> >
> >
> > well if the hams took back 11 meters....what would they do about all
> > the skip talkers on channel 6???? those old black men would not like
> > you hammies trying to run them off and they would jump up and down and
> > stomp a radiowave mudhole in the back of your necks and walk it
> > dry.........no doubt about it......
>
> You seem to have a reading comprehension problem. I will type slowly so
> you maybe can understand. T H E H A M S D O N O T W A N T
> E L E V E N M E T E R S B A C K. To use your silly cb lingo, "no
> doubt about it".
>

3850. Re: Do Hams get to use 11 Meters

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-06 10:20:21 UTC
From: Doug Davis <dougd@despammed.com>
Message-ID: <qa6dneMkt6z6MEyi4p2dnA@buckeye-express.com>
Source record: 83426
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.cb

All sailors don't cuss, Mr. Poopy Butt :)

Peace on Earth to you,

Ellen

"Radioman" <radio@ptt.edu> wrote in message
news:3FB91DE3.F17DEBDE@ptt.edu...
> > > You seem to have a reading comprehension problem. I will type slowly
so
> > > you maybe can understand. T H E H A M S D O N O T W A N T
> > > E L E V E N M E T E R S B A C K. To use your silly cb lingo, "no
> > > doubt about it".
> > >
> >
> > Speak for yourself, OM!
> >
> > Charles Brabham, N5PVL
>
> Do you want it back? You can still use CB if you have an amateur ticket.
> You're just not supposed to use your ham radio on it or cuss like a
sailor.

3851. Re: No!!! Re: Do Hams get 11 Meters Back

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-06 10:27:32 UTC
From: Doug Davis <dougd@despammed.com>
Message-ID: <EpqdncYA94yKMkyiRVn-ig@buckeye-express.com>
Source record: 83427
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.shortwave

Hams are getting old and dying off; soon all the bands will belong to CBers.

Ellen

"High SWR" <m@il.here> wrote in message
news:I5Aub.182685$9E1.958199@attbi_s52...
> No, the CB'ers get the Ham bands. Thanks ARRL for your work in dumbing
> things down.
>
> CQ Breaker, CQ Breaker, any 20 meter good-buddies got yer ears on, come on
> back. Ten-Four, Ten-Four, good buddy, Got ya twenty pounds. No Doubt yer
> gettin out, come on back...
>
>
>
> High SWR
>
>
>

3852. Re: No!!! Re: Do Hams get 11 Meters Back

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-06 10:35:07 UTC
From: Doug Davis <dougd@despammed.com>
Message-ID: <Lr2dnSSjUZIALUyiRVn-jA@buckeye-express.com>
Source record: 83428
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

You are getting even stinkier, Mr. Poopy Butt :)

Peace on Earth to you,

Ellen

"JJ" <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
news:xJGdnRU_NsO8EFyiRVn-uw@gbronline.com...
> Jerry Oxendine wrote:
>
> > "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
> > news:0DOvb.12159$P%1.10553614@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
> >
> >>"Richard Cranium" <richcranus@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> >>news:c5ecbb69.0311211606.7491c9cf@posting.google.com...
> >>
> >>>"Jerry Oxendine" <joxendi@bellsouth.net> wrote in message
> >>
> >>news:<v%evb.16249$ow5.3028@bignews2.bellsouth.net>...
> >>
> >>>>"Stephen M.H. Lawrence" <7.3steve@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> >>>>news:gP5vb.11687$Wy4.4805@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> >>>>
> >>>>>One day 3 weeks ago, I listened from 28.000 - 28.150, and
> >>>>>I counted over a dozen of 'em. Truckers in particular have been
> >>>>>"using" our ten - meter band illegally, and Riley Hollingsworth
> >>>>>has been doing something about it. Make no mistake, this is
> >>>>>happening.
> >>>>>
> >>>>>73,
> >>>>>
> >>>>>Steve Lawrence
> >>>>>Burnsville, MN
> >>>>
> >>>>
> >>>>
> >>>>And YOU can help! Get out there and listen on the road.
> >>>>Get the tag # of the tractor (not of the trailer), date, time,
> >>>>highway, milepost or exit number. Send this info to rholling@fcc.gov
> >
> > .
> >
> >>>>Make a difference: this is how those
> >>>>other truckers got warned--individual hams who quietly

> >>>>listened and accurately reported the above data. RH will
> >>>>then respond IF, again, the info is accurate. Each ham
> >>>>can make a difference and stop that "tan-fer thar, drivah,
> >>>>ah know you rah't, fer-tan thar SQUEAK!!" If we don't, we will
> >>
> >>eventually
> >>
> >>>>hear them beeping and squeaking their
> >>>>way along on 17 Meters.
> >>>>
> >>>>The way to "trap" a driver is to quietly cruise along. Do NOT talk
> >
> > to
> >
> >>them
> >>
> >>>>or get into an argument! Simply overtake a trucker who *may* be
> >>
> >>operating
> >>
> >>>>on 28.085 AM. As you pass, or he passes you, he may be curious
> >>>>about "them 'funny antenners' thar" and comment to you
> >>>>about it (or other truckers). It is then you copy down the
> >>>>tag # on the FRONT of the tractor, the DOT # (this confirms the
> >
> > identity
> >
> >>of
> >>
> >>>>the truck), the direction of travel and milepost (or exit), date and
> >>
> >>time.
> >>
> >>>>Also the company name. Send it in! Done correctly, the "man" will send
> >>
> >>out
> >>
> >>>>a warning notice to the company holding THEM responsible for their
> >>
> >>drivers'
> >>
> >>>>actions. It is legal and enforc-able.
> >>>>
> >>>>73
> >>>>
> >>>>Jerry
> >>>
> >>>Great idea, Jerry! Pile Riley's desk full with all sorts of false
> >>>reports so he won't believe any of you!
> >>>

> >>>*may*?? You better be damned certain when you file a report!
> >>>Entrapment is also a crime, goodbuddy.
> >>
> >>If you are just observing (and reporting what you hear and see) and not
> >>talking, that is not entrapment.
> >>
> >>Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
> >
> >
> > EXACTLY!! You are simply a "witness" or a "bystander". You have not
done
> > anything to entrap
> > anybody. Ain't it neat? LOL!~
> >
> > Jerry
> >
> >
> >
> It is really difficult to explain simple logic to someone (dickhead
> crainumless) who can't even find the 10 meter band.
>

3853. Re: No!!! Re: Do Hams get 11 Meters Back

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-06 10:37:03 UTC
From: Doug Davis <dougd@despammed.com>
Message-ID: <v-ydnYfN4c_NLEyiRVn-gQ@buckeye-express.com>
Source record: 83429
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.shortwave

What frequency do they use them on?

Ellen

"Steveo" <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com> wrote in message
news:20031120191736.882$ak@newsreader.com...
> Barry OGrady <god_freee_jones@hotmail.com> wrote:
> > I can't imagine any ham wanting to go back to meters after getting used
> > to LCD displays. I have a 1 meter 2 metre radio, but it's pretty old.
> >
> Some of the Elmers still use sun dials.

3854. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-06 13:12:24 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031206081224.25517.00002621@mb-m15.aol.com>
Source record: 83430

In article <iefAb.1103$Ho3.952@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> writes:

>"N2EY" wrote:

>> Depending on when someone gets their Extra,
>> they may have taken as many as 5 separate
>> written tests (snip)

> Of course, Jim. However, I was under the impression we were talking about
>the present (the three written tests).

We *are* talking about the present. Present-day Extras took a wide variety of written tests. For example, Hans took a single 100 question written test to go from General to Extra. I took two 50 question writtens to make the same transition. An April-16-2000 Extra took a single 50 question written. But all of us prenetly hold the same license with the same privileges.
>
>> "Similar difficulty" doesn't mean the same material.
>> Obviously a lot of the basics would be covered in
>> the Class B. (snip)
>
> I've looked over the existing exams and there isn't a lot of repeated
>material.

Sure - but the emphasis would be different.

>By the way, are the "Class B" operators going to be prohibited
>from building their own equipment also?

Just the opposite, I think! But it's Hans' proposal - ask him.

>If not, how would one really make
>the test simplier?

Take the current Tech test. Remove some of the RF exposure stuff (because Class Bs can't use more than 50 W). Add in some HF and Class B rules stuff. Done.

Since Techs are authorized to design/build/modify/repair/align/operate amateur gear using any mode and any technology, the Tech written test must be adequate for homebrewing, right?

How different is homebrewing for HF from homebrewing for 6 meters? (If anything, homebrewing for 6 meters is more critical because of the higher frequency).

Remember that Novices and Tech Pluses are already authorized to design/build/modify/repair/align/operate amateur gear using any CW and SSB on

10 meters, and CW on 80. 40, 1nd 15 meters, using any technology.

>> And with the simplified structure, some of the
>> questions like subbands-by-license-class
>> would go away. (snip)
>
> So we're now going to restructure the sub-bands also?

Nope.Haven't you read Hans' proposal?

Both Class B and Class A hams would have access to all amateur frequencies. For example, on 40 meters/Region 2 they would have:

7000-7150 CW/data
7150-7300.CW/phone/image

Compare this to the current mess of subbands on 40 for Extras, Advanceds, Generals, Tech Pluses and Novices.

>This whole thing is
>getting more absurd with each message posted.

Why "absurd"? Hans is proposing to dramatically simplify things for new hams. Lots of privileges for new hams. No more big divide at 30 MHz. No more having to memorize lots of little subbands which then become obsolete as one upgrades.

And existing hams don't have to give up anything they already have. If an existing ham wants to join the new system, just take a test.

My Extra license is up for renewing soon. I'd take the Class A just to avoide that little chore....
>
>> Related question for Hans: Would existing Extras
>> get Class A licenses automatically, or would they
>> have to retest?
>
> Oh, you know Extras are going to be grandfathered into the new license
>structure, Jim.

Not according to Hans' answer to the above question.

>Hans has no intention of messing with his fellow, perfect as
>is, Extras (just the rest of the ham community).
>
Do you really think such a test would be a problem for most of us Extras? I say "Bring it on!! - I got yer Class A right here!"

I don't agree with Hans' proposal in some areas, but I'd hardly call it "absurd".

Four years ago there were 6 license classes open to new hams. Now there are only 3, but the other 3 classes are still held by almost 200,000 hams. Was that an "absurd" change? Tell it to the FCC!

Hans' proposal would create 2 new license classes and close off the other 6 to new licensees. Is it really so absurd, given the changes we've already seen?

His proposal is no more absurd than the claim that a single 5 wpm code test is a "barrier".....

73 de Jim, N2EY

3855. Re: No!!! Re: Do Hams get 11 Meters Back

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-06 14:24:55 UTC
From: Susie Q <SGC@aol.com>
Message-ID: <3FD1E760.175F46D1@aol.com>
Source record: 83431
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.shortwave

hey doug, ellen or whoever you are...
there are a few hams in my area who just got there ham ticket. There are two
that are 13 and one that is14 years old.
Seems you have a long wait.

Doug Davis wrote:

> Hams are getting old and dying off; soon all the bands will belong to CBers.
>
> Ellen
>
> "High SWR" <m@il.here> wrote in message
> news:I5Aub.182685$9E1.958199@attbi_s52...
> > No, the CB'ers get the Ham bands. Thanks ARRL for your work in dumbing
> > things down.
> >
> > CQ Breaker, CQ Breaker, any 20 meter good-buddies got yer ears on, come on
> > back. Ten-Four, Ten-Four, good buddy, Got ya twenty pounds. No Doubt yer
> > gettin out, come on back...
> >
> >
> >
> > High SWR
> >
> >
> >

3856. Re: Dem boyz fum 3865

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-06 14:42:56 UTC
From: frogwatcher <noleaks3@hotmail.com>
Message-ID: <b0e5e$3fd1eb22$d1cc4e6b$8573@allthenewsgroups.com>
Source record: 83432
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Jon's 14.313 News page is far superior in both
it's intellectual appeal and humor. Jon's page
is on the level of a Fireside Theatre or George
Carlin Live, whereas this page, reminds me of a
bad comedy sketch from a spanish TeeVee
variety show on Univision.

Somehing else to think about:
http://www.nationmaster.com/graph-T/env_co2_emi

"Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:oJ1Ab.360$7p2.95@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net...
>
> Ooops. I finger-faulted that. The correct URL is
http://tinyurl.com/xtuj
>
> Enjoy.
>
> de Hans, K0HB
>
>

3857. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-06 14:53:18 UTC
From: Alun <alun@1stcounsel.com>
Message-ID: <Xns9449649382ED8elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 83433

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in
news:20031206081224.25517.00002621@mb-m15.aol.com:

> In article <iefAb.1103$Ho3.952@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>,
> "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> writes:
>
>>"N2EY" wrote:
>
>>> Depending on when someone gets their Extra, they may have taken as
>>> many as 5 separate written tests (snip)
>
>> Of course, Jim. However, I was under the impression we were talking
>> about the present (the three written tests).
>
> We *are* talking about the present. Present-day Extras took a wide
> variety of written tests. For example, Hans took a single 100 question
> written test to go from General to Extra. I took two 50 question
> writtens to make the same transition. An April-16-2000 Extra took a
> single 50 question written. But all of us prenetly hold the same
> license with the same privileges.
>>
>>> "Similar difficulty" doesn't mean the same material.
>>> Obviously a lot of the basics would be covered in the Class B.
>>> (snip)
>>
>> I've looked over the existing exams and there isn't a lot of repeated
>> material.
>
> Sure - but the emphasis would be different.
>
>>By the way, are the "Class B" operators going to be prohibited from
>>building their own equipment also?
>
> Just the opposite, I think! But it's Hans' proposal - ask him.
>
>>If not, how would one really make the test simplier?
>
> Take the current Tech test. Remove some of the RF exposure stuff
> (because Class Bs can't use more than 50 W). Add in some HF and Class B
> rules stuff. Done.
>
> Since Techs are authorized to design/build/modify/repair/align/operate
> amateur gear using any mode and any technology, the Tech written test
> must be adequate for homebrewing, right?

>
> How different is homebrewing for HF from homebrewing for 6 meters? (If
> anything, homebrewing for 6 meters is more critical because of the
> higher frequency).
>
> Remember that Novices and Tech Pluses are already authorized to
> design/build/modify/repair/align/operate amateur gear using any CW and
> SSB on 10 meters, and CW on 80. 40, 1nd 15 meters, using any
> technology.
>
>>> And with the simplified structure, some of the
>>> questions like subbands-by-license-class would go away. (snip)
>>
>> So we're now going to restructure the sub-bands also?
>
> Nope.Haven't you read Hans' proposal?
>
> Both Class B and Class A hams would have access to all amateur
> frequencies. For example, on 40 meters/Region 2 they would have:
>
> 7000-7150 CW/data
> 7150-7300.CW/phone/image
>
> Compare this to the current mess of subbands on 40 for Extras,
> Advanceds, Generals, Tech Pluses and Novices.
>
>>This whole thing is
>>getting more absurd with each message posted.
>
> Why "absurd"? Hans is proposing to dramatically simplify things for new
> hams. Lots of privileges for new hams. No more big divide at 30 MHz. No
> more having to memorize lots of little subbands which then become
> obsolete as one upgrades.
>
>
> And existing hams don't have to give up anything they already have. If
> an existing ham wants to join the new system, just take a test.
>
> My Extra license is up for renewing soon. I'd take the Class A just to
> avoide that little chore....
>>
>>> Related question for Hans: Would existing Extras
>>> get Class A licenses automatically, or would they have to retest?
>>
>> Oh, you know Extras are going to be grandfathered into the new
>> license structure, Jim.
>
> Not according to Hans' answer to the above question.
>
>>Hans has no intention of messing with his fellow, perfect as

>>is, Extras (just the rest of the ham community).
>>
> Do you really think such a test would be a problem for most of us
> Extras? I say "Bring it on!! - I got yer Class A right here!"
>
> I don't agree with Hans' proposal in some areas, but I'd hardly call it
> "absurd".
>
> Four years ago there were 6 license classes open to new hams. Now there
> are only 3, but the other 3 classes are still held by almost 200,000
> hams. Was that an "absurd" change? Tell it to the FCC!
>
> Hans' proposal would create 2 new license classes and close off the
> other 6 to new licensees. Is it really so absurd, given the changes
> we've already seen?
>
> His proposal is no more absurd than the claim that a single 5 wpm code
> test is a "barrier".....
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>

It's not really three, though. Although the 'Tech Plus' was abolished in theory it still exists in practice. That particular absurdity will go away when Element 1 is abolished, which it soon will be. To avoid actually taking away any privileges the FCC will have to give the Novice subbands to all Techs (assuming Element 1 will no longer be mentionned anywhere in Part 97, the only other alternative would be to take them away from those Techs who have them now, which would be very unpalatable).

I don't agree with all aspects of Hans' proposal. In particular, I oppose all time limits and time in grade requirements. However, I think that something ultimately will have to be done about the status of Novice and Advanced licences. It is just too messy to maintain closed licence classes indefinitely. I would have no problem with automatically upgrading them all, but I know that many others would not like it. Maybe the way around this is to have new (or at least re-named) licence classes. Someone who objects to Advanced licencees getting a free pass to Extra may aquiesce to both becoming Class As, for example. A rose by any other name would smell as sweet?

3858. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-06 14:55:41 UTC
From: Alun <alun@1stcounsel.com>
Message-ID: <Xns944964FB16959elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 83434

Alun <alun@1stcounsel.com> wrote in
news:Xns9449649382ED8elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4:

> n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in
> news:20031206081224.25517.00002621@mb-m15.aol.com:
>
>> In article <iefAb.1103$Ho3.952@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>,
>> "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> writes:
>>
>>>"N2EY" wrote:
>>
>>>> Depending on when someone gets their Extra, they may have taken as
>>>> many as 5 separate written tests (snip)
>>
>>> Of course, Jim. However, I was under the impression we were talking
>>> about the present (the three written tests).
>>
>> We *are* talking about the present. Present-day Extras took a wide
>> variety of written tests. For example, Hans took a single 100 question
>> written test to go from General to Extra. I took two 50 question
>> writtens to make the same transition. An April-16-2000 Extra took a
>> single 50 question written. But all of us prenetly hold the same
>> license with the same privileges.
>>>
>>>> "Similar difficulty" doesn't mean the same material.
>>>> Obviously a lot of the basics would be covered in the Class B.
>>>> (snip)
>>>
>>> I've looked over the existing exams and there isn't a lot of
>>> repeated material.
>>
>> Sure - but the emphasis would be different.
>>
>>>By the way, are the "Class B" operators going to be prohibited from
>>>building their own equipment also?
>>
>> Just the opposite, I think! But it's Hans' proposal - ask him.
>>
>>>If not, how would one really make the test simplier?
>>
>> Take the current Tech test. Remove some of the RF exposure stuff
>> (because Class Bs can't use more than 50 W). Add in some HF and Class
>> B rules stuff. Done.
>>

>> Since Techs are authorized to design/build/modify/repair/align/operate
>> amateur gear using any mode and any technology, the Tech written test
>> must be adequate for homebrewing, right?
>>
>> How different is homebrewing for HF from homebrewing for 6 meters? (If
>> anything, homebrewing for 6 meters is more critical because of the
>> higher frequency).
>>
>> Remember that Novices and Tech Pluses are already authorized to
>> design/build/modify/repair/align/operate amateur gear using any CW and
>> SSB on 10 meters, and CW on 80. 40, 1nd 15 meters, using any
>> technology.
>>
>>>> And with the simplified structure, some of the questions like
>>>> subbands-by-license-class would go away. (snip)
>>>
>>> So we're now going to restructure the sub-bands also?
>>
>> Nope.Haven't you read Hans' proposal?
>>
>> Both Class B and Class A hams would have access to all amateur
>> frequencies. For example, on 40 meters/Region 2 they would have:
>>
>> 7000-7150 CW/data
>> 7150-7300.CW/phone/image
>>
>> Compare this to the current mess of subbands on 40 for Extras,
>> Advanceds, Generals, Tech Pluses and Novices.
>>
>>>This whole thing is
>>>getting more absurd with each message posted.
>>
>> Why "absurd"? Hans is proposing to dramatically simplify things for
>> new hams. Lots of privileges for new hams. No more big divide at 30
>> MHz. No more having to memorize lots of little subbands which then
>> become obsolete as one upgrades.
>>
>>
>> And existing hams don't have to give up anything they already have. If
>> an existing ham wants to join the new system, just take a test.
>>
>> My Extra license is up for renewing soon. I'd take the Class A just to
>> avoide that little chore....
>>>
>>>> Related question for Hans: Would existing Extras get Class A
>>>> licenses automatically, or would they have to retest?
>>>
>>> Oh, you know Extras are going to be grandfathered into the new
>>> license structure, Jim.
>>

>> Not according to Hans' answer to the above question.
>>
>>>Hans has no intention of messing with his fellow, perfect as
>>>is, Extras (just the rest of the ham community).
>>>
>> Do you really think such a test would be a problem for most of us
>> Extras? I say "Bring it on!! - I got yer Class A right here!"
>>
>> I don't agree with Hans' proposal in some areas, but I'd hardly call
>> it "absurd".
>>
>> Four years ago there were 6 license classes open to new hams. Now
>> there are only 3, but the other 3 classes are still held by almost
>> 200,000 hams. Was that an "absurd" change? Tell it to the FCC!
>>
>> Hans' proposal would create 2 new license classes and close off the
>> other 6 to new licensees. Is it really so absurd, given the changes
>> we've already seen?
>>
>> His proposal is no more absurd than the claim that a single 5 wpm code
>> test is a "barrier".....
>>
>> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>>
>>
>
> It's not really three, though. Although the 'Tech Plus' was abolished
> in theory it still exists in practice. That particular absurdity will
> go away when Element 1 is abolished, which it soon will be. To avoid
> actually taking away any privileges the FCC will have to give the
> Novice subbands to all Techs (assuming Element 1 will no longer be
> mentionned anywhere in Part 97, the only other alternative would be to
> take them away from those Techs who have them now, which would be very
> unpalatable).
>
> I don't agree with all aspects of Hans' proposal. In particular, I
> oppose all time limits and time in grade requirements. However, I think
> that something ultimately will have to be done about the status of
> Novice and Advanced licences. It is just too messy to maintain closed
> licence classes indefinitely. I would have no problem with
> automatically upgrading them all, but I know that many others would not
> like it. Maybe the way around this is to have new (or at least
> re-named) licence classes. Someone who objects to Advanced licencees
> getting a free pass to Extra may aquiesce to both becoming Class As,
> for example. A rose by any other name would smell as sweet?
>

So maybe Class A (Extra/Advanced), B (General) and C (Tech/Novice)?

3859. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-06 14:56:01 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <56mAb.14211$P%1.13254782@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 83435

"Alun" <alun@1stcounsel.com> wrote in message
news:Xns9449649382ED8elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
> [snip] However, I think that
> something ultimately will have to be done about the status of Novice and
> Advanced licences. It is just too messy to maintain closed licence classes
> indefinitely. I would have no problem with automatically upgrading them
> all, but I know that many others would not like it. Maybe the way around
> this is to have new (or at least re-named) licence classes. Someone who
> objects to Advanced licencees getting a free pass to Extra may aquiesce to
> both becoming Class As, for example. A rose by any other name would smell
> as sweet?

Why is it "just too messy?" Afterall the databases are computerized.
Renewals will have to be processed regardless of whether the person stays at
the same level or upgrades. There is no problem generated by having the old
classes and no advantage whatsoever to combining them.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

3860. Re: No!!! Re: Do Hams get 11 Meters Back

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-06 15:31:41 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031206103141.28615.00000317@mb-m01.aol.com>
Source record: 83436

>Hams are getting old and dying off; soon all the bands will belong to CBers.
>
>Ellen

What do you mean soon, they are all ready nothing more than CB bands.

3861. Re: Do Hams get to use 11 Meters

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-06 15:55:45 UTC
From: Radioman <radio@ptt.edu>
Message-ID: <3FD1FC01.96A36B2D@ptt.edu>
Source record: 83437
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.cb

Doug Davis wrote:
>
> All sailors don't cuss, Mr. Poopy Butt :)
>
> Peace on Earth to you,
>
> Ellen

Are you Doug or Ellen?

Why do you respond to 3 week old posts? You troll you.

3862. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-06 16:58:13 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031206115813.23307.00004855@mb-m29.aol.com>
Source record: 83438

In article <i7eAb.1245$7p2.893@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote
>
>> Related question for Hans: Would existing Extras get Class
>> A licenses automatically, or would they have to retest?
>
>My inclination would be for current Extras to remain Extras unless they took
>the new test.

Bring it on!

>Lots of guys (Larry comes to mind) attach a certain cachet to
>their current license, having "done it the old way". I've no problem with
>honoring that.

There would be no difference in privileges, right?

What about vanity calls?
>
>And I like your notion of splitting the Class A test into broad subject
>areas --- off the top of my head "Electronics/Communications theory",
>"Regulations and Safety", and "Operating Practices" would make a nice three
>way division with perhaps 35 questions per segment.
>
Exactly the idea. A person would have to get a passing grade in each subject area on the same test, so it would still be one test, not three.

I'd even suggest doing the something similar to the Class B test.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3863. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-06 17:22:39 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <zfoAb.1421$Ho3.1241@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 83439

"K&#65533;HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:7l1Ab.335$7p2.123@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote
>
> > To cover the same material an Extra has covered today ("similar
> > difficulty"), your new test would have to include the material covered
in
> > all three current tests (with over 120 questions in one sitting).
>
> I expect it would be a longer test than todays Extra, but probably not 120
> questions (since some things, like band segments for example, would be the
> same as for the learner-permit level), and perhaps not necessarily in one
> sitting -- could be structured to be taken in 2 (or 3?) sessions for those
> who are intimidated by lengthy exams or have weak bladders.
>
> My Extra exam was 100 questions. You were allowed 3.5 hours to complete
it.
>
> 73, de Hans, K0HB

Maybe I missed a post somewhere. What would be the difference,
other than name, between a Class A and the Extra? If the
only difference is the name, why would any Extra waste time
to pass a class A test whenit buys them nothing?

Also, why would the FCC want to maintain the name difference
in their database if that is all it is?

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

3864. Re: Where Did THIS Come From...?!?!a

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-06 17:29:36 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bqt46u$3gt@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 83442

"Steve Robeson, K4CAP" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
news:5c01b95b.0312050651.4642472f@posting.google.com...
> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<JQ3zb.1321$Oe5.1121@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> > "Steve Robeson, K4CAP" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
> > news:5c01b95b.0312012005.49d2f5ac@posting.google.com...
>
> > Excuse me Steve, but I don't remember the Jews of Europe, in the pre
NAZI
> > days, sending in human bombs. Or shooting at soldiers, or declaring
that
> > Isreal has no right to exist.
> >
> > I think your compairison is flawed.
> >
> > Israel has no choice but to fight. If they do not they will indeed
cease to
> > exist.
>
> Perhaps it was an unbalanced comparison, Dan, but there's several
> things that rub me the wrong way.
>
> The first is that the State of Israel was formed, for the most
> part, by people who we not born there. They came, they saw, they took
> what they wanted and the natives were just "S.O.L.". Yes...I know
> this is the same way the US evolved, but it still doesn't make it
> right.
>
> Secondly, the State of Israel is no stranger to spreading a bit
> of terror around itself. If you doubt me, do a bit of research on the
> Likud Party and one of it's more famous members, Menachim Begin.
> Before he got himself elected Prime Minister and invited to break
> bread at Camp David, ole Menachim took some special pleasure in
> dispatching Palestinians and British alike. Some of the "tactics" you
> may recognize as those that the State of Isreal currently cries foul
> over now...
>
> Lastly, the Israelis, in my opinion anyway, still have a lot of
> explaining to do for the way they do business with their "friends",
> specifically us and the USS Liberty affair. Thier "misidentification"
> story still doesn't wash.
>
> My point is this...there's a circle of violence that is occuring
> in the Middle East...it's been going on since prehistoric times and

> will probably continue until the sun goes nova, so we ought to cut our
> losses and leave them to thier lifestyle. They'd not know how to act
> any other way.
>
> Our only valid interest in that region is maintaining the
> petroleum flow and free navigation via the Suez Canal. If geological
> studies are correct, Russia has petroleum reserves that exceed
> anything the Arabs have, so I think rather than sending arms to Israel
> and money to the Arabs, we should be investing our engineering
> resources farther north. The Arabs would go broke which would
> relegate them back to bedouin tents in a generation. No money means
> no guns, and the Israelis would no longer need OUR weapons.
>
> Of course that would tick off the Germans who'd be selling a lot
> fewer Mercedes and Audis, but they'd make up the slack on the back end
> selling them in Moscow ! ! !
>
> 73
>
> Steve, K4YZ
>

Man!!! Will you puhleeze run for President!? Not only *well* said, but *damned* well said. I know I have never said that well, heard it said that well, or will ever hear it said that well again, Steve.

Kim W5TIT

3865. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-06 17:32:38 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <WooAb.2338$rP6.175@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 83440

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote

> What about vanity calls?

No change from current rules.

> Exactly the idea. A person would have to get a passing grade in each
subject
> area on the same test, so it would still be one test, not three.
>
> I'd even suggest doing the something similar to the Class B test.

No, my vision for the Class B test is similar to the original Novice exam.
Some basic stuff to ensure the applicant has an acquaintence with the
subject matter, and not heavily weighted in any single area, and not such a
tight screen that it blocks those with 'casual interest'.

73, Hans, K0HB

3866. Re: No!!! Re: Do Hams get 11 Meters Back

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-06 17:38:58 UTC
From: trashcan@shadowstorm.com
Message-ID: <ac5fb34.0312060938.7d0f9171@posting.google.com>
Source record: 83441
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.shortwave

High SWR <m@il.here> wrote in message news:<I5Aub.182685$9E1.958199@attbi_s52>...
> No, the CB'ers get the Ham bands. Thanks ARRL for your work in dumbing
> things down.
>
> CQ Breaker, CQ Breaker, any 20 meter good-buddies got yer ears on, come on
> back. Ten-Four, Ten-Four, good buddy, Got ya twenty pounds. No Doubt yer
> gettin out, come on back...
>
>
>
> High SWR

Don't forget about the bought and paid for FCC. Viacom, Disney, Sony,
Clear Channel Communications, and Media One Group have paid good
money to own the FCC, and they want their money's worth.

See;

"Rotten, Old-Fashioned Corruption at the FCC"
http://www.alternet.org/story.html?StoryID=16032

and

"The FCC?s Rapidly Revolving Door"

http://www.publicintegrity.org/dtaweb/report.asp?ReportID=510&L1=10&L2=10&L3=0&L4=0&L5=0

and

"The FCC's Strange Non-Profit"
http://www.openairwaves.org/telecom/report.aspx?aid=31

and

"Behind Closed Doors: Top Broadcasters Met 71 Times With FCC
Officials"
http://www.publicintegrity.org/dtaweb/report.asp?ReportID=526&L1=10&L2=10&L3=0&L4=0&L5=0

3867. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-06 17:51:44 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bqt4t6$fop@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 83443

"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
news:c2356669.0312050919.61f73a0a@posting.google.com...
> "Kim" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:<bqonu2$5do@library2.airnews.net>...
> > "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
> > news:9xQzb.13921$P%1.12995789@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
> > >
> > > "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> > > news:20031201055840.12631.00003129@mb-m28.aol.com...
> > > > In article <Xns94442777C95Eelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun
> > > > <alun@1stcounsel.com> writes:
> > > > >
> > > > >I think you're missing the point. I took _code_ tests to get
phone
> > > > >subbands. There's no logic in that. Never was, even from the
beginning.
> > > > >
> > > > Sure there is. Here it is, though you may argue that it doesn't hold
> > much
> > water
> > > > today:
> > > > >
> > > >
> > > In addition, anyone one who thinks they took the code tests to get
phone
> > > subbands isn't really viewing it from the right perspective anyway.
The
> > > code test, as well as the additional writtens, was to get HF
privileges or
> > > should have been. It happens that phone privileges are included when
one
> > > earns HF privileges.
> > >
> > > Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
> > >
> >
> > I endured the study of and took the test for CW *just* for the phone
> > privleges on 10M, specifically to join in on a nightly ragchew with a
whole
> > bunch of local folks--which is no longer going on but it was neat while
it
> > did. That is the *only* reason I did anything involving CW. So, you
can
> > word it any way you want, Dee, but what compels one person to work with

CW
> > at all, may not be what compels someone else.
>
> Exactly!
>
> And consider this:
>
> I know hams who "endured" the study and *written* tests for the
> Technician, General, Advanced and Extra, because they wanted the
> *CW/data* privileges. (Code test was no problem for them).
>
> Hans' proposal would cause all new hams to "endure" the study for and
> taking of a written test just to *keep* an amateur license beyond 10
> years.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>

I think I like that idea!

Kim W5TIT

3868. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-06 18:06:13 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bqt5ob$ib9@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 83444

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:6I8Ab.14064$P%1.13150979@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
>
> "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> news:bqplut$inf@library1.airnews.net...
> > "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
> > news:FnTzb.4691$Oe5.1207@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> > >
> > > "Dee D. Flint" wrote:
> > > >
> > > > So please cite the statistical data that shows
> > > > people have had enough exposure to Morse
> > > > code to be able to evaluate it even though
> > > > they don't know it.
> > >
> > >
> > > I'll tell you what, Dee. You show me where such statistical data is
> > > collected and I'll cite it for you. Until then, it is clear that my
> > comments
> > > were nothing more than opinions. Of course, you knew that before
> > responding.
> > >
> > >
> > > Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
> > >
> > > http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
> > >
> >
> > The angle of argument that Dee is trying to use is old, tired and
> *yawn*....
> >
> > Kim W5TIT
>
> No Kim it is not. He made a statement as if it were fact rather than his
> personal opinion that most people had had exposure to Morse code. I
> challenged him to prove it. This is standard operating procedure in
debate.
> Since he is the originator of the statement, then in a debate, he must be
> prepared to back it with facts. That the subject here is Morse code does
> not negate debate procedures even if he wishes it did.
>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>

I was actually commenting, allbeit out of synch, on your defense that someone can't know they don't like something without experience...etc. I think that argument is quite indefensible...since it's quite common to decide that one doesn't like something (or does, for that matter) without any particular experience with it. For example, things I don't, or wouldn't, like that I've never tried:

parachuting
picking up clothes at a cleaners
dropping off babies to daycare
raising grandchildren
holding snot in my hand
bungee jumping
parasailing
rough sex
working in a foundry
getting a tattoo
being bald
all kinds of food
spelunking
building a computer...or anything for that matter
being a man

Add countless other things to that list.

If you accept the premise above that I don't like those things without ever having tried them, then you should accept that I know I would not like CW without having any real experience with it.

Kim W5TIT

3869. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-06 18:10:11 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bqt5vr$ldl@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 83445

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:MveAb.1070$Ho3.213@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> "Dee D. Flint" wrote:
> >
> > No Kim it is not. He made a statement as
> > if it were fact rather than his personal opinion
> > that most people had had exposure to Morse
> > code. I challenged him to prove it. This is
> > standard operating procedure in debate.
> > Since he is the originator of the statement,
> > then in a debate, he must be prepared to
> > back it with facts. That the subject here is
> > Morse code does not negate debate
> > procedures even if he wishes it did.
>
>
> This is a newsgroup, not a debating society, Dee. As such, there are no
> debate procedures. Instead, simple common sense applies in newsgroup
> discussions (as in most discussions). Since you're aware that nobody
> collects such data, simple common sense should have prevented you from
even
> asking for that.
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
>

Nope. I disagree, but only because I approach this venue exactly in the same manner as Dee. I like debating and there are few people who can do it artfully. But, I don't think I've ever expected anyone else to approach it the same way I do. However, to engage one in discourse almost dictates that you must be willing to communicate at their level and in their manner. For example, Waddles is way down below my league, so I don't even get his posts any more. Same for Dan. Larry's just fun...

Kim W5TIT

3870. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-06 18:25:13 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <dapAb.2425$rP6.2254@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 83446

"Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote

> I'm almost afraid to ask, Hans. What is QCAO?

Quarter Century Appliance Operators club, sorta like the QCWA (Quarter Century Wireless Association). See press release below.

73, de Hans, K0HB

News Release:

QCAO Reorganizes

The Quarter Century Appliance Operators was founded in the early 1950's by a small group of Amateur Radio operators from the Pacific Northwest. They had been active in their hobby for over 25 years, yet still lacked the basic knowledge of radio electronics and had no idea of how their equipment worked.

They banded together to try and protect each others honor and pride. At radio gatherings and club meetings in the 1950s one was considered unworthy of the name Ham Radio Operator if he or she couldn't not only name components, but know how to solder them together and make a radio work, or fix a broken set!

When faced with insults and dreision, those few hardy pioneers banded together and formed the First Chapter and National Organization of the QCAO. This was known as the "Cold Solder" Chapter. They even coined the now-famous club byword "e pluribus ignoramae" which is Latin for "We don't have to know how to solder, we just wanna talk on our radios."

No veterans of that first chapter are known to be active on the air today. In the late 1950s and early '60s, with the worldwide interest in science and space and technology, the QCAO membership went underground.

It is with great pride and dignity that today in the 21st Century the revived QCAO stands ready to rise from the ashes, and become the standard of mediocrity it once proudly was. In honor of those first pioneering members, QCAO hereby invites all eligible applicants to step forward and join!

The benefits of QCAO include not only the pride of membership. Think of the warm glow you will feel at club

meetings and gatherings showing off your new all-plastic imprinted QCAO pocket protector! And that's not all! For your minimal membership fee, you will also receive a handsome, suitable-for-framing, certificate of honor, with hand-lettered name and Charter Membership Number. Other QCAO memorabilia will soon be available for members, including T-shirts, caps, pins, etc. At this date charter membership numbers are still available. Membership requires a 25 years (more or less) interest in Amateur Radio, coupled with a basic ignorance of how radios work and how to repair them.

Think of meeting other QCAO members on the air! No more embarrassing pauses when someone in the QSO mentions an RF choke or a parasitic bleeder...Be able to exchange meaningful sharing, talk about real things, yes, even swap QCAO numbers with each other! And soon perhaps . . . a worldwide QCAO contest!

You no longer have to shrink to the back of the room at post-meeting sessions of your radio club. Just display your QCAO protector and others will be able to identify you immediately. Who knows? Perhaps one of the originals from that old QCAO Chapter is just waiting for you to find him. Join now! Remember "We don't have to know how to solder, we just wanna talk on our radios"! Don't let technoids embarrass you and kick jargon in your face. Stand up for what's right! Join QCAO!

"e pluribus ignoramae"

3871. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-06 18:33:54 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031206133354.08626.00002072@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 83447

In article <3FD0878D.902@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:

>Dwight Stewart wrote:
>> "Kï¿½HB" wrote:
>>
>>>Nope, you keep getting it wrong, Dwight.
>>>I'd also drop the Extra examination, and
>>>institute a **new** Class A examination,
>>>similar in difficulty (but with obviously
>>>different content) than the current Extra.

>> I don't think so, Hans. You're advocating a test "similar in difficulty"
>> to the Extra.

But emphasis on different things.

>> However, an Extra hasn't just taken that one test - he also
>> took the Tech and General prior to that.

Depends what vintage Extra you're talking about.

>> The material on each test is
>> different, with later tests building on the material in the earlier tests.

Yet if lots of time elapsed between upgrades, that's not going to be completely accurate.

>> To cover the same material an Extra has covered today ("similar
>> difficulty"), your new test would have to include the material covered in
>> all three current tests (with over 120 questions in one sitting).

Not really. It would only have to cover the stuff not covered in the Class B test.

And if it takes a 120 or 150 question test, is that really a problem? We're not talking EE or PE level questions here, just multiple choices from a published pool.

>> So, are
>> you advocating that, advocating some type of reduced content test (less
>> questions), or did you simply forget the material on the first two tests.
>
>Well said, Dwight. Everything is built on what went before it. So now
>what sounded kind of easy is not so easy. Someone here, perhaps Jim,
>pointed out how the Extra license tests did not address RF safety much
>if at all.

I don't recall saying that, but maybe I did.

Point is that a Tech today needs to be tested on RF safety at the 1500 W level for VHF/UHF/microwaves, which are obvioulsy present the most hazard (as WK3C says "meat-cooking frequencies"). Generals need to be tested on *all* RF exposure, because they have *all* bands and full power.

Meanwhile us *old* (pre-1996) hams never had any RF safety stuff in our tests. (At least some of us - ahem - learned the stuff anyway so we'd be current with the current tests)

But is RF safety really that tough a subject?

>But wait! the Class B tests are apparently not going to
>address RF safety either because the power is limited to a "safe"
>amount. So now safety related learning is confined to the second test
>for class A.

> Dat's gonna be one big test!
>
If so, is that really a problem?

73 de Jim, N2EY

3872. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-06 19:16:26 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <eWpAb.2497$rP6.797@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 83448

"Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote

> I don't know what's so fascinating about it, Kim. It stands to reason that
> to make an "educated" decision regarding anything, one should be...well,
> somewhat educated on the subject.

Sounds reasonable to me.

> That includes some practical experience.

Not necessarily. I've made decisions to do (or not to do) many, many things without a lick of practical experience. I have decided not to be a surfer, I've decided not to eat chocolate covered insects, I've decided not to engage in same-gender sex, I've decided not to be a vegetarian, I've decided not to be a Hindu, all with some 'education' on the subject but without a bit of practical experience. I'm sure some folks make the same decision about whether to learn Morse code.

> However, many of these anti-code
> folks are about to diminish the value (As a whole.) of a hobby I dearly
> love...despite having a very generous chunk of no-code RF real estate.

Bert, with all due respect, how are they diminishing the value of Amateur Radio? I truly enjoy Morse code, and use it frequently, but I'm not persuaded that we need a Morse qualification test any longer. I'm a member of FISTS and I'm a member of NCI. I see both organizations as having goals which advance Amateur Radio for me. FISTS encourages people to use Morse code, and NCI encourages regulatory agencies to modernize the qualification process for new licensees.

If some new guy/gal gets on HF without knowing Morse code, the value of Amateur Radio has not been diminished for me.

73, de Hans, K0HB

3873. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-06 20:10:20 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031206151020.07961.00000362@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 83449

In article <aZ8Ab.673$Ho3.149@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:

>Good thing I never made the argument about code testing
>being a barrier.

Agreed!

So we have to wonder why, even after almost four years, so many hams have not upgraded. I can think of several reasons:

1) Perfectly happy with the license they have now
2) Don't know what's involved in upgrading
3) Dead, incapacitated, or completely inactive.
4) Haven't gotten around to it yet.
5) Waiting for the requirements to change yet again (for example, there was a false rumor some time back that Advanceds would get a free upgrade to Extra)
6) Can't pass the written tests yet.

I expected the numbers of Advanceds and Tech Pluses to drop faster than they have in the 43 months.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3874. Eliminate the CW requirement for General & Extra, BUT THEN...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-06 20:13:42 UTC
From: Bill Wright <wrightw@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <WLqAb.5758$NN.550770@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 83450

BUT THEN change the CW band plan.
Eliminate the current segregation of the CW bands by license level and institute a band plan based on transmit speed. We could have Low speed - 5 wpm, Medium speed - 12 wpm and High speed - 20 wpm band sections. Even if you have an Extra license, you need to stay out of the "Fast Lane" unless you can keep up with the traffic.
Regards,
Bill
KO6SI

"Code" <code@codeyesno.net> wrote in message
news:bqflemgia0@pita.alt.net...
> Should Morse code be retained as a requirement to
> obtain an amateur radio license in the U.S.?
>
> 73
>
> Code Yes or No
>
>
>

3875. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-06 20:30:27 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <D%qAb.14247$P%1.13323087@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 83451

"Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:bqt5ob$ib9@library1.airnews.net...
>
> I was actually commenting, allbeit out of synch, on your defense that
> someone can't know they don't like something without experience...etc. I
> think that argument is quite indefensible...since it's quite common to
> decide that one doesn't like something (or does, for that matter) without
> any particular experience with it. For example, things I don't, or
> wouldn't, like that I've never tried:
>
> parachuting
> picking up clothes at a cleaners
> dropping off babies to daycare
> raising grandchildren
> holding snot in my hand
> bungee jumping
> parasailing
> rough sex
> working in a foundry
> getting a tattoo
> being bald
> all kinds of food
> spelunking
> building a computer...or anything for that matter
> being a man
>
> Add countless other things to that list.
>
> If you accept the premise above that I don't like those things without
ever
> having tried them, then you should accept that I know I would not like CW
> without having any real experience with it.
>
> Kim W5TIT
>
>

I do NOT accept the premis that a person can know what they like without trying something. While there are many valid reasons for not trying these things, you cannot know if you would like them or not. For example, the fear of heights and the potential risk factor stops me from trying parachuting. Thus I can never know whether I would actually like it. In the case of the 5th item on your list, it could be downright unhealthy and should NOT be tried even if you think you would like it.

There's lots of things in life that I thought I would not like until experience proved me wrong. I originally got into ham radio simply because my husband at that time insisted I do this with him. Of course I "knew" that I wouldn't like it and was only doing it to please him but in the end I was proven wrong. It is one of my favorite pastimes.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

3876. Re: Eliminate the CW requirement for General & Extra, BUT THEN...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-06 20:32:56 UTC
From: garigue <garigue@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <Y1rAb.448518$Fm2.443528@attbi_s04>
Source record: 83452

"Bill Wright" <wrightw@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:WLqAb.5758$NN.550770@news1.news.adelphia.net...
> BUT THEN change the CW band plan.
> Eliminate the current segregation of the CW bands by license level and
> institute a band plan based on transmit speed. We could have Low speed -
5
> wpm, Medium speed - 12 wpm and High speed - 20 wpm band sections. Even if
> you have an Extra license, you need to stay out of the "Fast Lane" unless
> you can keep up with the traffic.
Hello Bill ....

Yepper that's what we need a novice ghetto .... I can't understand why people can't see that one reason that the CW mess we are in is partially due to the CWists.

Yep lets put the newcomers on 80 where the summer QRN blows the phones off your head ....or better yet let them work DX between all the crap on 40 ... but wait go to 15 where the band has needed Viagra over the last few years. Give 'em a sliver of band so they can prove their worth .

I have always said that 5 WPM is a good entrance speed and should be accepted "all over" the bands. Let the true ham spirit shine and let the "speeders" slow down and work the new ops just like we once were ...or did we forget??? For those that don't ...well your dirty underwear is showing. We need to foster our mode not our speed accomplishments.

To repeat myself ....my CW unravels like a cheap sweater at 45 WPM .... maybe I shouldn't get the bottom 5-10-20 kcs (your pick) of each band.

God Bless 73 Tom Popovic KI3R Belle Vernon Pa

3877. Re: Eliminate the CW requirement for General & Extra, BUT THEN...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-06 20:34:08 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <43rAb.14248$P%1.13323632@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 83453

"Bill Wright" <wrightw@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:WLqAb.5758$NN.550770@news1.news.adelphia.net...
> BUT THEN change the CW band plan.
> Eliminate the current segregation of the CW bands by license level and
> institute a band plan based on transmit speed. We could have Low speed -
5
> wpm, Medium speed - 12 wpm and High speed - 20 wpm band sections. Even if
> you have an Extra license, you need to stay out of the "Fast Lane" unless
> you can keep up with the traffic.
> Regards,
> Bill
> KO6SI
>

I disagree. It's not like driving where it would be dangerous to be going slowly in the fast lane. Instead it is more like, oh say tennis, if you really want to improve, you work with the best even if you can't yet match them.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

3878. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-06 20:50:07 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031206155007.00545.00002743@mb-m02.aol.com>
Source record: 83454

In article <Xns9449649382ED8elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun
<alun@1stcounsel.com> writes:

>> Four years ago there were 6 license classes open to new hams. Now there
>> are only 3, but the other 3 classes are still held by almost 200,000
>> hams. Was that an "absurd" change? Tell it to the FCC!
>>
>> Hans' proposal would create 2 new license classes and close off the
>> other 6 to new licensees. Is it really so absurd, given the changes
>> we've already seen?
>>
>> His proposal is no more absurd than the claim that a single 5 wpm code
>> test is a "barrier".....
>>
>> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>>
>>
>
>It's not really three, though. Although the 'Tech Plus' was abolished in
>theory it still exists in practice. That particular absurdity will go away
>when Element 1 is abolished, which it soon will be. To avoid actually
>taking away any privileges the FCC will have to give the Novice subbands
>to all Techs (assuming Element 1 will no longer be mentionned anywhere in
>Part 97, the only other alternative would be to take them away from those
>Techs who have them now, which would be very unpalatable).

And also without any purpose.
>
>I don't agree with all aspects of Hans' proposal. In particular, I oppose
>all time limits and time in grade requirements.

Do either of them really create a problem? I entered ham radio with both of
those features (Novice license only good for two years, upgrade or go off the
air, and a two-year experience rule for Extra). I don't think they were such
awful ideas.

However, I doubt FCC will go for either. Just MHO.

>However, I think that
>something ultimately will have to be done about the status of Novice and
>Advanced licences.

Why? They're just entries in a database. Since no new ones are being issued,
they involve no more admin work than other license classes.

At the end of 1952, FCC stopped issuing new Advanceds. They allowed existing Advanceds to keep those licenses, renewing and modifying as needed. Most of the approximately 40,000 Advanceds of that time did just that.

Then, almost 15 years later, FCC reopened the Advanced to new issues.

>It is just too messy to maintain closed licence classes
>indefinitely.

How is it messy?

>I would have no problem with automatically upgrading them
>all, but I know that many others would not like it. Maybe the way around
>this is to have new (or at least re-named) licence classes. Someone who
>objects to Advanced licencees getting a free pass to Extra may aquiesce to
>both becoming Class As, for example.

I doubt that!

>A rose by any other name would smell
>as sweet?
>
Renaming isn't going to fool anyone that is against free upgrades.

Is the current 50 question Extra test so tough that it presents a serious "barrier" to existing Advanceds?

What is the problem of keeping old license classes on the database and rules?

73 de Jim, N2EY

3879. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-06 21:10:25 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bqtghm$o8v@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 83455

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:D%qAb.14247$P%1.13323087@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
>
> "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> news:bqt5ob$ib9@library1.airnews.net...
> >
> > I was actually commenting, allbeit out of synch, on your defense that
> > someone can't know they don't like something without experience...etc.
I
> > think that argument is quite indefensible...since it's quite common to
> > decide that one doesn't like something (or does, for that matter)
without
> > any particular experience with it. For example, things I don't, or
> > wouldn't, like that I've never tried:
> >
> > parachuting
> > picking up clothes at a cleaners
> > dropping off babies to daycare
> > raising grandchildren
> > holding snot in my hand
> > bungee jumping
> > parasailing
> > rough sex
> > working in a foundry
> > getting a tattoo
> > being bald
> > all kinds of food
> > spelunking
> > building a computer...or anything for that matter
> > being a man
> >
> > Add countless other things to that list.
> >
> > If you accept the premise above that I don't like those things without
> ever
> > having tried them, then you should accept that I know I would not like
CW
> > without having any real experience with it.
> >
> > Kim W5TIT
> >
> >
>
> I do NOT accept the premis that a person can know what they like without

> trying something. While there are many valid reasons for not trying these
> things, you cannot know if you would like them or not. For example, the
> fear of heights and the potential risk factor stops me from trying
> parachuting. Thus I can never know whether I would actually like it. In
> the case of the 5th item on your list, it could be downright unhealthy and
> should NOT be tried even if you think you would like it.
>
> There's lots of things in life that I thought I would not like until
> experience proved me wrong. I originally got into ham radio simply
because
> my husband at that time insisted I do this with him. Of course I "knew"
> that I wouldn't like it and was only doing it to please him but in the end
I
> was proven wrong. It is one of my favorite pastimes.
>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>

Your mileage may vary, Dee, but I *know* I would not like any of the items I listed. And, I cannot believe anyone would do something (outside of employment that is) because someone insisted on it--most of all a spouse or family member--who should know far better than to "insist" on anything from me that I don't wish to do. Nor would I insist of anything from them.

Kim W5TIT

3880. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-06 21:49:03 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <j9sAb.5787$NN.575589@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 83456

N2EY wrote:

> In article <Xns9449649382ED8elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun
> <alun@1stcounsel.com> writes:
>
>
>>>Four years ago there were 6 license classes open to new hams. Now there
>>>are only 3, but the other 3 classes are still held by almost 200,000
>>>hams. Was that an "absurd" change? Tell it to the FCC!
>>>
>>>Hans' proposal would create 2 new license classes and close off the
>>>other 6 to new licensees. Is it really so absurd, given the changes
>>>we've already seen?

>>>His proposal is no more absurd than the claim that a single 5 wpm code
>>>test is a "barrier".....
>>>
>>>73 de Jim, N2EY
>>>
>>
>>It's not really three, though. Although the 'Tech Plus' was abolished in
>>theory it still exists in practice. That particular absurdity will go away
>>when Element 1 is abolished, which it soon will be. To avoid actually
>>taking away any privileges the FCC will have to give the Novice subbands
>>to all Techs (assuming Element 1 will no longer be mentionned anywhere in
>>Part 97, the only other alternative would be to take them away from those
>>Techs who have them now, which would be very unpalatable).
>
>
> And also without any purpose.
>
>>I don't agree with all aspects of Hans' proposal. In particular, I oppose
>>all time limits and time in grade requirements.
>
>
> Do either of them really create a problem? I entered ham radio with both of
> those features (Novice license only good for two years, upgrade or go off the
> air, and a two-year experience rule for Extra). I don't think they were such
> awful ideas.

I don't oppose a time limit per se. I don't like a ten year time limit
though.

I support a time in grade, even though I would be frustrated (read
teased) by a two year stint before I could get the class A. Another

thing, which would be a little strange would be having to have a control op at field day (or operate lower power)

- Mike KB3EIA -

3881. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-06 22:15:39 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <fysAb.1703$Ho3.995@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 83457

"Dee D. Flint" wrote:
>
> Since you are aware that nobody collects
> such data, simple common sense should
> have prevented you from making such an
> unprovable statement in the first place.

No, you misunderstand my position. I'm not backing away from my statement. I still feel it is entirely accurate and therefore fact. However, as you well know, I can't prove it because nobody gathers such statistics. But that alone doesn't change the accuracy of a statement. There is a lot of truth and facts in this world that isn't backed up by statistics.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3882. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-06 22:49:28 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <Y1tAb.1743$Ho3.1287@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 83458

"Kim W5TIT" wrote:
>
> Nope. I disagree, but only because I approach
> this venue exactly in the same manner as Dee.
> I like debating and there are few people who can
> do it artfully. But, I don't think I've ever expected
> anyone else to approach it the same way I do.
> However, to engage one in discourse almost
> dictates that you must be willing to communicate
> at their level and in their manner. (snip)

Then we all need to get together and establish specific rules for debate in this newsgroup. And everyone should be made aware of those rules to insure an even playing field. Without that, screaming about rules and procedures is a little absurd, don't you think? So lets talk about common debate rules. Every debate I've seen allows for opinion - even opinions about what is a fact when that is not clear. Since nobody gathers statistics for what I said, there are no facts to prove or disprove my statement - there is only opinion either way. Therefore, since everyone involved has now admitted to knowing that nobody gathers such statistics, my statement would be acceptable even under standard debate rules and any challenge following that could only be interpreted as an attempt to sidetrack the debate (which, I believe, is not proper debate procedure).

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3883. Re: Bush Thrills Troops, Hillary Doesn't

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-06 23:02:21 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0312061502.2496d81@posting.google.com>
Source record: 83459

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:<3pfAb.1106$Ho3.906@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> "stewart" wrote:
> >
> > How'd you like us to cancel that little
> > NATO agreement, and let the BEARS
> > or POLES place your ungrateful
> > socialist-leaning ass under their rule?
>
>
> If put to a vote today, I think many Europeans would be thrilled to end
> NATO. Of course, since it benefits us (the USA), this country would strongly
> resist that. In other words, what you say is nothing more than a shallow
> threat (and the Europeans know it).
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

Wow. I never knew that NATO benefitted the USA. I always assumed
that it was just another welfare agency that sucked us dry.

So please detail the benefits that the USA receives, and don't tell me
it's an unlimited supply of blue helmuts.

Brian

3884. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-06 23:17:16 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <0stAb.14288$P%1.13356808@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 83460

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:fysAb.1703$Ho3.995@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
>
> "Dee D. Flint" wrote:
> >
> > Since you are aware that nobody collects
> > such data, simple common sense should
> > have prevented you from making such an
> > unprovable statement in the first place.
>
>
> No, you misunderstand my position. I'm not backing away from my
statement.
> I still feel it is entirely accurate and therefore fact. However, as you
> well know, I can't prove it because nobody gathers such statistics. But
that
> alone doesn't change the accuracy of a statement. There is a lot of truth
> and facts in this world that isn't backed up by statistics.

FEELING that something is true or false doesn't make it so. You have made an assertion that you claim to be fact therefore it IS up to you, even in a casual discussion to back it up with data. If that data has not been collected, then you cannot make such an assertion until either you find a data source or collect that data with valid statistical methods.

No one in my experience outside of ham radio knew anything about Morse code except possibly its name. Therefore I could state that most people have not had enough exposure to Morse code to make an educated decision on whether they would like it or not. However since I know that this is not sufficient data to provide proof of my opinion, I do not state it as a fact. Although my "fact" is just as valid and accurate as your "fact". This is why opinions are not allowed as proof of anything.

Unless you have statistical data on this, your statement is an OPINION and nothing more.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

3885. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-06 23:31:59 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <PFtAb.1776$Ho3.342@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 83461

"Kï¿½HB" wrote:
>
> Thank you. I was kind of hoping you might have
> something to add but so far you've only been a
> detractor, so it's probably just as well that you have
> decided to withdraw from the discussion.

Didn't you say the proposal has already been submitted? If so, there really isn't anything that can be added and therefore any further discussion is pointless.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3886. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-06 23:36:53 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <pKtAb.1783$Ho3.283@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 83462

"N2EY" wrote:
>
> Not according to Hans' answer to the
> above question.

Hans' answer is not in his proposal. In fact, a lot of what Hans has said in this newsgroup is not in the proposal. Instead, he just seems to be making up answers as he goes along.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3887. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-06 23:40:24 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <INtAb.1786$Ho3.823@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 83463

"Alun" wrote:
>
> So maybe Class A (Extra/Advanced), B (General)
> and C (Tech/Novice)?

Or how about no reference to class in the license names at all - such as "Temporary" and "Operator" licenses?

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3888. Re: Do Hams get 11 Meters Back

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-06 23:54:29 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <lIOdnf1W-qzm8U-iRVn-jg@gbronline.com>
Source record: 83464
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.cb

Doug Davis wrote:

> I don't think you can speak for all hams, Mr. Poopy Butt :)
>
> Peace on Earth to you,
>
> Ellen

Since you include so many posting from so many different individuals it
is difficult to determine just who you commenting to.
Name me some hams who would like to have 11 meters back.

3889. Re: Do Hams get to use 11 Meters

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-06 23:57:59 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <lIOdnfxW-qzK8E-iRVn-jg@gbronline.com>
Source record: 83465
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.cb

Radioman wrote:

> Doug Davis wrote:
>
>>All sailors don't cuss, Mr. Poopy Butt :)
>>
>>Peace on Earth to you,
>>
>>Ellen
>
>
>
> Are you Doug or Ellen?
>
> Why do you respond to 3 week old posts? You troll you.

He/she/it just got out of diapers (the 'poopy butt' gives it away), and
dosen't know much about the Internet yet.

3890. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-07 00:21:24 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <8cqdnTV_kZKU7k-i4p2dnA@gbronline.com>
Source record: 83466

Dee D. Flint wrote:

>
> I do NOT accept the premis that a person can know what they like without
> trying something. While there are many valid reasons for not trying these
> things, you cannot know if you would like them or not. For example, the
> fear of heights and the potential risk factor stops me from trying
> parachuting. Thus I can never know whether I would actually like it. In
> the case of the 5th item on your list, it could be downright unhealthy and
> should NOT be tried even if you think you would like it.
>
> There's lots of things in life that I thought I would not like until
> experience proved me wrong. I originally got into ham radio simply because
> my husband at that time insisted I do this with him. Of course I "knew"
> that I wouldn't like it and was only doing it to please him but in the end I
> was proven wrong. It is one of my favorite pastimes.
>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>
I have never tried drinking lye and I know I wouldn't
like it. By your reasoning I should try it as I might like dying.

3891. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-07 01:45:50 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <iDvAb.1899$Ho3.1189@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 83467

"Dee D. Flint" wrote:
>
> FEELING that something is true or false
> doesn't make it so. You have made an
> assertion that you claim to be fact
>therefore it IS up to you, even in a casual
>discussion to back it up with data. (snip)

Nonsense. I've never seen anybody asked to provide statistical data in a casual discussion.

> Unless you have statistical data on this,
> your statement is an OPINION and
> nothing more.

No kidding!!! Isn't that exactly what I've been saying all along? Lacking any evidence either way, it is my opinion that it is fact.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3892. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-07 02:09:59 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <XZvAb.2997$rP6.1104@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 83468

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote

> Lacking any evidence either way, it is my opinion that it is fact.

Translation: "My mind is made up. Don't try to confuse me with facts."

73, de Hans, K0HB
--
"If you are not certain of any fact, you cannot be certain of the meaning
of your words either."

"My opinions may have changed, but not the fact that I am right."

"The very powerful and the very stupid have one thing in common. Instead
of altering their views to fit the facts, they alter the facts to fit their
views... which can be very uncomfortable if you happen to be one of the
facts that needs altering."

.

3893. Re: Bush Thrills Troops, Hillary Doesn't

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-07 02:24:47 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <PbwAb.1935$Ho3.1635@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 83469

"Brian" wrote:
>
> Wow. I never knew that NATO benefitted
> the USA. I always assumed that it was just
> another welfare agency that sucked us dry.
>
> So please detail the benefits that the USA
> receives, and don't tell me it's an unlimited
> supply of blue helmuts.

You need to study up on national defense, Brian. NATO, even today, is critical to our strategic defense in that region of the world. Likewise, bases in Europe play an important role in many lesser conflicts overseas (refueling, supply, protection for ships passing through that area, area commands, and so on). Europe could defend itself today. We benefit that defense just as they benefit our defense. Therefore, we need those bases in Europe just about as much as they need us.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3894. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-07 02:28:11 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031206212811.29660.00001950@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 83470

In article <WooAb.2338$rP6.175@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>, "Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote
>
>> What about vanity calls?
>
>No change from current rules.

That means Class As could get a call from any callsign block. But what about Class Bs?
>
>> Exactly the idea. A person would have to get a passing grade in each
>> subject
>> area on the same test, so it would still be one test, not three.
>>
>> I'd even suggest doing the something similar to the Class B test.
>
>No, my vision for the Class B test is similar to the original Novice exam.

OK

>Some basic stuff to ensure the applicant has an acquaintence with the
>subject matter, and not heavily weighted in any single area, and not such a
>tight screen that it blocks those with 'casual interest'.

That makes sense and agrees with the stated goals.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3895. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-07 02:28:11 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031206212811.29660.00001949@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 83471

In article <pKtAb.1783$Ho3.283@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> writes:

>"N2EY" wrote:
>>
>> Not according to Hans' answer to the
>> above question.

> Hans' answer is not in his proposal.

OK, fine.

>In fact, a lot of what Hans has said
>in this newsgroup is not in the proposal.

It will be, if FCC acts on it in any way.

>Instead, he just seems to be
>making up answers as he goes along.

Is that bad? His answers are all in agreement with the stated goals and philosophy of his proposal. I haven't found a single case where Hans has contradicted himself in this proposal thing.

Hans has suggested his idea to FCC at least twice - but always in the form of comments to others' proposals. Seems to me it would make sense for him to submit it to FCC and get an RM number, just like the other 14 petitions.

He could just take the various answers he's given here and work them into the proposal (to answer the same questions which are bound to be asked by FCC and commenters) and ship the expanded proposal to FCC.

Even though I disagree with some parts of his proposal, it seems to me that such a formal submission is the next step if Hans is serious about it. And I think he is.

Plus it's good to see a proposal that at least tries to address the situation as a whole, rather than simply trying to slap another patch on the 1951 system.

btw, some of the concepts in Hans' proposal are also part of the KL7CC "21st Century" proposal - like the very-easy-to-get entry license with a low power limit. But Hans had those ideas first!

73 de Jim, N2EY

3896. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-07 02:28:13 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031206212813.29660.00001951@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 83472

In article <zfoAb.1421$Ho3.1241@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:

>Maybe I missed a post somewhere. What would be the difference,
>other than name, between a Class A and the Extra?

All I can see is that Class A doesn't need to be renewed.

>If the
>only difference is the name, why would any Extra waste time
>to pass a class A test whenit buys them nothing?

I'd do it just to avoid having to renew.

Plus, I could then say I'd passed both the "old" and "new" tests for full-privileges ham licenses.
>
>Also, why would the FCC want to maintain the name difference
>in their database if that is all it is?

Just a name.

For 15 years the FCC retained the name difference between Advanced and General even though Advanced privileges were exactly the same as General privileges. For most of that time, the FCC "database" wasn't even computerized (the amateur radio data was first computerized in 1964, IIRC).

So I don;t think it would be much of a problem today.

--

I think in all the arguments about the details, we may be losing sight of the main goals of Hans' proposal:

1) Make it easier to get an entry-level amateur license
2) Convey a very large set of privileges with that entry-level license so that new hams can sample *anything* amateur radio has to offer - except high power transmitters.
3) Offer a real incentive for new hams to increase their technical knowledge and qualify for full privilege licenses within a reasonable time
4) Simplify the rules and test procedures (two tests is simpler than three tests, anyway)

Of course there's disagreement about the methods. But aren't these all pretty good goals?

73 de Jim, N2EY

3897. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-07 02:34:43 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <7lwAb.5924$NN.658563@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 83473

Dwight Stewart wrote:
> "Dee D. Flint" wrote:
>
>>FEELING that something is true or false
>>doesn't make it so. You have made an
>>assertion that you claim to be fact
>
> >therefore it IS up to you, even in a casual
>
>>discussion to back it up with data. (snip)
>
>
>
> Nonsense. I've never seen anybody asked to provide statistical data in a
> casual discussion.

Can you provied statistical data on that Qwight? 8^)

-couldn't help meself! - Mike KB3EIA -

3898. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-07 03:42:26 UTC
From: "Richard L. Tannehill" <w7rtrick@firstinter.net>
Message-ID: <3FD2A1A2.E4D4F633@firstinter.net>
Source record: 83474

Dwight Stewart wrote:
>
> "N2EY" wrote:
> >
> > Because people are not specific. Look at thread
> > subject lines like "drop the code" or "IARU says
> > drop Morse". And there's a group what goes by
> > the name "No-Code International" - not "No
> > Code TEST International".
>
> All writers assume a certain level of knowledge on the part of their
> target readers. The same is true for this newsgroup. Most here are aware of
> the code testing debate, so there isn't any reason to restate the issue each
> time something is said. As for NCI, the names of many groups don't exactly
> reflect the group's publicly stated goals. For example, the Red Cross
> doesn't go around painting crosses red and the Salvation Army doesn't fight
> religious wars.
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

The the American Radio Relay League really doesn't
anymore....They're just the "ARRL".

Rick Tannehill - W7RT
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3899. Re: Fallacy - Morse code is still the easiest way to get on the air,

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-07 04:07:19 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20031206230719.11022.00002547@mb-m14.aol.com>
Source record: 83475

In article <rqatsvg3lo3caqgps7h12vklu9l1rodhmt@4ax.com>, Rod Anderson
<roda@dimensional.com> writes:

>On the other hand, some people require even more equipment to operate
>Morse code, Because I have Parkinson's disease I am unable to use a
>manual key or and if I were to use Morse: I would either need a
>computer keyboard with good macros or modify a speech to text program
>to provide my input, and since I can't write five words a minute and
>would either need a Morse to text converter or at the least a keyboard
>with a notebook program, I would be better off using RTTY or some
>other digital modes rather than Morse code.
>
>As far as learning Morse code what is the point? I will never be able
>to use it and in my case, why should I waste time learning it,
>
>Speech to text programs generate some interesting typos, I hope I
>caught them all.
>
>Rod Anderson
>W0RCA

Rod:

Just out of curiosity, have you tried using those speech-to-text programs
on RTTY or other digital modes? I'd be interested in knowing how they
worked.

If you are interested in digital modes and can type a little, you should
consider the MixW software. I am presently using MixW version 2.06,
and it works great on PSK-31, RTTY, and Hellschreiber. It also works
with virtually any other digital mode, but those are the only ones I've
personally used so far. It has very easy to program and use macros, so
it should be possible to communicate very effectively even without being
able to type in real time. I don't remember the web site URL, but just
do a search on MixW and it'll come right up.

73 de Larry, K3LT

3900. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-07 04:12:01 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <IMxAb.14494$P%1.13409545@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 83476

"JJ" <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
news:8cqdnTV_kZKU7k-i4p2dnA@gbronline.com...
> Dee D. Flint wrote:
>
>
>
> >
> > I do NOT accept the premis that a person can know what they like without
> > trying something. While there are many valid reasons for not trying
these
> > things, you cannot know if you would like them or not. For example, the
> > fear of heights and the potential risk factor stops me from trying
> > parachuting. Thus I can never know whether I would actually like it.
In
> > the case of the 5th item on your list, it could be downright unhealthy
and
> > should NOT be tried even if you think you would like it.
> >
> > There's lots of things in life that I thought I would not like until
> > experience proved me wrong. I originally got into ham radio simply
because
> > my husband at that time insisted I do this with him. Of course I "knew"
> > that I wouldn't like it and was only doing it to please him but in the
end I
> > was proven wrong. It is one of my favorite pastimes.
> >
> > Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
> >
> I have never tried drinking lye and I know I wouldn't
> like it. By your reasoning I should try it as I might like dying.
>

Negative. I've already stated that high risk levels of danger are
justification for NOT trying something. Such a risk level overrides the
potential of liking or disliking something. You just are NOT reading what I
write.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

3901. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-07 04:13:43 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <XNxAb.14495$P%1.13409935@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 83477

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:iDvAb.1899$Ho3.1189@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> "Dee D. Flint" wrote:
> >
> > FEELING that something is true or false
> > doesn't make it so. You have made an
> > assertion that you claim to be fact
> >therefore it IS up to you, even in a casual
> >discussion to back it up with data. (snip)
>
>
> Nonsense. I've never seen anybody asked to provide statistical data in a
> casual discussion.
>
>
> > Unless you have statistical data on this,
> > your statement is an OPINION and
> > nothing more.
>
>
> No kidding!!! Isn't that exactly what I've been saying all along?
Lacking
> any evidence either way, it is my opinion that it is fact.
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
>

You are being deliberately obtuse. Your opinion that it is a fact does not
make it so. And even in casual discussions, I've seen many statements
challenged and the proponent asked to prove it.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

3902. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-07 04:14:37 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <NOxAb.14497$P%1.13410106@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 83478

"Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:XZvAb.2997$rP6.1104@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net...
>
> "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote
>
> > Lacking any evidence either way, it is my opinion that it is fact.
>
> Translation: "My mind is made up. Don't try to confuse me with facts."
>
> 73, de Hans, K0HB
> --
> "If you are not certain of any fact, you cannot be certain of the
meaning
> of your words either."
>
> "My opinions may have changed, but not the fact that I am right."
>
> "The very powerful and the very stupid have one thing in common. Instead
> of altering their views to fit the facts, they alter the facts to fit
their
> views... which can be very uncomfortable if you happen to be one of the
> facts that needs altering."

Some great quotes.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

3903. Re: Bush Thrills Troops, Hillary Doesn't

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-07 04:43:03 UTC
From: wyatt@oregon-net.com
Message-ID: <ff275528.0312062043.611f441c@posting.google.com>
Source record: 83479

The only thing Hillary ever thrilled might have been Foster......poor man!!

3904. N8WWM shacked up with a felon?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-07 05:11:13 UTC
From: Anonymous Sender <anonymous@remailer.metacolo.com>
Message-ID: <061bff753b9db73f421ef6e6f6dcc6bf@remailer.metacolo.com>
Source record: 83480
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

Dogie has no reason to cry about being outedHe said terrable things about twistys son and chuckees mother.

3905. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-07 05:18:20 UTC
From: Alun <alun@1stcounsel.com>
Message-ID: <Xns944A31923459elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 83481

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in
news:20031206212811.29660.00001949@mb-m24.aol.com:

> In article <pKtAb.1783$Ho3.283@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>,
> "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> writes:
>
>>"N2EY" wrote:
>>>
>>> Not according to Hans' answer to the above question.
>
>> Hans' answer is not in his proposal.
>
> OK, fine.
>
>>In fact, a lot of what Hans has said in this newsgroup is not in the
>>proposal.
>
> It will be, if FCC acts on it in any way.
>
>>Instead, he just seems to be making up answers as he goes along.
>
> Is that bad? His answers are all in agreement with the stated goals and
> philosophy of his proposal. I haven't found a single case where Hans
> has contradicted himself in this proposal thing.
>
> Hans has suggested his idea to FCC at least twice - but always in the
> form of comments to others' proposals. Seems to me it would make sense
> for him to submit it to FCC and get an RM number, just like the other
> 14 petitions.
>
> He could just take the various answers he's given here and work them
> into the proposal (to answer the same questions which are bound to be
> asked by FCC and commenters) and ship the expanded proposal to FCC.
>
> Even though I disagree with some parts of his proposal, it seems to me
> that such a formal submission is the next step if Hans is serious about
> it. And I think he is.
>
> Plus it's good to see a proposal that at least tries to address the
> situation as a whole, rather than simply trying to slap another patch
> on the 1951 system.
>
> btw, some of the concepts in Hans' proposal are also part of the KL7CC
> "21st Century" proposal - like the very-easy-to-get entry license with

> a low power limit. But Hans had those ideas first!
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>
>

To answer your question from another part of this thread, anything that leaves closed licence classes intact feels to me like just another patch. I find it confusing to explain to prospective hams "oh yeah, there are two other classes of licence, but you can't get those anymore". They look at me as if I were mad! We do need a new system, and we need to fit all existing hams into it, albeit I don't think it will happen this time around.

I think the Canadians have an interesting system. Ignoring code endorsements (doubtless soon to become irrelevant), they are split into Basic and Advanced. The Basics get 200W and can go anywhere except 40 and the WARC bands, and can't use homebrew rigs or be a repeater control op. I'm not sure which bands a US Basic ought to get - it might be more useful to keep them off 20 than 40 (besides, Novices and Tech Plusses have part of 40, and we don't want to take privileges away). Also, nobody would want to call the higher grade 'Advanced', for obvious reasons, how about 'Expert'?

Maybe someone in VE would like to comment on whether they like the system they have?

73 de Alun, N3KIP

3906. Re: Where Did THIS Come From...?!?!a

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-07 05:25:39 UTC
From: Alun <alun@1stcounsel.com>
Message-ID: <Xns944A456E7592elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 83482

"Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote in
news:bqt46u$3gt@library1.airnews.net:

> "Steve Robeson, K4CAP" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:5c01b95b.0312050651.4642472f@posting.google.com...
>> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
>> news:<JQ3zb.1321$Oe5.1121@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
>> > "Steve Robeson, K4CAP" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
>> > news:5c01b95b.0312012005.49d2f5ac@posting.google.com...
>>
>> > Excuse me Steve, but I don't remember the Jews of Europe, in the
>> > pre NAZI days, sending in human bombs. Or shooting at soldiers, or
>> > declaring that Isreal has no right to exist.
>> >
>> > I think your compairison is flawed.
>> >
>> > Israel has no choice but to fight. If they do not they will indeed
>> > cease to exist.
>>
>> Perhaps it was an unbalanced comparison, Dan, but there's several
>> things that rub me the wrong way.
>>
>> The first is that the State of Israel was formed, for the most
>> part, by people who we not born there. They came, they saw, they took
>> what they wanted and the natives were just "S.O.L.". Yes...I know
>> this is the same way the US evolved, but it still doesn't make it
>> right.
>>
>> Secondly, the State of Israel is no stranger to spreading a bit
>> of terror around itself. If you doubt me, do a bit of research on the
>> Likud Party and one of it's more famous members, Menachim Begin.
>> Before he got himself elected Prime Minister and invited to break
>> bread at Camp David, ole Menachim took some special pleasure in
>> dispatching Palestinians and British alike. Some of the "tactics" you
>> may recognize as those that the State of Isreal currently cries foul
>> over now...
>>
>> Lastly, the Israelis, in my opinion anyway, still have a lot of
>> explaining to do for the way they do business with their "friends",
>> specifically us and the USS Liberty affair. Thier "misidentification"
>> story still doesn't wash.
>>
>> My point is this...there's a circle of violence that is occuring
>> in the Middle East...it's been going on since prehistoric times and

>> will probably continue until the sun goes nova, so we ought to cut our
>> losses and leave them to thier lifestyle. They'd not know how to act
>> any other way.
>>
>> Our only valid interest in that region is maintaining the
>> petroleum flow and free navigation via the Suez Canal. If geological
>> studies are correct, Russia has petroleum reserves that exceed
>> anything the Arabs have, so I think rather than sending arms to Israel
>> and money to the Arabs, we should be investing our engineering
>> resources farther north. The Arabs would go broke which would
>> relegate them back to bedouin tents in a generation. No money means
>> no guns, and the Israelis would no longer need OUR weapons.
>>
>> Of course that would tick off the Germans who'd be selling a lot
>> fewer Mercedes and Audis, but they'd make up the slack on the back end
>> selling them in Moscow ! ! !
>>
>> 73
>>
>> Steve, K4YZ
>>
>
> Man!!! Will you puhleeze run for President!? Not only *well* said,
> but *damned* well said. I know I have never said that well, heard it
> said that well, or will ever hear it said that well again, Steve.
>
> Kim W5TIT
>
>
>

Everything Steve said is true. That alone probably disqualifies him from
being a politician.

3907. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-07 05:29:43 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <bVyAb.3302$rP6.2329@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 83483

Dwight wrote:

> For example, the Red Cross doesn't go around painting
> crosses red and the Salvation Army doesn't fight religious wars.

But why the hell isn't there a Salvation Navy?

73, de Hans, K0HB

3908. Re: Where Did THIS Come From...?!?!a

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-07 05:53:45 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20031207005345.11022.00002549@mb-m14.aol.com>
Source record: 83484

In article <5c01b95b.0312050651.4642472f@posting.google.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) writes:

> Our only valid interest in that region is maintaining the
>petroleum flow and free navigation via the Suez Canal. If geological
>studies are correct, Russia has petroleum reserves that exceed
>anything the Arabs have, so I think rather than sending arms to Israel
>and money to the Arabs, we should be investing our engineering
>resources farther north. The Arabs would go broke which would
>relegate them back to bedouin tents in a generation. No money means
>no guns, and the Israelis would no longer need OUR weapons.

Steve:

The problem with Russian vs. Arab oil is that the Arabian oil is a whole lot easier to get at. You poke a hole in the sand, stick a pipe in it, and out it comes. Moreover, the oil fields are located close to accessible sea ports, meaning relatively short and inexpensive transport of the oil to the ships that will carry it away to the customers. I'm not at all certain, but I'm pretty sure you'd find that Russian oil is not only a whole lot further away from sea ports, but also a lot harder to drill for. A hot, arid climate, while not particularly comfortable, is still a whole lot easier to deal with than a frigid one when it comes to crude oil production. If Russia's oil were, in fact, economically feasible to produce, I have no doubt that those resources would be being exploited to the greatest extent possible.

> Of course that would tick off the Germans who'd be selling a lot
>fewer Mercedes and Audis, but they'd make up the slack on the back end
>selling them in Moscow ! ! !

They'd be better off sending their oil to Japan, which would then oblige by spewing out Toyotas, Honda's, and Nissans for the Russian market.

73 de Larry, K3LT

3909. Re: Eliminate the CW requirement for General & Extra, BUT THEN...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-07 05:53:46 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20031207005346.11022.00002550@mb-m14.aol.com>
Source record: 83485

In article <WLqAb.5758$NN.550770@news1.news.adelphia.net>, "Bill Wright"
<wrightw@adelphia.net> writes:

>BUT THEN change the CW band plan.
>Eliminate the current segregation of the CW bands by license level and
>institute a band plan based on transmit speed. We could have Low speed - 5
>wpm, Medium speed - 12 wpm and High speed - 20 wpm band sections.

This idea should not be tossed aside lightly. It should be hurled with
great force.

>Even if
>you have an Extra license, you need to stay out of the "Fast Lane" unless
>you can keep up with the traffic.

Don't look now, but it already works that way. What do you want to do --
have Riley Hollingsworth hand out NAL's to hams who are sending too
slowly in the wrong band segments? How could something like this
possibly be enforced?

>"Code" <code@codeyesno.net> wrote in message
>news:bqflemgia0@pita.alt.net...
>> Should Morse code be retained as a requirement to
>> obtain an amateur radio license in the U.S.?
>>
>> 73
>>
>> Code Yes or No

Yes.

73 de Larry, K3LT

3910. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-07 05:53:47 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20031207005347.11022.00002551@mb-m14.aol.com>
Source record: 83486

In article <i7eAb.1245$7p2.893@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote
>
>> Related question for Hans: Would existing Extras get Class
>> A licenses automatically, or would they have to retest?
>
>My inclination would be for current Extras to remain Extras unless they took
>the new test.

The FCC would not dare to do anything to alter the "status" of current Amateur Extra-class licensees, particularly those who attained that class in the Pre-Restructuring Era. We've already made it to the top, under a significantly more comprehensive and challenging set of testing requirements, including Morse code tests at speeds up to 20 WPM. Uncle Charlie won't muck around with that, considering it is the white-hot resentment of the General-class licensees of the Pre-Incentive Licensing Era which started the whole debate over licensing standards in the first place. Had the FCC taken the simple precaution of "grandfathering" those hams to the then-new Extra class, we may not be having this debate now.

>Lots of guys (Larry comes to mind) attach a certain cachet to
>their current license, having "done it the old way". I've no problem with
>honoring that.

The truth be known, I give relatively little thought to the fact that I am the holder of an Amateur Extra-class license. About the only time I've ever brought up the subject was to turn up the heat on the whining no-coders. The hardest license class for me to achieve was my Novice, which only came after 14 years wasted in my unwillingness to knuckle down and learn the Morse code. Once I overcame that personal character flaw, everything fell into place with surprising ease.

As far as "honoring" Extra-class amateurs who did it "the old way" is concerned, that would probably not be an issue except for the previously mentioned Inceltive Licensing debacle, and the fact that CB Radio had the effect of "consumerizing" personal radio communications to the point where a demand was created for that capability. Now, in these days of cell phones and "wireless" digital everything, amateur radio itself is all but irrelevant. So, in a way, I guess there may now be some point in "honoring" those of us who reached the pinnacle of the amateur radio licensing structure, under the "old order" set of standards. Perhaps it could serve to show newer hams what they have lost in the sense of true status

attained, and the good feeling of individual accomplishment that it brings. This may possibly cause the trend to again reverse itself, and create a demand for a return to a set of licensing standards which reward increased knowledge and operating skills with greater operating privileges.

73 de Larry, K3LT

3911. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-07 06:25:13 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <dJzAb.2478$7p2.2229@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 83487

"Kï¿½HB" wrote:
>
> Translation: "My mind is made up. Don't try
> to confuse me with facts."
>
> 73, de Hans, K0HB
> --
> "If you are not certain of any fact, you cannot
> be certain of the meaning of your words either."
>
> "My opinions may have changed, but not the
> fact that I am right."
>
> "The very powerful and the very stupid have
> one thing in common. Instead of altering their
> views to fit the facts, they alter the facts to fit
> their views... which can be very uncomfortable
> if you happen to be one of the facts that needs
> altering."

All nice quotes, Hans. But not very relevant when there are no facts. Lacking those facts, I can only go with what I believe to be fact. Of course, those who don't agree are never going to accept that.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3912. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-07 06:34:28 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <URzAb.2499$7p2.704@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 83488

"Dee D. Flint" wrote:
>
> You are being deliberately obtuse. Your opinion
> that it is a fact does not make it so.

And you're being deliberately disputatious. I've never said it did make it
so.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3913. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-07 06:53:31 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <L7AAb.2508$7p2.1820@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 83489

"N2EY" wrote:
> "Dwight Stewart" writes:
>
> > Hans' answer is not in his proposal.
>
> OK, fine.
>
> >In fact, a lot of what Hans has said
> >in this newsgroup is not in the proposal.
>
> It will be, if FCC acts on it in any way.
>
> >Instead, he just seems to be making
> > up answers as he goes along.
>
> Is that bad? His answers are all in agreement
> with the stated goals and philosophy of his
> proposal. I haven't found a single case where
> Hans has contradicted himself in this proposal
> thing.

You're missing the point, Jim. If it isn't in the proposal, he can't give definitive answers to those questions. Making up answers as the discussion goes along in this newsgroup isn't going to change that.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3914. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-07 07:11:35 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <HoAAb.3393$rP6.2209@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 83490

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote

> You're missing the point, Jim. If it isn't in the proposal, he can't
give
> definitive answers to those questions. Making up answers as the discussion
> goes along in this newsgroup isn't going to change that.

I've tried to give straightforward and responsive answers to every question asked about my proposal. Since it is so far only a proposal (work in process) and not yet a petition, it would be fair to say that some detail is missing and I've done my best to supply that detail, often in a contemporaneous manner. If that isn't definitive enough for you, I suggest you QSY up 5.

73, de Hans, K0HB
--
"A rock pile ceases to be a rock pile the moment a single man
contemplates it, bearing within him the image of a cathedral."
-- Antoine de Saint-Exupery

3915. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-07 07:31:50 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <GHAAb.2532$7p2.177@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 83491

"Kï¿½HB" wrote:
>
> Dwight wrote:
> > For example, the Red Cross doesn't go
> > around painting crosses red and the
> > Salvation Army doesn't fight religious wars.

Is this message (mine) just now showing up in the newsgroup for people to reply to? I posted it many days ago.

Did anyone hear the story on Fox several nights ago about the Red Cross in England planning to drop the red cross as their official logo? According to the story, they want to eliminate any reference to religion. I don't know if they intend to change the name also. The story said the U.S. chapter insists it has no intention of doing the same. Anyway, since the red cross logo is widely used outside religious circles (hospitals and so on) and I suspect few make a religious connection, I thought the entire thing was a little strange.

> But why the hell isn't there a Salvation Navy?

No department stores in the oceans to collect money at? It's too cold to stand around at piers during the Christmas season? On a more technical note, their ringing bells were mistaken for navigation buoys once too often? ;-)

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3916. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-07 11:33:19 UTC
From: Bert Craig <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM>
Message-ID: <3eEAb.11255$dr1.1736938@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>
Source record: 83492

"K�HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:eWpAb.2497$rP6.797@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net...
>
> "Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote
>
>
> > I don't know what's so fascinating about it, Kim. It stands to reason
that
> > to make an "educated" decision regarding anything, one should be...well,
> > somewhat educated on the subject.
>
> Sounds reasonable to me.
>
> > That includes some practical experience.
>
> Not necessarily. I've made decisions to do (or not to do) many, many
things
> without a lick of practical experience. I have decided not to be a
surfer,
> I've decided not to eat chocolate covered insects, I've decided not to
> engage in same-gender sex, I've decided not to be a vegetarian, I've
decided
> not to be a Hindu, all with some 'education' on the subject but without a
> bit of practical experience. I'm sure some folks make the same decision
> about whether to learn Morse code.

Fair enough, Hans. However, in the case of the 5-wpm test, it's difficult to fathom how so much effort can be placed on opposing it when such little effort is actually needed to ace it. Does that apply to everyone, no. But at 5-wpm, I believe it applies to the majority. I suppose it's the absence of the willingness to even try to learn something new that I find objectionable. It's commonly hidden behind the "I know I won't like it so I don't even want to learn the basics" defense.

> > However, many of these anti-code
> > folks are about to diminish the value (As a whole.) of a hobby I dearly
> > love...despite having a very generous chunk of no-code RF real estate.
>
> Bert, with all due respect, how are they diminishing the value of Amateur
> Radio? I truly enjoy Morse code, and use it frequently, but I'm not
> persuaded that we need a Morse qualification test any longer. I'm a
member
> of FISTS and I'm a member of NCI. I see both organizations as having
goals

> which advance Amateur Radio for me. FISTS encourages people to use Morse
> code, and NCI encourages regulatory agencies to modernize the
qualification
> process for new licensees.

Well, to be honest, Hans...Amateur Radio is a whole lot more than just regulatory to me. I believe that the regulatory agencies have sufficiently modernized the qualification process with the removal of the 13 and 20-wpm exams. Having said that, I further believe that many here, on both sides of the debate, have actually forgotten what the debate is over...the 5-wpm Element 1.

I personally don't think that the 5-wpm is a "barrier" to anybody except those who are unwilling to try in the first place. Additionally, there's been a no-code Amateur Radio license class available for over a decade now. (Via 35 multiple-choice questions for which the Q&A pool is published?!)

I think Element 1 is the bare minimum to be part of a well rounded curriculum, YMMV.

> If some new guy/gal gets on HF without knowing Morse code, the value of
> Amateur Radio has not been diminished for me.
>
> 73, de Hans, K0HB

Compared to you, I'm as green as Kermit the frog on the CW bands. But I have noticed a thing or two. I've yet to hear a dit sent in anger. Jim, N2EY assures me that I will eventually, but I'm still waiting. (And I'm on 30 and/or 40 every night now.) I have listened to some local (As well as some distant.) VHF/UHF repeaters and some of what I've heard made me feel as if Amateur Radio had been a tad diminished. I've heard the "F" word used on 20 and I won't even touch the subject of 75.

IOW, Hans...the trees are falling in out forest, but they're too far away for us to hear them. But it's still our forest as a whole.

73 de Bert
WA2SI

3917. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-07 13:53:32 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031207085332.07578.00002038@mb-m25.aol.com>
Source record: 83493

In article <bVyAb.3302$rP6.2329@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>, "Kï¿½HB"
<groupk0hb@earthlink.net> writes:

>Dwight wrote:
>
>> For example, the Red Cross doesn't go around painting
>> crosses red and the Salvation Army doesn't fight religious wars.
>
>But why the hell isn't there a Salvation Navy?

Because they'd always be trapped between the devil and the deep blue sea.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3918. Re: Where Did THIS Come From...?!?!a

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-07 14:20:49 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0312070620.4f1a170d@posting.google.com>
Source record: 83494

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<Pz3Ab.370$Ho3.320@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> "Steve Robeson, K4CAP" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:5c01b95b.0312050651.4642472f@posting.google.com...
> > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message

> Your right, what you say don't make it right. However what really happened
> was the UN, by RESOLUTION created the state of Israel. It was carved out
> of Palestine which was being vacated by the British. This was about 1947.

Understood. But what right did the United Nations have to create
a new "state" when the people who were already living on that land,
and had for centuries, were not party to that act? That would be like
my state's legislature re-zoning YOUR neighborhood!

> Of course the fine ragheads were trying to kill all the Jews before that
> happened.

And vice-versa. It's a love-hate relationship...Both sides
"love" hating the other side. Made for some sandskrit stories then
and CNN footage now. =)

> Remember our fine friends over there now...the Jordanians? They were
> marching on the Jews as the Brits left. And if the truth be known the
> reason Jordan had the butt is they wanted to be in charge of the Jews, i.e.
> part of the Kingdom of Jordan. And really didn't want the palestinians
> anyway. Just like today. Except they don't want to be in charge, they
> just hope the Jews don't get the arse and come over and kick theirs. Ah
> how times have changed.

Interesting bit of history.

> > Secondly, the State of Israel is no stranger to spreading a bit
> > of terror around itself. If you doubt me, do a bit of research on the
> > Likud Party and one of it's more famous members, Menachim Begin.
> > Before he got himself elected Prime Minister and invited to break
> > bread at Camp David, ole Menachim took some special pleasure in
> > dispatching Palestinians and British alike. Some of the "tactics" you
> > may recognize as those that the State of Isreal currently cries foul
> > over now...
>
> I never claimed the Isralies were sheep or Mr. Nice Guy. You fight fire
> with fire, period. It must work....Israel is still here and stronger than
> ever.

But this is my point...where do the Israeli's get off making scuh
a big ta-doo about Palestinian "terrorists" when they are/have been

just as quick to do a bit of artful manipulation of fear themselves?

And they are still around because Uncle Sam has made it his
business to keep Carrier Battle Groups in the Med!

Rest of stuff we agreed on snipped.

> > Our only valid interest in that region is maintaining the
> > petroleum flow and free navigation via the Suez Canal. If geological
> > studies are correct, Russia has petroleum reserves that exceed
> > anything the Arabs have, so I think rather than sending arms to Israel
> > and money to the Arabs, we should be investing our engineering
> > resources farther north. The Arabs would go broke which would
> > relegate them back to bedouin tents in a generation. No money means
> > no guns, and the Israelis would no longer need OUR weapons.
>
> Good theory.....but the Israelis don't need OUR weapons. They have their
> own.

True...and danged good ones too...However they what they DO need
is the threat of any one of the aforementioned Carrier Battle Groups
showing up to back up Isael's play...

Yes, the Israeli's have one of the finest Armed Forces in the
world, an intellegence agency that is second to none, and some
seriously big cajones to use them all...But if we weren't propping
them up, I doubt that they'd make it a year.

73

Steve, K4YZ

3919. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-07 14:24:20 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <oKGAb.3054$Ho3.2896@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 83495

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20031206212813.29660.00001951@mb-m24.aol.com...
> In article <zfoAb.1421$Ho3.1241@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Bill
Sohl"
> <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
>
> >Maybe I missed a post somewhere. What would be the difference,
> >other than name, between a Class A and the Extra?
>
> All I can see is that Class A doesn't need to be renewed.

An unlikly license aspect since if there is no
renewal, then the FCC data base gets larger and larger
since no licenseever expires. That should really screw up the
statistics as to how many hams there are.

> >If the
> >only difference is the name, why would any Extra waste time
> >to pass a class A test whenit buys them nothing?
>
> I'd do it just to avoid having to renew.

Last time I renewed the ARRL sent me a nice letter,I signed it
and mailed it back. Sure wasn't any effort on my part worth
the effort involved in a 100 question test..studying, going to a test
session, taking the test. But, your mileage may vary.

> Plus, I could then say I'd passed both the "old" and "new" tests for
> full-privileges ham licenses.

In other words, bragging rights and stroking your own ego...
which do nothing for the hobby.

> >Also, why would the FCC want to maintain the name difference
> >in their database if that is all it is?
>
> Just a name.
>
> For 15 years the FCC retained the name difference between Advanced and
General
> even though Advanced privileges were exactly the same as General
privileges.
> For most of that time, the FCC "database" wasn't even computerized (the
amateur
> radio data was first computerized in 1964, IIRC).
>

> So I don;t think it would be much of a problem today.

But, it would require "some" ongoing FCC effort, etc. The how much
is unquantifiable by anyone other than the FCC.

> --
> I think in all the arguments about the details, we may be losing sight of
the
> main goals of Hans' proposal:
>
> 1) Make it easier to get an entry-level amateur license
> 2) Convey a very large set of privileges with that entry-level license so
that
> new hams can sample *anything* amateur radio has to offer - except high
power
> transmitters.
> 3) Offer a real incentive for new hams to increase their technical
knowledge
> and qualify for full privilege licenses within a reasonable time
> 4) Simplify the rules and test procedures (two tests is simpler than three
> tests, anyway)
>
> Of course there's disagreement about the methods. But aren't these all
pretty
> good goals?

I agree. My comments above are directed at aspects that I think will need
to be addressed. Frankly, I don't give a hoot about retaing an existence
license name
just to show others I passed or did certain requirements that newer hams
didn't.
I think those that deliberately don't upgrade to Extra from Advanced, just
to
show others they once passed a 13 wpm test have a personal self esteem
problem.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

3920. Re: Where Did THIS Come From...?!?!a

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-07 14:25:32 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0312070625.4c8b0b08@posting.google.com>
Source record: 83496

"Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:<bqt46u$3gt@library1.airnews.net>...

> Man!!! Will you puhleeze run for President!? Not only *well* said, but
> *damned* well said. I know I have never said that well, heard it said that
> well, or will ever hear it said that well again, Steve.

Be careful, Kim...Brain insists that no one likes my "posting style"

Thanks, though!

88

Steve, K4YZ

3921. Re: Where Did THIS Come From...?!?!a

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-07 14:30:42 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0312070630.4b0dbace@posting.google.com>
Source record: 83497

Alun <alun@1stcounsel.com> wrote in message
news:<Xns944A456E7592elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>...

> Everything Steve said is true. That alone probably disqualifies him from
> being a politician.

Thank-you, Sir!

Steve, K4YZ

3922. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-07 14:32:44 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <gSGAb.3083$Ho3.1697@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 83498

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20031206151020.07961.00000362@mb-m03.aol.com...
> In article <aZ8Ab.673$Ho3.149@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Bill
Sohl"
> <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
>
> >Good thing I never made the argument about code testing
> >being a barrier.
>
> Agreed!
>
> So we have to wonder why, even after almost four years, so many hams have
not
> upgraded. I can think of several reasons:
>
> 1) Perfectly happy with the license they have now
> 2) Don't know what's involved in upgrading
> 3) Dead, incapacitated, or completely inactive.
> 4) Haven't gotten around to it yet.
> 5) Waiting for the requirements to change yet again (for example, there
was a
> false rumor some time back that Advanceds would get a free upgrade to
Extra)
> 6) Can't pass the written tests yet.
>
> I expected the numbers of Advanceds and Tech Pluses to drop faster than
they
> have in the 43 months.

Jim,

I agree all those reasons are valid...the difficulty is we have no
way of knowing the breakdown.

I think novice will dry up first...i.e. before Advanced.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

3923. Re: Eliminate the CW requirement for General & Extra, BUT THEN...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-07 14:36:12 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <wVGAb.3092$Ho3.2714@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 83499

"Bill Wright" <wrightw@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:WLqAb.5758$NN.550770@news1.news.adelphia.net...
> BUT THEN change the CW band plan.
> Eliminate the current segregation of the CW bands by license level and
> institute a band plan based on transmit speed. We could have Low speed -
5
> wpm, Medium speed - 12 wpm and High speed - 20 wpm band sections. Even if
> you have an Extra license, you need to stay out of the "Fast Lane" unless
> you can keep up with the traffic.
> Regards,
> Bill
> KO6SI

ARRL could suggest voluntary bandplans today. The FCC isn't
going to do that because then there is the monitor and
enforcement issue.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

3924. Re: Where Did THIS Come From...?!?!a

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-07 14:38:30 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0312070638.492e4e48@posting.google.com>
Source record: 83500

yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) wrote in message
news:<20031207005345.11022.00002549@mb-m14.aol.com>...

> The problem with Russian vs. Arab oil is that the Arabian oil is a whole
> lot easier to get at. You poke a hole in the sand, stick a pipe in it,
> and out it comes. Moreover, the oil fields are located close to accessible
> sea ports, meaning relatively short and inexpensive transport of the oil
> to the ships that will carry it away to the customers. I'm not at all
> certain, but I'm pretty sure you'd find that Russian oil is not only a
> whole lot further away from sea ports, but also a lot harder to drill
> for. A hot, arid climate, while not particularly comfortable, is still a
> whole lot easier to deal with than a frigid one when it comes to
> crude oil production. If Russia's oil were, in fact, economically feasible
> to produce, I have no doubt that those resources would be being
> exploited to the greatest extent possible.

All too true...but then too, the geography lends itself to long
pipelines, and once they were laid in, that existing infrastructure
alone would drop the price of oil.

Besides...Russians and Americans are closer in social and
geopolitical ideologies than Americans and those folks in the Middle
East and SW Asia...So let's spend our money where it's appreciated.

> > Of course that would tick off the Germans who'd be selling a lot
> >fewer Mercedes and Audis, but they'd make up the slack on the back end
> >selling them in Moscow ! ! !
>
> They'd be better off sending their oil to Japan, which would then oblige
> by spewing out Toyotas, Honda's, and Nissans for the Russian market.

Just as long as Central Europe keeps it's Tribants!

73

Steve, K4YZ

3925. Re: Eliminate the CW requirement for General & Extra, BUT THEN...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-07 14:44:21 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031207094421.21232.00002570@mb-m13.aol.com>
Source record: 83351

In article <WLqAb.5758$NN.550770@news1.news.adelphia.net>, "Bill Wright"
<wrightw@adelphia.net> writes:

>BUT THEN change the CW band plan.

Why?

>Eliminate the current segregation of the CW bands by license level and
>institute a band plan based on transmit speed.

The only "CW bands" in US amateur radio today are 50.0 - 50.1 and 144.0 - 144.1
MHz. And they're open to all licensees except Novices.

The HF bands have CW/data subbands.

>We could have Low speed - 5
>wpm, Medium speed - 12 wpm and High speed - 20 wpm band sections. Even if
>you have an Extra license, you need to stay out of the "Fast Lane" unless
>you can keep up with the traffic.

Why?

73 de Jim, N2EY

3926. Re: Where Did THIS Come From...?!?!a

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-07 17:00:07 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20031207120007.11022.00002575@mb-m14.aol.com>
Source record: 83352

In article <5c01b95b.0312070638.492e4e48@posting.google.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) writes:

>yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) wrote in message
>news:<20031207005345.11022.00002549@mb-m14.aol.com>...
>
>> The problem with Russian vs. Arab oil is that the Arabian oil is a whole
>> lot easier to get at. You poke a hole in the sand, stick a pipe in it,
>> and out it comes. Moreover, the oil fields are located close to accessible
>> sea ports, meaning relatively short and inexpensive transport of the oil
>> to the ships that will carry it away to the customers. I'm not at all
>> certain, but I'm pretty sure you'd find that Russian oil is not only a
>> whole lot further away from sea ports, but also a lot harder to drill
>> for. A hot, arid climate, while not particularly comfortable, is still a
>> whole lot easier to deal with than a frigid one when it comes to
>> crude oil production. If Russia's oil were, in fact, economically feasible
>> to produce, I have no doubt that those resources would be being
>> exploited to the greatest extent possible.
>
> All too true...but then too, the geography lends itself to long
>pipelines, and once they were laid in, that existing infrastructure
>alone would drop the price of oil.

> Besides...Russians and Americans are closer in social and
>geopolitical ideologies than Americans and those folks in the Middle
>East and SW Asia...So let's spend our money where it's appreciated.

I don't look upon the country formerly known as the Soviet Union ("Russia" is actually just a part of it) as being a place which is particularly stable, from a political standpoint. They now claim to be our allies, but are they really our friends? Keep in mind the civil strife which continues between the Russians and the Chechnyans (sp?). How do we know that other ethnic shredout groups wouldn't try to assert themselves, should they begin to feel as though they're not getting a fair share of the hegemony? Keep in mind that there is also a large Islamic population over there, and that is always going to mean trouble, from a political standpoint.

>> > Of course that would tick off the Germans who'd be selling a lot
>> >fewer Mercedes and Audis, but they'd make up the slack on the back end
>> >selling them in Moscow ! ! !
>>
>> They'd be better off sending their oil to Japan, which would then oblige
>> by spewing out Toyotas, Honda's, and Nissans for the Russian market.
>
> Just as long as Central Europe keeps it's Tribants!

That's Traubant, which means "grape." While stationed in Germany, I used to see them occasionally. Traubant drivers were usually experts in the navigation of the many back roads of Germany, since they dared not to venture out on the Autobahns. Their wheezing little 2-cycle engine only put out about 24 horsepower, the thing simply couldn't accelerate at all. I've never driven a "Trubby," but I'm told it's a very lawnmower-like experience.

73 de Larry, K3LT

3927. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-07 17:12:02 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <CbJAb.14565$P%1.13523435@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 83353

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:dJzAb.2478$7p2.2229@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> "Kï¿½HB" wrote:
> >
> > Translation: "My mind is made up. Don't try
> > to confuse me with facts."
> >
> > 73, de Hans, K0HB
> > --
> > "If you are not certain of any fact, you cannot
> > be certain of the meaning of your words either."
> >
> > "My opinions may have changed, but not the
> > fact that I am right."
> >
> > "The very powerful and the very stupid have
> > one thing in common. Instead of altering their
> > views to fit the facts, they alter the facts to fit
> > their views... which can be very uncomfortable
> > if you happen to be one of the facts that needs
> > altering."
>
>
> All nice quotes, Hans. But not very relevant when there are no facts.
> Lacking those facts, I can only go with what I believe to be fact. Of
> course, those who don't agree are never going to accept that.
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
>

Without data, in some endeavors (not ham radio) it can be downright
dangerous to act on what you believe to be fact. Without data, one should
tread with caution rather than certainty.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

3928. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-07 17:13:59 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <rdJAb.14566$P%1.13523822@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 83354

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:URzAb.2499$7p2.704@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net...
>
> "Dee D. Flint" wrote:
> >
> > You are being deliberately obtuse. Your opinion
> > that it is a fact does not make it so.
>
>
> And you're being deliberately disputatious. I've never said it did make
it
> so.
>

The phrasing used in your posts attempt to make it so. Thus naturally I will dispute the contention that you are trying to make it a fact without any supporting data. Not only are you trying to call it a fact but attempting to make others believe it, again without supporting data.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

3929. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-07 17:16:11 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <vfJAb.14567$P%1.13524175@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 83355

"Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:HoAAb.3393$rP6.2209@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net...
>
> "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote
>
> > You're missing the point, Jim. If it isn't in the proposal, he can't
> give
> > definitive answers to those questions. Making up answers as the
discussion
> > goes along in this newsgroup isn't going to change that.
>
> I've tried to give straightforward and responsive answers to every
question
> asked about my proposal. Since it is so far only a proposal (work in
> process) and not yet a petition, it would be fair to say that some detail
is
> missing and I've done my best to supply that detail, often in a
> contemporaneous manner. If that isn't definitive enough for you, I
suggest
> you QSY up 5.
>
> 73, de Hans, K0HB
> --
> "A rock pile ceases to be a rock pile the moment a single man
> contemplates it, bearing within him the image of a cathedral."
> -- Antoine de Saint-Exupery
>

Working on answers to such questions is actually beneficial in that it
allows you to see where your proposal may need refinement before becoming a
petition. Although I don't agree with what you are proposing, I do agree
with refining your proposal so it doesn't have the gaps that have been
spotted.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

3930. Re: Where Did THIS Come From...?!?!a

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-07 17:31:21 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <JtJAb.2864$_r6.643@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 83356

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote

> That's Traubant, which means "grape." While stationed in Germany, I used
> to see them occasionally. Traubant drivers were usually experts in the
> navigation of the many back roads of Germany, since they dared not to
> venture out on the Autobahns. Their wheezing little 2-cycle engine only
> put out about 24 horsepower, the thing simply couldn't accelerate at all.
> I've never driven a "Trubby," but I'm told it's a very lawnmower-like
> experience.

I spent a month in DL last spring and noticed a few of those still on the roads. Most of my time was in "previously West Germany", so they may be more prevalent in other parts of the country. The current 'econo-box-of-choice' seems to be the "SmartCar", a joint effort between Mercedes and Swatch (yes, the watch company who wanted to launch a ham-radio satelite with commercial messages a few years ago).

73, de Hans, K0HB

3931. Re: Eliminate the CW requirement for General & Extra, BUT THEN...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-07 18:09:41 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <F1KAb.3280$7p2.1187@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 83357

"garigue" <garigue@comcast.net> wrote in message
news:Y1rAb.448518$Fm2.443528@attbi_s04...
>
> "Bill Wright" <wrightw@adelphia.net> wrote in message
> news:WLqAb.5758$NN.550770@news1.news.adelphia.net...
> > BUT THEN change the CW band plan.
> > Eliminate the current segregation of the CW bands by license level and
> > institute a band plan based on transmit speed. We could have Low
speed -
> 5
> > wpm, Medium speed - 12 wpm and High speed - 20 wpm band sections. Even
if
> > you have an Extra license, you need to stay out of the "Fast Lane"
unless
> > you can keep up with the traffic.
> Hello Bill ....
>
> Yepper that's what we need a novice ghetto .... I can't understand why
> people can't see that one reason that the CW mess we are in is partially
due
> to the CWists.
>
> Yep lets put the newcomers on 80 where the summer QRN blows the phones off
> your head ....or better yet let them work DX between all the crap on 40
...
> but wait go to 15 where the band has needed Viagra over the last few
years.
> Give 'em a sliver of band so they can prove their worth .
>
>
> I have always said that 5 WPM is a good entrance speed and should be
> accepted "all over" the bands. Let the true ham spirit shine and let the
> "speeders" slow down and work the new ops just like we once were ...or did
> we forget??? For those that don't ...well your dirty underwear is
showing.
> We need to foster our mode not our speed accomplishments.
>
>
> To repeat myself ....my CW unravels like a cheap sweater at 45 WPM ....
> maybe I shouldn't get the bottom 5-10-20 kcs (your pick) of each band.
>
> God Bless 73 Tom Popovic KI3R Belle Vernon Pa
>
>

A good CW operator will slow down to the others speed. It makes sense really. Why keep going at QRQ if the other guy can't copy? Or maybe they are just showing off.

I wonder who will be impressed ?

Dan/W4NTI

3932. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-07 18:20:09 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <tbKAb.6149$NN.869328@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 83358

Kï¿½HB wrote:
> Dwight wrote:
>
>
>>For example, the Red Cross doesn't go around painting
>>crosses red and the Salvation Army doesn't fight religious wars.
>
>
> But why the hell isn't there a Salvation Navy?

Navy deals out something other than salvation! 8^)

- Mike KB3EIA -

3933. Re: Where Did THIS Come From...?!?!a

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-07 18:21:41 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <VcKAb.3296$7p2.2724@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 83359

"Steve Robeson, K4CAP" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
news:5c01b95b.0312070620.4f1a170d@posting.google.com...
> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<Pz3Ab.370$Ho3.320@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> > "Steve Robeson, K4CAP" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
> > news:5c01b95b.0312050651.4642472f@posting.google.com...
> > > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
>
> > Your right, what you say don't make it right. However what really
happened
> > was the UN, by RESOLUTION created the state of Israel. It was carved
out
> > of Palestine which was being vacated by the British. This was about
1947.
>
> Understood. But what right did the United Nations have to create
> a new "state" when the people who were already living on that land,
> and had for centuries, were not party to that act? That would be like
> my state's legislature re-zoning YOUR neighborhood!

The right of being the United Nations. No other. Apparantly most of the
then member nations agreed. I didn't say it was right.

>
> > Of course the fine ragheads were trying to kill all the Jews before that
> > happened.
>
> And vice-versa. It's a love-hate relationship...Both sides
> "love" hating the other side. Made for some sandskrit stories then
> and CNN footage now. =)
>
> > Remember our fine friends over there now...the Jordanians? They were
> > marching on the Jews as the Brits left. And if the truth be known the
> > reason Jordan had the butt is they wanted to be in charge of the Jews,
i.e.
> > part of the Kingdom of Jordan. And really didn't want the palestinians
> > anyway. Just like today. Except they don't want to be in charge, they
> > just hope the Jews don't get the arse and come over and kick theirs.
Ah
> > how times have changed.
>
> Interesting bit of history.
>
> > > Secondly, the State of Israel is no stranger to spreading a bit
> > > of terror around itself. If you doubt me, do a bit of research on the

> > > Likud Party and one of it's more famous members, Menachim Begin.
> > > Before he got himself elected Prime Minister and invited to break
> > > bread at Camp David, ole Menachim took some special pleasure in
> > > dispatching Palestinians and British alike. Some of the "tactics" you
> > > may recognize as those that the State of Isreal currently cries foul
> > > over now...
> >
> > I never claimed the Isralies were sheep or Mr. Nice Guy. You fight fire
> > with fire, period. It must work....Israel is still here and stronger
than
> > ever.
>
> But this is my point...where do the Israeli's get off making scuh
> a big ta-doo about Palestinian "terrorists" when they are/have been
> just as quick to do a bit of artful manipulation of fear themselves?
>
> And they are still around because Uncle Sam has made it his
> business to keep Carrier Battle Groups in the Med!
>
> Rest of stuff we agreed on snipped.
>
> > > Our only valid interest in that region is maintaining the
> > > petroleum flow and free navigation via the Suez Canal. If geological
> > > studies are correct, Russia has petroleum reserves that exceed
> > > anything the Arabs have, so I think rather than sending arms to Israel
> > > and money to the Arabs, we should be investing our engineering
> > > resources farther north. The Arabs would go broke which would
> > > relegate them back to bedouin tents in a generation. No money means
> > > no guns, and the Israelis would no longer need OUR weapons.
> >
> > Good theory.....but the Israelis don't need OUR weapons. They have
their
> > own.
>
> True...and danged good ones too...However they what they DO need
> is the threat of any one of the aforementioned Carrier Battle Groups
> showing up to back up Isael's play...
>
> Yes, the Israeli's have one of the finest Armed Forces in the
> world, an intellegence agency that is second to none, and some
> seriously big cajones to use them all...But if we weren't propping
> them up, I doubt that they'd make it a year.
>

No arguement here ... however I feel we must continue to support Israel. If
for no other (better) reason then for religious issues. I am not a real hot
to trot bible thumper, btw. This country has a lot in common with the
Isralies. As for their right to call the Palestinians terrorists...why not?
Their leader...Arafat is the founder of the terrorist movement. He is the
one that unleashed it upon the world. So the Israelies and the REST OF THE

WORLD have the right to call them terrorists...because that is exactly what they are.

Dan/W4NTI

> 73
>
> Steve, K4YZ

3934. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-07 18:22:28 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031207132228.07578.00002039@mb-m25.aol.com>
Source record: 83361

In article <oKGAb.3054$Ho3.2896@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Bill Sohl"
<billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20031206212813.29660.00001951@mb-m24.aol.com...
>> In article <zfoAb.1421$Ho3.1241@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Bill
>Sohl"
>> <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
>>
>> >Maybe I missed a post somewhere. What would be the difference,
>> >other than name, between a Class A and the Extra?
>>
>> All I can see is that Class A doesn't need to be renewed.
>
>An unlikly license aspect since if there is no
>renewal, then the FCC data base gets larger and larger
>since no licenseever expires. That should really screw up the
>statistics as to how many hams there are.

I noted that some time ago, Bill, but nobody commented on it until you did.

Perhaps that's part of the plan! Imagine if the FCC database totals showed the number of hams who had ever held a license, rather than the number of current licenses.....

Japan's operator licenses are "for life", which is one reason their totals appear to be so high.

The biggest downside I can see is that a lot of prime callsigns would be tied up unless family members could be convinced to send in a license cancellation letter.

>
>> >If the
>> >only difference is the name, why would any Extra waste time
>> >to pass a class A test whenit buys them nothing?
>>
>> I'd do it just to avoid having to renew.
>
>Last time I renewed the ARRL sent me a nice letter,I signed it
>and mailed it back.

I got one of those, too. Now it can even be done online.

>Sure wasn't any effort on my part worth
>the effort involved in a 100 question test..studying, going to a test
>session, taking the test. But, your mileage may vary.

I say "bring it on! I got yer 100 questions right here!"
>
>> Plus, I could then say I'd passed both the "old" and "new" tests for
>> full-privileges ham licenses.
>
>In other words, bragging rights and stroking your own ego...

Is that bad?

>which do nothing for the hobby.

That's one spin. Here's another: By getting a Class A instead of clinging to my Extra, I'd be setting an example for others *and* reducing FCC's admin workload.

After all, if every Extra got a Class A, there's be no problem. And one of the simplest tests of any action's morality is "what if everyone did that?"
>
>> >Also, why would the FCC want to maintain the name difference
>> >in their database if that is all it is?
>>
>> Just a name.
>>
>> For 15 years the FCC retained the name difference between Advanced and
>>General
>> even though Advanced privileges were exactly the same as General
>> privileges.
>> For most of that time, the FCC "database" wasn't even computerized (the
>> amateur
>> radio data was first computerized in 1964, IIRC).
>>
>> So I don;t think it would be much of a problem today.
>
>But, it would require "some" ongoing FCC effort, etc. The how much
>is unquantifiable by anyone other than the FCC.

Sure. But obviously FCC though it worth doing for 15 years, and again today with the Advanced and Novice.

Is it really almost four years since those changes?
>> --
>> I think in all the arguments about the details, we may be losing sight of
>> the main goals of Hans' proposal:
>>
>> 1) Make it easier to get an entry-level amateur license
>> 2) Convey a very large set of privileges with that entry-level license so
>> that new hams can sample *anything* amateur radio has to offer - except

>> high power transmitters.
>> 3) Offer a real incentive for new hams to increase their technical
>> knowledge and qualify for full privilege licenses within a reasonable
time
>> 4) Simplify the rules and test procedures (two tests is simpler than three

>> tests, anyway)
>>
>> Of course there's disagreement about the methods. But aren't these all
>> pretty good goals?
>
>I agree. My comments above are directed at aspects that I think will need
>to be addressed. Frankly, I don't give a hoot about retaing an existence
>license name
>just to show others I passed or did certain requirements that newer hams
>didn't.
>I think those that deliberately don't upgrade to Extra from Advanced, just
>to
>show others they once passed a 13 wpm test have a personal self esteem
>problem.

Actually, they have a logic problem! Because the fact of possesing an
Advanced in and of itself does not prove that someone passed the 13 wpm test
any more than having an Extra proves someone passed the 20 wpm test, due to
medical waivers.

73 de Jim, N2EY
>

3935. Re: Where Did THIS Come From...?!?!a

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-07 18:22:29 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031207132229.07578.00002040@mb-m25.aol.com>
Source record: 83362

In article <5c01b95b.0312070638.492e4e48@posting.google.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) writes:

>yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) wrote in message
>news:<20031207005345.11022.00002549@mb-m14.aol.com>...
>
>> The problem with Russian vs. Arab oil is that the Arabian oil is a whole
>> lot easier to get at. You poke a hole in the sand, stick a pipe in it,
>> and out it comes. Moreover, the oil fields are located close to accessible
>> sea ports, meaning relatively short and inexpensive transport of the oil
>> to the ships that will carry it away to the customers. I'm not at all
>> certain, but I'm pretty sure you'd find that Russian oil is not only a
>> whole lot further away from sea ports, but also a lot harder to drill
>> for. A hot, arid climate, while not particularly comfortable, is still a
>> whole lot easier to deal with than a frigid one when it comes to
>> crude oil production. If Russia's oil were, in fact, economically feasible
>> to produce, I have no doubt that those resources would be being
>> exploited to the greatest extent possible.
>
> All too true...but then too, the geography lends itself to long
>pipelines, and once they were laid in, that existing infrastructure
>alone would drop the price of oil.

Maybe.

Does anyone have a realistic estimate of how much it will cost and how long it will take to develop Russian oil to the point where it undercuts crude from the Middle East in total production cost? (drilling, pumping, infrastructure, transportation, refining)?

Remember that much of Russia's oil is in places as inhospitable and undeveloped as Alaska. And there's the added problem that the folks there don't necessarily play by American rules....

> Besides...Russians and Americans are closer in social and
>geopolitical ideologies than Americans and those folks in the Middle
>East and SW Asia...

In other words, we should trust the Russians?

>So let's spend our money where it's appreciated.

Sure.

But perhaps we should also consider reducing our dependence on imported energy.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3936. Re: Where Did THIS Come From...?!?!a

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-07 18:23:04 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <ceKAb.3301$7p2.3001@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 83360

"Steve Robeson, K4CAP" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
news:5c01b95b.0312070630.4b0dbace@posting.google.com...
> Alun <alun@1stcounsel.com> wrote in message
news:<Xns944A456E7592elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>...
>
> > Everything Steve said is true. That alone probably disqualifies him from
> > being a politician.
>
> Thank-you, Sir!
>
> Steve, K4YZ

Don't get all head inflated boys....Twit is ignored by most of us. Except possibly Howard McGovern....whoops.....Dean.

Dan/W4NTI

3937. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-07 18:26:53 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031207132653.11891.00002806@mb-m11.aol.com>
Source record: 83363

In article <iDvAb.1899$Ho3.1189@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> writes:

> Nonsense. I've never seen anybody asked to provide statistical data in a >casual discussion.

...happens all the time in here... :-)

LHA

3938. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-07 18:26:53 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031207132653.11891.00002805@mb-m11.aol.com>
Source record: 83364

In article <bVyAb.3302$rP6.2329@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>, "Kï¿½HB"
<groupk0hb@earthlink.net> writes:

>> For example, the Red Cross doesn't go around painting
>> crosses red and the Salvation Army doesn't fight religious wars.
>
>But why the hell isn't there a Salvation Navy?

...there is no salvation in the navy...

LHA

3939. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-07 18:26:54 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031207132654.11891.00002807@mb-m11.aol.com>
Source record: 83365

In article <XZvAb.2997$rP6.1104@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>, "Kï¿½HB"
<groupk0hb@earthlink.net> writes:

>"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote
>
>> Lacking any evidence either way, it is my opinion that it is fact.
>
>Translation: "My mind is made up. Don't try to confuse me with facts."

We KNOW that is how you think...now PROVE that is how
others think...

LHA

3940. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-07 18:26:55 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031207132655.11891.00002808@mb-m11.aol.com>
Source record: 83366

In article <XNxAb.14495$P%1.13409935@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> writes:

>You are being deliberately obtuse. Your opinion that it is a fact does not
>make it so. And even in casual discussions, I've seen many statements
>challenged and the proponent asked to prove it.

PROVE what you've said... :-)

LHA

3941. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-07 18:26:55 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031207132655.11891.00002809@mb-m11.aol.com>
Source record: 83367

In article <rdJAb.14566$P%1.13523822@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> writes:

>The phrasing used in your posts attempt to make it so. Thus naturally I will
>dispute the contention that you are trying to make it a fact without any
>supporting data. Not only are you trying to call it a fact but attempting
>to make others believe it, again without supporting data.

We will all remember the above when you extoll the virtues and honor
and glory of on-off keying morse code as the ONLY way to go in
amateur radio... :-)

LHA

3942. light bulbs in rrap

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-07 18:28:17 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <5jKAb.6151$NN.870834@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 83368

Some may have seen this one before, but I think it's funny and to the point.

How many rrap members does it takes to change a light bulb?

1 to change the light bulb and to post that the light bulb has been changed

14 to share similar experiences of changing light bulbs and how the
light bulb could have been changed differently

7 to caution about the dangers of changing light bulbs

10 to point out spelling/grammar errors in posts about changing light bulbs

5 to flame the spell checkers

3 to correct spelling/grammar flames

6 to argue over whether it's "lightbulb" or "light bulb" ... another 6
to condemn those 6 as stupid

2 industry professionals to inform the group that the proper term is "lamp"

15 know-it-alls who claim they were in the industry, and that "light
bulb" is perfectly correct

19 to post that this forum is not about light bulbs and to please take
this discussion to a lightbulb forum

11 to defend the posting to this forum saying that we all use light
bulbs and therefore the posts are relevant to this forum

36 to debate which method of changing light bulbs is superior, where to
buy the best light bulbs, what brand of light bulbs work best for
this technique and what brands are faulty

7 to post URL's where one can see examples of different light bulbs

4 to post that the URL's were posted incorrectly and then post the
corrected URL's

3 to post about links they found from the URL's that are relevant to
this group which makes light bulbs relevant to this group

13 to link all posts to date, quote them in their entirety including all
headers and signatures, and add "Me too"

5 to post to the group that they will no longer post because they cannot
handle the light bulb controversy

4 to say "didn't we go through this already a short time ago?"

13 to say "do a Google search on light bulbs before posting questions about light bulbs"

18 who trip over each other in their rush to say "repost!"

1 forum lurker to respond to the original post 6 months from now and start it all over again."

3943. Re: Where Did THIS Come From...?!?!a

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-07 18:36:37 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <VqKAb.6156$NN.871751@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 83369

N2EY wrote:

> But perhaps we should also consider reducing our dependence on imported energy.

Here is one that gets me into some trouble. I'm a firm believer that we should:

1. develop as much alternative energy as possible. Although we will never run out of oil, there are some real limits to it's inexpensive production.

2. In the interim, use as *much* imported oil as possible.

3. Our own oil resources should be husbanded very carefully, so we will still have oil in emergencies. We should use only as much as it takes to operate the wells and search for new sources.

It is one of those reasons why I don't believe that we should open that range in Alaska at this time. There may come a time that that oil is needed desparately.

- Mike KB3EIA -

3944. 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-07 18:59:37 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031207135937.21457.00002594@mb-m10.aol.com>
Source record: 83370

As of 7 December 2003, the number of documents in the FCC ECFS
were as follows:

RM-10781 321
RM-10782 272
RM-10783 276
RM-10784 254 [these 7 essentially eliminating the code test]
RM-10785 256
RM-10786 424
RM-10787 674

RM-10805 233
RM-10806 217
RM-10807 177
RM-10808 193 [these 7 essentially retaining the code test]
RM-10809 181
RM-10810 180
RM-10811 992

On the BPL or Broadband over Power Lines NOI, 03-104, there were
5,118 total documents, including a late submission by FEMA stating
that BPL would interfere with their FNARS and Homeland Security.
FEMA radio is regulated by the NTIA and is presumably part of or the
new name for SHARES (?). Both FNARS and SHARES use HF but
FNARS also uses VHF (at least in Puerto Rico).

To access the ECFS documents list, just address:

http://gullfoss2.fcc.gov/prod/ecfs/comsrch_v2.cgi

All you need do is enter the entire proceedings number in the upper
left-hand forms box (along with its prefix, such as "RM-10811").
Documents are in PDF but PDF readers are free softstuff from Adobe.

Or, to stay in the proper Chat Room mode, simply ignore what goes
on in the only real radio regulatory agency for U.S. civilians and
argue the whichness of the what on entertainers, Russian oil reserves,
the right for Judaism to exist in a nation, etc., etc., etc., all having
nothing whatsoever to do with amateur radio...except to REGULARS
who need an Internet kaffe klatsch.

One might, as a U.S. citizen, reflect what happened early one
Sunday morning 62 years ago at a U.S. island in the Pacific. The
result of that rather cut off amateur radio activity in the USA for about
four years.

LHA ex-RA16408336

3945. Re: light bulbs in rrap

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-07 19:52:00 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031207145200.23171.00002546@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 83371

In article <5jKAb.6151$NN.870834@news1.news.adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo
<mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:

>Some may have seen this one before, but I think it's funny and to the point.
>
>How many rrap members does it takes to change a light bulb?
>
>1 to change the light bulb and to post that the light bulb has been changed
>
>14 to share similar experiences of changing light bulbs and how the
>light bulb could have been changed differently
>
>7 to caution about the dangers of changing light bulbs
>
>10 to point out spelling/grammar errors in posts about changing light bulbs
>
>5 to flame the spell checkers
>
>3 to correct spelling/grammar flames
>
>6 to argue over whether it's "lightbulb" or "light bulb" ... another 6
>to condemn those 6 as stupid
>
>2 industry professionals to inform the group that the proper term is "lamp"
>
>15 know-it-alls who claim they were in the industry, and that "light
>bulb" is perfectly correct
>
>19 to post that this forum is not about light bulbs and to please take
>this discussion to a lightbulb forum
>
>11 to defend the posting to this forum saying that we all use light
>bulbs and therefore the posts are relevant to this forum
>
>36 to debate which method of changing light bulbs is superior, where to
>buy the best light bulbs, what brand of light bulbs work best for
>this technique and what brands are faulty
>
>7 to post URL's where one can see examples of different light bulbs
>
>4 to post that the URL's were posted incorrectly and then post the
>corrected URL's
>
>3 to post about links they found from the URL's that are relevant to

>this group which makes light bulbs relevant to this group
>
>13 to link all posts to date, quote them in their entirety including all
>headers and signatures, and add "Me too"
>
>5 to post to the group that they will no longer post because they cannot
>handle the light bulb controversy
>
>4 to say "didn't we go through this already a short time ago?"
>
>13 to say "do a Google search on light bulbs before posting questions
>about light bulbs"
>
>18 who trip over each other in their rush to say "repost!"
>
>1 forum lurker to respond to the original post 6 months from now and
>start it all over again."

88 federally licensed lightbulb changers stating that one MUST have
proper legal licensing in order to change light bulbs.

73 long-time lightbulb change licensees to DEMAND that all take a
bulb change test in order to fulfill the traditions of amateur lightbulb
changing.

13 unlicensed lightbulb changers stating that civilians change light
bulbs all the time and don't need licenses to do so.

69 incensed licensed lightbulb changers calling the unlicensed
"LB-plussers" or "change lite."

52 licensed changers denouncing the new organization called
"NCI" or No-Change International.

1 with Masters papers in sea-changing contemporaneously
developing a proposal for new federal laws on light bulb chaning.

1 who always wears a uniform of some sort with many insigina
demands instant obediance to strict lightbulb change rules.

1 who never changed a light bulb in his life but has many degrees
to show he can and who will immediately misdirect conversation
into something not about lightbulb changing.

1 who has 26 patents on lightbulb changing and once changed a
light bulb for naval intelligence.

1 female who adamantly demands that all show their references for
any opinion on changing lightbulbs.

1 other female who never needs lightbulbs due to the glow of her
inner self giving all illumination necessary...except that hardly
anyone can see what she is glowing about.

1 paraillumination logistics maintenance NCO who extolls the ONLY way to change light bulbs is to do as he did and become one with the divinity for accomplishment of rapid changing.

1 officious former government employee who states that unlicensed light bulb changers have no business commenting on amateur light bulb changing. Ever. They are never involved.

6 adolescent-minded to state offensive remarks about "screwing in light bulbs."

107 other parental surrogates to remind the 9 adolescent-minded to behave, become licensed light bulb changers, or be grounded.

963 incensed, angry parental surrogates denouncing one another in a spin-off thread stating that others are "virgin changers," unfaithful, incapable of changing, would not know which direction to take in screwing, in or out, and never changed in their lives.

8 official statements from the northeast American Bulb Change League (ABCL) stating that they are the only organization representing amateur light bulb changers...and demanding BPL (Bulbchange Power for Light) be abolished due to bulb noise.

LHA
(writing by the Light of the Ages)

3946. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-07 20:58:15 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031207155815.07961.00000378@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 83372

In article <j9sAb.5787$NN.575589@news1.news.adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo
<mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>
>> In article <Xns9449649382ED8elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun
>> <alun@1stcounsel.com> writes:
>>
>>
>>>>>>Four years ago there were 6 license classes open to new hams. Now there
>>>>>>are only 3, but the other 3 classes are still held by almost 200,000
>>>>>>hams. Was that an "absurd" change? Tell it to the FCC!
>>>>>
>>>>>>Hans' proposal would create 2 new license classes and close off the
>>>>>>other 6 to new licensees. Is it really so absurd, given the changes
>>>>>>we've already seen?
>>>>
>>>>>His proposal is no more absurd than the claim that a single 5 wpm code
>>>>>test is a "barrier".....
>>>>>
>>>>>73 de Jim, N2EY
>>>>>
>>>
>>>It's not really three, though. Although the 'Tech Plus' was abolished in
>>>theory it still exists in practice. That particular absurdity will go away
>>>when Element 1 is abolished, which it soon will be. To avoid actually
>>>taking away any privileges the FCC will have to give the Novice subbands
>>>to all Techs (assuming Element 1 will no longer be mentionned anywhere in
>>>Part 97, the only other alternative would be to take them away from those
>>>Techs who have them now, which would be very unpalatable).
>>
>>
>> And also without any purpose.
>>
>>>I don't agree with all aspects of Hans' proposal. In particular, I oppose
>>>all time limits and time in grade requirements.
>>
>>
>> Do either of them really create a problem? I entered ham radio with both of
>> those features (Novice license only good for two years, upgrade or go off
>the
>> air, and a two-year experience rule for Extra). I don't think they were
>such
>> awful ideas.

>
> I don't oppose a time limit per se. I don't like a ten year time limit
>though.

Why? It's my understanding that the 10-year idea is based partly on the current
license term and partly on the idea that we don't want to force anyone out
because of "life happens" events like education and family.
>
> I support a time in grade, even though I would be frustrated (read
>teased) by a two year stint before I could get the class A.

BTDT.

> Another
>thing, which would be a little strange would be having to have a control
>op at field day (or operate lower power)
>
Why would that be strange? It's the rule *today*.

Back in the late '60s and early '70s, there were *four* FD power levels: QRP,
50 W, 150 W, and the legal limit, IIRC.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3947. Re: Where Did THIS Come From...?!?!a

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-07 20:58:15 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031207155815.07961.00000379@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 83373

In article <VqKAb.6156$NN.871751@news1.news.adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo
<mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>
>> But perhaps we should also consider reducing our dependence on imported
>>energy.
>
>Here is one that gets me into some trouble.

With whom?

>I'm a firm believer that we should:
>
> 1. develop as much alternative energy as possible. Although we will
>never run out of oil, there are some real limits to it's inexpensive
>production.

Agreed! But the alternatives usually cost more, particularly in first-cost.

> 2. In the interim, use as *much* imported oil as possible.
>
> 3. Our own oil resources should be husbanded very carefully, so we will

>still have oil in emergencies. We should use only as much as it takes to
>operate the wells and search for new sources.

That's pretty much been US policy for about 40 years.
>
> It is one of those reasons why I don't believe that we should open that

>range in Alaska at this time. There may come a time that that oil is
>needed desparately.

The problem is that it takes years and years to develop a new field. And most
new fields are not easily accessible.

Ultimately the answer is to get away frok nonrenewable sources, and to increase
efficiency. But such things are a hard sell.

The inflation-adjusted US price of gasoline today is *less* than at almost any
time since the end of WW2.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3948. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-07 22:06:18 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <uvNAb.6270$NN.915568@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 83374

N2EY wrote:

> In article <j9sAb.5787$NN.575589@news1.news.adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo
> <mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:
>
>
>>N2EY wrote:
>>
>>
>>>In article <Xns9449649382ED8elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun
>>><alun@1stcounsel.com> writes:
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>>Four years ago there were 6 license classes open to new hams. Now there
>>>>are only 3, but the other 3 classes are still held by almost 200,000
>>>>hams. Was that an "absurd" change? Tell it to the FCC!
>>>>
>>>>Hans' proposal would create 2 new license classes and close off the
>>>>other 6 to new licensees. Is it really so absurd, given the changes
>>>>we've already seen?
>>
>>>>His proposal is no more absurd than the claim that a single 5 wpm code
>>>>test is a "barrier".....
>>>>
>>>>73 de Jim, N2EY
>>>>
>>>
>>>It's not really three, though. Although the 'Tech Plus' was abolished in
>>>theory it still exists in practice. That particular absurdity will go away
>>>when Element 1 is abolished, which it soon will be. To avoid actually
>>>taking away any privileges the FCC will have to give the Novice subbands
>>>to all Techs (assuming Element 1 will no longer be mentionned anywhere in
>>>Part 97, the only other alternative would be to take them away from those
>>>Techs who have them now, which would be very unpalatable).
>>>
>>>
>>>And also without any purpose.
>>>
>>>
>>>I don't agree with all aspects of Hans' proposal. In particular, I oppose
>>>all time limits and time in grade requirements.
>>>
>>>

>>>Do either of them really create a problem? I entered ham radio with both of
>>>those features (Novice license only good for two years, upgrade or go off
>>
>>the
>>
>>>air, and a two-year experience rule for Extra). I don't think they were
>>
>>such
>>
>>>awful ideas.
>>
>> I don't oppose a time limit per se. I don't like a ten year time limit
>>though.
>
>
> Why? It's my understanding that the 10-year idea is based partly on the current
> license term and partly on the idea that we don't want to force anyone out
> because of "life happens" events like education and family.

Its just too long. The license renewal period would just be another
number by that time, since the new A license would be forever. I'm busy
as all gitout, and it took me something over a week of hard study to get
ready for the Extra.

Plus I can't figure out what can make a person qualified to operate on
day 3652 of their licensing period and unqualified on day 3653. It takes
a lot less time than that to understand RF safety - the only real reason
I can think of for the second class license, so if we're going to do
this, it should make some timing sense.

>> I support a time in grade, even though I would be frustrated (read
>>teased) by a two year stint before I could get the class A.
>
> BTDT.

Not sure about BTDT.

>
>>Another
>>thing, which would be a little strange would be having to have a control
>>op at field day (or operate lower power)
>>
>
> Why would that be strange? It's the rule *today*.

I keep drawing parallels between the second class license and Generals.
We try to get people out to operate on field day, and you can get some
pretty strange setups. First a Ham with less than 2 years time in grade
would have to have a control op. We have hams what operate now at field
day that would suddenly have to have a control op (therefore taking
myself or another Extra away from a station) Of course the second class
ham could operate a 50 watt or less station, but that would mean that

either we change our setup - all stations except GOTA are full output -
or set up a special station just for the second class hams, a sort of
low power ghetto. Heck, the GOTA station can run more power. Maybe this
is no problem for you, but for others it isn't so good

> Back in the late '60s and early '70s, there were *four* FD power levels: QRP,
> 50 W, 150 W, and the legal limit, IIRC.

Could be. But if we went back to that, the clubs could be forced to
make a decision to either run what they would like to run, take control
ops away from available stations for those who don't have time in grade.
(or the proper upgrade) or make that little ghetto for the second class
Hams. I really don't think that is a good way to welcome new people. YMMV.

- Mike KB3EIA -

3949. Re: Where Did THIS Come From...?!?!a

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-08 00:02:54 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <OcPAb.6341$NN.943494@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 83375

N2EY wrote:

> In article <VqKAb.6156$NN.871751@news1.news.adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo
> <mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:
>
>
>>N2EY wrote:
>>
>>
>>>But perhaps we should also consider reducing our dependence on imported
>>>energy.
>>
>>Here is one that gets me into some trouble.
>
>
> With whom?

Mostly people who support things like opening the North slope. You know
who they are! 8^)

>>I'm a firm believer that we should:
>>
>> 1. develop as much alternative energy as possible. Although we will
>>never run out of oil, there are some real limits to it's inexpensive
>>production.
>
>
> Agreed! But the alternatives usually cost more, particularly in first-cost.
>
>
>> 2. In the interim, use as *much* imported oil as possible.
>>
>> 3. Our own oil resources should be husbanded very carefully, so we will
>
>
>>still have oil in emergencies. We should use only as much as it takes to
>>operate the wells and search for new sources.
>
>
> That's pretty much been US policy for about 40 years.
>
>> It is one of those reasons why I don't believe that we should open that
>
>
>>range in Alaska at this time. There may come a time that that oil is

>>needed desparately.
>
>
> The problem is that it takes years and years to develop a new field. And most
> new fields are not easily accessible.

All the better sometimes. And as WWII proved, we can do things amazingly
quickly under duress

> Ultimately the answer is to get away frok nonrenewable sources, and to increase
> efficiency. But such things are a hard sell.

Not glamorous at all.

- Mike KB3EIA -

3950. Re: Where Did THIS Come From...?!?!a

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-08 00:23:33 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <9wPAb.3273$_r6.446@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 83376

"Steve Robeson, K4CAP" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote

> Besides...Russians and Americans are closer in social and
> geopolitical ideologies than Americans and those folks in the Middle
> East and SW Asia...So let's spend our money where it's appreciated.

Hey, our competition is spending money there!!!

http://www.msnbc.com/news/1002205.asp?0cl=c3

I say either take them *all* out, or bring our young warriors home to their families and ignore the whole damned cesspool or use it as a test range.

73, de Hans, K0HB

3951. Re: Where Did THIS Come From...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-08 01:08:29 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031207200829.07578.00002048@mb-m25.aol.com>
Source record: 83377

In article <Xns9446DF3225ECBelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun
<alun@1stcounsel.com> writes:

>>>> The USA's open-door policies are one reason terror groups were able
>>>> at come here and operate the way they did on Sept 11.
>>>
>>>Actually, US immigration is amongst the toughest in the world. I can't
>>>help but smile to see it called 'open door'.
>>
>> I don't mean immigration policies. I mean the the way the USA allows
>> people in on visas, and doesn't control those who stay illegally.
>
>The main strategy to control this is the I-9 form that everyone fills in
>to get a job, even US citizens. The easiest way around that is probably to
>work "off the books" for cash. I'm not sure how this could ever be
>stopped.

One way to reduce it is high penalties for employers found to be doing such
things, and high rewards and protection for whistle-blowers.
>
>In the case of student visas, as were used in the 911 attacks, it does
>seem that immigration ought to check with colleges to see if the students
>are still there.

Exactly! That's what I mean by "open-door" - they let lots of folks in and then
don;t check to see what they're really doing.

>> How did the 9/11 terrorists get into the USA?
>
>On student visas

See above.

This also illustrates one of the conflicts in the way the US economy operates.
Colleges and universities *love* student visas, because foreigners studying in
the USA usually pay cash and help with the institution's need for "diversity".
Such students also help the trade deficit - and considering what a US degree
costs, we're talking serious hard currency per student. So there's pressure to
admit as many cash-paying foreign students as possible.

And the vast majority of them are hard-working, intelligent students whose
purpose in the USA is exactly what they say it is: to get an education.
>
>> How much trouble was it
>> for them to get past INS and set up shop here?
>

>Not much, as it happens. Doing it legally is much more difficult.
>
There's the problem. It should be easy to do legally and tough to do illegally.

>> As for tough immigration, check out what is required to immigrate to
>> New Zealand.

Two words: "Bring money"

73 de Jim, N2EY

3952. Re: Where Did THIS Come From...?!?!a

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-08 01:08:30 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031207200830.07578.00002049@mb-m25.aol.com>
Source record: 83378

In article <OcPAb.6341$NN.943494@news1.news.adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo
<mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:

>>>Here is one that gets me into some trouble.
>>
>>
>> With whom?
>
>Mostly people who support things like opening the North slope. You know
>who they are! 8^)

SUV drivers?
>
>>>I'm a firm believer that we should:
>>>
>>> 1. develop as much alternative energy as possible. Although we will
>>>never run out of oil, there are some real limits to it's inexpensive
>>>production.
>>
>> Agreed! But the alternatives usually cost more, particularly in first-cost.

Friend of mine wrote her chemical engineering master's thesis on a new
shale-oil extraction process back in 1980. Her method was an entirely practical
and efficient way of deriving oil from the type of shale found in abundance in
parts of the USA. Clean, too.

Only problem was that the recovered product cost about $45/barrel.
>
>>> 2. In the interim, use as *much* imported oil as possible.
>>>
>>> 3. Our own oil resources should be husbanded very carefully, so we will
>>>still have oil in emergencies. We should use only as much as it takes to
>>operate the wells and search for new sources.
>>
>> That's pretty much been US policy for about 40 years.
>>
>>> It is one of those reasons why I don't believe that we should open that
>>
>>
>>>range in Alaska at this time. There may come a time that that oil is
>>>needed desparately.
>>
>>
>> The problem is that it takes years and years to develop a new field. And
>most

>> new fields are not easily accessible.
>
>All the better sometimes. And as WWII proved, we can do things amazingly
>quickly under duress
>
Yes and no. WW2 ended 58 years ago. Some things are different now. And there were also colossal expensive failures and overruns as well as the well-known successes like the A bomb (which was only ready in the summer of 1945), radar and the proximity fuse.

>> Ultimately the answer is to get away frok nonrenewable sources, and to
>> increase
>> efficiency. But such things are a hard sell.
>
>Not glamorous at all.
>
That's part of it, but the real problem is the kind of mindset it requires. Many Americans don't like to think in terms of any sort of limits or long-term responsibility or planning. Look at the battle it took to get seat belts in cars, and how many Americans won't use them.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3953. Down with seat belts: (Was: Re: Where Did THIS Come From)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-08 01:31:06 UTC
From: K<unk>HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <uvQAb.3325$_r6.818@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 83379

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote

> Look at the battle it took to get seat belts in
> cars, and how many Americans won't use them.

Another example of the Great Dumbing Down of America.

The world is methodically being dumbed down by government efforts to protect us from stupid people.

Stupid drivers don't recognize the dangers of speed, so they drive too fast and kill themselves. The government regulates speed, so now more stupid people survive.

Stupid automobile passengers get killed because they don't buckle their seat belts. Government steps in and makes seat belt usage mandatory, so now more stupid people survive.

Stupid pedestrians don't know enough to not step out into a busy street, so they get injured and killed trying to cross the street. The government makes laws giving them the right-of-way, so now more stupid people survive.

Stupid parents don't recognize the value of childhood inoculations. The government makes them vaccinate their children before entering school, so now more stupid people survive.

Stupid hams don't know enough to keep their fingers out of 3KV plate transformers, so they get fried in their own juice. Some would have the government protect them, and more stupid people would survive.

In the ways of Mother Nature, stupidity was kept in check because stupid people generally didn't survive to breeding age, thus our species tended to get smarter over time.

But stupidity begets stupidity, so we are being overwhelmed by a tsunami of stupidity. The tsunami is triggered by the government protection of stupid people, which allows them to survive to reproduce.

Ergo, less government regulations makes a smarter populace.

73, de Hans, K0HB

3954. Re: Eliminate the CW requirement for General & Extra, BUT THEN...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-08 01:49:18 UTC
From: garigue <garigue@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <yMQAb.455303$HS4.3565022@attbi_s01>
Source record: 83380

> A good CW operator will slow down to the others speed. It makes sense
> really. Why keep going at QRQ if the other guy can't copy? Or maybe they
> are just showing off.
>
> I wonder who will be impressed ?
>
> Dan/W4NTI

Hello there Dan .....well I won't. I harbor no envy at the fellows who are 50+ or distain at those who have been on for years and are still at "slow" speeds. The important thing is that the mode and frequencies are being utilized. I was just on 80 with a fellow from WVA ...boy the band had a nice mellow sound to it tonight.

God Bless 73 Tom Popovic KI3R Belle Vernon Pa.

3955. Wonderful time on 160m contest CW

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-08 02:25:41 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <FiRAb.14662$P%1.13636240@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 83381

Just wanted to say I had a great time working the 160m CW contest this weekend. Only had a random wire at less than 10ft off the ground but worked stations from Maine to S. Texas.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

3956. Re: Wonderful time on 160m contest CW

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-08 02:42:55 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <PyRAb.7214$NN.983269@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 83382

Dee D. Flint wrote:
> Just wanted to say I had a great time working the 160m CW contest this
> weekend. Only had a random wire at less than 10ft off the ground but worked
> stations from Maine to S. Texas.

Wow. I wonder how many you would have worked on 160 with that antenna
if you had been using ssb?

I think that is one of the things that may dissapoint new hams that may
when the CW requirement is gone, (which I have predicted to happen about
the bottom of the sunspot cycle) and they get on the air, and they don't
do a whole lot after that? They will wonder what all the hubub was about.

Whereas you worked a lot of the US with an antenna that by all rights
shouldn't work much at all!

- Mike KB3EIA -

3957. Re: Wonderful time on 160m contest CW

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-08 03:19:51 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <r5SAb.14668$P%1.13646317@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 83383

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:PyRAb.7214$NN.983269@news1.news.adelphia.net...
> Dee D. Flint wrote:
> > Just wanted to say I had a great time working the 160m CW contest this
> > weekend. Only had a random wire at less than 10ft off the ground but
worked
> > stations from Maine to S. Texas.
>
> Wow. I wonder how many you would have worked on 160 with that antenna
> if you had been using ssb?
>

It would not have worked well for sideband (although I have worked PA on ssb
on it) as it is too low to the ground and the background noise on 160m is
often high. I worked 4 hours Friday night and 4 hours Saturday night doing
the "hunt and pounce" approach. This doesn't net a lot of stations but you
find some interesting ones. Altogether I worked 104 stations in a total of
8 hours. The one I wonder about is where a person on Long Island finds room
for a 160m antenna!

> I think that is one of the things that may dissapoint new hams that may
> when the CW requirement is gone, (which I have predicted to happen about
> the bottom of the sunspot cycle) and they get on the air, and they don't
> do a whole lot after that? They will wonder what all the hubub was about.
>

I've often thought the same myself.

> Whereas you worked a lot of the US with an antenna that by all rights
> shouldn't work much at all!
>

As they say: any antenna is better than no antenna!

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

3958. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-08 04:00:49 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <RHSAb.3957$7p2.3369@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 83384

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20031207132228.07578.00002039@mb-m25.aol.com...
> In article <oKGAb.3054$Ho3.2896@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Bill
Sohl"
> <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
>
> >"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> >news:20031206212813.29660.00001951@mb-m24.aol.com...
> >> In article <zfoAb.1421$Ho3.1241@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>,
"Bill
> >Sohl"
> >> <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
> >>
> >> >Maybe I missed a post somewhere. What would be the difference,
> >> >other than name, between a Class A and the Extra?
> >>
> >> All I can see is that Class A doesn't need to be renewed.
> >
> >An unlikly license aspect since if there is no
> >renewal, then the FCC data base gets larger and larger
> >since no licenseever expires. That should really screw up the
> >statistics as to how many hams there are.
>
> I noted that some time ago, Bill, but nobody commented on it until you
did.
>
> Perhaps that's part of the plan! Imagine if the FCC database totals showed
the
> number of hams who had ever held a license, rather than the number of
current
> licenses.....
>
> Japan's operator licenses are "for life", which is one reason their totals
> appear to be so high.
>
> The biggest downside I can see is that a lot of prime callsigns would be
tied
> up unless family members could be convinced to send in a license
cancellation
> letter.

Very good point.

> >> >If the
> >> >only difference is the name, why would any Extra waste time

> >> >to pass a class A test whenit buys them nothing?
> >>
> >> I'd do it just to avoid having to renew.
> >
> >Last time I renewed the ARRL sent me a nice letter,I signed it
> >and mailed it back.
>
> I got one of those, too. Now it can even be done online.
>
> >Sure wasn't any effort on my part worth
> >the effort involved in a 100 question test..studying, going to a test
> >session, taking the test. But, your mileage may vary.
>
> I say "bring it on! I got yer 100 questions right here!"

To each his or her own :-)

> >> Plus, I could then say I'd passed both the "old" and "new" tests for
> >> full-privileges ham licenses.
> >
> >In other words, bragging rights and stroking your own ego...
>
> Is that bad?

Maybe not bad, but insufficient reason for the FCC to retain
a separate license class.

> >which do nothing for the hobby.
>
> That's one spin. Here's another: By getting a Class A instead of clinging
to my
> Extra, I'd be setting an example for others *and* reducing FCC's admin
> workload.

That's a concern to the FCC, not anyone else.

> After all, if every Extra got a Class A, there's be no problem. And one of
the
> simplest tests of any action's morality is "what if everyone did that?"

You're not going to make this a morality
issue are you :-(:-)

> >> >Also, why would the FCC want to maintain the name difference
> >> >in their database if that is all it is?
> >>
> >> Just a name.
> >>
> >> For 15 years the FCC retained the name difference between Advanced and
> >>General
> >> even though Advanced privileges were exactly the same as General
> >> privileges.
> >> For most of that time, the FCC "database" wasn't even computerized (the

> >> amateur
> >> radio data was first computerized in 1964, IIRC).
> >>
> >> So I don;t think it would be much of a problem today.
> >
> >But, it would require "some" ongoing FCC effort, etc. The how much
> >is unquantifiable by anyone other than the FCC.
>
> Sure. But obviously FCC though it worth doing for 15 years, and again
today
> with the Advanced and Novice.

Not the same since there are distinct privileges with those licenses
which differentiate them from the others. IF the FCC had made Advanced
privileges exactly the same as Extra, then I fully believe they would have
just changed all Advanced to Extra when they were individually
renewed.

> Is it really almost four years since those changes?

Time flies when you're having fun.

> >> --
> >> I think in all the arguments about the details, we may be losing sight
of
> >> the main goals of Hans' proposal:
> >>
> >> 1) Make it easier to get an entry-level amateur license
> >> 2) Convey a very large set of privileges with that entry-level license
so
> >> that new hams can sample *anything* amateur radio has to offer -
except
>
> >> high power transmitters.
> >> 3) Offer a real incentive for new hams to increase their technical
> >> knowledge and qualify for full privilege licenses within a
reasonable
> time
> >> 4) Simplify the rules and test procedures (two tests is simpler than
three
> >> tests, anyway)
> >>
> >> Of course there's disagreement about the methods. But aren't these all
> >> pretty good goals?
> >
> >I agree. My comments above are directed at aspects that I think will
need
> >to be addressed. Frankly, I don't give a hoot about retaing an existence
> >license name
> >just to show others I passed or did certain requirements that newer hams
> >didn't.

> >I think those that deliberately don't upgrade to Extra from Advanced,
just
> >to
> >show others they once passed a 13 wpm test have a personal self esteem
> >problem.
>
> Actually, they have a logic problem! Because the fact of possesing an
> Advanced in and of itself does not prove that someone passed the 13 wpm
test
> any more than having an Extra proves someone passed the 20 wpm test, due
to
> medical waivers.

Agreed.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

3959. Re: Eliminate the CW requirement for General & Extra, BUT THEN...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-08 04:08:29 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <1PSAb.3970$7p2.1640@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 83385

"Bill Wright" <wrightw@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:WLqAb.5758$NN.550770@news1.news.adelphia.net...
> BUT THEN change the CW band plan.
> Eliminate the current segregation of the CW bands by license level and
> institute a band plan based on transmit speed. We could have Low speed -
5
> wpm, Medium speed - 12 wpm and High speed - 20 wpm band sections. Even if
> you have an Extra license, you need to stay out of the "Fast Lane" unless
> you can keep up with the traffic.
> Regards,
> Bill
> KO6SI

so is that:

Low speed - 0 up to 5 wpm
Medium - 5 wpm up to 12 wpm
High - 12 to 20

just curious where the 30wpm folks would then operate.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

3960. Re: Down with seat belts: (Was: Re: Where Did THIS Come From)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-08 04:29:02 UTC
From: Jerry Oxendine <joxendi@bellsouth.net>
Message-ID: <b5TAb.11432$nH.4943@bignews6.bellsouth.net>
Source record: 83386

"K�HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:uvQAb.3325$_r6.818@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net...
>
> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote
>
> > Look at the battle it took to get seat belts in
> > cars, and how many Americans won't use them.
>
> Another example of the Great Dumbing Down of America.
>
> The world is methodically being dumbed down by government efforts to protect
> us from stupid people.
>
> Stupid drivers don't recognize the dangers of speed, so they drive too fast
> and kill themselves. The government regulates speed, so now more stupid
> people survive.
>
> Stupid automobile passengers get killed because they don't buckle their
> seat belts. Government steps in and makes seat belt usage mandatory,
> so now more stupid people survive.
>
> Stupid pedestrians don't know enough to not step out into a busy street, so
> they get injured and killed trying to cross the street. The government makes
> laws giving them the right-of-way, so now more stupid people survive.
>
> Stupid parents don't recognize the value of childhood inoculations. The
> government makes them vaccinate their children before entering school, so
> now more stupid people survive.
>
> Stupid hams don't know enough to keep their fingers out of 3KV plate
> transformers, so they get fried in their own juice. Some would have the
> government protect them, and more stupid people would survive.
>
> In the ways of Mother Nature, stupidity was kept in check because stupid
> people generally didn't survive to breeding age, thus our species tended to
> get smarter over time.
>
> But stupidity begets stupidity, so we are being overwhelmed by a tsunami

of
> stupidity. The tsunami is triggered by the government protection of
stupid
> people, which allows them to survive to reproduce.
>
> Ergo, less government regulations makes a smarter populace.
>
> 73, de Hans, K0HB

Hans,

I have to agree with you! How did we survive the '50s,
even the '70s without socialists like Hilary Clinton "protecting" us from
ourselves? We misbehaved, we got
paddled by a teacher and Dad gave you a "whuppin'" when you got home! GASP!!
HORRORS! We rode our
bicycles and didn't know what helmets were? You're KIDDING! We climbed
trees, fell out, had the breath knocked out of us, got up and kept going.
HUH? Why,
we'll have to make trees illegal!! We sent each other flying high in the
air by jumping on a short plank in a modified game of see-saw; sometimes the
plank skewed
to one side and we broke arms and ribs. Let's SUE somebody! We got up again
with skinned knees, and when it quit smarting, we got back on the board and
did it again. In high school, we drove school busses at 16!
WHAAAAAAAAAAT??????? We even had bus drivers' club! What, that's CRAZY! No
it wasn't. At that time, North Carolina had one of the safest school
bus driver programs in the nation! We drove tractors as
soon as we could reach the pedals and Pop-popped (John Deere) our way down
the highway with no supervi-
sion going from one field to another. YIKES!! We drove farm pickups (off
road) as soon as we could shift
gears, too! HORRORS! GASP! CALL THE LIBERALS! We expect to remain
free, yet we quietly
surrender our rights to the left wingers who represent one
of the greatest threats next to our external enemies. That is because it is
creeping socialism" and slips up on us one right at a time. Like the
seatbelt issue, the liberals couch their agenda in issues that seem to "be
for the good of all".
They know that they cannot suddenly, for example, take
away guns (well, there's that pesky Constition thing they'd
like to get rid of); it would set off a rebellion. They know
that their dangerous agenda can be met if they use issues
that to seem to be "good"----like saving lives with laws such as seat belt
laws.

The thing is, seat belts DO save lives in the majority if cases. And I am
all in favor of them; I never start my
car without putting mine on. BUT! I don't like the idea
of some el-pinko, bleeding heart, drippy hippy relic from
1968 in wire-rimmed glasses telling me what to do, nor do I like it, or

think it should be a law.

We have too many laws now. Down with the Hillary Clintons!!!! LOL!

Jerry

>
>
>
>
>

3961. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-08 05:57:17 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <1pUAb.5304$rP6.1935@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 83387

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote

> Not the same since there are distinct privileges with those licenses
> which differentiate them from the others. IF the FCC had made Advanced
> privileges exactly the same as Extra, then I fully believe they would have
> just changed all Advanced to Extra when they were individually
> renewed.

From 1951 till 1968 the privileges for four license classes, Conditional, General, Advanced, and Extra were all exactly the same. We all used the same frequencies with the same authorized power, and from our call sign you couldn't tell one from the other. Life was good.

Then some dump huck social-engineering gummint dudes, cheered on by a radio club in West Hartford, CT., decided to set up a bunch of arbitrary exclusive band segments as 'rewards' for advancing amongst the various classes, and then later drove wider wedges between the classes with the 'reward' of distinctive call signs for the higher licenses. Whatever good came of this is long since lost in the damage caused by 'class wars' which still rage.

My proposal is based first on the notion that there should be two classes of license --- "Learners Permit" and "Fully Qualified", and second on the notion that those learners should operate in the mainstream with experienced hams, not segregated off into little ghettos populated with mostly other learners.

73, de Hans, K0HB

3962. Re: Wonderful time on 160m contest CW

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-08 06:04:06 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <qvUAb.8030$NN.1026816@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 83388

Dee D. Flint wrote:

> "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
> news:PyRAb.7214$NN.983269@news1.news.adelphia.net...
>
>>Dee D. Flint wrote:
>>
>>>Just wanted to say I had a great time working the 160m CW contest this
>>>weekend. Only had a random wire at less than 10ft off the ground but
>
> worked
>
>>>stations from Maine to S. Texas.
>>
>>Wow. I wonder how many you would have worked on 160 with that antenna
>>if you had been using ssb?
>>
>
>
> It would not have worked well for sideband (although I have worked PA on ssb
> on it) as it is too low to the ground and the background noise on 160m is
> often high. I worked 4 hours Friday night and 4 hours Saturday night doing
> the "hunt and pounce" approach. This doesn't net a lot of stations but you
> find some interesting ones. Altogether I worked 104 stations in a total of
> 8 hours. The one I wonder about is where a person on Long Island finds room
> for a 160m antenna!
>
>
>>I think that is one of the things that may dissapoint new hams that may
>>when the CW requirement is gone, (which I have predicted to happen about
>>the bottom of the sunspot cycle) and they get on the air, and they don't
>>do a whole lot after that? They will wonder what all the hubub was about.
>>
>
>
> I've often thought the same myself.
>
>
>>Whereas you worked a lot of the US with an antenna that by all rights
>>shouldn't work much at all!
>>
>
>
> As they say: any antenna is better than no antenna!

hehe, try telling that to some of the r.r.a.antenns group! Of course the guru's there are operating in rarified atmosphere. (no disrespect, there are some mighty knowledgeable people there - it's just that a person can start a thread, and the first one or two answers answer the problem, then the thread turns into a antenna minutae free for all. Hmm sounds familiar!!

- Mike KB3EIA -

3963. Re: Down with seat belts: (Was: Re: Where Did THIS Come From)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-08 06:04:42 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <ILmdnUU93f4dikmiRVn-hA@gbronline.com>
Source record: 83389

Jerry Oxendine wrote:

> I have to agree with you! How did we survive the '50s,
> even the '70s without socialists like Hilary Clinton "protecting" us from
> ourselves? We misbehaved, we got
> paddled by a teacher and Dad gave you a "whuppin'" when you got home! GASP!!
> HORRORS! We rode our
> bicycles and didn't know what helmets were? You're KIDDING! We climbed
> trees, fell out, had the breath knocked out of us, got up and kept going.
> HUH? Why,
> we'll have to make trees illegal!! We sent each other flying high in the
> air by jumping on a short plank in a modified game of see-saw; sometimes the
> plank skewed
> to one side and we broke arms and ribs. Let's SUE somebody! We got up again
> with skinned knees, and when it quit smarting, we got back on the board and
> did it again. In high school, we drove school busses at 16!
> WHAAAAAAAAAAT??????? We even had bus drivers' club! What, that's CRAZY! No
> it wasn't. At that time, North Carolina had one of the safest school
> bus driver programs in the nation! We drove tractors as
> soon as we could reach the pedals and Pop-popped (John Deere) our way down
> the highway with no supervi-
> sion going from one field to another. YIKES!! We drove farm pickups (off
> road) as soon as we could shift
> gears, too! HORRORS! GASP! CALL THE LIBERALS!

You bring back a lot of memories Jer. A poppin Johnny was the first
thing I learned to drive 10 years before I would be old enough for a
drivers license, that hand clutch really made it easy. Ever start it up
without removing the tin can off the exhaust stack first?

> We expect to remain
> free, yet we quietly
> surrender our rights to the left wingers who represent one
> of the greatest threats next to our external enemies. That is because it is
> creeping socialism" and slips up on us one right at a time. Like the
> seatbelt issue, the liberals couch their agenda in issues that seem to "be
> for the good of all".
> They know that they cannot suddenly, for example, take
> away guns (well, there's that pesky Constition thing they'd
> like to get rid of); it would set off a rebellion.

We used to take guns to school. Hear that anti-gun liberal nuts, yes,
real guns at school. Even carried them on the school bus. We never had
any thoughts of shooting up the school, and certainly no thoughts of
shooting someone. We would leave our rifles in the prinipal's office

until after school, then walk home through the fields and pastures
looking for varmits to shoot.

3964. Re: Wonderful time on 160m contest CW

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-08 06:44:38 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <q5VAb.5351$rP6.3027@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 83390

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote

> Just wanted to say I had a great time working the 160m CW contest this
> weekend.

Sorry I missed you, but Michigan was well represented. We only operated for about 2 hours, so our score is just over 10,000. Heard W4NTI at about esp-level, but QSB was bad, so I didn't try to call him. I wonder who was operating KV4FZ --- pretty sure it wasn't Herb, because the operator was really stumbling.

Getting ready for the 10M contest next. K0CKB and I will do a sort of multi/multi split between A1 and A3.

73, Hans, K0HB

3965. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-08 09:55:09 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <1UXAb.4061$Ho3.984@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 83391

"Dee D. Flint" wrote:
>
> The phrasing used in your posts
> attempt to make it so. Thus naturally
> I will dispute the contention that you
> are trying to make it a fact without
> any supporting data. Not only are
> you trying to call it a fact but attempting
> to make others believe it, again
> without supporting data.

You're not going to let it go, are you, Dee? I said what I believe to be fact. Lacking any real data, that is all I could possibly do.

I based that on the fact that Morse code has been widely featured in movies (Titantic to War Movies), television (Hogan's Heros to Westerns to Sci-Fi), books, children's toys, the military decades ago, youth organizations, and so on. So, again, I do think it is a fact that most people in this country today know about Morse code. They may not know what it's called, how to do it, or whatever, but only a truly isolated person would not know at least something about it. That is especially true for anyone interested in radio (shortwave listeners, potential new hams, and so on).

You haven't provided anything beyond your own opinion to dispute any of that. Instead, you assault my choice of words and then insist, even if true, that is not enough - that one must have practical experience to truly make a choice. Of course, that's nonsense. One does not have to murder someone to know that murder is not something one would particularly like to do. Indeed, we make choices in our lives each day without personal experience to back it up. Your demand for more here shows a serious lack of respect for people's ability to make their own choices.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3966. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-08 10:33:08 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <br1jul$hc4@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 83392

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:1UXAb.4061$Ho3.984@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> "Dee D. Flint" wrote:
> >
> > The phrasing used in your posts
> > attempt to make it so. Thus naturally
> > I will dispute the contention that you
> > are trying to make it a fact without
> > any supporting data. Not only are
> > you trying to call it a fact but attempting
> > to make others believe it, again
> > without supporting data.
>
>
> You're not going to let it go, are you, Dee? I said what I believe to be
> fact. Lacking any real data, that is all I could possibly do.
>
> I based that on the fact that Morse code has been widely featured in
> movies (Titantic to War Movies), television (Hogan's Heros to Westerns to
> Sci-Fi), books, children's toys, the military decades ago, youth
> organizations, and so on. So, again, I do think it is a fact that most
> people in this country today know about Morse code. They may not know what
> it's called, how to do it, or whatever, but only a truly isolated person
> would not know at least something about it. That is especially true for
> anyone interested in radio (shortwave listeners, potential new hams, and
so
> on).
>
> You haven't provided anything beyond your own opinion to dispute any of
> that. Instead, you assault my choice of words and then insist, even if
true,
> that is not enough - that one must have practical experience to truly make
a
> choice. Of course, that's nonsense. One does not have to murder someone to
> know that murder is not something one would particularly like to do.
Indeed,
> we make choices in our lives each day without personal experience to back
it
> up. Your demand for more here shows a serious lack of respect for people's
> ability to make their own choices.
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>

> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
>

Dwight...

If you don't mind, lemmee see if this works for you. Here's a post I'll use for an example:

::::::::::
"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20031201055840.12631.00003129@mb-m28.aol.com...
> In article <Xns94442777C95Eelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun
> <alun@1stcounsel.com> writes:
>
> >I think you're missing the point. I took _code_ tests to get _phone_
> >subbands. There's no logic in that. Never was, even from the beginning.
>
> Sure there is. Here it is, though you may argue that it doesn't hold much
water
> today:
>

In addition, anyone one who thinks they took the code tests to get phone subbands isn't really viewing it from the right perspective anyway. The code test, as well as the additional writtens, was to get HF privileges or should have been. It happens that phone privileges are included when one earns HF privileges.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
::::::::::

Now to counter Dee on the point that she made, where she essentially states to you that you presented something as fact (which isn't exactly clear that you did...by the way; she *interpreted* something you said as fact), then there's a lot to be said for her needing to present "statistical data" to show that anyone--*anyone*--who took the code test...was to get HF privileges. Now, in defense of her statement, she did qualify that statement with the phrase, "or should have been." But, the qualifier does not negate that she emphatically states "anyone who thinks they took the code tests to get phone subbands isn't really viewing it from the right perspective anyway." The implication between the conclusion that is derived from the two combined statements is that Dee is--we could say, as she has done with you--stating that it is a fact that anyone who takes the code test did so to get HF privileges. Period.

Where's *that* statistical data?

This could be done over and over. So, in true debate form--at least as far as I see it--the counter would be to fight fire with fire.

Fact is, though, you did open yourself up with the statement, "Few people today (especially boys and men) have not learned code, or at least played around with it, at some point in their lives." I mean, after all, you have

to see that such a statement would tend to be disagreed with. I would disagree with it, wholeheartedly, if I was inclined to nitpick--or if I was inclined to feel like I had nothing else to argue. It's a statement that is quite arguable. There are not many people who have "learned code" as you say. That's, uh, not a fact by the way.

Kim W5TIT

3967. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-08 10:57:25 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031208055725.25517.00002685@mb-m15.aol.com>
Source record: 83393

In article <1UXAb.4061$Ho3.984@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> writes:

> I based that on the fact that Morse code has been widely featured in >movies (Titantic to War Movies), television (Hogan's Heros to Westerns to >Sci-Fi), books, children's toys, the military decades ago, youth >organizations, and so on. So, again, I do think it is a fact that most >people in this country today know about Morse code.

Well, I simply disagree. Most people in the USA don't really know what Morse code is.

btw, the 1997 James Cameron film had no significant Morse code in it at all. Nor any real mention of the role played by radio. You have to see the 1956 flick "A Night To Remember" for that.

>They may not know what
>it's called, how to do it, or whatever, but only a truly isolated person >would not know at least something about it.

If they do't even know what it's called, they can hardly make an informed judgement about it.

>That is especially true for
>anyone interested in radio (shortwave listeners, potential new hams, and so >on).

Not from what I've seen whenever I've demonstrated Morse code.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3968. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-08 10:57:26 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031208055726.25517.00002686@mb-m15.aol.com>
Source record: 83394

In article <1pUAb.5304$rP6.1935@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>, "Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> writes:

>"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote
>
>> Not the same since there are distinct privileges with those licenses
>> which differentiate them from the others. IF the FCC had made Advanced
>> privileges exactly the same as Extra, then I fully believe they would have
>> just changed all Advanced to Extra when they were individually
>> renewed.
>
>From 1951 till 1968 the privileges for four license classes, Conditional,
>General, Advanced, and Extra were all exactly the same.

No, that's not exactly correct.

The period described started in February of 1953, not 1951.

Before then, hams needed an Extra or Advanced to use 'phone on the HF bands between 3 and 25 MHz. This is one reason 10 meter 'phone was so popular.

More important, however, is the fact that the basic concept of "incentives" wasn't a new '60s idea, but a rehash of a much older practice from at least the 1930s. Except that the 1930s version had only two levels (Class B/Class A) and was by mode, not subband.

>We all used the
>same frequencies with the same authorized power, and from our call sign you
>couldn't tell one from the other.

You could, however, usually tell the oldtimers from the newbies by the license class, but that was about all. Except that there was a very limited program where hams could get specific callsigns.

>Life was good.
>
So they tell me!

>Then some dump huck social-engineering gummint dudes, cheered on by a >radio
club in West Hartford, CT., decided to set up a bunch of arbitrary
>exclusive
>band segments as 'rewards' for advancing amongst the various classes, and
>then later drove wider wedges between the classes with the 'reward' of
>distinctive call signs for the higher licenses. Whatever good came of this
>is long since lost in the damage caused by 'class wars' which still rage.

All of which was only done after over 5 years of debate and discussion. I think the whole thing was a case of "Sputnik fever" by those guvmint dudes, who had seen one too many hamshacks owned by QCAO charter members.
>
>My proposal is based first on the notion that there should be two classes of
>license --- "Learners Permit" and "Fully Qualified", and second on the
>notion that those learners should operate in the mainstream with experienced
>hams, not segregated off into little ghettos populated with mostly other
>learners.

Exactly!

73 de Jim, N2EY

3969. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-08 12:57:35 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031208075735.07578.00002056@mb-m25.aol.com>
Source record: 83395

In article <L7AAb.2508$7p2.1820@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> writes:

>"N2EY" wrote:
>> "Dwight Stewart" writes:
>>
>> > Hans' answer is not in his proposal.
>>
>> OK, fine.
>>
>> >In fact, a lot of what Hans has said
>> >in this newsgroup is not in the proposal.
>>
>> It will be, if FCC acts on it in any way.
>>
>> >Instead, he just seems to be making
>> > up answers as he goes along.
>>
>> Is that bad? His answers are all in agreement
>> with the stated goals and philosophy of his
>> proposal. I haven't found a single case where
>> Hans has contradicted himself in this proposal
>> thing.
>
>
> You're missing the point, Jim. If it isn't in the proposal, he can't give
>definitive answers to those questions. Making up answers as the discussion
>goes along in this newsgroup isn't going to change that.
>
Hans has only submitted his proposal as a comment to others' petitions.

He can take the discussion here, and the answers he's given, revise the proposal into a petition and submit it to FCC for an RM number.

Even though I disagree with some parts of it, and would oppose those parts, I think his proposal has been much improved and clarified by the discussion here.

The end result could be something that FCC and much of the amateur commnunity would support.

--

Do GROLs have to be renewed?

73 de Jim, N2EY

3970. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-08 12:57:36 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031208075736.07578.00002057@mb-m25.aol.com>
Source record: 83396

In article <uvNAb.6270$NN.915568@news1.news.adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo
<mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:

>>> I don't oppose a time limit per se. I don't like a ten year time limit
>>>though.
>>
>>
>> Why? It's my understanding that the 10-year idea is based partly on the
>current
>> license term and partly on the idea that we don't want to force anyone out
>> because of "life happens" events like education and family.
>
> Its just too long.

Is it really too long, particularly considering the two-year experience
requirement?

One of the problems with the old 1 and 2 year Novices was that if a new ham ran
into "life happens" situations, their upgrade schedule would be seriously
disprupted.

Example: A few weeks after a teenager gets the Novice license his folks inform
him that the family is moving across the country. New house isn't quite ready
so they'll be living in temporary quarters for a while. Meanwhile most of their
stuff is in storage. "A while" becomes "a few months"..

Finally they get into the new house and there's a flurry of activity to get set
up - and the parents say ham radio isn't a top priority. By the time Our Hero
is back on the air, there's not much time left on his one-year license.

Look how long it's taken some *adults* (alleged adults, anyway) in this NG to
upgrade, or even get licenses.

>The license renewal period would just be another
>number by that time, since the new A license would be forever. I'm busy
>as all gitout, and it took me something over a week of hard study to get
>ready for the Extra.

Very true!
>
>Plus I can't figure out what can make a person qualified to operate on
>day 3652 of their licensing period and unqualified on day 3653.

The same principle that makes a General or Advanced class ham qualfied to
operate on 3526 kHz but not on 3524 kHz.

The same principle that makes a Tech Plus ham qualified to operate a transmitter of 1500 W output using any authorized mode on 6 meters but not 10 meters.

>It takes
>a lot less time than that to understand RF safety - the only real reason
>I can think of for the second class license, so if we're going to do
>this, it should make some timing sense.

There's a lot more to it than RF safety.

>>> I support a time in grade, even though I would be frustrated (read
>>>teased) by a two year stint before I could get the class A.
>>
>> BTDT.
>
>Not sure about BTDT.
>
Been There, Done That

>>>Another
>>>thing, which would be a little strange would be having to have a control
>>>op at field day (or operate lower power)
>>>
>>
>> Why would that be strange? It's the rule *today*.
>
>I keep drawing parallels between the second class license and Generals.
>We try to get people out to operate on field day, and you can get some
>pretty strange setups. First a Ham with less than 2 years time in grade
>would have to have a control op.

Why?

As long as the power level is less than 50 W, that Class B ham could operate any freq, any mode, as the control op.

>We have hams what operate now at field
>day that would suddenly have to have a control op (therefore taking
>myself or another Extra away from a station)

Not at all! Existing hams would retain their existing privs under Hans' proposal.

>Of course the second class
>ham could operate a 50 watt or less station, but that would mean that
>either we change our setup - all stations except GOTA are full output -
>or set up a special station just for the second class hams, a sort of
>low power ghetto.

You mean you folks operate 1500 W on FD? (that's "full output")

>Heck, the GOTA station can run more power. Maybe this
>is no problem for you, but for others it isn't so good
>

Try QRP some time ;-)

The fact is that if a non-Extra wants to operate FD, there has to be a control op present whenever the non-Extra exceeds his-her subband restrictions. That's a lot more onerous than turning down the power to 50 W.

>> Back in the late '60s and early '70s, there were *four* FD power levels:
>> QRP, 50 W, 150 W, and the legal limit, IIRC.
>
> Could be. But if we went back to that, the clubs could be forced to
>make a decision to either run what they would like to run, take control
>ops away from available stations for those who don't have time in grade.
>(or the proper upgrade) or make that little ghetto for the second class
>Hams. I really don't think that is a good way to welcome new people. YMMV.
>
There's another option: Change the rules so that different power levels could be used for different stations in the same multi setup. (It used to be this way!)

In fact, these changes should be done anyway. Right now there are three power levels on FD:

"QRP/battery", which requires 5 W or less output *and* non-generator power, (multiplier 5)

"Low power" which allows up to 150 W and requires a power source independent of mains (multiplier 2)

"High Power" (multiplier 1)

Multi transmitter setups are categorized at the power level of the *highest power* transmitter.

I'd do it this way:

"QRP", would require 10 W or less output (multiplier 5) and a power source independent of mains

"Low Power" would would allow up to 50 W and requires a power source independent of mains (multiplier 3.5)

"Medium power" would allow up to 200 W and requires a power source independent of mains (multiplier 2)

"High Power" (multiplier 1)

"Battery" multiplier (instead of a weenie 100 point bonus) for non-fossil-fuel energy sources

Multi transmitter setups would be categorized at the power level of the *highest power* transmitter but scored by the transmitters actually used on each band/mode. So 40 CW might run Low while 40 phone ran High, etc.

It used to be that way - and it was a good thing!

(Yes, I've suggested this to ARRL)

It seems that a major objection to the 50 watt rule is based on the fact that there aren't a lot of 50 watt rigs for sale today. That's a pretty sad commentary on the technical state of things, I think.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3971. Re: Wonderful time on 160m contest CW

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-08 13:25:33 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0312080525.311c875@posting.google.com>
Source record: 83397

Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:<PyRAb.7214$NN.983269@news1.news.adelphia.net>...
> Dee D. Flint wrote:
> > Just wanted to say I had a great time working the 160m CW contest this
> > weekend. Only had a random wire at less than 10ft off the ground but worked
> > stations from Maine to S. Texas.
>
> Wow. I wonder how many you would have worked on 160 with that antenna
> if you had been using ssb?
>
> I think that is one of the things that may dissapoint new hams that may
> when the CW requirement is gone, (which I have predicted to happen about
> the bottom of the sunspot cycle) and they get on the air, and they don't
> do a whole lot after that? They will wonder what all the hubub was about.
>
> Whereas you worked a lot of the US with an antenna that by all rights
> shouldn't work much at all!
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -

Wow, as a newbie I had EXACTLY the opposite experience.

I was a Novice and could hardly hear or work anyone on CW. After
upgrading to Tech, I was talked in to cutting my 40M dipole down to
10M (because I upgraded about the same time as the Novice Enhancement
came along), and got on 10M SSB. WOWEE!!! That was what all the
hubub was about!

And my 10M antenna was tied off to a crabapple tree at 8', and the
other end was tied off to the gutter at about 12'.

Yup, CW gets through when everything else will - sometimes.

Brian

3972. Re: Wonderful time on 160m contest CW

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-08 13:27:41 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0312080527.560c615e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 83398

Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:<qvUAb.8030$NN.1026816@news1.news.adelphia.net>...

> hehe, try telling that to some of the r.r.a.antenns group! Of course the
> guru's there are operating in rarified atmosphere.

ditto here.

3973. Re: Eliminate the CW requirement for General & Extra, BUT THEN...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-08 13:31:46 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0312080531.64b2b674@posting.google.com>
Source record: 83399

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<1PSAb.3970$7p2.1640@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> "Bill Wright" <wrightw@adelphia.net> wrote in message
> news:WLqAb.5758$NN.550770@news1.news.adelphia.net...
> > BUT THEN change the CW band plan.
> > Eliminate the current segregation of the CW bands by license level and
> > institute a band plan based on transmit speed. We could have Low speed -
> 5
> > wpm, Medium speed - 12 wpm and High speed - 20 wpm band sections. Even if
> > you have an Extra license, you need to stay out of the "Fast Lane" unless
> > you can keep up with the traffic.
> > Regards,
> > Bill
> > KO6SI
>
> so is that:
>
> Low speed - 0 up to 5 wpm
> Medium - 5 wpm up to 12 wpm
> High - 12 to 20
>
> just curious where the 30wpm folks would then operate.
>
> Cheers,
> Bill K2UNK

Hey, not so fast with splitting up the bands. I'm still trying to get
at what level "CW proficiency" begins.

3974. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-08 13:34:50 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0312080534.789df63c@posting.google.com>
Source record: 83400

"Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<1pUAb.5304$rP6.1935@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>...
> "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote
>
> > Not the same since there are distinct privileges with those licenses
> > which differentiate them from the others. IF the FCC had made Advanced
> > privileges exactly the same as Extra, then I fully believe they would have
> > just changed all Advanced to Extra when they were individually
> > renewed.
>
> From 1951 till 1968 the privileges for four license classes, Conditional,
> General, Advanced, and Extra were all exactly the same. We all used the
> same frequencies with the same authorized power, and from our call sign you
> couldn't tell one from the other. Life was good.
>
> Then some dump huck social-engineering gummint dudes, cheered on by a radio
> club in West Hartford, CT., decided to set up a bunch of arbitrary exclusive
> band segments as 'rewards' for advancing amongst the various classes, and
> then later drove wider wedges between the classes with the 'reward' of
> distinctive call signs for the higher licenses. Whatever good came of this
> is long since lost in the damage caused by 'class wars' which still rage.
>
> My proposal is based first on the notion that there should be two classes of
> license --- "Learners Permit" and "Fully Qualified", and second on the
> notion that those learners should operate in the mainstream with experienced
> hams, not segregated off into little ghettos populated with mostly other
> learners.
>
> 73, de Hans, K0HB

Hans, I'm in full agreement with your 3rd paragraph.

But what radio club in West Hartford are you referring to?

3975. Re: Where Did THIS Come From...?!?!a

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-08 13:39:36 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0312080539.57d2b8b2@posting.google.com>
Source record: 83551

Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:<VqKAb.6156$NN.871751@news1.news.adelphia.net>...
> N2EY wrote:
>
>
> > But perhaps we should also consider reducing our dependence on imported energy.
>
> Here is one that gets me into some trouble. I'm a firm believer that we
> should:
>
> 1. develop as much alternative energy as possible. Although we will
> never run out of oil, there are some real limits to it's inexpensive
> production.
>
> 2. In the interim, use as *much* imported oil as possible.
>
> 3. Our own oil resources should be husbanded very carefully, so we will
> still have oil in emergencies. We should use only as much as it takes to
> operate the wells and search for new sources.
>
>
> It is one of those reasons why I don't believe that we should open that
> range in Alaska at this time. There may come a time that that oil is
> needed desparately.
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -

Yep, national security is hard to do with alternatives. For example,
it would be difficult for the DoD to build stealth fighters that run
on nicads, charged by the sun.

But the rest of us could get along fine with alternatives.

3976. "No Diagrams Or Symbols"...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-08 13:40:06 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031208084006.07346.00002067@mb-m26.aol.com>
Source record: 83552

Check This Out:

http://www.arrl.org/news/stories/2003/12/03/1/?nc=1

Note this:

"The General class question pool does not contain any diagrams or symbols."

Hans' proposal sounds better and better...

73 de Jim, N2EY

3977. Re: Where Did THIS Come From...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-08 13:44:39 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0312080544.1439ef29@posting.google.com>
Source record: 83553

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20031207200829.07578.00002048@mb-m25.aol.com>...
> In article <Xns9446DF3225ECBelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun
> <alun@1stcounsel.com> writes:

> >> As for tough immigration, check out what is required to immigrate to
> >> New Zealand.
>
> Two words: "Bring money"
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

Ditto Canada. They admit lots of wealthy Chinese, but few Somalis.

3978. Re: light bulbs in rrap

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-08 13:48:45 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0312080548.6134652b@posting.google.com>
Source record: 83554

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20031207145200.23171.00002546@mb-m05.aol.com>...
> In article <5jKAb.6151$NN.870834@news1.news.adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo
> <mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:
>
> >Some may have seen this one before, but I think it's funny and to the point.
> >
> >How many rrap members does it takes to change a light bulb?
> >
> >1 to change the light bulb and to post that the light bulb has been changed
> >
> >14 to share similar experiences of changing light bulbs and how the
> >light bulb could have been changed differently
> >
> >7 to caution about the dangers of changing light bulbs
> >
> >10 to point out spelling/grammar errors in posts about changing light bulbs
> >
> >5 to flame the spell checkers
> >
> >3 to correct spelling/grammar flames
> >
> >6 to argue over whether it's "lightbulb" or "light bulb" ... another 6
> >to condemn those 6 as stupid
> >
> >2 industry professionals to inform the group that the proper term is "lamp"
> >
> >15 know-it-alls who claim they were in the industry, and that "light
> >bulb" is perfectly correct
> >
> >19 to post that this forum is not about light bulbs and to please take
> >this discussion to a lightbulb forum
> >
> >11 to defend the posting to this forum saying that we all use light
> >bulbs and therefore the posts are relevant to this forum
> >
> >36 to debate which method of changing light bulbs is superior, where to
> >buy the best light bulbs, what brand of light bulbs work best for
> >this technique and what brands are faulty
> >
> >7 to post URL's where one can see examples of different light bulbs
> >
> >4 to post that the URL's were posted incorrectly and then post the
> >corrected URL's

> >
> >3 to post about links they found from the URL's that are relevant to
> >this group which makes light bulbs relevant to this group
> >
> >13 to link all posts to date, quote them in their entirety including all
> >headers and signatures, and add "Me too"
> >
> >5 to post to the group that they will no longer post because they cannot
> >handle the light bulb controversy
> >
> >4 to say "didn't we go through this already a short time ago?"
> >
> >13 to say "do a Google search on light bulbs before posting questions
> >about light bulbs"
> >
> >18 who trip over each other in their rush to say "repost!"
> >
> >1 forum lurker to respond to the original post 6 months from now and
> >start it all over again."
>
> 88 federally licensed lightbulb changers stating that one MUST have
> proper legal licensing in order to change light bulbs.
>
> 73 long-time lightbulb change licensees to DEMAND that all take a
> bulb change test in order to fulfill the traditions of amateur lightbulb
> changing.
>
> 13 unlicensed lightbulb changers stating that civilians change light
> bulbs all the time and don't need licenses to do so.
>
> 69 incensed licensed lightbulb changers calling the unlicensed
> "LB-plussers" or "change lite."
>
> 52 licensed changers denouncing the new organization called
> "NCI" or No-Change International.
>
> 1 with Masters papers in sea-changing contemporaneously
> developing a proposal for new federal laws on light bulb chaning.
>
> 1 who always wears a uniform of some sort with many insigina
> demands instant obediance to strict lightbulb change rules.
>
> 1 who never changed a light bulb in his life but has many degrees
> to show he can and who will immediately misdirect conversation
> into something not about lightbulb changing.
>
> 1 who has 26 patents on lightbulb changing and once changed a
> light bulb for naval intelligence.
>
> 1 female who adamantly demands that all show their references for

> any opinion on changing lightbulbs.
>
> 1 other female who never needs lightbulbs due to the glow of her
> inner self giving all illumination necessary...except that hardly
> anyone can see what she is glowing about.
>
> 1 paraillumination logistics maintenance NCO who extolls the ONLY
> way to change light bulbs is to do as he did and become one with the
> divinity for accomplishment of rapid changing.
>
> 1 officious former government employee who states that unlicensed
> light bulb changers have no business commenting on amateur light
> bulb changing. Ever. They are never involved.
>
> 6 adolescent-minded to state offensive remarks about "screwing in
> light bulbs."
>
> 107 other parental surrogates to remind the 9 adolescent-minded to
> behave, become licensed light bulb changers, or be grounded.
>
> 963 incensed, angry parental surrogates denouncing one another in
> a spin-off thread stating that others are "virgin changers,"
> unfaithful, incapable of changing, would not know which
> direction to take in screwing, in or out, and never changed in their
> lives.
>
> 8 official statements from the northeast American Bulb Change
> League (ABCL) stating that they are the only organization
> representing amateur light bulb changers...and demanding BPL
> (Bulbchange Power for Light) be abolished due to bulb noise.
>
> LHA
> (writing by the Light of the Ages)

1 incensed licensed lightbulb changer who complains that "they're"
just giving light bulbs away.

3979. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-08 16:33:45 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <JJ1Bb.4011$_r6.3147@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 83555

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote

> >From 1951 till 1968 the privileges for four license classes, Conditional,
> >General, Advanced, and Extra were all exactly the same.
>
> No, that's not exactly correct.
>
> The period described started in February of 1953, not 1951.
>

Whatever.

> You could, however, usually tell the oldtimers from the newbies by the
license
> class, but that was about all.

Unless someone told you their license class, there was no way of knowing.
There was no 'QRZ.COM' to go check, the CallBook didn't show license class,
and all you could tell by their call sign was where their station was
located. We all played together in the ether as equals.

73, de Hans, K0HB

3980. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-08 16:57:36 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031208115736.07961.00000384@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 83556

In article <Xns943B9D3CC8D00elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun
<alun@1stcounsel.com> writes:

><snip>
>>> Several countries around the world have moved, or are moving, forward
>>> to
>>>eliminate the Morse Code testing requirement while the United States
>>>sits back and watches.
>>
>> What's the count now?
>
>I think they include at least the UK, Belgium, Germany, Switzerland, the
>Netherlands, Norway, Singapore, Papua New Guinea and Australia (not until
>Jan 1st). New Zealand may actually do it before Australia, as they have
>said it would be before the end of the year, but have given no date. I am
>pretty sure I have missed a couple out, too.
>

Oddly enough, Japan hasn't changed a thing, even though Japan has been the
poster country for no-code-test HF licenses.

The number of Japanese hams is dropping like a stone, judged by the number of
station licenses.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3981. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-08 16:57:37 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031208115737.07961.00000385@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 83557

In article <kENvb.15216$Rk5.10350@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> writes:

>N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote
>
>> What special knowledge is imparted by
>> the General and Extra class written tests?
>
>The tests aren't designed to 'impart' knowledge.

Good point!

>They are designed to
>determine if an applicant meets some predetermined minimum qualifications
>for the level of license being sought. (I'd have thought you knew that.)
>
OK, fine.

Then, what special knowledge is imparted by being able to pass the General and Extra class written tests that is a minimum qualification for the privileges granted by those licenses *and* is not tested adequately by the Technician test?

For example, the difference between being qualified to operate SSB on 20 meters vs. 2 meters?

73 de Jim, N2EY

3982. Re: light bulbs in rrap

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-08 16:58:11 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0312080858.5bab27cc@posting.google.com>
Source record: 83558

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20031207145200.23171.00002546@mb-m05.aol.com>...

> LHA
> (writing by the Light of the Ages)

...and all the rest of us wondering how much longer it will be
until you are committed to the ages...

Steve, K4YZ

3983. Re: 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-08 17:04:15 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0312080904.20e7e1d2@posting.google.com>
Source record: 83559

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20031207135937.21457.00002594@mb-m10.aol.com>...

> Or, to stay in the proper Chat Room mode, simply ignore what goes
> on in the only real radio regulatory agency for U.S. civilians and
> argue the whichness of the what on entertainers, Russian oil reserves,
> the right for Judaism to exist in a nation, etc., etc., etc., all having
> nothing whatsoever to do with amateur radio...except to REGULARS
> who need an Internet kaffe klatsch.

Sorry that you are not sufficiently versed in any other world
events, current or otherwise, that you could participate in those
other topics, Your Scumminess...Not that you'd have anything
constructive to add to THOSE topics either...

> One might, as a U.S. citizen, reflect what happened early one
> Sunday morning 62 years ago at a U.S. island in the Pacific. The
> result of that rather cut off amateur radio activity in the USA for about
> four years.

So what if it did, Lennie...It didn't affect you then...it
doesn't affect you now.

> LHA ex-RA16408336

You used to be a Russian aircraft registration number?

Steve, K4YZ

3984. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-08 17:33:55 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <7C2Bb.4096$_r6.4067@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 83560

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote

> Then, what special knowledge is imparted by being able to pass the General
and
> Extra class written tests that is a minimum qualification for the
privileges
> granted by those licenses *and* is not tested adequately by the Technician
> test?

What difference was there between a 1953 Technician written test, and a 1953 General written test? Nothing, of course. They were exactly the same examination.

But the 1953 General could beep 8WPM faster than the Tech. This 8WPM qualified them to operate on 2-meters where the Tech had no privileges in 1953. Novices of that era also beeped at 8WPM less than a General, but they *could* operate on 2-meters, and on 3 HF bands closed to Tech's. Didn't make any sense then --- still doesn't.

My point? All these arbitrary differences in operating privileges are just that --- arbitrary, based mostly on a misguided agenda of 'social engineering' by the regulators.

73, de Hans, K0HB

3985. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-08 18:04:00 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <k23Bb.4970$7p2.1232@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 83561

"Kim W5TIT" wrote:
>
> (snip) Fact is, though, you did open yourself
> up with the statement, "Few people today
> (especially boys and men) have not learned
> code, or at least played around with it, at
> some point in their lives." (snip)

Is that sentence what this is all about, Kim (and Dee)? If so, lets forget about debate rules and discuss how to write instead. I wrote a paragraph which contained a lead, supposition or hypothesis, and a conclusion. The "fact" mentioned in the lead of that paragraph is in the conclusion of that paragraph, not in any single sentence leading up to that conclusion. The sentence quoted above is supposition leading to the conclusion. The conclusion of that paragraph, and the "fact" mentioned in the lead of that paragraph, is, "...most adults today are familiar enough with code to know whether they have any real interest in it." Based on what I wrote in that paragraph, and in subsequent messages, I do believe that conclusion to be fact.

And the conclusion of this message is, if that sentence is indeed the root Dee's objection, we've spent several days arguing over two entirely different things - that sentence in Dee's case and the overall conclusion in my case.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3986. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-08 18:25:31 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <vm3Bb.5011$7p2.3741@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 83562

"N2EY" wrote:
> "Dwight Stewart" writes:
> > I based that on the fact that Morse code has
> > been widely featured in movies... (snip)
>
> Well, I simply disagree. Most people in the USA
> don't really know what Morse code is.

How can you say that, Jim? As I said, Morse code has been shown in some form or another in perhaps several hundred movies, television shows, and news broadcasts, over the last forty or fifty years. One would almost have to live in a cave without electric power to have not heard code at least several times and not know it is sent with a key (telegraph or other). Because of that, I think it is absurd to suggest that most don't know what Morse code is. They may not know the details, but they most certainly do know what it is.

> If they do't even know what it's called, they can
> hardly make an informed judgement about it.

Why do they have to know what something is called to make an informed judgement about it? I may not know what a certain crane is called (or how it works), but can still make an informed judgement not to stand under any load that crane may be moving.

> > That is especially true for anyone interested in radio
> > (shortwave listeners, potential new hams, and so
> > on).
>
> Not from what I've seen whenever I've demonstrated
> Morse code.

What are you basing that conclusion on? I don't doubt that those people didn't know how to send code, but you'll never convince me that they didn't even know what Morse code was.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3987. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-08 18:33:04 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <At3Bb.5026$7p2.4240@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 83563

"N2EY" wrote:
>
> (snip) The end result could be something that
> FCC and much of the amateur commnunity
> would support.

I disagree. For the reasons already stated, most specifically that the proposal doesn't serve a need not already addressed in the current licensing system, I don't think the FCC would have any interest at all in his proposal. When you consider the amount of changes needed to implement the proposal (rule changes, licensing procedures, and so on), I suspect the FCC would be dead set against it.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3988. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-08 18:49:34 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <2J3Bb.4153$_r6.3426@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 83564

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote

>
> Well, I simply disagree. Most people in the USA don't really know what
Morse
> code is.
>

I suppose that depends on what 'is' really is.

If I walk up to 100 random people over the age of 10 in a shopping mall and ask them "what is the Morse code", I'm sure every one them would give me an answer. You'd get answers like:

"The alphabet in dots and dashes".
"Those clicks they used to send telegrams in the cowboy movies."
"SOS"
"Those beeps and boops I used to hear on my SW receiver."
"A barrier to entry into HF amateur radio." [The devil made me say that.]
etc., etc., etc.

My point is that most people in the USA have at least a passing familiarity with *what* Morse code is, even if they can't recite the code for each letter/numeral.

73, de Hans, K0HB

3989. Re: Eliminate the CW requirement for General & Extra, BUT THEN...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-08 19:01:07 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <TT3Bb.5111$Ho3.3069@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 83565

"garigue" <garigue@comcast.net> wrote in message
news:yMQAb.455303$HS4.3565022@attbi_s01...
>
> > A good CW operator will slow down to the others speed. It makes sense
> > really. Why keep going at QRQ if the other guy can't copy? Or maybe
they
> > are just showing off.
> >
> > I wonder who will be impressed ?
> >
> > Dan/W4NTI
>
>
> Hello there Dan .....well I won't. I harbor no envy at the fellows who
are
> 50+ or distain at those who have been on for years and are still at "slow"
> speeds. The important thing is that the mode and frequencies are being
> utilized. I was just on 80 with a fellow from WVA ...boy the band had a
nice
> mellow sound to it tonight.
>
> God Bless 73 Tom Popovic KI3R Belle Vernon Pa.
>
>

I agree....its not the speed...its the accuracy.

Have a good one.

Dan/W4NTI

3990. Re: Eliminate the CW requirement for General & Extra, BUT THEN...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-08 19:02:16 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <YU3Bb.5118$Ho3.5096@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 83566

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:1PSAb.3970$7p2.1640@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net...
>
> "Bill Wright" <wrightw@adelphia.net> wrote in message
> news:WLqAb.5758$NN.550770@news1.news.adelphia.net...
> > BUT THEN change the CW band plan.
> > Eliminate the current segregation of the CW bands by license level and
> > institute a band plan based on transmit speed. We could have Low
speed -
> 5
> > wpm, Medium speed - 12 wpm and High speed - 20 wpm band sections. Even
if
> > you have an Extra license, you need to stay out of the "Fast Lane"
unless
> > you can keep up with the traffic.
> > Regards,
> > Bill
> > KO6SI
>
> so is that:
>
> Low speed - 0 up to 5 wpm
> Medium - 5 wpm up to 12 wpm
> High - 12 to 20
>
> just curious where the 30wpm folks would then operate.
>
> Cheers,
> Bill K2UNK
>
>
>

Anywhere they want....

Dan/W4NTI

3991. Re: Wonderful time on 160m contest CW

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-08 19:16:01 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <R54Bb.5169$Ho3.2543@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 83567

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:FiRAb.14662$P%1.13636240@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
> Just wanted to say I had a great time working the 160m CW contest this
> weekend. Only had a random wire at less than 10ft off the ground but
worked
> stations from Maine to S. Texas.
>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>

Your a real go getter Dee D. Congrats. Next time try an inverted L.
They say you need radials, but I don't have any, yet. Works good.

Dan/W4NTI

3992. Re: Wonderful time on 160m contest CW

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-08 19:20:08 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <I94Bb.5195$Ho3.4102@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 83568

"Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
news:f45722ac.0312080525.311c875@posting.google.com...
> Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:<PyRAb.7214$NN.983269@news1.news.adelphia.net>...
> > Dee D. Flint wrote:
> > > Just wanted to say I had a great time working the 160m CW contest this
> > > weekend. Only had a random wire at less than 10ft off the ground but
worked
> > > stations from Maine to S. Texas.
> >
> > Wow. I wonder how many you would have worked on 160 with that antenna
> > if you had been using ssb?
> >
> > I think that is one of the things that may dissapoint new hams that may
> > when the CW requirement is gone, (which I have predicted to happen about
> > the bottom of the sunspot cycle) and they get on the air, and they don't
> > do a whole lot after that? They will wonder what all the hubub was
about.
> >
> > Whereas you worked a lot of the US with an antenna that by all rights
> > shouldn't work much at all!
> >
> > - Mike KB3EIA -
>
>
> Wow, as a newbie I had EXACTLY the opposite experience.
>
> I was a Novice and could hardly hear or work anyone on CW. After
> upgrading to Tech, I was talked in to cutting my 40M dipole down to
> 10M (because I upgraded about the same time as the Novice Enhancement
> came along), and got on 10M SSB. WOWEE!!! That was what all the
> hubub was about!
>
> And my 10M antenna was tied off to a crabapple tree at 8', and the
> other end was tied off to the gutter at about 12'.
>
> Yup, CW gets through when everything else will - sometimes.
>
> Brian

Here is something you can use in your life Brian;

It takes two things to communicate, an operator at both ends.

Everything will radiate, its the degree of effeciency thereof.

Have a nice day.

Dan/W4NTI

3993. Re: Wonderful time on 160m contest CW

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-08 19:22:13 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <Fb4Bb.5207$Ho3.5056@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 83569

"K&#65533;HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:q5VAb.5351$rP6.3027@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net...
>
> "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote
>
> > Just wanted to say I had a great time working the 160m CW contest this
> > weekend.
>
> Sorry I missed you, but Michigan was well represented. We only operated
for
> about 2 hours, so our score is just over 10,000. Heard W4NTI at about
> esp-level, but QSB was bad, so I didn't try to call him. I wonder who was
> operating KV4FZ --- pretty sure it wasn't Herb, because the operator was
> really stumbling.
>
> Getting ready for the 10M contest next. K0CKB and I will do a sort of
> multi/multi split between A1 and A3.
>
> 73, Hans, K0HB
>
>
>
>

Sorry I missed you. That was probably on Friday evening when I was doing my
CQ thing.

I didn't do much of that on Saturday. Really didn't get into it much. But
condx were hot.

I think it was the Herpster. He called me by name. So maybe he was having
a bad day too.. hi.

But his signal was s3 on Friday. ANd S9 on Saturday.

Dan/W4NTI

3994. Re: "No Diagrams Or Symbols"...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-08 19:58:59 UTC
From: KHB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <7K4Bb.4217$_r6.3008@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 83570

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote

>
> http://www.arrl.org/news/stories/2003/12/03/1/?nc=1
>
> Note this:
>
> "The General class question pool does not contain any diagrams or
symbols."
>

NTI (No Theory International) at work in the background.

If this is a surprise to anyone, you only need examine the 'gang of four' who is responsible for the question pools. This has the fingerprints of W5YI smeared all over it. He has stated publicly that he feels that since people who acquire entry level ham tickets invariably purchase their equipment assembled these days, and send them in for repairs when broken, they no longer need to possess theknowledge needed to build their own stations, nor the knowledge to determine if their repairs/adjustments result in proper on-the-air signals. Because of this fact, he thinks that the majority of questions regarding math and theory (knowledge mainly needed to build/repair/adjust equipment) should be removed from qualification tests, and simply replaced with questions on operating technique and regulations. If he had his way, math and theory questions would only be part of Amateur Extra examinations.

73, de Hans, K0HB

3995. Re: light bulbs in rrap

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-08 20:15:08 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3FD4DBCC.2020300@psu.edu>
Source record: 83571

Len Over 21 wrote:

> 88 federally licensed lightbulb changers stating that one MUST have
> proper legal licensing in order to change light bulbs.
>

<snippage>

Hehe! What can I say but good one, Len!

- Mike KB3EIA -

3996. Re: "No Diagrams Or Symbols"...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-08 20:21:39 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <n35Bb.4243$_r6.676@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 83572

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote

> Note this:
>
> "The General class question pool does not contain any diagrams or
symbols."

Breaking news.....

.....a member of the QPC informs me thusly....

"I'm sure QPC Chairman W4WW will chime in on this, but just be aware that the committee has been continuing the posture established in 1987 by FCC that the General pool has no graphics. ..... So, as with all General pools since 1987, this one again has no graphics."

3997. Re: Down with seat belts: (Was: Re: Where Did THIS Come From)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-08 21:05:09 UTC
From: dennis@wawa.juniper.net
Message-ID: <br2p25$m8s$1@heap.juniper.net>
Source record: 83574

K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote:
>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote
>
>> Look at the battle it took to get seat belts in
>> cars, and how many Americans won't use them.
>
>Another example of the Great Dumbing Down of America.
>
>The world is methodically being dumbed down by government efforts to protect
>us from stupid people.

Note that America != world, though I've heard a foreign stereotype
of Americans which suggest that Americans might not always remember this.

>But stupidity begets stupidity, so we are being overwhelmed by a tsunami of
>stupidity. The tsunami is triggered by the government protection of stupid
>people, which allows them to survive to reproduce.
>
>Ergo, less government regulations makes a smarter populace.

While in the past I wouldn't have agreed with this at all, I've heard a
stereotype joke about Americans repeated enough in, of all places, China,
that I'm now not so sure there isn't something to it.

China has a lot of traveller-beware tourist attractions. An example I've
seen is a path dug into the side of a sheer cliff from which the views
are stunning, but which requires one to walk through sections of path
which are 18 inches wide, without an outside railing, over a sheer
drop. Lots of Chinese go. Some take a look and decide they aren't
up to it, but others decide its okay and head up to see the view. Probably
a quarter million Chinese people a year go up to take a look without
a mishap.

The joke I've heard (with respect to myself in fact; this may contribute
a bit to the popularity of sewing Canadian flags on one's backpack and
clothing), however, is that if Americans go up no one wants to stand too
close since, if you send a group of a dozen Americans up, one is sure to
go over the side.

I have no idea what occurance inspired the joke but I know in China
people are almost viserally aware that no one has responsibility for their
safety and well-being other than themselves, and so might have some
difficulty understanding the behaviour of people who assume someone else
is taking care of this for them.

Dennis Ferguson

3998. Just drop the code!!!!!!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-08 21:17:30 UTC
From: Lloyd Davies The GREAT TIME LORD <lloyd_vfp@msn.com>
Message-ID: <pT5Bb.411$4t2.196@bignews4.bellsouth.net>
Source record: 83573
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Who cares about background check! Let's get ham radio into reality!

http://www.qrz.com/cgi-bin/ikonboard.cgi?act=ST&f=3&t=49913

3999. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-08 21:32:24 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3FD4EDE8.8060207@psu.edu>
Source record: 83575

N2EY wrote:
> In article <uvNAb.6270$NN.915568@news1.news.adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo
> <mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:
>
>
>>>>I don't oppose a time limit per se. I don't like a ten year time limit
>>>>though.
>>>
>>>
>>>Why? It's my understanding that the 10-year idea is based partly on the
>>
>>current
>>
>>>license term and partly on the idea that we don't want to force anyone out
>>>because of "life happens" events like education and family.
>>
>> Its just too long.
>
>
> Is it really too long, particularly considering the two-year experience
> requirement?
>
> One of the problems with the old 1 and 2 year Novices was that if a new ham ran
> into "life happens" situations, their upgrade schedule would be seriously
> disprupted.
>
> Example: A few weeks after a teenager gets the Novice license his folks inform
> him that the family is moving across the country. New house isn't quite ready
> so they'll be living in temporary quarters for a while. Meanwhile most of their
> stuff is in storage. "A while" becomes "a few months"..
>
> Finally they get into the new house and there's a flurry of activity to get set
> up - and the parents say ham radio isn't a top priority. By the time Our Hero
> is back on the air, there's not much time left on his one-year license.
>
> Look how long it's taken some *adults* (alleged adults, anyway) in this NG to
> upgrade, or even get licenses.
>
>
>>The license renewal period would just be another
>>number by that time, since the new A license would be forever. I'm busy
>>as all gitout, and it took me something over a week of hard study to get
>>ready for the Extra.
>

>
> Very true!
>
>>Plus I can't figure out what can make a person qualified to operate on
>>day 3652 of their licensing period and unqualified on day 3653.
>
>
> The same principle that makes a General or Advanced class ham qualfied to
> operate on 3526 kHz but not on 3524 kHz.
>
> The same principle that makes a Tech Plus ham qualified to operate a
> transmitter of 1500 W output using any authorized mode on 6 meters but not 10
> meters.

I don't agree there Jim! True enough, its an arbitrary thing, but what
you are talking about is power limits and sub-bands, and I am talking
about the qualifications to operate *at all*. the other folks simply
operate within the limitations of their licenses, and the 10 year and 1
day class B ham is no ham at all anymore.

>>It takes
>>a lot less time than that to understand RF safety - the only real reason
>>I can think of for the second class license, so if we're going to do
>>this, it should make some timing sense.
>
>
> There's a lot more to it than RF safety.

>
>>>> I support a time in grade, even though I would be frustrated (read
>>>>teased) by a two year stint before I could get the class A.
>>>
>>>BTDT.
>>
>>Not sure about BTDT.
>>
>
> Been There, Done That
>
>
>>>>Another
>>>>thing, which would be a little strange would be having to have a control
>>>>op at field day (or operate lower power)
>>>>
>>>
>>>Why would that be strange? It's the rule *today*.
>>
>>I keep drawing parallels between the second class license and Generals.
>>We try to get people out to operate on field day, and you can get some
>>pretty strange setups. First a Ham with less than 2 years time in grade
>>would have to have a control op.

>
>
> Why?

If he/she is operating >50 Watts, they are outside their priveliges.

> As long as the power level is less than 50 W, that Class B ham could operate
> any freq, any mode, as the control op.

Ahh, but now we have to set up a special low power station. The low
power ghetto I was talking about. For good or bad, my club runs high
power during Field Day. I'm taking my reference of "Class B Ghetto" from
experience with the GOTA station. The first year our GOTA station
operated, many of the people operating it called it a "toy station".
They could op one of the high power stations, park on a frequency, and
rack up points, and the lowly GOTA station has to hunt and pounce. It
wasn't until I put PSK31 on the GOTA station that it took off.

note: I'm not suggesting that newbies use high power. Just the opposite
in fact. Hunt and pounce at low power builds competence in the new ham.
But its so hard to compete with power when you're working like crazy to
get a QSO, and the guy in the next tent is racking them up at a high rate.

>>We have hams what operate now at field
>>day that would suddenly have to have a control op (therefore taking
>>myself or another Extra away from a station)
>
>
> Not at all! Existing hams would retain their existing privs under Hans'
> proposal.

I'm saying that I'm sitting with the guy as a control op and not
operating myself.

>
>>Of course the second class
>>ham could operate a 50 watt or less station, but that would mean that
>>either we change our setup - all stations except GOTA are full output -
>>or set up a special station just for the second class hams, a sort of
>>low power ghetto.
>
>
> You mean you folks operate 1500 W on FD? (that's "full output")

Actually we operat @1kW. My bad.

>>Heck, the GOTA station can run more power. Maybe this
>>is no problem for you, but for others it isn't so good
>>
>
> Try QRP some time ;-)

Nothing wrong with QRP. I'm just noting possible problems as outlined
above. If you're going QRP then everyone is operating at less than 5 watts.

> The fact is that if a non-Extra wants to operate FD, there has to be a control
> op present whenever the non-Extra exceeds his-her subband restrictions. That's
> a lot more onerous than turning down the power to 50 W.

I stayed in my bands when I was a General at FD. Wasn't a problem.

>>>Back in the late '60s and early '70s, there were *four* FD power levels:
>>>QRP, 50 W, 150 W, and the legal limit, IIRC.
>>
>> Could be. But if we went back to that, the clubs could be forced to
>>make a decision to either run what they would like to run, take control
>>ops away from available stations for those who don't have time in grade.
>>(or the proper upgrade) or make that little ghetto for the second class
>>Hams. I really don't think that is a good way to welcome new people. YMMV.
>>
>
> There's another option: Change the rules so that different power levels could
> be used for different stations in the same multi setup. (It used to be this
> way!)

This might work well enough, but I still don't care for relegating the
class B to the ghetto, or to remove an Extra or class A from operating
to be a control op.

I know that the others I work with on field day wouldn't be too wild
about that sort of thing either. These are people that love working high
power, and enjoy racking up points. Inexperienced users can get working
with us, but adding another station (and putting us in another class)
for a 50 watt station isn't going to be too popular with them - and
after all, they and myself are the ones doing the setup and teardown, so
as long as we are within the rules, we should be allowed to do this. I
just don't think that the proposed setup will be both newbie friendly
and experienced friendly at the same time.

Note I'm not saying things couldn't work. I'm saying that every time I
turn around, this proposal is bumping into something else, and not
necessarily in a good way. It starts out prety simply, but then we have
to do all kinds of things to shoehorn it into the real world. So we end
up changing this so can coexist with the thing we changed before in
order to avoid messing that up which came about as a result of modifying
the rule that contradicted.....

4000. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-08 21:47:31 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <Tj6Bb.4317$_r6.2806@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 83576

"Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote

> Ahh, but now we have to set up a special low power station.

No you don't. At worst you need to put a wattmeter in the transmission line, and maybe a neon-orange sign reading "Observe the power limits of your operators license." with an arrow pointing to the "Pwr" knob on the radio.

73, de Hans, K0HB

4001. Re: Down with seat belts: (Was: Re: Where Did THIS Come From)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-08 23:24:32 UTC
From: Jerry Oxendine <joxendi@bellsouth.net>
Message-ID: <RI7Bb.750$Yt2.249@bignews3.bellsouth.net>
Source record: 83577

"JJ" <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
news:ILmdnUU93f4dikmiRVn-hA@gbronline.com...
> Jerry Oxendine wrote:
>
> > I have to agree with you! How did we survive the '50s,
> > even the '70s without socialists like Hilary Clinton "protecting" us
from
> > ourselves? We misbehaved, we got
> > paddled by a teacher and Dad gave you a "whuppin'" when you got home!
GASP!!
> > HORRORS! We rode our
> > bicycles and didn't know what helmets were? You're KIDDING! We climbed
> > trees, fell out, had the breath knocked out of us, got up and kept
going.
> > HUH? Why,
> > we'll have to make trees illegal!! We sent each other flying high in
the
> > air by jumping on a short plank in a modified game of see-saw; sometimes
the
> > plank skewed
> > to one side and we broke arms and ribs. Let's SUE somebody! We got up
again
> > with skinned knees, and when it quit smarting, we got back on the board
and
> > did it again. In high school, we drove school busses at 16!
> > WHAAAAAAAAAAT??????? We even had bus drivers' club! What, that's CRAZY!
No
> > it wasn't. At that time, North Carolina had one of the safest school
> > bus driver programs in the nation! We drove tractors as
> > soon as we could reach the pedals and Pop-popped (John Deere) our way
down
> > the highway with no supervi-
> > sion going from one field to another. YIKES!! We drove farm pickups
(off
> > road) as soon as we could shift
> > gears, too! HORRORS! GASP! CALL THE LIBERALS!
>
> You bring back a lot of memories Jer. A poppin Johnny was the first
> thing I learned to drive 10 years before I would be old enough for a
> drivers license, that hand clutch really made it easy. Ever start it up
> without removing the tin can off the exhaust stack first?
>
> > We expect to remain
> > free, yet we quietly

> > surrender our rights to the left wingers who represent one
> > of the greatest threats next to our external enemies. That is because
it is
> > creeping socialism" and slips up on us one right at a time. Like the
> > seatbelt issue, the liberals couch their agenda in issues that seem to
"be
> > for the good of all".
> > They know that they cannot suddenly, for example, take
> > away guns (well, there's that pesky Constition thing they'd
> > like to get rid of); it would set off a rebellion.
>
> We used to take guns to school. Hear that anti-gun liberal nuts, yes,
> real guns at school. Even carried them on the school bus. We never had
> any thoughts of shooting up the school, and certainly no thoughts of
> shooting someone. We would leave our rifles in the prinipal's office
> until after school, then walk home through the fields and pastures
> looking for varmits to shoot.

And I long for those days that will never come back. I just wish my
daughter could see how happy and (WHAT?) free we were We wore the same
clothes until they couldn't be patched anymore. Were we poor? Moneywise,
yes. But we didn't KNOW we were poor.
We farmed, raised our own vegetables, chickens. What
we didn't need for the root cellar, Mom canned and put up for the winter.
We picked blackberries and made jelly for sweets, or Mom made cakes or
cookies from scratch.
For a treat, she would bake yeast rolls----MMMMMM!
You could smell them at the back of the garden and out to the wheat field.
We sold eggs we didn't use ourselves
with a route in town, and frequented the farmers' market.

We knew nothing about pocket games. Computers were something that we
couldn't imagine except those huge Unix things with the multiple tape reels
seen on our black and white TVs. We couldn't believe it when we heard about
Sputnik Do you remember the International Geo-
physical Year?

Toys? We got a few things at Christmas, the rest we scrounged up wheels and
steering wheels to make "go" carts that coasted down the highway--YES! It
was the highway, or rural route, dodging cars or running in the ditch if
they got too close. We carried pocket knives and thought nothing of it! It
was a rite of passage for boys with which we carved whistles--which, in
turn, were confiscated by the teachers who spied them. Which, in turn, we
made more whistles, which.....you know! NO one ever thought about
shooting anyone. We boys had arguments and met out behind the ball field
and duked it out. Afterwards we pouted at our opponents, and gradually
started speaking again. Dads taught their kids how USE a gun, when, where,
and why. Not to murder someone. Never, never, never point a gun at anyone
unless you meant to use it. By 5th grade, I was moving Dad's guns around
the house, FIRST making sure there was no round in the chamber. I was taught
when hunting to break down your shotgun and carry it that way until you

intended to shoot at that prey, or keep the safety on at all times. Because Dad took the time to teach me to respect the power of a gun and to NEVER become careless, I never had an accident, and to this day, if I pick up my Dad's old shotgun, the FIRST thing I do is to break it down and check to see there is no shell in there. Now kids have to have police roaming the halls and metal detectors. A girl somewhere was expelled (an honor student) because she unthinkingly brought a knife to school as part of a school science project. What has become of us? And the older kids make fun of us for being "old fashioned". Give back the school's authority to discipline kids (yes, corporal), stop dumbing down education, and kick out the liberals that are slowly ruining this country.

The poppin' Johns? Oh, yeah! Every year, I go to at least one "Old Time Threshing" convention in my state
just to hear that sound.

Jerry
>
>

4002. Re: light bulbs in rrap

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-08 23:45:34 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <y28Bb.4762$b65.4336@news01.roc.ny>
Source record: 83578

Mike,

Is that an incandescent light bulb, or a flourescent light bulb? :)

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

4003. Re: light bulbs in rrap

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-08 23:47:09 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <148Bb.4763$Q05.2128@news01.roc.ny>
Source record: 83579

Len,

Before you discuss light bulbs, can you show me your electrician's license?
;)

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

4004. Re: Down with seat belts: (Was: Re: Where Did THIS Come From)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-08 23:53:12 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <I98Bb.4764$S75.2876@news01.roc.ny>
Source record: 83580

Hans,

These laws are necessary. We *must* protect stupid people. How else are we going to fill the ever-expanding number of government positions?

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

4005. Re: "No Diagrams Or Symbols"...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-08 23:56:56 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0312081556.352930f9@posting.google.com>
Source record: 83581

"Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<7K4Bb.4217$_r6.3008@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>...
> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote
>
> >
> > http://www.arrl.org/news/stories/2003/12/03/1/?nc=1
> >
> > Note this:
> >
> > "The General class question pool does not contain any diagrams or
> symbols."
> >
>
> NTI (No Theory International) at work in the background.

Incrementalism, too.

> If this is a surprise to anyone, you only need examine the 'gang of four'
> who is responsible for the question pools. This has the fingerprints of
> W5YI smeared all over it. He has stated publicly that he feels that since
> people who acquire entry level ham tickets invariably purchase their
> equipment assembled these days, and send them in for repairs when broken,
> they no longer need to possess theknowledge needed to build their own
> stations, nor the knowledge to determine if their repairs/adjustments result
> in proper on-the-air signals.

But the General isn't an entry-level license.

And people say there's no dumbing-down going on.

> Because of this fact, he thinks that the
> majority of questions regarding math and theory (knowledge mainly needed to
> build/repair/adjust equipment) should be removed from qualification tests,
> and simply replaced with questions on operating technique and regulations.

The current study manual has at least two pages on how to adjust VOX and anti-VOX.

Betcha it doesn't have diddly-squat about how to adjust a bug...

> If he had his way, math and theory questions would only be part of Amateur
> Extra examinations.

"Don't bother...they're here..."

73 de Jim, N2EY

4006. Re: "No Diagrams Or Symbols"...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-09 01:22:23 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <jt9Bb.4476$_r6.3299@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 83582

"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote

>
> And people say there's no dumbing-down going on.
>

As I noted in another post, Jim, this turns out to be old news. There
haven't been diagrams on the General examination for the past 15 years.

73, de Hans, K0HB

4007. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-09 01:26:39 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <br38gv$cet@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 83583

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:k23Bb.4970$7p2.1232@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> "Kim W5TIT" wrote:
> >
> > (snip) Fact is, though, you did open yourself
> > up with the statement, "Few people today
> > (especially boys and men) have not learned
> > code, or at least played around with it, at
> > some point in their lives." (snip)
>
>
> Is that sentence what this is all about, Kim (and Dee)? If so, lets
forget
> about debate rules and discuss how to write instead. I wrote a paragraph
> which contained a lead, supposition or hypothesis, and a conclusion. The
> "fact" mentioned in the lead of that paragraph is in the conclusion of
that
> paragraph, not in any single sentence leading up to that conclusion. The
> sentence quoted above is supposition leading to the conclusion. The
> conclusion of that paragraph, and the "fact" mentioned in the lead of that
> paragraph, is, "...most adults today are familiar enough with code to know
> whether they have any real interest in it." Based on what I wrote in that
> paragraph, and in subsequent messages, I do believe that conclusion to be
> fact.
>
> And the conclusion of this message is, if that sentence is indeed the
root
> Dee's objection, we've spent several days arguing over two entirely
> different things - that sentence in Dee's case and the overall conclusion
in
> my case.
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
>

Well, I am actually *supposing* that is what it is that Dee is basing the
major part of the discussion on. Dee? (PS--it doesn't matter a whoot for
me, I think I'm not so driven by statements as I am concepts).

Kim W5TIT

4008. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-09 03:14:22 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <i6bBb.14921$P%1.13873540@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 83584

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:1UXAb.4061$Ho3.984@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> I based that on the fact that Morse code has been widely featured in
> movies (Titantic to War Movies), television (Hogan's Heros to Westerns to
> Sci-Fi), books, children's toys, the military decades ago, youth
> organizations, and so on. So, again, I do think it is a fact that most
> people in this country today know about Morse code. They may not know what
> it's called, how to do it, or whatever, but only a truly isolated person
> would not know at least something about it. That is especially true for
> anyone interested in radio (shortwave listeners, potential new hams, and
so
> on).

Such exposure doesn't give anyone sufficient information to make an informed
decision.

>
> You haven't provided anything beyond your own opinion to dispute any of
> that. Instead, you assault my choice of words and then insist, even if
true,
> that is not enough - that one must have practical experience to truly make
a
> choice. Of course, that's nonsense. One does not have to murder someone to
> know that murder is not something one would particularly like to do.
Indeed,
> we make choices in our lives each day without personal experience to back
it
> up. Your demand for more here shows a serious lack of respect for people's
> ability to make their own choices.
>
>

Again you are NOT reading my words. I've repeatedly stated that one can
make judgments based on risks, dangers, and harm even if they have not
experienced it. Murder does serious harm and therefore does not need to be
experienced. However where such detrimental effects don't come into play,
it is not possible to say one does or does not like something unless they
have experienced it. One may think they won't like it but they truly do not
have the tools to do other than make an assumption.

I refrain from forming opinions on things I've never tried. There will be
things that I will never form an opinion on. For example my fear of the
risks of skydiving will never allow me to try it. So I do not know whether
I would like it or not and refrain from making a judgment on it. I've never
had occasion to eat frog legs or squid so I refrain from judging whether or

not I would like these foods. And so on.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

4009. Re: Eliminate the CW requirement for General & Extra, BUT THEN...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-09 03:20:59 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <vcbBb.14922$P%1.13874366@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 83585

"Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
news:f45722ac.0312080531.64b2b674@posting.google.com...
> "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<1PSAb.3970$7p2.1640@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> > "Bill Wright" <wrightw@adelphia.net> wrote in message
> > news:WLqAb.5758$NN.550770@news1.news.adelphia.net...
> > > BUT THEN change the CW band plan.
> > > Eliminate the current segregation of the CW bands by license level and
> > > institute a band plan based on transmit speed. We could have Low
speed -
> > 5
> > > wpm, Medium speed - 12 wpm and High speed - 20 wpm band sections.
Even if
> > > you have an Extra license, you need to stay out of the "Fast Lane"
unless
> > > you can keep up with the traffic.
> > > Regards,
> > > Bill
> > > KO6SI
> >
> > so is that:
> >
> > Low speed - 0 up to 5 wpm
> > Medium - 5 wpm up to 12 wpm
> > High - 12 to 20
> >
> > just curious where the 30wpm folks would then operate.
> >
> > Cheers,
> > Bill K2UNK
>
>
> Hey, not so fast with splitting up the bands. I'm still trying to get
> at what level "CW proficiency" begins.

I would pick 13wpm as that is the speed that once a person has attained it,
the code will stay with them and not be forgotten. They may get rusty but
are unlikely to forget. This is discussed in the book "The Art & Skill of
Radiotelegraphy."

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

4010. Re: Wonderful time on 160m contest CW

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-09 03:26:49 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <ZhbBb.14923$P%1.13875574@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 83586

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:R54Bb.5169$Ho3.2543@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
>
> "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
> news:FiRAb.14662$P%1.13636240@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
> > Just wanted to say I had a great time working the 160m CW contest this
> > weekend. Only had a random wire at less than 10ft off the ground but
> worked
> > stations from Maine to S. Texas.
> >
> > Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
> >
>
> Your a real go getter Dee D. Congrats. Next time try an inverted L.
> They say you need radials, but I don't have any, yet. Works good.
>
> Dan/W4NTI

Definitely going to do something different with an antenna next year. Don't know what yet but I've liked what I read about the inverted L. I sure would have liked to work that Wyoming that I heard so faintly.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

4011. Re: "No Diagrams Or Symbols"...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-09 03:36:33 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <5rbBb.6767$Ho3.4037@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 83587

"Kï¿½HB" wrote:
>
> This has the fingerprints of W5YI smeared
> all over it. He has stated publicly that he feels
> that since people who acquire entry level
> ham tickets invariably purchase their
> equipment assembled these days, and send
> them in for repairs when broken, they no
> longer need to possess theknowledge needed
> to build their own stations, nor the knowledge
> to determine if their repairs/adjustments result
> in proper on-the-air signals. (snip)

While I cannot speak for someone else, I would reword that to say that simple diagrams and a few questions in a license test is not going to prepare someone to build or repair the complex radio equipment used by most Amateurs today. To build such equipment, one would almost need an engineering degree and a labortory full of equipment. Anything beyond the most basic repairs would require considerable experience and a significant investment in equipment. So, in my opinion, instead of trying to meet that, the tests today serve as a basic introduction to electronics to both allow those basic repairs and encourage some to seek real electronics training elsewhere.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

4012. Re: "No Diagrams Or Symbols"...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-09 04:03:36 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031208230336.15425.00000581@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 83588

>the tests today serve as a basic introduction to electronics to both allow
>those basic repairs and encourage some to seek real electronics training
>elsewhere.
>
>
>Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
>http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
>

BS, the test today do nothing of the sort, all these stupid test do anymore is test someones ability to Memorize a Bunch of Q and As.

4013. Re: "No Diagrams Or Symbols"...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-09 04:09:45 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <dWbBb.4680$_r6.1189@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 83589

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote

> So, in my opinion, instead of trying to meet that,
> the tests today serve as a basic introduction to electronics to both allow
> those basic repairs and encourage some to seek real electronics training
> elsewhere.

I'd agree with that in general principle. But it strikes me that the ability to recognize the symbols for various electronic components in a simple schmatic and to be able to navigate an elementary block diagram would be essential to even the most elementary troubleshooting and repair tasks that we'd expect a General class amateur to be able to accomplish.

73, de Hans, K0HB

4014. Re: light bulbs in rrap

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-09 04:16:30 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3FD54C99.6DBBB576@earthlink.net>
Source record: 83590

Mike Coslo wrote:
>
> Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> > 88 federally licensed lightbulb changers stating that one MUST have
> > proper legal licensing in order to change light bulbs.
> >
>
> <snippage>
>
> Hehe! What can I say but good one, Len!

Don't be too generous with your praise, Mike. Len's never actually changed a lightbulb or owned a lightbulb but he has several friends who are lightbulb changers and fifty years ago, he worked in the sunlight. These things are enough to make him an expert in lighting technology and to lecture all licensed lightbulb changers.

Dave K8MN

4015. Re: Wonderful time on 160m contest CW

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-09 05:35:05 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3FD55EFC.8030409@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 83591

>
>
>>
>>
>
>Definitely going to do something different with an antenna next year. Don't
>know what yet but I've liked what I read about the inverted L. I sure would
>have liked to work that Wyoming that I heard so faintly.
>
>Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>
>
>
Maybe a 1/4 wave length of wire with a weather baloon at the top? A big
problem is
if it should get blown down and find the local high voltage distribution
lines.....

4016. Re: Wonderful time on 160m contest CW

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-09 05:41:18 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <2gdBb.6646$rP6.944@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 83592

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote

> Just wanted to say I had a great time working the 160m CW contest this
> weekend.

The Boring Amateur Radio Club would like to thank the ARRL for
recently completing the warm up competition for the 8th running of the
Stew Perry TopBand Challenge which will rock the ionosphere Dec. 27-28.

The rules may be perused at:
http://www.jzap.com/k7rat/stew.html

Now you know which hardware improvements/adjustments/renovations
should be done to optimize your unique situation...or not. Anybody from
hard-core icons of TopBand wizardry to the Newbie who just found out the
radio has a spot next to that big dial that says 1.8 can make a few or a
lot of Q's.

Recognition for Participants come from the competitors themselves
by sponsoring plaques for situations that they feel are important. The
donor Stalwarts and categories already spoken for are listed below:
Sponsor Category
KL7RA Top QSO Total
K1PX Top Score, Single Op, Europe, Low Power
VK6VZ Top Score using Home-brew gear (VK5AX memorial-winner
receives RFDS Cap)
WA9IRV Top Score by Operator of own Station in
VE3,VE4,MN,WI,ND
N5IA Most Grid Squares worked
N5UL Top Score, Single Op, Low Power
Horned Toad Wireless Top Score, Single Op, Low Power, Rest of World
W7GG Top Score, Single Op, QRP
BARC Top Score by a Plaque Donor

You want immortality? You want fame? You see a category that needs
channeling through you for expression in the TopBand world? Then simply
commit to spend $50.00 and impart that idea to me. First come....first
spoken for...first get! Several Stalwarts are pondering their categories
as we speak so decide upon one and e-mail me directly. This Contest is
what we all make it...and we all make it fun. The plaques from the 2002
event have all been sent out and should be arriving at the plaque
winners QTH's currently.

73 and I remain,
Lew W7EW/W7AT
Boring Amateur Radio Club

P.O.Box 3110
Salem, OR. 97302
U.S.A.
lew@teleport.com

4017. Re: Where Did THIS Come From...?!?!a

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-09 07:12:59 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0312082312.25dcd51d@posting.google.com>
Source record: 83593

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20031207132229.07578.00002040@mb-m25.aol.com>...

> Does anyone have a realistic estimate of how much it will cost and how long it
> will take to develop Russian oil to the point where it undercuts crude from the
> Middle East in total production cost? (drilling, pumping, infrastructure,
> transportation, refining)?

So, rather than spend the bucks and get it done, we continue to
hang our hats on the Arab's bedposts until all of THAT oil is gone,
THEN go looking?

> Remember that much of Russia's oil is in places as inhospitable and undeveloped
> as Alaska. And there's the added problem that the folks there don't necessarily
> play by American rules....

And the Arabs do?

> > Besides...Russians and Americans are closer in social and
> >geopolitical ideologies than Americans and those folks in the Middle
> >East and SW Asia...
>
> In other words, we should trust the Russians?

I trust them more. I never did foresee a nuclear war between us.
The true threat has been from some upstart trying to be the new kid
on the block or someone looking to drive a wedge between us and the
Russians.

> >So let's spend our money where it's appreciated.
>
> Sure.
>
> But perhaps we should also consider reducing our dependence on imported energy.

I'd agree with that, but getting the rest of America to is a
problem. We've had the technology to exploit many non-petroleum or
hybrid petroleum alternatives for decades. And even where there are
other US-controlled petro reserves, we ahve our own people fighting
our attempts to recover them.

73

Steve, K4YZ

4018. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-09 07:14:28 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0312082314.6007fb04@posting.google.com>
Source record: 83594

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20031207132653.11891.00002805@mb-m11.aol.com>...
> In article <bVyAb.3302$rP6.2329@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>, "Kï¿½HB"
> <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> writes:
>
> >> For example, the Red Cross doesn't go around painting
> >> crosses red and the Salvation Army doesn't fight religious wars.
> > >
> > >But why the hell isn't there a Salvation Navy?
> >
> > ...there is no salvation in the navy...

Tell that to a Navy Chaplain.

Steve, K4YZ

4019. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-09 08:12:14 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <ytfBb.7074$7p2.1970@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 83597

"Dee D. Flint" wrote:
>
> Such exposure doesn't give anyone
> sufficient information to make an
> informed decision.

Of course, that's just an opinion, isn't it? You're not an expert on the human decision making process and there are no studies to show whether it is or isn't sufficient, right? If not, your opinion is no more valid than mine.

> Again you are NOT reading my words.
> I've repeatedly stated that one can make
> judgments based on risks, dangers, and
> harm even if they have not experienced it.
> Murder does serious harm and therefore
> does not need to be experienced.
> However where such detrimental effects
> don't come into play, it is not possible to
> say one does or does not like something
> unless they have experienced it. (snip)

Again, we make decisions each day without personal experience to necessarily back it up. This includes who we associate with, who we date, what we eat for lunch, what books we buy, what shows we watch on television, whether we marry, and the list goes on virtually forever. And, again, your demand for more here shows a serious lack of respect for people's ability to make their own choices.

> I refrain from forming opinions on things
> I've never tried. There will be things that
> I will never form an opinion on. (snip)

I find that very difficult to believe, Dee. Did you try actual marrage before actually getting married? Did you try driving on the highway before deciding to get a license? Did you try your job before actually taking it? Again, there are many things we choose to do or not do without actually trying them first.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

4020. Re: Wonder how licensing will change...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-09 08:30:44 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <UKfBb.7076$7p2.5915@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 83596

"Steve Robeson, K4CAP" wrote:
> lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote:
> > "Kï¿½HB" writes:
> > >
> > >But why the hell isn't there a Salvation Navy?
> >
> > ...there is no salvation in the navy...
>
> Tell that to a Navy Chaplain.

I don't think he was refering to the religious context of the word. Instead, I suspect he was referring to "saving someone from an unpleasant situation." The "unpleasent situation" in this case being the Navy itself. Now, before someone jumps on me, let me point out that I'm only explaining what I think he's saying. I have no desire to engage in inter-service rivalries.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

4021. Re: "No Diagrams Or Symbols"...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-09 08:51:08 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <02gBb.7079$7p2.5846@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 83595

"Kï¿½HB" wrote:
>
> I'd agree with that in general principle.
> But it strikes me that the ability to
> recognize the symbols for various
> electronic components in a simple
> schmatic and to be able to navigate
> an elementary block diagram would
> be essential to even the most
> elementary troubleshooting and repair
> tasks that we'd expect a General class
> amateur to be able to accomplish.

How many symbols are there now, Hans? A hundred or more? How much can we include in the license tests before they become massive in size and overwhelming in nature? We have to draw a line somewhere on what to include and I'm satisfied with where that line is drawn now. By the way, the Technician question pool I studied (July 97 ~ June 01 pool) did include some simple block diagrams (transmitter and receiver), basic symbols (resisters, capacitors, and so on), and even a couple of simple schematics. One certainly couldn't build anything with that, but it was a good introduction.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

4022. New BPL system up in the microwave spectrum may avoid RFI issues to HF VHF

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-09 14:06:15 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3FD5D6C8.2070207@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 83598

See http://www.tvtechnology.com/dlrf/one.php?id=259

"Corridor Systems sent an Open letter to the FCC <http://www.corridor.biz/031201-fcc-letter.pdf> regarding ARRL's opposition to BPL. In the letter, Glenn Elmore, Chief Technology Officer, who also holds Amateur Radio call sign N6GN, said, "Corridor Systems has demonstrated a BPL technology which is completely compatible with the Amateur Radio Service and, indeed, with all users of the HF-VHF spectrum, one which can be operated completely within Part 15 guidelines, is compatible with other services and is an excellent cohabitant of the public spectrum." During the 216 Mbps BPL test using 2.4 GHz and 5.3 GHz ISM/Part 15 spectrum, the letter said "Corridor Systems demonstrated normal system operation, maintaining high dynamic range, in spite of the presence of a high-level, 2.4 GHz fixed wireless transmitter located approximately 1/2 mile and within line-of-sight of the BPL system and sharing common spectrum."

"These results indicate there is no reason for the FCC to allow high frequency based broadband over power line systems when an alternative exists that offers greater bandwidth and no threat to existing HF, VHF and UHF spectrum users. Users of the 2 to 20 GHz spectrum may have some concerns and these should be addressed, but if G-line technology or a later refinement of it is being used, as appears likely, there should be little radiation from the power lines.

4023. Re: Wonderful time on 160m contest CW

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-09 14:21:34 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3FD5DA6E.6060104@psu.edu>
Source record: 83599

Dee D. Flint wrote:
> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
> news:R54Bb.5169$Ho3.2543@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
>
>>"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
>>news:FiRAb.14662$P%1.13636240@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
>>
>>>Just wanted to say I had a great time working the 160m CW contest this
>>>weekend. Only had a random wire at less than 10ft off the ground but
>>
>>worked
>>
>>>stations from Maine to S. Texas.
>>>
>>>Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>>>
>>
>>Your a real go getter Dee D. Congrats. Next time try an inverted L.
>>They say you need radials, but I don't have any, yet. Works good.
>>
>>Dan/W4NTI
>
>
> Definitely going to do something different with an antenna next year. Don't
> know what yet but I've liked what I read about the inverted L. I sure would
> have liked to work that Wyoming that I heard so faintly.
>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>

Dan, what kind of ground system do you use?

- Mike KB3EIA -

4024. Re: light bulbs in rrap

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-09 14:26:30 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3FD5DB96.7040608@psu.edu>
Source record: 83600

Jim Hampton wrote:
> Mike,
>
> Is that an incandescent light bulb, or a flourescent light bulb? :)

HOWL! I must have forgotten - 1 person to ask that question!!

- Mike KB3EIA -

4025. Re: Just drop the code!!!!!!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-09 14:40:04 UTC
From: Nomen Nescio <nobody@dizum.com>
Message-ID: <ac614dc3b72bf39ceafd4e168d6898fb@dizum.com>
Source record: 83652
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.policy

In article <pT5Bb.411$4t2.196@bignews4.bellsouth.net>
"LARDASS Lloyd Davies The GREAT TIME LORD" <lloyd_vfp@msn.com>
whined:
>
>
> Who cares about background check! Let's get ham radio into reality!
>
> http://www.qrz.com/cgi-bin/ikonboard.cgi?act=ST&f=3&t=49913

How about we drop you from a 50 story building on your Evinrude
shaped head?

4026. Re: Wonderful time on 160m contest CW

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-09 14:40:39 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0312090640.31b7a01a@posting.google.com>
Source record: 83651

"Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<2gdBb.6646$rP6.944@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>...
> "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote
>
> > Just wanted to say I had a great time working the 160m CW contest this
> > weekend.
>
> The Boring Amateur Radio Club would like to thank the ARRL for
> recently completing the warm up competition for the 8th running of the
> Stew Perry TopBand Challenge which will rock the ionosphere Dec. 27-28.
>
> The rules may be perused at:
> http://www.jzap.com/k7rat/stew.html
>
> Now you know which hardware improvements/adjustments/renovations
> should be done to optimize your unique situation...or not. Anybody from
> hard-core icons of TopBand wizardry to the Newbie who just found out the
> radio has a spot next to that big dial that says 1.8 can make a few or a
> lot of Q's.
>
> Recognition for Participants come from the competitors themselves
> by sponsoring plaques for situations that they feel are important. The
> donor Stalwarts and categories already spoken for are listed below:
> Sponsor Category
> KL7RA Top QSO Total
> K1PX Top Score, Single Op, Europe, Low Power
> VK6VZ Top Score using Home-brew gear (VK5AX memorial-winner
> receives RFDS Cap)
> WA9IRV Top Score by Operator of own Station in
> VE3,VE4,MN,WI,ND
> N5IA Most Grid Squares worked
> N5UL Top Score, Single Op, Low Power
> Horned Toad Wireless Top Score, Single Op, Low Power, Rest of World
> W7GG Top Score, Single Op, QRP
> BARC Top Score by a Plaque Donor
>
> You want immortality? You want fame? You see a category that needs
> channeling through you for expression in the TopBand world? Then simply
> commit to spend $50.00 and impart that idea to me. First come....first
> spoken for...first get! Several Stalwarts are pondering their categories
> as we speak so decide upon one and e-mail me directly. This Contest is
> what we all make it...and we all make it fun. The plaques from the 2002
> event have all been sent out and should be arriving at the plaque
> winners QTH's currently.

>
> 73 and I remain,
> Lew W7EW/W7AT
> Boring Amateur Radio Club
> P.O.Box 3110
> Salem, OR. 97302
> U.S.A.
> lew@teleport.com

A couple of the neighborhood heavy hitters here oughta qualify for something . .

****

Call: AA1K
Operator(s): AA1K
Station: AA1K
Class: Single Op HP
QTH: Delaware
Operating Time (hrs): 30
Radios: SO2R

Summary:
Total: QSOs = 1393 Sections = 77 Countries = 47 Total Score = 414,656

Club: Frankford Radio Club

****

Call: W2GD
Operator(s): K2SG, K2TW, N2HN, N2OO, N4HY, W2CG, W2GD
Station: W2GD
Class: M/S HP
QTH: SNJ
Operating Time (hrs): 34

Summary:
Total: QSOs = 1230 Sections = 74 Countries = 46 Total Score = 380,000

Club: Frankford Radio Club

Station Description:

Former Marine Radio Service Coast Station, located on Barnaget Bay, near West
Creek, NJ

IC756ProII + Alpha 87A + IC746 Slave RX
IC765 + Alpha 76PA

NE Sloper with Delta Loop Reflector hung from 300' tower in salt marsh
Inverted L, 65' vertical, with 4 elevated radials, on edge of salt marsh
Phased 1000' terminated beverages NE. 560' terminated beveage West.
700' unterminated beverage South

****

'Nuff to make ya wanna cry . . !

w3rv

4027. Re: "No Diagrams Or Symbols"...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-09 15:59:42 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <OjmBb.5296$_r6.1938@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 83653

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote

> How many symbols are there now, Hans? A hundred or more? How much can we
> include in the license tests before they become massive in size and
> overwhelming in nature?

I wouldn't venture a guess off the top of my head how many symbols there are, but I'm not suggesting hundreds of questions on the test devoted to this. Ten or 15 questions in the pool, with maybe a couple actually in any given exam. Would that be too much for you to memorize ..... er, I mean learn?

73, de Hans, K0HB

4028. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-09 16:09:38 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3FD5F3C2.5090200@psu.edu>
Source record: 83654

Kï¿½HB wrote:
> "Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote
>
>
>>Ahh, but now we have to set up a special low power station.
>
>
> No you don't. At worst you need to put a wattmeter in the transmission
> line, and maybe a neon-orange sign reading "Observe the power limits of your
> operators license." with an arrow pointing to the "Pwr" knob on the radio.

At worst......

So we operate class one while operating 50 watts. Another bump.

All this is not insurmountable, but far reaching.

- Mike KB3EIA -

4029. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-09 16:36:20 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <8SmBb.5373$_r6.1297@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 83655

"Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote

>
> So we operate class one while operating 50 watts. Another bump.
>

Lifes a bitch, and then you die and they give away your call sign!

73, de Hans, K0HB

4030. Re: Where Did THIS Come From...?!?!a

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-09 17:36:55 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0312090936.31ea573e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 83656

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0312082312.25dcd51d@posting.google.com>...
> n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20031207132229.07578.00002040@mb-m25.aol.com>...
>
> > Does anyone have a realistic estimate of how much it will cost and how long it
> > will take to develop Russian oil to the point where it undercuts crude from the
> > Middle East in total production cost? (drilling, pumping, infrastructure,
> > transportation, refining)?
>
> So, rather than spend the bucks and get it done, we continue to
> hang our hats on the Arab's bedposts until all of THAT oil is gone,
> THEN go looking?

Not at all! If nothing else, economic development of that area will
help stabilize their political situation.

But we must dispel ourselves of the idea that there's a quick, cheap
and easy fix.

And you might want to look up just how much oil the USA imports from
the Middle East. It's not as much as many people think.

> > Remember that much of Russia's oil is in places as inhospitable and undeveloped
> > as Alaska. And there's the added problem that the folks there don't necessarily
> > play by American rules....
>
> And the Arabs do?

More so than you might imagine ;-)

Point is, Russian oil isn't a quick, cheap and easy fix.
>
> > > Besides...Russians and Americans are closer in social and
> > >geopolitical ideologies than Americans and those folks in the Middle
> > >East and SW Asia...
> >
> > In other words, we should trust the Russians?
>
> I trust them more. I never did foresee a nuclear war between us.

I always thought that the biggest danger was that a war would start by
mistake rather than intent.

That doesn't mean the Soviets never wanted to take over, just that
they never wanted to take over a burnt out radioactive cinder of a
world.

> The true threat has been from some upstart trying to be the new kid
> on the block or someone looking to drive a wedge between us and the
> Russians.

Or somebody who didn't really care if they or their society survived
or not.
>
> > >So let's spend our money where it's appreciated.
> >
> > Sure.
> >
> > But perhaps we should also consider reducing our dependence on imported energy.
>
> I'd agree with that, but getting the rest of America to is a
> problem.

Exactly!

The solutions are always on the supply side, as if demand is sacred.
Heaven forbid anyone say that putting 25,000 miles per year on a
vehicle that gets 15 MPG isn't an inalienable right.

> We've had the technology to exploit many non-petroleum or
> hybrid petroleum alternatives for decades.

In 1980 I bought a car that got over 40 mpg in the city and over 50
mpg on the road. And it weighed 2200+ pounds, met all the pollution
and safety requirements and was fun to drive. No ignition noise,
either. Of course it was small, but it was big enough for
six-foot-three-inch me and lots of stuff besides.

But cars like that aren't what Americans are told to want, so most of
them don't. They're not "babe magnets".

And if someone suggests that there may be better ways to travel than
4000 pound 250+ HP private cars, and jet airplanes, they're called
"socialists" and "tree huggers"....

> And even where there are
> other US-controlled petro reserves, we ahve our own people fighting
> our attempts to recover them.

Think about why. Does the name Exxon Valdez ring a bell? "What do we
do with a drunken sailor....."

Also check put how much oil those reserves would actually supply if
fully developed. And how much it costs...

And remember that one point of the philosophy is to preserve *our*
reserves...

Also recall what event sparked the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor. It
was FDR's decision to effectively stop the sales of oil, steel and
other strategic materials to Japan in response to their war of
aggression in China. Most important of these to Japan was the the

supply of oil, because without it their war machine would not be able to function for long. So they decided to attack and hopefully win a quick war that would secure for them a secure source of oil in Southeast Asia and the surrounding areas. Yet they missed a key target in their attack planning: they never attacked the tank farm above Pearl Harbor. And in the end they found themselves short of oil because American submarines and aircraft were sinking their tankers faster than they could be replaced.

Then there's Ploesti.....

In the end, I say we need to focus on being self-sufficient for basic necessities - and *all* of the changes needed to bring that about. Energy supply is a basic necessity for an industrial society.

73 de Jim, N2EY

4031. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-09 17:56:32 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0312090956.291360f@posting.google.com>
Source record: 83657

Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message news:<3FD4EDE8.8060207@psu.edu>...
> N2EY wrote:
> > In article <uvNAb.6270$NN.915568@news1.news.adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo
> > <mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:
> >
> >
> >>>>I don't oppose a time limit per se. I don't like a ten year time limit
> >>>>though.
> >>>
> >>>Why? It's my understanding that the 10-year idea is based partly on the
> >>
> >>current
> >>
> >>>license term and partly on the idea that we don't want to force anyone out
> >>>because of "life happens" events like education and family.
> >>
> >> Its just too long.
> >
> >
> > Is it really too long, particularly considering the two-year experience
> > requirement?
> >
> > One of the problems with the old 1 and 2 year Novices was that if a new ham ran
> > into "life happens" situations, their upgrade schedule would be seriously
> > disprupted.
> >
> > Example: A few weeks after a teenager gets the Novice license his folks inform
> > him that the family is moving across the country. New house isn't quite ready
> > so they'll be living in temporary quarters for a while. Meanwhile most of their
> > stuff is in storage. "A while" becomes "a few months"..
> >
> > Finally they get into the new house and there's a flurry of activity to get set
> > up - and the parents say ham radio isn't a top priority. By the time Our Hero
> > is back on the air, there's not much time left on his one-year license.
> >
> > Look how long it's taken some *adults* (alleged adults, anyway) in this NG to
> > upgrade, or even get licenses.
> >
> >
> >>The license renewal period would just be another
> >>number by that time, since the new A license would be forever. I'm busy
> >>as all gitout, and it took me something over a week of hard study to get
> >>ready for the Extra.

> >
> >
> > Very true!
> >
> >>Plus I can't figure out what can make a person qualified to operate on
> >>day 3652 of their licensing period and unqualified on day 3653.
> >
> >
> > The same principle that makes a General or Advanced class ham qualfied to
> > operate on 3526 kHz but not on 3524 kHz.
> >
> > The same principle that makes a Tech Plus ham qualified to operate a
> > transmitter of 1500 W output using any authorized mode on 6 meters but not 10
> > meters.
>
> I don't agree there Jim! True enough, its an arbitrary thing, but what
> you are talking about is power limits and sub-bands, and I am talking
> about the qualifications to operate *at all*. the other folks simply
> operate within the limitations of their licenses, and the 10 year and 1
> day class B ham is no ham at all anymore.

Just like the old Novices when their licenses ran out.

Point is, that hypothetical Class B had a window of 8 *years* to
upgrade to Class A. You said it took you all of a week to get ready
for Extra.
>
> >>It takes
> >>a lot less time than that to understand RF safety - the only real reason
> >>I can think of for the second class license, so if we're going to do
> >>this, it should make some timing sense.
> >
> > There's a lot more to it than RF safety.
> >
> >>>> I support a time in grade, even though I would be frustrated (read
> >>>>teased) by a two year stint before I could get the class A.
> >>>
> >>>BTDT.
> >>
> >>Not sure about BTDT.
> >>
> >
> > Been There, Done That
> >
> >
> >>>>Another
> >>>>thing, which would be a little strange would be having to have a control
> >>>>op at field day (or operate lower power)
> >>>>
> >>>
> >>>Why would that be strange? It's the rule *today*.

> >>
> >>I keep drawing parallels between the second class license and Generals.
> >>We try to get people out to operate on field day, and you can get some
> >>pretty strange setups. First a Ham with less than 2 years time in grade
> >>would have to have a control op.
> >
> >
> > Why?
>
> If he/she is operating >50 Watts, they are outside their priveliges.

OK. So turn down the power.
>
> > As long as the power level is less than 50 W, that Class B ham could operate
> > any freq, any mode, as the control op.
>
> Ahh, but now we have to set up a special low power station. The low
> power ghetto I was talking about. For good or bad, my club runs high
> power during Field Day.

Most clubs don't.

And if the power levels were restructured, the points from a 50 watt
station could make more difference than those from a 1500 W station.

> I'm taking my reference of "Class B Ghetto" from
> experience with the GOTA station. The first year our GOTA station
> operated, many of the people operating it called it a "toy station".

That's *their* problem.

> They could op one of the high power stations, park on a frequency, and
> rack up points, and the lowly GOTA station has to hunt and pounce. It
> wasn't until I put PSK31 on the GOTA station that it took off.

So? They're used to being Big Guns. Anybody who wants to be a Big Gun
could just get a Class A and be done with it.
>
> note: I'm not suggesting that newbies use high power. Just the opposite
> in fact. Hunt and pounce at low power builds competence in the new ham.
> But its so hard to compete with power when you're working like crazy to
> get a QSO, and the guy in the next tent is racking them up at a high rate.

That's part of the experience requirement. Part of the plan.

And remember the power multiplier idea. If the 50 watt station is
hunt/pecking 20 per hour but has a 3.5 multiplier, they're making more
points than the Big Gun doing 60 per hour.

> >>We have hams what operate now at field
> >>day that would suddenly have to have a control op (therefore taking
> >>myself or another Extra away from a station)

> > Not at all! Existing hams would retain their existing privs under Hans'
> > proposal.
>
> I'm saying that I'm sitting with the guy as a control op and not
> operating myself.

If they're existing hams (say, Generals) they could still do what
they've always done. If they're unlicensed, or not licensed for the
freq/power/mode in use, they still need a control op today.

And one of the *best* ways for them to learn is to work with an
experienced op.

> >>Of course the second class
> >>ham could operate a 50 watt or less station, but that would mean that
> >>either we change our setup - all stations except GOTA are full output -
> >>or set up a special station just for the second class hams, a sort of
> >>low power ghetto.
> >
> > You mean you folks operate 1500 W on FD? (that's "full output")
>
> Actually we operat @1kW. My bad.

FD rules can be changed, y'know.
>
>
> >>Heck, the GOTA station can run more power. Maybe this
> >>is no problem for you, but for others it isn't so good
> >>
> >
> > Try QRP some time ;-)
>
> Nothing wrong with QRP. I'm just noting possible problems as outlined
> above. If you're going QRP then everyone is operating at less than 5 watts.

Only if the current rules are kept.
>
> > The fact is that if a non-Extra wants to operate FD, there has to be a control
> > op present whenever the non-Extra exceeds his-her subband restrictions. That's
> > a lot more onerous than turning down the power to 50 W.
>
> I stayed in my bands when I was a General at FD. Wasn't a problem.

It's been so long since I had to worry about such things.....;-)
>
> >>>Back in the late '60s and early '70s, there were *four* FD power levels:
> >>>QRP, 50 W, 150 W, and the legal limit, IIRC.
> >>
> >> Could be. But if we went back to that, the clubs could be forced to
> >>make a decision to either run what they would like to run, take control
> >>ops away from available stations for those who don't have time in grade.
> >>(or the proper upgrade) or make that little ghetto for the second class
> >>Hams. I really don't think that is a good way to welcome new people. YMMV.

> >>
> >
> > There's another option: Change the rules so that different power levels could
> > be used for different stations in the same multi setup. (It used to be this
> > way!)
>
> This might work well enough, but I still don't care for relegating the
> class B to the ghetto, or to remove an Extra or class A from operating
> to be a control op.

Then let the Class Bs keep a log or feed the generator or cook
weenies. Or, heaven forbid, take the Class A test. Is it gonna kill
'em?
>
> I know that the others I work with on field day wouldn't be too wild
> about that sort of thing either. These are people that love working high
> power, and enjoy racking up points.

Uh-huh. How many points did they make per transmitter last year?

> Inexperienced users can get working
> with us, but adding another station (and putting us in another class)
> for a 50 watt station isn't going to be too popular with them - and
> after all, they and myself are the ones doing the setup and teardown, so
> as long as we are within the rules, we should be allowed to do this. I
> just don't think that the proposed setup will be both newbie friendly
> and experienced friendly at the same time.

Then the rules need some refining.

>
> Note I'm not saying things couldn't work. I'm saying that every time I
> turn around, this proposal is bumping into something else, and not
> necessarily in a good way.

So does any other proposal. FD is once a year. It's supposed to be a
learning experience, last time I checked.

> It starts out prety simply, but then we have
> to do all kinds of things to shoehorn it into the real world. So we end
> up changing this so can coexist with the thing we changed before in
> order to avoid messing that up which came about as a result of modifying
> the rule that contradicted...........

Then what's *your* solution, Mike?

I don't agree with all of Hans' ideas, but at least he's put forth a
coherent proposal.

I'd have three license classes, all renewable, minimum 1 year in each
class experience required, power levels 100W, 400W, 1500W,
subbands-by-license-class on HF/MF, and better writtens.

73 de Jim, N2EY

4032. Re: Just drop the code!!!!!!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-09 20:36:08 UTC
From: kk4tl@aol.com
Message-ID: <2b98299d.0312091236.1147ffca@posting.google.com>
Source record: 83658
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Nomen Nescio wrote >...
>
> How about we drop you from a 50 story building on your Evinrude
> shaped head?
>

Nahh .. who would we have to kick around in here if we did that?

Even his ol' buddy Nashville Joe wouldn't wish that on him.

Much.

4033. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-09 20:53:32 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3FD6364C.6050909@psu.edu>
Source record: 83660

N2EY wrote:
> Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message news:<3FD4EDE8.8060207@psu.edu>...

<snippage>

>>I don't agree there Jim! True enough, its an arbitrary thing, but what
>>you are talking about is power limits and sub-bands, and I am talking
>>about the qualifications to operate *at all*. the other folks simply
>>operate within the limitations of their licenses, and the 10 year and 1
>>day class B ham is no ham at all anymore.
>
>
> Just like the old Novices when their licenses ran out.
>
> Point is, that hypothetical Class B had a window of 8 *years* to
> upgrade to Class A. You said it took you all of a week to get ready
> for Extra.

Granted, I had a head start, and didn't need as much time as some, but
I find it hard to argue that 10 years is a good time limit when it isn't
needed. Anyone that takes ten years to upgrade to Extra is probably not
going to upgrade to Extra. Ooops, class A.

>>>>I keep drawing parallels between the second class license and Generals.
>>>>We try to get people out to operate on field day, and you can get some
>>>>pretty strange setups. First a Ham with less than 2 years time in grade
>>>>would have to have a control op.
>>>
>>>
>>>Why?
>>
>>If he/she is operating >50 Watts, they are outside their priveliges.
>
>
> OK. So turn down the power.

Sigh... our club has a group of guys and gals that make a big
production out of FD. It isn't what everyone does, but its what we do.
We don't want to run 50 watts. The first year I went to field day, I was
a Technician. I got to run a high power station with a control op
logging. It was great, and was what really got me interested in getting
my General. then I logged while he opped.

Then next year, when I had my General, I could op by myself,
discovering the joy of overnight operation.

My points are two. We worked in this rank beginner from a technician
up, and didn't interfere with the station operation, and it worked well.
No adjustments needed. And I was part of the group from the git-go.

>>>As long as the power level is less than 50 W, that Class B ham could operate
>>>any freq, any mode, as the control op.
>>
>>Ahh, but now we have to set up a special low power station. The low
>>power ghetto I was talking about. For good or bad, my club runs high
>>power during Field Day.
>
>
> Most clubs don't.

We do.

> And if the power levels were restructured, the points from a 50 watt
> station could make more difference than those from a 1500 W station.

Another "if-then" situation. Gaw, were getting a lot of them.

>
>>I'm taking my reference of "Class B Ghetto" from
>>experience with the GOTA station. The first year our GOTA station
>>operated, many of the people operating it called it a "toy station".
>
>
> That's *their* problem.

And it becomes *our* problem then. Since then, I have worked hard to
make the GOTA operators feel like part of the group. move that tent
nearer the big tent. Keep more people than just myself and the person at
the mic there. I'm a little surprised, Jim. All that I'm talking about
is making these potential hams and inactive hams feel like maybe we
want them there. Your arguments sound a little like some of the old
cranks I hear once in a while.

>
>>They could op one of the high power stations, park on a frequency, and
>>rack up points, and the lowly GOTA station has to hunt and pounce. It
>>wasn't until I put PSK31 on the GOTA station that it took off.
>
>
> So? They're used to being Big Guns. Anybody who wants to be a Big Gun
> could just get a Class A and be done with it.

After two years.

>>note: I'm not suggesting that newbies use high power. Just the opposite
>>in fact. Hunt and pounce at low power builds competence in the new ham.
>>But its so hard to compete with power when you're working like crazy to
>>get a QSO, and the guy in the next tent is racking them up at a high rate.
>
>

> That's part of the experience requirement. Part of the plan.
>
> And remember the power multiplier idea. If the 50 watt station is
> hunt/pecking 20 per hour but has a 3.5 multiplier, they're making more
> points than the Big Gun doing 60 per hour.

"if-then"

>>>>We have hams what operate now at field
>>>>day that would suddenly have to have a control op (therefore taking
>>>>myself or another Extra away from a station)
>>>
>
>
>>>Not at all! Existing hams would retain their existing privs under Hans'
>>>proposal.
>>
>> I'm saying that I'm sitting with the guy as a control op and not
>>operating myself.
>
>
> If they're existing hams (say, Generals) they could still do what
> they've always done. If they're unlicensed, or not licensed for the
> freq/power/mode in use, they still need a control op today.
>
> And one of the *best* ways for them to learn is to work with an
> experienced op.
>
>
>>>>Of course the second class
>>>>ham could operate a 50 watt or less station, but that would mean that
>>>>either we change our setup - all stations except GOTA are full output -
>>>>or set up a special station just for the second class hams, a sort of
>>>>low power ghetto.
>>>
>>>You mean you folks operate 1500 W on FD? (that's "full output")
>>
>>Actually we operat @1kW. My bad.
>
>
> FD rules can be changed, y'know.

>>
>>>>Heck, the GOTA station can run more power. Maybe this
>>>>is no problem for you, but for others it isn't so good
>>>>
>>>
>>>Try QRP some time ;-)
>>
>>Nothing wrong with QRP. I'm just noting possible problems as outlined
>>above. If you're going QRP then everyone is operating at less than 5 watts.

>
>
> Only if the current rules are kept.
>
>>>The fact is that if a non-Extra wants to operate FD, there has to be a control
>>>op present whenever the non-Extra exceeds his-her subband restrictions. That's
>>>a lot more onerous than turning down the power to 50 W.
>>
>> I stayed in my bands when I was a General at FD. Wasn't a problem.
>
>
> It's been so long since I had to worry about such things.....;-)
>
>>>>>Back in the late '60s and early '70s, there were *four* FD power levels:
>>>>>QRP, 50 W, 150 W, and the legal limit, IIRC.
>>>>
>>>> Could be. But if we went back to that, the clubs could be forced to
>>>>make a decision to either run what they would like to run, take control
>>>>ops away from available stations for those who don't have time in grade.
>>>>(or the proper upgrade) or make that little ghetto for the second class
>>>>Hams. I really don't think that is a good way to welcome new people. YMMV.
>>>>
>>>
>>>There's another option: Change the rules so that different power levels could
>>>be used for different stations in the same multi setup. (It used to be this
>>>way!)
>>
>> This might work well enough, but I still don't care for relegating the
>> class B to the ghetto, or to remove an Extra or class A from operating
>>to be a control op.
>
>
> Then let the Class Bs keep a log or feed the generator or cook
> weenies. Or, heaven forbid, take the Class A test. Is it gonna kill
> 'em?
>
>> I know that the others I work with on field day wouldn't be too wild
>>about that sort of thing either. These are people that love working high
>>power, and enjoy racking up points.
>
>
> Uh-huh. How many points did they make per transmitter last year?

We were 3A

W3YA + W3GA (GOTA) did 7362 points - I don't have the breakdown for each
transmitter. We don't get any power multiplier at all, so what you see
is what we get.

>>Inexperienced users can get working
>>with us, but adding another station (and putting us in another class)

>>for a 50 watt station isn't going to be too popular with them - and
>>after all, they and myself are the ones doing the setup and teardown, so
>>as long as we are within the rules, we should be allowed to do this. I
>>just don't think that the proposed setup will be both newbie friendly
>>and experienced friendly at the same time.
>
>
> Then the rules need some refining.
>
>
>> Note I'm not saying things couldn't work. I'm saying that every time I
>>turn around, this proposal is bumping into something else, and not
>>necessarily in a good way.
>
>
> So does any other proposal. FD is once a year. It's supposed to be a
> learning experience, last time I checked.

>>It starts out pretty simply, but then we have
>>to do all kinds of things to shoehorn it into the real world. So we end
>>up changing this so can coexist with the thing we changed before in
>>order to avoid messing that up which came about as a result of modifying
>> the rule that contradicted.....
>
>
> Then what's *your* solution, Mike?
>
> I don't agree with all of Hans' ideas, but at least he's put forth a
> coherent proposal.

I gave mine a while back, and I'll give it again.

Technician

General

Extra

Same rules as now. Tests expanded for General and Extra.

Minimum impact, and there ya go. Question pool change.

> I'd have three license classes, all renewable, minimum 1 year in each
> class experience required, power levels 100W, 400W, 1500W,
> subbands-by-license-class on HF/MF, and better writtens.

And I'm still a little surprised, Jim. Perhaps I shouldn't point out
any problems that will happen under Hans' proposal? I get the impression
from your answers - "so what" "that's their problem" "Uh Huh" and the
like, that you must think my objections are as Hans describes me
sometimes - "novel".

What the heck? Perhaps it's better if I just keep the old yap shut? Anytime things are changed, things are impacted. We can point them out before hand, or run into them blind.

You might not think my concerns are valid, but I can tell you that I know plenty of people that have the same concerns. We are all novel I guess! 8^) Maybe I point out small facts - but I've pointed out a pretty fair number of them, and I'm not looking very hard. Any small fact is insignificant by itself, but when a lot of them come up.....

- Mike KB3EIA -

4034. Re: Wonderful time on 160m contest CW

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-09 20:55:08 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3FD636AC.50805@psu.edu>
Source record: 83659

Brian Kelly wrote:
> "Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<2gdBb.6646$rP6.944@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>...
>
>>"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote
>>
>>
>>>Just wanted to say I had a great time working the 160m CW contest this
>>>weekend.
>>
>>The Boring Amateur Radio Club would like to thank the ARRL for

If ever a club needed to change it's name..... 8^)

- Mike KB3EIA -

4035. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-09 23:47:12 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0312091547.934d90b@posting.google.com>
Source record: 83661

"Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<8SmBb.5373$_r6.1297@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>...
> "Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote
>
> >
> > So we operate class one while operating 50 watts. Another bump.
>
> Lifes a

[female canine expletive deleted]

>and then you die and they give away your call sign!
>

Maybe not!

If Hans' "no expiration date" Class A is adopted by FCC, they *won't*
give away your call sign unless somebody proves to FCC that you're
really, truly, stone cold dead. Probably require a close family member
to send in the papers - and if you've left instructions not to, your
survivors could keep your call out of circulation for a long time.

Aren't GROLs issued "for life"? If so, there's your precedent for a
non-expiring FCC license.....

73 de Jim, N2EY

4036. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-09 23:51:18 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <WdtBb.7492$rP6.1176@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 83662

"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote

> If Hans' "no expiration date" Class A is adopted by FCC, they *won't*
> give away your call sign unless somebody proves to FCC that you're
> really, truly, stone cold dead.

ALRIGHT!!!!!! You **CAN** take it with you! Hey, I like my plan more and
more all the time.

Sunuvagun, I bet Dwight is gonna really spin up his rotors when he thinks
about this.

73, de Hans, K0HB
--
"I called them mad and they called me mad,
but damn it, they outvoted me."

4037. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-09 23:59:22 UTC
From: Bert Craig <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM>
Message-ID: <ultBb.9351$T24.3634371@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>
Source record: 83663

"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
news:c2356669.0312091547.934d90b@posting.google.com...
> Aren't GROLs issued "for life"?
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

Never thought about that. What happens to my GROL when I become a SK? How would they know?

73 de Bert
WA2SI

4038. Re: "No Diagrams Or Symbols"...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-10 00:53:03 UTC
From: N8IE <dot.com@dot.com>
Message-ID: <P7uBb.1884$I%1.852@fe2.columbus.rr.com>
Source record: 83664

That is the handy work of the likes of NCI, ARRL, and W5YI. The new test is a joke.
This is also why I e-mailed the ARRL VEC and told him to remove me from the VE list.

It's truly a sad thing to see a great hobby like Amateur Radio degraded to what it is today. :'-(

72, 73
Dan, N8IE

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message news:20031208084006.07346.00002067@mb-m26.aol.com...
> Check This Out:
>
>
> http://www.arrl.org/news/stories/2003/12/03/1/?nc=1
>
> Note this:
>
> "The General class question pool does not contain any diagrams or symbols."
>
> Hans' proposal sounds better and better...
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.542 / Virus Database: 336 - Release Date: 11/18/2003

4039. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-10 01:43:59 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <zTuBb.11602$NN.1533449@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 83665

Kï¿½HB wrote:
> "Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote
>
>
>>So we operate class one while operating 50 watts. Another bump.
>>
>
> Lifes a bitch, and then you die and they give away your call sign!

Don't know why, Hans, but that one made me howl! 8^)

odd justification tho'.

But thanks, I needed that today......

- Mike KB3EIA -

4040. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-10 01:47:16 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031209204716.29660.00001983@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 83666

In article <WdtBb.7492$rP6.1176@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>, "Kï¿½HB"
<groupk0hb@earthlink.net> writes:

>"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote
>
>> If Hans' "no expiration date" Class A is adopted by FCC, they *won't*
>> give away your call sign unless somebody proves to FCC that you're
>> really, truly, stone cold dead.
>
>ALRIGHT!!!!!! You **CAN** take it with you!

bwaahaahaaa!

Did you not realize that particular consequence of the non-expiring Class A,
Hans?

>Hey, I like my plan more and
>more all the time.

Me, too!

73 de Jim, N2EY

4041. Re: Where Did THIS Come From...?!?!a

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-10 01:48:44 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <0YuBb.11605$NN.1534129@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 83667

Brian wrote:

> Yep, national security is hard to do with alternatives. For example,
> it would be difficult for the DoD to build stealth fighters that run
> on nicads, charged by the sun.
>
> But the rest of us could get along fine with alternatives.

Bingo!

- Mike KB3EIA -

4042. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-10 01:50:14 UTC
From: Alun <alun@1stcounsel.com>
Message-ID: <Xns944CD3F421656elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 83668

Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in news:3FD6364C.6050909@psu.edu:

> N2EY wrote:
>> Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
>> news:<3FD4EDE8.8060207@psu.edu>...
>
>
> <snippage>
>
>
>>>I don't agree there Jim! True enough, its an arbitrary thing, but what
>>>you are talking about is power limits and sub-bands, and I am talking
>>>about the qualifications to operate *at all*. the other folks simply
>>>operate within the limitations of their licenses, and the 10 year and
>>>1 day class B ham is no ham at all anymore.
>>
>>
>> Just like the old Novices when their licenses ran out.
>>
>> Point is, that hypothetical Class B had a window of 8 *years* to
>> upgrade to Class A. You said it took you all of a week to get ready
>> for Extra.
>
> Granted, I had a head start, and didn't need as much time as some,
> but
> I find it hard to argue that 10 years is a good time limit when it
> isn't needed. Anyone that takes ten years to upgrade to Extra is
> probably not going to upgrade to Extra. Ooops, class A.
>
>
>>>>>I keep drawing parallels between the second class license and
>>>>>Generals. We try to get people out to operate on field day, and you
>>>>>can get some pretty strange setups. First a Ham with less than 2
>>>>>years time in grade would have to have a control op.
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>Why?
>>>
>>>If he/she is operating >50 Watts, they are outside their priveliges.
>>
>>
>> OK. So turn down the power.
>
> Sigh... our club has a group of guys and gals that make a big

> production out of FD. It isn't what everyone does, but its what we do.
> We don't want to run 50 watts. The first year I went to field day, I
> was a Technician. I got to run a high power station with a control op
> logging. It was great, and was what really got me interested in getting
> my General. then I logged while he opped.
>
> Then next year, when I had my General, I could op by myself,
> discovering the joy of overnight operation.
>
> My points are two. We worked in this rank beginner from a
> technician
> up, and didn't interfere with the station operation, and it worked
> well. No adjustments needed. And I was part of the group from the
> git-go.
>
>
>>>>As long as the power level is less than 50 W, that Class B ham could
>>>>operate any freq, any mode, as the control op.
>>>
>>>Ahh, but now we have to set up a special low power station. The low
>>>power ghetto I was talking about. For good or bad, my club runs high
>>>power during Field Day.
>>
>>
>> Most clubs don't.
>
> We do.
>
>
>> And if the power levels were restructured, the points from a 50 watt
>> station could make more difference than those from a 1500 W station.
>
> Another "if-then" situation. Gaw, were getting a lot of them.
>
>
>>
>>>I'm taking my reference of "Class B Ghetto" from
>>>experience with the GOTA station. The first year our GOTA station
>>>operated, many of the people operating it called it a "toy station".
>>
>>
>> That's *their* problem.
>
> And it becomes *our* problem then. Since then, I have worked hard
> to
> make the GOTA operators feel like part of the group. move that tent
> nearer the big tent. Keep more people than just myself and the person
> at the mic there. I'm a little surprised, Jim. All that I'm talking
> about is making these potential hams and inactive hams feel like maybe
> we *want* them there. Your arguments sound a little like some of the

> old cranks I hear once in a while.
>
>>
>>>They could op one of the high power stations, park on a frequency, and
>>>rack up points, and the lowly GOTA station has to hunt and pounce. It
>>>wasn't until I put PSK31 on the GOTA station that it took off.
>>
>>
>> So? They're used to being Big Guns. Anybody who wants to be a Big Gun
>> could just get a Class A and be done with it.
>
> After two years.
>
>
>>>note: I'm not suggesting that newbies use high power. Just the
>>>opposite in fact. Hunt and pounce at low power builds competence in
>>>the new ham. But its so hard to compete with power when you're working
>>>like crazy to get a QSO, and the guy in the next tent is racking them
>>>up at a high rate.
>>
>>
>> That's part of the experience requirement. Part of the plan.
>>
>> And remember the power multiplier idea. If the 50 watt station is
>> hunt/pecking 20 per hour but has a 3.5 multiplier, they're making more
>> points than the Big Gun doing 60 per hour.
>
> "if-then"
>
>
>>>>>We have hams what operate now at field
>>>>>day that would suddenly have to have a control op (therefore taking
>>>>>myself or another Extra away from a station)
>>>>
>>
>>
>>>>Not at all! Existing hams would retain their existing privs under
>>>>Hans' proposal.
>>>
>>> I'm saying that I'm sitting with the guy as a control op and not
>>>operating myself.
>>
>>
>> If they're existing hams (say, Generals) they could still do what
>> they've always done. If they're unlicensed, or not licensed for the
>> freq/power/mode in use, they still need a control op today.
>>
>> And one of the *best* ways for them to learn is to work with an
>> experienced op.
>>

>>
>>>>>Of course the second class
>>>>>ham could operate a 50 watt or less station, but that would mean
>>>>>that either we change our setup - all stations except GOTA are full
>>>>>output - or set up a special station just for the second class hams,
>>>>>a sort of low power ghetto.
>>>>
>>>>You mean you folks operate 1500 W on FD? (that's "full output")
>>>
>>>Actually we operat @1kW. My bad.
>>
>>
>> FD rules can be changed, y'know.
>
>>>
>>>>>Heck, the GOTA station can run more power. Maybe this
>>>>>is no problem for you, but for others it isn't so good
>>>>>
>>>>
>>>>Try QRP some time ;-)
>>>
>>>Nothing wrong with QRP. I'm just noting possible problems as outlined
>>>above. If you're going QRP then everyone is operating at less than 5
>>>watts.
>>
>>
>> Only if the current rules are kept.
>>
>>>>The fact is that if a non-Extra wants to operate FD, there has to be
>>>>a control op present whenever the non-Extra exceeds his-her subband
>>>>restrictions. That's a lot more onerous than turning down the power
>>>>to 50 W.
>>>
>>> I stayed in my bands when I was a General at FD. Wasn't a
>>> problem.
>>
>>
>> It's been so long since I had to worry about such things.....;-)
>>
>>>>>>Back in the late '60s and early '70s, there were *four* FD power
>>>>>>levels: QRP, 50 W, 150 W, and the legal limit, IIRC.
>>>>>
>>>>> Could be. But if we went back to that, the clubs could be
>>>>> forced to
>>>>>make a decision to either run what they would like to run, take
>>>>>control ops away from available stations for those who don't have
>>>>>time in grade. (or the proper upgrade) or make that little ghetto
>>>>>for the second class Hams. I really don't think that is a good way
>>>>>to welcome new people. YMMV.
>>>>>

>>>>
>>>>There's another option: Change the rules so that different power
>>>>levels could be used for different stations in the same multi setup.
>>>>(It used to be this way!)
>>>
>>> This might work well enough, but I still don't care for
>>> relegating the
>>> class B to the ghetto, or to remove an Extra or class A from
>>> operating to be a control op.
>>
>>
>> Then let the Class Bs keep a log or feed the generator or cook
>> weenies. Or, heaven forbid, take the Class A test. Is it gonna kill
>> 'em?
>>
>>> I know that the others I work with on field day wouldn't be too
>>> wild
>>>about that sort of thing either. These are people that love working
>>>high power, and enjoy racking up points.
>>
>>
>> Uh-huh. How many points did they make per transmitter last year?
>
> We were 3A
>
> W3YA + W3GA (GOTA) did 7362 points - I don't have the breakdown for
> each transmitter. We don't get any power multiplier at all, so what you
> see is what we get.
>
>>>Inexperienced users can get working
>>>with us, but adding another station (and putting us in another class)
>>>for a 50 watt station isn't going to be too popular with them - and
>>>after all, they and myself are the ones doing the setup and teardown,
>>>so as long as we are within the rules, we should be allowed to do
>>>this. I just don't think that the proposed setup will be both newbie
>>>friendly and experienced friendly at the same time.
>>
>>
>> Then the rules need some refining.
>>
>>
>>> Note I'm not saying things couldn't work. I'm saying that every
>>> time I
>>>turn around, this proposal is bumping into something else, and not
>>>necessarily in a good way.
>>
>>
>> So does any other proposal. FD is once a year. It's supposed to be a
>> learning experience, last time I checked.
>

>
>>>It starts out pretty simply, but then we have
>>>to do all kinds of things to shoehorn it into the real world. So we
>>>end up changing this so can coexist with the thing we changed before
>>>in order to avoid messing that up which came about as a result of
>>>modifying the rule that contradicted.....
>>
>>
>> Then what's *your* solution, Mike?
>>
>> I don't agree with all of Hans' ideas, but at least he's put forth a
>> coherent proposal.
>
> I gave mine a while back, and I'll give it again.
>
> Technician
>
> General
>
> Extra
>
> Same rules as now. Tests expanded for General and Extra.
>
> Minimum impact, and there ya go. Question pool change.
>
>
>> I'd have three license classes, all renewable, minimum 1 year in each
>> class experience required, power levels 100W, 400W, 1500W,
>> subbands-by-license-class on HF/MF, and better writtens.
>
> And I'm still a little surprised, Jim. Perhaps I shouldn't point
> out
> any problems that will happen under Hans' proposal? I get the
> impression from your answers - "so what" "that's their problem" "Uh
> Huh" and the like, that you must think my objections are as Hans
> describes me sometimes - "novel".
>
> What the heck? Perhaps it's better if I just keep the old yap
> shut?
> Anytime things are changed, things are impacted. We can point them out
> before hand, or run into them blind.
>
> You might not think my concerns are valid, but I can tell you that
> I
> know plenty of people that have the same concerns. We are all novel I
> guess! 8^) Maybe I point out small facts - but I've pointed out a
> pretty fair number of them, and I'm not looking very hard. Any small
> fact is insignificant by itself, but when a lot of them come up.....
>
>

> - Mike KB3EIA -
>
>

I have a proposal of my own. Here it is.

All General and above become Class As, everyone else becomes a Class B. Class As get all privileges. Class Bs get 80, 40, 15, 10 and everything above that, i.e. everything any one of the equivalent licence classes had before but whole bands, not just subbands. Only Class As could be VEs, and I would limit Class Bs to 200W, i.e. Novice power level. No other limits, restrictions, etc. of any kind.

The only losers would be Techs who could no longer run 1500W. I suspect that few do, and that those who do would have no difficulty passing a Class A test.

I think that this has the virtue of being more politically acceptable than Hans' version.

73 de Alun, N3KIP

4043. Re: "No Diagrams Or Symbols"...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-10 02:06:58 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031209210658.08390.00000633@mb-m02.aol.com>
Source record: 83669

>That is the handy work of the likes of NCI, ARRL, and W5YI. The new test is
>a joke.

Its what I have been saying all along. And the sad thing is its going to get
worse.
WELCOME TO THE NEW CBHAM SERVICE

4044. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-10 03:42:29 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <xnfcneeyarg.hpnlfa1.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>
Source record: 83670

On Tue, 09 Dec 2003 23:59:22 GMT, Bert Craig wrote:

>Never thought about that. What happens to my GROL when I become a SK? How
>would they know?

A GROL has no expiration date and the serial number is never
reissued anyhow. Your ghost/incarnation/whatever will retain the
operating privileges. It may do a better job of operating than
several allegedly "live" commercial operators that I have run
across.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

4045. Re: "No Diagrams Or Symbols"...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-10 04:12:44 UTC
From: blackm00@cam.org
Message-ID: <6447bcd3.0312092012.55a2e2af@posting.google.com>
Source record: 83671

"Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<7K4Bb.4217$_r6.3008@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>...
> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote
>
> >
> > http://www.arrl.org/news/stories/2003/12/03/1/?nc=1
> >
> > Note this:
> >
> > "The General class question pool does not contain any diagrams or
> symbols."
> >
>
> NTI (No Theory International) at work in the background.
>
> If this is a surprise to anyone, you only need examine the 'gang of four'
> who is responsible for the question pools. This has the fingerprints of
> W5YI smeared all over it. He has stated publicly that he feels that since
> people who acquire entry level ham tickets invariably purchase their
> equipment assembled these days, and send them in for repairs when broken,
> they no longer need to possess theknowledge needed to build their own
> stations, nor the knowledge to determine if their repairs/adjustments result
> in proper on-the-air signals. Because of this fact, he thinks that the
> majority of questions regarding math and theory (knowledge mainly needed to
> build/repair/adjust equipment) should be removed from qualification tests,
> and simply replaced with questions on operating technique and regulations.
> If he had his way, math and theory questions would only be part of Amateur
> Extra examinations.
>
> 73, de Hans, K0HB

Take note that that is the situation here in Canada.

When things were restructured back in 1990, not only was the code
test separated out, but the written test became simpler. And
that test did not allow for the building of transmitters. You had
to take the advanced test to do that.

I have no idea if that idea came from hams or the DOC. Certainly
there was the suggestion that since few were building, the test
did not need to deal too much with technical stuff. Of course,
the simpler test, and more important the rule that outright bans
a homemade transmitter's use with that Basic license, institutionalizes
the concept that it's a hobby of communication, not technical matters.

When I was licensed in 1972, it was still called the "Amateur Experimental Service" here in Canada.

Michael VE2BVW

4046. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-10 04:22:13 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <VbxBb.11692$NN.1568896@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 83672

Alun wrote:

> I have a proposal of my own. Here it is.
>
> All General and above become Class As, everyone else becomes a Class B.
> Class As get all privileges. Class Bs get 80, 40, 15, 10 and everything
> above that, i.e. everything any one of the equivalent licence classes had
> before but whole bands, not just subbands. Only Class As could be VEs, and
> I would limit Class Bs to 200W, i.e. Novice power level. No other limits,
> restrictions, etc. of any kind.
>
> The only losers would be Techs who could no longer run 1500W. I suspect
> that few do, and that those who do would have no difficulty passing a
> Class A test.
>
> I think that this has the virtue of being more politically acceptable than
> Hans' version.

Eeek! Your proposal almost makes it if we were to adoopt a systems such as what Hans proposes. But I don't think those Technicians would like losing their licenses after ten years - if they didn't upgrade, of course.

- Mike KB3EIA -

4047. Re: Where Did THIS Come From...?!?!a

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-10 09:01:31 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0312100101.2555d9fc@posting.google.com>
Source record: 83673

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20031207200830.07578.00002049@mb-m25.aol.com>...
> In article <OcPAb.6341$NN.943494@news1.news.adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo
> <mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:

> Friend of mine wrote her chemical engineering master's thesis on a new
> shale-oil extraction process back in 1980. Her method was an entirely practical
> and efficient way of deriving oil from the type of shale found in abundance in
> parts of the USA. Clean, too.
>
> Only problem was that the recovered product cost about $45/barrel.

Personally, I am a big proponent of new/expanded mass transit. I
DON'T believe the oil reserves are "unlimited". That's rediculous.
So it's time to build the infrastructure while the opportunity is
ripe.

> >>> 2. In the interim, use as *much* imported oil as possible.
> >>>
> >>> 3. Our own oil resources should be husbanded very carefully, so we will
> >>>still have oil in emergencies. We should use only as much as it takes to
> >>operate the wells and search for new sources.
> >>
> >> That's pretty much been US policy for about 40 years.
> >>
> >>> It is one of those reasons why I don't believe that we should open that
> >>>range in Alaska at this time. There may come a time that that oil is
> >>>needed desparately.
> >>
> >>
> >> The problem is that it takes years and years to develop a new field. And
> most
> >> new fields are not easily accessible.
> >
> >All the better sometimes. And as WWII proved, we can do things amazingly
> >quickly under duress
> >
> Yes and no. WW2 ended 58 years ago. Some things are different now. And there
> were also colossal expensive failures and overruns as well as the well-known
> successes like the A bomb (which was only ready in the summer of 1945), radar
> and the proximity fuse.

It amazes me that we pushed ourselves to the Moon in only 9 years
yet we've really done nothing more in space technology than what
existed 25 years ago.

Of course if we found some sort of massive mineral reserves on
the Moon, the commercial sector would have us buying real estate there
in half that.

> >> Ultimately the answer is to get away frok nonrenewable sources, and to
> >> increase
> >> efficiency. But such things are a hard sell.
> >
> >Not glamorous at all.
> >
> That's part of it, but the real problem is the kind of mindset it requires.
> Many Americans don't like to think in terms of any sort of limits or long-term
> responsibility or planning. Look at the battle it took to get seat belts in
> cars, and how many Americans won't use them.

Hey...it's job security for me! =)

Steve, K4YZ

4048. Re: "No Diagrams Or Symbols"...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-10 09:03:39 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <LjBBb.8431$7p2.8236@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 83674

"Kï¿½HB" wrote:
>
> I wouldn't venture a guess off the top of my
> head how many symbols there are, but I'm
> not suggesting hundreds of questions on the
> test devoted to this. Ten or 15 questions in
> the pool, with maybe a couple actually in any
> given exam. Would that be too much for
> you to memorize ..... er, I mean learn?

No, smart aleck. As I said in the last message, which you edited out of your quote, the Technician question pool I studied (July 97 ~ June 01 pool) covered simple block diagrams, symbols, and schematics. I suspect the current question pool does too. So perhaps you should make an effort to actually see what is on the current pools and exams before talking about what you want to see added. If you did so, perhaps you wouldn't be blathering about adding what is already there. Or is all that too much for you to understand?

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

4049. Re: Where Did THIS Come From...?!?!a

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-10 09:15:08 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0312100115.12112e7f@posting.google.com>
Source record: 83675

N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<c2356669.0312090936.31ea573e@posting.google.com>...
> k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0312082312.25dcd51d@posting.google.com>...
> > n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20031207132229.07578.00002040@mb-m25.aol.com>...
> >
> > > Does anyone have a realistic estimate of how much it will cost and how long it
> > > will take to develop Russian oil to the point where it undercuts crude from the
> > > Middle East in total production cost? (drilling, pumping, infrastructure,
> > > transportation, refining)?
> >
> > So, rather than spend the bucks and get it done, we continue to
> > hang our hats on the Arab's bedposts until all of THAT oil is gone,
> > THEN go looking?
>
> Not at all! If nothing else, economic development of that area will
> help stabilize their political situation.
>
> But we must dispel ourselves of the idea that there's a quick, cheap
> and easy fix.

I don't think any way is cheap or easy, Jim. It's jsut a matter
of idealogy...I'd rather my money went to Russians than to people who
think it's OK to treat women like property and use children as "human
shields".

> And you might want to look up just how much oil the USA imports from
> the Middle East. It's not as much as many people think.

It's got to be enough to keep OPEC rich, though...I don't see too
many soup lines in Saudi Arabia.

> > > Remember that much of Russia's oil is in places as inhospitable and undeveloped
> > > as Alaska. And there's the added problem that the folks there don't necessarily
> > > play by American rules....
> >
> > And the Arabs do?
>
> More so than you might imagine ;-)

I've been over there before, Jim...Back when Soddom...I meant
Saddam... was our "friend". I didn't like them as friends, so I can
only imagine what it's like for the guys over there now.

> Point is, Russian oil isn't a quick, cheap and easy fix.
> >
> > > > Besides...Russians and Americans are closer in social and
> > > > >geopolitical ideologies than Americans and those folks in the Middle
> > > > >East and SW Asia...
> > > >
> > > > In other words, we should trust the Russians?
> >
> > I trust them more. I never did foresee a nuclear war between us.
>
> I always thought that the biggest danger was that a war would start by
> mistake rather than intent.
>
> That doesn't mean the Soviets never wanted to take over, just that
> they never wanted to take over a burnt out radioactive cinder of a
> world.

The Russians wouldn't nuke us cuz they'd want to occupy us
afterwards. The Rags will nuke us because Allah said to, and be happy
to do it, consequences be damned.

> > The true threat has been from some upstart trying to be the new kid
> > on the block or someone looking to drive a wedge between us and the
> > Russians.
>
> Or somebody who didn't really care if they or their society survived
> or not.

That seven virgins thing sounds pretty good to enough of them, it
seems...I can only accept that they will continue thier current path
unless we find a way to derail them. Nuking them is out of the
question and biological weapons can't be controlled. I say we cut off
thier money and let them go back to using camels for transportation
instead of physical gratification.

> > > >So let's spend our money where it's appreciated.
> > >
> > > Sure.
> > >
> > > But perhaps we should also consider reducing our dependence on imported energy.
> >
> > I'd agree with that, but getting the rest of America to is a
> > problem.
>
> Exactly!
>
> The solutions are always on the supply side, as if demand is sacred.
> Heaven forbid anyone say that putting 25,000 miles per year on a
> vehicle that gets 15 MPG isn't an inalienable right.
>
> > We've had the technology to exploit many non-petroleum or
> > hybrid petroleum alternatives for decades.

>
> In 1980 I bought a car that got over 40 mpg in the city and over 50
> mpg on the road. And it weighed 2200+ pounds, met all the pollution
> and safety requirements and was fun to drive. No ignition noise,
> either. Of course it was small, but it was big enough for
> six-foot-three-inch me and lots of stuff besides.
>
> But cars like that aren't what Americans are told to want, so most of
> them don't. They're not "babe magnets".

I owned a "babe magnet" once...till I found out >>I<< was the
babe magnet, not the car! ! ! (Well...a guy can have his dreams,
can't he...?!?!)

> And if someone suggests that there may be better ways to travel than
> 4000 pound 250+ HP private cars, and jet airplanes, they're called
> "socialists" and "tree huggers"....
>
> > And even where there are
> > other US-controlled petro reserves, we ahve our own people fighting
> > our attempts to recover them.
>
> Think about why. Does the name Exxon Valdez ring a bell? "What do we
> do with a drunken sailor......"

He was only half the problem...the other half was the oil
companies that cut costs on single-hulled tankers.

> Also check put how much oil those reserves would actually supply if
> fully developed. And how much it costs...
>
> And remember that one point of the philosophy is to preserve *our*
> reserves...
>
> Also recall what event sparked the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor. It
> was FDR's decision to effectively stop the sales of oil, steel and
> other strategic materials to Japan in response to their war of
> aggression in China. Most important of these to Japan was the the
> supply of oil, because without it their war machine would not be able
> to function for long. So they decided to attack and hopefully win a
> quick war that would secure for them a secure source of oil in
> Southeast Asia and the surrounding areas. Yet they missed a key target
> in their attack planning: they never attacked the tank farm above
> Pearl Harbor. And in the end they found themselves short of oil
> because American submarines and aircraft were sinking their tankers
> faster than they could be replaced.
>
> Then there's Ploesti.....
>
> In the end, I say we need to focus on being self-sufficient for basic
> necessities - and *all* of the changes needed to bring that about.

> Energy supply is a basic necessity for an industrial society.

I'd say you're right!

73

Steve, K4YZ

4050. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-10 10:21:02 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <br6sj6$dua@library2.airnews.net>
Source record: 83676

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:ytfBb.7074$7p2.1970@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> "Dee D. Flint" wrote:
> >
> > Such exposure doesn't give anyone
> > sufficient information to make an
> > informed decision.
>
>
> Of course, that's just an opinion, isn't it? You're not an expert on the
> human decision making process and there are no studies to show whether it
is
> or isn't sufficient, right? If not, your opinion is no more valid than
mine.
>
>
> > Again you are NOT reading my words.
> > I've repeatedly stated that one can make
> > judgments based on risks, dangers, and
> > harm even if they have not experienced it.
> > Murder does serious harm and therefore
> > does not need to be experienced.
> > However where such detrimental effects
> > don't come into play, it is not possible to
> > say one does or does not like something
> > unless they have experienced it. (snip)
>
>
> Again, we make decisions each day without personal experience to
> necessarily back it up. This includes who we associate with, who we date,
> what we eat for lunch, what books we buy, what shows we watch on
television,
> whether we marry, and the list goes on virtually forever. And, again, your
> demand for more here shows a serious lack of respect for people's ability
to
> make their own choices.
>
>
> > I refrain from forming opinions on things
> > I've never tried. There will be things that
> > I will never form an opinion on. (snip)
>
>
> I find that very difficult to believe, Dee. Did you try actual marrage

> before actually getting married? Did you try driving on the highway before
> deciding to get a license? Did you try your job before actually taking it?
> Again, there are many things we choose to do or not do without actually
> trying them first.
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
>

Poifect!!!!!!!!

Kim W5TIT

4051. Re: Where Did THIS Come From...?!?!a

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-10 10:32:13 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <br6slc$9av@library2.airnews.net>
Source record: 83677

"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
news:c2356669.0312090936.31ea573e@posting.google.com...
> k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0312082312.25dcd51d@posting.google.com>...
> > n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20031207132229.07578.00002040@mb-m25.aol.com>...
> >
> > > Does anyone have a realistic estimate of how much it will cost and how
long it
> > > will take to develop Russian oil to the point where it undercuts crude
from the
> > > Middle East in total production cost? (drilling, pumping,
infrastructure,
> > > transportation, refining)?
> >
> > So, rather than spend the bucks and get it done, we continue to
> > hang our hats on the Arab's bedposts until all of THAT oil is gone,
> > THEN go looking?
>
> Not at all! If nothing else, economic development of that area will
> help stabilize their political situation.
>

As well as the rest of the world's.

>
> But we must dispel ourselves of the idea that there's a quick, cheap
> and easy fix.
>

Uh, any fix at all...don't think there is one--the Middle East is the
never-ending problem.

>
> And you might want to look up just how much oil the USA imports from
> the Middle East. It's not as much as many people think.
>

That's a part of the never-ending problem.

> > >
> > > > Besides...Russians and Americans are closer in social and
> > > >geopolitical ideologies than Americans and those folks in the Middle
> > > >East and SW Asia...
> > >
> > > In other words, we should trust the Russians?

> >
> > I trust them more. I never did foresee a nuclear war between us.
>
> I always thought that the biggest danger was that a war would start by
> mistake rather than intent.
>

Absolutely.

>
> That doesn't mean the Soviets never wanted to take over, just that
> they never wanted to take over a burnt out radioactive cinder of a
> world.
>
> > The true threat has been from some upstart trying to be the new kid
> > on the block or someone looking to drive a wedge between us and the
> > Russians.
>
> Or somebody who didn't really care if they or their society survived
> or not.
> >

And that threat will nearly never go away. Despite prophecies to the
contrary.

>
> Then there's Ploesti.....
>

And I'm reading business books...Oi!

>
> In the end, I say we need to focus on being self-sufficient for basic
> necessities - and *all* of the changes needed to bring that about.
> Energy supply is a basic necessity for an industrial society.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>

I believe this will happen...*someday*...and probably much longer than a few
of our lifetimes from now...

Kim W5TIT

4052. Re: Where Did THIS Come From...?!?!a

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-10 10:39:53 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <br6t3n$q42@library2.airnews.net>
Source record: 83678

"Steve Robeson, K4CAP" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
news:5c01b95b.0312100115.12112e7f@posting.google.com...
> N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<c2356669.0312090936.31ea573e@posting.google.com>...
> > k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0312082312.25dcd51d@posting.google.com>...
> > > n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20031207132229.07578.00002040@mb-m25.aol.com>...
> > >
> > > > Does anyone have a realistic estimate of how much it will cost and
how long it
> > > > will take to develop Russian oil to the point where it undercuts
crude from the
> > > > Middle East in total production cost? (drilling, pumping,
infrastructure,
> > > > transportation, refining)?
> > >
> > > So, rather than spend the bucks and get it done, we continue to
> > > hang our hats on the Arab's bedposts until all of THAT oil is gone,
> > > THEN go looking?
> >
> > Not at all! If nothing else, economic development of that area will
> > help stabilize their political situation.
> >
> > But we must dispel ourselves of the idea that there's a quick, cheap
> > and easy fix.
>
> I don't think any way is cheap or easy, Jim. It's jsut a matter
> of idealogy...I'd rather my money went to Russians than to people who
> think it's OK to treat women like property and use children as "human
> shields".
>
> 73
>
> Steve, K4YZ
>

Damn. I'd rather a majority of "our money" (it's really the government's)
go right here...in the United States...to rebuild and repair our
infrastructure, to all education levels, to assist in the social and civil
disasters that are taking place right here within the boundaries of our 50
states. : |

Kim W5TIT

4053. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-10 12:58:00 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031210075800.23171.00002578@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 83680

In article <3FD6364C.6050909@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>> Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
>news:<3FD4EDE8.8060207@psu.edu>...

><snippage>

>>>I don't agree there Jim! True enough, its an arbitrary thing, but what
>>>you are talking about is power limits and sub-bands, and I am talking
>>>about the qualifications to operate *at all*. the other folks simply
>>>operate within the limitations of their licenses, and the 10 year and 1
>>>day class B ham is no ham at all anymore.
>
>> Just like the old Novices when their licenses ran out.
>>
>> Point is, that hypothetical Class B had a window of 8 *years* to
>> upgrade to Class A. You said it took you all of a week to get ready
>> for Extra.
>
> Granted, I had a head start, and didn't need as much time as some, but
>I find it hard to argue that 10 years is a good time limit when it isn't
>needed.
>
We don't really know what the effects of a nonrenewable license would be today, because it's been so long since such a thing existed.

>Anyone that takes ten years to upgrade to Extra is probably not
>going to upgrade to Extra. Ooops, class A.

We don't know that for sure either, because for so long it's been a "round tuit" thing. No deadline, no pressure, upgrade when you feel like it. Changing to an "up or out" system would set up a very different environment. Maybe better, maybe worse.

>>>>>I keep drawing parallels between the second class license and Generals.
>>>>>We try to get people out to operate on field day, and you can get some
>>>>>pretty strange setups. First a Ham with less than 2 years time in grade
>>>>>would have to have a control op.
>>>
>>>>Why?
>>>
>>>If he/she is operating >50 Watts, they are outside their priveliges.

>> OK. So turn down the power.
>

> Sigh... our club has a group of guys and gals that make a big
>production out of FD. It isn't what everyone does, but its what we do.
>We don't want to run 50 watts.

OK, fine. You want to protect the way things are because they permit your club
to do what it does. Nothing wrong with wanting to keep it that way!

>The first year I went to field day, I was
>a Technician. I got to run a high power station with a control op
>logging. It was great, and was what really got me interested in getting
>my General. then I logged while he opped.

Under those circumstances your license didn't matter because he was the control
op.

> Then next year, when I had my General, I could op by myself,
>discovering the joy of overnight operation.

You joined the "Order of Boiled Owls", IOW.
>
> My points are two. We worked in this rank beginner from a technician
>up, and didn't interfere with the station operation, and it worked well.
>No adjustments needed. And I was part of the group from the git-go.
>
Sure! And all that Hans' proposal would do is require another year of
in-training status with a control op. That's a downside of *any* experience
requirement.

>>>>As long as the power level is less than 50 W, that Class B ham could
>operate
>>>>any freq, any mode, as the control op.
>>>
>>>Ahh, but now we have to set up a special low power station. The low
>>>power ghetto I was talking about. For good or bad, my club runs high
>>>power during Field Day.
>>
>>
>> Most clubs don't.
>
> We do.
>
I guess it comes down to "do we make the rules for the few or the many?"
>
>> And if the power levels were restructured, the points from a 50 watt
>> station could make more difference than those from a 1500 W station.
>
> Another "if-then" situation. Gaw, were getting a lot of them.

All I'm saying is that the rules (both FCC and FD) can change. In fact, I think
the FD rule of "all QSOs count at the power level of the highest power rig"
should definitely be changed because it homogenizes the FD experience too much.

>
>>>I'm taking my reference of "Class B Ghetto" from
>>>experience with the GOTA station. The first year our GOTA station
>>>operated, many of the people operating it called it a "toy station".
>
>> That's *their* problem.
>
> And it becomes *our* problem then.

I mean that the folks who call it a "toy" station have a problem.

>Since then, I have worked hard to
>make the GOTA operators feel like part of the group. move that tent
>nearer the big tent. Keep more people than just myself and the person at
>the mic there.

All good stuff.

If nothing else, points is points, no matter how ya make 'em.

One of my tricks for many years was to bring along a WW2 surplus ARC-5 receiver and dynamotor, plus a hank of wire. A few minutes before 10 AM, while everyone was either setting up or sidewalk superintending, I'd toss the wire in a tree and hook the dynamotor to my car's battery. Tune in W1AW and copy the special FD bulletin (CW, of course) for 100 bonus points - the first 100 points of the club score.

Just the looks on people's faces were worth it.

>I'm a little surprised, Jim. All that I'm talking about
>is making these potential hams and inactive hams feel like maybe we
>*want* them there.

And that's a good thing! I'm all for it!

> Your arguments sound a little like some of the old
>cranks I hear once in a while.
>
All I'm saying is that there are good and bad things that will result from Hans' ideas (if adopted). I think the good may outweigh the bad. YMMV.

>>>They could op one of the high power stations, park on a frequency, and
>>>rack up points, and the lowly GOTA station has to hunt and pounce. It
>>>wasn't until I put PSK31 on the GOTA station that it took off.

>> So? They're used to being Big Guns. Anybody who wants to be a Big Gun
>> could just get a Class A and be done with it.

> After two years.

Yup. Whether that's a problem or not is really an opinion question.
>
>>>note: I'm not suggesting that newbies use high power. Just the opposite
>>>in fact. Hunt and pounce at low power builds competence in the new ham.
>>>But its so hard to compete with power when you're working like crazy to

>>>get a QSO, and the guy in the next tent is racking them up at a high rate.
>>
>> That's part of the experience requirement. Part of the plan.
>>
>> And remember the power multiplier idea. If the 50 watt station is
>> hunt/pecking 20 per hour but has a 3.5 multiplier, they're making more
>> points than the Big Gun doing 60 per hour.
>
>"if-then"

Sure.
>
>>>>>We have hams what operate now at field
>>>>>day that would suddenly have to have a control op (therefore taking
>>>>>myself or another Extra away from a station)

>>>>Not at all! Existing hams would retain their existing privs under Hans'
>>>>proposal.

>>> I'm saying that I'm sitting with the guy as a control op and not
>>>operating myself.
>>
>> If they're existing hams (say, Generals) they could still do what
>> they've always done. If they're unlicensed, or not licensed for the
>> freq/power/mode in use, they still need a control op today.
>>
>> And one of the *best* ways for them to learn is to work with an
>> experienced op.
>>
>>>>>Of course the second class
>>>>>ham could operate a 50 watt or less station, but that would mean that
>>>>>either we change our setup - all stations except GOTA are full output -
>>>>>or set up a special station just for the second class hams, a sort of
>>>>>low power ghetto.
>>>>
>>>>You mean you folks operate 1500 W on FD? (that's "full output")
>>>
>>>Actually we operat @1kW. My bad.
>>
>> FD rules can be changed, y'know.
>>>
>>>>>Heck, the GOTA station can run more power. Maybe this
>>>>>is no problem for you, but for others it isn't so good
>>>>>
>>>>
>>>>Try QRP some time ;-)
>>>
>>>Nothing wrong with QRP. I'm just noting possible problems as outlined
>>>above. If you're going QRP then everyone is operating at less than 5 watts.
>>
>> Only if the current rules are kept.

>>
>>>>The fact is that if a non-Extra wants to operate FD, there has to be a
>control
>>>>op present whenever the non-Extra exceeds his-her subband restrictions.
>That's
>>>>a lot more onerous than turning down the power to 50 W.
>>>
>>> I stayed in my bands when I was a General at FD. Wasn't a problem.
>>
>> It's been so long since I had to worry about such things.....;-)
>>
>>>>>>Back in the late '60s and early '70s, there were *four* FD power levels:
>>>>>>QRP, 50 W, 150 W, and the legal limit, IIRC.
>>>>>
>>>>> Could be. But if we went back to that, the clubs could be forced to
>>>>>make a decision to either run what they would like to run, take control
>>>>>ops away from available stations for those who don't have time in grade.
>>>>>(or the proper upgrade) or make that little ghetto for the second class
>>>>>Hams. I really don't think that is a good way to welcome new people.
>YMMV.
>>>>>
>>>>
>>>>There's another option: Change the rules so that different power levels
>could
>>>>be used for different stations in the same multi setup. (It used to be
>this
>>>>way!)
>>>
>>> This might work well enough, but I still don't care for relegating the
>>> class B to the ghetto, or to remove an Extra or class A from operating
>>>to be a control op.
>>
>>
>> Then let the Class Bs keep a log or feed the generator or cook
>> weenies. Or, heaven forbid, take the Class A test. Is it gonna kill
>> 'em?
>>
>>> I know that the others I work with on field day wouldn't be too wild
>>>about that sort of thing either. These are people that love working high
>>>power, and enjoy racking up points.
>>
>> Uh-huh. How many points did they make per transmitter last year?
>
> We were 3A
>
>W3YA + W3GA (GOTA) did 7362 points - I don't have the breakdown for each
>transmitter. We don't get any power multiplier at all, so what you see
>is what we get.

Not exactly. Your setup made 4696 QSOs (!!). CW and digital modes are worth 2 points, and there were bonuses for independence of mains and other things I'm sure your setup had. And the GOTA station didn't add to your class of operation.

7362 points with three transmitters works out to 2454 points per transmitter. If we count the GOTA station as, say "half a transmitter", that drops to 2104 points per transmitter.

On that same weekend, I operated 1B-1 battery/QRP and made 2480 points.

>>>Inexperienced users can get working
>>>with us, but adding another station (and putting us in another class)
>>>for a 50 watt station isn't going to be too popular with them - and
>>>after all, they and myself are the ones doing the setup and teardown, so
>>>as long as we are within the rules, we should be allowed to do this. I
>>>just don't think that the proposed setup will be both newbie friendly
>>>and experienced friendly at the same time.
>>
>> Then the rules need some refining.
>>
>>
>>> Note I'm not saying things couldn't work. I'm saying that every time I
>>>turn around, this proposal is bumping into something else, and not
>>>necessarily in a good way.
>>
>>
>> So does any other proposal. FD is once a year. It's supposed to be a
>> learning experience, last time I checked.
>
>
>>>It starts out pretty simply, but then we have
>>>to do all kinds of things to shoehorn it into the real world. So we end
>>>up changing this so can coexist with the thing we changed before in
>>>order to avoid messing that up which came about as a result of modifying
>>> the rule that contradicted..........
>>
>>
>> Then what's *your* solution, Mike?
>>
>> I don't agree with all of Hans' ideas, but at least he's put forth a
>> coherent proposal.
>
>I gave mine a while back, and I'll give it again.
>
>Technician
>
>General
>
>Extra
>
>Same rules as now. Tests expanded for General and Extra.

>
>Minimum impact, and there ya go. Question pool change.

Works for me! But we have toi remember that outfits like NCVEC are working in
the opposite direction.
>
>> I'd have three license classes, all renewable, minimum 1 year in each
>> class experience required, power levels 100W, 400W, 1500W,
>> subbands-by-license-class on HF/MF, and better writtens.
>
> And I'm still a little surprised, Jim. Perhaps I shouldn't point out
>any problems that will happen under Hans' proposal?

No, you definitely should.

>I get the impression
>from your answers - "so what" "that's their problem" "Uh Huh" and the
>like, that you must think my objections are as Hans describes me
>sometimes - "novel".
>
Nope.

I just don't think they're as big a deal as you do, that's all.

> What the heck? Perhaps it's better if I just keep the old yap shut?

Nope. Not at all.

>Anytime things are changed, things are impacted. We can point them out
>before hand, or run into them blind.

Exactly!
>
> You might not think my concerns are valid, but I can tell you that I
>know plenty of people that have the same concerns. We are all novel I
>guess! 8^) Maybe I point out small facts - but I've pointed out a pretty
>fair number of them, and I'm not looking very hard. Any small fact is
>insignificant by itself, but when a lot of them come up.....
>
All I'm saying is that whether the good outweighs the bad is a matter of
opinion. And opinions vary all over the place.

73 de Jim, N2EY

4054. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-10 12:58:01 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031210075801.23171.00002579@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 83679

In article <Xns944CD3F421656elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun
<alun@1stcounsel.com> writes:

>I have a proposal of my own. Here it is.
>
>All General and above become Class As, everyone else becomes a Class B.

IOW, free upgrades for everyone except Novices and Techs. History repeating itself - almost exactly the same thing was announced 51 years ago this month.

>Class As get all privileges. Class Bs get 80, 40, 15, 10 and everything
>above that, i.e. everything any one of the equivalent licence classes had
>before but whole bands, not just subbands. Only Class As could be VEs, and
>I would limit Class Bs to 200W, i.e. Novice power level. No other limits,
>restrictions, etc. of any kind.

Well, it sure would be interesting!
>
>The only losers would be Techs who could no longer run 1500W. I suspect
>that few do, and that those who do would have no difficulty passing a
>Class A test.

Could also do a "keep your old license docs and you can run full power" thing, as "Techs-with-HF" do now.
>
>I think that this has the virtue of being more politically acceptable than
>Hans' version.

Probably!

73 de Jim, N2EY

4055. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-10 13:55:46 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <CBFBb.8744$7p2.5823@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 83681

"K�HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:1pUAb.5304$rP6.1935@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net...
>
> "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote
>
> > Not the same since there are distinct privileges with those licenses
> > which differentiate them from the others. IF the FCC had made Advanced
> > privileges exactly the same as Extra, then I fully believe they would
have
> > just changed all Advanced to Extra when they were individually
> > renewed.
>
> From 1951 till 1968 the privileges for four license classes, Conditional,
> General, Advanced, and Extra were all exactly the same. We all used the
> same frequencies with the same authorized power, and from our call sign
you
> couldn't tell one from the other. Life was good.

But that was 35+ years ago and times have changed. I'd bet the
FCC won't do that again and has, to a certain degree already
shown its mindset with the lack of differentiation
between tech and tech+...even though there is a difference
in operating bands permmitted.

> Then some dump huck social-engineering gummint dudes, cheered on by a
radio
> club in West Hartford, CT., decided to set up a bunch of arbitrary
exclusive
> band segments as 'rewards' for advancing amongst the various classes, and
> then later drove wider wedges between the classes with the 'reward' of
> distinctive call signs for the higher licenses. Whatever good came of
this
> is long since lost in the damage caused by 'class wars' which still rage.
>
> My proposal is based first on the notion that there should be two classes
of
> license --- "Learners Permit" and "Fully Qualified", and second on the
> notion that those learners should operate in the mainstream with
experienced
> hams, not segregated off into little ghettos populated with mostly other
> learners.

Other than my beliefs at how FCC would likly treat existing
licenses...I generally agree with your proposal.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

4056. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-10 14:05:29 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0312100605.47f2f0a1@posting.google.com>
Source record: 83682

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20031203134854.25815.00004875@mb-m07.aol.com>...

> What do you mean "we," white man?

Your point for introducing a racial suggestion, Your Putziness?

> Of course. A "learner's permit." As if the ONLY radio emitters in
> the world came from amateur radio stations.

The point here is training for Radio Amateurs...Not
"professional", Military, PLMRS, MURS, Special Emergency, etc etc
etc...

> Geez...for a work manager supposedly with a degree you sure don't
> know much about equipment that can go wrong, be misadjusted, and
> lots of other little nasties lurking inside electronics boxes. Tsk, tsk.

And you'd know WHAT of current Amateur gear, Lennie?

Your CURRENT practical experience in AMATEUR Radio...?!?!

Show YOUR work.

Steve, K4YZ

4057. Expirations in 2004

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-10 14:15:43 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <jUFBb.8762$7p2.1663@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 83683

The calendar year 2004 has a considerable
amount of expirations...well above a normal
distribution which would have been about 1/10th
of existing hams...or about 63K.

The actual future expiratons data from the Joe
Speroni web site is over 84K expirations
with two months showing very high numbers...
almost 11K in May and over 17K in July.

Will be interesting to watch the renewal results.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

4058. Re: Where Did THIS Come From...?!?!a

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-10 17:59:56 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0312100959.4bedfc77@posting.google.com>
Source record: 83684

"Kim" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote in message news:<br6t3n$q42@library2.airnews.net>...

> I'd rather a majority of "our money" (it's really the government's)
> go right here...in the United States...to rebuild and repair our
> infrastructure, to all education levels, to assist in the social and civil
> disasters that are taking place right here within the boundaries of our 50
> states. : |

So would I, Kim. Plus a balanced budget.

But it's easy to say that. The hard part is deciding how much you're willing to give up to make it happen. By "give up", I mean things like higher taxes, higher prices on many things, lifestyle changes, a redeining of the USA's role in world politics, etc.

For example, would you be willing to pay the same prices for fuel that Western Europeans do? Much of the difference is taxes, not production cost. That's why so many Western European countries have such good roads, trains and transit systems - because much of the fuel tax goes to support clean, efficient public transportation.

73 de Jim, N2EY

4059. Re: "No Diagrams Or Symbols"...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-10 19:15:37 UTC
From: VA7LNX <spamtrap@gwsn.com>
Message-ID: <thKBb.647128$9l5.420368@pd7tw2no>
Source record: 83685

Michael Black wrote:

> Take note that that is the situation here in Canada.
>
> When things were restructured back in 1990, not only was the code
> test separated out, but the written test became simpler. And
> that test did not allow for the building of transmitters. You had
> to take the advanced test to do that.
>
> I have no idea if that idea came from hams or the DOC. Certainly
> there was the suggestion that since few were building, the test
> did not need to deal too much with technical stuff. Of course,
> the simpler test, and more important the rule that outright bans
> a homemade transmitter's use with that Basic license, institutionalizes
> the concept that it's a hobby of communication, not technical matters.
>
> When I was licensed in 1972, it was still called the "Amateur Experimental
> Service" here in Canada.
>
> Michael VE2BVW

I seem to recall seeing a notice on either the RAC's or IC's websites that they would be removing the code requirement for anything lower than 6m. Do you know anything about that? It almost seems like a priviledge to get onto the low frequency bands with the 5wpm requirements.

On another note, do you know of any good morse resources? I'd like to learn Morse (I got my license in 1999 and didn't take the morse test).

As far as the test goes, I took Electronics Engineering Technology in college and I thought the advanced exam was quite easy, but I may be biased.
--
Donovan Hill
VA7LNX (Basic, Advanced)

4060. Re: Expirations in 2004

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-10 21:02:01 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0312101302.646c3852@posting.google.com>
Source record: 83686

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<jUFBb.8762$7p2.1663@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> The calendar year 2004 has a considerable
> amount of expirations...well above a normal
> distribution which would have been about 1/10th
> of existing hams...or about 63K.

Don't you mean "about 68K", Bill?
>
> The actual future expiratons data from the Joe
> Speroni web site is over 84K expirations
> with two months showing very high numbers...
> almost 11K in May and over 17K in July.

Didn't FCC change the vanity call rules right about then? If so, it would explain the spike because getting a vanity call causes an automatic renewal regardless of the 90 day rule (so FCC doesn't have to pro-rate the fee, IIUC)
>
> Will be interesting to watch the renewal results.

Yep!

Further clouded by the 90 days before/2 years after rules. If someone is a little late renewing, they show up as an expiration.

73 de Jim, N2EY

4061. Re: "No Diagrams Or Symbols"...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-11 00:14:47 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <XFOBb.9416$rP6.4449@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 83687

"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote

> BS, the test today do nothing of the sort, all these stupid test do
anymore is
> test someones ability to Memorize a Bunch of Q and As.

I have realised that it's actually possible to know _less_ than nothing about a subject - I am talking about people who deal with electronics at the level of superstition. Give these people a goat and they wouldn't know what to do with it.

73, de Hans, K0HB

4062. Re: Bush Kills Troops, Hillary Doesn't

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-11 02:21:58 UTC
From: Gr&#65533;mw&#65533;tch th&#65533; &#65533;nfl&#65533;pp&#65533;bl&#65533; <Gr&#65533;mw&#65533;tch@NOSPAM.THANKS.IM.FULL.lycos.co.de>
Message-ID: <axQBb.9560$rP6.686@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 83688

http://www.pwp.blueyonder.co.uk./about.htm

4063. Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-11 16:53:56 UTC
From: hamop_62@hotmail.com
Message-ID: <792e029d.0312110853.4daa825f@posting.google.com>
Source record: 83689
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.cb

This came from another radio group. They are doing a survey to find
out why some people do not like the ARRL. I don't like it because it
costs to much. If it were $10 a year I might consider joining.
Louis
>
>Subj: [REPEATER] Off List: ARRL
>Date: 12/11/2003 5:43:47 AM Pacific Standard Time
>From: billwa6itf@aol.com
>Reply-to: hamvideo@juno.com
>To: Repeater@yahoogroups.com
>CC: dbellw6aq@aol.com
>
>Hi all,
>
>This is directed only to those who are NOT currently ARRL members. I
have
>agreed to help compile a survey which seeks answers for these two
questions:
>
>1: If you are not a member of the ARRL, why not?
>
>2: If you were a member of the ARRL and quit, why?
>
>Please respond by December 18th. ï¿½ Please answer only OFF list to
>hamvideo@juno.com in order keep the clutter on the remailer down.
>
>Thank-you for assisting in this survey.
>
>Bill Pasternak, WA6ITF
>
>

4064. Re: Bush Kills Troops, Hillary Doesn't

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-11 18:27:05 UTC
From: horseshoe7@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <5f4fe4c2.0312111027.4c55daf1@posting.google.com>
Source record: 83690

"Grï¿½mwï¿½tch thï¿½ ï¿½nflï¿½ppï¿½blï¿½" <Grï¿½mwï¿½tch@NOSPAM.THANKS.IM.FULL.lycos.co.de> wrote in message news:<axQBb.9560$rP6.686@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>...

Yes - he kills ENEMY troops... Hillary and the foolish left give comfort to the enemy and and embolden them in their attempts to kill our BRAVE TROOPS.

Oh, TOO BAD about being left out of the IRAQI REBUILDING CONTRACTS. (LOSERS!)

Looks like it is time to start boycotting German products, in addition to French products.

- Stewart

4065. Re: Bush Kills Troops, Hillary Doesn't

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-11 18:53:27 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <0rWdnfdj398eIEWiRVn-uw@gbronline.com>
Source record: 83691

stewart wrote:
> "Grï¿½mwï¿½tch thï¿½ ï¿½nflï¿½ppï¿½blï¿½"
<Grï¿½mwï¿½tch@NOSPAM.THANKS.IM.FULL.lycos.co.de> wrote in message
news:<axQBb.9560$rP6.686@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>...
>
> Yes - he kills ENEMY troops... Hillary and the foolish left give
> comfort to the enemy and and embolden them in their attempts to kill
> our BRAVE TROOPS.
>
> Oh, TOO BAD about being left out of the IRAQI REBUILDING CONTRACTS.
> (LOSERS!)
>
> Looks like it is time to start boycotting German products, in addition
> to French products.
>
> - Stewart

What he said.

4066. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-11 18:55:19 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3FD8BD97.9080705@psu.edu>
Source record: 83692
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.cb

Louis C. LeVine wrote:
> This came from another radio group. They are doing a survey to find
> out why some people do not like the ARRL. I don't like it because it
> costs to much. If it were $10 a year I might consider joining.
> Louis

I do like the ARRL. Do I agree with everything they do? Nope. I don't agree with everything everyone does.

Expensive? A bit, but only for those that think they are just taking out a magazine subscription.

Love their website, I've mined enough out of that to justify the membership dues.

And the alternitive is?

- Mike KB3EIA -

4067. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-11 19:01:52 UTC
From: Gr&#65533;mw&#65533;tch th&#65533; &#65533;nfl&#65533;pp&#65533;bl&#65533; <Gr&#65533;mw&#65533;tch@NOSPAM.THANKS.IM.FULL.lycos.co.de>
Message-ID: <Aa3Cb.7781$_r6.3429@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 83693
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.cb

"Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote

:
: And the alternitive is?
:

DARC works good for us.

73/88 BGO
--
"All persons, living or dead, are purely coincidental, and should not be
construed."

4068. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-11 19:13:19 UTC
From: William Mutch <wcm1@NOSPAM.cornell.edu>
Message-ID: <MPG.1a428bdd8cfe4ea398973f@newsstand.cit.cornell.edu>
Source record: 83694
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.cb

In article <792e029d.0312110853.4daa825f@posting.google.com>, hamop_62
@hotmail.com says...
> This came from another radio group. They are doing a survey to find
> out why some people do not like the ARRL. I don't like it because it
> costs to much. If it were $10 a year I might consider joining.
> Louis
> >

"snip"
> >
> >Bill Pasternak, WA6ITF
> >
> >
>

I *am* a member of ARRL, but do find the membership a little
steep... I'd go $25,, but will think long and hard about renewing at
$40.

I think a lot of the long gray vanity call lists of DX and contest
results should be moved out of QST and onto some sub menu web page where
the three people who give a damn could look them up. QST is a pretty
good rag; it can still be improved.

I object to ARRL's position that we should not be discussing sex,
politics or religion on the bands...what else is left worth talking
about? BUT I wish ARRL or *someone* could act effectively to make
these discussions a bit more civil.

I don't think ARRL is doing enough of the "right stuff" to attract
newcomers, particularly youngsters, to the hobby. Often the emphasis is
too much on technolgy and equipment and not enough on the social
exploration that's possible with our radios.

On positive side I think ARRL is still doing a pretty decent job
representing our interests to the Beltway Bandits.

73 KC2LVQ

4069. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-11 19:56:07 UTC
From: Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com>
Message-ID: <20031211145607.253$hr@newsreader.com>
Source record: 83695
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.cb

Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote:
>> And the alternitive is?
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -
>
N8WWM's favorite.

http://www.rara.org/

4070. Re: Do Hams get 11 Meters Back

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-11 21:25:30 UTC
From: donrm@garbage.soco.agilent.com
Message-ID: <1071177925.458233@cswreg.cos.agilent.com>
Source record: 83696
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.cb

In rec.radio.amateur.misc JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote:
>>
> The hams hardly used 11 meters when they had it, what makes you think
> they would use it now if they got it back? Besides, the cbers have made
> such a mess of it, it would take years to clean the filth out.

11M was sparsely used because it was not harmonically related to the other HF bands (i.e., required a separate VFO band and couldn't be multiplied to other HF bands). With today's synthesized radios, 11M would be no more difficult to implement than any other band.

When the hams had 11M, they could also legally full duplex 10M and 11M simultaneously for a real 2X conversation like the telephone.

And yes, I was on the 11M ham band in those days.

73 de Don, K6LTS
email: take the garbage out.

4071. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-11 21:50:10 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <mE5Cb.10384$rP6.1701@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 83697
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.cb

"William Mutch" <wcm1@NOSPAM.cornell.edu> wrote

> I think a lot of the long gray vanity call lists of DX and contest
> results should be moved out of QST and onto some sub menu web page where
> the three people who give a damn could look them up.

You must have been distracted by a passing bimbo or something, but DXCC listings were removed from QST several years ago and moved to the DXCC Annual Report which goes only to DXCC participants.

The contest result listings similarly have been removed from QST and now can be accessed on the web.

> I object to ARRL's position that we should not be discussing sex,
> politics or religion on the bands...what else is left worth talking
> about? BUT I wish ARRL or *someone* could act effectively to make
> these discussions a bit more civil.

ARRL makes no regulations whatsoever. You can talk about what ever you deem proper, and only Riley Hollingsworth will challenge you if he thinks you're over the line.

73, de Hans, K0HB

4072. Re: Why You Don't Like Michigan

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-11 22:08:35 UTC
From: Radioman <radio@ptt.edu>
Message-ID: <3FD8EAE3.94C637BC@ptt.edu>
Source record: 83698
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.cb

> >> And the alternitive is?
> >
> N8WWM's favorite:
>
> http://www.rara.org/

Must be a part of the "Great Lakes Chapter" serving Michigan, Ohio and surrounding states, with their grandmaster WA8PUD!!! LOL!!

4073. Re: Why You Don't Like Michigan

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-11 22:14:52 UTC
From: Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com>
Message-ID: <20031211171452.428$30@newsreader.com>
Source record: 83699
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.cb

Radioman <radio@ptt.edu> wrote:
> > >> And the alternitive is?
> > >
> > N8WWM's favorite:
> >
> > http://www.rara.org/
>
> Must be a part of the "Great Lakes Chapter" serving Michigan, Ohio and
> surrounding states, with their grandmaster WA8PUD!!! LOL!!
>
Hehe, charter member!?!

http://tinyurl.com/yu6l

4074. W5NETs Christmas Card

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-11 22:31:00 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031211173100.11762.00000474@mb-m25.aol.com>
Source record: 83700

Well Dwight I got your card, was very surprised, now I suppose I will get 1 from TIT. Anyway, thanks for the Card Dwight, and you have a nice XMAS also.

4075. Re: Expirations in 2004

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-11 22:51:38 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <_x6Cb.8025$_r6.1795@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 83601

"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message

> Didn't FCC change the vanity call rules right about then?

No, IIRC Gate 1 of the vanity program opened in May or June of 1996.

73, de Hans, K0HB

4076. Re: W5NETs Christmas Card

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-11 23:36:51 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <nc7Cb.11686$7p2.392@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 83602

"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20031211173100.11762.00000474@mb-m25.aol.com...
> Well Dwight I got your card, was very surprised, now I suppose I will get
1
> from TIT. Anyway, thanks for the Card Dwight, and you have a nice XMAS
also.

I got one from Dwight also. Thanks a lot. And a Merry Christmas back to
you.

Wonder if he checked with the PC Police ??

Dan/W4NTI

4077. Re: W5NETs Christmas Card

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-11 23:54:08 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031211185408.12223.00000779@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 83603

>I got one from Dwight also. Thanks a lot. And a Merry Christmas back to
>you.
>
>Wonder if he checked with the PC Police ??
>
>Dan/W4NTI

Yea Dan thats what im wondering. I cant believe the PC Police would approve such a thing. May its a attempt by NCI and all the No-Coders to try and switch us to there side.
Who knows Dan, maybe Andy is in on this. Anyway check your mail box close Dan, who knows what they are up to.
On second thought Dan, maybe TIT will send us a Photo on her Card.

4078. Re: light bulbs in rrap

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-12 01:22:18 UTC
From: K7JEB <k7jeb.remove_this@qsl.net>
Message-ID: <2M8Cb.699$J77.253@fed1read07>
Source record: 83604

> > Is that an incandescent light bulb, or a flourescent light bulb? :)
>
> HOWL! I must have forgotten - 1 person to ask that question!!

And another dozen to assert that an LED isn't a *real*
lightbulb because it never needs changing.

K7JEB

4079. Re: Where Did THIS Come From...?!?!a

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-12 01:44:12 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20031211204412.15462.00004851@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 83605

In article <c2356669.0312100959.4bedfc77@posting.google.com>, N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) writes:

>For example, would you be willing to pay the same prices for fuel that
>Western Europeans do? Much of the difference is taxes, not production
>cost. That's why so many Western European countries have such good
>roads, trains and transit systems - because much of the fuel tax goes
>to support clean, efficient public transportation.
>
>73 de Jim, N2EY

Jim:

Most EU countries are much better suited for mass transit (meaning light rail systems) than is the U.S. as a whole. Sure, they're good in big cities, but the
USA has too many wide open spaces and too much suburban sprawl -- making long commutes necessary for the majority of the workforce. This means we're going to be dependent on personal, self-driven vehicles for a long time to come. Moreover, I don't think that adapting our public transit systems to be as accessible and accommodating to the majority of commuters as those in the EU would cost far more than they are spending. Remember, they had a headstart on their transit systems, dating back to the pre-war era. They also have a higher level of cultural acceptence of mass transit -- many EU families have never owned an automobile, simply because there was no need (not to mention the prohibitive cost).

The long distances which must be travelled by most Americans to get to work and go about their daily duties would make EU-style gasoline prices impossible for the average person to afford. Our economy depends on cheap, abundant energy, available at present-day market rates (or lower) basically in perpetuity. The liberal, socialist Democrats think we need to change that and have EU-type energy prices, but they hate this country anyway, and want us to be subjugated to the EU. These treasonous wackos won't be happy until we revert to a totally agrarian society. They are the enemies of the freedom that America stands for, and must be treated as such.

Europe will always be different from the U.S., and considering their geopolitical realities, it is just the way it should be. However, since most of the EU nations would fit inside a couple of our states, America must be different. We must consume a larger share of the world's energy simply because we have a lot further to go in order to make our own individual social and economic contributions. I agree that mass transit should be exploited to the greatest extent possible, but it will never replace the need for individual, personal mobility -- meaning the private automobile, in all of it's forms.

73 de Larry, K3LT

4080. Re: W5NETs Christmas Card

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-12 01:53:05 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20031211205305.15462.00004853@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 83606

Thanks for the card, Dwight! It's the first one I've received this year -- I haven't even had a chance to go out and buy mine yet! I wish you and your family a very Merry Christmas and a Happy and Prosperous New Year!

73 de Larry, K3LT

4081. Re: Bush Kills Troops, Hillary Doesn't

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-12 01:53:05 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20031211205305.15462.00004852@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 83607

In article <0rWdnfdj398eIEWiRVn-uw@gbronline.com>, JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
writes:

>
>stewart wrote:
>> "Grï¿½mwï¿½tch thï¿½ ï¿½nflï¿½ppï¿½blï¿½"
<Grï¿½mwï¿½tch@NOSPAM.THANKS.IM.FULL.lycos.co.de>
>wrote in message
>news:<axQBb.9560$rP6.686@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>...
>>
>> Yes - he kills ENEMY troops... Hillary and the foolish left give
>> comfort to the enemy and and embolden them in their attempts to kill
>> our BRAVE TROOPS.
>>
>> Oh, TOO BAD about being left out of the IRAQI REBUILDING CONTRACTS.
>> (LOSERS!)
>>
>> Looks like it is time to start boycotting German products, in addition
>> to French products.
>>
>> - Stewart
>
>What he said.

Me too. I hope that Hillary was in Afganistan and Iraq, she talked to some of
the men, women, and children who were tortured and had family members brutally
murdered by the Taliban and the Fedayeen. Not that I expect that it would
actually change her mind about anything, such as supporting her President in
his war against terrorism. That is something that I would expect from a Loyal
and Patriotic American -- not Hillary.

73 de Larry, K3LT

4082. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-12 02:12:46 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3FD92424.47B39D5A@earthlink.net>
Source record: 83608
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

William Mutch wrote:
>
> In article <792e029d.0312110853.4daa825f@posting.google.com>, hamop_62
> @hotmail.com says...
> > This came from another radio group. They are doing a survey to find
> > out why some people do not like the ARRL. I don't like it because it
> > costs to much. If it were $10 a year I might consider joining.
> > Louis
> > >
>
> "snip"
> > >
> > >Bill Pasternak, WA6ITF
> > >
> > >
> >
>
> I *am* a member of ARRL, but do find the membership a little
> steep... I'd go $25,, but will think long and hard about renewing at
> $40.
>
> I think a lot of the long gray vanity call lists of DX and contest
> results should be moved out of QST and onto some sub menu web page where
> the three people who give a damn could look them up. QST is a pretty
> good rag; it can still be improved.

For a member, you don't pay much attention. It has been over a year
since the contest results moved to the web. The Section News in the
back of the mag was also moved. I gave a damn about them. I was kind
of hoping the stuff you find interesting would be moved to the web.

> I object to ARRL's position that we should not be discussing sex,
> politics or religion on the bands...what else is left worth talking
> about?

You can't think of a single thing outside of politics, sex or religion?

> BUT I wish ARRL or *someone* could act effectively to make
> these discussions a bit more civil.

Why would the ARRL even try to do so? The League has no enforcement
powers.

> I don't think ARRL is doing enough of the "right stuff" to attract
> newcomers, particularly youngsters, to the hobby.

The ARRL is you. What have you done to attract newcomers?

> Often the emphasis is
> too much on technolgy and equipment and not enough on the social
> exploration that's possible with our radios.

Not in QST it isn't. Any real technical content was stripped years ago.

> On positive side I think ARRL is still doing a pretty decent job
> representing our interests to the Beltway Bandits.
>
> 73 KC2LVQ

The ARRL doesn't deal much with Beltway bandits. Do you know what a
Beltway Bandit is?

Dave K8MN

4083. Re: W5NETs Christmas Card

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-12 02:15:15 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3FD924BA.8F263899@earthlink.net>
Source record: 83609

Dwight isn't one to let differences stand in the way of Christmas and
for once, we are in total agreement!

Dave K8MN

4084. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-12 02:43:17 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <9X9Cb.15664$P%1.14565398@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 83610

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:ytfBb.7074$7p2.1970@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> "Dee D. Flint" wrote:
> >
> > Such exposure doesn't give anyone
> > sufficient information to make an
> > informed decision.
>
>
> Of course, that's just an opinion, isn't it? You're not an expert on the
> human decision making process and there are no studies to show whether it
is
> or isn't sufficient, right? If not, your opinion is no more valid than
mine.
>
>
> > Again you are NOT reading my words.
> > I've repeatedly stated that one can make
> > judgments based on risks, dangers, and
> > harm even if they have not experienced it.
> > Murder does serious harm and therefore
> > does not need to be experienced.
> > However where such detrimental effects
> > don't come into play, it is not possible to
> > say one does or does not like something
> > unless they have experienced it. (snip)
>
>
> Again, we make decisions each day without personal experience to
> necessarily back it up. This includes who we associate with, who we date,
> what we eat for lunch, what books we buy, what shows we watch on
television,
> whether we marry, and the list goes on virtually forever. And, again, your
> demand for more here shows a serious lack of respect for people's ability
to
> make their own choices.
>
>
> > I refrain from forming opinions on things
> > I've never tried. There will be things that
> > I will never form an opinion on. (snip)
>
>
> I find that very difficult to believe, Dee. Did you try actual marrage

> before actually getting married? Did you try driving on the highway before
> deciding to get a license? Did you try your job before actually taking it?
> Again, there are many things we choose to do or not do without actually
> trying them first.
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
>

Again you are not reading what I wrote. I stated that I avoided forming opinions about whether I would like something without experiencing it. I did not say that I avoided making decisions.

For example, I got a driver's license not because I wanted to drive but because in the area that I lived it was necessary. Mass transit was not an option. I continue to drive because of the convenience of it even though I now live in an area that does have mass transit.. However I absolutely HATE driving. The benefits of driving exceed my dislike of driving.

Since I am not independently wealthy, I have to work and therefore must select a job regardless of whether I can "try it" or not. One weighs the interview results, the benefits, the location, etc and make a selection and then makes a selection on the available data. Sometimes you get one you end up liking and other times you get one that keeps you inspired to make sure your resume is up to date and in circulation.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

4085. Re: Where Did THIS Come From...?!?!a

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-12 03:17:11 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <brbbtj$cfn@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 83612

"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
news:c2356669.0312100959.4bedfc77@posting.google.com...
> "Kim" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:<br6t3n$q42@library2.airnews.net>...
>
> > I'd rather a majority of "our money" (it's really the government's)
> > go right here...in the United States...to rebuild and repair our
> > infrastructure, to all education levels, to assist in the social and
civil
> > disasters that are taking place right here within the boundaries of our
50
> > states. : |
>
> So would I, Kim. Plus a balanced budget.
>
> But it's easy to say that. The hard part is deciding how much you're
> willing to give up to make it happen. By "give up", I mean things like
> higher taxes, higher prices on many things, lifestyle changes, a
> redeining of the USA's role in world politics, etc.
>
> For example, would you be willing to pay the same prices for fuel that
> Western Europeans do? Much of the difference is taxes, not production
> cost. That's why so many Western European countries have such good
> roads, trains and transit systems - because much of the fuel tax goes
> to support clean, efficient public transportation.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>

You know what? I am not so sure that it would take all that much, Jim. I am not even going to pretend to be a financier, but I wonder how much of the Federal Budget, i.e. your and my tax dollars, get spent away from our country. Then, how much foreign debt is "forgiven" each year? It goes on, I was thinking about this on the way to work this morning: oh yeah, not-so-smart subsidies, grants, etc. Salaries on superfluous government personnel *and* programs. I mean, a real mowing down of all the debt that is incurred each year, against what really, really needs to be spent. Pretty quick, and I doubt your dipping into peoples' pockets much at all...really.

But, if it meant a) one tax for all--no tax breaks for any, at about 10-14% per person and entity, b) taxing even religious institutions--anything outside of actual *church* and parish properties, c) cutting the fat from the equation, both in terms of programs and personnel; and there was still a need for higher taxes, I'd be willing to pay my *fair* share.

Kim W5TIT

4086. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-12 03:18:02 UTC
From: Jose <f@freebandjose.net>
Message-ID: <brbc0roio0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 83611
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.cb

I don't lilke the ARRL, because QST does not print
any articles on Freebanding. Freebanding IS more popular
than ham radio, and we represent almost 15 million new
potential ARRL members. Too bad the ARRL Yankees
can't figure this out.

Jose

"Louis C. LeVine" <hamop_62@hotmail.com> wrote in message
news:792e029d.0312110853.4daa825f@posting.google.com...
> This came from another radio group. They are doing a survey to find
> out why some people do not like the ARRL. I don't like it because it
> costs to much. If it were $10 a year I might consider joining.
> Louis
> >
> >Subj: [REPEATER] Off List: ARRL
> >Date: 12/11/2003 5:43:47 AM Pacific Standard Time
> >From: billwa6itf@aol.com
> >Reply-to: hamvideo@juno.com
> >To: Repeater@yahoogroups.com
> >CC: dbellw6aq@aol.com
> >
> >Hi all,
> >
> >This is directed only to those who are NOT currently ARRL members. I
> have
> >agreed to help compile a survey which seeks answers for these two
> questions:
> >
> >1: If you are not a member of the ARRL, why not?
> >
> >2: If you were a member of the ARRL and quit, why?
> >
> >Please respond by December 18th. Please answer only OFF list to
> >hamvideo@juno.com in order keep the clutter on the remailer down.
> >
> >Thank-you for assisting in this survey.
> >
> >Bill Pasternak, WA6ITF
> >
> >

4087. Re: Where Did THIS Come From...?!?!a

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-12 03:25:01 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <hyaCb.15726$P%1.14574944@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 83613

"Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:brbbtj$cfn@library1.airnews.net...
> "N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
> news:c2356669.0312100959.4bedfc77@posting.google.com...
> > "Kim" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> news:<br6t3n$q42@library2.airnews.net>...
> >
> > > I'd rather a majority of "our money" (it's really the government's)
> > > go right here...in the United States...to rebuild and repair our
> > > infrastructure, to all education levels, to assist in the social and
> civil
> > > disasters that are taking place right here within the boundaries of
our
> 50
> > > states. : |
> >
> > So would I, Kim. Plus a balanced budget.
> >
> > But it's easy to say that. The hard part is deciding how much you're
> > willing to give up to make it happen. By "give up", I mean things like
> > higher taxes, higher prices on many things, lifestyle changes, a
> > redeining of the USA's role in world politics, etc.
> >
> > For example, would you be willing to pay the same prices for fuel that
> > Western Europeans do? Much of the difference is taxes, not production
> > cost. That's why so many Western European countries have such good
> > roads, trains and transit systems - because much of the fuel tax goes
> > to support clean, efficient public transportation.
> >
> > 73 de Jim, N2EY
> >
>
> You know what? I am not so sure that it would take all that much, Jim. I
> am not even going to pretend to be a financier, but I wonder how much of
the
> Federal Budget, i.e. your and my tax dollars, get spent away from our
> country. Then, how much foreign debt is "forgiven" each year? It goes
on,
> I was thinking about this on the way to work this morning: oh yeah,
> not-so-smart subsidies, grants, etc. Salaries on superfluous government
> personnel *and* programs. I mean, a real mowing down of all the debt that
> is incurred each year, against what really, really needs to be spent.
> Pretty quick, and I doubt your dipping into peoples' pockets much at
> all...really.

>
> But, if it meant a) one tax for all--no tax breaks for any, at about
10-14%
> per person and entity, b) taxing even religious institutions--anything
> outside of actual *church* and parish properties, c) cutting the fat from
> the equation, both in terms of programs and personnel; and there was still
a
> need for higher taxes, I'd be willing to pay my *fair* share.
>
> Kim W5TIT
>
>

The average person is already paying nearly half their income in taxes if
you include all taxes plus the ones you pay indirectly. This is hardly
reasonable nor would it be reasonable for anyone to pay even more.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

4088. Re: Where Did THIS Come From...?!?!a

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-12 03:35:16 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <BPKdnZ9G5_9Up0SiRVn-sw@gbronline.com>
Source record: 83615

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:

> Jim:
>
> Most EU countries are much better suited for mass transit (meaning light rail
> systems) than is the U.S. as a whole. Sure, they're good in big cities, but
> the
> USA has too many wide open spaces and too much suburban sprawl -- making
> long commutes necessary for the majority of the workforce. This means we're
> going to be dependent on personal, self-driven vehicles for a long time to
> come. Moreover, I don't think that adapting our public transit systems to be
> as accessible and accommodating to the majority of commuters as those in the EU
> would cost far more than they are spending. Remember, they had a headstart on
> their transit systems, dating back to the pre-war era. They also have a higher
> level of cultural acceptence of mass transit -- many EU families have never
> owned an automobile, simply because there was no need (not to mention the
> prohibitive cost).
>
> The long distances which must be travelled by most Americans to get to work and
> go about their daily duties would make EU-style gasoline prices impossible for
> the average person to afford. Our economy depends on cheap, abundant energy,
> available at present-day market rates (or lower) basically in perpetuity. The
> liberal, socialist Democrats think we need to change that and have EU-type
> energy prices, but they hate this country anyway, and want us to be subjugated
> to the EU. These treasonous wackos won't be happy until we revert to a totally
> agrarian society. They are the enemies of the freedom that America stands for,
> and must be treated as such.
>
> Europe will always be different from the U.S., and considering their
> geopolitical realities, it is just the way it should be. However, since most
> of the EU nations would fit inside a couple of our states, America must be
> different. We must consume a larger share of the world's energy simply because
> we have a lot further to go in order to make our own individual social and
> economic contributions. I agree that mass transit should be exploited to the
> greatest extent possible, but it will never replace the need for individual,
> personal mobility -- meaning the private automobile, in all of it's forms.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT

The U.S. does need to develope better mass transit in large
metropolitian areas. When I lived in the Dallas/Ft. Worth, Texas area,
the two cities were always complaining about the heavy commute traffic
and how they were not using the available mass transit system. The would
encourage people to car pool or use what mass transit was available, all
the while they were expanding the freeway system to accomodate more

vehicles. If you want people to use mass transit you have to 1) build a good mass transit system, and 2) don't build massive freeway systems that make it easier for people to drive their vehicles to work than ride mass transit.

4089. Re: W5NETs Christmas Card <- reply to all

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-12 03:36:17 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <RIaCb.12872$Ho3.12015@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 83614

"WA8ULX" [and Others] wrote:
>
> (snip)

I tried to send cards to everyone I've talked to here recently (23 of you in all). However, I'm sure I missed a few. To those I did miss, including those just passing through, let me also wish you an early, but earnest, happy Christmas and new year. The same to those who celebrate Hanukkah, or other celebrations, this holiday season.

I think this is going to be a good Christmas for me - not because of what I'm getting, but because I feel like that will be true. And I'm very much looking forward to a new year filled with new experiences - even the new twists on the old discussions in this newsgroup.

Anyway, with that out of the way, let's get back to those discussions. We have a few more days to argue before Christmas (Hanukkah or whatever) actually gets here.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

4090. Re: Where Did THIS Come From...?!?!a

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-12 03:38:09 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <BPKdnZ5G5_8UpkSiRVn-sw@gbronline.com>
Source record: 83616

Kim W5TIT wrote:

>
>
> You know what? I am not so sure that it would take all that much, Jim. I
> am not even going to pretend to be a financier, but I wonder how much of the
> Federal Budget, i.e. your and my tax dollars, get spent away from our
> country. Then, how much foreign debt is "forgiven" each year?

I would wager we could cut the foreigh aid we send to support those
little pissant dictators in some of those pissant countries and have
more than enough to provide good health care for every citizen.

4091. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-12 04:18:13 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <9kbCb.13002$Ho3.10604@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 83617

"Dee D. Flint" wrote:
>
> Again you are not reading what I wrote.
> I stated that I avoided forming opinions
> about whether I would like something
> without experiencing it. I did not say
> that I avoided making decisions.

Actually, I did read what you wrote, Dee. And, since we all try to look into a subject before forming opinions, and then make decisions based on those opinions, the only difference between our two views is the matter of degree. Unlike you, I don't believe one has to personally experience everything before forming an opinion about it. In fact, I don't think it is even possible.

Regardless, when it comes to code, I suspect most newcomers to ham radio today are a lot like me when I first started - listened to code on the radio, tried a few code training programs, maybe played around with code translation software, and so on, before even beginning to study for that first license exam. While that alone is certainly not enough to make them an expert on code, it is enough to allow them to start forming opinions about it.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

4092. Re: Expirations in 2004

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-12 04:53:19 UTC
From: Alun <alun@1stcounsel.com>
Message-ID: <Xns944EF2FF5BD02elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 83618

"K�HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in
news:_x6Cb.8025$_r6.1795@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net:

```
>
> "N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
>
>> Didn't FCC change the vanity call rules right about then?
>
> No, IIRC Gate 1 of the vanity program opened in May or June of 1996.
>
> 73, de Hans, K0HB
>
>
>
>
>
```

No-code started in '92. I would expect a bump in renewals falling due from last year onwards.

4093. Re: Where Did THIS Come From...?!?!a

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-12 05:15:25 UTC
From: Alun <alun@1stcounsel.com>
Message-ID: <Xns944F29A4453elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 83619

JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in
news:BPKdnZ9G5_9Up0SiRVn-sw@gbronline.com:

> Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>
>
>> Jim:
>>
>> Most EU countries are much better suited for mass transit (meaning
>> light rail systems) than is the U.S. as a whole. Sure, they're good
>> in big cities, but the USA has too many wide open spaces and too much
>> suburban sprawl -- making long commutes necessary for the majority of
>> the workforce. This means we're going to be dependent on personal,
>> self-driven vehicles for a long time to come. Moreover, I don't think
>> that adapting our public transit systems to be as accessible and
>> accommodating to the majority of commuters as those in the EU would
>> cost far more than they are spending. Remember, they had a headstart
>> on their transit systems, dating back to the pre-war era. They also
>> have a higher level of cultural acceptence of mass transit -- many EU
>> families have never owned an automobile, simply because there was no
>> need (not to mention the prohibitive cost).
>>
>> The long distances which must be travelled by most Americans to get to
>> work and go about their daily duties would make EU-style gasoline
>> prices impossible for the average person to afford. Our economy
>> depends on cheap, abundant energy, available at present-day market
>> rates (or lower) basically in perpetuity. The liberal, socialist
>> Democrats think we need to change that and have EU-type energy prices,
>> but they hate this country anyway, and want us to be subjugated to the
>> EU. These treasonous wackos won't be happy until we revert to a
>> totally agrarian society. They are the enemies of the freedom that
>> America stands for, and must be treated as such.
>>
>> Europe will always be different from the U.S., and considering their
>> geopolitical realities, it is just the way it should be. However,
>> since most of the EU nations would fit inside a couple of our states,
>> America must be different. We must consume a larger share of the
>> world's energy simply because we have a lot further to go in order to
>> make our own individual social and economic contributions. I agree
>> that mass transit should be exploited to the greatest extent possible,
>> but it will never replace the need for individual, personal mobility
>> -- meaning the private automobile, in all of it's forms.
>>
>> 73 de Larry, K3LT

>
> The U.S. does need to develope better mass transit in large
> metropolitian areas. When I lived in the Dallas/Ft. Worth, Texas area,
> the two cities were always complaining about the heavy commute traffic
> and how they were not using the available mass transit system. The
> would encourage people to car pool or use what mass transit was
> available, all the while they were expanding the freeway system to
> accomodate more vehicles. If you want people to use mass transit you
> have to 1) build a good mass transit system, and 2) don't build massive
> freeway systems that make it easier for people to drive their vehicles
> to work than ride
> mass transit.
>
>

I think you should build the freeways, but mass transit should be developped much more as well. I used to commute 23 miles each way into London by train. I am now 27 miles by road from downtown Washington DC, but I am 15 miles from the nearest station!!

As long as I have to drive half way there to get to the station I'm going to drive all the way there. A system where the trains only run about 15 miles out from the middle of downtown is basically hopelessly crippled by European standards, and doesn't really count as 'available' to most people.

When most of the commuters live way, way beyond the end of the line it can never live up to it's potential. Sure, we are more spread out in America, but all that should mean is that I may have to drive across town to the station. It should never mean that I have to drive to another town 15 miles away to catch a commuter train, but that's how it is now, and needless to say, I don't do it.

4094. Re: Expirations in 2004

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-12 06:10:35 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.58.0312120617470.6819@kd6lvw.ampr.org>
Source record: 83620

On Wed, 10 Dec 2003, N2EY wrote:
> "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<jUFBb.8762$7p2.1663@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> > The calendar year 2004 has a considerable
> > amount of expirations...well above a normal
> > distribution which would have been about 1/10th
> > of existing hams...or about 63K.
>
> Don't you mean "about 68K", Bill?

More like 73K....

> > The actual future expiratons data from the Joe
> > Speroni web site is over 84K expirations
> > with two months showing very high numbers...
> > almost 11K in May and over 17K in July.
>
> Didn't FCC change the vanity call rules right about then? If so, it
> would explain the spike because getting a vanity call causes an
> automatic renewal regardless of the 90 day rule (so FCC doesn't have
> to pro-rate the fee, IIUC)

That's going to be the 2006 problem.

> > Will be interesting to watch the renewal results.
>
> Yep!
>
> Further clouded by the 90 days before/2 years after rules. If someone
> is a little late renewing, they show up as an expiration.

What's more interesting is the count of those whose licenses expire WITHOUT them
also having expired (i.e. those who DON'T renew, as opposed to those who can't).

4095. Re: Expirations in 2004

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-12 06:16:01 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.58.0312120624010.6819@kd6lvw.ampr.org>
Source record: 83621

On Fri, 12 Dec 2003, Alun wrote:
> "KØHB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in
> news:_x6Cb.8025$_r6.1795@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net:
> >
> > "N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
> >
> >> Didn't FCC change the vanity call rules right about then?
> >
> > No, IIRC Gate 1 of the vanity program opened in May or June of 1996.
> >
> > 73, de Hans, K0HB
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
>
> No-code started in '92. I would expect a bump in renewals falling due from
> last year onwards.

Wrong. Try getting your facts straight:

Testing change: 2/14/1991. First no-code license issued 4/12/1991.

4096. Re: Where Did THIS Come From...?!?!a

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-12 06:49:44 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3FD96511.7B4BEA3E@earthlink.net>
Source record: 83622

JJ wrote:
>
> Kim W5TIT wrote:
>
> >
> >
> > You know what? I am not so sure that it would take all that much, Jim. I
> > am not even going to pretend to be a financier, but I wonder how much of the
> > Federal Budget, i.e. your and my tax dollars, get spent away from our
> > country. Then, how much foreign debt is "forgiven" each year?
>
> I would wager we could cut the foreigh aid we send to support those
> little pissant dictators in some of those pissant countries and have
> more than enough to provide good health care for every citizen.

Foreign aid goes a long way toward having those countries vote in the U.N. in line with our policies. Some of it puts military officers from third world countries through *our* military academies. It gives those officers a chance to live in the U.S. and see how our system works. Some of the aid brings scholars to the U.S. to study. If we build a needed flood control dam in Sierra Leone, good will toward the United States is generated. A decade or so back, Botswana actually weaned itself from U.S. aid and thanked us.

Why would paying for your doctor visits and your medications be the government's responsibility?

Dave K8MN

4097. Re: Where Did THIS Come From...?!?!a

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-12 11:48:15 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <brc9rg$81s@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 83623

"JJ" <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
news:BPKdnZ9G5_9Up0SiRVn-sw@gbronline.com...
> Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>
>
> > Jim:
> >
> > Most EU countries are much better suited for mass transit (meaning light
rail
> > systems) than is the U.S. as a whole. Sure, they're good in big cities,
but
> > the
> > USA has too many wide open spaces and too much suburban sprawl -- making
> > long commutes necessary for the majority of the workforce. This means
we're
> > going to be dependent on personal, self-driven vehicles for a long time
to
> > come. Moreover, I don't think that adapting our public transit systems
to be
> > as accessible and accommodating to the majority of commuters as those in
the EU
> > would cost far more than they are spending. Remember, they had a
headstart on
> > their transit systems, dating back to the pre-war era. They also have a
higher
> > level of cultural acceptence of mass transit -- many EU families have
never
> > owned an automobile, simply because there was no need (not to mention
the
> > prohibitive cost).
> >
> > The long distances which must be travelled by most Americans to get to
work and
> > go about their daily duties would make EU-style gasoline prices
impossible for
> > the average person to afford. Our economy depends on cheap, abundant
energy,
> > available at present-day market rates (or lower) basically in
perpetuity. The
> > liberal, socialist Democrats think we need to change that and have
EU-type
> > energy prices, but they hate this country anyway, and want us to be
subjugated
> > to the EU. These treasonous wackos won't be happy until we revert to a

totally
> > agrarian society. They are the enemies of the freedom that America
stands for,
> > and must be treated as such.
> >
> > Europe will always be different from the U.S., and considering their
> > geopolitical realities, it is just the way it should be. However, since
most
> > of the EU nations would fit inside a couple of our states, America must
be
> > different. We must consume a larger share of the world's energy simply
because
> > we have a lot further to go in order to make our own individual social
and
> > economic contributions. I agree that mass transit should be exploited
to the
> > greatest extent possible, but it will never replace the need for
individual,
> > personal mobility -- meaning the private automobile, in all of it's
forms.
> >
> > 73 de Larry, K3LT
>
> The U.S. does need to develope better mass transit in large
> metropolitian areas. When I lived in the Dallas/Ft. Worth, Texas area,
> the two cities were always complaining about the heavy commute traffic
> and how they were not using the available mass transit system. The would
> encourage people to car pool or use what mass transit was available, all
> the while they were expanding the freeway system to accomodate more
> vehicles. If you want people to use mass transit you have to 1) build a
> good mass transit system, and 2) don't build massive freeway systems
> that make it easier for people to drive their vehicles to work than ride
> mass transit.
>

I tired mass transit when I first started working downtown. Nothing
convenient, friendly, safe, or good about it at all. It was scarey because
of the drivers, inconvenient because I had to work my schedule around
theirs, unfriendly people getting on and off knocking others with their
asses or briefcases, and I'll never do it again.

Kim W5TIT

4098. Re: Where Did THIS Come From...?!?!a

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-12 11:49:30 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <brc9tr$dlc@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 83624

"JJ" <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
news:BPKdnZ5G5_8UpkSiRVn-sw@gbronline.com...
> Kim W5TIT wrote:
>
>
> >
> >
> > You know what? I am not so sure that it would take all that much, Jim.
I
> > am not even going to pretend to be a financier, but I wonder how much of
the
> > Federal Budget, i.e. your and my tax dollars, get spent away from our
> > country. Then, how much foreign debt is "forgiven" each year?
>
> I would wager we could cut the foreigh aid we send to support those
> little pissant dictators in some of those pissant countries and have
> more than enough to provide good health care for every citizen.
>
>

At least the kids and our elderly.

Kim W5TIT

4099. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-12 11:51:03 UTC
From: Marylou@city.net
Message-ID: <3FD9ABA7.81869541@city.net>
Source record: 83626
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.cb

Sir, if you are so interested in having a magazine dedicated to the free banding people why don't you start one. With 15 million, seems that you would end up as a financial wizard.

The ARRL isn't going to print anything about free banding when they operate on frequencies they are not permitted. "Licensing" is the name of the game. "Legal" operation is the name of the game. Maybe you should go back to printing a "CB" magazine, something like there was back in the 60's-70's.

Jose wrote:
>
> I don't lilke the ARRL, because QST does not print
> any articles on Freebanding. Freebanding IS more popular
> than ham radio, and we represent almost 15 million new
> potential ARRL members. Too bad the ARRL Yankees
> can't figure this out.
>
> Jose

4100. Re: Where Did THIS Come From...?!?!a

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-12 12:02:14 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <brcaln$u1f@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 83625

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3FD96511.7B4BEA3E@earthlink.net...
> JJ wrote:
> >
> > Kim W5TIT wrote:
> >
> > >
> > >
> > > You know what? I am not so sure that it would take all that much,
Jim. I
> > > am not even going to pretend to be a financier, but I wonder how much
of the
> > > Federal Budget, i.e. your and my tax dollars, get spent away from our
> > > country. Then, how much foreign debt is "forgiven" each year?
> >
> > I would wager we could cut the foreigh aid we send to support those
> > little pissant dictators in some of those pissant countries and have
> > more than enough to provide good health care for every citizen.
>
> Foreign aid goes a long way toward having those countries vote in the
> U.N. in line with our policies.
>

Yeah, money always has been very easy to throw around, 'specially when it's
someone else's. There's other ways to win friends and influence people--and
ways that would mean a lot more and build better alliances in the longrun.

>
> Some of it puts military officers from
> third world countries through *our* military academies. It gives those
> officers a chance to live in the U.S. and see how our system works.
>

Yeah, so they can go and influence a bunch of rebels in their or other
homelands and train enemies to the US. We don't need someone learning "our"
way of doing things...let them figure it out for themselves.

>
> Some of the aid brings scholars to the U.S. to study.
>

So they can go back to their land, grow a company, and somehow through many
different ways, we end up losing jobs and capital over here.

>
> If we build a

> needed flood control dam in Sierra Leone, good will toward the United
> States is generated.
>

Give them a very, very low interest loan with a good down payment and let
them build their own damned dam.

>
> A decade or so back, Botswana actually weaned
> itself from U.S. aid and thanked us.
>

'Sbout damned time...although I doubt they're as "weaned" as they should be
or are.

>
> Why would paying for your doctor visits and your medications be the
> government's responsibility?
>
> Dave K8MN
>

Uh, because *we live* in this country? So, you disagree with programs that
improve our infrastructure that is pitiful, helps our kids and elderly with
healthcare and even education, begins an effort to ending welfare for the
capable, improves health conditions nationwide--and more, while our
government is off in other lands playing Godfather?! Figures, Dave.

The people of this country who are being taxed to the hilt are paying for
the backbone of crap in this country and the rest of the world. It's time
the rest of the world and the nitwits in this country get pushed out of the
nest. But, of course that ain't happenin' any time soon.

Kim W5TIT

4101. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-12 12:05:41 UTC
From: Marylou@city.net
Message-ID: <3FD9AF15.FBA9AC5D@city.net>
Source record: 83627
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave

"Louis C. LeVine" wrote:
>
> This came from another radio group. They are doing a survey to find
> out why some people do not like the ARRL. I don't like it because it
> costs to much. If it were $10 a year I might consider joining.
> Louis
>
I neither approve of or disapprove of the ARRL.

Yes, the dews are high. If they where lower they could attract more potential members. With the majority of hams being senior citizens, the ARRL needs to take that into consideration when it comes to dews. WE all know that seniors are on a fixed income. Members should be given a choice of what magazine they would like when joining the ARRL.

I showed a copy of QST to a new ham friend and ash him if he was interested. His comment after looking over the magazine was: The magazine is to technical for him and most likely other new hams, the cost for membership is to high.

For me, the ARRL reminds me of the Federal Government. We elect the officials who are supposed to be working for the membership, but they do as they darn well please once they are in office. Who is in bed with whom.

I dropped my membership for the reasons I have stated above.

4102. Re: Expirations in 2004

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-12 13:20:09 UTC
From: Alun <alun@1stcounsel.com>
Message-ID: <Xns944F54CA24D17elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 83628

"D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> wrote in
news:Pine.LNX.4.58.0312120624010.6819@kd6lvw.ampr.org:

> On Fri, 12 Dec 2003, Alun wrote:
>> "K&#65533;HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in
>> news:_x6Cb.8025$_r6.1795@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net:
>> >
>> > "N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
>> >
>> >> Didn't FCC change the vanity call rules right about then?
>> >
>> > No, IIRC Gate 1 of the vanity program opened in May or June of 1996.
>> >
>> > 73, de Hans, K0HB
>> >
>> >
>> >
>> >
>> >
>>
>> No-code started in '92. I would expect a bump in renewals falling due
>> from last year onwards.
>
> Wrong. Try getting your facts straight:
>
> Testing change: 2/14/1991. First no-code license issued 4/12/1991.
>

I see, December '91 instead of some time in '92. Not exactly a huge error,
is it? The first batch were all people who had taken the theory tests at
Anne Arundel ARC before no-code licences were actually introduced, and so
were ready to go when it came in. I think you may find that those six
people had the only no-code licences issued in the US in '91!

4103. Re: Where Did THIS Come From...?!?!a

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-12 13:26:43 UTC
From: Alun <alun@1stcounsel.com>
Message-ID: <Xns944F55E6CD1A5elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 83629

"Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote in
news:brcaln$u1f@library1.airnews.net:

> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:3FD96511.7B4BEA3E@earthlink.net...
>> JJ wrote:
>> >
>> > Kim W5TIT wrote:
>> >
>> > >
>> > >
>> > > You know what? I am not so sure that it would take all that much,
>> > > Jim. I am not even going to pretend to be a financier, but I
>> > > wonder how much of the Federal Budget, i.e. your and my tax
>> > > dollars, get spent away from our country. Then, how much foreign
>> > > debt is "forgiven" each year?
>> >
>> > I would wager we could cut the foreigh aid we send to support those
>> > little pissant dictators in some of those pissant countries and have
>> > more than enough to provide good health care for every citizen.
>>
>> Foreign aid goes a long way toward having those countries vote in the
>> U.N. in line with our policies.
>>
>
> Yeah, money always has been very easy to throw around, 'specially when
> it's someone else's. There's other ways to win friends and influence
> people--and ways that would mean a lot more and build better alliances
> in the longrun.
>
>>
>> Some of it puts military officers from
>> third world countries through *our* military academies. It gives
>> those officers a chance to live in the U.S. and see how our system
>> works.
>>
>
> Yeah, so they can go and influence a bunch of rebels in their or other
> homelands and train enemies to the US. We don't need someone learning
> "our" way of doing things...let them figure it out for themselves.
>
>>
>> Some of the aid brings scholars to the U.S. to study.
>>

>
> So they can go back to their land, grow a company, and somehow through
> many different ways, we end up losing jobs and capital over here.
>
>>
>> If we build a
>> needed flood control dam in Sierra Leone, good will toward the United
>> States is generated.
>>
>
> Give them a very, very low interest loan with a good down payment and
> let them build their own damned dam.
>
>
>>
>> A decade or so back, Botswana actually weaned
>> itself from U.S. aid and thanked us.
>>
>
> 'Sbout damned time...although I doubt they're as "weaned" as they
> should be or are.
>
>>
>> Why would paying for your doctor visits and your medications be the
>> government's responsibility?
>>
>> Dave K8MN
>>
>
> Uh, because *we live* in this country? So, you disagree with programs
> that improve our infrastructure that is pitiful, helps our kids and
> elderly with healthcare and even education, begins an effort to ending
> welfare for the capable, improves health conditions nationwide--and
> more, while our government is off in other lands playing Godfather?!
> Figures, Dave.
>
> The people of this country who are being taxed to the hilt are paying
> for the backbone of crap in this country and the rest of the world.
> It's time the rest of the world and the nitwits in this country get
> pushed out of the nest. But, of course that ain't happenin' any time
> soon.
>
> Kim W5TIT
>
>
>

FWIW I agree 100% with you, Kim. Paying for health care and mass transit would be far more worthwhile than most of the things the government does with tax revenue. Their priorities are completely backwards.

4104. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-12 14:14:09 UTC
From: Jose <f@freebandjose.net>
Message-ID: <brcif2$5vj$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 83630
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.cb

You should really self-examine the hatred in your heart, especially during this festive of seasons. Alfa-Tango International is the licensing authority.

Feliz Navidad,

Jose

<Marylou@city.net> wrote in message news:3FD9ABA7.81869541@city.net...
> Sir, if you are so interested in having a magazine dedicated to the free
> banding people why don't you start one. With 15 million, seems that you
> would end up as a financial wizard.
>
> The ARRL isn't going to print anything about free banding when they
> operate on frequencies they are not permitted. "Licensing" is the name
> of the game. "Legal" operation is the name of the game. Maybe you should
> go back to printing a "CB" magazine, something like there was back in
> the 60's-70's.
>
> Jose wrote:
> >
> > I don't lilke the ARRL, because QST does not print
> > any articles on Freebanding. Freebanding IS more popular
> > than ham radio, and we represent almost 15 million new
> > potential ARRL members. Too bad the ARRL Yankees
> > can't figure this out.
> >
> > Jose

4105. Re: Expirations in 2004

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-12 16:13:50 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <2PICb.387$Pg1.191@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 83631

"Alun" <alun@1stcounsel.com> wrote

> I think you may find that those six
> people had the only no-code licences issued in the US in '91!

Hardly! The first ones were issued in April of 91, and they issued somewhat
more than 6 Tech license in the next 8 months.

73, de Hans, K0HB

4106. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-12 17:36:57 UTC
From: Radioman <radio@ptt.edu>
Message-ID: <3FD9FCB9.9099EC70@ptt.edu>
Source record: 83632
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.cb

> Alfa-Tango International is the
> licensing authority.

LMFAO!!!!

4107. Re: W5NETs Christmas Card

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-12 17:50:08 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <kdnCb.625$5B.10@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 83633

"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20031211185408.12223.00000779@mb-m05.aol.com...
> >I got one from Dwight also. Thanks a lot. And a Merry Christmas back to
> >you.
> >
> >Wonder if he checked with the PC Police ??
> >
> >Dan/W4NTI
>
> Yea Dan thats what im wondering. I cant believe the PC Police would
approve
> such a thing. May its a attempt by NCI and all the No-Coders to try and
switch
> us to there side.
> Who knows Dan, maybe Andy is in on this. Anyway check your mail box close
Dan,
> who knows what they are up to.
> On second thought Dan, maybe TIT will send us a Photo on her Card.

Thanks for the advice....I think I already got one from TWIT. It was a
large roll of toilet paper, labled Hug and Chalk pads.

Dan/W4NTI

4108. Re: Where Did THIS Come From...?!?!a

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-12 17:58:45 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0312120958.2e3a6146@posting.google.com>
Source record: 83634

yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) wrote in message
news:<20031211204412.15462.00004851@mb-m06.aol.com>...
> In article <c2356669.0312100959.4bedfc77@posting.google.com>, N2EY@AOL.COM
> (N2EY) writes:
>
> >For example, would you be willing to pay the same prices for fuel that
> >Western Europeans do? Much of the difference is taxes, not production
> >cost. That's why so many Western European countries have such good
> >roads, trains and transit systems - because much of the fuel tax goes
> >to support clean, efficient public transportation.
> >
> >73 de Jim, N2EY
>
> Jim:
>
> Most EU countries are much better suited for mass transit (meaning light rail
> systems) than is the U.S. as a whole. Sure, they're good in big cities, but
> the
> USA has too many wide open spaces and too much suburban sprawl -- making
> long commutes necessary for the majority of the workforce.

We can't fix the wide open spaces, but we *can* do something about
suburban sprawl.

The transportation situations in the USA and Europe are the way they
are today because of choices made by *people*. Where and how to live,
work and vacation/recreate, what sort of house and car to buy, what
politicians to elect, etc. etc.

> This means we're
> going to be dependent on personal, self-driven vehicles for a long time to
> come.

And the time to start changing that is now. Doesn't mean we have to
give up our cars, just that we can develop and implement alternatives.

> Moreover, I don't think that adapting our public transit systems to be
> as accessible and accommodating to the majority of commuters as those in the > EU would
cost far more than they are spending.

Most transit systems in the USA struggle to continue operations. A lot
of that is due to factors like precarious funding.

> Remember, they had a headstart on
> their transit systems, dating back to the pre-war era.

You have to be kidding!

The USA had extensive mass transit long before WW1. Much of it was
removed and *destroyed* after WW2 in the USA. In EU, much of it was
destroyed in WW2 and rebuilt afterwards.

It's all about choices.

> They also have a higher
> level of cultural acceptence of mass transit -- many EU families have never
> owned an automobile, simply because there was no need (not to mention the
> prohibitive cost).

The USA used to be like that, in many places. I grew up in suburban
Philadelphia, and most families had only one car. And we kids did not
need auto transportation to do everything a kid usually does.
School, sports, church, running errands for Mom and Dad, visiting
friends, the library, etc. - none of that required auto transport.
Most of it didn't even require a bike.

And for some pocket change, we could go almost anywhere in the city or
surrounding suburbs.

> The long distances which must be travelled by most Americans to get to work and
> go about their daily duties would make EU-style gasoline prices impossible for
> the average person to afford.

Only if we insist on driving inefficient cars as much as we do now.

> Our economy depends on cheap, abundant energy,
> available at present-day market rates (or lower) basically in perpetuity.

That can and must be changed. It makes us too vulnerable. It's a
national security issue.

> The
> liberal, socialist Democrats think we need to change that and have EU-type
> energy prices, but they hate this country anyway, and want us to be subjugated
> to the EU.

> These treasonous wackos won't be happy until we revert to a totally
> agrarian society. They are the enemies of the freedom that America stands
> for, and must be treated as such.

That's pure bullshit, Larry. Pure unadulterated bullshit. There's no
other word for it.

It's not about liberals or conservatives, Republicans or Democrats.
It's about sound engineering and planning for the future.

How much "freedom" is there in being at the economic mercy of foreign
governments deciding to reduce the production of oil, or jack up its
price artificially, as was done twice in the 1970s?

How much "treason" is there in saying that the USA should be as
self-reliant as possible so that we don't have to do business with
(and line the pockets of) anyone who doesn't support our principles of
freedom?

How "wacko" is it to realize that clean air and water aren't luxuries
but necessities - and that they cost less than the health problems
resulting from pollution?

> Europe will always be different from the U.S., and considering their
> geopolitical realities, it is just the way it should be. However, since most
> of the EU nations would fit inside a couple of our states, America must be
> different.

Of course!

I'm *not* saying we must give up our cars. Just reduce our dependence
on them, and increase their efficiency. It *can* be done, if we choose
to do it.

> We must consume a larger share of the world's energy simply
> because
> we have a lot further to go in order to make our own individual social and
> economic contributions.

Not true at all.

The key is *efficiency*.

Consider this:

Half a century ago, the New York Central's 20th Century Limited ran a
consistent 16 hour schedule from New York to Chicago. That's 961 miles
in 960 minutes, including engine change at Harmon, at least ten
station stops, bridges, curves, grades, etc. On jointed rail and
wooden ties with steam and first-generation diesel locomotives. 16
hours downtown to downtown, and the service was dependable and
comfortable.

That sort of travel was largely replaced by air travel, which only
takes about a two-hour flight. However, it takes at least an hour to
get to and from the airport, and with security you need to be at the
airport two hours before flight time, so the *real* travel time is
more like six hours, downtown to downtown.

The French TGV trains run at close to 200 mph in revenue service. (You
don't want to know how fast they have gone in tests). That sort of
technology could cut the NYC-Chicago time down to about six hours if
station stops were limited - and it's safer, pollutes less, and is
much more efficient than air travel or private autos. And it's less
affected by weather. Imagine the country linked by such a highspeed
system, with local transit to complete the journey.

And that's just one example of existing technology. Don't you think
Americans could improve on that?

The only problem is making the *choice* to do it.

> I agree that mass transit should be exploited to the
> greatest extent possible, but it will never replace the need for individual,

> personal mobility -- meaning the private automobile, in all of it's forms.

Nor does it need to!

73 de Jim, N2EY

4109. Bill Pasternak a real asshole

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-12 18:06:20 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <wsnCb.655$5B.489@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 83635

Hey asshole Bill,

I did not initiate this little group. It was started by K1MAN. I did remove you, but before I did I get this in MY mailbox.

Furthermore, stop threatning me. Who cares if you don't want K1MAN's SPAM. Take it up with Glenn. How about YOU STAYING OUT OF MY MAILBOX ???

Oh, One more thing....since you don't seem to mind K1MAN qrming the bands with your newsline. When the crap hits the fan hopefully your going to slide into it too.

Have a nice day.

Dan/W4NTI

Dear Sir,

I asked you once to remove me from your K1MAN SPAM LIST. Obviously you did not understand me. Hence, as of this moment, all mail from you to ANY ARNewsline e-mail account is blocked. This matter is closed to further discussion.

Bill Pasternak, WA6ITF
Writer - Producer
The Amateur Radio Newsline, Inc.
wa6itf@arnewsline.org
http://www.arnewsline.org
"Since 1976 - Hobby Radio News
for Todays Radio Amateur"

4110. Re: Where Did THIS Come From...?!?!a

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-12 18:08:15 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0312121008.4a7b8194@posting.google.com>
Source record: 83636

"Kim " <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote in message news:<brc9tr$dlc@library1.airnews.net>...
> "JJ" <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
> news:BPKdnZ5G5_8UpkSiRVn-sw@gbronline.com...
> > Kim wrote:

> > > You know what? I am not so sure that it would take all that much, Jim.

Look up where your federal tax dollars are being spent.

> I
> > > am not even going to pretend to be a financier, but I wonder how much of
> the
> > > Federal Budget, i.e. your and my tax dollars, get spent away from our
> > > country.

Much of that is military spending.

Foreign aid constitutes about 1% of Federal spending.

>Then, how much foreign debt is "forgiven" each year?

Not much.
> >
> > I would wager we could cut the foreigh aid we send to support those
> > little pissant dictators in some of those pissant countries and have
> > more than enough to provide good health care for every citizen.
>
> At least the kids and our elderly.
>
You'd lose those bets.

Check out how much is spent on foreign aid vs. how much is spent on
Medicare alone.

And recall that a lot depends on how spending is categorized. For
example, are benefits paid to and for veterans and their families
"defense spending" or "human resources spending"? When the Army Corps
of Engineers restores critical infrastructure in Iraq or Afghanistan,
is that "foreign aid" or "defense spending"? How about when the
National Guard is called out in a domestic disaster like a flood?

The 800 pound budget gorillas are defense spending, Medicare and
Social Security. The rest is table scraps.

73 de Jim, N2EY

4111. K1MAN starts ANOTHER frequency war.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-12 18:18:11 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <DDnCb.661$5B.458@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 83637
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

Not content to leave things alone. Glenn Baxter, K1MAN has threatened ANOTHER hostile takeover of a frequency.

Glenn is now claiming the Feds are jamming his 75 meter SSB blabcast. And is demanding everyone around his 'new chosen home' of 3977 to clear out.

Word is those that were told to clear out OR ELSE (more bogus afidavits eh Glenn?) told him to take a flying F*&& at a rolling donut.

And one more thing boys and girls, he and his Polish gentlemen are planning a hostile move to 14.275. This after being thrown off the frequency previously.

How the worm turns.

This from your humble reporter and ever observant listener.

Dan/W4NTI

4112. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-12 18:20:56 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <cGnCb.663$5B.278@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 83638
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.cb

"Jose" <f@freebandjose.net> wrote in message
news:brbc0roio0@pita.alt.net...
> I don't lilke the ARRL, because QST does not print
> any articles on Freebanding. Freebanding IS more popular
> than ham radio, and we represent almost 15 million new
> potential ARRL members. Too bad the ARRL Yankees
> can't figure this out.
>
> Jose
>
>
> "Louis C. LeVine" <hamop_62@hotmail.com> wrote in message
> news:792e029d.0312110853.4daa825f@posting.google.com...
> > This came from another radio group. They are doing a survey to find
> > out why some people do not like the ARRL. I don't like it because it
> > costs to much. If it were $10 a year I might consider joining.
> > Louis
> > >
> > >Subj: [REPEATER] Off List: ARRL
> > >Date: 12/11/2003 5:43:47 AM Pacific Standard Time
> > >From: billwa6itf@aol.com
> > >Reply-to: hamvideo@juno.com
> > >To: Repeater@yahoogroups.com
> > >CC: dbellw6aq@aol.com
> > >
> > >Hi all,
> > >
> > >This is directed only to those who are NOT currently ARRL members. I
> > have
> > >agreed to help compile a survey which seeks answers for these two
> > questions:
> > >
> > >1: If you are not a member of the ARRL, why not?
> > >
> > >2: If you were a member of the ARRL and quit, why?
> > >
> > >Please respond by December 18th. Please answer only OFF list to
> > >hamvideo@juno.com in order keep the clutter on the remailer down.
> > >
> > >Thank-you for assisting in this survey.
> > >
> > >Bill Pasternak, WA6ITF
> > >

> > >
>
>

A troll of course. But to enlightnen the uneducated;

From the front cover of QST.

"Official Journal of ARRL The national association for AMATEUR RADIO"

Any questions JOSE?

Dan/W4NTI

4113. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-12 18:34:06 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <ySnCb.679$5B.393@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 83639
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave

<Marylou@city.net> wrote in message news:3FD9AF15.FBA9AC5D@city.net...
>
>
> "Louis C. LeVine" wrote:
> >
> > This came from another radio group. They are doing a survey to find
> > out why some people do not like the ARRL. I don't like it because it
> > costs to much. If it were $10 a year I might consider joining.
> > Louis
> >
> I neither approve of or disapprove of the ARRL.
>
> Yes, the dews are high. If they where lower they could attract more
> potential members. With the majority of hams being senior citizens, the
> ARRL needs to take that into consideration when it comes to dews. WE all
> know that seniors are on a fixed income. Members should be given a
> choice of what magazine they would like when joining the ARRL.
>
> I showed a copy of QST to a new ham friend and ash him if he was
> interested. His comment after looking over the magazine was: The
> magazine is to technical for him and most likely other new hams, the
> cost for membership is to high.
>
> For me, the ARRL reminds me of the Federal Government. We elect the
> officials who are supposed to be working for the membership, but they do
> as they darn well please once they are in office. Who is in bed with
> whom.
>
> I dropped my membership for the reasons I have stated above.

A choice of magazines? Explain please.

Its a bureaucracy. And according to Doctor Peters, who wrote a book called
'Peters principle' many years ago:

"In a bureaucracy everyone will eventually arise to their level of
incompetence"

Dan/W4NTI

4114. Re: K1MAN starts ANOTHER frequency war.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-12 18:45:50 UTC
From: Radioman <radio@ptt.edu>
Message-ID: <3FDA0CDE.7CBE13AA@ptt.edu>
Source record: 83640
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

Can you say "License Revocation"?

I knew you could!!!!!!

4115. Re: Expirations in 2004

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-12 19:02:00 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <IgoCb.696$X97.117@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 83641

"D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> wrote in message
news:Pine.LNX.4.58.0312120617470.6819@kd6lvw.ampr.org...
> On Wed, 10 Dec 2003, N2EY wrote:
> > "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<jUFBb.8762$7p2.1663@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> > > The calendar year 2004 has a considerable
> > > amount of expirations...well above a normal
> > > distribution which would have been about 1/10th
> > > of existing hams...or about 63K.
> > >
> > Don't you mean "about 68K", Bill?
>
> More like 73K....

I think Jim has it correct. The existing
ham base is 683K, so an even distribution
of those license renewals over a 10 year
span would net 68K renewals per year...if
they were evenly distributed.

> > > The actual future expiratons data from the Joe
> > > Speroni web site is over 84K expirations
> > > with two months showing very high numbers...
> > > almost 11K in May and over 17K in July.
> > >
> > Didn't FCC change the vanity call rules right about then? If so, it
> > would explain the spike because getting a vanity call causes an
> > automatic renewal regardless of the 90 day rule (so FCC doesn't have
> > to pro-rate the fee, IIUC)
>
> That's going to be the 2006 problem.
>
> > > Will be interesting to watch the renewal results.
> > >
> > Yep!
> > >
> > Further clouded by the 90 days before/2 years after rules. If someone
> > is a little late renewing, they show up as an expiration.
>
> What's more interesting is the count of those whose licenses expire
WITHOUT them
> also having expired (i.e. those who DON'T renew, as opposed to those who
can't).

How can you tell the difference?

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

4116. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-12 19:04:28 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3FDA113C.9000908@psu.edu>
Source record: 83644
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.cb

Gri¿½mwi¿½tch thi¿½ i¿½nfli¿½ppi¿½bli¿½ wrote:
> "Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote
>
> :
> : And the alternitive is?
> :
>
> DARC works good for us.

So you went over to the DARC side?

- Mike KB3EIA -

4117. Re: W5NETs Christmas Card

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-12 19:12:06 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031212141206.15374.00000775@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 83642

>Thanks for the advice....I think I already got one from TWIT. It was a
>large roll of toilet paper, labled Hug and Chalk pads.
>
>Dan/W4NTI

I was wondering where that came from

4118. Re: Where Did THIS Come From...?!?!a

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-12 19:16:45 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <xuoCb.914$Pg1.299@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 83643

"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote

> The 800 pound budget gorillas are defense spending, Medicare and
> Social Security.

Social Security is pretty much self-funded, and in fact has been tapped from
time to time for deficits in the general fund.

4119. Re: Where Did THIS Come From...?!?!a

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-12 19:16:55 UTC
From: dennis@wawa.juniper.net
Message-ID: <brd477$2q9r$1@heap.juniper.net>
Source record: 83646

Dee D. Flint <deehays@qix.net> wrote:
>"Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote in message
>news:brbbtj$cfn@library1.airnews.net...
>> But, if it meant a) one tax for all--no tax breaks for any, at about
>10-14%
>> per person and entity, b) taxing even religious institutions--anything
>> outside of actual *church* and parish properties, c) cutting the fat from
>> the equation, both in terms of programs and personnel; and there was still
>a
>> need for higher taxes, I'd be willing to pay my *fair* share.
>>
>> Kim W5TIT
>>
>>
>
>The average person is already paying nearly half their income in taxes if
>you include all taxes plus the ones you pay indirectly. This is hardly
>reasonable nor would it be reasonable for anyone to pay even more.

Where did your 50% number for the average person come from? Since revenues from all levels of government, as well as the nation's gross income, are well known, the average of all taxes isn't a difficult number to compute with some precision.

In fact the Tax Foundation (which should be called the Anti-Tax Foundation, their interests would never lead them to underestimate this number) does exactly this to calculate their "Tax Freedom Day", seen at

http://www.taxfoundation.org/taxfreedomday.html

Tax freedom day this year was April 19, meaning the average total tax burden was 30%. Note that the tax burden for the median wage earner was probably somewhat less than this since higher tax rates on corporate income and the wealthy tend to skew the average higher (see the "Q&A about critiques..." link on the same page).

I hence can't see how you concluded that the average American's total tax burden is anywhere near 50% of their income. I also recently saw (but have since lost) a table which showed comparative tax burdens for 36 industrialized nations. Only the northern-most European countries have total tax burdens in the 50% ballpark, while US taxes in 2003 were 35th on the list, with only Mexico lower (in 2000, Japan and Korea were also lower). Not that this suggests the US is in any way under-taxed; if you add in the additional 12% of income spent on private medical care you end up within a few percent, plus or minus, of the tax burdens in Canada and (south-)Western European countries which fund medical care via taxes.

I don't know how you define what is "reasonable" for someone to pay, and I certainly wish I paid less tax rather than more, but it is the case that you get about what you pay for. For an example of an industrialized country with significantly lower taxes one can look to, say, China, and observe that to get this tax rate one would also need to live with China-like infrastructure and services. This isn't a tradeoff I'd recommend, personally.

Dennis Ferguson

4120. Re: K1MAN starts ANOTHER frequency war.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-12 19:17:44 UTC
From: Carmen <carmensrt@XXhotmail.com>
Message-ID: <VroCb.108$qq.7@bignews1.bellsouth.net>
Source record: 83645
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

Hello,
"Radioman" <radio@ptt.edu> wrote in message
news:3FDA0CDE.7CBE13AA@ptt.edu...
> Can you say "License Revocation"?
>
> I knew you could!!!!!!

Having read of Mr. Baxter's antics over the years, as well as the ineffectual response (ineffectual in the sense that his behavior problems persist and he still has a license) I'm not holding my breath. It's doubtful that anything short of prison is going to keep him from misusing radios.

Carmen

4121. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-12 19:57:50 UTC
From: Roger Gt <Xenot@pacbell.net>
Message-ID: <25pCb.37964$2V1.28337@newssvr29.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 83647
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave

"Dan/W4NTI" wrote in message

> Its a bureaucracy. And according to Doctor Peters, who wrote a book
called
> 'Peters principle' many years ago:

I believe you meant the "Peter principal" named after the author Peter F.
Drucker.
He was a management guru!

4122. Re: Where Did THIS Come From...?!?!a

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-12 19:57:55 UTC
From: dennis@wawa.juniper.net
Message-ID: <brd6k3$6p$1@heap.juniper.net>
Source record: 83648

JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote:
>Kim W5TIT wrote:
>> You know what? I am not so sure that it would take all that much, Jim. I
>> am not even going to pretend to be a financier, but I wonder how much of the
>> Federal Budget, i.e. your and my tax dollars, get spent away from our
>> country. Then, how much foreign debt is "forgiven" each year?
>
>I would wager we could cut the foreigh aid we send to support those
>little pissant dictators in some of those pissant countries and have
>more than enough to provide good health care for every citizen.

You would lose that wager big time. The total US foreign aid budget
for 2001 (the last year I can find) was $15 billion, half of which went
to Isreal and some of its Arab neighbors. The total spending on health
care in the US in 2001 was $1.4 trillion, about 100 times the amount.

I don't know where the myth that the US spends a huge amount on foreign
aid came from. As a fraction of GDP the US foreign aid budget is the
stingiest among developed countries, and the money is usually spent on
things which advance some US foreign policy interest. It is way, way
cheaper than sending the military somewhere to advance some US foreign
policy interest.

Dennis Ferguson

4123. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-12 20:12:56 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <cjpCb.946$Pg1.267@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 83649
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave

"Roger Gt" <Xenot@pacbell.net> wrote

> I believe you meant the "Peter principal" named after the author Peter F.
> Drucker. He was a management guru!

No, he meant the "The Peter Priciple", from the book by that title written
by Dr. Laurence J. Peter and Raymond Hull.

Peter Drucker had nothing to do with it.

Good luck on this one now!

73, de Hans, K0HB

4124. Re: Where Did THIS Come From...?!?!a

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-12 20:30:14 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <I5KdnUcgK997u0eiRVn-gQ@gbronline.com>
Source record: 83650

Dave Heil wrote:

>
> Why would paying for your doctor visits and your medications be the
> government's responsibility?
>
> Dave K8MN

Do you pay for all your doctor visits and medications, or does some insurance pay for a good portion of it? I suppose when you are eligible for Medicare you are going to refuse it, after all,it should not be the governments responsibility to pay for your medical, Right?

4125. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-12 20:31:52 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <I5KdnUYgK9_SukeiRVn-gQ@gbronline.com>
Source record: 83751
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.cb

Jose wrote:

> I don't lilke the ARRL, because QST does not print
> any articles on Freebanding. Freebanding IS more popular
> than ham radio, and we represent almost 15 million new
> potential ARRL members. Too bad the ARRL Yankees
> can't figure this out.
>
> Jose

Why should the ARRL or anyone else, support a bunch of illegal law
breaking operators?

4126. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-12 20:37:50 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <6b2dnVV8sMpGtUei4p2dnA@gbronline.com>
Source record: 83752
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.cb

Jose wrote:

> You should really self-examine the hatred in your heart, especially
> during this festive of seasons. Alfa-Tango International is the
> licensing authority.

And it has no authority other than what it self subscribes. The FCC is the only authority that can issue licenses to use the radio spectrum in the U.S. and other countries have their own license structure. Alfa-Tango International has no authority to issue licenses for any use of the radio spectrum. It is just more "freeband" nonsense, and there is no "freeband" in the U.S. as those frequencies you use as a "freeband" are allocated to other services who have ligitimate licenses to use those frequencies. You ATI license isn't worth the paper it is written on and carries no authority whatsoever.

4127. Re: W5NETs Christmas Card

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-12 21:00:45 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0312121300.17572201@posting.google.com>
Source record: 83753

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3FD924BA.8F263899@earthlink.net>...
> Dwight isn't one to let differences stand in the way of Christmas and
> for once, we are in total agreement!
>
> Dave K8MN

Anyone heard from Dick/W0EX? Hope he's OK. Brian

4128. Re: light bulbs in rrap

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-12 21:02:53 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0312121302.14742b4c@posting.google.com>
Source record: 83754

"K7JEB" <k7jeb.remove_this@qsl.net> wrote in message
news:<2M8Cb.699$J77.253@fed1read07>...
> > > Is that an incandescent light bulb, or a flourescent light bulb? :)
> > >
> > > HOWL! I must have forgotten - 1 person to ask that question!!
> >
> > And another dozen to assert that an LED isn't a *real*
> > lightbulb because it never needs changing.
> >
> > K7JEB

I've only had to change one (1) so far.

4129. Re: Where Did THIS Come From...?!?!a

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-12 21:21:14 UTC
From: dennis@wawa.juniper.net
Message-ID: <brdbga$c91$1@heap.juniper.net>
Source record: 83755

K�HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote:
>"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote
>
>
>> The 800 pound budget gorillas are defense spending, Medicare and
>> Social Security.
>
>Social Security is pretty much self-funded, and in fact has been tapped from
>time to time for deficits in the general fund.

Social Security has only been separately accounted for since 1986. Before that payroll tax revenue and SS expenditures went to and from the general fund and so were indistiguishable from other taxes and expenditures, which is where the habit of lumping it all together came from. SS has been generating a surplus since Reagan raised the payroll tax (in 1983 or so) and separated out the accounting, and I think now SS owns over $3 trillion in US government debt.

This is with baby boomers still working, however. Since the separately accounted SS is essentially an insurance policy its financial health needs to be determined from actuarial tables, rather than from a simple current balance, since most SS liabilities are still in the future. The fact that SS was actuarily insolvent in the early 80's was why Reagan (back in the days when there was some adult attention paid to the country's fiscal state) cranked up the payroll tax to ensure that current surpluses sufficient to cover future liabilities were generated.

The only reason I point this out is that the current Congress generated a report a couple of years ago showing that SS would be unable to meet its obligations by, I think, 2014. The study reached this result by assuming the federal debt owed to SS would never be repaid, which suggests that the current government is again treating the payroll tax and SS payments as contributions to and expenditures from the general fund.

Dennis Ferguson

4130. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-12 22:33:25 UTC
From: Kee Low Cycle <k@mrkeelow.org>
Message-ID: <brdfnn$a0g$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 83756
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.cb

"JJ" <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
news:6b2dnVV8sMpGtUei4p2dnA@gbronline.com...
> Jose wrote:
>
> > You should really self-examine the hatred in your heart, especially
> > during this festive of seasons. Alfa-Tango International is the
> > licensing authority.
>
> And it has no authority other than what it self subscribes. The FCC is
> the only authority that can issue licenses to use the radio spectrum in
> the U.S. and other countries have their own license structure.
> Alfa-Tango International has no authority to issue licenses for any use
> of the radio spectrum. It is just more "freeband" nonsense, and there is
> no "freeband" in the U.S. as those frequencies you use as a "freeband"
> are allocated to other services who have ligitimate licenses to use
> those frequencies. You ATI license isn't worth the paper it is written
> on and carries no authority whatsoever.
>

BBZZZZZZZZZT! Wrong answer Goofy.

And you just opened your No-Code Tech mouth and inserted your fat
foot into it. Although ATI is not recognized by the American FCC,
ATI is recognized by several foreign governments, especially in
South America & Central America. Go back to helping Ox chase
trucks. HAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHHAHAHAHA
HAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHHAAH
ROTFLMAO!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!
LOL LOL LOL LOL LOL LOL LOL LOL LOL LOL LOL

4131. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-12 22:35:36 UTC
From: Roger Gt <Xenot@pacbell.net>
Message-ID: <YorCb.38097$EQ3.17335@newssvr29.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 83757
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave

Thanks, I couldn't see a connection with Drucker!
So it is spelled "Priciple"? That would explain why I didn't find it!

This one?

About the Author
Before Dr. Laurence Peter's death in 1988, he was a professor of education at the University of Southern California and at the University of British Columbia.
Raymond Hull lives in British Columbia.

This best-selling business classic of more than twenty-five years' duration is a dead-on account of why boredom, bungling, and bad management are built into every organization. Through hilarious case histories and cartoons adapted from Punch, Dr. Peter shows how America's corporate career track drives employees relentlessly upward -- until they get promoted into jobs they just can't do and wind up desperately treading water, driving their colleagues crazy, and dragging down productivity and profit.

---

73 OM DE K7DUP

"K&#65533;HB" wrote in message n
> "Roger Gt" wrote
> > I believe you meant the "Peter principal" named after the author Peter F.
> > Drucker. He was a management guru!
>
> No, he meant the "The Peter Priciple", from the book by that title written
> by Dr. Laurence J. Peter and Raymond Hull.
>
> Peter Drucker had nothing to do with it.
> Good luck on this one now!
> 73, de Hans, K0HB

4132. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-12 23:38:19 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3FDA516B.4030008@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 83758
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.cb

Kï¿½HB wrote:

>"William Mutch" <wcm1@NOSPAM.cornell.edu> wrote
>
>
>
>>I think a lot of the long gray vanity call lists of DX and contest
>>results should be moved out of QST and onto some sub menu web page where
>>the three people who give a damn could look them up.
>>
>>
>
>You must have been distracted by a passing bimbo or something, but DXCC
>listings were removed from QST several years ago and moved to the DXCC
>Annual Report which goes only to DXCC participants.
>
>
>
What's that on page 94-99 of the August 2003 QST then?

4133. Re: K1MAN starts ANOTHER frequency war.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-12 23:40:19 UTC
From: Harry Quiff <quiff@merkin.net>
Message-ID: <brdjl3hus0@216.221.129.15>
Source record: 83759
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

On Fri, 12 Dec 2003 13:18:11 -0500, Dan/W4NTI wrote:

> Not content to leave things alone. Glenn Baxter, K1MAN has threatened
> ANOTHER hostile takeover of a frequency.
>
> Glenn is now claiming the Feds are jamming his 75 meter SSB blabcast. And
> is demanding everyone around his 'new chosen home' of 3977 to clear out.

Fuck him, the UFO net has been on that freq. for YEARS. He can go "F"
himself.

4134. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-12 23:43:56 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3FDA52BC.8030305@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 83760
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.cb

Jose wrote:

>I don't lilke the ARRL, because QST does not print
>any articles on Freebanding. Freebanding IS more popular
>than ham radio, and we represent almost 15 million new
>potential ARRL members. Too bad the ARRL Yankees
>can't figure this out.
>
>
What about the ARRL Red Sox? ;-)

4135. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-12 23:56:50 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3FDA55C2.3040700@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 83761
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave

>
>
>
>Its a bureaucracy. And according to Doctor Peters, who wrote a book called
>'Peters principle' many years ago:
>
>"In a bureaucracy everyone will eventually arise to their level of
>incompetence"
>
>
>
That "incompetence" is more usually a lack of sufficient office politics skills than
technical skills. "Dilbert" is on target more often than you would believe if you
never had to work for a large corporation. AT&T was the worst with this. There you worked on stuff not because there was a chance that it might make the
company any money, but because your boss thinks it will impress his boss. Other
instances are when your department didn't spend all its allocated budget for the
year, so the boss has people order equipment that might be useful in the future.
Known as "Use it or lose it", as next year's budget would likely be scaled back if
this year's isn't fully spent.

I have run across incompetent people in companies I've worked for, but it's actually quite rare. One guy who didn't know what he was doing just tried to
wing it. And his work was very faulty. But by far most incompetence is found in management.

>
>
>
>
>

4136. Re: Expirations in 2004

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-13 00:52:22 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <aptCb.15994$P%1.14757953@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 83762

"D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> wrote in message
news:Pine.LNX.4.58.0312120617470.6819@kd6lvw.ampr.org...
> On Wed, 10 Dec 2003, N2EY wrote:
> > "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<jUFBb.8762$7p2.1663@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> > > The calendar year 2004 has a considerable
> > > amount of expirations...well above a normal
> > > distribution which would have been about 1/10th
> > > of existing hams...or about 63K.
> > >
> > Don't you mean "about 68K", Bill?
>
> More like 73K....
>
> > > The actual future expiratons data from the Joe
> > > Speroni web site is over 84K expirations
> > > with two months showing very high numbers...
> > > almost 11K in May and over 17K in July.
> > >
> > Didn't FCC change the vanity call rules right about then? If so, it
> > would explain the spike because getting a vanity call causes an
> > automatic renewal regardless of the 90 day rule (so FCC doesn't have
> > to pro-rate the fee, IIUC)
>
> That's going to be the 2006 problem.
>
> > > Will be interesting to watch the renewal results.
> > >
> > Yep!
> >
> > Further clouded by the 90 days before/2 years after rules. If someone
> > is a little late renewing, they show up as an expiration.
>
> What's more interesting is the count of those whose licenses expire
WITHOUT them
> also having expired (i.e. those who DON'T renew, as opposed to those who
can't).

Actually if you go to the FCC database and sort for expired licenses, those
that have lapsed but are in the grace period will not show up as expired.
So there is a two year lag between the actual expiration date and when they
are marked as expired in the database.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

4137. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-13 01:01:48 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <0ytCb.770$0s2.368@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 83763
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.cb

"Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote

> What's that on page 94-99 of the August 2003 QST then?

Honor Roll listings.

4138. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-13 01:07:36 UTC
From: Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com>
Message-ID: <20031212200736.940$yB@newsreader.com>
Source record: 83764
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.cb

"K�HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote:
> "Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote
>
> > What's that on page 94-99 of the August 2003 QST then?
>
> Honor Roll listings.
>
Vintage Mopar muscle car fans too. (66-74)

4139. Re: Where Did THIS Come From...?!?!a

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-13 01:08:56 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <IEtCb.15996$P%1.14760574@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 83765

"Dennis Ferguson" <dennis@wawa.juniper.net> wrote in message
news:brd477$2q9r$1@heap.juniper.net...
> Dee D. Flint <deehays@qix.net> wrote:
> >"Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> >news:brbbtj$cfn@library1.airnews.net...
> >> But, if it meant a) one tax for all--no tax breaks for any, at about
> >10-14%
> >> per person and entity, b) taxing even religious institutions--anything
> >> outside of actual *church* and parish properties, c) cutting the fat
from
> >> the equation, both in terms of programs and personnel; and there was
still
> >a
> >> need for higher taxes, I'd be willing to pay my *fair* share.
> >>
> >> Kim W5TIT
> >>
> >>
> >
> >The average person is already paying nearly half their income in taxes if
> >you include all taxes plus the ones you pay indirectly. This is hardly
> >reasonable nor would it be reasonable for anyone to pay even more.
>
> Where did your 50% number for the average person come from? Since
> revenues from all levels of government, as well as the nation's gross
> income, are well known, the average of all taxes isn't a difficult
> number to compute with some precision.
>
> In fact the Tax Foundation (which should be called the Anti-Tax
Foundation,
> their interests would never lead them to underestimate this number) does
> exactly this to calculate their "Tax Freedom Day", seen at
>
> http://www.taxfoundation.org/taxfreedomday.html
>
> Tax freedom day this year was April 19, meaning the average total tax
burden
> was 30%. Note that the tax burden for the median wage earner was probably
> somewhat less than this since higher tax rates on corporate income and the
> wealthy tend to skew the average higher (see the "Q&A about critiques..."
> link on the same page).
>
> I hence can't see how you concluded that the average American's total tax
> burden is anywhere near 50% of their income. I also recently saw (but

have
> since lost) a table which showed comparative tax burdens for 36
industrialized
> nations. Only the northern-most European countries have total tax burdens
> in the 50% ballpark, while US taxes in 2003 were 35th on the list, with
only
> Mexico lower (in 2000, Japan and Korea were also lower). Not that this
> suggests the US is in any way under-taxed; if you add in the additional
12%
> of income spent on private medical care you end up within a few percent,
> plus or minus, of the tax burdens in Canada and (south-)Western European
> countries which fund medical care via taxes.
>
> I don't know how you define what is "reasonable" for someone to pay, and
> I certainly wish I paid less tax rather than more, but it is the case that
> you get about what you pay for. For an example of an industrialized
country
> with significantly lower taxes one can look to, say, China, and observe
that
> to get this tax rate one would also need to live with China-like
> infrastructure and services. This isn't a tradeoff I'd recommend,
personally.
>
> Dennis Ferguson

An out of date number from when I paid attention to it a few years ago. At the time "Tax Freedom Day" was sometime in May. So at that time it was almost 50%. European countries at the time were a higher percentage.

However it does not mean that the US is undertaxed but instead that Europeans are overtaxed.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

4140. Re: Where Did THIS Come From...?!?!a

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-13 01:13:58 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <pJtCb.15997$P%1.14761081@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 83766

"JJ" <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
news:I5KdnUcgK997u0eiRVn-gQ@gbronline.com...
> Dave Heil wrote:
>
> >
> > Why would paying for your doctor visits and your medications be the
> > government's responsibility?
> >
> > Dave K8MN
>
> Do you pay for all your doctor visits and medications, or does some
> insurance pay for a good portion of it? I suppose when you are eligible
> for Medicare you are going to refuse it, after all,it should not be the
> governments responsibility to pay for your medical, Right?
>

Remember we all pay for our insurance. And don't say the company that employs you pays for it. That's a smokescreen. What they pay could just as well go into your paycheck so you could afford to pay for it yourself.

The government has taken every step possible to insure that we will NOT have the money to pay for our own insurance and our own health care. Instead they prefer that we depend on them to do it. That is potentially a bad situation as it depending on the government is risky. One can easily pay in all their lives and yet be severely limited on benefits eligibility. Investing in private benefits would allow one to have benefits commensurate with what they paid in.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

4141. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-13 01:18:43 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <TNtCb.15998$P%1.14761580@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 83767
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.cb

"Jack" <see.my.sig@below.for.email.address> wrote in message
news:9v7ktvs0njtk52m7d942n5kmmuu6joi0a6@4ax.com...
> This could be relaxed a little bit. The rules that disallow
> controversial topics sure don't stop arguing and ill-will on the
> bands. :-(
>

There is no rule against controversial topics. However there is a recommendation that one use common sense and remember that on the air we should be ambassadors of good will. So it is considered inappropriate to discuss such subjects with a stranger, especially those in other countries, since you may inadvertently offend them.

On the other hand, discussing a controversial subject with someone you know well is reasonable.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

4142. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-13 01:33:50 UTC
From: Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com>
Message-ID: <20031212203350.821$3q@newsreader.com>
Source record: 83768
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.cb

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote:
> "Jack" <see.my.sig@below.for.email.address> wrote in message
> news:9v7ktvs0njtk52m7d942n5kmmuu6joi0a6@4ax.com...
> > This could be relaxed a little bit. The rules that disallow
> > controversial topics sure don't stop arguing and ill-will on the
> > bands. :-(
> >
>
> There is no rule against controversial topics. However there is a
> recommendation that one use common sense and remember that on the air we
> should be ambassadors of good will. So it is considered inappropriate to
> discuss such subjects with a stranger, especially those in other
> countries, since you may inadvertently offend them.
>
> On the other hand, discussing a controversial subject with someone you
> know well is reasonable.
>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>
What Dee D said.

4143. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-13 02:42:51 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <T_KdnQYSTavf4EeiRVn-sA@gbronline.com>
Source record: 83769
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.cb

Kee Low Cycle wrote:
> "JJ" <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
> news:6b2dnVV8sMpGtUei4p2dnA@gbronline.com...
>
>>Jose wrote:
>>
>>
>>>You should really self-examine the hatred in your heart, especially
>>>during this festive of seasons. Alfa-Tango International is the
>>>licensing authority.
>>
>>And it has no authority other than what it self subscribes. The FCC is
>>the only authority that can issue licenses to use the radio spectrum in
>>the U.S. and other countries have their own license structure.
>>Alfa-Tango International has no authority to issue licenses for any use
>>of the radio spectrum. It is just more "freeband" nonsense, and there is
>>no "freeband" in the U.S. as those frequencies you use as a "freeband"
>>are allocated to other services who have ligitimate licenses to use
>>those frequencies. You ATI license isn't worth the paper it is written
>>on and carries no authority whatsoever.
>>
>
>
>
> BBZZZZZZZZZT! Wrong answer Goofy.
>
> And you just opened your No-Code Tech mouth and inserted your fat
> foot into it. Although ATI is not recognized by the American FCC,
> ATI is recognized by several foreign governments, especially in
> South America & Central America. Go back to helping Ox chase
> trucks. HAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHHAHAHAHA
> HAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHHAAH
> ROTFLMAO!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!
> LOL LOL LOL LOL LOL LOL LOL LOL LOL LOL LOL

Name those countries and show reliable documentation of your claim, and
BBZZZZZZZZZT! Your are wrong Dumbo in assuming I am a no code tech. Been
licensed over 40 years.

4144. Re: Where Did THIS Come From...?!?!a

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-13 02:45:14 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <_2vCb.447$xH2.295007@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 83778

Kim W5TIT wrote:
> "JJ" <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
> news:BPKdnZ9G5_9Up0SiRVn-sw@gbronline.com...
>
>>Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>>
>>
>>
>>>Jim:
>>>
>>>Most EU countries are much better suited for mass transit (meaning light
>
> rail
>
>>>systems) than is the U.S. as a whole. Sure, they're good in big cities,
>
> but
>
>>>the
>>>USA has too many wide open spaces and too much suburban sprawl -- making
>>>long commutes necessary for the majority of the workforce. This means
>
> we're
>
>>>going to be dependent on personal, self-driven vehicles for a long time
>
> to
>
>>>come. Moreover, I don't think that adapting our public transit systems
>
> to be
>
>>>as accessible and accommodating to the majority of commuters as those in
>
> the EU
>
>>>would cost far more than they are spending. Remember, they had a
>
> headstart on
>
>>>their transit systems, dating back to the pre-war era. They also have a
>
> higher
>

>>>level of cultural acceptence of mass transit -- many EU families have
>
> never
>
>>>owned an automobile, simply because there was no need (not to mention
>
> the
>
>>>prohibitive cost).
>>>
>>>The long distances which must be travelled by most Americans to get to
>
> work and
>
>>>go about their daily duties would make EU-style gasoline prices
>
> impossible for
>
>>>the average person to afford. Our economy depends on cheap, abundant
>
> energy,
>
>>>available at present-day market rates (or lower) basically in
>
> perpetuity. The
>
>>>liberal, socialist Democrats think we need to change that and have
>
> EU-type
>
>>>energy prices, but they hate this country anyway, and want us to be
>
> subjugated
>
>>>to the EU. These treasonous wackos won't be happy until we revert to a
>
> totally
>
>>>agrarian society. They are the enemies of the freedom that America
>
> stands for,
>
>>>and must be treated as such.
>>>
>>>Europe will always be different from the U.S., and considering their
>>>geopolitical realities, it is just the way it should be. However, since
>
> most
>
>>>of the EU nations would fit inside a couple of our states, America must

>
> be
>
>>>different. We must consume a larger share of the world's energy simply
>
> because
>
>>>we have a lot further to go in order to make our own individual social
>
> and
>
>>>economic contributions. I agree that mass transit should be exploited
>
> to the
>
>>>greatest extent possible, but it will never replace the need for
>
> individual,
>
>>>personal mobility -- meaning the private automobile, in all of it's
>
> forms.
>
>>>73 de Larry, K3LT
>>
>>The U.S. does need to develope better mass transit in large
>>metropolitian areas. When I lived in the Dallas/Ft. Worth, Texas area,
>>the two cities were always complaining about the heavy commute traffic
>>and how they were not using the available mass transit system. The would
>>encourage people to car pool or use what mass transit was available, all
>>the while they were expanding the freeway system to accomodate more
>>vehicles. If you want people to use mass transit you have to 1) build a
>>good mass transit system, and 2) don't build massive freeway systems
>>that make it easier for people to drive their vehicles to work than ride
>> mass transit.
>>
>
>
> I tired mass transit when I first started working downtown. Nothing
> convenient, friendly, safe, or good about it at all. It was scarey because
> of the drivers, inconvenient because I had to work my schedule around
> theirs, unfriendly people getting on and off knocking others with their
> asses or briefcases, and I'll never do it again.

Along similar lines, I tried the local version of mass transit. I had to wait 30 minutes for the bus, then undergo a very circuitous route, and still had to walk a quarter mile. Leaving work at 5:00, I got home a couple minutes after 7:00 p.m. 2 hours to go the 2.5 miles from work to home!!!!!

- Mike KB3EIA -

4145. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-13 03:06:54 UTC
From: Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com>
Message-ID: <20031212220654.818$3B@newsreader.com>
Source record: 83770
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.cb

JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote:
> Been
> licensed over 40 years.
>
What's your call, JJ?

4146. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-13 03:14:24 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <I-CdnZ2x-YvpGEeiRVn-jg@gbronline.com>
Source record: 83771
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave

Marylou@city.net wrote:

>
> I neither approve of or disapprove of the ARRL.
>
> Yes, the dews are high.

Didn't know the ARRL was into dew. They do however have dues. ;>)

4147. Re: Where Did THIS Come From...?!?!a

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-13 03:25:01 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <brehh5$fu2@library2.airnews.net>
Source record: 83785

"Alun" <alun@1stcounsel.com> wrote in message
news:Xns944F55E6CD1A5elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
> "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote in
> news:brcaln$u1f@library1.airnews.net:
>
> > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > news:3FD96511.7B4BEA3E@earthlink.net...
> >> JJ wrote:
> >> >
> >> > Kim W5TIT wrote:
> >> >
> >> > >
> >> > >
> >> > > You know what? I am not so sure that it would take all that much,
> >> > > Jim. I am not even going to pretend to be a financier, but I
> >> > > wonder how much of the Federal Budget, i.e. your and my tax
> >> > > dollars, get spent away from our country. Then, how much foreign
> >> > > debt is "forgiven" each year?
> >> >
> >> > I would wager we could cut the foreigh aid we send to support those
> >> > little pissant dictators in some of those pissant countries and have
> >> > more than enough to provide good health care for every citizen.
> >>
> >> Foreign aid goes a long way toward having those countries vote in the
> >> U.N. in line with our policies.
> >>
> >
> > Yeah, money always has been very easy to throw around, 'specially when
> > it's someone else's. There's other ways to win friends and influence
> > people--and ways that would mean a lot more and build better alliances
> > in the longrun.
> >
> >>
> >> Some of it puts military officers from
> >> third world countries through *our* military academies. It gives
> >> those officers a chance to live in the U.S. and see how our system
> >> works.
> >>
> >
> > Yeah, so they can go and influence a bunch of rebels in their or other
> > homelands and train enemies to the US. We don't need someone learning
> > "our" way of doing things...let them figure it out for themselves.
> >
> >>

> >> Some of the aid brings scholars to the U.S. to study.
> >>
> >
> > So they can go back to their land, grow a company, and somehow through
> > many different ways, we end up losing jobs and capital over here.
> >
> >>
> >> If we build a
> >> needed flood control dam in Sierra Leone, good will toward the United
> >> States is generated.
> >>
> >
> > Give them a very, very low interest loan with a good down payment and
> > let them build their own damned dam.
> >
> >
> >>
> >> A decade or so back, Botswana actually weaned
> >> itself from U.S. aid and thanked us.
> >>
> >
> > 'Sbout damned time...although I doubt they're as "weaned" as they
> > should be or are.
> >
> >>
> >> Why would paying for your doctor visits and your medications be the
> >> government's responsibility?
> >>
> >> Dave K8MN
> >>
> >
> > Uh, because *we live* in this country? So, you disagree with programs
> > that improve our infrastructure that is pitiful, helps our kids and
> > elderly with healthcare and even education, begins an effort to ending
> > welfare for the capable, improves health conditions nationwide--and
> > more, while our government is off in other lands playing Godfather?!
> > Figures, Dave.
> >
> > The people of this country who are being taxed to the hilt are paying
> > for the backbone of crap in this country and the rest of the world.
> > It's time the rest of the world and the nitwits in this country get
> > pushed out of the nest. But, of course that ain't happenin' any time
> > soon.
> >
> > Kim W5TIT
> >
> >
> >
>
> FWIW I agree 100% with you, Kim. Paying for health care and mass transit

> would be far more worthwhile than most of the things the government does
> with tax revenue. Their priorities are completely backwards.
>

And, it's not unique to the US Gov't. The priorities of a gov't. are not
the priorities of its people; it is the people's priorities they defy.

Kim W5TIT

4148. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-13 03:27:40 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031212222740.16110.00000561@mb-m22.aol.com>
Source record: 83772

> Been
>licensed over 40 years

In what service, Ill bet you have 1 of them Old CB Licenses and your counting
that.

4149. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-13 03:28:31 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031212222831.16110.00000562@mb-m22.aol.com>
Source record: 83773

>What's your call, JJ?

He doesnt have one, or hes to ashamed of it..

4150. IM So Popular

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-13 03:48:06 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031212224806.16110.00000563@mb-m22.aol.com>
Source record: 83774

I didnt realize I was so popular, over 2,000 look ups on my Callsign on QRZ..
Since Im hardly ever on the AIR, thats astounding.

4151. Re: W5NETs Christmas Card

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-13 03:54:53 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <h4wCb.30$mC1.2@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 83775

"WA8ULX" wrote:
>
> (snip) May its a attempt by NCI and
> all the No-Coders to try and switch
> us to there side. (snip)

That's right. It's a conspiracy - designed to garner good-will for this side of the argument, with the ultimate goal of winning the propaganda war. You should have seen the cards I sent to each of the FCC employees.

Just kidding, of course. It was just my little attempt to spread some cheer. It certainly wasn't much, but it might just make someone feel good, even if only for a moment.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

4152. Re: W5NETs Christmas Card

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-13 04:01:06 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <6awCb.36$mC1.7@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 83776

"Larry Roll K3LT" wrote:
>
> Thanks for the card, Dwight! It's the first
> one I've received this year -- I haven't even
> had a chance to go out and buy mine yet!

You better get at it, Larry. The holidays are coming up quickly. I love this time of year. There is perhaps nothing, in public, I enjoy more than sitting at the mall watching the people rushing around shopping from store to store. The looks on the childrens' faces is priceless.

> I wish you and your family a very Merry
> Christmas and a Happy and Prosperous
> New Year!

Same to you, my friend.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

4153. Re: W5NETs Christmas Card

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-13 04:04:06 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <WcwCb.37$mC1.14@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 83777

"Dave Heil" wrote:
>
> Dwight isn't one to let differences stand
> in the way of Christmas and for once,
> we are in total agreement!

I hate to disagree, but there isn't that much we disagree on, Dave. ;-)

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

4154. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-13 04:52:26 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <mNidnTWEx-YIAEeiRVn-sw@gbronline.com>
Source record: 83779

WA8ULX wrote:
>>What's your call, JJ?
>
>
> He doesnt have one, or hes to ashamed of it..

Sorry to dissappoint you but I received my call when the Novice ticket
was only good for a year, you either upgraded or lost it. Upgraded to
General then to Advanced, took all but the Novice in front of an FCC
examiner. I have had the same call since, just dropped the N after
upgrading, it is a 1X3 K call and not one of those later
2X3's like you have.

4155. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-13 04:53:51 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <mNidnTSEx-ZzAEeiRVn-sw@gbronline.com>
Source record: 83780

WA8ULX wrote:

>>Been
>>licensed over 40 years
>
>
> In what service, Ill bet you have 1 of them Old CB Licenses and your counting
> that.

In the amateur radio service, how long you been licensed? I never held
any cb license, never operated cb.

4156. Re: Bill Pasternak a real asshole

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-13 05:30:13 UTC
From: Bill Newkirk <wnewkirk@bellsouth.net>
Message-ID: <YoxCb.8783$Ob4.1141@bignews2.bellsouth.net>
Source record: 83781

Uh, this is Usenet, dood.

If you're reading this using mail, you're wasting your time.

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:wsnCb.655$5B.489@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> Hey asshole Bill,
>
> I did not initiate this little group. It was started by K1MAN. I did
> remove you, but before I did I get this in MY mailbox.
>
> Furthermore, stop threatning me. Who cares if you don't want K1MAN's
SPAM.
> Take it up with Glenn. How about YOU STAYING OUT OF MY MAILBOX ???
>
> Oh, One more thing....since you don't seem to mind K1MAN qrming the bands
> with your newsline. When the crap hits the fan hopefully your going to
> slide into it too.
>
> Have a nice day.
>
> Dan/W4NTI
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
> Dear Sir,
>
> I asked you once to remove me from your K1MAN SPAM LIST. Obviously you did
> not understand me. Hence, as of this moment, all mail from you to ANY
> ARNewsline e-mail account is blocked. This matter is closed to further
> discussion.
>
> Bill Pasternak, WA6ITF
> Writer - Producer
> The Amateur Radio Newsline, Inc.
> wa6itf@arnewsline.org
> http://www.arnewsline.org
> "Since 1976 - Hobby Radio News
> for Todays Radio Amateur"
>

>

4157. Re: K1MAN starts ANOTHER frequency war.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-13 05:54:47 UTC
From: Earnest Borg-9 <4rakesonwal@voicenet.com>
Message-ID: <b6a2d$3fdaaa88$d1cc5b63$31579@allthenewsgroups.com>
Source record: 83782
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:DDnCb.661$5B.458@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> Not content to leave things alone. Glenn Baxter, K1MAN has threatened
> ANOTHER hostile takeover of a frequency.

Well Dan...you do know things can get very boring up there
in Maine, especially in the Winter! (those Maine Winter's
last *8 Months* out of the Year you know! Remember those
Best Western Inn travel guides they used to print? Ever take
a look at the photos of the Best Western Inn's they had listed
for ME? All the photos...every darn one of em...showed pics
of kids playing in swimming pools with green mountain backgrounds.
I mean, who the heck are they trying to fool with that photogeneric
bullshi+ ?) I guess this is what keeps the Boy Broadcaster
busy 8 months out of the year whilst he's holed-up and
snowed-in eh Dan..??

> Glenn is now claiming the Feds are jamming his 75 meter SSB blabcast.
And
> is demanding everyone around his 'new chosen home' of 3977 to clear out.
> Word is those that were told to clear out OR ELSE (more bogus afidavits
eh
> Glenn?) told him to take a flying F*&& at a rolling donut.

He says the FED's are jamming him now? Is MAN going back to "conspiracy
theories" mode? Let me guess...the IARN is now going to be the official ham
EBS station for the approach of Planet-X. Perhaps the triangle-shaped UFO's
are on their way to Belgrade Lakes? Get those tinfoil hats ready
gentlemen because the alien "Eric Cartman mind and anyl-probes"
are on their way! (You know Dan, if Glen had some brains, he'd get on
the phone ASAP with either George Noorey or Art Bell and ask to
be a guest on a future Coast to Coast AM Broadcast. I mean, he
could get all that free publicity on 500+ late night AM Radio stations
just like Wayne Green does.) If he's really lucky, he'll be on some night
right after Richard Hoagland of "The Face on Mars" fame is on and
be an instant hit on the top-20 C toC AM Kooks List.

Finally, as for "rolling donuts", I feel Glen should stay away from
any and all of the same. I seem to remember a photo of him from
Hosstraders appearing on Jon's website, and the ole boy really needs
to lose that spare *Hummer H2 tire* he's carryin around his waistline.....

> And one more thing boys and girls, he and his Polish gentlemen are
planning
> a hostile move to 14.275. This after being thrown off the frequency

> previously.

Don't worry about that! I am sure the poleski boys from
Gdansk, Cleveland and Kalamazoo will give em a nice
ole RF bear hug! :)

>
> How the worm turns.
>
> This from your humble reporter and ever observant listener.
>
> Dan/W4NTI

The Walter Cronkite and General Westmoreland of ham radio.
ho-ho-ho-ho-ho!

4158. Re: Where Did THIS Come From...?!?!a

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-13 06:42:37 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3FDAB4D8.4A325492@earthlink.net>
Source record: 83783

JJ wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
>
> >
> > Why would paying for your doctor visits and your medications be the
> > government's responsibility?

>
> Do you pay for all your doctor visits and medications, or does some
> insurance pay for a good portion of it? I suppose when you are eligible
> for Medicare you are going to refuse it, after all,it should not be the
> governments responsibility to pay for your medical, Right?

I'm not old enough for medicare and it matters not whether insurance covers my visits or medications. Fact is: Government is not paying for my medical care nor do I feel that I have a right to government subsidized medical care. That said, care to answer my question?

Dave K8MN

4159. Re: Where Did THIS Come From...?!?!a

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-13 07:01:55 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3FDAB95D.DCF2F198@earthlink.net>
Source record: 83784

Kim W5TIT wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:3FD96511.7B4BEA3E@earthlink.net...
> > JJ wrote:
> > >
> > > Kim W5TIT wrote:
> > >
> > > >
> > > >
> > > > You know what? I am not so sure that it would take all that much,
> Jim. I
> > > > am not even going to pretend to be a financier, but I wonder how much
> of the
> > > > Federal Budget, i.e. your and my tax dollars, get spent away from our
> > > > country. Then, how much foreign debt is "forgiven" each year?
> > >
> > > I would wager we could cut the foreigh aid we send to support those
> > > little pissant dictators in some of those pissant countries and have
> > > more than enough to provide good health care for every citizen.
> >
> > Foreign aid goes a long way toward having those countries vote in the
> > U.N. in line with our policies.
> >
>
> Yeah, money always has been very easy to throw around, 'specially when it's
> someone else's.

It isn't "someone else's" money, Kim. It is government money obtained
from those Americans who pay taxes. The money is being spent in the
interest of the people of the U.S.

> There's other ways to win friends and influence people--and
> ways that would mean a lot more and build better alliances in the > longrun.

What would you suggest, takeovers of countries or free beer at the U.S.
embassy on Friday evenings?

> >
> > Some of it puts military officers from
> > third world countries through *our* military academies. It gives those
> > officers a chance to live in the U.S. and see how our system works.
> >
>
> Yeah, so they can go and influence a bunch of rebels in their or other

> homelands and train enemies to the US.

Is that what you believe is happening?

> We don't need someone learning "our"
> way of doing things...let them figure it out for themselves.

Not much chance of that. You live here and you haven't figured it out.

> >
> > Some of the aid brings scholars to the U.S. to study.
> >
>
> So they can go back to their land, grow a company, and somehow through many
> different ways, we end up losing jobs and capital over here.

Do you believe that is the purpose for bringing foreign students to the
U.S. for schooling?

> >
> > If we build a
> > needed flood control dam in Sierra Leone, good will toward the United
> > States is generated.
> >
>
> Give them a very, very low interest loan with a good down payment and let
> them build their own damned dam.

That is quite often done. On other occasions, the money comes in the
form of a grant. The actual construction, by the way, is often done by
U.S. companies.

> >
> > A decade or so back, Botswana actually weaned
> > itself from U.S. aid and thanked us.
> >
>
> 'Sbout damned time...although I doubt they're as "weaned" as they should be
> or are.

...but that's probably just another thing you know little about, huh?

> >
> > Why would paying for your doctor visits and your medications be the
> > government's responsibility?

>
> Uh, because *we live* in this country?

Yeah? So? How does that entitle you to free medical care?

> So, you disagree with programs that
> improve our infrastructure that is pitiful, helps our kids and elderly with
> healthcare and even education, begins an effort to ending welfare for the

> capable, improves health conditions nationwide--and more, while our
> government is off in other lands playing Godfather?! Figures, Dave.

I don't believe that most Americans believe that anyone other than those children and elderly people should be given free or subsidized health care.

> The people of this country who are being taxed to the hilt are paying for
> the backbone of crap in this country and the rest of the world.

They're paying for what?

> It's time
> the rest of the world and the nitwits in this country get pushed out of the
> nest. But, of course that ain't happenin' any time soon.

There's the Lucy Van Pelt view of Foreign Policy for you. Why don't you stick to things you know something about...as soon as you figure out what those might be?

Dave K8MN

4160. Re: Where Did THIS Come From...?!?!a

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-13 08:43:35 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <brejgf$f1n@library2.airnews.net>
Source record: 83786

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3FDAB95D.DCF2F198@earthlink.net...
> Kim W5TIT wrote:
> >
> > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > news:3FD96511.7B4BEA3E@earthlink.net...
> > > JJ wrote:
> > > >
> > > > Kim W5TIT wrote:
> > > >
> > > > >
> > > > > You know what? I am not so sure that it would take all that much,
> > Jim. I
> > > > > am not even going to pretend to be a financier, but I wonder how
much
> > of the
> > > > > Federal Budget, i.e. your and my tax dollars, get spent away from
our
> > > > > country. Then, how much foreign debt is "forgiven" each year?
> > > >
> > > > I would wager we could cut the foreigh aid we send to support those
> > > > little pissant dictators in some of those pissant countries and have
> > > > more than enough to provide good health care for every citizen.
> > >
> > > Foreign aid goes a long way toward having those countries vote in the
> > > U.N. in line with our policies.
> > >
> >
> > Yeah, money always has been very easy to throw around, 'specially when
it's
> > someone else's.
>
> It isn't "someone else's" money, Kim. It is government money obtained
> from those Americans who pay taxes. The money is being spent in the
> interest of the people of the U.S.
>
>
> > There's other ways to win friends and influence people--and
> > ways that would mean a lot more and build better alliances in the >
longrun.
>
> What would you suggest, takeovers of countries or free beer at the U.S.
> embassy on Friday evenings?

>
> > >
> > > Some of it puts military officers from
> > > third world countries through *our* military academies. It gives
those
> > > officers a chance to live in the U.S. and see how our system works.
> > >
> >
> > Yeah, so they can go and influence a bunch of rebels in their or other
> > homelands and train enemies to the US.
>
> Is that what you believe is happening?
>
> > We don't need someone learning "our"
> > way of doing things...let them figure it out for themselves.
>
> Not much chance of that. You live here and you haven't figured it out.
>
> > >
> > > Some of the aid brings scholars to the U.S. to study.
> > >
> >
> > So they can go back to their land, grow a company, and somehow through
many
> > different ways, we end up losing jobs and capital over here.
>
> Do you believe that is the purpose for bringing foreign students to the
> U.S. for schooling?
>
> > >
> > > If we build a
> > > needed flood control dam in Sierra Leone, good will toward the United
> > > States is generated.
> > >
> >
> > Give them a very, very low interest loan with a good down payment and
let
> > them build their own damned dam.
>
> That is quite often done. On other occasions, the money comes in the
> form of a grant. The actual construction, by the way, is often done by
> U.S. companies.
>
> > >
> > > A decade or so back, Botswana actually weaned
> > > itself from U.S. aid and thanked us.
> > >
> >
> > 'Sbout damned time...although I doubt they're as "weaned" as they should
be

> > or are.
>
> ...but that's probably just another thing you know little about, huh?
>
> > >
> > > Why would paying for your doctor visits and your medications be the
> > > government's responsibility?
>
> >
> > Uh, because *we live* in this country?
>
> Yeah? So? How does that entitle you to free medical care?
>
> > So, you disagree with programs that
> > improve our infrastructure that is pitiful, helps our kids and elderly
with
> > healthcare and even education, begins an effort to ending welfare for
the
> > capable, improves health conditions nationwide--and more, while our
> > government is off in other lands playing Godfather?! Figures, Dave.
>
> I don't believe that most Americans believe that anyone other than those
> children and elderly people should be given free or subsidized health
> care.
>
> > The people of this country who are being taxed to the hilt are paying
for
> > the backbone of crap in this country and the rest of the world.
>
> They're paying for what?
>
> > It's time
> > the rest of the world and the nitwits in this country get pushed out of
the
> > nest. But, of course that ain't happenin' any time soon.
>
> There's the Lucy Van Pelt view of Foreign Policy for you. Why don't you
> stick to things you know something about...as soon as you figure out
> what those might be?
>
> Dave K8MN
>

I think you're about the hugest piece of crap I've been witness to in a
long, long time, Dave Heil. You go back into your silver spoon 'gain,
now... Buh bye...get another book.

Kim W5TIT

4161. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-13 08:50:35 UTC
From: Dit Dit Dah <NoEmail@NoEmail.com>
Message-ID: <brejsrfgn0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 83787
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave

"JJ" <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
news:l-CdnZ2x-YvpGEeiRVn-jg@gbronline.com...
Marylou@city.net wrote:

>
> I neither approve of or disapprove of the ARRL.
>
> Yes, the dews are high.

Didn't know the ARRL was into dew. They do however have dues. ;>)

Either way...why bother?
They ain't getting my money.

4162. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-13 11:49:00 UTC
From: Kee Low Cycle <k@mrkeelow.org>
Message-ID: <breubd$527$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 83788
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.cb

"JJ" <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
news:T_KdnQYSTavf4EeiRVn-sA@gbronline.com...
> Kee Low Cycle wrote:
> > "JJ" <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
> > news:6b2dnVV8sMpGtUei4p2dnA@gbronline.com...
> >
> >>Jose wrote:
> >>
> >>
> >>>You should really self-examine the hatred in your heart, especially
> >>>during this festive of seasons. Alfa-Tango International is the
> >>>licensing authority.
> >>
> >>And it has no authority other than what it self subscribes. The FCC is
> >>the only authority that can issue licenses to use the radio spectrum in
> >>the U.S. and other countries have their own license structure.
> >>Alfa-Tango International has no authority to issue licenses for any use
> >>of the radio spectrum. It is just more "freeband" nonsense, and there is
> >>no "freeband" in the U.S. as those frequencies you use as a "freeband"
> >>are allocated to other services who have ligitimate licenses to use
> >>those frequencies. You ATI license isn't worth the paper it is written
> >>on and carries no authority whatsoever.
> >>
> >
> >
> >
> > BBZZZZZZZZZT! Wrong answer Goofy.
> >
> > And you just opened your No-Code Tech mouth and inserted your fat
> > foot into it. Although ATI is not recognized by the American FCC,
> > ATI is recognized by several foreign governments, especially in
> > South America & Central America. Go back to helping Ox chase
> > trucks. HAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHHAHAHAHA
> > HAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHHAAH
> > ROTFLMAO!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!
> > LOL LOL LOL LOL LOL LOL LOL LOL LOL LOL LOL
>
> Name those countries and show reliable documentation of your claim, and
> BBZZZZZZZZZT! Your are wrong Dumbo in assuming I am a no code tech. Been
> licensed over 40 years.
>

You have a No Code Tech License, which you just obtained. Prior to getting your No Code Tech, you operated CB for almost 40 years. Prove otherwise! What is your ham call?

Kee Low Cycle

4163. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-13 11:55:44 UTC
From: Kee Low Cycle <k@mrkeelow.org>
Message-ID: <breuo0$5sc$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 83789
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.misc

"JJ" <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
news:mNidnTWEx-YIAEeiRVn-sw@gbronline.com...
>
> Sorry to dissappoint you but I received my call when the Novice ticket
> was only good for a year, you either upgraded or lost it. Upgraded to
> General then to Advanced, took all but the Novice in front of an FCC
> examiner. I have had the same call since, just dropped the N after
> upgrading, it is a 1X3 K call and not one of those later
> 2X3's like you have.
>

You do not have an amateur radio call sign. You have operated on
CB for almost 40 years. Prove otherwise. What is your ham
radio call sign?

Kee Low Cycle

4164. Re: K1MAN starts ANOTHER frequency war.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-13 12:25:34 UTC
From: Cyclone Net <who@cyclonznet.org>
Message-ID: <brf0fu$93g$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 83790
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

Glen has done a great job of exposing corruption & criminality
inside the FCC.

Cyclone

4165. Re: K1MAN starts ANOTHER frequency war.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-13 13:22:20 UTC
From: drewcareyinohio@godmail.com
Message-ID: <3fdb12ef$0$54346$a0465688@nnrp.fuse.net>
Source record: 83791
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

What a nut case. I hope they pull his license soon.

4166. KC8LDO prances in dresses around children

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-13 13:58:29 UTC
From: Anonymous via the Cypherpunks Tonga Remailer <nobody@cypherpunks.to>
Message-ID: <d5ead94a4eef1239d60554b9b2fbf51e@cypherpunks.to>
Source record: 83792
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.skip.cb

http://isd.ingham.k12.mi.us/~class/BigHistory.html

4167. KC8LDO

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-13 14:04:23 UTC
From: George Orwell <nobody@mixmaster.it>
Message-ID: <68b329da9893e34099c7d8ad5cb9c940@mixmaster.it>
Source record: 83793
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.skip.cb

[No readable article body recovered]

4168. Re: W5NETs Christmas Card

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-13 14:07:32 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <E2FCb.592$xH2.464975@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 83794

Dwight Stewart wrote:

> "Dave Heil" wrote:
>
>>Dwight isn't one to let differences stand
>>in the way of Christmas and for once,
>>we are in total agreement!
>
>
>
> I hate to disagree, but there isn't that much we disagree on, Dave. ;-)

Well, I enjoyed the card very much. It was one of those "Well, I'll be darned" moments! It did brighten things up.

- Mike KB3EIA -

4169. KC8LDO

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-13 14:30:33 UTC
From: Anonymous <anon@anon.itys.net>
Message-ID: <d6fdbd08e11ad1005e58536e82b62b36@itys.net>
Source record: 83795
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.skip.cb

Looks like Lee the but munchs privacy was invaded. What is a docent Lee? Methinks thou protesth too much. After all you asked for it but munch. wink wink

4170. Re: W5NETs Christmas Card

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-13 14:37:39 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031213093739.11235.00000678@mb-m11.aol.com>
Source record: 83796

>Just kidding, of course. It was just my little attempt to spread some
>cheer. It certainly wasn't much, but it might just make someone feel good,
>even if only for a moment.
>
>
>Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

You could have made a BIGGER impression if you had put CASH in the
Card

4171. Re: W5NETs Christmas Card

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-13 14:39:00 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031213093900.11235.00000679@mb-m11.aol.com>
Source record: 83797

>Well, I enjoyed the card very much. It was one of those "Well, I'll be
>darned" moments! It did brighten things up.
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -

I used mine to line the BIRD CAGE

4172. Re: W5NETs Christmas Card

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-13 14:41:34 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <yyFCb.1682$0s2.212@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 83798

"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote

>
> You could have made a BIGGER impression if you had put CASH in the
> Card
>

He didn't include money in your card like the rest of ours?

4173. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-13 15:21:57 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0312130721.77a9b7af@posting.google.com>
Source record: 83799
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.cb

hamop_62@hotmail.com (Louis C. LeVine) wrote in message
news:<792e029d.0312110853.4daa825f@posting.google.com>...
> This came from another radio group. They are doing a survey to find
> out why some people do not like the ARRL. I don't like it because it
> costs to much. If it were $10 a year I might consider joining.
> Louis

And just exactly what do you expect that they could do for $10.00
a month?

Please name me ONE organization in ANY "hobby" activity that
provdes the scope of servcies and resources the ARRL offers to it's
target peer group.

Awaiting your informed response.

Steve, K4YZ

4174. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-13 15:24:04 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0312130724.78a5935f@posting.google.com>
Source record: 83800
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave

"Dit Dit Dah" <NoEmail@NoEmail.com> wrote in message news:<brejsrfgn0@pita.alt.net>...
> "JJ" <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
> news:l-CdnZ2x-YvpGEeiRVn-jg@gbronline.com...
> Marylou@city.net wrote:
>
> >
> > I neither approve of or disapprove of the ARRL.
> >
> > Yes, the dews are high.
>
> Didn't know the ARRL was into dew. They do however have dues. ;>)
>
>
> Either way...why bother?
> They ain't getting my money.

Good. Who wants money handled by idiots anyway?

Steve, K4YZ

4175. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-13 15:26:10 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <mcGCb.623$xH2.485769@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 83701
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.cb

Steve Robeson, K4CAP wrote:

> hamop_62@hotmail.com (Louis C. LeVine) wrote in message
news:<792e029d.0312110853.4daa825f@posting.google.com>...
>
>>This came from another radio group. They are doing a survey to find
>>out why some people do not like the ARRL. I don't like it because it
>>costs to much. If it were $10 a year I might consider joining.
>>Louis
>
>
> And just exactly what do you expect that they could do for $10.00
> a month?
>
> Please name me ONE organization in ANY "hobby" activity that
> provdes the scope of servcies and resources the ARRL offers to it's
> target peer group.
>
> Awaiting your informed response.

I think this is one of those cases where some people think that their membership is a subscription to QST. Its a lot more than that. ARRL does a lot for Amateurs, even those who hate the organization.

- Mike KB3EIA -

4176. Re: W5NETs Christmas Card

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-13 16:00:54 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <WIGCb.478$mC1.151@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 83702

"WA8ULX" wrote:
>
> You could have made a BIGGER impression
> if you had put CASH in the Card

You're joking, right? I put something in each envelope - either cash or a Ham Radio Outlet gift certificate (I only had fifteen gift certificates, so everyone else got cash).

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

4177. Re: W5NETs Christmas Card

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-13 16:07:34 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <aPGCb.484$mC1.348@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 83703

"Kï¿½HB" wrote:
>
> He didn't include money in your card
> like the rest of ours?

I don't think he's that gullible. But, if he is, he'll have to read to
this message to discover there is no cash or gift certificate (as mentioned
in my last message).

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

4178. Re: W5NETs Christmas Card

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-13 16:10:47 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031213111047.01554.00000511@mb-m20.aol.com>
Source record: 83704

>He didn't include money in your card like the rest of ours?
>
>

Thats what I figured. He sent all you CBplussers Money, and just a Card to us real HAMS.

4179. Re: W5NETs Christmas Card

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-13 16:13:52 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031213111352.01554.00000512@mb-m20.aol.com>
Source record: 83705

> You're joking, right? I put something in each envelope - either cash or a
>Ham Radio Outlet gift certificate (I only had fifteen gift certificates, so
>everyone else got cash).
>
>
>Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

You really want us to believe that, I think you sent all the Money to the CBplussers. I also heard from some reliable sources, that you also included a LIFETIME MEMBERSHIP TO NCI.

4180. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-13 16:15:49 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031213111549.01554.00000513@mb-m20.aol.com>
Source record: 83706

>some people think that their
>membership is a subscription to QST.

Thats all it really is

4181. Re: W5NETs Christmas Card

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-13 16:17:53 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <RYGCb.497$mC1.51@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 83707

"Mike Coslo" wrote:
>
> Well, I enjoyed the card very much. It
> was one of those "Well, I'll be darned"
> moments! It did brighten things up.

Glad you enjoyed it, Mike. It was fun (made me smile) thinking about how some might react when they opened the card and saw who it was from.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

4182. Re: KC8LDO prances in dresses around children

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-13 16:21:34 UTC
From: Landshark <S3Buell@SBCGlobail.com>
Message-ID: <i0HCb.70879$fF5.23496@newssvr25.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 83708
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.skip.cb

"Anonymous via the Cypherpunks Tonga Remailer" <nobody@cypherpunks.to> wrote in message news:d5ead94a4eef1239d60554b9b2fbf51e@cypherpunks.to...
> http://isd.ingham.k12.mi.us/~class/BigHistory.html
>

The point of this is?

Landshark

--
Try these to learn about newsgroup trolls.

http://www.io.com/~zikzak/troll_thesis.html
http://members.aol.com/intwg/trolls.htm

4183. Re: Bill Pasternak a real asshole

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-13 17:07:00 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <UGHCb.540$mC1.83@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 83709

Sorry to have confused you Bill. Perhaps if you scrolled down and read the
included message it would have helped.

Have a nice day.

Dan/W4NTI

"Bill Newkirk" <wnewkirk@bellsouth.net> wrote in message
news:YoxCb.8783$Ob4.1141@bignews2.bellsouth.net...
> Uh, this is Usenet, dood.
>
>
> If you're reading this using mail, you're wasting your time.
>
>
>
> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
> news:wsnCb.655$5B.489@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> > Hey asshole Bill,
> >
> > I did not initiate this little group. It was started by K1MAN. I did
> > remove you, but before I did I get this in MY mailbox.
> >
> > Furthermore, stop threatning me. Who cares if you don't want K1MAN's
> SPAM.
> > Take it up with Glenn. How about YOU STAYING OUT OF MY MAILBOX ???
> >
> > Oh, One more thing....since you don't seem to mind K1MAN qrming the
bands
> > with your newsline. When the crap hits the fan hopefully your going to
> > slide into it too.
> >
> > Have a nice day.
> >
> > Dan/W4NTI
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> > Dear Sir,
> >

> > I asked you once to remove me from your K1MAN SPAM LIST. Obviously you
did
> > not understand me. Hence, as of this moment, all mail from you to ANY
> > ARNewsline e-mail account is blocked. This matter is closed to further
> > discussion.
> >
> > Bill Pasternak, WA6ITF
> > Writer - Producer
> > The Amateur Radio Newsline, Inc.
> > wa6itf@arnewsline.org
> > http://www.arnewsline.org
> > "Since 1976 - Hobby Radio News
> > for Todays Radio Amateur"
> >
> >
>
>

4184. Re: IM So Popular

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-13 17:08:57 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <JIHCb.544$mC1.520@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 83710

"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20031212224806.16110.00000563@mb-m22.aol.com...
> I didnt realize I was so popular, over 2,000 look ups on my Callsign on
QRZ..
> Since Im hardly ever on the AIR, thats astounding.

Just think if they would have sent money instead.

Dan/W4NTI

4185. Re: K1MAN starts ANOTHER frequency war.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-13 17:11:58 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <yLHCb.547$mC1.363@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 83711
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

"Earnest Borg-9" <4rakesonwal@voicenet.com> wrote in message
news:b6a2d$3fdaaa88$d1cc5b63$31579@allthenewsgroups.com...
>
> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
> news:DDnCb.661$5B.458@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> > Not content to leave things alone. Glenn Baxter, K1MAN has threatened
> > ANOTHER hostile takeover of a frequency.
>
> Well Dan...you do know things can get very boring up there
> in Maine, especially in the Winter! (those Maine Winter's
> last *8 Months* out of the Year you know! Remember those
> Best Western Inn travel guides they used to print? Ever take
> a look at the photos of the Best Western Inn's they had listed
> for ME? All the photos...every darn one of em...showed pics
> of kids playing in swimming pools with green mountain backgrounds.
> I mean, who the heck are they trying to fool with that photogeneric
> bullshi+ ?) I guess this is what keeps the Boy Broadcaster
> busy 8 months out of the year whilst he's holed-up and
> snowed-in eh Dan..??
>
> > Glenn is now claiming the Feds are jamming his 75 meter SSB blabcast.
> And
> > is demanding everyone around his 'new chosen home' of 3977 to clear out.
> > Word is those that were told to clear out OR ELSE (more bogus afidavits
> eh
> > Glenn?) told him to take a flying F*&& at a rolling donut.
>
> He says the FED's are jamming him now? Is MAN going back to "conspiracy
> theories" mode? Let me guess...the IARN is now going to be the official
ham
> EBS station for the approach of Planet-X. Perhaps the triangle-shaped
UFO's
> are on their way to Belgrade Lakes? Get those tinfoil hats ready
> gentlemen because the alien "Eric Cartman mind and anyl-probes"
> are on their way! (You know Dan, if Glen had some brains, he'd get on
> the phone ASAP with either George Noorey or Art Bell and ask to
> be a guest on a future Coast to Coast AM Broadcast. I mean, he
> could get all that free publicity on 500+ late night AM Radio stations
> just like Wayne Green does.) If he's really lucky, he'll be on some night
> right after Richard Hoagland of "The Face on Mars" fame is on and
> be an instant hit on the top-20 C toC AM Kooks List.
>
> Finally, as for "rolling donuts", I feel Glen should stay away from

> any and all of the same. I seem to remember a photo of him from
> Hosstraders appearing on Jon's website, and the ole boy really needs
> to lose that spare *Hummer H2 tire* he's carryin around his waistline.....
>
> > And one more thing boys and girls, he and his Polish gentlemen are
> planning
> > a hostile move to 14.275. This after being thrown off the frequency
> > previously.
>
> Don't worry about that! I am sure the poleski boys from
> Gdansk, Cleveland and Kalamazoo will give em a nice
> ole RF bear hug! :)
>
> >
> > How the worm turns.
> >
> > This from your humble reporter and ever observant listener.
> >
> > Dan/W4NTI
>
> The Walter Cronkite and General Westmoreland of ham radio.
> ho-ho-ho-ho-ho!
>

Ho Ho....ROFLMAO.. Ho Ho

Dan/W4NTI

4186. Re: K1MAN starts ANOTHER frequency war.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-13 17:12:33 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <5MHCb.550$mC1.514@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 83712
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

"Cyclone Net" <who@cyclonznet.org> wrote in message
news:brf0fu$93g$0@pita.alt.net...
>
> Glen has done a great job of exposing corruption & criminality
> inside the FCC.
>
> Cyclone
>
>
>
>

Look everyone...another victim of brainsucking.

Dan/W4NTI

4187. Re: K1MAN starts ANOTHER frequency war.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-13 17:14:08 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <ANHCb.556$mC1.368@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 83713
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

<drewcareyinohio@godmail.com> wrote in message
news:3fdb12ef$0$54346$a0465688@nnrp.fuse.net...
> What a nut case. I hope they pull his license soon.

Don't count on it. The way I figure it, and based on what I've seen so far,
the Feds are just going to keep tabs on him. Collect as many complaints as
possible (they especially like the commercial products and blasting on top
of on going QSOs). Then when its time to renew.....well bye bye.

Dan/W4NTI

4188. Re: W5NETs Christmas Card

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-13 17:15:48 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <8PHCb.560$mC1.358@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 83714

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:h4wCb.30$mC1.2@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> "WA8ULX" wrote:
> >
> > (snip) May its a attempt by NCI and
> > all the No-Coders to try and switch
> > us to there side. (snip)
>
>
> That's right. It's a conspiracy - designed to garner good-will for this
> side of the argument, with the ultimate goal of winning the propaganda
war.
> You should have seen the cards I sent to each of the FCC employees.
>
> Just kidding, of course. It was just my little attempt to spread some
> cheer. It certainly wasn't much, but it might just make someone feel good,
> even if only for a moment.
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
>

Well it certainly made me feel good. I have it taped beside the Christmas
tree now.

Dan/W4NTI

4189. Re: W5NETs Christmas Card

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-13 17:17:21 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <BQHCb.564$mC1.467@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 83715

"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20031213093900.11235.00000679@mb-m11.aol.com...
> >Well, I enjoyed the card very much. It was one of those "Well, I'll be
> >darned" moments! It did brighten things up.
> >
> > - Mike KB3EIA -
>
> I used mine to line the BIRD CAGE

Not me....I used that internet picture of LLlllllooooyyyyyyddddddd.

Dan/W4NTI

4190. Re: W5NETs Christmas Card

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-13 17:18:32 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <IRHCb.569$mC1.235@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 83716

"K&#65533;HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:yyFCb.1682$0s2.212@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net...
>
> "WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote
>
> >
> > You could have made a BIGGER impression if you had put CASH in the
> > Card
> >
>
>
> He didn't include money in your card like the rest of ours?
>
Dang.....I got 20 bux. Wonder why the grinch didn't get any?

Dan/W4NTI

4191. Re: W5NETs Christmas Card

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-13 17:19:29 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <BSHCb.572$mC1.402@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 83717

"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20031213111047.01554.00000511@mb-m20.aol.com...
> >He didn't include money in your card like the rest of ours?
> >
> >
>
> Thats what I figured. He sent all you CBplussers Money, and just a Card to
us
> real HAMS.

Thats what I like about Bruce...he is always consistant.

Ho HO !!

Dan/W4NTI

4192. Re: Where Did THIS Come From...?!?!a

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-13 17:26:04 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <MYHCb.580$mC1.72@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 83718

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3FDAB95D.DCF2F198@earthlink.net...
> Kim W5TIT wrote:
> >
> > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > news:3FD96511.7B4BEA3E@earthlink.net...
> > > JJ wrote:
> > > >
> > > > Kim W5TIT wrote:
> > > >
> > > > >
> > > > > You know what? I am not so sure that it would take all that much,
> > Jim. I
> > > > > am not even going to pretend to be a financier, but I wonder how
much
> > of the
> > > > > Federal Budget, i.e. your and my tax dollars, get spent away from
our
> > > > > country. Then, how much foreign debt is "forgiven" each year?
> > > >
> > > > I would wager we could cut the foreigh aid we send to support those
> > > > little pissant dictators in some of those pissant countries and have
> > > > more than enough to provide good health care for every citizen.
> > >
> > > Foreign aid goes a long way toward having those countries vote in the
> > > U.N. in line with our policies.
> > >
> >
> > Yeah, money always has been very easy to throw around, 'specially when
it's
> > someone else's.
>
> It isn't "someone else's" money, Kim. It is government money obtained
> from those Americans who pay taxes. The money is being spent in the
> interest of the people of the U.S.
>
>
> > There's other ways to win friends and influence people--and
> > ways that would mean a lot more and build better alliances in the >
longrun.
>
> What would you suggest, takeovers of countries or free beer at the U.S.
> embassy on Friday evenings?

>
> > >
> > > Some of it puts military officers from
> > > third world countries through *our* military academies. It gives
those
> > > officers a chance to live in the U.S. and see how our system works.
> > >
> >
> > Yeah, so they can go and influence a bunch of rebels in their or other
> > homelands and train enemies to the US.
>
> Is that what you believe is happening?
>
> > We don't need someone learning "our"
> > way of doing things...let them figure it out for themselves.
>
> Not much chance of that. You live here and you haven't figured it out.
>
> > >
> > > Some of the aid brings scholars to the U.S. to study.
> > >
> >
> > So they can go back to their land, grow a company, and somehow through
many
> > different ways, we end up losing jobs and capital over here.
>
> Do you believe that is the purpose for bringing foreign students to the
> U.S. for schooling?
>
> > >
> > > If we build a
> > > needed flood control dam in Sierra Leone, good will toward the United
> > > States is generated.
> > >
> >
> > Give them a very, very low interest loan with a good down payment and
let
> > them build their own damned dam.
>
> That is quite often done. On other occasions, the money comes in the
> form of a grant. The actual construction, by the way, is often done by
> U.S. companies.
>
> > >
> > > A decade or so back, Botswana actually weaned
> > > itself from U.S. aid and thanked us.
> > >
> >
> > 'Sbout damned time...although I doubt they're as "weaned" as they should
be

> > or are.
>
> ...but that's probably just another thing you know little about, huh?
>
> > >
> > > Why would paying for your doctor visits and your medications be the
> > > government's responsibility?
>
> >
> > Uh, because *we live* in this country?
>
> Yeah? So? How does that entitle you to free medical care?
>
> > So, you disagree with programs that
> > improve our infrastructure that is pitiful, helps our kids and elderly
with
> > healthcare and even education, begins an effort to ending welfare for
the
> > capable, improves health conditions nationwide--and more, while our
> > government is off in other lands playing Godfather?! Figures, Dave.
>
> I don't believe that most Americans believe that anyone other than those
> children and elderly people should be given free or subsidized health
> care.
>
> > The people of this country who are being taxed to the hilt are paying
for
> > the backbone of crap in this country and the rest of the world.
>
> They're paying for what?
>
> > It's time
> > the rest of the world and the nitwits in this country get pushed out of
the
> > nest. But, of course that ain't happenin' any time soon.
>
> There's the Lucy Van Pelt view of Foreign Policy for you. Why don't you
> stick to things you know something about...as soon as you figure out
> what those might be?
>
> Dave K8MN

Dave,

You are wasting your time. Twit is a self proclaimed 'flower child' (of
the mid 70s !!!). Which translated means she is a braindead socialist
thinking Demoncrat.

Dan/W4NTI

4193. Re: Where Did THIS Come From...?!?!a

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-13 17:28:12 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <M_HCb.584$mC1.351@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 83719

"Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:brejgf$f1n@library2.airnews.net...
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:3FDAB95D.DCF2F198@earthlink.net...
> > Kim W5TIT wrote:
> > >
> > > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > > news:3FD96511.7B4BEA3E@earthlink.net...
> > > > JJ wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > Kim W5TIT wrote:
> > > > > >
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > You know what? I am not so sure that it would take all that
much,
> > > Jim. I
> > > > > > > am not even going to pretend to be a financier, but I wonder how
> much
> > > of the
> > > > > > > Federal Budget, i.e. your and my tax dollars, get spent away
from
> our
> > > > > > > country. Then, how much foreign debt is "forgiven" each year?
> > > > > >
> > > > > > I would wager we could cut the foreigh aid we send to support
those
> > > > > > little pissant dictators in some of those pissant countries and
have
> > > > > > more than enough to provide good health care for every citizen.
> > > > >
> > > > > Foreign aid goes a long way toward having those countries vote in
the
> > > > U.N. in line with our policies.
> > > > >
> > > >
> > > > Yeah, money always has been very easy to throw around, 'specially when
> it's
> > > someone else's.
> > >
> > > It isn't "someone else's" money, Kim. It is government money obtained
> > > from those Americans who pay taxes. The money is being spent in the
> > > interest of the people of the U.S.
> >

> >
> > > There's other ways to win friends and influence people--and
> > > ways that would mean a lot more and build better alliances in the >
> longrun.
> >
> > What would you suggest, takeovers of countries or free beer at the U.S.
> > embassy on Friday evenings?
> >
> > > >
> > > > Some of it puts military officers from
> > > > third world countries through *our* military academies. It gives
> those
> > > > officers a chance to live in the U.S. and see how our system works.
> > > >
> > >
> > > Yeah, so they can go and influence a bunch of rebels in their or other
> > > homelands and train enemies to the US.
> >
> > Is that what you believe is happening?
> >
> > > We don't need someone learning "our"
> > > way of doing things...let them figure it out for themselves.
> >
> > Not much chance of that. You live here and you haven't figured it out.
> >
> > > >
> > > > Some of the aid brings scholars to the U.S. to study.
> > > >
> > >
> > > So they can go back to their land, grow a company, and somehow through
> many
> > > different ways, we end up losing jobs and capital over here.
> >
> > Do you believe that is the purpose for bringing foreign students to the
> > U.S. for schooling?
> >
> > > >
> > > > If we build a
> > > > needed flood control dam in Sierra Leone, good will toward the
United
> > > > States is generated.
> > > >
> > >
> > > Give them a very, very low interest loan with a good down payment and
> let
> > > them build their own damned dam.
> >
> > That is quite often done. On other occasions, the money comes in the
> > form of a grant. The actual construction, by the way, is often done by
> > U.S. companies.

> >
> > > >
> > > > A decade or so back, Botswana actually weaned
> > > > itself from U.S. aid and thanked us.
> > > >
> > >
> > > 'Sbout damned time...although I doubt they're as "weaned" as they
should
> be
> > > or are.
> >
> > ...but that's probably just another thing you know little about, huh?
> >
> > > > Why would paying for your doctor visits and your medications be the
> > > > government's responsibility?
> >
> > >
> > > Uh, because *we live* in this country?
> >
> > Yeah? So? How does that entitle you to free medical care?
> >
> > > So, you disagree with programs that
> > > improve our infrastructure that is pitiful, helps our kids and elderly
> with
> > > healthcare and even education, begins an effort to ending welfare for
> the
> > > capable, improves health conditions nationwide--and more, while our
> > > government is off in other lands playing Godfather?! Figures, Dave.
> >
> > I don't believe that most Americans believe that anyone other than those
> > children and elderly people should be given free or subsidized health
> > care.
> >
> > > The people of this country who are being taxed to the hilt are paying
> for
> > > the backbone of crap in this country and the rest of the world.
> >
> > They're paying for what?
> >
> > > It's time
> > > the rest of the world and the nitwits in this country get pushed out
of
> the
> > > nest. But, of course that ain't happenin' any time soon.
> >
> > There's the Lucy Van Pelt view of Foreign Policy for you. Why don't you
> > stick to things you know something about...as soon as you figure out
> > what those might be?
> >

> > Dave K8MN
> >
>
> I think you're about the hugest piece of crap I've been witness to in a
> long, long time, Dave Heil. You go back into your silver spoon 'gain,
> now... Buh bye...get another book.
>
> Kim W5TIT
>
>

See what I mean Dave? Totally unable to counter what you said. Because she knows you are right. Yep,..... a knee jerk, bleeding heart, commie liberal.

Dan/W4NTI

4194. Re: W5NETs Christmas Card

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-13 17:35:09 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031213123509.22922.00000489@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 83720

>Thats what I like about Bruce...he is always consistant.
>
>Ho HO !!
>
>Dan/W4NTI
>

I got to be DAN, sometimes I almost screw up and let my real self show thru.

4195. Re: IM So Popular

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-13 17:36:47 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031213123647.22922.00000490@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 83721

>Just think if they would have sent money instead.
>
>Dan/W4NTI
>

I think they should DAN, if they started sending money I might be nicer.

4196. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-13 17:46:44 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <B4SdnayWcd6RzEai4p2dnA@gbronline.com>
Source record: 83722
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.misc

Kee Low Cycle spluttered:
>
> You do not have an amateur radio call sign. You have operated on
> CB for almost 40 years. Prove otherwise. What is your ham
> radio call sign?
>
> Kee Low Cycle

Well if that is what you wish to believe mr. kreep low cycle, then you are perfectly within your right to do so. I have never operated a tranmitter on cb or any frequency I am not licensed to use, and I don't have to prove a cottin-pickin thing to you.

4197. Re: Where Did THIS Come From...?!?!a

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-13 17:53:06 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <B4Sdna-Wcd4uz0ai4p2dnA@gbronline.com>
Source record: 83723

Dave Heil wrote:

> JJ wrote:
>
>>Dave Heil wrote:
>>
>>
>>>Why would paying for your doctor visits and your medications be the
>>>government's responsibility?
>
>
>>Do you pay for all your doctor visits and medications, or does some
>>insurance pay for a good portion of it? I suppose when you are eligible
>>for Medicare you are going to refuse it, after all,it should not be the
>>governments responsibility to pay for your medical, Right?
>
>
> I'm not old enough for medicare and it matters not whether insurance
> covers my visits or medications. Fact is: Government is not paying for
> my medical care nor do I feel that I have a right to government
> subsidized medical care. That said, care to answer my question?

How about answering my questions. Do you pay for all your doctor visits
and medications out of your pocket? When you do qualify for Medicare,
you are going to refuse?

4198. Re: Bush Thrills Troops, Hillary Doesn't

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-13 18:31:16 UTC
From: igoruberwald@home.nl
Message-ID: <e9b53b2a.0312131031.3a870d7d@posting.google.com>
Source record: 83724

Hi all,

Referring to the famous Baghdad dinner:

> > But in the next breath Rivera added, "They were even more impressed
> > with their turkey dinner."

Yes - and everybody knows that the turkey was a fake.

So was the bird on the plate.

ENJOY!

Igor

4199. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-13 19:54:04 UTC
From: no_spam_here34474@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <5a5fcb7b.0312131154.fc35697@posting.google.com>
Source record: 83725
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.cb

I don't like ARRL because:

1) Membership price too high
2) Can't separate QST from membership
3) QST only counts as $15 of the $39 membership fee
4) Incentive licensing from the 60's
5) Ham radio is a dying hobby
6) 5wpm Extras
7) No value given for the money invested
8) No accountability of the board and Executive staff
9) Really doesn't represent the majority of hams (majority don't
belong)
10) Really no different than 'NRA', 'AARP', 'NAACP'. Take your money
and use it for their own agenda, NOT yours!

That is enough for a start.

Sorry to see '73' and Wayne Green exit publishing.
Sorry to see 'Ham Radio' exit publishing.

ex ARRL member

Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:<mcGCb.623$xH2.485769@news1.news.adelphia.net>...
> Steve Robeson, K4CAP wrote:
>
> > hamop_62@hotmail.com (Louis C. LeVine) wrote in message
news:<792e029d.0312110853.4daa825f@posting.google.com>...
> >
> >>This came from another radio group. They are doing a survey to find
> >>out why some people do not like the ARRL. I don't like it because it
> >>costs to much. If it were $10 a year I might consider joining.
> >>Louis
> >
> >
> > And just exactly what do you expect that they could do for $10.00
> > a month?
> >
> > Please name me ONE organization in ANY "hobby" activity that
> > provdes the scope of servcies and resources the ARRL offers to it's
> > target peer group.
> >
> > Awaiting your informed response.
>
> I think this is one of those cases where some people think that their

> membership is a subscription to QST. Its a lot more than that. ARRL does
> a lot for Amateurs, even those who hate the organization.
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -

4200. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-13 19:54:23 UTC
From: Lancer <lancer@lancer.web>
Message-ID: <24lltv8otd81ble4cudpbtefhq5hoeb18h@4ax.com>
Source record: 83726
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.cb

On Fri, 12 Dec 2003 17:33:25 -0500, "Kee Low Cycle" <k@mrkeelow.org>
wrote:

>
>"JJ" <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
>news:6b2dnVV8sMpGtUei4p2dnA@gbronline.com...
>> Jose wrote:
>>
>> > You should really self-examine the hatred in your heart, especially
>> > during this festive of seasons. Alfa-Tango International is the
>> > licensing authority.
>>
>> And it has no authority other than what it self subscribes. The FCC is
>> the only authority that can issue licenses to use the radio spectrum in
>> the U.S. and other countries have their own license structure.
>> Alfa-Tango International has no authority to issue licenses for any use
>> of the radio spectrum. It is just more "freeband" nonsense, and there is
>> no "freeband" in the U.S. as those frequencies you use as a "freeband"
>> are allocated to other services who have ligitimate licenses to use
>> those frequencies. You ATI license isn't worth the paper it is written
>> on and carries no authority whatsoever.
>>
>
>
>BBZZZZZZZZZT! Wrong answer Goofy.
>
>And you just opened your No-Code Tech mouth and inserted your fat
>foot into it. Although ATI is not recognized by the American FCC,
>ATI is recognized by several foreign governments, especially in
>South America & Central America. Go back to helping Ox chase
>trucks. HAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHHAHAHAHA
>HAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHHAAH
>ROTFLMAO!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!
>LOL LOL LOL LOL LOL LOL LOL LOL LOL LOL LOL
>
>
>

Recognized as what? Which foreign goverments?

4201. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-13 20:05:26 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <YvmdnYd7GrbD7EaiRVn-uA@gbronline.com>
Source record: 83727
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.cb

Lancer wrote:

>>And you just opened your No-Code Tech mouth and inserted your fat
>>foot into it. Although ATI is not recognized by the American FCC,
>>ATI is recognized by several foreign governments, especially in
>>South America & Central America. Go back to helping Ox chase
>>trucks. HAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHHAHAHAHA
>>HAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHHAAH
>>ROTFLMAO!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!
>>LOL LOL LOL LOL LOL LOL LOL LOL LOL LOL LOL
>>
>>
>>
>
>
> Recognized as what? Which foreign goverments?

I ask basicly the same thing, which foreign countries, and to provide documented proof that those foreign countries recognized those "licenses", so far nothing from mr. kreep low cycle (just more cb bluster). The ATI is just an international club and any "license/call signs" issued carries no more authority to transmit on any frequency then if the ARRL issued licenses.

4202. Re: Where Did THIS Come From...?!?!a

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-13 20:16:37 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3FDB73A6.996633F3@earthlink.net>
Source record: 83728

Kim W5TIT wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:3FDAB95D.DCF2F198@earthlink.net...
> > Kim W5TIT wrote:
> > >
> > > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > > news:3FD96511.7B4BEA3E@earthlink.net...
> > > > JJ wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > Kim W5TIT wrote:
> > > > > >
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > You know what? I am not so sure that it would take all that much,
> > > Jim. I
> > > > > > > am not even going to pretend to be a financier, but I wonder how
> much
> > > of the
> > > > > > > Federal Budget, i.e. your and my tax dollars, get spent away from
> our
> > > > > > > country. Then, how much foreign debt is "forgiven" each year?
> > > > > >
> > > > > > I would wager we could cut the foreigh aid we send to support those
> > > > > > little pissant dictators in some of those pissant countries and have
> > > > > > more than enough to provide good health care for every citizen.
> > > > >
> > > > > Foreign aid goes a long way toward having those countries vote in the
> > > > > U.N. in line with our policies.
> > > > >
> > > >
> > > > Yeah, money always has been very easy to throw around, 'specially when
> it's
> > > someone else's.
> > >
> > It isn't "someone else's" money, Kim. It is government money obtained
> > from those Americans who pay taxes. The money is being spent in the
> > interest of the people of the U.S.
> >
> >
> > > There's other ways to win friends and influence people--and
> > > ways that would mean a lot more and build better alliances in the >
> longrun.
> >

> > What would you suggest, takeovers of countries or free beer at the U.S.
> > embassy on Friday evenings?
> >
> > > >
> > > > Some of it puts military officers from
> > > > third world countries through *our* military academies. It gives
> those
> > > > officers a chance to live in the U.S. and see how our system works.
> > > > >
> > > >
> > > Yeah, so they can go and influence a bunch of rebels in their or other
> > > homelands and train enemies to the US.
> >
> > Is that what you believe is happening?
> >
> > > We don't need someone learning "our"
> > > way of doing things...let them figure it out for themselves.
> >
> > Not much chance of that. You live here and you haven't figured it out.
> >
> > > > >
> > > > > Some of the aid brings scholars to the U.S. to study.
> > > > >
> > > >
> > > So they can go back to their land, grow a company, and somehow through
> many
> > > different ways, we end up losing jobs and capital over here.
> >
> > Do you believe that is the purpose for bringing foreign students to the
> > U.S. for schooling?
> >
> > > > >
> > > > > If we build a
> > > > > needed flood control dam in Sierra Leone, good will toward the United
> > > > > States is generated.
> > > > >
> > > >
> > > Give them a very, very low interest loan with a good down payment and
> let
> > > them build their own damned dam.
> >
> > That is quite often done. On other occasions, the money comes in the
> > form of a grant. The actual construction, by the way, is often done by
> > U.S. companies.
> >
> > > > >
> > > > > A decade or so back, Botswana actually weaned
> > > > > itself from U.S. aid and thanked us.
> > > > >
> > > >

> > > 'Sbout damned time...although I doubt they're as "weaned" as they should
> be
> > > or are.
> >
> > ...but that's probably just another thing you know little about, huh?
> >
> > > >
> > > > Why would paying for your doctor visits and your medications be the
> > > > government's responsibility?
> >
> > >
> > > Uh, because *we live* in this country?
> >
> > Yeah? So? How does that entitle you to free medical care?
> >
> > > So, you disagree with programs that
> > > improve our infrastructure that is pitiful, helps our kids and elderly
> with
> > > healthcare and even education, begins an effort to ending welfare for
> the
> > > capable, improves health conditions nationwide--and more, while our
> > > government is off in other lands playing Godfather?! Figures, Dave.
> >
> > I don't believe that most Americans believe that anyone other than those
> > children and elderly people should be given free or subsidized health
> > care.
> >
> > > The people of this country who are being taxed to the hilt are paying
> for
> > > the backbone of crap in this country and the rest of the world.
> >
> > They're paying for what?
> >
> > > It's time
> > > the rest of the world and the nitwits in this country get pushed out of
> the
> > > nest. But, of course that ain't happenin' any time soon.
> >
> > There's the Lucy Van Pelt view of Foreign Policy for you. Why don't you
> > stick to things you know something about...as soon as you figure out
> > what those might be?
> >
> > Dave K8MN
> >
>
> I think you're about the hugest piece of crap I've been witness to in a
> long, long time, Dave Heil.

That'd only be because I've refuted your silliness on yet another
occasion, Kim. You'll have to make up your mind on whether I'm the

biggest since you've awarded similar honors to Dwight, Dan, Larry and me at various times.

> You go back into your silver spoon 'gain,
> now...

I actually own some silver spoons, Kim, but if you're referring to the same soon you say I was born with, you're as wrong this time as the first time.

>Buh bye...get another book.

Why, thank you. I have a scads of books but I always enjoy getting a new one!

Aren't you going to tell me whether you believe yourself entitled to free health care at government expense? How about whether you think our foreign policy dollars are being misused?

Dave K8MN

4203. Re: Where Did THIS Come From...?!?!a

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-13 20:26:38 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3FDB75FF.81B76D2E@earthlink.net>
Source record: 83729

Dan/W4NTI wrote:
>
> "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote in message

> > I think you're about the hugest piece of crap I've been witness to in a
> > long, long time, Dave Heil. You go back into your silver spoon 'gain,
> > now... Buh bye...get another book.

> See what I mean Dave? Totally unable to counter what you said. Because she
> knows you are right.

I'm not sure that she knows I'm right but I suspect that she had an idea
that she is incorrect. Kim would rather babble about silver spoons and
books than defend her erroneous claims.

> Yep,..... a knee jerk, bleeding heart, commie
> liberal.

I don't know if I'd use a term like "commie". Kim writes like a
socialist and most of her positions are based on her emotions and
"feelings" rather than what she knows to be fact.

Dave K8MN

4204. Re: Where Did THIS Come From...?!?!a

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-13 20:30:54 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3FDB7700.8A9B23E9@earthlink.net>
Source record: 83730

JJ wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
>
> > JJ wrote:
> >
> >>Dave Heil wrote:
> >>
> >>
> >>>Why would paying for your doctor visits and your medications be the
> >>>government's responsibility?
> >
> >
> >>Do you pay for all your doctor visits and medications, or does some
> >>insurance pay for a good portion of it? I suppose when you are eligible
> >>for Medicare you are going to refuse it, after all,it should not be the
> >>governments responsibility to pay for your medical, Right?
> >
> >
> > I'm not old enough for medicare and it matters not whether insurance
> > covers my visits or medications. Fact is: Government is not paying for
> > my medical care nor do I feel that I have a right to government
> > subsidized medical care. That said, care to answer my question?
>
> How about answering my questions. Do you pay for all your doctor visits
> and medications out of your pocket?

Your question is irrelevant since I already stated that government is
not paying for my medical care. Neither my parents nor my sister are
paying for my medical care. My Uncle Frank isn't paying and you aren't
paying.

> When you do qualify for Medicare,
> you are going to refuse?

I'll let you know when the time comes. Is that fair?

Foreign aid wouldn't begin to cover socialized medicine and it is money
well spent.

Dave K8MN

4205. Re: KC8LDO prances in dresses around children

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-13 21:05:47 UTC
From: keyclownzmustgo@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <17b206c0.0312131305.1a86c17f@posting.google.com>
Source record: 83731
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.skip.cb

Anonymous via the Cypherpunks Tonga Remailer <nobody@cypherpunks.to> wrote in message news:<d5ead94a4eef1239d60554b9b2fbf51e@cypherpunks.to>...
> http://isd.ingham.k12.mi.us/~class/BigHistory.html

I dont see any dress I see a native american costume so that makes you
a racist as well as a troll. At least hes doing something worthwhile.
What do you do except promote radio piracy?????

http://isd.ingham.k12.mi.us/~class/voyageur.gif

4206. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-13 21:51:14 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <mRLCb.16116$P%1.14978870@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 83732
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.cb

"JEP" <no_spam_here34474@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:5a5fcb7b.0312131154.fc35697@posting.google.com...
> I don't like ARRL because:
>
> 1) Membership price too high

Really?? Many local clubs charge anywhere from $20 to $30 and can't do a whole lot for their members except maintain the local repeater.

> 2) Can't separate QST from membership

Why would you want to?

> 3) QST only counts as $15 of the $39 membership fee

Actually you are lucky that it counts as little as that. These days typical magazines generally cost $3 to $4 an issue so they must be getting a good break on the publishing.

> 4) Incentive licensing from the 60's

That was the FCC's idea not the ARRL's.

> 5) Ham radio is a dying hobby

There are more hams than ever before in history.

> 6) 5wpm Extras

So what. The very earliest requirements for licensing hams were, guess what, 5wpm.

> 7) No value given for the money invested

Let's see. Ham radio would have remained closed after WWI if not for the ARRL. They have managed to expand our HF and VHF frequencies. Battled, athough sometimes unsuccessfully, to preserve our allocations. Have lobbying power in Washinton. Convinced the FCC to come up with what is now PRB-1, which gives hams some protection from restrictive city ordinances on antenna height. They are now fighting BPL, which will tear up our HF bands if implemented, and they are working on a bill in Congress to give hams protection from restrictive covenants.

You have and will continue to benefit from the ARRL's work, all without having contributed a dime.

> 8) No accountability of the board and Executive staff

They are accountable to the membership. Any member can challenge them. Any member can get involved, run for a position, and work to change things.

> 9) Really doesn't represent the majority of hams (majority don't
> belong)

That is not the ARRL's fault. They keep trying to recruit. That majority of hams that don't belong don't belong to any other organization either nor do they attempt to form an alternate organization.

> 10) Really no different than 'NRA', 'AARP', 'NAACP'. Take your money
> and use it for their own agenda, NOT yours!

The agenda is set by the MEMBERS. Any time the MEMBERS do not like the policies they can elect new officials. The agenda is based on what members decide to push.

>
> That is enough for a start.
>
> Sorry to see '73' and Wayne Green exit publishing.
> Sorry to see 'Ham Radio' exit publishing.
>
> ex ARRL member
>

You obviously expected the ARRL to ignore all the other member's preferences and expected them to have an agenda 100% tailored to your wants and expectations. That doesn't happen in any organization. If you want them to change, you have to get in there and work hard to get into the thick of the action. Sitting on the sidelines and criticizing doesn't accomplish anything.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

4207. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-13 21:54:33 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <AeOdnfHSKvBoFkaiRVn-ig@gbronline.com>
Source record: 83734
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.cb

JEP wrote:

> 2) Can't separate QST from membership

Check your local newstand or magazine rack in stores, many carry QST.
You can purchase it without membership, or check you local library, they
may carry it and you can read it for free.

4208. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-13 21:57:49 UTC
From: Radioman <radio@ptt.edu>
Message-ID: <3FDB8B5D.6F0CF4C4@ptt.edu>
Source record: 83733
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.cb

JEP wrote:
>
> I don't like ARRL because:
>
> 1) Membership price too high
> 2) Can't separate QST from membership
> 3) QST only counts as $15 of the $39 membership fee
> 4) Incentive licensing from the 60's
> 5) Ham radio is a dying hobby
> 6) 5wpm Extras
> 7) No value given for the money invested
> 8) No accountability of the board and Executive staff
> 9) Really doesn't represent the majority of hams (majority don't
> belong)
> 10) Really no different than 'NRA', 'AARP', 'NAACP'. Take your money
> and use it for their own agenda, NOT yours!
>
> That is enough for a start.
>
> Sorry to see '73' and Wayne Green exit publishing.
> Sorry to see 'Ham Radio' exit publishing.
>
> ex ARRL member

Don't tell us. Send it to:
Reply-to: hamvideo@juno.com
with your real email addy.

4209. Re: Where Did THIS Come From...?!?!a

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-13 22:03:12 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <sYKdnfEPmoelE0aiRVn-gQ@gbronline.com>
Source record: 83735

Dave Heil wrote:
>
> Your question is irrelevant since I already stated that government is
> not paying for my medical care. Neither my parents nor my sister are
> paying for my medical care. My Uncle Frank isn't paying and you aren't
> paying.

Earlier you stated, "it matters not whether insurance covers my visits
or medications." Well, if you have no insurance and you can't pay out of
you own pocket when you receive medical care, then yep, your parents,
sister, Uncle Frank and the rest of us are paying for your medical care
with our taxes that subsidize medical care for those who don't pay.

>
>>When you do qualify for Medicare,
>>you are going to refuse?
>
>
> I'll let you know when the time comes. Is that fair?

Fair, but I bet you don't refuse.
>
> Foreign aid wouldn't begin to cover socialized medicine and it is money
> well spent.

Most of it probably, but a lot just goes to line the pockets of little
dictators.

4210. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-13 23:22:02 UTC
From: garigue <garigue@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <uaNCb.383771$ao4.1280541@attbi_s51>
Source record: 83736

"JEP" <no_spam_here34474@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:5a5fcb7b.0312131154.fc35697@posting.google.com...
> I don't like ARRL because:
>
> 1) Membership price too high
> 2) Can't separate QST from membership
> 3) QST only counts as $15 of the $39 membership fee
> 4) Incentive licensing from the 60's
> 5) Ham radio is a dying hobby
> 6) 5wpm Extras
> 7) No value given for the money invested
> 8) No accountability of the board and Executive staff
> 9) Really doesn't represent the majority of hams (majority don't
> belong)
> 10) Really no different than 'NRA', 'AARP', 'NAACP'. Take your money
> and use it for their own agenda, NOT yours!
>
> That is enough for a start.
>
> Sorry to see '73' and Wayne Green exit publishing.
> Sorry to see 'Ham Radio' exit publishing.
>
> ex ARRL member

Shouldda added "and a cheap whiner" after member. I am not going to waste space replying to each of the above as that would mean that there was some merit or better yet thought there. I run into the same rants from many of the other organizations I belong to when it comes to membership and dues. These people spout off their big mouths which have no shortage of hot air ...but part with a buck or two ....Katie bar the door .... I can take and listen to criticism regarding any organization if the person was a member and not a sap sucking leach-parasite. And yet the ARRL is for all hams. Show me an organization anywhere that operates without funds and I'll show you one that the few work their collective asses off for the benefit of the remainder of the membership i.e. the parasites. So I guess ham radio should collectively ask these tight-wad, freebie seeking, selfish, greedy and non-sharing hams ......WHAT HAVE YOU DONE FOR ME LATELY ????.....expect moan about crap that went under the bridge a long time ago, squeezing that nickel till the Buffalo defecates and hide behind some initial name in the newsgroup.

Take care, don't share and keep on spewing hot air ...

73 KI3R Tom Popovic Belle Vernon Pa

4211. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-14 00:01:54 UTC
From: Clint <"rattlehead at computron dot net">
Message-ID: <vtna3cc2376a6f@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 83737
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.cb

"Louis C. LeVine" <hamop_62@hotmail.com> wrote in message
news:792e029d.0312110853.4daa825f@posting.google.com...
> This came from another radio group. They are doing a survey to find
> out why some people do not like the ARRL. I don't like it because it
> costs to much. If it were $10 a year I might consider joining.
> Louis
> >

I don't like them because the head bosses see themselves as self-appointed gods of ham radio.... at least at one point in time they were trying to get the FCC to hand over authority of the ham radio spectrum to them entirely.

Clint

4212. Re: W5NETs Christmas Card

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-14 01:14:22 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3FDBB96B.2030708@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 83738

>
>
> On second thought Dan, maybe TIT will send us a Photo on her Card.
>
>

See picture in alt.binaries.pictures.radio

4213. Re: KC8LDO prances in dresses around children

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-14 01:15:42 UTC
From: Anonymous <anon@anon.itys.net>
Message-ID: <6eec06e115e31a7b6617986d992cdc9a@itys.net>
Source record: 83739
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Frank you have twist on the brain. Hes out of town on weekends hes not out of town. Go back to talking to yourself. Your more entertaining that way.

4214. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-14 01:19:49 UTC
From: garigue <garigue@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <VUOCb.341693$Dw6.1130956@attbi_s02>
Source record: 83740

Hello Clint ....

Well the FCC handed over testing to VEC groups and we all know how the milk of human honesty flows with that decision. Maybe if the ARRL did have control of the "ham" spectrum we wouldn't be concerned about protecting our turf from other interests. It is sort of ironic that the ARRL is becoming in some way like the NRA in that it is soliciting monies to protect the "bailiwick"

Ham radio Gods??? No more than the FCC is at present and I think I would take Newington over Washington to give me more of a radio bang for my buck ... albeit neither is perfect.

God Bless 73 KI3R Tom Popovic Belle Vernon Pa

"Clint" <rattlehead at computron dot net> wrote in message news:vtna3cc2376a6f@corp.supernews.com...
>
> "Louis C. LeVine" <hamop_62@hotmail.com> wrote in message
> news:792e029d.0312110853.4daa825f@posting.google.com...
> > This came from another radio group. They are doing a survey to find
> > out why some people do not like the ARRL. I don't like it because it
> > costs to much. If it were $10 a year I might consider joining.
> > Louis

Yepper Louis and if a Corvette were 10K I'd have one in my garage now ...
73 KI3R

> I don't like them because the head bosses see themselves as self-appointed
> gods of ham radio.... at least at one point in time they were trying to
get
> the FCC to hand over authority of the ham radio spectrum to them
> entirely.
>
> Clint
>
>

4215. Re: Where Did THIS Come From...?!?!a

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-14 01:23:21 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <dYOCb.12448$9O6.2235@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 83741

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3FDB75FF.81B76D2E@earthlink.net...
> Dan/W4NTI wrote:
> >
> > "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote in message
>
> > > I think you're about the hugest piece of crap I've been witness to in
a
> > > long, long time, Dave Heil. You go back into your silver spoon 'gain,
> > > now... Buh bye...get another book.
>
>
> > See what I mean Dave? Totally unable to counter what you said. Because
she
> > knows you are right.
>
> I'm not sure that she knows I'm right but I suspect that she had an idea
> that she is incorrect. Kim would rather babble about silver spoons and
> books than defend her erroneous claims.
>
> > Yep,..... a knee jerk, bleeding heart, commie
> > liberal.
>
> I don't know if I'd use a term like "commie". Kim writes like a
> socialist and most of her positions are based on her emotions and
> "feelings" rather than what she knows to be fact.
>
> Dave K8MN

It's a small jump from Socialist to Communist Dave. My life experience
tells me they are one and the same.

Dan/W4NTI

4216. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-14 02:52:36 UTC
From: Ragchewer <rc@ragchewnow.org>
Message-ID: <brgj9i$q2k$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 83742
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.cb

Why do I not like the ARRL? I will answer that with another
question. Would you trust a gang of Yankee carpetbaggers,
the same bunch who stole from the southerners at the end of
the War Between The States? You would? Good! Sign
up for life membership with the rest of the NewingtonYankee
gang. As for me, the league can go f..k itself, since that is what
it has been doing to the rest of us for decades.

RC

4217. Re: Bush Thrills Troops, Hillary Doesn't

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-14 02:55:59 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0312131855.7780b3ec@posting.google.com>
Source record: 83743

igoruberwald@home.nl (Igor von Uberwald) wrote in message
news:<e9b53b2a.0312131031.3a870d7d@posting.google.com>...
> Hi all,
>
> Referring to the famous Baghdad dinner:
>
> > > But in the next breath Rivera added, "They were even more impressed
> > > with their turkey dinner."
>
> Yes - and everybody knows that the turkey was a fake.

They always put out a relatively real looking turkey - it makes the
turkey loaf cubes slightly more palatable.

4218. Re: Bush Thrills Troops, Hillary Doesn't

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-14 03:02:03 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0312131902.1d75c847@posting.google.com>
Source record: 83744

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:<PbwAb.1935$Ho3.1635@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> "Brian" wrote:
> >
> > Wow. I never knew that NATO benefitted
> > the USA. I always assumed that it was just
> > another welfare agency that sucked us dry.
> >
> > So please detail the benefits that the USA
> > receives, and don't tell me it's an unlimited
> > supply of blue helmuts.
>
> You need to study up on national defense, Brian.

True, I haven't been an instrument of national policy since December
31, 1996. Things have probably changed a lot.

NATO, even today, is
> critical to our strategic defense in that region of the world. Likewise,
> bases in Europe play an important role in many lesser conflicts overseas
> (refueling, supply, protection for ships passing through that area, area
> commands, and so on). Europe could defend itself today. We benefit that
> defense just as they benefit our defense. Therefore, we need those bases in
> Europe just about as much as they need us.

Dwight, things haven't changed -that- much. You've somehow rolled
national defense and NATO into the United Nations. It just isn't so.

Brian

4219. Re: Where Did THIS Come From...?!?!a

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-14 04:05:09 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20031213230509.15462.00004935@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 83746

In article <BPKdnZ9G5_9Up0SiRVn-sw@gbronline.com>, JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
writes:

>The U.S. does need to develope better mass transit in large
>metropolitian areas. When I lived in the Dallas/Ft. Worth, Texas area,
>the two cities were always complaining about the heavy commute traffic
>and how they were not using the available mass transit system. The would
>encourage people to car pool or use what mass transit was available, all
>the while they were expanding the freeway system to accomodate more
>vehicles. If you want people to use mass transit you have to 1) build a
>good mass transit system, and 2) don't build massive freeway systems
>that make it easier for people to drive their vehicles to work than ride
> mass transit.

One of the main problems is that even in the most densely-populated areas
during peak traffic hours, all those cars on the roadway only occupy about
five percent of the available road surface. Intelligent highway systems could
solve that problem by taking the drivers out of the loop during, taking control
of the cars and allowing them to safely convoy almost bumper-to-bumper.
In this way, traffic volume could be multiplied many times without building
more roads. Would you trust a computer to drive your Buick?

73 de Larry, K3LT

4220. Re: Where Did THIS Come From...?!?!a

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-14 04:05:10 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20031213230510.15462.00004936@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 83745

In article <Xns944F29A4453elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun
<alun@1stcounsel.com> writes:

>I think you should build the freeways, but mass transit should be
>developped much more as well. I used to commute 23 miles each way into
>London by train. I am now 27 miles by road from downtown Washington DC,
>but I am 15 miles from the nearest station!!
>
>As long as I have to drive half way there to get to the station I'm going
>to drive all the way there. A system where the trains only run about 15
>miles out from the middle of downtown is basically hopelessly crippled by
>European standards, and doesn't really count as 'available' to most
>people.
>
>When most of the commuters live way, way beyond the end of the line it can
>never live up to it's potential. Sure, we are more spread out in America,
>but all that should mean is that I may have to drive across town to the
>station. It should never mean that I have to drive to another town 15
>miles away to catch a commuter train, but that's how it is now, and
>needless to say, I don't do it.

Alun:

The situation you describe pretty much sums up the limitations that geography
imposes on public transit systems. A partial solution would be to utilize
demand-
response systems whereby busses travelling flexible routes on flexible
schedules can pick up commuters at their door, and transfer them to the nearest
fixed-route terminal. Once demand patterns are established, the system can be
re-scheduled at will to ensure maximum transit vehicle utilization without
inconveniencing passenger scheduling. This is done all the time in my own line
of work, which is Paratransit operations. The concept can be easily overlayed
on any other route structure, and there would be the advantage that most, if
not all, of the passengers would be able-bodied, and there would be no time
lost loading and securing wheelchairs or providing assistance to slow-moving
people who have difficulty in boarding the bus. The problem, of course, is
that adding such a service would come at a high cost. Would most commuters be
willing to pay the price of being to leave their cars home? A fare structure
which required the rider to pay the full, non-subsidized cost of the
demand-response portion of his transit service would mean forking over a fare
of up to $10-15 for that portion of the ride. Of course, some commuters pay
that much just to park their automobiles for the day. OTOH, they would not have
the option of making a trip to Home Depot on the way home.

The best solution would probably to simply arrange it so that more people were able to work closer to where they live. Another is to adopt the European paradigm of establishing communities with higher population density in residential areas. That would mean more townhouses and condominium apartment complexes, and fewer single-family homes surrounded by acres of grass and concrete. When more people live closer together, it becomes much more cost-effective to provide mass transit.

73 de Larry, K3LT

4221. Re: Where Did THIS Come From...?!?!a

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-14 04:05:11 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20031213230511.15462.00004937@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 83747

In article <brc9rg$81s@library1.airnews.net>, "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
writes:

>I tired mass transit when I first started working downtown. Nothing
>convenient, friendly, safe, or good about it at all. It was scarey because
>of the drivers, inconvenient because I had to work my schedule around
>theirs, unfriendly people getting on and off knocking others with their
>asses or briefcases, and I'll never do it again.
>
>Kim W5TIT
>

Here's a little known fact that much of the travelling public would never be
able
to guess: There are no regulations at the state or federal level which govern
how
many hours a transit operator (bus driver, motorman, paratransit operator,
etc.)
can work within a 24-hour period. It is common practice for transit operators
to
work inordinate amounts of voluntary overtime, sometimes putting in double
shifts on a daily basis. The Interstate Commerce Commission (ICC) governs the
amount of hours truck drivers can be on duty during a 24-hour period, I believe
the present limit is 10 hours of continuous duty with a mandatory 8-hour rest
period thereafter. Log books documenting time at the wheel and at rest are
required, and in the case of single-operator trucks, the rest periods must be
verified by time and mileage records that are a part of their log.

Since transit vehicles operate within a closed region, as opposed to
interstate, they are not covered by such rules. Therefore, the bus you board
could be being driven by a person who has been on duty for 10, 12, or 14 hours
-- or more! I recently attended a meeting of my local union in which our own
local union President claimed that he routinely worked in excess of 100 hours
per week as a fixed-route bus driver. Keep in mind, there are only 168 hours
in a whole week! This is obviously a shocking hazard to public safety, and
legislation is obviously needed which establish and enforce reasonable operator
duty limits within the transit industry. "Scarey
drivers" indeed, Kim. Who wants to ride a bus being driven by a zombie?

73 de Larry, K3LT

4222. Re: Where Did THIS Come From...?!?!a

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-14 04:43:47 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3FDBEA81.483432B@earthlink.net>
Source record: 83748

JJ wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> >
> > Your question is irrelevant since I already stated that government is
> > not paying for my medical care. Neither my parents nor my sister are
> > paying for my medical care. My Uncle Frank isn't paying and you aren't
> > paying.
>
> Earlier you stated, "it matters not whether insurance covers my visits
> or medications." Well, if you have no insurance and you can't pay out of
> you own pocket when you receive medical care, then yep, your parents,
> sister, Uncle Frank and the rest of us are paying for your medical care
> with our taxes that subsidize medical care for those who don't pay.

That's quite a leap, JJ. If I'm against socialized medicine and have
clearly made known my opposition for government provided medical care,
I'm not likely looking for a handout.

> >>When you do qualify for Medicare,
> >>you are going to refuse?

> > I'll let you know when the time comes. Is that fair?

> Fair, but I bet you don't refuse.

Bet all you like but check with me in twelve years or so.

> > Foreign aid wouldn't begin to cover socialized medicine and it is money
> > well spent.
>
> Most of it probably, but a lot just goes to line the pockets of little
> dictators.

How much is a lot? What percentage of U.S. aid money lines the pockets
of dictators? Is it enough, as you claimed, to take care of providing
free health care to Americans?

Dave K8MN

4223. Re: Bill Pasternak a real asshole

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-14 04:52:40 UTC
From: Bill Newkirk <wnewkirk@bellsouth.net>
Message-ID: <p_RCb.13577$T14.464@bignews3.bellsouth.net>
Source record: 83749

i doubt k1man had anything to do with the start up of
rec.radio.amateur.policy.

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:UGHCb.540$mC1.83@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> Sorry to have confused you Bill. Perhaps if you scrolled down and read
the
> included message it would have helped.
>
> Have a nice day.
>
> Dan/W4NTI
>
> "Bill Newkirk" <wnewkirk@bellsouth.net> wrote in message
> news:YoxCb.8783$Ob4.1141@bignews2.bellsouth.net...
> > Uh, this is Usenet, dood.
> >
> >
> > If you're reading this using mail, you're wasting your time.
> >
> >
> >
> > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
> > news:wsnCb.655$5B.489@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> > > Hey asshole Bill,
> > >
> > > I did not initiate this little group. It was started by K1MAN. I did
> > > remove you, but before I did I get this in MY mailbox.
> > >
> > > Furthermore, stop threatning me. Who cares if you don't want K1MAN's
> > SPAM.
> > > Take it up with Glenn. How about YOU STAYING OUT OF MY MAILBOX ???
> > >
> > > Oh, One more thing....since you don't seem to mind K1MAN qrming the
> bands
> > > with your newsline. When the crap hits the fan hopefully your going
to
> > > slide into it too.
> > >
> > > Have a nice day.
> > >
> > > Dan/W4NTI
> > >
> > >

> > >
> > >
> > >
> > >
> > >
> > >
> > > Dear Sir,
> > >
> > > I asked you once to remove me from your K1MAN SPAM LIST. Obviously you
> did
> > > not understand me. Hence, as of this moment, all mail from you to ANY
> > > ARNewsline e-mail account is blocked. This matter is closed to further
> > > discussion.
> > >
> > > Bill Pasternak, WA6ITF
> > > Writer - Producer
> > > The Amateur Radio Newsline, Inc.
> > > wa6itf@arnewsline.org
> > > http://www.arnewsline.org
> > > "Since 1976 - Hobby Radio News
> > > for Todays Radio Amateur"
> > >
> > >
> >
> >
>
>

4224. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-14 06:04:08 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <s3TCb.16156$P%1.15064983@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 83750
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.cb

"Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
news:f45722ac.0312131852.55c74b74@posting.google.com...
> Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:<mcGCb.623$xH2.485769@news1.news.adelphia.net>...
> > Steve Robeson, K4CAP wrote:
> >
> > > hamop_62@hotmail.com (Louis C. LeVine) wrote in message
news:<792e029d.0312110853.4daa825f@posting.google.com>...
> > >
> > > >>This came from another radio group. They are doing a survey to find
> > > >>out why some people do not like the ARRL. I don't like it because it
> > > >>costs to much. If it were $10 a year I might consider joining.
> > > >>Louis
> > > >
> > > >
> > > > And just exactly what do you expect that they could do for $10.00
> > > > a month?
> > > >
> > > > Please name me ONE organization in ANY "hobby" activity that
> > > > provdes the scope of servcies and resources the ARRL offers to it's
> > > > target peer group.
> > > >
> > > > Awaiting your informed response.
> > >
> > > I think this is one of those cases where some people think that their
> > > membership is a subscription to QST. Its a lot more than that. ARRL does
> > > a lot for Amateurs, even those who hate the organization.
> > >
> > > - Mike KB3EIA -
> >
> >
> > Fair enough.
> >
> > I dislike some of the policies that the ARRL has promoted in the past,
> > and felt as if the ARRL did not represent me even though I have been a
> > member since 1986.

Did you get actively involved? Did you become a section director? Did you
campaign to sway the majority to your opinion? Or did you just write a
letter or two complaining and were disappointed because it didn't instantly
change the ARRL's policies? If you want your point of view to be policy
then you have to become very politically active in an organization.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

4225. Re: Bush Thrills Troops, Hillary Doesn't

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-14 06:27:21 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <dpTCb.97$6E.31@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 83801

"Brian" wrote:
> "Dwight Stewart" wrote:
> > NATO, even today, is critical to our
> > strategic defense in that region of the
> > world. Likewise, bases in Europe play
> > an important role in many lesser conflicts
> > overseas (refueling, supply, protection
> > for ships passing through that area, area
> > commands, and so on). Europe could
> > defend itself today. We benefit that
> > defense just as they benefit our defense.
> > Therefore, we need those bases in
> > Europe just about as much as they need
> > us.
>
> Dwight, things haven't changed -that- much.
> You've somehow rolled national defense
> and NATO into the United Nations. It just
> isn't so.

I did? I don't remember saying a single word about the United Nations. You were talking about NATO ("I never knew that NATO benefited the USA," you said). I responded to that. Our military relations with Europe is important and NATO is a major part of that.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

4226. Re: W5NETs Christmas Card

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-14 06:54:05 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <hOTCb.108$6E.83@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 83802

"WA8ULX" wrote:
>
> You really want us to believe that, I think
> you sent all the Money to the CBplussers.
> I also heard from some reliable sources,
> that you also included a LIFETIME
> MEMBERSHIP TO NCI.

I tried to get you a membership in some organization, but I haven't been able to find one with standards low enough to accept you. But don't give up hope yet - there is still several days till Christmas and I've found a Ham Radio Club in Gyzylarbat, Turkmenistan, that has shown some small interest in accepting your membership.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

4227. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-14 07:03:24 UTC
From: NRA LIfe Member <NoSpam@NoSpam>
Message-ID: <brh1vs$ln4$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 83803
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.cb

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:s3TCb.16156$P%1.15064983@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...

"Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
news:f45722ac.0312131852.55c74b74@posting.google.com...
> Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:<mcGCb.623$xH2.485769@news1.news.adelphia.net>...
> > Steve Robeson, K4CAP wrote:
> >
> > > hamop_62@hotmail.com (Louis C. LeVine) wrote in message
news:<792e029d.0312110853.4daa825f@posting.google.com>...
> > >
> > >>This came from another radio group. They are doing a survey to find
> > >>out why some people do not like the ARRL. I don't like it because it
> > >>costs to much. If it were $10 a year I might consider joining.
> > >>Louis
> > >
> > >
> > > And just exactly what do you expect that they could do for $10.00
> > > a month?
> > >
> > > Please name me ONE organization in ANY "hobby" activity that
> > > provdes the scope of servcies and resources the ARRL offers to it's
> > > target peer group.
> > >
> > > Awaiting your informed response.
> >
> > I think this is one of those cases where some people think that their
> > membership is a subscription to QST. Its a lot more than that. ARRL does
> > a lot for Amateurs, even those who hate the organization.
> >
> > - Mike KB3EIA -
>
>
> Fair enough.
>
> I dislike some of the policies that the ARRL has promoted in the past,
> and felt as if the ARRL did not represent me even though I have been a
> member since 1986.

Did you get actively involved? Did you become a section director? Did you
campaign to sway the majority to your opinion? Or did you just write a
letter or two complaining and were disappointed because it didn't instantly
change the ARRL's policies? If you want your point of view to be policy

then you have to become very politically active in an organization.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

Hey, Dee. Where is it written that one must be a member of the ARRL to dislike or disapprove of their policies? Your opinion is not the end-all of arguments in this arena, shock that this must be to you.
The fact of the matter is that many, many Hams, such as myself, have dropped our memberships because of the failed policies and ever-increasing costs of said membership.
What do we get for the forty bucks a year? (or whatever it is now).
Nada...nothing.
I will continue to work DX and continue to enjoy the hobby, but the only "loss" as I see it is that I will no longer be able to attach the ARRL logo to my QSL cards. No loss there.
By the way, when those of us who used to be ARRL members voiced our dissent, our voices went unheeded. Bottom line...what's the use? One soon learns that it is a useless endeavor to "piss into the wind".
I am but one voice in this maelstrom, but I take comfort in knowing that the ARRL no longer has use of my dollars.
Know what? I am getting along just fine.
I will not give my name or callsign on these news groups.
Even YOU should be able to understand why.

4228. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-14 07:05:44 UTC
From: Radioman <radio@ptt.edu>
Message-ID: <3FDC0BC8.D23349D4@ptt.edu>
Source record: 83804
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.cb

Ragchewer wrote:
>
> Why do I not like the ARRL? I will answer that with another
> question. Would you trust a gang of Yankee carpetbaggers,
> the same bunch who stole from the southerners at the end of
> the War Between The States? You would? Good! Sign
> up for life membership with the rest of the NewingtonYankee
> gang. As for me, the league can go f..k itself, since that is what
> it has been doing to the rest of us for decades.
>
> RC

Don't tell us. Send it to:
Reply-to: hamvideo@juno.com
with your real email addy.

4229. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-14 07:07:06 UTC
From: Radioman <radio@ptt.edu>
Message-ID: <3FDC0C1A.F317BBF5@ptt.edu>
Source record: 83805
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.cb

Clint wrote:

> I don't like them because the head bosses see themselves as self-appointed
> gods of ham radio.... at least at one point in time they were trying to get
> the FCC to hand over authority of the ham radio spectrum to them
> entirely.
>
> Clint

Don't tell us. Send it to:
Reply-to: hamvideo@juno.com
with your real email addy.

4230. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-14 07:19:29 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <5aUCb.121$6E.100@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 83806
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.cb

"JEP" wrote:
> I don't like ARRL because:
>
> 1) Membership price too high
> 2) Can't separate QST from membership
> (snip)

Several years ago (four or five), QST was available at the Barnes and Noble bookstore in this area. But it then disappeared off the shelf and I haven't seen it since. When I asked the manager about it, he looked on the computer and said the magazine was no longer available from the supplier. This was surprising since the magazine sold out almost immediately each month (I missed several issues because of that).

The newsgroups rec.radio.shortwave and rec.radio.cb has been deleted from this reply (discussion is off-topic in those newsgroups).

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

4231. Re: Where Did THIS Come From...?!?!a

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-14 07:25:09 UTC
From: Alun <alun@1stcounsel.com>
Message-ID: <Xns94511899EEF41elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 83807

yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) wrote in
news:20031213230510.15462.00004936@mb-m06.aol.com:

> In article <Xns944F29A4453elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun
> <alun@1stcounsel.com> writes:
>
>>I think you should build the freeways, but mass transit should be
>>developped much more as well. I used to commute 23 miles each way into
>>London by train. I am now 27 miles by road from downtown Washington DC,
>>but I am 15 miles from the nearest station!!
>>
>>As long as I have to drive half way there to get to the station I'm
>>going to drive all the way there. A system where the trains only run
>>about 15 miles out from the middle of downtown is basically hopelessly
>>crippled by European standards, and doesn't really count as 'available'
>>to most people.
>>
>>When most of the commuters live way, way beyond the end of the line it
>>can never live up to it's potential. Sure, we are more spread out in
>>America, but all that should mean is that I may have to drive across
>>town to the station. It should never mean that I have to drive to
>>another town 15 miles away to catch a commuter train, but that's how it
>>is now, and needless to say, I don't do it.
>
> Alun:
>
> The situation you describe pretty much sums up the limitations that
> geography imposes on public transit systems. A partial solution would
> be to utilize demand-
> response systems whereby busses travelling flexible routes on flexible
> schedules can pick up commuters at their door, and transfer them to the
> nearest fixed-route terminal. Once demand patterns are established,
> the system can be re-scheduled at will to ensure maximum transit
> vehicle utilization without inconveniencing passenger scheduling. This
> is done all the time in my own line of work, which is Paratransit
> operations. The concept can be easily overlayed on any other route
> structure, and there would be the advantage that most, if not all, of
> the passengers would be able-bodied, and there would be no time lost
> loading and securing wheelchairs or providing assistance to slow-moving
> people who have difficulty in boarding the bus. The problem, of
> course, is that adding such a service would come at a high cost. Would
> most commuters be willing to pay the price of being to leave their cars
> home? A fare structure which required the rider to pay the full,
> non-subsidized cost of the demand-response portion of his transit

> service would mean forking over a fare of up to $10-15 for that portion
> of the ride. Of course, some commuters pay that much just to park
> their automobiles for the day. OTOH, they would not have the option of
> making a trip to Home Depot on the way home.
>
> The best solution would probably to simply arrange it so that more
> people were able to work closer to where they live. Another is to
> adopt the European paradigm of establishing communities with higher
> population density in residential areas. That would mean more
> townhouses and condominium apartment complexes, and fewer single-family
> homes surrounded by acres of grass and concrete. When more people live
> closer together, it becomes much more cost-effective to provide mass
> transit.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>
>

I think what's missing is the political will to spend the money. Busses are no solution. They have to use the same roads as the cars, so by the time they have stopped to pick up and set down passengers they don't even have a fighting chance to make the trip in the same time as a car, even with HOV lanes. We have bus service, but it is rush hour only. It will be a cold day in you know where before I ride the bus.

If you build the subway lines only half way to the suburbs, it becomes easy to think they would not get enough passengers if extended further, as they are already under-used. Of course they are under-used when they don't go far enough to get you home. What else should anyone expect?

4232. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-14 11:07:26 UTC
From: no_spam_here34474@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <5a5fcb7b.0312140307.3113ccdf@posting.google.com>
Source record: 83808
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.cb

And just who is

hamvideo@juno.com ?????

I have given a real email address and feel free to respond to it.

The ARRL hasn't represented the membership directly---EVER!

The ARRL has had it's own agenda (big money) for years.

The ARRL would be considered a large corp. in most sectors, operating
under a non-profit status.

The only good about the ARRL is/was QST and now I can't even find it
on the news stands.

Bye bye ARRL.

Bye bye ham radio as we know it.

JEP

Radioman <radio@ptt.edu> wrote in message news:<3FDB8B5D.6F0CF4C4@ptt.edu>...
> JEP wrote:
> >
> > I don't like ARRL because:
> >
> > 1) Membership price too high
> > 2) Can't separate QST from membership
> > 3) QST only counts as $15 of the $39 membership fee
> > 4) Incentive licensing from the 60's
> > 5) Ham radio is a dying hobby
> > 6) 5wpm Extras
> > 7) No value given for the money invested
> > 8) No accountability of the board and Executive staff
> > 9) Really doesn't represent the majority of hams (majority don't
> > belong)
> > 10) Really no different than 'NRA', 'AARP', 'NAACP'. Take your money
> > and use it for their own agenda, NOT yours!
> >
> > That is enough for a start.
> >
> > Sorry to see '73' and Wayne Green exit publishing.
> > Sorry to see 'Ham Radio' exit publishing.
> >
> > ex ARRL member

>
>
> Don't tell us. Send it to:
> Reply-to: hamvideo@juno.com
> with your real email addy.

4233. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-14 13:54:20 UTC
From: "Dr. Daffodil Swain" <wa4jm@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <gYZCb.109$Bg5.3@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 83809
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.cb

```
Did you become a section director?

Those jobs are reserved for Lifetime Members.

"NRA LIfe Member" <NoSpam@NoSpam> wrote in message
news:brh1vs$ln4$0@pita.alt.net...
>
> "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
> news:s3TCb.16156$P%1.15064983@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
>
> "Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
> news:f45722ac.0312131852.55c74b74@posting.google.com...
> > Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
> news:<mcGCb.623$xH2.485769@news1.news.adelphia.net>...
> > > Steve Robeson, K4CAP wrote:
> > >
> > > > hamop_62@hotmail.com (Louis C. LeVine) wrote in message
> news:<792e029d.0312110853.4daa825f@posting.google.com>...
> > > > >
> > > >>This came from another radio group. They are doing a survey to find
> > > >>out why some people do not like the ARRL. I don't like it because it
> > > >>costs to much. If it were $10 a year I might consider joining.
> > > >>Louis
> > > > >
> > > > >
> > > > And just exactly what do you expect that they could do for
$10.00
> > > > a month?
> > > > >
> > > > Please name me ONE organization in ANY "hobby" activity that
> > > > provdes the scope of servcies and resources the ARRL offers to it's
> > > > target peer group.
> > > > >
> > > > Awaiting your informed response.
> > >
> > > I think this is one of those cases where some people think that their
> > > membership is a subscription to QST. Its a lot more than that. ARRL
does
> > > a lot for Amateurs, even those who hate the organization.
> > >
> > > - Mike KB3EIA -
> >
> >
> > Fair enough.
```

> >
> > I dislike some of the policies that the ARRL has promoted in the past,
> > and felt as if the ARRL did not represent me even though I have been a
> > member since 1986.
>
> Did you get actively involved? Did you become a section director? Did
you
> campaign to sway the majority to your opinion? Or did you just write a
> letter or two complaining and were disappointed because it didn't
instantly
> change the ARRL's policies? If you want your point of view to be policy
> then you have to become very politically active in an organization.
>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>
>
> Hey, Dee. Where is it written that one must be a member of the ARRL to
> dislike or disapprove of their policies? Your opinion is not the end-all
of
> arguments in this arena, shock that this must be to you.
> The fact of the matter is that many, many Hams, such as myself, have
dropped
> our memberships because of the failed policies and ever-increasing costs
of
> said membership.
> What do we get for the forty bucks a year? (or whatever it is now).
> Nada...nothing.
> I will continue to work DX and continue to enjoy the hobby, but the only
> "loss" as I see it is that I will no longer be able to attach the ARRL
logo
> to my QSL cards. No loss there.
> By the way, when those of us who used to be ARRL members voiced our
dissent,
> our voices went unheeded. Bottom line...what's the use? One soon learns
that
> it is a useless endeavor to "piss into the wind".
> I am but one voice in this maelstrom, but I take comfort in knowing that
the
> ARRL no longer has use of my dollars.
> Know what? I am getting along just fine.
> I will not give my name or callsign on these news groups.
> Even YOU should be able to understand why.
>
>
>
>
>

4234. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-14 14:48:51 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <nL_Cb.3597$0s2.1862@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 83810
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.cb

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote

> Several years ago (four or five), QST was available at the Barnes and
> Noble bookstore in this area. But it then disappeared off the shelf and I
> haven't seen it since.

At $4.99/mo ($59.88/yr) plus tax, I'm sure it wasn't a high volume business
for Barnes and Noble, since that's a 53% premium over the membership dues,
and you don't get the other benefits which comes with membership. Only an
idiot would regularly buy QST from a news stand!

73, de Hans, K0HB

4235. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-14 14:54:42 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <SQ_Cb.3599$0s2.2955@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 83811
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.cb

"Dr. Daffodil Swain" <wa4jm@earthlink.net> wrote

> Did you become a section director?
>
> Those jobs are reserved for Lifetime Members.

There is no such animal as a 'section director'. Perhaps you meant 'Section Manager'. There is no requirement to be a life member to be elected to that position. Neither is there such a requirement for Division Director or Division Vice Director (I was twice elected to that position, and I'm not a life member.)

Doncha just hate it when facts come into play and spoil your lovely rant?

73, de Hans, K0HB

4236. Re: Bill Pasternak a real asshole

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-14 15:35:32 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <8r%Cb.251$Bg5.207@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 83812

OK Bill, I'll try this in special english.

1. I didn't start the e-mail list that he is calling me a spammer about.

2. He removed my e-mail address access to ALL of his e-mail sites.

3. Thus, I have no way to respond.

4. This is a public forum.

5. If he don't read it, perhaps someone would pass it along.

6. Any questions?

This is Dan/W4NTI in special english.

"Bill Newkirk" <wnewkirk@bellsouth.net> wrote in message
news:p_RCb.13577$T14.464@bignews3.bellsouth.net...
> i doubt k1man had anything to do with the start up of
> rec.radio.amateur.policy.
>
>
>
> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
> news:UGHCb.540$mC1.83@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> > Sorry to have confused you Bill. Perhaps if you scrolled down and read
> the
> > included message it would have helped.
> >
> > Have a nice day.
> >
> > Dan/W4NTI
> >
> > "Bill Newkirk" <wnewkirk@bellsouth.net> wrote in message
> > news:YoxCb.8783$Ob4.1141@bignews2.bellsouth.net...
> > > Uh, this is Usenet, dood.
> > >
> > >
> > > If you're reading this using mail, you're wasting your time.
> > >
> > >
> > >
> > > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
> > > news:wsnCb.655$5B.489@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> > > > Hey asshole Bill,
> > > >
> > > > I did not initiate this little group. It was started by K1MAN. I

did
> > > > remove you, but before I did I get this in MY mailbox.
> > > >
> > > > Furthermore, stop threatning me. Who cares if you don't want
K1MAN's
> > > SPAM.
> > > > Take it up with Glenn. How about YOU STAYING OUT OF MY MAILBOX ???
> > > >
> > > > Oh, One more thing....since you don't seem to mind K1MAN qrming the
> > bands
> > > > with your newsline. When the crap hits the fan hopefully your going
> to
> > > > slide into it too.
> > > >
> > > > Have a nice day.
> > > >
> > > > Dan/W4NTI
> > > >
> > > >
> > > >
> > > >
> > > >
> > > >
> > > >
> > > >
> > > > Dear Sir,
> > > >
> > > > I asked you once to remove me from your K1MAN SPAM LIST. Obviously
you
> > did
> > > > not understand me. Hence, as of this moment, all mail from you to
ANY
> > > > ARNewsline e-mail account is blocked. This matter is closed to
further
> > > > discussion.
> > > >
> > > > Bill Pasternak, WA6ITF
> > > > Writer - Producer
> > > > The Amateur Radio Newsline, Inc.
> > > > wa6itf@arnewsline.org
> > > > http://www.arnewsline.org
> > > > "Since 1976 - Hobby Radio News
> > > > for Todays Radio Amateur"
> > > >
> > > >
> > >
> > >
> >
> >
>

>

4237. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-14 15:39:01 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <pu%Cb.254$Bg5.57@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 83813
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.cb

```
"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:s3TCb.16156$P%1.15064983@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
>
> "Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
> news:f45722ac.0312131852.55c74b74@posting.google.com...
> > Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
> news:<mcGCb.623$xH2.485769@news1.news.adelphia.net>...
> > > Steve Robeson, K4CAP wrote:
> > >
> > > > hamop_62@hotmail.com (Louis C. LeVine) wrote in message
> news:<792e029d.0312110853.4daa825f@posting.google.com>...
> > > > >
> > > >>This came from another radio group. They are doing a survey to find
> > > >>out why some people do not like the ARRL. I don't like it because it
> > > >>costs to much. If it were $10 a year I might consider joining.
> > > >>Louis
> > > > >
> > > > >
> > > > And just exactly what do you expect that they could do for
$10.00
> > > > a month?
> > > > >
> > > > Please name me ONE organization in ANY "hobby" activity that
> > > > provdes the scope of servcies and resources the ARRL offers to it's
> > > > target peer group.
> > > > >
> > > > Awaiting your informed response.
> > > >
> > > I think this is one of those cases where some people think that their
> > > membership is a subscription to QST. Its a lot more than that. ARRL
does
> > > a lot for Amateurs, even those who hate the organization.
> > >
> > > - Mike KB3EIA -
> >
> >
> > Fair enough.
> >
> > I dislike some of the policies that the ARRL has promoted in the past,
> > and felt as if the ARRL did not represent me even though I have been a
> > member since 1986.
>
> Did you get actively involved? Did you become a section director? Did
```

you
> campaign to sway the majority to your opinion? Or did you just write a
> letter or two complaining and were disappointed because it didn't
instantly
> change the ARRL's policies? If you want your point of view to be policy
> then you have to become very politically active in an organization.
>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>

Correct, and in other words. If you want to change it, you have to be on
the inside.

Dan/W4NTI

4238. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-14 15:41:21 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <Bw%Cb.256$Bg5.145@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 83814
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.cb

"NRA LIfe Member" <NoSpam@NoSpam> wrote in message
news:brh1vs$ln4$0@pita.alt.net...
>
> "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
> news:s3TCb.16156$P%1.15064983@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
>
> "Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
> news:f45722ac.0312131852.55c74b74@posting.google.com...
> > Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
> news:<mcGCb.623$xH2.485769@news1.news.adelphia.net>...
> > > Steve Robeson, K4CAP wrote:
> > >
> > > > hamop_62@hotmail.com (Louis C. LeVine) wrote in message
> news:<792e029d.0312110853.4daa825f@posting.google.com>...
> > > >
> > > > >>This came from another radio group. They are doing a survey to find
> > > > >>out why some people do not like the ARRL. I don't like it because it
> > > > >>costs to much. If it were $10 a year I might consider joining.
> > > > >>Louis
> > > > >
> > > > >
> > > > And just exactly what do you expect that they could do for
$10.00
> > > > a month?
> > > > >
> > > > Please name me ONE organization in ANY "hobby" activity that
> > > > provdes the scope of servcies and resources the ARRL offers to it's
> > > > target peer group.
> > > > >
> > > > Awaiting your informed response.
> > > >
> > > I think this is one of those cases where some people think that their
> > > membership is a subscription to QST. Its a lot more than that. ARRL
does
> > > a lot for Amateurs, even those who hate the organization.
> > >
> > > - Mike KB3EIA -
> >
> >
> > Fair enough.
> >
> > I dislike some of the policies that the ARRL has promoted in the past,
> > and felt as if the ARRL did not represent me even though I have been a

> > member since 1986.
>
> Did you get actively involved? Did you become a section director? Did
you
> campaign to sway the majority to your opinion? Or did you just write a
> letter or two complaining and were disappointed because it didn't
instantly
> change the ARRL's policies? If you want your point of view to be policy
> then you have to become very politically active in an organization.
>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>
>
> Hey, Dee. Where is it written that one must be a member of the ARRL to
> dislike or disapprove of their policies? Your opinion is not the end-all
of
> arguments in this arena, shock that this must be to you.
> The fact of the matter is that many, many Hams, such as myself, have
dropped
> our memberships because of the failed policies and ever-increasing costs
of
> said membership.
> What do we get for the forty bucks a year? (or whatever it is now).
> Nada...nothing.
> I will continue to work DX and continue to enjoy the hobby, but the only
> "loss" as I see it is that I will no longer be able to attach the ARRL
logo
> to my QSL cards. No loss there.
> By the way, when those of us who used to be ARRL members voiced our
dissent,
> our voices went unheeded. Bottom line...what's the use? One soon learns
that
> it is a useless endeavor to "piss into the wind".
> I am but one voice in this maelstrom, but I take comfort in knowing that
the
> ARRL no longer has use of my dollars.
> Know what? I am getting along just fine.
> I will not give my name or callsign on these news groups.
> Even YOU should be able to understand why.
>
>
The ARRL is why you CAN ENJOY your DXing and other things on the air.

When the league helps kill BPL how about sending them a thank you card,
ingrate.

Dan/W4NTI

4239. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-14 15:42:48 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <Yx%Cb.260$Bg5.33@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 83815
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.cb

```
Bullcrap. Any elected office is open to any ARRL member. Some have class
of license restrictions, but not Life Member requirements.

Dan/W4NTI

"Dr. Daffodil Swain" <wa4jm@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:gYZCb.109$Bg5.3@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> Did you become a section director?
>
> Those jobs are reserved for Lifetime Members.
>
>
> "NRA LIfe Member" <NoSpam@NoSpam> wrote in message
> news:brh1vs$ln4$0@pita.alt.net...
> >
> > "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
> > news:s3TCb.16156$P%1.15064983@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
> >
> > "Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
> > news:f45722ac.0312131852.55c74b74@posting.google.com...
> > > Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
> > news:<mcGCb.623$xH2.485769@news1.news.adelphia.net>...
> > > > Steve Robeson, K4CAP wrote:
> > > >
> > > > > hamop_62@hotmail.com (Louis C. LeVine) wrote in message
> > news:<792e029d.0312110853.4daa825f@posting.google.com>...
> > > > > >
> > > > > >>This came from another radio group. They are doing a survey to
find
> > > > > >>out why some people do not like the ARRL. I don't like it because
it
> > > > > >>costs to much. If it were $10 a year I might consider joining.
> > > > > >>Louis
> > > > > >
> > > > > >
> > > > > > And just exactly what do you expect that they could do for
> $10.00
> > > > > > a month?
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Please name me ONE organization in ANY "hobby" activity that
> > > > > > provdes the scope of servcies and resources the ARRL offers to
it's
> > > > > > target peer group.
> > > > > >
```

> > > > > Awaiting your informed response.
> > > > >
> > > > > I think this is one of those cases where some people think that
their
> > > > > membership is a subscription to QST. Its a lot more than that. ARRL
> does
> > > > > a lot for Amateurs, even those who hate the organization.
> > > > >
> > > > > - Mike KB3EIA -
> > > >
> > > >
> > > > Fair enough.
> > > >
> > > > I dislike some of the policies that the ARRL has promoted in the past,
> > > > and felt as if the ARRL did not represent me even though I have been a
> > > > member since 1986.
> > >
> > > Did you get actively involved? Did you become a section director? Did
> you
> > > campaign to sway the majority to your opinion? Or did you just write a
> > > letter or two complaining and were disappointed because it didn't
> instantly
> > > change the ARRL's policies? If you want your point of view to be policy
> > > then you have to become very politically active in an organization.
> > >
> > > Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
> > >
> > >
> > > Hey, Dee. Where is it written that one must be a member of the ARRL to
> > > dislike or disapprove of their policies? Your opinion is not the end-all
> of
> > > arguments in this arena, shock that this must be to you.
> > > The fact of the matter is that many, many Hams, such as myself, have
> dropped
> > > our memberships because of the failed policies and ever-increasing costs
> of
> > > said membership.
> > > What do we get for the forty bucks a year? (or whatever it is now).
> > > Nada...nothing.
> > > I will continue to work DX and continue to enjoy the hobby, but the only
> > > "loss" as I see it is that I will no longer be able to attach the ARRL
> logo
> > > to my QSL cards. No loss there.
> > > By the way, when those of us who used to be ARRL members voiced our
> dissent,
> > > our voices went unheeded. Bottom line...what's the use? One soon learns
> that
> > > it is a useless endeavor to "piss into the wind".
> > > I am but one voice in this maelstrom, but I take comfort in knowing that
> the

> > ARRL no longer has use of my dollars.
> > Know what? I am getting along just fine.
> > I will not give my name or callsign on these news groups.
> > Even YOU should be able to understand why.
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
>
>

4240. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-14 15:44:01 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <5z%Cb.263$Bg5.246@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 83816
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.cb

"K&#65533;HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:SQ_Cb.3599$0s2.2955@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net...
>
> "Dr. Daffodil Swain" <wa4jm@earthlink.net> wrote
>
> > Did you become a section director?
> >
> > Those jobs are reserved for Lifetime Members.
>
> There is no such animal as a 'section director'. Perhaps you meant
'Section
> Manager'. There is no requirement to be a life member to be elected to
that
> position. Neither is there such a requirement for Division Director or
> Division Vice Director (I was twice elected to that position, and I'm not
a
> life member.)
>
> Doncha just hate it when facts come into play and spoil your lovely rant?
>
> 73, de Hans, K0HB
>
It continually amazes me Hans.

BTW, THanks for the chat on 20. I am playing a bit in the 10 meter
contest, CW only.

Dan/W4NTI

4241. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-14 15:53:27 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <XH%Cb.16219$P%1.15143145@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 83817
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.cb

```
"NRA LIfe Member" <NoSpam@NoSpam> wrote in message
news:brh1vs$ln4$0@pita.alt.net...
>
> "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
> news:s3TCb.16156$P%1.15064983@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
>
> "Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
> news:f45722ac.0312131852.55c74b74@posting.google.com...
> > Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
> news:<mcGCb.623$xH2.485769@news1.news.adelphia.net>...
> > > Steve Robeson, K4CAP wrote:
> > >
> > > > hamop_62@hotmail.com (Louis C. LeVine) wrote in message
> news:<792e029d.0312110853.4daa825f@posting.google.com>...
> > > >
> > > >>This came from another radio group. They are doing a survey to find
> > > >>out why some people do not like the ARRL. I don't like it because it
> > > >>costs to much. If it were $10 a year I might consider joining.
> > > >>Louis
> > > >
> > > >
> > > > And just exactly what do you expect that they could do for
$10.00
> > > > a month?
> > > >
> > > > Please name me ONE organization in ANY "hobby" activity that
> > > > provdes the scope of servcies and resources the ARRL offers to it's
> > > > target peer group.
> > > >
> > > > Awaiting your informed response.
> > >
> > > I think this is one of those cases where some people think that their
> > > membership is a subscription to QST. Its a lot more than that. ARRL
does
> > > a lot for Amateurs, even those who hate the organization.
> > >
> > > - Mike KB3EIA -
> >
> >
> > Fair enough.
> >
> > I dislike some of the policies that the ARRL has promoted in the past,
> > and felt as if the ARRL did not represent me even though I have been a
```

> > member since 1986.
>
> Did you get actively involved? Did you become a section director? Did
you
> campaign to sway the majority to your opinion? Or did you just write a
> letter or two complaining and were disappointed because it didn't
instantly
> change the ARRL's policies? If you want your point of view to be policy
> then you have to become very politically active in an organization.
>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>
>
> Hey, Dee. Where is it written that one must be a member of the ARRL to
> dislike or disapprove of their policies? Your opinion is not the end-all
of
> arguments in this arena, shock that this must be to you.
> The fact of the matter is that many, many Hams, such as myself, have
dropped
> our memberships because of the failed policies and ever-increasing costs
of
> said membership.
> What do we get for the forty bucks a year? (or whatever it is now).
> Nada...nothing.
> I will continue to work DX and continue to enjoy the hobby, but the only
> "loss" as I see it is that I will no longer be able to attach the ARRL
logo
> to my QSL cards. No loss there.
> By the way, when those of us who used to be ARRL members voiced our
dissent,
> our voices went unheeded. Bottom line...what's the use? One soon learns
that
> it is a useless endeavor to "piss into the wind".
> I am but one voice in this maelstrom, but I take comfort in knowing that
the
> ARRL no longer has use of my dollars.
> Know what? I am getting along just fine.
> I will not give my name or callsign on these news groups.
> Even YOU should be able to understand why.
>

Several of us have already listed the numerous benefits of the ARRL. Again how did you voice your dissent? Did you get actively and heavily involved? Doesn't sound like it. If you did get involved, you did not convince the majority of members to change to your point of view.

Instead you choose to have little to no impact on proposed changes by the FCC. Yes I know individuals can write letters but a decent sized lobby has a far greater effect. An organized body can much more effectively solicit the backing of other affected groups on questions like BPL.

Being "One voice in the maelstrom" is a waste of one's time as it will be completely obliterated by that maelstrom.

Now I do not say that everyone should be a member of ARRL. That is up to the individual. However if you are not, then don't complain about their policies. Don't complain when BPL makes HF useless in your area. Don't complain when VHF/UHF frequencies get reallocated to commercial uses. Don't complain if the government should choose to eliminate amateur radio entirely as it has tried to do twice in the past.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

4242. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-14 15:56:27 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <LK%Cb.16220$P%1.15143612@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 83818
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.cb

"JEP" <no_spam_here34474@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:5a5fcb7b.0312140307.3113ccdf@posting.google.com...
> And just who is
>
> hamvideo@juno.com ?????
>
> I have given a real email address and feel free to respond to it.
>
>
> The ARRL hasn't represented the membership directly---EVER!
>
> The ARRL has had it's own agenda (big money) for years.
>
> The ARRL would be considered a large corp. in most sectors, operating
> under a non-profit status.
>
> The only good about the ARRL is/was QST and now I can't even find it
> on the news stands.
>
> Bye bye ARRL.
>
> Bye bye ham radio as we know it.
>
> JEP

It probably was no longer cost effective to sell it on newstands.

If the ARRL is making money (a no-no for a non-profit corp) then report them
to the IRS. If they are not making money, then no matter how big they are,
it is not about money since no one is making a profit.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

4243. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-14 16:38:25 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <5m0Db.1812$mC1.543@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 83819
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.cb

"Kï¿½HB" wrote:
> "Dwight Stewart" wrote
>
> > Several years ago (four or five), QST was
> > available at the Barnes and Noble bookstore
> > in this area. But it then disappeared off the
> > shelf and I haven't seen it since.
>
> At $4.99/mo ($59.88/yr) plus tax, I'm sure it
> wasn't a high volume business for Barnes and
> Noble, since that's a 53% premium over the
> membership dues, and you don't get the other
> benefits which comes with membership. Only
> an idiot would regularly buy QST from a news
> stand!

There are circumstances that might require one to be an "idiot," Hans. In my case, I purchased it at the news stand because ARRL never seemed able to deliver my copy of the magazine (not fast enough to keep up with me). The first time I joined, my address changed several times in a single year. I joined at my home here. Two months later, I went elsewhere to prepare for our operations in Kosovo. Several months later, I went to Italy for the actual Kosovo conflict itself. Even though a change of address was sent with each move, I received only one issue of the magazine that year.

The second year was pretty much the same as the first. I moved back to the USA, moved several months later, and finally ended up back here again two months after that. I got two issues of the magazine that year and didn't rejoin at the end of the year (and didn't make any effort to get the magazine for several years).

I joined ARRL again this year and have gotten each copy of the magazine so far.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

4244. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-14 16:44:46 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <2s0Db.16237$P%1.15152539@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 83820
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.cb

"Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
news:f45722ac.0312140830.11631e36@posting.google.com...
> "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:<s3TCb.16156$P%1.15064983@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>...
> > "Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
> > news:f45722ac.0312131852.55c74b74@posting.google.com...
> > > Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
> > news:<mcGCb.623$xH2.485769@news1.news.adelphia.net>...
> > > > Steve Robeson, K4CAP wrote:
> > > >
> > > > > hamop_62@hotmail.com (Louis C. LeVine) wrote in message
> > news:<792e029d.0312110853.4daa825f@posting.google.com>...
> > > > > >
> > > > > >>This came from another radio group. They are doing a survey to
find
> > > > > >>out why some people do not like the ARRL. I don't like it because
it
> > > > > >>costs to much. If it were $10 a year I might consider joining.
> > > > > >>Louis
> > > > > >
> > > > > >
> > > > > > And just exactly what do you expect that they could do for
$10.00
> > > > > a month?
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Please name me ONE organization in ANY "hobby" activity that
> > > > > provdes the scope of servcies and resources the ARRL offers to
it's
> > > > > target peer group.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Awaiting your informed response.
> > > > >
> > > > I think this is one of those cases where some people think that
their
> > > > membership is a subscription to QST. Its a lot more than that. ARRL
does
> > > > a lot for Amateurs, even those who hate the organization.
> > > >
> > > > - Mike KB3EIA -
> > >
> > >
> > > Fair enough.
> > >

> > > I dislike some of the policies that the ARRL has promoted in the past,
> > > and felt as if the ARRL did not represent me even though I have been a
> > > member since 1986.
> >
> > Did you get actively involved? Did you become a section director? Did
you
> > campaign to sway the majority to your opinion? Or did you just write a
> > letter or two complaining and were disappointed because it didn't
instantly
> > change the ARRL's policies? If you want your point of view to be policy
> > then you have to become very politically active in an organization.
> >
> > Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>
>
> Dee, how very judgemental of you, which is what I've come to expect
> from the very politically active - The Liberals. No, I didn't burn
> any bra's or jock straps, and didn't participate in any "Tech-Pride"
> parades. My greatest dilema was some soul-searching on whether I
> should continue supporting financially an organization which I thought
> lacked leadership and supported backward policies. Otherwise, the
> ARRL is an excellent educational and publishing organization.
>

I happen to be a stout conservative. Regardless of whether one is liberal
or conservative, one has to get involved and stay involved to be effective.
Complaining about lack of leadership simply shows that either you didn't
want to do the work yourself or that you were unable to convince the
majority to back your view.

> As a matter of fact, I did write two letters to the ARRL and I was a
> member of the field organization. I also participated in the NOI/NPRM
> process.
>
> Thanks for your concern.

This is not a particularly effective way to change the policies of the
organization.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

4245. Re: W5NETs Christmas Card

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-14 16:48:50 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031214114850.09719.00000751@mb-m17.aol.com>
Source record: 83821

> I tried to get you a membership in some organization, but I haven't been
>able to find one with standards low enough to accept you.

TRY NCI, there standards are pretty low.

4246. Re: Bush Thrills Troops, Hillary Doesn't

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-14 16:49:14 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0312140849.6957f5d4@posting.google.com>
Source record: 83822

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:<dpTCb.97$6E.31@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> "Brian" wrote:
> > "Dwight Stewart" wrote:
> > > NATO, even today, is critical to our
> > > strategic defense in that region of the
> > > world. Likewise, bases in Europe play
> > > an important role in many lesser conflicts
> > > overseas (refueling, supply, protection
> > > for ships passing through that area, area
> > > commands, and so on). Europe could
> > > defend itself today. We benefit that
> > > defense just as they benefit our defense.
> > > Therefore, we need those bases in
> > > Europe just about as much as they need
> > > us.
> >
> > Dwight, things haven't changed -that- much.
> > You've somehow rolled national defense
> > and NATO into the United Nations. It just
> > isn't so.
>
>
> I did? I don't remember saying a single word about the United Nations. You
> were talking about NATO ("I never knew that NATO benefited the USA," you
> said). I responded to that. Our military relations with Europe is important
> and NATO is a major part of that.
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

My mistake, Dwight. I've had some pretty confused moments lately.

Brian

4247. Re: IM So Popular

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-14 16:52:29 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0312140852.268f06f4@posting.google.com>
Source record: 83823

wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) wrote in message
news:<20031212224806.16110.00000563@mb-m22.aol.com>...
> I didnt realize I was so popular, over 2,000 look ups on my Callsign on QRZ..
> Since Im hardly ever on the AIR, thats astounding.

They're just curious if you are the living chromosonal missing link to homo-erectus.

4248. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-14 17:01:48 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <0I0Db.16240$P%1.15155778@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 83824
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.cb

```
"Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
news:f45722ac.0312140844.52e9096e@posting.google.com...
> "NRA LIfe Member" <NoSpam@NoSpam> wrote in message
news:<brh1vs$ln4$0@pita.alt.net>...
> > "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
> > news:s3TCb.16156$P%1.15064983@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
> >
> > "Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
> > news:f45722ac.0312131852.55c74b74@posting.google.com...
> > > Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
> > news:<mcGCb.623$xH2.485769@news1.news.adelphia.net>...
> > > > Steve Robeson, K4CAP wrote:
> > > >
> > > > > hamop_62@hotmail.com (Louis C. LeVine) wrote in message
> > news:<792e029d.0312110853.4daa825f@posting.google.com>...
> > > > > >
> > > > > >This came from another radio group. They are doing a survey to
find
> > > > > >out why some people do not like the ARRL. I don't like it because
it
> > > > > >costs to much. If it were $10 a year I might consider joining.
> > > > > >Louis
> > > > > >
> > > > > >
> > > > > And just exactly what do you expect that they could do for
$10.00
> > > > > a month?
> > > > >
> > > > > Please name me ONE organization in ANY "hobby" activity that
> > > > > provdes the scope of servcies and resources the ARRL offers to
it's
> > > > > target peer group.
> > > > >
> > > > > Awaiting your informed response.
> > > >
> > > > I think this is one of those cases where some people think that
their
> > > > membership is a subscription to QST. Its a lot more than that. ARRL
does
> > > > a lot for Amateurs, even those who hate the organization.
> > > >
> > > > - Mike KB3EIA -
> > >
```

> > >
> > > Fair enough.
> > >
> > > I dislike some of the policies that the ARRL has promoted in the past,
> > > and felt as if the ARRL did not represent me even though I have been a
> > > member since 1986.
> >
> > Did you get actively involved? Did you become a section director? Did
you
> > campaign to sway the majority to your opinion? Or did you just write a
> > letter or two complaining and were disappointed because it didn't
instantly
> > change the ARRL's policies? If you want your point of view to be policy
> > then you have to become very politically active in an organization.
> >
> > Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
> >
> >
> > Hey, Dee. Where is it written that one must be a member of the ARRL to
> > dislike or disapprove of their policies? Your opinion is not the end-all
of
> > arguments in this arena, shock that this must be to you.
>
> Dee got on early supporting the status quo; hook,line and sinker. She
> is a perfect mouth-piece for the ARRL, and I've heard her repeating,
> word for word, the policies of this organization. She is, more or
> less, an official ARRL spam-bot. Wonder if she is an official
> bulletin station?
>

Not hardly. I disapprove of some of the policies but I do not expect it to change when my view doesn't represent the majority view. I do not consider differences of opinion on some policies to be reason to stop supporting them. Also I merely state that non-members shouldn't think they can change the policies. The ARRL policies, as with any organization, will reflect the opinions of the majority of members. Someone with a minority opinion in any organization will have to work very hard to get the majority to adopt it. Organizations have no obligation to reflect the opinion of non-members.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

4249. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-14 17:06:03 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3FDC9882.F6EFE220@earthlink.net>
Source record: 83825

"Dr. Daffodil Swain" wrote:
>
> Did you become a section director?

There is no such position.

> Those jobs are reserved for Lifetime Members.

There are no ARRL positions requiring Life Membership.

Your rant just went *poof*!

Dave K8MN

4250. Re: Bush Thrills Troops, Hillary Doesn't

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-14 17:10:07 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3FDC9975.C8BBA13A@earthlink.net>
Source record: 83826

Brian wrote:
>
> "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:<dpTCb.97$6E.31@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> > "Brian" wrote:

> > I did? I don't remember saying a single word about the United Nations. You
> > were talking about NATO ("I never knew that NATO benefited the USA," you
> > said). I responded to that. Our military relations with Europe is important
> > and NATO is a major part of that.
> >
> >
> > Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> My mistake, Dwight. I've had some pretty confused moments lately.

Lately?

Dave K8MN

4251. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-14 17:33:09 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <p91Db.3948$xH2.825482@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 83827
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.cb

Dan/W4NTI wrote:

> "NRA LIfe Member" <NoSpam@NoSpam> wrote in message
> news:brh1vs$ln4$0@pita.alt.net...
>
>>"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
>>news:s3TCb.16156$P%1.15064983@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
>>
>>"Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
>>news:f45722ac.0312131852.55c74b74@posting.google.com...
>>
>>>Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
>>
>>news:<mcGCb.623$xH2.485769@news1.news.adelphia.net>...
>>
>>>>Steve Robeson, K4CAP wrote:
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>hamop_62@hotmail.com (Louis C. LeVine) wrote in message
>>
>>news:<792e029d.0312110853.4daa825f@posting.google.com>...
>>
>>>>>>This came from another radio group. They are doing a survey to find
>>>>>>out why some people do not like the ARRL. I don't like it because it
>>>>>>costs to much. If it were $10 a year I might consider joining.
>>>>>>Louis
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>> And just exactly what do you expect that they could do for
>
> $10.00
>
>>>>>a month?
>>>>>
>>>>> Please name me ONE organization in ANY "hobby" activity that
>>>>>provdes the scope of servcies and resources the ARRL offers to it's
>>>>>target peer group.
>>>>>
>>>>> Awaiting your informed response.
>>>>
>>>>I think this is one of those cases where some people think that their
>>>>membership is a subscription to QST. Its a lot more than that. ARRL
>

> does
>
>>>>a lot for Amateurs, even those who hate the organization.
>>>>
>>>>- Mike KB3EIA -
>>>
>>>
>>>Fair enough.
>>>
>>>I dislike some of the policies that the ARRL has promoted in the past,
>>>and felt as if the ARRL did not represent me even though I have been a
>>>member since 1986.
>>
>>Did you get actively involved? Did you become a section director? Did
>
> you
>
>>campaign to sway the majority to your opinion? Or did you just write a
>>letter or two complaining and were disappointed because it didn't
>
> instantly
>
>>change the ARRL's policies? If you want your point of view to be policy
>>then you have to become very politically active in an organization.
>>
>>Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>>
>>
>>Hey, Dee. Where is it written that one must be a member of the ARRL to
>>dislike or disapprove of their policies? Your opinion is not the end-all
>
> of
>
>>arguments in this arena, shock that this must be to you.
>>The fact of the matter is that many, many Hams, such as myself, have
>
> dropped
>
>>our memberships because of the failed policies and ever-increasing costs
>
> of
>
>>said membership.
>>What do we get for the forty bucks a year? (or whatever it is now).
>>Nada...nothing.
>>I will continue to work DX and continue to enjoy the hobby, but the only
>>"loss" as I see it is that I will no longer be able to attach the ARRL
>
> logo
>

>>to my QSL cards. No loss there.
>>By the way, when those of us who used to be ARRL members voiced our
>
> dissent,
>
>>our voices went unheeded. Bottom line...what's the use? One soon learns
>
> that
>
>>it is a useless endeavor to "piss into the wind".
>>I am but one voice in this maelstrom, but I take comfort in knowing that
>
> the
>
>>ARRL no longer has use of my dollars.
>>Know what? I am getting along just fine.
>>I will not give my name or callsign on these news groups.
>>Even YOU should be able to understand why.
>>
>>
>
> The ARRL is why you CAN ENJOY your DXing and other things on the air.
>
> When the league helps kill BPL how about sending them a thank you card,
> ingrate.

Won't happen, Dan. People like that have selective memory. They'll rail about how QST doesn't have articles about what they want to see, and conveniently forget about the important jobs ARRL does for us.

1. That only a minority of hams belong to ARRL speaks much more about hams than it does the ARRL.

2. I would challenge the ARRL haters to come up with scenario's of what the ARS would be like today (if it even existed) if there was no ARRL.

- Mike KB3EIA -

4252. Re: Where Did THIS Come From...?!?!a

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-14 17:37:12 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0312140937.233ec257@posting.google.com>
Source record: 83828

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<dYOCb.12448$9O6.2235@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
>
> It's a small jump from Socialist to Communist Dave. My life experience
> tells me they are one and the same.

Dan,

You may find it useful to use the word "collectivist" as a general
term for what you're discussing. Meaning any system that values the
"collective" over the individual, and thereby denies individual rights
- and responsibilities.

73 de Jim, N2EY

4253. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-14 17:37:43 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031214123743.00545.00002923@mb-m02.aol.com>
Source record: 83829

In article <gYZCb.109$Bg5.3@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dr. Daffodil Swain" <wa4jm@earthlink.net> writes:

>Did you become a section director?

There's no such position. The ARRL has Section Managers, Division Directors and Vice Directors.

Directors and Vice Directors are elected by the membership. And it is they who set ARRL policy. They're from all over the country, not just Newington.

73 de Jim, N2EY

"I'm the ARRL"

4254. Saddam

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-14 18:10:02 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <krKdnYXcttH0NUGiRVn-iw@gbronline.com>
Source record: 83831

Saddam Hussein has been captured. He was found hiding in a hole near Tikrit.

4255. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-14 18:13:30 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <eL1Db.4048$xH2.835121@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 83830

N2EY wrote:

> In article <gYZCb.109$Bg5.3@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dr. Daffodil
> Swain" <wa4jm@earthlink.net> writes:
>
>
>>Did you become a section director?
>
>
> There's no such position. The ARRL has Section Managers, Division Directors and
> Vice Directors.

So the answer must be "no"! 8^)

> Directors and Vice Directors are elected by the membership. And it is they who
> set ARRL policy. They're from all over the country, not just Newington.

Yeah, but you guys know how to spoil a rant!

- Mike KB3EIA -

4256. Re: Saddam

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-14 18:56:28 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031214135628.10830.00000618@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 83832

>Saddam Hussein has been captured. He was found hiding in a hole near Tikrit.
>

Way to Go GEORGE, and the US Troops. Now lets wait to hear the DEMS and the LIEBERALS complain

4257. Re: W5NETs Christmas Card

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-14 19:19:56 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <brie8r$qpt@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 83833

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:RYGCb.497$mC1.51@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
>
> "Mike Coslo" wrote:
> >
> > Well, I enjoyed the card very much. It
> > was one of those "Well, I'll be darned"
> > moments! It did brighten things up.
>
>
> Glad you enjoyed it, Mike. It was fun (made me smile) thinking about how
> some might react when they opened the card and saw who it was from.
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
>

Yeah, thanks Dwight...what a nice thought! I definitely was very surprised and it even took a moment to figure out who the card was coming from!

Have a delightful Year End Season and think nothing but pink elephants for the New Year!

Kim W5TIT

4258. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-14 19:51:31 UTC
From: rhf-mail@pacbell.net
Message-ID: <e5e13af8.0312141151.7adb09a6@posting.google.com>
Source record: 83834
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.cb

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:<LK%Cb.16220$P%1.15143612@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>...
> "JEP" <no_spam_here34474@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> news:5a5fcb7b.0312140307.3113ccdf@posting.google.com...
> > And just who is
> >
> > hamvideo@juno.com ?????
> >
> > I have given a real email address and feel free to respond to it.
> >
> >
> > The ARRL hasn't represented the membership directly---EVER!
> >
> > The ARRL has had it's own agenda (big money) for years.
> >
> > The ARRL would be considered a large corp. in most sectors, operating
> > under a non-profit status.
> >
> > The only good about the ARRL is/was QST and now I can't even find it
> > on the news stands.
> >
> > Bye bye ARRL.
> >
> > Bye bye ham radio as we know it.
> >
> > JEP
>
> It probably was no longer cost effective to sell it on newstands.
>
> If the ARRL is making money (a no-no for a non-profit corp) then report them
> to the IRS. If they are not making money, then no matter how big they are,
> it is not about money since no one is making a profit.
>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

DDF,

Profits My Ass [.]
- - - They can soon disappear through...
= = = High Priced Management and Staff Salaries ? ? ?

gc ~ RHF

.

.

4259. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-14 20:00:02 UTC
From: no_spam_here34474@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <5a5fcb7b.0312141200.5bc6a82c@posting.google.com>
Source record: 83835
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.cb

>
> It probably was no longer cost effective to sell it on newstands.
>
> If the ARRL is making money (a no-no for a non-profit corp) then report them
> to the IRS. If they are not making money, then no matter how big they are,
> it is not about money since no one is making a profit.
>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

Creative book keeping and Yankee lawyers keeps them out of trouble.
Are they making a profit? Hell yes. No profit, No ARRL. Can they
legally hide their profit? Well sure. With all of the books, CD's,
DVD's, tapes and magazines they sell every year you know there is a
profit. They are no different than GoodWill when it comes to making a
profit except that Goodwill actually helps people. ARRL only helps
itself!

We will probably see QST being hawked in Publishers Clearing House
before too long. Get a magazine and win a million

4260. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-14 20:26:49 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <dI3Db.4185$xH2.863892@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 83836
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.cb

JEP wrote:
>>It probably was no longer cost effective to sell it on newstands.
>>
>>If the ARRL is making money (a no-no for a non-profit corp) then report them
>>to the IRS. If they are not making money, then no matter how big they are,
>>it is not about money since no one is making a profit.
>>
>>Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>
>
>
> Creative book keeping and Yankee lawyers keeps them out of trouble.

Hey! You forgot to call them liberals!

> Are they making a profit? Hell yes. No profit, No ARRL. Can they
> legally hide their profit? Well sure. With all of the books, CD's,
> DVD's, tapes and magazines they sell every year you know there is a
> profit. They are no different than GoodWill when it comes to making a
> profit except that Goodwill actually helps people. ARRL only helps
> itself!

Lessee, just from their website, I've looked up exam dates and
locations, Contest dates and rules, Hamfest dates and locations. I've
downloaded project and info PDF's from them, looked up callsigns and
matched names with callsigns. Looked through the swap section of the
site, and been informed and sometimes entertained by the FCC enforcement
news. Off the web, I've used their hints and kinks books, and I'd be
lost without the Handbook.

And those are just the superficial things, not counting the spectrum
work and really critical stuff such as BPL.

Yup, sure signs of an organization that only helps itself!

Good luck with this one now!

- Mike KB3EIA -

4261. Doesn't play nice with others, was Re: Bill Pasternak a real asshole

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-14 20:45:23 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0312141245.2b27639d@posting.google.com>
Source record: 83837

Da Man be O-pressin' you?

So go join his organization and change it from within.

Isn't that your advice to others about the ARRL???

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<8r%Cb.251$Bg5.207@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> OK Bill, I'll try this in special english.
>
> 1. I didn't start the e-mail list that he is calling me a spammer about.
>
> 2. He removed my e-mail address access to ALL of his e-mail sites.
>
> 3. Thus, I have no way to respond.
>
> 4. This is a public forum.
>
> 5. If he don't read it, perhaps someone would pass it along.
>
> 6. Any questions?
>
> This is Dan/W4NTI in special english.
>
>
> "Bill Newkirk" <wnewkirk@bellsouth.net> wrote in message
> news:p_RCb.13577$T14.464@bignews3.bellsouth.net...
> > i doubt k1man had anything to do with the start up of
> > rec.radio.amateur.policy.
> >
> >
> >
> > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
> > news:UGHCb.540$mC1.83@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> > > Sorry to have confused you Bill. Perhaps if you scrolled down and read
> the
> > > included message it would have helped.
> > >
> > > Have a nice day.
> > >
> > > Dan/W4NTI
> > >
> > > "Bill Newkirk" <wnewkirk@bellsouth.net> wrote in message
> > > news:YoxCb.8783$Ob4.1141@bignews2.bellsouth.net...
> > > > Uh, this is Usenet, dood.

> > > >
> > > >
> > > > If you're reading this using mail, you're wasting your time.
> > > >
> > > >
> > > >
> > > > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
> > > > news:wsnCb.655$5B.489@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> > > > > Hey asshole Bill,
> > > > >
> > > > > I did not initiate this little group. It was started by K1MAN. I
> did
> > > > > remove you, but before I did I get this in MY mailbox.
> > > > >
> > > > > Furthermore, stop threatning me. Who cares if you don't want
> K1MAN's
> SPAM.
> > > > > Take it up with Glenn. How about YOU STAYING OUT OF MY MAILBOX ???
> > > > >
> > > > > Oh, One more thing....since you don't seem to mind K1MAN qrming the
> bands
> > > > > with your newsline. When the crap hits the fan hopefully your going
> to
> > > > > slide into it too.
> > > > >
> > > > > Have a nice day.
> > > > >
> > > > > Dan/W4NTI
> > > > >
> > > > >
> > > > >
> > > > >
> > > > >
> > > > >
> > > > >
> > > > >
> > > > >
> > > > > Dear Sir,
> > > > >
> > > > > I asked you once to remove me from your K1MAN SPAM LIST. Obviously
> you
> did
> > > > > not understand me. Hence, as of this moment, all mail from you to
> ANY
> > > > > ARNewsline e-mail account is blocked. This matter is closed to
> further
> > > > > discussion.
> > > > >
> > > > > Bill Pasternak, WA6ITF
> > > > > Writer - Producer
> > > > > The Amateur Radio Newsline, Inc.

> > > > > wa6itf@arnewsline.org
> > > > > http://www.arnewsline.org
> > > > > "Since 1976 - Hobby Radio News
> > > > > for Todays Radio Amateur"
> > > > > >
> > > > > >
> > > > >
> > > > >
> > > >
> > > >
> > >
> >

4262. Re: Saddam

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-14 20:53:13 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <M-idneERu4ccTEGiRVn-iw@gbronline.com>
Source record: 83838

WA8ULX wrote:

>>Saddam Hussein has been captured. He was found hiding in a hole near Tikrit.
>>
>
>
> Way to Go GEORGE, and the US Troops. Now lets wait to hear the DEMS and the
> LIEBERALS complain

They will loud and clear, The dummycrats are already claiming this is no
big deal.

4263. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-14 22:44:26 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <xnfcneeyarg.hpw8q70.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>
Source record: 83839

On 14 Dec 2003 17:37:43 GMT, N2EY wrote:

>There's no such position. The ARRL has Section Managers, Division
>Directors and Vice Directors.

>Directors and Vice Directors are elected by the membership. And it is
>they who set ARRL policy. They're from all over the country, not just
>Newington.

The Section Managers are also elected by the membership of the
Section. In fact, in the Oregon Section we elected one about a year
or so ago and we didn't like what he was doing so we held a recall
election and out he went.

The system works.

In the several years when I was active in Pacific Division politics,
I became aware that there are Division Directors who challenge what
some folks refer to as the "Codfish Curtain". (Right, Hans ??). When
enough of them prevail, policy changes.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane
ARRL Paid-Up Life Member

4264. Re: Expirations in 2004

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-14 22:58:23 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031214175823.25815.00005212@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 83841

In article <aptCb.15994$P%1.14757953@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> writes:

>"D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> wrote in message
>news:Pine.LNX.4.58.0312120617470.6819@kd6lvw.ampr.org...
>> On Wed, 10 Dec 2003, N2EY wrote:
>> > "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
>news:<jUFBb.8762$7p2.1663@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
>> > > The calendar year 2004 has a considerable
>> > > amount of expirations...well above a normal
>> > > distribution which would have been about 1/10th
>> > > of existing hams...or about 63K.
>> >
>> > Don't you mean "about 68K", Bill?
>>
>> More like 73K....
>>
>> > > The actual future expiratons data from the Joe
>> > > Speroni web site is over 84K expirations
>> > > with two months showing very high numbers...
>> > > almost 11K in May and over 17K in July.
>> >
>> > Didn't FCC change the vanity call rules right about then? If so, it
>> > would explain the spike because getting a vanity call causes an
>> > automatic renewal regardless of the 90 day rule (so FCC doesn't have
>> > to pro-rate the fee, IIUC)
>>
>> That's going to be the 2006 problem.
>>
>> > > Will be interesting to watch the renewal results.
>> >
>> > Yep!
>> >
>> > Further clouded by the 90 days before/2 years after rules. If someone
>> > is a little late renewing, they show up as an expiration.
>>
>> What's more interesting is the count of those whose licenses expire
>WITHOUT them
>> also having expired (i.e. those who DON'T renew, as opposed to those who
>can't).
>
>Actually if you go to the FCC database and sort for expired licenses, those
>that have lapsed but are in the grace period will not show up as expired.
>So there is a two year lag between the actual expiration date and when they

>are marked as expired in the database.
>
Very true.

The 683K number quoted above does not include grace priod licenses, though, only active ones. It also does not include club, military and RACES licenses - only individuals.

This difference sometimes causes confusion because someone will see a number that reflects the entire database including grace period licenses, and then see a later number that does not include grace period licenses. If only 5% of hams don't renew before the end of the grace period, (2-1/2% per year) that works out to over 34,000.

73 de Jim, N2EY

4265. Re: Saddam

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-14 22:58:24 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031214175824.25815.00005213@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 83840

In article <krKdnYXcttH0NUGiRVn-iw@gbronline.com>, JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
writes:

>Saddam Hussein has been captured.

Alive.

>He was found hiding in a hole near Tikrit.

Quite appropriate, don't you think?

Now the question is: what to do with him?

4266. Re: Doesn't play nice with others, was Re: Bill Pasternak a real asshole

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-14 23:15:46 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <Ca6Db.1546$Bg5.1026@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 83842

Are you and Bill both from the same school system or something? I'm not
being O-pressind, I'm being ignored.

Should I do this in special english for you also?

Dan/W4NTI

"Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
news:f45722ac.0312141245.2b27639d@posting.google.com...
> Da Man be O-pressin' you?
>
> So go join his organization and change it from within.
>
> Isn't that your advice to others about the ARRL???
>
>
> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<8r%Cb.251$Bg5.207@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> > OK Bill, I'll try this in special english.
> >
> > 1. I didn't start the e-mail list that he is calling me a spammer about.
> >
> > 2. He removed my e-mail address access to ALL of his e-mail sites.
> >
> > 3. Thus, I have no way to respond.
> >
> > 4. This is a public forum.
> >
> > 5. If he don't read it, perhaps someone would pass it along.
> >
> > 6. Any questions?
> >
> > This is Dan/W4NTI in special english.
> >
> >
> > "Bill Newkirk" <wnewkirk@bellsouth.net> wrote in message
> > news:p_RCb.13577$T14.464@bignews3.bellsouth.net...
> > > i doubt k1man had anything to do with the start up of
> > > rec.radio.amateur.policy.
> > >
> > >
> > >
> > > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
> > > news:UGHCb.540$mC1.83@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> > > > Sorry to have confused you Bill. Perhaps if you scrolled down and

read
> > the
> > > > included message it would have helped.
> > > >
> > > > Have a nice day.
> > > >
> > > > Dan/W4NTI
> > > >
> > > > "Bill Newkirk" <wnewkirk@bellsouth.net> wrote in message
> > > > news:YoxCb.8783$Ob4.1141@bignews2.bellsouth.net...
> > > > > Uh, this is Usenet, dood.
> > > > >
> > > > >
> > > > > If you're reading this using mail, you're wasting your time.
> > > > >
> > > > >
> > > > >
> > > > > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in
message
> > > > > news:wsnCb.655$5B.489@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> > > > > > Hey asshole Bill,
> > > > > >
> > > > > > I did not initiate this little group. It was started by K1MAN.
I
> > did
> > > > > > remove you, but before I did I get this in MY mailbox.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Furthermore, stop threatning me. Who cares if you don't want
> > K1MAN's
> > SPAM.
> > > > > > Take it up with Glenn. How about YOU STAYING OUT OF MY MAILBOX
???
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Oh, One more thing....since you don't seem to mind K1MAN qrming
the
> > bands
> > > > > > with your newsline. When the crap hits the fan hopefully your
going
> > to
> > > > > > slide into it too.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Have a nice day.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Dan/W4NTI
> > > > > >
> > > > > >
> > > > > >
> > > > > >
> > > > > >
> > > > > >

> > > > > >
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Dear Sir,
> > > > > >
> > > > > > I asked you once to remove me from your K1MAN SPAM LIST.
Obviously
> > you
> > did
> > > > > > not understand me. Hence, as of this moment, all mail from you
to
> > ANY
> > > > > > ARNewsline e-mail account is blocked. This matter is closed to
> > further
> > > > > > discussion.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Bill Pasternak, WA6ITF
> > > > > > Writer - Producer
> > > > > > The Amateur Radio Newsline, Inc.
> > > > > > wa6itf@arnewsline.org
> > > > > > http://www.arnewsline.org
> > > > > > "Since 1976 - Hobby Radio News
> > > > > > for Todays Radio Amateur"
> > > > > >
> > > > > >
> > > > >
> > > > >
> > > >
> > > >
> > >
> > >
> >
> >

4267. Re: Saddam

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-14 23:19:13 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <Rd6Db.1548$Bg5.983@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 83843

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20031214175824.25815.00005213@mb-m07.aol.com...
> In article <krKdnYXcttH0NUGiRVn-iw@gbronline.com>, JJ
<radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
> writes:
>
> >Saddam Hussein has been captured.
>
> Alive.
>
> >He was found hiding in a hole near Tikrit.
>
> Quite appropriate, don't you think?
>
> Now the question is: what to do with him?
>
>
Do you think he was looking so po'd because some grunt decided to piss in
the latrine hole?

We can only hope.

To answer ur question, I suggest we tie him up with leather straps, stake
him out in the sun, and let the Iraqi people put the boot to him.

Dan/W4NTI

4268. Re: Where Did THIS Come From...?!?!a

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-14 23:20:54 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <qf6Db.1549$Bg5.288@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 83844

"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
news:c2356669.0312140937.233ec257@posting.google.com...
> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<dYOCb.12448$9O6.2235@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> >
> > It's a small jump from Socialist to Communist Dave. My life experience
> > tells me they are one and the same.
>
> Dan,
>
> You may find it useful to use the word "collectivist" as a general
> term for what you're discussing. Meaning any system that values the
> "collective" over the individual, and thereby denies individual rights
> - and responsibilities.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

No, sounds too pc to me Jim. I'll stick with my statement.

Dan/W4NTI

4269. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-14 23:24:37 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <Vi6Db.1552$Bg5.15@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 83845
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.cb

"Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
news:f45722ac.0312141214.29da767c@posting.google.com...
> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<Bw%Cb.256$Bg5.145@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
>
> > The ARRL is why you CAN ENJOY your DXing and other things on the air.
>
> DX can be enjoyed without the ARRL.
>
> > When the league helps kill BPL how about sending them a thank you card,
> > ingrate.
> >
> > Dan/W4NTI
>
> And that is the reason I tolerate the ARRL's other crappola.
>
> But be sure to send a thank you card to the NTIA and FEMA as well.

Man you got that right. NTIA and FEMA slapped a hard one beside their
heads.

Oh and all you league haters...it can be read at;

www.arrl.org

Dan/W4NTI

4270. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-14 23:39:13 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <Bw6Db.1569$Bg5.860@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 83846
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.cb

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:5m0Db.1812$mC1.543@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> "K HB" wrote:
> > "Dwight Stewart" wrote
> >
> > > Several years ago (four or five), QST was
> > > available at the Barnes and Noble bookstore
> > > in this area. But it then disappeared off the
> > > shelf and I haven't seen it since.
> >
> > At $4.99/mo ($59.88/yr) plus tax, I'm sure it
> > wasn't a high volume business for Barnes and
> > Noble, since that's a 53% premium over the
> > membership dues, and you don't get the other
> > benefits which comes with membership. Only
> > an idiot would regularly buy QST from a news
> > stand!
>
>
> There are circumstances that might require one to be an "idiot," Hans.
In
> my case, I purchased it at the news stand because ARRL never seemed able
to
> deliver my copy of the magazine (not fast enough to keep up with me). The
> first time I joined, my address changed several times in a single year. I
> joined at my home here. Two months later, I went elsewhere to prepare for
> our operations in Kosovo. Several months later, I went to Italy for the
> actual Kosovo conflict itself. Even though a change of address was sent
with
> each move, I received only one issue of the magazine that year.
>
> The second year was pretty much the same as the first. I moved back to
the
> USA, moved several months later, and finally ended up back here again two
> months after that. I got two issues of the magazine that year and didn't
> rejoin at the end of the year (and didn't make any effort to get the
> magazine for several years).
>
> I joined ARRL again this year and have gotten each copy of the magazine
so
> far.
>

>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
>

You do realize that the ARRL has the publication and distribution of QST contracted out, don't you? You should crab to them, not the league per se.

I had similar problems when I was globe trotting, like you. But when I finally did settle down I dropped both QST and CQ a note...and guess what? They sent me every single issue I missed.
Amazing, hu?

Dan/W4NTI

4271. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-15 00:04:33 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <IU6Db.4504$Pg1.632@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 83847
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.cb

"Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote

> She is, more or less, an official ARRL spam-bot.
> Wonder if she is an official bulletin station?

And you are, more or less, the official LHA junior-Unabasher. I want you to be fully aware of your role in rrap, Brian. It goes like this: LHA is the organ grinder, playing a song called "I Left My Heart in ADA, and Newington Won't Give It Back". You are the little monkey in a bright red hat hopping up and down and acting silly for our amusement.

With all best wishes for the recovery of your missing T5 logs,

de Hans, K0HB/4ID

4272. Re: Saddam

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-15 00:33:10 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031214193310.11565.00000559@mb-m25.aol.com>
Source record: 83848

>To answer ur question, I suggest we tie him up with leather straps, stake
>him out in the sun, and let the Iraqi people put the boot to him.
>
>Dan/W4NTI
>

Cant do that Dan the Lieberals would say it was unfair

4273. The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-15 01:39:25 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031214203925.21642.00002939@mb-m01.aol.com>
Source record: 83849

As of the close of Friday, the following 14 petitions had the indicated
document quantities:

RM-10781 321
RM-10782 272
RM-10783 276
RM-10784 254
RM-10785 256
RM-10786 424
RM-10787 674 total 2,477

RM-10805 234
RM-10806 272
RM-10807 178
RM-10808 194
RM-10809 182
RM-10810 181
RM-10811 996 total 2,237 grand total for all 14: 4,714

Everyone can expect some delay in decision-making at the FCC due
to the reorganization of the Wireless Bureau announced recently.

Although the official comment period is over for these petitions, very
few have made "late" comments, therefore the number change for the
bottom 7 is very small and the upper 7 is untouched since last week.

Merry Christmas and a Happy New Year, chatroomers.

LHA

4274. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-15 01:39:27 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031214203927.21642.00002940@mb-m01.aol.com>
Source record: 83850

In article <lU6Db.4504$Pg1.632@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>, "Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> writes as if he just had a colorectal examination with a fully warmed-up 100 W American Beauty soldering iron:

>"Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote
>
>> She is, more or less, an official ARRL spam-bot.
>> Wonder if she is an official bulletin station?
>
>And you are, more or less, the official LHA junior-Unabasher.

OLD one, Brian Burke is his own man. He states an opposite opinion from the "official" Newington spin on how amateurism in radio is "supposed to be." Therefore, you, as a Devout Believer in the glory and honor and mysticism of amateurism, must chastise the UNbelievers...and call them "unabashers" for not accepting the legends, mythos, and religious traditions of radio as "officially" stated by ARRL publications.

Somewhere in the past you were often saying "gentlemen can disagree without being disagreeable." You, sir, are being terribly disagreeable, ergo you are NO gentleman.

>I want you to be fully aware of your role in rrap, Brian.

Tsk, tsk, tsk, you should be "aware" of how others see you, OLD man, and that others are quite aware you are NOT the CNO of any rrap party.

>It goes like this: LHA is the
>organ grinder, playing a song called "I Left My Heart in ADA, and Newington
>Won't Give It Back".

"Newington" had absolutely nothing to do with ACAN or ADA, super chief. ARRL had NOTHING to do with any other places I worked in the last half century nor the people I worked WITH from DoD and other branches of the U.S. government. The BoD of a small town club in New England would be lost trying to carry even half the traffic load of the third largest U.S. Army transmitter site in the world 50 years ago. All that the League seems to know is that on-off keying code is the ultimate "art" of radio because that is what they spin off on their membership, covertly and overtly.

>You are the little monkey in a bright red hat hopping
>up and down and acting silly for our amusement.

You are being truly a contentious OLD fart in here, trolling desperately for someone to despise...and then doing a poor job of denigration.

>With all best wishes for the recovery of your missing T5 logs,

And here's "best wishes" for some education that might penetrate a code-warped psyche housing in regards to: (1) voice modulated transmitters of 1906; (2) cell phone differences between power-up and first cell-connect; (3) so-called "one-way" ionospheric radio propagation paths; (4) assorted little gems of radio disinformation that you haven't recognized in the past nor admit to making mistakes on in public.

I've not commented in this subject thread before, only on the 14 petitions before the FCC thread (as its origininator). The NPRM or whatever as a result of those petitions will decide the FUTURE of radio amateurism in the USA. While the REGULARS in the jolly little chatroom of morseaholics are busy puffing themselves up about their marvelous experience and tenure in on-offing the radio waves, the future is sneaking up on everyone. All you are doing lately is just behaving like one of your iceholes in the wintertime.

It's too bad that your Xanax ran out and you switched from ran to rant.

Don't you just HATE it when somebody steps in and ruins your rant?

Merry Christmas and a Happy New Year.

LHA

4275. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-15 01:59:49 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <pA8Db.16317$P%1.15245654@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 83852
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.cb

"JEP" <no_spam_here34474@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:5a5fcb7b.0312141200.5bc6a82c@posting.google.com...
> >
> > It probably was no longer cost effective to sell it on newstands.
> >
> > If the ARRL is making money (a no-no for a non-profit corp) then report
them
> > to the IRS. If they are not making money, then no matter how big they
are,
> > it is not about money since no one is making a profit.
> >
> > Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>
>
> Creative book keeping and Yankee lawyers keeps them out of trouble.
> Are they making a profit? Hell yes. No profit, No ARRL. Can they
> legally hide their profit? Well sure. With all of the books, CD's,
> DVD's, tapes and magazines they sell every year you know there is a
> profit. They are no different than GoodWill when it comes to making a
> profit except that Goodwill actually helps people. ARRL only helps
> itself!
>
> We will probably see QST being hawked in Publishers Clearing House
> before too long. Get a magazine and win a million

If they are making a profit, then who is getting the money?? It's got to be going somewhere. There are no stockholders receiving dividends. It doesn't do any good just to sit on the money. And don't say salaries as that is fully documented in the financial records and is not profit. If you believe the salaries are too high, get on the board that makes the decisions and reduce them.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

4276. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-15 02:00:27 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <%A8Db.16318$P%1.15245662@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 83851
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.cb

"Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
news:f45722ac.0312141205.320f3579@posting.google.com...
> "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:<LK%Cb.16220$P%1.15143612@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>...
> >
> > It probably was no longer cost effective to sell it on newstands.
> >
> > If the ARRL is making money (a no-no for a non-profit corp) then report
them
> > to the IRS. If they are not making money, then no matter how big they
are,
> > it is not about money since no one is making a profit.
> >
> > Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>
> Un-friggin-believable.
>
> Non-profits aren't about profit. They're about salaries.

If the salaries are too high, get on the board and get them reduced.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

4277. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-15 02:06:55 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <3H8Db.16319$P%1.15247122@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 83853
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.cb

```
"Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
news:f45722ac.0312140844.52e9096e@posting.google.com...
> "NRA LIfe Member" <NoSpam@NoSpam> wrote in message
news:<brh1vs$ln4$0@pita.alt.net>...
> > "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
> > news:s3TCb.16156$P%1.15064983@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
> >
> > "Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
> > news:f45722ac.0312131852.55c74b74@posting.google.com...
> > > Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
> > news:<mcGCb.623$xH2.485769@news1.news.adelphia.net>...
> > > > Steve Robeson, K4CAP wrote:
> > > >
> > > > > hamop_62@hotmail.com (Louis C. LeVine) wrote in message
> > news:<792e029d.0312110853.4daa825f@posting.google.com>...
> > > > > >
> > > > > >This came from another radio group. They are doing a survey to
find
> > > > > >out why some people do not like the ARRL. I don't like it because
it
> > > > > >costs to much. If it were $10 a year I might consider joining.
> > > > > >Louis
> > > > > >
> > > > > >
> > > > > And just exactly what do you expect that they could do for
$10.00
> > > > > a month?
> > > > >
> > > > > Please name me ONE organization in ANY "hobby" activity that
> > > > > provdes the scope of servcies and resources the ARRL offers to
it's
> > > > > target peer group.
> > > > >
> > > > > Awaiting your informed response.
> > > >
> > > > I think this is one of those cases where some people think that
their
> > > > membership is a subscription to QST. Its a lot more than that. ARRL
does
> > > > a lot for Amateurs, even those who hate the organization.
> > > >
> > > > - Mike KB3EIA -
> > >
```

> > >
> > > Fair enough.
> > >
> > > I dislike some of the policies that the ARRL has promoted in the past,
> > > and felt as if the ARRL did not represent me even though I have been a
> > > member since 1986.
> >
> > Did you get actively involved? Did you become a section director? Did
you
> > campaign to sway the majority to your opinion? Or did you just write a
> > letter or two complaining and were disappointed because it didn't
instantly
> > change the ARRL's policies? If you want your point of view to be policy
> > then you have to become very politically active in an organization.
> >
> > Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
> >
> >
> > Hey, Dee. Where is it written that one must be a member of the ARRL to
> > dislike or disapprove of their policies? Your opinion is not the end-all
of
> > arguments in this arena, shock that this must be to you.
>
> Dee got on early supporting the status quo; hook,line and sinker. She
> is a perfect mouth-piece for the ARRL, and I've heard her repeating,
> word for word, the policies of this organization. She is, more or
> less, an official ARRL spam-bot. Wonder if she is an official
> bulletin station?
>

No I am not. However, I have studied the history of amateur radio, etc and
can see the virtues of the ARRL even when I don't necessarily agree with all
their policies.

> > The fact of the matter is that many, many Hams, such as myself, have
dropped
> > our memberships because of the failed policies and ever-increasing costs
of
> > said membership.
> > What do we get for the forty bucks a year? (or whatever it is now).
> > Nada...nothing.
>
> You could have the satisfaction of financially supporting an
> organization that does not support you.
>
> > I will continue to work DX and continue to enjoy the hobby, but the only
> > "loss" as I see it is that I will no longer be able to attach the ARRL
logo
> > to my QSL cards. No loss there.
>
> Yet you can still participate in their DX awards if you choose.

No, you have to be an ARRL member to get ARRL awards if you are a US ham.

>
> > By the way, when those of us who used to be ARRL members voiced our
dissent,
> > our voices went unheeded.
>
> True.

Were you in the majority?? If not then why should everyone else change to
suit you.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

4278. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-15 02:33:55 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <n49Db.4657$Pg1.168@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 83854

"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote

> "Brian Burke is his own man."

The old organ grinder says of his red-hatted dancing monkey.

With all kind wishes for the holidays, old sir,

de Hans, K0HB

4279. Re: KG4LEG new jammer in tampa bay on 146.640 N9EE wide area repeater

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-15 02:50:51 UTC
From: itsokintexas@hotmail.com
Message-ID: <697a7b67.0312141850.28bd5d40@posting.google.com>
Source record: 83855
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.swap

I have heard that my friend no-jam is not running the quiz net on
suday is that true. Gary

4280. Re: Bill Pasternak a real asshole

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-15 02:53:56 UTC
From: Bill Newkirk <wnewkirk@bellsouth.net>
Message-ID: <7k9Db.11279$C24.3739@bignews5.bellsouth.net>
Source record: 83856

Your original message implied that *this* was an e-mail based system.

certainly there's ways of getting here from there with e-mail.

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:8r%Cb.251$Bg5.207@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> OK Bill, I'll try this in special english.
>
> 1. I didn't start the e-mail list that he is calling me a spammer about.
>
> 2. He removed my e-mail address access to ALL of his e-mail sites.
>
> 3. Thus, I have no way to respond.
>
> 4. This is a public forum.
>
> 5. If he don't read it, perhaps someone would pass it along.
>
> 6. Any questions?
>
> This is Dan/W4NTI in special english.
>
>
> "Bill Newkirk" <wnewkirk@bellsouth.net> wrote in message
> news:p_RCb.13577$T14.464@bignews3.bellsouth.net...
> > i doubt k1man had anything to do with the start up of
> > rec.radio.amateur.policy.
> >
> >
> >
> > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
> > news:UGHCb.540$mC1.83@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> > > Sorry to have confused you Bill. Perhaps if you scrolled down and
read
> > the
> > > included message it would have helped.
> > >
> > > Have a nice day.
> > >
> > > Dan/W4NTI
> > >
> > > "Bill Newkirk" <wnewkirk@bellsouth.net> wrote in message
> > > news:YoxCb.8783$Ob4.1141@bignews2.bellsouth.net...
> > > > Uh, this is Usenet, dood.
> > > >

> > > >
> > > > If you're reading this using mail, you're wasting your time.
> > > >
> > > >
> > > >
> > > > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
> > > > news:wsnCb.655$5B.489@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> > > > > Hey asshole Bill,
> > > > >
> > > > > I did not initiate this little group. It was started by K1MAN. I
> did
> > > > > remove you, but before I did I get this in MY mailbox.
> > > > >
> > > > > Furthermore, stop threatning me. Who cares if you don't want
> K1MAN's
> > > > SPAM.
> > > > > Take it up with Glenn. How about YOU STAYING OUT OF MY MAILBOX
???
> > > > >
> > > > > Oh, One more thing....since you don't seem to mind K1MAN qrming
the
> > > bands
> > > > > with your newsline. When the crap hits the fan hopefully your
going
> > to
> > > > > slide into it too.
> > > > >
> > > > > Have a nice day.
> > > > >
> > > > > Dan/W4NTI
> > > > >
> > > > >
> > > > >
> > > > >
> > > > >
> > > > >
> > > > >
> > > > >
> > > > >
> > > > > Dear Sir,
> > > > >
> > > > > I asked you once to remove me from your K1MAN SPAM LIST. Obviously
> you
> > > did
> > > > > not understand me. Hence, as of this moment, all mail from you to
> ANY
> > > > > ARNewsline e-mail account is blocked. This matter is closed to
> further
> > > > > discussion.
> > > > >
> > > > > Bill Pasternak, WA6ITF

> > > > > Writer - Producer
> > > > > The Amateur Radio Newsline, Inc.
> > > > > wa6itf@arnewsline.org
> > > > > http://www.arnewsline.org
> > > > > "Since 1976 - Hobby Radio News
> > > > > for Todays Radio Amateur"
> > > > >
> > > > >
> > > >
> > > >
> > >
> > >
> >
> >
>
>

4281. Re: Expirations in 2004

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-15 04:15:15 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.58.0312150419450.7244@kd6lvw.ampr.org>
Source record: 83857

On Fri, 12 Dec 2003, Alun wrote:
> "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> wrote in
> news:Pine.LNX.4.58.0312120624010.6819@kd6lvw.ampr.org:
> > On Fri, 12 Dec 2003, Alun wrote:
> >> "KØHB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in
> >> news:_x6Cb.8025$_r6.1795@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net:
> >> >
> >> > "N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
> >> >
> >> >> Didn't FCC change the vanity call rules right about then?
> >> >
> >> > No, IIRC Gate 1 of the vanity program opened in May or June of 1996.
> >> >
> >> > 73, de Hans, K0HB
> >> >
> >> >
> >> >
> >> >
> >> >
> >> >
> >>
> >> No-code started in '92. I would expect a bump in renewals falling due
> >> from last year onwards.
> >
> > Wrong. Try getting your facts straight:
> >
> > Testing change: 2/14/1991. First no-code license issued 4/12/1991.
>
> I see, December '91 instead of some time in '92. Not exactly a huge error,
> is it? The first batch were all people who had taken the theory tests at
> Anne Arundel ARC before no-code licences were actually introduced, and so
> were ready to go when it came in. I think you may find that those six
> people had the only no-code licences issued in the US in '91!

Obviously, you have other issues too. It doesn't seem as if you can read dates either (and if you were thinking of the European format for dates, then there is no 14th month, so it should have been obvious that such a format wasn't used). You're not off by a month - but by 10; almost a year, and with the number of licensees in that period, the error is significant.

4282. Re: Expirations in 2004

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-15 04:18:54 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.58.0312150428270.7244@kd6lvw.ampr.org>
Source record: 83858

On Fri, 12 Dec 2003, Bill Sohl wrote:
> "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> wrote in message
> news:Pine.LNX.4.58.0312120617470.6819@kd6lvw.ampr.org...
> > On Wed, 10 Dec 2003, N2EY wrote:
> > > "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
> news:<jUFBb.8762$7p2.1663@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> > > > The calendar year 2004 has a considerable
> > > > amount of expirations...well above a normal
> > > > distribution which would have been about 1/10th
> > > > of existing hams...or about 63K.
> > >
> > > Don't you mean "about 68K", Bill?
> >
> > More like 73K....
>
> I think Jim has it correct. The existing
> ham base is 683K, so an even distribution
> of those license renewals over a 10 year
> span would net 68K renewals per year...if
> they were evenly distributed.
>
> > > > The actual future expiratons data from the Joe
> > > > Speroni web site is over 84K expirations
> > > > with two months showing very high numbers...
> > > > almost 11K in May and over 17K in July.
> > >
> > > Didn't FCC change the vanity call rules right about then? If so, it
> > > would explain the spike because getting a vanity call causes an
> > > automatic renewal regardless of the 90 day rule (so FCC doesn't have
> > > to pro-rate the fee, IIUC)
> >
> > That's going to be the 2006 problem.
> >
> > > > Will be interesting to watch the renewal results.
> > >
> > > Yep!
> > >
> > > Further clouded by the 90 days before/2 years after rules. If someone
> > > is a little late renewing, they show up as an expiration.
> >
> > What's more interesting is the count of those whose licenses expire
> WITHOUT them
> > also having expired (i.e. those who DON'T renew, as opposed to those who
> can't).

>
> How can you tell the difference?

Compare the licensing database against the "Social Security Death Index" and look for matches.

Granted, not every death shows up in the SSDI, but nowadays, more than 95% do.

4283. Re: Expirations in 2004

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-15 04:34:16 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.58.0312150442300.7244@kd6lvw.ampr.org>
Source record: 83859

On Sun, 14 Dec 2003, N2EY wrote:
> In article <aptCb.15994$P%1.14757953@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D.
> Flint" <deehays@qix.net> writes:
> >"D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> wrote in message
> >news:Pine.LNX.4.58.0312120617470.6819@kd6lvw.ampr.org...
> >> On Wed, 10 Dec 2003, N2EY wrote:
> >> > "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
> >news:<jUFBb.8762$7p2.1663@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> >> > > The calendar year 2004 has a considerable
> >> > > amount of expirations...well above a normal
> >> > > distribution which would have been about 1/10th
> >> > > of existing hams...or about 63K.
> >> >
> >> > Don't you mean "about 68K", Bill?
> >>
> >> More like 73K....
> >>
> >> > > The actual future expiratons data from the Joe
> >> > > Speroni web site is over 84K expirations
> >> > > with two months showing very high numbers...
> >> > > almost 11K in May and over 17K in July.
> >> >
> >> > Didn't FCC change the vanity call rules right about then? If so, it
> >> > would explain the spike because getting a vanity call causes an
> >> > automatic renewal regardless of the 90 day rule (so FCC doesn't have
> >> > to pro-rate the fee, IIUC)
> >>
> >> That's going to be the 2006 problem.
> >>
> >> > > Will be interesting to watch the renewal results.
> >> >
> >> > Yep!
> >> >
> >> > Further clouded by the 90 days before/2 years after rules. If someone
> >> > is a little late renewing, they show up as an expiration.
> >>
> >> What's more interesting is the count of those whose licenses expire
> >WITHOUT them
> >> also having expired (i.e. those who DON'T renew, as opposed to those who
> >can't).
> >
> >Actually if you go to the FCC database and sort for expired licenses, those
> >that have lapsed but are in the grace period will not show up as expired.
> >So there is a two year lag between the actual expiration date and when they

> >are marked as expired in the database.
> >
> Very true.
>
> The 683K number quoted above does not include grace priod licenses, though,
> only active ones. It also does not include club, military and RACES licenses -
> only individuals.

Perhaps it should. These other license types expire too (and for RACES, they expire permanently). I saw nothing in the original post that should have implied to me that these and the grace-period licenses should be excluded from the count.

> This difference sometimes causes confusion because someone will see a number
> that reflects the entire database including grace period licenses, and then see
> a later number that does not include grace period licenses. If only 5% of hams
> don't renew before the end of the grace period, (2-1/2% per year) that works
> out to over 34,000.

Substituting "individual" for "license" would at least have excluded some of those (the CRM's).

4284. Re: Doesn't play nice with others, was Re: Bill Pasternak a real asshole

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-15 06:20:18 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0312142220.131283d7@posting.google.com>
Source record: 83860

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<Ca6Db.1546$Bg5.1026@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> Are you and Bill both from the same school system or something?

Dunno. Did he attend Ursaline?

I'm not
> being O-pressind, I'm being ignored.

You should continue to be ignored. I'll start on it right away.

> Should I do this in special english for you also?

Sorry, Dan, but I just started ignoring you.

4285. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-15 06:22:48 UTC
From: Gray Shockley <gray-87a@cybercoffee.org>
Message-ID: <0001HW.BC02AF58000288A313E93E90@news.giganews.com>
Source record: 83861
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.cb

On Mon, 15 Dec 2003 0:03:17 -0600, Brian wrote
(in message <f45722ac.0312142203.7ce7a551@posting.google.com>):

> Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
> news:<p91Db.3948$xH2.825482@news1.news.adelphia.net>...
>
>>
>> Won't happen, Dan. People like that have selective memory. They'll rail
>> about how QST doesn't have articles about what they want to see, and
>> conveniently forget about the important jobs ARRL does for us.
>>
>> 1. That only a minority of hams belong to ARRL speaks much more about
>> hams than it does the ARRL.
>
> Are you saying that I'm a sucker?
>
>> 2. I would challenge the ARRL haters to come up with scenario's of what
>> the ARS would be like today (if it even existed) if there was no ARRL.
>>
>> - Mike KB3EIA -
>
> World peace?

Are you also wondering what the ARRL has to do with swling?

Perhaps it is time to add "ARRL" to "syphilis"
and "Hal Turner" in my "social disease" killfool.

Gray Shockley

Entropy Maintenance Technician
Tao Chemical Company
---
gray-87a@cybercoffee.org
http://www.compcomm.com/
Vicksburg, Mississippi US

4286. Re: Bush Thrills Troops, Hillary Doesn't

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-15 08:56:44 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <gHeDb.4080$mC1.2728@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 83862

"Brian" wrote:
>
> My mistake, Dwight. I've had some
> pretty confused moments lately.

No problem. I've done it occasionally too.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

4287. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-15 09:00:35 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <TKeDb.4094$mC1.1314@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 83863
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.cb

"Dan/W4NTI" wrote:
>
> You do realize that the ARRL has the
> publication and distribution of QST
> contracted out, don't you? You should
> crab to them, not the league per se.

Of course. I wasn't complaining about not getting the magazine - only explaining why I purchased the magazine at a book store.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

4288. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-15 10:22:52 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <brk1v6$rlj@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 83864
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.cb

"Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
news:f45722ac.0312142241.7c2ff284@posting.google.com...
> "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:<%A8Db.16318$P%1.15245662@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>...
> > "Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
> > news:f45722ac.0312141205.320f3579@posting.google.com...
> > > "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
> > news:<LK%Cb.16220$P%1.15143612@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>...
> > > >
> > > > It probably was no longer cost effective to sell it on newstands.
> > > >
> > > > If the ARRL is making money (a no-no for a non-profit corp) then
report
> > them
> > > > to the IRS. If they are not making money, then no matter how big
they
> > are,
> > > > it is not about money since no one is making a profit.
> > > >
> > > > Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
> > >
> > > Un-friggin-believable.
> > >
> > > Non-profits aren't about profit. They're about salaries.
> >
> > If the salaries are too high, get on the board and get them reduced.
> >
> > Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>
> Who said they were too high?
>
> They have to balance their books somehow (to avoid the appearance of
> profit), and the salary is the most convenient place to dump the
> excess.
>
> It's about your ignorance of what a non-profit really is.
>

Oh yeah...non-profit is the best place to be...And, the greates exploiter of
human emotion, etc. With little effort, the dollars churn in--most people
don't file for the donation they are entitled to (only large donations whose
contributors are also playing the non-profit game).

That's why I'd like to see the tax structure change to some kind of percentage across the board. The *only* entity that would not have to pay any would be a church--and that only for the church building, its parking lot, and its parish. If they've got a private school, nursing home, etc., they pay. And, no deductions for *anyone* or *anything* across the board. Colgate, Mr. Bates, and me all pay the same percentage of tax out of our income; that's it--end of game.

Kim W5TIT

Kim W5TIT

4289. Re: W5NETs Christmas Card

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-15 10:55:08 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <gqgDb.4396$mC1.119@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 83865

"Kim W5TIT" wrote:
>
> Yeah, thanks Dwight...what a nice thought!
> (snip)

It was a real pleasure, Kim. Merry Christmas.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

4290. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-15 11:27:21 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <tUgDb.4496$mC1.3674@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 83866
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave

"Kim W5TIT" wrote:
>
> (snip) The *only* entity that would not
> have to pay any would be a church--
> and that only for the church building, its
> parking lot, and its parish. If they've
> got a private school, nursing home, etc.,
> they pay. (snip)

Why limit any exclusion to just the church building, parking lot, and parish? Since churches have been running schools, colleges, homeless shelters, women and youth shelters, food kitchens, youth camps and sports activities, hospitals, nursing homes, and so on, for many years (some long before this country was created and each requiring buildings, land, or equipment), such a limit would have a serious impact on many traditional church activities.

The newsgroup "rec.radio.cb" deleted from this message.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

4291. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-15 12:11:56 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3FDDA509.41E0876D@earthlink.net>
Source record: 83867

Brian wrote:
>
> "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:<0I0Db.16240$P%1.15155778@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>...
> > "Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
> > news:f45722ac.0312140844.52e9096e@posting.google.com...
>
> > > Dee got on early supporting the status quo; hook,line and sinker. She
> > > is a perfect mouth-piece for the ARRL, and I've heard her repeating,
> > > word for word, the policies of this organization. She is, more or
> > > less, an official ARRL spam-bot. Wonder if she is an official
> > > bulletin station?
> > >
> >
> > Not hardly. I disapprove of some of the policies but I do not expect it to
> > change when my view doesn't represent the majority view. I do not consider
> > differences of opinion on some policies to be reason to stop supporting
> > them. Also I merely state that non-members shouldn't think they can change
> > the policies. The ARRL policies, as with any organization, will reflect the
> > opinions of the majority of members. Someone with a minority opinion in any
> > organization will have to work very hard to get the majority to adopt it.
> > Organizations have no obligation to reflect the opinion of non-members.
> >
> > Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>
> Oh, BS, Dee. You just got through saying that if you don't belong, if
> you don't rise to the top of the food chain, blah blah, horse crap,
> blah blah.

You've become a particularly rude little electrolyte of late, Brian.
You can't expect to change those things which you happen to dislike
about the ARRL from outside it. If you are on the inside, your task is
to convince others to adopt your point of view. I've been a member of
the League for most of my forty years as a ham and a life member for
nearly thirty of those years. The League takes some positions and
actions of which I approve. It also takes positions and actions of
which I disapprove. If one of those seems important enough to me, I
make noise to HQ, to my Director and to other members. Sometimes enough
members make enough noise to change an ARRL position. Sometimes they
don't.

> The ARRL wants to be the -ONE- voice for the ARS.

The ARRL is the biggest and most influential voice within the Amateur
Radio Service. There is clout in numbers. If you've not yet figured

this out, it is time that you learned it.

> I suggest that they
> start with forward thinking leadership representing all, not just
> their CW-centric membership. Or get out of the way.

Get out of whose way--yours? I don't see you as any kind of progressive steamroller with any followers at all. Who are you leading?

Dave K8MN

4292. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-15 12:19:34 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3FDDA6D5.3785E1F1@earthlink.net>
Source record: 83868
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.cb

```
Brian wrote:
>
> "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:<2s0Db.16237$P%1.15152539@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>...
> > "Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
> > news:f45722ac.0312140830.11631e36@posting.google.com...
> > > "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
> > news:<s3TCb.16156$P%1.15064983@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>...
> > > > "Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
> > > > news:f45722ac.0312131852.55c74b74@posting.google.com...
> > > > > Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
> > news:<mcGCb.623$xH2.485769@news1.news.adelphia.net>...
> > > > > > Steve Robeson, K4CAP wrote:
> > > > > >
> > > > > > > hamop_62@hotmail.com (Louis C. LeVine) wrote in message
> > news:<792e029d.0312110853.4daa825f@posting.google.com>...
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > >>This came from another radio group. They are doing a survey to
> > find
> > > > > > >>out why some people do not like the ARRL. I don't like it because
> > it
> > > > > > >>costs to much. If it were $10 a year I might consider joining.
> > > > > > >>Louis
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > And just exactly what do you expect that they could do for
> > $10.00
> > > > > > > a month?
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > Please name me ONE organization in ANY "hobby" activity that
> > > > > > > provdes the scope of servcies and resources the ARRL offers to
> > it's
> > > > > > > target peer group.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > Awaiting your informed response.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > I think this is one of those cases where some people think that
> > their
> > > > > > membership is a subscription to QST. Its a lot more than that. ARRL
> > does
> > > > > > a lot for Amateurs, even those who hate the organization.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > - Mike KB3EIA -
```

> > > > >
> > > > >
> > > > > Fair enough.
> > > > >
> > > > > I dislike some of the policies that the ARRL has promoted in the past,
> > > > > and felt as if the ARRL did not represent me even though I have been a
> > > > > member since 1986.
> > > >
> > > > Did you get actively involved? Did you become a section director? Did
> > you
> > > > campaign to sway the majority to your opinion? Or did you just write a
> > > > letter or two complaining and were disappointed because it didn't
> > instantly
> > > > change the ARRL's policies? If you want your point of view to be policy
> > > > then you have to become very politically active in an organization.
> > > >
> > > > Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
> > >
> > >
> > > Dee, how very judgemental of you, which is what I've come to expect
> > > from the very politically active - The Liberals. No, I didn't burn
> > > any bra's or jock straps, and didn't participate in any "Tech-Pride"
> > > parades. My greatest dilema was some soul-searching on whether I
> > > should continue supporting financially an organization which I thought
> > > lacked leadership and supported backward policies. Otherwise, the
> > > ARRL is an excellent educational and publishing organization.
> > >
> >
> > I happen to be a stout conservative. Regardless of whether one is liberal
> > or conservative, one has to get involved and stay involved to be effective.
>
> Blah blah blah
>
> > Complaining about lack of leadership simply shows that either you didn't
> > want to do the work yourself or that you were unable to convince the
> > majority to back your view.
>
> Mere humans were incapable of convincing the ARRL leadership...

...and you take that view because you didn't convince folks to back your
view.

> > > As a matter of fact, I did write two letters to the ARRL and I was a
> > > member of the field organization. I also participated in the NOI/NPRM
> > > process.
> > >
> > > Thanks for your concern.
> >
> > This is not a particularly effective way to change the policies of the
> > organization.
>

> Dee, pull your head out.

Your poor manners are showing again, little electrolyte.

> Writing letters to the ARRL, becoming a
> member of the field organization, and participating in the
> NOI/NPRM...?

The League doesn't issue Notices of Inquiry or Notices of Proposed Rule Making. As to the other items, you've as much as told us that if the majority of League membership doesn't agree with you, you'll take your ball and go home. Then you'll bad mouth the organization.

Dave K8MN

4293. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-15 12:27:26 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3FDDA8AD.8023FC6A@earthlink.net>
Source record: 83869

Brian wrote:
>
> "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:<%A8Db.16318$P%1.15245662@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>...
> > "Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
> > news:f45722ac.0312141205.320f3579@posting.google.com...
> > > "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
> > news:<LK%Cb.16220$P%1.15143612@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>...
> > > >
> > > > It probably was no longer cost effective to sell it on newstands.
> > > >
> > > > If the ARRL is making money (a no-no for a non-profit corp) then report
> > them
> > > > to the IRS. If they are not making money, then no matter how big they
> > are,
> > > > it is not about money since no one is making a profit.
> > > >
> > > > Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
> > >
> > > Un-friggin-believable.
> > >
> > > Non-profits aren't about profit. They're about salaries.
> >
> > If the salaries are too high, get on the board and get them reduced.
> >
> > Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>
> Who said they were too high?
>
> They have to balance their books somehow (to avoid the appearance of
> profit), and the salary is the most convenient place to dump the
> excess.

Sounds like one of Len's typical conspiracy/dishonesty rants aimed
toward the ARRL. I interviewed for a League position years back. The
salary offered wasn't enough to cover a move and life in the greater
Hartford area. While I'm sure that salaries are now better, I don't
think any League staffers are putting up gold-plated Rohn tower and 80m
yagis at their palatial estates.

> It's about your ignorance of what a non-profit really is.

Guffaw!. Her ignorance? I see some gaping holes in your own
database.

With all the dissatisfaction you've expressed, why not start your own organization for like-minded hams? I'm sure you'd amass a following in no time.

Dave K8MN

4294. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-15 12:40:14 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3FDDABA8.BFFA8D74@earthlink.net>
Source record: 83870

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <lU6Db.4504$Pg1.632@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>, "Kï¿½HB"
> <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> writes as if he just had a colorectal examination
> with a fully warmed-up 100 W American Beauty soldering iron:
>
> >"Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote
> >
> >> She is, more or less, an official ARRL spam-bot.
> >> Wonder if she is an official bulletin station?
> >
> >And you are, more or less, the official LHA junior-Unabasher.
>
> OLD one, Brian Burke is his own man. He states an opposite
> opinion from the "official" Newington spin on how amateurism
> in radio is "supposed to be."

...as compared to your own "unofficial" west coast spin on how
amateurism in radio is "supposed to be"--That in your "unofficial"
capacity as non-participant in amateur radio and non-member of the ARRL.

> Therefore, you, as a Devout Believer
> in the glory and honor and mysticism of amateurism, must
> chastise the UNbelievers...and call them "unabashers" for not
> accepting the legends, mythos, and religious traditions of radio
> as "officially" stated by ARRL publications.

The above is just one example of the type material which sets you apart
as a flake beyond compare.

> Somewhere in the past you were often saying "gentlemen can
> disagree without being disagreeable." You, sir, are being terribly
> disagreeable, ergo you are NO gentleman.

Len, meet Len.

> >I want you to be fully aware of your role in rrap, Brian.
>
> Tsk, tsk, tsk, you should be "aware" of how others see you, OLD
> man, and that others are quite aware you are NOT the CNO of
> any rrap party.

Maybe you'll agree to stand as a candidate opposing Hans' role here.
We can take an informal r.r.a.p. vote. I think the poll will surprise
you, kindly old gent.

> >It goes like this: LHA is the
> >organ grinder, playing a song called "I Left My Heart in ADA, and Newington
> >Won't Give It Back".
>
> "Newington" had absolutely nothing to do with ACAN or ADA, super
> chief. ARRL had NOTHING to do with any other places I worked in
> the last half century nor the people I worked WITH from DoD and
> other branches of the U.S. government.

By golly, I think we're starting to make some progress. Your frank admissions reveal you as a man whose path toward enlightenment has begun.

> The BoD of a small town
> club in New England would be lost trying to carry even half the traffic
> load of the third largest U.S. Army transmitter site in the world 50
> years ago.

We haven't been discussing the board of a small town club in New England. We've been discussing the largest organization of American radio amateurs. Did ADA have a board of directors elected by members of the Army?

> All that the League seems to know is that on-off keying
> code is the ultimate "art" of radio because that is what they spin off
> on their membership, covertly and overtly.

You're fabricating, Leonard.

> >You are the little monkey in a bright red hat hopping
> >up and down and acting silly for our amusement.
>
> You are being truly a contentious OLD fart in here, trolling desperately
> for someone to despise...and then doing a poor job of denigration.

Len, meet Len.

> >With all best wishes for the recovery of your missing T5 logs,
>
> And here's "best wishes" for some education that might penetrate
> a code-warped psyche housing in regards to: (1) voice modulated
> transmitters of 1906; (2) cell phone differences between power-up
> and first cell-connect; (3) so-called "one-way" ionospheric radio
> propagation paths; (4) assorted little gems of radio disinformation
> that you haven't recognized in the past nor admit to making mistakes
> on in public.

I seem to recall you getting blown out of the water on items one through three. I have no idea of what item four means.

> I've not commented in this subject thread before, only on the 14
> petitions before the FCC thread (as its origininator). The NPRM or
> whatever as a result of those petitions will decide the FUTURE of
> radio amateurism in the USA. While the REGULARS in the jolly

> little chatroom of morseaholics are busy puffing themselves up about
> their marvelous experience and tenure in on-offing the radio waves,
> the future is sneaking up on everyone. All you are doing lately is
> just behaving like one of your iceholes in the wintertime.

What is any of this to you? You aren't a radio amateur. You aren't a member of the ARRL. That hasn't stopped you from huffing and puffing.

Dave K8MN

4295. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-15 12:58:30 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031215075830.12631.00003380@mb-m28.aol.com>
Source record: 83871

In article <brk1v6$rlj@library1.airnews.net>, "Kim" <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
writes:

>Oh yeah...non-profit is the best place to be...And, the greates exploiter of
>human emotion, etc.

Naw, that would be a better description of show business.

>With little effort, the dollars churn in--most people
>don't file for the donation they are entitled to (only large donations whose
>contributors are also playing the non-profit game).

I disagree! Most people I know take the legitimate deductions - small or large.
If you don't, that's *your* problem.
>
>That's why I'd like to see the tax structure change to some kind of
>percentage across the board.

Usually called a "flat tax".

>The *only* entity that would not have to pay
>any would be a church--and that only for the church building, its parking
>lot, and its parish.

OK - who/what defines what a "church" is?

And if the govt. only exempts churches from taxation, isn't that government
support of religion? Why not?

>If they've got a private school, nursing home, etc.,
>they pay. And, no deductions for *anyone* or *anything* across the board.

Is that really fair, or even close to fair?

Is it fair or even close to fair for the person struggling on, say, $25,000/yr
to pay the same percentage tax as someone making $250,000/yr?

Is it fair or even close to fair for the person with multiple dependents, or a
permanent disability (like blindness) to pay the same percentage as someone who
is not so encumbered?

Is it fair or even close to fair for people in places with wage taxes and state
income taxes to pay the same as those in places without those taxes?

>Colgate, Mr. Bates, and me all pay the same percentage of tax out of our
>income; that's it--end of game.

OK - now, what constitutes "income"?

Is it just wages you receive for working, or do benefits paid for you by your employer count too?

How about earnings from investments? How about sales of items you own?

Suppose I bought some radio parts for $10 at a hamfest 20 years ago, brought them home, cleaned them up, tested and fixed them and kept the good ones. I sell them today for $100 - is that $100 to be considered "income"? Or just $90? What about the time and effort I put into them?

If you bought a house or some land 10 years ago and paid $50,000, and next year you sell it for $150,000, how much of that $150,000 should be taxable income?

In the case of corporations, is "income" measured in gross sales or in net profits?

What about 401ks, IRAs, FSAs, etc.?

--

"Flat" taxes sound nice until you get down into the details, and then things get real ugly.

Take away deductions for charitable contributions, and exemptions for nonprofits, and many of them will simply stop operating. Take away deductions for home mortgages and RE taxes, and RE values will tumble because people won't be able to afford as much house. (Foreclosures will rise, too.)

The reality is that most of us would be *worse* off with a "flat" tax because of the side effects.

73 de Jim, N2EY

4296. Re: W5NETs Christmas Card <- reply to all

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-15 13:11:38 UTC
From: Keith Hosman <log-remove-nospam-dshr@remove.bnnorth.nospam.net>
Message-ID: <3ncrtvkqtds2jv6t9lkpagja60l83jno2f@4ax.com>
Source record: 83872

On Fri, 12 Dec 2003 03:36:17 GMT, "Dwight Stewart"
<stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote:

>"WA8ULX" [and Others] wrote:
>>
>> (snip)
>
>
> I tried to send cards to everyone I've talked to here recently (23 of you
>in all). However, I'm sure I missed a few. To those I did miss, including
>those just passing through, let me also wish you an early, but earnest,
>happy Christmas and new year. The same to those who celebrate Hanukkah, or
>other celebrations, this holiday season.
>
> I think this is going to be a good Christmas for me - not because of what
>I'm getting, but because I feel like that will be true. And I'm very much
>looking forward to a new year filled with new experiences - even the new
>twists on the old discussions in this newsgroup.
>
> Anyway, with that out of the way, let's get back to those discussions. We
>have a few more days to argue before Christmas (Hanukkah or whatever)
>actually gets here.
>
>
>Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
>http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

Same to you Dwight.

73 de Keith
--
KC8TCQ
ARRL Member - ARES
SKYWARN

4297. Re: Expirations in 2004

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-15 13:38:21 UTC
From: Alun <alun@1stcounsel.com>
Message-ID: <Xns945257E0ADB3Eelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 83873

"D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> wrote in
news:Pine.LNX.4.58.0312150419450.7244@kd6lvw.ampr.org:

> On Fri, 12 Dec 2003, Alun wrote:
>> "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> wrote in
>> news:Pine.LNX.4.58.0312120624010.6819@kd6lvw.ampr.org:
>> > On Fri, 12 Dec 2003, Alun wrote:
>> >> "K�HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in
>> >> news:_x6Cb.8025$_r6.1795@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net:
>> >> >
>> >> > "N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
>> >> >
>> >> >> Didn't FCC change the vanity call rules right about then?
>> >> >
>> >> > No, IIRC Gate 1 of the vanity program opened in May or June of
>> >> > 1996.
>> >> >
>> >> > 73, de Hans, K0HB
>> >> >
>> >> >
>> >> >
>> >> >
>> >> >
>> >>
>> >> No-code started in '92. I would expect a bump in renewals falling
>> >> due from last year onwards.
>> >
>> > Wrong. Try getting your facts straight:
>> >
>> > Testing change: 2/14/1991. First no-code license issued 4/12/1991.
>>
>> I see, December '91 instead of some time in '92. Not exactly a huge
>> error, is it? The first batch were all people who had taken the theory
>> tests at Anne Arundel ARC before no-code licences were actually
>> introduced, and so were ready to go when it came in. I think you may
>> find that those six people had the only no-code licences issued in the
>> US in '91!
>
> Obviously, you have other issues too. It doesn't seem as if you can
> read dates either (and if you were thinking of the European format for
> dates, then there is no 14th month, so it should have been obvious that
> such a format wasn't used). You're not off by a month - but by 10;
> almost a year, and with the number of licensees in that period, the

> error is significant.
>

Other issues?

Because I was mistaken about a date?

Get a life!

4298. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-15 14:27:30 UTC
From: rhf-mail@pacbell.net
Message-ID: <e5e13af8.0312150627.712a2c5d@posting.google.com>
Source record: 83874
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.cb

WHAT I DO NOT UNDERSTAND IS . . .
= = = The 'same' People Who Want Total Separation of Church and State.
= = = Want to Tax Churches and Any Religious Charitable Activities.

I For One Believe That: There Should be Separation of Organized
Church and Organized State. But that there IS the 'personal' FREEDOM
to be a Religious Person 'within' the State Setting. NO Taxation of
ANY Religious Activities or Properties.

The Simple Fast Is: For about 150 Years before the Personal Income
Tax and the Creation of the IRS by the Government of the USofA. The
were NO Laws establishing Taxation of Religious Properties and
Charitable Giving (Restricting Religious Freedom).

God Bless America ~ RHF
.

.
= = = "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
= = = wrote in message news:<brk1v6$rlj@library1.airnews.net>...
>
> Oh yeah...non-profit is the best place to be...And, the greates exploiter of
> human emotion, etc. With little effort, the dollars churn in--most people
> don't file for the donation they are entitled to (only large donations whose
> contributors are also playing the non-profit game).
>
> That's why I'd like to see the tax structure change to some kind of
> percentage across the board. The *only* entity that would not have to pay
> any would be a church--and that only for the church building, its parking
> lot, and its parish. If they've got a private school, nursing home, etc.,
> they pay. And, no deductions for *anyone* or *anything* across the board.
> Colgate, Mr. Bates, and me all pay the same percentage of tax out of our
> income; that's it--end of game.
>
> Kim W5TIT
>

.

4299. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-15 16:27:21 UTC
From: Dave Bushong <dbushong@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <JhlDb.4658$xH2.1131197@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 83875
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave

RHF wrote:
> WHAT I DO NOT UNDERSTAND IS . . .
> = = = The 'same' People Who Want Total Separation of Church and State.
> = = = Want to Tax Churches and Any Religious Charitable Activities.
>
> I For One Believe That: There Should be Separation of Organized
> Church and Organized State. But that there IS the 'personal' FREEDOM
> to be a Religious Person 'within' the State Setting. NO Taxation of
> ANY Religious Activities or Properties.
>
> The Simple Fast Is: For about 150 Years before the Personal Income
> Tax and the Creation of the IRS by the Government of the USofA. The
> were NO Laws establishing Taxation of Religious Properties and
> Charitable Giving (Restricting Religious Freedom).
>
>
> God Bless America ~ RHF

If you don't understand it, then allow me to help. The term "separation of church and state" does not appear in the US Constitution, nor the Declaration of Independence. The closest thing to it is in the First Amendment, which starts with my favorite five words:

"Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof ..."

Only a lawyer could claim not to understand the plain meaning of those words.

Dave

4300. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-15 17:05:08 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0312150905.520592@posting.google.com>
Source record: 83876

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20031214203925.21642.00002939@mb-m01.aol.com>...

> Everyone can expect some delay in decision-making at the FCC due
> to the reorganization of the Wireless Bureau announced recently.

Whew...sure glad you threw in THAT commentary, Lennie...We we all
expecting them to jump right on this live grenade...

> Although the official comment period is over for these petitions, very
> few have made "late" comments, therefore the number change for the
> bottom 7 is very small and the upper 7 is untouched since last week.

Glad for that tidbit, too...

> Merry Christmas and a Happy New Year, chatroomers.

Come on, Lennie...you can say it...."FELLOW chatroomers". Of
course it still doesn't answer the qustion as to why you call it that
when, as a "professional electronics engineer", you should know
better.

And Merry Christmas to you and Mrs Lennie, too.

Steve

4301. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-15 17:43:36 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0312150943.194e5cad@posting.google.com>
Source record: 83877

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20031214203927.21642.00002940@mb-m01.aol.com>...
>
> OLD one, Brian Burke is his own man. He states an opposite
> opinion from the "official" Newington spin on how amateurism
> in radio is "supposed to be." Therefore, you, as a Devout Believer
> in the glory and honor and mysticism of amateurism, must
> chastise the UNbelievers...and call them "unabashers" for not
> accepting the legends, mythos, and religious traditions of radio
> as "officially" stated by ARRL publications.
>
> Somewhere in the past you were often saying "gentlemen can
> disagree without being disagreeable." You, sir, are being terribly
> disagreeable, ergo you are NO gentleman.
> >
> Tsk, tsk, tsk, you should be "aware" of how others see you, OLD
> man, and that others are quite aware you are NOT the CNO of
> any rrap party.
> >
> "Newington" had absolutely nothing to do with ACAN or ADA, super
> chief. ARRL had NOTHING to do with any other places I worked in
> the last half century nor the people I worked WITH from DoD and
> other branches of the U.S. government. The BoD of a small town
> club in New England would be lost trying to carry even half the traffic
> load of the third largest U.S. Army transmitter site in the world 50
> years ago. All that the League seems to know is that on-off keying
> code is the ultimate "art" of radio because that is what they spin off
> on their membership, covertly and overtly.
> >
> You are being truly a contentious OLD fart in here, trolling desperately
> for someone to despise...and then doing a poor job of denigration.
> >
> And here's "best wishes" for some education that might penetrate
> a code-warped psyche housing in regards to: (1) voice modulated
> transmitters of 1906; (2) cell phone differences between power-up
> and first cell-connect; (3) so-called "one-way" ionospheric radio
> propagation paths; (4) assorted little gems of radio disinformation
> that you haven't recognized in the past nor admit to making mistakes
> on in public.
>
> I've not commented in this subject thread before, only on the 14
> petitions before the FCC thread (as its origininator). The NPRM or
> whatever as a result of those petitions will decide the FUTURE of
> radio amateurism in the USA. While the REGULARS in the jolly

> little chatroom of morseaholics are busy puffing themselves up about
> their marvelous experience and tenure in on-offing the radio waves,
> the future is sneaking up on everyone. All you are doing lately is
> just behaving like one of your iceholes in the wintertime.
>
> It's too bad that your Xanax ran out and you switched from ran to rant.
>

Sometimes the pool-pah exceeds the ability of humans to comment......

4302. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-15 17:58:07 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0312150958.5f46f89a@posting.google.com>
Source record: 83878

"Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<7C2Bb.4096$_r6.4067@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>...
> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote
>
> > Then, what special knowledge is imparted by being able to pass the General
> and
> > Extra class written tests that is a minimum qualification for the
> privileges
> > granted by those licenses *and* is not tested adequately by the Technician
> > test?
>
> What difference was there between a 1953 Technician written test, and a 1953
> General written test? Nothing, of course. They were exactly the same
> examination.

And it stayed that way until March 20, 1987!
>
> But the 1953 General could beep 8WPM faster than the Tech. This 8WPM
> qualified them to operate on 2-meters where the Tech had no privileges in
> 1953. Novices of that era also beeped at 8WPM less than a General, but they
> *could* operate on 2-meters, and on 3 HF bands closed to Tech's. Didn't
> make any sense then --- still doesn't.

Actually, there *was* a point to it, way back then.

The Technician, as you know, was created and named with the concept
that it would be for those hams who wanted to try out new
technologies. The mindset back then was that "new technologies" =
"VHF-UHF-microwaves" = "lots of time in the shop, not much time on the
air".

This was FCC's idea, btw. They had gotten into a "social engineering"
mindset about 1950 (remember "design for living" and such?) and
thought the Tech would foster development of the ultrahighs.

So when the original Tech was created, it gave privs to 220 and above.
Not only was there no HF but no 6 or 2 either. It's probably not a
coincidence that when the Tech was created there was little or no
manufactured or kit gear meant for hams that covered 220 and above, so
those original Techs were either homebrewing from scratch or
converting surplus to get on the air. After all, a technician
shouldn't need someone else to build him/her a rig, right?

2 meters back then was the most popular ham band above 30 MHz (thanks
to the SCR-522, WERS and Channel 2) so it made sense (to FCC) that
Novices be allowed there but not Techs.

But while the Novice was an instant hit, the Tech didn't get a lot of takers until first 6 and then 2 meters were added. Well into the '70s, the FCC continued to cling to the "Techs aren't communicators" concept. I think it was the widespread use of repeaters by hams that finally ended that idea.

> My point? All these arbitrary differences in operating privileges are just
> that --- arbitrary, based mostly on a misguided agenda of 'social
> engineering' by the regulators.

Exactly! Some of them worked well (like the Novice) and some of them didn't.

And the regulators and would-be regulators like NCVEC are still at it.

Didja know that the whole "Basis and Purpose" business in Part 97 was part of that "social engineering" thing, and was first incorporated into the rules in 1951? FCC wanted it, not hams.

73 de Jim, N2EY

4303. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-15 18:42:51 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3FDE00AB.5030709@psu.edu>
Source record: 83879

garigue wrote:
> "JEP" <no_spam_here34474@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> news:5a5fcb7b.0312131154.fc35697@posting.google.com...
>
>>I don't like ARRL because:
>>
>>1) Membership price too high
>>2) Can't separate QST from membership
>>3) QST only counts as $15 of the $39 membership fee
>>4) Incentive licensing from the 60's
>>5) Ham radio is a dying hobby
>>6) 5wpm Extras
>>7) No value given for the money invested
>>8) No accountability of the board and Executive staff
>>9) Really doesn't represent the majority of hams (majority don't
>>belong)
>>10) Really no different than 'NRA', 'AARP', 'NAACP'. Take your money
>>and use it for their own agenda, NOT yours!
>>
>>That is enough for a start.
>>
>>Sorry to see '73' and Wayne Green exit publishing.
>>Sorry to see 'Ham Radio' exit publishing.
>>
>>ex ARRL member
>
>
>
> Shouldda added "and a cheap whiner" after member. I am not going to waste
> space replying to each of the above as that would mean that there was some
> merit or better yet thought there. I run into the same rants from many of
> the other organizations I belong to when it comes to membership and dues.
> These people spout off their big mouths which have no shortage of hot air
> ...but part with a buck or two ....Katie bar the door .... I can take and
> listen to criticism regarding any organization if the person was a member
> and not a sap sucking leach-parasite. And yet the ARRL is for all hams.
> Show me an organization anywhere that operates without funds and I'll show
> you one that the few work their collective asses off for the benefit of the
> remainder of the membership i.e. the parasites. So I guess ham radio should
> collectively ask these tight-wad, freebie seeking, selfish, greedy and
> non-sharing hams ......WHAT HAVE YOU DONE FOR ME LATELY ????.....expect moan
> about crap that went under the bridge a long time ago, squeezing that nickel
> till the Buffalo defecates and hide behind some initial name in the
> newsgroup.

>
> Take care, don't share and keep on spewing hot air ...

Heheh, what you said, Tom. Good one!

I never cease to be amazed by the disgruntled and their whining.
Especially when they whine about number 7 in the list. Perhaps the ARRL
deos not represent the majority view, (though I believe ARRL does) so if
the whiners who supposedly represent the majority of licensed hams
really want to change things, all they would have to do is join en mass,
elect exactly who they want, and then the ARRL would be "made right" in
one fell swoop.

But then that means they would have to part with that precious money, eh?

But that means they would have to get off their keisters and do
something, eh?

And finally, and what I think is the most important thing, they would
be running the show. Now they the man! Oh oH!

One big thing I've learned in life is that it is a lot easier to
bitch about something than it is to *do* something about it.

It's also a great way of absolving one's self of any guilt or
responsibility.

- Mike KB3EIA -

4304. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-15 18:45:15 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3FDE013B.5020308@psu.edu>
Source record: 83880

Brian wrote:
> Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote

>>I think this is one of those cases where some people think that their
>>membership is a subscription to QST. Its a lot more than that. ARRL does
>>a lot for Amateurs, even those who hate the organization.
>>
>> - Mike KB3EIA -
>
>
>
> Fair enough.
>
> I dislike some of the policies that the ARRL has promoted in the past,
> and felt as if the ARRL did not represent me even though I have been a
> member since 1986.

Well, there you go! As a member, I'll pay a lot more attnetion to what
you have to say.

- Mike KB3EIA -

4305. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-15 18:53:00 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3FDE030C.8040404@psu.edu>
Source record: 83881

newsgroups trimmed..

Brian wrote:
> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<Bw%Cb.256$Bg5.145@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
>
>
>>The ARRL is why you CAN ENJOY your DXing and other things on the air.
>
>
> DX can be enjoyed without the ARRL.
>
>
>>When the league helps kill BPL how about sending them a thank you card,
>>ingrate.
>>
>>Dan/W4NTI
>
>
> And that is the reason I tolerate the ARRL's other crappola.
>
> But be sure to send a thank you card to the NTIA and FEMA as well.

Brian, did the NTIA weigh in on this one yet? I saw the FEMA story, and
they did "lay 'em one upside the head" pretty good.

I'm still kind of twitchy about the BPL concept getting even this far.

- Mike KB3EIA -

4306. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-15 19:03:26 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3FDE057E.4040206@psu.edu>
Source record: 83882

Groups trimmed....

Brian wrote:
> "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:<XH%Cb.16219$P%1.15143145@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>...
>
>
>>Several of us have already listed the numerous benefits of the ARRL.
>
>
> Well, there you have it. What benefits Dee must benefit all.
>
> Again
>
>>how did you voice your dissent? Did you get actively and heavily involved?
>>Doesn't sound like it. If you did get involved, you did not convince the
>>majority of members to change to your point of view.
>
>
> Must one become El Supremo Commandant to have an organization that
> they belong to and pay dues to represent them? Must be so in this
> case.

No - absolutely not!

>
>>Instead you choose to have little to no impact on proposed changes by the
>>FCC.
>
>
> Actually, the road the FCC took is closer to leadership of the ARS
> than the road that the ARRL took.
>
> Yes I know individuals can write letters but a decent sized lobby
> has
>
>>a far greater effect.

Lobby=Baksheesh. Necessary or not, it is an abomination.

>
> Which is the very saddest part of the whole episode.
>
> An organized body can much more effectively solicit
>
>>the backing of other affected groups on questions like BPL.

>
>
> It is necessary for the ARRL to fight BPL - it threatens their very
> existence.
>
>
>>Being "One voice in the maelstrom" is a waste of one's time as it will be
>>completely obliterated by that maelstrom.
>
>
> Being in the minority doesn't necessarily make one wrong nor
> necessarily make ones efforts a waste of time. Re: Galileo

One of the greatest rules of parliamentary procedure, and a real
cornerstone of representative democracy in gneral is that even though
the majority rules, the minority is allowed to have it's say.

I think waaaaaayyyy too many people these days seem to have forgotten
that. The minority must have it's say.

Dee, I think you are taking a wrong tack on this one. Brian needs his
say, and should not be forced to be a person at a high level of power in
an institution to have his opinion.

Not everyone wants to be active or even *can* be active in an
organization. There are only so many leadership positions.

>
>>Now I do not say that everyone should be a member of ARRL. That is up to
>>the individual. However if you are not, then don't complain about their
>>policies. Don't complain when BPL makes HF useless in your area. Don't
>>complain when VHF/UHF frequencies get reallocated to commercial uses. Don't
>>complain if the government should choose to eliminate amateur radio entirely
>>as it has tried to do twice in the past.
>>
>>Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>
>
>
> Yes, yes, Dee. Of course. Whatever you say. ARRL spam-bot.

4307. Re: Doesn't play nice with others, was Re: Bill Pasternak a real asshole

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-15 19:05:45 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <dCnDb.1814$SX1.1300@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 83883

"Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
news:f45722ac.0312142220.131283d7@posting.google.com...
> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<Ca6Db.1546$Bg5.1026@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> > Are you and Bill both from the same school system or something?
>
> Dunno. Did he attend Ursaline?
>
> I'm not
> > being O-pressind, I'm being ignored.
>
> You should continue to be ignored. I'll start on it right away.
>
> > Should I do this in special english for you also?
>
> Sorry, Dan, but I just started ignoring you.

Good. I'll hold you to it.

Dan/W4NTI

4308. Re: Saddam

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-15 19:09:14 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <uFnDb.1816$SX1.282@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 83884

"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20031214193310.11565.00000559@mb-m25.aol.com...
> >To answer ur question, I suggest we tie him up with leather straps,
stake
> >him out in the sun, and let the Iraqi people put the boot to him.
> >
> >Dan/W4NTI
> >
>
> Cant do that Dan the Lieberals would say it was unfair

Your right...well to even it up we can put the liberals out there with him.

Dan/W4NTI

4309. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-15 20:28:55 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031215152855.22081.00002502@mb-m17.aol.com>
Source record: 83885

In article <3FDDABA8.BFFA8D74@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>What is any of this to you? You aren't a radio amateur. You aren't a
>member of the ARRL. That hasn't stopped you from huffing and puffing.

I'm just campaigning for the elimination of morse code testing.

What is that to you?

You've already passed morse code tests.

You are the ultimate amateur.

You might have been a professional once, but you could not even
get a job with an amateur organization.

No wonder you are so bitter.

LHA

4310. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-15 20:28:56 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031215152856.22081.00002503@mb-m17.aol.com>
Source record: 83888

In article <3FDDA8AD.8023FC6A@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>Brian wrote:
>>
>> "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
>news:<%A8Db.16318$P%1.15245662@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>...
>> > "Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
>> > news:f45722ac.0312141205.320f3579@posting.google.com...
>> > > "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
>> > news:<LK%Cb.16220$P%1.15143612@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>...
>> > > >
>> > > > It probably was no longer cost effective to sell it on newstands.
>> > > >
>> > > > If the ARRL is making money (a no-no for a non-profit corp) then
>report
>> > them
>> > > > to the IRS. If they are not making money, then no matter how big
>they
>> > are,
>> > > > it is not about money since no one is making a profit.
>> > > >
>> > > > Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>> > >
>> > > Un-friggin-believable.
>> > >
>> > > Non-profits aren't about profit. They're about salaries.
>> >
>> > If the salaries are too high, get on the board and get them reduced.
>> >
>> > Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>>
>> Who said they were too high?
>>
>> They have to balance their books somehow (to avoid the appearance of
>> profit), and the salary is the most convenient place to dump the
>> excess.
>
>Sounds like one of Len's typical conspiracy/dishonesty rants aimed
>toward the ARRL.

Quit trying to sound like a Ba'athist amateur, Klunk.

The League (of Notions) MAKES MONEY on the publication side
of their conglomerate of control.

Ads in QST pay for everything in the QST staff and the cost of job printing and fulfillment (publication talk for mailing/distributing).

The "non-profit" stuff and nonsense is for lowering their taxes.

You need copies of their IRS forms from 2002 and previous years? Those are on the Internet.

>I interviewed for a League position years back. The
>salary offered wasn't enough to cover a move and life in the greater
>Hartford area.

Translation: You were rejected. (boo hoo for you)

> While I'm sure that salaries are now better, I don't
>think any League staffers are putting up gold-plated Rohn tower and 80m
>yagis at their palatial estates.

Rohn filed for bankruptcy on account of that?

You can see the top five staffers' salaries given on their 2002 IRS forms.

>> It's about your ignorance of what a non-profit really is.
>
>*Guffaw!*. Her ignorance? I see some gaping holes in your own
>database.

Nooo, Klunk, "non-profit" is a status to claim for paying LESS taxes.

If you are foolish enough to believe that W1AW's station, the "museum" and all the other paraphenalia came out of dues, you've got a database gap large enough to sail the USS Enterprise through.

>With all the dissatisfaction you've expressed, why not start your own
>organization for like-minded hams? I'm sure you'd amass a following in
>no time.

Three-fourths of all licensed U.S. radio amateurs are NOT members.

That should be evidenciary. To all but the minority who are members.

Members "KNOW what is good for all the others" and therefore they are the elite.

The League (of Notions) still holds on vainly to the idea that morse code is still the ultimate of amateur skills...long after the rest of the radio world has given it up, discarded it for communications.

Continue to be the acidic spam-bot for the League (of Notions), old Klunk. You have taken a Ba'ath...but are yet unclean.

LHA

4311. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-15 20:28:57 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031215152857.22081.00002504@mb-m17.aol.com>
Source record: 83886

In article <3FDDA6D5.3785E1F1@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>Brian wrote:
>>
>> "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
>news:<2s0Db.16237$P%1.15152539@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>...
>> > "Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
>> > news:f45722ac.0312140830.11631e36@posting.google.com...
>> > > "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
>> > news:<s3TCb.16156$P%1.15064983@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>...
>> > > > "Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
>> > > > news:f45722ac.0312131852.55c74b74@posting.google.com...

>> > Complaining about lack of leadership simply shows that either you didn't
>> > want to do the work yourself or that you were unable to convince the
>> > majority to back your view.
>>
>> Mere humans were incapable of convincing the ARRL leadership...
>
>...and you take that view because you didn't convince folks to back your
>view.

Three-fourths of all licensed U.S. radio amateurs "took that view"
and are NOT members.

>> > > As a matter of fact, I did write two letters to the ARRL and I was a
>> > > member of the field organization. I also participated in the NOI/NPRM
>> > > process.
>> > >
>> > > Thanks for your concern.
>> >
>> > This is not a particularly effective way to change the policies of the
>> > organization.
>>
>> Dee, pull your head out.
>
>Your poor manners are showing again, little electrolyte.

Ho, ho, ho...and just who called whom "Tugboat Annie,"
Kolonel Klunk?

>
>> Writing letters to the ARRL, becoming a
>> member of the field organization, and participating in the
>> NOI/NPRM...?

>
>The League doesn't issue Notices of Inquiry or Notices of Proposed Rule
>Making. As to the other items, you've as much as told us that if the
>majority of League membership doesn't agree with you, you'll take your
>ball and go home. Then you'll bad mouth the organization.

Three-fourths of all U.S. radio amateurs are NOT members.

Think on that, Klunk.

LHA

4312. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-15 20:28:58 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031215152858.22081.00002505@mb-m17.aol.com>
Source record: 83887

In article <f45722ac.0312142234.73b9a558@posting.google.com>,
brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:

>> Were you in the majority?? If not then why should everyone else change to
>> suit you.
>
>The FCC spoke. And what they spoke was not ARRL majority opinion.
>
>What do you make of that, Dee?

Three fourths of all U.S. licensed radio amateurs are NOT members.

Dee, as a devout baathist believer in the league of the nation, thinks
that one fourth is a "majority." Belief can cloud thinking.

The League (of Notions) has been busy propagandizing amateurs
for no less than 89 years...ever since they were formed as a way
to hack Western Union and other telegram businesses.

Constant, repetitive propagandizing is known as the "Big Lie"
technique. Those who want to Believe WILL. Those will adopt
that credo as their code of life and God forbid those who say
against their Beliefs.

Problem is that Believers are in the minority...but they cannot ever
see that or they are so set that what they think is the absolute
"they know what is best."

That's why the staunch Believers insist on morsemanship as the
Ulimate in amateur akill...even after the entirety of the rest of the
radio world gave up on morse codes for communication. "They
KNOW what is best" therefore their way MUST triumph.

Incredible that there's such a similarity of the League (of notions)
to the Ba'athists in Iraq.

Anyone for a deck of cards?

LHA

4313. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-15 21:42:51 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <guydnUqVppYZtkOiRVn-vA@gbronline.com>
Source record: 83889

Len Over 21 wrote:

> In article <3FDDABA8.BFFA8D74@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
>
>>What is any of this to you? You aren't a radio amateur. You aren't a
>>member of the ARRL. That hasn't stopped you from huffing and puffing.
>
>
> I'm just campaigning for the elimination of morse code testing.

Why? Can't or to lazy to learn the code? Is that the only way you will ever be able to get a ham license? I guess if they remove the code requirement you will campaign to get the written eleminated also so you won't have to do anything for a license. I haven't belonged to the ARRL in many years, but you have convinced me I need to join, thanks to you the ARRL will get a new member.

4314. KV4FZ Annual Christmas Message

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-15 21:59:13 UTC
From: W55 <barf@wherblives.net>
Message-ID: <brlarejon0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 83890

Does anyone have details for the frequency, time, date of
KV4FZ's annual Christmas message?

73 de W55

4315. Re: Saddam

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-15 22:55:44 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031215175544.07996.00000839@mb-m16.aol.com>
Source record: 83891

>Your right...well to even it up we can put the liberals out there with him.
>
>Dan/W4NTI

Great Idea, Im all for it. On second thought if we did that, we would probably loose alot of posters on this BOARD.

4316. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-15 23:16:23 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <bhrDb.16418$P%1.15446997@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 83892
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.cb

"Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
news:f45722ac.0312142210.5420ff20@posting.google.com...
> "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:<0I0Db.16240$P%1.15155778@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>...
> > "Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
> > news:f45722ac.0312140844.52e9096e@posting.google.com...
>
> > > Dee got on early supporting the status quo; hook,line and sinker. She
> > > is a perfect mouth-piece for the ARRL, and I've heard her repeating,
> > > word for word, the policies of this organization. She is, more or
> > > less, an official ARRL spam-bot. Wonder if she is an official
> > > bulletin station?
> > >
> >
> > Not hardly. I disapprove of some of the policies but I do not expect it
to
> > change when my view doesn't represent the majority view. I do not
consider
> > differences of opinion on some policies to be reason to stop supporting
> > them. Also I merely state that non-members shouldn't think they can
change
> > the policies. The ARRL policies, as with any organization, will reflect
the
> > opinions of the majority of members. Someone with a minority opinion in
any
> > organization will have to work very hard to get the majority to adopt
it.
> > Organizations have no obligation to reflect the opinion of non-members.
> >
> > Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>
> Oh, BS, Dee. You just got through saying that if you don't belong, if
> you don't rise to the top of the food chain, blah blah, horse crap,
> blah blah.
>
> The ARRL wants to be the -ONE- voice for the ARS. I suggest that they
> start with forward thinking leadership representing all, not just
> their CW-centric membership. Or get out of the way.

There you show how out of date you are. In recent years, the ARRL has
shifted to a neutral stand on CW. Their efforts have indeed been centered
on more important issues. What policies do you think the ARRL should be
focusing on? They have to pick and choose. And again they have to pick the

issues that the majority of their members want not the minority and not non-members. If they don't, they'll be voted out of office and someone will be put in who will do it that way.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

4317. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-15 23:17:38 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <mirDb.16420$P%1.15447370@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 83893
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.cb

"Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
news:f45722ac.0312142215.41a55b6e@posting.google.com...
> "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:<2s0Db.16237$P%1.15152539@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>...
> > "Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
> > news:f45722ac.0312140830.11631e36@posting.google.com...
> > > "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
> > news:<s3TCb.16156$P%1.15064983@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>...
> > > > "Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
> > > > news:f45722ac.0312131852.55c74b74@posting.google.com...
> > > > > Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
> > news:<mcGCb.623$xH2.485769@news1.news.adelphia.net>...
> > > > > > Steve Robeson, K4CAP wrote:
> > > > > >
> > > > > > > hamop_62@hotmail.com (Louis C. LeVine) wrote in message
> > news:<792e029d.0312110853.4daa825f@posting.google.com>...
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > >>This came from another radio group. They are doing a survey to
> > find
> > > > > > > >>out why some people do not like the ARRL. I don't like it
because
> > it
> > > > > > > >>costs to much. If it were $10 a year I might consider joining.
> > > > > > > >>Louis
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > And just exactly what do you expect that they could do
for
> > $10.00
> > > > > > > > a month?
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > Please name me ONE organization in ANY "hobby" activity
that
> > > > > > > provdes the scope of servcies and resources the ARRL offers to
> > it's
> > > > > > > target peer group.
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > Awaiting your informed response.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > I think this is one of those cases where some people think that
> > their
> > > > > > membership is a subscription to QST. Its a lot more than that.
ARRL

> > does
> > > > > > a lot for Amateurs, even those who hate the organization.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > - Mike KB3EIA -
> > > > > >
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Fair enough.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > I dislike some of the policies that the ARRL has promoted in the
past,
> > > > > > and felt as if the ARRL did not represent me even though I have
been a
> > > > > > member since 1986.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Did you get actively involved? Did you become a section director?
Did
> > you
> > > > > campaign to sway the majority to your opinion? Or did you just
write a
> > > > > letter or two complaining and were disappointed because it didn't
> > instantly
> > > > > change the ARRL's policies? If you want your point of view to be
policy
> > > > > then you have to become very politically active in an organization.
> > > > >
> > > > > Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
> > > >
> > > >
> > > > Dee, how very judgemental of you, which is what I've come to expect
> > > > from the very politically active - The Liberals. No, I didn't burn
> > > > any bra's or jock straps, and didn't participate in any "Tech-Pride"
> > > > parades. My greatest dilema was some soul-searching on whether I
> > > > should continue supporting financially an organization which I thought
> > > > lacked leadership and supported backward policies. Otherwise, the
> > > > ARRL is an excellent educational and publishing organization.
> > > >
> > >
> > > I happen to be a stout conservative. Regardless of whether one is
liberal
> > > or conservative, one has to get involved and stay involved to be
effective.
> >
> > Blah blah blah
> >
> > > Complaining about lack of leadership simply shows that either you didn't
> > > want to do the work yourself or that you were unable to convince the
> > > majority to back your view.
> >
> > Mere humans were incapable of convincing the ARRL leadership...
> >

> > > As a matter of fact, I did write two letters to the ARRL and I was a
> > > member of the field organization. I also participated in the NOI/NPRM
> > > process.
> > >
> > > Thanks for your concern.
> >
> > This is not a particularly effective way to change the policies of the
> > organization.
>
> Dee, pull your head out. Writing letters to the ARRL, becoming a
> member of the field organization, and participating in the
> NOI/NPRM...?
>
> As I said, mere humans....

And what efforts did you make to convert the majority of members to your point of view?? While the items you list are worthy activities, they don't do much to change policy.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

4318. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-15 23:19:09 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <NjrDb.16421$P%1.15447817@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 83894
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.cb

"Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
news:f45722ac.0312142234.73b9a558@posting.google.com...
> > Were you in the majority?? If not then why should everyone else change
to
> > suit you.
>
> The FCC spoke. And what they spoke was not ARRL majority opinion.
>
> What do you make of that, Dee?

Very simple. The ARRL only has the power to lobby. They cannot force the
FCC to go along with the ARRL opinion.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

4319. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-15 23:20:40 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <clrDb.16423$P%1.15447574@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 83895
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.cb

"Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
news:f45722ac.0312142241.7c2ff284@posting.google.com...
> "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:<%A8Db.16318$P%1.15245662@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>...
> > "Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
> > news:f45722ac.0312141205.320f3579@posting.google.com...
> > > "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
> > news:<LK%Cb.16220$P%1.15143612@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>...
> > > >
> > > > It probably was no longer cost effective to sell it on newstands.
> > > >
> > > > If the ARRL is making money (a no-no for a non-profit corp) then
report
> > them
> > > > to the IRS. If they are not making money, then no matter how big
they
> > are,
> > > > it is not about money since no one is making a profit.
> > > >
> > > > Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
> > >
> > > Un-friggin-believable.
> > >
> > > Non-profits aren't about profit. They're about salaries.
> >
> > If the salaries are too high, get on the board and get them reduced.
> >
> > Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>
> Who said they were too high?
>
> They have to balance their books somehow (to avoid the appearance of
> profit), and the salary is the most convenient place to dump the
> excess.
>
> It's about your ignorance of what a non-profit really is.

Ok where is the money going?? You said they dump it into salaries thus
implying that said salaries are artificially inflated and then indicate that
you don't think the salaries are too high. Which is it? Facts please, not
emotional innuendo.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

4320. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-15 23:22:38 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <2nrDb.16425$P%1.15448434@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 83896
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:tUgDb.4496$mC1.3674@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> "Kim W5TIT" wrote:
> >
> > (snip) The *only* entity that would not
> > have to pay any would be a church--
> > and that only for the church building, its
> > parking lot, and its parish. If they've
> > got a private school, nursing home, etc.,
> > they pay. (snip)
>
>
> Why limit any exclusion to just the church building, parking lot, and
> parish? Since churches have been running schools, colleges, homeless
> shelters, women and youth shelters, food kitchens, youth camps and sports
> activities, hospitals, nursing homes, and so on, for many years (some long
> before this country was created and each requiring buildings, land, or
> equipment), such a limit would have a serious impact on many traditional
> church activities.
>
> The newsgroup "rec.radio.cb" deleted from this message.
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
>

If we are going all the way on separation of church and state, why should
they get any special status beyond what other non-profit organization would
get?

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

4321. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-15 23:31:10 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <2vrDb.16426$P%1.15450005@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 83897

"Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
news:3FDE030C.8040404@psu.edu...
> newsgroups trimmed..
>
> Brian wrote:
> > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<Bw%Cb.256$Bg5.145@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> >
> >
> >>The ARRL is why you CAN ENJOY your DXing and other things on the air.
> >
> >
> > DX can be enjoyed without the ARRL.
> >
> >
> >>When the league helps kill BPL how about sending them a thank you card,
> >>ingrate.
> >>
> >>Dan/W4NTI
> >
> >
> > And that is the reason I tolerate the ARRL's other crappola.
> >
> > But be sure to send a thank you card to the NTIA and FEMA as well.
>
> Brian, did the NTIA weigh in on this one yet? I saw the FEMA story, and
> they did "lay 'em one upside the head" pretty good.
>
> I'm still kind of twitchy about the BPL concept getting even this far.
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -
>

From what I remember, it was the ARRL who advised the NTIA and FEMA that
they could be hurt by BPL.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

4322. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-15 23:35:45 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <lzrDb.16427$P%1.15450884@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 83898

"Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
news:3FDE057E.4040206@psu.edu...
> Groups trimmed....
> One of the greatest rules of parliamentary procedure, and a real
> cornerstone of representative democracy in gneral is that even though
> the majority rules, the minority is allowed to have it's say.
>
> I think waaaaaayyyy too many people these days seem to have forgotten
> that. The minority must have it's say.
>
> Dee, I think you are taking a wrong tack on this one. Brian needs his
> say, and should not be forced to be a person at a high level of power in
> an institution to have his opinion.
>
> Not everyone wants to be active or even *can* be active in an
> organization. There are only so many leadership positions.
>

Mike, I agree with what you have said. Everyone should be free to voice their opinion.

But what we cannot forget that to get a change, someone has got to buckle down and do the work. That should fall upon the person or persons who want the change to either do the work themselves or to convince someone to lead this effort for them. Whining and complaining doesn't get the job done. Brian seems to think that his opinion as expressed in a couple of letters to the ARRL should have caused them to adopt the policies that he likes. That's totally unrealistic. If he's not willing to do the work, then he has no business slamming the ARRL.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

4323. Re: KV4FZ Annual Christmas Message

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-15 23:51:47 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <nOrDb.338$Ts5.12@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 83899

"W55" <barf@wherblives.net> wrote in message
news:brlarejon0@pita.alt.net...
>
> Does anyone have details for the frequency, time, date of
> KV4FZ's annual Christmas message?
>
> 73 de W55
>
>
1.816 @ 2359 Eastern Standard Time, Dec 24, 2003.

CW mode.

Dan/W4NTI

4324. Re: Saddam

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-15 23:52:51 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <nPrDb.343$Ts5.336@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 83900

"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20031215175544.07996.00000839@mb-m16.aol.com...
> >Your right...well to even it up we can put the liberals out there with
him.
> >
> >Dan/W4NTI
>
> Great Idea, Im all for it. On second thought if we did that, we would
probably
> loose alot of posters on this BOARD.

And your point is?

Dan/W4NTI

4325. Re: Saddam

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-15 23:56:04 UTC
From: Harry Quiff <quiff@merkin.net>
Message-ID: <brlhmkvgf4@216.221.129.15>
Source record: 84001

On Sun, 14 Dec 2003 13:10:02 -0500, JJ wrote:

> Saddam Hussein has been captured. He was found hiding in a hole near
> Tikrit.

Big deal, they didn't kill him and he was too big a pussy (surprise)
to kill himself.

Now we'll waste money giving him a trial. Great.

4326. Re: Saddam

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-15 23:57:27 UTC
From: Fred Garvin <Garvin@Truss.net>
Message-ID: <brlhp7vgf5@216.221.129.15>
Source record: 84002

On Sun, 14 Dec 2003 17:58:24 -0500, N2EY wrote:

> In article <krKdnYXcttH0NUGiRVn-iw@gbronline.com>, JJ
> <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> writes:
>
>>Saddam Hussein has been captured.
>
> Alive.
>
>>He was found hiding in a hole near Tikrit.
>
> Quite appropriate, don't you think?
>
> Now the question is: what to do with him?

I'd turn his head into ground chuck personally. Which is what they SHOULD
have done when they found him.

4327. Re: KV4FZ Annual Christmas Message

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-16 01:07:32 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3FDE5AD0.8040805@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 84003

Dan/W4NTI wrote:

>"W55" <barf@wherblives.net> wrote in message
>news:brlarejon0@pita.alt.net...
>
>
>>Does anyone have details for the frequency, time, date of
>>KV4FZ's annual Christmas message?
>>
>>73 de W55
>>
>>
>>
>>
>1.816 @ 2359 Eastern Standard Time, Dec 24, 2003.
>
>CW mode.
>
>Dan/W4NTI
>
>
>
>
>

I've heard it said that it is impossible to misbehave on the air when using CW....

;-)

4328. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-16 01:30:30 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <WetDb.16444$P%1.15471690@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 84004

"Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
news:f45722ac.0312151556.22a71f9f@posting.google.com...
> Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
news:<3FDE057E.4040206@psu.edu>...
>
> >
> > One of the greatest rules of parliamentary procedure, and a real
> > cornerstone of representative democracy in gneral is that even though
> > the majority rules, the minority is allowed to have it's say.
> >
> > I think waaaaaayyyy too many people these days seem to have forgotten
> > that. The minority must have it's say.
> >
> > Dee, I think you are taking a wrong tack on this one. Brian needs his
> > say, and should not be forced to be a person at a high level of power in
> > an institution to have his opinion.
> >
> > Not everyone wants to be active or even *can* be active in an
> > organization. There are only so many leadership positions.
>
> Mike, thanks for your comments. Its refreshing to hear that I don't
> have to carry the weight of the ARS on my back, and that my personal
> involvement in the national club, though significant, is not an
> absolute requirement to achieve change. I really don't think the
> "minority" that I belong to is much smaller than the other minority
> that claims to speak for all amateur radio.
>
> Notice the FCC comments during the NPRM with respect to the code.
> Notice the current debate about the number of license classes
> necessary to keep the ARS vibrant and healthy.
>
> There is no need for me to be a subversive within that other minority
> group for which I have supported and paid annual dues since 1986.
> There is no need for a hostile takeover. Hainey is not my president.
> The FCC has solicited my comments, and I gave them.
>
> I think Dee's demands are extreme.

You are expecting changes out of all proportion to the effort that you are
putting into it and you think my opinions are extreme??

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

4329. Re: Saddam

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-16 01:50:40 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20031215205040.12300.00002252@mb-m20.aol.com>
Source record: 84005

In article <20031214175824.25815.00005213@mb-m07.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) writes:

>
>>Saddam Hussein has been captured.
>
>Alive.
>
>>He was found hiding in a hole near Tikrit.
>
>Quite appropriate, don't you think?
>
>Now the question is: what to do with him?

Jim:

The answer is obvious. Extract as much intel out of him as possible, then turn him over to the new Iraqi government for his fair trial and subsequent execution. I just hope it is televised, and the method chosen is hanging. And not the modern, trap-door on the gallows floor, neck snaps and you're instantly dead kind -- I want to watch him do the rope dance. He should be winched up to the top of a very high tower and left to hang there long enough for every Iraqi citizen to see him there. I generally don't believe in capital punishment, but I can gladly make an exception in his case.

73 de Larry, K3LT

4330. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-16 02:12:44 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <xnfcneeyarg.hpyk3e7.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>
Source record: 84006

On 15 Dec 2003 09:58:07 -0800, N2EY wrote:

>But while the Novice was an instant hit, the Tech didn't get a lot of
>takers until first 6 and then 2 meters were added.

A lot of us (including me) used the Tech as an incremental
stepping-stone to the General after our Novices ran out - the
closest thing to a CSCE before the VE system got approval to use the
latter. I kept mine for 10 years before I got my General (but
several things like undergrad and graduate school and finding a
steady job needed my attention more than practicing Morse).

Techs on 2 were very active in NY and LA in the very early 60s.
Southern California even had 2-m repeaters by then (AM, of course).

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

4331. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-16 02:12:45 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <xnfcneeyarg.hpylo28.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>
Source record: 84007

On 15 Dec 2003 12:58:30 GMT, N2EY wrote:

>OK - who/what defines what a "church" is?

"Rev Gene" (W.Eugene Scott), one of the first TV preachers in the 1970s, tried to claim that his radio and TV stations (licensed to House of Faith, at one time a real church but by that time merely a shell for his radio and TV operations) were his "church" and therefore immune from FCC and California Attorney General audit and investigation of claims of misappropriation of donated funds. The Supreme Court of the US disagreed with him and eventually he lost all the stations, some in outright license revocation and some in tax sales.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

From a Clearing in the Silicon Forest
Beaverton (Washington County) Oregon

4332. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-16 02:19:25 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3FDE6BAD.DD80477C@earthlink.net>
Source record: 84008

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3FDDABA8.BFFA8D74@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >What is any of this to you? You aren't a radio amateur. You aren't a
> >member of the ARRL. That hasn't stopped you from huffing and puffing.
>
> I'm just campaigning for the elimination of morse code testing.
>
> What is that to you?

It effects me because I am an active radio amateur. You, on the other hand, are in no way involved.

> You've already passed morse code tests.

Yes, I have. That is of no concern to you.

> You are the ultimate amateur.

Thanks for the accolades, Len but I'm just one U.S. radio amateur among hundreds of thousands.

> You might have been a professional once, but you could not even
> get a job with an amateur organization.

Yes, I was a professional in radio for quite a number of years. I don't use that as a pulpit from which to lecture radio amateurs. You do and you aren't even involved.

If you've been paying attention, I was offered a job with the ARRL. I turned it down. Are you playing loose with facts again?

> No wonder you are so bitter.

I think you must have me mixed up with you. I'm a radio amateur. You are a bystander.

Dave K8MN

4333. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-16 02:34:02 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3FDE6F1A.4559E86B@earthlink.net>
Source record: 84009

```
Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3FDDA8AD.8023FC6A@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >Brian wrote:
> >>
> >> "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
> >news:<%A8Db.16318$P%1.15245662@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>...
> >> > "Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
> >> > news:f45722ac.0312141205.320f3579@posting.google.com...
> >> > > "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
> >> > news:<LK%Cb.16220$P%1.15143612@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>...
> >> > > >
> >> > > > It probably was no longer cost effective to sell it on newstands.
> >> > > >
> >> > > > If the ARRL is making money (a no-no for a non-profit corp) then
> >report
> >> > them
> >> > > > to the IRS. If they are not making money, then no matter how big
> >they
> >> > are,
> >> > > > it is not about money since no one is making a profit.
> >> > > >
> >> > > > Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
> >> > >
> >> > > Un-friggin-believable.
> >> > >
> >> > > Non-profits aren't about profit. They're about salaries.
> >> >
> >> > If the salaries are too high, get on the board and get them reduced.
> >> >
> >> > Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
> >>
> >> Who said they were too high?
> >>
> >> They have to balance their books somehow (to avoid the appearance of
> >> profit), and the salary is the most convenient place to dump the
> >> excess.
> >
> >Sounds like one of Len's typical conspiracy/dishonesty rants aimed
> >toward the ARRL.
>
> Quit trying to sound like a Ba'athist amateur, Klunk.
```

There certainly weren't many of them, kindly old gent. Still, YI1BGD contacts weren't that hard to come by. Rarer still would be a QSL confirming a contact with you on the ham bands.

> The League (of Notions) MAKES MONEY on the publication side
> of their conglomerate of control.
>
> Ads in QST pay for everything in the QST staff and the cost of job
> printing and fulfillment (publication talk for mailing/distributing).
>
> The "non-profit" stuff and nonsense is for lowering their taxes.

No kidding? Thanks for clearing this up for those of us who've only been members for three or four decades, Len. You're pretty up to date for a non-member, non-radio amateur.

> You need copies of their IRS forms from 2002 and previous years?
> Those are on the Internet.

Thanks, but I have no need of them.

> >I interviewed for a League position years back. The
> >salary offered wasn't enough to cover a move and life in the greater
> >Hartford area.
>
> Translation: You were rejected. (boo hoo for you)

You've mistranslated. What part of "the salary offered" wasn't clear to you? Are you playing loose with the facts again?

> > While I'm sure that salaries are now better, I don't
> >think any League staffers are putting up gold-plated Rohn tower and 80m
> >yagis at their palatial estates.
>
> Rohn filed for bankruptcy on account of that?

No, I think they waited for decades for your business and it dawned on someone at the plant that it just wasn't going to come about.

> You can see the top five staffers' salaries given on their 2002 IRS
> forms.

And?

> >> It's about your ignorance of what a non-profit really is.
> >
> >*Guffaw!*. Her ignorance? I see some gaping holes in your own
> >database.
>
> Nooo, Klunk, "non-profit" is a status to claim for paying LESS
> taxes.

Really? Can I see a show of hands for those here who weren't aware of that?

> If you are foolish enough to believe that W1AW's station, the
> "museum" and all the other paraphenalia came out of dues, you've
> got a database gap large enough to sail the USS Enterprise through.

I've made no such statement. I know how a non-profit organization
operates. I know how the ARRL operates. Sadly, I know how you operate.

> >With all the dissatisfaction you've expressed, why not start your own
> >organization for like-minded hams? I'm sure you'd amass a following in
> >no time.
>
> Three-fourths of all licensed U.S. radio amateurs are NOT members.

One fourth, a sizeable number, ARE members. There are also Associate
Members who are not licensees. You aren't a Full Member nor are you an
Associate Member.

> That should be evidenciary. To all but the minority who are members.

So, to see if we have your latest yarn straight, ARRL members aren't
aware that there are others who are not members?

> Members "KNOW what is good for all the others" and therefore they
> are the elite.

Other than you, who issues such statements? What is any of this to you
as an outsider to amateur radio and the ARRL?

> The League (of Notions) still holds on vainly to the idea that morse
> code is still the ultimate of amateur skills...long after the rest of the
> radio world has given it up, discarded it for communications.

Maybe you can point us to some place on the ARRL web site where such a
statement is made.

> Continue to be the acidic spam-bot for the League (of Notions), old
> Klunk. You have taken a Ba'ath...but are yet unclean.

Sounds like the bilious rantings of some geezer who is on the outside of
amateur radio, looking in.

Dave K8MN

4334. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-16 02:38:15 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3FDE7017.1091EF1C@earthlink.net>
Source record: 84010

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3FDDA6D5.3785E1F1@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >Brian wrote:
> >>
> >> "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
> >news:<2s0Db.16237$P%1.15152539@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>...
> >> > "Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
> >> > news:f45722ac.0312140830.11631e36@posting.google.com...
> >> > > "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
> >> > news:<s3TCb.16156$P%1.15064983@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>...
> >> > > > "Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
> >> > > news:f45722ac.0312131852.55c74b74@posting.google.com...
>
> >> > Complaining about lack of leadership simply shows that either you didn't
> >> > want to do the work yourself or that you were unable to convince the
> >> > majority to back your view.
> >>
> >> Mere humans were incapable of convincing the ARRL leadership...
> >
> >...and you take that view because you didn't convince folks to back your
> >view.
>
> Three-fourths of all licensed U.S. radio amateurs "took that view"
> and are NOT members.

You have no idea of the views held by those radio amateurs who are or
are not members of the ARRL, Leonard. You aren't a player from within
or without.

>
> >> > > As a matter of fact, I did write two letters to the ARRL and I was a
> >> > > member of the field organization. I also participated in the NOI/NPRM
> >> > > process.
> >> > >
> >> > > Thanks for your concern.
> >> >
> >> > This is not a particularly effective way to change the policies of the
> >> > organization.
> >>
> >> Dee, pull your head out.
> >
> >Your poor manners are showing again, little electrolyte.

>
> Ho, ho, ho...and just who called whom "Tugboat Annie,"
> Kolonel Klunk?

When was it that Dee ever showed any of the lack of class that Kim
brings to r.r.a.p?

> >
> >> Writing letters to the ARRL, becoming a
> >> member of the field organization, and participating in the
> >> NOI/NPRM...?
> >
> >The League doesn't issue Notices of Inquiry or Notices of Proposed Rule
> >Making. As to the other items, you've as much as told us that if the
> >majority of League membership doesn't agree with you, you'll take your
> >ball and go home. Then you'll bad mouth the organization.
>
> Three-fourths of all U.S. radio amateurs are NOT members.
>
> Think on that, Klunk.

I've thought about it. One quarter of U.S. radio amateurs ARE members.
You are not in either camp.

Dave K8MN

4335. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-16 02:44:02 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3FDE7172.BF1D62F0@earthlink.net>
Source record: 84011

Len Over 21 wrote:

> Problem is that Believers are in the minority...but they cannot ever
> see that or they are so set that what they think is the absolute
> "they know what is best."

But, Len, you think you know what is best for amateur radio and you aren't even involved. You're pretty much of a minority.

> That's why the staunch Believers insist on morsemanship as the
> Ulimate in amateur akill...even after the entirety of the rest of the
> radio world gave up on morse codes for communication. "They
> KNOW what is best" therefore their way MUST triumph.

You claim to know what is best for amateur radio. Your comments above do not address morse testing; they address morse USE. What is it to you, a fellow with no stake at all in amateur radio, if radio amateurs continue to use morse?

> Incredible that there's such a similarity of the League (of notions)
> to the Ba'athists in Iraq.

Really? Your comment seems pretty flakey to me. The Ba'ath Party supports continues use and testing of morse code?

> Anyone for a deck of cards?

I'd give you a deck but you couldn't cut it.

Dave K8MN

Dave K8MN

4336. Re: W5NETs Christmas Card

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-16 03:02:15 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <brlti9$1rr@library2.airnews.net>
Source record: 84012

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:gqgDb.4396$mC1.119@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> "Kim W5TIT" wrote:
> >
> > Yeah, thanks Dwight...what a nice thought!
> > (snip)
>
>
> It was a real pleasure, Kim. Merry Christmas.
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
>

Whoops...sheesh...how ignorant of me. I've been working way too much

To you and yours, Dwight, all the best,

Kim

4337. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-16 03:21:50 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <iTuDb.7020$xH2.1288455@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 84013
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.cb

Brian wrote:
> Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:<p91Db.3948$xH2.825482@news1.news.adelphia.net>...
>
>
>> Won't happen, Dan. People like that have selective memory. They'll rail
>>about how QST doesn't have articles about what they want to see, and
>>conveniently forget about the important jobs ARRL does for us.
>>
>> 1. That only a minority of hams belong to ARRL speaks much more about
>>hams than it does the ARRL.
>
>
> Are you saying that I'm a sucker?

Don't think so. I'm a member too.
>
>
>> 2. I would challenge the ARRL haters to come up with scenario's of what
>>the ARS would be like today (if it even existed) if there was no ARRL.
>>
>> - Mike KB3EIA -
>
>
> World peace?

I prefer my peas boiled with butter, though I might like to try whirled
peas some time.

- Mike KB3EIA

4338. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-16 03:25:39 UTC
From: Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com>
Message-ID: <20031215222539.940$7E@newsreader.com>
Source record: 84014
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.cb

Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote:
>> I prefer my peas boiled with butter, though I might like to try whirled
> peas some time.
>
> - Mike KB3EIA
>
Finally something I can relate to in rec.radio.cb . Homegrown
peas and butter. Mmmmm!

Thanks for sharing this thread with us CBer's.

4339. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-16 03:29:04 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <brlu6h$3d2@library2.airnews.net>
Source record: 84015

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20031215075830.12631.00003380@mb-m28.aol.com...
> In article <brk1v6$rlj@library1.airnews.net>, "Kim" <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
> writes:
>
> >Oh yeah...non-profit is the best place to be...And, the greates exploiter
of
> >human emotion, etc.
>
> Naw, that would be a better description of show business.
>
> >With little effort, the dollars churn in--most people
> >don't file for the donation they are entitled to (only large donations
whose
> >contributors are also playing the non-profit game).
>
> I disagree! Most people I know take the legitimate deductions - small or
large.
> If you don't, that's *your* problem.
>

I don't give, and I don't have a problem. But, for example, on tonight's radio broadcast of one of NPR's shows, a lady guest said that donations to charities are up over last year and averages at +/- $2,500.00 per family. I can state as a matter of fact to you that I know at least 5 families off the top of my head who give nothing. So, someone's picking up that average from somewhere. I think "charitable" organizations are a good thing--but I also think there's a lot--a LOT--of abuse from within them.

> >
> >That's why I'd like to see the tax structure change to some kind of
> >percentage across the board.
>
> Usually called a "flat tax".
>
> >The *only* entity that would not have to pay
> >any would be a church--and that only for the church building, its parking
> >lot, and its parish.
>
> OK - who/what defines what a "church" is?
>

Well, we the People do, I would imagine. So, it would be defined by the eligible voters who bother to vote. If eligible voters who bother to vote don't like the idea, then it doesn't fly. I'd be a supporter of my way of

thinking, of course :)

>
> And if the govt. only exempts churches from taxation, isn't that
government
> support of religion? Why not?
>

Giving churches a break from taxation is as close to having government support religion, too. So, neither way particularly exempts one from being able to argue that our government supports religion.

> >
> >If they've got a private school, nursing home, etc.,
> >they pay. And, no deductions for *anyone* or *anything* across the
board.
>
> Is that really fair, or even close to fair?
>

Who said life is fair?

>
> Is it fair or even close to fair for the person struggling on, say,
$25,000/yr
> to pay the same percentage tax as someone making $250,000/yr?
>

Yep. Because right now, the person making $25,000.00 annually is likely paying more taxes because the person making $250,000.00 annually can avail themselves of all kinds of tax breaks and loopholes.

>
> Is it fair or even close to fair for the person with multiple dependents,
or a
> permanent disability (like blindness) to pay the same percentage as
someone who
> is not so encumbered?
>

Yep. Why should a person's abilities determine what tax they pay? Is there a deduction right now for a lack of abilities? One thing I think ought to be done away with is elderly folks paying school taxes. It's ridiculous.

>
> Is it fair or even close to fair for people in places with wage taxes and
state
> income taxes to pay the same as those in places without those taxes?
>

Yep. Move to the state that you wish and pay under whatever structure you wish.

> >
> >Colgate, Mr. Bates, and me all pay the same percentage of tax out of our
> >income; that's it--end of game.
>
> OK - now, what constitutes "income"?
>

You *are* an engineer aren't you? :-)

>
> Is it just wages you receive for working, or do benefits paid for you by
your
> employer count too?
>

Whatever the IRS considers as income...the total taxable income that is
reported on a W-2--and that's determined by IRS rules, which ultimately, I
suppose are determined by we the People (yeah, right, but you get the gist).

>
> How about earnings from investments? How about sales of items you own?
>

If it's considered income by the IRS, it's all rolled in.

>
> Suppose I bought some radio parts for $10 at a hamfest 20 years ago,
brought
> them home, cleaned them up, tested and fixed them and kept the good ones.
I
> sell them today for $100 - is that $100 to be considered "income"? Or just
$90?
> What about the time and effort I put into them?
>

On a regular, or once in a while basis?

>
> If you bought a house or some land 10 years ago and paid $50,000, and next
year
> you sell it for $150,000, how much of that $150,000 should be taxable
income?
>

What's the IRS say?

>
> In the case of corporations, is "income" measured in gross sales or in net
> profits?
>

Net profits would be my way of thinking.

>
> What about 401ks, IRAs, FSAs, etc.?

>

'Z it income? What's the IRS say?

> --
>
> "Flat" taxes sound nice until you get down into the details, and then
things
> get real ugly.
>
> Take away deductions for charitable contributions, and exemptions for
> nonprofits, and many of them will simply stop operating. Take away
deductions
> for home mortgages and RE taxes, and RE values will tumble because people
won't
> be able to afford as much house. (Foreclosures will rise, too.)
>
> The reality is that most of us would be *worse* off with a "flat" tax
because
> of the side effects.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>

I don't know. I guess I'd be living dangerously, then, to vote in support
of a flat tax.

Kim W5TIT

4340. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-16 03:36:10 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <K4vDb.7040$xH2.1292698@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 84016

Dee D. Flint wrote:

> "Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
> news:f45722ac.0312151556.22a71f9f@posting.google.com...
>
>>Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
>
> news:<3FDE057E.4040206@psu.edu>...
>
>>>One of the greatest rules of parliamentary procedure, and a real
>>>cornerstone of representative democracy in gneral is that even though
>>>the majority rules, the minority is allowed to have it's say.
>>>
>>>I think waaaaaayyyy too many people these days seem to have forgotten
>>>that. The minority must have it's say.
>>>
>>>Dee, I think you are taking a wrong tack on this one. Brian needs his
>>>say, and should not be forced to be a person at a high level of power in
>>>an institution to have his opinion.
>>>
>>>Not everyone wants to be active or even *can* be active in an
>>>organization. There are only so many leadership positions.
>>
>>Mike, thanks for your comments. Its refreshing to hear that I don't
>>have to carry the weight of the ARS on my back, and that my personal
>>involvement in the national club, though significant, is not an
>>absolute requirement to achieve change. I really don't think the
>>"minority" that I belong to is much smaller than the other minority
>>that claims to speak for all amateur radio.
>>
>>Notice the FCC comments during the NPRM with respect to the code.
>>Notice the current debate about the number of license classes
>>necessary to keep the ARS vibrant and healthy.
>>
>>There is no need for me to be a subversive within that other minority
>>group for which I have supported and paid annual dues since 1986.
>>There is no need for a hostile takeover. Hainey is not my president.
>>The FCC has solicited my comments, and I gave them.
>>
>>I think Dee's demands are extreme.
>
>
> You are expecting changes out of all proportion to the effort that you are
> putting into it and you think my opinions are extreme??

I'm not so sure he is, Dee. I see a person that disagrees with some of what the ARRL is doing, yet still supports the basic objective. I mean if he's been a member since 86, that counts for something.

Kind of like how I am with politics. The Dems are in shambles, and the Repubs are waaaaaayyyyy too liberal any more with their way out of line deficit spending.

But I still vote, and try to pick the least awful candidate.

4341. Amateur Radio Newsline™ Report 1374 – December 12, 2003

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-16 03:43:00 UTC
From: radionews@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031215224300.15210.00001124@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 84017

Amateur Radio Newsline™ Report 1374 – December 12, 2003

LISTENER ADVISORY: PLEASE ASSIST IN THIS SURVEY

This is directed only to those who are not currently ARRL members.

Amateur Radio Newsline has agreed to help compile a survey which seeks answers for these two questions:

1: If you are not a member of the ARRL, why not?

2: If you were a member of the ARRL and quit, why?

If you are already an ARRL member, please do not reply as those conducting the survey only want to hear from those hams who never joined or who have dropped their membership.

Please respond by e-mail to hamvideo@juno.com before December 18th. And we sincerely thank-you for assisting in this survey. (The Producers)

**

Amateur Radio Newsline report number 1374 with a release date of Friday, December 12 2003 to follow in 5-4-3-2-1.

The following is a Q-S-T. A new study says that the Executive Branch should take over the duties of the FCC, hams in Australia could loose part of the 70 centimeter band and the K-6-D-U-E commemorative event is finally on the air from space. Find out the details on Amateur Radio Newsline report number 1374 coming your way right now.

(Billboard Cart Here)

**

RADIO POLITICS: STUDY SAYS WHITE HOUSE SHOULD REGULATE RF SPECTRUM

A new study says that its time for the White House to replace the FCC as the nations regulator of the airwaves. Amateur Radio Newsline’s Bill Pasternak, WA6ITF, is here with the story:

--

The Center for Strategic and International Studies is a private research organization that analyzes global issues. And in a recent report, it basically posed the rhetorical questions of -- what if the FCC went away -- and -- what if the Executive branch of the federal government -- the White House -- took over management of the nation’s airwaves?

Would it be better or worse for America? The Center says yes. That in its view, such a change would definitely improve the way the finite resource called electromagnetic spectrum is managed, but critics have their doubts. One told Amateur Radio Newsline: -- quote -- “You think the spectrum management is bad now, put it under the executive branch” -- unquote.

Be that as it may, the Center’s report called Spectrum Management for the 21st Century was recently presented to Representative Tom Davis. Davis is chairman of the House Committee on Government Reform and the report recommends a number of steps to stop what the think-tank describes as the increasing number of fights over existing spectrum space.

Among its recommendations are to develop a national spectrum strategy. Increase research support for technologies that make better use of the spectrum and the controversial one. Establish a spectrum oversight advisory board to implement full White House control of all spectrum related matters.

Davis said his committee will weigh the report’s findings, along with the results of five ongoing General Accounting Office reviews and a Presidential Spectrum Policy Initiative study commissioned last June. With all of this information for Congress to gather and digest, any change in who will regulate the nations spectrum is probably years, if not decades away.

With thanks to KC0DGY for bringing this to our attention, I’m Bill Pasternak, WA6ITF, for the Amateur Radio Newsline.

--

Currently, the Federal Communications Commission oversees commercial use of the electronic magnetic spectrum while the National Telecommunications and Information Administration handles all aspects of government use. Its far to early to speculate on what effect -- if any -- such a change might have on Amateur Radio.

More information can be found on-line at http://www.gcn.com/vol1_no1/mobile-wireless/24166-1.html (KC0DGY, GCN)

**

INTERNATIONAL - VK: 20 - 430 MHZ AT RISK IN VK-LAND

Australian hams may loose access to all of 420 through 430 MHZ. This, as demands in this part of the spectrum by non-amateurs increases.

Q-News reports on an e-mail from the Space & Terrestrial Systems Team at the Australian Communications Authority to the Wireless Institute of Australia’s Federal President Ernest Hocking, VK1LK, last Tuesday. It deals with an amendment that was made to the Australian radio regulations recently that prohibits the operation of amateur stations in the frequency band 420-430 MHz in certain locations. This, to minimize the risk of interference to that nations Fire Brigades Network and the Mobile Data Radio Service emergency services that operate in this frequency band.

VK1LK told Q-NEWS that he will continue to adopt the view that the Wireless Institute of Australia is looking for primary allocation in the 430 to 440 MHz

band -- or at least some part of it -- to protect ham radio interests. (Q-News)

**

INTERNATIONAL: BIG HAM RADIO EDUCATIONAL SUCCESS IN ALBANIA

Success reported for 33 students in an internationally sponsored Albanian Amateur Radio training project. We go across the Atlantic to Jeremy Boot, G4NJH, is in Nottinham the UK for the latest:

--
The following update on the unique amateur radio training course that is ongoing in Albania has been sent in by Martti Laine, OH2BH, in Tirana.

"A memorable second week came to an end when the US ARRL delegation headed by K7WX and K9LA departed Tirana with many fond memories and new friendships taken back home”

"The theory exam was conducted on Wednesday the 26th of November with 33 students gaining a pass at the CEPT 1 level. Now the course will move on to pure amateur radio related subjects under the leadership of Uli, DJ2YA, while John, G3OKA, will head back to the UK after a job well done.”

Britain's RSGB deserves credit for their support of the first part of the program. I’m G4NJH, in Nottingham.

--

Another wave of lecturers representing Finland and Germany has now arrived. Also, Albanian authorities have released the callsign ZA1UT. This is an acronym for the 'University of Tirana and is meant to assist in commemorating this extraordinary ham radio educational program. (GB2RS)

**

HAM RADIO IN SPACE: K6DUE OPERATING EVENT UNDER WAY

The K6DUE International Space Station Commemorative Event from the International Space Station is finally under way. What’s described as a challenging schedule kept the crew from getting on the air November 29th and 30th, but the ISS ham station was active during a pass on Saturday, December 6th. We have more in this report:

--
According to ARISS International Chairman Frank Bauer, KA3HDO, numerous hams across North America and Europe were able to contact with Astronaut Mike Foal, KB5UAC or heard the ISS ham radio station downlink. Those who did qualify for a special ISS Commemorative Certificate. Information on obtaining one is on-line at www.rac.ca/ariss

KA3HDO also reports that the Phase 2 equipment setup has been completed and the gear activated at approximately 11:20 UTC on December 8th. The new radio is a Kenwood D 700 dual band transceiver. It appeared to operate flawlessly but the packet operation was turned off after Russian controllers requested that the

crew power down the hardware while bilateral safety paperwork coordination is being completed. Bauer says that hopefully, this will be completed quickly and that the long awaited packet operation will be on the air once again.

For the Amateur Radio Newsline, Norm Seeley, KI7UP.

--

The event commemorates the contributions of the late Roy Neal, K6DUE, to manned ham radio space operations and continues through the end of the month. (ARISS)

**

Break 1

From the United States of America, We are the Amateur Radio Newsline, heard on bulletin stations around the world including the W3OC repeater serving North Huntington, Pennsylvania.

(5 sec pause here)

**

LAW: HIGH TECH MUST FIGHT CYBERTERRORISM

The Federal government says that technology companies must cooperate in the battle against cyber terrorism. This, according to Homeland Security Secretary Tom Ridge who said that the alternative is to submit to government imposed security regulations.

Speaking at a recent two day conference sponsored by his agency, Ridge said that the enemies of freedom use the same techniques as hackers do and the nations industries must be as diligent and determined as the hackers."

The two-day conference was the first formal brainstorming session to draft security guidelines and a cyberspace attack warning systems. (Published news reports)

**

ENFORCEMENT: FCC AGAIN WARNS AERO ENTHUSIASTS ABOUT UNLICENSED OPERATIONS

The FCC is once again warning several hang gliding and sky-diving enthusiasts and the operators of a number of training facilities about the use of ham gear by unlicensed persons. Bruce Tennant, K6PZW, reports:

--

In a letter to sixteen such California based flying groups, the FCC’s Riley Hollingsworth says that the Commission is receiving an increasing number of complaints that users of these facilities are operating Amateur Radio equipment without a license. Hollingsworth specifically notes the use of hand-held radio transceivers as the biggest violation.

Hollingsworth says that while the FCC encourages the use of radio equipment for the safety of flyers, there are numerous alternative radio services that do not

require a license. These include the Family Radio Service and the Multiple Use Radio Service.

Hollingswoth adds that the use of Amateur Radio Transmitting equipment is also permissible as long as the users -- in this case the pilots and sky-divers -- are licensed in the Amateur Radio Service. Translated, they must have a ham ticket to put an Amateur band transceiver on-the-air.

For the Amateur Radio Newsline, I'm Bruce Tennant, K6PZW, reporting.

--

Hollingsworth's letter tells the groups that the use of radio transmitting equipment in a service where a license is required, without obtaining a license, is a violation the Communications Act and will result in criminal penalties. He says that fines normally range from $7,500 to $10,000. (FCC)

**

ENFORCEMENT: HOMEOWNERS ASSN MUST FIND INTERFERENCE

And a big win for a Pennsylvania ham that could be precedent setting. The FCC has written to the lawyer representing the Pine Ridge Community Association in the city of Stroudsburg. The note informs the counsel that his interpretation of the Community Association's obligations under Part 15 was incorrect and that the Association is required to investigate the source of its radio frequency interference to an Amateur licensee residing within the Association's property. (FCC)

**

AT THE FCC: CHANGES AT THE CGB

Still with the FCC, word that Louis J. Sigalos has been named Chief and Sherry Dawson has been named Deputy Chief of the FCC's Consumer Affairs and Outreach Division of the Consumer & Governmental Affairs Bureau. This bureau is responsible for conducting outreach to the American public on a broad array of telecommunications issues including the deployment of broadband services, the transition to digital TV, wireless phones and services including local number portability and much more. The Division also promotes public awareness of the Commission's strategic goals and initiatives through consumer advisories and fact sheets, consumer forums and participation in conferences and workshops. (FCC)

**

CHANGING OF HE GUARD: JULIAN HIRSCH

Some sad news. Famed technical writer Julian Hirsch, W2KFB, who spent most of his life testing the latest developments in stereo equipment and explaining them for Stereo Review magazine has died.

Hirsch was a graduate electrical engineer from Cooper Union University. He and Gladden Houck created the Hirsch-Houck Laboratories to test electronic equipment in 1957.

Hirsch went on to author more than 4,000 reports on stereo systems, speakers, turntables and other equipment until his retirement in 1998. He was 81 when he passed away on November 24th. (LA Times, other published news reports)

**

HAM EVENTS: HRU 2004 ON LONG ISLAND NY

Mark Sunday, January 18, 2004 at 8AM, for the fifth annual Ham Radio University. The event is being held at the East Woods School in Oyster Bay New York with special forums geared to the non-ham as well as the experienced ham radio operator. The focus will be hands-on with many demonstrations on just about everything including ham radio satellite communications, low power operating using radios as small as a tuna tin and the latest in emergency communications. There will also be a testing session for those who would like to take an FCC exam.

Again this year, Ham Radio University will be combined with the ARRL New York City and Long Island Section Convention. Talk-in will be provided on the W-2-V-L repeater on 146.85 MHz and using an access tone of 136.5 Hertz. For more information e-mail n2ga@arrl.org (K2EPM)

**

INDUSTRY NEWS: FREE SUB TO THE UNEMPLOYED FROM ATVQ

If you are out of work and would like to have something to read, has Amateur Television Quarterly Magazine got a deal for you. How about a free one-year subscription to their flagship magazine?

To qualify, you must be normally employed and not retired. Also, the offer is limited to the first 100 to apply.

To take advantage of this one time offer, send a letter by U-S mail requesting a free subscription and stating that you are temporarily out of work. The address is Holiday Offer - ATVQ, 5931 Alma Dr. Rockford, IL 61108.

Sorry, the magazine will not accept e-mail subscriptions for this one time offer. (ATVQ)

**

INDUSTRY NEWS: JVC TO CLOSE US VHS TAPE PLANT

A not so happy Christmass for some employees of JVC America. This, as the company announces that it will shut down its VHS tape production plant in Tuscaloosa Alabama by January 31st.

The reason given for the closure is the loss of the VHS market to Digital Video Discs. About 115 people will be laid off from the VHS tape plant closing. JVC already has compact disc and DVD plants in Tuscaloosa and Kennesaw, Georgia that employ about 550 people. (KB4KCH)

**

BREAK 2

This is ham radio news for today’s radio amateur. From the United States of America, We are the Amateur Radio Newsline with links to the world from our only official website at www.arnewsline.org and being relayed by the volunteer services of the following radio amateur:

(5 sec pause here)

**

ARNEWSLINE(TM) NEWS: WE THANK YOU

I'm Andy Jarema, N6TCQ with a list of people to thank.

It's been since March that we did this, and we were in big trouble financially at the time. The following is only the first half of who helped us in April:

George Jacobs W3ASK of Silver Spring, MD. He's the former Propagation and Space Communications Editor of CQ Magazine.

Benton Bonney, W4PE of Orlando

David Ziskind, KE4QLH of Atlanta

Joseph Bartzi, Jr., KC8DKF of Wadsworth, OH, who since became a recurring contributor

The Hiram's Ham Amateur Radio Society of Reynoldsburg, OH

Donald West, W9DEW of Fortville, IN

Paul Lebzelter, K8PFL of West Branch, MI

Michael Leahan, N9PQK of Sun Prairie, WI

Gary Harrison, K0BC of Bolivar, MO

Kent Stutzman of Newton, KS

George Ancell, N5LEZ and B&G Communications of Electra, TX

That wasn't everybody in April- we'll continue trying to catch up in the weeks that follow.

Finally, in the entertainment industry, oftentimes one of the biggest stars is listed at the end of the opening credits, such as: "and starring Martin Sheen as President Bartlett."

We at Newsline also have one of those: "and starring Roy Blanchard, N5YHS,” as an occasional, but extraordinary benefactor. Roy, you're amazing!”

Thank you to everyone. Your April response to our crisis was exceptional, and got us all the way to December. We promise to do our best to continue to earn your care and support.

A reminder that Newsline is a 501(c)(3), federally chartered, California non-profit corporation. FCC regulations prohibit us from telling you exactly how to support us, but that information is on our website at www.arnewsline.org.

I'm Andy Jarema, N6TCQ.

**

ON THE AIR: 6 METERS IS BIG IN KNOXVILLE

If you live near Knoxville Tennessee and like to operate vintage ham gear, listen up. This one is for you.

The Repeater Journal reports that a group of local hams have gone back to the future and created a new Six Meter Nostalgia Net that meets on 50 point 4 Megahertz -- or should we say Megacycles in this case. The gathering takes place every Thursday night at 8:30 P.M. local time and anyone with gear capable of running full carrier A-M is invited to take part.

And what if you are not into A-M operation? Well the same group also sponsors F-M and S-S-B nets on Sundays. The F-M gathering takes places at 9 P.M. on the 53.770 MHz repeater. Five minutes after the F-M net is secured the S-S-B net takes to the airwaves on 50 point 200 MHz.

And if that’s not enough, yet another Knoxville area 6 meter F-M net has just started up on the 53 point 610 MHz repeater. It meets on Thursdays at 8:00 P-M local Eastern U-S time. (Repeater Journal)

**

EMERGING TECHNOLOGY: RADIO RESEARCH: NAVY AND AIR FORCE AGREE ON NEW JOINT COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEM

The Air Force and Navy have agreed to merge their two formerly separate programs for the acquisition of improved radio systems. The result will be the development of a single family of radios designed to replace incompatible units in use across the services.

Called the Joint Tactical Radio System, this joint Air Force-Navy initiative is expected to produce more than 17,000 units. Initial deliveries of the new radios are expected to begin in late 2008. (Science OnLine)

**

INTERNATIONAL - CANADA: VE9HC RE-ELECTED

Radio Amateurs of Canada reports that Hugh Clark, VE9HC was recently re-elected Section Manager in the Maritimes Section. This, for a two-year term that will begin on March 1st, 2004. Clark ran unopposed eliminating the need for a balloted election. (RAC)

**

INTERNATIONAL - IRAQ: BAGHDAD COMES TO ECHOLINK

Ian Abel, G3ZHI, reports that Iraq is now on Echolink. Ian says that on December 4th he held a 90 minute cyberspace QSO with YI1SRA in Baghdad using the Echolink program. Laith was operating from an Internet cafe as full Internet access has yet to be widely restored in the city.

YI1SRA reported that he and fellow members of the Baghdad Radio Club are hoping to install a 2 meter repeater in the city. It would be linked to Echolink network allowing on demand around the clock contact with the city and provide communications back home for any foreign ham in Baghdad.

YI1SRA also now has e-mail. Messages to him go to laithtariq@yahoo.com (G3ZHI)

**

DX

In D-X, now its your chance to QSO the real Santa Claus on the air. This, as station OH9SCL is active from Santa Claus Land near the Arctic Circle. OH9SCL will take to the ham radio airwaves from December 17th through the 21st. Operation will be 80 through 10 meters on cw, ssb, rtty, psk31 and slow scan television. The digital modes will be primary focus durning the weekend hours. Santa’s ham radio helpers this year include Finnish amateurs OH2BH, OH2NWG, OH3BHL and several others. QSL via OH9UV. (Via e-mail)

Meantime, the ARRL says that its new Logbook of the World secure contact-verification database continues to grow. ARRL Membership Services Manager Wayne Mills, N7NG, reports that nearly 5000 users have uploaded logs containing some 25.4 million Amateur Radio contacts. This has resulted in more than 1 million QSL records to date. (ARRL)

**

THAT FINAL ITEM: BRINGING THE DEAD BANDS BACK TO LIFE

And finally, its that time of year that the V-H-F frequencies are pretty dead as far as propagation goes. So here's as idea from Terry Hosack, W-A-3-L-T-B, on how to bring them to life.

Terry suggests over the V-H-F Reflector that you download a copy of the W-S-J-T program for digital high speed meteor scatter, weak signal, trop and E-M-E. He says to be certain that you get all the current updates including the new JT65 mode.

Hosack says that other than skeds, activity may be found on 144.140 and 50.260 Mhz mainly during contest and activity periods. If you are on the East Coast just beam west. Conversely, if you live out West, beam to the East and you might be surprised at what you might hear.

Terry says to just put the program in the monitor mode and see if you can decode any signals. If you find an interest in the mode you can buy or build an interface to actually transmit and help bring the dead VHF bands back to life.

The following web site is used for Skeds and chat about WSJT and meteorscatter: http://www.pingjockey.net/cgi-bin/pingtalk (VHF Reflector)

**

NEWSCAST CLOSE

With thanks to Alan Labs, AMSAT, the ARRL, the CGC Communicator, CQ Magazine, the FCC, the Ohio Penn DX Bulletin, Radio Netherlands, Rain, the RSGB and Australia's Q-News, that's all from the Amateur Radio Newsline(tm). Our e-mail address is newsline @arnewsline.org. More information is available at Amateur Radio Newsline's(tm) only official website located at www.arnewsline.org. You can also write to us or support us at Amateur Radio Newsline(tm), P.O. Box 660937, Arcadia, California 91066.

For now, with Bill Pasternak, WA6ITF, at the editors desk, I’m Don Wilbanks, AE5DW, in New Orleans, saying 73 and we thank you for listening." Amateur Radio Newsline(tm) is Copyright 2003. All rights reserved.

4342. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-16 03:53:50 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0312151953.52750508@posting.google.com>
Source record: 84018

brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0312151556.22a71f9f@posting.google.com>...

> I think Dee's demands are extreme.

You also think the demands to prove your own assertions are
"extreme"...so what???...You haven't done that yet so why should we
expect anything else from you?

Steve, K4YZ

4343. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-16 03:57:33 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0312151957.67982bc1@posting.google.com>
Source record: 84019

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20031215152855.22081.00002502@mb-m17.aol.com>...
> In article <3FDDABA8.BFFA8D74@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >What is any of this to you? You aren't a radio amateur. You aren't a
> >member of the ARRL. That hasn't stopped you from huffing and puffing.
>
> I'm just campaigning for the elimination of morse code testing.

This is an assertion that has proven to be false over and over
again, Anderscum...so why do you keep making it?

> What is that to you?

What's ANYTHING about Amateur Radio to you?
>
> You've already passed morse code tests.

You've passed NO Amateur Radio tests of ANY kind. No license =
No practical experience.

> You are the ultimate amateur.

You're not much of anything...You're an "ex" of many things, none
of them mastered, it would seem.

> You might have been a professional once, but you could not even
> get a job with an amateur organization.

Ditto you, Lennie.

> No wonder you are so bitter.

Double ditto. And a very ugly, DECEITFUL kind of bitter, at
that.

Steve, K4YZ

4344. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-16 04:16:21 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0312152016.212962b1@posting.google.com>
Source record: 84020

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20031214203927.21642.00002940@mb-m01.aol.com>...
> In article <lU6Db.4504$Pg1.632@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>, "Kï¿½HB"
> <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> writes as if he just had a colorectal examination
> with a fully warmed-up 100 W American Beauty soldering iron:
>
> >"Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote
> >
> >> She is, more or less, an official ARRL spam-bot.
> >> Wonder if she is an official bulletin station?
> >
> >And you are, more or less, the official LHA junior-Unabasher.
>
> OLD one...(SNIP)

And YOU would be WHAT...?!?! You're HOW old, Lennie? Older than
DIRT, was it?

> (UNSNIP)...Brian Burke is his own man.

Not according to HIM, Lennie. YOU are his mentor...A bitter,
openly contemptful and patently untruthful person. Said so himself.

> He states an opposite
> opinion from the "official" Newington spin on how amateurism
> in radio is "supposed to be." Therefore, you, as a Devout Believer
> in the glory and honor and mysticism of amateurism, must
> chastise the UNbelievers...and call them "unabashers" for not
> accepting the legends, mythos, and religious traditions of radio
> as "officially" stated by ARRL publications.

Very little of Brain's "commentary" has anything to do with the
ARRL. Most of it has to do with uncorroborated claims of achievements
in Amateur radio.

> Somewhere in the past you were often saying "gentlemen can
> disagree without being disagreeable." You, sir, are being terribly
> disagreeable, ergo you are NO gentleman.

I guess it's a relief that YOU have never made such a claim, ergo
we can dispense with any ideas of what kind of gentleman YOU are, eh,
Lennie?

> >I want you to be fully aware of your role in rrap, Brian.
>
> Tsk, tsk, tsk, you should be "aware" of how others see you, OLD
> man, and that others are quite aware you are NOT the CNO of

> any rrap party.

An assertion by He Who Would Be King. Ya really do need to read
your own stuff before ya send it, Lennie.

> >It goes like this: LHA is the
> >organ grinder, playing a song called "I Left My Heart in ADA, and Newington
> >Won't Give It Back".
>
> "Newington" had absolutely nothing to do with ACAN or ADA, super
> chief. ARRL had NOTHING to do with any other places I worked in
> the last half century nor the people I worked WITH from DoD and
> other branches of the U.S. government.

Hot flash, hot rod...No place you've ever worked (save for a long
defunct magazine) nor anyone you know has anything to do with Amateur
Radio TODAY, yesterday, in the fifties, thirties, or any OTHER decade
either.

> The BoD of a small town
> club in New England would be lost trying to carry even half the traffic
> load of the third largest U.S. Army transmitter site in the world 50
> years ago. All that the League seems to know is that on-off keying
> code is the ultimate "art" of radio because that is what they spin off
> on their membership, covertly and overtly.

I doubt you are trutly aware of what Amateur Radio is really
capable of, and I serioulsy doubt most of your other "claims" about
the bulk of traffic handled by ANY Army Radio station.

> >You are the little monkey in a bright red hat hopping
> >up and down and acting silly for our amusement.
>
> You are being truly a contentious OLD fart in here, trolling desperately
> for someone to despise...and then doing a poor job of denigration.

Whew! THAT had to hurt, Lennie! Ducking as it came back at you,
that is...

> >With all best wishes for the recovery of your missing T5 logs,
>
> And here's "best wishes" for some education that might penetrate
> a code-warped psyche housing in regards to: (1) voice modulated
> transmitters of 1906; (2) cell phone differences between power-up
> and first cell-connect; (3) so-called "one-way" ionospheric radio
> propagation paths; (4) assorted little gems of radio disinformation
> that you haven't recognized in the past nor admit to making mistakes
> on in public.
>
> I've not commented in this subject thread before, only on the 14
> petitions before the FCC thread (as its origininator).

Wow...an original bit of work...In an unmoderated USENET group discussing an avocation for which you have no practical experience....I'll bet the guys in the IEEE are just bowing down in reverence at this very moment...

> The NPRM or
> whatever as a result of those petitions will decide the FUTURE of
> radio amateurism in the USA. While the REGULARS in the jolly
> little chatroom of morseaholics are busy puffing themselves up about
> their marvelous experience and tenure in on-offing the radio waves,
> the future is sneaking up on everyone. All you are doing lately is
> just behaving like one of your iceholes in the wintertime.

You say this as if YOUR day with etrnity is never coming.

You also say it in such a way as to IGNORE the countless posts by almost all of the "morseaholics" in this newsgroup that have discussed, at length on occassion, digital and other modes.

Screws up your "I Know Bettr Than You Do" rants.

> It's too bad that your Xanax ran out and you switched from ran to rant.

You cetainly like to THINK that others hav a problem, don't you, Lennie???

You should break out Mrs. Lennie's correspondence course shrink books and see what it says about the manifesting symptoms of paranoia.

> Don't you just HATE it when somebody steps in and ruins your rant?

You've only managed to create yet another rant of YOUR own in which YOU provided yet another opportunity to rub your nose in your own excrement, Your Most Stupidness.

> Merry Christmas and a Happy New Year.

Not yet. Back under your rock, Lennie...The SNL "Pathological Liars Association" needs a new poster boy and your name is on a real short list.

Steve, K4YZ

4345. Re: KV4FZ Annual Christmas Message

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-16 04:18:13 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0312152018.578795ed@posting.google.com>
Source record: 84021

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<nOrDb.338$Ts5.12@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> "W55" <barf@wherblives.net> wrote in message
> news:brlarejon0@pita.alt.net...
> >
> > Does anyone have details for the frequency, time, date of
> > KV4FZ's annual Christmas message?
> >
> > 73 de W55
> >
> >
> 1.816 @ 2359 Eastern Standard Time, Dec 24, 2003.
>
> CW mode.

With a straight key...?!?!

Steve, K4YZ

4346. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-16 04:30:01 UTC
From: sideband <AINO8SPAMW@cac.net>
Message-ID: <dTvDb.16491$P%1.15504181@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 84022
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.cb

I eat my peas with honey,
I've done it all my life.
It makes the peas taste funny,
But it keeps them on my knife.

-SSB

Mike Coslo wrote:
> Brian wrote:
>
>> Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
>> news:<p91Db.3948$xH2.825482@news1.news.adelphia.net>...
>>
>>
>>> Won't happen, Dan. People like that have selective memory.
>>> They'll rail about how QST doesn't have articles about what they want
>>> to see, and conveniently forget about the important jobs ARRL does
>>> for us.
>>>
>>> 1. That only a minority of hams belong to ARRL speaks much more
>>> about hams than it does the ARRL.
>>
>>
>>
>> Are you saying that I'm a sucker?
>
>
> Don't think so. I'm a member too.
>
>>
>>
>>> 2. I would challenge the ARRL haters to come up with scenario's
>>> of what the ARS would be like today (if it even existed) if there was
>>> no ARRL.
>>>
>>> - Mike KB3EIA -
>>
>>
>>
>> World peace?
>
>
> I prefer my peas boiled with butter, though I might like to try whirled
> peas some time.

>
> - Mike KB3EIA
>

4347. Re: KV4FZ Annual Christmas Message

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-16 04:40:27 UTC
From: Rodney not Roy <froot5005ar@voicenet.com>
Message-ID: <4bea8$3fde8cc2$d1cc5bf9$29700@allthenewsgroups.com>
Source record: 84023

"W55" <barf@wherblives.net> wrote in message
news:brlarejon0@pita.alt.net...
>
> Does anyone have details for the frequency, time, date of
> KV4FZ's annual Christmas message?
>
> 73 de W55

I understand he's delegated the duty
of that esteemed 20M ham radio tradition to a
certain station from Georgia who lives on
14.313 on a 12/7 daytime basis. Check on
the 25th in the morning when I am sure all
the whole gang will be on there as usual
like on the weekend knucklehead show.

4348. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-16 04:43:29 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031215234329.21457.00002776@mb-m10.aol.com>
Source record: 84026

In article <3FDE7172.BF1D62F0@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>Len Over 21 wrote:
>
>> Problem is that Believers are in the minority...but they cannot ever
>> see that or they are so set that what they think is the absolute
>> "they know what is best."
>
>But, Len, you think you know what is best for amateur radio and you
>aren't even involved. You're pretty much of a minority.

I've not claimed to "know what is best for amateur radio."

That's YOUR claim.

"What is best" is what YOU like. Everyone understands that.

>> That's why the staunch Believers insist on morsemanship as the
>> Ulimate in amateur akill...even after the entirety of the rest of the
>> radio world gave up on morse codes for communication. "They
>> KNOW what is best" therefore their way MUST triumph.
>
>You claim to know what is best for amateur radio.

Nope.

>Your comments above
>do not address morse testing; they address morse USE.

Poor baby, you still don't understand the relationship?

PCTAs have constantly whined and bitched about "removing the
morse test will end the use of morse!"

>What is it to
>you, a fellow with no stake at all in amateur radio, if radio amateurs
>continue to use morse?

What is it to you...who will never ever have to take any sort of
amateur radio test again in your lifetime?

Will your paddles freeze if the morse test is removed?

Will you be struck dumb if the morse test is removed?

Will you lose your valued arrogance and superiority if the morse
test is removed?

>> Incredible that there's such a similarity of the League (of notions)
>> to the Ba'athists in Iraq.
>
>Really? Your comment seems pretty flakey to me. The Ba'ath Party
>supports continues use and testing of morse code?

Both are adherents of absolute obediance.

You try tactics of verbal terroism in newsgroups. Poorly.

Do you have a spidey hole at the ready?

>> Anyone for a deck of cards?
>
>I'd give you a deck but you couldn't cut it.

"Deck?" What do you know about "deck?"

"Dreck," yes, you DO know about that...

Come on, Ace, surrender to authorities like a good little dictator.

LHA

4349. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-16 04:43:30 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031215234330.21457.00002777@mb-m10.aol.com>
Source record: 84025

In article <3FDE7017.1091EF1C@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>> Three-fourths of all U.S. radio amateurs are NOT members.
>>
>> Think on that, Klunk.
>
>I've thought about it.

Made your head hurt?

Poor baby.

>One quarter of U.S. radio amateurs ARE members.

A MINORITY.

You still don't understand the difference between "minority" and
"majority," do you?

>You are not in either camp.

I'm in our home office right now. Haven't been to "camp" for a while.

Why do you ask?

Is there a morse camp one has to go to in amateur radio?

:-)

LHA

4350. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-16 04:43:32 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031215234332.21457.00002778@mb-m10.aol.com>
Source record: 84024

In article <3FDE6F1A.4559E86B@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>Len Over 21 wrote:
>>
>> In article <3FDDA8AD.8023FC6A@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
><k8mn@earthlink.net>
>> writes:
>>
>> >Brian wrote:
>> >>
>> >> "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
>> >news:<%A8Db.16318$P%1.15245662@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>...
>> >> > "Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
>> >> > news:f45722ac.0312141205.320f3579@posting.google.com...
>> >> > > "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
>> >> > news:<LK%Cb.16220$P%1.15143612@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>...
>> >> > > >
>> >> > > > It probably was no longer cost effective to sell it on newstands.
>> >> > > >
>> >> > > > If the ARRL is making money (a no-no for a non-profit corp) then
>> >report
>> >> > them
>> >> > > > to the IRS. If they are not making money, then no matter how big
>> >they
>> >> > are,
>> >> > > > it is not about money since no one is making a profit.
>> >> > > >
>> >> > > > Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>> >> > >
>> >> > > Un-friggin-believable.
>> >> > >
>> >> > > Non-profits aren't about profit. They're about salaries.
>> >> >
>> >> > If the salaries are too high, get on the board and get them reduced.
>> >> >
>> >> > Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>> >>
>> >> Who said they were too high?
>> >>
>> >> They have to balance their books somehow (to avoid the appearance of
>> >> profit), and the salary is the most convenient place to dump the
>> >> excess.
>> >

>> >Sounds like one of Len's typical conspiracy/dishonesty rants aimed
>> >toward the ARRL.
>>
>> Quit trying to sound like a Ba'athist amateur, Klunk.
>
>There certainly weren't many of them, kindly old gent. Still, YI1BGD
>contacts weren't that hard to come by. Rarer still would be a QSL
>confirming a contact with you on the ham bands.

Rarer still would be the Great Amateur Heil getting above 70 cm.

So, your only "interest" in radio is contacting "rare ones?"

Home Depot and Lowes have fine selections of tasteful wallpaper
if you need some. Better than QSL cards for the esthetic senses
of non-radio guests. [you DO have guests, don't you? or are all
your social contacts of the ham variety?]

>> The League (of Notions) MAKES MONEY on the publication side
>> of their conglomerate of control.
>>
>> Ads in QST pay for everything in the QST staff and the cost of job
>> printing and fulfillment (publication talk for mailing/distributing).
>>
>> The "non-profit" stuff and nonsense is for lowering their taxes.
>
>No kidding? Thanks for clearing this up for those of us who've only
>been members for three or four decades, Len. You're pretty up to date
>for a non-member, non-radio amateur.

SOMEONE had to clue you in, ignorant one.

You've been so busy worshipping at the Church of St. Hiram you
never knew about the BUSINESS side of the League?

Tsk, tsk, tsk.

>> You need copies of their IRS forms from 2002 and previous years?
>> Those are on the Internet.
>
>Thanks, but I have no need of them.

You are AFRAID to look, aren't you? :-)

You might find out some truth.

You can't handle the truth.

>> >I interviewed for a League position years back. The
>> >salary offered wasn't enough to cover a move and life in the greater
>> >Hartford area.
>>
>> Translation: You were rejected. (boo hoo for you)
>

>You've mistranslated. What part of "the salary offered" wasn't clear to
>you? Are you playing loose with the facts again?

What was the AMOUNT of the salary offering? You never gave any
"facts," only some CLAIM that "you interviewed."

YOUR facts are simply salesmanship doubletalk on "facts." You've
not given any supportable facts. None.

>> > While I'm sure that salaries are now better, I don't
>> >think any League staffers are putting up gold-plated Rohn tower and 80m
>> >yagis at their palatial estates.
>>
>> Rohn filed for bankruptcy on account of that?
>
>No, I think they waited for decades for your business and it dawned on
>someone at the plant that it just wasn't going to come about.

I've never gone to Rohn for any towers are antennas. Three other
commercial firms, Andrew being the oldest (and still solvent).

Why the sudden misdirection into FALSE CLAIMS about some
company "waiting for my business?"

>> You can see the top five staffers' salaries given on their 2002 IRS
>> forms.
>
>And?

It would give you a baseline for MORE creative lying in here about
"interviewing with the ARRL." :-)

>> >> It's about your ignorance of what a non-profit really is.
>> >
>> >*Guffaw!*. Her ignorance? I see some gaping holes in your own
>> >database.
>>
>> Nooo, Klunk, "non-profit" is a status to claim for paying LESS
>> taxes.
>
>Really? Can I see a show of hands for those here who weren't aware of
>that?

Why? Can't you think for yourself anymore? Tsk, tsk, tsk.

>> If you are foolish enough to believe that W1AW's station, the
>> "museum" and all the other paraphenalia came out of dues, you've
>> got a database gap large enough to sail the USS Enterprise through.
>
>I've made no such statement. I know how a non-profit organization
>operates. I know how the ARRL operates. Sadly, I know how you operate.

I'm not a licensed MD. :-)

>> >With all the dissatisfaction you've expressed, why not start your own
>> >organization for like-minded hams? I'm sure you'd amass a following in
>> >no time.
>>
>> Three-fourths of all licensed U.S. radio amateurs are NOT members.
>
>One fourth, a sizeable number, ARE members.

That's still a *MINORITY*.

Hello? Are you rational yet?

>There are also Associate
>Members who are not licensees.

NON-VOTING. They can't "decide" a damn thing in League things.

>You aren't a Full Member nor are you an Associate Member.

So, everyone is not allowed to comment on anything if they
are not a "member?"

The League is a POLITICAL ENTITY. They lobby.

The League is OPEN FOR COMMENTARY BY EVERYONE,
senior.

The First Amendment of the United States Constitution allows
EVERY CITIZEN to comment.

Except in your amateur universe...

>> That should be evidenciary. To all but the minority who are members.
>
>So, to see if we have your latest yarn straight, ARRL members aren't
>aware that there are others who are not members?

Bad attempt at editing and word cut-and-pasting, senior.

TAKE THINGS IN CONTEXT.

>> Members "KNOW what is good for all the others" and therefore they
>> are the elite.
>
>Other than you, who issues such statements? What is any of this to you
>as an outsider to amateur radio and the ARRL?

Does such statements upset you?

See a real MD...or psychiatric specialist.

You need one.

>> The League (of Notions) still holds on vainly to the idea that morse
>> code is still the ultimate of amateur skills...long after the rest of the
>> radio world has given it up, discarded it for communications.
>

>Maybe you can point us to some place on the ARRL web site where such a
>statement is made.

Maybe you can go to another Scientology office and get "clear" so
that you can see years and years and years of propagandizing of
and for morsemanship.

I doubt you can. It is obvious to the rest of clear-thinking
radio-interested
folks.

>> Continue to be the acidic spam-bot for the League (of Notions), old
>> Klunk. You have taken a Ba'ath...but are yet unclean.
>
>Sounds like the bilious rantings of some geezer who is on the outside of
>amateur radio, looking in.

Poor baby, still don't understand, do you?

I've never been "outside radio" for a half century.

You don't play fast and loose with facts. You just don't understand
real facts.

Not my problem.

Go get "clear."

LHA

4351. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-16 04:43:33 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031215234333.21457.00002779@mb-m10.aol.com>
Source record: 84028

In article <3FDE6BAD.DD80477C@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>If you've been paying attention, I was offered a job with the ARRL. I
>turned it down. Are you playing loose with facts again?

What "facts" Ripley? You made a CLAIM. An UNSUPPORTED
CLAIM.

Get someone to vouch for your "job interview," someone in the
League who was there at the time.

I'll be generous and accept State Department notification (if on
official letterhead stationery). :-)

Or, knowing State, on their official stationary...

>> No wonder you are so bitter.
>
>I think you must have me mixed up with you. I'm a radio amateur. You
>are a bystander.

Nope. I've been IN RADIO longer than you have, done more in radio
and electronics than you have. I'm a PROFESSIONAL.

Been a professional in radio longer than you have, too. :-)

Now, did you have some comment on morse code test retention and
"how that so terribly affects your ability to perform as an amateur?"

I'm sure that anyone daring to express the thought that the morse test
should be eliminated gives you the terrible shivers as an amateur.

We can't have Kolonel Klunk getting emotionally upset, can we?

LHA

4352. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-16 04:43:33 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031215234333.21457.00002780@mb-m10.aol.com>
Source record: 84031

In article <WetDb.16444$P%1.15471690@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> writes:

>> I think Dee's demands are extreme.
>
>You are expecting changes out of all proportion to the effort that you are
>putting into it and you think my opinions are extreme??

Extremist to the point of acting like an evangelical believer in the nobility, glory, and efficacy of the League. [they are without reproach]

Is that enough for you, Dee?

LHA

4353. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-16 04:43:34 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031215234334.21457.00002781@mb-m10.aol.com>
Source record: 84029

In article <lzrDb.16427$P%1.15450884@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> writes:

>"Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
>news:3FDE057E.4040206@psu.edu...
>> Groups trimmed....
>> One of the greatest rules of parliamentary procedure, and a real
>> cornerstone of representative democracy in gneral is that even though
>> the majority rules, the minority is allowed to have it's say.
>>
>> I think waaaaaayyyy too many people these days seem to have forgotten
>> that. The minority must have it's say.
>>
>> Dee, I think you are taking a wrong tack on this one. Brian needs his
>> say, and should not be forced to be a person at a high level of power in
>> an institution to have his opinion.
>>
>> Not everyone wants to be active or even *can* be active in an
>> organization. There are only so many leadership positions.
>
>Mike, I agree with what you have said. Everyone should be free to voice
>their opinion.

[except in amateur radio matters... :-)]

>But what we cannot forget that to get a change, someone has got to buckle
>down and do the work.

Fine. For my part, feel free to search the ECFS at the FCC for my name on 16 different NPRMs and NOIs.

I agree with what you said.

The Internet has finally allowed real and true democratic action of the citizenry of the USA.

>That should fall upon the person or persons who want
>the change to either do the work themselves or to convince someone to lead
>this effort for them.

Or...what usually happens is that Big Brother in Newington is selected to do the job so as not to bother all the amateurs too busy playing on their radios.

>Whining and complaining doesn't get the job done.

Neither does your parental-stance netiquete-nazi commentary. :-)

>Brian seems to think that his opinion as expressed in a couple of letters to
>the ARRL should have caused them to adopt the policies that he likes.
>That's totally unrealistic. If he's not willing to do the work, then he has
>no business slamming the ARRL.

The League of Notions is beyond reproach, isn't it? :-)

Thou Shalt Not Fault The League!!! Ever... :-)

LHA

4354. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-16 04:43:35 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031215234335.21457.00002782@mb-m10.aol.com>
Source record: 84027

In article <NjrDb.16421$P%1.15447817@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> writes:

>> The FCC spoke. And what they spoke was not ARRL majority opinion.
>>
>> What do you make of that, Dee?
>
>Very simple. The ARRL only has the power to lobby. They cannot force the
>FCC to go along with the ARRL opinion.

Then what is the worth of being a League Believer?

LHA

4355. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-16 04:43:36 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031215234336.21457.00002783@mb-m10.aol.com>
Source record: 84030

In article <guydnUqVppYZtkOiRVn-vA@gbronline.com>, JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
writes:

>> I'm just campaigning for the elimination of morse code testing.
>
>Why? Can't or to lazy to learn the code?

I can, I did learn morse. I don't see the need of it after being in
radio communications for 50 1/2 years.

>Is that the only way you will
>ever be able to get a ham license?

An AMATEUR license is not one of my life priorities. I've had a
COMMERCIAL license for 47 1/2 years.

>I guess if they remove the code
>requirement you will campaign to get the written eleminated also so you
>won't have to do anything for a license.

No. You are starting to show evidence of high irritation, anonymous
one.

Why is it imperative to have a license, especially an AMATEUR
license? I took my FCC office test way back in March, 1956. I'd
already been communicating in the HF Big Leagues for three years.
Later on, I've communicated on LF, MF, HF, VHF, UHF, and
microwaves without needing any amateur radio certificate. Never
ever needed to use or understand morse code for any of that.
Nobody involved in all that communicating complained about
lack of morsemanship.

>I haven't belonged to the ARRL
>in many years, but you have convinced me I need to join, thanks to you
>the ARRL will get a new member.

Go for it. They need warm bodies rather desperately. The League
has yet to get membership from a majority of licensed U.S. radio
amateurs.

Hurry on getting your membership...wonder upon wonders, they are
defraying shipping charges on items puchased from Newington right
now! [of course, you pay the same price in a ham store for ARRL
merchandise and there's no shipping charges to pay...]

LHA
Leonard H. Anderson

4356. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-16 04:43:37 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031215234337.21457.00002784@mb-m10.aol.com>
Source record: 84032

In article <3FDE030C.8040404@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:

>newsgroups trimmed..
>
>Brian wrote:
>> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
>news:<Bw%Cb.256$Bg5.145@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
>>
>>
>>>The ARRL is why you CAN ENJOY your DXing and other things on the air.
>>
>>
>> DX can be enjoyed without the ARRL.
>>
>>
>>>When the league helps kill BPL how about sending them a thank you card,
>>>ingrate.
>>>
>>>Dan/W4NTI
>>
>>
>> And that is the reason I tolerate the ARRL's other crappola.
>>
>> But be sure to send a thank you card to the NTIA and FEMA as well.
>
> Brian, did the NTIA weigh in on this one yet? I saw the FEMA story, and

>they did "lay 'em one upside the head" pretty good.
>
> I'm still kind of twitchy about the BPL concept getting even this far.

As of the end of Friday there were 5,121 documents under the
BPL NOI 03-104.

You are free to search through ALL of them to find out who said
what. Everything out in the open.

By the way, FEMA radio use is under the regulation of NTIA. It is a
government entity.

My comment is in that database. Is yours? Or do you want to sit
back and let the League of Notions handle everything for you?

Good luck on this one, now.

LHA

4357. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-16 04:57:07 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <DgwDb.7082$xH2.1310174@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 84033
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.cb

sideband wrote:

> I eat my peas with honey,
> I've done it all my life.
> It makes the peas taste funny,
> But it keeps them on my knife.
>
> -SSB

I like it!!

- mike KB3EIA -

4358. Re: Saddam

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-16 04:58:31 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031215235831.07961.00000568@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 84035

In article <20031215205040.12300.00002252@mb-m20.aol.com>, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) writes:

>In article <20031214175824.25815.00005213@mb-m07.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com
>(N2EY)
>writes:
>
>>Saddam Hussein has been captured.
>>
>>Alive.
>>
>>>He was found hiding in a hole near Tikrit.
>>
>>Quite appropriate, don't you think?
>>
>>Now the question is: what to do with him?
>
>Jim:
>
>The answer is obvious. Extract as much intel out of him as possible, then
>turn
>him over to the new Iraqi government for his fair trial and subsequent
>execution. I just hope it is televised, and the method chosen is hanging.
>And
>not the modern, trap-door on the gallows floor, neck snaps and you're
>instantly
>dead kind -- I want to watch him do the rope dance. He should be winched up
>to
>the top of a very high tower and left to hang there long enough for every
>Iraqi
>citizen to see him there. I generally don't believe in capital punishment,
>but
>I can gladly make an exception in his case.
>

Well, that's certainly one way to go, and W4NTI's is another.

Seems to me that since most of his crimes were against the Iraqi, Kuwaiti and Iranian people, *they* should be the ones to judge him (after all possible intel has been obtained, as you say.) If done right, the USA could gain much credibility in the region by *not* being too involved.

73 de Jim, N2EY

4359. Why I Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-16 04:58:32 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031215235832.07961.00000569@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 84034

In no particular order:

1) Representation of amateur radio (what other organization or individual would do anyhting like the 121 page commentary on BPL?)

2) QST and other publications (only the RSGB Handbook is comparable)

3) Contests and operating activities (particularly SS and FD)

4) Product reviews (much more in-depth than any other amateur publication)

5) Elected officials (they listen even if they don't agree)

6) W1AW (been there and operated the station, too)

73 de Jim, N2EY

4360. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-16 04:58:55 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <jiwDb.7083$xH2.1310662@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 84036

Len Over 21 wrote:

> My comment is in that database. Is yours?

Yes it is.

- Mike KB3EIA -

4361. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-16 04:59:54 UTC
From: Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com>
Message-ID: <20031215235954.903$t4@newsreader.com>
Source record: 84037
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.cb

sideband <AINO8SPAMW@cac.net> wrote:
> I eat my peas with honey,
> I've done it all my life.
> It makes the peas taste funny,
> But it keeps them on my knife.
>
> -SSB
>
Yum Yum, I like it.

4362. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-16 05:16:49 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <aL-dnfk936e8BkOiRVn-gg@gbronline.com>
Source record: 84039

Len Over 21 wrote:
> In article <guydnUqVppYZtkOiRVn-vA@gbronline.com>, JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
> writes:
>
>
>>> I'm just campaigning for the elimination of morse code testing.
>>
>>Why? Can't or to lazy to learn the code?
>
>
> I can, I did learn morse. I don't see the need of it after being in
> radio communications for 50 1/2 years.
>
>
>>Is that the only way you will
>>ever be able to get a ham license?
>
>
> An AMATEUR license is not one of my life priorities. I've had a
> COMMERCIAL license for 47 1/2 years.

Then what's you problem? If you have no interest in an amateur license
then why spout off hear? Go somewhere where someone cares.

>>I guess if they remove the code
>>requirement you will campaign to get the written eleminated also so you
>>won't have to do anything for a license.
>
>
> No. You are starting to show evidence of high irritation, anonymous
> one.

Doesn't irratate me, I have my license, code test and all.
>
> Why is it imperative to have a license, especially an AMATEUR
> license?

If one wishes to operate on the amateur bands one needs an amateur
license - DUH!

> I took my FCC office test way back in March, 1956. I'd
> already been communicating in the HF Big Leagues for three years.
> Later on, I've communicated on LF, MF, HF, VHF, UHF, and
> microwaves without needing any amateur radio certificate. Never
> ever needed to use or understand morse code for any of that.
> Nobody involved in all that communicating complained about

> lack of morsemanship.

Great, then go back to your LF, MF, HF, VHF, UHF and microwaves with
your commercial license. You obviously have no interest in amateur radio
so it is obvious to the most casual of observers that your only reason
to be hear is to see how big a jackass you can make of yourself.
And you're doing a bang-up job of it.

>
>>I haven't belonged to the ARRL
>>in many years, but you have convinced me I need to join, thanks to you
>>the ARRL will get a new member.
>
>
> Go for it. They need warm bodies rather desperately. The League
> has yet to get membership from a majority of licensed U.S. radio
> amateurs.
>
> Hurry on getting your membership...wonder upon wonders, they are
> defraying shipping charges on items puchased from Newington right
> now! [of course, you pay the same price in a ham store for ARRL
> merchandise and there's no shipping charges to pay...]

It will give me a say in campainging to keep the code test, looks like
that is what keeps you out of ham radio and that's a good thing for ham
radio.

4363. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-16 05:27:00 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <EIwDb.913$Ts5.669@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 84038
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave

"Dee D. Flint" wrote:
>
> "Dwight Stewart" wrote:
> > Why limit any exclusion to just the
> > church building, parking lot, and parish?
> > Since churches have been running schools,
> > colleges, homeless shelters, women and
> > youth shelters, food kitchens, youth camps
> > and sports activities, hospitals, nursing
> > homes, and so on, for many years (some
> > long before this country was created and
> > each requiring buildings, land, or equipment),
> > such a limit would have a serious impact on
> > many traditional church activities.
>
> If we are going all the way on separation of
> church and state, why should they get any
> special status beyond what other non-profit
> organization would get?

There is very little special special status involved. Every non-profit organization can write off the costs for buildings, land, facilities, equipment, personnel, and so on. Any remaining special status, and again there is very little, is covered by the "free exercise thereof" clause of the First Amendment - "Congress shall make no law respecting the establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free excercise thereof..."

In my opinion, we cannot "go all the way on separation of church and state" without violating the "free excercise thereof" clause. If anyone were to argue to ignore the "free excercise thereof" clause, others could just as easily argue to ignore the "establishment of religion" clause. Luckily, both clauses exist and people who truly believe in the Bill of Rights should honor and defend both. Many people are not doing so today.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

4364. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-16 06:03:50 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <afxDb.932$Ts5.711@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 84040

"Dave Heil" wrote:
> Len Over 21 wrote:
> >
> > What is that to you?
>
> It effects me because I am an active radio
> amateur. You, on the other hand, are in no
> way involved. (snip)
>
> (snip) I think you must have me mixed up
> with you. I'm a radio amateur. You are a
> bystander.

I'm somewhat uncomfortable with that, Dave. As I see it, when discussing a radio service which uses the radio frequencies that belong to all Americans, no American Citizen who wants to be involved is a bystander and all (Amateur and non-Amateur) have a right to be involved in the discussion. Likewise, I saw nothing in rules of this newsgroup which would restrict the participation of non-Amateurs. You may not like what Len has to say, but the lack of a Ham license alone should not diminish it or dismiss it.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

4365. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-16 11:45:55 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0312160345.f38ea25@posting.google.com>
Source record: 84041

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20031215234330.21457.00002777@mb-m10.aol.com>...
> In article <3FDE7017.1091EF1C@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >> Three-fourths of all U.S. radio amateurs are NOT members.
> >>
> >> Think on that, Klunk.
> >
> >I've thought about it.
>
> Made your head hurt?
>
> Poor baby.
>
> >One quarter of U.S. radio amateurs ARE members.
>
> A MINORITY.
>
> You still don't understand the difference between "minority" and
> "majority," do you?

Of this minority, the ARRL polled their little group in the mid-late
nineties, and came away with "no clear mandate." An even spilt within
the ranks of the true believers? So even at the time, something was
wearing away at the propaganda machine. I wonder what's happened
since then?

Now you've got hams kicking around the idea of a two license structure
w/o Morse Code for HF access.

4366. Re: Saddam

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-16 11:58:55 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0312160358.72c5cefc@posting.google.com>
Source record: 84042

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20031215235831.07961.00000568@mb-m03.aol.com>...
>
> Well, that's certainly one way to go, and W4NTI's is another.
>
> Seems to me that since most of his crimes were against the Iraqi, Kuwaiti and
> Iranian people, *they* should be the ones to judge him (after all possible
> intel has been obtained, as you say.) If done right, the USA could gain much
> credibility in the region by *not* being too involved.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

Just as long as we're guarding his sorry butt. You never know when
the PLO, with many sympathizers, will try to spring him.

4367. Re: KV4FZ Annual Christmas Message

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-16 12:02:51 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0312160402.11570755@posting.google.com>
Source record: 84043

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0312152018.578795ed@posting.google.com>...
> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<nOrDb.338$Ts5.12@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> > "W55" <barf@wherblives.net> wrote in message
> > news:brlarejon0@pita.alt.net...
> > >
> > > Does anyone have details for the frequency, time, date of
> > > KV4FZ's annual Christmas message?
> > >
> > > 73 de W55
> > >
> > >
> > 1.816 @ 2359 Eastern Standard Time, Dec 24, 2003.
> >
> > CW mode.
>
> With a straight key...?!?!
>
> Steve, K4YZ

Key? These guys are hard-core. He'll be using two bare copper wires.

4368. Re: Why I Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-16 13:19:36 UTC
From: Harry Wolf <wolf@htwolforg.net>
Message-ID: <brn0p5$3q6$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 84044

Put another way, you paid your ARRL life membership, you now
know that was a very poor decision, so you are now desperately
trying to rationalize your poor decision to yourself & us.

73 de Harry in Abilene

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20031215235832.07961.00000569@mb-m03.aol.com...
> In no particular order:
>
> 1) Representation of amateur radio (what other organization or individual
would
> do anyhting like the 121 page commentary on BPL?)
>
> 2) QST and other publications (only the RSGB Handbook is comparable)
>
> 3) Contests and operating activities (particularly SS and FD)
>
> 4) Product reviews (much more in-depth than any other amateur publication)
>
> 5) Elected officials (they listen even if they don't agree)
>
> 6) W1AW (been there and operated the station, too)
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

4369. Re: Why I Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-16 14:14:27 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3FDF1343.5090202@psu.edu>
Source record: 84045

Harry Wolf wrote:
> Put another way, you paid your ARRL life membership, you now
> know that was a very poor decision, so you are now desperately
> trying to rationalize your poor decision to yourself & us.
>
> 73 de Harry in Abilene
>
>
> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20031215235832.07961.00000569@mb-m03.aol.com...
>
>>In no particular order:
>>
>>1) Representation of amateur radio (what other organization or individual
>
> would
>
>>do anyhting like the 121 page commentary on BPL?)
>>
>>2) QST and other publications (only the RSGB Handbook is comparable)
>>
>>3) Contests and operating activities (particularly SS and FD)
>>
>>4) Product reviews (much more in-depth than any other amateur publication)
>>
>>5) Elected officials (they listen even if they don't agree)
>>
>>6) W1AW (been there and operated the station, too)
>>
>>73 de Jim, N2EY

Or put yet another way, probably quite closer to the truth, is that
he's paid his dues and likes it just fine.

If you don't like the ARRL, that's fine. You don't have to be so bitter
about it, though!

- Mike KB3EIA -

- happily getting more than my money's worth out of the league.....

4370. Re: Saddam

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-16 14:27:20 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0312160627.db8b0ec@posting.google.com>
Source record: 84046

brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0312160358.72c5cefc@posting.google.com>...

> Just as long as we're guarding his sorry butt. You never know when
> the PLO, with many sympathizers, will try to spring him.

The PLO...?!?!

BBWHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHA! ! ! ! ! ! !

You're not exactly "up to snuff" on current events, are you, "Brain"...?!?!

BBBWWWWHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHA ! ! ! ! ! !

Steve, K4YZ

4371. Re: Riley Orders W8CH OFF 75 METERS FOR 3 Years!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-16 14:34:27 UTC
From: Rado Free Iraqi Spider Hole <pumpkins444@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <e6bd5$3fdf17fd$d1cc7ae2$17034@allthenewsgroups.com>
Source record: 84047
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.shortwave

"Pirate Operators of RRCB UNITE! NOW!" <thor6883@yahoo.com> wrote in
message news:971a42a7.0312160554.667ca11@posting.google.com...
> I was listening to 3.865 this morning...
>
> It is written in stone.
>
> Riley Hollingsworth has ordered W8CH, Criss Heston, off of 75 meters for
3 years.

Please provide a relavant link to an OFFICIAL announcement
of the above alleged news. (sorry buddy, but there is **so much**
bull shi+ talked over, spun and re-hashed on 75 and 20 meters on a daily
basis
that your "announcement" above is thus right up there with the
return of Planet-X and the latest theory on some of the arab/islamic
newsgroups that we arrested one of Saddam's doubles instead
of the general article....)

> Good job to the people responsible for getting the job done!!!!
>
> Bad thing is... the moron is now on 160 does the same crap!
>
> He won't last long.
>
> Thor

Did you drop the hammer also like you did the football
on the 3rd down a 4 also Thor...? (grin)

4372. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-16 15:33:39 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3FDF25D3.21E36AE3@earthlink.net>
Source record: 84048

Dwight Stewart wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" wrote:
> > Len Over 21 wrote:
> > >
> > > What is that to you?
> >
> > It effects me because I am an active radio
> > amateur. You, on the other hand, are in no
> > way involved. (snip)
> >
> > (snip) I think you must have me mixed up
> > with you. I'm a radio amateur. You are a
> > bystander.
>
> I'm somewhat uncomfortable with that, Dave. As I see it, when discussing a
> radio service which uses the radio frequencies that belong to all Americans,
> no American Citizen who wants to be involved is a bystander and all (Amateur
> and non-Amateur) have a right to be involved in the discussion.

I'm not at all uncomfortable with it, Dwight. Len has had his say on countless occasions. He isn't involved with amateur radio though he knows some hams. He has no background in amateur radio from which to make an informed decision regarding amateur radio testing. He wants morse testing ended. Based on what special knowledge and background? He wants a minimum age for amateur radio licensing. Based on what special knowledge and background? His right to direct his opinion to his government is intact. Government is not forced to agree with his assessment of how amateur radio should be changed. I'm certainly not forced to agree with his views, to respect his views or to refrain from sarcasm with regard to his views. Wanting to be involved does not make Len other than a bystander in the world of amateur radio. He is not a part of amateur radio simply because he comments to government or because he posts here.

> Likewise, I
> saw nothing in rules of this newsgroup which would restrict the
> participation of non-Amateurs.

Len has participated and participated and participated. He wants to participate and to prevent others from laughing at him or his ideas. Others are free to participate and may form their own opinions of LHA's ideas. They are free to laugh at his ideas, to poke fun of his ideas and to counter his ideas.

> You may not like what Len has to say, but the
> lack of a Ham license alone should not diminish it or dismiss it.

There's no "may" involved. I don't like what Len has to say and don't care for his windy, pontificating and condescending posts. If you've read Len's stuff, you'll have no difficulty in understanding that his lack of an amateur license is not the only reason for making light of his opinions regarding amateur radio licensing.

Dave K8MN

4373. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-16 16:23:14 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0312160823.4293fa3d@posting.google.com>
Source record: 84049

"Kim" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote in message news:<brlu6h$3d2@library2.airnews.net>...
> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20031215075830.12631.00003380@mb-m28.aol.com...
> > In article <brk1v6$rlj@library1.airnews.net>, "Kim" <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
> > writes:
> >
> > >Oh yeah...non-profit is the best place to be...And, the greates exploiter
> of
> > >human emotion, etc.
> >
> > Naw, that would be a better description of show business.
> >
> > >With little effort, the dollars churn in--most people
> > >don't file for the donation they are entitled to (only large donations
> whose
> > >contributors are also playing the non-profit game).
> >
> > I disagree! Most people I know take the legitimate deductions - small or
> large.
> > If you don't, that's *your* problem.
> >
>
> I don't give, and I don't have a problem.

OK.

But I do give, and you want to take away *my* deduction for doing so.

> But, for example, on tonight's
> radio broadcast of one of NPR's shows, a lady guest said that donations to
> charities are up over last year and averages at +/- $2,500.00 per family.

That's pretty much a meaningless number all by itself.

> I
> can state as a matter of fact to you that I know at least 5 families off the
> top of my head who give nothing.

Another meaningless fact.

> So, someone's picking up that average from
> somewhere.

Could be anywhere, and unless we know how the average was computed, it
means very little if anything.

For example, if we take a sample of 400 families, and just one of them donates $1 million, and the 399 others donate absolutely nothing, the *average* donation is $2500 per family.

Or if one-third donate nothing, one third donate $2500 and one third donate $5000, the average is still $2500.

> I think "charitable" organizations are a good thing--but I also
> think there's a lot--a LOT--of abuse from within them.

Based on what facts?

> > >That's why I'd like to see the tax structure change to some kind of
> > >percentage across the board.
> >
> > Usually called a "flat tax".
> >
> > >The *only* entity that would not have to pay
> > >any would be a church--and that only for the church building, its parking
> > >lot, and its parish.
> >
> > OK - who/what defines what a "church" is?

> Well, we the People do, I would imagine. So, it would be defined by the
> eligible voters who bother to vote. If eligible voters who bother to vote
> don't like the idea, then it doesn't fly. I'd be a supporter of my way of
> thinking, of course :)

So what's the criteria?

Are Wiccans a church?

Could atheists form a church?

> > And if the govt. only exempts churches from taxation, isn't that
> > government support of religion? Why not?
>
> Giving churches a break from taxation is as close to having government
> support religion, too.

The govt. gives all charitable organizations a tax break. Therefore, it is charity, not religion, that is supported.

> So, neither way particularly exempts one from being
> able to argue that our government supports religion.
>
See above. The Ronald McDonald House is not a church but it gets a tax break. You would take that away.

> > >If they've got a private school, nursing home, etc.,
> > >they pay. And, no deductions for *anyone* or *anything* across the
> board.
> >
> > Is that really fair, or even close to fair?
> >

>
> Who said life is fair?

We're not talking about life. The saying is "death and taxes",
remember?
>
> >
> > Is it fair or even close to fair for the person struggling on, say,
> $25,000/yr
> > to pay the same percentage tax as someone making $250,000/yr?
> >
>
> Yep. Because right now, the person making $25,000.00 annually is likely
> paying more taxes because the person making $250,000.00 annually can avail
> themselves of all kinds of tax breaks and loopholes.

That's simply not true.

What "tax breaks and loopholes" exist for the $250K person that do not
exist for the $25K person?

> > Is it fair or even close to fair for the person with multiple dependents,
> or a
> > permanent disability (like blindness) to pay the same percentage as
> someone who
> > is not so encumbered?
> >
>
> Yep. Why should a person's abilities determine what tax they pay?

Why not?

> Is there
> a deduction right now for a lack of abilities?

Yes.

> One thing I think ought to
> be done away with is elderly folks paying school taxes. It's ridiculous.

Why? On what basis should they be exempt?

And how old is "elderly"? 50? 55? 65?
>
> > Is it fair or even close to fair for people in places with wage taxes and
> > state income taxes to pay the same as those in places without those taxes?
>
> Yep. Move to the state that you wish and pay under whatever structure you
> wish.

And then those states are so overburdened with immigrants that they
enact wage and state income taxes...
>
> > >

> > >Colgate, Mr. Bates, and me all pay the same percentage of tax out of our
> > >income; that's it--end of game.
> >
> > OK - now, what constitutes "income"?
>
> You *are* an engineer aren't you? :-)
>
Obviously you're not...;-0

Engineers deal with precise information and details, not just feelings
and vague ideas.
> >
> > Is it just wages you receive for working, or do benefits paid for you by
> > your
> > employer count too?
> >
>
> Whatever the IRS considers as income...the total taxable income that is
> reported on a W-2--and that's determined by IRS rules, which ultimately, I
> suppose are determined by we the People (yeah, right, but you get the gist).

If it's OK to use IRS' definition of income, why not IRS' definition
of exemptions and deductions?

IRS says I can put money in a 401K, IRA, FSA and some other places and
it doesn't count immediately as income. Growth in certain investments
(Roth IRAs, some municipal bonds) isn't considered taxable income by
IRS either.

So the person who puts lots of $$ into those things can pay less than
the person who doesn't.
> >
> > How about earnings from investments? How about sales of items you own?

> If it's considered income by the IRS, it's all rolled in.
>
> > Suppose I bought some radio parts for $10 at a hamfest 20 years ago,
> brought
> > them home, cleaned them up, tested and fixed them and kept the good ones.
> I
> > sell them today for $100 - is that $100 to be considered "income"? Or just
> $90?
> > What about the time and effort I put into them?
>
> On a regular, or once in a while basis?

Once in a while.
>
> >
> > If you bought a house or some land 10 years ago and paid $50,000, and next
> year
> > you sell it for $150,000, how much of that $150,000 should be taxable

> income?
> >
>
> What's the IRS say?

It's taxable unless certain exemption rules are met. For example, if
it's your principal or secondary residence and you reinvest the money
in another principal or secondary residence within (I think) 2 years,
it's not taxable. (There are other exemption rules). In other cases
it's taxable (if it were not your principal or secondary residence,
for example).
> >
> > In the case of corporations, is "income" measured in gross sales or in net
> > profits?
> >
>
> Net profits would be my way of thinking.

In which case many companies would have very little net profit.
> >
> > What about 401ks, IRAs, FSAs, etc.?

> 'Z it income? What's the IRS say?

IRS says "it depends"

> > --
> >
> > "Flat" taxes sound nice until you get down into the details, and then
> > things
> > get real ugly.
> >
> > Take away deductions for charitable contributions, and exemptions for
> > nonprofits, and many of them will simply stop operating. Take away
> deductions
> > for home mortgages and RE taxes, and RE values will tumble because people
> won't
> > be able to afford as much house. (Foreclosures will rise, too.)
> >
> > The reality is that most of us would be *worse* off with a "flat" tax
> because
> > of the side effects.
> >
> > 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>
> I don't know.

I do.

>I guess I'd be living dangerously, then, to vote in support
> of a flat tax.

>
Do you really think it would reduce your taxes? Get real!

Besides, it's a fantasy to think that there'd ever be widespread
support for flat taxes. Too many average people would lose too much.
Including you.

73 de Jim, N2EY

4374. Re: KV4FZ Annual Christmas Message

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-16 17:42:01 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <JtHDb.1314$Ts5.193@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 84050

"Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
news:3FDE5AD0.8040805@ix.netcom.com...
> Dan/W4NTI wrote:
>
> >"W55" <barf@wherblives.net> wrote in message
> >news:brlarejon0@pita.alt.net...
> >
> >
> >>Does anyone have details for the frequency, time, date of
> >>KV4FZ's annual Christmas message?
> >>
> >>73 de W55
> >>
> >>
> >>
> >>
> >1.816 @ 2359 Eastern Standard Time, Dec 24, 2003.
> >
> >CW mode.
> >
> >Dan/W4NTI
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> I've heard it said that it is impossible to misbehave on the air when
> using CW....
>
> ;-)
>
Not so, now a days if you do misbehave hardly anyone will catch it. Most
folks don't know enough CW to do more than a canned qso.

I suspect a lot of that is because of 'readers'.

Dan/W4NTI

4375. Re: KV4FZ Annual Christmas Message

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-16 17:43:11 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <PuHDb.1316$Ts5.976@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 83901

"Steve Robeson, K4CAP" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
news:5c01b95b.0312152018.578795ed@posting.google.com...
> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<nOrDb.338$Ts5.12@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> > "W55" <barf@wherblives.net> wrote in message
> > news:brlarejon0@pita.alt.net...
> > >
> > > Does anyone have details for the frequency, time, date of
> > > KV4FZ's annual Christmas message?
> > >
> > > 73 de W55
> > >
> > >
> > 1.816 @ 2359 Eastern Standard Time, Dec 24, 2003.
> >
> > CW mode.
>
> With a straight key...?!?!
>
> Steve, K4YZ

Could be. He may be in SKN. Drop him an e-mail at;

Theherpster@Imnotadumbassanymore.com

4376. Re: Saddam

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-16 17:48:42 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <_zHDb.1327$Ts5.1211@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 83902

"Fred Garvin" <Garvin@Truss.net> wrote in message
news:brlhp7vgf5@216.221.129.15...
> On Sun, 14 Dec 2003 17:58:24 -0500, N2EY wrote:
>
> > In article <krKdnYXcttH0NUGiRVn-iw@gbronline.com>, JJ
> > <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> writes:
> >
> >>Saddam Hussein has been captured.
> >
> > Alive.
> >
> >>He was found hiding in a hole near Tikrit.
> >
> > Quite appropriate, don't you think?
> >
> > Now the question is: what to do with him?
>
>
> I'd turn his head into ground chuck personally. Which is what they SHOULD
> have done when they found him.

Nah....capturing the rat alive is by far the best solution. Now we can give
him a front end alignment and adjust his attitude. Get all the info we can,
then give him to the Iraqi people.

They will then give him a trial, and kill him on July 1, 2004.

Now that is justice.

Dan/W4NTI

4377. Re: Saddam

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-16 17:50:25 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <BBHDb.1329$Ts5.1220@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 83903

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20031215205040.12300.00002252@mb-m20.aol.com...
> In article <20031214175824.25815.00005213@mb-m07.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com
(N2EY)
> writes:
>
> >
> >>Saddam Hussein has been captured.
> >
> >Alive.
> >
> >>He was found hiding in a hole near Tikrit.
> >
> >Quite appropriate, don't you think?
> >
> >Now the question is: what to do with him?
>
> Jim:
>
> The answer is obvious. Extract as much intel out of him as possible, then
turn
> him over to the new Iraqi government for his fair trial and subsequent
> execution. I just hope it is televised, and the method chosen is hanging.
And
> not the modern, trap-door on the gallows floor, neck snaps and you're
instantly
> dead kind -- I want to watch him do the rope dance. He should be winched
up to
> the top of a very high tower and left to hang there long enough for every
Iraqi
> citizen to see him there. I generally don't believe in capital
punishment, but
> I can gladly make an exception in his case.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>
>
>

I agree....but we need to start the planning now. We have to get a new
satellite up to make sure we have simocast over Korea, Iran and Syria. Live
and in living color, so to speak.

Dan/W4NTI

4378. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-16 17:52:45 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <NDHDb.417$wL6.62@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 83904

"Dave Heil" wrote:
>
> I'm not at all uncomfortable with it,
> Dwight. Len has had his say on countless
> occasions. He isn't involved with amateur
> radio though he knows some hams. He
> has no background in amateur radio from
> which to make an informed decision
> regarding amateur radio testing. (snip)

Dave, I don't have a background in a lot of things (child birth, international affairs with Belarus, NASA space missions, to name just a few), but expect to have a voice in those things when I have something to say and would be darn offended, and very confrontational, if someone told me to go away simply because I don't have the proper background. I suspect you would react the same way if you thought what you had to say was relevant.

And, even if it is true that Len "has no background in amateur radio from which to make an informed decision regarding amateur radio testing," he has nonetheless successfully managed in spite of that to make a decision about code testing which is consistent with the decisions of many within the Amateur Radio Service (people who do have the background you seek).

> He wants morse testing ended. Based
> on what special knowledge and
> background? (snip)

I didn't know a "special" knowledge or background was required. It doesn't take great knowledge, or an indepth background, to see that Morse code is a declining skill throughout the radio world. Or to read what the FCC and others have said about Morse code. Or to think through the issue. Or to form an opinion based on any or all of that. Or voice that opinion.

> (snip) I'm certainly not forced to agree with
> his views, to respect his views or to refrain
> from sarcasm with regard to his views. (snip)

Of course. Just as Len is not forced to leave the discussion just because you think he should.

> (snip) Len has participated and participated
> and participated. (snip)

More power to him. He has just as much of a right to do so as anyone else.

> (snip) He wants to participate and to prevent
> others from laughing at him or his ideas. (snip)

Really? I missed that. How has he tried to prevent others from doing anything?

> (snip) Others are free to participate and may
> form their own opinions of LHA's ideas. They are
> free to laugh at his ideas, to poke fun of his ideas
> and to counter his ideas. (snip)

> (snip) I don't like what Len has to say and don't
> care for his windy, pontificating and condescending
> posts. (snip)

Lets be honest here, Dave. I seriously doubt his lack of a license, or comments (condescending, outragious, or otherwise), would really bother you that much if those comments agreed more with your own views. In the end, the only reason you point to his lack of a license, or try to ridicule his ideas, is that you don't agree with what he has to say. There's nothing wrong with that, but I doubt you are going to sway that many to your side of the argument with such transparent tactics (few are that stupid).

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

4379. Re: Why I Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-16 17:56:28 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <gHHDb.1334$Ts5.1064@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 83905

"Harry Wolf" <wolf@htwolforg.net> wrote in message
news:brn0p5$3q6$0@pita.alt.net...
> Put another way, you paid your ARRL life membership, you now
> know that was a very poor decision, so you are now desperately
> trying to rationalize your poor decision to yourself & us.
>
> 73 de Harry in Abilene
>
>
> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20031215235832.07961.00000569@mb-m03.aol.com...
> > In no particular order:
> >
> > 1) Representation of amateur radio (what other organization or
individual
> would
> > do anyhting like the 121 page commentary on BPL?)
> >
> > 2) QST and other publications (only the RSGB Handbook is comparable)
> >
> > 3) Contests and operating activities (particularly SS and FD)
> >
> > 4) Product reviews (much more in-depth than any other amateur
publication)
> >
> > 5) Elected officials (they listen even if they don't agree)
> >
> > 6) W1AW (been there and operated the station, too)
> >
> > 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>

When I decided to become a Life Member of the ARRL the price was going to go
up soon. I believe it was going up to 8 bucks a year and going up a buck.

So I sent in my 180.00 (one hundred eighty dollars), I think that was
about 1974 or so.

Yeah it sure was a bad investment.

What an ass you are Harry. You need to have that horse kick looked at.

Dan/W4NTI

4380. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-16 17:57:58 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <xnfcneeyarg.hpzti5c.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>
Source record: 83906

On Tue, 16 Dec 2003 02:44:02 GMT, Dave Heil wrote:

>You claim to know what is best for amateur radio. Your comments above
>do not address morse testing; they address morse USE. What is it to
>you, a fellow with no stake at all in amateur radio, if radio amateurs
>continue to use morse?

Not only that, at a recent meeting, the ITU-T (Telecommunications
Group, which defines coding) put forth a definition for a _new_
character in International Morse - the "at" sign (@). It's
.__._. (_AC_).

So much for "Morse is dead".

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane
(Who is in favor of deleting the Morse
test but continuing the use of Morse)

4381. Re: Why I Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-16 17:58:45 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <pJHDb.1337$Ts5.561@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 83907

"Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
news:3FDF1343.5090202@psu.edu...
> Harry Wolf wrote:
> > Put another way, you paid your ARRL life membership, you now
> > know that was a very poor decision, so you are now desperately
> > trying to rationalize your poor decision to yourself & us.
> >
> > 73 de Harry in Abilene
> >
> >
> > "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> > news:20031215235832.07961.00000569@mb-m03.aol.com...
> >
> >>In no particular order:
> >>
> >>1) Representation of amateur radio (what other organization or
individual
> >
> > would
> >
> >>do anyhting like the 121 page commentary on BPL?)
> >>
> >>2) QST and other publications (only the RSGB Handbook is comparable)
> >>
> >>3) Contests and operating activities (particularly SS and FD)
> >>
> >>4) Product reviews (much more in-depth than any other amateur
publication)
> >>
> >>5) Elected officials (they listen even if they don't agree)
> >>
> >>6) W1AW (been there and operated the station, too)
> >>
> >>73 de Jim, N2EY
>
> Or put yet another way, probably quite closer to the truth, is that
> he's paid his dues and likes it just fine.
>
> If you don't like the ARRL, that's fine. You don't have to be so bitter
> about it, though!
>
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -
>

>
> - happily getting more than my money's worth out of the league.....
>

Harry is whats knows as a 'spoiler'. Sort of like a field mouse coming into your house, crapping all over it, chewing up what he can, and then running away to hide.

Don't worry about it. There are so many of them on usenet you need a score card to keep up.

Dan/W4NTI

4382. Re: Why I Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-16 18:50:24 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0312161050.572112bc@posting.google.com>
Source record: 83908

"Harry Wolf" <wolf@htwolforg.net> wrote in message news:<brn0p5$3q6$0@pita.alt.net>...
> Put another way, you paid your ARRL life membership,

Nope.

I'm not a life member. I renew every couple of years, depending on
where the multi-year price break is and whether I still think it's
worth the money.

For the past 36 years (I joined in February of 1968) it's been worth
the money.

> you now
> know that was a very poor decision,

I know now that being a member has (so far) been a very GOOD decision
for me. YMMV.

> so you are now desperately
> trying to rationalize your poor decision to yourself & us.
>
Not at all. I'm simply stating a point of view.

If we consider just the magazine, $39/year works out to $3.25 an issue
for a pretty good general-interest ham radio mag. How much is a year
of "Worldradio" or "CQ"?

"73" is now gone, and "ham radio" has been defunct for well over a
decade.

None of the alternatives are as good as QST. And none of the others
were more than a magazine.

73 de Jim, N2EY

And I'll ask again:

what other organization or individual would do anything like the 121
page commentary on BPL?

> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20031215235832.07961.00000569@mb-m03.aol.com...
> > In no particular order:
> >
> > 1) Representation of amateur radio (what other organization or individual
> would
> > do anyhting like the 121 page commentary on BPL?)
> >

> > 2) QST and other publications (only the RSGB Handbook is comparable)
> >
> > 3) Contests and operating activities (particularly SS and FD)
> >
> > 4) Product reviews (much more in-depth than any other amateur publication)
> >
> > 5) Elected officials (they listen even if they don't agree)
> >
> > 6) W1AW (been there and operated the station, too)
> >
> > 73 de Jim, N2EY

4383. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-16 19:14:54 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3FDF59AA.A2AFA7DD@earthlink.net>
Source record: 83909

Dwight Stewart wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" wrote:
> >
> > I'm not at all uncomfortable with it,
> > Dwight. Len has had his say on countless
> > occasions. He isn't involved with amateur
> > radio though he knows some hams. He
> > has no background in amateur radio from
> > which to make an informed decision
> > regarding amateur radio testing. (snip)
>
> Dave, I don't have a background in a lot of things (child birth,
> international affairs with Belarus, NASA space missions, to name just a
> few), but expect to have a voice in those things when I have something to
> say and would be darn offended, and very confrontational, if someone told me
> to go away simply because I don't have the proper background. I suspect you
> would react the same way if you thought what you had to say was relevant.

I'm sorry, I can't agree with your new age "everyone's opinion has
value" when the topic is something in which someone has no background.
I take it that you believe that your opinions on child birth would be
meaningful or relevant to a woman who has had several children and that
your views on space flights would be found useful to NASA engineers. I
don't happen to think they would be. If you find that you have an
interest in a topic, I'd expect that you'd want to study it, learn a
great deal about it, participate to some degree--in other words, to gain
experience in the field under discussion. I'd expect, for example, that
someone who wants to participate to any meaningful degree in regulating
mining be schooled in mining and that someone who is to particpate in
the regulation of amateur radio be more than casually familiar with
amateur radio. If an individual has no background in a field and
attempted to preach to those actively engaged in that field, I'd not be
at all upset if that individual became "darned offended" or
confrontational. In fact, I'd find it fairly easy to go on with my
life.

> And, even if it is true that Len "has no background in amateur radio from
> which to make an informed decision regarding amateur radio testing," he has
> nonetheless successfully managed in spite of that to make a decision about
> code testing which is consistent with the decisions of many within the
> Amateur Radio Service (people who do have the background you seek).

Well, he'd have to land somewhere on the issue, wouldn't he? He has
also arrived at a conclusion about code testing and about a minimum age

for radio amateurs which is at odds with the decisions reached by many
within the Amateur Radio Service (other people who have a background in
the subject).

> > He wants morse testing ended. Based
> > on what special knowledge and
> > background? (snip)
>
> I didn't know a "special" knowledge or background was required. It doesn't
> take great knowledge, or an indepth background, to see that Morse code is a
> declining skill throughout the radio world.

Not in amateur radio, it isn't. Now you see that you and Len share a
common mistaken view. Each of you might have a desire to see it as a
truth but reality doesn't seem to bear it out.

> Or to read what the FCC and
> others have said about Morse code. Or to think through the issue. Or to form
> an opinion based on any or all of that. Or voice that opinion.

Which brings us back to an earlier point made by you: that Len's opinion
should carry the same weight as the opinions of radio amateurs. The FCC
has said, on a number of occasions, that they'd wait for a concensus
among radio amateurs. They did not see fit to include SWL's or those
who worked at a military radio station in Japan fifty years ago. That
aside, Len has formed an opinion and has, on countless occasions, voiced
his opinion.

> > (snip) I'm certainly not forced to agree with
> > his views, to respect his views or to refrain
> > from sarcasm with regard to his views. (snip)
>
> Of course. Just as Len is not forced to leave the discussion just because
> you think he should.

Please point to one occasion in which I've suggested, requested or
demanded that the kindly old gent do so.

> > (snip) Len has participated and participated
> > and participated. (snip)
>
> More power to him. He has just as much of a right to do so as anyone else.

Having the right to speak isn't the same as forcing others to listen, to
accept or to give the same weight to an opinion.

> > (snip) He wants to participate and to prevent
> > others from laughing at him or his ideas. (snip)
>
> Really? I missed that. How has he tried to prevent others from doing
> anything?

Go to Google. Select this newsgroup. Enter "Len Anderson". Be prepared
to devote one or more evenings.

> > (snip) Others are free to participate and may
> > form their own opinions of LHA's ideas. They are
> > free to laugh at his ideas, to poke fun of his ideas
> > and to counter his ideas. (snip)
>
> > (snip) I don't like what Len has to say and don't
> > care for his windy, pontificating and condescending
> > posts. (snip)
>
> Lets be honest here, Dave. I seriously doubt his lack of a license, or
> comments (condescending, outragious, or otherwise), would really bother you
> that much if those comments agreed more with your own views.

Really? Have you noticed a single occasion where I've supported the
posts of Bruce?

> In the end, the
> only reason you point to his lack of a license, or try to ridicule his
> ideas, is that you don't agree with what he has to say. There's nothing
> wrong with that,

You still don't completely understand so again, I urge that Google
search. Len isn't just wrong, he's rude and abrasive. Len claims to
just want civil debate on the issue of code testing. His posts do not
bear that out.

> but I doubt you are going to sway that many to your side of
> the argument with such transparent tactics (few are that stupid).

The stupid are those who'd take their ideas about amateur radio or
amateur radio licensing from one who is not involved in any way with
amateur radio.

Never underestimate the stupid. They are legion.

Dave K8MN

4384. Re: Why I Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-16 19:24:56 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3FDF5C06.992BFBB9@earthlink.net>
Source record: 83910

N2EY wrote:
>
> In no particular order:
>
> 1) Representation of amateur radio (what other organization or individual would
> do anyhting like the 121 page commentary on BPL?)
>
> 2) QST and other publications (only the RSGB Handbook is comparable)
>
> 3) Contests and operating activities (particularly SS and FD)
>
> 4) Product reviews (much more in-depth than any other amateur publication)
>
> 5) Elected officials (they listen even if they don't agree)
>
> 6) W1AW (been there and operated the station, too)

To which I'll add my own reasons:

1) The League presents a unified voice to the FCC and to congress.

2) The DXCC program.

3) Contests (especially FD, the DX 'tests, VHF/UHF events, 160m Contest)

4) Field Organization (to include the SM, net managers, Emergency
Coordinators, OO's)

5) League bulletins, whether via W1AW, local nets or the internet

6) The web page.

7) W1AW (I've also operated from the station).

Dave K8MN

4385. Re: Why I Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-16 19:31:47 UTC
From: Harry Wolf <wolf@htwolforg.net>
Message-ID: <brnmiuvqd0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 83911

Suuurrrrrrrrrrre!
The faster you spin your story, the bigger a fool you appear
to us and the more $$$ the Newington buffoons rake in
from the gullible.

73 de Harry

"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
news:c2356669.0312161050.572112bc@posting.google.com...
> "Harry Wolf" <wolf@htwolforg.net> wrote in message
news:<brn0p5$3q6$0@pita.alt.net>...
> > Put another way, you paid your ARRL life membership,
>
> Nope.
>
> I'm not a life member. I renew every couple of years, depending on
> where the multi-year price break is and whether I still think it's
> worth the money.
>
> For the past 36 years (I joined in February of 1968) it's been worth
> the money.
>
> > you now
> > know that was a very poor decision,
>
> I know now that being a member has (so far) been a very GOOD decision
> for me. YMMV.
>
> > so you are now desperately
> > trying to rationalize your poor decision to yourself & us.
> >
> Not at all. I'm simply stating a point of view.
>
> If we consider just the magazine, $39/year works out to $3.25 an issue
> for a pretty good general-interest ham radio mag. How much is a year
> of "Worldradio" or "CQ"?
>
> "73" is now gone, and "ham radio" has been defunct for well over a
> decade.
>
> None of the alternatives are as good as QST. And none of the others
> were more than a magazine.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>

> And I'll ask again:
>
> what other organization or individual would do anything like the 121
> page commentary on BPL?
>
>
>
> > "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> > news:20031215235832.07961.00000569@mb-m03.aol.com...
> > > In no particular order:
> > >
> > > 1) Representation of amateur radio (what other organization or
individual
> > would
> > > do anyhting like the 121 page commentary on BPL?)
> > >
> > > 2) QST and other publications (only the RSGB Handbook is comparable)
> > >
> > > 3) Contests and operating activities (particularly SS and FD)
> > >
> > > 4) Product reviews (much more in-depth than any other amateur
publication)
> > >
> > > 5) Elected officials (they listen even if they don't agree)
> > >
> > > 6) W1AW (been there and operated the station, too)
> > >
> > > 73 de Jim, N2EY

4386. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-16 19:42:35 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3FDF602B.3050904@psu.edu>
Source record: 83912

N2EY wrote:

<snippage>

> But I do give, and you want to take away *my* deduction for doing so.

A good example of deductive reasoning! ;^)

<more snippage>

> Besides, it's a fantasy to think that there'd ever be widespread
> support for flat taxes. Too many average people would lose too much.
> Including you.

One of the biggest reasons that a flat tax will *never* happen is that it will provice an easily quantifiable dollar figure as to what is collected. And that dog won't hunt for any number of reasons.

There are certain ummmm..., advantages of the murky system we have now.

- Mike KB3EIA -

4387. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-16 20:12:12 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031216151212.07346.00002164@mb-m26.aol.com>
Source record: 83916

In article <3FDF25D3.21E36AE3@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>Dwight Stewart wrote:
>>
>> "Dave Heil" wrote:
>> > Len Over 21 wrote:
>> > >
>> > > What is that to you?
>> >
>> > It effects me because I am an active radio
>> > amateur. You, on the other hand, are in no
>> > way involved. (snip)
>> >
>> > (snip) I think you must have me mixed up
>> > with you. I'm a radio amateur. You are a
>> > bystander.
>>
>> I'm somewhat uncomfortable with that, Dave. As I see it, when discussing
>a
>> radio service which uses the radio frequencies that belong to all
>Americans,
>> no American Citizen who wants to be involved is a bystander and all
>(Amateur
>> and non-Amateur) have a right to be involved in the discussion.
>
>I'm not at all uncomfortable with it, Dwight.

Yes you are. Your beligerance keeps on.

>Len has had his say on
>countless occasions. He isn't involved with amateur radio though he
>knows some hams.

Yup, beligerance with flags and banners waving... :-)

>He has no background in amateur radio from which to
>make an informed decision regarding amateur radio testing.

Klunk, you are indeed weird as well as beligerant to
say that amateur radio is somehow so "unique" that it
is totally different from all other radio!

The physics of amateur radio is the SAME as the physics
of all other radio.

The jargon, patois, colloquialisms of amateur radio
communicating MIGHT be considered "different" than all
other radio services, but that is as easily picked up by
anyone going from one lodge hall to another. 10-4? :-)

>He wants morse testing ended.

Yes.

>Based on what special knowledge and background?

Based on 50 1/2 years of radio communications without
ever needing it or having to know it to "work HF."

Based on four decades of direct design engineering for
communications which considers ALL available modes.

Based on knowing the literature and history of ALL
radio communications, not the limited spoon-feeding
of knowledge from amateur fraternal organizations.
["Shannon's Law" was based on teleprinter signals,
not morse code and that Law became public in 1948
and accepted by the entire world of radio]

Based on the same bullshit heard for six decades
from elitist morsemen who still think that standards
and practices are the "same" as in the 1930s.

Based on what the FCC said publicly in 1990 and
again in 1999 that a morse code test is not necessary
for them to grant any amateur radio license.

>He wants a minimum age for amateur radio licensing.

Yes, but I don't make near the BIG THING you try
to make of it in here, Klunk. I said that on the public
record on NPRM 98-143 in January 1999 and
haven't pursued it since.

>Based on what special knowledge and background?

Show us your certificates and pretty paper saying you
are the EXPERT in everything you pontificate on.

>His right to direct his opinion to his government is intact.

Damn right it is, Herr Robust.

>Government is not forced to agree with his
>assessment of how amateur radio should be changed.

Who, besides your gloriousness and nobility, said
it should?

[let us know the date of your coronation so that we
may genuflect and worship your presence...]

>I'm certainly not
>forced to agree with his views, to respect his views or to refrain from
>sarcasm with regard to his views.

You are beligerant and pissed off that anyone DARES
challenge your arrogance about What Should Be!

In most anything...

>Wanting to be involved does not make
>Len other than a bystander in the world of amateur radio.

Herr Robust forgets that amateur radio licensing is NOT
dictated by a members-only club. Not in the USA...

>He is not a
>part of amateur radio simply because he comments to government or
>because he posts here.

Neither is this newsgroup some kind of "ARRL South."

>> Likewise, I
>> saw nothing in rules of this newsgroup which would restrict the
>> participation of non-Amateurs.
>
>Len has participated and participated and participated.

Herr Robust has arrogantly proclaimed and issued orders
and done the whole nine yards of the KH2D bit...on and
on and on and on and on...

>He wants to
>participate and to prevent others from laughing at him or his ideas.

Poor baby, reflections of your own golden eye scowling at
remarks you receive?

Herr Robust, I was on Usenet before the Internet went
public and am very, very familiar with what goes on,
and the inhabitants' attitudes in the cyberspace of
computer-modem communications...for more than
two decades.

The arrogant - such as yourself - HATE the comebacks
you get poking holes in your mighty balloons. Ergo,
you try the "reversal" bit and say that the hole-poker is
"afraid of being laughed at." Tsk, tsk, tsk.

EVERYONE takes a chance on posting something in
public. EVERYONE has to "take" what comes back
to them...or leave. That includes arrogant Waffle-SS
colonels.

>Others are free to participate and may form their own opinions of LHA's
>ideas. They are free to laugh at his ideas, to poke fun of his ideas
>and to counter his ideas.

AND AGREE WITH LHA's postings.

Now doesn't that just completely fry your psyche? :-)

However, your ego needs to have you completely in
control so you've gone into a fantasyland where you
are Supreme Commander who Knows Truth! :-)

>> You may not like what Len has to say, but the
>> lack of a Ham license alone should not diminish it or dismiss it.
>
>There's no "may" involved. I don't like what Len has to say and don't
>care for his windy, pontificating and condescending posts.

All the readers have "noticed" your opinion...:-)

>If you've
>read Len's stuff, you'll have no difficulty in understanding that his
>lack of an amateur license is not the only reason for making light of
>his opinions regarding amateur radio licensing.

The Supreme Commander has spoken!

There is NO First Amendment in regards to ham radio
regulations!

All amateur licensing regulations are handled STRICTLY
by the existing amateur licensees!

Supreme Commanders don't give a damn about
anyone who doesn't agree with his arrogant
pontificating orders of the day!

Sick transit, gloria mundi...

4388. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-16 20:12:14 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031216151214.07346.00002165@mb-m26.aol.com>
Source record: 83914

In article <f45722ac.0312160345.f38ea25@posting.google.com>,
brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:

>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>news:<20031215234330.21457.00002777@mb-m10.aol.com>...
>> In article <3FDE7017.1091EF1C@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
><k8mn@earthlink.net>
>> writes:
>>
>> >> Three-fourths of all U.S. radio amateurs are NOT members.
>> >>
>> >> Think on that, Klunk.
>> >
>> >I've thought about it.
>>
>> Made your head hurt?
>>
>> Poor baby.
>>
>> >One quarter of U.S. radio amateurs ARE members.
>>
>> A MINORITY.
>>
>> You still don't understand the difference between "minority" and
>> "majority," do you?
>
>Of this minority, the ARRL polled their little group in the mid-late
>nineties, and came away with "no clear mandate." An even spilt within
>the ranks of the true believers? So even at the time, something was
>wearing away at the propaganda machine. I wonder what's happened
>since then?

As I see it the schism is from the general attitude of long-timers
evolving into two main groupings: Those that mightily resist change
and those who can accept change.

The first group wants a relatively inflexible hobby activity, generally
frozen at the standards and practices of the time when they first
became acquainted with amateur radio (usually their first license).
They want the hobby to remain relatively stable, something they
can identify with, something familiar and comforting. They want to
be first among their equals ("primus inter pares"). Such feel secure
only with the old familiar things. They take the fraternal order view
of amateur radio and thus build up a mystique amongst themselves
far greater than reality. Those favor morse code because the

fraternal order elders favored morse code when they were first into amateur radio.

The second group is accepting of change and they are not afraid of it (although the constant advancement of all electronics does cause some irritation). They are more interested in communicating and the communication arts, are willing to try out new things. They have a more realistic view of amateur radio as an avocational activity and don't have it become their lifestyle. They don't mind the "fraternal order" aspect (some enjoy that) but, at the same time, they are into trying out new things of many kinds. Their emphasis is on communicating, not the mode of communication.

The first group appears to have been in control of the League since the beginnings of that fraternal order as a local club. Such is a positive-feedback condition which supports the generally conservative-traditionalist fraternal brotherhood that is heavy into mystique. They cannot abide the second group because they are resistant to change. The end result is the schism kept wide by the first group.

The first group is secure and comfortable in familiar surroundings (and familiar mystique). If something was good for their Daddy and Grand-Daddy, then by damn it is good for them. Change is anathema because that is not familiar and makes them insecure. A side effect of that behavior is the pretense they are still as young as when they were first licensed long ago...or that they want to be that young again.

The upper echelons of the League have, by public statements and Board meetings, indicated that they have a majority of the first group. Hence the League remained adamant in supporting the morse code test requirement of S25.5 long after the IARU came out for revision. The upper echelons did the appeasement bit about a year prior to WRC-03 by taking the Neutral stand on the code test.

A neutral stand is a nice, easy cop-out in public. It takes no sides and thus doesn't cause as much controversy as taking one side or the other. Such is "comfortable." It also creates more mystique by the pretense that the upper echelons are "considering more important matters (than the code test)." Since most of the League membership has already passed a morse code test, it seems (to the upper ranks) that the code test is "unimportant."

All of the above is understandable...except that change WILL happen to the upper ranks whether or not they like it. League membership hasn't been above the one-quarter mark for a long time and the League NEEDS more members to survive whether the U.S. amateur radio license totals increase or decrease. League leadership needs to adapt to new times...denial of reality might be okay for a few more years but such stalling tactics will only foment a much larger event in the future.

>Now you've got hams kicking around the idea of a two license structure
>w/o Morse Code for HF access.

Unthinkable! :-)

"Morse code has always been in ham radio and it always will be!"

"The code test as always been in ham radio licensing and that's
how it must remain!"

"Nobody should be on HF unless they are licensed with a morse
code test!"

Brian, those aren't verbatim quotes but the gist of what they are
have been written by many of the beligerant "first-group" hams.

It should be clear that there will never be any "consensus" on
code testing as long as such beligerance remains rooted among
the self-styled elite morsemen of U.S. amateur radio.

LHA

4389. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-16 20:12:15 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031216151215.07346.00002166@mb-m26.aol.com>
Source record: 83915

In article <aL-dnfk936e8BkOiRVn-gg@gbronline.com>, JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
writes:

>Len Over 21 wrote:
>> In article <guydnUqVppYZtkOiRVn-vA@gbronline.com>, JJ
><radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
>> writes:
>>
>>>> I'm just campaigning for the elimination of morse code testing.
>>>
>>>Why? Can't or to lazy to learn the code?
>>
>> I can, I did learn morse. I don't see the need of it after being in
>> radio communications for 50 1/2 years.
>>
>>>Is that the only way you will
>>>ever be able to get a ham license?
>>
>> An AMATEUR license is not one of my life priorities. I've had a
>> COMMERCIAL license for 47 1/2 years.
>
>Then what's you problem? If you have no interest in an amateur license
>then why spout off hear? Go somewhere where someone cares.

[in cyberspace you cannot be "hear"...] :-)

Gosh, for an anonymous person you are very touchy. Did you hurt
yourself with the dagger under your cloak?

>>>I guess if they remove the code
>>>requirement you will campaign to get the written eleminated also so you
>>>won't have to do anything for a license.
>>
>> No. You are starting to show evidence of high irritation, anonymous
>> one.
>
>Doesn't irratate me, I have my license, code test and all.

Of COURSE you do, anonymous one.

How could anyone possibly doubt such a thing?

>> Why is it imperative to have a license, especially an AMATEUR
>> license?
>
>If one wishes to operate on the amateur bands one needs an amateur

>license - DUH!

Is "DUH" your real name's initials?

You had best check on which amateur bands are EXCLUSIVELY
allocated only to amateur radio.

Any other radio service allocated as primary or co-resident on ham
bands doesn't need any amateur license to operate there.

Worse yet, the government (including military) can and sometimes
does operate on bands which many amateurs think are exclusively
"theirs." No amateur license required by government/military operators
to operate there.

>> I took my FCC office test way back in March, 1956. I'd
>> already been communicating in the HF Big Leagues for three years.
>> Later on, I've communicated on LF, MF, HF, VHF, UHF, and
>> microwaves without needing any amateur radio certificate. Never
>> ever needed to use or understand morse code for any of that.
>> Nobody involved in all that communicating complained about
>> lack of morsemanship.
>
>Great, then go back to your LF, MF, HF, VHF, UHF and microwaves with
>your commercial license. You obviously have no interest in amateur radio
>so it is obvious to the most casual of observers that your only reason
>to be hear is to see how big a jackass you can make of yourself.
>And you're doing a bang-up job of it.

How come for why you say "I have no interest in amateur radio?"

Is everyone within your touch required to profess love, honor, and
obeyance to the amateur lifestyle in order for you to be civil to
them?

>>>I haven't belonged to the ARRL
>>>in many years, but you have convinced me I need to join, thanks to you
>>>the ARRL will get a new member.
>>
>> Go for it. They need warm bodies rather desperately. The League
>> has yet to get membership from a majority of licensed U.S. radio
>> amateurs.
>>
>> Hurry on getting your membership...wonder upon wonders, they are
>> defraying shipping charges on items puchased from Newington right
>> now! [of course, you pay the same price in a ham store for ARRL
>> merchandise and there's no shipping charges to pay...]
>
>It will give me a say in campainging to keep the code test, looks like
>that is what keeps you out of ham radio and that's a good thing for ham
>radio.

You can have your "say" DIRECTLY to the FCC. Of course, on the 14 petitions the official comment period is over but you are still allowed to late-file.

The only problem with comments to the FCC is that they expect all commenters to give their real name, address, etc., in order to be on the public record.

That makes everyone commenting vulnerable, doesn't it? By using ARRL as a middleman, you can keep your anonymity and arrogance and alleged superiority, spouting off from time to time. No problem.

If that is the sort of attitude of modern U.S. amateur radio, then it is no wonder that folks aren't rushing in to get acquainted with it or don't admire all the "expertise" of such amateur radio gurus.

LHA

4390. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-16 20:12:16 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031216151216.07346.00002167@mb-m26.aol.com>
Source record: 83913

In article <jiwDb.7083$xH2.1310662@news1.news.adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo
<mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:

>Len Over 21 wrote:
>
>> My comment is in that database. Is yours?
>
>Yes it is.

On NOI 03-104, 23 Jun 03...good on you.

Now...how about on the 14 petitions?

LHA

4391. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-16 20:14:07 UTC
From: garigue <garigue@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <jlJDb.129836$_M.669763@attbi_s54>
Source record: 83917

"sideband" <AINO8SPAMW@cac.net> wrote in message
news:dTvDb.16491$P%1.15504181@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
> I eat my peas with honey,
> I've done it all my life.
> It makes the peas taste funny,
> But it keeps them on my knife.

There once was a hermit named Dave ......

73 KI3R Tom Popovic Belle Vernon Pa

4392. Re: Why I Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-16 20:17:30 UTC
From: Nate Bargmann <n0nb@networksplus.net>
Message-ID: <pan.2003.12.16.20.17.24.833771@networksplus.net>
Source record: 83918

On Tue, 16 Dec 2003 04:58:32 +0000, N2EY wrote:

> In no particular order:
>
> 1) Representation of amateur radio (what other organization or individual would
> do anyhting like the 121 page commentary on BPL?)
>
> 2) QST and other publications (only the RSGB Handbook is comparable)
>
> 3) Contests and operating activities (particularly SS and FD)
>
> 4) Product reviews (much more in-depth than any other amateur publication)
>
> 5) Elected officials (they listen even if they don't agree)
>
> 6) W1AW (been there and operated the station, too)
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

I'll add:

1. They haven't revised the Amateur's Code to be Politically Correct.

2. A wealth of history is available through the QST View series.

3. ARES

4. QST holds a higher standard for products advertised to hams than any
other publication.

5. Doesn't send several fund-raising letters per week although this year
was busy for ARRL, I received two such mailings in 2003.

6. A field organization that will help anyone with an issue related to ham
radio, whether licensed or not, or an ARRL member or not.

7. Repeater Directory

8. The Handbook

9. The Antenna Book

10. ARRL Web site

I need to leave a few more for others to list!

73, de Nate >>

--

"The optimist proclaims that we live in the best of all possible worlds,
the pessimist fears this is true."

4393. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-16 20:33:05 UTC
From: garigue <garigue@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <5_JDb.408021$275.1281866@attbi_s53>
Source record: 83919

>
> > Besides, it's a fantasy to think that there'd ever be widespread
> > support for flat taxes. Too many average people would lose too much.
> > Including you.
>
>
> One of the biggest reasons that a flat tax will *never* happen is that
> it will provice an easily quantifiable dollar figure as to what is
> collected. And that dog won't hunt for any number of reasons.
>
> There are certain ummmm..., advantages of the murky system we have now.
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -

Right Mike ....I seem to remember reading a few years ago that our tax laws at the Federal level when upright is a stack about 6 feet high. Wanna know what comprises this volume .... specific and I do mean specific tax breaks to individuals or businesses. The reason the flat tax will never be seen is that the gravy thats puts these "laws" into the books will be cut off from our duly elected reps. Also a fellow in here mentioned that the tax rate isn't really that 50% plus level doesn't count for the fact that not only are our payrolls taxed but also the good and services we all purchase. The big lie is found herein.

My Buddy phoned me with glee when Bill Clinton got into office. He is really going to put it to those rich bastards with a tax hike ...I was told. I said who is rich ...a 100K salary? My buddy said yes sir 100 K is a lot of money. I then told him that the fellow down the street who has a dry cleaning business probably takes that home after paying his staff, taxes and other expenses. and guess what ...your pants will probably cost 25 cents more for a clean when your buddy Bill's signature hits the paper.

73 God Bless KI3R Tom Popovic Belle Vernon Pa

4394. Re: Saddam

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-16 21:26:05 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0312161326.7ccb375c@posting.google.com>
Source record: 83920

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0312160627.db8b0ec@posting.google.com>...
> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0312160358.72c5cefc@posting.google.com>...
>
> > Just as long as we're guarding his sorry butt. You never know when
> > the PLO, with many sympathizers, will try to spring him.
>
> The PLO...?!?!
>
> BBWHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHA! ! ! ! ! ! !
>
> You're not exactly "up to snuff" on current events, are you, "Brain"...?!?!
>
> BBBWWWWHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHA ! ! ! ! ! !
>
> Steve, K4YZ

What would you call them?

4395. Re: Why I Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-16 21:38:17 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3FDF7B49.6080200@psu.edu>
Source record: 83921

Dan/W4NTI wrote:
> "Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
> news:3FDF1343.5090202@psu.edu...
>
>>Harry Wolf wrote:
>>
>>>Put another way, you paid your ARRL life membership, you now
>>>know that was a very poor decision, so you are now desperately
>>>trying to rationalize your poor decision to yourself & us.
>>>
>>>73 de Harry in Abilene
>>>
>>>
>>>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>>>news:20031215235832.07961.00000569@mb-m03.aol.com...
>>>
>>>
>>>>In no particular order:
>>>>
>>>>1) Representation of amateur radio (what other organization or
>>>
> individual
>
>>>would
>>>
>>>
>>>>do anyhting like the 121 page commentary on BPL?)
>>>>
>>>>2) QST and other publications (only the RSGB Handbook is comparable)
>>>>
>>>>3) Contests and operating activities (particularly SS and FD)
>>>>
>>>>4) Product reviews (much more in-depth than any other amateur
>>>
> publication)
>
>>>>5) Elected officials (they listen even if they don't agree)
>>>>
>>>>6) W1AW (been there and operated the station, too)
>>>>
>>>>73 de Jim, N2EY
>>>
>>Or put yet another way, probably quite closer to the truth, is that
>>he's paid his dues and likes it just fine.

>>
>>If you don't like the ARRL, that's fine. You don't have to be so bitter
>>about it, though!
>>
>>
>>- Mike KB3EIA -
>>
>>
>>- happily getting more than my money's worth out of the league.....
>>
>
>
> Harry is whats knows as a 'spoiler'. Sort of like a field mouse coming into
> your house, crapping all over it, chewing up what he can, and then running
> away to hide.
>
> Don't worry about it. There are so many of them on usenet you need a score
> card to keep up.

Yeah, but so many.... so many!

I wonder how they wasted their time and annoyed people before usenet?

- Mike KB3EIA -

4396. Re: Why I Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-16 21:47:20 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3FDF7D68.9040105@psu.edu>
Source record: 83922

Harry Wolf wrote:
> Suuurrrrrrrrrrre!
> The faster you spin your story, the bigger a fool you appear
> to us and the more $$$ the Newington buffoons rake in
> from the gullible.
>
> 73 de Harry

HAR! Okay Harry! We'll sit in our fools paradise and enjoy the
presumably nonexistant benefits which we seem to think we're getting.

For all you Wobbly headed Bob fans:

http://bob.slightly-mental.net/

- Mike KB3EIA -

4397. Re: Why I Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-16 23:05:50 UTC
From: Nate Bargmann <n0nb@networksplus.net>
Message-ID: <pan.2003.12.16.23.05.48.154346@networksplus.net>
Source record: 83923

On Tue, 16 Dec 2003 16:38:17 -0500, Mike Coslo wrote:

> I wonder how they wasted their time and annoyed people before usenet?
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -

So that's why 75m is so quiet these days!

;-)

73, de Nate >>

--
Wireless | Amateur Radio Station N0NB | Successfully Microsoft
Internet | n0nb@networksplus.net | free since January 1998.
Location | Bremen, Kansas USA EM19ov | "Debian, the choice of
Amateur radio exams; ham radio; Linux info @ | a GNU generation!"
http://www.qsl.net/n0nb/ | http://www.debian.org

4398. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-16 23:18:44 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <npMDb.16596$P%1.15623695@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 83924
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.cb

"Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
news:f45722ac.0312160348.7a97c78e@posting.google.com...
> "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:<mirDb.16420$P%1.15447370@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>...
>
> > And what efforts did you make to convert the majority of members to your
> > point of view?? While the items you list are worthy activities, they
don't
> > do much to change policy.
> >
> > Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>
> Dee, what ARRL office(s) do you hold in your effort to stem the tide
> of changes within the ARS? If your answer is "none," I suggest you
> start campaigning yesterday.

When and if I wish to change ARRL policy, I'll dive into the political
arena. I'm not the one complaining about ARRL policies.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

4399. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-16 23:34:17 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <ZDMDb.16598$P%1.15625594@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 83926

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3FDE7017.1091EF1C@earthlink.net...
> Len Over 21 wrote:
> > [snip]
> > Three-fourths of all licensed U.S. radio amateurs "took that view"
> > and are NOT members.
>
> You have no idea of the views held by those radio amateurs who are or
> are not members of the ARRL, Leonard. You aren't a player from within
> or without.
>

And there are simply a lot of people who are not joiners. What percent of the seniors belong to AARP? What percent of gun owners belong to the NRA. With 1/4 or so of the licensed amateurs belonging to ARRL, it would not be surprising to if the ARRL were to rank quite high on the list of target group people actually belonging to the organization.

> > [snip]
> > Three-fourths of all U.S. radio amateurs are NOT members.
> >
> > Think on that, Klunk.
>
> I've thought about it. One quarter of U.S. radio amateurs ARE members.
> You are not in either camp.
>
> Dave K8MN

It would be interesting to compare the ARRL membership percentage to groups like AARP and NRA.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

4400. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-16 23:34:19 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <%DMDb.16599$P%1.15625710@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 83925

"Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:brlu6h$3d2@library2.airnews.net...
>
> Yep. Why should a person's abilities determine what tax they pay? Is
there
> a deduction right now for a lack of abilities? One thing I think ought to
> be done away with is elderly folks paying school taxes. It's ridiculous.
>

Not at all. The elderly benefited in their youth from public schools and in their productive years from schools for their children. Do you honestly think that in that limited time span that the percentage of the tax that went to the schools was enough to cover their own education and that of their children? My total annual property taxes are less than it would take to send one child to private school for one year. The public schools make it up by spreading it over a taxpayer's lifetime. Or are you saying that during their working years, a person's property taxes ought to be increased?

Keep in mind that even if a person never has children, they still benefit from the public education of the community as a whole. If they did not pay school taxes, they would end up paying increased taxes to support an increased number of people on welfare. It's far cheaper to pay school taxes so people can be productive than to support them on welfare.

>
> Whatever the IRS considers as income...the total taxable income that is
> reported on a W-2--and that's determined by IRS rules, which ultimately, I
> suppose are determined by we the People (yeah, right, but you get the
gist).
>

They keep changing the rules on that you know.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

4401. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-17 00:08:38 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <a8NDb.16603$P%1.15630794@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 83931

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:K4vDb.7040$xH2.1292698@news1.news.adelphia.net...
> Dee D. Flint wrote:
>
> > You are expecting changes out of all proportion to the effort that you
are
> > putting into it and you think my opinions are extreme??
>
> I'm not so sure he is, Dee. I see a person that disagrees with some of
> what the ARRL is doing, yet still supports the basic objective. I mean
> if he's been a member since 86, that counts for something.
>
> Kind of like how I am with politics. The Dems are in shambles, and the
> Repubs are waaaaaayyyyy too liberal any more with their way out of line
> deficit spending.
>
> But I still vote, and try to pick the least awful candidate.
>

Which is fine. But if you want something better than what the least awful candidate will provide, what do you do? If the majority of your party disagrees with you on some points, what do you do? Do you expect them to change just because you want them to or because you have been a member for nearly 20 years? It isn't going to happen. If you want change, then you roll up your sleeves and go to work on it; not sit and complain, not "take your marbles and go home." The latter two approaches never work.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

4402. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-17 00:08:39 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <b8NDb.16604$P%1.15630788@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 83929

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:afxDb.932$Ts5.711@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> "Dave Heil" wrote:
> > Len Over 21 wrote:
> > >
> > > What is that to you?
> >
> > It effects me because I am an active radio
> > amateur. You, on the other hand, are in no
> > way involved. (snip)
> >
> > (snip) I think you must have me mixed up
> > with you. I'm a radio amateur. You are a
> > bystander.
>
>
> I'm somewhat uncomfortable with that, Dave. As I see it, when discussing
a
> radio service which uses the radio frequencies that belong to all
Americans,
> no American Citizen who wants to be involved is a bystander and all
(Amateur
> and non-Amateur) have a right to be involved in the discussion. Likewise,
I
> saw nothing in rules of this newsgroup which would restrict the
> participation of non-Amateurs. You may not like what Len has to say, but
the
> lack of a Ham license alone should not diminish it or dismiss it.
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
>

Philosophically you are right Dwight. However, Len has a long history of diatribes and disjointed rambles that do not hang together. He is simply trying to agitate. I've kill filed his various aliases because of it. In contrast, the other denizens of this newsgroup, whether or not I agree with them, at least can put together a coherent statement of their point of view and the logic that they used to arrive at it. Naturally we all pick apart each other's logic when we don't agree or consider the logic faulty but the discussions make sense.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

4403. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-17 00:08:40 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <c8NDb.16605$P%1.15630721@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 83930

"Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
news:f45722ac.0312160339.4fd97376@posting.google.com...
> "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:<WetDb.16444$P%1.15471690@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>...
> > "Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
> > news:f45722ac.0312151556.22a71f9f@posting.google.com...
>
>
> > > I think Dee's demands are extreme.
> >
> > You are expecting changes out of all proportion to the effort that you
are
> > putting into it and you think my opinions are extreme??
> >
> > Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>
> Yes, yes. Let them eat cake says Dee Marie.
>
> You don't seem to recognize that the desire to modernize the ARS has a
> groundswell of support. It doesn't need to be filtered through state
> and regional directors, brought up in a board meeting, with lots of
> hand-wringing that there is no clear mandate...

So how do you propose that change occur? What is your plan? Show me
changes that are needed and an effective plan to get there. So far all you
have done is bash the ARRL without presenting any alternative.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

4404. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-17 00:08:41 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <d8NDb.16606$P%1.15630750@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 83928

"Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
news:f45722ac.0312160351.1cbbeda0@posting.google.com...
> Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
news:<3FDE013B.5020308@psu.edu>...
> > Brian wrote:
> > > Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote
> > >
> > >
> > > >>I think this is one of those cases where some people think that their
> > > >>membership is a subscription to QST. Its a lot more than that. ARRL
does
> > > >>a lot for Amateurs, even those who hate the organization.
> > > >>
> > > >> - Mike KB3EIA -
> > > >
> > > >
> > > >
> > > > Fair enough.
> > > >
> > > > I dislike some of the policies that the ARRL has promoted in the past,
> > > > and felt as if the ARRL did not represent me even though I have been a
> > > > member since 1986.
> > >
> > > Well, there you go! As a member, I'll pay a lot more attnetion to what
> > > you have to say.
> > >
> > > - Mike KB3EIA -
> >
> >
> > Mike, don't let Dee hear you say that. ;^)
> >
> > I must hold an official ARRL elected office to have any influence.
> >

Not necessarily. You merely need to convince the majority that your view is
correct so that people who have the same agenda as you will be elected.

> I wonder what elected office she holds in an effort to stem the tide of
change?

I choose to vote for officials who have the goals that I believe in. While
I disagree with the probable changes that are coming, they are not so
heinous that I see a need to rearrange my priorities to personally fight
them. They are changes I can live with should they come to pass.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

4405. Re: Why I Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-17 00:08:42 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <e8NDb.16607$P%1.15630807@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 83927

"Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
news:3FDF1343.5090202@psu.edu...
> Harry Wolf wrote:
> > Put another way, you paid your ARRL life membership, you now
> > know that was a very poor decision, so you are now desperately
> > trying to rationalize your poor decision to yourself & us.
> >
> > 73 de Harry in Abilene
> >
> >
> > "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> > news:20031215235832.07961.00000569@mb-m03.aol.com...
> >
> >>In no particular order:
> >>
> >>1) Representation of amateur radio (what other organization or
individual
> >
> > would
> >
> >>do anyhting like the 121 page commentary on BPL?)
> >>
> >>2) QST and other publications (only the RSGB Handbook is comparable)
> >>
> >>3) Contests and operating activities (particularly SS and FD)
> >>
> >>4) Product reviews (much more in-depth than any other amateur
publication)
> >>
> >>5) Elected officials (they listen even if they don't agree)
> >>
> >>6) W1AW (been there and operated the station, too)
> >>
> >>73 de Jim, N2EY
>
> Or put yet another way, probably quite closer to the truth, is that
> he's paid his dues and likes it just fine.
>
> If you don't like the ARRL, that's fine. You don't have to be so bitter
> about it, though!
>
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -
>

>
> - happily getting more than my money's worth out of the league.....
>

Same here. I've been quite pleased with what I get from the League. The only times that I have not belonged after becoming a ham was when I was in exceedingly difficult financial straights where even that little bit of money could not be sparred. Thank goodness that didn't happen too often.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

4406. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-17 00:09:42 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <a9NDb.16608$P%1.15630855@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 83932

"Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
news:3FDF602B.3050904@psu.edu...
> N2EY wrote:
>
>
> <snippage>
>
>
> > But I do give, and you want to take away *my* deduction for doing so.
>
> A good example of deductive reasoning! ;^)
>
> <more snippage>
>
> > Besides, it's a fantasy to think that there'd ever be widespread
> > support for flat taxes. Too many average people would lose too much.
> > Including you.
>
>
> One of the biggest reasons that a flat tax will *never* happen is that
> it will provice an easily quantifiable dollar figure as to what is
> collected. And that dog won't hunt for any number of reasons.
>
> There are certain ummmm..., advantages of the murky system we have now.
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -
>

Yeah the average Joe would then know what he is really paying through all
the hidden taxes and boy would he scream then.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

4407. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-17 00:37:26 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <xnfcneeyarg.hq0bzx0.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>
Source record: 83933

On Tue, 16 Dec 2003 23:34:19 GMT, Dee D. Flint wrote:

>> Whatever the IRS considers as income...the total taxable income that is
>> reported on a W-2--and that's determined by IRS rules, which ultimately, I
>> suppose are determined by we the People (yeah, right, but you get the
>> gist).

>They keep changing the rules on that you know.

Shhhh...you'll wake Dieter up.....

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

4408. Re: Riley Orders W8CH OFF 75 METERS FOR 3 Years!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-17 00:39:14 UTC
From: thor6883@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <971a42a7.0312161639.2636c12@posting.google.com>
Source record: 83934
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.shortwave

"Rado Free Iraqi Spider Hole" <pumpkins444@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:<e6bd5$3fdf17fd$d1cc7ae2$17034@allthenewsgroups.com>...
> "Pirate Operators of RRCB UNITE! NOW!" <thor6883@yahoo.com> wrote in
> message news:971a42a7.0312160554.667ca11@posting.google.com...
> > I was listening to 3.865 this morning...
> >
> > It is written in stone.
> >
> > Riley Hollingsworth has ordered W8CH, Criss Heston, off of 75 meters for
> 3 years.
>
> Please provide a relavant link to an OFFICIAL announcement
> of the above alleged news. (sorry buddy, but there is **so much**
> bull shi+ talked over, spun and re-hashed on 75 and 20 meters on a daily
> basis
> that your "announcement" above is thus right up there with the
> return of Planet-X and the latest theory on some of the arab/islamic
> newsgroups that we arrested one of Saddam's doubles instead
> of the general article....)

First of all, why in the world did you reply to my newsgroup posting
and crosspoast in 3 other groups? what a flippin' Moron!

Next of all, The info is accurate. when the FCC releases it's next
enforcement log to the ARRL, it will be released. unless Ol' Chicken
head told Riley not to tell nobody. so, we might not see a offical
notice, but if one wants confirmation contact W8NS, he's the dude the
dropped the dime. Trust me, Chicken Head got what he deserved. and
seeing the crap he pulled with yours truly, I'll MORE THAN happily
testify in court, on W8NS's part, if need be. So, Don, If you're
reading this, Come see your ol' buddy south of Detroit, if you need
some back up in court. I was personally a witness to that drunk's
antics on 3.865, night after night. and how he broke rules and acted
like an Idiot for like 3 years. (I got my general in 2000)

>
> > Good job to the people responsible for getting the job done!!!!
> >
> > Bad thing is... the moron is now on 160 does the same crap!
> >
> > He won't last long.
> >
> > Thor
>

> Did you drop the hammer also like you did the football
> on the 3rd down a 4 also Thor...? (grin)

Say what? I don't even watch football.

Anyhow, there's your info.

enjoy

Thor

4409. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-17 01:07:58 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <O%NDb.12440$xH2.1605425@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 83935

Dee D. Flint wrote:
> "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
> news:K4vDb.7040$xH2.1292698@news1.news.adelphia.net...
>
>>Dee D. Flint wrote:
>>
>>
>>>You are expecting changes out of all proportion to the effort that you
>
> are
>
>>>putting into it and you think my opinions are extreme??
>>
>>I'm not so sure he is, Dee. I see a person that disagrees with some of
>>what the ARRL is doing, yet still supports the basic objective. I mean
>>if he's been a member since 86, that counts for something.
>>
>>Kind of like how I am with politics. The Dems are in shambles, and the
>>Repubs are waaaaaayyyyy too liberal any more with their way out of line
>>deficit spending.
>>
>>But I still vote, and try to pick the least awful candidate.
>>
>
>
> Which is fine. But if you want something better than what the least awful
> candidate will provide, what do you do? If the majority of your party
> disagrees with you on some points, what do you do? Do you expect them to
> change just because you want them to or because you have been a member for
> nearly 20 years? It isn't going to happen. If you want change, then you
> roll up your sleeves and go to work on it; not sit and complain, not "take
> your marbles and go home." The latter two approaches never work.

I vote! That's really about all I can do. And when enough people
believe what I do, then things may change.

Lets say I think that the deficit is too high. Who do I vote for? Who
speaks for me? Right now, I don't think anyone does, but I'll vote for
anyone who will.

But you seem to be saying that in order to have an opinion and express
it, I have to run for office. I wonder what office is high enough to
have an opinion? local tax collector or commisioner? Maybe they would be
allowed to have an opinion and express it on local issues. In order to
have an opinion and express it, I would have to be a Senator or a member

of the House. I suppose that the State versions of thes would have their opinions dissappear when an issue goes to the Federal level.

Seriously your approach sounds like: "Don't you worry your little head about anything, we have everything taken care of thankyouverymuch. And when we want your opinion, we'll tell you what it is.

- Mike KB3EIA -

4410. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-17 01:16:25 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <J7ODb.12823$xH2.1607937@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 83936

Dee D. Flint wrote:

> "Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
> news:f45722ac.0312160351.1cbbeda0@posting.google.com...
>
>>Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
>
> news:<3FDE013B.5020308@psu.edu>...
>
>>>Brian wrote:
>>>
>>>>Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote
>>>
>>>
>>>>>I think this is one of those cases where some people think that their
>>>>>membership is a subscription to QST. Its a lot more than that. ARRL
>
> does
>
>>>>>a lot for Amateurs, even those who hate the organization.
>>>>>
>>>>>- Mike KB3EIA -
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>Fair enough.
>>>>
>>>>I dislike some of the policies that the ARRL has promoted in the past,
>>>>and felt as if the ARRL did not represent me even though I have been a
>>>>member since 1986.
>>>
>>>Well, there you go! As a member, I'll pay a lot more attnetion to what
>>>you have to say.
>>>
>>>- Mike KB3EIA -
>>
>>
>>Mike, don't let Dee hear you say that. ;^)
>>
>>I must hold an official ARRL elected office to have any influence.
>>
>
>
> Not necessarily. You merely need to convince the majority that your view is

> correct so that people who have the same agenda as you will be elected.

Good heavens. I appreciate that you believe that people should work for what they believe in. But I can paraphrase what you are saying is that if a person isn't willing to get heavily involved, then they are welcome to shut up.

That isn't democracy, representative or otherwise, it's a virtual dictatorship.

In my club, I listen to everyone. You would just listen to the other board members.

I can imagine the response when someone wants to know where the money is gone, and has some ideas on how it should be spent. I guess you would tell them it isn't any of their business since they don't care to be a member of the board?

>>I wonder what elected office she holds in an effort to stem the tide of
>
> change?
>
> I choose to vote for officials who have the goals that I believe in. While
> I disagree with the probable changes that are coming, they are not so
> heinous that I see a need to rearrange my priorities to personally fight
> them. They are changes I can live with should they come to pass.

Sure. And that's fine. But you seem to be telling Brian that he can't have his opinion. It may be stronger than your's but that's how some people are.

- Mike KB3EIA -

4411. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-17 01:17:06 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <m8ODb.12836$xH2.1607979@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 83937

Dee D. Flint wrote:

<snippage

> Yeah the average Joe would then know what he is really paying through all
> the hidden taxes and boy would he scream then.

Yup!

4412. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-17 01:29:47 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <fkODb.16624$P%1.15644027@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 83938

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:J7ODb.12823$xH2.1607937@news1.news.adelphia.net...
> Dee D. Flint wrote:
>
> > "Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
> > news:f45722ac.0312160351.1cbbeda0@posting.google.com...
> >
> >>Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
> >
> > news:<3FDE013B.5020308@psu.edu>...
> >
> >>>Brian wrote:
> >>>
> >>>>Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote
> >>>
> >>>
> >>>>>I think this is one of those cases where some people think that their
> >>>>>membership is a subscription to QST. Its a lot more than that. ARRL
> >>
> > does
> >>
> >>>>>a lot for Amateurs, even those who hate the organization.
> >>>>>
> >>>>>- Mike KB3EIA -
> >>>>
> >>>>
> >>>>Fair enough.
> >>>>
> >>>>I dislike some of the policies that the ARRL has promoted in the past,
> >>>>and felt as if the ARRL did not represent me even though I have been a
> >>>>member since 1986.
> >>>
> >>>Well, there you go! As a member, I'll pay a lot more attnetion to what
> >>>you have to say.
> >>>
> >>>- Mike KB3EIA -
> >>
> >>
> >>Mike, don't let Dee hear you say that. ;^)
> >>
> >>I must hold an official ARRL elected office to have any influence.
> >>
> >

> >
> > Not necessarily. You merely need to convince the majority that your
view is
> > correct so that people who have the same agenda as you will be elected.
>
> Good heavens. I appreciate that you believe that people should work for
> what they believe in. But I can paraphrase what you are saying is that
> if a person isn't willing to get heavily involved, then they are welcome
> to shut up.
>
> That isn't democracy, representative or otherwise, it's a virtual
> dictatorship.

No that's not what I'm saying. I'm saying change doesn't happen without work. Since Brian chooses only to complain and not dig in and do the work, then he can't expect change. Brian's approach of changing because Brian wants the change is the dictatorial approach.

>
> In my club, I listen to everyone. You would just listen to the other
> board members.
>

No, any dues paying member has a right to be heard. They just can't expect change unless they do more. At the very least they need to convince other club members and then bring it to a vote of the general membership. But again this requires WORK.

> I can imagine the response when someone wants to know where the money is
> gone, and has some ideas on how it should be spent. I guess you would
> tell them it isn't any of their business since they don't care to be a
> member of the board?
>
>

All who pay dues have a right to examine the books. All who do not agree with where the money is going have a right to bring it up in a general club meeting and ask for a vote. But guess what. The latter two activities once again require WORK.

> >>I wonder what elected office she holds in an effort to stem the tide of
> >
> > change?
> >
> > I choose to vote for officials who have the goals that I believe in.
While
> > I disagree with the probable changes that are coming, they are not so
> > heinous that I see a need to rearrange my priorities to personally fight
> > them. They are changes I can live with should they come to pass.
>
> Sure. And that's fine. But you seem to be telling Brian that he can't
> have his opinion. It may be stronger than your's but that's how some

> people are.
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -
>

No Brian is welcome to his opinion. But if he isn't willing to do the work to effect a change then he is being unrealistic in expecting that change to come to pass. That is all. He wants things to change just by saying he wants them to change. I am challenging that self-centered, simplistic, and unrealistic expectation.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

4413. Re: KV4FZ Annual Christmas Message

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-17 02:59:15 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <7EPDb.7495$Pg1.6720@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 83939

"Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote

> Key? These guys are hard-core. He'll be using two bare copper wires.

And sending with Farnsworth spacing to confound the little red-hatted
monkeys and ADA transmitter tuner-uppers.

Sunvugun!

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

4414. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-17 04:17:12 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3FDFD8C7.C3E0B827@earthlink.net>
Source record: 83940

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3FDE7172.BF1D62F0@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >Len Over 21 wrote:
> >
> >> Problem is that Believers are in the minority...but they cannot ever
> >> see that or they are so set that what they think is the absolute
> >> "they know what is best."
> >
> >But, Len, you think you know what is best for amateur radio and you
> >aren't even involved. You're pretty much of a minority.
>
> I've not claimed to "know what is best for amateur radio."
>
> That's YOUR claim.

That isn't correct, Leonard. You made quite a lengthy plea to the FCC
for the elimination of morse testing and for institution of a minimum
age requirement for amateur licensing. Are you now telling us that you
didn't mean those things? If not, it looks as if you, a
non-participant, knows far more about what is good for amateur radio
than any active, licensed ham.

> "What is best" is what YOU like. Everyone understands that.

No, that's what you're comments to the FCC and your comments here
indicate that you believe: that what is best for amateur radio should be
decided by someone who isn't remotely involved.

> >> That's why the staunch Believers insist on morsemanship as the
> >> Ulimate in amateur akill...even after the entirety of the rest of the
> >> radio world gave up on morse codes for communication. "They
> >> KNOW what is best" therefore their way MUST triumph.
> >
> >You claim to know what is best for amateur radio.
>
> Nope.

Your weak denial rings hollow.

> >Your comments above
> >do not address morse testing; they address morse USE.
>
> Poor baby, you still don't understand the relationship?

Yes, I do understand the relationship between morse testing and morse use. Further, I understood that your most recent comments addressed used, not testing.

> PCTAs have constantly whined and bitched about "removing the
> morse test will end the use of morse!"
>
> >What is it to
> >you, a fellow with no stake at all in amateur radio, if radio amateurs
> >continue to use morse?
>
> What is it to you...who will never ever have to take any sort of
> amateur radio test again in your lifetime?

Any change in amateur radio regulation effects those who are active licensees in the ARS.

> Will your paddles freeze if the morse test is removed?
>
> Will you be struck dumb if the morse test is removed?
>
> Will you lose your valued arrogance and superiority if the morse
> test is removed?

You've not lost yours and you've never even taken the morse exam.

> >> Incredible that there's such a similarity of the League (of notions)
> >> to the Ba'athists in Iraq.
> >
> >Really? Your comment seems pretty flakey to me. The Ba'ath Party
> >supports continues use and testing of morse code?
>
> Both are adherents of absolute obediance.

I don't believe you. I suggest though, that you know about as much about one as the other--very little.

> You try tactics of verbal terroism in newsgroups. Poorly.
>
> Do you have a spidey hole at the ready?

Why would I need one, Leonard?

> >> Anyone for a deck of cards?
> >
> >I'd give you a deck but you couldn't cut it.
>
> "Deck?" What do you know about "deck?"
>
> "Dreck," yes, you DO know about that...

If you meant "dreck", you should have written "dreck". Of course that wouldn't have made much sense--"Anyone for a dreck of cards"?

> Come on, Ace, surrender to authorities like a good little dictator.

I hope Dwight Stewart is reading this and makes some mental connections between your comments above and what I wrote to him earlier.

Dave K8MN

4415. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-17 04:29:02 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <iYQDb.7965$0s2.4954@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 83941

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote

> Lets be honest here, Dave. I seriously doubt his lack of a license, or
> comments (condescending, outragious, or otherwise), would really bother
you
> that much if those comments agreed more with your own views.

I'll take that bet. I happen to agree 100% with LHA that Morse testing is
no longer necessary in the amateur radio service. Even so, I still think he
is an over-pompous posturing twit who could benefit from wider bonding
straps attached to several additional grounding rods.

With all kind wishes for a joyous holiday season,

de Hans, K0HB

4416. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-17 04:37:10 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3FDFDD71.BE6AC4A1@earthlink.net>
Source record: 83942

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3FDE7017.1091EF1C@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >> Three-fourths of all U.S. radio amateurs are NOT members.
> >>
> >> Think on that, Klunk.
> >
> >I've thought about it.
>
> Made your head hurt?

Not at all.

> Poor baby.

I'm not poor and I'm not your baby.

> >One quarter of U.S. radio amateurs ARE members.
>
> A MINORITY.

The LARGEST organization of radio amateurs in this country. The
minority making up the League's membership vastly exceeds your army of
one.

> You still don't understand the difference between "minority" and
> "majority," do you?
>
> >You are not in either camp.
>
> I'm in our home office right now. Haven't been to "camp" for a while.
>
> Why do you ask?

I asked you nothing. Pay attention.

> Is there a morse camp one has to go to in amateur radio?
>
> :-)

Maybe there is a morse camp available. Perhaps it could help with your
morse learning disability. :-) :-)

Dave K8MN

4417. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-17 04:57:56 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3FDFE253.A1C81BDB@earthlink.net>
Source record: 83943

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3FDE6F1A.4559E86B@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >Len Over 21 wrote:
> >>
> >> In article <3FDDA8AD.8023FC6A@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
> ><k8mn@earthlink.net>

> >> Quit trying to sound like a Ba'athist amateur, Klunk.
> >
> >There certainly weren't many of them, kindly old gent. Still, YI1BGD
> >contacts weren't that hard to come by. Rarer still would be a QSL
> >confirming a contact with you on the ham bands.
>
> Rarer still would be the Great Amateur Heil getting above 70 cm.

How would you know?

> So, your only "interest" in radio is contacting "rare ones?"

Excuse me? Where did you see that statement from me?

> Home Depot and Lowes have fine selections of tasteful wallpaper
> if you need some.

...and Toy 'R' Us carries "Clue". Maybe someone will get you a "Clue"
for Christmas!

> Better than QSL cards for the esthetic senses
> of non-radio guests. [you DO have guests, don't you? or are all
> your social contacts of the ham variety?]

Whaddya writing a book? If so, leave out the chapter on my socializing
and make it a mystery.

> >> The League (of Notions) MAKES MONEY on the publication side
> >> of their conglomerate of control.
> >>
> >> Ads in QST pay for everything in the QST staff and the cost of job
> >> printing and fulfillment (publication talk for mailing/distributing).
> >>
> >> The "non-profit" stuff and nonsense is for lowering their taxes.
> >
> >No kidding? Thanks for clearing this up for those of us who've only
> >been members for three or four decades, Len. You're pretty up to date

> >for a non-member, non-radio amateur.
>
> SOMEONE had to clue you in, ignorant one.

Why not regale us with another account of ARRL dishonesty, Foghorn?

> You've been so busy worshipping at the Church of St. Hiram you
> never knew about the BUSINESS side of the League?
>
> Tsk, tsk, tsk.

I'm sure that you're as much an expert on the inner workings of the ARRL
as you are on amateur radio.

> >> You need copies of their IRS forms from 2002 and previous years?
> >> Those are on the Internet.

> >> >I interviewed for a League position years back. The
> >> >salary offered wasn't enough to cover a move and life in the greater
> >> >Hartford area.
> >>
> >> Translation: You were rejected. (boo hoo for you)
> >
> >You've mistranslated. What part of "the salary offered" wasn't clear to
> >you? Are you playing loose with the facts again?
>
> What was the AMOUNT of the salary offering? You never gave any
> "facts," only some CLAIM that "you interviewed."

I have to ask, Len. What business would that be of yours?

> YOUR facts are simply salesmanship doubletalk on "facts." You've
> not given any supportable facts. None.

What part of "salary offered" wasn't clear to you? What is the point of
your attempting make an issue of the matter.

> >> > While I'm sure that salaries are now better, I don't
> >> >think any League staffers are putting up gold-plated Rohn tower and 80m
> >> >yagis at their palatial estates.
> >>
> >> Rohn filed for bankruptcy on account of that?
> >
> >No, I think they waited for decades for your business and it dawned on
> >someone at the plant that it just wasn't going to come about.
>
> I've never gone to Rohn for any towers are antennas. Three other
> commercial firms, Andrew being the oldest (and still solvent).
>
> Why the sudden misdirection into FALSE CLAIMS about some
> company "waiting for my business?"

Sudden misdirection? What was your comment about Rohn's bankruptcy?

> >> You can see the top five staffers' salaries given on their 2002 IRS
> >> forms.
> >
> >And?
>
> It would give you a baseline for MORE creative lying in here about
> "interviewing with the ARRL." :-)

What on earth are you babbling about?

> >> If you are foolish enough to believe that W1AW's station, the
> >> "museum" and all the other paraphenalia came out of dues, you've
> >> got a database gap large enough to sail the USS Enterprise through.
> >
> >I've made no such statement. I know how a non-profit organization
> >operates. I know how the ARRL operates. Sadly, I know how you operate.
>
> I'm not a licensed MD. :-)

...and you're not a license radio amateur either :-) :-)

> >> >With all the dissatisfaction you've expressed, why not start your own
> >> >organization for like-minded hams? I'm sure you'd amass a following in
> >> >no time.
> >>
> >> Three-fourths of all licensed U.S. radio amateurs are NOT members.
> >
> >One fourth, a sizeable number, ARE members.
>
> That's still a *MINORITY*.

It is 25% of all radio amateurs in the U.S. It beats your one of a
kind.

> Hello? Are you rational yet?
>
> >There are also Associate
> >Members who are not licensees.
>
> NON-VOTING. They can't "decide" a damn thing in League things.

Why would they expect to?

> >You aren't a Full Member nor are you an Associate Member.
>
> So, everyone is not allowed to comment on anything if they
> are not a "member?"

Comment all you like. You have no say in ARRL matters.

> The League is a POLITICAL ENTITY. They lobby.

That is certainly a part of what the ARRL does, and it does it very,
very well.

> The League is OPEN FOR COMMENTARY BY EVERYONE,
> senior.

You can stand outside and comment your buns off. They don't amount to a
hill of beans. Non-members have no vote.

> The First Amendment of the United States Constitution allows
> EVERY CITIZEN to comment.

...not from inside an organization it doesn't. The ARRL isn't required
to listen to or act on your comments.

> Except in your amateur universe...
>
> >> That should be evidenciary. To all but the minority who are members.
> >
> >So, to see if we have your latest yarn straight, ARRL members aren't
> >aware that there are others who are not members?
>
> Bad attempt at editing and word cut-and-pasting, senior.
>
> TAKE THINGS IN CONTEXT.

I took them in context. Go back and read your own words. Don't forget
to look at the those you snipped. You'll need them for clarity.

> >> Members "KNOW what is good for all the others" and therefore they
> >> are the elite.
> >
> >Other than you, who issues such statements? What is any of this to you
> >as an outsider to amateur radio and the ARRL?
>
> Does such statements upset you?

Who has issued such statements? What is any of this to you?

> See a real MD...or psychiatric specialist.
>
> You need one.

Oh, are you an expert on medicine as well as amateur radio?

> >> The League (of Notions) still holds on vainly to the idea that morse
> >> code is still the ultimate of amateur skills...long after the rest of the
> >> radio world has given it up, discarded it for communications.
> >
> >Maybe you can point us to some place on the ARRL web site where such a
> >statement is made.
>
> Maybe you can go to another Scientology office and get "clear" so
> that you can see years and years and years of propagandizing of
> and for morsemanship.

So you can't provide us with anything to back your latest wild claim.

Dave K8MN

4418. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-17 05:05:26 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3FDFE415.77B6F92@earthlink.net>
Source record: 83944

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3FDE6BAD.DD80477C@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >If you've been paying attention, I was offered a job with the ARRL. I
> >turned it down. Are you playing loose with facts again?
>
> What "facts" Ripley? You made a CLAIM. An UNSUPPORTED
> CLAIM.

> Get someone to vouch for your "job interview," someone in the
> League who was there at the time.

Do your own leg work, Windy. If it bothers you, why not contact Dave
Sumner and confirm it with him. The year was 1975.

> I'll be generous and accept State Department notification (if on
> official letterhead stationery). :-)

> Or, knowing State, on their official stationary...

Remember the N2EY profile of your likely actions? I think it is about
time we dust it off.

> >> No wonder you are so bitter.
> >
> >I think you must have me mixed up with you. I'm a radio amateur. You
> >are a bystander.
>
> Nope. I've been IN RADIO longer than you have, done more in radio
> and electronics than you have. I'm a PROFESSIONAL.

Then you are simply in the wrong newsgroup. This one has to do with
amateur radio, Windy. Statistics will even things out in the long run.

> Been a professional in radio longer than you have, too. :-)
>
> Now, did you have some comment on morse code test retention and
> "how that so terribly affects your ability to perform as an amateur?"
>
> I'm sure that anyone daring to express the thought that the morse test
> should be eliminated gives you the terrible shivers as an amateur.
>
> We can't have Kolonel Klunk getting emotionally upset, can we?

Look, Foggy--Any change in amateur regulations or in the licensing of radio amateurs effects me directly because I am a user of those segments of the radio spectrum designated for use by radio amateurs. Those changes would have no impact on someone who is not a licensed amateur--someone like you.

Dave K8MN

4419. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-17 10:03:12 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031217050312.02537.00002101@mb-m23.aol.com>
Source record: 83945

These are the number of unexpired FCC ARS
licenses held by individuals on the dates listed:

As of May 14, 2000:

Novice - 49,329
Tech - 205,394
Tech Plus - 128,860
General - 112,677
Advanced - 99,782
Extra - 78,750
Total - 674,792

As of December 15, 2003:

Novice - 32,792 (decrease of 16,537)
Technician - 259,563 (increase of 54,169)
Technician Plus - 63,689 (decrease of 65,396)
General - 141,431 (increase of 28,754)
Advanced - 82,092 (decrease of 17,690)
Extra - 104,798 (increase of 26,048)
Total - 684,140 (increase of 9,348)

73 de Jim, N2EY

4420. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-17 10:29:28 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <ceWDb.1551$wL6.52@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 83946

"Dave Heil" wrote:
> "Dwight Stewart" wrote:
> > (snip)
>
> I'm sorry, I can't agree with your new age
> "everyone's opinion has value" when the
> topic is something in which someone has
> no background. (snip)

Really? So, if you have no background in senior levels of government or no background in the issues at hand, you don't offer opinions when the government decides to makes policy decisions (taxes, immigration, welfare, social security, foreign affairs, and so on)? I find that highly unlikely, Dave. Code testing is a government decision/policy. And the right of the people to have a say in government decisions and policies is not "new age" thing.

> I take it that you believe that your opinions
> on child birth would be meaningful or
> relevant to a woman who has had several
> children and that your views on space flights
> would be found useful to NASA engineers.

Nice dodge, Dave. But we're not talking about a woman with several children or NASA engineers - this is a discussion about government policy. And, when it come to that (even abortion and NASA financing), I do expect my views to matter. After all, my tax dollars are paying for it. Code testing is also a government policy and the radio frequencies involved belong to all Americans.

> > I didn't know a "special" knowledge or
> > background was required. It doesn't take
> > great knowledge, or an indepth background,
> > to see that Morse code is a declining skill
> > throughout the radio world.
>
> Not in amateur radio, it isn't. Now you see that
> you and Len share a common mistaken view.
> Each of you might have a desire to see it as a
> truth but reality doesn't seem to bear it out.

What mistaken view - that the rest of the radio world must be considered when discussing code testing? If so, you're the one mistaken here. The FCC itself has even taken that view in the Report & Order following the last round of restructuring when they said;

"We are persuaded that because the amateur service is fundamentally a technical service, the emphasis on Morse code proficiency as a licensing requirement does not comport with the basis and purpose of the service. We note, moreover, that the design of modern communications systems, including personal communication services, satellite, fiber optic, and high definition television systems, are based on digital communication technologies. We also note that no communication system has been designed in many years that depends on hand-keyed telegraphy or the ability to receive messages in Morse code by ear. In contrast, modern communication systems are designed to be automated systems. Given the changes that have occurred in communications in the last fifty years, we believe that reducing the emphasis on telegraphy proficiency as a licensing requirement will allow the amateur service to, as it has in the past, attract technically inclined persons, particularly the youth of our country, and encourage them to learn and to prepare themselves in the areas where the United States needs expertise."

The FCC went on to later say;

"We also note that most amateur radio operators who choose to provide emergency communication do so, according to the amateur radio press, using voice or digital modes of communication, in part, because information can be exchanged much faster using these other modes of communication. Further, we note that in traditional emergency services, such as police, fire, and rescue, there is no requirement that emergency service personnel hold amateur radio licenses or any other license that requires telegraphy proficiency. We conclude, therefore, that telegraphy proficiency is not a significant factor in determining an individual's ability to provide or be prepared to provide emergency communications."

Note the references throughout to other radio services and to other,
non-Amateur, radio technologies. If we're going to remain a valuable radio
service, worthy of the massive frequencies we hold and unlike personal radio
services (CB), then our ability to fit with and contribute to those outside
Amateur Radio must be a factor in this discussion.

> > Lets be honest here, Dave. I seriously doubt
> > his lack of a license, or comments (condescending,
> > outragious, or otherwise), would really bother you
> > that much if those comments agreed more with
> > your own views.
>
> Really? Have you noticed a single occasion where
> I've supported the posts of Bruce?

I also haven't noticed an ongoing effort to criticize and ridicule Bruce's
posts as you've done with Len's.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

4421. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-17 10:42:58 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <SqWDb.1557$wL6.970@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 83947

"Dee D. Flint" wrote:
>
> Philosophically you are right Dwight.
> However, Len has a long history of
> diatribes and disjointed rambles that
> do not hang together. He is simply
> trying to agitate. I've kill filed his
> various aliases because of it. (snip)

I can think of several others here who could easily fit into that description, Dee. Len is indeed confrontational, but I've noticed the biggest complainers seem to be those who disagree more with his opinions then his demeaner - these same people seem to object far less when someone with a similar demeanor posts opinions similar to their own.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

4422. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-17 11:03:08 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <MJWDb.1562$wL6.285@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 83948

"Dave Heil" wrote:
>
> I hope Dwight Stewart is reading this
> and makes some mental connections
> between your comments above and
> what I wrote to him earlier.

I'm following along, Dave. You seem to be giving just as much as you get. Len is working hard to pull your strings and you're working hard to pull just as many strings yourself. And the debate (if you want to call it that) goes on.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

4423. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-17 11:31:56 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <brpfan$1gm@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 83950

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3FDF59AA.A2AFA7DD@earthlink.net...
> Dwight Stewart wrote:
> >
>
> > In the end, the
> > only reason you point to his lack of a license, or try to ridicule his
> > ideas, is that you don't agree with what he has to say. There's nothing
> > wrong with that,
>
> You still don't completely understand so again, I urge that Google
> search. Len isn't just wrong, he's rude and abrasive. Len claims to
> just want civil debate on the issue of code testing. His posts do not
> bear that out.
>
> > but I doubt you are going to sway that many to your side of
> > the argument with such transparent tactics (few are that stupid).
>
> The stupid are those who'd take their ideas about amateur radio or
> amateur radio licensing from one who is not involved in any way with
> amateur radio.
>
> Never underestimate the stupid. They are legion.
>
> Dave K8MN
>

Dwight, Dave loves being smug from inside his book of life...

Kim W5TIT

4424. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-17 11:39:30 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <brpfao$1gm@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 83951

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:%DMDb.16599$P%1.15625710@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
>
> "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> news:brlu6h$3d2@library2.airnews.net...
> >
> > Yep. Why should a person's abilities determine what tax they pay? Is
> there
> > a deduction right now for a lack of abilities? One thing I think ought
to
> > be done away with is elderly folks paying school taxes. It's
ridiculous.
> >
>
> Not at all. The elderly benefited in their youth from public schools and
in
> their productive years from schools for their children. Do you honestly
> think that in that limited time span that the percentage of the tax that
> went to the schools was enough to cover their own education and that of
> their children? My total annual property taxes are less than it would
take
> to send one child to private school for one year. The public schools make
> it up by spreading it over a taxpayer's lifetime. Or are you saying that
> during their working years, a person's property taxes ought to be
increased?
>

Welp, whatever it takes, I suppose...I'm just not a supporter of as much
taxation as there is. And, I think Sr. Ctitizens shouldn't have to pay
taxes and that if that needs to be accommodated, then the school taxes
should be increased during the years of some hereto-undertemined-age-limit
based timeframe. YMMV

>
> Keep in mind that even if a person never has children, they still benefit
> from the public education of the community as a whole. If they did not
pay
> school taxes, they would end up paying increased taxes to support an
> increased number of people on welfare. It's far cheaper to pay school
taxes
> so people can be productive than to support them on welfare.
>

Hmmm, hadn't thought about the people not having kids. If they aren't going
to add to the burden of society (terrible way to put that...but) by having

kids, then they get the break, too. After all...it'd probably come up a wash anyway; a trade for the tax-break they'd get on their annual income for not having to pay school tax if they don't have kids.

I like the idea of giving people who choose *NOT* to have kids breaks (on local school taxes), as well as those who choose to have kids (on federal income tax deductions).

> >
> > Whatever the IRS considers as income...the total taxable income that is
> > reported on a W-2--and that's determined by IRS rules, which ultimately,
I
> > suppose are determined by we the People (yeah, right, but you get the
> gist).
> >
>
> They keep changing the rules on that you know.
>
>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>

Yeah, but this is a democracy--we have a voice in that (pfffffft, right, eh?).

Kim W5TIT

4425. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-17 11:41:41 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <brpfap$1gm@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 83949

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:MJWDb.1562$wL6.285@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> "Dave Heil" wrote:
> >
> > I hope Dwight Stewart is reading this
> > and makes some mental connections
> > between your comments above and
> > what I wrote to him earlier.
>
>
> I'm following along, Dave. You seem to be giving just as much as you
get.
> Len is working hard to pull your strings and you're working hard to pull
> just as many strings yourself. And the debate (if you want to call it
that)
> goes on.
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
>

psssst, I think Len is superior at pulling Dave's strings...

Kim W5TIT

4426. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-17 11:43:51 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <brpfeq$139@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 83952

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:ceWDb.1551$wL6.52@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> "Dave Heil" wrote:
> > "Dwight Stewart" wrote:
> > > (snip)
> >
> > I'm sorry, I can't agree with your new age
> > "everyone's opinion has value" when the
> > topic is something in which someone has
> > no background. (snip)
>
>
> Really? So, if you have no background in senior levels of government or
no
> background in the issues at hand, you don't offer opinions when the
> government decides to makes policy decisions (taxes, immigration, welfare,
> social security, foreign affairs, and so on)? I find that highly unlikely,
> Dave. Code testing is a government decision/policy. And the right of the
> people to have a say in government decisions and policies is not "new age"
> thing.
>

But, Dwight....Dave's principles (if they could be called that) only apply
to others!! Not himself.

Hang in there, though...this one could get good! I am getting popcorn
before I download messages next time!

Kim W5TIT

4427. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-17 11:46:19 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031217064619.12501.00004671@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 83955

In article <ZDMDb.16598$P%1.15625594@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> writes:

>"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
>news:3FDE7017.1091EF1C@earthlink.net...
>> Len Over 21 wrote:
>> > [snip]
>> > Three-fourths of all licensed U.S. radio amateurs "took that view"
>> > and are NOT members.
>>
>> You have no idea of the views held by those radio amateurs who are or
>> are not members of the ARRL, Leonard. You aren't a player from within
>> or without.
>>
>
>And there are simply a lot of people who are not joiners. What percent of
>the seniors belong to AARP? What percent of gun owners belong to the NRA.

What percentage of US hams belong to NCI? (Less than 1%)

>With 1/4 or so of the licensed amateurs belonging to ARRL, it would not be
>surprising to if the ARRL were to rank quite high on the list of target
>group people actually belonging to the organization.
>
>> > [snip]
>> > Three-fourths of all U.S. radio amateurs are NOT members.
>> >
>> > Think on that, Klunk.
>>
>> I've thought about it. One quarter of U.S. radio amateurs ARE members.
>> You are not in either camp.

More than 99% are not NCI members, either.

>It would be interesting to compare the ARRL membership percentage to groups
>like AARP and NRA

Good point!

I would add this, though:

There are currently about 684,000 individuals with US amateur radio licenses. Of these, at least 328,000 hold General, Advanced or Extra class amateur licenses. (I mention this group because they have access to all amateur radio HF/MF bands and modes, at full power). Novices and "Techs with HF" make up at least another 100,000, but their privileges only cover two modes and small parts of four bands.

Not including the five 60 meter channels and the Alaska emergency frequency, the US amateur bands below 30 MHz amount to 3,750 kHz of spectrum.

So why aren't the bands filled to overflowing with amateur signals 24/7? If even 1% of those 328,000 are on the HF/MF bands at any given time, that's 3,280 - a litle more than a kHz per ham, from the bottom of 160 to the top of 10. And that's not counting DX or Novices and Tech-Pluses.

A similar situation exists on VHF/UHF.

The inescapable conclusion is that many of those listed in the database are either totally inactive or only slightly active.

73 de Jim, N2EY

4428. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-17 11:46:21 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031217064621.12501.00004672@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 83956

In article <3FDF59AA.A2AFA7DD@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>Dwight Stewart wrote:
>>
>> "Dave Heil" wrote:
>> >
>> > I'm not at all uncomfortable with it,
>> > Dwight. Len has had his say on countless
>> > occasions. He isn't involved with amateur
>> > radio though he knows some hams. He
>> > has no background in amateur radio from
>> > which to make an informed decision
>> > regarding amateur radio testing. (snip)
>>
>> Dave, I don't have a background in a lot of things (child birth,
>> international affairs with Belarus, NASA space missions, to name just a
>> few), but expect to have a voice in those things when I have something to
>> say and would be darn offended, and very confrontational, if someone told
>me
>> to go away simply because I don't have the proper background. I suspect you
>> would react the same way if you thought what you had to say was relevant.

Has anyone told Len to go away? Not that I can recall.

Len, on the other hand, has told people things like this (direct quote from a
post of his on Oct 28, 2003:)

"Shut the hell up, you little USMC feldwebel. Learn to READ English."

(direct quote from Len Anderson - is that the sort of thing that constitutes
civil debate? Should we look to Len Anderson as a role model?)

Pot...kettle...
>
>I'm sorry, I can't agree with your new age "everyone's opinion has
>value" when the topic is something in which someone has no background.

Everyone's opinion has value, Dave. But everyone's opinion does not have the
same value.

>I take it that you believe that your opinions on child birth would be
>meaningful or relevant to a woman who has had several children and that
>your views on space flights would be found useful to NASA engineers. I
>don't happen to think they would be. If you find that you have an
>interest in a topic, I'd expect that you'd want to study it, learn a
>great deal about it, participate to some degree--in other words, to gain

>experience in the field under discussion. I'd expect, for example, that
>someone who wants to participate to any meaningful degree in regulating
>mining be schooled in mining and that someone who is to particpate in
>the regulation of amateur radio be more than casually familiar with
>amateur radio. If an individual has no background in a field and
>attempted to preach to those actively engaged in that field, I'd not be
>at all upset if that individual became "darned offended" or
>confrontational. In fact, I'd find it fairly easy to go on with my
>life.

Particularly when the inexperienced person deals with opposition to his views
with name calling, insults, factual errors, ethnic slurs, unsolicited emails
containing nudity and other childish behavior.
>
>> And, even if it is true that Len "has no background in amateur radio from
>> which to make an informed decision regarding amateur radio testing," he has
>> nonetheless successfully managed in spite of that to make a decision about
>> code testing which is consistent with the decisions of many within the
>> Amateur Radio Service (people who do have the background you seek).

So? It's like a person who has never tasted ice cream saying that vanilla bean
is 'better' than rocky road. There are plenty of people who will agree with
that statement - and plenty who will disagree.
>
>Well, he'd have to land somewhere on the issue, wouldn't he? He has
>also arrived at a conclusion about code testing and about a minimum age
>for radio amateurs which is at odds with the decisions reached by many
>within the Amateur Radio Service (other people who have a background in
>the subject).
>
>> > He wants morse testing ended. Based
>> > on what special knowledge and
>> > background? (snip)
>>
>> I didn't know a "special" knowledge or background was required. It
>doesn't
>> take great knowledge, or an indepth background, to see that Morse code is a
>> declining skill throughout the radio world.
>
>Not in amateur radio, it isn't. Now you see that you and Len share a
>common mistaken view. Each of you might have a desire to see it as a
>truth but reality doesn't seem to bear it out.
>
>
>> Or to read what the FCC and
>> others have said about Morse code.

Done that.

>> Or to think through the issue.

Done that too.

>> Or to form
>> an opinion based on any or all of that. Or voice that opinion.

Ditto.

And in my opinion, a Morse code test for an amateur radio license is a good idea.

For expressing that opinion, Len has unleashed more name calling, insults, slurs and other childish behavior on me than I can remember.
>
>Which brings us back to an earlier point made by you: that Len's opinion
>should carry the same weight as the opinions of radio amateurs. The FCC
>has said, on a number of occasions, that they'd wait for a concensus
>among radio amateurs. They did not see fit to include SWL's or those
>who worked at a military radio station in Japan fifty years ago. That
>aside, Len has formed an opinion and has, on countless occasions, voiced
>his opinion.

And nobody has stopped him or even tried to. He has flooded FCC with hundreds of pages of commentary even though he has no interest in becoming a radio amateur.
>
>> > (snip) I'm certainly not forced to agree with
>> > his views, to respect his views or to refrain
>> > from sarcasm with regard to his views. (snip)
>>
>> Of course. Just as Len is not forced to leave the discussion just because
>> you think he should.
>
>Please point to one occasion in which I've suggested, requested or
>demanded that the kindly old gent do so.

I cannot recall any, Dave, even after being told, by Len Anderson:

"Shut the hell up, you little USMC feldwebel. Learn to READ English."

Dave did not respond in kind to Len's remarks, btw.

>> > (snip) Len has participated and participated
>> > and participated. (snip)
>>
>> More power to him. He has just as much of a right to do so as anyone
>> else.
>
>Having the right to speak isn't the same as forcing others to listen, to
>accept or to give the same weight to an opinion.

In fact, Len becomes less and less credible over time. His behavior here reduces his credibility.
>
>> > (snip) He wants to participate and to prevent
>> > others from laughing at him or his ideas. (snip)
>>

>> Really? I missed that. How has he tried to prevent others from doing
>> anything?
>
>Go to Google. Select this newsgroup. Enter "Len Anderson". Be prepared
>to devote one or more evenings.

Be sure to use the various screen names he's used here, ("nocwtest", "lenof21",
"averyfine", "averyfineman", "lenover21" (all AOL) because most of his posts
don't contain his name. And he doesn't have a callsign.

BTW, he denied the use of at least one screen name ("averyfine") here. Then he
was angry, insulting and abusive when his mistake was pointed out.
>
>> > (snip) Others are free to participate and may
>> > form their own opinions of LHA's ideas. They are
>> > free to laugh at his ideas, to poke fun of his ideas
>> > and to counter his ideas. (snip)
>>
>> > (snip) I don't like what Len has to say and don't
>> > care for his windy, pontificating and condescending
>> > posts. (snip)
>>
>> Lets be honest here, Dave. I seriously doubt his lack of a license, or
>> comments (condescending, outragious, or otherwise), would really bother you
>> that much if those comments agreed more with your own views.
>
>Really? Have you noticed a single occasion where I've supported the
>posts of Bruce?

Game, set, match.
>
>> In the end, the
>> only reason you point to his lack of a license, or try to ridicule his
>> ideas, is that you don't agree with what he has to say. There's nothing
>> wrong with that,
>
>You still don't completely understand so again, I urge that Google
>search. Len isn't just wrong, he's rude and abrasive. Len claims to
>just want civil debate on the issue of code testing. His posts do not
>bear that out.

What his posts prove is that what Len really wants is for amateur radio to
either go away or become a high power, multiband version of cb. Every post of
his bears that out.

His interest is not in becoming a radio amateur or helping ham radio. His
interest is just the opposite.

Just my opinion.

73 de Jim, N2EY

4429. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-17 11:46:22 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031217064622.12501.00004673@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 83953

In article <f45722ac.0312160339.4fd97376@posting.google.com>,
brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:

>You don't seem to recognize that the desire to modernize the ARS has a
>groundswell of support.

How do you know?

Have you made a scientific survey to determine this "groundswell"?

What constitutes "modernizing the ARS"? Shall we all go out and buy new radios?

>It doesn't need to be filtered through state
>and regional directors, brought up in a board meeting, with lots of
>hand-wringing that there is no clear mandate...

Then what needs to be done? What is the "mandate"?

Some folks make a big deal out of the fact that ARRL's membership is only about
25% of US hams. These same folks ignore the fact that No-Code International's
membership is less than 1% of US hams, despite the fact that such membership
has no dues and no expiration or renewal requirements.

4430. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-17 11:46:23 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031217064623.12501.00004674@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 83954

In article <JhlDb.4658$xH2.1131197@news1.news.adelphia.net>, Dave Bushong <dbushong@adelphia.net> writes:

>If you don't understand it, then allow me to help. The term "separation >of church and state" does not appear in the US Constitution, nor the >Declaration of Independence.

That's right. It's an interpretation that has developed over the years.

>The closest thing to it is in the First
>Amendment, which starts with my favorite five words:
>
>"Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or >prohibiting the free exercise thereof ..."

Exactly!

"Respecting an establishment of religion" means that the state shall neither support nor hinder any particular religion above any other. The most logical way to do that is to separate them.

It must be remembered that in colonial times many of the colonies had "establishment of religion" meaning that tax dollars were spent on specific churches, (almost always the Anglican Church, whether you believed in it or not). There was also a *legal requirement* that an authorized clergyman of that *established church* preside at weddings, christenings, funerals and other religious functions. The Founders did not want that sort of thing in their new country.
>
73 de Jim, N2EY

4431. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-17 12:58:51 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031217075851.23171.00002737@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 83957

In article <brpfao$1gm@library1.airnews.net>, "Kim" <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
writes:

>"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
>news:%DMDb.16599$P%1.15625710@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
>>
>> "Kim" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote in message
>> news:brlu6h$3d2@library2.airnews.net...
>> >
>> > Yep. Why should a person's abilities determine what tax they pay? Is
>> there
>> > a deduction right now for a lack of abilities? One thing I think ought
>to
>> > be done away with is elderly folks paying school taxes. It's
>ridiculous.
>> >
>>
>> Not at all. The elderly benefited in their youth from public schools and
>in
>> their productive years from schools for their children. Do you honestly
>> think that in that limited time span that the percentage of the tax that
>> went to the schools was enough to cover their own education and that of
>> their children? My total annual property taxes are less than it would
>take
>> to send one child to private school for one year. The public schools make
>> it up by spreading it over a taxpayer's lifetime. Or are you saying that
>> during their working years, a person's property taxes ought to be
>increased?
>>
>
>Welp, whatever it takes, I suppose...I'm just not a supporter of as much
>taxation as there is.

Nobody is - that's the easy part.

What services are you willing to give up in order to have less taxation? Less road maintenance and construction? Less police and fire protection? How about cutting the military budget? Education? Social Security? Medicare/Medicaid?

Your post reminds me of the scene in "Simple Life" where Paris Hilton and Nicole Ritchie are at the checkout counter in the supermarket. The total is almost $65 and they only have $50. They bat their eyelashes and ask "Can't we just have it?" (I am not making this up).

>And, I think Sr. Ctitizens shouldn't have to pay
>taxes

Why not?

Many senior citizens have significant incomes, from both employment and investment. Why should they be exempt? They already get an extra persoanl exemption just for being over 65.

Tell ya what, Kim - find a senior citizen of "average income" in your area and pay his/her taxes out of your own pocket.

>and that if that needs to be accommodated, then the school taxes
>should be increased during the years of some hereto-undertemined-age-limit
>based timeframe. YMMV
>
So the people who are struggling to raise and educate their kids, pay for their mortgages and their careers need even more of a tax burden?

>> Keep in mind that even if a person never has children, they still benefit
>> from the public education of the community as a whole.

Unless they grew up outside the USA, they also benefited from the school system that was in existence when *they* were growing up. Even if they went to private school, a public school system existed for them.

>> If they did not
>> pay
>> school taxes, they would end up paying increased taxes to support an
>> increased number of people on welfare. It's far cheaper to pay school
>> taxes
>> so people can be productive than to support them on welfare.
>>
Exactly!
>
>Hmmm, hadn't thought about the people not having kids. If they aren't going
>to add to the burden of society (terrible way to put that...but) by having
>kids, then they get the break, too.

If you think kids are a burden to society, why did you have so many?

And remember that educating children is an investment in their productive power in the future.

Senior citizens can be "a burden to society" (your term, not mine) in the form of Medicare, Social Security, etc. Yet you would give them tax breaks.

>After all...it'd probably come up a
>wash anyway; a trade for the tax-break they'd get on their annual income for
>not having to pay school tax if they don't have kids.

More like not having to pay back for what they got as kids.
>
>I like the idea of giving people who choose *NOT* to have kids breaks (on
>local school taxes), as well as those who choose to have kids (on federal
>income tax deductions).

You forget that the people who don't have kids had public education avaialble
to them when they were growing up.
>
>> >
>> > Whatever the IRS considers as income...the total taxable income that is
>> > reported on a W-2--and that's determined by IRS rules, which ultimately,
>I
>> > suppose are determined by we the People (yeah, right, but you get the
>> gist).
>> >
>>
>> They keep changing the rules on that you know.
>>
>>

>Yeah, but this is a democracy

No, it's a constitutional republic.

>--we have a voice in that (pfffffft, right,
>eh?).
>
Sure we do. Unless you don't vote.

73 de Jim, N2EY

4432. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-17 14:12:30 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3FE0644E.6050803@psu.edu>
Source record: 83958

Dave Heil wrote:
> Len Over 21 wrote:

<snippage>

>>>You are not in either camp.
>>
>> I'm in our home office right now. Haven't been to "camp" for a while.
>>
>> Why do you ask?
>
>
> I asked you nothing. Pay attention.
>
>
>> Is there a morse camp one has to go to in amateur radio?
>>
>> :-)
>
>
> Maybe there is a morse camp available. Perhaps it could help with your
> morse learning disability. :-) :-)

Well, there is this:

http://www.trefoilnet.net/disp/morse.htm

- Mike KB3EIA -

4433. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-17 14:23:28 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3FE066E0.2040107@psu.edu>
Source record: 83959

Dwight Stewart wrote:
> "Dave Heil" wrote:
>
>>I hope Dwight Stewart is reading this
>>and makes some mental connections
>>between your comments above and
>>what I wrote to him earlier.
>
>
>
> I'm following along, Dave. You seem to be giving just as much as you get.
> Len is working hard to pull your strings and you're working hard to pull
> just as many strings yourself. And the debate (if you want to call it that)
> goes on.

Co-dependency? Running for cover now! 8^)

But seriously, you hit on something. These guys really don't mind bashing each other at all. The anger, name calling, and baiting is just stress relief, IMO. So I just sit back and enjoy the show. Might even be a new genre' "Reality Newsgroup"! 8^)

- Mike KB3EIA -

4434. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-17 14:38:06 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3FE06A4B.CDEB9CC8@earthlink.net>
Source record: 83960

Dwight Stewart wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" wrote:
> > "Dwight Stewart" wrote:
> > > (snip)
> >
> > I'm sorry, I can't agree with your new age
> > "everyone's opinion has value" when the
> > topic is something in which someone has
> > no background. (snip)
>
> Really?

Really.

> So, if you have no background in senior levels of government or no
> background in the issues at hand, you don't offer opinions when the
> government decides to makes policy decisions (taxes, immigration, welfare,
> social security, foreign affairs, and so on)? I find that highly unlikely,
> Dave. Code testing is a government decision/policy. And the right of the
> people to have a say in government decisions and policies is not "new age"
> thing.

Offering an opinion and offering a sound opinion based upon experience
can be two quite different things. An opinion offered by someone who
has little or no knowledge of that being discussed isn't likely to be
worth much.

> > I take it that you believe that your opinions
> > on child birth would be meaningful or
> > relevant to a woman who has had several
> > children and that your views on space flights
> > would be found useful to NASA engineers.
>
> Nice dodge, Dave.

Thanks. How did you know that I drive a Dodge?

> But we're not talking about a woman with several
> children or NASA engineers - this is a discussion about government > policy.

Why, Dwight! It was you who brought up those very items. How can it be
a dodge when I respond to them? Let's now discuss them as government
policy. What value would your suggestions on child bearing policy or
NASA policy have to those making decisions?

> And, when it come to that (even abortion and NASA financing), I do > expect my views to matter.

We all have unfulfilled expectations.

> After all, my tax dollars are paying for it. Code testing
> is also a government policy and the radio frequencies involved belong to all
> Americans.

Your tax dollars couldn't provide fuel for a rocket engine test-firing.
Have your view. Speak your mind. Don't expect others to greet your
views with reverence if you have no background in the matter under
discussion.

> > > I didn't know a "special" knowledge or
> > > background was required. It doesn't take
> > > great knowledge, or an indepth background,
> > > to see that Morse code is a declining skill
> > > throughout the radio world.
> >
> > Not in amateur radio, it isn't. Now you see that
> > you and Len share a common mistaken view.
> > Each of you might have a desire to see it as a
> > truth but reality doesn't seem to bear it out.
>
> What mistaken view - that the rest of the radio world must be considered
> when discussing code testing? If so, you're the one mistaken here.

The mistake is in the view that morse use is declining in amateur radio.
It matters not that the morse isn't used much by other radio services.

> The FCC
> itself has even taken that view in the Report & Order following the last
> round of restructuring when they said;
>
> "We are persuaded that because the
> amateur service is fundamentally a
> technical service, the emphasis on
> Morse code proficiency as a licensing
> requirement does not comport with
> the basis and purpose of the service.
> <snip>
> we believe that reducing the emphasis on
> telegraphy proficiency as a licensing
> requirement will allow the amateur service
> to, as it has in the past, attract technically
> inclined persons, particularly the youth of
> our country, and encourage them to learn
> and to prepare themselves in the areas
> where the United States needs expertise."

Morse testing is no longer emphasized as evidenced by the reduction in
speed to five wpm in testing for HF access. Now go out and prepare

yourself in areas where the U.S. needs technical expertise.

> The FCC went on to later say;
>
> "We also note that most amateur radio
> operators who choose to provide
> emergency communication do so,
> according to the amateur radio press,
> using voice or digital modes of
> communication, in part, because
> information can be exchanged much
> faster using these other modes of
> communication. Further, we note that
> in traditional emergency services, such
> as police, fire, and rescue, there is no
> requirement that emergency service
> personnel hold amateur radio licenses
> or any other license that requires
> telegraphy proficiency. We conclude,
> therefore, that telegraphy proficiency is
> not a significant factor in determining an
> individual's ability to provide or be
> prepared to provide emergency
> communications."
>
> Note the references throughout to other radio services and to other,
> non-Amateur, radio technologies. If we're going to remain a valuable radio
> service, worthy of the massive frequencies we hold and unlike personal radio
> services (CB), then our ability to fit with and contribute to those outside
> Amateur Radio must be a factor in this discussion.

Nothing in a five word per minute morse test prevents you from
performing public service work to your heart's content via digital or
voice modes. This public service work, according to FCC, is something
you may or may not choose to do. It is not mandatory.

> > > Lets be honest here, Dave. I seriously doubt
> > > his lack of a license, or comments (condescending,
> > > outragious, or otherwise), would really bother you
> > > that much if those comments agreed more with
> > > your own views.
> >
> > Really? Have you noticed a single occasion where
> > I've supported the posts of Bruce?
>
> I also haven't noticed an ongoing effort to criticize and ridicule Bruce's
> posts as you've done with Len's.

To be very honest, Dwight, Bruce is rather a dim bulb and I seldom read
his posts, much less respond to them. Is an ongoing effort necessary or
am I permitted to choose to which posts I'll respond?

Dave K8MN

4435. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-17 14:39:59 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3FE06ABF.ACC9D608@earthlink.net>
Source record: 83961

Kim W5TIT wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:3FDF59AA.A2AFA7DD@earthlink.net...
> > Dwight Stewart wrote:
> > >
> >
> > > In the end, the
> > > only reason you point to his lack of a license, or try to ridicule his
> > > ideas, is that you don't agree with what he has to say. There's nothing
> > > wrong with that,
> >
> > You still don't completely understand so again, I urge that Google
> > search. Len isn't just wrong, he's rude and abrasive. Len claims to
> > just want civil debate on the issue of code testing. His posts do not
> > bear that out.
> >
> > > but I doubt you are going to sway that many to your side of
> > > the argument with such transparent tactics (few are that stupid).
> >
> > The stupid are those who'd take their ideas about amateur radio or
> > amateur radio licensing from one who is not involved in any way with
> > amateur radio.
> >
> > Never underestimate the stupid. They are legion.

>
> Dwight, Dave loves being smug from inside his book of life...

Speak of the devil...

Dave K8MN

4436. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-17 14:48:58 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3FE06CD9.EFC66B24@earthlink.net>
Source record: 83962

Mike Coslo wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> > Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> <snippage>
>
> >>>You are not in either camp.
> >>
> >> I'm in our home office right now. Haven't been to "camp" for a while.
> >>
> >> Why do you ask?
> >
> >
> > I asked you nothing. Pay attention.
> >
> >
> >> Is there a morse camp one has to go to in amateur radio?
> >>
> >> :-)
> >
> >
> > Maybe there is a morse camp available. Perhaps it could help with your
> > morse learning disability. :-) :-)
>
> Well, there is this:
>
> http://www.trefoilnet.net/disp/morse.htm

I think you've come up with some valueable aids for overcoming Len's
inertia.

Dave K8MN

4437. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-17 14:54:51 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3FE06E39.262D5BEA@earthlink.net>
Source record: 83963

> Dave Heil wrote:
> > Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> <snippage>
>
> >>>You are not in either camp.
> >>
> >> I'm in our home office right now. Haven't been to "camp" for a while.
> >>
> >> Why do you ask?
> >
> >
> > I asked you nothing. Pay attention.
> >
> >
> >> Is there a morse camp one has to go to in amateur radio?
> >>
> >> :-)
> >
> >
> > Maybe there is a morse camp available. Perhaps it could help with your
> > morse learning disability. :-) :-)

Here, Len--I found one for you. Maybe a few of the lads will be able to provide you some helpful pointers.

http://www.shohola.com/hamradio.html

Dave K8MN

4438. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-17 16:54:29 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0312170854.1acfabd2@posting.google.com>
Source record: 83964

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20031215234333.21457.00002779@mb-m10.aol.com>...

> What "facts" Ripley? You made a CLAIM. An UNSUPPORTED
> CLAIM.

Like your CLAIM to obtain an "Extra Lite out of the box"...?!?!

Like your CLAIM about aeronautical qualifications...?!?!?

Like your...oh, forget it...I could go on and on like this all
day...

> >> No wonder you are so bitter.
> >
> >I think you must have me mixed up with you. I'm a radio amateur. You
> >are a bystander.
>
> Nope.

Yep. You are NOT a licensed Radio Amateur. This is a fact.

> I've been IN RADIO longer than you have, done more in radio
> and electronics than you have. I'm a PROFESSIONAL.

No, you are not.

"Professionals" do not conduct themselves the way you do. You
are a documented pathological liar and antagonist. You are not a
trustworthy person.

> Now, did you have some comment on morse code test retention and
> "how that so terribly affects your ability to perform as an amateur?"

Do YOU have a comment on how Morse Code testing (or lack of)
affects YOUR ability to perform as an amateur, Lennie?

Ooops...forgot...You are not a licensed Amateur...Just a
bystander. A boistrous bystander at that.

> I'm sure that anyone daring to express the thought that the morse test
> should be eliminated gives you the terrible shivers as an amateur.
>
> We can't have Kolonel Klunk getting emotionally upset, can we?

More of your "I'm only here to civilly debate the Morse Code
test" technique, Lennie...?!?!

Or yet another example of what a lying sack of excrement you are?

(That was a rhetorical question, Lennie...Don't sweat coming up with an answer...You can't.)

Steve, K4YZ

4439. Re: Why I Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-17 17:00:16 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <AY%Db.1836$wL6.508@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 83965

"Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
news:3FDF7B49.6080200@psu.edu...
> Dan/W4NTI wrote:
> > "Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
> > news:3FDF1343.5090202@psu.edu...
> >
> >>Harry Wolf wrote:
> >>
> >>>Put another way, you paid your ARRL life membership, you now
> >>>know that was a very poor decision, so you are now desperately
> >>>trying to rationalize your poor decision to yourself & us.
> >>>
> >>>73 de Harry in Abilene
> >>>
> >>>
> >>>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> >>>news:20031215235832.07961.00000569@mb-m03.aol.com...
> >>>
> >>>
> >>>>In no particular order:
> >>>>
> >>>>1) Representation of amateur radio (what other organization or
> >>>
> > individual
> >
> >>>would
> >>>
> >>>
> >>>>do anyhting like the 121 page commentary on BPL?)
> >>>>
> >>>>2) QST and other publications (only the RSGB Handbook is comparable)
> >>>>
> >>>>3) Contests and operating activities (particularly SS and FD)
> >>>>
> >>>>4) Product reviews (much more in-depth than any other amateur
> >>>
> > publication)
> >
> >>>>5) Elected officials (they listen even if they don't agree)
> >>>>
> >>>>6) W1AW (been there and operated the station, too)
> >>>>
> >>>>73 de Jim, N2EY
> >>>

> >>Or put yet another way, probably quite closer to the truth, is that
> >>he's paid his dues and likes it just fine.
> >>
> >>If you don't like the ARRL, that's fine. You don't have to be so bitter
> >>about it, though!
> >>
> >>
> >>- Mike KB3EIA -
> >>
> >>
> >>- happily getting more than my money's worth out of the league.....
> >>
> >
> >
> > Harry is whats knows as a 'spoiler'. Sort of like a field mouse coming
into
> > your house, crapping all over it, chewing up what he can, and then
running
> > away to hide.
> >
> > Don't worry about it. There are so many of them on usenet you need a
score
> > card to keep up.
>
>
> Yeah, but so many.... so many!
>
>
>
> I wonder how they wasted their time and annoyed people before usenet?
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -
>
The 'lucky ones' did it to their wives, or husbands. And if they got away
with that they spread it around their neighborhood. Until they ran into
'Bubba'. At which point it ALL stopped.

Now we have usenet. And they can't be found, well not quite so easily
anyway. So they feel safe.

Dan/W4NTI

4440. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-17 17:25:08 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0312170925.66633aa0@posting.google.com>
Source record: 83966

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20031216151212.07346.00002164@mb-m26.aol.com>...

> Yes you are. Your beligerance keeps on.

"I am only here to civilly debate the Morse Code test
issue"...LHA

> Yup, beligerance with flags and banners waving...

"I am only here to civilly debate the Morse Code test
issue"...LHA

> Klunk, you are indeed weird as well as beligerant to
> say that amateur radio is somehow so "unique" that it
> is totally different from all other radio!

"I am only here to civilly debate the Morse Code test
issue"...LHA
>
> The physics of amateur radio is the SAME as the physics
> of all other radio.

"I am only here to civilly debate the Morse Code test
issue"...LHA

> The jargon, patois, colloquialisms of amateur radio
> communicating MIGHT be considered "different" than all
> other radio services, but that is as easily picked up by
> anyone going from one lodge hall to another. 10-4?

"I am only here to civilly debate the Morse Code test
issue"...LHA

> >He wants morse testing ended.
>
> Yes.
>
> >Based on what special knowledge and background?
>
> Based on 50 1/2 years of radio communications without
> ever needing it or having to know it to "work HF."

Based on absolutely ZERO experience in Amateur Radio.

> Based on four decades of direct design engineering for
> communications which considers ALL available modes.

Based on absolutely ZERO experience in Amateur Radio.

> Based on knowing the literature and history of ALL
> radio communications, not the limited spoon-feeding
> of knowledge from amateur fraternal organizations.
> ["Shannon's Law" was based on teleprinter signals,
> not morse code and that Law became public in 1948
> and accepted by the entire world of radio]

Based on absolutely ZERO experience in Amateur Radio.

> Based on the same bullshit heard for six decades
> from elitist morsemen who still think that standards
> and practices are the "same" as in the 1930s.

So far, Leonard H. Anderson, a person not licensed in ANY radio
service, is the only person suggesting that we "think that standards
and practices are the "same" as the 1930's.

(And more profanity from the ALLEGED professional.)

This is because he's extremely ignorant of the facts and arrogant
IN his ignorance.

> Based on what the FCC said publicly in 1990 and
> again in 1999 that a morse code test is not necessary
> for them to grant any amateur radio license.

Based on absolutely ZERO experience in Amateur Radio.

> >He wants a minimum age for amateur radio licensing.
>
> Yes, but I don't make near the BIG THING you try
> to make of it in here, Klunk. I said that on the public
> record on NPRM 98-143 in January 1999 and
> haven't pursued it since.

Based on absolutely ZERO experience in Amateur Radio. And I
might add absolutely ZERO experience in child rearing or participation
in ANY organization or activity that might justify his opinion.

> >Based on what special knowledge and background?
>
> Show us your certificates and pretty paper saying you
> are the EXPERT in everything you pontificate on.

He's licensed. He's EXPERIENCED in the Amateur Radio Service.

Lennie the Liar is not.

> >His right to direct his opinion to his government is intact.
>
> Damn right it is, Herr Robust.

More profanity from the "professional".

> >Government is not forced to agree with his
> >assessment of how amateur radio should be changed.
>
> Who, besides your gloriousness and nobility, said
> it should?

You have, Lennie. You have repeatedly placed yourself above just
about anyone who might express an opinion on radio matters, including
what the FCC should "think".

> [let us know the date of your coronation so that we
> may genuflect and worship your presence...]

"I am only here to civilly debate the Morse Code test
issue"...LHA

> >I'm certainly not
> >forced to agree with his views, to respect his views or to refrain from
> >sarcasm with regard to his views.
>
> You are beligerant and pissed off that anyone DARES
> challenge your arrogance about What Should Be!

Kinda like you, Lennie? Except HE has the credentials to back up
his play.

You don't.

> >Wanting to be involved does not make
> >Len other than a bystander in the world of amateur radio.
>
> Herr Robust forgets that amateur radio licensing is NOT
> dictated by a members-only club. Not in the USA...

And it STILL does not change the fact that his assertion is
absolutely true.

Sorry for you.

> >He is not a
> >part of amateur radio simply because he comments to government or
> >because he posts here.
>
> Neither is this newsgroup some kind of "ARRL South."

Why should it be? Dave lives NORTH of the Mason-Dixon line.

> >> Likewise, I
> >> saw nothing in rules of this newsgroup which would restrict the
> >> participation of non-Amateurs.
> >
> >Len has participated and participated and participated.
>
> Herr Robust has arrogantly proclaimed and issued orders
> and done the whole nine yards of the KH2D bit...on and

> on and on and on and on...

Yet another lie from the desk of leonard H. Anderson.

Sir Scummy is asked to cite the post in which Dave issued any
"orders".

> >He wants to
> >participate and to prevent others from laughing at him or his ideas.
>
> Poor baby, reflections of your own golden eye scowling at
> remarks you receive?
>
> Herr Robust, I was on Usenet before the Internet went
> public and am very, very familiar with what goes on,
> and the inhabitants' attitudes in the cyberspace of
> computer-modem communications...for more than
> two decades.

Obviously yet another lie, or Sir Putzalot would not make so many
"mistakes", including "missent" e mails, misrepresentations of his
identity via multiple screen names, etc etc etc.

> The arrogant - such as yourself - HATE the comebacks
> you get poking holes in your mighty balloons. Ergo,
> you try the "reversal" bit and say that the hole-poker is
> "afraid of being laughed at." Tsk, tsk, tsk.

So far all you have done is call Dave Heil names, Lennie. You've
not "poked holes" in anything, least of all anything he's had to say.

On the otherhand YOU have been caught lying so many times that
you make Jon Lovitz's "SNL" character look like a paragon of
virtue...Morgan Fairchild included...

> EVERYONE takes a chance on posting something in
> public. EVERYONE has to "take" what comes back
> to them...or leave. That includes arrogant Waffle-SS
> colonels.

Including you...or should I say ESPEICALLY you, Lennie?

> >Others are free to participate and may form their own opinions of LHA's
> >ideas. They are free to laugh at his ideas, to poke fun of his ideas
> >and to counter his ideas.
>
> AND AGREE WITH LHA's postings.

Like Brian Burke, the guy who can't provide us with the identity
of a single QSO allegedly made from Somalia...?!?!

Or Vipul Shah...The guy who (like Lennie) CLAIMS to be an
electrical engineer, then changes jobs because his family disaproves
of his job...Yeah...I can see how being a "professional" in an

honorable profession could be a black mark on the old family tree...

And of course we have "MegHz" and a litany of other "anonymous"
posters who leap to Lennie's defense, only to leap right back in to
obscurity.

> Now doesn't that just completely fry your psyche?

If it were true, it might. But even the folks who express the
same sentiments as you (save for the above mentioned fools) don't want
to be even remotely associated with you.

Do you know why?

> However, your ego needs to have you completely in
> control so you've gone into a fantasyland where you
> are Supreme Commander who Knows Truth!

Dig into Mama Lennie's correspondence books, Lennie...Look up
"paranoia" and what symptoms and behaviour manifest with it...

> >> You may not like what Len has to say, but the
> >> lack of a Ham license alone should not diminish it or dismiss it.
> >
> >There's no "may" involved. I don't like what Len has to say and don't
> >care for his windy, pontificating and condescending posts.
>
> All the readers have "noticed" your opinion...

As we have yours...along with your LACK of practical experience
in the Amateur Radio Service to back it up.

> >If you've
> >read Len's stuff, you'll have no difficulty in understanding that his
> >lack of an amateur license is not the only reason for making light of
> >his opinions regarding amateur radio licensing.
>
> The Supreme Commander has spoken!

And it's the truth...Whether you care to accept it or not.

> There is NO First Amendment in regards to ham radio
> regulations!

The First Amendment bars the GOVERNMENT from infringing on Free
Speech...I thought you would ahve learned that somewhere in the 14
eyars of night school you alleged to ahve completed.

> All amateur licensing regulations are handled STRICTLY
> by the existing amateur licensees!
>
> Supreme Commanders don't give a damn about
> anyone who doesn't agree with his arrogant
> pontificating orders of the day!

>
> Sick transit, gloria mundi...

Didn't ahve the "nads" to sign your post again, I see, Lennie.

PUTZ!

Steve, K4YZ

4441. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-17 17:28:10 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0312170928.60dfc5a7@posting.google.com>
Source record: 83967

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20031215234329.21457.00002776@mb-m10.aol.com>...
> In article <3FDE7172.BF1D62F0@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >Len Over 21 wrote:
> >
> >> Problem is that Believers are in the minority...but they cannot ever
> >> see that or they are so set that what they think is the absolute
> >> "they know what is best."
> >
> >But, Len, you think you know what is best for amateur radio and you
> >aren't even involved. You're pretty much of a minority.
>
> I've not claimed to "know what is best for amateur radio."

Leonard H. Anderson is a liar. Again.

> Come on, Ace, surrender to authorities like a good little dictator.

"I am only here to civilly debate the Morse Code test issue"...LHA

Steve, K4YZ

4442. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-17 18:12:56 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <I01Eb.2926$Ts5.274@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 83968

"Dave Heil" wrote:
> Dwight Stewart wrote:
> >
> > But we're not talking about a woman with
> > several children or NASA engineers - this
> > is a discussion about government policy.
>
> Why, Dwight! It was you who brought up
> those very items. How can it be a dodge
> when I respond to them? (snip)

As you know, they (child birth and NASA) were brought up in a discussion about government policy. Your reply was a dodge because you tried to apply those comments to something other than government policy rather than addressing them in the context they were made.

> (snip) What value would your suggestions on
> child bearing policy or NASA policy have to
> those making decisions? (snip)

We were talking about opinions, not suggestions. My opinions affect how I vote, which effects who is elected, which effects where tax dollars are spent, and so on. My opinions, voiced to others, may affect their opinions, which effects who is elected, and so on. Is this process all that unfamiliar to you?

> (snip) Don't expect others to greet your views
> with reverence if you have no background in the
> matter under discussion. (snip)

Don't be so vain, Dave. You don't speak for "others" and I don't expect anything from you.

> (snip) The mistake is in the view that morse use
> is declining in amateur radio. (snip)

I haven't said Morse use is declining in Amateur Radio. My exact words were "...Morse code is a declining skill throughout the radio world." Considering far fewer people in radio today are using code compared to just few decades ago, that isn't exactly an astonishing revelation, is it?

> (snip) It matters not that the morse isn't used much
> by other radio services. (snip)

Oh, it most certainly does matter. As I've already stated, if we're going to remain a valuable radio service, worthy of the massive frequencies we hold and unlike personal radio services (CB), we must consider the needs of

the other radio services when discussing any licensing issue - including code testing.

The FCC did exactly that in the Report & Order following the last round of restructuring when they looked at personal communication services, satellite communications, fiber optic communications, high definition television systems, and police, fire, and rescue communications. In that Report & Order, the FCC stated that "...no communication system has been designed in many years that depends on hand-keyed telegraphy or the ability to receive messages in Morse code by ear" and that "...the emphasis on Morse code proficiency as a licensing requirement does not comport with the basis and purpose of the service." Finally, the FCC said, "...reducing the emphasis on telegraphy proficiency as a licensing requirement will allow the amateur service to, as it has in the past, attract technically inclined persons, particularly the youth of our country, and encourage them to learn and to prepare themselves in the areas where the United States needs expertise." In my opinion, the exact same argument could be made for eliminating telegraphy proficiency as a licensing requirement.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

4443. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-17 18:15:01 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <F21Eb.2928$Ts5.2763@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 83969

"Kim W5TIT" wrote:
>
> (snip) Hang in there, though...this one could
> get good! I am getting popcorn before I
> download messages next time!

Pop me up some popcorn while you're at it. :-)

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

4444. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-17 18:28:31 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <jf1Eb.2934$Ts5.2437@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 83970

"Mike Coslo" wrote:
>
> Co-dependency? Running for cover now! 8^)
>
> But seriously, you hit on something. These guys
> really don't mind bashing each other at all. The
> anger, name calling, and baiting is just stress
> relief, IMO. So I just sit back and enjoy the
> show. Might even be a new genre' "Reality
> Newsgroup"! 8^)

I would suggest a wider audience (a reality TV show, for example), but perhaps it is better that all this stays here in the newsgroup though. I'm not exactly sure the world outside is ready for the sense of reality shown by some in this newsgroup. They may just decide to lock the whole darn bunch of us up in the loony house.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

4445. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-17 20:44:12 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031217154412.07961.00000599@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 83971

In article <brpfap$1gm@library1.airnews.net>, "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
writes:

>> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>>
>> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
>>
>
>psssst, I think Len is superior at pulling Dave's strings...

Shhhh...don't tell anybody... :-) :-) :-)

LHA

4446. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-17 20:44:12 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031217154412.07961.00000600@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 83972

In article <f45722ac.0312170354.3bfc410a@posting.google.com>,
brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:

>> It should be clear that there will never be any "consensus" on
>> code testing as long as such beligerance remains rooted among
>> the self-styled elite morsemen of U.S. amateur radio.
>>
>> LHA
>
>Darn-it, Len, I wanted Dee to say those things.

She never will... :-)

>I think those endless droplets of water falling and hitting her
>between the eyes, while listening to Farnsworth-spaced propoganda from
>W1AW will be hard to undo.

Nah. It's a more subtle form of propaganda...lying by omission.

Any organization that has a large media base can do that bit
by simply omitting content that is unfavorable to the media Hq.

They control the media content.

If the high wire-pullers at the League want to emphasize code by
deemphasizing all other modes, they have perfect control to do so.

No one else will be the wiser if all the news-events-doings comes
their way via League-controlled information. Everyone is captive
if they don't have other sources of information. Very subtle.

LHA

4447. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-17 23:00:39 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <re5Eb.17007$P%1.15792522@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 83973

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:SqWDb.1557$wL6.970@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> "Dee D. Flint" wrote:
> >
> > Philosophically you are right Dwight.
> > However, Len has a long history of
> > diatribes and disjointed rambles that
> > do not hang together. He is simply
> > trying to agitate. I've kill filed his
> > various aliases because of it. (snip)
>
>
> I can think of several others here who could easily fit into that
> description, Dee. Len is indeed confrontational, but I've noticed the
> biggest complainers seem to be those who disagree more with his opinions
> then his demeaner - these same people seem to object far less when someone
> with a similar demeanor posts opinions similar to their own.
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
>

You haven't seen the worst of his diatribes. There is no one else in this news group that I have kill filed. For example, you and I do not agree on a number of issues but I would not consider putting you in the kill file. Your writings are well constructed and generally stick to the point of the particular discussion. Thus one can have a give and take discussion presenting opinions and data to back those opinions.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

4448. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-17 23:13:08 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <8q5Eb.17010$P%1.15794615@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 83974

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20031217064622.12501.00004673@mb-m04.aol.com...
> In article <f45722ac.0312160339.4fd97376@posting.google.com>,
> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
>
> >You don't seem to recognize that the desire to modernize the ARS has a
> >groundswell of support.
>
> How do you know?
>
> Have you made a scientific survey to determine this "groundswell"?
>
> What constitutes "modernizing the ARS"? Shall we all go out and buy new
radios?
>
> >It doesn't need to be filtered through state
> >and regional directors, brought up in a board meeting, with lots of
> >hand-wringing that there is no clear mandate...
>
> Then what needs to be done? What is the "mandate"?
>
>
> Some folks make a big deal out of the fact that ARRL's membership is only
about
> 25% of US hams. These same folks ignore the fact that No-Code
International's
> membership is less than 1% of US hams, despite the fact that such
membership
> has no dues and no expiration or renewal requirements.
>
>

And let's keep in mind that NCI does have a structure with officers and a board. The detailed policies and procedures were developed by those officers and that board based on the organization's stated goal. Thus it was "filtered" through a limited group.

One thing that the NCI has quite convincingly demonstrated is that HARD WORK is what is required to achieve a goal. Although I don't agree with their goal, I must commend them for getting in there and doing the work required. They did not sit on their hands and whine. They organized on a world wide basis. They lobbied the various governing bodies around the world to support a change in the code requirement at the last ITU conference. It is all the more convincing when one considers the low percentage of hams belonging to NCI. It shows that the minority can prevail if they have the

commitment.

Personally I support code testing but NCI certainly did their homework to achieve their goal.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

4449. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-17 23:17:52 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <Au5Eb.17012$P%1.15795473@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 83975

"Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
news:f45722ac.0312170346.4bcdb086@posting.google.com...
> "Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<iYQDb.7965$0s2.4954@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>...
> > "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote
> >
> > > Lets be honest here, Dave. I seriously doubt his lack of a license,
or
> > > comments (condescending, outragious, or otherwise), would really
bother
> > you
> > > that much if those comments agreed more with your own views.
> >
> > I'll take that bet. I happen to agree 100% with LHA that Morse testing
is
> > no longer necessary in the amateur radio service.
>
> Lots of people agree with that view, a point completely lost on Dee.

No that point is not lost on me. I'm well aware of it. Lots of people
support continued testing, which is a point that is completely lost on you.

>
> Even so, I still think he
> > is an over-pompous posturing twit who could benefit from wider bonding
> > straps attached to several additional grounding rods.
>
> Hans, remove those jack-boots immediately. Death by electric chair
> for mere freedom of speech is unAmerican, even if you do agree with
> him.
>

Well freedom of speech, while allowing verbal abuse, does not make such
verbal abuse as LHA likes to heap on those in this newsgroup acceptable.
Just because one can do something doesn't mean that it is reasonable to do
it.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

4450. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-17 23:43:06 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <eS5Eb.17015$P%1.15799862@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 83976

"Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
news:f45722ac.0312171514.2f3ad477@posting.google.com...
> "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:<fkODb.16624$P%1.15644027@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>...
>
> > No that's not what I'm saying. I'm saying change doesn't happen without
> > work. Since Brian chooses only to complain and not dig in and do the
work,
> > then he can't expect change. Brian's approach of changing because Brian
> > wants the change is the dictatorial approach.
>
> Dictator Dee doth protestith too much.
>
> I think I've been persuasive in my arguments with respect to changes
> within the ARS. We've even got Hans discussing one full license class
> w/o a Morse Code exam requirement, and a learners permit. Gee, where
> have we heard that before?
>
> > No Brian is welcome to his opinion. But if he isn't willing to do the
work
> > to effect a change then he is being unrealistic in expecting that change
to
> > come to pass. That is all. He wants things to change just by saying he
> > wants them to change. I am challenging that self-centered, simplistic,
and
> > unrealistic expectation.
>
> No, Dee. Your self-centered, complex, and unrealistic expectation
> that I lead a coup at the ARRL so that I can then have the ARRL effect
> changes at the FCC is just not going to happen.
>
> Ever heard of working smarter, not harder?
>
> Brian is willing to do the work, but not the work that you have
> demanded of me. Trying to change the ARRL is not my goal. They can
> bumble along for another century if they so choose. And changing FCC
> rules is not within the ability of the ARRL anyway. So where do you
> think I've put my efforts?
>
> You can try to maintain the ARRL status quo by spam-botting RRAP at
> every opportunity, and I think you've got your work cut out for you.
>
> I'll keep changing the ARS one amateur radio operator at a time.
>

> FWIW, it seems to be working.

Sorry but haven't seen you change anyone here. From what I've seen, each and every person here has there own opinion and continues to promote that idea.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

4451. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-18 00:37:41 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <pF6Eb.82$Vv2.41574@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 83977

Dave Heil wrote:
> Mike Coslo wrote:
>
>>Dave Heil wrote:
>>
>>>Len Over 21 wrote:
>>
>><snippage>
>>
>>>>>You are not in either camp.
>>>>
>>>> I'm in our home office right now. Haven't been to "camp" for a while.
>>>>
>>>> Why do you ask?
>>>
>>>
>>>I asked you nothing. Pay attention.
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>> Is there a morse camp one has to go to in amateur radio?
>>>>
>>>> :-)
>>>
>>>
>>>Maybe there is a morse camp available. Perhaps it could help with your
>>>morse learning disability. :-) :-)
>>
>>Well, there is this:
>>
>>http://www.trefoilnet.net/disp/morse.htm
>
>
> I think you've come up with some valueable aids for overcoming Len's
> inertia.

Always willing to help!

- Mike KB3EIA -

4452. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-18 00:42:51 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <fK6Eb.87$Vv2.43275@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 83978

Brian wrote:

> "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:<brpfeq$139@library1.airnews.net>...
>
>>"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
>>news:ceWDb.1551$wL6.52@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
>>
>>>"Dave Heil" wrote:
>>>
>>>>"Dwight Stewart" wrote:
>>>>
>>>>> (snip)
>>>>
>>>>I'm sorry, I can't agree with your new age
>>>>"everyone's opinion has value" when the
>>>>topic is something in which someone has
>>>>no background. (snip)
>>>
>>>
>>> Really? So, if you have no background in senior levels of government or
>>
>> no
>>
>>>background in the issues at hand, you don't offer opinions when the
>>>government decides to makes policy decisions (taxes, immigration, welfare,
>>>social security, foreign affairs, and so on)? I find that highly unlikely,
>>>Dave. Code testing is a government decision/policy. And the right of the
>>>people to have a say in government decisions and policies is not "new age"
>>>thing.
>>>
>>
>>But, Dwight....Dave's principles (if they could be called that) only apply
>>to others!! Not himself.
>>
>>Hang in there, though...this one could get good! I am getting popcorn
>>before I download messages next time!
>>
>>Kim W5TIT
>
>
> Chardonnay goes nicely with popcorn.

BEER goes with popcorn! Especially a nice IPA.

Which reminds me, if there is a rrap get together at Dayton, maybe we can trade off some homebrews.

- Mike KB3EIA -

4453. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-18 03:00:36 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <oL8Eb.8723$Pg1.2095@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 83979

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote

>
> The inescapable conclusion is that many of those listed in the database
are
> either totally inactive or only slightly active.
>

I don't think it's "inescapable" --- in fact, I think it's incredibly
far-fetched to expect that...

1) ...1% of all of us would be on the air transmitting at any given moment,
and....

2) ... even if we were, that more than a fraction of that 1% would be heard
at any given QTH, presuming they're somewhat evenly distributed across the
available 3,750 kHz of spectrum.

I consider myself a reasonably active licensee, perhaps more active than the
average. Other than contest weekends, my transmitter is actually ON THE AIR
transmitting a signal perhaps no more than 60 minutes a week. That's less
than 1% of the time that you could hear on the air, propagation permitting.
If everyone were as active as me, it would take 168 hams transmitting (and
presumably another 168 listening --- total of 336 hams) to keep a single
frequency occupied 24/7. Now if we suppose that on average, each ongoing
QSO occupies 1kHz of spectrum (phone takes up more, morse and data take up
less) we'd need 1,260,000 (336 x 3750) active hams to keep all frequencies
QRL 24/7. Of course this presumes that every QSO would be heard everywhere,
but thanks to the magic of RF propagation, we are able share most
frequencies geographically, and in fact more than two stations can
simultaneously use a single frequency.

So much for your 'inescapable' conclusion!!!

73, de Hans, K0HB

4454. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-18 03:06:13 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <FQ8Eb.8730$Pg1.7583@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 83980

"Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote

> We've even got Hans discussing one full license class
> w/o a Morse Code exam requirement, and a learners
> permit. Gee, where have we heard that before?

Don't flatter yourself, Brian. I've been discussing that notion since the mid 1960's when the FCC and ARRL were busy dreaming up their dis-incentive licensing fiasco.

Sunuvagun, isn't it a shame I've spoiled another of your organ-grinder dance tunes.

73, de Hans, K0HB

4455. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-18 04:32:56 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <brramg$mkh@library2.airnews.net>
Source record: 83981

Just a quick reply:

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20031217075851.23171.00002737@mb-m05.aol.com...
> In article <brpfao$1gm@library1.airnews.net>, "Kim" <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
> writes:
> >
> >Welp, whatever it takes, I suppose...I'm just not a supporter of as much
> >taxation as there is.
>
> Nobody is - that's the easy part.
>
> What services are you willing to give up in order to have less taxation?
Less
> road maintenance and construction? Less police and fire protection? How
about
> cutting the military budget? Education? Social Security?
Medicare/Medicaid?
>

Less road maintenance and construction? For sure. I haven't driven anywhere in Texas since 1979 without some kind of road maintenance or construction going on, literally. Don't need it. It's still going to be congested, there's still going to be accidents, etc. The *only* thing I'd like to see on the roads here is higher stripes or city titties (as they're called). When it rains here, can't see the lane markings.

I couldn't be objective with the police and fire protection. I don't live in an area where I either need a lot of that or see any benefit of it. BUT, I bet the fat could be trimmed from the departments of both entities and we could save some money.

Military budget. Again, how much fat and ridiculous spending is there? I suspect a lot.

Education. Well, let's see. Up north when my kids went to school in the public school system, I cannot remember ever having to buy their school supplies when they were in elementary school. Down here, I pay school taxes PLUS had to spend about $200.00 per kid each year of school up to about 7th grade, for their school supplies. Go figure. And, again, enough fat trimming and I bet the taxes wouldn't have had to be as high as they are.

Social Security, in my opinon, is a farce. Do away with it.

Medicare and Medicaid I am happy to provide for my elderly community. However, again fat trimming probably would save lots of money.

>
> Your post reminds me of the scene in "Simple Life" where Paris Hilton and
> Nicole Ritchie are at the checkout counter in the supermarket. The total
is
> almost $65 and they only have $50. They bat their eyelashes and ask "Can't
we
> just have it?" (I am not making this up).
>

Don't know why my post reminds you of that. I'd more be saying, "why do we need the pretty building, the pretty concrete stars on all the bridge columns, the pretty landscaping along the new highway, the pretty building with all the way overboard amenities for the high-salaried and not-so-worth-their-salary mucky mucks in offices that are plush and grand, etc., blah, blah, blah.

Yep, "why do we need it?"

> >
> >And, I think Sr. Ctitizens shouldn't have to pay
> >taxes
>
> Why not?
>
> Many senior citizens have significant incomes, from both employment and
> investment. Why should they be exempt? They already get an extra persoanl
> exemption just for being over 65.
>
> Tell ya what, Kim - find a senior citizen of "average income" in your area
and
> pay his/her taxes out of your own pocket.
>

Not only no, but hell no. I'd rather see people get pissed off enough at the ridiculous spending that goes on with our tax dollars. Trim all the ridiculous spending, and some of the cuts I am talking about would hardly be noticed.

> >
> >and that if that needs to be accommodated, then the school taxes
> >should be increased during the years of some
hereto-undertemined-age-limit
> >based timeframe. YMMV
> >
> So the people who are struggling to raise and educate their kids, pay for
their
> mortgages and their careers need even more of a tax burden?
>

Did I ask them to "struggle to raise and educate" children? Do I get to have a say in how many kids they have and how lavishly they raise them?

> >> Keep in mind that even if a person never has children, they still
benefit
> >> from the public education of the community as a whole.
>
> Unless they grew up outside the USA, they also benefited from the school
system
> that was in existence when *they* were growing up. Even if they went to
private
> school, a public school system existed for them.
>
> >> If they did not
> >> pay
> >> school taxes, they would end up paying increased taxes to support an
> >> increased number of people on welfare. It's far cheaper to pay school
> >> taxes
> >> so people can be productive than to support them on welfare.
> >>
> Exactly!

Uh huh. And it's a pipe dream to think that having less school tax would
convert to a higher percentage of dropouts.

> >
> >Hmmm, hadn't thought about the people not having kids. If they aren't
going
> >to add to the burden of society (terrible way to put that...but) by
having
> >kids, then they get the break, too.
>
> If you think kids are a burden to society, why did you have so many?
>

So many? How many is so many?

>
> And remember that educating children is an investment in their productive
power
> in the future.
>

And, I am supposed to care about someone else's kid's productive power? Is
that going to lessen *my* tax burden down the road? Am I going to be able
to "get back" from whatever it is they shall be producing? Hardly.

>
> Senior citizens can be "a burden to society" (your term, not mine) in the
form
> of Medicare, Social Security, etc. Yet you would give them tax breaks.
>

Uh, well, yeah. I am closer to being a Sr Citizen than I am of having kids
and raising them again.

> >
> >After all...it'd probably come up a
> >wash anyway; a trade for the tax-break they'd get on their annual income
for
> >not having to pay school tax if they don't have kids.
>
> More like not having to pay back for what they got as kids.
>
> >
> >I like the idea of giving people who choose *NOT* to have kids breaks (on
> >local school taxes), as well as those who choose to have kids (on federal
> >income tax deductions).
>
> You forget that the people who don't have kids had public education
avaialble
> to them when they were growing up.
>

Sounds like a viscious circle.

> >
> >> >
> >> > Whatever the IRS considers as income...the total taxable income that
is
> >> > reported on a W-2--and that's determined by IRS rules, which
ultimately,
> >I
> >> > suppose are determined by we the People (yeah, right, but you get the
> >> gist).
> >> >
> >>
> >> They keep changing the rules on that you know.
> >>
> >>
>
> >Yeah, but this is a democracy
>
> No, it's a constitutional republic.
>
> >--we have a voice in that (pfffffft, right,
> >eh?).
> >
> Sure we do. Unless you don't vote.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

And, many don't. Which is why my tax dollars--hard earned by me--will
continue to be frivolously spent on useless crap; more for the benefit of
"showing off" than for anything truly worthwhile to the public.

Kim W5TIT

4456. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-18 04:35:16 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <brraqr$n0r@library2.airnews.net>
Source record: 83982

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:F21Eb.2928$Ts5.2763@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net...
>
> "Kim W5TIT" wrote:
> >
> > (snip) Hang in there, though...this one could
> > get good! I am getting popcorn before I
> > download messages next time!
>
>
> Pop me up some popcorn while you're at it. :-)
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
>

Hey, no way. Well, OK, way. BUT, I'll pop it and eat it for you. You need to keep busy! LOL

Kim W5TIT

4457. Re: Why I Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-18 04:56:12 UTC
From: Loving the ARRL <No.m@il.here>
Message-ID: <MraEb.580784$Tr4.1558680@attbi_s03>
Source record: 83983
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

I love the ARRL because I'm a fucking Dumb-Ass.

4458. K1MAN...Radio criminal?? Check this out!!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-18 06:21:45 UTC
From: "Chuck...K1KW" <cdoneal@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <YHbEb.385584$Dw6.1240923@attbi_s02>
Source record: 83984
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

http://users.adelphia.net/~k3vr/bs.htm

4459. Re: Why I Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-18 07:55:32 UTC
From: Tommy <Wa4XXXX@NoSpam.com>
Message-ID: <brrmhm$751$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 83985
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

"Loving the ARRL" <No.m@il.here> wrote in message
news:MraEb.580784$Tr4.1558680@attbi_s03...

I love the ARRL because I'm a fucking Dumb-Ass.

I love the ARRL, too, but not because I am dumb.
They don't get a penny from me. Never have, never will.

4460. Re: W5NETs Christmas Card <- reply to all

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-18 10:56:10 UTC
From: wa2si@arrl.net
Message-ID: <b7d1465c.0312180256.259c0264@posting.google.com>
Source record: 83986

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:<RIaCb.12872$Ho3.12015@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> "WA8ULX" [and Others] wrote:
> >
> > (snip)
>
>
> I tried to send cards to everyone I've talked to here recently (23 of you
> in all). However, I'm sure I missed a few. To those I did miss, including
> those just passing through, let me also wish you an early, but earnest,
> happy Christmas and new year. The same to those who celebrate Hanukkah, or
> other celebrations, this holiday season.

Thank you very much for the nice card, Dwight. It was very thoughtful
of you. Sorry my thank you is a tad late...just got around to the P.O.
yesterday.

> I think this is going to be a good Christmas for me - not because of what
> I'm getting, but because I feel like that will be true. And I'm very much
> looking forward to a new year filled with new experiences - even the new
> twists on the old discussions in this newsgroup.

I hope it'll be a great holiday season for you, your family, and
everybody else on R.R.A.P.

> Anyway, with that out of the way, let's get back to those discussions. We
> have a few more days to argue before Christmas (Hanukkah or whatever)
> actually gets here.

The Ten-Tec Orion's review is in this month's QST! Anybody here used
one yet?! If so, impressions pse. :-)

> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

73 de Bert
WA2SI

4461. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-18 11:19:58 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <y3gEb.3204$wL6.2099@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 83987

"Dee D. Flint" wrote:
>
> You haven't seen the worst of his diatribes.
> There is no one else in this news group that
> I have kill filed. (snip)

Oh, yes I have. You forget that I've been fairly active in this newsgroup for a number of years (five, six, maybe more). Len and I have even been on opposite sides of a few "discussions" before. His antics are legendary, but there is humor to it all if you look for it.

there is method to the madness if you look for it.

> For example, you and I do not agree on a
> number of issues but I would not consider
> putting you in the kill file. (snip)

Well, thats' nice to know. ;-)

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

4462. Re: KV4FZ Annual Christmas Message

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-18 11:22:50 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0312180322.4bd3005b@posting.google.com>
Source record: 83988

"Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<7EPDb.7495$Pg1.6720@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>...
> "Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote
>
> > Key? These guys are hard-core. He'll be using two bare copper wires.
>
> And sending with Farnsworth spacing to confound the little red-hatted
> monkeys and ADA transmitter tuner-uppers.

Hans, that's a lot to ask from two bare copper wires.

4463. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-18 12:42:37 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <1hhEb.3421$wL6.208@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 83989

"Dee D. Flint" wrote:
>
> (snip) One thing that the NCI has quite
> convincingly demonstrated is that HARD
> WORK is what is required to achieve a
> goal. (snip) They organized on a world
> wide basis. They lobbied the various
> governing bodies around the world to
> support a change in the code requirement
> at the last ITU conference. (snip) It
> shows that the minority can prevail if they
> have the commitment.

I think you're giving NCI way too much credit, Dee. Indeed, created in the late 90's, they came to the debate rather late and have done little beyond urging members to file comments on related issues before the FCC (no visible government lobbying and no significant world-wide organization - a few members in a few countries). If anything, NCI's most significant contribution, once they did arrive on the scene, has been to serve as a lightning rod for criticism from code supporters, leaving a vastly greater number of non-members relatively free to make the case against code testing wherever possible. Moreover, there would have been no gains at all if there had been no substance to the core arguments against code testing. Those arguments existed, and were being made, long before NCI joined the debate.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

4464. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-18 12:58:44 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031218075844.21642.00003005@mb-m01.aol.com>
Source record: 83990

In article <oL8Eb.8723$Pg1.2095@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>, "Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> writes:

>I don't think it's "inescapable" --- in fact, I think it's incredibly
>far-fetched to expect that...
>
>1) ...1% of all of us would be on the air transmitting at any given moment,
>and....

That works out to 1 hour and 22 minutes of transmitting per week per ham.
>
>2) ... even if we were, that more than a fraction of that 1% would be heard
>at any given QTH,

Very true!

> presuming they're somewhat evenly distributed across the
>available 3,750 kHz of spectrum.
>
That's the really far-fetched part. Distribution won't ever be even or even nearly so, by frequency or time. At 2AM local during sunspot minimum, the 1700 kHz of 10 meters isn't lilkely to be full of signals.

>I consider myself a reasonably active licensee, perhaps more active than the
>average. Other than contest weekends, my transmitter is actually ON THE AIR
>transmitting a signal perhaps no more than 60 minutes a week. That's less
>than 1% of the time that you could hear on the air, propagation permitting.

Well, there you have it. Some would say an hour a week is reasonably active, others would say it's quite inactive, etc. YMMV

>If everyone were as active as me, it would take 168 hams transmitting (and
>presumably another 168 listening --- total of 336 hams) to keep a single
>frequency occupied 24/7.

And that's the point - everyone isn't even as active as you (on noncontest weekends)

>Now if we suppose that on average, each ongoing
>QSO occupies 1kHz of spectrum (phone takes up more, morse and data take up
>less) we'd need 1,260,000 (336 x 3750) active hams to keep all frequencies
>QRL 24/7.

Exactly! And the bands aren't anywhere near that busy - even on contest weekends.

> Of course this presumes that every QSO would be heard everywhere,
>but thanks to the magic of RF propagation, we are able share most

>frequencies geographically, and in fact more than two stations can
>simultaneously use a single frequency.

And then there's things like roundtables and nets.
>
>So much for your 'inescapable' conclusion!!!
>
bwaahaahaa

73 de Jim, N2EY

4465. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-18 12:58:45 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031218075845.21642.00003006@mb-m01.aol.com>
Source record: 83991

In article <MJWDb.1562$wL6.285@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> writes:

>Len is working hard to pull your strings

It isn't a string that Len is pulling. And it's not on Dave.

;-) ;-0 ;-) ;-) ;-) ;-) ;-) ;-0 ;-) ;-0 ;-) ;-) ;-) ;-) ;-) ;-0 ;-) ;-0 ;-) ;-) ;-) ;-) ;-) ;-) ;-0 ;-) ;-0 ;-) ;-) ;-) ;-) ;-) ;-0 ;-) ;-0 ;-) ;-) ;-) ;-) ;-) ;-) ;-0 ;-) ;-0 ;-) ;-) ;-) ;-) ;-) ;-0

4466. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-18 13:42:28 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031218084228.06226.00002069@mb-m19.aol.com>
Source record: 83992

In article <8q5Eb.17010$P%1.15794615@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20031217064622.12501.00004673@mb-m04.aol.com...
>> In article <f45722ac.0312160339.4fd97376@posting.google.com>,
>> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
>>
>> >You don't seem to recognize that the desire to modernize the ARS has a
>> >groundswell of support.
>>
>> How do you know?
>>
>> Have you made a scientific survey to determine this "groundswell"?
>>
>> What constitutes "modernizing the ARS"? Shall we all go out and buy new
>radios?
>>
>> >It doesn't need to be filtered through state
>> >and regional directors, brought up in a board meeting, with lots of
>> >hand-wringing that there is no clear mandate...
>>
>> Then what needs to be done? What is the "mandate"?
>>
>>
>> Some folks make a big deal out of the fact that ARRL's membership is only
>about
>> 25% of US hams. These same folks ignore the fact that No-Code
>International's
>> membership is less than 1% of US hams, despite the fact that such
>membership
>> has no dues and no expiration or renewal requirements.
>>
>>
>
>And let's keep in mind that NCI does have a structure with officers and a
>board. The detailed policies and procedures were developed by those
>officers and that board based on the organization's stated goal. Thus it
>was "filtered" through a limited group.

Excellent point, Dee!
>
>One thing that the NCI has quite convincingly demonstrated is that HARD WORK
>is what is required to achieve a goal. Although I don't agree with their
>goal, I must commend them for getting in there and doing the work required.

>They did not sit on their hands and whine.

Very true - but how much "hard work" was really required?

- They set up a website and a board
- They made a proposal to FCC and two directors went to Washington (on their own nickel, BTW) for an ex parte (3 hour drive at most)

- They petitioned FCC after the treaty changed

>They organized on a world wide
>basis. They lobbied the various governing bodies around the world to
>support a change in the code requirement at the last ITU conference.

How much did that really take?

>It is
>all the more convincing when one considers the low percentage of hams
>belonging to NCI. It shows that the minority can prevail if they have the
>commitment.

And if the governing bodies are already headed in that direction to begin with. We've had a nocodetest amateur license here in the USA since 1991 - that's more than 5 years before NCI was started.

>Personally I support code testing but NCI certainly did their homework to
>achieve their goal.

Agreed!

73 de Jim, N2EY

4467. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-18 14:13:52 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <ACiEb.9500$0s2.606@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 83993

"Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote i

> Is that documentable? Letters and pictures with circles and arrows?

Build yourself a time machine and go back 40 years and look.

73, de Hans, K0HB

4468. Re: Why I Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-18 16:12:40 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <I5udnayzo8vRT3yiXTWc9g@ptd.net>
Source record: 83994

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20031215235832.07961.00000569@mb-m03.aol.com...
> In no particular order:
>
> 1) Representation of amateur radio (what other organization or individual
would
> do anyhting like the 121 page commentary on BPL?)

Representation of what the Board *perceives* to be the wishes of the
membership.
I don't believe that non-members get the same attention on issues as
members, but
that is reasonable, since member dues support the ARRL.

> 2) QST and other publications (only the RSGB Handbook is comparable)

QST has gotten better, with the dropping of a lot of the contest data and
more
focus on a range of articles from beginner to expert level. I'd like to see
more
technical focus on modern stuff and fewer articles on building regen
receivers
with tubes, though.

> 3) Contests and operating activities (particularly SS and FD)

I'm not a contester, but sponsoring such activities is fine (glad they're
not using valuable QST pages for data dumps of results, though ... the
website is a much better venue for that info).

> 4) Product reviews (much more in-depth than any other amateur publication)

The lab does a great job on product reviews.

> 5) Elected officials (they listen even if they don't agree)

YMMV, depending on what area you live in, whether your Director is
open-minded and progressive, etc.

> 6) W1AW (been there and operated the station, too)

I have mixed views on the value of W1AW ... a good museum to "the Old Man,"
but perhaps its services could be provided by alternative means at lower
operating
cost.

Having said all of that, I'll now surprise some of you who have accused me
of being

an "ARRL-hater" (not saying that Jim has made that accusation).

I recently paid the $975 fee and am now a Life Member of the ARRL.

While I've had, and may continue to have, disagreements on some aspects of policy with the ARRL Board, I recognize that the ARRL does do a LOT of good things for the ARS and, in addition to my previous contribution to the BPL
fund, I wanted to support the organization's good works (I can always continue
to fight with them on areas of disagreement :-)

73,
Carl - wk3c

4469. ham radio fruitcakes online

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-18 17:07:20 UTC
From: Brother Stairmeister the Fart-Whistle <xemuiscomming@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <74b5d$3fe1df53$d1cc7967$7486@allthenewsgroups.com>
Source record: 83995
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

Remember the "good ole days" of the 14.313/14.300 wars?
The amazing cavalcade of assorted nuts, goofballs, toilet tics
and freaks that would flock to this on a near-daily daytime
basis? Remember also all the legendary crazies and kooks
that populated 75 meters in the P.R.H. (Pre-Reilly H.) days?

Well....those days are gone forever, unless you have a tape
recording collection of the same. If you wish for those fun
days when 20 and 75 were a non-stop cavalcade of comedic
camaraderie of crapola again....just point your mouse to:

http://www.network54.com/Hide/Forum/243612 (....and click)

I am fairly certain that every kook and goofball that the FCC ran off
of 20 and 75 are now at this URL. See for yourself and decide.

A very amusing place, with funny pictures too!!

Bro. R.G.58AU Stairmaster
First Unification Church of the Divine Fart Whistle
Doha, Quatar
(a fully tax deductible ministry and subsidiary of Halliburton Corp)

RIYADH, Saudi Arabia
13 Dec 2003

Saudi Arabia has officially banned the importation of female blowup dolls
and stuffed
animals, giving merchants three months to dispose of such stock, a
state-owned ewspaper reported Wednesday.

Interior Minister Prince Nayef ordered the ban which was relayed
around the country by the national Chamber of Commerce and Industry,
Al-Riyadh said.

The daily gave no reason for the ban, which could not be confirmed
with government officials Wednesday. Strict interpretations of Islamic
law ban representations of living beings and any exposure of the
female figure.

The ban singled out stuffed-animal toys and female dolls. It did not
mention male dolls, and it was not clear if these were banned as well.
The order also ordered any mannequins for female clothes be "far from
any indecency"

The ban comes at a time when some in Saudi Arabia have questioned whether the country's strict Islamic law fuels Islamic militancy.

Yes, it's another flash presentation:

http://62.189.42.125/12stisofchristmas/12-stis.swf

"The 12 sexually-transmitted infections of Xmas."

Happy holidays!

4470. Re: K1MAN...Radio criminal?? Check this out!!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-18 17:15:07 UTC
From: Brother Stairmeister the Fart-Whistle <xemuiscomming@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <251ac$3fe1e0a2$d1cc7967$7728@allthenewsgroups.com>
Source record: 83996
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

"Chuck...K1KW" <cdoneal@comcast.net> wrote in message
news:YHbEb.385584$Dw6.1240923@attbi_s02...
> http://users.adelphia.net/~k3vr/bs.htm
>
>

He may or may not be a radio criminal, I will leave that to
the FCC to decide.

I do know however that he has no shame.

See:
http://cgi.ebay.com/ws/eBayISAPI.dll?ViewItem&category=1502&item=3066280206

(.......and some stupid schmuck already bid on it too!)

4471. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-18 17:21:11 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3FE1E206.783CF499@earthlink.net>
Source record: 83997

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <brpfap$1gm@library1.airnews.net>, "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
> writes:
>
> >> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
> >>
> >> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
> >>
> >
> >psssst, I think Len is superior at pulling Dave's strings...
>
> Shhhh...don't tell anybody... :-) :-) :-)

Is this the part where you make me one of your playthings or have me
fall into one of your carefully laid snares, Len?

4472. Re: K1MAN...Radio criminal?? Check this out!!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-18 20:02:35 UTC
From: RedOctober90@space.com
Message-ID: <9553ed5f.0312181202.6c020cd0@posting.google.com>
Source record: 83998
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

"Chuck...K1KW" <cdoneal@comcast.net> wrote in message
news:<YHbEb.385584$Dw6.1240923@attbi_s02>...
> http://users.adelphia.net/~k3vr/bs.htm

I thought K1MAN were those amateur radio news programs found in all the bands.

4473. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-18 22:09:02 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <2ApEb.69$IM3.27@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 83999

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20031218084228.06226.00002069@mb-m19.aol.com...
> In article <8q5Eb.17010$P%1.15794615@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D.
> Flint" <deehays@qix.net> writes:
>
> >"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> >news:20031217064622.12501.00004673@mb-m04.aol.com...
> >> In article <f45722ac.0312160339.4fd97376@posting.google.com>,
> >> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
> >>
> >> >You don't seem to recognize that the desire to modernize the ARS has a
> >> >groundswell of support.
> >>
> >> How do you know?
> >>
> >> Have you made a scientific survey to determine this "groundswell"?
> >>
> >> What constitutes "modernizing the ARS"? Shall we all go out and buy new
> >radios?
> >>
> >> >It doesn't need to be filtered through state
> >> >and regional directors, brought up in a board meeting, with lots of
> >> >hand-wringing that there is no clear mandate...
> >>
> >> Then what needs to be done? What is the "mandate"?
> >>
> >>
> >> Some folks make a big deal out of the fact that ARRL's membership is
only
> >about
> >> 25% of US hams. These same folks ignore the fact that No-Code
> >International's
> >> membership is less than 1% of US hams, despite the fact that such
> >membership
> >> has no dues and no expiration or renewal requirements.
> >
> >And let's keep in mind that NCI does have a structure with officers and a
> >board. The detailed policies and procedures were developed by those
> >officers and that board based on the organization's stated goal. Thus it
> >was "filtered" through a limited group.
>
> Excellent point, Dee!

What's the point? Would anyone expect that the creation
of NCI (or just about any other organization) doesn't start
on the initiative of a small group that founded the organization?

> >One thing that the NCI has quite convincingly demonstrated is that HARD
WORK
> >is what is required to achieve a goal. Although I don't agree with their
> >goal, I must commend them for getting in there and doing the work
required.
> >They did not sit on their hands and whine.
>
> Very true - but how much "hard work" was really required?

Depends on how you measure it. I know I made a trip
to the FCC with Carl to make a direct presentation on an
"exparte" basis. There was lots of other stuff done by
different folks (web site creation, process membership donations,
etc.)

> - They set up a website and a board
> - They made a proposal to FCC and two directors went to Washington (on
their
> own nickel, BTW) for an ex parte (3 hour drive at most)

3 hour drive...more like 4-5 hours one way.

> - They petitioned FCC after the treaty changed
>
> >They organized on a world wide
> >basis. They lobbied the various governing bodies around the world to
> >support a change in the code requirement at the last ITU conference.
>
> How much did that really take?

Do you want some sort of accounting :-) :-)

> >It is
> >all the more convincing when one considers the low percentage of hams
> >belonging to NCI. It shows that the minority can prevail if they have
the
> >commitment.
>
> And if the governing bodies are already headed in that direction to begin
with.
> We've had a nocodetest amateur license here in the USA since 1991 - that's
more
> than 5 years before NCI was started.

No argument there and we'll never know the weight of NCI's
role in the 98-143 decisions...but who cares anyway? NCI
did what we did to further the end result. If anyone knew the
result beforehand, let them speak now. failing that, NCI wasn't
about to trust to chance not doing what we did. If, in the end,
it really wasn't necessary, then we don't care. We did what we

believed was necessary to further our cause.

> >Personally I support code testing but NCI certainly did their homework to
> >achieve their goal.
>
> Agreed!

Thanks...and I do think a number of folks in this newsgroup
did not expect anything of significance to come from those of us
that formed NCI in the beginning. Those same people (IMHO)
thought NCI just was a group of people posting in this
newsgroup...they never expected the core of NCI had life
experience in FCC dealings, organization skills, web skills,
legal document writing, etc.

To NCI's credit, NCI commentary was quoted several times
in the FCC R&O on 98-143 to bolster FCC conclusions.
That's a significant accomplishment (IMHO).

Anyway, it has been a relatively good year...even of the FCC
is dragging their feet on droppng code in the USA :-) :-)

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

4474. Re: Why I Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-18 23:32:10 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031218183210.21642.00003041@mb-m01.aol.com>
Source record: 84000

In article <I5udnayzo8vRT3yiXTWc9g@ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
<wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20031215235832.07961.00000569@mb-m03.aol.com...
>> In no particular order:
>>
>> 1) Representation of amateur radio (what other organization or individual
>> would do anyhting like the 121 page commentary on BPL?)

It should be mentioned that Carl has done very significant work in fighting
BPL, both in the form of first-hand observations and measurement of the Emmaus
test site, and commentary to the FCC. But even he, an experienced professional
in the field, cannot equal the resources of an organization like ARRL. (And I
bet he'll agree with me on that.
>
>Representation of what the Board *perceives* to be the wishes of the
>membership.

What else can be expected?

>I don't believe that non-members get the same attention on issues as
>members, but
>that is reasonable, since member dues support the ARRL.

Exactly! Just like NCI...
>
>> 2) QST and other publications (only the RSGB Handbook is comparable)
>
>QST has gotten better, with the dropping of a lot of the contest data and
>more focus on a range of articles from beginner to expert level.

I think the contest info belongs in QST as well as the articles.

>I'd like to see more technical focus on modern stuff

Such as?

Perhaps you could write some articles for QST. I did.

>and fewer articles on building regen receivers
>with tubes, though.

Unless I missed something in the index, in the past 47-1/2 years, QST has had
exactly two articles on building ham band regenerative receivers with tubes.
>
>> 3) Contests and operating activities (particularly SS and FD)
>

>I'm not a contester, but sponsoring such activities is fine (glad they're
>not using valuable QST pages for data dumps of results, though ... the
>website is a much better venue for that info).

I disagree. The mag is permanent, the website isn't. Part of being a journal is to document things for posterity.

I think the contest results, BoD minutes, and Section News belong in QST. As do technical articles.
>
>> 4) Product reviews (much more in-depth than any other amateur publication)
>
>The lab does a great job on product reviews.

And has been for more than 20 years now. If a Product Review saves a member from making just one expensive mistake, a lot of dues are paid for.

Remember the "Maxxcomm Matcher" (sp?).
>
>> 5) Elected officials (they listen even if they don't agree)
>
>YMMV, depending on what area you live in, whether your Director is
>open-minded and progressive, etc.

Every ARRL director and vice-director I've dealt with has been open-minded and progressive. Including our present Atlantic division director and vice director.
>
>> 6) W1AW (been there and operated the station, too)
>
>I have mixed views on the value of W1AW ... a good museum to "the Old Man,"
>but perhaps its services could be provided by alternative means at lower
>operating cost.

How would you suggest they be done?

>While I've had, and may continue to have, disagreements on some aspects of
>policy with the ARRL Board, I recognize that the ARRL does do a LOT of
>good things for the ARS and, in addition to my previous contribution to the
>BPL fund, I wanted to support the organization's good works (I can always
>continue to fight with them on areas of disagreement :-)

I agree with all of that except for one small point. The ARRL is not "them" - the ARRL is "us" (the members). We elect the policy-makers (Directors and Vice Directors) and the Section Managers (who don't make policy, but are the top field personnel in our sections).

73 de Jim, N2EY

"I'm the ARRL"

(and so is WK3C)

4475. Re: Why I Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-18 23:39:36 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0312181539.55a82802@posting.google.com>
Source record: 84051

"Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
news:<I5udnayzo8vRT3yiXTWc9g@ptd.net>...
> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20031215235832.07961.00000569@mb-m03.aol.com...
> > In no particular order:
> >
> > 1) Representation of amateur radio (what other organization or individual
> would
> > do anyhting like the 121 page commentary on BPL?)
>
> Representation of what the Board *perceives* to be the wishes of the
> membership.
> I don't believe that non-members get the same attention on issues as
> members, but
> that is reasonable, since member dues support the ARRL.

This member supports the ARRL. Also, this member did not receive a
questionare when the ARRL was conducting a poll of members and
non-members.

> > 2) QST and other publications (only the RSGB Handbook is comparable)
>
> QST has gotten better, with the dropping of a lot of the contest data and
> more
> focus on a range of articles from beginner to expert level. I'd like to see
> more
> technical focus on modern stuff and fewer articles on building regen
> receivers
> with tubes, though.

Memory lane.

> > 3) Contests and operating activities (particularly SS and FD)
>
> I'm not a contester, but sponsoring such activities is fine (glad they're
> not using valuable QST pages for data dumps of results, though ... the
> website is a much better venue for that info).

The CQWW magazine regularly presents information on the modernizing of
the ARS, and even has space to present contest information.

> > 4) Product reviews (much more in-depth than any other amateur publication)
>
> The lab does a great job on product reviews.

Ditto.

> > 5) Elected officials (they listen even if they don't agree)
>
> YMMV, depending on what area you live in, whether your Director is
> open-minded and progressive, etc.

Apparently they think that they cannot present the needs or want of
both camps until they come to a concensus.

> > 6) W1AW (been there and operated the station, too)
>
> I have mixed views on the value of W1AW ... a good museum to "the Old Man,"
> but perhaps its services could be provided by alternative means at lower
> operating cost.

Commercial gear? Why?

> Having said all of that, I'll now surprise some of you who have accused me
> of being
> an "ARRL-hater" (not saying that Jim has made that accusation).
>
> I recently paid the $975 fee and am now a Life Member of the ARRL.
>
> While I've had, and may continue to have, disagreements on some aspects of
> policy with the ARRL Board, I recognize that the ARRL does do a LOT of
> good things for the ARS and, in addition to my previous contribution to the
> BPL
> fund, I wanted to support the organization's good works (I can always
> continue
> to fight with them on areas of disagreement :-)

I don't disagree that the ARRL is a valuable organization in the US,
and I will continue to support it. However, when it comes to the
future of the ARS, I'd rather stand before the FCC and handle my views
all by myself.

> 73,
> Carl - wk3c

Carl, you should see the NCI bashing being done by Dee and Jim on the
other ARRL thread.

73, Brian

4476. Re: KV4FZ Annual Christmas Message

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-18 23:41:19 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0312181541.2270861a@posting.google.com>
Source record: 84052

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<PuHDb.1316$Ts5.976@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> "Steve Robeson, K4CAP" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:5c01b95b.0312152018.578795ed@posting.google.com...
> > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
> news:<nOrDb.338$Ts5.12@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> > > "W55" <barf@wherblives.net> wrote in message
> > > news:brlarejon0@pita.alt.net...
> > > >
> > > > Does anyone have details for the frequency, time, date of
> > > > KV4FZ's annual Christmas message?
> > > >
> > > > 73 de W55
> > > >
> > > >
> > > 1.816 @ 2359 Eastern Standard Time, Dec 24, 2003.
> > >
> > > CW mode.
> >
> > With a straight key...?!?!
> >
> > Steve, K4YZ
>
> Could be. He may be in SKN.

Ooooh. That's spooky - Silent Key Night.

4477. Re: Why I Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-19 00:02:15 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <berEb.17184$P%1.15991934@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 84053

"Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
news:f45722ac.0312181539.55a82802@posting.google.com...
> Carl, you should see the NCI bashing being done by Dee and Jim on the
> other ARRL thread.
>
> 73, Brian

I have never bashed the NCI. I've stated that I disagree with their goal
but that does not constitute bashing them.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

4478. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-19 00:31:03 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <bFrEb.10043$0s2.7696@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 84054

"Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote

> Hansel, if you don't have the proper documentation then it doesn't count.

Brian, you have me confused with someone who gives a shit how you feel about documentation. In other words, you don't count.

Kill-file=ON. Plonk.

With warmest personal regards,

de Hans, K0HB

4479. Re: Saddam

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-19 00:41:04 UTC
From: "Leland C. Scott" <no-spam@junk-mail.net>
Message-ID: <xLidnVnNadW81H-iRVn-hA@comcast.com>
Source record: 84055

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20031214175824.25815.00005213@mb-m07.aol.com.
..
> In article
<krKdnYXcttH0NUGiRVn-iw@gbronline.com>, JJ
<radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
> writes:
>
> >Saddam Hussein has been captured.
>
> Alive.
>
> >He was found hiding in a hole near Tikrit.
>
> Quite appropriate, don't you think?
>
> Now the question is: what to do with him?

Bush and the Republican party may need him. If
Bush starts to take a beating in the reelection
poles over his actions in Iraq he may well need to
have Saddam come out and admit he had WMD, and
where they are currently. Then Bush can sit back a
say "I told you so!". That's why I don't think
Saddam will get the death penalty and why he
didn't put up a fight. He figures he can cut a
deal with Bush to help his reelection while saving
his own skin in the process. All he has to do is
hold out long enough. It may suck, but hey, its
always been politics over justice in this country.

--
Leland C. Scott
KC8LDO

ARRL Member
NCI Member

Charter member of the
Lawrence Technological University
Wireless Society W8LTU
>
>

4480. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-19 01:09:26 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031218200926.15462.00005055@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 84056

In article <f45722ac.0312181528.1a3a7ef8@posting.google.com>,
brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:

>"Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
>news:<ACiEb.9500$0s2.606@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>...
>> "Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote i
>>
>>
>> > Is that documentable? Letters and pictures with circles and arrows?
>>
>> Build yourself a time machine and go back 40 years and look.
>
>Hansel, if you don't have the proper documentation then it doesn't count.
>
You mean like your alleged /T5 operation?

4481. Re: K1MAN...Radio criminal?? Check this out!!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-19 01:13:57 UTC
From: Mike <mlawson1@twcny.rr.com>
Message-ID: <phsEb.28935$UY6.17985@twister.nyroc.rr.com>
Source record: 84057
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

5.00 for fucking shipping!!!!!

"RedOctober90" <RedOctober90@space.com> wrote in message
news:9553ed5f.0312181202.6c020cd0@posting.google.com...
> "Chuck...K1KW" <cdoneal@comcast.net> wrote in message
news:<YHbEb.385584$Dw6.1240923@attbi_s02>...
> > http://users.adelphia.net/~k3vr/bs.htm
>
>
>
> I thought K1MAN were those amateur radio news programs found in all the
bands.

4482. Re: Why I Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-19 01:18:55 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <xnfcneeyarg.hq3zjoc.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>
Source record: 84058

On Thu, 18 Dec 2003 16:12:40 -0000, Carl R. Stevenson wrote:

>QST has gotten better, with the dropping of a lot of the contest data
>and more focus on a range of articles from beginner to expert level.
>I'd like to see more technical focus on modern stuff and fewer
>articles on building regen receivers with tubes, though.

Yeah, Nuvistors are getting hard to get.

How about reprints of memorable articles from yesteryear? Two from
the 1950s which are still applicable today for every class of licensee
come to mind:

"Guys for Guys Who Have to Guy" (a basic paper on guyed towers)
"Over the Hills and Far Away" (ditto on tropo propagation)

How many of the "frequent poster" club here read them when they
first came out or even some time later?

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

4483. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-19 01:18:56 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <xnfcneeyarg.hq40v3d.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>
Source record: 84059

On Wed, 17 Dec 2003 22:32:56 -0600, Kim W5TIT wrote:

>Less road maintenance and construction? For sure. I haven't driven
>anywhere in Texas since 1979 without some kind of road maintenance or
>construction going on, literally. Don't need it.

You must have a wonderful car/truck that fills in the potholes just
ahead of your driving over them.

>I couldn't be objective with the police and fire protection. I don't live
>in an area where I either need a lot of that or see any benefit of it.

Wait 'till your building catches on fire or you need paramedic
service after a fall. Been there, glad that it was available.
Since then I've been one of the biggest boosters for the local fire
department when budget time comes up.

>Education. Well, let's see. Up north when my kids went to school in the
>public school system, I cannot remember ever having to buy their school
>supplies when they were in elementary school.

One of the fun times as a kid was when Mom took us to the local
stationery store for our school supplies at the beginning of the
school year - pencils, crayons, a new ruler, notebooks and pads,
book covers, erasers, all sorts of stuff.

>Down here, I pay school taxes
>PLUS had to spend about $200.00 per kid each year of school up to about 7th
>grade, for their school supplies.

What do you have to buy for that price? If it includes books I can
agree. They should be supplied at no cost to the student..

>Social Security, in my opinon, is a farce. Do away with it.

I and a lot of others here and elsewhere receive SocSec retirement
benefits. Fix it, don't wreck it any further.
>
>Medicare and Medicaid I am happy to provide for my elderly community.
>However, again fat trimming probably would save lots of money.

The recent "improvement" in Medicare was a big step backwards. I
get Medicare as well as private health insurance benefits and I pay
handsomely for both. The only difference with Medicare included is
that I don't have to pay a co-pay for office visits and for that
privilege I pay a lot more in "Medicare monthly payments". Who
ever said that Medicare is free?

>Not only no, but hell no. I'd rather see people get pissed off enough at
>the ridiculous spending that goes on with our tax dollars. Trim all the
>ridiculous spending, and some of the cuts I am talking about would hardly be
>noticed.

Yeah, that's it. Don't pay a pension to those retired employees who
invested their after-tax income in government pension plans while
they worked their a**es off for diminished salaries because they
believed in using their skills for the benefit of the citizenry.
Especially my late father-in-law who was a civilian USAF engine
mechanic who got forgotten in an engine housing and spent almost 15
minutes baking in 110 degree heat in the desert...

Why am I wasting my time debating this ??

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

4484. Re: K1MAN...Radio criminal?? Check this out!!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-19 02:16:21 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <_ZGdnc8FvMRw_3-iRVn-jA@gbronline.com>
Source record: 84060
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

Mike wrote:

> 5.00 for fucking shipping!!!!!

Don't believe I have ever heard of that shipper. They any better than UPS?

4485. Re: Why I Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-19 03:03:10 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <OTtEb.689$Vv2.349555@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 84061

Dee D. Flint wrote:

> "Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
> news:f45722ac.0312181539.55a82802@posting.google.com...
>
>>Carl, you should see the NCI bashing being done by Dee and Jim on the
>>other ARRL thread.
>>
>>73, Brian
>
>
> I have never bashed the NCI. I've stated that I disagree with their goal
> but that does not constitute bashing them.

I have! I think that they have recieved what they wanted, but as yet
don't really offer anything of substance to fill the gap. Instead, some
members express "unofficial opinions that scare the bejabbers out of me.

Always have an encore ready.

- Mike KB3EIA -

4486. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-19 03:11:13 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <I%tEb.690$Vv2.350911@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 84062

Dwight Stewart wrote:

> "Dee D. Flint" wrote:
>
>>(snip) One thing that the NCI has quite
>>convincingly demonstrated is that HARD
>>WORK is what is required to achieve a
>>goal. (snip) They organized on a world
>>wide basis. They lobbied the various
>>governing bodies around the world to
>>support a change in the code requirement
>>at the last ITU conference. (snip) It
>>shows that the minority can prevail if they
>>have the commitment.
>
>
>
> I think you're giving NCI way too much credit, Dee. Indeed, created in the
> late 90's, they came to the debate rather late and have done little beyond
> urging members to file comments on related issues before the FCC (no visible
> government lobbying and no significant world-wide organization - a few
> members in a few countries). If anything, NCI's most significant
> contribution, once they did arrive on the scene, has been to serve as a
> lightning rod for criticism from code supporters, leaving a vastly greater
> number of non-members relatively free to make the case against code testing
> wherever possible. Moreover, there would have been no gains at all if there
> had been no substance to the core arguments against code testing. Those
> arguments existed, and were being made, long before NCI joined the debate.

I agree, Dwight. What I find most distressing about NCI is that as a
late comer to the game, they were in a position to offer some leadership
in the "brave new world" post CW. While there is no question that Carl
supports retention of technical acumen in the service, some other
members do not. If I were in charge, I would have a plan all mapped out
to fill the coming vacuum. Of course its hard for me to say what that
plan would be, because I support continuned Morse code testing. 8^)

- Mike KB3EIA -

4487. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-19 03:14:50 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <K2uEb.691$Vv2.351418@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 84063

N2EY wrote:

> In article <MJWDb.1562$wL6.285@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dwight
> Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> writes:
>
>
>>Len is working hard to pull your strings
>
>
> It isn't a string that Len is pulling. And it's not on Dave.
>
> ;-) ;-0 ;-) ;-) ;-) ;-) ;-) ;-0 ;-) ;-0 ;-) ;-) ;-) ;-) ;-) ;-0 ;-) ;-0 ;-) ;-)
> ;-) ;-) ;-) ;-0 ;-) ;-0 ;-) ;-) ;-) ;-) ;-) ;-0 ;-) ;-0 ;-) ;-) ;-) ;-) ;-) ;-0
> ;-) ;-0 ;-) ;-) ;-) ;-) ;-) ;-0

Spunky today, eh Jim!

8^)

- Mike KB3EIA -

4488. Re: K1MAN...Radio criminal?? Check this out!!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-19 03:23:11 UTC
From: Brenda Ann <brendad@shinbiro.com>
Message-ID: <brtocq$1ko$1@news1.kornet.net>
Source record: 84064
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

"JJ" <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
news:_ZGdnc8FvMRw_3-iRVn-jA@gbronline.com...
> Mike wrote:
>
> > 5.00 for fucking shipping!!!!!
>
> Don't believe I have ever heard of that shipper. They any better than UPS?
>

They'd have to be...

4489. Re: K1MAN...Radio criminal?? Check this out!!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-19 10:52:17 UTC
From: Mike <mlawson1@twcny.rr.com>
Message-ID: <BLAEb.29307$UY6.2801@twister.nyroc.rr.com>
Source record: 84065
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

Sorry, what I had meant to say was, wow $5.00 for shipping!
He could slap a postcard stamp on it for what 27 cents?

"Brenda Ann" <brendad@shinbiro.com> wrote in message
news:brtocq$1ko$1@news1.kornet.net...
>
> "JJ" <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
> news:_ZGdnc8FvMRw_3-iRVn-jA@gbronline.com...
> > Mike wrote:
> >
> > > 5.00 for fucking shipping!!!!!
> >
> > Don't believe I have ever heard of that shipper. They any better than
UPS?
> >
>
> They'd have to be...
>
>

4490. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-19 11:42:10 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bruo76$dk2@library2.airnews.net>
Source record: 84066

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:xnfcneeyarg.hq40v3d.pminews@netnews.comcast.net...
> On Wed, 17 Dec 2003 22:32:56 -0600, Kim W5TIT wrote:
>
> >Less road maintenance and construction? For sure. I haven't driven
> >anywhere in Texas since 1979 without some kind of road maintenance or
> >construction going on, literally. Don't need it.
>
> You must have a wonderful car/truck that fills in the potholes just
> ahead of your driving over them.
>

The "road maintenance and construction" I am speaking of is the constant
construction/reconstruction (to include redirecting even) of lanes on
highways. What you are speaking of *is* the kind of maintenance that is
needed; therefore *not* included in my "trimming the fat" concept of
reducing-costs-therefore-taxes.

> >
> >I couldn't be objective with the police and fire protection. I don't
live
> >in an area where I either need a lot of that or see any benefit of it.
>
> Wait 'till your building catches on fire or you need paramedic
> service after a fall. Been there, glad that it was available.
> Since then I've been one of the biggest boosters for the local fire
> department when budget time comes up.
>

Again, you're speaking of needed services. I am talking about trimming the
fat. For instance, why on God's green earth does it ever, ever take 4-5 cop
cars to handle a traffic call? Now, before the zealots go nuts--yes, I know
there are times when that call may become dangerous for an officer--so I can
see two cars, maybe, and not every time.

> >
> >Education. Well, let's see. Up north when my kids went to school in the
> >public school system, I cannot remember ever having to buy their school
> >supplies when they were in elementary school.
>
> One of the fun times as a kid was when Mom took us to the local
> stationery store for our school supplies at the beginning of the
> school year - pencils, crayons, a new ruler, notebooks and pads,
> book covers, erasers, all sorts of stuff.
>

> >Down here, I pay school taxes
> >PLUS had to spend about $200.00 per kid each year of school up to about
7th
> >grade, for their school supplies.
>
> What do you have to buy for that price? If it includes books I can
> agree. They should be supplied at no cost to the student..
>

Thank goodness I don't pay it any more--but my kids' school supplies ended
up at just near $200.00 a kid by the time they got to around 4th grade.
Kleenex, glitter, scissors, glue, ruler, pencil box, colored map pencils,
pencils, construction paper, on and on and on. AND specific brands, even.

> >
> >Social Security, in my opinon, is a farce. Do away with it.
>
> I and a lot of others here and elsewhere receive SocSec retirement
> benefits. Fix it, don't wreck it any further.
> >

Uh huh. Well your resentment is forgetting that I, too, will *maybe* be a
benefactor of the system someday. But, again, a much better system could be
had and I think it would be better run by *us*, meaning either a system
wherein we determine our own investment, or it is "governed" but not held by
the government.

>
> >Medicare and Medicaid I am happy to provide for my elderly community.
> >However, again fat trimming probably would save lots of money.
>
> The recent "improvement" in Medicare was a big step backwards. I
> get Medicare as well as private health insurance benefits and I pay
> handsomely for both. The only difference with Medicare included is
> that I don't have to pay a co-pay for office visits and for that
> privilege I pay a lot more in "Medicare monthly payments". Who
> ever said that Medicare is free?
>

Again, something governed but not held or kept or run by the government
would be much better.

> >
> >Not only no, but hell no. I'd rather see people get pissed off enough at
> >the ridiculous spending that goes on with our tax dollars. Trim all the
> >ridiculous spending, and some of the cuts I am talking about would hardly
be
> >noticed.
>
> Yeah, that's it. Don't pay a pension to those retired employees who
> invested their after-tax income in government pension plans while
> they worked their a**es off for diminished salaries because they

> believed in using their skills for the benefit of the citizenry.
>

Pension? So, you consider SS as a pension--something, I might add, for which it was *never* intended? I said nothing about people retirements and pensions and don't be so willing to let your indignance misdirect what someone said. I *do* include companies trimming the superfluous crap from their budgets, to where maybe pensions and retirements would reflect *more* what you deserve and what your hard ass work was for. By the way, I do *not* work for the benefit of "the" citizenry...hardly. I work for *me* and *mine.* The benefit is that, through that, it works for the citizenry.

>
> Especially my late father-in-law who was a civilian USAF engine
> mechanic who got forgotten in an engine housing and spent almost 15
> minutes baking in 110 degree heat in the desert...
>
> Why am I wasting my time debating this ??
>
> --
> 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane
>
>

More importantly, why did you bring such an emotional topic up in a debate? To influence or shut down response? Sorry about your late father-in-law, but you could have left that to yourself and continued on with effective (well, at least as effective as it could get here) debate. But...were you blaming *me* for what happened? Because of how I believe? I mean, c'mon Phil, that came from nowhere.

Oh well...go ahead, attack now.

Kim W5TIT

4491. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-19 11:46:05 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <1yBEb.4678$wL6.3472@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 84068

"Mike Coslo" wrote:
>
> I agree, Dwight. What I find most
> distressing about NCI is that as a
> late comer to the game, they were
> in a position to offer some leadership
> in the "brave new world" post CW.
> While there is no question that Carl
> supports retention of technical
> acumen in the service, some other
> members do not. If I were in charge,
> I would have a plan all mapped out
> to fill the coming vacuum. Of course
> its hard for me to say what that plan
> would be, because I support
> continuned Morse code testing. 8^)

Agreed. By the time NCI joined the debate, the debate was pretty much resolved. So, instead of linking themselves to this one issue, they may have better served the Ham community by focusing more on what follows. But, I don't think there is any consensus on what might follow. Since most are satisfied with everything else, I suspect the code test debate may be the last big debate in the Ham community. Of course, they'll always be small debates, but not nearly as widespead or as all consuming as this one.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

4492. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-19 12:18:55 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <P0CEb.4683$wL6.3877@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 84067

"Phil Kane" wrote:
> Kim W5TIT wrote:
>
> > Less road maintenance and construction?
> > For sure. I haven't driven anywhere in
> > Texas since 1979 without some kind of
> > road maintenance or construction going
> > on, literally. Don't need it.
>
> You must have a wonderful car/truck that
> fills in the potholes just ahead of your driving
> over them.

Exactly. I've driven through Texas recently (I-10 and I-20) and they do need road maintenance. On several sections of those highways, it may be smoother to just drive through the desert on the sand. The last time I drove through Northern California (several years ago), I-5 had similar problems. On some sections of I-5, I had to slow down to 35 mph to avoid being literally bounced around inside the vehicle. By comparison, Alabama recently repaved their major roads and was a pleasure to drive through.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

4493. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-19 13:38:36 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0312190538.7efbfa9a@posting.google.com>
Source record: 84069

"Kim" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote in message news:<bqn2nt$dcs@library1.airnews.net>...
> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20031203075807.02537.00001939@mb-m23.aol.com...
> > In article <bqhq6q$q9h@library2.airnews.net>, "Kim" <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
> > writes:

Sorry for the delay - thought I'd answered this, Kim

> > >It's fine for them to go 20 mph above the speed limit. It's fine if they
> > >want to go 30-40 mph above the speed limit. But, they won't find me
> > > moving
> > >out of their way; they'll have to go around because I am not moving into
> a
> > >lane where I have to slow down, or even get "stuck" there for a while, if
> > >there happens to be more than one vehicle that wants to go past.
> >
> > Ah, I see. The right lane is going 60-65, the left lane (with you in it by
> > yourself) is going 70-75, and you're not going to lose a few seconds in
> order
> > to accomodate someone who wants to go 80-85.
> > >
>
> It's not the matter of being kind and courteous and moving over so someone
> who's acting like an idiot can go by. It's the principle of the matter that
> *because* of the way they are being self-important, it's going to be *them*
> that does the moving around. I.E., I see them in kind of like the "bully"
> role of a little kid. Well, I'm not giving in to the bully.

After some thought, it occurred to me to restate your posstion in
slightly different terms. How about this:

People tend to do what works for them. If a certain behavior produces
a desired result, they will tend to repeat and expand that behavior if
they want the result another time. This is a basic concept in child
rearing - you reward the behaviors you want and do not reward the
behaviors you don't want. And "reward" can take many forms - arguing
with a child from 7:30 to 7:35 about the fact that their bedtime is
7:30 is "rewarding" the arguing behavior because it results in a 7:35
bedtime.

And the effects go beyond the people directly involved. If another
child sees that arguing with a parent "works", then they're much more
likely to try arguing or some variation of it somewhere down the line.
Maybe the argument won't be about bedtime but the same tactics will be
used.

This doesn't mean the child has consciously figured all that out and is working from a preconceived plan. It just means that the effects are the same, and a parent has to take a different approach that doesn't effectively reward the unwanted behavior. Good parents know all this - again, sometimes not consciously.

Another important concept is to be consistent. The child needs to learn not only that arguing over bedtime at bedtime doesn't work but that it *never* works.

So in the case of the driver who "behaves like an idiot", Kim is being very careful and consistent to *not* reward the "idiot" behavior by pulling over and letting the person go by. Because if such behavior works, we'll see more and more of it. Not just from the current batch of idiots but from presently non-idiot drivers who see that it works and try it themselves.

OTOH, if "behaving like an idiot" on the road is not rewarded, the driver may try something else (like courtesy, or getting on the road a few minutes earlier).

Does all this agree with your thinking, Kim?

73 de Jim, N2EY

4494. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-19 14:06:57 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0312190606.18645337@posting.google.com>
Source record: 84070

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3FDFD8C7.C3E0B827@earthlink.net>...
> Len Over 21 wrote:
> >
> > In article <3FDE7172.BF1D62F0@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> > writes:
> >
> > >Len Over 21 wrote:
> > >
> > >> Problem is that Believers are in the minority...but they cannot ever
> > >> see that or they are so set that what they think is the absolute
> > >> "they know what is best."
> > >
> > >But, Len, you think you know what is best for amateur radio and you
> > >aren't even involved. You're pretty much of a minority.
> >
> > I've not claimed to "know what is best for amateur radio."
> >
> > That's YOUR claim.
>
> That isn't correct, Leonard.

Dave,

A bit of clarification.

Mr. Anderson has repeatedly expounded his views on a wide range of
topics both here and in voluminous, repetitive comments to the FCC.
But I don't recall him ever claiming that they were "what is best for
amateur radio" or that he even knows "what is best for amateur radio."

> You made quite a lengthy plea to the FCC
> for the elimination of morse testing and for institution of a minimum
> age requirement for amateur licensing.

That is correct.

> Are you now telling us that you
> didn't mean those things?

I'm pretty sure Mr. Anderson means them. But even if he doesn't, he
has not disavowed them to FCC or to us.

> If not, it looks as if you, a
> non-participant, knows far more about what is good for amateur radio
> than any active, licensed ham.

Ah, there's where your logic fails, Dave. You're working on a false
premise.

You're *assuming* that everyone who has an opinion on amateur radio
policy issues is interested in amateur radio having the best possible
future. And in most cases that's true - but not when Mr. Anderson is
involved. His behavior here, and his comments to FCC, indicate that
he's *not* interested in what's best for amateur radio. He's just
interested in stirring up division, discord and hostility between
amateurs, diverting them from other issues, and denying amateur
traditions and contributions to society and the radio art.

His hobby isn't radio. His hobby is wasting time. Your time.
>
> > "What is best" is what YOU like. Everyone understands that.
>
> No, that's what you're comments to the FCC and your comments here
> indicate that you believe: that what is best for amateur radio should be
> decided by someone who isn't remotely involved.

Not what is best.....
>
> > >> That's why the staunch Believers insist on morsemanship as the
> > >> Ulimate in amateur akill...even after the entirety of the rest of the
> > >> radio world gave up on morse codes for communication. "They
> > >> KNOW what is best" therefore their way MUST triumph.
> > >
> > >You claim to know what is best for amateur radio.
> >
> > Nope.
>
> Your weak denial rings hollow.

Not at all. Mr. Anderson wants what he wants, not what is best for
amateur radio. See how logically consistent that is?

Suppose someone really hated amateur radio and wanted to damage it as
much as possible without being obvious about what they were doing.

Wouldn't one way to do that be to try to maximize internal bickering
and arguing among hams, thereby diverting them from useful discussion?

Wouldn't another way be to constantly bash and deny the
accomplishments, practices and traditions of amateurs and the national
organization for amateur radio?

Wouldn't yet another way be to spread false information and to push
for rules changes that have no purpose except to reduce the number of
newcomers (like age restrictions)?

Think about it, Dave. Remember the behavior profile. One of your
premises is faulty.

73 de Jim, N2EY

4495. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-19 14:21:07 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0312190621.4e78fc6a@posting.google.com>
Source record: 84071

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20031216151214.07346.00002165@mb-m26.aol.com>...
> In article <f45722ac.0312160345.f38ea25@posting.google.com>,
> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:

> >Of this minority, the ARRL polled their little group in the mid-late
> >nineties, and came away with "no clear mandate." An even spilt within
> >the ranks of the true believers? So even at the time, something was
> >wearing away at the propaganda machine. I wonder what's happened
> >since then?
>
> As I see it the schism is from the general attitude of long-timers
> evolving into two main groupings: Those that mightily resist change
> and those who can accept change.

You WOULD see a "schism", Lennie, but then since you are NOT a
part of Amateur Radio and do NOT have any experience in matters
pertaining TO Amateur Radio, yours is an uninformed opinion.

> The first group wants a relatively inflexible hobby activity, generally
> frozen...(SNIPPED)

You have yet to have this incessantly repeated assertion
validated by any substantial evidence, except for your own mindless
rantings, Your Scumminess.

> The second group is accepting of change and they are not afraid of
> it (although the constant advancement of all electronics does cause
> some irritation). They are more interested in communicating and the
> communication arts, are willing to try out new things. They have a
> more realistic view of amateur radio as an avocational activity and
> don't have it become their lifestyle. They don't mind the "fraternal
> order" aspect (some enjoy that) but, at the same time, they are
> into trying out new things of many kinds. Their emphasis is on
> communicating, not the mode of communication.

You really do hate the "lifestyle" thing, don't you, Lennie?

It just irks the be-jeebers out of you that people do for
free-and-fun that which you only saw as a pecuniary pursuit.

Sucks to be you, Putz.

> The first group...(SNIP)

"The first group" of "what", Lennie? From what poll or
demographics survey did you come up with ANY different "groups"...?!?!

A casual purusing of todays QST or CQ magazine compared with,
say, September 1955 will immediately shatter any more of your
assertions of "stuck" in past practices or technologies rants.

> It should be clear that there will never be any "consensus" on
> code testing as long as such beligerance remains rooted among
> the self-styled elite morsemen of U.S. amateur radio.

So what you're saying is that until everyone sees it YOUR way,
there'll be no concensus, huh???

Arrogant Putz.

Steve, K4YZ

4496. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-19 14:42:26 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <m7EEb.846$IM3.697@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 84072

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:l%tEb.690$Vv2.350911@news1.news.adelphia.net...
> Dwight Stewart wrote:
>
> > "Dee D. Flint" wrote:
> >
> >>(snip) One thing that the NCI has quite
> >>convincingly demonstrated is that HARD
> >>WORK is what is required to achieve a
> >>goal. (snip) They organized on a world
> >>wide basis. They lobbied the various
> >>governing bodies around the world to
> >>support a change in the code requirement
> >>at the last ITU conference. (snip) It
> >>shows that the minority can prevail if they
> >>have the commitment.
> >
> >
> >
> > I think you're giving NCI way too much credit, Dee. Indeed, created in
the
> > late 90's, they came to the debate rather late and have done little
beyond
> > urging members to file comments on related issues before the FCC (no
visible
> > government lobbying and no significant world-wide organization - a few
> > members in a few countries). If anything, NCI's most significant
> > contribution, once they did arrive on the scene, has been to serve as a
> > lightning rod for criticism from code supporters, leaving a vastly
greater
> > number of non-members relatively free to make the case against code
testing
> > wherever possible. Moreover, there would have been no gains at all if
there
> > had been no substance to the core arguments against code testing. Those
> > arguments existed, and were being made, long before NCI joined the
debate.
>
> I agree, Dwight. What I find most distressing about NCI is that as a
> late comer to the game, they were in a position to offer some leadership
> in the "brave new world" post CW. While there is no question that Carl
> supports retention of technical acumen in the service, some other
> members do not. If I were in charge, I would have a plan all mapped out
> to fill the coming vacuum. Of course its hard for me to say what that

> plan would be, because I support continuned Morse code testing. 8^)

Two questions...
1. What "other members" (I presume you mean Board Members), other
than W5YI, do NOT support retention of technical acumen?

2. What is "the coming vacuum"?

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

4497. Re: Why I Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-19 14:48:56 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <sdEEb.854$IM3.140@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 84073

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:berEb.17184$P%1.15991934@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
>
> "Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
> news:f45722ac.0312181539.55a82802@posting.google.com...
> > Carl, you should see the NCI bashing being done by Dee and Jim on the
> > other ARRL thread.
> >
> > 73, Brian
>
> I have never bashed the NCI. I've stated that I disagree with their goal
> but that does not constitute bashing them.
>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

I agree with Dee. I see "commentary", not any
bashing. Freedom to discuss differing
viewpoints. That's all.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK, NCI Director

4498. Re: Why I Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-19 14:51:33 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <VfEEb.856$IM3.172@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 84074

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:OTtEb.689$Vv2.349555@news1.news.adelphia.net...
> Dee D. Flint wrote:
>
> > "Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
> > news:f45722ac.0312181539.55a82802@posting.google.com...
> >
> >>Carl, you should see the NCI bashing being done by Dee and Jim on the
> >>other ARRL thread.
> >>
> >>73, Brian
> >
> >
> > I have never bashed the NCI. I've stated that I disagree with their
goal
> > but that does not constitute bashing them.
>
> I have! I think that they have recieved what they wanted, but as yet
> don't really offer anything of substance to fill the gap.

What GAP?

> Instead, some
> members express "unofficial opinions that scare the bejabbers out of me.

"Some members"? Who? It is always easy to make non-speciifc
accusations against unidentified "some members".

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

4499. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-19 16:20:41 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0312190820.17bca6cb@posting.google.com>
Source record: 84075

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20031215152856.22081.00002503@mb-m17.aol.com>...
> In article <3FDDA8AD.8023FC6A@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:

> >Sounds like one of Len's typical conspiracy/dishonesty rants aimed
> >toward the ARRL.
>
> Quit trying to sound like a Ba'athist amateur, Klunk.

"I am only here to civilly debate the Morse Code test
issue"...LHA

Quit avoiding making direct answers to direct questions, Your
Scumminess.

> The League (of Notions) MAKES MONEY on the publication side
> of their conglomerate of control.

"Conglomerate of control"...?!?! The ARRL is the >>ONLY<<
Amateur Radio publisher out tehre, Lennie?

> Ads in QST pay for everything in the QST staff and the cost of job
> printing and fulfillment (publication talk for mailing/distributing).

Speaking of "fulfillment", I imagine that's what the ARRL staff,
(Ed hare, et al) have once every two weeks, Lennie.

Sure is nice that THIER magazine is still in business, isn't
it...?!?!

> The "non-profit" stuff and nonsense is for lowering their taxes.

It works. It could work for you too, if you cared to try.

> >I interviewed for a League position years back. The
> >salary offered wasn't enough to cover a move and life in the greater
> >Hartford area.
>
> Translation: You were rejected. (boo hoo for you)

Facts to the contrary exist. The League has solicited for other
positions int eh past, and Dave's assessment of the League's salary
offerings are on-the-mark.

That's on the web too, Lennie. (Facts suck when they screw up
your rants, huh, Lennie...?!?!)

> > While I'm sure that salaries are now better, I don't
> >think any League staffers are putting up gold-plated Rohn tower and 80m
> >yagis at their palatial estates.
>
> Rohn filed for bankruptcy on account of that?
>
> You can see the top five staffers' salaries given on their 2002 IRS
> forms.

We can see yours too. Your point?

> >> It's about your ignorance of what a non-profit really is.
> >
> >*Guffaw!*. Her ignorance? I see some gaping holes in your own
> >database.
>
> Nooo, Klunk, "non-profit" is a status to claim for paying LESS
> taxes.

"Non-profit" is more than a tax shelter.

The nature of the ARRL still supports and substantiates thier
non-profit status.

Sorry you don't care for it.

> If you are foolish enough to believe that W1AW's station, the
> "museum" and all the other paraphenalia came out of dues, you've
> got a database gap large enough to sail the USS Enterprise through.

And you have, of course, "facts" that delineate what dollars came
from which accounts to cover all these projects, Lennie?

> >With all the dissatisfaction you've expressed, why not start your own
> >organization for like-minded hams? I'm sure you'd amass a following in
> >no time.
>
> Three-fourths of all licensed U.S. radio amateurs are NOT members.

Eight tenths of all Americans are not card-carrying members of
the political parties they usually "support", either, but they do.

Your point?

> That should be evidenciary. To all but the minority who are members.

Again...so what?

> Members "KNOW what is good for all the others" and therefore they
> are the elite.

Obviously not enough of the "majority" feel compelled to
"overthrow" the ARRL over it's policies or practicies, Your
Scumminess.

Even more evident, then, is that the "minority" you refer to MUST
be fairly representing the "non-members" since there is no organized
alternative to the ARRL.

> The League (of Notions) still holds on vainly to the idea that morse
> code is still the ultimate of amateur skills...long after the rest of the
> radio world has given it up, discarded it for communications.

Why do you persist in publically misrepresenting the truth, Sir
Anderscum?

> Continue to be the acidic spam-bot for the League (of Notions), old
> Klunk. You have taken a Ba'ath...but are yet unclean.

"I am only here to civilly debate the Morse Code test
issue"...LHA

Obviously not.

Steve, K4YZ

4500. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-19 16:40:53 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <pSFEb.4874$wL6.2412@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 84076

"N2EY" wrote:
>
> OTOH, if "behaving like an idiot" on
> the road is not rewarded, the driver
> may try something else (like courtesy,
> or getting on the road a few minutes
> earlier).

However, your child analogy falls apart when you remember that you're talking about an adult - an adult that is going to get very angry at a person blocking the fast lane while he and others are trying to pass. Lets be realistic here. If Kim is intentionally blocking others on the roads, she doesn't deserve courtesy. Instead, she is more likely to be a victim of road rage (something else she doesn't deserve, but far more likely). If she manages to avoid that, and if one of those people she is blocking just happens to be a cop, she may instead eventually get a ticket for not driving on the right.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

4501. Lennie Makes "Idiot" An Olympic Event

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-19 16:52:11 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0312190852.52b92e19@posting.google.com>
Source record: 84077

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20031215234332.21457.00002778@mb-m10.aol.com>...
> In article <3FDE6F1A.4559E86B@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:

> >There certainly weren't many of them, kindly old gent. Still, YI1BGD
> >contacts weren't that hard to come by. Rarer still would be a QSL
> >confirming a contact with you on the ham bands.
>
> Rarer still would be the Great Amateur Heil getting above 70 cm.

What would it matter? You are not licensed to operate there
anyway, Lennie.

> So, your only "interest" in radio is contacting "rare ones?"

What's rarer than Lennie NoCall on the air?

> Home Depot and Lowes have fine selections of tasteful wallpaper
> if you need some. Better than QSL cards for the esthetic senses
> of non-radio guests. [you DO have guests, don't you? or are all
> your social contacts of the ham variety?]

And YOUR guests are treated to WHAT in YOUR ham shack,
Lennie...?!?!

Ooooopssss...Forgot...No ham shack possible at Lennie's house!

> You've been so busy worshipping at the Church of St. Hiram you
> never knew about the BUSINESS side of the League?

I'd dare say he does...afterall QST >>IS<< still in
publication...UNLIKE certain other magazines that are now DEFUNCT.

> >> You need copies of their IRS forms from 2002 and previous years?
> >> Those are on the Internet.
> >
> >Thanks, but I have no need of them.
>
> You are AFRAID to look, aren't you? :-)
>
> You might find out some truth.
>
> You can't handle the truth.

Coming from YOU, Lennie...?!?!

You can't tell the truth to save your life, as worthless as THAT is...

> I've never gone to Rohn for any towers are antennas. Three other
> commercial firms, Andrew being the oldest (and still solvent).

For what? Obviously NOT the "tower" at YOUR "QTH", Lennie.

> Why the sudden misdirection into FALSE CLAIMS about some
> company "waiting for my business?"

Why YOUR "misirection" away from the hundreds of direct questions put to you about your countless mistruths, assertions of action (where no action took place), misrepresentation of the character of your military service, etc etc etc...?!?!

> It would give you a baseline for MORE creative lying in here about
> "interviewing with the ARRL."

Speaking of "creative lying", let's review a few of yours:

Your assertion of "I am only here to civilly debate the Morse Code test issue".

Your assertion of dishonesty of the ARRL in general and the ARRL BoD in particilar.

Your assertion "I am going to get an Extra Lite out of the box"

Your attempt to associate your military service with that of Soldiers who were KIA in Korea, despite your having still been in school when it happened.

Your "record" of aeronautical experience.

Your numerous attempts to disguise your identity behind numerous screen names.

Shall we go on...?!?!

> >I've made no such statement. I know how a non-profit organization
> >operates. I know how the ARRL operates. Sadly, I know how you operate.
>
> I'm not a licensed MD.

Whew. That's a relief. Now it's just too bad Mrs Lennie isn't a proctologist...

> So, everyone is not allowed to comment on anything if they
> are not a "member?"

"Commenting" on League issues is a courtesy, not a right, Lennie.

> The League is a POLITICAL ENTITY. They lobby.
>
> The League is OPEN FOR COMMENTARY BY EVERYONE,
> senior.

It's "Senor" in your application, Lennie.

> The First Amendment of the United States Constitution allows
> EVERY CITIZEN to comment.

No, it does not.

The First Ammendment prohibits the GOVERNMENT from supressing
"free speech". Please refer to Junior High School Civics, Lennie...

> Except in your amateur universe...

And anywhere else that is not a Governmental entity, Lennie.

Please try to get it right. It's embarrassing to have my kids
read your asserions of college education only to not be able to
understand first year US Government.

> >> That should be evidenciary. To all but the minority who are members.
> >
> >So, to see if we have your latest yarn straight, ARRL members aren't
> >aware that there are others who are not members?
>
> Bad attempt at editing and word cut-and-pasting, senior.
>
> TAKE THINGS IN CONTEXT.

Why? You don't.

> See a real MD...or psychiatric specialist.
>
> You need one.

Please dig out Mrs Lennie's correspondence books, Lennie, and
research the manifesting symptoms of paranoia. Especially note the
parts where folks with that particular malady usually suggest everyone
EXCEPT themselves has some problem requiring "professional attention".

> >Sounds like the bilious rantings of some geezer who is on the outside of
> >amateur radio, looking in.
>
> Poor baby, still don't understand, do you?
>
> I've never been "outside radio" for a half century.

YO! LENNIE! Just three paragraphs ago you assailed Dave for
allegedly "taking things out of context", then you BLATANTLY do it
right here!

You HAVE been "outside" of AMATEUR Radio (as clearly stated by
Dave) ALL OF YOUR LIFE!

The physics of what transpire INSIDE the box notwithstanding, you
have exactly zero-point-zero minutes of experience IN AMATUER RADIO.

Amateur Radio is NOT about a fixed set of physics or dynamics of
radio wave propagation anymore than driving your staion wagon is the
same thing as driving for NASCAR.

> You don't play fast and loose with facts. You just don't understand
> real facts.
>
> Not my problem.

Lennie, liars and antagonists are EVERYONES problem...

> Go get "clear."

Do it yourself. You seem to be steeping in "idiot" lately.

Steve, K4YZ

4502. Re: ham radio fruitcakes online

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-19 17:54:59 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <TXGEb.4927$wL6.2270@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 84078
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

Its all about Lllllllloooooyyyyyyddddddd and Wiseman. It would be better
to just put a cap in your head than go there.

Dan/W4NTI

"Brother Stairmeister the Fart-Whistle" <xemuiscomming@yahoo.com> wrote in
message news:74b5d$3fe1df53$d1cc7967$7486@allthenewsgroups.com...
> Remember the "good ole days" of the 14.313/14.300 wars?
> The amazing cavalcade of assorted nuts, goofballs, toilet tics
> and freaks that would flock to this on a near-daily daytime
> basis? Remember also all the legendary crazies and kooks
> that populated 75 meters in the P.R.H. (Pre-Reilly H.) days?
>
> Well....those days are gone forever, unless you have a tape
> recording collection of the same. If you wish for those fun
> days when 20 and 75 were a non-stop cavalcade of comedic
> camaraderie of crapola again....just point your mouse to:
>
> http://www.network54.com/Hide/Forum/243612 (....and click)
>
> I am fairly certain that every kook and goofball that the FCC ran off
> of 20 and 75 are now at this URL. See for yourself and decide.
>
> A very amusing place, with funny pictures too!!
>
> Bro. R.G.58AU Stairmaster
> First Unification Church of the Divine Fart Whistle
> Doha, Quatar
> (a fully tax deductible ministry and subsidiary of Halliburton Corp)
>
> --
>
> RIYADH, Saudi Arabia
> 13 Dec 2003
>
> Saudi Arabia has officially banned the importation of female blowup dolls
> and stuffed
> animals, giving merchants three months to dispose of such stock, a
> state-owned ewspaper reported Wednesday.
>
> Interior Minister Prince Nayef ordered the ban which was relayed
> around the country by the national Chamber of Commerce and Industry,
> Al-Riyadh said.
>

> The daily gave no reason for the ban, which could not be confirmed
> with government officials Wednesday. Strict interpretations of Islamic
> law ban representations of living beings and any exposure of the
> female figure.
>
> The ban singled out stuffed-animal toys and female dolls. It did not
> mention male dolls, and it was not clear if these were banned as well.
> The order also ordered any mannequins for female clothes be "far from
> any indecency"
>
> The ban comes at a time when some in Saudi Arabia have questioned
> whether the country's strict Islamic law fuels Islamic militancy.
>
> -------------------
>
> Yes, it's another flash presentation:
>
> http://62.189.42.125/12stisofchristmas/12-stis.swf
>
> "The 12 sexually-transmitted infections of Xmas."
>
> Happy holidays!
>
>
>
>

4503. Re: Why I Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-19 18:00:20 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <LaWdnUpk3pWGoH6iUSdV9w@ptd.net>
Source record: 84079

"Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
news:f45722ac.0312181539.55a82802@posting.google.com...
> "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
news:<I5udnayzo8vRT3yiXTWc9g@ptd.net>...
> > "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> > news:20031215235832.07961.00000569@mb-m03.aol.com...
> > > In no particular order:
> > >
> > > 1) Representation of amateur radio (what other organization or
individual
> > would
> > > do anyhting like the 121 page commentary on BPL?)
> >
> > Representation of what the Board *perceives* to be the wishes of the
> > membership.
> > I don't believe that non-members get the same attention on issues as
> > members, but
> > that is reasonable, since member dues support the ARRL.
>
> This member supports the ARRL. Also, this member did not receive a
> questionare when the ARRL was conducting a poll of members and
> non-members.

Perhaps they did a random survey of some percentage of the membership?

> > > 5) Elected officials (they listen even if they don't agree)
> >
> > YMMV, depending on what area you live in, whether your Director is
> > open-minded and progressive, etc.
>
> Apparently they think that they cannot present the needs or want of
> both camps until they come to a concensus.

The "c-word" is an excuse to do nothing. On some things there may
never be consensus - should the ARRL do nothing? Leadership is
when one has the courage and wisdom to make a sound judgement
and then "do the right thing." Otherwise, they could just do a web vote
popularity contest on every issue and wouldn't need Directors ... the
staff could handle the whole thing ...

> > > 6) W1AW (been there and operated the station, too)
> >
> > I have mixed views on the value of W1AW ... a good museum to "the Old
Man,"
> > but perhaps its services could be provided by alternative means at lower

> > operating cost.
>
> Commercial gear? Why?

Perhaps you misunderstand ... first, W1AW is running commercial gear (and has for
many years). I believe the current main transmitters are super-commercial gear from
Harris Corp., if memory serves me correctly, suplimented by some other commercial
gear donated by some or all of "the big 4" ham equipment mfgrs.

What I was referring to were things like CW practice, bulletins, etc. All of that could
be provided (and much is) by the web site, and probably would reduce operating
costs. (Though doing things by non-radio means is heresy to some ...)

> Carl, you should see the NCI bashing being done by Dee and Jim on the
> other ARRL thread.

I have been on business travel to the ITU in Geneva for two weeks and to New Orleans for a week of meetings and haven't been keeping up.

Let them bash ... NCI continues to gain new members (and the pace picked up quite dramatically with all of the publicity surrounding the Petitions before the
FCC); the membership is, judging by the large number of e-mails I get, happy with our policies and actions and ready to continue to support NCI through the
end-game; and our detractors still haven't presented the FCC with a single rational,
valid, compelling reason to keep any Morse testing ...

73,
Carl - wk3c

4504. Re: Why I Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-19 18:07:17 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <bqadnfyED8gho36iUSdV9w@ptd.net>
Source record: 84081

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:xnfcneeyarg.hq3zjoc.pminews@netnews.comcast.net...
> On Thu, 18 Dec 2003 16:12:40 -0000, Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
>
> >QST has gotten better, with the dropping of a lot of the contest data
> >and more focus on a range of articles from beginner to expert level.
> >I'd like to see more technical focus on modern stuff and fewer
> >articles on building regen receivers with tubes, though.
>
> Yeah, Nuvistors are getting hard to get.

And even half-a**ed decent transistors can blow their performance away,
with better ones being worlds better.

My point is essentially that, IMHO, there is too much "nostalgia" and
"let's go back to the past" content in QST. I'd prefer a more bleeding
edge "let's push into the future" approach myself.

> How about reprints of memorable articles from yesteryear? Two from
> the 1950s which are still applicable today for every class of licensee
> come to mind:
>
> "Guys for Guys Who Have to Guy" (a basic paper on guyed towers)
> "Over the Hills and Far Away" (ditto on tropo propagation)

Some articles are ageless ... I agree with the idea of occasionally
reprinting
classics that are still applicable ... or making a compendium of them
available
on a CD-ROM might be an even better approach.

> How many of the "frequent poster" club here read them when they
> first came out or even some time later?

I don't recall them by title, but I probably read them ... my high school
had an extensive collection of QSTs and I spend most of my study hall
time signed out to the library reading QST ... I think I'd read every copy
they had in the collection by the time I graduated in 1967.

73,
Carl - wk3c

4505. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-19 18:08:44 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <xnfcneeyarg.hq5dx1f.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>
Source record: 84080

On Fri, 19 Dec 2003 05:42:10 -0600, Kim W5TIT wrote:

>Oh well...go ahead, attack now.

I'm not going to waste my time.

Have a happy holiday.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

4506. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-19 18:29:32 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3FE3438C.3090502@psu.edu>
Source record: 84082

N2EY wrote:
> "Kim" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote in message news:<bqn2nt$dcs@library1.airnews.net>...
>
>>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>>news:20031203075807.02537.00001939@mb-m23.aol.com...
>>
>>>In article <bqhq6q$q9h@library2.airnews.net>, "Kim" <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
>>>writes:
>>
>
> Sorry for the delay - thought I'd answered this, Kim
>
>
>>>>It's fine for them to go 20 mph above the speed limit. It's fine if they
>>>>want to go 30-40 mph above the speed limit. But, they won't find me
>>>>moving
>>>>out of their way; they'll have to go around because I am not moving into
>>>
>> a
>>
>>>>lane where I have to slow down, or even get "stuck" there for a while, if
>>>>there happens to be more than one vehicle that wants to go past.
>>>
>>>Ah, I see. The right lane is going 60-65, the left lane (with you in it by
>>>yourself) is going 70-75, and you're not going to lose a few seconds in
>>
>> order
>>
>>>to accomodate someone who wants to go 80-85.
>>>
>>It's not the matter of being kind and courteous and moving over so someone
>>who's acting like an idiot can go by. It's the principle of the matter that
>>*because* of the way they are being self-important, it's going to be *them*
>>that does the moving around. I.E., I see them in kind of like the "bully"
>>role of a little kid. Well, I'm not giving in to the bully.
>
>
> After some thought, it occurred to me to restate your posstion in
> slightly different terms. How about this:
>
> People tend to do what works for them. If a certain behavior produces
> a desired result, they will tend to repeat and expand that behavior if
> they want the result another time. This is a basic concept in child
> rearing - you reward the behaviors you want and do not reward the

> behaviors you don't want. And "reward" can take many forms - arguing
> with a child from 7:30 to 7:35 about the fact that their bedtime is
> 7:30 is "rewarding" the arguing behavior because it results in a 7:35
> bedtime.
>
> And the effects go beyond the people directly involved. If another
> child sees that arguing with a parent "works", then they're much more
> likely to try arguing or some variation of it somewhere down the line.
> Maybe the argument won't be about bedtime but the same tactics will be
> used.
>
> This doesn't mean the child has consciously figured all that out and
> is working from a preconceived plan. It just means that the effects
> are the same, and a parent has to take a different approach that
> doesn't effectively reward the unwanted behavior. Good parents know
> all this - again, sometimes not consciously.
>
> Another important concept is to be consistent. The child needs to
> learn not only that arguing over bedtime at bedtime doesn't work but
> that it *never* works.
>
> So in the case of the driver who "behaves like an idiot", Kim is being
> very careful and consistent to *not* reward the "idiot" behavior by
> pulling over and letting the person go by. Because if such behavior
> works, we'll see more and more of it. Not just from the current batch
> of idiots but from presently non-idiot drivers who see that it works
> and try it themselves.

So you are saying that in order to show the idiot where the bear went
in the buckwheat that you have to act like the idiot?

Agressive drivers are known to do some pretty insane things. Even if
that piece of incorrect logic would be correct, the aggressive driver
may be "provoked" (in his or her mind) to get even with the person ahead
of him in the lane by doing something like a high speed rear-ending.

"Rewarding" or "teaching a lesson" or "showing them" or whatever doesn't
work.

No thanks, if someone is going to be an idiot on the road, they can do
it in front of me. I'll pull off and let 'em pass!

> OTOH, if "behaving like an idiot" on the road is not rewarded, the
> driver may try something else (like courtesy, or getting on the road a
> few minutes earlier).

The time for teaching courtesy to them has long passed. Ain't gonna happen.

- Mike KB3EIA -

4507. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-19 18:32:13 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3FE3442D.6020309@psu.edu>
Source record: 84083

Dwight Stewart wrote:
> "N2EY" wrote:
>
>>OTOH, if "behaving like an idiot" on
>>the road is not rewarded, the driver
>>may try something else (like courtesy,
>>or getting on the road a few minutes
>>earlier).
>
>
>
> However, your child analogy falls apart when you remember that you're
> talking about an adult - an adult that is going to get very angry at a
> person blocking the fast lane while he and others are trying to pass. Lets
> be realistic here. If Kim is intentionally blocking others on the roads, she
> doesn't deserve courtesy. Instead, she is more likely to be a victim of road
> rage (something else she doesn't deserve, but far more likely). If she
> manages to avoid that, and if one of those people she is blocking just
> happens to be a cop, she may instead eventually get a ticket for not driving
> on the right.

In some states, like Washington, you are in violation if you have 5
cars behind you regardless of the speed, and are required to pull over.

And yes, the police will ticket a person for interfereing with the flow
of traffic.

- Mike KB3EIA -

4508. Re: Why I Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-19 18:45:44 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3FE34758.8000802@psu.edu>
Source record: 84084

Bill Sohl wrote:
> "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
> news:OTtEb.689$Vv2.349555@news1.news.adelphia.net...
>
>>Dee D. Flint wrote:
>>
>>
>>>"Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
>>>news:f45722ac.0312181539.55a82802@posting.google.com...
>>>
>>>
>>>>Carl, you should see the NCI bashing being done by Dee and Jim on the
>>>>other ARRL thread.
>>>>
>>>>73, Brian
>>>
>>>
>>>I have never bashed the NCI. I've stated that I disagree with their
>>
> goal
>
>>>but that does not constitute bashing them.
>>
>>I have! I think that they have recieved what they wanted, but as yet
>>don't really offer anything of substance to fill the gap.
>
>
> What GAP?

Code test dissapears, nothing in it's place. I want to see something in
it's place, or else itis pretty hard to argue that it hasn't been made
much much easier to get a license.

You may want it made much easier to get a license, but I don't. Not a
filter, not a way of keeping people out. just a way of ensuring that the
amateur has some level of acumen.

Otherwise, those who want little or no testing are just encouraged.

>
>>Instead, some
>>members express "unofficial opinions that scare the bejabbers out of me.
>
>
> "Some members"? Who? It is always easy to make non-speciifc

> accusations against unidentified "some members".

W5YI for one. I trust you have read his work?

- Mike KB3EIA -

4509. Re: Why I Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-19 20:21:01 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <N4JEb.11043$0s2.2996@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 84085

"Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote

> Code test dissapears, nothing in it's place. I want to see something in
> it's place, or else itis pretty hard to argue that it hasn't been made
> much much easier to get a license.

Siince the Novice license was discontinued, it has become more difficult to become an amateur.

> Not a filter, not a way of keeping people out. just a way
> of ensuring that the amateur has some level of acumen.

I don't hold the opinion that the Morse test established that the applicant has any "level of acumen" (check with Funk and Wagnalls before you respond).

In the world of Amateur Radio there are users and tinkerers. We need more tinkerers, not more users.

73, de Hans, K0HB

4510. Future ARS licenses, was Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-19 20:35:44 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3FE36120.8050001@psu.edu>
Source record: 84086

Dwight Stewart wrote:
> "Mike Coslo" wrote:
>
>>I agree, Dwight. What I find most
>>distressing about NCI is that as a
>>late comer to the game, they were
>>in a position to offer some leadership
>>in the "brave new world" post CW.
>>While there is no question that Carl
>>supports retention of technical
>>acumen in the service, some other
>>members do not. If I were in charge,
>>I would have a plan all mapped out
>>to fill the coming vacuum. Of course
>>its hard for me to say what that plan
>>would be, because I support
>>continuned Morse code testing. 8^)
>
>
>
> Agreed. By the time NCI joined the debate, the debate was pretty much
> resolved. So, instead of linking themselves to this one issue, they may have
> better served the Ham community by focusing more on what follows. But, I
> don't think there is any consensus on what might follow. Since most are
> satisfied with everything else, I suspect the code test debate may be the
> last big debate in the Ham community. Of course, they'll always be small
> debates, but not nearly as widespead or as all consuming as this one.

Probably so. I would venture that the immediate future debates will be
one last donnybrook over the Morse code testing, and after that is over,
remnants of the testing debate will go on a little while. The final
episodes of this will be when old pro-coders kvetch in similar style as
we occasionally hear from someone that is still incensed over incentive
licensing.

My guess on the debate of the future is one of testing regimen. I
predict that a new movement will arise that views testing per se as an
unnecessary nuisance, and will agitate for simplification of the test,
and eventually it's removal.

Variations on this theme include reducing the qualification process to
signing an affidavit that you have read a book or booklet on the ARS, or
perhaps granting a license after attending an informative seminar.

In the variations, my guess is that most people would prefer to sign an affidavit, because the seminar might take up a big part of their day, while the affidavit only takes as long as writing their signature.

The affidavit route has already been proposed, (NCVEC/W5YI paper) while the seminar was something I just thought of recently.

Of course, the entire new regimen would only work efficiently if there were only one license class, which would be another debate topic.

- Mike KB3EIA -

4511. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-19 20:55:19 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3FE365B7.5040506@psu.edu>
Source record: 84087

Bill Sohl wrote:
> "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
> news:l%tEb.690$Vv2.350911@news1.news.adelphia.net...
>
>>Dwight Stewart wrote:
>>
>>
>>>"Dee D. Flint" wrote:
>>>
>>>
>>>>(snip) One thing that the NCI has quite
>>>>convincingly demonstrated is that HARD
>>>>WORK is what is required to achieve a
>>>>goal. (snip) They organized on a world
>>>>wide basis. They lobbied the various
>>>>governing bodies around the world to
>>>>support a change in the code requirement
>>>>at the last ITU conference. (snip) It
>>>>shows that the minority can prevail if they
>>>>have the commitment.
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>> I think you're giving NCI way too much credit, Dee. Indeed, created in
>>
> the
>
>>>late 90's, they came to the debate rather late and have done little
>>
> beyond
>
>>>urging members to file comments on related issues before the FCC (no
>>
> visible
>
>>>government lobbying and no significant world-wide organization - a few
>>>members in a few countries). If anything, NCI's most significant
>>>contribution, once they did arrive on the scene, has been to serve as a
>>>lightning rod for criticism from code supporters, leaving a vastly
>>
> greater
>
>>>number of non-members relatively free to make the case against code
>>

> testing
>
>>>wherever possible. Moreover, there would have been no gains at all if
>>
> there
>
>>>had been no substance to the core arguments against code testing. Those
>>>arguments existed, and were being made, long before NCI joined the
>>
> debate.
>
>>I agree, Dwight. What I find most distressing about NCI is that as a
>>late comer to the game, they were in a position to offer some leadership
>>in the "brave new world" post CW. While there is no question that Carl
>>supports retention of technical acumen in the service, some other
>>members do not. If I were in charge, I would have a plan all mapped out
>>to fill the coming vacuum. Of course its hard for me to say what that
>>plan would be, because I support continuned Morse code testing. 8^)
>
>
> Two questions...
> 1. What "other members" (I presume you mean Board Members), other
> than W5YI, do NOT support retention of technical acumen?

They don't have to be Board members, Bill. And I don't have their names
off the top of my head.

If you like, I can retract the "members" statement, and substitute
"member" or "prominent member". Although I think that's almost like
saying a person's argument is invalid because they made a typo.

> 2. What is "the coming vacuum"?

Didn't you ask this question in another post? See that one! ;^)

- Mike KB3EIA -

4512. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-19 22:10:47 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <HHKEb.11145$0s2.674@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 84088

"Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote

>
> If you like, I can retract the "members" statement, and substitute
> "member" or "prominent member".
>

I'm a member (you'll have to ask K0CKB if my member is considered
"prominent" (sic)).

I support more rigorous technical exams for full privileges, to which you
have expressed some rather strenuous opposition.

Go figure!

3333333,

de Hans, K0HB

4513. Re: Why I Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-19 23:00:47 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <zqLEb.17430$P%1.16158722@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 84089

"Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
news:LaWdnUpk3pWGoH6iUSdV9w@ptd.net...
>
> > Carl, you should see the NCI bashing being done by Dee and Jim on the
> > other ARRL thread.
>
> I have been on business travel to the ITU in Geneva for two weeks and to
New
> Orleans for a week of meetings and haven't been keeping up.
>
> Let them bash ... NCI continues to gain new members (and the pace picked
up
> quite dramatically with all of the publicity surrounding the Petitions
> before the
> FCC); the membership is, judging by the large number of e-mails I get,
happy
> with our policies and actions and ready to continue to support NCI through
> the
> end-game; and our detractors still haven't presented the FCC with a single
> rational,
> valid, compelling reason to keep any Morse testing ...
>
> 73,
> Carl - wk3c
>

Carl, just a gentle reminder. I do not bash the NCI but merely disagree
with its goals.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

4514. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-19 23:37:18 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <OYLEb.1633$IM3.1311@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 84090

"Mike Coslo" wrote:
>
> In some states, like Washington, you are
> in violation if you have 5 cars behind you
> regardless of the speed, and are required
> to pull over.
>
> And yes, the police will ticket a person for
> interfereing with the flow of traffic.

Yep, many states now have similar laws (driving to right except passing, blocking traffic, interfering with flow of traffic, and so on).

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

4515. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-19 23:37:45 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0312191537.63070711@posting.google.com>
Source record: 84091

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:<pSFEb.4874$wL6.2412@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> "N2EY" wrote:
> >
> > OTOH, if "behaving like an idiot" on
> > the road is not rewarded, the driver
> > may try something else (like courtesy,
> > or getting on the road a few minutes
> > earlier).
>
>
> However, your child analogy falls apart when you remember that you're
> talking about an adult

A biological adult who is acting like a spoiled child.

Remember the scenario Kim describes:

- multilane divided highway
- all vehicles at or above the posted speed limit.
- vehicle comes up behind her, flashes brights, follows too closely,
tries to get around on the *inside* shoulder. IOW, unsafe, aggressive
driving actions intended to intimidate Kim. (as if!!)

Some "adult".

>- an adult that is going to get very angry at a
> person blocking the fast lane while he and others are trying to pass.

Let them behave like adults, then. Following too closely for the speed
of travel is not adult behavior, regardless of what Kim is doing.

> Lets be realistic here.

OK, fine.

It's realistic to behave in a safe responsible way when driving a
motor vehicle.

> If Kim is intentionally blocking others on the roads, she
> doesn't deserve courtesy.

She's only blocking those who want to speed faster than she wants to
speed.

Suppose several cars were to line up side-by-side on a multilane
divided highway and go exactly the speed limit. Would that justify the
"idiot" behaviors Kim describes?

Suppose they were police cars....

> Instead, she is more likely to be a victim of road
> rage (something else she doesn't deserve, but far more likely). If she
> manages to avoid that, and if one of those people she is blocking just
> happens to be a cop, she may instead eventually get a ticket for not driving
> on the right.

Agreed! That's why I previously said I let the "idiots" get past,
because I'd rather have them in front of me than behind me.

But the behavior/reward model I gave is valid. For both children and
alleged adults.

73 de Jim, N2EY

4516. Re: Why I Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-19 23:44:34 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0312191544.5aa31328@posting.google.com>
Source record: 84092

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:<xnfcneeyarg.hq3zjoc.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>...
> On Thu, 18 Dec 2003 16:12:40 -0000, Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
>
> >QST has gotten better, with the dropping of a lot of the contest data
> >and more focus on a range of articles from beginner to expert level.
> >I'd like to see more technical focus on modern stuff and fewer
> >articles on building regen receivers with tubes, though.
>
> Yeah, Nuvistors are getting hard to get.

Last time a construction article with Nuvistors in it was when?
Probably 1965 or so. Almost 40 years.

There's an on-line index of QST, QEX and ham radio at the ARRL
website. Searchable by keyword, author, date, author callsign, all
sorts of stuff.

> How about reprints of memorable articles from yesteryear? Two from
> the 1950s which are still applicable today for every class of licensee
> come to mind:
>
> "Guys for Guys Who Have to Guy" (a basic paper on guyed towers)
> "Over the Hills and Far Away" (ditto on tropo propagation)
>
> How many of the "frequent poster" club here read them when they
> first came out or even some time later?

I've read them - first time probably 30+ years ago. At least a few
times since then, too.

Lots of other classics. Having a QST collection helps. ;-)

73 de Jim, N2EY

4517. Re: Why I Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-20 00:05:28 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0312191605.469f743b@posting.google.com>
Source record: 84093

"Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
news:<LaWdnUpk3pWGoH6iUSdV9w@ptd.net>...
> "Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
> news:f45722ac.0312181539.55a82802@posting.google.com...
> > "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
> news:<I5udnayzo8vRT3yiXTWc9g@ptd.net>...
> > > "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> > > news:20031215235832.07961.00000569@mb-m03.aol.com...
> > > > In no particular order:
> > > >
> > > > 1) Representation of amateur radio (what other organization or
> individual
> would
> > > > do anyhting like the 121 page commentary on BPL?)
> > >
> > > Representation of what the Board *perceives* to be the wishes of the
> > > membership.
> > > I don't believe that non-members get the same attention on issues as
> > > members, but
> > > that is reasonable, since member dues support the ARRL.
> >
> > This member supports the ARRL. Also, this member did not receive a
> > questionare when the ARRL was conducting a poll of members and
> > non-members.
>
> Perhaps they did a random survey of some percentage of the membership?

They hired READEX to do a survey. It was supposedly a scientific
sample of the membership.

That was 1996.
>
> > > > 5) Elected officials (they listen even if they don't agree)
> > >
> > > YMMV, depending on what area you live in, whether your Director is
> > > open-minded and progressive, etc.
> >
> > Apparently they think that they cannot present the needs or want of
> > both camps until they come to a concensus.
>
> The "c-word" is an excuse to do nothing.

No, it isn't. And it's spelled "consensus", as WK3C demonstrates.

The "c-word" came into use because FCC said some years ago that they weren't going to do any serious restructuring until the amateur radio community came up with a consensus on what they wanted. That policy was quite visibly abandoned in 1998 when FCC issued an NPRM without any consensus being evident.

> On some things there may
> never be consensus - should the ARRL do nothing?

Depends on the issue and how close to a consensus exists. There's a world of difference between a 90% majority and a 51% majority, for example.

> Leadership is
> when one has the courage and wisdom to make a sound judgement
> and then "do the right thing."

Who decides what "the right thing" really is? For example, look at that "21st century" paper (CQ published it, btw, and it was in their mill before I evder saw it, so don't give me a hard time about it). Is the "Communicator" idea "the right thing"?

> Otherwise, they could just do a web vote
> popularity contest on every issue and wouldn't need Directors ... the
> staff could handle the whole thing ...

And if that vote runs opposite to what you think is "the right thing"?

It sounds to me like you're saying the ARRL Directors should sometimes go against what the majority of members say they want. Do you really think that's a good idea?

>
> > > > 6) W1AW (been there and operated the station, too)
> > >
> > > I have mixed views on the value of W1AW ... a good museum to "the Old
> Man,"
> > > but perhaps its services could be provided by alternative means at lower
> > > operating cost.
> >
> > Commercial gear? Why?
>
> Perhaps you misunderstand ... first, W1AW is running commercial gear (and
> has for
> many years). I believe the current main transmitters are super-commercial
> gear from
> Harris Corp., if memory serves me correctly, suplimented by some other
> commercial
> gear donated by some or all of "the big 4" ham equipment mfgrs.

The transmitters (actually transceivers) used for bulletins and code practice are Harris units. They are stock items. They were chosen for that service because they were capable of total computer control and because they were judged to be rugged enough for W1AW service.

Remember that the W1AW modernization was done more than a few years ago, so you have to look at what was available then, not now.

The supplemental guest stations are for general operating and contesting, and are not used when the bulletin/code practice sessions are being run.

Homebrew transmitters *were* considered - that had been the standard W1AW setup since the station was first put on the air more than 65 years ago. But the cost of paying staff members to design and build such rigs was calculated to be greater than the cost of the Harris units.

> What I was referring to were things like CW practice, bulletins, etc. All
> of that could
> be provided (and much is) by the web site, and probably would reduce
> operating
> costs. (Though doing things by non-radio means is heresy to some ...)

IOW, you want to shut down the station.

The whole point of W1AW is to do those things by *radio*. If we're going to use the website for bulletins and code practice, why not rag chewing, traffic handling, DX chasing, contesting......
>
> > Carl, you should see the NCI bashing being done by Dee and Jim on the
> > other ARRL thread.

It would be interesting to see whether Carl considers my comments "bashing"...

> Let them bash ... NCI continues to gain new members (and the pace picked up
> quite dramatically with all of the publicity surrounding the Petitions
> before the
> FCC); the membership is, judging by the large number of e-mails I get, happy
> with our policies and actions and ready to continue to support NCI through
> the end-game;

And there are how many of them? ;-)

What percentage of US hams do they comprise? ;-)

Point is, the whole "consensus" thing is history. FCC is deciding by different criteria now.

73 de Jim, N2EY

4518. Re: Why I Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-20 00:13:08 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0312191613.61c2ef40@posting.google.com>
Source record: 84094

"Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
news:<bqadnfyED8gho36iUSdV9w@ptd.net>...
> "Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
> news:xnfcneeyarg.hq3zjoc.pminews@netnews.comcast.net...
> > On Thu, 18 Dec 2003 16:12:40 -0000, Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
> >
> > >QST has gotten better, with the dropping of a lot of the contest data
> > >and more focus on a range of articles from beginner to expert level.
> > >I'd like to see more technical focus on modern stuff and fewer
> > >articles on building regen receivers with tubes, though.
> >
> > Yeah, Nuvistors are getting hard to get.
>
> And even half-a**ed decent transistors can blow their performance away,
> with better ones being worlds better.

The most recent construction article in QST using Nuvistors was when?
>
> My point is essentially that, IMHO, there is too much "nostalgia" and
> "let's go back to the past" content in QST.

I disagree. There's a good mix now.

> I'd prefer a more bleeding
> edge "let's push into the future" approach myself.

Then write some articles about stuff you'd like to see there. Look at
the bylines of QST construction articles - most of them aren't by
staffers. They're written by hams - like me.

Remember that one of the biggest complaints readers had about QST in
the past was that it was "too technical". So QEX was started, and the
more technical stuff migrated there.

> > How about reprints of memorable articles from yesteryear? Two from
> > the 1950s which are still applicable today for every class of licensee
> > come to mind:
> >
> > "Guys for Guys Who Have to Guy" (a basic paper on guyed towers)
> > "Over the Hills and Far Away" (ditto on tropo propagation)
>
> Some articles are ageless ... I agree with the idea of occasionally
> reprinting
> classics that are still applicable ... or making a compendium of them
> available
> on a CD-ROM might be an even better approach.

Problem is, such a compendium would compete with the QST CD-ROMs. But
it's still a good idea.

I'd really like to see old and rare ARRL publications on CD-ROM, both
for historic and fund-raising reasons.
>
> > How many of the "frequent poster" club here read them when they
> > first came out or even some time later?

I did. And almost every other QST article since - well, you don't
really want to know how far back....
>
> I don't recall them by title, but I probably read them ... my high school
> had an extensive collection of QSTs and I spend most of my study hall
> time signed out to the library reading QST ... I think I'd read every copy
> they had in the collection by the time I graduated in 1967.
>
How far back did they go?

73 de Jim, N2EY

4519. Re: Why I Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-20 01:17:26 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <GqNEb.11298$0s2.2493@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 84095

"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote

>
> It sounds to me like you're saying the ARRL Directors should sometimes
> go against what the majority of members say they want. Do you really
> think that's a good idea?
>

Yes, sometimes I think it IS a good idea. That sort of activity is often
called leadership.

Other times I think it's NOT a good idea.

The mark of a good leader is determining the difference.

73, de Hans, K0HB

4520. Re: Why I Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-20 01:28:01 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <BANEb.11320$0s2.9247@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 84096

"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote

>
> Last time a construction article with Nuvistors in it was when?
> Probably 1965 or so. Almost 40 years.
>

The current issue of QST has some really up-to-date-technology in it, not quite Nuvistors, but well beyond spark.

For example, a full length article on how important the quartz crystal industry was to winning the war. (WW-II, that is!)

Or another full length article on bringing a DX-100 AM transmitter (1955 era) up to factory spec.

Or how about the leading edge article on restoring a 1948 wooden-chassis homebrew 2-tube transmitter?

Hang around, and pretty soon -- perhaps within the decade -- we'll get up to Nuvistor technology!

73, de Hans, K0HB

PS: I almost forgot to mention, there's also some tantalizing information in this issue about panoramic reception, developed in 1932 by F3HM. Maybe it'll catch on!

4521. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-20 01:39:10 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bs0m1k$6e8@library2.airnews.net>
Source record: 84113

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:P0CEb.4683$wL6.3877@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> "Phil Kane" wrote:
> > Kim W5TIT wrote:
> >
> > > Less road maintenance and construction?
> > > For sure. I haven't driven anywhere in
> > > Texas since 1979 without some kind of
> > > road maintenance or construction going
> > > on, literally. Don't need it.
> >
> > You must have a wonderful car/truck that
> > fills in the potholes just ahead of your driving
> > over them.
>
>
> Exactly. I've driven through Texas recently (I-10 and I-20) and they do
> need road maintenance. On several sections of those highways, it may be
> smoother to just drive through the desert on the sand.
>

Ha!!! Yep, and the hilarious thing is that it is only recent that I-20
(don't know about I-10, near Houston, right?) is getting any attention.
Point being: the roads that need the fixin' the most haven't gotten it, and
the roads that are half-way decent are that way because "they" won't leave
'em alone!

>
> The last time I drove
> through Northern California (several years ago), I-5 had similar problems.
> On some sections of I-5, I had to slow down to 35 mph to avoid being
> literally bounced around inside the vehicle. By comparison, Alabama
recently
> repaved their major roads and was a pleasure to drive through.
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
>

4522. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-20 01:43:06 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bs0m1l$6e8@library2.airnews.net>
Source record: 84114

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:pSFEb.4874$wL6.2412@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> "N2EY" wrote:
> >
> > OTOH, if "behaving like an idiot" on
> > the road is not rewarded, the driver
> > may try something else (like courtesy,
> > or getting on the road a few minutes
> > earlier).
>
>
> However, your child analogy falls apart when you remember that you're
> talking about an adult - an adult that is going to get very angry at a
> person blocking the fast lane while he and others are trying to pass. Lets
> be realistic here. If Kim is intentionally blocking others on the roads,
she
> doesn't deserve courtesy.
>

I am not "intentionally" blocking anyone, Dwight. I am driving. That's
all.

>
> Instead, she is more likely to be a victim of road
> rage (something else she doesn't deserve, but far more likely). If she
> manages to avoid that, and if one of those people she is blocking just
> happens to be a cop, she may instead eventually get a ticket for not
driving
> on the right.
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
>

Nope, the only ticket would probably be for speeding...

Kim W5TIT

4523. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-20 01:50:35 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bs0m1m$6e8@library2.airnews.net>
Source record: 84112

"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
news:c2356669.0312191537.63070711@posting.google.com...
> "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:<pSFEb.4874$wL6.2412@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> > "N2EY" wrote:
> > >
> > > OTOH, if "behaving like an idiot" on
> > > the road is not rewarded, the driver
> > > may try something else (like courtesy,
> > > or getting on the road a few minutes
> > > earlier).
> > >
> > >
> > > However, your child analogy falls apart when you remember that you're
> > > talking about an adult
> >
> > A biological adult who is acting like a spoiled child.
> >
> > Remember the scenario Kim describes:
> >
> > - multilane divided highway
> > - all vehicles at or above the posted speed limit.
> > - vehicle comes up behind her, flashes brights, follows too closely,
> > tries to get around on the *inside* shoulder. IOW, unsafe, aggressive
> > driving actions intended to intimidate Kim. (as if!!)
> >
> > Some "adult".
> >
> > >- an adult that is going to get very angry at a
> > > person blocking the fast lane while he and others are trying to pass.
> >
> > Let them behave like adults, then. Following too closely for the speed
> > of travel is not adult behavior, regardless of what Kim is doing.
> >
> > > Lets be realistic here.
> >
> > OK, fine.
> >
> > It's realistic to behave in a safe responsible way when driving a
> > motor vehicle.
> >
> > > If Kim is intentionally blocking others on the roads, she
> > > doesn't deserve courtesy.
> >

> She's only blocking those who want to speed faster than she wants to
> speed.
>
> Suppose several cars were to line up side-by-side on a multilane
> divided highway and go exactly the speed limit. Would that justify the
> "idiot" behaviors Kim describes?
>
> Suppose they were police cars....
>
> > Instead, she is more likely to be a victim of road
> > rage (something else she doesn't deserve, but far more likely). If she
> > manages to avoid that, and if one of those people she is blocking just
> > happens to be a cop, she may instead eventually get a ticket for not
driving
> > on the right.
>
> Agreed! That's why I previously said I let the "idiots" get past,
> because I'd rather have them in front of me than behind me.
>
> But the behavior/reward model I gave is valid. For both children and
> alleged adults.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>

Well, I suppose it's valid, Jim. I've really never given the "behavior"
such thought, i.e. analogy, etc. BUT, I am generally a very even tempered
person and I don't feel I'm in any way wrong to stay in the lane I've chosen
to drive in, above the posted speed, safely, forming safe distances between
myself and drivers ahead of me, and never-minding nitwits behind me who
think I should "yield" to them so they can speed faster and keep making each
successive vehicle move.

Kim W5TIT

4524. Re: Why I Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-20 02:26:12 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <O7ecnQDg264aLn6iUSdV9w@ptd.net>
Source record: 84097

"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
news:c2356669.0312191613.61c2ef40@posting.google.com...
> "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
news:<bqadnfyED8gho36iUSdV9w@ptd.net>...
> > "Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
> > news:xnfcneeyarg.hq3zjoc.pminews@netnews.comcast.net...
> > > On Thu, 18 Dec 2003 16:12:40 -0000, Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
> > >
> > > >QST has gotten better, with the dropping of a lot of the contest data
> > > >and more focus on a range of articles from beginner to expert level.
> > > >I'd like to see more technical focus on modern stuff and fewer
> > > >articles on building regen receivers with tubes, though.
> > >
> > > Yeah, Nuvistors are getting hard to get.
> >
> > And even half-a**ed decent transistors can blow their performance away,
> > with better ones being worlds better.
>
> The most recent construction article in QST using Nuvistors was when?

Ask Phil, he's the one who mentioned them :-) Seriously, I think it was in
the
60's ... but I don't think tube projects have much relevance any more,
except,
perhaps for amplifiers, and you know how I feel about QRO ...

> > > How many of the "frequent poster" club here read them when they
> > > first came out or even some time later?
>
> I did. And almost every other QST article since - well, you don't
> really want to know how far back....
> >
> > I don't recall them by title, but I probably read them ... my high
school
> > had an extensive collection of QSTs and I spend most of my study hall
> > time signed out to the library reading QST ... I think I'd read every
copy
> > they had in the collection by the time I graduated in 1967.
> >
> How far back did they go?

I honestly don't remember ... but well back into the 50's IIRC.

73,
Carl - wk3c

4525. Re: Why I Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-20 02:38:33 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <1bKcnRsopILxK36iUSdV9w@ptd.net>
Source record: 84098

"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
news:c2356669.0312191605.469f743b@posting.google.com...
> "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
news:<LaWdnUpk3pWGoH6iUSdV9w@ptd.net>...
> > Leadership is
> > when one has the courage and wisdom to make a sound judgement
> > and then "do the right thing."
>
> Who decides what "the right thing" really is?

That's what "leadership" is *supposed* to be there for ... to make
the tough calls when the answer isn't necessarily obvious (or may
be right, but not overwhelmingly popular).

> For example, look at
> that "21st century" paper (CQ published it, btw, and it was in their
> mill before I evder saw it, so don't give me a hard time about it). Is
> the "Communicator" idea "the right thing"?

No ... we need more people who understand radio, not more appliance
operators.

> > Otherwise, they could just do a web vote
> > popularity contest on every issue and wouldn't need Directors ... the
> > staff could handle the whole thing ...
>
> And if that vote runs opposite to what you think is "the right thing"?

I wasn't advocating a popularity contest ... just saying that if nobody in
"leadership" has the cajones and good judgement to make the right call,
then it might as well devolve to that ...

> It sounds to me like you're saying the ARRL Directors should sometimes
> go against what the majority of members say they want. Do you really
> think that's a good idea?

Yes ... the leadership should, theoretically at least, have superior
knowledge,
insight, and experience and should be there to guide, not simply be a bunch
of political "yes men" to a majority who may/may not necessarily make the
best
choices in terms of what's in the best interests of ham radio long term.

> > What I was referring to were things like CW practice, bulletins, etc.
All
> > of that could
> > be provided (and much is) by the web site, and probably would reduce

> > operating
> > costs. (Though doing things by non-radio means is heresy to some ...)
>
> IOW, you want to shut down the station.

No, I wasn't saying that ... I was just "thinking out loud" about what
things
might be more cost-effectively provided by other means.

> The whole point of W1AW is to do those things by *radio*. If we're
> going to use the website for bulletins and code practice, why not rag
> chewing, traffic handling, DX chasing, contesting......

I've always said that the ampr.org domain should be come a much more
integrated, vibrant part of the internet as a whole ...

Carl - wk3c

4526. Re: Why I Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-20 02:39:49 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <MbKcnRBjktklK36iUSdV9w@ptd.net>
Source record: 84099

"Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:GqNEb.11298$0s2.2493@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net...
>
> "N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote
>
> >
> > It sounds to me like you're saying the ARRL Directors should sometimes
> > go against what the majority of members say they want. Do you really
> > think that's a good idea?
> >
>
> Yes, sometimes I think it IS a good idea. That sort of activity is often
> called leadership.
>
> Other times I think it's NOT a good idea.
>
> The mark of a good leader is determining the difference.
>
> 73, de Hans, K0HB

Hans,

You and I are on the same frequency on this one ... you said it
clearer than I did the first time, but hopefully my explanation was
better in response to Jim's question.

73,
Carl - wk3c

4527. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-20 02:54:01 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3FE3B9D2.F8D14CE1@earthlink.net>
Source record: 84100

Dwight Stewart wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" wrote:
> > Dwight Stewart wrote:
> > >
> > > But we're not talking about a woman with
> > > several children or NASA engineers - this
> > > is a discussion about government policy.
> >
> > Why, Dwight! It was you who brought up
> > those very items. How can it be a dodge
> > when I respond to them? (snip)
>
> As you know, they (child birth and NASA) were brought up in a discussion
> about government policy. Your reply was a dodge because you tried to apply
> those comments to something other than government policy rather than
> addressing them in the context they were made.

Your earlier comments:

"Dave, I don't have a background in a lot of things (child birth,
international affairs with Belarus, NASA space missions, to name just a
few), but expect to have a voice in those things when I have something
to say and would be darn offended, and very confrontational..."

Please point out the portion in which you state that you're discussing
government policy on child birth, NASA, etc.

> > (snip) What value would your suggestions on
> > child bearing policy or NASA policy have to
> > those making decisions? (snip)
>
> We were talking about opinions, not suggestions. My opinions affect how I
> vote, which effects who is elected, which effects where tax dollars are
> spent, and so on. My opinions, voiced to others, may affect their opinions,
> which effects who is elected, and so on. Is this process all that unfamiliar
> to you?

Not at all. Opinions become suggestions all the time. Are you familiar
with Len's lengthy submission to the FCC regarding the morse test?
Would you believe his words could be construed as being suggestions to
the FCC? Would they be considered as Len's opinions?

> > (snip) Don't expect others to greet your views
> > with reverence if you have no background in the
> > matter under discussion. (snip)

>
> Don't be so vain, Dave. You don't speak for "others" and I don't
> expect anything from you.

My comments had nothing to do with vanity.

> > (snip) The mistake is in the view that morse use
> > is declining in amateur radio. (snip)
>
> I haven't said Morse use is declining in Amateur Radio. My exact words
> were "...Morse code is a declining skill throughout the radio world."

That's what you wrote, alright. I pointed out that morse use is not
declining in amateur radio. Amateur radio is certainly part of the
radio world.

> Considering far fewer people in radio today are using code compared to just
> few decades ago, that isn't exactly an astonishing revelation, is it?
>
> > (snip) It matters not that the morse isn't used much
> > by other radio services. (snip)
>
> Oh, it most certainly does matter. As I've already stated, if we're going
> to remain a valuable radio service, worthy of the massive frequencies we
> hold and unlike personal radio services (CB), we must consider the needs of
> the other radio services when discussing any licensing issue - including
> code testing.

The needs of other radio services? What need has any other service to
tell hams which modes to use? How would a great number of hams using
morse be less worthy of the "massive" frequencies we have for our use?

> The FCC did exactly that in the Report & Order following the last round of
> restructuring when they looked at personal communication services, satellite
> communications, fiber optic communications, high definition television
> systems, and police, fire, and rescue communications. In that Report &
> Order, the FCC stated that "...no communication system has been designed in
> many years that depends on hand-keyed telegraphy or the ability to receive
> messages in Morse code by ear"...

Simple statement of fact. No new system has been developed. Yet
thousands of radio amateurs use morse daily.

> and that "...the emphasis on Morse code
> proficiency as a licensing requirement does not comport with the basis and
> purpose of the service." Finally, the FCC said, "...reducing the emphasis on
> telegraphy proficiency as a licensing requirement will allow the amateur
> service to, as it has in the past, attract technically inclined persons,
> particularly the youth of our country, and encourage them to learn and to
> prepare themselves in the areas where the United States needs expertise."

Yup. Five words per minute isn't exactly emphasis on morse, is it?
Technically inclined people didn't let a morse test stop them in the

past and don't seem to let it stop them now. Much of the youth seems
busy downloading MP3 files and playing computer games.

> In
> my opinion, the exact same argument could be made for eliminating telegraphy
> proficiency as a licensing requirement.

Maybe it could--if you believe that 5 wpm constitutes "emphasis".

Dave K8MN

4528. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-20 02:58:56 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031219215856.21232.00002859@mb-m13.aol.com>
Source record: 84101

In article <f45722ac.0312191629.3a2b2835@posting.google.com>,
brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:

>n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
>news:<20031218200926.15462.00005055@mb-m06.aol.com>...
>> In article <f45722ac.0312181528.1a3a7ef8@posting.google.com>,
>> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
>>
>> >"Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
>> >news:<ACiEb.9500$0s2.606@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>...
>> >> "Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote i
>> >>
>> >>
>> >> > Is that documentable? Letters and pictures with circles and arrows?
>> >>
>> >> Build yourself a time machine and go back 40 years and look.
>> >
>> >Hansel, if you don't have the proper documentation then it doesn't count.
>> >
>> You mean like your alleged /T5 operation?
>
>Which one?
>
Any and all of them

4529. Re: Why I Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-20 02:58:56 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031219215856.21232.00002860@mb-m13.aol.com>
Source record: 84102

In article <N4JEb.11043$0s2.2996@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>, "Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> writes:

>"Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote
>
>> Code test dissapears, nothing in it's place. I want to see something in
>> it's place, or else itis pretty hard to argue that it hasn't been made
>> much much easier to get a license.
>
>Siince the Novice license was discontinued, it has become more difficult to
>become an amateur.

That means passing the post-restructuring 35 question Tech test is "more difficult" (YMMV on what constitutes "more difficult") than passing both the pre-restructuring 30 question Novice test *and* the 5 wpm code receiving test.

Sunuvagun!
>
>> Not a filter, not a way of keeping people out. just a way
>> of ensuring that the amateur has some level of acumen.
>
>I don't hold the opinion that the Morse test established that the applicant
>has any "level of acumen" (check with Funk and Wagnalls before you respond).
>
Nor does the written test....

>In the world of Amateur Radio there are users and tinkerers. We need more
>tinkerers, not more users.

Have the changes of 2000 gotten us more tinkerers per unit time than before?

73 de Jim, N2EY

4530. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-20 03:00:48 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3FE3BB6B.6060946A@earthlink.net>
Source record: 84103

Len Over 21 wrote:

> ...Your beligerance keeps on.

> Yup, beligerance with flags...

> You are beligerant and pissed off...

Once could be a typo. Three would be one of your "Atila" gaffes.
"Belligerent", Len. I thought you were a professional writer.

Dave K8MN

4531. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-20 03:06:35 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3FE3BCC6.22E2A836@earthlink.net>
Source record: 84104

Len Over 21 wrote:

> ...written by many of the beligerant...

"belligerent"

> ...as long as such beligerance remains rooted

"belligerence"

Dave K8MN

4532. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-20 03:26:32 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3FE3C172.918E403C@earthlink.net>
Source record: 84105

N2EY wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3FDFD8C7.C3E0B827@earthlink.net>...
> > Len Over 21 wrote:
> > >
> > > In article <3FDE7172.BF1D62F0@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> > > writes:
> > >
> > > >Len Over 21 wrote:
> > > >
> > > >> Problem is that Believers are in the minority...but they cannot ever
> > > >> see that or they are so set that what they think is the absolute
> > > >> "they know what is best."
> > > >
> > > >But, Len, you think you know what is best for amateur radio and you
> > > >aren't even involved. You're pretty much of a minority.
> > >
> > > I've not claimed to "know what is best for amateur radio."
> > >
> > > That's YOUR claim.
> >
> > That isn't correct, Leonard.
>
> Dave,
>
> A bit of clarification.
>
> Mr. Anderson has repeatedly expounded his views on a wide range of
> topics both here and in voluminous, repetitive comments to the FCC.
> But I don't recall him ever claiming that they were "what is best for
> amateur radio" or that he even knows "what is best for amateur radio."

Jim, I have to disagree. The very fact that Len submitted his ideas on morse testing and a minimum age for amateur radio licensing to the Commission demonstrates that he believes that he knows what is best for amateur radio, in which he has never been a participant.

Leonard has, on occasion, tried to have it both ways. He has told us that he was going for an "Extra right out of the box" and, in a turnabout, that he really isn't interested in obtaining an amateur radio license. He has written of his decades-long interest but he has never even attempted to obtain even a code free ticket.

Truth is, when I'm chasing S92SS on 160, when I'm checking into the WV Fone Net or when I'm reading the latest QST, I don't give Leonard a thought. He wasn't a part of amateur radio's past, isn't part of its present and, I'm guessing, won't be part of its future.

Dave K8MN

4533. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-20 04:13:05 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <I%PEb.1375$Vv2.649025@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 84106

N2EY wrote:
> "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:<pSFEb.4874$wL6.2412@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
>
>>"N2EY" wrote:
>>
>>>OTOH, if "behaving like an idiot" on
>>>the road is not rewarded, the driver
>>>may try something else (like courtesy,
>>>or getting on the road a few minutes
>>>earlier).
>>
>>
>> However, your child analogy falls apart when you remember that you're
>>talking about an adult
>
>
> A biological adult who is acting like a spoiled child.
>
> Remember the scenario Kim describes:
>
> - multilane divided highway
> - all vehicles at or above the posted speed limit.
> - vehicle comes up behind her, flashes brights, follows too closely,
> tries to get around on the *inside* shoulder. IOW, unsafe, aggressive
> driving actions intended to intimidate Kim. (as if!!)
>
> Some "adult".
>
>
>>- an adult that is going to get very angry at a
>>person blocking the fast lane while he and others are trying to pass.
>
>
> Let them behave like adults, then. Following too closely for the speed
> of travel is not adult behavior, regardless of what Kim is doing.
>
>
>>Lets be realistic here.
>
>
> OK, fine.
>
> It's realistic to behave in a safe responsible way when driving a

> motor vehicle.
>
>
>>If Kim is intentionally blocking others on the roads, she
>>doesn't deserve courtesy.
>
>
> She's only blocking those who want to speed faster than she wants to
> speed.

Okay, who made her the arbiter of how fast the lane travels? Kim has no more the right to limit other drivers speed than I do to limit hers, if I were to try the same tactic.
> Suppose several cars were to line up side-by-side on a multilane
> divided highway and go exactly the speed limit. Would that justify the
> "idiot" behaviors Kim describes?

Nope. Nothing ever justifies idiot behavior.

> Suppose they were police cars....

Then I suspect I would go the speed limit!

>>Instead, she is more likely to be a victim of road
>>rage (something else she doesn't deserve, but far more likely). If she
>>manages to avoid that, and if one of those people she is blocking just
>>happens to be a cop, she may instead eventually get a ticket for not driving
>>on the right.
>
>
> Agreed! That's why I previously said I let the "idiots" get past,
> because I'd rather have them in front of me than behind me.
>
> But the behavior/reward model I gave is valid. For both children and
> alleged adults.

Another model I can think of for this kind of behavior is when a person feels stressed out, out of control, and is in a bad mood. The other drivers, those going faster or slower are an irritant. You're traveling along, and someone comes up behind you and invades your "auto persanl space". You can exert just a little smidgem of control, and spread a little stress on the other driver by taking just a liiittlle biit looonggerr to get out of his/her way. If you get them to react to you, short of provoking a roadrage incident, you get a little dose of satisfaction.

I'll bet everyone here has done something like that one time or another.

And as George Carlin points out:

Have you ever noticed? Anybody going slower than you is an idiot, and anyone going faster than you is a moron.

- Mike KB3EIA -

4534. Re: Why I Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-20 04:28:46 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <2eQEb.11638$Pg1.3410@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 84107

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote

>
> That means passing the post-restructuring 35 question Tech test is "more
> difficult" than passing both the pre-restructuring 30 question Novice
> test *and* the 5 wpm code receiving test.
>

Yes. (But only barely, and it is woefully inadequate for the resultant
privileges.)

>
> Have the changes of 2000 gotten us more tinkerers per unit time than
before?
>

What the hell are "tinkerers per unit time"? The generally accepted
language of rrap is English.

73, de Hans, K0HB

4535. Re: Why I Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-20 04:31:47 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031219233147.05539.00003103@mb-m16.aol.com>
Source record: 84108

In article <BANEb.11320$0s2.9247@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>, "Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> writes:

>"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote
>
>>
>> Last time a construction article with Nuvistors in it was when?
>> Probably 1965 or so. Almost 40 years.
>
>The current issue of QST has some really up-to-date-technology in it, not
>quite Nuvistors, but well beyond spark.

Yep. It's the annual "vintage radio" issue. Says so right on the cover.
>
>For example, a full length article on how important the quartz crystal
>industry was to winning the war. (WW-II, that is!)

Yep. It's the annual "vintage radio" issue. Says so right on the cover. Radio grade quartz was mined back then - today it's grown.
>
>Or another full length article on bringing a DX-100 AM transmitter (1955
>era) up to factory spec.
>
Yep. It's the annual "vintage radio" issue. Says so right on the cover.

The DX-100 was basically a bargain version of the Viking 2/ 122 VFO combo in one box. Not as good, though. YMMV.

The article tells how a ham bought an old Heathkit rig on eBay, fixed it up, and put it on the air. Looks like he had fun doing it, too. Rig was actually Made In USA, and the present owner actually worked on it hisself. Very electro-politically incorrect.

>Or how about the leading edge article on restoring a 1948 wooden-chassis
>homebrew 2-tube transmitter?

Yep. It's the annual "vintage radio" issue. Says so right on the cover.

The DX-100 was basically a bargain version of the Viking 2/ 122 VFO combo in one box. Not as good, though. YMMV.

The article tells how a ham bought an old homebrew rig on eBay, fixed it up, made a few modifications and put it on the air. Looks like he had fun doing it, too. Rig was actually home-built by a ham - not even a kit. Parts were all Made In USA, and the present owner actually worked on it hisself. And it puts out a perfectly clean signal. Very, very electro-politically incorrect, though.

How dare these hams actually work on their own rigs! Next thing you know,
they'll be turning their backs on Ikensu....
>
>Hang around, and pretty soon -- perhaps within the decade -- we'll get up to
>Nuvistor technology!
>
PS: I almost forgot to mention, there's also some tantalizing information
>in this issue about panoramic reception, developed in 1932 by F3HM. Maybe
>it'll catch on!
>
I recall about a decade ago when the IC-781 appeared how gaga some folks were
over the display. As if nobody had ever done it before. Shades of the QS-59
receiver....

Also in the same issue of QST:

- Article on using a transmitter-receiver modules to eliminate the key cable
(tail wagging the dog..)

- 5 page article on the K1B Baker Island DXpedition

- Article on contesting as a "little pistol"

- Article on "casual" RTTY contesting

- "Short Takes" column on MultiPSK freeware package (does several flavors of
PSK, SSTV, RTTY, AMTOR, Hellschreiber, and (oh yes) CW

- 3-1/2 page article on building an AC wattmeter

- 2 page "Hands On Radio" column. This is #12 in a series - subject is FETs.

- 2 page "Hints and Kinks" column.

- 5 page review of the Ten Tec Orion

- 2 page review of the SGC add on audio DSP unit (ADSP2)

- Correspondence from Members, Happenings, Technical Correspondence, Public
Service, DX, Exam Info, World above 50 MHz, At The Foundation, Old Radio, YL
News, SKs, New Products, 75/50/25 years ago in QST, Contest and hamfest
calendars, W1AW schedule...

- Microwavelengths (Part 1 of an article about microwave LNAs - no nuvistors in
sight)

- Results of June VHF contest, School club Roundup, August UHF contest.

- and more. 160 pages this issue.

How many articles of cutting-edge technology have you submitted?

73 de Jim, N2EY

4536. Re: Why I Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-20 04:54:41 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <ICQEb.11665$Pg1.3885@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 84109

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote

>
> Yep. It's the annual "vintage radio" issue. Says so right on the cover.
>

Thank you, Thank You, THANK YOU!!! You make my point exactly!!!

I'm very much an ARRL supporter, but an "Annual Vintage Radio Issue" is a pathetic statement about the technical leadership out of 225 Main Street. Sorta validates LHA's persistent jeremiads about how backward amateurs seem to him. How much nicer if there were an "Annual Future Systems Issue".

73, de Hans, K0HB

4537. Re: K1MAN...Radio criminal?? Check this out!!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-20 05:11:03 UTC
From: "Chuck...K1KW" <cdoneal@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <HRQEb.606634$Fm2.551016@attbi_s04>
Source record: 84110
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

Wow!!...after looking at that rip off price to send a card through the mail,
it reminds me of what my late Grandfather used to say, " a man reveals
his true values in every thing he does". Well, after seeing this, I can
only
guess what my Grandfather would have thought of this...If this guy, K1MAN,
is a scumbag on Ebay, he may be a scumbag on amateur radio also. Look at
all the correspondence from the FCC concerning this station. Just enter
K1MAN
in a Google search. Lots of reading concerning FCC violations.

What do you think???

73,
Chuck...

"Brother Stairmeister the Fart-Whistle" <xemuiscomming@yahoo.com> wrote in
message news:251ac$3fe1e0a2$d1cc7967$7728@allthenewsgroups.com...
>
> "Chuck...K1KW" <cdoneal@comcast.net> wrote in message
> news:YHbEb.385584$Dw6.1240923@attbi_s02...
> > http://users.adelphia.net/~k3vr/bs.htm
> >
> >
>
> He may or may not be a radio criminal, I will leave that to
> the FCC to decide.
>
> I do know however that he has no shame.
>
> See:
>
http://cgi.ebay.com/ws/eBayISAPI.dll?ViewItem&category=1502&item=3066280206
>
> (.......and some stupid schmuck already bid on it too!)
>

4538. Re: Why I Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-20 05:15:43 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3WQEb.1404$Vv2.662089@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 84111

Kï¿½HB wrote:

> "Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote
>
>
>>Code test dissapears, nothing in it's place. I want to see something in
>>it's place, or else itis pretty hard to argue that it hasn't been made
>>much much easier to get a license.
>
>
> Siince the Novice license was discontinued, it has become more difficult to
> become an amateur.

really? The most difficult thing for me in Amateur Radio was to learn Morse code. It would have taken me just as long to get a Novice as it would to get my General ticket.

>
>>Not a filter, not a way of keeping people out. just a way
>>of ensuring that the amateur has some level of acumen.
>
>
> I don't hold the opinion that the Morse test established that the applicant
> has any "level of acumen" (check with Funk and Wagnalls before you respond).

acumen: keenness and depth of perception, discernment, or discrimination especially in practical matters.

Sounds good to me Hans, although it was from Merriam Webster, not Funk and Wagnalls. Any other corrections to make to my posts?

I'm a firm believer that we need to ensure that the prospective amateur is *interested* in the hobby. No question to me that the old Morse code test went some way towards that. That's not a filter. Making a prospective ham have to stand up against a tree while other hams throw eggs at him/her before a license is issued is a filter.

The Morse code is almost certainly going away. I don't really give a good rat's backside about it. So now we are arguing about whatever word you want to use instead of acumen. I desire more, and you appear to desire less.

> In the world of Amateur Radio there are users and tinkerers. We need more
> tinkerers, not more users.

Well we aren't heading that way!

- Mike KB3EIA -

4539. Re: Why I Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-20 05:32:35 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <T9REb.1412$Vv2.664605@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 84115

Carl R. Stevenson wrote:

> "Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
> news:f45722ac.0312181539.55a82802@posting.google.com...
>
>>"Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
>
> news:<I5udnayzo8vRT3yiXTWc9g@ptd.net>...
>
>>>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>>>news:20031215235832.07961.00000569@mb-m03.aol.com...
>>>
>>>>In no particular order:
>>>>
>>>>1) Representation of amateur radio (what other organization or
>
> individual
>
>>> would
>>>
>>>>do anyhting like the 121 page commentary on BPL?)
>>>
>>>Representation of what the Board *perceives* to be the wishes of the
>>>membership.
>>>I don't believe that non-members get the same attention on issues as
>>>members, but
>>>that is reasonable, since member dues support the ARRL.
>>
>>This member supports the ARRL. Also, this member did not receive a
>>questionare when the ARRL was conducting a poll of members and
>>non-members.
>
>
> Perhaps they did a random survey of some percentage of the membership?
>
>
>>>>5) Elected officials (they listen even if they don't agree)
>>>
>>>YMMV, depending on what area you live in, whether your Director is
>>>open-minded and progressive, etc.
>>
>>Apparently they think that they cannot present the needs or want of
>>both camps until they come to a concensus.
>

>
> The "c-word" is an excuse to do nothing.

No it doesn't. I've used consensus building for years. I don't do it unless a decision *needs* to be made. I even use it in situations where I have absolute dictatorial power, such as on my Ice Hockey team. I find out what the guys think on a lot of the issues. Then as long as it makes sense, and is within the rules I'll decide what they like. You'd be surprised how well they listen to you when they *need* to when you listen to them when you *should*.

Other BOD activities I've been involved in are run the same way - although I don't have absolute power there! 8^)

> On some things there may
> never be consensus - should the ARRL do nothing? Leadership is
> when one has the courage and wisdom to make a sound judgement
> and then "do the right thing."

Sure, ya have to do that sometimes. Problem is that if you use that courage and wisdom in the wrong way, you can find yourself on the outside pretty quickly. Then you're a leader with no flock. No leader at all.

> Otherwise, they could just do a web vote

familiar with web voting?

> popularity contest on every issue and wouldn't need Directors ... the
> staff could handle the whole thing ...

Leaders get usually get elected or appointed or whatever because they have some values that appeal to those who are to be governed. The most successful leaders I know ask for and get as much input as they can when faced with decisions. Figuring that you know the answers and what you know is right regardless is hubris.

- Mike KB3EIA -

4540. Re: Why I Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-20 05:40:31 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <jhREb.1416$Vv2.665174@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 84116

Carl R. Stevenson wrote:

> "Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
> news:xnfcneeyarg.hq3zjoc.pminews@netnews.comcast.net...
>
>>On Thu, 18 Dec 2003 16:12:40 -0000, Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
>>
>>
>>>QST has gotten better, with the dropping of a lot of the contest data
>>>and more focus on a range of articles from beginner to expert level.
>>>I'd like to see more technical focus on modern stuff and fewer
>>>articles on building regen receivers with tubes, though.
>>
>> Yeah, Nuvistors are getting hard to get.
>
>
> And even half-a**ed decent transistors can blow their performance away,
> with better ones being worlds better.
>
> My point is essentially that, IMHO, there is too much "nostalgia" and
> "let's go back to the past" content in QST. I'd prefer a more bleeding
> edge "let's push into the future" approach myself.

I really enjoy the old timey stories. And I'm not an old time ham,
being first licensed in fall of 1998.

And you might think of writing some articles. (forgive if you already
have, I've only read QST for a short time now)

I'd love to see cutting edge stuff, although I would prefer emphasis on
RF instead of digital.

- Mike KB3EIA -

4541. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-20 06:20:37 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <VSREb.5909$wL6.4312@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 84117

"Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
news:3FE365B7.5040506@psu.edu...
> Bill Sohl wrote:
> > "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
> > news:l%tEb.690$Vv2.350911@news1.news.adelphia.net...
> >
> >>Dwight Stewart wrote:
> >>
> >>
> >>>"Dee D. Flint" wrote:
> >>>
> >>>
> >>>>(snip) One thing that the NCI has quite
> >>>>convincingly demonstrated is that HARD
> >>>>WORK is what is required to achieve a
> >>>>goal. (snip) They organized on a world
> >>>>wide basis. They lobbied the various
> >>>>governing bodies around the world to
> >>>>support a change in the code requirement
> >>>>at the last ITU conference. (snip) It
> >>>>shows that the minority can prevail if they
> >>>>have the commitment.
> >>>
> >>>
> >>>
> >>> I think you're giving NCI way too much credit, Dee. Indeed, created
in
> >>
> > the
> >
> >>>late 90's, they came to the debate rather late and have done little
> >>
> > beyond
> >
> >>>urging members to file comments on related issues before the FCC (no
> >>
> > visible
> >
> >>>government lobbying and no significant world-wide organization - a few
> >>>members in a few countries). If anything, NCI's most significant
> >>>contribution, once they did arrive on the scene, has been to serve as a
> >>>lightning rod for criticism from code supporters, leaving a vastly
> >>
> > greater

> >
> >>>number of non-members relatively free to make the case against code
> >>
> > testing
> >
> >>>wherever possible. Moreover, there would have been no gains at all if
> >>
> > there
> >
> >>>had been no substance to the core arguments against code testing. Those
> >>>arguments existed, and were being made, long before NCI joined the
> >>
> > debate.
> >
> >>I agree, Dwight. What I find most distressing about NCI is that as a
> >>late comer to the game, they were in a position to offer some leadership
> >>in the "brave new world" post CW. While there is no question that Carl
> >>supports retention of technical acumen in the service, some other
> >>members do not. If I were in charge, I would have a plan all mapped out
> >>to fill the coming vacuum. Of course its hard for me to say what that
> >>plan would be, because I support continuned Morse code testing. 8^)
> >
> >
> > Two questions...
> > 1. What "other members" (I presume you mean Board Members), other
> > than W5YI, do NOT support retention of technical acumen?
>
> They don't have to be Board members, Bill. And I don't have their names
> off the top of my head.
>
> If you like, I can retract the "members" statement, and substitute
> "member" or "prominent member". Although I think that's almost like
> saying a person's argument is invalid because they made a typo.

Bottom line, without names, the statement is grossly misleading
as you apear to try and broaden your claim to NCI in general...
which is absolutely false.

> > 2. What is "the coming vacuum"?
>
> Didn't you ask this question in another post? See that one! ;^)

I did, someone else called it a gap???

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

4542. Re: Why I Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-20 06:32:47 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <j2SEb.5919$wL6.1820@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 84118

"Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
news:3FE34758.8000802@psu.edu...
>
>
> Bill Sohl wrote:
> > "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
> > news:OTtEb.689$Vv2.349555@news1.news.adelphia.net...
> >
> >>Dee D. Flint wrote:
> >>
> >>>"Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
> >>>news:f45722ac.0312181539.55a82802@posting.google.com...
> >>>
> >>>>Carl, you should see the NCI bashing being done by Dee and Jim on the
> >>>>other ARRL thread.
> >>>>
> >>>>73, Brian
> >>>
> >>>
> >>>I have never bashed the NCI. I've stated that I disagree with their
> > goal
> >
> >>>but that does not constitute bashing them.
> >>
> >>I have! I think that they have recieved what they wanted, but as yet
> >>don't really offer anything of substance to fill the gap.
> >
> >
> > What GAP?
>
> Code test dissapears, nothing in it's place.

Why should there be anything in its place? This isn't about
some mystical quantification of effort, dedication, yada yada....
The morse tests have completely disappeared for General
and Extra without anything taking its place. If 5 wpm is dropped
for tech, why should there be something to replace it?

> I want to see something in
> it's place, or else itis pretty hard to argue that it hasn't been made
> much much easier to get a license.

Ending a requirement that no longer has a rational need
does not translate into a search for some "replacement".
If you had the opportunity to state what the replacement

should be, what would you suggest?

> You may want it made much easier to get a license, but I don't. Not a
> filter, not a way of keeping people out. just a way of ensuring that the
> amateur has some level of acumen.

Ending morse doesn't change the level of written tests.

> Otherwise, those who want little or no testing are just encouraged.

Encouraged about what?

> >>Instead, some
> >>members express "unofficial opinions that scare the bejabbers out of me.
> >
> > "Some members"? Who? It is always easy to make non-speciifc
> > accusations against unidentified "some members".
>
> W5YI for one. I trust you have read his work?

W5YI's comments as to testing issues beyond the elimination
of code testing are NOT, in any way, shape or form,
the position or opinion of NCI.

As to other NCI members, assuming you can ID someone,
they too may have a personal belief as to how testing should go...
but that does NOT make their opinions or beliefs NCI
doctrine.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

4543. Re: Why I Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-20 06:44:34 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <mdSEb.5924$wL6.596@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 84119

"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
news:c2356669.0312191605.469f743b@posting.google.com...
> "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
news:<LaWdnUpk3pWGoH6iUSdV9w@ptd.net>...
> > "Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
> > news:f45722ac.0312181539.55a82802@posting.google.com...
> > > "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
> > news:<I5udnayzo8vRT3yiXTWc9g@ptd.net>...
> > > > "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> > > > news:20031215235832.07961.00000569@mb-m03.aol.com...
> > > > > In no particular order:
> > > > >
> > > > > 1) Representation of amateur radio (what other organization or
> > individual
> > would
> > > > > do anyhting like the 121 page commentary on BPL?)
> > > > >
> > > > Representation of what the Board *perceives* to be the wishes of the
> > > > membership.
> > > > I don't believe that non-members get the same attention on issues as
> > > > members, but
> > > > that is reasonable, since member dues support the ARRL.
> > > >
> > > This member supports the ARRL. Also, this member did not receive a
> > > questionare when the ARRL was conducting a poll of members and
> > > non-members.
> > >
> > Perhaps they did a random survey of some percentage of the membership?
>
> They hired READEX to do a survey. It was supposedly a scientific
> sample of the membership.
>
> That was 1996.
> >
> > > > > 5) Elected officials (they listen even if they don't agree)
> > > > >
> > > > YMMV, depending on what area you live in, whether your Director is
> > > > open-minded and progressive, etc.
> > > >
> > > Apparently they think that they cannot present the needs or want of
> > > both camps until they come to a concensus.
> > >
> > The "c-word" is an excuse to do nothing.
>

> No, it isn't. And it's spelled "consensus", as WK3C demonstrates.
>
> The "c-word" came into use because FCC said some years ago that they
> weren't going to do any serious restructuring until the amateur radio
> community came up with a consensus on what they wanted. That policy
> was quite visibly abandoned in 1998 when FCC issued an NPRM without
> any consensus being evident.

But for several years the FCC was quite happy to
avoid the issue based on the "consensus" argument.
By 1998, the writing apparently was on the wall
in the FCC that there probably was no rational reason
to retain code testing. The FCC then gave pro-code
advocates the opportunity to provide reasons for
code testing and for various code speeds. The pro-code
arguments were insufficient and all were denied
by the FCC as being rational or otherwise justifiable.

> > On some things there may
> > never be consensus - should the ARRL do nothing?
>
> Depends on the issue and how close to a consensus exists. There's a
> world of difference between a 90% majority and a 51% majority, for
> example.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

4544. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-20 11:55:45 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <5NWEb.5989$wL6.919@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 84120

"N2EY" wrote:
>
> Remember the scenario Kim describes:
>
> - multilane divided highway
> - all vehicles at or above the posted speed limit.
> - vehicle comes up behind her, flashes brights,
> follows too closely, tries to get around on the
> *inside* shoulder. IOW, unsafe, aggressive
> driving actions intended to intimidate Kim.
> (as if!!)

That's your (and/or perhaps Kim's) interpretation of the scenario. Others may interpret it as Kim being an inattentive driver that is not acting courteously to others by driving to the right, causing others to take extraordinary steps to get her attention back on the road and courteous driving (with extraordinary steps being necessary to get someone to drive courteously only adding to the fustration of other drivers).

> She's only blocking those who want to speed
> faster than she wants to speed.

Exactly. However, as you well know, she doesn't have a mandate, or a right, to self-enforce how fast others drive. Instead, she has the same obligations as other drivers, including an obligation to move to the right to allow others to pass. If others are driving too fast while doing so, that is law enforcement's business - not the business of a self-styled road vigilante.

> But the behavior/reward model I gave is valid.
> For both children and alleged adults.

I disagree. For it to be valid, you would have to establish there is nothing more than childhood impulse behind the decision drive fast - impulse that can be easily modified by simple rewards. And you haven't established that. Adults can make decisions based on some level of knowledge, experience, and review of the situation, not impulse. In the case of fast drivers, perhaps the driver feels, based on a consideration of his/her skills and experience, that he/she can drive safely at faster speeds. For example, I've driven many thousands of miles on German autobahns, and know full well I can drive safely at speeds faster than 55-65 mph (therefore only the laws and conditions attenuate my driving speeds). Perhaps the person has a legitimate reason for driving faster. For example, the driver may be taking someone to the hospital (and Kim is blocking his way). I could go on, but these examples alone should make it clear that not all are acting solely on impulse that can be easily modified by simple rewards.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

4545. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-20 12:17:15 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <f5XEb.5996$wL6.2632@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 84121

"Kim W5TIT" wrote:
>
> I am not "intentionally" blocking anyone,
> Dwight. I am driving. That's all.

But if you are intentionally not moving to the right, not yielding to others trying to pass, that is not all. If Texas is like many states, you have a legal obligation to drive on the right to allow others to pass. There is rarely an exception which allows you to ignore these laws when you feel it is justified - when you feel others are driving too fast or you feel others are violating the laws, for examples. It is true these laws are rarely enforced, but that doesn't mean they're never enforced. For example, you will most often see these laws enforced when there are multiple car accidents where the slower vehicle causing the congestion necessary for this type of accident is ticketed (with that driver being responsible for the damage to all vehicles involved).

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

4546. Re: Why I Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-20 12:58:47 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031220075847.25815.00005323@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 84122

In article <lCQEb.11665$Pg1.3885@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>, "Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote
>
>> Yep. It's the annual "vintage radio" issue. Says so right on the cover.
>
>Thank you, Thank You, THANK YOU!!!

You're welcome.

> You make my point exactly!!!

Of course.
>
>I'm very much an ARRL supporter,

And a long-time member...

>but an "Annual Vintage Radio Issue" is a
>pathetic statement about the technical leadership out of 225 Main Street.

Why is it "pathetic"? A significant number of hams are interested in "vintage" radio. Just like a significant number of people like antique furniture, classic cars, oldies music, past films and books, vintage clothing, etc. Doesn't mean they are "stuck in the past".

I know a 9 year old who is fascinated with Louisa May Alcott's "Little Women" - both the book and the 1949 film version. Is that "pathetic"? How about folks who restore and drive classic cars like 1960s Corvairs or Triumphs?

>Sorta validates LHA's persistent jeremiads about how backward amateurs seem
>to him.

The organ grinder plays the same few tunes over and over. No matter what we hams did, or what the ARRL published, we'd get the same jeremiads from him. He's not involved. Anyone can sit on the sidelines like he does.

>How much nicer if there were an "Annual Future Systems Issue".

Why not? Isn't there room for both?

How many articles have there been in QST over the past few years on PSK, MFSK, WSJT, digital voice, IRLP.....?

How many articles on "future systems" have you submitted? Or anyone else here, for that matter?

You say you want more "tinkerers". At least the vintage radio folks are tinkering, and have an idea how their rigs work. They aren;t just buying and plugging in, with no concept of what goes on behind the panel. Isn't that a step in the right direction?

I think one reason "vintage" radio has gained popularity is that many hams *want* to be knowledgeable and skilled in the technical side of radio, but the "future systems" stuff is too sterile and too inaccessible to them. Look at old radio mags and see how many "Build This Radio!" articles there were, describing receivers and transmitters that could be built by someone with a few tools and some basic knowledge. How much of that do you see in amateur radio magazines today?

If a 50+ year old transmitter on a wooden chassis can put out a legal signal and make QSOs, what't the problem? Guess we've got to keep that sort of thing secret - might cut into Ikensu's sales....

73 de Jim, N2EY

4547. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-20 13:19:52 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <Y%XEb.6017$wL6.2836@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 84123

"Dave Heil" wrote:
>
> Your earlier comments:
>
> "Dave, I don't have a background in a lot
> of things (child birth, international affairs
> with Belarus, NASA space missions, to
> name just a few), but expect to have a
> voice in those things when I have
> something to say and would be darn
> offended, and very confrontational..."
>
> Please point out the portion in which you
> state that you're discussing government
> policy on child birth, NASA, etc.

Yes, those are my earlier comments - which you've disingenuously taken out of context. That paragraph was a reply to words you wrote about code testing - a government policy. The message that paragraph appeared in was about code testing - a government policy. The discussion that message appeared in was about code testing - a government policy. Please show me where, in all that, there was even a hint that we were not talking about government policy.

> The needs of other radio services? What need
> has any other service to tell hams which modes
> to use? How would a great number of hams using
> morse be less worthy of the "massive" frequencies
> we have for our use?

This is not, and has never been, about the "use" of code, Dave. This discussion is about a testing requirement. And, from that perspective, I've already addressed other radio services in my last message. But, since you seem to have missed it (or decided to chop it up rather than look at it as a whole), I'll repeat it here...

As I've already stated, if we're going to
remain a valuable radio service, worthy
of the massive frequencies we hold and
unlike personal radio services (CB), we
must consider the needs of the other
radio services when discussing any
licensing issue - including code testing.
The FCC did exactly that in the Report
& Order following the last round of

restructuring when they looked at
personal communication services, satellite
communications, fiber optic
communications, high definition television
systems, and police, fire, and rescue
communications. In that Report & Order,
the FCC stated that "...no communication
system has been designed in many years
that depends on hand-keyed telegraphy
or the ability to receive messages in Morse
code by ear" and that "...the emphasis on
Morse code proficiency as a licensing
requirement does not comport with the
basis and purpose of the service." Finally,
the FCC said, "...reducing the emphasis
on telegraphy proficiency as a licensing
requirement will allow the amateur service
to, as it has in the past, attract technically
inclined persons, particularly the youth of
our country, and encourage them to learn
and to prepare themselves in the areas
where the United States needs expertise."

> Simple statement of fact. No new system has
> been developed. Yet thousands of radio amateurs
> use morse daily.

Again, this is not about the "use" of code, Dave. Those same radio
amateurs, and any others who want to join them, can and will continue to
freely "use" code long after any testing requirement is gone.

> Maybe it could--if you believe that 5 wpm
> constitutes "emphasis".

It is "emphasis" compared to the other operating modes, and compared to
where this country needs expertise (see FCC statements above).

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

4548. Re: Future ARS licenses, was Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-20 13:34:39 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <PdYEb.6022$wL6.1286@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 84124

"Mike Coslo" wrote:
>
> My guess on the debate of the future
> is one of testing regimen. I predict that
> a new movement will arise that views
> testing per se as an unnecessary nuisance,
> and will agitate for simplification of the test,
> and eventually it's removal.

I don't think so, Mike. While I do see comments here and there, I don't see a growing consensus for a need to change the written tests, much less a growing consensus on any specific change to those tests. I suspect the vast majority would agree those tests are needed and are just fine as they are. Instead, I hope we can finally focus on more fully using the frequencies we have. Of course, I don't see any growing consensus for that either, but one can hope.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

4549. Re: Why I Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-20 13:35:38 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <JeYEb.17679$P%1.16269412@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 84125

"Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:lCQEb.11665$Pg1.3885@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net...
>
> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote
>
> >
> > Yep. It's the annual "vintage radio" issue. Says so right on the cover.
> >
>
> Thank you, Thank You, THANK YOU!!! You make my point exactly!!!
>
> I'm very much an ARRL supporter, but an "Annual Vintage Radio Issue" is a
> pathetic statement about the technical leadership out of 225 Main Street.
> Sorta validates LHA's persistent jeremiads about how backward amateurs
seem
> to him. How much nicer if there were an "Annual Future Systems Issue".
>
> 73, de Hans, K0HB
>

Is it really too much to have one issue out of 12 address vintage radio?
Afterall there are some hams to whom this is of interest either practical or
just as a window into history. Although my own interest is in new radios
and how much they can pack into how little space, the vintage issue is a
nice relaxing look at the past.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

4550. Re: Why I Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-20 14:04:17 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <BFYEb.1485$Vv2.740000@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 84126

Carl R. Stevenson wrote:

> "N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
> news:c2356669.0312191605.469f743b@posting.google.com...
>
>>"Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
>
> news:<LaWdnUpk3pWGoH6iUSdV9w@ptd.net>...
>
>>>Leadership is
>>>when one has the courage and wisdom to make a sound judgement
>>>and then "do the right thing."
>>
>>Who decides what "the right thing" really is?
>
>
> That's what "leadership" is *supposed* to be there for ... to make
> the tough calls when the answer isn't necessarily obvious (or may
> be right, but not overwhelmingly popular).

Sure. In one group I was the director of, I directly defied a board decision, reinstating something that they revoked. But even then, I relied on the input of the people that were affected by the board's decision. They were displeased by the decision, and appealed to me to do something. They were right, so I did it. Then offered my resignation to the board for the defiance. (being a leader does not give you unlimited power)

Oddly enough, my offer was unanimously rejected. I think the rest of the BOD was actually relieved.

But the occasional and very uncomfortable times that you have to stick your neck out does not releas you from a obligation to listen as often as possible.

>
>>For example, look at
>>that "21st century" paper (CQ published it, btw, and it was in their
>>mill before I evder saw it, so don't give me a hard time about it). Is
>>the "Communicator" idea "the right thing"?
>
>
> No ... we need more people who understand radio, not more appliance
> operators.

and we are headed in the opposite direction.

>
>>>Otherwise, they could just do a web vote
>>>popularity contest on every issue and wouldn't need Directors ... the
>>>staff could handle the whole thing ...
>>
>>And if that vote runs opposite to what you think is "the right thing"?
>
>
> I wasn't advocating a popularity contest ... just saying that if nobody in
> "leadership" has the cajones and good judgement to make the right call,
> then it might as well devolve to that ...

Must be pretty good to always know what the "right call" is.

>
>>It sounds to me like you're saying the ARRL Directors should sometimes
>>go against what the majority of members say they want. Do you really
>>think that's a good idea?
>
>
> Yes ... the leadership should, theoretically at least, have superior
> knowledge,
> insight, and experience and should be there to guide, not simply be a bunch
> of political "yes men" to a majority who may/may not necessarily make the
> best
> choices in terms of what's in the best interests of ham radio long term.

Of course not. But they still have to represent their constituents. In
our locale, we have had a number of County commissioners that believed
they had the right ideas, to the point of ignoring what a large majority
of the citezenry wanted, and with their "leadership" saddled the county
with a huge new and unnesesary project and the billing therof.
Commisioner 1 was the lowest vote-getter in the next election, and
commisioner two was smart enough to not run again for that office. THe
only one re-elected was the sole commissioner who voted against the project.

These people displayed your kind of "leadership". Once.

- Mike KB3EIA -

4551. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-20 14:04:30 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <OFYEb.6041$wL6.3746@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 84127

"Kim W5TIT" wrote:
>
> Ha!!! Yep, and the hilarious thing is that
> it is only recent that I-20 (don't know
> about I-10, near Houston, right?) is getting
> any attention. Point being: the roads that
> need the fixin' the most haven't gotten it,
> and the roads that are half-way decent
> are that way because "they" won't leave
> 'em alone!

While the Houston area was bad, driving on I-20 around El Paso was a nightmare. The highway has a washboard effect which feels like it's shaking your vehicle, and you, apart. You honestly have to clench your teeth to keep them from clattering. And, after about twenty miles of that, I had to stop because my hands were getting numb from the shaking steering wheel.

I mentioned I-5 in Norther California before. On sections of that highway, the road has cracked and been pushed up from the changing weather (extreme heat in summer and snows in winter). As a result, there are six to twelve inch humps in the road about every ten to fifty feet. And, if you drive the speed limit, you can feel your tires leave the road and slam back down on the opposite side of each hump. Even if you slow down, you're still tossed around in the vehicle on the larger humps. Anyway, since I was pulling a fairly heavy trailer through that section of highway, the experience was not at all pleasant.

Those two sections of highways stand out in my mind from the last trip. The other thing that stood out was the traffic congestion near each major city. LA traffic has been a nightmare for many years and it seems to be getting worse. Houston has major traffic and darn poor road signs. Each time we drive across country, the traffic always feels like it is getting worse.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

4552. Re: Why I Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-20 14:11:26 UTC
From: garigue <garigue@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <iMYEb.604206$Tr4.1576641@attbi_s03>
Source record: 84128

> > Yep. It's the annual "vintage radio" issue. Says so right on the cover.
> >
>
> Thank you, Thank You, THANK YOU!!! You make my point exactly!!!
>
> I'm very much an ARRL supporter, but an "Annual Vintage Radio Issue" is a
> pathetic statement about the technical leadership out of 225 Main Street.
> Sorta validates LHA's persistent jeremiads about how backward amateurs
seem
> to him. How much nicer if there were an "Annual Future Systems Issue".
>
> 73, de Hans, K0HB

Hello there Hans ......

Again I have to say that our service, hobby, endeavor, passion, pastime, escape or whatever description or definition one makes is like the blind men and the elephant. Each have a part and use their senses-perception to come up with a concrete explanation of what they have. Ham radio is like this .... and it is a strength not a weakness.

I know a lot of fellows will say that the service is strictly defined by the FCC. That is a given but it has evolved into other areas. Kudos to the ARRL for a nostalgia issue or any topic issue that generates interest.

I really think it is myopic to beat that "technical" horse as a lot of fellows are not as interested as others ... part 97 or not. Grabbing the technical end of the elephant and saying it is more important for the future just may not be the case ....I don't know. Technology will come and be absorbed by future hams more on the basis of modification of use rather than basic "new" discoveries.

Like it or not the "marketplace" drives the existence of publications. I used to subscribe to Ham Radio .....if it was "that good" then we would still be getting it. The technos aspect just didn't ring enough ham bells out there.

I'd like to say to all on the newsgroup .... Merry Christmas and the best for 04

73 KI3R Tom Popovic KI3R Belle Vernon Pa

4553. Re: Why I Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-20 14:13:35 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <jOYEb.1494$Vv2.741736@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 84129

Kï¿½HB wrote:

> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote
>
>
>>That means passing the post-restructuring 35 question Tech test is "more
>>difficult" than passing both the pre-restructuring 30 question Novice
>>test *and* the 5 wpm code receiving test.
>>
>
>
> Yes. (But only barely, and it is woefully inadequate for the resultant
> privileges.)

So you think it is not only more difficult, but it is nott difficult enough?

>>Have the changes of 2000 gotten us more tinkerers per unit time than
>
> before?
>
>
> What the hell are "tinkerers per unit time"? The generally accepted
> language of rrap is English.

Funny, I understood that. We'll work through this with you Hans. 8^)

- Mike KB3EIA -

4554. Re: Why I Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-20 14:18:39 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3FE45A4F.AD1BE218@earthlink.net>
Source record: 84130

"Kï¿½HB" wrote:
>
> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote
>
> >
> > Yep. It's the annual "vintage radio" issue. Says so right on the cover.
> >
>
> Thank you, Thank You, THANK YOU!!! You make my point exactly!!!
>
> I'm very much an ARRL supporter, but an "Annual Vintage Radio Issue" is a
> pathetic statement about the technical leadership out of 225 Main Street.

I can't agree. I enjoy articles about vintage rigs. There is every
indication that there are many others who enjoy them. I collect vintage
rigs and restore them.

> Sorta validates LHA's persistent jeremiads about how backward amateurs seem
> to him. How much nicer if there were an "Annual Future Systems Issue".

While I enjoy my vintage equipment, I don't use it every day. I run a
Ten-Tec Orion. It is something from the present which was very much the
future only a few short months ago. Len likes to prattle about ancient
morse code yet most of us don't stick with only one mode. I discount
Len's rants heavily since he isn't really involved and has little idea
what radio amateurs are doing.

Dave K8MN

4555. Re: Why I Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-20 14:26:49 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <J_YEb.1514$Vv2.744413@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 84131

N2EY wrote:

> In article <BANEb.11320$0s2.9247@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>, "Kï¿½HB"
> <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> writes:
>
>
>>"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote
>>
>>
>>>Last time a construction article with Nuvistors in it was when?
>>>Probably 1965 or so. Almost 40 years.
>>
>>The current issue of QST has some really up-to-date-technology in it, not
>>quite Nuvistors, but well beyond spark.
>
>
> Yep. It's the annual "vintage radio" issue. Says so right on the cover.

Yup, and a very interesting issue it is to me.

>>For example, a full length article on how important the quartz crystal
>>industry was to winning the war. (WW-II, that is!)
>
>
> Yep. It's the annual "vintage radio" issue. Says so right on the cover. Radio
> grade quartz was mined back then - today it's grown.
>
>>Or another full length article on bringing a DX-100 AM transmitter (1955
>>era) up to factory spec.
>>
>
> Yep. It's the annual "vintage radio" issue. Says so right on the cover.
>
> The DX-100 was basically a bargain version of the Viking 2/ 122 VFO combo in
> one box. Not as good, though. YMMV.
>
> The article tells how a ham bought an old Heathkit rig on eBay, fixed it up,
> and put it on the air. Looks like he had fun doing it, too. Rig was actually
> Made In USA, and the present owner actually worked on it hisself. Very
> electro-politically incorrect.
>
>
>>Or how about the leading edge article on restoring a 1948 wooden-chassis
>>homebrew 2-tube transmitter?
>

>
> Yep. It's the annual "vintage radio" issue. Says so right on the cover.
>
> The DX-100 was basically a bargain version of the Viking 2/ 122 VFO combo in
> one box. Not as good, though. YMMV.
>
> The article tells how a ham bought an old homebrew rig on eBay, fixed it up,
> made a few modifications and put it on the air. Looks like he had fun doing it,
> too. Rig was actually home-built by a ham - not even a kit. Parts were all Made
> In USA, and the present owner actually worked on it hisself. And it puts out a
> perfectly clean signal. Very, very electro-politically incorrect, though.
>
> How dare these hams actually work on their own rigs! Next thing you know,
> they'll be turning their backs on Ikensu....
>
>>Hang around, and pretty soon -- perhaps within the decade -- we'll get up to
>>Nuvistor technology!
>>
>
> PS: I almost forgot to mention, there's also some tantalizing information
>
>>in this issue about panoramic reception, developed in 1932 by F3HM. Maybe
>>it'll catch on!
>>
>
> I recall about a decade ago when the IC-781 appeared how gaga some folks were
> over the display. As if nobody had ever done it before. Shades of the QS-59
> receiver....
>
> Also in the same issue of QST:
>
> - Article on using a transmitter-receiver modules to eliminate the key cable
> (tail wagging the dog..)
>
> - 5 page article on the K1B Baker Island DXpedition
>
> - Article on contesting as a "little pistol"
>
> - Article on "casual" RTTY contesting
>
> - "Short Takes" column on MultiPSK freeware package (does several flavors of
> PSK, SSTV, RTTY, AMTOR, Hellschreiber, and (oh yes) CW
>
> - 3-1/2 page article on building an AC wattmeter
>
> - 2 page "Hands On Radio" column. This is #12 in a series - subject is FETs.
>
> - 2 page "Hints and Kinks" column.
>
> - 5 page review of the Ten Tec Orion

>
> - 2 page review of the SGC add on audio DSP unit (ADSP2)
>
> - Correspondence from Members, Happenings, Technical Correspondence, Public
> Service, DX, Exam Info, World above 50 MHz, At The Foundation, Old Radio, YL
> News, SKs, New Products, 75/50/25 years ago in QST, Contest and hamfest
> calendars, W1AW schedule...
>
> - Microwavelengths (Part 1 of an article about microwave LNAs - no nuvistors in
> sight)
>
> - Results of June VHF contest, School club Roundup, August UHF contest.
>
> - and more. 160 pages this issue.
>
> How many articles of cutting-edge technology have you submitted?

I've though of writing an article or two for QST myself. Probably
wouldn't be cutting edge. Most contributions I could make would be
geared toward homebrewing, and most likely on panel layout technique,
ergonomics and (gasp) aesthetics. If they print an article about doing
panels in Powerpoint, the state of Amateur radio equipment layout could
use the boost.

Hans would probably still make fun of it tho'! ;^)

- Mike KB3EIA -

4556. Re: Why I Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-20 14:28:14 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3FE45C8E.7CD5BF0@earthlink.net>
Source record: 84132

Mike Coslo wrote:
>
> Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
>
> > "Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
> > news:f45722ac.0312181539.55a82802@posting.google.com...
> >
> >>"Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
> >
> > news:<I5udnayzo8vRT3yiXTWc9g@ptd.net>...
> >
> >>>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> >>>news:20031215235832.07961.00000569@mb-m03.aol.com...

> >>Apparently they think that they cannot present the needs or want of
> >>both camps until they come to a concensus.
> >
> >
> > The "c-word" is an excuse to do nothing.
>
> No it doesn't. I've used consensus building for years. I don't do it
> unless a decision *needs* to be made. I even use it in situations where
> I have absolute dictatorial power, such as on my Ice Hockey team. I find
> out what the guys think on a lot of the issues. Then as long as it makes
> sense, and is within the rules I'll decide what they like. You'd be
> surprised how well they listen to you when they *need* to when you
> listen to them when you *should*.

The Finnish government is made up of numerous political parties. There
isn't much difference between most of them. Finns have typically
governed through concensus politics. This has been their way for
decades and they seem to have less trouble in getting things done than
we do.

> Other BOD activities I've been involved in are run the same way -
> although I don't have absolute power there! 8^)
>
> > On some things there may
> > never be consensus - should the ARRL do nothing? Leadership is
> > when one has the courage and wisdom to make a sound judgement
> > and then "do the right thing."
>
> Sure, ya have to do that sometimes. Problem is that if you use that
> courage and wisdom in the wrong way, you can find yourself on the
> outside pretty quickly. Then you're a leader with no flock. No leader at

> all.

Jimmy Carter comes to mind. Len Anderson comes to mind.

> > Otherwise, they could just do a web vote
>
> familiar with web voting?
>
> > popularity contest on every issue and wouldn't need Directors ... the
> > staff could handle the whole thing ...
>
> Leaders get usually get elected or appointed or whatever because they
> have some values that appeal to those who are to be governed. The most
> successful leaders I know ask for and get as much input as they can when
> faced with decisions. Figuring that you know the answers and what you
> know is right regardless is hubris.

As Phil Kane pointed out, there have been occasions when a "leader" in
the ARRL has been recalled. There've been other occasions when an ARRL
leader has been ousted in regular elections.

Dave K8MN

4557. Re: Why I Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-20 14:33:12 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0312200633.5f38e229@posting.google.com>
Source record: 84133

"Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
news:<MbKcnRBjktklK36iUSdV9w@ptd.net>...
> "Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:GqNEb.11298$0s2.2493@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net...
> >
> > "N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote
> >
> > >
> > > It sounds to me like you're saying the ARRL Directors should sometimes
> > > go against what the majority of members say they want. Do you really
> > > think that's a good idea?
> > >
> >
> > Yes, sometimes I think it IS a good idea. That sort of activity is often
> > called leadership.
> >
> > Other times I think it's NOT a good idea.
> >
> > The mark of a good leader is determining the difference.
> >
> > 73, de Hans, K0HB
>
> Hans,
>
> You and I are on the same frequency on this one ... you said it
> clearer than I did the first time, but hopefully my explanation was
> better in response to Jim's question.
>
> 73,
> Carl - wk3c

Carl, that's the one aspect that I have found the most disappointing
about the ARRL leadership, they "governed" - like Clinton - with
polls.

Their big poll was one of the most poorly constructed polls I've ever
seen. Even worse is that they paid an outside agency to do it - with
our dues money. The fact that -I- helped pay for that poll and I
didn't even receive a questionaire was just icing on the cake.

I never saw the ARRL vision of the future as anything other than old
men in Western Union garb tapping away at their keys. That should be
their vision of the past, not the future. Repeating the past over and
over again gets the ARS where? One more tube regen receiver article
will likely put me over the edge.

I know the ARRL is a superb watchdog concerning legislation that affects the ARS. They are also the best publishing house on radio related material. Their lab reviews are unrivaled. And their operating activities are lots of fun. Thus, I continue to support the ARRL.

But with respect to the future, just about any decision is better than no decision.

73, Brian

4558. Re: Why I Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-20 14:38:39 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0312200638.5bc8583b@posting.google.com>
Source record: 84134

"Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<lCQEb.11665$Pg1.3885@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>...
> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote
>
> >
> > Yep. It's the annual "vintage radio" issue. Says so right on the cover.
> >
>
> Thank you, Thank You, THANK YOU!!! You make my point exactly!!!
>
> I'm very much an ARRL supporter, but an "Annual Vintage Radio Issue" is a
> pathetic statement about the technical leadership out of 225 Main Street.
> Sorta validates LHA's persistent jeremiads about how backward amateurs seem
> to him. How much nicer if there were an "Annual Future Systems Issue".
>
> 73, de Hans, K0HB

Love him or hate him, LHA put the big nail thru that one.

Brian

4559. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-20 14:50:15 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3FE461B6.BF9F2F5E@earthlink.net>
Source record: 84135

Dwight Stewart wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" wrote:
> >
> > Your earlier comments:
> >
> > "Dave, I don't have a background in a lot
> > of things (child birth, international affairs
> > with Belarus, NASA space missions, to
> > name just a few), but expect to have a
> > voice in those things when I have
> > something to say and would be darn
> > offended, and very confrontational..."
> >
> > Please point out the portion in which you
> > state that you're discussing government
> > policy on child birth, NASA, etc.
>
> Yes, those are my earlier comments - which you've disingenuously taken out
> of context.

There was nothing disingenuous about anything and there was nothing in your earlier statements to indicate that you were discussing government policy. If I wanted to make it clear that I was speaking of policy, I might have written something like, "I don't have a background in NASA policy or child birth policy". Child birth policy doesn't seem to make much sense does it?

> That paragraph was a reply to words you wrote about code
> testing - a government policy. The message that paragraph appeared in was
> about code testing - a government policy. The discussion that message
> appeared in was about code testing - a government policy. Please show me
> where, in all that, there was even a hint that we were not talking about
> government policy.

Show me that your words indicate in any way that you were discussing child birth policy or NASA policy.

> > The needs of other radio services? What need
> > has any other service to tell hams which modes
> > to use? How would a great number of hams using
> > morse be less worthy of the "massive" frequencies
> > we have for our use?
>
> This is not, and has never been, about the "use" of code, Dave.

That isn't what your words say. Look at 'em and see if you can find any
words about morse *use*. If you can't find them, perhaps I can provide
a quote.

> This
> discussion is about a testing requirement. And, from that perspective, I've
> already addressed other radio services in my last message. But, since you
> seem to have missed it (or decided to chop it up rather than look at it as a
> whole), I'll repeat it here...
>
> As I've already stated, if we're going to
> remain a valuable radio service, worthy
> of the massive frequencies we hold and
> unlike personal radio services (CB), we
> must consider the needs of the other
> radio services when discussing any
> licensing issue - including code testing.
> The FCC did exactly that in the Report
> & Order following the last round of
> restructuring when they looked at
> personal communication services, satellite
> communications, fiber optic
> communications, high definition television
> systems, and police, fire, and rescue
> communications. In that Report & Order,
> the FCC stated that "...no communication
> system has been designed in many years
> that depends on hand-keyed telegraphy
> or the ability to receive messages in Morse
> code by ear" and that "...the emphasis on
> Morse code proficiency as a licensing
> requirement does not comport with the
> basis and purpose of the service." Finally,
> the FCC said, "...reducing the emphasis
> on telegraphy proficiency as a licensing
> requirement will allow the amateur service
> to, as it has in the past, attract technically
> inclined persons, particularly the youth of
> our country, and encourage them to learn
> and to prepare themselves in the areas
> where the United States needs expertise."
>
> > Simple statement of fact. No new system has
> > been developed. Yet thousands of radio amateurs
> > use morse daily.
>
> Again, this is not about the "use" of code, Dave. Those same radio
> amateurs, and any others who want to join them, can and will continue to
> freely "use" code long after any testing requirement is gone.
>
> > Maybe it could--if you believe that 5 wpm

> > constitutes "emphasis".
>
> It is "emphasis" compared to the other operating modes, and compared to
> where this country needs expertise (see FCC statements above).

I strongly disagree that a five word per minute morse test indicates emphasis. Additionally, nothing precludes anyone from developing expertise though "where this country needs expertise" hasn't been defined. If you'd like to take the position that a five word per minute code test is a huge hurdle for those who could develop some technical expertise if they could only obtain HF amateur radio access, I'll play along.

Dave K8MN

4560. Re: Why I Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-20 14:52:47 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0312200652.53e9e552@posting.google.com>
Source record: 84136

"Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
news:<LaWdnUpk3pWGoH6iUSdV9w@ptd.net>...
> "Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
> news:f45722ac.0312181539.55a82802@posting.google.com...
> > "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
> news:<I5udnayzo8vRT3yiXTWc9g@ptd.net>...
> > > "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> > > news:20031215235832.07961.00000569@mb-m03.aol.com...
> > > > In no particular order:
> > > >
> > > > 1) Representation of amateur radio (what other organization or
> individual
> would
> > > > do anyhting like the 121 page commentary on BPL?)
> > >
> > > Representation of what the Board *perceives* to be the wishes of the
> > > membership.
> > > I don't believe that non-members get the same attention on issues as
> > > members, but
> > > that is reasonable, since member dues support the ARRL.
> >
> > This member supports the ARRL. Also, this member did not receive a
> > questionare when the ARRL was conducting a poll of members and
> > non-members.
>
> Perhaps they did a random survey of some percentage of the membership?

I'm sure they did - one thing that they probably did right. But they
also officially polled non-members.

> > > > 5) Elected officials (they listen even if they don't agree)
> > >
> > > YMMV, depending on what area you live in, whether your Director is
> > > open-minded and progressive, etc.
> >
> > Apparently they think that they cannot present the needs or want of
> > both camps until they come to a concensus.
>
> The "c-word" is an excuse to do nothing. On some things there may
> never be consensus - should the ARRL do nothing? Leadership is
> when one has the courage and wisdom to make a sound judgement
> and then "do the right thing."

Its tough being a leader. You can never make everyone happy. But
doing nothing is likely to piss everyone off.

Otherwise, they could just do a web vote
> popularity contest on every issue and wouldn't need Directors ... the
> staff could handle the whole thing ...

They probably are handling it. ;^)

> > > > 6) W1AW (been there and operated the station, too)
> > >
> > > I have mixed views on the value of W1AW ... a good museum to "the Old
> Man,"
> > > but perhaps its services could be provided by alternative means at lower
> > > operating cost.
> >
> > Commercial gear? Why?
>
> Perhaps you misunderstand ... first, W1AW is running commercial gear (and
> has for
> many years). I believe the current main transmitters are super-commercial
> gear from
> Harris Corp., if memory serves me correctly, suplimented by some other
> commercial
> gear donated by some or all of "the big 4" ham equipment mfgrs.

I've use Harris gear in the service.

How about a prolonged lab test on real amateur gear? Or are the
operations at W1AW really too severe for amateur gear?

> What I was referring to were things like CW practice, bulletins, etc. All
> of that could
> be provided (and much is) by the web site, and probably would reduce
> operating
> costs. (Though doing things by non-radio means is heresy to some ...)

I honestly have no problem with the transmissions. Perhaps W1MAN
could contact with the ARRL to put out his bulletins and stop the
duplicity.

> > Carl, you should see the NCI bashing being done by Dee and Jim on the
> > other ARRL thread.
>
> I have been on business travel to the ITU in Geneva for two weeks and to New
> Orleans for a week of meetings and haven't been keeping up.

Perhaps I was a bit rash in that statement.

> Let them bash ... NCI continues to gain new members (and the pace picked up
> quite dramatically with all of the publicity surrounding the Petitions
> before the
> FCC); the membership is, judging by the large number of e-mails I get, happy
> with our policies and actions and ready to continue to support NCI through
> the
> end-game;

They needed an alternative to the status-quo.

and our detractors still haven't presented the FCC with a single
> rational,
> valid, compelling reason to keep any Morse testing ...

Aaron Jones was keeping the list of Morse Myths, and he's been silent
for a couple of years. There must be nothing new to debunk.

> 73,
> Carl - wk3c

73, Brian/N0iMD

4561. Re: Why I Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-20 14:58:43 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0312200658.1f898c6d@posting.google.com>
Source record: 84137

N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<c2356669.0312191605.469f743b@posting.google.com>...
> "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
news:<LaWdnUpk3pWGoH6iUSdV9w@ptd.net>...
> > "Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
> > news:f45722ac.0312181539.55a82802@posting.google.com...
> > > "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
> news:<I5udnayzo8vRT3yiXTWc9g@ptd.net>...
> > > > "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> > > > news:20031215235832.07961.00000569@mb-m03.aol.com...
> > > > > In no particular order:
> > > > >
> > > > > 1) Representation of amateur radio (what other organization or
> > individual
> > would
> > > > > do anyhting like the 121 page commentary on BPL?)
> > > >
> > > > Representation of what the Board *perceives* to be the wishes of the
> > > > membership.
> > > > I don't believe that non-members get the same attention on issues as
> > > > members, but
> > > > that is reasonable, since member dues support the ARRL.
> > >
> > > This member supports the ARRL. Also, this member did not receive a
> > > questionare when the ARRL was conducting a poll of members and
> > > non-members.
> >
> > Perhaps they did a random survey of some percentage of the membership?
>
> They hired READEX to do a survey. It was supposedly a scientific
> sample of the membership.
>
> That was 1996.

Jim, why do you say "supposedly?"

Do you, like me, also disagree with Mike Deignan that the ARRL survey
was "substantive?"

4562. Re: Why I Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-20 15:48:13 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <1b_Eb.1540$Vv2.760904@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 84138

Kï¿½HB wrote:

> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote
>
>
>>Yep. It's the annual "vintage radio" issue. Says so right on the cover.
>>
>
>
> Thank you, Thank You, THANK YOU!!! You make my point exactly!!!
>
> I'm very much an ARRL supporter, but an "Annual Vintage Radio Issue" is a
> pathetic statement about the technical leadership out of 225 Main Street.
> Sorta validates LHA's persistent jeremiads about how backward amateurs seem
> to him. How much nicer if there were an "Annual Future Systems Issue".

Huh? ARRL has several specialty issues, and many hams enjoy the Vintage radio issue. Myself included. Maybe you could write a cutting edge article or two? Want a future systems issue? get in touch with them and suggest it.

- Mike KB3EIA -

4563. Re: Why I Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-20 16:16:12 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <gB_Eb.1546$Vv2.766121@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 84139

Bill Sohl wrote:

> "Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
> news:3FE34758.8000802@psu.edu...
>
>>
>>Bill Sohl wrote:
>>
>>>"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
>>>news:OTtEb.689$Vv2.349555@news1.news.adelphia.net...
>>>
>>>
>>>>Dee D. Flint wrote:
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>"Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
>>>>>news:f45722ac.0312181539.55a82802@posting.google.com...
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>>Carl, you should see the NCI bashing being done by Dee and Jim on the
>>>>>>other ARRL thread.
>>>>>>
>>>>>>73, Brian
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>I have never bashed the NCI. I've stated that I disagree with their
>>>
>>>goal
>>>
>>>
>>>>>but that does not constitute bashing them.
>>>>
>>>>I have! I think that they have recieved what they wanted, but as yet
>>>>don't really offer anything of substance to fill the gap.
>>>
>>>
>>>What GAP?
>>
>>Code test dissapears, nothing in it's place.
>
>
> Why should there be anything in its place? This isn't about
> some mystical quantification of effort, dedication, yada yada....

You are kind of right there Bill. I can prove to you without a doubt
that a person can get on the air without ever taking a test. They can
get on the air and run relatively high power without doing harm to
themselves. There is no need for any yada yada at all.

It isn't mystical, it isn't yada yada. It is philosophy. And my
philosophy is that the amateur should want to be an amateur, and should
have some level of knowledge in order to be there.

> The morse tests have completely disappeared for General
> and Extra without anything taking its place. If 5 wpm is dropped
> for tech, why should there be something to replace it?

Now I'm a little confused. As far as I know, if you want a general or
above, you still have to take a Morse code test. And they don't do tech
plusses any more. My Tech license had no code test in it.

>
>>I want to see something in
>>it's place, or else itis pretty hard to argue that it hasn't been made
>>much much easier to get a license.
>
>
> Ending a requirement that no longer has a rational need
> does not translate into a search for some "replacement".
> If you had the opportunity to state what the replacement
> should be, what would you suggest?

I support strengthening the tests. In general, I want more questions on
theory, and more procedural questions. I wouldn't mind if there were a
ham etiquette section added to the test.

I want the new ham to come on board with some idea of what is expected
of him or her in the way of how to conduct themselves on the air. I want
them to have at least a rudimentary knowledge of electronics, and know
some basics on antenna theory, like our "quarter wave dipole" discussion
on rrap of a few months back proves is needed.

>>You may want it made much easier to get a license, but I don't. Not a
>>filter, not a way of keeping people out. just a way of ensuring that the
>>amateur has some level of acumen.
>
>
> Ending morse doesn't change the level of written tests.

No kidding! I want the level of the tests changed though. And not to the
level of the "average sixth grader" either.

>>Otherwise, those who want little or no testing are just encouraged.
>
>
> Encouraged about what?

About little or no testing.

>
>>>>Instead, some
>>>>members express "unofficial opinions that scare the bejabbers out of me.
>>>
>>>"Some members"? Who? It is always easy to make non-speciifc
>>>accusations against unidentified "some members".
>>
>>W5YI for one. I trust you have read his work?
>
>
> W5YI's comments as to testing issues beyond the elimination
> of code testing are NOT, in any way, shape or form,
> the position or opinion of NCI.

Show me where I said it was!

> As to other NCI members, assuming you can ID someone,
> they too may have a personal belief as to how testing should go...
> but that does NOT make their opinions or beliefs NCI
> doctrine.

I'm not talking about NCI, I'm talking about NCI members. There is a
difference. As far as I know, NCI has no official opinions beyond ending
the Morse code test.

- Mike KB3EIA -

4564. Re: Why I Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-20 16:19:48 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <EE_Eb.1548$Vv2.767053@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 84140

N2EY wrote:

> In article <lCQEb.11665$Pg1.3885@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>, "Kï¿½HB"
> <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> writes:
>
>
>>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote
>>
>>
>>>Yep. It's the annual "vintage radio" issue. Says so right on the cover.
>>
>>Thank you, Thank You, THANK YOU!!!
>
>
> You're welcome.
>
>
>>You make my point exactly!!!
>
>
> Of course.
>
>>I'm very much an ARRL supporter,
>
>
> And a long-time member...
>
>
>>but an "Annual Vintage Radio Issue" is a
>>pathetic statement about the technical leadership out of 225 Main Street.
>
>
> Why is it "pathetic"? A significant number of hams are interested in "vintage"
> radio. Just like a significant number of people like antique furniture, classic
> cars, oldies music, past films and books, vintage clothing, etc. Doesn't mean
> they are "stuck in the past".
>
> I know a 9 year old who is fascinated with Louisa May Alcott's "Little Women" -
> both the book and the 1949 film version. Is that "pathetic"? How about folks
> who restore and drive classic cars like 1960s Corvairs or Triumphs?
>
>
>>Sorta validates LHA's persistent jeremiads about how backward amateurs seem
>>to him.

>
>
> The organ grinder plays the same few tunes over and over. No matter what we
> hams did, or what the ARRL published, we'd get the same jeremiads from him.
> He's not involved. Anyone can sit on the sidelines like he does.
>
>
>>How much nicer if there were an "Annual Future Systems Issue".
>
>
> Why not? Isn't there room for both?
>
> How many articles have there been in QST over the past few years on PSK, MFSK,
> WSJT, digital voice, IRLP.....?
>
> How many articles on "future systems" have you submitted? Or anyone else here,
> for that matter?
>
> You say you want more "tinkerers". At least the vintage radio folks are
> tinkering, and have an idea how their rigs work. They aren;t just buying and
> plugging in, with no concept of what goes on behind the panel. Isn't that a
> step in the right direction?
>
> I think one reason "vintage" radio has gained popularity is that many hams
> *want* to be knowledgeable and skilled in the technical side of radio, but the
> "future systems" stuff is too sterile and too inaccessible to them. Look at old
> radio mags and see how many "Build This Radio!" articles there were, describing
> receivers and transmitters that could be built by someone with a few tools and
> some basic knowledge. How much of that do you see in amateur radio magazines
> today?
>
> If a 50+ year old transmitter on a wooden chassis can put out a legal signal
> and make QSOs, what't the problem? Guess we've got to keep that sort of thing
> secret - might cut into Ikensu's sales....
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>
>
>

4565. Re: Why I Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-20 16:26:55 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <jL_Eb.12148$0s2.8545@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 84141

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote

>
> Why is it "pathetic"? A significant number of hams are interested in
"vintage"
> radio. Just like a significant number of people like antique furniture,
classic
> cars, oldies music, past films and books, vintage clothing, etc. Doesn't
mean
> they are "stuck in the past".
>

They already have a monthly feature called "Old Radios" and "75/50/25 Years Ago", and now a special "Vintage Radio" issue each year besides? Maybe we could do a photo-feature of "The Girls of Geratol Net" with a centerfold for those of you who get off on old stuff. (Yes, Virginia, there really is a "Geratol Net"!)

73, de Hans, K0HB

4566. Re: Why I Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-20 16:32:39 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <HQ_Eb.1552$Vv2.769871@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 84142

Oops sorry, I accidentally posted without comment

N2EY wrote:

> In article <lCQEb.11665$Pg1.3885@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>, "Kï¿½HB"
> <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> writes:
>
>
>>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote
>>
>>
>>>Yep. It's the annual "vintage radio" issue. Says so right on the cover.
>>
>>Thank you, Thank You, THANK YOU!!!
>
>
> You're welcome.
>
>
>>You make my point exactly!!!
>
>
> Of course.
>
>>I'm very much an ARRL supporter,
>
>
> And a long-time member...
>
>
>>but an "Annual Vintage Radio Issue" is a
>>pathetic statement about the technical leadership out of 225 Main Street.
>
>
> Why is it "pathetic"? A significant number of hams are interested in "vintage"
> radio. Just like a significant number of people like antique furniture, classic
> cars, oldies music, past films and books, vintage clothing, etc. Doesn't mean
> they are "stuck in the past".
>
> I know a 9 year old who is fascinated with Louisa May Alcott's "Little Women" -
> both the book and the 1949 film version. Is that "pathetic"? How about folks
> who restore and drive classic cars like 1960s Corvairs or Triumphs?
>
>
>>Sorta validates LHA's persistent jeremiads about how backward amateurs seem

>>to him.
>
>
> The organ grinder plays the same few tunes over and over. No matter what we
> hams did, or what the ARRL published, we'd get the same jeremiads from him.
> He's not involved. Anyone can sit on the sidelines like he does.
>
>
>>How much nicer if there were an "Annual Future Systems Issue".
>
>
> Why not? Isn't there room for both?
>
> How many articles have there been in QST over the past few years on PSK, MFSK,
> WSJT, digital voice, IRLP.....?

Here you have a pattern, Jim. As much as I like the new modes, All they
are is install the software and hook up the interface. Troubleshooting
is which software switch to change.

> How many articles on "future systems" have you submitted? Or anyone else here,
> for that matter?
>
> You say you want more "tinkerers". At least the vintage radio folks are
> tinkering, and have an idea how their rigs work. They aren;t just buying and
> plugging in, with no concept of what goes on behind the panel. Isn't that a
> step in the right direction?

I just restored an SB-200. It was great fun resurrecting the old thing,
and I learned a lot about RF amps. They were a mystery to me, and now I
know their simplicity.

> I think one reason "vintage" radio has gained popularity is that many hams
> *want* to be knowledgeable and skilled in the technical side of radio, but the
> "future systems" stuff is too sterile and too inaccessible to them. Look at old
> radio mags and see how many "Build This Radio!" articles there were, describing
> receivers and transmitters that could be built by someone with a few tools and
> some basic knowledge. How much of that do you see in amateur radio magazines
> today?
>
> If a 50+ year old transmitter on a wooden chassis can put out a legal signal
> and make QSOs, what't the problem? Guess we've got to keep that sort of thing
> secret - might cut into Ikensu's sales....

Another way of enjoying the hobby! Now that I am getting my Morse code
up to acceptable speed, I intend to build one of these old sets. I'm
looking forward to working as much as possible while the new hams with
their Ikensu's will be coming on the air at just about the minimim of
the sunspot cycle are trying out their ssb and wondering what all the
fuss about ham radio was about!

- Mike KB3EIA -

4567. Re: Why I Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-20 16:36:08 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <YT_Eb.12214$0s2.10529@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 84143

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote

>
> If a 50+ year old transmitter on a wooden chassis can put out a legal
signal
> and make QSOs, what't the problem?
>

No problem at all if you want to waste your time with that, but to have the National Association of Amateur Radio feature half century old technology as feature article(s) in their membership journal speaks volumns.

&#65533; 97.1(b) Continuation and extension of the amateur's proven ability to contribute to the ADVANCEMENT of the radio art.

73, de Hans, K0HB

4568. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-20 16:38:25 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031220113825.12631.00003575@mb-m28.aol.com>
Source record: 84146

In article <3FE3C172.918E403C@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>>
>> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
>news:<3FDFD8C7.C3E0B827@earthlink.net>...
>> > Len Over 21 wrote:
>> > >
>> > > In article <3FDE7172.BF1D62F0@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
><k8mn@earthlink.net>
>> > > writes:
>> > >
>> > > >Len Over 21 wrote:
>> > > >
>> > > >> Problem is that Believers are in the minority...but they cannot
>ever
>> > > >> see that or they are so set that what they think is the absolute
>> > > >> "they know what is best."
>> > > >
>> > > >But, Len, you think you know what is best for amateur radio and you
>> > > >aren't even involved. You're pretty much of a minority.
>> > >
>> > > I've not claimed to "know what is best for amateur radio."
>> > >
>> > > That's YOUR claim.
>> >
>> > That isn't correct, Leonard.
>>
>> Dave,
>>
>> A bit of clarification.
>>
>> Mr. Anderson has repeatedly expounded his views on a wide range of
>> topics both here and in voluminous, repetitive comments to the FCC.
>> But I don't recall him ever claiming that they were "what is best for
>> amateur radio" or that he even knows "what is best for amateur radio."
>
>Jim, I have to disagree. The very fact that Len submitted his ideas on
>morse testing and a minimum age for amateur radio licensing to the
>Commission demonstrates that he believes that he knows what is best for
>amateur radio, in which he has never been a participant.

Let me state it another way.

Suppose someone thought that "what was best for amateur radio" was for the service as we know it to die out. Do you think they'd actually come right out and say that?
>
>Leonard has, on occasion, tried to have it both ways.

Not "on occasion". Frequently.

>He has told us
>that he was going for an "Extra right out of the box" and, in a
>turnabout, that he really isn't interested in obtaining an amateur radio
>license.

Of course! Those darn new question pools.....!

Do you really think anything he writes here is to be taken seriously? Or, for that matter, anything he writes?

>He has written of his decades-long interest but he has never
>even attempted to obtain even a code free ticket.

Because radio isn't his interest or his hobby. His hobby is wasting time - your time.
>
>Truth is, when I'm chasing S92SS on 160, when I'm checking into the WV
>Fone Net or when I'm reading the latest QST, I don't give Leonard a
>thought.

Nor do I.

Ever read "The Fountainhead" by Ayn Rand? There's a great little scene where the hero (Howard Roark, a talented architect) meets his nemesis (Ellsworth Toohey, an architectural critic whose only talent is clever wordsmithing that denigrates others' accomplishments . Toohey is the kind of fellow who would refer to others as "Nursie", "Kolonel Klunk" and "Rev. Jim"..). Toohey wants to destroy Roark, and tries all sorts of tricks to ruin him. Toohey has never been an architect - he's not involved - but through various tricks he's manuevered himself into being a commentator on architecture.

They meet when Roark goes to see a building which he (Roark) had designed, but which Toohey had caused to be modified horribly - at Roark's expense. Toohey talks a lot and finally asks Roark what he thinks of him.

Roark replies "But I don't think of you"

Sound familiar?

>He wasn't a part of amateur radio's past, isn't part of its
>present and, I'm guessing, won't be part of its future.
>
Of course not! That isn't his goal.

Remember the profile? Have you seen any behavior that doesn't match that profile?

73 de Jim, N2EY

4569. Re: Why I Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-20 16:38:26 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031220113826.12631.00003576@mb-m28.aol.com>
Source record: 84145

In article <O7ecnQDg264aLn6iUSdV9w@ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
<wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:

>"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
>news:c2356669.0312191613.61c2ef40@posting.google.com...
>> "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
>news:<bqadnfyED8gho36iUSdV9w@ptd.net>...
>> > "Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
>> > news:xnfcneeyarg.hq3zjoc.pminews@netnews.comcast.net...
>> > > On Thu, 18 Dec 2003 16:12:40 -0000, Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
>> > >
>> > > >QST has gotten better, with the dropping of a lot of the contest data
>> > > >and more focus on a range of articles from beginner to expert level.
>> > > >I'd like to see more technical focus on modern stuff and fewer
>> > > >articles on building regen receivers with tubes, though.
>> > >
>> > > Yeah, Nuvistors are getting hard to get.
>> >
>> > And even half-a**ed decent transistors can blow their performance away,
>> > with better ones being worlds better.

Better in some ways, worse in others.

>> The most recent construction article in QST using Nuvistors was when?
>
>Ask Phil, he's the one who mentioned them :-) Seriously, I think it was in
>the 60's

About 40 years ago.

> ... but I don't think tube projects have much relevance any more,

Why not?

Is there something wrong with using older technologies?

>except,
>perhaps for amplifiers, and you know how I feel about QRO ...

Purely an emotional thing, then.

Some hams recently have set new records by working EME on 24 GHz using small
(two-metre-diameter) dishes and power outputs of 100 watts or less. Neat stuff.
Their transmitters used transmitting wave tubes. I'll let you guess the
mode....
>
>> > > How many of the "frequent poster" club here read them when they

>> > > first came out or even some time later?
>>
>> I did. And almost every other QST article since - well, you don't
>> really want to know how far back....
>> >
>> > I don't recall them by title, but I probably read them ... my high
>> > school
>> > had an extensive collection of QSTs and I spend most of my study hall
>> > time signed out to the library reading QST ... I think I'd read every
>> > copy
>> > they had in the collection by the time I graduated in 1967.
>> >
>> How far back did they go?
>
>I honestly don't remember ... but well back into the 50's IIRC.
>
HAW! If you graduated in 1967, and the collection went back to, say, 1952,
that's 15 years. Like someone today with a collection that went back to 1988.
While certainly worthwhile and useful, I'd hardly call a 15 year collection
"extensive"...

If you don't like what's in QST, why not write some articles featuring things
you'd like to see? Heck, they published some of my stuff - they can't be *that*
fussy! ;-)

73 de Jim, N2EY

4570. Re: Why I Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-20 16:38:27 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031220113827.12631.00003577@mb-m28.aol.com>
Source record: 84144

In article <2eQEb.11638$Pg1.3410@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>, "Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote

>> That means passing the post-restructuring 35 question Tech test is "more
>> difficult" than passing both the pre-restructuring 30 question Novice
>> test *and* the 5 wpm code receiving test.
>
>Yes.

Well, there you have it. Element 1 is easier than 5 questions on the written test.

>(But only barely, and it is woefully inadequate for the resultant
>privileges.)

Woefully inadequate? FCC disagrees! In fact, in 2000 FCC drastically *reduced* the written testing needed for a Tech. From two tests and pools, frowm which were derived tests with a total of 65 questions down to one test of 35 questions and a combined pool.

FCC thinks that 35 question Tech test is adequate. The same FCC that sees "no regulatory purpose" in code tests.

Is FCC mistaken?
>
>> Have the changes of 2000 gotten us more tinkerers per unit time than
>before?
>
>What the hell are "tinkerers per unit time"?

Sorry, Hans, I thought you had an engineering background. ;-)

I'll rephrase:

Have the changes of 2000 resulted in more tinkerers entering the ARS in a given time period (say, per year) than before the changes were made?

73 de Jim, N2EY

4571. Re: Why I Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-20 16:54:49 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <t9%Eb.17719$P%1.16297829@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 84147

"Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:jL_Eb.12148$0s2.8545@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net...
>
> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote
>
> >
> > Why is it "pathetic"? A significant number of hams are interested in
> "vintage"
> > radio. Just like a significant number of people like antique furniture,
> classic
> > cars, oldies music, past films and books, vintage clothing, etc. Doesn't
> mean
> > they are "stuck in the past".
> >
>
> They already have a monthly feature called "Old Radios" and "75/50/25
Years
> Ago", and now a special "Vintage Radio" issue each year besides? Maybe we
> could do a photo-feature of "The Girls of Geratol Net" with a centerfold
for
> those of you who get off on old stuff. (Yes, Virginia, there really is a
> "Geratol Net"!)
>
> 73, de Hans, K0HB
>

Are you aware of what the GERATOL net is all about? It doesn't sound like it from your post. They are an organization of and for Extra class amateur radio operators and promote usage of the Extra class band segments by an award program. The awards add difficulty to the pursuit since only stations worked in the Extra segments count for their equivalent of Worked All States, etc. It has nothing to do with age.

http://www.skyport.com/geratol/
Greetings
Extra
Radio
Amateurs
Tired of
Operating
Lately

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

4572. Re: Why I Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-20 17:21:05 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <5y%Eb.17720$P%1.16302077@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 84148

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:HQ_Eb.1552$Vv2.769871@news1.news.adelphia.net...
> Oops sorry, I accidentally posted without comment
>
> N2EY wrote:
>
>
>
> > In article <lCQEb.11665$Pg1.3885@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>,
"Kï¿½HB"
> > <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> writes:
> >
> >
> >>How much nicer if there were an "Annual Future Systems Issue".
> >
> >
> > Why not? Isn't there room for both?
> >
> > How many articles have there been in QST over the past few years on PSK,
MFSK,
> > WSJT, digital voice, IRLP.....?
>
> Here you have a pattern, Jim. As much as I like the new modes, All they
> are is install the software and hook up the interface. Troubleshooting
> is which software switch to change.
>
>

Besides that PSK, MFSK, WSJT, digital voice, and IRLP are not "future systems". They are here now. A "future system" would have to be something envisioned but not yet set up in hardware and software to do it. In other words, it would need to be an issue of speculation. Now whether that would be good or bad or popular or unpopular, I don't know.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

4573. Re: Why I Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-20 17:21:06 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <6y%Eb.17721$P%1.16302240@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 84149

"Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:YT_Eb.12214$0s2.10529@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net...
>
> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote
>
> >
> > If a 50+ year old transmitter on a wooden chassis can put out a legal
> signal
> > and make QSOs, what't the problem?
> >
>
> No problem at all if you want to waste your time with that, but to have
the
> National Association of Amateur Radio feature half century old technology
as
> feature article(s) in their membership journal speaks volumns.
>
> ï¿½ 97.1(b) Continuation and extension of the amateur's proven ability to
> contribute to the ADVANCEMENT of the radio art.
>
>
>
> 73, de Hans, K0HB

It's often helpful to have insight into the past and past systems to come up
with the future proposals.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

4574. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-20 18:19:45 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <5p0Fb.1585$Vv2.793747@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 84150

Kï¿½HB wrote:

> "Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote
>
>
>>If you like, I can retract the "members" statement, and substitute
>>"member" or "prominent member".
>>
>
>
> I'm a member (you'll have to ask K0CKB if my member is considered
> "prominent" (sic)).

HA! Good one. No thanks, Hans. If Mrs Hans is happy, then I'm happy.
Thanks for the spelink crection.

> I support more rigorous technical exams for full privileges, to which you
> have expressed some rather strenuous opposition.
>
> Go figure!

I don't recall having a problem with the qualifications of your second
license. Did I say that?

- Mike KB3EIA -

4575. Re: Why I Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-20 18:26:22 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <iv0Fb.12495$0s2.1450@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 84151

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote

>
> Are you aware of what the GERATOL net is all about?
>

Yes, I'm aware what it's about and 25 years ago I was a member (#515 if you care to check). Now it has devolved into an inbred group of about 50 people who meet every night on 75 meters and "exchange numbers". Some "difficulty"!

Yawwwwwwwwwwwwwwwwwwwwwwwwwwwwwwwwwwwwnnnnnnnnnnnnnnnn!!!!

73, de Hans, K0HB

4576. Re: Why I Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-20 18:32:03 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <DA0Fb.12502$0s2.6886@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 84152

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote

>
> It's often helpful to have insight into the past and past systems to come
up
> with the future proposals.
>

If you can persuade me that a transmitter comprised of 2 obsolete 1930's tubes cobbled together on a wooden chassis gives insights which lead to future breakthroughs in the radio art, then I'll owe you a lobster dinner at Dayton.

73, de Hans, K0HB

4577. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-20 18:35:35 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <XD0Fb.1592$Vv2.796649@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 84153

Bill Sohl wrote:

> "Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message

<snippage>

>>>Two questions...
>>>1. What "other members" (I presume you mean Board Members), other
>>>than W5YI, do NOT support retention of technical acumen?
>>
>>They don't have to be Board members, Bill. And I don't have their names
>>off the top of my head.
>>
>>If you like, I can retract the "members" statement, and substitute
>>"member" or "prominent member". Although I think that's almost like
>>saying a person's argument is invalid because they made a typo.
>
>
> Bottom line, without names, the statement is grossly misleading
> as you apear to try and broaden your claim to NCI in general...
> which is absolutely false.

Bottom line, I have never accused >>>NCI<<< of having any particular
opinion.

I wrote:

>Instead, some members express "unofficial opinions that scare the
>bejabbers out of me.

Back to now:

Who is broadening any claim? I even put unofficial opinions on my sentence.

Your trying to pin me down on this is amusing, since the membership
rolls of NCI are a closely guarded secret. The only way we know is if
the member outs him or her self.

I don't like Han's entry level license requirement either. He's a member.

- Mike KB3EIA -

4578. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-20 18:59:13 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031220135913.29660.00002148@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 84155

In article <bs0m1m$6e8@library2.airnews.net>, "Kim " <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
writes:

>"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
>news:c2356669.0312191537.63070711@posting.google.com...
>> "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
>news:<pSFEb.4874$wL6.2412@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
>> > "N2EY" wrote:
>> > >
>> > > OTOH, if "behaving like an idiot" on
>> > > the road is not rewarded, the driver
>> > > may try something else (like courtesy,
>> > > or getting on the road a few minutes
>> > > earlier).
>> >
>> >
>> > However, your child analogy falls apart when you remember that you're
>> > talking about an adult
>>
>> A biological adult who is acting like a spoiled child.
>>
>> Remember the scenario Kim describes:
>>
>> - multilane divided highway
>> - all vehicles at or above the posted speed limit.
>> - vehicle comes up behind her, flashes brights, follows too closely,
>> tries to get around on the *inside* shoulder. IOW, unsafe, aggressive
>> driving actions intended to intimidate Kim. (as if!!)
>>
>> Some "adult".
>>
>> >- an adult that is going to get very angry at a
>> > person blocking the fast lane while he and others are trying to pass.
>>
>> Let them behave like adults, then. Following too closely for the speed
>> of travel is not adult behavior, regardless of what Kim is doing.
>>
>> > Lets be realistic here.
>>
>> OK, fine.
>>
>> It's realistic to behave in a safe responsible way when driving a
>> motor vehicle.
>>

>> > If Kim is intentionally blocking others on the roads, she
>> > doesn't deserve courtesy.
>>
>> She's only blocking those who want to speed faster than she wants to
>> speed.
>>
>> Suppose several cars were to line up side-by-side on a multilane
>> divided highway and go exactly the speed limit. Would that justify the
>> "idiot" behaviors Kim describes?
>>
>> Suppose they were police cars....
>>
>> > Instead, she is more likely to be a victim of road
>> > rage (something else she doesn't deserve, but far more likely). If she
>> > manages to avoid that, and if one of those people she is blocking just
>> > happens to be a cop, she may instead eventually get a ticket for not
>driving
>> > on the right.
>>
>> Agreed! That's why I previously said I let the "idiots" get past,
>> because I'd rather have them in front of me than behind me.
>>
>> But the behavior/reward model I gave is valid. For both children and
>> alleged adults.
>>
>> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>>
>
>Well, I suppose it's valid, Jim.

Thank you

>I've really never given the "behavior"
>such thought, i.e. analogy, etc.

Think about it. You've dealt with children - isn't it true that they will tend to repeat behavior that gets them what they want? If whining works, don't you get more whining?

It's illogical to think that sort of thing isn't present in adults.

>BUT, I am generally a very even tempered
>person and I don't feel I'm in any way wrong to stay in the lane I've chosen
>to drive in, above the posted speed, safely, forming safe distances between
>myself and drivers ahead of me, and never-minding nitwits behind me who
>think I should "yield" to them so they can speed faster and keep making each
>successive vehicle move.
>
Would you agree that if you *do* yield, you validate their behavior and in a small way encourage them to do more of it?

Personally, I move, because I care more about my own safety. But that's just me.

73 de Jim, N2EY

4579. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-20 18:59:15 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031220135915.29660.00002149@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 84154

In article <5NWEb.5989$wL6.919@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> writes:

>"N2EY" wrote:
>>
>> Remember the scenario Kim describes:
>>
>> - multilane divided highway
>> - all vehicles at or above the posted speed limit.
>> - vehicle comes up behind her, flashes brights,
>> follows too closely, tries to get around on the
>> *inside* shoulder. IOW, unsafe, aggressive
>> driving actions intended to intimidate Kim.
>> (as if!!)
>
> That's your (and/or perhaps Kim's) interpretation of the scenario.

I'd call it an accurate description, not an interpretation.

>Others
>may interpret it as Kim being an inattentive driver that is not acting
>courteously to others by driving to the right, causing others to take
>extraordinary steps to get her attention back on the road and courteous
>driving (with extraordinary steps being necessary to get someone to drive
>courteously only adding to the fustration of other drivers).

Hmmm...

She's going with the flow of traffic, *above* the posted speed limit, but she should slow down and change lanes so that someone who wants to go even faster can get by?

She's not being "courteous" enough to do the above, so that somehow validates the dangerous actions of another driver (following too closely, trying to pass on the shoulder)?
>
>> She's only blocking those who want to speed
>> faster than she wants to speed.
>
> Exactly.

Well, there you have it.

>However, as you well know, she doesn't have a mandate, or a
>right, to self-enforce how fast others drive.

Nor do *they* (or Kim) have a right to speed.

>Instead, she has the same
>obligations as other drivers, including an obligation to move to the right
>to allow others to pass.

Where is it in the motor vehicle code that a driver on a multilane divided highway has to change lanes and slow down to allow a speeder to pass in a non-emergency situation?

>If others are driving too fast while doing so, that
>is law enforcement's business - not the business of a self-styled road
>vigilante.

It's everyone's business.

>> But the behavior/reward model I gave is valid.
>> For both children and alleged adults.
>
> I disagree. For it to be valid, you would have to establish there is
>nothing more than childhood impulse behind the decision drive fast - impulse
>that can be easily modified by simple rewards.

The behaviors described by Kim go far beyond driving fast. They are obviously childish - and often dangerous. Following too closely is simply unsafe.

If you think childish impulses are easily modified by simple rewards, you obviously haven't spent much time with impulsive children.

>And you haven't established
>that.

It's self-evident.

>Adults can make decisions based on some level of knowledge,
>experience, and review of the situation, not impulse.

Of course!

But the behaviors Kim describes are not those of a responsible adult.

>In the case of fast
>drivers, perhaps the driver feels, based on a consideration of his/her
>skills and experience, that he/she can drive safely at faster speeds.

The driver *feels*?

So the driver's *feelings* supersede the judgement of the traffic engineers and lawmakers who determine the posted speed limits?

I'd like to see that argument defended in court!

My daily commute to work is often made longer by school buses and school zones. It's gotten so I know exactly where the zones, the children, and the bus stops are. Is it adult behavior for me to go faster than 15 in a school zone, or zoom past a bus with its red lights flashing, because I *feel* I can do so safely?

Or how about the ham who *feels* he "needs" 10 kW output? Suppose said ham can safely assemble and operate a 10 kW transmitter that meets all of the FCC

requirements for spurious emissions and RF exposure. Is it therefre OK for him to do so because he *feels* it's OK?

>For
>example, I've driven many thousands of miles on German autobahns, and know
>full well I can drive safely at speeds faster than 55-65 mph (therefore only
>the laws and conditions attenuate my driving speeds).

You know you can do it on German autobahns. But we're not in Germany. You want to drive faster, go to Germany.

>Perhaps the person has
>a legitimate reason for driving faster. For example, the driver may be
>taking someone to the hospital (and Kim is blocking his way).

Sure. That's an emergency situation. But Kim says it's an every-day thing. Hardly an emergency. And if there's only one person in the car....

>I could go on,
>but these examples alone should make it clear that not all are acting solely
>on impulse that can be easily modified by simple rewards.

The only valid counterexample you give is the emergency case.

I don't exactly agree with Kim's behavior either, because a person who is childishly impulsive enough to do what she describes may do other, even more dangerous things. And I don't want Kim (or me) to be a victim of someone else's childish impulses.

73 de Jim, N2EY

4580. Re: Why I Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-20 19:03:41 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <h21Fb.1606$Vv2.802859@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 84156

N2EY wrote:

> In article <2eQEb.11638$Pg1.3410@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>, "Kï¿½HB"
> <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> writes:
>
>
>>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote
>
>
>>>That means passing the post-restructuring 35 question Tech test is "more
>>>difficult" than passing both the pre-restructuring 30 question Novice
>>>test *and* the 5 wpm code receiving test.
>>
>>Yes.
>
>
> Well, there you have it. Element 1 is easier than 5 questions on the written
> test.

Balderdash!

>>(But only barely, and it is woefully inadequate for the resultant
>>privileges.)
>
>
> Woefully inadequate? FCC disagrees! In fact, in 2000 FCC drastically *reduced*
> the written testing needed for a Tech. From two tests and pools, frowm which
> were derived tests with a total of 65 questions down to one test of 35
> questions and a combined pool.

> FCC thinks that 35 question Tech test is adequate. The same FCC that sees "no
> regulatory purpose" in code tests.
>
> Is FCC mistaken?

Another argument for the no test agenda:

We regularly hurtle at each other at combined speeds of 150 miles per
hour and more, wearing nothing but street clothes, and strapped into
devices carrying a large load of almomst explosivly flammable liquid.

And we're afraid to let people run radios that are putting out the same
power as the microwave oven over my stove?

>>>Have the changes of 2000 gotten us more tinkerers per unit time than
>>
>>before?

>>
>>What the hell are "tinkerers per unit time"?
>
>
> Sorry, Hans, I thought you had an engineering background. ;-)
>
> I'll rephrase:
>
> Have the changes of 2000 resulted in more tinkerers entering the ARS in a given
> time period (say, per year) than before the changes were made?

Most of the tinkerers I know are pro-code test amateurs. Mine isn't a scientific survey, but I've noticed a common thread among them. They are very interested in RF technology. They are intensely interested in Amateur radio. They really like getting their hands down into the equipment. And whether this is related or not, they are also very interested in Morse code. I've seen some cutting edge stuff made by these same people.

I do not know one technician that has done as much as build his or her own antenna. Well wait, I built a 1/4 wave ground plane for 2 meters when I was a Tech. But that's it.

Based on that admittidly small sample, I would have to say that we are putting out less tinkers per unit time, and almost certainly less per hamcapita. (Hans, that means tinkerers per total numbe of Hams. 8^))

- Mike KB3EIA -

4581. Re: Why I Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-20 19:05:27 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <X31Fb.1607$Vv2.803246@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 84157

N2EY wrote:

> If you don't like what's in QST, why not write some articles featuring things
> you'd like to see? Heck, they published some of my stuff - they can't be *that*
> fussy! ;-)

Cool!!! When? I'd love to read them.

- Mike KB3EIA -

4582. Re: Why I Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-20 19:10:10 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <m81Fb.1609$Vv2.800838@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 84158

Dee D. Flint wrote:

> "Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:jL_Eb.12148$0s2.8545@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net...
>
>>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote
>>
>>
>>>Why is it "pathetic"? A significant number of hams are interested in
>>
>>"vintage"
>>
>>>radio. Just like a significant number of people like antique furniture,
>>
>>classic
>>
>>>cars, oldies music, past films and books, vintage clothing, etc. Doesn't
>>
>>mean
>>
>>>they are "stuck in the past".
>>>
>>
>>They already have a monthly feature called "Old Radios" and "75/50/25
>
> Years
>
>>Ago", and now a special "Vintage Radio" issue each year besides? Maybe we
>>could do a photo-feature of "The Girls of Geratol Net" with a centerfold
>
> for
>
>>those of you who get off on old stuff. (Yes, Virginia, there really is a
>>"Geratol Net"!)
>>
>>73, de Hans, K0HB
>>
>
>
> Are you aware of what the GERATOL net is all about? It doesn't sound like
> it from your post. They are an organization of and for Extra class amateur
> radio operators and promote usage of the Extra class band segments by an
> award program. The awards add difficulty to the pursuit since only stations
> worked in the Extra segments count for their equivalent of Worked All

> States, etc. It has nothing to do with age.

Tuning through one evening, I came across the net. After hearing it was the Geratol net, I perked up. This might be worth a few minutes of weird fun, hearing about peoples bunions and hernia operations. Nothing! a regular net, except for one person who asked how anothers wife was doing. "much better thank you" was the answer, then went on to net business.

Sunnavgun!

- Mike KB3EIA -

4583. Re: Why I Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-20 19:20:24 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <Yh1Fb.12569$0s2.8434@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 84159

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote

>
> Well, there you have it. Element 1 is easier than 5 questions on the
written
> test.
>

No, you don't "have it" at all, Jim.

Question for question, the Technician examination questions are noticeably
more difficult than those on the old Novice examination, and there are more
of them.

>
> Woefully inadequate? FCC disagrees!
>

Do you think they're right?

> (1) FCC thinks that 35 question Tech test is adequate.
> (2)The same FCC that sees "no regulatory purpose" in code tests.
>
> Is FCC mistaken?

They are mistaken on point one. They are correct on point 2.

> Have the changes of 2000 resulted in more tinkerers entering the ARS in a
given
> time period (say, per year) than before the changes were made?

I have no way of knowing for sure. Neither do you. It is my belief,
however, that the diminished emphasis on technical issues in the test, along
with the 'Ham Press' lack of emphasis on technical matters, is making the
Amateur Radio service less effective in recruiting those of an experimental
and tinkering bent.

73, de Hans, K0HB

4584. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-20 19:25:42 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <Wm1Fb.1614$Vv2.807293@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 84160

N2EY wrote:

> In article <bs0m1m$6e8@library2.airnews.net>, "Kim " <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
> writes:
>
>
>>"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
>>news:c2356669.0312191537.63070711@posting.google.com...
>>
>>>"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
>>
>>news:<pSFEb.4874$wL6.2412@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
>>
>>>>"N2EY" wrote:
>>>>
>>>>OTOH, if "behaving like an idiot" on
>>>>the road is not rewarded, the driver
>>>>may try something else (like courtesy,
>>>>or getting on the road a few minutes
>>>>earlier).
>>>>
>>>>
>>>> However, your child analogy falls apart when you remember that you're
>>>>talking about an adult
>>>
>>>A biological adult who is acting like a spoiled child.
>>>
>>>Remember the scenario Kim describes:
>>>
>>>- multilane divided highway
>>>- all vehicles at or above the posted speed limit.
>>>- vehicle comes up behind her, flashes brights, follows too closely,
>>>tries to get around on the *inside* shoulder. IOW, unsafe, aggressive
>>>driving actions intended to intimidate Kim. (as if!!)
>>>
>>>Some "adult".
>>>
>>>
>>>>- an adult that is going to get very angry at a
>>>>person blocking the fast lane while he and others are trying to pass.
>>>
>>>Let them behave like adults, then. Following too closely for the speed
>>>of travel is not adult behavior, regardless of what Kim is doing.
>>>

>>>
>>>>Lets be realistic here.
>>>
>>>OK, fine.
>>>
>>>It's realistic to behave in a safe responsible way when driving a
>>>motor vehicle.
>>>
>>>
>>>>If Kim is intentionally blocking others on the roads, she
>>>>doesn't deserve courtesy.
>>>
>>>She's only blocking those who want to speed faster than she wants to
>>>speed.
>>>
>>>Suppose several cars were to line up side-by-side on a multilane
>>>divided highway and go exactly the speed limit. Would that justify the
>>>"idiot" behaviors Kim describes?
>>>
>>>Suppose they were police cars....
>>>
>>>
>>>>Instead, she is more likely to be a victim of road
>>>>rage (something else she doesn't deserve, but far more likely). If she
>>>>manages to avoid that, and if one of those people she is blocking just
>>>>happens to be a cop, she may instead eventually get a ticket for not
>>
>>driving
>>
>>>>on the right.
>>>
>>>Agreed! That's why I previously said I let the "idiots" get past,
>>>because I'd rather have them in front of me than behind me.
>>>
>>>But the behavior/reward model I gave is valid. For both children and
>>>alleged adults.
>>>
>>>73 de Jim, N2EY
>>>
>>
>>Well, I suppose it's valid, Jim.
>
>
> Thank you
>
>
>>I've really never given the "behavior"
>>such thought, i.e. analogy, etc.
>
>

> Think about it. You've dealt with children - isn't it true that they will tend
> to repeat behavior that gets them what they want? If whining works, don't you
> get more whining?
>
> It's illogical to think that sort of thing isn't present in adults.
>
>
>>BUT, I am generally a very even tempered
>>person and I don't feel I'm in any way wrong to stay in the lane I've chosen
>>to drive in, above the posted speed, safely, forming safe distances between
>>myself and drivers ahead of me, and never-minding nitwits behind me who
>>think I should "yield" to them so they can speed faster and keep making each
>>successive vehicle move.
>>
>
> Would you agree that if you *do* yield, you validate their behavior and in a
> small way encourage them to do more of it?

I don't think they even think of it. If you don't move, they will pass
on the right. I've seen berm passing both right and left. They are
idiots, and probably wouldn't understand anything subtle.

I wonder if any of them realize why it takes so long for the officer to
issue them the ticket? Slowing the jerks up by a half hour or so in
addition to lightening their wallet is somethig they understand.

- Mike KB3EIA -

4585. Re: Future ARS licenses, was Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-20 19:33:59 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031220143359.01893.00002227@mb-m22.aol.com>
Source record: 84164

In article <PdYEb.6022$wL6.1286@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> writes:

>"Mike Coslo" wrote:
>>
>> My guess on the debate of the future
>> is one of testing regimen. I predict that
>> a new movement will arise that views
>> testing per se as an unnecessary nuisance,
>> and will agitate for simplification of the test,
>> and eventually it's removal.
>
> I don't think so, Mike. While I do see comments here and there, I don't
>see a growing consensus for a need to change the written tests, much less a
>growing consensus on any specific change to those tests. I suspect the vast
>majority would agree those tests are needed and are just fine as they are.
>Instead, I hope we can finally focus on more fully using the frequencies we
>have. Of course, I don't see any growing consensus for that either, but one
>can hope.

There are many and varied definitions of "consensus" among the newsgroupies in here. In the main, they consider "consensus" as being anything that they and their close acquaintences agree upon.

:-)

LHA

4586. Re: Why I Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-20 19:34:01 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031220143401.01893.00002228@mb-m22.aol.com>
Source record: 84165

In article <gB_Eb.1546$Vv2.766121@news1.news.adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo
<mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:

>Bill Sohl wrote:
>
>> "Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
>> news:3FE34758.8000802@psu.edu...
>>
>>>Bill Sohl wrote:
>>>
>>>>"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
>>>>news:OTtEb.689$Vv2.349555@news1.news.adelphia.net...
>>>>
>>>>>Dee D. Flint wrote:
>>>>>
>>>>>>"Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
>>>>>>news:f45722ac.0312181539.55a82802@posting.google.com...
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>Carl, you should see the NCI bashing being done by Dee and Jim on the
>>>>>>>other ARRL thread.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>73, Brian
>>>>>>
>>>>>>I have never bashed the NCI. I've stated that I disagree with their
>>>>
>>>>goal
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>>but that does not constitute bashing them.
>>>>>
>>>>>I have! I think that they have recieved what they wanted, but as yet
>>>>>don't really offer anything of substance to fill the gap.
>>>>
>>>>What GAP?
>>>
>>>Code test dissapears, nothing in it's place.
>>
>> Why should there be anything in its place? This isn't about
>> some mystical quantification of effort, dedication, yada yada....
>
> You are kind of right there Bill. I can prove to you without a doubt
>that a person can get on the air without ever taking a test.

I did that 50 1/2 years ago. No test. Nothing involving morse
code. 43 transmitters of 1 KW or higher RF output.

>They can
>get on the air and run relatively high power without doing harm to
>themselves. There is no need for any yada yada at all.
>
>It isn't mystical, it isn't yada yada. It is philosophy.

It's ALL about mystique in amateurism. :-)

Mystique. Class distinction. Strict adherence to old tradition
established by long-gone old-timers of another era.

>And my
>philosophy is that the amateur should want to be an amateur, and should
>have some level of knowledge in order to be there.

MYSTIQUE again!

All shall meet the requirements of the collective group mind, NOT
that of the government entity doing the licensing.

>> The morse tests have completely disappeared for General
>> and Extra without anything taking its place. If 5 wpm is dropped
>> for tech, why should there be something to replace it?
>
>Now I'm a little confused. As far as I know, if you want a general or
>above, you still have to take a Morse code test. And they don't do tech
>plusses any more. My Tech license had no code test in it.

God didn't ordain that a morse code test was necessary for an
amateur radio license. It is just a government regulation that
hasn't been taken off the law books. Some of us are trying to
eliminate that legal requirement. What was made by man can be
undone by man.

>>>I want to see something in
>>>it's place, or else itis pretty hard to argue that it hasn't been made
>>>much much easier to get a license.
>>
>> Ending a requirement that no longer has a rational need
>> does not translate into a search for some "replacement".
>> If you had the opportunity to state what the replacement
>> should be, what would you suggest?
>
>I support strengthening the tests. In general, I want more questions on
>theory, and more procedural questions. I wouldn't mind if there were a
>ham etiquette section added to the test.

"Etiquette?" :-)

The questions and answers are all generated by the VEC QPC, not
the FCC. All the FCC does is specify the total number of
questions and approve the VEC QPC set. Talk to the VEC QPC.

The FCC states, and has stated for some time, that the MINIMUM
number of questions in any written test element is 10. They do not

state a maximum. Each VEC QPC written test pool could have 20
or 30, or even 100 more questions-answers. It's all up to the VEC
QPC. So far they haven't made more than 10 times the number of
questions required.

>I want the new ham to come on board with some idea of what is expected
>of him or her in the way of how to conduct themselves on the air. I want
>them to have at least a rudimentary knowledge of electronics, and know
>some basics on antenna theory, like our "quarter wave dipole" discussion
>on rrap of a few months back proves is needed.

God forbid any dipole which is NOT exactly a half wave in total
length! :-) :-) :-) It can't possible work, can it? :-) :-)

You want a "basic training" or "boot camp" for amateur radio SERVICE
members? Good. They can all march in ranks to the same drum
beat. No dissension, no discord, all one big happy family. Once
out of Basic or Boot you can decide on Rank, uniforms, insignia, etc.

Don't like the "education" of modern amateur radiomen? Talk to the
Chief Educator who lives in Newington at 225 Main.

>>>You may want it made much easier to get a license, but I don't. Not a
>>>filter, not a way of keeping people out. just a way of ensuring that the
>>>amateur has some level of acumen.
>>
>> Ending morse doesn't change the level of written tests.
>
>No kidding! I want the level of the tests changed though. And not to the
>level of the "average sixth grader" either.

There's NO age discrimination in U.S. amateur radio.

Amateurs have been licensed as young as 6 years old. That's a
FIRST GRADE age.

Perfectly legal.

>>>Otherwise, those who want little or no testing are just encouraged.
>>
>> Encouraged about what?
>
> About little or no testing.

Everyone KNOWS all the questions, right? Just a matter of
memorizing them. Piece of cake. If a FIRST GRADER can do it,
anyone can, right?

>> As to other NCI members, assuming you can ID someone,
>> they too may have a personal belief as to how testing should go...
>> but that does NOT make their opinions or beliefs NCI
>> doctrine.
>
> I'm not talking about NCI, I'm talking about NCI members. There is a

>difference. As far as I know, NCI has no official opinions beyond ending
>the Morse code test.

No, no, no, no! You haven't gotten the WORD from the other
newsgroupies in here!

NCI is a direct competitor to ARRL. NCI threatens the existance of
ARRL. NCI threatens the security, safety, simplicity, stability, and
serenity of the amateur radio community! The newsgroupies demand
the abolishment of NCI.

Such has been the Word in here. Gods have spoken!

Amen.

LHA

4587. Re: Why I Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-20 19:34:02 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031220143402.01893.00002229@mb-m22.aol.com>
Source record: 84161

In article <HQ_Eb.1552$Vv2.769871@news1.news.adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:

>Oops sorry, I accidentally posted without comment

How dare you? :-)

LHA

4588. Re: Why I Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-20 19:34:03 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031220143403.01893.00002230@mb-m22.aol.com>
Source record: 84162

In article <YT_Eb.12214$0s2.10529@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>, "Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote
>
>> If a 50+ year old transmitter on a wooden chassis can put out a legal signal
>> and make QSOs, what't the problem?
>
>No problem at all if you want to waste your time with that, but to have the
>National Association of Amateur Radio feature half century old technology as
>feature article(s) in their membership journal speaks volumns.
>
>ï¿½ 97.1(b) Continuation and extension of the amateur's proven ability to
>contribute to the ADVANCEMENT of the radio art.

The thing being ADVANCED is the peace and tranquility state of
the amateur, Hans. That's important to their mental well-being.

Going back to past technology, rebuilding and restoring, is SAFE.
Such is a known quantity. It can be explained via many existing
texts. SECURITY. No problems about learning anything new. All
can become "expert" on things made long ago without undue
struggle. Such is already-proven technology...no struggling with
unproven ideas.

There's also the Nostalgia of the Never. Most restorers were not
alive or too young when old equipment was high-tech. They want
to relive a pioneering past they never lived in, indulging in fantasy
and make-believe through vicarious mental other-lives.

Old radio is SIMPLE. Everything is analogue. No need to learn
new things like digital frequency meters (why get direct numbers
when it is so much "fun" to beat a 221 and interpolate from that
little book?), or PLLs for VFO stability (let it warm up for a half
hour first then squint at a hand-scratched dial reading and hope
you are still in-band), or "product detectors" when everyone knows
a detector is a diode and must always have a BFO.

STABILITY. Not just in quartz crystal control of a single transmit
frequency. Known quantities are stable...all that is required is to
consult existing texts and pictures long in existance and praised
by mostly-gone users. If it was good then it MUST still be good.

SERENITY. Self-satisfaction of "accomplishing" what has already
been done.

Safe. Secure. Simple. Stable. Serene. Old ways are best...

LHA

4589. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-20 19:34:04 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031220143404.01893.00002231@mb-m22.aol.com>
Source record: 84163

In article <f45722ac.0312200714.316470a0@posting.google.com>,
brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:

>N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in message
>news:<c2356669.0312190606.18645337@posting.google.com>...
>
>> Ah, there's where your logic fails, Dave. You're working on a false
>> premise.
>>
>> You're *assuming* that everyone who has an opinion on amateur radio
>> policy issues is interested in amateur radio having the best possible
>> future. And in most cases that's true - but not when Mr. Anderson is
>> involved. His behavior here, and his comments to FCC, indicate that
>> he's *not* interested in what's best for amateur radio. He's just
>> interested in stirring up division, discord and hostility between
>> amateurs, diverting them from other issues, and denying amateur
>> traditions and contributions to society and the radio art.
>
>Inventive Licensing comes to mind as the big divider.

:-)

>> Suppose someone really hated amateur radio and wanted to damage it as
>> much as possible without being obvious about what they were doing.
>>
>> Wouldn't one way to do that be to try to maximize internal bickering
>> and arguing among hams, thereby diverting them from useful discussion?
>
>One could propose to the FCC a licensing structure with multiple
>levels, multiple exams, and multiple privelege slices and power
>levels.

Another way is to have everyone believe in the same thing...as is
published every month in a certain membership magazine.

As a single "authoritative voice," a New England membership
group DEFINES everything in amateurism for all amateurs. No
bickering, no dissension, no arguing. All do as They say.
No problems. Everyone happy in Nirvana.

All who oppose the above shall be villified, burned at the stake,
and denounced as not Believing in the True Way.

Halleluya. Amen.

LHA

4590. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-20 19:41:40 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bs28m7$49@library2.airnews.net>
Source record: 84166

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:5NWEb.5989$wL6.919@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> "N2EY" wrote:
> >
> > Remember the scenario Kim describes:
> >
> > - multilane divided highway
> > - all vehicles at or above the posted speed limit.
> > - vehicle comes up behind her, flashes brights,
> > follows too closely, tries to get around on the
> > *inside* shoulder. IOW, unsafe, aggressive
> > driving actions intended to intimidate Kim.
> > (as if!!)
>
>
> That's your (and/or perhaps Kim's) interpretation of the scenario.
Others
> may interpret it as Kim being an inattentive driver that is not acting
> courteously to others by driving to the right, causing others to take
> extraordinary steps to get her attention back on the road and courteous
> driving (with extraordinary steps being necessary to get someone to drive
> courteously only adding to the fustration of other drivers).
>

Dwight, I've got a couple of questions for you, but let me first say: a) I
am already driving above the posted speed (by at least 10 and often 15 mph).
So, I am not going at posted or under posted speed; b) I am driving "as
courteously" or more than anyone else...certainly safer--I am leaving plenty
of distance between myself and the traffic ahead, if there is any and, keep
in mind, the traffic ahead is generally going the same speed I am--it is the
oddballs that come up from behind and want everyone to start moving over for
them.

OK, question 1:

Why should it be *me* who has to yield to someone else to be courteous to
them, when it is *them* acting unsafe, speeding faster than anyone else, and
often copping quite a conscious attitude of beign an idiot--the rest of us
are just driving along.

>
> > She's only blocking those who want to speed
> > faster than she wants to speed.
>
>

> Exactly. However, as you well know, she doesn't have a mandate, or a
> right, to self-enforce how fast others drive. Instead, she has the same
> obligations as other drivers, including an obligation to move to the right
> to allow others to pass. If others are driving too fast while doing so,
that
> is law enforcement's business - not the business of a self-styled road
> vigilante.
>

OK. So I don't have that mandate. Neither does the person behind me.
Since I am "in line" first, they should recalculate when they get on the
road if my being there (and others) is going to be such an aggravation for
them.

I don't consider myself a self-styled vigilante. I consider myself as a
driver like anyone else on the road...except I don't act like an idiot
around others (if I speed--and I do--I make darned sure that I keep a safe
distance from others). The jerk (yeah, jerk) behind me obviously thinks
they are more important than anyone else--I ignore them.

>
> > But the behavior/reward model I gave is valid.
> > For both children and alleged adults.
>
>
> I disagree. For it to be valid, you would have to establish there is
> nothing more than childhood impulse behind the decision drive fast -
impulse
> that can be easily modified by simple rewards. And you haven't established
> that. Adults can make decisions based on some level of knowledge,
> experience, and review of the situation, not impulse. In the case of fast
> drivers, perhaps the driver feels, based on a consideration of his/her
> skills and experience, that he/she can drive safely at faster speeds. For
> example, I've driven many thousands of miles on German autobahns, and know
> full well I can drive safely at speeds faster than 55-65 mph (therefore
only
> the laws and conditions attenuate my driving speeds). Perhaps the person
has
> a legitimate reason for driving faster. For example, the driver may be
> taking someone to the hospital (and Kim is blocking his way). I could go
on,
> but these examples alone should make it clear that not all are acting
solely
> on impulse that can be easily modified by simple rewards.
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
>

Kim W5TIT

4591. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-20 19:44:04 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bs28qm$8op@library2.airnews.net>
Source record: 84167

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:f5XEb.5996$wL6.2632@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
>
> "Kim W5TIT" wrote:
> >
> > I am not "intentionally" blocking anyone,
> > Dwight. I am driving. That's all.
>
>
> But if you are intentionally not moving to the right, not yielding to
> others trying to pass, that is not all. If Texas is like many states, you
> have a legal obligation to drive on the right to allow others to pass.
There
> is rarely an exception which allows you to ignore these laws when you feel
> it is justified - when you feel others are driving too fast or you feel
> others are violating the laws, for examples. It is true these laws are
> rarely enforced, but that doesn't mean they're never enforced. For
example,
> you will most often see these laws enforced when there are multiple car
> accidents where the slower vehicle causing the congestion necessary for
this
> type of accident is ticketed (with that driver being responsible for the
> damage to all vehicles involved).
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
>

Someone said something about the "flow" of traffic. Generally, my speeding matches the majority of other speeders on the road. If they are going faster than I feel safe to do, I move over to the right. Point being: the "rest" of us are in the flow of traffic. It is those who wish to speed faster that are being the disruptive ones. They can work their way around everyone--who stays there *to* get around the infrequent (at that time of morning) drivers who are probably still speeding, but in the right hand lane.

Kim W5TIT

4592. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-20 19:54:09 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bs29dk$5dn@library2.airnews.net>
Source record: 84168

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20031220135913.29660.00002148@mb-m24.aol.com...
> In article <bs0m1m$6e8@library2.airnews.net>, "Kim " <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
> writes:
>
> >I've really never given the "behavior"
> >such thought, i.e. analogy, etc.
>
> Think about it. You've dealt with children - isn't it true that they will
tend
> to repeat behavior that gets them what they want? If whining works, don't
you
> get more whining?
>

What I meant by my comment was that I've never really thought of it much
beyond just making a conscious decision not to "give in," "yield," "cave,"
whatever one wishes to call it. But I agree, it'd be much the same as with
a child.

>
> It's illogical to think that sort of thing isn't present in adults.
>

I agree again, and it is...I see it in my training sessions and elsewhere
every day at work ;)

> >
> >BUT, I am generally a very even tempered
> >person and I don't feel I'm in any way wrong to stay in the lane I've
chosen
> >to drive in, above the posted speed, safely, forming safe distances
between
> >myself and drivers ahead of me, and never-minding nitwits behind me who
> >think I should "yield" to them so they can speed faster and keep making
each
> >successive vehicle move.
> >
> Would you agree that if you *do* yield, you validate their behavior and in
a
> small way encourage them to do more of it?
>

Absolutely.

>
> Personally, I move, because I care more about my own safety. But that's
just
> me.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>

I am probably lately more apt to be ignorant of my own safety in a steady determination to "dammit, stop allowing others to treat me like that" attitude. I've been in one of those attitudes for a while now. I'm kind of liking it.

Kim W5TIT

4593. Re: Why I Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-20 19:59:06 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031220145906.21642.00003100@mb-m01.aol.com>
Source record: 84169

In article <1bKcnRsopILxK36iUSdV9w@ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
<wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:

>"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
>news:c2356669.0312191605.469f743b@posting.google.com...
>> "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
>news:<LaWdnUpk3pWGoH6iUSdV9w@ptd.net>...
>> > Leadership is
>> > when one has the courage and wisdom to make a sound judgement
>> > and then "do the right thing."
>>
>> Who decides what "the right thing" really is?
>
>That's what "leadership" is *supposed* to be there for ... to make
>the tough calls when the answer isn't necessarily obvious (or may
>be right, but not overwhelmingly popular).

But ultimately it comes down to popularity, because if the "leader" makes
unpopular-enough decision(s), he/she may not be a "leader" anymore. This
happens in government, in business (if a decision isn't popular-enough with
customers and/or stockholders), and in almost all voluntary organizations.
>
>> For example, look at
>> that "21st century" paper (CQ published it, btw, and it was in their
>> mill before I evder saw it, so don't give me a hard time about it). Is
>> the "Communicator" idea "the right thing"?
>
>No ... we need more people who understand radio, not more appliance
>operators.

Agreed!

But the leaders of the NCVEC committee disagree with us.

And some of the provisions of the "Communicator" work against that. (No rigs
over 30 volts??)

But others will argue that an easier entry-level license will attract more new
hams, and therefore more who will want to *understand radio*. After all, isn't
education one of the B&Ps of the ARS?

It boils down to the old argument of:

"Become a ham to learn about radio"

vs.

"Learn about radio to become a ham"

>> > Otherwise, they could just do a web vote
>> > popularity contest on every issue and wouldn't need Directors ... the
>> > staff could handle the whole thing ...
>>
>> And if that vote runs opposite to what you think is "the right thing"?
>
>I wasn't advocating a popularity contest ... just saying that if nobody in
>"leadership" has the cajones and good judgement to make the right call,
>then it might as well devolve to that ...

They *do* have the intestinal fortitude to make the "right" call. But there's disagreement about what that call is. There are honest people on all sides of most disagreements.
>
>> It sounds to me like you're saying the ARRL Directors should sometimes
>> go against what the majority of members say they want. Do you really
>> think that's a good idea?
>
>Yes ... the leadership should, theoretically at least, have superior
>knowledge,
>insight, and experience and should be there to guide, not simply be a bunch
>of political "yes men" to a majority who may/may not necessarily make the
>best
>choices in terms of what's in the best interests of ham radio long term.

Others describe the ARRL leadership as "self appointed gods of radio" who claim to "know what is best". And they use that description as a reason not to join.

Like it or not, it's ultimately a popularity contest. And the long term is hard to gauge because things aren't left alone long enough. Even when they are, there is often little agreement with what the results mean.

For example, did US amateur radio grow faster in the nocodetest 90s than in the allcodetest 80s?
>
>> > What I was referring to were things like CW practice, bulletins, etc.
>All
>> > of that could
>> > be provided (and much is) by the web site, and probably would reduce
>> > operating
>> > costs. (Though doing things by non-radio means is heresy to some ...)
>>
>> IOW, you want to shut down the station.
>
>No, I wasn't saying that ... I was just "thinking out loud" about what
>things
>might be more cost-effectively provided by other means.

If the bulletins and code practice were done online instead of on-air, what would be left of W1AW?
>

>> The whole point of W1AW is to do those things by *radio*. If we're
>> going to use the website for bulletins and code practice, why not rag
>> chewing, traffic handling, DX chasing, contesting......
>
>I've always said that the ampr.org domain should be come a much more
>integrated, vibrant part of the internet as a whole ...

But what have you *done* to make that a reality except for talking about it?

73 de Jim, N2EY
>

4594. Re: Future ARS licenses, was Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-20 19:59:08 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031220145908.21642.00003101@mb-m01.aol.com>
Source record: 84170

In article <PdYEb.6022$wL6.1286@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> writes:

>"Mike Coslo" wrote:
>>
>> My guess on the debate of the future
>> is one of testing regimen. I predict that
>> a new movement will arise that views
>> testing per se as an unnecessary nuisance,
>> and will agitate for simplification of the test,
>> and eventually it's removal.
>
>
> I don't think so, Mike. While I do see comments here and there, I don't
>see a growing consensus for a need to change the written tests, much less a
>growing consensus on any specific change to those tests.

Don't need a consensus. Just somebody or somebodys with an agenda. Like NCVEC's Gang of Four.

>I suspect the vast
>majority would agree those tests are needed and are just fine as they are.

Sure - just like the vast majority might say that a single 5 wpm code test is needed and is just fine it is.

>Instead, I hope we can finally focus on more fully using the frequencies we
>have.

How?

What changes do you suggest to make that happen?

And what does "more fully" mean in that context?

>Of course, I don't see any growing consensus for that either, but one
>can hope.

Don't need a consensus...

73 de Jim, N2EY

4595. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-20 19:59:37 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bs29ns$5n3@library2.airnews.net>
Source record: 84171

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20031220135915.29660.00002149@mb-m24.aol.com...
> In article <5NWEb.5989$wL6.919@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dwight
> Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> writes:
>
> >"N2EY" wrote:
> >>
> >> Remember the scenario Kim describes:
> >>
> >> - multilane divided highway
> >> - all vehicles at or above the posted speed limit.
> >> - vehicle comes up behind her, flashes brights,
> >> follows too closely, tries to get around on the
> >> *inside* shoulder. IOW, unsafe, aggressive
> >> driving actions intended to intimidate Kim.
> >> (as if!!)
> > > That's your (and/or perhaps Kim's) interpretation of the scenario.
>
> I'd call it an accurate description, not an interpretation.
>

Me too.

> >
> >Others
> >may interpret it as Kim being an inattentive driver that is not acting
> >courteously to others by driving to the right, causing others to take
> >extraordinary steps to get her attention back on the road and courteous
> >driving (with extraordinary steps being necessary to get someone to drive
> >courteously only adding to the fustration of other drivers).
>
> Hmmm...
>
> She's going with the flow of traffic, *above* the posted speed limit, but
she
> should slow down and change lanes so that someone who wants to go even
faster
> can get by?
>

Thank you. Doesn't make much sense to me, either.

>
> She's not being "courteous" enough to do the above, so that somehow

validates
> the dangerous actions of another driver (following too closely, trying to
pass
> on the shoulder)?
> >
> >> She's only blocking those who want to speed
> >> faster than she wants to speed.
> >
> > Exactly.
>
> Well, there you have it.
>

Haw...as you would say! :o

> >
> >However, as you well know, she doesn't have a mandate, or a
> >right, to self-enforce how fast others drive.
>
> Nor do *they* (or Kim) have a right to speed.
>

Correct as correct can be.

> >
> >Instead, she has the same
> >obligations as other drivers, including an obligation to move to the
right
> >to allow others to pass.
>
> Where is it in the motor vehicle code that a driver on a multilane divided
> highway has to change lanes and slow down to allow a speeder to pass in a
> non-emergency situation?
>

They have *some* (one that I know of) of those highways down here. The only
one I know of is well north of the DFW metroplex, up above Lewisville,
even...almost to the OK border.

> >
> >If others are driving too fast while doing so, that
> >is law enforcement's business - not the business of a self-styled road
> >vigilante.
>
> It's everyone's business.
>

Yep.

> >>
> >> But the behavior/reward model I gave is valid.
> >> For both children and alleged adults.
> >

> > I disagree. For it to be valid, you would have to establish there is
> >nothing more than childhood impulse behind the decision drive fast -
impulse
> >that can be easily modified by simple rewards.
>
> The behaviors described by Kim go far beyond driving fast. They are
obviously
> childish - and often dangerous. Following too closely is simply unsafe.
>

Uh, *especially* at near 70-75 and above mph!!!!!!!!!!!

>
> If you think childish impulses are easily modified by simple rewards, you
> obviously haven't spent much time with impulsive children.
>
> >And you haven't established
> >that.
>
> It's self-evident.
>

Oh, I'm here to tell you that strategy works on children, groups, etc.

> >
> >Adults can make decisions based on some level of knowledge,
> >experience, and review of the situation, not impulse.
>
> Of course!
>
> But the behaviors Kim describes are not those of a responsible adult.
>
> >In the case of fast
> >drivers, perhaps the driver feels, based on a consideration of his/her
> >skills and experience, that he/she can drive safely at faster speeds.
>
> The driver *feels*?
>
> So the driver's *feelings* supersede the judgement of the traffic
engineers and
> lawmakers who determine the posted speed limits?
>
> I'd like to see that argument defended in court!
>
> My daily commute to work is often made longer by school buses and school
zones.
> It's gotten so I know exactly where the zones, the children, and the bus
stops
> are. Is it adult behavior for me to go faster than 15 in a school zone, or
zoom
> past a bus with its red lights flashing, because I *feel* I can do so

safely?
>

The adult thing to do is either get up and leave earlier, or leave after the school zones are relinquished to normal traffic.

>
> Or how about the ham who *feels* he "needs" 10 kW output? Suppose said ham can
> safely assemble and operate a 10 kW transmitter that meets all of the FCC
> requirements for spurious emissions and RF exposure. Is it therefre OK for him
> to do so because he *feels* it's OK?
>
> >For
> >example, I've driven many thousands of miles on German autobahns, and know
> >full well I can drive safely at speeds faster than 55-65 mph (therefore only
> >the laws and conditions attenuate my driving speeds).
>
> You know you can do it on German autobahns. But we're not in Germany. You want
> to drive faster, go to Germany.
>
> >Perhaps the person has
> >a legitimate reason for driving faster. For example, the driver may be
> >taking someone to the hospital (and Kim is blocking his way).
>
> Sure. That's an emergency situation. But Kim says it's an every-day thing.
> Hardly an emergency. And if there's only one person in the car....
>
> >I could go on,
> >but these examples alone should make it clear that not all are acting solely
> >on impulse that can be easily modified by simple rewards.
>
> The only valid counterexample you give is the emergency case.
>
> I don't exactly agree with Kim's behavior either, because a person who is
> childishly impulsive enough to do what she describes may do other, even more
> dangerous things. And I don't want Kim (or me) to be a victim of someone else's
> childish impulses.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>

'Zactly.

Kim W5TIT

4596. Re: Why I Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-20 20:12:19 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0312201212.4485c45@posting.google.com>
Source record: 84172

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:<JeYEb.17679$P%1.16269412@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>...
> "Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:lCQEb.11665$Pg1.3885@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net...
> >
> > "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote
> >
> > >
> > > Yep. It's the annual "vintage radio" issue. Says so right on the cover.
> > >
> >
> > Thank you, Thank You, THANK YOU!!! You make my point exactly!!!
> >
> > I'm very much an ARRL supporter, but an "Annual Vintage Radio Issue" is a
> > pathetic statement about the technical leadership out of 225 Main Street.
> > Sorta validates LHA's persistent jeremiads about how backward amateurs
> seem
> > to him. How much nicer if there were an "Annual Future Systems Issue".
> >
> > 73, de Hans, K0HB
> >
>
> Is it really too much to have one issue out of 12 address vintage radio?

No. But every issue seems to have the same theme: vintage radio.

> Afterall there are some hams to whom this is of interest either practical or
> just as a window into history. Although my own interest is in new radios
> and how much they can pack into how little space,

Tiny radios? May I suggest the "Tuna Tin," the "Tuna Tin Two," the
all solid state "Altoids Tin?" More recently we've had the film can
antenna tuner and the batteryless "Tic-Tac" diode receiver.

the vintage issue is a
> nice relaxing look at the past.
>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

You might even enjoy CQ's calendar with vintage equipment photos.

Brian

4597. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-20 20:49:16 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <a4qdncoc16O4JXmiRVn-sw@gbronline.com>
Source record: 84175

Dwight Stewart wrote:
> "Kim W5TIT" wrote:
>
>>I am not "intentionally" blocking anyone,
>>Dwight. I am driving. That's all.
>
>
>
> But if you are intentionally not moving to the right, not yielding to
> others trying to pass, that is not all. If Texas is like many states, you
> have a legal obligation to drive on the right to allow others to pass. There
> is rarely an exception which allows you to ignore these laws when you feel
> it is justified - when you feel others are driving too fast or you feel
> others are violating the laws, for examples.

Especially when one is already breaking the law themselves by speeding
as TWIT admits to doing.

4598. Re: Why I Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-20 20:50:21 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031220155021.25815.00005330@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 84174

In article <h21Fb.1606$Vv2.802859@news1.news.adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo
<mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>
>> In article <2eQEb.11638$Pg1.3410@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>, "Kï¿½HB"
>> <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> writes:
>>
>>>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote
>>
>>>>That means passing the post-restructuring 35 question Tech test is "more
>>>>difficult" than passing both the pre-restructuring 30 question Novice
>>>>test *and* the 5 wpm code receiving test.
>>>
>>>Yes.
>>
>> Well, there you have it. Element 1 is easier than 5 questions on the written
>> test.
>
>Balderdash!

ANYONE can do, Mike. That's the Word from the newsgroupies in
here. Little kids can do it. No aptitude needed...just the guts and
determination and a terrible Will To Win, like it was the Most
Important Thing In Your Life!

>>>(But only barely, and it is woefully inadequate for the resultant
>>>privileges.)
>>
>> Woefully inadequate? FCC disagrees! In fact, in 2000 FCC drastically
reduced
>> the written testing needed for a Tech. From two tests and pools, frowm which
>> were derived tests with a total of 65 questions down to one test of 35
>> questions and a combined pool.
>
>> FCC thinks that 35 question Tech test is adequate. The same FCC that sees
"no
>> regulatory purpose" in code tests.
>>
>> Is FCC mistaken?
>
>Another argument for the no test agenda:

You didn't answer the question!

A god of radio posed you a question. You MUST answer.

It's a newsgroup LAW!

>We regularly hurtle at each other at combined speeds of 150 miles per
>hour and more, wearing nothing but street clothes, and strapped into
>devices carrying a large load of almomst explosivly flammable liquid.
>
>And we're afraid to let people run radios that are putting out the same
>power as the microwave oven over my stove?

Absolutely. In order to transmit on HF, ALL must know
morse code first. It's the LAW!

No one is safe without the morse code skill.

Know morse and everyone is safe.

> Most of the tinkerers I know are pro-code test amateurs. Mine isn't a
>scientific survey, but I've noticed a common thread among them. They are
>very interested in RF technology. They are intensely interested in
>Amateur radio. They really like getting their hands down into the
>equipment. And whether this is related or not, they are also very
>interested in Morse code. I've seen some cutting edge stuff made by
>these same people.

Those who do NOT test/know morse code cannot possibly be
"interested" in radio.

The rest of the radio world does not exist without that morse code
skill demonstrated by federal test.

The rest of the radio world does not count, has no bearing on
amateur radio.

All significant advances in radio have been done by amateurs.
That's how we all got cellular telephones carryable in shirt
pockets (complete with vision capability), cordless telephones
operating at 5 GHz, FM stereo broadcasting, and life-saving
capability during all emergencies when all the infrastructure
collapses immediately. Morse code skill did it every time!

> I do not know one technician that has done as much as build his or her
>own antenna. Well wait, I built a 1/4 wave ground plane for 2 meters
>when I was a Tech. But that's it.

There you have it. Those without federal testing in morse code
are all incompetent, ignorant, and worthless.

> Based on that admittidly small sample, I would have to say that we are
>putting out less tinkers per unit time, and almost certainly less per
>hamcapita. (Hans, that means tinkerers per total numbe of Hams. 8^))

"Numbe?"

"Tinkers?"

You build radios out of tin?

You need plans for the Tuna Tin 2? Or its companion receiver,
the Herring Aid?

No one can possibly be interested in radio without being morse code
tested. The gods of radio have spoken! It's divine LAW!

Amen.

LHA

4599. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-20 20:50:22 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031220155022.25815.00005331@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 84173

In article <XD0Fb.1592$Vv2.796649@news1.news.adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:

>Your trying to pin me down on this is amusing, since the membership
>rolls of NCI are a closely guarded secret. The only way we know is if
>the member outs him or her self.

"Closely guarded secret?!?" :-)

Good grief, NCI members in here have been free with publishing their membership numbers. No one has been arrested for that yet. :-)

So, give us an EXACT number of ARRL members. :-)

LHA

4600. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-20 21:06:45 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <tdmdnQyZDJkqIXmiRVn-hQ@gbronline.com>
Source record: 84179

N2EY wrote:

>
> Hmmm...
>
> She's going with the flow of traffic, *above* the posted speed limit, but she
> should slow down and change lanes so that someone who wants to go even faster
> can get by?

Yes, in Texas it is the law. You are supposed to drive in the right lane
and use the left lane for passing, even if you are doing the speed limit
or over, you are obliged to pull to the right lane to let another pass.
The following is an exerpt from an article in the Ft. Worth Star
Telegram, April 12, 2003.
****
Texans must drive in the right-hand lane.

In other words -- move over.

Yes, you. Get out of the left lane.

I don't care how fast you're driving. Or what the speed limit is.

Texas law is blunt.

Except to pass, motorists "shall drive in the right-hand lane."

Both chronic slowpokes and self-appointed speed-limit vigilantes were
stung by transportation writer Gordon Dickson's report. He told how
habitual left-lane drivers are "despised" and how some traffic engineers
believe they cause wrecks.

I am not going to defend the lunatics who zoom up from behind at rush
hour, bearing down two inches behind your rear bumper and so close that
you can smell the extra-grande Starbucks coffee on their breath.

But the law is the law. Yes, it says drivers can't speed or tailgate.
But it also says to stay out of the left lane.

Some violators are obviously in denial.

4601. Re: Future ARS licenses, was Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-20 21:13:18 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031220161318.22081.00002639@mb-m17.aol.com>
Source record: 84176

In article <20031220145908.21642.00003101@mb-m01.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
writes:

>In article <PdYEb.6022$wL6.1286@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dwight
>Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> writes:
>
>>"Mike Coslo" wrote:
>>>
>>> My guess on the debate of the future
>>> is one of testing regimen. I predict that
>>> a new movement will arise that views
>>> testing per se as an unnecessary nuisance,
>>> and will agitate for simplification of the test,
>>> and eventually it's removal.
>>
>> I don't think so, Mike. While I do see comments here and there, I don't
>>see a growing consensus for a need to change the written tests, much less a
>>growing consensus on any specific change to those tests.
>
>Don't need a consensus. Just somebody or somebodys with an agenda. Like
>NCVEC's Gang of Four.

Obviously a Gang of running-dog imperialists!

>>I suspect the vast
>>majority would agree those tests are needed and are just fine as they are.
>
>Sure - just like the vast majority might say that a single 5 wpm code test is
>needed and is just fine it is.

You think it and the "vast majority" agrees automatically.

Marvelous this god-hood thing...

>>Of course, I don't see any growing consensus for that either, but one
>>can hope.
>
>Don't need a consensus...

None at all. Everyone do as you say, following the True Beliefs
of the Church of St. Hiram.

As long as everyone thinks like you do, all is serene, safe,
secure. No dissension, no arguments, all big happy family.

Morse code makes every ham happy.

Ohm mane padme ohm...

Let there be no resistance. Resistance is futile.

LHA

4602. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-20 21:13:19 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <BOydnWJGx-3sI3mi4p2dnA@gbronline.com>
Source record: 84181

N2EY wrote:

>
> My daily commute to work is often made longer by school buses and school zones.
> It's gotten so I know exactly where the zones, the children, and the bus stops
> are. Is it adult behavior for me to go faster than 15 in a school zone, or zoom
> past a bus with its red lights flashing, because I *feel* I can do so safely?

So what is the max speed you can go in a 15 mph school zone?

4603. Re: Why I Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-20 21:13:20 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031220161320.22081.00002640@mb-m17.aol.com>
Source record: 84177

In article <20031220145906.21642.00003100@mb-m01.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
writes:

>In article <1bKcnRsopILxK36iUSdV9w@ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
><wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:
>
>>"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
>>news:c2356669.0312191605.469f743b@posting.google.com...
>>> "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
>>news:<LaWdnUpk3pWGoH6iUSdV9w@ptd.net>...
>>> > Leadership is
>>> > when one has the courage and wisdom to make a sound judgement
>>> > and then "do the right thing."
>>>
>>> Who decides what "the right thing" really is?
>>
>>That's what "leadership" is *supposed* to be there for ... to make
>>the tough calls when the answer isn't necessarily obvious (or may
>>be right, but not overwhelmingly popular).
>
>But ultimately it comes down to popularity, because if the "leader" makes
>unpopular-enough decision(s), he/she may not be a "leader" anymore. This
>happens in government, in business (if a decision isn't popular-enough with
>customers and/or stockholders), and in almost all voluntary organizations.
>>
>>> For example, look at
>>> that "21st century" paper (CQ published it, btw, and it was in their
>>> mill before I evder saw it, so don't give me a hard time about it). Is
>>> the "Communicator" idea "the right thing"?
>>
>>No ... we need more people who understand radio, not more appliance
>>operators.
>
>Agreed!
>
>But the leaders of the NCVEC committee disagree with us.

Such is forbidden!

You need no consensus. You KNOW the true way.

All else are ignorant, incapable of the correct decisions.

>It boils down to the old argument of:
>
>"Become a ham to learn about radio"

>
>vs.
>
>"Learn about radio to become a ham"

NO ONE can be "interested in radio" without getting a ham
license!

Know morse and one knows all.

>>> > Otherwise, they could just do a web vote
>>> > popularity contest on every issue and wouldn't need Directors ... the
>>> > staff could handle the whole thing ...
>>>
>>> And if that vote runs opposite to what you think is "the right thing"?
>>
>>I wasn't advocating a popularity contest ... just saying that if nobody in
>>"leadership" has the cajones and good judgement to make the right call,
>>then it might as well devolve to that ...
>
>They *do* have the intestinal fortitude to make the "right" call. But there's
>disagreement about what that call is. There are honest people on all sides of
>most disagreements.

But...you KNOW the true way already.

There can be NO disagreement then.

>>> It sounds to me like you're saying the ARRL Directors should sometimes
>>> go against what the majority of members say they want. Do you really
>>> think that's a good idea?
>>
>>Yes ... the leadership should, theoretically at least, have superior
>>knowledge,
>>insight, and experience and should be there to guide, not simply be a bunch
>>of political "yes men" to a majority who may/may not necessarily make the
>>best
>>choices in terms of what's in the best interests of ham radio long term.
>
>Others describe the ARRL leadership as "self appointed gods of radio" who
>claim
>to "know what is best". And they use that description as a reason not to
>join.

Gasp...you mean to imply they DON'T know what is best?!?!?

>Like it or not, it's ultimately a popularity contest. And the long term is
>hard
>to gauge because things aren't left alone long enough. Even when they are,
>there is often little agreement with what the results mean.

You need NO consensus. You KNOW.

>If the bulletins and code practice were done online instead of on-air, what
>would be left of W1AW?

It's a MEMORIAL station. Remember?

>>> The whole point of W1AW is to do those things by *radio*. If we're
>>> going to use the website for bulletins and code practice, why not rag
>>> chewing, traffic handling, DX chasing, contesting......
>>
>>I've always said that the ampr.org domain should be come a much more
>>integrated, vibrant part of the internet as a whole ...
>
>But what have you *done* to make that a reality except for talking about it?

Just for starters, Carl was IN Geneva helping to get all of S25
redone. It got redone. Reality. Love it or leave it.

Some day I might hear W1AW out here 3000 or so miles away.
It doesn't reach Hawaii very well, or Alaska. Obviously us in the
west don't exist as states of the Union.

Nobody can possibly be "interested in radio" without testing for
morse code and then Acceptance of the True Way via ARRL.

LHA

4604. Re: Why I Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-20 21:15:58 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <i_2Fb.17738$P%1.16339939@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 84178

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20031220145906.21642.00003100@mb-m01.aol.com...
> In article <1bKcnRsopILxK36iUSdV9w@ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
> <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:
>
> But others will argue that an easier entry-level license will attract more
new
> hams, and therefore more who will want to *understand radio*. After all,
isn't
> education one of the B&Ps of the ARS?
>
> It boils down to the old argument of:
>
> "Become a ham to learn about radio"
>
> vs.
>
> "Learn about radio to become a ham"
>

What it should be and too many fail to realize is that the proper sequence is "Learn radio basics to become a ham and then as a ham continue to learn and increase one's expertise." It should not be one versus the other.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

4605. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-20 21:21:58 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <W33Fb.17739$P%1.16340952@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 84180

"Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:bs29ns$5n3@library2.airnews.net...
> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>[snip all the long thread]
> 'Zactly.
>
> Kim W5TIT

Just to illustrate the idiocy of some of the people on the freeway, I'll throw in a personal anecdote. I was driving down a multilane freeway through a construction zone and I was in the rightmost lane. I was going with the flow of the traffic in the slow lane, which was slightly above the limit posted for the construction zone. A semi truck comes up behind me, rides my bumper, honks, flashes his lights. Now, I'm already in the slow lane with no way to speed up since the vehicles ahead of me aren't going any faster and wouldn't want to anyway as there is too much chance to hurt a construction worker plus fines in construction zones are very steep here. This idiot keeps it up until we are out of the construction zone and it is possible to move further to the right.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

4606. Re: Why I Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-20 21:25:49 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <x73Fb.17740$P%1.16341630@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 84182

"Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
news:f45722ac.0312201212.4485c45@posting.google.com...
> "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:<JeYEb.17679$P%1.16269412@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>...
> > Afterall there are some hams to whom this is of interest either
practical or
> > just as a window into history. Although my own interest is in new
radios
> > and how much they can pack into how little space,
>
> Tiny radios? May I suggest the "Tuna Tin," the "Tuna Tin Two," the
> all solid state "Altoids Tin?" More recently we've had the film can
> antenna tuner and the batteryless "Tic-Tac" diode receiver.

Not enough features to be interesting. I want a lot more "bells &
whistles". Although now somewhat dated as other radios pack in more
features, I bought one of the earliest TS-50 radios. At the time, it was
the smallest radio around covering all the HF bands with typical user
features. However the TS-50 would be representative of what I consider to
be interesting in terms of compact size.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

4607. Re: Why I Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-20 21:29:06 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031220162906.15210.00001549@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 84183

>Subject: Re: Why I Like The ARRL
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 12/20/03 1:34 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20031220143403.01893.00002230@mb-m22.aol.com>

> Going back to past technology, rebuilding and restoring, is SAFE.
> Such is a known quantity. It can be explained via many existing
> texts. SECURITY. No problems about learning anything new. All
> can become "expert" on things made long ago without undue
> struggle. Such is already-proven technology...no struggling with
> unproven ideas.

Is this why we are bombarded with stories about "ADA", 1950's era RTTY nets, and a whole plethora of what you did in NON-Amateur radio from the PAST four decades, Lennie?

You sure haven't offered us anything new!

> Old radio is SIMPLE.

So are you. Easy to see through and unlikely to ever be anything else but...

> STABILITY.

Ahhhh...Now THERE is your shortfall.

> SERENITY. Self-satisfaction of "accomplishing" what has already
> been done.

That would be you!

> Safe. Secure. Simple. Stable. Serene. Old ways are best...

Thank God, then, that Amateur Radio hasn't been stagnant, huh, Putzman?

Steve, K4YZ

4608. Re: Why I Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-20 21:32:29 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031220163229.15210.00001550@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 84184

>Subject: Re: Why I Like The ARRL
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 12/20/03 2:50 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20031220155021.25815.00005330@mb-m07.aol.com>

> ANYONE can do, Mike. That's the Word from the newsgroupies in
> here. Little kids can do it. No aptitude needed...just the guts and
> determination and a terrible Will To Win, like it was the Most
> Important Thing In Your Life!

If you're 10 years old and it's a school project you need a good grade for, it just may be the most important thing in your life!

But then how would YOU know about anyhting important in Amateur Radio, Lennie...?!?!? You're STILL not a licensee.

Just a liar.

> No one can possibly be interested in radio without being morse code
> tested. The gods of radio have spoken! It's divine LAW!

You have yet to provide the quote form ANYone who has said anything like this, Lennie...You keep reciting this as "fact", yet you offer no proof.

More lies from someone who finds it easier to lie than to "do it".

Steve, K4YZ

4609. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-20 21:39:57 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031220163957.15210.00001553@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 84185

>ubject: Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 12/20/03 2:50 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20031220155022.25815.00005331@mb-m07.aol.com>
>
>In article <XD0Fb.1592$Vv2.796649@news1.news.adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo
><mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:
>
>>Your trying to pin me down on this is amusing, since the membership
>>rolls of NCI are a closely guarded secret. The only way we know is if
>>the member outs him or her self.
>
> "Closely guarded secret?!?"
>
> Good grief, NCI members in here have been free with publishing
> their membership numbers. No one has been arrested for that
> yet.

It's sad to have to point out the obvious, but a "membrship number" is not the same as the number of members.

> So, give us an EXACT number of ARRL members.

Check their annual postal statement. It's a violation for them to purjure that, and it delineates the number of "paid subscriptions" (ie: paid-up members)

Steve, K4YZ

4610. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-20 21:50:27 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031220165027.15210.00001555@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 84186

>Subject: Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL
>From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
>Date: 12/20/03 2:21 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <f45722ac.0312201221.318c0272@posting.google.com>
>
>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
>news:<5c01b95b.0312190621.4e78fc6a@posting.google.com>...
>> lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>news:<20031216151214.07346.00002165@mb-m26.aol.com>...
>> > In article <f45722ac.0312160345.f38ea25@posting.google.com>,
>> > brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
>>
>> > >Of this minority, the ARRL polled their little group in the mid-late
>> > >nineties, and came away with "no clear mandate." An even spilt within
>> > >the ranks of the true believers? So even at the time, something was
>> > >wearing away at the propaganda machine. I wonder what's happened
>> > >since then?
>> >
>> > As I see it the schism is from the general attitude of long-timers
>> > evolving into two main groupings: Those that mightily resist change
>> > and those who can accept change.
>>
>> You WOULD see a "schism", Lennie, but then since you are NOT a
>> part of Amateur Radio and do NOT have any experience in matters
>> pertaining TO Amateur Radio, yours is an uninformed opinion.
>
>I have experience in matters pertaining to amateur radio.

BBBWWWHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHA ! ! ! ! !

OH YES, Brain! We have SEEN your "experience" in Amateur Radio! No logs...Unsubstantiated claims...Inability to name even ONE person who may have "worked" you from Somalia and have a T5/N0IMD card that could "validate" your claims...?!?!

Yes Sir, I am sooooooooooooooo (un)impressed!

>And I see the same thing.

No doubt you see a LOT of things, Brain!

>Both of our opinions are validated by your daily postings.

Both of your opinions have the "support" of your years of failed rantings in this forum, unsubstantiated claims, and YOUR acknowledged support and admiration of a "man" who is a documented pathological liar!

So please....Tell me about your valued opinion again, Brain...?!?!

BBBWWWHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHA ! ! ! ! ! !

Steve, K4YZ

4611. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-20 23:39:09 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <x45Fb.17751$P%1.16364232@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 84187

"JJ" <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
news:tdmdnQyZDJkqIXmiRVn-hQ@gbronline.com...
> N2EY wrote:
>
>
> >
> > Hmmm...
> >
> > She's going with the flow of traffic, *above* the posted speed limit,
but she
> > should slow down and change lanes so that someone who wants to go even
faster
> > can get by?
>
> Yes, in Texas it is the law. You are supposed to drive in the right lane
> and use the left lane for passing, even if you are doing the speed limit
> or over, you are obliged to pull to the right lane to let another pass.
> The following is an exerpt from an article in the Ft. Worth Star
> Telegram, April 12, 2003.
> **********
> Texans must drive in the right-hand lane.
>
> In other words -- move over.
>
> Yes, you. Get out of the left lane.
>
> I don't care how fast you're driving. Or what the speed limit is.
>
> Texas law is blunt.
>
> Except to pass, motorists "shall drive in the right-hand lane."
>
> Both chronic slowpokes and self-appointed speed-limit vigilantes were
> stung by transportation writer Gordon Dickson's report. He told how
> habitual left-lane drivers are "despised" and how some traffic engineers
> believe they cause wrecks.
>
> I am not going to defend the lunatics who zoom up from behind at rush
> hour, bearing down two inches behind your rear bumper and so close that
> you can smell the extra-grande Starbucks coffee on their breath.
>
> But the law is the law. Yes, it says drivers can't speed or tailgate.
> But it also says to stay out of the left lane.
>

> Some violators are obviously in denial.
>

How does the Texas law address the use of highways with say 4 or more lanes? If everyone is supposed to stay in the right lane except to pass, the highway then fails in its design purpose, i.e. to reduce congestion. The law would seem to indicate that no more than two lanes in each direction are ever needed.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

4612. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-20 23:49:02 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3FE4E004.6BC4A8AD@earthlink.net>
Source record: 84188

Brian wrote:
>
> N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<c2356669.0312190606.18645337@posting.google.com>...

> > You're *assuming* that everyone who has an opinion on amateur radio
> > policy issues is interested in amateur radio having the best possible
> > future. And in most cases that's true - but not when Mr. Anderson is
> > involved. His behavior here, and his comments to FCC, indicate that
> > he's *not* interested in what's best for amateur radio. He's just
> > interested in stirring up division, discord and hostility between
> > amateurs, diverting them from other issues, and denying amateur
> > traditions and contributions to society and the radio art.
>
> Inventive Licensing comes to mind as the big divider.

You're probably right. Everyone who holds an amateur ticket likely had
some incentive. Len had none.

Dave K8MN

4613. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-21 01:26:28 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031220202628.05539.00003110@mb-m16.aol.com>
Source record: 84189

In article <3FE4E004.6BC4A8AD@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>You're probably right. Everyone who holds an amateur ticket likely had
>some incentive. Len had none.

The ONLY way to have incentive is to get a ham license.

The radio god has spoken.

Halleluja and Amen.

LHA

4614. Re: Why I Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-21 01:26:30 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031220202630.05539.00003111@mb-m16.aol.com>
Source record: 84190

In article <i_2Fb.17738$P%1.16339939@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> writes:

>What it should be and too many fail to realize is that the proper sequence
>is "Learn radio basics to become a ham and then as a ham continue to learn
>and increase one's expertise." It should not be one versus the other.

The ONLY way to have an interest in radio is to get a ham license.

Nothing else matters.

Radio gods have spoken.

LHA

4615. New Q signs

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-21 02:57:24 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3FE50C14.3080609@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 84191

```
QMC = Merry Christmas
QMX = Merry Xmas
QHH = Happy Hoildays
QHY = Happy new Year
```

4616. K1MAN

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-21 03:00:11 UTC
From: ycthulhu@aol.complex
Message-ID: <20031220220011.09506.00001341@mb-m17.aol.com>
Source record: 84192

Sometimes I listen to the ARUFON (UFO) Net on 3977.7, as I did tonight. But lo and behold, guess who's planted his fat ass on 3973.0? K1MAN ! The UFO net had already started and K1MAN just opens up 4 khz away without any regard to ongoing QSOs.

Where the hell is the FCC? Why is K1MAN still on the air?

Nations are like leaves; they change color before they fall.

4617. Re: K1MAN

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-21 03:09:33 UTC
From: ycthulhu@aol.complex
Message-ID: <20031220220933.09506.00001345@mb-m17.aol.com>
Source record: 84193

I wrote:

>
>
> K1MAN just opens up 4 khz away
>

oops, I meant 400 cycles.

Nations are like leaves; they change color before they fall.

4618. Re: K1MAN

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-21 03:14:09 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <5e8Fb.13083$0s2.1218@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 84194

"Nobody You Know" <ycthulhu@aol.complex> wrote

> Sometimes I listen to the ARUFON (UFO) Net on 3977.7, as I did tonight.
But lo
> and behold, guess who's planted his fat ass on 3973.0? K1MAN ! The UFO net
had
> already started and K1MAN just opens up 4 khz away without any regard to
> ongoing QSOs.

Do the math --- that's 4.7 khz, not 4 khz.

I have no love for the antics of K1MAN, but 4.7 khz is enough room to put 2
QSO's with modern 2.1 or 2.4 khz filters. If you can't separate two
stations almost 5 khz apart, then you need remedial tuning training.

73, de Hans, K0HB

4619. Re: K1MAN

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-21 03:27:28 UTC
From: me <yo@here.com>
Message-ID: <Aq8Fb.6806$wL6.3789@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 84195

W1AW does the same thing daily.

Who Cares.

"Nobody You Know" <ycthulhu@aol.complex> wrote in message
news:20031220220933.09506.00001345@mb-m17.aol.com...
> I wrote:
>
> > >
> > >
> > > K1MAN just opens up 4 khz away
> > >
>
> oops, I meant 400 cycles.
>
>
> ---
> Nations are like leaves; they change color before they fall.
> ---

4620. Re: K1MAN

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-21 03:47:08 UTC
From: ycthulhu@aol.complex
Message-ID: <20031220224708.09506.00001351@mb-m17.aol.com>
Source record: 84196

groupk0hb@earthlink.net wrote:

>
>
>I have no love for the antics of K1MAN, but 4.7 khz is enough room to put 2
>QSO's with modern 2.1 or 2.4 khz filters. If you can't separate two
>stations almost 5 khz apart, then you need remedial tuning training.
>
>73, de Hans, K0HB
>

Oh man, I'm sorry. I really messed up my original posting. K1MAN opened up on
3977.3 khz, only 400 cycles away from the ARUFON net on 3977.7 khz.

NOW do you see my point?

Nations are like leaves; they change color before they fall.

4621. Re: Why I Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-21 03:52:14 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <xnfcneeyarg.hq7ykml.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>
Source record: 84197

On 19 Dec 2003 16:05:28 -0800, N2EY wrote:

>The "c-word" came into use because FCC said some years ago that they
>weren't going to do any serious restructuring until the amateur radio
>community came up with a consensus on what they wanted. That policy
>was quite visibly abandoned in 1998 when FCC issued an NPRM without
>any consensus being evident.

I wasn't there (Dayton?) when Bill Cross said "the C word" but my
understanding was that unless the ham community came with a consensus,
it (we) were liable to get things that we may not like from the FCC
if we back them into a corner.

Perhaps - I hope - that was Bill's personal opinion and not "the
official policy" of the FCC (we've differed on things before).

With the latest Bureau restructuring, he now reports through another
layer of supervision, and I understand that his immediate supervisor
is now someone who is a ham, which was not the case before.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

4622. Re: Why I Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-21 03:52:14 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <xnfcneeyarg.hq7zezm.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>
Source record: 84198

On Sat, 20 Dec 2003 04:28:46 GMT, K HB wrote:

>> Have the changes of 2000 gotten us more tinkerers per unit time than
>before?

>What the hell are "tinkerers per unit time"? The generally accepted
>language of rrap is English.

Yeah - to quote one of my favorite lines from the defunct "Amos and
Andy" TV show "speak to the man in Algebra, Andy"

Perhaps you can rephrase the question in the stone-furlong-fortnight
system of measurement. Perhaps it needs a Yaenkel coordinate transform
from reality to surreality.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

4623. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-21 06:07:21 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <tMaFb.3058$IM3.1916@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 84199

"N2EY" wrote:
>
> I'd call it an accurate description, not
> an interpretation.

And I could just as easily say mine is an accurate description.

> She's going with the flow of traffic,
> *above* the posted speed limit, but
> she should slow down and change
> lanes so that someone who wants to
> go even faster can get by?

You're not that ignorant of the traffic laws around the country, Jim. In most states, slower vehicles must drive in the right lane (or right lanes on multiple lane roads), drivers should not impede the flow of traffic, and drivers must allow others to pass. Of course she doesn't have to slow down to do so. Instead, she would be expected to move to the right as soon as there is an opening for her to do so (instead of camping out in the left lane because she is driving fast enough).

> Where is it in the motor vehicle code
> that a driver on a multilane divided
> highway has to change lanes and slow
> down to allow a speeder to pass in a
> non-emergency situation?

Don't be silly, Jim. I don't live in your state. I've already said that is the law in "most" states, which obviously isn't a statement about all states. If you have any question about the laws in your specific state, look it up yourself. After all, it's your motor vehicle code, not mine.

> It's everyone's business.

It's everyone's business to enforce the traffic laws by taking direct action on the highways? I suppose you're also going to say she should chase speeders down the highway and ram their vehicles if they refuse to stop. The last thing we need is self-styled vigilantes on our nation's highways.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

4624. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-21 06:18:53 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <hXaFb.3060$IM3.557@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 84200

"JJ" wrote:
>
> Yes, in Texas it is the law. You are
> supposed to drive in the right lane
> and use the left lane for passing, even
> if you are doing the speed limit or
> over, you are obliged to pull to the
> right lane to let another pass. The
> following is an exerpt from an article
> in the Ft. Worth Star Telegram,
> April 12, 2003.
> **********
> Texans must drive in the right-hand lane.
>
> In other words -- move over.
>
> Yes, you. Get out of the left lane.
>
> I don't care how fast you're driving. Or
> what the speed limit is.
>
> Texas law is blunt. (snip)

Thanks for looking that up, JJ. I suspected it was the law in Texas. I suspect it is also the law in Jim's state. Most states have, or are passing, laws in this regard because of studies which show that drivers who refuse to move to the right to allow others to pass cause accidents. I haven't seen these studies myself, but I've heard mention of them in debates about these laws.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

4625. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-21 06:24:19 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <n0bFb.3062$IM3.3051@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 84251

"Dee D. Flint" wrote:
>
> How does the Texas law address the
> use of highways with say 4 or more
> lanes? (snip)

It's on the driver's test in most states - you drive with the "flow of traffic" in any specific lane (neither too fast or too slow for that lane, with the far left lane always reserved for passing). You'll see "flow of traffic" repeated in many driver's test questions (how to merge with traffic when entering a highway and so on).

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

4626. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-21 06:34:32 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <Y9bFb.3064$IM3.1874@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 84252

"Kim W5TIT" wrote:
>
> Why should it be *me* who has to yield
> to someone else to be courteous to them,
> when it is *them* acting unsafe, (snip)

It's not just you - it's everybody driving in the left lane. If someone wants to pass, everyone has to let them do so. If they're speeding, the cops will eventually get them (that's what they're there for). If each driver is allowed to set the speed others can drive, what will stop it from reaching an extreme (I'm sure there is someone who doesn't think people should drive faster then 45 mph)?

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

4627. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-21 06:58:59 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <YYqdndJN7Pro2HiiRVn-iw@gbronline.com>
Source record: 84253

Dee D. Flint wrote:

> "JJ" <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
> news:tdmdnQyZDJkqIXmiRVn-hQ@gbronline.com...
>
>>N2EY wrote:
>>
>>
>>
>>>Hmmm...
>>>
>>>She's going with the flow of traffic, *above* the posted speed limit,
>
> but she
>
>>>should slow down and change lanes so that someone who wants to go even
>
> faster
>
>>>can get by?
>>
>>Yes, in Texas it is the law. You are supposed to drive in the right lane
>>and use the left lane for passing, even if you are doing the speed limit
>>or over, you are obliged to pull to the right lane to let another pass.
>>The following is an exerpt from an article in the Ft. Worth Star
>>Telegram, April 12, 2003.
>>**********
>>Texans must drive in the right-hand lane.
>>
>>In other words -- move over.
>>
>>Yes, you. Get out of the left lane.
>>
>>I don't care how fast you're driving. Or what the speed limit is.
>>
>>Texas law is blunt.
>>
>>Except to pass, motorists "shall drive in the right-hand lane."
>>
>>Both chronic slowpokes and self-appointed speed-limit vigilantes were
>>stung by transportation writer Gordon Dickson's report. He told how
>>habitual left-lane drivers are "despised" and how some traffic engineers
>>believe they cause wrecks.
>>

>>I am not going to defend the lunatics who zoom up from behind at rush
>>hour, bearing down two inches behind your rear bumper and so close that
>>you can smell the extra-grande Starbucks coffee on their breath.
>>
>>But the law is the law. Yes, it says drivers can't speed or tailgate.
>>But it also says to stay out of the left lane.
>>
>>Some violators are obviously in denial.
>>
>
>
> How does the Texas law address the use of highways with say 4 or more lanes?
> If everyone is supposed to stay in the right lane except to pass, the
> highway then fails in its design purpose, i.e. to reduce congestion. The
> law would seem to indicate that no more than two lanes in each direction are
> ever needed.

Slower traffic stays to the right no matter how many lanes, if you are
in the left most lane of a four lane expressway you should move right to
give way to faster traffic.

4628. Re: Future ARS licenses, was Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-21 13:26:49 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0312210526.7ea5b4b0@posting.google.com>
Source record: 84254

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20031220161318.22081.00002639@mb-m17.aol.com>...

> Let there be no resistance. Resistance is futile.

Sure...we'll all just blindly follow Lennie the Loser, a known
pathological liar and USENET antagonist. THAT will solve ALL our
problems...

Not...

Steve, K4YZ

4629. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-21 14:03:24 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031221090324.26118.00001463@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 84255

>Subject: Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL
>From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
>Date: 12/20/03 9:05 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <f45722ac.0312201905.12b71574@posting.google.com>
>
>Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
>news:<3FE4E004.6BC4A8AD@earthlink.net>...

>> You're probably right. Everyone who holds an amateur ticket likely had
>> some incentive. Len had none.
>>
>> Dave K8MN
>
>Of course I'm right! ;^)
>
>Len, like any Americans who've shown an interest in the ARS, have a
>disincentive. It is the Morse requirement for HF access.

Lennie's "disincentive" had/has NOTHING to do with Morse Code, Brain...It has to do with having absolutely NO understanding of what Amateur Radio is all about, what it's purpose and capabilities are, and what it means to be a "part" of something.

He's ALL about being an antagonist.

The "disincentive" was not an "ARS" or "ARRL" issue...it was a matter of the United States complying with treaties it was signatory to.

Lennie is a loser. He will never be more than a sideline observer to Amateur Radio, and he was hardly more than that in his "professional" career. This I have from people who knew him personally. His "contributions" to certain Naval projects were more significant when he stayed out of other people's way and let the REAL engineers do their job unimpeded.

Lennie alledges a "professional" career spanning four decades...Well, An Amateur Radio license granting access to over 97% of all allocations WITHOUT Morse Code was available for a fourth of that. So where was Lennie?

Lennie makes issue about how Amateurs allegedly don't "move on" in technology. Current technology places almost all advances far above the HF spectrum. The Technician Class license has granted those privileges since 1991. So where was Lennie?

One can only surmise that this "argument" about Morse for HF access is simply yet another LennieRant for "I don't wanna do it", and nothing else. If he were a TRUE leader in electrical engineering and technology, he'd be out in front showing "us" how it's done...But WHERE is he...?!?!

On the sidelines...No plan...No experience...No interest in contibuting to the program.

Just an observer...never a player.

Steve, K4YZ

4630. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-21 14:16:01 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031221091601.26118.00001464@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 84256

>Subject: Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL
>From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
>Date: 12/20/03 9:01 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <f45722ac.0312201901.22f61d99@posting.google.com>
>
>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>news:<20031220165027.15210.00001555@mb-m04.aol.com>...

>> OH YES, Brain! We have SEEN your "experience" in Amateur Radio!
>
>No you haven't - we've never had a QSO. I've had several QSO's with
>Dave Heil.

It's not about having a QSO, BRAIN! It's about what you have claimed and
what you have done to substantiate those claims!.

> No
>> logs...Unsubstantiated claims...Inability to name even ONE person who may
>have
>> "worked" you from Somalia and have a T5/N0IMD card that could "validate"
>your
>> claims...?!?!
>
>I've operated from various loactions under various callsigns.

So have I, Brain. And I can substantiate them. I even have some of my
/JR6 logs left from 22 YEARS ago!

>You haven't worked me under my Novice call, and you haven't worked me
>with my Korean call. You never worked me from /KH2, you've never even
>worked me from Nebraska, Illinois, Florida, nor Ohio. Why is it no
>suprise that you didn't work me from Somalia?

It's no surprise that YOU have yet to provide even ONE record of that
activity, yet here you are AGAIN trying to defend it with the same "tactics"
taht have made you look so idiotic.

It's NOT about what I have done or NOT done, Brain...I am NOT the one
making the assertions!

>And, NO, I won't forge a card for you.

Please don't. Lying is your mentor's bag.

And you may ask KC8MK how I handle QSL cards that aren't issued to me...
I got a bunch of his 160 meter QSL cards from the Buro by mistake (I used to be
KC8M...some DX mistook his second letter as "go ahead") Shipped some of his

cards to him. Destroyed those that he didn't want.

I don't need to bogus up anything...But thanks for expressing the idea
that you were thinking about it...I think THAT says more than anything!

>> Yes Sir, I am sooooooooooooooo (un)impressed!
>
>You are singularly indistinctive.

Doesn't matter what >>I<< am, Brain...it's what YOU are NOT. "Factual"
and "truthful" come to mind at first...

>> >And I see the same thing.
>>
>> No doubt you see a LOT of things, Brain!
>
>And I hear things, too. I hear the voices in your head. They have
>that maniacal laugh, too.

They should...YOU make it soooooooo easy to laugh! You are quickly
becoming the Milton Berle of the NG! Thanks!

>> >Both of our opinions are validated by your daily postings.
>>
>> Both of your opinions have the "support" of your years of failed
>rantings
>> in this forum, unsubstantiated claims, and YOUR acknowledged support and
>> admiration of a "man" who is a documented pathological liar!
>>
>> So please....Tell me about your valued opinion again, Brain...?!?!
>>
>> BBBWWWHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHA ! ! ! ! ! !
>
>You're the ranter and it's not working. You might want to try a new
>approach, this one came up a bit short.

No, Brain, it didn't...I imagine it hit yuo right between the
eyes...Again.

Why don't you wise up and realise that you've made stupid assertions you
can't/won't validate, never WILL be able to validate, and just stop making a
fool of yourself...?!?!

Or is THAT the objective?

Steve, K4YZ

4631. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-21 14:18:54 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031221091854.26118.00001465@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 84257

>Subject: Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL
>From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
>Date: 12/20/03 9:09 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <f45722ac.0312201909.4391d40b@posting.google.com>
>
>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>news:<20031220163957.15210.00001553@mb-m04.aol.com>...
>> >ubject: Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL
>> >From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>> >Date: 12/20/03 2:50 PM Central Standard Time
>> >Message-id: <20031220155022.25815.00005331@mb-m07.aol.com>
>> >
>> >In article <XD0Fb.1592$Vv2.796649@news1.news.adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo
>> ><mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:
>> >
>> >>Your trying to pin me down on this is amusing, since the membership
>> >>rolls of NCI are a closely guarded secret. The only way we know is if
>> >>the member outs him or her self.
>> >
>> > "Closely guarded secret?!?"
>> >
>> > Good grief, NCI members in here have been free with publishing
>> > their membership numbers. No one has been arrested for that
>> > yet.
>>
>> It's sad to have to point out the obvious, but a "membrship number" is
>not
>> the same as the number of members.
>>
>> > So, give us an EXACT number of ARRL members.
>>
>> Check their annual postal statement. It's a violation for them to
>purjure
>> that, and it delineates the number of "paid subscriptions" (ie: paid-up
>> members)
>>
>> Steve, K4YZ
>
>
>I was a member of the ARRL prior to earning my Novice ticket.
>
>What was my call sign then?

I am sure there was a point ot your asking this question, Brain, even though it was not part-and-parcel of the quoted item above.

Regardless of your licensure status when you joined the ARRL, the only 'relevence' would have been your voting staus. You were STILL a member.

Now...the point?

Steve, K4YZ

4632. Re: New Q signs

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-21 14:21:32 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031221092132.26118.00001466@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 84258

```
>Subject: New Q signs
>From: Robert Casey wa2ise@ix.netcom.com
>Date: 12/20/03 8:57 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <3FE50C14.3080609@ix.netcom.com>
>
>QMC = Merry Christmas
>QMX = Merry Xmas
>QHH = Happy Hoildays
>QHY = Happy new Year

QBH: Bah, Humbug

73

Steve, K4YZ
```

4633. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-21 14:59:15 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031221095915.12501.00004756@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 84259

In article <f45722ac.0312200714.316470a0@posting.google.com>,
brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:

>N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in message
>news:<c2356669.0312190606.18645337@posting.google.com>...
>
>
>> Ah, there's where your logic fails, Dave. You're working on a false
>> premise.
>>
>> You're *assuming* that everyone who has an opinion on amateur radio
>> policy issues is interested in amateur radio having the best possible
>> future. And in most cases that's true - but not when Mr. Anderson is
>> involved. His behavior here, and his comments to FCC, indicate that
>> he's *not* interested in what's best for amateur radio. He's just
>> interested in stirring up division, discord and hostility between
>> amateurs, diverting them from other issues, and denying amateur
>> traditions and contributions to society and the radio art.
>
>Inventive Licensing comes to mind as the big divider.

What is "inventive licensing"?
>
>> Suppose someone really hated amateur radio and wanted to damage it as
>> much as possible without being obvious about what they were doing.
>>
>> Wouldn't one way to do that be to try to maximize internal bickering
>> and arguing among hams, thereby diverting them from useful discussion?
>
>One could propose to the FCC a licensing structure with multiple
>levels, multiple exams, and multiple privelege slices and power
>levels.
>
That was FCC's own idea. Goes back to at least 1936. Complain to FCC.

4634. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-21 15:43:38 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <KcjFb.3913$Vv2.1073874@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 84260

Dwight Stewart wrote:

> "JJ" wrote:
>
>>Yes, in Texas it is the law. You are
>>supposed to drive in the right lane
>>and use the left lane for passing, even
>>if you are doing the speed limit or
>>over, you are obliged to pull to the
>>right lane to let another pass. The
>>following is an exerpt from an article
>>in the Ft. Worth Star Telegram,
>>April 12, 2003.
>>**********
>>Texans must drive in the right-hand lane.
>>
>>In other words -- move over.
>>
>>Yes, you. Get out of the left lane.
>>
>>I don't care how fast you're driving. Or
>>what the speed limit is.
>>
>>Texas law is blunt. (snip)
>
>
>
> Thanks for looking that up, JJ. I suspected it was the law in Texas. I
> suspect it is also the law in Jim's state. Most states have, or are passing,
> laws in this regard because of studies which show that drivers who refuse to
> move to the right to allow others to pass cause accidents. I haven't seen
> these studies myself, but I've heard mention of them in debates about these
> laws.

I've read one. It notes that vehicles tend to get clogged up for that reason, and that you end up with odd clots of vehicles all bunched together, with a few people that want to get ahead of the clot. Dangerous? You betchya! Their recommendation was that laws about letting people pass, pullover when followed by too many cars, and enforcement that takes into account traffic flow rather than absolute speed was important.

Personally, I've found that the cure is to travel between those nasty clots of traffic. I don't have to worry about all the brake checks and close-in driving at 75 mph. I get there about 10 seconds after all the

smart people driving inside the clot!

- Mike KB3EIA -

4635. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-21 17:54:30 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bs4nhe$1d5@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 84261

"JJ" <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
news:tdmdnQyZDJkqIXmiRVn-hQ@gbronline.com...
> N2EY wrote:
>
> >
> > Hmmm...
> >
> > She's going with the flow of traffic, *above* the posted speed limit,
but she
> > should slow down and change lanes so that someone who wants to go even
faster
> > can get by?
>
> Yes, in Texas it is the law. You are supposed to drive in the right lane
> and use the left lane for passing, even if you are doing the speed limit
> or over, you are obliged to pull to the right lane to let another pass.
> The following is an exerpt from an article in the Ft. Worth Star
> Telegram, April 12, 2003.
> **********
> Texans must drive in the right-hand lane.
>
> In other words -- move over.
>
> Yes, you. Get out of the left lane.
>
> I don't care how fast you're driving. Or what the speed limit is.
>
> Texas law is blunt.
>
> Except to pass, motorists "shall drive in the right-hand lane."
>
> Both chronic slowpokes and self-appointed speed-limit vigilantes were
> stung by transportation writer Gordon Dickson's report. He told how
> habitual left-lane drivers are "despised" and how some traffic engineers
> believe they cause wrecks.
>
> I am not going to defend the lunatics who zoom up from behind at rush
> hour, bearing down two inches behind your rear bumper and so close that
> you can smell the extra-grande Starbucks coffee on their breath.
>
> But the law is the law. Yes, it says drivers can't speed or tailgate.
> But it also says to stay out of the left lane.
>
> Some violators are obviously in denial.

>

That was an excerpt from the Startlegram? Shocking.

This violator isn't in denial at all. This violator is waiting for mere words to turn into action...

Kim W5TIT

4636. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-21 17:59:10 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bs4nhf$1d5@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 84262

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:W33Fb.17739$P%1.16340952@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
>
> "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> news:bs29ns$5n3@library2.airnews.net...
> > "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> >[snip all the long thread]
> > 'Zactly.
> >
> > Kim W5TIT
>
> Just to illustrate the idiocy of some of the people on the freeway, I'll
> throw in a personal anecdote. I was driving down a multilane freeway
> through a construction zone and I was in the rightmost lane. I was going
> with the flow of the traffic in the slow lane, which was slightly above
the
> limit posted for the construction zone. A semi truck comes up behind me,
> rides my bumper, honks, flashes his lights. Now, I'm already in the slow
> lane with no way to speed up since the vehicles ahead of me aren't going
any
> faster and wouldn't want to anyway as there is too much chance to hurt a
> construction worker plus fines in construction zones are very steep here.
> This idiot keeps it up until we are out of the construction zone and it is
> possible to move further to the right.
>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>

You must have been driving near Dallas...<GRIN>

Kim W5TIT

4637. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-21 18:25:32 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bs4og1$dtk@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 84263

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:x45Fb.17751$P%1.16364232@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
>
> "JJ" <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
> news:tdmdnQyZDJkqIXmiRVn-hQ@gbronline.com...
> > N2EY wrote:
> >
> >
> > >
> > > Hmmm...
> > >
> > > She's going with the flow of traffic, *above* the posted speed limit,
> but she
> > > should slow down and change lanes so that someone who wants to go even
> faster
> > > can get by?
> >
> > Yes, in Texas it is the law. You are supposed to drive in the right lane
> > and use the left lane for passing, even if you are doing the speed limit
> > or over, you are obliged to pull to the right lane to let another pass.
> > The following is an exerpt from an article in the Ft. Worth Star
> > Telegram, April 12, 2003.
> > **********
> > Texans must drive in the right-hand lane.
> >
> > In other words -- move over.
> >
> > Yes, you. Get out of the left lane.
> >
> > I don't care how fast you're driving. Or what the speed limit is.
> >
> > Texas law is blunt.
> >
> > Except to pass, motorists "shall drive in the right-hand lane."
> >
> > Both chronic slowpokes and self-appointed speed-limit vigilantes were
> > stung by transportation writer Gordon Dickson's report. He told how
> > habitual left-lane drivers are "despised" and how some traffic engineers
> > believe they cause wrecks.
> >
> > I am not going to defend the lunatics who zoom up from behind at rush
> > hour, bearing down two inches behind your rear bumper and so close that
> > you can smell the extra-grande Starbucks coffee on their breath.
> >

> > But the law is the law. Yes, it says drivers can't speed or tailgate.
> > But it also says to stay out of the left lane.
> >
> > Some violators are obviously in denial.
> >
>
> How does the Texas law address the use of highways with say 4 or more
lanes?
> If everyone is supposed to stay in the right lane except to pass, the
> highway then fails in its design purpose, i.e. to reduce congestion. The
> law would seem to indicate that no more than two lanes in each direction
are
> ever needed.
>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>

Well, I don't believe what JJ (or my husband, incidentally) is saying is correct. I just went to the State of TX DPS website looking to see if I could find the traffic laws, but it looks more involved (read: ridiculously arranged) than I had thought it would be... I'll find it.

www.baetzler.de/humor/texas_driving_rules.html in the meantime!

Kim W5TIT

4638. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-21 18:33:22 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bs4ouo$g68@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 84264

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:tMaFb.3058$IM3.1916@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> "N2EY" wrote:
> >
> > I'd call it an accurate description, not
> > an interpretation.
>
>
> And I could just as easily say mine is an accurate description.
>
>
> > She's going with the flow of traffic,
> > *above* the posted speed limit, but
> > she should slow down and change
> > lanes so that someone who wants to
> > go even faster can get by?
>
>
> You're not that ignorant of the traffic laws around the country, Jim. In
> most states, slower vehicles must drive in the right lane (or right lanes
on
> multiple lane roads),
>

I'd go along with that. However, I have always (maybe incorrectly, but...)
interpreted that "rule" to mean traffic that is going *slower than the
posted speed.* Wrong? Right? If the rule is designed to facilitate a
smooth flow of traffic *and* driver safety, why would it be contrary to the
safety aspect by making drivers constantly adjust to how much or little
someone is following the posted speed? The *flow of traffic* is probably
meant to imply flow of traffic at posted speeds.

>
> drivers should not impede the flow of traffic, and
> drivers must allow others to pass. Of course she doesn't have to slow down
> to do so. Instead, she would be expected to move to the right as soon as
> there is an opening for her to do so (instead of camping out in the left
> lane because she is driving fast enough).
>

I'd *almost* be willing to bet that I am more in line with the law--and even
the spirit of the law--than a person behind me acting like an idiot. I am
acting like an idiot, too, because you are correct in feeling that I could
just move over. But I liken it to the same thing as someone who is at an
intersection with others--in Texas it is common (though I would venture to

say illegal) that the first person at a stop sign goes first. This practice ignores all right-of-way laws I learned when I was learning to drive, but it is common practice. So, do I part from common practice and keep sitting at a stop sign, waiting for the person going straight to go through the intersection before I take my turn?

> > > Where is it in the motor vehicle code
> > > that a driver on a multilane divided
> > > highway has to change lanes and slow
> > > down to allow a speeder to pass in a
> > > non-emergency situation?
> >
> > Don't be silly, Jim. I don't live in your state. I've already said that is
> > the law in "most" states, which obviously isn't a statement about all
> > states. If you have any question about the laws in your specific state, look
> > it up yourself. After all, it's your motor vehicle code, not mine.
> >

I am looking for that now.

> > > It's everyone's business.
> >
> > It's everyone's business to enforce the traffic laws by taking direct
> > action on the highways? I suppose you're also going to say she should chase
> > speeders down the highway and ram their vehicles if they refuse to stop. The
> > last thing we need is self-styled vigilantes on our nation's highways.
> >
> > Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
> >
> > http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
> >

Then, maybe I should stop calling police when I see drunk and/or unsafe drivers on the road?

Kim W5TIT

4639. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-21 18:43:33 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bs4phq$uas@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 84265

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:hXaFb.3060$IM3.557@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> "JJ" wrote:
> >
> > Yes, in Texas it is the law. You are
> > supposed to drive in the right lane
> > and use the left lane for passing, even
> > if you are doing the speed limit or
> > over, you are obliged to pull to the
> > right lane to let another pass. The
> > following is an exerpt from an article
> > in the Ft. Worth Star Telegram,
> > April 12, 2003.
> > **********
> > Texans must drive in the right-hand lane.
> >
> > In other words -- move over.
> >
> > Yes, you. Get out of the left lane.
> >
> > I don't care how fast you're driving. Or
> > what the speed limit is.
> >
> > Texas law is blunt. (snip)
>
>
> Thanks for looking that up, JJ. I suspected it was the law in Texas. I
> suspect it is also the law in Jim's state. Most states have, or are
passing,
> laws in this regard because of studies which show that drivers who refuse
to
> move to the right to allow others to pass cause accidents. I haven't seen
> these studies myself, but I've heard mention of them in debates about
these
> laws.
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
>

I don't accept JJ's submission at all. Perhaps if he'd reference more than
just the name of a newspaper, I could go and do some research myself. What

part of the "submission" from JJ is actually from the newspaper? The line that says, "Texans must drive in the right-hand lane" or the rest or any other part of it? I just tried on the Startlegram (an affectionate local colloquialism for the Ft Worth newspaper) to lookup any news article with "traffic" in it and didn't pull a thing related to what JJ has above. Not even anything remotely connected for that matter.

So, JJ, how 'bout something a little more concrete. By the way, the research did just net that beginning on Sep 1 of this year there is some new law in effect regarding police safety on highways during traffic stops.

Kim W5TIT

4640. New General

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-21 18:52:41 UTC
From: nightowls627@aol.comnojunk
Message-ID: <20031221135241.13822.00001215@mb-m10.aol.com>
Source record: 84266

Well, passed my element one with no problems yesterday and have been trying to get some contacts on hf with cw. I love cw but 5wpm just isn't cutting it so I am back to Numorse to bring up my speed. Anyone out there that tried a contact with me, sorry. I was forever putting out QRS and still not getting it all. I will be back though as I cannot use phone when the baby is sleeping. The light *tick-ticking* on the straight key doesn't disturb her as much as me talking.

Thanks
73
G. Doughty
KI4BBL@arrl.net

4641. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-21 19:16:27 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031221141627.25815.00005345@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 84267

In article <20031220143404.01893.00002231@mb-m22.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com
(Len Over 21) writes:

>In article <f45722ac.0312200714.316470a0@posting.google.com>,
>brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
>
>>N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in message
>>news:<c2356669.0312190606.18645337@posting.google.com>...
>>
>>> Ah, there's where your logic fails, Dave. You're working on a false
>>> premise.
>>>
>>> You're *assuming* that everyone who has an opinion on amateur radio
>>> policy issues is interested in amateur radio having the best possible
>>> future. And in most cases that's true - but not when Mr. Anderson is
>>> involved. His behavior here, and his comments to FCC, indicate that
>>> he's *not* interested in what's best for amateur radio. He's just
>>> interested in stirring up division, discord and hostility between
>>> amateurs, diverting them from other issues, and denying amateur
>>> traditions and contributions to society and the radio art.
>>
>>Inventive Licensing comes to mind as the big divider.
>
> :-)
>
;-) ;-) ;-) ;-) ;-) ;-) ;-) ;-) ;-) ;-) ;-) ;-) ;-) ;-) ;-) ;-) ;-) ;-) ;-) ;-)
;-) ;-) ;-) ;-) ;-) ;-) ;-) ;-) ;-) ;-) ;-) ;-) ;-) ;-) ;-) ;-) ;-) ;-) ;-) ;-)
;-) ;-) ;-) ;-) ;-) ;-) ;-) ;-) ;-) ;-) ;-) ;-) ;-) ;-) ;-) ;-) ;-) ;-) ;-) ;-)
;-) ;-) ;-) ;-) ;-) ;-) ;-) ;-) ;-) ;-) ;-) ;-) ;-) ;-) ;-) ;-) ;-) ;-) ;-) ;-)
;-) ;-) ;-) ;-) ;-) ;-) ;-) ;-) ;-) ;-) ;-) ;-) ;-) ;-) ;-) ;-)
>
>>> Suppose someone really hated amateur radio and wanted to damage it as
>>> much as possible without being obvious about what they were doing.
>>>
>>> Wouldn't one way to do that be to try to maximize internal bickering
>>> and arguing among hams, thereby diverting them from useful discussion?
>>
>>One could propose to the FCC a licensing structure with multiple
>>levels, multiple exams, and multiple privelege slices and power
>>levels.
>
> Another way is to have everyone believe in the same thing...as is
> published every month in a certain membership magazine.

What magazine is that, Ellsworth...err, Leonard?
>
> As a single "authoritative voice," a New England membership
> group DEFINES everything in amateurism for all amateurs. No
> bickering, no dissension, no arguing. All do as They say.
> No problems. Everyone happy in Nirvana.

Which group and which magazine? ham radio and 73 magazines were New England based, but they're both defunct.

Your description of a membership organization that does not tolerate dissent sounds exactly like NoCode International. Right in their bylaws it says that any member who publicly disagrees with their stated position on code testing is subject to expulsion. They also require that all members agree to their prime directive goal as a condition of membership. No one who disagrees with their core policy can be a member of NoCode International.

I'm not saying that's right or wrong, just stating facts.
>
> All who oppose the above shall be villified, burned at the stake,
> and denounced as not Believing in the True Way.

Now, Ells err, Len, why are you bashing NCI? All they'll do to someone who disagrees is rescind their membership. Since they state all that in their bylaws (which even I, a nonmember, have seen) what's your problem?

To my knowledge, such membership withdrawal has never been necessary. A very few members have asked to be removed from the membership list because they no longer agreed. Otherwise, the loyalty oath membership conditions have served NCI quite well, eliminating up front anyone who disagrees.

4642. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-21 20:25:20 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <QknFb.4023$Vv2.1145222@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 84268

N2EY wrote:

> In article <20031220143404.01893.00002231@mb-m22.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com
> (Len Over 21) writes:
>
>
>>In article <f45722ac.0312200714.316470a0@posting.google.com>,
>>brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
>>
>>
>>>N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in message
>>>news:<c2356669.0312190606.18645337@posting.google.com>...
>>>
>>>
>>>>Ah, there's where your logic fails, Dave. You're working on a false
>>>>premise.
>>>>
>>>>You're *assuming* that everyone who has an opinion on amateur radio
>>>>policy issues is interested in amateur radio having the best possible
>>>>future. And in most cases that's true - but not when Mr. Anderson is
>>>>involved. His behavior here, and his comments to FCC, indicate that
>>>>he's *not* interested in what's best for amateur radio. He's just
>>>>interested in stirring up division, discord and hostility between
>>>>amateurs, diverting them from other issues, and denying amateur
>>>>traditions and contributions to society and the radio art.
>>>
>>>Inventive Licensing comes to mind as the big divider.
>>
>> :-)
>>
>
> ;-)
> ;-)
> ;-)
> ;-)
> ;-) ;-) ;-) ;-) ;-) ;-) ;-) ;-) ;-) ;-) ;-) ;-) ;-) ;-) ;-) ;-) ;-)
>
>>>>Suppose someone really hated amateur radio and wanted to damage it as
>>>>much as possible without being obvious about what they were doing.
>>>>
>>>>Wouldn't one way to do that be to try to maximize internal bickering
>>>>and arguing among hams, thereby diverting them from useful discussion?
>>>
>>>One could propose to the FCC a licensing structure with multiple

>>>levels, multiple exams, and multiple privelege slices and power
>>>levels.
>>
>> Another way is to have everyone believe in the same thing...as is
>> published every month in a certain membership magazine.
>
>
> What magazine is that, Ellsworth...err, Leonard?
>
>> As a single "authoritative voice," a New England membership
>> group DEFINES everything in amateurism for all amateurs. No
>> bickering, no dissension, no arguing. All do as They say.
>> No problems. Everyone happy in Nirvana.
>
>
> Which group and which magazine? ham radio and 73 magazines were New England
> based, but they're both defunct.
>
> Your description of a membership organization that does not tolerate dissent
> sounds exactly like NoCode International. Right in their bylaws it says that
> any member who publicly disagrees with their stated position on code testing is
> subject to expulsion. They also require that all members agree to their prime
> directive goal as a condition of membership. No one who disagrees with their
> core policy can be a member of NoCode International.
>
> I'm not saying that's right or wrong, just stating facts.

And now some puzzle pieces fit together. I can now reconcile Carl's
vision of how leaders are supposed to lead and his organization. Strong
leadership, independent from member opinion, and if you don't like it,
you're out.

Umm, no thanks.

- Mike KB3EIA -

4643. Re: Morse Yes or No ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-21 22:07:35 UTC
From: Steve Silverwood <kb6ojs@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <MPG.1a4f8d56a66802b498969b@news-server.socal.rr.com>
Source record: 84269

In article <bqflemgia0@pita.alt.net>, code@codeyesno.net says...
> Should Morse code be retained as a requirement to
> obtain an amateur radio license in the U.S.?
>
> 73
>
> Code Yes or No

No. It served its purpose once upon a time, but as a =requirement= for
a ham radio license it is no longer needed.

--

-- //Steve//

Steve Silverwood, KB6OJS
Fountain Valley, CA
Email: kb6ojs@arrl.net

4644. Re: Morse Yes or No ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-21 22:13:56 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031221171356.07996.00001223@mb-m16.aol.com>
Source record: 84270

>No. It served its purpose once upon a time, but as a =requirement= for
>a ham radio license it is no longer needed.
>
>--
>
>-- //Steve//
>
>Steve Silverwood, KB6OJS

Of course not, now that Ham Radio is nothing more than a CB Service lets dump it. Hell while were at it lets dump all testing.

4645. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-21 22:17:03 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <zZoFb.14026$Pg1.11807@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 84271

"JJ" <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote

> Both chronic slowpokes and self-appointed speed-limit vigilantes were
> stung by transportation writer Gordon Dickson's report. He told how
> habitual left-lane drivers are "despised" and how some traffic engineers
> believe they cause wrecks.

I don't know about Texas law, but I spent part of the spring and early summer in Germany. Over there you ABSOLUTELY stay out of the left lane unless you in the act of overtaking and passing. If you dilly-dally around in that lane and hold up traffic overtaking you from the rear, you'll be cited and the fine is of some consequence (250 Euro's if I recall correctly.) Traffic in Germany is SO much better, because everyone moves crisply in and out of the 'passing lanes', rather than the buttheads here who take their sweet leisurely time about overtaking and passing, often just 1 or 2 MPH faster than the right hand traffic lane is moving.

73, de Hans, K0HB

4646. Re: K1MAN

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-21 22:20:58 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <e1pFb.4135$IM3.3880@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 84272

"Nobody You Know" <ycthulhu@aol.complex> wrote in message
news:20031220224708.09506.00001351@mb-m17.aol.com...
> groupk0hb@earthlink.net wrote:
>
> >
> >
> >I have no love for the antics of K1MAN, but 4.7 khz is enough room to put
2
> >QSO's with modern 2.1 or 2.4 khz filters. If you can't separate two
> >stations almost 5 khz apart, then you need remedial tuning training.
> >
> >73, de Hans, K0HB
> >
>
>
> Oh man, I'm sorry. I really messed up my original posting. K1MAN opened up
on
> 3977.3 khz, only 400 cycles away from the ARUFON net on 3977.7 khz.
>
> NOW do you see my point?
>
>
>
>
> ----------
> Nations are like leaves; they change color before they fall.
> ----------

Thats not possible. According to MAN he listened on that frequency for
months and quote "never heard a thing", of course he IS in Maine.

What you do is this;

Record it.

Sign a statement of complaint and mail it to Riley Hollingsworth.

His e-mail is RHOLLING@fcc.gov

Dan/W4NTI

4647. Re: New General

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-21 22:22:41 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <R2pFb.4147$IM3.583@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 84273

"G. Doughty" <nightowls627@aol.comnojunk> wrote in message
news:20031221135241.13822.00001215@mb-m10.aol.com...
> Well, passed my element one with no problems yesterday and have been
trying to
> get some contacts on hf with cw. I love cw but 5wpm just isn't cutting it
so I
> am back to Numorse to bring up my speed. Anyone out there that tried a
contact
> with me, sorry. I was forever putting out QRS and still not getting it
all. I
> will be back though as I cannot use phone when the baby is sleeping. The
light
> *tick-ticking* on the straight key doesn't disturb her as much as me
talking.
>
> Thanks
> 73
> G. Doughty
> KI4BBL@arrl.net

Ahhhhh....a real ham in the making. Don't give up .....keep at it. I'll be
looking for you.

Dan/W4NTI

4648. Re: Why I Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-21 22:25:27 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <r5pFb.4167$IM3.1991@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 84274

"K�HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:iv0Fb.12495$0s2.1450@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net...
>
> "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote
>
> >
> > Are you aware of what the GERATOL net is all about?
> >
>
> Yes, I'm aware what it's about and 25 years ago I was a member (#515 if
you
> care to check). Now it has devolved into an inbred group of about 50
people
> who meet every night on 75 meters and "exchange numbers". Some
> "difficulty"!
>
> Yawwwwwwwwwwwwwwwwwwwwwwwwwwwwwwwwwwwwwnnnnnnnnnnnnnnnnn!!!!
>
> 73, de Hans, K0HB
>
The Geratol net fired up right on top of the DX window of 80 meters back in
the 70s. I called them and they told me to get lost, they didn't work DX.
I was DA2LJ and operating from Germany at the time. Just a bunch of losers
in my book.

Dan/W4NTI

4649. Re: New General

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-21 22:42:50 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <KlpFb.4074$Vv2.1192720@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 84275

"G. Doughty" wrote:

>Well, passed my element one with no problems yesterday and have been
> trying to get some contacts on hf with cw. I love cw but 5wpm just isn't
>cutting it so I am back to Numorse to bring up my speed.

>Anyone out there that tried a contact with me, sorry. I was forever
>putting out QRS and still not getting it all. I will be back though.

You and me both G. (George?) 5wpm didn't work too well for me, so I'm doing a lot of Numorse. don't forget to listen too, as there is a difference between the computer spitting out Morse and real on the air listening.

- Mike KB3EIA -

4650. Re: New General

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-21 23:29:20 UTC
From: garigue <garigue@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <k1qFb.610850$HS4.4472774@attbi_s01>
Source record: 84276

Hello Guys .... give me a time and I'd be glad to meet
you on 80 or 40 after 9PM ....

God Bless Merrry Christmas ...Tom KI3R
"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:KlpFb.4074$Vv2.1192720@news1.news.adelphia.net...
> "G. Doughty" wrote:
>
> >Well, passed my element one with no problems yesterday and have been
> > trying to get some contacts on hf with cw. I love cw but 5wpm just
isn't
> >cutting it so I am back to Numorse to bring up my speed.
>
> >Anyone out there that tried a contact with me, sorry. I was forever
> >putting out QRS and still not getting it all. I will be back though.
>
> You and me both G. (George?) 5wpm didn't work too well for me, so I'm
> doing a lot of Numorse. don't forget to listen too, as there is a
> difference between the computer spitting out Morse and real on the air
> listening.
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -
>

4651. Re: Morse Yes or No ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-21 23:30:41 UTC
From: garigue <garigue@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <B2qFb.616735$Tr4.1600748@attbi_s03>
Source record: 84277

"Steve Silverwood" <kb6ojs@arrl.net> wrote in message
news:MPG.1a4f8d56a66802b498969b@news-server.socal.rr.com...
> In article <bqflemgia0@pita.alt.net>, code@codeyesno.net says...
> > Should Morse code be retained as a requirement to
> > obtain an amateur radio license in the U.S.?
> >
> > 73
> >
> > Code Yes or No
>
> No. It served its purpose once upon a time, but as a =requirement= for
> a ham radio license it is no longer needed.

Snooooooooooooooooooooore ....

73 Tom KI3R

4652. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-21 23:31:33 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <p3qFb.17902$P%1.16587502@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 84278

"Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:bs4nhf$1d5@library1.airnews.net...
> "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
> news:W33Fb.17739$P%1.16340952@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
> >
> > "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> > news:bs29ns$5n3@library2.airnews.net...
> > > "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> > >[snip all the long thread]
> > > 'Zactly.
> > >
> > > Kim W5TIT
> >
> > Just to illustrate the idiocy of some of the people on the freeway, I'll
> > throw in a personal anecdote. I was driving down a multilane freeway
> > through a construction zone and I was in the rightmost lane. I was
going
> > with the flow of the traffic in the slow lane, which was slightly above
> the
> > limit posted for the construction zone. A semi truck comes up behind
me,
> > rides my bumper, honks, flashes his lights. Now, I'm already in the
slow
> > lane with no way to speed up since the vehicles ahead of me aren't going
> any
> > faster and wouldn't want to anyway as there is too much chance to hurt a
> > construction worker plus fines in construction zones are very steep
here.
> > This idiot keeps it up until we are out of the construction zone and it
is
> > possible to move further to the right.
> >
> > Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
> >
>
> You must have been driving near Dallas...<GRIN>
>
> Kim W5TIT
>
>

Nope. It was near Detroit, MI.

We also have a problem that sometimes mandates driving regularly in the
leftmost lane in some areas. We have a lot of left side freeway exits.

Sometimes traffic is heavy enough that you'd better get into that left lane at least 5 miles before you get to the exit or you will never be able to get over to it.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

4653. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-21 23:37:08 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <E8qFb.17903$P%1.16588292@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 84279

"Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:bs4ouo$g68@library1.airnews.net...
> [snip]
> But I liken it to the same thing as someone who is at an
> intersection with others--in Texas it is common (though I would venture to
> say illegal) that the first person at a stop sign goes first. This
practice
> ignores all right-of-way laws I learned when I was learning to drive, but
it
> is common practice. So, do I part from common practice and keep sitting
at
> a stop sign, waiting for the person going straight to go through the
> intersection before I take my turn?

The typical law in the states that I am familiar with is that at a 4 way stop says that the person arriving at the stop first goes through the intersection first. If two or more vehicles arrive simultaneously, the one furthest to the right in the circle goes first (i.e. the person who has no vehicle immediately to his/her right at the intersection). If four arrive simultaneously, well there's no rule for that and someone has to take the courteous route of gesturing the cross traffic across before taking their turn.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

4654. Re: New General

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-21 23:38:59 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <naqFb.17904$P%1.16587954@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 84280

Keep at it. Also keep trying on air work as that will bring your speed up nicely. Check out the FISTS website and check out their code buddy program.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

"G. Doughty" <nightowls627@aol.comnojunk> wrote in message news:20031221135241.13822.00001215@mb-m10.aol.com...
> Well, passed my element one with no problems yesterday and have been trying to
> get some contacts on hf with cw. I love cw but 5wpm just isn't cutting it so I
> am back to Numorse to bring up my speed. Anyone out there that tried a contact
> with me, sorry. I was forever putting out QRS and still not getting it all. I
> will be back though as I cannot use phone when the baby is sleeping. The light
> *tick-ticking* on the straight key doesn't disturb her as much as me talking.
>
> Thanks
> 73
> G. Doughty
> KI4BBL@arrl.net

4655. Re: New General

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-21 23:43:10 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <ieqFb.17906$P%1.16589201@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 84281

If someone wants to set up a time and frequency, I'd be happy to show up
too.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

"garigue" <garigue@comcast.net> wrote in message
news:k1qFb.610850$HS4.4472774@attbi_s01...
> Hello Guys .... give me a time and I'd be glad to meet
> you on 80 or 40 after 9PM ....
>
> God Bless Merrry Christmas ...Tom KI3R
> "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
> news:KlpFb.4074$Vv2.1192720@news1.news.adelphia.net...
> > "G. Doughty" wrote:
> >
> > >Well, passed my element one with no problems yesterday and have been
> > > trying to get some contacts on hf with cw. I love cw but 5wpm just
> isn't
> > >cutting it so I am back to Numorse to bring up my speed.
> >
> > >Anyone out there that tried a contact with me, sorry. I was forever
> > >putting out QRS and still not getting it all. I will be back though.
> >
> > You and me both G. (George?) 5wpm didn't work too well for me, so I'm
> > doing a lot of Numorse. don't forget to listen too, as there is a
> > difference between the computer spitting out Morse and real on the air
> > listening.
> >
> > - Mike KB3EIA -
> >
>
>

4656. Re: New General

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-21 23:54:35 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <%oqFb.14098$Pg1.14065@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 84282

"G. Doughty" <nightowls627@aol.comnojunk> wrote

> Anyone out there that tried a contact
> with me, sorry. I was forever putting out QRS
> and still not getting it all. I will be back though as I
> cannot use phone when the baby is sleeping. The light
> *tick-ticking* on the straight key doesn't disturb her
> as much as me talking.

Next time you get the courage to fire up on the air, go to a frequency at the lower part of most bands ending in "58" like 3558, 7058, 14058, or 21058. Usually you can find people there looking for slower Morse.

73, de Hans, K0HB

4657. Re: New General

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-22 00:38:03 UTC
From: nightowls627@aol.comnojunk
Message-ID: <20031221193803.26083.00001548@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 84283

Wow! Thanks so much for the support. I thought I would get some negative feedback but you guys are awesome. As far as setting up times, my daughter is usually in bed by about 9pm. I get nervous though. That is what blew it the first time I took the code. It's funny too, I find it difficult to send as well, but I read a lot about how people find sending easier than receiving. I actually have to write down what I want to send before I do it. Oh well, practice makes perfect!!!

73
Greg
ki4bbl@arrl.net

4658. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-22 00:59:16 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <xnfcneeyarg.hq9ka92.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>
Source record: 84284

On Sun, 21 Dec 2003 22:17:03 GMT, Kï¿½HB wrote:

>I don't know about Texas law, but I spent part of the spring and early
>summer in Germany. Over there you ABSOLUTELY stay out of the left lane
>unless you in the act of overtaking and passing. If you dilly-dally around
>in that lane and hold up traffic overtaking you from the rear, you'll be
>cited and the fine is of some consequence

IIRC Ohio and a bunch of other states had that law years ago. I
don't know if they still do - I'll leave that to the Ahians.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

4659. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-22 00:59:17 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <xnfcneeyarg.hq9krf3.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>
Source record: 84285

On Sun, 21 Dec 2003 23:31:33 GMT, Dee D. Flint wrote:

>We also have a problem that sometimes mandates driving regularly in the
>leftmost lane in some areas. We have a lot of left side freeway exits.
>Sometimes traffic is heavy enough that you'd better get into that left lane
>at least 5 miles before you get to the exit or you will never be able to get
>over to it.

We have one spot on a major freeway in Portland (US 26 eastbound)
where it goes into a three-way split very shortly after a tunnel in
which there is no lane changes permitted. There are big signs
"urging" motorists to get in the proper lane long before the tunnel
because both the left-hand split (I-405 North) and the right-hand
split (I-405 South) do not have convenient exits for recovering from
a bad choice. The straight-ahead split leaves you on the downtown
streets, which again does not have a convenient recovery option.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

4660. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-22 01:11:39 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <JZOdnXqiKII32XuiUSdV9g@ptd.net>
Source record: 84286

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:QknFb.4023$Vv2.1145222@news1.news.adelphia.net...
>
> And now some puzzle pieces fit together. I can now reconcile Carl's
> vision of how leaders are supposed to lead and his organization. Strong
> leadership, independent from member opinion, and if you don't like it,
> you're out.
>
> Umm, no thanks.
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -

Mike ...

Don't confuse NCI's membership requirement of supporting the cause with
what I said about leadership.

In the case of NCI, which is a single-purpose organization, it seems to me
that supporting the cause of the organization is a legitimate membership
requirement.

In a more general purpose organization (like the ARRL, for example), I *do*
believe that the leadership needs to have the courage of their convictions
to
"do the right thing, even if it's not overwhelmingly popular - in fact, even
if it's
unpopular ..."

Sort of like the way the law treats folks like the DC snipers, if you will.

While the general public, if polled and left to its whim, might just take
those two our and string them up summarily, the law ("leadership")
must have the courage to say "No, they are entitled to a fair trial."

The point that I am making is that what is popular may not always
be the right thing to do, and leaders are supposed to exhibit the
courage and wisdom to do the right thing.

I hope this has clarified my point and eliminated any confusion between
NCI's membership requirements and my personal views on leadership
sometimes needing to do what's right, rather than what's popular at the
moment.

Another example would be Tony Blair ... the war in Iraq was not popular
at all in the UK, but Tony had the courage of his convictions to do the
right thing ... for the world and for the people of Iraq.

73,
Carl - w3kc

4661. Re: New General

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-22 01:30:58 UTC
From: VA7LNX <spamtrap@gwsn.com>
Message-ID: <mPrFb.774519$6C4.748277@pd7tw1no>
Source record: 84287

Kï¿½HB wrote:

>
> "G. Doughty" <nightowls627@aol.comnojunk> wrote
>
>> Anyone out there that tried a contact
>> with me, sorry. I was forever putting out QRS
>> and still not getting it all. I will be back though as I
>> cannot use phone when the baby is sleeping. The light
>> *tick-ticking* on the straight key doesn't disturb her
>> as much as me talking.
>
> Next time you get the courage to fire up on the air, go to a frequency at
> the lower part of most bands ending in "58" like 3558, 7058, 14058, or
> 21058. Usually you can find people there looking for slower Morse.
>
> 73, de Hans, K0HB

speaking of bands, what's a good band to start on for CW.

--
Donovan Hill
VA7LNX (Basic, Advanced)

4662. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-22 01:39:34 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <qXrFb.4439$IM3.2779@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 84288

"Kim W5TIT" wrote:
>
> I don't accept JJ's submission at all.

One has to register to view the The Ft. Worth Star Telegram's article archives, so I didn't look any further. However, will you accept a submission from the National Highway Traffic Safety Adminstration (DOT) website instead? If so, this link will take you to a description of Texas traffic laws. Scroll down words "Minimum Speed Limit" on the left and then read the information to the right of that (quoted below).

http://www.nhtsa.dot.gov/people/injury/enforce/stspdlaw98/txspeed.htm

Minimum Speed Limit:
I. No person shall drive so slowly
as to impede the normal and
reasonable movement of traffic.
Tran. Code ï¿½545.363(a)
II. A person, driving at less than the
normal speed of traffic, shall drive in
the right-hand lane then available for
traffic or as close as practicable to
the right-hand curb or edge of the
roadway. Tran. Code ï¿½545.051(b)

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

4663. Re: K1MAN

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-22 01:55:58 UTC
From: me <yo@here.com>
Message-ID: <OasFb.4453$IM3.303@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 84289

Would that work with W1AW, also?

==========
"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:e1pFb.4135$IM3.3880@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net...
>
> "Nobody You Know" <ycthulhu@aol.complex> wrote in message
> news:20031220224708.09506.00001351@mb-m17.aol.com...
> > groupk0hb@earthlink.net wrote:
> >
> > >
> > >
> > > >I have no love for the antics of K1MAN, but 4.7 khz is enough room to
put
> 2
> > > >QSO's with modern 2.1 or 2.4 khz filters. If you can't separate two
> > > >stations almost 5 khz apart, then you need remedial tuning training.
> > >
> > > >73, de Hans, K0HB
> > >
> >
> >
> > Oh man, I'm sorry. I really messed up my original posting. K1MAN opened
up
> on
> > 3977.3 khz, only 400 cycles away from the ARUFON net on 3977.7 khz.
> >
> > NOW do you see my point?
> >
> >
> >
> >
> > ---
> > Nations are like leaves; they change color before they fall.
> > ---
>
> Thats not possible. According to MAN he listened on that frequency for
> months and quote "never heard a thing", of course he IS in Maine.
>
> What you do is this;
>
> Record it.
>
> Sign a statement of complaint and mail it to Riley Hollingsworth.

>
> His e-mail is RHOLLING@fcc.gov
>
>
> Dan/W4NTI
>
>

4664. Re: New General

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-22 02:15:24 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <0tsFb.14353$Pg1.8@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 84290

"VA7LNX" <spamtrap@gwsn.com> wrote

>
> speaking of bands, what's a good band to start on for CW.
>

Whichever one sounds open at your location. I prefer 30 and 40 meters.

73, Hans, K0HB

4665. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-22 02:23:56 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <0BsFb.4496$IM3.2096@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 84291

"Kim W5TIT" wrote:
>
> I'd go along with that. However, I
> have always (maybe incorrectly,
> but...) interpreted that "rule" to mean
> traffic that is going *slower than the
> posted speed.* Wrong? Right?
> (snip)

In general, you're right. Nobody is supposed to break the speed limit, so laws about slower vehicles moving to the right and not impeding the flow of traffic don't defend the speeder's actions. But, by the same token, slower drivers are supposed to move to the right and not impede the flow of traffic (if those are the laws in your state), so someone speeding doesn't defend the actions of the slower driver who is impeding the flow of traffic either. I know that sounds strange, but there is some logic behind it. On multiple lane highways, congestion (cars bunching too closely together) is one of the most common causes of accidents. And congestion is dangerious at all highway speeds, but even more so when drivers are speeding. To prevent that bunching up, many states have adopted laws to encourage slower drivers to move to the right so faster vehicles can proceed without bunching up behind the slower vehicle. The idea is to keep all vehicles flowing smoothly - yes, even if some are speeding.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

4666. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-22 02:27:05 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <ZDsFb.4511$IM3.1110@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 84292

"Dee D. Flint" wrote:
>
> The typical law in the states that I am
> familiar with is that at a 4 way stop
> says that the person arriving at the stop
> first goes through the intersection first.
> If two or more vehicles arrive
> simultaneously, the one furthest to the
> right in the circle goes first (i.e. the
> person who has no vehicle immediately
> to his/her right at the intersection). If four
> arrive simultaneously, well there's no rule
> for that and someone has to take the
> courteous route of gesturing the cross
> traffic across before taking their turn.

Exactly the same in each of the states I'm familiar with (and that is a
good number of states).

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

4667. Re: New General

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-22 02:29:34 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <iGsFb.4143$Vv2.1260355@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 84293

Greg Doughty wrote:

> Wow! Thanks so much for the support. I thought I would get some negative
> feedback but you guys are awesome. As far as setting up times, my daughter is
> usually in bed by about 9pm. I get nervous though. That is what blew it the
> first time I took the code. It's funny too, I find it difficult to send as
> well, but I read a lot about how people find sending easier than receiving. I
> actually have to write down what I want to send before I do it. Oh well,
> practice makes perfect!!!

Sounds familiar, Greg! I'm a champion at "flying behind the plane", and
can really get frustrated if I make a mistake. That's my big problem, as
well as having trouble with bg noise - but I'm working on that too.

Yeah, we'll need to get together some evening. I'm good foro either 40
or 80.

- Mike KB3EIA -

4668. a page of motorola 2way 2 way portable and mobile radio history

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-22 02:42:41 UTC
From: jackofalltrades2001@hotmail.com
Message-ID: <b6ef7950.0312211842.517dcd93@posting.google.com>
Source record: 84294

this is the text from a web page i found recently...
http://www.mbay.net/~wb6nvh/Motadata.htm

if you follow the above link, it even shows radio pictures.....

MOTOROLA EARLY LAND MOBILE EQUIPMENT INDEX, 1938-1946

This page is an index to the earliest Motorola police radio equipment. It is not intended as an all-inclusive history of early land mobile radio or of the Motorola Corporation itself.

The Galvin Manufacturing Corporation began producing "Motorola" mobile police receivers in 1937, considerably later than some other manufacturers such as American Bosch, Link and Philco. Motorola eventually called their receiver the "Police Cruiser" model, all but the first of which were model prefixed "P69". Some prototypes are believed to exist from late 1936 which are not identified on this list. Also, special production equipment, which carried an "SP-" suffix, is not listed here. AM medium wave receivers were still being produced in the mid-1950's, even though the FCC began granting VHF 30-39 MHz licenses for 2-way AM systems in 1936 and granted permanent VHF FM licenses on both low and high VHF bands in late 1945. After World War Two, most manufacturers abandoned AM equipment other than as replacement parts for existing systems. No new Police Cruiser models were introduced after the War, although at least the P69-18 was available from existing stock through about 1949.

In 1942, Motorola began selling the "Deluxe" line of equipment, a large rounded-top two piece radio set often referred to as the "coffin units" or "doghouse sets." Although primarily an FM product, the Deluxe line apparently was offered in a VHF AM version with a type number AMR-13(V) for the receiver and presumably AMT-30(D) for the transmitter, but this author has never run across any or found production documentation supporting a "Deluxe" AM transmitter. Information is solicited ! In approximately 1948, the Galvin Company officially adopted the name "Motorola, Inc.."

In January 1951, as a replacement for the discontinued Police Cruiser series, a Unichannel AM medium wave receiver strip was made available in the new "Research Line" one-piece radio equipment. It was available as either a stand-alone receiver (mounted in a "41V" style case or a motorcycle side-carrier) or combined with an FM Unichannel transmitter strip in a 10 or 15" mobile case, for those systems still using medium wave AM for dispatching. No new model AM VHF transmitters were introduced after the pre-war T69-20A mentioned below, other than possibly a "Deluxe" Line AM transmitter.

During wartime, military orders caused cessation of production of civilian radios and several reductions in the production of police sets. Police orders were still taken, as municipalities had a wartime priority, however no new models were designed during this time. Many departments upgraded to "2 way" capability after December 1941, particularly the smaller cities, in order to better prepare for civil defense and "wartime emergency" operations. In 1946, the the War Assets Administration was in charge of disposal of surplus military equipment, and provided many large AM medium wave transmitters (such as the BC-610) to police agencies free of charge. These were used on medium wave frequencies to communicate with Police Cruiser type receivers, and their abundance probably slowed the trend to convert to new VHF and FM equipment by a number of years. The majority of police agencies in the United States had vacated the medium wave frequencies by the end of the 1940's, scrapping their medium wave equipment such as the Police Cruiser receivers. However, a few large regional and urban systems continued well into the 1950's with the same frequencies they had used prior to World War II. For example, the Los Angeles Police Department continued to use its 1700 and 2300 Kilocycle dispatching system into the early 1960's !

Galvin also produced a number of base station receivers and transmitters during the prewar period. That equipment consisted of 19 inch rack panel receivers, operating on the 30-40 Megacycle spectrum, AM, Type B19-19, or a (1942 and newer) "Deluxe" line AMR-13(B) AC powered VHF AM receiver, in its own case. There was a complete line of rack mounted medium wave transmitters:

BASE STATION TRANSMITTERS

T19-23A: 25 Watt "Intermediate Frequency"
T19-30L : 50 Watt "Intermediate Frequency"
T19-30H: 50 Watt UHF 30 MHz
T19-31L: 100 Watt "Intermediate Frequency"
T19-31H: 100 Watt "UHF" 30 MHz
T19-32L: 250 Watt "Intermediate Frequency"
T19-32H: 250 Watt "UHF"
T19-33L: 500 Watt "Intermediate Frequency"
T19-33H: 500 Watt "UHF"
Presumably there was a T19-23H "UHF" transmitter, but I have no sales literature on that model.

RECEIVERS:

Nearly all Galvin receivers prior to WWII were called "Police Cruisers". They should have a chrome nameplate on the front of the housing which says "Police Cruiser" in script, with a red paint background. The word Motorola does not appear on the exterior of the receiver itself, but is on the face of the control head in the form of a red painted tin nameplate. With the exception of the P69-18SP-2 and later SP models of the P69-18, all Police Cruiser receivers were originally intended to mount on the automobile firewall, behind and below the dashboard. Again with the exception of the P69-18 (which

uses a "DC" electrical volume control,) the volume control is located on the receiver itself and is turned via a two foot "speedometer" style jacketed mechanical cable which connects to a knob on the control head. "UHF" model P69-17A could be mounted in the car trunk, with a long speedometer type control cable running to the volume control knob under the car's dash.

All Police Cruisers were essentially modified versions of Motorola's late 1930's AM broadcast car radios (even the "UHF" models !) The basic frequency range of all Police Cruisers except the P69-17A is 1500-3000 Kilocycles. The P69-17A covered 30-40 Megacycles. The earlier Police Cruisers have a black wrinkle finish, while the last Police Cruisers have a blue/gray wrinkle finish. The antenna input was designed for either a conventional broadcast whip or a copper "screen" antenna inside the car's headliner ("tar" roof sedans), except for the P69-17A "UHF" receiver, which shared the transmitting "whip" antenna on the vehicle's rear quarter panel.

Police systems of the time broadcast on two ranges: state police, counties and highway patrol (and a few large metro areas) generally broadcast on the 1550-1750 Kilocycle band, while cities and small towns used the upper band of 2300-2490 Kilocycles. In most areas, all local agencies other than state police shared the same frequency. Frequencies were "coordinated" into geographical zones to minimize interference, but night-time skip conditions had become a severe problem by 1942. The Fire Radio Service was not created at the same time as the Police Radio Service and appeared some years later. At first, it was not thought necessary to have radios in fire engines ! Those fire departments which did install radios, did so by licensing them as mobile police radio stations, and shared the police dispatch system.

The Models:

All equipment was designed for 6 volt DC operation only. Polarity was not important. All were powered by standard 4-pin auto radio vibrators. All models of Police Cruiser receivers except the P69-14 and the very first Police Cruiser contain two vibrators; only one is in use at any given time. A switch which protrudes through the front panel selects either vibrator. Should one vibrator fail, the officer could reach down and select the other vibrator, allowing the vehicle to continue on patrol without the need to return to the station for radio repairs. The transmitters did not offer this feature, but the transmitter vibrators were not in use except during a transmission and were evidently considered more reliable. All P69 Police Cruisers except the P69-14 are single channel.

* "POLICE" and "POLICE CRUISER": The first police receivers made by Galvin, before the P69 model series. Essentially a broadcast auto radio with the oscillator and RF section cut down to receive 1.5-1.7 or 2.1-2.8 Mc/s police frequencies. Tunable, the control head was identical to a broadcast auto radio control head except for the

frequency range markings. The case was a rectangular black wrinkle tub, the same as used by the auto broadcast radios. The first police receiver appears to have been just called "Police," and was merely a modified broadcast set. It was almost immediately updated to the "Police Cruiser," which now featured the die cast chrome "Police Cruiser" nameplate on front. All of the tubes were double-ended ST style two-digit glass types. Discontinued by 1937. No squelch control on the "Police" set..

Thanks to Ray Grimes of Motorola, Inc. for the above photo

* P69-12: 6 tube "economy model". Crystal control, single channel. Dual selectable vibrators. Uses button cell bias batteries in the audio section. Exterior black wrinkle enamel. 1550-3000 kilocycle range. Appearance nearly identical to P-69-18. Production dates approximately 1939-42. (PHOTO TO FOLLOW SOON)

* P69-13: 8 tube "deluxe model". Crystal control. Exterior black wrinkle enamel. The most common Cruiser prewar model other than the P-69-12. Dual selectable vibrators. 1550-3000 kilocycle range. Appearance nearly identical to P-69-18. Production dates approximately 1939-42. (PHOTO TO FOLLOW SOON)

* P69-14: 8 tube "pushbutton" 4 channel model. Tunable, no crystal. Channels changed by electromechanical solenoid stepper system. Single vibrator. Case elongated and different than other Police Cruiser sets. Control head involved separate pushbutton channel selection box. This model believed very rare. Exterior is black wrinkle enamel. There were at least two different models of P69-14. The model below is the original version , P69-14. There was also at least a P69-14D, which featured a rectangular case. Production dates approximately 1939-42.

* P69-17 (P69-17A): 8 tube VHF AM model. Operated in the 30-40 Megacycle range, crystal control. Single channel. Exterior black wrinkle enamel. Case style in front is slightly different from others; holes for alignment points are present a large handle is mounted on the front panel (evidently it was thought this new "UHF" set would need more frequent service !) Used then-new 1853 (6AB7) VHF tube as RF amplifier. Intended as the companion to the T69-20A VHF AM transmitter in all "UHF" 2-way systems. The Motorola P-374-A control head physical appearance is unknown; it is similar to other Cruiser heads but has a squelch on/off switch and mechanical volume control knob. Many units were apparently supplied with the same control head as the medium wave "intermediate frequency" Police Cruisers, which did not feature a squelch switch. The P69-17 was typically trunk-mounted, in contrast to medium wave receivers, and shared the transmitting antenna via a T/R relay. Production dates approximately 1940-49.

* P69-18: 8 tube final version of Police Cruiser, probably 1942 or later introduction. Crystal control, single channel. Selectable dual vibrators. Exterior blue-gray wrinkle enamel. Volume control is a DC remotely controlled design. Control head is the P-8022 as used on

wartime and postwar FM sets. The squelch control is located on chassis of receiver, but several -SP modifications allow the P-8022 control head to also control squelch. -SP1 Modification allowed remote squelch control. -SP2 modification allows trunk mounting of P-69-18 and cabling interface to standard FMTR series cable set and FMTR-30D transmitter plus adding the -SP1 modification. Production dates approximately 1943-50. It is believed that most were produced in the 1945-49 era.

* No P-69-15 or P-69-16 sets are believed to have been manufactured.

RECEIVER CONTROL HEADS:

Shown below are the speedometer cable style "remote" control head for the Police Cruiser receivers which did not feature electrical volume control, and the "small" mobile speaker. There was also a "large" mobile speaker, featured in the photo of the transmitter installation shown later on this page.

MOBILE TRANSMITTERS:

The AM mobile transmitter was the T69-20A. This appears to have been Motorola's only AM mobile transmitter, and is a two piece set in which the power supply and modulator are in one case and the RF section in a second. As originally configured, the power supply was usually installed on the firewall of the automobile, next to the receiver and under the glove box, while the RF section was located in the trunk and attached to its antenna via a short braided copper rope. A fat cable delivered the high voltage and other lines back to the trunk, under the floor mat. However, placing both sections in the vehicle trunk was a popular option.

Exterior color of the units is blue-gray wrinkle enamel, with color shades varying substantially over the years of production, as the photos below show. It is believed the T69-20A first began to be sold in late 1939; production continued through at least 1949. The control head was available as a "handset" type, in which a push to talk Western Electric "E" series telephone handset hung alongside or on a cradle on top of the control box, which was a gray square box with Amphenol connectors on the bottom for the control cable connections. Later versions featured a Western Electric "F" series handset, as shown below. A microphone type control box was alternately available; this is believed to have been the same control box, but without the handset cradle. The control head only controlled the transmitter; the receiver retained its own control head . See typical T69-20A installation photo below:

"SPECIALS":

Various special production radios were produced. One such example is the curious pack-set transmitter-receiver appearing below, which is shown in a circa 1941 Motorola catalog. It is believed this unit was essentially a prototype which led to the postwar FPTR - and FHTR-

series pack sets. Probably few (if any ?) were actually sold.

"ONE PIECE SETS":

During wartime and to the end of Police Cruiser production, a kind of "one-piece" two-way radio set was manufactured, which consisted of both T69-20A transmitter cases and a P69-18 or -17 Police Cruiser receiver, all mounted on a large copper plated chassis, which was mounted in the trunk compartment of a police car or in a utility compartment on a fire engine. The later versions of these sets used the P-8022 control head for both receiver and transmitter functions. They were purchased by the US Government in some quantity. For example, they were used in the trunks of Signal Corps staff cars for the 1940 annual War Games at Camp McCoy, Sparta, Wisconsin (believed to be P69-17A/T69-20A combinations.) Advertisements in CQ Magazine in the late 1940's by surplus dealers offered them as having come from "military police service."

The P-8022 control head above was often used with the "one piece" installation shown above it, but not with the original T69-20A installations, which used separate control heads for transmitter and receiver. Also note that coiled microphone cords are a postwar development. The original microphone used with the above control head would have had a straight cord, and would have had a more flush-appearing, "push up to talk" button which identified the earliest Shure Mfg. Corp. mobile microphones used by Motorola. In addition, the rear "hangup button" was a wartime development; prewar mikes would have had a hang-up ring on the top. As an aside, the above control head, last produced in 1950, was used by the Los Angeles Police Department from 1949-58 !

NOTE REGARDING CAR-TO-CAR OPERATION: Readers may wonder how radio equipped cars communicated with each other directly using medium frequency receivers and VHF AM transmitters. Normally, they couldn't ! However, there was an interconnect function available at the base station, which allowed the audio from the base station receiver to be fed into the microphone line of the base station transmitter, and the base station would be left on the air continuously as long as this switch was closed. This function, often called the "hot button," allowed cars to communicate with each other in emergencies, such as coordinating chases and so forth. Of course, mobile units with microphones instead of handsets would need to reduce the receiver volume to prevent feedback, as such a system was "full duplex."

MIX AND MATCH: It was not uncommon to find Motorola receivers or transmitters matched up with competitive makes of equipment. For example, some agencies might have started out with Philco mobile police receivers, and then added Motorola T69-20A transmitters. Or, a Galvin Police Cruiser receiver installation might have had a Stancor or GE transmitter added later. Some of the earliest postwar 2-way California Highway Patrol installations started out with a Police Cruiser receiver, and added both Motorola and RCA 39 Megacycle VHF FM

transmitters later on, in the case of the RCA by modifying the RCA control head to operate the P69-18 Motorola receiver !

THE ANTENNAS:

In Police Cruiser receive only installations (1 way radio), the antenna used was a regular broadcast whip. Other options included the "screen" antenna and an extra length "super" broadcast whip. The "screen" antenna was only used in cars of the 1920's and early 1930's, which still had a roof made of a tarred fabric material rather than a full steel roof. A copper or bronze screen was inserted between the "tar" top and the wooden slats of the roof, and the lead-in brought down to the receiver through the hollow post on one side of the windshield. The "screen" antenna was far superior to all other types, but disappeared into history when cars began being manufactured with all metal roofs. There were other antenna designs, which were unsuccessful, such as a trombone shaped affair which mounted under the auto running board on the driver's side, on insulated spacers, or the front bumper being used as an antenna by completely rubber-insulating it from the rest of the auto chassis. Although outside the scope of this web page, motorcycles did make use of the screen antenna to some extent. Old photos show the screen, about the size of a ping-pong paddle, mounted horizontally on insulators above the rear fender.

In two-way installations, a separate antenna was used for the transmitter. Motorola's antenna was the strange three-legged affair as shown in the above photograph of a T69-20A in a police car, which featured an adjustable length whip. The one-piece set shown above included a transmit-receive antenna relay, in a small box, such that the only antenna necessary would be the transmitting antenna on the rear of the patrol car.

THE FM EQUIPMENT:

FM was first used in 1940 by the Connecticut State Police radio system, with equipment built and designed by Fred M. Link Radio Co. in connection with Professor Daniel Noble, consultant. Noble would shortly thereafter joing Galvin in direct competition with Link. It can be seen that it was no accident that the Motorola FM equipment bore a close resemblance to the Link designs !

Galvin brought out its own line of FM police equipment in approximately 1941. FM was not an immediate success, and initially few units were sold. The widespread success of VHF FM in armored units during the war proved its superiority in mobile operation, and the men who would return from war to work in and design mobile radio systems had learned its advantages. There was widespread conversion to FM and "UHF" at the end of the War, when the FCC made permanent allocations of 30-40 and 118 Megacycle range frequencies to police and emergency radio systems.

Motorola's FM equipment was called the "Deluxe" line, although they appear to have thought up that name sometime after the equipment was being marketed. The Deluxe line was a superb piece of equipment for its day, reliable and offering high performance. It outperformed the AM equipment to a significant degree in both range and clarity, and represented Motorola's primary product line after the War. Once production of the FM equipment was in progress, Motorola ceased promotion of AM equipment although it was still produced and available for purchase for another ten years. Shown below is the first Deluxe line equipment to be offered; the FMR-13(V) 30-40 Megacycle FM receiver is on the right, the FMT-30(D) 25 Watt 30-40 Megacycle FM transmitter on the left, and the P-8022 standard control head in front. The Deluxe line went through a number of improvements, which will be detailed in a separate web page covering Motorola postwar and 1950's equipment.

This page is maintained and updated by Geoff Fors, WB6NVH, in Monterey California USA. It is intended to convey historical information rather than be a masterpiece of web design ! It is a private effort not sponsored by Motorola.

If you have or are looking for old police radio information, printed materials, equipment, parts, photos, etc. I would like to talk to you ! Any submissions can be added to this and other web pages I am creating. You can contact me via e-mail by manually entering my address as wb6nvh @mbay.net . I had to remove the auto-link to my e-mail address, due to excessive SPAM. By regular mail: Geoff Fors, PO Box 342, Monterey California 93942. If you are interested in old land mobile technology, contact me - - I am starting an internet special interest group to share resources, equipment and knowledge.

Thanks to Ray Grimes of Motorola, Inc. for some of the black & white brochure photos

Be sure to check my other web-pages, such as the California Highway Patrol Radio pages at http://www.mbay.net/~wb6nvh/chpradio.htm

http://www.mbay.net/~wb6nvh/CHP2001.htm

Ver. 2/06/2002 Copyright 2000 All Rights Reserved

Since October 31, 2002, this page has been accessed the following number of times:

4669. Re: New General

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-22 02:45:09 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <VUsFb.17923$P%1.16619948@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 84295

"Greg Doughty" <nightowls627@aol.comnojunk> wrote in message
news:20031221193803.26083.00001548@mb-m06.aol.com...
> Wow! Thanks so much for the support. I thought I would get some negative
> feedback but you guys are awesome. As far as setting up times, my
daughter is
> usually in bed by about 9pm. I get nervous though. That is what blew it
the
> first time I took the code. It's funny too, I find it difficult to send
as
> well, but I read a lot about how people find sending easier than
receiving. I
> actually have to write down what I want to send before I do it. Oh well,
> practice makes perfect!!!
>
>
> 73
> Greg
> ki4bbl@arrl.net

That's because we've all been there and done that. Early on I had a real old-timer answer me and he must have been going at least 35wpm, probably been doing code since radio began. After several requests, he got down to what I could handle, about 10wpm, and stayed with me for a few minutes and then gracefully said goodbye. I sensed that going so slow was a strain for him but he still was willing to spend a few minutes with me.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

4670. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-22 02:47:17 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <2ISdnemspcZIxnuiRVn-tA@gbronline.com>
Source record: 84296

Kim W5TIT wrote:
> "JJ" <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
> news:tdmdnQyZDJkqIXmiRVn-hQ@gbronline.com...
>
>>N2EY wrote:
>>
>>
>>>Hmmm...
>>>
>>>She's going with the flow of traffic, *above* the posted speed limit,
>
> but she
>
>>>should slow down and change lanes so that someone who wants to go even
>
> faster
>
>>>can get by?
>>
>>Yes, in Texas it is the law. You are supposed to drive in the right lane
>>and use the left lane for passing, even if you are doing the speed limit
>>or over, you are obliged to pull to the right lane to let another pass.
>>The following is an exerpt from an article in the Ft. Worth Star
>>Telegram, April 12, 2003.
>>**********
>>Texans must drive in the right-hand lane.
>>
>>In other words -- move over.
>>
>>Yes, you. Get out of the left lane.
>>
>>I don't care how fast you're driving. Or what the speed limit is.
>>
>>Texas law is blunt.
>>
>>Except to pass, motorists "shall drive in the right-hand lane."
>>
>>Both chronic slowpokes and self-appointed speed-limit vigilantes were
>>stung by transportation writer Gordon Dickson's report. He told how
>>habitual left-lane drivers are "despised" and how some traffic engineers
>>believe they cause wrecks.
>>
>>I am not going to defend the lunatics who zoom up from behind at rush
>>hour, bearing down two inches behind your rear bumper and so close that

>>you can smell the extra-grande Starbucks coffee on their breath.
>>
>>But the law is the law. Yes, it says drivers can't speed or tailgate.
>>But it also says to stay out of the left lane.
>>
>>Some violators are obviously in denial.
>>
>
>
> That was an excerpt from the Startlegram? Shocking.
>
> This violator isn't in denial at all. This violator is waiting for mere
> words to turn into action...
>
> Kim W5TIT
>
>
So your mentality is, "until I am caught, I will continue to break the
law." Do you speed throught school zones with that same attitude?

4671. Re: New General

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-22 02:47:47 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <nXsFb.17925$P%1.16620344@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 84297

"VA7LNX" <spamtrap@gwsn.com> wrote in message
news:mPrFb.774519$6C4.748277@pd7tw1no...
> Kï¿½HB wrote:
>
> >
> > "G. Doughty" <nightowls627@aol.comnojunk> wrote
> >
> >> Anyone out there that tried a contact
> >> with me, sorry. I was forever putting out QRS
> >> and still not getting it all. I will be back though as I
> >> cannot use phone when the baby is sleeping. The light
> >> *tick-ticking* on the straight key doesn't disturb her
> >> as much as me talking.
> >
> > Next time you get the courage to fire up on the air, go to a frequency
at
> > the lower part of most bands ending in "58" like 3558, 7058, 14058, or
> > 21058. Usually you can find people there looking for slower Morse.
> >
> > 73, de Hans, K0HB
>
> speaking of bands, what's a good band to start on for CW.
>
> --
> Donovan Hill
> VA7LNX (Basic, Advanced)

Depends on the time of day and what areas you want to work but I would
suggest 40m or 80m at night and 15m or 20m for day.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

4672. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-22 02:50:11 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <2ISdneispcYLwXuiRVn-tA@gbronline.com>
Source record: 84298

Kim W5TIT wrote:

>
> I don't accept JJ's submission at all. Perhaps if he'd reference more than
> just the name of a newspaper, I could go and do some research myself. What
> *part* of the "submission" from JJ is actually from the newspaper? The line
> that says, "Texans must drive in the right-hand lane" or the rest or any
> other part of it? I just tried on the Startlegram (an affectionate local
> colloquialism for the Ft Worth newspaper) to lookup any news article with
> "traffic" in it and didn't pull a thing related to what JJ has above. Not
> even anything remotely connected for that matter.
>
> So, JJ, how 'bout something a little more concrete. By the way, the
> research did just net that beginning on Sep 1 of this year there is some new
> law in effect regarding police safety on highways during traffic stops.

Here, go read it yourself, assuming you can read, if not, maybe your
kids can read it to you.

http://www.broward.com/mld/startelegram/news/columnists/bud_kennedy/5618883.htm

4673. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-22 02:53:27 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <H0tFb.4576$IM3.679@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 84299

"Kï¿½HB" wrote:
>
> I don't know about Texas law, but I
> spent part of the spring and early
> summer in Germany. Over there you
> ABSOLUTELY stay out of the left
> lane unless you in the act of overtaking
> and passing. If you dilly-dally around
> in that lane and hold up traffic overtaking
> you from the rear, you'll be cited and the
> fine is of some consequence (250 Euro's
> if I recall correctly.) Traffic in Germany
> is SO much better, because everyone
> moves crisply in and out of the 'passing
> lanes', rather than the buttheads here who
> take their sweet leisurely time about
> overtaking and passing, often just 1 or 2
> MPH faster than the right hand traffic
> lane is moving.

I really enjoyed driving in Germany also. At first, the autobahns were shocking. But, after I got used to it (a couple of years), I drove just as fast as everyone else. Later, after I gained more experience (and a vehicle that could safely do it), driving at 110 to 120 mph on the autobahn was fairly routine - faster if I was in a hurry to get somewhere. At those speeds, it is critical for all drivers to cooperate.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

4674. Trip through the log book (was Re: New General)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-22 02:54:35 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <L1tFb.17926$P%1.16621393@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 84300

"Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:0tsFb.14353$Pg1.8@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net...
>
> Whichever one sounds open at your location. I prefer 30 and 40 meters.
>

By the way Hans, I was working on QSL cards today and when I entered your call in my computerized log I found not only the two relatively recent contacts for which you sent me cards but a much older one too. It appears that we worked back in January of 1993 during the "Minnesota Beach Party." I had tested in May of 1992 and received the actual license at the end of July 1992. I'd only been licensed a little over 5 months then. My Extra class license arrived at the end of January 1993.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

4675. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-22 02:57:50 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <j_ednZsOXNYGw3uiRVn-ug@gbronline.com>
Source record: 84201

Dwight Stewart wrote:

>
> In general, you're right. Nobody is supposed to break the speed limit, so
> laws about slower vehicles moving to the right and not impeding the flow of
> traffic don't defend the speeder's actions. But, by the same token, slower
> drivers are supposed to move to the right and not impede the flow of traffic
> (if those are the laws in your state), so someone speeding doesn't defend
> the actions of the slower driver who is impeding the flow of traffic either.
> I know that sounds strange, but there is some logic behind it. On multiple
> lane highways, congestion (cars bunching too closely together) is one of the
> most common causes of accidents. And congestion is dangerious at all highway
> speeds, but even more so when drivers are speeding. To prevent that bunching
> up, many states have adopted laws to encourage slower drivers to move to the
> right so faster vehicles can proceed without bunching up behind the slower
> vehicle. The idea is to keep all vehicles flowing smoothly - yes, even if
> some are speeding.

W5TWIT wants to play citizen traffic cop, it isn't for her to decide if
someone is going to fast and make them slow down by staying in the left
lane (even though she is exceeding the speed limit herself), she is
obliged to move over and let the faster traffic pass. It is up to the
authorities to take care of the speeder.

4676. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-22 03:04:42 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <ebtFb.17930$P%1.16623304@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 84203

"JJ" <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
news:j_ednZsOXNYGw3uiRVn-ug@gbronline.com...
> Dwight Stewart wrote:
>
>
> >
> > In general, you're right. Nobody is supposed to break the speed limit,
so
> > laws about slower vehicles moving to the right and not impeding the flow
of
> > traffic don't defend the speeder's actions. But, by the same token,
slower
> > drivers are supposed to move to the right and not impede the flow of
traffic
> > (if those are the laws in your state), so someone speeding doesn't
defend
> > the actions of the slower driver who is impeding the flow of traffic
either.
> > I know that sounds strange, but there is some logic behind it. On
multiple
> > lane highways, congestion (cars bunching too closely together) is one of
the
> > most common causes of accidents. And congestion is dangerious at all
highway
> > speeds, but even more so when drivers are speeding. To prevent that
bunching
> > up, many states have adopted laws to encourage slower drivers to move to
the
> > right so faster vehicles can proceed without bunching up behind the
slower
> > vehicle. The idea is to keep all vehicles flowing smoothly - yes, even
if
> > some are speeding.
>
> W5TWIT wants to play citizen traffic cop, it isn't for her to decide if
> someone is going to fast and make them slow down by staying in the left
> lane (even though she is exceeding the speed limit herself), she is
> obliged to move over and let the faster traffic pass. It is up to the
> authorities to take care of the speeder.
>

From the description, it is the person coming up behind that is trying to
disrupt the flow of traffic as Kim stated that she was going the same speed
as the traffic ahead of her. The person coming up behind would be then

trying to force a whole stream of cars one after another to move over for him/her.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

4677. Re: Trip through the log book (was Re: New General)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-22 03:05:12 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <IbtFb.14407$Pg1.2680@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 84202

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote

> It appears that we worked back in January of
> 1993 during the "Minnesota Beach Party."

That was the "Frostbite Falls Beach Party" which was the old name for the Minnesota QSO Party.

You can work us again soon, I think Feb 7th. Rules at http://www.w0aa.org

73, de Hans, K0HB

4678. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-22 03:24:32 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <A82dnUtrM7MQ-Hui4p2dnA@gbronline.com>
Source record: 84205

Dee D. Flint wrote:

> "JJ" <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
> news:j_ednZsOXNYGw3uiRVn-ug@gbronline.com...
>
>>Dwight Stewart wrote:
>>
>>
>>
>>> In general, you're right. Nobody is supposed to break the speed limit,
>
> so
>
>>>laws about slower vehicles moving to the right and not impeding the flow
>
> of
>
>>>traffic don't defend the speeder's actions. But, by the same token,
>
> slower
>
>>>drivers are supposed to move to the right and not impede the flow of
>
> traffic
>
>>>(if those are the laws in your state), so someone speeding doesn't
>
> defend
>
>>>the actions of the slower driver who is impeding the flow of traffic
>
> either.
>
>>>I know that sounds strange, but there is some logic behind it. On
>
> multiple
>
>>>lane highways, congestion (cars bunching too closely together) is one of
>
> the
>
>>>most common causes of accidents. And congestion is dangerious at all
>
> highway

>
>>>speeds, but even more so when drivers are speeding. To prevent that
>
> bunching
>
>>>up, many states have adopted laws to encourage slower drivers to move to
>
> the
>
>>>right so faster vehicles can proceed without bunching up behind the
>
> slower
>
>>>vehicle. The idea is to keep all vehicles flowing smoothly - yes, even
>
> if
>
>>>some are speeding.
>>
>>W5TWIT wants to play citizen traffic cop, it isn't for her to decide if
>>someone is going to fast and make them slow down by staying in the left
>>lane (even though she is exceeding the speed limit herself), she is
>>obliged to move over and let the faster traffic pass. It is up to the
>>authorities to take care of the speeder.
>>
>
>
> From the description, it is the person coming up behind that is trying to
> disrupt the flow of traffic as Kim stated that she was going the same speed
> as the traffic ahead of her. The person coming up behind would be then
> trying to force a whole stream of cars one after another to move over for
> him/her.
>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>

I fail to see what is so hard to understand about the law...slower
traffic stays to the right. It really is very simple.

4679. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-22 03:30:36 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <wztFb.4618$IM3.2964@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 84204

"Dave Heil" wrote:
>
> There was nothing disingenuous about
> anything and there was nothing in your
> earlier statements to indicate that you
> were discussing government policy. If
> I wanted to make it clear that I was
> speaking of policy, I might have written
> something like, "I don't have a
> background in NASA policy or child birth
> policy". Child birth policy doesn't seem
> to make much sense does it?

Your inability to comprehend seems to increase whenever your argument grows weak, Dave. You stated that one must have experience to make an informed decision - not knowledge, experience. I pointed to child birth, as one example, to prove that wasn't true. But, since you can't seem to understand that, I'll spell it out for you. One does not have to have a child ("child birth") to make an informed decision about abortion laws ("government policy"). And, before you object to that, the act of abortion is a medical procedure, but the laws governing abortion are government policy.

> That isn't what your words say. Look at 'em
> and see if you can find any words about
> morse *use*. If you can't find them, perhaps
> I can provide a quote.

You were talking about an entirely different "use" than I was. You were talking about Amateur radio operators "using" code while I was talking about the "use" of Morse code by other radio services as that relates to code testing. Apples and oranges, Dave. This discussion isn't about the "use" of code by Amateur radio operators - ending code testing will not stop you from using Morse code.

> I strongly disagree that a five word per minute
> morse test indicates emphasis. (snip)

Again, it is "emphasis" compared to the other operating modes, and compared to where this country needs expertise (see FCC statements in previous messages).

> (snip) Additionally, nothing precludes anyone
> from developing expertise though "where this
> country needs expertise" hasn't been defined.
> (snip)

Morse code certainly isn't "where this country needs expertise" today.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

4680. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-22 03:32:58 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <WPednYfUdZFe-nuiRVn-sQ@gbronline.com>
Source record: 84206

JJ wrote:

> Dee D. Flint wrote:
>
>> "JJ" <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
>> news:j_ednZsOXNYGw3uiRVn-ug@gbronline.com...
>>
>>> Dwight Stewart wrote:
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>> In general, you're right. Nobody is supposed to break the speed limit,
>>
>>
>> so
>>
>>>> laws about slower vehicles moving to the right and not impeding the
>>>> flow
>>
>>
>> of
>>
>>>> traffic don't defend the speeder's actions. But, by the same token,
>>
>>
>> slower
>>
>>>> drivers are supposed to move to the right and not impede the flow of
>>
>>
>> traffic
>>
>>>> (if those are the laws in your state), so someone speeding doesn't
>>
>>
>> defend
>>
>>>> the actions of the slower driver who is impeding the flow of traffic
>>
>>
>> either.
>>
>>>> I know that sounds strange, but there is some logic behind it. On
>>

>>
>> multiple
>>
>>>> lane highways, congestion (cars bunching too closely together) is
>>>> one of
>>
>>
>> the
>>
>>>> most common causes of accidents. And congestion is dangerious at all
>>
>>
>> highway
>>
>>>> speeds, but even more so when drivers are speeding. To prevent that
>>
>>
>> bunching
>>
>>>> up, many states have adopted laws to encourage slower drivers to
>>>> move to
>>
>>
>> the
>>
>>>> right so faster vehicles can proceed without bunching up behind the
>>
>>
>> slower
>>
>>>> vehicle. The idea is to keep all vehicles flowing smoothly - yes, even
>>
>>
>> if
>>
>>>> some are speeding.
>>>
>>>
>>> W5TWIT wants to play citizen traffic cop, it isn't for her to decide if
>>> someone is going to fast and make them slow down by staying in the left
>>> lane (even though she is exceeding the speed limit herself), she is
>>> obliged to move over and let the faster traffic pass. It is up to the
>>> authorities to take care of the speeder.
>>>
>>
>>
>> From the description, it is the person coming up behind that is trying to
>> disrupt the flow of traffic as Kim stated that she was going the same
>> speed
>> as the traffic ahead of her. The person coming up behind would be then

>> trying to force a whole stream of cars one after another to move over for
>> him/her.
>>
>> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>>
>
> I fail to see what is so hard to understand about the law...slower
> traffic stays to the right. It really is very simple.
>

Until 1977 the road signs in Texas read, "SLOWER TRAFFIC KEEP RIGHT",
those signs are being replaced with "LEFT LANE FOR PASSING ONLY". How
much clearer than that can it be? Even Kim should be able to grasp the
concept of that.
It is all spelled out in the Star Telegram article.

4681. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-22 03:36:32 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <WPednYbUdZEv9XuiRVn-sQ@gbronline.com>
Source record: 84207

JJ wrote:

> Kim W5TIT wrote:

>>
>> This violator isn't in denial at all. This violator is waiting for mere
>> words to turn into action...
>>
>> Kim W5TIT
>>
>>
> So your mentality is, "until I am caught, I will continue to break the
> law." Do you speed throught school zones with that same attitude?
>

I asked this question of another poster and got no answer, so I will ask
you Kimmygirl. What is the fast speed you can go in a 15 MPH school zone?

4682. Re: Why I Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-22 03:56:40 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031221225640.22081.00002687@mb-m17.aol.com>
Source record: 84208

In article <xnfcneeyarg.hq7zezm.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>, "Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> writes:

> Perhaps it needs a Yaenkel coordinate transform
> from reality to surreality.

With the untimely loss of N0BK, somebody's gotta pick up the slack...

73 de Jim, N2EY

4683. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-22 03:56:41 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031221225641.22081.00002688@mb-m17.aol.com>
Source record: 84209

In article <BOydnWJGx-3sI3mi4p2dnA@gbronline.com>, JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> writes:

>N2EY wrote:

>> My daily commute to work is often made longer by school buses and school
>> zones.
>> It's gotten so I know exactly where the zones, the children, and the bus
>> stops
>> are. Is it adult behavior for me to go faster than 15 in a school zone, or
>> zoom
>> past a bus with its red lights flashing, because I *feel* I can do so
>> safely?
>
>So what is the max speed you can go in a 15 mph school zone?
>
If there's no reason to go slower or stop - 15 mph. And no faster, even if I *feel* I can go faster safely.

In similar fashion, if I see a school bus put on the red lights and/or the little stop sign folds out, I don't try to go by in either direction. Even if I can plainly see that there are no children who could possibly be in danger from my car, and I may *feel* I can proceed safely, I don't go until the red lights are out. Because that's the law and it's the safe way.

73 de Jim, N2EY

4684. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-22 04:58:09 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bs5u69$cqd@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 84212

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:qXrFb.4439$IM3.2779@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> "Kim W5TIT" wrote:
> >
> > I don't accept JJ's submission at all.
>
>
> One has to register to view the The Ft. Worth Star Telegram's article
> archives, so I didn't look any further. However, will you accept a
> submission from the National Highway Traffic Safety Adminstration (DOT)
> website instead? If so, this link will take you to a description of Texas
> traffic laws. Scroll down words "Minimum Speed Limit" on the left and then
> read the information to the right of that (quoted below).
>
> http://www.nhtsa.dot.gov/people/injury/enforce/stspdlaw98/txspeed.htm
>
> Minimum Speed Limit:
> I. No person shall drive so slowly
> as to impede the normal and
> reasonable movement of traffic.
> Tran. Code ?545.363(a)
> II. A person, driving at less than the
> normal speed of traffic, shall drive in
> the right-hand lane then available for
> traffic or as close as practicable to
> the right-hand curb or edge of the
> roadway. Tran. Code ?545.051(b)
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
>

Cool. I'll check that website out. However, the two above put me legal
driving in the left lane--since I am traveling at the speed that the
majority of drivers are driving in the left hand lane, which makes *that*
the flow of traffic--with the people desiring to blast passed all of us in
the wrong; they are going against the flow (at least in my opinion).

Kim W5TIT

4685. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-22 05:06:30 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bs5u6a$cqd@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 84211

"JJ" <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
news:A82dnUtrM7MQ-Hui4p2dnA@gbronline.com...
> Dee D. Flint wrote:
>
> > "JJ" <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
> > news:j_ednZsOXNYGw3uiRVn-ug@gbronline.com...
> >
> >>Dwight Stewart wrote:
> >>
> >>
> >>
> >>> In general, you're right. Nobody is supposed to break the speed
limit,
> >
> > so
> >
> >>laws about slower vehicles moving to the right and not impeding the
flow
> >
> > of
> >
> >>traffic don't defend the speeder's actions. But, by the same token,
> >
> > slower
> >
> >>drivers are supposed to move to the right and not impede the flow of
> >
> > traffic
> >
> >>(if those are the laws in your state), so someone speeding doesn't
> >
> > defend
> >
> >>the actions of the slower driver who is impeding the flow of traffic
> >
> > either.
> >
> >>I know that sounds strange, but there is some logic behind it. On
> >
> > multiple
> >
> >>lane highways, congestion (cars bunching too closely together) is one
of
> >

> > the
> >
> >>>most common causes of accidents. And congestion is dangerious at all
> >
> > highway
> >
> >>>speeds, but even more so when drivers are speeding. To prevent that
> >
> > bunching
> >
> >>>up, many states have adopted laws to encourage slower drivers to move
to
> >
> > the
> >
> >>>right so faster vehicles can proceed without bunching up behind the
> >
> > slower
> >
> >>>vehicle. The idea is to keep all vehicles flowing smoothly - yes, even
> >
> > if
> >
> >>>some are speeding.
> >>
> >>W5TWIT wants to play citizen traffic cop, it isn't for her to decide if
> >>someone is going to fast and make them slow down by staying in the left
> >>lane (even though she is exceeding the speed limit herself), she is
> >>obliged to move over and let the faster traffic pass. It is up to the
> >>authorities to take care of the speeder.
> >>
> >
> >
> > From the description, it is the person coming up behind that is trying
to
> > disrupt the flow of traffic as Kim stated that she was going the same
speed
> > as the traffic ahead of her. The person coming up behind would be then
> > trying to force a whole stream of cars one after another to move over
for
> > him/her.
> >
> > Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
> >
>
> I fail to see what is so hard to understand about the law...slower
> traffic stays to the right. It really is very simple.
>

JJ, there is a line in that *commentary* in the newspaper article you referred to: something about the signs that say Left Lane for Passing Only. Well, I'll look on my way in to the office in the morning but, as far as I can remember, there is not one sign in the 32 mile stretch of highway that I travel that says anything about "Left Lane for Passing Only."

Kim W5TIT

4686. Re: New General

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-22 05:08:45 UTC
From: VA7LNX <spamtrap@gwsn.com>
Message-ID: <x%uFb.776321$6C4.744787@pd7tw1no>
Source record: 84210

Kï¿½HB wrote:

>
> "VA7LNX" <spamtrap@gwsn.com> wrote
>
>>
>> speaking of bands, what's a good band to start on for CW.
>>
>
> Whichever one sounds open at your location. I prefer 30 and 40 meters.
>
> 73, Hans, K0HB

Hmmm... I'm going to build a 15m CW direct conversion transciever... maybe
I'll build it and make sure it's upgradable to 30m (frequency doubler on
the VFO and a 2nd input filter).

--
Donovan Hill
VA7LNX (Basic, Advanced)

4687. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-22 05:08:53 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bs5u6b$cqd@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 84213

"JJ" <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
news:WPednYfUdZFe-nuiRVn-sQ@gbronline.com...
> JJ wrote:
>
> > Dee D. Flint wrote:
> >
> >> "JJ" <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
> >> news:j_ednZsOXNYGw3uiRVn-ug@gbronline.com...
> >>
> >>> Dwight Stewart wrote:
> >>>
> >>>
> >>>
> >>>> In general, you're right. Nobody is supposed to break the speed
limit,
> >>
> >>
> >> so
> >>
> >>>> laws about slower vehicles moving to the right and not impeding the
> >>>> flow
> >>
> >>
> >> of
> >>
> >>>> traffic don't defend the speeder's actions. But, by the same token,
> >>
> >>
> >> slower
> >>
> >>>> drivers are supposed to move to the right and not impede the flow of
> >>
> >>
> >> traffic
> >>
> >>>> (if those are the laws in your state), so someone speeding doesn't
> >>
> >>
> >> defend
> >>
> >>>> the actions of the slower driver who is impeding the flow of traffic
> >>
> >>
> >> either.

> >>
> >>>> I know that sounds strange, but there is some logic behind it. On
> >>
> >>
> >> multiple
> >>
> >>>> lane highways, congestion (cars bunching too closely together) is
> >>>> one of
> >>
> >>
> >> the
> >>
> >>>> most common causes of accidents. And congestion is dangerious at all
> >>
> >>
> >> highway
> >>
> >>>> speeds, but even more so when drivers are speeding. To prevent that
> >>
> >>
> >> bunching
> >>
> >>>> up, many states have adopted laws to encourage slower drivers to
> >>>> move to
> >>
> >>
> >> the
> >>
> >>>> right so faster vehicles can proceed without bunching up behind the
> >>
> >>
> >> slower
> >>
> >>>> vehicle. The idea is to keep all vehicles flowing smoothly - yes,
even
> >>
> >>
> >> if
> >>
> >>>> some are speeding.
> >>>
> >>>
> >>> W5TWIT wants to play citizen traffic cop, it isn't for her to decide
if
> >>> someone is going to fast and make them slow down by staying in the
left
> >>> lane (even though she is exceeding the speed limit herself), she is
> >>> obliged to move over and let the faster traffic pass. It is up to the
> >>> authorities to take care of the speeder.
> >>>

> >>
> >>
> >> From the description, it is the person coming up behind that is trying
to
> >> disrupt the flow of traffic as Kim stated that she was going the same
> >> speed
> >> as the traffic ahead of her. The person coming up behind would be then
> >> trying to force a whole stream of cars one after another to move over
for
> >> him/her.
> >>
> >> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
> >>
> >
> > I fail to see what is so hard to understand about the law...slower
> > traffic stays to the right. It really is very simple.
> >
>
> Until 1977 the road signs in Texas read, "SLOWER TRAFFIC KEEP RIGHT",
> those signs are being replaced with "LEFT LANE FOR PASSING ONLY". How
> much clearer than that can it be? Even Kim should be able to grasp the
> concept of that.
> It is all spelled out in the Star Telegram article.
>

Slower than who or what? Slower than the flow of traffic ahead, or the traffic behind? Slower than most of the drivers on the road, or slower than the fewer drivers on the road (who are speeding faster)? A sign that simply says "slower traffic keep right" is pretty darned ambiguous.

Kim W5TIT

4688. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-22 05:11:15 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bs5uan$uh2@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 84214

"JJ" <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
news:WPednYbUdZEv9XuiRVn-sQ@gbronline.com...
> JJ wrote:
>
> > Kim W5TIT wrote:
>
> >>
> >> This violator isn't in denial at all. This violator is waiting for
mere
> >> words to turn into action...
> >>
> >> Kim W5TIT
> >>
> >>
> > So your mentality is, "until I am caught, I will continue to break the
> > law." Do you speed throught school zones with that same attitude?
> >
>
> I asked this question of another poster and got no answer, so I will ask
> you Kimmygirl. What is the fast speed you can go in a 15 MPH school zone?
>

JJ, this is probably the last response you'll ever see from me...because
you're disrespectful, childish, and pretty darned assinine to boot. The
fastest someone could go through a 15 MPH school zone would be as fast as
the vehicle can go. The fastest *I* would go in a 15 MPH school zone is
about 12-13 MPH. Now, shrivel your dick up and go play with it somewhere
else...

Kim W5TIT

4689. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-22 05:37:51 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <ENqdnTGIEahRGnuiRVn-uw@gbronline.com>
Source record: 84215

Kim W5TIT wrote:

>
>
> JJ, there is a line in that *commentary* in the newspaper article you
> referred to: something about the signs that say Left Lane for Passing Only.
> Well, I'll look on my way in to the office in the morning but, as far as I
> can remember, there is not one sign in the 32 mile stretch of highway that I
> travel that says anything about "Left Lane for Passing Only."
>
> Kim W5TIT

Well, I knew you should have gotten you kids to read it to you, here is
another quote from the article.

****
Until 1997, the messages along Texas' divided highways were passive:

SLOWER TRAFFIC

KEEP RIGHT

Since 1997, those signs are being replaced with a more direct command:

LEFT LANE FOR

PASSING ONLY

The law is not new.

Only the signs are new.
****

Notice is says the signs *are being replaced*. It does not say all the
signs have been replaced so just because you don't see it on your little
32 mile stretch of road out of the 76,986 miles of highway in Texas,
dosen't mean there aren't any signs that say "LEFT LANE FOR PASSING
ONLY". I have seen them. There are over 1 million highway signs along
Texas roadways and a lot of them are the signs in question to be
replaced. I am sure they will get to your 32 miles someday.

I also call your attention to the last two lines, the law has always
been the left lane is for passing only, only the signs are being changed
to better express what some have a hard time understanding. So even if
you don't see the signs, the law still applies. I haven't seen a Texas
driver's written test in a long time but I would not be suprised that a
question about this very subject is there and is something you should
know even without a sign to remind you. Maybe on your 32 mile stetch of

road they will need a sign every mile or two to keep you reminded.

You remind me of the blond gal that collasped on the sidewalk. Several came to her aid and someone noticed she was wearing earphones attatched to a small cd player. In the process of attempting to help her the earphones were removed and she suddenly expired. Someone picked up the earphones to see what she was listening to and heard, "breath in...breath out...breath in...breath out."

4690. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-22 05:41:53 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <j4mdnWKCGeRLFXuiRVn-uA@gbronline.com>
Source record: 84216

Kim W5TIT wrote:

> "JJ" <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
> news:WPednYfUdZFe-nuiRVn-sQ@gbronline.com...
>
>>JJ wrote:
>>
>>
>>>Dee D. Flint wrote:
>>>
>>>
>>>>"JJ" <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
>>>>news:j_ednZsOXNYGw3uiRVn-ug@gbronline.com...
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>Dwight Stewart wrote:
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>> In general, you're right. Nobody is supposed to break the speed
>
> limit,
>
>>>>
>>>>so
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>laws about slower vehicles moving to the right and not impeding the
>>>>>flow
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>of
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>traffic don't defend the speeder's actions. But, by the same token,
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>slower
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>drivers are supposed to move to the right and not impede the flow of
>>>>
>>>>

>>>>traffic
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>>(if those are the laws in your state), so someone speeding doesn't
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>defend
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>>the actions of the slower driver who is impeding the flow of traffic
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>either.
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>>I know that sounds strange, but there is some logic behind it. On
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>multiple
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>>lane highways, congestion (cars bunching too closely together) is
>>>>>>one of
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>the
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>>most common causes of accidents. And congestion is dangerious at all
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>highway
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>>speeds, but even more so when drivers are speeding. To prevent that
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>bunching
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>>up, many states have adopted laws to encourage slower drivers to
>>>>>>move to
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>the
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>>right so faster vehicles can proceed without bunching up behind the
>>>>
>>>>

>>>>slower
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>>vehicle. The idea is to keep all vehicles flowing smoothly - yes,
>
> even
>
>>>>
>>>>if
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>>some are speeding.
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>W5TWIT wants to play citizen traffic cop, it isn't for her to decide
>
> if
>
>>>>>someone is going to fast and make them slow down by staying in the
>
> left
>
>>>>>lane (even though she is exceeding the speed limit herself), she is
>>>>>obliged to move over and let the faster traffic pass. It is up to the
>>>>>authorities to take care of the speeder.
>>>>>
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>From the description, it is the person coming up behind that is trying
>
> to
>
>>>>disrupt the flow of traffic as Kim stated that she was going the same
>>>>speed
>>>>as the traffic ahead of her. The person coming up behind would be then
>>>>trying to force a whole stream of cars one after another to move over
>
> for
>
>>>>him/her.
>>>>
>>>>Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>>>>
>>>
>>>I fail to see what is so hard to understand about the law...slower
>>>traffic stays to the right. It really is very simple.
>>>
>>
>>Until 1977 the road signs in Texas read, "SLOWER TRAFFIC KEEP RIGHT",
>>those signs are being replaced with "LEFT LANE FOR PASSING ONLY". How

>>much clearer than that can it be? Even Kim should be able to grasp the
>>concept of that.
>>It is all spelled out in the Star Telegram article.
>>
>
>
> Slower than who or what? Slower than the flow of traffic ahead, or the
> traffic behind? Slower than most of the drivers on the road, or slower than
> the fewer drivers on the road (who are speeding faster)? A sign that simply
> says "slower traffic keep right" is pretty darned ambiguous.
>
> Kim W5TIT
>
>
If traffic in the lane you are in is travling faster than you and you
have a lane to the right, you are obliged to move to the right. It isn't
that hard to understand. However for those like you who seem to have a
difficult time with that concept is why they are changing the signs to
read, "LEFT LANE FOR PASSING ONLY."

4691. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-22 05:48:19 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <Ab6dnfCtWoQbF3uiRVn-vA@gbronline.com>
Source record: 84217

Kim W5TIT wrote:

> "JJ" <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
> news:WPednYbUdZEv9XuiRVn-sQ@gbronline.com...
>
>>JJ wrote:
>>
>>
>>>Kim W5TIT wrote:
>>
>>>>This violator isn't in denial at all. This violator is waiting for
>
> mere
>
>>>>words to turn into action...
>>>>
>>>>Kim W5TIT
>>>>
>>>>
>>>
>>>So your mentality is, "until I am caught, I will continue to break the
>>>law." Do you speed throught school zones with that same attitude?
>>>
>>
>>I asked this question of another poster and got no answer, so I will ask
>>you Kimmygirl. What is the fast speed you can go in a 15 MPH school zone?
>>
>
>
> JJ, this is probably the last response you'll ever see from me...because
> you're disrespectful, childish, and pretty darned assinine to boot.

Like you haven't been. Must be hitting a nerve.

> The
> fastest someone could go through a 15 MPH school zone would be as fast as
> the vehicle can go. The fastest *I* would go in a 15 MPH school zone is
> about 12-13 MPH. Now, shrivel your dick up and go play with it somewhere
> else...

I ask a valid question and here you fly off the handle and start with
the vulgar suggestions.

Now to answer the question I ask of you and another poster. I don't know
about other states, but in Texas you can go only as fast as any other
vehicle in the zone at or below the posted limit. If another vehicle in

the zone is going 10 mph, then you may go no faster than that vehicle. In other words, no passing in a school zone. If you are the only vehicle in the zone, then what ever the limit is is valid unless unusual conditions dictate otherwise.

4692. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-22 09:56:32 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031222045632.21642.00003148@mb-m01.aol.com>
Source record: 84218

In article <JZOdnXqiKIl32XuiUSdV9g@ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
<wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:

>"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
>news:QknFb.4023$Vv2.1145222@news1.news.adelphia.net...
>>
>> And now some puzzle pieces fit together. I can now reconcile Carl's
>> vision of how leaders are supposed to lead and his organization. Strong
>> leadership, independent from member opinion, and if you don't like it,
>> you're out.
>>
>> Umm, no thanks.
>>
>> - Mike KB3EIA -
>
>
>Mike ...
>
>Don't confuse NCI's membership requirement of supporting the cause with
>what I said about leadership.
>
>In the case of NCI, which is a single-purpose organization, it seems to me
>that supporting the cause of the organization is a legitimate membership
>requirement.
>
>In a more general purpose organization (like the ARRL, for example), I *do*
>believe that the leadership needs to have the courage of their convictions
>to
>"do the right thing, even if it's not overwhelmingly popular - in fact, even
>if it's unpopular ..."
>
>Sort of like the way the law treats folks like the DC snipers, if you will.

How is that "unpopular"?
>
>While the general public, if polled and left to its whim, might just take
>those two our and string them up summarily,

I don't think so! You have a curiously low opinion of your fellow citizens.

I think a majority of "the general public" realizes that the rule of law and
the rights of the individual to a fair trial apply to everyone. If nothing
else, most people in "the general public" realize that if those two can be
sentenced without trial, then at some point in the future, members of "the
general public" could face the same fate.

>the law ("leadership")
>must have the courage to say "No, they are entitled to a fair trial."

And "the law" is the result of checks and balances between the legislative, the judicial and the exectutive branches of government.
>
>The point that I am making is that what is popular may not always
>be the right thing to do, and leaders are supposed to exhibit the
>courage and wisdom to do the right thing.

And to convince the majority that it is the right thing.

History is full of leaders who committed unspeakable atrocities and were unrepentant because they thought they were doing "the right thing".
>
>I hope this has clarified my point and eliminated any confusion between
>NCI's membership requirements and my personal views on leadership
>sometimes needing to do what's right, rather than what's popular at the
>moment.

What you are saying puts the leader's persoanl judgement above democracy.
>
>Another example would be Tony Blair ... the war in Iraq was not popular
>at all in the UK, but Tony had the courage of his convictions to do the
>right thing ... for the world and for the people of Iraq.

It is my understanding that the prime minister serves only as long as the Parliament backs him up. If he/she does something unpopular enough, he/she can be recalled/replaced at any moment. So ultimately even Mr. Blair has to retain popularity or be removed from office.

In any democratic organization, the people ultimately retain control. In a constitutional republic such as the USA, there are checks and balances to limit direct control and slow down radical changes, but ultimately the people governed are the ultimate power, not the judgement of the "leaders".

73 de Jim, N2EY

4693. Re: New General

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-22 11:30:56 UTC
From: aaa@nu-ware.com
Message-ID: <ba2ef257.0312220330.318e155b@posting.google.com>
Source record: 84219

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:<ieqFb.17906$P%1.16589201@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>...
> > > You and me both G. (George?) 5wpm didn't work too well for me, so I'm
> > > doing a lot of Numorse. don't forget to listen too, as there is a
> > > difference between the computer spitting out Morse and real on the air
> > > listening.
Agreed, human sent code is disconcerting at first if you have learned
using nothing but computer generated code.

Good work all in getting your 5 wpm.

If you have NuMorse Pro you can also try the "Real Morse Code" option
to give a simulation of on air code complete with QRN and QSB.

Tony Lacy, G4AUD

4694. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-22 12:10:36 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bs6msv$n09@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 84220

"JJ" <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
news:ENqdnTGIEahRGnuiRVn-uw@gbronline.com...
>
> You remind me of the blond gal that collasped on the sidewalk. Several
> came to her aid and someone noticed she was wearing earphones attatched
> to a small cd player. In the process of attempting to help her the
> earphones were removed and she suddenly expired. Someone picked up the
> earphones to see what she was listening to and heard, "breath
> in...breath out...breath in...breath out."
>

You can't get any more creative than using a washed up old cliche joke? Oh,
I forgot, you *are* from Texas, so that would be all you're capable of...

Kim W5TIT

4695. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-22 12:16:13 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bs6n7g$dg8@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 84221

"JJ" <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
news:Ab6dnfCtWoQbF3uiRVn-vA@gbronline.com...
> Kim W5TIT wrote:
>
> > "JJ" <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
> > news:WPednYbUdZEv9XuiRVn-sQ@gbronline.com...
> >
> >>JJ wrote:
> >>
> >>
> >>>Kim W5TIT wrote:
> >>
> >>>>This violator isn't in denial at all. This violator is waiting for
> >
> > mere
> >
> >>>>words to turn into action...
> >>>>
> >>>>Kim W5TIT
> >>>>
> >>>>
> >>>
> >>>So your mentality is, "until I am caught, I will continue to break the
> >>>law." Do you speed throught school zones with that same attitude?
> >>>
> >>
> >>I asked this question of another poster and got no answer, so I will ask
> >>you Kimmygirl. What is the fast speed you can go in a 15 MPH school
zone?
> >>
> >
> >
> > JJ, this is probably the last response you'll ever see from me...because
> > you're disrespectful, childish, and pretty darned assinine to boot.
>
> Like you haven't been. Must be hitting a nerve.
>
> > The
> > fastest someone could go through a 15 MPH school zone would be as fast
as
> > the vehicle can go. The fastest *I* would go in a 15 MPH school zone is
> > about 12-13 MPH. Now, shrivel your dick up and go play with it
somewhere
> > else...

>
> I ask a valid question and here you fly off the handle and start with
> the vulgar suggestions.
>
> Now to answer the question I ask of you and another poster. I don't know
> about other states, but in Texas you can go only as fast as any other
> vehicle in the zone at or below the posted limit. If another vehicle in
> the zone is going 10 mph, then you may go no faster than that vehicle.
> In other words, no passing in a school zone. If you are the only vehicle
> in the zone, then what ever the limit is is valid unless unusual
> conditions dictate otherwise.
>

Whoopee....so what does that have to do with anything that has been being discussed about multiple lane highway traffic and, specifically, traveling in the left-lane at above posted speed limits?

What it took you several words to say is this: in Texas (at least) you may not pass another vehicle in an active school zone. So, genius, how 'bout ya explain where you were going with this? Oh forget it, I forgot you can't...never mind.

Kim W5TIT

4696. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-22 14:10:54 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <OXCFb.17957$P%1.16723332@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 84222

"JJ" <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
news:A82dnUtrM7MQ-Hui4p2dnA@gbronline.com...
> Dee D. Flint wrote:
>
> > "JJ" <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
> > news:j_ednZsOXNYGw3uiRVn-ug@gbronline.com...
> >
> >>Dwight Stewart wrote:
> >>
> >>
> >>
> >>> In general, you're right. Nobody is supposed to break the speed
limit,
> >
> > so
> >
> >>laws about slower vehicles moving to the right and not impeding the
flow
> >
> > of
> >
> >>traffic don't defend the speeder's actions. But, by the same token,
> >
> > slower
> >
> >>drivers are supposed to move to the right and not impede the flow of
> >
> > traffic
> >
> >>(if those are the laws in your state), so someone speeding doesn't
> >
> > defend
> >
> >>the actions of the slower driver who is impeding the flow of traffic
> >
> > either.
> >
> >>I know that sounds strange, but there is some logic behind it. On
> >
> > multiple
> >
> >>lane highways, congestion (cars bunching too closely together) is one
of
> >

> > the
> >
> >>>most common causes of accidents. And congestion is dangerious at all
> >
> > highway
> >
> >>>speeds, but even more so when drivers are speeding. To prevent that
> >
> > bunching
> >
> >>>up, many states have adopted laws to encourage slower drivers to move
to
> >
> > the
> >
> >>>right so faster vehicles can proceed without bunching up behind the
> >
> > slower
> >
> >>>vehicle. The idea is to keep all vehicles flowing smoothly - yes, even
> >
> > if
> >
> >>>some are speeding.
> >>
> >>W5TWIT wants to play citizen traffic cop, it isn't for her to decide if
> >>someone is going to fast and make them slow down by staying in the left
> >>lane (even though she is exceeding the speed limit herself), she is
> >>obliged to move over and let the faster traffic pass. It is up to the
> >>authorities to take care of the speeder.
> >>
> >
> >
> > From the description, it is the person coming up behind that is trying
to
> > disrupt the flow of traffic as Kim stated that she was going the same
speed
> > as the traffic ahead of her. The person coming up behind would be then
> > trying to force a whole stream of cars one after another to move over
for
> > him/her.
> >
> > Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
> >
>
> I fail to see what is so hard to understand about the law...slower
> traffic stays to the right. It really is very simple.
>

I don't see what's so hard to understand about the law. No one is supposed to exceed the speed limit.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

4697. The main problem with Ham radio...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-22 14:35:40 UTC
From: Jrad@aol.com
Message-ID: <bs6vfs0fsh@enews1.newsguy.com>
Source record: 84224

...is simply this:

Know code = Know ham
No code = No ham

The eternal truth, proven every day.

4698. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-22 14:40:46 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031222094046.01690.00000403@mb-m18.aol.com>
Source record: 84223

>Subject: Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL
>From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
>Date: 12/21/03 2:20 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <f45722ac.0312211220.2c68c00@posting.google.com>

>Steve, I think it has to do with the disincentive of Morse Code
>testing. You might want to check with Len on this.

Why?

Morse Code is only required for access to less than 3% of all Amateur allocations, none of which is above 30MHz.

Lennie keeps asserting that the future of Amateur Radio is in the new technologies, none of which is occuring below 30Mhz.

Lennie ALSO keeps insisting Amateur Radio is "stuck" in the 1930's somewhere, yet evidence in every media indicates he's grossly mistaken. Also, the fact that the majority of Amateur Radio activity takes place above 30Mhz further exposes Lennie's rants for the silliness and antagonistic fodder they are.

Ask Lennie? I could, but that would just amke the heap of unanswered questions that much higher.

Steve, K4YZ

4699. Here is TITSs Dream

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-22 15:12:40 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031222101240.11589.00000922@mb-m25.aol.com>
Source record: 84225

Check out kk6nn on QRZ. This is what could have came of TIT if she would have become a REAL HAM. Notice She has an Advanced License, so she does know 13 WPM
KK6NN is the most positive reason for keeping CW

4700. Re: The main problem with Ham radio...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-22 15:13:38 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031222101338.11589.00000923@mb-m25.aol.com>
Source record: 84226

```
>...is simply this:
>
>Know code = Know ham
>No code = No ham
>
>The eternal truth, proven every day.
>

So TRUE
```

4701. Re: Why I Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-22 16:22:08 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3FE71A30.4000702@psu.edu>
Source record: 84227

Len Over 21 wrote:
> In article <HQ_Eb.1552$Vv2.769871@news1.news.adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo
> <mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:
>
>
>>Oops sorry, I accidentally posted without comment
>
>
> How dare you? :-)

HAH! I knew that one was coming! ;^)

- mike KB3EIA -

4702. Re: Why I Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-22 16:26:52 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3FE71B4C.60306@psu.edu>
Source record: 84228

N2EY wrote:
> In article <xnfcneeyarg.hq7zezm.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>, "Phil Kane"
> <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> writes:
>
>
>>Perhaps it needs a Yaenkel coordinate transform
>> from reality to surreality.
>
>
> With the untimely loss of N0BK, somebody's gotta pick up the slack...

Whoah!! Something happened to Dick?? 8^(

- Mike KB3EIA -

4703. Re: New General

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-22 17:12:29 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0312220912.47111af9@posting.google.com>
Source record: 84229

nightowls627@aol.comnojunk (G. Doughty) wrote in message news:<20031221135241.13822.00001215@mb-m10.aol.com>...
> Well, passed my element one with no problems yesterday and have been trying to
> get some contacts on hf with cw. I love cw but 5wpm just isn't cutting it so > I am back to Numorse to bring up my speed.

That's excellent but don't limit yourself to just the computer.

Listen around the bands too. Part of what you may be experience is not being skilled (yet) at both running the rig and copying code. The way to cure that is to use your rig to listen to real live code.

W1AW sends code practice on a regular schedule and should be very strong at your location on 80 and 40 meters in the evenings. Check

http://www.arrl.org

for the current schedule.

Also, don't limit yourself to 5 wpm or whatever speed you can copy. Spend some time at higher speeds. Even if you only get 1 letter out of every 3, it will sharpen your reflexes and when you listen to 5 wpm it will sound much slower. Try a range of speeds, up to the point where you only get maybe 10-20% of what's being sent.

> Anyone out there that tried a contact
> with me, sorry. I was forever putting out QRS and still not getting it all.

No problem. We were all beginners once.

>I
> will be back though as I cannot use phone when the baby is sleeping. The
> light
> *tick-ticking* on the straight key doesn't disturb her as much as me talking.
>
Just another advantage of the mode!

73 es GL de Jim, N2EY

4704. Re: New General

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-22 17:17:21 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0312220917.119ce13f@posting.google.com>
Source record: 84230

nightowls627@aol.comnojunk (Greg Doughty) wrote in message
news:<20031221193803.26083.00001548@mb-m06.aol.com>...
> I get nervous though.

That's normal!

> That is what blew it the
> first time I took the code. It's funny too, I find it difficult to send as
> well, but I read a lot about how people find sending easier than receiving.

Try this:

Disable the transmit part of your rig so that it doesn't put out a
signal, or use a code practice oscillator. Tune around for a CQ that
you can copy and have a "pretend" QSO, with you sending just to
yourself. Gets you used to doing the various things without actually
being on the air.

> I
> actually have to write down what I want to send before I do it. Oh well,
> practice makes perfect!!!

Absolutely!

Remember that CW operating involves a whole set of skills, but Element
1 only tests one of them. The rest are left "as an exercise for the
reader".

73 es GL de Jim, N2EY

4705. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-22 17:21:05 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3FE727B9.2BA141CE@earthlink.net>
Source record: 84231

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3FE4E004.6BC4A8AD@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >You're probably right. Everyone who holds an amateur ticket likely had
> >some incentive. Len had none.
>
> The ONLY way to have incentive is to get a ham license.
>
> The radio god has spoken.

No gods needed. Simple observation will show that someone who proclaims
a decades-long interest in amateur radio and who has never bothered to
attempt even the easiest license exam has no incentive to obtain an
amateur radio license. See "intertia".

It won't bother me if you never obtain an amateur radio license, Len.
Just don't feign interest and then attempt to tell me how you think
amateur radio should be regulated.

Dave K8MN

4706. Re: Why I Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-22 17:25:48 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3FE728D4.ACA2C528@earthlink.net>
Source record: 84232

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <i_2Fb.17738$P%1.16339939@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D.
> Flint" <deehays@qix.net> writes:
>
> >What it should be and too many fail to realize is that the proper sequence
> >is "Learn radio basics to become a ham and then as a ham continue to learn
> >and increase one's expertise." It should not be one versus the other.
>
> The ONLY way to have an interest in radio is to get a ham license.

You could say that you have an interest in amateur radio, Len. It isn't true, but you could say it.

You could say that you have an interest in gardening, but if your interest extends only to walking past someone's garden and advising that they're not properly caring for their climatus, you aren't a gardner.

You could say that you have a great interest in flying an airplane, but if your interest extends to buying a ticket to fly to Chicago, you aren't an aviator.

Reality points to the fact that you have nothing to do with amateur radio other than to make submissions to the FCC regarding an avocation in which you take no part.

Dave K8MN

4707. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-22 17:27:23 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3FE72935.F4D597C4@earthlink.net>
Source record: 84233

Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3FE4E004.6BC4A8AD@earthlink.net>...
> > Brian wrote:
> > >
> > > N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<c2356669.0312190606.18645337@posting.google.com>...
> >
> > > > You're *assuming* that everyone who has an opinion on amateur radio
> > > > policy issues is interested in amateur radio having the best possible
> > > > future. And in most cases that's true - but not when Mr. Anderson is
> > > > involved. His behavior here, and his comments to FCC, indicate that
> > > > he's *not* interested in what's best for amateur radio. He's just
> > > > interested in stirring up division, discord and hostility between
> > > > amateurs, diverting them from other issues, and denying amateur
> > > > traditions and contributions to society and the radio art.
> > >
> > > Inventive Licensing comes to mind as the big divider.
> >
> > You're probably right. Everyone who holds an amateur ticket likely had
> > some incentive. Len had none.
> >
> > Dave K8MN
>
> Of course I'm right! ;^)
>
> Len, like any Americans who've shown an interest in the ARS, have a
> disincentive. It is the Morse requirement for HF access.

Your claim might ring true if Len had bothered to obtain a code-free
ticket at some point. He hasn't.

Dave K8MN

4708. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-22 17:31:26 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0312220931.114c6e75@posting.google.com>
Source record: 84234

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:<p3qFb.17902$P%1.16587502@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>...
>
> We also have a problem that sometimes mandates driving regularly in the
> leftmost lane in some areas.

Ahh, Dee, ya beat me to it.

> We have a lot of left side freeway exits.
> Sometimes traffic is heavy enough that you'd better get into that left lane
> at least 5 miles before you get to the exit or you will never be able to get
> over to it.
>
Same here in EPA. In fact we have both lefthand off-ramps and on-ramps
to major divided highways. Usually you need to get over as soon as the
first advance sign shows up (usually 2 miles out).

btw, there's a way to tell from the advance sign whether it's a left-
or right-hand offramp.....

For example, if you're going west out of Philly on the Schuylkill
Expressway (I-76) and you want to go south on the Blue Route (I-476),
it's a left-hand exit and you are warned 2 miles out.

You better hit the ramp at no more than about 35 because it's sharp
and of rapidly decreasing radius. And it comes up fast.

Someone in the left lane approaching that exit cannot move over
because they won't get back in time.

On top of that, many of the divided highways (like most of I-76 east
of Valley Forge) around here are only 4 lanes (2 each direction) and
if everyone stayed to the right there'd be no end of delays. And there
would be lots of accidents and delays at on-ramps.

So we tend to use all lanes. Slower folks *usually* stay to the right,
but not always, because there may be a reason for them to be on the
left.

One reason our roads are like this is the terrain.

73 de Jim, N2EY

4709. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-22 17:36:34 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3FE72B5B.D0D251F7@earthlink.net>
Source record: 84235

Brian wrote:

> Steve, I think it has to do with the disincentive of Morse Code
> testing. You might want to check with Len on this.

You'll pardon our confusion. You've been acting as Len's representative for a few posts now in speaking of his motivations or lack thereof. I wasn't aware that you'd turned the controls over to him.

Dave K8MN

4710. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-22 17:43:20 UTC
From: groupk0hb@earthlink.net
Message-ID: <5ee63311.0312220943.176bd725@posting.google.com>
Source record: 84236

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote

> I think a majority of "the general public" realizes that the rule of law and
> the rights of the individual to a fair trial apply to everyone.

That's certainly the high-sounding politically correct
intellectualized response, but it's untrue.

The majority of the general public, in their heart-of-hearts, would
like to see a certain class of sub-human criminals summarily 'dealt
with'. In the case of sub-humans like Lee Malvo, John Mohammed,
Timothy McVeigh, and Robert Hanssen, the majority of the general
public would prefer that they be invited to an impromptu necktie party
and air dance, and that the festivities be broadly televised. The
majority of the general public, in their heart-of-hearts, would have
preferred that the GI's in YI1 land had lobbed a couple of grenades
into Saddams hidey-hole, rather than provide him with the opportunity
of a ''fair trial'. There is a certain level of crime, so calculated,
cold blooded, inhuman, and unredeemable that it does NOT deserve the
civilized right of "fair trial".

We all know that, but the majority of the general public have been
conditioned by liberals to feel guilty about such beliefs, and the
result is that sub-human trash feels safer in perpetrating their
heinous crimes knowing that the "fair trial" process might spare them
the fate they richly deserve.

73, de Hans, K0HB

4711. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-22 17:49:57 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3FE72E7C.4DABE0D7@earthlink.net>
Source record: 84237

Dwight Stewart wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" wrote:
> >
> > There was nothing disingenuous about
> > anything and there was nothing in your
> > earlier statements to indicate that you
> > were discussing government policy. If
> > I wanted to make it clear that I was
> > speaking of policy, I might have written
> > something like, "I don't have a
> > background in NASA policy or child birth
> > policy". Child birth policy doesn't seem
> > to make much sense does it?
>
> Your inability to comprehend seems to increase whenever your argument
> grows weak, Dave. You stated that one must have experience to make an
> informed decision - not knowledge, experience. I pointed to child birth, as
> one example, to prove that wasn't true. But, since you can't seem to
> understand that, I'll spell it out for you. One does not have to have a
> child ("child birth") to make an informed decision about abortion laws
> ("government policy"). And, before you object to that, the act of abortion
> is a medical procedure, but the laws governing abortion are government
> policy.

Dwight, I'm with you on Kim's silliness about driving but this one just
keeps getting skewed more and more. Now you're writing about abortion
instead of child birth and NASA. You did not write anything in your
original comments to indicate that you were discussing "child birth
policy" or "NASA policy".

> > That isn't what your words say. Look at 'em
> > and see if you can find any words about
> > morse *use*. If you can't find them, perhaps
> > I can provide a quote.
>
> You were talking about an entirely different "use" than I was. You were
> talking about Amateur radio operators "using" code while I was talking about
> the "use" of Morse code by other radio services as that relates to code
> testing. Apples and oranges, Dave.

A different "use"? Sorry, I'm not buying that.

> This discussion isn't about the "use" of
> code by Amateur radio operators - ending code testing will not stop you from

> using Morse code.

Aren't you growing tired from all the tap dancing you've been doing?

> > I strongly disagree that a five word per minute
> > morse test indicates emphasis. (snip)
>
> Again, it is "emphasis" compared to the other operating modes, and
> compared to where this country needs expertise (see FCC statements in
> previous messages).

Can you talk? Can you do "hunt and peck" keyboarding? That takes care
of voice and keyboard modes. Tell me more about the areas where this
country needs expertise.

> > (snip) Additionally, nothing precludes anyone
> > from developing expertise though "where this
> > country needs expertise" hasn't been defined.
> > (snip)
>
> Morse code certainly isn't "where this country needs expertise" today.

I didn't write that it is. I pointed out that the 5 wpm test for HF
access doesn't preclude anyone from developing expertise in those murky
areas "where this country needs expertise".

Dave K8MN

4712. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-22 19:10:57 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031222141057.25517.00002949@mb-m15.aol.com>
Source record: 84240

In article <3FE72935.F4D597C4@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>Brian wrote:
>>
>> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
>news:<3FE4E004.6BC4A8AD@earthlink.net>...
>> > Brian wrote:
>> > >
>> > > N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in message
>news:<c2356669.0312190606.18645337@posting.google.com>...
>> >
>> > > > You're *assuming* that everyone who has an opinion on amateur radio
>> > > > policy issues is interested in amateur radio having the best possible
>> > > > future. And in most cases that's true - but not when Mr. Anderson is
>> > > > involved. His behavior here, and his comments to FCC, indicate that
>> > > > he's *not* interested in what's best for amateur radio. He's just
>> > > > interested in stirring up division, discord and hostility between
>> > > > amateurs, diverting them from other issues, and denying amateur
>> > > > traditions and contributions to society and the radio art.
>> > >
>> > > Inventive Licensing comes to mind as the big divider.
>> >
>> > You're probably right. Everyone who holds an amateur ticket likely had
>> > some incentive. Len had none.
>> >
>> > Dave K8MN
>>
>> Of course I'm right! ;^)
>>
>> Len, like any Americans who've shown an interest in the ARS, have a
>> disincentive. It is the Morse requirement for HF access.
>
>Your claim might ring true if Len had bothered to obtain a code-free
>ticket at some point. He hasn't.

Of whom are you speaking, old man?

I've had HF access several times in the last half century, all legal,
all involving actual communications. No amateur license was
required at any time. No morse skill needed whatsoever.

The discussion should be about the federal regulations for an amateur
radio license regulation, not the individual "motivations" of any
aspirant to an avocational radio activity.

You constantly insist on personalizing everything about those who do not share your holy and illustrious viewpoints. That is your problem and you continually foul this newsgroup with arrogant remarks against the person of those of opposite opinions. Not my problem but certainly yours in attitude.

Amateur radio is supposed to be a recreation, a fun activity involving radio, licensing required only because of physics of EM waves and federal regulation. Instead, you've turned it into a battleground of your own, arrogantly demanding adherence to your personal view-points. You join several others in here in so doing, some past, some present. That's counter to the original purpose of "the service," isn't it? Or is it?

Perhaps you embody modern amateur radio, a constant striving for leading the pack in competitive activity? A competition complete with taunts and jibes and outright insults against those who "challenge" your arrogant expertise? If so, there is no wonder that amateur radio has not increased in number commensurate with the growth in population.

Enjoy your little clique of morse code uber alles in amateur radio where the "bands" are only on HF. Feel superior that you've met all the criteria and standards established by long-gone amateurs of past times. You are important, superior, vital, and that is all that matters.

You should be demanding that ALL test for high rates of morse in order to become fully FDA licensed as a ham. Condemn all those who cannot learn, will not learn, nor share your opinions.

May Santa bring you an irrepairable intermittent in your favorite HF transceiver along with a truckload of dusty, high-sulphur-content coal in your stocking. Merry Christmas.

LHA

4713. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-22 19:10:58 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031222141058.25517.00002950@mb-m15.aol.com>
Source record: 84239

In article <3FE72B5B.D0D251F7@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>Brian wrote:
>
>> Steve, I think it has to do with the disincentive of Morse Code
>> testing. You might want to check with Len on this.
>
>You'll pardon our confusion. You've been acting as Len's representative
>for a few posts now in speaking of his motivations or lack thereof. I
>wasn't aware that you'd turned the controls over to him.

Brian Burke is not my "representative" nor am I his.

It is not my Life's Ambition to immortalize morse code as the
epitome of amateurism in an avocational radio activity.

Morse code skills are needed ONLY in amateur radio...according
to certain long-timers who have few other skills and ebody hatred
and bigotry against all on that one extremely important (to them)
skill in amateur radio.

If it is your purpose as a newsgroupie to spread malicious lies
about others, to challenge "motivations" of those not thinking as
your holiness does, then you are doing a fine job.

I am not "motivated" to love, honor, and cherish morse code as
the embodyment of expertise in radio of past times. Been in real
HF radio communications before most of these newsgroupies
were in existance...never used morse code, never had to...but
only as a professional, not as an amateur.

May the lump of coal in your stocking turn into a truckload of
dusty, high-sulphur-content carbon. Merry Christmas.

LHA

4714. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-22 19:10:59 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031222141059.25517.00002951@mb-m15.aol.com>
Source record: 84238

In article <QknFb.4023$Vv2.1145222@news1.news.adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo
<mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>
>> In article <20031220143404.01893.00002231@mb-m22.aol.com>,
>lenover21@aol.com
>> (Len Over 21) writes:

>>> As a single "authoritative voice," a New England membership
>>> group DEFINES everything in amateurism for all amateurs. No
>>> bickering, no dissension, no arguing. All do as They say.
>>> No problems. Everyone happy in Nirvana.
>>
>> Which group and which magazine? ham radio and 73 magazines were New England
>> based, but they're both defunct.
>>
>> Your description of a membership organization that does not tolerate dissent
>> sounds exactly like NoCode International. Right in their bylaws it says that
>> any member who publicly disagrees with their stated position on code testing
is
>> subject to expulsion. They also require that all members agree to their
prime
>> directive goal as a condition of membership. No one who disagrees with their
>> core policy can be a member of NoCode International.
>>
>> I'm not saying that's right or wrong, just stating facts.
>
> And now some puzzle pieces fit together. I can now reconcile Carl's
>vision of how leaders are supposed to lead and his organization. Strong
>leadership, independent from member opinion, and if you don't like it,
>you're out.

Jimmie isn't stating any "facts." He is simply manufacturing an
argument for the sake of something to argue about. SOP for Jimmie.
[he seems to need something, anything, to argue about every day]

No Code International is most of all a political special interest group.
It asks for no dues, does not demand a license of any kind in order
to belong.

Unlike the ARRL...which IS a dues-asking, amateur license required,
membership organization and political special interest group and a
publishing business, NCI does not pretend to represent "all" amateurs.

ARRL pretends to "represent all amateurs" yet they still haven't gotten close to a majority of all licensed U.S. amateurs to belong to them. They've not been able to do that for years past.

ARRL refuses to take a stand on code testing in the USA yet the International Amateur Radio Union long ago came out for eliminating the code test internationally. Once that happens, NCI has stated that it will dissolve, cease to exist as a special interest entity.

NCI is a very small group, has no law firm on retainer in DC, nor does it have another group on retainer to lobby the FCC. ARRL does. NCI directors get out and personally lobby for action on elimination of code testing, including all the way to Geneva and WRC-03...and not on a multi-million annual budget available to the ARRL.

ARRL is your shepherd, you shall not want...

Amen

LHA

4715. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-22 21:01:16 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <UrOdnWt2VL1LxnqiRVn-sQ@gbronline.com>
Source record: 84241

Kim W5TIT wrote:
> "JJ" <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
> news:Ab6dnfCtWoQbF3uiRVn-vA@gbronline.com...
>
>>Kim W5TIT wrote:
>>
>>
>>>"JJ" <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
>>>news:WPednYbUdZEv9XuiRVn-sQ@gbronline.com...
>>>
>>>
>>>>JJ wrote:
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>Kim W5TIT wrote:
>>>>
>>>>>>This violator isn't in denial at all. This violator is waiting for
>>>
>>>mere
>>>
>>>
>>>>>>words to turn into action...
>>>>>>
>>>>>>Kim W5TIT
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>So your mentality is, "until I am caught, I will continue to break the
>>>>>law." Do you speed throught school zones with that same attitude?
>>>>>
>>>>
>>>>I asked this question of another poster and got no answer, so I will ask
>>>>you Kimmygirl. What is the fast speed you can go in a 15 MPH school
>
> zone?
>
>>>
>>>JJ, this is probably the last response you'll ever see from me...because
>>>you're disrespectful, childish, and pretty darned assinine to boot.
>>
>>Like you haven't been. Must be hitting a nerve.
>>
>>

>>>The
>>>fastest someone could go through a 15 MPH school zone would be as fast
>
> as
>
>>>the vehicle can go. The fastest *I* would go in a 15 MPH school zone is
>>>about 12-13 MPH. Now, shrivel your dick up and go play with it
>
> somewhere
>
>>>else...
>>
>>I ask a valid question and here you fly off the handle and start with
>>the vulgar suggestions.
>>
>>Now to answer the question I ask of you and another poster. I don't know
>>about other states, but in Texas you can go only as fast as any other
>>vehicle in the zone at or below the posted limit. If another vehicle in
>>the zone is going 10 mph, then you may go no faster than that vehicle.
>>In other words, no passing in a school zone. If you are the only vehicle
>>in the zone, then what ever the limit is is valid unless unusual
>>conditions dictate otherwise.
>>
>
>
> Whoopee....so what does that have to do with anything that has been being
> discussed about multiple lane highway traffic and, specifically, traveling
> in the left-lane at above posted speed limits?
>
> What it took you several words to say is this: in Texas (at least) you may
> not pass another vehicle in an active school zone. So, genius, how 'bout ya
> explain where you were going with this? Oh forget it, I forgot you
> can't...never mind.
>
> Kim W5TIT

> JJ, this is probably the last response you'll ever see from me.

So much for that, and I really had my hopes up.

4716. Re: Here is TITSs Dream

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-22 21:02:52 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <UrOdnWp2VL3fwXqiRVn-sQ@gbronline.com>
Source record: 84242

WA8ULX wrote:

> Check out kk6nn on QRZ. This is what could have came of TIT if she would
> have become a REAL HAM. Notice She has an Advanced License, so she does know 13
> WPM
> KK6NN is the most positive reason for keeping CW

Would you expect someone who chooses a call sign suffix like TIT to
really have the brains to know CW?

4717. Re: Here is TITSs Dream

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-22 21:13:47 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031222161347.14429.00001415@mb-m14.aol.com>
Source record: 84243

>Would you expect someone who chooses a call sign suffix like TIT to
>really have the brains to know CW?
>

Of course not, shes just your typical CBplusser

4718. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-22 21:29:04 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0312221329.9c1e358@posting.google.com>
Source record: 84244

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20031221095915.12501.00004756@mb-m04.aol.com>...
> In article <f45722ac.0312200714.316470a0@posting.google.com>,
> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
>
> >N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in message
> >news:<c2356669.0312190606.18645337@posting.google.com>...
> > >
> > >
> > >> Ah, there's where your logic fails, Dave. You're working on a false
> > >> premise.
> > >>
> > >> You're *assuming* that everyone who has an opinion on amateur radio
> > >> policy issues is interested in amateur radio having the best possible
> > >> future. And in most cases that's true - but not when Mr. Anderson is
> > >> involved. His behavior here, and his comments to FCC, indicate that
> > >> he's *not* interested in what's best for amateur radio. He's just
> > >> interested in stirring up division, discord and hostility between
> > >> amateurs, diverting them from other issues, and denying amateur
> > >> traditions and contributions to society and the radio art.
> > >
> > >Inventive Licensing comes to mind as the big divider.
> >
> > What is "inventive licensing"?
> > >
> > >> Suppose someone really hated amateur radio and wanted to damage it as
> > >> much as possible without being obvious about what they were doing.
> > >>
> > >> Wouldn't one way to do that be to try to maximize internal bickering
> > >> and arguing among hams, thereby diverting them from useful discussion?
> > >
> > >One could propose to the FCC a licensing structure with multiple
> > >levels, multiple exams, and multiple privelege slices and power
> > >levels.
> > >
> > That was FCC's own idea. Goes back to at least 1936. Complain to FCC.

Jim, I can't complain back that far. See if Phil can do it - he can
complain back to the 13oo's.

4719. Re: Here is TITSs Dream

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-22 21:48:56 UTC
From: horseshoe7@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <5f4fe4c2.0312221348.379b8fab@posting.google.com>
Source record: 84245

wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) wrote in message
news:<20031222101240.11589.00000922@mb-m25.aol.com>...
> Check out kk6nn on QRZ. This is what could have came of TIT if she would
> have become a REAL HAM. Notice She has an Advanced License, so she does know 13
> WPM
> KK6NN is the most positive reason for keeping CW

Idiot!

She is a 435er, AND she hangs around with "Notorious 435ers":

http://www.qsl.net/k6pxa/couples.htm

It's likely she doesn't know a "beep" of CW!

- Stewart (N0MHS)
http://groups.yahoo.com/group/MURS-OPEN

4720. Re: Here is TITSs Dream

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-22 22:02:36 UTC
From: horseshoe7@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <5f4fe4c2.0312221402.59016542@posting.google.com>
Source record: 84246

wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) wrote in message
news:<20031222101240.11589.00000922@mb-m25.aol.com>...
> Check out kk6nn on QRZ. This is what could have came of TIT if she would
> have become a REAL HAM. Notice She has an Advanced License, so she does know 13
> WPM
> KK6NN is the most positive reason for keeping CW

Here she is again, in the same dress (but not such a hot angle), and
taken by ANOTHER 435er:

http://www.qsl.net/k6pxa/janet.htm

She knows CW, eh? My ass.

BTW, Richard Burton now frequents 151.820Mhz in SoCal, I talk to him
sometimes from San Diego using my beam on MURS... all on the up and
up.

- Stewart
http://groups.yahoo.com/group/MURS-OPEN

4721. Re: Here is TITSs Dream

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-22 22:27:31 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031222172731.15295.00001373@mb-m12.aol.com>
Source record: 84247

>It's likely she doesn't know a "beep" of CW!

Oh but she does, she holds an ADANCED

4722. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-22 22:59:36 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3FE7770B.E0737CAF@earthlink.net>
Source record: 84248

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3FE72935.F4D597C4@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >Brian wrote:
> >>
> >> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> >news:<3FE4E004.6BC4A8AD@earthlink.net>...
> >> > Brian wrote:
> >> > >
> >> > > N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in message
> >news:<c2356669.0312190606.18645337@posting.google.com>...
> >> > >
> >> > > > You're *assuming* that everyone who has an opinion on amateur radio
> >> > > > policy issues is interested in amateur radio having the best possible
> >> > > > future. And in most cases that's true - but not when Mr. Anderson is
> >> > > > involved. His behavior here, and his comments to FCC, indicate that
> >> > > > he's *not* interested in what's best for amateur radio. He's just
> >> > > > interested in stirring up division, discord and hostility between
> >> > > > amateurs, diverting them from other issues, and denying amateur
> >> > > > traditions and contributions to society and the radio art.
> >> > > >
> >> > > Inventive Licensing comes to mind as the big divider.
> >> > >
> >> > You're probably right. Everyone who holds an amateur ticket likely had
> >> > some incentive. Len had none.

> >> Of course I'm right! ;^)
> >>
> >> Len, like any Americans who've shown an interest in the ARS, have a
> >> disincentive. It is the Morse requirement for HF access.
> >>
> >Your claim might ring true if Len had bothered to obtain a code-free
> >ticket at some point. He hasn't.
>
> Of whom are you speaking, old man?

Your name is Len, isn't it, grizzled older man?

> I've had HF access several times in the last half century, all legal,
> all involving actual communications. No amateur license was
> required at any time. No morse skill needed whatsoever.

Your memory must be failing in your dotage. Amateur radio is the topic.
Your HF access of the past isn't an issue this time around.

> The discussion should be about the federal regulations for an amateur
> radio license regulation, not the individual "motivations" of any
> aspirant to an avocational radio activity.

Maybe you feel that's what it should be about....but it isn't.

> You constantly insist on personalizing everything about those who do
> not share your holy and illustrious viewpoints.

I neither do it constantly nor with all others. You personalize many
discussions here. How do you explain that away?

> That is your problem
> and you continually foul this newsgroup with arrogant remarks against
> the person of those of opposite opinions. Not my problem but
> certainly yours in attitude.

It doesn't seem to be a problem for me, Len. At the moment, judging
from your reply, it is one for you. Deal with it.

> Amateur radio is supposed to be a recreation, a fun activity involving
> radio, licensing required only because of physics of EM waves and
> federal regulation.

It is all of that and more, old gent.

> Instead, you've turned it into a battleground of
> your own, arrogantly demanding adherence to your personal view-
> points.

No, I've not turned amateur radio into any battlegrounds nor did I note
your presence on any of the ham bands this past week.

> You join several others in here in so doing, some past, some
> present. That's counter to the original purpose of "the service," isn't
> it? Or is it?

Are you confusing amateur radio with this newsgroup? Is it your opinion
that I'm required to quietly accept your guff?

> Perhaps you embody modern amateur radio, a constant striving for
> leading the pack in competitive activity? A competition complete
> with taunts and jibes and outright insults against those who
> "challenge" your arrogant expertise? If so, there is no wonder that
> amateur radio has not increased in number commensurate with
> the growth in population.

Well, old chap, it looks as if you're wrong in your assumptions yet
again. It is a cinch that you don't embody any of amateur radio--past,
present or future. That hasn't stopped you from doing the very things
of which you accuse others. You are--what is it you call
it?..."beligerant" toward radio amateurs who tire of your tales of life
at ADA a half century ago.

> Enjoy your little clique of morse code uber alles in amateur radio
> where the "bands" are only on HF. Feel superior that you've met all
> the criteria and standards established by long-gone amateurs of past
> times. You are important, superior, vital, and that is all that matters.

I enjoy morse code, SSB, FM, RTTY, Pactor and several other modes on MW,
HF, VHF and UHF. My "little clique" numbers hundreds of thousands in
this country alone. I haven't noted your presence.

> You should be demanding that ALL test for high rates of morse in
> order to become fully FDA licensed as a ham. Condemn all those
> who cannot learn, will not learn, nor share your opinions.

Morse or no morse, consider yourself condemned.

> May Santa bring you an irrepairable intermittent in your favorite HF
> transceiver along with a truckload of dusty, high-sulphur-content
> coal in your stocking. Merry Christmas.

Do you really know of any irrepairable intermittents? I have no need of
the coal. I heat with gas. Come to think of it, I'd gather from the
length of your pontifications that you do too.

Dave K8MN

4723. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-22 23:09:36 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3FE77964.F92357C0@earthlink.net>
Source record: 84249

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3FE72B5B.D0D251F7@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >Brian wrote:
> >
> >> Steve, I think it has to do with the disincentive of Morse Code
> >> testing. You might want to check with Len on this.
> >
> >You'll pardon our confusion. You've been acting as Len's representative
> >for a few posts now in speaking of his motivations or lack thereof. I
> >wasn't aware that you'd turned the controls over to him.
>
> Brian Burke is not my "representative" nor am I his.

You'll likely want to straighten the lad out then, Leonard. He has been
speaking for you of late.

> It is not my Life's Ambition to immortalize morse code as the
> epitome of amateurism in an avocational radio activity.

I'll mark that down as yet another of things we know are not your life's
ambition. It'll be listed right under "amateur radio license".

> Morse code skills are needed ONLY in amateur radio...

...then it is one of those things which shouldn't bother you in the
least.

> according
> to certain long-timers who have few other skills and ebody hatred
> and bigotry against all on that one extremely important (to them)
> skill in amateur radio.

I have lots of amateur radio skills, Len. Morse code proficiency is but
one of them. I use other modes and often QSO those amateurs who have no
HF access at all.

> If it is your purpose as a newsgroupie to spread malicious lies
> about others, to challenge "motivations" of those not thinking as
> your holiness does, then you are doing a fine job.

Please tell us what you view as an example of a malicious lie which has
been spread about you, Leonard. It can't be about your lack of
motivation toward obtaining an amateur radio license. You've declared a
decades-long interest. You bragged that you'd get an "Extra right out

of the box". A code-free exam has been available for a number of years.
Straighten us out.

> I am not "motivated" to love, honor, and cherish morse code as
> the embodyment of expertise in radio of past times. Been in real
> HF radio communications before most of these newsgroupies
> were in existance...never used morse code, never had to...but
> only as a professional, not as an amateur.

I've pointed out the availability of a code-free license which provides
access to the VHF/UHF frequencies which you say are the new frontier.
Your motivation hasn't extended to obtaining one of those. You have no
incentive for overcoming your inertia.

Dave K8MN

4724. Re: K1MAN

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-22 23:36:31 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <3eLFb.9608$wL6.1584@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 84250

I would assume so. But why would one want to do that to W1AW? Oh...I get
it...you think they do the same thing, right? Wrong. Go listen to both of
them. Tell me which one is doing HAM RADIO STUFF, and which isn't.

Dan/W4NTI

"me" <yo@here.com> wrote in message
news:OasFb.4453$IM3.303@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> Would that work with W1AW, also?
>
>
> ==============================
> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
> news:e1pFb.4135$IM3.3880@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> >
> > "Nobody You Know" <ycthulhu@aol.complex> wrote in message
> > news:20031220224708.09506.00001351@mb-m17.aol.com...
> > > groupk0hb@earthlink.net wrote:
> > >
> > > >
> > > >
> > > >I have no love for the antics of K1MAN, but 4.7 khz is enough room to
> put
> > 2
> > > > >QSO's with modern 2.1 or 2.4 khz filters. If you can't separate two
> > > > >stations almost 5 khz apart, then you need remedial tuning training.
> > > > >
> > > > >73, de Hans, K0HB
> > > > >
> > > >
> > > >
> > > Oh man, I'm sorry. I really messed up my original posting. K1MAN
opened
> up
> > on
> > > > 3977.3 khz, only 400 cycles away from the ARUFON net on 3977.7 khz.
> > > >
> > > > NOW do you see my point?
> > > >
> > > >
> > > >
> > > >
> > > > --
> > > > Nations are like leaves; they change color before they fall.
> > > > --

> >
> > Thats not possible. According to MAN he listened on that frequency for
> > months and quote "never heard a thing", of course he IS in Maine.
> >
> > What you do is this;
> >
> > Record it.
> >
> > Sign a statement of complaint and mail it to Riley Hollingsworth.
> >
> > His e-mail is RHOLLING@fcc.gov
> >
> >
> > Dan/W4NTI
> >
> >
>
>

4725. Re: Here is TITSs Dream

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-22 23:40:58 UTC
From: bark@the.moon.com
Message-ID: <bs7vea01si8@enews4.newsguy.com>
Source record: 84303

In article <20031222101240.11589.00000922@mb-m25.aol.com>, wa8ulx@aol.com says...
>
> Check out kk6nn on QRZ. This is what could have came of TIT if she would
>have become a REAL HAM. Notice She has an Advanced License, so she does know 13
>WPM
> KK6NN is the most positive reason for keeping CW

I'll take Mandy at www.mandysplayhouse.com

One look at Mandy, and I GUARANTEE you will be in love! You'll swear off those skinny, scrawny, anorexic, skank hos for good, ham license or not. CB plusser or not.

4726. Re: New General

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-22 23:42:43 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <TjLFb.9618$wL6.7191@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 84301

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:VUsFb.17923$P%1.16619948@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
>
> "Greg Doughty" <nightowls627@aol.comnojunk> wrote in message
> news:20031221193803.26083.00001548@mb-m06.aol.com...
> > Wow! Thanks so much for the support. I thought I would get some
negative
> > feedback but you guys are awesome. As far as setting up times, my
> daughter is
> > usually in bed by about 9pm. I get nervous though. That is what blew
it
> the
> > first time I took the code. It's funny too, I find it difficult to send
> as
> > well, but I read a lot about how people find sending easier than
> receiving. I
> > actually have to write down what I want to send before I do it. Oh
well,
> > practice makes perfect!!!
> >
> >
> > 73
> > Greg
> > ki4bbl@arrl.net
>
> That's because we've all been there and done that. Early on I had a real
> old-timer answer me and he must have been going at least 35wpm, probably
> been doing code since radio began. After several requests, he got down to
> what I could handle, about 10wpm, and stayed with me for a few minutes and
> then gracefully said goodbye. I sensed that going so slow was a strain
for
> him but he still was willing to spend a few minutes with me.
>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>

It really is difficult for those able to copy above 30 wpm to slow down to
ten. Its not a macho thing, really.

Also now a days many folks use puters to send and readers to copy. Ive been
answered by someone going 20 when I called at 40 and they copied just fine,
and no ask for a QRS.

But, what I do is slow down if answered by someone slower than I was
sending. I feel that is courtesy and good operating practice.

Also be aware that this time of year the low bands are skipping out like crazy. If your too close together you may not hear each other at night.

Dan/W4NTI

4727. Re: New General

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-22 23:44:50 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <SILFb.9619$wL6.2451@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 84302

"VA7LNX" <spamtrap@gwsn.com> wrote in message
news:mPrFb.774519$6C4.748277@pd7tw1no...
> K�HB wrote:
>
> >
> > "G. Doughty" <nightowls627@aol.comnojunk> wrote
> >
> >> Anyone out there that tried a contact
> >> with me, sorry. I was forever putting out QRS
> >> and still not getting it all. I will be back though as I
> >> cannot use phone when the baby is sleeping. The light
> >> *tick-ticking* on the straight key doesn't disturb her
> >> as much as me talking.
> >
> > Next time you get the courage to fire up on the air, go to a frequency
at
> > the lower part of most bands ending in "58" like 3558, 7058, 14058, or
> > 21058. Usually you can find people there looking for slower Morse.
> >
> > 73, de Hans, K0HB
>
> speaking of bands, what's a good band to start on for CW.
>
> --
> Donovan Hill
> VA7LNX (Basic, Advanced)

40 is decent during the day, with 80 good at night, especially in the
winter months.

20 can be good, but you will run into dxers and such more often.

Dan/W4NTI

4728. Re: New General

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-23 00:15:08 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <gOLFb.18145$P%1.16802575@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 84304

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:TjLFb.9618$wL6.7191@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
>
> "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
> news:VUsFb.17923$P%1.16619948@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
> >
> > "Greg Doughty" <nightowls627@aol.comnojunk> wrote in message
> > news:20031221193803.26083.00001548@mb-m06.aol.com...
> > > Wow! Thanks so much for the support. I thought I would get some
> negative
> > > feedback but you guys are awesome. As far as setting up times, my
> > daughter is
> > > usually in bed by about 9pm. I get nervous though. That is what blew
> it
> > the
> > > first time I took the code. It's funny too, I find it difficult to
send
> > as
> > > well, but I read a lot about how people find sending easier than
> > receiving. I
> > > actually have to write down what I want to send before I do it. Oh
> well,
> > > practice makes perfect!!!
> > >
> > >
> > > 73
> > > Greg
> > > ki4bbl@arrl.net
> >
> > That's because we've all been there and done that. Early on I had a
real
> > old-timer answer me and he must have been going at least 35wpm, probably
> > been doing code since radio began. After several requests, he got down
to
> > what I could handle, about 10wpm, and stayed with me for a few minutes
and
> > then gracefully said goodbye. I sensed that going so slow was a strain
> for
> > him but he still was willing to spend a few minutes with me.
> >
> > Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
> >
>
> It really is difficult for those able to copy above 30 wpm to slow down to

> ten. Its not a macho thing, really.
>
> Also now a days many folks use puters to send and readers to copy. Ive
been
> answered by someone going 20 when I called at 40 and they copied just
fine,
> and no ask for a QRS.
>
> But, what I do is slow down if answered by someone slower than I was
> sending. I feel that is courtesy and good operating practice.
>
> Also be aware that this time of year the low bands are skipping out like
> crazy. If your too close together you may not hear each other at night.
>
> Dan/W4NTI
>
>

Well in a contest, I've answered those going faster than I can without expecting them to slow down as I've generally got the info by listening through their response several times before I throw in my call. However I'm relieved when they do slow down automatically as then I can verify what I have when they answer.

I personally do not use a code reader as that limits me to answering stations only when conditions are good, the signal is loud and the sending consists of nearly perfectly formed code. I've worked stations in contests that were so faint that I wasn't sure they got the exchange until they sent the "TU". Another time, I was one of the operators at a special event station and conditions were bad but several stations contacted us on CW and I'm quite sure that a code reader would have failed as the static was high and the signals distorted. One guy even sent us a thank you for working so hard to copy him. He really wanted to make the contact as he was a Civil War buff and we were commemorating the first Medal of Honor and it's winner. I happened to be the one to work him and it meant a lot that he enclosed the special thank you note.

Now when conditions are right for a code reader to work, yes, it beats me hands down. But when conditions are less than ideal, I find that I do a better job even though I don't work code enough to be really good at it.

For casual conversation instead of contesting, I'll need the other station to slow down. 15 wpm is my comfort level as more than that I have a tough time writing that fast (I'm working on head copy but that will take awhile yet).

So Dan, if you come across me on the bands, slow down to my speed as I don't and won't use a code reader. Maybe someday, I'll finally be good at it.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

4729. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-23 00:21:58 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0312221621.43e11b14@posting.google.com>
Source record: 84305

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3FE72B5B.D0D251F7@earthlink.net>...
> Brian wrote:
>
> > Steve, I think it has to do with the disincentive of Morse Code
> > testing. You might want to check with Len on this.
>
>
> You'll pardon our confusion.

Our confusion? Do you have a Frenchman in your pocket?

You've been acting as Len's representative
> for a few posts now in speaking of his motivations or lack thereof. I
> wasn't aware that you'd turned the controls over to him.
>
> Dave K8MN

I haven't.

4730. Re: Here is TITSs Dream

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-23 00:43:30 UTC
From: Santa Ham <sh@sandahamnet.net>
Message-ID: <bs833jqhd0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 84306

"JJ" <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
news:UrOdnWp2VL3fwXqiRVn-sQ@gbronline.com...
> WA8ULX wrote:
>
> > Check out kk6nn on QRZ. This is what could have came of TIT if she
would
> > have become a REAL HAM. Notice She has an Advanced License, so she does
know 13
> > WPM
> > KK6NN is the most positive reason for keeping CW
>
> Would you expect someone who chooses a call sign suffix like TIT to
> really have the brains to know CW?
>

Would you expect kk6nn to give the time of day to the pot-bellied old men
in r.r.a.p. who have no life other than seeing who can be the bigger teller
of tall tales about how important they were in their former career and/or
how
important they are now?

Santa Ham

4731. Re: Here is TITSs Dream

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-23 01:22:09 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bs8e9e$6t7@library2.airnews.net>
Source record: 84321

"stewart" <horseshoe7@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:5f4fe4c2.0312221402.59016542@posting.google.com...
> wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) wrote in message
news:<20031222101240.11589.00000922@mb-m25.aol.com>...
> > Check out kk6nn on QRZ. This is what could have came of TIT if she
would
> > have become a REAL HAM. Notice She has an Advanced License, so she does
know 13
> > WPM
> > KK6NN is the most positive reason for keeping CW
>
> Here she is again, in the same dress (but not such a hot angle), and
> taken by ANOTHER 435er:
>
> http://www.qsl.net/k6pxa/janet.htm
>
> She knows CW, eh? My ass.
>
> BTW, Richard Burton now frequents 151.820Mhz in SoCal, I talk to him
> sometimes from San Diego using my beam on MURS... all on the up and
> up.
>
> - Stewart
> http://groups.yahoo.com/group/MURS-OPEN

Hmmm, not sure how this thread got titled "TITSs Dream," but that chic ain't
me...thank goodness...!! I mean, great for her and all, but my dream is
being me...and I live it every day! Is she your daughter, Stew? Ooops,
well, wait a minute...maybe wife?

Kim W5TIT

4732. Re: Here is TITSs Dream

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-23 01:24:38 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bs8e9f$6t7@library2.airnews.net>
Source record: 84322

"Santa Ham" <sh@sandahamnet.net> wrote in message
news:bs833jqhd0@pita.alt.net...
>
> "JJ" <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
> news:UrOdnWp2VL3fwXqiRVn-sQ@gbronline.com...
> > WA8ULX wrote:
> >
> > > Check out kk6nn on QRZ. This is what could have came of TIT if she
> would
> > > have become a REAL HAM. Notice She has an Advanced License, so she
does
> know 13
> > > WPM
> > > KK6NN is the most positive reason for keeping CW
> >
> > Would you expect someone who chooses a call sign suffix like TIT to
> > really have the brains to know CW?
> >
>
> Would you expect kk6nn to give the time of day to the pot-bellied old men
> in r.r.a.p. who have no life other than seeing who can be the bigger
teller
> of tall tales about how important they were in their former career and/or
> how
> important they are now?
>
> Santa Ham
>

Oh, so she's not real friendly?

Kim W5TIT

4733. Re: New General

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-23 01:30:20 UTC
From: wb0mbi@wmconnect.comnojunk
Message-ID: <20031222203020.21882.00000690@mb-m19.wmconnect.com>
Source record: 84307

Hey Greg, I know the stagefright thing. I passed my 5 wpm many years ago. Wasn t good enough to pass 13 to get My General in '76. Dropped out of ham pretty much until 2001. Got into SSB at first and late last year regained my interest in CW. I am still trying to break the barrier of 13 wpm but can t copy it on paper. Download the Koch Software Program by G4FON. It will play text on random characters from your computer. Read the free book on CW by N0HFF. Downloadable in pdf format. I am using the 200 most common words and playing them alternatively at 15 and 20 WPM. I use CW Morse to convert to wav files and record them on cd. At first 20 wpm was a total blur. Now I can pick up about half the words at 20 wpm.
Some of the experts say not to pick up a key until you can copy 13 wpm. That may be true.
My goal is to copy CW faster than I can send it. Listen to code faster than what you can currently copy. The best challenge is the OM who sends a couple of words per minute more than I am comfortable with. There is an order to the progression of a qso, so it's relatively easy to pick up name, qth, signal, rig, etc

Have fun learning 73's
Jerry

4734. Re: K1MAN

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-23 01:52:59 UTC
From: me <yo@here.com>
Message-ID: <%dNFb.5521$IM3.1220@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 84308

Sorry, but the point is W1AW, just like K1MAN, starts transmitting on top of existing QSOs.

Neither moves up or down frequency to avoid causing interference.

==========
"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message news:3eLFb.9608$wL6.1584@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> I would assume so. But why would one want to do that to W1AW? Oh...I get
> it...you think they do the same thing, right? Wrong. Go listen to both of
> them. Tell me which one is doing HAM RADIO STUFF, and which isn't.
>
> Dan/W4NTI
>
>
>
> "me" <yo@here.com> wrote in message
> news:OasFb.4453$IM3.303@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> > Would that work with W1AW, also?
> >
> >
> > ==========
> > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
> > news:e1pFb.4135$IM3.3880@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> > >
> > > "Nobody You Know" <ycthulhu@aol.complex> wrote in message
> > > news:20031220224708.09506.00001351@mb-m17.aol.com...
> > > > groupk0hb@earthlink.net wrote:
> > > >
> > > > >
> > > > >
> > > > >I have no love for the antics of K1MAN, but 4.7 khz is enough room to
> > put
> > > 2
> > > > >QSO's with modern 2.1 or 2.4 khz filters. If you can't separate two
> > > > >stations almost 5 khz apart, then you need remedial tuning training.
> > > > >
> > > > >73, de Hans, K0HB
> > > > >
> > > >
> > >
> >

> > > > Oh man, I'm sorry. I really messed up my original posting. K1MAN
> opened
> > up
> > > on
> > > > 3977.3 khz, only 400 cycles away from the ARUFON net on 3977.7 khz.
> > > >
> > > > NOW do you see my point?
> > > >
> > > >
> > > >
> > > >
> > > > --
> > > > Nations are like leaves; they change color before they fall.
> > > > --
> > >
> > > Thats not possible. According to MAN he listened on that frequency
for
> > > months and quote "never heard a thing", of course he IS in Maine.
> > >
> > > What you do is this;
> > >
> > > Record it.
> > >
> > > Sign a statement of complaint and mail it to Riley Hollingsworth.
> > >
> > > His e-mail is RHOLLING@fcc.gov
> > >
> > >
> > > Dan/W4NTI
> > >
> > >
> >
> >
>
>

4735. Re: Here is TITSs Dream

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-23 02:18:01 UTC
From: horseshoe7@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <5f4fe4c2.0312221818.6a8c8e44@posting.google.com>
Source record: 84309

wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) wrote in message
news:<20031222172731.15295.00001373@mb-m12.aol.com>...
> >It's likely she doesn't know a "beep" of CW!
>
> Oh but she does, she holds an ADANCED

What does that have to do with the price of tea in China?

Can you say "Medical Waiver", or even "The fix is in"? With 435ers, I can believe ANYTHING... EXCEPT that leggy big-busted California blondes would bother to take the time to PRACTICE in order to pass a 13WPM Morris Code exam. Fat, out-of-shape slobs, yes -- hot blondes, no.

435ers are FAMOUS for breaking the rules... their HERO, Richard Burton, is the only ham to ever get thrown in the clink for FCC-related violations.

Sorry to ruin your fantasy.

- Stewart (n0mhs)
http://groups.yahoo.com/group/MURS-OPEN

4736. Re: K1MAN

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-23 02:21:47 UTC
From: Alun <alun@1stcounsel.com>
Message-ID: <Xns9459D94DE35D2elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 84310

"me" <yo@here.com> wrote in
news:%dNFb.5521$IM3.1220@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net:

> Sorry, but the point is W1AW, just like K1MAN, starts transmitting on
> top of existing QSOs.
>
> Neither moves up or down frequency to avoid causing interference.
>
> ==========
> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
> news:3eLFb.9608$wL6.1584@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
>> I would assume so. But why would one want to do that to W1AW? Oh...I
>> get it...you think they do the same thing, right? Wrong. Go listen
>> to both of them. Tell me which one is doing HAM RADIO STUFF, and
>> which isn't.
>>
>> Dan/W4NTI
>>
>>
>>
>> "me" <yo@here.com> wrote in message
>> news:OasFb.4453$IM3.303@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net...
>> > Would that work with W1AW, also?
>> >
>> >
>> > ==========
>> > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
>> > news:e1pFb.4135$IM3.3880@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net...
>> > >
>> > > "Nobody You Know" <ycthulhu@aol.complex> wrote in message
>> > > news:20031220224708.09506.00001351@mb-m17.aol.com...
>> > > > groupk0hb@earthlink.net wrote:
>> > > >
>> > > > >
>> > > > >
>> > > > >
>> > > > >I have no love for the antics of K1MAN, but 4.7 khz is enough
>> > > > >room to put 2 QSO's with modern 2.1 or 2.4 khz filters. If you
>> > > > >can't separate two stations almost 5 khz apart, then you need
>> > > > >remedial tuning training.
>> > > > >
>> > > > >73, de Hans, K0HB
>> > > > >
>> > > >
>> > > >

>> > > > Oh man, I'm sorry. I really messed up my original posting. K1MAN
>> > > > opened up on 3977.3 khz, only 400 cycles away from the ARUFON
>> > > > net on 3977.7 khz.
>> > > >
>> > > > NOW do you see my point?
>> > > >
>> > > >
>> > > >
>> > > >
>> > > > --
>> > > > Nations are like leaves; they change color before they fall.
>> > > > --
>> > >
>> > > Thats not possible. According to MAN he listened on that
>> > > frequency for months and quote "never heard a thing", of course
>> > > he IS in Maine.
>> > >
>> > > What you do is this;
>> > >
>> > > Record it.
>> > >
>> > > Sign a statement of complaint and mail it to Riley Hollingsworth.
>> > >
>> > > His e-mail is RHOLLING@fcc.gov
>> > >
>> > >
>> > > Dan/W4NTI
>> > >
>> > >
>> >
>> >
>>
>>
>
>
>

Exactly right. As a non-member of ARRL, I think you have to let K1MAN do
everything they do, or stop them both, and I don't advocate the latter.

4737. Re: Here is TITSs Dream

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-23 02:25:57 UTC
From: Alun <alun@1stcounsel.com>
Message-ID: <Xns9459DA030A75Felektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 84311

JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in
news:UrOdnWp2VL3fwXqiRVn-sQ@gbronline.com:

> WA8ULX wrote:
>
>> Check out kk6nn on QRZ. This is what could have came of TIT if she
>> would
>> have become a REAL HAM. Notice She has an Advanced License, so she
>> does know 13 WPM
>> KK6NN is the most positive reason for keeping CW
>
> Would you expect someone who chooses a call sign suffix like TIT to
> really have the brains to know CW?
>

Whatever it takes to learn CW, it sure isn't brains, and whatever you
think of Kim's callsign, she shows more intelligence than you guys.

4738. Re: K1MAN

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-23 02:28:07 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <XKNFb.18166$P%1.16828550@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 84312

"Alun" <alun@1stcounsel.com> wrote in message
news:Xns9459D94DE35D2elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
> "me" <yo@here.com> wrote in
> news:%dNFb.5521$IM3.1220@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net:
>
> > Sorry, but the point is W1AW, just like K1MAN, starts transmitting on
> > top of existing QSOs.
> >
> > Neither moves up or down frequency to avoid causing interference.
> >
> > ==========
> > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
> > news:3eLFb.9608$wL6.1584@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> >> I would assume so. But why would one want to do that to W1AW? Oh...I
> >> get it...you think they do the same thing, right? Wrong. Go listen
> >> to both of them. Tell me which one is doing HAM RADIO STUFF, and
> >> which isn't.
> >>
> >> Dan/W4NTI
> >>
> >>
> >>
> >> "me" <yo@here.com> wrote in message
> >> news:OasFb.4453$IM3.303@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> >> > Would that work with W1AW, also?
> >> >
> >> >
> >> > ==========
> >> > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
> >> > news:e1pFb.4135$IM3.3880@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> >> > >
> >> > > "Nobody You Know" <ycthulhu@aol.complex> wrote in message
> >> > > news:20031220224708.09506.00001351@mb-m17.aol.com...
> >> > > > groupk0hb@earthlink.net wrote:
> >> > > >
> >> > > > >
> >> > > > > >
> >> > > > > >I have no love for the antics of K1MAN, but 4.7 khz is enough
> >> > > > > >room to put 2 QSO's with modern 2.1 or 2.4 khz filters. If you
> >> > > > > >can't separate two stations almost 5 khz apart, then you need
> >> > > > > >remedial tuning training.
> >> > > > > >
> >> > > > > >73, de Hans, K0HB
> >> > > > > >

> >> > > >
> >> > > >
> >> > > > Oh man, I'm sorry. I really messed up my original posting. K1MAN
> >> > > > opened up on 3977.3 khz, only 400 cycles away from the ARUFON
> >> > > > net on 3977.7 khz.
> >> > > >
> >> > > > NOW do you see my point?
> >> > > >
> >> > > >
> >> > > >
> >> > > >
> >> > > > --
> >> > > > Nations are like leaves; they change color before they fall.
> >> > > > --
> >> > >
> >> > > Thats not possible. According to MAN he listened on that
> >> > > frequency for months and quote "never heard a thing", of course
> >> > > he IS in Maine.
> >> > >
> >> > > What you do is this;
> >> > >
> >> > > Record it.
> >> > >
> >> > > Sign a statement of complaint and mail it to Riley Hollingsworth.
> >> > >
> >> > > His e-mail is RHOLLING@fcc.gov
> >> > >
> >> > >
> >> > > Dan/W4NTI
> >> > >
> >> > >
> >> >
> >> >
> >>
> >>
> >
> >
> >
>
> Exactly right. As a non-member of ARRL, I think you have to let K1MAN do
> everything they do, or stop them both, and I don't advocate the latter.

Much of K1MAN's transmission are not ham related. This is a violation of
the rules. It is not at all the same thing that W1AW does.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

4739. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-23 02:44:31 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0312221844.56b4e396@posting.google.com>
Source record: 84313

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3FE3BB6B.6060946A@earthlink.net>...
> Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> > ...Your beligerance keeps on.
>
> > Yup, beligerance with flags...
>
> > You are beligerant and pissed off...
>
> Once could be a typo. Three would be one of your "Atila" gaffes.
> "Belligerent", Len. I thought you were a professional writer.
>
> Dave K8MN

You must be a professional Righter.

Get to work on Bruice/WA8ULX.

4740. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-23 02:45:54 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0312221845.1655295d@posting.google.com>
Source record: 84314

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3FE1E206.783CF499@earthlink.net>...
> Len Over 21 wrote:
> >
> > In article <brpfap$1gm@library1.airnews.net>, "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
> > writes:
> >
> > >> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
> > >>
> > >> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
> > >>
> > >
> > >psssst, I think Len is superior at pulling Dave's strings...
> >
> > Shhhh...don't tell anybody... :-) :-) :-)
>
> Is this the part where you make me one of your playthings or have me
> fall into one of your carefully laid snares, Len?

And he has arrived. Congratulations Dave.

4741. Re: Here is TITSs Dream

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-23 02:50:58 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0312221850.74ce5e8f@posting.google.com>
Source record: 84315

wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) wrote in message
news:<20031222101240.11589.00000922@mb-m25.aol.com>...
> Check out kk6nn on QRZ. This is what could have came of TIT if she would
> have become a REAL HAM. Notice She has an Advanced License, so she does know 13
> WPM
> KK6NN is the most positive reason for keeping CW

Guarantee you that Kim smoked her at 20.

4742. Re: New General

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-23 03:03:54 UTC
From: nightowls627@aol.comnojunk
Message-ID: <20031222220354.12262.00001672@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 84316

Very cool! I am now listening more than ever. I will occassionally go onto an open freq and send CQ just to see if I can pick up a slow contact. But I send s l o w. Great advice though about progression- What would cw be to me if I just kept trying to find folks with 5wpm . . . I would always be at 5wpm! I really appreciate the kind words.

Thanks
73
Greg
ki4bbl@arrl.net

4743. Re: K1MAN

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-23 03:19:36 UTC
From: Santa Ham <sh@sandahamnet.net>
Message-ID: <bs8c89bgc0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 84317

I love watching the way MAN gets all you old has been
ham radio ops stirred up to the point where you are
slobbering all over yourselves and your microphones!

Santa Ham

"Nobody You Know" <ycthulhu@aol.complex> wrote in message
news:20031220220011.09506.00001341@mb-m17.aol.com...
> Sometimes I listen to the ARUFON (UFO) Net on 3977.7, as I did tonight.
But lo
> and behold, guess who's planted his fat ass on 3973.0? K1MAN ! The UFO net
had
> already started and K1MAN just opens up 4 khz away without any regard to
> ongoing QSOs.
>
> Where the hell is the FCC? Why is K1MAN still on the air?
>
>
>
> ----------
> Nations are like leaves; they change color before they fall.
> ----------

4744. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-23 03:21:09 UTC
From: Santa Ham <sh@sandahamnet.net>
Message-ID: <bs8cb7blt0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 84318
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.cb

K1MAN has done more good for ham radio in one year
than the ARRL has done in its entire life!

Santa Ham

4745. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-23 03:26:41 UTC
From: Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com>
Message-ID: <20031222222641.929$bk@newsreader.com>
Source record: 84319
Cross-posted to: alt.dogie.is.an.idiot,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.cb

"Santa Ham" <sh@sandahamnet.net> wrote:
> K1MAN has done more good for ham radio in one year
> than the ARRL has done in its entire life!
>
> Santa Ham
>
Who cares in rec.radio cb?

4746. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-23 03:50:48 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <sYOFb.5722$IM3.4199@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 84320

"JJ" wrote:
>
> (snip) You remind me of the blond gal
> that collasped on the sidewalk. Several
> came to her aid and someone noticed
> she was wearing earphones attatched
> to a small cd player. In the process of
> attempting to help her the earphones
> were removed and she suddenly expired.
> Someone picked up the earphones to
> see what she was listening to and heard,
> "breath in...breath out...breath in...
> breath out."

My wife and I both had a good laugh over that, JJ. Not necessarily at Kim's expense, just blonds in general. Thanks.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

4747. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-23 03:55:53 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3FE7BCC5.8C7111AE@earthlink.net>
Source record: 84323

Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3FE72B5B.D0D251F7@earthlink.net>...
> > Brian wrote:
> >
> > > Steve, I think it has to do with the disincentive of Morse Code
> > > testing. You might want to check with Len on this.
> >
> >
> > You'll pardon our confusion.

> Our confusion? Do you have a Frenchman in your pocket?

Our confusion--Steve's and mine. Steve wrote (and you snipped):

"Lennie's "disincentive" had/has NOTHING to do with Morse Code,
Brain...It has to do with having absolutely NO understanding of what
Amateur Radio is all about, what it's purpose and capabilities are, and
what it means to be a 'part' of something."

> You've been acting as Len's representative
> > for a few posts now in speaking of his motivations or lack thereof. I
> > wasn't aware that you'd turned the controls over to him.

> I haven't.

Someone should tell you that he's busy writing his own views on the
subject...in a way.

Dave K8MN

4748. Re: Here is TITSs Dream

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-23 03:58:02 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bs8egn$7o9@library2.airnews.net>
Source record: 84324

"Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
news:f45722ac.0312221850.74ce5e8f@posting.google.com...
> wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) wrote in message
news:<20031222101240.11589.00000922@mb-m25.aol.com>...
> > Check out kk6nn on QRZ. This is what could have came of TIT if she
would
> > have become a REAL HAM. Notice She has an Advanced License, so she does
know 13
> > WPM
> > KK6NN is the most positive reason for keeping CW
>
> Guarantee you that Kim smoked her at 20.

heh heh...well, *that's* the picture I should have put on the QRZ site for Larry. He'd have moved to Texas in a heartbeat, looked me up, and fell over when he saw that I'd turned into a middle-aged used-to-be-drop-dead-gorgeous gramma! Yep, let's see, at 20 I weighed around 118 and at 5'6 that's pretty damned slim. Although, I pride myself on only being in size 20 slacks and pants right now...and I feel great! Back to my bowl of ice cream <GRIN>

Kim W5TIT

4749. Re: Here is TITSs Dream

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-23 03:59:42 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3FE7BDAC.ECBCF981@earthlink.net>
Source record: 84325

Alun wrote:

> Whatever it takes to learn CW, it sure isn't brains, and whatever you
> think of Kim's callsign, she shows more intelligence than you guys.

Her postings on her driving habits and her views on taxation haven't demonstrated that. In addition, she's now showing some of that same lack of class in her responses which she showed in choosing her callsign.

Dave K8MN

4750. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-23 04:07:09 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <NbPFb.5732$IM3.400@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 84326

"Kim W5TIT" wrote:
> "Dwight Stewart" wrote:
> >
> > Minimum Speed Limit:
> > I. No person shall drive so slowly
> > as to impede the normal and
> > reasonable movement of traffic.
> > Tran. Code ï¿½545.363(a)
> > II. A person, driving at less than the
> > normal speed of traffic, shall drive in
> > the right-hand lane then available for
> > traffic or as close as practicable to
> > the right-hand curb or edge of the
> > roadway. Tran. Code ï¿½545.051(b)
>
> Cool. I'll check that website out. However,
> the two above put me legal driving in the left
> lane--since I am traveling at the speed that
> the *majority* of drivers are driving in the
> left hand lane, which makes *that* the flow
> of traffic--with the people desiring to blast
> passed all of us in the wrong; they are going
> against the flow (at least in my opinion).

If that interpretation were really true, the slowest vehicle in the left lane would set the flow of traffic (even if only ten mph) since all the others behind that vehicle are now going the same speed. Clearly, there is something wrong with that interpretation, isn't there? In reality, if there are two or three vehicles behind you who want to go faster, you're impeding the flow of traffic.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

4751. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-23 04:09:52 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3FE7C00B.CAF60CBE@earthlink.net>
Source record: 84327

Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3FE77964.F92357C0@earthlink.net>...
> > Len Over 21 wrote:
> > >
> > > In article <3FE72B5B.D0D251F7@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> > > writes:
> > >
> > > >Brian wrote:
> > > >
> > > >> Steve, I think it has to do with the disincentive of Morse Code
> > > >> testing. You might want to check with Len on this.
> > > >
> > > >You'll pardon our confusion. You've been acting as Len's representative
> > > >for a few posts now in speaking of his motivations or lack thereof. I
> > > >wasn't aware that you'd turned the controls over to him.
> > >
> > > Brian Burke is not my "representative" nor am I his.
> >
> > You'll likely want to straighten the lad out then, Leonard. He has been
> > speaking for you of late.
>
> We just happen to agree that the Morse Exam has to go and that the ARS
> is divided between folks who can accept change, and those who cannot.

Perhaps Len's mistaken views can be excused. He isn't, after all, a
part of amateur radio. You, on the other hand, should know better.

> > > It is not my Life's Ambition to immortalize morse code as the
> > > epitome of amateurism in an avocational radio activity.
> >
> > I'll mark that down as yet another of things we know are not your life's
> > ambition. It'll be listed right under "amateur radio license".
>
> I think working Frenchmen out of band otta be #2.

Okay, Brian, I'll do as you've requested.

THINGS WHICH ARE NOT LEONARD ANDERSON'S LIFE'S AMBITION

1. It is not my life's ambition to obtain an amateur radio license.

2. It is not my life's ambition to work Frenchmen out of band.

3. It is not my Life's Ambition to immortalize morse code as the
epitome of amateurism in an avocational radio activity.

Feel better now?

> > > Morse code skills are needed ONLY in amateur radio...
> >
> > ...then it is one of those things which shouldn't bother you in the
> > least.
>
> Bothers me.

I can deal with that.

> > > according
> > > to certain long-timers who have few other skills and ebody hatred
> > > and bigotry against all on that one extremely important (to them)
> > > skill in amateur radio.
> >
> > I have lots of amateur radio skills, Len. Morse code proficiency is but
> > one of them. I use other modes and often QSO those amateurs who have no
> > HF access at all.
>
> What? No Morse?
>
> What? No HF?
>
> Such as out of band Frenchmen on 6M?

I broke no Tanzanian regs, operated where I was permitted to be and did
nothing to encourage French stations to leave their alloted band
segments. If you, after all this time, still have a problem, you need
to follow the advice I gave you ages ago: Contact the French PTT and
the REF.

> > > If it is your purpose as a newsgroupie to spread malicious lies
> > > about others, to challenge "motivations" of those not thinking as
> > > your holiness does, then you are doing a fine job.
> >
> > Please tell us what you view as an example of a malicious lie which has
> > been spread about you, Leonard. It can't be about your lack of
> > motivation toward obtaining an amateur radio license. You've declared a
> > decades-long interest. You bragged that you'd get an "Extra right out
> > of the box". A code-free exam has been available for a number of years.
> > Straighten us out.
> >
> > > I am not "motivated" to love, honor, and cherish morse code as
> > > the embodyment of expertise in radio of past times. Been in real
> > > HF radio communications before most of these newsgroupies
> > > were in existance...never used morse code, never had to...but
> > > only as a professional, not as an amateur.
> >
> > I've pointed out the availability of a code-free license which provides

> > access to the VHF/UHF frequencies which you say are the new frontier.
> > Your motivation hasn't extended to obtaining one of those. You have no
> > incentive for overcoming your inertia.
>
> Now that all the Techs have been chased off of VHF, where do you
> 'spect them to go?

Really? The Techs have been chased from VHF? When and how did this transpire? How would it keep Leonard from obtaining a code-free license?

Dave K8MN

4752. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-23 04:11:22 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3FE7C067.8DBC3E7B@earthlink.net>
Source record: 84328

Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3FE3BCC6.22E2A836@earthlink.net>...
> > Len Over 21 wrote:
> >
> > > ...written by many of the beligerant...
> >
> > "belligerent"
> >
> > > ...as long as such beligerance remains rooted
> >
> > "belligerence"
> >
> > Dave K8MN
>
> Dave, once again, takes the honors at the national spelling bee,
> beating out 9 year old Mary Caldwell, who ran off-stage in tears.

Actually, I took top honors from seventy-year-old Leonard "Atila"
Anderson, a PROFESSIONAL writer.

Dave K8MN

4753. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-23 04:14:46 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3FE7C131.92DE591@earthlink.net>
Source record: 84329

Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3FE3BB6B.6060946A@earthlink.net>...
> > Len Over 21 wrote:
> >
> > > ...Your beligerance keeps on.
> >
> > > Yup, beligerance with flags...
> >
> > > You are beligerant and pissed off...
> >
> > Once could be a typo. Three would be one of your "Atila" gaffes.
> > "Belligerent", Len. I thought you were a professional writer.
> >
> > Dave K8MN
>
> You must be a professional Righter.

No, I'm a mere amateur. I receive no payment for correcting Len's
spelling. Consider it a service to a professional.

> Get to work on Bruice/WA8ULX.

That'd be a hopeless exercise. Bruce misspells more words than he
spells correctly. Besides, he never claimed to be a PROFESSIONAL
writer.

Dave K8MN

4754. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-23 04:16:09 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3FE7C185.7FD27649@earthlink.net>
Source record: 84330

Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3FE1E206.783CF499@earthlink.net>...
> > Len Over 21 wrote:
> > >
> > > In article <brpfap$1gm@library1.airnews.net>, "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
> > > writes:
> > >
> > > >> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
> > > >>
> > > >> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
> > > >>
> > > >
> > > >psssst, I think Len is superior at pulling Dave's strings...
> > >
> > > Shhhh...don't tell anybody... :-) :-) :-)
> >
> > Is this the part where you make me one of your playthings or have me
> > fall into one of your carefully laid snares, Len?
>
> And he has arrived. Congratulations Dave.

Len is clearly the Wile E. Coyote of r.r.a.p.

Dave K8MN

4755. Re: Here is TITSs Dream

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-23 04:17:15 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3FE7C1C8.83064010@earthlink.net>
Source record: 84331

Brian wrote:
>
> wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) wrote in message
news:<20031222101240.11589.00000922@mb-m25.aol.com>...
> > Check out kk6nn on QRZ. This is what could have came of TIT if she would
> > have become a REAL HAM. Notice She has an Advanced License, so she does know 13
> > WPM
> > KK6NN is the most positive reason for keeping CW
>
> Guarantee you that Kim smoked her at 20.

Yeah, she was doing 20 and Kim was doing 75 in the left lane.

Dave K8MN

4756. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-23 04:36:25 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <dDPFb.5765$IM3.2933@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 84332

"Dave Heil" wrote:
>
> Dwight, I'm with you on Kim's silliness
> about driving but this one just keeps
> getting skewed more and more. Now
> you're writing about abortion instead
> of child birth and NASA. You did not
> write anything in your original comments
> to indicate that you were discussing "child
> birth policy" or "NASA policy".

I've explained that just about as much as I intend to. At this point,
you're simply using this to side-step the issues raised.

> A different "use"? Sorry, I'm not buying
> that.

Obviously. Like most of us, you have no intention of "buying" anything
that disagrees with your position.

> (snip) Tell me more about the areas where
> this country needs expertise.

Don't hold your breath, Dave. I have no desire whatsoever to get into a
long discussion about today's communications technology. If you truly want
to know more about that, a search of the internet may be worthwhile.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

4757. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-23 05:13:30 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3FE7CEF2.74129FC3@earthlink.net>
Source record: 84333

Dwight Stewart wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" wrote:
> >
> > Dwight, I'm with you on Kim's silliness
> > about driving but this one just keeps
> > getting skewed more and more. Now
> > you're writing about abortion instead
> > of child birth and NASA. You did not
> > write anything in your original comments
> > to indicate that you were discussing "child
> > birth policy" or "NASA policy".
>
> I've explained that just about as much as I intend to. At this point,
> you're simply using this to side-step the issues raised.

Not really, Dwight. You're now dancing around your earlier statements
in order to make them read like something different.

> > A different "use"? Sorry, I'm not buying
> > that.
>
> Obviously. Like most of us, you have no intention of "buying" anything
> that disagrees with your position.

...especially when we get into something which appears to be a sizeable
stretch of earlier statements.

> > (snip) Tell me more about the areas where
> > this country needs expertise.
>
> Don't hold your breath, Dave. I have no desire whatsoever to get into a
> long discussion about today's communications technology. If you truly want
> to know more about that, a search of the internet may be worthwhile.

You may find this difficult to believe, but not all of us rely on the
internet as our primary source for information. You've mentioned
several times about areas where our country needs expertise but you've
offered not even a single example. I questioned whether a 5 wpm morse
test precluded someone from developing such expertise.

Dave K8MN

4758. Re: K1MAN

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-23 05:34:59 UTC
From: "Chuck...K1KW" <cdoneal@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <wtQFb.432025$Dw6.1328271@attbi_s02>
Source record: 84334

What you are missing is that k1man is NOT like the W1AW bulletins at all. W1AW bulletins last 10 minutes. They are on ONCE a day, weekdays only. IF they interfere with existing QSO's it last only 10 minutes. Nothing anyone would get pissed about. However, k1man, likes to say he is just like W1AW... well he isn't. His "broadcasts" last 1 1/2 hours, several times a day!!!. So, he is NOT like the W1AW bulletins. He is just an amateur wannabee broadcaster and egotist that thinks he found a "loophole" in the FCC rules, and uses the W1AW bulletins as an excuse. Hey...given this precedent, why couldn't any ham have a 24/7 broadcast on ham radio! Just call it a "bulletin" The call in talk shows is an option.

It's time to limit bulletin broadcasts to what W1AW has been doing for their 90+ year history and keep bulletins to 10 minutes and once a day. This should please k1man, the belgrade bastard, and ensure that he IS JUST LIKE W1AW.

73,
Chuck...K1KW

4759. Old college ham radio club recruitment poster in a.b.p.radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-23 05:45:25 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3FE7D66B.8000306@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 84335

Note that there were novice classes worth 1 credit given.
I had my old style tech + (novice code, general written) back then
in 1978. There was an inside joke on this poster, the guy falling
off the roof was a CBer attempting to install a CB antenna.
Also note that we had female hams as well.

4760. k1man - W1AW bulletins

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-23 05:46:56 UTC
From: "Chuck...K1KW" <cdoneal@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <kFQFb.634183$Fm2.570107@attbi_s04>
Source record: 84336
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

K1man broadcasts are NOT like W1AW bulletins as
the fat "MAN" claims. The W1AW bulletins last 10 minutes. They
are on ONCE a day, weekdays only. IF they interfere
with existing QSO's it last only 10 minutes. Nothing
anyone would get pissed about. However, k1man, likes
to say he is "just like" W1AW... well he isn't. His "broadcasts"
last 1 1/2 hours, several times a day!!!. So, he is NOT like the
W1AW bulletins. He is just an amateur wannabee broadcaster
and egotist that thinks he found a "loophole" in the FCC rules,
and uses the W1AW bulletins as an excuse. Hey...given this
precedent, why couldn't any ham have a 24/7 broadcast on
ham radio! Just call it a "bulletin" The call in talk show is an option.

It's time to limit bulletin broadcasts to what W1AW has been
doing for their 90+ year history and keep bulletins to 10 minutes
and once a day. This should please K1man, the belgrade bastard,
and ensure that he IS JUST LIKE W1AW.

73,
Chuck...K1KW

4761. Re: Old college ham radio club recruitment poster in a.b.p.radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-23 05:58:36 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031223005836.12363.00001541@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 84337

> There was an inside joke on this poster, the guy falling
>off the roof was a CBer attempting to install a CB antenna.

Thats not a Joke anymore, there now called CBplussers

4762. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-23 06:00:06 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031223010006.29815.00002406@mb-m21.aol.com>
Source record: 84338

In article <f45722ac.0312221845.1655295d@posting.google.com>,
brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:

>Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
>news:<3FE1E206.783CF499@earthlink.net>...
>> Len Over 21 wrote:
>> >
>> > In article <brpfap$1gm@library1.airnews.net>, "Kim W5TIT"
><kimscliff@yahoo.com>
>> > writes:
>> >
>> > >> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>> > >>
>> > >> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
>> > >>
>> > >
>> > >psssssst, I think Len is superior at pulling Dave's strings...
>> >
>> > Shhhh...don't tell anybody... :-) :-) :-)
>>
>> Is this the part where you make me one of your playthings or have me
>> fall into one of your carefully laid snares, Len?
>
>And he has arrived. Congratulations Dave.

...told ya. :-)

LHA

4763. Re: Why I Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-23 06:00:06 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031223010006.29815.00002405@mb-m21.aol.com>
Source record: 84341

In article <3FE728D4.ACA2C528@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>Len Over 21 wrote:
>>
>> In article <i_2Fb.17738$P%1.16339939@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D.
>> Flint" <deehays@qix.net> writes:
>>
>> >What it should be and too many fail to realize is that the proper sequence
>> >is "Learn radio basics to become a ham and then as a ham continue to learn
>> >and increase one's expertise." It should not be one versus the other.
>>
>> The ONLY way to have an interest in radio is to get a ham license.
>
>You could say that you have an interest in amateur radio, Len. It isn't
>true, but you could say it.

I haven't. I don't.

The only way to have an interest in radio is to get a ham license.

To you it doesn't count at all that "interest in radio" can result in
a half century of professional work...including design in radio.

To you it doesn't count that "interest in radio" AND electronics
can lead to very enjoyable hobby activities in building, testing,
designing new electronics things ('electronics' includes radio).

No, FIRST one "must" get an AMATEUR license according to
Herr Robust.

>You could say that you have an interest in gardening, but if your
>interest extends only to walking past someone's garden and advising that
>they're not properly caring for their climatus, you aren't a gardner.

I've been into "gardening" for over 40 years. At this same address.

No amateur license required. No LICENSE required to garden.

Not a problem. I can discuss gardening with any neighbor and they
don't take offense. We share ideas, experiences, help each other
out.

In here, the arrogant officious ones DICTATE as to how all shall
behave according to their holy rules.

>You could say that you have a great interest in flying an airplane, but
>if your interest extends to buying a ticket to fly to Chicago, you

>aren't an aviator.

I don't have a great interest in flying an airplane now. Too expensive.

I was once a student pilot. Still no license required for that. Not even to operate a radio...already had the First Phone, so no 3rd Class Restricted permit necessary.

An amateur radio license isn't legal to use on civil airways frequencies, is it?

I am into flying R/C model aircraft on a casual basis...and have on and off for 40+ years. NO license required there to use the 72 MHz band channels. I've been into flying model aircraft for 60 years and even worked as a professional at Testors before they got into the plastic model side of that hobby. I was an International contestant in that some time ago.

>Reality points to the fact that you have nothing to do with amateur
>radio other than to make submissions to the FCC regarding an avocation
>in which you take no part.

Reality points to the fact that you CANNOT accept any opinions contrary to your own with grace or gentle manner...you constantly, beligerantly go after any person who can stand up to you and show where your ideas aren't valid.

The FCC accepts ALL input on ALL radio services, Herr Robust.
They don't need "licenses" in any radio service to accept comments.
I know that is a very foreign thought to your proud, arrogant holiness, but that IS true.

I'd like to see YOU address the FCC in the same manner as you address others. Good luck on that one now!

LHA

4764. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-23 06:00:09 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031223010009.29815.00002407@mb-m21.aol.com>
Source record: 84340

In article <3FE7770B.E0737CAF@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>Len Over 21 wrote:
>>
>> In article <3FE72935.F4D597C4@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
><k8mn@earthlink.net>
>> writes:
>>
>> >Brian wrote:
>> >>
>> >> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
>> >news:<3FE4E004.6BC4A8AD@earthlink.net>...
>> >> > Brian wrote:
>> >> > >
>> >> > > N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in message
>> >news:<c2356669.0312190606.18645337@posting.google.com>...
>> >> >
>> >> > > > You're *assuming* that everyone who has an opinion on amateur
>radio
>> >> > > > policy issues is interested in amateur radio having the best
>possible
>> >> > > > future. And in most cases that's true - but not when Mr. Anderson
>is
>> >> > > > involved. His behavior here, and his comments to FCC, indicate
>that
>> >> > > > he's *not* interested in what's best for amateur radio. He's just
>> >> > > > interested in stirring up division, discord and hostility between
>> >> > > > amateurs, diverting them from other issues, and denying amateur
>> >> > > > traditions and contributions to society and the radio art.
>> >> > >
>> >> > > Inventive Licensing comes to mind as the big divider.
>> >> >
>> >> > You're probably right. Everyone who holds an amateur ticket likely
>had
>> >> > some incentive. Len had none.
>>
>> >> Of course I'm right! ;^)
>> >>
>> >> Len, like any Americans who've shown an interest in the ARS, have a
>> >> disincentive. It is the Morse requirement for HF access.
>> >
>> >Your claim might ring true if Len had bothered to obtain a code-free
>> >ticket at some point. He hasn't.

>>
>> Of whom are you speaking, old man?
>
>Your name is Len, isn't it, grizzled older man?
>
>> I've had HF access several times in the last half century, all legal,
>> all involving actual communications. No amateur license was
>> required at any time. No morse skill needed whatsoever.
>
>Your memory must be failing in your dotage. Amateur radio is the topic.

It is?!?!?

I thought it was all about vehicle codes under the subject heading
of "Is Michael Jackson Innocent."

I thought it was all about national economy, presidential politics,
the antics of State, and general subjects that must be dear to
hamhearts everywhere that do NOT touch on amateur radio in
all those other threads.

>Your HF access of the past isn't an issue this time around.

Neither is the HF access I had from a Ventura marina a few
months ago...again (for at least the 5th time) without requiring
any amateur radio license or knowing morse code.

>> The discussion should be about the federal regulations for an amateur
>> radio license regulation, not the individual "motivations" of any
>> aspirant to an avocational radio activity.
>
>Maybe you feel that's what it should be about....but it isn't.

It seems to be about ANYTHING EXCEPT amateur radio. It seems
to be all about Kolonel Klunk wanting retribution for some imaginary
wrongs done to his psyche in here.

>> You constantly insist on personalizing everything about those who do
>> not share your holy and illustrious viewpoints.
>
>I neither do it constantly nor with all others. You personalize many
>discussions here. How do you explain that away?

Tsk, tsk, tsk. Yes, I copy down the screen name of the individual
I am replying to...call that "personalizing?" :-)

>> That is your problem
>> and you continually foul this newsgroup with arrogant remarks against
>> the person of those of opposite opinions. Not my problem but
>> certainly yours in attitude.
>
>It doesn't seem to be a problem for me, Len. At the moment, judging
>from your reply, it is one for you. Deal with it.

I did already. You got what you deserve. Be happy with that.

>> Amateur radio is supposed to be a recreation, a fun activity involving
>> radio, licensing required only because of physics of EM waves and
>> federal regulation.
>
>It is all of that and more, old gent.

Yes, to you. To you, amateur radio is a wondrous experience where
you may have title, rank, privileges beyond your wildest dreams, of
doing things that mundane professionals could never do by constantly
recreating the past in the future and pioneering the HF airways. It is
your Lifestyle.

Ho hum.

>> Instead, you've turned it into a battleground of
>> your own, arrogantly demanding adherence to your personal view-
>> points.
>
>No, I've not turned amateur radio into any battlegrounds nor did I note
>your presence on any of the ham bands this past week.

Is it now a requirement to "have presence" on ham bands in order
to even speak of amateur radio?

Is the FCC requiring all Wireless Bureau staffers to have amateur
radio licenses in order to regulate U.S. amateur radio?

>> You join several others in here in so doing, some past, some
>> present. That's counter to the original purpose of "the service," isn't
>> it? Or is it?
>
>Are you confusing amateur radio with this newsgroup? Is it your opinion
>that I'm required to quietly accept your guff?

If I have to "accept" your guff, then you have to accept mine.

YOU deal with it. [in your own quaint SS manner, of course]

>> Perhaps you embody modern amateur radio, a constant striving for
>> leading the pack in competitive activity? A competition complete
>> with taunts and jibes and outright insults against those who
>> "challenge" your arrogant expertise? If so, there is no wonder that
>> amateur radio has not increased in number commensurate with
>> the growth in population.
>
>Well, old chap, it looks as if you're wrong in your assumptions yet
>again.

No, old chop, I don't "assume" anything. I tell it like it is. You are
just another arrogant control-freak wanting others to be subservient
to your viewpoints. You can't accept a damn thing if it isn't in line
with your holy opinions.

>It is a cinch that you don't embody any of amateur radio--past,
>present or future.

Absolutely TRUE. I've been a professional for over a half
century.

Herr Robust must think that professionals are not required to have
any recreation. Is it that way in your SS?

>of which you accuse others. You are--what is it you call
>it?..."beligerant" toward radio amateurs who tire of your tales of life
>at ADA a half century ago.

So...if the U.S. Army hasn't been using OOK CW on HF for six
decades, that is "tiring?"

You must not be tired. You must be in coma. You are not
conscious of anything that has happened in the last six decades.

>> Enjoy your little clique of morse code uber alles in amateur radio
>> where the "bands" are only on HF. Feel superior that you've met all
>> the criteria and standards established by long-gone amateurs of past
>> times. You are important, superior, vital, and that is all that
>matters.
>
>I enjoy morse code, SSB, FM, RTTY, Pactor and several other modes on MW,
>HF, VHF and UHF. My "little clique" numbers hundreds of thousands in
>this country alone. I haven't noted your presence.

You wouldn't note anything. All you can see is your own glorious,
glowing presence radiating back at you.

No problem. YOUR presence hasn't been noted in any professional
writings or periodicals.

>> You should be demanding that ALL test for high rates of morse in
>> order to become fully FDA licensed as a ham. Condemn all those
>> who cannot learn, will not learn, nor share your opinions.
>
>Morse or no morse, consider yourself condemned.

"Condemned" only to calling an asshole an asshole.

Not very holiday-like but it is true.

>> May Santa bring you an irrepairable intermittent in your favorite HF
>> transceiver along with a truckload of dusty, high-sulphur-content
>> coal in your stocking. Merry Christmas.
>
>Do you really know of any irrepairable intermittents?

Yourself.

>I have no need of
>the coal. I heat with gas.

Everyone is aware of the "gas" you emit in here.

Say goodnight, Gracie.

LHA

4765. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-23 06:00:10 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031223010010.29815.00002408@mb-m21.aol.com>
Source record: 84342

In article <f45722ac.0312221327.324b3b7e@posting.google.com>,
brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:

>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>news:<20031221091854.26118.00001465@mb-m06.aol.com>...
>> >Subject: Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL
>> >From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
>> >Date: 12/20/03 9:09 PM Central Standard Time
>> >Message-id: <f45722ac.0312201909.4391d40b@posting.google.com>
>> >
>> >k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>> >news:<20031220163957.15210.00001553@mb-m04.aol.com>...
>> >> >ubject: Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL
>> >> >From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>> >> >Date: 12/20/03 2:50 PM Central Standard Time
>> >> >Message-id: <20031220155022.25815.00005331@mb-m07.aol.com>
>>
>>
>> >> > So, give us an EXACT number of ARRL members.
>> >>
>> >> Check their annual postal statement. It's a violation for them to
>> purjure
>> >> that, and it delineates the number of "paid subscriptions" (ie: paid-up
>> >> members)
>> >>
>> >> Steve, K4YZ
>> >
>> >
>> >I was a member of the ARRL prior to earning my Novice ticket.
>> >
>> >What was my call sign then?
>>
>> I am sure there was a point ot your asking this question, Brain, even
>> though it was not part-and-parcel of the quoted item above.
>>
>> Regardless of your licensure status when you joined the ARRL, the only
>> 'relevence' would have been your voting staus. You were STILL a member.
>>
>> Now...the point?
>>
>> Steve, K4YZ
>
>Let me think it through for you.
>

>A non-member, me, receives QST. I am included in the annual postal
>statement.
>
>Every library is included in the postal statement.
>
>Every club that subscribes is included in the postal statement.
>
>Every foreign subscriber non-member is included in the postal
>statement.
>
>Now would you mind answereing the question: "So, give us an EXACT
>number of ARRL members."

He cannot, so, as his "representative" in here, I will. :-)

According to the ARRL's own information, their last Publisher's Sworn Circulation Statement was end of June, 2003.

At that time ARRL membership was 155,132.

Of those, 19,180 were Life Members.

All of the information is from ARRL's own website under QST Circulation. There are some apparent discrepancies on that, probably due to "creative rearrangement" of the data. For example, the "average monthly paid circulaion" (six months, ending at end of June) was only 142,992. Between that and the indicated membership is 12,140 unaccounted for and not explained by any sales to library/institution subscriptions (only 891) or net single copy sales (only 1,784).

In the "average monthly paid circulation by type," the number of issues to associations and members (including Life Members) was 140,317 and, with libraries and single copy sales, adds up to 142,311. That's off of Cathy's statement of 142,992 by 681. ?

If there were 682 thousand total U.S. amateur radio licensees at the end of June, 2003, then ARRL membership is only 22.79% and LESS than a quarter.

LHA

4766. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-23 06:00:11 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031223010011.29815.00002409@mb-m21.aol.com>
Source record: 84339

In article <f45722ac.0312221323.4eeab70d@posting.google.com>,
brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:

>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>news:<20031222094046.01690.00000403@mb-m18.aol.com>...
>> >Subject: Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL
>> >From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
>> >Date: 12/21/03 2:20 PM Central Standard Time
>> >Message-id: <f45722ac.0312211220.2c68c00@posting.google.com>
>>
>> >Steve, I think it has to do with the disincentive of Morse Code
>> >testing. You might want to check with Len on this.
>>
>> Why?
>>
>> Morse Code is only required for access to less than 3% of all Amateur
>> allocations, none of which is above 30MHz.
>
>I hope you meant, "most of which...," unless we just got some lowfer
>freqs.
>
>> Lennie keeps asserting that the future of Amateur Radio is in the new
>> technologies, none of which is occuring below 30Mhz.
>
>Why not? What have you been doing with that Extra license? I hope
>that you haven't been squandering a national resource.

He's been collecting issues of QST and memorizing every ad.

That way he's going to be a "guru" and "know all about it."

>> Lennie ALSO keeps insisting Amateur Radio is "stuck" in the 1930's
>> somewhere, yet evidence in every media indicates he's grossly mistaken.
>
>See the Annual Classic Radio Issue, plus the February, March, April,
>May, June, July, August, September, October, November, and December
>issues.

He might have gotten only to the March issue.

When he got to March he started counting cadence and hasn't
been seen for a while...

> Also,
>> the fact that the majority of Amateur Radio activity takes place above
>30Mhz

>> further exposes Lennie's rants for the silliness and antagonistic fodder
>they
>> are.
>
>Citation, please.

At best all he can do is a parking ticket. :-)

>> Ask Lennie? I could, but that would just amke the heap of unanswered
>> questions that much higher.
>
>Humble yourself.

Do not ask the impossible. :-)

LHA

4767. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-23 06:29:22 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031223012922.12631.00003623@mb-m28.aol.com>
Source record: 84343

In article <3FE7C067.8DBC3E7B@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>Brian wrote:
>>
>> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
>news:<3FE3BCC6.22E2A836@earthlink.net>...
>> > Len Over 21 wrote:
>> >
>> > > ...written by many of the beligerant...
>> >
>> > "belligerent"
>> >
>> > > ...as long as such beligerance remains rooted
>> >
>> > "belligerence"
>> >
>> > Dave K8MN
>>
>> Dave, once again, takes the honors at the national spelling bee,
>> beating out 9 year old Mary Caldwell, who ran off-stage in tears.
>
>Actually, I took top honors from seventy-year-old Leonard "Atila"
>Anderson, a PROFESSIONAL writer.

You couldn't take "top honors" on a toy top.

I've been a professional writer (accepting monetary compensation
for writing work performed) since 1968.

The age is 71, not 70.

Too bad you'll never make that age...

LHA

4768. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-23 06:29:24 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031223012924.12631.00003624@mb-m28.aol.com>
Source record: 84344

In article <3FE7C00B.CAF60CBE@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>Brian wrote:
>>
>> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
>news:<3FE77964.F92357C0@earthlink.net>...
>> > Len Over 21 wrote:
>> > >
>> > > In article <3FE72B5B.D0D251F7@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
><k8mn@earthlink.net>
>> > > writes:
>> > >
>> > > >Brian wrote:
>> > > >
>> > > >> Steve, I think it has to do with the disincentive of Morse Code
>> > > >> testing. You might want to check with Len on this.
>> > > >
>> > > >You'll pardon our confusion. You've been acting as Len's
>representative
>> > > >for a few posts now in speaking of his motivations or lack thereof. I
>> > > >wasn't aware that you'd turned the controls over to him.
>> > >
>> > > Brian Burke is not my "representative" nor am I his.
>> >
>> > You'll likely want to straighten the lad out then, Leonard. He has been
>> > speaking for you of late.
>>
>> We just happen to agree that the Morse Exam has to go and that the ARS
>> is divided between folks who can accept change, and those who cannot.
>
>Perhaps Len's mistaken views can be excused.

"Mistaken views?!?" :-)

The Lord High Executioner mumbled something again before he
fell off the scaffold in a drunken stupor...

>... You, on the other hand, should know better.

Why do you say that?

Saying that as you do implies that you are a god of amateur radio
who has ALL the answers. You don't.

>> > > It is not my Life's Ambition to immortalize morse code as the
>> > > epitome of amateurism in an avocational radio activity.
>> >
>> > I'll mark that down as yet another of things we know are not your life's
>> > ambition. It'll be listed right under "amateur radio license".
>>
>> I think working Frenchmen out of band otta be #2.
>
>Okay, Brian, I'll do as you've requested.
>
>THINGS WHICH ARE NOT LEONARD ANDERSON'S LIFE'S AMBITION
>
>1. It is not my life's ambition to obtain an amateur radio license.

Explain to me why this is so "necessary," high holy god of ham.

>2. It is not my life's ambition to work Frenchmen out of band.

I'm not keen to work them IN band.

Why is that so necessary, high holy god of ham?

>3. It is not my Life's Ambition to immortalize morse code as the
> epitome of amateurism in an avocational radio activity.

But it IS YOURS, right, high holy god of ham?

>I can deal with that.

You can't deal a deck of cards...much less deal with debate on
issues...you always switch to insulting each and every person
who disagrees with your opinions.

>> Now that all the Techs have been chased off of VHF, where do you
>> 'spect them to go?
>
>Really? The Techs have been chased from VHF? When and how did this
>transpire? How would it keep Leonard from obtaining a code-free
>license?

Why must I obtain a "code-free license?"

Why can't it be a "coded" license?

I've had a code-free license since 1956.

LHA

4769. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-23 09:05:10 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0312230105.633d89f4@posting.google.com>
Source record: 84345

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20031222141057.25517.00002949@mb-m15.aol.com>...
> In article <3FE72935.F4D597C4@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >Brian wrote:
> >>
> >> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:<3FE4E004.6BC4A8AD@earthlink.net>...
> >> > Brian wrote:
> >> > >
> >> > > N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in message
> news:<c2356669.0312190606.18645337@posting.google.com>...

> >> Len, like any Americans who've shown an interest in the ARS, have a
> >> disincentive. It is the Morse requirement for HF access.
> >>
> >Your claim might ring true if Len had bothered to obtain a code-free
> >ticket at some point. He hasn't.
>
> Of whom are you speaking, old man?
>
> I've had HF access several times in the last half century, all legal,
> all involving actual communications. No amateur license was
> required at any time. No morse skill needed whatsoever.

Any CBer has "HF access" everytime s/he pics up the mic...so
what?

You have NOT had "access" to the Amateur Radio Service, save via
this forum or as a guest operator.

You are unlicensed.

> The discussion should be about the federal regulations for an amateur
> radio license regulation, not the individual "motivations" of any
> aspirant to an avocational radio activity.

Thank-you, SuperModerator. You may now retire to the nearest
phonebooth to resume your secret identity as Sir Anderscum of
Kaliphornya.

> You constantly insist on personalizing everything about those who do
> not share your holy and illustrious viewpoints. That is your problem
> and you continually foul this newsgroup with arrogant remarks against
> the person of those of opposite opinions. Not my problem but

> certainly yours in attitude.

Amateur Radio >>IS<< a "personalized" service. It can be
whatever the licensee wants it to be.

As for any remarks made in THIS forum, this is NOT Amateur Radio,
and YOU have NO RIGHT to whine about any name calling. You are Number
1 on the Hit Parade of Name Callers and Antagonizers.

You reap what you sew.

> Amateur radio is supposed to be a recreation, a fun activity involving
> radio, licensing required only because of physics of EM waves and
> federal regulation. Instead, you've turned it into a battleground of
> your own, arrogantly demanding adherence to your personal view-
> points. You join several others in here in so doing, some past, some
> present. That's counter to the original purpose of "the service," isn't
> it? Or is it?

Better re-read paragraph 1 of Part 97 again, Sir Putzalot.

Once again you insist on ignoring what the FCC says. Although it
obviously IS fun and great recreation, that is ancilliary to it. The
one here who is arrogantly demanding adherence to personal views is
YOU. Anyone who dares to suggest anything contrary to the Words of
The Professional is immediately attacked by you.

> Perhaps you embody modern amateur radio, a constant striving for
> leading the pack in competitive activity? A competition complete
> with taunts and jibes and outright insults against those who
> "challenge" your arrogant expertise? If so, there is no wonder that
> amateur radio has not increased in number commensurate with
> the growth in population.

With people like YOU "promoting" it...?!?!

> Enjoy your little clique of morse code uber alles in amateur radio
> where the "bands" are only on HF. Feel superior that you've met all
> the criteria and standards established by long-gone amateurs of past
> times. You are important, superior, vital, and that is all that matters.

Here we go with more accusations and assertions by the ALLEGED
"radio profesional"...Of course they are NOT substantiated by ANY
facts, either from posts made herein or from third party media.

> You should be demanding that ALL test for high rates of morse in
> order to become fully FDA licensed as a ham. Condemn all those
> who cannot learn, will not learn, nor share your opinions.

We have YOU for that, Lennie. You do it constantly.

> May Santa bring you an irrepairable intermittent in your favorite HF
> transceiver along with a truckload of dusty, high-sulphur-content
> coal in your stocking. Merry Christmas.

"I am only here to civilly debate the Morse Code test issue"...LHA

What a liar...again...and again...and again...

Steve, K4YZ

4770. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-23 11:51:37 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0312230351.57168cbd@posting.google.com>
Source record: 84346

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3FE7BCC5.8C7111AE@earthlink.net>...
> Brian wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3FE72B5B.D0D251F7@earthlink.net>...
> > > Brian wrote:
> > >
> > > > Steve, I think it has to do with the disincentive of Morse Code
> > > > testing. You might want to check with Len on this.
> > >
> > >
> > > You'll pardon our confusion.
>
> > Our confusion? Do you have a Frenchman in your pocket?
>
> *Our* confusion--Steve's and mine. Steve wrote (and you snipped):
>
> "Lennie's "disincentive" had/has NOTHING to do with Morse Code,
> Brain...It has to do with having absolutely NO understanding of what
> Amateur Radio is all about, what it's purpose and capabilities are, and
> what it means to be a 'part' of something."

Steve doesn't appear to be confused with those comments. But I could
be mistaken. Why don't you get with him on the "back-channel," get
your stories straight, then meet up with me here at some point in the
future.

> > You've been acting as Len's representative
> > > for a few posts now in speaking of his motivations or lack thereof. I
> > > wasn't aware that you'd turned the controls over to him.
>
> > I haven't.
>
> Someone should tell you that he's busy writing his own views on the
> subject...in a way.

I agreed with his view that amateur radio has a divide between those
who can accept change and those who cannot.

His view was thrown out by Steve because Len had no amateur license
and dare not have any views whatsoever on amateur radio.

I have a license and agreed with Len's view, so now it's "attack,
attack, attack," like rabid dogs. Pack mentality. Bad dog.

4771. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-23 12:04:30 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0312230404.384c4936@posting.google.com>
Source record: 84347

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20031223010006.29815.00002406@mb-m21.aol.com>...
> In article <f45722ac.0312221845.1655295d@posting.google.com>,
> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
>
> >Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> >news:<3FE1E206.783CF499@earthlink.net>...
> >> Len Over 21 wrote:
> >> >
> >> > In article <brpfap$1gm@library1.airnews.net>, "Kim W5TIT"
> <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
> >> > writes:
> >> >
> >> > >> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
> >> > >>
> >> > >> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
> >> > >>
> >> > >
> >> > >psssssst, I think Len is superior at pulling Dave's strings...
> >> >
> >> > Shhhh...don't tell anybody... :-) :-) :-)
> >>
> >> Is this the part where you make me one of your playthings or have me
> >> fall into one of your carefully laid snares, Len?
> >
> >And he has arrived. Congratulations Dave.
>
> ...told ya. :-)
>
> LHA

Beebeep!

4772. Re: Here is TITSs Dream

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-23 12:06:38 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bs9b4q$1ov@library2.airnews.net>
Source record: 84348

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3FE7BDAC.ECBCF981@earthlink.net...
> Alun wrote:
>
> > Whatever it takes to learn CW, it sure isn't brains, and whatever you
> > think of Kim's callsign, she shows more intelligence than you guys.
>
> Her postings on her driving habits and her views on taxation haven't
> demonstrated that. In addition, she's now showing some of that same
> lack of class in her responses which she showed in choosing her
> callsign.
>
> Dave K8MN
>

ROFLMAO....and you're the poster boy for class, right, Dave? YEAH, that's
the ticket...

Kim W5TIT

4773. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-23 12:12:52 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bs9bgh$42o@library2.airnews.net>
Source record: 84349

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:NbPFb.5732$IM3.400@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> "Kim W5TIT" wrote:
> > "Dwight Stewart" wrote:
> > >
> > > Minimum Speed Limit:
> > > I. No person shall drive so slowly
> > > as to impede the normal and
> > > reasonable movement of traffic.
> > > Tran. Code §545.363(a)
> > > II. A person, driving at less than the
> > > normal speed of traffic, shall drive in
> > > the right-hand lane then available for
> > > traffic or as close as practicable to
> > > the right-hand curb or edge of the
> > > roadway. Tran. Code §545.051(b)
> >
> > Cool. I'll check that website out. However,
> > the two above put me legal driving in the left
> > lane--since I am traveling at the speed that
> > the *majority* of drivers are driving in the
> > left hand lane, which makes *that* the flow
> > of traffic--with the people desiring to blast
> > passed all of us in the wrong; they are going
> > against the flow (at least in my opinion).
>
>
> If that interpretation were really true, the slowest vehicle in the left
> lane would set the flow of traffic (even if only ten mph) since all the
> others behind that vehicle are now going the same speed. Clearly, there is
> something wrong with that interpretation, isn't there? In reality, if
there
> are two or three vehicles behind you who want to go faster, you're
impeding
> the flow of traffic.
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
>

Well, guess so...however, 40 MPH is the minimum speed limit on some roads...

Oh, and as to JJ's claim (backed up with a commentary <Giggle> from a newspaper) that the left lane is for passing only? Well, my hubby and I have been extensively searching for this in the Texas Code and haven't found it yet. Then, there's the signs that currently say "slower traffic keep right" that are supposedly all over the place and being replaced with "left lane for passing only." I checked my whole route yesterday and there's not a sign to be seen--of any type--indicating anything about lane travel. So, I called some folks who I knew were traveling up from Aransus. The saw one sign all the way up from there that say "slower traffic keep right."

I was also contemplating the safety of having a traffic law that would apply to all highway travel...and it would really impede traffic. There are so many people getting on and off on the highways in the core area of the metroplex; as well as so many left lane exits for other highways and streets, that if the left lane were truly for passing only, one may as well pack a boxed lunch to get to work.

I think JJ's leg's been pulled.

Kim W5TIT

4774. Re: Here is TITSs Dream

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-23 12:13:37 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bs9bht$8ui@library2.airnews.net>
Source record: 84351

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3FE7C1C8.83064010@earthlink.net...
> Brian wrote:
> >
> > wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) wrote in message
news:<20031222101240.11589.00000922@mb-m25.aol.com>...
> > > Check out kk6nn on QRZ. This is what could have came of TIT if she
would
> > > have become a REAL HAM. Notice She has an Advanced License, so she
does know 13
> > > WPM
> > > KK6NN is the most positive reason for keeping CW
> >
> > Guarantee you that Kim smoked her at 20.
>
> Yeah, she was doing 20 and Kim was doing 75 in the left lane.
>
> Dave K8MN
>

I'll ask again, Dave, have you *ever* broken the law?

Kim W5TIT

4775. Re: New General

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-23 12:13:47 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0312230413.40392d11@posting.google.com>
Source record: 84350

N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<c2356669.0312220917.119ce13f@posting.google.com>...
> nightowls627@aol.comnojunk (Greg Doughty) wrote in message
news:<20031221193803.26083.00001548@mb-m06.aol.com>...
> > I get nervous though.
>
> That's normal!
>
> > That is what blew it the
> > first time I took the code. It's funny too, I find it difficult to send as
> > well, but I read a lot about how people find sending easier than receiving.
>
> Try this:
>
> Disable the transmit part of your rig so that it doesn't put out a
> signal, or use a code practice oscillator. Tune around for a CQ that
> you can copy and have a "pretend" QSO, with you sending just to
> yourself. Gets you used to doing the various things without actually
> being on the air.
>
> > I
> > actually have to write down what I want to send before I do it. Oh well,
> > practice makes perfect!!!
>
> Absolutely!
>
> Remember that CW operating involves a whole set of skills, but Element
> 1 only tests one of them. The rest are left "as an exercise for the
> reader".
>
> 73 es GL de Jim, N2EY

Jim, that actually make a whole lot of sense. Brian

4776. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-23 12:19:27 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bs9bsr$7qg@library2.airnews.net>
Source record: 84352

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:dDPFb.5765$IM3.2933@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> "Dave Heil" wrote:
> >
> > Dwight, I'm with you on Kim's silliness
> > about driving but this one just keeps
> > getting skewed more and more. Now
> > you're writing about abortion instead
> > of child birth and NASA. You did not
> > write anything in your original comments
> > to indicate that you were discussing "child
> > birth policy" or "NASA policy".
>
>
> I've explained that just about as much as I intend to. At this point,
> you're simply using this to side-step the issues raised.
>

If one were to...well, waste time...reviewing many, if not all, of Dave's
posts; all Dave is about is posting replies that have no content other than
to pontificate and humor himself. There's nothing, *nothing* of any
substance whatsoever in a thing he writes...he's like a lawyer...

>
> > A different "use"? Sorry, I'm not buying
> > that.
>
>
> Obviously. Like most of us, you have no intention of "buying" anything
> that disagrees with your position.
>

Dave hasn't found his position yet...well, except for above others (he
thinks, anyway).

>
> > (snip) Tell me more about the areas where
> > this country needs expertise.
>
>
> Don't hold your breath, Dave. I have no desire whatsoever to get into a
> long discussion about today's communications technology. If you truly want
> to know more about that, a search of the internet may be worthwhile.
>
>

> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
>

I don't think Dave knows much more about the internet than downloading a newsgroup...you know, he is so busy with "class" distinction and all...

Kim W5TIT

4777. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-23 12:29:53 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <5zWFb.10159$wL6.9021@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 84353

"Dave Heil" wrote:
>
> Not really, Dwight. You're now dancing around
> your earlier statements in order to make them
> read like something different.

Nonsense, Dave. I mentioned three things in that message - "child birth, international affairs with Belarus, and NASA space missions." You intentionally took two of those out of context (a response to your message about code testing), and ignored the third ("Belarus"), to suggest I was talking about something other than government policy. On top of that, you used this nonsense to side-step the real issue being discussed - your false claim that personal experience was required to make informed decisions.

> ...especially when we get into something which
> appears to be a sizeable stretch of earlier
> statements.

There has been no stretch of earlier statements - just your attempts to twist what was actually said.

> (snip) You've mentioned several times about areas
> where our country needs expertise but you've
> offered not even a single example. (snip)

No, I quoted or paraphrased what the FCC said about that. Again, if you don't understand it, don't hold your breath waiting for me to explain it to you.

> (snip) I questioned whether a 5 wpm morse test
> precluded someone from developing such
> expertise.

Since the main goal, as stated by the FCC, is to "...attract technically inclined persons, particularly the youth of our country...," the question is simply not relevant. The second goal to "...encourage them to learn and to prepare themselves in the areas where the United States needs expertise" comes after they enter this radio service. To be honest, I don't believe we can achieve either goal with the continued emphasis on Morse code through code testing. CW should join the other operating modes, allowing each person to discover on their own what really interests them without being pushed towards Morse code through a licensing requirement.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

4778. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-23 12:48:31 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <zQWFb.10165$wL6.5405@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 84354

"Len Over 21" wrote:
>
> (snip) All of the information is from
> ARRL's own website under QST
> Circulation. There are some apparent
> discrepancies on that, probably due to
> "creative rearrangement" of the data.
> For example, the "average monthly paid
> circulaion" (six months, ending at end
> of June) was only 142,992. Between
> that and the indicated membership is
> 12,140 unaccounted for and not
> explained by sales to library/institution
> subscriptions (only 891) or net single
> copy sales (only 1,784). (snip)

While I obviously cannot be certain, most of those 12,140 issues are probably free handouts, Len - sent to current advertisers, potential advertisers, staff, those who wrote articles or sent pictures for each issue, executives of various companies, industry insiders, news organizations, politicians, and so on. It's a fairly common practice in the publishing industry.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

4779. Re: Here is TITSs Dream

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-23 13:48:09 UTC
From: "Dr. Richard Kimball" <xmastitties@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <44029$3fe847c2$d1cc4588$22507@allthenewsgroups.com>
Source record: 84355

"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20031222161347.14429.00001415@mb-m14.aol.com...
> >Would you expect someone who chooses a call sign suffix like TIT to
> >really have the brains to know CW?
> >
>
> Of course not, shes just your typical CBplusser

PFHBLTTT!!!!!.....and you are an atypical fat-ass'ed miserable old
fart ARRL ham-op, who likely wishes it was still the 1950's and everyone
had to pass a cw test to get a licence. Go back to the Liberty Net
and play *RF-circle-jerk* with that paranoid crew of misfits
and malcontents.

PFHBLTTTTTT!!!!!!!!!!

4780. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-23 13:49:07 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <nJXFb.10275$wL6.10143@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 84356

"Kim W5TIT" wrote:
>
> (snip) There's nothing, *nothing* of
> any substance whatsoever in a thing
> he writes...he's like a lawyer...

Oh, come on, Kim. You know a lawyer would make more sense.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

4781. Re: Here is TITSs Dream

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-23 13:56:43 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031223085643.12223.00001737@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 84357

What a typical CBplusse, whats your handle GOOD Buddy?

4782. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-23 14:41:24 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <ouYFb.18195$P%1.16921039@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 84358

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:zQWFb.10165$wL6.5405@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
>
> "Len Over 21" wrote:
> >
> > (snip) All of the information is from
> > ARRL's own website under QST
> > Circulation. There are some apparent
> > discrepancies on that, probably due to
> > "creative rearrangement" of the data.
> > For example, the "average monthly paid
> > circulaion" (six months, ending at end
> > of June) was only 142,992. Between
> > that and the indicated membership is
> > 12,140 unaccounted for and not
> > explained by sales to library/institution
> > subscriptions (only 891) or net single
> > copy sales (only 1,784). (snip)
>
>
> While I obviously cannot be certain, most of those 12,140 issues are
> probably free handouts, Len - sent to current advertisers, potential
> advertisers, staff, those who wrote articles or sent pictures for each
> issue, executives of various companies, industry insiders, news
> organizations, politicians, and so on. It's a fairly common practice in
the
> publishing industry.
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
>

Also keep in mind that there are members who will not show up under the paid
circulation number. In my home, both I and the OM are members. We only get
one magazine as he is a family member under my main membership. So there is
only one paid circulation but two ARRL members.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

4783. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-23 14:48:39 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <bBYFb.10323$wL6.1280@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 84359

"Kim W5TIT" wrote:
>
> Oh, and as to JJ's claim (backed up
> with a commentary <Giggle> from a
> newspaper) that the left lane is for
> passing only? Well, my hubby and I
> have been extensively searching for
> this in the Texas Code and haven't
> found it yet. (snip)

You're right on this one, Kim. After looking over the Texas Drivers Handbook, this does not appear to be the law in Texas. You can download a copy of the handbook at the Texas Department of Public Safety's website...

http://www.txdps.state.tx.us/administration/driver_licensing_control/dlindex.htm

You'll see the related information under the "Driving the Freeway" section of the handbook (page 9-3 of the handbook or page 53 of the PDF file). For those who don't want to download the 2.5 MB PDF file, it basically says...

"Choosing the Proper Lane
Look twice before changing speed
or lanes and always signal.
- Use the right-hand lane:
If you wish to drive at the minimum
speed limit or below the normal flow
of traffic.
- Using the middle or left-hand lane:
1. Use the middle or left-hand lane if
you are traveling faster than other
traffic.
2. If you plan to leave the freeway
soon, change to the exit lane as
soon as possible."

There are obviously other things in that section, but nothing about using the left lane for passing only. It appears you can use the left lane "if you are traveling faster then other traffic." Of course, if you're traveling faster than other traffic, you're probably also passing them. But, unlike some other states, it appears you don't have to get back into the right lane if there is nobody to pass (if you just want to drive in that lane on an open road) unless a road sign states otherwise.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

4784. Re: Why I Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-23 15:38:59 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031223103859.14309.00001461@mb-m14.aol.com>
Source record: 84360

>Subject: Re: Why I Like The ARRL
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 12/23/03 12:00 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20031223010006.29815.00002405@mb-m21.aol.com>

> To you it doesn't count that "interest in radio" AND electronics
> can lead to very enjoyable hobby activities in building, testing,
> designing new electronics things ('electronics' includes radio).

But to be a Radio Amateur, as defined by the Federal Communicaitions
Commission, one must be a licensee.

You can call yourself a "radio hobbyist", radio afficionado, CBer, or
whatever else may fit. But "Radio Amateur" is not one of them.

>>You could say that you have a great interest in flying an airplane, but
>>if your interest extends to buying a ticket to fly to Chicago, you
>>aren't an aviator.
>
> I don't have a great interest in flying an airplane now. Too expensive.

But..but...but...LENNIE!

YOU have been the one flaunting his copious retirement holdings and
telling us how grand it is to be you!

Are you now telling us you can't afford it...?!?!

The average cost of obtaining a Private Pilot's license in 1974 (when I
finished up my ticket) was around $2700. Todays it's just a bit over $3500.

> I was once a student pilot. Still no license required for that. Not
> even to operate a radio...already had the First Phone, so no 3rd
> Class Restricted permit necessary.

Yes, Lennie...When you were a "student pilot" (snickering under my breath
here!!!!!) a permit was required to operate the radios...One is STILL required
if you intend to operate across an international boundry.

Your "first phone" was not acceptable for operating an aircraft radio.
The FAA did not accept ANYTHING except the Restricted Radiotelephone Permit as
late as the 1980's.

> An amateur radio license isn't legal to use on civil airways frequencies,
> is it?

Only you keep suggesting that "someone" suggests it is.

> I am into flying R/C model aircraft on a casual basis...and have on
> and off for 40+ years. NO license required there to use the 72 MHz
> band channels. I've been into flying model aircraft for 60 years and
> even worked as a professional at Testors before they got into the
> plastic model side of that hobby. I was an International contestant
> in that some time ago.

Then at one time you were required to have a station license for your Part 95 (Subpart C) operations. No...one is not required now. However YOU suggest that it was not required "40+" years ago.

Again, you are in error, "Mr. Radio Professional".

>>Reality points to the fact that you have nothing to do with amateur
>>radio other than to make submissions to the FCC regarding an avocation
>>in which you take no part.
>
> Reality points to the fact that you CANNOT accept any opinions
> contrary to your own with grace or gentle manner...you constantly,
> beligerantly go after any person who can stand up to you and show
> where your ideas aren't valid.

So far, Your Putziness, you ahve FAILED to make any argument that suggests Dave's "ideas aren't valid".

You HAVE demonstrated your gross ignorance on a great number of radio topics, and an even far greater number of issues (all, actually) relating to Amateur Radio.

> The FCC accepts ALL input on ALL radio services, Herr Robust.
> They don't need "licenses" in any radio service to accept comments.
> I know that is a very foreign thought to your proud, arrogant holiness,
> but that IS true.

Again...YOUR assertion rings hollow. An error. A falsehood.

> I'd like to see YOU address the FCC in the same manner as you
> address others. Good luck on that one now!

Dave! Did you forget to bow in deep reverence to His Radio Holiness, Sir Anderscum the First?

I am sooooooooo (NOT!) ashamed of you!

Steve, K4YZ

4785. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-23 15:55:33 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031223105533.14309.00001465@mb-m14.aol.com>
Source record: 84361

>Subject: Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 12/22/03 1:10 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20031222141059.25517.00002951@mb-m15.aol.com>

>Jimmie isn't stating any "facts."

Lennie! Again with the belittling names towards people who don't do it to you.

Do we need to re-post the posts wherein YOU stated you DON'T respond with such cutesy names when not so addressed yourself?

It's been at least five years now that you've been calling Jim "Jimmie", the "pedantic parson", etc.

Why do you lie? Why do you insist on making such obviously irresponsible assertions only to have them fed back to you?

Is being an idiot a family curse?

>Unlike the ARRL...which IS a dues-asking, amateur license required,
> membership organization and political special interest group and a
> publishing business, NCI does not pretend to represent "all" amateurs.

An Amateur Radio license is NOT required for membership in the American Radio Relay League. It never has.

When the ARRL lobbies in washington, it DOES seek to represent ALL Amateurs, dues paying or not.

I have yet to see the ARRL submit any document saying "We represent all Amateurs except..(fill in the names)..."

>ARRL pretends to "represent all amateurs" yet they still haven't
> gotten close to a majority of all licensed U.S. amateurs to belong
> to them. They've not been able to do that for years past.

Yet the ARRL >>IS<< accepted by the FCC and a number of other Washington agencies as THE defacto representive of Amateur Radio as a whole.

This is a fact. It is not subject to YOUR opinion, Lennie.

Sorry.

> ARRL refuses to take a stand on code testing in the USA yet the
> International Amateur Radio Union long ago came out for eliminating
> the code test internationally. Once that happens, NCI has stated
> that it will dissolve, cease to exist as a special interest entity.

The code test requirement as an international regulation has been eliminated.

So I don't see the NCI wrapping things up.

>ARRL is your shepherd, you shall not want...

Lennie is an arrogant fool, we know this well...

Steve, K4YZ

4786. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-23 16:00:43 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031223110043.14309.00001466@mb-m14.aol.com>
Source record: 84362

>Subject: Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 12/23/03 12:00 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20031223010011.29815.00002409@mb-m21.aol.com>

>That way he's going to be a "guru" and "know all about it."

Whatever I know about Amateur Radio is more than you can ever hope to know,
Your Scumminess...

Over 30 years of PRACTICAL experience.

>>> Ask Lennie? I could, but that would just amke the heap of unanswered
>>> questions that much higher.
>>
>>Humble yourself.
>
> Do not ask the impossible.

Lennie has clearly indicated that he does NOT have the experience in
Amateur Radio to make an informed opinion. His technical knowledge is dubious,
no doubt the off-spring of a well-honed cut-and-paste skill.

My only "humbling" before Lennie would be to not further embarass him with
his own foolishness.

Steve, K4YZ

4787. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-23 16:01:49 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031223110149.14309.00001467@mb-m14.aol.com>
Source record: 84363

>Subject: Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 12/23/03 12:29 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20031223012922.12631.00003623@mb-m28.aol.com>

>The age is 71, not 70.
>
> Too bad you'll never make that age...

Hopefully you won't make it PAST it.

Steve, K4YZ

4788. Re: K1MAN

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-23 16:06:38 UTC
From: me <yo@here.com>
Message-ID: <iKZFb.6098$IM3.3008@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 84364

```
Were we discussing programming content?

--------------------------------------------------------------------------
-------
"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:XKNFb.18166$P%1.16828550@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
>
> "Alun" <alun@1stcounsel.com> wrote in message
> news:Xns9459D94DE35D2elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
> > "me" <yo@here.com> wrote in
> > news:%dNFb.5521$IM3.1220@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net:
> >
> > > Sorry, but the point is W1AW, just like K1MAN, starts transmitting on
> > > top of existing QSOs.
> > >
> > > Neither moves up or down frequency to avoid causing interference.
> > >
> > > ==========================================
> > > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
> > > news:3eLFb.9608$wL6.1584@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> > >> I would assume so. But why would one want to do that to W1AW?
Oh...I
> > >> get it...you think they do the same thing, right? Wrong. Go listen
> > >> to both of them. Tell me which one is doing HAM RADIO STUFF, and
> > >> which isn't.
> > >>
> > >> Dan/W4NTI
> > >>
> > >>
> > >>
> > >> "me" <yo@here.com> wrote in message
> > >> news:OasFb.4453$IM3.303@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> > >> > Would that work with W1AW, also?
> > >> >
> > >> >
> > >> > ==============================
> > >> > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
> > >> > news:e1pFb.4135$IM3.3880@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> > >> > >
> > >> > > "Nobody You Know" <ycthulhu@aol.complex> wrote in message
> > >> > > news:20031220224708.09506.00001351@mb-m17.aol.com...
> > >> > > > groupk0hb@earthlink.net wrote:
> > >> > > >
> > >> > > > >
> > >> > > > > >
```

> > >> > > > >
> > >> > > > >I have no love for the antics of K1MAN, but 4.7 khz is enough
> > >> > > > >room to put 2 QSO's with modern 2.1 or 2.4 khz filters. If
you
> > >> > > > >can't separate two stations almost 5 khz apart, then you need
> > >> > > > >remedial tuning training.
> > >> > > > >
> > >> > > > >73, de Hans, K0HB
> > >> > > > >
> > >> > > >
> > >> > > >
> > >> > > > Oh man, I'm sorry. I really messed up my original posting.
K1MAN
> > >> > > > opened up on 3977.3 khz, only 400 cycles away from the ARUFON
> > >> > > > net on 3977.7 khz.
> > >> > > >
> > >> > > > NOW do you see my point?
> > >> > > >
> > >> > > >
> > >> > > >
> > >> > > >
> > >> > > > --
> > >> > > > Nations are like leaves; they change color before they fall.
> > >> > > > --
> > >> > >
> > >> > > Thats not possible. According to MAN he listened on that
> > >> > > frequency for months and quote "never heard a thing", of
course
> > >> > > he IS in Maine.
> > >> > >
> > >> > > What you do is this;
> > >> > >
> > >> > > Record it.
> > >> > >
> > >> > > Sign a statement of complaint and mail it to Riley Hollingsworth.
> > >> > >
> > >> > > His e-mail is RHOLLING@fcc.gov
> > >> > >
> > >> > >
> > >> > > Dan/W4NTI
> > >> > >
> > >> > >
> > >> >
> > >> >
> > >>
> > >>
> > >
> > >
> > >
> > >
> >

> > Exactly right. As a non-member of ARRL, I think you have to let K1MAN do
> > everything they do, or stop them both, and I don't advocate the latter.
>
> Much of K1MAN's transmission are not ham related. This is a violation of
> the rules. It is not at all the same thing that W1AW does.
>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>

4789. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-23 16:09:45 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031223110945.14309.00001469@mb-m14.aol.com>
Source record: 84365

>Subject: Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL
>From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
>Date: 12/22/03 3:27 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <f45722ac.0312221327.324b3b7e@posting.google.com>
>
>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>news:<20031221091854.26118.00001465@mb-m06.aol.com>...
>> >Subject: Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL
>> >From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
>> >Date: 12/20/03 9:09 PM Central Standard Time
>> >Message-id: <f45722ac.0312201909.4391d40b@posting.google.com>
>> >
>> >k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>> >news:<20031220163957.15210.00001553@mb-m04.aol.com>...
>> >> >ubject: Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL
>> >> >From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>> >> >Date: 12/20/03 2:50 PM Central Standard Time
>> >> >Message-id: <20031220155022.25815.00005331@mb-m07.aol.com>
>
>
>> >> > So, give us an EXACT number of ARRL members.
>> >>
>> >> Check their annual postal statement. It's a violation for them to
>> purjure
>> >> that, and it delineates the number of "paid subscriptions" (ie: paid-up
>> >> members)
>> >>
>> >> Steve, K4YZ
>> >
>> >
>> >I was a member of the ARRL prior to earning my Novice ticket.
>> >
>> >What was my call sign then?
>>
>> I am sure there was a point ot your asking this question, Brain, even
>> though it was not part-and-parcel of the quoted item above.
>>
>> Regardless of your licensure status when you joined the ARRL, the only
>> 'relevence' would have been your voting staus. You were STILL a member.
>>
>> Now...the point?
>>
>> Steve, K4YZ
>

>Let me think it through for you.

No need to, Brain...but I'll let you flail through this since it amuses you.

>A non-member, me, receives QST. I am included in the annual postal
>statement.

As an individual you ARE a member. If you are not licensed, you are a NON-VOTING member.

>Every library is included in the postal statement.

Identified in the statement. Subtract from the total.

>Every club that subscribes is included in the postal statement.

How can a "club subscribe", Brain? An individual (the trustee) dos that.

>Every foreign subscriber non-member is included in the postal
>statement.

Every foreign "subscriber" is an individual, and is therefore a "member".

>Now would you mind answereing the question: "So, give us an EXACT
>number of ARRL members."

Total magazines printed

minus wasted copies

minus library subscriptions

minus complimentary copies

equals "EXACT" number of ARRL members

(Guess that new math really confounded ya, Huh BRAIN?

What an idiot.

Steve, K4YZ

4790. Re: K1MAN

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-23 16:12:25 UTC
From: me <yo@here.com>
Message-ID: <JPZFb.6102$IM3.4338@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 84366

Dear Santa,
Could you bring the guys in this newsgroup a life for
Christmas?
=======================================
"Santa Ham" <sh@sandahamnet.net> wrote in message
news:bs8c89bgc0@pita.alt.net...
> I love watching the way MAN gets all you old has been
> ham radio ops stirred up to the point where you are
> slobbering all over yourselves and your microphones!
>
> Santa Ham
>
>
>
> "Nobody You Know" <ycthulhu@aol.complex> wrote in message
> news:20031220220011.09506.00001341@mb-m17.aol.com...
> > Sometimes I listen to the ARUFON (UFO) Net on 3977.7, as I did tonight.
> But lo
> > and behold, guess who's planted his fat ass on 3973.0? K1MAN ! The UFO
net
> had
> > already started and K1MAN just opens up 4 khz away without any regard to
> > ongoing QSOs.
> >
> > Where the hell is the FCC? Why is K1MAN still on the air?
> >
> >
> >
> > ---
> > Nations are like leaves; they change color before they fall.
> > ---
>
>

4791. Re: Why You Don't Like Ham's Who Can't Accept Change.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-23 16:15:54 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031223111554.14309.00001473@mb-m14.aol.com>
Source record: 84367

>Subject: Re: Why You Don't Like Ham's Who Can't Accept Change.
>From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
>Date: 12/23/03 6:01 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <f45722ac.0312230401.5699ee23@posting.google.com>

>"But, but, but....

I snipped the rant. Caps and all.

>Welp, Len, see where knowledge and facts will get ya?

Neither you nor Lennie have expressed ANYthing here that resembles
"knowldege" or "facts", Brain. Lennie's manipulating of ARRL membership
numbers is interesting, but just as much "theory" as his "Extra Lite" excuses.

Try again, Brain...It's almost Christmas and I am sure you'd like to have
that warm, fuzzy feeling again before then.

Steve, K4YZ

4792. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-23 16:17:15 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031223111715.14309.00001475@mb-m14.aol.com>
Source record: 84368

>Subject: Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL
>From: "Dee D. Flint" deehays@qix.net
>Date: 12/23/03 8:41 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <ouYFb.18195$P%1.16921039@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>

>
>Also keep in mind that there are members who will not show up under the paid
>circulation number. In my home, both I and the OM are members. We only get
>one magazine as he is a family member under my main membership. So there is
>only one paid circulation but two ARRL members.

Good point, Dee...I forgot that, and my XYL and I have the same
arrangement.

73

Steve, K4YZ

4793. Re: K1MAN

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-23 16:21:27 UTC
From: me <yo@here.com>
Message-ID: <bYZFb.6114$IM3.3564@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 84369

Chuck,
You need to check the W1AW schedule. Is ONLY once a day on PHONE. It's also on more frequencies than K1MAN.

The original point is that they fire up on existing QSOs. The original post did address programming content.

==========

"Chuck...K1KW" <cdoneal@comcast.net> wrote in message news:wtQFb.432025$Dw6.1328271@attbi_s02...
> What you are missing is that k1man is NOT like the W1AW
> bulletins at all. W1AW bulletins last 10 minutes. They are on
> ONCE a day, weekdays only. IF they interfere with existing
> QSO's it last only 10 minutes. Nothing anyone would get
> pissed about. However, k1man, likes to say he is just like
> W1AW... well he isn't. His "broadcasts" last 1 1/2 hours,
> several times a day!!!. So, he is NOT like the W1AW bulletins.
> He is just an amateur wannabee broadcaster and egotist that
> thinks he found a "loophole" in the FCC rules, and uses the
> W1AW bulletins as an excuse. Hey...given this precedent,C
> why couldn't any ham have a 24/7 broadcast on ham radio!
> Just call it a "bulletin" The call in talk shows is an option.
>
> It's time to limit bulletin broadcasts to what W1AW has been
> doing for their 90+ year history and keep bulletins to 10 minutes
> and once a day. This should please k1man, the belgrade bastard,
> and ensure that he IS JUST LIKE W1AW.
>
> 73,
> Chuck...K1KW
>
>

4794. Re: K1MAN

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-23 17:42:24 UTC
From: Jack Bandy <jb@bandysnetshow.com>
Message-ID: <bs9upvcsm0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 84370

"Chuck...K1KW" <cdoneal@comcast.net> wrote in message
news:wtQFb.432025$Dw6.1328271@attbi_s02...
> What you are missing is that k1man is NOT like the W1AW
> bulletins at all. W1AW bulletins last 10 minutes. They are on
> ONCE a day, weekdays only. IF they interfere with existing
> QSO's it last only 10 minutes. Nothing anyone would get
> pissed about. However, k1man, likes to say he is just like
> W1AW... well he isn't. His "broadcasts" last 1 1/2 hours,
> several times a day!!!. So, he is NOT like the W1AW bulletins.
> He is just an amateur wannabee broadcaster and egotist that
> thinks he found a "loophole" in the FCC rules, and uses the
> W1AW bulletins as an excuse. Hey...given this precedent,
> why couldn't any ham have a 24/7 broadcast on ham radio!
> Just call it a "bulletin" The call in talk shows is an option.
>
> It's time to limit bulletin broadcasts to what W1AW has been
> doing for their 90+ year history and keep bulletins to 10 minutes
> and once a day. This should please k1man, the belgrade bastard,
> and ensure that he IS JUST LIKE W1AW.
>
> 73,
> Chuck...K1KW
>
>

Oh BWAHHHHHHHH BWAHHHHHHHH
Poor little No Code Tech Chuckie doesn't know how to turn
the tuning knob on his super CB, so he doesn't have to listen to
MAN. Cry us a river of tears Chuckie. MAN OWNS YOU!
and all the rest of the MAN bashers & whiners.

Jack Bandy

4795. Re: k1man - W1AW bulletins

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-23 17:44:42 UTC
From: Jack Bandy <jb@bandysnetshow.com>
Message-ID: <bs9uua$d32$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 84371
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

MAN owns you No Code Chuckie! You & all the rest of the
MAN bitchers & whiners.

Jack Bandy

"Chuck...K1KW" <cdoneal@comcast.net> wrote in message
news:kFQFb.634183$Fm2.570107@attbi_s04...
> K1man broadcasts are NOT like W1AW bulletins as
> the fat "MAN" claims. The W1AW bulletins last 10 minutes. They
> are on ONCE a day, weekdays only. IF they interfere
> with existing QSO's it last only 10 minutes. Nothing
> anyone would get pissed about. However, k1man, likes
> to say he is "just like" W1AW... well he isn't. His "broadcasts"
> last 1 1/2 hours, several times a day!!!. So, he is NOT like the
> W1AW bulletins. He is just an amateur wannabee broadcaster
> and egotist that thinks he found a "loophole" in the FCC rules,
> and uses the W1AW bulletins as an excuse. Hey...given this
> precedent, why couldn't any ham have a 24/7 broadcast on
> ham radio! Just call it a "bulletin" The call in talk show is an option.
>
> It's time to limit bulletin broadcasts to what W1AW has been
> doing for their 90+ year history and keep bulletins to 10 minutes
> and once a day. This should please K1man, the belgrade bastard,
> and ensure that he IS JUST LIKE W1AW.
>
> 73,
> Chuck...K1KW
>
>
>

4796. Re: Here is TITSs Dream

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-23 17:49:51 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0312230949.effbee3@posting.google.com>
Source record: 84372

"Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:<bs9bht$8ui@library2.airnews.net>...
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:3FE7C1C8.83064010@earthlink.net...
> > Brian wrote:
> > >
> > > wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) wrote in message
> news:<20031222101240.11589.00000922@mb-m25.aol.com>...
> > > > Check out kk6nn on QRZ. This is what could have came of TIT if she
> would
> > > > have become a REAL HAM. Notice She has an Advanced License, so she
> does know 13
> > > > WPM
> > > > KK6NN is the most positive reason for keeping CW
> > >
> > > Guarantee you that Kim smoked her at 20.
> >
> > Yeah, she was doing 20 and Kim was doing 75 in the left lane.
> >
> > Dave K8MN
> >
>
> I'll ask again, Dave, have you *ever* broken the law?
>
> Kim W5TIT

Heavens, NO! He just talks to French out of banders legally.

Its all the other guy's fault.

4797. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-23 18:15:19 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <XC%Fb.18414$P%1.16949076@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 84373

"Steve Robeson K4CAP" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20031223110945.14309.00001469@mb-> Total magazines printed
>
> minus wasted copies
>
> minus library subscriptions
>
> minus complimentary copies
>
> equals "EXACT" number of ARRL members
>
> (Guess that new math really confounded ya, Huh BRAIN?
>
> What an idiot.
>
> Steve, K4YZ
>

You forgot to add in members who don't receive their own magazine, such as
those on the family membership.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

4798. Re: K1MAN

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-23 18:50:39 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <380Gb.6272$IM3.3997@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 84374

No, the point is W1AW actually sends BULLETINS per the rules and
regulations, which IS PERMITTED. K1MAN has a call in talk show, which is
NOT A BULLETIN and is not legal.

If you have any doubts of that do a google search and put in K1MAN, then
read what the FCC has sent him in the last SEVERAL years.

Dan/W4NTI

"me" <yo@here.com> wrote in message
news:%dNFb.5521$IM3.1220@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> Sorry, but the point is W1AW, just like K1MAN, starts transmitting on top
of
> existing QSOs.
>
> Neither moves up or down frequency to avoid causing interference.
>
> ==========
> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
> news:3eLFb.9608$wL6.1584@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> > I would assume so. But why would one want to do that to W1AW? Oh...I
get
> > it...you think they do the same thing, right? Wrong. Go listen to both
> of
> > them. Tell me which one is doing HAM RADIO STUFF, and which isn't.
> >
> > Dan/W4NTI
> >
> >
> >
> > "me" <yo@here.com> wrote in message
> > news:OasFb.4453$IM3.303@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> > > Would that work with W1AW, also?
> > >
> > >
> > > ==========
> > > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
> > > news:e1pFb.4135$IM3.3880@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> > > >
> > > > "Nobody You Know" <ycthulhu@aol.complex> wrote in message
> > > > news:20031220224708.09506.00001351@mb-m17.aol.com...
> > > > > groupk0hb@earthlink.net wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > >
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > >

> > > > > >I have no love for the antics of K1MAN, but 4.7 khz is enough
room
> to
> > > put
> > > > 2
> > > > > >QSO's with modern 2.1 or 2.4 khz filters. If you can't separate
> two
> > > > > >stations almost 5 khz apart, then you need remedial tuning
> training.
> > > > > >
> > > > > >73, de Hans, K0HB
> > > > > >
> > > > >
> > > > >
> > > > > Oh man, I'm sorry. I really messed up my original posting. K1MAN
> > opened
> > > up
> > > > on
> > > > > 3977.3 khz, only 400 cycles away from the ARUFON net on 3977.7
khz.
> > > > >
> > > > > NOW do you see my point?
> > > > >
> > > > >
> > > > >
> > > > >
> > > > > ----------
> > > > > Nations are like leaves; they change color before they fall.
> > > > > ----------
> > > > >
> > > > Thats not possible. According to MAN he listened on that frequency
> for
> > > > months and quote "never heard a thing", of course he IS in Maine.
> > > > >
> > > > What you do is this;
> > > > >
> > > > Record it.
> > > > >
> > > > Sign a statement of complaint and mail it to Riley Hollingsworth.
> > > > >
> > > > His e-mail is RHOLLING@fcc.gov
> > > > >
> > > > >
> > > > Dan/W4NTI
> > > > >
> > > > >
> > > >
> > > >
> > >
> >

>
>

4799. Re: K1MAN

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-23 18:59:00 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <Uf0Gb.6284$IM3.4679@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 84375

"Jack Bandy" <jb@bandysnetshow.com> wrote in message
news:bs9upvcsm0@pita.alt.net...
>
> "Chuck...K1KW" <cdoneal@comcast.net> wrote in message
> news:wtQFb.432025$Dw6.1328271@attbi_s02...
> > What you are missing is that k1man is NOT like the W1AW
> > bulletins at all. W1AW bulletins last 10 minutes. They are on
> > ONCE a day, weekdays only. IF they interfere with existing
> > QSO's it last only 10 minutes. Nothing anyone would get
> > pissed about. However, k1man, likes to say he is just like
> > W1AW... well he isn't. His "broadcasts" last 1 1/2 hours,
> > several times a day!!!. So, he is NOT like the W1AW bulletins.
> > He is just an amateur wannabee broadcaster and egotist that
> > thinks he found a "loophole" in the FCC rules, and uses the
> > W1AW bulletins as an excuse. Hey...given this precedent,
> > why couldn't any ham have a 24/7 broadcast on ham radio!
> > Just call it a "bulletin" The call in talk shows is an option.
> >
> > It's time to limit bulletin broadcasts to what W1AW has been
> > doing for their 90+ year history and keep bulletins to 10 minutes
> > and once a day. This should please k1man, the belgrade bastard,
> > and ensure that he IS JUST LIKE W1AW.
> >
> > 73,
> > Chuck...K1KW
> >
> >
>
> Oh BWAHHHHHHHH BWAHHHHHHHH
> Poor little No Code Tech Chuckie doesn't know how to turn
> the tuning knob on his super CB, so he doesn't have to listen to
> MAN. Cry us a river of tears Chuckie. MAN OWNS YOU!
> and all the rest of the MAN bashers & whiners.
>
> Jack Bandy
>
>

Does that include the entire FCC and most of the licensed hams that pay
attention? How does it feel to be a moron Jack Bandy?

Dan/W4NTI

4800. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-23 19:09:58 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <aq0Gb.4922$Vv2.1806646@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 84376

Dee D. Flint wrote:
> "Steve Robeson K4CAP" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20031223110945.14309.00001469@mb-> Total magazines printed
>
>> minus wasted copies
>>
>> minus library subscriptions
>>
>> minus complimentary copies
>>
>> equals "EXACT" number of ARRL members
>>
>> (Guess that new math really confounded ya, Huh BRAIN?
>>
>> What an idiot.
>>
>>Steve, K4YZ
>>
>
>
> You forgot to add in members who don't receive their own magazine, such as
> those on the family membership.

Might as well add the memberships for blind hams that don't want to get
QST.

- Mike KB3EIA -

4801. Re: Why I Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-23 19:33:49 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <xnfcneeyarg.hqcv5a2.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>
Source record: 84377

On 23 Dec 2003 15:38:59 GMT, Steve Robeson K4CAP wrote:

>Your "first phone" was not acceptable for operating an aircraft radio.
>The FAA did not accept ANYTHING except the Restricted Radiotelephone Permit
>as late as the 1980's.

One could not hold an RP and a higher grade of radiotelephone
operator license (which WAS valid for aircraft use) at the same time.
It was the Radiotelephone Third Class Permit with Broadcast
Endorsement that was not valid for aircraft operation.

The solution was the License Verification Card, the same shape and
color as the RP, attesting to the fact that the holder held an FCC
radiotelephone or radiotelegraph First or Second operator license.
The FAA was quite aware of this situation.

We were asked about that many times by student pilots who held First
or Second Class Radiotelephone operator licenses in that era and never
got any feedback that the FAA wasn't accepting it in lieu of the RP.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

4802. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-23 19:33:49 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <xnfcneeyarg.hqcvnk3.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>
Source record: 84378

On Tue, 23 Dec 2003 14:41:24 GMT, Dee D. Flint wrote:

>Also keep in mind that there are members who will not show up under the paid
>circulation number. In my home, both I and the OM are members. We only get
>one magazine as he is a family member under my main membership. So there is
>only one paid circulation but two ARRL members.

I would suspect that in this computers-r-us era of acccounting, the
Membership Department can furnish the exact number of members-in-good-
standing (i.e. paid up to date) in every category as of the last
database entry.

After all, the ARRL -is- a membership organization and any member is
entitled to that information. Getting it may be another story,
however.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

4803. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-23 20:49:27 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031223154927.07346.00002242@mb-m26.aol.com>
Source record: 84380

In article <zQWFb.10165$wL6.5405@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> writes:

>"Len Over 21" wrote:
>>
>> (snip) All of the information is from
>> ARRL's own website under QST
>> Circulation. There are some apparent
>> discrepancies on that, probably due to
>> "creative rearrangement" of the data.
>> For example, the "average monthly paid
>> circulaion" (six months, ending at end
>> of June) was only 142,992. Between
>> that and the indicated membership is
>> 12,140 unaccounted for and not
>> explained by sales to library/institution
>> subscriptions (only 891) or net single
>> copy sales (only 1,784). (snip)
>
> While I obviously cannot be certain, most of those 12,140 issues are
>probably free handouts, Len - sent to current advertisers, potential
>advertisers, staff, those who wrote articles or sent pictures for each
>issue, executives of various companies, industry insiders, news
>organizations, politicians, and so on. It's a fairly common practice in the
>publishing industry.

Dwight, with all due respect, I think I know a bit about the periodicals industry and Publisher's Sworn Statements. :-)

The seed of this particular sub-thread was the EXACT number of ARRL membership. According to Katherine A. Capodicasa, Circulation Manager of QST, given on ARRL's own web page, the ARRL membership as of the end of June 2003 was 155,132.

Also, on the same ARRL page was the statement of the "average monthly paid circulation" (for previous 6 months). That is 142,992. It is also a difference of 12,140 from the June membership number. That difference MIGHT account for the "family membership" single copies and other things. Might, that is, trying to infer anything from insufficient data is pure speculation such as others have been doing.

In item 3 on the Circulation page is "average unpaid and sample copy circulation per month" of 1,140. That would be freebies, sample copies, stuff sent to potential advertisers, and so forth. [others have tried to imply higher numbers for this as rationalizing

other differences but that is more speculation without facts and
also - obviously - not going to the "official" ARRL pages...:-)]

Now, connecting the dots to other notable numbers, one who
longs for the olden days keeps putting up others' database values
to show that U.S. amateur radio licenses are increasing. [they
are, but only slightly and don't follow the overall population increase]
Yet, on the Circulation page of QST, ARRL membership shows a
slight but definite DECREASE in paid circulation...from 143,904 at
end of January 2003 to 142,311 at end of June 2003, a difference
of -1,593.

Connecting more dots farther apart, clicking on ARRL publications
and QST yields a table of contents of January 2004 issue. On
there is a link to a "Micro Keyer" (CW keyer) which is viewable,
but no other viewable link to more general amateur radio articles
such as making nice front panels for homebuilt equipment. This is
just another subtle bit of business on ARRL's continuing push for
morse code related over and above all other modes. ARRL may
take a "neutral" stance on morse code testing regulations but one
can only take away their code key from their cold, dead fingers...

In truth, a "Publishers Sworn Statement" is SOLELY for the
benefit of potential ADVERTISERS. QST subsists almost entirely
on the income of advertising to pay for printing, author compensation
(miniscule by comparison to other periodicals), "fulfillment"
(publishing-speak for subscriptions), and QST direct staff. Note that
QST has used a heavier-weight glossy paper than most periodicals
(which costs more) but has gone to slightly lower-weight glossy paper.
Anyone can go through any issue, count column-inches, and
determine the issue's Real income within 20% or so just from QST's
rates (also on the web site, different page).

Advertising pays the bills at a periodical. Advertising revenue is
finite so all periodical publishers will condense and "tailor" the
Publisher's Sworn Statements as much as they can...so that
potential advertisers are convinced to pay them instead of any
competition. Since advertising budgets are finite, some periodicals
just don't get as much income...and some may have to quit when
there isn't enough income to pay bills.

There's bound to be someone who shows "exceptions" to the rule
that advertising pays the bills. I'm familiar with that. As one who
gets a number of trade periodicals (EDN, Electronic Design, RF
Design, Microwaves & RF, PET, etc.) entirely without any monies
from me ("controlled circulation" magazines), that's proof enough of
my statement. There are MORE "free" trade publications in the
USA than there are subscription-fee publications.

Parishoners at the Church of St. Hiram have been busy rationalizing
and speculating on the "reason" for differences that I noted. :-)
They are all wrong, but are convinced they Know...ARRL can do no

wrong.

All that can be gleaned from the QST Circulation page is the number (and EXACT number) of ARRL membership at any one time.

ARRL is basically three organizations in one: A membership club; a political-action special interest group; a publishing business. Members try to rationalize others' negative criticsm by using only one or two of the triad as "justification." In truth, ARRL tries to be too many things under one roof and that, if too inflexible, may be its eventual undoing.

Merry Christmas to you and yours, Dwight.

Len Anderson

4804. Re: Why You Don't Like Ham's Who Can't Accept Change.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-23 20:49:28 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031223154928.07346.00002243@mb-m26.aol.com>
Source record: 84379

In article <f45722ac.0312230401.5699ee23@posting.google.com>,
brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:

>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>news:<20031223010010.29815.00002408@mb-m21.aol.com>...
>> In article <f45722ac.0312221327.324b3b7e@posting.google.com>,
>> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
>>
>> >k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>> >news:<20031221091854.26118.00001465@mb-m06.aol.com>...
>> >> >Subject: Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL
>> >> >From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
>> >> >Date: 12/20/03 9:09 PM Central Standard Time
>> >> >Message-id: <f45722ac.0312201909.4391d40b@posting.google.com>
>> >> >
>> >> >k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>> >> >news:<20031220163957.15210.00001553@mb-m04.aol.com>...
>> >> >> >ubject: Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL
>> >> >> >From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>> >> >> >Date: 12/20/03 2:50 PM Central Standard Time
>> >> >> >Message-id: <20031220155022.25815.00005331@mb-m07.aol.com>
>> >>
>> >>
>> >> >> > So, give us an EXACT number of ARRL members.
>> >> >>
>> >> >> Check their annual postal statement. It's a violation for them
>to
>> purjure
>> >> >> that, and it delineates the number of "paid subscriptions" (ie:
>paid-up
>> >> >> members)
>> >> >>
>> >> >> Steve, K4YZ
>> >> >>
>> >> >>
>> >> >>I was a member of the ARRL prior to earning my Novice ticket.
>> >> >>
>> >> >>What was my call sign then?
>> >>
>> >> I am sure there was a point ot your asking this question, Brain,
>even
>> >> though it was not part-and-parcel of the quoted item above.
>> >>
>> >> Regardless of your licensure status when you joined the ARRL, the

>only
>> >> 'relevence' would have been your voting staus. You were STILL a member.
>> >>
>> >> Now...the point?
>> >>
>> >> Steve, K4YZ
>> >
>> >Let me think it through for you.
>> >
>> >A non-member, me, receives QST. I am included in the annual postal
>> >statement.
>> >
>> >Every library is included in the postal statement.
>> >
>> >Every club that subscribes is included in the postal statement.
>> >
>> >Every foreign subscriber non-member is included in the postal
>> >statement.
>> >
>> >Now would you mind answereing the question: "So, give us an EXACT
>> >number of ARRL members."
>>
>> He cannot, so, as his "representative" in here, I will. :-)
>>
>> According to the ARRL's own information, their last Publisher's
>> Sworn Circulation Statement was end of June, 2003.
>>
>> At that time ARRL membership was 155,132.
>>
>> Of those, 19,180 were Life Members.
>>
>> All of the information is from ARRL's own website under QST
>> Circulation. There are some apparent discrepancies on that,
>> probably due to "creative rearrangement" of the data. For example,
>> the "average monthly paid circulaion" (six months, ending at end
>> of June) was only 142,992. Between that and the indicated
>> membership is 12,140 unaccounted for and not explained by any
>> sales to library/institution subscriptions (only 891) or net single
>> copy sales (only 1,784).
>>
>> In the "average monthly paid circulation by type," the number of
>> issues to associations and members (including Life Members) was
>> 140,317 and, with libraries and single copy sales, adds up to
>> 142,311. That's off of Cathy's statement of 142,992 by 681. ?
>>
>> If there were 682 thousand total U.S. amateur radio licensees at
>> the end of June, 2003, then ARRL membership is only 22.79%
>> and LESS than a quarter.
>>
>> LHA

>
>"But, but, but....
>
>YOU DON'T HAVE A LICENSE! YOU SHOULDN'T BE ABLE TO READ THOSE FIGURES
>ON THE ARRL WEB SITE. YOU SHOULDN'T BE ABLE TO DO MATH AND CREATE A
>RATIO OF MEMBEERS TO NON-MEMBERS. YOUR RESEARCH DOESN'T COUNT. YOU
>CAN'T HAVE AN OPINION.
>
>...blah, blah, blah."
>
>Welp, Len, see where knowledge and facts will get ya?
>
>Merry Christmas.

I know. Isn't it awful? :-)

It's so comforting to know that one can read and repeat Cathy's Circulation page on ARRL's website as a "LIE!" :-)

There are other little gems from da Wundermarine in here, such as its impossible for a First Phone to be used in U.S. civil aviation band radio communications since a Restricted 3rd Class "must" be used...which was nonsense in 1962...and later when the Commercial licenses got converted to the General Radiotelephone. He could not give exact figures on QST circulation for any issue (despite being only a few key-presses away from the main web page) but he "Knows" the exact costs in certain years for student flying lessons. The circulation for QST is very much amateur radio related but the student pilot costs are not. [he might have been hit by a couple of close isobars once and had an adiabatic lapse rate decrease...:-)]

Stebe thinks that the "majority" of U.S. amateur radio activity is above HF. That must mean that he never listens below 30 MHz. Probably true since all he can do is transmit over-modulated shouting and hollering about close-order drill below 30 MHz. Hup too tree foah, ya lie, ya lie, ya lie! :-)

The ONLY way one can be "interested in radio" is to get a ham license and be proficient in morse code...with extra gold stars if one was once a member of da murine corpse. Doesn't hurt if one was a purchasing agent for a small modem and set-top box company in the "south" for a few months...that counts as "being in radio engineering!" :-)

Amateur radio FUN is only "ancilliary" to the U.S. amateur radio SERVICE. Ham radio is all about wearing a Lifestyle mental uniform, marching in ranks to the morse drumbeat of the 1930s, and being ready, willing, able to "take over communications" when all the commercial/professional infrastructure FAILS in an emergency? That's the thoughts I see expressed in here.

There can be no fun in the ham SERVICE. It is all about duty, dedication, close-order drill on the proper and correct jargon and prosigns. [why the name "prosigns" when there is so much hatred of the pros?] Hupp, too, tree, foah! Beep, beep, beep!

It's a wonderful life. [but all the cast players are mentally SK]

Merry Christmas and Happy Holidays, Brian, all the best to you and your family.

Len Anderson

4805. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-23 21:56:20 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <8S2Gb.10671$wL6.1674@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 84381

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:XD0Fb.1592$Vv2.796649@news1.news.adelphia.net...
> Bill Sohl wrote:
>
> > "Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
>
> <snippage>
>
> >>>Two questions...
> >>>1. What "other members" (I presume you mean Board Members), other
> >>>than W5YI, do NOT support retention of technical acumen?
> >>
> >>They don't have to be Board members, Bill. And I don't have their names
> >>off the top of my head.
> >>
> >>If you like, I can retract the "members" statement, and substitute
> >>"member" or "prominent member". Although I think that's almost like
> >>saying a person's argument is invalid because they made a typo.
> >
> > Bottom line, without names, the statement is grossly misleading
> > as you apear to try and broaden your claim to NCI in general...
> > which is absolutely false.
>
> Bottom line, I have never accused >>>NCI<<< of having any particular
> opinion.
>
> I wrote:
>
> >Instead, some members express "unofficial opinions that scare the
> >bejabbers out of me.

That's the point. "Unofficial opinions". That alone, regardless
of what you say, creates an impression that there is an "unofficial
'NCI' opinion". If a person has their own opinion about
something, that isn't "official" or "unofficial" by itself. Adding the
"unofficial opinion" label in talking about an NCI
member DOES create a different perception than simply
saying John Doe has an opinion that scares me.

> Back to now:
>
> Who is broadening any claim? I even put unofficial opinions on my
sentence.
>
> Your trying to pin me down on this is amusing, since the membership

> rolls of NCI are a closely guarded secret. The only way we know is if
> the member outs him or her self.

Then how can you even make the statement that some "members" have
opinions that scare you IF you can't even identify them.

> I don't like Han's entry level license requirement either. He's a member.

BUT, his NCI membership doesn't tie NCI to Han's personal support
for an entry level license.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

4806. Psych Expert Admits Mistake

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-23 22:12:34 UTC
From: Shrink HQ <hq@shrinkhqnuts.org>
Message-ID: <bsaekg$b71$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 84382

Your Shrink reporter was on scene recently as a Freshman psych
student proved world respected psych expert
Dr Heirreech Viktor Von Rebenshaldernut wrong.

Freshman Ludvigstatic N'Attic informed Dr Von Rebenshaldernut
that a radio station in Maine was driving several dozen men around
the U.S. into psycho-frenzies several times a day by simply
coming on the air.

Sure enough. When the Bellprade Ponds, ME station began
broadcasting, dozens of men began shrill screams, sounding like,
"It's my sandbox, it's my sandbox, get out, shutup, my friends
& I was here first..."

Originally highly skeptical such a thing was ever possible, the
good Dr Rebenshaldernut readily admitted his error and promised
to fund his student's studies into the strange psycho reactions which the
Bellprade Ponds, ME station was causing to a minute segment of
the ham radio population.

Eriktor Lubenfruit
Roving Reporter
University of Fruit Loops Student News

4807. Re: Why I Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-23 22:17:15 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <L93Gb.10686$wL6.662@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 84383

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:gB_Eb.1546$Vv2.766121@news1.news.adelphia.net...
> Bill Sohl wrote:
>
> > "Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
> > news:3FE34758.8000802@psu.edu...
> >
> >>
> >>Bill Sohl wrote:
> >>
> >>>"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
> >>>news:OTtEb.689$Vv2.349555@news1.news.adelphia.net...
> >>>
> >>>
> >>>>Dee D. Flint wrote:
> >>>>
> >>>>
> >>>>>"Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
> >>>>>news:f45722ac.0312181539.55a82802@posting.google.com...
> >>>>>
> >>>>>
> >>>>>>Carl, you should see the NCI bashing being done by Dee and Jim on
the
> >>>>>>other ARRL thread.
> >>>>>>
> >>>>>>73, Brian
> >>>>>
> >>>>>
> >>>>>I have never bashed the NCI. I've stated that I disagree with their
> >>>
> >>>goal
> >>>
> >>>
> >>>but that does not constitute bashing them.
> >>>>
> >>>>I have! I think that they have recieved what they wanted, but as yet
> >>>>don't really offer anything of substance to fill the gap.
> >>>
> >>>
> >>>What GAP?
> >>
> >>Code test dissapears, nothing in it's place.
> >
> >

> > Why should there be anything in its place? This isn't about
> > some mystical quantification of effort, dedication, yada yada....
>
> You are kind of right there Bill. I can prove to you without a doubt
> that a person can get on the air without ever taking a test. They can
> get on the air and run relatively high power without doing harm to
> themselves. There is no need for any yada yada at all.
>
> It isn't mystical, it isn't yada yada. It is philosophy. And my
> philosophy is that the amateur should want to be an amateur, and should
> have some level of knowledge in order to be there.

No argument there. The point is that morse is no longer a needed
knowledge base and the end of morse testing doesn't create
a void in terms of the "net effort value" of learning what is
needed to pss the tests.

> > The morse tests have completely disappeared for General
> > and Extra without anything taking its place. If 5 wpm is dropped
> > for tech, why should there be something to replace it?
>
> Now I'm a little confused. As far as I know, if you want a general or
> above, you still have to take a Morse code test.

True, but in actuality you usually qualify as tech+ (even if
note actually issued a unique license).

> And they don't do tech
> plusses any more. My Tech license had no code test in it.

True, but passing the 5 wpm gives you the functional equivalent
plus you then have lifetime 5wpm credit I believe.

> >>I want to see something in
> >>it's place, or else itis pretty hard to argue that it hasn't been made
> >>much much easier to get a license.
> >
> > Ending a requirement that no longer has a rational need
> > does not translate into a search for some "replacement".
> > If you had the opportunity to state what the replacement
> > should be, what would you suggest?
>
> I support strengthening the tests. In general, I want more questions on
> theory, and more procedural questions. I wouldn't mind if there were a
> ham etiquette section added to the test.

Not unreasonable, but it probably won't be addressed as a quid pro quo
of ending morse testing by the FCC.

> I want the new ham to come on board with some idea of what is expected
> of him or her in the way of how to conduct themselves on the air. I want
> them to have at least a rudimentary knowledge of electronics, and know
> some basics on antenna theory, like our "quarter wave dipole" discussion

> on rrap of a few months back proves is needed.
>
>
> >>You may want it made much easier to get a license, but I don't. Not a
> >>filter, not a way of keeping people out. just a way of ensuring that the
> >>amateur has some level of acumen.
> >
> > Ending morse doesn't change the level of written tests.
>
> No kidding! I want the level of the tests changed though. And not to the
> level of the "average sixth grader" either.

But again, the FCC won't buy that argument (IMHO) as needed because code
testing is ended..

> >>Otherwise, those who want little or no testing are just encouraged.
> >
> > Encouraged about what?
>
> About little or no testing.

Whatever.

> >>>>Instead, some
> >>>>members express "unofficial opinions that scare the bejabbers out of
me.
> >>>
> >>>"Some members"? Who? It is always easy to make non-speciifc
> >>>accusations against unidentified "some members".
> >>
> >>W5YI for one. I trust you have read his work?
> >
> > W5YI's comments as to testing issues beyond the elimination
> > of code testing are NOT, in any way, shape or form,
> > the position or opinion of NCI.
>
> Show me where I said it was!

Then why the reference to NCI when commenting about W5YI's
opinions on other than code testing? Kinda like saying John Doe,
member of Organization X has racist opinions. Why would anyone
say such a thing unless they wanted others to think that Organization
X has racist motives.

> > As to other NCI members, assuming you can ID someone,
> > they too may have a personal belief as to how testing should go...
> > but that does NOT make their opinions or beliefs NCI
> > doctrine.
>
> I'm not talking about NCI, I'm talking about NCI members. There is a
> difference.

You blurr the difference in the way you make your statements.

> As far as I know, NCI has no official opinions beyond ending
> the Morse code test.

Correct.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

4808. Re: Why I Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-23 22:25:20 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <kh3Gb.10691$wL6.5398@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 84384

"Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
news:f45722ac.0312200633.5f38e229@posting.google.com...
> "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
news:<MbKcnRBjktklK36iUSdV9w@ptd.net>...
> > "K&#65533;HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > news:GqNEb.11298$0s2.2493@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net...
> > >
> > > "N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote
> > >
> > > > It sounds to me like you're saying the ARRL Directors should
sometimes
> > > > go against what the majority of members say they want. Do you really
> > > > think that's a good idea?
> > >
> > > Yes, sometimes I think it IS a good idea. That sort of activity is
often
> > > called leadership.
> > >
> > > Other times I think it's NOT a good idea.
> > > The mark of a good leader is determining the difference.
> > > 73, de Hans, K0HB
> >
> > Hans,
> >
> > You and I are on the same frequency on this one ... you said it
> > clearer than I did the first time, but hopefully my explanation was
> > better in response to Jim's question.
> >
> > 73,
> > Carl - wk3c
>
> Carl, that's the one aspect that I have found the most disappointing
> about the ARRL leadership, they "governed" - like Clinton - with
> polls.
>
> Their big poll was one of the most poorly constructed polls I've ever
> seen. Even worse is that they paid an outside agency to do it - with
> our dues money. The fact that -I- helped pay for that poll and I
> didn't even receive a questionaire was just icing on the cake.

But even if the poll was well done it ONLY shows a snapshot of opinion at
that time. Given the prior (several years prior) almost universal
opposition to droppping code and then seeing a significant shift
from that 90% or more support to something closer to 1/2, one

could easily conclude the shift was not going to stop and eventually
more hams would support ending all code testing than keeping it.

> I never saw the ARRL vision of the future as anything other than old
> men in Western Union garb tapping away at their keys. That should be
> their vision of the past, not the future. Repeating the past over and
> over again gets the ARS where? One more tube regen receiver article
> will likely put me over the edge.
>
> I know the ARRL is a superb watchdog concerning legislation that
> affects the ARS. They are also the best publishing house on radio
> related material. Their lab reviews are unrivaled. And their
> operating activities are lots of fun. Thus, I continue to support the
> ARRL.

Agreed. I'm ARRL also.

> But with respect to the future, just about any decision is better than
> no decision.

Agree also.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

4809. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-23 22:34:38 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <2q3Gb.16862$Pg1.8050@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 84385

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote

>
> BUT, his NCI membership doesn't tie NCI to Han's personal support
> for an entry level license.
>

Are you saying that NCI does not reciprocate my support for their goals?
That would certainly be a strange sort of membership-organization.

73, de Hans, K0HB

4810. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-23 22:41:39 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0312231441.3c87ff31@posting.google.com>
Source record: 84386

"Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:<bs9bsr$7qg@library2.airnews.net>...

> If one were to...well, waste time...reviewing many, if not all, of Dave's
> posts; all Dave is about is posting replies that have no content other than
> to pontificate and humor himself. There's nothing, *nothing* of any
> substance whatsoever in a thing he writes...he's like a lawyer...

Dave's posting are an RRAP universal constant.

Nobody knows why the constant is there, but it always is.

4811. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-23 22:51:18 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0312231451.25f5adf@posting.google.com>
Source record: 84387

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20031223110043.14309.00001466@mb-m14.aol.com>...

> My only "humbling" before Lennie would be to not further embarass him with
> his own foolishness.

Hey, its Christmas.

4812. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-23 23:08:41 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <I_udneEScdRAU3WiRVn-sw@gbronline.com>
Source record: 84393

Dwight Stewart wrote:

> "Kim W5TIT" wrote:
>
>>Oh, and as to JJ's claim (backed up
>>with a commentary <Giggle> from a
>>newspaper) that the left lane is for
>>passing only? Well, my hubby and I
>>have been extensively searching for
>>this in the Texas Code and haven't
>>found it yet. (snip)
>
>
>
> You're right on this one, Kim. After looking over the Texas Drivers
> Handbook, this does not appear to be the law in Texas. You can download a
> copy of the handbook at the Texas Department of Public Safety's website...
>
> http://www.txdps.state.tx.us/administration/driver_licensing_control/dlindex.htm
>
> You'll see the related information under the "Driving the Freeway" section
> of the handbook (page 9-3 of the handbook or page 53 of the PDF file). For
> those who don't want to download the 2.5 MB PDF file, it basically says...
>
> "Choosing the Proper Lane
> Look twice before changing speed
> or lanes and always signal.
> - Use the right-hand lane:
> If you wish to drive at the minimum
> speed limit or below the normal flow
> of traffic.
> - Using the middle or left-hand lane:
> 1. Use the middle or left-hand lane if
> you are traveling faster than other
> traffic.
> 2. If you plan to leave the freeway
> soon, change to the exit lane as
> soon as possible."
>
> There are obviously other things in that section, but nothing about using
> the left lane for passing only. It appears you can use the left lane "if you
> are traveling faster then other traffic." Of course, if you're traveling
> faster than other traffic, you're probably also passing them. But, unlike
> some other states, it appears you don't have to get back into the right lane

> if there is nobody to pass (if you just want to drive in that lane on an
> open road) unless a road sign states otherwise.
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
>

Here is what I found in Chapter 6 of The Texas Driver's Handbook, page 62...quote:

KEEP TO THE RIGHT

NEVER drive on the left half of the road in the following instances:

1. When pavement markings prohibit driving on the left (a "No Passing Zone").

2. When there are two or more traffic lanes in one direction. (In other words, don't "drive" in the left lane/s...my words)

3. When 100 feet (about five car lengths) of or crossing an intersection or railroad crossing.

4. When on a hill, curve, or any other place where vision is limited.

5. Wnen within 100 feet of a bridge, viaduct, or tunnel.

You should always keep to the right half of the road EXCEPT:

1. When passing another vehicle on a two or three lane street. (In other words, after passing you should move back to the right...my words).

2. When driving on a one-way street.

3. When the right half of the road is blocked.

End quote:

Sounds pretty simple, the right lane is for passing, you should always keep to the left except for passing.

4813. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-23 23:16:47 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031223181647.04265.00001548@mb-m29.aol.com>
Source record: 84388

>Subject: Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL
>From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
>Date: 12/23/03 4:38 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <f45722ac.0312231438.e754a15@posting.google.com>

>And all the SK's out there who forgot to terminate their memberships.

Brain, do you think there's ANY "membership" organization that has a 100%,
real-time accounting of thier membership? I don't.

Steve, K4YZ

4814. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-23 23:19:28 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031223181928.04265.00001549@mb-m29.aol.com>
Source record: 84389

>Subject: Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL
>From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
>Date: 12/23/03 4:44 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <f45722ac.0312231444.6a8835c4@posting.google.com>
>
>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>news:<20031223110149.14309.00001467@mb-m14.aol.com>...
>> >Subject: Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL
>> >From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>> >Date: 12/23/03 12:29 AM Central Standard Time
>> >Message-id: <20031223012922.12631.00003623@mb-m28.aol.com>
>>
>> >The age is 71, not 70.
>> >
>> > Too bad you'll never make that age...
>>
>> Hopefully you won't make it PAST it.
>>
>> Steve, K4YZ
>
>Not nice.

If you want "nice", spend more time in a "Victoria's Secret" catolog,
Brain.

Steve, K4YZ

4815. Re: Why I Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-23 23:20:38 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <a54Gb.18807$P%1.16995298@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 84391

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:L93Gb.10686$wL6.662@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
>
> > And they don't do tech
> > plusses any more. My Tech license had no code test in it.
>
> True, but passing the 5 wpm gives you the functional equivalent
> plus you then have lifetime 5wpm credit I believe.
>

For purposes of upgrading, the code credit is good for only one year. If you do not upgrade within a year, you will have to retake the code test.

For purposes of operating using the equivalent of the old "Tech Plus" privileges, assuming that one stays at the Tech level license, it is good for a lifetime.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

4816. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-23 23:21:11 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031223182111.04265.00001550@mb-m29.aol.com>
Source record: 84390

>Subject: Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL
>From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
>Date: 12/23/03 4:51 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <f45722ac.0312231451.25f5adf@posting.google.com>
>
>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>news:<20031223110043.14309.00001466@mb-m14.aol.com>...
>
>> My only "humbling" before Lennie would be to not further embarass him
>with
>> his own foolishness.
>
>Hey, its Christmas.

Yes, it is...and Lennie keeps providing us with more and more
netertainment...And also proves that "stupid" and "foolish" are not
age-specific acts.

Steve, K4YZ

4817. Re: Why You Don't Like Ham's Who Can't Accept Change.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-23 23:22:40 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031223182240.04265.00001551@mb-m29.aol.com>
Source record: 84392

>Subject: Re: Why You Don't Like Ham's Who Can't Accept Change.
>From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
>Date: 12/23/03 4:55 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <f45722ac.0312231455.2e7b662d@posting.google.com>
>
>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>news:<20031223111554.14309.00001473@mb-m14.aol.com>...
>> >Subject: Re: Why You Don't Like Ham's Who Can't Accept Change.
>> >From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
>> >Date: 12/23/03 6:01 AM Central Standard Time
>> >Message-id: <f45722ac.0312230401.5699ee23@posting.google.com>
>>
>> >"But, but, but....
>>
>> I snipped the rant. Caps and all.
>>
>> >Welp, Len, see where knowledge and facts will get ya?
>>
>> Neither you nor Lennie have expressed ANYthing here that resembles
>> "knowldege" or "facts", Brain. Lennie's manipulating of ARRL membership
>> numbers is interesting, but just as much "theory" as his "Extra Lite"
>excuses.
>>
>> Try again, Brain...It's almost Christmas and I am sure you'd like to
>have
>> that warm, fuzzy feeling again before then.
>>
>> Steve, K4YZ
>
>So how many members does the ARRL have?

Enough, I am sure.

I showed you how to find out. You do the math. You CAN "do the math",
can't you, "BRAIN"...?!?!

Steve, K4YZ

4818. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-23 23:23:34 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <W74Gb.18808$P%1.16995720@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 84394

"Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
news:f45722ac.0312231438.e754a15@posting.google.com...
> Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:<aq0Gb.4922$Vv2.1806646@news1.news.adelphia.net>...
> > Dee D. Flint wrote:
> > > You forgot to add in members who don't receive their own magazine,
such as
> > > those on the family membership.
> >
> > Might as well add the memberships for blind hams that don't want to get
> > QST.
> >
> > - Mike KB3EIA -
>
> And all the SK's out there who forgot to terminate their memberships.

However, the latter is a somewhat self correcting situation for the most
part as, except for life members, the membership must be renewed on an
annual basis.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

4819. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-24 00:56:47 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031223195647.00545.00003077@mb-m02.aol.com>
Source record: 84395

In article <20031222141059.25517.00002951@mb-m15.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com
(Len Over 21) writes:

>In article <QknFb.4023$Vv2.1145222@news1.news.adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo
><mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:
>
>>N2EY wrote:
>>
>>> In article <20031220143404.01893.00002231@mb-m22.aol.com>,
>>lenover21@aol.com
>>> (Len Over 21) writes:
>
>>>> As a single "authoritative voice," a New England membership
>>>> group DEFINES everything in amateurism for all amateurs. No
>>>> bickering, no dissension, no arguing. All do as They say.
>>>> No problems. Everyone happy in Nirvana.
>>>
>>> Which group and which magazine? ham radio and 73 magazines were New
>>> England based, but they're both defunct.
>>>
>>> Your description of a membership organization that does not tolerate
>>> dissent sounds exactly like NoCode International. Right in their bylaws it

>>> says that any member who publicly disagrees with their stated position on
>>> code testing is subject to expulsion. They also require that all members
>>> agree to their prime directive goal as a condition of membership. No one
>>> who disagrees with their core policy can be a member of NoCode
>>> International.
>>>
>>> I'm not saying that's right or wrong, just stating facts.
>>
>> And now some puzzle pieces fit together. I can now reconcile Carl's
>>vision of how leaders are supposed to lead and his organization. Strong
>>leadership, independent from member opinion, and if you don't like it,
>>you're out.
>
> Jimmie isn't stating any "facts."

"Of whom are you speaking, old man?"

Right in NCI's bylaws it says that any member who publicly disagrees with their
stated position on code testing is subject to expulsion.

Fact or fiction?

They also require that all members agree to their prime directive goal as a condition of membership.

Fact or fiction?

No one who disagrees with their core policy can be a member of NoCode International.

Fact or fiction?

> He is simply manufacturing an
> argument for the sake of something to argue about. SOP for Jimmie.

"I tell it like it is. You are just another arrogant control-freak wanting others to be subservient to your viewpoints. You can't accept a damn thing if it isn't in line with your holy opinions."

> [he seems to need something, anything, to argue about every day]

"Reality points to the fact that you CANNOT accept any opinions contrary to your own with grace or gentle manner...you constantly, belligerently go after any person who can stand up to you and show where your ideas aren't valid."

> No Code International is most of all a political special interest group.
> It asks for no dues, does not demand a license of any kind in order
> to belong.

But it does require absolute allegiance to its prime directive of eliminating all code testing. No disagreement or dissent allowed, under penalty of expulsion.
>
> Unlike the ARRL...which IS a dues-asking, amateur license required,
> membership organization and political special interest group and a
> publishing business, NCI does not pretend to represent "all" amateurs.

NCI says that it knows what is best for the future of amateur radio.
>
> ARRL pretends to "represent all amateurs"

Where does it claim that? Show us an exact quote.

> yet they still haven't
> gotten close to a majority of all licensed U.S. amateurs to belong
> to them. They've not been able to do that for years past.

The exact size of either organization is unknown, but from all davailable data it is clear that ARRL, despite dues and annual renewals, is at least 30 times the size of NCI.

ARRL accepts for membership those who disagree with and want to change their policies. NCI does not.

There has been an amateur license available in the USA without any code test for almost 13 years now. ARRL membership voting rights are the same regardless of license class.
>

> ARRL refuses to take a stand on code testing in the USA yet the
> International Amateur Radio Union long ago came out for eliminating
> the code test internationally.

"Strange words. According to the FCC, not to mention a couple of Acts of Congress (one in 1934, another in 1996), only the FCC created the class of the (no-code-test) Technician license. Not the US Congress. Not the ITU."

> Once that happens, NCI has stated
> that it will dissolve, cease to exist as a special interest entity.

Perhaps it will, perhaps it won't.

It seems you want ARRL to dissolve, cease to exist. You accept the organization that does not allow dissent, and reject the organization that accepts and allows dissent. Why?
>
> NCI is a very small group,

What is its exact membership?

> has no law firm on retainer in DC,

"Oh, my, were you admitted to a bar this afternoon and thought you had become a legal beagle? Arf, arf?"

> nor
> does it have another group on retainer to lobby the FCC.

Why would that be needed for a single issue?

> ARRL does.
> NCI directors get out and personally lobby for action on elimination
> of code testing, including all the way to Geneva and WRC-03...and
> not on a multi-million annual budget available to the ARRL.

WK3C was at Geneva for reasons other than S25.5. His way was paid for by his employer. He has stated that right here in this newsgroup. He did not go on his own nickel, or NCI's.

"I'd like to see YOU address the FCC in the same manner as you address others."

"When I see "cogent debate" from yourself, sans the snarly sarcasm...from yourself, I'll be more than happy to do REAL debate with you.....

You can't do it. Have never done it."

You get one guess who wrote the wors in quotes.

4820. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-24 01:49:26 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <xnfcneeyarg.hqdbfb5.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>
Source record: 84396

On Tue, 23 Dec 2003 16:08:41 -0700, JJ wrote:

>Here is what I found in Chapter 6 of The Texas Driver's Handbook, page
>62...quote:
>
>KEEP TO THE RIGHT
>
>NEVER drive on the left half of the road in the following instances:

[snip]

>Sounds pretty simple, the right lane is for passing, you should always
>keep to the left except for passing.

Huh ?? Comprehension problem? Try "the other left".....

The question wasn't about driving on the left-hand side of the road,
it was about driving on the right-hand side of the center of a road
where traffic flows in both directions, or at the left-hand side of
a one-way road with two or more lanes.

In California traffic engineering practice, numbering starts at the
furthest left-hand lane in each direction and numbering proceeds to
the right - IOW no matter how many lanes of traffic in that
direction, the #1 lane is the "fast" or "inner" or "left-hand" lane
-- still on the right hand side of the road if traffic flows in both
directions and there is a demarcation of where the "center" line is.

This is independent of whether one may drive in the #1 lane except
when passing.

Did I succeed in confusing you further ??

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

4821. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-24 01:50:37 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <2rqdnVFPd_YZa3Wi4p2dnA@gbronline.com>
Source record: 84399

Phil Kane wrote:

> On Tue, 23 Dec 2003 16:08:41 -0700, JJ wrote:
>
>
>>Here is what I found in Chapter 6 of The Texas Driver's Handbook, page
>>62...quote:
>>
>>KEEP TO THE RIGHT
>>
>>NEVER drive on the left half of the road in the following instances:
>
>
> [snip]
>
>
>>Sounds pretty simple, the right lane is for passing, you should always
>>keep to the left except for passing.
>
>
> Huh ?? Comprehension problem? Try "the other left".....

Opps, caught me Phil, seems the right dosen't know what the left is doing. Should be the other way around. Left is for passing, right is for driving.

4822. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-24 01:51:44 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <2rqdnVBPd_ZRa3Wi4p2dnA@gbronline.com>
Source record: 84400

Mike Coslo wrote:

> Phil Kane wrote:
>
>> On Tue, 23 Dec 2003 16:08:41 -0700, JJ wrote:
>>
>>
>>> Here is what I found in Chapter 6 of The Texas Driver's Handbook, page
>>> 62...quote:
>>>
>>> KEEP TO THE RIGHT
>>>
>>> NEVER drive on the left half of the road in the following instances:
>>
>>
>>
>> [snip]
>>
>>
>>> Sounds pretty simple, the right lane is for passing, you should always
>>> keep to the left except for passing.
>>
>>
>>
>> Huh ?? Comprehension problem? Try "the other left".....
>>
>> The question wasn't about driving on the left-hand side of the road,
>> it was about driving on the right-hand side of the center of a road
>> where traffic flows in both directions, or at the left-hand side of
>> a one-way road with two or more lanes.
>
>
> Does anyone know what on earth the original question was in this
> thread?

It was something about michael jackson I think. Does he even drive?

4823. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-24 01:54:13 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <9l6Gb.5070$Vv2.1916813@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 84397

Phil Kane wrote:

> On Tue, 23 Dec 2003 16:08:41 -0700, JJ wrote:
>
>
>>Here is what I found in Chapter 6 of The Texas Driver's Handbook, page
>>62...quote:
>>
>>KEEP TO THE RIGHT
>>
>>NEVER drive on the left half of the road in the following instances:
>
>
> [snip]
>
>
>>Sounds pretty simple, the right lane is for passing, you should always
>>keep to the left except for passing.
>
>
> Huh ?? Comprehension problem? Try "the other left".....
>
> The question wasn't about driving on the left-hand side of the road,
> it was about driving on the right-hand side of the center of a road
> where traffic flows in both directions, or at the left-hand side of
> a one-way road with two or more lanes.

Does anyone know what on earth the original question was in this thread?

- Mike KB3EIA -

4824. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-24 01:56:51 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031223205651.28496.00002896@mb-m18.aol.com>
Source record: 84398

In article <l_udneEScdRAU3WiRVn-sw@gbronline.com>, JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
writes:

>Here is what I found in Chapter 6 of The Texas Driver's Handbook, page
>62...quote:
>
>KEEP TO THE RIGHT
>
>NEVER drive on the left half of the road

The "left half of the road" refers to the left half of the entire road. IOW,
the part meant for traffic in the other direction!

> in the following instances:
>
>1. When pavement markings prohibit driving on the left (a "No Passing
>Zone").

Solid double yellow line
>
>2. When there are two or more traffic lanes in one direction. (In other
>words, don't "drive" in the left lane/s...my words)

No, that's not what it means.

It means that if there's more than one lane of traffic in the direction you are
traveling (say, a road with two northbound and two southbound lanes) you should
never cross the center line.

IOW, passing by crossing the center line is only allowed on roads with one lane
in the direction you're traveling
>
>3. When 100 feet (about five car lengths) of or crossing an intersection
>or railroad crossing.

Whether the train hits the car or the car hits the train, the car loses.
>
>4. When on a hill, curve, or any other place where vision is limited.

Usually double yellow line anyway.
>
>5. Wnen within 100 feet of a bridge, viaduct, or tunnel.
>
>You should always keep to the right half of the road EXCEPT:

Again, the "right half of the road" refers to the right half of the entire
road. IOW, the part meant for traffic in your direction of travel!

>
>1. When passing another vehicle on a two or three lane street. (In other
>words, after passing you should move back to the right...my words).

It means if you only cross the center line on a 2 or 3 lane road.
>
>2. When driving on a one-way street.

No lanes in the other direction.

>3. When the right half of the road is blocked.

Obvious.
>
>End quote:
>
>Sounds pretty simple, the right lane is for passing, you should always
>keep to the left except for passing.
>
HAW!!! Good one, JJ!!

I wonder how many will read that and not see the inversion!

73 de Jim, N2EY

4825. Re: New General

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-24 02:46:50 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20031223214650.07346.00002245@mb-m26.aol.com>
Source record: 84401

In article <mPrFb.774519$6C4.748277@pd7tw1no>, VA7LNX <spamtrap@gwsn.com>
writes:

>
>speaking of bands, what's a good band to start on for CW.

I suggest 40 meters, if you're seeking one band. It has good DX
propogation characteristics throughout the year, and there is a lot of
CW activity. After 40, your next best bet is 20, which is where I
spend most of my operating time.

73 de Larry, K3LT

4826. Re: New Q signs

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-24 02:46:51 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20031223214651.07346.00002247@mb-m26.aol.com>
Source record: 84402

In article <20031221092132.26118.00001466@mb-m06.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) writes:

>>Subject: New Q signs
>>From: Robert Casey wa2ise@ix.netcom.com
>>Date: 12/20/03 8:57 PM Central Standard Time
>>Message-id: <3FE50C14.3080609@ix.netcom.com>
>>
>>QMC = Merry Christmas
>>QMX = Merry Xmas
>>QHH = Happy Hoildays
>>QHY = Happy new Year
>
> QBH: Bah, Humbug
>
>73
>
>Steve, K4YZ

QGB: God bless us, every one!

73 and Merry CHRISTmas, de Larry, K3LT

BTW: I hold the fervent hope that there is someone out there who is offended by my emphasis of the name "Christ" in the word "CHRISTmas." If so, please do me a favor and reply with an amusing post about how I'm being Politically Incorrect, or something like that!

LT

4827. Re: New General

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-24 02:46:51 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20031223214651.07346.00002246@mb-m26.aol.com>
Source record: 84403

In article <20031221135241.13822.00001215@mb-m10.aol.com>,
nightowls627@aol.comnojunk (G. Doughty) writes:

>
>Well, passed my element one with no problems yesterday and have been trying
>to
>get some contacts on hf with cw. I love cw but 5wpm just isn't cutting it so
>I
>am back to Numorse to bring up my speed. Anyone out there that tried a
>contact
>with me, sorry. I was forever putting out QRS and still not getting it all.
>I
>will be back though as I cannot use phone when the baby is sleeping. The
>light
>*tick-ticking* on the straight key doesn't disturb her as much as me talking.
>
>Thanks
>73
>G. Doughty
>KI4BBL@arrl.net

How refreshing! A new ham who actually passes his General, gets OTA
with CW, and isn't whining about it! I'm especially impressed by the fact
that Mr. Doughty is a new father with a young baby, but is not using that
as an excuse not to get in some operating time! Moreover, the non-voice
nature of CW is giving him the means to do so without disturbing the
harmonic's slumbers. Good work, BBL! Carry on, and I hope to work you
someday!

73 de Larry, K3LT

4828. Re: New Q signs

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-24 03:06:14 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <Go7Gb.17284$Pg1.513@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 84404

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote

> BTW: I hold the fervent hope that there is someone out there who is
offended
> by my emphasis of the name "Christ" in the word "CHRISTmas."

What an odd wish! I would think you'd hold fervent hope for unanimous
approval of that emphasis.

73, de Hans, K0HB

4829. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-24 03:14:35 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <vw7Gb.18828$P%1.17028609@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 84405

"JJ" <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
news:l_udneEScdRAU3WiRVn-sw@gbronline.com...
> Dwight Stewart wrote:
>
> > "Kim W5TIT" wrote:
> >
> >>Oh, and as to JJ's claim (backed up
> >>with a commentary <Giggle> from a
> >>newspaper) that the left lane is for
> >>passing only? Well, my hubby and I
> >>have been extensively searching for
> >>this in the Texas Code and haven't
> >>found it yet. (snip)
> >
> >
> >
> > You're right on this one, Kim. After looking over the Texas Drivers
> > Handbook, this does not appear to be the law in Texas. You can download
a
> > copy of the handbook at the Texas Department of Public Safety's
website...
> >
> >
http://www.txdps.state.tx.us/administration/driver_licensing_control/dlindex
.htm
> >
> > You'll see the related information under the "Driving the Freeway"
section
> > of the handbook (page 9-3 of the handbook or page 53 of the PDF file).
For
> > those who don't want to download the 2.5 MB PDF file, it basically
says...
> >
> > "Choosing the Proper Lane
> > Look twice before changing speed
> > or lanes and always signal.
> > - Use the right-hand lane:
> > If you wish to drive at the minimum
> > speed limit or below the normal flow
> > of traffic.
> > - Using the middle or left-hand lane:
> > 1. Use the middle or left-hand lane if
> > you are traveling faster than other
> > traffic.

> > 2. If you plan to leave the freeway
> > soon, change to the exit lane as
> > soon as possible."
> >
> > There are obviously other things in that section, but nothing about
using
> > the left lane for passing only. It appears you can use the left lane "if
you
> > are traveling faster then other traffic." Of course, if you're traveling
> > faster than other traffic, you're probably also passing them. But,
unlike
> > some other states, it appears you don't have to get back into the right
lane
> > if there is nobody to pass (if you just want to drive in that lane on an
> > open road) unless a road sign states otherwise.
> >
> >
> > Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
> >
> > http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
> >
>
> Here is what I found in Chapter 6 of The Texas Driver's Handbook, page
> 62...quote:
>
> KEEP TO THE RIGHT
>
> NEVER drive on the left half of the road in the following instances:
>
> 1. When pavement markings prohibit driving on the left (a "No Passing
> Zone").
>
> 2. When there are two or more traffic lanes in one direction. (In other
> words, don't "drive" in the left lane/s...my words)
>
> 3. When 100 feet (about five car lengths) of or crossing an intersection
> or railroad crossing.
>
> 4. When on a hill, curve, or any other place where vision is limited.
>
> 5. Wnen within 100 feet of a bridge, viaduct, or tunnel.
>
> You should always keep to the right half of the road EXCEPT:
>
> 1. When passing another vehicle on a two or three lane street. (In other
> words, after passing you should move back to the right...my words).
>
> 2. When driving on a one-way street.
>
> 3. When the right half of the road is blocked.

>
> End quote:
>
> Sounds pretty simple, the right lane is for passing, you should always
> keep to the left except for passing.
>
>

Not so simple in city freeway driving. Following these guidelines literally would mean that cutting back and forth from lane to lane if you can only move to the left to pass each vehicle individually. And don't forget the left-hand freeway exits.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

4830. Re: New General

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-24 03:17:42 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <bc6dnaEMqMPCkXSi4p2dnA@gbronline.com>
Source record: 84406

G. Doughty wrote:

> Well, passed my element one with no problems yesterday and have been trying to
> get some contacts on hf with cw. I love cw but 5wpm just isn't cutting it so I
> am back to Numorse to bring up my speed. Anyone out there that tried a contact
> with me, sorry. I was forever putting out QRS and still not getting it all. I
> will be back though as I cannot use phone when the baby is sleeping. The light
> *tick-ticking* on the straight key doesn't disturb her as much as me talking.
>
> Thanks
> 73
> G. Doughty
> KI4BBL@arrl.net

Congrats on getting the ticket! I spent a lot of time in the wee hours
of the morning on the 40 meter novice band with the new daughter propped
on my crossed leg, working the key with one hand and holding the bottle
with the other. Now the daughter has two of her own and another on the way.

4831. Re: Why I Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-24 03:49:18 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <218Gb.5146$Vv2.1962826@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 84407

Bill Sohl wrote:

> "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
> news:gB_Eb.1546$Vv2.766121@news1.news.adelphia.net...
>
>>Bill Sohl wrote:
>>
>>
>>>"Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
>>>news:3FE34758.8000802@psu.edu...
>>>
>>>
>>>>Bill Sohl wrote:
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
>>>>>news:OTtEb.689$Vv2.349555@news1.news.adelphia.net...
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>>Dee D. Flint wrote:
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>"Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
>>>>>>>news:f45722ac.0312181539.55a82802@posting.google.com...
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>Carl, you should see the NCI bashing being done by Dee and Jim on
>
> the
>
>>>>>>>>other ARRL thread.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>73, Brian
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>I have never bashed the NCI. I've stated that I disagree with their
>>>>>
>>>>>goal
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>

>>>>>>>but that does not constitute bashing them.
>>>>>>
>>>>>>I have! I think that they have recieved what they wanted, but as yet
>>>>>>don't really offer anything of substance to fill the gap.
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>What GAP?
>>>>
>>>>Code test dissapears, nothing in it's place.
>>>
>>>
>>>Why should there be anything in its place? This isn't about
>>>some mystical quantification of effort, dedication, yada yada....
>>
>>You are kind of right there Bill. I can prove to you without a doubt
>>that a person can get on the air without ever taking a test. They can
>>get on the air and run relatively high power without doing harm to
>>themselves. There is no need for any yada yada at all.
>>
>>It isn't mystical, it isn't yada yada. It is philosophy. And my
>>philosophy is that the amateur should want to be an amateur, and should
>>have some level of knowledge in order to be there.
>
>
> No argument there. The point is that morse is no longer a needed
> knowledge base and the end of morse testing doesn't create
> a void in terms of the "net effort value" of learning what is
> needed to pss the tests.
>
>
>>>The morse tests have completely disappeared for General
>>>and Extra without anything taking its place. If 5 wpm is dropped
>>>for tech, why should there be something to replace it?
>>
>>Now I'm a little confused. As far as I know, if you want a general or
>>above, you still have to take a Morse code test.
>
>
> True, but in actuality you usually qualify as tech+ (even if
> note actually issued a unique license).
>
>
>>And they don't do tech
>>plusses any more. My Tech license had no code test in it.
>
>
> True, but passing the 5 wpm gives you the functional equivalent
> plus you then have lifetime 5wpm credit I believe.

I'm not sure about that. When I took my original General test and
flunked the Morse code portion, I was issued credit for the written part
which lasted a year (or was that a ear and a day?) So maybe passing
element 1 would be the same?

>>>>I want to see something in
>>>>it's place, or else itis pretty hard to argue that it hasn't been made
>>>>much much easier to get a license.
>>>
>>>Ending a requirement that no longer has a rational need
>>>does not translate into a search for some "replacement".
>>>If you had the opportunity to state what the replacement
>>>should be, what would you suggest?
>>
>>I support strengthening the tests. In general, I want more questions on
>>theory, and more procedural questions. I wouldn't mind if there were a
>>ham etiquette section added to the test.
>
>
> Not unreasonable, but it probably won't be addressed as a quid pro quo
> of ending morse testing by the FCC.

I wonder? Quid pro quo or not - and I agree it isn't strictly, I would
wager that a whole lot of things are addressed before this one is over.
There are a lot of wordings that need replaced or changed if Element 1
goes away. There are many privileges that will need visited and altered
as needed: tech and tech plus for instance. Are they now the equivalent
of Generals? So there *is* a lot of work to be done.

None of these are answered simply. There will be a major overhaul in the
near future, IMO. And I bet it comes about when Element one is eliminated.
>
>>I want the new ham to come on board with some idea of what is expected
>>of him or her in the way of how to conduct themselves on the air. I want
>>them to have at least a rudimentary knowledge of electronics, and know
>>some basics on antenna theory, like our "quarter wave dipole" discussion
>>on rrap of a few months back proves is needed.
>>
>>
>>
>>>>You may want it made much easier to get a license, but I don't. Not a
>>>>filter, not a way of keeping people out. just a way of ensuring that the
>>>>amateur has some level of acumen.
>>>
>>>Ending morse doesn't change the level of written tests.
>>
>>No kidding! I want the level of the tests changed though. And not to the
>>level of the "average sixth grader" either.
>
>
> But again, the FCC won't buy that argument (IMHO) as needed because code
> testing is ended..

Tell me what happens if Element one is eliminated tomorrow, and no
other change happens? Then I have some questions for you.

>>>>Otherwise, those who want little or no testing are just encouraged.
>>>
>>>Encouraged about what?
>>
>>About little or no testing.
>
>
> Whatever.

Bill, if you're going to do that, you have to do it right:

whuuuut-evuh! 8^)

>>>>>>Instead, some
>>>>>>members express "unofficial opinions that scare the bejabbers out of
>
> me.
>
>>>>>"Some members"? Who? It is always easy to make non-speciifc
>>>>>accusations against unidentified "some members".
>>>>
>>>>W5YI for one. I trust you have read his work?
>>>
>>>W5YI's comments as to testing issues beyond the elimination
>>>of code testing are NOT, in any way, shape or form,
>>>the position or opinion of NCI.
>>
>>Show me where I said it was!
>
>
> Then why the reference to NCI when commenting about W5YI's
> opinions on other than code testing?

It's like separating Ex-Presidents from their political parties.

And all this aside, my major gripe with NCI is that they don't have any
post Morse plan. Just saying Element one goes away, and all is well, is
naive.

If I had an organization that proposed the elimination of Element one,
there is no doubt that I would have a whole set of proposals that I
would offer in it's place.

And that is the problem. There is no action without a reaction or
consequences. Something like Morse code testing, which is interwoven
into the fabric of the ARS as much as it is, cannot simply be yanked out
without consequences.

- Mike KB3EIA -

4832. Re: Why I Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-24 03:59:45 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <Ra8Gb.5150$Vv2.1967187@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 84408

Dee D. Flint wrote:

> "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
> news:L93Gb.10686$wL6.662@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
>
>>>And they don't do tech
>>>plusses any more. My Tech license had no code test in it.
>>
>>True, but passing the 5 wpm gives you the functional equivalent
>>plus you then have lifetime 5wpm credit I believe.
>>
>
>
> For purposes of upgrading, the code credit is good for only one year. If
> you do not upgrade within a year, you will have to retake the code test.
>
> For purposes of operating using the equivalent of the old "Tech Plus"
> privileges, assuming that one stays at the Tech level license, it is good
> for a lifetime.

And this is just one of the things that can give you a headache:

Should Tech plus people be given a General (or whatever replaces it)
license? After all, they passed the Element one test, the old barrier to
HF...... BUT....

Since there is no barrier to HF from the code test, and Tech pluses
might get HF privileges, should ALL tech's get HF privileges since
they took the same test? After all the only difference is the Tech plus'
took Element one, which is no longer, which means it isn't a
requirement, so they shouldn't have HF privileges on a defunct test
requirement.............. SO it only follows.......

HF privileges would in the future be granted by taking the equivalent
of a Technician test?

Yup, simple indeed.

- Mike KB3EIA -

4833. Re: Why You Don't Like Ham's Who Can't Accept Change.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-24 04:01:16 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <gc8Gb.5151$Vv2.1967709@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 84409

Brian wrote:

> k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<20031223111554.14309.00001473@mb-m14.aol.com>...
>
>>>Subject: Re: Why You Don't Like Ham's Who Can't Accept Change.
>>>From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
>>>Date: 12/23/03 6:01 AM Central Standard Time
>>>Message-id: <f45722ac.0312230401.5699ee23@posting.google.com>
>>
>>
>>
>>>"But, but, but....
>>
>> I snipped the rant. Caps and all.
>>
>>
>>>Welp, Len, see where knowledge and facts will get ya?
>>
>> Neither you nor Lennie have expressed ANYthing here that resembles
>>"knowldege" or "facts", Brain. Lennie's manipulating of ARRL membership
>>numbers is interesting, but just as much "theory" as his "Extra Lite" excuses.
>>
>> Try again, Brain...It's almost Christmas and I am sure you'd like to have
>>that warm, fuzzy feeling again before then.
>>
>>Steve, K4YZ
>
>
> So how many members does the ARRL have?

At least 2, you and me.

- Mike KB3EIA -

4834. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-24 04:09:39 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bsb3rr$vbu@library2.airnews.net>
Source record: 84412

"JJ" <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
news:l_udneEScdRAU3WiRVn-sw@gbronline.com...
> Dwight Stewart wrote:
>
> > "Kim W5TIT" wrote:
> >
> >>Oh, and as to JJ's claim (backed up
> >>with a commentary <Giggle> from a
> >>newspaper) that the left lane is for
> >>passing only? Well, my hubby and I
> >>have been extensively searching for
> >>this in the Texas Code and haven't
> >>found it yet. (snip)
> >
> >
> >
> > You're right on this one, Kim. After looking over the Texas Drivers
> > Handbook, this does not appear to be the law in Texas. You can download
a
> > copy of the handbook at the Texas Department of Public Safety's
website...
> >
> >
http://www.txdps.state.tx.us/administration/driver_licensing_control/dlindex.htm
> >
> > You'll see the related information under the "Driving the Freeway"
section
> > of the handbook (page 9-3 of the handbook or page 53 of the PDF file).
For
> > those who don't want to download the 2.5 MB PDF file, it basically
says...
> >
> > "Choosing the Proper Lane
> > Look twice before changing speed
> > or lanes and always signal.
> > - Use the right-hand lane:
> > If you wish to drive at the minimum
> > speed limit or below the normal flow
> > of traffic.
> > - Using the middle or left-hand lane:
> > 1. Use the middle or left-hand lane if
> > you are traveling faster than other
> > traffic.
> > 2. If you plan to leave the freeway

> > soon, change to the exit lane as
> > soon as possible."
> >
> > There are obviously other things in that section, but nothing about
using
> > the left lane for passing only. It appears you can use the left lane "if
you
> > are traveling faster then other traffic." Of course, if you're traveling
> > faster than other traffic, you're probably also passing them. But,
unlike
> > some other states, it appears you don't have to get back into the right
lane
> > if there is nobody to pass (if you just want to drive in that lane on an
> > open road) unless a road sign states otherwise.
> >
> >
> > Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
> >
> > http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
> >
>
> Here is what I found in Chapter 6 of The Texas Driver's Handbook, page
> 62...quote:
>
> KEEP TO THE RIGHT
>
> NEVER drive on the left half of the road in the following instances:
>
> 1. When pavement markings prohibit driving on the left (a "No Passing
> Zone").
>
> 2. When there are two or more traffic lanes in one direction. (In other
> words, don't "drive" in the left lane/s...my words)
>
> 3. When 100 feet (about five car lengths) of or crossing an intersection
> or railroad crossing.
>
> 4. When on a hill, curve, or any other place where vision is limited.
>
> 5. Wnen within 100 feet of a bridge, viaduct, or tunnel.
>
> You should always keep to the right half of the road EXCEPT:
>
> 1. When passing another vehicle on a two or three lane street. (In other
> words, after passing you should move back to the right...my words).
>
> 2. When driving on a one-way street.
>
> 3. When the right half of the road is blocked.
>

> End quote:
>
> Sounds pretty simple, the right lane is for passing, you should always
> keep to the left except for passing.
>

JJ, sounds like you found something that contradicts what Dwight found, and vice versa. The point is, there is nothing that my husband or I have been able to find in the TAC (Texas Administrative Code)--which would be the *LAW*. The manual and words like "should," etc., are not laws--they are suggestions. I suggest to you that *if* it were illegal--ILLEGAL--to drive in left lanes on highways not marked (and the highways I am driving are not), then there'd be no threat to the budget here in Texas.

Simple 'nuff, find a *LAW* and I'll accept that it is illegal to drive in left lanes, otherwise, you're allowing yourself to be impressioned for the benefit of winning a side to an argument--which, of course, I am also. Seems I'm winning, though... Law, JJ, not suggestions, not a manual, not someone's (as in the circumstance with your submitted commentary) interpretation, but law.

Kim W5TIT

4835. Re: Why I Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-24 04:10:05 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <xk8Gb.18835$P%1.17036437@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 84410

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:218Gb.5146$Vv2.1962826@news1.news.adelphia.net...
> Bill Sohl wrote:
> > True, but passing the 5 wpm gives you the functional equivalent
> > plus you then have lifetime 5wpm credit I believe.
>
> I'm not sure about that. When I took my original General test and
> flunked the Morse code portion, I was issued credit for the written part
> which lasted a year (or was that a ear and a day?) So maybe passing
> element 1 would be the same?
>

For purposes of Technician's operating with the equivalent HF privileges of the old Tech+, the 5wpm is a lifetime credit should you remain a Technician.

For purposes of upgrading, the credit is good only for one year (actually 365 days). So if you don't pass your General written within 365 days of passing the Morse code test, then you would have to retake the test to upgrade.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

4836. Re: New Q signs

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-24 04:14:41 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3FE912AE.1050908@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 84411

Kï¿½HB wrote:

>"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote
>
>
>
>>BTW: I hold the fervent hope that there is someone out there who is
>>
>>
>offended
>
>
>>by my emphasis of the name "Christ" in the word "CHRISTmas."
>>
>>
>
>What an odd wish! I would think you'd hold fervent hope for unanimous
>approval of that emphasis.
>
>73, de Hans, K0HB
>
Saw a card saying "Keep Santa in Xmas". A kind of back ended statement to
make you laugh a little and to remind you to keep Christ in Christmas.

>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>

4837. Re: Why I Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-24 04:14:47 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <Xo8Gb.18836$P%1.17037611@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 84413

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:Ra8Gb.5150$Vv2.1967187@news1.news.adelphia.net...
> Dee D. Flint wrote:
>
> > "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
> > news:L93Gb.10686$wL6.662@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> >
> >>>And they don't do tech
> >>>plusses any more. My Tech license had no code test in it.
> >>
> >>True, but passing the 5 wpm gives you the functional equivalent
> >>plus you then have lifetime 5wpm credit I believe.
> >>
> >
> >
> > For purposes of upgrading, the code credit is good for only one year.
If
> > you do not upgrade within a year, you will have to retake the code test.
> >
> > For purposes of operating using the equivalent of the old "Tech Plus"
> > privileges, assuming that one stays at the Tech level license, it is
good
> > for a lifetime.
>
> And this is just one of the things that can give you a headache:
>
> Should Tech plus people be given a General (or whatever replaces it)
> license? After all, they passed the Element one test, the old barrier to
> HF..... BUT....
>
> Since there is no barrier to HF from the code test, and Tech pluses
> *might* get HF privileges, should ALL tech's get HF privileges since
> they took the same test? After all the only difference is the Tech plus'
> took Element one, which is no longer, which means it isn't a
> requirement, so they shouldn't have HF privileges on a defunct test
> requirement.............. SO it only follows.......
>
> HF privileges would in the future be granted by taking the equivalent
> of a Technician test?
>
> Yup, simple indeed.
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -
>

If any change is made, I would bet on the current Techs getting the same privileges as the Tech+ or Tech with HF without having to take a code test. This is probably the simplest thing the FCC could do. As to whether the FCC will change it for other licenses, I wouldn't want to make any bets. As for automatic upgrades, I doubt it. They didn't do it the last time around when they reduced the number of classes to three for new licensees and there is no reason to do it this time.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

4838. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-24 04:24:21 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <Vx8Gb.5162$Vv2.1974588@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 84414

Bill Sohl wrote:

> "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
> news:XD0Fb.1592$Vv2.796649@news1.news.adelphia.net...
>
>>Bill Sohl wrote:
>>
>>
>>>"Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
>>
>><snippage>
>>
>>>>>Two questions...
>>>>>1. What "other members" (I presume you mean Board Members), other
>>>>>than W5YI, do NOT support retention of technical acumen?
>>>>
>>>>They don't have to be Board members, Bill. And I don't have their names
>>>>off the top of my head.
>>>>
>>>>If you like, I can retract the "members" statement, and substitute
>>>>"member" or "prominent member". Although I think that's almost like
>>>>saying a person's argument is invalid because they made a typo.
>>>
>>>Bottom line, without names, the statement is grossly misleading
>>>as you apear to try and broaden your claim to NCI in general...
>>>which is absolutely false.
>>
>>Bottom line, I have never accused >>>NCI<<< of having any particular
>>opinion.
>>
>>I wrote:
>>
>> >Instead, some members express "unofficial opinions that scare the
>> >bejabbers out of me.
>
>
> That's the point. "Unofficial opinions". That alone, regardless
> of what you say, creates an impression that there is an "unofficial
> 'NCI' opinion". If a person has their own opinion about
> something, that isn't "official" or "unofficial" by itself. Adding the
> "unofficial opinion" label in talking about an NCI
> member DOES create a different perception than simply
> saying John Doe has an opinion that scares me.

I have a question. There is no doubt that NCI is a political
organization. So this is a fair question.

Why don't you ask a good conservative Republican what they think of the
new Govorner of California's stand on say, abortion, or say same sex
marriages? So while his opinion doesn't really have that much to do with
the national scene, therefore it isn't relevant to anything but himself,
I do know that there are plenty of the above mentioned conservatives
that don't think a whole lot of him or his opinion at all.

>>Back to now:
>>
>>Who is broadening any claim? I even put unofficial opinions on my
>
> sentence.
>
>>Your trying to pin me down on this is amusing, since the membership
>>rolls of NCI are a closely guarded secret. The only way we know is if
>>the member outs him or her self.
>
>
> Then how can you even make the statement that some "members" have
> opinions that scare you IF you can't even identify them.

I just identified two.
>
>>I don't like Han's entry level license requirement either. He's a member.
>
>
> BUT, his NCI membership doesn't tie NCI to Han's personal support
> for an entry level license.

But he certainly serves as another data point. Why don't we go over
some stuff.

You (apparently) don't support any change in anything except the
elimination of Element one.

W5YI supports what to me seems to be a radical simplification and
bastardization of the ARS requirements.

Hans has a plan that I generally don't like. I must say that he does
address the issue of needed change when element one disappears.

So forgive me, but I think I can form an opinion and defend it.

All I propose is strengthening the requirements of what exists now, and
otherwise leaving things intact. I would really encourage going into the
regulations and cleaning them up after the changover.

And yes, since NCI sees itself as the vanguard of change, I see NCI as
derelict in it's duties. To just say "eliminate the Code test" really
isn't enough.

- Mike KB3EIA -

4839. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-24 04:27:31 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <TA8Gb.5164$Vv2.1975129@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 84415

Kï¿½HB wrote:

> "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote
>
>
>>BUT, his NCI membership doesn't tie NCI to Han's personal support
>>for an entry level license.
>>
>
>
> Are you saying that NCI does not reciprocate my support for their goals?
> That would certainly be a strange sort of membership-organization.

Sorry Hans! Only elimination of the Test!

And that is what bothers me about NCI.

But it is a great way to dodge responsibility! 8^)

- Mike KB3EIA -

4840. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-24 04:36:37 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <pJ8Gb.5171$Vv2.1977962@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 84416

N2EY wrote:

> In article <20031222141059.25517.00002951@mb-m15.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com
> (Len Over 21) writes:
>
>
>>In article <QknFb.4023$Vv2.1145222@news1.news.adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo
>><mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:
>>
>>
>>>N2EY wrote:
>>>
>>>
>>>>In article <20031220143404.01893.00002231@mb-m22.aol.com>,
>>>
>>>lenover21@aol.com
>>>
>>>>(Len Over 21) writes:
>>
>>>>> As a single "authoritative voice," a New England membership
>>>>> group DEFINES everything in amateurism for all amateurs. No
>>>>> bickering, no dissension, no arguing. All do as They say.
>>>>> No problems. Everyone happy in Nirvana.
>>>>
>>>>Which group and which magazine? ham radio and 73 magazines were New
>>>>England based, but they're both defunct.
>>>>
>>>>Your description of a membership organization that does not tolerate
>>>>dissent sounds exactly like NoCode International. Right in their bylaws it
>
>
>>>>says that any member who publicly disagrees with their stated position on
>>>>code testing is subject to expulsion. They also require that all members
>>>>agree to their prime directive goal as a condition of membership. No one
>>>>who disagrees with their core policy can be a member of NoCode
>>>>International.
>>>>
>>>>I'm not saying that's right or wrong, just stating facts.
>>>
>>> And now some puzzle pieces fit together. I can now reconcile Carl's
>>>vision of how leaders are supposed to lead and his organization. Strong
>>>leadership, independent from member opinion, and if you don't like it,
>>>you're out.
>>

>> Jimmie isn't stating any "facts."
>
>
> "Of whom are you speaking, old man?"
>
> Right in NCI's bylaws it says that any member who publicly disagrees with their
> stated position on code testing is subject to expulsion.
>
> Fact or fiction?
>
> They also require that all members agree to their prime directive goal as a
> condition of membership.

> Fact or fiction?
>
> No one who disagrees with their core policy can be a member of NoCode
> International.
>
> Fact or fiction?

And yet....... while expulsion can be obtained so easily in one matter,
there is an extreme amount of slack granted for "unofficial" positions
on other matters regarding amateur radio! Why doesn't NCI have a
position on anything else?

>> He is simply manufacturing an
>> argument for the sake of something to argue about. SOP for Jimmie.
>
>
> "I tell it like it is. You are just another arrogant control-freak wanting
> others to be subservient to your viewpoints. You can't accept a damn thing if
> it isn't in line with your holy opinions."
>
>
>
>> [he seems to need something, anything, to argue about every day]
>
>
> "Reality points to the fact that you CANNOT accept any opinions contrary to
> your own with grace or gentle manner...you constantly, belligerently go after
> any person who can stand up to you and show where your ideas aren't valid."
>
>
>> No Code International is most of all a political special interest group.
>> It asks for no dues, does not demand a license of any kind in order
>> to belong.
>
>
> But it does require absolute allegiance to its prime directive of eliminating
> all code testing. No disagreement or dissent allowed, under penalty of
> expulsion.

>
>> Unlike the ARRL...which IS a dues-asking, amateur license required,
>> membership organization and political special interest group and a
>> publishing business, NCI does not pretend to represent "all" amateurs.
>
>
> NCI says that it knows what is best for the future of amateur radio.
>
>> ARRL pretends to "represent all amateurs"
>
>
> Where does it claim that? Show us an exact quote.
>
>
>> yet they still haven't
>> gotten close to a majority of all licensed U.S. amateurs to belong
>> to them. They've not been able to do that for years past.
>
>
> The exact size of either organization is unknown, but from all davailable data
> it is clear that ARRL, despite dues and annual renewals, is at least 30 times
> the size of NCI.
>
> ARRL accepts for membership those who disagree with and want to change their
> policies. NCI does not.
>
> There has been an amateur license available in the USA without any code test
> for almost 13 years now. ARRL membership voting rights are the same regardless
> of license class.
>
>> ARRL refuses to take a stand on code testing in the USA yet the
>> International Amateur Radio Union long ago came out for eliminating
>> the code test internationally.
>
>
> "Strange words. According to the FCC, not to mention a couple of Acts of
> Congress (one in 1934, another in 1996), only the FCC created the class of the
> (no-code-test) Technician license. Not the US Congress. Not the ITU."
>
>
>> Once that happens, NCI has stated
>> that it will dissolve, cease to exist as a special interest entity.
>
>
> Perhaps it will, perhaps it won't.

Maybe this is the point for another poll, Jim?

> It seems you want ARRL to dissolve, cease to exist. You accept the organization
> that does not allow dissent, and reject the organization that accepts and
> allows dissent. Why?

>
>> NCI is a very small group,
>
>
> What is its exact membership?

Always growing!

>
>> has no law firm on retainer in DC,
>
>
> "Oh, my, were you admitted to a bar this afternoon and thought you had become a
> legal beagle? Arf, arf?"
>
>
>> nor
>> does it have another group on retainer to lobby the FCC.
>
>
> Why would that be needed for a single issue?
>
>
>> ARRL does.
>> NCI directors get out and personally lobby for action on elimination
>> of code testing, including all the way to Geneva and WRC-03...and
>> not on a multi-million annual budget available to the ARRL.
>
>
> WK3C was at Geneva for reasons other than S25.5. His way was paid for by his
> employer. He has stated that right here in this newsgroup. He did not go on his
> own nickel, or NCI's.
>
> "I'd like to see YOU address the FCC in the same manner as you address others."

Snarf!!!! 8^)

- Mike KB3EIA -

4841. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-24 04:41:51 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <jO8Gb.5173$Vv2.1979528@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 84417

JJ wrote:

> Mike Coslo wrote:
>
>> Phil Kane wrote:
>>
>>> On Tue, 23 Dec 2003 16:08:41 -0700, JJ wrote:
>>>
>>>
>>>> Here is what I found in Chapter 6 of The Texas Driver's Handbook, page
>>>> 62...quote:
>>>>
>>>> KEEP TO THE RIGHT
>>>>
>>>> NEVER drive on the left half of the road in the following instances:
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>> [snip]
>>>
>>>
>>>> Sounds pretty simple, the right lane is for passing, you should always
>>>> keep to the left except for passing.
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>> Huh ?? Comprehension problem? Try "the other left".....
>>>
>>> The question wasn't about driving on the left-hand side of the road,
>>> it was about driving on the right-hand side of the center of a road
>>> where traffic flows in both directions, or at the left-hand side of
>>> a one-way road with two or more lanes.
>>
>>
>>
>> Does anyone know what on earth the original question was in this
>> thread?
>
>
> It was something about michael jackson I think. Does he even drive?
>
Ohhhh don't go there!!! ;^) I just wonder how it evolved into an

expression of passive agressive road rage?

- Mike KB3EIA -

- Mike KB3EIA -

4842. Re: New Q signs

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-24 04:48:20 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <oU8Gb.5175$Vv2.1981232@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 84418

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:

> In article <20031221092132.26118.00001466@mb-m06.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve
> Robeson K4CAP) writes:
>
>
>>>Subject: New Q signs
>>>From: Robert Casey wa2ise@ix.netcom.com
>>>Date: 12/20/03 8:57 PM Central Standard Time
>>>Message-id: <3FE50C14.3080609@ix.netcom.com>
>>>
>>>QMC = Merry Christmas
>>>QMX = Merry Xmas
>>>QHH = Happy Hoildays
>>>QHY = Happy new Year
>>
>> QBH: Bah, Humbug
>>
>>73
>>
>>Steve, K4YZ
>
>
> QGB: God bless us, every one!
>
> 73 and Merry CHRISTmas, de Larry, K3LT
>
> BTW: I hold the fervent hope that there is someone out there who is offended
> by my emphasis of the name "Christ" in the word "CHRISTmas." If so, please
> do me a favor and reply with an amusing post about how I'm being Politically
> Incorrect, or something like that!

Now Larry! Who cares about politically correct, who really cares about offending whoever? Better to have pity on those who may be offended by your expression than trying to bait them.

Celebrate Christmas!

- Mike KB3EIA -

4843. Re: Why I Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-24 04:51:54 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <KX8Gb.17487$Pg1.13980@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 84419

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote

>
> HF privileges would in the future be granted by taking the equivalent
> of a Technician test?
>

HF privileges were granted in the past by taking a test far less demanding
than the current Technician test.

And Technicians of the past took the General written test AND a Morse test,
but were not allowed on HF, but they could get a (simultaneous) Novice
license and operate on HF (even though the General written they'd taken for
Technician didn't allow them on HF or 2 meters).

And you new kids think MY licensing proposal is strange!

Merry (whatever god you worship) Feast,

73.5, de Hans, K0HB

4844. Re: Why I Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-24 04:56:44 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <g09Gb.5177$Vv2.1982989@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 84420

Kï¿½HB wrote:

> "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote
>
>
>>HF privileges would in the future be granted by taking the equivalent
>>of a Technician test?
>>
>
>
> HF privileges were granted in the past by taking a test far less demanding
> than the current Technician test.

True, but they were pretty limited otherwise.

> And Technicians of the past took the General written test AND a Morse test,
> but were not allowed on HF, but they could get a (simultaneous) Novice
> license and operate on HF (even though the General written they'd taken for
> Technician didn't allow them on HF or 2 meters).
>
> And you new kids think MY licensing proposal is strange!

Hey, I think everything is strange, Hans!

> Merry (whatever god you worship) Feast,

The same to you, be s/he vengeful thunderer or cosmic muffin.

- Mike KB3EIA -

4845. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-24 12:01:30 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031224070130.25815.00005391@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 84421

In article <pJ8Gb.5171$Vv2.1977962@news1.news.adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo
<mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:

> And yet..... while expulsion can be obtained so easily in one matter,

>there is an extreme amount of slack granted for "unofficial" positions
>on other matters regarding amateur radio! Why doesn't NCI have a
>position on anything else?

Because it's a one-purpose organization.

Some years back, there was a petition by a VHF group to change the rules slightly. As you know, the lowest 100 kHz of 6 and 2 meters are CW only, and the rest of amateur VHF/UHF allows all authorized modes everywhere.

Folks in that and other VHF/UHF groups are "weak signal" fans, and had noticed increased QRM from local FM simplex folks. They'd be trying to work some SSB DX on, say, 144.200 and would find themselves buried by local FM simplex ops who had simply dropped down there from a repeater. Note that the typical ham FM signal is maybe 5-6 times wider than an SSB signal and you'll begin to see the problem.

So the VHF group proposed eliminating the CW-only 100 kHz, and instead setting up the lowest 300 kHz of 6 and 2, plus about the same amount just above 432 MHz, as "narrow band preserves" - no modes wider than 3 kHz allowed.

NCI wrote a strongly worded opposition to that proposal. The rallying cry was "no setasides for legacy modes!!" (SSB is a "legacy mode").

Now of course anyone can comment to FCC. And there can be an honest disagreement about subbands-by-mode. But it was really odd - N0BK would say surreal - to see such comments by a one-purpose group on a subject that had absolutely nothing to do with code testing, and which involved bands completely open to Technicians.

After having this discrepancy pointed out, NCI took more of a one-purpose stance, and has not gotten involved in any issues other than "drop Element 1"
>
>>> He is simply manufacturing an

>>> Once that happens, NCI has stated
>>> that it will dissolve, cease to exist as a special interest entity.
>>
>>
>> Perhaps it will, perhaps it won't.
>
> Maybe this is the point for another poll, Jim?

To what purpose? ;-)

>> What is its exact membership?
>
>Always growing!

Of course!

73 de Jim, N2EY

4846. Re: Why I Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-24 12:01:30 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031224070130.25815.00005392@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 84422

In article <KX8Gb.17487$Pg1.13980@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>, "Ki¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> writes:

>HF privileges were granted in the past by taking a test far less demanding
>than the current Technician test.

The old Novice written plus 5 wpm code was "far less demanding"? OK....
>
>And Technicians of the past took the General written test AND a Morse test,
>but were not allowed on HF, but they could get a (simultaneous) Novice
>license and operate on HF (even though the General written they'd taken for
>Technician didn't allow them on HF or 2 meters).
>
>And you new kids think MY licensing proposal is strange!

Even stranger is the fact that there was a period of time (1970s?) when FCC did not allow the simultaneous possession of both the Novice and Technician licenses, so when a ham passed the written test for Tech, he/she lost all HF privs - even though both licenses required the same code test.
>
>Merry (whatever god you worship) Feast,
>
Happy Solstice

73 de Jim, N2EY

4847. Re: Why I Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-24 13:57:05 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031224085705.12501.00004833@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 84425

In article <218Gb.5146$Vv2.1962826@news1.news.adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo
<mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:

>And all this aside, my major gripe with NCI is that they don't have any
>post Morse plan. Just saying Element one goes away, and all is well, is
>naive.

Agreed but there's a reason they have no other plan. The reason is that such a
plan would create several problems.
>
> If I had an organization that proposed the elimination of Element one,
>there is no doubt that I would have a whole set of proposals that I
>would offer in it's place.

But that would create several problems:

1) The stated purpose of NCI is to eliminate the code test and nothing more.
Proposing other changes would exceed that charter.

2) The organization has said it would cease to function in any country where
the code test is totally eliminated. If a govt. drops the code test first, NCI
would have to violate that rule to present a plan with other changes.

3) There is bound to be a wide range of opinion on what the other changes
should be, even in an organization as small as NCI (5000 members, tops!) Plans
would range from "one license class, minimal written test" to "more license
classes, beefed up written tests, experience requirements, required upgrading"
and all sorts of other things. Look at all the discussion over Hans' simple
proposal.
Imagine all the headaches trying to get a consensus.

4) Any plan would doubtless upset some members to the point they would then
resign.

5) Putting together any such plan is a lot of work. Particularly once folks get
hold of it and start asking questions. Again, look at all the issues Hans'
simple, straightforward proposal has raised. Now add the work of turning that
revised idea into FCC rules language...

6) If NCI did it here, some might say they'd need to do it in other countries.
Even more work.

> And that is the problem. There is no action without a reaction or
>consequences. Something like Morse code testing, which is interwoven
>into the fabric of the ARS as much as it is, cannot simply be yanked out
>without consequences.

Of course! But folks disagree on what those consequences would be. Some say "We'll get a horde of undisciplined freebanders!" Others say "We'll get a bunch of RF engineers who will revolutionize amateur radio!"

But NCI won't be around to take the heat....

The reality is likely to be very different.

73 de Jim, N2EY

4848. Re: Why I Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-24 13:57:06 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031224085706.12501.00004834@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 84424

In article <218Gb.5146$Vv2.1962826@news1.news.adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:

>I'm not sure about that. When I took my original General test and
>flunked the Morse code portion, I was issued credit for the written part
>which lasted a year (or was that a year and a day?)

It was neither. CSCEs are good for 365 days. Leap years have burned a few hams.

Note that in nonleap years the calendar advances one weekday per year. IOW Dec. 24 was a Tuesday in 2002 and is a Wednesday in 2003. But in 2004, Dec. 24 will be a Friday.

73 de Jim, N2EY

4849. Re: Why I Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-24 13:57:07 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031224085707.12501.00004835@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 84423

In article <Ra8Gb.5150$Vv2.1967187@news1.news.adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo
<mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:

>Should Tech plus people be given a General (or whatever replaces it)
>license?

If they passed their Tech written before March 21, 1987, they can get a General
with no additional testing. The rules have provided for this testless upgrade
since restructuring.

Even if they let their old license expire, they can get credit for current
Element 1 *and* Element 3.

>After all, they passed the Element one test, the old barrier to
>HF..... BUT....

"barrier"??
>
> Since there is no barrier to HF from the code test, and Tech pluses
>*might* get HF privileges, should ALL tech's get HF privileges since
>they took the same test?

Sure - and that has been proposed by several of the petitions before FCC,
including NCI's and NCVEC's.

The surreal part of it is that those privileges consist of Morse privileges on
three bands plus CW and SSB privileges on one band.

>After all the only difference is the Tech plus'
>took Element one, which is no longer, which means it isn't a
>requirement, so they shouldn't have HF privileges on a defunct test
>requirement.............. SO it only follows.....
>
> HF privileges would in the future be granted by taking the equivalent
>of a Technician test?
>
> Yup, simple indeed.
>
Depends entirely on the wording of the changes if Element 1 is dropped. Some
folks want to take the incremental approach - just drop Element 1 and see what
happens.

73 de Jim, N2EY

4850. Merry Christmas

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-24 14:18:19 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bsc749$6po@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 84426

Merry Christmas! I wish for you something to hug, something to be hugged by, and the happiness inside to provide these for yourself if you need to!

Kim W5TIT

4851. Re: Why I Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-24 14:58:21 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <hQhGb.18864$P%1.17106423@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 84427

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20031224085705.12501.00004833@mb-m04.aol.com...
> In article <218Gb.5146$Vv2.1962826@news1.news.adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo
> <mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:
> > And that is the problem. There is no action without a reaction or
> >consequences. Something like Morse code testing, which is interwoven
> >into the fabric of the ARS as much as it is, cannot simply be yanked out
> >without consequences.
>
> Of course! But folks disagree on what those consequences would be. Some
say
> "We'll get a horde of undisciplined freebanders!" Others say "We'll get a
bunch
> of RF engineers who will revolutionize amateur radio!"
>
> But NCI won't be around to take the heat....
>
> The reality is likely to be very different.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

My guess is no change in the number of new hams coming in but they might test straight to General because of the differences in privileges or they would test for General very shortly after getting the Tech. There would be a surge of upgrades for awhile which would taper off. There would be some temporary chaos on the HF bands until the new operators learn the ropes. Plus DX chasing would jump for awhile and that would be chaotic for awhile for the same reason, however I would expect this to taper off as some of the people either achieve their goals or become disenchanted and quit doing it.

The reality is probably very little actual change.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

4852. Happy Holidays to all

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-24 15:08:35 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <NPydnfgxv5mtMXSiUSdV9g@ptd.net>
Source record: 84428

Happy Holidays and a safe, healthy, and prosperous new year to all.

73,

--
Carl R. Stevenson - wk3c
Grid Square FN20fm
http://home.ptd.net/~wk3c

NCI-1052
Executive Director, No Code International
Fellow, The Radio Club of America
Senior Member, IEEE
Member, IEEE Standards Association
Chair, IEEE 802.18 Radio Regulatory Technical Advisory Group
Chair, Wi-Fi Alliance Regulatory Committee
Co-Chair, Wi-Fi Alliance Legislative Committee
Member, QCWA (31424)
Life Member, ARRL
Member, TAPR

Join No Code International! Hams for the 21st Century.
Help assure the survival and prosperity of ham radio.
<http://www.nocode.org>

4853. Re: New Q signs

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-24 15:21:56 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031224102156.12501.00004837@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 84429

In article <20031223214651.07346.00002247@mb-m26.aol.com>, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) writes:

>I hold the fervent hope that there is someone out there who is offended
>by my emphasis of the name "Christ" in the word "CHRISTmas." If so, please
>do me a favor and reply with an amusing post about how I'm being Politically
>Incorrect, or something like that!

I find it humorous that some are offended by the word "Xmas", because they obviously don't know its origin.

A Verry Merry to All, whatever your holiday

73 de Jim, N2EY

4854. Re: Why You Don't Like Ham's Who Can't Accept Change.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-24 15:21:56 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031224102156.12501.00004836@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 84430

In article <20031223154928.07346.00002243@mb-m26.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) writes:

>Amateur radio FUN is only "ancilliary" to the U.S. amateur radio
> SERVICE. Ham radio is all about wearing a Lifestyle mental
> uniform, marching in ranks to the morse drumbeat of the 1930s,
> and being ready, willing, able to "take over communications" when
> all the commercial/professional infrastructure FAILS in an
> emergency? That's the thoughts I see expressed in here.

By whom?
>
> There can be no fun in the ham SERVICE.

Says who?

4855. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-24 15:22:05 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031224102205.03883.00001835@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 84431

>Subject: Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL
>From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
>Date: 12/24/03 5:32 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <f45722ac.0312240332.2a76f3f1@posting.google.com>
>
>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>news:<20031223181647.04265.00001548@mb-m29.aol.com>...
>> >Subject: Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL
>> >From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
>> >Date: 12/23/03 4:38 PM Central Standard Time
>> >Message-id: <f45722ac.0312231438.e754a15@posting.google.com>
>>
>> >And all the SK's out there who forgot to terminate their memberships.
>>
>> Brain, do you think there's ANY "membership" organization that has a
>100%,
>> real-time accounting of thier membership? I don't.
>>
>> Steve, K4YZ
>
>Now that I've lead you in a full circle, we're back to NCI's membership
>roster.

>>I<< was never "AT" NCI's membership roster, Brain.

...And we are used to you going in circles. If it wasn't for the tail
you're chasing, how would you know which end was your head?

Steve, K4YZ

4856. Re: Happy Holidays to all

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-24 15:25:08 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031224102508.08176.00001471@mb-m16.aol.com>
Source record: 84432

>Happy Holidays and a safe, healthy, and prosperous new year to all.
>
>73,
>
>--
>Carl R. Stevenson - wk3c

And more Dumbing Down in the New Year

4857. Happy New Year

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-24 16:17:30 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <u_iGb.17959$Pg1.2635@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 84433

Dear Friends,

It becomes my painful duty to write you a letter of apology instead of sending you the holiday remembrance that I had intended for you.

Knowing so well the appetites, likes and dislikes of my close friends, I made up a list of twelve of my best friends and went down and bought several quarts of "Royal Canadian" 18-year-old whiskey. Nothing but the very finest for my friends. I took this home and put it in my cellar and intended to put it up in nice Holiday wrappings and send it out to you just before the New Year.

My wife got to fumbling around in the cellar and found the liquor and didn't understand just what I intended to do with it. So she came up and told me to empty the contents of every bottle down the sink, or else. So I proceeded with the unpleasant task.

I withdrew the cork from the first bottle and poured the contents down the sink, with the exception of one glass which I drank. I extracted the cork of the second bottle and likewise poured the contents down the sink, with the exception of the glass which I drank. I pulled the sink from the next bottle from the cork of the next and drank one sink out of it and threw the rest down the glass. I pulled the sink out of the next glass and poured the cork from the bottle. Then I corked the sink with the glass, bottled the drink and drank the pour.

When I had everything emptied, I steadied the house with one hand and counted the bottles, corks, glasses, and sinks with the other, which were twenty-nine. And, as the houses came by, I counted them again and finally had all the houses and bottles and corks and glasses and sinks counted, except one house which I drank.

So this accounts, dear friend, for your not receiving a more stimulating present than this letter.

And Merry Christmas to those who partake,

de K0HB

--
http://www.home.earthlink.net/~k0hb

4858. Re: Why I Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-24 16:57:21 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031224115721.23171.00002871@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 84434

In article <Yh1Fb.12569$0s2.8434@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>, "Kï¿½HB"
<groupk0hb@earthlink.net> writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote

>> Well, there you have it. Element 1 is easier than 5 questions on the
>> written test.
>
>No, you don't "have it" at all, Jim.

Then what am I missing?
>
>Question for question, the Technician examination questions are noticeably
>more difficult than those on the old Novice examination, and there are more
>of them.

OK, fine. 5 more of them to be exact.
>
>> Woefully inadequate? FCC disagrees!
>
>Do you think they're right?

Nope. But they're the "expert agency"...

And I also disagree with them on code testing serving "no regulatory
purpose"...
>
>> (1) FCC thinks that 35 question Tech test is adequate.
>> (2)The same FCC that sees "no regulatory purpose" in code tests.
>>
>> Is FCC mistaken?
>
>They are mistaken on point one. They are correct on point 2.

I think they're worng on both points. YMMV

But the main point is that they *can* be wrong.
>
>> Have the changes of 2000 resulted in more tinkerers entering the ARS in a
>> given time period (say, per year) than before the changes were made?
>
>I have no way of knowing for sure. Neither do you.

That's true. But we can have impressions and opinions.

>It is my belief,
>however, that the diminished emphasis on technical issues in the test, along

>with the 'Ham Press' lack of emphasis on technical matters, is making the
>Amateur Radio service less effective in recruiting those of an experimental
>and tinkering bent.

Agreed!

73 de Jim, N2EY

4859. Re: Why I Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-24 16:57:22 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031224115722.23171.00002872@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 84435

In article <i_2Fb.17738$P%1.16339939@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20031220145906.21642.00003100@mb-m01.aol.com...
>> In article <1bKcnRsopILxK36iUSdV9w@ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
>> <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:
>>
>> But others will argue that an easier entry-level license will attract more
>new
>> hams, and therefore more who will want to *understand radio*. After all,
>isn't
>> education one of the B&Ps of the ARS?
>>
>> It boils down to the old argument of:
>>
>> "Become a ham to learn about radio"
>>
>> vs.
>>
>> "Learn about radio to become a ham"
>>
>
>
>What it should be and too many fail to realize is that the proper sequence
>is "Learn radio basics to become a ham and then as a ham continue to learn
>and increase one's expertise." It should not be one versus the other.
>
I agree 100%!

But what constitutes "the basics" is a question that will get all kinds of responses. And whether there should be just one level of license, or several, is another wide-open question.

73 de Jim, N2EY

4860. Re: New General

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-24 17:00:57 UTC
From: nightowls627@aol.comnojunk
Message-ID: <20031224120057.19816.00001035@mb-m01.aol.com>
Source record: 84436

>Congrats on getting the ticket! I spent a lot of time in the wee hours
>of the morning on the 40 meter novice band with the new daughter propped
>on my crossed leg, working the key with one hand and holding the bottle

That is cool!! We are now expecting another one and as my wife and I take turns with night duty, I think the soft glow of the transceiver and the tick tick may be the ticket to helping the little one go to sleep. What a great excuse to cw. It makes it hard to copy though!

Thanks

73
Greg
ki4bbl@arrl.net

4861. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-24 18:08:44 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <oZqdnXYCd5z7SnSiRVn-sw@gbronline.com>
Source record: 84437

Kim W5TIT wrote:

>
> Simple 'nuff, find a *LAW* and I'll accept that it is illegal to drive in
> left lanes, otherwise, you're allowing yourself to be impressioned for the
> benefit of winning a side to an argument--which, of course, I am also.
> Seems I'm winning, though...

Not so fast tits.

> Law, JJ, not suggestions, not a manual, not
> someone's (as in the circumstance with your submitted commentary)
> interpretation, but law.

Here is the response I received from Bud Kennedy, the author of the article.

Hi Bill,

Thanks for your note.

Your friend obviously thinks she knows everything, so she probably will think she knows more than the law or the DPS. - (boy does he have you pegged - jj)

I quoted the law in the column. It's from 545.051 --

http://www.capitol.state.tx.us/statutes/tr/tr0054500.html

+(b) An operator of a vehicle on a roadway moving more slowly than the normal speed of other vehicles at the time and place under the existing conditions shall drive in the right-hand lane available for vehicles, or as close as practicable to the right-hand curb or edge of the roadway, unless the operator is:

+(1) passing another vehicle; or
+(2) preparing for a left turn at an intersection or into a private road or driveway.

This law is not defined by the speed limit. It is defined by the "normal speed of other vehicles."

In other words, if you're driving slower than other drivers, you "shall" move over.

Write again or anytime

--Bud

4862. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-24 19:03:31 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <7qlGb.18891$P%1.17136308@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 84438

"JJ" <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
news:oZqdnXYCd5z7SnSiRVn-sw@gbronline.com...
> Kim W5TIT wrote:
>
> >
> > Simple 'nuff, find a *LAW* and I'll accept that it is illegal to drive
in
> > left lanes, otherwise, you're allowing yourself to be impressioned for
the
> > benefit of winning a side to an argument--which, of course, I am also.
> > Seems I'm winning, though...
>
> Not so fast tits.
>
> > Law, JJ, not suggestions, not a manual, not
> > someone's (as in the circumstance with your submitted commentary)
> > interpretation, but law.
>
> Here is the response I received from Bud Kennedy, the author of the
article.
>
> Hi Bill,
>
> Thanks for your note.
>
> Your friend obviously thinks she knows everything, so she probably will
> think she knows more than the law or the DPS. - (boy does he have you
> pegged - jj)
>
> I quoted the law in the column. It's from 545.051 --
>
> http://www.capitol.state.tx.us/statutes/tr/tr0054500.html
>
> +(b) An operator of a vehicle on a roadway moving more slowly than the
> normal speed of other vehicles at the time and place under the existing
> conditions shall drive in the right-hand lane available for vehicles, or
> as close as practicable to the right-hand curb or edge of the roadway,
> unless the operator is:
>
> +(1) passing another vehicle; or
> +(2) preparing for a left turn at an intersection or into a private road
> or driveway.
>
> This law is not defined by the speed limit. It is defined by the "normal

> speed of other vehicles."
>
> In other words, if you're driving slower than other drivers, you "shall"
> move over.
>
> Write again or anytime
>
> --Bud
>

Well Kim has several times stated that she was driving at the normal speed of the other drivers in the lane. So your quotation makes Kim correct. That a single individual wants to drive much faster than the rest of the traffic does not make Kim wrong for not moving. She may or may not be unwise depending on the overall circumstances but from this quotation is not doing anything illegal.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

4863. Re: New General

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-24 19:10:58 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <6xlGb.7931$IM3.6620@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 84439

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20031223214651.07346.00002246@mb-m26.aol.com...
> In article <20031221135241.13822.00001215@mb-m10.aol.com>,
> nightowls627@aol.comnojunk (G. Doughty) writes:
>
> >
> >Well, passed my element one with no problems yesterday and have been
trying
> >to
> >get some contacts on hf with cw. I love cw but 5wpm just isn't cutting
it so
> >I
> >am back to Numorse to bring up my speed. Anyone out there that tried a
> >contact
> >with me, sorry. I was forever putting out QRS and still not getting it
all.
> >I
> >will be back though as I cannot use phone when the baby is sleeping. The
> >light
> >*tick-ticking* on the straight key doesn't disturb her as much as me
talking.
> >
> >Thanks
> >73
> >G. Doughty
> >KI4BBL@arrl.net
>
> How refreshing! A new ham who actually passes his General, gets OTA
> with CW, and isn't whining about it! I'm especially impressed by the fact
> that Mr. Doughty is a new father with a young baby, but is not using that
> as an excuse not to get in some operating time! Moreover, the non-voice
> nature of CW is giving him the means to do so without disturbing the
> harmonic's slumbers. Good work, BBL! Carry on, and I hope to work you
> someday!
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

It is wonderful, a breath of fresh air. Gives one renewed hope that all in
the ARS are not dimwits.

Dan/W4NTI

4864. Re: New General

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-24 19:12:37 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <FylGb.7933$IM3.1245@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 84440

"Greg Doughty" <nightowls627@aol.comnojunk> wrote in message
news:20031224120057.19816.00001035@mb-m01.aol.com...
> >Congrats on getting the ticket! I spent a lot of time in the wee hours
> >of the morning on the 40 meter novice band with the new daughter propped
> >on my crossed leg, working the key with one hand and holding the bottle
>
> That is cool!! We are now expecting another one and as my wife and I take
> turns with night duty, I think the soft glow of the transceiver and the
tick
> tick may be the ticket to helping the little one go to sleep. What a
great
> excuse to cw. It makes it hard to copy though!
>
> Thanks
>
> 73
> Greg
> ki4bbl@arrl.net

At first yes, but you will eventually start copying in your head and won't
need to do much other than take notes. Enjoy.

Dan/W4NTI

4865. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-24 19:18:56 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031224141856.15462.00005210@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 84441

In article <20031223154927.07346.00002242@mb-m26.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) writes:

> clicking on ARRL publications
> and QST yields a table of contents of January 2004 issue. On
> there is a link to a "Micro Keyer" (CW keyer) which is viewable,
> but no other viewable link to more general amateur radio articles
> such as making nice front panels for homebuilt equipment.

So?

> This is
> just another subtle bit of business on ARRL's continuing push for
> morse code related over and above all other modes.

Not at all. It's just a sample. Other months there are different sample articles.

> ARRL may
> take a "neutral" stance on morse code testing regulations but one
> can only take away their code key from their cold, dead fingers...

Sounds like you want radio amateurs to stop using Morse code. Why is that?

> In truth, a "Publishers Sworn Statement" is SOLELY for the
> benefit of potential ADVERTISERS. QST subsists almost entirely
> on the income of advertising to pay for printing, author compensation
> (miniscule by comparison to other periodicals), "fulfillment"
> (publishing-speak for subscriptions), and QST direct staff.

How do you know? Have you gone over their books?

Even if true, what's the problem? ARRL does a lot more than publish QST.

> Note that
> QST has used a heavier-weight glossy paper than most periodicals
> (which costs more) but has gone to slightly lower-weight glossy paper.
> Anyone can go through any issue, count column-inches, and
> determine the issue's Real income within 20% or so just from QST's
> rates (also on the web site, different page).

And your point is?
>
> Advertising pays the bills at a periodical. Advertising revenue is
> finite so all periodical publishers will condense and "tailor" the
> Publisher's Sworn Statements as much as they can...so that
> potential advertisers are convinced to pay them instead of any
> competition. Since advertising budgets are finite, some periodicals

> just don't get as much income...and some may have to quit when
> there isn't enough income to pay bills.

You mean like ham radio and 73, both defunct?
>
> There's bound to be someone who shows "exceptions" to the rule
> that advertising pays the bills. I'm familiar with that. As one who
> gets a number of trade periodicals (EDN, Electronic Design, RF
> Design, Microwaves & RF, PET, etc.) entirely without any monies
> from me ("controlled circulation" magazines), that's proof enough of
> my statement. There are MORE "free" trade publications in the
> USA than there are subscription-fee publications.

Show your work.

> Members try to rationalize others' negative criticsm by using only one
> or two of the triad as "justification."

You have nothing but negative criticism and insults, Len. You're playing a sort of Zen game where you never say what something is or should be but only what it isn't, or should not be. Why is that?

> In truth, ARRL tries to be too
> many things under one roof

What would you have them change besides their code test policy?

> and that, if too inflexible, may be its
> eventual undoing.

It's clear you'd be really happy if ARRL disappeared.

ARRL and QST have existed continuously since 1919. There is no larger amateur radio organization on earth. At least 30 times the size of NCI....

You seem to think that amateur radio doesn't need a strong national organization. Reality shows that such an organization - or more than one! - *are* needed - otherwise, amateur radio would slowly be legislated out of existence. You'd like that, wouldn't you, Len?

To give just one example - the BPL issue.

Since you have no intention of becoming a ham, Len, why doies any of this matter to you?

4866. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-24 19:43:05 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <YJqdnQusX-rQcnSiRVn-hA@gbronline.com>
Source record: 84442

Dee D. Flint wrote:

> "JJ" <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
> news:oZqdnXYCd5z7SnSiRVn-sw@gbronline.com...
>
>>Kim W5TIT wrote:
>>
>>
>>>Simple 'nuff, find a *LAW* and I'll accept that it is illegal to drive
>
> in
>
>>>left lanes, otherwise, you're allowing yourself to be impressioned for
>
> the
>
>>>benefit of winning a side to an argument--which, of course, I am also.
>>>Seems I'm winning, though...
>>
>>Not so fast tits.
>>
>>
>>>Law, JJ, not suggestions, not a manual, not
>>>someone's (as in the circumstance with your submitted commentary)
>>>interpretation, but law.
>>
>>Here is the response I received from Bud Kennedy, the author of the
>
> article.
>
>>Hi Bill,
>>
>>Thanks for your note.
>>
>>Your friend obviously thinks she knows everything, so she probably will
>>think she knows more than the law or the DPS. - (boy does he have you
>>pegged - jj)
>>
>>I quoted the law in the column. It's from 545.051 --
>>
>>http://www.capitol.state.tx.us/statutes/tr/tr0054500.html
>>
>>+(b) An operator of a vehicle on a roadway moving more slowly than the
>>normal speed of other vehicles at the time and place under the existing

>>conditions shall drive in the right-hand lane available for vehicles, or
>>as close as practicable to the right-hand curb or edge of the roadway,
>>unless the operator is:
>>
>>+(1) passing another vehicle; or
>>+(2) preparing for a left turn at an intersection or into a private road
>>or driveway.
>>
>>This law is not defined by the speed limit. It is defined by the "normal
>>speed of other vehicles."
>>
>>In other words, if you're driving slower than other drivers, you "shall"
>>move over.
>>
>>Write again or anytime
>>
>>--Bud
>>
>
>
> Well Kim has several times stated that she was driving at the normal speed
> of the other drivers in the lane. So your quotation makes Kim correct.
> That a single individual wants to drive much faster than the rest of the
> traffic does not make Kim wrong for not moving. She may or may not be
> unwise depending on the overall circumstances but from this quotation is not
> doing anything illegal.
>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>
It should be obvious to the most casual of observers that if you are in
the left lane and other traffic is attempting to go faster than you are,
even if you are driving the normal speed, speeding, or whatever, you are
obliged to move to the right lane to let the faster traffic pass. That
is stated pretty plainly. Even if you are going the same speed of the
vehicles in the right lane, you cannot block faster traffic in the left
lane. The law states that the operator of a moving vehicle "*shall*
drive in the *right* hand lane unless the operator is: (1)passing
another vehicle." Pretty plain, if you are in the left lane and going
the same speed as vehicles in the right, then you are not passing, so
you are obliged to move to the right.
I bet that if kimmygirl is in the left lane and approaches a slower
vehicle in that lane she certainly expects them to move over so she can
speed on her merry way.

4867. Re: Happy Holidays to all

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-24 20:10:13 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <FomGb.8006$IM3.4785@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 84443

"Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
> Happy Holidays and a safe, healthy,
> and prosperous new year to all.

Same to you, Carl.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

4868. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-24 20:18:08 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <4wmGb.8019$IM3.3000@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 84444

"Len Over 21" wrote:
>
> Dwight, with all due respect, I think
> I know a bit about the periodicals
> industry and Publisher's Sworn
> Statements. :-)

Well, then by all means, you go at it. I'm not going to get into this discussion beyond what I've already done, and I'm certainly not going to write a detailed response to the long-winded message you wrote. ;-)

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

4869. Re: Merry Christmas

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-24 20:33:05 UTC
From: garigue <garigue@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <5KmGb.470916$275.1367654@attbi_s53>
Source record: 84445

I wish all on the group a Merry Christmas and God's blessings for 04 .....

KI3R Tom Popovic Belle Vernon Pa nr Pittsburgh

4870. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-24 20:33:11 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <I7GdnXjbtJm3YXSiRVn-uA@gbronline.com>
Source record: 84450

Dwight Stewart wrote:

> "JJ" wrote:
>
>>Here is what I found in Chapter 6 of
>>The Texas Driver's Handbook, page
>>62...quote:
>>
>>KEEP TO THE RIGHT
>>
>>NEVER drive on the left half of the
>>road in the following instances:
>>
>>1. When pavement markings prohibit
>>driving on the left (a "No Passing
>>Zone").
>>
>>2. When there are two or more traffic
>>lanes in one direction. (In other words,
>>don't "drive" in the left lane/s...my words)
>
>
>
> Give up on it, JJ. I saw that section too, but it refers to driving on the
> opposite side of the highway (note the "left half of the road" above), not
> driving in the left lane of a multiple-lane highway (in the left lane of
> multiple-lane highway, you wouldn't be on the left half of the overall
> road). There simply doesn't appear to be a "left lane only for passing" law
> in Texas.
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
>
Suggest you read 545.051 of the law in my previous post.

4871. Re: Happy Holidays to all

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-24 20:37:00 UTC
From: garigue <garigue@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <MNmGb.127683$8y1.398971@attbi_s52>
Source record: 84446

Aw com'on LUX .... can't you just cast aside all we have been "discussing"
over the year for just one message...

Sad ...73 Tom KI3R
"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20031224102508.08176.00001471@mb-m16.aol.com...
> >Happy Holidays and a safe, healthy, and prosperous new year to all.
> >
> >73,
> >
> >--
> >Carl R. Stevenson - wk3c
>
> And more Dumbing Down in the New Year

4872. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-24 20:39:47 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <nQmGb.8045$IM3.985@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 84447

"JJ" wrote:
>
> Here is what I found in Chapter 6 of
> The Texas Driver's Handbook, page
> 62...quote:
>
> KEEP TO THE RIGHT
>
> NEVER drive on the left half of the
> road in the following instances:
>
> 1. When pavement markings prohibit
> driving on the left (a "No Passing
> Zone").
>
> 2. When there are two or more traffic
> lanes in one direction. (In other words,
> don't "drive" in the left lane/s...my words)

Give up on it, JJ. I saw that section too, but it refers to driving on the opposite side of the highway (note the "left half of the road" above), not driving in the left lane of a multiple-lane highway (in the left lane of multiple-lane highway, you wouldn't be on the left half of the overall road). There simply doesn't appear to be a "left lane only for passing" law in Texas.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

4873. Re: Happy Holidays to all

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-24 20:46:25 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031224154625.12131.00001696@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 84448

>Aw com'on LUX .... can't you just cast aside all we have been "discussing"
>over the year for just one message...
>
>Sad ...73 Tom KI3R

Whos "LUX"

4874. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-24 20:48:41 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <JYmGb.8051$IM3.3609@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 84449

"Kim W5TIT" wrote:
>
> JJ, sounds like you found something
> that contradicts what Dwight found,
> and vice versa. (snip)

Not really. Read my reply to his message. He simply misinterpreted what was being said.

> The point is, there is nothing that my
> husband or I have been able to find
> in the TAC (Texas Administrative
> Code)--which would be the *LAW*.
> The manual and words like "should,"
> etc., are not laws--they are
> suggestions. (snip)

The drivers handbook was written by a government agency to provide guidence and simplify the laws within Texas. If something is in that handbook as a "must," you can be fairly certain there is a law somewhere to back it up.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

4875. Re: Merry Christmas

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-24 20:52:16 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <40nGb.8056$IM3.4867@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 84451

"Kim W5TIT" wrote:
>
> Merry Christmas!

Merry Christmas to you too, Kim.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

4876. Re: Happy New Year

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-24 20:53:47 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <v1nGb.8058$IM3.949@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 84452

"Kï¿½HB" wrote:
>
> And Merry Christmas to those who partake,

Merry Christmas, Hans.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

4877. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-24 21:30:59 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <nAnGb.18901$P%1.17155656@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 84453

"JJ" <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
news:YJqdnQusX-rQcnSiRVn-hA@gbronline.com...
> Dee D. Flint wrote:
>
> > "JJ" <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
> > news:oZqdnXYCd5z7SnSiRVn-sw@gbronline.com...
> >
> >>Kim W5TIT wrote:
> >>
> >>
> >>>Simple 'nuff, find a *LAW* and I'll accept that it is illegal to drive
> >
> > in
> >
> >>>left lanes, otherwise, you're allowing yourself to be impressioned for
> >
> > the
> >
> >>>benefit of winning a side to an argument--which, of course, I am also.
> >>>Seems I'm winning, though...
> >>
> >>Not so fast tits.
> >>
> >>
> >>>Law, JJ, not suggestions, not a manual, not
> >>>someone's (as in the circumstance with your submitted commentary)
> >>>interpretation, but law.
> >>
> >>Here is the response I received from Bud Kennedy, the author of the
> >
> > article.
> >
> >>Hi Bill,
> >>
> >>Thanks for your note.
> >>
> >>Your friend obviously thinks she knows everything, so she probably will
> >>think she knows more than the law or the DPS. - (boy does he have you
> >>pegged - jj)
> >>
> >>I quoted the law in the column. It's from 545.051 --
> >>
> >>http://www.capitol.state.tx.us/statutes/tr/tr0054500.html
> >>

> >>+(b) An operator of a vehicle on a roadway moving more slowly than the
> >>normal speed of other vehicles at the time and place under the existing
> >>conditions shall drive in the right-hand lane available for vehicles, or
> >>as close as practicable to the right-hand curb or edge of the roadway,
> >>unless the operator is:
> >>
> >>+(1) passing another vehicle; or
> >>+(2) preparing for a left turn at an intersection or into a private road
> >>or driveway.
> >>
> >>This law is not defined by the speed limit. It is defined by the "normal
> >>speed of other vehicles."
> >>
> >>In other words, if you're driving slower than other drivers, you "shall"
> >>move over.
> >>
> >>Write again or anytime
> >>
> >>--Bud
> >>
> >
> >
> > Well Kim has several times stated that she was driving at the normal
speed
> > of the other drivers in the lane. So your quotation makes Kim correct.
> > That a single individual wants to drive much faster than the rest of the
> > traffic does not make Kim wrong for not moving. She may or may not be
> > unwise depending on the overall circumstances but from this quotation is
not
> > doing anything illegal.
> >
> > Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
> >
> It should be obvious to the most casual of observers that if you are in
> the left lane and other traffic is attempting to go faster than you are,
> even if you are driving the normal speed, speeding, or whatever, you are
> obliged to move to the right lane to let the faster traffic pass. That
> is stated pretty plainly. Even if you are going the same speed of the
> vehicles in the right lane, you cannot block faster traffic in the left
> lane. The law states that the operator of a moving vehicle "*shall*
> drive in the *right* hand lane unless the operator is: (1)passing
> another vehicle." Pretty plain, if you are in the left lane and going
> the same speed as vehicles in the right, then you are not passing, so
> you are obliged to move to the right.
> I bet that if kimmygirl is in the left lane and approaches a slower
> vehicle in that lane she certainly expects them to move over so she can
> speed on her merry way.
>

You are being deliberately obtuse. Kim repeatedly stated that she was going the same speed as the other cars in the lane that she was in not the lanes to her right. She was going with the normal flow of traffic in the lane she was in. It should be obvious to the most casual observer that she was not blocking traffic in the left lane as she was going at the speed of the traffic in that lane. That ONE car tries to force her to move over does not constitute impeding the flow of traffic as the blockhead that is trying to get her to move over will have to attempt the same maneuver with all the other cars in the lane.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

4878. Re: New Q signs

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-24 21:59:04 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0312241359.d0bc3fb@posting.google.com>
Source record: 84454

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20031224102156.12501.00004837@mb-m04.aol.com>...
> In article <20031223214651.07346.00002247@mb-m26.aol.com>, yodoc@aol.comnospam
> (Larry Roll K3LT) writes:
>
> >I hold the fervent hope that there is someone out there who is offended
> >by my emphasis of the name "Christ" in the word "CHRISTmas." If so, please
> >do me a favor and reply with an amusing post about how I'm being Politically
> >Incorrect, or something like that!
>
> I find it humorous that some are offended by the word "Xmas", because they
> obviously don't know its origin.

Perhaps Christ couldn't write, and had to mark an "X" in the signature
block when he filed his taxes?

> A Verry Merry to All, whatever your holiday
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

4879. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-24 23:02:36 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <gWoGb.8202$IM3.2920@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 84455

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:TA8Gb.5164$Vv2.1975129@news1.news.adelphia.net...
> K&#65533;HB wrote:
>
> > "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote
> >
> >
> >>BUT, his NCI membership doesn't tie NCI to Han's personal support
> >>for an entry level license.
> >
> > Are you saying that NCI does not reciprocate my support for their goals?
> > That would certainly be a strange sort of membership-organization.
>
> Sorry Hans! Only elimination of the Test!

Essentually correct. NCI doesn't take positions on the wider
scope of testing and opinions held by any individual member.
Indeed, one could readily see where two members might have totally
opposite opinions on written testing.

> And that is what bothers me about NCI.

Why that bothers anyone makes no sense to me. Indeed, we are
damned if we do, damn;ed if we don't. We formed as a "one issue"
organization and now some folks are bothered by that...strange,
truly strange.

> But it is a great way to dodge responsibility! 8^)

Dodge responsibilities? So exactly what does that mean?
What specific "responsibility" is NCI dodging?
Did I miss some unstated responsibility of NCI and/or any
other ham club or organization?

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

4880. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-24 23:17:45 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <t8pGb.8222$IM3.4186@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 84456

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:Vx8Gb.5162$Vv2.1974588@news1.news.adelphia.net...
> Bill Sohl wrote:
>
> > "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
> > news:XD0Fb.1592$Vv2.796649@news1.news.adelphia.net...
> >
> >>Bill Sohl wrote:
> >>
> >>>"Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
> >>
> >>><snippage>
> >>
> >>>>>Two questions...
> >>>>>1. What "other members" (I presume you mean Board Members), other
> >>>>>than W5YI, do NOT support retention of technical acumen?
> >>>>
> >>>>They don't have to be Board members, Bill. And I don't have their
names
> >>>>off the top of my head.
> >>>>
> >>>>If you like, I can retract the "members" statement, and substitute
> >>>>"member" or "prominent member". Although I think that's almost like
> >>>>saying a person's argument is invalid because they made a typo.
> >>>
> >>>Bottom line, without names, the statement is grossly misleading
> >>>as you apear to try and broaden your claim to NCI in general...
> >>>which is absolutely false.
> >>
> >>Bottom line, I have never accused >>>NCI<<< of having any particular
> >>opinion.
> >>
> >>I wrote:
> >>
> >> >Instead, some members express "unofficial opinions that scare the
> >> >bejabbers out of me.
> >
> > That's the point. "Unofficial opinions". That alone, regardless
> > of what you say, creates an impression that there is an "unofficial
> > 'NCI' opinion". If a person has their own opinion about
> > something, that isn't "official" or "unofficial" by itself. Adding the
> > "unofficial opinion" label in talking about an NCI
> > member DOES create a different perception than simply
> > saying John Doe has an opinion that scares me.

>
> I have a question. There is no doubt that NCI is a political
> organization. So this is a fair question.
>
> Why don't you ask a good conservative Republican what they think of the
> new Govorner of California's stand on say, abortion, or say same sex
> marriages? So while his opinion doesn't really have that much to do with
> the national scene, therefore it isn't relevant to anything but himself,
> I do know that there are plenty of the above mentioned conservatives
> that don't think a whole lot of him or his opinion at all.

Who cares, so what? In any organization there will be a range
of opinions regarding issues. NCI was formed as and still is a ONE
issue organization. Why that fails to sink in to some folks still
amazes me. The ONE area of universal agreement amongst
NCI members is ending all code tests. If an NCI member does not
support that goal, then he or she should really consider dropping
NCI memebrship.

> >>Back to now:
> >>
> >>Who is broadening any claim? I even put unofficial opinions on my
> > >sentence.
> >
> >>Your trying to pin me down on this is amusing, since the membership
> >>rolls of NCI are a closely guarded secret. The only way we know is if
> >>the member outs him or her self.
> >
> > Then how can you even make the statement that some "members" have
> > opinions that scare you IF you can't even identify them.
>
> I just identified two.

But neither of those people speak for NCI when offering
their opinions on non-code test issues. THAT is the
important aspect of my discussion here.

> >>I don't like Han's entry level license requirement either. He's a
member.
> >
> > BUT, his NCI membership doesn't tie NCI to Han's personal support
> > for an entry level license.
>
> But he certainly serves as another data point. Why don't we go over
> some stuff.

Hans is a data point as to Han's...not any position for
or against an entry level license by NCI.

> You (apparently) don't support any change in anything except the
> elimination of Element one.

Now you are making things up. What I support overs a wide
range of stuff. The distinction again is that if, for example, I
were to support an entry level test, it would be as Bill K2UNK,
and not as any official NCI position simply because I sit on the NCI
board. If I go back to your Republican
example above, if I support abortion and I am an NCI
member, that anti-abortion folks should be worried about
NCI members having pro-abortion opinions? Of couse
NOT, because the issue is NOT on the NCI agenda.

> W5YI supports what to me seems to be a radical simplification and
> bastardization of the ARS requirements.

And W5YI is free to expound his opinions. Has he ever done so
and tried to claim NCI supported his viewpoints. Answer: NO.

> Hans has a plan that I generally don't like. I must say that he does
> address the issue of needed change when element one disappears.

And Han's proposal is neither supported or opposed by
NCI.

> So forgive me, but I think I can form an opinion and defend it.

Never said you aren't free to do so.

> All I propose is strengthening the requirements of what exists now, and
> otherwise leaving things intact. I would really encourage going into the
> regulations and cleaning them up after the changover.

What changeover?

> And yes, since NCI sees itself as the vanguard of change, I see NCI as
> derelict in it's duties.

Pretty amusing. "Derilict" as determined by what
yardstick?

> To just say "eliminate the Code test" really
> isn't enough.

You are entitled to your opinion and I suspect, because
of that opinion, NCI won't expect your membership application
in the near future :-)

Cheers and Merry Christmas to all.

Bill K2UNK

4881. Re: Why I Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-24 23:25:56 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <8gpGb.8229$IM3.3431@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 84457

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:218Gb.5146$Vv2.1962826@news1.news.adelphia.net...
> Bill Sohl wrote:
>
> > "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
> > news:gB_Eb.1546$Vv2.766121@news1.news.adelphia.net...
> >
> >>Bill Sohl wrote:
> >>
> >>
> >>>"Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
> >>>news:3FE34758.8000802@psu.edu...
> >>>
> >>>
> >>>>Bill Sohl wrote:
> >>>>
> >>>>
> >>>>>"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
> >>>>>news:OTtEb.689$Vv2.349555@news1.news.adelphia.net...
> >>>>>
> >>>>>
> >>>>>
> >>>>>>Dee D. Flint wrote:
> >>>>>>
> >>>>>>
> >>>>>>
> >>>>>>>"Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
> >>>>>>>news:f45722ac.0312181539.55a82802@posting.google.com...
> >>>>>>>
> >>>>>>>
> >>>>>>>
> >>>>>>>>Carl, you should see the NCI bashing being done by Dee and Jim on
> >>>
> >>> the
> >>>
> >>>>other ARRL thread.
> >>>>
> >>>>73, Brian
> >>>>>
> >>>>>
> >>>>>I have never bashed the NCI. I've stated that I disagree with
their
> >>>>>
> >>>>>goal

> >>>>>
> >>>>>
> >>>>>
> >>>>>>>but that does not constitute bashing them.
> >>>>>>
> >>>>>>I have! I think that they have recieved what they wanted, but as yet
> >>>>>>don't really offer anything of substance to fill the gap.
> >>>>>
> >>>>>
> >>>>>What GAP?
> >>>>
> >>>>Code test dissapears, nothing in it's place.
> >>>
> >>>
> >>>Why should there be anything in its place? This isn't about
> >>>some mystical quantification of effort, dedication, yada yada....
> >>
> >>You are kind of right there Bill. I can prove to you without a doubt
> >>that a person can get on the air without ever taking a test. They can
> >>get on the air and run relatively high power without doing harm to
> >>themselves. There is no need for any yada yada at all.
> >>
> >>It isn't mystical, it isn't yada yada. It is philosophy. And my
> >>philosophy is that the amateur should want to be an amateur, and should
> >>have some level of knowledge in order to be there.
> >
> >
> > No argument there. The point is that morse is no longer a needed
> > knowledge base and the end of morse testing doesn't create
> > a void in terms of the "net effort value" of learning what is
> > needed to pss the tests.
> >
> >
> >>>The morse tests have completely disappeared for General
> >>>and Extra without anything taking its place. If 5 wpm is dropped
> >>>for tech, why should there be something to replace it?
> >>
> >>Now I'm a little confused. As far as I know, if you want a general or
> >>above, you still have to take a Morse code test.
> >
> >
> > True, but in actuality you usually qualify as tech+ (even if
> > note actually issued a unique license).
> >
> >
> >>And they don't do tech
> >>plusses any more. My Tech license had no code test in it.
> >
> >
> > True, but passing the 5 wpm gives you the functional equivalent

> > plus you then have lifetime 5wpm credit I believe.
>
> I'm not sure about that. When I took my original General test and
> flunked the Morse code portion, I was issued credit for the written part
> which lasted a year (or was that a ear and a day?) So maybe passing
> element 1 would be the same?
>
>
> >>>>I want to see something in
> >>>>it's place, or else itis pretty hard to argue that it hasn't been made
> >>>>much much easier to get a license.
> >>>
> >>>Ending a requirement that no longer has a rational need
> >>>does not translate into a search for some "replacement".
> >>>If you had the opportunity to state what the replacement
> >>>should be, what would you suggest?
> >>
> >>I support strengthening the tests. In general, I want more questions on
> >>theory, and more procedural questions. I wouldn't mind if there were a
> >>ham etiquette section added to the test.
> >
> >
> > Not unreasonable, but it probably won't be addressed as a quid pro quo
> > of ending morse testing by the FCC.
>
> I wonder? Quid pro quo or not - and I agree it isn't strictly, I would
> wager that a whole lot of things are addressed before this one is over.
> There are a lot of wordings that need replaced or changed if Element 1
> goes away. There are many privileges that will need visited and altered
> as needed: tech and tech plus for instance. Are they now the equivalent
> of Generals? So there *is* a lot of work to be done.
>
> None of these are answered simply. There will be a major overhaul in the
> near future, IMO. And I bet it comes about when Element one is eliminated.
> >
> >>I want the new ham to come on board with some idea of what is expected
> >>of him or her in the way of how to conduct themselves on the air. I want
> >>them to have at least a rudimentary knowledge of electronics, and know
> >>some basics on antenna theory, like our "quarter wave dipole" discussion
> >>on rrap of a few months back proves is needed.
> >>
> >>
> >>
> >>>>You may want it made much easier to get a license, but I don't. Not a
> >>>>filter, not a way of keeping people out. just a way of ensuring that
the
> >>>>amateur has some level of acumen.
> >>>
> >>>Ending morse doesn't change the level of written tests.
> >>

> >>No kidding! I want the level of the tests changed though. And not to the
> >>level of the "average sixth grader" either.
> >
> >
> > But again, the FCC won't buy that argument (IMHO) as needed because code
> > testing is ended..
>
> Tell me what happens if Element one is eliminated tomorrow, and no
> other change happens? Then I have some questions for you.

The changes to FCC rules were included in NCI's petition.
It was really pretty simple stuff. No wholesale problems with
the changes.

> >>>>Otherwise, those who want little or no testing are just encouraged.
> >>>
> >>>Encouraged about what?
> >>
> >>About little or no testing.
> >
> >
> > Whatever.
>
> Bill, if you're going to do that, you have to do it right:
>
> whuuuut-evuh! 8^)
>
>
> >>>>>>Instead, some
> >>>>>>members express "unofficial opinions that scare the bejabbers out of
> >
> > me.
> >
> >>>>>"Some members"? Who? It is always easy to make non-speciifc
> >>>>>accusations against unidentified "some members".
> >>>>
> >>>>W5YI for one. I trust you have read his work?
> >>>
> >>>W5YI's comments as to testing issues beyond the elimination
> >>>of code testing are NOT, in any way, shape or form,
> >>>the position or opinion of NCI.
> >>
> >>Show me where I said it was!
> >
> >
> > Then why the reference to NCI when commenting about W5YI's
> > opinions on other than code testing?
>
> It's like separating Ex-Presidents from their political parties.
>
> And all this aside, my major gripe with NCI is that they don't have any

> post Morse plan. Just saying Element one goes away, and all is well, is
> naive.

Any and all "post" Element one changes I might support will
be done via ARRL. I have stated on many occasions
in the past that once code tetsing is gone, I see no further
need for NCI and will, as I have now, work via ARRL
for the "other stuff".

> If I had an organization that proposed the elimination of Element one,
> there is no doubt that I would have a whole set of proposals that I
> would offer in it's place.

Yet for all the discussion, debate and commentary to the FCC, the
FCC has not indicated any desire to replace code testing with
anything else.

> And that is the problem. There is no action without a reaction or
> consequences. Something like Morse code testing, which is interwoven
> into the fabric of the ARS as much as it is, cannot simply be yanked out
> without consequences.

I still don't see any undesired consequences.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

4882. Re: Why I Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-24 23:27:57 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <1ipGb.8231$IM3.1406@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 84458

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:xk8Gb.18835$P%1.17036437@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
>
> "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
> news:218Gb.5146$Vv2.1962826@news1.news.adelphia.net...
> > Bill Sohl wrote:
> > > True, but passing the 5 wpm gives you the functional equivalent
> > > plus you then have lifetime 5wpm credit I believe.
> >
> > I'm not sure about that. When I took my original General test and
> > flunked the Morse code portion, I was issued credit for the written part
> > which lasted a year (or was that a ear and a day?) So maybe passing
> > element 1 would be the same?
> >
>
> For purposes of Technician's operating with the equivalent HF privileges
of
> the old Tech+, the 5wpm is a lifetime credit should you remain a
Technician.
>
> For purposes of upgrading, the credit is good only for one year (actually
> 365 days). So if you don't pass your General written within 365 days of
> passing the Morse code test, then you would have to retake the test to
> upgrade.
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

Yet I believe Novice DOES have permanent credit towards the 5wpm.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

4883. Re: Happy Holidays to all

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-25 00:40:30 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <2mqGb.5505$Vv2.2252848@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 84459

Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
> Happy Holidays and a safe, healthy, and prosperous new year to all.

And a very good holiday to you Carl!

- Mike KB3EIA -

4884. Re: Happy Holidays to all

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-25 01:12:54 UTC
From: consistent psycopathic <butbecau3@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <552d3$3fea3c41$d1cc5763$15147@allthenewsgroups.com>
Source record: 84460

"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20031224154625.12131.00001696@mb-m05.aol.com...
> >Aw com'on LUX .... can't you just cast aside all we have been
"discussing"
> >over the year for just one message...
> >
> >Sad ...73 Tom KI3R
>
> Whos "LUX"

Wasn't that a soap they used to clean marble
steps and ceramic bathroom tiles in the 40's
or 50's...?

4885. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-25 02:49:18 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <OesGb.5538$Vv2.2283406@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 84461

Bill Sohl wrote:

> "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
> news:TA8Gb.5164$Vv2.1975129@news1.news.adelphia.net...
>
>>Kï¿½HB wrote:
>>
>>
>>>"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>>BUT, his NCI membership doesn't tie NCI to Han's personal support
>>>>for an entry level license.
>>>
>>>Are you saying that NCI does not reciprocate my support for their goals?
>>>That would certainly be a strange sort of membership-organization.
>>
>>Sorry Hans! Only elimination of the Test!
>
>
> Essentually correct. NCI doesn't take positions on the wider
> scope of testing and opinions held by any individual member.
> Indeed, one could readily see where two members might have totally
> opposite opinions on written testing.
>
>
>>And that is what bothers me about NCI.
>
>
> Why that bothers anyone makes no sense to me. Indeed, we are
> damned if we do, damn;ed if we don't. We formed as a "one issue"
> organization and now some folks are bothered by that...strange,
> truly strange.

Well, I'm sorry about it Bill, but that is how it works. Spoils of success.

In the world of politics, there is no such thing as a one issue
organization. When agitating for the addition or removal of something,
there must be some kind of plan for afterward. If there is no plan, then
one of two things happened. Either there was an immense amount of
naivety, or a concept of "no plan for the aftermath" was made".

I'm bothered by it now because I'm new to the ARS and didn't even know
about NCI in it's early years. I would have taken NCI members to task if

I was a ham then.

>>But it is a great way to dodge responsibility! 8^)
>
>
> Dodge responsibilities? So exactly what does that mean?
> What specific "responsibility" is NCI dodging?
> Did I miss some unstated responsibility of NCI and/or any
> other ham club or organization?

Yes you did miss it, IMO! What other Morse code pro/con advocacy groups are there? NCI is the one standing around when the change happened, it happened their way, and now all we hear is some people's personal beliefs when they should be at least putting together a plan for the aftermath of the ARS, post Element one. The two I have seen I'm not overwhelmed with.

So I will be yapping about what I percieve to be a *grave* error in omission.

- Mike KB3EIA -

4886. Re: New Q signs

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-25 03:55:51 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031224225551.23307.00005361@mb-m29.aol.com>
Source record: 84462

In article <f45722ac.0312241359.d0bc3fb@posting.google.com>,
brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:

>> I find it humorous that some are offended by the word "Xmas", because they
>> obviously don't know its origin.
>
>Perhaps Christ couldn't write,

The nuns would be ashamed of a bold brazen article who could not recall John
Chapter 8 Verses 5 to 9 ;-)

>> A Verry Merry to All, whatever your holiday

4887. Re: Here is TITSs Dream

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-25 04:03:29 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20031224230329.01893.00002322@mb-m22.aol.com>
Source record: 84464

In article <20031222101240.11589.00000922@mb-m25.aol.com>, wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) writes:

>
> Check out kk6nn on QRZ. This is what could have came of TIT if she would
>have become a REAL HAM. Notice She has an Advanced License, so she does know
>13
>WPM
> KK6NN is the most positive reason for keeping CW

Wow! I'll say! Kim, eat your heart out. Better still, stop eating that ice cream you spoke of in a later reply, go out and get some exercise, and maybe you can give Janet some competition someday. Keep it up the way you are, and you're heading toward adult-onset diabetes, possible kidney failure, and saying goodbye to your toes, feet, and legs in that order. I see the results of self-induced obesity every day -- I'm usually loading them into my bus, securing their wheelchairs, and hauling them off to dialysis treatments three times a week! The choice is up to you!

I'm assuming that's a recent photo of Janet. The detail page gives her birthdate as Feb. 1960, meaning she's pushing 44 years old! Can anyone place the vintage of the 'Vette she's leaning on?

73 de Larry, K3LT

4888. Re: k1man - W1AW bulletins

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-25 04:03:30 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20031224230330.01893.00002323@mb-m22.aol.com>
Source record: 84463

In article <kFQFb.634183$Fm2.570107@attbi_s04>, "Chuck...K1KW"
<cdoneal@comcast.net> writes:

>
>It's time to limit bulletin broadcasts to what W1AW has been
>doing for their 90+ year history and keep bulletins to 10 minutes
>and once a day. This should please K1man, the belgrade bastard,
>and ensure that he IS JUST LIKE W1AW.
>
>73,
>Chuck...K1KW

Chuck:

I think you've got a good idea. Send it in to the FCC as a Petition for Rulemaking, then, if and when it comes out as an NPRM, I'll provide favorable comments in support of the new rule. Baxter is obviously driving a tractor-trailer rig thru a skateboard-sized loophole. Considering the fact that the majority of radio amateurs now get their amateur radio-related "news" via the internet, K1MAN can hardly justify his self-indulgent waste of spectrum. At the very least, he should be time-limited in the manner you suggest. I'd much prefer that he was simply given a Cease And Desist order from the FCC.

73 de Larry, K3LT

4889. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-25 04:22:58 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <CCtGb.5559$Vv2.2300866@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 84465

Bill Sohl wrote:

> "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
> news:Vx8Gb.5162$Vv2.1974588@news1.news.adelphia.net...
>
>>Bill Sohl wrote:

Well Bill, it looks like we will just have to remain at odds about this issue.

Have a great Christmas!

- Mike KB3EIA -

4890. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-25 04:57:17 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <8aKdnRULWMQl83eiRVn-tA@gbronline.com>
Source record: 84466

Dee D. Flint wrote:

> You are being deliberately obtuse. Kim repeatedly stated that she was going
> the same speed as the other cars in the lane that she was in not the lanes
> to her right. She was going with the normal flow of traffic in the lane she
> was in. It should be obvious to the most casual observer that she was not
> blocking traffic in the left lane as she was going at the speed of the
> traffic in that lane.

If other traffic behind her is attempting to go faster than she is, she
is blocking traffic unless she is passing traffic in the right lane.

That ONE car tries to force her to move over does not
> constitute impeding the flow of traffic as the blockhead that is trying to
> get her to move over will have to attempt the same maneuver with all the
> other cars in the lane.
>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>

Stop trying to make something complicated out of a simple Texas law. If
kim or anyone else is in the left lane, they are obligated to move to
the right for any faster traffic. The law plainly states that if you are
in the left lane and not passing other traffic you should be in the
right lane. As long as she is passing the other traffic in the right
lane, then being in the left lane is where she should be, but as soon as
she passes the traffic in the right lane she should move over to the
right to let faster traffic pass. What is so hard for you and kim to
understand about that?

4891. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-25 05:31:07 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <vCuGb.8492$IM3.8186@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 84467

"JJ" wrote:
>
> Suggest you read 545.051 of the law in
> my previous post.

I've read it, JJ. Instead, I suggest you read it again because you've misinterpreted what it says. Section 545.051(a) refers to driving on the opposite side of the highway - the side for traffic traveling in the opposite direction. Section 545.051(b) refers to driving in the right lane if moving slower than other traffic. But, again, absolutely nothing says the left lane is only for passing - nothing says a person can't drive in the left lane on a multiple-lane highway when not interfering with the flow of traffic.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

4892. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-25 06:05:49 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <17vGb.8524$IM3.1531@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 84468

"JJ" wrote:
>
> (snip) The law plainly states that if you are
> in the left lane and not passing other traffic
> you should be in the right lane. (snip)

It clearly doesn't say that, JJ. Instead, it says, "An operator of a vehicle on a roadway moving more slowly than the normal speed of other vehicles at the time and place under the existing conditions shall drive in the right-hand lane available for vehicles." In other words, the only time one must absolutely be in the right lane of a multiple-lane highway is when moving more slowly than other vehicles. This clearly supports the idea that one must move to the right to let others pass, but it doesn't support your premise that on must always drive in the right lane.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

4893. live scanner

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-25 06:33:10 UTC
From: "h.reijnierse" <reijnierse@home.nl>
Message-ID: <bse07d$1d8$1@news1.tilbu1.nb.home.nl>
Source record: 84469

http://members.home.nl/reijnierse/

4894. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-25 06:56:27 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <nuidnTTjOdcqEXei4p2dnA@gbronline.com>
Source record: 84470

Dwight Stewart wrote:

> "JJ" wrote:
>
>>Suggest you read 545.051 of the law in
>>my previous post.
>
>
>
> I've read it, JJ. Instead, I suggest you read it again because you've
> misinterpreted what it says. Section 545.051(a) refers to driving on the
> opposite side of the highway - the side for traffic traveling in the
> opposite direction.

Yes it does, but we are talking about a multiple lane road which item
(b) deals with.

Section 545.051(b) refers to driving in the right lane
> if moving slower than other traffic. But, again, absolutely nothing says
> the left lane is only for passing - nothing says a person can't drive in the
> left lane on a multiple-lane highway when not interfering with the flow of
> traffic.
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
>

If there are no other vehicles in the left lane then no, you do not have
to move to the right lane. But what started this argument is kimmygirl
saying that just because someone comes up behind her wanting to go
faster than she is dosen't mean she has to yield by moving to the right.

Here are her exact words from her posting of 12/2/03.

"It's fine for them to go 20 mph above the speed limit. It's fine if
they want to go 30-40 mph above the speed limit. But, they won't find
me moving out of their way; they'll have to go around because I am not
moving into a lane where I have to slow down, or even get "stuck" there
for a while, if there happens to be more than one vehicle that wants to
go past."

So her take is she has a perfect right to set in the left lane because
she dosen't have to yield to faster traffic. As long as she is passing
traffic to the right OK, but when she has passed the traffic to the

right she is obligated by the law to move to the right and yield to the faster traffic, even if she thinks they are speeding. If she is going as fast or slower than the traffic to the right then she is not passing and, as the law plainly states, she should move to the right lane to yield to any faster traffic. In plain words the law says, drive to the right and pass to the left and if you are in the left lane, yield to faster traffic by moving to the right. Very simple.

4895. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-25 10:52:10 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <ujzGb.8600$IM3.1186@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 84471

"JJ" wrote:
>
> "Dwight Stewart" wrote:
> > Section 545.051(b) refers to driving
> > in the right lane if moving slower than
> > other traffic. But, again, absolutely
> > nothing says the left lane is only for
> > passing - nothing says a person can't
> > drive in the left lane on a multiple-lane
> > highway when not interfering with the
> > flow of traffic.
>
> If there are no other vehicles in the
> left lane then no, you do not have
> to move to the right lane. But what
> started this argument is kimmygirl
> saying that... (snip)

That may be what started this discussion, but I was responding to your comments posted 12/23/03 (6:08 PM), in which you said....

"Sounds pretty simple, the left lane
is for passing, you should always
keep to the right except for passing."

As noted above, nothing in Section 545.051 supports that position. A person can drive in the left lane, even without passing, as long as there is no interference with the flow of traffic.

Notice that the words "left" and "right" were corrected in the 12/23/03 quote to reflect your stated intent (you had reversed those two words in the original message, but corrected that in a follow-up message).

Merry Christmas, JJ. After posting this, I'm going to sit back and drink some hot chocolate while listening to some good Christmas music. After that, perhaps I'll go back to bed for a few hours (that bed was mighty warm and comfortable).

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

4896. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-25 13:01:38 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031225080138.21642.00003238@mb-m01.aol.com>
Source record: 84472

In article <OesGb.5538$Vv2.2283406@news1.news.adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo
<mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:

>The two I have seen I'm not
>overwhelmed with.

Was this one of the plans you saw?

1) Three classes of license: Basic, Intermediate, Full (change the
names if you don't like them - Third, Second, First, Novice,
General, Extra, whatever)

2) HF/MF bands split into subbands by mode and split again by
license class. Some bands (30 meters) may be split by mode only.
Bottom of each band is CW only, middle is CW/digital, top is
CW/phone/image. Percentage division about 20%/30%/50% (varies with
band). "Digital" includes digital voice modes if bandwidth under
1 kHz.

3) "Basic" license test is simple 20-25 question exam on regs,
procedures, and safety. Very little technical and RF exposure
stuff. Main objective is to keep Basics out of trouble. Basics
get 100-50 watts on HF/MF and 25 watts or so on VHF/UHF (power
level is below the point where RF exposure evaluation required).
Modes are CW, analog voice, PSK31, RTTY and many of the other
common data modes like packet. Basics cannot be VEs, control
ops for repeaters, or club trustees. Basics get most VHF/UHF
and about half of HF/MF spectrum, including parts of all
subbands-by-mode. Basic is meant as the entry level. Easy to
get, lots of privs, yet there's still a reason to upgrade.

4) "Intermediate" license test is more complex 50-60 question exam
on regs, procedures, safety and technical stuff. Intermediates
get 300-400 watts on all bands, all modes. Intermediates can be
VEs after qualification (see below), control ops for repeaters,
and club trustees. Intermediates get all VHF/UHF and about
three quarters (or more) of HF/MF spectrum. Intermediate requires
at least one year experience as a Basic.

5) "Full" license test is quite complex 100-120 question exam on
regs, procedures, safety and technical stuff. Mostly technical,
with some regs to cover expanded privs. Fulls get all
privileges, modes, bands, etc. except that Fulls can be VEs
only after qualification (see below). Full license requires
at least one year as an Intermediate.

6) All licenses are 10 year and fully renewable/modifiable. No age requirements or limits.

7) Basics have six-character calls, Intermediates have five- or six-character calls, and Fulls have four-, five-, or six-character calls. Nobody has to give up an existing callsign.

8) Separate 30-35 question test for VE qualification, open to Intermediates and Fulls, which allows them to be VEs. Existing VEs are grandfathered.

9) Existing Novices, Techs and Tech Pluses become Basics, existing Generals and Advanceds become Intermediates, and existing Extras become Fulls. Existing hams can continue to use their current privileges as long as they retain license documents showing their old license class. Existing Tech Pluses who can show proof of license before Mar 21, 1987 get Intermediates.

10) Change to new system is at least six months to one year after announcement to allow time for question pool reorganization and so existing hams can upgrade under present rules if they want.

11) Experience requirement is not waived for existing hams to upgrade, but their time in existing classes counts.

End result is a system that is easy to get into (Basic is envisioned as a 21st century version of the Novice) and has reasonable but meaningful steps to reach full privileges. Testing matches the privs granted. Power levels are set about one S-unit apart. Nobody loses any privileges. There are only three license classes and four written tests, so FCC doesn't have more work.

Example of new privileges:

80/75 meters
3500-3575 CW only
3575-3750 CW/data
3750-4000 CW/analog phone/image

Basic: 3525-3625 and 3900-4000
Intermediate: 3525-3750 and 3850-4000
Full: entire band

How's that?

73 de Jim, N2EY

4897. Re: Why I Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-25 13:35:32 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <EIBGb.18959$P%1.17258408@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 84473

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:1ipGb.8231$IM3.1406@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net...
>
> "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
> news:xk8Gb.18835$P%1.17036437@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
> >
> > "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
> > news:218Gb.5146$Vv2.1962826@news1.news.adelphia.net...
> > > Bill Sohl wrote:
> > > > True, but passing the 5 wpm gives you the functional equivalent
> > > > plus you then have lifetime 5wpm credit I believe.
> > >
> > > I'm not sure about that. When I took my original General test and
> > > flunked the Morse code portion, I was issued credit for the written
part
> > > which lasted a year (or was that a ear and a day?) So maybe passing
> > > element 1 would be the same?
> > >
> >
> > For purposes of Technician's operating with the equivalent HF privileges
> of
> > the old Tech+, the 5wpm is a lifetime credit should you remain a
> Technician.
> >
> > For purposes of upgrading, the credit is good only for one year
(actually
> > 365 days). So if you don't pass your General written within 365 days of
> > passing the Morse code test, then you would have to retake the test to
> > upgrade.
> > Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>
> Yet I believe Novice DOES have permanent credit towards the 5wpm.
>
> Cheers,
> Bill K2UNK
>

The Novice license does indeed bestow lifetime credit but that is not the
same situation as a Tech who subsequent to the April 2000 passed element 1.
In the latter case, the credit is only good for 365 for the purposes of
upgrading as stated.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

4898. Re: Happy Holidays to all

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-25 15:28:49 UTC
From: Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com>
Message-ID: <20031225102849.680$py@newsreader.com>
Source record: 84474

wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) wrote:
> >Happy Holidays and a safe, healthy, and prosperous new year to all.
> >
> >73,
> >
> >--
> >Carl R. Stevenson - wk3c
>
> And more Dumbing Down in the New Year
>
Enjoy your lump of coal, ya miserable bastard.

4899. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-25 16:16:36 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031225111636.00545.00003094@mb-m02.aol.com>
Source record: 84475

In article <nuidnTTjOdcqEXei4p2dnA@gbronline.com>, JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
writes:

>If there are no other vehicles in the left lane then no, you do not have
>to move to the right lane. But what started this argument is kimmygirl
>saying that just because someone comes up behind her wanting to go
>faster than she is dosen't mean she has to yield by moving to the right.

Exactly!
>
>Here are her exact words from her posting of 12/2/03.
>
>"It's fine for them to go 20 mph above the speed limit. It's fine if
>they want to go 30-40 mph above the speed limit. But, they won't find
>me moving out of their way; they'll have to go around because I am not
>moving into a lane where I have to slow down, or even get "stuck" there
>for a while, if there happens to be more than one vehicle that wants to
>go past."
>
>So her take is she has a perfect right to set in the left lane because
>she dosen't have to yield to faster traffic. As long as she is passing
>traffic to the right OK, but when she has passed the traffic to the
>right she is obligated by the law to move to the right and yield to the
>faster traffic, even if she thinks they are speeding.

IF there is someone behind who wants to go faster.

>If she is going as
>fast or slower than the traffic to the right then she is not passing
>and, as the law plainly states, she should move to the right lane to
>yield to any faster traffic. In plain words the law says, drive to the
>right and pass to the left and if you are in the left lane, yield to
>faster traffic by moving to the right. Very simple.
>
Not exactly, but close. How about this:

"When there are multiple lanes for the same direction, slower traffic must keep
to the right unless an exception as listed below applies. 'Slower traffic'
refers to any vehicle that is impeding the flow of traffic behind it.

Exceptions:

- When a vehicle has to be in a certain lane(s) to exit, enter or turn.
- When a vehicle has to avoid certain lane(s) that require an exit or turn.
- When dividers, signs, road markings or other traffic control devices prohibit
changing lanes.

- In any emergency situation"

The above isn't from any traffic code, it's just my interpretation. But do you see any holes in it?

Reading all these posts has convinced me that intentionally blocking the left lane on a multilane divided highway just to avoid letting others pass (and having to slow down oneself) is a violation of the Texas laws as written - even if both the passer is speeding.

In fact, in the case Kim describes, I would not be surprised if the LEOs pulled over both cars and wrote multiple violations for speeding, impeding the flow of traffic and following too closely. And that's the short list.

So my advice remains: Move over and let the "idiot" go past.

--

Dwight has the right idea. Turkey's in the oven, fresh cup of tea is waiting for me. Perfect running weather this morning, I was out for 40 minutes.

Merry Christmas to all

73 de Jim, N2EY

4900. Re: Happy Holidays to all

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-25 16:30:15 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031225113015.29591.00001085@mb-m02.aol.com>
Source record: 84476

>Enjoy your lump of coal, ya miserable bastard.

Is that anyway for you to talk on Christmas Day, I guess thats what we can expect from CBplussers

4901. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-25 16:45:56 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <REMOVETHISkc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <bsg5ol$ct04c$9@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 84487
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.cb

Not in the Mid-Michigan area.....can't find any radio related magazine
anymore! (except for something like Popular Electronics)

Heard some vicious rumor about the anti-radio relay league pulling magazines
from "shelf sales" recently but I cannot confirm this.

Ryan KC8PMX
--
"The Pope has issued a proclamation on Michael Jackson. If he hears any
more allegations about little boys, the Pope says he'll have no choice but
to make him a priest."

"JJ" <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
news:AeOdnfHSKvBoFkaiRVn-ig@gbronline.com...
> JEP wrote:
>
>
> > 2) Can't separate QST from membership
>
> Check your local newstand or magazine rack in stores, many carry QST.
> You can purchase it without membership, or check you local library, they
> may carry it and you can read it for free.
>

4902. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-25 16:47:52 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <YwEGb.19501$Pg1.1123@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 84477

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote

> 1) Three classes of license: Basic, Intermediate, Full (change the
> names if you don't like them - Third, Second, First, Novice,
> General, Extra, whatever)
>
> 2) HF/MF bands split into subbands by mode and split again by
> license class. Some bands (30 meters) may be split by mode only.
> Bottom of each band is CW only, middle is CW/digital, top is
> CW/phone/image. Percentage division about 20%/30%/50% (varies with
> band). "Digital" includes digital voice modes if bandwidth under
> 1 kHz.
>

clip....clip.....clip

Sames old disincentive licensing scheme we've had since the 60's warmed over
a bit.

Yawn.

73, de Hans, K0HB

4903. Re: Why I Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-25 16:56:43 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031225115643.28496.00002909@mb-m18.aol.com>
Source record: 84478

In article <EIBGb.18959$P%1.17258408@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> writes:

>> Yet I believe Novice DOES have permanent credit towards the 5wpm.
>>
>> Cheers,
>> Bill K2UNK
>>
>
>The Novice license does indeed bestow lifetime credit but that is not the
>same situation as a Tech who subsequent to the April 2000 passed element 1.
>In the latter case, the credit is only good for 365 for the purposes of
>upgrading as stated.
>
>Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>
You're both right, but there are even odder twists in Part 97.

Any expired license still in the grace period bestows the obvious element credits.

A Novice license expired beyond the grace period bestows Element 1

A Technician license expired beyond the grace period *and* issued before Feb 14, 1991 bestows Element 1 (but not Element 2!)

A Technician license expired beyond the grace period *and* issued before Mar 21, 1987 bestows Elements 1 and 3 (but not Element 2!)

Any commercial radiotelegraph license (issued by FCC, of course) current or expired less than 5 years bestows Element 1

No other credit for expired licenses.

Think of all the twists!

Suppose someone had a Tech Plus issued after Feb 14, 1991 but more than 12 years prior to today, and they did not renew it, and they bypassed the Novice back then. No credit. But if they'd gotten that same license before Feb 14, 1991, they'd have credit for Element 1. And if they'd gotten that same license before Mar 21, 1987, they'd have credit for Elements 1 and 3.

Or suppose someone got a Novice or Tech way back in 1951 (52 years ago) and never did anyting with it. The old license document would be good for Element 1 in both cases and also Element 3 in the Technician case. But someone who bypassed those licenses and went straight for General or above gets *no* credits at all.

Lots of other scenarios. A 1951 Tech whose let his/her license expire in 1956 needs only the old license document and Element 2 to get a General, but someone who went straight to Extra 12 years and 1 day ago and did not renew gets no credit at all.

It seems to me it would be a lot simpler to have the rules say that *any* class of code tested license or equivalent CSCE would grant Element 1 credit, but they don't. The written test situation is even odder, but it could be argued that the old writtens did not include RF exposure questions and the regs have changed quite a bit.

73 de Jim, N2EY

4904. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-25 16:59:51 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <REMOVETHISkc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <bsg5om$ct04c$10@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 84488
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.cb

That would be true if they were selling only ONE copy of it, but when I COULD find a copy of it locally, due to the fact that it almost ALWAYS sold out each month, I inquired as to how many copies they got at the closest store. They said 15 per issue.

So your math would be in slight error. Multiply that number by 15 and you get $718.56. Not bad for only one magazine, and when you consider they usually have at least 100 or more magazines on their shelves.

Ryan KC8PMX
--
"The Pope has issued a proclamation on Michael Jackson. If he hears any more allegations about little boys, the Pope says he'll have no choice but to make him a priest."

>
> At $4.99/mo ($59.88/yr) plus tax, I'm sure it wasn't a high volume
business
> for Barnes and Noble, since that's a 53% premium over the membership dues,
> and you don't get the other benefits which comes with membership. Only an
> idiot would regularly buy QST from a news stand!
>
> 73, de Hans, K0HB
>
>
>
>

4905. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-25 17:04:18 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <REMOVETHISkc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <bsg5oo$ct04c$11@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 84489
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.cb

> You do realize that the ARRL has the publication and distribution of QST
> contracted out, don't you? You should crab to them, not the league per
se.

Cop out excuse. A person's beef would be with the ARRL, not the contracted agency, and it would be the ARRL's responsibility to deal with the contracted agency.

Ryan KC8PMX
--
"The Pope has issued a proclamation on Michael Jackson. If he hears any more allegations about little boys, the Pope says he'll have no choice but to make him a priest."

4906. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-25 17:16:18 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <REMOVETHISkc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <bsg5op$ct04c$12@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 84490
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.cb

Moving it to the south is gonna do NOTHING more than change the location of the headquarters.....

"Ragchewer" <rc@ragchewnow.org> wrote in message news:brgj9i$q2k$0@pita.alt.net...
>
> Why do I not like the ARRL? I will answer that with another
> question. Would you trust a gang of Yankee carpetbaggers,
> the same bunch who stole from the southerners at the end of
> the War Between The States? You would? Good! Sign
> up for life membership with the rest of the NewingtonYankee
> gang. As for me, the league can go f..k itself, since that is what
> it has been doing to the rest of us for decades.
>
> RC
>
>
>
>

4907. Re: Why I Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-25 17:38:34 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <ugFGb.18984$P%1.17283413@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 84479

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20031225115643.28496.00002909@mb-m18.aol.com...
> In article <EIBGb.18959$P%1.17258408@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D.
> Flint" <deehays@qix.net> writes:
>
> >> Yet I believe Novice DOES have permanent credit towards the 5wpm.
> >>
> >> Cheers,
> >> Bill K2UNK
> >>
> >
> >The Novice license does indeed bestow lifetime credit but that is not the
> >same situation as a Tech who subsequent to the April 2000 passed element
1.
> >In the latter case, the credit is only good for 365 for the purposes of
> >upgrading as stated.
> >
> >Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
> >
> You're both right, but there are even odder twists in Part 97.
>
> Any expired license still in the grace period bestows the obvious element
> credits.
>
> A Novice license expired beyond the grace period bestows Element 1
>
> A Technician license expired beyond the grace period *and* issued before
Feb
> 14, 1991 bestows Element 1 (but not Element 2!)
>
> A Technician license expired beyond the grace period *and* issued before
Mar
> 21, 1987 bestows Elements 1 and 3 (but not Element 2!)
>
> Any commercial radiotelegraph license (issued by FCC, of course) current
or
> expired less than 5 years bestows Element 1
>
> No other credit for expired licenses.
>
> Think of all the twists!
>
> Suppose someone had a Tech Plus issued after Feb 14, 1991 but more than 12
> years prior to today, and they did not renew it, and they bypassed the

Novice
> back then. No credit. But if they'd gotten that same license before Feb
14,
> 1991, they'd have credit for Element 1. And if they'd gotten that same
license
> before Mar 21, 1987, they'd have credit for Elements 1 and 3.
>
> Or suppose someone got a Novice or Tech way back in 1951 (52 years ago)
and
> never did anyting with it. The old license document would be good for
Element 1
> in both cases and also Element 3 in the Technician case. But someone who
> bypassed those licenses and went straight for General or above gets *no*
> credits at all.
>
> Lots of other scenarios. A 1951 Tech whose let his/her license expire in
1956
> needs only the old license document and Element 2 to get a General, but
someone
> who went straight to Extra 12 years and 1 day ago and did not renew gets
no
> credit at all.
>
> It seems to me it would be a lot simpler to have the rules say that *any*
class
> of code tested license or equivalent CSCE would grant Element 1 credit,
but
> they don't. The written test situation is even odder, but it could be
argued
> that the old writtens did not include RF exposure questions and the regs
have
> changed quite a bit.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

I was trying to avoid all the permutations of the current rules and just address the statements as presented. It does get quite complex as to what grants which credits.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

4908. Re: Happy Holidays to all

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-25 17:55:52 UTC
From: garigue <garigue@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <IwFGb.478650$275.1378019@attbi_s53>
Source record: 84480

OOPPPs my dyslexia again "hi hi ",,,, the all time hit I took for this tendency of mine was when I put the coils in the K-2 in opposite sites ....those who put one together know what I mean ....

73 Tom
"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20031224154625.12131.00001696@mb-m05.aol.com...
> >Aw com'on LUX .... can't you just cast aside all we have been
"discussing"
> >over the year for just one message...
> >
> >Sad ...73 Tom KI3R
>
> Whos "LUX"

4909. Re: Happy Holidays to all

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-25 17:59:33 UTC
From: garigue <garigue@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <9AFGb.39721$VB2.79930@attbi_s51>
Source record: 84481

"consistent psycopathic" <butbecau3@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:552d3$3fea3c41$d1cc5763$15147@allthenewsgroups.com...
>
> "WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20031224154625.12131.00001696@mb-m05.aol.com...
> > >Aw com'on LUX .... can't you just cast aside all we have been
> "discussing"
> > >over the year for just one message...
> > >
> > >Sad ...73 Tom KI3R
> >
> > Whos "LUX"
>
> Wasn't that a soap they used to clean marble
> steps and ceramic bathroom tiles in the 40's
> or 50's...?

Haven't thought about LUX for years ... I think they opened up LUX theater
with drums ..typany ?? sp??
Lux is Latin for light if I can remember old Prof Miller
from my college days.

God Bless 73 KI3R Tom Popovic nr Pittsburgh

4910. Re: Why You Don't Like Ham's Who Can't Accept Change.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-25 23:02:26 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031225180226.09599.00001471@mb-m17.aol.com>
Source record: 84482

>Subject: Re: Why You Don't Like Ham's Who Can't Accept Change.
>From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
>Date: 12/24/03 9:21 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <20031224102156.12501.00004836@mb-m04.aol.com>
>
>In article <20031223154928.07346.00002243@mb-m26.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com
>(Len Over 21) writes:
>
>>Amateur radio FUN is only "ancilliary" to the U.S. amateur radio
>> SERVICE. Ham radio is all about wearing a Lifestyle mental
>> uniform, marching in ranks to the morse drumbeat of the 1930s,
>> and being ready, willing, able to "take over communications" when
>> all the commercial/professional infrastructure FAILS in an
>> emergency? That's the thoughts I see expressed in here.
>
>By whom?
>>
>> There can be no fun in the ham SERVICE.
>
>Says who?

Say Sir Putzii the First. He's said it over and over so it HAS to be
true, Jim. =)

Thank God yet another "holiday" is only 7 hours from being over. Maybe we
can get back to some semplence of sanity...But not until the "Day After" sakes
are over, I guess.....

73

Steve, K4YZ

4911. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-25 23:04:09 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031225180409.09599.00001472@mb-m17.aol.com>
Source record: 84483

>Subject: Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL
>From: "Kï¿½HB" groupk0hb@earthlink.net
>Date: 12/25/03 10:47 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <YwEGb.19501$Pg1.1123@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>

>clip....clip.....clip
>
>Sames old disincentive licensing scheme we've had since the 60's warmed over
>a bit.

It's only a "disincentive" to those who want something for nothing, Hans.

73

Steve, K4YZ

4912. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-25 23:05:55 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031225180555.09599.00001473@mb-m17.aol.com>
Source record: 84484

>Subject: Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL
>From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
>Date: 12/25/03 5:01 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <f45722ac.0312251501.133978ef@posting.google.com>

>Sounds like what we've inherited today. Let's do something rational instead.

It will be interesting to see what YOU call "rational".

Steve, K4YZ

4913. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-26 00:55:49 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <pGLGb.5708$Vv2.2491873@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 84485

JJ wrote:
> Dee D. Flint wrote:
>
>>
>> You are being deliberately obtuse. Kim repeatedly stated that she was
>> going
>> the same speed as the other cars in the lane that she was in not the
>> lanes
>> to her right. She was going with the normal flow of traffic in the
>> lane she
>> was in. It should be obvious to the most casual observer that she was
>> not
>> blocking traffic in the left lane as she was going at the speed of the
>> traffic in that lane.
>
>
> If other traffic behind her is attempting to go faster than she is, she
> *is* blocking traffic unless she is passing traffic in the right lane.
>
> That ONE car tries to force her to move over does not
>
>> constitute impeding the flow of traffic as the blockhead that is
>> trying to
>> get her to move over will have to attempt the same maneuver with all the
>> other cars in the lane.
>>
>> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>>
>
> Stop trying to make something complicated out of a simple Texas law. If
> kim or anyone else is in the left lane, they are obligated to move to
> the right for any faster traffic. The law plainly states that if you are
> in the left lane and not passing other traffic you should be in the
> right lane. As long as she is passing the other traffic in the right
> lane, then being in the left lane is where she should be, but as soon as
> she passes the traffic in the right lane she should move over to the
> right to let faster traffic pass. What is so hard for you and kim to
> understand about that?

psst..... think about failure to yield....

- Mike KB3EIA -

4914. Re: Why I Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-26 01:04:01 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <5OLGb.5711$Vv2.2493335@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 84486

N2EY wrote:

> In article <EIBGb.18959$P%1.17258408@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D.
> Flint" <deehays@qix.net> writes:
>
>
>>>Yet I believe Novice DOES have permanent credit towards the 5wpm.
>>>
>>>Cheers,
>>>Bill K2UNK
>>>
>>
>>The Novice license does indeed bestow lifetime credit but that is not the
>>same situation as a Tech who subsequent to the April 2000 passed element 1.
>>In the latter case, the credit is only good for 365 for the purposes of
>>upgrading as stated.
>>
>>Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>>
>
> You're both right, but there are even odder twists in Part 97.
>
> Any expired license still in the grace period bestows the obvious element
> credits.
>
> A Novice license expired beyond the grace period bestows Element 1
>
> A Technician license expired beyond the grace period *and* issued before Feb
> 14, 1991 bestows Element 1 (but not Element 2!)
>
> A Technician license expired beyond the grace period *and* issued before Mar
> 21, 1987 bestows Elements 1 and 3 (but not Element 2!)
>
> Any commercial radiotelegraph license (issued by FCC, of course) current or
> expired less than 5 years bestows Element 1
>
> No other credit for expired licenses.
>
> Think of all the twists!
>
> Suppose someone had a Tech Plus issued after Feb 14, 1991 but more than 12
> years prior to today, and they did not renew it, and they bypassed the Novice
> back then. No credit. But if they'd gotten that same license before Feb 14,
> 1991, they'd have credit for Element 1. And if they'd gotten that same license

> before Mar 21, 1987, they'd have credit for Elements 1 and 3.
>
> Or suppose someone got a Novice or Tech way back in 1951 (52 years ago) and
> never did anyting with it. The old license document would be good for Element 1
> in both cases and also Element 3 in the Technician case. But someone who
> bypassed those licenses and went straight for General or above gets *no*
> credits at all.
>
> Lots of other scenarios. A 1951 Tech whose let his/her license expire in 1956
> needs only the old license document and Element 2 to get a General, but someone
> who went straight to Extra 12 years and 1 day ago and did not renew gets no
> credit at all.
>
> It seems to me it would be a lot simpler to have the rules say that *any* class
> of code tested license or equivalent CSCE would grant Element 1 credit, but
> they don't. The written test situation is even odder, but it could be argued
> that the old writtens did not include RF exposure questions and the regs have
> changed quite a bit.

I'll bet you have a headache now, Jim! Its kind of like what I was
saying about actions and their consequences. Any time you change a rule
there are plenty of consequenses - like removing Element one without any
other changes. (which I think is impossible anyway, BTW)

- Mike KB3EIA -

4915. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-26 02:41:33 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bsg7l7$3q1@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 84492

"JJ" <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
news:oZqdnXYCd5z7SnSiRVn-sw@gbronline.com...
> Kim W5TIT wrote:
>
> >
> > Simple 'nuff, find a *LAW* and I'll accept that it is illegal to drive
in
> > left lanes, otherwise, you're allowing yourself to be impressioned for
the
> > benefit of winning a side to an argument--which, of course, I am also.
> > Seems I'm winning, though...
>
> Not so fast tits.
>

OK, Dick-less...

> >
> > Law, JJ, not suggestions, not a manual, not
> > someone's (as in the circumstance with your submitted commentary)
> > interpretation, but law.
>
> Here is the response I received from Bud Kennedy, the author of the
article.
>
> Hi Bill,
>
> Thanks for your note.
>
> Your friend obviously thinks she knows everything, so she probably will
> think she knows more than the law or the DPS. - (boy does he have you
> pegged - jj)
>

Well, JJ, maybe your columnist thinks he knows everything, but I think he's
wrong on his assessment of the law, here.
And, while I'm at it...since you're so obsessed with my tits, perhaps you
can't think clearly enough...

You have it your way, I'll have it mine. And, if I ever get a ticket for
driving the way I do and will continue to do...I'll let ya know...

Kim W5TIT

4916. Re: Why I Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-26 02:42:01 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3FEB9FF2.20005@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 84491

>
>
>>
>>
>> It seems to me it would be a lot simpler to have the rules say that
>> *any* class
>> of code tested license or equivalent CSCE would grant Element 1
>> credit, but
>> they don't. The written test situation is even odder, but it could be
>> argued
>> that the old writtens did not include RF exposure questions and the
>> regs have
>> changed quite a bit.
>
>
> I'll bet you have a headache now, Jim! Its kind of like what I was
> saying about actions and their consequences. Any time you change a
> rule there are plenty of consequenses - like removing Element one
> without any other changes. (which I think is impossible anyway, BTW)
>
Some brearucrat must have wrote those rules. And didn't understand that
a 13wpm or
20wpm code test would imply the ability to do 5wpm, and thus deserve
credit for element 1.
Said brearucrat was probably told to get the ham rules done this
afternoon, and get on
the new cell phone or whatever rules tommrow.

4917. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-26 02:47:14 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bsg7l8$3q1@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 84493

"JJ" <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
news:YJqdnQusX-rQcnSiRVn-hA@gbronline.com...
> Dee D. Flint wrote:
>
> > "JJ" <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
> > news:oZqdnXYCd5z7SnSiRVn-sw@gbronline.com...
> >
> >>Kim W5TIT wrote:
> >>
> >>
> >>>Simple 'nuff, find a *LAW* and I'll accept that it is illegal to drive
> >
> > in
> >
> >>>left lanes, otherwise, you're allowing yourself to be impressioned for
> >
> > the
> >
> >>>benefit of winning a side to an argument--which, of course, I am also.
> >>>Seems I'm winning, though...
> >>
> >>Not so fast tits.
> >>
> >>
> >>>Law, JJ, not suggestions, not a manual, not
> >>>someone's (as in the circumstance with your submitted commentary)
> >>>interpretation, but law.
> >>
> >>Here is the response I received from Bud Kennedy, the author of the
> >
> > article.
> >
> >>Hi Bill,
> >>
> >>Thanks for your note.
> >>
> >>Your friend obviously thinks she knows everything, so she probably will
> >>think she knows more than the law or the DPS. - (boy does he have you
> >>pegged - jj)
> >>
> >>I quoted the law in the column. It's from 545.051 --
> >>
> >>http://www.capitol.state.tx.us/statutes/tr/tr0054500.html
> >>

> >>+(b) An operator of a vehicle on a roadway moving more slowly than the
> >>normal speed of other vehicles at the time and place under the existing
> >>conditions shall drive in the right-hand lane available for vehicles, or
> >>as close as practicable to the right-hand curb or edge of the roadway,
> >>unless the operator is:
> >>
> >>+(1) passing another vehicle; or
> >>+(2) preparing for a left turn at an intersection or into a private road
> >>or driveway.
> >>
> >>This law is not defined by the speed limit. It is defined by the "normal
> >>speed of other vehicles."
> >>
> >>In other words, if you're driving slower than other drivers, you "shall"
> >>move over.
> >>
> >>Write again or anytime
> >>
> >>--Bud
> >>
> >
> >
> > Well Kim has several times stated that she was driving at the normal
speed
> > of the other drivers in the lane. So your quotation makes Kim correct.
> > That a single individual wants to drive much faster than the rest of the
> > traffic does not make Kim wrong for not moving. She may or may not be
> > unwise depending on the overall circumstances but from this quotation is
not
> > doing anything illegal.
> >
> > Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
> >
> It should be obvious to the most casual of observers that if you are in
> the left lane and other traffic is attempting to go faster than you are,
> even if you are driving the normal speed, speeding, or whatever, you are
> obliged to move to the right lane to let the faster traffic pass. That
> is stated pretty plainly. Even if you are going the same speed of the
> vehicles in the right lane, you cannot block faster traffic in the left
> lane. The law states that the operator of a moving vehicle "*shall*
> drive in the *right* hand lane unless the operator is: (1)passing
> another vehicle." Pretty plain, if you are in the left lane and going
> the same speed as vehicles in the right, then you are not passing, so
> you are obliged to move to the right.
> I bet that if kimmygirl is in the left lane and approaches a slower
> vehicle in that lane she certainly expects them to move over so she can
> speed on her merry way.
>

You really *are* ignoring pertinent facts to this discussion. I've said more than a couple/few times that if I come up behind someone who is going a slower speed than me, I simply maintain the distance between us at a slower speed. I leave in plenty of time to arrive at places I need to be; so I don't need to act like an idiot behind someone else...

Maybe you drive the way I am describing...huh? Is that why you are having such a problem? You're useless...never mind...

Kim W5TIT

4918. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-26 02:59:44 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bsg843$dnc@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 84494

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:nAnGb.18901$P%1.17155656@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
>
> "JJ" <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
> > >
> > It should be obvious to the most casual of observers that if you are in
> > the left lane and other traffic is attempting to go faster than you are,
> > even if you are driving the normal speed, speeding, or whatever, you are
> > obliged to move to the right lane to let the faster traffic pass. That
> > is stated pretty plainly. Even if you are going the same speed of the
> > vehicles in the right lane, you cannot block faster traffic in the left
> > lane. The law states that the operator of a moving vehicle "*shall*
> > drive in the *right* hand lane unless the operator is: (1)passing
> > another vehicle." Pretty plain, if you are in the left lane and going
> > the same speed as vehicles in the right, then you are not passing, so
> > you are obliged to move to the right.
> > I bet that if kimmygirl is in the left lane and approaches a slower
> > vehicle in that lane she certainly expects them to move over so she can
> > speed on her merry way.
> >
>
> You are being deliberately obtuse. Kim repeatedly stated that she was
going
> the same speed as the other cars in the lane that she was in not the lanes
> to her right. She was going with the normal flow of traffic in the lane
she
> was in. It should be obvious to the most casual observer that she was not
> blocking traffic in the left lane as she was going at the speed of the
> traffic in that lane. That ONE car tries to force her to move over does
not
> constitute impeding the flow of traffic as the blockhead that is trying to
> get her to move over will have to attempt the same maneuver with all the
> other cars in the lane.
>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>

Oh, they do!! They do. And, you describe it correctly, Dee. I am with the
flow of traffic in the speeders lane--those of us who are already (usually)
well above the speed limit. Then, some bozo will come up from behind,
barreling faster than we are, and want every single one of us to move as
he/she proceeds forward. As I have observed most other drivers also feel
the same way I do--becuase few if any move. The faster speeder usually ends
up moving to the right when they get a break, zooms up and squeezes into a

space the length of a Volkswagon, with a dooly four-door pickup truck!!!

The really funny part is, when they get closer to town? We all catch up, usually toot and wave as we drive past because they've now gotten themselves stuck over in the right hand lane... I know, it's not nice to gloat... but it sure is satisfying!

Kim W5TIT

4919. Re: Here is TITSs Dream

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-26 03:07:29 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bsg8il$udi@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 84495

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20031224230329.01893.00002322@mb-m22.aol.com...
> In article <20031222101240.11589.00000922@mb-m25.aol.com>, wa8ulx@aol.com
> (WA8ULX) writes:
>
> >
> > Check out kk6nn on QRZ. This is what could have came of TIT if she
would
> >have become a REAL HAM. Notice She has an Advanced License, so she does
know
> >13
> >WPM
> > KK6NN is the most positive reason for keeping CW
>
> Wow! I'll say! Kim, eat your heart out. Better still, stop eating that
ice
> cream you spoke of in a later reply, go out and get some exercise, and
> maybe you can give Janet some competition someday.
>

Larry, just for once, would you stop thinking with your dick and show *some*
kind of intelligence? Why in Hell's bells would I be interested in giving
anyone "competition." Are you really that pathetic? Is it your game to
"keep up" with the Jones's or something? Maybe you're just that insecure in
life, that all that matters to you is how a woman looks. I am damned
beautiful, and I wouldn't give you the time of day if you had to adjust your
pacemaker to the next beat of the clock. Tell ya what...*you* go get this
person you are speaking of...lemmee see you *cough* just waltz up and sweep
'er off 'er feet, Larry. har dee har har Yeah, right.

>
> Keep it up the
> way you are, and you're heading toward adult-onset diabetes, possible
> kidney failure, and saying goodbye to your toes, feet, and legs in that
> order. I see the results of self-induced obesity every day -- I'm usually
> loading them into my bus, securing their wheelchairs, and hauling them
> off to dialysis treatments three times a week! The choice is up to you!
>

Uh huh, and you are sadly mistaken to think that it is only weight that
determines things like that. By the way, seems the one time I looked at
your pic on QRZ, you didn't have much more room to swell your chipmunk
cheeks out any. And, the tee-shirt did no justice to hide your gut...
Maybe you better start *your* diet. Then, you can go find some gorgeous
babe you think you can get....

>
> I'm assuming that's a recent photo of Janet. The detail page gives her
> birthdate as Feb. 1960, meaning she's pushing 44 years old! Can anyone
> place the vintage of the 'Vette she's leaning on?
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

Not something you'll ever own...that's for sure. And, that's probably all that'll impress her. So, if that's the kind of woman you're turned on by, go for it Larry. Tell me when you find some dream babe to actually give you the time of day... In fact, tell me when you find any woman to actually give you anything....

Kim W5TIT

4920. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-26 03:09:36 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bsg8mk$u2f@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 84496

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:17vGb.8524$IM3.1531@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net...
>
> "JJ" wrote:
> >
> > (snip) The law plainly states that if you are
> > in the left lane and not passing other traffic
> > you should be in the right lane. (snip)
>
>
> It clearly doesn't say that, JJ. Instead, it says, "An operator of a
> vehicle on a roadway moving more slowly than the normal speed of other
> vehicles at the time and place under the existing conditions shall drive
in
> the right-hand lane available for vehicles." In other words, the only time
> one must absolutely be in the right lane of a multiple-lane highway is
when
> moving more slowly than other vehicles. This clearly supports the idea
that
> one must move to the right to let others pass, but it doesn't support your
> premise that on must always drive in the right lane.
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
>

Your cornfusing (misspelled deliberately) him with facts, Dwight. :)

Kim W5TIT

4921. Re: Here is TITSs Dream

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-26 03:17:23 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031225221723.07958.00001421@mb-m16.aol.com>
Source record: 84497

>Larry, just for once, would you stop thinking with your dick

Wow, I wonder if TITs GAY?

4922. Re: Here is TITSs Dream

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-26 03:32:30 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20031225223230.12300.00002329@mb-m20.aol.com>
Source record: 84498

In article <bs8egn$7o9@library2.airnews.net>, "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> writes:

>heh heh...well, *that's* the picture I should have put on the QRZ site for
>Larry. He'd have moved to Texas in a heartbeat, looked me up, and fell over
>when he saw that I'd turned into a middle-aged used-to-be-drop-dead-gorgeous
>gramma! Yep, let's see, at 20 I weighed around 118 and at 5'6 that's pretty
>damned slim. Although, I pride myself on only being in size 20 slacks and
>pants right now...and I feel great! Back to my bowl of ice cream <GRIN>
>
>Kim W5TIT

Kim:

I've seen the photos of Janet, KK6NN, and I am not moving to California, so why should I have moved to Texas?

BTW, if you were to get rid of the ice cream, get on some good low-carb (not Atkins) diet, get some good exercise on a regular basis, you could be liberated from the size 20 slacks and be in a size 8 dress by this time next year. I'm sure you, your OM, your harmonics, and your 2nd harmonics would be a lot happier.

Merry Christmas to you and your family.

73 de Larry, K3LT

4923. Re: Happy Holidays to all

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-26 03:32:31 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20031225223231.12300.00002330@mb-m20.aol.com>
Source record: 84499

In article <NPydnfgxv5mtMXSiUSdV9g@ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
<wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:

>
>Happy Holidays and a safe, healthy, and prosperous new year to all.
>
>73,
>
>--
>Carl R. Stevenson - wk3c

Carl (and everyone else reading):

May the warmth and joy of the season in which we celebrate the birth of our Lord and Savior, Jesus Christ, be with you and your family now and throughout the New Year! Merry Christmas!

To those of you who may not celebrate Christmas, I wish you the same warmth, joy, and whatever special fulfillment your particular holiday celebration may bring to you and your loved ones.

To all: Please celebrate safely and be here with us in the New Year!

73 de Larry, K3LT

4924. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-26 03:55:44 UTC
From: BDK <kingratboyoboy@buckeye-express.com>
Message-ID: <MPG.1a557b4e48b6f5e8989851@news.buckeye-express.com>
Source record: 84500
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.cb

In article <bsg5ol$ct04c$9@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>,
REMOVETHISkc8pmx@diamondcs.net says...
> Not in the Mid-Michigan area.....can't find any radio related magazine
> anymore! (except for something like Popular Electronics)
>
> Heard some vicious rumor about the anti-radio relay league pulling magazines
> from "shelf sales" recently but I cannot confirm this.
>
>
> Ryan KC8PMX
> --
> "The Pope has issued a proclamation on Michael Jackson. If he hears any
> more allegations about little boys, the Pope says he'll have no choice but
> to make him a priest."
>
>
> "JJ" <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
> news:AeOdnfHSKvBoFkaiRVn-ig@gbronline.com...
> > JEP wrote:
> >
> >
> > > 2) Can't separate QST from membership
> >
> > Check your local newstand or magazine rack in stores, many carry QST.
> > You can purchase it without membership, or check you local library, they
> > may carry it and you can read it for free.
> >
>
>
>

Popular Communications (Never met a radio they didn't like)
CQ
QST
Monitoring Times

These should be easily found at any decent newstand. Don't you have any
bookstores there??

Borders?
BDalton?

BDK

4925. Re: Bye, Bye, David Tolassi

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-26 04:08:44 UTC
From: bignose bob0 <9laughds@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <46b72$3febb455$d1cc5770$12644@allthenewsgroups.com>
Source record: 84501
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

"Timmie" <Toodles@NoEmailAddress> wrote in message
news:bsg4fh$i4a$0@pita.alt.net...
> David Tolassi recently whined:
> "Well, I am about to enter radio prison for 3 years, with NO voice
> priviliges
> on 20 meters for that duration. That is the "deal" I made with Riley,
and I
> consider myself to be lucky considering the efforts put in by my
> detractors,..."
>
> Well, the dumbass brought it upon himself through his own actions. He was
> warned
> and warned. Now he is whining?
> Three years is ALL?? It should have been more, much more.
> Adios, David. Good riddance.

Poor baby!

Let the motel man from Vt. go and buy airtime on k1man's broadcast
like some 'other guy' did recently. Seems like this is now the in-thing
to do...(?)

" The conspiracy has hogged Fascism long enough! We're taking
back Fascism for the people man...yeah! Fascism for the individual.
It's what we like to call Patriopsychoticenarcomaterialism. "

- Rev. Ivan Stang on the Hour of Slack
http://www.subgenius.com/ts/hos.html

ARE WE CONTROLLED BY SECRET FORCES?
ARE ALIEN SPACE MONSTERS BRINGING A
STARTLING NEW WORLD?
DO PEOPLE THINK YOU'RE STRANGE?
DO YOU??
...THEN YOU MAY BE ON THE RIGHT TRACK!
http://www.subgenius.com/pam1/pamphlet.html

4926. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-26 04:31:32 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <Y4-dnVdK0LREIXaiRVn-gw@gbronline.com>
Source record: 84502

Kim W5TIT wrote:

> And, while I'm at it...since you're so obsessed with my tits, perhaps you
> can't think clearly enough...

Lets see now, you pick that call sign and you think I am obsessed with
your breasts? Looks like you are more obsessed with them than anyone else.

4927. live scanner

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-26 08:20:02 UTC
From: "h.reijnierse" <reijnierse@home.nl>
Message-ID: <bsgqrs$97o$1@news3.tilbu1.nb.home.nl>
Source record: 84503

http://members.home.nl/reijnierse/

4928. Re: Why I Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-26 13:08:58 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031226080858.21232.00002984@mb-m13.aol.com>
Source record: 84507

In article <20031220161320.22081.00002640@mb-m17.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com
(Len Over 21) writes:

>In article <20031220145906.21642.00003100@mb-m01.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com
>(N2EY)
>writes:
>
>>In article <1bKcnRsopILxK36iUSdV9w@ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
>><wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:
>>
>>>"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
>>>news:c2356669.0312191605.469f743b@posting.google.com...
>>>> "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
>>>news:<LaWdnUpk3pWGoH6iUSdV9w@ptd.net>...
>>>> > Leadership is
>>>> > when one has the courage and wisdom to make a sound judgement
>>>> > and then "do the right thing."
>>>>
>>>> Who decides what "the right thing" really is?
>>>
>>>That's what "leadership" is *supposed* to be there for ... to make
>>>the tough calls when the answer isn't necessarily obvious (or may
>>>be right, but not overwhelmingly popular).
>>
>>But ultimately it comes down to popularity, because if the "leader" makes
>>unpopular-enough decision(s), he/she may not be a "leader" anymore. This
>>happens in government, in business (if a decision isn't popular-enough with
>>customers and/or stockholders), and in almost all voluntary organizations.
>>>
>>>> For example, look at
>>>> that "21st century" paper (CQ published it, btw, and it was in their
>>>> mill before I evder saw it, so don't give me a hard time about it). Is
>>>> the "Communicator" idea "the right thing"?
>>>
>>>No ... we need more people who understand radio, not more appliance
>>>operators.
>>
>>Agreed!
>>
>>But the leaders of the NCVEC committee disagree with us.
>
> Such is forbidden!

By whom?
>

> You need no consensus.

Lack of consensus never stopped you from spreading your blatherskite all over,
Len, including your voluminous commentary to the FCC.

> You KNOW the true way.

I know what I think is the best way for the ARS' future. WK3C knows what he
thinks is the best way for the ARS' future. On some things we disagree and on
some things we agree.
>
> All else are ignorant, incapable of the correct decisions.
>

"That is your problem and you continually foul this newsgroup with arrogant
remarks against the person of those of opposite opinions. Not my problem but
certainly yours in attitude."
>
>>It boils down to the old argument of:
>>
>>"Become a ham to learn about radio"
>>
>>vs.
>>
>>"Learn about radio to become a ham"
>
> NO ONE can be "interested in radio" without getting a ham
> license!

Says who?
>
> Know morse and one knows all.
>
Not true.

>>>> > Otherwise, they could just do a web vote
>>>> > popularity contest on every issue and wouldn't need Directors ... the
>>>> > staff could handle the whole thing ...
>>>>
>>>> And if that vote runs opposite to what you think is "the right thing"?
>>>
>>>I wasn't advocating a popularity contest ... just saying that if nobody in
>>>"leadership" has the cajones and good judgement to make the right call,
>>>then it might as well devolve to that ...
>>
>>They *do* have the intestinal fortitude to make the "right" call. But
>there's
>>disagreement about what that call is. There are honest people on all sides
>of
>>most disagreements.
>
> But...you KNOW the true way already.

I know what I think is the best way for the ARS' future.
>
> There can be NO disagreement then.

More untruths from Len.

Of course there can be disagreement.

>>>> It sounds to me like you're saying the ARRL Directors should sometimes
>>>> go against what the majority of members say they want. Do you really
>>>> think that's a good idea?
>>>
>>>Yes ... the leadership should, theoretically at least, have superior
>>>knowledge,
>>>insight, and experience and should be there to guide, not simply be a bunch
>>>of political "yes men" to a majority who may/may not necessarily make the
>>>best
>>>choices in terms of what's in the best interests of ham radio long term.
>>
>>Others describe the ARRL leadership as "self appointed gods of radio" who
>>claim
>>to "know what is best". And they use that description as a reason not to
>>join.
>
> Gasp...you mean to imply they DON'T know what is best?!?!?

Do YOU know what is best, Len?

Or do you only know what you want, regardless of what others think?
>
>>Like it or not, it's ultimately a popularity contest. And the long term is
>>hard
>>to gauge because things aren't left alone long enough. Even when they are,
>>there is often little agreement with what the results mean.
>
> You need NO consensus. You KNOW.

You've never needed a consensus, Len. Why should anyone else?
>
>>If the bulletins and code practice were done online instead of on-air, what
>>would be left of W1AW?
>
> It's a MEMORIAL station. Remember?

A memorial to a great man, who you denigrate with childish snide remarks.
>
>>>> The whole point of W1AW is to do those things by *radio*. If we're
>>>> going to use the website for bulletins and code practice, why not rag
>>>> chewing, traffic handling, DX chasing, contesting......
>>>
>>>I've always said that the ampr.org domain should be come a much more
>>>integrated, vibrant part of the internet as a whole ...
>>

>>But what have you *done* to make that a reality except for talking about it?
>
> Just for starters, Carl was IN Geneva helping to get all of S25
> redone.

WK3C was in Geneva for his work. His employer paid the way. No secret about that, he told us all about it here on rrap.

> It got redone. Reality. Love it or leave it.

"Administrations are free to impose morse code testing for all amateur licensees if they so wish, or partial morse code testing for privileges above 30 MHz. It is all up to each nation's administrations."

That's reality, Len, as stated by you.

> Some day I might hear W1AW out here 3000 or so miles away.

That would require a half-decent receiver and antenna, Len. Of course if you choose to live in the shadow of a mountain, refuse to build or buy suitable equipment, and refuse to inform yourself of when and where to listen, that's not my problem.

Have you ever actually listened for W1AW, on a time and frequency where there would be a reasonable chance of hearing it?

W1AW is about 200 miles northeast of here. I frequently contact west coast amateurs on 80 and 40 meters using my homebrew and kit stations, with antennas far inferior to W1AW's and much less power. If you can't receive W1AW where you are, the problem is obviously at your end.

What we call "a short circuit between the headphones" or "cockpit trouble" ;-)

> It doesn't reach Hawaii very well, or Alaska.

How do you know?

> Obviously us in the
> west don't exist as states of the Union.

More untruths. Gee, Len, you seem bent on spreading untruths and misinformation.

> Nobody can possibly be "interested in radio" without testing for
> morse code and then Acceptance of the True Way via ARRL.

Another falsehood from Len. Anyone can be "interested in radio". But being "interested in amateur radio" requires a license and active participation.

You're not interested, Len. You're not even interesting.

4929. Re: Why I Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-26 13:08:59 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031226080859.21232.00002985@mb-m13.aol.com>
Source record: 84505

In article <xnfcneeyarg.hq7ykml.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>, "Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> writes:

>On 19 Dec 2003 16:05:28 -0800, N2EY wrote:
>
>>The "c-word" came into use because FCC said some years ago that they
>>weren't going to do any serious restructuring until the amateur radio
>>community came up with a consensus on what they wanted. That policy
>>was quite visibly abandoned in 1998 when FCC issued an NPRM without
>>any consensus being evident.
>
> I wasn't there (Dayton?) when Bill Cross said "the C word" but my
> understanding was that unless the ham community came with a consensus,
> it (we) were liable to get things that we may not like from the FCC
> if we back them into a corner.

I wasn't there either, Phil, but I got basically the same message.

And its not a new message, either. Remember the Eye Bank Net?

> Perhaps - I hope - that was Bill's personal opinion and not "the
> official policy" of the FCC (we've differed on things before).
>
I hope so, too. But after all, we hams are a "legacy" service that doesn't provide much revenue, has huge pieces of spectrum set aside for it, and is quite anarchic in some ways (no channelization, licensees building their own equipment, etc.) Indeed, the very concept of "radio operator" is considered archaic in most services - or they are going in that direction.

> With the latest Bureau restructuring, he now reports through another
> layer of supervision, and I understand that his immediate supervisor
> is now someone who is a ham, which was not the case before.
>
Which could explain a lot of things.

73 de Jim, N2EY

4930. Re: Why I Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-26 13:09:00 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031226080900.21232.00002986@mb-m13.aol.com>
Source record: 84504

In article <ugFGb.18984$P%1.17283413@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> writes:

>I was trying to avoid all the permutations of the current rules and just
>address the statements as presented.

Of course, Dee. No criticism intended.

>It does get quite complex as to what
>grants which credits.

Agreed!

73 de Jim, N2EY

4931. Re: Why I Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-26 13:09:01 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031226080901.21232.00002987@mb-m13.aol.com>
Source record: 84506

In article <5OLGb.5711$Vv2.2493335@news1.news.adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:

>I'll bet you have a headache now, Jim!

Not at all, Mike. I'm used to the rules having all sorts of twists like that. You should have seen what the FCC rules for the ARS looked like in the early '70s! Particularly to put a repeater on the air.

Didja know that there was a considerable period of time (started in the early 1950s) when, if a General or Advanced class ham could document heving held an amateur license before WW1 (USA entered WW1 in May 1917) the FCC would give you an Extra with no tests at all?

>Its kind of like what I was
>saying about actions and their consequences. Any time you change a rule
>there are plenty of consequenses - like removing Element one without any
>other changes. (which I think is impossible anyway, BTW)
>
Sure. It's called "The Law of Unexpected Results". Change something, and a other things will change, too.

For example, look at traffic light timing. It used to be the standard that when the yellow interval ended in one direction, the green for conflicting traffic would display right away. Traffic engineers noticed that sometimes accidents would result from drivers "crowding the yellow" too closely. ("It was orange, Officer!")

So they decided that there should be a 3 second interval of "all red" to give time for the intersection to clear.

But after a while they noted people entering intersections *against the red* (when the yellow interval had just ended) because they knew they had 3 seconds. Result: More accidents.

But it *is* possible for the FCC to just drop Element 1. K2UNK and I discussed this some time back right here on rrap and outlined the paragraphs in Part 97 that needed changing or deletion for that to happen. There weren't many!

FCC could make it even simpler, though. They could add the following to the rules:

"Pending further review and rules changes, Element 1 credit is given to any applicant for an amateur radio license of any class".

or

"Pending further review and rules changes, the requirement for Element 1 is waived for an amateur radio license of any class".

One sentence, no other changes until FCC gets the proverbial round tuit.

And if FCC were 100% convinced that code testing serves no purpose, it would have been dropped by now. Instead, it looks more and more like we're headed for another NPRM cycle.

73 de Jim, N2EY

4932. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-26 14:00:53 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <paXGb.7284$lo3.4193@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 84508

"Steve Robeson K4CAP" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote

> those who want something for nothing

Ah, yes, when they can't make a reasoned argument they trot out the old "something for nothing" mantra.

Sorry, but that just doesn't stand up in the light of day, Steve. My plan, for example, calls for an examination similar to the current Extra written for full privileges, yet avoids building a new set of Amateur Radio ghettos like Jim's 1968-leftover plan would do. It also avoids 'free upgrades' which we'll likely see proposed by a prominent CT radio club.

Hans

4933. Re: Why I Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-26 14:01:26 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <WaXGb.19065$P%1.17403884@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 84509

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20031226080900.21232.00002986@mb-m13.aol.com...
> In article <ugFGb.18984$P%1.17283413@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D.
> Flint" <deehays@qix.net> writes:
>
> >I was trying to avoid all the permutations of the current rules and just
> >address the statements as presented.
>
> Of course, Dee. No criticism intended.
>
> >It does get quite complex as to what
> >grants which credits.
>
> Agreed!
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

Don't worry, I did not take it as criticism. However, it reminds me that I need to get an updated rule book as they keep changing and mine is about one edition out of date. Of course I can always look things up on the internet but I prefer to have a book.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

4934. Re: Why I Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-26 14:56:37 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031226095637.05539.00003191@mb-m16.aol.com>
Source record: 84510

In article <WaXGb.19065$P%1.17403884@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> writes:

>However, it reminds me that I
>need to get an updated rule book as they keep changing and mine is about one
>edition out of date. Of course I can always look things up on the internet
>but I prefer to have a book.

You can also download Part 97 from the ARRL website. Available in several formats including pdf IIRC.

73 de Jim, N2EY

4935. Re: Why I Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-26 15:10:41 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <RbYGb.5801$Vv2.2669073@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 84511

N2EY wrote:
> In article <5OLGb.5711$Vv2.2493335@news1.news.adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo
> <mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:
>
>
>>I'll bet you have a headache now, Jim!
>
>
> Not at all, Mike. I'm used to the rules having all sorts of twists like that.
> You should have seen what the FCC rules for the ARS looked like in the early
> '70s! Particularly to put a repeater on the air.
>
> Didja know that there was a considerable period of time (started in the early
> 1950s) when, if a General or Advanced class ham could document heving held an
> amateur license before WW1 (USA entered WW1 in May 1917) the FCC would give you
> an Extra with no tests at all?
>
>>Its kind of like what I was
>>saying about actions and their consequences. Any time you change a rule
>>there are plenty of consequenses - like removing Element one without any
>>other changes. (which I think is impossible anyway, BTW)
>>
>
> Sure. It's called "The Law of Unexpected Results". Change something, and a
> other things will change, too.
>
> For example, look at traffic light timing. It used to be the standard that when
> the yellow interval ended in one direction, the green for conflicting traffic
> would display right away. Traffic engineers noticed that sometimes accidents
> would result from drivers "crowding the yellow" too closely. ("It was orange,
> Officer!")
>
> So they decided that there should be a 3 second interval of "all red" to give
> time for the intersection to clear.

Green= go like crazy
Yellow= foot to the floor
Red= only 3 more cars through the intersection.

And some people blame the root of all this on the right turn on red rule.

> But after a while they noted people entering intersections *against the red*
> (when the yellow interval had just ended) because they knew they had 3 seconds.
> Result: More accidents.
>

> But it *is* possible for the FCC to just drop Element 1. K2UNK and I discussed
> this some time back right here on rrap and outlined the paragraphs in Part 97
> that needed changing or deletion for that to happen. There weren't many!
>
> FCC could make it even simpler, though. They could add the following to the
> rules:
>
> "Pending further review and rules changes, Element 1 credit is given to any
> applicant for an amateur radio license of any class".
>
> or
>
> "Pending further review and rules changes, the requirement for Element 1 is
> waived for an amateur radio license of any class".

Yeah, I guess so. Maybe they can eventually give the other element
credits that way too! ;^)

> One sentence, no other changes until FCC gets the proverbial round tuit.
>
> And if FCC were 100% convinced that code testing serves no purpose, it would
> have been dropped by now. Instead, it looks more and more like we're headed for
> another NPRM cycle.

About 3.5 years, if my predictions hold.

- Mike KB3EIA -

4936. Re: Here is TITSs Dream

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-26 15:15:20 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bshjan$53q@library2.airnews.net>
Source record: 84512

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20031225223230.12300.00002329@mb-m20.aol.com...
> In article <bs8egn$7o9@library2.airnews.net>, "Kim W5TIT"
<kimscliff@yahoo.com>
> writes:
>
> >heh heh...well, *that's* the picture I should have put on the QRZ site
for
> >Larry. He'd have moved to Texas in a heartbeat, looked me up, and fell
over
> >when he saw that I'd turned into a middle-aged
used-to-be-drop-dead-gorgeous
> >gramma! Yep, let's see, at 20 I weighed around 118 and at 5'6 that's
pretty
> >damned slim. Although, I pride myself on only being in size 20 slacks
and
> >pants right now...and I feel great! Back to my bowl of ice cream <GRIN>
> >
> >Kim W5TIT
>
> Kim:
>
> I've seen the photos of Janet, KK6NN, and I am not moving to California,
so
> why should I have moved to Texas?
>
> BTW, if you were to get rid of the ice cream, get on some good low-carb
> (not Atkins) diet, get some good exercise on a regular basis, you could be
> liberated from the size 20 slacks and be in a size 8 dress by this time
> next year. I'm sure you, your OM, your harmonics, and your 2nd harmonics
> would be a lot happier.
>
> Merry Christmas to you and your family.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

Larry, you are too damned ignorant to understand that it is apparently *you*
roped to the chains of physical impression or how "good" something looks
based upon the unrealistic standards of a media based majority that anorexic
looking is beautiful. I am quite liberated and am quite beautiful and my
husband, leave the "OM" title to you, are about as happy as can be. See?
When you liberate yourself from having to meet the fake standards of some
over-winded individual such as yourself, you'll be a lot happier, too. Make

it a New Year's resolution--by this time next year you'll be feeling a lot more confident, successful, and you won't need false gods to feel secure.

Kim W5TIT

4937. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-26 15:22:02 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bshjna$rb2@library2.airnews.net>
Source record: 84513

"JJ" <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
news:Y4-dnVdK0LREIXaiRVn-gw@gbronline.com...
> Kim W5TIT wrote:
>
> > And, while I'm at it...since you're so obsessed with my tits, perhaps
you
> > can't think clearly enough...
>
> Lets see now, you pick that call sign and you think I am obsessed with
> your breasts? Looks like you are more obsessed with them than anyone else.
>

Ummmm, well, yuh. You are right about that--I picked a *VANITY* callsign that has everything to do with *VANITY*. However, my tits aren't a distraction or obsession to me; they are a distraction to those who are too simple minded to get passed them and carry on with some resemblance of real dialogue--without the reference to tits all the time.

Try it, JJ, you may sound a lot more intelligent--but that's a stretch so don't be disappointed... 'Course, if you want to keep referring to my tits, I can keep referring to your dick...or lack thereof; you *are* demonstrating the characteristics of a man with a little dick, or who is short. There's absolutely nothing wrong with either, mind you, except usually in the man who holds either or both titles. Maybe some counseling would help you.

Kim W5TIT

4938. Re: Here is TITSs Dream

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-26 15:40:16 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031226104016.21489.00000996@mb-m23.aol.com>
Source record: 84514

>Larry, you are too damned ignorant to understand that it is apparently *you*
>roped to the chains of physical impression or how "good" something looks
>based upon the unrealistic standards of a media based majority that anorexic
>looking is beautiful.

Translated, she is now a FAT Heafer.

>When you liberate yourself from having to meet the fake standards of some
>over-winded individual such as yourself, you'll be a lot happier, too.

No Question now, TIT ius a Heefer

4939. Re: Why I Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-26 15:56:47 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031226105647.21642.00003253@mb-m01.aol.com>
Source record: 84515

In article <h21Fb.1606$Vv2.802859@news1.news.adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo
<mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>
>> In article <2eQEb.11638$Pg1.3410@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>, "Kï¿½HB"
>> <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> writes:

>>>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote

>>>>That means passing the post-restructuring 35 question Tech test is "more
>>>>difficult" than passing both the pre-restructuring 30 question Novice
>>>>test *and* the 5 wpm code receiving test.

>>>Yes.

>> Well, there you have it. Element 1 is easier than 5 questions on the
>> written test.
>
>Balderdash!
>
Poppycock!

(I'm just pointing out the logical results of Hans' statement about the tests,
Mike. If we want to make an entry-level ham license easier to get, it follows
that we should go back to Element 1 and a very simple written...)
>
>>>(But only barely, and it is woefully inadequate for the resultant
>>>privileges.)

>> Woefully inadequate? FCC disagrees! In fact, in 2000 FCC drastically
>> *reduced*
>> the written testing needed for a Tech. From two tests and pools, frowm
>> which
>> were derived tests with a total of 65 questions down to one test of 35
>> questions and a combined pool.
>
>> FCC thinks that 35 question Tech test is adequate. The same FCC that sees
>> "no
>> regulatory purpose" in code tests.
>>
>> Is FCC mistaken?
>
>Another argument for the no test agenda:
>
>We regularly hurtle at each other at combined speeds of 150 miles per

>hour and more, wearing nothing but street clothes, and strapped into
>devices carrying a large load of almomst explosivly flammable liquid.

Yup. And tens of thousands of Americans are killed each year in accidents while doing same. At least as many are seriously injured, and the property damage is what - hundreds of millions?
>
>And we're afraid to let people run radios that are putting out the same
>power as the microwave oven over my stove?
>
Sure - because the microwave oven contains the energy. The antenna connected to the radio radiates it.

>>>>Have the changes of 2000 gotten us more tinkerers per unit time than
>>>before?

>>>What the hell are "tinkerers per unit time"?

>> Sorry, Hans, I thought you had an engineering background. ;-)

>> I'll rephrase:

>> Have the changes of 2000 resulted in more tinkerers entering the ARS in a
>> given
>> time period (say, per year) than before the changes were made?

> Most of the tinkerers I know are pro-code test amateurs.

Same here.

> Mine isn't a
>scientific survey, but I've noticed a common thread among them. They are
>very interested in RF technology. They are intensely interested in
>Amateur radio. They really like getting their hands down into the
>equipment. And whether this is related or not, they are also very
>interested in Morse code. I've seen some cutting edge stuff made by
>these same people.

Note that when it comes to actually building and using functioning rigs on their own time and with their own resources, the self-proclaimed "RF professionals" are very quiet here.

> I do not know one technician that has done as much as build his or her
>own antenna. Well wait, I built a 1/4 wave ground plane for 2 meters
>when I was a Tech. But that's it.

I know a few. But by and large the serious tinkering is done by hams who at least know the code.
>
> Based on that admittidly small sample, I would have to say that we are
>putting out less tinkers per unit time, and almost certainly less per
>hamcapita. (Hans, that means tinkerers per total numbe of Hams. 8^))
>
Maybe. Actually I think license class and structure have little to do with it.

Much more important are factors such as what new hams see in other hams' shacks and in the amateur literature.

Look through old ham magazines - QST, CQ, the now-defunct 73 and ham radio. The older mags had lots of "build me!" articles for actual *rigs*, not just gadgets. By that I mean actual receivers, transmitters, transceivers, and power amplifiers, that a ham could build in the attic/basement workshop and put on the air. There was no shortage of gadget and antenna articles, either, but the mags weren't limited to gadget/antenna articles. And the further back you go, the more of that sort of thing was in the magazines.

They weren't mostly simple 1- or 2-tube regens and MOPAs, either. Check out QST in the late 1950s-early 1960s and in the complex-receiver category alone there were (at least) the HBR-14, HBR-8/11, HBR-16, (and several variants thereof), the "HBR-453" by W2PPL (two versions based on the then-ubiquitous BC-453), DCS-500, PHJ-1, and the 23 tube triple-conversion sectionalized masterpiece by W2LYH. And that's just the ones I can recall without looking through the indices.

Look through today's mags and there ain't much in the "rig" category anymore. It's just *assumed* that hams aren't going to build much anymore.

73 de Jim, N2EY

4940. Re: Here is TITSs Dream

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-26 16:46:58 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <6CZGb.10304$IM3.5702@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 84516

"Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:bsg8il$udi@library1.airnews.net...
> "Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
> news:20031224230329.01893.00002322@mb-m22.aol.com...
> > In article <20031222101240.11589.00000922@mb-m25.aol.com>,
wa8ulx@aol.com
> > (WA8ULX) writes:
> >
> > >
> > > Check out kk6nn on QRZ. This is what could have came of TIT if she
> would
> > >have become a REAL HAM. Notice She has an Advanced License, so she does
> know
> > >13
> > >WPM
> > > KK6NN is the most positive reason for keeping CW
> >
> > Wow! I'll say! Kim, eat your heart out. Better still, stop eating
that
> ice
> > cream you spoke of in a later reply, go out and get some exercise, and
> > maybe you can give Janet some competition someday.
> >
>
> Larry, just for once, would you stop thinking with your dick and show
some
> kind of intelligence? Why in Hell's bells would I be interested in giving
> anyone "competition." Are you really that pathetic? Is it your game to
> "keep up" with the Jones's or something? Maybe you're just that insecure
in
> life, that all that matters to you is how a woman looks. I am damned
> beautiful, and I wouldn't give you the time of day if you had to adjust
your
> pacemaker to the next beat of the clock. Tell ya what...*you* go get this
> person you are speaking of...lemmee see you *cough* just waltz up and
sweep
> 'er off 'er feet, Larry. har dee har har Yeah, right.
>
> >
> > Keep it up the
> > way you are, and you're heading toward adult-onset diabetes, possible
> > kidney failure, and saying goodbye to your toes, feet, and legs in that
> > order. I see the results of self-induced obesity every day -- I'm
usually

> > loading them into my bus, securing their wheelchairs, and hauling them
> > off to dialysis treatments three times a week! The choice is up to you!
> >
>
> Uh huh, and you are sadly mistaken to think that it is only weight that
> determines things like that. By the way, seems the one time I looked at
> your pic on QRZ, you didn't have much more room to swell your chipmunk
> cheeks out any. And, the tee-shirt did no justice to hide your gut...
> Maybe you better start *your* diet. Then, you can go find some gorgeous
> babe you think you can get....
>
> >
> > I'm assuming that's a recent photo of Janet. The detail page gives her
> > birthdate as Feb. 1960, meaning she's pushing 44 years old! Can anyone
> > place the vintage of the 'Vette she's leaning on?
> >
> > 73 de Larry, K3LT
> >
>
> Not something you'll ever own...that's for sure. And, that's probably all
> that'll impress her. So, if that's the kind of woman you're turned on by,
> go for it Larry. Tell me when you find some dream babe to actually give
you
> the time of day... In fact, tell me when you find any woman to actually
> give you anything....
>
> Kim W5TIT
>
>
Dang Larry, looks like you pushed ole hug and chalks buttons again.

Dan/W4NTI

4941. Re: Why I Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-26 16:47:50 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <WCZGb.5827$Vv2.2686666@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 84517

N2EY wrote:

> In article <h21Fb.1606$Vv2.802859@news1.news.adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo
> <mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:
>
>
>>N2EY wrote:
>>
>>
>>>In article <2eQEb.11638$Pg1.3410@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>, "Kï¿½HB"
>>><groupk0hb@earthlink.net> writes:
>
>>>>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote
>
>>>>>That means passing the post-restructuring 35 question Tech test is "more
>>>>>difficult" than passing both the pre-restructuring 30 question Novice
>>>>>test *and* the 5 wpm code receiving test.
>
>>>>Yes.
>
>>>Well, there you have it. Element 1 is easier than 5 questions on the
>>>written test.
>>
>>Balderdash!
>>
>
> Poppycock!
>
> (I'm just pointing out the logical results of Hans' statement about the tests,
> Mike. If we want to make an entry-level ham license easier to get, it follows
> that we should go back to Element 1 and a very simple written...)

Depends on the person. Took me 6 months of hard frustrating daily work,
a flunk, and another test to pass. Whereas to me there is no difference
between a question pool and a book containing the info that will be in a
test. Read it-got it.

For me, learning CW was more difficult than the Extra test. It was
harder than it would habe been to take the extra test and having to
answer every question in the pool, and some that weren't in the pool.

My point is that if Morse code comes easy, just be thankful and use it.
Don't fall into the common trap of thinking that everyone else
experiences things just like you do. For some people, it is *extremely*
difficult. With a slightly different outlook and personality, I could be

the ultimate poster child for the NCTA's. Well okay I would have to be a
little better looking too! 8^)

On a better note, My project to bootstrap myself into being able to
work Morse CW at a usable speed is starting to pay off. It has been a
very strange route I have taken, and if it finally works, I'll post the
method I used. Forewarned, it is pretty weird!

>>>>(But only barely, and it is woefully inadequate for the resultant
>>>>privileges.)
>
>
>
>>>Woefully inadequate? FCC disagrees! In fact, in 2000 FCC drastically
>>>*reduced*
>>>the written testing needed for a Tech. From two tests and pools, frowm
>>>which
>>>were derived tests with a total of 65 questions down to one test of 35
>>>questions and a combined pool.
>>
>>>FCC thinks that 35 question Tech test is adequate. The same FCC that sees
>>>"no
>>>regulatory purpose" in code tests.
>>>
>>>Is FCC mistaken?
>>
>>Another argument for the no test agenda:
>>
>>We regularly hurtle at each other at combined speeds of 150 miles per
>>hour and more, wearing nothing but street clothes, and strapped into
>>devices carrying a large load of almomst explosivly flammable liquid.
>
>
> Yup. And tens of thousands of Americans are killed each year in accidents while
> doing same. At least as many are seriously injured, and the property damage is
> what - hundreds of millions?
>
>>And we're afraid to let people run radios that are putting out the same
>>power as the microwave oven over my stove?
>>
>
> Sure - because the microwave oven contains the energy. The antenna connected to
> the radio radiates it.

1. But we could surely get used to the idea

2. I bet a relatively uniformed person would be impressed by my argument.

3. When do you feel safer, operating QRO or driving on the interstate?

>
>>>>>Have the changes of 2000 gotten us more tinkerers per unit time than

>>>>
>>>>before?
>
>
>>>>What the hell are "tinkerers per unit time"?
>
>
>
>>>Sorry, Hans, I thought you had an engineering background. ;-)
>
>
>
>>>I'll rephrase:
>
>
>
>>>Have the changes of 2000 resulted in more tinkerers entering the ARS in a
>>>given
>>>time period (say, per year) than before the changes were made?
>
>
>> Most of the tinkerers I know are pro-code test amateurs.
>
>
> Same here.
>
>
>>Mine isn't a
>>scientific survey, but I've noticed a common thread among them. They are
>>very interested in RF technology. They are intensely interested in
>>Amateur radio. They really like getting their hands down into the
>>equipment. And whether this is related or not, they are also very
>>interested in Morse code. I've seen some cutting edge stuff made by
>>these same people.
>
>
> Note that when it comes to actually building and using functioning rigs on
> their own time and with their own resources, the self-proclaimed "RF
> professionals" are very quiet here.
>
>
>> I do not know one technician that has done as much as build his or her
>>own antenna. Well wait, I built a 1/4 wave ground plane for 2 meters
>>when I was a Tech. But that's it.
>
>
> I know a few. But by and large the serious tinkering is done by hams who at
> least know the code.
>
>> Based on that admittidly small sample, I would have to say that we are

>>putting out less tinkers per unit time, and almost certainly less per
>>hamcapita. (Hans, that means tinkerers per total numbe of Hams. 8^))
>>
>
> Maybe. Actually I think license class and structure have little to do with it.
> Much more important are factors such as what new hams see in other hams' shacks
> and in the amateur literature.
>
> Look through old ham magazines - QST, CQ, the now-defunct 73 and ham radio. The
> older mags had lots of "build me!" articles for actual *rigs*, not just
> gadgets. By that I mean actual receivers, transmitters, transceivers, and power
> amplifiers, that a ham could build in the attic/basement workshop and put on
> the air. There was no shortage of gadget and antenna articles, either, but the
> mags weren't limited to gadget/antenna articles. And the further back you go,
> the more of that sort of thing was in the magazines.

I know this would be a massive undertaking, but wouldn't it be a hoot
for some enterprising Amateur to come up with a project similar in
complexity to say the Elecraft radios? That's a lot to ask, but it would
be sooo cool.

> They weren't mostly simple 1- or 2-tube regens and MOPAs, either. Check out QST
> in the late 1950s-early 1960s and in the complex-receiver category alone there
> were (at least) the HBR-14, HBR-8/11, HBR-16, (and several variants thereof),
> the "HBR-453" by W2PPL (two versions based on the then-ubiquitous BC-453),
> DCS-500, PHJ-1, and the 23 tube triple-conversion sectionalized masterpiece by
> W2LYH. And that's just the ones I can recall without looking through the
> indices.
>
> Look through today's mags and there ain't much in the "rig" category anymore.
> It's just *assumed* that hams aren't going to build much anymore.

pffft! 8^(

- Mike KB3EIA -

4942. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-26 16:57:10 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3FEC6847.A0F17E1C@earthlink.net>
Source record: 84518

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <f45722ac.0312221845.1655295d@posting.google.com>,
> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
>
> >Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> >news:<3FE1E206.783CF499@earthlink.net>...
> >> Len Over 21 wrote:
> >> >
> >> > In article <brpfap$1gm@library1.airnews.net>, "Kim W5TIT"
> ><kimscliff@yahoo.com>
> >> > writes:
> >> >
> >> > >> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
> >> > >>
> >> > >> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
> >> > >>
> >> > >
> >> > >psssssst, I think Len is superior at pulling Dave's strings...
> >> >
> >> > Shhhh...don't tell anybody... :-) :-) :-)
> >>
> >> Is this the part where you make me one of your playthings or have me
> >> fall into one of your carefully laid snares, Len?
> >
> >And he has arrived. Congratulations Dave.
>
> ...told ya. :-)

This one ranks right up there with one of those non-replies you've sent
out when there's been a snafu in the Anderson home comm center. You're
quite the diabolical mastermind.

Dave K8MN

4943. Re: Here is TITSs Dream

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-26 16:58:42 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031226115842.19889.00001091@mb-m01.aol.com>
Source record: 84519

>Dang Larry, looks like you pushed ole hug and chalks buttons again.
>
>Dan/W4NTI

With all that FAT how would you find her button?

4944. Re: Why I Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-26 17:15:24 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3FEC6C8C.8B54BB7E@earthlink.net>
Source record: 84520

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3FE728D4.ACA2C528@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >Len Over 21 wrote:
> >>
> >> In article <i_2Fb.17738$P%1.16339939@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D.
> >> Flint" <deehays@qix.net> writes:
> >>
> >> >What it should be and too many fail to realize is that the proper sequence
> >> >is "Learn radio basics to become a ham and then as a ham continue to learn
> >> >and increase one's expertise." It should not be one versus the other.
> >>
> >> The ONLY way to have an interest in radio is to get a ham license.
> >
> >You could say that you have an interest in amateur radio, Len. It isn't
> >true, but you could say it.
>
> I haven't. I don't.

Actually, you're quite the fibber. You have said it, and more than
once.

> The only way to have an interest in radio is to get a ham license.

You can be interested in radio all you want without obtaining a ham
license. You can even be interested in *amateur* radio without
obtaining a ham license. That doesn't mean that you know much about it
or that your interest runs very deep. After all, you've declared a
decades-long interest in amateur radio and you've posted here for seven
years or so without acting on that "interest".

> To you it doesn't count at all that "interest in radio" can result in
> a half century of professional work...including design in radio.

I didn't write about "interest in radio". I wrote about "interest in
amateur radio". What counts is the convenience you find in leaving out
certain key words.

> To you it doesn't count that "interest in radio" AND electronics
> can lead to very enjoyable hobby activities in building, testing,
> designing new electronics things ('electronics' includes radio).

Wrong again. You can build, test, design or smash all the radio and
electronics items you like. That has nothing to do with the fact that

you've yet to act on your supposed interest in amateur radio.

> No, FIRST one "must" get an AMATEUR license according to
> Herr Robust.

Wrong, yet again, Doctor Evil. To join the fun in amateur radio, you've first got to obtain a license. You have to put your declared interest into motion. You have yet to do that.

> >You could say that you have an interest in gardening, but if your
> >interest extends only to walking past someone's garden and advising that
> >they're not properly caring for their climatus, you aren't a gardner.
>
> I've been into "gardening" for over 40 years. At this same address.
>
> No amateur license required. No LICENSE required to garden.

Wooooooosh! That was an analogy zipping over your forehead. I didn't write anything about licensing gardeners.

> Not a problem. I can discuss gardening with any neighbor and they
> don't take offense. We share ideas, experiences, help each other
> out.

Bully for you.

> In here, the arrogant officious ones DICTATE as to how all shall
> behave according to their holy rules.

What holy rules would those be? You seem to be an arrogant, officious type of guy. Are you one of those who dictate how you'll behave or are you somehow a slave of the N2EY profile, unable to resist the outline of your likely actions?

> >You could say that you have a great interest in flying an airplane, but
> >if your interest extends to buying a ticket to fly to Chicago, you
> >aren't an aviator.
>
> I don't have a great interest in flying an airplane now. Too expensive.

I understand how it can be when you're on a budget.

> I was once a student pilot. Still no license required for that. Not
> even to operate a radio...already had the First Phone, so no 3rd
> Class Restricted permit necessary.

Woooosh! Look out for those analogy strafing runs.

> An amateur radio license isn't legal to use on civil airways frequencies,
> is it?

Don't you know?

> I am into flying R/C model aircraft on a casual basis...and have on
> and off for 40+ years. NO license required there to use the 72 MHz

> band channels. I've been into flying model aircraft for 60 years and
> even worked as a professional at Testors before they got into the
> plastic model side of that hobby. I was an International contestant
> in that some time ago.

Good for you. Maybe that's just the place for you. Are there any R/C
aircraft newsgroups for you to haunt?

> >Reality points to the fact that you have nothing to do with amateur
> >radio other than to make submissions to the FCC regarding an avocation
> >in which you take no part.
>
> Reality points to the fact that you CANNOT accept any opinions
> contrary to your own with grace or gentle manner...you constantly,
> beligerantly go after any person who can stand up to you and show
> where your ideas aren't valid.

Oh, you're a fine, fine fellow to write of grace and gentle manner when
it comes to differences of opinion. When you're busy standing up to me,
do you think you'll ever get the spelling of "belligerent" or its
variants down pat?

> The FCC accepts ALL input on ALL radio services, Herr Robust.
> They don't need "licenses" in any radio service to accept comments.
> I know that is a very foreign thought to your proud, arrogant holiness,
> but that IS true.

Having the FCC accept your comments doesn't mean that you are a
participant in amateur radio. I've already acknowledged that you've
made comments to the Commission so the concept must not be at all
foreign to me. Get your facts straight.

> I'd like to see YOU address the FCC in the same manner as you
> address others. Good luck on that one now!

Why didn't you address the FCC in the same manner you've used here? Did
you call anyone "Colonel Klunk" or make any nifty S.S. references? Did
you include comments about "morsodism" or "the Church of St. Hiram"?
This looks like another "do as I say and not as I do" on your part.

Dave K8MN

4945. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-26 17:48:47 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3FEC745E.BA336F53@earthlink.net>
Source record: 84521

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3FE7770B.E0737CAF@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >Len Over 21 wrote:
> >>
> >> In article <3FE72935.F4D597C4@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
> ><k8mn@earthlink.net>
> >> writes:
> >>
> >> >Brian wrote:
> >> >>
> >> >> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> >> >news:<3FE4E004.6BC4A8AD@earthlink.net>...
> >> >> > Brian wrote:
> >> >> > >
> >> >> > > N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in message
> >> >news:<c2356669.0312190606.18645337@posting.google.com>...

> >> >> Len, like any Americans who've shown an interest in the ARS, have a
> >> >> disincentive. It is the Morse requirement for HF access.
> >> >
> >> >Your claim might ring true if Len had bothered to obtain a code-free
> >> >ticket at some point. He hasn't.
> >>
> >> Of whom are you speaking, old man?
> >
> >Your name is Len, isn't it, grizzled older man?
> >
> >> I've had HF access several times in the last half century, all legal,
> >> all involving actual communications. No amateur license was
> >> required at any time. No morse skill needed whatsoever.
> >
> >Your memory must be failing in your dotage. Amateur radio is the topic.
>
> It is?!?!?
>
> I thought it was all about vehicle codes under the subject heading
> of "Is Michael Jackson Innocent."

Why would you comment about having had HF access several times in the
past half century to someone's post concerning Michael Jackson? That
wouldn't make sense.

> I thought it was all about national economy, presidential politics,
> the antics of State, and general subjects that must be dear to
> hamhearts everywhere that do NOT touch on amateur radio in
> all those other threads.

Why would you insert comments concerning having HF access several times
in the past half century to posts about the national economy,
presidential politics, the Department of State and such? That wouldn't
make sense.

> >Your HF access of the past isn't an issue this time around.
>
> Neither is the HF access I had from a Ventura marina a few
> months ago...again (for at least the 5th time) without requiring
> any amateur radio license or knowing morse code.

See, you're oscillator is drifting again. Your HF operation from a
marina had nothing to do with amateur radio, did it? Why did you think
those here would be interested? You seem to have a one-track mind.

> >> The discussion should be about the federal regulations for an amateur
> >> radio license regulation, not the individual "motivations" of any
> >> aspirant to an avocational radio activity.
> >
> >Maybe you feel that's what it should be about....but it isn't.
>
> It seems to be about ANYTHING EXCEPT amateur radio. It seems
> to be all about Kolonel Klunk wanting retribution for some imaginary
> wrongs done to his psyche in here.

It does? Do you mean those exchanges where you knew more about State
Department embassy communications operations, practices and objectives
than those who were actually employed to do the work? Do you mean your
antics regarding Key Officers Lists? You came off looking as silly in
those as you do in attempting to set the agenda for amateur radio ops.

> >> You constantly insist on personalizing everything about those who do
> >> not share your holy and illustrious viewpoints.
> >
> >I neither do it constantly nor with all others. You personalize many
> >discussions here. How do you explain that away?
>
> Tsk, tsk, tsk. Yes, I copy down the screen name of the individual
> I am replying to...call that "personalizing?" :-)

I call it an example of your dodging a question because a truthful
answer would have embarrassed you.

> >> That is your problem
> >> and you continually foul this newsgroup with arrogant remarks against
> >> the person of those of opposite opinions. Not my problem but
> >> certainly yours in attitude.
> >
> >It doesn't seem to be a problem for me, Len. At the moment, judging

> >from your reply, it is one for you. Deal with it.
>
> I did already. You got what you deserve. Be happy with that.
>
> >> Amateur radio is supposed to be a recreation, a fun activity involving
> >> radio, licensing required only because of physics of EM waves and
> >> federal regulation.
> >
> >It is all of that and more, old gent.
>
> Yes, to you. To you, amateur radio is a wondrous experience where
> you may have title, rank, privileges beyond your wildest dreams, of
> doing things that mundane professionals could never do by constantly
> recreating the past in the future and pioneering the HF airways. It is
> your Lifestyle.

Yes, to me. That's because I am a licensed radio amateur. It is
obviously less than that to you. You aren't a licensed radio amateur.

> Ho hum.

You can feign boredom. If amateur radio bores you, why do you persist
in haunting a newsgroup which discusses amateur radio?

> >> Instead, you've turned it into a battleground of
> >> your own, arrogantly demanding adherence to your personal view-
> >> points.
> >
> >No, I've not turned amateur radio into any battlegrounds nor did I note
> >your presence on any of the ham bands this past week.
>
> Is it now a requirement to "have presence" on ham bands in order
> to even speak of amateur radio?

You've spoken of amateur radio here but you are unable to participate in
amateur radio. you said I've turned amateur radio into a battleground.
I haven't. You know nothing of what I do, have done or am likely to do
in, for or about amateur radio except for what you can glean here or
from a number of web pages.

> Is the FCC requiring all Wireless Bureau staffers to have amateur
> radio licenses in order to regulate U.S. amateur radio?

That matters not at all. You aren't one of them.

> >> You join several others in here in so doing, some past, some
> >> present. That's counter to the original purpose of "the service," isn't
> >> it? Or is it?
> >
> >Are you confusing amateur radio with this newsgroup? Is it your opinion
> >that I'm required to quietly accept your guff?
>
> If I have to "accept" your guff, then you have to accept mine.

That is pretty evident. I'll continue to point out that you have no stake in amateur radio. You're a bystander.

> YOU deal with it. [in your own quaint SS manner, of course]

Well, Foghorn Lenhorn, it pains me to no end that you've again resorted to your usual tactics.

> >> Perhaps you embody modern amateur radio, a constant striving for
> >> leading the pack in competitive activity? A competition complete
> >> with taunts and jibes and outright insults against those who
> >> "challenge" your arrogant expertise? If so, there is no wonder that
> >> amateur radio has not increased in number commensurate with
> >> the growth in population.
> >
> >Well, old chap, it looks as if you're wrong in your assumptions yet
> >again.
>
> No, old chop, I don't "assume" anything. I tell it like it is.

You'd first have to *know* how it is. You plainly don't know.

> You are
> just another arrogant control-freak wanting others to be subservient
> to your viewpoints. You can't accept a damn thing if it isn't in line
> with your holy opinions.

The statement above is more likely to be true of:

1) one who has been a licensed radio amateur for four decades, interested in the well-being of the service?

or

2) one who has never been a radio amateur but who claims that his ideas for amateur radio licensing are the right way?

> >It is a cinch that you don't embody any of amateur radio--past,
> >present or future.
>
> Absolutely TRUE. I've been a professional for over a half
> century.

Spiffy! Be as professional as you like. You're still on the outside of amateur radio.

> Herr Robust must think that professionals are not required to have
> any recreation. Is it that way in your SS?

Watch TV. Play Canasta. Listen to a scanner. Take a drive in the countryside. You professionals need all the recreation you can get.

> >of which you accuse others. You are--what is it you call
> >it?..."beligerant" toward radio amateurs who tire of your tales of life
> >at ADA a half century ago.
>

> So...if the U.S. Army hasn't been using OOK CW on HF for six
> decades, that is "tiring?"

C-O-M-P-R-E-H-E-N-S-I-O-N. Noooooo, you tales of it are tiring. Your
belligerence toward radio amateurs is tiring.

> You must not be tired. You must be in coma. You are not
> conscious of anything that has happened in the last six decades.

Because I'm not up to date on what happened at ADA fifty years ago? I
can't quite remember the full six decades, Len. Then again, I'm not
quite 55.

> >> Enjoy your little clique of morse code uber alles in amateur radio
> >> where the "bands" are only on HF. Feel superior that you've met all
> >> the criteria and standards established by long-gone amateurs of past
> >> times. You are important, superior, vital, and that is all that
> >matters.
> >
> >I enjoy morse code, SSB, FM, RTTY, Pactor and several other modes on MW,
> >HF, VHF and UHF. My "little clique" numbers hundreds of thousands in
> >this country alone. I haven't noted your presence.
>
> You wouldn't note anything. All you can see is your own glorious,
> glowing presence radiating back at you.

But I *have* noted it, Len. I've been a part of it. You haven't.

> No problem. YOUR presence hasn't been noted in any professional
> writings or periodicals.

Do you subscribe to all professional writings and periodicals?

> >> You should be demanding that ALL test for high rates of morse in
> >> order to become fully FDA licensed as a ham. Condemn all those
> >> who cannot learn, will not learn, nor share your opinions.
> >
> >Morse or no morse, consider yourself condemned.
>
> "Condemned" only to calling an asshole an asshole.

Do you use a cellphone to communicate with your opposite end?

> Not very holiday-like but it is true.

I don't see you a very "holiday-like" kind of guy, Len.

> >> May Santa bring you an irrepairable intermittent in your favorite HF
> >> transceiver along with a truckload of dusty, high-sulphur-content
> >> coal in your stocking. Merry Christmas.
> >
> >Do you really know of any irrepairable intermittents?
>
> Yourself.

...and you think I'm an HF transceiver?

Dave K8MN

4946. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-26 17:52:10 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3FEC752A.AC6FF705@earthlink.net>
Source record: 84522

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3FE7C067.8DBC3E7B@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >Brian wrote:
> >>
> >> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> >news:<3FE3BCC6.22E2A836@earthlink.net>...
> >> > Len Over 21 wrote:
> >> >
> >> > > ...written by many of the beligerant...
> >> >
> >> > "belligerent"
> >> >
> >> > > ...as long as such beligerance remains rooted
> >> >
> >> > "belligerence"
> >> >
> >> > Dave K8MN
> >>
> >> Dave, once again, takes the honors at the national spelling bee,
> >> beating out 9 year old Mary Caldwell, who ran off-stage in tears.
> >>
> >Actually, I took top honors from seventy-year-old Leonard "Atila"
> >Anderson, a PROFESSIONAL writer.
>
> You couldn't take "top honors" on a toy top.

It looks as if you lost the spelling bee, Leonard.

> I've been a professional writer (accepting monetary compensation
> for writing work performed) since 1968.

You'd likely receive a higher rate if you could spell.

> The age is 71, not 70.

Cheer up. You could still have a little time as a radio amateur if you
could just overcome that intertia.

> Too bad you'll never make that age...

Statistics say I'm likely to do so. Do you know more about me than you
do about amateur radio?

Dave K8MN

4947. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-26 17:59:14 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3FEC76D2.DE8BB196@earthlink.net>
Source record: 84523

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3FE7C00B.CAF60CBE@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >Brian wrote:
> >>
> >> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> >news:<3FE77964.F92357C0@earthlink.net>...
> >> > Len Over 21 wrote:
> >> > >
> >> > > In article <3FE72B5B.D0D251F7@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
> ><k8mn@earthlink.net>
> >> > > writes:
> >> > >
> >> > > >Brian wrote:
> >> > > >
> >> > > >> Steve, I think it has to do with the disincentive of Morse Code
> >> > > >> testing. You might want to check with Len on this.
> >> > > >
> >> > > >You'll pardon our confusion. You've been acting as Len's
> >representative
> >> > > >for a few posts now in speaking of his motivations or lack thereof. I
> >> > > >wasn't aware that you'd turned the controls over to him.
> >> > >
> >> > > Brian Burke is not my "representative" nor am I his.
> >> >
> >> > You'll likely want to straighten the lad out then, Leonard. He has been
> >> > speaking for you of late.
> >>
> >> We just happen to agree that the Morse Exam has to go and that the ARS
> >> is divided between folks who can accept change, and those who cannot.
> >
> >Perhaps Len's mistaken views can be excused.
>
> "Mistaken views?!?" :-)

Yes, mistaken views.

> >... You, on the other hand, should know better.
>
> Why do you say that?

...because, unlike you, he has an amateur radio license and has held it
for some time.

> Saying that as you do implies that you are a god of amateur radio
> who has ALL the answers. You don't.

You've waffled on this issue for some time. In the past, you've held
that I am a god of amateur radio. In frequent reversals, you've stated
that I am not. I think I'll wait until the several of you inside the
Leonard Anderson cranium come to an agreement.

> >> > > It is not my Life's Ambition to immortalize morse code as the
> >> > > epitome of amateurism in an avocational radio activity.
> >> >
> >> > I'll mark that down as yet another of things we know are not your life's
> >> > ambition. It'll be listed right under "amateur radio license".
> >>
> >> I think working Frenchmen out of band otta be #2.
> >
> >Okay, Brian, I'll do as you've requested.
> >
> >THINGS WHICH ARE NOT LEONARD ANDERSON'S LIFE'S AMBITION
> >
> >1. It is not my life's ambition to obtain an amateur radio license.
>
> Explain to me why this is so "necessary," high holy god of ham.

I didn't write that it was necessary. Pay attention.

> >2. It is not my life's ambition to work Frenchmen out of band.
>
> I'm not keen to work them IN band.

Relax. You won't have to worry about working them at all.

> Why is that so necessary, high holy god of ham?

I didn't write that it was necessary. Pay attention.

> >3. It is not my Life's Ambition to immortalize morse code as the
> > epitome of amateurism in an avocational radio activity.
>
> But it IS YOURS, right, high holy god of ham?

The list isn't about me, Len. It is about you. Pay attention.

> >I can deal with that.
>
> You can't deal a deck of cards...much less deal with debate on
> issues...you always switch to insulting each and every person
> who disagrees with your opinions.

Did your face redden as you typed those words? C'mon, fess up.

> >> Now that all the Techs have been chased off of VHF, where do you
> >> 'spect them to go?
> >
> >Really? The Techs have been chased from VHF? When and how did this

> >transpire? How would it keep Leonard from obtaining a code-free
> >license?
>
> Why must I obtain a "code-free license?"

You don't have to do anything. Let inertia be your guide. Pay attention.

> Why can't it be a "coded" license?

It can, Len. First you'd have to overcome inertia. Pay attention.

> I've had a code-free license since 1956.

We're discussing amateur radio, Len. Pay attention.

Dave K8MN

4948. Re: Here is TITSs Dream

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-26 18:01:49 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3FEC776E.FEE26092@earthlink.net>
Source record: 84524

Kim W5TIT wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:3FE7BDAC.ECBCF981@earthlink.net...
> > Alun wrote:
> >
> > > Whatever it takes to learn CW, it sure isn't brains, and whatever you
> > > think of Kim's callsign, she shows more intelligence than you guys.
> >
> > Her postings on her driving habits and her views on taxation haven't
> > demonstrated that. In addition, she's now showing some of that same
> > lack of class in her responses which she showed in choosing her
> > callsign.

> ROFLMAO....and you're the poster boy for class, right, Dave?

I guess you mean that I don't drive like you and didn't choose a tacky
callsign. Guilty as charged!

> YEAH, that's
> the ticket...

That must have something to do with your driving.

Dave K8MN

4949. Re: Here is TITSs Dream

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-26 18:02:29 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3FEC7796.4EEBCFC7@earthlink.net>
Source record: 84525

Kim W5TIT wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:3FE7C1C8.83064010@earthlink.net...
> > Brian wrote:
> > >
> > > wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) wrote in message
> news:<20031222101240.11589.00000922@mb-m25.aol.com>...
> > > > Check out kk6nn on QRZ. This is what could have came of TIT if she
> would
> > > > have become a REAL HAM. Notice She has an Advanced License, so she
> does know 13
> > > > WPM
> > > > KK6NN is the most positive reason for keeping CW
> > >
> > > Guarantee you that Kim smoked her at 20.
> >
> > Yeah, she was doing 20 and Kim was doing 75 in the left lane.
> >
> > Dave K8MN
> >
>
> I'll ask again, Dave, have you *ever* broken the law?

...and I'll respond again: I've already answered.

Dave K8MN

4950. Amateur Radio Newsline™ Report 1376 - December 26, 2003

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-26 18:29:13 UTC
From: radionews@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031226132913.15401.00001914@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 84526

Amateur Radio Newsline™ Report 1376 - December 26, 2003

Amateur Radio Newsline report number 1376 with a release date of Friday, December 26, 2003 to follow in 5-4-3-2-1.

The following is a Q-S-T. A California city says NO to BPL, an earthquake hits the central California and Kids Day 2004 is just a week or so away. The details on Amateur Radio Newsline report number 1376 coming your way right now.

(Billboard Cart Here)

**

RADIO LAW: LOMPOC SAYS NO TO BPL

The City of Lompoc, California, has said NO to Broadband over Powerlines, and its a big win for ham radio. Amateur Radio Newsline's Bruce Tennant, K6PZW, has been monitoring the situation and has the details:

--

Paul Andreasen, K1JAN, said it this way -- quote: "Well, we won ONE at least!"

What Andreasen is referring to was a plan by Lompoc city leaders to deploy Broadband over Powerlines in that city and the work of the ham community to head it off.

Andreasen is the ARRL Technical Coordinator for the Santa Barbara Section and a ARRL Technical Advisor for the League's Southwestern Division. And he was one of the organizers of the movement to stop the deployment of B-P-L in the Lompoc area.

In an e-mail, Andreasen says that his group sprang into action when they learned of plans to permit powerline broadband. He presented city leaders with several studies and some facts on interference effects to and from other licensed RF users.

--

Andreasen: "I know the mayor so I stopped in one day and asked him. He said yes they were and I introduced him to some of the facts of radiation not only causing problems with public communications, the CHP, Amateur Radio, etc., but about it also causing problems with the BPL system (itself).

--

Meantime, Eric Lemmon, WB6FLY, made the California Highway Patrol aware of their efforts. The statewide C-H-P radio system operates on low-band F-M which falls right smack in the middle of the spectrum used by B-P-L.

And then they wait until December 17th for the newspapers to report the results of their City Council vote on the matter. The good news: No Broadband Over Powerlines in Lompoc. Instead, the City Council approved a rival, non radiating system that uses fiber optic technology.

But that's not all. The company that did the study for the planners was told by the City Administrator not to entertain any radiating methodologies at all. All because ham radio operators spoke up and provided proof that B-P-L could be hazardous to the regions R-F environment.

For the Amateur Radio Newsline, I'm Bruce Tennant, K6PZW, reporting.

--

Another quote from Paul Andreasen, K1JAN, kind of sums it up. "We not only win one, but a bureaucracy kept it's word!" (K1JAN, W6YN)

**

RESCUE RADIO: THE CENTRAL CALIFORNIA QUAKE

Meantime, about 90 miles North of Lompoc an earthquake measuring 6 point 5 on the Richter scale struck at 11:15 a.m. on Monday December 22nd. Centered not far from the famed Hearst Castle tourist attraction at San Simmeon. Ham radio was quick to respond as we hear in this report:

--

K6YR: "Various parts of the livingroom looked like the U.S. Army had gone through a Fedeey'n safe house. Just glass and food stuffs all over the place. It was pretty scary."

--
That's Rob Griffin, K6YR, the Section Manager for the area where the quake hit. He was describing what his own home looked like after the magnitude 6.5 temblor hit. But Griffin would have to put off clean-up chores because there was other work that needed to be done:

--

K6YR: By noon the San Luis Obispo Emergency Operations Center had called out the ARES and RACES operators, primarily supporting the Red Cross in opening shelters in Paso Robles and Oceana. Morrow Bay also had Red Cross shelters and we provided communications for the Red Cross because their cell phones just weren't functioning for the first 12 hours after the earthquake.

--

According to Griffin with cellphones down, another way to communicate was needed by emergency workers. Enter ham radio volunteers.

--

K6YR: "We had some come from as far as South county which includes Oceana, Nipomo, maybe even some from Santa Maria to help support the North county Paso Robles ARES area."
--

The city of Paso Robles was hardest hit. Part of the historic downtown area was destroyed and two people were killed. Griffin says that hams were on scene providing communications for about 24 hours. When we spoke to K6YR some were still there:

--

K6YR: " There are some Amateur operators still manning the county Emergency Operations Center. but my understanding is that the communications and support up at the Paso Robles Police Department has closed down for the timer being and it appears that the Red Cross has its communications which relies on cell phones back in operation."

--

The bottom line. It took the cellular providers about 12 hours to get service back to most of the stricken area. Meantime ham radio operators were there, doing what they do best.

For the Amateur Radio Newsline, I'm Burt Hicks, WB6MQV, reporting.

--

According to Cal Tech, Monday's temblor was the state's first deadly earthquake since the magnitude 6.7 shaker that hit Northridge California in 1994. (ARNewsline(tm))

**

RESTRUCTURING: VK TO GET REVISED AMATEUR RADIO SERVICE

Hams in Australia will soon have a restructured Amateur Radio Service. Some of the changes are coming soon Others are still being negotiated. Q-News Graham Kemp, VK4BB, is here with the details:

--

As reported, the Australian Communications Authority has decided to discontinue the Morse code proficiency requirement for the amateur service. The ACA will also remove the prohibition of third party communications to an amateur station in another country. If another country seeks a prohibition on such communications, this will be published and conveyed to the amateurs. To effect this decision, the ACA will need to amend the Radiocommunications Licence Conditions Determination No. 1 of 1997. Thats the Amateur LCD.

The ACA will directly inform the amateur community through established communication channels when the amendment has been made. The ACA will update the Amateur Internet Linking System consumer fact sheet to

incorporate changes to third party communication arrangements.

The ACA will continue to impose limits on the purity and stability of emitted frequencies, and maximum power limits on amateur stations in accordance with the ITU's requirements for transmitting stations. The ITU requirements will be incorporated into the ACA's public information doments in early 2004 to ensure that they are available to amateur licensees.

The ACA will maintain current requirements for use of a callsign while operating an amateur station, as contained in sections 8, 37 and 44 of the Amateur LCD. The ACA is still considering whether to permit the abbreviation of callsigns during emergency services operations and training. A decision will be announced by mid-2004.

The ACA will proceed with the proposal for Australia to participate in European Conference of Postal and Telecommunications Administrations - CEPT. While liaison with CEPT about T/R 61-01 can commence immediately, the licensing arrangements necessary to implement this will not begin until mid-2004.

The ACA is working through submissions about the remaining proposals, including the licensing structure, and expects to announce decisions by mid 2004.

For the Amateur Radio Newsline, I'm Graham Kemp, VK4BB, of Q-News Australia.

--

Obviously for hams down-under, this is the start of something big. (Q-News)

**

Break 1

News never takes a holiday and neither do we. From the United States of America, We are the Amateur Radio Newsline, heard on bulletin stations around the world including the K-9-K-E repeater serving Godfrey Illinois.

(5 sec pause here)

**

HAM RADIO EVENTS: KID'S DAY IS SUNDAY JANUARY 4

Its one of the two most important ham radio holidays of the ham radio year and its only about a week away. Of coarse we are talking about the first of two Kids Day operating events for 2004.

According to a recent ARRL Letter, the first Kid's Day of 2004 will occur on a Sunday. Next Sunday, January the 4th. And unlike most other on-the-air events, Kid's Day is not a contest. Rather its a time when

experienced hams open their hearts and their stations to invite kids in and put them on the air to experience the magic that is ham radio.

Kid's Day will run from 1800 to 2400 UTC, and there's no limit on operating time. The suggested exchange is a youngsters name, age, location and favorite color. Most operation will be found on 14.270 to 14.300, 21.380 to 21.400 and 28.350 to 28.400 MHz and local 2 meter repeaters.

Guidelines for Kids Day are available at www.arrl.org/FandES/ead/kd-rules.htm. And -- oh yes: If you miss this Kids Day operating event the next one won't take place until Saturday, June 19th. (ARRL)

**

HAM RADIO EDUCATION: IARU CONGRATULATES NEW HAMS

A top IARU official has welcomed Albania's newly licensed hams to the hobby. Bill Pasternak, WA6ITF, is here with more:

--

Ole Garpestadt, LA2RR, is IARU Region 1 Chairman. And while participating in the recent graduation ceremony for Project Goodwill Albania 2003, he took the time to congratulate the new Albanian licensees, and welcomed them to the bands.

Garpestadt credited the University of Triana and the program organizers with their success in conducting the training and succeeding in something that the IARU itself has had only limited results with. It should be noted that LA2RR participated in final negotiations with Albanian authorities for their entry to CEPT and bringing the Albanian licensing regime into line with the rest of the CEPT world.

For the Amateur Radio Newsline, I'm Bill Pasternak, WA6ITF

--

One final note on Project Goodwill Albania 2003. Its organizer, the famed D-Xer Martti Laine, O-H-2-B-H, was awarded a "Senior Fellow of Polytechnic University of Tirana" at the graduation ceremony. In his closing remarks Liane thanked everyone involved for what he termed as their five weeks of serious effort. (Via press release)

**

HAM RADIO EDUCATION: 2004 - 2005 FAR SCHOLARSHIPS OPEN

Meanwhile, here in the United States, it's ham radio scholarship time again. This, with word that Foundation for Amateur Radio is providing applications for hams to apply for the 59 awards that it will administer for the 2004 through 2005 academic.

Right now, the foundation is inviting Amateur Radio licensees planning to pursue a full-time course of study beyond high school, and who are

either enrolled in or accepted for enrollment at an accredited university, college or technical school to compete for these scholarships. Awards range from $500 to $2500 with preference in some cases going to residents of specific geographic area or to those pursuing certain study programs.

The cutoff date is April 30, 2004. Application forms are available by mailing a request to FAR Scholarships, P.O. Box 831 Riverdale, Maryland. The Zipcode is 20738. (Foundation for Amateur Radio)

**

ELECTRONIC ASSISTANCE: REPAIRCLINIC.COM

A new Web site has been created to usher Americans away from their throwaway habits and into the world of yesteryear when we just kept it working.

Called RepairClinic.com, the cyberspac port provides aids for those looking to repair anything from a refrigerator or air conditioner to more complex devices such as microwave ovens. The site appears to derive most of its income by selling spare parts and factory manuals.

At the moment the site sticks to typical kitchen appliances. It does not provide advice on such items as radios, T-V sets, VCRs and other consumer electronics. At least, not yet. (Science Today)

**

RESCUE RADIO: THE LATEST TOWER TO COLLAPSE IS....

A 528 foot tower supporting antennas for WMGX and WYNZ in the Portland, Maine area collapsed on Thursday, December 11th. As reported on Scott Fybush's web site, the reason for the tower falling appears to be a guy wire that apparently snapped. The story, and a photo of the tower prior to collapse, can be seen at www.fybush.com/nerw.html Its not known if any ham radio repeaters shared this support structure. (CGC)

**

NAMES IN THE NEWS: VE1MR NAMED RAC RADIO AMATEUR OF 2003

Bill Elliott, VE1MR, has been named to receive the RAC Radio Amateur of the Year Award for 2003. Currently President of Halifax Amateur Radio Club, Elliott has been a Radio Amateur and a member of Radio Amateurs of Canada and its predecessor national organizations for over twenty years. Through that time, VE1MR has consistently and generously donated his technical and organizational skills to significantly promoting excellence in Amateur Radio and facilitating its public service role.

For a complete story on VE1MR's activities and the contributions which qualified him for this prestigious award, see http://www.rac.ca/new/canada.htm (RAC)

**

NAMES IN THE NEWS: JENNICAM GOING QRT

And, by the time you read this, Jennifer Ringley will have taken her famed jennicam.org webcam off the Internet and Q-R-T. This, after 7 years of her permitting the world to watch her life through a cyberspace eye.

Ringley was 20 and a student at a Pennsylvania college when she installed a web camera in her room and launched jennicam.org. That was in April of 1996 and over the years the cameras have followed her every movement 24 hours a day.

A self-described former computer geek who now lives in Northern California, Ringley has posted that her web cam was intended to be a fun way for her mom or friends to keep tabs on her. Also, that it was an interesting use for the digital camera that she bought on a whim in the bookstore.

Now, the site has a notice saying it will be closing on December 31st. No reason is given and Ringley has not respond to e-mail query's from the press. (Published news reports)

**

BREAK 2

Bringing you communications news 52 weeks a year. From the United States of America, we are the Amateur Radio Newsline with links to the world from our only official website at www.arnewsline.org and being relayed by the volunteer services of the following radio amateur:

(5 sec pause here)

**

NEWSLINE NEWS: MORE THANK YOU'S WITH N6TCQ

Ladies and gentlemen, we end this year and begin the next by saying thank you to more listeners who kept the Amateur Radio Newsline on the air throughout 2003. Here's Andy Jarema, N6TCQ:

--
This week we have the second half of our list of people who helped us financially in the month of April:

Linda Reeder of Salt Lake City, Vic Hartpence, W7RKU of Sparks, NV, The Puget Amateur Radio Society of Kirkland, WA, The Quarter Century Wireless Association of Eugene, OR'. Bill Alexander, KR6G of Quincy, CA, Leo Halog, KR6EG of San Fransisco, Mark Lunge and the MSARC N6MPX Repeater System, San Leandro, Monthly contributor William Walters, WA2IBM, of San Jose, Monthly contributor Scott Hensley of the Area Communications Team, San Jose
SCATS, the Southern California Amateur Transmitting Society, in West Covina, Our good friend Dave Bell, W6AQ of Hollywood, And Newsline Staff volunteers who paid out-of-pocket to keep Newsline on the air.

Thank you to everyone. Your April response to our crisis was exceptional, and we promise to do our best to continue to earn your care and support. A reminder that Newsline is a 501c 3 California non-profit corporation. FCC regulations prohibit us from telling you exactly how to support us, but that information is on our website at www.arnewsline.org. I'm Andy Jarema,
N6TCQ.

--

More from Andy in future Amateur Radio Newsline reports. (ARNewsline(tm))

**

HAM RADIO AND SPACE: THE MARS EXPRESS

An amazing space DX record for ham radio. This as Charlie Suckling, G3WDG reports that he has successfully received the 'Mars Express' deep-space probe using his 3 meter dish antenna.

Mars Express has been on its way to the red planet since the 2nd of June and was scheduled to arrive on Christmas Day. The signal was earlier received on 8.4 GHz by James Miller, G-3-R-U-H, at the AMSAT D-L ground station in Bochum, Germany. This, when the probe was 107 million kilometers away on November 16th.

Although traveling at the speed of light, the signal took about six minutes to reach earth. The AMSAT D-L website has information on how amateurs can receive Mars Express.

The AMSAT-DL website at www.amsat-dl/pa5/reception_g3ruh.htm provides information on how amateurs can receive Mars Express. (GB2RS)

**

HAM RADIO IN SPACE: PC SAT UPDATE

AMSAT North America reports that P-C sat is doing fine and will continue in good sunlight through New Years Eve. The satellite is seeing about 50 packet users per day and 30 per pass over the USA.

Anyone with a 2 meter transceiver and T-N-C can easily copy this bird. Just tune the radio to 145.825 and watch for 1200 baud normal AX.25 packet. (AMSAT)

**

INTERNATIONAL-SWEDEN: NO CODE ON JANUARY 1?

GB2RS reports that Sweden is likely to permit former CEPT Class 2 amateurs access to the High Frequency bands from the 1st of January. SM0SMK, the President of Swedish national amateur radio society has said that they hope the Morse code test requirement will be removed at the turn of the year.b (RSGB)

**

INTERNATIONAL - UK: NEW TRAINING PRESENTATIONS ON THE WEB

The Chelmsford Amateur Radio Society in Essex England has made all of its Powerpoint slide presentations for the United Kingdom's Foundation and Intermediate courses available on the web. Those who are interested in seeing what's involved in getting these new U-K licenses can download the slides from www.qsl.net/g0mwt (M5AKA)

**

DX

In DX, the FMRE Sunday bulletin has announced that the X-F4 DXpedition to Socorro Island will begin March 3rd, and run for two weeks. The call sign to be used is X-F-4-I-H. 8 operators from Mexico will be active all bands and modes including VHF, UHF and satellite. No QSL information is available at this time. (XE1KK, N4GN)

And S57CQ expects to be in Bhutan by the time you hear this newscast. He plans to spend as much of his spare time as possible active as A52Q. QSL as directed on the air. (RSGB)

Lastly PA4WM will be in Turkey for six months, on a four week rotation schedule. He operates SSB, CW and RTTY as TA1/PA4WM with 100 watts into a G5RV. He plans to upgrade his antennas with a vertical and receiving antenna for 160 and 80 meters at the earliest available time. (GB2RS)

**

THAT FINAL ITEM: HEAVY METAL ON THE HAM BANDS

And finally this week, Heavy metal is back on the ham bands. No, not the rock music kind. We are talking heavy metal as in vintage AM gear. Paul Goodman, K2ORC, has more in this report filed over the air - using AM :

--

Sunset on December 27, 2003 will mark the kickoff of this year's Heavy Metal Rally. A showcase for AM transmitters that weigh at least 250 pounds and produce 250 watts or
more, the annual event is sponsored by Electric Radio magazine.

The Rally has become a coast to coast highlight for many AM amateur stations in North America with activity on 160, 75 and 40 meters. The event goes all night, ending at sunrise on December 28

Participants who want to compete for the top place trophy submit logs to the event coordinator. Scoring for the Heavy Metal Rally utilizes a point system that takes into account, among other things, total number of contacts and the number of states and bands worked. In a departure from traditional contest-type scoring, a station can receive an extra point for each positive signal or audio report received by the event coordinator from other hams and SWLs.

Scoring notwithstanding, many AM fans participate in the Heavy Metal Rally simply for the pleasure of talking and listening to other AM stations with strong signals and outstanding audio.

Winter HF operating conditions generally lead to numerous coast to coast contacts featuring a diversity of transmitters. It would not be unusual for listeners to hear, an amateur in Colorado on a restored Gates broadcast transmitter chatting with someone in California running a Collins broadcast transmitter.

--
Contact Audio
--

While broadcast transmitters may be the first thing to come to mind when picturing equipment that meets the Heavy Metal weight and power criteria, the Rally also features a sizeable number of homebrew and military rigs. For more information on the 2003 Heavy Metal Rally, including the email address for log submissions and a list of suggested operating frequencies, please visit amfone.net -- that's alpha-mike-foxtrot-oscar-november-echo - dot - net.

Reporting for the Amateur Radio Newsline, this is Paul Goodman, K2ORC.

--

Sounds great, doesn't it! You can hear more for yourself on Saturday evening December 27th overnight into Sunday the 28th on 160 and 75 meters. Its the 2003 Heavy Metal Rally on your radio to enjoy. (ARNewsline(tm))

**

NEWSCAST CLOSE

For this week and this year, that's all from the Amateur Radio Newsline. Our thanks to Alan Labs, AMSAT, the ARRL, the CGC Communicator, CQ Magazine, the FCC, the Ohio Penn DX Bulletin, Radio Netherlands, Rain, the RSGB and Australia's Q-News for their assistance in producing this weeks report.

A reminder that our e-mail address is newsline@arnewsline.org. More information is available at Amateur Radio Newsline's(tm) only official website located at www.arnewsline.org. You can also write to us or support us at Amateur Radio Newsline(tm), P.O. Box 660937, Arcadia, California 91066.

For now, with Bill Pasternak, WA6ITF, at the editors desk, I'm Jim Davis, W2JKD, saying 73, Happy New Year and we thank you for listening. Amateur Radio Newsline(tm) is Copyright 2003 and 2004. All rights are reserved.

4951. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-26 19:14:38 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <jaidndFeB4cbFHGi4p2dnA@gbronline.com>
Source record: 84527

Kim W5TIT wrote:

>
> Ummmm, well, yuh. You are right about that--I picked a *VANITY* callsign
> that has everything to do with *VANITY*. However, my tits aren't a
> distraction or obsession to me; they are a distraction to those who are too
> simple minded to get passed them and carry on with some resemblance of real
> dialogue--without the reference to tits all the time.
>
> Try it, JJ, you may sound a lot more intelligent--but that's a stretch so
> don't be disappointed... 'Course, if you want to keep referring to my tits,
> I can keep referring to your dick...or lack thereof; you *are* demonstrating
> the characteristics of a man with a little dick, or who is short. There's
> absolutely nothing wrong with either, mind you, except usually in the man
> who holds either or both titles. Maybe some counseling would help you.
>
> Kim W5TIT
>
>
You certainly seem to be enamored with a certain part of my anatomy. At
least I didn't pick a tasteless callsign like W5DIK, I have more taste,
commone sense and class than that, something you obviously lack to a
great degree. You must be pretty simple minded yourself as your
tasteless callsign is a reference to and a reminder to everyone of your
tits every time you post.
You demonstrate the characteristics of a woman who must call attention
to herself constantly, probably short and dumpy. You would be a real hit
with the cb crowd.

4952. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-26 21:02:36 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0312261302.5107b0de@posting.google.com>
Source record: 84528

"Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<paXGb.7284$lo3.4193@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>...
> "Steve Robeson K4CAP" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote
>
> > those who want something for nothing
>
> Ah, yes, when they can't make a reasoned argument they trot out the old
> "something for nothing" mantra.
>
> Sorry, but that just doesn't stand up in the light of day, Steve. My plan,
> for example, calls for an examination similar to the current Extra written
> for full privileges, yet avoids building a new set of Amateur Radio ghettos
> like Jim's 1968-leftover plan would do. It also avoids 'free upgrades'
> which we'll likely see proposed by a prominent CT radio club.
>
> Hans

Hans, if we're going to have to eat leftowvers, could we at least warm them up?

The fat is all congealed on this one.

4953. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-26 21:26:12 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031226162612.23171.00002925@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 84529

In article <bs29dk$5dn@library2.airnews.net>, "Kim" <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20031220135913.29660.00002148@mb-m24.aol.com...
>> In article <bs0m1m$6e8@library2.airnews.net>, "Kim " <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
>> writes:
>>
>> >I've really never given the "behavior"
>> >such thought, i.e. analogy, etc.
>>
>> Think about it. You've dealt with children - isn't it true that they will
>> tend
>> to repeat behavior that gets them what they want? If whining works, don't
>> you
>> get more whining?
>
>What I meant by my comment was that I've never really thought of it much
>beyond just making a conscious decision not to "give in," "yield," "cave,"
>whatever one wishes to call it. But I agree, it'd be much the same as with
>a child.

My point exactly.
>
>> It's illogical to think that sort of thing isn't present in adults.
>
>I agree again, and it is...I see it in my training sessions and elsewhere
>every day at work ;)

Of course.
>
>> >BUT, I am generally a very even tempered
>> >person and I don't feel I'm in any way wrong to stay in the lane I've
>> >chosen
>> >to drive in, above the posted speed, safely, forming safe distances
>> >between
>> >myself and drivers ahead of me, and never-minding nitwits behind me who
>> >think I should "yield" to them so they can speed faster and keep making
>> >each successive vehicle move.
>> >
>> Would you agree that if you *do* yield, you validate their behavior and in
>> a small way encourage them to do more of it?
>
>Absolutely.
>

That was my point.

>> Personally, I move, because I care more about my own safety. But that's
>> just me.

>I am probably lately more apt to be ignorant of my own safety in a steady
>determination to "dammit, stop allowing others to treat me like that"
>attitude. I've been in one of those attitudes for a while now. I'm kind of
>liking it.

Which means *your* behavior is being rewarded....

However, I recommend the safer alternative. Let the "idiot" be ahead of you.

73 de Jim, N2EY

4954. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-26 21:26:14 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031226162614.23171.00002926@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 84530

In article <bs29ns$5n3@library2.airnews.net>, "Kim" <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20031220135915.29660.00002149@mb-m24.aol.com...
>> In article <5NWEb.5989$wL6.919@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dwight
>> Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> writes:
>>
>> >"N2EY" wrote:
>> >>
>> >> Remember the scenario Kim describes:
>> >>
>> >> - multilane divided highway
>> >> - all vehicles at or above the posted speed limit.
>> >> - vehicle comes up behind her, flashes brights,
>> >> follows too closely, tries to get around on the
>> >> *inside* shoulder. IOW, unsafe, aggressive
>> >> driving actions intended to intimidate Kim.
>> >> (as if!!)
>> >
>> > That's your (and/or perhaps Kim's) interpretation of the scenario.
>>
>> I'd call it an accurate description, not an interpretation.
>>
>
>Me too.
>
>> >
>> >Others
>> >may interpret it as Kim being an inattentive driver that is not acting
>> >courteously to others by driving to the right, causing others to take
>> >extraordinary steps to get her attention back on the road and courteous
>> >driving (with extraordinary steps being necessary to get someone to drive
>> >courteously only adding to the fustration of other drivers).
>>
>> Hmmm...
>>
>> She's going with the flow of traffic, *above* the posted speed limit, but
>she
>> should slow down and change lanes so that someone who wants to go even
>faster
>> can get by?
>>
>

>Thank you. Doesn't make much sense to me, either.

But it appears to be the law.

>> She's not being "courteous" enough to do the above, so that somehow
>validates
>> the dangerous actions of another driver (following too closely, trying to
>pass
>> on the shoulder)?
>> >
>> >> She's only blocking those who want to speed
>> >> faster than she wants to speed.
>> >
>> > Exactly.
>>
>> Well, there you have it.
>>
>
>Haw...as you would say! :o

Exactly. But the law seems to have a different take.
>
>> >
>> >However, as you well know, she doesn't have a mandate, or a
>> >right, to self-enforce how fast others drive.
>>
>> Nor do *they* (or Kim) have a right to speed.
>>
>
>Correct as correct can be.

Which puts everyone in the wrong. Ticketing opportunities galore.

>> >Instead, she has the same
>> >obligations as other drivers, including an obligation to move to the
>right
>> >to allow others to pass.
>>
>> Where is it in the motor vehicle code that a driver on a multilane divided
>> highway has to change lanes and slow down to allow a speeder to pass in a
>> non-emergency situation?
>>
>
>They have *some* (one that I know of) of those highways down here. The only
>one I know of is well north of the DFW metroplex, up above Lewisville,
>even...almost to the OK border.

Then what kind of road are we talking about?
>
>> >If others are driving too fast while doing so, that
>> >is law enforcement's business - not the business of a self-styled road
>> >vigilante.

>>
>> It's everyone's business.
>
>Yep.
>
>> >> But the behavior/reward model I gave is valid.
>> >> For both children and alleged adults.
>> >
>> > I disagree. For it to be valid, you would have to establish there is
>> >nothing more than childhood impulse behind the decision drive fast -
>impulse
>> >that can be easily modified by simple rewards.
>>
>> The behaviors described by Kim go far beyond driving fast. They are
>obviously
>> childish - and often dangerous. Following too closely is simply unsafe.
>>
>
>Uh, *especially* at near 70-75 and above mph!!!!!!!!!!!

And that's the problem.

>> If you think childish impulses are easily modified by simple rewards, you
>> obviously haven't spent much time with impulsive children.
>>
>> >And you haven't established
>> >that.
>>
>> It's self-evident.
>>
>
>Oh, I'm here to tell you that strategy works on children, groups, etc.

Of course. The problem is that they're usually not in hurtling pieces of
machinery.
>
>> >Adults can make decisions based on some level of knowledge,
>> >experience, and review of the situation, not impulse.
>>
>> Of course!
>>
>> But the behaviors Kim describes are not those of a responsible adult.
>>
>> >In the case of fast
>> >drivers, perhaps the driver feels, based on a consideration of his/her
>> >skills and experience, that he/she can drive safely at faster speeds.
>>
>> The driver *feels*?
>>
>> So the driver's *feelings* supersede the judgement of the traffic
>> engineers and

>> lawmakers who determine the posted speed limits?
>>
>> I'd like to see that argument defended in court!
>>
>> My daily commute to work is often made longer by school buses and school
>zones.
>> It's gotten so I know exactly where the zones, the children, and the bus
>stops
>> are. Is it adult behavior for me to go faster than 15 in a school zone, or
>zoom
>> past a bus with its red lights flashing, because I *feel* I can do so
>safely?
>>
>
>The adult thing to do is either get up and leave earlier, or leave after the
>school zones are relinquished to normal traffic.

How about simply doing what the law requires? I wait for the school bus to turn off the lights and I only go the safe speed (15 max) in a school zone. I lose a few seconds here and there - big deal.

>> Or how about the ham who *feels* he "needs" 10 kW output? Suppose said ham
>can
>> safely assemble and operate a 10 kW transmitter that meets all of the FCC
>> requirements for spurious emissions and RF exposure. Is it therefre OK for
>him
>> to do so because he *feels* it's OK?
>>
>> >For
>> >example, I've driven many thousands of miles on German autobahns, and
>know
>> >full well I can drive safely at speeds faster than 55-65 mph (therefore
>only
>> >the laws and conditions attenuate my driving speeds).
>>
>> You know you can do it on German autobahns. But we're not in Germany. You
>want
>> to drive faster, go to Germany.
>>
>> >Perhaps the person has
>> >a legitimate reason for driving faster. For example, the driver may be
>> >taking someone to the hospital (and Kim is blocking his way).
>>
>> Sure. That's an emergency situation. But Kim says it's an every-day thing.
>> Hardly an emergency. And if there's only one person in the car....
>>
>> >I could go on,
>> >but these examples alone should make it clear that not all are acting
>solely
>> >on impulse that can be easily modified by simple rewards.
>>

>> The only valid counterexample you give is the emergency case.
>>
>> I don't exactly agree with Kim's behavior either, because a person who is
>> childishly impulsive enough to do what she describes may do other, even
>more
>> dangerous things. And I don't want Kim (or me) to be a victim of someone
>else's
>> childish impulses.

>'Zactly.
>
The problem is that if you do the highway vigilante thing you may be the victim of someone else's childish impulses. Or mistake. How many people died on Texas highways last year?

Please don't be a statistic.

73 de Jim, N2EY

4955. Re: Is Michael Jackson Innocent?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-26 21:26:16 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031226162616.23171.00002927@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 84532

In article <3FE3438C.3090502@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>> "Kim" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote in message
>news:<bqn2nt$dcs@library1.airnews.net>...
>>
>>>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>>>news:20031203075807.02537.00001939@mb-m23.aol.com...
>>>
>>>>In article <bqhq6q$q9h@library2.airnews.net>, "Kim" <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
>>>>writes:
>>>
>>
>> Sorry for the delay - thought I'd answered this, Kim
>>
>>
>>>>>It's fine for them to go 20 mph above the speed limit. It's fine if they
>>>>>want to go 30-40 mph above the speed limit. But, they won't find me
>>>>>moving
>>>>>out of their way; they'll have to go around because I am not moving into
>>>>
>>> a
>>>
>>>>>lane where I have to slow down, or even get "stuck" there for a while, if
>>>>>there happens to be more than one vehicle that wants to go past.
>>>>
>>>>Ah, I see. The right lane is going 60-65, the left lane (with you in it by
>>>>yourself) is going 70-75, and you're not going to lose a few seconds in
>>>
>>> order
>>>
>>>>to accomodate someone who wants to go 80-85.
>>>>
>>>It's not the matter of being kind and courteous and moving over so someone
>>>who's acting like an idiot can go by. It's the principle of the matter
>that
>>>*because* of the way they are being self-important, it's going to be *them*
>>>that does the moving around. I.E., I see them in kind of like the "bully"
>>>role of a little kid. Well, I'm not giving in to the bully.
>>
>>
>> After some thought, it occurred to me to restate your posstion in
>> slightly different terms. How about this:
>>

>> People tend to do what works for them. If a certain behavior produces
>> a desired result, they will tend to repeat and expand that behavior if
>> they want the result another time. This is a basic concept in child
>> rearing - you reward the behaviors you want and do not reward the
>> behaviors you don't want. And "reward" can take many forms - arguing
>> with a child from 7:30 to 7:35 about the fact that their bedtime is
>> 7:30 is "rewarding" the arguing behavior because it results in a 7:35
>> bedtime.
>>
>> And the effects go beyond the people directly involved. If another
>> child sees that arguing with a parent "works", then they're much more
>> likely to try arguing or some variation of it somewhere down the line.
>> Maybe the argument won't be about bedtime but the same tactics will be
>> used.
>>
>> This doesn't mean the child has consciously figured all that out and
>> is working from a preconceived plan. It just means that the effects
>> are the same, and a parent has to take a different approach that
>> doesn't effectively reward the unwanted behavior. Good parents know
>> all this - again, sometimes not consciously.
>>
>> Another important concept is to be consistent. The child needs to
>> learn not only that arguing over bedtime at bedtime doesn't work but
>> that it *never* works.
>>
>> So in the case of the driver who "behaves like an idiot", Kim is being
>> very careful and consistent to *not* reward the "idiot" behavior by
>> pulling over and letting the person go by. Because if such behavior
>> works, we'll see more and more of it. Not just from the current batch
>> of idiots but from presently non-idiot drivers who see that it works
>> and try it themselves.
>
> So you are saying that in order to show the idiot where the bear went
>in the buckwheat that you have to act like the idiot?

No, just the opposite. Kim is making sure that "acting like an idiot" doesn't
get the "idiot" what he-she wants (to pass and go faster).
>
>Agressive drivers are known to do some pretty insane things. Even if
>that piece of incorrect logic would be correct, the aggressive driver
>may be "provoked" (in his or her mind) to get even with the person ahead
>of him in the lane by doing something like a high speed rear-ending.

Agreed! Or, more likely, an accident could result that is much more severe
because of the behavior of both Kim and the "idiot". For example, if someone
cut in front of Kim and she had to hit the brakes, a rearender is almost
guaranteed.
>
>"Rewarding" or "teaching a lesson" or "showing them" or whatever doesn't
>work.

Sure it does. The question is whether it's legal and/or justified at 70+ mph in the left lane. You, Dwight and JJ have convinced me that it's neither legal nor justified.
>
> No thanks, if someone is going to be an idiot on the road, they can do
>it in front of me. I'll pull off and let 'em pass!
>
Same here!

>> OTOH, if "behaving like an idiot" on the road is not rewarded, the
>> driver may try something else (like courtesy, or getting on the road a
>> few minutes earlier).
>
> The time for teaching courtesy to them has long passed. Ain't gonna >
happen.
>
Even if it works, it's a dangerous game. Too dangerous.

73 de Jim, N2EY

4956. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-26 21:26:17 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031226162617.23171.00002928@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 84531

In article <JJ1Bb.4011$_r6.3147@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>, "Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote
>
>> >From 1951 till 1968 the privileges for four license classes, Conditional,
>> >General, Advanced, and Extra were all exactly the same.
>>
>> No, that's not exactly correct.
>>
>> The period described started in February of 1953, not 1951.
>
>Whatever.

Point is, FCC spent years developing the new structure, announced it on 1951, but then just when the tough part of the new rules (requiring an Extra for amateur HF phone on 80 thru 15), they dumped those rules and gave everybody except Novices and Techs everything.

>
>> You could, however, usually tell the oldtimers from the newbies by the
>> license class, but that was about all.
>
>Unless someone told you their license class, there was no way of knowing.
>There was no 'QRZ.COM' to go check, the CallBook didn't show license class,
>and all you could tell by their call sign was where their station was
>located. We all played together in the ether as equals.

Except for Novices, whose distinctive callsigns were unmistakeable.

Except for Techs.who had no HF at all and originally no 6 or 2 meters either.

And the alphabetic order of license told who was an OT and who was a newbie. W3ABC was an OT compared to W3YIK. W3YIK was an OT compared to K3NYT. K3NYT was an OT compared to WA3IYC. Etc. Usually, anyway.

If everything was so nice, why was FCC so unhappy with the way things were going? As early as 1958, FCC wanted to know why there were so few Extras. They asked again in 1963 and made it clear they wanted to bigtime changes.

Personally, I think it was "Sputnik fever". They, like many others in the USA, were spooked by the early Soviet achievements in space (first artificial satellite, first animal in space, first pictures of the far side of the moon, first man in space, first woman in space.....the list goes on and on) and perceived the USA to need "incentive" in all things technological.

73 de Jim, N2EY

4957. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-26 21:46:03 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <U5idnbqvO7KnMnGiRVn-tA@gbronline.com>
Source record: 84534

Kï¿½HB wrote:

> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote
>
>
>>And the alphabetic order of license told who was an OT and who was a
>
> newbie.
>
>>W3ABC was an OT compared to W3YIK. W3YIK was an OT compared to K3NYT.
>
> K3NYT was
>
>>an OT compared to WA3IYC. Etc. Usually, anyway.
>>
>
>
> Not necessarily. Since we all got a new call sign everytime we moved, we
> might trade an 'old' call in Minnesota (W0ABC) for a 'new' call in Virginia
> (WA4ABC). Not only couldn't you tell how long we'd been licensed, but you
> couldn't tell our license class (except for Novices with KN, WN, or WV
> prefixes). My mentor, W0VDI, was licensed at a Tech in 1952 and went SK 50
> years later with the same call and the same Tech license.

My call was a re-issue, I received a K prefix call while my friends who
received calls about the same time got WA and WB prefix calls. One had
received his WA call sometime before I got the K call.

4958. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-26 21:51:22 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <u32Hb.7535$lo3.2857@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 84533

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote

>
> And the alphabetic order of license told who was an OT and who was a
newbie.
> W3ABC was an OT compared to W3YIK. W3YIK was an OT compared to K3NYT.
K3NYT was
> an OT compared to WA3IYC. Etc. Usually, anyway.
>

Not necessarily. Since we all got a new call sign everytime we moved, we might trade an 'old' call in Minnesota (W0ABC) for a 'new' call in Virginia (WA4ABC). Not only couldn't you tell how long we'd been licensed, but you couldn't tell our license class (except for Novices with KN, WN, or WV prefixes). My mentor, W0VDI, was licensed at a Tech in 1952 and went SK 50 years later with the same call and the same Tech license.

> If everything was so nice, why was FCC so unhappy with the way things were
> going?

It wasn't the FCC who was unhappy. The unhappy folks were a few resentful and vocal OT's who felt disenfranchised because a nubby new guy could operate phone on 20M, not having first passed the old class A exam like he had to. The march to disincentive licensing moved to the beat of drum being banged up in West Hartford, CT. I know it's hard for you to accept that, given that history is written by the victors.

73, de Hans, K0HB
--
"Beware of the man who works hard to learn something, learns it, and finds himself no wiser than before. He is full of murderous resentment of people who are ignorant without having come by their ignorance the hard way."
-- Bokonon

4959. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-26 22:44:52 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <ER2Hb.10618$IM3.2748@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 84535

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20031226162617.23171.00002928@mb-m05.aol.com...
> In article <JJ1Bb.4011$_r6.3147@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>, "K&#65533;HB"
> <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> writes:
>
> >"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote
> >
> >> >From 1951 till 1968 the privileges for four license classes,
Conditional,
> >> >General, Advanced, and Extra were all exactly the same.
> >>
> >> No, that's not exactly correct.
> >>
> >> The period described started in February of 1953, not 1951.
> >
> >Whatever.
>
> Point is, FCC spent years developing the new structure, announced it on
1951,
> but then just when the tough part of the new rules (requiring an Extra for
> amateur HF phone on 80 thru 15), they dumped those rules and gave
everybody
> except Novices and Techs everything.
> >
> >> You could, however, usually tell the oldtimers from the newbies by the
> >> license class, but that was about all.
> >
> >Unless someone told you their license class, there was no way of knowing.
> >There was no 'QRZ.COM' to go check, the CallBook didn't show license
class,
> >and all you could tell by their call sign was where their station was
> >located. We all played together in the ether as equals.
>
> Except for Novices, whose distinctive callsigns were unmistakeable.
>
> Except for Techs.who had no HF at all and originally no 6 or 2 meters
either.
>
> And the alphabetic order of license told who was an OT and who was a
newbie.
> W3ABC was an OT compared to W3YIK. W3YIK was an OT compared to K3NYT.
K3NYT was
> an OT compared to WA3IYC. Etc. Usually, anyway.

>
> If everything was so nice, why was FCC so unhappy with the way things were
> going? As early as 1958, FCC wanted to know why there were so few Extras.
They
> asked again in 1963 and made it clear they wanted to bigtime changes.
>
> Personally, I think it was "Sputnik fever". They, like many others in the
USA,
> were spooked by the early Soviet achievements in space (first artificial
> satellite, first animal in space, first pictures of the far side of the
moon,
> first man in space, first woman in space.....the list goes on and on) and
> perceived the USA to need "incentive" in all things technological.

I agree with Jim on the "Sputnick fever" reaction. My Earth Science
teached just about went off his rocker when Sputnick went up.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

4960. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-26 22:48:17 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <RU2Hb.10620$IM3.10419@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 84536

"JJ" <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
news:U5idnbqvO7KnMnGiRVn-tA@gbronline.com...
> K&#65533;HB wrote:
>
> > "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote
> >
> >
> > >>And the alphabetic order of license told who was an OT and who was a
> >
> > newbie.
> >
> > >>W3ABC was an OT compared to W3YIK. W3YIK was an OT compared to K3NYT.
> >
> > K3NYT was
> >
> > >>an OT compared to WA3IYC. Etc. Usually, anyway.
> >>
> >
> >
> > Not necessarily. Since we all got a new call sign everytime we moved,
we
> > might trade an 'old' call in Minnesota (W0ABC) for a 'new' call in
Virginia
> > (WA4ABC). Not only couldn't you tell how long we'd been licensed, but
you
> > couldn't tell our license class (except for Novices with KN, WN, or WV
> > prefixes). My mentor, W0VDI, was licensed at a Tech in 1952 and went SK
50
> > years later with the same call and the same Tech license.
>
> My call was a re-issue, I received a K prefix call while my friends who
> received calls about the same time got WA and WB prefix calls. One had
> received his WA call sometime before I got the K call.

And even while some folks were getting K2 calls, the FCC would
occasionally issue someone a W2 call that had gone unassigned for
some time period.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

4961. Re: Why I Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-26 22:57:03 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031226175703.12501.00004919@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 84537

In article <DA0Fb.12502$0s2.6886@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>, "Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> writes:

>"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote
>
>> It's often helpful to have insight into the past and past systems to come
>> up with the future proposals.
>
>If you can persuade me that a transmitter comprised of 2 obsolete 1930's
>tubes cobbled together on a wooden chassis gives insights which lead to
>future breakthroughs in the radio art, then I'll owe you a lobster dinner at
>Dayton.

I doubt anyone could convince you, but...

The publication of actual homebrew equipment in today's ham mags may just get some folks to actually start tinkering. The fact that a 21st century had restored *and used* a ~50 year old homebrew rig says that it's not just something hams used to do years and years ago.

The technology isn't nearly so important as the mindset that homebrewing is a viable alternative.

And if the signal is up to modern requirements and the ham has fun, what's the problem?

Couple months back there was a homebrew 17 meter DSB transceiver article in QST. Not exactly bleeding edge technology but it worked and the ham learned things and had a ton of fun. So it ain't just vintage stuff in QST.

73 de Jim, N2EY

4962. Re: Why I Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-26 22:57:04 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031226175704.12501.00004920@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 84538

In article <WCZGb.5827$Vv2.2686666@news1.news.adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo
<mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>
>> In article <h21Fb.1606$Vv2.802859@news1.news.adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo
>> <mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:

>>>N2EY wrote:

>>>>In article <2eQEb.11638$Pg1.3410@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>, "Kï¿½HB"
>>>><groupk0hb@earthlink.net> writes:
>>
>>>>>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote
>>
>>>>>>That means passing the post-restructuring 35 question Tech test is "more
>>>>>>difficult" than passing both the pre-restructuring 30 question Novice
>>>>>>test *and* the 5 wpm code receiving test.
>>
>>>>>Yes.
>>
>>>>Well, there you have it. Element 1 is easier than 5 questions on the
>>>>written test.
>>>
>>>Balderdash!
>>
>> Poppycock!
>>
>> (I'm just pointing out the logical results of Hans' statement about the
>tests,
>> Mike. If we want to make an entry-level ham license easier to get, it
>follows
>> that we should go back to Element 1 and a very simple written...)
>
> Depends on the person.

Exactly. That's the refutation of Hans' claim.

>Took me 6 months of hard frustrating daily work,
>a flunk, and another test to pass. Whereas to me there is no difference
>between a question pool and a book containing the info that will be in a
>test. Read it-got it.

Exactly. And for others the reverse is true.
>
> For me, learning CW was more difficult than the Extra test. It was

>harder than it would habe been to take the extra test and having to
>answer every question in the pool, and some that weren't in the pool.
>
> My point is that if Morse code comes easy, just be thankful and use it.

>Don't fall into the common trap of thinking that everyone else
>experiences things just like you do. For some people, it is *extremely*
>difficult.

Of course! Nobody denies that. Sorry if I didn't make that clear.

>With a slightly different outlook and personality, I could be
>the ultimate poster child for the NCTA's. Well okay I would have to be a
>little better looking too! 8^)

HAW!
>
> On a better note, My project to bootstrap myself into being able to
>work Morse CW at a usable speed is starting to pay off. It has been a
>very strange route I have taken, and if it finally works, I'll post the
>method I used. Forewarned, it is pretty weird!

That's another point - there is no one learning method that works for everyone
- code or written test.

>>>>>(But only barely, and it is woefully inadequate for the resultant
>>>>>privileges.)

>>>>Woefully inadequate? FCC disagrees! In fact, in 2000 FCC drastically
>>>>*reduced*
>>>>the written testing needed for a Tech. From two tests and pools, frowm
>>>>which
>>>>were derived tests with a total of 65 questions down to one test of 35
>>>>questions and a combined pool.
>>>
>>>>FCC thinks that 35 question Tech test is adequate. The same FCC that sees
>>>>"no
>>>>regulatory purpose" in code tests.
>>>>
>>>>Is FCC mistaken?
>>>
>>>Another argument for the no test agenda:
>>>
>>>We regularly hurtle at each other at combined speeds of 150 miles per
>>>hour and more, wearing nothing but street clothes, and strapped into
>>>devices carrying a large load of almomst explosivly flammable liquid.

>> Yup. And tens of thousands of Americans are killed each year in accidents
>while
>> doing same. At least as many are seriously injured, and the property damage
>is
>> what - hundreds of millions?
>>

>>>And we're afraid to let people run radios that are putting out the same
>>>power as the microwave oven over my stove?
>>
>> Sure - because the microwave oven contains the energy. The antenna
>> connected to the radio radiates it.
>
> 1. But we could surely get used to the idea

Just as we have gotten used to the idea of all those traffic deaths and
injuries.
>
> 2. I bet a relatively uni[n]formed person would be impressed by my
argument.
>
Absolutely!

The reverse is also true. Look at the opposition to cell towers.

> 3. When do you feel safer, operating QRO or driving on the interstate?

Fact is, if you drive to the airport, fly in commerical airliners all over the
USA and return to the same airport and drive home, your greatest risk was in
the rides to and from the airport.

>>
>> Look through old ham magazines - QST, CQ, the now-defunct 73 and ham radio.
>The
>> older mags had lots of "build me!" articles for actual *rigs*, not just
>> gadgets. By that I mean actual receivers, transmitters, transceivers, and
>power
>> amplifiers, that a ham could build in the attic/basement workshop and put
>on
>> the air. There was no shortage of gadget and antenna articles, either, but
>the
>> mags weren't limited to gadget/antenna articles. And the further back you
>go,
>> the more of that sort of thing was in the magazines.
>
> I know this would be a massive undertaking, but wouldn't it be a hoot
>for some enterprising Amateur to come up with a project similar in
>complexity to say the Elecraft radios? That's a lot to ask, but it would
>be sooo cool.

Two amateurs have already done it. They live in Aptos, California.
>
>> They weren't mostly simple 1- or 2-tube regens and MOPAs, either. Check out
>QST
>> in the late 1950s-early 1960s and in the complex-receiver category alone
>there
>> were (at least) the HBR-14, HBR-8/11, HBR-16, (and several variants
>thereof),
>> the "HBR-453" by W2PPL (two versions based on the then-ubiquitous BC-453),

>> DCS-500, PHJ-1, and the 23 tube triple-conversion sectionalized masterpiece
>by
>> W2LYH. And that's just the ones I can recall without looking through the
>> indices.
>>
>> Look through today's mags and there ain't much in the "rig" category
>anymore.
>> It's just *assumed* that hams aren't going to build much anymore.
>
> pffft! 8^(
>
Exactly. Although occasionally something like that 17 meter DSB transceiver
gets published.

73 de Jim, N2EY
> - Mike KB3EIA -
>
>

4963. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-26 22:57:05 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031226175705.12501.00004921@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 84539

In article <u32Hb.7535$lo3.2857@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>, "Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote

>> And the alphabetic order of license told who was an OT and who was a
>>newbie.
>> W3ABC was an OT compared to W3YIK. W3YIK was an OT compared to K3NYT.
>K3NYT was
>> an OT compared to WA3IYC. Etc. Usually, anyway.
>>
>
>Not necessarily.

That's why I wrote "usually".

>Since we all got a new call sign everytime we moved, we
>might trade an 'old' call in Minnesota (W0ABC) for a 'new' call in Virginia
>(WA4ABC).

Only if you moved to another district *and* the corresponding call wasn't available.

>Not only couldn't you tell how long we'd been licensed, but you
>couldn't tell our license class (except for Novices with KN, WN, or WV
>prefixes). My mentor, W0VDI, was licensed at a Tech in 1952 and went SK 50
>years later with the same call and the same Tech license.

Same sort of thing around here. In fact, until recently there was a 1x2 in the third call district with a Tech license.
>
>> If everything was so nice, why was FCC so unhappy with the way things were
>> going?
>
>It wasn't the FCC who was unhappy.

Then why did they start the ball rolling with all the changes, both in 1951 and 1958/63?

>The unhappy folks were a few resentful
>and vocal OT's who felt disenfranchised because a nubby new guy could
>operate phone on 20M, not having first passed the old class A exam like he
>had to.

You mean like W2OY of "no kids no lids no space cadets" fame?

Note also that FCC had upped the ante in the 1951 restructuring. After the end of 1952 they would no longer issue Advanceds, so anybody who didn't have an

Advanced by that date would have had to get an Extra just to work HF phone on 80 thru 15. Then, just before Christmas 1952, FCC completely reversed itself and gave all hams except Novices and Techs full operating privileges. Why the sudden about-face? Nobody seems to know, and the literature of that era only briefly mentions the change.

>The march to disincentive licensing moved to the beat of drum being
>banged up in West Hartford, CT.

And a majority of members wanted it. A very slim majority, to be sure.

>I know it's hard for you to accept that,
>given that history is written by the victors.

And your source for this is?

I know you were a ham then, Hans, but where does this info come from? Or is it just an opinion?

73 de Jim, N2EY

4964. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-26 22:57:33 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <x13Hb.10632$IM3.8680@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 84540

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:OesGb.5538$Vv2.2283406@news1.news.adelphia.net...
> Bill Sohl wrote:
>
> > "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
> > news:TA8Gb.5164$Vv2.1975129@news1.news.adelphia.net...
> >
> > >>K&#65533;HB wrote:
> > >>
> > >>>"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote
> > >>>
> > >>>>BUT, his NCI membership doesn't tie NCI to Han's personal support
> > >>>>for an entry level license.
> > >>>
> > >>>Are you saying that NCI does not reciprocate my support for their
goals?
> > >>>That would certainly be a strange sort of membership-organization.
> > >>
> > >>Sorry Hans! Only elimination of the Test!
> > >
> > > Essentually correct. NCI doesn't take positions on the wider
> > > scope of testing and opinions held by any individual member.
> > > Indeed, one could readily see where two members might have totally
> > > opposite opinions on written testing.
> > >
> > >
> > >>And that is what bothers me about NCI.
> > >
> > >
> > > Why that bothers anyone makes no sense to me. Indeed, we are
> > > damned if we do, damn;ed if we don't. We formed as a "one issue"
> > > organization and now some folks are bothered by that...strange,
> > > truly strange.
>
> Well, I'm sorry about it Bill, but that is how it works. Spoils of
success.
>
> In the world of politics, there is no such thing as a one issue
> organization. When agitating for the addition or removal of something,
> there must be some kind of plan for afterward. If there is no plan, then
> one of two things happened. Either there was an immense amount of
> naivety, or a concept of "no plan for the aftermath" was made".

The "plan" is simple. There is NO need to replace code testing
with anything else. That is and always has been the NCI objective.
Anyone (NCI member or otherwise) that wants to pursue
other test changes (written made harder, easier, entrylevel,
etc..) are free to pursue such aims independent of the NCI
banner. As Jim (N2EY) can attest to, I have made several
suggestions on imprving testing to the VEC, but that was and
still is seperate from the NCI "plan."

> I'm bothered by it now because I'm new to the ARS and didn't even know
> about NCI in it's early years. I would have taken NCI members to task if
> I was a ham then.

NCI isn't really that old. Less than 10 years if my memory
serves me correctly.

> >>But it is a great way to dodge responsibility! 8^)
> >
> > Dodge responsibilities? So exactly what does that mean?
> > What specific "responsibility" is NCI dodging?
> > Did I miss some unstated responsibility of NCI and/or any
> > other ham club or organization?
>
> Yes you did miss it, IMO! What other Morse code pro/con advocacy groups
> are there? NCI is the one standing around when the change happened, it
> happened their way, and now all we hear is some people's personal
> beliefs when they should be at least putting together a plan for the
> aftermath of the ARS, post Element one. The two I have seen I'm not
> overwhelmed with.

Well I guess NCI will just have to live with your
disappointment. See again the "plan" above.

> So I will be yapping about what I percieve to be a *grave* error in
> omission.

Its a free country, yap away.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

4965. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-27 00:36:08 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <Yt4Hb.5932$Vv2.2808490@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 84541

N2EY wrote:
> In article <JJ1Bb.4011$_r6.3147@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>, "Kï¿½HB"
> <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> writes:
>
>
>>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote
>>
>>
>>>>From 1951 till 1968 the privileges for four license classes, Conditional,
>>>
>>>>General, Advanced, and Extra were all exactly the same.
>>>
>>>No, that's not exactly correct.
>>>
>>>The period described started in February of 1953, not 1951.
>>
>>Whatever.
>
>
> Point is, FCC spent years developing the new structure, announced it on 1951,
> but then just when the tough part of the new rules (requiring an Extra for
> amateur HF phone on 80 thru 15), they dumped those rules and gave everybody
> except Novices and Techs everything.
>
>>>You could, however, usually tell the oldtimers from the newbies by the
>>>license class, but that was about all.
>>
>>Unless someone told you their license class, there was no way of knowing.
>>There was no 'QRZ.COM' to go check, the CallBook didn't show license class,
>>and all you could tell by their call sign was where their station was
>>located. We all played together in the ether as equals.
>
>
> Except for Novices, whose distinctive callsigns were unmistakeable.
>
> Except for Techs.who had no HF at all and originally no 6 or 2 meters either.
>
> And the alphabetic order of license told who was an OT and who was a newbie.
> W3ABC was an OT compared to W3YIK. W3YIK was an OT compared to K3NYT. K3NYT was
> an OT compared to WA3IYC. Etc. Usually, anyway.
>
> If everything was so nice, why was FCC so unhappy with the way things were
> going? As early as 1958, FCC wanted to know why there were so few Extras. They
> asked again in 1963 and made it clear they wanted to bigtime changes.

>
> Personally, I think it was "Sputnik fever". They, like many others in the USA,
> were spooked by the early Soviet achievements in space (first artificial
> satellite, first animal in space, first pictures of the far side of the moon,
> first man in space, first woman in space.....the list goes on and on) and
> perceived the USA to need "incentive" in all things technological.

And what a short-lived phenom that was! Now at the university level at
least, the Techies and Engineers to a large extent are not from the US,
while our kids are busy getting MBA's and becoming lawyers!

- Mike KB3EIA -

4966. Re: Why I Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-27 01:03:59 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3U4Hb.5941$Vv2.2814410@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 84542

N2EY wrote:

> In article <DA0Fb.12502$0s2.6886@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>, "Kï¿½HB"
> <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> writes:
>
>
>>"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote
>>
>>
>>>It's often helpful to have insight into the past and past systems to come
>>>up with the future proposals.
>>
>>If you can persuade me that a transmitter comprised of 2 obsolete 1930's
>>tubes cobbled together on a wooden chassis gives insights which lead to
>>future breakthroughs in the radio art, then I'll owe you a lobster dinner at
>>Dayton.
>
>
> I doubt anyone could convince you, but...

A person can learn a lot MORE from the older technology. It is a lot
closer to the theory by virtue of simplicity.

What would do a better job of teaching a newbie about antenna matching,
a simple L or T network tuner, or an LDG tuner?

What would teach a newbie the technical ins and outs of transcievers, a
rock mite or a FT1000MP-Mark V? Or to keep within the bet, that wooden
chassis three tube thing.

And the newbies of today may become the bloody edge pro's of tomorrow.

> The publication of actual homebrew equipment in today's ham mags may just get
> some folks to actually start tinkering. The fact that a 21st century had
> restored *and used* a ~50 year old homebrew rig says that it's not just
> something hams used to do years and years ago.
>
> The technology isn't nearly so important as the mindset that homebrewing is a
> viable alternative.
>
> And if the signal is up to modern requirements and the ham has fun, what's the
> problem?

Hear Hear! There is not thing one wrong with old technology, and the
pursuit of that part of the hobby is every bit as valid as the latest
gee whiz techno-marvel.

Too many people seem to think that a ham can only enjoy one facet of
the hobby, it would seem. I like and use the latest technology, but I
just love the old stuff too.

> Couple months back there was a homebrew 17 meter DSB transceiver article in
> QST. Not exactly bleeding edge technology but it worked and the ham learned
> things and had a ton of fun. So it ain't just vintage stuff in QST.

I'm homebrewing a high power tuner right now that will double as a
piece of art. Bleeding edge technology? Heck no! if other hams don't
like it, thay can just ignore my CQ!!

- Mike KB3EIA -

4967. Re: Here is TITSs Dream

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-27 01:36:23 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20031226203623.02537.00002225@mb-m23.aol.com>
Source record: 84543

In article <bsg8il$udi@library1.airnews.net>, "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
writes:

>> Wow! I'll say! Kim, eat your heart out. Better still, stop eating that
>ice
>> cream you spoke of in a later reply, go out and get some exercise, and
>> maybe you can give Janet some competition someday.
>>
>
>Larry, just for once, would you stop thinking with your dick and show *some*
>kind of intelligence? Why in Hell's bells would I be interested in giving
>anyone "competition."

Kim:

It's just a figure of speech.

>Are you really that pathetic?

Not even.

>Is it your game to "keep up" with the Jones's or something?

As I recall, this was all about you, not me.

>Maybe you're just that insecure in
>life, that all that matters to you is how a woman looks.

Of course not, but I am concerned with the health of women I care about
(not saying that you are included in that group, other than to the extent that
I care about the well-being of all my fellow human beings).

>I am damned

I certainly hope not!

>beautiful, and I wouldn't give you the time of day if you had to adjust your
>pacemaker to the next beat of the clock.

To the best of my understanding, that's not how they work, but thanks for the
warning. If I ever have a pacemaker, and require any assistance with it's
adjustment, you will not receive any calls.

>Tell ya what...*you* go get this
>person you are speaking of...lemmee see you *cough* just waltz up and sweep
>'er off 'er feet, Larry. har dee har har Yeah, right.

I would not do that, because I believe that Janet is married.

>> Keep it up the
>> way you are, and you're heading toward adult-onset diabetes, possible
>> kidney failure, and saying goodbye to your toes, feet, and legs in that
>> order. I see the results of self-induced obesity every day -- I'm usually
>> loading them into my bus, securing their wheelchairs, and hauling them
>> off to dialysis treatments three times a week! The choice is up to you!
>>
>
>Uh huh, and you are sadly mistaken to think that it is only weight that
>determines things like that.

Don't look now, Kim, but obesity is a major risk factor in adult-onset
diabetes,
particularly among women. And if you're more than 30 lbs. overweight, based
on your height, you're obese.

>By the way, seems the one time I looked at
>your pic on QRZ, you didn't have much more room to swell your chipmunk
>cheeks out any.

At the time that photo was taken (around 1997) I was around 188 lbs. I am
now ten pounds lighter. I have not been clinically obese ever in my life, and
my weight for my height (just about a millimeter less than 6 ft.) is within the
normal, healthy range for my age (51).

>And, the tee-shirt did no justice to hide your gut...

I *never* wear tee-shirts in public, Kim. I am looking at that photo, and I am
wearing a pullover golf shirt. Also, the photo only shows me from the collar
up, my "gut" doesn't show at all. However, if you like, I could E-mail you a
more recent head-to-toe photo, which will reveal the fact that I have no "gut"
worth hiding.

>Maybe you better start *your* diet. Then, you can go find some gorgeous
>babe you think you can get....

I am on a permanent diet, which means I almost never indulge in empty-
calorie, high-carbohydrate foods. I had Christmas dinner with friends tonight,
and it was virtually the first time this year I'd eaten anything which could be
categorized as "dessert." I live on a very plain diet of chicken, fish
(usually
salmon), beans (usually lima beans, never the sugary, fatty "baked beans"
fat people eat), veggies and fruits. I eat virtually no potatoes, and only
an occasional (meaning not even once weekly) small portion of rice. I never
eat ice cream at all. I haven't had any in almost 10 years. I have made a
lifetime commitment to keeping myself healthy, which, in turn, keeps me
from looking like the usual fat slob you're used to seeing. I don't know
whose photo you were looking at, but it apparently wasn't mine!

>> I'm assuming that's a recent photo of Janet. The detail page gives her
>> birthdate as Feb. 1960, meaning she's pushing 44 years old! Can anyone
>> place the vintage of the 'Vette she's leaning on?
>>
>> 73 de Larry, K3LT

>Not something you'll ever own...that's for sure.

If you're speaking about the 'Vette, you're probably right. I can certainly afford one, but I simply have no use for an inefficient, highly impractical automobile such as a Corvette. My own car is a 2003 Toyota Corolla LE. It gets outstanding fuel economy, and is capable of taking me anywhere I can go in a Corvette, without the punishing ride, speeding tickets, and lack of useful luggage space. Moreover, if I lived in a place where I could legally drive a high-performance sports car the way it is capable of being driven, I wouldn't have a Corvette -- I'd have an Accura RSX. I only drive about 10K miles a year in my personal car, so my Corolla serves my purposes nicely.

>And, that's probably all that'll impress her.

If I felt that I needed a Corvette to impress any particular woman, then I probably wouldn't have much interest in that woman in the first place. It would be highly unlikely that we had anything meaningful in common.

>So, if that's the kind of woman you're turned on by, go for it Larry.

Actually, I'm "turned on" by women who are friendly, pleasant, easy-going, secure in their femininity, appreciative of an intelligent and caring male partner, and don't have any liberal feminist axe to grind. Trust me, you wouldn't know anything about someone like her.

>Tell me when you find some dream babe to actually give you
>the time of day... In fact, tell me when you find any woman to actually
>give you anything....

I have just described her, but that's not the subject here, Kim -- you are. I made some observations which showed well-intended concern for your well being, and all you could think of as a reply was another of your tedious personal attacks. Quite frankly, I don't know why I bothered, other than the fact that I care about people, and that, for some odd reason, includes you.

73 de Larry, K3LT

4968. Re: Here is TITSs Dream

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-27 01:46:28 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <Uv5Hb.10764$IM3.9955@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 84544

"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20031226115842.19889.00001091@mb-m01.aol.com...
> >Dang Larry, looks like you pushed ole hug and chalks buttons again.
> >
> >Dan/W4NTI
>
> With all that FAT how would you find her button?

Well I suppose that after all the huggin and chalkin, and if you had any
chalk left, ya could mark a spot and hunt for it.

Dan/W4NTI

4969. Re: Here is TITSs Dream

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-27 02:21:12 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bsiq7p$i2j@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 84545

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20031226203623.02537.00002225@mb-m23.aol.com...
>
> I have just described her, but that's not the subject here, Kim -- you
are.
> I made some observations which showed well-intended concern for
> your well being, and all you could think of as a reply was another of
> your tedious personal attacks. Quite frankly, I don't know why I
bothered,
> other than the fact that I care about people, and that, for some odd
> reason, includes you.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>
>

Pa!!!! Give me a break. You and "caring for people" do not go together in
the same sentence, Larry. You are truly a legend in your own mind...

Kim W5TIT

4970. Re: Here is TITSs Dream

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-27 03:28:11 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20031226222811.02537.00002226@mb-m23.aol.com>
Source record: 84548

In article <bshjan$53q@library2.airnews.net>, "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> writes:

>Larry, you are too damned ignorant to understand that it is apparently *you*
>roped to the chains of physical impression or how "good" something looks
>based upon the unrealistic standards of a media based majority that anorexic
>looking is beautiful.

Kim:

I don't think you could Goggle-up any instance where I made the claim that "anorexic looking" is beautiful. On the contrary, I happen to be attracted to women who are "full figured." However, this doesn't mean "fat." It means weight proportional to height, with proper muscle tone and all the curves in place and well defined. Most women, including yourself by your own admission, have these characteristics when they are in their late teens and twenties. It is usually after they marry, and no longer feel that there is any need to keep themselves attractive to the opposite sex that they "let themselves
go," and binge on the ice cream, chocolate, and other empty calories. Then, after having had a few children, they usually experience a permanent weight gain, and, in the absence of any serious exercise regimen, and the continuance of the poor eating habits, they run into a series of physical problems associated with carrying around up to twice their normal weight. The truly unlucky ones then go on to adult-onset (Type II) diabetes. The sad part is, all this misery can be easily avoided by simply following the basic rules of healthy living: Don't eat more than you need, avoid refined sugars in all their forms (our bodies were never meant to process the vast quantities of sugar we now consume), be moderate in your consumption of alcohol (which is also mostly sugar), and get regular exercise -- walking preferred.

> I am quite liberated and am quite beautiful

Forgive me for pointing this out, but that is strictly a self-serving observation.

>and my
>husband, leave the "OM" title to you, are about as happy as can be. See?

I'm so happy for you.

>When you liberate yourself from having to meet the fake standards of some
>over-winded individual such as yourself, you'll be a lot happier, too. Make
>it a New Year's resolution--by this time next year you'll be feeling a lot
>more confident, successful, and you won't need false gods to feel secure.

I have no false gods, only the one true God.

73 de Larry, K3LT

4971. Re: Here is TITSs Dream

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-27 03:28:12 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20031226222812.02537.00002228@mb-m23.aol.com>
Source record: 84546

In article <6CZGb.10304$IM3.5702@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dan/W4NTI"
<w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> writes:

>> Uh huh, and you are sadly mistaken to think that it is only weight that
>> determines things like that. By the way, seems the one time I looked at
>> your pic on QRZ, you didn't have much more room to swell your chipmunk
>> cheeks out any. And, the tee-shirt did no justice to hide your gut...
>> Maybe you better start *your* diet. Then, you can go find some gorgeous
>> babe you think you can get....
>>
>> >
>> > I'm assuming that's a recent photo of Janet. The detail page gives her
>> > birthdate as Feb. 1960, meaning she's pushing 44 years old! Can anyone
>> > place the vintage of the 'Vette she's leaning on?
>> >
>> > 73 de Larry, K3LT
>> >
>>
>> Not something you'll ever own...that's for sure. And, that's probably all
>> that'll impress her. So, if that's the kind of woman you're turned on by,
>> go for it Larry. Tell me when you find some dream babe to actually give
>you
>> the time of day... In fact, tell me when you find any woman to actually
>> give you anything....
>>
>> Kim W5TIT
>>
>>
>Dang Larry, looks like you pushed ole hug and chalks buttons again.
>
>Dan/W4NTI

Dan:

It's a thankless task, but someone's gotta do it!

73 de Larry, K3LT

4972. Re: Here is TITSs Dream

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-27 03:28:12 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20031226222812.02537.00002227@mb-m23.aol.com>
Source record: 84547

In article <20031226104016.21489.00000996@mb-m23.aol.com>, wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) writes:

>>When you liberate yourself from having to meet the fake standards of some
>>over-winded individual such as yourself, you'll be a lot happier, too.
>
>No Question now, TIT ius a Heefer

"Titius?" I kinda like that. OBTW, I believe it's spelled "heifer."

73 de Larry, K3LT

4973. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-27 07:46:18 UTC
From: Steve Silverwood <kb6ojs@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <MPG.1a54e8996474f0029896a3@news-server.socal.rr.com>
Source record: 84549
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.cb

In article <bs8cb7blt0@pita.alt.net>, sh@sandahamnet.net says...
> K1MAN has done more good for ham radio in one year
> than the ARRL has done in its entire life!

You've got to be kidding, right?

--

-- //Steve//

Steve Silverwood, KB6OJS
Fountain Valley, CA
Email: kb6ojs@arrl.net

4974. Re: The main problem with Ham radio...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-27 07:46:19 UTC
From: Steve Silverwood <kb6ojs@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <MPG.1a54eee2e7e7e4509896a5@news-server.socal.rr.com>
Source record: 84550

In article <bs6vfs0fsh@enews1.newsguy.com>, Jrad@aol.com says...
> ...is simply this:
>
> Know code = Know ham
> No code = No ham
>
> The eternal truth, proven every day.

I have a feeling that this issue about the code will never be resolved, at least not while the "old guard" of CW loyalists are still around. I've been a ham since I got my Novice ticket in 1986 -- before the Novice Enhancement started -- so I did my 5wpm test back then. Unfortunately, I've not had the need to use it much. At one point, I felt as you do, that Morse skills were necessary in order to be qualified to operate HF. However, technology has pretty much removed Morse skills from the list of skills needed to operate properly in the Amateur Service.

I do intend to refresh my Morse skills and operate more using that mode, especially since I am doing more operating while camping and traveling, plus operating at QRP power levels from home and on the road. That's a matter of personal choice, though. I also plan to get onto PSK31, RTTY and even SSTV and ATV as opportunities present themselves. But as things stand now, the ability to operate CW is no longer a necessity. It's still a valid mode, CW sub-bands should still be set aside for operating in that mode, and it's still a skill that should be cultivated among the Amateur ranks, but it has outlived its usefulness as a requirement and should be eliminated as such.

Morse skills were once considered to be a "filter" by which those operators who were going to screw around on the air would be eliminated -- the theory was that if someone was a goof-off, (s)he would be deterred from getting a ham license by having to study for the Morse exam. As I've stated elsewhere, that theory has been disproven by the antics of licensed Amateur operators in places like 14.313 MHz, the "Animal House" repeater in Los Angeles, and the jammers that disrupt communications during the Rose Parade, among others. A lot of these bozos hold amateur licenses, Tech Plus and up, so they have taken the Morse exam and still are irritants. So much for the "filter" theory....

And no, I don't consider a no-code Tech to be any less of a ham than a Novice or a Tech Plus or anyone else. Everyone with an interest in amateur radio should be able to participate without having to demonstrate knowledge of a mode that they will probably never use.

It was suggested in a reply to a related thread on another newsgroup that the whole exam structure should be tossed as well, if Morse is eliminated. Not true, nor do I even consider suggesting it. If we as amateurs are going to be responsible for the emissions coming from our stations, we must be able to prove that we know what we are doing, we understand our responsibilities under Part 97, and that we have the necessary skills to recognize and correct problems as they arise, or to prevent them from happening at all.

So yes, passing the written exams are a valid entry requirement. In fact, they should probably be even more of a test of our knowledge and skills than they are at present. I'd go along with an increase in the number of questions in the exams, especially in the areas of what is permitted and prohibited in the operation of our stations. For one thing, it gives the FCC additional ammunition in prosecution of operators who violate the regulations -- Mr. Hollingsworth can point to the exam taken by "Joe Ham, KA6XYZ" and say, "See, this person answered the questions correctly, demonstrating that he knew that such-and-such was illegal, then went ahead and did it anyway."

--

-- //Steve//

Steve Silverwood, KB6OJS
Fountain Valley, CA
Email: kb6ojs@arrl.net

4975. Re: The main problem with Ham radio...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-27 13:48:53 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0312270548.16caf227@posting.google.com>
Source record: 84551

wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) wrote in message
news:<20031222101338.11589.00000923@mb-m25.aol.com>...
> >...is simply this:
> >
> >Know code = Know ham
> >No code = No ham
> >
> >The eternal truth, proven every day.
> >
>
> So TRUE

If "So TRUE," why did you wait to take the code-free upgrade to Extra?

Are you saying that you're "No ham?"

4976. Re: The main problem with Ham radio...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-27 14:50:39 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031227095039.13641.00001497@mb-m10.aol.com>
Source record: 84552

>If "So TRUE," why did you wait to take the code-free upgrade to Extra?

You know why I took it, and it still bugs you to think you cant do the same. By the way Bryan, I still havent used the EXTRA Privilages.

4977. Re: Here is TITSs Dream

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-27 15:34:47 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bsk8nn$4dh@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 84553

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20031226222812.02537.00002227@mb-m23.aol.com...
> In article <20031226104016.21489.00000996@mb-m23.aol.com>, wa8ulx@aol.com
> (WA8ULX) writes:
>
> >>When you liberate yourself from having to meet the fake standards of
some
> >>over-winded individual such as yourself, you'll be a lot happier, too.
> >
> >No Question now, TIT ius a Heefer
>
> "Titius?" I kinda like that. OBTW, I believe it's spelled "heifer."
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

Oh good grief, is Waddles still around? That's hilarious... I shoulda been
payin' attention I suppose, is that what started this thread?

Kim W5TIT

4978. Re: Here is TITSs Dream

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-27 15:35:58 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bsk8pu$b10@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 84554

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20031226222812.02537.00002228@mb-m23.aol.com...
> In article <6CZGb.10304$IM3.5702@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>,
"Dan/W4NTI"
> <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> writes:
>
> >>
> >Dang Larry, looks like you pushed ole hug and chalks buttons again.
> >
> >Dan/W4NTI
>
> Dan:
>
> It's a thankless task, but someone's gotta do it!
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

And, Danny, too! Wow. What in the world is "hug and chalks?"

Kim W5TIT

4979. Re: Here is TITSs Dream

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-27 15:48:35 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031227104835.21935.00000953@mb-m26.aol.com>
Source record: 84555

>Oh good grief, is Waddles still around? That's hilarious... I shoulda been
>payin' attention I suppose, is that what started this thread?
>
>Kim W5TIT

Hi Heefer, did youi get a new Wheel Barow for XMAS?

4980. Re: Here is TITSs Dream

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-27 15:50:04 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031227105004.21935.00000954@mb-m26.aol.com>
Source record: 84556

>And, Danny, too! Wow. What in the world is "hug and chalks?"
>
>Kim W5TIT
>

Hey Dan is that something like covering them with flower and then look for a spot ?

4981. Re: Here is TITSs Dream

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-27 17:44:01 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <BxjHb.2743$d4.1623@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 84557

"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20031227105004.21935.00000954@mb-m26.aol.com...
> >And, Danny, too! Wow. What in the world is "hug and chalks?"
> >
> >Kim W5TIT
> >
>
> Hey Dan is that something like covering them with flower and then look for
a
> spot ?

Hmmmmm...no , not exactly. Hug and chalk is when they are more than a body
can handle and ya wanta give em a hug. You need to mark the spot where
your hand stopped, so you knew where to start again.

You can tell TIT ain't from the south.

Dan/W4NTI

4982. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-27 20:23:16 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <REMOVETHISkc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <bst6mt$186r9$6@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 84681
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.cb

Yes I am familiar with all of those, but good luck finding them..... Unless
one travels up to an hour away.

>
> Popular Communications (Never met a radio they didn't like)
> CQ
> QST
> Monitoring Times
>
> These should be easily found at any decent newstand. Don't you have any
> bookstores there??
>
> Borders?
> BDalton?
>
> BDK

4983. Re: The main problem with Ham radio...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-27 20:31:47 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0312271231.4994f7b5@posting.google.com>
Source record: 84558

wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) wrote in message
news:<20031227095039.13641.00001497@mb-m10.aol.com>...
> >If "So TRUE," why did you wait to take the code-free upgrade to Extra?
>
> You know why I took it,

Yup. Because you couldn't pass 20wpm, so you waited on your chalky
butt till the FCC gave you a "gimme!"

4984. Re: The main problem with Ham radio...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-27 22:50:22 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031227175022.21697.00001025@mb-m23.aol.com>
Source record: 84559

>Yup. Because you couldn't pass 20wpm, so you waited on your chalky
>butt till the FCC gave you a "gimme!"
>

You know thats a LIE, I never wanted the Extra. But I guess I need to explain
to you again.
A Bunch of No-Code Knuckle Draggers bet me $250.00 I couldnt pass the TEST.
Well I not only passed with a score of 100%, with no study at all, I got to
collect $250.00 From the Knuckle Draggers.
As I remember you still are not able to pass it.

4985. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-28 01:21:44 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <xnfcneeyarg.hqkqexc.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>
Source record: 84560

On Fri, 26 Dec 2003 22:44:52 GMT, Bill Sohl wrote:

>I agree with Jim on the "Sputnick fever" reaction. My Earth Science
>teached just about went off his rocker when Sputnick went up.

You should have seen what went on inside my then-employer,
Ramo-Wooldridge, the system managers for the USAF ICBM program.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

4986. Re: The main problem with Ham radio...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-28 02:38:20 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3FEE4204.1050103@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 84561

Steve Silverwood wrote:

>In article <bs6vfs0fsh@enews1.newsguy.com>, Jrad@aol.com says...
>
>
>>...is simply this:
>>
>>Know code = Know ham
>>No code = No ham
>>
>>The eternal truth, proven every day.
>>
>>
>
>I have a feeling that this issue about the code will never be resolved,
>at least not while the "old guard" of CW loyalists are still around.
>I've been a ham since I got my Novice ticket in 1986 -- before the
>Novice Enhancement started -- so I did my 5wpm test back then.
>Unfortunately, I've not had the need to use it much. At one point, I
>felt as you do, that Morse skills were necessary in order to be
>qualified to operate HF. However, technology has pretty much removed
>Morse skills from the list of skills needed to operate properly in the
>Amateur Service.
>
>I do intend to refresh my Morse skills and operate more using that mode,
>especially since I am doing more operating while camping and traveling,
>plus operating at QRP power levels from home and on the road. That's a
>matter of personal choice, though. I also plan to get onto PSK31, RTTY
>and even SSTV and ATV as opportunities present themselves. But as
>things stand now, the ability to operate CW is no longer a necessity.
>It's still a valid mode, CW sub-bands should still be set aside for
>operating in that mode, and it's still a skill that should be cultivated
>among the Amateur ranks, but it has outlived its usefulness as a
>requirement and should be eliminated as such.
>
>Morse skills were once considered to be a "filter" by which those
>operators who were going to screw around on the air would be eliminated
>-- the theory was that if someone was a goof-off, (s)he would be
>deterred from getting a ham license by having to study for the Morse
>exam. As I've stated elsewhere, that theory has been disproven by the
>antics of licensed Amateur operators in places like 14.313 MHz, the
>"Animal House" repeater in Los Angeles, and the jammers that disrupt
>communications during the Rose Parade, among others. A lot of these
>bozos hold amateur licenses, Tech Plus and up, so they have taken the

>Morse exam and still are irritants. So much for the "filter" theory....
>
>And no, I don't consider a no-code Tech to be any less of a ham than a
>Novice or a Tech Plus or anyone else. Everyone with an interest in
>amateur radio should be able to participate without having to
>demonstrate knowledge of a mode that they will probably never use.
>
>It was suggested in a reply to a related thread on another newsgroup
>that the whole exam structure should be tossed as well, if Morse is
>eliminated. Not true, nor do I even consider suggesting it. If we as
>amateurs are going to be responsible for the emissions coming from our
>stations, we must be able to prove that we know what we are doing, we
>understand our responsibilities under Part 97, and that we have the
>necessary skills to recognize and correct problems as they arise, or to
>prevent them from happening at all.
>
>So yes, passing the written exams are a valid entry requirement. In
>fact, they should probably be even more of a test of our knowledge and
>skills than they are at present. I'd go along with an increase in the
>number of questions in the exams, especially in the areas of what is
>permitted and prohibited in the operation of our stations. For one
>thing, it gives the FCC additional ammunition in prosecution of
>operators who violate the regulations -- Mr. Hollingsworth can point to
>the exam taken by "Joe Ham, KA6XYZ" and say, "See, this person answered
>the questions correctly, demonstrating that he knew that such-and-such
>was illegal, then went ahead and did it anyway."
>
Do they keep the completed exams beyond a few months? The VEs? Or the FCC?
Anyway, it would be possible to get most of the rules and regs questions
wrong and
still pass the exam. My father got his advanced back in 72 down at the
FCC field
office in NYC. The examiner told him he passed, but to reread the rules
and regs
before he goes on the air. He got most of those questions wrong. Point
is, that you
could have a rule or reg misunderstood, and still pass to get the
license. Most rules
that do get violated often and the FCC goes after are ones people should
know
better. Who would think that jamming a repeater is legal and proper?

>
>
>

4987. Re: The main problem with Ham radio...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-28 04:32:01 UTC
From: Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com>
Message-ID: <20031227233201.308$dC@newsreader.com>
Source record: 84562

wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) wrote:
> >Yup. Because you couldn't pass 20wpm, so you waited on your chalky
> >butt till the FCC gave you a "gimme!"
> >
>
> You know thats a LIE, I never wanted the Extra. But I guess I need to
> explain to you again.
> A Bunch of No-Code Knuckle Draggers bet me $250.00 I couldnt pass the
> TEST. Well I not only passed with a score of 100%, with no study at all,
> I got to collect $250.00 From the Knuckle Draggers.
> As I remember you still are not able to pass it.
>
You swallow. Nuff said.

--
Frank Gilliland is a dipshit!

4988. Re: The main problem with Ham radio...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-28 04:36:13 UTC
From: Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com>
Message-ID: <20031227233613.571$3o@newsreader.com>
Source record: 84563
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

Steveo <moparholic@hotmail-nospam-.com> wrote:
> wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) wrote:
> > >Yup. Because you couldn't pass 20wpm, so you waited on your chalky
> > >butt till the FCC gave you a "gimme!"
> > >
> >
> > You know thats a LIE, I never wanted the Extra. But I guess I need to
> > explain to you again.
> > A Bunch of No-Code Knuckle Draggers bet me $250.00 I couldnt pass the
> > TEST. Well I not only passed with a score of 100%, with no study at
> > all, I got to collect $250.00 From the Knuckle Draggers.
> > As I remember you still are not able to pass it.
> >
> You swallow. Nuff said.
>
Well whenever someone say's nuff said, it usually not e-nuff.

Check out my sig file, you rotten bastard. hehe

--
Frank Gilliland is a dipshit!

4989. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-28 07:32:08 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031228023208.21547.00000836@mb-m23.aol.com>
Source record: 84564

>Subject: Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL
>From: "Kï¿½HB" groupk0hb@earthlink.net
>Date: 12/26/03 8:00 AM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <paXGb.7284$lo3.4193@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>

>"Steve Robeson K4CAP" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote
>
>> those who want something for nothing
>
>Ah, yes, when they can't make a reasoned argument they trot out the old
>"something for nothing" mantra.

Ah, yes...the "if they can't argue the argument, make fun of it" mantra.

>Sorry, but that just doesn't stand up in the light of day, Steve.

Sure it does, Hans. The present system was set up in such a way as to encourage licensees to pursue a program of self study.

The alternatives I have seen here lately suggest that potential new licensees are either idiots for whom we must dilute the test to it's least common denominator, or that we must hang a seriously big carrot out in front to get them to get involved. THAT doesn't stand up in the light of day, Hans.

The current licensing strucure has already PROVEN that the tests are reasonable (when the material is sequestered) and that it provides for a structured occupancy of the bands.

There was no "ghettos" from Incentive Licensing, Hans. Yes, there were hundreds of disenfranchised Amateurs who were, in fact, cheated out of something they had already been using. That was indeed unfair to say the very least.

As for "free upgrades", the FCC already unleased THAT genie with thier last round of "restructuring" with no help at all from the ARRL.

73

Steve, K4YZ

4990. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-28 07:59:49 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031228025949.04179.00002059@mb-m29.aol.com>
Source record: 84565

>Subject: Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL
>From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
>Date: 12/26/03 3:01 PM Central Standard Time
>Message-id: <f45722ac.0312261301.4066fb17@posting.google.com>

>How many amateur radio services do we really need? How many do you
>really want?

One radio service with a TIERED license structure, Brain.

Obviously you do not concur with the FCC's "Basis and Purpose" of the
Amateur Radio Service, espeically those that establish the service as one of
"self-training".

A "single license" concept does not support that premise, Brain. A tiered
one does.

Was that too difficult for you?

Steve, K4YZ

4991. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-28 10:25:03 UTC
From: no_spam_here34474@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <5a5fcb7b.0312280225.77ff125a@posting.google.com>
Source record: 84566
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.cb

> Check your local newstand or magazine rack in stores, many carry QST.
> > > You can purchase it without membership, or check you local library, they
> > > may carry it and you can read it for free.
> > >
> >
> >
> >
>
> Popular Communications (Never met a radio they didn't like)
> CQ
> QST
> Monitoring Times
>
> These should be easily found at any decent newstand. Don't you have any
> bookstores there??
>
> Borders?
> BDalton?
>
> BDK

Better check your local book seller your self. Barnes & Noble and
Books a Million around here and no QST.
NO QST anywhere.
CQ always did suck.
Pop Comm--ditto--SUCKS.
Monitoring Times is kinda OK.
73 & Ham Radio are gone.
Guess Mother Earth News it is ;-(

4992. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-28 10:55:52 UTC
From: Gray Shockley <gray-87a@cybercoffee.org>
Message-ID: <0001HW.BC1412D8000BC8DF13FC5A20@news.giganews.com>
Source record: 84567
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.cb

On Sun, 28 Dec 2003 4:25:03 -0600, JEP wrote
(in message <5a5fcb7b.0312280225.77ff125a@posting.google.com>):

>> Check your local newstand or magazine rack in stores, many carry QST.
>>>> You can purchase it without membership, or check you local library, they
>>>> may carry it and you can read it for free.
>>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>
>> Popular Communications (Never met a radio they didn't like)
>> CQ
>> QST
>> Monitoring Times
>>
>> These should be easily found at any decent newstand. Don't you have any
>> bookstores there??
>>
>> Borders?
>> BDalton?
>>
>> BDK
>
> Better check your local book seller your self. Barnes & Noble and
> Books a Million around here and no QST.
> NO QST anywhere.
> CQ always did suck.
> Pop Comm--ditto--SUCKS.
> Monitoring Times is kinda OK.
> 73 & Ham Radio are gone.
> Guess Mother Earth News it is ;-(

If I were interested in ham radio, I'd have a ham radio license.

But I'm a SWL and so I could care less about QST, CQ, 73 and Ham Radio. It's "interesting" to see so many x-posts to r.r.s about ham radio.

About 45 years ago I used ta listen to hams and decided that I didn't want to be one nor continue listening to them. Most of my closest friends are hams but they've given up on "converting" me (even when I help them with tech "stuff").

The great majority of hams are nice people and they sure do justify more than their hobby when there's an emergency. But why they think that SWLer's are

interested in /their/ hobby still puzzles me.

There are times when there are mutual interests. When a ham goes feral and starts broadcasting as a pirate and a felon, this can connect both hobbies and such as that makes me not want to just automatically killfool all the ham newsgroups.

But look at this SUBJ: "Why you don't like the ARRL".

And - of the four newsgroups - two are for SWLers and CBers.

May I ask for as little more care when deciding to what many newsgroups one posts to?

Thanks,

Gray Shockley

DX-392 DX-398
RX-320 DX-399
CCradio w/RS Loop
Torus Tuner (3-13 MHz)
Select-A-Tenna

Vicksburg, MS US

4993. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-28 12:38:10 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <S8AHb.3698$d4.2373@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 84568
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.cb

"Gray Shockley" wrote:
>
> And - of the four newsgroups - two are
> for SWLers and CBers.
>
> May I ask for as little more care when
> deciding to what many newsgroups one
> posts to?

Sadly, we don't always have much control over where messages are cross-posted, Gray. Since some Hams are CB'ers and others SWL's, the discussion itself may have actually started in one of those non-ham newsgroups. In other cases, it is trolls (in any one of the newsgroups) trying to belittle Ham radio and it's operators (posted to a number of newsgroups in an effort to get the widest possible audience for that). In still other cases, the discussion started in a ham radio newsgroup, with other newsgroups added by participants who mainly frequent those other newsgroups. Whatever the case, you're certainly not alone - we get our share of messages relating to other topics posted in the Ham radio newsgroups as well.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

4994. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-28 13:18:03 UTC
From: Dave Head <rally2xs@att.net>
Message-ID: <s3ltuv0i8mmbqv1uoptiu0sgsrjobidcen@4ax.com>
Source record: 84569

On Sat, 27 Dec 2003 00:36:08 GMT, Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote:

> And what a short-lived phenom that was! Now at the university level at
>least, the Techies and Engineers to a large extent are not from the US,
>while our kids are busy getting MBA's and becoming lawyers!
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -

Ya' go where the money is! Engineering is great, but the law, and management is greater if you're talking from a money angle.

Engineers are workers. They should probably have a division in the UAW, 'cuz sure as you're born, if you're a worker (employee), you're going to get abused.

Those doing the abusing are the guys with the MBAs.

There are no longer enough jobs to be had to simply leave if you get abused, you mostly have to take it. If you do leave, chances are you'll just get abused by different people.

Lawyers hang out a shingle and charge what the traffic will bear. They don't have someone else setting their pay rates, nor screwing around with their health insurance, making them sign away their rights to anything they might be able to think up and patent, etc.

Look at what's happened to programmers. Their livelihood has been destroyed both by importation of cheap labor (H1B visas) and export of the work entirely to places like India, Russia, etc. If you move the needle on the idiot meter at all, you may just get into programming school. Then you can figure significantly in the unemplyoment statistics, or the "working poor" statistics.

You mostly can't export what an MBA does, nor can cheap foreign labor be imported to do it. Ditto for the law practicioners.

So, no need to wonder why the kids aren't falling all over themselves to get in line to be abused.

I think the kids today are smarter than we were...

Dave Head

4995. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-28 15:14:50 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <KrCHb.22203$Pg1.19051@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 84570

"Steve Robeson K4CAP" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote

>
> Ah, yes...the "if they can't argue the argument, make fun of it"
mantra.
>

>
> ..... it provides for a structured occupancy of the bands.
>

It's hard NOT to make fun of declarations such as the above!!!!!!

Stand At Ease, Gunny!

73, de Hans, K0HB

4996. Re: The main problem with Ham radio...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-28 16:13:33 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0312280813.1d50685a@posting.google.com>
Source record: 84571

wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) wrote in message
news:<20031227175022.21697.00001025@mb-m23.aol.com>...
> >Yup. Because you couldn't pass 20wpm, so you waited on your chalky
> >butt till the FCC gave you a "gimme!"
> >
>
> You know thats a LIE, I never wanted the Extra.

But here you are.

> But I guess I need to explain
> to you again.

Let's see if you can remember your own lies.

> A Bunch of No-Code Knuckle Draggers bet me $250.00 I couldnt pass the TEST.
> Well I not only passed with a score of 100%, with no study at all, I got to
> collect $250.00 From the Knuckle Draggers.
> As I remember you still are not able to pass it.

You appear to have forgotten something.

You did it in "less than 8 minutes."

And you lie.

4997. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-28 16:22:00 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0312280822.12317188@posting.google.com>
Source record: 84572

"Kï¿½HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<u32Hb.7535$lo3.2857@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>...
> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote
>
> >
> > And the alphabetic order of license told who was an OT and who was a
> newbie.
> > W3ABC was an OT compared to W3YIK. W3YIK was an OT compared to K3NYT.
> K3NYT was
> > an OT compared to WA3IYC. Etc. Usually, anyway.
> >
>
> Not necessarily. Since we all got a new call sign everytime we moved, we
> might trade an 'old' call in Minnesota (W0ABC) for a 'new' call in Virginia
> (WA4ABC). Not only couldn't you tell how long we'd been licensed, but you
> couldn't tell our license class (except for Novices with KN, WN, or WV
> prefixes).

Hans, that was the old pecking order stuff. I foresee a new ARS where
if you want to know how long an amateur has been licensed, you simply
ask him. And if you want to know the amateur's achievements, you
don't look at how short his call sign is, you look on the air, the
www, and to the journals and see who is doing what. No Merit Badge
system required, but I guess we could move toward hash marks on the
sleeves if need be.

My mentor, W0VDI, was licensed at a Tech in 1952 and went SK 50
> years later with the same call and the same Tech license.

Absolutely no shame in that, though some would think so.

Wonder if he put up with 50 years of "encouragement" to "upgrade?"

> > If everything was so nice, why was FCC so unhappy with the way things were
> > going?
>
> It wasn't the FCC who was unhappy. The unhappy folks were a few resentful
> and vocal OT's who felt disenfranchised because a nubby new guy could
> operate phone on 20M, not having first passed the old class A exam like he
> had to. The march to disincentive licensing moved to the beat of drum being
> banged up in West Hartford, CT. I know it's hard for you to accept that,
> given that history is written by the victors.
>
> 73, de Hans, K0HB

One ARS, One license (class).

4998. Re: The main problem with Ham radio...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-28 17:12:11 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bsn3gh$hu8@library2.airnews.net>
Source record: 84575

"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20031227175022.21697.00001025@mb-m23.aol.com...
> >Yup. Because you couldn't pass 20wpm, so you waited on your chalky
> >butt till the FCC gave you a "gimme!"
> >
>
> You know thats a LIE, I never wanted the Extra. But I guess I need to
explain
> to you again.
> A Bunch of No-Code Knuckle Draggers bet me $250.00 I couldnt pass the
TEST.
> Well I not only passed with a score of 100%, with no study at all, I got
to
> collect $250.00 From the Knuckle Draggers.
> As I remember you still are not able to pass it.
>

Waddles *is* still around. It's a wonder there's anyone left getting his posts, eh? He keeps ragging on folks for not wanting to upgrade to Extra. Well, as I recall, Waddles never planned on the Extra until his (legendary for sure) bet was presented. He had a price, you don't. You've decided (so far) not to go for Extra and you've stood by your decision--unlike Waddles who can't keep to a decision.

And, ain't it a hoot that he's out from the lower ranks and sittin' right up there with the ranks of other Extras whom you and I know are rather questionable in nature, motivation, and even personality? LOL

Kim W5TIT

4999. Re: The main problem with Ham radio...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-28 17:17:20 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031228121720.15599.00001908@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 84573

>You appear to have forgotten something.
>
>You did it in "less than 8 minutes.

No I didnt forget the 8 Minutes, I was just wanting to see if you could keep up.

>And you lie.

NEVER

5000. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-28 17:21:26 UTC
From: BDK <kingratboyoboy@buckeye-express.com>
Message-ID: <MPG.1a58db1e7b6c49db989855@news.buckeye-express.com>
Source record: 84574
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.cb

In article <5a5fcb7b.0312280225.77ff125a@posting.google.com>,
no_spam_here34474@yahoo.com says...
> > Check your local newstand or magazine rack in stores, many carry QST.
> > > > > You can purchase it without membership, or check you local library, they
> > > > > may carry it and you can read it for free.
> > > > >
> > > >
> > > >
> > > >
> > >
> > Popular Communications (Never met a radio they didn't like)
> > CQ
> > QST
> > Monitoring Times
> >
> > These should be easily found at any decent newstand. Don't you have any
> > bookstores there??
> >
> > Borders?
> > BDalton?
> >
> > BDK
>
> Better check your local book seller your self. Barnes & Noble and
> Books a Million around here and no QST.
> NO QST anywhere.
> CQ always did suck.
> Pop Comm--ditto--SUCKS.
> Monitoring Times is kinda OK.
> 73 & Ham Radio are gone.
> Guess Mother Earth News it is ;-(
>

Where are you anyway?? You can get MT on line. CQ and POPComm did always
suck. 73, at least Wayne's editorial, was pretty weird. You can get QST
all over the place around the Toledo/Detroit area. All the bookstores
have it, a couple of drugstores have it, and I think at least one of the
Meijer's has it too.

BDK

5001. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-28 17:28:40 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bsn3si$v8r@library2.airnews.net>
Source record: 84576

"Steve Robeson K4CAP" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20031228023208.21547.00000836@mb-m23.aol.com...
> >Subject: Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL
> >From: "K&#65533;HB" groupk0hb@earthlink.net
> >Date: 12/26/03 8:00 AM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <paXGb.7284$lo3.4193@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>
>
> >"Steve Robeson K4CAP" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote
> >
> >> those who want something for nothing
> >
> >Ah, yes, when they can't make a reasoned argument they trot out the old
> >"something for nothing" mantra.
>
> Ah, yes...the "if they can't argue the argument, make fun of it"
mantra.
>
> >Sorry, but that just doesn't stand up in the light of day, Steve.
>
> Sure it does, Hans. The present system was set up in such a way as
to
> encourage licensees to pursue a program of self study.
>
> The alternatives I have seen here lately suggest that potential new
> licensees are either idiots for whom we must dilute the test to it's least
> common denominator, or that we must hang a seriously big carrot out in
front to
> get them to get involved. THAT doesn't stand up in the light of day,
Hans.
>
> The current licensing strucure has already PROVEN that the tests are
> reasonable (when the material is sequestered) and that it provides for a
> structured occupancy of the bands.
>
> There was no "ghettos" from Incentive Licensing, Hans. Yes, there
were
> hundreds of disenfranchised Amateurs who were, in fact, cheated out of
> something they had already been using. That was indeed unfair to say the
very
> least.
>
> As for "free upgrades", the FCC already unleased THAT genie with
thier

> last round of "restructuring" with no help at all from the ARRL.
>
> 73
>
> Steve, K4YZ
>

Know what would solve a *lot* of discontent with the current licensing system(?)--at least from the perspective of those who think the current system lends itself to "dumbed" down hams; which is absurd by the way, there a loads of dumbed down long-licensed hams.

Keep the written exam, nix all CW or alternative mode testing, and increase the license fee to at least that of the GMRS fee of $75.00 (not sure for how long that $75.00 is good for).

Kim W5TIT

5002. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-28 17:30:17 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bsn3vk$qh@library2.airnews.net>
Source record: 84577

"Steve Robeson K4CAP" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20031228025949.04179.00002059@mb-m29.aol.com...
> >Subject: Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL
> >From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
> >Date: 12/26/03 3:01 PM Central Standard Time
> >Message-id: <f45722ac.0312261301.4066fb17@posting.google.com>
>
> >How many amateur radio services do we really need? How many do you
> >really want?
>
> One radio service with a TIERED license structure, Brain.
>
> Obviously you do not concur with the FCC's "Basis and Purpose" of
the
> Amateur Radio Service, espeically those that establish the service as one
of
> "self-training".
>
> A "single license" concept does not support that premise, Brain. A
tiered
> one does.
>
> Was that too difficult for you?
>
> Steve, K4YZ
>
>

Speaking of which, the FCC needs to update the whole section on ham radio R&R. ESPECIALLY the Basis and Purpose. That portion is so far removed from the spirit and letter of reasons why people are in ham radio these days, and that's a pity of course--but a reality nevertheless.

Kim W5TIT

5003. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-28 17:33:55 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <LIucnZCH3tGliXKiUSdV9g@ptd.net>
Source record: 84578

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:OesGb.5538$Vv2.2283406@news1.news.adelphia.net...
> Yes you did miss it, IMO! What other Morse code pro/con advocacy groups
> are there? NCI is the one standing around when the change happened, it
> happened their way, and now all we hear is some people's personal
> beliefs when they should be at least putting together a plan for the
> aftermath of the ARS, post Element one. The two I have seen I'm not
> overwhelmed with.
>
> So I will be yapping about what I percieve to be a *grave* error in
> omission.
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -
>

Mike,

Why the (at least implied) premise that there will be an "aftermath" when Morse testing finally, completely goes away?

What sort of doom and gloom scenario are you envisioning?

How is this any different than the dire predictions of the end of ham radio when spark gave way to CW, AM to SSB, etc.???

All of these predictions have failed to come to pass ...

There IS no "vacuum" to be filled, or anything necessary to "replace," Morse testing when it goes ... it's simply unecessary, so it logically follows that it is not necessary to "find something to replace it."

73,
Carl - wk3c

5004. Re: The main problem with Ham radio...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-28 18:03:44 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031228130344.29482.00001180@mb-m02.aol.com>
Source record: 84579

TIT your just Mad that you cant upgrade. By the way is that Fork Lift still working

5005. Re: Why You Don't Like Warmed Over Incentive Licensing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-28 18:56:57 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031228135657.07346.00002296@mb-m26.aol.com>
Source record: 84580

In article <f45722ac.0312280800.3c3a5dcc@posting.google.com>,
brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:

>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>news:<20031228025949.04179.00002059@mb-m29.aol.com>...
>> >Subject: Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL
>> >From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
>> >Date: 12/26/03 3:01 PM Central Standard Time
>> >Message-id: <f45722ac.0312261301.4066fb17@posting.google.com>
>>
>> >How many amateur radio services do we really need? How many do you
>> >really want?
>>
>> One radio service with a TIERED license structure, Brain.
>
>It is a "TIRED" radio structure.

Not at all!

It's a "tried and true" license structure.

When "incentive licensing" was re-established in 1968, there were about 250,000
US hams. Today there are about 680,000.

>If you want Merit Badges, join the
>BSA (or CAP).

License class is not a merit badge.

>There is no need to have class distinctions between
>hams artificially created by the FCC.

License class is not about class distinctions. It's about qualification for
privileges. In order to have full privileges, the knowledge to pass the Extra
is required. Same for the other classes. More knowledge, more privileges.

This doesn't mean an Extra knows everyhting there is to know about amateur
radio because they passed the tests. It just means that said Extra has
demonstrated the *minimum* knowledge required for full privileges.

>Allow the ham to distinguish
>himself or herself, based upon actual achievements.

Such as?
>
>> Obviously you do not concur with the FCC's "Basis and Purpose" of the
>> Amateur Radio Service, espeically those that establish the service as one
>> of "self-training".

>
>I do.

Then why didn't you train yourself on practical antennas for HF?

>-Espeically- "self-training." Obviously you believe that once
>you obtain the "Amateur Extra" license that all learning must stop.
>There is nothing more to be learned!

Nope, not at all. All it means to have passed the Extra is that said Extra has demonstrated the *minimum* knowledge required for full privileges.

>You couldn't be more wrong. Again.
>
>> A "single license" concept does not support that premise, Brain.
>
>It does. Unless you believe that once you obtain Amateur Extra that
>all learning stops because ther is nothing new to be learned.

See above.
>
>> A tiered one does.
>
>No more than a one license ARS.

Depends on the license.
>
>> Was that too difficult for you?
>
>Trying hard to keep your position at the top of the hill is sooo
>transparent.
>
>Allow the ham to show the world his real achievements, not some
>government supported and forced Merit Badge system of false
>achievements.
>
Such as what? Number of antennas not erected? Number of details forgotten about an alleged DX operation?

You want one class of license, fine. Here's how to do it:

First, put aside the code test issue and concentrate on the writtens.

Second, close off the Tech and General to new issues.

Third, combine the existing Tech, General and Extra question pools into one large question pool. Eliminate any questions that are specific to the Tech or General license classes because they won't be issued new any more.

Fourth, a single new 120 question written exam would be generated from the combined question pool. All new hams would have to pass this test to become hams. All would get "Amateur Class" licenses with all privileges.

Fifth, all existing hams would have their license terms automatically extended to 10 years beyond the date on which the new rules took effect. No renewals.

Sixth, all existing hams would have to retest using the new "Amateur Class" test within the next 10 years or leave the air.

At the end of 10 years we'd all have the same license class and all have passed the same test to get it.

Why not?

5006. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-28 19:17:21 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <5%FHb.7117$Vv2.3329382@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 84581

Dave Head wrote:
> On Sat, 27 Dec 2003 00:36:08 GMT, Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote:
>
>
>> And what a short-lived phenom that was! Now at the university level at
>>least, the Techies and Engineers to a large extent are not from the US,
>>while our kids are busy getting MBA's and becoming lawyers!
>>
>> - Mike KB3EIA -
>
>
> Ya' go where the money is! Engineering is great, but the law, and management
> is greater if you're talking from a money angle.
>
> Engineers are workers. They should probably have a division in the UAW, 'cuz
> sure as you're born, if you're a worker (employee), you're going to get abused.
>
> Those doing the abusing are the guys with the MBAs.
>
> There are no longer enough jobs to be had to simply leave if you get abused,
> you mostly have to take it. If you do leave, chances are you'll just get
> abused by different people.
>
> Lawyers hang out a shingle and charge what the traffic will bear. They don't
> have someone else setting their pay rates, nor screwing around with their
> health insurance, making them sign away their rights to anything they might be
> able to think up and patent, etc.
>
> Look at what's happened to programmers. Their livelihood has been destroyed
> both by importation of cheap labor (H1B visas) and export of the work entirely
> to places like India, Russia, etc. If you move the needle on the idiot meter
> at all, you may just get into programming school. Then you can figure
> significantly in the unemplyoment statistics, or the "working poor" statistics.
>
> You mostly can't export what an MBA does, nor can cheap foreign labor be
> imported to do it. Ditto for the law practicioners.
>
> So, no need to wonder why the kids aren't falling all over themselves to get in
> line to be abused.
>
> I think the kids today are smarter than we were...

I doubt it! Capitalism is a grand thing, but it destroys the people who
practice it if they don't have a guiding principle beyond pecuniary

accumulation.

Want to know what happens to us when we are all MBA's and lawyers and the rest of the world is doing all the manufacturing and the things too *low* for us? It isn't going to be pretty!

- Mike KB3EIA -

5007. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-28 21:34:56 UTC
From: Dave Head <rally2xs@att.net>
Message-ID: <sihuuv0alfjan6hgs42han7gprniiijm9p@4ax.com>
Source record: 84582

On Sun, 28 Dec 2003 19:17:21 GMT, Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote:

>Dave Head wrote:
>> On Sat, 27 Dec 2003 00:36:08 GMT, Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote:
>>
>>
>>> And what a short-lived phenom that was! Now at the university level at
>>>least, the Techies and Engineers to a large extent are not from the US,
>>>while our kids are busy getting MBA's and becoming lawyers!
>>>
>>> - Mike KB3EIA -
>>
>>
>> Ya' go where the money is! Engineering is great, but the law, and management
>> is greater if you're talking from a money angle.
>>
>> Engineers are workers. They should probably have a division in the UAW, 'cuz
>> sure as you're born, if you're a worker (employee), you're going to get abused.
>>
>> Those doing the abusing are the guys with the MBAs.
>>
>> There are no longer enough jobs to be had to simply leave if you get abused,
>> you mostly have to take it. If you do leave, chances are you'll just get
>> abused by different people.
>>
>> Lawyers hang out a shingle and charge what the traffic will bear. They don't
>> have someone else setting their pay rates, nor screwing around with their
>> health insurance, making them sign away their rights to anything they might be
>> able to think up and patent, etc.
>>
>> Look at what's happened to programmers. Their livelihood has been destroyed
>> both by importation of cheap labor (H1B visas) and export of the work entirely
>> to places like India, Russia, etc. If you move the needle on the idiot meter
>> at all, you may just get into programming school. Then you can figure
>> significantly in the unemplyoment statistics, or the "working poor" statistics.
>>
>> You mostly can't export what an MBA does, nor can cheap foreign labor be
>> imported to do it. Ditto for the law practicioners.
>>
>> So, no need to wonder why the kids aren't falling all over themselves to get in
>> line to be abused.
>>
>> I think the kids today are smarter than we were...
>

> I doubt it! Capitalism is a grand thing, but it destroys the people who
>practice it if they don't have a guiding principle beyond pecuniary
>accumulation.

With 30 million people in this country laboring at equal to or less than the $8.25 / hr wage that the government defines as poverty level, that would pretty much say that, "We have met the enemy, and he is us."
>
> Want to know what happens to us when we are all MBA's and lawyers and
>the rest of the world is doing all the manufacturing and the things too
>*low* for us? It isn't going to be pretty!

All we have to do is wait - we'll find out. Doesn't matter if its Democrats or Republicans, nobody's gonna do anything for workers any more. It has to do with the waning of union power, I think, and the mistake that "tech" people including engineers make that they don't need a union. If you're an employee, you need a union. Period. But the IT bunch won't join one, and look what happened to them.

Engineers are next.

Even people at the top of the pay scale - pro ball players, actors, etc - have unions. Why do techs think they're so indispensible as to not need one?

Dave Head
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -

5008. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-28 23:52:34 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <xnfcneeyarg.hqmg43l.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>
Source record: 84583

On Sun, 28 Dec 2003 11:28:40 -0600, Kim W5TIT wrote:

>Keep the written exam, nix all CW or alternative mode testing,

So far I agree with you, with the caveat that the content of the exams at each level be of significance.

>and increase the license fee to at least that of the GMRS fee of >$75.00 (not sure for how long that $75.00 is good for).

There's where we differ. At present there is no license fee paid to the U S Treasury via the FCC. The League worked very hard to make sure that the politicians didn't have such a route to our wallets and I feel strongly that it should remain that way. Unfortunately, we were not successful in keeping the so-called "vanity call sign" program fee-free - even the sobriquet "vanity" was imposed by The Congress. I would have liked it called something else, like "selected".

Note that the FCC doesn't get a nickel of license fees - they go directly into the Treasury's General Fund. The requirement for levying such fees is mandated by act of Congress and the FCC just jumps and asks "how high" on the way up.

The exam fee paid to the private-sector VE teams is something else, and can only be imposed on a reimbursement level.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

5009. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-28 23:52:34 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <xnfcneeyarg.hqmeyfk.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>
Source record: 84584

On Sun, 28 Dec 2003 13:18:03 GMT, Dave Head wrote:

>Engineers are workers. They should probably have a division in the
>UAW, 'cuz sure as you're born, if you're a worker (employee), you're
>going to get abused.

There have been engineer's unions for at least the last 50 years in
the aircradt industry. Having worked one year as an engineer for an
airplane company at the beginning of my career, I can see why. Real
professionals look down on unionizing.

>Those doing the abusing are the guys with the MBAs.

Read it not as ab-using, but as con-fusing.

>Lawyers hang out a shingle and charge what the traffic will bear.
>They don't have someone else setting their pay rates, nor screwing
>around with their health insurance, making them sign away their rights
>to anything they might be able to think up and patent, etc.

HAH! Talk to any associate at any decent-sized law firm and get an
education otherwise.

As for going solo - did it, been there, got the T-shirt, and I
wouldn't do it again. I love to do law - I hate to run a business.

>You mostly can't export what an MBA does,

Give it time, my man - they used to say the same thing about
engineers.

>nor can cheap foreign labor be imported to do it. Ditto for the law
>practicioners.

Wanna bet? The top two guys in my law school class were from India,
and that was many years ago. One is also an MBA and CPA and runs
his family's extensive business interests in the 'States, and the
other is one of the top immigration lawyers in California.

It's easy to make such generalities.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

Retired and loving every minute of it....
Work was getting in the way of my hobbies

5010. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-28 23:52:35 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <xnfcneeyarg.hqmghdm.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>
Source record: 84585

On Sun, 28 Dec 2003 11:30:17 -0600, Kim W5TIT wrote:

>Speaking of which, the FCC needs to update the whole section on ham radio
>R&R. ESPECIALLY the Basis and Purpose. That portion is so far removed from
>the spirit and letter of reasons why people are in ham radio these days, and
>that's a pity of course--but a reality nevertheless.

I have a brilliant solution for you, Kim.

Draft a document called a Petition for Rule Making and in it say:

I request that Part 97 of the FCC Rules and Regulations be amended
to read as follows:

and then write what YOU think the exact wording of each section that
you want changes should say. Add to that the reasons for each change
and your standing and qualfications for them to give serious
consideration to your request.

Send it to the Secretary of the Commission, original and 11 copies.

Then sit back and wait. I wish you luck.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

5011. Australian CBers better than US technicians

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-28 23:56:51 UTC
From: Anonymous Sender <anonymous@remailer.metacolo.com>
Message-ID: <334da724b329f79c0bd4923a1723a3ac@remailer.metacolo.com>
Source record: 84586

Australian novices on HF bands :

http://www.nocode.org/articles.html

and the US technicians are not allowed.

Now you understand lately why it was
necessary to remove totally CW in the
S.25-5 .

5012. Re: Why I Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-28 23:57:14 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031228185714.25815.00005516@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 84588

In article <3U4Hb.5941$Vv2.2814410@news1.news.adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo
<mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>
>> In article <DA0Fb.12502$0s2.6886@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>, "Kï¿½HB"
>> <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> writes:
>>
>>
>>>"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote
>>>
>>>
>>>>It's often helpful to have insight into the past and past systems to come
>>>>up with the future proposals.
>>>
>>>If you can persuade me that a transmitter comprised of 2 obsolete 1930's
>>>tubes cobbled together on a wooden chassis gives insights which lead to
>>>future breakthroughs in the radio art, then I'll owe you a lobster dinner
>at
>>>Dayton.
>>
>>
>> I doubt anyone could convince you, but...
>
>A person can learn a lot MORE from the older technology. It is a lot
>closer to the theory by virtue of simplicity.

Sometimes, anyway.
>
>What would do a better job of teaching a newbie about antenna matching,
>a simple L or T network tuner, or an LDG tuner?

Exactly!
>
>What would teach a newbie the technical ins and outs of transcievers, a
>rock mite or a FT1000MP-Mark V? Or to keep within the bet, that wooden
>chassis three tube thing.
>
The wooden chassis rig is just a transmitter. But the Rock Mite comparison is
dead-on.

>And the newbies of today may become the bloody edge pro's of tomorrow.

Everybody's gotta start somewhere. Insisting that old and simple technologies
have no place or are a "waste of time" ensures that a lot of folks won;t take
the first step.

>> The publication of actual homebrew equipment in today's ham mags may just
>> get some folks to actually start tinkering.

And that seems to really bother some folks...

>> The fact that a 21st century had
>> restored *and used* a ~50 year old homebrew rig says that it's not just
>> something hams used to do years and years ago.
>>
>> The technology isn't nearly so important as the mindset that homebrewing is
>> a viable alternative.
>>
>> And if the signal is up to modern requirements and the ham has fun, what's
>> the problem?
>
>Hear Hear! There is not thing one wrong with old technology, and the
>pursuit of that part of the hobby is every bit as valid as the latest
>gee whiz techno-marvel.

It's electro-politically incorrect, Mike.
>
> Too many people seem to think that a ham can only enjoy one facet of
>the hobby, it would seem. I like and use the latest technology, but I
>just love the old stuff too.

Like being able to enjoy both a modern pickup truck and a '62 Corvair...
>
>> Couple months back there was a homebrew 17 meter DSB transceiver article >>
in QST. Not exactly bleeding edge technology but it worked and the ham
>> learned things and had a ton of fun. So it ain't just vintage stuff in QST.
>
> I'm homebrewing a high power tuner right now that will double as a
>piece of art. Bleeding edge technology? Heck no! if other hams don't
>like it, thay can just ignore my CQ!!
>
This afternoon I worked NN3SI on 40 CW. He was running an Omni 6, I was using
the Southgate Type 7.

73 de Jim, N2EY

5013. Re: The main problem with Ham radio...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-28 23:57:15 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031228185715.25815.00005517@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 84587

In article <bsn3gh$hu8@library2.airnews.net>, "Kim" <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
writes:

>Waddles *is* still around.

Of course, Kim.

>It's a wonder there's anyone left getting his
>posts, eh?

Background noise, nothing more.

>He keeps ragging on folks for not wanting to upgrade to Extra.

And if they do, he still rags on them.

>Well, as I recall, Waddles never planned on the Extra until his (legendary
>for sure) bet was presented.

And the code requirement was reduced.

You don't really think anyone takes Bruce seriously, do ya? He and LHA are
philosophically the same person, with the same goals here. Just different
methods. Heck, they might even be the same person, period. Nobody with any
sense takes Len seriously, same as ULX.

>He had a price, you don't.

Everyone has a price, Kim. Often it's not money, though.

>You've decided (so
>far) not to go for Extra and you've stood by your decision--unlike Waddles
>who can't keep to a decision.

You mean like someone who says they're going for Extra "right out of the box"
but hasn't done so in 4 years?
>
>And, ain't it a hoot that he's out from the lower ranks and sittin' right up
>there with the ranks of other Extras whom you and I know are rather
>questionable in nature, motivation, and even personality? LOL

Who would they be?

73 de Jim, N2EY

5014. Re: The main problem with Ham radio...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-29 00:02:03 UTC
From: richcranus@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <c5ecbb69.0312281602.ec06e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 84589

Jrad@aol.com (Observer) wrote in message news:<bs6vfs0fsh@enews1.newsguy.com>...
> ...is simply this:
>
> Know code = Know ham
> No code = No ham
>
> The eternal truth, proven every day.

Bovine excrement.

Did you learn how to crank an engine to start your car before you took a driving test? Did you have to learn to run to the outhouse and use dried leaves (or corn cobs) before the days of indoor plumbing and toilet paper? Whether you did or didn't, it's irrelevant to the rest of us. Exactly the same as Morse code.

Nobody worth mentioning uses CW any more; the military dropped its' use years ago and their communications are necessary (unlike amateur radio). The Coast Guard doesn't even use it any more. So, given the facts, why should I have to learn it to please you?

TROLL!

5015. Re: The main problem with Ham radio...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-29 00:12:43 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0312281612.78568ebe@posting.google.com>
Source record: 84590

wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) wrote in message
news:<20031228121720.15599.00001908@mb-m03.aol.com>...
> >You appear to have forgotten something.
> >
> >You did it in "less than 8 minutes.
>
> No I didnt forget the 8 Minutes, I was just wanting to see if you could keep
> up.

I can keep up with your lies, no problem.

Every time I hear something proposterous out of you mouth, I chalk it
up as just another lie.

5016. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-29 00:29:13 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bsnt43$gek@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 84592

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:xnfcneeyarg.hqmghdm.pminews@netnews.comcast.net...
> On Sun, 28 Dec 2003 11:30:17 -0600, Kim W5TIT wrote:
>
> >Speaking of which, the FCC needs to update the whole section on ham radio
> >R&R. ESPECIALLY the Basis and Purpose. That portion is so far removed
from
> >the spirit and letter of reasons why people are in ham radio these days,
and
> >that's a pity of course--but a reality nevertheless.
>
> I have a brilliant solution for you, Kim.
>
> Draft a document called a Petition for Rule Making and in it say:
>
> I request that Part 97 of the FCC Rules and Regulations be amended
> to read as follows:
>
> and then write what YOU think the exact wording of each section that
> you want changes should say. Add to that the reasons for each change
> and your standing and qualfications for them to give serious
> consideration to your request.
>
> Send it to the Secretary of the Commission, original and 11 copies.
>
> Then sit back and wait. I wish you luck.
>
> --
> 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane
>
>

Oh, no, no, no. I didn't say I want to or would pick up the torch for
change. I've got other irons in the fire dealing with things much closer to
my heart than ham radio...

So, I assume you're of the opinion that even if someone petitioned, it would
not be worth the while?

Kim W5TIT

5017. Re: The main problem with Ham radio...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-29 00:40:54 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bsnt44$gek@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 84593

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20031228185715.25815.00005517@mb-m07.aol.com...
> In article <bsn3gh$hu8@library2.airnews.net>, "Kim" <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
> writes:
>
> >Waddles *is* still around.
>
> Of course, Kim.
>

Well, I've got my new computer all reset to keep the riff raff off my
machine...at least the riff raff from this newsgroup...heh heh.

> >
> >It's a wonder there's anyone left getting his
> >posts, eh?
>
> Background noise, nothing more.
>

Yep...and I like doing with background noise here the same I do on the air
with it: ignore it.

> >
> >He keeps ragging on folks for not wanting to upgrade to Extra.
>
> And if they do, he still rags on them.
>

That's true.

> >
> >Well, as I recall, Waddles never planned on the Extra until his
(legendary
> >for sure) bet was presented.
>
> *And* the code requirement was reduced.
>

ROFLMAO!!!! Oh r-r-r-r-r-e-a-l-l-y???!!! I had not realized that--man
that's hilarious!!

>
> You don't really think anyone takes Bruce seriously, do ya? He and LHA are
> philosophically the same person, with the same goals here. Just different
> methods. Heck, they might even be the same person, period. Nobody with any
> sense takes Len seriously, same as ULX.

>

I hadn't seen anyone take Waddles seriously before I started ignoring posts with his information in them...and doubt they would. There's no one here *that* dumbed down.

> >
> >He had a price, you don't.
>
> Everyone has a price, Kim. Often it's not money, though.
>

I'd like to believe I don't have one. But you're probably right. I don't have one, though, where ham radio is concerned--it's not that much of a passion for me. The way I feel about it's the way I feel about it.

> >
> >You've decided (so
> >far) not to go for Extra and you've stood by your decision--unlike Waddles
> >who can't keep to a decision.
>
> You mean like someone who says they're going for Extra "right out of the box"
> but hasn't done so in 4 years?
> >

Is that what Waddles did? Actually, I fault no one for saying something, then changing their mind. I do it all the time. I used to say I'd never be able to marry a Texan...and I did--and he's proved wrong everything I ever thought about it. :)

> >
> >And, ain't it a hoot that he's out from the lower ranks and sittin' right up
> >there with the ranks of other Extras whom you and I know are rather
> >questionable in nature, motivation, and even personality? LOL
>
> Who would they be?
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>

Oh, I think you're well aware!

Kim W5TIT

5018. Re: Australian CBers better than US technicians

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-29 00:42:24 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031228194224.03823.00001965@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 84591

>Now you understand lately why it was
>necessary to remove totally CW in the
>S.25-5 .

Yea we understand, its the only way the Knuckle Draggin CBplussers could get on HF.

5019. Re: The main problem with Ham radio...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-29 00:46:48 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031228194648.03823.00001968@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 84594

>I can keep up with your lies, no problem.

Its not a LIE, you know it isnt, your just MAD because you cant perform the same Task.
Everyone knows your waiting for another FREE HANDOUT by the FCC.

5020. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-29 01:14:22 UTC
From: Dave Head <rally2xs@att.net>
Message-ID: <4mtuuv4sjp8etqj1c03a8vvs9k84tqgoeu@4ax.com>
Source record: 84595

On Sun, 28 Dec 2003 23:52:34 GMT, "Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
wrote:

>On Sun, 28 Dec 2003 13:18:03 GMT, Dave Head wrote:
>
>>Engineers are workers. They should probably have a division in the
>>UAW, 'cuz sure as you're born, if you're a worker (employee), you're
>>going to get abused.
>
> There have been engineer's unions for at least the last 50 years in
> the aircradt industry. Having worked one year as an engineer for an
> airplane company at the beginning of my career, I can see why. Real
> professionals look down on unionizing.

Real professional actors, football players, baseball players, etc. don't seem
to look down on unionization.

My guess is that the airplane engineers get screwed less, and have more secure
jobs, save the periodic downturns in the aircraft industry itself.

>>Those doing the abusing are the guys with the MBAs.
>
> Read it not as ab-using, but as con-fusing.

>>Lawyers hang out a shingle and charge what the traffic will bear.
>>They don't have someone else setting their pay rates, nor screwing
>>around with their health insurance, making them sign away their rights
>>to anything they might be able to think up and patent, etc.
>
> HAH! Talk to any associate at any decent-sized law firm and get an
> education otherwise.

I bet, but then there's that "organization" thing. Work for an organization
(be an employee) and... you need a union.

> As for going solo - did it, been there, got the T-shirt, and I
> wouldn't do it again. I love to do law - I hate to run a business.

I'd hate it too, I think.

>>You mostly can't export what an MBA does,
>
> Give it time, my man - they used to say the same thing about
> engineers.

MBA's are performing a service where they have to be present. They're not
going to offshore the pizza delivery guy, either - he has to be here to do the

work, too. Of course, entire corporate headquarters have moved off-shore I guess, so apparently it is possible.

>>nor can cheap foreign labor be imported to do it. Ditto for the law
>>practicioners.
>
> Wanna bet? The top two guys in my law school class were from India,
> and that was many years ago. One is also an MBA and CPA and runs
> his family's extensive business interests in the 'States, and the
> other is one of the top immigration lawyers in California.

I suppose if they are educated here... sure. But growing up in India, Russia, Korea, and learning Indian, Russian, or Korean law won't do you any good in the USA. The problem with engineering and IT is that the laws of physics, and the principles of good software design and construction, are universal. What works in India, Russia, and Korea works here, and vice-versa.

> It's easy to make such generalities.

The generality that holds is: If you are an employee, you need a union. I think exceptions are pretty rare. Again, the number of people, 30 million, in poverty-level wage jobs (<= $8.25 / hr) pretty much says that this is right. All those people would likely do much better with a union.

I'm a government engineer. I work for the Navy. Don't need a union, right? Wrong! In the 1980's, the OPM illegally capped the across the board raises of engineers on the advanced engineering pay scale. Who should step up to the plate but the Treasury Employee's Union, and sued the socks off the government for 2 decades. Finally won the case last year. Last week I got a check as partial payment for compensation for that misdeed - $1090.95. Unions don't have to strike to get results, even if the results come later. Maybe the OPM will realize eventually that even tho they're the government, they're not omnipotent, and have to play by the rules, like everyone else. Anyway, I'm better off because of a union.

Without a resurgence of union power, I think this country is headed for a third-world model society, where there are the very rich, and the very poor, and nobody in between. The people slinging code and designing/building bridges won't be on the "very rich" side, either. They'll be the ones that are willing to work for $8.00 / hr, side-by-side with the Indians, Mexicans, Russians, etc. that will be quite happy with that amount. Its a matter of how far in the future that is... I guess about 50 years. What's your guess?

Dave Head

5021. Re: Why You Don't Like Warmed Over Incentive Licensing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-29 02:10:37 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <x2MHb.19370$P%1.17943663@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 84596

"Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
news:f45722ac.0312281608.349c8c77@posting.google.com...
> [major snip] I'll support it, perhaps with Han's caveat
> of a non-renewable learner's permit, limited by power and scope, but
> not mode.

Supporting a "learner's permit" license contradicts the concept of not having class distinctions as discussed in the earlier part the post. Once you have more than one license class for any reason, you have a class distinction, which according to your posts is undesirable.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

5022. Re: The main problem with Ham radio...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-29 03:04:43 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0312281904.70a9830d@posting.google.com>
Source record: 84597

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20031228185715.25815.00005517@mb-m07.aol.com>...

> You mean like someone who says they're going for Extra "right out of the box"
> but hasn't done so in 4 years?

So what class are you working toward since you got Extra?

5023. Re: Why You Don't Like Warmed Over Incentive Licensing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-29 03:49:04 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031228224904.02537.00002244@mb-m23.aol.com>
Source record: 84598

In article <f45722ac.0312281608.349c8c77@posting.google.com>,
brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:

>n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
>news:<20031228135657.07346.00002296@mb-m26.aol.com>...
>> In article <f45722ac.0312280800.3c3a5dcc@posting.google.com>,
>> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
>>
>> >k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>> >news:<20031228025949.04179.00002059@mb-m29.aol.com>...
>> >> >Subject: Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL
>> >> >From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
>> >> >Date: 12/26/03 3:01 PM Central Standard Time
>> >> >Message-id: <f45722ac.0312261301.4066fb17@posting.google.com>
>> >>
>> >> >How many amateur radio services do we really need? How many do you
>> >> >really want?
>> >>
>> >> One radio service with a TIERED license structure, Brain.
>> >
>> >It is a "TIRED" radio structure.
>>
>> Not at all!
>>
>> It's a "tried and true" license structure.
>>
>> When "incentive licensing" was re-established in 1968, there were about
>250,000
>> US hams. Today there are about 680,000.
>
>But CW testing was implemented to limit the number of amateurs, not
>grow the number.

Where did you get that idea?

Morse code testing was implemented for a number of reasons, but limiting the number of hams wasn't one of them. And in 1968, when the requirements for full amateur privileges were increased in both the written and code tests, the number of hams began to grow again after at least 5 years of stagnation at the quarter-million mark.

>> >If you want Merit Badges, join the
>> >BSA (or CAP).
>>
>> License class is not a merit badge.

>
>Not even when you puff out your chest and declare, "I'm a 20wpm
>Extra!"

When have I done that?

Besides, 20 wpm isn't that fast. I can do at least 35 wpm.
>
>> >There is no need to have class distinctions between
>> >hams artificially created by the FCC.
>>
>> License class is not about class distinctions.
>
>Are you positively sure abaout that?

Yep.
>
>> It's about qualification for
>> privileges. In order to have full privileges, the knowledge to pass the
>> Extra
>> is required. Same for the other classes. More knowledge, more privileges.
>
>Is that like when the General licence holder had all priveleges?

1953 to 1968. Then FCC decided that it wasn't enough.
>
>And when the Tech (General written w/o 13wpm Code) had VHF only.
>
>> This doesn't mean an Extra knows everyhting there is to know about amateur
>> radio because they passed the tests. It just means that said Extra has
>> demonstrated the *minimum* knowledge required for full privileges.
>
>Then tell Steve about self-training.

He knows. You don't.

>Even in the scheme of incentive
>licensing, the lowest and the highest licensed individuals still have
>a lot to learn.

Of course! No one with any sense denies that. The license is just the
beginning.
>
>> >Allow the ham to distinguish
>> >himself or herself, based upon actual achievements.
>>
>> Such as?
>
>Cop McDonald - SSTV.

45+ years ago. I've read the original articles. That work is so old that 11
meters was a ham band.
>

>> >> Obviously you do not concur with the FCC's "Basis and Purpose" of
>the
>> >> Amateur Radio Service, espeically those that establish the service as
>one
>> >> of "self-training".
>> >
>> >I do.
>>
>> Then why didn't you train yourself on practical antennas for HF?
>
>Oh, I have.

I don't think so.

>What I haven't done is train myself on EVERY practical
>antenna for HF, especially those antennas applicable to low visual
>impact in a restricted neighborhood, and cannot (or rather shouldn't
>be placed against) a house sheathed in aluminum siding. So I looked
>outside my personal breadth of knowledge for something new, and ran
>into you and Brian Kelly. What a pair.

You wanted to be spoon-fed antenna theory and practice instead of
self-training. I pointed you to several websites. It's clear you didn't even
look.
>
>Some would call that self-training, seeking information and knowledge
>outside ones own experience.

Then why didn't you find the information on your own? It became clear to me
that you hadn't even tried googling. You wanted others to do the work for you,
then you'd insult those who tried to help you out.
>
>> >-Espeically- "self-training." Obviously you believe that once
>> >you obtain the "Amateur Extra" license that all learning must stop.
>> >There is nothing more to be learned!
>>
>> Nope, not at all. All it means to have passed the Extra is that said Extra
>> has
>> demonstrated the *minimum* knowledge required for full privileges.
>
>You and Steve have a lot in common - being wrong.

How is that statement wrong? FCC set the standard. Pass the test, get the
license.
>
>For Steve's assertion to be true, there would have to be a license
>class above Amateur Extra, and when a person achieved that, to fufill
>Steve's vision "self-training" there would have to be another level
>above that. And so on.

Nonsense.
>

>I.E., a merit badge system.

More nonsense.
>
>> >You couldn't be more wrong. Again.
>> >
>> >> A "single license" concept does not support that premise, Brain.
>> >
>> >It does. Unless you believe that once you obtain Amateur Extra that
>> >all learning stops because ther is nothing new to be learned.
>>
>> See above.
>
>See below your see above.
>
>> >> A tiered one does.
>> >
>> >No more than a one license ARS.
>>
>> Depends on the license.
>
>Amateur License.

Call it that.
>
>> >> Was that too difficult for you?
>> >
>> >Trying hard to keep your position at the top of the hill is sooo
>> >transparent.
>> >
>> >Allow the ham to show the world his real achievements, not some
>> >government supported and forced Merit Badge system of false
>> >achievements.
>> >
>> Such as what? Number of antennas not erected? Number of details forgotten
>> about an alleged DX operation?
>
>Again you try to make this personal.

You've personally refused to answer any questions on some alleged DX
operations.

>I've built HF and VHF antennas,
>some from a box, some from a reel of wire and bamboo poles. And I've
>operated on HF from Nebraska, ROK, Guam, Illinois, Somalia, Florida,
>and Ohio, in that order.

Who is puffing out his chest now?

But you can't seem to tell us anything about the /T5 operation.
>
>Just don't be so jealous.

I'm not.

>Besides, I don't see your name behind "Invented SSTV."

Nor yours besides "invented anything".
>
>So, what mode, what l/o circuit, or even soldering technique has your
>name on it?

A few articles in the amateur press. Several homebrew rigs. And some other
things...

>How many JOTA stations have you hosted?

None. How many have you hosted?
>
>How many intro-license classes have you hosted?

A few. Code and theory. Plus upgrade study groups. Plus online help to many
amateurs.

How many have you taught?

>How many VE sessions have you hosted?

A few.

How many have you done?
>
>Certainly you've done something other than DX and belittle you fellow
>hams.

I'm not a DXer.

Where have I belittled any other hams?

>Not all hams will distinguish themselves - you certainly haven't. So
>let them just be hams, like 99% of all the other Extra class
>licensees.

And like you?
>
>> You want one class of license, fine. Here's how to do it:
>>
>> First, put aside the code test issue and concentrate on the writtens.

>> Second, close off the Tech and General to new issues.
>
>What? No learners permit?

Nope. You said you want one class of license, no class distinctions, no merit
badges. A learner's permit would mean a two-tiered structure.

You said one license. That means one class of license - no learner's permit.

Or were you lying about wanting one class of license?
>

>> Third, combine the existing Tech, General and Extra question pools into one
>> large question pool. Eliminate any questions that are specific to the Tech
>> or General license classes because they won't be issued new any more.
>
>Such as operating priveleges?

Exactly. If there's to be one license class, it would have to be for all
operating priviliges, so there's no need to test on where the old
subbands-by-license-class used to be. But that's about all that would be
removed.
>
>> Fourth, a single new 120 question written exam would be generated from the
>> combined question pool. All new hams would have to pass this test to become
>> hams. All would get "Amateur Class" licenses with all privileges.
>
>Just leave out "Class" and call it "Amateur License."

Whatever.
>
>> Fifth, all existing hams would have their license terms automatically
>> extended
>> to 10 years beyond the date on which the new rules took effect. No
>> renewals.
>>
>> Sixth, all existing hams would have to retest using the new "Amateur Class"
>> test within the next 10 years or leave the air.
>
>You could even ask to have the pools FOUO, and/or increase the size to
>12,000 questions. Just make the subject matter relavent.

What subject matter in the combined question pool that was just described is
not relevant?
>
>> At the end of 10 years we'd all have the same license class and all have
>> passed the same test to get it.
>>
>> Why not?
>
>Why not, Indeed?

Two reasons:

1) All newcomers would have to pass a written test about equivalent to the
Extra just to get on the air.

2) Existing hams would have to retest at that level or leave the air.

How many US hams do you think would be left in 10 years under such a system?

>Deal.
>
>You run it up the flag

No. It's your idea.

You want it, you do the work. Self-training, remember? Learn how to write and submit a proposal to the FCC and get an RM number assigned. Then see what the amateur community thinks of your ideas in their comments.

I don't want such a system - I just described what would logically be the structure of such a system. I did it to point out exactly what such a system would require, and some of the foreseeable consequences.

>and I'll support it, perhaps with Han's caveat
>of a non-renewable learner's permit, limited by power and scope, but
>not mode.

No. You said one class of license. That means no learner's permits, no easy-to-get licenses, just one class of license. Unless you support "dumbing down", such a license would have to require roughly the equivalent written test knowledge as an Extra. Some regulations questions could be eliminated but that's all.

Or were you lying about wanting one class of license?

5024. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-29 04:12:59 UTC
From: Alun <alun@1stcounsel.com>
Message-ID: <Xns945FEC2798205elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 84599

Dave Head <rally2xs@att.net> wrote in
news:s3ltuv0i8mmbqv1uoptiu0sgsrjobidcen@4ax.com:

> On Sat, 27 Dec 2003 00:36:08 GMT, Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
> wrote:
>
>> And what a short-lived phenom that was! Now at the university
>> level at
>>least, the Techies and Engineers to a large extent are not from the US,
>>while our kids are busy getting MBA's and becoming lawyers!
>>
>> - Mike KB3EIA -
>
> Ya' go where the money is! Engineering is great, but the law, and
> management is greater if you're talking from a money angle.
>
> Engineers are workers. They should probably have a division in the
> UAW, 'cuz sure as you're born, if you're a worker (employee), you're
> going to get abused.
>
> Those doing the abusing are the guys with the MBAs.
>
> There are no longer enough jobs to be had to simply leave if you get
> abused, you mostly have to take it. If you do leave, chances are
> you'll just get abused by different people.
>
> Lawyers hang out a shingle and charge what the traffic will bear. They
> don't have someone else setting their pay rates, nor screwing around
> with their health insurance, making them sign away their rights to
> anything they might be able to think up and patent, etc.
>
> Look at what's happened to programmers. Their livelihood has been
> destroyed both by importation of cheap labor (H1B visas) and export of
> the work entirely to places like India, Russia, etc. If you move the
> needle on the idiot meter at all, you may just get into programming
> school. Then you can figure significantly in the unemplyoment
> statistics, or the "working poor" statistics.
>
> You mostly can't export what an MBA does, nor can cheap foreign labor
> be imported to do it. Ditto for the law practicioners.
>
> So, no need to wonder why the kids aren't falling all over themselves
> to get in line to be abused.
>

> I think the kids today are smarter than we were...
>
> Dave Head
>

Bingo!

5025. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-29 04:21:15 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <%YNHb.7908$Vv2.3454998@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 84600

Alun wrote:
> Dave Head <rally2xs@att.net> wrote in
> news:s3ltuv0i8mmbqv1uoptiu0sgsrjobidcen@4ax.com:
>
>
>>On Sat, 27 Dec 2003 00:36:08 GMT, Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
>>wrote:
>>
>>
>>> And what a short-lived phenom that was! Now at the university
>>> level at
>>>least, the Techies and Engineers to a large extent are not from the US,
>>>while our kids are busy getting MBA's and becoming lawyers!
>>>
>>> - Mike KB3EIA -
>>
>>Ya' go where the money is! Engineering is great, but the law, and
>>management is greater if you're talking from a money angle.
>>
>>Engineers are workers. They should probably have a division in the
>>UAW, 'cuz sure as you're born, if you're a worker (employee), you're
>>going to get abused.
>>
>>Those doing the abusing are the guys with the MBAs.
>>
>>There are no longer enough jobs to be had to simply leave if you get
>>abused, you mostly have to take it. If you do leave, chances are
>>you'll just get abused by different people.
>>
>>Lawyers hang out a shingle and charge what the traffic will bear. They
>>don't have someone else setting their pay rates, nor screwing around
>>with their health insurance, making them sign away their rights to
>>anything they might be able to think up and patent, etc.
>>
>>Look at what's happened to programmers. Their livelihood has been
>>destroyed both by importation of cheap labor (H1B visas) and export of
>>the work entirely to places like India, Russia, etc. If you move the
>>needle on the idiot meter at all, you may just get into programming
>>school. Then you can figure significantly in the unemplyoment
>>statistics, or the "working poor" statistics.
>>
>>You mostly can't export what an MBA does, nor can cheap foreign labor
>>be imported to do it. Ditto for the law practicioners.
>>

>>So, no need to wonder why the kids aren't falling all over themselves
>>to get in line to be abused.
>>
>>I think the kids today are smarter than we were...
>>
>>Dave Head
>>
>
>
> Bingo!

So let me get this right..... the secret to happiness is to become an
MBA or a lawyer, even if you would rather be a technophile?

I've had a screwed up outlook all these years!!!!

- Mike KB3EIA -

5026. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-29 04:26:22 UTC
From: Alun <alun@1stcounsel.com>
Message-ID: <Xns945FEE6C477D9elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 84601

Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in
news:5%FHb.7117$Vv2.3329382@news1.news.adelphia.net:

> Dave Head wrote:
>> On Sat, 27 Dec 2003 00:36:08 GMT, Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
>> wrote:
>>
>>
>>> And what a short-lived phenom that was! Now at the university
>>> level at
>>>least, the Techies and Engineers to a large extent are not from the
>>>US, while our kids are busy getting MBA's and becoming lawyers!
>>>
>>> - Mike KB3EIA -
>>
>>
>> Ya' go where the money is! Engineering is great, but the law, and
>> management is greater if you're talking from a money angle.
>>
>> Engineers are workers. They should probably have a division in the
>> UAW, 'cuz sure as you're born, if you're a worker (employee), you're
>> going to get abused.
>>
>> Those doing the abusing are the guys with the MBAs.
>>
>> There are no longer enough jobs to be had to simply leave if you get
>> abused, you mostly have to take it. If you do leave, chances are
>> you'll just get abused by different people.
>>
>> Lawyers hang out a shingle and charge what the traffic will bear.
>> They don't have someone else setting their pay rates, nor screwing
>> around with their health insurance, making them sign away their rights
>> to anything they might be able to think up and patent, etc.
>>
>> Look at what's happened to programmers. Their livelihood has been
>> destroyed both by importation of cheap labor (H1B visas) and export of
>> the work entirely to places like India, Russia, etc. If you move the
>> needle on the idiot meter at all, you may just get into programming
>> school. Then you can figure significantly in the unemplyoment
>> statistics, or the "working poor" statistics.
>>
>> You mostly can't export what an MBA does, nor can cheap foreign labor
>> be imported to do it. Ditto for the law practicioners.
>>

>> So, no need to wonder why the kids aren't falling all over themselves
>> to get in line to be abused.
>>
>> I think the kids today are smarter than we were...
>
> I doubt it! Capitalism is a grand thing, but it destroys the
> people who
> practice it if they don't have a guiding principle beyond pecuniary
> accumulation.
>
> Want to know what happens to us when we are all MBA's and lawyers
> and
> the rest of the world is doing all the manufacturing and the things too
> *low* for us? It isn't going to be pretty!
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -
>
>

Right again, but the trouble is that there is no longer any incentive to go for a productive career. You can't blame people for not lining up to be exploited, even if the end result is likely to be destruction of the soceity as a whole. What we have now is a management culture in which having a low number of overworked employees is considered to be desirable.

5027. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-29 04:36:31 UTC
From: Alun <alun@1stcounsel.com>
Message-ID: <Xns945FF024C7648elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 84602

Dave Head <rally2xs@att.net> wrote in
news:4mtuuv4sjp8etqj1c03a8vvs9k84tqgoeu@4ax.com:

> On Sun, 28 Dec 2003 23:52:34 GMT, "Phil Kane"
> <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote:
>
>>On Sun, 28 Dec 2003 13:18:03 GMT, Dave Head wrote:
>>
>>>Engineers are workers. They should probably have a division in the
>>>UAW, 'cuz sure as you're born, if you're a worker (employee), you're
>>>going to get abused.
>>
>> There have been engineer's unions for at least the last 50 years in
>> the aircradt industry. Having worked one year as an engineer for an
>> airplane company at the beginning of my career, I can see why. Real
>> professionals look down on unionizing.
>
> Real professional actors, football players, baseball players, etc.
> don't seem to look down on unionization.
>
> My guess is that the airplane engineers get screwed less, and have more
> secure jobs, save the periodic downturns in the aircraft industry
> itself.
>
>>>Those doing the abusing are the guys with the MBAs.
>>
>> Read it not as ab-using, but as con-fusing.
>
>>>Lawyers hang out a shingle and charge what the traffic will bear.
>>>They don't have someone else setting their pay rates, nor screwing
>>>around with their health insurance, making them sign away their rights
>>>to anything they might be able to think up and patent, etc.
>>
>> HAH! Talk to any associate at any decent-sized law firm and get an
>> education otherwise.
>
> I bet, but then there's that "organization" thing. Work for an
> organization (be an employee) and... you need a union.
>
>> As for going solo - did it, been there, got the T-shirt, and I
>> wouldn't do it again. I love to do law - I hate to run a business.
>
> I'd hate it too, I think.
>

>>>You mostly can't export what an MBA does,
>>
>> Give it time, my man - they used to say the same thing about
>> engineers.
>
> MBA's are performing a service where they have to be present. They're
> not going to offshore the pizza delivery guy, either - he has to be
> here to do the work, too. Of course, entire corporate headquarters
> have moved off-shore I guess, so apparently it is possible.
>
>>>nor can cheap foreign labor be imported to do it. Ditto for the law
>>>practicioners.
>>
>> Wanna bet? The top two guys in my law school class were from India,
>> and that was many years ago. One is also an MBA and CPA and runs
>> his family's extensive business interests in the 'States, and the
>> other is one of the top immigration lawyers in California.
>
> I suppose if they are educated here... sure. But growing up in India,
> Russia, Korea, and learning Indian, Russian, or Korean law won't do you
> any good in the USA. The problem with engineering and IT is that the
> laws of physics, and the principles of good software design and
> construction, are universal. What works in India, Russia, and Korea
> works here, and vice-versa.
>
>> It's easy to make such generalities.
>
> The generality that holds is: If you are an employee, you need a union.
> I think exceptions are pretty rare. Again, the number of people, 30
> million, in poverty-level wage jobs (<= $8.25 / hr) pretty much says
> that this is right. All those people would likely do much better with a
> union.
>
> I'm a government engineer. I work for the Navy. Don't need a union,
> right? Wrong! In the 1980's, the OPM illegally capped the across the
> board raises of engineers on the advanced engineering pay scale. Who
> should step up to the plate but the Treasury Employee's Union, and sued
> the socks off the government for 2 decades. Finally won the case last
> year. Last week I got a check as partial payment for compensation for
> that misdeed - $1090.95. Unions don't have to strike to get results,
> even if the results come later. Maybe the OPM will realize eventually
> that even tho they're the government, they're not omnipotent, and have
> to play by the rules, like everyone else. Anyway, I'm better off
> because of a union.
>
> Without a resurgence of union power, I think this country is headed for
> a third-world model society, where there are the very rich, and the
> very poor, and nobody in between. The people slinging code and
> designing/building bridges won't be on the "very rich" side, either.
> They'll be the ones that are willing to work for $8.00 / hr,

> side-by-side with the Indians, Mexicans, Russians, etc. that will be
> quite happy with that amount. Its a matter of how far in the future
> that is... I guess about 50 years. What's your guess?
>
> Dave Head
>

Actually, you know India is a common law country, so Indian law would be very similar to US law, and Indian lawyers all speak English too. Being licenced to practice is quite another thing altogether, but I could see paying someone in Delhi to draw up a contract, etc. Of course the case law would be different, but they can access Lexis/Nexis and WestLaw from there too, so legal research is no problem.

5028. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-29 04:56:55 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031228235655.02537.00002249@mb-m23.aol.com>
Source record: 84603

In article <sihuuv0alfjan6hgs42han7gprniiijm9p@4ax.com>, Dave Head
<rally2xs@att.net> writes:

> It has to do
>with the waning of union power, I think, and the mistake that "tech" people
>including engineers make that they don't need a union. If you're an
>employee,
>you need a union. Period. But the IT bunch won't join one, and look what
>happened to them.

Dave,

I partly agree with you. A lot of the problem is waning union power.

But that doesn't mean everyone needs to be unionized. The mere existence of strong unions benefits nonunion workers, too, because often employers with nonunion shops will treat their workers better in order to stave off unionization.

But as the percentage of labor that is unionized decreases, that effect diminishes also.

73 de Jim, N2EY

5029. Re: Why You Don't Like Warmed Over Incentive Licensing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-29 05:22:21 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <Y5OdnWRBkpckI3KiRVn-tw@gbronline.com>
Source record: 84604

Brian wrote:

>
> But CW testing was implemented to limit the number of amateurs, not
> grow the number. How much higher do you think it would have grown to
> if ...
>

Huh? CW testing was implemented because when the Amateur Radio service began with the Radio Act of 1912, CW was *the* main mode of communication. The CW test was 5wpm, same as it is now. How did you ever come up with the idiotic idea it was implemented to limit the number of amateurs?

5030. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-29 10:11:35 UTC
From: Dave Head <rally2xs@att.net>
Message-ID: <bevvuvslqf6q9m0a6nhdi4gl0mobmgf2tg@4ax.com>
Source record: 84605

On 29 Dec 2003 04:36:31 GMT, Alun <alun@1stcounsel.com> wrote:

>Dave Head <rally2xs@att.net> wrote in
>news:4mtuuv4sjp8etqj1c03a8vvs9k84tqgoeu@4ax.com:
>
>> On Sun, 28 Dec 2003 23:52:34 GMT, "Phil Kane"
>> <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote:
>>
>>>On Sun, 28 Dec 2003 13:18:03 GMT, Dave Head wrote:
>>>
>>>>Engineers are workers. They should probably have a division in the
>>>>UAW, 'cuz sure as you're born, if you're a worker (employee), you're
>>>>going to get abused.
>>>
>>> There have been engineer's unions for at least the last 50 years in
>>> the aircradt industry. Having worked one year as an engineer for an
>>> airplane company at the beginning of my career, I can see why. Real
>>> professionals look down on unionizing.
>>
>> Real professional actors, football players, baseball players, etc.
>> don't seem to look down on unionization.
>>
>> My guess is that the airplane engineers get screwed less, and have more
>> secure jobs, save the periodic downturns in the aircraft industry
>> itself.
>>
>>>>Those doing the abusing are the guys with the MBAs.
>>>
>>> Read it not as ab-using, but as con-fusing.
>>
>>>>Lawyers hang out a shingle and charge what the traffic will bear.
>>>>They don't have someone else setting their pay rates, nor screwing
>>>>around with their health insurance, making them sign away their rights
>>>>to anything they might be able to think up and patent, etc.
>>>
>>> HAH! Talk to any associate at any decent-sized law firm and get an
>>> education otherwise.
>>
>> I bet, but then there's that "organization" thing. Work for an
>> organization (be an employee) and... you need a union.
>>
>>> As for going solo - did it, been there, got the T-shirt, and I
>>> wouldn't do it again. I love to do law - I hate to run a business.
>>

>> I'd hate it too, I think.
>>
>>>>You mostly can't export what an MBA does,
>>>
>>> Give it time, my man - they used to say the same thing about
>>> engineers.
>>
>> MBA's are performing a service where they have to be present. They're
>> not going to offshore the pizza delivery guy, either - he has to be
>> here to do the work, too. Of course, entire corporate headquarters
>> have moved off-shore I guess, so apparently it is possible.
>>
>>>>nor can cheap foreign labor be imported to do it. Ditto for the law
>>>>practicioners.
>>>
>>> Wanna bet? The top two guys in my law school class were from India,
>>> and that was many years ago. One is also an MBA and CPA and runs
>>> his family's extensive business interests in the 'States, and the
>>> other is one of the top immigration lawyers in California.
>>
>> I suppose if they are educated here... sure. But growing up in India,
>> Russia, Korea, and learning Indian, Russian, or Korean law won't do you
>> any good in the USA. The problem with engineering and IT is that the
>> laws of physics, and the principles of good software design and
>> construction, are universal. What works in India, Russia, and Korea
>> works here, and vice-versa.
>>
>>> It's easy to make such generalities.
>>
>> The generality that holds is: If you are an employee, you need a union.
>> I think exceptions are pretty rare. Again, the number of people, 30
>> million, in poverty-level wage jobs (<= $8.25 / hr) pretty much says
>> that this is right. All those people would likely do much better with a
>> union.
>>
>> I'm a government engineer. I work for the Navy. Don't need a union,
>> right? Wrong! In the 1980's, the OPM illegally capped the across the
>> board raises of engineers on the advanced engineering pay scale. Who
>> should step up to the plate but the Treasury Employee's Union, and sued
>> the socks off the government for 2 decades. Finally won the case last
>> year. Last week I got a check as partial payment for compensation for
>> that misdeed - $1090.95. Unions don't have to strike to get results,
>> even if the results come later. Maybe the OPM will realize eventually
>> that even tho they're the government, they're not omnipotent, and have
>> to play by the rules, like everyone else. Anyway, I'm better off
>> because of a union.
>>
>> Without a resurgence of union power, I think this country is headed for
>> a third-world model society, where there are the very rich, and the
>> very poor, and nobody in between. The people slinging code and

>> designing/building bridges won't be on the "very rich" side, either.
>> They'll be the ones that are willing to work for $8.00 / hr,
>> side-by-side with the Indians, Mexicans, Russians, etc. that will be
>> quite happy with that amount. Its a matter of how far in the future
>> that is... I guess about 50 years. What's your guess?
>>
>> Dave Head
>>
>
>Actually, you know India is a common law country, so Indian law would be
>very similar to US law, and Indian lawyers all speak English too. Being
>licenced to practice is quite another thing altogether, but I could see
>paying someone in Delhi to draw up a contract, etc. Of course the case law
>would be different, but they can access Lexis/Nexis and WestLaw from there
>too, so legal research is no problem.

Really depressing idea there, Alun. Maybe the pizza delivery guy _is_ the only one that is safe...

Dave Head

5031. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-29 10:18:24 UTC
From: Dave Head <rally2xs@att.net>
Message-ID: <hhvvuv4taeib9stihhkfo7te6asdgjifhe@4ax.com>
Source record: 84606

On Mon, 29 Dec 2003 04:21:15 GMT, Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote:

>Alun wrote:
>> Dave Head <rally2xs@att.net> wrote in
>> news:s3ltuv0i8mmbqv1uoptiu0sgsrjobidcen@4ax.com:
>>
>>
>>>On Sat, 27 Dec 2003 00:36:08 GMT, Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
>>>wrote:
>>>
>>>
>>>> And what a short-lived phenom that was! Now at the university
>>>> level at
>>>>least, the Techies and Engineers to a large extent are not from the US,
>>>>while our kids are busy getting MBA's and becoming lawyers!
>>>>
>>>> - Mike KB3EIA -
>>>
>>>Ya' go where the money is! Engineering is great, but the law, and
>>>management is greater if you're talking from a money angle.
>>>
>>>Engineers are workers. They should probably have a division in the
>>>UAW, 'cuz sure as you're born, if you're a worker (employee), you're
>>>going to get abused.
>>>
>>>Those doing the abusing are the guys with the MBAs.
>>>
>>>There are no longer enough jobs to be had to simply leave if you get
>>>abused, you mostly have to take it. If you do leave, chances are
>>>you'll just get abused by different people.
>>>
>>>Lawyers hang out a shingle and charge what the traffic will bear. They
>>>don't have someone else setting their pay rates, nor screwing around
>>>with their health insurance, making them sign away their rights to
>>>anything they might be able to think up and patent, etc.
>>>
>>>Look at what's happened to programmers. Their livelihood has been
>>>destroyed both by importation of cheap labor (H1B visas) and export of
>>>the work entirely to places like India, Russia, etc. If you move the
>>>needle on the idiot meter at all, you may just get into programming
>>>school. Then you can figure significantly in the unemplyoment
>>>statistics, or the "working poor" statistics.
>>>
>>>You mostly can't export what an MBA does, nor can cheap foreign labor

>>>be imported to do it. Ditto for the law practicioners.
>>>
>>>So, no need to wonder why the kids aren't falling all over themselves
>>>to get in line to be abused.
>>>
>>>I think the kids today are smarter than we were...
>>>
>>>Dave Head
>>>
>>
>>
>> Bingo!
>
> So let me get this right..... the secret to happiness is to become an
>MBA or a lawyer, even if you would rather be a technophile?

Can you think of another job you might like to do as well as tech, but the pay sucks? I can. I could maybe have been a photographer. But unless you're absolutely exceptional (I don't have _talent_... my pictures would have to be good via training & practice, and would then still not rival the truely greats) you're likely to starve a lot. So, I didn't get into photography for a living. Its a hobby.

> I've had a screwed up outlook all these years!!!!

I dunno - if you really think about it, was there maybe a point you passed up something equally or nearly as interesting as tech because the pay sucked?

One could do something lucrative for a living, and reserve tech to be a hobby, like ham radio.

Dave Head

> - Mike KB3EIA -

5032. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-29 10:29:45 UTC
From: Dave Head <rally2xs@att.net>
Message-ID: <d000vvoe3gtta7ehl34u0gcgufuru4122o@4ax.com>
Source record: 84607

On 29 Dec 2003 04:56:55 GMT, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:

>In article <sihuuv0alfjan6hgs42han7gprniiijm9p@4ax.com>, Dave Head
><rally2xs@att.net> writes:
>
>> It has to do
>>with the waning of union power, I think, and the mistake that "tech" people
>>including engineers make that they don't need a union. If you're an
>>employee,
>>you need a union. Period. But the IT bunch won't join one, and look what
>>happened to them.
>
>Dave,
>
>I partly agree with you. A lot of the problem is waning union power.

>But that doesn't mean everyone needs to be unionized. The mere existence of
>strong unions benefits nonunion workers, too, because often employers with
>nonunion shops will treat their workers better in order to stave off
>unionization.

Yes, there is that good effect.

>But as the percentage of labor that is unionized decreases, that effect
>diminishes also.

We're going to be a 3rd world country if workers don't wake up. Very rich.
Very poor. Nobody else.

Dave Head

>73 de Jim, N2EY
>

5033. Re: Why You Don't Like Warmed Over Incentive Licensing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-29 12:57:01 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <xwVHb.19440$P%1.18023883@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 84608

"Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
news:f45722ac.0312290336.fe6b971@posting.google.com...
> "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:<x2MHb.19370$P%1.17943663@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>...
> > "Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
> > news:f45722ac.0312281608.349c8c77@posting.google.com...
> > > [major snip] I'll support it, perhaps with Han's caveat
> > > of a non-renewable learner's permit, limited by power and scope, but
> > > not mode.
> >
> > Supporting a "learner's permit" license contradicts the concept of not
> > having class distinctions as discussed in the earlier part the post.
>
> Of course it doesn't.
>
> Once
> > you have more than one license class for any reason, you have a class
> > distinction, which according to your posts is undesirable.
>
> It's not a class. Its a learners permit - a temp.

Even though only temporary, it's still a separate class.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

5034. Re: Why You Don't Like Warmed Over Incentive Licensing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-29 14:35:42 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <VaCcnVCpmJJlpm2iUSdV9g@ptd.net>
Source record: 84609

"Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
news:f45722ac.0312290611.7025d8ff@posting.google.com...
> n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20031228224904.02537.00002244@mb-m23.aol.com>...
> >
> > Morse code testing was implemented for a number of reasons, but limiting
the
> > number of hams wasn't one of them. And in 1968, when the requirements
for full
> > amateur privileges were increased in both the written and code tests,
the
> > number of hams began to grow again after at least 5 years of stagnation
at the
> > quarter-million mark.
>
> A direct quote from the pages of QST was posted on here several years
> back. It was during the Aaron Jones Morse Myths demything era. I
> don't think Aaron posted it, though.

The Morse test speed for was increased to 13 wpm as a direct effort to limit the number of hams - and the moving force was the ARRL - it's documented in public records in the Library of Congress and was researched by a certified archivist.

See the article at http://www.nocode.org/articles.html - scroll way down to the bottom it's the 3rd article from the bottom.

73,
Carl - wk3c

5035. Re: Why You Don't Like Warmed Over Incentive Licensing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-29 15:02:30 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031229100230.14343.00001696@mb-m14.aol.com>
Source record: 84610

>It was tough answering a lot of the theory
>questions.

Im sure it was for you. Thats why you done have a chance at the EXTRA. You know nothing

>I've done nothing out of the ordinary.

We know thaT

>I don't deserve ridicule because of my license class,

oh but the EXTRA do.

>Learners permit is fatally temporary. Does NOT create an underclass
>of Amateurs.

Of course it does.

>Only the ones who really worked hard.

I thought you CBplussers and NCI have stated numerous times, WORK had nothing do with getting a License.

5036. Re: Why You Don't Like Warmed Over Incentive Licensing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-29 15:06:14 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031229100614.14343.00001697@mb-m14.aol.com>
Source record: 84611

> it's
>documented in public records in the Library of Congress and was researched
>by a certified archivist.

certified archivist. Probably Karl or FRED

5037. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-29 15:31:53 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <xnfcneeyarg.hqmrdar.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>
Source record: 84612

On Sun, 28 Dec 2003 18:29:13 -0600, Kim W5TIT wrote:

>So, I assume you're of the opinion that even if someone petitioned, it would
>not be worth the while?

Not in the least. I'm running over 75% of petitions granted, which
is a pretty good batting average.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

From a Clearing in the Silicon Forest
Beaverton (Washington County) Oregon

5038. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-29 15:31:53 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <xnfcneeyarg.hqmpl4q.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>
Source record: 84613

On Mon, 29 Dec 2003 01:14:22 GMT, Dave Head wrote:

>The problem with engineering and IT is that the laws of physics, and the
>principles of good software design and construction, are universal. What works
>in India, Russia, and Korea works here, and vice-versa.

Tell that to my wife who spent several years correcting and re-doing
the engineering designs of Russian-educated emigre engineers in the
US who across the board act as if electrical codes and Ohm's Law
are mere suggestions. She's now on the staff of the world's largest
environmental engineering consultant, and there's no union or need
for one. She would never have joined them if there was, and if one
comes in, she's gone.

>I'm a government engineer. I work for the Navy. Don't need a union, right?

I had 30 years as an engineer and law enforcement manager with The Uncle -
wannna' trade horror stories? Especially those where "the union"
stood by and did nothing?

>Wrong! In the 1980's, the OPM illegally capped the across the board raises of
>engineers on the advanced engineering pay scale. Who should step up to the
>plate but the Treasury Employee's Union, and sued the socks off the government
>for 2 decades. Finally won the case last year. Last week I got a check as
>partial payment for compensation for that misdeed - $1090.95.

My folks were represented by the NTEU and in fact a good friend was
the "field VP" of the local. He finally saw the light as to what
"the union" would do or not do and resigned. He's now retired, as
am I.

Navy engineer, huh? Remember the "demonstration project" at the
Naval Ocean Systems Center (San Diego) where all statutory
protections of employees were suspended and all pay raises capped?
Where was the union on that one? A close buddy was denied the step
raise that he would otherwise been entitled to by regulation. He
retired after 33 years as a specialized acoustic engineer with the
Navy. Guess who was the loser (Answer: not him...)

The union couldn't or wouldn't do a damn thing when the chairman of
the FCC decided to RIF several hundred engineers, technicians, and
non-technical enforcement agents because he didn't understand the
need for field enforcement. Two of the folks working for me,
excellent performers, got caught up in that mess, and they didn't
deserve it.

Ham radio, as well as all other radio services, are suffering the
results of that ill-informed decision almost 10 years later.

Enough of this ..this is not the place to argue this point.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

Retired and loving every minute of it....
Work was getting in the way of my hobbies

5039. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-29 16:47:20 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <sUYHb.24895$Pg1.12912@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 84614

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote

>
> So let me get this right..... the secret to happiness is to become an
> MBA or a lawyer, even if you would rather be a technophile?
>

I don't think the "secret to happiness" has anything to do with how you earn
your living.

73, de Hans, K0HB
--
For my "secrets to happiness", see http://tinyurl.com/22v9k lower left
corner of that page.

5040. Re: Why You Don't Like Warmed Over Incentive Licensing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-29 17:40:57 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <eb-dnWa7MadN-m2i4p2dnA@gbronline.com>
Source record: 84615

Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
> "Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
> news:f45722ac.0312290611.7025d8ff@posting.google.com...
>
>>n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
>
> news:<20031228224904.02537.00002244@mb-m23.aol.com>...
>
>>>Morse code testing was implemented for a number of reasons, but limiting
>
> the
>
>>>number of hams wasn't one of them. And in 1968, when the requirements
>
> for full
>
>>>amateur privileges were increased in both the written and code tests,
>
> the
>
>>>number of hams began to grow again after at least 5 years of stagnation
>
> at the
>
>>>quarter-million mark.
>>
>>A direct quote from the pages of QST was posted on here several years
>>back. It was during the Aaron Jones Morse Myths demything era. I
>>don't think Aaron posted it, though.
>
>
> The Morse test speed for was increased to 13 wpm as a direct effort to
> limit the number of hams - and the moving force was the ARRL - it's
> documented in public records in the Library of Congress and was researched
> by a certified archivist.

It may have been increased for that purpose, but it was not originally
implemented for that purpose.

5041. Re: Australian CBers better than US technicians

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-29 17:56:36 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <oVZHb.13900$IM3.10739@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 84616

"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20031228194224.03823.00001965@mb-m07.aol.com...
> >Now you understand lately why it was
> >necessary to remove totally CW in the
> >S.25-5 .
>
> Yea we understand, its the only way the Knuckle Draggin CBplussers could
get on
> HF.

At one time I was seriously considering immigrating to VK land. Glad I
didn't now. First off the take all the guns from its citizens and the crime
rate tripples. Now they put unqualified operators on HF.

What does a roger beep sound like down under?

Dan/W4NTI

5042. Re: Why You Don't Like Warmed Over Incentive Licensing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-29 18:13:36 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0312291013.3b20f72f@posting.google.com>
Source record: 84617

"Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
news:<VaCcnVCpmJJlpm2iUSdV9g@ptd.net>...
> "Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
> news:f45722ac.0312290611.7025d8ff@posting.google.com...
> > n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
> news:<20031228224904.02537.00002244@mb-m23.aol.com>...
> > >
> > > Morse code testing was implemented for a number of reasons, but limiting
> > > the number of hams wasn't one of them. And in 1968, when the requirements
> > > for full amateur privileges were increased in both the written and code
> > > tests, the number of hams began to grow again after at least 5 years of
> > > stagnation at the quarter-million mark.
> >
> > A direct quote from the pages of QST was posted on here several years
> > back.

It's also in "200 Meters And Down"

> > It was during the Aaron Jones Morse Myths demything era. I
> > don't think Aaron posted it, though.
>
> The Morse test speed for was increased to 13 wpm as a direct effort to
> limit the number of hams - and the moving force was the ARRL - it's
> documented in public records in the Library of Congress and was researched
> by a certified archivist.

The key word is "implemented" - not increased.

Here's "the rest of the story":

The year was 1936.

US amateur radio had grown faster than at any time before or since.
The number of US hams had almost tripled since 1929, despite the Great
Depression and highly restrictive new rules that went into effect in
1929.

There were serious problems with interference, poor signals,
out-of-band operation, and overcrowding of the bands, and rapid
turnover of new hams (approaching 40% per year).

The remedy was twofold: Both the written test and the code test were
revised. The written test was upgraded and the code test increased
from 10 wpm (where it had been since 1919)to 13 wpm.

ARRL asked for 12-1/2 wpm but FCC went for 13. There was also a big
redoing of the written tests, but somehow that fact is forgotten...

>
> See the article at http://www.nocode.org/articles.html - scroll way down to
> the bottom it's the 3rd article from the bottom.

That's why the code test of 67 years ago was increased by 3 wpm from
10 to 13 - but not why it was implemented in the first place.

Some folks wonder about the claim of overcrowding. In order to
appreciate what amateur radio was like back then, it's necessary to
understand what technologies and operating practices were in use by
average hams.

Consider this: The bands were crowded enough back then that as early
as 1931 some enterprising hams (W6DEI, Ray Moore, and others) built
and operated single-sideband transmitters and receivers.

73 de Jim, N2EY

5043. Elmering Opportunity New Years Eve

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-29 18:13:57 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <F9_Hb.24986$Pg1.11333@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 84618
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Elmering.

SKN is an elmering opportunity. If you know the code, and you want to see it continue as part of our ham radio culture, you have to pass it on. Nobody teaches CW any more. We used to have converts from the military, where CW ops were to learn code or face a courtmartial. They got to 20WPM in a couple of weeks but had a gun to their heads for 8 hours a day to do it. Learning CW is a one-on-one activity and each of us CW ops needs to feel an obligation to our elmers to pass it on. SKN is designed to do just that.

Get on the air. Encourage friends that have expressed interest in CW to get on the air and provide them a Q. That's what SKN is all about. Check out the old novice bands and try a CQ at 12 WPM or even slower. You don't HAVE to use a straight key. Many CW ops don't even own one. I didn't until last year when I tried my first ever SKN. So don't feel pressure to not operate because you don't have a straight key. Just tell whoever you talk to that you are using an electronic contrivance to facilitate the code sending. The ARRL has a competition for "the best fist heard." Don't even think about accepting that award either.

And let me tell you it isn't easy slowing down to 5 WPM and still be able to copy. And the rusty old key don't seem to work with the grace that used to fill the novice bands with music. It's much easier at 30WPM. It was baby steps that got you to where you are and it's baby steps that will get others there too.

Take a shot at the new "@" character. It's not easy for me to send for some reason. CA run together is not in this op's vocabulary. dah dit dah dit dit dah was a good choice for the character, but it's one trick this old dog is resisting for some reason.

Look for me in the old novice bands on 80M and 40M. Afterwords, represent to me that you worked 10 Qs and you will have some MWA Brasso to spiff up the old key. And turn in your soapbox at the ARRL. Tell us about your elmer too.

Ford-N0FP
ford@cmgate.com

5044. Win a J-38

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-29 18:14:41 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <la_Hb.24988$Pg1.21949@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 84619

Straight Key Night in Minnesota and Surrounding Areas

New Year's Eve is just around the corner. You could stay up and watch the "ball drop" in New York at 11PM local or get on the air with your old Radio Shack straight key and recapture some of the nostalgic magic of radio. It will be fun. And this year, you can participate in a the ARRL sponsored SKN and receive special recognition sponsored by the MWA.

Straight Key Night (SKN) is 24 hours. SKN 2004 begins at 6:00 p.m. CST December 31 and runs for 24 hours through 6:00 p.m. CST January 1 (0000 --2400 UTC January 1, 2004). Rules are found here...

http://www.arrl.org/contests/rules/2004/skn.html

The Minnesota Wireless Association (http://wb0tra.no-ip.org/mwa/) is a local contesting group whose official ARRL territory is a 175 mile radius circle centered on Sauk Centre, MN. If you fall within the MWA circle, and DON'T consider yourself a seasoned CW op, you could win a real J-38 straight key to replace that old Radio Shack special just by booking at least 10 QSOs.

Anyone in MWAland is eligible to participate in SKN. However, to be eligible to win the J-38, you cannot be a seasoned CW op. Anyone who has posted over 2,000 CW contest QSOs or handled more than 100 pieces of CW traffic is not eligible to participate in the grand prize J-38 special. But forget about the awards. Just get on and operate CW!

SKN is not a true "contest." Instead, it is designed to promote CW as a second language. There are lots of CW op wanna-bees in the area. There is no better time than right now to start the learning process, and receive some recognition for your effort.

Any participant within the MWA territory who completes 10 CW QSOs on SKN (24 hour period) will receive an MWA Certificate of Achievement and a personalized bottle of MWA SKN Brasso to help keep the old Brass Straight Key in fine shape. The J-38 award, mounted on a beautiful Hickory (Pecan) wooden base, will be presented based on representations and claims, rather than any sort of log checking. The J-38 award will be based on time spent operating, the number, and primarily the quality of QSOs (keep your notes about name, city, state, RST, age, years a ham, other discussions in the QSOs, etc., to complete the questionaire). A summary of those participating will be posted on the MWA reflector and on the club's web page in summary form only. The final award will be delivered to the meeting this fall, although you need not attend the annual meeting to win the J-38. A questionaire will be used to determine eligibility and final awards. Decisions of the judges (N0FP Chair) are final. All official

correspondence regarding the MWA SKN should be emailed to N0FP@arrl.net.

Ford-N0FP
ford@cmgate.com

5045. Re: Why You Don't Like Warmed Over Incentive Licensing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-29 18:30:30 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <ap_Hb.5411$d4.3753@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 84620

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20031228135657.07346.00002296@mb-m26.aol.com...
> In article <f45722ac.0312280800.3c3a5dcc@posting.google.com>,
> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
>
> >k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
> >news:<20031228025949.04179.00002059@mb-m29.aol.com>...
> >> >Subject: Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL
> >> >From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
> >> >Date: 12/26/03 3:01 PM Central Standard Time
> >> >Message-id: <f45722ac.0312261301.4066fb17@posting.google.com>
> >>
> >> >How many amateur radio services do we really need? How many do you
> >> >really want?
> >>
> >> One radio service with a TIERED license structure, Brain.
> >
> >It is a "TIRED" radio structure.
>
> Not at all!
>
> It's a "tried and true" license structure.
>
> When "incentive licensing" was re-established in 1968, there were about
250,000
> US hams. Today there are about 680,000.
>
> >If you want Merit Badges, join the
> >BSA (or CAP).
>
> License class is not a merit badge.
>
> >There is no need to have class distinctions between
> >hams artificially created by the FCC.
>
> License class is not about class distinctions. It's about qualification
for
> privileges. In order to have full privileges, the knowledge to pass the
Extra
> is required. Same for the other classes. More knowledge, more privileges.

But, as you and I have agred before, the privileges gained do NOT relate to
the additional knowledge needed for the higher license class.
What is the technical competency difference between an Extra

operating SSB with a TS440 in the 80m Extra voice segment vs a General
operating the same rig at say 3.885Mhz?

> This doesn't mean an Extra knows everyhting there is to know about amateur
> radio because they passed the tests. It just means that said Extra has
> demonstrated the *minimum* knowledge required for full privileges.

The problem, again one we agreed on before, is that granting
additional frequency spectrum doesn't rationally flow from the
additional knowledge required for the higher license class (e.g.
Extra vs General, General vs Tech.

> >Allow the ham to distinguish
> >himself or herself, based upon actual achievements.
>
> Such as?

Good question.

> >> Obviously you do not concur with the FCC's "Basis and Purpose" of the
> >> Amateur Radio Service, espeically those that establish the service as
one
> >> of "self-training".
> >
> >I do.
>
> Then why didn't you train yourself on practical antennas for HF?
>
> >-Espeically- "self-training." Obviously you believe that once
> >you obtain the "Amateur Extra" license that all learning must stop.
> >There is nothing more to be learned!
>
> Nope, not at all. All it means to have passed the Extra is that said
Extra has
> demonstrated the *minimum* knowledge required for full privileges.

True under the current scheme of licensing for the USA. It could
be changed and that is the point raised in this discussion. Should
it be changed and if so, how?

> >You couldn't be more wrong. Again.
> >
> >>A "single license" concept does not support that premise, Brain.
> >
> >It does. Unless you believe that once you obtain Amateur Extra that
> >all learning stops because ther is nothing new to be learned.
>
> See above.
> >
> >> A tiered one does.
> >
> >No more than a one license ARS.

>
> Depends on the license.
> >
> >> Was that too difficult for you?
> >
> >Trying hard to keep your position at the top of the hill is sooo
> >transparent.
> >
> >Allow the ham to show the world his real achievements, not some
> >government supported and forced Merit Badge system of false
> >achievements.
> >
> Such as what? Number of antennas not erected? Number of details forgotten
about
> an alleged DX operation?
>
> You want one class of license, fine. Here's how to do it:
>
> First, put aside the code test issue and concentrate on the writtens.
>
> Second, close off the Tech and General to new issues.
>
> Third, combine the existing Tech, General and Extra question pools into
one
> large question pool. Eliminate any questions that are specific to the Tech
or
> General license classes because they won't be issued new any more.
>
> Fourth, a single new 120 question written exam would be generated from the
> combined question pool. All new hams would have to pass this test to
become
> hams. All would get "Amateur Class" licenses with all privileges.
>
> Fifth, all existing hams would have their license terms automatically
extended
> to 10 years beyond the date on which the new rules took effect. No
renewals.

Never happen.

> Sixth, all existing hams would have to retest using the new "Amateur
Class"
> test within the next 10 years or leave the air.

Never happen. You want a way to kill ham radio, then that'd
do it in a heartbeat...a 10 year heartbeat at the longest.

> At the end of 10 years we'd all have the same license class and all have
passed
> the same test to get it.

At the end of 10 years we'd have no ham service of any consequence.
Retesting does NOT get any support at all. A handful of people
propose retesting (I oppose retesting)...but that is all. If 1968 incentive
licensing drove some folks away, you can bet the "all existing
hams would need to be retested" will certainly do it.

> Why not?

Please tell me any example of something you do in life that
requires anyone to be knowledge retested...other than
something in the medical field such as CPR recertification.

Cheers and happy new year.
Bill K2UNK

5046. Re: Why You Don't Like Warmed Over Incentive Licensing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-29 18:38:20 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <ww_Hb.5428$d4.959@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 84621

"JJ" <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
news:eb-dnWa7MadN-m2i4p2dnA@gbronline.com...
> Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
> > "Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
> > news:f45722ac.0312290611.7025d8ff@posting.google.com...
> >
> >>n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
> >
> > news:<20031228224904.02537.00002244@mb-m23.aol.com>...
> >
> >>>Morse code testing was implemented for a number of reasons, but
limiting
> >
> > the
> >
> >>>number of hams wasn't one of them. And in 1968, when the requirements
> >
> > for full
> >
> >>>amateur privileges were increased in both the written and code tests,
> >
> > the
> >
> >>>number of hams began to grow again after at least 5 years of stagnation
> >
> > at the
> >
> >>>quarter-million mark.
> >>
> >>A direct quote from the pages of QST was posted on here several years
> >>back. It was during the Aaron Jones Morse Myths demything era. I
> >>don't think Aaron posted it, though.
> >
> >
> > The Morse test speed for was increased to 13 wpm as a direct effort to
> > limit the number of hams - and the moving force was the ARRL - it's
> > documented in public records in the Library of Congress and was
researched
> > by a certified archivist.
>
> It may have been increased for that purpose, but it was not originally
> implemented for that purpose.

Fair statement.

The "original" morse requirement was to
enable non-amateur stations to dialog via morse with
amateur stations in case of interfereing operation.

The increase to 13wpm was, as the article states, intended
to raise the bar of entrance criteria to limit the number
of new hams.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

5047. Re: The main problem with Ham radio...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-29 18:49:56 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <oH_Hb.5438$d4.1240@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 84622

"Steve Silverwood" <kb6ojs@arrl.net> wrote in message
news:MPG.1a54eee2e7e7e4509896a5@news-server.socal.rr.com...
> In article <bs6vfs0fsh@enews1.newsguy.com>, Jrad@aol.com says...
> > ...is simply this:
> >
> > Know code = Know ham
> > No code = No ham
> >
> > The eternal truth, proven every day.
>
> I have a feeling that this issue about the code will never be resolved,
> at least not while the "old guard" of CW loyalists are still around.

The issue has been resolved internationally in July of
this year. There is NO code requirement necessary
anymore to stay compliant with international treaty
agreements.

Since July '03, a number of countries, including Great Britain,
Netherlands, Belgium and others have already ended
or announced an end date for morse testing in their
contry's requirments.

At some point the FCC will drop all code testing
also. The direction is clear, the path has been taken,
there's no turning back. The FCC provided every
opportunity to pro-code advocates to argue their
case and the pro-coders failed to convince the FCC
as to there being any need (other than the ITU treaty
at the time) for code testing at all.

The only thing at issue will be how soon?

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

5048. Re: K1MAN

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-29 20:16:57 UTC
From: VA7LNX <spamtrap@gwsn.com>
Message-ID: <ZY%Hb.865830$9l5.399870@pd7tw2no>
Source record: 84623

me wrote:

> Dear Santa,
> Could you bring the guys in this newsgroup a life for
> Christmas?
> ==
> "Santa Ham" <sh@sandahamnet.net> wrote in message
> news:bs8c89bgc0@pita.alt.net...
>> I love watching the way MAN gets all you old has been
>> ham radio ops stirred up to the point where you are
>> slobbering all over yourselves and your microphones!
>>
>> Santa Ham
>>
>>
>>
>> "Nobody You Know" <ycthulhu@aol.complex> wrote in message
>> news:20031220220011.09506.00001341@mb-m17.aol.com...
>> > Sometimes I listen to the ARUFON (UFO) Net on 3977.7, as I did tonight.
>> But lo
>> > and behold, guess who's planted his fat ass on 3973.0? K1MAN ! The UFO
> net
>> had
>> > already started and K1MAN just opens up 4 khz away without any regard
>> > to ongoing QSOs.
>> >
>> > Where the hell is the FCC? Why is K1MAN still on the air?
>> >
>> >
>> >
>> > --
>> > Nations are like leaves; they change color before they fall.
>> > --
>>
>>

Hey! I just got my Christmas present! a life! *:O)

--
Donovan Hill
VA7LNX (Basic, Advanced)

5049. Re: Australian CBers better than US technicians

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-29 20:20:53 UTC
From: VA7LNX <spamtrap@gwsn.com>
Message-ID: <F00Ib.856500$pl3.822356@pd7tw3no>
Source record: 84624

Dan/W4NTI wrote:

>
> "WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20031228194224.03823.00001965@mb-m07.aol.com...
>> >Now you understand lately why it was
>> >necessary to remove totally CW in the
>> >S.25-5 .
>>
>> Yea we understand, its the only way the Knuckle Draggin CBplussers could
> get on
>> HF.
>
> At one time I was seriously considering immigrating to VK land. Glad I
> didn't now. First off the take all the guns from its citizens and the
> crime
> rate tripples. Now they put unqualified operators on HF.
>
> What does a roger beep sound like down under?
>
> Dan/W4NTI

regor ;-)

Seriously though.... I wish they wouldn't remove the code requirement on HF.
It creates a new goal to get onto those bands. (Admittedly, I don't have
code either).

--
Donovan Hill
VA7LNX (Basic, Advanced)

5050. Re: K1MAN

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-29 20:25:50 UTC
From: Vince Wesa Werber <ka1iic@prexar.com>
Message-ID: <pan.2003.12.29.20.25.34.249751@prexar.com>
Source record: 84647

Yeah... I was one to check in on that net also... but being only 30 air
miles from the 'boy broadcaster' I gave up on it...
Fact is, I've given up on amateur radio in general. You may not know or
understand but this issue with k1man will be the rallying cry for those
that want to do away with amateur radio totally...

Look and understand what Glenn did for the AM maximum power situation and
you too will see beyond the 'truth' and see the 'facts' of this matter...

73
sk
vince
ka1iic

On Sun, 21 Dec 2003 03:00:11 +0000, Nobody You Know wrote:

> Sometimes I listen to the ARUFON (UFO) Net on 3977.7, as I did tonight. But lo
> and behold, guess who's planted his fat ass on 3973.0? K1MAN ! The UFO net had
> already started and K1MAN just opens up 4 khz away without any regard to
> ongoing QSOs.
>
> Where the hell is the FCC? Why is K1MAN still on the air?
>
>
>
> ---
> Nations are like leaves; they change color before they fall.
> ---

5051. Re: Elmering Opportunity New Years Eve

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-29 20:43:09 UTC
From: Tango Victor <tv@willydone.org>
Message-ID: <bsq3kvafn0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 84625
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Bullshit! Thanks for reminding why I let my VFW membership
lapse. Boring war stories from old men with no life. And how
the tales got taller as the evening wore on on. Audie Murphys,
all of them!

"Learn code or face court martial" BULLSHIT!
"20 wpm in two weeks" BULLSHIT!

Willy Victor

"K&#65533;HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:F9_Hb.24986$Pg1.11333@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net...
> Elmering.
>
> SKN is an elmering opportunity. If you know the code, and you want to see
> it continue as part of our ham radio culture, you have to pass it on.
> Nobody teaches CW any more. We used to have converts from the military,
> where CW ops were to learn code or face a courtmartial. They got to 20WPM
> in a couple of weeks but had a gun to their heads for 8 hours a day to do
> it. Learning CW is a one-on-one activity and each of us CW ops needs to
> feel an obligation to our elmers to pass it on. SKN is designed to do
just
> that.
>
> Get on the air. Encourage friends that have expressed interest in CW to
get
> on the air and provide them a Q. That's what SKN is all about. Check out
> the old novice bands and try a CQ at 12 WPM or even slower. You don't
HAVE
> to use a straight key. Many CW ops don't even own one. I didn't until
last
> year when I tried my first ever SKN. So don't feel pressure to not
operate
> because you don't have a straight key. Just tell whoever you talk to that
> you are using an electronic contrivance to facilitate the code sending.
The
> ARRL has a competition for "the best fist heard." Don't even think about
> accepting that award either.
>
> And let me tell you it isn't easy slowing down to 5 WPM and still be able
to
> copy. And the rusty old key don't seem to work with the grace that used
to

> fill the novice bands with music. It's much easier at 30WPM. It was baby
> steps that got you to where you are and it's baby steps that will get
others
> there too.
>
> Take a shot at the new "@" character. It's not easy for me to send for
some
> reason. CA run together is not in this op's vocabulary. dah dit dah dit
> dit dah was a good choice for the character, but it's one trick this old
dog
> is resisting for some reason.
>
> Look for me in the old novice bands on 80M and 40M. Afterwords, represent
> to me that you worked 10 Qs and you will have some MWA Brasso to spiff up
> the old key. And turn in your soapbox at the ARRL. Tell us about your
> elmer too.
>
> Ford-N0FP
> ford@cmgate.com
>
>
>
>
>

5052. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-29 20:44:32 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <Qm0Ib.8131$Vv2.3668835@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 84626

Kï¿½HB wrote:

> "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote
>
>
>>So let me get this right..... the secret to happiness is to become an
>>MBA or a lawyer, even if you would rather be a technophile?
>>
>
>
> I don't think the "secret to happiness" has anything to do with how you earn
> your living.

Happiness is a mode of travel, not a destination. I feel bad for thes
folk who make career and life decisions based on money.

> For my "secrets to happiness", see http://tinyurl.com/22v9k lower left
> corner of that page.

Cool stuff, Hans.

- Mike KB3EIA -

5053. Re: Why You Don't Like Warmed Over Incentive Licensing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-29 20:57:59 UTC
From: Bert Craig <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM>
Message-ID: <rz0Ib.27201$wz4.4773680@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>
Source record: 84627

"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
news:c2356669.0312291013.3b20f72f@posting.google.com...
> "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
news:<VaCcnVCpmJJlpm2iUSdV9g@ptd.net>...
> > "Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
> > news:f45722ac.0312290611.7025d8ff@posting.google.com...
> > > n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
> > news:<20031228224904.02537.00002244@mb-m23.aol.com>...
> > > >
> > > > Morse code testing was implemented for a number of reasons, but
limiting
> > > > the number of hams wasn't one of them. And in 1968, when the
requirements
> > > > for full amateur privileges were increased in both the written and
code
> > > > tests, the number of hams began to grow again after at least 5 years
of
> > > > stagnation at the quarter-million mark.
> > > >
> > > > A direct quote from the pages of QST was posted on here several years
> > > > back.
> >
> > It's also in "200 Meters And Down"
> >
> > > > It was during the Aaron Jones Morse Myths demything era. I
> > > > don't think Aaron posted it, though.
> > >
> > > The Morse test speed for was increased to 13 wpm as a direct effort to
> > > limit the number of hams - and the moving force was the ARRL - it's
> > > documented in public records in the Library of Congress and was
researched
> > > by a certified archivist.
> >
> > The key word is "implemented" - not increased.
> >
> > Here's "the rest of the story":

Gee, why am I not suprised that the complete story had been "conveniently"
edited. Thanks Jim.

73 de Bert
WA2SI

5054. Re: Elmering Opportunity New Years Eve

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-29 21:04:35 UTC
From: Bert Craig <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM>
Message-ID: <DF0Ib.27305$wz4.4798066@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>
Source record: 84628
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"K�HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:F9_Hb.24986$Pg1.11333@newsread1.news.pas.earthlink.net...
> Elmering.
>
> SKN is an elmering opportunity. If you know the code, and you want to see
> it continue as part of our ham radio culture, you have to pass it on.
> Nobody teaches CW any more. We used to have converts from the military,
> where CW ops were to learn code or face a courtmartial. They got to 20WPM
> in a couple of weeks but had a gun to their heads for 8 hours a day to do
> it. Learning CW is a one-on-one activity and each of us CW ops needs to
> feel an obligation to our elmers to pass it on. SKN is designed to do
just
> that.
>
> Get on the air. Encourage friends that have expressed interest in CW to
get
> on the air and provide them a Q. That's what SKN is all about. Check out
> the old novice bands and try a CQ at 12 WPM or even slower. You don't
HAVE
> to use a straight key. Many CW ops don't even own one. I didn't until
last
> year when I tried my first ever SKN. So don't feel pressure to not
operate
> because you don't have a straight key. Just tell whoever you talk to that
> you are using an electronic contrivance to facilitate the code sending.
The
> ARRL has a competition for "the best fist heard." Don't even think about
> accepting that award either.
>
> And let me tell you it isn't easy slowing down to 5 WPM and still be able
to
> copy. And the rusty old key don't seem to work with the grace that used
to
> fill the novice bands with music. It's much easier at 30WPM. It was baby
> steps that got you to where you are and it's baby steps that will get
others
> there too.
>
> Take a shot at the new "@" character. It's not easy for me to send for
some
> reason. CA run together is not in this op's vocabulary. dah dit dah dit
> dit dah was a good choice for the character, but it's one trick this old

dog
> is resisting for some reason.
>
> Look for me in the old novice bands on 80M and 40M. Afterwords, represent
> to me that you worked 10 Qs and you will have some MWA Brasso to spiff up
> the old key. And turn in your soapbox at the ARRL. Tell us about your
> elmer too.
>
> Ford-N0FP
> ford@cmgate.com

Thanks Hans,

CU OTA! 7040 & 7110 kHz will my "hang outs." :-)

73 de Bert
WA2SI

5055. Re: K1MAN

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-29 21:44:03 UTC
From: Vince Wesa Werber <ka1iic@prexar.com>
Message-ID: <pan.2003.12.29.21.43.57.25406@prexar.com>
Source record: 84649

>
> Almost nobody outside the hobby has ever heard of K1MAN, hence the idea
> that his operations will be used as ammunition against us is pure fantasy

but they are know to certain commercial interests,,, I know that as
FACT... I wonder if Glenn has money in those organizations???
73
v
p.s. I have know that the NAB knows all too well about k1man... think on
this... Walter Conkite... NAB & CBS... sorry guy, they know it all and
more!

5056. Re: Australian CBers better than US technicians

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-29 22:24:25 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <tQ1Ib.14492$IM3.2258@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 84629

"VA7LNX" <spamtrap@gwsn.com> wrote in message
news:F00Ib.856500$pl3.822356@pd7tw3no...
> Dan/W4NTI wrote:
>
> >
> > "WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
> > news:20031228194224.03823.00001965@mb-m07.aol.com...
> >> >Now you understand lately why it was
> >> >necessary to remove totally CW in the
> >> >S.25-5 .
> >>
> >> Yea we understand, its the only way the Knuckle Draggin CBplussers
could
> > get on
> >> HF.
> >
> > At one time I was seriously considering immigrating to VK land. Glad I
> > didn't now. First off the take all the guns from its citizens and the
> > crime
> > rate tripples. Now they put unqualified operators on HF.
> >
> > What does a roger beep sound like down under?
> >
> > Dan/W4NTI
>
> regor ;-)
>
> Seriously though.... I wish they wouldn't remove the code requirement on
HF.
> It creates a new goal to get onto those bands. (Admittedly, I don't have
> code either).
>
> --
> Donovan Hill
> VA7LNX (Basic, Advanced)

Obviously most of you blokes decided otherwise. Working DX into VK will be
a lot harder now. 40 meter SSB sucks on that path.

Dan/W4NTI

5057. Re: The main problem with Ham radio...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-29 23:40:10 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0312291540.2e06039b@posting.google.com>
Source record: 84630

wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) wrote in message
news:<20031228194648.03823.00001968@mb-m07.aol.com>...
> >I can keep up with your lies, no problem.
>
> Its not a LIE, you know it isnt, your just MAD because you cant perform the
> same Task.
> Everyone knows your waiting for another FREE HANDOUT by the FCC.

You're ranting. Go take a cold shower and an aspirin.

5058. Re: Australian CBers better than US technicians

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-30 00:03:36 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0312291603.2a55d068@posting.google.com>
Source record: 84631

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<oVZHb.13900$IM3.10739@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>...

> What does a roger beep sound like down under?
>
> Dan/W4NTI

Sounds just like your microphone.

5059. Re: Elmering Opportunity New Years Eve

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-30 00:17:29 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <xnfcneeyarg.hqoa8yz.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>
Source record: 84632
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On Mon, 29 Dec 2003 21:04:35 GMT, Bert Craig wrote:

>CU OTA! 7040 & 7110 kHz will my "hang outs." :-)

Do you mean QSX 7040/7110 KHZ

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

5060. Re: Elmering Opportunity New Years Eve

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-30 01:24:31 UTC
From: Bert Craig <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM>
Message-ID: <jt4Ib.29782$wz4.5825265@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>
Source record: 84633
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:xnfcneeyarg.hqoa8yz.pminews@netnews.comcast.net...
> On Mon, 29 Dec 2003 21:04:35 GMT, Bert Craig wrote:
>
> >CU OTA! 7040 & 7110 kHz will my "hang outs." :-)
>
> Do you mean QSX 7040/7110 KHZ
>
> --
> 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

OK K2ASP DE WA2SI QSX 7040/7110 TNX ES 73 ;-)

5061. Re: Why You Don't Like Warmed Over Incentive Licensing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-30 03:19:00 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031229221900.05539.00003252@mb-m16.aol.com>
Source record: 84636

In article <rz0Ib.27201$wz4.4773680@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>, "Bert Craig"
<wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> writes:

>> The key word is "implemented" - not increased.
>>
>> Here's "the rest of the story":
>
>Gee, why am I not suprised that the complete story had been "conveniently"
>edited.

bwaahaahaaa

>Thanks Jim.

You're welcome.

73 de Jim, N2EY

CU SKN

5062. Re: Why You Don't Like Warmed Over Incentive Licensing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-30 03:19:00 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031229221900.05539.00003253@mb-m16.aol.com>
Source record: 84637

In article <ww_Hb.5428$d4.959@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Bill Sohl"
<billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:

>> It may have been increased for that purpose, but it was not originally
>> implemented for that purpose.
>
>Fair statement.
>
>The "original" morse requirement was to
>enable non-amateur stations to dialog via morse with
>amateur stations in case of interfereing operation.

That was one reason. Here are some others:

- To permit amateur stations to dialog via morse with each other
- To set a minimum standard of operator qualification so that newcomers would
not try to learn the code on the air. (Remember that in the early days the
effective selectivity of radio systems was not very good)
- To support hte idea of the amateur service as a training ground for
commercial and military operators
- To support the use of the most spectrum-efficient mode then available

>The increase to 13wpm was, as the article states, intended
>to raise the bar of entrance criteria to limit the number
>of new hams.

And so was the simultaneous upgrading of the written tests.

73 de Jim, N2EY

5063. Re: Why You Don't Like Warmed Over Incentive Licensing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-30 03:19:03 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031229221903.05539.00003255@mb-m16.aol.com>
Source record: 84634

In article <eb-dnWa7MadN-m2i4p2dnA@gbronline.com>, JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
writes:

>It may have been increased for that purpose, but it was not originally
>implemented for that purpose.
>
My point exactly.

73 de Jim, N2EY

5064. Re: Why You Don't Like Warmed Over Incentive Licensing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-30 03:19:03 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031229221903.05539.00003254@mb-m16.aol.com>
Source record: 84638

In article <ap_Hb.5411$d4.3753@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Bill Sohl"
<billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20031228135657.07346.00002296@mb-m26.aol.com...
>> In article <f45722ac.0312280800.3c3a5dcc@posting.google.com>,
>> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
>>
>> >k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>> >news:<20031228025949.04179.00002059@mb-m29.aol.com>...
>> >> >Subject: Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL
>> >> >From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
>> >> >Date: 12/26/03 3:01 PM Central Standard Time
>> >> >Message-id: <f45722ac.0312261301.4066fb17@posting.google.com>
>> >>
>> >> >How many amateur radio services do we really need? How many do you
>> >> >really want?
>> >>
>> >> One radio service with a TIERED license structure, Brain.
>> >
>> >It is a "TIRED" radio structure.
>>
>> Not at all!
>>
>> It's a "tried and true" license structure.
>>
>> When "incentive licensing" was re-established in 1968, there were about
>> 250,000 US hams. Today there are about 680,000.

Bill,

Remember how the number of US hams barely moved from 1962 to 1968?
>>
>> >If you want Merit Badges, join the
>> >BSA (or CAP).
>>
>> License class is not a merit badge.
>>
>> >There is no need to have class distinctions between
>> >hams artificially created by the FCC.
>>
>> License class is not about class distinctions. It's about qualification
>> for privileges. In order to have full privileges, the knowledge to pass the
>> Extra is required. Same for the other classes. More knowledge, more
privileges.

>
>But, as you and I have agred before, the privileges gained do NOT relate to
>the additional knowledge needed for the higher license class.

FCC disagrees, Bill.

>What is the technical competency difference between an Extra
>operating SSB with a TS440 in the 80m Extra voice segment vs a General
>operating the same rig at say 3.885Mhz?

Not much! But the FCC thinks it's a good idea to reward additional
technical knowledge with more privileges.

For that matter, what is the technical competency difference between operating
CW on the low end of 2 meters vs. the low end of 20 meters? (note that I wrote
technical)
>
>> This doesn't mean an Extra knows everyhting there is to know about amateur
>> radio because they passed the tests. It just means that said Extra has
>> demonstrated the *minimum* knowledge required for full privileges.
>
>The problem, again one we agreed on before, is that granting
>additional frequency spectrum doesn't rationally flow from the
>additional knowledge required for the higher license class (e.g.
>Extra vs General, General vs Tech.

It rationally flows if you buy into FCC's logic on the matter.

Would you rather that FCC did away with the Extra, Bill? For that matter, what
about the General?
>
>> >Allow the ham to distinguish
>> >himself or herself, based upon actual achievements.
>>
>> Such as?
>
>Good question.
>
My point exactly.

>> >> Obviously you do not concur with the FCC's "Basis and Purpose" of the
>> >> Amateur Radio Service, espeically those that establish the service as
>> >> one
>> >> of "self-training".
>> >
>> >I do.
>>
>> Then why didn't you train yourself on practical antennas for HF?
>>
>> >-Espeically- "self-training." Obviously you believe that once
>> >you obtain the "Amateur Extra" license that all learning must stop.
>> >There is nothing more to be learned!

>>
>> Nope, not at all. All it means to have passed the Extra is that said
>> Extra has demonstrated the *minimum* knowledge required for full privileges.
>
>True under the current scheme of licensing for the USA. It could
>be changed and that is the point raised in this discussion. Should
>it be changed and if so, how?

I wrote up a suggested three-tiered system some time back and reposted it
recently. I think it's the best compromise between all the various
considerations. YMMV.

Please note the following sentence. I'm *not* saying I want one class of
license! I'm simply describing how to do it.

>> You want one class of license, fine. Here's how to do it:
>>
>> First, put aside the code test issue and concentrate on the writtens.
>>
>> Second, close off the Tech and General to new issues.
>>
>> Third, combine the existing Tech, General and Extra question pools into
>> one large question pool. Eliminate any questions that are specific to the
Tech
>> or General license classes because they won't be issued new any more.
>>
>> Fourth, a single new 120 question written exam would be generated from the
>> combined question pool. All new hams would have to pass this test to
>> become hams. All would get "Amateur Class" licenses with all privileges.
>>
>> Fifth, all existing hams would have their license terms automatically
>> extended to 10 years beyond the date on which the new rules took effect. No
>> renewals.
>
>Never happen.

I hope you're right, Bill. But I learned long ago to "never say never".
>
>> Sixth, all existing hams would have to retest using the new "Amateur
>> Class" test within the next 10 years or leave the air.
>
>Never happen. You want a way to kill ham radio, then that'd
>do it in a heartbeat...a 10 year heartbeat at the longest.

Exactly! But the hams who remained would all have passed the same test so
there's be no more license-based "class distinctions". That's the point.
>
>> At the end of 10 years we'd all have the same license class and all have
>> passed the same test to get it.
>
>At the end of 10 years we'd have no ham service of any consequence.

Sure we would. Just not the one you or I want. But it would be more like what Brian wants.

>Retesting does NOT get any support at all. A handful of people
>propose retesting (I oppose retesting)...but that is all. If 1968 incentive
>licensing drove some folks away, you can bet the "all existing
>hams would need to be retested" will certainly do it.

I think most active hams would just take the %^&#$% test and be done with it. The problem is that many semi-active or inactive hams wouldn't, and we'd see a drastic reduction in numbers. Bad news.Very bad news.

To repeat: I'm not in favor of a one-class system. I'm just pointing out where such a system would lead.
>
>> Why not?
>
>Please tell me any example of something you do in life that
>requires anyone to be knowledge retested...other than
>something in the medical field such as CPR recertification.

In my line of work, (no, I'm not going to say what it is here), employees are constantly retested on safety and procedures. The last time I took a safety test, the passing grade was 100%. Get *one* question wrong and you fail. And in a year or less you have to do it all over again.
>
>Cheers and happy new year.

All the best in '04, Bill

73 de Jim, N2EY

5065. Re: Elmering Opportunity New Years Eve

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-30 03:19:04 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031229221904.05539.00003256@mb-m16.aol.com>
Source record: 84635

Thanks for the reminder, Hans. I'll be there, same as every year, with the old J-37 from my Novice days.

BTW, note that despite the name, it's not just a "night" but a 24 hour period.

CU SKN

73 de Jim, N2EY

5066. Re: Australian CBers better than US technicians

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-30 03:44:00 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3FF0F47F.4010902@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 84639

>
>
>
>What does a roger beep sound like down under?
>
>Dan/W4NTI
>
>
>
>
Like that "sproing" sound the baby kangaroo in the Warner Bros
cartoons makes?

5067. Look for the Union Label (was: The 14 Petitions)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-30 03:51:12 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <xnfcneeyarg.hqonb02.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>
Source record: 84640

On Mon, 29 Dec 2003 01:14:22 GMT, Dave Head wrote:

>The problem with engineering and IT is that the laws of physics, and the
>principles of good software design and construction, are universal. What works
>in India, Russia, and Korea works here, and vice-versa.

Tell that to my wife who spent several years correcting and re-doing
the engineering designs of Russian-educated emigre engineers in the
US who across the board act as if electrical codes and Ohm's Law are
mere suggestions. She's now on the staff of the world's largest
environmental engineering consulting company, and there's no union
or need for one. She would never have joined them if there was, and
if one comes in, she's gone.

>I'm a government engineer. I work for the Navy. Don't need a union, right?

I had 30 years as an engineer and enforcement manager with The Uncle -
wannna' trade horror stories? Especially those where "the union"
stood by and did nothing?

>Wrong! In the 1980's, the OPM illegally capped the across the board raises of
>engineers on the advanced engineering pay scale. Who should step up to the
>plate but the Treasury Employee's Union, and sued the socks off the government
>for 2 decades. Finally won the case last year. Last week I got a check as
>partial payment for compensation for that misdeed - $1090.95.

My folks were represented by the NTEU and in fact a good friend was
the "field VP" of the local. He finally saw the light as to what
"the union" would do or not do and resigned. He's now retired, as
am I.

Navy engineer, huh? Remember the "demonstration project" at the
Naval Ocean Systems Center (San Diego) where all statutory
protections of employees were suspended and all pay raises made
discretionary? Where was the union on that one? A close buddy was
denied the step increase that he would otherwise been entitled to by
regulation. As a result he retired after 33 years as a specialized
acoustic engineer with the Navy. Guess who was the loser (Answer:
not him...)

The union couldn't or wouldn't do a damn thing when the chairman of
the FCC decided to RIF several hundred engineers, technicians, and
non-technical enforcement agents because he didn't understand the
need for field enforcement. Two of the folks working for me,
excellent performers, got caught up in that mess, and they didn't
deserve it.

Ham radio, as well as all other radio services, are still suffering
the results of that ill-informed decision almost 10 years later.

Enough of this...this is not the place to argue this point.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

Retired and loving every minute of it....
Work was getting in the way of my hobbies

5068. Re: Why You Don't Like Warmed Over Incentive Licensing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-30 03:55:37 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <ZG6lb.8566$Vv2.3772948@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 84641

N2EY wrote:
> In article <ap_Hb.5411$d4.3753@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Bill Sohl"
> <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
>
>
>>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>>news:20031228135657.07346.00002296@mb-m26.aol.com...
>>
>>>In article <f45722ac.0312280800.3c3a5dcc@posting.google.com>,
>>>brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
>>>
>>>
>>>>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>>>>news:<20031228025949.04179.00002059@mb-m29.aol.com>...
>>>>
>>>>>Subject: Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL
>>>>>From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
>>>>>Date: 12/26/03 3:01 PM Central Standard Time
>>>>>Message-id: <f45722ac.0312261301.4066fb17@posting.google.com>
>>>>>
>>>>>How many amateur radio services do we really need? How many do you
>>>>>really want?
>>>>>
>>>>> One radio service with a TIERED license structure, Brain.
>>>>
>>>>It is a "TIRED" radio structure.
>>>
>>>Not at all!
>>>
>>>It's a "tried and true" license structure.
>>>
>>>When "incentive licensing" was re-established in 1968, there were about
>>>250,000 US hams. Today there are about 680,000.
>
>
> Bill,
>
> Remember how the number of US hams barely moved from 1962 to 1968?
>
>>>>If you want Merit Badges, join the
>>>>BSA (or CAP).
>>>
>>>License class is not a merit badge.
>>>

>>>
>>>>There is no need to have class distinctions between
>>>>hams artificially created by the FCC.
>>>
>>>License class is not about class distinctions. It's about qualification
>>>for privileges. In order to have full privileges, the knowledge to pass the
>>>Extra is required. Same for the other classes. More knowledge, more
>
> privileges.
>
>>But, as you and I have agred before, the privileges gained do NOT relate to
>>the additional knowledge needed for the higher license class.
>
>
> FCC disagrees, Bill.
>
>>What is the technical competency difference between an Extra
>>operating SSB with a TS440 in the 80m Extra voice segment vs a General
>>operating the same rig at say 3.885Mhz?
>
>
> Not much! But the FCC thinks it's a good idea to reward additional
> technical knowledge with more privileges.

And so do I! The arguments of tying technical knowledge to priveleges
is completely bogus, irritating, and eventually self defeating. That
many NCTA's used it as an argument against Morse code testing does not
make it less so. It's just that now, that bird will come home to roost.

> For that matter, what is the technical competency difference between operating
> CW on the low end of 2 meters vs. the low end of 20 meters? (note that I wrote
> *technical*)

What is the technical comptency difference between the Extra operating
in his or her segment of a HF band and an unlicensed CB'er running a
linear?

>>>This doesn't mean an Extra knows everyhting there is to know about amateur
>>>radio because they passed the tests. It just means that said Extra has
>>>demonstrated the *minimum* knowledge required for full privileges.
>>
>>The problem, again one we agreed on before, is that granting
>>additional frequency spectrum doesn't rationally flow from the
>>additional knowledge required for the higher license class (e.g.
>>Extra vs General, General vs Tech.
>
> It rationally flows if you buy into FCC's logic on the matter.

I look at it as more of a philosophy thing than specific logic. They
seem to want people to learn things. Tying knowledge to priveliges is a
good philosophy in my estimation.

> Would you rather that FCC did away with the Extra, Bill? For that matter, what
> about the General?

If we adopt the philosophy, it could be done. Insane, but stranger
things have happened.

>>>>Allow the ham to distinguish
>>>>himself or herself, based upon actual achievements.
>>>
>>>Such as?
>>
>>Good question.
>>
>
> My point exactly.

Maybe we could have merit badges? 8^),

<rest snipped>

- Mike KB3EIA -

5069. Re: Why You Don't Like Warmed Over Incentive Licensing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-30 03:56:34 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <B--dnXoKIbftZm2iRVn-sQ@gbronline.com>
Source record: 84642

Brian wrote:

>>
>>The key word is "implemented" - not increased.
>
>
> You just play word games. You should have corrected that in your last
> post, but no, you thought you could just play it off and keep it a big
> secret.

Lets see now, the amateurs were on the air communicating with code long before it was required they be licensed. Likely, most amateurs could easily do 10 wpm or more. Now along comes licensing *implementing* a 10 wpm code speed (may have orginally been 5 wpm but I can't document that) test along with a technical test. So with amateurs already being able to copy code, just how was this 10 wpm test going to reduce the number of amateurs? It is not a word play, the key word is *implemented*. The code was not *implemented* to reduce the number of amateurs, it was part of the standard to be met to be licensed. If anything the technical part was more likely to reduce the number of amateurs from being licensed than the code. The code may have been *increased* later to in an attempt to limit the numbers of licensees, but it was not *implemented* orginally for that purpose.
At the time, the thing which was thought would do the task of reducing, even eleminating the amatures would be to relegate them to 200 meters. Those wavelengths were thought to be of no use for communications and the amatures would not be able to get a signal out of their back yards, thus in time the amateurs would loose interest and amateur radio would, for all practical purposes, die away.

5070. Re: Elmering Opportunity New Years Eve

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-30 04:13:55 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <xnfcneeyarg.hqoo1m3.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>
Source record: 84643
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On Tue, 30 Dec 2003 01:24:31 GMT, Bert Craig wrote:

>OK K2ASP DE WA2SI QSX 7040/7110 TNX ES 73 ;-)

QSL DE K2ASP UP

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

5071. Re: Why You Don't Like Warmed Over Incentive Licensing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-30 04:22:12 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0312292022.170c2f9e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 84644

. . n2ey & Brainiac go at it. "Entertainment is where ya find it" . .

n2ey sez:

> > Some folks wonder about the claim of overcrowding. In order to
> > appreciate what amateur radio was like back then, it's necessary to
> > understand what technologies and operating practices were in use by
> > average hams.

w3rv jumps in here:

I basically agree with your contention but it needs to be expanded
(particularly sincs Brainiac is on the freq). The reason the bands
were "crowded" back then was simply because of the absolutely
ferschtink selectivity even the state-of-the-art superhet rcvrs of
those days provided. On top of the problems those folk had with their
wandering oscillators.

I daresay that if the 1931 hams had any of today's cheapest
consumer-level MF/HF xcvrs they would have, on average, found a
whole lot of dead space between signals in the ham bands.

> > Consider this: The bands were crowded enough back then that as early
> > as 1931 some enterprising hams (W6DEI, Ray Moore, and others) built
> > and operated single-sideband transmitters and receivers.

Here comes me again:

The big trick SSB brought to the game had nothing to do with bandwidth
and/or "interfernce reduction". It had and has everything to do with
the abilty of SSB to eliminate the AM carrier which sucks up power,
equipment space and money and conveys no intelligence to the listener
whatsoever.

Brainiac responds to n2ey:

> But that was some 72 years ago. Cop's invention was only 40 years ago
> and you discount it.
>
> Jim, I'm beginning to see a pattern of untruths and inconsistency in
> your postings. And I'll not ever refer to you as Rev. Jim again, no
> matter how many swear words you snip out of other peoples posts. You
> are unworthy, and definitely bear watching.

w3rv sez pffft! Pot calling kettle black again.

. . T5 logs. Gonna toss 'em into the LoW are ya Burke? Hmmm??

w3rv

5072. Re: Australian CBers better than US technicians

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-30 05:41:05 UTC
From: VA7LNX <spamtrap@gwsn.com>
Message-ID: <Rd8Ib.872984$9I5.806631@pd7tw2no>
Source record: 84645

Dan/W4NTI wrote:

>
> "VA7LNX" <spamtrap@gwsn.com> wrote in message
> news:F00Ib.856500$pl3.822356@pd7tw3no...
>> Dan/W4NTI wrote:
>>
>> >
>> > "WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
>> > news:20031228194224.03823.00001965@mb-m07.aol.com...
>> >> >Now you understand lately why it was
>> >> >necessary to remove totally CW in the
>> >> >S.25-5 .
>> >>
>> >> Yea we understand, its the only way the Knuckle Draggin CBplussers
> could
>> > get on
>> >> HF.
>> >
>> > At one time I was seriously considering immigrating to VK land. Glad I
>> > didn't now. First off the take all the guns from its citizens and the
>> > crime
>> > rate tripples. Now they put unqualified operators on HF.
>> >
>> > What does a roger beep sound like down under?
>> >
>> > Dan/W4NTI
>>
>> regor ;-)
>>
>> Seriously though.... I wish they wouldn't remove the code requirement on
> HF.
>> It creates a new goal to get onto those bands. (Admittedly, I don't have
>> code either).
>>
>> --
>> Donovan Hill
>> VA7LNX (Basic, Advanced)
>
> Obviously most of you blokes decided otherwise. Working DX into VK will
> be
> a lot harder now. 40 meter SSB sucks on that path.
>
> Dan/W4NTI

I'm in Canada. The RAC and IC are pushing to remove the code requirement for HF.

--
Donovan Hill
VA7LNX (Basic, Advanced)

5073. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-30 06:23:07 UTC
From: Alun <alun@1stcounsel.com>
Message-ID: <Xns9461E12D5ED4elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 84646

Dave Head <rally2xs@att.net> wrote in
news:d000vvoe3gtta7ehl34u0gcgufuru4122o@4ax.com:

> On 29 Dec 2003 04:56:55 GMT, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:
>
>>In article <sihuuv0alfjan6hgs42han7gprniiijm9p@4ax.com>, Dave Head
>><rally2xs@att.net> writes:
>>
>>> It has to do
>>>with the waning of union power, I think, and the mistake that "tech"
>>>people including engineers make that they don't need a union. If
>>>you're an employee, you need a union. Period. But the IT bunch won't
>>>join one, and look what happened to them.
>>
>>Dave,
>>
>>I partly agree with you. A lot of the problem is waning union power.
>
>>But that doesn't mean everyone needs to be unionized. The mere
>>existence of strong unions benefits nonunion workers, too, because
>>often employers with nonunion shops will treat their workers better in
>>order to stave off unionization.
>
> Yes, there is that good effect.
>
>>But as the percentage of labor that is unionized decreases, that effect
>>diminishes also.
>
> We're going to be a 3rd world country if workers don't wake up. Very
> rich. Very poor. Nobody else.
>
> Dave Head
>
>>73 de Jim, N2EY
>>
>
>

Oh, arise ye victims of opression, rise up ye workers from your chains,
Come rally, come rally, sing the Internationale

(Words of the Communist Internationale, a rare instance of a song that
refers reflexively to itself, must have been written by a Unix programmer)

5074. Re: K1MAN

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-30 06:34:35 UTC
From: Alun <alun@1stcounsel.com>
Message-ID: <Xns946110049C131elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 84648

Vince Wesa Werber <ka1iic@prexar.com> wrote in
news:pan.2003.12.29.20.25.34.249751@prexar.com:

> Yeah... I was one to check in on that net also... but being only 30
> air miles from the 'boy broadcaster' I gave up on it...
> Fact is, I've given up on amateur radio in general. You may not know
> or understand but this issue with k1man will be the rallying cry for
> those that want to do away with amateur radio totally...
>
> Look and understand what Glenn did for the AM maximum power situation
> and you too will see beyond the 'truth' and see the 'facts' of this
> matter...
>
> 73
> sk
> vince
> ka1iic
>
>
> On Sun, 21 Dec 2003 03:00:11 +0000, Nobody You Know wrote:
>
>> Sometimes I listen to the ARUFON (UFO) Net on 3977.7, as I did
>> tonight. But lo and behold, guess who's planted his fat ass on 3973.0?
>> K1MAN ! The UFO net had already started and K1MAN just opens up 4 khz
>> away without any regard to ongoing QSOs.
>>
>> Where the hell is the FCC? Why is K1MAN still on the air?
>>
>>
>>
>> --
>> Nations are like leaves; they change color before they fall.
>> --
>
>

Almost nobody outside the hobby has ever heard of K1MAN, hence the idea
that his operations will be used as ammunition against us is pure fantasy

5075. Re: The main problem with Ham radio...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-30 09:12:26 UTC
From: Steve Silverwood <kb6ojs@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <MPG.1a5a693b98d709e99896b2@news-server.socal.rr.com>
Source record: 84650

In article <3FEE4204.1050103@ix.netcom.com>, wa2ise@ix.netcom.com
says...
> Do they keep the completed exams beyond a few months?
> The VEs? Or the FCC? Anyway, it would be possible to
> get most of the rules and regs questions wrong and
> still pass the exam. My father got his advanced back
> in 72 down at the FCC field office in NYC. The
> examiner told him he passed, but to reread the rules
> and regs before he goes on the air. He got most of
> those questions wrong. Point is, that you could have
> a rule or reg misunderstood, and still pass to get
> the license. Most rules that do get violated often
> and the FCC goes after are ones people should know
> better. Who would think that jamming a repeater is
> legal and proper?

I don't know if they keep the exams. From what I understand, the exams
are administered and retained by the VE team rather than the FCC. But I
definitely DO feel that the number of questions should be increased for
each license, with additional weight given to the questions regarding
Part 97 and operating practices, especially for the Tech exam.

--

-- //Steve//

Steve Silverwood, KB6OJS
Fountain Valley, CA
Email: kb6ojs@arrl.net

5076. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-30 10:09:55 UTC
From: Dave Head <rally2xs@att.net>
Message-ID: <ugj2vvc0tq2ih8vf65dslinm0nmga8b4n7@4ax.com>
Source record: 84651

On 30 Dec 2003 06:23:07 GMT, Alun <alun@1stcounsel.com> wrote:

>Dave Head <rally2xs@att.net> wrote in
>news:d000vvoe3gtta7ehl34u0gcgufuru4122o@4ax.com:
>
>> On 29 Dec 2003 04:56:55 GMT, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:
>>
>>>In article <sihuuv0alfjan6hgs42han7gprniiijm9p@4ax.com>, Dave Head
>>><rally2xs@att.net> writes:
>>>
>>>> It has to do
>>>>with the waning of union power, I think, and the mistake that "tech"
>>>>people including engineers make that they don't need a union. If
>>>>you're an employee, you need a union. Period. But the IT bunch won't
>>>>join one, and look what happened to them.
>>>
>>>Dave,
>>>
>>>I partly agree with you. A lot of the problem is waning union power.
>>
>>>But that doesn't mean everyone needs to be unionized. The mere
>>>existence of strong unions benefits nonunion workers, too, because
>>>often employers with nonunion shops will treat their workers better in
>>>order to stave off unionization.
>>
>> Yes, there is that good effect.
>>
>>>But as the percentage of labor that is unionized decreases, that effect
>>>diminishes also.
>>
>> We're going to be a 3rd world country if workers don't wake up. Very
>> rich. Very poor. Nobody else.
>>
>> Dave Head
>>
>>>73 de Jim, N2EY
>>>
>>
>>
>
>Oh, arise ye victims of opression, rise up ye workers from your chains,
>Come rally, come rally, sing the Internationale
>
>(Words of the Communist Internationale, a rare instance of a song that

>refers reflexively to itself, must have been written by a Unix programmer)

Well, we've had at least 1 request to end the thread, but I have to come back this once to say that I believe we can have protection for workers via their own actions, through unions, without going the communist route. I'm pretty seriously anti-communist, but do believe that workers are progressively getting abused and need to do something about it, themselves, since they are the only ones that do or ever will care about their welfare.

Dave Head

5077. Re: Why You Don't Like Warmed Over Incentive Licensing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-30 12:10:25 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bsrpvt$de6@library2.airnews.net>
Source record: 84652

"JJ" <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
news:B--dnXoKIbftZm2iRVn-sQ@gbronline.com...
> Brian wrote:
>
>
> >>
> >>The key word is "implemented" - not increased.
> >
> >
> > You just play word games. You should have corrected that in your last
> > post, but no, you thought you could just play it off and keep it a big
> > secret.
>
> Lets see now, the amateurs were on the air communicating with code long
> before it was required they be licensed. Likely, most amateurs could
> easily do 10 wpm or more. Now along comes licensing *implementing* a 10
> wpm code speed (may have orginally been 5 wpm but I can't document that)
> test along with a technical test. So with amateurs already being able to
> copy code, just how was this 10 wpm test going to reduce the number of
> amateurs? It is not a word play, the key word is *implemented*. The code
> was not *implemented* to reduce the number of amateurs, it was part of
> the standard to be met to be licensed. If anything the technical part
> was more likely to reduce the number of amateurs from being licensed
> than the code. The code may have been *increased* later to in an attempt
> to limit the numbers of licensees, but it was not *implemented*
> orginally for that purpose.
> At the time, the thing which was thought would do the task of reducing,
> even eleminating the amatures would be to relegate them to 200 meters.
> Those wavelengths were thought to be of no use for communications and
> the amatures would not be able to get a signal out of their back yards,
> thus in time the amateurs would loose interest and amateur radio would,
> for all practical purposes, die away.
>

What's your callsign, JJ? Just wondering...

Kim W5TIT

5078. Re: Why You Don't Like Warmed Over Incentive Licensing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-30 14:02:46 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031230090246.01690.00000824@mb-m18.aol.com>
Source record: 84653

>I cannot trust what he says anymore.
>

BIG DEAL, no one cares what you think.

5079. Re: Why You Don't Like Warmed Over Incentive Licensing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-30 14:35:50 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <a3gIb.584$6B.179@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 84654

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20031229221903.05539.00003254@mb-m16.aol.com...
> In article <ap_Hb.5411$d4.3753@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Bill
Sohl"
> <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
>
> >"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> >news:20031228135657.07346.00002296@mb-m26.aol.com...
> >> In article <f45722ac.0312280800.3c3a5dcc@posting.google.com>,
> >> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
> >>
> >> >k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
> >> >news:<20031228025949.04179.00002059@mb-m29.aol.com>...
> >> >> >Subject: Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL
> >> >> >From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
> >> >> >Date: 12/26/03 3:01 PM Central Standard Time
> >> >> >Message-id: <f45722ac.0312261301.4066fb17@posting.google.com>
> >> >>
> >> >> >How many amateur radio services do we really need? How many do you
> >> >> >really want?
> >> >>
> >> >> One radio service with a TIERED license structure, Brain.
> >> >
> >> >It is a "TIRED" radio structure.
> >>
> >> Not at all!
> >>
> >> It's a "tried and true" license structure.
> >>
> >> When "incentive licensing" was re-established in 1968, there were about
> >> 250,000 US hams. Today there are about 680,000.
>
> Bill,
>
> Remember how the number of US hams barely moved from 1962 to 1968?

Jim,
The "When incentive licensing was re-est...." was not my statement.

> >> >If you want Merit Badges, join the
> >> >BSA (or CAP).
> >>
> >> License class is not a merit badge.
> >>
> >> >There is no need to have class distinctions between

> >> >hams artificially created by the FCC.
> >>
> >> License class is not about class distinctions. It's about qualification
> >> for privileges. In order to have full privileges, the knowledge to pass
the
> >> Extra is required. Same for the other classes. More knowledge, more
> privileges.
> >
> >But, as you and I have agreed before, the privileges gained do NOT relate
to
> >the additional knowledge needed for the higher license class.
>
> FCC disagrees, Bill.

True for now. But if anyone is serious about a new license
structure, I'd like to see rational relationship between the
license class knowledge test requirements and whatever
additional privileges are associated with that license.

> >What is the technical competency difference between an Extra
> >operating SSB with a TS440 in the 80m Extra voice segment vs a General
> >operating the same rig at say 3.885Mhz?
>
> Not much!

Not any as I see it.

> But the FCC thinks it's a good idea to reward additional
> technical knowledge with more privileges.

I don't oppose the concept, I oppose the illogical implementation.

> For that matter, what is the technical competency difference between
operating
> CW on the low end of 2 meters vs. the low end of 20 meters? (note that I
wrote
> *technical*)

None and that point has been made by myself as well. The only
two truly CW only sub-bands do NOT require passing any
code test to be able to use them.

> >> This doesn't mean an Extra knows everyhting there is to know about
amateur
> >> radio because they passed the tests. It just means that said Extra has
> >> demonstrated the *minimum* knowledge required for full privileges.
> >
> >The problem, again one we agreed on before, is that granting
> >additional frequency spectrum doesn't rationally flow from the
> >additional knowledge required for the higher license class (e.g.
> >Extra vs General, General vs Tech.
>
> It rationally flows if you buy into FCC's logic on the matter.

It only flows as to "pure incentive". It doiesn't flow or relate
at all to the additional knowledge tested to pass the license.

> Would you rather that FCC did away with the Extra, Bill? For that matter,
what
> about the General?

Did I even hint at that. The answer is basically no...although
I have NO preference for or against changing license structure
to a more rational basis for added privileges.

> >> >Allow the ham to distinguish
> >> >himself or herself, based upon actual achievements.
> >>
> >> Such as?
> >
> >Good question.
> >
> My point exactly.
>
> >> >> Obviously you do not concur with the FCC's "Basis and Purpose" of
the
> >> >> Amateur Radio Service, espeically those that establish the service
as
> >> >> one
> >> >> of "self-training".
> >> >
> >> >I do.
> >>
> >> Then why didn't you train yourself on practical antennas for HF?
> >>
> >> >-Espeically- "self-training." Obviously you believe that once
> >> >you obtain the "Amateur Extra" license that all learning must stop.
> >> >There is nothing more to be learned!
> >>
> >> Nope, not at all. All it means to have passed the Extra is that said
> >> Extra has demonstrated the *minimum* knowledge required for full
privileges.
> >
> >True under the current scheme of licensing for the USA. It could
> >be changed and that is the point raised in this discussion. Should
> >it be changed and if so, how?
>
> I wrote up a suggested three-tiered system some time back and reposted it
> recently. I think it's the best compromise between all the various
> considerations. YMMV.
>
> Please note the following sentence. I'm *not* saying I want one class of
> license! I'm simply describing how to do it.
>
> >> You want one class of license, fine. Here's how to do it:
> >>

> >> First, put aside the code test issue and concentrate on the writtens.
> >>
> >> Second, close off the Tech and General to new issues.
> >>
> >> Third, combine the existing Tech, General and Extra question pools into
> >> one large question pool. Eliminate any questions that are specific to
the
> Tech
> >> or General license classes because they won't be issued new any more.
> >>
> >> Fourth, a single new 120 question written exam would be generated from
the
> >> combined question pool. All new hams would have to pass this test to
> >> become hams. All would get "Amateur Class" licenses with all
privileges.
> >>
> >> Fifth, all existing hams would have their license terms automatically
> >> extended to 10 years beyond the date on which the new rules took
effect. No
> >> renewals.
> >
> >Never happen.
>
> I hope you're right, Bill. But I learned long ago to "never say never".

I hope I'm right too :-) :-)

> >> Sixth, all existing hams would have to retest using the new "Amateur
> >> Class" test within the next 10 years or leave the air.
> >
> >Never happen. You want a way to kill ham radio, then that'd
> >do it in a heartbeat...a 10 year heartbeat at the longest.
>
> Exactly! But the hams who remained would all have passed the same test so
> there's be no more license-based "class distinctions". That's the point.

But, again, not at all a probable possibility.

> >> At the end of 10 years we'd all have the same license class and all
have
> >> passed the same test to get it.
> >
> >At the end of 10 years we'd have no ham service of any consequence.
>
> Sure we would. Just not the one you or I want. But it would be more like
what
> Brian wants.

IF the numbers of hams dropped considerably because of the proposal,
I seriously doubt the service as well as ham organizations would survive.
Calling for all retesting of existing hams would play right into the hands
of

the commercial interests that would love to get us off the air completely.

> >Retesting does NOT get any support at all. A handful of people
> >propose retesting (I oppose retesting)...but that is all. If 1968
incentive
> >licensing drove some folks away, you can bet the "all existing
> >hams would need to be retested" will certainly do it.
>
> I think most active hams would just take the %^&#$% test and be done with
it.
> The problem is that many semi-active or inactive hams wouldn't, and we'd
see a
> drastic reduction in numbers. Bad news.Very bad news.

Exactly my point.

> To repeat: I'm not in favor of a one-class system. I'm just pointing out
where
> such a system would lead.

I believe we both believe, if imlemented as you proposed above,
the end result would be disastor.

> >> Why not?
> >
> >Please tell me any example of something you do in life that
> >requires anyone to be knowledge retested...other than
> >something in the medical field such as CPR recertification.
>
> In my line of work, (no, I'm not going to say what it is here), employees
are
> constantly retested on safety and procedures. The last time I took a
safety
> test, the passing grade was 100%. Get *one* question wrong and you fail.
And in
> a year or less you have to do it all over again.

But if you get one wrong do you lose your job...or
just take it again until you pass? The last time I took
any test that actually might have impacted my career was
when I was first hired and tested by the personel office
back in 1970.

> >Cheers and happy new year.
>
> All the best in '04, Bill

Mega dittos to you and everyone else in RRAP
Bill K2UNK

5080. Re: The main problem with Ham radio...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-30 14:38:08 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <k5gIb.19640$P%1.18292052@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 84655

"Steve Silverwood" <kb6ojs@arrl.net> wrote in message
news:MPG.1a5a693b98d709e99896b2@news-server.socal.rr.com...
> I don't know if they keep the exams. From what I understand, the exams
> are administered and retained by the VE team rather than the FCC. But I
> definitely DO feel that the number of questions should be increased for
> each license, with additional weight given to the questions regarding
> Part 97 and operating practices, especially for the Tech exam.
>

Actually I'd like to see a new, separate element that is devoted entirely to rules and regulations that would have to be passed before taking the technical elements for the license classes. One should not be able to get on the air if they miss a significant percentage of the rules. As some have commented, right now it is quite possible to miss the majority of the regulatory questions on an exam yet still pass the exam. The exams for the various classes could then focus on operating procedures and technical elements. For example, let's call the rules test Element R and then for the various licenses we could have a system as follows:

Technician - Element R, Element 2
Technician with HF - Element R, Element 1, Element 2
General - Element R, Element 1, Element 2, Element 3
Extra - Element R, Element 1, Element 2, Element 3

Although if it is a truly comprehensive rules test, I'd would find it acceptable to eliminate element 1 for Tech with HF thus combining the current Tech & Tech with HF and perhaps even for General.

Too many people just gloss over the rules and are not willing to look them up. They then rely on other people who have also glossed over the rules when they have a question and get some really bad information.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

5081. Re: The main problem with Ham radio...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-30 14:45:41 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <pcgIb.590$6B.23@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 84656

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:k5gIb.19640$P%1.18292052@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
>
> "Steve Silverwood" <kb6ojs@arrl.net> wrote in message
> news:MPG.1a5a693b98d709e99896b2@news-server.socal.rr.com...
> > I don't know if they keep the exams. From what I understand, the exams
> > are administered and retained by the VE team rather than the FCC. But I
> > definitely DO feel that the number of questions should be increased for
> > each license, with additional weight given to the questions regarding
> > Part 97 and operating practices, especially for the Tech exam.
>
> Actually I'd like to see a new, separate element that is devoted entirely
to
> rules and regulations that would have to be passed before taking the
> technical elements for the license classes.

I believe Jim N2EY and I have a similar viewpoint as to making
the written into two or more specific and separate elements for
each class. Where I would differ from your suggestion is that
it makes no difference which element(s) are passed first as long
as each stands on its own.

> One should not be able to get
> on the air if they miss a significant percentage of the rules. As some
have
> commented, right now it is quite possible to miss the majority of the
> regulatory questions on an exam yet still pass the exam. The exams for
the
> various classes could then focus on operating procedures and technical
> elements. For example, let's call the rules test Element R and then for
the
> various licenses we could have a system as follows:
>
> Technician - Element R, Element 2
> Technician with HF - Element R, Element 1, Element 2
> General - Element R, Element 1, Element 2, Element 3
> Extra - Element R, Element 1, Element 2, Element 3
>
> Although if it is a truly comprehensive rules test, I'd would find it
> acceptable to eliminate element 1 for Tech with HF thus combining the
> current Tech & Tech with HF and perhaps even for General.
>
> Too many people just gloss over the rules and are not willing to look them
> up. They then rely on other people who have also glossed over the rules
> when they have a question and get some really bad information.

Seems reasonable to me.

Cheers
Bill K2UNK

5082. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-30 15:51:32 UTC
From: no_spam_here34474@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <5a5fcb7b.0312300751.61637e51@posting.google.com>
Source record: 84657
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.cb

You may not be aware but HAMS operate on SHORTWAVE, so do CB
operators. Doesn't matter HF, VHF, UHF. Still shortwave.

Gray Shockley <gray-87a@cybercoffee.org> wrote in message
news:<0001HW.BC1412D8000BC8DF13FC5A20@news.giganews.com>...
> On Sun, 28 Dec 2003 4:25:03 -0600, JEP wrote
> (in message <5a5fcb7b.0312280225.77ff125a@posting.google.com>):
>
> >> Check your local newstand or magazine rack in stores, many carry QST.
> >>>> You can purchase it without membership, or check you local library, they
> >>>> may carry it and you can read it for free.
> >>>>
> >>>
> >>>
> >>>
> >>
> >> Popular Communications (Never met a radio they didn't like)
> >> CQ
> >> QST
> >> Monitoring Times
> >>
> >> These should be easily found at any decent newstand. Don't you have any
> >> bookstores there??
> >>
> >> Borders?
> >> BDalton?
> >>
> >> BDK
> >
> > Better check your local book seller your self. Barnes & Noble and
> > Books a Million around here and no QST.
> > NO QST anywhere.
> > CQ always did suck.
> > Pop Comm--ditto--SUCKS.
> > Monitoring Times is kinda OK.
> > 73 & Ham Radio are gone.
> > Guess Mother Earth News it is ;-(
>
>
> If I were interested in ham radio, I'd have a ham radio license.
>
> But I'm a SWL and so I could care less about QST, CQ, 73 and Ham Radio. It's
> "interesting" to see so many x-posts to r.r.s about ham radio.

> About 45 years ago I used ta listen to hams and decided that I didn't want to
> be one nor continue listening to them. Most of my closest friends are hams
> but they've given up on "converting" me (even when I help them with tech
> "stuff").
>
> The great majority of hams are nice people and they sure do justify more than
> their hobby when there's an emergency. But why they think that SWLer's are
> interested in /their/ hobby still puzzles me.
>
> There are times when there are mutual interests. When a ham goes feral and
> starts broadcasting as a pirate and a felon, this can connect both hobbies
> and such as that makes me not want to just automatically killfool all the ham
> newsgroups.
>
> But look at this SUBJ: "Why you don't like the ARRL".
>
> And - of the four newsgroups - two are for SWLers and CBers.
>
> May I ask for as little more care when deciding to what many newsgroups one
> posts to?
>
>
> Thanks,
>
>
>
> Gray Shockley
> ----------------------
> DX-392 DX-398
> RX-320 DX-399
> CCradio w/RS Loop
> Torus Tuner (3-13 MHz)
> Select-A-Tenna
> ----------------------
> Vicksburg, MS US

5083. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-30 15:54:55 UTC
From: no_spam_here34474@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <5a5fcb7b.0312300754.35f8a0d@posting.google.com>
Source record: 84658
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.cb

BDK

Well, Barnes and Noble in upper Michigan does NOT carry it any more as
B Dalton does not either. I'm now in central Florida and B & N and
Books a Million NO GO.
QST is not available everywhere and you might find it's not available
in the Toledo area anymore.

BDK <kingratboyoboy@buckeye-express.com> wrote in message
news:<MPG.1a58db1e7b6c49db989855@news.buckeye-express.com>...
> In article <5a5fcb7b.0312280225.77ff125a@posting.google.com>,
> no_spam_here34474@yahoo.com says...
> > > Check your local newstand or magazine rack in stores, many carry QST.
> > > > > You can purchase it without membership, or check you local library, they
> > > > > may carry it and you can read it for free.
> > > > >
> > > >
> > > >
> > > >
> > >
> > > Popular Communications (Never met a radio they didn't like)
> > > CQ
> > > QST
> > > Monitoring Times
> > >
> > > These should be easily found at any decent newstand. Don't you have any
> > > bookstores there??
> > >
> > > Borders?
> > > BDalton?
> > >
> > > BDK
> >
> > Better check your local book seller your self. Barnes & Noble and
> > Books a Million around here and no QST.
> > NO QST anywhere.
> > CQ always did suck.
> > Pop Comm--ditto--SUCKS.
> > Monitoring Times is kinda OK.
> > 73 & Ham Radio are gone.
> > Guess Mother Earth News it is ;-(
> >
>
> Where are you anyway?? You can get MT on line. CQ and POPComm did always

> suck. 73, at least Wayne's editorial, was pretty weird. You can get QST
> all over the place around the Toledo/Detroit area. All the bookstores
> have it, a couple of drugstores have it, and I think at least one of the
> Meijer's has it too.
>
> BDK

5084. Re: The main problem with Ham radio...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-30 16:01:52 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <QjhIb.15369$IM3.1835@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 84659

"Dee D. Flint" wrote:
>
> (snip) As some have commented, right
> now it is quite possible to miss the majority
> of the regulatory questions on an exam yet
> still pass the exam. (snip

Theoretically possible, but not really very likely. A person that poorly prepared would likely miss several other questions on the exam, meaning he or she would almost have to get the majority correct on each part of the exam to pass the overall exam. That is one of the strengths of this type of exam.

> The exams for the various classes could then
> focus on operating procedures and technical
> elements. (snip)

What about the rules specific to each license class (VE rules, for example)? Also, some important rules are reenforced by repeating them at least one more time in another exam. How would you handle that?

> For example, let's call the rules test Element
> R and then for the various licenses we could
> have a system as follows: (snip)

The rules are already in the current Technician exam and reenforced in the General (and a few even reenforced in the Extra). A single exam for the rules would eliminate that system of reenforcement. Also, there are about 100 questions in the current written exams, from a pool of about 600 questions. Beyond the rules, how would you break those questions down for each element?

Finally, I have to wonder if there is any reason to change the exams at all. The current exams have evolved over many years, and I just don't see how the suggested changes I've seen (yours and others) offer a real improvement.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

5085. Re: K1MAN

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-30 16:02:45 UTC
From: rigerours protocols <foundfene4@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <67441$3ff1a1a2$d1cc7b90$31549@allthenewsgroups.com>
Source record: 84660

"Vince Wesa Werber" <ka1iic@prexar.com> wrote in message
news:pan.2003.12.29.21.43.57.25406@prexar.com...
>
> >
> > Almost nobody outside the hobby has ever heard of K1MAN, hence the idea
> > that his operations will be used as ammunition against us is pure
fantasy
>
> but they are know to certain commercial interests,,, I know that as
> FACT... I wonder if Glenn has money in those organizations???
> 73

Good point Mr. V !

The likely proof of this is the several ad's he has on his
website for you own "IARN Visa and/or Master Card".
It would not suprise me if we soon see him hawking
Sprint Pre-Paid telephone calling cards or pay-as-you-go
Nokia cellphones for sale.

funny though, he don't sell and ham gear. What's up with this?

5086. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-30 17:34:48 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <JoqdnY4xmOxFKmyiRVn-jQ@gbronline.com>
Source record: 84661
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.cb

Gray Shockley wrote:

> The great majority of hams are nice people and they sure do justify more than
> their hobby when there's an emergency. But why they think that SWLer's are
> interested in /their/ hobby still puzzles me.

And then he includes this.

> Gray Shockley
> ----------------------
> DX-392 DX-398
> RX-320 DX-399
> CCradio w/RS Loop
> Torus Tuner (3-13 MHz)
> Select-A-Tenna
> ----------------------
> Vicksburg, MS US

Why you think hams are interested in what radios and antennas you use to
SWL with is beyond me.

5087. Ham Fest Entrepreneur

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-30 17:51:50 UTC
From: Alan Jatowski <a@letdjatow.org>
Message-ID: <bssdvl$r2j$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 84662
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Michael Hughes, a 21 year old ham radio op, has come up with
a unique money making idea for hamfests.

After attending hamfest for years and experiencing the putrid
body odor which hams emit at hamfest and seeing the thousands of
unshaven faces, Michael has joined forces with a national
toiletries company to produce the first ever "Ham Radio
Convention Personal Hygiene Kit."

The kits will be hawked on the convention floor for under $5,
according to Michael, which is a reasonable price for hams
who would rather spend money on radio junk than personal
hygiene items.

Kiosks, where the kits will be sold on the convention floor, will
have large signs over them with the words, "Hams Stink."
"That alone will get people's attention," said Michael.

5088. Re: Why You Don't Like Warmed Over Incentive Licensing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-30 17:54:47 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0312300954.317e28da@posting.google.com>
Source record: 84663

```
brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0312290611.7025d8ff@posting.google.com>...
> n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20031228224904.02537.00002244@mb-m23.aol.com>...
> > In article <f45722ac.0312281608.349c8c77@posting.google.com>,
> > brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
> >
> > >n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
> > >news:<20031228135657.07346.00002296@mb-m26.aol.com>...
> > >> In article <f45722ac.0312280800.3c3a5dcc@posting.google.com>,
> > >> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
> > >>
> > >> >k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
> > >> >news:<20031228025949.04179.00002059@mb-m29.aol.com>...
> > >> >> >Subject: Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL
> > >> >> >From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
> > >> >> >Date: 12/26/03 3:01 PM Central Standard Time
> > >> >> >Message-id: <f45722ac.0312261301.4066fb17@posting.google.com>
>
> > >> >> >How many amateur radio services do we really need? How many do you
> > >> >> >really want?
> > >> >>
> > >> >> One radio service with a TIERED license structure, Brain.
> > >> >
> > >> >It is a "TIRED" radio structure.
> > >>
> > >> Not at all!
> > >>
> > >> It's a "tried and true" license structure.
> > >>
> > >> When "incentive licensing" was re-established in 1968, there were about
> 250,000
> > >> US hams. Today there are about 680,000.
> > >
> > >But CW testing was implemented to limit the number of amateurs, not
> > >grow the number.
> >
> > Where did you get that idea?
> >
> > Morse code testing was implemented for a number of reasons, but limiting the
> > number of hams wasn't one of them. And in 1968, when the requirements for full
> > amateur privileges were increased in both the written and code tests, the
> > number of hams began to grow again after at least 5 years of stagnation at the
> > quarter-million mark.
```

>
> A direct quote from the pages of QST was posted on here several years
> back. It was during the Aaron Jones Morse Myths demything era. I
> don't think Aaron posted it, though.
>
> > >> >If you want Merit Badges, join the
> > >> >BSA (or CAP).
> > >>
> > >> License class is not a merit badge.
> > >
> > >Not even when you puff out your chest and declare, "I'm a 20wpm
> > >Extra!"
> >
> > When have I done that?
>
> Not necessarily you.

You wrote:

"Not even when you puff out your chest and declare, "I'm a 20wpm
Extra!""

Fourth word in that sentence is...

> Can you say that others don't do it?

Fourth word in that sentence....
>
> > Besides, 20 wpm isn't that fast. I can do at least 35 wpm.
>
> Do I detect a little swelling of your shirt?

Nope. Just fact.

It seems to really bother you that others have learned radio operating
skills that you have not.
>
> > >> >There is no need to have class distinctions between
> > >> >hams artificially created by the FCC.
> > >>
> > >> License class is not about class distinctions.
> > >
> > >Are you positively sure abaout that?
> >
> > Yep.
>
> I'm not.

I am.

> Enough RRAPpers have abused their status to convince me
> otherwise.

That's you. Others think differently.
>
> > >> It's about qualification for
> > >> privileges. In order to have full privileges, the knowledge to pass the
> > >> Extra
> > >> is required. Same for the other classes. More knowledge, more privileges.
> > >
> > >Is that like when the General licence holder had all priveleges?
> >
> > 1953 to 1968. Then FCC decided that it wasn't enough.
>
> But didn't the FCC first decide that it was enough?

Nope.

From the FCC's/FRC's origins in the early 1930s until 1951, there was effectively a two-level system (Class A/B/C, but a C was just a B by mail). Class A was required for full privileges, and it required an advanced written test (with essay questions and diagrams) plus a year as a Class B or C.

From 1951 to 1953, an Advanced or Extra was required for full privileges.

From 1968 until the present, an Extra has been required for full privileges.

So out of about 70 years of FRC/FCC regulation of amateur radio, the period of "Generals get it all" was a bit less than 16 years. And even then it was a three-level system (Novice, Tech, General-and-above).

> Some would call
> this era the golden years of amateur radio.

Which era?

I'd call the present era the golden years. We have all sorts of wonderful equipment and modes never dreamed of before, at lower prices (adjusted for inflation) than could have been imagined at any time in the past. More hams, more DX, more opportunities.

> > >And when the Tech (General written w/o 13wpm Code) had VHF only.
> > >
> > >> This doesn't mean an Extra knows everyhting there is to know about amateur
> > >> radio because they passed the tests. It just means that said Extra has
> > >> demonstrated the *minimum* knowledge required for full privileges.
> > >
> > >Then tell Steve about self-training.
> >
> > He knows. You don't.
>
> Apparently he doesn't. Nor do you.

Sure I do. I never attended any amateur radio classes as a student.

>
> > >> >Allow the ham to distinguish
> > >> >himself or herself, based upon actual achievements.
> > >>
> > >> Such as?
> > >
> > >Cop McDonald - SSTV.
> >
> > 45+ years ago. I've read the original articles. That work is so old that 11
> > meters was a ham band.
>
> So Cop didn't distinguish himself because he hasn't done anything
> lately?

He did, both back then and more recently.
>
> Maybe the press that ran the original articles you read is now
> defunct?

Nope. Still puts out a mag every month.
>
> > >> >> Obviously you do not concur with the FCC's "Basis and Purpose" of
> the
> > >> >> Amateur Radio Service, espeically those that establish the service as
> one
> > >> >> of "self-training".
> > >> >
> > >> >I do.
> > >>
> > >> Then why didn't you train yourself on practical antennas for HF?
> > >
> > >Oh, I have.
> >
> > I don't think so.
>
> Then you simply don't know.

Do you have an HF amateur radio station ready to go at your home now,
Brian?
>
> > >What I haven't done is train myself on EVERY practical
> > >antenna for HF, especially those antennas applicable to low visual
> > >impact in a restricted neighborhood, and cannot (or rather shouldn't
> > >be placed against) a house sheathed in aluminum siding. So I looked
> > >outside my personal breadth of knowledge for something new, and ran
> > >into you and Brian Kelly. What a pair.
> >
> > You wanted to be spoon-fed antenna theory and practice instead of
> > self-training. I pointed you to several websites. It's clear you didn't even
> > look.
>
> How so?

By your obvious ignorance of the resources available with a simple
google search.
>
> > >Some would call that self-training, seeking information and knowledge
> > >outside ones own experience.
> >
> > Then why didn't you find the information on your own? It became clear to me
> > that you hadn't even tried googling. You wanted others to do the work for you,
> > then you'd insult those who tried to help you out.
>
> Kelly was abusive.

So are you.

You get far more respect here than you give.

> And because something worked in his backyard he
> knew it would work in everyone elses back yard. Even when I put the
> limitations up front.

You did not even try it, did you?

> He is mentally deficient and emotionally
> immature.

And yet you call others "abusive".
> >
> > You've personally refused to answer any questions on some alleged DX
> > operations.
>
> Most of your questions have been answered.

No, they haven't. You said they were "too hard".

> You're not really
> interested in what I have to say, only interested character
> assassination.

I'm interested in the facts. You're not.

> Once you discredit me, you think you can discredit
> what I say.

Your own words discredit you far better than I ever could.
>
> > >I've built HF and VHF antennas,
> > >some from a box, some from a reel of wire and bamboo poles. And I've
> > >operated on HF from Nebraska, ROK, Guam, Illinois, Somalia, Florida,
> > >and Ohio, in that order.
> >
> > Who is puffing out his chest now?
>
> Not based on license class. Remember, achievements, not FCC Merit
> Badges.

So you don't think passing the license tests is an achievement.
>
> Many snicker at working huge pileups with a mere Technician license
> while operating SSB on the "kiddie band."

I have no idea what you mean by the "kiddie band".
>
> Maybe you've distinguished yourself professionally?

Some people think so. But I'm not going to say anything about that
because you'd call it puffery or some such.
>
> > >How many JOTA stations have you hosted?
> >
> > None. How many have you hosted?
>
> Three.

That's good!
>
> > >How many intro-license classes have you hosted?
> >
> > A few. Code and theory. Plus upgrade study groups. Plus online help to many
> > amateurs.
>
> I've seen your on-line help.

Do you subscribe to the reflectors where I give most of it?

> You and Kelly make a great tag-team.

He knows far more about practical HF antennas than I. I'm EE, he's ME,
practical amateur radio antennas are about 10% EE and 90% ME. And
that's probably exaggerating the EE part.
>
> > How many have you taught?
>
> Two. Technician. It was tough answering a lot of the theory
> questions. It would have been nice if more Extra's had been
> interested enough to help out.

There you go, bashing by license class.

Self-training, remember?

> > >Certainly you've done something other than DX and belittle you fellow
> > >hams.
> >
> > I'm not a DXer.
>
> You should.

Why?

> You can actually earn waards based upon actual
> achievements, not just FCC Merit Badges.

Don't need any "waards"
>
> > Where have I belittled any other hams?
>
> Good grief!!! You just belittled my antenna knowledge again,

Where?

> and you
> tag-teamed with Kelly on it a little more than a year ago.

You label any disagreement as belittling and abuse, then.
>
> > >Not all hams will distinguish themselves - you certainly haven't. So
> > >let them just be hams, like 99% of all the other Extra class
> > >licensees.
> >
> > And like you?
>
> I've done nothing out of the ordinary. I don't claim to. I've had
> lots of fun being just an ordinary ham.

Same here - so what's the problem.
>
> I don't deserve ridicule because of my license class,

Neither do Extras.

> or because
> someone else thinks that my fun could have been greater if my license
> class had been higher.

Your choice.

Note the following sentence:
>
> > >> You want one class of license, fine.

See what it says? I was writing about what *YOU* say you want.

> > >> Here's how to do it:
> > >>
> > >> First, put aside the code test issue and concentrate on the writtens.
>
> > >> Second, close off the Tech and General to new issues.
> > >
> > >What? No learners permit?
> >
> > Nope. You said you want one class of license, no class distinctions, no
> > merit
> > badges. A learner's permit would mean a two-tiered structure.
>

> Nope.

Do you want one class of license or not? One class means one class.

> A person expresses and interest, get a learners permit and has
> access to other amateurs for mentoring.

No license is needed for "access to other amateurs for mentoring". And
what happened to "self training"?

> Then becomes an amateur with
> the "Amateur License." No renewals.

That's a two-class system. By definition.

Would those with "learner's permits" be allowed to be control
operators and have their own stations? If so, then it's a license, not
a learner's permit. If not, and they need a control op, there's no
need for it.

> > You said one license. That means one class of license - no learner's permit.
>
> Learners permit is fatally temporary.

How temporary? Could a person get another one after the first one runs
out?

> Does NOT create an underclass of Amateurs.

Two classes is two classes. Either you want one class or you don't.

> > Or were you lying about wanting one class of license?
>
> Not lying.

Then why do you want two classes of license now?
>
> > >> Third, combine the existing Tech, General and Extra question pools into one
> > >> large question pool. Eliminate any questions that are specific to the Tech
> > >> or General license classes because they won't be issued new any more.
> > >
> > >Such as operating priveleges?
> >
> > Exactly. If there's to be one license class, it would have to be for all
> > operating priviliges, so there's no need to test on where the old
> > subbands-by-license-class used to be. But that's about all that would be
> > removed.
>
> OK so far.
>
> > >> Fourth, a single new 120 question written exam would be generated from the
> > >> combined question pool. All new hams would have to pass this test to become
> > >> hams. All would get "Amateur Class" licenses with all privileges.
> > >

> > >Just leave out "Class" and call it "Amateur License."
> >
> > Whatever.
>
> You wanted a one license ARS, didn't you?

Not me. You're the one that's been yammering on and on about "class distinctions" and "underclass of amateurs" and "merit badges".

Remember these two sentences that I wrote at the beginning of the discussion:

"You want one class of license, fine. Here's how to do it:"
>
> > >> Fifth, all existing hams would have their license terms automatically
> > >> extended
> > >> to 10 years beyond the date on which the new rules took effect. No
> > >> renewals.
> > >>
> > >> Sixth, all existing hams would have to retest using the new "Amateur Class"
> > >> test within the next 10 years or leave the air.
> > >
> > >You could even ask to have the pools FOUO, and/or increase the size to
> > >12,000 questions. Just make the subject matter relavent.
> >
> > What subject matter in the combined question pool that was just described is
> > not relevant?
>
> Example: How many minutes it takes to send a FAX image?
>
> That's nonsense.

No, it's bad grammar. Good grammar would be "How many minutes does it take to send a FAX image?"

Why is it nonsense? Hams use FAX and similar modes. Shouldn't the test cover something about those modes? Or should it only cover modes *you* use?
>
> > >> At the end of 10 years we'd all have the same license class and all have
> > >> passed the same test to get it.
> > >>
> > >> Why not?
> > >
> > >Why not, Indeed?
> >
> > Two reasons:
> >
> > 1) All newcomers would have to pass a written test about equivalent to the
> > Extra just to get on the air.
>
> It was your suggestion.

No, it was my explanation of what your demand for a one-class system
would require.

> I just went along with it.

You've been beating the drum for a one-class system for quite a while
but you're short on the details.

> Why did you drop
> the code discussion out of the equation?

Because you'd never agree to a code test.

> > 2) Existing hams would have to retest at that level or leave the air.
>
> Basis and purpose is fufilled.
>
> > How many US hams do you think would be left in 10 years under such a system?
>
> Only the ones who really worked hard.
>
> > >Deal.
> > >
> > >You run it up the flag
> >
> > No. It's your idea.
>
> No, its your idea.

I don't want it. I simply outlined how to do it.

Remember these two sentences that I wrote at the beginning of the
discussion:

"You want one class of license, fine. Here's how to do it:"

> > You want it, you do the work. Self-training, remember? Learn how to write
> > and submit a proposal to the FCC and get an RM number assigned. Then see
> > what the amateur community thinks of your ideas in their comments.
> >
> > I don't want such a system - I just described what would logically be the
> > structure of such a system. I did it to point out exactly what such a system
> > would require, and some of the foreseeable consequences.
>
> Ah, you ran up a straw man that you really don't support.

Not at all.

I simply outlined how to do something so that all the ramifications
would be
clear.

> You've been
> doing a lot of that lately, i.e., no written exams.

It's called thinking before acting.
>
> Welp, I guess I'll never be able to take you at your word again.

Why? You're the one who has been pounding the drum for a one-class
license system, not me. But you won't do the work to even figure out
the details, let alone write a proposal. Now you're saying you want a
two class system.

Here are those two sentences again:

"You want one class of license, fine. Here's how to do it:"
>
> > >and I'll support it, perhaps with Han's caveat
> > >of a non-renewable learner's permit, limited by power and scope, but
> > >not mode.
> >
> > No. You said one class of license. That means no learner's permits, no
> > easy-to-get licenses, just one class of license. Unless you support "dumbing
> > down", such a license would have to require roughly the equivalent written > > test
knowledge as an Extra. Some regulations questions could be eliminated > > but that's all.
> >
> > Or were you lying about wanting one class of license?
>
> You certainly were.

No, I was not. Nowhere did I say I wanted one class of amateur
license.

Your behavior makes it clear why people don't want to help you, Brian.

5089. Re: The main problem with Ham radio...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-30 18:53:06 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <xnfcneeyarg.hqpsog8.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>
Source record: 84664

On Tue, 30 Dec 2003 14:38:08 GMT, Dee D. Flint wrote:

>Actually I'd like to see a new, separate element that is devoted entirely to
>rules and regulations that would have to be passed before taking the
>technical elements for the license classes. One should not be able to get
>on the air if they miss a significant percentage of the rules.

I agree with you 150 %.

Let's have the present Element 1 replaced by this "rules" element -
it is more relevant to all amateurs on any band, any class, any mode.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

From a Clearing in the Silicon Forest
Beaverton (Washington County) Oregon

5090. Re: Ham Fest Entrepreneur

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-30 19:00:44 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <wXjIb.8925$Vv2.3963158@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 84665
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Alan Jatowski wrote:
> Michael Hughes, a 21 year old ham radio op, has come up with
> a unique money making idea for hamfests.
>
> After attending hamfest for years and experiencing the putrid
> body odor which hams emit at hamfest and seeing the thousands of
> unshaven faces, Michael has joined forces with a national
> toiletries company to produce the first ever "Ham Radio
> Convention Personal Hygiene Kit."
>
> The kits will be hawked on the convention floor for under $5,
> according to Michael, which is a reasonable price for hams
> who would rather spend money on radio junk than personal
> hygiene items.
>
> Kiosks, where the kits will be sold on the convention floor, will
> have large signs over them with the words, "Hams Stink."
> "That alone will get people's attention," said Michael.

Don't quit your day job.

- Mike KB3EIA -

5091. Re: Australian CBers better than US technicians

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-30 19:08:04 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <o2kIb.935$6B.245@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 84666

"Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
news:f45722ac.0312291603.2a55d068@posting.google.com...
> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<oVZHb.13900$IM3.10739@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
>
> > What does a roger beep sound like down under?
> >
> > Dan/W4NTI
>
> Sounds just like your microphone.

I don't have a microphone like that. I use a MD-100 by Yaesu on the MP. U
use a MC-50 on my TS-530s. Can you recommend a better kind ? I am all ears
good buddy...come back.

Dan/W4NTI

5092. Re: Australian CBers better than US technicians

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-30 19:09:33 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <N3kIb.937$6B.882@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 84667

"VA7LNX" <spamtrap@gwsn.com> wrote in message
news:Rd8Ib.872984$9l5.806631@pd7tw2no...
> Dan/W4NTI wrote:
>
> >
> > "VA7LNX" <spamtrap@gwsn.com> wrote in message
> > news:F00Ib.856500$pl3.822356@pd7tw3no...
> >> Dan/W4NTI wrote:
> >>
> >> >
> >> > "WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
> >> > news:20031228194224.03823.00001965@mb-m07.aol.com...
> >> >> >Now you understand lately why it was
> >> >> >necessary to remove totally CW in the
> >> >> >S.25-5 .
> >> >>
> >> >> Yea we understand, its the only way the Knuckle Draggin CBplussers
> > could
> >> > get on
> >> >> HF.
> >> >
> >> > At one time I was seriously considering immigrating to VK land. Glad
I
> >> > didn't now. First off the take all the guns from its citizens and
the
> >> > crime
> >> > rate tripples. Now they put unqualified operators on HF.
> >> >
> >> > What does a roger beep sound like down under?
> >> >
> >> > Dan/W4NTI
> >>
> >> regor ;-)
> >>
> >> Seriously though.... I wish they wouldn't remove the code requirement
on
> > HF.
> >> It creates a new goal to get onto those bands. (Admittedly, I don't
have
> >> code either).
> >>
> >> --
> >> Donovan Hill
> >> VA7LNX (Basic, Advanced)

> >
> > Obviously most of you blokes decided otherwise. Working DX into VK will
> > be
> > a lot harder now. 40 meter SSB sucks on that path.
> >
> > Dan/W4NTI
>
> I'm in Canada. The RAC and IC are pushing to remove the code requirement
for
> HF.
>
> --
> Donovan Hill
> VA7LNX (Basic, Advanced)

I know you are....but since your part of the 'commonwealth' I figured its
all the same arguement.

Dan/W4NTI

5093. Re: New Q signs

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-30 19:24:21 UTC
From: "Hole E. Ghost" <kornform@aol.com>
Message-ID: <gjj3vv4gacmt4ab1qd680q0hbn3daqba15@4ax.com>
Source record: 84668

On 24 Dec 2003 02:46:51 GMT, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
wrote:

>73 and Merry CHRISTmas, de Larry, K3LT
>
>BTW: I hold the fervent hope that there is someone out there who is offended
>by my emphasis of the name "Christ" in the word "CHRISTmas." If so, please
>do me a favor and reply with an amusing post about how I'm being Politically
>Incorrect, or something like that!
>
>LT

You're not bring politically incorrect - just stupid.

I am sick and tired of the signs and the pious folks who loudly
proclaim that "JESUS IS THE REASON FOR THE SEASON" and "KEEP CHRIST IN
CHRISTMAS". It is moments like this that confirms my suspicion that
most Christians are a bunch of illiterate dumbasses. If one of them
even took a moment to read something else besides the bible, they
would find out that the original reason for the season is the Winter
Solstice. You see, what happens when you read non-fiction is this; you
actually learn something.

For centuries the church could not decide on the proper date of the
birth of JC (bible scholars are still debating if this person actually
existed, or if he was just another concoction of the church to control
the masses), according to Ruth Reichmann of the Max Kade
German-American Center, IUPUI, "Pagans had traditionally decked their
halls with boughs of holly, evergreens and mistletoe to symbolize
winter's inability to prevent the renewal of life. Merrymaking came to
have a share in Christmas observance through popular enthusiasm. The
medieval secular celebrations lasted for a "season," extending from
Christmas eve to Epiphany, and in some localities even from St.
Thomas' Day, Dec. 21 (honoring the "doubting Thomas," disciple of
Jesus) to Candlemas (February 2).
There was some dispute about the proper date of the birth of Christ
and not everyone agrees even to this day. It was not until A.D. 350,
that December 25 was declared the official date for celebrating
Christmas by Pope Julius I. When the fathers of the church decided to
settle upon a date to celebrate the event, they wisely chose the day
of the winter solstice, since it coincided with some rival religions'
celebrations and the rebirth of the sun and approaching longer days,
symbolized by bon-fires and yule logs. December 25 was a festival long
before the conversion of the Germanic peoples to Christianity, it
seemed fitting that the time of their winter festival would also be

the time to celebrate the birth of Christ. The darkness that had frightened and threatened to defeat the ancient pagans, was forever defeated by the coming of Christ."

So there you have it. Jesus was not the reason for the season. Christmas, as we know it, is another example of Christian plagiarism and crusades. They stole the holiday from the pagan to wipe out the competition by creating the myth of a fake birth to a virgin. Can you believe that people actually buy that? "Honest honey, it was an angel of god, not Bob next door."

So enjoy the holidays with family and friends. It is a special time, the beginning of Winter, the shortest day of the year (in the northern hemisphere), but please do not insult the nonbelievers with the Christian-fabricated myth of the "reason for the season."

5094. Re: The main problem with Ham radio...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-30 20:14:25 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <B0IIb.12175$lo3.6940@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 84669

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote

>
> Actually I'd like to see a new, separate element that is devoted entirely
to
> rules and regulations that would have to be passed before taking the
> technical elements for the license classes.
>

If there were a broad problem with rules compliance I might agree with you.
But there isn't, and most of the scofflaws we hear on the bands know the
rules just fine --- they've just decided to ignore them or apply tortured
interpretations to support their egotistical agenda. K1MAN comes to mind.

73, de Hans, K0HB

5095. Re: New Q signs

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-30 20:58:48 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3FF1E708.7080008@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 84670

>
>
>
>I am sick and tired of the signs and the pious folks who loudly
>proclaim that "JESUS IS THE REASON FOR THE SEASON" and "KEEP CHRIST IN
>CHRISTMAS".
>

> "Pagans had traditionally decked their
>halls with boughs of holly, evergreens and mistletoe to symbolize
>winter's inability to prevent the renewal of life. Merrymaking came to
>have a share in Christmas observance through popular enthusiasm. The
>medieval secular celebrations lasted for a "season," extending from
>Christmas eve to Epiphany, and in some localities even from St.
>Thomas' Day, Dec. 21 (honoring the "doubting Thomas," disciple of
>Jesus) to Candlemas (February 2).
>
AKA Groundhog Day....

>There was some dispute about the proper date of the birth of Christ
>and not everyone agrees even to this day.
>
Last I heard, it was sometime in the spring. So JC wasn't born on
Christmas Day
(DEC 25) but likely sometime during Lent. Around 6BC. It's a trivial
issue
as far as beliving in God anyway. Another trivial issue is that Adam
and Eve
thing that has some in the Bible Belt upset about evolution.

As for Santa Claus, he has more connection to JC than Xmas trees. Santa
is a modified version of St. Nichilas, who used to give gifts to kids in
his town to celebrate JC's birth.

>It was not until A.D. 350,
>that December 25 was declared the official date for celebrating
>Christmas by Pope Julius I. When the fathers of the church decided to
>settle upon a date to celebrate the event, they wisely chose the day
>of the winter solstice, since it coincided with some rival religions'
>celebrations and the rebirth of the sun and approaching longer days,
>symbolized by bon-fires and yule logs.
>
It was partially cover to choose Dec 25th as, IIRC, Christians were
still getting fed
to lions in hte Roman Empire. So Christians could party without calling

attention to
themselves. Or was the Roman Empire history by then? Been a long time since
history class....

Did people really worry about the Sun going away forever instead of comming back
every year? Hey, any reason to party....

5096. Re: Ham Fest Entrepreneur

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-30 21:10:13 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <boSdnW_I9vG2d2yiRVn-sA@gbronline.com>
Source record: 84671
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Alan Jatowski wrote:
> Michael Hughes, a 21 year old ham radio op, has come up with
> a unique money making idea for hamfests.
>
> After attending hamfest for years and experiencing the putrid
> body odor which hams emit at hamfest and seeing the thousands of
> unshaven faces, Michael has joined forces with a national
> toiletries company to produce the first ever "Ham Radio
> Convention Personal Hygiene Kit."
>
> The kits will be hawked on the convention floor for under $5,
> according to Michael, which is a reasonable price for hams
> who would rather spend money on radio junk than personal
> hygiene items.
>
> Kiosks, where the kits will be sold on the convention floor, will
> have large signs over them with the words, "Hams Stink."
> "That alone will get people's attention," said Michael.

Probably will be difficult to get up to the counter with all the cbers
in the way.

5097. Re: The main problem with Ham radio...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-30 21:13:01 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <xTIIb.19713$P%1.18354431@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 84672

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:QjhIb.15369$IM3.1835@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net...
>
> "Dee D. Flint" wrote:
> >
> > (snip) As some have commented, right
> > now it is quite possible to miss the majority
> > of the regulatory questions on an exam yet
> > still pass the exam. (snip
>
>
> Theoretically possible, but not really very likely. A person that poorly
> prepared would likely miss several other questions on the exam, meaning he
> or she would almost have to get the majority correct on each part of the
> exam to pass the overall exam. That is one of the strengths of this type
of
> exam.
>
>

I have known several people who already had the technical background (or
most of it) and passed the exam and knew very little about the rules. Take
the Technician exam. There are only 5 questions on the test pertaining to
rules out of a total of 35 questions. You can miss all five and pass since
you can miss as many as 9 and still have a passing score. Plus the
questions don't begin to cover all the rules that directly apply to the
operations of a Technician class licensee.

> > The exams for the various classes could then
> > focus on operating procedures and technical
> > elements. (snip)
>
>
> What about the rules specific to each license class (VE rules, for
> example)? Also, some important rules are reenforced by repeating them at
> least one more time in another exam. How would you handle that?
>

None of the tests currently comes close to covering the full scope of rules
applying to the license class on that particular license exam and that is
what needs to be changed. Since Generals and higher can be VEs, they need
to test for the VE rules anyway. And yes Generals can be VEs as they are
eligible to administer Tech class license tests. Right now the General test
is sorely lacking in VE rule questions. The VE rules (in comparison to most
of the other material) are fairly simple so it wouldn't hurt the Techs to

learn them anyway.

Most of the rules apply across the board. Yes there are band limits for the different license classes so perhaps that could be put on the individual license exams or repeated on the individual exams for reinforcment but all classes need to know the baud rate limit for RTTY on HF. Even the Techs need to know this if they chose to earn HF privileges or if the code is done away with in the future.

If the applicant has studied sufficiently to get 75% right on a rules only test of say 100 or so questions, he/she shouldn't have too much problem remembering the rules.

The rules that get reinforced on today's testing happen to be those that are the easiest to remember. They are items such as: no playing of music, no profanity, no interference etc. They are the common sense items that nearly everyone can remember with just a single test simply because they are common sense. That some people choose to flout those basic common sense rules doesn't mean they don't know them.

>
> > For example, let's call the rules test Element
> > R and then for the various licenses we could
> > have a system as follows: (snip)
>
>
> The rules are already in the current Technician exam and reenforced in
the
> General (and a few even reenforced in the Extra). A single exam for the
> rules would eliminate that system of reenforcement. Also, there are about
> 100 questions in the current written exams, from a pool of about 600
> questions. Beyond the rules, how would you break those questions down for
> each element?

The rules covered in the exam barely scratch the surface. And one can miss most or all the rules questions and still pass the current exam element. The rules that get reinforced are only those that are major (i.e. no interference or false distress calls for example) and generally are easily remembered anyway.

I regularly have people tell me they'd like to practice their code on the air but "can't because they are only a Tech." They are totally unaware that they can work code in the VHF and higher spectrum so if they want to practice with a friend (or elmer) or work the DX 6m band openings on CW, it's perfectly legal to do so. Another example; many people at all levels of license classes are very confused about the difference between regulated band requirements and band plans. This question comes up over and over.

As far as then filling in on the existing tests to make up for moving rules to a separate element, there is plenty of operational and technical material, etc. that could be inserted. Again, take the Tech test. There is very little on digital operations or satellite operations yet these are open

to Technicians. Here is another example. The tests do not have questions addressing the issue of how far from the band edge one should stay to insure that none of their signal is outside the allowable band. I've heard Generals, for example, operating LSB at 7.226, just 1kc above their band limit, which puts part of their signal out-of-band. And it's not limited to Generals. I've heard Extras operating LSB at 7.151, which is the same problem. They, of all people, should know better but often do not. It's not adequately covered in the study material or the exams.

Or another area that could be included in the test, although I'd admit it's not a necessity, is something on the history of amateur radio. How many people realize amateurs made major contributions to the development of radio and what those contributions were? Cell phone technology is basically a commercialized version of the linked repeater systems with phone patch that amateurs developed. They've automated functions that the amateurs left as manual functions.

Or how about including a little bit on space weather and it's effects not only on propagation but how major flares can potentially effect electronics in general.

Or how about a bit more detail on how to address RFI issues. The coverage in the licensing and testing is extremely limited.

There's no shortage of valuable material that could be used.

>
> Finally, I have to wonder if there is any reason to change the exams at
> all. The current exams have evolved over many years, and I just don't see
> how the suggested changes I've seen (yours and others) offer a real
> improvement.
>

Dwight that argument can be turned against the proposal to eliminate code testing as follows so don't go there.
"Finally, I have to wonder if there is any reason to change the exams at all.
The current exams have evolved over many years, and I just don't see how the suggested changes I've seen (yours and others to eliminate code
testing) offer a real improvement."

Although nothing will stop the deliberate violators, knowing the rules helps prevent the good and decent people from making mistakes. It will help prevent, but not completely stop, well intentioned but uninformed people from spreading misinformation about what the rules are. Do you know how many times I've had to show them the actual FCC rules to convince people (including Extras) that 50.0 to 50.1 and 144.0 to 144.1 are CW only with not even digital modes allowed? It happens several times a year. They have fallen into the trap of thinking, incorrectly, that VHF and higher has only band plans when in fact it does have a few regulatory limits and this is one of them.

The top three things that any ham should know, in my opinion, are rules/regulations, safety, and good operating practices. These need a great deal more coverage than they currently get.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

5098. Re: Why You Don't Like Warmed Over Incentive Licensing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-30 21:32:33 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031230163233.14167.00002175@mb-m28.aol.com>
Source record: 84673

>Not true. If so, they wouldn't argue so vehemently against what I say.

Most people just like to give you hard time because they know you dont have a Clue. Lets face it Brian, if the FCC hadnt decided to give Ham Licenses away, you will still be on 11 Meters.

5099. Re: Ham Fest Entrepreneur

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-30 21:42:16 UTC
From: "Dr. A.T. Squeegee" <SpammersArePondScum@Dev.Null>
Message-ID: <MPG.1a5b911275851e77989bcc@192.168.42.131>
Source record: 84674
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

In article <bssdvl$r2j$0@pita.alt.net>, a@letdjatow.org says...

<nothing of importance>

PLONK!

--
Dr. Anton Squeegee, Director, Dutch Surrealist Plumbing Institute
(Known to some as Bruce Lane, KC7GR)
kyrrin a/t bluefeathertech d-o=t c&o&m
Motorola Radio Programming & Service Available -
http://www.bluefeathertech.com/rf.html
"Quando Omni Flunkus Moritati" (Red Green)

5100. Re: The main problem with Ham radio...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-30 22:14:12 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <UMmIb.1308$6B.627@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 84675

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:QjhIb.15369$IM3.1835@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net...
>
> "Dee D. Flint" wrote:
> >
> > (snip) As some have commented, right
> > now it is quite possible to miss the majority
> > of the regulatory questions on an exam yet
> > still pass the exam. (snip
>
>
> Theoretically possible, but not really very likely. A person that poorly
> prepared would likely miss several other questions on the exam, meaning he
> or she would almost have to get the majority correct on each part of the
> exam to pass the overall exam. That is one of the strengths of this type
of
> exam.
>
>
> > The exams for the various classes could then
> > focus on operating procedures and technical
> > elements. (snip)
>
>
> What about the rules specific to each license class (VE rules, for
> example)? Also, some important rules are reenforced by repeating them at
> least one more time in another exam. How would you handle that?

Frankly, I believe VE rules don't belong on the license exam at all.
Far better to focus on operating rather than regulatory minutia
of how to operate VE sessions, etc. I'd have no problem with
a "VE" endorsement if the FCC deemed it necessary or just
handle things as they do today via ARRL, W5YI or other
VE accreditation (sp?).

> > For example, let's call the rules test Element
> > R and then for the various licenses we could
> > have a system as follows: (snip)
>
> The rules are already in the current Technician exam and reenforced in
the
> General (and a few even reenforced in the Extra). A single exam for the
> rules would eliminate that system of reenforcement. Also, there are about
> 100 questions in the current written exams, from a pool of about 600
> questions. Beyond the rules, how would you break those questions down for

> each element?
>
> Finally, I have to wonder if there is any reason to change the exams at
> all. The current exams have evolved over many years, and I just don't see
> how the suggested changes I've seen (yours and others) offer a real
> improvement.

I think Dee's suggestions would make a small, but valid, improvement.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

5101. Re: Ham Fest Entrepreneur

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-30 22:19:14 UTC
From: fartmo my elmo <heekcere3@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <c54fa$3ff1fb08$d1cc57cb$15862@allthenewsgroups.com>
Source record: 84676
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Alan Jatowski" <a@letdjatow.org> wrote in message
news:bssdvl$r2j$0@pita.alt.net...
> Michael Hughes, a 21 year old ham radio op, has come up with
> a unique money making idea for hamfests.

21 yo's should be out having wild, un-inhibited monkeysex
with college girls in the dorm, not wasting their time with stinky
old farts at hamfests.

5102. Re: Ham Fest Entrepreneur

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-30 22:24:10 UTC
From: fartmo my elmo <heekcere3@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <4c5d7$3ff1fb0a$d1cc57cb$15862@allthenewsgroups.com>
Source record: 84677
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:wXjIb.8925$Vv2.3963158@news1.news.adelphia.net...
> Alan Jatowski wrote:
> > Michael Hughes, a 21 year old ham radio op, has come up with
> > a unique money making idea for hamfests.

and here's a pic of michael's girlfriend.....

click here:
http://ww3.voyeurweb.com/main/Pre54b/ps20031221-65702/index.html

5103. Re: Why You Don't Like Warmed Over Incentive Licensing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-30 23:56:07 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031230185607.07961.00000897@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 84678

In article <a3gIb.584$6B.179@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Bill Sohl"
<billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20031229221903.05539.00003254@mb-m16.aol.com...
>> In article <ap_Hb.5411$d4.3753@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Bill
>Sohl"
>> <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
>>
>> >"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>> >news:20031228135657.07346.00002296@mb-m26.aol.com...
>> >> In article <f45722ac.0312280800.3c3a5dcc@posting.google.com>,
>> >> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
>> >>
>> >> >k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
>> >> >news:<20031228025949.04179.00002059@mb-m29.aol.com>...
>> >> >> >Subject: Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL
>> >> >> >From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
>> >> >> >Date: 12/26/03 3:01 PM Central Standard Time
>> >> >> >Message-id: <f45722ac.0312261301.4066fb17@posting.google.com>
>> >> >>
>> >> >> >How many amateur radio services do we really need? How many do you
>> >> >> >really want?
>> >> >>
>> >> >> One radio service with a TIERED license structure, Brain.
>> >> >
>> >> >It is a "TIRED" radio structure.
>> >>
>> >> Not at all!
>> >>
>> >> It's a "tried and true" license structure.
>> >>
>> >> When "incentive licensing" was re-established in 1968, there were about
>> >> 250,000 US hams. Today there are about 680,000.
>>
>> Bill,
>>
>> Remember how the number of US hams barely moved from 1962 to 1968?
>
>Jim,
>The "When incentive licensing was re-est...." was not my statement.

Agreed! It was mine!

Point was you and I have been hams long enough to actually recall those times.
>
>> >> >If you want Merit Badges, join the
>> >> >BSA (or CAP).
>> >>
>> >> License class is not a merit badge.
>> >>
>> >> >There is no need to have class distinctions between
>> >> >hams artificially created by the FCC.
>> >>
>> >> License class is not about class distinctions. It's about qualification
>> >> for privileges. In order to have full privileges, the knowledge to pass
>the
>> >> Extra is required. Same for the other classes. More knowledge, more
>> privileges.
>> >
>> >But, as you and I have agreed before, the privileges gained do NOT relate
>to
>> >the additional knowledge needed for the higher license class.
>>
>> FCC disagrees, Bill.
>
>True for now. But if anyone is serious about a new license
>structure, I'd like to see rational relationship between the
>license class knowledge test requirements and whatever
>additional privileges are associated with that license.

First off, there's bound to be disagreement about what constitutes a "rational
relationship"

Second and more important is, if we don't use spectrum as an incentive, what do
we use?

If we use power (as Hans suggests), there's little incentive for QRP and low
power folks to upgrade. And since we're supposed to use the minimum power
required by the situation anyway.....

If we use modes as the incentive, which modes do we use for the incentive?

There's also the question of enforcement. You can tell right away if someone is
outside their allocated spectrum, but power is another issue.
>
>> >What is the technical competency difference between an Extra
>> >operating SSB with a TS440 in the 80m Extra voice segment vs a General
>> >operating the same rig at say 3.885Mhz?
>>
>> Not much!
>
>Not any as I see it.
>
Exactly.The difference is in operating skills and knoiwledge. The Extra part is
where the DX often goes.

>> But the FCC thinks it's a good idea to reward additional
>> technical knowledge with more privileges.
>
>I don't oppose the concept, I oppose the illogical implementation.

We can agree to disagree about the logic.

But what should be used for an incentive besides spectrum?
>
>> For that matter, what is the technical competency difference between
>> operating
>> CW on the low end of 2 meters vs. the low end of 20 meters? (note that I
>> wrote *technical*)
>
>None and that point has been made by myself as well. The only
>two truly CW only sub-bands do NOT require passing any
>code test to be able to use them.

technical knowledge....
>
>> >> This doesn't mean an Extra knows everyhting there is to know about
>> >> amateur
>> >> radio because they passed the tests. It just means that said Extra has
>> >> demonstrated the *minimum* knowledge required for full privileges.
>> >
>> >The problem, again one we agreed on before, is that granting
>> >additional frequency spectrum doesn't rationally flow from the
>> >additional knowledge required for the higher license class (e.g.
>> >Extra vs General, General vs Tech.
>>
>> It rationally flows if you buy into FCC's logic on the matter.
>
>It only flows as to "pure incentive". It doiesn't flow or relate
>at all to the additional knowledge tested to pass the license.

Some of the knowledge does, such as HF propagation.
>
>> Would you rather that FCC did away with the Extra, Bill? For that matter,
>> what about the General?
>
>Did I even hint at that.

Not at all!

>The answer is basically no...although
>I have NO preference for or against changing license structure
>to a more rational basis for added privileges.
>
My point is simply that being anticodetest does *not* necessarily mean someone
wants to water dwon the writtens or eliminate license classes.

>> >> >Allow the ham to distinguish
>> >> >himself or herself, based upon actual achievements.

>> >>
>> >> Such as?
>> >
>> >Good question.
>> >
>> My point exactly.
>>
>> >> >> Obviously you do not concur with the FCC's "Basis and Purpose" of
>the
>> >> >> Amateur Radio Service, espeically those that establish the service
>as
>> >> >> one
>> >> >> of "self-training".
>> >> >
>> >> >I do.
>> >>
>> >> Then why didn't you train yourself on practical antennas for HF?
>> >>
>> >> >-Espeically- "self-training." Obviously you believe that once
>> >> >you obtain the "Amateur Extra" license that all learning must stop.
>> >> >There is nothing more to be learned!
>> >>
>> >> Nope, not at all. All it means to have passed the Extra is that said
>> >> Extra has demonstrated the *minimum* knowledge required for full
>privileges.
>> >
>> >True under the current scheme of licensing for the USA. It could
>> >be changed and that is the point raised in this discussion. Should
>> >it be changed and if so, how?
>>
>> I wrote up a suggested three-tiered system some time back and reposted it
>> recently. I think it's the best compromise between all the various
>> considerations. YMMV.
>>
>> Please note the following sentence. I'm *not* saying I want one class of
>> license! I'm simply describing how to do it.
>>
>> >> You want one class of license, fine. Here's how to do it:
>> >>
>> >> First, put aside the code test issue and concentrate on the writtens.
>> >>
>> >> Second, close off the Tech and General to new issues.
>> >>
>> >> Third, combine the existing Tech, General and Extra question pools into
>> >> one large question pool. Eliminate any questions that are specific to
>the
>> Tech
>> >> or General license classes because they won't be issued new any more.
>> >>
>> >> Fourth, a single new 120 question written exam would be generated from

>the
>> >> combined question pool. All new hams would have to pass this test to
>> >> become hams. All would get "Amateur Class" licenses with all
>privileges.
>> >>
>> >> Fifth, all existing hams would have their license terms automatically
>> >> extended to 10 years beyond the date on which the new rules took
>effect. No
>> >> renewals.
>> >
>> >Never happen.
>>
>> I hope you're right, Bill. But I learned long ago to "never say never".
>
>I hope I'm right too :-) :-)

That makes two of us.
>
>> >> Sixth, all existing hams would have to retest using the new "Amateur
>> >> Class" test within the next 10 years or leave the air.
>> >
>> >Never happen. You want a way to kill ham radio, then that'd
>> >do it in a heartbeat...a 10 year heartbeat at the longest.
>>
>> Exactly! But the hams who remained would all have passed the same test so
>> there's be no more license-based "class distinctions". That's the point.
>
>But, again, not at all a probable possibility.

A lot of things we thought impossible have come to pass. Heck, FCC never
imagined that cb would get out of their control...
>
>> >> At the end of 10 years we'd all have the same license class and all
>> >> have passed the same test to get it.
>> >
>> >At the end of 10 years we'd have no ham service of any consequence.
>>
>> Sure we would. Just not the one you or I want. But it would be more like
>> what Brian wants.
>
>IF the numbers of hams dropped considerably because of the proposal,
>I seriously doubt the service as well as ham organizations would survive.
>Calling for all retesting of existing hams would play right into the hands
>of
>the commercial interests that would love to get us off the air completely.
>
We can agree on this: Neither of us wants to find out the hard way what the
result would be.

>> >Retesting does NOT get any support at all. A handful of people
>> >propose retesting (I oppose retesting)...but that is all. If 1968

>> >incentive
>> >licensing drove some folks away, you can bet the "all existing
>> >hams would need to be retested" will certainly do it.
>>
>> I think most active hams would just take the %^&#$% test and be done with
>> it.
>> The problem is that many semi-active or inactive hams wouldn't, and we'd
>> see a
>> drastic reduction in numbers. Bad news.Very bad news.
>
>Exactly my point.
>
>> To repeat: I'm not in favor of a one-class system. I'm just pointing out
>where
>> such a system would lead.
>
>I believe we both believe, if imlemented as you proposed above,
>the end result would be disastor.
>
Or worse.

>> >> Why not?
>> >
>> >Please tell me any example of something you do in life that
>> >requires anyone to be knowledge retested...other than
>> >something in the medical field such as CPR recertification.
>>
>> In my line of work, (no, I'm not going to say what it is here), employees
>> are
>> constantly retested on safety and procedures. The last time I took a
>> safety
>> test, the passing grade was 100%. Get *one* question wrong and you fail.
>> And in
>> a year or less you have to do it all over again.
>
>But if you get one wrong do you lose your job...or
>just take it again until you pass?

You cannot work until you pass the test. Fail enough times and you lose your
job.

>The last time I took
>any test that actually might have impacted my career was
>when I was first hired and tested by the personel office
>back in 1970.
>
The last time for me was in August.

>> >Cheers and happy new year.
>>
>> All the best in '04, Bill

>
>Mega dittos to you and everyone else in RRAP
>Bill K2UNK
>
73 de Jim, N2EY>

5104. Re: The main problem with Ham radio...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-31 00:07:59 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0312301607.5df013e0@posting.google.com>
Source record: 84679

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:<xnfcneeyarg.hqpsog8.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>...
> On Tue, 30 Dec 2003 14:38:08 GMT, Dee D. Flint wrote:
>
> >Actually I'd like to see a new, separate element that is devoted entirely to
> >rules and regulations that would have to be passed before taking the
> >technical elements for the license classes. One should not be able to get
> >on the air if they miss a significant percentage of the rules.
>
> I agree with you 150 %.
>
> Let's have the present Element 1 replaced by this "rules" element -
> it is more relevant to all amateurs on any band, any class, any mode.

Phil, I said it before the restructuring and I''ll say it again.

"What I fear most about the restructuring is a lack of enforcement,
and what I fear most about maintaining the status quo is a lack of
enforcement."

Having people memorizing the rules is completely meaningless unless
the FCC enforces them.

5105. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-31 00:19:44 UTC
From: rhf-mail@pacbell.net
Message-ID: <e5e13af8.0312301619.5b8a48a8@posting.google.com>
Source record: 84680
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.cb

JJ,

"Why you think hams are interested in what radios
and antennas you use to SWL with is beyond me."

Since this was Cross Posted to several NewsGroups:

* rec.radio.amateur.policy, [Amateur - HAM]

* rec.radio.amateur.misc, [Amateur - HAM]

* rec.radio.shortwave, [S H O R T W A V E]

* rec.radio.cb [C B]

The Devil Is In The Details...
So "GS" is simply communicating his 'status' as a SWL.

The Question Every Amateur Must Ask Themselves is . . .
Is Any Body ? ? ? L I S T E N I N G ? ? ?

YES - But they may be a lowly SWL and You will Never Know;
Unless the SWL sends the HAM a QCL Request and the HAM Replys in Kind.
? How many Amateurs Actively Seek QCL Reports form SWLs ?
? How many Amateurs 'send out' "QCL Cards" to the SWLs ?

Exus Laxus Good Buddy ~ RHF
Breaking-On-the-Low-Side - Can I Get a Radio Check ? QC? QC? BS!
.
.
= = = JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
= = = wrote in message news:<JoqdnY4xmOxFKmyiRVn-jQ@gbronline.com>...
> Gray Shockley wrote:
>
> > The great majority of hams are nice people and they sure do justify more than
> > their hobby when there's an emergency. But why they think that SWLer's are
> > interested in /their/ hobby still puzzles me.
>
> And then he includes this.
>
> > Gray Shockley
> > ----------------------
> > DX-392 DX-398
> > RX-320 DX-399
> > CCradio w/RS Loop
> > Torus Tuner (3-13 MHz)

> > Select-A-Tenna
> > ----------
> > Vicksburg, MS US
>
> Why you think hams are interested in what radios
> and antennas you use to SWL with is beyond me.

5106. Re: Why You Don't Like Warmed Over Incentive Licensing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-31 00:56:16 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031230195616.21232.00003050@mb-m13.aol.com>
Source record: 84682

In article <ZG6Ib.8566$Vv2.3772948@news1.news.adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo
<mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:

>But the FCC thinks it's a good idea to reward additional
>> technical knowledge with more privileges.
>
> And so do I! The arguments of tying technical knowledge to priveleges
>is completely bogus, irritating, and eventually self defeating. That
>many NCTA's used it as an argument against Morse code testing does not
>make it less so. It's just that now, that bird will come home to roost.

You mean like in the "21st Century" paper?
>
>> For that matter, what is the technical competency difference between
>operating
>> CW on the low end of 2 meters vs. the low end of 20 meters? (note that I
>wrote
>> *technical*)
>
> What is the technical comptency difference between the Extra operating
>in his or her segment of a HF band and an unlicensed CB'er running a
>linear?

Legality, for one.
>
>>>>This doesn't mean an Extra knows everyhting there is to know about amateur
>>>>radio because they passed the tests. It just means that said Extra has
>>>>demonstrated the *minimum* knowledge required for full privileges.
>>>
>>>The problem, again one we agreed on before, is that granting
>>>additional frequency spectrum doesn't rationally flow from the
>>>additional knowledge required for the higher license class (e.g.
>>>Extra vs General, General vs Tech.
>>
>> It rationally flows if you buy into FCC's logic on the matter.
>
>I look at it as more of a philosophy thing than specific logic. They
>seem to want people to learn things. Tying knowledge to priveliges is a
>good philosophy in my estimation.

Some people seem to disagree.
>
>> Would you rather that FCC did away with the Extra, Bill? For that matter,
>what
>> about the General?

>
> If we adopt the philosophy, it could be done. Insane, but stranger
>things have happened.

Much stranger things.

73 de Jim, N2EY

5107. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-31 01:00:52 UTC
From: BDK <kingratboyoboy@buckeye-express.com>
Message-ID: <MPG.1a5be9d047e29434989864@news.buckeye-express.com>
Source record: 84683
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.cb

```
In article <5a5fcb7b.0312300754.35f8a0d@posting.google.com>,
no_spam_here34474@yahoo.com says...
> BDK
>
> Well, Barnes and Noble in upper Michigan does NOT carry it any more as
> B Dalton does not either. I'm now in central Florida and B & N and
> Books a Million NO GO.
> QST is not available everywhere and you might find it's not available
> in the Toledo area anymore.
>
>
> BDK <kingratboyoboy@buckeye-express.com> wrote in message
news:<MPG.1a58db1e7b6c49db989855@news.buckeye-express.com>...
> > In article <5a5fcb7b.0312280225.77ff125a@posting.google.com>,
> > no_spam_here34474@yahoo.com says...
> > > > Check your local newstand or magazine rack in stores, many carry QST.
> > > > > > You can purchase it without membership, or check you local library, they
> > > > > > may carry it and you can read it for free.
> > > > > >
> > > > >
> > > > >
> > > > >
> > > > >
> > > >
> > > > Popular Communications (Never met a radio they didn't like)
> > > > CQ
> > > > QST
> > > > Monitoring Times
> > > >
> > > > These should be easily found at any decent newstand. Don't you have any
> > > > bookstores there??
> > > >
> > > > Borders?
> > > > BDalton?
> > > >
> > > > BDK
> > >
> > > Better check your local book seller your self. Barnes & Noble and
> > > Books a Million around here and no QST.
> > > NO QST anywhere.
> > > CQ always did suck.
> > > Pop Comm--ditto--SUCKS.
> > > Monitoring Times is kinda OK.
> > > 73 & Ham Radio are gone.
```

> > > Guess Mother Earth News it is ;-(
> > >
> >
> > Where are you anyway?? You can get MT on line. CQ and POPComm did always
> > suck. 73, at least Wayne's editorial, was pretty weird. You can get QST
> > all over the place around the Toledo/Detroit area. All the bookstores
> > have it, a couple of drugstores have it, and I think at least one of the
> > Meijer's has it too.
> >
> > BDK
>

Hmm, well I saw it at one place last week, along with MT, CQ, and the
scanner one, I can't think of the name. Leo's bookstore has them all,
they used to have the British SW Magazine and Practical Wireless too,
but not lately.

I haven't been to B Dalton in a long time, but Barnes and Nobles had it
a couple of months ago.

I guess you will have to subscribe, it's cheaper than buying it anyway.

BDK

5108. Re: Why You Don't Like Warmed Over Incentive Licensing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-31 01:03:34 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <groupk0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <GfpIb.12512$lo3.10605@newsread2.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 84684

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote

>
> Second and more important is, if we don't use spectrum as an incentive,
what do
> we use?
>

Incentive?

Jim, you sound like a typical eastern liberal with an agenda of social
engineering.

You're either qualified for a ham license or you're not qualified. This
incentive notion (and Steve Robeson's 'structured occupancy' notion) are
liberal ideas whose time has gone.

73, de Hans, K0HB

5109. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-31 01:18:30 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <GtpIb.19766$P%1.18401304@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 84685
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.cb

"BDK" <kingratboyoboy@buckeye-express.com> wrote in message
news:MPG.1a5be9d047e29434989864@news.buckeye-express.com...
> In article <5a5fcb7b.0312300754.35f8a0d@posting.google.com>,
> no_spam_here34474@yahoo.com says...
>
> Hmm, well I saw it at one place last week, along with MT, CQ, and the
> scanner one, I can't think of the name. Leo's bookstore has them all,
> they used to have the British SW Magazine and Practical Wireless too,
> but not lately.
>
> I haven't been to B Dalton in a long time, but Barnes and Nobles had it
> a couple of months ago.
>
> I guess you will have to subscribe, it's cheaper than buying it anyway.
>
> BDK

Technically you don't "subscribe" to QST. You join the ARRL and receive the
magazine as a result of your membership.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

5110. Re: The 14 Petitions

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-31 01:54:42 UTC
From: Alun <alun@1stcounsel.com>
Message-ID: <Xns9461D4B4C31elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 84686

Dave Head <rally2xs@att.net> wrote in
news:ugj2vvc0tq2ih8vf65dslinm0nmga8b4n7@4ax.com:

> On 30 Dec 2003 06:23:07 GMT, Alun <alun@1stcounsel.com> wrote:
>
>>Dave Head <rally2xs@att.net> wrote in
>>news:d000vvoe3gtta7ehl34u0gcgufuru4122o@4ax.com:
>>
>>> On 29 Dec 2003 04:56:55 GMT, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:
>>>
>>>>In article <sihuuv0alfjan6hgs42han7gprniiijm9p@4ax.com>, Dave Head
>>>><rally2xs@att.net> writes:
>>>>
>>>>> It has to do
>>>>>with the waning of union power, I think, and the mistake that "tech"
>>>>>people including engineers make that they don't need a union. If
>>>>>you're an employee, you need a union. Period. But the IT bunch
>>>>>won't join one, and look what happened to them.
>>>>
>>>>Dave,
>>>>
>>>>I partly agree with you. A lot of the problem is waning union power.
>>>
>>>>But that doesn't mean everyone needs to be unionized. The mere
>>>>existence of strong unions benefits nonunion workers, too, because
>>>>often employers with nonunion shops will treat their workers better
>>>>in order to stave off unionization.
>>>
>>> Yes, there is that good effect.
>>>
>>>>But as the percentage of labor that is unionized decreases, that
>>>>effect diminishes also.
>>>
>>> We're going to be a 3rd world country if workers don't wake up. Very
>>> rich. Very poor. Nobody else.
>>>
>>> Dave Head
>>>
>>>>73 de Jim, N2EY
>>>>
>>>
>>>
>>
>>Oh, arise ye victims of opression, rise up ye workers from your chains,

>>Come rally, come rally, sing the Internationale
>>
>>(Words of the Communist Internationale, a rare instance of a song that
>>refers reflexively to itself, must have been written by a Unix
>>programmer)
>
> Well, we've had at least 1 request to end the thread, but I have to
> come back this once to say that I believe we can have protection for
> workers via their own actions, through unions, without going the
> communist route. I'm pretty seriously anti-communist, but do believe
> that workers are progressively getting abused and need to do something
> about it, themselves, since they are the only ones that do or ever will
> care about their welfare.
>
> Dave Head
>

I don't think there has ever been a true communist state, so it's
impossible to say what it would be like, or if it could even be done. The
Soviet Union was a highly stratified soceity, and didn't allow what we
would call unions.

5111. Re: The main problem with Ham radio...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-31 02:08:26 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031230210826.10794.00001159@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 84687

>Having people memorizing the rules is completely meaningless unless
>the FCC enforces them.
>

Now your getting the Picture

5112. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-31 02:14:54 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <NJidnZn_UqXmrm-iRVn-gQ@gbronline.com>
Source record: 84688
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.cb

RHF wrote:

> The Devil Is In The Details...
> So "GS" is simply communicating his 'status' as a SWL.

All it conveys is he owns two radios and some other stuff, it conveys nothing about his 'status' as an SWL. Just a brag list. Maybe I should list all my ham equipment with my postings, like anyone would care.

5113. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-31 02:35:15 UTC
From: Telamon <telamon_spamshield@pacbell.net.is.invalid>
Message-ID: <telamon_spamshield-961F49.18351430122003@news.sf.sbcglobal.net>
Source record: 84689
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

In article <S8AHb.3698$d4.2373@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>,
"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote:

> "Gray Shockley" wrote:
> >
> > And - of the four newsgroups - two are
> > for SWLers and CBers.
> >
> > May I ask for as little more care when
> > deciding to what many newsgroups one
> > posts to?
>
>
> Sadly, we don't always have much control over where messages are
> cross-posted, Gray. Since some Hams are CB'ers and others SWL's, the
> discussion itself may have actually started in one of those non-ham
> newsgroups. In other cases, it is trolls (in any one of the newsgroups)
> trying to belittle Ham radio and it's operators (posted to a number of
> newsgroups in an effort to get the widest possible audience for that). In
> still other cases, the discussion started in a ham radio newsgroup, with
> other newsgroups added by participants who mainly frequent those other
> newsgroups. Whatever the case, you're certainly not alone - we get our share
> of messages relating to other topics posted in the Ham radio newsgroups as
> well.

You have plenty of control. Just delete the groups where this is OT like
I did.

--
Telamon
Ventura, California

5114. Re: Why You Don't Like Warmed Over Incentive Licensing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-31 02:55:40 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <MUqIb.9223$Vv2.4058285@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 84690

N2EY wrote:
> In article <ZG6Ib.8566$Vv2.3772948@news1.news.adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo
> <mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:
>
>
>>But the FCC thinks it's a good idea to reward additional
>>
>>>technical knowledge with more privileges.
>>
>> And so do I! The arguments of tying technical knowledge to priveleges
>>is completely bogus, irritating, and eventually self defeating. That
>>many NCTA's used it as an argument against Morse code testing does not
>>make it less so. It's just that now, that bird will come home to roost.
>
>
> You mean like in the "21st Century" paper?

Yes! So many of the arguments used in priceless instruments like that
can be used against any knowledge requirements whatsoever.

Why should I have to learn about (fill in the blank), I never intend
to(fill in the blank)?

Why sould anyone be discriminated against? Even NCVEC wants a entry
level license that is geared toward an average 6th grader.

Any tying of knowledge to priveliges is unwarranted social engineering.
I mean what are ya, a liberal? (must be said with a sneer)

Any tying of priveliges to knowledge is hazing. What is this anyhow,
some sort of radio God fraternity?

Technology has brought us to the point that with a few minor adjustments
(modified radios to eliminate band edge problems, elimination of
homebrewing to get rid of dangerous experimentation, perhaps even
potting the interiors of transcievers) we will be able to transform Ham
radio into the true PEOPLES radio service.

True Amateur Radio Nirvana

from your humble Cassandra, Mike.

>>>For that matter, what is the technical competency difference between
>>
>>operating
>>
>>>CW on the low end of 2 meters vs. the low end of 20 meters? (note that I

>>
>>wrote
>>
>>>*technical*)
>>
>> What is the technical comptency difference between the Extra operating
>>in his or her segment of a HF band and an unlicensed CB'er running a
>>linear?
>
>
> Legality, for one.

Sure, but let us go past legality for a minute. Those jokers get on the
air and don't fry themselves in the process. They put out a signal too,
even if it is often overmodulated to an extreme. But there they are,
exhibit one. At the lowes common denominator, NO license needed.

>>>>>This doesn't mean an Extra knows everyhting there is to know about amateur
>>>>>radio because they passed the tests. It just means that said Extra has
>>>>>demonstrated the *minimum* knowledge required for full privileges.
>>>>
>>>>The problem, again one we agreed on before, is that granting
>>>>additional frequency spectrum doesn't rationally flow from the
>>>>additional knowledge required for the higher license class (e.g.
>>>>Extra vs General, General vs Tech.
>>>
>>>
>>>It rationally flows if you buy into FCC's logic on the matter.
>>
>>I look at it as more of a philosophy thing than specific logic. They
>>seem to want people to learn things. Tying knowledge to priveliges is a
>>good philosophy in my estimation.
>
>
> Some people seem to disagree.

Yeah, well I think they are wrong. And I think I know enough about human
nature to give myself pretty good odds of being right.

- Mike KB3EIA -

5115. Re: Why You Don't Like Warmed Over Incentive Licensing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-31 03:03:07 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <L%qIb.9227$Vv2.4059835@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 84691

Kï¿½HB wrote:

> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote
>
>
>>Second and more important is, if we don't use spectrum as an incentive,
>
> what do
>
>>we use?
>>
>
>
> Incentive?
>
> Jim, you sound like a typical eastern liberal with an agenda of social
> engineering.

Thank goodness the Conservatives have NO social engineering agenda!!!

> You're either qualified for a ham license or you're not qualified. This
> incentive notion (and Steve Robeson's 'structured occupancy' notion) are
> liberal ideas whose time has gone.

Personally I think good true conservative idea is to allow people on
the air with no licencing requirements whatsoever, then cull out the
ones that violate the rules.

- Mike KB3EIA -

5116. Ham Radio in The Information Age and Terrorism

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-31 03:41:09 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bstgh0$vld@library2.airnews.net>
Source record: 84692

According to a story in the Washington Post, by Dan Eggen, on Tuesday, Dec. 30, 2003:
An FBI intelligence bulletin sent to law enforcement agencies last week warned that "terrorist operatives may rely on almanacs to assist with target selection and pre-operational planning" because they include detailed information on bridges, tunnels and other U.S. landmarks, officials said.

OK, fault me and sneer at me all you want but, isn't the above just going way too far? (the rest of the story can be read on the Washington Post website--just do a search on the word almanac and it should be around the second item in the list). I mean, I understand the fear, the tendency to jump to safety, but even if terrorists are using almanacs, do we want to be "caught" with one if we are thought to be acting "suspicious" as is mentioned in the article?

Sheesh, what about ham radio?! One of the most widely used communication mediums in this country and maybe the world, right? What do we open ourselves up for by being on the air and "just talking?"

--
Kim W5TIT

5117. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-31 03:49:33 UTC
From: gw@webhideout.com
Message-ID: <235a74db.0312301949.588e1c4c@posting.google.com>
Source record: 84693
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.cb

JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
news:<JoqdnY4xmOxFKmyiRVn-jQ@gbronline.com>...
> Gray Shockley wrote:
>
> > The great majority of hams are nice people and they sure do justify more than
> > their hobby when there's an emergency. But why they think that SWLer's are
> > interested in /their/ hobby still puzzles me.
>
> And then he includes this.
>
> > Gray Shockley
> > ----------
> > DX-392 DX-398
> > RX-320 DX-399
> > CCradio w/RS Loop
> > Torus Tuner (3-13 MHz)
> > Select-A-Tenna
> > ----------
> > Vicksburg, MS US
>

hey john how are things in colorado springs???

> Why you think hams are interested in what radios and antennas you use to
> SWL with is beyond me.

5118. Re: The main problem with Ham radio...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-31 04:14:45 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <xnfcneeyarg.hqqjb95.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>
Source record: 84694

On 30 Dec 2003 16:07:59 -0800, Brian wrote:
>
>Phil, I said it before the restructuring and I''ll say it again.
>
>"What I fear most about the restructuring is a lack of enforcement,
>and what I fear most about maintaining the status quo is a lack of
>enforcement."
>
>Having people memorizing the rules is completely meaningless unless
>the FCC enforces them.

I said that long before you were a ham and I'll continue to say it.
I and others did our parts to make it happen, and I'm sad that it
degenerated as it did. I can point fingers 40 years back as to why
but it wouldn't do any good.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

5119. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-31 07:15:17 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <9IuIb.2000$6B.769@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 84695
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

"Telamon" wrote:
>
> You have plenty of control. Just delete
> the groups where this is OT like I did.

At which point, since you don't know which newsgroup the person is posting from, you potentially lose contact with the person you're responding to.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

5120. Re: The main problem with Ham radio...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-31 10:13:23 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <7jxIb.2044$6B.285@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 84696

"Dee D. Flint" wrote:
>
> I have known several people who
> already had the technical background
> (or most of it) and passed the exam
> and knew very little about the rules.
> Take the (snip)

While that might be an exception, would a person with a technical background be the type to ignore rules? Instead, I suspect a person who would make the effort to gain a technical background would also likely make the effort to learn the rules of any activity he or she might be involved in.

> (snip) Plus the questions don't begin to
> cover all the rules that directly apply to
> the operations of a Technician class
> licensee.

Well, if you're looking for a test to cover all the rules, it seems to me you're looking for a test with several hundred questions. College students don't even have to take a test with several hundred questions to pass a class to prepare for a career. Likewise, an extensive exam like this doesn't fit into the current exam concept (basic exams for entry into each license class). With that in mind, how are you going to sell the FCC on that idea?

> None of the tests currently comes close
> to covering the full scope of rules
> applying to the license class on that
> particular license exam and that is
> what needs to be changed. (snip)

Why? Do you have some evidence (personal, rhetorical, or otherwise) that would suggest the current tests are linked to a specific problem with rule violations? From what I've seen, most violations are the result of intentional rule infractions, not ignorance of the rules themselves.

> If the applicant has studied sufficiently to
> get 75% right on a rules only test of say
> 100 or so questions, he/she shouldn't
> have too much problem remembering
> the rules.

My wife only had 50 questions on the exams to pass her international law class recently (two 20 question exams and one 10 question exam). You're asking for much more from people preparing for what is fundamentally a

recreational activity. That, in my opinion, is a little ridiculous, Dee.

> The rules covered in the exam barely
> scratch the surface. And one can miss
> most or all the rules questions and still
> pass the current exam element. (snip)

You keep saying that, but do you have anything to suggest it has ever happened (much less commonly so)? Again, it is theoretically possible, but not really very likely. As I said before, a person that poorly prepared would likely miss several other questions on the exam, meaning he or she would almost have to get the majority correct on each part of the exam to pass the overall exam.

> I regularly have people tell me they'd
> like to practice their code on the air but
> "can't because they are only a Tech."
> They are totally unaware that they can
> work code in the VHF (snip)

Did they tell you that (they were unaware they can work code on VHF), or is that your interpretation of their comment. I've made a similar comment once or twice over the years - not because I was unaware I could work code on VHF, but because there are so few others doing so on those frequencies.

> Again, take the Tech test. There is
> very little on digital operations or
> satellite operations yet these are open
> to Technicians. (snip)

There was such material in the pool I studied (7/97 - 6/01 pool). For satellite, questions T1C01 through T1C11, T1E05 through T1E08, T3C01 through T3C05, T3C10 through T3C12, and a few others here and there throughout the pool. There are a similar number of questions for digital operations.

> Or another area that could be included
> in the test, although I'd admit it's not a
> necessity, is something on the history
> of amateur radio. (snip)

> Or how about including a little bit on
> space weather and it's effects not only
> on propagation but how major flares
> can potentially effect electronics
> in general. (snip)

Come on, Dee. If you throw in a little more math and language skills, you could almost offer a college degree to those who pass the exams you want.

> Here is another example. The tests do
> not have questions addressing the issue
> of how far from the band edge one
> should stay to insure that none of their

> signal is outside the allowable band.
> I've heard (snip)

Not in so many words, but the concepts are there (bandwidths of various modes and frequency limits). The old Novice used to have a couple of questions about this, but I'm not sure that made it's way over to the new tests.

> Dwight that argument can be turned
> against the proposal to eliminate code
> testing as follows so don't go there.
> "Finally, I have to wonder if there
> is any reason to change the exams
> at all. The current exams have
> evolved over many years, and I
> just don't see how the suggested
> changes I've seen (yours and
> others to eliminate code testing)
> offer a real improvement."

Not really. My objection isn't based on the fact that the current exams have evolved over the years, but on the fact that I don't see how the suggested changes offer an improvement. The part about the current exams evolving over the years was intended to point out how well they fit the current needs, leaving little room for improvement by the suggestions offered. The same cannot be said about the code test because it hasn't really evolved to fit the current needs (from a regulatory perspective, there is no current need for the code test). Now, before this turns into a code test debate, lets drop this at that.

> The top three things that any ham should know,
> in my opinion, are rules/regulations, safety, and
> good operating practices. These need a great
> deal more coverage than they currently get.

Obviously every Ham should know those things. But, as noted in section 97.3 of the rules (below), this is an activity oriented towards self-study or self-training, not massive tests with extensive knowledge before entrance.

Section 97.3
"A radio communications service for
the purpose of self-training,
intercommunication and technical
investigations carried out by amateurs,
that is, duly authorized persons
interested in radio technique solely with
a personal aim and without pecuniary
interest."

The rules are there for any Ham to study on their own - with plenty of warnings in the exams about what might happen if they don't follow those

rules.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

5121. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-31 12:38:42 UTC
From: no_spam_here34474@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <5a5fcb7b.0312310438.75c314fb@posting.google.com>
Source record: 84697
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.cb

Just my point. I don't want to belong to ARRL just as I don't care to
belong to AARP, NRA, AAA, Skinheads, etc. I just want to read their
magazine when it has something that interests me. I wouldn't buy it
every month as most of the time it has useless drivel about some
clowntest or whether someone died or some such crap. ARRL and QST have
a short time left as the active Ham population lessens. If they took a
real survey as to how many real active ham there are they would find
the number far less than they think. I'm not talking about members,
I'm talking about HAMS that really use a radio to transmit a signal.
Doesnt matter what band. How many transmit a signal at least once a
week? Most don't.
Look at your local HAM clubs, talk to the members(if you can wake them
up). Most show up and act disgusted with the club, Ham radio, life in
general. New folks are never there. Ya I know about your Skywarn in
Flint, MI. Great service! Could be run on CB, NEXTEL, GMRS.

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:<GtpIb.19766$P%1.18401304@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>...
> "BDK" <kingratboyoboy@buckeye-express.com> wrote in message
> news:MPG.1a5be9d047e29434989864@news.buckeye-express.com...
> > In article <5a5fcb7b.0312300754.35f8a0d@posting.google.com>,
> > no_spam_here34474@yahoo.com says...
> >
> > Hmm, well I saw it at one place last week, along with MT, CQ, and the
> > scanner one, I can't think of the name. Leo's bookstore has them all,
> > they used to have the British SW Magazine and Practical Wireless too,
> > but not lately.
> >
> > I haven't been to B Dalton in a long time, but Barnes and Nobles had it
> > a couple of months ago.
> >
> > I guess you will have to subscribe, it's cheaper than buying it anyway.
> >
> > BDK
>
> Technically you don't "subscribe" to QST. You join the ARRL and receive the
> magazine as a result of your membership.
>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

5122. Re: Why You Don't Like Warmed Over Incentive Licensing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-31 14:23:57 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <1_AIb.16878$IM3.13697@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 84698

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20031230195616.21232.00003050@mb-m13.aol.com...
> In article <ZG6Ib.8566$Vv2.3772948@news1.news.adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo
> <mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:
>
> >But the FCC thinks it's a good idea to reward additional
> >> technical knowledge with more privileges.
> >
> > And so do I! The arguments of tying technical knowledge to priveleges
> >is completely bogus, irritating, and eventually self defeating. That
> >many NCTA's used it as an argument against Morse code testing does not
> >make it less so. It's just that now, that bird will come home to roost.
>
> You mean like in the "21st Century" paper?
> >
> >> For that matter, what is the technical competency difference between
> >operating
> >> CW on the low end of 2 meters vs. the low end of 20 meters? (note that
I
> >wrote
> >> *technical*)
> >
> > What is the technical comptency difference between the Extra operating
> >in his or her segment of a HF band and an unlicensed CB'er running a
> >linear?
>
> Legality, for one.
> >
> >>>>This doesn't mean an Extra knows everyhting there is to know about
amateur
> >>>>radio because they passed the tests. It just means that said Extra has
> >>>>demonstrated the *minimum* knowledge required for full privileges.
> >>>
> >>>The problem, again one we agreed on before, is that granting
> >>>additional frequency spectrum doesn't rationally flow from the
> >>>additional knowledge required for the higher license class (e.g.
> >>>Extra vs General, General vs Tech.
> >>
> >> It rationally flows if you buy into FCC's logic on the matter.
> >
> >I look at it as more of a philosophy thing than specific logic. They
> >seem to want people to learn things. Tying knowledge to priveliges is a
> >good philosophy in my estimation.
>

> Some people seem to disagree.

The point is that no other licensing (federal or state) takes such a
position....i.e. where the additional privileges are not otherwise
a function of additional knowledge required for the license.

> >> Would you rather that FCC did away with the Extra, Bill?
> >> For that matter what about the General?
> >
> > If we adopt the philosophy, it could be done. Insane, but stranger
> >things have happened.

There are, as we have discussed, valid privileges which could be
tied to the increased license knowledge. Power would be a good
example (IMHO). Most of us have agreed that it makes almost
no sense to have the entry level license (technician) allowed to
run 1500 watts based on a knowledge base of so little technical
and theory.

Cheers and Happy New Year to all,
Bill K2UNK

5123. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-31 14:43:01 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <VfBIb.19838$P%1.18531178@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 84751
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.cb

"JEP" <no_spam_here34474@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:5a5fcb7b.0312310438.75c314fb@posting.google.com...
> Just my point. I don't want to belong to ARRL just as I don't care to
> belong to AARP, NRA, AAA, Skinheads, etc. I just want to read their
> magazine when it has something that interests me. I wouldn't buy it
> every month as most of the time it has useless drivel about some
> clowntest or whether someone died or some such crap. ARRL and QST have
> a short time left as the active Ham population lessens.

Well then you can't expect the magazine to be sold at outlets when you only buy it once in a while. They've got to recoup the costs of printing and distributing and the "once in a while" buyer just doesn't provide that.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

5124. Re: Why You Don't Like Warmed Over Incentive Licensing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-31 14:56:12 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <gsBIb.16918$IM3.6633@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 84699

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20031230185607.07961.00000897@mb-m03.aol.com...
> In article <a3gIb.584$6B.179@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Bill
Sohl"
> <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
>
> >"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> >news:20031229221903.05539.00003254@mb-m16.aol.com...
> >> In article <ap_Hb.5411$d4.3753@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Bill
> >Sohl"
> >> <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
> >>
> >> >"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> >> >news:20031228135657.07346.00002296@mb-m26.aol.com...
> >> >> In article <f45722ac.0312280800.3c3a5dcc@posting.google.com>,
> >> >> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
> >> >>
> >> >> >k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote in message
> >> >> >news:<20031228025949.04179.00002059@mb-m29.aol.com>...
> >> >> >> >Subject: Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL
> >> >> >> >From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
> >> >> >> >Date: 12/26/03 3:01 PM Central Standard Time
> >> >> >> >Message-id: <f45722ac.0312261301.4066fb17@posting.google.com>
> >> >> >>
> >> >> >> >How many amateur radio services do we really need? How many do
you
> >> >> >> >really want?
> >> >> >>
> >> >> >> One radio service with a TIERED license structure, Brain.
> >> >> >>
> >> >> >It is a "TIRED" radio structure.
> >> >>
> >> >> Not at all!
> >> >>
> >> >> It's a "tried and true" license structure.
> >> >>
> >> >> When "incentive licensing" was re-established in 1968, there were
about
> >> >> 250,000 US hams. Today there are about 680,000.
> >>
> >> Bill,
> >>
> >> Remember how the number of US hams barely moved from 1962 to 1968?
> >

> >Jim,
> >The "When incentive licensing was re-est...." was not my statement.
>
> Agreed! It was mine!
>
> Point was you and I have been hams long enough to actually recall those
times.
> >
> >> >> >If you want Merit Badges, join the
> >> >> >BSA (or CAP).
> >> >>
> >> >> License class is not a merit badge.
> >> >>
> >> >> >There is no need to have class distinctions between
> >> >> >hams artificially created by the FCC.
> >> >>
> >> >> License class is not about class distinctions. It's about
qualification
> >> >> for privileges. In order to have full privileges, the knowledge to
pass
> >the
> >> >> Extra is required. Same for the other classes. More knowledge, more
> >> privileges.
> >> >
> >> >But, as you and I have agreed before, the privileges gained do NOT
relate
> >to
> >> >the additional knowledge needed for the higher license class.
> >>
> >> FCC disagrees, Bill.
> >
> >True for now. But if anyone is serious about a new license
> >structure, I'd like to see rational relationship between the
> >license class knowledge test requirements and whatever
> >additional privileges are associated with that license.
>
> First off, there's bound to be disagreement about what constitutes a
"rational
> relationship"
>
> Second and more important is, if we don't use spectrum as an incentive,
what do
> we use?
>
> If we use power (as Hans suggests), there's little incentive for QRP and
low
> power folks to upgrade.

The irony, however, is that I would bet most people that
are dedicated QRPers are much more tehnically oriented

to begin with and more likly to upgrade. On the other hand,
IF a QRPer is content with the entry level power limits
and doesn't choose to upgrade, what's the harm? One can
look at all those that don't upgrade today...even with
spectrum privileges as the enhancement...to see folks that
are content at their current license level and are also good
hams.

> And since we're supposed to use the minimum power
> required by the situation anyway.....

True, but the FCC has never made a big case of checking to
see that everyone is running at the least practical power.
Additionally, I suspect the FCC concern on the "least power"
is driven more by those running "big" power rather than
anyone run a basic rig of 100 watts or less.

> If we use modes as the incentive, which modes do we use for the incentive?

I don't see modes as an incentive.

> There's also the question of enforcement. You can tell right away if
someone is
> outside their allocated spectrum, but power is another issue.

Yet it has been an aspect of Novice license for over 50 years.
I agree the enforcement would have its problems, but I suspect
the gross violations could be detected (e.g. if limit is 200 watts
and someone is running a kilowatt). In the end, I believe "most"
hams want to operate legally and will do so. Those that might run
double their allowed power (say 400 when limited to 200) are
only fooling themselves.

> >> >What is the technical competency difference between an Extra
> >> >operating SSB with a TS440 in the 80m Extra voice segment vs a General
> >> >operating the same rig at say 3.885Mhz?
> >>
> >> Not much!
> >
> >Not any as I see it.
> >
> Exactly.The difference is in operating skills and knowledge.
> The Extra part is where the DX often goes.

Maybe we could tie some power limits to frequency
spectrum which would then create a valid reason to not allow
a lower level licesnse in that spectrum slot.

> >> But the FCC thinks it's a good idea to reward additional
> >> technical knowledge with more privileges.
> >
> >I don't oppose the concept, I oppose the illogical implementation.
>

> We can agree to disagree about the logic.
>
> But what should be used for an incentive besides spectrum?

I agree with Hans that power certanly can be and has been.
Also, at the risk of being stoned, how has the Canadian
entry level license been going which restricts those hams to
commercial equipment only? Perhaps an entry level USA
license could have a restriction of commercial only rigs
"OR" hmebrew transmitter "IF" the homebrew has been
checked out and signed off as OK by an Extra class ham.

Allowing "homebrew" via an Extra certification process would
foster positive relationships and Elmering (IMHO).

> >> For that matter, what is the technical competency difference between
> >> operating
> >> CW on the low end of 2 meters vs. the low end of 20 meters? (note that
I
> >> wrote *technical*)
> >
> >None and that point has been made by myself as well. The only
> >two truly CW only sub-bands do NOT require passing any
> >code test to be able to use them.
>
> *technical* knowledge....

You know I couldn't pass up the opportunity :-) :-)

> >> >> This doesn't mean an Extra knows everyhting there is to know about
> >> >> amateur
> >> >> radio because they passed the tests. It just means that said Extra
has
> >> >> demonstrated the *minimum* knowledge required for full privileges.
> >> >
> >> >The problem, again one we agreed on before, is that granting
> >> >additional frequency spectrum doesn't rationally flow from the
> >> >additional knowledge required for the higher license class (e.g.
> >> >Extra vs General, General vs Tech.
> >>
> >> It rationally flows if you buy into FCC's logic on the matter.
> >
> >It only flows as to "pure incentive". It doesn't flow or relate
> >at all to the additional knowledge tested to pass the license.
>
> Some of the knowledge does, such as HF propagation.

Yet the "only" difference between technicians not allowed
any HF and those allowed on the "novice" segments is a code test...
no additional knowledge of HF needed for Tech with code
to operate the Novice segments.

> >> Would you rather that FCC did away with the Extra, Bill?
> >> For that matter, what about the General?
> >
> >Did I even hint at that.
>
> Not at all!
>
> >The answer is basically no...although
> >I have NO preference for or against changing license structure
> >to a more rational basis for added privileges.
> >
> My point is simply that being anticodetest does *not* necessarily mean
someone
> wants to water dwon the writtens or eliminate license classes.

THANK YOU Jim!

I wish certain others in this newsgroup had the ability to
understand that.

> >> >> >Allow the ham to distinguish
> >> >> >himself or herself, based upon actual achievements.
> >> >>
> >> >> Such as?
> >> >
> >> >Good question.
> >> >
> >> My point exactly.
> >>
> >> >> >> Obviously you do not concur with the FCC's "Basis and Purpose"
> >> >> >> of the Amateur Radio Service, espeically those that establish
> >> >> >> the service as one of "self-training".
> >> >> >
> >> >> >I do.
> >> >>
> >> >> Then why didn't you train yourself on practical antennas for HF?
> >> >>
> >> >> >-Espeically- "self-training." Obviously you believe that once
> >> >> >you obtain the "Amateur Extra" license that all learning must stop.
> >> >> >There is nothing more to be learned!
> >> >>
> >> >> Nope, not at all. All it means to have passed the Extra is that
said
> >> >> Extra has demonstrated the *minimum* knowledge required for
> >> >> full privileges.
> >> >
> >> >True under the current scheme of licensing for the USA. It could
> >> >be changed and that is the point raised in this discussion. Should
> >> >it be changed and if so, how?
> >>
> >> I wrote up a suggested three-tiered system some time back and reposted
it

> >> recently. I think it's the best compromise between all the various
> >> considerations. YMMV.
> >>
> >> Please note the following sentence. I'm *not* saying I want one class
of
> >> license! I'm simply describing how to do it.
> >>
> >> >> You want one class of license, fine. Here's how to do it:
> >> >>
> >> >> First, put aside the code test issue and concentrate on the
writtens.
> >> >>
> >> >> Second, close off the Tech and General to new issues.
> >> >>
> >> >> Third, combine the existing Tech, General and Extra question pools
into
> >> >> one large question pool. Eliminate any questions that are specific
to
> >the
> >> Tech
> >> >> or General license classes because they won't be issued new any
more.
> >> >>
> >> >> Fourth, a single new 120 question written exam would be generated
from
> >the
> >> >> combined question pool. All new hams would have to pass this test to
> >> >> become hams. All would get "Amateur Class" licenses with all
> >privileges.
> >> >>
> >> >> Fifth, all existing hams would have their license terms
automatically
> >> >> extended to 10 years beyond the date on which the new rules took
> >effect. No
> >> >> renewals.
> >> >
> >> >Never happen.
> >>
> >> I hope you're right, Bill. But I learned long ago to "never say never".
> >
> >I hope I'm right too :-) :-)
>
> That makes two of us.
> >
> >> >> Sixth, all existing hams would have to retest using the new "Amateur
> >> >> Class" test within the next 10 years or leave the air.
> >> >
> >> >Never happen. You want a way to kill ham radio, then that'd
> >> >do it in a heartbeat...a 10 year heartbeat at the longest.
> >>

> >> Exactly! But the hams who remained would all have passed the same test
so
> >> there's be no more license-based "class distinctions". That's the
point.
> >
> >But, again, not at all a probable possibility.
>
> A lot of things we thought impossible have come to pass. Heck, FCC never
> imagined that cb would get out of their control...

In hindsight, the FCC certainly should have seen it coming. The big
mistake,
in my opinion, was the failure of the FCC to take into account the
basic "plug-n-play aspect of CB, the multitude of sales outlets via Radio
Shack (Tandy), and the constantly lowering of CB set costs, especially
once they became all solid state.

> >> >> At the end of 10 years we'd all have the same license class and all
> >> >> have passed the same test to get it.
> >> >
> >> >At the end of 10 years we'd have no ham service of any consequence.
> >>
> >> Sure we would. Just not the one you or I want. But it would be more
like
> >> what Brian wants.
> >
> >IF the numbers of hams dropped considerably because of the proposal,
> >I seriously doubt the service as well as ham organizations would survive.
> >Calling for all retesting of existing hams would play right into the
hands
> >of
> >the commercial interests that would love to get us off the air
completely.
> >
> We can agree on this: Neither of us wants to find out the hard way what
the
> result would be.
>
> >> >Retesting does NOT get any support at all. A handful of people
> >> >propose retesting (I oppose retesting)...but that is all. If 1968
> >> >incentive
> >> >licensing drove some folks away, you can bet the "all existing
> >> >hams would need to be retested" will certainly do it.
> >>
> >> I think most active hams would just take the %^&#$% test and be done
with
> >> it.
> >> The problem is that many semi-active or inactive hams wouldn't, and
we'd
> >> see a
> >> drastic reduction in numbers. Bad news.Very bad news.

> >
> >Exactly my point.
> >
> >> To repeat: I'm not in favor of a one-class system. I'm just pointing
out
> >where
> >> such a system would lead.
> >
> >I believe we both believe, if imlemented as you proposed above,
> >the end result would be disastor.
> >
> Or worse.
>
> >> >> Why not?
> >> >
> >> >Please tell me any example of something you do in life that
> >> >requires anyone to be knowledge retested...other than
> >> >something in the medical field such as CPR recertification.
> >>
> >> In my line of work, (no, I'm not going to say what it is here),
employees
> >> are
> >> constantly retested on safety and procedures. The last time I took a
> >> safety
> >> test, the passing grade was 100%. Get *one* question wrong and you
fail.
> >> And in
> >> a year or less you have to do it all over again.
> >
> >But if you get one wrong do you lose your job...or
> >just take it again until you pass?
>
> You cannot work until you pass the test. Fail enough times and you lose
your
> job.
>
>
> >The last time I took
> >any test that actually might have impacted my career was
> >when I was first hired and tested by the personel office
> >back in 1970.
> >
> The last time for me was in August.
>
> >> >Cheers and happy new year.
> >>
> >> All the best in '04, Bill
> >
> >Mega dittos to you and everyone else in RRAP
> >Bill K2UNK

> >
> 73 de Jim, N2EY>

Cheers
Bill K2UNK

5125. Re: Why You Don't Like Warmed Over Incentive Licensing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-31 15:00:35 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <nwBIb.16932$IM3.5849@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 84700

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:L%qIb.9227$Vv2.4059835@news1.news.adelphia.net...
> K&#65533;HB wrote:
>
> > "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote
> >
> >
> > >>Second and more important is, if we don't use spectrum as an incentive,
> >
> > > what do
> >
> > >>we use?
> > >>
> >
> >
> > > Incentive?
> >
> > > Jim, you sound like a typical eastern liberal with an agenda of social
> > > engineering.
>
> Thank goodness the Conservatives have NO social engineering agenda!!!
>
> > > You're either qualified for a ham license or you're not qualified. This
> > > incentive notion (and Steve Robeson's 'structured occupancy' notion) are
> > > liberal ideas whose time has gone.
>
> Personally I think good true conservative idea is to allow people on
> the air with no licencing requirements whatsoever, then cull out the
> ones that violate the rules.

Wrong. A true conservative desires the least practical government intervention in life. Clearly a "free-for-all" no license approach to ham radio wouldn't cut it and, as such, I and other conservative minded individuals do support ham licensing. Where we depart from the current approach is in the recognition that the "incentives" of today's licensing do NOT dovetail with the knowledge needed to pass the higher level license exams.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

5126. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-31 15:08:30 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <ODBIb.16943$IM3.1446@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 84752
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.cb

"JEP" <no_spam_here34474@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:5a5fcb7b.0312310438.75c314fb@posting.google.com...
> Just my point. I don't want to belong to ARRL just as I don't care to
> belong to AARP, NRA, AAA, Skinheads, etc.

Can you "just buy" the magazines of AARP, NRA, AAA, etc.
without joining? I am always amazed at people that want the "benefits"
of an organization's efforts, in this case the publication, but don't want
to support the organization by joining. I see the same thing at times
in the antique car hobby. People that bitch about the club rules
at a car show, or otherwise want technical help from club officials
but won't part with the few bucks it takes to join.

> I just want to read their
> magazine when it has something that interests me. I wouldn't buy it
> every month as most of the time it has useless drivel about some
> clowntest or whether someone died or some such crap. ARRL and QST have
> a short time left as the active Ham population lessens.

Is it lessening? News to me.

> If they took a
> real survey as to how many real active ham there are they would find
> the number far less than they think. I'm not talking about members,
> I'm talking about HAMS that really use a radio to transmit a signal.
> Doesnt matter what band. How many transmit a signal at least once a
> week? Most don't.

Please provide your survey data.

> Look at your local HAM clubs, talk to the members(if you can wake them
> up). Most show up and act disgusted with the club, Ham radio, life in
> general. New folks are never there. Ya I know about your Skywarn in
> Flint, MI. Great service! Could be run on CB, NEXTEL, GMRS.

Could be but isn't...there in lies the difference.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

5127. Re: The main problem with Ham radio...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-31 15:21:06 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <CPBIb.19842$P%1.18538480@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 84753

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:7jxIb.2044$6B.285@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
>
> "Dee D. Flint" wrote:
> >
> > I have known several people who
> > already had the technical background
> > (or most of it) and passed the exam
> > and knew very little about the rules.
> > Take the (snip)
>
>
> While that might be an exception, would a person with a technical
> background be the type to ignore rules? Instead, I suspect a person who
> would make the effort to gain a technical background would also likely
make
> the effort to learn the rules of any activity he or she might be involved
> in.
>

Yes they can be. I've known several. They too often fall in the "know it
all" category.

>
> > (snip) Plus the questions don't begin to
> > cover all the rules that directly apply to
> > the operations of a Technician class
> > licensee.
>
>
> Well, if you're looking for a test to cover all the rules, it seems to
me
> you're looking for a test with several hundred questions. College students
> don't even have to take a test with several hundred questions to pass a
> class to prepare for a career. Likewise, an extensive exam like this
doesn't
> fit into the current exam concept (basic exams for entry into each license
> class). With that in mind, how are you going to sell the FCC on that idea?
>

I think 50 to 100 questions ought to do it. Only the pool would need to be
several hundred questions, just as today's pools are far larger than the
number of questions actually occurring on any one exam.

>
> > None of the tests currently comes close
> > to covering the full scope of rules
> > applying to the license class on that
> > particular license exam and that is
> > what needs to be changed. (snip)
>
>
> Why? Do you have some evidence (personal, rhetorical, or otherwise) that
> would suggest the current tests are linked to a specific problem with rule
> violations? From what I've seen, most violations are the result of
> intentional rule infractions, not ignorance of the rules themselves.
>
>

I find band edge violations almost every time I dial up and down the HF
bands.

> > If the applicant has studied sufficiently to
> > get 75% right on a rules only test of say
> > 100 or so questions, he/she shouldn't
> > have too much problem remembering
> > the rules.
>
>
> My wife only had 50 questions on the exams to pass her international law
> class recently (two 20 question exams and one 10 question exam). You're
> asking for much more from people preparing for what is fundamentally a
> recreational activity. That, in my opinion, is a little ridiculous, Dee.
>

How many questions has she had to pass to get her law degree and to pass her
bar exam?

Fifty to 100 multiple choice questions on the FCC rules is simple as the
rules are very simple.

>
> > The rules covered in the exam barely
> > scratch the surface. And one can miss
> > most or all the rules questions and still
> > pass the current exam element. (snip)
>
>
> You keep saying that, but do you have anything to suggest it has ever
> happened (much less commonly so)? Again, it is theoretically possible, but
> not really very likely. As I said before, a person that poorly prepared
> would likely miss several other questions on the exam, meaning he or she
> would almost have to get the majority correct on each part of the exam to
> pass the overall exam.
>

On the Tech exam there are only 5 rules questions. That means missing all 5 gives you a score of 30, which is passing. This gives you room to miss several other questions on the exam. However several of those 5 are so common sense (i.e. no interference) that even someone who has not studied will not miss them all. Afterall the passing grade for the exam is only 74%. That means you can miss a total of 9 and still get it.

Neither the examiners nor the applicants know which specific questions were used on any one exam. The answer sheets and question sheets are separated. So determining whether someone had difficulty with the technical, operating, or rules sections is not allowed at the test session. The data could be computerized and correlated at the VEC but isn't. However in teaching classes and using practice exams, it is common for a student to struggle with a particular section while acing the others. The section will vary from student to student however.

>
> > I regularly have people tell me they'd
> > like to practice their code on the air but
> > "can't because they are only a Tech."
> > They are totally unaware that they can
> > work code in the VHF (snip)
>
>
> Did they tell you that (they were unaware they can work code on VHF), or
> is that your interpretation of their comment. I've made a similar comment
> once or twice over the years - not because I was unaware I could work code
> on VHF, but because there are so few others doing so on those frequencies.
>

They actually told me so and were astonished that it was legal for them to work CW on VHF even though they had not passed a code test. The sad thing is the only people I ever find on VHF CW are Generals, Advanced and Extras.

>
> > Again, take the Tech test. There is
> > very little on digital operations or
> > satellite operations yet these are open
> > to Technicians. (snip)
>
>
> There was such material in the pool I studied (7/97 - 6/01 pool). For
> satellite, questions T1C01 through T1C11, T1E05 through T1E08, T3C01
through
> T3C05, T3C10 through T3C12, and a few others here and there throughout the
> pool. There are a similar number of questions for digital operations.
>

The current question pool however no longer includes the data rates for digital. This is quite important for legal operation that does not exceed the bandwidths for these modes. These groups in the pool are repetitious repeating the same question in several forms and thus a lot of important material is omitted.

>
> > Or another area that could be included
> > in the test, although I'd admit it's not a
> > necessity, is something on the history
> > of amateur radio. (snip)
>
> > Or how about including a little bit on
> > space weather and it's effects not only
> > on propagation but how major flares
> > can potentially effect electronics
> > in general. (snip)
>
>
> Come on, Dee. If you throw in a little more math and language skills,
you
> could almost offer a college degree to those who pass the exams you want.
>

Note that I said these areas aren't really necessary but simply interesting.
One or two questions in the pool might spark a person's interest to pursue
self study in these areas.

>
> > Here is another example. The tests do
> > not have questions addressing the issue
> > of how far from the band edge one
> > should stay to insure that none of their
> > signal is outside the allowable band.
> > I've heard (snip)
>
>
> Not in so many words, but the concepts are there (bandwidths of various
> modes and frequency limits). The old Novice used to have a couple of
> questions about this, but I'm not sure that made it's way over to the new
> tests.
>

No it hasn't made its way into the new tests. And I hear this violation
happening regularly when I am on HF and it seems to be increasing.

>
> > Dwight that argument can be turned
> > against the proposal to eliminate code
> > testing as follows so don't go there.
> > "Finally, I have to wonder if there
> > is any reason to change the exams
> > at all. The current exams have
> > evolved over many years, and I
> > just don't see how the suggested
> > changes I've seen (yours and
> > others to eliminate code testing)
> > offer a real improvement."

>
>
> Not really. My objection isn't based on the fact that the current exams
> have evolved over the years, but on the fact that I don't see how the
> suggested changes offer an improvement. The part about the current exams
> evolving over the years was intended to point out how well they fit the
> current needs, leaving little room for improvement by the suggestions
> offered. The same cannot be said about the code test because it hasn't
> really evolved to fit the current needs (from a regulatory perspective,
> there is no current need for the code test). Now, before this turns into a
> code test debate, lets drop this at that.
>

Difference of opinion is fine but don't assume that the FCC knows what they
are doing. Just because they've said it doesn't make it true. They have a
long history of mistakes.

>
> > The top three things that any ham should know,
> > in my opinion, are rules/regulations, safety, and
> > good operating practices. These need a great
> > deal more coverage than they currently get.
>
>
> Obviously every Ham should know those things. But, as noted in section
> 97.3 of the rules (below), this is an activity oriented towards self-study
> or self-training, not massive tests with extensive knowledge before
> entrance.
> [snip]
> The rules are there for any Ham to study on their own - with plenty of
> warnings in the exams about what might happen if they don't follow those
> rules.
>

Adding one 50 question test on rules hardly constitutes massive tests with
extensive knowledge. Changing the handful of rules questions in the current
tests to other material if a separate rules test were instituted hardly
constitutes asking for extensive knowledge. My comments on what could be
used for this were to point out that there was a wealth of material to pick
from not to say that ALL technical and operating issues should be covered.
Or one could simply reduce the number of questions in the Tech, General, &
Extra since the rules would already be covered in the rules exam..

There are NOT plenty of warnings in the exams about what can happen to
violators if they do not follow the rules. Reread the question pool. There
NO questions in the Technician pool about the possible penalties for
violating the rules. Questions about the rules, yes. Questions about the
penalties, no.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

5128. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-31 15:56:04 UTC
From: Radioman <radio@ptt.edu>
Message-ID: <3FF2F194.DEC19F8A@ptt.edu>
Source record: 84754
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.cb

> I'm talking about HAMS that really use a radio to transmit a signal.
> Doesnt matter what band. How many transmit a signal at least once a
> week? Most don't.

If that HAM is active on CB, does that count? It's a radio signal.

5129. Re: The main problem with Ham radio...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-31 16:04:25 UTC
From: Alun <alun@1stcounsel.com>
Message-ID: <Xns9462709FBE973elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 84755

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in
news:CPBIb.19842$P%1.18538480@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com:

>
> "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
> news:7jxIb.2044$6B.285@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
>>
>> "Dee D. Flint" wrote:
>> >
>> > I have known several people who
>> > already had the technical background
>> > (or most of it) and passed the exam
>> > and knew very little about the rules.
>> > Take the (snip)
>>
>>
>> While that might be an exception, would a person with a technical
>> background be the type to ignore rules? Instead, I suspect a person
>> who would make the effort to gain a technical background would also
>> likely make the effort to learn the rules of any activity he or she
>> might be involved in.
>>
>
> Yes they can be. I've known several. They too often fall in the "know
> it all" category.
>
>>
>> > (snip) Plus the questions don't begin to
>> > cover all the rules that directly apply to
>> > the operations of a Technician class licensee.
>>
>>
>> Well, if you're looking for a test to cover all the rules, it seems
>> to me
>> you're looking for a test with several hundred questions. College
>> students don't even have to take a test with several hundred questions
>> to pass a class to prepare for a career. Likewise, an extensive exam
>> like this doesn't fit into the current exam concept (basic exams for
>> entry into each license class). With that in mind, how are you going
>> to sell the FCC on that idea?
>>
>
> I think 50 to 100 questions ought to do it. Only the pool would need
> to be several hundred questions, just as today's pools are far larger

> than the number of questions actually occurring on any one exam.
>
>>
>> > None of the tests currently comes close
>> > to covering the full scope of rules
>> > applying to the license class on that
>> > particular license exam and that is what needs to be changed.
>> > (snip)
>>
>>
>> Why? Do you have some evidence (personal, rhetorical, or otherwise)
>> that
>> would suggest the current tests are linked to a specific problem with
>> rule violations? From what I've seen, most violations are the result
>> of intentional rule infractions, not ignorance of the rules
>> themselves.
>>
>>
>
> I find band edge violations almost every time I dial up and down the HF
> bands.
>
>> > If the applicant has studied sufficiently to
>> > get 75% right on a rules only test of say
>> > 100 or so questions, he/she shouldn't
>> > have too much problem remembering the rules.
>>
>>
>> My wife only had 50 questions on the exams to pass her international
>> law
>> class recently (two 20 question exams and one 10 question exam).
>> You're asking for much more from people preparing for what is
>> fundamentally a recreational activity. That, in my opinion, is a
>> little ridiculous, Dee.
>>
>
> How many questions has she had to pass to get her law degree and to
> pass her bar exam?
>
> Fifty to 100 multiple choice questions on the FCC rules is simple as
> the rules are very simple.
>
>>
>> > The rules covered in the exam barely
>> > scratch the surface. And one can miss
>> > most or all the rules questions and still pass the current exam
>> > element.
>> > (snip)
>>
>>

>> You keep saying that, but do you have anything to suggest it has
>> ever
>> happened (much less commonly so)? Again, it is theoretically possible,
>> but not really very likely. As I said before, a person that poorly
>> prepared would likely miss several other questions on the exam,
>> meaning he or she would almost have to get the majority correct on
>> each part of the exam to pass the overall exam.
>>
>
> On the Tech exam there are only 5 rules questions. That means missing
> all 5 gives you a score of 30, which is passing. This gives you room
> to miss several other questions on the exam. However several of those
> 5 are so common sense (i.e. no interference) that even someone who has
> not studied will not miss them all. Afterall the passing grade for the
> exam is only 74%. That means you can miss a total of 9 and still get
> it.
>
> Neither the examiners nor the applicants know which specific questions
> were used on any one exam. The answer sheets and question sheets are
> separated. So determining whether someone had difficulty with the
> technical, operating, or rules sections is not allowed at the test
> session. The data could be computerized and correlated at the VEC but
> isn't. However in teaching classes and using practice exams, it is
> common for a student to struggle with a particular section while acing
> the others. The section will vary from student to student however.
>
>>
>> > I regularly have people tell me they'd
>> > like to practice their code on the air but
>> > "can't because they are only a Tech."
>> > They are totally unaware that they can work code in the VHF (snip)
>>
>>
>> Did they tell you that (they were unaware they can work code on
>> VHF), or
>> is that your interpretation of their comment. I've made a similar
>> comment once or twice over the years - not because I was unaware I
>> could work code on VHF, but because there are so few others doing so
>> on those frequencies.
>>
>
> They actually told me so and were astonished that it was legal for them
> to work CW on VHF even though they had not passed a code test. The sad
> thing is the only people I ever find on VHF CW are Generals, Advanced
> and Extras.
>
>>
>> > Again, take the Tech test. There is
>> > very little on digital operations or
>> > satellite operations yet these are open to Technicians. (snip)

>>
>>
>> There was such material in the pool I studied (7/97 - 6/01 pool).
>> For satellite, questions T1C01 through T1C11, T1E05 through T1E08,
>> T3C01 through
>> T3C05, T3C10 through T3C12, and a few others here and there throughout
>> the pool. There are a similar number of questions for digital
>> operations.
>>
>
> The current question pool however no longer includes the data rates for
> digital. This is quite important for legal operation that does not
> exceed the bandwidths for these modes. These groups in the pool are
> repetitious repeating the same question in several forms and thus a lot
> of important material is omitted.
>
>>
>> > Or another area that could be included
>> > in the test, although I'd admit it's not a
>> > necessity, is something on the history of amateur radio. (snip)
>>
>> > Or how about including a little bit on
>> > space weather and it's effects not only
>> > on propagation but how major flares
>> > can potentially effect electronics in general. (snip)
>>
>>
>> Come on, Dee. If you throw in a little more math and language
>> skills, you
>> could almost offer a college degree to those who pass the exams you
>> want.
>>
>
> Note that I said these areas aren't really necessary but simply
> interesting. One or two questions in the pool might spark a person's
> interest to pursue self study in these areas.
>
>>
>> > Here is another example. The tests do
>> > not have questions addressing the issue
>> > of how far from the band edge one
>> > should stay to insure that none of their
>> > signal is outside the allowable band.
>> > I've heard (snip)
>>
>>
>> Not in so many words, but the concepts are there (bandwidths of
>> various
>> modes and frequency limits). The old Novice used to have a couple of
>> questions about this, but I'm not sure that made it's way over to the

>> new tests.
>>
>
> No it hasn't made its way into the new tests. And I hear this
> violation happening regularly when I am on HF and it seems to be
> increasing.
>
>>
>> > Dwight that argument can be turned
>> > against the proposal to eliminate code
>> > testing as follows so don't go there.
>> > "Finally, I have to wonder if there
>> > is any reason to change the exams
>> > at all. The current exams have
>> > evolved over many years, and I
>> > just don't see how the suggested
>> > changes I've seen (yours and
>> > others to eliminate code testing)
>> > offer a real improvement."
>>
>>
>> Not really. My objection isn't based on the fact that the current
>> exams
>> have evolved over the years, but on the fact that I don't see how the
>> suggested changes offer an improvement. The part about the current
>> exams evolving over the years was intended to point out how well they
>> fit the current needs, leaving little room for improvement by the
>> suggestions offered. The same cannot be said about the code test
>> because it hasn't really evolved to fit the current needs (from a
>> regulatory perspective, there is no current need for the code test).
>> Now, before this turns into a code test debate, lets drop this at
>> that.
>>
>
> Difference of opinion is fine but don't assume that the FCC knows what
> they are doing. Just because they've said it doesn't make it true.
> They have a long history of mistakes.
>
>>
>> > The top three things that any ham should know, in my opinion, are
>> > rules/regulations, safety, and good operating practices. These need
>> > a great deal more coverage than they currently get.
>>
>>
>> Obviously every Ham should know those things. But, as noted in
>> section
>> 97.3 of the rules (below), this is an activity oriented towards
>> self-study or self-training, not massive tests with extensive
>> knowledge before entrance. [snip]
>> The rules are there for any Ham to study on their own - with plenty

>> of
>> warnings in the exams about what might happen if they don't follow
>> those rules.
>>
>
> Adding one 50 question test on rules hardly constitutes massive tests
> with extensive knowledge. Changing the handful of rules questions in
> the current tests to other material if a separate rules test were
> instituted hardly constitutes asking for extensive knowledge. My
> comments on what could be used for this were to point out that there
> was a wealth of material to pick from not to say that ALL technical and
> operating issues should be covered. Or one could simply reduce the
> number of questions in the Tech, General, & Extra since the rules would
> already be covered in the rules exam..
>
> There are NOT plenty of warnings in the exams about what can happen to
> violators if they do not follow the rules. Reread the question pool.
> There NO questions in the Technician pool about the possible penalties
> for violating the rules. Questions about the rules, yes. Questions
> about the penalties, no.
>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>
>

I don't think it is practical to test everyone on everything. Tests are written in such a way that the candidate doesn't know what will come up, so has to learn everything in the pool. There should be more questions in the pool, though, covering topics that are presently left out.

Interestingly, WRC 2003 laid down a syllabus for the first time. However, I confess I have no idea whether current FCC tests comply with it or not.

Unlike in the US, the UK tests have extensive questions on operating practice. One thing at least that comes out of that is that UK hams all know the international phonetics by heart. US hams don't, because it's not in the FCC question pools. It should be. There are also extensive questions on interference in the UK, including questions on band edges. If that were the case in the US, I doubt if you would come across so many US hams operating USB on 14.350 or the like (I hear them too, and much too often). The UK question pools are not published, but I know these questions occur.

This is not meant to say that the UK tests are superior, it is just an observation on a couple of things that ought to be in the FCC question pools that aren't, and the corresponding broader areas in which the FCC tests are weak. Yes, I suppose I should write some questions on these subjects and submit them. It is one of the good points of the US system that I could do that. It is perhaps also one of it's bad points, in that questions submitted by volunteers may have a few holes in the first place

(gaps in coverage, not necessarily flaws in the questions).

73 de Alun, N3KIP (Ex-G8VUK, G0VUK)

PS: I am a 'know-it-all' EE, but I don't think anyone in my position would take the tests without at least reading Part 97.

5130. Re: The main problem with Ham radio...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-31 16:21:22 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <6ICIb.19847$P%1.18549651@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 84756

"Alun" <alun@1stcounsel.com> wrote in message
news:Xns9462709FBE973elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
> I don't think it is practical to test everyone on everything. Tests are
> written in such a way that the candidate doesn't know what will come up,
so
> has to learn everything in the pool. There should be more questions in the
> pool, though, covering topics that are presently left out.
>
> Interestingly, WRC 2003 laid down a syllabus for the first time. However,
I
> confess I have no idea whether current FCC tests comply with it or not.
>
> Unlike in the US, the UK tests have extensive questions on operating
> practice. One thing at least that comes out of that is that UK hams all
> know the international phonetics by heart. US hams don't, because it's not
> in the FCC question pools. It should be. There are also extensive
questions
> on interference in the UK, including questions on band edges. If that were
> the case in the US, I doubt if you would come across so many US hams
> operating USB on 14.350 or the like (I hear them too, and much too often).
> The UK question pools are not published, but I know these questions occur.
>
> This is not meant to say that the UK tests are superior, it is just an
> observation on a couple of things that ought to be in the FCC question
> pools that aren't, and the corresponding broader areas in which the FCC
> tests are weak. Yes, I suppose I should write some questions on these
> subjects and submit them. It is one of the good points of the US system
> that I could do that. It is perhaps also one of it's bad points, in that
> questions submitted by volunteers may have a few holes in the first place
> (gaps in coverage, not necessarily flaws in the questions).
>
> 73 de Alun, N3KIP (Ex-G8VUK, G0VUK)
>
> PS: I am a 'know-it-all' EE, but I don't think anyone in my position would
> take the tests without at least reading Part 97.
>

Alun, not everyone is as conscientious as you are about having checked out
the rules. Of those hams that I personally know, only a small percentage
have a copy of the Part 97 rules and an even smaller percentage bother to
keep up with making sure it is current.

Also you didn't have to quote the ENTIRE discussion to make a reply. I was
beginning to wonder if you had written anything as I scrolled down.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

5131. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-31 17:20:00 UTC
From: BDK <kingratboyoboy@buckeye-express.com>
Message-ID: <MPG.1a5ccf4f76d39f11989868@news.buckeye-express.com>
Source record: 84757
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.cb

In article <GtpIb.19766$P%1.18401304@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>,
deehays@qix.net says...
>
> "BDK" <kingratboyoboy@buckeye-express.com> wrote in message
> news:MPG.1a5be9d047e29434989864@news.buckeye-express.com...
> > In article <5a5fcb7b.0312300754.35f8a0d@posting.google.com>,
> > no_spam_here34474@yahoo.com says...
> >
> > Hmm, well I saw it at one place last week, along with MT, CQ, and the
> > scanner one, I can't think of the name. Leo's bookstore has them all,
> > they used to have the British SW Magazine and Practical Wireless too,
> > but not lately.
> >
> > I haven't been to B Dalton in a long time, but Barnes and Nobles had it
> > a couple of months ago.
> >
> > I guess you will have to subscribe, it's cheaper than buying it anyway.
> >
> > BDK
>
> Technically you don't "subscribe" to QST. You join the ARRL and receive the
> magazine as a result of your membership.
>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>
>

True, sad, but true. The good info I have gotten out of it outweighs my
feelings against them.

BDK

5132. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-31 17:20:42 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <EI2dne22pLqfm26iRVn-jg@gbronline.com>
Source record: 84758
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.cb

JEP wrote:
> Just my point. I don't want to belong to ARRL just as I don't care to
> belong to AARP, NRA, AAA, Skinheads, etc. I just want to read their
> magazine when it has something that interests me. I wouldn't buy it
> every month as most of the time it has useless drivel about some
> clowntest or whether someone died or some such crap.

Then go to your library and read it, assuming you know what a library is.

5133. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-31 17:22:31 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <EI2dney2pLrmm26iRVn-jg@gbronline.com>
Source record: 84759
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.cb

gw wrote:

>
>
> hey john how are things in colorado springs???

???

5134. Re: Why You Don't Like Warmed Over Incentive Licensing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-31 18:02:07 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <zaElb.235$uF6.197425@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 84760

```
Bill Sohl wrote:
> "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
> news:L%qIb.9227$Vv2.4059835@news1.news.adelphia.net...
>
>>Kï¿½HB wrote:
>>
>>
>>>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>>Second and more important is, if we don't use spectrum as an incentive,
>>>
>>>what do
>>>
>>>
>>>>we use?
>>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>Incentive?
>>>
>>>Jim, you sound like a typical eastern liberal with an agenda of social
>>>engineering.
>>
>>Thank goodness the Conservatives have NO social engineering agenda!!!
>>
>>
>>>You're either qualified for a ham license or you're not qualified. This
>>>incentive notion (and Steve Robeson's 'structured occupancy' notion) are
>>>liberal ideas whose time has gone.
>>
>>Personally I think good true conservative idea is to allow people on
>>the air with no licencing requirements whatsoever, then cull out the
>>ones that violate the rules.
>
>
> Wrong. A true conservative desires the least practical government
> intervention in life. Clearly a "free-for-all" no license approach
> to ham radio wouldn't cut it and, as such, I and other conservative
> minded individuals do support ham licensing. Where we depart from
> the current approach is in the recognition that the "incentives" of
> today's licensing do NOT dovetail with the knowledge needed
> to pass the higher level license exams.
```

Wrong yourself Bill. I say that a person takes what is their own political leanings, then applies their personal thoughts on the Morse code or testing issue, and tries to apply the label.

If you are conservative, and pro code, the elimination of Morse code is a liberal thing, and vice versa.

I think that Ham licensing is a leftover of social engineering practices. The reason that many conservatives support it today is a cultural inertia - it is old and status quo, so it is good. But it ain't conservative - it's almost like having a Union card. You have your Apprentices, you have your Journeymen.....

- Mike KB3EIA -

5135. Re: The main problem with Ham radio...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-31 18:23:19 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <ruEIb.17203$IM3.4490@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 84761

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:xnfcneeyarg.hqqjb95.pminews@netnews.comcast.net...
> On 30 Dec 2003 16:07:59 -0800, Brian wrote:
> >
> >Phil, I said it before the restructuring and I''ll say it again.
> >
> >"What I fear most about the restructuring is a lack of enforcement,
> >and what I fear most about maintaining the status quo is a lack of
> >enforcement."
> >
> >Having people memorizing the rules is completely meaningless unless
> >the FCC enforces them.
>
> I said that long before you were a ham and I'll continue to say it.
> I and others did our parts to make it happen, and I'm sad that it
> degenerated as it did. I can point fingers 40 years back as to why
> but it wouldn't do any good.
>
> --
> 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane
>
>
>
>
I believe the downward spin began with Dick Bash.

Dan/W4NTI

5136. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-31 19:30:56 UTC
From: no_spam_here34474@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <5a5fcb7b.0312311130.33106e40@posting.google.com>
Source record: 84762
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.cb

Only if you are pre 1960 and still consider 11 meters as a ham band.

Radioman <radio@ptt.edu> wrote in message news:<3FF2F194.DEC19F8A@ptt.edu>...
> > I'm talking about HAMS that really use a radio to transmit a signal.
> > Doesnt matter what band. How many transmit a signal at least once a
> > week? Most don't.
>
> If that HAM is active on CB, does that count? It's a radio signal.

5137. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-31 19:31:50 UTC
From: no_spam_here34474@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <5a5fcb7b.0312311131.41d83b79@posting.google.com>
Source record: 84763
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.cb

Thats why I say good riddance to ARRL and QST.

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:<VfBIb.19838$P%1.18531178@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>...
> "JEP" <no_spam_here34474@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> news:5a5fcb7b.0312310438.75c314fb@posting.google.com...
> > Just my point. I don't want to belong to ARRL just as I don't care to
> > belong to AARP, NRA, AAA, Skinheads, etc. I just want to read their
> > magazine when it has something that interests me. I wouldn't buy it
> > every month as most of the time it has useless drivel about some
> > clowntest or whether someone died or some such crap. ARRL and QST have
> > a short time left as the active Ham population lessens.
>
> Well then you can't expect the magazine to be sold at outlets when you only
> buy it once in a while. They've got to recoup the costs of printing and
> distributing and the "once in a while" buyer just doesn't provide that.
>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

5138. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-31 19:37:00 UTC
From: no_spam_here34474@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <5a5fcb7b.0312311137.11929708@posting.google.com>
Source record: 84764
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.cb

Check the figures yourself then check how many are really active. Yes
you can but NRA and AARP rags on the stand. AAA no. I quoted no data,
I made an observation. Get you head out the sand and look around. See
all of your old buddies just hanging around the club meeting doing
nothing? is field day as well attended as it was in the 60's? Are new
folks welcomed? Is help provided?
If so then consider yourself lucky.

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<ODBIb.16943$IM3.1446@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> "JEP" <no_spam_here34474@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> news:5a5fcb7b.0312310438.75c314fb@posting.google.com...
> > Just my point. I don't want to belong to ARRL just as I don't care to
> > belong to AARP, NRA, AAA, Skinheads, etc.
>
> Can you "just buy" the magazines of AARP, NRA, AAA, etc.
> without joining? I am always amazed at people that want the "benefits"
> of an organization's efforts, in this case the publication, but don't want
> to support the organization by joining. I see the same thing at times
> in the antique car hobby. People that bitch about the club rules
> at a car show, or otherwise want technical help from club officials
> but won't part with the few bucks it takes to join.
>
> > I just want to read their
> > magazine when it has something that interests me. I wouldn't buy it
> > every month as most of the time it has useless drivel about some
> > clowntest or whether someone died or some such crap. ARRL and QST have
> > a short time left as the active Ham population lessens.
>
> Is it lessening? News to me.
>
> > If they took a
> > real survey as to how many real active ham there are they would find
> > the number far less than they think. I'm not talking about members,
> > I'm talking about HAMS that really use a radio to transmit a signal.
> > Doesnt matter what band. How many transmit a signal at least once a
> > week? Most don't.
>
> Please provide your survey data.
>
> > Look at your local HAM clubs, talk to the members(if you can wake them
> > up). Most show up and act disgusted with the club, Ham radio, life in
> > general. New folks are never there. Ya I know about your Skywarn in

> > Flint, MI. Great service! Could be run on CB, NEXTEL, GMRS.
>
> Could be but isn't...there in lies the difference.
>
> Cheers,
> Bill K2UNK

5139. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-31 20:10:30 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3FF32D36.DA7F397D@earthlink.net>
Source record: 84765
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.cb

JEP wrote:
>
> Thats why I say good riddance to ARRL and QST.

That'll show 'em...

Dave K8MN

5140. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-31 20:13:29 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3FF32DE8.5249C675@earthlink.net>
Source record: 84766
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.cb

JEP wrote:
>
> Check the figures yourself then check how many are really active. Yes
> you can but NRA and AARP rags on the stand. AAA no. I quoted no data,
> I made an observation. Get you head out the sand and look around.

> See all of your old buddies just hanging around the club meeting doing
> nothing?

Yep, that's the same thing they were doing twenty or thirty years ago.
They show up though.

> is field day as well attended as it was in the 60's?

Yep.

> Are new folks welcomed?

Yep.

> Is help provided?

Yep.

> If so then consider yourself lucky.

I don't know about lucky. Fortunate, maybe, that my experience over
forty years in amateur radio hasn't been the unpleasant one you've
obviously been forced to endure.

Dave K8MN

5141. Re: Australian CBers better than US technicians

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-31 20:54:33 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <dIGIb.32665$Gn5.16083@news01.roc.ny>
Source record: 84767

Dan,

Look at the bright side; all of the qrm will be on voice. Drop down to the bottom of 40 and life will be beautiful :)

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message news:tQ1Ib.14492$IM3.2258@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net...
>
> "VA7LNX" <spamtrap@gwsn.com> wrote in message
> news:F00Ib.856500$pl3.822356@pd7tw3no...
> > Dan/W4NTI wrote:
> >
> > >
> > > "WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
> > > news:20031228194224.03823.00001965@mb-m07.aol.com...
> > >> >Now you understand lately why it was
> > >> >necessary to remove totally CW in the
> > >> >S.25-5 .
> > >>
> > >> Yea we understand, its the only way the Knuckle Draggin CBplussers
> could
> > > > get on
> > >> HF.
> > > >
> > > > At one time I was seriously considering immigrating to VK land. Glad
I
> > > > didn't now. First off the take all the guns from its citizens and the
> > > > crime
> > > > rate tripples. Now they put unqualified operators on HF.
> > > >
> > > > What does a roger beep sound like down under?
> > > >
> > > > Dan/W4NTI
> > >
> > > regor ;-)
> > >
> > > Seriously though.... I wish they wouldn't remove the code requirement on
> HF.
> > > It creates a new goal to get onto those bands. (Admittedly, I don't have
> > > code either).
> > >
> > > --

> > Donovan Hill
> > VA7LNX (Basic, Advanced)
>
> Obviously most of you blokes decided otherwise. Working DX into VK will
be
> a lot harder now. 40 meter SSB sucks on that path.
>
> Dan/W4NTI
>
>

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.557 / Virus Database: 349 - Release Date: 12/30/03

5142. Re: The main problem with Ham radio...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-31 22:22:43 UTC
From: garigue <garigue@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <T_HIb.17085$I07.49105@attbi_s53>
Source record: 84768

> > I said that long before you were a ham and I'll continue to say it.
> > I and others did our parts to make it happen, and I'm sad that it
> > degenerated as it did. I can point fingers 40 years back as to why
> > but it wouldn't do any good.
> >
> > --
> > 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane
> >
> >
> >
> >
> I believe the downward spin began with Dick Bash.
>
> Dan/W4NTI

Which in turn Dan was IMHO due to the incentive debaucle. I think we all need to kick our collective asses for allowing a lot of things to happen over the years.

Film at 11 as this is New Years Eve ....

73 God Bless KI3R Tom Popovic Belle Vernon Pa

5143. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-31 22:46:26 UTC
From: groupk0hb@earthlink.net
Message-ID: <5ee63311.0312311446.3ebe5f10@posting.google.com>
Source record: 84769

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote

>
> As for "free upgrades", the FCC already unleased THAT genie with thier
> last round of "restructuring" with no help at all from the ARRL.
>

And what "free upgrade" did you see in the last round or
restructuring?

The only thing that remotely resembles "free", was giving Pre-87
Technicians credit for the General written exam which they took.
Since the exam was EXACTLY the same as Generals took, I don't see any
freebie there.

But just wait till ARRL BoD meets next month..... I expect to see
them recommend a three-tier license regime, with a new low-powered 50W
beginners "C" license, a new mid-range "B" license with 3-400W power
limit, and a new top of the line "A" class license with 1.5KW power
limit and a CW test in the 15-25WPM range. Frequency ghettos for "C"
and "B" similar to now. Current Novice/Tech get free upgrade to "B"
privs, current General/Advanced get free upgrade to "A".
Yawwwwwnnnnnnnnnnnnnnn!

I'm sure I'll miss some of the details in their proposal, but the
above is pretty much the way I read the tea-leaves.

73, de Hans, K0HB

5144. Re: The main problem with Ham radio...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-31 22:50:26 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <xnfcneeyarg.hqry2k6.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>
Source record: 84770

On Wed, 31 Dec 2003 15:21:06 GMT, Dee D. Flint wrote:

>> My wife only had 50 questions on the exams to pass her international law
>> class recently (two 20 question exams and one 10 question exam). You're
>> asking for much more from people preparing for what is fundamentally a
>> recreational activity. That, in my opinion, is a little ridiculous, Dee.
>>
>
>How many questions has she had to pass to get her law degree and to pass her
>bar exam?

Pending Dwight's reply, I can add from my own experience.

Minimum accredited law school requirements for a JD were 80 units of
classwork, in which 60 units required written tests of six essay
questions (3 midterm, 3 final) per unit, one hour per essay. Rarely
did we have a multiple choice or fill-in-the-blank exam. The other
20 units were performance subjects where every day was, in effect,
an exam.

The Bar Exam is something different. Each state has slightly
different requirements, one or two days' worth of written "essay"
exams and the one-day Multistate Bar Exam (MBE). The MBE is a
national requirement, a 200-question multiple-choice exam,
100 in the morning, 100 in the afternoon, with three hours per
session. The time for each question comes out to 1.8 minutes each.
Half of the questions come from a published 500 question-and-answer
pool. Of course there's a hitch - two or more choices are close to
the expected answer and it's the applicant's job to pick the right one.

In the year that I took the Bar Exam, most states required a minimum
of 130 correct answers (65%) to even be considered for admission,
and the average nationwide was 132 including the superstars from
places like Harvard and Yale Law Schools. California - the toughest
of the states - granted admission to anyone who scored 152 (76%) or
more, regardless of his/her performance on the written portion.

Not quite the same as the FCC license tests.....

>Fifty to 100 multiple choice questions on the FCC rules is simple as the
>rules are very simple.

50 seems to be a reasonable number for the average applicant. This
isn't, and shouldn't be, a Bar Exam because folks who pass the rules
exam are not expected to be qualified to do interpretation and
analysis to the level and precision that an attorney does.

Another radical idea: The (commercial) radiotelephone operator's exam has two elements that all classes must pass: Element 1 dealing with Rules and Regulations, and Element 2 dealing with operating practices and procedures.

As this is a requirement even for a charter boat skipper operating in tidal waters who isn't even allowed to do anything with the transmitter except to operate the external channel and volume knobs, I can see having a counterpart of perhaps another 50 questions in the Amateur exam dealing with operating practices in all modes.

Like the Rules exam, pass it once, never have to pass it again unless the license lapses beyond the grace period for renewal or the licensee's conduct is found to be so egregious that a re-exam under FCC supervision is necessary - "all or nothing".

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

5145. Re: Australian CBers better than US technicians

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-31 23:27:12 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <kXIIb.17428$IM3.2083@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 84771

Not really....you still have to goofs on digital jumping all over the CW guys on 40.

Heard a guy on 75 the other night say he wanted CW testing elliminated so the FCC could/would move phone down to fill in the gap.

I told him, thats fine. I'll just start operating CW above 3750.

Dan/W4NTI

"Jim Hampton" <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote in message news:dIGIb.32665$Gn5.16083@news01.roc.ny...
> Dan,
>
> Look at the bright side; all of the qrm will be on voice. Drop down to the
> bottom of 40 and life will be beautiful :)
>
> 73 from Rochester, NY
> Jim AA2QA
>
>
> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
> news:tQ1Ib.14492$IM3.2258@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> >
> > "VA7LNX" <spamtrap@gwsn.com> wrote in message
> > news:F00Ib.856500$pl3.822356@pd7tw3no...
> > > Dan/W4NTI wrote:
> > >
> > > >
> > > > "WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
> > > > news:20031228194224.03823.00001965@mb-m07.aol.com...
> > > >> >Now you understand lately why it was
> > > >> >necessary to remove totally CW in the
> > > >> >S.25-5 .
> > > >>
> > > >> Yea we understand, its the only way the Knuckle Draggin CBplussers
> > could
> > > > > get on
> > > >> HF.
> > > >
> > > > At one time I was seriously considering immigrating to VK land.
Glad
> I
> > > > didn't now. First off the take all the guns from its citizens and

the
> > > > crime
> > > > rate tripples. Now they put unqualified operators on HF.
> > > >
> > > > What does a roger beep sound like down under?
> > > >
> > > > Dan/W4NTI
> > >
> > > regor ;-)
> > >
> > > Seriously though.... I wish they wouldn't remove the code requirement
on
> > HF.
> > > It creates a new goal to get onto those bands. (Admittedly, I don't
have
> > > code either).
> > >
> > > --
> > > Donovan Hill
> > > VA7LNX (Basic, Advanced)
> >
> > Obviously most of you blokes decided otherwise. Working DX into VK will
> be
> > a lot harder now. 40 meter SSB sucks on that path.
> >
> > Dan/W4NTI
> >
> >
>
>
> ---
> Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
> Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
> Version: 6.0.557 / Virus Database: 349 - Release Date: 12/30/03
>
>

5146. Re: The main problem with Ham radio...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-31 23:28:36 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <EYIIb.17430$IM3.3823@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 84772

"garigue" <garigue@comcast.net> wrote in message
news:T_HIb.17085$I07.49105@attbi_s53...
>
> > > I said that long before you were a ham and I'll continue to say it.
> > > I and others did our parts to make it happen, and I'm sad that it
> > > degenerated as it did. I can point fingers 40 years back as to why
> > > but it wouldn't do any good.
> > >
> > > --
> > > 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane
> > >
> > >
> > >
> > >
> > I believe the downward spin began with Dick Bash.
> >
> > Dan/W4NTI
>
> Which in turn Dan was IMHO due to the incentive debaucle. I think we all
> need to kick our collective asses for allowing a lot of things to happen
> over the years.
>
> Film at 11 as this is New Years Eve ....
>
> 73 God Bless KI3R Tom Popovic Belle Vernon Pa
>
>

Totally agree.

Dan/W4NTI

5147. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-31 23:32:25 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <d0JIb.17433$IM3.9044@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 84773
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.cb

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3FF32D36.DA7F397D@earthlink.net...
> JEP wrote:
> >
> > Thats why I say good riddance to ARRL and QST.
>
> That'll show 'em...
>
> Dave K8MN

I bet it will Dave....maybe they should cut off their noses also, eh?

Dan/W4NTI

5148. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-31 23:33:49 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <x1JIb.17435$IM3.6802@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 84774
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.cb

Good points....now allow me to add some from the other side.

No, lets make it just one.

Know many new guys that DONT KNOW IT ALL?

Dan/W4NTI

"JEP" <no_spam_here34474@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:5a5fcb7b.0312311137.11929708@posting.google.com...
> Check the figures yourself then check how many are really active. Yes
> you can but NRA and AARP rags on the stand. AAA no. I quoted no data,
> I made an observation. Get you head out the sand and look around. See
> all of your old buddies just hanging around the club meeting doing
> nothing? is field day as well attended as it was in the 60's? Are new
> folks welcomed? Is help provided?
> If so then consider yourself lucky.
>
>
>
> "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<ODBIb.16943$IM3.1446@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> > "JEP" <no_spam_here34474@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> > news:5a5fcb7b.0312310438.75c314fb@posting.google.com...
> > > Just my point. I don't want to belong to ARRL just as I don't care to
> > > belong to AARP, NRA, AAA, Skinheads, etc.
> >
> > Can you "just buy" the magazines of AARP, NRA, AAA, etc.
> > without joining? I am always amazed at people that want the "benefits"
> > of an organization's efforts, in this case the publication, but don't
want
> > to support the organization by joining. I see the same thing at times
> > in the antique car hobby. People that bitch about the club rules
> > at a car show, or otherwise want technical help from club officials
> > but won't part with the few bucks it takes to join.
> >
> > > I just want to read their
> > > magazine when it has something that interests me. I wouldn't buy it
> > > every month as most of the time it has useless drivel about some
> > > clowntest or whether someone died or some such crap. ARRL and QST have
> > > a short time left as the active Ham population lessens.
> >
> > Is it lessening? News to me.
> >

> > > If they took a
> > > real survey as to how many real active ham there are they would find
> > > the number far less than they think. I'm not talking about members,
> > > I'm talking about HAMS that really use a radio to transmit a signal.
> > > Doesnt matter what band. How many transmit a signal at least once a
> > > week? Most don't.
> >
> > Please provide your survey data.
> >
> > > Look at your local HAM clubs, talk to the members(if you can wake them
> > > up). Most show up and act disgusted with the club, Ham radio, life in
> > > general. New folks are never there. Ya I know about your Skywarn in
> > > Flint, MI. Great service! Could be run on CB, NEXTEL, GMRS.
> >
> > Could be but isn't...there in lies the difference.
> >
> > Cheers,
> > Bill K2UNK

5149. Re: Why You Don't Like The ARRL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-31 23:36:38 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <a4JIb.17436$IM3.15777@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 84775

"Hans K0HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:5ee63311.0312311446.3ebe5f10@posting.google.com...
> k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson K4CAP) wrote
>
> >
> > As for "free upgrades", the FCC already unleased THAT genie with
thier
> > last round of "restructuring" with no help at all from the ARRL.
> >
>
> And what "free upgrade" did you see in the last round or
> restructuring?
>
> The only thing that remotely resembles "free", was giving Pre-87
> Technicians credit for the General written exam which they took.
> Since the exam was EXACTLY the same as Generals took, I don't see any
> freebie there.
>
> But just wait till ARRL BoD meets next month..... I expect to see
> them recommend a three-tier license regime, with a new low-powered 50W
> beginners "C" license, a new mid-range "B" license with 3-400W power
> limit, and a new top of the line "A" class license with 1.5KW power
> limit and a CW test in the 15-25WPM range. Frequency ghettos for "C"
> and "B" similar to now. Current Novice/Tech get free upgrade to "B"
> privs, current General/Advanced get free upgrade to "A".
> Yawwwwwnnnnnnnnnnnnnnn!
>
> I'm sure I'll miss some of the details in their proposal, but the
> above is pretty much the way I read the tea-leaves.
>
>
> 73, de Hans, K0HB

Dang Hans....imagine....a three tier license structure....what a wonderful
thought....too simple, to obvious, and necessary. So it won't happen.

Dan/W4NTI

5150. Re: Why You Don't Like Warmed Over Incentive Licensing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-12-31 23:56:47 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20031231185647.22081.00002876@mb-m17.aol.com>
Source record: 84776

In article <nwBIb.16932$IM3.5849@newsread3.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:

>> Personally I think good true conservative idea is to allow people on
>> the air with no licencing requirements whatsoever, then cull out the
>> ones that violate the rules.
>
>Wrong. A true conservative desires the least practical government
>intervention in life.

A true liberal desires the least practical government intervention in life as well.

The devil is in the details of what "least practical government intervention" really means.

Just one example: The government used tax dollars to rescue Chrysler about 20 years ago. It turned out to be a good gamble because Chrysler paid back all of the money with interest, and in the end it cost the taxpayers nothing.

Now - was the bailout a "liberal" move to save workers' jobs and try to manage the economy? Some "conservatives" would say that companies that get in trouble should be allowed to fail in a 'free market' and not propped up with tax dollars.

OTOH, was the bailout a "conservative" move to save investors' money? Or to give some help to an industry bedeviled with safety, pollution and economy regulations *and* the double whammy of foreign competiton and two oil crises?

Some "liberals" would say that Big Business should not be propped up with tax dollars. (Ma's Diner wouldn't get such a bailout)

>Clearly a "free-for-all" no license approach
>to ham radio wouldn't cut it and, as such, I and other conservative
>minded individuals do support ham licensing.

Most "conservatives", anyway. The exact same is said by most "liberals".

>Where we depart from
>the current approach is in the recognition that the "incentives" of
>today's licensing do NOT dovetail with the knowledge needed
>to pass the higher level license exams.

Not perfectly, anyway.

73 es HNY de Jim, N2EY